UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 106—PART 8

MAY 6, 1960, TO MAY 25, 1960
(PAGES 9685 TO 11136)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1960

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 6, 1960

The Senate met at 9:30 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, whose love is unfailing and whose mercies are new every morning, again we turn unfilled to Thee, bowing in our ignorance and weakness, praying for strength and wisdom to face with courage the somber specters of hatred and misery that stalk our darkened earth. Through the angry emotions which embitter the present days help us to seek not the vindication of our opinions but the truth no matter where it leads.

If we secretly covet the superior gifts of others and so neglect our one talent, if we inwardly rejoice in the failure of others, if we furnish hospitality to thoughts that debase and degrade, if we are content with anything short of our best, if we have believed the worst about others on flimsy and perhaps false reports, if in any human relationship we have been untrue, unfair, unbrotherly: O Thou who takest away the sin of the world, forgive us, cleanse us, renew us, restore our soiled souls, and lead us in the paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 5, 1960, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, May 5, 1960, he signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 7947. An act relating to the income tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association;

H.R. 8684. An act to provide transitional provisions for the income tax treatment of dealer reserve income;

H.R. 9660. An act to amend section 6659 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10234. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 5, 1960, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 150) permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 11998) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 11998) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 722) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement there is to be an hour on each side, to be controlled by the majority and minority leaders.

I wonder if the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is prepared to take any time now.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is on his way to the Chamber. He had intended to open the debate; but if the majority leader desires, I am prepared to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS entered the Chamber.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Illinois has been a leading advocate of this legislation. It was due largely to his efforts that the original bill was passed. It has been materially reduced by the House of Representatives substitute, but I was pleased to support the Senator from Illinois when S. 722 was originally before the Senate. While I would like to see legislation that at least went as far as S. 722, I do not see any chance of getting it at this session.

As I understand, the Senate bill provided some $389 million. The President recommended a sort of token appropriation of $50 million odd, and the House of Representatives, against great parliamentary obstacles, passed a bill providing $251 million; and I am hopeful that that reasonable, moderate, fair, prudent course will be upheld by the Senate today.

I yield to the Senator from Illinois. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, before the Senator from Illinois proceeds, will the majority leader yield for one comment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I think it is important, as we debate this bill, for us to remember that this is only an authorization bill. The other bill was a spending bill, but this bill has been converted by the House into an authorization bill, so it would not cost one cent unless appropriations were later forthcoming.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator points out a very important matter.

Mr. President, I do not believe we ought to have double standards in this Government. I sat with the Appropriations Committee. All last week I tried to get a mutual aid bill through for all the free world, containing almost $4 billion in grants throughout the free world. Now we are asking for $251 million, largely in loans for our own people in distressed and depressed areas, and we have to fight every inch of the way. I do not think we should have a standard like that, under which we grant $4 billion to other people, and cannot even lend a quarter of a billion to our own people. I am for helping both. I think we can do it and remain fiscally solvent. I think we can do it and become a stronger nation in a stronger world. I do not understand the voices which say, "You cannot cut one dime from the $4 billion of grants to foreign nations, but you must not permit loans of a quarter of a billion to our own people."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I appreciate the generous comments of the majority leader. It would have been impossible to pass this bill through the Senate at any time—and it was passed three times—without his unfailing cooperative and efficient help. I pay tribute to him on this point. We have not always agreed on every measure before the Senate, but no one could have been more cooperative and helpful than the senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is a very important measure, and I think I should describe the House amendments first, indicate some of the details in which it differs from the Senate bill, and then make a very brief argument.

As the Senator from Texas has said, Senate bill 722, when it passed this body, made commitments for a total of $379 million. The House has cut this sum to an authorization for $251 million, but it has retained all the features of the program embodied in S. 722.

Thus, loans for industrial redevelopment has been cut from $100 million to $75 million; loans to establish new industries in critical farm areas of low income and high underemployment have also been reduced from $100 million to $75 million; loans to localities to provide industrial facilities, such as industrial water and industrial parks, have been reduced from $100 million to $50 million.

The figure for grants to especially needy localities which have need for some outright grants in addition to loans, has been cut from $75 million to $35 million. Funds for technical assistance have been maintained at $4,500,000. Then there are authorizations of $10 million for, in subsistence payments during retraining and $1,500,000 for vocational rehabilitation.

As the Senator from Pennsylvania has stated, Senate bill 722 originally provided that the $300 million of loans could be made by the Administrator without further appropriation by Congress, and then the costs would have been met by the flotation of additional quantities of Government bonds. As the Senator from Pennsylvania has made clear, no part of the entire amount can now be spent without further authorization by Congress.

The House has also made changes in eligibility and has effected some liberalization of the rather stringent standards which had been imposed in the Senate bill. However, the provisions which are retained are quite stringent and, in my judgment, adequate.

There is an initial requirement that there must be at least 6 percent unemployment at the time the application is made, that there must have been at least 9 percent unemployment during at least 15 of the 18 previous months, and 6 percent during at least 18 months of the preceding 24 months, if unemployment of not less than 15 percent of the labor force has existed during the 6-month period immediately preceding the date of the application.

A proviso has also been inserted at the last moment by the House that if unemployment falls below 6 percent of the labor force during the period that the application is being processed, such an area will lose its eligibility, and the administrator will not make grants to it. There would be 30 "major" industrial areas which in March of 1960 would be eligible in industrial areas, and 100 smaller areas.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a list of the areas which, in March 1960, would be eligible under the provisions of the House bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tentative list of areas that may qualify for Federal assistance as areas with substantial and persistent unemployment under various legislative proposals,[1] March 1960

MAJOR AREAS[2]

Administration (Kilburn) bill, H.R. 4278	Spence bill (S. 722) (as reported by House committee)	Douglas bill (S. 722) (as passed by Senate)	Administration (Kilburn) bill, H.R. 4278	Spence bill (S. 722) (as reported by House committee)	Douglas bill (S. 722) (as passed by Senate)
(16 major areas)	(44 major areas)	(19 major areas)	(16 major areas)	(44 major areas)	(19 major areas)
Indiana:	Indiana:	Indiana:	Ohio:	Ohio:	Ohio:
Evansville.	Evansville.	Evansville.	----------	Steubenville-Weirton.	Steubenville-Weirton.
Terre Haute.	Terre Haute.	Terra Haute.	Pennsylvania:	Pennsylvania:	Pennsylvania:
Massachusetts:	Massachusetts:	Massachusetts:	Altoona.	Altoona.	Altoona.
----------	Brockton.	----------	Erie.[3]	Erie.	Erie.
Fall River.	Fall River.	Fall River.	Johnstown.	Johnstown.	Johnstown.
Lawrence.	Lawrence.	Lawrence.	----------	Pittsburgh.	----------
Lowell.	Lowell.	Lowell.	Scranton.	Scranton.	Scranton.
New Bedford.	New Bedford.	New Bedford.	Wilkes-Barre—Hazleton.	Wilkes-Barre—Hazleton.	Wilkes-Barre—Hazleton.
----------	Springfield-Holyoke.	----------	Rhode Island:	Rhode Island:	Rhode Island:
Michigan:	Michigan:	Michigan:	Providence.	Providence.	Providence.
Detroit.	Detroit.	Detroit.	Tennessee:	Tennessee:	Tennessee:
----------	Muskegon-Muskegon Heights.	Muskegon-Muskegon Heights.[3]	----------	Chattanooga.	----------
Minnesota:	Minnesota:	Minnesota:	Texas:	Texas:	Texas:
----------	Duluth-Superior.	----------	----------	Beaumont-Port Arthur.	----------
New Jersey:	New Jersey:	New Jersey:	Virginia:	Virginia:	Virginia.
Atlantic City.	Atlantic City.	Atlantic City.	----------	Roanoke.	----------
New York:	New York:	New York:	West Virginia:	West Virginia:	West Virginia:
----------	Albany-Schenectady-Troy.	----------	Charleston.	Charleston.	Charleston.
----------	Buffalo.	----------	Huntington-Ashland.[3]	Huntington-Ashland.	Huntington-Ashland.
----------	Utica-Rome.	----------	----------	Wheeling.	Wheeling.
North Carolina:	North Carolina:	North Carolina:			
----------	Durham.	----------			

[1] This listing is preliminary and tentative, and is based largely on bimonthly or semiannual data compiled from area labor market reports prepared in connection with the Bureau of Employment Security's program for the classification of areas according to relative adequacy of labor supply. Data used cover a 2-to-5 year period, generally extending through January 1960. Later data, now becoming available for some areas, could result in several changes in the above listing. A more comprehensive review of area data on a monthly—rather than bimonthly or semiannual—basis, and in the light of whatever criteria may be included in the bill finally enacted, would be required to determine which areas are eligible for assistance as areas with substantial and persistent unemployment.

[2] Major areas are areas included in the Bureau of Employment Security's regular area labor market reporting and classification program. This program covers 149 of the country's leading employment centers. Unemployment and labor force data for these areas are generally available on bimonthly basis.

[3] Borderline.

Tentative list of areas that may qualify for Federal assistance as areas with substantial and persistent unemployment under various legislative proposals, March 1960—Continued

SMALLER AREAS [4]

Administration (Kilburn) bill, H.R. 4278	Spence bill (S. 722) (as reported by House committee)	Douglas bill (S. 722) (as passed by Senate)	Administration (Kilburn) bill, H.R. 4278	Spence bill (S. 722) (as reported by House committee)	Douglas bill (S. 722) (as passed by Senate)
(49 smaller areas)	(148 smaller areas)	(61 smaller areas)	(49 smaller areas)	(148 smaller areas)	(61 smaller areas)
Alabama:	Alabama:	Alabama:	New York—Continued	New York—Continued	New York—Continued
Florence-Sheffield.	Florence-Sheffield.	Florence-Sheffield.		Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon.	
	Gadsden.			Odgensburg-Massena-Malone.	
Jasper.	Jasper.	Jasper.		Plattsburgh.	
	Talladega.			Wellsville.	
Alaska:	Alaska:	Alaska:	North Carolina:	North Carolina:	North Carolina:
Anchorage.	Anchorage.	Anchorage.	Fayetteville.	Fayetteville.	Fayetteville.
Connecticut:	Connecticut:	Connecticut:		Hendersonville.	
	Ansonia.			Lumberton.	
	Bristol.	Bristol.		Mount Airy.	
Danielson.	Danielson.	Danielson.	Rockingham-Hamlet.	Rockingham-Hamlet.	Rockingham-Hamlet.
	Meriden.		Ohio:	Ohio:	Ohio:
	Middletown.			West Union.	
	Norwich.			Portsmouth-Chillicothe.	Portsmouth-Chillicothe.
	Thompsonville.				
	Torrington.				
Illinois:	Illinois:	Illinois:	Oklahoma:	Oklahoma:	Oklahoma:
Centralia.	Centralia.	Centralia.		Ardmore.	
Harrisburg.	Harrisburg.	Harrisburg.	McAlester.	McAlester.	McAlester.
Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort.	Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort.	Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort.		Muskogee.	
Litchfield.		Litchfield.		Okmulgee-Henryetta.	
	Mount Carmel-Olney.		Pennsylvania:	Pennsylvania:	Pennsylvania:
Mount Vernon.	Mount Vernon.	Mount Vernon.	Berwick-Bloomsburg.	Berwick-Bloomsburg.	Berwick-Bloomsburg.
Indiana:	Indiana:	Indiana:		Butler.	Butler.
	Connersville.		Clearfield-Du Bois.	Clearfield-Du Bois	Clearfield-Du Bois.
		Muncie.		Indiana.	
Vincennes.	Vincennes.	Vincennes.		Kittanning-Ford City.	
Kansas:	Kansas:	Kansas:		Lewistown.	
	Coffeyville-Independence-Parsons.			Meadville.	
Pittsburg.	Pittsburg.	Pittsburg.	New Castle.	New Castle.	New Castle.
Kentucky:	Kentucky:	Kentucky:		Oil City-Franklin-Titusville.	
Corbin.	Corbin.	Corbin.	Pottsville.	Pottsville.	**Pottsville.**
Hazard.	Hazard.	Hazard.		Sayre-Athens-Towanda.	
Madisonville.	Madisonville.	Madisonville.		St. Marys.	
Morehead-Grayson.	Morehead-Grayson.	Morehead-Grayson.	Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel.	Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel.	Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel.
Paintsville-Prestonsburg.		Paintsville-Prestonsburg.	Uniontown-Connellsville.	Uniontown-Connellsville.	Uniontown-Connellsville.
Pikeville-Williamson.		Pikeville-Williamson.		Williamsport.	
Maine:	Maine:	Maine:	Tennessee:	Tennessee:	Tennessee:
Biddeford-Sanford.	Biddeford-Sanford.	Biddeford-Sanford.	La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell.	La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell.	La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell.
		Lewiston-Auburn	Texas:	Texas:	Texas:
Maryland:	Maryland:	Maryland:		Laredo.	
	Cambridge.			Texarkana.	
Cumberland.	Cumberland.	Cumberland.	Virginia:	Virginia:	Virginia:
Massachusetts:	Massachusetts:	Massachusetts:	Big Stone Gap-Appalachia.	Big Stone Gap-Appalachia.	Big Stone Gap-Appalachia.
	Newburyport.			Richlands-Bluefield.	
North Adams.	North Adams.	North Adams.	Washington:	Washington:	Washington:
Michigan:	Michigan:	Michigan:		Aberdeen.	
Bay City.	Bay City.	Bay City.	Anacortes.	Anacortes.	Anacortes.
Iron Mountain.	Iron Mountain.	Iron Mountain.		Bellingham.	Bellingham.
	Marquette.	Marquette.		Bremerton.	
Monroe.	Monroe.	Monroe.		Port Angeles.	Port Angeles.
Port Huron.	Port Huron.	Port Huron.	West Virginia:	West Virginia:	West Virginia:
Mississippi:	Mississippi:	Mississippi:	Beckley.	Beckley.	Beckley.
	Biloxi-Gulfport.		Bluefield.	Bluefield.	Bluefield.
				Clarksburg.	Clarksburg.
Missouri:	Missouri:	Missouri:	Fairmont.	Fairmont.	Fairmont.
	Flat River.	Flat River.	Logan.	Logan.	Logan.
	Joplin.			Martinsburg.	
	Washington.		Morgantown.	Morgantown.	Morgantown.
Montana:	Montana:	Montana:		Parkersburg.	
Butte.	Butte.	Butte.	Point Pleasant-Gallipolis.	Point Pleasant-Gallipolis.	Point Pleasant-Gallipolis.
	Kalispell.	Kalispell.	Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs.	Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs.	Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs.
New Jersey:	New Jersey:	New Jersey:	Welch.	Welch.	Welch.
Bridgeton.	Bridgeton.	Bridgeton.	Wisconsin:	Wisconsin:	Wisconsin:
	Long Branch.			La Crosse.	
New York:	New York:	New York:			
Amsterdam.	Amsterdam.	Amsterdam.			
Auburn.	Auburn.	Auburn.			
	Elmira.				
Gloversville.	Gloversville.	Gloversville.			
	Jamestown-Dunkirk.				

[4] Smaller areas: Areas with a labor force of 15,000 or more which are officially classified as "smaller areas of substantial labor surplus" by the Bureau of Employment Security. Data for such areas are generally available on a semiannual basis. Information for smaller areas which are not classified, or for areas with a labor force of less than 15,000, is not available in Washington on a consistent basis.

ATTACHMENT TO MARCH 1960 TENTATIVE LIST OF ELIGIBLE AREAS UNDER PROPOSED AREA ASSISTANCE LEGISLATION

SUMMARY OF ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA USED

The administration (Kilburn) bill (H.R. 4278):

1. Unemployment is now 6 percent or more of the labor force, discounting seasonal or temporary factors.

2. The annual average unemployment rate in the area has been:

(a) At least 50 percent above the national average for 4 of the preceding 5 calendar years.

(b) At least 75 percent above the national average for 3 of the preceding 4 calendar years.

(c) At least 100 percent above the national average for 2 of the preceding 3 calendar years.

The Douglas bill (S. 722) as passed by the Senate:

1. Unemployment is now 6 percent or more of the labor force, discounting seasonal or temporary factors.

2. The annual average unemployment rate in the area has been:

(a) At least 50 percent above the national average for 3 of the preceding 4 calendar years.

(b) At least 75 percent above the national average for 2 of the preceding 3 calendar years.

(c) At least 100 percent above the national average for 1 of the preceding 2 calendar years.

Spence bill (S. 722) as reported by House Banking and Currency Committee:

1. Unemployment in the area is currently 6 percent and has been:

(a) At least 6 percent during 18 of the preceding 24 months.

(b) At least 9 percent during 15 of the preceding 18 months.

(c) At least 12 percent during the preceding 12 months.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So far as the agricultural areas in the country are concerned, they are to include those areas in

which there existed the largest number of low-income farm families, and the administrator is also to consider the number of those families in each of such areas and the current prospective employment opportunity in such area and the availability of manpower in each area for supplemental employment.

There shall be included among these areas any county which is among the 500 counties in the United States ranked lowest in the level of living of the farm families, or which is among the 500 counties in the United States having the highest percentage of commercial farms producing less than $2,500 worth of products for sale annually.

I should emphasize that this bill is intended to help the farming regions of the country equally with the industrial regions. I cannot understand how Senators from low-income farm areas can contend that the bill is intended to help exclusively industrial areas, because it applies equally to farming areas, and because the sums authorized for loans are equal.

What is intended is to have a loan made at the average yield on Government bonds of 30 years duration, plus one-half percent. So this is in no sense a grant program. It is instead a loan program designed to bring industry into areas of high and persistent unemployment and underemployment and to provide instead additional employment and additional income.

Under the bill there would be set up a separate Administrator, to be appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation, and an advisory board consisting of various Cabinet officers and leading members of the administration, and a public advisory board of 25 members consisting of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, and the public in general.

As I have said, the loan program is conditioned upon sound industrial opportunities, and no Government loan can exceed 65 percent of the cost of the fixed capital, including not merely the cost of buildings, but also plant and machinery, but with no provision for working capital.

The local authorities must also put up at least 10 percent as a minimum—whereas 65 percent is the ceiling for the Federal loans—and those who request loans must put up at least 5 percent, and, of course, must provide for all working capital and for such portions as are not made from Federal and local loans. In practice they will have to put up or raise 25 percent of the capital and in the overwhelming majority of cases far more than this.

So the aim is merely to provide seed capital with which to start new industries in areas where unemployment is high and persistent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Texas has already referred to the fact that the Government and the administration are spending abroad enormous sums of money for industrial development in so-called undeveloped countries or, as I believe the phrase now is, "developing countries."

I hold in my hand a list of projects for which outright grants, not loans, have been made by the Federal Government in countries abroad, which has been collected by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and which he has made available to me.

Visitors in the gallery and Senators on the floor can see the huge size of this volume. I have had it weighed before I came on the floor. It weighs 6 pounds, 7 ounces, and it lists the billions upon billions of dollars that this administration, is giving away to communities abroad.

I voted for most of these appropriations. Incidentally when I have done so, at the request of the administration, I have been attacked by the administration supporters at home.

We also have a Development Loan Fund, largely put into effect through the imagination of the Senator from Oklalahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who has never been given proper credit for what he has done. This book weighs somewhat less, about a half pound. It contains hundreds of authorizations amounting to $1,400 million, with loans which have already been committed amounting to $900 million.

The administration is saying we cannot reduce a single cent of these sums. I have voted for this program in the past, and I expect to vote for substantial portions of it this year, although not for all. However, I do protest the administration program of spending enormous sums of money abroad and refusing to spend small sums of money at home to help rehabilitate areas which have suffered from persistent and continued high unemployment.

It is a fact that industries decay. The coal mining industry, due to technical improvements and the substitution of other fuels, employs hundreds of thousands fewer workers than before. As a result, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, West Virginia, and southern Illinois have a high percentage of unemployment and have had this high percentage of unemployment for years. The textile industries of the country have sustained unemployment. Other regions of the country also have high unemployment.

As a result, people from those regions have migrated into industrial centers. However, people of advanced years or in the middle age group, who have established families, find it very difficult to migrate. The drying up of payrolls has left in many cases ghost towns, areas with high unemployment, tax rolls shrinking, and relief payments increasing. These areas and the people in them are in great difficulty. I believe we should bring industry to those localities under loans, so as to bring jobs to some of these people and utilize the social facilities which are already there.

For if large numbers continue to migrate, it will be necessary for them to go into other regions, where not only will it be difficult for them to find work, but where housing, street pavements, water systems, sewer systems, electric light systems, and all the other public services will have to be constructed for them; whereas if the work is brought to them, they can more fully utilize the social capital and the community life which exist in their home communities. All this and the reduction of relief costs will mean that even in more dollars and cents, this measure will yield large dividends to the American people. Let us delay no longer and pass this bill. And may I point out that it is futile to try to change it for if we do, under the rules of the House, it will undoubtedly be killed. If we wish to make some changes, as I personally would like to do, we can amend the act later. But if we really want action, we should vote "yes." Now is the time to stand up and be counted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hope the distinguished minority leader can support the motion. If he cannot, I hope he will use some of the time on the other side. I do not want to say "in opposition to the motion," because I know the minority leader has great faith in the municipalities and distressed areas of America. He knows that they will pay back every dollar which the Federal Government lends them. As a matter of fact, the Federal Government made a great profit during the time Mr. Jesse Jones was in charge of a program which came to the rescue of a good many sections of the country which had pockets of unemployment.

I believe this is a sound program. Certainly it is a much more modest one than the one which earlier passed the Senate. I hope the minority leader can support it. If he cannot, I hope he will be gentle in his opposition to it, and will use some of his time to discuss it now.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is precisely because the minority leader has great faith in the counties, localities, and other political subdivisions of the Nation that he opposes the motion. I shall address myself to it later. For the moment, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, when the bill passed the Senate, I spoke in opposition to it, as I shall again this morning. Because the Senate will take its final action upon it today, the Senator from New Hampshire wishes to make a brief statement reiterating his unalterable opposition to the measure.

I base my opposition on the ground not only that it is dangerous, but that it violates every principle or rule concerning participation by the Federal Government in such matters that has existed throughout the history of the Republic.

No Member of the Senate has more sympathy for areas of unemployment or for business, industrial, or agricultural distress than I have. The reason is that the State of New Hampshire, only a few years ago, passed through a critical period when some of our biggest textile mills closed their doors. We had areas of heavy unemployment and distress, and we had a burdensome relief load. However, during that period, we did not wait for Federal help. We went to work ourselves. We succeeded in bringing to our State small industries—plastics, elec-

tronics—and in diversifying our industries and our employment. Today, because of the resourcefulness, the courage, the persistence, and, even more, the adaptability of the working people of New Hampshire to take up new fields of activity, our economic situation is such that we could not even qualify for this Federal aid, should it become available to other parts of the country.

But that is not the reason for my opposition. In section 6, page 8, of the bill, there is included a provision against what is known as pirating. I am positive that the framers of the measure have drafted the bill with the most praiseworthy and laudable motives, and have endeavored to write into it every safeguard which they could. Nevertheless, this provision attempts to make certain that Federal aid, Federal resources, and Federal money shall not be used to take industries away from one area or one State and relocate them in a new area or another State, and thus cause employment and distress in the State or area from which they were taken.

The very fact that this provision is contained in the bill indicates that the framers and the supporters of the measure are painfully aware of the dangers of the proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I think I can state, without fear of contradiction by anyone who would ever study this matter to its depth, that human ingenuity can never write into a measure, can never hedge it about with enough safeguards to prevent the inevitable result that someone in Washington—perhaps the Administrator, or the executive department, or even the President—will be face to face with the problem of determining what parts of the country shall receive the beneficent aid of the Federal Government to lift them up over a period of depression and unemployment, and what parts of the country will suffer thereby.

It is not enough to say that a factory should not be taken away from Connecticut and located in Michigan. However, when the Federal Government stretches forth its long arm and encourages or induces a factory to locate in Michigan, it is thereby taking a factory which, if left to its own accord and resources, might have located in Connecticut, New Hampshire, New York, or West Virginia. Furthermore, the use of Federal aid and of facilities built at public expense will give such a relocated industry an unfair competitive advantage which could result in hardship, unemployment, and distress in totally unforeseen areas.

So there is no way on earth that the proposed program can be administered, no matter how good may be the intentions, without exercising favoritism and discrimination by the Federal Government among the States.

Who would be the man who could administer the new permanent bureau which would be established in Washington? That man, if such a man were available, if a human being could be found who could exercise this arbitrary power and be completely fair in deciding the relative needs and merits of the different sections and States of the Union, would have to be a man of high caliber and discernment, a man having divine intuition.

If there were such a man, there are many other places in the Government where he ought to be used. He could be given the task of administering the farm program, because such a man would know when it was going to rain and when there would be a drought. He would understand all the conditions of nature which intervene in the matter of farm production and farm price supports. Or such a man could administer the national defense, because he could foresee the relative merits of every weapon. Such a man would be gifted with intelligence which has thus far been denied human beings.

Mr. President, it is utterly impossible that this kind of authority could be exercised wisely and justly, and without someone suffering from the decisions made in Washington. Therein lies the distinction between the fields in which the Federal Government has an obligation to participate and those in which it should not.

I am not one who wishes to curtail, block, and prevent all Federal aid. I take this opportunity to say that I supported the measure for Federal participation with the States and local subdivisions in the construction of facilities to prevent the pollution of water. This morning, I wish to say that I would have welcomed an opportunity to vote to override the President's veto of that measure, because I happen to believe that is a field in which the Federal Government has a distinct obligation and a distinct responsibility.

But in this field of aid to depressed areas, as in certain other fields, we are marching straight into an activity in which the Federal Government is attempting to arrogate unto itself powers for good and powers for harm that never can be carefully and wisely exercised.

I regret that some of those who support programs in this field—and they even include the administration—are doing so on the basis of dollars and cents. When shall we ever learn that there cannot be a little bit of pregnancy? When shall we ever learn that when we embark upon a new field of activity, particularly one which is unsound in principle and dangerous in practice, when we create downtown a new department which will be permanent, which always will be with us once it is created, we shall have traveled down a road along which we can move in only one direction, and that will be ahead; we shall have adopted a program which will be subject to change in only one dimension, and that will be to enlarge it.

So, Mr. President, once more I find myself in complete opposition to this bill—in any form, no matter what amendments may be adopted, no matter what "safeguards" may be incorporated in it, no matter how much it may be surrounded by every kind of skillful protection which its framers can devise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The time yielded to the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, may I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, I repeat: The fact that the bill has to have some of those safeguards and restrictions shows how dangerous it is, and demonstrates the fact that the bill is fundamentally and basically unsound.

Mr. President, a little more than 1 year ago—in April of last year—the Senate acted on this original bill. At that time, under date of April 2, 1959, I wrote a report to my constituents in the State of New Hampshire. In the report, I summarized the features of this proposed legislation, and indicated some of the reasons why it should be opposed. I ask unanimous consent that that report by me may be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR SENATOR REPORTS

(By NORRIS COTTON)

This week by a surprising close vote the Senate passed the so-called area redevelopment bill. The meat in that coconut is all found in the word "area." By way of illustration, let me tell you the story of two States, New Hampshire and Michigan.

In 1935 the Amoskeag, largest cotton mill in the world employing 16,000 at its peak, closed its doors forever. Manchester, a one-industry city for more than a century, faced its darkest hour and won out by sheer grit and self-reliance. Manchester businessmen organized the Amoskeag Industries, took over the chain of mills, split them up, and went out after small plants. Between 1936 and 1952 they brought in 73 concerns employing approximately 11,000 people—without special inducements, tax exemptions, or Federal aid. When Textron pulled out of Nashua throwing 3,500 out of work, Nashua met its challenge the same way, bringing in 19 companies employing 3,700. Dover and many other communities have written a similar glorious chapter in their history. I wish space permitted me to name them all. They are healthier today than when they were at the mercy of one large industry, and this solid foundation adds new meaning to the name "Granite State."

Michigan, with its giant automotive industry, has long been a wealthy State, but it dissipated that wealth on lush, vote-getting welfare programs of every kind and variety. Modern methods produce more cars with less workers. Hence, unemployment has mounted. On February 15 Michigan went broke. Its State universities had to borrow from banks to heat their buildings and pay professors. That tragic date came to be called Collapse Day. Private enterprise finally came to the rescue by advancing $35 million in taxes months ahead of their due date. Governor Williams' only solution is more borrowing and this area redevelopment bill—giving him Federal money to buy new industries.

Under this bill, New Hampshire, which tightened its belt and won its battle, could not qualify for a single cent of the $400 million. Thanks to its own efforts, it doesn't have the required percentage of unemployment. On the contrary, we would pay our

share to help attract new industries to Michigan, which wallowed in wealth and squandered its resources.

However, the main reason for opposing this bill is not because it siphons money from New Hampshire to aid Michigan. The bill is dead wrong in principle and in practice. The fact that its language tries to prevent using Federal money to pirate industries from one area to another shows that even its supporters know what is bound to happen. Every year we gladly place funds in the hands of the President for quick and generous help to any area stricken by earthquake, flood, or other catastrophe, but it will be a sad day when a new nest of bureaucrats in Washington (set up in this bill) use the long arm of the Federal Government to aid some areas at the expense of others. Furthermore, the minute $1 of Federal funds is available to help get new industries, every community in this country will be after it. Self-reliance and frugality will go out the window, and the floodgates will be opened for a torrent of spending carrying with it all kinds of discrimination and favoritism. It is regrettable that the President opposes this bill on the amount rather than its principle, and many who voted against it this week might vote for a lesser sum. Why must we always be plunging into new fields of Federal spending under the old delusion that it's possible to be "a little bit pregnant"?

Members homeward bound for Easter display some misgivings for there are signs of revolt in the hinterlands against the congressional spending spree, particularly as April 15 draws near and income taxes are being computed. As a counterirritant, AFL-CIO is bringing 5,000 unemployed to Washington for a mass meeting as Congress returns. Unlike Coxey's army of 1894 and the bonus marchers of 1932, who trudged on foot and slept in tents, they will travel comfortably by plane, train, or bus, and the tab will be picked up by the union.

This is a gentle reminder to the majorities in the 86th Congress who owe their election to labor and have not been quite as subservient as was expected. The depressed area bill had a narrow squeak. Unemployment benefits were extended but not set up as a permanent Federal dole. The demand increases for a labor rackets law with teeth in it. Most amazing of all is the proposal by two liberal Senators, Neuberger and CLARK, that this Congress hike taxes to pay for its new spending. This is rank heresy to those who want to sugar-coat the pill by more borrowing. Imagine suggesting that we stop taking paregoric and swallow castor oil.

Perhaps these young men are waking up to the fact that a government big enough to give you everything you want is big enough to take everything you've got.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without having the time required therefor charged to the time available to either side under the agreement, and that I may have permission to withdraw the quorum call before it is concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the proposal before us is for a modest program of economic aid for areas of the Nation in which there exist the devastating problems of chronic unemployment. This measure has as its purpose the encouraging of local distressed communities to mobilize, with the aid of our Federal Government, for rehabilitation.

Last year, Mr. President, during the first session of this Congress, we passed S. 722, the area redevelopment bill. That measure was given the approval of the membership of this body after extensive hearings, voluminous testimony, and adequate debate on the floor of the Senate. I say the hearings were extensive; and I know that to be true, because they were conducted in many sections of the Nation. Some of them were held in West Virginia.

I had the privilege of being one of the cosponsors of Senate bill 722.

As we know, that measure was broader in its coverage, and called for the expenditure of a larger sum of money than does the bill which was passed the day before yesterday by the House of Representatives. But the measure, in the form before us at this time, is a meritorious and vital one.

I recall that I offered testimony at Beckley, the county seat of Raleigh County, in the heart of the coal-mining area of West Virginia. Tremendous tonnages of bituminous coal are produced in the area surrounding Beckley. Approximately 118 million tons of bituminous coal were mined there in 1959. About the same tonnage was produced in 1958. Yet the 1959 production was achieved with 7,000 less miners on the job than were employed in 1958.

That is the result of mechanization within this industry. That situation did not develop only in 1958 or 1959; it is the result of a long-continuing process.

In mentioning Raleigh County, I speak of an area where, today, perhaps as much as 27 percent of the labor force—eager to work—is unemployed.

There are other counties in West Virginia where these same percentages prevail.

In West Virginia the subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee conducted the hearings to which I have referred. My diligent colleague from West Virginia, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, was in charge of those hearings as a member of that committee. I participated actively, Mr. President, in the debate in this Chamber, because this is legislation of vital interest to the unemployed people of our labor surplus areas, and, in fact, to all of the people, approximately 2 million, in the State of West Virginia.

We know that if erosion takes place in one area of one State, that erosion probably will spill over into other areas in other States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON in the chair). The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield such time to the Senator from West Virginia as he may require.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It was my privilege during the last few months, as a member of the Senate's Special Committee on Unemployment Problems, to conduct hearings in West Virginia last winter on these matters. I became more convinced that it is important for us to realize that problems growing out of unemployment constitute a responsibility which must be shared at all governmental levels—local, county, State, and Federal. We cannot set it apart; we cannot bracket this job to be done by any particular unit of government.

I repeat that the people of West Virginia are interested—desperately interested—in helping themselves. They are sturdy folk. These men, who are unemployed today, are just as hardy as were their fathers and their grandfathers; but they have been caught in a situation, little of which is of their making, but which is well known, and which has been explained before. There seems to be an overriding concern within the Congress today to face up to this problem.

There must be bold action, although certainly this is but a modest program of the total effort which must be made. The timid approach of the present Federal administration will not suffice. These are full-time obligations which the Congress must assume, and part-time attention to this requirement is not enough.

I think it is important also to point out that the President of the United States, in his latest budget message, urged the Congress to authorize and appropriate billions of dollars to foreign nations. He said:

> Through the mutual security program as a whole the United States helps promote stability and economic growth in less developed countries and helps strengthen the defense of the free world.

There is no doubt in my mind that the President is correct in that statement.

There should not be any doubt on the part of the President or any other official in public affairs that we must accept the same relative urgency as relates to programs right here in the United States which, as Mr. Eisenhower said about foreign aid, "will promote stability and economic growth."

How can we be expected to literally pour billions of dollars into countries abroad without doing everything within our power to do at least as much for our own people as the President would have us do for citizens of other lands?

The President also said, in his mutual security message:

> I emphasize once again that, as we strive to build the kind of world in which America believes, our adversaries are not all included in the single word "communism." There are distress and privation as well, and also the desperation of peoples when they realize that, lacking outside help, they struggle in vain to better their lives. Widespread chaos and misery cannot provide a world climate in which our free Republic can prosper and remain secure.

Those were the words of the President of the United States in speaking of men and women of foreign countries. Why

does he not speak as compassionately and act as forthrightly concerning those of our unfortunate fellow citizens in these United States who are victims of the factors and conditions which have compounded the problems of so many of our communities and turned them into distressed areas?

It is possible that "distress and privation" in foreign countries is more entitled to our sympathy than "distress and privation" at home.

The President is aggressively in favor of this country providing the "outside help" that is needed by desperate people overseas—but he apparently becomes ultra budget conscious when there is proposed by the representatives of the people in the Congress "outside help" for our own communities back home in the form of Federal loans and grants, technical assistance, and vocational retraining.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an edition of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette of Thursday morning, May 5. I read in the opening paragraph these words:

> President Eisenhower has given assurances of lending a hand toward helping West Virginia with its economic troubles, Governor Underwood of West Virginia reported Wednesday from Washington after a conference with the President.

That discussion revolved around the legislation which we have under consideration here today.

I say again, let those of us who believe in this measure—and I trust we shall have a very substantial vote in favor of the passage of the proposal—give to the President not only the opportunity but the responsibility, of signing this proposed legislation into law, and then we shall see if the vow he has made will turn out to be a valid one.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROUTY in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has 31 minutes. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has 48 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Illinois does not appear to have Senators interested in this matter on his side, so I will yield 5 minutes to the very able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. Then I hope the other side will yield some time.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Senate bill 722, the area redevelopment bill, was passed in the House of Representatives by a vote of 201 to 184. The responsibility now is with the Senate to approve the House version of the bill.

Although the bill passed by the other body provides for some $138 million less than the original bill passed by the Senate, I feel that half a loaf is better than no loaf at all.

As passed by the House, the area redevelopment bill provides for $251 million to help economically depressed areas; $75 million will be provided in loans for urban industrial development, $75 million in loans for rural area development, $50 million in loans for construction of public facilities, $35 million in grants for public facilities, $4.5 million for technical assistance grants, $10 million in grants to retain workers for new jobs, and $1.5 million for vocational training grants.

On September 6, 1958, President Eisenhower vetoed Senate bill 3683, which provided the same assistance, generally, that Senate bill 722 would provide.

This type of legislation should not become partisan; yet the President himself has made it so with his adamant position.

The administration suggests $53 million for area redevelopment. Just how far would $53 million go in a program of this nature? That figure would not suffice in my State of West Virginia, exclusively. Is the administration aware of the depressed areas in our country? It would appear that it is not.

I realize fully that the plight of West Virginia has been aired frequently in the past month, but allow me, once again, to state that the situation is worsening in some sections of the country.

In 20 of 55 counties in my State, 15 percent or more of the citizenry receive surplus food commodities. There is one county in which 19,000 persons or 41 percent of the population, are receiving these commodities.

Rehabilitation in an area where machines have replaced man is a necessity. For instance, this year in West Virginia, 40,000 men will extract the same amount of coal from the fertile fields of this natural resource as was extracted by 117,000 men 10 years ago. It is impossible to battle such catalysmic changes without Federal aid.

Chronic unemployment in this country in serving as a brake on the economy. We, the most powerful nation on earth, must be prepared to combat the problem.

There are the humanitarian aspects of this bill, but from purely an economic standpoint the merits are evident also. This bill would cut down the inflationary process. It would promote productivity. Money put out by the Federal Government would come back later, with interest.

After a time the large sums that the Federal and State governments pay out in unemployment compensation would naturally be lessened if the people now drawing such payments were given work.

Welfare programs now burdening the Federal Government, not connected directly with unemployment, would also be somewhat reduced.

Thousands upon thousands of words have been said about the area redevelopment bill. They went for nothing in 1958. In 1960 there is, once again, the opportunity to allow the distressed areas to help themselves.

Productive communities, now lifeless, would be the result. Inhabitants of these depressed areas would have the responsibility themselves to make this bill work for them.

Mr. President, I feel that S. 722 embodies the plan which can adequately come to grips with the problem of depressed areas. As I said earlier, I am disappointed with the cutting of the $138 million from the original figure in the Senate bill, but such legislation is needed so extremely and so urgently, I urge passage of the bill as it has been returned to this Chamber.

The practicality, the feasibility, and the reasonability of the bill have not been erased. It would induce new vitality into areas of lingering joblessness.

Were the Senate to pass the House version of S. 722, the President of the United States would have within his power the opportunity to aid thousands of American citizens. Only his signature would be needed.

In the past, the administration has dourly complained of the cost of such legislation. This time it is my hope that it will pass up the price tag—knowing in advance—that a quality item, one of deep necessity, does not come inexpensively.

The people have spoken. The need for area redevelopment legislation is evident.

The depressed areas, where serious unemployment has existed for some time, are undergoing structural changes in their economies. Automation is resulting in a growing number of displaced workers, and there is a need for governmental action. With this change to automation, in the long run, there will be greater prosperity. There will be better working conditions; but, we must be aware that the transition will work temporary hardships—hardships that should and can be eased by legislation such as the area redevelopment bill.

The administration has given lip service to the needs for area redevelopment legislation. As late as May 3, 1960, the President expressed the desire that a bill of this nature be sent to his desk.

This body should act quickly and positively.

I for one do not feel that a balanced budget is more important than that the people of this country have jobs, homes, and useful lives.

The Senate should put the stamp of approval on the area redevelopment bill returned to us from the House of Representatives, and the President should sign it immediately so that the unemployed thousands can work again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the proponents of the bill have been taking most of the time, and the minority leader does not seem to have any speakers available in the Chamber, I hope the distinguished minority leader, my esteemed colleague, will take some of his time now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 26 minutes remaining and the Senator from Illinois has 48 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. 26 minutes and 48 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have given very serious study to this bill, as it comes to us from the House of Representatives, because I am a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

In March of 1959, when the bill was under debate in the Senate, I gave it a considerable amount of time and attention. It may be recalled, Mr. President, that I voted against the bill on the vote on passage at that time. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut and I sought to have the bill amended, in order to eliminate from it further the danger of raiding of the industries of large industrial States.

Mr. President, I would be less than true to my own conscience and to the interests of my State if I did not make my position very clear. We in the Senate occupy a dual position as Senators of the United States who are solicitous about its interests, and as Senators of our own States and solicitous about their interests. We must necessarily balance both interests.

Mr. President, I would be derelict in my duty if I did not state that though I now intend to support the measure—and I shall state my reasons for doing so—it is by no means wholly satisfactory. I think it is, however, a necessary step at this time under these circumstances.

I think it should be fairly said to those who may benefit from passage of this measure that if we face a situation where the measure is abused through the way in which it is used and an effort is made to unfairly load the situation in competition among the States, people like myself, I think, will be absolutely free to exercise their discretion in respect to appropriations, in view of the fact that we shall, by our votes, allow the measure to become substantive law so that appropriations may be requested.

Mr. President, I think it is important to point out that in States like my own the moderating and precautionary aspects of this plan may be invoked on appropriations, if it is abused and if it is not administered in accordance with its fundamentally substantive purpose.

After some soul searching, I have decided to support the measure for the following reasons:

The measure has now been pending for a year in the other body. I served in the other body. Whatever may be the ways in which the other body works, it is now clear that this opportunity must be taken advantage of, if the bill is reasonable at all or remotely reasonable, in order to send a measure to the President for signature. If the bill should be sent back to the other body, it will unquestionably mean we shall again have to run the same gauntlet, and we shall be delayed for a year, probably, until the next Congress, before the matter will have to be started all over again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 more minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am disappointed in the fact that the measure still permits loans to be made for machinery and equipment, something to which the Senator from Connecticut and I strongly objected. I note, however, that the amounts involved have been very considerably reduced. I cannot see how any administrator could afford to devote anything to machinery and equipment in the handling of the bill, so I think perhaps the objections I have might be dealt with in the practicalities of the situation.

The same is true with respect to the 65 percent of loan capability, which I think is much too high and which I felt should be 50 percent.

So in respect to the machinery and equipment factor; the 65 percent of loan factor; and, notwithstanding the two antiraiding provisions, still the possibility that some raiding may be attempted, I found myself in a difficult state of mind about the bill. On balance, considering the fact that the amount has been reduced and considering the fact that those of us who feel it is very essential to deal with rehabilitation and improvement in world areas must of necessity and in good conscience give our attention to domestic areas of persistent unemployment, I believe the bill is entitled to support.

Mr. President, I shall support the bill.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the comparison of the areas in New York which will be affected by the bill as it came over to us from the House, as compared to the effect upon similar areas by the bill as passed by the Senate. I call attention to the fact that this was the question raised by the Scott amendment at the time it was debated in the Senate. I, as well as my distinguished colleague from New York, supported that amendment.

There being no objection, the comparison was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tentative list of areas in New York State that may qualify for Federal assistance as areas with substantial and persistent unemployment under various legislative proposals, March 1960

MAJOR AREAS

Administration bill	S. 722 as passed by House	S. 722 as passed by Senate	Administration bill	S. 722 as passed by House	S. 722 as passed by Senate
(No major areas)	(4 major areas)	(No major areas)	(No major areas)	(4 major areas)	(No major areas)
	Albany-Schenectady-Troy			New York City	
	Buffalo			Utica-Rome	

SMALLER AREAS

Administration bill	S. 722 as passed by House	S. 722 as passed by Senate	Administration bill	S. 722 as passed by House	S. 722 as passed by Senate
(3 smaller areas)	(16 smaller areas)	(3 smaller areas)	(3 smaller areas)	(16 smaller areas)	(3 smaller areas)
Amsterdam	Amsterdam	Amsterdam.		Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon.	
Auburn	Auburn	Auburn.		Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone.	
	Batavia			Olean-Salamanca	
	Corning-Hornell			Oneida	
	Elmira			Plattsburg	
	Glens Falls-Hudson Falls			Watertown	
Gloversville	Gloversville	Gloversville.		Wellsville	
	Jamestown-Dunkirk				
	Kingston				

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I believe that my State will receive no benefits whatsoever under this legislative proposal, but I would not oppose the bill on that ground. I think as a U.S. Senator it is my responsibility to be concerned with problems at the national level and wherever they exist in the country. I point out, Mr. President, that as a member of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems I collaborated in drafting minority views with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

We devoted considerable time and thought to this problem—and I must confess that it is a problem, and one which gives me no little concern. I believe it is a problem which cannot be solved entirely at State and local levels. There must be Federal participation and Federal assistance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks chapter 3 of the minority views in the report of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems, entitled "Economic Aid to Distressed Areas."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPTER III. ECONOMIC AID TO DISTRESSED AREAS

The minority agree with the conclusion that "no single remedy will cure the deep-rooted problems of chronic unemployment and underdevelopment." However, the report as it now stands offers no remedies that are new, nor does it list all the remedies that are possible.

If the committee really desires the passage of a bill, it might be desirable at least to outline the basic points which are essential for the beginning of such a program. In vetoing the area redevelopment bill which was passed by the 85th Congress, the President cited a number of specific objections, many of which remain in the legislation as it passed the Senate in the 86th Congress, and an effort should be made to meet some of these objections in order to evolve a practical program and to assure the passage of a bill in this session.

Comments on essential points to be included in legislation, with comments on possible changes from various existing proposals, are noted below:

1. SCOPE OF FEDERAL AID TO LABOR SURPLUS AREAS

In general, the Federal aid provided should be restricted to a limited number of areas with truly chronic unemployment, including rural areas, so that the aid which can be given will be effective, rather than be so thinly spread as to be wasted.

2. URBAN AREAS

The amount of unemployment which would qualify an area for industrial loans could vary with the national level of unemployment, thus defining specific areas having separate problems. During a recession Federal activity is essential, but it should be broad gaged. The distressed area program should be geared to the specific problem of longrun chronic unemployment.

It is important, therefore, that flexible criteria be the basis for legislation. The nature of the criteria for eligibility of areas for industrial loans constituted one of the principal reasons for the President's veto of the earlier legislation.

3. RURAL AREAS

It is absolutely essential that assistance be provided for rural areas. Many of the coalmining areas are in this category.

Numerous witnesses testified to the gravity of unemployment and underemployment in rural areas. Moreover, studies by the Department of Labor and the Department of Agriculture indicate that the number of farm jobs required in the 1960's will decline further, as they have in the last three decades. If many of the people now living on farms, and especially the young people, are to find a livelihood without moving out of the area it will be necessary to develop industrial activity. This is widely recognized. Work is under way through the rural development program of the Department of Agriculture to improve the situation in these areas, but that program is primarily oriented to agriculture and makes no provision either for technical assistance or for loans for industrial development. Therefore, the minority believe that aid to rural as well as urban areas is essential to the attack on the problem of chronic unemployment.

We recommend that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor be authorized to develop more effective measures for the identification of chronically depressed rural areas, within a broad provision indicating that they are to be selected from low-income areas with high levels of unemployment and underemployment.

4. PUBLC FACILITIES

Public facilities are often the real bar to local redevelopment, whether the lack be sewers, a good water supply, access roads, or other public facilities. There is ample evidence that, next to technical assistance for planning an economic redevelopment program, especially in small towns and rural areas, adequate public facilities are most urgent. Many communities can and do finance such improvements, but others do not have credit to do the job by themselves. The minority believe that some aid of this kind is absolutely essential, particularly in the rural program, and further suggests that there is more which should be done by the States than has so far been achieved.

The administration has opposed grants, for local public facilities, as well as the provision for such loans through a new area redevelopment agency. It has proposed, instead, that the existing facilities of HHFA be used to make loans of this kind, with the provision that first priority be given to processing applications for projects in redevelopment areas. The HHFA has already made loans amounting to close to $100 million for facilities, all to communities of 10,000 population or under, and is presently seeking authorization for an additional $100 million. The minority recommend that a legislative solution be sought along these lines, in order to avoid setting up still another Federal lending agency. Since loans for public facilities appear to be essential for the redevelopment of some areas, notably the smaller areas whose credit is not sufficiently good to float bonds for major improvements, a satisfactory solution is important.

5. INDUSTRIAL LOANS

There is general agreement that loans for the construction of industrial facilities are essential to this program. There has been disagreement on the amounts which should be authorized.

The President has again urged passage of area redevelopment legislation, and has included $50 million for industrial redevelopment loans in the budget for fiscal 1961.

While the minority believe a larger authorization than $50 million is needed for this program, the main thing is to make a start. Time is required to organize an agency, to qualify areas, to provide technical assistance, for communities to develop suitable local economic development plans and to have them approved by an appropriate State authority, to negotiate for loans, etc. Not all industrial areas that would qualify under the administration bill have redevelopment plans; not all such areas want Federal loans, as testimony before this committee indicates.

6. CONTINUED NEED FOR AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

There is no fundamental difference of opinion as to the continuing need for economic assistance to depressed areas throughout the country.

In all of the affected communities which your committee visited during the hearings, there were repeated pleas for development loans, for technical planning, for projects whereby the community could attract new industry and improve its opportunities for a share in the national prosperity.

Unemployment in some areas has reached as high as 16 percent of the labor force, and has persisted at high levels for long periods of time. In other areas opportunities for employment simply do not exist, and the stultifying effects are equally apparent. These are not temporary maladjustments, but continuing problems of economic distress.

Technological changes, migration of industry, shifts in demand, depletion of resources all have contributed to the complexity of the situation. But whatever the cause, we cannot be healthy as a nation with sagging pockets of unemployment and underemployment as unpleasant reminders of our lack of action and inability to set our economic house in order.

Depressed areas are an expensive burden which our country cannot afford to carry. Not only is the individual deprived of his right to livelihood, but our national cash register must suffer accordingly.

A greater part of our country is enjoying a high degree of prosperity, with indications that we will forge ahead to even greater business and economic growth. For certain areas and communities to be caught in the backwash of this tide, through no fault of their own, is a national hazard.

We need the active participation of every American citizen in our national welfare. We must extend to these areas of continued depressed conditions the financial and technical assistance needed to put themselves back on the track.

It is a matter of prime importance to the work of this committee that an area redevelopment bill be enacted and the program launched this year with sufficient means for stimulating local effort.

7. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Technical assistance must have a very high priority in any distressed areas legislation, everyone is agreed. If charges are considered, the minority believe that even greater stress should be placed upon this feature. It is especially important for rural areas and very small communities.

8. VOCATIONAL TRAINING

Great emphasis is placed upon vocational training in the present report, and this is highly advisable. All bills relating to area redevelopment contain some provision for vocational training, and the Senate measure makes it clear that training other than conventional vocational education is involved. Training includes such important programs as apprenticeship training and on-the-job

training, both of which, in practice, are much more closely related to acquiring skills that will lead to reemployment, since this training would be directed to the needs of particular industries.

However, none of the bills presently under consideration indicates that the prospective reemployment for which training is being given need necessarily be in a distressed area, since some people will presumably be moving from this area. Nor does any bill make provision for transporting persons to places of training or retraining. A special allotment for needed training facilities might well be provided through a grant, to be handled by the agency operating the local program. At the Federal level, HEW might administer the financial aid for training, after consultation with the Department of Labor on needed types of training. A specific provision of $1,500,000 for this purpose is made in the bill reported out by the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and is favored by the minority.

9. SUBSISTENCE PAYMENTS DURING RETRAINING

Both the Senate-passed and the proposed House bill include a provision for grants to States in an amount of $10 million for subsistence payments to unemployed persons not receiving unemployment insurance benefits but certified as undergoing vocational training or retraining. Under present rules, an unemployed person, otherwise eligible, who decides to take training is considered ineligible for unemployment compensation since he is not available for work while undergoing training. This penalizes the person with the initiative to undertake a training program. There is, therefore, considerable merit in retraining subsistence payments. However, it is regarded as undesirable that these should be administered by the unemployment compensation services.

It is therefore recommended that a local authority, preferably an educational authority or the local director of the redevelopment program, administer these grants, which would be related in amount to what the individuals would be entitled to under the State unemployment compensation system. A specific authorization of funds, on the order of $5 million, for payments for training and grants to States for administering should be provided.

10. RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Inadequate attention is given by the majority to the rural development program in connection with the proposals for area redevelopment. This whole subject deserves more emphasis. There is no doubt that there are many rural areas in which income from farming is very small and where there is considerable underemployment or unemployment.

As noted elsewhere, the number of jobs available in agriculture has declined steadily and will decline during the 1960's. Department of Labor estimates, indicate another decline, this time of approximately 17 percent, between 1960 and 1970. In the circumstances, the emphasis of the rural development program should be directed not merely toward assisting farmers to improve their incomes, although this is useful, but toward assisting the development of these areas along industrial lines, and the education and training of young people to take their places in an industrial society, and aid in placing persons displaced in rural areas in suitable jobs. The following recommendations are made along these lines:

(1) Substantial stepping up of the services of the U.S. Employment Service and its affiliated employment services in rural areas, not necessarily through the location of new offices but through three phases of their program:

(a) Registration for job applications—with traveling representatives going to small towns on a regular basis;

(b) Work with the rural schools to provide better occupational information for young people on future occupations together with testing and counseling services for those going into the labor market, similar to the services now provided in urban areas;

(c) Extension to more areas of the valuable skill surveys made by the State employment security agencies under the guidance of the Bureau of Employment Security, on the skills of the people in these areas. Similar surveys have been helpful, as in the Lawrence, Mass., area, in attracting new industry. It is reported by the Department of Labor that some 36 States have made or are currently making area skill surveys. Among the larger States which are active in this field are a number with areas of substantial labor surplus, including Illinois, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia. The availability of manpower is one sound basis for attracting industry to an area. It is, therefore, recommended that the Department of Labor, through the Bureau of Employment Security, working with the States in which there are areas of substantial labor surplus, such as would qualify for area redevelopment assistance, expand its program for making these skill surveys and give priority to areas of labor surplus.

The Department of Labor and four of its cooperating State agencies now have an experimental rural program in process, as a part of the regular Employment Service activities. Working with the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, and the staff of the Extension Service and the State employment services have arranged for experimental projects in Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Wisconsin, involving skill surveys, the promotion of nonfarm jobs, placement, testing, and counseling of workers and potential workers in the area. All of these States have active rural development committees.

The Department of Labor prepared technical guidelines for a group of surveys for appraising the occupational potential of these areas, and the State agency has surveyed the population in the selected counties and has taken applications for placement, and has prepared a report on the economic base of the area. In one of these counties, Adair County in Kentucky, a new garment factory has been opened, employing 75 persons, and may later employ 125. Its establishment was in part the result of the availability of evidence that suitable manpower could be found in this area.

It is anticipated that a full report on the work of these experimental studies will be available in the spring, and that by early summer the Department of Labor will have a proposal for a more active program in rural areas. The minority recommended that the committee request the Secretary of Labor to expedite plans for an active program in rural areas for counseling, testing, and placement.

11. A COORDINATED ATTACK ON THE DEPRESSED AREA PROBLEM

Insufficient attention is paid in the majority report to the important activities already being carried out by the Federal Government, which, if more effectively coordinated, would be of great help to areas in need of redevelopment. A bill along these lines (S. 2730) was introduced by Senator COOPER in the 1st session of the 86th Congress, providing for an interagency committee to prepare coordinated programs for the development of areas in need of redevelopment.

In December 1959 an Interdepartmental Committee To Coordinate Federal Area Assistance Programs was appointed by the President. The members of the committee include the Under Secretary of Commerce, Chairman; the Deputy Postmaster General; the Under Secretary of Interior; the Under Secretary of Agriculture; the Under Secretary of Labor; the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics); the Administrator of the General Services Administration; the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; the Administrator of the Small Buisness Administration; the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency; the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization; the Special Assistant to the President for Public Works; and a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

This Committee is working with the long-established Committee for Rural Development Programs.

The Committee, which began operations in December 1959, has prepared a report on the activities of the Federal agencies. The record of assistance by the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, and other agencies is quite impressive. We understand that this Committee has already sent a task force into one coal-mining area in Pennsylvania (Tamaqua) where there has been a large layoff, to aid in working out a local program. This effort should go much further. More task forces should be sent into distressed areas to work out specific activities through coordinated use of existing Federal programs, where possible, along the lines proposed by Senator COOPER.

The Interdepartmental Committee To Coordinate Federal Area Assistance Programs is a step in the right direction, and the minority recommend that it be given statutory authority in connection with any area redevelopment program which is past. It is clear that such a committee would be needed even if there were a new area redevelopment authority.

12. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AID

The Small Business Administration also has a community development program which offers aid to local development companies in the form of loans for the cost of planned new factory buildings or their conversion or expansion, as well as various forms of technical assistance, in addition to its regular loans to small business. These services are not confined to labor-surplus areas, but requests for projects in such areas are given priority in processing. The Small Business Administrator indicates that 37 loans aggregating $4,280,000 were made to community development companies in 1959 and 1960 through March 21. Loans are also made to State development companies. So far, one such loan, for $314,000 to Rhode Island, has been approved. We urge increased activity by the Small Business Administration in its community development program.

13. PREFERENTIAL FEDERAL PURCHASING AND CONTRACTING

For a number of years the Federal Government has followed an official policy of encouraging the placing of defense contracts and facilities in areas where there is a surplus of labor. It has diverted a portion of defense contracts into areas of substantial unemployment or to industries which are depressed, on a preferential basis, to the extent that facilities are available and the bids are competitive. It has also paid particular attention to the effects of employment cutbacks, giving advance notice to the Employment Service.

The most important of the programs for preferential procurement operates under Defense Manpower Policy No. 4. Under this policy, $14 billion in contract awards have

gone to labor-surplus areas from January 1, 1958, to January 1, 1960. This total includes many awards which would have gone into these labor-surplus areas in any case. Of the total, $144,600,000 have gone to areas of labor surplus specifically as a result of preferential treatment. These figures include contracts of $10,000 and over for defense supplies and services and construction.

Prior to January 1, 1958, records were kept only of contracts of $25,000 and over and only for supplies and equipment. In the period between July 1, 1952, and January 1, 1958, these figures show a total of $4 billion in awards to surplus areas generally, of which $95 million were awarded on a preferential basis.

Early in 1958 when a business recession was on, the Assistant Secretary of Defense, as indicated in testimony by his representative before this committee, took several actions to give emphasis to this program. He inserted a clause in supply contracts of $5,000 and over, in which the contractor agreed to use his efforts to place subcontracts with firms in areas of substantial labor surplus, and policy decisions were taken that where there was a choice between making a set-aside for small business and a set-aside for firms in labor surplus areas, the labor surplus area would be given preference. The record shows that the volume of preference awards rose considerably after these actions were taken.

While these amounts are not a large share of the defense budget, defense contracts can be very important to surplus labor communities, particularly smaller communities. Although the minority is of the opinion that the Government services concerned are making conscientious and continuing efforts under existing regulations to give special attention to labor surplus areas, we believe that the dollars spent in these areas by the Federal Government could be increased if the policy is extended beyond the procurement of defense supplies and services and construction per se.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We therefore recommend that—

1. The Federal Government direct all Federal agencies, defense and otherwise, either through Executive order or by legislation, to give preferential treatment to areas of substantial labor surplus in their purchasing and contracting, under preferential policies affecting contracts of substantial size similar to those in Defense Manpower Policy No. 4.

2. Federal agencies should be directed, when locating or expanding or curtailing employment outside Washington, to give special consideration to putting new installations in areas of substantial labor surplus. This applies both to defense and other Government agencies and facilities.

New defense installations are being dispersed; so are special installations for manufacture of new weapons. There is every reason to put such installations where there is surplus civilian labor to aid in their construction and to man the civilian-type services. It would be advantageous to the military and to the area.

On the civilian side of governmental activities, it is also good policy to decentralize certain functions—notably clerical functions—outside of Washington. Instead of crowding these offices into huge, congested areas where labor is scarce, they could well be erected or leased in lower cost areas where labor is available.

Excellent examples are the Internal Revenue office for tabulation of income tax returns in Lawrence, Mass., with 400–500 employees; the office for the tabulation of the Census of Population of 1960 in Jeffersonville, Ind., in the Louisville, Ky., area, with 600–1,500 employees. This was formerly a large ordnance facility. In addition, the Census Department has arranged for clerical work on the Census of Agriculture of 1954 in Pittsburg, Kans., a labor surplus area, which is now a district office. The Census of Agriculture of 1959 is being tabulated in Parsons, Kans., and this installation will be converted into a national headquarters.

The Atomic Energy Commission was instrumental in securing locations of plants of its contractors in labor surplus areas in the Korean period—for example, the plant in Portsmouth, Ohio, and the Union Carbide & Carbon plant in Paducah, Ky. These actions were taken on the initiative of the agencies concerned, with surveys by the Department of Labor's Bureau of Employment Security and its affiliated State agencies to assure a location where there was an adequate labor supply. It is this kind of activity which we believe should be pursued more systematically by the Federal Government, and especially by the Department of Defense. Although the Department of Defense follows a policy of notification where installations are being curtailed, we believe that more could be done on a positive approach to this problem. Positive action to explore other governmental uses of these facilities should be taken prior to announcement of decision to curtail.

3. The Secretary of Labor be asked to give consideration to changing the present definition of "labor surplus areas" for purposes of Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 and similar programs, to make more restrictive the list of areas qualified to receive perference in Federal purchases so that a larger share of purchases will bo into areas of truly chronic unemployment.

In the recession of 1957–58, unemployment rose above 6 percent for several months. In consequence, many major labor market areas qualified for preferential treatment under Defense Manpower Policy No. 4. For example, in mid-1958, at the trough of the most recent recession, 89 out of 149 major labor market areas, with over 70 percent of the total labor force in these areas, had unemployment above 6 percent and were eligible for preferential treatment. These included such major areas as Detroit and Philadelphia.

The minority believe that the test for qualification of areas receiving special preferential treatment should rise or fall with the national average rate of unemployment, and that in periods of recession a higher minimum rate should be established. This principle was established in the qualifications for cities eligible for loans under the Area Redevelopment Act which was passed by the Senate in the 1st session of the 86th Congress (S. 722). It is requested that special study be given to effecting this change in a period of prosperity such as the present, so that regulations will be well understood in advance of any possible rise in unemployment in future years.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I believe that that statement represents a sympathetic and objective approach to this problem, and I hope Members of the Senate will take time to read it, either in the report or in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the report of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems, the minority recommended that the Secretary of Labor give consideration to changing the present definition of "labor surplus areas" for purposes of Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 and similar programs to make more restrictive the list of areas qualified to receive preference in Federal purchases so that a larger share of purchases will go into areas of truly chronic unemployment. For example, in mid-1958, at the trough of the most recent recession, 89 out of 149 major labor market areas, with over 70 percent of the total labor force in these areas, had unemployment above 6 percent and were eligible for preferential treatment. These included such major areas as Detroit and Philadelphia.

I believe that the test for qualification of areas receiving special preferential treatment should rise or fall with the national average rate of unemployment, and that in periods of recession a higher minimum rate should be established.

This principle was embodied in the Senate-passed bill, S. 722, but it is conspicuously absent from the House-passed version of this legislation.

Area redevelopment proposals are designed to help hard-core depressed areas. I have right here with me a list of industrial areas which would qualify for help under the House distortion of the Senate bill. This amended proposal would qualify 44 major industrial areas notwithstanding the fact that 9 out of 10 of the major industrial areas in the United States show employment totals greater than a year ago. Let us take a look at some of the major areas that will qualify for money under this bill even though they have less than 6 percent unemployment now. These areas are New York City; Philadelphia; Newark, N.J.; York, Pa.; Corpus Christi, Tex.; Worcester, Mass.; Trenton, N.J.; Paterson, N.J.; Birmingham, Ala.; and Portland, Maine.

The criteria in both the Senate-passed bill, S. 722, and the criteria in the administration bill were so drafted as to insure that the bulk of money would go to the truly depressed areas that have a long range problem to solve. The Douglas bill would qualify 19 major areas; the administration bill, 16 major areas. Contrast these realistic assessments of what constitutes a depressed area with the results of the criteria of the House proposal which would qualify right now 44 major areas.

Why does the House bill produce such weird consequences? The principal reason is that one of its criteria for determining a depressed area is an unemployment rate of 6 percent in 18 out of the last 24 months. Anytime we have the slightest recession practically every industrial area in the country will be eligible for help and this will spread the money so thin that hard-core depressed areas for whom the bill is really intended would get practically nothing.

Up to this point, I have spoken principally about industrial redevelopment areas. Now let us turn our attention to the rural development situation. The House bill purportedly attempts to set up a rural development program which will allegedly aid farming areas by bringing industry to these rural counties. Here again we find that the criteria are almost fictional in concept and have no relationship whatsoever to reality.

The bill calls for a $75 million plant loan fund. This is enough money to start a real substantial program. But here again it isn't the amount of money

that's bad, it's how the money will be distributed under the poorly drawn criteria.

Seventy-five million dollars will have to be spread thinly across 663 eligible counties. When you split up this fund by the 663 counties, you end up with 23 new jobs per county. This calculation is based on testimony to the effect that it takes about $5,000 to create a new job.

Those who support the criteria in the House bill are faced with this dilemma. The first horn of the dilemma is that either everyone of the 663 counties eligible for rural development may well get funds to the loss and serious detriment of chronically depressed areas such as those in West Virginia or, and this is the second prong of the dilemma, only truly depressed areas will get the money if the bill is administered properly and the hundreds of counties that are made eligible by the bill will have been misled to believe that they are going to get Federal money when, in fact, they are not.

I do not agree with all the elements in the Senate bill. In particular, I disagree with the procedures which call for borrowing money from the Treasury rather than using the appropriation process, but I must say that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and his colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee, did have the good sense to realize that the legislation that is needed is legislation to help depressed areas and that we will be hurting rather than be helping depressed areas if we spread the money so thinly that the truly troubled areas, such as those in West Virginia and Kentucky, will get virtually nothing.

I shall vote against the bill for two principal reasons. First, I object, as a matter of principle, to legislation of this kind and of this importance being brought up on such short notice and under such restricted time for debate. The House acted on this measure only 2 days ago. This morning I called the staff of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and asked them to give me a comparison of the House amendment and the Senate bill, which was passed some time ago. They said, "We have not had sufficient time to do that." Up to this time I have not received a report from the staff members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee on the Senate side.

Second, I shall oppose the bill, because I think we are developing a political issue rather than a program. I think we can all take it for granted that this bill will not be approved by President Eisenhower, and that the veto will not be overridden. The margin in the House was only 17 votes, I believe.

If more time had been provided, it might have been possible to arrive at a compromise with the White House, which would have resulted in the enactment of legislation bringing into being a realistic, worthwhile program. I know that the men and women who are suffering hardship and privation in the distressed areas want a program rather than an issue.

That is the second reason why I shall vote against the bill today, even though in principle I believe the Federal Government should participate in programs of this nature.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I esteem the Senator from Vermont very highly; but is it not his opinion, as a member of the Special Committee on Unemployment, that more than $50 million is needed for this program?

Mr. PROUTY. I do believe that more than $50 million is required.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The President's program calls for only $50 million, and the House amendment to the bill provides for $253 million.

Mr. PROUTY. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that I think it is a possibility, at least, that the President might have approved a higher figure than the one originally suggested in the budget. I believe that a figure of $100 million, $125 million, or even $150 million might have received Presidential approval. I have no authority for that statement, but I know that I and others on this side would have exerted great effort to persuade the President that more funds were needed, provided a more realistic and equitable formula for distribution had been conceived.

To repeat, what is being developed here now is a political issue instead of a program to alleviate suffering and hardship on the part of many people in the distressed areas.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this bill is an authorization bill only. The factor of Treasury financing is no longer in it. The bill would have no impact upon the 1960–61 budget. It would require at least 6 months to implement the bill, I am advised by departmental agencies. We could not get an appropriation until next year. Therefore, in my judgment, this particular bill would not run counter to the objections which we have heard from the executive department, as to impact upon the current budget.

It is my intention to offer an amendment to the pending bill, in the nature of a substitute, if the parliamentary situation will permit. My amendment contains the language of an amendment offered by Representative VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, when Senate bill 722 was before the House of Representatives on May 4.

I realize that favorable action on the motion to concur, as provided in the consent agreement, would preclude my being able to offer a substitute amendment, unless, of course, the motion should fail. For that reason I wish to discuss very briefly my reasons for attempting to submit substitute language.

My first consideration is that the Senate pass an area redevelopment bill that will have a better chance of avoiding a Presidential veto. That has been my purpose since first introducing an area redevelopment bill, Senate bill 268, in the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

As Senate bill 722 was passed by the Senate, it contained a formula for determining unemployment areas which would have limited the application of the benefits to major areas of chronic and persistent unemployment. S. 722, as it passed the House, and is now before us, contains a considerably expanded formula, which would dilute the funds to the point where the eligible communities—and this is particularly true in Pennsylvania—would not receive sufficient assistance to be effective.

One of the reasons for the veto of the earlier legislation, in 1958, was the inclusion of areas not affected by chronic unemployment. If we could substitute a formula which would cut down the coverage to those communities of proven need, I feel sure we would improve the chances for having an Area Redevelopment Act finally approved.

There are other features of S. 722 which I believe would also be improved by the amendment I would hope to offer.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a comparison of the features of the cost of S. 722 as passed by the Senate, S. 722 as passed by the House, and the Scott-Van Zandt amendment; also a brief analysis of the substitute amendment.

There being no objection, the comparison, summary, and analysis, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison—Area redevelopment bills

Subject	S. 722 as passed Senate	S. 722 as passed House	Scott-Van Zandt amendment
Organization	Separate area redevelopment administration	Separate area redevelopment administration.	Department of Commerce with Administrator equal to Assistant Secretary.
Division of redevelopment areas	Administrator to designate 2 types: Industrial—having substantial and persistent unemployment. Rural—large percentage of low-income families, and substantial unemployment and underemployment.	Same as Senate version	Secretary authorized to make grants for technical assistance, industrial loans, and public facility grants to assist areas of substantial and persistent unemployment, designated by Labor Department. Also to assist rural areas to develop manufacturing, processing, and service activities to supplement agricultural.

Comparison—Area redevelopment bills—Continued

Revolving fund loans	Borrowed from Treasury	Appropriated	Appropriated
Industrial	$100,000,000	$75,000,000	$100,000,000.
Rural	$100,000,000	$75,000,000	None specified.
Public facilities	$100,000,000	$50,000,000	$25,000,000.
Federal participation in loans	65 percent	65 percent	33⅓ percent in class I area, 50 percent in class II area, 75 percent in class III area.
Maximum loan period	30 years (possible extension to 40)	40 years; permits loans up to full amount of project cost, and omits requirement of ten percent State contribution.	25 years (possible extension 10 years); not less than 15 percent participation by State, agency instrumentality, etc.
Grants for public facilities	$75,000,000	$35,000,000	$25,000,000; Federal participation: 33⅓ percent class II areas, 75 percent class III areas.
Retraining subsistence payments.	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	$5,000,000.
Vocational training grants	Not specified	$1,500,000	Secretary of Labor to determine vocational training or retraining needs. Secretary HEW to provide assistance, and if necessary financial assistance to State vocational education agency. May also provide through public or private educational institutions.
Technical assistance	$4,500,000	$4,500,000	$3,000,000.
Criteria of unemployment	6 percent throughout qualifying period (below) and, 50 percent above national average for 3 of 4 years preceding, or 75 percent above national average for 2 of 3 years preceding, or 100 percent above national average for 1 of 2 years preceding.	12 percent for 12 months preceding, or 9 percent for 15 of 18 months preceding, or 6 percent for 18 of 24 months preceding.	6 percent throughout qualifying period (below) and, 50 percent above national average for 4 out of 5 years preceding in class I areas, or 75 percent above national average for 3 out of 4 years preceding in class II areas, or 100 percent above national average for 2 out of 3 years preceding in class III areas.
Rate of interest on loans	Maximum permitted would come to about 4⅜ percent.	Maximum permitted, 2⅞ percent	To be determined by Secretary based on going rates.

SUMMARY—PRINCIPAL FEATURES

Subject	S. 722 as passed Senate	S. 722 as passed House	Scott-Van Zandt amendment	Subject	S. 722 as passed Senate	S. 722 as passed House	Scott-Van Zandt amendment
Industrial loans	100, 000, 000	75, 000, 000	100, 000, 000	Vocational training grants	(1)	1, 500, 000	(1)
Rural loans	100, 000, 000	75, 000, 000	None	Technical assistance	4, 500, 000	4, 500, 000	3, 000, 000
Public facility loans	100, 000, 000	50, 000, 000	25, 000, 000				
Public facility grants	75, 000, 000	35, 000, 000	25, 000, 000	Total	389, 500, 000	251, 000, 000	158, 000, 000
Retraining subsistence payments	10, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	5, 000, 000				

[1] Not specified.

BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE SCOTT-VAN ZANDT SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT

Briefly, the substitute proposal provides for the following:

First. Technical assistance: Depressed areas would be eligible for technical assistance to help the communities to appraise their physical and human resources, which would prepare them to plan constructive programs to attract new businesses and expand existing businesses in these areas.

Second. Community loans: Depressed communities would be eligible to receive loans from a revolving fund of $100 million.

We know that conventional lending facilities in depressed areas are not as venturesome as those in growing and expanding communities.

The fund would put the depressed areas on a more equal footing with other communities in attracting new jobs.

Third. Public facilities: Some communities need improvement in public facilities before they would become sufficiently attractive to new businesses which might desire to locate in these areas.

The amendment provides for an establishment of a $25 million revolving fund from which these communities would be able to borrow.

While the figure may appear modest, attention is called to the fact that legislation is pending which would establish special funds for community facilities.

Meanwhile, under the amendment a smaller fund would be allocated and earmarked to aid depressed areas.

In addition, the most depressed communities which do not have the sufficient resources to borrow funds would be eligible to receive grants up to a maximum of $25 million for public facilities related to redevelopment.

Let me stress that this is not an annual appropriation but is intended to be a $25 million revolving fund from which these communities would be able to borrow.

The administrator of the program would be expected to limit the grants only to communities with the greatest need for aid and which do not have sufficient resources to repay the loans in the foreseeable future.

It should be stressed that this is no giveaway program; under the provisions of the bill grants would be made only for projects which would provide lasting improvements and broaden the economic base of the communities.

Fourth. Vocational training and subsistence: One of the big problems in depressed areas is the fact that many industries have declined or disappeared and, consequently, the demand for the skills acquired by the people in these areas has also diminished or vanished.

In order to enable these people whose skills have become obsolete to gain new employment, we must provide facilities to retrain them.

But many have been unemployed for a long period of time, and it would be unreasonable to expect that they could undergo an effective period of vocational training without any means of support.

Consequently, while the unemployed are undergoing training and if they are no longer eligible for unemployment compensation, they would be receiving subsistence payments equal to the average unemployment insurance in their State during the period while they are undergoing training, but not for a period exceeding 13 weeks.

Only the unemployed residing in the communities with the highest level of unemployment would be eligible for this type of aid and the total amount that would be appropriated for this program would be limited to $5 million a year.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I have no alternative, as a proponent of area redevelopment legislation, but to vote for S. 722 as it is now pending, notwithstanding the fact that I feel it has, by action of the other body, tended to become a legislative grabbag, in view of the unemployment formula which it would apply. I want the RECORD to show that I have done all in my power for a realistic bill which would serve the needs of the people in the depressed areas, to whom we must render this assistance.

If this bill is passed and vetoed, and the veto is not overridden, perhaps we can—and we certainly should—write a realistic bill pinpointing the areas of need, and costing in the neighborhood of $150 million.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SCOTT. I shall be glad to yield in just a moment.

In my opinion, such a bill would receive approval at the other end of the avenue, and give us relief instead of a political issue.

Finally, let me say that I have talked with the President. Of course, I am in no position to quote him, but the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Governor of West Virginia, Mr. Underwood, and I talked with the President this week. First of all, we all, including the President, want a bill. There would be no objection, in my opinion, to a reasonable bill which pinpointed the need in the areas where critical unemployment is most serious, and is a matter of concern to both the executive and legislative departments.

I now yield to my senior colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator not have some hope, because of the stiffening up of the requirements for eligibility, which the House made after my friend from Pennsylvania saw the President, that the President will be persuaded to sign the bill, if passed?

Mr. SCOTT. I want to make it clear to my colleague that I hope the President will sign the bill, even though I have certain objections to it. I think the bill is more acceptable, as the Senator says, because after our conference with the President an amendment was added in the House tightening somewhat the unemployment criteria.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. The bill therefore does pinpoint the need more than heretofore, and therefore it is, in my opinion, more acceptable. In my summary I have indicated the features which I think would give us a good bill, at a cost in the neighborhood of $150 million.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana such time as he may require.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] is unable to be present because of prior commitments undertaken as a member of the Subcommittee of Freedom of Communications of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement which the Senator from Wyoming had prepared and intended to make on the pending subject be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCGEE

The purpose of this bill is to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of unemployment in certain areas of the Nation which are economically depressed. As a member of the Senate Special Committee on Unemployment Problems, I am painfully aware that such sections of our otherwise prosperous economy do exist and that where they exist, economic conditions are just as bad as they were throughout the Nation during the darkest days of the great depression.

Our committee held a number of hearings in States where these depressed areas exist. We found that in many cases as much as 20 or 30 percent of the working force was either unemployed or underemployed. The tragic and community-corroding loss which such unemployment causes, especially when it is chronic, has become a matter of grave concern to every member of our committee.

The causes for chronic employment disadvantage in some 70 labor market areas throughout the country are diverse. There is no single program which will alleviate the disease from which these labor market areas suffer. In its report our committee pointed out that changes in consumer demand depletion of resources, changes in defense procurement or in location of defense facilities, decentralization of production, lack of industrial diversification, and technological change are the most important causes of depressed areas.

S. 722, with the House amendment, is a measure which will not be fully responsive to the need which our committee's study has demonstrated exists. It is a measure of limited scope; but, of course, those of us who believe in doing something about such problems must often be content with half a loaf when the whole loaf cannot be obtained. This bill, if enacted in its present form, will be a start.

If we combine this minimal start with the imagination and initiative of the American people themselves, we can and we shall accomplish a very great deal.

One of the hearings of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems was held in Rock Springs, Wyo., a community which has suffered grievously in the past from unemployment because of wholesale mine closings which occurred in 1953 and 1954. If this hearing demonstrated nothing else, it demonstrated the courage and the ingenuity with which a community can meet a crippling blow to employment in its basic industries.

This bill, though meager, can at least be a beginning in providing stimulus for such courageous action on the part of other communities in other areas.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I think it is about time that we did something for the American people.

Last week the Senate passed a bill authorizing more than $4 billion in aid to approximately 104 foreign countries. The pending bill would help the American people in ways similar to those by which we are helping foreign countries It would authorize $251 million, which is one-sixteenth of the amount the Senate last week authorized for the people in countries overseas.

The probability has been expressed by the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont, who rose in opposition to the bill, that the President would veto the bill. I hope that will not happen, although it would not be wholly surprising in view of the fact that he vetoed an area redevelopment bill 2 years ago, and before and since the Eisenhower administration has repeatedly taken a position adverse to adequate expenditures for the benefit of the American people, whether for airport development, to meet the urgency of the jet age, whether for housing, whether for education, whether to stop the pollution in our waters, whether to conserve and develop our natural resources, or whether to provide adequate medical insurance for the aged.

We are repeatedly told by the Eisenhower-Nixon administration such expenditures are extravagant, wasteful, and that they would unbalance the budget. However, the contrary attitude is revealed by the White House when it comes to spending money abroad. Those appropriations of American dollars, it tells us, are sacrosanct, and must not be cut by a nickel.

The pending bill, coming from the House, which is a very modest bill and less effective than the Senate-passed bill, is desirable to help many areas in our country, would aid depressed areas in Pennsylvania and West Virginia—which I visited only two nights ago—in Kentucky, in Arizona, in Illinois, in Alaska, where our fishing communities are in a serious plight owing to the steady depletion of our salmon fishery as a result of Federal mismanagement, and in many other parts of our country.

Is it not about time that we considered our own domestic needs and took care of them? Being only an authorization bill, and regrettably, therefore it will not be effective for another year or more. But it is not the fault of the Congress that the Presidential veto prevented a start 2 years ago.

I shall support the bill, and I hope that the President will at last see the light and decide that the interests of the American people should not, as hitherto, be placed second to the interests of other people.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In view of the fact that we have taken more time than the other side, I hope that my colleague from Illinois will be able to take some time now. If he is not ready, I will yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Illinois for yielding this time to me. I wish to concur in the decision to bring up the House bill, and to commend the House of Representatives on the passage of the area redevelopment bill.

I am sure that every Senator knows that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and I have been engaged in some very careful observations of the economic, social, and political scene in the beautiful State of West Virginia. I can assure Senators that the beauty and the charm of that wonderful State, and the quality and character of its people, would be further enhanced by passage of the area redevelopment bill.

Of course the proposed legislation is not designed for any particular State. It is designed for the Nation. It is the kind of economic assistance program, for our own workers, for our own economy, for our American communities, that we extend rather generously to the rest of the world.

I am a supporter of foreign aid, particularly foreign economic aid based upon the principle of long-term loans at low interest rates for the purpose of constructive, productive economic development.

I feel, however, that the same principle is applicable to situations in the United States, where there are underdeveloped areas and areas which, due to technological change, or due to working out of basic resources, suffer chronic unemployment or economic distress.

We have many such areas in the United States. The Labor Department's Bureau of Employment Security presently classifies 142 American communities as labor surplus areas with substantial unemployment.

Mr. President, we have in many parts of our Nation, in State after State, communities which were once thriving industrial, productive, prosperous communities, but which, through no fault on the part of management or local government or labor or civic organizations, find themselves today in serious economic stress.

This is to be found, for example—using my own State—in the northern and northeastern parts of Minnesota, where there is needed diversification of industry. We have done much in Minnesota

to help diversify our industry. We have the Iron Range Resources Commission, established by the State of Minnesota. It extends economic aid and technical assistance to localities and industries and workers in the northern and northeastern portions of Minnesota. We have our Department of Business Development, which is equally helpful.

However, there is a time when even greater assistance is required. That is where the area redevelopment bill becomes vital. The bill before us is a sincere effort on the part of Congress to find a mutual ground, so to speak, between the completely inadequate proposal advanced by the administration and the bill as passed by the Senate last year.

Area redevelopment is not new to Congress. This is no election-year panacea. Area redevelopment was passed in the Senate and in the House in 1958. It was passed by an overwhelming vote in the House, and it was passed in the Senate after a considerable struggle. Unfortunately, however, the President pocket vetoed this bill.

We passed it again in the Senate last year by a relatively close vote. Finally the House acted this past Wednesday on a modified version. The bill before us is not all I want, but it is effective legislation. I for one will support it. I say to Members of Congress, particularly to my colleagues in the Senate, who vote for foreign aid, "You cannot go home and face your constituents after having voted substantial sums of money for foreign aid, and deny to the American people, American industry, American labor, and American agriculture an opportunity for economic assistance on the basis of loans, on the basis of the kind of help that American communities need." The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] put it so well when he stated that we cannot accept such a double standard.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to approve this measure. It deserves to be passed by an overwhelming vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the minority leader? Is it agreed that we will yield back the remainder of our time, after an additional 10 minutes has been expended on each side, so that we may accommodate Senators who wish to leave?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has the Senator made provision for the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]?

Mr. CLARK. If he comes to the Chamber.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Also, the majority leader may wish to speak a few minutes on the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Is it agreed that we will yield back whatever time remains after that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is agreeable.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the first point I wish to make in support of the bill is that it is not an expenditure bill; it is an authorization bill. If the bill passes, not one cent of money will be appropriated for the program unless and until the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses, and the President, agree on an appropriation measure. So no Senator should be deterred from voting for the bill because he expects it to result in large amounts of immediate expenditures. This is a very important difference between the bill which we are now dealing with and the bill which we passed last year.

Senators who believe that this bill provides an amount which is too high will get another crack at it when the appropriation comes before the Senate. It seems to me that it is entirely unlikely that the full amount of the authorization will be required for the first fiscal year. Therefore, I make the point, as strongly as I can, that this is only an authorization, not an expenditure.

Moreover, the amount of the authorization has been reduced. The original Senate bill provided for $389 million. The bill now before the Senate calls for only $251 million of authorizations. So the amount has been reduced to make it approach more nearly the objectives of the President.

My third point is that the bill has a strong antipirating provision. It is a substantially stronger provision than was contained in the bill which passed the Senate last year. This bill forbids the lending of money, under its provisions, if such a loan will result in increasing unemployment in the area from which the industry has moved in order to go into a depressed area.

More than that, by an amendment made to the bill in the House at the last minute, a large number of communities which would otherwise have been eligible are no longer eligible. The eligibility restrictions have been tightened up by the House. Several big cities, including my own city of Philadelphia, and New York, have been excluded by these stronger provisions which were written into the bill by the House. Hundreds of additional areas would be deprived of eligibility if only our economy could be gotten back on the road, so that unemployment would be decreased. A drop in unemployment of 1 percent across the country would, in my judgment, result in the elimination from eligibility of scores of areas, because they would then be in a situation where their labor surpluses did not exceed 6 percent.

So the bill will take effect if, but only if, there are conditions of substantial unemployment throughout the country, and which highlight areas of chronic unemployment, so as to make the areas more eligible.

Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania from the time on this side, so that he may answer two questions.

First, I am glad the Senator pointed out—and I think it is important for the people in our Commonwealth to understand that both Senators from Pennsylvania accept and recognize as a desirable factor—that our city of Philadelphia has of necessity been eliminated, much as we should like to help our own home city. But its elimination has made it possible, if the bill shall become law, to provide needed aid to Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, Hazleton, Uniontown, Connellsville, and other areas of economic distress and unemployment. Does the Senator not agree?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. I am in accord with his view. Of course, if unemployment should get very much worse in Philadelphia, then our city could well qualify. But it does not qualify now.

Mr. SCOTT. That is true. Second, with respect to the matter of the use of Federal funds—the taxpayers' money—it occurs to me that at times the allocation is inequitable. I call the attention to the Senator to the testimony given by officials of the Department of Agriculture that one grain storage company in the Midwest received $23,470,636 from the Federal Government last year in fees charged for storing surplus crops. One storage company, in other words, received more money than the amount of farm surplus payments paid as subsidies to all of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware combined; and, moreover, more than Pennsylvania probably would receive for unemployment and economic distress under this bill. Does the senior Senator from Pennsylvania not believe that that is inequitable and a costly shame?

Mr. CLARK. I am glad my colleague has pointed out these facts. In addition, I point out that the bill calls for an authorization of $75 million in loans to depressed rural areas. So it is neither a big city bill nor an industrial bill. It is a national bill, which takes care of rural underemployment to the same extent and in the same amount as it takes care of urban unemployment.

Mr. SCOTT. It is much more useful to the rural areas than is generally believed.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. I thank him for his helpful interjection into the debate.

Mr. President, I turn to a document which, in my judgment, makes the bill a "must," and that is the report of the Senate Special Committee on Unemployment Problems, a committee consisting of nine members, whose conclusions were practically unanimous. They made their report only a little more than a month ago, and stated in no uncertain terms the need for this kind of legislation, a need which was found out only by the Democratic members of the committee, but also by the Republican members of the committee. I quote from page 69 of the report:

> Members of the committee and its staff observed directly the suffering and distress of people in depressed areas and were deeply impressed with the need for immediate action. The committee therefore recommends that highest priority be given to the enactment into law in this session of an effective area redevelopment bill.

While that statement was in the report of the majority, we find the following in minority views:

It is a matter of prime importance that an area redevelopment bill be enacted

and that it contain means for stimulating local effort.

There we have the statements of nine U.S. Senators, from both sides of the aisle, saying that an area redevelopment bill is needed this year. This is our only chance this year to pass such a bill. I hope Senators on both sides of the aisle will give effect to the unanimous recommendation of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems of their own body, which has so recently reported.

I share the views of Senators who deplore the "double standard," as it has come to be called. I have always supported mutual security aid for underdeveloped countries abroad. I hope to continue to do so. However, I may say that I share the views of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and other Senators that it is unconscionable and unethical to give the money of American taxpayers to the underdeveloped people abroad, much as they need it, and to deny the very same kind of assistance to American citizens who are asking only for an opportunity to work for an honest living.

I do not understand how Senators of good conscience can vote for foreign aid, or urge the Senate to vote for foreign aid, and deny domestic aid to undernourished Americans who live in conditions of squalor. If Senators could see, as I have seen, and as members of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems have seen, they would be ill at their stomachs and be astounded to learn that such conditions could exist in the United States of America.

Finally, this situation is a cancer in our body politic; a cancer which is invading the sound soul of democracy.

Our neglect of the people who are suffering such misery, our failure to show a sense of compassion toward our fellow citizens, must make them feel that they are abandoned; it must make them feel that this is indeed an odd way for the richest country in the history of the world to treat its own citizens. This cancer will spread, unless it is cut out by drastic surgery.

Mr. President, this bill is a pale little bill; it makes only a start; it is not nearly good enough. We accept it only because we legislate under the shadow of the rules of the House of Representatives, over which we have no control. There is a hammer at our heads. We are told, "Take it or leave it. This or nothing."

So those of us who fought so hard and so long for a better bill will take this bill, and will return, another day, to fight for a more adequate bill.

I hope every Member of the Senate will search his heart and his conscience before he determines how he will vote on the question of the passage of this bill. If he does so, I have no doubt that the bill will be passed by the Senate by an overwhelming vote, which the bill so justly deserves.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The time yielded to the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the other day, I noticed that the President of the United States had suggested to the agencies of the Government that they do what they could to be of help to the communities of the great State of West Virginia. Instead of telling the agencies of the Government to do what they should, he watered down his request, and told them to do what they could. Instead of telling them to do what was needed, he said to the heads of those agencies, "Do what you think you may be able to do nicely and easily."

There is one way for the administration to demonstrate that it really cares about the American people, the American economy, and what is occurring in our country: The President still has time to send to the Senate a message that he will sign the area redevelopment bill.

What the President does in regard to this bill will be the test; then we shall find out whether we shall receive from him more in the field of public relations or more in the field of public policies. Unfortunately, Mr. President, I am afraid that we are likely to get more of the public-relations gobbledygook, instead of public policies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time yielded to the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall vote for the House amendment to Senate bill 722, which was passed by the Senate last year.

This is not a new position for me. In 1958, I supported the Douglas-Payne bill. In 1959, I joined with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] in introducing the original version of Senate bill 722, which the Senate passed.

It is true that the country as a whole is enjoying an extended period of prosperity—the longest period of prosperity, I believe, our country has ever known in peacetime. Wages, personal income, investments, housing starts, and gross national product prove my statement to be true. Except for this high level of prosperity, conditions in the depressed areas would be worse.

But, Mr. President, it cannot be denied that throughout the Nation there are areas in which substantial and persistent unemployment has existed for several years. Several of those areas—notably, in the eastern coal mining section—are in my own State.

The fact remains that growing prosperity elsewhere in the Nation has not been able to bring employment and better times to the depressed areas of the United States.

Today, Mr. President, I do not have time to explain the details of this legislation; but many of us know how acute the situation is, because of the vast technological changes which have occurred in many areas of the United States. In the coal mining areas of the Nation, a miner who formerly produced an average of 3 or 4 tons of coal a day, by using a pick, now can produce 35 tons of coal a day, with the use of modern equipment. The average production per day, per man has risen from 3–4 tons to 14 tons. I know that in the eastern part of Kentucky, where formerly 60,000 miners were employed, today less than 30,000 produce the same amount of coal.

This bill is designed to bring to these sections new opportunities for employment of the people, who may never again secure employment in the work they have known throughout all their lives.

This morning, I should like to address myself to the Members of the Senate, and particularly the members of my own party, and ask them to consider carefully what is at stake. I hope they will vote for this bill. Let Senators on this side of the aisle, in particular, remember that the President of the United States was the first one to recommend to the Congress the enactment of a bill to give assistance to the depressed areas of the United States. The Congress passed its own bill in 1958; and I believe this bill will be passed.

It is true that the approach of the President and the approach of the Congress have differed. If a greater effort had been made in the last 2½ years, both by the administration and by the majority leaders of the House and the Senate, to conciliate their differences, perhaps today we would have on the statute books legislation which would be giving aid to these areas, rather than be engaged in a fight which may deteriorate into a political issue.

But, Mr. President, whatever the record of the past, we have an opportunity today to do something about this critical situation.

This measure is not an appropriation bill; it is an authorization bill. The Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress will have opportunities to consider the value of all the programs provided by this bill, and fix the appropriations for such programs as they may approve.

I hope the Senate will pass this bill, and I hope the President will sign it. For before the Appropriations Committees act on the necessary appropriations bill, the administration and the congressional leaders can meet and can conciliate—and they ought to conciliate—the differences between them with respect to the provisions of this bill.

In the face of the demonstrated need of the people of the depressed areas, and the present opportunity to help those who have been left behind in the progress of our Nation, surely the executive branch and the legislative branch, and our two parties and their leaders, will demonstrate the statesmanship and

conciliate the differences which exist between the administration and the Congress.

A few minutes ago I heard the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] speak about the President's responsibility; the Senator from Minnesota said the President had only lately directed the heads of the Government's executive agencies in these areas to take action. Let me say that I have been in correspondence with the President, and I have talked to him two or three times this year about depressed areas. The remarks of the President followed a meeting which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and I had with the President. At that meeting we made certain suggestions for additional executive action, and the President's response was a response to those suggestions.

Let me also say to the distinguished minority leader——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to have additional time, if I may.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, as I was about to say, I would point out to the distinguished minority leader that, although he may know more about this particular subject than I do, so far as I know, the President has not yet said he would veto this bill. I hope he will sign it—to give opportunity to get a program going. I ask the Members of the Senate who belong to my party to give the administration and the congressional leaders an opportunity to attempt to work out, by means of this authorization bill, a measure which will meet the needs of the people of the distressed areas of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time yielded to the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to have an additional minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, I wish to assure the Senate that unhappy situations do exist in this country.

I have visited many times these areas in my own State, I have seen these conditions—people who do not have an adequate diet, or enough clothes, and whose morale is very low, because they believe, unhappily, that they have been forgotten.

Mr. President, these are realities. Mercy, compassion, and justice ought to move the Members of our body and demand that we help our less fortunate fellow countrymen, their families, and their children.

It is better to do something today than to do nothing. I urge the Senate to pass this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD, following my remarks, my recommendations to the President of executive action which could be taken to assist our depressed areas, in addition to this legislative bill.

There being no objection, the recommendation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSALS OF SENATOR JOHN SHERMAN COOPER FOR EXECUTIVE ACTION IN AID OF DEPRESSED AREAS WITHIN EXISTING PROGRAMS

1. Department of Labor:

Provide additional personnel for employment offices, and establish additional employment offices in distressed areas—to search out immediately all employable persons.

Direct employment offices throughout the country to search out and list all job opportunities.

Provide emergency funds to move employable persons from distressed areas to job opportunities, and provide temporary assistance to such persons.

2. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

Establish vocational training schools in distressed areas for persons capable of employment.

Provide compensation to trainees under Defense Education Act or vocational training programs. If not adequate, provide emergency compensation during term of training.

3. Department of Agriculture:

Establish rural development programs in all rural depressed areas.

Establish immediately a garden program in cooperation with State farm agencies to supplement surplus foods. Provide emergency seeds and fertilizers.

4. Long-range programs toward development of rural distressed areas:

Establish, in connection with State, priorities for needed roads, civilian airports, and water development for basic economic growth of such areas.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator from Kentucky and I were both at the White House recently. The point has been made previously that we may not indulge in direct quotations. However, does not the Senator agree with me it is better to get an actual bill for the relief of chronically distressed areas of unemployment at a cost in the neighborhood of $150 million than to see the $251 million bill vetoed and fail to become law? Does not the Senator agree that we would be better off with $150 million to start the work than to say, "We tried to get $251 million, but did not get it"?

Mr. COOPER. I agree, but the Appropriations Committee can take what action it desires on the bill. I think we ought to pass the bill.

Mr. SCOTT. I do, too.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, consonant with the understanding I had with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, I will remain within the 10-minute limit.

I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the first time such a bill came to the floor it came out of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I had the honor of being the floor manager for it. This bill is overdue. I think it should have been passed 4 or 5 years ago, when it first came to our attention.

There are many areas in the country which have been left high and dry by the advance of technology and automation. Unless the influence, power, and credit of the Federal Government is placed behind the rehabilitation of those centers, they will continue to decline in a gradually increasing spiral.

I hope the bill will pass, and that the President will sign it into law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I was very proud to support this proposed legislation when it was originally before the Senate. I did not think it went too far then. I do not think it goes too far now. I think so long as this country is as wealthy, as big, and as broad as it is, and so long as we can grant $4 billion a year to make grants around the world, we can at least make loans at home totaling one tenth of that amount.

Mr. President, I have traveled from one end of this great Nation to the other. I have seen pockets of unemployment. I have seen areas depressed. I have seen people distressed. I think all those people could be paying taxes and all those areas could be prosperous communities if the powers of government were used to help them help themselves.

I remember that a great man was brought to this town under another administration. Mr. Hoover reached down to our State of Texas and selected Mr. Jesse Jones. He went from one State to another, making loans, some of which were like those contemplated in this bill. I think the Treasury made a profit out of those loans. I remember in my own State, when people were hungry, when their children were in boxcars, when their areas were depressed, that a loan was made to a State authority for a development program, and that loan was made at 4 percent interest, but the indenture provided that if the bonds were paid off before a certain period they would have to be paid off at 105 instead of 100. We were later able to recover, and pay those bonds off. The Treasury made money as a result of the aid it gave to depressed areas and distressed people during the 1930's. The Treasury can do the same in the 1960's.

I do not think the wise or provident or prudent course is to say, "Go away," because this problem will not go away. We must face up to it. We are going to do so today.

I hope and believe that each Member of the Senate will seriously consider whether or not he is willing to

use the powers of this Government to help people help themselves.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This bill has had a long and tortuous course. It passed after 9 tumultuous hours in the House, interspersed with many quorum calls and motions to put it aside and send it back to the committee, and when they got all through in the House the vote was 201 to 184. It was carried by only 17 votes.

It has been 13 months or more since a bill of larger dimension was passed in the Senate. That bill carried in the Senate by a vote of 49 to 46. So it has been here a long time, and it has taken a long time to get back to the Senate in the form of a proposal to concur in the House amendment. I have no objection to the procedure. I do not believe any cause would be served particularly by having this bill go to conference. I only point out one or two things.

First, this is a new undertaking, and here we are authorizing $251 million. In the Senate bill we authorized $389 million. The distinction is made that this is an authorization, and not an appropriation bill. Well, it is a naive distinction, for when the money and the authority are authorized, then the next step, of course, is to go before the Appropriations Committee and get money. That is inevitably done, and it is inevitably voted.

Second, I point out that it is a new agency that is involved. I introduced the administration bill. It was introduced in February of 1959. That bill left the matter in the Department of Commerce and in the Department of Labor. Here is a new permanent agency provided; and after a long period of time in the legislative branch I have discovered how these agencies proliferate, how they grow, how definitions are changed, how new areas are brought into the picture, and how greater and greater sums are finally requested.

I look upon this proposal as just another threat to our fiscal integrity. It has been said by its proponents that this must be done, and they point out what a great record has been made in appropriations. As a matter of fact, this Congress, so far as the House and Senate are concerned, has made a good record on appropriations. But I point out something else. The Senate passed the Youth Conservation Corps bill. The impact will be $181 million if the House passes it. We passed the veterans peacetime pension bill. That will call for a very substantial sum. The House has already passed the omnibus housing bill, involving $1 billion.

The Senate has passed the international health bill. So has the House of Representatives. The 1961 budget impact will be $50 million. We passed an educational TV bill. The cost will be $10 million. Pending in the House now, reported from the House committee, is a pay bill. Had the committee reported the original bill the cost involved would have been $1,637 million, and in its original form the impact even on this fiscal year, since the provisions of the bill were retroactive till January, would have been over $800 million. That is now a 9-percent pay raise bill instead of a 20-percent bill, but whatever it is, it is going to "nibble away" at what the President had hoped would be a surplus in 1961.

Only by frugality, only by caution, only by watching can we "nose out" a very slender $100 million surplus in 1960. If we fail to supply the necessary revenues and if we add to the expenditures, I envision that what looked like a $4.2 billion surplus to be applied on the public debt in 1961 will be "nibbled away" and will be reduced finally to a deficit rather than a surplus.

I wish to add only one other thing, Mr. President. Why compare this with foreign aid? How often does one have to point out that the mutual security bill is for the common defense of the country? There is no analogy whatsoever.

Of course, if there is any virtue in the argument which was made on the floor this morning, then why not open up the gates? Let us have an omnibus public works bill. Let us encompass every State, every county, every locality, every water course, every harbor, every place which needs a public building. Let us throw everything in.

We are already committed to the expenditure of billions of dollars—more than $25 billion on highways, billions of dollars for public buildings and other improvements, billions of dollars for subsidies for the merchant marine and others. It is an amazing state of affairs.

We are piling up not only c.o.d.'s, but also I O U's. I wonder whether that is in the interest of continuing confidence in the country. When that confidence ebbs, if something should happen to the economy, then, of course, there will be real hardship in the areas which have been presenting an appeal to us this morning.

I leave it there. If it were left to me, I would say to the President, "You should veto this bill. It is not consonant with your program and is not in the interests of the country, as it stands today."

I am ready to vote.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I will not take the 2 minutes. When I spoke earlier, I had been unable to get all the information on the bill which I thought important to justify a logical vote. I have obtained some information since then, and I ask unanimous consent that I may include the statement with the remarks I made earlier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Does the Senator from Illinois yield back his remaining time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understand that the time has been yielded back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have not yielded it back. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a brief statement which I had intended to make at this time.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

The Senate is about to vote on one of the most important bills it will consider this year. We are going to send a bill to the President that will provide some assistance to Americans who live in areas of substantial, and persistent, unemployment.

I would have preferred to see the original Senate bill enacted into law. That bill provided sums that are needed and that could be used almost at once to help these distressed areas to help themselves. Compared to the need that exists, it was not an extravagant bill.

The House has reduced the total figure in S. 722, and it has provided an authorization bill in lieu of direct financing by the Treasury. Nevertheless, the bill we are voting on today is meaningful and will go a long way toward restoring these areas to productive life.

For that is what we are doing here—providing the means by which Americans who want to work may do so. This is not a dole. It is not a handout. It is an encouragement to hundreds of thousands of men who can work, who want to work, and who have been rendered idle by circumstance.

Technological change, the migration of industry, shifts in demand, long periods of seasonal unemployment, the depletion of natural resources—all these factors have made distressed areas out of places that once contributed to our economic life.

What happens when industry leaves a town and the mines and factories close? All those resources that go to make up a community—schools, stores, hospitals, banks, office buildings, homes, churches, all the public services of a community—waste away. They were built at great expense and effort, and now they are left to disintegrate.

We do not want this kind of disintegration, this kind of waste of human and natural resources, anywhere in the world. And it is strange to me that the same people who tell us that we must do something about such waste in other parts of the world, tell us that we cannot lend our own people enough money to prevent that waste in America.

Let us stop using this double standard. Let us stop this waste at home, as we are trying to stop it abroad. Let us give these American men and women the hope of prosperity we are trying to give our friends abroad. Let us give them the chance to rebuild their economic and community life, and once again to have some part in the American dream of a better life.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BENNETT subsequently said: Mr. President, I was attending a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on

Banking and Currency and was therefore unable to be on the floor during the discussion of the depressed areas bill. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared concerning the bill may be printed in the body of the RECORD, at a point before the vote on the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT

The depressed areas bill, officially tabbed the area redevelopment bill, is a serious mistake. I have sincere compassion for those persons presently unemployed in certain labor surplus areas of our economy; but, frankly, it is because of this compassion that I am opposed to the bill.

The general motive behind the bill is most worthy. The bill would provide Federal assistance to treat the problem of economically-depressed areas by attempting to induce industry to locate in these areas by offering Federal subsidies. The bill provides for capital loans for industrial development projects, together with loans for certain public facilities and for rural development. In addition, the bill would set up a program of grants for those areas which cannot provide these facilities on a loan basis. There are other minor provisions of the bill. In order to qualify, an area must have a level of joblessness which persists for 2 or more years, even during periods of overall national prosperity.

All this sounds worthy, but the trouble is the bill holds out false hopes to the people in those areas. Depressed area problems arise from change; from shifts and adaptations in output and the use of capital; from the depletion of natural resources. You can legislate against change, but you can't stop it. If the Federal Government had tried to do so in the past, it might still be subsidizing western ghost towns and buggy whip factories.

I agree with the President when he said that "this bill would perpetuate insecurity by making distressed areas dependent upon the uncertainties of continued Federal subsidies, or would pour Federal dollars into areas where distress has been temporary and which are competent to meet their problems themselves."

This bill cannot do the job its proponents claim. It is billed as a cure-all for the economy. The qualifying areas are in a constant state of change but the latest best estimates show about 1 million unemployed in the 30 major areas and 100 minor areas which would qualify for aid under the bill at the present time. The committee received evidence indicating that an investment of from $10,000 to $15,000 is required to support each industrial job. Thus, to provide jobs for all of the unemployed in these areas which are the prospective beneficiaries of the bill would cost from $10 billion to $15 billion.

The bill would not only fail to meet the problem, it would create a "Pandora's box" of new problems. To name just a few:

1. DISCRIMINATION IN FAVOR OF FEW

Careful scrutiny of the bill's provisions shows that only a select proportion of the Nation's unemployed would be singled out as eligible for the alleged benefits of the program, and it should be noted that the selection process is based on purely arbitrary criteria. The criteria for eligibility, by their nature, impose an impossible burden on the administration of the program. In the absence of detailed area studies of the forces underlying high unemployment, the Administrator is placed in an unenviable position of making discriminatory judgments, in favor of some unemployed, and against others, without having a clear-cut basis for his decision.

2. IT RAISES A PROBLEM OF JOB TRANSFERS

The bill does not adequately protect against the pirating of industry from one area to another. Under the terms of the bill the people in the healthy economic areas, and this, mind you, is the major portion of our country, would be forced to underwrite with their Federal tax dollars the export of jobs to competing areas. This, to my mind, is unconscionable. Our efforts should be aimed at creating new job opportunities, instead of merely transferring jobs from one locality to another.

3. DISCRIMINATION WITHIN INDUSTRIES

Moreover, not only would the bill promote discrimination by the Federal Government in favor of some areas at the expense of others it would also promote such discrimination to benefit some companies within a given industry at the expense of competitors.

Assume a situation in which several companies have plants in various parts of the country, none of which are in a so-called depressed area.

Company A, employing 250 persons, is at a competitive disadvantage because it has not kept pace with the industry as a whole in modernizing its factory and improving machinery.

A community eligible for redevelopment under the bill builds and equips a factory with Federal assistance, and induces company A to relocate.

A double discrimination, promoted with Federal funds, has thus taken place: discrimination against the area of original location of company A and discrimination against company A's industrial competitors.

4. IMPROPER INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE MARKETS

A basic defect of the approach of this bill is this that it runs counter to the precepts of what is still essentially a private market mechanism operating within a dynamic and growing economy.

The strength of the United States to a great degree is attributable to the fluidity of its resources among such areas as could use them most efficiently. Unlike the economies of other continents, the economy of the United States has been able to distribute its resources into their most efficient uses without regard to State boundaries or regional areas. This has always been an essential strength of our political system—that it permitted these adjustments. And this bill would threaten to destroy that adjustment mechanism within our system.

5. FAILURE TO RECOGNIZE EXISTING PROGRAMS

The devices established in the bill to carry out its objectives are defective in the failure to recognize existing programs, thus causing a duplication of efforts. I won't take time to detail them at this time, but most States have development corporations or industrial planning committees. In addition, during the last Congress we passed the Small Business Investment Act which provides for loans and investments based upon private judgment with a minimum of interference from the SBA. And there are others.

In light of these and other objections, I hope this bill will be rejected by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] that the Senate concur in the House amendment to Senate bill 722.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. BEALL (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT.] If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from MISSOURI [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent because of a death in his family.

I further announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay" and the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would "yea," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from

Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Nebraska, [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], is absent on official business as a member of the Board of Visitors of the Coast Guard Academy.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] would each vote "nay."

The respective pairs of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] have been previously announced.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 32, as follows:

[No. 194]

YEAS—45

Bible	Hartke	Morse
Byrd, W. Va.	Hayden	Moss
Cannon	Hill	Murray
Carroll	Humphrey	Muskie
Case, N.J.	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Church	Javits	Pastore
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Proxmire
Cooper	Kennedy	Randolph
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Scott
Douglas	Lusk	Smith
Engle	McCarthy	Sparkman
Gore	McNamara	Symington
Green	Magnuson	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	Mansfield	Yarborough
Hart	Monroney	Young, Ohio

NAYS—32

Aiken	Dworshak	Martin
Allott	Ellender	Morton
Bennett	Ervin	Prouty
Bridges	Frear	Saltonstall
Brunsdale	Fulbright	Smathers
Bush	Hickenlooper	Stennis
Butler	Holland	Talmadge
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	Wiley
Cotton	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Long, La.	Young, N. Dak.
Dirksen	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—23

Anderson	Fong	Kerr
Bartlett	Goldwater	McGee
Beall	Hennings	Mundt
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Robertson
Capehart	Johnston, S.C.	Russell
Carlson	Jordan	Schoeppel
Chavez	Keating	Thurmond
Eastland	Kefauver	

So the motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas to concur in the amendment of the House was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion of the Senator from Texas was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. SYMINGTON subsequently said: Mr. President, today's vote marks a significant day for the distressed areas of our country.

Congressional approval of the area redevelopment bill (S. 722), which I joined in cosponsoring, is a recognition of the fact that when there is suffering in any part of our country, all America suffers.

On the other hand, when there is economic health in distressed areas, all of the country benefits.

This bill is a good start, but much is left to be done. I have visited many of the chronically depressed areas of our country, and have come away from these visits with a conviction that we in Washington cannot afford to ignore these conditions.

The Federal Government must move ahead with effective programs, such as S. 722, to wipe out the persistent unemployment in our pockets of poverty, especially because most of the country is experiencing unprecedented prosperity.

S. 722 should be viewed as the beginning of cooperative Federal-State and private efforts designed to eradicate unemployment and depression from the American economy.

The area redevelopment bill rejects the theory that such conditions are an inevitable part of our system.

We must invest further in the economic health of our country, just as we have been doing in other countries.

PETITION AND MEMORIAL

A petition, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N.Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Forand bill, to provide medical care for the aged; to the Committee on Finance.

A telegram, in the nature of a memorial, from Mr. and Mrs. Max Brenner, of North Hollywood, Calif., remonstrating against the adoption of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 83) to strengthen the authority of the United Nations to prevent war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 3501. A bill to promote greater equity in the administration of the pay systems of employees in the Veterans' Administration under prevailing rate schedules by providing for certain adjustments in the compensation of such employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 3502. A bill to extend and amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide mortgage insurance for individually owned units in a multifamily structure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MCNAMARA (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HART, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 3503. A bill to provide for the payment of hospital and other health services furnished to aged retired individuals, and to provide for a continuing study of the health needs of such individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCNAMARA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) (by request):

S. 3504. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to remove certain limitations on the aggregate amount of outstanding mortgage insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators KENNEDY, CLARK, RANDOLPH, SYMINGTON, HUMPHREY, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, MAGNUSON, MCGEE, YOUNG of Ohio, DOUGLAS, GRUENING, LONG of Hawaii, MURRAY, HART, and MORSE, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the payment of hospital and other health services furnished to aged retired individuals, and to provide for a continuing study of the health needs of such individuals.

Within the very near future, I will present a detailed explanation of the bill, along with the compelling reasons why it, or a bill of similar content, should be enacted at this session of the Congress. For the moment, I wish only to say that the bill represents the results of 18 months of study by the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, of which I have been privileged to serve as chairman.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3503) to provide for the payment of hospital and other health services furnished to aged retired individuals, and to provide for a continuing study of the health needs of such individuals, introduced by Mr. MCNAMARA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Retired Persons Medical Insurance Act".

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

SEC. 101. (a) Title II of the Social Security Act is amended by adding after section 225 the following new section:

"MEDICAL INSURANCE BENEFITS

"SEC. 226. (a)(1) Every individual who—

"(A) has attained retirement age (as defined in section 216(a)),

"(B) is retired (as defined in paragraph (3)),

"(C) is, or would upon filing application be, entitled to monthly benefits under section 202, shall be eligible to receive medical insurance benefits. Payment of such benefits shall be made in accordance with the pro-

visions of this section, but only if application is filed for such payment in such form and in such manner and by such person as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe. The provisions of clauses (B) and (C) shall not apply to any person (i) who is the husband or wife of an individual eligible to receive medical insurance benefits and (ii) who was receiving more than one-half of his or her support from such individual for one year provided such year began no earlier than the calendar year preceding the year such person attained retirement age.

"(2) Payment of medical insurance benefits shall be made for hospital services, nursing home services, home health services, diagnostic outpatient services, and very expensive drugs (as defined in subsection (c)).

"(3) For purposes of paragraph (1)—

"(A) Except as may be provided in subparagraph (B), an individual shall be retired with respect to the period for which he files for payment of medical insurance benefits if—

"(i) he had total earnings (as defined in section 203(e)) of less than $2,000 in any calendar year preceding the year in which the first day of such period occurs, provided such calendar year is no earlier than the year preceding the year in which he attained retirement age, or

"(ii) he did not render services for wages of more than $100, and did not engage in self-employment in each of at least three months in any calendar year, provided such third month preceded the first day of such period and such calendar year is no earlier than the year preceding the year in which he attained retirement age, or

"(iii) he attained the age of seventy-two in a month prior to such period.

"(B) For the purposes of benefits for very expensive drugs, an individual shall be retired if on the first day of the month in which he incurs the cost of such drugs he meets the provisions of clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (A). Such first day shall be deemed the first day of the period for which he files for the payment of medical insurance benefits.

For purposes of subparagraph (A)(iii), an individual shall be presumed not to have engaged in self-employment with respect to any month if, by applying the provisions of section 203(e) and the regulations issued thereunder, the Secretary determines that such individual did not engage in self-employment in such month, except that for such purposes the term 'substantial services,' as used in paragraph (3)(B)(i) of such section 203(e), shall mean services rendered by such individual with respect to his trade or business in more than 7 days in such month.

"(4) Payment of medical insurance benefits which an individual is eligible to receive may be made for—

"(A) hospital services furnished to such individuals for a total of not more than 90 days in any calendar year;

"(B) nursing home services furnished to such individual for a total of not more than 180 days in any calendar year;

"(C) home health services furnished to such individual for a total of not more than 240 days;

"(D) disagnostic outpatient services but only to the extent the Secretary, after consultation with the Advisory Council established pursuant to subsection (f), may by regulation specify;

"(E) very expensive drugs furnished such individual, but only to the extent the Secretary, after consultation with such Advisory Council, may by regulation specify.

The maximum of any combination of hospital services, nursing home services, and home health services for which payment may be made for such services furnished, during any calendar year, to any individual eligible to receive medical insurance benefits, shall not exceed 90 units of services. For the purpose of the preceding sentence, one "unit of services" equals (i) one day of hospital services, (ii) two days of nursing home services, or (iii) two and two-thirds days of home health services.

"(5) Notwithstanding the previous provisions of this subsection, no individual shall be eligible to receive medical insurance benefits insofar as they relate to hospital services, nursing home services, or home health services, unless such services are rendered after referral by a physician, and such physician certifies in writing that such hospital services, nursing home services, or home health services are or were required for his medical treatment; except that such referral shall not be required for hospital services in case of an emergency which makes such referral impracticable. Periodic recertification that medical treatment which extends over a period of time is required shall, in accordance with regulations established by the Secretary, be a condition of continuing eligibility to receive such benefits during the period such services are furnished.

"(6)(A) An application for the payment of medical insurance benefits shall be valid, with respect to a period during which one or more of the services described in subsection (c) are furnished, if such application is filed no earlier than the first day of the third month preceding the month in which the first day of such period occurs or no later than the last day of the twelfth month succeeding the month in which the first day of such period occurs. An application for the payment of medical insurance benefits shall be valid with respect to the cost incurred for a very expensive drug if such application is filed within such time as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe.

"(B) For purposes of this section, a period during which—

"(i) hospital or nursing home services (or both) are furnished means a consecutive number of days (including only one day) in which such services are furnished;

"(ii) home health services are furnished means one or more days (but not exceeding 240 days in any calendar year) in which such services are furnished, but only if the number of days elapsing between any two days in which such services are furnished does not exceed 30;

"(iii) diagnostic outpatient services are furnished means one or more days (but not exceeding in any calendar year the number of days specified by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (4)(D) of this subsection) in which such services are furnished, but only if the number of days elapsing between any two days in which such services are furnished does not exceed 14.

"EVIDENCE AND DETERMINATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY

"(b)(1) Proof that an individual is entitled to monthly insurance benefits under section 202 by reason of having attained retirement age shall be conclusive evidence that such individual has attained retirement age.

"(2) The provisions of section 205 relating to the making and review of determinations shall be applicable to determinations as to (i) whether an individual is eligible to receive medical insurance benefits, and (ii) the number of days, in any calendar year, for which an individual is eligible to receive such benefits.

"DESCRIPTION OF MEDICAL INSURANCE BENEFITS

"(c)(1) 'Hospital services' means, subject to further definition and limitation by regulations, the following services provided an individual as an inpatient: bed and board in a hospital, in semiprivate accommodations unless they are unavailable, or unless other accommodations are occupied at the request of the patient or, are required for medical reasons; and such medical, nursing, ambulance, and other services, and such drugs, supplies, and appliances, as the hospital customarily provides bed patients either through its own employees or through arrangements with others, except that this term shall not include service provided in connection with cosmetic or plastic surgery performed for beautification.

"(2) 'Nursing home services' means, subject to further definition by regulations, skilled nursing care, related medical and personal services required for the treatment of the patient, and accompanying bed and board furnished to an individual as an inpatient.

"(3) 'Home health services' means, subject to further definition by regulations, professional nursing care (including part-time homemaker services, physical and occupational therapy, medical social services, dietary counseling, ambulance service, and similar allied services) in a place of residence maintained as an individual's home, furnished by a nonprofit home health service agency.

"(4) 'Diagnostic outpatient services' means, subject to further definition by regulations, such services furnished by a hospital and prescribed by a physician licensed to practice surgery or medicine to any individual as an outpatient for purposes of diagnostic study.

"(5) 'Very expensive drugs' means, subject to further definition by regulations, those drugs which have been prescribed by a physician licensed to practice surgery or medicine in a State for use of an individual, if such drugs are prescribed by their official title as included in United States Pharmacopoeia, National Formulary, Homeopathic Pharmacopoeia or New and Non-Official Remedies, or in an equivalent manner, specified in regulations and the cost of which is in excess of an amount fixed by the Secretary. Nothing in this definition shall be construed to prevent any physician from prescribing by brand or trade name if the prescription bears a notation to the effect that no substitution may be made. Notwithstanding the preceding description of medical services in this subsection, such services shall also include that part of similar but of more expensive medical services as is equivalent in cost to such benefits.

"AGREEMENTS WITH PROVIDERS OF HEALTH SERVICES

"(d)(1)(A) The Secretary shall publish, at such time or times as he designates, a list of (i) hospitals, (ii) hospitals furnishing outpatient diagnostic services, (iii) nursing homes, and (iv) public or other nonprofit home health services agencies in the United States, which meet the standards prescribed by him for providing hospital services, diagnostic outpatient services, nursing home services, and home health services, and which have filed with him agreements under subparagraph (B) of this paragraph. No institution or agency required by or pursuant to State law to be licensed shall be included in any such list unless it is duly licensed. In setting eligibility standards for any class of institutions or agencies, the Secretary may take account of standards set by any recognized national listing or accrediting body. The Secretary may utilize the services of appropriate State agencies in determining whether providers of services meet such standards as he shall prescribe.

"(B) No hospital, nursing home, or home health service agency shall be included in a list under subparagraph (A) unless it has filed with the Secretary an agreement to make no charge to or on account of individuals or other persons for services for which such individuals are eligible to receive medical insurance benefits under this section (or to cancel any charge and refund any payment made prior to a determination of eligibility to receive such benefits), but such

agreements shall not preclude the making of charges to such individuals or persons for accommodations or services, furnished at their request, which are in addition to, or more expensive than, those for which patients are eligible to receive medical insurance benefits by reason of this section. An agreement under this paragraph may be terminated by the provider of health services at such time and upon such notice to the Secretary and to the public as he may specify by regulations.

"(C) No mental or tuberculosis hospital shall be included in a list under this paragraph.

"(2) (A) Any hospital, nursing home, or home health services agency, listed by the Secretary under paragraph (1) for providing a class of services, which provides services of that class to an individual eligible to receive medical insurance benefits under this section shall be entitled to receive payment for such services under this title. Under conditions specified in regulations, and in amounts determined in accordance therewith, payments shall be made to hospitals not listed by the Secretary for emergency hospital services rendered to individuals eligible to receive medical insurance benefits under this section.

"(3) Payments for hospital services and outpatient diagnostic services, to hospitals listed by the Secretary, shall be equal to the cost of rendering the services. The method or methods of determining such cost shall be prescribed by regulations, issued after consulation with the Advisory Council.

"(4) No payment shall be made under this section for any hospital services which the hospital is obligated by law, or by contract with the United States or a State or political subdivision thereof, to render at public expense and without regard to the income or resources of the patient. No such payment shall be made for any hospital services for any injury, disease or disability for which the patient is entitled to hospitalization (or to the cost thereof) under any workmen's compensation law; except that payment may be made if (A) an appropriate application for hospitalization (or for the cost thereof) has been made under the workmen's compensation law, (B) entitlement thereto has not been finally determined, and (C) an arrangement satisfactory to the Secretary has been made for reimbursement of the Federal Medical Insurance Trust Fund if the claim under the workmen's compensation law is finally sustained.

"(5) The amount of payments for nursing home services and for home health services shall be determined in accordance with regulations, issued after consultation with the Advisory Council. The method of determining the amount of the payments shall be based on the reasonable cost of rendering the services.

"(6) (A) Any pharmacy which employs one or more pharmacists who are licensed under the laws of the State in which it is located to dispense drugs at retail shall be eligible to enter into an agreement with the Secretary whereby such pharmacy will be paid for furnishing drugs to individuals eligible to receive medical insurance benefits under this section.

"(B) Such agreement shall apply only to the furnishing of 'very expensive drugs' as defined in subsection (c) (5), and shall relate only to the part of the cost of such drugs which exceeds such amount as may be fixed by the Secretary. The amount of the payments to any pharmacy for furnishing drugs to individuals under such an agreement shall be determined in accordance with regulations issued after consultation with the Advisory Council. The method of determining the amount of the payments shall be based on the reasonable cost of such drugs to such pharmacy plus such percentage of such costs as may be determined to provide adequate compensation to such pharmacy for its services in furnishing such drugs.

"(7) No supervision or control over the administration or operation, or over the selection, tenure, or compensation of personnel, shall be exercised under the authority of this section over any hospital, nursing home, home health services agency or pharmacy which has entered into an agreement under this section.

"(8) Agreements under this section shall be made with the hospital, nursing home, home health services agency or pharmacy providing the services described in subsection (c), but this paragraph shall not preclude representation of such institution or pharmacy by any individual, association, or organization authorized by the institution or agency to act on its behalf.

"(9) Nothing in such agreements or in this section shall be construed to give the Secretary supervision or control over the practice of medicine or the manner in which medical services are provided.

"(10) Except to the extent the Secretary has made provision pursuant to subsection (g) (relating to utilization of private nonprofit organizations) for the making of payments to providers of health services, he shall from time to time determine the amount to be paid to each provider of health services under an agreement with respect to the services furnished and shall pay such amount, except that such amount may be reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary finds that the amount paid to such provider of health services for any prior period was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to it for such period. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment from the Federal Medical Insurance Trust Fund, at the time or times fixed by the Secretary, in accordance with such certification.

"FREE CHOICE BY PATIENT

"(e) Any individual eligible to receive medical insurance benefits under this section may obtain hospital services, nursing home services, home health services, or diagnostic outpatient services from any provider of health services which is listed by the Secretary under subsection (d) (1) as eligible to provide the class of health services in question and which admits such individual or undertakes to provide him services; and may obtain very expensive drugs, upon such payment as may be required, from any pharmacy with which the Secretary has in effect an agreement under subsection (c) (6).

"NATIONAL MEDICAL INSURANCE BENEFITS ADVISORY COUNCIL

"(f) (1) For the purpose of advising and assisting the Secretary in the formulation of policy and the promulgation of regulations in connection with the administration of this section, there is hereby created a National Medical Insurance Benefits Advisory Council which shall consist of the Commissioner of Social Security and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, who shall serve as cochairman ex officio, and twelve members to be appointed by the Secretary. Not less than four of the appointed members shall be representatives of the general public, and the remainder of the appointed members shall be persons who are outstanding in the fields pertaining to hospitals and health activities. Each appointed member shall hold office for a term of four years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and the terms of office of the member first taking office shall expire, as described by the Secretary at the time of appointment, three at the end of the first year, three at the end of the fourth year after the date of appointment. An appointed member shall not be eligible to serve continuously for more than two terms but shall be eligible for reappointment if he has not served immediately preceding his reappointment. The Advisory Council is authorized to appoint such special advisory and technical committees as may be useful in carrying out its functions. Appointed members of the Advisory Council and members of its advisory or technical committees, while serving on business of the Advisory Council, shall receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $50 per day, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary travel and for subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence. The Advisory Council shall meet as frequently as the Secretary deems necessary, but not less than once each year. Upon request of four or more members it shall be the duty of the Secretary to call a meeting of the Advisory Council.

"(2) The Advisory Council, or a technical committee appointed by the Council with the approval of the Secretary, shall have the duty of study and evaluation of the operation of this section. Any recommendations by the Council for amendment of this section shall be transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary.

"UTILIZATION OF PRIVATE NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

"(g) (1) The Secretary may utilize, to the extent he finds economical and otherwise advantageous, the services of private nonprofit organizations which are exempt from Federal income taxation under section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code and which are skilled in dealing with hospitals in matters pertaining to hospitalization of individual patients and payment therefor. The Secretary is authorized to enter into an agreement with any such organization under which, in the whole or any part of the United States, the organization undertakes to determine (subject to such review as may be provided for in the agreement) the payments to hospitals required by this section and by regulations prescribed thereunder, and to make such payments, and to perform such other functions as may be deemed appropriate by the Secretary. The Secretary is authorized to utilize in similar manner the services of nonprofit organizations to determine and make payments, and to perform such other functions as he deems appropriate, in the provision of medical insurance benefits other than hospital services.

"(2) An agreement under paragraph (1) shall provide for payment from the Federal Medical Insurance Trust Fund to the organization of the amounts paid out by such organization to providers of health services under this section and of the cost of administration determined by the Secretary with the advice of the Advisory Council to be necessary and proper for carrying out such organization's functions under its agreement pursuant to this section. Such payments to any organization shall be made either in advance on the basis of estimates by the Secretary or as reimbursement, as may be agreed upon by the organization and the Secretary, and adjustments may be made in subsequent payments on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made to the organization under this section. Such payments shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury from the Federal Medical Insurance Trust Fund at such time or times as the Secretary may specify and shall be made prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

"(3) The Secretary with the advice of the Advisory Council shall prescribe stand-

ards relating to the certification of payments or the disbursement of funds by organizations entering into an agreement under this section.

"(4) The Secretary with the advice of the Advisory Council shall formulate procedures and prescribe standards relating to the certifying of payments and disbursing of funds made available to organizations under this section, and such procedures and standards shall be binding upon all organizations entering into such agreements.

"(5) An agreement under subsection (a) with any organization may require any of its officers or employees certifying payments or disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement, or otherwise participating in its performance, to give surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Secretary may deem necessary, and may provide for the payment of the cost of such bond from the Federal Medical Insurance Trust Fund.

"RULEMAKING POWERS OF THE SECRETARY

"(h) The Secretary, after consulting with the Advisory Council, shall have full power and authority to make rules and regulations and to establish procedures, not inconsistent with the provision of this section, which are necessary or appropriate to carry out such provisions, and shall adopt reasonable and proper rules and regulations to regulate and provide for the nature and extent of the proofs and evidence and the method of taking and furnishing the same in order to establish the right of individuals to medical insurance benefits hereunder.

"CERTIFYING AND DISBURSING OFFICERS

"(i) (1) No individual designated by the Secretary pursuant to an agreement under this section, as a certifying officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payments certified by him under this section.

"(2) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this section if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated as provided in paragraph (1)."

Federal medical insurance trust fund

(b) (1) The heading to section 201 of the Social Security Act is amended to read: "Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, Federal disability insurance trust fund, and Federal medical insurance trust fund".

(2) Subsection (a) of section 201 of such Act is amended by inserting before the semicolon in paragraph (3) thereof the following: "and in clause (1) of subsection (c) of this section"; by inserting before the period in paragraph (4) thereof the following: "and in clause (2) of subsection (c) of this section"; by amending the last sentence thereof to read as follows: "The amounts appropriated by clauses (3) and (4) shall be transferred from time to time from the general fund in the Treasury to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, the amounts appropriated by clauses (1) and (2) of subsection (b) shall be transferred from time to time from the general fund in the Treasury to the Federal disability insurance trust fund, and the amounts appropriated by clauses (1) and (2) of subsection (c) shall be transferred from time to time from the general fund in the Treasury to the Federal medical insurance trust fund, such amounts to be determined on the basis of estimates by the Secretary of the Treasury of the taxes, specified in clauses (3) and (4) of this subsection, paid to or deposited into the Treasury; and proper adjustments shall be made in amounts subsequently transferred to the extent prior estimates were in excess of or were less than the taxes specified in such clauses (3) and (4) of this subsection.

(3) Section 201 of such Act is further amended by redesignating subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h) as (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i), respectively.

(4) Section 201 of such Act is further amended by adding after subsection (b) the following new paragraph:

"(c) There is hereby created on the books of the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the 'Federal Medical Insurance Trust Fund.' The Federal Medical Insurance Trust Fund shall consist of such amounts as may be appropriated to, or deposited in, such fund as provided in this section. There is hereby appropriated to the Federal Medical Insurance Trust Fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for each fiscal year thereafter, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, amounts equivalent to 100 per centum of—

"(1)(A) ½ of 1 per centum of the wages (as defined in section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) paid after December 31, 1960, and before January 1, 1972, and reported to the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate pursuant to subtitle F of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which wages shall be certified by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the basis of the records of wages established and maintained by such Secretary in accordance with such reports; and

"(B) ¾ of 1 per centum of the wages (as defined in section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) paid after December 31, 1971, and reported to the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate pursuant to subtitle F of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which wages shall be certified by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the basis of the records of wages established and maintained by such Secretary in accordance with such reports; and

"(2)(A) ⅜ of 1 per centum of the amount of self-employment income (as defined in section 1402 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) reported to the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate on tax returns under subtitle F of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1960, and before January 1, 1972, which self-employment income shall be certified by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the basis of the records of self-employment income established and maintained by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in accordance with such returns; and

"(B) 9/16 of 1 per centum of the amount of self-employment income (as defined in section 1402 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) reported to the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate on tax returns under subtitle F of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1971, which self-employment income shall be certified by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the basis of the records of self-employment income established and maintained by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in accordance with such returns."

(5) Subsection (d) of section 201 of such Act, as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection, is amended by striking out "and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, and the Federal Medical Insurance Trust Fund".

(6) Subsection (g) of section 201 of such Act, as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection, is amended to read as follows:

"(g) The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, and the Federal Medical Insurance Trust Fund shall be credited to and form a part of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, and the Federal Medical Insurance Trust Fund, respectively."

(7) Subsection (h) of section 201 of such Act, as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection, is amended by striking out in the third sentence of paragraph (1) thereof "either or both" and inserting in lieu thereof "any or all"; by striking out in the fourth sentence of such paragraph "from one to the other of" and inserting in lieu thereof "among"; by striking out in the fifth sentence of such paragraph "from one to the other of" and inserting in lieu thereof "among".

(8) The last sentence of paragraph (2) of subsection (h), as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection, is amended to read as follows: "Payments pursuant to the first sentence of this paragraph shall be made from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, and the Federal Medical Insurance Trust Fund in the ratio in which amounts were appropriated to such Trust Funds under clause (3) of subsection (a) of this section, clause (1) of subsection (b) of this section, and clause (1) of subsection (c) of this section."

(9) Subsection (i) of section 201 of the Social Security Act, as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection, is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following sentence: "Payments required to be made under section 226 shall be made only from the Federal Medical Insurance Trust Fund."

(10) Subsection (h)(1) of section 218 of such Act is amended by striking out "and (b)(1)" and inserting in lieu thereof ", (b)(1), and (c)(1)".

(11) Subsection (b) of section 1106 of such Act is amended by striking out "and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund" and inserting in lieu thereof ", the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, and the Federal Medical Insurance Trust Fund".

Effective Date

(c) Payments pursuant to section 226 of the Social Security Act, as added to such Act by subsection (a) of this section, shall be made only with respect to hospital services, nursing home services, home health services, diagnostic outpatient services furnished or very expensive drugs purchased after dates to be fixed by the Secretary, but such dates shall be, in the case of (1) hospital services, not earlier than July 1, 1961, or later than January 1, 1962, (2) nursing home services, not earlier than January 1, 1963, or later than July 1, 1963, (3) home health services, not earlier than January 1, 1962, or later than July 1, 1962, (4) diagnostic outpatient services, not earlier than July 1, 1961, or later than January 1, 1962, and (5) the purchase of very expensive drugs, not earlier than July 1, 1962, or later than January 1, 1963. The terms used in this section shall have the meaning assigned to them in title II of the Social Security Act.

TITLE II—MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR RETIRED AGED NOT ELIGIBLE FOR BENEFITS UNDER TITLE II

SEC. 201.(a) The Social Security Act is further amended by adding after title XV thereof the following new title:

"TITLE XVI—MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR THE RETIRED AGED NOT ELIGIBLE FOR BENEFITS UNDER TITLE II

"SEC. 1601. (a)(1) Every individual who—

"(A) has attained retirement age (as defined in section 216(a)),

"(B) is retired (as defined in paragraph (3)),

"(C) is a resident of the United States, and

"(D) is not eligible to receive medical insurance benefits under section 226,
shall be eligible to receive medical benefits. Payments of medical benefits shall be made in accordance with the provisions of this section, but only if application is filed for such payment in such form and in such manner and by such person as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe. The provisions of clause (B) shall not apply to any person (i) who is the husband or wife of an individual eligible to receive medical benefits and (ii) who was receiving more than one-half of his or her support from such individual for one year provided such year began no earlier than the calendar year preceding the year such person attained retirement age.

"(2) Payment of medical benefits shall be made for hospital services, nursing home services, home health services, diagnostic outpatient services, and very expensive drugs (as defined in section 226(c)).

"(3) For purposes of paragraph (1)—

"(A) Except as may be provided in subparagraph (B), an individual shall be retired with respect to the period for which he files for payment of medical benefits if—

"(i) he had total earnings (as defined in section 203(e)) of less than $2,000 in any calendar year preceding the year in which the first day of such period occurs, provided such calendar year is no earlier than the year preceding the year in which he attained retirement age, or

"(ii) he did not render services for wages of more than $100, and did not engage in self-employment in each of at least three months in any calendar year, provided such third month preceded the first day of such period and such calendar year is no earlier than the year preceding the year in which he attained retirement age, or

"(iii) he attained the age of seventy-two in a month prior to such period.

"(B) For the purposes of benefits for very expensive drugs, an individual shall be retired if on the first day of the month in which he incurs the cost of such drugs he meets the provisions of clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (A). Such first day shall be deemed the first day of the period for which he files for the payment of medical benefits.

For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), an individual shall be presumed not to have engaged in self-employment with respect to any month if, by applying the provisions of section 203(e) and the regulations issued thereunder, the Secretary determines that such individual did not engage in self-employment in such month, except that for such purposes the term 'substantial services', as used in paragraph (3)(B)(i) of such section 203(e), shall mean services rendered by such individual with respect to his trade or business in more than 7 days in such month.

"(4) Payment of medical benefits which an individual is eligible to receive may be made for—

"(A) hospital services furnished to such individual for a total of not more than 90 days in any calendar year;

"(B) nursing home services furnished to such individual for a total of not more than 135 days in any calendar year;

"(C) home health services furnished to such individual for a total of not more than 180 days.

"(D) diagnostic outpatient services but only to the extent the Secretary, after consultation with the Advisory Council, established pursuant to subsection 226 (f), may by regulation specify;

"(E) very expensive drugs furnished such individual, but only to the extent the Secretary, after consultation with such Advisory Council, may by regulation specify.

The maximum of any combination of hospital services, nursing home services, and home health services for which payment may be made for such services furnished, during any calendar year, to any individual eligible to receive medical benefits shall not exceed 90 units of services. For the purpose of the preceding sentence, one "unit of services" equals (i) one day of hospital services, (ii) one and one-half days of nursing home services, or (iii) two days of home health services.

"(5) Notwithstanding the previous provisions of this subsection, no individual shall be eligible to receive medical benefits insofar as they relate to hospital services, nursing home services, or home health services, unless such services are rendered after referral by a physician, and such physician certifies in writing that such hospital services, nursing home services, or home health services are or were required for his medical treatment except that such referral shall not be required for hospital services in case of an emergency which makes such referral impracticable. Periodic recertification that medical treatment which extends over a period of time is required shall, in accordance with regulations established by the Secretary, be a condition of continuing eligibility to receive such benefits during the period such services are furnished.

"(6)(A) An application for the payment of medical benefits shall be valid, with respect to a period during which one or more of the services described in section 226(c) are furnished, if such application is filed no earlier than the first day of the third month preceding the month in which the first day of such period occurs or no later than the last day of the twelfth month succeeding the month in which the first day of such period occurs. An application for the payment of medical benefits shall be valid with respect to the cost incurred for a very expensive drug if such application is filed within such time as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe.

"(B) For purposes of this section, a period during which—

"(i) hospital or nursing home services (or both) are furnished means a consecutive number of days (including only one day) in which such services are furnished;

"(ii) home health services are furnished means one or more days (but not exceeding 180 days in any calendar year) in which such services are furnished, but only if the number of days elapsing between any 2 days in which such services are furnished does not exceed 30;

"(iii) diagnostic outpatient services are furnished means one or more days (but not exceeding in any calendar year the number of days specified by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (4)(D) of this subsection) in which such services are furnished, but only if the number of days elapsing between any two days in which such services are furnished does not exceed fourteen.

"Determinations of eligibility

"(b) The provisions of section 205 relating to the making and review of determinations shall be applicable to determinations as to (i) whether an individual is eligible to receive medical benefits, and (ii) the number of days, in any calendar year, for which an individual is eligible to receive such benefits.

"Incorporation of certain provisions of section 226

"(c) For the purposes of administering this title, the provisions of section 226 (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h) shall be applicable to this title, and for such purposes references in such subsections of section 226 to title II, medical insurance benefits, and section 226 (or any subsection, paragraph, or subparagraph thereunder) shall be deemed to refer to this title, medical benefits for which payment may be made under this section, and this section, respectively.

"Certifying and disbursing officers

"(d)(1) No individual designated by the Secretary pursuant to an agreement under this section as a certifying officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payments certified by him under this section.

"(2) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this section if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated as provided in paragraph (1).

"Appropriation

"SEC. 1602. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Medical Insurance Trust Fund for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as the Secretary determines to be necessary to meet the payments made from such Trust Fund pursuant to this title with respect to individuals who are eligible to receive medical benefits under this title, plus interest accruing on such sums at the rate for each such fiscal year equal to the average rate of interest (as determined by the Managing Trustee) earned on the invested assets of such Trust Fund during the preceding fiscal year.

"Payments

"SEC. 1603. Payments required to be made under this title, as provided in section 1601, shall be made from the Federal Medical Insurance Trust Fund.

"Nonapplicability of this title

"SEC. 1604. The provisions of this title shall not apply to any individual (i) who is, or upon filing application would be, entitled to an annuity or a pension under the Railroad Retirement Act or (ii) who is receiving, or is eligible to receive, an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act, or (iii) who is the wife or dependent husband of an individual described in clauses (i) or (ii)."

Effective Date

(b) Payments pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be made only with respect to hospital services, nursing home services, home health services, diagnostic outpatient services furnished, or very expensive drugs purchased after dates to be fixed by the Secretary, but such dates shall be, in the case of (1) hospital services, not earlier than July 1, 1961, or later than January 1, 1962, (2) nursing home services, not earlier than January 1, 1963, or later than July 1, 1963, (3) home health services, not earlier than January 1, 1962, or later than July 1, 1962, (4) diagnostic outpatient services, not earlier than July 1, 1961, or later than January 1, 1962, and (5) the purchase of very expensive drugs, not earlier than July 1, 1962, or later than January 1, 1963. The terms used in this section shall have the meaning assigned to them in title II of the Social Security Act.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Changes in tax schedules

Self-Employment Income Tax

SEC. 301. (a) Section 1401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of tax on self-employment income) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1401. RATE OF TAX:

"In addition to other taxes, there shall be imposed for each taxable year, on the self-employment income of every individual, a tax as follows:

"(1) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1959, and before January 1, 1961, the tax shall be equal to

4½ percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year;

"(2) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1960, and before January 1, 1963, the tax shall be equal to 4⅞ percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year;

"(3) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1962, and before January 1, 1966, the tax shall be equal to 5⅝ percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year;

"(4) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1965, and before January 1, 1969, the tax shall be equal to 6⅜ percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year;

"(5) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1968, and before January 1, 1972, the tax shall be equal to 7⅛ percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year; and

"(6) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1971, the tax shall be equal to 7⅝16 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year."

Tax on Employees

(b) Section 3101 of such Code (relating to rate of tax on employees under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3101. RATE OF TAX:

"In addition to other taxes, there is hereby imposed on the income of every individual a tax equal to the following percentages of the wages (as defined in section 3121 (a)) received by him with respect to employment (as defined in section 3121 (b))—

"(1) with respect to wages received during the calendar year 1960, the rate shall be 3 percent;

"(2) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1961 and 1962, the rate shall be 3¼ percent;

"(3) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1963 to 1965, both inclusive, the rate shall be 3¾ percent;

"(4) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1966 to 1968, both inclusive, the rate shall be 4¼ percent;

"(5) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1969 to 1971, both inclusive, the rate shall be 4¾ percent; and

"(6) with respect to wages received after December 31, 1971, the rate shall be 4⅞ percent."

Tax on Employers

(c) Section 3111 of such Code (relating to rate of tax on employers under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3111. RATE OF TAX:

"In addition to other taxes, there is hereby imposed on every employer an excise tax, with respect to having individuals in his employ, equal to the following percentages of the wages (as defined in section 3121(a)) paid by him with respect to employment (as defined in section 3121(b))—

"(1) with respect to wages paid during the calendar year 1960, the rate shall be 3 percent;

"(2) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1961 and 1962, the rate shall be 3¼ percent;

"(3) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1963 to 1965, both inclusive, the rate shall be 3¾ percent;

"(4) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1966 to 1968, both inclusive, the rate shall be 4¼ percent;

"(5) with respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1969 to 1971, both inclusive, the rate shall be 4¾ percent; and

"(6) with respect to wages paid after December 31, 1971, the rate shall be 4⅞ percent."

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Declaration of policy on railroad retirement and civil service annuitants

SEC. 401. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress in enacting this Act to include as many retired people as possible under the type of program established by this Act and to provide that their benefits should, to the extent possible, be financed by contributions made by them (and their employers) during their working years. To further this policy, the Congress should take action as soon as possible to make available to persons receiving annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act and the Civil Service Retirement Act a program under which such individuals can obtain the same type of services made available by this Act to those who are receiving old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

Study of health needs of individuals

SEC. 402. Section 702 of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "(a)" after "702"; by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The Secretary shall conduct a continuing study and investigation of the health needs of individuals who have reached retirement age, and the means by which such needs may most effectively and efficiently be met. In connection with such study and investigation, the Secretary shall institute and conduct appropriate demonstration programs relating to the health needs of such individuals and the manner and means by which such needs may be fulfilled. The Secretary is authorized to provide for the carrying on of such research studies pertaining to health care and the administration of such care as may be recommended by the Advisory Council designated pursuant to section 226(f). Such research studies may be carried on directly by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, by others under contracts negotiated for, or grants made by the Secretary for, such purpose."

SEC. 403. As used in the provisions of the Social Security Act, amended by this Act, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for 4 calendar days, in order to afford other Senators an opportunity to cosponsor it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, by request, on behalf of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, an administration housing bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3504) to amend the National Housing Act to remove certain limitations on the aggregate amount of outstanding mortgage insurance, introduced by Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART, by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement in connection with the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON BILL TO REMOVE CERTAIN LIMITATIONS ON FHA'S MORTGAGE INSURANCE AUTHORIZATION

This bill would remove the limitation on the aggregate amount of the Federal Housing Administration's General Mortgage Insurance Authorization and the separate limitation on the amount of FHA mortgage insurance under title II of the National Housing Act. With respect to insurance now subject to the general mortgage insurance authorization, the effect of the bill would be to authorize the FHA to insure all loans submitted at any time by private lenders if the loans conform to the standards established by Federal law and by FHA rules. The amendment would not remove the separate limitation on the aggregate amount of FHA mortgage insurance which may be outstanding under title VIII of the Act (military housing) or on the amount of property improvement loan insurance which may be outstanding under title I of the Act.

This bill is designed to allow both the FHA and the homebuilding industry to operate in the future without needless interruption or uncertainty concerning the availability of FHA assistance for loans which are eligible under applicable law and regulations. Congress would be relieved of the necessity to act on authorization requests virtually every year or two. Of course, the Congress would in no way be precluded from restoring such a limitation or from liberalizing or tightening FHA mortgage insurance terms, including per room or per unit mortgage ceilings, maximum maturities, and maximum ratios of loan amounts to cost or value. Such changes in permissible mortgage terms can always be made by the Congress to meet changing economic conditions. These changes in terms, if wisely made, automatically have a desirable effect on the volume of FHA mortgage insurance business. By contrast, fixed ceilings on the total insurance authorization merely serve to disrupt the homebuilding industry from time to time when authorizations run out.

The FHA has run out of needed insurance authorization with respect to one or more of its programs about 25 times while noncontroversial increases or time extensions were delayed. In some cases a single special program, having a small impact on the building and lending industries, was affected for a short period of time. In other cases there was a serious impact on total housing construction. In 1950 there was a 6-week delay and in 1951 there was a 10-week delay in obtaining needed authority.

During many of these occasions in the past, the FHA was forced to maintain daily controls through its central Washington Office to assure that new mortgage insurance written in its field offices did not exceed repayments under existing insured mortgages. More recently, from October 16, 1958, to September 24, 1959, the FHA, in lieu of issuing actual insurance commitments, issued "agreements to insure" at such time as mortgage insurance authority later became available. However, the "agreements to insure" were not a satisfactory substitute for adequate insurance authority, and in any case they are no longer permitted as a result of legislation enacted in 1959.

The rationing of FHA commitments or delays in processing commitments which result whenever FHA mortgage insurance authorization runs out are extremely disturbing to the homebuilding and lending industries. This is especially true because housing production involves many months of time needed for general planning, land acquisition, and the preparation of detailed

plans and specifications. Both builders and lenders want to be sure that FHA insurance authorization will be available when their long-range building plans are completed and new homes are ready for sale.

Even more important is the fact that the uncertainties and delays ultimately cause hardship to consumers, both indirectly because of the disturbance to the market and directly because consumers need to know the terms at which financing will be available to them.

It is to be noted that the purpose of this bill is to provide long-term assurance of availability of FHA mortgage insurance, rather than any immediately needed authorization. Estimates made on the basis of current tendencies in the market indicate that the existing FHA authorization should be adequate to carry into the next session of the Congress.

LOANS TO SCHOOLTEACHERS FOR SUMMER SCHOOL COURSES—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON DESK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on yesterday I introduced the bill (S. 3481) to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to make student loans under title II of such act available to teachers attending summer sessions in institutions of higher education. At that time I obtained unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table until tomorrow, Saturday, for additional cosponsors. I now ask unanimous consent that the time for the bill to lie on the desk be extended until the close of business on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AGREEMENT WITH INDIA FOR AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there was transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States Executive H, 86th Congress, 2d session, being an agreement between the United States of America and India for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on November 10, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the agreement, and that the agreement, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith an agreement between the United States of America and India for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on November 10, 1959.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report by the Acting Secretary of State and an exchange of notes between the American Embassy at New Delhi and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of India with respect to the proposed agreement.

The agreement has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 6, 1960.*

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Excerpts from address delivered by him at West Virginia University on May 5, 1960.

AMENDMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 2131.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill, S. 2131, to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, as amended.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JAMES MURRAY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, well do I remember Senator JAMES MURRAY's coming to the Senate in 1934. A resurgence of liberalism was pulsating throughout the country and the liberals in the Senate, of which I counted—and still count—myself one, were most gratified to welcome the able new Member to our group as successor to another outstanding western liberal, Senator Thomas Walsh.

The light of liberalism burned brightly in the new man from Montana, and from that day to this JIM MURRAY has never deviated from the course of true liberalism. His liberalism has not been of the shouting type which seeks to ride roughshod over any opposition; it has always been the basic, progressive kind that seeks to obtain for all citizens opportunity for sharing to the fullest extent the rich life of our great country.

He has fought many a good fight for liberal causes, and I have been more than proud to be associated with him in these. One achievement I recall with deep satisfaction is the enactment of the Employment Act of 1946, in the introduction of which I joined Senator Murray; Senator Robert A. Wagner, Democrat, of New York; Senator Elbert Thomas, Democrat, of Utah; Senator Wayne Morse, Republican, of Oregon; Senator Charles W. Tobey, Republican, of Vermont; Senator George Aiken, Republican, of Vermont, and Senator William Langer, Republican, of North Dakota. This was the law which established the Council of Economic Advisers to the President and the Joint Economic Committee.

That was in 1946. Six years earlier Senator MURRAY, realizing the mounting pressures on small businesses, pressures which threatened the existence of these independent American organizations, introduced a resolution creating the Select Committee on Small Business; he served as the first chairman of the group and thereby did yeoman service to the cause of free enterprise.

In the same vein he sponsored the Smaller War Plants Corporations Act, to enable modest private plants to share in government contracts.

These outstanding achievements in the battle to preserve our free American economy are only a few examples of JIM MURRAY's contribution to true American liberalism. The country, as well as the citizens of Montana, owe a deep debt of gratitude to him for these accomplishments.

The same vision that inspired JIM MURRAY, through his long and fruitful career, to promote liberal ideas that provide opportunity for all has been responsible for his effective championship of natural resource development, on which the prosperity and welfare of our Western States, indeed our very national survival, may well depend.

JIM MURRAY has always labored for the development of the resources of our great West—the water, the soil, the timber, the oil and other minerals. I am proud to be one of those who have worked with him for these objectives.

Finally, I pay tribute to JIM MURRAY, the man and friend. I count him a close personal friend and I take deep pride in that fact. My service in the Senate, as that of many Senators, has been enriched by his strength of character, his kindness, his unfailing courtesy under every circumstance. My friendship with him will not cease with his retirement from the Senate; it will endure through the years ahead, a relationship I shall ever cherish.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT TO PROVIDE SAFEGUARDS AGAINST MERGERS AND CONSOLIDATIONS OF BANKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, I believe the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], former chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, in the absence of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who is absent because of a death in his family, is prepared to make a motion in connection with the bank merger bill.

I do not believe it will take very long. It is not controversial. However, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arkansas may make the motion at this time, and that there be not to exceed 5 minutes debate, pro and con.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate

a message from the House on the bill S. 1062 with the amendment of the House thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1062) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidations of banks which might lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly in the field of banking, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That subsection (c) of section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act is amended by striking out the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "No insured bank shall merge or consolidate with any other insured bank or, either directly or indirectly, acquire the assets of, or assume liability to pay any deposits made in, any other insured bank without the prior written consent (i) of the Comptroller of the Currency if the acquiring, assuming, or resulting bank is to be a national bank or a District bank, or (ii) of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System if the acquiring, assuming, or resulting bank is to be a State member bank (except a District bank), or (iii) of the Corporation if the acquiring, assuming, or resulting bank is to be a nonmember insured bank (except a District bank). Notice of any proposed merger, consolidation, acquisition of assets, or assumption of liabilities, in a form approved by the Comptroller, the Board, or the Corporation, as the case may be, shall (except in a case where the furnishing of reports under the seventh sentence of this subsection is not required) be published, at appropriate intervals during a period (prior to the approval or disapproval of the transaction) at least as long as the period allowed under such sentence for furnishing such reports, in a newspaper of general circulation in the community or communities where the main offices of the banks involved are located (or, if there is no such newspaper in any such community, then in the newspaper of general circulation published nearest thereto). In granting or withholding consent under this subsection, the Comptroller, the Board, or the Corporation, as the case may be, shall consider the financial history and condition of each of the banks involved, the adequacy of its capital structure, its future earnings prospects, the general character of its management, the convenience and needs of the community to be served, and whether or not its corporate powers are consistent with the purposes of this Act. In the case of a merger, consolidation, acquisition of assets, or assumption of liabilities, the appropriate agency shall also take into consideration the effect of the transaction on competition (including any tendency toward monopoly), and shall not approve the transaction unless, after considering all of such factors, it finds the transaction to be in the public interest. In the interests of uniform standards, before acting on a merger, consolidation, acquisition of assets, or assumption of liabilities under this subsection, the agency (unless it finds that it must act immediately in order to prevent the probable failure of one of the banks involved) shall request a report on the competitive factors involved from the Attorney General and the other two banking agencies referred to in this subsection (which report shall be furnished within thirty calendar days of the date on which it is requested, or within ten calendar days of such date if the requesting agency advises the Attorney General and the other two banking agencies that an emergency exists requiring expeditious action). The Comptroller, the Board, and the Corporation shall each include in its annual report to the Congress a description of each merger, consolidation, acquisition of assets, or assumption of liabilities approved by it during the period covered by the report, along with the following information: the name and total resources of each bank involved; whether a report has been submitted by the Attorney General hereunder, and, if so, a summary by the Attorney General of the substance of such report; and a statement by the Comptroller, the Board, or the Corporation, as the case may be, of the basis for its approval.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require Federal approval for mergers and consolidations of insured banks."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

Senate bill 1062 was introduced on February 16, 1959. It was sponsored by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and myself. S. 1062 was based on bills which had previously passed the Senate, S. 3911, 84th Congress, in 1956, and section 23 of title III of the financial institutions bill, S. 1451, 85th Congress, in 1957.

The Banking and Currency Committee held hearings on S. 1062. The committee considered the bill thoroughly and amended it to require reports from the Attorney General on prospective mergers.

The Senate debated the bill thoroughly and amended it to require semiannual reports to Congress on approved mergers.

The House Banking and Currency Committee held hearings and made a number of additional amendments, which I will discuss later. The bill, as amended by the House committee, passed the House on April 4, 1960.

Since the bill has already been thoroughly considered by the Senate, it is not necessary to discuss at length the reasons for the bill—the great number of mergers which have recently been taking place and the vast resources involved in these mergers; and the fact that many bank mergers are subject to virtually no control, and even those which are subject to control are not covered by clear standards with respect to competitive factors.

On previous occasions when the Senate has considered bank merger bills, the principal issue has been whether bank mergers should be regulated by the Federal bank supervisory agencies—the Comptroller of the Currency in the case of national banks, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in the case of State member banks, and the FDIC in the case of insured nonmember banks—on the basis of banking factors and competitive factors, like other regulated industries; or whether bank mergers should be subject to the antimerger provisions of section 7 of the Clayton Act, like ordinary nonregulated industrial or commercial enterprises.

As it passed the Senate, S. 1062 expressed the view of the Senate, for the third time, that bank mergers should be regulated by the Federal banking agencies on the basis of banking factors and competitive factors, with no single factor being in itself controlling. S. 1062 was a clear statement, for the third time, of the Senate's view that the provisions of section 7 of the Clayton Act should not apply to bank mergers.

The amendments to S. 1062 made by the House do not change this aspect of the bill. The House has agreed with the Senate that bank mergers should be controlled by the Federal banking agencies on the basis of both banking factors and competitive factors, and that section 7 of the Clayton Act should continue to be inapplicable to bank mergers.

Banking is regulated and subject to many controls not applicable to the ordinary industrial or commercial enterprise: entry into the field of banking is restricted; the establishment of branches is restricted; and the practices and procedures of banking, from the payment of interest on deposits to the kinds of loans made and the reserves which must be maintained, are closely regulated and controlled. Competition in banking is desirable and beneficial; but unrestricted competition in banking, with the bank failures which would result, is no more possible than it is in the field of public utilities or other industries affected to a greater or lesser extent with the public interest. Banking is too important to depositors, to borrowers, to the Government, and the public generally, to permit unregulated and unrestricted competition in that field.

The antitrust laws have reflected an awareness of the difference between banking and other regulated industries on the one hand, and ordinary unregulated industries and commercial enterprises on the other hand. The 1950 amendment to section 7 of the Clayton Act, which for the first time imposed controls over mergers by means other than stock acquisitions, did not apply to bank mergers which are practically invariably accomplished by means other than stock acquisition. Accordingly for all practical purposes bank mergers have been and still are exempt from section 7 of the Clayton Act.

It is not clear whether the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 would now be held to apply to banking in general and to bank mergers in particular, though it seems clear that Senator John Sherman, the former Secretary of the Treasury, for whom the act was named, and the 51st Congress, did not expect or intend banking to be covered by an act applicable to interstate commerce. And even if the Sherman Act is held to apply to banking and to bank mergers, it seems clear that under the rule of reason spelled out in the Standard Oil case, different considerations will be found applicable, in a regulated field like banking, in determining whether activities would "unduly diminish competition," in the words of the Supreme Court in that case.

I should like to explain the amendments made by the House in more detail.

The House committee bill, which was passed by the House under suspension of rules on April 4, is a complete substitute for S. 1062.

Both bills require the appropriate banking agency to consider the six banking factors set forth in the Federal Deposit Insurance Act. These are: First, the financial history and condition of each of the banks involved; second, the adequacy of its capital structure; third, its earnings prospects; fourth, the general character of its management; fifth, the convenience and needs of the community to be served; and sixth, whether the bank's corporate powers are consistent with the purposes of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act. S. 1062 incorporated these factors by reference; the House amendment lists them.

S. 1062, as passed by the Senate, added a seventh factor to be considered: whether the transaction would "unduly lessen competition or tend unduly to create a monopoly." The House bill substitutes for this the requirement that "the appropriate agency shall also take into consideration the effect of the transaction on competition—including any tendency toward monopoly."

The House amendment goes on to provide that the merger "shall not" be approved unless, "after considering all such factors, it—the agency—finds the transaction to be in the public interest."

The House amendment, like the Senate version of S. 1062, makes it clear that the banking factors and the competitive factors must be considered by the banking agencies. The House amendment, like the Senate version of S. 1062, makes it clear that no one of these factors is controlling. In any given merger, competitive factors unfavorable to the merger may be outweighed by banking factors favorable to the merger, and competitive factors favorable to the merger may outweigh banking factors unfavorable to the merger. All of these seven factors must be considered and weighed together, and the merger should be approved only if, after consideration of all of these factors, the net result is in favor of the proposal.

This balancing of favorable and unfavorable banking factors along with favorable and unfavorable competitive factors, with no one of them being overlooked and no one of them being controlling, was just what was meant by the Senate when it used the word "unduly" in referring to the competitive factors. I am satisfied that the House has reached just the same result the Senate reached three times before.

This is made clear at pages 11 and 12 of the House report, where it is stated that:

> Your committee is convinced the Senate's approach is basically sound. Where demonstrable benefits would flow from a proposed merger, these should be weighed against any adverse effect on competition. Your committee feels, however, that the language of the Senate bill can be improved, to insure that the intent indicated in the legislative history of the bill in the Senate will be properly carried out. Your committee concurs with the Senate committee report's repeatedly expressed intent to allow approval of bank mergers that would be in the public interest.
>
> After all the factors have been weighed, the transaction should be approved only if the supervisory agency is satisfied that, on balance, its effect will be beneficial.

This understanding was also expressed by Representative BROWN, chairman of the subcommittee which handled the bill, in presenting the bill to the House at page 7258 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Representative BROWN said:

> In determining whether a merger is in the public interest, the banking agency will consider the several factors listed in the bill; after weighing them, the agency will determine whether the net balance is favorable or unfavorable, and will approve the merger only if the merger is in the public interest in the sense that this balance is favorable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask that I may have 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was quoting from Representative BROWN's explanation of the purpose and meaning of the phrase "in the public interest."

The phrase "in the public interest" as used in S. 1062 is not independent; it is not isolated. The phrase is specifically and clearly tied in with the banking and competitive factors which are specifically listed in the bill. The language of the bill is entirely clear on this point:

> The agency shall not approve the transaction unless, after considering all of such factors, it finds the transaction to be in the public interest.

This distinguishes the phrase "in the public interest," as here used, from comparable phrases in other statutes where the phrase, "consistent with the public interest," is used as a general standard without reference to specific factors.

The phrase, "in the public interest," is not a new standard itself. It is not an eighth factor. It does not call for a separate finding that a proposed merger is "in the public interest," aside from the banking factors and competitive factors which must be considered. The phrase is used only to indicate that if the merger is to be approved, the weighing of the seven specified factors must have resulted in a finding favorable to a merger.

The requirement that a favorable finding must be made if the merger is to be approved means only that a beneficial result must appear after the weighing of the seven specific factors set forth in the bill. It does not require the agency to go beyond these seven factors and find an independent and separate public interest in the merger.

The requirement of a favorable finding after weighing these seven factors does not seem out of place in this legislation. A favorable finding would have to be made, for example, in other cases which the banking agencies must consider, such as the chartering of a new bank. It is this distinction between banking and other businesses which justifies different treatment for bank mergers and other mergers. It was this distinction that led the Senate to reject the flat prohibition of the Clayton Act test which applies to other mergers.

Furthermore, with respect to the requirement of a favorable finding, it is clear this question remains entirely within the determination of the Federal banking agency passing upon the merger, to be based upon its weighing of the six "banking" factors and the "competitive" factor.

The Senate version of S. 1062 required the banking agency considering a merger to obtain a report from the Attorney General on the competitive factors involved in the merger. This report was required in order that the Attorney General's knowledge and background of experience in the field of anticompetitive and monopolistic matters should be made available to the banking agencies in their consideration of bank mergers. At the same time, it was made clear that the Attorney General's report on competitive factors was limited to this one aspect of the proposed merger. The Attorney General was not expected to consider or report on the various banking factors involved, nor was he expected to make any recommendation as to the action the banking agencies should take on the basis of consideration of all of the factors involved. Under these circumstances, while cooperation is, of course, expected between the banking agencies and the Justice Department, it is not intended that this provision should give the Justice Department free entry to the files of the banking agencies. It is not intended that the Justice Department would have any occasion to examine the banking agencies' files relating to the banking factors under consideration, and in particular, it is expected that the banking agencies will continue to give the bank examiners' reports the same confidential treatment which the Department of Justice gives to FBI reports.

The House made several amendments to the bill with respect to the mechanics of consultation among the banking agencies. The procedure for obtaining the views of the other two banking agencies, by the banking agency which has final responsibility, is made to conform with the procedure for obtaining a report from the Attorney General. Under the House bill, the supervisory agency having jurisdiction can act to save a failing bank without seeking the views of the other banking agencies; and the other banking agencies are required to submit their views within 30 days, or within 10 days if an emergency exists. The House amendment also provides that the reports of the other banking agencies shall be requested only on the competitive factors, rather than on all factors to be considered, including the banking factors.

The Senate bill required semiannual reports of the bank supervisory agencies; the House amendment provides instead for including this information in the agencies' annual reports. The Senate bill provided for a summary by the banking agencies of the Attorney General's reports; the House amendment makes it clear that the summary should be prepared by the Attorney General.

An entirely new provision in the House amendment is a requirement that notice

of a proposed merger be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the community or communities where the main offices of the banks involved are located. In the normal case, the notice must be published at least 30 days before the banking agency approves or disapproves the merger, with exceptions for emergency situations. A similar requirement now exists for national bank mergers and for bank holding company acquisitions.

I have consulted with members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency who would be conferees if the bill were to be sent to conference, and we are agreed that the Senate should agree to the House amendments.

I should add that I believe this bill, providing for effective regulation of bank mergers for the first time, is a significant accomplishment. We have tried for a long time to enact sound legislation on this subject and I trust we shall now be successful.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to the bill, S. 1062.

During the delivery of Senator FULBRIGHT's remarks,

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. We are now operating under a strict time limitation. As the Senator from Arkansas knows, the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and I prepared a set of questions and answers in order to set forth and make clear our understanding of the purpose and effect of the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. That is correct. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] prepared answers to several questions which the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] had posed. These answers represent the views of the Senator from Virginia, who is chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Subcommittee on Banking. Other members of the committee have considered these questions and answers and they represent, I am satisfied, the committee's understanding of the bill, and the correct understanding of the bill.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, in order to make clear to the banking agencies, which will administer this act, the understanding and intention of the Senate in accepting the amendments of the House and passing the amended bill, I ask unanimous consent that this set of questions and answers be printed in the RECORD following the statement by the Senator from Arkansas, as though I had asked the questions and the Senator from Arkansas had made the answers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXHIBIT 1

BANK MERGER BILL

Question. As I understand it, this bill is not directed against nor intended to proscribe or limit size as such, without regard to the banking and competitive tests set forth in the bill, and hence a merger of two large banks should be approved if found to be in the public interest under the tests set down in the bill. Suppose, for example, a situation where such a merger would increase the extent, quality, and efficiency of services rendered to the public, enhance local, regional, or national competition, and meet all the other specific tests in the bill, would not such a merger be considered to be in the public interest under this bill, regardless of size?

Answer. Yes. The bill is not directed against size as such, nor does it impose limits on the size of banks. Size may be, of course, an element to be considered as part of the banking tests and as part of the competitive test under the bill. But it is not controlling. If a merger of two large banks qualifies under the tests set forth in the bill, it should be approved and it will be approved, no matter how big the two banks may be.

Question. The competitive factor in the bill I take to refer, in appropriate cases, not only to local but also to State, regional, and national competitive effect. Is this correct?

Answer. Yes. The Federal banking agency reviewing a proposed merger should consider whatever field of competition the merging banks are engaged in and the new bank will engage in. Some banks are engaged only in local competition. Other banks are primarily engaged in regional competition. Other banks engage in national or international competition. The field of competition which is actually involved is the field which should be given consideration in reviewing a merger. This is true also of the Justice Department reports on the competitive factors involved in the merger. These, too, should be concerned with the kinds of competition the two banks are now engaged in and the kind of competition the merged banks will be engaged in.

Question. In considering a proposed merger, should the needs of the community and the area and the country as a whole for increased financial services resulting from an expanding economy be considered?

Answer. Yes. The Federal banking agency reviewing a merger under S. 1062 would certainly give due regard to the adequate accommodation of the growing capital requirements of an expanding economy in the community, in the area, and in the country generally. This would not, of course, be the controlling factor any more than any other single factor and, of course, other means of providing increased financial services would be borne in mind.

But there is no question that the Federal banking agency should give due regard to the adequate accommodation of the growing capital requirements of an expanding economy.

Question. In considering a proposed merger, would the responsible Federal banking agency be able to take into consideration the competition which the merging banks face, and the merged bank would face, from other kinds of financial institutions—savings and loan associations, credit unions, insurance companies, finance companies, and the like?

Answer. Yes, indeed. All competition which the merging banks now face, and which the merged bank would face, must be taken into consideration by the banking agency. This includes both competition from other banks and trust companies and competition from other financial institutions which may provide the same or similar services. It includes competition for the public's funds, in the form of deposits, savings accounts, and the like, and it includes competition in supplying the public's needs for funds in the way of personal loans, consumer credit, mortgages, business loans, and so on.

Question. Mergers already effected have given some banks distinct competitive advantages because of increased lending limits, increased quantity and quality of services, increased availability of highly specialized and technical personnel, and increased overall resources. Other banks have not so grown in size through mergers because of lack of feasible merger opportunities, State laws, management policy, or other reasons. If the effect of the adoption of this bill is to discriminate against these latter banks and thereby to affect adversely their future opportunity to acquire or regain reasonable competitive equality through merger, then we shall be protecting and making permanent a competitive advantage or, a kind of monopolistic position. It is my understanding that such a discriminatory result is not intended, and that the competitive test in this bill should not be so construed. Is that correct?

Answer. S. 1062 is not intended to have any discriminatory results. It is not intended to discriminate against banks which have been unable to merge in the past because of State laws or any other reasons. The fact that a bank has been unable to merge in the past, and therefore is at a competitive disadvantage with other banks, is something which can be and should be taken into consideration by the banking agency reviewing a merger application. The bill is not intended to prevent banks which have not been able to merge from acquiring or regaining reasonable competitive equality through merger.

Of course, this does not mean that merely because a bank was unable to grow by merger before the enactment of S. 1062, it would thereby have a right to engage in a merger which otherwise would be ruled out by the standards of S. 1062. The standards set forth in S. 1062 are the controlling tests; the competitive disadvantage which a bank is suffering from because it could not previously merge is to be considered as just one of the factors entering into these tests.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent that a letter I have received from Mr. J. Russell Clark, superintendent of banks of New York, be printed at this point in the RECORD. Mr. Clark raises two questions, which have been written out for Senator ROBERTSON, together with Senator ROBERTSON'S answers to those questions. If the Senator from Arkansas agrees—and I understand that he does—I ask unanimous consent that the questions and answers may also be printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] prepared answers to the questions posed by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. In order to make clear to the banking agencies which will administer this act the understanding and intention of the Senate in passing this bill, I join in the request of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

There being no objection, the letter and the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
BANKING DEPARTMENT,
New York, N.Y., April 28, 1960.

HON. JACOB J. JAVITS,
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Reference is made to your letter of April 11, 1960, requesting my views and comments on S. 1062, as amended by the House of Representatives.

I believe the amendments to such bill effected by the House of Representatives to be most constructive and desirable. The criteria specified under the bill is quite similar

to the criteria that we in New York are required to consider in approving or disapproving bank mergers, as well as applications to form or to expand bank holding companies. Moreover, such criteria are similar to those required to be considered by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System under the Bank Holding Act of 1956. I personally believe there should be no substantial difference between the criteria to be considered in approving or disapproving a merger and those to be considered in approving or disapproving the formation or expansion of a bank holding company. Consequently, I believe the criteria now contained in the bill to be vastly superior to the criteria previously specified in the original Senate version.

As I pointed out in a speech which is included in the House report, I have some doubts as to how the adjective "unduly," as applied to a lessening of competition, in the original Senate version, would be interpreted in those cases where banking factors did not necessitate approval of a proposed merger. Ultimately, the courts would have had the responsibility of interpreting the adjective "unduly" in the original Senate version, for the very indefiniteness as to what was meant by the use of such adjective as contrasted with the "substantial" as employed in the Clayton Act, would probably have lead to extended litigation. I firmly believe that the House in deleting the adjective "unduly" has negated a great deal of needless litigation. In passing, I should like to note that the title to the act still retains the adjective "unduly" and in view of the new criteria, I would suggest that the title to the act be changed.

I would also like to call your attention to the remarks in my statement in regard to whether the bill may not place State-chartered banks somewhat at a disadvantage as compared to national banks, since in the case of State bank mergers both a State and a Federal supervisory agency are required to approve, while in the case of national banks, only approval by the Comptroller's office is required. On the other hand, I believe the requirement that each of the Federal agencies consult with the others as to their opinions with respect to competitive factors would certainly tend to reduce the possibility that the various supervising agencies will adopt conflicting policies. Perhaps State banks might be placed in a more equal position, if it were made clear that the Comptroller could not approve a merger where the principal consideration was the possible adverse effect upon competition, if both the FDIC and the Federal Reserve were of the opinion that the effect on competition would be adverse. Of course, I must admit that as a practical matter I doubt that the Comptroller would so approve in the face of the opposition of both the Federal Reserve and the FDIC and, therefore, do not strongly urge this point.

I would, however, like to call your attention to the House report accompanying S. 1062, which states that the approval of the merger should depend "on a positive showing of some benefit to be derived from it * * * the burden should be on the proponents of a merger to show that it is in the public interest, if it is to be approved * * *." New York State's approach to this same point is that it is necessary to determine whether the effect on competition is such as to be injurious to the public interest. In other words, under New York's approach, if all other factors are equal, approval would be granted unless it can be shown that the public will be harmed. In the majority of cases, this difference is purely a matter of semantics, but it can be controlling in a few unique situations. Personally, I believe that the inference that a proposed merger should be affirmatively in the public interest creates an unfortunate inference that banks, unlike other segments of private industry, do not have the right to engage in mergers unless the public can benefit therefrom, rather than merely having the burden of showing that there would be no substantial harm to the public through a lessening of competition. In addition, of course, there is the possibility that over the years a more and more affirmative showing that a particular merger is in the public interest may be required by the Federal supervisory authorities either as a result of conviction or public pressure. On the other hand, I think it to be obvious that a merger is either in or against the public interest. If it is clear that the burden of proof is to be placed on the applying banks to show that the merger is in the public interest, I think there could be no reasonable objection to the intent of the House report. The reason for this is that in my experience the question of burden of proof is not too important, since it has always been the individual investigation on the part of the supervisory authorities which has been controlling and not what the parties allege. Consequently, if it was intended merely to place the burden of proof on the applying parties, I think there could be no reasonable objection to this, but I think such intent should be made clear.

With the foregoing qualification, I certainly would recommend enactment of S. 1062 by the U.S. Congress, as I believe it to be a constructive and desirable step in achieving uniformity in the approach of bank supervisory authorities toward mergers.

If I may be of any further assistance in connection with this matter, please do not hesitate to communicate with me.

Very truly yours,

G. RUSSELL CLARK.

Question. Mr. Clark inquires whether the bill may place State chartered banks at a disadvantage as compared with national banks. He thinks such a disadvantage might arise out of the fact that, in the case of State bank mergers, both a State and a Federal supervisory agency must approve the merger, while in the case of national banks only the approval of the Comptroller is necessary. Mr. Clark recognizes that as a practical matter, the Comptroller probably would not approve a merger in the face of the opposition of both the Federal Reserve and the FDIC. Could I have your comments on this point?

Answer. It was to avoid the possibility of discriminatory treatment between State banks and national banks or betweeen State member banks and State nonmember insured banks that, when one of these agencies is considering a merger, it is required to get the comments of the other two agencies on the other competitive factors involved. This provides for the maximum of uniformity of treatment among the three agencies. Certainly we all expect that the consultation and the cooperation among these three Federal banking agencies will be close and will be meaningful. I do not, of course, expect that they will agree 100 percent in every case, but I do expect that they will pay careful attention and give great weight to the views of the agencies, and I do expect that in most cases there will be no disagreement between them.

Question. Mr. Clark also raises a question about a case where there is no positive showing of benefit resulting from the merger, and no positive showing of detriment. Mr. Clark points out that under these conditions New York State would approve a merger. Could I have your comments on this question?

Answer. These cases, where the banking agency in charge just cannot make its mind up, sound difficult. But I question whether in fact they will really cause much trouble.

I see that Mr. Clark thinks that in most cases the difference would be purely a matter of semantics—in most cases, he says, it will be obvious that a merger is either in the public interest or against the public interest. In most cases, in other words, the banking agency will be able to make up its mind.

Much of the trouble comes, I think, from misunderstanding and overemphasizing the expression "in the public interest." This expression does not mean that the agencies will have to find a direct and immediate benefit to the public, as Mr. Clark suggests. On the contrary, all this expression means is that, after considering all the seven factors and giving due weight to each of them, the agency can approve only if the net result of the seven factors is favorable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have talked with the chairman of our committee, who is not here, and have assured him that I am in full accord with his conclusion to accept the House bill. The explanation of the bill given by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and particularly the questions and answers developed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] give a clear statement of the purpose of the bill and the way in which it is to be administered by the banking agencies. I am glad that we have been assured, by informal conversations with representatives of the American Bankers Association, the Federal Reserve Board, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, that the House bill is acceptable to those organizations. I understand the Comptroller of the Currency has a slight reservation concerning the House amendment, but that this is not held too strongly by him, and that he is willing to accept the House bill and believes it will be workable.

I hope the Senate will support the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, did the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] want time?

Mr. JAVITS. I have concluded my remarks on the subject. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then, Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me in connection with the motion of the Senator from Arkansas be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

The action of the Senate in approving the House amendments to S. 1062, and sending the bill on to the President for his approval, is an event which deserves comment. The Congress, the Senate, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, its chairman, Senator ROBERTSON, and its former chairmen, Senator FULBRIGHT, and Senator CAPEHART, all should be congratulated and complimented for this significant piece of legislation.

This bill establishes uniform and clear standards, including both banking and competitive factors, for the consideration of proposed bank mergers. It eliminates a

number of gaps in the statutory framework, which now permit many bank mergers to occur with no review by any Federal agency. It provides for a thorough review by the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency, under these comprehensive standards, and with the benefit of any information which may be supplied by the Department of Justice in the report required from them, of the bank mergers by asset acquisitions and other means which are now and will continue to be exempt from the antimerger provisions of section 7 of the Clayton Antitrust Act.

It has been a slow and arduous task to bring this legislation to this present stage. In the 84th Congress, in 1956, Senator FULBRIGHT introduced S. 3911. This passed the Senate, but it died in the House. In the 85th Congress, in 1957, Senator ROBERTSON introduced a comparable provision as part of his major financial institutions bill, S. 1451. This passed the Senate, but again the bill died in the House. S. 1062 was introduced in the 86th Congress, in 1959, by Senator ROBERTSON on behalf of himself and Senators FULBRIGHT and CAPEHART. This was amended by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. It was passed by the Senate with a further amendment on May 14, 1959, almost a year ago. This time the House did not allow it to die. After holding hearings and after further amending the bill, the House, on April 4, of this year, finally passed the Senate bill. And the Senate has now accepted the House amendments, which clarify but do not change the substance of the Senate bill.

This long process tries the temper of those who must suffer under it. But in my judgment the repeated improvements in S. 1062, in the course of this slow process, show the real merits, the real benefits, of the legislative process at its best.

Again, I want to express my congratulations to Senator ROBERTSON and Senator FULBRIGHT, and Senator CAPEHART and the other members of the Banking and Currency Committee for the persistence and the thoroughness and the statesmanship which they have displayed in carrying this matter through to a satisfactory conclusion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the House was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE MUTUAL AID AUTHORIZATION BILL—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for this action; and I desire to ask him a question at this time. Early in the week we passed the mutual security authorization bill, and it went to conference. I am informed that the very able Senator from Arkansas has been able to work out a conference agreement. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct; we completed it just before the yea-and-nay vote the Senate had a few moments ago.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am also informed that the conference report will soon be prepared. In that event, the report will have to be acted on first by the House, before the report comes to the Senate.

Is not that correct, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let me ask whether the Senator from Arkansas has any information as to when the conference report on the mutual security authorization bill will be taken up.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. At the earliest possible moment, I believe. But the staff will have to have time to prepare the formal report. So I think Monday will be the earliest possible time.

There threatened to be some objection in the House in regard to the Senate policy concerning the Development Loan Fund; and it is thought that a move might be made to have the bill recommitted. However, the only controversy relates to the Development Loan Fund. If that controversy does not develop, we should be able to take up the conference report immediately after the House acts on it. I believe the Senate will have no reason to object to the conference report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to give notice that as soon as the House acts on the conference report on this very important measure, which involves $4 billion-odd, the Senate will proceed promptly to its consideration.

Let me state that we shall give priority to all appropriation bills.

Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished minority leader. So far as I am informed, no major proposed legislation is now on the calendar, although there are on the calendar several noncontroversial bills. What is the pleasure of the minority leader in regard to having a session tomorrow?

Mr. DIRKSEN. My personal pleasure is that we have a long weekend; and I trust that all Members of the Senate will concur in that viewpoint.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I personally feel the same way about that matter. Let me hasten to state that I did not wish to put the minority leader "on the spot."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I never mind that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I was merely attempting to ascertain his pleasure in the matter, before I stated my own view.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND PROSPECTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to point out, for the RECORD, that the majority and the minority have worked very effectively together, this week. We passed the mutual security bill which authorizes the appropriation of approximately $4 billion.

We passed the space authorization bill, with authorizations of approximately $1 billion.

We have sent to the White House the Commerce Department appropriation bill, with a substantial reduction below the amount of the budget estimates.

We have sent to the White House the Interior Department appropriation bill.

We passed 57 bills which were on the calendar.

Yesterday we passed the Government retirees' health bill.

We have just now passed a very important piece of legislation, which has the purpose of helping people help themselves; it is called the area redevelopment bill.

We have passed the bank merger bill.

That does not mean that we have passed all the bills which must be passed at this session; but it means that we have made substantial progress on our program for the year.

I believe we have already passed almost half of the appropriation bills; and that much progress with the appropriation bills is unusual for this time in the session.

We have a wage-hour bill which we hope will be reported from the committee at an early date.

We have a bill for a medical plan for the aged, which the House is now considering. I believe the Congress will enact some legislation in that field before the session ends.

We have a Federal employees' pay raise bill, to which the committees are giving consideration, and which I hope will be reported.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has already reported a farm bill; and I think the House of Representatives has such a bill under consideration. We expect to act on the wheat bill, and perhaps on a more comprehensive farm bill.

The distinguished chairman of the Housing Subcommittee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], will, I believe, on Monday begin hearings on a comprehensive housing bill.

There is in committee an immigration bill which we expect to consider, and perhaps revise; but I hope some effective immigration bill will be reported and acted upon.

In addition, we anticipate that the other body will pass a social security bill.

If we can make as much progress in the weeks to come as we have made this week, we shall have little difficulty in facing up to these issues and resolving them in the way the majority of the Senate may desire.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, AT NOON

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today—after having had a very productive week, for which all Senators are entitled to substantial credit—the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, as a reward for the diligent and effective efforts of each Member of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, let me ask whether the distinguished Senator from Texas expects the Senate to adjourn at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. There are some noncontroversial measures to be dealt with later this afternoon. If it is necessary, in order to accommodate Senators, the Senate will remain in session until late in the evening.

But I want all Senators to know that we shall not have a session tomorrow, and we do not expect any more yea-and-nay votes today. That is largely because of the fine and harmonious relationships we have with the Senators on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, after listening to my good friend, the majority leader, I cannot tell whether this is a reward or workmen's compensation. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hope the Congress will act on an unemployment compensation measure before it adjourns. That measure will originate in the other body, and we are waiting on it. But I anticipate that we shall take some action in that field.

Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I wish to make another statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

SHOOTING DOWN OF U.S. PLANE IN THE TURKISH REGION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am deeply troubled by Premier Khrushchev's statement, on yesterday, concerning the shooting down of a one-man, unarmed American weather plane.

Mr. President, the Government of the Soviet Union is a sovereign government, and it must be respected as such. But men of good will do not act in this fashion just before important peace talks are about to begin.

Premier Khrushchev may well have thought the flight of the plane was a deliberate intrusion on our part. If that were even a remote possibility, we, too, should be taken to task for allowing it just before the summit meeting, or at any other time.

But how much better it would have been if Premier Khrushchev had chosen to discuss his apprehension openly and frankly.

Mr. President, it is time that we talked more openly about these things. It has been the Soviet habit to perpetuate crises in an attempt to force negotiations or to influence the outcome of conferences. Such tactics will not work with America, nor could we expect them to work with Russia.

The Russian people are courageous and brave. They love and honor their homeland. Both they and we fought the Nazis in World War II.

But, Mr. President, lest the world forget, we Americans have a deep and unshakable belief in our country and its institutions; and I would remind the world that Americans are not afraid. We intend to continue to walk among the nations of the world with strength and with honor and with dignity.

Great nations, as with great men, can dwell in peace only if they share honor and mutual respect.

No talks, either long or short, on Berlin, on disarmament, or on nuclear test bans, can be expected to really produce unless good will also sits with the nations at the conference.

I do not wish to be misunderstood, Mr. President. The world has had enough of saber rattling. America is strong today, and we shall continue to keep America strong. Rocket threats will not produce peace.

These are simply statements of fact.

Premier Khrushchev loves his country. He says he believes in his system. He says, "We want peace, but we do not want to beg for it."

Mr. President, he must afford us the same honor and respect.

We are more than willing to talk peace with him, to attempt to iron out our difficulties. It must be done in an atmosphere of quiet dignity, good will, and mutual respect. That is what we in America have tried to do. That is what our distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee does each day. I remember his telling me of the conference he had with some important representatives of the Soviet Union just a few days ago, and I think it is worth repeating: That this Nation feels we can do this in an atmosphere of dignity, good will, and mutual respect, but America will not be coerced.

Let us tell the world this, and let us hope that we understand one another better.

Mr. FULBRIGHT Mr. President, first, I wish to compliment the majority leader on a very fine statement, and I hope that it will be taken seriously by the leader of the Soviet Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. The Senator from Arkansas is a constant inspiration to me, and I try to emulate the example he sets.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

THE THREAT OF A WAR BY MISTAKE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "'War by Mistake,' a Real Threat," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Evening Star several days ago.

In view of the unfortunate circumstance reported yesterday concerning the shooting down of an American airplane by Soviet Russia, war by mistake, or possibly by miscalculation, is a very real threat. This article should be read by every Member of Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"WAR BY MISTAKE" A REAL THREAT—EAST-WEST ACCORD TO HALT ARMS RACE CALLED MOST TO BE HOPED FOR

(By Constantine Brown)

Secretary of State Christian Herter made a very grave and telling point when he warned recently of the dangers of "war by miscalculation." Most of us tend to be blissfully unaware of the possibility, which exists every moment of every day, that a simple mistake could unleash the nuclear monsters on the world.

Indeed, the danger is growing steadily, in direct proportion to the stockpiling of more and more nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them.

In his hair-raising book, "On the Beach," the late Nevil Shute had his catastrophic war open with a mistake, at least a mistake in identity. Egyptian bombers were mistaken for Russian, the forces of massive retaliation moved into action, and the atomic holocaust was on.

These days events move swiftly; developments of weeks or months are today compressed into hours. The fiction of the Shute novel is not farfetched in this nuclear age.

Fortunately, the Soviet Union and its allies and satellites are just as concerned as are we and our allies with the serious dangers of war by mistake.

Moscow has used the miscalculation argument to protest the regular training flights of Strategic Air Command manned bombers. But American offers to meet the Soviet objections with a mutual security agreement, involving inspection of specific areas in the United States and the Soviet Union were rejected.

The Communists are very touchy indeed about having any outsiders prying into their peaceful secrets.

Just as in every other area of the cold war and its tensions, the prevention of war by miscalculation has to be a mutual project. Right there is the problem.

If there could exist enough trust and confidence on both sides to erect effective safeguards against war by mistake, there would be no need for the weapons that would be the occasion for the mistake. Yet so long as the situation remains as it is, the possibility that some hotheaded second lieutenant, some beserk sergeant, or some frustrated general could push the button certainly exists.

Apprehension on this score is certainly one of the major reasons for the obvious desire on both sides to remove at least some of the areas of tension where mistakes are most likely to happen.

The first step essential to international security in guarding against a war by mistake has to be an agreement, with guarantees, that will prevent the possibility of surprise attack.

This would be a monumental task indeed, but no accord, no detente or peaceful coexistence will be possible without it. Neither could any progress be made toward disarmament unless a beginning was made on prevention of surprise attack.

France has joined the nuclear club now, and it is only a matter of time before Communist China and other nations are rapping at the membership door. As the number of nuclear-armed powers increases, it will become progressively easier for any nation to acquire nuclear weapons. There will be so many, of such a variety, that it will eventually be as easy for a nation to purchase nuclear weapons as it is today to buy guns.

What a prospect. Suppose for example, a dictator in Latin America had designs on his neighbor? Suppose another megalomaniac like Adolf Hitler achieved power in a major nation? What would Gamal Abdel Nasser do to Israel if he had a hydrogen bomb?

It is becoming clearer every day, in the light of the facts, that mankind is either going to get better organized or is going to be destroyed sooner or later.

International anarchy is no longer sufficient for the protection of the world's peoples. But some of the efforts being made to bring about an improvement are going in the wrong direction. For example, world government as promoted by the one worlders would not solve the problem, because it would pre-

tend that the issues that divide nations and are responsible for our present peril do not exist. And so long as these basic cleavages do exist, then nations and alliances are to be inevitable.

Plainly, the chasm between the free world and the Communist world is too wide to be closed or even bridged.

All we can hope for is a truce, a wary armistice, a mutual recognition, however grudging, that survival depends on observing the truce. It is unlikely that such a truce, if worked out, would permit of very much disarming. Distrust is much too deep for that. But a trust, an East-West detente, could conceivably act to halt the arms race by freezing armaments at a determined level.

We should try.

SUEZ CANAL RIDER IN FOREIGN AID AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there has been a good deal of discussion recently and I have received a great many letters about the amendment involving the Suez Canal that was considered a few days ago on the floor. There have been many editorials written about the subject, but there are three items which I think should be brought to the attention of the Senate: One editorial from the New York Times, one editorial from the Washington Post, and also an article by Mr. Arthur Krock in the New York Times of May 3. I believe, read together, these discussions by eminent commentators of the American scene can bring a good deal of light to this emotional question.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorials and article to which I have referred be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 5, 1960]

DISTORTING MUTUAL SECURITY

With the ultimate purpose of Congress' most recent action aimed at opening the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping we are in entire accord. With the method chosen by both Houses through their amendment last week to the mutual security authorization bill of 1960 we are in complete disagreement.

Senator FULBRIGHT is right in calling the congressional moves "a textbook case of how not to conduct international relations." What Congress did was to give the President discretionary power to withhold aid from nations waging economic warfare against other beneficiaries of mutual security—an innocuous proposal in itself but, in the context, a suggestion, as its sponsors intended, that the people of the United Arab Republic be deprived of American assistance until the canal is opened to Israel.

That Nasser is violating every rule of decent international conduct and is utterly unjustified in barring the canal to Israel or to anyone else is a fact beyond question and we have expressed ourselves upon it on this page many times. But to try to force him to change his position through a threat to withhold American aid is not merely to distort the purpose of the mutual security program. It is also to invite a hardening of Nasser's position and to induce him to seek further recourse in the Russian assistance which under such highly political circumstances is always available.

The great strength of the American nonmilitary aid program is—or ought to be—that it is given without political strings, that the recipient is not expected to line up with our side, that this kind of assistance is offered in the hope of encouraging underdeveloped countries to achieve their economic freedom as well as to solidify their political independence. This is the only basis on which nonmilitary aid should be offered, and the only basis on which the mutual security program can succeed.

In the long run it is political in the sense that a world of free nations is a major political objective of the United States. But to use nonmilitary mutual security as a handy political weapon to achieve an immediate political purpose, whether in Asia, Africa, or South America, would be fatal and would wreck the program, as it is already threatening in Congress to wreck the International Development Association, one of the major new weapons of economic assistance to the underdeveloped countries.

[From the Washington Post, May 4, 1960]

MISCHIEF BOTH WAYS

The Senate probably made the best of a troublesome situation on Monday by retaining the Suez Canal rider in the foreign aid authorization bill. We say "probably" because we do not expect the "free navigation" declaration to accomplish much in opening the canal to Israeli shipping. The language was mischievous in the first place, as both Senator FULBRIGHT and Under Secretary Dillon emphasized. But once the provision was in the bill passed by the House and was initially approved in the Senate, its deletion might have been construed as encouragement to President Nasser.

This newspaper shares the view of Senator FULBRIGHT that the rider is a poor device for the conduct of foreign relations. It ties the hands of the Executive, and it intrudes into a delicate area advice that can only seem ex parte and gratuitous. Whether or not this particular rider resulted from domestic political pressures as charged by Mr. FULBRIGHT, it scarcely points the way to resolution of the difficulties between Israel and the United Arab Republic. Of course the boycott of Arab shipping by seamen's unions already had imposed a serious handicap on foreign policy.

When all of the objections about method have been registered, however, the rider still derives from a widespread feeling that the UAR is wrong in blocking the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping and to shipping carrying Israeli goods. There have been injustices on both sides, and Israel herself could contribute more to a solution of the Arab refugee problem. But the United States remains committed by Presidential declaration and by its own instincts to freedom of transit in the Suez Canal and there is no need, in the desire for better relations with the UAR, for this country to swallow its principles. The congressional statement is clumsy, but it would not have come about if President Nasser were not engaging in a maneuver that is offensive to many Americans.

[From the New York Times, May 3, 1960]

AN UNSOUND BASIS FOR FOREIGN POLICY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—The statements made by Senator FULBRIGHT, supported by Senator COOPER and Under Secretary of State Dillon, in his unsuccessful effort to induce the Senate to modify a foreign aid bill amendment by Senator DOUGLAS that it previously had approved, merit the serious consideration of all citizens who don't want to see foreign policy shaped—as much domestic policy is—by pressures of ethnic and religious groups in this country.

"This amendment," in FULBRIGHT'S accurate description, "contemplates that the President is to use the Mutual Security (foreign aid) Act as a club to force the United Arab Republic to open the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping." Like many other proposals of like origin, its objective is admirable but its method assures the defeat of the objective. And when the area involved has produced, as FULBRIGHT pointed out, "probably the most delicate international situation * * * in the world today," that defect is of utmost gravity.

The following extracts from the plea by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that the Senate reverse its action go straight to the point:

"The principal reason this amendment was offered was not because of the overwhelming good of the United States, but because of the existence of a pressure group in the United States which seeks to inject the Arab-Israeli dispute into domestic politics. This amendment and the recent economic coercion to prevent the loading of an Arab ship in New York are part of a pattern which I find disastrous in the functioning of our constitutional system. One hundred and eighty million Americans find their foreign policy being whipsawed by an irresponsible maritime union and by a minority pressure group." In elaboration FULBRIGHT offered these arguments:

The New York union boycott and the Douglas amendment are attempts to integrate into American politics "the feuds and emotions that are part of the political conflicts of foreign nations to avoid which this Nation was created."

The formulation and conduct of sound American foreign policy is being more and more "compromised" by these multiplying attempts.

In this instance the immediate effects have been reprisals by the UAR which demonstrate that the steps taken here do not advance but, on the contrary, impede progress toward an amicable settlement of the Arab boycott of Israeli ships desiring to pass through the Suez Canal.

Repeating these points, Under Secretary Dillon today also factually refuted one of the reasons given for the Douglas amendment. This reason was that the UAR has denied canal passage to American ships and any others which merely have called at Israeli ports. That, Dillon informed the Senate, is simply not true.

Senator COOPER'S observations were particularly impressive because, as he informed his colleagues, he had first been inclined to support the Douglas amendment as a move which might "forward the principle of freedom of navigation in international waterways and, inferentially, in the Suez Canal." But upon reflection I decided that [the amendment] would be harmful to these very purposes. His principal conclusion, he said, was that the amendment "would be viewed solely as an effort by the American Congress to put pressure on another country through our aid program," a charge the Soviet Union has long been making "with a great hue and cry" and has induced "some free countries unfortunately to believe it." And the greatest individual sufferer, in COOPER'S judgment, would be Israel itself.

From this point of departure, the Kentucky Senator, justly celebrated as progressive, made an analysis of the whole problem of foreign aid that was particularly authoritative for the reason that, as an Ambassador to India and a legislator, he has studied the project from both sides. "If the program is to survive," he said, "it demands reorganization by the executive branch and by Congress. It is not as effectively used as it should be. It must be given continuity, like the Marshall plan. And for the secondary projects into which a great amount of aid is channeled there should be substituted primary ones, especially agricultural, in consultation with the World Bank and the United Nations."

A very large crop of political courage and common sense from just two Senators and one Under Secretary of State.

PROVISION FOR CERTAIN PILOTAGE REQUIREMENTS IN NAVIGATION OF U.S. WATERS OF GREAT LAKES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1317, Senate bill 3019.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3019) to provide for certain pilotage requirements in the navigation of U.S. waters of the Great Lakes, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 2, line 4, after the word "a", to strike out "person" and insert "person,"; at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "vessel" and insert "vessel,"; in line 20, after the word "means", to strike out "a" and insert "the master or any other"; on page 3, after line 2, to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(f) "Foreign vessels" means all foreign merchant vessels except Canadian vessels whose operations are exclusively upon the Great Lakes or between ports in the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River, or whose operations while predominantly as aforesaid fail of being exclusively so only because of an occasional voyage to a port or ports in the maritime provinces of Canada in the Canadian coastal trade.

At the beginning of line 13, to strike out "those"; in the same line, after the word "vessels", to strike out "designated by him"; at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "such"; in the same line, after the word "and", to strike out "designated"; on page 4, line 18, after the word "service", to strike out "provided" and insert "provide"; on page 8, line 12, after the word "of", to strike out "such vessel in violation of the provisions of section 3(a) and 3(b) of this Act or regulation issued pursuant thereto" and insert "the vessel by a person not a registered pilot in the waters designated by the President pursuant to section 3(a) of this Act or who permits the navigation of the vessel without having on board a registered pilot or other officer in the waters described in section 3(b) of this Act"; in line 23, after the word "jurisdiction", to strike out "of the violation" and insert "thereof"; on page 9, line 3, after the word "a", to strike out "United States or Canadian"; in line 4, after the word "vessel", to insert "subject to this Act in the waters designated by the President pursuant to"; at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "in violation of the provisions of"; in the same line, after the word "Act", to strike out "or regulations issued pursuant thereto,"; on page 10, line 14, after "(c)", to strike out "This Act shall be administered and applied so as to permit Canadian vessels operating exclusively on the Great Lakes and the Saint Lawrence River to be navigated in United States waters of the Great Lakes solely by qualified officers certificated by Canada," and insert "The exceptions in section 2(f) applying to Canadian vessels shall be effective only"; and on page 11, line 1, after the word "three", to insert "public", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Great Lakes Pilotage Act of 1960."

SEC. 2. As used in this Act:

(a) "Great Lakes" means Lakes Superior, Michigan, Huron, Erie, and Ontario, their connecting and tributary waters, the Saint Lawrence River as far east as Saint Regis, and adjacent port areas.

(b) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce.

(c) "United States registered pilot" means a person, other than a member of the regular complement of a vessel, who holds an unlimited master's license authorizing navigation on the Great Lakes and suitably endorsed for pilotage on routes specified therein, issued by the head of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating under regulations issued by him, and is registered by the Secretary as provided in section 4 of this Act.

(d) "Canadian registered pilot" means a person, other than a member of the regular complement of a vessel, who holds a master's certificate or equivalent license authorizing navigation on the Great Lakes and pilotage on routes specified therein, issued by the appropriate agency of Canada, and is registered by a designated agency of Canada on substantially the same basis as registration by the Secretary under the provisions of section 4 of this Act.

(e) "Other officer" means the master or any other member of the regular complement of the vessel concerned who is qualified for the navigation of the Great Lakes waters described in section 3(b) of this Act and who is either licensed by the head of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating under regulations issued by him or certificated by an appropriate agency of Canada.

(f) "Foreign vessels" means all foreign merchant vessels except Canadian vessels whose operations are exclusively upon the Great Lakes or between ports in the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River, or whose operations while predominately as aforesaid fail of being exclusively so only because of an occasional voyage to a port or ports in the maritime provinces of Canada in the Canadian coastal trade.

SEC. 3. (a) The President shall designate and by proclamation announce those United States waters of the Great Lakes in which registered vessels of the United States and foreign vessels shall be required to have in their service a United States registered pilot or a Canadian registered pilot for the waters concerned, who shall, subject to the customary authority of the master, direct the navigation of the vessel in those waters. These designations shall be made with due regard to the public interest, the effective utilization of navigable waters, marine safety, and the foreign relations of the United States.

(b) In those United States waters of the Great Lakes which are not designated by the President in accordance with paragraph (a) of this section, there shall be on board registered vessels of the United States and foreign vessels, a United States registered pilot or Canadian registered pilot or other officer qualified for the waters concerned who shall be available to direct the navigation of the vessel in such undesignated waters at the discretion of and subject to the customary authority of the master.

(c) The authority extended in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section to Canadian registered pilots or to other officers certificated by Canada to serve on registered vessels of the United States and foreign vessels in United States waters of the Great Lakes shall be in effect only so long as Canada extends reciprocity to United States registered pilots or to other officers licensed by the United States, in regard to requirements established for the pilotage of Canadian waters of the Great Lakes.

SEC. 4. (a) The registration of United States pilots shall be carried out by the Secretary under such regulations as to qualifications, terms, and conditions which will assure adequate and efficient pilotage service, provide for equitable participation of United States registered pilots with Canadian registered pilots in the pilotage of vessels to which this Act applies, and provide fair and reasonable opportunity for registration. Each applicant must, as a prerequisite, be the holder of an appropriate master's license as described in section 2(c). In addition, the qualifications, terms, and conditions to be met by each applicant shall include, but not be limited to, availability for service when required and agreement to comply with all applicable regulations issued by the Secretary pursuant to this Act. Such qualifications, terms, and conditions shall not include matters relating to a pilot's professional competency nor be inconsistent with his duties under the license issued to him by the Coast Guard, which matters shall remain the responsibility of the Coast Guard.

(b) The Secretary shall issue documentary evidence of registration to United States registered pilots and such evidence shall be in their possession at all times when in the service of a vessel. Further, this evidence of registration shall describe the part or parts of the Great Lakes within which the holder is authorized to perform pilotage under this Act and such description shall not be inconsistent with the terms of the pilotage authorization in his license.

(c) The Secretary shall establish by regulation the period of validity of registration of United States registered pilots. When the Secretary determines on the record, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, that a United States registered pilot has violated any regulation pursuant to this Act, he may revoke or suspend the registration of such pilot. The basis for such revocation or suspension of a pilot's registration shall not extend to or include matters which may be the basis for revocation or suspension of his license by the Coast Guard under section 4450, Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U.S.C. 239), or under any other law or regulation administered or prescribed by the Coast Guard, except that upon revocation or suspension by the Coast Guard the Secretary shall revoke or suspend the pilot's registration. The Secretary shall advise the Coast Guard of the name and Coast Guard license number of each pilot who has been registered or whose registration has been revoked or suspended. The Coast Guard shall advise the Secretary of the name of any registered pilot whose license has been revoked or suspended.

(d) The Secretary is authorized to enter into arrangements with an appropriate agency of Canada for equitable participation by United States registered pilots with Canadian registered pilots in the pilotage services required by both countries for vessels navigating the Great Lakes. To that end, the Secretary is further authorized to arrange with an appropriate agency of Canada for the number of pilots who shall be registered in each country.

(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary may authorize the formation of a pool or pools by a voluntary association or associations of United States registered pilots to provide such arrangements and facilities as may be necessary or desirable for the efficient dispatching of ves-

sels and rendering of pilotage services required under the provisions of this Act. The Secretary may—

(i) establish such rules and regulations for the operation of a pool or pools as he may deem necessary;

(ii) require that pooling be coordinated on a reciprocal basis with similar arrangements established by the appropriate agency of Canada;

(iii) limit the number of pools;

(iv) audit and inspect the administration and operation of a pool or pools;

(v) prescribe uniform systems of accounts for a pool or pools.

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to establish by regulations the rates, charges, and any other conditions or terms for services performed by registered pilots to meet the provisions of this Act.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to arrange with the appropriate agency of Canada for the establishment of joint or identical rates, charges, and any other conditions or terms for services by registered pilots in the waters of the Great Lakes.

(c) The rates, charges, and any other conditions or terms for pilotage services by registered pilots established by the Secretary in accordance with subdivisions (a) and (b) of this section shall be fair and equitable, giving due consideration to the public interest and the reasonable cost and expense of providing and maintaining such facilities and arrangements as are required for the efficient performance of pilotage services in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 6. Any written arrangements between the Secretary and the appropriate agency of Canada under the provisions of this Act shall be subject to the concurrence of the Secretary of State.

SEC. 7. (a) Any owner, master, or person in charge of a vessel subject to this Act who permits the navigation of the vessel by a person not a registered pilot in the waters designated by the President pursuant to section 3(a) of this Act or who permits the navigation of the vessel without having on board a registered pilot or other officer in the waters described in section 3(b) of this Act shall be liable to the United States in a civil penalty not exceeding $500 for each violation, for which sum the vessel shall be liable and may be seized and proceeded against by way of libel in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction thereof. Each day the vessel shall be so navigated shall constitute a separate violation. This subsection shall be enforced by the head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating.

(b) Any person, not a registered pilot, who directs the navigation of a vessel subject to this Act in the waters designated by the President pursuant to section 3(a) of this Act, shall be subject to a civil penalty in an amount not exceeding $500 for each violation. Each day such person so directs the navigation of such vessel shall constitute a separate violation. This subsection shall be enforced by the head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating.

(c) A person who violates any regulation issued pursuant to sections 4 and 5 of this Act shall be liable to the United States in a civil penalty not exceeding $500 for each violation. The provisions of this subsection shall be enforced by the Secretary, who may, upon application therefor, remit or mitigate the penalty provided for herein, upon such terms as he, in his discretion, shall think proper.

SEC. 8. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a vessel may be navigated in the United States waters of the Great Lakes without a United States or Canadian registered pilot when—

(a) the Secretary, or his designee, with the concurrence of the head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, or his designee, notifies the master that a United States or Canadian registered pilot is not available, or

(b) the vessel or its cargo is in distress or jeopardy.

SEC. 9. (a) No State, municipal, or other local authority shall have any power to require the use of pilots or to regulate any aspect of pilotage in any of the waters specified in this Act.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall apply to any vessel of the United States which, in its navigation of waters to which this Act is applicable, is required by any other Act to have in its service and on board pilots or other navigating officers licensed by the United States for such waters.

(c) The exceptions in section 2(f) applying to Canadian vessels shall be effective only so long as Canada permits enrolled vessels of the United States to be navigated on Canadian waters of the Great Lakes solely by qualified officers licensed by the head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating.

SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary is authorized to appoint an Advisory Committee of three public members, each of whom shall have had at least five years of practical experience in maritime operations. The term for which a member may be appointed or reappointed shall not exceed five years.

(b) The Advisory Committee shall meet at the call of the Secretary. The Advisory Committee may review proposed pilotage regulations and policies and make such recommendations as are deemed appropriate.

(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall be compensated at a rate not exceeding $75 per day when actually engaged in the performance of their duties, together with their necessary travel expenses while going to and from meetings and when engaged on business at the call of the Secretary.

SEC. 11. (a) The Secretary may use, with their consent, the available services, equipment, personnel, and facilities of agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, on a reimbursable basis when appropriate.

(b) In carrying out the functions vested in him by this Act, the Secretary, subject to the standards and procedures of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is authorized to place not to exceed two positions in grades 16, 17, or 18 of the general schedule established by such Act. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by such section 505.

SEC. 12. If a provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 13. This Act shall become effective upon the date of its enactment, except that the pilotage provisions of this Act shall not become effective until the first day of the fourth month following the issuance of regulations pursuant hereto by the Secretary.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point portions of the report on this bill. The reason why I am bringing the bill up today is that the season is opening on the Great Lakes, and it is necessary to act on the bill now.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSES OF THE BILL

S. 3019 would establish certain pilotage requirements for foreign oceangoing vessels as well as for vessels of U.S. registry while such vessels are navigating the five Great Lakes, their connecting and tributary waters, the St. Lawrence River as far east as St. Regis, and adjacent port areas. It also would provide for a regulated pilotage system and for the coordination of this system with a similar pilotage system in Canada for ocean vessels navigating the Great Lakes waters of that country. None of these ocean vessels have any statutory pilotage requirements now for the navigation of U.S. waters of the Great Lakes.

Section 2 of the bill defines certain terms as employed in the bill, and sets up qualifications for the registered pilots authorized to direct the navigation of the vessels in certain to-be-designated restricted waters, as well as in the open waters of the lakes, and for the other officers who will be authorized to direct navigation solely in the nondesignated, or open, waters.

Section 3(a) provides that the President shall designate certain areas in which registered vessels of the United States and foreign vessels coming into the lakes must have in their service a registered pilot to direct their navigation, and lays down certain bases for such designation.

In section 3(b), applying to waters not designated by the President, the bill permits vessels to have available aboard either a registered pilot or the master or another officer among the vessel's licensed complement who is qualified to direct navigation in such open waters.

Section 3(c) specifies that the authority extended in sections 3(a) and 3(b) to Canadian registered pilots or to other officers certified by Canada shall be on a reciprocal basis.

Sections 4(a) and 4(b) authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make regulations covering registration of pilots which will assure adequate service and provide for equitable participation of U.S. registered pilots in the pilotage of vessels, but reserve to the Coast Guard the question of the pilots' professional competency. Pilots are required to have in their possession when in service of a vessel the documentary evidence of registration issued by the Secretary.

Section 4(c) deals with the period of validity of registration of U.S. pilots; reasons and procedures for suspension of pilots; and the respective responsibilities of the Secretary and the Coast Guard in such matters. Remaining provisions of section 4 authorize the Secertary to arrange with Canadian authorities as to the number of pilots to be registered, and to assure equitable participation in this pilotage by U.S. pilots; to authorize the formation of a pool or pools by U.S. pilots, to establish rules and regulations for their operations, etc.

In section 5 the Secretary is authorized and directed to establish rates, charges, etc., for pilotage services, and to arrange with Canadian authorities for joint or identical rates, etc. Section 6 provides that written agreements shall be subject to concurrence of the Secretary of State.

Sections 7(a) and 7(b) provide penalties for violations of section 3, and for enforcement by the head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating.

Section 8 affords relief from pilotage requirements in emergency, or when registered pilots are not available. Section 9 provides that States or localities may not require the use of pilots, or regulate any aspect of pilotage, in waters covered by this act; exempts from application of the provisions of the act any U.S. vessel which, in the waters covered by the act, is required by any other act to have aboard pilots or other navigating officers licensed for such waters; and provides for reciprocity in the exemption from requirements as to use of registered pilots on enrolled U.S. vessels navigating Canadian waters and on Canadian "lakers" and "canalers" navigating U.S. waters of the lakes.

Sections 10(a), 10(b), and 10(c) authorize the Secretary to appoint an advisory committee of three, who shall meet at his call to

review regulations and policies, and make recommendations and provide for their pay and travel.

The bill is not intended to apply to small enrolled motor-driven vessels which are not now required to have licensed pilots aboard.

The act would become effective upon enactment, except that the pilotage provisions would not become effective until the first day of the fourth month following the issuance of regulations by the Secretary.

REASONS FOR THE LEGISLATION

Opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway in 1959 has greatly complicated vessel safety problems on the Great Lakes by making possible entry into the lakes of ocean vessels of higher tonnage and in far larger numbers than previously was the case. In addition to the 2,206 United States and Canadian vessels operating on the lakes exclusively or in large part, some 1,033 foreign commercial vessels and 61 vessels under U.S. registry made round voyages on the lakes in 1959. All indications are that this total, of foreign vessels particularly, will increase in the years ahead.

The upsurge of foreign vessels navigating U.S. waters of the Great Lakes, and the entry of U.S. ocean vessels into the area, present a definite threat to safe navigation. There is presently statutory requirement for the use of qualified pilots on both U.S. and Canadian vessels navigating only on the lakes. However, operation of the oceangoing vessels, without skilled lake pilots, as evidenced by the reported accidents and near accidents during the first year's operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway, presents a threat of considerable magnitude not only to the lake vessels, but also to the ocean vessels whose officers, in some cases, may not be sufficiently familiar with the Great Lakes rules of the road, the restricted waters, etc.

When S. 2096, the Coast Guard's bill to require pilotage on the U.S. waters of the Great Lakes, was considered by your committee in the 85th Congress, there was opposition presented by Canada and various European maritime nations, largely due to the requirement that vessels must carry a registered pilot the entire time they were in the Great Lakes waters. Because of this opposition, the committee did not approve the bill. Instead, request was made of the State Department that consultation be held with the responsible Canadian authorities, to the end that a bill acceptable to the authorities of both nations be developed.

Your committee is satisfied that the bill now before us will be mutually acceptable. Our State Department has had the cooperation of the Commerce Department, Treasury Department, and the Coast Guard in its consultations with the Department of Transport of the Canadian Government, and assurance has been had from the Canadian authorities that action will be taken there, once this act is approved, to legislate along similar lines. Similarly, the representative of the Shipping Federation of Canada, which vigorously opposed S. 2096, stated at our committee hearing on S. 3019:

"The federation, on behalf of the ocean shipping industry which it represents, is happy to give its support to bill S. 3019 and wishes to assure the Government agencies concerned of its wholehearted cooperation in the attainment of the objectives which the legislation is intended to further."

The federation witness was speaking also, he said, for the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom and the International Chamber of Shipping, both of London, as well as for the Baltic and International Maritime Conference of Copenhagen, three organizations which represent and present the views of the British and European shipping interests as a whole on all questions of major policy.

S. 3019 has met the objections to use of registered pilots on all waters of the Great Lakes by permitting on waters not designated by the President as restricted that the vessels may have on board either—

* * * a U.S. registered pilot or Canadian registered pilot or other officer qualified for the waters concerned who shall be available to direct the navigation of the vessel in such undesignated waters at the discretion of and subject to the customary authority of the master.

Your committee gave consideration to proposals by the American Merchant Marine Institute representative that (1) the bill, instead of the President, should designate the restricted waters and the vessels required to carry the registered pilots, and (2) that in connection with section 5 of the bill, the Secretary of Commerce be required to hold public hearings prior to the establishment of rates, charges, and other conditions or terms for services rendered by these pilots. In accordance with the one industry view, a new subsection, 2(f), was added to define the foreign vessels intended to be covered by the bill.

With regard to the designation of the restricted waters, your committee believes that, because of the international aspects of the bill, the division of authority and responsibilities among the three Government departments directly involved, and the necessity for expert, detailed delineation of the restricted areas, the overall authority and responsibility should be reserved for the Chief Executive. Specific designation in the act of these areas might well require continuing modification of the act, to meet circumstances which may later develop but which cannot be foreseen. The committee has been informed that Canadian authorities plan to designate their restricted areas by regulation rather than by law.

However, it seems beyond question that certain general areas of U.S. waters in and adjoining the Great Lakes do require and will be designated for expert navigation in the interest of safety. These areas include the St. Lawrence River, as far as St. Regis; the waters of western Lake Erie, and the Detroit, St. Clair, and St. Marys Rivers and the waters adjacent thereto.

As for the proposed public hearings on rates, etc., the Administrative Procedure Act would provide for such hearings, your committee has been officially advised, and so interprets that act.

It should be made clear that the registered pilots, who become members of the voluntary associations or pools that may be authorized by the Secretary of Commerce under section 4(e) of the bill, will not be employees of the Federal Government but will function after the manner of pilot associations elsewhere in the country.

With reference to the provision in 11(b) of the bill, that the Secretary of Commerce, subject to the standards and procedures of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, would be authorized to place not to exceed two positions in grades 16, 17, or 18 of the general schedule established by such act, the U.S. Civil Service Commission made the following comment:

"Section 11(b) requires the Civil Service Commission to evaluate the duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements of the two positions (as well as the qualifications of proposed appointees) to determine whether they warrant allocation to grade GS–16, 17, or 18. It would not, however, require that the Commission allocate the two positions to any one of these grades unless such action is appropriate under the standards and grade definitions in the Classification Act."

Included herewith are the reports of the Government departments and agencies on the bill, as follows: Department of State, dated February 11, 1960, requesting introduction of the legislation, with attached analysis of the draft proposals; Department of the Treasury, dated March 31, 1960, with draft of suggested amendments; Department of Commerce, dated February 29, 1960; Depart of Justice, dated March 30, 1960; Comptroller General, dated March 18, 1960; U.S. Civil Service Commission, dated March 16, 1960; and the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, dated March 28, 1960.

There is no change in existing law.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 11, 1960

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: Pursuant to the Department's letter of January 18, 1960, there are transmitted herewith a draft and analysis of a proposed bill to provide for certain pilotage requirements in the navigation of U.S. waters of the Great Lakes, and for other purposes.

This draft bill has been prepared jointly by the Departments of State and Commerce and the Coast Guard, with advice from the Bureau of the Budget.

The primary purposes of the proposed bill are to establish pilotage requirements in U.S. waters of the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River for U.S. and foreign-flag vessels operating on ocean routes into the Great Lakes and to provide the basis for a regulated system of pilotage to meet those requirements. Provision is made for coordination of this system with a pilotage system regulated by Canada in Canadian waters of the Great Lakes.

The requirements provided for in the proposed bill would not be applicable to any vessel of the United States which is required by any other act to have in its service and on board pilots or other navigating officers licensed by the United States for navigation in the Great Lakes.

The proposed bill would not discriminate against foreign-flag ships and need not conflict with treaties to which the United States is a party.

The Department has beeen informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendments will be considered en bloc.

The committee amendments were agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to provide for certain pilotage requirements in the navigation of U.S. waters of the Great Lakes, and for other purposes."

PHILIPPINE SUGAR—U.S. SOLON RAISES VALID POINT

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, on April 5, 1960, the Honorable ROBERT W. LEVERING, Democrat of Ohio, a member of the House Agriculture Committee, in an ex-

tension of his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, complained that the Philippines had been denied increases in its sugar quota because of its ban on American tobacco, while no such action had been taken against Cuba. His remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pointed out that at the time of the approval of the last extension of the Sugar Act in 1956 the only foreign area denied participation then to share in the increased consumption provided for all other foreign countries was the Philippines.

The New York Times article of April 2, bearing a Havana dateline, cited by Mr. LEVERING should remind the members of the Congress representing tobacco growing States that Cuba, the principal beneficiary of U.S. sugar import quotas, has placed a ban on U.S. cigarettes. To quote from the article:

For his own reasons, Dr. Castro has declared a war on luxuries, privileges, and wealth. He contends that they have led to these economic distortions and the poverty of the Cuban masses.

As Mr. LEVERING further reminds us, the Philippine Government, in curtailing the importation of Virginia burley leaf tobacco, followed the recommendation of the U.S. Economic Mission in 1950, commonly called the Bell Mission, which suggested the curtailment of importation by the Philippines of luxury items, including tobacco, in order to conserve fast-dwindling dollar reserves.

It is not fair or even relevant to use the argument that the Philippines do not freely import Virginia burley leaf tobacco as a basis for opposing favorable consideration of Philippine sugar producers in the increases of import quotas included in any revision of the Sugar Act in this Congress. It is much more logical and pertinent to refer, in this connection, to the unequivocal promise of President Eisenhower when he signed the amendments to the Sugar Act in 1956, when the Philippines alone among the foreign areas were not granted an increase in quotas. May I take the liberty of again quoting the press release which came from the White House at the time of the enactment of the 1956 amendments:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I have today approved H.R. 7030, to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes.

In addition to extending the Sugar Act for 4 years, the bill restores to the domestic areas the right to supply 55 percent of this country's increased requirements of sugar. The amendments also permit foreign countries to supply as much as they have been, plus 45 percent of the increases in our requirements. These increases will be most important relatively for the countries that heretofore have been minor suppliers.

It was not considered feasible to recommend an increase in the Philippine quota at this time. I believe, therefore, that when new amendments are being prepared at the conclusion of the present act, consideration should be given to allowing the Philippines to share in increased consumption, as is now provided for other foreign countries by this bill.

It is not hard to believe that the words imputed to the President raised high the hopes of the Philippine people that the 1960 revision of the Sugar Act would include favorable consideration of Philippine sugar producers. Nonetheless, the President of the United States on April 4, in reply to an inquiry by the President of the Philippines, wrote as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have received your telegram of March 17 asking that I increase the Philippine sugar quota. As you know, the sugar quotas are determined by Congress, and any modification would require congressional action. Since the Sugar Act of 1948 as amended in 1956 expires this year, Congress is expected to consider its extension during the present session.

The administration has been giving considerable thought to what recommendations it should make to Congress for its consideration. After weeks of most careful study of this problem, I have concluded that the time is not propitious to recommend any change in the present structure of quotas assigned to foreign countries.

Accordingly, I have recommended to the Congress only certain minimum changes in the present Sugar Act. The most important of these would give me the authority to reduce the quota for a calendar year for any foreign country, except, of course, the Philippines, and to make required replacements from any source when I determine it to be in the national interest or necessary to insure adequate supplies of sugar. I have requested this authority primarily to enable me to protect our sugar consumers should our supplies of sugar from foreign sources be endangered for any reason. The final decision as to whether I am to be given this authority, however, rests with Congress. I regret, therefore, that it has not been possible for me to comply with the wishes of the Philippine sugar producers. I wish to assure you, however, that the position of the Philippines has been given full consideration by the administration in arriving at the position which I have recommended to Congress.

With assurances of my continued esteem,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

This reply, with a number of equivocal and unclear phrases, disregards and dismisses the simple words of the President, uttered less than 4 years ago, that "when new amendments are being prepared at the conclusion of the present Sugar Act, consideration should be given to allowing the Philippines to share in increased consumption as is now provided for other foreign countries by this bill." The reply of the President, the message accompanying the recommended revision of the Sugar Act, and the message from the executive department accompanying these recommendations all appear to make much of the design to give the President authority to reduce quotas during any calendar year for foreign countries excepting the Philippines. The reduction of the fixed minimum quota of the Philippines is not a subject for our present consideration. In 1934 when our quota system was adopted, the Philippines received a staggering reduction of its historical and proportionate participation in the U.S. sugar market to the tune of 897,872 short tons. From 1934 the annual fixed quota for the Philippines has never been increased to any extent despite the apportionment among other foreign suppliers in the annual increased demands of U.S. users. What we are talking about now is a belated increase in the export quota to the United States for the Philippines along with other foreign suppliers to meet our annual increased sugar requirements.

At this point it may be well again to clarify what seems to be an impression, mistaken though it is, that the fixed Philippine quota of 980,000 tons annually cannot be increased due to the provisions of the Sugar Act and the trade agreement in force between our country and the Philippines. Article II of the Philippine Trade Agreement Revision Act of 1955 specifically provides:

The establishment herein of the limitations on the amounts of the Philippine raw and refined sugar that may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, in the United States for consumption, shall be without prejudice to any increases which the Congress of the United States might allocate to the Philippines in the future.

There are many strong economic and political reasons for including in any revisions which this Congress makes of the Sugar Act for the period commencing January 1, 1961, an increase in the Philippine quota commensurate with other foreign suppliers to meet the annual increased sugar needs of the United States. I shall not elaborate upon them, but point again only to the moral obligation which we have to act in this manner in fulfillment of the promise of the President of the United States reflected in the press release which I have quoted to the effect that at this very time we would allow the Philippines to share in increased consumption.

The remarks of Mr. LEVERING, a survivor of the Bataan death march and a firm friend of the Philippines, have received wide notice and favorable comment. Among other news items, and this one particularly of interest to our colleagues representing tobacco producing and processing States, is an editorial published in the Philippines Herald of Saturday, April 9, 1960, entitled "U.S. Solon Raises Valid Point," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SOLON RAISES VALID POINT

A Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, Representative ROBERT W. LEVERING, Ohio Democrat, complained on the U.S. Congress floor the other day that the Philippines had been denied increases in its sugar quota because of its ban on American leaf tobacco. At the same time, Representative LEVERING called attention to the fact that, while Cuba had similarly cracked down on American cigarettes, no such action had been taken by the United States against that country.

The implications of this charge which hews along similar others that had been raised in the U.S. Congress anent the Philippine Islands bid for an increased sugar quota, add up to a powerful indication of deliberate discrimination against the Philippines, for reasons that, considering the close ties of friendship between the Philippine Islands and the United States, are hard to understand, indeed.

Representative LEVERING, who obviously is one Member of the U.S. Congress who has not permitted his sense of justice to be influenced by selfish or petty considerations in discussions on the Philippine Islands sugar quota question, has raised a valid point which his colleagues in the U.S. Congress

would do well to ponder. It is that the Philippine Islands decision to curtail its tobacco imports was actually prompted by the recommendations of the Bell economic mission in 1950 which had suggested such a recourse as a means of conserving the country's fast-dwindling dollar reserves. In short, there was nothing in the Philippine Islands Government's move to suggest any intent at discrimination, but was taken solely as a legitimate and necessary step to protect the country's interests.

In sharp contrast to the circumstances involved in the Philippine Islands move, LEVERING said, was the act of Cuba in curbing its own imports of American cigarettes—an act taken, not as the result of recommendations by an American mission, but which, one might say, had been prompted largely by feelings of anti-Americanism and therefore constituting discrimination of a vicious and vindictive sort. Yet, strangely enough, America has reacted to this virtual slap in the face in the most inconceivably magnanimous manner, refusing to take any move that might be construed by the Cubans as being in the nature of a reprisal against their country.

The injustice to the Philippines becomes even more pronounced when the U.S. reluctance to grant the Philippine Islands bid is viewed in the light of the assurance that President Eisenhower himself had made to consider recommending an expansion of the Philippine Islands quota when the Sugar Act is renewed in 1960. But the Philippine Island's cause, of course, is not entirely a lost one. It may sound like wishful thinking, but, as President Garcia had pointed out in effect, there is still a chance that the United States may realize the injustice and assay in time to correct it.

FREE OR REDUCED RATE TRANSPORTATION FOR CERTAIN ADDITIONAL PERSONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1314, H.R. 4049.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4049) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to authorize free or reduced rate transportation for certain additional persons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 4049) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to authorize free or reduced rate transportation for certain additional persons, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments, on page 2, line 2, after the word "retired", to strike out "directors" and insert "directors who have served at least five years"; at the beginning of line 6, to insert "widows, widowers, and minor children of employees who have died as a result of personal injury sustained while in the performance of duty in the service of such air carrier or foreign air carrier;"; at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "oversea" and insert "overseas"; and in line 20, after the word "regulations", to strike out "prescribe: *Provided*, That the free transportation authorized herein, which is for pleasure or vacation travel, shall be on a space available basis" and insert "prescribe. Any air carrier, under such terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe, may grant reduced-rate transportation to members of the United States armed services when such persons are traveling at their own expense, in uniform of those services, between a place in Alaska or Hawaii, on the one hand, and a place in any of the other States, on the other hand, while on official leave, furlough, or pass."

Mr MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement relating to the purpose of the proposed legislation, with pertinent information relative to committee amendments, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize air carriers to grant free or reduced-rate transportation to certain classes of persons, in addition to those already designated in section 403(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. These are the following:

(1) Retired directors, officers, and employees and their immediate families;

(2) Parents of active or retired officers and employees (whether or not living in the immediate household);

(3) Immediate family of any person injured or killed in an accident where the object is to transport such persons in connection with such accident;

(4) Widows, widowers, and minor children of employees who die of injuries received in line of duty;

(5) Servicemen in Alaska or Hawaii returning to places in the other States, on leave or furlough, at their own expense.

The bill, which implements a legislative recommendation of the Civil Aeronautics Board, was introduced at the request of the Board and was supported by all segments of the aviation industry, including management and labor. It is permissive and not mandatory and the Board will retain control over all conduct of the air carriers pursued thereunder.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

Under the provisions of existing law (sec. 403(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958), air carriers are permitted to transport various classes of persons at free or reduced rates under terms and regulations prescribed by the CAB. Included in this classification of persons are airline employees, officers and directors and their immediate families, as well as persons injured in aircraft accidents and physicians and nurses attending such persons.

Over the years, however, the air carriers extended similar privileges to their retired employees, officers and directors, and to parents of employees and officers, irrespective of whether or not such parents were actually residing in the same household. Additionally, as a humanitarian practice, the air carriers have transported members of the families of persons injured or killed in an aircraft accident to and from the place of the accident, or to the hospital or other appropriate location in the area of the accident.

Several years ago the CAB reviewed and investigated all the practices of the regulated air carriers in the granting of free or reduced-rate transportation. This investigation disclosed that many of the air carriers were granting such transportation to persons who did not appear to qualify within the limited number of categories specified in section 403(b), such as executives of the advertising agency retained by the carrier, attorneys or members of the firm of attorneys retained by the air carriers, physicians retained by an air carrier who continued their own private medical practice, and the Board promptly forbade the continuation of such practices. Additionally, the Board was constrained to hold that the provisions of existing law did not permit the granting of such privileges to (a) retired employees; (b) parents who did not live in the immediate household of employees; (c) members of the immediate family of a person injured or killed in an accident; or (d) widows and minor children of employees who had died as the result of injuries sustained while in the service of the carrier. Upon representation by the industry that the privileges accorded to this latter group of persons was a custom of long standing which had become imbedded in the industry's public- and labor-relations structure, the Board suspended the effectiveness of its prohibition as to them from time to time, the latest suspension order expiring April 30, 1960.

In order to regularize and validate these industry practices, the Board proposed and sponsored this legislation. Your committee has been advised that the Board believes that the provision of such free or reduced-rate transportation will not unduly burden the carriers and would be in the public interest.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The hearings conducted by your committee indicated a need for amending the House bill in the following respects:

(1) Require service of at least 5 years before a retired director could qualify for pass privilege;

(2) Add survivors of employees who die of injuries received in line of duty;

(3) Eliminate the restriction of pleasure and vacation travel to space-available basis;

(4) Continue status quo for servicemen in Alaska or Hawaii traveling back to States on furlough or leave at own expense (Magnuson-Bartlett amendment).

With reference to amendment (1) above, the committee felt it desirable to require a period of active service of at least 5 years before a retired director could qualify for a pass privilege in order to prevent potential abuses.

With respect to amendment (2) above, the hearings established the need for permitting widows, widowers, and minor children of employees who have died as the result of personal injury sustained while in the performance of duty in the service of an air carrier to be entitled to receive the same privileges which would have accrued to them had the decedent survived and lived to the age of retirement.

With reference to amendment (3) above, the House, in passing H.R. 4049, adopted an amendment which would require all free transportation for pleasure or vacation travel to be on a space-available basis. The Civil Aeronautics Board advised your committee that such an amendment was neither necessary nor desirable since the legislation is permissive and not mandatory. The Board stated that should experience demonstrate that such a restriction was needed, it could be imposed voluntarily by the carrier. Moreover, representatives of the air carriers pointed out that it is customary to place such privilege on a space-available basis and that it is in the self-interest of the airlines not to permit an uneconomic situation to develop in the use of such privilege. Accordingly, we were urged to remove this unnecessary restriction by the Board as well as by management and labor.

In regard to amendment (4) above, the CAB specifically requested such addition to the bill for the purpose of allowing air carriers to offer reduced rates for furlough travel of military personnel stationed in the State of Alaska or Hawaii in accordance with a practice which the Board has permitted in the years prior to their admission

to the Union. Specifically, the Board advised that when Alaska and Hawaii were Territories, air transportation between the States and Alaska or Hawaii was "overseas air transportation" as defined in the Federal Aviation Act and, consequently, the Board had authority under existing law, to permit air carriers to grant reduced rates to military personnel traveling at their own expense on furlough between the States and these Territories. With their admission to the Union, such transportation can no longer be regarded as "overseas air transportation" and authority to grant reduced rates under section 403(b) is lacking.

Your committee adopted the recommendation of the Board but has limited the privilege to travel only between a place in Alaska or Hawaii on the one hand and a place in any of the other States, on the other hand. This amendment would not permit or authorize the carriage of military furlough traffic at reduced rates to or from any other place in the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 4049) was read the third time and passed.

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1329, H.R. 10474, which is to be the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10474) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

NEW YORK HIGH SCHOOL SENIOR WINS AMERICAN LEGION AWARD

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, each year the American Legion, as part of its Americanism program, conducts a nationwide high school oratorical contest through its 50 departments. This contest is approved by the National Association of Secondary School Principals who assist in the organization and judging of the contest. This year more than 350,000 high school students competed in 12 basic regions. The subject was a phase of the Constitution of the United States chosen by the student.

The winner of regional No. 2 contest, covering New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, is Frank J. Buono, of Binghamton, N.Y. This 17-year-old high school senior selected as the title of his oration, "The Framing Fathers and the Constitution." This is a most laudable achievement and I congratulate the young man.

I ask unanimous consent that this oration be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the oration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FRAMING FATHERS AND THE CONSTITUTION

On a beautiful Sunday afternoon, last summer, I had the rare privilege of visiting a shrine. I visited the national shrine dedicated to free men everywhere—Independence Hall in Philadelphia, Pa. There, in the scenic grandeur of Independence Square, in the heart of the modern city, I gazed upon the birthplace of the Constitution of the United States of America. And as I looked upon the simple splendor of the red brick statehouse. I thought about the men who made history there. And as I thought about their inspiring lives and of the seemingly hopeless task before them, I suddenly realized that here, on this very spot, was the beginning of the contribution which they made to their country, and to posterity. They gave us the Constitution of the United States.

Here it was, then, in the quiet, graceful surroundings of 18th century colonial America, that they met in a period considered the most critical time in the history of our Nation. And as I entered the assembly hall, I thought I heard a voice. It spoke: "Gentlemen, we have emerged from the Revolutionary War. Victory is ours and we have gained our freedom. Shall be now destroy what we have won? The Thirteen Colonies are operating under different forms of colonial government. We are separated by social and economic differences. The feeling of national unity, born within us during the war years, has now changed to jealousy and hate. There are threats of rebellion everywhere. The colonies are looking to us, the delegates to this Constitutional Convention, to save them and our young Nation from disaster and ruin."

And as I looked about the room, I saw Benjamin Franklin, inventor, philosopher, and wise man. I saw James Madison, Virginia lawyer, the Father of the Constitution. I saw Alexander Hamilton, genius in all matters of finance. I saw George Washington, soldier, statesman, leader of men. And I saw Charles Pinckney, James Randolph, planters from Virginia, farmers, businessmen, Catholics, Protestants, rich men, poor men.

And I thought about those long, hot afternoons, in the summer of 1787, when tempers flared and men made threats; when political beliefs and social differences made the task seem hopeless indeed; when the delegates discovered that the Articles of Confederation, whatever amendments they might contain, would be inadequate to establish a strong central government; when they cast aside the original purpose of the Convention and proceeded to form an entirely new government. I thought of the pleading and the disappointment, and the heartbreak, too, made bearable only by the sturdy faith of those patriots who cast aside all differences and finally, through compromise and understanding—and because of the common bond that existed in their hearts for freedom and the right of the individual—brought forth the Constitution of the United States of America.

And all at once I knew, as I stood there, that here was a document the like of which the world has never known. The great English statesman, William Gladstone, once called the Constitution of the United States the most wonderful work ever struck off at one time by the brain and purpose of man. It had not been wrested by force from a despot king, nor did it develop over the years by trial and error. But rather, here was a document that grew from the spiritual depths of the people themselves, without any previous experience and training in self-government, without indeed any other guidance but the desire of men to be free. It established the first great order in the age-old chaos of politics. It arose out of all classes and subjected them to an equal law. It wiped out all social casts, and thenceforth no one was called lord or master, and no one remained superior or inferior to his neighbor except by the natural and desirable distinctions of virtue, heroism, and intellect. Here was a document, conservative in that it clung steadfastly to the spirit of liberty, yet elastic enough to meet the ever-changing aspects of society and human nature, a document with a system of checks and balances and a control shared by the States, the Federal Government, and by the people themselves.

Our Founding Fathers created for posterity the very best that mankind, till then, had been able to offer. For did not they mold into this one glorious document the democracy of the Greeks, the freedom of the Romans, the principles of the Magna Charta? Yes, the work of the Framing Fathers was completed.

Since then, we have grown from one of the smallest nations of the world to be one of the greatest and the most populous. We have grown richer than all the rest of mankind. Our skyscraper towers rise higher in the clouds than man could ever have dreamed, and deeper than the ocean floor lie the beds of our inexhaustible mines. Our endless roadways web this vast continent of the earth and our ships plow through all its waters.

But, ladies and gentlemen, as I stood there, 172 years later, in spite of these material accomplishments, I suddenly became aware of the problems which we face in 1960 America—juvenile delinquency, disobedience to our laws, intolerance of the rights of men of all races and creeds. To assist us in the solution of these problems, we need the inspiration of these men of yesterday. And I feel that, as their spirit moved me, so must we, as a nation be inspired by these great men. They stand in the unbroken line of patriots whose personal sacrifice and devotion to country must be an inspiration to those of us who live. Let us make better use of our heritage. Let us protect these fundamental rights of men, so hard won and so generously provided for by our Framing Fathers. We have inherited from them a priceless possession—the Constitution of the United States. It is their monument to freedom. It is the gift of their noble hearts to us. But it is also a most sacred obligation. Now it is our turn. It is our duty to pass it on, intact, to future generations.

Let us keep the faith of the Framing Fathers of the Constitution. If we keep that faith—and if this be our motto, "In God is our trust," then, the banner of free men forever shall wave o'er this land of the free, this home of the brave.

FRANK J. BUONO.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have always taken great pride in the leadership of the University of Minnesota in the program of international educational exchange. As with the private colleges of Minnesota, the university has demonstrated a thorough understanding of the role of the American college and university in creating a more vigorous and meaningful American foreign policy.

Among recent comments on the international education exchange program, few have so much information and display so much insight into the exchange program as the University of Minnesota Alumni News, April 1960 issue.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from several of the articles prepared for this issue of the Minnesota Alumni News.

I call these articles to the attention of my colleagues as an illustration of the vigorous role being played by university leaders in developing broader understanding and cooperation among people.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

(By J. L. Morrill, president, University of Minnesota)

The migration of scholars from one country to study in another is not new.

Not only in the Middle Ages, with their sometimes roving scholastic guilds of masters and students in the Western World, but also in the ancient Asian universities it occurred. Historians have noted the export of Buddhism to China and other Asian countries by Chinese students in large numbers who sojourned in India between the fifth and seventh centuries, principally at the famed University of Nalanda. In China itself, beginning with the seventh century there were outstanding cosmopolitan universities with student migrants from Siberia, India, Greece, Arabia, Persia, and Japan.

Nearer to our own day, have been the hundreds upon hundreds of American scholars who flocked to the great German universities of the 19th century for graduate study, and the long procession of Rhodes Scholars at Oxford from this country, for example.

But there were slender precedents to the worldwide educational exchange which has followed upon World War II. How many thousands of students, scholars, and scientists from how many lands in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America are now in the universities and technical institutes in Soviet Russia we do not know with any accuracy. But the flood of some 50,000 foreign students on American campuses today far surpasses our prewar experience—and the number of American students and teachers in the universities and governmental missions overseas exceeds almost infinitely any prewar exodus of this kind.

Truly the educational world of today has become one world beyond anything we have ever known.

All this we welcome, for it has been always the instinct of universities to recognize that knowledge transcends national boundaries and that the quest for, and the fellowship of, learning are universal. Deeply we have believed and understood with men and women everywhere, of every race, religion, and color, that learning above all else can contribute best to "the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind"; and that "it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed," as it was declared in the first sentence of the constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

The University of Minnesota today is a different and better, a more significant and productive institution by reason of the nearly 1,000 students and teachers and researchers from other lands, and by reason of our working partnership with the National University of Seoul and far-off Korea.

We are confronted with new challenges to which the universities of this and every other nation are just beginning to respond. International educational exchange, I deeply believe, is at the threshold of a new destiny and vastly greater dimensions which we must strive better to perceive and must endeavor more usefully to realize.

GOPHERS COMPOSE OUR INTERNATIONAL ALUMNI

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In April 1958 the University of Minnesota received a grant from the Carnegie Corp. of New York to make a study of continuing relationships with our foreign alumni. Forrest G. Moore, 1946, M.A., 1953, Ph. D., adviser to foreign students at the university since 1946, had the opportunity to visit alumni in 13 Asian countries, the United Arab Republic and Greece. Here he tells what he found in the way of alumni interest and something of the nature of the problems and challenges faced by our alumni overseas.)

"Don't make us oversea orphans, please."

This plea was voiced by a young Minnesota-trained scientist, back in his home country since 1958.

What does he mean? What do our oversea alumni expect of us?

It was questions like these that led the University of Minnesota to express an interest in undertaking a study of its oversea alumni in an attempt to determine what needs to be done to retain the institution's contacts with them.

From December 1958 to March 1959 I visited—in their homes and on the job—268 former students of the university. About half of the group visited were able to take time to respond to questions about their feelings of the importance of maintaining contact, and to express their ideas about how we can best accomplish this purpose. Fifty-two were interviewed at length in an attempt to determine the problems of maintaining the contact as well as the benefits which could result from maintenance. Their responses were encouraging, provocative, and practical.

From the cautious reminder that "the university should not build up hope for something that can't be done" to the cryptic comment that "continued communication with the experts in one's own field is essential to the serious researcher's existence," the responses backed enthusiastically the importance of maintaining contact with oversea alumni.

In a number of instances the feeling was expressed that the attention being paid to this idea is long overdue. Those alumni who attended the university in the twenties—and there were a number of these oldtimers in the Philippines, Taiwan, and India—spoke of President L. D. Coffman's visits to alumni around the world in 1931–32 and waxed nostalgic about their days at Minnesota.

The purpose behind such contact and the means by which the relationships may be maintained are much less agreed upon. The problems of keeping the relationship personal, valuable, and free of political overtones are undisputed. The more recent returnees speak of the importance of keeping up professional contacts. They see this as a channel through which they can give their major advisers a sense of the problems they face in putting their training into practice and at the same time keeping themselves up to date in their fields.

Here and there an alumnus, not quite satisfied with his own performance or his professional advancement, spoke of the value of the morale support which contact gives, and a few alumni hold the view that the parent university must follow up its alumni to evaluate accurately the outcome of university training.

It was tremendously encouraging to see these alumni on the job, many of them holding positions of power and responsibility that will do much to shape the view of human values and economic policies, affecting the lives of millions of people, in the decades ahead. Their dedication to their work, the professional skill with which they are solving problems and the enthusiasm with which they face these problems is inspiring to see. The university can be justly proud of the role it has played in their education for leadership.

And this leadership is evident in every country visited. In Japan their leadership is most evident in the field of education, but many of those who studied at the university during the last 12 years are now working in ministries of the government.

With the resurgence of Japanese industry and the reappearance of their industrial products on the international market, American-trained Japanese find their services in demand in the large corporations with oversea customers. Andrew Nakamura, 1947, B.M.E., 1948, M.S. and M.E., missed my visit to Japan because he was on a business trip accompanying the president of his company to the United States and South America. Another alumnus had recently moved to France as an officer in the Paris branch of the Bank of Japan.

In Turkey, Greece, and Iran, the alumni groups, though small (20–30) in number, are making effective contributions in colleges and universities and in government agencies in the fields of public health, medicine, and engineering. In each of these countries, individual alumni often are working in enterprises that maximize their effectiveness as internationally trained experts.

These include foundations, private business firms, and educational institutions that are, in effect, mutually sponsored by in-country and American interests. The positions of influence and importance these alumni hold are evidence of the cordial reception given to American-trained foreign students.

These alumni also are being called on to serve as experts in other foreign countries. Alumni from Iran, Pakistan, and the United Arab Republic have served with UNESCO Missions in other African and Asian countries in projects attempting to overcome the debilitating effects of illiteracy and disease.

In Korea, the number of alumni has risen rapidly because of the university's contract with Seoul National University. More than 200 individuals have been trained in this program during the 5 years of operation ending October 19, 1959, and the presence of Minnesota-trained agriculturalists, engineers, and physicians is becoming the dominant force in education in Korea. Alumni say that the reputation of Harvard and Columbia as the universities to attend in the United States is being overshadowed by that of Minnesota.

Taiwan-located alumni are a combination of oldtimers and recent returnees. The president of the Minnesota Club at the time of my visit to Taiwan, Mr. Shu-Ming Lin, received a bachelor of science degree from the school of architecture in 1920. His brother, Sze Chen Lin, 1922, E.M., 1923, M.S., studied geology under Professor Grout. Still another early alumnus is President Yuan-Tsai Tu of Taiwan Provincial Normal University and another, Ching-Po Sun, 1925, B.S. Ag., 1926, M.S., heads the department of agricultural engineering at National Taiwan University.

Among the more recent alumni are five who work on the Joint Commission of Rural Reconstruction, which has established a pattern of economy and effectiveness in the use of American aid for improvement in agriculture in Taiwan. Dr. Y. S. Tsiang, 1940, M.S., 1945, Ph. D., an advisee of Professor Emeritus Herbert K. Hayes in agronomy, is secretary-general.

The alumni group in Taiwan is a well organized and active group. Dr. J. L. Wong,

1922, D.D.S., and C. Y. Wu, a 1950 graduate in agricultural economics, are among its enthusiastic members, both active in getting a club established on Taiwan after the retreat from the mainland in 1948–50.

Minnesotans who visit Taiwan are given a warm welcome as both Harold Stassen, 1927, B.A., 1929, LL.B., and Gov. Orville Freeman, 1940, B.A., 1946, LL.B., found during their visits to the Far East. Members of the alumni group are disappointed when visitors from Minnesota neglect to let them know of their arrival in Taipei, as they want to be brought up to date on the Minnesota news and have the opportunity to host Minnesota friends.

The Philippine alumni constituency is the largest organized oversea alumni group. In the Manila area alone, some 40 alumni meet regularly to renew Minnesota ties. Dr. Juan C. Orendain, 1918–20, well-known Manila attorney who attended both Minnesota and St. Thomas, has been the president of the club for the past 2 years. A directory of alumni of Big Ten universities is published and an annual meeting held Thanksgiving Day to install—as president of the Big Ten Alumni Association—the president of the alumni club of the university which wins the conference title in football.

"Johnny," as he is affectionately known among his associates, is hoping that one of these days a Philippine alumnus of Minnesota will be the president.

Alumni in the Philippines from Minnesota are heavily committed to leadership in education. About half of the 40 in the Manila area are teaching in colleges and universities or providing leadership in secondary education. Cesario Bandong, 1952, M.S., is principal of Torres High School, the largest in Manila with more than 8,000 students including those in evening classes.

Others serve on the faculties of the University of the Philippines in Quezon City and Laguna, Central Luzon Agricultural College, Central Philippine University, University of Santo Tomas, Wesleyan College, Philippine Normal College, Araneta University, University of the East, and Philippine Women's College. Still other alumni are serving in the fields of public health, dentistry, and medicine.

The alumni groups in Malaya, Burma, and Iraq are all post-World War II. Small in number—5 in Malaya, 13 in Burma, and 20 in Iraq—they have had no need or wish to organize as a group. Some of them have been in touch with each other informally, but in most instances, my visit brought a number of them together for the first time.

In Malaya, three of the five alumni had journalistic training. The effect of the British educational system for the United States trained, including the passing of University of Malaya examination as the only avenue of qualifying for a government job, was adversely commented upon by the alumni. Those educated in the United States are seldom able to obtain a government position.

A group of the oversea alumni recently had banded together in an effort to get the government to recognize degrees earned in the United States as equivalent to the degrees of the University of Malaya. An on-the-spot observer indicated that the group had made the mistake of trying to compel the government to recognize degrees from all American colleges and universities as equivalent.

Alumni in Malaya are not very positive about the importance of followup relationships. One alumnus indicated he felt that many changes would need to come to Malaya before continued affiliation with an American university would be of any value—a feeling that one would be better off if he had taken his higher education in Great Britain or if he hadn't, to keep quiet about it.

Burmese alumni are few in number but have had the opportunity to be very effective. U. Myint, 1954, M.S., a graduate in agricultural economics, serves as deputy secretary of the Agricultural Rural Development corporation. U Khin, 1951, M.A., is deputy director of information for the government, and Hla Aung, 1953, M.A., serves as executive secretary of the Burma Law Institute. All hold positions which allow them to take an active part in the developments taking place in Burma.

Alumni from Thailand all are located in Bangkok or Dhonburi, the twin cities on the Chao Pharya River. The first students from Thailand enrolled at Minnesota during World War II. Thailand, like the Philippines, sends many women to the United States since they often continue their careers after marriage. Numerous alumni have studied in the field of public health and the majority are employed in universities or in government posts.

There is an informal alumni organization with an alumnus named as convenor of the group. Two of the group have been prominent in government circles. Mrs. Nandaka Suprabhatananda is secretary to the mayor of Bangkok and Chalaw Vanaputi heads the Ministry of Interior.

In India, Pakistan, and Israel the alumni are graduates primarily in the fields of agriculture and engineering. The partition of Pakistan and India in 1948 has meant the wholesale relocation of alumni, and one result of my visit was to bring up-to-date university records on alumni in the Indian subcontinent.

One gets the feeling in both India and Pakistan that the graduates in agriculture surely hold the key to the future in these two countries. Their responsibilities are heavy.

Positions held by alumni in India include those of the joint director of agriculture in Mysore, Andhre Pradesh, and Uttar Pradesh, head of the Institute of Jute Technology in Calcutta and principal of the Assam Engineering College in Assam, to name only two. The Hyderbad alumni group includes three alumni who attended the university in the twenties and thirties.

Dr. L. G. Kulkarni, plant genetics, and Dr. Syed Vaheeduddin, plant pathology, received Ph. D.'s from Minnesota in 1934 and 1936, respectively, and the third, G. A. Dewaji, began his work at the university in 1922 and received his B.S. in mechanical engineering in 1926. His daughter, Miss Vera Dewaji, only recently returned to India from a year's study at Minnesota to take up work at the Institute of Preventive Medicine in Hyderbad.

Government offices and educational institutions in New Delhi employ 17 alumni of the university. Three graduates of Minnesota located in New Delhi are serving in important posts in the Ministry of Agriculture. They are Mohan P. Bhargava, 1946, M.S., concerned with community development and cooperatives; P. R. Mehta, 1948, Ph. D., plant protection quarantine and storage; and T. R. Mehta, 1948, Ph. D., farm extension work.

In Pakistan, as in India, many alumni are serving in the field of agriculture. Many Pakistan alumni came to the university as Indian Government scholars before partition. The more recent returnees studied mainly in engineering fields. Men in their early thirties, they are having the opportunity to pioneer new developments in a new country.

In West Pakistan A. A. Anwar, 1949, Ph. D., head of the microbiology department, and S. Z. Hasanain, 1948, Ph. D., head of the botany department, are both at the University of Karachi; and F. S. Hasan, 1954, M.S., 1957, Ph. D., and S. B. Ali, 1948, M.C.E., serve in the Ministry of Agriculture. Chowdhry Mohammed Rafique, 1950, Ph. D., at Rawalpindi works in the Soil Conservation Directorate. Others are located at Punjab Agriculture College, Lyallpur; Government Central College, Quetta; and in Lahore. All are among the alumni completing work at Minnesota since 1946.

Alumni in the United Arab Republic are an example of an influential group of alumni; young, vigorous, and with training of high quality. Fifteen of the twenty-two alumni in Cairo and Alexandria took Ph. D. degrees while in the United States and as a consequence are moving rapidly into positions of significance.

These are but a few of Minnesota's alumni found working in 80 countries around the world. In all 15 countries visited I found young men and women doing a dedicated and effective job in the struggle to improve the living standards, the health, and literacy of their people.

American alumni of the university also are at work in many of these countries. Oversea alumni look to the university for leadership in the field of higher education. They want and expect the university to maintain contacts with its graduates. They feel they have the right to be kept abreast of the university's development and to be able to call on professional colleagues in the university for advice and assistance.

They expect and wish to demonstrate by personal example the vitality and the effectiveness of an education obtained at the University of Minnesota. They need our help.

Minnesota's Foreign Student Program—A Story of Progress

(By Forrest G. Moore, foreign student adviser)

Fall 1959, 284 new students from overseas began classes for the first time on the University of Minnesota campus.

They joined approximately 600 others who had been at Minnesota from 1 quarter to about 5 years, studying in 117 different graduate fields and in most of the undergraduate colleges.

Eighteen in every one hundred are women, 36 percent are married, but only 52 percent of those married have family members with them in this country.

India, China, Korea, and Canada each send more than 100 students to the campus. More than 20 students each are registered in the fields of agronomy and plant genetics, entomology, analytical chemistry, civil, chemical, electrical, and mechanical engineering, business administration, economics, English, internal medicine, and surgery.

The interplay of ideas which takes place between American and foreign students, as these young people from overseas seek an education on our campus today, is the result of an early and sustained interest at Minnesota in oversea students.

In the first published calendar of the university (1874–75), students from Nova Scotia, Canada and Denmark, were listed alongside those in the Dacotah Territory and Texas. By 1912–13, 30 foreign students from 13 countries took their place among an enrollment of 3,414. The first student from oversea to receive a Ph. D. from the graduate school, Sakyo Kanda of Japan, completed his work at the university in 1915.

A U.S. Office of Education bulletin issued in 1921 mentions Minnesota as one of 74 educational institutions offering courses of special interest to foreign students. Agriculture, medicine, dentistry, geology and chemistry were listed as the schools and departments with strong courses.

That year, 45 oversea students were registered at Minnesota and the university ranked 20th among all the schools in the country in the number of foreign students enrolled.

The university very early indicated an interest in providing special assistance for the oversea student. The Regents' Minutes for December 13, 1921, carried a notation of the appointment of H. J. Leonard 1912 D.D.S.,

1915 B.A., of the School of Dentistry, as Adviser to Foreign Students. In 1925–26, J. B. Johnston, chairman of a special committee on Freshman Week, recommended that a special "committee on advice and help for foreign students" be appointed.

By 1927–28, the number of oversea students had reached 198. The late Alfred E. Koenig 1910 M.A., then secretary of the Minneapolis YMCA, spent many hours during these years working with oversea students. He was a member of the committee on foreign students, chaired by the late E. M. Freeman 1898 B.S., 1899 M.S., 1905 Ph. D., then dean of the College of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics, which authored a report that received the approval and endorsement of the university senate and President L. D. Coffman in 1931. The report called for the establishment of an office to assist foreign students, and recommended that the dean of women and dean of men maintain centralized records on foreign students.

From 1931–35 C. P. Barnum, 1904, B.A., offered creative leadership to the university's work with foreign students. The Rotary Club of Minneapolis financed the program for 3 years and in 1934–35 the Carnegie Corp. of New York made a grant to continue the project.

During this period the university received the Education Medal for distinguished service in promoting international goodwill and understanding, awarded by the Federation Interalliée des Anciens Combattants (International Body of War Veterans).

The depression years, followed by the years of tension in Europe, combined to deemphasize the importance of work with foreign students and from 1936–46 the adviser to foreign students worked on a part-time basis under the administrative leadership first of Prof. Harold S. Quigley in the International Relations Bureau, and then under E. G. Williamson, 1931, Ph. D., dean of students.

During these years Prof. Asher N. Christensen, 1924, B.A. (1936–42), Aldus C. Smith, 1944, Ph. D. (1942–44), and John D. Foley, 1940, B.A. (1944–46), served as advisers to foreign students.

Through most of this period and until her death in 1957 Mrs. Mary Frances Pierce, secretary to deans of the graduate school from 1914–39, took an active interest in oversea students, both as a part of her work in the graduate school office and through her interest and sponsorship of the Cosmopolitan Club. This group played a vital role in bringing together American and foreign students to work on common problems and discuss ideas of mutual interest from its inception on the campus in 1911 until the late forties.

As a result of the attention given exchange of students with Latin America early in World War II, in 1941–42 the Regents—at the recommendation of Professor Christensen—voted to authorize two tuition scholarships from Latin American students.

Graduate Dean T. C. Blegen 1912, B.A. 1915, M.A. 1925, Ph.D. in 1942, was designated chairman of the committee to administer these scholarships and during the ensuing 18 years Blegen and many members of the original committee (Professors E. C. Stakman 1906, B.A. 1910, M.A. 1913, Ph.D., Christensen, F. B. Barton 1917–19 and Williamson) were to furnish incisive and creative leadership to the university's mounting commitment to the implementation of the purposes and ideals of international educational interchange.

In June, 1945, at the urging of the committee on Latin American scholarships, President W. C. Coffey charged the committee with the responsibility of surveying the entire situation of both undergraduate and graduate foreign students and the role of the university in their education.

This committee transmitted to President J. L. Morrill in August, 1945, a comprehensive report which was to serve as the guide to development of the foreign student program at the university in years to come. In July, 1946, President Morrill acted on one of the committee's urgent recommendations by authorizing sufficient funds to employ a full-time foreign student adviser.

The action was none too soon since the end of World War II brought to this country an influx of foreign students which sharply increased their enrollment at the university.

In addition to urging the appointment of a full-time adviser, the committee of foreign students proposed the adoption of a statement on university policy regarding educational facilities for foreign students. The statement, which was timely and farsighted in its implications, reads in part:

The University of Minnesota recognizes that a great university builds and enhances its scholarly standing and prestige not only through educating students from its own native State and from other parts of the United States, but also through educating those from many foreign countries. This is equally true in all fields of professional, scientific, and cultural study. For this and other related reasons, the university encourages and actively seeks to increase the enrollment of foreign students in its undergraduate, professional, and graduate colleges. Consistent with the diversified requisites of an educational program balanced for both American and foreign students, the university further undertakes to make fully available its facilities—instructional, cultural, counseling and housing—in educating foreign students and in forwarding their personal welfare while enrolled as students in the university.

The performance of the initial Latin American students awarded scholarships was impressive and the committee advocated and was authorized to increase the number of scholarships to 6, 12, 30, and then, in 1948, to 40. In 1946 the Latin American Scholarship Committee became the Foreign Student Committee and the benefits of the tuition scholarships were extended to students from all countries.

Foundations also have come to the assistance of the university in providing financial aid. Since 1952 the John Cowles Foundation annually has provided funds for fellowships for Asian students and in 1959 this interest was broadened to include students from Africa. Since their inception, these fellowships have been used to aid 130 students from 11 countries studying for graduate degrees.

American students on campus have made significant contributions to the financial support of the programs for the interchange of information and experience between U.S. and foreign students. Since 1951 at least one student from the university has studied at the Free University of Berlin and in return, a student from Berlin has spent a year on the university campus.

An additional demonstration of the vitality of student leadership saw the arrival on the campus in 1956 of a student leader from both Indonesia and Japan. This program, now in its fourth year of operation, is supported jointly by student organizations, the university and the National Student Association.

The importance of foreign students on campus as a facet in the education of American students was stressed in the 1945 report of the Committee on Foreign Students. In 1950–51 Minnesota students launched an American brother-sister program. Specially trained American students assisted newly arrived foreign students in becoming familiar with the demands and the potential of American university life. Each year more than 100 American students are selected and take part in this program. They are selected on the basis of special interests ranging from the language and culture of the oversea student to preparation for oversea employment.

As the number of students from overseas increased the university became more cognizant of its role in their training. An internationally minded university community is indicated by the increasing number of faculty members from overseas on the staff. Many faculty members go abroad on sabbatical leave or on special projects (35 spent from 3 months to a year overseas in 1958–59 and 38 leaves of absence have been granted during the 1959–60 academic year).

Special programs such as the Minnesota-Seoul National University relationship under the sponsorship of the International Cooperation Administration insure that a number of the university's best minds devote some time assisting in the solution of the problems of educating for leadership in the underdeveloped countries of the world.

All of these developments have found an atmosphere of ready acceptance on the Minnesota campus; welcome supplements to the academic experience of the classroom and laboratory. For the test of greatness here—as in any university—is the quality of its faculty. The foreign student comes to the campus because of the scientific excellence exemplified by men such as E. C. Stakman, to name only one of the pioneers in the shaping of a university of international reputation.

During the 1958–59 calendar year more than 1,100 foreign students studied at the university. During the same period, 184 completed degrees, 46 received the Ph. D., and 110 were awarded the master's degree between July 1, 1958, and June 30, 1959. Two of every three foreign graduate students who register at the university take an advanced degree and fewer than 10 percent fail to maintain satisfactory records while attending.

HEALTH CARE FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recent articles in labor newspapers give excellent perspective on the anxiety of our senior citizens about the terrifying costs of health care and private health insurance for older people.

One article, appearing in the April 14 issue of the Machinist, a publication of the International Association of Machinists, is entitled "A Tragedy of Old Age." The second article, which appeared in the AFL–CIO News of April 9, is entitled "Health Insurance Too High for Aged."

I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Machinist, April 14, 1960]

A TRAGEDY OF OLD AGE

(By Dr. William A. Sawyer)

One doesn't have to be a doctor very long without realizing that older folks have frequent medical needs which they haven't the money to pay for. Many doctors take care of such people without charging them anything. This has been a tradition of the medical profession—never to refuse treatment even though the patient could not afford to pay.

Even though older folks have read that doctors will take care of them for nothing, few would have the courage to ask for it.

Despite the statement in the press by the president of the American Medical Associa-

tion that doctors have been willing for years to treat all patients regardless of their ability to pay, this hardly seems the dignified answer to such a large and increasing problem. I do not believe that doctors generally would relish this as the answer.

If everyone had voluntary prepaid insurance that was never canceled, there would be no need for something like the Forand bill. There are too many old folks past 65 who have inadequate insurance protection for their later years. From testimony given to the McNamara Committee on the Problems of the Aged, there is ample evidence of need. Whether the Forand bill is the best answer is beside the point. Something like it is urgently required.

One man writes, "I have two sore stiff hip joints and lower spine. I cannot walk up the steps. I cannot raise my feet. The doctors do not seem to know my trouble. I walk only with the back of a chair. I can't put any weight on my sore hip joints. The neighbors bring in something to eat. Have no social security. Have nothing, so I am asking your help. Thank you."

This is not an uncommon letter. I get them frequently. The need for medical care for those past 65 is a pressing problem, and there are going to be more old people.

Organized medicine's opposition to an orderly way, such as the Forand bill, of handling such problems is unrealistic. They say these people ought to ask for welfare relief. To obtain this aid the recipient must prove his poverty, often to the point of taking a pauper's oath. In many States they must assign their homes, and sell their cars.

Organized labor rejects this recommendation. They say it is unjust that they go on relief after retirement from a lifetime of work. Through such a provision of social security as the Forand bill, they could have medical and hospital care when they need it, by paying in during their working years.

Many of these over 65 can get along fairly well until illness comes into the picture.

This is illustrated by the fact that one of the major causes of hospital deficits is the inability of those over 65 to pay their hospital bills. One witness before the McNamara committee said that "this cost is now socialized by united community funds, other charity funds, individual donations, and subsidy from local, State, and Federal taxes. Meeting the cost through the insurance provisions of the Federal social security system is merely a more orderly and efficient way of meeting this already accepted social obligation."

[From the AFL–CIO News, Apr. 9, 1960]

HEALTH INSURANCE TOO HIGH FOR AGED

(By Sidney Margolius)

Most older people can't afford even the best of the new hospital and surgical insurance plans currently being offered them. This department's survey of "over-65" plans finds that the problem of medical insurance for senior citizens is simply too big for private companies or voluntary associations to solve.

The only feasible solution yet proposed is the use of the present social security machinery as provided by the Forand bill now pending in Congress. That way we would deposit a quarter a week in the social security piggybank during our working years and our employers would chip in another quarter, to pay for hospital and surgical needs when we retire.

Here are the financial facts of retirement:

1. It now costs about $205 a month for a retired couple to have a modest standard of living in a typical U.S. city, as based on data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Community Council of Greater New York. This is a modest budget providing for a three-room apartment, about a dollar a day per person for food, and approximately $15 to $17 a month in most cities for medical care. The medical allotment worked out by welfare experts takes 8 percent of the modest model budget compared to the 5 to 6 percent most younger families spend.

2. Most elderly people can't afford even this modest budget. Actually three out of five older people have less than $1,000 a year money income from all sources, compared to the welfare council budget of about $2,400 a year for a couple or $1,700 for a single person. Even the current maximum social security of $170 to a couple can't meet this modest budget with its medical allotment outlay of $15 to $17.

You want to know how much retired persons really can afford for medical care? Two-thirds of the people over 65 interviewed in a survey by the Health Information Foundation said they could pay just $5 a month for insurance that covered all medical expenses.

3. Even if you could afford $15 to $17 a month, the best of the plans now available would take most of your medical-care allotment and not begin to meet all your medical needs.

The retired worker's dilemma is that the purportedly cheap medical insurance being offered him provides only very limited benefits, but more adequate insurance is too costly.

For example, the plan now being offered by the American Association of Retired Persons costs a couple $144 a year if you include partial insurance for doctors' visits outside the hospital. Yet the model budget provides only about $200 a year for all medical care. This must pay for dentists, drugs, eyeglasses and other needs, as well as that part of the surgical, hospital, and doctor expenses not covered by the insurance. For example, the AARP plan, like the similar "65 plus" plan being promoted by the Continental Insurance Co., pays only $10 a day for hospital care compared to actual typical charges of $20.

Another plan for insuring elderly people for hospital and surgical care is being tried out by Blue Shield in Wisconsin, reports the Group Health Association. It costs $9 a month per person, or $216 a year for a couple—more than the entire medical allotment in the modest model budget. Despite this large cost, it provides only $10 a day for hospital care, although unlike the AARP plan it does pay for all miscellaneous hospital expenses, not just part.

A third possibility for the hospital insurance part of medical care is the Blue Cross senior plans spreading through the country. So far, 19 Blue Cross regional plans now offer a special "Senior Certificate." This calls for either a higher rate or reduced benefits at the same rate for people over 65. Fourteen additional Blue Cross regions have no restriction at all on age. Two do have an age limitation but periodically open membership lists to people over 65. Eight additional plans have applied to their State insurance departments for approval of a senior certificate.

This trend is desirable if Congress again refuses to pass the Forand bill. People already retired or expecting to be soon should first see what the local Blue Cross offers before signing up for commercial hospital insurance.

Yet even the best of the Blue Cross plans are still too costly for most retired people. For example, Cleveland's Blue Cross is considered an outstanding plan because it makes no extra charge for age, and provides relatively generous benefits. It provides 120 days of hospital care including full payment for all extras such as X-rays, plus hospital outpatient care and minor surgery. But the cost is $69.60 a year in a ward for one person, or $140 for a family. (Family cost for semiprivate accommodations is $165.) That would take two-thirds of the entire medical-care budget in the modest model budget.

Some of the new Blue Cross senior plans trim the cost by coinsurance, meaning you pay part of the bill. Detroit's "senior certificate," for example, provides 30 days payment for hospital care for each confinement. You pay the first $25 or 20 percent of the first $500 of hospital cost, whichever is greatest. Maximum payment is $500. Over that, you pay the bill itself. The cost is $125 a year for a couple.

POLISH INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on May 3 Poles everywhere celebrated Polish Independence Day. As many of my colleagues know, this historic day is somewhat parallel to our own Fourth of July.

There are few peoples, Mr. President, who have shown the courage and determination that the Poles have in times of adversity. They have had a long history of oppression, and yet the Poles have never lost their sense of identity and their resolve to be the masters of their own fate.

It is particularly important that we reflect on the meaning of this day as we approach the summit meeting. I strongly urge the President to make it clear to Mr. Khrushchev that we do not accept the status quo in Eastern Europe. We must continually press the Russians to live up to their wartime agreement to guarantee free elections in the Eastern European countries.

I am sure that my colleagues here join me in asserting our strong identification with the hopes and aspirations of the Poles and other enslaved peoples. We hope and believe that one day they will live in freedom again.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on May 3, 1960, the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] placed in the RECORD an article written by the distinguished columnist Arthur Krock entitled "An Unsound Basis for Foreign Policy," and undertook to speak in support of Mr. Krock's position, which was highly critical of a number of Members of this body.

On the same day, Mr. President, six Members of the Senate—the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]—addressed a letter to the New York Times defending ourselves for the position we had taken. I am happy to say that the New York Times published that letter this morning, and I asked unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1960.

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: May we take exception to our good friend Arthur Krock's May 3 column "An Unsound Basis for Foreign Policy." In that column, Mr. Krock seemingly undertakes to impugn the motives and deride

the judgment of the Members of Congress who successfully supported an amendment to the policy statement of the Mutual Security Act so that it shall provide:

1. That the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations.

2. The peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive mutual security aid wage economic warfare against each other.

3. These principles shall be applied in administering the mutual security program as the President may determine.

This declaration is one of the "sense" of the Congress—it tells the President how strongly we feel on the subject, but does not and cannot tie his hands in directing the mutual security program or the foreign policy of the United States. It is a declaration on a moral and legal issue of universal application and such importance that Congress could not just let it slide.

These provisions were approved by the House of Representatives without significant debate. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee did not include them in the Senate bill. They were restored by a floor amendment sponsored by Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and 28 colleagues from both parties. The amendment was supported by a bipartisan majority of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, all four Democratic presidential candidates, and by all eight Senators from the States of Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania where readership of the Times is extensive.

The purpose of the proposal is to urge the President, in administering foreign aid, to try to secure compliance with the principles of freedom of navigation and economic cooperation to which we all subscribe. President Nasser, in clear violation of the Suez Canal Convention of 1888 and of the 1951 decision of the United Nations Security Council and of the pledge he made when he nationalized the Suez Canal in 1956, has repudiated these principles. He has not only prohibited Israeli shipping from using the canal, but also prevented ships flying the flags of other nations from utilizing the canal if they carried cargo for or from Israel.

The report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs correctly states that the committee "believes the United States has not done as effective a job as it should have in urging the removal of the restrictions on the free movement of commerce through the canal."

The Congress, by its vote, evidenced its belief that the action taken would advance the attainment of the agreed goal of opening the Suez Canal to the shipping of all nations.

Mr. Krock, Mr. Dillon, and Senator FULBRIGHT disagree, as they have every right to do. But surely they are not gifted with the omniscience to predict that the amendment "will assure the defeat of (its sponsors') objective." Nor does it aid their cause to attempt to read the minds of its sponsors and to find therein motivations of "domestic politics" created by "minority pressure groups." And the effort to identify Congressional action with labor union picketing of Arab shipping—with which of course it has nothing whatever to do—is specious to put it mildly.

No one in the Senate debate contended that American ships have been denied access to the Suez Canal. So Mr. Krock's quotation of Mr. Dillon to this effect is merely to destroy a straw man he himself has erected.

That the foreign aid program demands reorganization, as Senator COOPER suggests, few would deny. But this truism can hardly be transposed into an argument in opposition to action by Congress in favor of moral principles incorporated into international law which men of good will across the world support.

Very truly yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.
JOSEPH S. CLARK.
J. K. JAVITS.
HUGH SCOTT.
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.
THOMAS J. DODD.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN TABER AND THE HONORABLE EMANUEL CELLER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, away back when the House of Representatives declared its "Capitol gains" for 1922, two of the names mentioned were those of JOHN TABER and EMANUEL CELLER. Now, 38 years later, these two "Capitol gains" are listed as national monuments of the Congress—active, mobile, operational and cogitational monuments, moving too fast to be admired by sightseer.

I rise today to extend birthday wishes to each of these congressional giants. JOHN TABER celebrated his 80th birthday yesterday, and EMANUEL CELLER celebrates his 72d birthday today.

Representative TABER is the senior Republican on the New York delegation, and Representative CELLER is the senior Democrat. They came to Congress together. Their length of service in the other body is exceeded only by the service of the Speaker and of Representative VINSON, of Georgia.

During my years in the House of Representatives I grew to respect and to admire these two elder statesmen of our Congress. It is true that "MANNY" CELLER and I often put on the gloves of debate and slugged it out toe to toe, but I also recall many times when we fought together shoulder to shoulder for the principles in which we both believed. Parenthetically, anyone would say it is much better to fight with "MANNY" than against him, for in 38 years of intellectual sparring he has learned all of the tricks, and he has invented some of his own.

JOHN TABER, of course, is of my political persuasion, but there have been times when I felt persuasion that JOHN did not feel, and vice versa. Our few differences have been what I might call scattered pockets of resistance in a broad field of agreement—after all, how can one differ very strenuously with a man whose name is a synonym for budgetary integrity?

JOHN TABER has been a tower of strength in maintaining our Nation's fiscal sanity, and in fighting for those causes which he felt would best benefit America. No one at any time has ever questioned his sincerity or his integrity.

The birthdays belong to JOHN TABER and "MANNY" CELLER, but their districts, their Nation, their colleagues, and their friends receive the gifts—gifts of their long and distinguished dedication to the tasks of government; gifts of their mind and judgment; and gifts of time and sacrifice and devotion which they have given freely over the years; and, above all, to those who know them, to those of us who have worked with them, they have given the supreme gift of friendship, the gift we cherish and look forward to enjoying for many, many years to come.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished acting minority leader in the kind words he has had to say about the birthday anniversaries of Representatives TABER and CELLER, both of New York.

As the acting minority leader will recall, we both served in the House with these two gentlemen; and while they belong to opposite parties, and while their views are on most occasions quite divergent, nevertheless, each, in his own way, has made a solid contribution to the welfare of the district he represents, the State from which he comes, and the Nation as a whole. So it is a pleasure and privilege for me to join with my distinguished friend the Senator from New York in extending best wishes and congratulations to these two outstanding Members of the Congress.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I express my gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Montana for his kind words. I know that they will be greatly appreciated by the two fine gentlemen to whom we have referred, both of whom, I am sure, bear, as I do, a deep affection and admiration for the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We, too, and many others have learned much from both of these two outstanding Members of Congress, and the country as a whole owes them both a debt of gratitude.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I join the distinguished Senator from New York and the distinguished Senator from Montana in expressing congratulations and commendations to our colleagues in the House of Representatives, Representatives JOHN TABER and EMANUEL CELLER. I have never had the honor of serving with them in the House. I have come to know them, however, and to admire and respect them. I think it can be said of them that they have been giants in the legislative process, and that they are men whose integrity is respected in the Congress and elsewhere throughout the country. They are indeed great and patriotic Americans.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to express my gratitude to my friend from Kentucky for his fine words about the two distinguished Members of the other body from New York. I know that they would share with me the feeling that the fact that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has not had the privilege of serving with them in the House is the House's loss. I know I can speak for them in reciprocating toward our friend from Kentucky all the very fine things he has said about these two distinguished gentlemen.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to commend the Senate for the outstanding work it has accom-

plished this week. When I say "commend the Senate," I include both Republicans and Democrats.

We have passed to date something on the order of six or seven appropriation bills. We recently passed the bank merger bill and the area redevelopment bill. We passed this week 57 bills on the call of the calendar. We disposed of two conference reports, in connection with the appropriation bills for the Commerce Department and the Department of the Interior. We have also passed a mutual security bill, and will have the conference report before us before too long. We also passed a space bill, with an authorization for an appropriation covering a sizable sum.

It is anticipated that in the days ahead the Senate will take action on wage-hour legislation, on medical aid, and on a Federal employees' pay increase. We hope to pass a good farm bill, a good housing bill, and a good social security bill. I dare say that from the Committee on the Judiciary will come an immigration bill.

So, on the basis of the record made so far, and especially on the basis of the record made this week, I think the Senate is to be commended for the application and the diligence it has shown, as well as for the legislation itself; and certainly, before this session is completed, we shall take care of the other measures to which I have called the attention of the Senate.

I think special credit should go to the majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and to the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. They worked together in bringing much of this legislation before the Senate for consideration; and because of the fact that they were able to work out agreements covering the bringing up of these measures, Congress as a whole is entitled to credit for the good work done this week.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, May 9, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 6, 1960:

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Cornelius W. Wickersham, Jr., of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of New York for the term of 4 years, vice Leonard P. Moore, resigned.

Louis B. Blissard, of Hawaii, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Hawaii for the term of 4 years, vice a new position.

U.S. MARSHAL

Thomas R. Clark, of Hawaii, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Hawaii for the term of 4 years, vice a new position.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

I. FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior surgeon

Henry H. Kyle

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Robert J. Lucas
Joe T. Hillsman
Samuel J. Wycoff
Francis O. Webb

To be assistant dental surgeons

Charles C. Swoope, Jr.
Gerald W. Gaston
William E. Dorrill
Richard L. Christiansen
George N. Newton
Wellesley H. Wright
Jim D. Webb
William L. Knudson
Richard K. Fred
David A. Dutton
Franz P. Helm
Buckner S. Burch
Manuel H. Marks
Orlen N. Johnson
Gresham T. Farrar, Jr.
Donald R. Swatman

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

Ian K. Burgess

To be senior assistant nurse officers

Laurette M. Beck
Patricia P. Grimaila

To be assistant nurse officer

Juanita M. Barkley

To be junior assistant nurse officer

Ray Cameron

IN THE ARMY

To be Assistant Surgeon General

Col. Joseph Leroy Bernier, O20093, Dental Corps, U.S. Army, for appointment as Assistant Surgeon General, U.S. Army, as major general, Dental Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3040, 3442, and 3447.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Richard Steinbach, O18560, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Howard Allen Morris, O20141, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Thomas DeForth Rogers, O19351, U.S. Army.

Col. Seymour Austin Potter, Jr., O29937, U.S. Army.

U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Lt. Col. Virgil J. O'Connor, 6357A, for appointment as permanent registrar of the U.S. Air Force Academy, under the provisions of section 9333(c), title 10, United States Code.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under section 8067 of title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

Edwin M. Bradley, AO3074753.
Roy C. Ezell, AO3043809.
Orville L. Langford, AO2245814.
Felix R. Portelli, AO3076094.
Emerson K. Wirtz, AO3010978.

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

Loy L. Julius, AO689060.
Lucius L. Robinson, AO2239975.
Eugene J. Stoebenau, AO3076478.

To be captain, USAF (Veterinary)

Farrel R. Robinson, AO2239021.

To be captains, USAF (nurse)

Alvira L. Clemetson, AN2214429.
Mary A. Flenner, AN2241978.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical)

James D. Deacon, AO3089053.
Thomas O. English, Jr., AO3089278.
Dale C. Metheny, AO3089279.
Harry A. Schwamm, AO1852529.
Robert S. White, AO3091126.
Frank W. Zimmerman, Jr., AO3089110.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Dental)

John C. Helder, AO3089310.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (nurse)

Phyllis J. Carter, AN2243052.
Pauline K. Dabkiewicz, AN3075714.
Evelyn G. Richardson, AN2243541.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade indicated, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be first lieutenants

Leroy G. Cuny, AO3054943.
Stephen W. Gilbert, AO3066756.
Richard H. Hartke, AO3055720.
Charles W. Hooker, AO3054239.
Wendell R. Keller, AO3067915.
Allan J. Kelly, AO3068726.
Elery P. Morphew, AO3054688.
Don A. Patterson, AO3067742.
Ray A. Perry, AO3054866.
Earl C. Ruby, Jr., AO3055758.
John E. Ruonala, AO3070406.
James B. Sevebeck, AO3068826.
Harold C. Smith, AO3055023.
James D. Staten, AO3066607.
John C. Tynan, AO3069420.

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

John W. Carlson
Robert W. Corcoran
William F. Lawrence
Robert F. Mullen
Albert M. Salem, Jr.

The following-named cadets, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 8284 of title 10, United States Code. Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Donald Joseph Stukel
Thomas Allen Walker

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 6, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 27: 1: *The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? the Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?*

O Thou God of all grace and goodness, as Thou hast set before us an unknown day and an untraveled way, wilt Thou

open our minds and hearts widely to Thy kindly light to lead us and Thy divine strength to sustain us.

Grant that we may be men and women of insight and understanding, whose life and labors, in the vast upheaval of these perilous days, are illumined and girded with a great faith, confident that Thou wilt have Thy way with us and our troubled world.

May nothing obscure or eclipse the prophet's vision of that glorious day when nations shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks and neither shall they learn war anymore.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1217. An act to suspend for 2 years the import duty on certain amorphous graphite;

H.R. 1456. An act for the relief of Universal Trades, Inc.;

H.R. 1752. An act for the relief of Wilhelmina Ordonez;

H.R. 2082. An act for the relief of James Demetrios Chrysanthes, also known as James Demetrios Chrysanthacopoulos;

H.R. 3786. An act for the relief of Chan Kit Ying and James George Bainter;

H.R. 3934. An act for the relief of Mrs. E. Christine Williams;

H.R. 4562. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Grzelewski;

H.R. 4825 An act for the relief of Jean K. Simmons;

H.R. 5349. An act to provide for the conveyance to Orange County, Calif., of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property situated in Orange County, Calif.;

H.R. 6083. An act for the relief of Mary V. Jones;

H.R. 6493. An act for the relief of Robert Dolton;

H.R. 6843. An act for the relief of Daniel Wilging;

H.R. 7226. An act for the relief of Mr. Hughie D. Martin and Ione Martin;

H.R. 7254. An act for the relief of Simeen Helena Chaghaghi;

H.R. 7363. An act for the relief of Chester A. Spindler;

H.R. 8280. For the relief of Clarence T. Tolpo;

H.R. 8383. An act for the relief of Maj. Jack E. Hudson;

H.R. 8456. An act for the relief of Capt. Jack Rubley;

H.R. 8672. An act for the relief of Dr. Deh Chang Tao;

H.R. 8868. An act for the relief of the Albertson Water District, Nassau County, N.Y.;

H.R. 8941. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alice Anderson;

H.R. 9216. An act for the relief of Daniel C. Turner;

H.R. 9464. An act to remove the requirement that, of the Chief and Deputy Chief of the Bureau of Ships, one must be specially qualified and experienced in naval engineering and the other must be specially qualified and experienced in naval architecture;

H.R. 9476. An act for the relief of George E. Williams and William L. Johnson;

H.R. 9760. An act for the relief of Sam Doolittle;

H.R. 10164. An act to change the name of the locks and dam No. 41 on the Ohio River at Louisville, Ky.;

H.R. 10550. An act to extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for 2 additional years; and

H.J. Res. 598. Joint resolution to extend the time for filing of the final report of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1607. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anne Morgan;

H.R. 4029. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the proration of the occupational tax on persons dealing in machineguns and certain other firearms, to reduce occupational and transfer taxes on certain weapons, to make the transferor and transferee jointly liable for the transfer tax on firearms, and to make certain changes in the definition of a firearm;

H.R. 6779. An act to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable contributions for certain individuals);

H.R. 8241. An act to amend certain provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act relating to the reemployment of former Members of Congress;

H.R. 9308. An act to extend for 3 years the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory;

H.R. 9465. An act to authorize the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China;

H.R. 9862. An act to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing; and

H.J. Res. 640. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of General of the Armies John J. Pershing.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1349. An act for the relief of Song Tai Song;

S. 1857. An act to promote the foreign trade of the United States in grapes and plums, to protect the reputation of American-grown grapes and plums in foreign markets, to prevent deception or misrepresentation as to the quality of such products moving in foreign commerce, to provide for the commercial inspection of such products entering such commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 2087. An act for the relief of Janis Papulis;

S. 2369. An act for the relief of Sachiko Kato;

S. 2499. An act for the relief of Halina Konik Wojtusiak;

S. 2528. An act for the relief of John Lipset;

S. 2575. An act to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government;

S. 2618. An act to authorize the exchange of certain war-built vessels for more modern and efficient war-built vessels owned by the United States;

S. 2627. An act for the relief of Nicholas Anthony Marcantonakis;

S. 2635. An act for the relief of Maria Genowefa Kon Musial;

S. 2739. An act for the relief of Yu Sui Ling, also known as Yee Shui Ling;

S. 2769. An act for the relief of John George Sarkis Lindell;

S. 2792. An act for the relief of Luigia Mion;

S. 2821. An act for the relief of Kristina Selan;

S. 2822. An act for the relief of Low Wing Quey (Kwai);

S. 2833. An act for the relief of Sadako Suzuki;

S. 2857. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for refunds of contributions in the case of annuitants whose length of service exceeds the amount necessary to provide the maximum annuity allowable under such act;

S. 2886. An act for the relief of Nikolija Lazic;

S. 2923. An act for the relief of Ki Su (Theresa) Moun;

S. 2966. An act for the relief of Antigone Apostolaki Cassel;

S. 2969. An act to authorize the award posthumously of appropriate medals to Chaplain George L. Fox, Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, Chaplain Clark V. Poling, and Chaplain John P. Washington;

S. 3081. An act for the relief of Irena Maria Koller;

S. 3114. An act for the relief of Adolphe Herstein;

S. 3327. An act for the relief of Jean Goedicke; and

S. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate (S. 722) of the following title: "An act to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10401) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961."

The message also announced that the Senate requests the return to the Senate of the bill (H.R. 5421) entitled "An act to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes."

The message also announced the appointment of the Senator from Iowa, [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], to represent the Senate on the official delegation of the American Battle Monuments Commission to dedicate six of the World War II American military cemeteries in Europe during the period July 4–25, 1960.

THE LATE MARTIN L. SWEENEY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I regret to announce to the Members of the House

that the Honorable Martin L. Sweeney died in his sleep at his home in Westlake, a suburb of Cleveland. Martin Sweeney was my predecessor in Congress, representing the 20th Ohio District during the 72d through the 77th Congresses. Mr. Sweeney was a very colorful public figure. He served with distinction, with vigor, and devotion. He was a gentleman of strong character and firm convictions. He had served in the Ohio State Legislature in 1913–14 and served as a judge of the municipal court of Cleveland for 8 years preceding his election to Congress. Mr. Sweeney had been a public figure in Cleveland since 1912, and early in his career had won recognition by fighting for the principles in which he believed. He was a gifted orator. He had served as national president of the Ancient Order of Hibernians.

Mr. Sweeney had, in the past few years, retired from active participation in political affairs, but he had retained his keen interest in civic, national, and international affairs.

On April 15 Mr. Sweeney had observed his 75th birthday. To his widow, children, and grandchildren I extend my most sincere sympathy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was very sorry when I heard of the death of Martin Sweeney. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] has very ably presented in a broad way the life of our late friend and former colleague. Martin Sweeney was a dedicated American, an outstanding legislator, and a man of unusual ability. He was very colorful. He and I became close friends during his service in this body, a friendship which continued in the intervening years up to the time of his death. I join my friend from Ohio in extending to Mrs. Sweeney and her loved ones my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know Martin Sweeney in Cleveland, not politically but as a friend. He was very generous, very delightful, and as the majority leader has said, a most colorful person. I think we are going to miss him in Cleveland. We are going to miss that color. We are going to miss some of the things he was famous for. I thank my colleague from Ohio very much for permitting me to have this little word this morning, and to send my sympathy to Mrs. Sweeney and to the family.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I never had the pleasure of knowing the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Sweeney, but he must have been something of a prophet. On the occasion of a visit of the King and Queen of England to Washington a good many years ago, Government buildings were ordered closed, and he suggested that among those buildings that ought to be closed tight was the U.S. Treasury. He must have been something of a prophet because since that time billions of dollars have gone down the drain in uncollected so-called loans to the British.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and service of our former colleague, Martin Sweeney.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join my distinguished colleague from Ohio, the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, in expressing sympathy at the untimely passing of the Honorable Martin L. Sweeney, former Member of Congress from the 20th District of Ohio, who was deceased on April 15.

During the years when the Honorable Martin L. Sweeney served in this Congress, between 1933 and 1944, he distinguished himself as an outspoken and dedicated crusader. He opposed political bosses and he opposed prohibition with equal zeal.

During his time in the Congress the Honorable Martin L. Sweeney was uniquely independent, both in thought and in action. He was colorful; he was challenging. During the troublesome days of the great depression he constantly endeavored to improve the plight of the people he represented.

Although he served the 20th Congressional District for 11 years, he was born in the district which I now represent.

I want to take this opportunity to extend words of comfort to his beloved wife, Mrs. Marie Sweeney, and his four devoted children.

FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, last July the Congress passed Senate Joint Resolution 111 providing for the designation of the third week of July as "Captive Nations Week."

Under this resolution the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation inviting the people to observe such a week with appropriate ceremonies.

I have written President Eisenhower to strongly urge that he issue a proclamation this year at this early date, showing that the freedom and independence of the unfortunate peoples of the world are especially in our minds at the time of the shooting down of our weather plane and in view of the forthcoming summit meeting.

Referring to this act of international banditry and the ensuing vitriolic verbal attack by Khrushchev on the United States, I can only say I favor something more than an official protest deploring the situation.

I would call off the President's visit to the Soviet Union and have the United States withdraw from the summit talks.

KENTUCKY DERBY

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, now that the Congress has just passed a bill making Louisville, Ky., a depressed area there is talk going on around the Hill about changing the name of the Kentucky Derby to the Depressed Areas Sweepstakes.

I hope that the thousands who attend this time-honored event in Louisville tomorrow will not grumble about Derby Day prices. The money they spend will be for a worthy cause. They will be aiding a depressed area.

SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower should call off the summit conference. If the President goes to this summit meeting following recent events, he will be at a tremendous disadvantage. Khrushchev has carefully created incidents so as to bargain with the President. The Chinese Communists have imprisoned Bishop Walsh. The Soviets shot down another one of our planes. They helped stir up riots in Korea and elsewhere in the world. The Communists threatened the Panama Canal and gave Castro military equipment. They created the Berlin crisis. Now Khrushchev wants to sit down with the President and offer the return of Bishop Walsh, temporarily cease to incite riots, curb Castro, and refrain from shooting down our planes, all in return for Berlin or some other surrender by the United States. We cannot possibly win peace or honor at such a

conference. Khrushchev steals Eisenhower's cow before a conference, then at the conference Khrushchev says, "I will return your cow if you give me the cow's calf." The calf is what Khrushchev wanted all along. Eisenhower has all to lose and nothing to gain. We can only win the respect of the world and restore dignity to the Office of the President by refusing to meet Khrushchev under such ridiculous and shocking circumstances. This is Khrushchev's game and if we continue to play it, the United States will lose. At every conference, we make concessions and surrender just a little more, while Khrushchev gives nothing. Under no circumstances should the United States dignify Khrushchev with a summit conference until he gives the captive nations their freedom. Khrushchev can end the cold war, simply by keeping Russian treaties and promises. There is nothing to talk about.

UNION-INDUSTRIAL SHOW AT NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to announce to the Members, which I do with pleasure, that today the Union-Industrial Show opens at the National Guard Army at 1 o'clock and continues through to May 11. The President opened the show and the ribbons were cut for one of the greatest union-labor-management shows in the world.

It is a fine example of cooperation between the workers and management when they get together and display their wonderful union label products and demonstrate efficient union services.

One hundred thousand dollars in prizes will be given away.

The exhibit is free—there will be no admission charge—no sale of goods on the floor.

Everyone is invited to view this marvelous exhibition.

Mr. Joseph Lewis is the director of the show which is sponsored by the Union-Labor and Services Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11713) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11713, with Mr. ALBERT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 11713 is a bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1961. The bill follows the same general form as the AEC authorization bills for the past 4 fiscal years.

Section 101 authorizes $211,476,000 for new AEC construction projects. This compares with $293,876,000 requested by the AEC. In other words, the Joint Committee has reduced this bill by $82,400,000. A total of 39 line-item projects are listed in section 101 of the bill, covering all aspects of the AEC program.

Sections 102 through 106 of the bill contain standard provisions on "limitations"—section 102—"advanced planning and design"—section 103—"restoration or replacement"—section 104—"currently available funds"—section 105—and "substitutions"—section 106.

Section 107 of the bill is in the form requested by AEC and amends projects authorized by prior Authorization Acts. Project 57–d–1, the zero gradient synchrotron, Argonne National Laboratory, is increased from $27 million to $42 million, and project 60–e–12, alterations to Shippingport reactor facilities, is increased from $5 million to $9 million, in order to construct a heat sink, and to modify the reactor plant for operation at a power level equivalent of 150 electrical megawatts under PWR Core 2.

Section 108 of the bill rescinds certain projects previously authorized which are no longer considered necessary by the AEC or the Joint Committee. A total of seven projects would be rescinded, amounting to $18,290,000. I think this is a sound way to legislate, because in the experience of every Member, we authorize so many things that the departments fail to use, and we sometimes do not rescind the authorization.

Section 109 authorizes an additional $40 million funds, and $5 million waiver of use charge authority, for use in the cooperative power demonstration program under the conditions and limitations of previous applicable statutes. Of the $40 million in this section, $25 million is intended for construction of an intermediate sized organic-cooled prototype reactor, if no satisfactory proposal is received from industry under the third round, under the AEC Authorization Act for fiscal year 1960. If a satisfactory proposal should be received, AEC may construct, or support the construction of, some other reactor type deemed appropriate, such as a spectral shift reactor. The remaining $15 million under section 109 is available for research and development assistance for either unsolicited proposals or third round proposals, whichever may develop, such as the large scale powerplants reportedly under consideration by two California utility groups.

Section 110 authorized $5 million for use in the cooperative program with Canada for research and development in connection with heavy water moderated nuclear powerplants.

The bill contains severals changes recommended by the Joint Committee from the bill originally proposed by the AEC.

First, the committee added as project 61–d–10, $13 million for power reactor plants for the Antarctic. Testimony furnished the committee during the hearings indicated the extremely high cost of fuel in the Antarctic, as well as the fact that many lives and equipment have been lost in the transportation process. The $13 million authorization could provide for construction of three or four small atomic powerplants in the Antarctic which would enhance our international prestige in that area, would help develop the reactor art, and would result in eventual savings to the taxpayers because of lower operating costs.

Secondly, the majority of the committee recommends, in project 61–f–7, $3 million for design and engineering of the linear electron accelerator at Stanford University, rather than the $107,200,000 construction authorization requested by AEC. The majority believes that the design and engineering authorization will allow the project to go ahead on an adequate basis and will result in better cost estimates before construction is authorized. The project came to us at a very late date. We are concerned with the history of rising costs in the high energy physics program, and the changes that have been made in this particular accelerator. The committee has requested that an overall report on the high energy physics program, and more data on this proposed accelerator, be submitted by AEC to the Joint Committee by next January 1961. We believe that the Congress would then be in a better position to consider the requested $107,200,000 construction authorization.

I do not think anyone quite realizes here in this body the amount of research that has been necessary under the AEC as well as in the Armed Forces. But I see somewhat the same situation developing here today that we had in the days immediately after World War II when we had no plans whatever and we had virtually no wind tunnels in this country. We even moved one from Germany when we got to Dortmund and Peenemunde. We moved it here to Carderock, Md. Then we had a great flurry of activity and all the agencies involved wanted wind tunnels, particularly the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. So we had to devise a program in this field to save money for the Government. NACA did more for the development of science in this country than any other agency although their activities have now been transferred to the new agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This accelerator problem is somewhat similar to the wind tunnel situation. We have built some of those accelerators in this country.

I have here a list of the high energy accelerators in operation and under construction which I include as a part of my remarks at this point:

High-energy accelerators—In operation

DOMESTIC

Machine	Energy (Bev.)	Intensity	Particles	Location
Synchrotron	1.4	Average	Electron	California Institute of Technology.
Do	1.5	do	do	Cornell University.
Do	3.0	do	Proton	Brookhaven National Laboratory.
Do	6.2	do	do	University of California.

FOREIGN

Synchrotron	1.0	Average	Proton	University of Birmingham, United Kingdom.
Do	1.2	do	Electron	Rome, Italy.
Do	3.0	do	Proton	Saclay, France.
Do	10.0	Low	do	Dubna, U.S.S.R.
Do	28.0	Average	do	CERN, Geneva, Switzerland.

High energy accelerators—Under construction

DOMESTIC

Machine	Energy (Bev.)	Intensity	Particles	Location
Synchrotron	3.0	High	Proton	Princeton University.
Do	6.0	do	Electron	Cambridge, Mass.
Do	12.5	do	Proton	Argonne National Laboratory.
Do	25–30	Average	do	Brookhaven National Laboratory.

FOREIGN

Linear accelerator	1.0	Average	Electron	Saclay, France.
Synchrotron	1.0	do	Proton	Delft, Netherlands.
Do	1.2	do	Electron	Lund, Sweden.
Do	1.3	do	do	Tokyo, Japan.
Linear accelerator	4.0	(?)	do	Kharkov, U.S.S.R.
Synchrotron	7.0	Average	Proton	Harwell, United Kingdom.
Do	7.0	do	do	Moscow, U.S.S.R.
Do	7.5	High	Electron	Hamburg, Germany.
Do	10.6	Very low	Proton	Canberra, Australia.
Do	50.0	(?)	do	Moscow, U.S.S.R.

In the free world, in foreign countries which we have access to for this high energy physics research work, we have available to us one which I believe is 30 bev and several more linear accelerators.

This is almost too theoretical a subject to discuss because of its technical complexity. I am not opposed to going on with this project in an orderly fashion. I think we ought to go into all promising research work in the accelerator field, both in regard to heavy particles and light particles.

As I said, I am not opposed to any of these projects. I made the motion to put $3 million in here and let AEC come back with a thorough study to show this body exactly what it is going to cost. We started out with another accelerator, on which we estimated a cost of $15 million. But as of today we have authorized around $40 million or $42 million and we may not be through yet.

So I feel very much the same way about this item as I did about the wind tunnels. When I found out that the wind tunnels were going to use as much power as the city of New York, I thought it time to come in and take a look at them. We adopted a unified control plan and it is working out fine. It gives us all the information which I think is necessary. We have an installation, of course, in Virginia, with a wind tunnel. We have some in other parts of the country, one at Wright-Patterson Field and in that section. We have some more. I think we set up a sound program when we pooled this thing.

I think we are going to have to do something similar in the accelerator field because it is an expensive area of research. I do not have the estimated cost of operation of the ones we have in operation today but it is in the hearings. I do not have it before me. I can see, of course, that we are going to run into considerable money here unless we use a sound approach in developing this field.

I am not opposed to it. Nobody can accuse me of playing politics on these items in all my years in Congress, some 22 years or more. If they have a sound approach, if they have the physicists and other personnel, and have good cost estimates, I am not opposed to it.

Also, the committee added two projects to the AEC-proposed bill, and both of them are in the basic research field.

Project 61–f–8, $5.6 million for construction of a materials research laboratory at the University of Illinois and project 61–f–9, $2.2 million for the construction of a radiation laboratory at the University of Notre Dame.

Both of these projects were requested by the AEC Division of Research but were eliminated during the budget process. The Joint Committee believes that intensified laboratory work and research in the two important areas of materials and radiation effects will be of great benefit to the atomic energy program. The work would take place in the universities. It has been my position from the beginning that we should emphasize placing research in the hands of the universities.

The committee also increased the amount for project 61–h–1, facilities in the biomedical research field, from $4 million to $5 million, in order to intensify research efforts in the field of radiation, including effects of radioactive fallout.

Well, we know of the fine work that has been done in cancer research in this field. There is no use arguing about this. I think we could use much more money, but we did increase it $1 million.

I want to say here that I do not believe a group of more dedicated scientists in the field of biomedical research exists today than exists in the agency of the AEC and its laboratories and contractors. They have done a fine job, and we should support them. We all know of the hazards of radiation, and I think we should know all there is to know about it.

In summary, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, through its Subcommittee on Legislation, has held detailed hearings on every project and provision in the bill. The subcommittee and the full Joint Committee gave the bill very careful consideration, making a few revisions, and reducing the total amount authorized from $293,876,000 to $211,476,000, or a net reduction of $82,400,000. We believe that the actions of the Joint Committee, and the reasons for these actions, are thoroughly explained in our committee report, House Report No. 1277, which is available to all our colleagues in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of the House to vote for H.R. 11713, in the form recommended by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to ask the gentleman if there is a provision in this bill for the reactor that was proposed in the Antarctic.

Mr. DURHAM. Yes.

Mr. MONAGAN. That is included in the bill?

Mr. DURHAM. Yes.

Mr. MONAGAN. I compliment the committee. I think it is a very progressive policy, and it should save a lot of money, as I understand it.

Mr. DURHAM. Well, it is discretionary, of course. They can build three or four or whatever they need within the $13 million figure. The reactors can be readily manufactured in the United States. All we have to do is to transport them there, and thereby save a lot of money, instead of paying $7 a gallon for fuel oil.

Mr. MONOGAN. There will be a tremendous saving in fuel oil alone.

Mr. DURHAM. In the long run we will save considerable money. As I said in my previous remarks, I do not see that we can do otherwise, and I think we should go ahead and provide these three.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I know that I speak the sentiments of all the Members of the House when I say that we regret very much that our distinguished friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], has announced that he will not run for reelection next fall. There is no man, in my opinion, who has ever served in this body who has made a more sincere and profound impression upon his colleagues and upon the legislative history of our country than my sweet and lovable friend from North Carolina, who is a dedicated legislator. The gentleman has always conducted himself with outstanding ability, with vision, and with great courage, but over and above that he has always been a gentleman. I keenly regret that the gentleman has made the decision which he has, because in the world of today, with the international menace that confronts our country and the world as a whole, particularly the free world, we need in the Halls of Congress men with the ability and the experience and the outlook and the character and the leadership of my dear friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

I am not going to start anything, but I certainly would be pleased if a grassroots campaign started in the gentleman's district, urging him to continue his service in this body.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished majority leader very much. It is very kind of him to make those remarks. I have had the privilege and honor of serving with him over many years, and have long admired his leadership and courage, going back to the early days of the Manhattan District in World War II.

I suppose this will be probably the last authorization bill that I shall handle on the floor of the House. I want to say to this body that the support which they have given us in these many years in developing the very complicated field of atomic energy, the military developments which, under civilian control, have helped to keep the peace of the world, has meant a great deal to me and to all the members of our committee. I am sure the Members of this body will continue to look upon this as one of the first needs in our national defense and in the security of the free world, as well as recognizing the necessity for the peaceful development of the atom.

I hope I have contributed something, may I say to our distinguished majority leader, through my years of service in the House. I have enjoyed my service on the committees of the House. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has especially offered a challenge. I have appreciated the fine cooperation and association with CHET HOLIFIELD and MEL PRICE, as well as my other old associate from the start of the committee, JIM VAN ZANDT. Our newer members of the Joint Committee—WAYNE ASPINALL and ALBERT THOMAS; and CRAIG HOSMER, BILL BATES, and JACK WESTLAND—have also been most kind and considerate. The Members of the other body on the Joint Committee have also been very cooperative.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to make a general statement concerning H.R. 11713, the bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1961.

At a later time, my colleague, Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, will offer an amendment, which I support, to authorize construction of the linear electron accelerator, as requested by the President and the AEC.

Before commencing my statement on this bill, I would like to say a few words in commendation of the distinguished vice chairman of our committee, Congressman CARL DURHAM, who has announced his retirement at the end of this session. CARL DURHAM and I have served together since creation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in 1946. He has conscientiously served the committee and the Congress, and we, on this side of the aisle, are very sorry to see him leave us. We wish him many happy future years after he retires to join his family and many friends in Chapel Hill, N.C., and we hope that he will come back often to see his old colleagues on the Joint Committee and in the Congress.

I would also like to commend another "plank owner" on the Joint Committee, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, who has worked hard, as he always does, on the provisions of this bill to make them acceptable to him. Although we differ on the method of authorizing one important project, as recommended by his subcommittee, and later by the full committee, we realize that differences are possible on such a major project, and we hope that he and his colleagues on the other side of the aisle will eventually come around to our point of view with respect to the Stanford accelerator.

Supplementing Mr. DURHAM's remarks, I would like to comment on a few of the most important projects in the bill.

Subsection 101(a) of this bill covers the necessary new construction projects for the AEC special nuclear materials program, including projects at Fernald, Ohio; Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Hanford, Wash.; Savannah River, S.C.; and other AEC plants. Project 61–a–1 authorizes $10 million to provide flexibility for new construction projects as they may develop during the course of the year.

Subsections 101 (b) and (c) lists four new construction projects in the atomic weapons field, to provide our AEC laboratories with the necessary facilities to keep up their vitally important work. Included as project 61–b–1 is a $10 million authorization, which again provides flexibility to meet new requirements as they may develop.

Subsections 101 (d) and (e) contain a total of 13 reactor development projects, including project 61–d–7, test installation for Project Rover, $20 million, and project 61–d–8, test installation for Project Pluto, $15 million. The costs of these two programs have been going up, and costs for future years are still undetermined, but to date our committee and the Congress have been very generous in making available funds without insisting on detailed cost justifications.

Subsections 101 (f) and (g) contain a total of 11 physical research projects, including improvements to the Princeton-Pennsylvania accelerator—project 61–f–2, $10,820,000—and to the bevatron at Lawrence Radiation Laboratory—project 61–f–6, $9,600,000. Project 61–f–7 contains only a "design and engineering" authorization, rather than a construction authorization, for the linear electron accelerator at Stanford University.

We will offer an amendment to project 61–f–7 later this afternoon because we believe that the $3 million "design and engineering" authorization is not sufficient for work to proceed on the items which are needed now—site preparation, construction of the klystron test laboratory, and construction of working space to house scientists and engineers to work on the project. A limited "design and engineering" authorization will delay commencement of useful experiments, and will result in eventual higher costs, as we shall point out in more detail later this afternoon.

I would like to stress our competition with Soviet Russia in this field. We are competing with the Russians in an overall scientific race for men's minds, and for future accomplishments in areas which command worldwide attention. High-energy physics is one area where we are now ahead, where we have made most of the outstanding discoveries, but where the Soviets are anxious to catch up. The key to the future has always come from basic research, and I regret to see our efforts, especially our congressional support, slacken for even one step. Extensive basic research tools are admittedly necessary to come in first in this race. The Russians are spending money in this area, and will continue to do so. In our separate views to the committee report—House Report No. 1525, pages 19–29—we pointed out:

> The Stanford accelerator would permit exploration into a new field (light, charged particles at high energy) not now adequately covered by the U.S. high-energy physics program or that of any other nation. By going ahead with this research tool, our scientists will be in a position, we feel, to make discoveries that will bring our country distinction in a highly competitive field among scientists throughout the world, including Russia.
>
> The Russians have three accelerators scheduled to start up in 1960 and 1961, including a 2-Bev electron linear accelerator planned at Kharkov, and they have announced a 4-Bev electron linear accelerator planned for construction at Kharkov. Even discounting the Russian claims, the Stanford 10- to 20-Bev accelerator would be the acknowledged leader in this dynamic area of science, and would offer opportunity for some positive U.S. firsts.
>
> The Stanford accelerator will also round out our program by giving a better balance between light particle (electron) and heavy particle (proton) accelerators.

With respect to the linear electron accelerator proposed by Stanford University, it has been unanimously recom-

mended by a panel of distinguished scientists, and I quote from the letter dated February 5, 1960, reprinted at pages 27–29 of our separate views:

> In particular, this panel wishes to reaffirm its recommendation to start immediately the construction of the linear electron accelerator proposed by Stanford University, and to express its concern about the delay which has been encountered in authorizing this machine to date. All the experimental potentialities of this machine, which the panel foresaw last year, still look as attractive as they did then. In addition, new potentialities have developed for which this high-intensity, high-energy, electron machine is well suited.

When our amendment is offered, I hope it will merit the support of members of the House from both sides of the aisle.

Returning now to the other projects and provisions of this bill, subsection 101(h) of the bill contains $5 million for installations for support of biomedical research, an increase of $1 million over the amount requested.

Subsection 101(i) authorizes three community projects at Los Alamos, N. Mex., and subsection 101(j) authorizes funds for general plant projects, under the limitations of subsection 102(c).

Congressman DURHAM, the vice chairman of the committee, has already explained sections 102 through 106, which contain standard provisions.

As for section 107(b), I am happy that AEC and the other interested parties have agreed on the method of operation for the second core of the Shippingport PWR reactor. The second core will be operated at an equivalent of 150,000 electrical kilowatts, and some of the heat energy will be dissipated through a new heat sink. Admiral Rickover testified before our committee that this method of operation will permit us to obtain all the valuable data—in fact, our ability to obtain data will be enhanced—page 182 of the hearings.

Section 109 of the bill authorizes $40 million for the cooperative power reactor demonstration program. This is the amount requested by the AEC, and I believe that it is a proper amount for a well-balanced civilian atomic power development program during the next year.

Section 110 of the bill authorizes $5 million for use in a cooperative program with Canada for research and development in connection with heavy water moderated nuclear powerplants. Under the proposed arrangements with Canada, the United States will be able to obtain for use by the AEC and U.S. industry all the engineering and economic information developed under the Canadian program, including drawings, plans, specifications, and all other technical data. The $5 million authorized will be spent in this country, mostly at AEC laboratories. In my opinion, this is a very sensible and businesslike way to proceed, in cooperation with our Canadian friends, to obtain data on heavy water moderated reactors.

Section 111 of the bill authorizes certain design and engineering studies and provides that the Commission may submit reports on such studies to the joint committee by April 1, 1961.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, this bill covers authorization of projects for our entire atomic energy program. The minority will offer an important amendment a little later. That amendment will be for a high-energy physics project unanimously recommended by our scientists. We will ask our colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, to reverse the committee action, and to support the scientists, and to authorize now the proposed Stanford linear electron accelerator.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I join the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and the ranking member of the Joint Committee on the minority side, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], in paying tribute to the vice chairman of the Joint Committee, who was the first Member of the House to serve as chairman of the Joint Committee, back in 1952. He subsequently served another term as chairman of the Joint Committee, and that term was distinguished by a progressive and a fine record of the committee.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has been interested in laboratories and scientific achievements of the country not only during his period of service on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy but he has concentrated in this area also in his work on the House Committee on Armed Services.

He vitally has concerned himself with the success of laboratories in the National Advisory Committee on Aviation and the National Science Foundation, and it was his great knowledge in this field that prompted the various chairmen of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Military Affairs that preceded the Committee on Armed Services in always designating him as the chairman of subcommittees having to do with legislation dealing with scientific matters involving our Armed Forces and our national defense. I doubt if there is a greater expert in the House on the subject of wind tunnels. I know that through his great efforts millions of dollars have been saved to the taxpayers as a result of the coordination of this program of development of wind tunnels.

Mr. Chairman, I rise particularly this afternoon in support of the bill under consideration by the committee. This bill is recommended by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy after careful and long study. First, it had long study by a subcommittee headed by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. We all know of his diligence and the great attention and study that he gives to matters pertaining to our national defense and our atomic energy program. So the bill comes before the House well recommended and after careful and complete study.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I would like to speak especially of three projects we have added to the bill after receiving initial recommendations from the Atomic Energy Commission. I would like to make clear that while these items did not come to the committee in direct requests this year from the Commission, they are endorsed by the Commission. The Commission certainly would not oppose them because all of them have high priority within the Commission's division on research. The Commission, in my humble opinion, would be very happy to have the Congress act favorably on the items which I will mention.

Project 61–f–8 authorizes $5,600,000 for construction of a materials research laboratory at the University of Illinois. One of the roadblocks in the atomic energy program to date has been the difficulties with materials. Special new alloys are needed, capable of withstanding radiation, to meet special requirements in new atomic energy machines and equipment. Some of this work has been going on at the University of Illinois, which has now agreed to make available, on a long-term basis, valuable land on the campus, centrally located with respect to the participating departments. Scientists and engineers from several departments at the university would be able to participate, after construction of this new laboratory, in theoretical and experimental research of the following kinds: Solid state physics, theoretical studies, diffusion effects, solid state chemistry, magnetic resonance studies, theory of alloys, physical metallurgy, fundamental diffusion studies, and ceramics and refractories.

With this laboratory, the output of doctors of philosophy in this field would double within 5 or 10 years, from about 18 to about 36 annually, thus increasing the pool of qualified scientists in this critical area.

I might say this is one of our weak points, in the production or the lack of production of qualified people in these particular areas.

Project 61–f–9, also added by the Joint Committee, authorizes $2,200,000 for construction of a radiation laboratory at the University of Notre Dame. The radiation project at the University of Notre Dame is the largest university program primarily devoted to this work in the United States, and probably in the world.

In order to carry out this research, use is made of a 2-million-electron-volt Van de Graaff electrical generator, 2 cobalt 60 irradiators consisting of 1,200 curies each, X-ray equipment, special research spectrometers, and many pieces of scientific and electronic equipment. The present facilities made available by the university consist of 12,000 square feet of insufficient, inadequate floor space, mainly in the basement of the old chemistry building. The new laboratories would provide adequate effective facilities for the present program and allow a modest expansion of the project to make possible some additional needed research on radiation effects. The proposed building would contain radiation source and high intensity laboratories, research laboratories, and offices, shops, and supply and storage rooms.

Both of these projects were requested by the AEC Division of Research but were eliminated during the budget process. In the opinion of the Joint Committee, construction of these two laboratories, with the resulting increased effort, would help advance progress in the fields of materials and radiation effects, two critically important areas in our atomic energy program.

These two facilities would be constructed on university-owned land, but the Joint Committee believes that the Government's investment could and should be adequately protected by appropriate long-term lease arrangements, as has been done by the Atomic Energy Commission on other occasions.

Project 61–h–1 provides $5 million for installations for support of biomedical research in atomic energy. This program is under the direction of the AEC's Division of Biology and Medicine, and the facilities are used to explore biological and medical effects of radiation, including those from radioactive fallout. In 1957 and again in 1959 the Joint Committee held detailed hearings on the nature of radioactive fallout and its effect on man. One of the major conclusions of our committee hearings was that an increased research effort was needed. This year the AEC requested $4 million for new construction projects in the biomedical research program, and the Joint Committee has recommended increasing this by $1 million to a new total of $5 million.

In view of the concern of the public over fallout and radiation in the new atomic age, I urge all Members of the House to support this increase, as recommended by our committee.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, the Joint Committee has added two projects and increased the amount for one other so as to provide what we believe to be a balanced basic research program in three critically important areas. Our recommendations are based upon thorough hearings, both on this bill and in previous years.

I urge all Members of the House to support the bill in the form recommended by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. I would like at this time to thank the gentleman for what he said about me. I want to say that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] has done one of the most devoted jobs of running the Research Committee of any individual who has ever served on the committee. He has brought to the House many things by extensive hearings, and he has done a wonderful job all through the years.

So has my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]. He has rendered outstanding service to the committee, present most of the time. To a large degree House Members have spent many hours of service trying to carry out this program and solve our problems. There is not a Member on the House side of the committee that has not worked hard in the committees and attended the hearings.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina. May I say that one of the greatest awards in my career in the House of Representatives has been the pleasure I have had in serving almost the entire time on committees with the gentleman from North Carolina: The old Military Affairs Committee, the House Armed Services Committee, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have never been associated with a more wonderful person.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I want to concur in the remarks which have been made directed toward my good friend and able colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, CARL DURHAM. I have now served with him for 2 years on the Joint Atomic Energy Committee and over 10 years on the Armed Services Committee, as my father did before me. We all have a deep affection and respect for CARL DURHAM. We will all miss him when he retires this year. On behalf of myself and others who have a fond affection for him, we wish him a long and prosperous life.

Mr. Chairman, we present to the House today for its consideration H.R. 11713, a bill authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1961. The authorizations contained in section 101 total $211,476,000, and with one exception which I shall discuss later, represent an effort which will permit the United States to maintain its lead in the nuclear field.

The advent of atomic energy in the forties brought with it not only speculation of the outgrowth of this field, but it was commonly accepted that its frontiers were unlimited and its answers to the problems of the day were almost all encompassing. The last decade and, more particularly, the last few years indictated the fallacy of many overenthusiastic laymen, for instance, that electric power could be produced with extremely low cost and that desire alone could bring to fruition boundless solutions.

Today the approach to the problem is more realistic, heads have come down out of the clouds and the practical avenues in this field are more closely followed and more generally understood. This evaluation has not in any way limited the frontiers which are sought; it is only that scientific knowledge and understanding have replaced fiction with fact.

The previous speakers have explained the bill in detail involving nuclear materials, atomic weapons, reactor development, physical research, and those projects having to do with biology and medicine. I believe, as does the committee, that all of these fields must be aggressively pursued to not only preserve the prestige involved in being the leading nuclear power in the world today, but also because of their vital significance in regard to the security of our Nation, and also because of the contributions the peaceful uses of atomic energy can make to the well-being of our people in so many ways.

For the most part this bill was recommended to the committee by the Atomic Energy Commission. There was one item added that I would like to discuss that has also been approved by the AEC.

When Admiral Dufek returned from his great Polar expedition to the Antarctic sometime ago, he explained with graphic illustrations, both orally and by pictures, many of the problems he encountered there. He told of the great cost of fuel oil being delivered there. He indicated that 80 percent of all transportation involved in the project was merely to get oil delivered from its source to its destination. The cost of this fuel ranged up to $10 a gallon compared to 12 to 15 cents in the States. In the last 3 years, equipment valued at almost $11 million had been lost in providing logistics for these bases. Most important of all, 17 lives have been lost. It seemed to me that these remote areas would be ideal for small nuclear reactors. It would save lives, it would save money, and add to the prestige of our Nation. I understand that these reactors will recover their costs in approximately 3 years. It is for these reasons that I have advocated these reactors for the Antarctic and why I support their inclusion in the bill before us.

It is my understanding that an amendment will be offered to authorize the full amount of $107 million for the Stanford accelerator. There was a difference in the committee as to the approach of this problem and the majority of the committee voted to include only $3 million under project 61–f–7 for design and engineering for a linear electron accelerator.

A strict interpretation of this language would preclude the design of buildings, site layout, specifications and drawings for accelerator housing, and such other detailed design and engineering required by the master plan, as well as securing bids. The committee report supplements the language of the bill to provide that all of these functions can be performed and that such is the intent of the committee. Hence one problem was clarified.

However, the Stanford scientists expressed further concern. The AEC had requested $4.2 million for appropriations this year and $107 million for authorization. The limiting authorization of $3 million meant that appropriations would be limited to that amount and, consequently, the construction of a general laboratory to house the design and engineering group and site preparation cannot be commenced.

In addition, the Stanford scientists believe that the limited action by the committee of authorizing only $3 million out of the $107 million requested creates such uncertainty that recruitment of top grade scientific personnel will present an acute problem. This is especially true in view of the fact that last year no action was taken on the request. Hence scientists who presently have tenure and

challenging positions elsewhere will not go to Stanford unless the situation is clarified and the uncertainty removed.

The matter of this accelerator is the only point at issue in this bill. The scientists in the Piore panel who studied this whole matter stated that it is "clearly our view, the Nation will err seriously if budgetary limitations should prevent the authorization of new accelerator construction. The panel wishes to express its concern about the delay which has been encountered in authorizing this machine to date."

I understand that an amendment will be offered to include the full amount of $107 million. I will support the amendment and recommend its adoption to the House.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentlemen from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND].

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to pay my respects to the vice chairman of this committee, the gentleman from North Carolina, CARL DURHAM.

As a new member of this Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I have done my best to learn as much as possible about the subject. Certainly it is a vast and complex one. I have learned a great deal from my valued friend, CARL DURHAM and I have admired his stand on many problems and questions that have come before this committee. As he intimated in his first address, there have never been any political overtones to his judgment. He has taken a look at the facts as they have come before him and judged accordingly. As I say, it has been a pleasure to work with him.

The majority leader previously intimated that he might start a grassroots groundswell to return CARL DURHAM to Congress. Although I am on the Republican side of this House, I would be very happy to go down to Chapel Hill and, if such a movement could be started, participate in that, because I really believe that CARL DURHAM has contributed tremendously to the solution of the problems faced by the Atomic Energy Committee. It has not been an easy job, and I know of no one who has devoted his time more assiduously to it. I sincerely regret that the gentleman from North Carolina has seen fit to resign from Congress.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Forty-two Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 82]

Alexander	Blitch	Brown, Mo.
Alford	Boggs	Buckley
Allen	Bolling	Burdick
Andrews	Bonner	Burleson
Anfuso	Bow	Canfield
Ayres	Bowles	Carnahan
Bailey	Boykin	Celler
Barden	Brooks, Tex.	Chamberlain
Chelf	Kirwan	Reece, Tenn.
Clark	Kitchin	Rhodes, Ariz.
Coad	Lafore	Rivers, S.C.
Colmer	Landrum	Roberts
Cook	Lankford	Robison
Cooley	Lennon	Rogers, Colo.
Corbett	Loser	Rogers, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	McCulloch	Rooney
Davis, Tenn.	McDowell	St. George
Dawson	McGovern	Scherer
Dent	Machrowicz	Schwengel
Dowdy	Magnuson	Scott
Evins	Mailliard	Shelley
Farbstein	Marshall	Sheppard
Flynt	Martin	Short
Fogarty	Meader	Spence
Forand	Merrow	Stratton
Friedel	Michel	Taylor
Garmatz	Miller, George P.	Teague, Tex.
Gavin	Miller, N.Y.	Teller
Gilbert	Mitchell	Thompson, La.
Grant	Monagan	Van Pelt
Hays	Montoya	Wainwright
Hébert	Moore	Walter
Hemphill	Morris, N. Mex.	Wampler
Hoffman, Mich.	Multer	Watts
Holland	O'Hara, Mich.	Weaver
Ikard	O'Neill	Wharton
Irwin	Pilcher	Winstead
Jackson	Pillion	Wolf
Kee	Powell	Young
Kelly	Rains	Zelenko
Kilburn		

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALBERT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 11713, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 309 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, we have discussed what is in the atomic energy authorization bill. I am about to discuss something that is not in it, and that many of us desire to place in the bill. This has a lot to do with protons, neutrons, and electrons. I am going to talk a little bit about those as well as about what a linear electron accelerator is so that we can clearly have in mind what the issue before us later today will be. But before that, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] who has chosen not to return to the Congress. We are going to miss him just as his district will miss his representation in this body and just as the Nation will miss his wisdom and the effectiveness with which he has served it for so long.

Now, my colleagues, if you pick up this glass of water here and pour it out, you make a mess on the floor. But, if you took a glass this size and back in the beginning of time, as we know it, started to pour into that glass a single stream of atoms, kept it up until today, after all those millions of years this glass still would not be half full. We are dealing in this area with something that small—the basic building blocks of the universe. These atoms—hydrogen, uranium, helium, and all the rest are divided further into parts and particles—neutrons, electrons, protons, and many others. It is the knowledge basically of what is inside these minute particles of matter that leads us to the knowledge of the universe, how and why we live in it and the ways in which to make our world better. Basic research brought us much knowledge already. Basic research has discovered the existence of these neutrons, electrons, and protons; discovered how they are put together in the thing we call the atom; how there is a nucleus of protons and neutrons; how it is surrounded by a shell of electrons to make up the basic atom. It was many years ago that scientists first theoretically determined these facts. Then experimentally they developed machinery to check out the theories and in checking out the theories, they added greatly to the basic knowledge that they have today. In the early thirties, when I was on the University of California campus, an obscure physicist named Ernest Orlando Lawrence, in a little tin building on the campus there, was constructing a new kind of scientific machine; he called it a cyclotron. What the cyclotron did was to take one of these basic particles, the proton, accelerate it to very high velocity and smash it into an atom. When that collision occurred, wreckage was created, its impression was caught on a photographic plate, and analysis showed Dr. Lawrence many of the things which later earned him a Nobel Prize and many other honors. These experiments also produced the knowledge which enabled us to conclude World War II successfully and which since that time has enabled us to resist the overwhelming manpower of the Russians, because it gave us the secret of the atomic bomb.

In other words, the atomic bomb was discovered basically out of the knowledge gained of this piece of machinery and others like it. It lead to the creation and discovery of plutonium, a substance that had disappeared from the earth many million years ago. It gave us knowledge of uranium 235 and led to discovery of all the other transuranium elements. It is these discoveries that have enabled the United States to lead the world in science.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I make an observation at this point? I think it is only fair to do so in connection with the atomic bomb, to which the gentleman has referred. Both branches of the Congress made marked contributions because I can remember when Speaker RAYBURN asked former Speaker MARTIN and myself to meet him in his office one morning. I did not know who was going to be there. I heard a rumor, but I did not know about the Manhattan project, and what they put up to us was that the Congress had to pass about $1,800 million in the next 2 fiscal years to carry on and maintain a project without letting our enemies know. It had to be done in secret. It was a calculated risk. It might be $2 billion down the drain, but we knew that Hitler's government was doing it. They started the experiment.

We did not know how many experimental plants they had. It was a race against time. If they perfected it before we did, we could very well lose the war overnight. I think this body and the other body, but it emanated from this body and the other body carried through—the money to carry on was originally started by President Roosevelt out of blanket funds appropriated to him, but he did not have enough money. We had to appropriate that money, and the American people are indebted to the Congress for what it did at that time.

Mr. HOSMER. The gentleman is correct. Every man who took part in it is to be congratulated. Today this Congress is going to have an opportunity to make a decision that might mean an equal amount to the United States of America, on this accelerator we are here talking about.

We have in this country, and they have now in U.S.S.R., machines known as cyclotrons and synchrotrons, and other great atomic smashers, which accelerate protons, as I have described, and smash them into an atomic target. When you are dealing with protons you are dealing with a particle that is 1,800 times greater in mass than electrons. When you use protons as bullets you get a lot of wreckage along with the information and data on subatomic particles that are keys to the inner secrets of the universe. In this linear accelerator we seek to accelerate the electron and use it as a bullet. Its mass is so much less than the proton that wreckage will be markedly reduced and a more discriminate and readable impression upon a photographic plate produced.

It, the linear accelerator, is the only type of scientific tool that will enable us to get into the areas of physics that no other nation is today penetrating. The construction and operation of this piece of machinery will guarantee the United States of America leadership in basic physics and leadership in basic sciences for at least a decade to come.

You might ask, why can we not accelerate these electrons in the atom smashers we have already spent a lot of money for, and get the job done right away? The reason is, if you attempt to accelerate an electron in a circular machine, it commences to lose energy by radiation instead of retaining energy by acceleration. As a consequence you have to accelerate in a straight line to achieve the required energies.

The linear acelerator is essentially a copper tube 2 miles long. I have here a section of the copper tube. It is about 3.5 inches in diameter. About every 1.5 inches, within this section of copper tube 2 miles long, there is a baffle with a small hole in the center. That is the hole through which the electrons pass as they accelerate.

Where do these electrons come from? You all have a television set in your home. Inside the television tube is an electron tube which causes the picture to show up. You have one of these at the beginning of the linear accelerator.

How do you accelerate? You accelerate the electrons in a very simple way. Actually, what you do is to take one of the parts out of a radar set, the klystron tube which creates very high energy, very short radio waves. These very short radio waves from the klystron tube are brought into the copper tube and bent in so they travel down through the baffle holes in the middle of the tube. Those waves act about like the situation at Waikiki Beach with the surfboards riding the waves. What happens is that the electrons ride along these high energy waves in similar fashion and are accelerated in velocity.

These waves come in from klystrons spaced about every 40 feet along the 2 miles. They enable acceleration to tremendous velocities. In accordance with Einstein's theory, as velocity increases mass increases. The mass of these electrons is increased approximately 100 times by the acceleration by the time they hit the target at the end of the tube. They are then about one one-hundred-and-eightieth the size of the proton. With that mass they are manageable. They can be aimed at a target. The resulting collisions give us information we have never had before. The linear accelerator will fill up the barrel of basic knowledge out of which our practical developments come. Interestingly enough, the majority of the committee only wants to delay this project until better cost estimates are made. But this piece of science machinery that can keep the United States ahead for decades is there, the cost is known, plus or minus 5 percent, and there is no good reason why we should not get on with it today. There is no good reason why we should not authorize the project in full rather than the $3 million for the study that the bill provides. Delay will cost us millions of dollars more in the end. Full authorization now will only raise from $3 million to $4 million the actual amount expended this year. Is that the something the majority is worried about when they say the costs have not been studied enough? We ought to authorize this in full.

That is what the President has asked for. He asked for it for a year ago and he asks for it now. A committee of the finest scientists of the country has again and again urged that we get going with the research tool, because it fills out our science effort in the field of basic physics. Today that effort is akin to a wheel with one side flat, a flat tire. It is not round. So, we are not going along as fast and as smoothly as we should. This tool will round out the wheel of high energy physics and make us able to go swiftly and smoothly down the road of basic knowledge.

There is posed here not whether we should spend this money but whether we can afford not to spend it, and we cannot afford not to spend it in today's competitive world. Neither can we afford to go about this job inadequately. As a nation we can afford to go about it properly, to do it right and we owe it to ourselves to so proceed. There is a lot of money involved here, we might as well do the job right, and get the most for our dollars.

We need the full authorization now, at this time, so that we can get a scientific team together. That is prerequisite to doing this job. It so happens that at Stanford University there is the nucleus of a team that developed the klystron tube that I talked about. That is the only reason the project happens to be located there. But, there are not enough of these people to do this design and engineering job as it should be done. We need to pull in additional members of this team, about double the size, from around 30 to around 60, so that it can be done perfectly the first time, so that it can be done with the highest quality. You simply cannot attract that quality people and bring the team together without a full authorization. They will not uproot themselves on the basis of a mere 1 year design study. Some people say, "Well, if we do not authorize it, we will only delay it 6 or 8 months." Well, that is true, but I am as much more worried about the quality of the scientific tool, the adequate design of this fine and expensive piece of machinery as I am in the time delay. For that reason it is inconceivable that this Congress will not act expeditiously to get the scientific team together.

It faces us with a great decision on our country's scientific future. The gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McCORMACK, spoke about a momentous decision that this Congress was faced with before on the Manhattan project. Congress then rose to its responsibility. Here again we have today the responsibility of either denying or acquiring for the Nation a piece of science machinery that is fundamental to our entire scientific effort. Just as with the Manhattan project, if we can persuade you gentlemen, when the amendment today is offered, to authorize this fully, I can assure you that as the years go by you will look back and say, "That was a fine thing I did that day in May 1960, because out of what I did has come to our Nation advancement that was far beyond anything we have ever known before."

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I wonder if the gentleman would tell the committee what it would mean in the way of increased cost by simply authorizing an appropriation of $3 million for design and study this year and neglecting to authorize the project in its entirety?

Mr. HOSMER. If we authorize the project in its entirety, we will start getting the building built, and we will require about $4 million cash instead of $3 million cash this year. If we fail to authorize it this year and delay for 1 year, we will run into the cost escalation factors which will more than overcome any money that might be saved otherwise. In other words, if the project costs $107.2 million if it is started now, if we delay a year it will cost almost another 4 million or 5 million. That is on the bare basis of the cost escalation. It will inevitably go up. So, if you want to buy it now and buy it right and buy a high quality of machinery at the lowest price, the time to go for it is now.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I hold in my hand here a letter signed by the Chairman of

the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. McCone, in which he points out that the failure of this Congress to authorize this project means that the cost eventually will rise from $107.2 million to $110 million, and from a time factor or standpoint, instead of spending 6 years to construct, it is going to take 6½ to 6¾ years, and thus the valuable experience that we need will be delayed and the construction will cost more.

Mr. HOSMER. Not only do we need it, but this is the kind of thing that scientific people all over the world, on this side of the Iron Curtain and the other side of the Iron Curtain, are excited about. They know that this is one of the boldest projects, one of the most profitable areas, of research, one of the greatest research tools that man will ever have.

And they can see, if this Congress authorizes this to be done today, the firmness and the determination of the leadership of the United States. I ask my colleagues to live up to the worthy reputation of this body and do what is best for our country and our people. When you have the opportunity to take part in the advancement of this great scientific effort by your vote on the amendment, I ask that you cast aside the doubts that you may have and, with our own scientific people, boldly move ahead, to give them and to give the United States what is needed to insure our scientific leadership.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'NEILL). The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Will the gentleman yield to me at this time?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman has made a very fine technical discourse, but I believe that the House should know, from all the evidence and all the information we have before us, that the request is for $4,200,000. They only need that much.

Mr. HOSMER. The bill only authorizes $3 million.

Mr. DURHAM. That is all they were requesting. I think this is a little bit of a departure from the policy of the Congress. We have heretofore rather hesitated to build buildings on university campuses, without Government control, without building on land that we own in this country. This project I think is so large that I, as an individual, want to know all of the details. I feel that we have very little information.

Mr. HOSMER. I just want to say to the gentleman that the issue here is not nit-picking about location, it is not quibbling about cost, it is not sending this back, as has been done for 2 years now, to restudy it to death. The issue here is whether this Congress is going to act decisively and give this Nation the machinery that it needs to project itself forward in science and all that is allied with science. There can be legislative lags and authorizational gaps and congressional defaults which are just as dangerous to this country as those occurring anywhere else. I feel that unless we move forward on this project today we may find ourselves guilty of that kind of charges.

Mr. DURHAM. I believe the Commission testified that they can make progress under what is authorized by the committee; is not that correct?

Mr. HOSMER. Of course they can make progress. You can make progress with a dime, but if you have a dollar you can get there. That is what we are asking to be done here.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I should like to refer to this letter received from the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission in which he says this:

> The earlier it can be completed—

He is referring to the Stanford accelerator—

> The earlier it can be completed and placed into operation the sooner will its contributions be realized and the greater will be our assurance of continued U.S. leadership in this important scientific field.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Hr. HOSMER] has again expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's statement is a fine one. It was very theoretical, but it was a good statement on this subject, which is technical. We have this Midwest group of universities; there are about 12 of them, and they have still not come up with some of the answers involved in this matter. Those universities are in Indiana, Illinois, and elsewhere in the Midwest. It is a large group of universities, which have very fine technical personnel. My position in this is that until these theoretical physicists come in here and tell the Congress that this is feasible, that this can be done within our cost estimates, we had better follow the course we are suggesting.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I think the record will show that there was unanimous agreement among the scientists that this linear accelerator is feasible and it is basically necessary. The gentleman is referring to the Mura project, which is not an electron accelerator but a proton accelerator, an entirely different piece of machinery, about which some question was raised; but there is no question about the feasibility of the electron accelerator nor is there any question but that it opens up a new horizon for the scientist and unlocks a completely new door to basic knowledge, a door to which no other country is going to have access.

Mr. DURHAM. But we had not agreed on the construction cost of it.

Mr. HOSMER. The Atomic Energy Commission has studied it and got it down as close as anybody can get it, $107 million.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, first I should like to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]. It has been my pleasure for the past 4 years to be associated with him as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. In all of that association I have never known him to be anything but constructive and not in the least political. In my opinion, this Congress is losing a true southern gentleman. We all wish him well.

I should like to address my remarks entirely to the amendment which will be presented by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] to fully authorize a linear electron accelerator.

The question to be decided here today is this: Is the United States of America seriously interested in scientific advancement or do we intend to just talk about it? The scientific prestige of this Nation is at stake.

The entire scientific community of the country has endorsed construction of the Stanford linear electron accelerator. It has told us that present-day accelerators have been immensely useful in rolling back the frontiers of scientific knowledge; that these accelerators—or atom smashers, to use laymen's terms—can do much more in the future. But they also tell us that the newest frontier requires research in the acceleration of light particles or electrons. Present-day machines are so limited by their principle that penetrating research into the very basis of the universe is impossible without the use of a linear-type accelerator. This is a new type machine which will be a tool of basic science, the foundation for applied science. It is not a duplication of any existing machine.

The linear accelerator principle has been developed at Stanford whose personnel is recognized throughout the world as the most qualified group to construct this proposed machine. Since 1946, 10 linear accelerators have been constructed at Stanford or under Stanford's direction. Other nations are using Stanford personnel or design in forging ahead in this important work.

This machine would be used by all of the Nation's scientists. It would belong to the Nation and would be located on land valued at $4 million, offered to the country without charge.

The question is not whether the Stanford accelerator should or should not be built. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has recommended authorization of $3 million for design studies. This is a clearcut indication of the committee's desire to make construction of the accelerator possible.

I quote from page 9 of the committee report:

> The Joint Committee recognizes that an accelerator of this type could make a valuable addition to our national high-energy physics program.

On page 21 of the report, Dr. John H. Williams, AEC Commissioner and former Director of the Division of Research, testifies as follows:

> The 10- to 20-billion electron-volt electrical linear accelerator proposed by Stanford should be the next major step in the high-energy physics program of the country. Construction and operation of this machine

would put in the hands of U.S. physicists a most necessary tool, if we are to achieve maximum scientific progress.

The only question, therefore, is whether it should be fully authorized now or only partially authorized to the extent of $3 million. The appropriation for fiscal year 1961 will hardly be changed by full authorization. In fact, it will be increased by only $1,200,000. The only question, I repeat, is whether the project should be authorized partially or in full.

There are compelling reasons why the accelerator should be authorized in full at this session of Congress.

First, partial authorization will not make it possible to obtain the services of prominent personnel to design the accelerator, because such people would have serious misgivings about permanent employment.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are talking about a machine which costs $107 million. We cannot afford to have less than the best to design it. If we are forced to accept less than the best, we will get an inferior machine; it will cost more, and its completion will be delayed at a time when this Nation is in a desperate race to answer the unanswered in scientific research.

Here is what scientific advisers had to say about partial authorization in the committee hearings:

Dr. E. L. Ginzton, director of the Hansen Microwave Laboratory at Stanford, said:

I think the whole question before us and before the whole world is whether this country intends to or does not intend to build such an accelerator. If it is partially authorized, there will be an open question before everybody. It means we will not be able to obtain the services of prominent people who will have serious misgivings about permanent employment. As a result, the project will not be designed with the excellent staff we need. It will take longer to build and will cost more.

Dr. R. Rollefson, director, Midwestern Universities Research Association, has testified:

I agree with all the others who have testified here that it is important to authorize the whole amount. I think we of MURA have had considerable experience along this line, and we know how hard it is to attract and hold the best people when it is not sure what is going to happen.

Dr. Henry DeWolfe Smyth, of Princeton University, testified:

I feel very strongly, Mr. PRICE, that the full amount should be authorized at this time. I have had some experience in the past with situations where preliminary design was authorized or research was authorized on a project, and then there was a long delay before further authorization came through. This is extremely demoralizing. It makes it difficult to assemble a staff, and once the staff is assembled, and then there is delay in further authorization, the staff disappears and it becomes extremely difficult to reassemble the staff. In this case particularly, where the design is so fully worked out in the sense of depending on components that are already in use, and where, as I understand it, a machine could be built that would be very useful even without further development of the components, I think it would be very undesirable to give partial authorization.

In a letter dated April 13, 1960, to Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Mr. John F. Floberg, Acting Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, said in part:

The Stanford linear accelerator project should be fully authorized for construction at this session of Congress.

* * * * *

We believe that the lack of full authorization of the project at this time may seriously hamper the recruitment of the additional top staff necessary for orderly progress of this project.

Within the past few weeks, in response to a specific query from the AEC, Stanford University has now stated:

We are experiencing some difficulty at the present time in keeping our present staff, the nucleus of the project, together, and there is serious danger that a number of the principal scientists on the staff will leave the university's employ because of the continuing uncertainty concerning full authorization of the project.

The number of physicists and engineers presently involved in Project Agreement No. 1 work is 27. We had planned to increase this to an average of 60 man-years during the first year of integrated development and construction activities. Under the existing circumstances we think we could recruit only five or six more physicists and engineers than we now have. Moreover, it is not likely that these new people will be of the excellence we had intended. Undoubtedly a partial authorization will not be attractive to scientists having tenure in other institutions or who otherwise require long-term commitments. As an example it would be impossible to recruit experienced high energy particle physicists who would be involved in more detailed calculations of shielding or study of other problems related to the utilization of the machine. This work is necessary for its design. Given full authorization this year we believe that we could staff to the extent and excellence that was originally contemplated.

My second reason for urging full authorization is that partial authorization will increase its costs. Present estimates provide for a 5 percent annual escalation of construction costs for each year that passes. The contingency fund also increases by 5 percent each year. Thus, for each year that final construction is delayed because of partial authorization, the cost will go up.

According to Blume & Associates, a consequence of delay in authorization for construction of the project will be an increase in the costs. Blume's estimates were predicated on the start of the construction program on July 1, 1960, with completion 6 years thereafter. Estimates of escalation were included for the second through sixth years at 5 percent a year. According to Blume:

If the project is not authorized and operations initiated so that this schedule can be followed, the cost estimates should be increased at the rate of 5 percent per year for escalation.

Thirdly, the national prestige requires full authorization at this time.

We are now the acknowledged leaders in high-energy nuclear physics research. The Soviet Union is putting tremendous effort into the construction and operation of linear accelerators. These machines have all been built on extraordinarily short construction schedules and with extremely rapid initial engineering and development. Clearly they emphasize the high-energy field as a matter of national prestige. For example, they have under design and site development a 50-billion-electron-volt machine of the circular, proton type which will probably be altered during construction to a capacity of 70 billion electron volts. They have three linear accelerators ready to start in 1960 or 1961 and another scheduled to be started at Kharkov.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I just want to correct the gentleman on that point. The Soviet Union will not have anything like this in operation.

Mr. GUBSER. They have three linear accelerators scheduled to go into operation in 1960 or 1961, with power up to 2 billion electron volts, and another to be constructed at Kharkov of 4 billion electron volts. This is considerably less than the Stanford accelerator.

Mr. PRICE. They have such a small machine that they are not even comparable in this area.

Mr. GUBSER. Granted—we are way ahead of them and the gentleman has clinched my point. But Russia is becoming active in the high-energy field.

Much has been made of the alleged fact that we lag behind the Soviet Union in scientific research. Here is a field where we excel them. Must we partially authorize the Stanford accelerator, delay a year, spend more money, and allow the Russians to catch up? The national prestige is at stake.

Fourth, this project is ready for full authorization now. Look at this stack of reports and cost estimates from reliable enginering firms. It has been thoroughly reviewed by the Atomic Energy Commission in addition to two engineering firms. The President's Scientific Advisory Committee has twice recommended it. A special National Science Foundation panel on high-energy physics has recommended it. The general advisory committee of the Atomic Energy Commission has also recommended it; and so has the President of the United States.

The costs of this project are estimated better than any other project which has ever been presented. They are estimated as exactly as they can ever be. Listen to the testimony of Dr. T. A. Welton of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Oak Ridge, during the hearings:

The proposal is remarkably free of technical difficulties and cost uncertainties. This is the result of the extensive experience with the present Stanford machine. * * * The independent cost estimate by William M. Brobeck & Associates is much more detailed than any ever before prepared prior to construction authorization. It fails to reveal any such gross optimism on the part of the Stanford group as it has become customary to expect. There seems to be no reasonable basis to doubt that the requested funds will allow completion of the planned machine, with highly successful operation. To summarize, the Stanford proposal is very much more free of technical problems than has been the case for any previous accelerator.

On page 9 of the committee report, the majority indicates as its sole reasons for partial rather than full authorization

the fact that it is not satisfied with the cost estimates because "Unforeseen additions relating to possible changes in cooling, shielding, ground loading, and so forth, should be more carefully reviewed before proceeding." This field of cooling, shielding, and ground loading is exactly the area where Stanford believes that it cannot recruit prominent personnel with less than full authorization. It therefore follows that cost estimates cannot be improved in the areas mentioned by the majority unless personnel is available. In fact, it is quite possible that without prominent personnel, the cost estimates will be less favorable. Let me repeat a previous quotation of Stanford University officials which substantiates the above view:

It would be impossible to recruit experienced high energy particle physicists who would be involved in more detailed calculations of shielding or study of other problems related to the utilization of the machine.

To quote the minority report from page 20 of the committee report:

Because the majority report states that "more design and engineering might result in better cost estimates," we believe it necessary to emphasize the thoroughness of the cost reviews already made. Volume 3, page XI–2, of the Blume report contains a table entitled "Comparison of project cost estimates—Stage 1 construction," setting forth columns of estimated costs at five different sites, and demonstrating that the Sand Hill site would have the lowest cost. Then, beginning at page XV–7, there commences a table entitled "Sand Hill site, stage 1 construction, project cost estimates," which sets out, for eight pages, a detailed cost breakdown and schedule, followed by a list of drawings and site location plans.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me repeat my points. The Nation needs this machine. If it is not built, we—

First, will not get the best personnel to design it;

Second, it will cost more;

Third, it will not be the best we can get; and

Fourth, we will suffer a serious blow to our national prestige.

This project is ready for full authorization. Its cost estimates have been made by experts. Full authorization will have practically no effect on the budget we are now considering, but it will have a maximum effect upon the quality of machine we will get, how much it will cost, and when we will get it.

We all worry about the great scientific competition afforded us by the Soviet Union. This is our chance to prove before the world that we too will fill the granary of knowledge for use by generations of the future. I urge adoption of the amendment to fully authorize the Stanford linear electron accelerator.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGER. I want to join with the gentleman on this question of authorization of this project. We have listened on this floor many times on the scientific race, and we have authorized many millions of dollars to encourage students in the universities. Here is a project, a machine that is absolutely essential in the further development of certain scientific knowledge. I think if the Congress fails to authorize it in this session we are going to set this development back for over a year.

I think you have made a wonderful contribution, to the discussion and I join you in it.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. I cannot agree with the gentleman who has just made the statement to the gentleman who holds the floor, because I do not think that anyone on the Joint Committee opposes this project as such. The issue is not whether or not this is an essential tool, but the issue is whether or not we are quite ready, on the basis of cost estimates that we now have, to grant the full authorization, because our experiences have already proven that by careful study we have been able to adjust this program, and perhaps by further study we can make further adjustments that will guarantee its efficient use after it is completed.

I would like to ask the gentleman this question. I would like to read the conclusion of the report by John A. Blume & Associates:

Before final design is undertaken and before the final alinement is selected, a detailed site investigation is recommended. Such investigation should include detailed geological mapping, further investigation of ground water conditions, careful study of cut and fill slope stability, and definitive analysis of excavation and foundation problems. This work should include a comprehensive program of trenching, drilling, and material testing and investigation of possible elastic strain accumulation in the subject areas. This latter recommendation is amplified and explained in the text.

This is all we are asking. We commit ourselves to authorization, but we want a full investigation. What the committee is doing is exactly what the committee is doing with the 12 midwestern universities.

Mr. GUBSER. May I say to the gentleman that I can also quote from the Blume report:

If the project is not authorized and operation initiated so that this schedule—

The 6-year schedule—

can be followed, the cost estimate should be increased at the rate of 5 percent per year for installation.

I would like to say one more thing to the gentleman. The committee report states that the area in which better cost estimates are desired is in the area of shielding and cooling. Yet the testimony of experts tells us this is information that will develop during the course of construction. They tell us you can get better cost estimates and better construction if you have prominent people. They also state that with partial authorization you will not get the people who can give us the best shielding and cooling cost estimates.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. We have heard a lot about a more detailed study that is needed. I would like to comment that if we follow this type of philosophy, obstacles can be raised for every project in the Atomic Energy Commission program. If we do this what will happen to the other proposed accelerators, and also power reactors, the ANP project Project Rover? Project Pluto? Project Sherwood?

Final site study would not normally be done until after the project is authorized.

Site problems have been as thoroughly studied as could be expected at this stage of authorization.

Studies which have been more thorough than for any other similar project indicate no fundamental adverse site conditions.

Of course, more detailed site studies will be made, as in any project, as the projects proceed.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], chairman of the subcommittee, who knows more about this measure than anyone connected with the committee.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, we have heard some rather extensive statements on this matter, and I would like to recapitulate if I can and describe the situation. I do not intend to make a long speech. I intend to place my comments in detail in the RECORD for those who wish to read them later. It is late Friday afternoon, and a number of Members have expressed the desire to catch trains and planes home for speaking engagements to which they were previously committed. It has been necessary to curtail some of their plans because of the unanticipated carryover of this bill until today. This is through no fault of anyone, of course, because the defense bill took more time for debate yesterday than was expected.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Surely the gentleman does not expect us on the floor to pay more attention to the fact that somebody wants to catch a train and leave his duties in Washington than to pass on an important subject of this kind? The gentleman does not want us to go away with that sort of impression, does he?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman knows that the present speaker does not want anyone to go away with that impression, but there is such a thing as using a certain degree of consideration for your colleagues. It is frequently practiced on the floor of this House, that we adjourn over, for instance.

Mr. YOUNGER. Let us adjourn over until Monday, then.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Unfortunately, the gentleman now in the well of the House is not in charge of the program. The gentleman is following the leadership, as the gentleman on the other side of the aisle is, I am sure.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] made a very fine technical explanation of what an electron accelerator happens to be. There are various kinds of accelerators. I could spend a half hour telling you the kinds of accelerators there are.

The statement has been made by the gentleman who intends to introduce an amendment which will raise this bill $104 million that this accelerator is needed. Well, there is no quarrel on the part of the Members on the majority side that this is a desirable accelerator. The testimony before our committee established the fact that it is desirable, but there was also a great deal of testimony before our committee which, in the opinion of the majority, shows that the main work has not been done on this particular case.

Let me give you a few figures. In 1957, when this accelerator was first proposed it was supposed to cost $80 million. Then another estimate was made and it was supposed to cost $116 million. In 1959 the AEC estimated it would cost $105 million. Now, they hired a very distinguished group to make a study of it, Blume & Associates, engineers, and the Blume people came back and said it would cost $126 million. Then the AEC proposal presented to this committee amounted to $107 million.

Now, the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have not talked to you about some other things that go along with this $107 million. There is $18 million needed for research and development. There will be $20 million the first year for operating costs, and that is a total of $46 million that will be added to the $107 million, provided that is all that will be spent.

Now, we are building one large accelerator. That is located at the Argonne National Laboratory. The first estimate to come before us was $15 million. They came back and raised this figure to $27 million. Do you know what the figure is today? Forty-two million dollars, starting out with a $15 million estimate.

Now, we want to know what we are doing when we go into this program. Spending $107 million, that is the first estimate. Is the cost of this accelerator going to accelerate three times as the Argonne Laboratory did, from $15 million up to $42 million? Is it going to be $107 million? Is it going to be $321 million? Is it going up three times? That is what the majority of this committee is concerned about. That is why we are asking for some additional cost estimates on this. For instance, Blume & Associates asked for some additional work to be done, and their conclusions and recommendations, No. 2, state as follows:

> Before final design is undertaken and before the final alinement is selected, a detailed site investigation is recommended. Such investigation should include detailed geological mapping, further investigation of ground water conditions, careful study of cut and fill slope stability, and definitive analysis of excavation and foundation problems. This work should include a comprehensive program of trenching, drilling, and material testing and investigation of possible elastic strain accumulation in the subject areas. This latter recommendation is amplified and explained in the text.

Now, this job of preliminary work has not been done; it has been partly done. We do not know what they are going to come up with. In the first instance, they were going to put this accelerator in a tunnel in the ground, and the Joint Committee demurred at that last year. This was going to cost them a great deal of money. They went back and made a study and decided that they could build it above ground on a cut and fill basis, and they decided that that would save about $25 million by making a cut and fill operation in place of a tunnel through the earth.

We went into the matter of the cost of operation of this particular accelerator from the standpoint of electrical energy. In last year's hearings the AEC came before us and said they were going to buy electricity at a cost of 9.3 mills. We told them to go back and look at the situation again and study it. They came back this year with an estimate that they had now made arrangements through the Bureau of Reclamation, Trinity River Division, to obtain electricity at 4.6 mills. We saved $660,000 a year by that one point of delay.

This committee is in favor of scientific research. There is not another committee in the House over the years, the 14 years that this committee has been in existence, that has supported scientific research any more diligently and aggressively than this committee. The progress of the Atomic Energy program is evidence that this tremendous scientific effort has been amply supported by this committee. This committee intends to continue to support scientific research. At the present time we have upwards of $150 million invested in accelerators. They are not all this kind of accelerator; I do not want to mislead the House. But the free world at this time has, as far as we know, the largest electron accelerators in existence. As far as we know the Russians do not have one. They have plans for building one, it is true; but as far as we know they are not building one. So we are excelling in this field at the present time. There is no doubt we can go faster. You can go faster in any program if you want to put the money into it. It is a problem of how much money you want to put in at the present time. How do you want to space your expenditures? Do you want to develop a balanced program or an unbalanced program?

Maybe the majority of the committee are wrong in estimating that this is the right way to go about it, the balanced way to go about it. We are furnishing $3 million in this program for further design and engineering studies and to give them a few more months to bring back the information which this committee wants and which the Blume Associates said they should obtain before they started their operations.

I know my friends on my left are interested in this subject just as I am. But I do not yield to them any greater degree of interest in the advancement of science in this country, nor does the majority yield to them any greater degree of interest in science. We believe we are proceeding in an orderly way. We believe that the program we have laid before you is an orderly program.

The Bureau of the Budget has approved $293,876,000 for the atomic energy program. This bill authorizes $211,476,000. This is a reduction of $82,400,000 from the request of the AEC and the Bureau of the Budget. We believe that we are justified in making that reduction at this time in view of the overall expenditures of Government and in view of the overall expenditures in the atomic energy program and in view of our position of competition in the world in this particular line of high energy physics.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take any additional time at this time. I understand that an amendment will be offered to increase the amount of this bill by $104 million. The position of the majority in bringing this bill to your attention is that we are against that particular amendment. I ask that the Committee consider the arguments that have been made on both sides and vote their conscience on this matter.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I would not want to have this House go away with the impression that we have pinned any economy merit badges on our chest in this authorization bill by cutting out $107.2 million for this linear accelerator below what the President requested.

When that went out, $35 million went in for various other projects, projects that will actually require expenditures this year by way of appropriations much greater than the $4 million-plus on the linear accelerator even if we did make a full authorization of it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman had better consult his figures.

Mr. HOSMER. I have consulted my figures and I have confidence in them.

May I ask this question: In view of the unanimous testimony that a linear accelerator of this size and power is a basic tool necessary for the Nation's scientific advancement, does the gentleman feel that there is any question about eventually building that machine in this country?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman has very clearly stated that the position of the majority is not against the building of this type of accelerator at the proper time, but the position of the majority on this item is as it has been on other items, to properly and carefully look at the preparatory work that has been done and to select the timing to initiate such a gigantic undertaking. We are furnishing $3 million for them to start on their design and engineering work. They have testified before the committee they can spend only $2.2 million in that field. We feel that by the time they have spent the $3 million and brought back to us the other items of information that we want—and the gentleman is aware I have touched on only

a few; I could go into the patent position of the klystron tube and a few other things that have to be ironed out—when they bring that information back, I am sure this committee will exercise its good judgment and come back to this House with a timely item in its authorization bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11713, the AEC authorization bill for the fiscal year 1961 program which has been recommended by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislation I sat through hearings on March 8, 10, 11, and April 5, 6, and 7, in which we explored every item in the bill very carefully. Vice Chairman DURHAM has given you a description of the scope of the authorization bill and the projects which the Joint Committee has added or modified.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development, has described particularly those research projects which the Joint Committee added to the bill.

I would like to endorse what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has stated and to support all of the projects added and modified by the Joint Committee.

I would particularly call your attention to the Antarctic atomic power projects—project 61–d–10, page 3, lines 19 and 20—added by the Joint Committee as being a very necessary and desirable project. From the standpoint of economy alone they will pay for themselves after a few—2 to 5—years of operation in comparison with conventional fuel supplies. In addition they will save many lives which would otherwise be lost in transporting fuel for conventional power units. Over the last 2 or 3 years 17 planes have been wrecked, with a total of 17 lives lost and $10½ million in property damage. Moreover, having atomic powerplants at our Antarctic bases will undoubtedly enhance the prestige of the United States with the international scientific community which is represented by numerous expeditions in this important area.

Another project I would like to discuss is project 61–h–1, installation for support of biomedical research in atomic energy, $5 million.

This project covers miscellaneous additional facilities for the conduct of research in the field of radiation effects on biological systems, including the effects of radiation from radioactive fallout.

Included in this project are such items as a nuclear reactor to furnish bursts of radiation for the study of the effects of radiation on animals, radiobotany facilities to study genetic effects, animal quarters to study the effects of chronic radiation, radiobiological laboratory facilities, and modification of existing facilities in this field.

The Atomic Energy Commission requested $4 million for such facilities in its fiscal year 1961 authorization request. The Joint Committee increased this amount by $1 million, to a total of $5 million.

Last year the Commission requested $2 million for such facilities and the Joint Committee increased the request by $1 million, to a total of $3 million. The total $3 million authorized last year has been committed by the Commission for the support of work in this vital field.

The hearings held by our committee on the biological effects of radiation have brought forth the great need for additional data in this field. Solutions to the problems of radiation are absolutely dependent on the availability of additional experimental data on the biological effects of radiation.

The Joint Committee's Special Radiation Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, has scheduled additional hearings on this subject. These hearings are scheduled to start on May 24 and will extend through the first week in June. In these hearings we intend to get the information on our work in the field of radiation standards to clarify some of the confusion and misunderstanding by the public and the scientific community concerning the basis and use of radiation standards.

POWER DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

This authorizes a total of $40 million for the atomic power demonstration program. Of this amount, $15 million is authorized for research and development assistance for unsolicited proposals for construction of private power reactors. The Southern California Edison Co. recently announced it is negotiating with Westinghouse for a large 360,000-kilowatt plant, which could be assisted under this authorization. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is also interested in a large plant. The other $25 million is for an organic moderated prototype, or can be used for other projects under certain conditions.

It should be noted that the AEC did not request authorization of additional atomic power projects for fiscal 1961. There were one or two projects which the Joint Committee might have added—such as a $60 million natural uranium heavy water prototype. However, we decided to watch the development of technology from reactor experiments and research and development before taking this step.

Finally, I would like to mention the authorization of $3 million for further design and engineering for the Stanford linear accelerator. It is believed this is an adequate amount to make progress in the project, while at the same time firming up plans and estimates prior to authorization of construction. I expect to discuss this project at greater length later.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill is a good one, and deserves our support.

STANFORD ACCELERATOR PROJECT

I would like to mention the reasons the Joint Committee provided $3 million for further design and engineering on the Stanford accelerator project. I want to make it clear at the outset that the Joint Committee, and particularly its majority, is in favor of continuing design, engineering, and development of this project, and doing everything necessary—short of authorizing construction—to enable the project to go ahead after January 1961, providing proper justification of cost estimates, personnel, and program planning.

This Stanford accelerator project has had a rather peculiar history. When Stanford originally made its proposal to the Commission several years ago for this accelerator project, the cost estimate was $79 million. This, of course, is a lot of money. However, when the project was submitted to the Congress and the Joint Committee in May of 1959 the cost estimate was $105 million. Although the project was submitted too late in 1959 to be considered in conjunction with the AEC authorization bill we were admonished that we should consider the project thoroughly and authorize it if possible.

The Joint Committee did hold special hearings on the project. It became apparent that the cost situation did require some looking into. However, we were, as I say, requested to go ahead and authorize the project. Two examples, however, of questions on the cost may serve to indicate some of the things that troubled us at that time.

One of them was the cost of the 2-mile tunnel for the accelerator. We inquired whether the problem of stable ground conditions had been considered and whether enough attention had been given to special problems of tunneling. We were assured that they had been. However, AEC Chairman McCone, last fall, did institute a further engineering study that came up with the fact that the costs of the tunnel would substantially increase the cost of the project by several millions of dollars. In total the estimate, instead of being $105 million, would have been $126,700,000.

Another question that we raised last year concerned the cost of electric power needed for the operation of the accelerator. The estimate used by the AEC and its contractors was based on obtaining power at a rate of 9 or 10 mills from the private power company serving that general area. Chairman Anderson raised the question of whether or not it would be possible to obtain cheaper power from some other source since the amounts required for the operation of the accelerator were rather large—some 50,000 electrical kilowatts capacity being required initially and 120,000 kilowatts ultimately. It turned out after substantial study over the recess that the AEC has now arranged to get power from the Department of Interior for the Stanford accelerator at about 4½ mills thereby halving the original estimated operating costs for the accelerator. The net cost savings run from $660,000 to $1,300,000 per year.

Each of these examples of caution by the Joint Committee has saved millions of dollars in construction and operating costs for the Stanford accelerator.

This year we followed the pattern of last year in terms of the request for the authorization of the Stanford accelerator.

Instead of the project being submitted as a part of the AEC authorization bill we were told that there were differences

of opinion within the executive branch that needed to be ironed out before it could be submitted. Therefore, the project was not submitted until shortly before the conclusion of our hearings on the AEC authorization bill. Nevertheless the Subcommittee on Legislation did conduct hearings on the project and after considerable deliberation decided not to authorize construction but did provide $3 million to proceed with further design and engineering on the project. There are several reasons for this position taken by the Joint Committee with respect to the project.

It should be pointed out that the $107 million estimate is not the whole story. There is additional development work and other activities in conjunction with the accelerator which will cost approximately $46 million which the AEC has classified as "operating costs," which will also have to be incurred with the construction of the reactor. One of our Senate minority members suggested that perhaps this additional $46 million should be classified as construction costs rather than operating costs. In any event, this additional money will be required. This $107 million estimate, plus $46 million estimate, will also be increased by an additional $40–$50 million when, and if, the output of the accelerator is increased from 15 Bev to 45 Bev.

So as the project stands today, together with its acknowledged future increases in cost, it is already a $200 million project. If the experience we have had with other accelerator projects is followed, the ultimate cost of the project could go up another $100 million, since actual costs have generally doubled over the original estimates.

We believe that the cost estimates for this project have been improved as a result of further study by the Commission and its contractors over the recess. However, there are still certain aspects of the cost that would appear to require looking into.

As I mentioned, the cost estimate for the project, utilizing a tunnel for the accelerator, rose from $105 million to $126,700,000. As a result of this increase, presumably, it was determined that rather than utilizing a tunnel they would utilize the cut-and-fill method of construction with the accelerator housing lying on top of the land rather than in a tunnel. By this means, together with other cuts, the project estimate was pulled down from the $127 million estimate to $107 million.

However, with respect even to the cut-and-fill method, there may be some matters which should be further looked into. For example, only three test borings have been made for the particular site that is now recommended. It is recognized for the so-called cut-and-fill method, not as many test borings have to be made as for a tunnel. However, for a 2-mile cut-and-fill location it would seem that greater attention should be given to taking borings for the entire length of the acceleraor housing rather than at only one end of it as has been done.

Another question on the cost estimate involves the cost of the accelerator itself. In the hearings held by the Subcommittee on Legislation we inquired as to why the estimate for the accelerator proper rose from $23,789,000 to $27,635,000. The answer we received was quite vague and seemed to be more of a horseback guess.

Another reason for giving the AEC time to develop its cost estimates is to put the Stanford accelerator in proper relationship and balance to other high energy physics projects, as well as other basic research projects. The cost of high energy physics projects has increased tremendously in the last few years. The Joint Committee is in favor of proceeding with such projects but not at the expense of other desirable basic research projects. It should be noted that the various advisers to the President called attention to the need for insuring that low energy physics, for example, be encouraged and that the stress on high energy physics should not be at the expense of low energy physics. The AEC General Advisory Panel stated in regard to the high energy physics projects:

> We note, however, that the magnitude of Federal expenditure for high energy physics is reaching such a high level that it is important to insure that progress in this field does not interfere with the building up and orderly growth of other areas of basic science.

In this year's AEC authorization bill the Joint Committee, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] has explained, has attempted to obtain a balance in basic research projects by adding projects on materials research and radiation to be carried on in private and State institutions. The Joint Committee has asked for a report from the Atomic Energy Commission on the high energy physics program which is due in January 1961, which, we hope, will cover the relationship and costs of these projects and other research fields.

Another aspect of the Stanford project, which is of some concern and we hope will receive attention during the recess is as to what the organizational arrangements will be for operating the project. The Joint Committee inquired into this last year and received only general answers. We were surprised this year to find that apparently no progress had been made in determining how the project was going to be run. It seems to me that we are entitled to know how a $105 to a $150 million project is going to be organized and administered.

Lastly, there were some problems relating to patents and conflicts of interest which were looked into during the recess. It appears that the patent problem has been largely taken care of. Whether or not the conflicts of interest problem has been adequately handled remains to be seen.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that the Joint Committee inquired of the AEC as to whether or not the $3 million provided for the Stanford accelerator was adequate to make progress on the project. The letter from the Acting Chairman of the AEC confirmed that progress would be made. This is contained on pages 10–11 of the committee report on the bill, as follows:

> It is the Commission's view that the amount of $3 million for design and engineering together with the operating funds for continued development work is adequate for the Atomic Energy Commission and Stanford to make progress on the project.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I was greatly impressed a while ago when the majority leader told how this Congress appropriated $1,600 million for the Manhattan project without any quibbling or any information at all in order to achieve something that was necessary for the protection of this country. Here we are, even granting all of the figures given by the opponents, quibbling over a question of a few million dollars on a project that they say must be built, but they want it built in the future. I wish this Congress could rise to the heights that the Congress did when they were appealed to on the Manhattan project and go ahead and authorize this project which they all say is going to be built anyway.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 101. PLANT OR FACILITY ACQUISITION OR CONSTRUCTION.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with the provisions of section 261a.(1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the sum of $211,476,000 for acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion as follows:

(a) SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS.—

Project 61–a–1, modifications to production and supporting installations, $10,000,000.

Project 61–a–2, billet production plant, $1,800,000.

Project 61–a–3, heat treatment and inspection modifications, Fernald, Ohio, $2,500,000.

Project 61–a–4, development laboratory building, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $766,000.

Project 61–a–5, plutonium reclamation plant, Hanford, Washington, $2,900,000.

Project 61–a–6, moderator purification improvements, Savannah River, South Carolina, $2,500,000.

(b) ATOMIC WEAPONS.—

Project 61–b–1, weapons production, development, and test installations, $10,000,000.

Project 61–b–2, high-velocity test track, Sandia Base, New Mexico, $2,100,000.

Project 61–b–3, special metals fabrication plant, $3,000,000.

(c, ATOMIC WEAPONS.—

Project 61–c–1, contaminated waste plant, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $2,000,000.

(d) REACTOR DEVELOPMENT.—

Project 61–d–1, additions and modifications to Chemical Engineering Building, Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois, $2,000,000.

Project 61–d–2, special purpose test installation addition, Santa Susana, California, $1,200,000.

Project 61–d–3, technical space for SPERT, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, $500,000.

Project 61–d–4, critical building, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, $600,000.

Project 61–d–5, fast reactor core test installation, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, $6,900,000.

Project 61–d–6, plutonium fuel service and development building, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, $600,000.

Project 61–d–7, test installation for Project Rover, $20,000,000.

Project 61–d–8, test installation for Project Pluto, $15,000,000.

Project 61–d–9, advanced test reactor, $24,000,000.

Project 61–d–10, power reactor plants for the Antarctic, $13,000,000.

(e) REACTOR DEVELOPMENT.—

Project 61–e–1, additions and modifications, MTR-ETR area, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, $800,000.

Project 61–e–2, site utilities, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, $1,250,000.

Project 61–e–3, quarters for visiting scientists, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, $550,000.

(f) PHYSICAL RESEARCH.—

Project 61–f–1, bubble chamber house, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, $1,660,000.

Project 61–f–2, Princeton-Pennsylvania accelerator addition, Princeton, New Jersey, $10,820,000.

Project 61–f–3, accelerator and reactor additions and modifications, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, $1,085,000.

Project 61–f–4, high flux isotope reactor, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tennessee, $12,000,000.

Project 61–f–5, accelerator improvements, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, $500,000.

Project 61–f–6, major bevatron improvements, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, $9,600,000.

Project 61–f–7, design and engineering, linear electron accelerator, $3,000,000.

Project 61–f–8, materials research laboratory, University of Illinois. $5,600,000.

Project 61–f–9, radiation laboratory, University of Notre Dame, $2,200,000.

(g) PHYSICAL RESEARCH.—

Project 61–g–1, metallurgy building extension, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, $655,000.

Project 61–g–2, addition to cyclotron building, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, $500,000.

(h) BIOLOGY AND MEDICINE.—

Project 61–h–1, installations for support of biomedical research in atomic energy, $5,000,000.

(i) COMMUNITY.—

Project 61–i–1, real estate development, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $435,000.

Project 61–i–2, elementary school addition, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $145,000.

Project 61–i–3, steam transmission line, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $135,000.

(j) GENERAL PLANT PROJECTS.—$34,175,000.

SEC. 102. LIMITATIONS.—(a) The Commission is authorized to start any project set forth in subsections 101 (a), (b), (d), (f), and (h), only if the currently estimated cost of that project does not exceed by more than 25 per centum the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(b) The Commission is authorized to start any project set forth in subsections 101 (c), (e), (g), and (i), only if the currently estimated cost of that project does not exceed by more than 10 per centum the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(c) The Commission is authorized to start a project under subsection 101(j) only if it is in accordance with the following:

1. For community operations, the maximum currently estimated cost of any project shall be $100,000 and the maximum currently estimated cost of any building included in such project shall be $10,000.

2. For all other programs, the maximum currently estimated cost of any project shall be $500,000 and the maximum currently estimated cost of any building included in such a project shall be $100,000.

3. The total cost of all projects undertaken under subsection 101(j) shall not exceed the estimated cost set forth in that subsection by more than 10 per centum.

SEC. 103. ADVANCE PLANNING AND DESIGN.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated funds for advance planning, construction design, and architectural services, in connection with projects which are not otherwise authorized by law, and the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to use funds currently or otherwise available to it for such purposes.

SEC. 104. RESTORATION OR REPLACEMENT.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated funds necessary to restore or to replace plants or facilities destroyed or otherwise seriously damaged, and the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to use funds currently or otherwise available to it for such purposes.

SEC. 105. CURRENTLY AVAILABLE FUNDS.—In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission by section 101 of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission to accomplish the purposes of this Act such sums of money as may be currently available to the Atomic Energy Commission.

SEC. 106. SUBSTITUTIONS.—Funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to start any other new project for which an estimate was not included in this Act if it be a substitute for a project or portion of a project authorized in subsections 101(a), (b), and (c) and the estimated cost thereof is within the limit of cost of the project for which substitution is to be made, and the Commission certifies that—

(a) the project is essential to the common defense and security;

(b) the new project is required by changes in weapon characteristics or weapon logistic operations; and

(c) it is unable to enter into a contract with any person, including a licensee, on terms satisfactory to the Commission to furnish from a privately owned plant or facility the product or services to be provided in the new project.

SEC. 107. AMENDMENT OF PRIOR YEAR PROJECTS.—(a) Section 101(d) of Public Law 84–506, as amended, is further amended by striking therefrom "Project 57–d–1, high energy accelerator, $27,000,000" and substituting therefor "Project 57–d–1, zero gradient synchrotron, Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois, $42,000,000."

(b) Public Law 86–50 is amended by striking out the figure "$5,000,000" for project 60–e–12, alterations to Shippingport reactor facilities, and substituting therefor the figure "$9,000,000".

SEC. 108. PROJECT RESCISSIONS.—(a) Public Law 86–50 is amended by rescinding therefrom authorization for a project, except for funds heretofore obligated, as follows:

Project 60–c–2, special processing plant, phase II, Mound Laboratory, Ohio, $3,800,000.

(b) Public Law 85–590, as amended, is further amended by rescinding therefrom authorization for projects, except for funds heretofore obligated, as follows:

Project 59–b–4, special processing plant, Mound Laboratory, Ohio, $2,000,000.

Project 59–c–8, lineal acceleration tester, Livermore, California, $390,000.

Project 59–g–3, gamma process development irradiator, $1,600,000.

(c) Public Law 85–162, as amended, is further amended by rescinding therefrom authorization for projects, except for funds heretofore obligated, as follows:

Project 58–b–5, additions to scrap plants, various sites, $1,500,000.

Project 58–c–2, weapons special component plant, $6,000,000.

(d) Public Law 84–506, as amended, is further amended by rescinding therefrom authorization for a project except for funds heretofore obligated, as follows:

Project 57–a–7, modifications to existing production facilities for increased efficiency and safety, Hanford, Washington, $3,000,000.

SEC. 109. COOPERATIVE POWER REACTOR DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—(a) Section 111 of Public Law 85–162, as amended, is further amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1960," in clause (3) of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1961."

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission the sum of $40,000,000 to be available, in addition to the funds heretofore authorized, for carrying out the Commission's power reactor demonstration program in accordance with the terms and conditions provided in Sections 110 and 112 of Public Law 86–50. The maximum amount of the program authorization, specified in subsection 110(b) of Public Law 86–50, is increased by $45,000,000. In addition to the amount authorized under subsection 110(c) of Public Law 86–50, the Commission is authorized to use funds not to exceed $15,000,000 in the aggregate, to provide research and development assistance in support of unsolicited proposals from the utility industry to construct nuclear powerplants.

(c) Section 110 of Public Law 86–50 is amended by deleting the word "two" in the first sentence of subsection (d).

SEC. 110. COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM WITH CANADA.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission, in accordance with the provisions of section 261(a)(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the sum of $5,000,000 for use in a cooperative program of research and development in connection with heavy water moderated nuclear powerplants to be conducted under the Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, signed on the 15th day of June 1955, as now or hereafter modified.

SEC. 111. DESIGN AND ENGINEERING STUDIES.—The Commission is authorized within its discretion to proceed with design and engineering studies to include, but not be limited to, the following:

(a) Facilities for food irradiation;

(b) Power reactor of steam-cooled type.

The Commission may submit reports on studies under this section to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy by April 1, 1961.

Mr. HOSMER (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSMER: On page 4, lines 19 and 20, strike out "Project 61–f–7, design and engineering, linear electron accelerator, $3,000,000." and insert "Project 61–f–7, linear electron accelerator, $107,200,000."

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, we are at the point now where the issue is

drawn. It is drawn on a project that everybody agrees is a good one, a necessary one and one that has to be built—a project that will insure the scientific leadership of the United States. The only difference from the financial standpoint is whether we are going to spend $4 million on it this year or spend $3 million on it this year. But from the standpoint of getting a quality project and getting a topnotch machine that will pull together the scientific team that is needed to produce this, we are facing a much greater issue. We are facing an issue akin to that mentioned by the majority leader when he said that the Congress had risen to its duty in connection with the Manhattan project. We are also dealing with a much vaster issue because this particular machinery in the eyes of the scientific world is something that is incomparable from the standpoint of potential accomplishment; something that is incomparable from the standpoint of prestige of the country that undertakes it. So my colleagues for $1 million actual appropriations increase in authorization of the full project that this year would involve, you can buy that tremendous prestige; for the $1 million you can put that team of topnotch scientific experts together to do the job the way it should be done—the way that this United States of America ought to do a job. As a matter of fact, with that $1 million you will probably get $5 million or $10 million or $15 million in return because if you delay this thing, you are going to run into cost escalation factors that will exceed the $1 million many many times. This is a science issue—this is a science issue, my colleagues, and it is an issue of whether you are going to support the scientific community and support the Nation's scientific effort with this project or whether you are not. The Joint Atomic Committee contrary to the way some of the Members have talked today, when they issued their report on basic science in 1958, after listening to one Nobel Prize winner after another Nobel Prize winner, asked for and pleaded for and recommended that the expenditures in this basic science field for just this kind of research tools be doubled and trebled. And that is the issue today. Are we going to have this thing? Are we going to have the best? Are we going to keep our national scientific leadership?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman knows in order to eliminate some of the confusion concerning this project, the minority asked the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission to clarify the position of the Commission, and I would like to read what the Chairman of the Commission had to say:

> If the project were authorized in this session of the Congress for design engineering only and was not fully authorized until June of 1961, it appears that the most serious effect will be the lack of ability to recruit certain additional key scientists whom Stanford considers are essential for the development and design of the accelerator and experimental facilities.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman. I hope every one of you can go home after this session is over and be able to say that his action today prevented a gap in U.S. science; that he would not permit this to lag by congressional default. There will be no lag and there will be no gap if action is taken favorably on this amendment today, and I plead with you to act favorably on the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman know of any outstanding nuclear physicist in this country who is opposed to beginning the construction of this project at the earliest possible date?

Mr. HOSMER. There is none such. There is none such and there is no scientific leadership in the world that does not today look to the Congress of the United States to find out whether or not this country lives up to its role of leadership by boldly moving ahead with this project or loses that leadership by inaction today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, as I said in my opening statement, there is no one on the committee who is opposed to this project. It is a question of opinion. I think it is based on sound evidence and sound judgment, that we obtain a detailed cost estimate on this project. When we look at the list of construction of accelerators: cosmotron, bevatron, ZGS, Argonne, and Harvard, we see we started out with an initial cost of $4 million for the cosmotron and it went to $13 million. The others also had increases. The total cost was $72,300,000 at the start, and now it is $124,400,000. We have been trying at all times, all through this program, to bring to this Congress and to the country whatever was necessary to do the job. But we have always tried to do it based on evidence and based on facts, so that we would not get ourselves in a position of spending, as I said this morning, like we did on the wind tunnels, when we wasted a lot of money, we pulled the thing together and said, "No, we are going to have some judgment and some good estimates."

Now we have handled a very scientific matter that came out of the old Military Affairs Committee about 1940 or 1941. It began in the old days with the Fermi reactor under Stagg Field at the University of Chicago out of which has come all of this scientific development that we are discussing today. The Congress, in my judgment, has provided funds for these theoretical and experimental physicists to work with when they were ready.

I have talked to physicists all over the country.

We have heard talk about budget-busting. We do not want to throw this thing wide open without knowledge and without facts. All we are asking you to do is to give it study. I am not opposed to the project. I have stated that dozens of times. I offered an amendment giving them $3 million when they said they were only going to ask for $2½ million. There will be no undue delay in this thing.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to authorize in full the linear electron accelerator proposed by Stanford University.

In addition to the convincing arguments already made by my colleagues, I would like to emphasize two points:

First. This project has been thoroughly studied. The original proposal for this accelerator was made by Stanford University in 1957, after 4 years of serious study by the scientists and engineers at Stanford who had performed many experiments in this field and were working on similar machines of smaller scale. In 1958, a special National Science Foundation Panel on High Energy Physics reviewed and recommended the Stanford accelerator. Later, in 1958, the President convened a special panel of scientists consisting of members of the President's Science Advisory Committee and the AEC General Advisory Committee, and on November 16, 1958, this panel, after careful review of our entire high energy program as well as this project, recommended the Stanford accelerator as the next, and a necessary, step.

In May 1959, the President reviewed the previous studies and recommendations, decided that it was worthwhile, and accordingly the AEC requested congressional authorization.

In July and August 1959, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held detailed hearings, published as a 649-page document entitled "Stanford Linear Electron Accelerator," containing a multitude of technical details and data on the project.

But the Joint Committee decided, in 1959, that further study was needed. During the fall, the AEC conducted a thorough review, investigating all matters raised by the AEC and the Joint Committee. In March 1960, the AEC submitted a complete "Status Report" reprinted at pages 396–400 of the hearings this year entitled "AEC Authorizing Legislation, Fiscal Year 1961." The Status Report indicates that because of the thorough AEC review, all matters of possible conflicts of interest, power supply, site location, methods of construction, and cost estimates have been thoroughly studied and resolved.

With regard to cost estimates, I would like to quote from page 20 of the separate views in our minority report:

> Because the majority report states that "more design and engineering might result in better cost estimates," we believe it necessary to emphasize the thoroughness of the cost reviews already made. Volume 3, page XI–2 of the Blume report, contains a table entitled "Comparison of Project Cost Estimates—State 1 Construction," setting forth columns of estimated costs at five different sites, and demonstrating that the Sand Hill site would have the lowest cost. Then, beginning at page XV–7, there commences a table entitled "Sand Hill Site, Stage 1 Construction, Project Cost Estimates," which

sets out, for eight pages, a detailed cost breakdown and schedule, followed by a list of drawings and site location plans.

In January 1960 the special panel of scientists convened again and once more recommended the project in the following words:

In particular, this panel wishes to reaffirm its recommendation to start immediately the construction of the linear electron accelerator proposed by Stanford University, and to express its concern about the delay which has been encountered in authorizing this machine to date.

In April of this year, the Joint Committee held further hearings and AEC Chairman McCone and Commissioner John H. Williams testified once more in strong support of the project.

Second. This accelerator will be able to perform new and important experiments. Scientists have testified before our committee on the advances in recent years in understanding the fundamental constitution of matter—the structure of molecules, atoms, protons, neutrons, electrons, and strange particles. The study of the atomic nucleus is important, has led to important national defense discoveries in the past, and has aroused the interest of scientists the world over. This knowledge can be effectively advanced only through the use of ultrahigh energy accelerators of diverse capabilities. Dr. Leland J. Haworth, Director of the Brookhaven National Laboratory, stated at page 77 of the 1959 hearings concerning the Stanford accelerator:

The unique potentiality of the proposed accelerator lies, however, in the possibilities it affords for structural studies of elementary particles.

During the hearings this year, I asked some questions, understandable to laymen, of Dr. John H. Williams as to the type of particles that would be sought in this machine:

Representative WESTLAND. There is not one fundamental particle that you are seeking?

Dr. WILLIAMS. No. There are over 30 that we have seen. The fundamental difference between what we can do with existing machines and the so-called Stanford accelerator is that all the existing machines that get up to this energy are proton machines. There is no electron machine with the characteristics of the Stanford accelerator available. In other words, we believe by building this so-called linear electron accelerator we will be making the next and most important advance in the science of high energy physics.

I also asked Dr. Williams the difference between an electron and a proton machine and received the following answer:

Representative WESTLAND. What is the difference between an electron and proton machine? What do you hope to find in one that you don't find in the other?

Dr. WILLIAMS. There is a very specific difference between them. In the electron machine one is investigating the interaction of electrons. On this chart you will see the electrons are the lightest of the real particles with any finite mass. Interacting through its electric field with the field of protons and neutrons in the nucleus, is called an electromagnetic interaction. Because of the nature of the theory we understand that interaction better. If we talk about the interaction of a proton or neutron with other protons and neutrons in the nucleus, that is a description which we really don't understand fully. So there is quite a different thing between proton and electron machines.

The opinions of our scientists about the value of this machine, and its importance in our continuing scientific competition with Soviet Russia, has been amply and convincingly demonstrated during the hearings before our committee.

In summary, this project has already been thoroughly studied. Further study will serve no useful purpose, but will cause more delay and increased ultimate costs. This accelerator will be able to perform new and important experiments considered extremely important by our scientists which will greatly advance knowledge and aid us in our continuing scientific competition with Soviet Russia.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is the second year President Eisenhower has requested construction authorization for a linear accelerator as a vital step in the field of high energy nuclear physics basic research. The United States is ahead in the field on a worldwide basis and to me it seems important that we stay out in front.

The action of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in failing to respond to the President's construction request will result in an unfortunate delay in obtaining such an accelerator. I support an amendment to H.R. 11713 for the project authorization. In other words, I favor the full request; not just $3 million for design studies. This is a fully tested and proven program and no good purpose will be served by a delay. On the contrary, the ultimate project cost would increase.

I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on this Friday afternoon I would like to present a proposition to my colleagues which I think will be attractive. If you will listen to me intently on this one point for 2 minutes, I guarantee you I will be through. Here it is.

Everyone here this afternoon has said that this accelerator should be built, but the only question is, Do we have reliable cost estimates?

Now, where is the major area where the cost estimates are doubted? The majority of the committee has said that it is in the area of cooling and shielding. Most scientists agree. Even the civil engineers cannot start their calculations until they know how much dirt and how much cement and concrete is to be required to shield this machine. Now then, how are we going to get reliable cost estimates for the cooling and shielding unless we have the best people available?

I will close by quoting the people who will be doing this job. They argue against partial authorization and they say "As an example, it would be impossible to recruit experienced high-energy particle physicists who would be involved in more detailed calculations of shielding."

My point is this: The only question is the cost estimate. The major part, or the major area in doubt, is the area of shielding and cooling, and we must have the most reliable and best technical people you can find to get this data. We do not think we can get them unless we have full authorization. I ask your support of the Hosmer amendment.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, to authorize in full the linear electron accelerator proposed by Stanford University. I believe that this is a very important project. But more than that, I believe that Congress should support our scientists. When a program and a project have been thoroughly reviewed by a top panel of distinguished scientists, who have made a unanimous, and an enthusiastic, recommendation, I believe we should give them support, especially in view of our continuing scientific competition with Soviet Russia.

First. The $3 million design and engineering authorization will delay the project and increase the total costs. I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter dated April 28, 1960, to me from the Honorable John A. McCone, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. This letter indicates that, even assuming prompt authorization next year, commencement of useful experiments will be delayed an estimated 6 to 9 months, total estimated construction costs will be increased $2 to $3 million due to escalation, and possibly an additional $1 million more because of the uncertain status and inefficiency resulting from partial authorization.

Second. Staff recruitment will be difficult. As pointed out by this letter, it appears that the most serious effect of partial authorization will be "the lack of ability to recruit certain additional key scientists which Stanford considers essential in the development and design of the accelerator and experimental facilities." Many competent scientists have testified that the first step vital to a project of this importance is to recruit topnotch scientists and engineers. Under partial authorization this cannot be done.

Third. We are in a competition with Russia in the basic research fields. The scientists in our country, many of our best scientific minds, are terrifically excited and enthusiastic about the prospects of high energy physics—the discoveries which have been made, and the discoveries they feel can yet be made. I feel that if we in Congress falter, if we delay, if we give our scientists something short of complete, nonpolitical support, the United States will be the loser.

Our scientists tell us that funds for high energy physics should be increased, not decreased, and they are talking about this coming fiscal year 1961. I quote from the letter of February 5, 1960, from this special panel of scientists—pages 27–29 of our separate views:

At present the United States is leading the world in high-energy physics, one of

the most dynamic areas of science which, as a byproduct, is training some of our brightest physicists.

To maintain this leadership, to continue the growth of this science and to continue the training of some of our best minds, requires vigorous support by the Federal Government. The panel is concerned that the fiscal year 1961 budget for high-energy physics, as submitted to the Congress, is too low. The reduced construction obligation envisaged for fiscal year 1961, as compared with fiscal year 1960, implies a level of activity in the future which may jeopardize our present leading position in the world in this field. The authorization of the Stanford accelerator and other anticipated construction over the next 5 years, which the panel considers essential for an effective development of the high-energy physics field, will require an increasing annual expenditure for high-energy physics which may approach some $200 million by 1965.

With respect to project 61–f–7 in this bill—which the House will be asked to vote on this afternoon—the special panel of distinguished scientists clearly, forcefully, and unanimously stated its view, and I quote from page 27, appendix A to our separate views:

In particular, this panel wishes to reaffirm its recommendation to start immediately the construction of the linear electron accelerator proposed by Stanford University, and to express its concern about the delay which has been encountered in authorizing this machine to date. All the experimental potentialities of this machine, which the panel foresaw last year, still look as attractive as they did then. In addition, new potentialities have developed for which this high-intensity, high-energy electron machine is well suited.

The scientific point of view is clear. The project deserves support.

I urge all Members of the House to vote for the amendment to authorize in full the linear electron accelerator proposed by Stanford University.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary to carry the debate a great deal further as far as the majority side is concerned. I have pointed out that in one instance we had an estimate for an accelerator that started out at $15 million and has now grown to $42 million. This particular estimate of $105 million or $107 million may be an accurate estimate, and it may not. We do not know. I point out NASA just recently let a contract to 1 of 12 bidders. The contract was for $18 million. In this particular instance it has mushroomed to $105 million and they tell us that it is going even higher on this particular project.

So, this is not a matter of being for or against science. This is a matter of spending American public funds in a constructive and sound manner. This Congress cannot be accused of not being for science. We are authorizing more than $9 billion a year for research and development in the scientific field, in addition to another $9 billion that is being spent by industry. This Nation is spending close to $18 billion a year in scientific research and development. But there is a great deal of waste in that spending in my opinion and whenever a responsible committee of the Congress can look at this very difficult and complicated problem, and can see that we can save a few million dollars, as we have already on this project, then I think it is the duty of that committee to do so. The majority feels that they are handling this in an orderly, sound and timely manner.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Committee support the majority position of the Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The reason I do so is to allay the fears of Members who I know are interested in the advancement of our research program. If this amendment is defeated it will not in any appreciable way delay a sound program in the field of high energy physics.

I am afraid that the impression has been left that unless we authorize immediately the Stanford accelerator we will cause a serious gap in the high energy field particularly as it relates to electron acceleration. This is not correct because within a year and a half a 6 billion electron volt electron accelerator will be completed at Cambridge, Mass. This will be an effective machine for electron acceleration that will contribute greatly to our high-energy research while we are perfecting the Stanford project.

It may be argued that the Cambridge machine is not a linear accelerator, which is true. But some scientists believe that you are not going to get much more information out of the linear accelerator than you will out of the Cambridge type. I am not going to argue that point. I do not know whether there is any basis for the argument. But at least some scientists argue this. This is an indication of the type of data that the majority of the committee wanted to have before giving full and complete authorization to the project.

I personally favor further consideration of the project early next year and I personally will appreciate the opportunity within a short time of voting for full authorization for the Stanford accelerator. But I think that what has transpired in the past year in the study of this project indicates that the committee is wise in seeking more cost data before giving final and complete authorization.

We know they originally intended to build the accelerator in a tunnel and when the committee did not rush the authorization last year a restudy indicated that the tunnel would have been a very critical and serious mistake. As a result of the committee's diligence the plans were changed.

I feel that what the committee is doing here is proceeding in an orderly fashion so that when we do come to the House for authorization of the Stanford accelerator we will be able to give our colleagues assurance of what the final cost estimate might be.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. I wanted to clear up the matter of the Cambridge electronic accelerator. It is roughly a 6-billion-electron-volt job as compared to a 20-billion-electron-volt job. In other words, the power of the Stanford accelerator is infinitely greater. It would be like doing a job with a tack hammer when the job requires a sledge hammer, which is the big linear accelerator that we have been talking about today.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman knows that the accelerator that we are talking about at the moment at Stanford is a 10-billion-electron-volt accelerator.

Mr. HOSMER. 10 to 20.

Mr. PRICE. The Cambridge accelerator can go up to 10 billion electron volts also.

Mr. HOSMER. I am sure it cannot go up to that figure because of the radiation loss.

Mr. PRICE. Scientists disagree with the gentleman. This would indicate that the argument is sound that we should proceed in orderly manner in all matters of authorization.

Mr. HOSMER. There is no argument among the scientists, there is only argument among the Congressmen.

Mr. PRICE. Only on whether we should authorize fully before we have all the data necessary to establish a firm cost estimate.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOSMER) there were ayes 53, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'NEILL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11713) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 513, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GUBSER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GUBSER moves to recommit the bill to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendments: On page 1, line 7, strike out "$211,476,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$315,676,000"; and on page 4, lines 19 and 20, strike out "Project 61–f–7, design and engineering, linear electron accelerator, $3,000,000." and insert "Project 61–f–7, linear electron accelerator, $107,200,000."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GUBSER. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 128, nays 195, not voting 109, as follows:

[No. 83]

YEAS—128

Adair	Devine	McIntire
Alger	Dixon	Mason
Andersen, Minn.	Donohue	May
	Dooley	Meader
Arends	Dorn, N.Y.	Milliken
Auchincloss	Dwyer	Minshall
Avery	Elliott, Pa.	Monagan
Baker	Fenton	Mumma
Baldwin	Ford	Nelsen
Barry	Frelinghuysen	Norblad
Bass, N.H.	Fulton	Osmers
Bates	Gavin	Ostertag
Baumhart	Glenn	Pelly
Becker	Goodell	Philbin
Belcher	Griffin	Pirnie
Bennett, Mich.	Gubser	Poff
Bentley	Hagen	Quie
Berry	Halleck	Ray
Betts	Halpern	Rees, Kans.
Boland	Henderson	Richlman
Bolton	Hess	Robison
Bosch	Hiestand	Rogers, Mass.
Bow	Hoeven	Saylor
Broomfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Schenck
Brown, Ohio	Holt	Schneebeli
Broyhill	Holtzman	Simpson
Burke, Mass.	Horan	Smith, Calif.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hosmer	Smith, Iowa
Cahill	Jensen	Smith, Kans.
Cederberg	Johansen	Springer
Chenoweth	Judd	Taber
Chiperfield	Kearns	Teague, Calif.
Church	Keith	Thomson, Wyo.
Collier	King, Calif.	Tollefson
Conte	Knox	Utt
Cramer	Kyl	Van Zandt
Curtin	Laird	Wainwright
Curtis, Mass	Langen	Wallhauser
Curtis, Mo.	Latta	Weis
Daddario	Lindsay	Westland
Dague	Lipscomb	Widnall
Derounian	McCulloch	Wilson
Derwinski	McDonough	Younger

NAYS—195

Abbitt	Fascell	Karth
Abernethy	Feighan	Kasem
Addonizio	Fisher	Kastenmeier
Albert	Flood	Keogh
Anderson, Mont.	Flynn	Kilday
	Fogarty	Kilgore
Ashley	Foley	King, Utah
Ashmore	Forrester	Kluczynski
Aspinall	Fountain	Kowalski
Baring	Frazier	Lane
Barr	Friedel	Lankford
Barrett	Gallagher	Lesinski
Bass, Tenn.	Garmatz	Levering
Beckworth	Gary	Libonati
Bennett, Fla.	Gathings	McCormack
Blatnik	George	McFall
Brademas	Giaimo	McGinley
Bray	Granahan	McMillan
Breeding	Gray	McSween
Brewster	Green, Oreg.	Macdonald
Brock	Green, Pa.	Mack
Brooks, La.	Griffiths	Madden
Brown, Ga.	Gross	Mahon
Budge	Haley	Matthews
Burke, Ky.	Hardy	Metcalf
Byrne, Pa.	Hargis	Meyer
Cannon	Harmon	Miller, Clem
Casey	Harris	Mills
Coffin	Harrison	Moeller
Cohelan	Healey	Moorhead
Cooley	Hechler	Morgan
Cunningham	Herlong	Morris, Okla.
Daniels	Hogan	Moss
Davis, Tenn.	Holifield	Moulder
Delaney	Huddleston	Murphy
Denton	Hull	Murray
Diggs	Inouye	Natcher
Dingell	Irwin	Nix
Dorn, S.C.	Jarman	Norrell
Downing	Jennings	O'Brien, Ill.
Doyle	Johnson, Calif.	O'Brien, N.Y.
Dulski	Johnson, Colo.	O'Hara, Ill.
Durham	Johnson, Md.	O'Konski
Edmondson	Johnson, Wis.	O'Neill
Elliott, Ala.	Jonas	Oliver
Everett	Jones, Ala.	Passman
Evins	Jones, Mo.	Patman
Fallon	Karsten	Perkins
Pfost	Saund	Toll
Poage	Selden	Trimble
Preston	Shelley	Tuck
Price	Shipley	Udall
Prokop	Sikes	Ullman
Pucinski	Siler	Vanik
Quigley	Sisk	Vinson
Rabaut	Smith, Miss.	Whitener
Randall	Smith, Va.	Whitten
Reuss	Spence	Wier
Rhodes, Pa.	Staggers	Williams
Riley	Steed	Willis
Rodino	Stubblefield	Winstead
Rogers, Fla.	Sullivan	Wright
Roosevelt	Thomas	Yates
Rostenkowski	Thompson, N.J.	Zablocki
Roush	Thompson, Tex.	
Santangelo	Thornberry	

NOT VOTING—109

Alexander	Gilbert	Pilcher
Alford	Grant	Pillion
Allen	Hays	Porter
Andrews	Hébert	Powell
Anfuso	Hemphill	Rains
Ayres	Hoffman, Mich.	Reece, Tenn.
Bailey	Holland	Rhodes, Ariz.
Barden	Ikard	Rivers, Alaska
Blitch	Jackson	Rivers, S.C.
Boggs	Kee	Roberts
Bolling	Kelly	Rogers, Colo.
Bonner	Kilburn	Rogers, Tex.
Bowles	Kirwan	Rooney
Boykin	Kitchin	Rutherford
Brooks, Tex.	Lafore	St. George
Brown, Mo.	Landrum	Scherer
Buckley	Lennon	Schwengel
Burdick	Loser	Scott
Burleson	McDowell	Sheppard
Canfield	McGovern	Short
Carnahan	Machrowicz	Slack
Celler	Magnuson	Stratton
Chamberlain	Mailliard	Taylor
Chelf	Marshall	Teague, Tex.
Clark	Martin	Teller
Coad	Merrow	Thompson, La.
Colmer	Michel	Van Pelt
Cook	Miller, George P.	Walter
Corbett	Miller, N.Y.	Wampler
Davis, Ga.	Mitchell	Watts
Dawson	Montoya	Weaver
Dent	Moore	Wharton
Dowdy	Morris, N.Mex.	Withrow
Farbstein	Morrison	Wolf
Fino	Multer	Young
Flynt	O'Hara, Mich.	Zelenko
Forand		

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Mailliard for, with Mr. Hays against.

Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Kitchin against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Pilcher against.

Mr. Weaver for, with Mr. Bailey against.

Mr. Van Pelt for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Mr. Canfield for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Ikard against.

Mr. Allen for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against

Mr. Withrow for, with Mr. Walter against.

Mr. Lafore for, with Mr. Watts against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Anfuso against.

Mr. Pillion for, with Mr. Rooney against.

Mr. Wharton for, with Mr. Multer against.

Mr. Scherer for, with Mr. Farbstein against.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Zelenko against.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Davis of Georgia against.

Mr. Merrow for, with Mr. Carnahan against.

Mr. Chamberlain for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Moore for, with Mr. Teller against.

Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Landrum against.

Mr. Short for, with Mrs. Blitch against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rains with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Scott with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. KEARNS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 322, nays 2, not voting 109, as follows:

YEAS—322

Abbitt	Dorn, N.Y.	Kastenmeier
Abernethy	Dorn, S.C.	Kearns
Adair	Downing	Keith
Addonizio	Doyle	Keogh
Albert	Dulski	Kilday
Alger	Durham	Kilgore
Andersen, Minn.	Dwyer	King, Calif.
	Edmondson	King, Utah
Anderson, Mont.	Elliott, Ala.	Kluczynski
	Elliott, Pa.	Knox
Arends	Everett	Kowalski
Ashley	Evins	Kyl
Ashmore	Fallon	Laird
Aspinall	Fascell	Lane
Auchincloss	Feighan	Langen
Avery	Fenton	Lankford
Baker	Fisher	Latta
Baldwin	Flood	Lesinski
Baring	Flynn	Levering
Barr	Fogarty	Libonati
Barrett	Foley	Lindsay
Barry	Ford	Lipscomb
Bass, N.H.	Forrester	Loser
Bass, Tenn.	Fountain	McCormack
Bates	Frazier	McCulloch
Baumhart	Frelinghuysen	McDonough
Becker	Friedel	McFall
Beckworth	Fulton	McGinley
Belcher	Gallagher	McIntire
Bennett, Fla.	Garmatz	McMillan
Bennett, Mich.	Gary	McSween
Bentley	Gathings	Macdonald
Berry	Gavin	Mack
Betts	George	Madden
Blatnik	Giaimo	Mahon
Boland	Glenn	Mason
Bolton	Goodell	Matthews
Bosch	Granahan	May
Bow	Gray	Meader
Brademas	Green, Oreg.	Metcalf
Bray	Green, Pa.	Meyer
Breeding	Griffin	Miller, Clem
Brewster	Griffiths	Milliken
Brock	Gross	Mills
Brooks, La.	Hagen	Minshall
Broomfield	Haley	Moeller
Brown, Ga.	Halleck	Monagan
Brown, Ohio	Halpern	Moorhead
Broyhill	Hardy	Morgan
Budge	Hargis	Morris, Okla.
Burke, Ky.	Harris	Morrison
Burke, Mass.	Harrison	Moss
Byrne, Pa.	Healey	Moulder
Byrnes, Wis.	Hechler	Mumma
Cahill	Henderson	Murphy
Cannon	Herlong	Murray
Casey	Hess	Natcher
Cederberg	Hiestand	Nelsen
Chenoweth	Hoeven	Nix
Chiperfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Norblad
Church	Hogan	Norrell
Coffin	Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.
Cohelan	Holt	O'Brien, N.Y.
Collier	Holtzman	O'Hara, Ill.
Conte	Horan	O'Konski
Cooley	Hosmer	O'Neill
Cramer	Huddleston	Oliver
Cunningham	Hull	Osmers
Curtin	Inouye	Ostertag
Curtis, Mass.	Irwin	Passman
Curtis, Mo.	Jarman	Patman
Daddario	Jennings	Pelly
Dague	Jensen	Perkins
Daniels	Johansen	Pfost
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Calif.	Philbin
Delaney	Johnson, Colo.	Pirnie
Denton	Johnson, Md.	Poage
Derounian	Johnson, Wis.	Poff
Derwinski	Jonas	Preston
Devine	Jones, Ala.	Price
Diggs	Jones, Mo.	Prokop
Dingell	Judd	Pucinski
Dixon	Karsten	Quie
Donohue	Karth	Quigley
Dooley	Kasem	Rabaut

Randall	Simpson	Tuck
Ray	Sisk	Udall
Rees, Kans.	Smith, Calif.	Ullman
Reuss	Smith, Iowa	Utt
Rhodes, Pa.	Smith, Kans.	Vanik
Riehlman	Smith, Miss.	Van Zandt
Riley	Smith, Va.	Vinson
Robison	Spence	Wainwright
Rodino	Springer	Wallhauser
Rogers, Fla.	Staggers	Weis
Rogers, Mass.	Steed	Westland
Rostenkowski	Stubblefield	Whitener
Roush	Sullivan	Whitten
Santangelo	Taber	Widnall
Saund	Teague, Calif.	Wier
Saylor	Thomas	Williams
Schenck	Thompson, N.J.	Wilson
Schneebeli	Thompson, Tex.	Winstead
Selden	Thomson, Wyo.	Wright
Shelley	Thornberry	Yates
Shipley	Toll	Younger
Sikes	Tollefson	Zablocki
Siler	Trimble	

NAYS—2

Gubser	Harmon

NOT VOTING—109

Alexander	Gilbert	Porter
Alford	Grant	Powell
Allen	Hays	Rains
Andrews	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Anfuso	Hemphill	Rhodes, Ariz.
Ayres	Hoffman, Mich.	Rivers, Alaska
Bailey	Holland	Rivers, S.C.
Barden	Ikard	Roberts
Blitch	Jackson	Rogers, Colo.
Boggs	Kee	Rogers, Tex.
Bolling	Kelly	Rooney
Bonner	Kilburn	Roosevelt
Bowles	Kirwan	Rutherford
Boykin	Kitchin	St. George
Brooks, Tex.	Lafore	Scherer
Brown, Mo.	Landrum	Schwengel
Buckley	Lennon	Scott
Burdick	McDowell	Sheppard
Burleson	McGovern	Short
Canfield	Machrowicz	Slack
Carnahan	Magnuson	Stratton
Celler	Mailliard	Taylor
Chamberlain	Marshall	Teague, Tex.
Chelf	Martin	Teller
Clark	Merrow	Thompson, La.
Coad	Michel	Van Pelt
Colmer	Miller, George P.	Walter
Cook	Miller, N.Y.	Wampler
Corbett	Mitchell	Watts
Davis, Ga.	Montoya	Weaver
Dawson	Moore	Wharton
Dent	Morris, N. Mex.	Willis
Dowdy	Multer	Withrow
Farbstein	O'Hara, Mich.	Wolf
Fino	Pilcher	Young
Flynt	Pillion	Zelenko
Forand		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Martin.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Allen.
Mr. Porter with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Brooks of Texas with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Weaver.
Mr. McGovern with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Pillion.
Mr. Wampler with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Wolf with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Cook with Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Lafore.
Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Short.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Jackson.
Mr. Burdick with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. HOGAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEN. MELVIN MAAS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, especially those of us who served with Gen. Melvin J. Maas when he was a Member of the House, who is the head of the physically handicapped group in the country, rejoice he was reappointed by President Eisenhower. He served in World War I. He was in Congress and left to serve in the Army. He returned after the war to the Congress and went back to serve in the Army in World War II.

In the House one day the Congress had an opportunity to witness his courage. One day I saw him catch a loaded revolver thrown down by a man, who was a mental case, in the gallery of the House, a very dangerous and brave thing to do. He has done an outstanding job for the handicapped. General Maas is blind which gives him a special understanding of those who have a physical disability. He has been an inspiration to them and to the entire country.

The President did well to reappoint him. He has done a marvelous job.

The following is the last sheet of the several days conference the President called:

PRELIMINARY PROGRAM

THURSDAY MORNING, MAY 5, DEPARTMENTAL AUDITORIUM

Presiding: Earl Gammons, former Vice Chairman, President's Committee.

8:30: Registration.

9:30: Musical selections, U.S. Marine Band.

10: Presentation of colors, Marine Corps Color Guard.

"Star Spangled Banner."

Invocation: Rabbi Harry J. Kaufman, Beth Sholom Congregation and Talmud Torah, Washington, D.C.

Introduction: Rollcall of States.

In memoriam: Vice Adm. Ross T. McIntire (MC), U.S. Navy, retired.

Welcome: Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, retired, Chairman, President's Committee.

Musical selections.

11:15: Introduction of the President of the United States.

Address by the President of the United States.

Presentation of awards by the President.

National essay contest winners.

President's trophy, "Handicapped American of the Year," Dwight D. Guilfoil Jr., Arlington Heights, Ill.

11:45: Lunch recess.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, MAY 5, DEPARTMENTAL AUDITORIUM

Presiding: Earl Gammons, former Vice Chairman, President's Committee.

1:30: Address, Rudolph F. Bannow, president, National Association of Manufacturers.

2: Address by labor representative (to be selected).

2:30: Panel—Utilizing Handicapped Workers in Small Business.

Moderator: Philip McCallum, Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C.

Members: "Selection, Training, and Assignment," Carl Strahle, Steiner & Co., Milford, Del.

"Promotion and Transfer" (to be selected).

"Supervision," Leo Weisfield, Weisfield's Jewelers, Seattle, Wash.

"Management's Relationship With Agencies Serving the Handicapped," Aaron Solomon, Ace Electronics Association, Inc., Somerville, Mass.

3:30: Discussion.

4: Recess.

5:30–7:30: Reception, Presidential Arms, 1320 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

FRIDAY MORNING, MAY 6, DEPARTMENTAL AUDITORIUM

Presiding: Earl Gammons, former vice Chairman, President's Committee.

9: Musical selections.

9:15: Remarks, V. J. Skutt, president, Mutual of Omaha, Omaha, Nebr.

Film, "The Biggest Bridge in Action."

9:50: Report of executive committee, Earl Gammons, former vice chairman, President's Committee.

10:05: Address, Vivian Acord, public information director, Indiana Association of Mental Health.

10:25: Address, Waldo Stephens, chairman, Oklahoma Governor's Committee.

10:45: Cartoon varieties, Allen Saunders, chairman, Cartoonist Committee, Toledo, Ohio.

12: Lunch recess.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, MAY 6, GRAND BALLROOM, WILLARD HOTEL

12:15: International luncheon.

Musical selections.

Toastmistress, Mrs. Raymond Clapper.

Invocation, Rev. John Graham, minister, Lewinsville Presbyterian Church, McLean, Va.

1:15: Addresses: Miss Jayne Shover, associate director, National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Inc.

Miss Mary E. Switzer, Director, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

2: Benediction, Rear Adm. George A. Rosso, U.S. Navy, Chief of Chaplains.

This morning four gracious, devout, and inspired nuns who are teachers at Keith Hall in Lowell, where I live, brought with them the lovely girl, and her father and mother, who won an essay contest sponsored by the President Eisenhower Committee for the Physically Handicapped, and 48 fine young girls from their Keith Hall school. We breakfasted together and then saw a little of the beautiful Capitol before going to the Conference for the Physically Handicapped.

I felt very proud today of the young essay winner and the splendid Sisters and their group of students. Many fine compliments were paid to the group. I want the House to know the names of the Sisters and the girls of Keith Hall who came to the Capitol.

Sister Mary Ursulita, L.S.J., principal of Keith Hall, would have been proud of her group. I heard very many comments of approval, both of their behavior and their looks.

The Sisters are Sister Mary Agnello, Sister Mary Therezon, Sister Mary Fonthanne, and Sister Mary Gertruda.

The students are Betty Riopelle, Geraldine Perisino, Janice St. Onge, Maureen Rourke, Joan Zawodney, Mary Jane Gath, Mary Ann Nison, Antonia Elias, Maureen Shanahan, Martha Monazynski, Eleanor Poirier, Carol Sadowski, Catherine Dalton, Roberta McBride, Eileen Desmond, Leona McCaughey, Honey Blazonis, Phyllis Zaleski, Marilyn Sheahan, Sharon Coulter, Sandra McAleer, Barbara Milner, Maryanne Chibas, Dona Craig, Priscilla Frechette, Beverly Melanson, Margaret Cotter, Joyce Richey, Carol St. Jean, Francine Lynch, Gloria Girard, Linda Salce, Sandra Oliver, Dorothy McMahon, Marilyn McParland, Lana Brule, Carolyn Clark, Betsy Parent, Sue Parent, Dorothy Patenaude, Cathy Crane, Sheila McOsker, Lorraine Hebert, MaryJo Plumley, Judith Pulsifer, Mary Vieria—also Mr. and Mrs. Vieria and Anthony, her brother.

Mrs. Salce and Mrs. Oliver accompanied the group.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 10809, to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. FULTON, and Mr. MCDONOUGH.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 11713, the atomic energy authorization bill under consideration today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

A LIBERTY BELL SHRINE

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the district which I have the honor to represent is fortunate in many ways, not the least of which is the fact that we are pridefully endowed with a uniquely rich heritage of history. The counties of Bucks and Lehigh, which together make up the Eighth Pennsylvania District, have contributed immeasurably to the cultural and economic growth of this Nation since the founding struggles of our Republic.

What is not generally known, however, is that during a critical period in our Nation's beginning years the Liberty Bell, symbol of our American free way of life, was brought from Philadelphia and hidden in Zion's Church in Allentown, Lehigh County. This event occurred during the period between September 24, 1777, and July 10, 1778. The bell, then known as the State House Bell, was secretly removed from Philadelphia to guard against its capture by the British, who invaded Philadelphia after the battles of Brandywine and Germantown. There is no disagreement among historians as to the fact that the bell found a haven in a church basement in Allentown; the only controversy has centered on which of two men provided the team of horses to haul the bell.

Perhaps the best authority for the story of the flight to Allentown with the Liberty Bell can be found in the account written by Dr. Simon Sipple, pastor of Zion Church, 1910–47, and pastor emeritus until his death in 1956.

Dr. Sipple, in his book "History of Zion Reformed Church," points out that there are many people who do not know that the Liberty Bell was hidden in Allentown and others who only know a fragmentary bit of the account.

THE SIPPLE STORY

He wrote:

It was to Allentown (or Northampton Town, as the struggling village then was known) that the Liberty Bell made its first trip.

In September 1777, a little more than a year after the bell had fired the hearts of the patriots by proclaiming freedom throughout the land, the British became rather too numerous for comfort in the vicinity of Philadelphia.

At a meeting of the executive council it was decided to send the Liberty Bell * * * to some distant settlement. The British were in need of ammunition, and what a delight it would have been to them to convert the herald of freedom into cannon balls!

NORTHAMPTON SELECTED

The patriotism and loyalty to the Continental cause of the citizens of Northampton Town were well known to the Executive Council, and it was decided to entrust the Liberty Bell to the care of the people of this village.

In those days farmers from this region made frequent trips to Philadelphia. They would arrive in the city with wagonloads of produce and return emptyhanded.

WAGONS COVERED

On the returning farm wagons the bells were packed, they being carefully covered with potato sacks and the refuse of stables.

The announcement was then made that the Liberty Bell had been buried in the waters of the Delaware.

Many people are still under the impression that the Delaware was the hiding place of the bell, but that this is wrong is shown by the following entry in the diary of the Moravian Church, at Bethlehem, under the date of September 25, 1777:

WAGON BREAKS DOWN

"The bells from Philadelphia were brought in wagons. The wagon with the statehouse bell broke down here, so it had to be unloaded. The other bells went on."

John Jacob Mickley drove the team on which the Liberty Bell was loaded. After his wagon broke down Frederick Leaser, another farmer, came along and the bell was loaded on his wagon and the journey to Northampton resumed.

Arriving at this place the bells, together with the church chimes, were hidden underneath the floor of the old Zion Reformed Church, the pastor, the Reverend Abraham Blumer, assisting in the concealment.

RETURNED IN 1778

Here the bells remained until after the evacuation of Philadelphia by the British in the latter part of 1778, when they were taken back to Philadelphia.

The tablet, which recognizes that Frederick Leaser also deserves mention, was erected in Zion Reformed Church November 1908. It reads as follows:

In commemoration of the saving of the Liberty Bell from the British, September 1777.

Erected to the memory of John Jacob Mickley, commisary of issues and member of the central committee from Whitehall Township, Northampton County, Pa., who under cover of darkness and with his farm team hauled the Liberty Bell from Independence Hall, Philadelphia, through the British lines to Bethlehem where the wagon broke down, September 23, 1777. The bell was then transferred to Frederick Leaser's wagon and brought to Allentown, September 24, 1777. It was placed beneath the floor of Zion Reformed Church and remained secreted for nearly a year. This tablet is placed by order of the Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, June 2, 1907, under the auspices of the Pennsylvania Daughters of the American Revolution. Erected October 15, 1908. Mrs. Alfred G. Saeger, chairman; Miss Minnie Mickley, secretary, of the John Jacob Mickley Memorial Committee appointed by Mrs. Allen P. Perley, State Regent of Pennsylvania, N.S.D.A.R.

Only in recent months, however, has action been taken to bring this significant milestone out into the full light of public knowledge and appreciation. A committee of public-spirited citizens has established the Liberty Bell Shrine of Allentown, a group dedicated to the commemoration of the place where possibly the greatest symbol of freedom was protected to the everlasting glory of the whole world.

The Liberty Bell Shrine has wasted no time in making up for lost years. It is just a little over 1 year ago, on April 25, 1959, to be exact, that a handsome replica of the Liberty Bell was formally presented to Zion's Reformed Church—United Church of Christ—at impressive ceremonies in front of the original church on Hamilton Street, Allentown. The replica was presented by grant of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and today may be seen proudly reposing in front of the church which served as a haven for the bell nearly 200 years ago.

The Liberty Bell Shrine of Allentown was incorporated as a nonprofit corporation by the Lehigh County court of common pleas on September 22, 1959, and

has been making remarkable strides ever since under the able chairmanship of Dr. Morgan D. Person. It should be noted that the group has been working in close liaison with the bicentennial committee of Zion's Church, which will observe the 200th year of the founding of Zion's Church in 1962.

Since last September and to the present date, the Liberty Bell Shrine of Allentown has been working zealously and with unselfish devotion to build a permanent shrine in which the replica of the Liberty Bell can be housed, preferably in the original surroundings beneath Zion's Church where the original bell was hidden. To this end, there will soon be launched in the city of Allentown and the general Lehigh Valley area a public subscription drive to raise sufficient funds to erect a fitting home in which to place the Liberty Bell replica. The realization of this goal of building a shrine will accomplish three things:

First. It will serve to mark for all time the place where the emblem of American liberty was kept—a unique instance of church and state working together to save an enduring symbol of freedom.

Second. It will function as a mecca for thousands, including young people, who visit the shrine and who will be reminded of this heritage of freedom that we enjoy.

Third. It will serve to challenge us to the renewed importance of always being worthy of our heritage.

The Liberty Bell Shrine of Allentown is confident that the public will respond promptly and generously to the building fund appeal. Certainly no cause is more deserving from the standpoint of enduring value and its meaning to future generations of Americans.

Still another event has recently taken place which is probably a first in the entire history of our Nation. I refer to the "Portrait of Freedom," in which a remarkable organization of artists working together as the Lehigh Art Alliance have collaborated with the Liberty Bell Shrine of Allentown to present a very fine project that has resulted in the creation of the "Portrait of Freedom" with the sitter being the Liberty Bell Shrine itself.

This "Portrait of Freedom" was unveiled to the public on Monday, April 25, on the main floor showroom of the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. in Allentown. This is the seventh such community project undertaken by the Lehigh Art Alliance, and is proving invaluable in providing additional visual impact and significance of the shrine's meaning. This project has produced a very fine collection of paintings and other art works to a total portrait number of 47, the selections made from total entries of more than 100 by a distinguished jury comprising Ralph Somers Walter, curator of design, Pennsylvania State Museum; Charles T. Coiner, vice president and art director, N. W. Ayer & Son, Independence Square, Philadelphia; and Clarence H. Carter, well-known artist, Frenchtown, N.J.

With the presentation of the "Portrait of Freedom," Lehigh Art Alliance explores one of the oldest and most powerful of man's motivations since the beginning of his civilized existence—freedom. In the words of Quentin Smith, director of development for the art alliance:

> The sitter idea for this undertaking, seventh in the alliance's "Portraits of Our Times" series, has none of the well-defined shapes and patterns of industry which have characterized previous portraits presented during the past decade.
>
> Freedom has such a variety of meanings to each of us that few of the living artists of the world could hope to successfully encompass all of its many ramifications into one painting or piece of sculpture.
>
> Therefore, we have dared to assay its forms and meanings on a collective basis, hoping that, together, these works in oil, clay, and metal will merit their creation through worthwhile service in renewing and stimulating some greater present-day consciousness and appreciation of this priceless heritage that has been handed down into our safekeeping. The true measure of the success of this undertaking can only be found in the extent that this is accomplished.
>
> The Freedom Portrait was created by the Lehigh Art Alliance as a public service and, specifically, to service the aims of the Liberty Bell Shrine of Allentown—which is cooperating in making this first showing of these art forms possible.
>
> This organizaion of area citizens was founded for the purpose of developing a shrine to freedom, commemorating the flight to and sheltering of the Liberty Bell at Zion United Church of Christ, Allentown, during the British occupation of Philadelphia in 1777.
>
> At the same time Washington and his ragged troops were enduring that harsh winter encamped at Valley Forge, the bell, symbol of the hopes of all men aspiring toward freedom, had its own Valley Forge in Allentown.
>
> The development of a freedom shrine in this area merits the interest and support of every member of the community.
>
> With its realization we will be forging a local link into the chain of our Nation's history and creating a tangible and enduring reminder to our children that freedom is not an inheritance but a heritage to be cherished and won anew by each succeeding generation.

This portrait will be seen elsewhere in Allentown for the remainder of the month of May, and for the following 2 months will hang in the State museum in Pennsylvania's capital, Harrisburg. Eventually, we hope that it may be deemed worthy—as I feel certain it will—of being sponsored for audiences in other cities of the United States and for showing in countries overseas.

Mr. Speaker, Allentown and Lehigh County are to be commended for this splended contribution to an important and meaningful chapter in America's history. We are proud to have been the haven for the Liberty Bell at a critical time of history, and we look forward soon to seeing this eventful occasion being permanently memorialized in a proper setting—indeed almost the exact place where the Liberty Bell was kept safe from harm back in 1777. I congratulate the Liberty Bell Shrine of Allentown, the Lehigh Art Alliance, and Zion's Church for their unselfish advocacy of one of our country's finest traditions.

PRESIDENT URGED TO SIGN AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the day before yesterday the House passed the area redevelopment bill, S. 722. This afternoon the other body accepted the House version of the bill, the bill is on its way to the White House.

I wish to issue an urgent appeal to the President of the United States to sign this bill which will mean so much to the economy of my State of West Virginia and, indeed, to the economy of the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this is a modest bill which calls for loans and grants of $251 million which actually is only 6 percent of the $4 billion foreign aid bill which the President has asked this Congress to pass. Two hundred million dollars of the $251 million is in loans. I believe that the people in our own country are a very good risk for loans. I believe that if we can grant technical assistance to foreign lands, our own people deserve technical assistance too.

In my hometown of Huntington, W. Va., the unemployment rate is running around 13 or 14 percent. We have exerted all of the initiative we can through the united fund, through industrial development bodies, through the chamber of commerce, and through widespread local grassroots efforts which won the city of Huntington the title "All-American City" last year. We have done everything possible to solve this problem locally.

I believe we could use the type of assistance in retraining grants, community facilities grants, and loans for the development of industrial property that are contained in the area redevelopment bill. I therefore hope the President in his wisdom will sign this bill which will mean so much to West Virginia and to the Nation.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I gladly yield to my colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would like to associate myself with the statement of my colleague from West Virginia as to the desirability and the urgency of the President signing this bill, because a majority of the elected Representatives of the people of the United States has voted for the bill after study and ample hearings, enough I am sure, to establish the merit and need of the legislation.

The area redevelopment bill, introduced as S. 722 by the Honorable PAUL DOUGLAS, passed the Senate on March 23, 1959, and by the House on May 4, 1960, is essentially a humanitarian measure. Appropriations set up the bill are relatively insignificant. The total amounts of loans and grants authorized, if used to the limit, will admittedly go only a short way toward providing jobs for every unemployed person in the United States. Their practical purpose is to initiate and set free local investment in industrial and business enter-

prises which will provide innumerable opportunities for jobs for the jobless. In doing this, the effect of the loans authorized will be multiplied indefinitely. Establishment of one industry in a depressed area will suggest to local investors other industries for which resources are available, and additional prospects for success and profits. It has always been the history of economic development that one industry breeds another. Industries tend to multiply and proliferate in given areas because one industry in a sense supports and protects another. Thus we can expect that the provisions of this bill, if utilized vigorously, will have far-reaching effects in economic rehabilitation of distressed areas, far more than the industrial building value of the small sum appropriated. Furthermore, since the loans constitute only 65 percent of the capital needed, and since they are repayable, the revolving nature of the fund will reduce the necessity for continued appropriations.

It has been argued that enterprises set up under the bill will be necessarily hazardous and that they are doomed to failure. On this point it is appropriate to remark that the bill stipulates full and complete analysis of the resources available for a proposed enterprise, together with study of market conditions and all other factors contributing to success, before a loan is approved. The enterprises set up under these conditions will be totally unlike small businesses set up on the hunch of some private individual or corporation. Conditions favorable to success, as determined by experts and not by untrained business amateurs, must be present before action is started. Our discussions have indicated that many possibilities for industrial development almost certainly exist in many of the distressed areas. But we do not propose to go into those areas and set up establishments haphazardly, even on the basis of facts that seem on their face indisputable. We propose that conditions and resources be thoroughly investigated by those who have the business know-how before we act. Our duty to those who supply a significant proportion of the required capital demands that we shield them as far as possible from disaster. We emphatically do not want them to risk and lose their money in unprofitable enterprises. Consequently the percent of failure in small businesses common to less carefully considered projects should be materially different for these Government-promoted operations.

The purpose of the statements offered above is to indicate that the practical effects of the moneys authorized by the bill will be vastly greater than the use of such small amounts for industrial development which would not be supplemented by local interest, drive, and capital investment. That is, the psychological consequences of the bill should overpower the practical consequences.

However, the psychological effects would fall with still greater force on the thousands of unemployed. The demoralizing effect of long and continuous unemployment is practically paralyzing on workers possessed of but a single skill or trade. They are completely helpless in finding another job or another trade. They read daily in the papers of efforts to relieve the distress of similarly situated people in foreign lands. They hear that the Congress is appropriating annually billions of dollars for that purpose, with the approval of the administration. They wonder why the Nation should not try to do for them what it is doing for other people no more in need, but thousands of miles away. Approval of this bill will provide a tremendous moral stimulant for them. They will be energized by the fact that their Government does care for them in some more practical way than in passing out a few trifling handouts of food. In fact, they do need a spur to action. A spur may well set them into individual effort in their own behalf, for they are not lazy, indifferent, and irresponsible people. They want to work and to make their own way in the world. They have simply been paralyzed by the staggering blow of unemployment until they can not initiate action of their own will and effort. This bill should offer them just enough help to get started again. That is all those of us who have supported the bill have hoped for.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I would like to second what the gentlemen from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER and Mr. STAGGERS] have said. I served on the subcommittee which considered this legislation. I was extremely distressed during general debate in the House to hear certain Members indicate that this subcommittee had not discharged its responsibilities and was bringing irresponsible legislation to the floor for consideration. I do not believe anyone could have sat on that subcommittee and listened to the appalling testimony which we received, not of simple unemployment, not of continuous unemployment, but of unemployment which had become a cancer to those areas not for months, but for years without being concerned. I was amazed to hear Members say that the situation had so radically changed from last year, between the time this subcommittee reported the bill and when it reached the floor. We had evidence to indicate that these were areas of longtime suffering.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] was one of the most eloquent witnesses in this regard. He brought tape recordings before our subcommittee of actual interviews with the people of West Virginia that would have brought tears to your eyes. How anybody could have made the assertions and the accusations which were made on the floor, how the Committee on Rules could have considered the matter in the way it did in light of this testimony, is beyond me. As a member of this subcommittee, and I attended every single one of the hearings, we brought a responsible piece of legislation to the floor of the House. We were soundly vindicated by the membership of this body at that time.

I wonder if anyone noticed the ambivalence of those who opposed the bill? Fifty percent said that there was no problem, that it was a depression measure for a situation which has cured itself. The other 50 percent said there was a problem, but nothing could be done about it. Which way is it going to be. I noticed that those who were closest to the facts revealed at the hearings took the latter view. To contend that we can do nothing about the situation is not merely defeatist, but begs the entire question. We cannot find out whether anything can be accomplished until we take the steps to find out. That is what this bill is for—to find the facts.

There is one other matter, I would like to raise, and that concerns charges that the administrator of the agency proposed by this legislation would be a czar or a dictator. Would he be any more so than any of the other administrators we now have for dozens of agencies? Of course he would not. He would have the same powers and limitations, he would have the same discretion to act, the same sense of responsibility to use appropriated funds wisely, in those areas where it is most needed. It is absurd to scare us with claims that these funds for area redevelopment would be lost in New York, Detroit, or Philadelphia. Certainly, we must have more confidence in the discretion and temperateness of any individual selected for such a job and approved by the Senate.

There is one more thing I would like to say with respect to this legislation. This is not a depressed area bill; this is an area redevelopment bill. I wish to emphasize that point because there were a number of challenges by opponents on the floor of the House Wednesday defying us to stand up and tell why this legislation was necessary. When I asked the gentlemen to yield in order to accept the challenges, I was put off. I am here to say now that I am prepared at any time to answer those challenges, and particularly with respect to the reasons for this legislation. The purpose of this legislation is to provide a workshop and a laboratory of knowledge about the cancer of continuous unemployment. This is not a bill for West Virginia, for Kentucky, for Pennsylvania, or for any other area which is suffering from unemployment in particular. This is legislation for the entire United States, for any area where technological unemployment might strike at any time in a serious manner, whether it be California, Texas, Arkansas, Minnesota—wherever there is technological unemployment. We must find out what can be done. We need facts.

I would like to remind the Members of this body that with the increasing speed of technological change, this is not going to be an occasional phenomenon, and hence, the need for facts will double and redouble. It is for this reason that I would like to join with the gentleman from West Virginia in urging the President to sign this legislation, not to relieve a specific area, perhaps, but to provide us with the raw material upon which we can develop the factual

information to combat and conquer this problem. I recall those who on the floor said that the funds for this problem were just a drop in the bucket; that this would not solve the problem in even one district of Pennsylvania. This is no reason to oppose the legislation. You have to learn basic facts before you can attack a problem wholesale. This is the logical, cautious way to proceed. We have heard all kinds of charges and countercharges about the usefulness or uselessness of an approach such as this. There is no evidence either way to back up the asseverations on one side or the other. This is additional reasoning why we need the data which the application of this bill would furnish us, to give us the backstopping to conquer this problem in a coordinated way. Again, I would like to urge that the President of the United States sign this legislation into law so that we can go forward with the job of accomplishing area redevelopment problems to solve the problem of technological change which is a national problem of the first magnitude, and promises to grow more serious as time goes on.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman from West Virginia and the other Members who have spoken here with reference to the need and desirability for the President to sign the legislation which I understand has gone down to his office today. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the observations which were made by the gentleman from California just now are extremely pertinent, which indicate beyond any shadow of doubt that this legislation is needed, to take care of unemployment that has persisted over these many years in ever-increasing numbers in some areas, including my own. It is not only necessary to take care of that condition, but it is also necessary to take care of any future unemployment that could be caused by technological upsets or advances or by any changes in the patterns of weaponry in the various sections of the country. The people of my State, Mr. Speaker, have gotten a great deal of encouragement from the action which was taken by this House, and I know that they will get a similar reaction when they know about the Senate action today. They are hoping and expecting that the President of the United States will go along with the Congress in approving this highly desirable and I may say, much-needed legislation. I join with the gentleman from West Virginia in the observations he has made and I thank him very much for the opportunity to so express myself.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday morning the Charleston Gazette carried this story, and I quote:

President Eisenhower has given assurances of lending a hand toward helping West Virginia with its economic problems, Governor Underwood reported yesterday from Washington after a conference with the President.

Governor Underwood said President Eisenhower promised to urge all Federal agencies "to do what they could to help West Virginia."

On the strength of that I have sent a telegram to the Governor of my State as follows:

HON. CECIL UNDERWOOD:

Hope you will personally urge President Eisenhower to sign S. 722 the area redevelopment bill which will mean so much to the State of West Virginia and the economy of the entire Nation. The bill has passed both the House and Senate and will soon be on its way to the President.

I believe the way to help immediately would be for the President to sign the bill.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to voice my concurrence in the statements of the gentleman from West Virginia with respect to the urgency of this legislation in the sincere hope that the President will be prevailed upon to sign it into law. Of the three counties in the State of Ohio that are terribly affected at the present time by unemployment, one of them is within the confines of my district. I feel there are a number of other counties in my district affected just as badly. Every time I go down to visit with the people there the question is always raised, "What can be done to help us get on our feet?" My people are not interested in handouts. They do not want donations from the Government. They do, however, wish to have the opportunity, a favorable opportunity, through loans to get on their feet economically. For that reason I feel it is of great urgency. I know my district is very much like the district which the gentleman from West Virginia so ably represents. Our people are in dire need at this time of help and I sincerely hope that the President will be prevailed upon to sign this into law.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from across the Ohio River in the 10th District of Ohio.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I should like enthusiastically to endorse what the gentleman from West Virginia has said, and to associate myself with him in his remarks. I come from a State, the State of Utah, which according to the committee report, would not receive one penny from this area redevelopment legislation, for the reason that there is not one community in Utah that would now qualify.

I endorse this legislation because it is basically and inherently right.

May I at this time commend the gentleman from West Virginia for the diligent, the vigorous, and the courageous fight which he has waged with others to secure the passage of this legislation. I have observed the gentleman. I have the privilege of sitting near him in the Space Committee. I have observed him in action. I know that he has raised his voice many times in behalf of this legislation. I know of his persuasiveness among his colleagues, and I have no question but that the passage of this bill has, in large measure, been due to his own particular efforts.

May I add this further thought. The President of the United States, just 1 day before this bill was taken up by this body, sent us a message in which he insisted, among other things, that action be taken in this general area of legislation.

I should like to quote one or two sentences from his message. The President said:

Area redevelopment legislation also needs priority attention. I have long urged legislation authorizing loans and technical assistance to help areas afflicted with long-term substantial unemployment resulting from technological changes. The purpose is to diversify these economies and thereby create new sources of private employment.

And he concludes by saying:

For this purpose I have recommended a Federal program amounting to $53 million to be expended for loans and technical assistance.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I make the assertion: If the President of the United States in delivering this message was sincere—and I am certain that he was, I do not question his sincerity for a minute—then this is the time for that sincerity to become manifest by his approving the bill that will be shortly placed upon his desk. I join with the gentleman from West Virginia in appealing to him to do this.

Mr. HECHLER. I appreciate the comment of the gentleman from Utah.

In that very same message which the gentleman from Utah cited, the President pointed out with reference to the mutual security funds:

Widespread chaos and misery cannot provide a world climate in which our free Republic can prosper and remain secure. There is for America no higher purpose nor greater need than to measure up to her world leadership responsibilities.

It seems to me that this is a challenge which applies not alone to the world but to our own front doorstep as well.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman in the well, the distinguished Representative from West Virginia, my good and valued friend, Mr. HECHLER, not only for voicing an appeal to the President at this time but for the fine, hard fight he has made for this legislation for many long, hard months. Few Members have contributed in fuller measure to the passage of the bill in the House.

Mr. Speaker, at this time everybody in America must be alerted to the condition that obtains in the State of West Virginia. This primary contest there has served to focus attention upon the plight of the people of West Virginia. I do hope that the President of the United States will have the heart and the vision quickly to sign into law a measure that is a matter of life or death to so many fine families in the distressed areas.

At the present time we do not have in my district the condition that is now

so widespread in West Virginia, but the day is not far off in this changing period, where one industry is folding up and another is expanding, when people must have available to them training to go from a job in one employment to another in a different field. So much now is needed in West Virginia, southern Illinois, parts of Ohio, and other States, but not immediately needed in my district. Yet very soon it will be needed in my district. I do hope the President of the United States will have the vision to contemplate what is ahead and the importance of this measure, not only for the present relief of the suffering of unemployed families, but for the safeguarding of the future in an age of automation.

Mr. HECHLER. I thank my friend from Illinois. I think his remarks and the remarks of my friend from Utah indicate that even though their districts are not directly affected they have the statesmanship to understand what this bill will do for the economy of the Nation. When Khrushchev says he is going to bury us he does not mean with bombs, he means economically. In order for this Nation to move forward economically we can no longer afford the luxury of chronic distressed areas, or pockets of unemployment.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEVERING. I rise to compliment my colleague from the State of West Virginia on the statement he is making urging the President to sign the depressed areas bill which passed the House and Senate and will be sent to the White House for the President's consideration. I think it is extremely appropriate that we consider this matter today especially in view of the policy of our Government of late to award defense contracts to foreign companies. I am sure we would all agree that if we are to successfully meet the threat of communism we must remain economically strong. It happens that at this very time I and other Members of the Congress are very much concerned about whether a defense contract for 39 locomotives for the Panama Canal Co. to tow ships through the locks will be awarded to the Plymouth Locomotive Co. in my district, a fine small company hiring less than 250 people, or whether it will be awarded to a Japanese firm, the Mitsubishi Co., one of the world's largest combines and with one of the cheapest labor markets in the world. We have been contending that we really ought to mean what we say about wanting to help small business in America under the terms of the Buy American Act and the Small Business Act.

Administration leaders have done a great deal of talking about how we want small business to participate in these defense contracts, but I am appalled day after day to see some of our fine small businesses having to yield to some foreign bidders on our defense contracts. I know in this particular case in Plymouth, Ohio, we have an unemployment situation now which is growing worse and fast approaching the condition of a critically distressed area. Again I say the gentleman's remarks are extremely appropriate today. The President ought to give favorable consideration to this legislation for the reasons he has so clearly stated. I am confident that the "anybody but America" policies of the administration—the policies which seem to suggest that we can afford anything for peoples abroad but cannot afford to meet the needs of our own, has helped to a great extent in causing distressed areas throughout this land of ours.

Mr. Speaker, the law firm headed by a former candidate for President of the United States, representing the Mitsubishi Co., I am told, is contending that the future of our relations with Japan may hinge on the decision in this Locomotive case. It seems to me this is hardly an endorsement of our foreign aid program under which we have spent some $2,526,000 since the end of World War II up to June 30, 1959.

Mr. Speaker, I have received a great deal of encouragement in my fight on behalf of Plymouth from the people in my own 17th Ohio District. This is only natural. But some of my colleagues and I have received many communications from all parts of the country in support of my position in this case. In this connection I insert in the RECORD at this point some typical messages which express the concern of our citizens about the threat from foreign competition to our own economic well-being:

Hon. ROBERT W. LEVERING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LEVERING: I have written my Senator that my vote is for Plymouth Locomotive Works. This Nation is giving away all its money. Now it's giving away its jobs, we're holding up the world and letting our own down. We rose, and now we're falling fast (who will write of our "Rise and Fall"?).

A KEY WESTER.

MIAMI, FLA., *April 23, 1960.*

Hon. ROBERT W. LEVERING.

DEAR SIR: I read with interest, in my local paper, that you are blocking the Japanese Mitsubishi Co. from obtaining an Army contract.

As a former Japanese prisoner of war, captured on Bataan, I am with you 100 percent. Thank God for men like you, who know what it is to suffer in a war, who now have the opportunity to speak out and make themselves heard.

By all means give the contract to Americans. Perhaps, if some of the members of your opposition would have been subjected to some of that wartime Japanese hospitality, they wouldn't be so eager to please the Japanese businessman.

So keep up the good work, Mr. LEVERING, I know that I am not the only ex-GI that agrees with you.

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS ZOLEUSKI.

BROADWAY DISCOUNT SALES,
Alliance, Ohio, April 23, 1960.

Hon. ROBERT W. LEVERING.

SIR: In your fight to keep the Army contract in this country is something everyone should go along with. Just like in World War II, you are fighting for a good cause. Not every time money is the most important. I, like you, feel this contract should go to the Mansfield firm.

ROY C. GUESS.

OMAHA, NEBR., *April 27, 1960.*

GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Esq.,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GLENN: One of your fellow Congressmen, ROBERT W. LEVERING from Ohio, is endeavoring to keep a contract to furnish our Army some 39 locomotives at $3,829,900, for use on the Panama Canal, from going to the Mitsubishi Co. in Japan. Mr. LEVERING is endeavoring to have the contract awarded to the Plymouth Locomotive Works, near Mansfield, Ohio for $4,741,867. The latter will pay the Government close to $500,000 taxes. For the difference in quality of materials and workmanship the Government will get a great deal more than the $500,000 in taxes. Mr. LEVERING puts up some excellent arguments why the Plymouth firm should be awarded the contracts and I agree with him 100 percent.

I hope, GLENN, you can find time to give Mr. LEVERING an "assist" on this.

Sincerely yours,

PHI T. GRAHAM.

Mr. LEVERING: You may be surprised to get word anybody out of your district, especially as far west as Omaha, could be interested in your effort, but I'm not a native of the Buckeye State for nothing. I still love it.

PHILIP GRAHAM.

(From Portsmouth.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to my distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. While it is very well to urge the President to sign this bill, I am going to go further and say that the President should sign the bill. This bill is an investment in America. I wish the President would take a little time and go out and visit these depressed areas. He has traveled in South America, the Middle East, Europe, and now he is going out to the Far East—and that is all very well. He is going to a summit meeting, but he ought to have a summit meeting here in the United States in connection with legislation of this type. I hope the President will get the views of some forward looking and progressive Republicans before he acts on this bill. Having in mind the hundreds of thousands of people in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Ohio, and other parts of the country who are looking with hope to the passage of this bill, a veto would show a heartless disregard for the best interests of the people in these distressed areas as well as a disregard for the best interests of our country as a whole. Only a few days ago, the President referred to this in his message. Of course, we know that his program is innocuous and inadequate. His program will in no way scratch even the surface of this problem. We, in the Congress, undertook to put through a program that he could sign and that he should sign into law. If we had a Democratic President, it would be a much bigger program—as it should be. This is a program calling for $200 million in loans and $51 million in grants. For the $200 million in loans, the local communities and the local interests will spend from 5 to 10 times as much on capital investments. Actually, an investment of $200 million will produce at least $1 billion in the operation of this program. The provision of $51

million in grants will operate in the same way. There again the local communities and the local businesses will spend from $5 to $10 for each dollar that the Federal Treasury puts out. Therefore, this is more than a $251 million program when it comes to its practical operation. The President sent his message to us last Tuesday, and that was rather unusual timing. I do not say the President knew that Calendar Wednesday business would be in order on last Wednesday and that we were going to call the bill up on Calendar Wednesday, but certainly he did send his message up on Tuesday and that made it more embarrassing for those of us who favored this legislation in getting the bill through on Wednesday. The President could have just as well sent his message up last week. He could have sent his message up on Thursday. But somehow or other, it was timed for Tuesday. The message had to be read word for word when on Wednesday the Journal was being read. As we all know, points of order were made that a quorum was not present and every time it was established that a quorum was not present, that meant three rollcalls—which all amounted to a filibuster in an effort to prevent the bill from being considered. Now I do not charge the President with sending up his message on Tuesday in order to interfere with the operation of Calendar Wednesday and to interfere with those of us who favored this bill, but it is an unusual coincidence, that it happened that his message should come to the House of Representatives on the day before Calendar Wednesday. In his message he asked for the cooperation of the Congress—of course, from the Democratic leadership. The other day I said that the President has never asked the Democratic leadership to come to the White House to talk to him about legislation to see where and how we could have a meeting of minds on legislation. This is his eighth year in office. The Democratic leadership on this side of the Congress has never been asked.

We have been invited down for briefings, but that is entirely different. That is entirely different from being invited down to discuss legislation.

Now, we put this bill through. It will be before the President in a short time. I hope he will study it. I hope he will try to get some information in those areas throughout the country where there is at present permanent unemployment and there are human beings, American families, there looking to the breadwinner to bring home food for the family and to pay the rent and take care of other household duties.

I hope the President will cooperate with Congress, and that means with the Democratic leadership. We have put the bill through. He has asked for cooperation, and we have given him the bill. Now let him sign it.

Mr. HECHLER. I appreciate the remarks of my majority leader. I was glad, as I know many Members were, to sit here Wednesday through the many quorum calls, because we could see victory in sight. It was sweet indeed on Wednesday evening, even though it took long hours of rollcalls and quorum calls. I ought to be back in the State of West Virginia right now, because I have a primary opponent in next Tuesday's election. But I believe I am serving the State of West Virginia and the Nation far better by getting up here before the House this afternoon and urging that the President sign this bill.

We have heard much talk about how to balance the budget. I believe in a balanced budget. I believe that we can balance the national budget if people can balance their individual budgets. I believe that can best be done by putting people back to work, through the assistance of the area redevelopment bill.

Mr. PROKOP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PROKOP. I am happy to rise and associate myself with my distinguished colleague from West Virginia and preceding speakers in urging the President to sign this most desperately needed legislation. In my particular district we have 16.6 percent of our labor force unemployed. During the last 10 years the people of my area have, through voluntary contributions, spent more than $10 million to try to help ourselves. I believe the people of my area are to be commended for the fine work they have been doing in trying to bring back employment. I believe the President should take heed at this particular time and sign this bill which is so urgently needed by the various sections of this Nation.

I again commend my distinguished colleague from West Virginia for the excellent work he is doing on this particular legislation.

Mr. HECHLER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I close by urging the President of the United States to sign S. 722 for the interests of the entire Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the remarks that have been made today calling upon the President to sign the Area Redevelopment Act. I did not expect to speak here today, but when I have heard some of the Members of this House indicate that the President of the United States had no interest or care for the underprivileged and those who are in need and in want, I cannot sit by and not speak out.

I do not believe there has ever been a President of the United States who has the concern of the people more deeply in his heart than has President Eisenhower; and when there is an indication made that President Eisenhower may not know of the want and the distress in some of the areas of the country I just wonder how anyone can make that statement, for the President has been deeply concerned with all the people, and he knows of the need.

The President sent messages here time and time again asking that something be done to relieve these situations. It has not been done until just the other day; and in 6 of the 8 years of the administration the Congress of the United States has been controlled by the Democratic Party with the majority on that side to put through these bills if they were so desperately needed.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. Not at this time; I will yield later.

The President asked for fifty-some million dollars and in came a bill for $350 million. I voted against the area redevelopment bill the other day with reluctance, because I may say to the gentleman from West Virginia, I know of the situation in his State and I want his people helped. I know of the situation in Pennsylvania, and I want those people helped, likewise in Kentucky. But as I pointed out on the floor the other day when the bill was being considered, instead of granting the $53 million asked for by the President, which would give adequate help in the areas where it was desperately needed, in came a bill for $350 million. The gentleman from California stated a few moments ago that he would answer questions and tell us how this money would be used. I would like an answer to the question of what you are going to do to rehabilitate Atlantic City, N.J., out of this $350 million.

Oh, it seems to me a shame that you will put in the report of a bill where the people so desperately need help such an item as the one for the redevelopment of Atlantic City. Are the taxpayers of the United States—and they are your taxpayers too—going to be called upon for redevelopment in Atlantic City?

Let me remind you of something I said here the other day. Here is another area that in this $350 million bill you say needs redevelopment, Bristol, Tenn. Let me just read to you briefly about Bristol. This is from the Bristol, Tenn., Chronicle of March 6, 1960. Now, this is an area where you need part of this $350 million to redevelop, you say.

"Area Builders Undergoing the Biggest Boom in History" is the headline:

> Despite the frigidity of one of the worst winters in years, the area's builders are in the midst of the biggest building boom in history.
>
> Either under construction now or planned for the near future is a total of $105,669,231 in major building projects. These projects are within a 50-mile radius of Johnson City.

And it goes on to tell of the great boom. Just look at the RECORD, page 9434, and you will find other areas of Tennessee who say they do not want this help; but they are in here. You say they need help; they say they do not. Many who are in need may suffer because of the irresponsible manner in which this bill has been brought to the floor.

Now, let us face up to the facts.

If the President's bill had been adopted, the bill of the man with a heart,

who believes in taking care of those who need help, calling for $53 million, it would have been signed. But you come to the floor and you beg the President, yes, some have demanded him, to sign a bill that includes in it boom areas and asks all of the people of the country to pay for the redevelopment of boom areas, including Atlantic City.

I said earlier today that they are going to be running the Kentucky Derby tomorrow out in Louisville, Ky. I hope all those people attending the Kentucky Derby will look around at that situation, for Louisville, Ky., is listed in this $350 million bill. If they had adopted the $53 million bill of the President, the man with a heart, who for months has been trying to get this Democrat Congress to do something about it, you would not be here today urging that your people who are so desperately in need be taken care of. It would have been done if you had followed the leadership of Dwight Eisenhower.

Another thing that was interesting to me was to hear it said here today that there were some quorum calls and roll-calls here the other day trying to block this bill. These statements by the same people who were accusing the President of the United States of not having a heart. But I ask you to look at the record. From which side of the aisle did those quorum calls and requests for votes come?

Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentlemen who today have said that the President of the United States has no heart for the people who are downtrodden or up against it or in need will correct that statement. We have had a lot said to us because we send money abroad and we ought to spend it here. With that I agree. My record is such that I can agree. I have not voted to send it abroad. I have always thought we should be doing more for our people. May I say to my colleague from Ohio I have been as much concerned about the Plymouth contract as he is. I think I was the first one to raise the question on the floor of the House. I was concerned about the steel question where steel was purchased abroad and sent over here. But, Mr. Speaker, if you will repeal the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act that was started under the Democrat administration and continued on down and adopted by my administration, and when we get rid of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, we will be able to give some real protection to American industry. We will not see some of our industries folding up, and we will not need these redevelopment bills.

So I ask you to join with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], on the other side of the aisle, and myself in this effort. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is one of the great champions of protecting industry. I admire him so much for it for he has in his heart the thoughts of his own people.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. I know my colleague wants to be fair. I do not believe in my statement I indicated that the President of the United States did not have a heart. I was merely appealing to him to utilize his heart, and sign the bill. I take it the gentleman from Ohio is opposed to the bill, and would like the President to veto it?

Mr. BOW. My vote will show that I voted against the $350 million bill and if the President vetoes that bill I will vote to sustain his veto. Then I hope the leadership on the Democratic side will bring in the $53 million bill. Let us pass it, let the President sign it, and give your people help, and not indulge in a lot of boondoggling in the amount of $350 million for a lot of areas that do not need it. Let us begin to get some fiscal responsibility.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I sat during weeks of hearings in the State of West Virginia last year on this bill, and the Governor of our State, Republican Governor Underwood, when asked which of these bills would be more efficacious and reach the root of the problems as they exist in West Virginia, responded in the hearings before the Senate subcommittee: "I do think it important and emphasize that the provisions in the bill which you mentioned offering assistance in retraining and economic studies are in my opinion very essential and very helpful." That is on page 995 of the subcommittee hearings.

I submit that the President's bill not containing those items would be of very little assistance in the chronically depressed areas.

I would like to ask the gentleman further, since he mentioned the source of the quorum calls, how he voted on them.

Mr. BOW. I voted wth them. I did not want to see the $350 million bill passed. I would have voted for the $53 million bill, and we could have passed a bill here this week that would have been signed by the President of the United States if you would have accepted it instead of going for the places that I have here pointed out in the boom areas. And, you will find them in the record. They are in the hearings.

Mr. HECHLER. I think, my friend, we have an honest difference of opinion.

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. I know the gentleman from Ohio wants to be eminently fair, and I think he is attempting to state the bill as it passed, but I call his attention on page 9458 of the RECORD where the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] was adopted. I appreciate the concern which the gentleman from Ohio has evidenced for my home district of Louisville, and calling attention to the events there tomorrow. But, the bill that passed the House, and the bill that passed the Senate, and the bill which will be before the President by virtue of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], will not include my home city nor probably will it include Atlantic City, nor will it include upon application any other city where the employment level at the time of application is above the minimum set. I see how the gentleman, from looking at the committee report, and in looking at some of the things said earlier, might have reached the conclusion that he did, but the bill that was passed is not the bill which the gentleman describes.

Mr. BOW. I quite agree with the gentleman. It is not the bill I described. But, it is a bill that includes some of these areas. I think the final passage was over $200 million? What was finally passed by the Senate today?

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. The vote on the bill?

Mr. BOW. No. I am talking about the amount involved.

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Two hundred and fifty-one million dollars.

Mr. BOW. As against $53 million. And, that $53 million, according to the studies that have been made, would have taken care of the needy.

I am delighted to see that the gentleman's area is not going to be in this bill; that you are in good shape now, and that the Derby will even help you more, because they tell me that the price of mint juleps has gone up, and most of that money stays right in Louisville. And, I am delighted to know that this new industry is flourishing in Louisville.

Mr. Speaker, in closing may I say again that the President of the United States, Dwight Eisenhower, has done more for the people of this country than any other in our history. This has been proven time and time again. What he does on this bill will be in the best interest of the United States.

To those who have implied the President has no knowledge of conditions, I can only say they are ill-informed or deliberately misstating facts in an effort to gain political advantage.

There should be no partisan politics where human suffering is concerned. It is unfortunate that the earlier remarks of some who have spoken are in that vein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that he has referred to a very old industry, and that the subject of this colloquy was called to my attention first today by the Associated Press. In pointing out to them the true nature of the bill, as being different from that which the gentleman described, I assured the press that the gentleman from Ohio is a very distinguished legislator, but that it was my opinion that as a purveyor of comedy he had poor writers.

FORAND BILL LOBBY BOGS DOWN

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his

remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in my speech on the floor of the House on Monday, May 2, 1960, I pointed out the inaccurate reporting of the media concerning the pressures on the Congress for the Forand bill.

I hope the various columnists and editors who were telling the people and their Representatives in Congress that the old people were on the march will read the article from the St. Louis Labor Tribune of April 28, 1960, which I am now inserting in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

A LABOR REPRESENTATIVE SPEAKS OUT

(By Larry Connors, directing business representative, Machinists District No. 9)

WANTED: ACTION! ACTION! ACTION!

This is an emergency call for your help to get quick action on the Forand bill in Congress. Letters are badly needed.

The Forand bill is a top priority goal for the organized labor movement. It is urgently needed to help elderly persons meet the skyrocketing costs of sickness.

The bill would: Provide hospitalization, nursing home, and certain surgical benefits for those receiving social security payments. Increase employee and employer contributions by one-fourth of 1 percent of wages each, to pay for the program. Permit choice of doctors, hospitals, and nursing homes by the patient.

The first step in passing this bill is to secure approval by the House Ways and Means Committee.

Here's how you can help. Organize your family, your friends, the neighbors on your block, union members, and anyone else you can think of today, to start writing letters to Congress.

Make sure that all of the people who participate are registered voters. Write the letters in long hand even if your writing is bad. *Tell your* Representatives that you are counting on them to support and vote for H.R. 4700, the Forand bill. Be sure and give your full name and your home address, and give them some of your reasons for wanting the bill passed.

It would be a smart idea to organize some letter writing meetings at homes. Pass the hat around and let someone be responsible for getting the stationery and stamps together. Draw up some chairs to the tables, put on the coffee pot and while the aroma of the percolating brew is giving you inspiration, take your pens in hand and write something like this to your Congressman: (If you are not sure who your Congressman is, call the union office and ask, or call your local postmaster).

"Honorable John Doe,
"House Office Building,
"Washington 25, D. C.

"DEAR SIR: I am a registered voter. I live at (give your address and city).

"I hope you will support and vote for H.R. 4700 the Forand bill to help the aged.

"Very truly yours.

"JANE SMITH."

Then write to your Senators. Their letters should be addressed to the Honorable John Jones, Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.

The above is just a sample letter. You can add to it or change it, whatever you wish. The important thing is to get the letters rolling in immediately and to let the Members of Congress know that you want this bill passed.

We especially urge those of you whose Representatives may be members of the House Ways and Means Committee to really see to it that they are flooded with mail. Here are the members names:

WILBUR MILLS, Arkansas; AIME FORAND, Rhode Island (author of the bill); CECIL KING, California; THOMAS O'BRIEN, Illinois; HALE BOGGS, Louisiana; EUGENE KEOGH, New York; BURR HARRISON, Virginia; FRANK KARSTEN, Missouri; A. S. HERLONG, Florida; FRANK IKARD, Texas; THADDEUS MACHROWICZ, Michigan; JAMES V. FRAZIER, Tennessee; WILLIAM GREEN, Pennsylvania; JOHN C. WATTS, Kentucky; LEE METCALF, Montana; NOAH MASON, Illinois; JOHN BYRNES, Wisconsin; HOWARD BAKER, Tennessee; THOMAS CURTIS, Missouri; VICTOR KNOX, Michigan; JAMES UTT, California; JACKSON BETTS, Ohio; BRUCE ALGER, Texas; and ALBERT BOSCH, New York.

There are many more signatures to the Forand bill that will benefit not only our neglected aged, but younger working people too.

SEVENTY-SIXTH BIRTHDAY OF HARRY S. TRUMAN

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL], paid a well-deserved tribute to Harry S. Truman as he approaches his 76th birthday on Sunday, May 8.

I wish to associate myself with Mr. RANDALL'S remarks, for he certainly sets forth the fine caliber of the man and the fine caliber of a devoted public servant.

Mr. Truman is a man of decision, whether in or out of public office. He is a forceful reminder that in the complex, ever-changing world in which we live firm leadership is the pressing need of our time.

I salute the gentleman from Missouri on his birthday and wish him continued good health and happiness in the years to come.

INVESTIGATION OF EMPLOYMENT, UTILIZATION, AND RETENTION OF OLDER FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 5, 1960, I introduced House Resolution 522 which provides for a special investigation and study on the employment, utilization, and retention of older workers in the Federal Government. The purpose of the investigation and study will be to insure the adoption of a general policy by the Government for attracting and retaining the skills, abilities, and training possessed by older persons. Such a policy should contribute measurably to the economy and efficiency in the operations of the Government. Appropriate consideration of older persons should also facilitate more effective recruitment and retention by the Federal Government of an adequate work force of civilian personnel in positions at all levels of responsibility.

This study will be another step toward alleviating some of the more pressing problems of the aged which I consistently have been attempting to overcome by my support of legislation to increase benefits of the aged under the civil service retirement plan, social security, and Railroad Retirement.

It is well recognized that the average age of the population in the United States increases from year to year. By 1985, approximately one-half of the population of the country will be over 45 years of age. This means that an increasingly large segment of the work force and of the population available for appointment to new or different jobs in the Government service have the maturity, skills, and abilities, which come only from long experience in their chosen fields. It is essential that steps be taken to insure that the Federal Government does not fail to utilize these values in the older members of our work force as a result of shortsighted overemphasis on the recruitment of younger less-experienced trainee-type individuals for responsible positions in the Federal service.

The recruitment of young college-trained technical and professional people is essential to meet the needs of Government in these dynamic times. It is equally important, however, in my view, that we maintain a proper balance in the work force by giving attention also to the recruitment and utilization of workers whose special talents and skills have been enhanced by longer experience.

Some of the special problems relating to the older workers in Government were disclosed during recent hearings on office automation conducted by the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics, of which I am chairman. It was shown during these hearings that frequently the jobs which are eliminated as a result of automation are held by older employees with long years of service. The same kind of situation frequently is found where reorganizations occur as a result of changes in the missions of Federal agencies. It is important in these circumstances that there be continuing emphasis on programs for the training and retraining of such employees to insure the continued effective employment in the Government wherever possible. I am convinced that programs of this sort are necessary, not only to protect the equitable rights of the employees, but, also, as a practical matter to protect the substantial Government investment which is represented by the long careers of these valuable public servants.

A recent study conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics concerning the productivity of office workers disclosed that Government agencies had a higher percentage of employees over age 55 than do private companies. Conversely, the private concerns had a much higher ratio of employees under age 25. This results in part from certain measures which now exist to protect the interests of older persons in connection with Federal employment; for example, a maximum age limitation for most Federal jobs is prohibited by law. The procedures for conducting reductions in force also placed emphasis on length of service which tends to favor the older worker. While these and other measures had some effect, the investigation I am proposing would be directed to insuring that there be continuing attention to the problem of the older worker and that such additional measures as might be necessary are installed to insure that there is no discrimination on the basis of age in connection with the appointment or retention of persons in the civilian service of the Government.

ALL GROUPS AGREE ON A SOLUTION TO THE FARM PROBLEM—WHY NOT ADOPT IT?

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FLYNN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 360 million acres of land producing crops in the United States. Productivity of this land has increased faster than the population. Productivity has increased faster than the need of the people for the produce that is grown. We have attempted, at tremendous expense, to store, to hold in reserve, to sell to foreign countries or to barter away the surplus. None of these programs have worked and there has been much waste and the loss of billions of dollars annually to the American taxpayer in an attempt to solve the problem of overproduction and surplus.

The cheapest and easiest way of solving the problem of overproductivity and surplus and the best way of bringing domestic supply into balance with domestic demand is to remove from production, a sufficient number of acres to accomplish this result. When supply balances with demand, the economic laws governing all business will apply, and farmers will be able to receive a fair price for their products. I introduced a bill last year calling for the removal of 80 million acres of land from production. I discussed, at great length, this proposal during my last campaign. I am happy to see that in 1960, most major farm bills and almost all farm groups approve this method of solving farm surpluses and overproduction. The Agriculture Department now recommends the removal of 60 million acres of land from production. The Farm Bureau supports this position. The Poage bill, under the formula contained therein, would remove from 50 million to 80 million acres of land from production. The farmers union and the Grange support this measure. The Iowa farm conference last October recommended the removal of 70 million acres of productive land. Several farm bureau local organizations concur in the 70-million-acre figure. I believe that this shows that all major bills and groups have one common denominator in their approach to the solving of the farm problem. Why, therefore, can we not agree upon a farm bill that will use this basic approach as a means of solving the farm dilemma.

I have introduced bill H.R. 12005 and am having it printed at the end of this statement. I sincerely urge you to examine it. I believe that it will bring domestic production into balance with domestic consumption within 3 years, and that it will enable the Government to dispose of its existing surplus within another 3 years, or less. I believe that all of this can be done at a cost of less than $2 billion a year. This will be about 25 percent of the cost of the existing program. It will be a price that the American taxpayer and the urban dweller can afford to pay to assist the farm economy.

I propose to permit farmers to rent their entire farm minus the buildings not to exceed 5 acres of land. I propose to permit farmers to rent parts of their farm and I propose to remove the mandatory features that other bills contain. I propose to free the farmer from the dictation of bureaucrats operating out of local CCC offices. I propose to return the farmer as a free enterprise citizen to the complete control and usage of his farm.

Investigation has shown conclusively that there are three categories of farmers:

First. The elderly man that would be willing to lease his entire farm minus the buildings to the conservation reserve and use the annual rental as a retirement annuity.

Second. There is the middle-aged man who would be willing to reduce his operation by 25 percent or more and thus have some spare time which he could devote to other activities such as local politics or some outside business interest. I propose to let these individuals choose whether they desire to rent part of their farm or their entire farm.

Third. There is then the young married man who desires to farm a large acreage and who has the health and ability to do so. I propose to permit him to become as big as he desires. He will benefit from the fact that large acreage has been removed from production and he can look forward to receiving a fair price for the reason that supply will be in balance with demand on a national basis.

I have set aside 1 hour to discuss the farm problem, and this plan in particular, on Thursday, May 12, at the conclusion of all other business before the House. I would be pleased to have as many Congressmen as possible participate in this discussion in order that we might determine whether there is any common meeting of the minds on a plan that could be enacted into law during the present session.

H.R. 12005

A bill to balance domestic supplies of, and domestic demand for, agricultural commodities, and to prevent the loss of soil, farm labor, and farm capital resources, by providing for withdrawal of up to eighty million acres from agricultural production

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SECTION 101. This Act may be cited as the "Agricultural Production Stabilization Through Conservation Act".

SEC. 102. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to eliminate the recurrence in the future of burdensome surpluses of agricultural production by reducing the acreage in production to the extent necessary to bring into balance the domestic supply of, and the domestic demand for, agricultural products, and to prevent the loss of soil, farm labor, and farm capital resources. It is intended that existing surpluses be disposed of through such other programs as the Congress may by law authorize or direct, including the food stamp plan and the food-for-peace program.

SEC. 103. It is the intention of the Congress that the programs authorized by this Act be carried out in the various sections of the country as nearly as may be practicable in proportion to the competitive desires of producers to participate therein.

SEC. 104. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(2) The term "Corporation" means the Commodity Credit Corporation.

(3) The term "county committee" means a county committee established under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (7 U.S.C. 1831(d)).

(4) The term "acreage allotment" means an acreage allotment made pursuant to the agriculture laws of the United States.

(5) The term "farm" means the land constituting a farming unit as determined by the Secretary, taking into consideration the use of common work stock, equipment, labor, management, and other pertinent factors.

SEC. 105. In the execution of the programs authorized by this Act, the Secretary of the Corporation shall have due regard for the interests of tenant farmers and sharecroppers.

TITLE II—CONTRACTS

SEC. 201. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary is directed to determine and announce the national conservation reserve goal and the program applicable thereto for each year not later than March 1 of the preceding year. Not later than thirty days after enactment of this title the Secretary shall announce the national goal and program for 1961. The Secretary shall enter into contracts pursuant to the provisions of this title at a maximum rate approximating twelve million acres increase per year, until such time as the conservation reserve shall reach the smaller of eighty million acres, or a level at which the Secretary finds that agricultural commodity surpluses are being diminished in an orderly manner. Thereafter new contracts or contract riders pursuant to section 203(b) shall be entered into which shall maintain the conservation reserve at such level not in excess of eighty million acres as the Secretary finds to be in the public interest. The Secretary shall not enter into contracts which will result in the conservation reserve acreage's exceeding one-third of the total cropland of any county in which crop production is a major factor in the economy of a

trade area without approval of a majority of those firms located in that trade area whose income is deemed to be substantially dependent on sustained crop production.

SEC. 202. Any such contract shall be of a duration of not less than five and not more than twenty years, and shall be with the person or persons (hereinafter referred to as the contractor) who own or control the farm which is the subject of the contract. Any such contract may contain such provisions relating to transfer of the property which is the subject thereof, assignment, and termination, and such other provisions, as may in the opinion of the Secretary be necessary or appropriate in the public interest and to assure equitable treatment of contractors.

SEC. 203. (a) Any such contract shall provide that the contractor shall place in the conservation reserve, subject to the provisions of subtitle B of the Soil Bank Act and regulations issued thereunder, an acreage which prior thereto accounted for at least 25 per centum of the total crop-producing capacity of the land in the farm which is eligible for the conservation reserve. And not recently cropped which is brought into cultivation within the three years immediately preceding the first year of the proposed contract period shall not be eligible for placement in the conservation reserve until three full years have elapsed.

(b) Any such contract shall describe the boundaries of the conservation reserve acreage, and such boundaries may not be changed without the consent of the Secretary.

(c) Any such contract which is approved after land has been prepared for the planting of an annual crop for harvest in the first year of a contract period, and which places such land in the conservation reserve, shall, at the option of the contractor, permit the harvesting or grazing of the crop for which the land was prepared. This privilege shall apply for only the first year of the contract period and no annual rental payment shall be made on that acreage for the year in which the harvesting or grazing occurs.

(d) Any such contract may contain such other provisions as the Secretary may deem necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this title.

SEC. 204. (a) (1) In consideration of the obligations imposed on a contractor pursuant to section 203, any such contract shall provide that the Secretary shall make payments to the contractor, in cash or in kind, as provided in this section.

(2) For each of the first five years the contract is in effect, the Secretary shall compute for the contractor an annual rental payment determined according to section 107(b)(2) of the Soil Bank Act. Such amount shall be specified in the contract prior to execution.

(3) Upon the expiration of each five-year period after the effective date of the contract, the amount of the annual rental payment shall be adjusted by multiplying the amount determined pursuant to paragraph (2) by the ratio of the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index as of the date of such adjustment to such index as of the first of the year for which the first annual rental payment is due under the contract. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (2) and this paragraph, no annual rental payment in excess of $10,000 shall be payable in cash to a producer for all contracts within a State in which he has an interest.

(b) (1) In lieu of the annual rental payments specified in subsection (a) the Secretary shall make surplus commodities available to those contractors who have not placed all of their eligible land in the conservation reserve as specified in this subsection.

(2) Whenever, before land preparation begins for a crop year, the Corporation holds stocks of any commodity which it deems to be critical surplus stocks, the Secretary shall offer a contract rider for that crop year to those contractors with land which prior to being placed in the conservation reserve produced thereon crops currently deemed to be critical surplus crops. If accepted by the contractor the rider shall require reduction of the aggregate acreage of the designated critical surplus crops for the current year below the acreage thereof on the farm prior to placing land in the conservation reserve.

(3) In consideration of the aggregate reduction in critical surplus crops the contractor shall be eligible for a negotiable certificate for a stated number of dollars redeemable in one or more critical surplus commodities chosen by the contractor from those for which an acreage reduction was made in lieu of the cash annual rental which would otherwise be payable.

(4) The value of all negotiable certificates issued under a contract rider shall not exceed the amount obtained by multiplying the total rental under the contract that year by the ratio of the aggregate reduction of critical surplus crop acreage to the total conservation reserve acreage for the farm. In no case shall the value of all negotiable certificates exceed the total rental due under the contract for that year.

(5) Negotiable certificates shall not be redeemable during the normal harvest season of the commodity. Where a negotiable certificate is presented for redemption, the Corporation shall deliver the specified commodity which shall be considered to have a value not less than 80 per centum of the current market price determined by the Corporation at the time and point of delivery. The Corporation shall not be responsible for transporting the commodity from its current location in fulfillment of negotiable certificates.

TITLE III—ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS, MARKETING QUOTAS, AND PRICE SUPPORTS

SEC. 301. Paragraph (7) of the joint resolution of May 26, 1941, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1340(7)), is amended to read as follows:

"(7) A farm marketing quota for wheat shall not be applicable to any farm on which the acreage planted to wheat is ten acres or less."

SEC. 302. For the purpose of determining future acreage allotments and marketing quotas the cropland acreage and the acreage deemed to have been diverted from the production of any commodity in order to carry out a conservation reserve contract shall continue to be deemed to be cropland, or acreage of the commodity, respectively, after termination of the contract as long as the conservation cover or use is maintained in a satisfactory condition.

SEC. 303. The Secretary shall take steps to permit specified grain commodity prices to find their proper free market relationship one toward another as the expanded conservation reserve and surplus disposal programs progressively relieve the surplus situation. In order that adjustments in price relationships shall not be too rapid for any single commodity, the Secretary shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, establish national average price support rates for barley, corn, dry edible beans, flaxseed, grain sorghums, oats, rye, soybeans, and wheat which shall be: (1) for 1961, 95 per centum of the rate in effect for 1960; (2) for 1962, 90 per centum of the rate in effect for 1960; and (3) for 1963, 85 per centum of the rate in effect for 1960. For 1964 and thereafter, price support shall not be offered for these commodities.

SEC. 304. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any contractor who knowingly and willfully grazes or harvests any crop from any acreage in violation of a conservation reserve contract or contract rider shall, in addition to liability for penalties stated in section 123 of the Soil Bank Act, be ineligible for price support benefits that year on all farms in which he has an interest within the State.

SEC. 305. Section 211 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 is hereby amended by striking out the words "For a period of three years from the date of enactment of this Act," wherever they appear therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Until directed otherwise by Act of Congress,".

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. GIAIMO), for Friday, May 6, through Friday, May 13, 1960, on account of official business.

Mr. DENT, for Friday, May 6, 1960, on account of official business.

Mr. VINSON for 10 days, starting Monday, May 9, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. HECHLER, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ULLMAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TABER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. GROSS) and to include extraneous material at the conclusion of general debate on the bill H.R. 11713.

Mr. BUDGE.

Mr. HARRIS and include an address he made to the Federal Trial Examiners Conference last night.

(At the request of Mr. BURKE of Kentucky, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. RODINO.

(At the request of Mr. QUIE, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. WEAVER.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1349. An act for the relief of Song Tai Song; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1857. An act to promote the foreign trade of the United States in grapes and plums, to protect the reputation of American-grown grapes and plums in foreign markets, to prevent deception or misrepresentation as to the quality of such products moving in foreign commerce, to provide for the commercial inspection of such products entering such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2087. An act for the relief of Janis Papulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2369. An act for the relief of Sachiko Kato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2499. An act for the relief of Halina Konik Wojtusiak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2528. An act for the relief of John Lipset; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2575. An act to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2618. An act to authorize the exchange of certain war-built vessels for more modern and efficient war-built vessels owned by the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2627. An act for the relief of Nicholas Anthony Marcantonakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2635. An act for the relief of Maria Genowefa Kon Musial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2739. An act for the relief of Yu Sui Ling, also known as Yee Shui Ling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2769. An act for the relief of John George Sarkis Lindell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2792. An act for the relief of Luigia Mion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2821. An act for the relief of Kristina Selan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2822. An act for the relief of Low Wing Quey (Kwai); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2833. An act for the relief of Sadako Suzuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2857. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for refunds of contributions in the case of annuitants whose length of service exceeds the amount necessary to provide the maximum annuity allowable under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2886. An act for the relief of Nikolija Lazic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2923. An act for the relief of Ki Su (Theresa) Moun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2966. An act for the relief of Antigone Apostolaki Cassel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2969. An act to authorize the award posthumously of appropriate medals to Chaplain George L. Fox, Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, Chaplain Clark V. Poling, and Chaplain John P. Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3081. An act for the relief of Irena Maria Koller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3114. An act for the relief of Adolphe Herstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3327. An act for the relief of Joan Goedicke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7947. An act relating to the income tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association;

H.R. 8684. An act to provide transitional provisions for the income tax treatment of dealer reserve incomes;

H.R. 9660. An act to amend section 6659 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10234. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 9, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 86th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948: HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, 17th District, Pennsylvania; DOUGLAS H. ELLIOTT, 18th District, Pennsylvania.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2128. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1960 in the amount of $200,000 for the Department of Justice and $150,000 for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 386); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2129. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DADDARIO: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 11985. A bill to make American nationals eligible for scholarships and fellowships authorized by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 1591). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 12117. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1592). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee of conference. H.R. 11510. A bill to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1593). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 12103. A bill to provide for the free entry of pilot plant grain cleaning and flour milling equipment for Kansas State University; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 12104. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12105. A bill to authorize user charges for certain services performed by the Department of Agriculture and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 12106. A bill to eliminate discriminatory employment practices on account of age by contractors and subcontractors in the performance of contracts with the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H.R. 12107. A bill to convey Fort Amezquita Military Reservation, P.R., to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 12108. A bill to provide for Federal grants and contracts to carry out projects with respect to techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution, and control of juvenile delinquency, and for the training of personnel; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 12109. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide that the transportation of bulk commodities by railroad shall be exempt from regulation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 12110. A bill to provide judicial review of agency orders concerning biological products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 12111. A bill to amend section 2(a) of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 12112. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend by 1 additional year the time within which a minister may elect coverage as a self-employed individual for social security purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 12113. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is physically handicapped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 12114. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease and desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 12115. A bill to extend the minimum national marketing quota for extra long staple cotton to the 1961 crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 12116. A bill to provide for Federal contribution to the cost of election campaigns of candidates for Federal offices, conditioned upon effective control and publication of other sources of financing such campaigns; to encourage small individual campaign contributions and to reduce the importance of large contributions in Federal elections; to provide Federal financial assistance for State voters' and campaign pamphlets; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 12117. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Con. Res. 687. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H. Con. Res. 688. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 12118. A bill for the relief of Maloney Bros. Nursery Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 12119. A bill for the relief of Otilia Maria del Rosario Michelena y Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Helping the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 6, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, earlier this session Congressman ADDONIZIO introduced a bill to provide an additional $600 exemption for disabled individuals. Because I have received many letters on this problem, and because my personal experience persuades me that this is an excellent proposal, I wish to support Mr. ADDONIZIO today by introducing a similar bill.

For the past 2 years I have served as Essex County chairman for the Sister Kenny Fund, which in that time raised over $110,000 for the Sister Kenny Institute. In this capacity, I have had the opportunity to learn at firsthand the problems and almost insurmountable difficulties which face the disabled individual in his struggle to achieve economic independence.

The disabled person not only has trouble supporting himself; he has needs and expenses which the average person does not even contemplate. Even such a matter as buying shoes, which most of us take for granted, can become a terrible burden, when the shoes must be specially designed and frequently replaced. A sudden disability may make the family home inadequate, and the family may have to move to a one-story house for the benefit of the disabled member. Taxicabs for those who can no longer use public transportation suddenly become a necessity. Prosthetic devices, specially equipped cars and special equipment for the household are matters which the handicapped must take for granted.

In addition to unique needs and expenses, the handicapped individual faces an uphill struggle in obtaining employment. Attention is now being focused on this problem by the President's Committee on the Physically Handicapped, which is currently meeting.

All these reasons are cogent ones, in my opinion, for giving the disabled some tax relief and thereby helping his economic adjustment.

A precedent for this measure lies in the additional exemption already accorded the blind.

How Do You Stand?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 6, 1960

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial by the Honorable BARRY GOLDWATER, Senator from Arizona, appearing in the May 3 edition of the Idaho Daily Statesman, published at Boise, Idaho.

The distinguished Senator from Arizona is to be commended for his forthright statement on Americanism. It is a statement which will further endear Senator GOLDWATER to millions of loyal Americans who look to the Constitution of the United States for the protection of their liberty.

The editorial follows:

HOW DO YOU STAND, SIR?

(By Senator BARRY GOLDWATER)

How did it happen? How did our national Government grow from a servant with sharply limited powers into a master with virtually unlimited power?

In part, we were swindled. We have elevated men and political parties to power who promised to restore limited Government and who proceeded, after their election, to expand the activities of Government.

But let us be honest with ourselves. Broken promises are not the major causes of our trouble. Kept promises are. All too often we have put men in office who have suggested spending a little more on this, a little more on that, who have proposed a new welfare program, who have thought of another variety of security. We have taken the bait, preferring to put off to another day the recapture of freedom and the restoration of our constitutional system. We have gone the way of many a democratic society which has lost its freedom by persuading itself that if the people rule, all is well.

The Frenchman, Alexis de Tocqueville, probably the most clairvoyant political observer of modern times, saw the danger when he visited this country in the 1830's. Even then he foresaw decay for a society that tended to put more emphasis on its democracy than on its republicanism.

He predicted that America would produce, not tyrants, but guardians. And that the American people would "console themselves for being in tutelage by the reflection that they have chosen their own guardians. Every man allows himself to be put in leadstrings, because he sees that it is not a person nor a class of persons, but the people at large that hold the end of his chain."

Our tendency to concentrate power in the hands of a few men deeply concerns me. We can be conquered by bombs or by subversion; but we can also be conquered by neglect—by ignoring the Constitution and disregarding the principles of limited government. Our defenses against the accumulation of unlimited power in Washington are in poorer shape, I fear, than our defenses against the aggressive designs of Moscow. Like so many other nations before us, we may succumb through internal weakness rather than fall before a foreign foe.

I am convinced that most Americans now want to reverse the trend. I think their concern for our vanishing freedoms is genuine. I think that the people's uneasiness in the stifling omnipresence of government has turned into something approaching alarm. But bemoaning the evil will not drive it back and accusing fingers will not shrink government.

The turn will come when we entrust the conduct of our affairs to men who understand that their first duty as public officials is to divest themselves of the power they have been given.

It will come when Americans, in hundreds of communities throughout the Nation decide to put the man in office who is pledged to enforce the Constitution and restore the Republic; who will proclaim in a campaign speech: "I have little interest in streamlining government or in making it more ef-

ficient, for I mean to reduce its size. I do not undertake to promote welfare, for I propose to extend freedom. My aim is not to pass laws, but to repeal them.

"It is not to inaugurate new programs, but to cancel old ones that do violence to the Constitution—or that have failed in their purpose—or that impose on the people an unwarranted financial burden.

"I will not attempt to discover whether legislation is needed before I have first determined whether it is constitutionally permissible.

"And if I should be attacked for neglecting my constituents' interests, I shall reply that I was informed their main interest is liberty and that in that cause I am doing the very best I can." How do you stand, sir?

Address Delivered by Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota, at West Virginia University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 6, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from an address delivered by me at West Virginia University on Thursday, May 5, 1960.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPPORTUNITY FOR PROGRESS—WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY, THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1960

Sometimes when I travel from region to region in this country of ours, I think of the hungry little boy who saw a tree full of ripe apples on the other side of the hill.

"Ain't no reason to go over there," the little boy said sadly. "I ain't got no wagon to bring any apples home to the family."

That is the story in too many regions of America today. We do not have enough wagons to haul the abundant resources of one area to meet the desperate needs of another area.

Some regions have more water than they need, while others lie wasted and unproductive in the sun.

Some regions have more food than they need, while others are strained to feed the people.

Some regions have more jobs than men, while other areas represent pockets of unemployment and inactivity.

There are many men who say that this is just a natural state of affairs. They say it is all very sad and unfortunate, but that nothing can be done about it.

Well, I disagree.

I say that an unbalanced water supply, or an unbalanced distribution of food or an unbalanced employment force, should not be ignored. I say that it is the responsibility of Government to balance the Nation, to see that the resources of one area are utilized fully to meet the needs of another area.

Now don't misunderstand. I am not talking about Government handouts or total Government control of the whole fabric and pattern of society. I am talking about Government with enough commonsense and heart to work for the healthy growth of every area, to help each area build its own security and prosperity.

Let me use an example all of you will understand—the unbalanced supply and demand of electric power, the vast supply of coal in West Virginia and the growing demand for electric power throughout the East.

I have seen solid proof of that demand, my friends. America's population is growing by leaps and bounds. Its cities are spreading over wider areas. New homes are springing up like wild grass and new business and industry are boosting their output to service the growing population. And 55 percent of all Americans live within 500 miles of West Virginia. This growing region needs power—and lots of it—to meet the demands of more people, more homes, more business.

West Virginia is in the center of this circle of growth. And West Virginia has the source for power—coal. The State produced 30 percent of the Nation's supply, but still has an estimated eight times the amount of coal it has already produced under the ground. West Virginia's coal can produce power—and lots of it—to meet the needs of the growing East.

The implication is obvious. West Virginia should be the heart of the East—sending out the life blood of any nation's growth, power. But instead, West Virginia and its vast resources are treated like an unnecessary appendage, getting smaller and smaller as the rest of the Nation's body grows and prospers.

You know the results. Coal output is down. Miners are unemployed. The whole State—and all its people—have suffered because the coal industry is the most important in West Virginia.

Despite the tragic effects of the industry's decline, West Virginians have not given up. You are a hardy, determined people, and you are not quitters. Like the little boy eyeing the apple tree on the other side of the hill, you are not going to move off to satisfy your own individual needs. You are going to stay put, and face the responsibility for taking care of your families, your homes, and your State.

And like the little boy who needed a wagon to carry the apples, West Virginia needs a new method for sending the power of its coal to the growing areas which need it.

The cost of hauling your coal to centers of consumption is just too high. The freight charge for transporting coal by traditional methods amounts to almost three-fourths of the average value of coal at the mine. Such costs represent a major competitive disadvantage for coal compared to other energy sources.

There is a new method to reduce such costs and increase the demand and production of coal. This is the establishment of power stations at the mines able to send electricity by line to the major consuming centers.

Traditionally, the cost of transmitting electricity over high voltage powerlines more than 200 miles has been greater than the cost of transporting the coal itself.

But today growing demand has established the need for huge "blocks" of power at specific centers of consumption. Sweden has demonstrated that it is economically feasible to transmit more than 500,000 volts more than 500 miles. And, yes, the Soviet Union has done the same thing.

It is obvious that "mine-mouth electric power stations" represent an exciting new possibility for the growth of the coal industry and the revitalization of West Virginia's economy.

The State is ideally located for such power stations. In time electrical power from your coal could hum steadily through the high lines stretching to America's great industrial and urban centers. The coal beneath your hills could then become the source of new wealth and economic security for West Virginians.

Just listen to one prediction, reported recently by the Federal Power Commission.

FPC experts estimate that 10 strategically placed mine-mouth generating plants could supply the entire area east of the Mississippi with sufficient electrical power. Those 10 plants could do the job done by 1,623 plants now scattered in various regions.

But much must be done. It is the job of the Federal Government to take the lead in encouraging construction of mine-mouth generating plants. We must embark on a bold new program to stimulate the use of West Virginia coal. We must immediately establish a mood of cooperation between Federal and State governments and private industry to accomplish that purpose.

Right now we have the chance to make a big start in this direction. Congress is considering legislation calling for a study of the electrical power supply situation in the United States. The study would pave the way for additional legislation to assure development of bulk power supply.

The establishment of mine-mouth power stations would not be a boost just for industry in other States.

West Virginia's great potential contributions would be vividly dramatized to the whole Nation. Others would come to understand—as I do—the wealth of this State.

Development of new, low-cost energy resources can be the single greatest attraction to new industry to move into West Virginia itself.

Paper and chemical industries which consume huge quantities of electrical energy and use coal, water and forest products could not resist the West Virginia location.

And—above all—others would come to appreciate the skills and reliability of West Virginia's labor force.

It is time for the Government to take action to balance the Nation. It is time for giant steps to balance the needs for power with the supply of coal here. It is time for transforming the potential wealth of West Virginia into real prosperity for her citizens.

Two Thousand One Hundred and Eighty Residents of the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania Participate in Post Card Survey of Public Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 6, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks 6,000 residents representing a good cross section of the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania were invited to participate in a post card poll of public opinion on 15 vital issues being discussed by the American people and their representatives in Congress. It is encouraging to report that 2,180 of my constituents favored me with their opinions on the questions submitted, some of them taking the time to elaborate on their views by attaching explanatory letters which proved very interesting because the position often taken on a subject was the result of personal experience and observations. The number of replies received represents a response from over 36 percent of those polled which is recognized as a very fine average in a public opinion poll by mail. In a few instances, questions were not answered on the grounds that the person lacked adequate information to form a definite opinion.

The idea of using various mailing lists in conducting a survey of public opinion from the residents of my congressional district was an effort to obtain assurance that the sentiment expressed would represent a good cross section of opinion from constituents. The result has been that it has been possible to secure the benefit of the views of persons in all walks of life including ministers, doctors, dentists, veterans, teachers, farmers, members of various professions, housewives, businessmen, and members of labor organizations.

The number of persons participating in the post card poll in the three-county area was as follows: Blair County 1,095, Centre County 536, Clearfield County 549, making a grand total of 2,180 persons responding out of the 6,000 polled.

The question receiving the greatest number of favorable replies was the query concerning the advisability of concentrating on building an all-around defense rather than specializing on missiles. A total of 90.5 percent favored an all-around defense with 9.5 in favor of concentrating on missiles. On the question as to whether the Eisenhower-Nixon-Khrushchev meetings are a means of promoting world peace 78.4 percent favored such meetings while 21.6 percent doubted their value in restoring peace to a troubled world. A total of 80.6 percent of the 2,180 replies favored retention of the loyalty oath required for student loans under the national defense student loan program while 19.4 percent expressed dissenting opinions.

Concerning the proposal to extend Federal aid to depressed areas suffering from chronic unemployment 77.1 percent favored such assistance. With respect to the questions concerning Government controls over agriculture 79.1 percent favored their abolishment. The question of providing Federal aid to education revealed 57.9 percent in favor with 42.1 percent against such assistance.

Another question which resulted in a very close division in public opinion concerned the proposal to increase the hourly minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 with 50.2 percent favoring such an increase and 49.8 percent in opposition. On the subject of the so-called Forand bill designed to provide medical and hospital care to persons receiving social security benefits, the cost to be borne by an increase in payroll taxes, 39.3 percent went on record in favor of the proposal with 60.7 percent against it. In regard to favoring a pension at age 65 for World War I veterans, 65.5 percent were in favor of a pension, while 34.5 percent opposed it.

It is my desire to thank all of those who cooperated in my efforts to obtain a good cross section of public opinion on vital issues of the day. The letters that accompanied the post cards revealed a sincere desire to provide constructive criticism where it was felt that such action was merited. This attitude on the part of the participants in the poll is deeply appreciated, as some of the writers stated that they welcomed the opportunity to express their views through the medium of an opinion poll because of reluctance in writing a personal letter to their Representative in Congress. By aiding me in the poll the result has proven mutually beneficial.

The tabulation of the 15 questions representing the views of the 2,180 persons in the 3 counties in my congressional district is as follows:

1. Are the Eisenhower-Nixon-Khrushchev meetings a means of promoting world peace? Yes, 78.4 percent; no, 21.6 percent.
2. Should foreign aid in all forms be reduced? Yes, 69.2 percent; no, 30.8 percent.
3. Should the $1 Federal minimum hourly wage be increased? Yes, 50.2 percent; no, 49.8 percent.
4. Do you believe the loyalty oath now required under the national defense student loan program should be retained? Yes, 80.6 percent; no, 19.4 percent.
5. Do you favor Federal aid to depressed areas suffering from chronic unemployment? Yes, 77.1 percent; no, 22.9 percent.
6. Do you believe that Government controls over agriculture should be eliminated? Yes, 79.1 percent; no, 20.9 percent.
7. Are you in favor of increasing the postal rate on letters from 4 cents to 5 cents? Yes, 34.1 percent; no, 65.9 percent.
8. Do you believe the limitation of $1,200 on outside earnings of those drawing social security benefits should be increased? Yes, 68.2 percent; no, 31.8 percent.
9. Would you favor giving the President the right to veto or accept specific items in an appropriation bill instead of the present requirement that he accept all or nothing? Yes, 77.1 percent; no, 22.9 percent.
10. Do you think that the United States should try to place a man in space ahead of the Russians regardless of the cost? Yes, 13.9 percent; no, 86.1 percent.
11. Should we concentrate on building an all-round national defense or specialize on missiles? Yes, 90.5 percent; no, 9.5 percent.
12. Do you favor Federal aid to education? Yes, 57.9 percent; no, 42.1 percent.
13. Are you in favor of the proposal to provide medical and hospital care to persons receiving social security benefits and paying the cost by increasing payroll taxes? Yes, 39.3 percent; no, 60.7 percent.
14. Do you favor approval of a GI educational benefit program for peacetime veterans? Yes, 36.6 percent; no, 63.4 percent.
15. Do you favor a pension for World War I veterans when they reach age 65? Yes, 65.5 percent; no, 34.5 percent.

The Public Community Junior College Construction Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 6, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I find that the interest across the Nation in my proposal for Federal assistance to States in carrying out a program of establishing and expanding community junior colleges continues to grow. I am receiving an increasing number of letters expressing support for my bill, H.R. 967, and asking for further information about it. So that my colleagues and others may have the benefit of a short explanation of my proposal, I wish, under leave to extend my remarks, to insert into the RECORD the brief statement I made before the Special Education Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee earlier this year:

THE PUBLIC COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE CONSTRUCTION ACT

(Statement of Hon. AL ULLMAN before Special Education Subcommittee, House Education and Labor Committee, March 23, 1960)

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the members of this subcommittee for the opportunity to appear here today. The current and future needs of America's institutions of higher education certainly demand the kind of careful examination which you are now undertaking. I heartily commend the fine and very necessary work my colleagues are doing by holding these hearings to survey the needs and to consider what legislation would best serve them.

It is not necessary for me, I am sure, to repeat the statistical evidence of the rising enrollments in our institutions of higher education, the projections of even greater enrollments, and the resulting demands being made on the Nation's colleges and universities. The problems are manifold. The challenges of solving them are multiplying. And the diversity of American higher education implies that no single solution can suffice.

Last year I introduced H.R. 967—the Public Community Junior College Act—which I believe represents one method of approaching the increasing demands being placed on our institutions of higher education. This proposal also is intended to make education beyond the high school more readily available to many more of our young people. I do not presume, however, to imply that this proposal is the only way to meet the needs which confront higher education today. Our 4-year colleges and universities, of course, also require expanded facilities. Moreover, I endorse proposals which would assist this necessary expansion.

The fact remains, Mr. Chairman, that the 4-year colleges have not been able to grow in proportion to the tremendously increasing enrollments. Recognition of this fact is one of the major reasons behind my interest in the community college idea. The value and unique advantages of the community college have received considerable attention from educational authorities throughout the Nation. Dr. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., executive director of the American Association of Junior Colleges, accounts for the growing popularity of the community college idea with these facts:

1. They are economical to attend; tuition fees are either very low or nonexistent.
2. They are close to the homes of their students.
3. They are responsive to local needs.
4. Their programs are flexible yet thorough.
5. Through their adult programs they provide opportunities for continuing education.

In my opinion, one of the most significant benefits of the expansion of community college facilities is that such expansion would almost certainly encourage more of the Nation's high school graduates to pursue further education. The Nation needs more highly trained persons. The availability of public junior colleges would surely help to increase opportunities for such training. Furthermore, junior colleges also help to relieve freshmen and sophomore overcrowding at 4-year colleges and universities.

Another distinct advantage of the 2-year college is the semiprofessional or technical training which it provides. This is an especially attractive feature for students who wish to pursue courses of terminal instruction.

The community college also helps many students who plan to continue their studies in a 4-year institution by reducing their matriculation and adjustment difficulties.

Also significant is the fact that public community colleges strengthen the American tradition of providing educational opportunity for all since these institutions further extend opportunities for the fuller development of more students.

Two other very practical aspects of providing more public community college facilities are those of economy and geographical proximity. These institutions provide low-cost education for many capable students who otherwise would be unable to afford post-high-school education. Also, studies made in a number of States confirm the fact that proximity to an institution of higher education is directly related to student enrollment.

Mr. Chairman, at the present time there are 400 publicly supported junior colleges in the country serving over 800,000 students. In fact, one out of every four students who entered a college in 1959 enrolled in a 2-year institution. Since college enrollments continue to rise, obviously these junior college facilities must grow concurrently along with those of the 4-year institution.

But, just as clearly, the expansion of State educational programs on the junior college level cannot be undertaken by States and localities fast enough and on a large enough scale without Federal assistance. Letters which I have received from numerous persons in the field of junior college education and several discussions with others concerned with community colleges indicate a nationwide need for expanded facilities and the value of Federal financial support. For example, the superintendent of public instruction and director of education of the State of California, Mr. Roy E. Simpson, informs me that:

"We here in California are deeply concerned about the tremendous pressures we face with the expanding enrollments in post-high-school education. * * * Actually, this year the junior college enrollments exceeded the projection * * * and we now have over 91,000 full-time students enrolled. It is now our belief that we will have over 220,000 full-time students in the junior colleges by 1970. The increases in enrollments in the State colleges and the university are also serious problems. * * * At the same time we are building junior colleges we are also having to expand our State college system and also the campuses of the University of California, so we have a three-way burden.

"Actually, at the present time we have as many full-time students enrolled in junior colleges as we have in the total enrollments in the State colleges and the campuses of the University of California. We believe that the junior college is performing a very significant and unique higher education function in our State; and it is reaching a point where the financial strain of providing facilities for all three is causing deep concern. Your bill, H.R. 967, if enacted into law, would provide a very substantial relief to our problem of meeting post-high-school needs."

From the Midwest, Dr. Harvey D. Martin, of the Education Department of Keokuk Community College, Keokuk, Iowa, writes:

"The community colleges need help in meeting the demands placed upon them by the ever-increasing student body. Our own college, presently bursting at the seams with more than the projected anticipated enrollment for 1958–59, is a good example depicting the needs of the community colleges throughout the United States."

Mr. Chairman, my bill is specifically designed to meet these demands. It would provide assistance to the participating States for the initial establishment of public community junior colleges and for the expansion of those public 2-year institutions which now exist either as subsidiaries of senior institutions or as separate junior colleges. Of equal importance at this time is the assistance that the bill would make available for the public technical institutions which are, under great handicaps, providing us with a large percentage of the technicians and skilled persons our Nation requires.

Not only will this proposal help to meet the demands of increasing enrollments, but it will also encourage the States to expand their diversified educational programs and provide education for many more thousands at reduced financial costs to the student.

H.R. 967 proposes to establish a 5-year program of grants-in-aid to the States for construction and expansion of public junior colleges.

The total authorized appropriation for each year of the program would be $200 million, of which one-half or $100 million would be apportioned equally among the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The remaining $100 million would be apportioned among the States according to the ratio of their total public elementary and secondary enrollment as compared with the national enrollment for these grades. The States would be required to match this second amount on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

I believe that the system of a flat Federal grant and a variable Federal grant allows for the greatest amount of equity in meeting the varying enrollment potential among the States. In other words, the flat Federal grant guarantees that each State shall receive at least a minimum amount of Federal assistance through the allotment of an equal share of $100 million. An equitable share of the other $100 million would be apportioned to each State on the basis of its public school enrollment. This provision gives special consideration to the States with the highest potential public junior college enrollment.

The bill also provides that funds apportioned shall be used only for the construction of public community junior college facilities, public technical institutes and junior colleges of public senior institutions of higher education, and for the expansion of the facilities of these institutions.

Bearing in mind the importance of reaching those areas within the States which need public community junior colleges the most, I have provided within the framework of the bill that consideration would be given under the State plan to those communities which: are geographically removed from other State colleges and universities; desire the establishment or expansion of a community college; are making an effort commensurate with their economic resources; and are unable, solely because of a lack of such resources, to finance the full cost of the needed facilities. H.R. 967 also would require that the State educational agency determine those communities in which the need for community colleges is most urgent. I believe that this bill offers a dynamic, workable, and positive approach to junior college needs of all areas of the Nation.

The construction cost of junior colleges, of course, would vary with the location of those colleges. However, it has been estimated that the average cost of expanded plant per student is $2,500, or 125 square feet per student at $20 per square foot. Using this estimate, for example, and calculating on the basis of an authorized appropriation of $200 million, H.R. 967 could provide for an expansion of public junior college facilities to accommodate approximately 80,000 additional students. This number is equal to almost 10 percent of all those enrolled in public junior college in 1958–59. Moreover, State matching funds provided for under the bill would further increase the number of classrooms available.

Of course, in view of projected enrollments the amount authorized under H.R. 967 is but a small portion of the funds which will be required for needed college classroom expansion in the future. The fact remains, Mr. Chairman, that legislation of this kind would certainly serve as a stimulus to the States and local communities in their efforts to meet the increasing demands for more and better education beyond the high school.

I wish to thank the members of this subcommittee once again for the opportunity to discuss this bill and my reasons for sponsoring it.

Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton Outlines Dramatic Electric Power Gains Under Eisenhower Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 6, 1960

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to one of the most important policy statements made by the Eisenhower administration concerning the development of hydroelectric power in the United States. Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton made this statement before the American Public Power Association at its annual convention here in Washington on Wednesday May 4, 1960.

The speech was met of course by mixed reaction but on the whole most favorably. Afterward I heard many comments that this was the most forthright, hard-hitting statement of the administration's position on this vital subject in many years. In his speech, Mr. Seaton not only outlined the tremendous gains made in the orderly development of our natural resources under the Eisenhower administration, and more particularly under his own administration of the Department of Interior, but also pointed the way to a vital growing future in this area.

It is an honor and a real pleasure to present this speech to my colleagues. It follows:

The American Public Power Association represents a vital component of the electric power industry of the United States. For that, and other reasons, it is a great pleasure to participate in your program.

As Secretary of the Interior, by way of the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Southeastern, Southwestern, and Bonneville Power Adminstrations, I am myself directly involved in the great industry of which you are a part.

You and I have many interests in common. Most important of these, as servants of the American public, is our joint concern that this Nation always has sufficient electric power to meet its present and future needs.

In 78 years, electric power has moved from the status of just a new-fangled item of public curiosity to that of an absolute necessity.

Gone from use now, with only rare exceptions, are the gas lamp and kerosene lantern. In their place there is electricity, for use in lighting, for powering industry and the home, for making possible everything from the X-ray to our whole vast electronic system of communication. It affects our daily lives and even our national security in hundreds and thousands of different ways.

Today the annual electric energy requirements of the United States total more than

700 billion kilowatt-hours, almost double that of 10 years ago. By 1980, this Nation likely will need over 2,100 billion kilowatt-hours each year—three times more than today. Even so, there is no doubt in my mind as to our ability to stay ahead of this increasing demand. Two factors, in particular, warrant that conclusion.

The first is the tremendous technological progress of the industry itself.

Where Edison's original Pearl Street Station in New York had 6 dynamos, each with the capability of lighting 800 incandescent lamps, today the Nation's largest generator is turning out enough energy to provide electric power for a city of 500,000 people. And even larger generators are being designed and constructed.

It took 10 pounds of coal to produce 1 kilowatt-hour in 1882; last year about nine-tenths of a pound did the same job. In 1940, 16 cubic feet of natural gas were required to produce a kilowatt-hour; in 1958, 11½ cubic feet.

Taken together, these facts represent solid reasons to foresee more efficient generation, higher transmission voltages, advances in plant design, and a whole host of other improvements to come. Encouraging, too, is the fact that technological advances are now coming at a faster rate than ever before in your industry's history.

These achievements, coupled with the greater efficiency made possible by volume operations, have enabled you to meet an ever-increasing demand and at the same time reduce the cost of electricity. Thirty-four years ago the consumer paid just under 3 cents a kilowatt-hour. The average price today is a penny less. And I don't need to remind you that this was accomplished during a period when general living costs have skyrocketed.

Without question, your members have contributed materially to the operating practices and efficiencies which have brought these cost reductions about.

The second reason for my optimism that the United States will have enough electric power to meet its future needs is the record of accomplishment made by the several segments of the electric power industry during the past 7 years.

Less than a decade ago, you will recall, a serious power shortage existed in the Pacific Northwest. Mandatory curtailment of power consumption adversely affected the economic development of the area. Existing industry was seriously hampered, if not prevented from expanding. New industries were unable to locate in the region, simply because there was not enough available power. Most unfortunately, even important defense production was affected.

Such an intolerable situation demanded action—action which would put added kilowatts on the line rather than merely mouthing political promises of power sometime in an uncertain future.

You and I know there are no brownouts today. To the contrary, the Nation's power additions remain well ahead of predicted load growth.

Let's look at the record.

During the two decades from 1932 to 1952, additions to the net generating capacity of the United States were made at an average of 2,723,000 kilowatts per year. Over the last 7 years ending December 31, 1959, annual additions averaged in excess of 11 million kilowatts. In simple arithmetic, this represents a difference of 4 to 1.

Despite the fact that annual energy requirements almost doubled from 1952 to 1959, reserve capacity last year was more than four times what it had been in 1952.

Between June 30, 1953, and June 30, 1959, the United States added to its generating capacity 65 million kilowatts. That is the largest amount added in any 6-year period in this Nation's history. And it is 88 percent greater than the amount added in the last 6 years of the preceding administration.

The facts are that we have made a better record in every type of power: In Federal power, 10.4 million kilowatts to 5.6 million; in non-Federal power, 54.7 million to 28.9 million.

Within less than the short space of one decade, the United States has moved from a period of electricity shortage to one of plenty, and a firm foundation has been laid for expanding requirements in the future.

This accomplishment speaks for itself. The principal reason for the dramatic change is because the Eisenhower administration has created a climate for the development of water resources, including hydroelectric power, which has been favorable for a triple teamwork assault on the job.

In 1953 President Eisenhower freed our economy of stifling and needless controls. In the electric power field his action meant two very important things.

First, it abolished the futile and foolish Federal policy of preemption of all waterpower sites.

Second, it removed material controls which had made it difficult, to say the least, for your industry to design and obtain necessary equipment.

This administration believes that neither any area of Government nor of private industry has the exclusive right or responsibility for the construction of dams or the generation, transmission, and sale of hydroelectric energy.

We do believe that all licensed non-Federal development must be consistent with the overall requirements of wise and multipurpose use of our natural resources. When non-Federal projects meet that test, why then should the Federal Government insist on preempting the site and prevent either private or public organizations from making their contribution in the electric power field?

In the public interest, privately owned utilities are strictly regulated, and they should be. Consumer-owned utilities are, of course, responsible to the people they serve.

As to whether electrical energy should be supplied by a consumer-owned or a private agency in any particular area, I firmly believe that is a decision for the people affected to determine.

For instance, in my State of Nebraska, the people have themselves determined that all power distribution shall be by public and consumer-owned agencies.

In the State of Kansas, where I grew up, much of the production and distribution of power is in the hands of private utilities.

Each State, and the areas and municipalities within it, made its own decision. What is wrong with that?

As the Secretary of the Interior, I shall continue to support the right of any State to make its own choice and, consistent with State laws, for the right of any locality to itself decide whether it wants public or private or Federal power. But I will not support the fallacious and dangerous proposition that the Federal Government has a public utility responsibility, the inevitable end result of which could only be a Federal monopoly and a complete lack of local determination and control.

In the power field, as in all other areas, the proper function of the Federal Government is to do only that which must be done in the national interest and then only when non-Federal agencies cannot or will not do it.

With that principle firmly in mind, the Federal Government, by cooperative effort with other power services, is now setting an example in assuring the fullest possible utilization of the capabilities of all the elements in the power industry—public, private, and Federal. A longstanding example of this kind of cooperative effort is the Northwest Power Pool, pulled together largely by means of the Bonneville Power Administration's backbone transmission grid.

Another possibility of this kind lies in the Missouri Basin. Last December, a group of consultants, led by former Senator Arthur V. Watkins, recommended to me that steps be taken to bring about the general coordination of all Missouri Basin power supplies by means of pooling, integration, and interchange arrangements utilizing the Bureau of Reclamation's backbone transmission grid.

I am hopeful that this grid can be the means of working out arrangements to make the best possible use of all available power resources in this area.

I have read with much interest the article concerning the proposed upper Colorado storage project transmission system which appeared in your Public Power magazine for April 1960. The author states that the "biggest decision will be to determine who will build the backbone transmission system and to decide whether Arizona will be within the marketing area."

This past week the Bureau of Reclamation submitted to my staff for review recommendations upon which a decision as to the marketing area may be based. The Bureau also suggested basic data against which proposals for the construction of the transmission system may be weighed. Previously, the Department of the Interior had concurred with five basic principles which transmission system proposals must meet.

As of now, it seems highly unlikely that any non-Federal organization will be able to provide a backbone transmission system which will meet the necessary principles, and particularly the requirements of the project itself.

In any event, let me assure you that these decisions will be made promptly and that both the spirit and letter of the preference clause provisions of Federal law will be observed.

The provisions of Federal law which provide preference be given to public agencies in the sale and distribution of power generated at Federal installations do not have be spelled out to your association.

You and I regard the preference clause as the hallmark of the power marketing policy of the Federal Government. And I am opposed to repealing it by legislative action or eroding it by administrative noncompliance.

Here again, let us look at the record.

For example, Federal power sales to preference customers, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1959, totaled 37½ billion kilowatt-hours. Notwithstanding the fact that many public agencies throughout the United States materially increased their own generating capacity in the 7-year period, this is an increase of some 74 percent over 1952.

Furthermore, we have under way the largest water resources program in history. For fiscal year 1961 alone, $1.4 billion are programed. This fiscal year we are investing nearly $1.3 billion in these programs. Thus, we have set an alltime record.

It would be shortsighted and extremely wasteful if hydropower were not added to Federal water control and conservation projects wherever economically feasible. Therefore, the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have programed, for the years 1960 through 1965, the installation of hydrogeneration in excess of 4½ million kilowatts.

All in all, the Eisenhower administration has already installed in Federal multipurpose projects generating units having a capacity of 5.7 million kilowatts.

In its 7 years, this administration has completed more than 7,000 circuit miles of transmission lines to transport power to market centers. This is almost one-third the circuit

miles completed by Federal agencies in the preceding half century.

Even more important to future prospects in the electric energy field, in my opinion, has been the stimulation we have given to consumer and privately owned non-Federal agencies for the development of hydroelectric projects.

During the 7-year period 1952–59, applications for non-Federal power projects having an aggregate capacity of more than 33 million kilowatts were filed with the Federal Power Commission. This is an amount far greater than ever applied for in any comparable previous period.

Outstanding projects being undertaken by consumer and private non-Federal entities, which have been licensed or for which applications have been pending, include the New York State Power Authority's Niagara project of over 2 million kilowatts—the largest single project of its kind in the country. Included also are the joint Ontario Province-New York State Power Authority's St. Lawrence project of 940,000 kilowatts; the private Coosa River project of about 420,000 kilowatts; and several projects, both consumer and private, in California and in the Pacific Northwest, totaling about 7 million kilowatts.

Non-Federal agencies are now able to act on their own initiative, always subject, of course, to proper licensing procedures. Each of you in your association can now plan your development program without having to beg someone in Washington for permission to do that which, in your judgment, is in the best interest of the public in your community.

Surely, most of us will agree that the strength of America, in large part, lies in the massive diffusion of power, of knowledge, of skills, and of initiative going down to the very roots of our economic and social systems.

If the day ever comes when any group, private or Federal, can monopolize control of the electric power field in this Nation, that day your segment of the industry at best will begin its decline. In the long run, it will lose its identity altogether.

In spite of all forces to the contrary, I am confident that your organization, following the traditions of this great Republic, will insist on preserving your role in power development for the future.

Against the Item Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 6, 1960

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, for nearly a century there has been agitation from time to time to give the Executive the power to veto individual items in appropriation bills. The item veto is a very bad proposition.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, an outstanding authority on parliamentary law and procedure, and who has been a Member of the House since 1923, has written an excellent article against the proposition. It appeared in the April 21 issue of the Harvard Law Record.

Under leave to extend, I include the article for the information of Members and others interested in the matter.

The article follows:

AGAINST THE ITEM VETO

(By Hon. CLARENCE CANNON)

(The Honorable CLARENCE CANNON from the Ninth District in Missouri has served in the U.S. House of Representatives since 1923. For many years he was Parliamentarian for the House and for the Democratic National Convention. He has authored many books and articles on procedure, including Procedure in the House of Representatives and the National Convention Parliamentary Manual. He is presently the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.)

(This article presents the arguments against any proposal to give the President an item veto, thus answering the proposals of Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, which appeared in the RECORD on February 11, 1960.)

The proposition to clothe the President of the United States with power to exercise an item veto on appropriation bills was first introduced in the Congress in 1876. It has since been advocated and agitated many times. A number of Presidents have urged it. It is found among suggestions advanced by the major periodic movements of reform of the Federal fiscal or legislative machinery. But its failure of adoption after 85 years of repeated consideration is perhaps the best indication of its lack of merit.

The item veto proposition is advanced in the name of economy and for the purpose of disencumbering appropriation bills of so-called legislative riders. It is sometimes asserted by the Executive, whose power would be greatly strengthened, and others in sympathy with the idea, that the item veto would permit the Executive to prevent, or nullify, or at least discourage, actions characterized as "evils" of the legislative process in inserting appropriations or legislative riders not to his liking either as to amount or purpose, or both. Thus, the item veto would vastly increase the executive power while weakening the legislative control of the purse.

The Congress ought to concentrate on effective measures to strengthen its exercise of control of the national purse, not weaken it. In recent years, various devices—some sponsored by the executive branch—to get money out of the Federal Treasury through the side doors and the back doors, rather than the front door, have gained in popularity. Through these sundry methods of diffused action in response to the financial needs of the Government, the Congress has made such inroads on its traditional annual appropriations process that it has in practice deprived itself of a significant measure of effective control of the purse.

SUBSTANTIAL SEGMENT

A substantial segment of new authority to obligate the Government is insulated from effective annual determination in the appropriation bills by reason of such items as permanent appropriations, permanent contract authorizations, authorizations to expend from public debt receipts contained in legislative rather than appropriation bills, and specific formulas in various grant-in-aid and other programs in basic legislation beyond practicable reach of the annual appropriations process. Substantial amounts of authority to obligate, and even to actually spend, are granted in other than the regular appropriation bills. Basis for effective annual determination of expenditure levels is undermined. The Congress cannot continue to place large segments of the budget beyond reach of annual determination without further seriously impairing the practical limits of exercise of effective control of the purse through the traditional means of the appropriation bills.

The alleged evils for which the item veto is advanced as a cure are exaggerated. It is axiomatic that virtually every piece of legislation adopted in every Congress represents a compromise, whether an appropriation bill or a legislative bill. It would be a rare occasion, indeed, when Members of the House and the Senate did not disagree with one or more items in a bill sent to the President. Yet they often vote for passage of the bill because of concurrence with the major purposes or features or the great majority of items encompassed.

Proponents of item veto plead that without it the Executive must "accept the wasteful and extravagant items along with the useful and necessary ones." Wasteful and extravagant—in whose opinion? Useful and necessary—in whose opinion? In the opinion of one person—the President? [Possibly on occasions with advice of the special interest department with a gimlet-hole view of Government finances and the necessities of the occasion?] Or in the opinion of a majority of the directly elected representatives of the people?

Let us concede that there are wasteful and extravagant propositions in virtually every appropriation bill—in somebody's opinion. And the same is certainly true of the Executive budget from the President—in somebody's opinion. There has never been a budget that could not be reduced, and generally the Congress does reduce it—regardless of the party in control.

Under our constitutional separation of powers, it is the function of the executive to propose and the function of the legislative to dispose. And this power to dispose is final and absolute. Of all the legislative prerogatives, the power to appropriate is the most vital. Not a wheel of Government can turn without motivation of an appropriation. Basic authorizing statutes for the most part are broad in scope and grant to the executive rather wide latitude. The one continuing and recurring procedure for congressional control over governmental activities within such statutes is the annual appropriations review and legislative provision of funds.

MONEY BILLS

The annual money bills implement programs and activities previously authorized by law—programs which have in the legislative authorizing stage already run the gauntlet, including the opportunity for Executive veto. The subsequent act of appropriation thus represents the stage of final and, necessarily, conclusive action by the elected representatives of the people, each of whom must accept his own responsibility for his participation before his own constituency. Responsibility for appropriation of the people's tax funds would be unwisely diffused if impinged upon by an item veto.

The present budget system, enacted in 1921, greatly increased the executive power in Government finance matters. The executive budget concept was established. The budget is the President's budget. He has the sole power to include, or exclude, whatever items or amounts or restrictive provisions which in his judgment are necessary. Not the judgment of someone else; exclusively his own judgment. Under the law he is directed to include that which he deems necessary. But the item veto on appropriation bills would be tantamount to permitting the President to tell the Congress what to include in appropriation bills. It would, in effect, transfer from the legislative to the executive branch of the Government the control of the purse.

Incidentally, force of logic compels the suggestion that the item veto would be as appropriate in application to legislative authorization bills as to appropriation bills. And as far as is known, the President for the first time advocated this application in his budget message of January 1959. The genesis of the appropriating process is in the initial authorization statutes. The Executive is not infrequently—sometimes vigorously—

opposed to a specific item, provision, or restriction in basic authorizing legislation submitted for Presidential approval. The fundamental purpose of Executive veto is now fulfilled under the constitutional provision according the President oportunity to take exception to a proposition of legislation in the first instance. That same recourse is available to him on appropriation bills and he has used it at his discretion.

WITHOUT SUBSTANCE

Proponents of the item veto seek to justify it on the grounds that, without it, the President is reluctant to veto a bill providing for many necessary functions in order to register his objections to individual items or provisions. The argument is without substance, as the Congress has never, and certainly would never, adjourn without providing appropriations for the necessary functions of Government.

Furthermore, a vetoed bill assumes high privilege in the House and is almost always disposed of at once—in any event, expeditiously. More important, perhaps, is the record of disposition, for in the majority of instances of appropriation vetoes, Congress has yielded to the President and passed legislation omitting the offensive matter. There is no evidence that the public interest suffered by reason of delaying final settlement long enough to dispose of a vetoed appropriation bill.

The item veto would also encourage Executive capriciousness. We have seen this happen more than once through unwarranted use of the provisions of the antideficiency statute permitting the Executive, under certain defined conditions, to withhold expenditure of appropriations. An appropriation is not a mandate to spend every dollar provided, but neither was the impounding clause of the antideficiency law intended to provide the Executive with a statute to thwart the clear will of the Congress. To provide item veto power would be to give the Executive a club which could be held over individuals and Members and even whole delegations, to coerce their cooperation on wholly unrelated legislative propositions in which the Executive was especially interested.

MORE CHECKS

Legislative enactment of the appropriation bills is surrounded by far more checks and balances than is the preparation of the executive budget. As noted, the executive budget is whatever the President determines it shall be. It is prepared behind closed doors. It can include, or exclude, any proposition the President wants to include, or exclude—and in any amount. It is not subject to a parliamentary point of order. It is not materially restrained by any act of Congress or rule of either House.

In contrast, the appropriation bills are subject to several hurdles and must run a number of gauntlets at both ends of the Capital. Items not previously authorized by basic law and provisions of legislation are subject to deletion on objection of a single Member. Only by majority consent, or vote, are propositions of legislation included in appropriation bills, and most of these are administrative and facilitating, or restrictive, in character; and again, many of them will be found to have been recommended by the President in his budget. Furthermore, only by majority action in both Houses is the President's budget exceeded. But the President, without consulting anyone, can submit budget increases above the previous year's appropriation.

Drawing a suitable definition of an "item" would entail serious complications and dispute as regards its application to specific instances. What is to be embraced by the term "item"? Is it to be a separate paragraph of a bill or only a portion? Where many projects are financed in a single lump-sum appropriation, and thus not separately identified in the bill, is it the lump-sum total or only a portion? Would it apply to restrictive or prohibitive language intended to deny use of the funds for a certain object or to require their use in a specific manner and no other? Implicit in the legislative power of the purse is the right to prescribe the conditions of expenditure and to deny use of the appropriation for a purpose or object even though previously authorized by law. Would "item" veto embrace the power to strike such conditions or restrictions?

There have been instances where the Congress inserted appropriations and provisions not budgeted by the executive and the action proved beyond question to have been in the national interest. There will be others which the item veto could threaten.

Finally, the legislative appropriations process would resemble a one-way street if the item veto were adopted. The executive would have a greater voice, the legislative branch correspondingly less, in the final determination. We need just the opposite.

The constitutional separation of powers is a two-way street—the Executive to propose appropriations and related provisions he deems necessary, and the legislative to enact such appropriations and related provisions as it deems in the public interest. The legislative prerogative of the elected representatives of the people must not be diluted. To permit otherwise would impair Members' ability to act in response to the wishes of the people they are elected to serve.

A real grasp of the full dimensions of the one-way character of this proposition can be had from the following statement of the Director of the Budget, as principal spokesman of the executive branch, made to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives in May 1957 in support of the item veto proposal:

"I think it ought to be made clear in whatever bill is reported that authority would be granted to veto legislative provisions as well as appropriation items, and that the authority to veto an appropriation item would include authority to reduce an appropriation—but only to the extent necessary to permit the disapproval of amounts added by the Congress for unbudgeted programs or projects, or of increases by Congress of amounts included in the budget."

The import of this statement is clear. Implicit in such reasoning is the assumption that the Executive is all wise and superior in judgment as to how much should be appropriated from the Treasury and for what purposes.

I am certain the Congress could never seriously entertain such an absurdity as the item veto.

Oregonians in the Fourth Congressional District Comment on Major Issues Before the Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 6, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I mailed to 131,000 residents of Oregon's Fourth Congressional District a postcard questionnaire, requesting their opinions on major issues concerning them. The response was excellent. A total of 20,349 returns were tallied and each day a few more arrive.

I believe the opinions of my constituents deserve the widest possible distribution. For this reason, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following questionnaire results. There were 12 questions. The results by number and by percentage follow each question. My opinion on each question is included.

The results of the poll were sent to members of the press and to each person receiving my newsletter. A copy of the press release appears with the results.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

I am grateful to the 20,349 constituents who answered my postcard poll. Thank you very much. I'm doing my best to finish answering the many letters sent along with the questionnaires. In case you're interested, my own answer to each question was "yes."

1. Do you favor a national seashore recreation area in the dunes region in the vicinity of Florence and Reedsport? Yes, 10,273 (57 percent); No, 7,909 (43 percent). I think the legislation now being improved will meet most of the objections.

2. Do you favor legislation as proposed in the Forand bill which provides medical care for social security retirees? Yes, 13,410 (73 percent); No, 5,028 (27 percent). My hope and my prediction are that Congress will soon act to meet these urgent needs.

3. Do you believe that the farm price support and crop control program should be ended? Yes; 14,176 (80 percent); No, 3,455 (20 percent). I am supporting the Poage-Ullman-McGovern farm bill.

4. Do you believe cranberry growers who are suffering as a result of Secretary Flemming's action should receive Federal payment for a portion of their losses? Yes, 10,444 (57 percent); No, 7,885 (43 percent). Almost all the cranberry growers did nothing wrong. Now they will receive some Federal help so they can stay in business.

5. Provided it was concealed by trees and thus entailed no disfigurement of the scenery, and no tax funds were required, would you favor an aerial gondola (i.e., an enclosed chairlift) traveling from the rim to the surface of Crater Lake? Yes, 9,490 (52 percent); No, 8,696 (48 percent). If this device would be a blemish on Crater Lake's incomparable beauty, I would oppose its installation. That is why a model is being built.

6. Do you approve putting labels on shoes listing the materials used? Yes, 16,476 (89 percent); No, 2,033 (11 percent). It is pretty clear that you would like to know what your shoes are.

7. Do you believe Congress should reform the income tax law to equalize the tax burden and eliminate loopholes? Yes, 16,818 (95 percent); No, 981 (5 percent). I told Representative WILBUR MILLS (chairman of House Committee on Taxes) that I could show overwhelming sentiment for tax reform.

8. Do you favor Federal financial aid, with no lessening of State and local control, for public schools? Yes, 10,076 (56 percent); No, 8,054 (44 percent). This is no handout, just a recognition that Federal tax collections have to be used along with local taxes to meet this great need.

9. Do you favor Federal assistance for the retraining and relocation of workers thrown out of jobs by automation? Yes, 7,067 (40 percent); No, 10,665 (60 percent). This important subject needs more discussion. How else are we to get displaced workers off welfare rolls and back into productive activity?

10. Do you favor an increase in communication with Red China? Yes, 5,955 (34 percent); No, 11,372 (66 percent). I believe strongly that increased communication with China is essential if we are to have any effec-

tive, safeguarded disarmament—and will reduce the chances of world war III breaking out. "Communication" in positive steps, starting with exchange of newsmen and other individuals, in my opinion, is long overdue.

11. Do you favor abolishing the draft? Yes, 4,799 (27 percent); No, 13,088 (73 percent). I disagree with the majority. We should pay our servicemen proper wages and develop more good career men and specialists—they will deter the enemy and win the wars, far better than thousands of boys who ought to be in school or learning jobs.

12. Do you favor an increase in Federal income taxes if it would mean more funds for education and scientific research? Yes, 4,211 (23 percent); no, 13,970 (77 percent). This was a tough one. All these questions tried to put complex issues into a few words. What education? What scientific research? All the questions suffered from this unavoidable defect, but even so I found the results and accompanying comments and letters useful.

More than 20,000 Oregonians participated in a post card opinion poll sent to 131,000 residents of the Fourth Congressional District by Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat, of Oregon. They strongly supported legislation providing medical care for social security retirees, ending farm price supports and crop controls, shoe labeling and income tax law revision.

They told PORTER they favored the draft, but disapproved any increase in taxes to provide more funds for education and scientific research or for the retraining and relocation of workers displaced by automation. They do not favor an increase in communication with Red China.

A majority of those responding to the questionnaire approved establishment of the Neuberger National Seashore Park and agreed that cranberry growers should have Federal assistance to help meet their marketing losses. They want Federal financial aid for public schools. By a narrow margin they approved the idea of a chairlift from the rim to the surface of Crater Lake.

Greatest positive response came to the question "Do you believe Congress should reform the income tax law to equalize the tax burden and eliminate loopholes?" The result: Yes, 16,818 (95 percent); no, 981 (5 percent). PORTER said he has informed House Ways and Means Committee Chairman WILBUR MILLS of the response to the question.

Southwestern Oregon residents also endorsed PORTER'S shoe labeling legislation. They were asked, "Do you approve putting labels on shoes listing the materials used?" They replied: Yes, 16,476 (89 percent); no, 2,033 (11 percent). PORTER said he felt it was pretty clear that consumers would like to know from what materials their shoes are made. His bill, H.R. 1320, proposes that shoes be labeled as to content. The idea originated with a resident of PORTER'S district, shoe repairman Wilbur Gardner, of Medford.

PORTER reported that his question "Do you favor an increase in communication with Red China?" drew this response: Yes, 5,955 (34 percent); no, 11,372 (66 percent). He said he believed strongly that increased communication with China "is essential if we are to have any effective, safeguarded disarmament—and that it will reduce the chances of world war III breaking out." He said he felt "communication in positive steps, starting with an exchange of newsmen and other individuals, is long overdue."

Earlier, PORTER released the tabulated results of the 13th question of his poll, which asked his constituents to name their presidential preferences. Vice President RICHARD NIXON and Senator WAYNE MORSE ranked first and second.

Some Problems of the Independent Federal Regulatory Commissions

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 6, 1960

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor and pleasure to address the annual dinner meeting of the Federal Trial Examiners' Conference on some of the problems of the independent Federal regulatory commissions. In that our committee has been studying these problems for some time and have proposed legislation under consideration, I know of no group which I think more appropriate than this distinguished group for discussion of these problems. Because of its importance and interest manifest in these problems, under unanimous consent I extend my remarks and include it therein:

SOME PROBLEMS OF THE INDEPENDENT FEDERAL REGULATORY COMMISSIONS

(Remarks of Hon. OREN HARRIS, chairman, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at annual dinner of Federal Trial Examiners' Conference, May 5, 1960)

Mr. President, members of the Federal Trial Examiners' Conference, honored guests, it is a great pleasure for me to appear as your speaker tonight, at the annual dinner of the Federal Trial Examiners' Conference. As you know, my duties as chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and of two of its important subcommittees have brought me intimately into touch with many of the problems that confront you. Of course, our committee work has been concerned with the problems of the regulatory agencies administering statutes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. For that reason we have not focused on every problem that might face all of you, particularly those of you who serve as examiners in executive agencies. And yet I think that the matters we have had occasion to consider in connection with the adjudicatory functions of the independent commissions are pretty representative of many matters of professional interest to your whole membership.

Tonight I thought I would discuss with you four topics of relevance to the administrative process. I am sure most of you will recognize that these topics are roughly the same ones considered in the panel discussion hearings held last June before the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. At those highly instructive sessions, the subcommittee had the benefit of the views of several of you. You will remember that there was a good deal of difference of opinion on practically every point raised. In the matter of ex parte contacts, for instance, everybody professed to be against sin, but a number of our distinguished panelists seemed to prefer a little sin to any proposal that would do away with it. It is the belief of the committee, however, that from the give and take of opposing viewpoints set forth in the hearing record will emerge a workable approach to the ex parte and other problems.

As you know, we have tried to do just that in H.R. 4800, the bill I introduced in the first session of this Congress as a result of recommendations contained in the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee's report to the 85th Congress. I also introduced H.R. 6774, a bill proposed by the American Bar Association and also designed to cope with the problem of improper pressures on agency personnel. Now the legislative hearings we held in March and April of this year indicated a few imperfections in those bills. But I believe that the general approach is a sound one and that legislation in this field is essential.

I. REGULATORY COMMISSIONS AND THE ROLE OF HEARING EXAMINERS

First, I want to touch briefly on the role of the independent commission in the regulatory scheme, and to try to cast some perspective on the adjudicatory function of the hearing examiner. It is not my intention to justify the existence of the independent regulatory commission. While the commission as a regulatory instrument has its critics, I feel it has demonstrated that it has a permanent place in our governmental scheme. I think we'll all concede that no human arrangements are without their flaws. In recognition of this, we strive to diagnose them and to apply whatever remedies seem necessary and practicable. I simply do not hold with certain commentators on the administrative process whose proposals seem to me equivalent to burning up the roost to catch a chicken thief.

Many of us are in danger of forgetting that these regulatory commissions were established, not to fulfill some grandiose scheme of visionary planners, but to meet down-to-earth, practical difficulties. As time went by, experience amply showed that rail, water, and air transportation, electric power, interstate communications, security exchanges and the like would not adequately serve the public interest if left in the hands of large unregulated corporate owners. It became clear that the responsibility of the managers of these giant organizations to their stockholders must be accompanied by a corresponding responsibility to their customers and, indeed, to the public generally. Accordingly, the Congress, as representative of the public interest, intervened to redress the imbalances and dislocations in our economy brought about by the unfettered sway of these corporations affected with a public interest.

So it was for practical reasons that Congress delegated to regulatory commissions diverse broad discretionary powers limited by the confines of enabling statutes.

Formal adjudication is but one phase of the work of most regulatory commissions. In addition, they are directed to investigate, advise, prosecute, study, legislate, supervise, and enforce. The commission member must wear many hats. We hear it suggested, and the charge has some foundation, that occasionally a commission member forgets to take off his prosecuting or legislative hat when he is supposed to be deciding an adversary dispute.

The job of the commission hearing examiner is to see to it that such disputes are initially heard and decided in the proper judicial manner when the situation calls for judicial procedures. His duties are not concerned with the legislative, supervisory, prosecutory or enforcement functions of his agency. But when opposing parties compete for favors available through his agency or resist enforcement measures the agency seeks to impose, the trial examiner will be called upon to determine the rights of the parties. His determination must be based on substantial evidence taken at a hearing. He hears and observes the demeanor of the conflicting witnesses and counsel. He has a firsthand opportunity to appraise the credibility of witnesses and to make findings of fact based on his firsthand experience. In these matters his role is precisely analogous to that of a trial judge or master charged with finding the facts of a dispute without

a jury. As such, the agency hearing examiner's findings, if contested, should be entitled to considerable weight. It is no secret to you, however, that the weight given to the findings of fact and conclusions of law of hearing examiners varies widely from commission to commission.

Now without in any way trying to glorify trial examiners or pretending to magnify their importance all out of proportion, it is obvious that the examiner is of central and crucial importance to the success and integrity of agency adjudication. Both the agencies and the Congress, as well as your own Federal Trial Examiners' Conference, are constantly trying to devise means of improving the training and quality of hearing examiners and, correspondingly, of enhancing their compensation and prestige and of improving their working conditions. Of these matters I shall have something more to say later.

II. EX PARTE PRESSURES

The second point I want to take up with you is the problem of improper ex parte approaches to commission personnel. In our consideration of this problem, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight have heard a wealth of commentary. Putting aside for the moment the very tough questions of propriety of ex parte contacts in connection with rulemaking proceedings, even adjudication has given us trouble. When, for example, does adjudication begin? Does it begin when either the agency or an outside party files a first pleading invoking agency action? Or does it begin only when a second party comes into the picture, that is, when a contest of some kind becomes inevitable? Is it sufficient to bar ex parte communications at the stage when the separation of functions provision of the Administrative Procedure Act takes effect, or may the damage not be done by that time? Is it sufficient to prohibit ex parte communications with "decisional personnel," or should the ban go farther? How can routine procedural matters and matters leading to settlements, stipulations, and more expeditious procedures be handled without leaving open the door to more sinister approaches? H.R. 4800 prohibits certain approaches concerning the "issues, merits, and disposition" of agency matters. Does this language go far enough? Does it attempt too much? Is it sufficiently clear to afford reasonable guidance to commission personnel and to the public?

What weight should be given the findings, rulings, and recommendations of hearing officers? What restraints should be placed on their powers to control their own proceedings? Do the hidden review procedures in certain commissions afford a means of circumventing the hearing examiner and thus effecting an improper result?

These are only a few of the questions raised in hearings before us during this session of Congress. Even more difficult questions arise concerning the uneasy borderland between adjudicatory and rulemaking proceedings. The latter are conventionally and, for the most part, properly likened to the proceedings of a legislative body. The agency, like the legislative body, is seeking information from all possible reliable sources to assist it in formulating as intelligently and fairly as possible rules to govern future conduct. The procedures associated with the trial of a lawsuit, with its limitations on parties in interest, evidence restrictions, and so forth, are as inappropriate to the quasi-legislative as to the legislative task.

We are becoming increasingly aware that the distinction made in the Administrative Procedure Act between adjudication and rulemaking in some instances breaks down. Recent developments have taught us that adjudication and rulemaking are not water-tight compartments. Rather, they are useful guides, readily applicable in the bulk of agency proceedings. But where, as in the celebrated Sangamon Valley case,[1] handed down in May 1959, the outcome of a rulemaking proceeding in effect determines the substantive rights of contesting parties, ex parte contacts with commission personnel should be strictly circumscribed. Too many people have gotten the idea that the sky is the limit if only they can tag the rulemaking label on a given proceeding. Perhaps the hardest task confronting the draftsman of legislation is to devise language to cover this type of borderland situation.

But despite the many vexatious questions raised by an effort to bring a higher level of integrity to commission proceedings, many of which I suspect merely conceal a desire to prevent any tightening up at all, our committee intends to go forward with its efforts. If H.R. 4800 or H.R. 6774 or some combination of their provisions cannot best do the job, modifications can be made that will strengthen existing law while recognizing certain criticisms as legitimate. Our hearings on this legislation were to some extent marred because of the failure of some critics to address themselves carefully to the actual language of the bills. In fact, I had doubts as to whether some opponents of the legislation had even read all the provisions they opposed.

III. EXCESSIVE DELAYS AND REDTAPE

The third general topic I want to mention tonight is the question of increasing redtape that is threatening to strangle the administrative process. Among the matters of overriding importance that have caused concern, even alarm, are the related problems of unduly protracted hearings and extensive length of hearing records, the high costs of commission proceedings, and the frequent lengthy delays in bringing agency matters to a conclusion. Apart from the inconvenience and financial loss caused by these factors to litigants, their representatives, and the agencies, they have been cited as an unintended inducement to ex parte activity. Many such contacts begin as a result of frustration and exasperation with interminable agency delays. As one experienced attorney told the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight in 1958:

"Ethics in the administrative process is linked with efficiency in administrative operations. The climate for fast deals or sly arrangements is good when administrative operations are marked by excessive delays, inadequate procedures, complexity of regulations, poor public information provisions, and so forth.

"On the other hand, efficient operations tend to keep everyone on a straight and narrow path."

One agency for which the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee has figures is the Civil Aeronautics Board. The CAB issues some 175 opinions and orders a month, some 2,100 a year. At least 32 tons of this "green stuff," as the opinions and orders issued on green letter-size paper are called, are issued and distributed annually. In a recently heard route proceeding now awaiting an initial decision by the examiner, the written testimony and exhibits which should be required to be served on all parties were estimated by the subcommittee staff to weigh some 15 tons. We hear of proceedings dragging on over several years, and there is at least one instance of a hearing officer's decision that exceeded 650 pages.

The cumbersomeness of such procedures represents a burden that falls heavily on the hearing officer. People outside the agencies got a graphic idea of what this burden can mean from a photograph in the September 1959 copy of Fortune magazine showing one of your veteran members, the Chief Hearing Examiner of the Federal Power Commission, almost hidden behind a mound of hearing transcripts, briefs, exhibits, etc., for a single case.

These unwieldy proceedings are expensive, both to the regulated industry and to the commissions concerned. Ultimately, of course, the American people bear the heavy costs. The taxes they pay support the commissions, and they indirectly pay the industry bills through inflated rate bases, subsidies, and the like.

A number of causes are suggested for these problems: inadequate agency personnel, clumsy hearing procedures often stemming from inadequate power in the examiner to direct and control the hearing, excessive and secret intra-agency review of examiners' findings, obstructive tactics by parties and their representatives, inefficient and bureaucratic staff work, uncertainty as to limitations on parties in interest, abuse of the principle of the Ashbacker case,[2] and so on. Unquestionably all these factors and many others contribute to the confusion. The blame, if it is fair to ascribe blame for such a complex situation, lies in no one place. I think there are some respects in which the Congress could lend a hand. But the effort must be a cooperative one. Neither the Congress, the agencies, the examiners, the regulated industries, nor the bar alone can do the job.

I have tried to take at least a first step toward dealing with the situation. With the help of the staff of the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight and representatives of each of the so-called "Big Six" regulatory commissions, we have established an Advisory Council on Administrative Procedure. The Advisory Council is in the process of collecting, sifting and evaluating a mass of detailed factual information respecting agency procedures. Our expectation is that the council will serve as a clearinghouse that will before long be able to advise the Congress as to concrete measures that might be taken, measures based on a careful appraisal of up-to-date, documented information.

Since one of the classical reasons advanced for resort to the administrative process was the need to avoid the unwieldy procedures of courts of law, it is clear that the situation I have described calls for corrective action. Increasingly we hear doubts as to whether the regulatory commissions can "do the job." It is up to all concerned to show that it can if it will.

IV. PROBLEMS OF HEARING EXAMINERS

Finally, I turn to my fourth point, a discussion of some questions of immediate practical concern to all of you—the role of hearing examiners in the administrative process.

Many factors enter into a determination of this role—the extent to which the agencies determine general questions of policy in advance of the decision of a particular case, the breadth of the discretion vested in examiners to control proceedings before them, the weight attached to their reports, the facilities and assistance furnished to them for the performance of their duties, and, above all, the caliber of the men chosen for these positions.

There is a widespread, though by no means universal, belief that examiners could function more effectively if the agencies gave them more policy guidance for the handling of specific cases. One of the most experi-

[1] *Sangamon Valley Television Corp.* v. *United States*, 358 U.S. 49 (1958) and, on remand, 103 D.C. App. 113, 255 F. 2d 191 (D.C. Cir. 1959).

[2] *Ashbacker Radio Corp.* v. *FCC*, 326 U.S. 327 (1945).

enced practitioners before the ICC, John R. Turney, has said that:

"The failure of administrative agencies, including the ICC, to engage in clear-cut policymaking has resulted in inconsistent and unsound decisions and doubtless, in some cases, in unjust or discriminatory treatment of parties in different proceedings."

I'm sure you are all familiar with the provocative memorandum submitted to the President by Mr. Louis J. Hector at the time of his resignation from the CAB. In that memorandum he placed much of the blame for the delay in the disposition of important cases on the fact that the board assigns them for hearing without any policy direction whatever.

I know you don't all agree with Mr. Hector's view, but I believe it is a point which deserves serious study by the agencies themselves and by Congress.

Another important aspect of the hearing examiner's function is the extent of his power to control the proceedings in cases heard by him. Lack of adequate authority for this purpose is assigned as one of the causes of delay and the inordinate length of hearing records. One experienced examiner in an agency which has given its examiners relatively little discretion made the off-the-record observation that he would probably let a Sears, Roebuck catalog go into the record if any one offered it.

The extent of the examiner's effective control depends not only on the text of the agency's rules. In practice, it also depends to a large degree on the weight accorded to his conclusions in the final disposition of the case. When the final decisions are drafted by anonymous reviewers who are free to disregard the hearing examiner's findings, the examiner is likely to have difficulty in obtaining cooperation of the parties in his efforts to define the issues and expedite the proceedings. This was recognized by the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedures in 1941. That committee noted in its report that as the conduct of the hearing becomes divorced from responsibility for decision two undesirable consequences ensue. The hearing itself degenerates, and the decision becomes anonymous.

Testimony before our subcommittee has shown that the practice deplored by the Attorney General's committee persists in some form in many agencies today. In some the hearing examiner's report passes through the hands of a succession of reviewers, each of whom is free to disregard entirely the report prepared by the examiner and to substitute his own conclusions based on a reading of the cold record. Moreover, the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight has heard testimony that in at least one agency proceedings before the examiner have been regarded as a costly waste of time, because the final decision is believed to be reached by members of the agency in response to representations made either on or off the record after the hearing examiner has made his report.

While I am not sure that I see eye to eye with all of you as to the extent to which administrative proceedings should be judicialized, I most emphatically agree that every proceeding should be what it purports to be. Any proceeding which by statute or regulation is required to be decided in a record should, in fact, be decided on the record made in open hearings or on written pleadings, evidence and argument available to all interested persons.

I also agree with the conclusion of the Attorney General's committee that the status of the hearing examiner "is the heart of formal administrative adjudication. It cannot succeed without competent and well-paid men exercising functions of responsibility and interest. This is necessary to protect both the public interest and the private interests which are concerned in the proceedings."

There was recently introduced in the House of Representatives a bill, H.R. 11669, which is designed to attract and retain the ablest men as hearing examiners. Although it was referred to another committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is interested in it because of the central role played by examiners in administration of statutes within our jurisdiction. In addition to the higher salary scale provided for examiners generally, this bill has two other features which are significant to the administrative process. One is the fact that the statute itself prescribes the grade for examiners in each agency. Secondly, it places all examiners in any agency in the same grade. Both these changes take away discretion now exercised by the Civil Service Commission with respect to the assignment of examiners in various agencies to specific salary grades. I recognize that there are a number of arguments for and against the vesting of this discretion in the CSC. Two of the arguments in favor of withdrawing CSC discretion appeal to me as meriting particular study. One is that in determining whether to reclassify the position of an examiner in a given agency the CSC is alleged to give undue weight to the volume of the record made in proceedings handled by an examiner. Such a practice, if in truth it is followed, tends to defeat the objective of simplifying proceedings and shortening records. An examiner who hopes for a reclassification of his position or for promotion to a higher grade already allocated to the agency is said to face the dilemma of being penalized if he courageously exercises his authority to confine the testimony to the relevant and important issues, reducing its volume and sharpening the issues, or of being rewarded if he allows the parties to prolong the proceedings and encumber the record with a mass of irrelevant material.

A second point urged in favor of the proposed change is that where examiners in any agency are assigned to two or more grades, the CSC is believed to give great weight to the recommendations of the agency for the promotion of examiners. The result, it is said, is that in certain agencies examiners in lower grades are susceptible to pressure because of the fear that their opportunity for promotion will be jeopardized if they propose decisions contrary to the desires of senior staff members or of individual members of the agency. I refer to these matters not to pass judgment on their merits, but simply to indicate that they deserve serious attention in the consideration of H.R. 11669.

With respect to the proposal to assign examiners in the major regulatory agencies to a higher grade under the Classification Act of 1949, I was interested to discover that in 1941 the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure recommended that for major agencies, salaries for hearing commissioners should be $7,500 and for chief hearing commissioners, $8,500. Translated into the deflated dollars of 1960, these figures would, I believe, exceed the highest salary now paid to examiners in these agencies.

To make the best use of their examiners' time and skill, agencies must furnish them adequate working quarters, facilities, and assistance. Unhappily some agencies have not found it possible to do this. In such cases a modest investment in additional space equipment and clerical and technical assistance would probably pay large dividends in sounder decisions and speedier disposition of cases.

The Government, and the people, are fortunate in having men and women of your stature and dedication to duty who are willing to accept, even under adverse conditions, the responsibilities of adjudicating the almost unbelievably complex cases arising under statutes regulating various forms of business enterprise. The Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight has benefited greatly by the insight into the administrative process presented by members of your conference who have participated in its panel discussions. I bespeak your continued interest and cooperation in our efforts to hammer out legislation to improve this process and to put an end to the abuses which our hearings have revealed.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 9, 1960

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, as we turn to Thee, from whom no secrets are hid, save us from softly spoken insincerities.

In the revealing mirror of prayer, all the speeding, jostling world which continually closes about us and impinges upon us is shut out, as in Thy presence we see only ourselves as we really are. As we look steadily at our own image, we pour contempt on all our pride.

Give us the grace to rebuke the unlovely things we try to forget or ignore, as we become so conscious of the faults of others. Give us boldness to disapprove that which we would be better without. We would that the best within us may come to rule our lives until we live as, in our highest hours, we really want to live, and until our daily deeds and our attitudes to others, near or half a world away, are the answer to our prayers.

In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 6, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 6, 1960, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1751) to place in trust status certain lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which

was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–906, as amended, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the First Annual Report of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure covering the period ending December 31, 1959.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Robert A. Bicks, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10809) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. FULTON, and Mr. MCDONOUGH were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 11713) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 722. An act to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; and

S. 1062. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require Federal approval for mergers and consolidation of insured banks.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H.R. 11713) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar, under the rule, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Foreign Relations Committee and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

AMENDMENT OF CHAPTER 37, TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO IMPROVEMENT OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION LOAN GUARANTY PROGRAM

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to improve the effectiveness of the Veterans' Administration loan guaranty program, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the petition of Mrs. H. W. Beatie, of Walnut Creek, Calif., relating to foreign and domestic aid, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I present, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of South Carolina expressing the concern of the general assembly over the unfair competitive situation in which the textile industry of the United States finds itself and memorializing the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps to protect this industry which employs thousands of persons and is vital to the continued growth and prosperity of South Carolina and many parts of the Nation.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE CONCERN OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OVER THE UNFAIR COMPETITIVE SITUATION IN WHICH THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY OF THE STATE FINDS ITSELF AND MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO TAKE IMMEDIATE STEPS TO PROTECT THIS INDUSTRY WHICH EMPLOYS THOUSANDS OF PERSONS AND IS VITAL TO CONTINUED GROWTH AND PROSPERITY OF THIS STATE AND MANY PARTS OF THE NATION

Whereas the textile industry of the State of South Carolina and many other States of the Nation finds itself in a highly competitive market with foreign goods priced from 20 to 50 percent under those made in the United States; and

Whereas the reason for this great differential in price is the cheap labor of foreign countries of a much lower standard of living which makes possible placing on the markets of the world products, the selling price of which is far below even the cost of production in the United States due to our higher wage scale and standard of living; and

Whereas the general assembly recognizes that if the flood of cheap foreign goods is not regulated to the extent where our own industry is placed on a basis of fair competition the textile industry will be forced out of business; and

Whereas the loss of an industry the size and importance of the textile mills will be a great blow to the progress of the State of South Carolina and other States similarly affected: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the general assembly does hereby express its deep concern over the flood of cheap foreign goods being placed on the markets of the United States and memorializes the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps to enact remedial legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress and each U.S. Senator from South Carolina and each Representative from this State in the Congress of the United States.

RESOLUTION OF BUFFALO AIRPORT MANAGEMENT CLUB

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I want to call attention today to a resolution of the Buffalo Airport Management Club calling for the repeal of the Federal excise tax on transportation. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At its regular monthly meeting on May 3, 1960, the Buffalo Airport Management Club, by unanimous vote, directed that the following resolution be transmitted to you:

"Whereas there is presently pending before the Congress of the United States legislation which would repeal the tax on transportation of persons: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Buffalo Airport Management Club representing approximately 90 individual members of management engaged in the community and business life of the Greater Buffalo International Airport, does hereby petition and respectfully urge you to enact into law such legislation as will repeal the 'wartime' excise tax upon the transportation of persons."

Very sincerely yours,

L. G. RILEY,
President.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. CLARK, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. HARTKE, and Mr. McGEE):

S. 3505. A bill to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARTHY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 3506. A bill for the relief of Athansia G. Koumontsos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3507. A bill for the relief of Capt. Ernest Mountain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3508. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 3509. A bill to amend certain laws relating to the provision of private and public housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 3510. A bill to remove the restriction relating to public use placed upon certain land held by the Minidoka Irrigation District in Rupert, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3511. A bill for the relief of Vincent Lee Chebat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (by request):

S. 3512. A bill to amend the laws relating to cooperative housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE SYSTEMS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish national standards for the unemployment insurance systems and to provide for a degree of Federal responsibility for the long-term unemployed.

This bill is the outgrowth of the study made by the Special Senate Committee on Unemployment Problems. Joining me as cosponsors are the other members of the majority on the committee: the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE].

The study of the Committee on Unemployment Problems has demonstrated that unemployment continues to be a serious problem. It is also clear that in many of its causes and effects it is a national problem. Unemployment is the result of complex and interrelated factors. It is influenced by the fiscal, monetary and trade policies of the Federal Government as well as by business practices, technological advances, changes in consumer preferences and cyclical trends in the economy.

There is a point at which the responsibility for protection against the hazard of unemployment is beyond the means and the duty of the individual employer or of the States. It becomes a Federal responsibility to establish standards and assist the State programs.

The problem of unemployment will continue to get worse unless a number of private and public measures are adopted. Over 4 million citizens were unemployed in March, nearly half of them men 25 years of age and over. The rate of unemployment has been 5 percent or more in 27 of the last 29 months. Automation is eliminating many unskilled jobs, and the labor force is expanding rapidly because of the larger number of new entrants. A series of positive policies and programs to meet unemployment problems is badly needed.

The Congress has regularly adjusted the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act, but we have done very little to keep unemployment insurance in line with changes in the economy and changes in the types of unemployment and the needs of the unemployed. We have reached the point where revision of the unemployment insurance system requires immediate attention.

There is the need, first of all, to extend coverage. Some 46 million workers are presently covered but another 13 million who work for wages and salaries are not. This bill would not include all of these, since there are some unresolved problems about how to handle some categories of workers, but it would extend coverage to employees of small firms. It is a matter of serious concern that in March of this year only 2.2 million of the more than 4 million unemployed persons were eligible for benefits. The rest were ineligible, either because they had exhausted their rights or had been excluded from coverage in their previous job.

Insurance benefits vary widely from State to State, but the overall deficiency is indicated by the fact that in all States the maximum benefit, as a percentage of the average weekly wage is smaller now than it was 20 years ago. In 1939 maximum benefits of 60 percent or more of the average weekly wage were paid by 32 States. Today, only one State maintains this average. The bill being introduced today would set benefits at 50 percent of the employee's average weekly wage, up to a maximum of two-thirds of the statewide average weekly wage.

Perhaps the most serious deficiency which has developed in the unemployment insurance system is in regard to the duration of benefits. In 38 States the duration varies according to the worker's earnings during the base period and may be as low as 6 weeks, with the most common maximum duration of benefits being set at 26 weeks. This is inadequate to cope with the types of unemployment problems we are experiencing today. The problem of the long-term unemployed, especially in areas of chronic unemployment, is a most serious one. We cannot attain the purposes of the unemployment insurance program without more realistic provisions for the long-term unemployed. In March, for example, 1.2 million of the 4 million unemployed had been out of work 15 weeks or longer. The number of persons exhausting their State benefits rose from 125,000 in February to an estimated 155,000 in March. Even in 1957, a relatively prosperous year, 3 million of the 9.5 million persons who experienced some unemployment that year were unemployed 15 weeks or longer and about 1.5 million were unemployed 27 weeks or longer.

Under provisions of this bill all States would adjust their systems to permit eligible unemployed to receive up to 39 weeks of benefits. In recognition of the special problem created for industry and for the States by long-term unemployment, the bill provides for an unemployment reinsurance program to aid States whose reserves have been depleted by unusually severe unemployment. The bill also provides for a federally financed program for an additional 13 weeks of coverage to workers whose rights have been exhausted under State programs. This bill differs from many others which have been introduced in this and preceding Congresses chiefly in that it does provide for some degree of Federal responsibility for the long-term unemployed. However, the concept is not new. As far back as 1948 the Advisory Council on Social Security made a report to the Finance Committee of the Senate in which it suggested extended unemployment benefits financed "either on a joint State-Federal basis or by the Federal Government alone," for an additional 13 to 26 weeks.

Finally, serious weaknesses in financing the unemployment insurance systems have developed. Originally, as Members of the Senate know, the law set the maximum employer contribution at 3 percent of the first $3,000 paid an employee annually, and it was expected that this amount would be needed to meet the costs of the program.

As unemployment declined, as experience rating provisions took place, and as increases in benefit payments lagged behind the general rise in wages, the average employer contribution has declined. It was approximately 1.3 percent between 1956 and 1958 and 1.7 in 1959. The maintenance of the $3,000 limit has resulted in an uneven impact on industries and States, and it no longer raises sufficient revenue to provide the amounts required for reasonable benefits and duration of payments. The bill which I am introducing today provides for raising the base from $3,000 to $4,800, the figure used in the old age and survivors insurance system. The financing of the additional 13 weeks would also take a slight adjustment in the three-tenths of 1 percent now retained by the Federal Government. A preliminary estimate of the cost of the 13 weeks federally financed program is as follows: If all States had 39 weeks maximum duration and if they all provided for 50 percent of weekly wages up to a maximum of two-thirds of the statewide average weekly wage, then the estimated additional cost of the 13 weeks would have been $100

million in 1957, $500 million in 1958, and $200 million in 1959. Such payments would have been effective both in alleviating the suffering of the unemployed and in stimulating the economy during the recession.

Mr. President, this bill has the support of the majority members of the Committee on Unemployment Problems. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for 1 week in order that other Members who wish to cosponsor it may have an opportunity to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bill (S. 3505) to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the report of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS

INADEQUATE COVERAGE

About 46 million of the 72 million persons in the total labor force, including railroad and Federal workers and members of the Armed Forces, have unemployment insurance protection. On the other hand, some 13 million who work for wages and salaries are not protected. As shown in chart 13, these 13 million include:

	Million
Employees of small firms	1.7
Employees of nonprofit firms	1.3
Farm workers	1.9
State and local government employees	5.6
Domestic servants	2.5
Others	.3

If a worker moves from a job which is covered by unemployment insurance to one which is excluded, he loses protection with respect to the excluded employment; should he become unemployed, his benefits will be lower than they would have been if his employment earnings from both jobs had been counted.

The Advisory Council to the Senate Committee on Finance in 1948 pointed out that "the laundress and the cook in a hospital (not covered) have the same need for protection as those in a hotel (covered); [the same applies to] * * * the janitor in a private school and * * * in a retail store, or the elevator operator in a YMCA and * * * in a factory."

The beneficial effects of the unemployment insurance system are weakened by the exclusion of these millions of wage and salary workers.

BENEFITS

A basic concept of our unemployment insurance system is that a worker's weekly benefit should have a reasonable relationship to his regular weekly wages; it is commonly accepted that the benefit should be not less than half the regular wage. The States establish the relationship of benefits to weekly wages in various ways. In many States the individual weekly benefit is determined as a specified fraction of high earnings for a 3-month period, up to the permitted maximum. The fractions vary, but all produce a benefit of about half the claimant's weekly wage as averaged over a 3-month period. Eleven States provide additional amounts if the claimant has family dependents.

The individual benefit formulas, exclusive of dependent allowances, operate within a range defined by weekly minimum and maximum amounts. The maximum weekly benefit amounts vary considerably from State to State; the lowest is $26 and the highest $55. These maximums are higher than the maximums of 20 years ago, but they have not kept pace with the rise in wages; individual benefit formulas are now limited to a narrower range of wages than they once were.

It is sometimes argued that maximum benefits (related to gross wages) have actually maintained a constant relationship to takehome pay because withheld income taxes are higher now than they were 20 years ago. The great increase in nonwage remuneration (welfare benefits, vacations, etc.) tends, however, to offset increased tax deductions.

In every State the maximum benefit, as a percentage of the average weekly wage in covered employment, is smaller now than 20 years ago. The following table shows the 1939 and 1959 distribution of States according to maximum benefit amounts as related to average wages:

Maximum weekly benefit amount as a percentage of average weekly wage	1939		1959	
	Number of States	Percent of covered workers	Number of States	Percent of covered workers
Over 70 percent	16	15	0	0
60 to 69 percent	16	15	1	.3
50 to 59 percent	17	55	13	22.9
40 to 49 percent	2	15	27	50.9
Under 40 percent	0	0	10	25.9

Prepared from data supplied by Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor.

Maximum benefit amounts of 60 percent or more of average weekly wages were paid by 32 States in 1939, compared with 1 State today. The decline of these maximums as percentages of wages has weakened the role of the individual benefit formulas and prevented more and more beneficiaries from receiving benefits of half their own lost wage.

The unemployment insurance program has in effect changed from providing benefits in some relationship to the claimant's wages, to providing flat benefits for most claimants. In some States, the benefits of three out of four claimants are limited by the maximums to less than half of the actual wage loss.

The duration of benefits also varies from State to State. In 12 States, all workers who qualify are entitled to benefits for the same duration—20 to 30 weeks. The other 38 States and the District of Columbia vary the duration of benefits according to the individual's total base-period earnings, but establish an overriding maximum which is most commonly 26 weeks, but varies from 20 to 39 weeks. Because the duration of benefits varies according to earnings during the base period, workers in some States may be entitled to benefits for as few as 5 or 6 weeks. These short periods result from legal provisions under which workers qualify for benefits on the basis of various periods of prior employment and earnings. More adequate protection is provided in States whose laws require workers to demonstrate substantial attachment to the labor force and allow a uniform period of duration for all who meet this requirement.

The funds for unemployment insurance are raised by a tax on the employer's payroll. The maximum rate for which an employer can get credit against the Federal tax is 3 percent, but in practice the rate is much lower in most States, depending on the unemployment experience of the individual employer and on the rate and duration of benefits allowed by State law. For the system as a whole, benefit costs have been more than 2 percent of taxable wages in only 3 years since 1940; 1.5 percent or less in 12 years; and less than 1 percent in 7 years. In terms of total wages, benefit costs have been 1 percent or less in 13 of the past 20 years. Figures for the past 20 years indicate that our unemployment insurance system has been less expensive than was anticipated when the 3-percent maximum rate was set for employer contributions.

Unemployment insurance benefits made up about one-fifth of the wages lost through unemployment in the 1957–58 recession. The low ratio of benefits to wages declined during the recession, and an increasingly large number of workers exhausted their rights to benefits. During 1958, 2.6 million persons out of the 8.2 million who received benefits, or 1 out of 3, exhausted their rights before returning to their old jobs or finding new ones. Most States paid benefits for a maximum of 26 weeks to workers with good records of employment and earnings. But even if all States had paid 26 weeks of benefits to all beneficiaries who remained unemployed for at least that period of time, the number who exhausted their benefit rights would have declined by only 600,000, from 2.6 million to 2 million.

When the Federal temporary unemployment compensation program took effect in June 1958, exhaustion of benefit rights had so weakened the effectiveness of the system that only one-half of the 5.4 million unemployed at that time were receiving benefits. The danger of a complete breakdown of the system led the Federal Government to lend money to the States under a temporary program to provide additional payments for the unemployed who had exhausted their benefits. The temporary program extended the duration of benefits for half the original period; 17 States borrowed money under the act to provide these additional weeks of coverage. The program lapsed on July 1, 1959.

WEAKNESS IN FINANCING

When unemployment insurance was established in this country it was expected that an employer contribution of 3 percent of total wages would be required to finance benefits and administrative costs. Initially, the States collected 2.7 percent of employers' payrolls (up to $3,000 annually for each insured employee) to finance unemployment benefits. In subsequent years, as the experience rating provisions of State laws took effect and unemployment declined, employer tax rates also declined. The average employer contribution rate, which averaged about 2.7 percent of taxable wages in 1939 and 1940, declined to 2 percent in 1943 and 1944, to less than 1.2 percent by 1954, remained at approximately 1.3 percent between 1956 and 1958, and rose to 1.7 percent in 1959 as a result of increased recession costs.

The $3,000 wage-base limitation meant that the unemployment insurance tax applied to a decreasing proportion of total wages as wages rose during the last two decades. The tax applied to 98 percent of all wages paid in insured employment in 1938 and 1939, to only 80 percent in 1950, and to less than 66 percent in 1958. If the unemployment insurance tax had been applied to 98 percent of wages in 1959, as in 1939, it would have been necessary to raise the taxable wage base to nearly $10,000 a year. Thus, the relative cost of the program has been declining on two fronts—in the actual rate of contribution and in the proportion of wages to which the contribution rate is applied. In 1959, for example, the average tax rate was 1.7 percent of taxable wages, and represented only about 1.1 percent of total wages.

The $3,000 limitation has had an uneven impact upon industries and areas. Paradoxically, the employer in the lowest wage situations pays contributions on virtually all wages, while in high-wage industries the employer's tax burden in proportion to his

total wage bill is much lower. The financial burden of unemployment insurance has fallen unevenly among States, reflecting in part economic differences in such things as industrial composition and the impact of recession unemployment. The differences also reflect legislative choice in benefit provisions, and in the percentage of payroll subject to the unemployment insurance tax. In 1958, 14 States had average tax rates of less than 1 percent, while the rate in 3 States was 2.6 percent or more of taxable wages.

The present benefit system, financed by an average tax rate of slightly over 1 percent of total wages, permits the States to compete in establishing low contribution rates and discourages the adoption of adequate benefit provisions, since proposals to provide more adequate benefits are inevitably weighed against the effect of increased contribution rates on the competitive position of employers.

Competition among States in lowering tax rates has seriously affected the solvency of many State systems. A number of States had enough money at the end of 1958 to pay benefits for 7 to 8 years at the 1958 unemployment rate, but five others had less than 1 year's reserves. For the country as a whole, reserves have declined substantially in relation to potential liabilities, falling from over 10 percent of total wages in 1945 to under 4 percent by June 30, 1959 (chart 17).

A further illustration of the uneven financing of the unemployment insurance system among the various States is the fact that the Federal Government in 1958 advanced $600 million to States for temporary unemployment benefits, plus $200 million in interest-free loans, while, in the same year, it paid some $200 million in interest to States which had balances in the unemployment trust fund.

SUMMARY

In order to meet more adequately the needs of the unemployed the committee recommends the adoption of Federal legislation to accomplish the following changes in the unemployment compensation system:

1. Removal of restrictions on coverage based on size of firm and type of employment.

2. Establishment of maximum benefit formulas high enough to assure the great majority of covered employees in each State at least 50 percent of their regular weekly earnings.

3. Continuation of benefits for 39 weeks in all States for all eligible persons who have demonstrated a steady attachment to the labor force.

4. Establishment of a permanent federally financed, State-administered system for 13 weeks of supplementary insurance benefits for the long-term unemployed.

5. Revision of methods of financing this program:

(a) The taxable wage base should be increased from the present $3,000 to the $4,800 figure used in the old-age and survivors insurance system.

(b) States whose reserves fall below a determined level in relation to past benefit costs should be required to provide for suspension of experience rating or otherwise to assure sufficient statewide yield.

(c) Present Federal law should be amended to permit States to modify employer tax rates on a statewide basis as well as on the present individual-employer basis, as States find best suited to their needs.

(d) A nationwide reinsurance fund should be established to make grants to States with prolonged duration and high rates of unemployment.

HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1960

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for not in excess of 10 minutes, despite the fact that the Senate is in the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "Housing Amendments of 1960."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3509) to amend certain laws relating to the provision of private and public housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLARK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on the high points of the proposed legislation.

This is a six-part comprehensive housing and urban renewal bill which will be considered during the hearings of the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, which hearings began this morning and will continue for the next couple of weeks.

This bill is a 1-year transition bill to tide us over until a new administration takes office in 1961. It contains enough authorizations and enough Treasury borrowing to provide adequately for the various housing programs until mid-1961.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly about the Federal Housing Administration provisions.

The bill would authorize an additional $4 billion of mortgage insurance authorization. While the FHA has not used all of its existing authorization of $15 billion, officials testified both in February and this morning that the existing authority might not suffice to carry them beyond the first of next year.

Another provision in the bill would extend the section 220 program, which was designed to aid housing construction in urban renewal areas, so as to make it available to neighborhoods designated as conservation areas.

The bill also would provide higher loan-to-value ratios for certain types of mortgages in these areas.

This will represent a major new departure in the FHA program. The FHA has been spectacularly successful in the suburbs, but it has never been effectively used in the rehabilitation and conservation of older neighborhoods. From the standpoint of the total housing supply, a house saved is the equal of a house built. These amendments should make it possible for private builders to move aggressively into conservation and rehabilitation work as a phase of each city's urban renewal program.

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Mr. President, with respect to the Federal National Mortgage Association, colloquially known as "Fanny Mae," an additional $150 million is provided for FNMA special assistance programs. This is the same amount sought by the administration, although the administration recommended that the funds be obtained through appropriations rather than direct borrowing from the Treasury, which has been the practice hitherto, ever since FNMA was set up.

The funds, which would be allocated at the discretion of the President, would be available for purchase of FHA-insured mortgages on housing constructed in urban renewal areas and for relocation housing for families displaced by urban renewal and other governmental programs, and would also be available to buy mortgages on housing constructed for the elderly.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. President, with respect to urban renewal, an additional $600 million would be authorized for this purpose. This amount is based on a survey made by the American Municipal Association and the United States Conference of Mayors, which shows that the local governments are prepared to carry on an urban renewal program at an annual rate of $600 million.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of May 9, 1960, directed to me by Raymond R. Tucker, president, American Municipal Association, who is the mayor of St. Louis, and by Richard J. Daley, President, United States Conference of Mayors, who is the mayor of Chicago, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1960.

The Honorable JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: The American Municipal Association and the United States Conference of Mayors have just concluded a nationwide survey undertaken to determine the extent to which local governments are prepared to carry out urban renewal activity as authorized by the Housing Act of 1949, as amended. This is the third such survey we have conducted, and we believe the results will prove of considerable interest and value to you in considering and initiating legislative proposals to further improve the effectiveness of the renewal program.

Cooperating with AMA and the United States Conference of Mayors in carrying out the actual survey were such other public-interest groups as the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, the American Institute of Planners, and the National Housing Conference.

When the American Municipal Association originally, in 1957, conceived of the idea of carrying out a national survey of urban renewal needs, it did so to fill a very real need for this kind of information. It was not then, nor is it now, being gathered by any other agency or organization public or private. It was the judgment of the governing bodies of the two principal sponsoring organizations that unless such data were secured, it would be impossible for local government officials to take any kind of a positive and rational stand as to the kind of Federal program required to carry out vigorous and effective local urban renewal programs designed to achieve the progressive elimination of the Nation's slums and blighted areas—a task known to be of considerable dimension.

As you know, during the period from the enactment of the original 1949 act through most of 1957, capital grant authorizations were available in sufficient supply so that every city in every State which was prepared and anxious to undertake programs of urban

renewal was able to benefit from Federal grant moneys being made available. Since the latter part of 1957, inadequate grant authorizations have had the effect of unduly limiting program progress and expansion.

This year's survey shows a deficit of over $500 million in existing capital grant authorizations for only the communities surveyed. Further, the results again fully support the position taken by both the American Municipal Association and the United States Conference of Mayors, that a 10-year, $600 million a year program should be approved by the Congress and vigorously administered by the administrative branch.

It is our position that local governments must be positively encouraged to carry out urban renewal and that adequate grant money should be made available as the community is ready to move ahead. The alternative will be a nation saddled with an urban renewal program without end, urban communities burdened forever with slums and blighted areas.

Only through such a long-range program can the cities of the Nation purposely plan for the ultimate elimination of their slums and blighted areas and move toward the goal of the 1949 Housing Act—decent housing in a suitable living environment for every American family.

Very truly yours,

RAYMOND R. TUCKER,
President, American Municipal Association; Mayor of St. Louis.

RICHARD J. DALEY,
President, United States Conference of Mayors; Mayor of Chicago.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a "Summary of Results of the 1960 Urban Renewal Survey," conducted by the American Municipal Association and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF THE 1960 URBAN RENEWAL SURVEY CONDUCTED BY THE AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION AND THE U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

SCOPE OF SURVEY

Questionnaires were sent to all cities with a population of 35,000 or more, plus all other local governments in the 50 States and the District of Columbia (but not Puerto Rico) thought to be interested or considering the initiation of an urban renewal program.

Over 1,200 local governments were requested to respond by completing and returning the questionnaire. Local officials assigned the task of handling the survey were instructed to make all estimates "in line with your community's fiscal and relocation capabilities."

RESPONSE

By May 1, 1960, 446 communities had responded. A tabulation of the number of questionnaires mailed and responses on a State basis is attached.

Of the 446, 258 answered in some detail. Of this group, 198 had one or more Federal project programs under way, representing slightly over half of the total of 390 localities (exclusive of Puerto Rico) estimated as having been active in the Federal program as of December 31, 1959.

Although the remaining 188 communities returned no useful information on the survey form, 125 of this group did indicate positive interest in the Federal program and an intent to further consider the feasibility of local renewal action.

Almost three-fourths of the Nation's cities with a population of 50,000 or more filed a completed questionnaire. Of the 60 cities in this population group which did not respond, less than half were active in the program at the end of 1959.

SIGNIFICANCE OF SURVEY RESULTS

Thus while the survey totals probably include the estimated immediate needs of about three-fourths of the Nation's larger cities, they nevertheless are based on information furnished by less than half of the communities now actively engaged in renewal activity as provided for under the Housing Act of 1949.

The survey totals do not include any estimates of needs other than those furnished by the community. The totals do not include any projections from the sample responding.

Total estimates of needs, by States, for the periods covered are included in the attached tabulation.

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS

Forty-seven cities indicated that they had applications pending with URA for increases in existing capital grant reservations amounting to $132 million.

Thirty-eight cities indicated that they had applications pending for new projects with URA which they estimated would require $173 million in Federal grant funds.

Of the over 430 communities now participating in the program, 108 indicated that they intended to file applications during calendar 1960 covering projects which would require $458 million in Federal capital grant funds.

In addition, 93 cities indicated that they would, sometime in the near future, file applications for $44.5 million in grant funds to carry out community renewal programs as authorized under the Housing Act of 1959.

Thus, for calendar 1960, local governments will request URA to act on applications for either increases in existing grant reservations for existing projects or for new projects involving in excess of $763 million.

Of the over 430 local governments now active in the Federal program responses from 131 indicated intent to file applications for new projects during calendar 1961 in the amount of $424.2 million. Assuming one-half of these applications will be filed during the first 6 months of 1961, i.e., $212.1 million, it is estimated the total Federal grant funds required between the 18-month period from January 1, 1960, to July 1, 1961, will exceed $1,019 million, which amount includes the additional $44.5 million in grant funds it is expected will be requested from URA for the completion of community renewal plans during this period.

Against this total need of $1,019 million there currently exists in unreserved funds from 1960 an estimated $200 million, plus the $300 million which will become available on July 1, 1960. The net deficit amounts to approximately $517 million—this is the amount needed to accommodate only the communities which were able to file responses to our questionnaire. This amount does not provide for those communities which were unable to file need estimates nor does it provide for the needs of the new communities which will be initiating new programs during this period.

FUTURE NEEDS

One hundred and eighty-one of the communities responding were able to provide estimates as to their anticipated grant needs for the 3-year period, 1962 through 1964. The total amounted to $969.8 million, or an annual average need of $323.3 million.

For the 5-year period, 1965 through 1969, 170 communities estimated their grant needs at $1,765.9 million, or an estimated average annual grant need of, for these local governments alone, $353.2 million.

Considering the relatively small number of communities able to make estimates as to future needs at this time and in anticipation of further increases in number of communities participating in the program, a $600 million annual authorization of Federal grants seems fully justified.

American Municipal Association—U.S. Conference of Mayors, national urban renewal program survey, January 1960

ESTIMATED 10-YEAR URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM—FEDERAL CAPITAL GRANT REQUIREMENTS

[In millions of dollars]

State	1960	1961	1962–64	1965–69	10-year total	State	1960	1961	1962–64	1965–69	10-year total
Alabama	2.0	7.0	16.2	19.0	44.2	Nebraska			1.0	2.0	3.0
Alaska			.1		.1	Nevada	1.6		.5		2.1
Arizona	2.5				2.5	New Jersey	15.5	7.0	26.0	36.0	84.5
Arkansas [1]						New Mexico [1]					
California	44.3	20.7	66.2	96.1	227.3	New York	44.0	54.2	123.3	188.0	409.5
Colorado	2.0	1.0	3.3	4.0	10.3	North Carolina	5.6	9.0	14.0	22.0	50.6
Connecticut	10.0	22.0	33.0	59.5	124.5	Ohio	67.4	36.0	82.0	178.5	363.9
Delaware [1]						Oklahoma		1.0	.9	2.0	3.9
District of Columbia	.8	10.0	25.0	50.0	85.8	Oregon		6.0	4.2	1.0	11.2
Florida		.3	14.5	4.0	18.8	Pennsylvania	56.2	57.1	106.3	251.1	470.7
Georgia	14.2	7.0	14.3	34.0	69.5	Rhode Island	13.1		12.0	20.5	45.6
Hawaii	6.6		45.3	15.0	66.9	South Carolina		1.0	2.0	5.0	8.0
Illinois	2.0	22.0	60.0	91.0	175.0	Tennessee	10.0	21.0	32.0	29.2	92.2
Indiana		2.5	9.4	14.0	25.9	Texas	16.0	13.5	15.3	24.0	68.8
Iowa	4.8	4.0	6.0	8.0	22.8	Utah [1]					
Kansas	3.1	1.0	5.0	5.0	14.1	Vermont [1]					
Kentucky	.2		2.0	2.0	4.2	Virginia		.2	11.0	6.5	17.7
Maine	2.5	1.0	1.0	3.0	7.5	Washington	18.5	4.0	10.0	7.0	39.5
Maryland [1]						West Virginia	.7	1.2	.7	1.4	4.0
Massachusetts	54.3	24.4	48.0	49.0	175.7	Wisconsin	3.0	8.0	17.0	30.0	58.0
Michigan	22.5	38.9	57.2	320.2	438.8	Total	[2] 458.0	424.2	969.8	1,765.9	3,617.9
Minnesota	4.6	6.0	15.0	25.4	51.0						
Missouri	5.1	13.3	20.2	45.0	83.6						

[1] No figures provided where only 1 community has responded and has requested its reply be kept confidential. Totals, however, include all data collected.

[2] Exclusive of applications pending for new projects or expansions of existing projects.

National urban renewal survey—January 1960

State	Questionnaires		Cities over 50,000 not responding	State	Questionnaires		Cities over 50,000 not responding
	Sent	Returned			Sent	Returned	
Alabama	70	6	Montgomery.[1]	Nebraska	2	2	
Alaska	4	1		Nevada	2	2	
Arizona	4	2		New Hampshire	4	1	Manchester.[1]
Arkansas	19	1	Fort Smith, North Little Rock.	New Jersey	49	15	Atlantic City,[1] Bayonne, Jersey City,[1] Trenton,[1] Union City.[1]
California	99	68					
Colorado	6	4	Pueblo.[1]	New Mexico	2	1	
Connecticut	24	11		New York	42	21	Albany,[1] Amherst, New Rochelle,[1] Troy, Mount Vernon, Niagara Falls.[1]
Delaware	2	1					
District of Columbia	44	1		North Carolina	18	9	
Florida	44	12		North Dakota	2		
Georgia	101	14	Columbus.[1]	Ohio	29	21	Akron.[1]
Hawaii	2	2		Oregon	6	3	
Illinois	42	14	Aurora, Berwyn, Cicero, Joliet.	Pennsylvania	57	19	Chester,[1] Harrisburg,[1] Johnstown,[1] McKeesport.[1]
Indiana	20	9	Anderson, Evansville,[1] Indianapolis, Terre Haute.	Rhode Island	7	4	Cranston.
Iowa	10	6	Cedar Rapids, Davenport.	South Carolina	9	3	Columbia, Greenville.
Kansas	5	4		Tennessee	76	8	
Kentucky	34	7	Covington.	Texas	113	24	Amarillo, Beaumont, Corpus Christi,[1] Galveston, Laredo, Wichita Falls, Waco.[1]
Maine	11	5					
Maryland	7	2		Utah	2	1	
Massachusetts	35	20	Brockton, Fall River,[1] Newton, Pittsfield, Somerville.[1]	Vermont	1	1	
				Virginia	15	7	Portsmouth.[1]
Michigan	35	17	Bay City, Dearborn, Flint, Jackson, Lansing, Kalamazoo.[1]	Washington	32	8	
				West Virginia	10	3	Wheeling.[1]
Minnesota	10	4	St. Paul.[1]	Wisconsin	15	9	Kenosha.
Mississippi	43	2		Wyoming	2	1	
Missouri	19	10	St. Joseph.				
Montana	3	1					

[1] Community with an active renewal program.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in connection with urban renewal, a most interesting article was recently published in Architectural Forum for May 1960. I point out that this is one of the publications of the Luce empire.

The article summarizes a study made by ACTION, the American Council To Improve Our Neighborhoods.

The American Council To Improve Our Neighborhoods, on whose board of directors I have the honor to serve, consists largely, although not entirely, of farsighted and intelligent businessmen who are interested in the problem of shelter for all of our people.

The former president of ACTION is Mr. Andrew Heiskell, formerly the publisher of Life magazine, and presently president of Time, Inc., the holding company for the Luce publications.

The present active president of ACTION is Mr. Roy Johnson, who was at one time executive vice president of the General Electric Co., and who has only recently resigned from a position of the greatest importance in connection with our missile and space programs in the Department of Defense.

This study, I think, can be taken as having been sponsored by conservative business as well as by a few of us politicians and by an occasional social worker and labor leader. It is estimated that the total cost of desirable urban renewal is $42 billion a year in excess of current spending. This means current spending by private industry and commerce, by local governments, by State governments, and by the National Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article from Architectural Forum be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTION PUTS COST OF TOTAL URBAN RENEWAL AT $42 BILLION A YEAR OVER CURRENT SPENDING

What would it cost to accomplish the normal expansion of all urban centers of the United States, the elimination of all of their slums, and the renewal of all of their deteriorating areas to a modest standard of desirable, safe, sanitary, and decent conditions during the next 10 years?

Would the combined expense for this growth and regeneration have inflationary effects on the national economy, or would the economic activity it stimulated increase national prosperity?

The gross cost would be approximately $100 billion a year, or $42 billion a year more than outlays of about $58 billion annually now being made for these purposes (estimated as of 1958), according to a research report made last month to a directors meeting of ACTION (the American Council To Improve Our Neighborhoods) in Boston. At the same meeting, however, there was little agreement on whether spending for these purposes at this rate would prove a blessing or a burden on the economy.

The cost estimate, reported by Martin Meyerson, vice president and research director of ACTION, and director of the MIT Harvard Joint Center for Urban Studies, was developed from an intensive case study of an east coast city of about 300,000 population made by Reginald R. Isaacs, professor of city planning at Harvard, and John W. Dyckman, University of California economist. Projected on a national scale, the Dyckman-Isaacs study estimated that total renewal could be achieved by the following increased outlays in major categories of building, modernization, and community improvement:

For private expenditures for ordinary maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation, a boost from today's rate of $15 billion to $25 billion a year.

For Federal, State, and local public expenditures for official redevelopment and urban renewal projects, an advance to $5 billion a year from the current spending at a rate of less than $1 billion. (Meyerson later suggested that this $5 billion projection might be higher than necessary, inasmuch as it was based on conditions found in an old eastern city, whereas many newer western cities would require relatively less public renewal activity.)

For private expenditures that are generated by official public redevelopment and renewal projects, an increase from $4.5 billion to $13.5 billion a year.

For regular new private building for normal community growth, an advance from $26 billion to about $31.5 billion a year.

For new schools, public buildings, community facilities, and roads, sewers, and utilities, an increase from $10 billion to $20 billion a year.

For all other miscellaneous spending for improving urban environments, an increase from $1.5 billion to $5 billion a year.

The $58 billion spent for all types of urban growth, development, and renewal in 1958 represented 13 percent of the gross national product that year, said Meyerson. If the Nation's economic growth continued at a rate of 3 percent a year, he pointed out, expenditures of $100 billion a year in 1970 would then represent 16 percent of gross national product. But if a 5-percent growth rate were achieved, by 1970 the expenditure of $100 billion a year would still represent only 13 percent of gross national product.

After Meyerson had outlined these proposed expenditures for urban growth and total renewal, Walter E. Hoadley, Jr., treasurer of Armstrong Cork Co., told the ACTION meeting that one of the Nation's biggest problems during the sixties would be how to meet all of its needs, including extensive urban renewal, without incurring inflation, or, "how to balance our unlimited desires with our limited resources." Without disputing the need or desirability of urban renewal, Hoadley stressed that both private and public expenditures ultimately must be financed out of national savings. He noted that if debt is incurred, in an unbalanced relation to income or savings, inflation will result, savings will decline, and the entire economy could be disrupted.

On the other hand, Gustave Amsterdam, chairman and president of Bankers Securities Corp., of Philadelphia, suggested that the public purpose served by urban renewal justified increased Federal expenditures for this purpose. In the latest Federal budget, he said, roughly 60 percent of expenditures are allocated for defense; 8 percent for agriculture, representing 12 percent of the population; 7 percent for veterans, representing 37 percent of the population; and 0.2 percent for urban renewal, representing 64 percent of the population. The population explosion is concentrated in its metropolitan areas, said Amsterdam. Federal expenditures for renewal, at least up to a rate of $1 billion a year, would not be inflationary, he declared, nor would such Federal assistance involve any local loss of freedom.

There is no question that spending for urban growth and renewal ought to reach $100 billion a year by 1970, said Jervis Babb,

chairman of the area development committee of Committee for Economic Development. But he made no estimate about what portion should be public. Babb said his committee is still drafting a policy statement on the public interest in urban renewal to be submitted for approval by the full CED. John Nixon, director of CED's area development committee, likewise avoided giving any clue to the stand this committee or the full CED might take on urban renewal. As a teaser, he deliberately ended a talk on economic base studies and urban renewal with a question. Noting that "the automobile has depopulated cities of taxpayers and allowed both industry and upper-income families to move to taxfree suburbia," he asked: If cities could develop practical means for taxing those who have moved to the suburbs, but who benefit from the fact that they are still within the metropolitan area, would this be preferable to the present system of Federal taxes and Federal grants to help finance the writedown subsidies involved in public urban renewal programs?

Those who took up Nixon's question felt that local area taxation might be preferable, but that it would be impractical. Effective, equitable metropolitan taxation would be possible only through metropolitan government, and the widespread introduction of that is still largely unattainable. In the meantime, as it was pointed out by Joseph W. Lund, chairman of the Boston Redevelopment Authority and former president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the continuing erosion of the $300 billion of real estate values in central cities, if urban renewal programs are not pressed, will be just as much a loss and just as detrimental to the national economy as the deterioration or loss of any other national resources or assets.

LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the bill I have introduced would deal with low-rent public housing by making available the unused 100,000 units originally authorized by the Housing Act of 1949. Moreover, it would make it possible for low-rent housing authorities to accept more elderly persons. Such a provision is needed, because of the low incomes of the elderly people as a group.

The bill would authorize an additional subsidy of $120 per elderly family, where this is necessary to prevent the project from operating at a loss.

I wish to point out, Mr. President, that this provision results from a recommendation made by the Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] on which subcommittee I had the honor to serve.

The bill would also authorize public housing authorities to sell units to tenants in cases where the income of the tenant rises above the ceiling permissible for public-housing occupants. This sales provision is particularly designed for projects which consist of scattered single-family houses, rather than multi-family units.

There is a philosophical question involved in this on which the Senate has heard debate in the last few years. I hope we shall have an opportunity, when the bill comes to the Senate for consideration, to make a case in support of this provision.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

The bill increases the authorization for housing for the elderly, under the new FHA program enacted last year, from $50 million to $100 million.

It also adds a provision requiring that all projects for the elderly, whether carried out under FHA or by public-housing authorities, include special facilities to serve the health, social, and recreational needs of elderly persons.

Both of these provisions carry out recommendations of the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, headed by Senator PAT MCNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan.

PLANNING SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS

The bill authorizes $500,000 annually for 3 years for scholarships and fellowships for the graduate training of professional city planning and housing technicians and specialists. This provision was passed by the Congress last year in housing bills which were vetoed by the President.

This provision has been strongly urged for many years by the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. I need only say that the short supply in which cities and metropolitan areas find the planning provision is one of the very real deterrents to further appropriate progress in the general field of metropolitan development and urban renewal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may appear at this point in my remarks a section-by-section analysis of the bill I have just sent to the desk for referral.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE PROVISIONS OF S. 3509, HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1960

FHA INSURANCE PROGRAMS

Section 2(a) increases FHA's general mortgage insurance authorization by $4 billion.

Section 2(b)(1) amends section 220 of the National Housing Act to make it clear that the program may be used to accomplish conservation and prevention of deterioration of housing in addition to being used for housing rehabilitation purposes.

Section 2(b)(2) amends section 220 of the National Housing Act to make the program applicable outside of urban renewal areas in those neighborhoods in which a municipality is carrying out a code enforcement program under an approved workable program and undertaken on an area basis, with the approval of the HHFA Administrator.

Section 2(b)(3) amends section 220 of the National Housing Act to permit, in the case of dwellings designed principally for a two or more family residence, the FHA Commissioner to approve a mortgage involving a principal obligation in an amount equal to the sum of 97 percent of $13,500 of the Commissioner's estimate of the appraised value of the property and (2) 90 percent of such appraised value in excess of $13,500.

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Section 3 provides an additional $150 million mortgage purchase authority under the special assistance function of the Federal National Mortgage Association. These funds, which are allocated at the discretion of the President, would be available for the purchase of FHA insured mortgages on housing constructed in urban renewal areas and for relocation housing and housing for the aged.

URBAN RENEWAL

Section 4(a) provides an additional $600 million Federal capital grant authorization be made available immediately upon enactment.

Section 4(b) increases from $3,000 to $5,000 the amount business concerns may be paid for their reasonable and necessary moving expenses and any actual direct losses for which they are not compensated resulting from their displacement as a result of urban renewal or certain other governmental activities.

Section 4(c) provides that land already acquired as a part of an urban renewal project may be used for public low-rent housing purposes in addition to land so acquired as a part of future projects.

Section 4(d) amends section 110(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that loans and grants may be made to local Public Agencies for the purpose of carrying out pilot rehabilitation programs within renewal areas limited to no more than (1) 50 dwelling units or (2) 2 percent of the total number of dwelling units designated for rehabilitation under the renewal plan, whichever is less.

Section 4(e) provides for certan technical amendments relating to the program established in 1959 to assist colleges and universities to carry out programs of blight elimination in areas to be developed by them to handle expanding needs for essential facilities.

LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAMS

Section 5(a) authorizes the payment of an additional annual Federal contribution in respect to each elderly family of not to exceed $120 per year, provided such additional contribution is required in any year to avoid a deficit in project operation.

Section 5(b) makes available the remaining balance of the annual contribution authorization contained in the Housing Act of 1949. The effect of this restoration would be to permit contracts with local housing authorities for about 100,000 dwelling units in addition to the 37,000 units authorized by the Housing Act of 1959.

Section 5(c) adds a new paragraph to the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to stipulate the terms on which a low-rent dwelling unit may be sold to a public housing tenant. The tenant would be required to pay local taxes, amortize the full purchase price of his home, and pay interest at not less than the cost the local agency must pay to borrow money. The local agency would have an option to repurchase a dwelling if the family fails to carry out its contract. This plan is permissive with local agencies. If any agency finds it is not feasible to operate under this plan, it could permit overincome tenants to remain in occupancy if the local agency determines that it is impossible for the family to rent or buy a decent private dwelling, and if an unsubsidized rent is paid.

Section 6(b) requires that projects for elderly persons constructed under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, section 231 of the National Housing Act and section 10(m) of the U.S. Housing Act shall contain special facilities to serve the health, social and recreational needs of elderly persons, as the respective administrators determine to be necessary.

PLANNING SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS

Section 7 authorizes $500,000 annually for a 3-year period to be used by the HHFA Administrator to provide scholarships and fellowships in public and private nonprofit institutions of higher education for the graduate training of professional city planning and housing technicians and specialists.

LOANS TO SCHOOLTEACHERS FOR SUMMER SCHOOL COURSES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of May 5 and May 6, 1960, the names of Senators CLARK, MORSE, MCGEE,

RANDOLPH, MURRAY, LONG of Hawaii, KEFAUVER, LUSK, HENNINGS, SYMINGTON, GRUENING, MUSKIE, and DODD were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3481) to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to make student loans under title II of such act available to teachers attending summer sessions in institutions of higher education, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY) on May 5, 1960.

GRANT OF FURTHER TARIFF REDUCTIONS IN FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO LIE ON DESK

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on Wednesday, May 4, with my good friend, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], as cosponsor, I submitted the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 104) expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes, and asked that it lie on the table through May 8 for additional cosponsors. I ask unanimous consent that it lie on the table through Wednesday, May 11.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN:

Address entitled "Foreign Economic Policy—On the Road to Peace," delivered by Senator SYMINGTON before the Sunday evening forum at Tucson, Ariz., on May 1, 1960.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him recently over radio station WGM, Chicago, on the need for public understanding of East-West conference issues.

THE SHOOTING DOWN OF THE U.S. PLANE OVER RUSSIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may proceed for 6 minutes in addition to the time permitted under the order entered as to length of statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the facts in the plane incident are now becoming clear. They are not pleasant facts, and we shall do well to face them as the President and the Secretary of State are doing. Acknowledgment of the identity of the plane and its general purposes was the only honorable course to pursue in this situation. I commend both the President and Mr. Herter; and I commend the Soviet Premier, too, for his perspicacity in recognizing that the President had no advance knowledge of this action.

These attitudes may help to put the incident in the larger perspective of the critical need of mankind to find a way out of the deadly morass of incipient nuclear war. The attitudes would appear to make possible the convening of the summit conference as scheduled and, I would hope, would permit the President, if he so desired, to go to Russia this summer.

Let it not be assumed, however, that this incident will soon be forgotten and that, after a little while, we can go back to cold war as usual. I hope the Russians no less than ourselves will grasp the larger and lasting significance of this incident. If I may say so, that significance is not to be found in treaties on the immorality of spying. It is not for the Russians to lecture us on that subject. For there is spying and there is spying, and he who is with sin in this matter ought not to cast the first stone.

I shall not take the time of the Senate, nor Mr. Khrushchev's—if these remarks should come to his attention—to review the history of Soviet espionage in this country and throughout the world during the past quarter century. If one wishes to speak of immorality and provocations, there is more than enough to go around. But there is no point in raking recriminations out of the sorry ashes of the past.

That is precisely the point which this incident should bring home to the Russians no less than to ourselves. We are dealing in this incident, as in the many variations of espionage which have already been indulged in by all, not so much with acts of immorality, but with acts of desperation, with unwise, foolish acts, perhaps, but with the inevitable acts of mutual terror, which stem from the fearful situation into which the world has been allowed to drift.

That is the larger significance of this incident. We will make a great contribution to the peace of mankind if we recognize that significance rather than attempt to minimize the incident by proclaiming that the Russians have done worse in the past. Mr. Khrushchev, too, will make a great contribution to the peace of mankind if he concentrates on the fearful world situation which gave rise to the incident. To do so, however, he will have to forgo the urge to don the robes of the pulpit and deliver sermons on morality. He will have to resist the obvious temptation to milk this incident of the last drop of propaganda value.

That may be asking a great deal, for I cannot say in all honesty that we have done very well on this score in the past. Nevertheless, if the Russians, no less than ourselves, mean to have peace, if we mean to put an end to the fearful situation which gives rise to these incidents, then they, no less than we, must make an end to the childlike, black-and-white, cowboy-and-Indian, gangster-and-policeman interpretation of the world and its peoples and what transpires among them.

For us, for this Nation, there are other reasons—national reasons—why this incident cannot and must not be put aside lightly. There are implications in this incident which go to the very heart of our system of representative, responsible government.

The record will show that I have supported, as firmly as I have been able, the preservation of the primary powers of the Presidency, through Republican and Democratic administrations, in matters pertaining to the conduct of foreign policy and defense. The record is available in the debates on the Formosa resolution, on the Eisenhower resolution, and on other matters. That support, Mr. President, however, was contingent on the assumption that the powers of the Presidency would be exercised by the duly elected, duly constituted President. It is one thing for an elected, popularly responsive President to exercise these enormous powers. It is another for the nonelected, nonresponsive bureaucracy to take upon itself these powers.

The President has made it quite clear that he had no knowledge of the flight of the plane involved in this incident. Yet somewhere in this Government, in some fashion, orders were given, a chain of command was followed. And the net result was to bring about the most serious damage to our efforts to promote peace. The President has been undercut on the eve of a major international conference at a moment of world crisis. The worldwide adverse repercussions to the foreign policy of the United States have only begun, but they will be heard loudly and ominously from Norway to Japan. Moreover, this incident or any other of this kind might well have accidently set off the holocaust of nuclear conflict which we have been striving at great cost and sacrifice to prevent.

All of these consequences—these damaging consequences—have derived from the exercise of the powers of the Presidency in foreign relations and defense, but the powers have been exercised without the knowledge of the President and, as far as I am aware, without the knowledge of even a member of the Cabinet. These consequences, in short, may well have derived not from an act of responsible representative government, but from what on other occasions I have tried to define as government by agency rivalry or agency accommodation.

It is this problem to which the plane incident compels us to address our attention firmly and relentlessly. The President played no part in the particular incident, but the administration, any administration, nevertheless, does bear a grave responsibility, for it is incumbent on it to provide politically responsible leadership to, and popularly responsible control over, the bureaucracy. Nor is Congress without responsibility. For, while the administration conducts the foreign relations and defense of the Nation, Congress can and does color this conduct in providing for the agencies which serve the President in this connection.

The need, now, as it long has been, is to see to it that the actions of the agencies of this Government reflect the foreign policies which should be laid down by the President through the Secretary of State. The need is to see to it that

when the President and the Secretary of State give voice to policies of peace, no agency presumes to undo what they say—by accident or design.

It would not be difficult, I suppose, to find scapegoats for this incident. Nor would it be difficult to make political capital of it. The interests of the Nation and the hope for peace, however, will hardly be served by either course. I hope all of us will eschew either a blood lust for scapegoats or the temptations of political advantage in this incident. I hope the administration and the Congress together will strive to get at the dangerous flaws in the structure of the executive branch of this Government, at the grounds of irresponsibility which give rise to incidents of this kind, and put an end to them before irreparable damage is done to the freedom and safety of the Nation and to the prospects for peace.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I had intended no comment on the incident that was so generously ventilated in the press yesterday. Whatever I have to say, I say entirely on my own responsibility, and I speak for no one other than myself.

It is now a little over 40 years ago that I served in the Army Intelligence Service in Germany. I became familiar with our intelligence operations, and I know what their general object is, and that they proceed in a most realistic fashion.

One reason why the Central Intelligence Agency was created, and why it has been functioning for a good many years, is that we recognize the need for intelligence service in the Army, in the Navy, and in the Air Force; and in maintaining such a service, we assume a realistic posture, and take account of something that is as old as Biblical history. I think there is reference in the Bible to spies who were concealed, of long ago. Those spies, of course, were trying to secure information, which one may well assume was designed for the security of the people whom they represented.

I have read a great deal in this field. Every country is forever trying to implement and to fortify its security by obtaining information, wherever and whenever it can, which will be useful in the cause of security and defense.

I have no comment to make upon this particular incident, but if it fits into that pattern it certainly would not be singularly strange, I would say. I am speaking now as one who served in the Intelligence Service of the Army; namely, G–2. The business of the service was to try to procure information wherever it could and whenever it could, from whatever source it could, to serve the interests of the country.

I am confident that M. Charles de Gaulle, the President of France, is a realist in that field. I am confident that Prime Minister Macmillan of England is an absolute realist in that field. I am certain, having listened to the words of and had an opportunity to ask questions of the Premier of Russia, Mr. Khrushchev, in the Committee on Foreign Relations, that he is an absolute realist.

I will remember as long as I live something of Mr. Khrushchev's irritation when I continued to pursue a line of questioning with respect to censored dispatches from Moscow. He finally turned off that line of questions by saying simply, "How would we know whether these correspondents were not spies?"

We know the Russians take a pretty realistic estimate of who comes to their country, what their business is, and whether they are procuring information which may be useful for security and defensive purposes.

I add that the President of the United States and the military leaders of our country are realists as well. In that concept and in that estimate they have followed a pattern which is as old as the relationships of human beings of different groups and tribes, which go back thousands of years.

Without commenting specifically upon the incident, since I would rather ascertain, if I can, what all the facts are, I think the statement I saw as an official statement yesterday was marked by complete candor and simply took account of the verities which are involved. I am certain that in due course there will be clarification and there will be some amplification, to set it all in proper perspective.

The acting majority leader is very sincerely correct when he says this is no occasion for moralizing upon the morality or immorality of the business of procuring information by means of whatever intelligence services are at the command of the country. Such conduct has been followed for a long time. We have been supplying the funds which are necessary. We do not pry too deeply into the techniques, the methods, and the approaches which are employed, but we are certain that other countries, including the Soviet Union, are doing the same thing, probably to a degree that makes some of our efforts pale perhaps not into particular insignificance, but at least makes them measure up as being much smaller than the amount of money, time, and energy which other nations devote to the work.

The Soviet Union's security network, as everyone knows, is really a very, very tight network. We have had occasion to see how it works. As a member of the McCarthy committee long ago, I remember a good deal of the testimony which was offered at that time, which had a direct bearing upon the efforts going on in this country to secure information which might be useful to the Soviet Union.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Reference has been made by the minority leader to Mr. Khrushchev as being an absolute realist in this field.

In view of the fact that the provisions of the Litvinov-Roosevelt agreement, entered into in 1933, provided for the abolition of the Comintern, and that the Soviets would refrain from espionage work in this country, could it not be said that there has been constant violation rather than observation of that agreement?

Considering all we know about the present efforts of espionage and subversion in this country, at the hands of the Communist Party of America, and others, would it not also be in order to refer to Mr. Khrushchev as being a practicing realist and a currently practicing realist in this field?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The record is an open book on that point.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, about 8 o'clock last Saturday evening at my home in Lexington I received a call from a reporter of the Roanoke Times asking if I knew that an American plane manned by a Virginia boy had been shot down in Russia. I said I had heard that news at 6 o'clock. The reporter said the Associated Press reported the flight was authorized.

I said, "I cannot believe that is true, for any officer to order a man into Russia is equivalent to signing his death warrant. For any flier to go voluntarily into Russia is to commit suicide."

I had been hearing testimony presented before the Committee on Appropriations by the Central Intelligence Agency for 13 years. Never during that time were we told what the money was to be used for. It was a deep, dark secret. I did not know, and today I asked a number of members of our Defense Subcommittee if they knew that the Central Intelligence Agency owned and operated planes, and they said they did not. Consequently, I was positive it was a military plane, and that no officer would have directed the pilot of a military plane to fly over Russia.

The only satisfaction which I have from the tragic mistake is the one mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], that our President and our Secretary of State knew nothing about it and had no responsibility. However, somebody made a tragic blunder. It was not only a tragic blunder of trying to send a plane across the continent of Russia, but in violating the neutrality of two friendly nations, for the morning paper indicates that the flight was to start in Pakistan and to end in the friendly country of Norway. That was a gap. Someone made a terrible mistake in ordering the flight, and it is the second costly mistake in recent years. I point that out because we had no notice that the Communists of North Korea were poised to attack South Korea, and when we called representatives of the Central Intelligence Agency before us, they said:

> We reported to the President, to the Secretary of State, to the Pentagon, and to all the branches of the military service that the North Koreans had assembled close to the border an unusual quantity of heavy artillery and tanks, but it was not our responsibility to evaluate that information.

The attack started and we knew nothing about it. We never got any explanation, when it would have been so easy to have divulged such information. We had no information at all that the attack was coming in North Korea when it did, catching us flatfooted. We almost lost the war before we could get into it and bring the necessary troops to bear for our defense.

As has been pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr.

MANSFIELD] on the eve of a momentous international peace conference. we have a decision to make which is very embarrassing. As I said, it embarrassed me not to know that the CIA had planes, and I made the statement in all good faith that I was shocked, and I would not believe that anybody had sent a pilot into Russian territory, as alleged, and as has since been admitted by our State Department.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I listened with intense interest and approval to the statement made by the distinguished assistant majority leader, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and to the statement made by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], regarding the incident of the young man in our plane which was shot down over the Soviet Union.

Of course, I regret that this plane was shot down and the young man had to parachute to safety within the Soviet Union. It is to be regretted that on the eve of the conference at the summit the dictator of the Soviet Union should gain a propaganda advantage from this incident.

However, I am neither surprised nor shocked by the fact that it is necessary for those who have the defense of this Nation as their responsibility to be compelled to penetrate the Iron Curtain in any manner possible, and thus penetrate the secrecy which surrounds the activities of the Soviet Union within its borders.

We know that the Soviet Union has submarines off our shores. We know that the Russians are engaged in surveillance within the borders of the United States. We know that they have spy rings operating within this country. We know that it is comparatively easy for those in command in the Soviet Union to obtain information on the missile strength, the submarine strength, the jet air strength, and the rocketry of the United States.

However, we in the United States are confronted with a different situation. We can obtain that kind of information with reference to the Soviet Union only by agents within the Soviet Union, by intelligence that we are able to gather from the Soviet Union, and perhaps by aerial reconnaissance.

Therefore, the latest incident is not shocking to me. Those constituents of mine in Ohio who have written to me, saying that we should forego the summit conference because of this incident, are completely wrong, in my opinion.

It was with a considerable feeling of pride that I read the candid and truthful statement issued by the Secretary of State, Mr. Herter. Years ago I served in the House of Representatives with him. He was my colleague there. I regard him as a good Secretary of State, in the tradition of Cordell Hull, Dean Acheson, and other great American Secretaries of State.

I take comfort from the fact that in any conference in which the U.S. Government will take part, it will be represented by our determined, honest, and highly patriotic Secretary of State, Mr. Herter. I am sure that he is fully capable of dealing face to face with any leader of the Soviet Union.

Of course, the summit conference should be held. If I were to make a prediction about the fate of the young man who had to parachute to safety inside the Soviet Union, my prediction would be that, instead of being executed, it is just as likely that Mr. Khrushchev will issue a statement on the eve of the summit conference that this young man will be given safe conduct out of the Soviet Union.

The people of America are entitled to know the facts. Our country is great because of the courage, industry, intelligence, and enterprise of the people back home from whom the authority in this country comes, not because of a comparatively few people who are in a position of authority in Washington.

How was it possible for us to ascertain the fact that the Soviet Union now has a missile lead over this Nation, has more intercontinental ballistic missiles in operational status within the Soviet Union, capable of striking targets within this country in perhaps 15 or 20 minutes, except by our intelligence penetrating behind the Iron Curtain? How do we know that at the present time the Soviet Union has a submarine fleet of perhaps 450 or 500 submarines, with perhaps a 3-to-1 supremacy over us—and we must remember that Hitler started aggressive warfare with fewer than 70 submarines—except by the enterprise and courage of men in our Central Intelligence Agency and in our Armed Forces? It is through their reports that we in the Senate secure the facts and are able to bring those facts to the knowledge of the American people.

That is why such activities are needed. Unfortunately, this Nation is engaged in a cold war with the Soviet Union. It is not of our will. It is regrettable that even a few are losing their lives in it. But we should face the facts.

We in America are living in a grim period of international anarchy. Those of our leaders who participate in conferences at the summit with the leaders of the Soviet Union will be much better off if they are fully informed. The only way in which they can be fully informed is by intelligence. It is unfortunate if a plane is shot down, and the dictator of the Soviet Union boasts about a new rocket which scored the hit. We should be comforted by the thought that because of the intelligence we are able to obtain, we may also have rockets and intercontinental ballistic missiles which are fully capable of hitting their targets.

I am sorry to assert that at the moment, largely because of duplication in our Armed Forces, the progress of the United States is behind that of the Soviet Union in rocketry, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and submarine strength. We in Congress must close our ranks in order to close that gap. We must encourage meetings at the summit and conferences with the leaders of the Soviet Union. The more often those conferences take place with our delegation, headed by men of determination, buttressed by information obtained through our intelligence, the greater the likelihood will be that we may eventually have complete disarmament, with adequate safeguards. Then the leaders of the Soviet Union will be compelled to abide by and obey the agreements which they enter into.

So, in this hour, instead of being critical, instead of saying that we are shocked with this matter, let us be realists, as are the distinguished assistant majority leader and the distinguished minority leader. Let us close our ranks and back up with determination our leaders who will participate in the summit conference. We want them to confer with the utmost determination for the welfare and safety of the American people. I am confident that they will do just that.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish I might agree with the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], but I find it difficult to close ranks behind the President in the case of an incident about which the State Department and the administration say he knew nothing.

It seems to me that the decision to fly a plane across the heartland of Russia is one which should have been made at the highest levels of Government in this country. I will not dispute the statement of the administration that the President knew nothing about it. But if he did not—and I hope he did—I say that that fact is a worse indictment than if he had knowledge of it and had approved it.

I introduced early in this Congress a resolution for the establishment of a Joint Commission on Intelligence Information. Similar proposed legislation has been introduced by other Members of Congress in this Congress and in previous Congresses.

In 1953, the Hoover Commission undertook a study of intelligence and information services in the United States and recommended that a joint committee be established, so that Congress might exercise some kind of continuous surveillance over the intelligence activities of our Government.

It seems to me that the events which have occurred since 1955, when this recommendation was made, underscore the wisdom of that recommendation.

In the case of the Suez crisis, we were told that our Intelligence Service had no advance knowledge, and that we had not anticipated any such action.

Again, in the case of the Hungarian revolt, the indications were that our intelligence had really not anticipated that any such event would occur, even though we were told that the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe were giving what were taken to be assurances of some kind of support from the United States in the event that revolts did occur in the middle European area.

When the Vice President went to South America and was the object of several unpleasant incidents in that country, our Government received conflicting reports. Some said that intelligence had warned against his going; some said that intelligence thought he was going to receive a most pleasant reception.

In general, Russian progress and advancements in the field of science seem to have been unknown to our Intelligence Agency. The administration expressed surprise at the great progress which was being made. With the launching of the Russian sputnik in 1957, our Government became aware that Russia was no longer a country in which science was in its primitive stage.

In general, the intelligence which we have received, or at least that which has been given to Congress and the public with regard to Soviet activities has been inadequate and behind the times.

Now we have been confronted with an incident which has been variously reported and variously explained. A test pilot for Lockheed, we are told, was flying an intelligence mission over the heart of the Soviet Union. I think Congress has the responsibility to ascertain what the facts are in this case.

Is our intelligence now being let out on contract to private enterprise? Is this the explanation we are to accept? I urge the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to hold hearings on this question. I hope he will hold hearings on the proposition of establishing a Joint Commission on Intelligence and Information. I think this is a responsibility which rests on the entire Congress, Democratic and Republican alike, but one which rests particularly upon the Democratic majority of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. I, too, am disturbed about the comment that the aircraft in question was being piloted by a Lockheed test pilot having civilian status. I am also disturbed about the position which NASA may play in this particular picture, as evidenced by one of the newspaper articles.

I am certain the Senator from Minnesota recalls that in 1958 Congress authorized NASA as an independent agency, and declared that it was the policy of the United States that activity in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes, and authorized NASA in the authorizing legislation toward that end.

It was further declared that such activities should be directed by the Space agency, and that the Department of Defense would assume all responsibility in connection with the peace and security of our country in connection with military operations.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota whether, if NASA is actually involved in this matter, it would appear to him that they have far exceeded their constitutional authority as designated by Congress in the Space Act of 1958.

Mr. McCARTHY. They certainly would be in clear violation of the intent of Congress and would prejudice the position of NASA, both in the United States and throughout the rest of the world, as an agency having potentially great influence for peace.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. In one of the newspapers I saw an article in which it was stated that perhaps NASA had loaned the airplane, which presumably it owned, to some other agency, for operation in that area.

I should like to direct the attention of the Senate to section 201(e)(4), of title II of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. Subsection (e) of section 201 covers the specific duties of the President, and provides, among other things:

> In conformity with the provisions of section 102 of this act, it shall be the duty of the President to—

And now I drop down to subsection (4)—

> (4) provide for effective cooperation between the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense in all such activities, and specify which of such activities may be carried on concurrently by both such agencies notwithstanding the assignment of primary responsibility therefor to one or the other of such agencies.

In view of that provision and also in view of the statement of the Senator from Minnesota that the President disclaims any knowledge of, or responsibility for, this incident, would it appear that if NASA has, in effect, engaged in a cooperative agreement with the Department of Defense, without the knowledge or authority of the President, NASA has thereby exceeded its authority, insofar as this act of Congress is concerned?

Mr. McCARTHY. I certainly must answer the Senator's question in the affirmative, and must say that the President, either himself or through his agents or representatives, has failed to meet the responsibility which the Congress has imposed upon him by means of that act.

But this is not surprising, because the thesis under which this administration seems to operate is one which has developed under the French monarchy, which was that if anything went wrong, the King was not to be blamed, but the fault was to be placed on one of his advisers. It was said that that led to civil obedience. But it did not lead to good government.

I fear that the same thesis is being followed by the present administration of the Government of the United States.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. I should like to ask the Senator whether, in view of these circumstances, it appears that at least this incident was very poorly timed, most ill conceived, and very improperly handled, regardless of who assumes the responsibility or is chargeable with it, at a time when we are trying to negotiate in good faith, in order to derive some benefits and some good out of the forthcoming conference.

Mr. McCARTHY. I certainly agree with the Senator from Nevada. The accuracy of his conclusions and observations is obvious; and I thank the Senator for his contributions.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as an American, I am most gratified that, with regard to the plane incident, the majority leader of the Senate has made a prompt appeal for national unity, and has said this is a time for all Americans to keep their heads and to dedicate themselves to the unity of the country. I am also very proud of the fact that the majority whip [Mr. MANSFIELD] has assumed—as he always does—a responsible attitude in a time of the occurrence of critical developments in our national life.

I particularly deplore any attempt to make political capital out of a situation which evolves from the fact that it is the duty of the intelligence forces of the United States at all times to protect the security of the United States.

I suggest that this would be a very good time to look at the other side of the coin, and to ask ourselves what kind of furor would arise if our forces were not alert; what sort of reaction would be expected from the country and from the Congress if it were to appear that explosions, the development of new and terrible weapons, or secret activities of a menacing and hostile nature, were taking place on the part of the Soviet Government, and we were unaware of them.

Mr. President, in the Second World War, I was a naval intelligence officer in the Pacific; and I think it is the height of naivete for anyone to contend that espionage is not practiced by all major nations at all times.

Not to admit that we are embarrassed by this event would be a lack of candor. Not to admit that we have violated the 11th commandment—namely, Thou shalt not get caught—would also be a lack of candor.

But, Mr. President, it would be far worse if our country were not alert to detect any activity, anywhere in the world, which menaces the security of the United States.

I suppose it is to be expected that some people, at some times, in some places, will attempt to make political capital of an event of that kind. The responsible leadership of this body has not done so. I would not in the least be surprised to find someone writing in the press or some other person attempt to link this incident to the West Virginia primary or to some other unrelated event.

But, Mr. President, the plain facts, as I view them, are that we are supporting, and we must support, the intelligence activities of the United States; and that if those intelligence activities have fallen short, we have the right to inquire and to investigate. I raise no objection to having the Congress inform itself fully of the circumstances in connection with this matter.

But there is a great difference between investigating to determine the facts and investigating for political advantage.

I suggest that the Congress, and this body in particular, inasmuch as I speak as a Member of this body, confine itself to a determination of the facts, and that such inquiry be at all times carefully limited to protecting the security of the United States and to protecting the military and civilian methods by which we

assure that security, and that at all times we be sure that we strike the proper balance between the proper administration of the program and the necessity for the program itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, an editorial published in the New York Tribune and an editorial published in the Philadelphia Inquirer, both bearing this date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 9, 1960]

OUR PLANE WAS SHOT DOWN

There is no obscuring the fact that the prestige of the United States has received a blow. When the Russians shot down a reconnaissance plane deep in their territory, captured the pilot and his films and discovered his flight plan, Premier Khrushchev exploited the event with great shrewdness to undercut the American stand at the summit.

The special difficulty at this time is that the summit conference is generally expected to deal mostly with intangibles. The chief hope of the world is for some relaxation of tensions springing from the meeting of the heads of government. To achieve that and to avert pressures which the Soviet Union is expected to exert for a change in the status of Berlin and Germany, the West must bring into play all the moral authority it can muster.

In the eyes of very many that moral authority has been impaired at a critical moment. Even those who accept the absolute necessity of maintaining intelligence services to learn as much as possible about the massive military machine poised against the free world by the Soviet Union must question why this particular flight—on the face of it a very dangerous one—was made at this particular time.

Perhaps the answer may never be known to the public. In the nature of things, intelligence activities are secret in virtually all their aspects—if any of the latter become known, it is almost always an error. In this instance, the United States must face up to the consequences of such an error. But the consequences should not be overstated.

In the first place, the downing of the American plane, however costly its diplomatic and propaganda effects, is no argument whatever against intelligence work in general. The world in which we live makes such work supremely necessary to the security of this Nation and all its allies.

The number of Communist spies who have been caught, the ramifications of their network of espionage, sabotage, and subversion are common knowledge. To meet this by the most efficient possible system of intelligence and counterintelligence is a first responsibility of any free government.

In the second place, however gleeful Mr. Khrushchev and the Soviet press may be over the episode, whatever doubts it may stir among the uninformed, it does not affect in the slightest the basic goals of the United States and the West.

The freedom of 2 million residents of West Berlin is no less important because of the public revelation that the United States has engaged in a form of reconnaissance that both sides have practiced for years. The safeguarding of West Germany is no less significant. The need for controlled disarmament is even more evident.

Finally, while many Americans will be disturbed and unhappy over the equivocal position in which their Government has been placed, there is no disunity here. The American people insist that their guardians be alert. If that involves errors or incidents the price may be high—but not as high as being taken unawares by aggression. Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, in offering his support and that of the Democratic Party to the President in this crisis, put the fundamental American reaction well:

"We do not know just how far Premier Khrushchev intends to push his saber rattling. But we do know just how far Americans intend to go to preserve their freedoms—right to the limit. And by that I mean all Americans—Republicans and Democrats alike."

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, May 9, 1960]

FACING UP TO REALITIES

The State Department has made the best of a bad situation in explaining the mission of the U.S. plane that Premier Khrushchev says was shot down over Russian territory.

Millions of Americans are shocked by the State Department's pronouncement. Some find it hard to believe this country would engage deliberately in activities intended to learn secrets behind the Iron Curtain.

Serious errors of judgment may have been made somewhere in the ranks of U.S. intelligence when the American plane was permitted to fly over the Soviet border so close to the scheduled opening of important East-West summit talks in Paris 1 week from today. The United States and allies find themselves in an extremely embarrassing and disadvantageous position as Mr. Khrushchev gloats over the alleged capture and confession of an American spy.

It would be unfair, however, to condemn whoever was responsible for this flight until all the facts are known. The situation is muddled at the moment. While a serious blunder appears to have been made by someone, it should be borne in mind that a function of intelligence is to safeguard the Nation against surprise attack at all times.

Suspension of U.S. flights near the Russian border during the presummit period would seem on the surface a wise move to avert precisely the kind of crisis which now has arisen. But an important question is whether the plane was sent aloft for some purpose essential to American security.

Suppose, for example, that U.S. intelligence operations along the Iron Curtain had been suspended until after the summit conference in the interests of peace and goodwill. And suppose that Russia took advantage of this lapse in American security to stage a surprise foray aaginst, say, the Middle East. Under such circumstances the very persons who now loudly condemn U.S. intelligence officers for sending a plane over Russia would protest even louder their failure to be constantly on the alert.

Hardly a week goes by without someone in Congress quoting the latest intelligence estimates of Russian military strength. It has long been obvious that such information is obtained through a system of espionage, whether conducted from the air or on the ground. As the State Department said, "Intelligence collection activities are practiced by all countries and the Soviet Union has not been lagging behind in this field."

Disclosure of the U.S. plane's real mission does not necessarily reflect bad faith on Government spokesmen who previously said the aircraft was on a weather research flight. It is common procedure for intelligence operations to be disguised and many persons in official capacity may have thought the purpose was weather research.

Of immediate urgency is the need for a personal interview with the pilot of the plane by American Embassy officials in Moscow. This might shed new light on the story of the pilot's confession.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, we believe, performed a service to the country and gave good advice to the American people in issuing a prompt appeal for national unity. The Democratic majority leader of the Senate did not exaggerate in the slightest when he said "there is no doubt that a serious international crisis may be in the making." This is, as JOHNSON said, a "time for all Americans to keep their heads" and "dedicate themselves to the unity of the country."

It is a time, too, for all Americans to face up to the grim realities of the cold war and not be misled by Khrushchev's self-righteous sneers at the integrity of the United States.

DISARMAMENT AND THE RECENT AIRPLANE INCIDENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I received in this morning's mail from the University of Wisconsin a resolution in relation to disarmament. This resolution, and bearing in mind the facts which developed yesterday in relation to the United States plane that was shot down over Russia, caused me ask myself a few questions. I remember back in the early 1930's when the Japanese walked out on the League of Nations. I remember that the great talk then was disarmament, and after the First World War we did partially disarm. We dismantled a great deal of our Navy, and the hopes and the prayers of all the people were toward the end that war would be no more.

Then I remember that, after the Japanese walked out at Geneva, they started building up their forces. I remember that Pearl Harbor then came upon us. We were asleep, and thought it could not happen. I remember listening to President Roosevelt give his tremendous challenge, and we declared war.

Another question that came to my mind was: What was the effect of the shooting down of our plane? Would it affect the summit conference? In my humble opinion, the answer is, "No." We have been playing poker too long. Khrushchev is one of the great international poker players on the world stage. He came over to this country. We took him in. He went back. A few months ago we thought everything was going to be as sweet as honey, and then he started in with his abuse. The result was that we received letters from people telling us that the thing to do is disarm.

Mr. President, in my humble opinion, every man who will sit down at the council table and everyone who will be associated with the negotiations will be men who know history. The plane incident undoubtedly has had a great effect upon the people in America, whose eyes were again closing, as they were before Pearl Harbor.

I am satisfied that all the bluster of Khrushchev is some more of his poker-playing attitude. He knows that for a long time we have had our airplanes along the boundary line.

As was stated on the floor today, Khrushchev's agents are right in the

United States. They are in South America. They are in every capital of South America. They are in the espionage game 24 hours a day. If we read some of the comments in the European papers, we would think the common people of Europe have their eyes closed to the realities of life. Why do we have our Army over there? Why do we have our bases in Turkey, Greece, and elsewhere? Why do we have our airplanes there? It must be that we feel it is necessary to establish a deterrent. It must be, as a Senator said on the floor a little while ago, that it is necessary for us to know what is going on behind the so-called Iron Curtain. Khrushchev knows what is going on on the other side of the Iron Curtain in every nation in Europe—in fact, in every nation in the world. Consequently, when people talk about this incident having a bad effect upon the summit conference, I cannot agree. In my humble opinion, it means there are going to be realists there; and the greatest realist of all will be Khrushchev himself.

The President, after Camp David, of which Khrushchev talked so much, and after the experience of the last several months with Khrushchev, is certainly alert.

One other word, Mr. President. Some persons want to place responsibility for this incident somewhere. I ask them again, Why do we have airplanes in Europe? Why are we training some of our young men in the intelligence field? Of course, we are not supposed to invade another country, but we are living in a time when it is important for us to know what is going on behind that Iron Curtain. As was stated, we have had reconnaissance planes for a long time. What about Russia? Does Russia have some? Yes. Do those airplanes cross the boundary lines? Well, we have not shot any of them down, but they do not have to fly across the boundary lines to get the information they want, because they have their people in every nation of the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to remind the Senator from Wisconsin that the Senate is operating under the 3-minute limitation. Does the Senator wish to ask for more time?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the able Senator from Wisconsin may proceed for another 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield, I have no desire to urge him not to complete his speech, but how much longer does he wish to take? I have something to present for the morning hour.

Mr. WILEY. I shall finish in about 60 seconds.

Mr. CLARK. Please take more than that.

Mr. WILEY. Such courtesy by the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Pennsylvania is really beyond the stage at which I can thank the Senators for their complimentary attitude, but I do wish to express my gratitude.

I was reasoning out loud, Mr. President, about the effect of the news of the shooting down of our plane. I think more than ever it will mean we will be alert. The American people will be alert. The Armed Forces will be alert.

It may have an effect on the coming conference, that those who are engineering the deal will become more realistic and will realize that some kind of a solution must be found which will bring about a partial disarmament—not a partial disarmament of alertness but a partial disarmament in the weapons of war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks the resolution of the University of Wisconsin be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN—MILWAUKEE

To the Honorable Christian A. Herter, Editors of the Milwaukee Journal and Sentinel, the Governor of Wisconsin, the Senators and Representatives of Wisconsin in the Congress of the United States:

The current disarmament negotiations at Geneva and the impending summit talks impel us, members of the faculty of the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, to recommend to your attention the following statement, originally prepared and endorsed by 105 members of the faculty of Johns Hopkins University and Goucher College. This statement represents our personal views:

"Never have the peoples of the world spent so much on armament in time of peace and never have they been so insecure. During the past year the arms competition between the United States and the Soviet Union has become more intense than ever. The continuing spread of nuclear weapons to an enlarging circle of nations increases the danger of war and makes disarmament ever more difficult. The survival of civilization requires the control of armaments of unlimited power and their eventual elimination as instruments of national policy.

"The Soviets in disarmament negotiations have shown suspicion of American proposals for inspection and control, and our own representatives have been reluctant to consider any scheme that would not eliminate every risk of deception. But every alternative open to the United States involves risk. Insistence upon a perfect system only insures that there will be no inspection and no control; the result must be an unrestricted arms race which sooner or later will almost certainly bring about unrestricted nuclear war. The present impasse must be broken.

"Serious as are the conflicting interests between the United States and the U.S.S.R., both countries, we believe, have been too preoccupied with their differences and not enough concerned with their common goals. Americans need not shed all their skepticism about Soviet words and actions; successful international agreements are based more on mutual advantage than on trust. Although the prevailing attitude of distrust has made agreement difficult, the American and Soviet positions on a test ban are now very close as a result of mutual concessions. Any resolution of the remaining differences is preferable to the dangers which would follow a breakdown of negotiations.

"The United States and the Soviet Union have a strong common interest in preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, which appears inevitable without an agreement to stop testing. Recent administration suggestions that such weapons be furnished to American allies would, if carried out, jeopardize further negotiations to end the arms race.

"We believe that the test ban is an essential first step toward comprehensive arms control. In view of the gravity of the present situation we are convinced that the United States should, if necessary, accept considerable risks to achieve the goal of general disarmament in order to avoid the far greater risks attendant upon continuing the arms race."

Arthur P. Becker, Professor of Economics; Neal Billings, Professor of Elementary Education; Mrs. Lois Griggs, Professor of Elementary Education; Lee Lawrence, Professor of History; James March, Professor of Commerce; L. H. Matthews, Professor and Director of Financial Aids; H. O. Engelmann, Associate Professor of Sociology and Anthropology; Gerald Gleason, Associate Professor of Elementary Education; J. A. Leer, Associate Professor of Commerce; John L. Phelan, Associate Professor of History; I. D. Rinder, Associate Professor of Sociology and Anthropology; C. G. Screven, Associate Professor of Psychology; Donald R. Shea, Associate Professor of Political Science; Mrs. Freida Voigt, Associate Professor of German; T. W. Walton, Associate Professor of Elementary Education; Manuel Gottlieb, Visiting Associate Professor of Economics; Harold Altman, Assistant Professor of Art; Martin L. Cohnstaedt, Assistant Professor of Sociology and Anthropology; Bernard Knieger, Assistant Professor of English; Ted Kraynik, Assistant Professor of Art; Eric Schenker, Assistant Professor of Economics: Harold Altman, Assistant Professor of Sociology and Anthropology; Marvin Summers, Assistant Professor of Political Science; J. Dale Chastain, Instructor of Political Science; Justin Replogle, Instructor of English; Peter Sinclair, Instructor of Art; Mrs. C. Shannon, A. Clarke Hogensuck.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I know all of us were tremendously shocked to read in the paper and to hear over the radio the account of the shooting down of an American plane over the Soviet Union. The one thing that we must derive from this incident is that the cold war is still going on. We must remember that Communist dogma, doctrine, and philosophy is pledged to the destruction of all that we in the free world hold dear. We must remember that the Soviet Union is continuing to seek ways and means of subverting us and taking us over, destroying our system in whatever way may present itself to them. They obviously know a great deal about us. They have not only an efficient espionage system, but we in this democracy and free world continue to reveal facts and figures about almost everything which we have anyway. They do know a lot about us. Those in our Government whose responsibility it is to protect and defend us against what might be at any moment an onslaught from the Soviet Union have a responsibility to try to find out everything that is possible to find out about the capability of the Soviet Union. If they did not do so, those who are charged with the responsibility, which I presume are the CIA and, in some measure, the Defense Department, I believe would be dilatory in their respon-

sibility to provide protection to the people of the United States. The unfortunate fact about this particular episode is that this particular plane was shot down, and the world is now reminded that we live in a cold and difficult world, that things have not eased off a great deal despite the fact that we have a lot of soft conversation and soft and appeasing words from time to time from the leaders of the Soviet Union. But ideology hardness still exists. They have pledged and dedicated their resources to the destruction of democracy, and particularly to the destruction of the system under which we live. It is unfortunate that events have turned out the way they have, but I believe the lesson we must remind ourselves always to keep in mind is that while from time to time the cold war gets a little colder and then moves into a hot stage—fortunately, not a shooting stage—nonetheless the hard, ideological fact still exists that the Communists are seeking ways to get advantage of us, and in our own interest, to protect ourselves from them, we must continue in every way we can to learn what are their intentions, and specifically what are their capabilities.

I hope this particular episode will not necessarily put us on the defensive when the President of the United States and the Secretary of State go to the summit conference. I do not think it need put us on the defensive. I believe this is a fact of life which almost everybody realized was going on. Almost everyone realized that we are trying to gather information about the Soviet Union wherever and whenever we can. That we are doing so is now before the public. We would be ashamed of ourselves if we were not pursuing this course. We would be derelict in our duty if we were not attempting to learn everything that we could about them. Now that it is out, I do not think there is any great cause for us to go on the defensive. It is unfortunate the information has been revealed in the manner in which it was. Nevertheless I think the long and established record demonstrates that our whole purpose and intention is defensive in nature. We have not over the course of 20 years sought to be aggressive against any country. We have not sought to take over any country, either through military aggression or subversion, and when we seek information it is only in the nature of acquiring exact information so that we may defend ourselves and so that we may defend other nations who are incapable of defending themselves and whom we list in the free world bloc. I believe we have the duty to learn everything we can about them. Therefore I hope and expect that this incident should not put us on the defensive, and I hope the people of this Nation will not think it has.

I hope the people of this Nation will not think it has put us into a difficult situation with respect to the forthcoming developments at the summit conference.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to be associated with the position taken by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. I would like to add that if the Russians were half as tolerant and free in letting American citizens travel over Russia as we are toward Russian citizens traveling over the United States, events like this would not occur. Only about a year or two ago an aerial picture of the Washington area was published in a Washington newspaper. I suppose every Russian could get an aerial picture of every city in the United States without having to fly military planes over the United States. They have access to all this information, and yet we are denied any information as far as Russia is concerned.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I completely agree with the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. We give information to the Russians which they, of course, do not give to us, and yet we in our own interest have to find out what we can about what they are doing, and if our people did not do so, they would be derelict in their duty and exposing us to an unnecessary danger.

Undoubtedly the plan did not work as undoubtedly somebody had planned it would work. I suppose it was planned so that the men would not be detected. However, I do not believe there is any justification for us suddenly to throw up our hands in holy horror and say, "This should not go on."

In this practical world in which Soviet Russia is pledged to destroy us and are building capabilities to destroy us we have to know what they are doing, and I am sure the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles of the CIA, and the President will move on in their efforts to demonstrate, probably from this particular incident, that it would be better all around if we could have inspection as we have asked for of what is going on in their country, so that we can on that inspection bring about a disarmament proposal by which we would disarm and they would disarm, so that this kind of action would not be necessary. It lends emphasis to the thought that we should pursue a meaningful and useful disarmament program coupled with a proper inspection program so that we can lessen attention and do away with this kind of espionage system on their part as well as on ours.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have not discussed this matter with any other member of the Foreign Relations Committee; therefore, what I shall say at this time represents my own thinking.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I feel some responsibility in connection with international developments; and I strongly urge that the administration suggest to the Secretary of State, to the head of the CIA, Mr. Allen Dulles, and to others, that they tell us what happened in Russia, particularly in the case of the plane that was shot down.

I understand they have limited the explanation, at least at this time, in particular, to the leadership of the Senate and to the chairmen and the ranking minority members of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee.

As one member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I wish to protest against this situation—not against the giving of the information to them, but against the fact that the information is not being given to every member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

This Russian matter is very serious, very embarrassing, and very humiliating. If members of the Foreign Relations Committee are to accept their responsibility in connection with service on that committee, it seems to me they are entitled to have the facts, and to have them today, not tomorrow.

So I want the other members of the Foreign Relations Committee to know how I feel, and I want the Senate to know how I feel, and I want the administration to know how I feel.

I believe the time has come for us to tighten our belts and tighten up our activities and our actions and our thoughts, and to clarify our policies, and to know in what direction the country is going and what is occurring, and not constantly be put in the position of being embarassed and humiliated and having to deal without knowledge of the full and complete facts in connection with incidents which develop from time to time, and which prove embarassing to me, both as a citizen and as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the execution of one's duties as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee depends completely upon the accuracy of the information and the knowledge he has concerning the problems which are to be solved. If knowledge of what is happening is not in the possession of a member of the committee, his ultimate judgment can be rooted only in guesses, and never in facts. If it happens that his judgment is rooted in facts, it comes only as an accident. That would be a most dangerous method of trying to execute his duty.

I would like to know the basic facts surrounding the incident that occurred in the Soviet. It does not necessarily follow that I at this time condone or do not condone what has happened. I will not believe that at this moment there are not in the United States many representatives of Communist Russia and other Communist nations that are gathering information about what we are doing.

In our system of government the ability to get information is simpler for the Soviet to get than it is for our Government to get it from the Soviet. Hence, the Soviet, though it is complaining, should remember that in its methods of operation it undoubtedly has, within the boundaries of our country, persons who are spying and trying to get possession of information that will serve the cause of Russia. That fact, however, does not mean that I at this time condone what has happened. I would like to know. We have a Central Intelligence Agency. We rely upon it for information given to the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committees and the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Ohio will agree with me that as members of the Foreign Relations Committee, as he and I are, we ought to have the facts; will he not?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have already said that.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator has stated it. I wanted to emphasize that fact. That was the purpose of my saying what I just said. We do not get the facts.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur in what the Senator has said.

Mr. CAPEHART. We cannot pass judgment upon these facts. Why they would ignore every member of the Foreign Relations Committee except two is something I shall never understand. Are we second-class members of the committee, or second-class citizens? My people of Indiana want me to have the facts as best I can ascertain them as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. I am sure that is true of the able Senator from Ohio. We do not get the facts. I am not criticizing anybody for what happened over there, because I do not know the facts. I am just pleading to get the facts, and I know that is what the able Senator from Ohio wishes to have.

Mr. LAUSCHE. At this morning's meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee, I suggested to the chairman that Secretary of State Herter and Mr. Dulles should appear before our committee. I made that suggestion on the basis of wanting to learn the background and the circumstances of the incident in the Soviet. About 5 or 10 minutes ago, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] told me that Mr. Dulles, of the Central Intelligence Agency, and Secretary of State Herter were in a meeting room downstairs, to be attended by the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and one other committee. I went to that room and gained admittance only to be told it was a closed meeting for the leaders of the Senate and the leaders of the House and two members of certain committees. I do not know which committees they were. To my embarrassment, I had to leave. A newspaperman asked me why I was leaving, and, facetiously, I said I was thrown out.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is my position. I would like to know who was responsible for limiting the meeting to just a few. If I remember correctly, it is the entire committee that passes upon matters before the Foreign Relations Committee, as well as the Armed Services Committee. Why should those attending the meeting be limited to just a few? It makes one sort of suspicious as to what the purpose of it is.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not know that it makes me suspicious at all——

Mr. CAPEHART. Perhaps that was not a good word.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But I do agree with the Senator from Indiana that, as a Senator burdened with certain responsibilities, and required to answer questions of the citizens of my State, I ought to know in the fullest degree possible what happened.

Mr. CAPEHART. In my opinion, there are too many mistakes being made. As the Senator well knows, I was publicly opposed to the Khrushchev-Eisenhower-Nixon visits back and forth, and I think history is proving I was right.

I do not know about Ohio, but I just came back from Indiana, and our people are very much concerned about this matter. It is a serious matter. They are beginning to wonder if we in Washington know what is going on in the world. It is about time that the administration, which must accept the responsibility for this sort of thing, took the Senate and the House of Representatives into their confidence. Perhaps we could be of some help to them. God knows, they need it, if I can read the record and the times correctly.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With respect to giving us information about how much money we should spend for national defense and for mutual aid, we have had the Central Intelligence Agency representatives testify before our committee. When those representatives came before the committee, I assumed they implied they were getting information about the Soviet. That fact would lead to the question, How are they getting the information? Is it being gotten through voluntary revelation by the Soviet of what it is doing? The answer to that question manifestly would be in the negative. The next question is, If you are giving us information, how should we assume you got it?

I would like to know, in discussions that would be had in an adequate meeting. I am disappointed in the fact that we have not been given the right to attend the meeting. However, I do not want to conclude that that right will not be made available to us. The justice of the position taken by the Senator from Indiana to me would indicate that it is indispensable that the members of the Foreign Relations Committee hear what has happened.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is not any question about it. We ought not to be on the committee unless we are entitled to all the facts; and it is within the next 24, 48, or 72 hours that decisions ought to be made on what to say and how to handle this matter. A summit conference is coming up a week from today, and yet we find now that we do not have the facts. We cannot attend the meeting. I do not want to say anything more about it, because I do not want to do anything that is in any way going to give any satisfaction to Mr. Khrushchev; but I believe I know that the people of this Nation want to know what has happened, and they are entitled to know what has happened, because we are being pushed around all over the world, even by a little fellow named Castro, down in Cuba.

How long will this go on? The people are beginning to wonder, and I think rightly so. One of the reasons I think they wonder is that we in the Senate, who serve on committees responsible for these things, do not have the facts.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I want to separate the two propositions. First, is our right to know what is going on, our right to hear the testimony of the persons who allegedly know. Second, is the question, What should be our realistic course?

When we approach the second question, of course, in a measure we have to be influenced by our knowledge of what the Soviet Union is doing. Is the Soviet Union keeping people in our country—perhaps even sitting in the galleries of the Senate—to learn what is going on? That is the second question.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think there is any question that the Soviets do have spies in our country. We have spies in their country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why have we had so much misinformation in connection with the matter? The first day it was one thing, the second day it was another thing, the third day another thing, and the fourth day another thing. There are a lot of questions which ought to be answered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My hope and expectation is that shortly the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations will be accorded the right, to which they are entitled, to hear a narration of what actually happened.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, that was the purpose of my rising, to make the remarks I did.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Indiana and I are not engaged in a hostile exchange of views.

Mr. CAPEHART. No. The Senator from Ohio and I are 100 percent together on this matter. We think alike, and have been talking alike. We are 100 percent together. I know exactly how the able Senator feels, because I feel the same way.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the able Senator from Ohio, I am sorry if I brought the Senator information which later proved not to be exactly correct. I simply presented information which a newsman in a crowded corridor, waiting for the "cloak and dagger" arrival of the head of the CIA and of the Secretary of State, told me. I was trying to be helpful and friendly to my distinguished friend from Ohio.

I think we could all blow this matter way up out of proportion, if I may say so. It seems to me my distinguished friends on the Committee on Foreign Relations, disappointed as they are in not being included, have probably no greater cause for disappointment than the members of the Committee on Appropriations, of whom I happen to be one, or the members of the Committee on Armed Services, or perhaps members of other committees we could mention.

Since the House of Representatives is also represented at this meeting in this small cloistered chamber in the catacombs of the Capitol, I assume that we will all learn in due time something about the matter.

In the meantime, we are in good company, because the first announcement was that the President did not know anything about it. I think there is nothing for us to feel left out about. I must say again, it is not unusual that this great free country shows itself not to be very adept at "cloak and dagger" tactics.

I must say also, I think we are very adept at the poorest timing which could possibly be practiced. It seems to me anybody engaged in practical politics, as well as anybody engaged in military life, must know that timing is all important. Somebody has committed a mistake, but I do not think we should be too disturbed about it.

I remember that now a colonel of the Russian establishment is languishing in jail because he was spying upon us in our country. I remember other incidents which I will not attempt to recount at the present time.

I think all of us must recall that we have a tremendous stake in this summit conference. No one has quite the stake in it which the President himself has. Much as we might be inclined to voice our disappointment, that we did not know about this, and our regret that we are not learning all about it at once, the best thing we can do, I think, is to suffer in silence until we are told.

In the meantime, we should let the whole world know that the Senate, the Congress, and the country stand behind the effort to attain some degree of peace, and that by all means, regardless of party, we stand behind the efforts of the President. I am sure every Senator on the floor agrees completely with that point of view.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have no quarrel with what the Senator has said. I simply say that perhaps as a result of our colloquy today we can help in the situation a little bit, to make certain that these things do not happen in the future. Perhaps we can be of some help to the administration, if it will give us the opportunity, if it will give us the facts and the information. That is my position. I said, and I repeat, we have been making too many mistakes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

UNYIELDING AMERICAN POSITION ON GERMANY AND BERLIN

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the AFL–CIO magazine supplement entitled, "American Labor Seeks Peace and Freedom," published in Sunday's issue of the New York Times. This supplement contains a number of excellent and informative articles on American foreign policy, with emphasis upon the promotion and maintenance of peace and freedom throughout the world.

Mr. President, the publication of these articles, written by several distinguished Americans noted for their knowledge of international affairs, indeed constitutes an important and valuable contribution to greater understanding of America's position in the world in which we live. The introductory statement to the articles notes that the publication of the supplement is in conjunction with the AFL–CIO Conference on World Affairs and is an effort to maintain and encourage an informed public opinion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the introductory statement be printed at this point in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR AN INFORMED PUBLIC OPINION

The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations believes that in a democracy informed public opinion must participate and lead in the development of foreign policy. Our Nation's foreign policy, if it is to have public understanding and support, cannot be created and fashioned behind closed doors.

We believe, quite frankly, that a large part of America's difficulties in world affairs stem from the fact that the American people have too often been kept in the dark about the developing stages of major foreign policy. This is particularly true of a large part of the American press which rarely prints serious news about foreign affairs.

As the world crisis deepens, it becomes more and more imperative that the American people be better informed and more informed on the issues of foreign policy, particularly as it concerns our relations with the Soviet Union. The AFL–CIO and many of its constituent unions have devoted much time and money in an endeavor to keep their memberships abreast of foreign policy developments. That is why the AFL–CIO called its recent conference on world affairs. That is why we are publishing this special supplement which includes excerpts from addresses by speakers at the conference so that those who seek information can find it readily.

The AFL–CIO hopes that our contributions to the great debate will alert the American people to the urgency of the world crisis and the necessity of creating a positive program which will prevent further totalitarian encroachment and at the same time aid countries, now emerging from colonial bondage or struggling for existence, to achieve progress and prosperity and to become viable free societies.

To the success of this struggle, to the achievement of human rights, peace and freedom for all mankind, this special supplement is dedicated.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to call special attention to an article by the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Douglas Dillon, which appeared in the AFL–CIO supplement. Secretary Dillon addressed himself to what he termed the "central issue confronting the Soviet Union and the Western nations"—namely, the problem of Berlin and Germany.

Mr. Dillon's article is an excellent and clear-cut enunciation of America's determination to hold firm in our support of a united Germany, and stanchly opposed to the "isolation and engulfment" of West Berlin. Mr. Dillon states explicitly that "in the long run, the problem of Berlin and Germany can only be solved through German reunification."

Mr. President, there is absolutely no question that the regime in power in East Germany does not represent the hopes and aspirations of the people it so arbitrarily controls. Secretary Dillon rightly points out that "it is doubtful that these rulers could remain in power for a single day without the support of Soviet bayonets."

Mr. President, I commend Secretary Dillon for his thoughtful treatment of a subject which is recognized by many to be the most important and far-reaching issue of the cold war. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF PEACE IS TO BE KEPT

(By Douglas Dillon)

The central issue confronting the Soviet Union and the Western nations at the summit is the problem of Berlin and Germany. No issue on earth today is more critical. It involves the immediate fate of two and a quarter million West Berliners and the ultimate destiny of about 70 million Germans. It bears directly upon the future stability of Central Europe and the possibility of a lasting European peace. It represents a critical test of the integrity and dependability of the free world's collective security systems—because no nation could preserve its faith in collective security if we permitted the courageous people of West Berlin to be sold into slavery. It also represents a critical test of Soviet good faith in all areas of negotiation. For the goals of disarmament and the general improvement of East-West relations have no prospect of attainment if we find that the Soviet rulers or their East German puppets are prepared to use force or the threat of force in an attempt to isolate and eventually to subjugate West Berlin. Finally, we must recognize that the issue of Berlin and Germany, if it cannot be resolved through negotiation, may involve the gravest of all issues: the issue of peace or war.

In the long run, the problem of Berlin and Germany can only be solved through German reunification. This the Soviets have so far rejected, fearing to put their rule in East Germany to the test of a free vote. But we cannot abandon our goal or abate our efforts toward its achievement, because we know that a divided Germany will remain a powder keg so long as the division persists. Meanwhile, we are willing to consider interim arrangements to reduce tensions in Berlin and lessen present dangers. But we are determined to maintain our presence in Berlin and to preserve its ties with the Federal Republic. We will not accept any arrangement which might become a first step toward abandonment of West Berlin or the extinguishing of freedom in that part of Germany which is a free, peaceful, and democratic member of the world community.

It would be highly optimistic to pretend that prospects of an early agreement are bright. Mr. Khrushchev has had a great deal to say recently which bears upon Berlin and Germany, and his words leave the inescapable impression that the Soviet view of Berlin is far removed from the facts. Let us examine some of his comments:

He begins with the assertion that West Berlin lies on the territory of the so-called German Democratic Republic. This is not only false, it is contrary to the pledged word of the Soviet Government. While it is true enough that the Soviet-occupied portion of Germany surrounds Berlin, it is equally true that Berlin was given separate status under the occupation agreement—which the Soviets themselves formulated, together with the British and ourselves. Moreover, the so-called German Democratic Republic is one of the outstanding myths in a vast Communist web of prodigious mythology. Its puppet rulers are totally under the control of

Moscow. Despite tireless efforts to build a local Communist apparatus in East Germany, it is doubtful that these rulers could remain in power for a single day without the support of Soviet bayonets. The East German regime is not recognized as a government by any non-Communist nation. Both legally and as a matter of geographic fact, West Berlin is entirely independent of the so-called German Democratic Republic—and it will remain so.

Mr. Khrushchev continues to insist that Western forces leave West Berlin and that it be declared a "free city." He ignores the fact that West Berlin is already a free city—the lone island of freedom within the sprawling Communist empire. When he speaks of making West Berlin a "free city," his meaning is only too clear: he desires West Berlin to be free from protection, free from security, free from its commercial and cultural ties with West Germany—and cut off from freedom itself.

Mr. Khrushchev has also complained that the situation in Berlin is abnormal. With this contention, we can wholeheartedly agree. It is indeed abnormal when one million East Berliners are forcibly divided from more than two million fellow citizens in West Berlin—when they are constrained to live under a totalitarian regime unlawfully imposed by a foreign power—and when even family units are divided by an arbitrary boundary imposed in the name of a foreign ideology.

But the abnormal situation in Berlin is merely one facet of the greater abnormality created by the artificial separation of the east zone from the remainder of Germany. The monstrous nature of this abnormality has been strikingly demonstrated by the fact that more than two and a third million East Germans and East Berliners have, during the last 10 years, exercised the only franchise available to them and have voted with their feet against Communist rule by fleeing to West Berlin and the Federal Republic.

The abnormality of which Mr. Khrushchev speaks can be cured only by permitting the whole German Nation to decide its own way of life. The only practical way in which they can exercise this right is through free elections. Mr. Khrushchev and other Soviet spokesmen have often proclaimed their devotion to the principle of self-determination. This pretense is exposed as an empty gesture when they refused to apply the principle of self-determination to Berlin and Germany.

Mrs. Khrushchev has also argued that we must move rapidly to liquidate the leftovers of the Second World War—among which he includes what he describes as the occupation of West Berlin by American, British, and French forces. We are even more anxious than Mr. Khrushchev to liquidate the leftovers of World War II, but Mr. Khrushchev must recognize that these leftovers are rather numerous:

Is the Soviet Union prepared to remove its forces from East Germany and the eastern European countries on which they are imposed? Is it willing to grant self-determination to the East Germans and to permit the peoples of the Soviet-dominated states in Eastern Europe to choose their own destiny? Is it willing to withdraw support from the Communist regime in North Korea and to permit the whole Korean people to reunite under free elections supervised by the United Nations? Is it at last willing to cease obstructing the operation of the United Nations Charter—to which the Soviet Union pledged itself in San Francisco—and whose application it has consistently frustrated by a series of vetoes in the Security Council?

The United States and its Western Allies would be happy indeed to see these leftovers of World War II liquidated. But we are not prepared to begin this process by permitting the isolation and engulfment of West Berlin.

We have repeatedly informed Mr. Khrushchev that we will not negotiate under duress. Yet in his recent statements about his intentions to sign a separate peace treaty with the so-called German Democratic Republic unless an East-West agreement is reached on Berlin, he is skating on very thin ice. We are approaching the summit with every intention of seeking a mutually acceptable solution of the German problem, including Berlin, of seeking just settlements of other international differences, and of exploring ways to improve relations between the Western World and the Soviet bloc.

CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL URGES FATE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS BE DISCUSSED AT SUMMIT MEETING

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last week representatives of the Czechoslovak National Council of America presented me an important memorandum concerning the forthcoming summit conference. They also conferred with officials at the State Department about the part our Government should play at this vital meeting.

It is important for the United States to grasp every opportunity to discuss the fate of the captive nations and to press for the holding of free and honest elections behind the Iron Curtain. We cannot, and must not, accept the present state of affairs, when so many noble peoples are being subjugated by Communist tyranny. I am hopeful this whole subject will be explored at the summit conference.

Because it contains a message of vital importance to all concerned with our friends behind the Iron Curtain, I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM OF THE CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICA CONCERNING THE SUMMIT MEETING

On the eve of the summit meeting, scheduled for May 16, 1960, we wish to declare that countless Americans of Czechoslovak descent shall give again—as they have always done in the past—their wholehearted support to any U.S. policy designed to restore freedom and justice to the people now living under Communist rule.

We recall with satisfaction many earlier efforts of our Government and are hopefully confident that a persistently vigorous policy along the same lines might ultimately yield the desired results.

The U.S. policy, as we see it, is based on the following assumptions:

(1) There is no freedom in the captive nations and the division of Europe (not only of Germany) is unnatural.

Captive Nations Week resolution of July 1959: "* * * the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism * * *."

The Bermuda Declaration of December 8, 1953: "We cannot accept as justified or permanent the present division of Europe."

(2) The interest of peace and justice requires a discussion of the captive nations with the U.S.S.R.

President Eisenhower replying to Premier Khrushchev in 1958: "Surely the Hungarian developments and the virtually unanimous action of the United Nations General Assembly in relation thereto show that conditions in Eastern Europe are regarded throughout the world as much more than a matter purely of domestic scope. I propose that we should now discuss this matter. There is an intrinsic need of this, in the interest of peace and justice, which seems to me compelling."

(3) The U.S. Government has a moral duty and right to concern itself with the problems of the captive nations.

This right is based, among other things, on the following documents:

The Atlantic Charter, endorsed by the Soviet Union on January 1, 1942, containing the principle that the signatory powers shall "respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

The Teheran Conference of December 1, 1943, stating that the "three governments will jointly assist the people in any European liberated state * * * (c) to form interim governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people; and (d) to facilitate where necessary the holding of such elections."

The treaties of peace concluded with Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania on February 10, 1947:

"Hungary (Bulgaria, Rumania) shall take all measures necessary to secure to all persons under Hungarian (Bulgarian, Rumanian) jurisdiction, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, the enjoyment of human rights and of the fundamental freedoms, including freedom of expression, of press and publication, of religious worship, of political opinion, and of public meeting."

(4) The U.S. Government wishes to see free elections to be held in the now captive nations.

This desire is based not only on the principles of our democratic traditions, but also on the spirit of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted December 10, 1948:

"The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government. This will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held in secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures."

(5) Unless such elections are held and liberty and independence restored, the people of the United States are not prepared to accept the present status quo of the captive nations as just and permanent.

Captive Nations Week resolution: "It is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence."

The Potomac declaration of June 29, 1954: "We will not be party to any agreement or treaty which would confirm or prolong the subordination of the formerly sovereign states of central and eastern Europe, now held in bondage by the U.S.S.R."

The logical sequence of the previous assumptions is found in the three following points, which thousands of American citizens of Czechoslovak descent wish to be our policy at the forthcoming summit meeting:

(1) That the U.S. Government insist on a discussion of the fate of the captive nations.

(2) That the U.S. Government refuse to recognize the present status quo in central and eastern Europe as just and permanent.

(3) That the U.S. Government demand that free elections under international control be held throughout the captive nations.

JAMES HOVORKA,
President, Czechoslovakia National Council of America.

ANDREW JICISSEL,
ANDREW VALUSEK,
Vice President.
EMILIE WELCL,
Executive Secretary.
D. VISNOVY,
REV. JOSEPH F. SEFL,
MARIA VACLAVELX
FRANCIS SCHWARZENBERG,
Chairman, Political Committee.

CHICAGO, *May 1960.*

PROFESSOR WESTIN SUPPORTS EAVESDROPPING LEGISLATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, yesterday's New York Times contains a very important letter to the editor from Prof. Alan F. Westin, of Columbia University. Professor Westin has served as a consultant to the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, on the subject of wiretapping and eavesdropping, and has given a great deal of study to this whole problem.

The point of Professor Westin's letter is that a comprehensive eavesdropping statute, such as the one I have introduced—S. 1292—would be very helpful in combating unauthorized private eavesdropping. This is an aspect of the subject which frequently is overlooked by those who have an adverse, emotional reaction to all legislation in this field. The truth is that under present law the private citizen has practically no protection against electronic snooping, while, at the same time, law-enforcement agencies are completely stymied in legitimate efforts to obtain evidence of crime plotted by telephone.

Professor Westin, in his other writings, has made the point that it is not outside "traditional justice" to permit wiretapping and other forms of eavesdropping under the safeguards of a court order. My comprehensive bill—S. 1292—based on the law in New York, would impose this requirement on all law-enforcement officers, and at the same time would add important protection against unauthorized invasions of privacy under any other circumstances. The provisions of the more limited bill which Representative CELLER and I have introduced in the House and in the Senate—S. 3340—are likewise designed to permit State wiretapping only under the same limitations.

Professor Westin's letter indicates that this is a reasonable approach to the problem, and is enforcible. I commend his letter to the attention of all Members of the Senate who are interested in this important subject; and I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROSECUTING WIRETAPPING—RECORD OF INDICTMENTS UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE NOTED

(The writer of the following letter, associate professor of public law at Columbia University, has published a number of articles on the subject of wiretapping.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In the current discussion of wiretapping practices and prospective legislation, there is one matter on which virtually all commentators, including several Federal judges and legislators, have made unintentionally misleading statements. This relates to the record of prosecutions under section 605 of the Federal Communications Act of 1934, the existing national wiretap statute.

Most remarks on the application of this statute have asserted that only one or two prosecutions have been brought under the statute in recent years.

Actually, a survey made by this writer shows that since 1953 at least 10 persons have been indicted in 7 separate cases in 6 different Federal districts stretching from New York to Oregon.

In six of the seven cases the defendants pleaded guilty or were convicted after trial; a private detective in Albuquerque, N. Mex., who tapped telephones in two family investigations; a private detective in New York City who tapped in a divorce case; a gambler and his employee who used telephone taps and room recordings in the course of an intragang dispute also involving city officials in Portland, Oreg.; a San Antonio, Tex., investigator who wiretapped in a divorce case; a private detective who tapped the telephone of the mayor of New Orleans, La., during a political campaign; and an attorney and detective agency owner in Cincinnati, Ohio, who tapped in several family investigations.

RANGE OF SENTENCES

Sentences in these cases range from a $500 fine to 2 years in prison. In only one case, that of Teamsters officials James Hoffa and Owen Brennan, and wiretap specialist Bernard Spindel, were the defendants acquitted.

It is possible that other prosecutions have taken place since 1953 which this survey did not uncover. However, the important fact is that after a hiatus of 14 years during which not a single private wiretapper was indicted by Federal attorneys, the shift in public opinion against free enterprise wiretapping has resulted in a widely distributed set of successful prosecutions, under even as leaky a statute as section 605.

This indicates that much more wiretapping can be discovered and prosecuted successfully than some commentators have assumed.

If a carefully drafted and comprehensive Federal antieavesdropping law, such as the Keating-Celler bill, were enacted by Congress, much more private eavesdropping could be reached.

Equally important, with a clear law stating when Federal officials can and cannot tap, and under what minimum safeguards State wiretapping may be authorized, U.S. attorneys may begin to move against officials who eavesdrop illegally. Until such a new Federal law is passed, the record of prosecutions of official wiretap violators will remain what it has been since 1934—zero.

ALAN F. WESTIN.

NEW YORK, *May 4, 1960.*

ON TO THE SUMMIT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, of course the summit conference should go on and President Eisenhower should attend it. I have no doubt that he will—and I, for one, expect something from it.

Mr. President, I went to a baseball game a few nights ago and, unless I am badly mistaken, the coaches on both sides were trying to steal the other's signals. And I found myself trying to figure out when the coach on the third base line tugged his cap and passed his arms over his chest just what he was trying to tell the batter—whether a fast ball was coming or a curve, and whether he should take it or not. That happens every day, and probably in every league.

But the knowledge that the coach and the players may be trying to get a line on what the other team has and whether its pitcher is throwing a fast ball or a floater does not prevent the managers from getting together for an understanding to prevent a competitive game from turning into a knockdown and drag-out fight.

The United States of America, Mr. President, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics represent competitive economic and social systems. Neither of them is going to abandon its system in our generation. But it is infinitely to the self-interest of the people of both nations, as well as to the other peoples of the world, that the heads of these nations get together and, with the heads of state of the other nuclear powers, work out an understanding that will relieve the tensions which exist today.

They may or may not, at this first summit meeting, define a rule for every circumstance or dispose of every troublesome question. As the President of France, General de Gaulle, so wisely said in his speech at the joint meeting of Congress:

> All things have to have a beginning • • • only a detente is now possible and necessary. In the peaceable climate which could be created, objective solutions would little by little come into view.

So, Mr. President, now that the whole world knows we as well as the Russians have been trying to find out a little bit about how the ground lies and perhaps to learn something of the pitching ability of a rival, let the President proceed to a meeting with the heads of state from these other great powers with confidence, and with the clear backing and support of the people of the United States. Our hopes and our prayers will go with him, and all mankind will applaud whatever improvement of the international climate may follow.

Let us remember that it is as much to the interest of the Soviet Union that there should come a relaxation of tension and a lifting of the burden of an arms race as to any other country. The self-interest if not the altruism of every nation represented should contribute to a good result.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Apropos of this discussion, I simply wanted to add one statement because the summit conference has been mentioned.

Our international intercourse is marked by constant conferences. When we think about missile gaps and deterrent gaps, I also think of an intelligence gap. I do not want to see an intelligence gap occur in our operations at any time. So who shall say when these things happen that they must necessarily be related to some kind of conference, because nothing more

untoward could happen than to have a gap in our intelligence operations, wherever they may be carried on.

ATTACK AIRCRAFT CARRIER FUNDS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes to speak on the subject of the other gap of our defense, the attack carrier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the House has seen fit in its military appropriations bill to delete funds that had been requested for construction of a new attack aircraft carrier badly needed by the Navy.

The modern attack carrier is the very life's blood of American naval striking power, now and indefinitely. Manned combat aircraft in naval warfare cannot be replaced by inflexible ballistic missile systems.

The modern carrier provides a mobile base to take jet planes to the scene of crisis or conflict, concentrate this force where it is needed, keep it there as long as the need exists, and then move it to another location.

The modern carrier is the least vulnerable of any base for airpower, particularly in terms of surprise ballistic missile attack. Its very mobility provides effectively for its safety.

The carrier is essential to our balanced antisubmarine warfare effort. Carrier airpower provides the primary means of destroying sea-based enemy submarine support vessels.

The carrier is the most effective instrument of naval striking power. Each carrier can deliver from 40 to 60 nuclear weapons on target. A carrier can fight in any type of war, but is exceptionally important for limited objective wars. This is vital as the probability of all-out war diminishes.

A point of added importance that may be overlooked in this connection is that the aircraft carrier constitutes sovereign United States territory, which can be established off the shores of any country without treaties, commitments, or monetary grants.

Overall, the modern attack aircraft carrier represents a capital investment in security that pays dividends for well in excess of 20 years, a feature unique in this respect among U.S. weapons systems.

Now, Mr. President, the Navy has an inventory of 14 attack aircraft carriers, including 4 of the modern *Forrestal* class, 3 of the modernized *Midway* class, and 7 of the World War II *Essex* class. Under construction are two more carriers of the *Forrestal* class and one nuclear powered carrier. In 1962, the Navy's operating carrier inventory will include six *Forrestals*, one nuclear, three *Midways*, and four *Essex* class ships.

The Navy's prime need now is to start one additional *Forrestal* class carrier, with operating facilities for 90 modern jets and improved landing safety features, to replace one of the *Essex* carriers in 1962. As new attack carriers join the fleet, they replace carriers that are then designated for antisubmarine warfare. Thus, both the attack carrier strength and the strength of the antisub carrier fleet are kept at requisite levels through a single carrier building program.

As to the powerplant of the proposed new carrier, the Navy advises me that nuclear propulsion is far down the list in relative importance among other features. The carrier deck and modern aviation facilities are of primary concern. If the proposed new carrier is conventionally powered, an estimated $130 million will be saved for use in other programs.

Some misunderstanding may have arisen, Mr. President, over the language contained in the House committee report as to the need for an additional carrier at this time. The report said, on page 56:

> The committee action on the request for an additional attack carrier is directly related to the number of carriers which are necessary to meet the operational requirements of the Navy and whether or not the carrier force in being, plus the three now under construction, are adequate for the present time.

Taking into account the leadtime involved in the construction of a ship of this size and complexity, we must appropriate for the foreseeable future, not merely for the present time. Four full years are required to construct a new carrier. If a new one is not authorized this year, there will be a gap of more than 3 years after the commissioning of the nuclear-powered *Enterprise* before the next modern replacement carrier could join the fleet.

By that time, the four remaining World War II ships still forced to operate as attack carriers will be on the brink of unserviceability for the operation of modern aircraft. This would constitute a serious deficiency in the Navy's readiness for either limited or nuclear warfare.

In considering the carrier fleet's readiness for action at any given time, a clear understanding also must be grasped of the magnitude of necessary maintenance and upkeep of these enormously complex mobile air bases and their complement of planes.

At any given point of time, two of our carriers will be laid up for overhaul, repair, and refitting. This means that the remaining 12 attack carriers must be deployed throughout our fighting fleets in areas of assignment best calculated to maintain for the United States her traditional position of supremacy on the seas.

I heartily approve the action of the House in providing additional funds for the expansion of the Navy's antisubmarine warfare capabilities and for the construction of additional Polaris firing submarines.

In addition to these items, I hope, for the reasons I have stated to see the Senate restore the funds requested in the President's budget for the construction of another vitally needed attack carrier.

BANK MERGER LEGISLATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement in which I commend, during my unavoidable absence from the Senate last Friday, the work of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and other members of the Committee on Banking and Currency in calling up and securing concurrence in the action of the House of Representatives on the bank merger bill, which had been pending before the Senate on and off for the last 5 years.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

Last Friday the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] was kind enough to bring up for me S. 1062, the bank merger bill, and the Senate accepted the House amendments and sent the bill on to the President for his signature.

I appreciate the kindness of the Senator from Arkansas in doing this. I am glad that he had the opportunity to present this bill to the Senate, because it is a subject in which he has had great interest, going as far back as 1956, when he introduced S. 3911.

I should like to make it clear in the RECORD that I am in entire accord with the views expressed by the Senator from Arkansas in urging the Senate to adopt the House amendments, and I agree entirely with his statement to the Senate of the effect and meaning of the amended bill. I also want to make it clear that the answers to the questions posed by the Senators from Utah, Mr. BENNETT, and New York, Mr. JAVITS, which have been printed in the RECORD express my views in response to those questions. The Senator from Utah, Mr. BENNETT, and the Senator from New York, Mr. JAVITS, have, through these questions, made a contribution to the proper understanding of the bill, both in the Senate at the time of its passage, and in the banking agencies which will be administering the act when it becomes law.

Other members of the committee, too, especially Senator FREAR and Senator BUSH, have been most helpful in connection with this bill, and I should like to thank them also.

I appreciate particularly the kind words of the majority leader in connection with the passage of S. 1062. He did not underestimate the delays and difficulties which this legislation has met, and I am glad that he is able to take satisfaction in the final passage of the bill.

REPLY BY ABBOTT LABORATORIES TO LIFE MAGAZINE ARTICLE ON THE PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on February 15, 1960, there appeared in Life magazine a 7-page article entitled "Big Pill Bill To Swallow."

The Abbott Laboratories, a very reputable and substantial pharmaceutical producer located in North Chicago, Ill., responded with a paid editorial to the Nation's doctors on this article, and pointed out what it deemed to be errors of fact affecting both the medical profession and the pharmaceutical industry.

Inasmuch as this matter is under investigation by the Senate Subcommittee on Anti-Trust and Monopoly, I believe

this article merits inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and, therefore, I request consent that it be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG PILL BILL TO SWALLOW

On February 15, Life magazine carried a seven-page editorial feature on the ethical pharmaceutical industry. Implicit in this article were errors of fact, affecting both the medical profession and the pharmaceutical industry.

In the March 7 issue, Life carried this correction in the "Letters to the Editor" column:

"Life misfilled its pill bottle. Our reporter was told there were only 10 pills in each $3 Temaril bottle. The correct figure is 20".—Ed.

Unfortunately, Life misfilled more than its pill bottle. The first sentence of the February 15 article told of 4-year-old Jimmy Porter taking a "30 cent pill, a Temaril pill prescribed to relieve the itching * * * of chicken pox." Fact: This tablet (which is not made by Abbott Laboratories, incidentally) sells on prescription at an average price of 11.3 cents—not 30 cents.

Life said the tablets were given to each of the five Porter children every 3 hours. Fact: If this happened, the children were getting twice the dosage recommended by the manufacturer.

Life said the chicken pox epidemic in this family cost "more than $50 in drugs alone." Fact: To spend $50, it must be assumed that all five children took the anti-itching tablets for more than 4 days at twice the recommended dosage and at a cost of 30 cents a tablet. Typical treatment for five youngsters with this particular drug, even for a full week, would cost $15.40 in all, not $50.

Life said the Porters spent a tenth of their income on medical care last year, and that their problem, on a vast scale, is a problem of "all American families." Fact: Per capita expenditures for drugs in 1959 came to about $18, and about $94 for all medical care. The average prescription price last year was only $3.08. We do not know whether the Porters had more, or less, illness than usual.

What is important—to all Americans—is how many illnesses and hospital stays were shortened or prevented by doctors and drugs, how much pain was alleviated, how many lives were saved. Can present drug expense of $18 per person be too heavy in a nation that spends $52 per person (over 14 years of age) on tobacco and $87 per person (over 21 years of age) on alcoholic beverages?

Life implied that drug prices are too high because of the "advantage of selling to captive consumers." Fact: The physician, who is ethically bound to prescribe in the best interests of his patient, is the only man professionally capable of diagnosis and treatment. If the patient has a real financial problem, the physician, as part of his obligation, may provide drug samples he may have on hand or, in extreme cases, he will contact social or government agencies.

Life said that "in a single day a doctor may collect $40 worth of free drug samples." Fact: This figure might be true—if the doctor opened all of his mail, and interviewed all detail men, on just one day of the week. Samples inform the doctor about new drugs or remind him of old ones. Life did not mention what eventually happens to samples. Physicians treat patients with them—the indigent, the aged, the unfortunate, those in charitable institutions.

Life compared the costs of drug promotion (14 percent) to the "less than 3 percent" spent on new car promotion by manufacturers. Fact: Ethical drug advertising in medical journals and direct mail varies from year to year between 3.9 and 4.7 percent. And this, of course, is carried on entirely by the manufacturer. New car advertising is sponsored by manufacturer and dealer, so there is no comparison here at all.

Life said "the average doctor is deluged with sales talk, either through direct mail or visits from drug firm representatives known as detail men." Fact: It is true that the doctor receives, and reads, a lot of direct mail, and many medical journals. He also sees, and listens to, many detail men. This is one way he can keep up with the rapidly changing pace of medical progress—one form of education which enables him to give his patients the best possible medical attention. Medical advertising already is, and must continue to be, the best-policed of all advertising. It deals with human lives.

Life quoted a pharmacologist to the effect that new products are introduced "because they are profitable, not because they have a medical advantage over the products of preceding years." Fact: Pharmaceutical houses routinely produce drugs which have a limited market—and at little or no profit. The criterion is simply whether the drug is needed to prevent or cure disease. Products which do not deliver real benefits to doctor and patient alike soon pass out of the medical market. Good products survive.

Life quoted another pharmacologist to the effect that "extraordinarily few important new drugs have been originated by American drug houses." Fact: In the last decade alone, American pharmaceutical houses have developed 392 new medicinal chemicals, including tranquilizers, steroids, antibiotics, diuretics, antihypertensives, etc. Useful drugs discovered elsewhere have been developed to clinical usefulness within the industry. Penicillin is a classic example. So was insulin. So are some of the new tranquilizers. Without tremendous research and production efforts by the industry, many modern drugs would still be just medical curiosities.

Life showed a pie chart allocating the consumer's drugs dollar, with company profit taking 15 percent of this dollar. Fact: This is reasonably accurate—but only when you consider just a few products. Further, Life neglects to mention that half of this profit goes into taxes. On these products the purchaser pays about 7 cents toward profit. On others he pays much less. These are the pennies which provide the incentive for developing effective drugs—drugs which ease pain, prevent or cure illness, prolong life.

Life said "a good part of the blame for the high price of prescriptions must be borne by the physician," and that "better informed consumers" should "pressure the doctors into using finer discrimination." Fact: Such assertions belittle the scientific knowledge and judgment of every doctor. He is indicted for prescribing medications only he is competent to judge as best for each patient. The pressure Life suggests would bring chaos to medical practice.

Life stated there is no real difference between brand name drugs and equivalent generic name drugs. Fact: Many unbranded drugs have been proven inferior, as a scrutiny of Food and Drug Administration citation would show. A physician typically prefers not to take a chance on unbranded drugs, especially with those turned out by firms operating within a State and therefore not subject to Federal food and drug laws. With most things we buy, we rely on the quality and integrity of brand names. In the case of drugs, this is even more important than with other consumer items, since the health, and even the life, of a patient may be at stake. The brand name is the physician's assurance that the drug he prescribes is the exact drug the patient receives.

Abbott Laboratories believes the American people want to retain and improve our present system of medical care. We believe they want to keep the same kind of doctor-patient relationship, with its freedom of choice, which has done so much to take us to our present astonishing levels of national health. Progress depends upon further effort and teamwork among all the health professions. This must continue. To this all of us are dedicated by tradition, purpose, and training. For the greatest medical challenges—and the greatest triumphs—still belong to the future.

This is our report. It is not our intention to vilify Life. We accept that it has the right to a viewpoint. Our concern is that the conditions it reported, and the interpretation put to them, are not consistent with the facts.

THE WHEAT AND RICE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND INDIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last week at the White House the President of the United States and the Government of India's Minister of Food and Agriculture, the Honorable S. K. Patil, signed an agreement, under the Public Law 480 program, which will provide India with almost 600 million bushels of wheat and 22 million bags of rice during the next 4 years.

This is a truly historical occasion. History is being made, not because of the gigantic size of this program, but also because of its aims. In simplest terms, the conclusion of this agreement means that the United States is using its agricultural abundance on a forward basis to buttress the determined efforts of the Indian Government as it moves ahead during the next 4 years to provide a better diet for its people from its own resources. We, as Americans, could not have shown more evidence of our sincere faith and interest in the Indian effort to be self-sustaining than by means of the action which was taken last week.

Much will be said about the value of this program to American farmers. Much will be said about its importance to the Indian economy. Certainly, these aspects are extremely important. But I should like to call the attention of the Senate to one fact—namely, that this agreement did not just happen. Somebody in the U.S. Government and somebody in the Indian Government had to work on this idea and plan for many, many weeks and months before anything was ready for signature. And judging by the size of our exports of agricultural commodities over the last few years, this process of day-in and day-out work leading to occasions such as this one has been going on for some time. Although Public Law 480 is a complicated program requiring participation by many agencies, primary responsibility is centered in the U.S. Department of Agriculture; and within the Department, it rests with the Foreign Agricultural Service. This is a relatively small agency, totaling considerably less than 1,000 persons stationed in the United States and abroad; and I have had brought to my attention, on many occasions, the efficient work that this group does in developing and carrying out the Public Law 480 program.

I know that a lot of night and weekend work went into the planning and drafting of the agreement which was signed last week. I want to thank those in the Department of Agriculture and the Foreign Agricultural Service for their efforts. They have made a notable contribution to the cause of world peace, and I know they will continue to do so.

USEFUL WORK

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of today, in the column "These Days," written by George E. Sokolsky, appears an article entitled "Useful Work." The article acclaims the wonderful work of the Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation in the field of medical journalism, as it relates to cancer and heart ailments. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 9, 1960]

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

USEFUL WORK

Rich men do not always know what to do with their money, particularly after they die. They work hard accumulating a fortune and then it often goes to encourage profligacy, waste, and appalling dissipation. The value of the foundation is that it makes it possible for a rich person to put his money to use for some purpose other than for himself or his family.

Albert Lasker was an advertising man and industrialist who served his country ably in World War I. He amassed a fortune and desired to leave it for useful purposes. Mary Lasker, his widow, is a person of unusual perspicacity and social consciousness who devotes herself to good works in a very sensible manner.

Of particular value, I think, are the awards to medical journalists. This is a new and increasingly popular field of bringing news to the public.

The two big killers are heart ailments and various cancers and with regard to both nothing can be more damaging than ignorance. Physicians and surgeons do what they can, but too often they are resisted by frightened patients, by those who so fear death that they stand in the way of continuing life. The advantage of knowledge is that it can, under favorable circumstances, eliminate this element of fear.

I have had a very thorough experience with both these killers and I must say that somehow I was never terrified by them. The word, cancer, neither frightened nor distressed me and when I was permitted to return home, I knew that I should be examined twice a year for about 5 years. These examinations are now as routine as going to a dentist for a cleaning. I have to see my heart man, Dr. O. Alan Rose, on stated occasions, and a delightful technician shows up every other Tuesday morning to stick a needle into my left arm to discover by blood chemistry whether I am sinning. (I use doctors' names purposedly to break down a stupid tradition of anonymity.)

Perhaps this will go on for the rest of my life. It is a routine that interferes with nothing, that is gentle and at times even jolly, and there it is.

The value of the Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation awards to medical journalism is that it stimulates bringing everything out in the open. Alcoholics Anonymous discovered that talking about our illnesses and weaknesses is a form of therapy. And presumably that is, to a degree, true about so many of our illnesses. Perhaps that is why elderly ladies enjoy sitting on hotel verandas talking about their operations. It helps them get over their troubles.

I find when I use the word "cancer," a look comes into the listener's eye. It is as though I were a disembodied spirit, some ghostly creature returned from Sheol. But when I say that the best way to get over one's aches and pains is to have a cancer clipped out, the listener regards my levity as unseemly. The other day, I heard Arthur Godfrey talk about his cancer and I thought that he took it altogether too seriously. One need only thank God and the doctors and the needle-stickers that one is still alive and kicking and to leave it at that.

The Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation is to be congratulated for promoting medical journalism. Ignorance is not bliss; it can be a frightful pain in all the wrong places. The more we know, the less we fear—unless we enjoy fear, which some do. Who shall deprive such a one of his pleasures? Mary Lasker looks like a fearless person who has discovered all the joys of giving and who gives not only generously but with unusual wisdom.

PREVENTION OF TYRANNY BY MAJORITY

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the May issue of Nation's Business contains an excellent article entitled "Right To Speak Prevents Tyranny by Majority," written by Felix Morley. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHT TO SPEAK PREVENTS TYRANNY BY MAJORITY

(By Felix Morley)

In the year of a presidential election Congress necessarily works within the confines of a rigid timetable. Because many of its Members are politically instrumental, the legislative body must adjourn before the nominating conventions are called to order. That deadline is especially pronounced this year, with four Democratic Senators contending for first place on the ticket of their party.

Decision on this nomination will be made at Los Angeles in the week of July 11. So only a scant 2 months remain for winding up congressional business, including appropriations that demand close scrutiny yet cannot be postponed. Since the agenda is overloaded this means that a good deal of it is going to be lost in the shuffle. This, because of the nature of some of the pending measures, is certainly no unmixed evil.

Blame for the congestion is naturally being laid on the bloc of 18 southern Senators who fought a stubborn, and largely successful, battle against the civil rights legislation proposed by the administration.

This one issue consumed almost 2 months of the Senate Calendar, contrary to the desires of a majority of that body. By using every possible parliamentary device, including outright filibuster, the compact southern group was able to stand off the less concentrated will of 82 percent of the Senate Members. Not all of the civil rights proponents favored the legislation in the form presented by Illinois Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN for the administration. But except for the protection afforded to the minority by the Senate rules, some compromise bill would have gone through as expeditiously as happened under the more democratic procedure of the House.

Anticipation that the two-thirds majority necessary for cloture would be difficult to obtain seems to have been the basis of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON'S clever strategy throughout. He could exert effective leadership for moderate legislation, confined to the voting issue, primarily because moderation was as unsatisfactory to northern as to southern diehards. While southerners wanted no civil rights legislation at all, others wanted it to include penalties for continued school segregation, provision for the extension of nationalized education and even for the control of local employment policies by Washington. Early cloture would have muzzled the expression of this viewpoint and was therefore, though for opposite reasons, as distasteful to Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, as to Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia.

So the moral pointed by the protracted debate on civil rights is that few Senators, whether of right, left, or center, are willing to compromise a strongly held viewpoint in order to reach an agreement. And this obduracy, within limits, is justified by the very nature of the Senate. That body, giving equal representation to every State regardless of population area, or wealth, was specifically designed to represent the States as such. From the beginning, the Senate's function in our Federal system has been quite other than that of the more democratic House, planned to reflect the majority opinion of the Republic as a whole. It is too often forgotten that this fundamental difference in the representative character of Senate and House is an important aspect of the principle of checks and balances.

The debate over civil rights, so quickly terminated in the House, so long dragged out in the Senate, should consequently be regarded as an outstanding illustration of the ingenuity of our form of government. To appreciate this lesson at full value, it must not be obscured by personal feelings on the nature of the issues immediately involved. Indeed the emotions aroused, in both North and South, should rather serve to emphasize the importance of a parliamentary system that gives such healthy protection to the expression of discordant viewpoints.

Seen in this light, the device of the filibuster becomes something very different from the merely obstructionist trick which many critics both foreign and domestic have painted it to be. Although sometimes grossly abused, as when the late Huey Long utilized it to recite endless recipes for "potlikker," the provision for unlimited Senate debate is in principle a guarantee that a State shall not be deprived of the right to present its local viewpoint simply because this may not accord with the opinion of the Nation as a whole. The fifth amendment, as a vital safeguard for the individual, is not likely to be abolished because it has often been twisted to protect unsavory persons. Similarly, the practice of unlimited Senate debate may be expected to continue even though it occasionally produces arguments that are anathema to many.

The very bitterness of the civil rights controversy, moreover, should serve to focus attention on the underlying problem of government for any people who value freedom. How can the protection of minorities, which may on occasion be right, be reconciled with the acceptance of a majority opinion, which sometimes may certainly be wrong? In a true democracy—which our Government is not—minorities have no effective protection against the will or passion of the majority. But in a federal republic, as established by our Constitution, the potential tyranny of the majority is severely circumscribed. One of the safeguards is certainly the Senate's stubborn adherence to its time-honored practice of unlimited debate.

Because the filibuster has been most often employed by southern Senators, many regard

it as an undue protection for a particular regional viewpoint.

The explanation is that the former slave States have for a century been on the defensive in their social attitudes, and therefore prone to take advantage of every parliamentary device that serves their cause. That is to be expected. Were a liberal northern Democrat elected President, with a Congress highly responsive to pressure from organized labor, one might anticipate a filibuster by conservative Republicans, perhaps to prevent complete repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. Indeed, many actual instances could be drawn from our history to show that the filibuster is in nature wholly nonpartisan. It may best be defined as a tactic to check a legislative steamroller, regardless of the direction in which it is moving. Because of its applicability to any situation, the demise of King Filibuster, to use the bygone phrase, seems most unlikely.

Of course, those who do not believe that the minority has rights will always be hostile to the practice of unlimited debate. During the recent debate in the Senate the Communist radio worked overtime to prove this point. Peiping's criticisms were particularly unbridled, defining the filibuster as "a traditional dirty trick of American politicians—one of the typical farces of bourgeois democracy."

Certainly the filibuster is not democratic under the Communist definition of this nebulous word. And if by democratic we mean a system in which the minority has no established rights, then the filibuster is not democratic in any sense. But most of us will feel that condemnation by the People's Democracy of Communist China is an argument for the practice.

For 171 years Americans have maintained a governmental system under which free men have prospered as nowhere else in either place or time. The assurance of unlimited Senate debate has throughout been an integral part of that system. When the Communist dictatorships have accomplished as much, then but not before, it will be reasonable for them to attack the filibuster.

All our privileges demand discretion in their use. This applies to freedom of speech as a principle, and to its particular application in the form of unlimited Senate debate. Between affirmation and denial of free expression, however, the choice is clear. Mistakes may result from discussion at the expense of action. But the irreparable blunders come from acting without adequate consideration in advance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN NAVAL VESSELS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10474) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels.

EX-PRESIDENT SYNGMAN RHEE, OF KOREA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Evening Star of Friday, April 29, written by William S. White, entitled "Some Thoughts on Behalf of Rhee."

Mr. President, I commend this editorial to the attention of Senators, because I cannot help thinking that it points out with great clarity and persuasion the double standard we have developed in this country, unfortunately, in our estimation of dictators.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Friday, Apr. 29, 1960]

SOME THOUGHTS ON BEHALF OF RHEE—PAST HEROISM OF KOREAN AGAINST REDS PROMPTS A RESERVATION ON HIS DEMISE

(By William S. White)

The old man of Korea has gone out of office in heartbroken disgrace. The world's most exclusive club is shrunken yet a little more as Syngman Rhee passes from its membership. This is the Association of Indestructible Elder Statesmen.

Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of Germany, who is 84, leads the surviving band of those who, past 70, still carry crushing responsibilities. With him are Prime Minister Ben-Gurion of Israel (74) and Prime Minister Nehru of India (70 plus some months).

At 85, Mr. Rhee has ceased to be President of the Republic of Korea. And so has come to its close a career of 65 years as a public man.

Much has been written that this aged symbol of Korea's long struggle for independence had overstayed his time. It is said, no doubt rightly, that he permitted police brutality, and worse, to stain his regime. It is said, no doubt justly, that a farce of "democracy" was being made in his country. So it is said that he had to go, and the United States was wholly justified in helping to push him out.

There is no quarrel with this reasoning—so far as it goes. To the world Korea is our creation and thus our responsibility. For Korea's sake (and for the sake of collective security everywhere) was shed the blood of so many of our people in a bitter war a decade ago.

Perhaps it is possible, however, without defending corruption and antidemocratism, to raise reservations about this episode. Is the U.S. Government as ready to act to maintain the future integrity of Korea from Communist penetration as it was ready to oust bad old Mr. Rhee?

Is our righteous decision to overturn one regime—which was at any rate a determined regime—matched by equal determination to insist on a fair and strong successor regime? And having acted against Rhee on standards that are valid enough—that he had become a rightwing despot—are we ready for one other action?

Are we ready to apply these same standards to the leftwing despot in another country in which there is an undeniably close and historic U.S. responsibility? Will we now help to oust the Communist-backed dictator in Cuba, Fidel Castro, as we helped to oust the supposedly pro-Fascist dictator in Korea, Syngman Rhee?

Or is there a double standard here? The Eisenhower administration has no difficulty in justifying a naked intervention in Korea, call it what we will. But that administration finds enormous difficulty in even thinking about intervening in any way, naked or polite, in Cuba. After all, other Latin American nations might not like it. And the Organization of American States would "forbid" it anyhow.

A nation which wants to act can find the fine print oddly hard to read. A nation which does not want to act can find the print compelling, indeed.

So this one columnist is not quite able to join the almost universal and unqualified satisfaction that we have succeeded in casting out old Syngman Rhee in his 86th year and sending him off to end his life in the House of the Pear Blossoms in Seoul. It has been a famous victory. But one columnist, not denying the evils connected with the old man, also does not forget the past heroism of that old man against imperialist communism.

This much, anyhow, history must grant him. How much does history owe to Castro whose victims in Cuba are quite as dead as Rhee's victims in Korea? How much of the free world's struggle against imperialist communism has Fidel Castro ever borne?

MODERNIZATION OF THE EXISTING SUGAR ACT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am introducing at this time for appropriate reference a bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948. The proposal incorporates some reforms in the current sugar legislation which are long overdue, and which are particularly urgently required in the light of present day conditions.

The proposed legislation would insure adequate supplies of sugar by broadening the base from which these supplies are obtained and encourage foreign countries to make purchases in the United States by adopting a new formula for allocating sugar quotas which takes into account their foreign trade relationships with the United States. It is a 4-year proposal.

For many years, our sugar legislation has given a virtual monopoly of the foreign share of the U.S. sugar market to one country. This, in itself, represents a basic weakness in the present sugar law since it is conducive to monopolistic manipulation of prices and to predatory competition on the world market.

A wholly disproportionate share of the U.S. quota in the hands of a single country, and I refer of course to Cuba, has enabled that country to use the premium paid by U.S. consumers to subsidize sales to Russia and to Red China and other Iron Curtain countries at prices beneath the world market price; in fact, at prices beneath the cost of production in Cuba.

In my opinion, the Congress simply must face up to the fact that the time has come to reduce the Cuban monopoly of our foreign sugar supply. I believe I have been rather candid in my criticism of the present regime in Cuba. What I say with respect to proposed changes in the Sugar Act, however, would be true regardless of who happened to be in power there. This particular statement is not intended at this time in criticism of the present Government of Cuba.

The proposed legislation would effectuate certain much needed reforms. It is not politically motivated and it is not a measure against Cuba, as I said, although I am in my mind not certain that some measures should not be taken to protect the interests of the U.S. investors in the Republic of Cuba.

The New York Times of March 5, 1960, reported a speech by Maj. Ernesto Guevara, president of the National Bank of Cuba, made at Havana University, in which Major Guevara stated that the premium paid by the United States for

Cuban sugar amounted to "economic enslavement." According to the New York Times:

> Major Guevara charged that the United States "gave us an apparent gift" of a higher price, but demanded in exchange "preferred tariffs for their manufactured products, making it impossible for native products or the manufacturers of other countries to compete."

This statement was made in face of the fact that in addition to the premium price which Cuba receives for sugar, of 5½ cents a pound, when the world price is nearly 3 cents a pound, Cuba enjoys a 20 percent tariff preference on sugar imports to the United States.

The United Press International reported from Havana on March 20, 1960, that the same Major Guevara had stated:

> The great friend of Cuba is the U.S.S.R.

I could multiply many times the hostile and inflammatory statements against the United States made by leaders of the present Cuban regime. This is not my purpose, however. The bill which I have introduced is in no sense a reprisal against Cuba. It is a very conservative bill. It is an attempt to correct certain basic deficiencies in existing law in a way which will make the law work better while at the same time recognizing the equities of our own domestic industry and of friendly foreign nations.

In brief, the proposal would make the following changes in the existing sugar law.

It would restrict Cuba's quota to the basic quota established for Cuba under the 1956 act. The incremental quotas accruing to Cuba by virtue of the growth of the U.S. market since 1956, some 310,695 tons, would be distributed among domestic U.S. suppliers and friendly foreign suppliers.

Of this amount my bill would distribute 200,000 tons to the domestic producing areas, of which 150,000 tons would go to the beet-producing areas and 50,000 tons to the mainland cane-producing areas. This is the same allocation to the domestic areas as made in the bills introduced by my distinguished colleagues, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The remaining 110,695 tons would be distributed among other foreign suppliers including new countries seeking to enter the U.S. market for the first time, on the basis of an index which takes into account their average annual purchases from the United States as well as their existing statutory quotas, if any, in the U.S. market. I think it is extremely important to establish in the Sugar Act a trade principle as a basis for administering the distribution of foreign sugar quotas. I certainly believe in a policy of buying from the people who buy from us insofar as it is economically feasible to do so.

At the same time this criterion, as employed in the bill is tempered by taking into account to an equal degree the existing statutory quotas enjoyed by foreign sugar suppliers, so that adjustments are not made entirely on the basis of trade; although I would like to point out that it is my hope that eventually we can arrive at a formula by which the sugar quotas granted to foreign suppliers will be based entirely on the basis of the relationship which the amount of purchases which each country seeking a sugar quota has made in the United States bears to all the purchases made by countries seeking sugar quotas.

The underlying formula of the proposed legislation represents a weighted average of the statutory sugar quotas and trade with the United States as a reasonable and rational means of distributing quotas among friendly foreign nations.

It should be noted that after this distribution is made Cuba is still left with the lion's share of foreign participation in the U.S. market. It would still enjoy a quota of more than 2,800,000 tons which is almost three times the quota of the next largest foreign sugar supplier, the Republic of the Philippines, and almost five times the quotas of all of the full-duty countries combined.

When it is realized that a quota of 2,800,000 tons represents a premium to Cuba over average world market prices in the amount of approximately $140 million per annum, it is clear that the proposed legislation is not a reprisal against Cuba. The second basic change which would be made by the proposed bill would be to remove from Cuba its present share in the future growth of the U.S. market.

The Cuban share of the growth in the U.S. sugar market presently amounts to approximately 30 percent. The bill would distribute one-third of that growth to new areas in the continental United States for the production of domestic sugar beet or mainland cane.

There are many areas in the United States in such States as Washington and Idaho, and other Western States which are ideally situated for the growing of sugar beets and there is no reason why these areas should be foreclosed from our demestic markets. At the same time in the State of Louisiana and my own State of Florida there are persons who are ready, willing, and able to produce additional mainland cane if afforded the opportunity. The bill would afford that opportunity.

The proposed legislation would set aside 10 percent of Cuba's present share of the U.S. market growth for distribution among the producers of sugar in the various States throughout the Union.

On the basis of the annual growth experience over the past several years this would provide quotas of 15,000 tons per annum for distribution by the Secretary of Agriculture to new and additional acreage in the manner I have just indicated.

Such new areas would be given quotas equivalent to 60,000 tons in the fourth year of operation of this legislation. Cumulatively over the entire operation of the bill, it would enable such areas to sell in the U.S. market a total of 150,000 tons. I submit that this is a very significant contribution to the development of new domestic sugar industry.

The remaining portion of Cuba's share of the growth would be distributed among other foreign suppliers including not only present suppliers but also new countries seeking to enter the U.S. market for the first time. This distribution also would be made on the basis of an index derived from average annual purchases from the United States over the past 4 years and existing statutory quotas. For the first time, it would also give the Republic of the Philippines a share in the growth of the U.S. market. The new countries included for a share in U.S. market growth by virtue of this reform would include Brazil, Colombia, El Salvador, Ecuador, and Guatemala.

None of those countries has any quota in the U.S. market at present. Also, the Philippines, by virtue of the growth factor, would be given an additional quota.

The third basic change would be to give the President power to further reduce the quota of Cuba in any calendar year when he finds and proclaims that such action is necessary in the public interest or to insure an adequate supply of sugar. Any reduction so made would be effective only for the calendar year in which the President made such a finding, and would not change permanent quotas. The replacement purchases would be distributed 65 percent to domestic sugar-producing areas and 35 percent to foreign sugar-producing areas.

The fourth major change is a reform of the deficit allocation provisions.

The bill allots to the domestic beet sugar areas and the mainland cane sugar areas any deficits derived from Hawaii. This is the same as provided in the proposals introduced by Senators BENNETT and ELLENDER.

It allots to all foreign suppliers except Cuba deficits derived from Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

The deficit allocations to the foreign countries again take in new suppliers and are again based on an index of the 4-year purchases of all of these suppliers from the United States and their existing quotas. Moreover, the proposal would insure that each of these new suppliers is permitted to make sugar sales in the United States of at least 5,000 tons annually.

Finally the bill would reduce the amount of direct consumption sugar which may be imported from Cuba from 375,000 tons to 75,000 tons. While this provision will have no effect upon the amount of sugar Cuba can otherwise sell in the U.S. market, it will insure that at least 300,000 tons of additional sugar imported into the United States come in in raw form and be refined in the United States by U.S. refineries.

I have heard it said that any measures which would tend to diminish the Cuban share of the market, even conservatively, might lead to a sugar shortage in the United States. Nothing could be further from the truth. The fact is that as of the beginning of this year there was in this hemisphere alone, available for export, at least 4 million tons of sugar, not

considering Cuba, and this quantity is rising rapidly.

The following is a recapitulation of the export capacity of these Western Hemisphere countries and the Philippines at the beginning of the present harvest season:

Sugar available for export, 1960

[Thousand short tons, raw value]

Country:	
Argentina	368
Brazil	1,227
Costa Rica	5
Dominican Republic	930
Guatemala	5
Haiti	58
Mexico	589
Nicaragua	5
Panama	5
Peru	638
Philippines	282
Total	4,112

These figures were compiled from the Statistical Bulletin of the International Sugar Council and the U.S. Department of Agriculture publication entitled "Foreign Crops and Markets," dated February 25, 1960.

The proposal is a relatively conservative bill. It reduces Cuba's share of the U.S. market by less than 10 percent. Yet it embraces much needed reform in existing law to cope with present-day conditions.

If the changes suggested in the proposed legislation are not adopted and the present law is extended, as has been proposed, then Cuba in a single year would benefit by additions to quotas of approximately 195,000 tons or in pecuniary terms, would be given an additional subsidy of $9,750,000 in the first year of the extension.

That, of course, is in addition to the roughly $387 million a year which Cuba gets from us by the sale of some 3,100,000 tons as her regular quota in the domestic market. Assuming a 4-year extension of the present act and a continuation of present deficits, these additions to Cuban sales would amount to approximately 1 million tons, or an additional monetary premium or subsidy in the amount of approximately $50 million.

Under existing law, unless corrective measures are taken, the Secretary of Agriculture will be forced to allot to Cuba this summer an addition to its regular quota in an amount of about 150,000 tons as a result of deficits in Puerto Rican production.

I suggest that it would be intolerable for us to continue along this path, especially in view of current circumstances in Cuba. It is a path which is not only manifestly unfair to U.S. interest, but is also unfair to other friendly foreign suppliers as well.

The measure that I have proposed would result in a more equitable division of the foreign share of our sugar supply among many friendly foreign countries and still leave Cuba with about 30 percent of the total U.S. market.

Assuming that deficits continue to run at approximately the same average annual figure as in 1959, and the growth of U.S. consumption continues to rise at an average of 150,000 tons per annum, the proposed bill would result in the following tonnages for the year 1961:

Domestic areas:	
Domestic beet	2,349,243
Mainland cane	726,940
Hawaii	999,199
Puerto Rico	987,090
Virgin Islands	16,528
New areas	15,000
Total	5,094,000
Cuba	2,808,960
Philippines	1,017,360
Total	3,826,310

With respect to Cuba and the Philippines, Cuba does not pay full duty, and the United States has a separate and special treaty with the Philippines.

Full-duty countries:	
Brazil	46,688
Colombia	25,816
Costa Rica	11,239
Dominican Republic	119,013
Ecuador	4,943
El Salvador	4,943
Guatemala	8,231
Haiti	14,707
Mexico	167,251
Nicaragua	25,578
Panama	15,084
Peru	163,211
Taiwan	17,831
Other countries	5,417
Total	629,690
Grand total	9,550,000

Brazil certainly deserves a quota. Brazil has been and continues to be our friend. Brazil never before has been privileged to sell sugar in the United States on a quota basis. She would be provided, in the proposed legislation, with a quota of 46,688 tons.

Colombia would be granted a quota for the first time.

Neither Ecuador nor El Salvador has had a quota previously. Heretofore Guatemala has not had a quota.

Haiti's quota heretofore has been below 7,000 tons.

Mexico would receive a sizable increase. Mexico carries on a large trade with the United States. She is almost our principal customer in the world. So, based on her trade with the United States, Mexico would be entitled to a sizable sugar market in the United States.

This distribution would represent significant increases for friendly foreign sugar suppliers. For example, purchases from Haiti would increase from 7,000 tons in 1960 to 14,700 tons in 1961; Peru from 95,500 tons to 163,200 tons; Mexico from 65,000 tons to 167,200 tons; Taiwan from 3,600 tons to 17,800 tons; and the Philippines from 980,000 to 1,017,400 tons.

In addition, countries not presently sharing at all in the market would be enabled to make initial sales in our market estimated as follows:

Brazil	46,700
Colombia	25,800
Ecuador	5,000
El Salvador	5,000
Guatemala	8,200

Assuming the continuation of the current rate of deficits and of growth in the U.S. market, these areas would enjoy sales in the United States, during the first year of the bill, amounting to 90,629 tons. Based on the same assumptions, their sales in the fourth year would be 116,624 tons, and cumulatively over the 4-year period would amount to 414,506 tons. I know, from my recent visit to Latin America, this assistance would be of great value to these countries, and would make many friends for the United States, in the Central American area and in the South American area.

In conclusion Mr. President, let me reemphasize what the proposed bill would accomplish.

First. It would grant the President power, if needed, to deal with special emergency situations which might be brought about as a result of the present unsettled situation in Cuba. Obviously the motivation behind that request by the President was the conditions which have developed in Cuba. The bill would give the President the right to deal with Cuba in any way he wanted, other than to increase Cuba's quota above 2,800,000 tons. But the bill would give to the President, when he thought it was in the public interest, the right to reduce Cuba's quota to any point he thought advisable, or, if necessary, even to eliminate it completely.

Second. It would extend to domestic producers of sugar more adequate relief and assistance than is provided for under existing law or in the proposals as introduced by my distinguished colleagues, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. The proposal would make provision for the addition of new domestic beet and mainland cane acreage, by allotting one-third of the present Cuban share in U.S. growth for this purpose. This would provide an additional 60,000 tons of quota for such domestic areas in the fourth year of the bills' operation; and cumulatively, over the life of the bill, 150,000 tons for such new areas of sugar production. It would also allot to domestic sugar-producing areas 65 percent of any reduction the President may find it necessary to make in the present Cuban quota. Under the Ellender and Bennett proposals, all of this reduction would go to the benefit of foreign suppliers.

Third. It would make a modest reduction in Cuba's present U.S. quota, amounting to less than 10 percent of its present sales to the United States, while preserving to Cuba approximately 30 percent of the U.S. sugar market.

I may add that this is in keeping with the general philosophy of the so-called GATT conference—the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs—to which we and most of the other countries of the world belong, whereby it was agreed, in all those conferences, that any one country can reduce by 10 percent the permissive quota it allows other countries, and may do so without negotiating a new treaty with such country.

This may be done with respect to Cuba, thereby staying within the 10-percent principle.

Fourth. It would increase the share in our sugar market of many friendly foreign countries, and would permit entry into that market of five new suppliers which need the assistance that this trade would provide.

Fifth. It would decrease the amount of direct consumption sugar entering our market, thereby increasing the amount to be refined in the United States by U.S. refineries.

Mr. President, it is my sincere opinion that the bill represents a vast improvement over existing law and pending sugar legislation, and would bring about reforms which experience under present law has shown to be urgently required. It would also serve to cement friendly relations with a great number of foreign countries which need, and would appreciate, the trade which this bill would afford.

It is a reasonable proposal, a modest and conservative proposal, and a proposal which is in the national interest of the United States.

I sincerely trust that the Finance Committee and the Senate will act promptly and favorably on it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3508) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 9, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 722. An act to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; and

S. 1062. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require Federal approval for mergers and consolidation of insured banks.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 10, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 9, 1960:

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Robert A. Bicks, of New York, to be Assistant Attorney General, vice Victor R. Hansen, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 9, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Revelation 3: 20: *Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hears my voice and opens the door, I will come in, and sup with him and he with Me.*

Almighty God, who art the source and inspiration of the true, the beautiful, and the good, in the plans and labors of this new week, may we be receptive and responsive to the voice and leading of Thy divine spirit, seeking to bless us with a happy, a useful, and more abundant life.

We are bringing unto Thee our fears and our foreboding thoughts about these days in which we are living and our apprehensions for humanity, earnestly beseeching Thee that we may appropriate by faith those resources of spiritual power and poise which will enable us to remain strong and courageous.

Grant that the demons of hatred and ill will, which have assailed and invaded the life of the nations and torn apart their unity, may be driven out and the heart of mankind may be opened to give lodgment to the blessed spirit of the Prince of Peace.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 6, 1960, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on May 6, 1960, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

On May 6, 1960:

H.R. 8601. An act to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3019. An act to provide for certain pilotage requirements in the navigation of U.S. waters of the Great Lakes, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4049. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to authorize free or reduced-rate transportation for certain additional persons.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1062. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidations of banks which might lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly in the field of banking.

TOWARD A PROPER USE OF MISSOURI RIVER WATER

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to some startling information which I recently have received from the Army Engineers and the Department of Interior.

The facts disclosed to me forecast serious consequences for my State of South Dakota and its neighboring States in the Missouri River Basin. As I believe all of the Members of this body know, the most critical difficulty facing the people of South Dakota today is the plight of our agricultural economy. Positive and aggressive action is urgently needed to correct the conditions which are making it impossible for the family farmer to earn a fair return. That is why I have joined with a number of my colleagues in sponsoring legislation designed to assure farmers a fair price and to halt the buildup of Government-owned farm surpluses.

The second threat to the successful development of our economy is the improper use of the scarce water supply which is available to us.

The very sad truth is that there is no need for us to be burdened with either of these misfortunes. When we remembered how the farmer fared before 1952, we realize that to a very large extent the farmer's present predicament results from the ill advised policies which have been followed by Mr. Benson.

I am sorry to report that our water problems are likewise aggravated by the unwise management of the waters of the Missouri River by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

These agencies have performed a superb construction job in building the projects which were so wisely authorized by Congress. The projects are of untold benefit to the people of the Missouri Basin. Only recently they have prevented millions of dollars in property losses and the loss of many lives when the lower basin suffered from one of the greatest floods on record. But despite this outstanding record in the field of construction, both of these agencies have permitted waste in the use of water, which has accumulated in reservoirs made possible by citizens of South Dakota and other Upper Missouri Basin

States who have given up highly productive land. Precious water stored in the reservoirs is being released to make possible the maintenance of a free flowing 9-foot navigation channel downstream, at the very time we have dire need for that water in our State.

We need the water for many purposes. Last year was one of our driest years on record. More and more farmers will have to turn to supplemental irrigation. With the passage of the Conservancy District Act of 1959, great steps forward will be taken in the developments of the South Dakota irrigation program. Our progressive Governor, the Honorable Ralph Herseth, highlighted these steps in his recent appearance before the House Appropriations Subcommittee.

We need more water for domestic and municipal use. We are not going to be able to attract new industries to our State unless we are able to provide them with an adequate supply of the quality of water they need. Fortunately, water in sufficient quantities to take care of these needs can be stored in the reservoirs on the mainstem of the Missouri. Unfortunately, the waters have not been permitted to accumulate in sufficient quantities to fill those reservoirs to the desired levels because the engineers have insisted in releasing the water for downsteam navigation purposes.

In addition to the water uses I have referred to previously, our economy receives a great impetus from the availability of the low-cost electric power and energy which is generated at the dams which back up the water in the reservoirs on the Missouri. If it were not for this hydropower, a large percentage of South Dakota farms would never have enjoyed the blessings of electricity because they are located in such sparsely settled areas and because our costs of steam generation are so high. If we could avail ourselves of greater quantities of this low-cost electricity we could develop much new industry.

But here is what is happening: Of the approximately 1,600,000 kilowatts of electric generating capacity installed at those dams, the Bureau of Reclamation has allocated less than 1 million kilowatts to be sold as firm power. To a considerable extent this is the result of the water being released at the wrong times for downstream navigation. As a result, our farmers and other users of that power are going to have to obtain almost one-fourth of their electricity from other sources at an additional cost of several millions of dollars per year.

Now for the distributing information I referred to at the beginning of my remarks. In answer to an inquiry from me, General Barney of the Corps of Engineers has written to me stating that the estimates in their last annual operating report indicated less dependable peaking capacity and energy to the extent of approximately 100,000 kilowatts of firm power for the next 4 years. He blames the lower estimates on the subnormal water supply.

In another letter, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior stated, in reply to my inquiry, that—

> The Corps of Engineers recently prepared a new estimate of the project capability, which forecasts that under adverse water conditions the peaking capability would be about 125,000 kilowatts less in 1962 and 1963 than was indicated in the former forecasts upon which the recent allocation was based.

You will remember even that allocation required the preference customers to obtain a part of their power elsewhere. If those allocations are now reduced as a result of the Army's new estimates it will cost the cooperatives and municipalities approximately $2 million per year in added power costs. Also the inability of the Government to sell these kilowatts as firm power will cause the Government to lose approximately $2,750,000 per year.

Despite the attempt to blame this loss of revenue to the Government and the added burden of costs to the consumers on poor water years, the fact is they both could be avoided if the flow of water were managed properly. We are being deprived of this water which rightfully belongs to us by the practices followed by the Corps of Engineers and acquiesced in by the Bureau of Reclamation.

I am very pleased to tell you that Governor Herseth has decided not to sit idly by and watch the economy of South Dakota being stifled by having our waters taken away from us by the actions of Federal agencies. He proposes to do something about it and I am determined to do all in my power to make certain that the people of South Dakota get the benefits from the Missouri to which the Congress has said we are entitled.

Under the leadership of Governor Herseth, the South Dakota State Water Resources Commission has employed experienced counsel to study the legal rights of the State to the use of the waters of the Missouri. The results of that study were presented at a meeting of the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee in Grand Forks, N. Dak., on April 20. After a thorough review of the legislative history of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and other pertinent statutory and case law, counsel expressed the categorical opinion that under the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment, South Dakota and all other States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th meridian have priority to the use of the waters of the Missouri River Basin for all beneficial uses, including the generation of power, as against the use of those waters for navigation. The study quotes many excerpts from the congressional debates which clearly shows that was the intent of Congress. Also, Senator O'MAHONEY has stated that power has priority over navigation to the use of the waters of the Missouri under the terms of his amendment.

I insist that the Army Engineers and the Bureau administer this law as passed by Congress. I request the help of the members in seeing that they do so. I wish to emphasize that all that I have said about South Dakota applies to the other States of the upper basin.

While I have said that we are determined to protect our rights and to insist that the law be administered as written, I do not want to create the impression that we are not anxious to cooperate with the downstream States. We definitely are. For that reason I sponsored a resolution which was approved by the Public Works Committee under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY] which authorized the Army Engineers to make a study of the Missouri River from Yankton to the mouth to determine whether a slackwater system of navigation would be economically feasible. If it is, such a system would remove any possibility of conflict between the upper and lower States. It would greatly improve the navigation facilities and would eliminate the heavy current with which river traffic now must contend. It would allow the water to be stored in the reservoirs to fill them to the proper level. The requirements for this better navigation system would be only a fraction of what they now are for a free flowing channel. There would be sufficient water for irrigation purposes in the upper States as well as for the other necessary purposes. Moreover, the amount of firm power which could be sold from the hydroplants would be greatly increased.

The President's budget for next fiscal year asks for $10,000 to commence the slack-water study on the Missouri. This is an absurd figure since the Army estimates that the study will cost approximately $300,000 and that it would require about $75,000 in the first year. A group of members from the Missouri Basin have requested the Appropriations Committee to increase the budget figure to $75,000. We ask for the support of the House for this amount.

In closing my remarks, I wish to emphasize again the desire of the people of South Dakota to live in harmony with our friends in the States downstream. We hope they will work with us in making possible the development of a slackwater system of navigation which will be a boon to their economy as well as ours. Until that solution is reached, however, we want to be equally emphatic in informing the Army Engineers and the Bureau that we insist the intent of Congress be carried out in administering the laws relating to the Missouri and that our waters not be wrongfully taken from us.

THE COLORADO RIVER LAWSUIT: ARIZONA IS VINDICATED

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, this is a day of triumph and vindication for the State

of Arizona. Today ends the most important phase of one of the most complex and massive lawsuits in the history of this country between Arizona and California over the waters of the Colorado River. Nine years ago the Congress turned the State of Arizona down when we presented a great reclamation project to make the desert blossom and to bring the waters of the Colorado River to central Arizona. Congress said we should acquire the water rights first and they sent us to the courts.

We have now successfully completed the first phase of this litigation. I am confident that the Supreme Court will confirm the findings of the master, Judge Simon Rifkin, of New York.

Mr. Speaker, I express the hope today that my colleagues from California will join with us once the Supreme Court speaks and help Arizona secure congressional approval of a project to deliver our share of Colorado River water to the fertile valleys of central Arizona.

TRUNK AIRLINE SUBSIDIES SHOULD BE DISCONTINUED

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to prohibit payment of Government subsidies to any domestic trunk airline for flight service in the United States. My bill would permit continued subsidy payments to local service airlines and U.S. overseas carriers.

The Federal Government has spent nearly $200 million in subsidizing the trunklines since 1938. There are very few industries which have received such lavish assistance. It seems to me that after 22 years, a continuation can no longer be justified on the theory of helping these companies get started.

Most of the carriers have prospered. They are large corporations with great revenues. The original Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 was passed to help them get on their feet and they should not be entitled to any help from the taxpayers.

My bill would lift from the shoulders of the taxpayer of this country the constant burden of subsidizing airline competition. This legislation would mean that route awards by the Civil Aeronautics Board would henceforth have to be based on a more careful analysis of the economic factors. This, in turn, would reduce regional and local pressures for airline service which cannot be justified by any true test of public convenience and necessity.

Requests for subsidy are caused either by bad management or by an airline route structure which does not make economic sense.

You cannot attribute it to accidents or weather or other transitory features. Weather affects everybody and it does not last very long. And, despite accidents, the industry's business has been growing by leaps and bounds year after year. Every knowledgeable person knows that the effect of accidents on traffic is a matter of a few days or weeks at the most. Furthermore, you cannot use such transitory factors to explain losses in 4 successive years when other carriers were showing profits.

I hope that Congress, through enactment of my bill, will not permit one more penny to be spent on subsidizing the trunk airlines. I hope that the Civil Aeronautics Board will make this clear. I hope that it will acknowledge that the Department of Commerce has practically said as much in its recent recommendation against any subsidy, once a carrier has been off subsidy for 5 years.

I hope that the Board will face up to realities and make route adjustments as may be necessary in order to carry out this policy. I believe the Congress is tired of excuses for costly and unnecessary operations, and determined to see that the hard but realistic decisions are made. This is not a case of taking advantage of companies which have come upon difficult times. It is quite the reverse, for it is the companies which would continue to take advantage of the U.S. taxpayer, irrespective of the true transportation requirements of the Nation. This we should not permit, for we do not need subsidy to operate the best competitive trunkline system in the world.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join my distinguished colleague, the Honorable PETER F. MACK, JR., of Illinois, in introducing a bill to prohibit subsidy payments to any U.S. domestic airline.

The purpose of trunk carrier subsidy was to develop a vital American industry until such time as the industry would be self-sustaining. Subsidy was never expected to be a Federal guarantee against loss of the private investment involved.

Since 1951 no trunk carrier has been on subsidy, and there is no reason why any trunk carrier, facing financial problems because of inefficient management and overambitious route extensions and overscheduling, should assume that its losses, resulting from its bad judgment, should be passed on to the American taxpayer.

Although trunk airlines have not reported glowing profits and although net returns have been quite low because of expensive investment in more modern equipment, the fact is that few American businesses face as bright a future.

Fifty-six million people traveled on the domestic airlines last year. In the next decade at least 700 million persons will be traveling on the domestic airlines. This tremendous passenger volume, coupled with accelerated airfreight revenues, should make the future bright indeed for well-managed domestic carriers. It would certainly be wise that future route determination by the Civil Aeronautics Board be based on the economic factors involved. Public convenience and necessity today demand a reduction in subsidies and a reduction in Federal taxes.

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–906, as amended, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the First Annual Report of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure covering the period ending December 31, 1959.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 9, 1960.*

INVESTIGATION OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the impending investigation of the Federal Power Commission highlights a particularly unsavory situation in that Federal Regulatory Agency.

Natural gas pipeline companies have collected $662 million from the Nation's gas consumers through self-imposed rate increases which have not yet been passed on by the Federal Power Commission. This vast sum will climb past the one billion mark later this year with pipelines filing new rate boost applications faster than the Commission will rule upon them. This immense backlog of pending gas rate cases stems in almost equal parts from lack of ability on the part of members of the Commission and from an outright disinterest in any real or effective regulation of the industry. The inaction, disinterest and disregard of responsibility in this agency have caused hardship on the consumers and on the industry regulated alike.

These so-called temporary rate boosts are often actually funds to finance gas pipeline expansion. This is the only industry anywhere which can avoid borrowing or raising new equity capital by sale of stock by using such a device. Action of this sort is a kind of enforced investment by consumers and gas distributors alike.

The historic record indicates that only about 40 percent of these so-called bonded rate increases will be allowed and that the balance will be at some future

date ordered refunded to the consumers from whom taken.

Rate increases of pipelines have run from 20 percent to 40 percent over the past 3 years and will continue to rise far beyond any justification as long as the Federal Power Commission continues to administer its responsibility in this slapdash, slovenly and irresponsible manner.

Formerly the pipelines were required to strictly segregate funds collected from rate boosts and to hold them available for refund to consumers. The Federal Power Commission now permits pipeline companies to commingle such money with their own capital funds. They are free to use, and do use, such temporary rate increases for expansion or similar purposes.

The Tennessee Gas Transmission Co. tops all pipelines with three rate boosts totaling $70.7 million a year. This is an increase of about 36 percent in its rate since 1957.

El Paso Natural Gas Co. is second with rate increase requests pending for three rate boosts totaling $67.7 million a year. Its rates have gone up some 39½ percent since 1957.

Other pipelines have big rate boosts pending. United Gas Pipeline has $45.7 million in increases requested; United Fuel Gas has requests for $38 million in rate increases; Panhandle Eastern has requests for some $34.9 million; Texas Eastern has requests for some $28.2 million in rate increases. These rate increases are being paid by the consumer while they are being decided on by the Federal Power Commission.

Chairman Kuykendall has said that the Commission was powerless to forestall successive gas rate increases unless the Natural Gas Act is amended. This is not in comport with either fact or law. However, since the only protection which can be given the American consumer is by legislation so long as such an irresponsible do-nothing Commission regulates the power sources of this country, I have introduced a bill which will prohibit any rate change going into effect while there is already a rate increase pending by a natural gas pipeline which has not been decided by the Federal Power Commisison. It is to be hoped this will stop some of the solvenliness within the Federal Power Commission and perhaps stimulate that agency to act as something other than a high cost repository for official looking documents.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SCOTT (at the request of Mr. FOUNTAIN), from May 9 through June 1, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BOWLES in two instances.

Mr. BUDGE.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. UDALL.

Mr. COLMER and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3019. An act to provide for certain pilotage requirements in the navigation of U.S. waters of the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 722. An act to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; and

S. 1062. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require Federal approval for mergers and consolidation of insured banks.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 10, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2130. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize certain persons to administer oaths and to perform notarial acts for persons serving with, employed by, or accompanying the Armed Forces outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2131. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to reassign officers designated for supply duty as officers not restricted in the performance of duty in the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2132. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the Government's rights and practices concerning recovery of the cost of hospital and medical services in negligent third-party cases; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2133. A letter from the assistant to the president, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, transmitting the official report of the American Academy of Arts and Letters for the year 1959, in compliance with section 4 of their charter; to the Committee on House Administration.

2134. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 12120. A bill to provide for grants-in-aid to the States for the treatment of narcotic drug addicts in closed institutions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H.R. 12121. A bill to amend section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, so as to eliminate authority for the payment of subsidies for domestic trunk air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 12122. A bill to amend section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, so as to eliminate authority for the payment of subsidies for domestic trunk air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H.J. Res. 702. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual Youth Appreciation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to safeguard and preserve established State and individual rights to the use of water within the separate States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the general assembly expressing its deep concern over the flood of cheap foreign goods being placed on the markets of the United States, and requesting that immediate steps be taken to enact remedial legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 12123. A bill for the relief of Comdr. Chester B. Peake; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 12124. A bill for the relief of Victoria M. Poquiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

455. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Joseph J. Cooley, city clerk, Buffalo, N.Y., expressing approval of the provisions of the Forand bill in dealing with the problem of providing adequate medical care for our senior citizens, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Let Us Remember Our Unknown Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1960

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on May 30, many of our citizens will pay homage to their war dead in Memorial Day services.

Originally conceived soon after the Civil War as an occasion on which graves of the fallen would be visited and decorated with flowers by citizens of a grateful nation, Memorial Day takes on a special significance here in the Nation's Capital because of the special tribute paid to America's three unknown soldiers in the simple but impressively beautiful Amphitheater of Arlington National Cemetery.

Although Memorial Day is not universally celebrated on May 30, mostly for historical reasons, these small differences detract nothing from the great fact that we as a nation have a single purpose as we recall the supreme sacrifices of all American wars. This purpose is symbolized by the several patriotic private organizations which have undertaken to insure that our honored dead in 96 cemeteries in the United States and 14 oversea memorials receive at least a token of remembrance on this special day.

But I sometimes wonder if we do not have far more unknown soldiers than we would care to admit. We sometimes seem to forget how much we owe to our soldiers—many of them literally unknown—who lie silently in our national shrines.

In Arlington National Cemetery, by far the best known of our national cemeteries, more than 103,000 of the Nation's honored dead lie buried. Yet I am informed that on Memorial Day last year, no more than one-third, or about 35,000 of these soldiers of democracy and their immediate family members, were fittingly remembered with floral tributes.

I hope that this fact is not typical of our national, and even more international, observance of Memorial Day. I do not know. Arlington is one of our oldest national cemeteries, having been established in 1864. In some cases, family lines may have died out. But I find it hard to believe that sufficient reason exists for our failure to remember more than 65,000 of our dead. With our modern means of communication, which has made possible the sending of flowers by telegraph and other convenient means, it would seem that a great gap exists between what we intend and what we do.

To me it is more important than ever before that we keep fresh in our minds why these men and women died. Events since 1945 have demonstrated how perilously close we are to still another great war, one in which all of us would stand in the front lines so gallantly filled in the past by those at Arlington and elsewhere who sacrificed everything for us.

It may be that we have not done enough to enshrine in the hearts and minds of our people what our brave sons did for us. Yet renewed remembrance must spring from the people themselves if it is to have lasting value, particularly the strengthening of America for whatever uncertain future lies ahead.

With this thought in mind, I urge all citizens of this Nation, wherever they may be, to mark Memorial Day 1960 as a day of reaffirmation; a day on which to renew our pledge to Americans who have gone before, and who have made it possible for us to hand to the world a torch blazing with the fire of freedom.

At Arlington on May 30, we can speak with a single national voice to the world, in terms which will be an unmistakable sign that the spirit of our gallant dead lives on.

Supreme Lack of Coordination in U–2 Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement which I released earlier today on the controversy over the U–2 incident. The statement follows:

SUPREME LACK OF COORDINATION IN U–2 INCIDENT

People throughout the world have been profoundly shocked and disturbed by the news that an American espionage plane was shot down over the Soviet Union. There is no doubt that our Government has suffered a serious setback at a critical moment. As an incident this one is likely to go down in history as the greatest single item of national embarrassment in the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration. As a symbol of what is basically wrong with the present conduct of our foreign policy, it is of even greater importance. I am conscious of the delicacy of the situation itself. I am aware that while the administration has been embarrassed by these events, all Americans are embarrassed with it. I do not wish to add personal or partisan fuel to the controversy which will be raging for weeks ahead on this issue. Nor do I wish, in anything I say, to imply that I have any more information, official or unofficial, on the intelligence aspects of this case than does any other American citizen.

As I said on television yesterday afternoon ("Meet the Press," NBC–TV, Sunday, May 8, 1960):

"I don't think any one of us as outsiders can know what is essential in the way of espionage. We are all realists. We all know that this is a difficult and complex world. We know we are at a disadvantage, that the Soviet is a closed police state and has certain very great advantages over us. I don't know the inside story of how much information we have or what we lack or what risks should be required to get it. I would assume that we should not do this sort of thing for a marginal gain.

"But we are preparing for a summit meeting. The whole history of the world may depend upon our ability to negotiate with the Soviet Union. We are in a very delicate position and certainly this would be a time to be far more circumspect than obviously these people have been. I think they have committed a very gross case of misjudgment and I think it is highly reckless, dangerous, and hurtful."

Here, as I see them, are the unalterable, embarassing facts which now face us.

1. The State Department has been caught in a dramatic falsehood. The Department may have been the victim of misinformation provided by other Government agencies. Nevertheless, foreign governments—both friendly and otherwise—are bound to press the point that the word of the U.S. State Department can no longer be trusted. In international negotiations, as in personal relationships, lack of trust is damaging and costly.

2. If the flight really was not authorized in Washington, the incident demonstrates that the President has been kept in ignorance of critically important developments and activities within our own Government. This, in turn, seriously undermines the prestige of the President at a time when the world urgently needs his strength and influence in behalf of peace.

3. The Russian suspicions of our good faith in negotiating the control and inspection systems which are essential to disarmament programs have been increased. As a result, we will find them even more difficult to deal with on these critical questions at the Summit.

4. We have placed ourselves in a defensive position in our efforts to negotiate a step by step relaxation in cold war tensions. In contrast the Soviet position has been greatly strengthened. It is safe to assume that the Kremlin will use its advantage to the limit in mustering world opinion against us.

Hence this incident adds up to a devastating loss of faith in the quality of American leadership: A loss of faith in the reliability and straightforwardness of official U.S. statements; a loss of faith in the President's role in the conduct of critical policy matters; and a loss of faith in U.S. sincerity in easing tensions in advance of the summit meeting.

The role of clandestine operations is inherently difficult for a democracy. I do not underestimate it. But that is an argument for greater Presidential control, not less. The astonishment and incredulity of many millions of Americans today over the headlines is magnified by the knowledge that our President and his administration are simply not in control of their own operations. The bumbling nature of this whole incident—the supreme lack of coordination between one department of our Government and the others—this is what is so serious and what merits our strongest dismay.

It symbolizes what is chiefly wrong with this administration's record in foreign policy. Indeed we can generalize from this instance.

The administration is uncoordinated. No one is in control. The State Department is not—it doesn't even know what some of our military and intelligence people are doing. The President is not a master in his own house. Each sector of the administration undermines another.

This has been the story all along—on defense, on disarmament, on foreign aid. No one has a firm grasp on where we are headed. Lacking overall goals, we continually let

means get in the way of ends. Our military policy defeats our economic policy. Our intelligence policy defeats our diplomatic policy. Our short-term requirements defeat our long-term ones.

This Government and this Nation simply cannot survive piecemeal, uncoordinated administration where our vital national interests are clearly at stake.

This incident, embarrassing, dangerous, and damaging as we know it to be, may in the long run prove to be worth while if it will wake America and the world to the hideous dangers of this cold war struggle.

Every thoughtful person must now see that we are walking a tightrope in world affairs. Miscalculations either in Moscow or in Washington could plunge us all into a war that no one wants, that no one could win, and from which few could survive. The stupendous dangers we face have been clearly dramatized.

What is required of us now is a bipartisan effort to break the logjam in world affairs and to embark on a new study of methods to ease our way gradually out of the impasse into which the world has stumbled and to begin to lay the foundation for a meaningful peace.

In saying this, I do not suggest that peace will come easily. On the contrary, the difficulties are enormous. I simply say that it is time that mankind took charge of its own destiny while we still have the opportunity to act rationally.

Foreign Economic Policy—On the Road to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HAYDEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 9, 1960

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on May 1, the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] appeared before the Tucson, Ariz., Sunday Evening Forum, a public-affairs forum of national stature, and spoke to an audience of over 2,000 on the need for a long-range foreign economic policy.

His remarks that evening are especially timely if one hopes to understand the interrelationship of tariffs, foreign aid, and foreign investment in developing a dynamic American foreign policy. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY—ON THE ROAD TO PEACE

(Address by Senator SYMINGTON, Sunday Evening Forum, Tucson, Ariz., May 1, 1960)

Whether we like it or not, the United States is no longer an island of freedom and strength, safely surrounded by great oceans on the East and West, and great friends on the North and South.

The freedom and strength are still here, and so are the oceans and our friendly neighbors. But distances between nations have shrunk almost overnight—and the oceans are hidden tunnels for potential aggressors.

The subject of foreign policy is no longer a weekend exercise, and the alternative of noninvolvement is no longer ours.

We are involved—and the involvement is bound to become greater, not less.

Our lives, and the lives of our children and grandchildren, will of necessity become increasingly affected by what happens all over the world, and—let us not forget—throughout space as well.

This we can readily see—whether it be a threatened attack upon one of many nations with which we have defense commitments or whether it be the prestige effect of Soviet satellites upon uncommitted nations.

There is, however, another interrelationship in world affairs—one which is too often overlooked. I refer to the interrelationship between tariffs, foreign aid, and foreign investments.

Each of these affects the other. None can be handled in isolation, any more than we can have a policy about the unification of Germany without regard to the pronouncements from the Kremlin.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF EXPORTS AND IMPORTS

Yet, so far as I can discover, our Government has no policy which meshes these important things together. Nor has it explained their interrelationship to the American people.

Rather, the question of imports of goods is treated as a special type of economic invasion of our country—for the purpose of depriving American laborers of their jobs and American stockholders of their profits.

Exports, on the other hand, are considered to be good business, and any effort of some other nation to undersell us abroad is termed unfriendly—and even Communist-inspired.

Of course, any sound businessman knows that his sales are a total loss unless he gets paid for them. The same is true in the world of foreign trade. Imports are the means of payment for our exports; hence, anything that cuts down on imports makes it more difficult to export. A policy which tends to encourage exports and another policy which tends to discourage imports are operating against each other.

In the short run, there is little difference between exports for which we do not receive comparable value of imports in return, and foreign aid grants. The latter are also exports, generally, of goods produced here in the United States—but given away, rather than paid for by returning imports.

Yet, if you were in Washington, you would soon see that the same organization, or even the same Government official, urges an expansion of exports, a curtailment of imports, and a decrease in foreign aid.

To understand the interrelationship of these things, however, does not automatically solve the problem.

Take the businessman who is having difficulty competing with foreign imports. It doesn't help him to know that some other businessman is benefiting because such imports are the means by which the latter businessman gets paid for his export sales.

A TWO-EDGED TARIFF POLICY

I believe we should have a two-edged tariff policy, based on a full realization of the economic significance of both edges.

First, for good practical reasons we should keep down our tariff barriers. The reasons are as follows:

1. Tariffs are taxes paid by American consumers—not by foreign sellers.

2. Tariffs are inflationary. They are taxes added onto the price of imported goods; or, if they are sufficiently protective, they permit higher prices for domestic goods.

3. Tariffs encourage other countries to raise barriers against our export goods and therefore cost us part of our foreign market.

4. Tariffs encourage the investment of American capital abroad. Some of this money could well be used in building up our own country.

5. Tariffs may even cause unemployment in the United States, in that they decrease sales of our most efficient large-scale production industries.

The other edge of the tariff policy, however, should be this: when commodities flow into our country, underselling U.S. goods and threatening the employment of U.S. labor and capital, the facts in each individual case should be examined carefully to see if the damage to our own people is such as to merit an exception to the general tariff policy and give that industry at least temporary added protection.

In each case in which such a decision is made, the Federal Government should cooperate with local governments and private organizations to see if new industries and new production cannot be introduced into the areas which have been hurt by the foreign competition.

The argument that tariffs protect domestic industries and their profits and therefore cause a greater flow of income tax revenue to the Government is, to put it bluntly, nonsense.

Curtailment of international trade decreases income tax revenue to the Government.

Nonetheless, I would not make individual tariff judgments on a Government revenue basis, but on how the people in the areas concerned are affected.

I am convinced that the added tax revenues from increased exports would be more than sufficient to foot the bill for the research and the Government financial assistance which may be necessary to modernize those industries which find they cannot beat foreign competition.

The United States is the greatest exporter of goods in the world. We undersell other countries in a large volume of goods. It is obvious that we could do this only if our costs and prices were lower in those goods. Otherwise, foreigners would buy them someplace else.

There is no basis for complacency in this situation, however, as an examination of our recent trade statistics reveals. We have to keep improving both quality and our production efficiency if we are to maintain the advantage we have held for so many years.

SOVIET COMPETITION

There is, moreover, an increasing concern—and rightly so—about the threat of economic competition from Soviet Russia. So far, this is not serious in the sense of free competition, because no one seriously considers that Russian costs of production are generally as low as ours. For example, some of the top production men from our steel industry visited Russia recently, went through their plants, and examined their techniques. Their conclusion was that Russian costs of producing steel—a commodity so basic to the production of other goods—was far above ours.

The serious aspect of Soviet competition lies in the fact that their prices are not determined on the basis of cost. Rather, they are set by the dictator at whatever level he considers would best serve the aims of this foreign policy.

As example, the Russians put the aluminum industry into something of a frenzy last year by the simple process of dumping a small amount of aluminum on the world market at a price well below the existing level. This was done even though Russia has not enough aluminum to meet its own needs, and undoubtedly offered the aluminum at a net loss if figured in our own accounting terms.

With a population about 15 percent greater than ours, and a gross national product about 55 percent less than ours, Russia is in no position to take away much of the world market from the United States. Yet,

we are in danger of losing it anyway if we don't change our policies.

If our Government continues to push up interest rates, and certain of our large basic industries continue to take advantage of their semimonopolistic position to set high prices, we will lose customers. It will not help to blame the Communists.

AN AMERICAN ECONOMIC OFFENSIVE

Anybody who doesn't believe that this country, with its free labor market, its vast amount of investment capital, its successful business experience, and its wealth of natural resources, cannot meet competition with other countries, bases his conclusion on fear and not on facts.

Curiously enough, our export business is threatened more by our own policy weaknesses than by any Soviet dictator, or low-wage rates in other countries.

I hasten to emphasize that I do not minimize the significance of either the Communist economic potential or the occasional advantages which may accrue to those whose labor costs are lower than ours.

But, I am convinced that, with sound policy leadership in our Government and astute management in our private businesses, the United States can launch an economic offensive which cannot be matched by any country or any combination of countries throughout the world.

FOREIGN AID

Closely related to the foreign trade problem is the matter of foreign aid.

This question is greeted with fewer facts and more emotion than almost any other issue before the country.

Mostly, foreign aid is viewed as an unnecessary tax burden or as an example of undue generosity on the part of the United States.

It is true that foreign aid costs money, and therefore the taxpayers have to pay for it. It is not necessarily true, however, that economic foreign aid over the long run adds to the total tax burden. Whether it does or not depends more on our foreign aid policies and how they are administered than on the amount of money involved.

Most Government grants as well as loans to foreigners increase our exports of goods. Almost all of the money we spend for foreign aid is spent in this country—to buy our agricultural surpluses, our machinery, and our other manufactured goods.

In addition, to the extent that foreign assistance builds up underdeveloped countries, we are adding potential customers for more of our goods through commercial channels.

If everyone who consumed alcoholic beverages in the United States cut out every third drink—and I do not take a position on that one way or the other—the amount saved would pay for our entire foreign aid programs, both military and economic.

I mention that just to put the size of the program in perspective.

The entire mutual security appropriation will amount this year to less than eight-tenths of 1 percent of our gross national income.

With the exception of emergency gifts of medical supplies, food, and similar essentials, there is little room in a foreign aid policy for what might be called altruism or generosity for generosity's sake.

Rather, we should evaluate each foreign aid program on the basis of whether it will benefit the citizens of this country. This is only reasonable, and is the only fair approach as far as our taxpayers are concerned.

In talking about foreign aid, I want to emphasize that assistance to our distressed areas here at home must always have a higher priority than aid to other countries.

On that premise, it is my belief that well administered foreign aid can do several things, all of which can benefit this country.

First, it can help build up the underdeveloped countries and forge ties of trade and friendly relations with the United States.

Second, it can blunt the Communist propaganda and economic offensives, or at least make these Communist programs very much more expensive to the Soviets.

Third, it can establish a realistic basis for uncommitted countries to support the United States as the free world leader in the United Nations, as well as in high level international negotiations.

If the less fortunate countries of the world could achieve, through the stimulus of a well managed foreign aid program, a per capita income increase of 1 percent a year during the coming decade, they could well offer to the United States alone a $14 billion market for our goods. This would amount to double the present market in those areas.

It is a matter of good business sense, if you want to increase your sales, to look for new markets.

So far as the makeup of a foreign aid program is concerned, I favor an increased proportion of the total aid to be economic rather than military, and believe such aid should be primarily in the form of long-term loans rather than outright grants.

LONG-TERM PLANNING NEEDED

Such programing should be on a long-term basis—not chopped into annual, unplanned segments, as is currently the situation.

For example, to get the best return on our investment, our Development Loan Fund should be financed over a period of a minimum of 5 years.

One major feature of a long-term program could and should be an increased flow of our surplus agricultural commodities. It is my belief that this could be accomplished much more effectively on a 5-year basis than on a 1-year basis.

The foreign assistance-investment program of the 1960's should be a cooperative venture of all free industrialized nations. To be most effective, such cooperative efforts should be directed toward investment to stimulate growth—not toward investment for immediate profit returns. Before such investment can bring real growth, both time and money must go into what are called preinvestment activities.

Such activities should be carefully planned and programed, and should range from labor and resource surveys to educational and technical assistance.

High on the list of such programs would be those which would raise the skill level of the labor force in those countries.

Along with such training should go a clear understanding of the benefits of private enterprise and the knowledge that benefits from economic improvement can be enjoyed by the population as a whole only under democratic types of government.

SOUNDNESS OF THE DOLLAR

We can have a sound overall foreign economic policy without impairing the integrity of the dollar. It is true that in the last few years there has been some outflow of gold—and even some talk of devaluing the dollar.

The facts are that this outflow of gold has in no way affected our economic growth or the soundness of our financial structure. Incidentally, we still have more than half of the total supply of gold in the free world. If such an outflow were to continue indefinitely, there might come a time when we would have to worry about it.

However, that time has not come—and there is no reason for it ever to come.

Until the last 7 years, the rate of economic growth in the United States has been such as to attract foreign investment; and those who accumulated funds here as a result of sales of goods and services have been eager to invest those funds in our thriving economy.

Recently, however, our growth rate has slowed to a walk and has been surpassed by other countries. Hence, there has been some encouragement for those who accumulated balances here to withdraw them in the form of gold, and either hoard them in their banking systems or invest them elsewhere.

I am convinced that we can and we must, with firm leadership in our Federal Government, reinstate the previous high growth rate.

If we do that, the steady outflow of gold will cease and gold in international finance will revert to its customary role of adjustment of international banking balances.

It is my conclusion that there is nothing wrong with our international economic position which sound foreign policies and firm leadership will not cure and cure promptly.

Hon. Graham A. Barden, of North Carolina, Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1960

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on April 30 last the American Good Government Society, a nonprofit, patriotic institution, dedicated to the cause of good government in these United States, held its annual dinner and made its annual awards to two outstanding Americans. Each year this splendid institution presents the George Washington Award to two outstanding American patriots. This year these highly coveted honors went to the Honorable GRAHAM A. BARDEN, a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from the State of North Carolina, and to the Honorable BARRY GOLDWATER, a Member of the U.S. Senate from the State of Arizona.

The dinner was held in the Sheraton-Park Hotel. In attendance were some 600 or more guests who are interested in seeing good government perpetuated in this Republic. The American Good Government Dinner speaker was the Honorable Maurice H. Stans, the highly respected Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

The Honorable STROM THURMOND, a Senator from the State of South Carolina, made the presentation of the award to his colleague, Senator GOLDWATER.

The Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, the minority leader of the House of Representatives and a distinguished Member of that body from the State of Indiana, made the presentation of the award to the Honorable GRAHAM A. BARDEN.

Mr. HALLECK's remarks in presenting this highly coveted award to Mr. BARDEN, together with the text of the award of the society to this splendid North Carolinian follows:

REMARKS OF HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

This is one of those occasions which finds me happy and somewhat sad at the same time.

I'm happy that the chance has come my way to join in tribute to a great American,

the Honorable GRAHAM A. BARDEN, of North Carolina. But I am sad in the knowledge that this high honor is coming to him at the close of a distinguished career in the Congress of the United States.

You know, GRAHAM, some people—who don't think I have the right philosophy of government—have announced that they are going to end my political career come next November.

But I think maybe the people of the Second District of Indiana are going to have something to say about that, and I expect to be back down here next January.

But, folks, things won't be quite the same as far as I'm concerned.

Our honored guest and beloved friend has announced his decision to retire, and I shall miss him more than I can tell.

I know of no Member of the Congress of the United States who more richly deserves this recognition from your fine organization than my long-time friend and colleague.

"HAP" and I were both freshmen in the 74th Congress. But he has a few months' seniority on me, because I won a seat in the House of Representatives in a special election just after the Congress convened.

Through the years he has been a generous, warmhearted, loyal friend of mine, and I have come to feel a devotion toward him that can only be appreciated by men who have stood side by side and shoulder to shoulder through the smoke and fire of legislative battle.

The fact that he is a Democrat, and I am a Republican by allegiance, has never been a consideration, as we have fought together for common ideals, common principles, and a common faith in the inherent strength and majesty of our constitutional way of life.

Early in my career in the Congress I saw in GRAHAM BARDEN a public servant who could be counted upon to put the well-being of his country above private or party considerations.

I saw in him a stalwart American who had the courage to stand up and be counted when the chips were down on issues vital to the maintenance of the freedoms we cherish as citizens of this great Republic.

I saw in "HAP" BARDEN an able, articulate and dedicated representative of the people, who time and again brought his considerable talents and energies to bear against what on many occasions seemed to be an irresistible tide of political radicalism.

As I look back over the years of our service in the Congress together, I am well aware that in spite of our best efforts there seems to have been an erosion of some of the old-fashioned virtues that made this country the greatest on the face of the earth.

Thrift, self-reliance, faith in the future, the willingness to put forth sustained effort, and the courage to face adversity, seems, in too many instances, to have been abandoned in favor of what has been falsely sold as the easy way of life—let Washington do it.

But I am convinced of this: It is to the everlasting credit of men like GRAHAM BARDEN that this Nation of ours has not gone the whole way of so many other liberty-loving people: into socialism or something worse.

And I am also convinced of this: We are now witnessing a reawakening of our citizenry to a sense of values we might well have lost forever.

And I foresee that with the continuing support of the kind of people here tonight—citizens who recognize the worth of men like "HAP" BARDEN—we will see a steady resurgence of support for those principles of government for which he has fought so nobly and so long.

"HAP", my most sincere congratulations to you on the occasion of this recognition you have so well earned by your distinguished contributions to the cause of good government.

And before I read this citation I just want to say one more thing:

If you don't invite me to come down your way to help you catch some of those fish you are going after in your leisure I'm going to publicly repudiate all of the nice things I've said about you tonight.

Now, it is with a deep sense of personal satisfaction that I read this citation symbolic of the American Good Government Society's award for 1960:

TEXT OF THE AWARD TO HON. GRAHAM A. BARDEN

Patriot, jurist, and legislator, has devoted half his years to the service of his native State of North Carolina and to the Nation—more than a quarter-century of them in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Courage, integrity, and wisdom have made him a major constructive force in the movement for responsible labor legislation and tower of strength against one-sided and unbalanced proposals, destructive of the mutual interests of employees, employers, and the public. In the field of education he has been a steadfast leader in the continuing struggle to keep control of public education in the States and their communities.

Representative BARDEN, over the years of his service, has exerted a powerful influence for good on the work of the Congress of the United States. In well-earned retirement, he will be long remembered as one of North Carolina's most illustrious sons.

U–2 Plane Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include excerpts from yesterday's NBC–TV program, Meet the Press, containing my remarks in answers to questions on the controversy over the U–2 plane incident. The panel members were Peter Lisagor of the Chicago Daily News, Chalmers Roberts of the Washington Post, John Steele of Time-Life, Inc., and Frank Bourgholtzer, NBC news. The moderator was Ned Brooks. The excerpts follow:

Mr. BROOKS. Now, Congressman BOWLES, if you are ready, we will start the questions with Mr. Bourgholtzer.

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. Mr. BOWLES, if you were foreign policy adviser to a President, rather than a candidate, would you advise him in this situation where an American pilot has been shot down by the Russians and has admitted being a spy, would you advise just admitting that he was a spy as has been done?

Representative BOWLES. You have asked a very tough question. It seems to me that the administration did about all it could with a very difficult, very unpleasant, and highly embarrassing situation. It is pretty clear that Mr. Khrushchev knew what was going on. He appears to have the evidence with which he could confront the world and presumably persuade the world. I think it is a very bad situation. I think it would have only made a bad situation worse if we had tried to cover it up.

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. On the same question there are a lot of aspects but I am wondering particularly what your viewpoint would be, particularly thinking of the upcoming administration, to the point of the President being unaware of such an activity, as apparently is the case in this incident. Do you think the President should be kept purposely unaware of certain intelligence operations?

Representative BOWLES. Well, let's start with the fact that I believe this will go down in history as probably the most embarrassing and in some ways shocking occurrence in the last 7 or 8 years. We are going to hear a lot more of it.

I wish I were talking about it 2 or 3 days from now when, perhaps, we will have a better chance to settle down and think it through. Certainly I want to be sure that anything I say is very responsible and thoughtful, because no one has any desire to make this worse, certainly not for partisan reasons.

But it seems to me that the whole situation has placed the State Department in the position of having deliberately told a falsehood. I assume they did not know the actual facts, that these facts were initially simply given them.

I would go on to say that the President himself is placed in the position of not appearing to know a very major development in regard to our foreign policy. The Soviet Union has been encouraged to be suspicious of us—they are already very suspicious—on this whole matter of controls and inspections. They have always charged that the reason we want inspection in disarmament agreements is for spying work and espionage generally.

They now have been granted a beautiful opportunity, and they will certainly use it very adroitly to weaken our already weak position as we approach the summit. The whole world has been given a very deep contrast between our professed desire for peace, our desire to try to negotiate, while carrying on this kind of activity almost simultaneously. I think it is a very bad situation.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. BOWLES, I want to get one thing straight. Are you criticizing the activities of the plane or are you criticizing the pilot getting caught?

Representative BOWLES. Well, let me say this. I don't think any one of us who is simply an outsider and a newspaper reader, as I am, can know what is essential here in the way of espionage. We all are realists. We all know that this is a difficult and complex world. We know we are at a disadvantage, and that the Soviet Union is a closed police state which has certain very great advantages over us.

However, it seems to me that this is not really the point here. Espionage may be necessary under certain circumstances, depending of course on the technical problems, of how great our lack of knowledge really is. The point is the timing. The point is we are preparing for a summit meeting. The whole history of the world may depend upon our ability to negotiate with the Soviet Union, to talk with them with at least some degree of mutual trust. By timing this particular excursion at this particular time, we have certainly gone a long way to undermine that hope.

Mr. STEELE. Well, now let's see if I understand. You mean these activities are all right except when we have an international meeting; is that correct?

Representative BOWLES. I don't know that they are all right at all, Mr. Steele, because I don't know the inside story of how much information we have or what we lack or what risks should be run to get it. I would assume that we should not do this sort of thing for a marginal gain but only if the gain was so very vital that it could be justified to the utmost degree on the basis of our national security.

But the point is that we are now in a very delicate position and certainly this would be a time to be far more circumspect than these people obviously have been. I think

they have committed a gross case of misjudgment. I think the flight was highly reckless, dangerous, and hurtful.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. BOWLES, you are the foreign policy adviser to Senator KENNEDY and presumably will become the Secretary of State if he is elected President.

Representative BOWLES. I wouldn't presume that for 1 minute.

Mr. STEELE. You would not presume it?

Representatives BOWLES. No. There will be lots of possibilities.

Mr. STEELE. There has been talk of keeping the candidates informed about developments in foreign policy. Have you been kept informed as to these flights, either as Senator KENNEDY'S foreign policy adviser or as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee?

Representative BOWLES. No, I have not heard of them. I have not been kept advised in any way, and I doubt that he has. I am very sure that none of us have.

Mr. LISAGOR. On another point, Mr. BOWLES, in Milwaukee last night I believe you made a speech blaming a good deal of Mr. Khrushchev's bitter blasts at the United States recently on what you called China and the extreme rightists within the Soviet Union, suggesting, according to the accounts I read, that these people want to torpedo a summit conference.

Now how do you square that kind of a statement with the general belief here in Washington that Mr. Khrushchev needs peace and needs certain relaxation in order to get his 7 year plan to work?

Representative BOWLES. I haven't seen the paper, the quotation wouldn't be quite accurate if that is the way it appeared.

I asked the question, How much influence have the Chinese had in this situation? How much influence does the old Stalinist regime still have within the Soviet Union? I asked that as a question, and I think it is a very proper question, too.

The Chinese have always timed a lot of their intransigence in the Far East, Quemoy and Matsu and the rest, for the periods when we were trying to negotiate and talk with the Soviet Union. It is my guess that Mr. Khrushchev would really like to try to develop an easier atmosphere here. I felt this strongly when I saw him and talked with him a little over 3 years ago in Moscow. I had a long 3-hour talk with him, and I came out of it quite convinced that he wanted a détente. He wanted to see the situation ease. He felt the need of it for his own country, but was highly suspicious and was feeling his way.

It would seem to me that this development is not necessarily in the interests of the Mao Tse-tung government in Peiping. They naturally want to keep the cold war between the Soviet Union and the United States just as active and vigorous as they possibly can, because this assures them of a flow of material and loans and the other things they need from the Soviet Union.

I would assume that there is at least a potential clash here between Chinese Communist interests and the Kremlin's interests.

Mr. LISAGOR. But do you not believe that Mr. Khrushchev is secure enough today in Russia so that he can move on toward relaxation if he so chooses at a summit conference?

Representative BOWLES. I don't think we really know. I hope so.

I visited Belgrade in November. I wanted to go there to talk to some of the Yugoslavs who often follow pretty much the Soviet line. For instance in regard to Berlin, their line is almost identical with the Soviet position. But they do have some insight on what is going on in the Soviet Union and also in China.

I found a general feeling in Belgrade that Mao Tse-tung's government in Peiping had some contracts and some hope for support for an extreme position from certain elements in the Soviet military. They were inclined to feel that this was the case.

How Do You Stand?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1960

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the May 2 edition of the Idaho Daily Statesman, published in Boise, Idaho.

Written by the Honorable BARRY GOLDWATER, Senator from Arizona, the editorial is a short history of our Government from the days of the drafting of the Constitution down to the present time. It shows what the Founding Fathers intended, and what we have done to those intentions.

The distinguished Senator from Arizona has shown how far we have drifted away from the precepts of those noble patriots who gave the United States the greatest form of government in the history of the world.

Mr. Speaker, we should return to them immediately.

The editorial follows:

[From the Boise (Idaho) Daily Statesman, May 2, 1960]

HOW DO YOU STAND, SIR?

(By Senator BARRY GOLDWATER)

To understand the importance of the Federal Constitution, we must recognize that it is primarily a system of restraints against the natural tendency of government to expand in the direction of absolutism.

We all know the main components of the system. The first is the limitation of the Federal Government's authority to specific, delegated powers. The second, a corollary of the first, is the reservation to the States and the people of all power not delegated to the Federal Government. The third is a careful division of the Federal Government's power among three separate branches. The fourth is a prohibition against impetuous alteration of the system—namely, article V's tortuous, but wise, amendment procedures.

Was it then a democracy the framers created? Hardly. The system of restraints, on the face of it, was directed not only against individual tyrants, but also against a tyranny of the masses. The framers were well aware of the danger posed by self-seeking demagogs—that they might persuade a majority of the people to confer on government vast powers in return for deceptive promises of economic gain.

And so they forbade such a transfer of power: first, by declaring, in effect, that certain activities are outside the natural and legitimate scope of the public authority; and secondly, by dispersing public authority among several levels and branches of government in the hope that each seat of authority, jealous of its own prerogatives, would have a natural incentive to resist aggression by the others.

But the framers were not visionaries. They knew that rules of government, however brilliantly calculated to cope with the imperfect nature of man, however carefully designed to avoid the pitfalls of power, would be no match for men who were determined to disregard them.

In the last analysis their system of government would prosper only if the governed were sufficiently determined that it should.

"What have you given us?" a woman asked Ben Franklin toward the close of the Constitutional Convention. "A republic," he said, "if you can keep it."

We have not kept it. The system of restraints has fallen into disrepair. The Federal Government has moved into every field in which it believes its services are needed.

The State governments are either excluded from their rightful functions by Federal preemption, or they are allowed to act at the sufferance of the Federal Government. Inside the Federal Government both the executive and judicial branches have roamed far outside their constitutional boundary lines.

There are a number of ways in which the power of government can be measured.

One is the size of its financial operations. Federal spending is now approaching a hundred billion dollars a year (compared with 3½ billion less than three decades ago).

Another is the scope of its activities. A study recently conducted by the Chicago Tribune showed the Federal Government is now the biggest landowner, property manager, renter, mover and hauler, medical clinician, lender insurer, mortgage broker, employer, debtor, taxer, and spender in all history.

Still another is the portion of the people's earnings Government appropriates for its own use: nearly a third of earnings are taken every year in the form of taxes.

A fourth is the extent of Government interference in the daily lives of individuals. The farmer is told how much wheat he can grow. The wage earner is at the mercy of national union leaders whose great power is a direct consequence of Federal labor legislation. The businessman is hampered by a maze of Government regulations, and often by direct Government competition.

The Government takes 6 percent of most payrolls in social security taxes and thus compels millions of individuals to postpone until later years the enjoyment of wealth they might otherwise enjoy today. Increasingly, the Federal Government sets standards of education, health, and safety.

The Constitution is not an antique document. It is as pertinent today as it was when it was written. Our great error has been in departing from the letter and the intent of the Constitution as a document to restrain the concentration of power. How do you stand, sir?

Need for Public Understanding of East-West Conference Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 9, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for some time now, the world has looked hopefully toward the upcoming summit conference.

As realists, we have not expected panacea-type solutions to East-West differences. Nevertheless, it has been hoped that at the summit conference involving and comprised of Premier Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan,

President de Gaulle and President Eisenhower, we can at least make some progress toward resolving East-West differences.

Now, the flight of a U.S. pilot deep into Soviet territory has raised significant questions.

Apparently, the authorization for such a cross-country flight was not made in Washington. The President, the Secretary of State, and the Nation deserve an answer not only for scheduling of such a flight, not only for such deep penetration into Soviet territory, but also for reaching such a decision at this critical time in international affairs.

To meet the situation forthrightly, I believe we might well adopt the following course:

First, acknowledge to the Soviet Union the flight, designating that the decision was not made in Washington.

Second. Urge the Soviet Union to retain all data and information in possession of the pilot they deem necessary to their security.

Third. Point out that the pilot's armaments—a small, .322 caliber pistol—could hardly be a military threat to the Soviet Union, particularly in competition with what Mr. Khrushchev calls his "remarkable missiles."

Fourth. Request the return of the pilot to the United States for appropriate action in accordance with the situation.

Fifth. Again, stress—as President Eisenhower has done—the need for lessening of international tensions to allow greater freedom of airspace.

Regrettably, Soviet activities in subversion, espionage, and other similar activities has created the need for counterefforts to obtain information to protect ourselves against possible sneak attack—presumably the reason for the flight.

What effect will all this have on the proposed summit conference?

As yet, it is not possible to say. After the sensationalism of the incident has simmered down—and all the facts are in—perhaps it will be easier to assess the situation.

For the most part, I believe we—and the world—must attempt to put the incident in perspective—that the flight of one plane, over one country certainly is not enough to upset the global applecart.

We can expect, of course, that Mr. Khrushchev will play the incident to the hilt for propaganda purposes. However, perhaps a greater question in the whole affair now is whether or not Khrushchev will go off the deep end far enough to make it appear questionable as to whether a summit conference, scheduled to open on May 16, should be held at all.

If, however, it still appears that such a meeting would have a chance to lessen world tensions, there are, I believe, fundamental issues which would need to be considered at such a time.

Recently, I was privileged to review a few of the major issues in an address over radio station WGN in Chicago reviewing the situation. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

WILEY STRESSES NEED FOR PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING OF EAST-WEST CONFERENCE ISSUES—SAYS WORLD OPINION WILL BE FIFTH POWER AT CONFERENCE

Friends, I welcome the opportunity to discuss with you the major challenge facing America and the world—that is, keeping the peace; or conversely, preventing World War III, which would wound, dismember, if not destroy mankind.

If a major war can be averted, however, then we can all look forward to a better, brighter future.

In the modern world, the idea of a fortress America, go-it-alone kind of policy has been made obsolete by development of jet planes, missiles, nuclear bombs, and other modern weapons of destruction that eliminate distance, oceans, and terrain as barriers. As a result, we cannot close our eyes; pull in our personal, family, and community interests around us; and hope that the dangerous ogre, communism—the major threat to world peace—will vanish.

To the contrary, we must either face its threat and defeat its purposes of world conquest—if possible in a peaceful way—or become its slaves.

Outlook for summit conference—opening May 16, 1960

As you know, the summit conference, comprised of President Eisenhower, Prime Minister Macmillan, President de Gaulle, and Premier Khrushchev, will begin meeting in Paris, France, on May 16—about a week from now. The world is waiting, watching expectantly and prayerfully, hoping that these leaders of two conflicting ideologies will find a way: to resolve some of the international differences, and to establish a pattern of followup action—perhaps by successive top—or lower—level conferences to continue efforts to ease the tensions between the East-West blocs.

In reviewing the summit outlook, I shall not attempt to be a prophet—to be all knowing on such crucial international matters affecting us.

In an election year—with a ringful of hats for the Presidency; and a corral full of dark horses for both the No. 1 and No. 2 spots—there are more than enough self-styled experts floating around the country declaring, condemning, criticizing, admonishing, at the tops of their voices—with the last word on every issue.

As a Senator and citizen, and a human being who, along with each of you, deeply desires peace, I believe, however, we all must obtain as clear an understanding as possible of the challenges ahead, and the alternative ways in which to meet such challenges.

World opinion—Fifth power at summit

Generally, the summit will be considered a conference of four great powers. However, I believe there will be a fifth power at the conference—that is, world opinion. Neither the East nor the West can ignore this fifth power.

Around the globe there is a deep-seated yearning in the hearts of almost all people for the dawning of a peace in which the dark-cloud threat of nuclear annihilation will be lifted from above the heads of mankind.

During the negotiations, this great worldwide will for peace will, I believe, make its presence—and its force—felt by both East and West.

Whatever agreements may be reached at the summit affecting the destiny of mankind, I believe, will bear the invisible signature of this fifth power.

Major issues of the conference

Now, what are the major issues at the upcoming conference?

The gamut of East-West differences, of course, is widespread and complex.

First, a major issue confronting the East-West conference is the problem of Germany, including Berlin. Why? For the following reasons: A lasting peace in Europe depends upon protecting the freedom and integrity of the 2¼ million West Berliners and finding a realistic solution for German unification. Unless this is done, Germany will remain a powderkeg for years to come.

Settlement of the German question, too, represents a test of whether or not the Soviets can be depended upon to adhere to agreements—which are already established in relation to West Berlin—or whether again they will be treatybreakers.

Second, attaining safeguarded agreements on reduction of armaments, including bans on nuclear testing, is essential to reducing tensions and lessening the possibility of war.

While these constitute major challenges at the Paris summit meeting, additional issues—really as farflung as the world fronts—include:

Third, curbing the propaganda warfare by the Communists, which in itself constitutes a form of aggression.

Fourth, reaching agreements on limitation of arms shipments to such areas as Asia, Africa, and South America and other places in the world where "invasions of such military arsenals" would serve to stir up greater tensions and possibly create open conflicts.

Fifth, the question of the future status of the so-called captive nations, too, is legitimate subject matter for discussion. As in the past, however, we can expect that the Soviets will be reluctant to discuss this topic.

And a wide variety of other East-West differences that require ultimate solution—before there will be peace in the world.

East-West seek different objectives

The job of obtaining realistic achievements at the summit is made particularly difficult because the East and the West leaders—although they will discuss the same issues—are actually seeking different goals.

The West—in accordance with its traditional policies—is attempting to obtain a settlement of the problem relating to Germany, of reduction of armaments and other major issues to establish a just and lasting peace.

By contrast, the Communists—although they give "lip service" to peace—have not yet disavowed their ultimate goal of world conquest.

Consequently, this narrows the field of possible agreements to areas in which negotiations—or perhaps even mutual concessions—may service different objectives.

As humans, we, of course, wish for a panacea-type solution to the struggle: "Let's settle it and forget it." Unfortunately, the outlook is for no such accomplishment.

Even if the conference attained a high degree of success, it would still leave a great many unsolved problems.

Among other goals, the conference will need, I believe, to attempt to establish a pattern of future negotiations to carry forward efforts for resolving the multitude of problems that will still exist between the free and Communist worlds.

Major free-world goals

Unfortunately, in the complex jungle of East-West negotiations—including false Communist propaganda and our efforts to refute it, we—and the world—may lose sight of our goals in international affairs. Consequently a restatement of United States and Western objectives would, I believe, serve a useful purpose.

The major objectives include:

1. A unified Germany, free to elect its own government by vote of the people.

2. Existence of the European nations—now the so-called captive nations—under self-determined governments.

3. The attainment of realistic agreements for reduction of armaments to: reduce the fear of war, and enable nations to channel more of their resources, manpower and brainpower to benefiting—not threatening to destroy—mankind.

4. Creating greater respect for, and willingness to abide by, international law, to preserve peace and order on the globe.

5. A redefinition of world relations—as recently emphasized by Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon—declaring that coexistence among nations should not necessarily be by international agreement. Rather, the rights of separate states and systems to exist should be unquestioned—so long as the respective governments are determined by the people within each country.

Coexistence has always been, and should continue to be, a minimal condition of peaceful international relations—not a subject for negotiation or for ratification by the Kremlin.

6. A restatement of our willingness, as evidenced by postwar programs, and reaffirmed recently by President Eisenhower—to channel more of our resources—particularly savings resulting from safeguarded agreements for reduction of armaments, to aiding the less developed nations of the world to create a better way of life for their people.

In essence, this would mean emphasis on our adherence to a philosophy, not just of live and let live, but also to help others live better.

Overall, there are a great many ways—economic, intellectual, cultural, spiritual—in which nations, instead of threatening to destroy each other, could cooperate constructively to provide a better climate and a brighter future.

Government "of, by, and for the people"—not communism—most revolutionary

Prior to concluding, I would like to knock down one more strawman created by Communist propaganda: that is, that communism is a new, revolutionary political-economic system, designed to create a better life for people under its dominion.

Actually, this is contrary to the truth.

Communism, as we know it today, is really totalitarian dictatorship. Throughout history, dictatorial ideas and individuals have paraded behind many facades and masks to attain their goal of absolute power—and that means the decisions, not just of rights and privileges, but of life and death (and too often, the latter) over a people.

The Soviet Union and Red China, representative of modern-day communism—are no different from the bloody tyrannical regimes of the past that have subjugated peoples, deprived them of fundamental rights—and yes, annihilated them if it served the purposes of the state.

Realistically speaking, our form of government—"of, by, and for" a free people—is the most revolutionary in history.

As a novel adventure in self-government by a people—vigilant to preserve for themselves the maximum freedom consistent with an orderly society—our free system stands unique.

Only by constant vigilance and selfless dedication to high principles and ideals—consistent with our traditions—however, can we expect to remain a free people.

Conclusion

Today, we are beseiged by the Communist menace, employing all kinds of tactics, military and nonmilitary, to attain its objectives of world domination.

Can we defeat it?

Yes, I believe we will prove that freedom is the superior system.

To accomplish this, however, will require an ever-greater understanding by our citizens—you and me—of the scope of the danger; as well as a rededication of time, manpower, brainpower, and resources to further strengthen our system for withstanding one of the great tests of its life.

As we face this great challenge, however, I am confident that we will come through with flying colors.

U.S. participation in the summit conference—with President Eisenhower representing us—illustrates, once more, the President's willingness—reflecting the will of our people to go the "extra mile"—if it offers promise of promoting lasting peace.

Thank you for listening.

The Presidential Candidates and the People: NBC's Statesmanlike Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1960

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the President, as a student of our history recently wrote, is the one authentic trumpet in the American system. Out of regard for the importance of the Presidency, and concern over the overriding urgency of the presidential election of 1960, earlier this year I sponsored a bill (H.R. 11260) which would have required the networks to provide free radio and television time for the candidates of both major parties during the campaign this fall.

It gives me great satisfaction to report that Mr. Robert W. Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the National Broadcasting Co., has voluntarily put forward a plan which would achieve the main objectives of my bill—and identical legislation sponsored by 21 Members of the other body. I am happy to commend Mr. Sarnoff for this statesmanlike proposal and am reproducing below an address which he delivered before the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences in New York on April 21 in which he outlined his plan, together with a letter which I wrote him a few days ago in response to his proposal.

The speech and letter follow:

When I received my invitation to address the academy, I felt not only honored but heartened to be reminded that those respectable handmaidens of civilization, art and science, may still be mentioned in the same breath as television. I am glad to see that you are still meeting openly in public places.

It is no laughing matter, but this may go down in the more light-hearted histories of broadcasting as the season that a funny thing happened on the way to the studio. And, indeed, it has not been without its lighter side. For example, the popular pastime of deploring television has made some strange bedfellows: David Susskind and Jack O'Brian; Walter Winchell and Walter Lippmann; James Hoffa and the Attorney General of the United States; Henry Luce and Clare.

It is now 6 months since the open season on television began with a vengeance. We are not out of it by any means but we have lived through this critical period long enough to make a sober accounting of just what has been happening, to assess the damage that may have been done—and the good—and while nursing our wounds, to count our blessings and take a clear-eyed view of the hopes and hazards ahead. In the 6 months since the quiz-show disclosures struck the industry with full force, we have witnessed a curious confusion between ethics and taste.

The quiz rigging posed a grave and clear-cut ethical issue upon which honest, thoughtful men could not differ. Those cynical malpractices on the part of some producers and contestants not only abused the confidence of the public but set a premium on dishonesty and blurred the difference between right and wrong. The most striking single evidence of the social damage represented by these malpractices, as well as the thoroughness of their concealment, is the fact that they prompted scores of men and women to commit wholesale perjury before a grand jury. The issue of ethics is clearly involved in any form of deception that goes beyond the limits of traditional artifice in the field of entertainment.

But what began as a sense of indignation over dishonest practices in one corner of television has been rubbed off increasingly on all of television. An ethical judgment on wrongdoing has been distorting an evaluation of the overall quality and character of television programing. It is a classic case of guilt by association.

The charges that have been aired so vigorously against television in recent months are long-familiar charges of mediocrity, imbalance, violence, and overcommercialism. There is no firmer basis for these charges now than there has ever been, but those who press them are now armed with the cudgels represented by the quiz-show deceptions, and they are making the most of them.

IRONY OF THE PRESENT CLIMATE

Certainly this medium has its faults and frustrations. We often deserve criticism and we need it. Yet, in my opinion, the great irony of what we have come to call "the present climate" is that it has descended on us at a time when, in most respects, television has gone further than ever in raising its sights. This is the season that television has presented more special news, public affairs and cultural programs during peak evening viewing hours than at any time in its history. These enlarged efforts grow out of the steady progress of the past; they are not a sudden reflex to new pressures. As professionals in this medium, you know that such major projects in a season's schedule have to be planned, organized and committed long before the season begins.

Speaking for one network alone, this is the season that has seen the doubling of a pioneering effort to teach college-level courses in science for academic credit; the season that operas in English have returned in force and won sponsorship for the first time in 10 years; the season that has given "The Tempest" the biggest audience Shakespeare has ever had; the season that has offered more specials, more sports, more color than ever before; the season that is lavishing the finest creative resources on provocative live drama as controversial as the story of Ira Hayes and the Sacco-Vanzetti case. This month alone viewers are being offered Mozart's "Don Giovanni," Gilbert & Sullivan's "The Mikado," an adaptation of Joseph Conrad's "Victory," a biographical drama about Andrew Carnegie, an Easter documentary retracing the Way of the Cross, other documentaries ranging from the America of Mark Twain to the one Charles de Gaulle will start visiting tomorrow. And these are only highlights of what one network is offering. We hear so much about what's wrong with television; it may not be amiss to remember what's right with television.

RESULTS OF SELF-REGULATION

What are some of the lessons of the climate in which broadcasters have been living? We were caught unprepared by the quiz-show disclosures, but in swift and decisive response to the discovery of deceptions, we faced up to the sins of omission that helped make them possible. We have long since taken vigorous and thorough measures to clean our house, and to keep it clean. These have been measures of self-regulation so that, in some respects, they have differed from one network to another, but they reflect a solid determination to keep broadcasting ethically above reproach.

And they are working effectively. In the case of quiz and audience participation shows, for example, it was our conviction at NBC that these programs could and should be presented with integrity to the millions of viewers who find them enjoyable and instructive. Such shows are now operating under rigorous safeguards and they have passed the acid test with the public. Today six of the seven programs in this category on the NBC daytime schedule lead their opposition in popularity, and the seventh is a close contender for first place in its time period. On our evening schedule, two shows of this type are among the most popular in all of television.

In a larger sense, there is another significant verdict on television by the viewing public. The major audience measurement services report there have been more sets in use this season than last, and more time spent watching them in the average telesion home. These facts hardly support the notion of some observers that the public is losing interest in television or turning away from it. On the contrary, they make clear that the vitality of the medium is strong, and the public is responding to its powerful attraction.

Still the clamor of criticism goes on. Indeed, we have been entering a new and more dangerous phase in the period that began 6 months ago—a phase that makes this more than ever a time for reason.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

Seen in proper perspective, the disclosures of wrongdoing developed by Chairman HARRIS' House subcommittee represent a genuine service to the public and the industry. By the same token, much of the proposed legislation introduced in the wake of these disclosures reflects an earnest and constructive effort to create legal sanctions to deter such wrongdoing in the future. For example, Chairman HARRIS and his associates are conscientiously seeking to cope with the difficult, complex problems of legislating against payola, and are considering various bills to set up criminal penalties against quiz-show rigging, along lines that we at NBC were the first to urge.

But the emotions generated over the past 6 months have also spilled over into legislative proposals ranging far afield from these ethical issues—proposals that would dictate the scheduling and quantity of certain types of programs, and would drastically alter the structure of broadcasting itself. I am hopeful that, upon sober analysis, responsible legislators will discard the type of bill that threatens to create far more serious problems than it seeks to solve.

Another aspect of proposed legislation demonstrates how ill-conceived regulation can breed problems that beget still more regulation. An example is the recent bill that would make broadcasters give at least 8 hours of free evening time to the presidential nominees of the two major parties during the election campaign. Here is a bill that would unfairly compel broadcasters to do what they have in the past been prevented from doing by the impractical restrictions of section 315 of the Communications Act.

Those restrictions made it impossible for a broadcaster to present the major-party candidates for President without giving equal time to every other candidate for the office. In 1956, that would have meant some 15 other candidates. Devoting hour upon hour to the often quixotic antics of little known minority and splinter-group candidates would have been an unreasonable price on the public's patience and a disservice to common sense.

As I wrote Senator LYNDON JOHNSON in 1956, NBC has always stood ready to offer suitable opportunities for network appearances to the major-party presidential and vice-presidential candidates if we could be relieved of the penalty of having to grant equal time to every minor candidate. I repeated those assurances last year when the broadcasting industry was urging Congress to ease the "equal-time" restrictions imposed by section 315 of the Communications Act.

Unfortunately, Congress failed to remove these practical obstacles to face-to-face debate or campaign appearances by the major candidates as guests of the networks. But it did lift the "equal-time" penalty from candidates' appearances in news broadcasts and on regularly scheduled news interview programs.

A WAY TO PRESENT THE CANDIDATES

On the basis of this recent amendment of section 315, we believe we have found a way to give the public an unprecedented opportunity to hear, observe, and evaluate the major presidential candidates in appearances on network television in prime evening viewing hours. Beginning 8 weeks before election day, NBC will enable the Democratic and Republican nominees for President to appear together side by side before the American television audience in regular weekly sessions to come to grips with the issues confronting the country.

The vehicle for these historic appearances will be "Meet the Press," television's oldest news interview series. We propose to expand it to a full hour—as we have done on occasion in the past—and to reschedule it on Saturday evenings, preempting "Worldwide 60."

On six of the eight weekly programs leading to election day, each major presidential candidate will get an equal chance to reply to well-informed questions by impartial, trained journalists—courteous but skillful questions designed to bring out their views clearly and effectively on the matters uppermost in the voter's mind. Each program featuring the two presidential nominees will be devoted to a major national issue or a particular group of issues, designated in advance, and the final one before election day will treat the highlights of the issues as they have developed in the homestretch of the campaign.

In addition to these six programs, there will be one devoted to a session with the two vice-presidential candidates. And another will present the minor candidates for President—not out of any legal requirement but because we believe their appearance within this framework will make an interesting and informative program. It will also give them a national hearing far in excess of any that could be justified by their voting support.

I believe that the course we are taking voluntarily is far preferable to the one that the proposed legislation would impose upon us. It represents the initiative of a broadcaster acting in freedom, not a Government edict that raises grave questions of public policy and constitutionality. Moreover, it represents a broadcaster's exercise of his own judgment as to how the candidates can be presented most effectively rather than Government dictation that they be presented in a prescribed way. There can be no doubt, in my opinion, that the format in which we plan to present the candidates can be more genuinely informative to the American people, and more interesting as well, than the speechifying contemplated by the pending bill.

HUMPHREY-KENNEDY DEBATE

Now I would like to discuss a dramatic and unusual development that arose only yesterday. As you know, Senators HUMPHREY and KENNEDY have agreed to engage in a televised debate during the West Virginia primary campaign. After thorough consideration of the circumstances and implications, we have today offered the NBC television network facilities for this debate.

You might wonder why we decided to follow this course, in view of the equal-time burdens of section 315; and why if we are able to offer time for a Humphrey-Kennedy debate in this instance, we cannot do the same for debates by the Democratic and Republican presidential candidates after they have been nominated. The differences between these two situations themselves illustrate the problems arising under section 315.

After the conventions, there will be a large number of presidential candidates from all the minor and splinter parties. If NBC were to devote as much time to debates between the Democratic and Republican candidates as we will allot to their appearances on Meet the Press under the plan we have developed, we could be under legal obligation to offer over 50 hours of evening time to the minor-party candidates. This would be an intolerable burden on the public and the network.

By contrast, televising a Humphrey-Kennedy debate at this initial stage of the campaign could give rise only to a limited number of claims for equal time. Since this is a Democratic primary contest, our only obligations under section 315 would be to bona fide qualified candidates for the Democratic nomination. Since it is still early in the preconvention period, relatively few contenders have committed themselves and would be eligible for equal time.

This course presents some problems, but we believe they are manageable. We have assessed the burden and decided to accept it, because in our news judgment, the particular issues being raised in the West Virginia primary are of unusual significance to the public and may not be representative of any of the other preconvention contests.

Station WTRF-TV, the NBC affiliate in Wheeling, W. Va., has already undertaken to originate the Humphrey-Kennedy debate and to furnish it to NBC. We expect to present this debate at a time and date to be worked out with our Wheeling affiliate and with the candidates.

In my opinion, this is probably the last time in the campaign that any network will be able to afford the luxury of presenting a debate between candidates. The way to make such televised debates possible as a regular feature of our political life is simply to free such programs from the equal-time penalty of section 315. The way not to do it is to pass another law enabling the Government to expropriate air time for campaign purposes.

THE AIR AS A PUBLIC RESOURCE

It has been argued that broadcasting is fair game for expropriation of air time by the Government on behalf of political candidates, because the airwaves belong to the people. The air does belong to the public, but what is proposed for Government expropriation is a great deal more than air. The public resource represented by the airwaves had no value until scientists and technicians invented ways to use it as a means of communication. In fact, vast unchartered areas still remain in the spectrum which cannot be used until science, technology, and enterprise develop their usefulness for the public. Thus, the

present broadcast frequencies had only theoretical value until individuals undertook the heavy investments in facilities and programing to provide a broadcasting service. Networks and stations lost millions of dollars for many years in pioneering this service; and today, many stations are operating at a loss in developing their own service.

It is not the airwaves that would be expropriated under the proposed legislation. What would be expropriated is the product of a broadcasting enterprise which, through business risk and development, like any other enterprise, has created a service where none existed before.

Is it fair to single out the broadcasting industry for expropriation of a portion of this service? It makes as much sense to suggest that newspapers and magazines be compelled to donate a prescribed number of pages to the major candidates. After all, most of them get the benefit, not of the public air, but of public money through second-class mailing privileges for which the taxpayers provide scores of millions of dollars a year.

It makes as much sense to suggest that the airlines, the railroads and the telephone company be compelled to donate their facilities to political candidates. Like broadcasting, they all make use of a public resource; and they also operate under a Federal standard of public interest, convenience, and necessity. Indeed, the telephone company uses radio frequencies to provide network interconnections and is licensed by the FCC for that purpose just as broadcasters are licensed.

THE ISSUE OF FREE EXPRESSION

There is another issue at stake here that goes to the heart of the current threat to broadcasting: the issue of free expression. Any scheme that puts the hand of Government upon broadcast program content is a curb on the freedom of expression that Americans have as much right to expect from their radio and television stations as from their newspapers and magazines. When the Government can tell a broadcaster that he must carry a certain program, or a publisher that he must print a certain story, it is as much a curb on free expression as when the Government tells them what not to print or broadcast.

The danger of governmental tampering with program content hovers like a specter over broadcasting. It is the chief hazard before us. It lurks behind every scheme to license the networks. It looms over the proposals that the Government lay down fixed percentages for program categories and that the FCC impose program rules and regulations on anyone who wishes to receive and hold a broadcasting license.

What makes this problem especially delicate and confusing is that the FCC's duties in resolving public-interest questions sometimes do require it to consider overall programing. For example, this issue can arise when two or more applicants equally qualified on other grounds are seeking a station license; or when an existing licensee is seeking a renewal.

But this delicate problem can and must be solved. The FCC should exercise its role in such cases with the utmost restraint. Instead of laying down fixed and uniform rules to govern programing throughout the country, the Commission should encourage the broadcaster to exercise his own responsibility in judging and meeting the needs of his own area. It should ask him to describe how he has sought to determine the audience interests in his community; to define those interests he seeks to satisfy, whether specialized or diversified; to outline how he proposes to serve those interests and, if he is seeking a license renewal, how he has already served them. Under this procedure, the Commission would be justified in raising questions about programing only if the application reflected a service unreasonable on its face.

Such a standard of reasonableness, properly applied, can effectively reconcile the freedom of the broadcaster to exercise his initiative and the duty of the Commission to grant licenses only to those who will serve the public interest. And by placing proper bounds upon the Commission's role in programing, it can help hold the line against attempts to set up the Government as the arbiter of taste for American viewers and listeners. That is the ultimate challenge we must meet as the outgrowth of the trying period that began 6 months ago.

THE TASKS AHEAD

To meet that challenge, we have some difficult tasks to master. One of them is to create greater knowledge and understanding of our medium—an awareness of its nature as a mass medium and its obligation to the total public. This also means creating an awareness of all that we do to meet the specialized viewing tastes of those who have been so out of temper with us. It means cultivating the concept and practice of selective viewing as the only intelligent means of enjoying a service that cannot possibly please all its viewers with all its programs all the time. And it means persuading some of our viewers that their enjoyment of television should not be conditional upon depriving others of programs they enjoy.

This is a task that has been assigned to the Television Information Office, and it has made a good start. But it is not a task that can be delegated altogether. It is one in which every one of us with a stake in this medium can and should play a part. Broadcasters have a special role they can play through the use of their own facilities in creating this understanding. They should explore means of doing so not on a hit-or-miss basis but with care and a sense of responsibility.

There are other important tasks to which these difficult months have spurred us and in which we have already made encouraging progress. We must keep at the job of maintaining the highest standards of ethical conduct in our operations. We must continue to strengthen our supervision of all broadcast material, commercials as well as program content, in the interests of taste, truth, and our special obligation to young viewers. And always we must work with all our creative might to keep expanding the horizons of the most powerful and eloquent medium in the history of communication. On the basis of what we have already accomplished in this medium—even with our mistakes and shortcomings, and in spite of the dangers that now threaten us—there is every good omen that we will prove worthy of all that must be done.

Mr. ROBERT W. SARNOFF,
Chairman of the Board, National Broadcasting Company, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. SARNOFF: I just had the pleasure of reading your April 21 speech to the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences in which you announced that NBC will give both Democratic and Republican nominees for President an opportunity to appear side by side in prime evening time (on a "Meet the Press" type program) for the eight weeks prior to election day.

I think this is a most statesmanlike step by NBC, and it is my feeling that your action wholly meets the objectives of my bill, H.R. 11260 (which was sponsored on the Senate side by 21 Senators) and will give the American people the opportunity they should have to make a close study of the candidates and the issues in this critical election year.

I should also like to advise you that as a result of this step which you have taken I have advised the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that I consider my bill superfluous, and have asked that it be tabled.

Sincerely,

STEWART L. UDALL.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 10, 1960

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Very Reverend F. M. Galdau, rector, St. Dumitru Romanian Orthodox Church, New York, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

O Heavenly Father, our true peace and love eternal, Thou hast endowed man with free will and with an unquenchable thirst for freedom and justice. By Thine inscrutable and rich providence, Thou hast bestowed upon all nations all things profitable to the body and soul and the spirit of truth that abhors falsehood, terror, and tyranny.

We beseech Thee, O Lord, on this day, to remember all those who invoke Thy great loving kindness; those who love us; those who hate us; and those who have enjoined us. More, especially, we beseech Thee to remember the trials and tribulations of the enslaved Rumanian people, on this 10th of May, their day of independence, and save them and all freedom-loving peoples of the world from the tyranny of the godless ones. Deliver them, O Lord, and all the oppressed peoples of the world from all injustice, calamities, wrath, and want, and grant unto them their freedom and independence, which art from Thee.

Grant, O Lord, wisdom, strength, courage, and patience to all leaders of the free world, so that they may be aware of the danger that is lurking at our very door, because, lo, the tyrant has consorted in our midst and has spread honeyed words of deception and confusion, while his mighty power is ready to impart destruction, ruin, and death.

We pray Thee, O Lord, to inspire and guide the work and activity of all our Senators and Representatives, so that, without hindrance or hesitation, they may fulfill their duties and achieve their supreme ideal of freedom and peace with justice for all nations of the world, for Thou art our hope, our strength, and our salvation, for ever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 9, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (H.R. 5421) to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes, together with all accompanying papers.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 10401) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PLANE INCIDENT AND THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this is certainly a time in which Americans—and people everywhere—must keep their heads. We cannot afford hysteria, panic, or hasty and ill-advised action.

There are many unanswered questions about the incident of the American plane that was shot down over the Soviet Union. These are serious questions which will have to be considered very carefully by Congress and by the American people.

But it is doubtful whether the answers will be forthcoming immediately. There are too many facts which are not available and which will be available only when the Soviets permit a cool and realistic appraisal of what happened in their airspace.

Furthermore, it is always difficult to come to objective conclusions in an atmosphere of sanctimonious statements and threats against other nations. It is ridiculous for Nikita Khrushchev to profess such shocked surprise over efforts to gather information.

When Mr. Khrushchev visited this country last year, I do not think he impressed any of us as being a man who is naive. By that, I mean naive about what his own country has been doing for many, many years.

The incident, of course, will be assessed with great care and all of its implications will be explored carefully. But meanwhile, we cannot lose sight of the overriding reality which confronts us immediately.

It is whether this incident will become an excuse and an alibi for sabotaging the summit conference.

Within a very few days, our country is going to enter negotiations with the Soviet Union in an effort to relax the very tensions that have brought about this kind of an incident. It is difficult to imagine those negotiations as having much success if they are to be conducted in this kind of an atmosphere.

If Nikita Khrushchev is going to spend his time taunting the United States over what he considers the blunders it has made and threatening other countries on the basis of facts which have not been clearly established, there will be little time to talk about the real problems which divide the world.

Those problems cannot be traced back to the fact that nations seek to extract information from each other. Espionage and intelligence gathering are not something that cause the cold war. They are merely byproducts of the cold war—something that follows logically when nations cannot trust each other.

Whatever may be his motivations, it is obvious that Nikita Khrushchev has handled this incident in such a way as to draw attention away from the real problems. We must get back to those problems—of people, of armaments, of respect for the integrity of smaller nations—if the summit conference has any meaning.

If blunders have been made, the American people can be certain that Congress will go into them thoroughly. But this is something that should be done objectively and not merely as a panicky reaction to Soviet charges.

And I think that one point should be crystal clear. Nikita Khrushchev cannot use this incident in such a way as to divide the American people and to weaken our national strength. The American people are united in a determination to preserve our freedoms and we are not going to be shaken from that course, or we are not going to be divided in this critical hour.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Texas will yield——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Texas has made a forthright statement, and I concur in it.

This is not a time for us to retreat or walk backward; and I, for one, absolutely refuse to do so. To be sure, there are facts yet to be disclosed. But there is nothing that we need conceal particularly.

Certainly, ever since civilization began, there have been intelligence activities and espionage of a kind; and in proportion as civilization has become more complex, obviously the intelligence activities have become more complex.

During World War II, we set up the Office of Strategic Services. I had opportunities to examine their installations in many parts of the world.

So, Mr. President, as the majority leader has well put it, we would indeed be naive if we did not view this matter objectively and realistically; and we so stated yesterday when this matter was discussed on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to congratulate the majority leader on his strong and forceful statement; and I desire to associate myself with the expressions he has made.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of this colloquy an article entitled "In the New 'Wet War'—Russia Steps Up Her Spying," which appears in the current issue of the U.S. News & World Report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his statement.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, May 16, 1960]

IN THE NEW "WET WAR"—RUSSIA STEPS UP HER SPYING

Soviet espionage by fishing ships, submarines, is giving concern to U.S. officials. Innocent-looking trawlers, appearing off U.S. coasts, turn out to be loaded with radar, other electronic gear. Red fishing craft of large size have no fishing gear in sight, but can mother fleets of subs. Also showing up: missile-tracking ships, weather ships.

Now the Russians are opening up on still another front. It is a sudden, secretive invasion of all the world's oceans, including America's own home waters. Worried officials are calling this the "wet war."

With increased frequency, you hear of Soviet ships or submarines prowling close to this Nation's coastal shores.

Late in April a U.S. Navy blimp photographed the Soviet fishing trawler *Vega* 60 miles off Long Island—and just a mile from where the first Polaris submarine *George Washington* was conducting important dummy-missile tests.

It wasn't the first time these seemingly innocent oceangoing vessels have acted so boldly. After the *Vega* incident, the Navy announced that the Soviets had scouted missile firings before.

In addition, it was only little more than a year ago that the Navy was ordered by President Eisenhower to board the trawler *Novorossisk* off Newfoundland after mysterious damage had been done to five transatlantic cables.

Now there are reports of still more cable cuttings in recent weeks.

WHY THERE'S CONCERN

These are only a few of the cases in the Pentagon's growing dossier on the "wet war." Officers have been aware of similar offshore

intrusions by Russia before, so why the sudden new concern?

Mainly, it is because of what is being learned about the trawlers.

These are no ordinary fishing boats. The *Novorossisk* was a sizable ship of 1,670 tons, able to steam at 12 knots. The *Vega* is smaller, but photos under scrutiny show she carried no fishing gear in sight and was topheavy with detachable radar antennas capable of screening a vast expanse.

American intelligence marks this about the *Vega*: It was the very first of a new "loaded" type seen in these waters. All Soviet trawlers carry modern radar eyes and electronic ears, but none observed previously was as well equipped as the *Vega* for close-up espionage.

Further, there is evidence that at least some of the craft, which nest regularly in the North Atlantic, can act as mother ships to restock—but not refuel—marauding Soviet submarines. Only their fuel capacities limit Soviet sub patrols. If they could establish refueling stations on this side of the Atlantic, they would be able to lie off American coasts on an almost permanent basis.

How about reports that they are using north Cuban ports for just this purpose? So far, there is "absolutely no evidence of this," emphasize Navy specialists.

ON ALL SIDES

This "wet war" is not confined to the Atlantic. It is being carried close to the Pacific and gulf coasts of the United States as well. Several years ago, Communist submarines were detected farther away—off Venezuela and the Panama Canal, or were observed tracking the U.S. naval fleets.

Now there are more submarines—a total of 500 in the Russian Navy—and they are becoming more daring. In naval files are records of Soviet intrusions within 10 miles, and very probably much closer, of big cities such as New York, San Francisco, and New Orleans.

RUSSIA'S OBJECTIVES

What are these intruders looking for, and what—if anything at all—can be done about it?

The answer to the riddle of what they are up to comes from intelligence experts who have been investigating Soviet naval actions ever since World War II. They conclude the Russians are using their "wet war" for a variety of purposes.

The "trawlers," for example, can collect all sorts of useful information about Polaris-type tests, become familiar with the underwater characteristics of U.S. nuclear subs to make them easier to detect in the future. They can snoop on communications networks—the very heart of U.S. air defense—and some sources claim these trawlers could steer Soviet bombers through "electronic holes" in the distant early warning radar screen in Canada.

Russian submarines can chart the ocean floors surrounding the North American Continent. The purpose, as suspected by U.S. officials, is to prepare accurate maps so their nuclear submarine fleet, now being built, can navigate into exact undersea positions for missile firings against U.S. cities. With radar and infrared sensing devices, they can peer inland to mark targets on the American mainland.

A WORLDWIDE OPERATION

The "wet war," as waged by the Kremlin, is not confined to America. It is going on all around the world. In the mid-Pacific, once regarded as a private lake for the U.S. Pacific fleet, you find Soviet picket ships capable of tracking missiles. Russian subs slip out of pens in Albania to roam the Mediterranean, or move through the Taiwan Strait and south to Singapore from Siberian bases. Their weather ships linger suspiciously close to secret installations of U.S. forces in the Far East.

And, right under American noses, the Russians are conducting important research on minerals, according to Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington. He wrote in a newspaper article that, 300 miles off Lower California, Soviet scientists "have taken sharp deep-sea photographs of the mysterious manganese-cobalt-nickel-copper nodules which thickly carpet the ocean floor in that and some other oceanic areas."

The tabulation of Russia's sudden interest in the oceans is almost without end. The Soviets have more ships and scientists in the polar regions than all other countries combined, and more ships and scientists assigned to deep ocean studies than any other nation.

"Soviet effort in oceanography is massive, of high caliber, and is designed to establish and demonstrate world leadership," warns Vice Adm. John T. Hayward, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations.

It all ties together. Victory in the "wet war"—ultimate mastery of the seas—would give a great edge to Russia in any efforts to blanket American coastal areas with nuclear-tipped missiles fired from offshore perches. For such an attack, complete understanding of the oceans is needed. Currents, bottom topography, magnetic, and gravitational fields are all important things to a submarine skipper. Russia is making these studies all along American coasts, in midocean, along the Continental Shelves and in all the seven seas.

NEEDED: ALARM SYSTEM

This "wet war" will be intensified, predict American officers. Ask one of these experts what can be done about it, and he answers: "As long as the Communists stay outside our 3-mile limit, all we can do is grit our teeth." By law, the high seas are free for any nation to use.

The U.S. Navy, of course, does keep as sharp an eye as it can on Communist maneuvering. "Hunter-killer" search forces constantly survey the sea lanes. But this is not enough, say U.S. Navy men. What they would like is a burglar alarm system—a very expensive underseas sonar fence—that would keep tab on all Soviet submarines in peacetime, with the implied warning that any warlike move would mean sudden death.

This is still in the dream stage. For now, American officers caution, this country should brace itself for more Soviet submarine activity and bigger and faster trawlers operating near America's home waters, and all around the world, spying out data that would be helpful in an attack on the United States itself.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to join the Senator from Connecticut in congratulating the distinguished majority leader on his extremely statesmanlike utterance. I know that he speaks for the people of the United States when he says they will not allow this incident to divide our country.

Of course it is regrettable that the incident occurred on the very eve of the summit conference, because it does give to Soviet Russia an opportunity to "explode a propaganda bomb," and perhaps places us at some psychological disadvantage.

However, I see no reason why this incident should endanger the hopes which all of us have for the forthcoming summit conference. As the majority leader has said, if ever we needed to act toward achieving a reduction of the tensions which exist in the world, we must act to do so now.

Also, we must appraise this incident realistically. As the distinguished minority leader has said, spying is nothing new in the world. It is a recognized and accepted fact of life in the situation in which the world finds itself. Soviet planes engage in it regularly. They have flown over parts of Alaska, northern Canada, Japan, and other Western defense areas. As a matter of fact, Soviet spying has been a more expanded and intense operation than ours, because their spies have infiltrated into every area of the free world, whereas the Iron Curtain has impeded and handicapped our securing intelligence information. Of course, many more Russian spies have been caught than have Americans or those from other countries.

Finally, the circumstances surrounding this episode would never have existed if Russia had accepted the President's "open skies" proposal of several years ago.

I am more pleased than I can say to hear our distinguished majority leader stand up here in the way he has and express himself as he has. Knowing him as I do, it is the exact manner in which I would have expected him to act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to commend the majority leader and other Senators who have spoken today in defense of our country. A number of us were serving in the other body when Peral Harbor occurred. Following that episode, an investigation was moved, and a committee was established to investigate why Pearl Harbor had happened and why our armed services did not know more about it.

I think our armed services should be commended for finding out what is going on in the world.

In our cities we have fire inspectors going around, without our referring to them as spying. If the police forces give due attention to suspicious characters, nobody accuses them of spying.

Our Armed Forces are charged with a grave responsibility—the preservation of this Republic; and if we are not faced with a serious threat, then we are wasting about $40 billion a year, trying to defend ourselves.

I for one do not think we should shake and quake in our boots every time Khrushchev and his gang do not like what is going on. They never give the world an accurate story of it; and we should say, as a great patriot did, "Our country! May she always be in the right, but our country, right or wrong!"

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I, too, desire to join in the complimentary remarks the majority leader has made. I have never found him wanting. I believe that he is made of the mettle that makes America great.

I wish to say that while I have been interviewed several times, as a general rule I have refrained from remarks; but in this particular instance I spoke very definitely. First, I do not believe it is going to hurt the summit conference to have the facts about this incident disclosed.

Khrushchev has known all the time, the leaders who are to sit down at the table at the summit conference have known all the time, that Khrushchev has been playing a great international game of poker, and that we have certainly had our planes and our armed forces in Europe with an object. As has been suggested, that object has been that we shall not be caught again as we were at Pearl Harbor.

It was the privilege of some of us to be in a special meeting yesterday and we were briefed. What was said or done, of course, is not for me to say, but I came out of that meeting with the thought, "Thank God it has been demonstrated, to me at least, that we are alert, and not asleep."

Mr. President, there appeared in the paper this morning the text of a statement issued by Secretary Herter. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD following these brief words of mine.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 10, 1960]

TEXT OF STATEMENT ON PLANE

On May 7 the Department of State spokesman made a statement with respect to the alleged shooting down of an unarmed American civilian aircraft of the U-2 type over the Soviet Union. The following supplements and clarifies this statement as respects the position of the U.S. Government.

Ever since Marshal Stalin shifted the policy of the Soviet Union from wartime cooperation to postwar conflict, in 1946, and particularly since the Berlin blockade, the forceful takeover of Czechoslovakia and the Communist aggressions in Korea and Vietnam, the world has lived in a state of apprehension with respect to Soviet intentions. The Soviet leaders have almost complete access to the open societies of the free world and supplement this with vast espionage networks. However, they keep their own society tightly closed and rigorously controlled.

With the development of modern weapons carrying tremendously destructive nuclear warheads, the threat of surprise attack and aggression presents a constant danger. This menace is enhanced by the threats of mass destruction frequently voiced by the Soviet leadership.

IKE PROPOSAL CITED

For many years the United States in company with its allies has sought to lessen or even to eliminate this threat from the life of man so that he can go about his peaceful business without fear. Many proposals to this end have been put up to the Soviet Union. The President's "open skies" proposal of 1955 was followed in 1957 by the offer of an exchange of ground observers between agreed military installations in the United States, the U.S.S.R. and other nations that might wish to participate.

For several years we have been seeking the mutual abolition of the restrictions on travel imposed by the Soviet Union and those which the United States felt obliged to institute on a reciprocal basis.

More recently at the Geneva Disarmament Conference the United States has proposed far-reaching new measures of controlled disarmament. It is possible that the Soviet leaders have a different version and that, however unjustifiedly, they fear attack from the West. But this is hard to reconcile with their continual rejection of our repeated proposals for effective measures against surprise attack and for effective inspection of disarmament measures.

RESPONSIBILITY NOTED

I will say frankly that it is unacceptable that the Soviet political system should be given an opportunity to make secret preparations to face the free world with the choice of abject surrender or nuclear destruction. The Government of the United States would be derelict to its responsibility not only to the American people but the free peoples everywhere if it did not, in the absence of Soviet cooperation, take such measures as are possible unilaterally to lessen and to overcome this danger of surprise attack. In fact the United States has not and does not shirk this responsibility.

In accordance with the National Security Act of 1947, the President has put into effect since the beginning of his administration directives to gather by every possible means the information required to protect the United States and the free world against surprise attack and to enable them to make effective preparations for their defense. Under these directives programs have been developed and put into operation which have included extensive aerial surveillance by unarmed civilian aircraft, normally of a peripheral character but on occasion by penetration.

Specific missions of these unarmed civilian aircraft have not been subject to Presidential authorization. The facts that such surveillance was taking place has apparently not been a secret to the Soviet leadership and the question indeed arises as to why at this particular juncture they should seek to exploit the present incident as a propaganda battle in the cold war.

This Government had sincerely hoped and continues to hope that in the coming meeting of the heads of government in Paris Chairman Khrushchev will be prepared to cooperate in agreeing to effective measures which would remove this fear of sudden mass destruction from the minds of people everywhere.

Far from being damaging to the forthcoming meeting in Paris, this incident should serve to underline the importance to the world of an earnest attempt there to achieve agreed and effective safeguards against surprise attack and aggression.

At my request and with the authority of the President, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Honorable Allen W. Dulles, is today briefing members of the Congress fully along the foregoing lines.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I could not refrain from expressing my appreciation to the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas, for the dispassionate, considered remarks he has made in the Senate this morning. The majority leader can, at the proper time and place, be a loyal, skillful, and adroit majority partisan, and I do not reproach him for that ability. I admire him for it. But at a time like this, it is of inestimable benefit to the Senate and to the country when the majority leader takes the floor and, without appeal to partisanship, and without attempting to capitalize on any phase of the incident, counsels prudence and the path of care in seeing that the welfare of our country is guarded.

I shall take his advice and I congratulate the distinguished majority leader for the tenor and tone of his remarks this morning.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to address a short remark to the majority leader.

While the majority leader and I do not always see eye to eye on partisan politics and political matters, I think he knows full well the great respect which I have for him and the extremely high regard in which I hold him. I know of no man in the Congress with greater ability. I know of no man in the Congress with greater loyalty to his country, to its security and to its progress than the majority leader.

The remarks of the majority leader this morning are the remarks of a truly great leader who is interested in his country and who, on an occasion when his country is definitely and deeply involved, not only can now but also has in the past risen completely above any partisan or political motivation. His remarks this morning are apt and to the point, and should be taken to heart by all Americans.

I am not completely and thoroughly conversant with all phases of our activities in the military and in other services in this country, but I believe, Mr. President, that I have had in the past several years my full share of exposure to what has to be done by the United States and by those responsible for its security.

I agree that all of us should be very careful at this time of tension not to express too vigorous an opinion in one way or another. Tensions in the world are very great. They can either be fanned or they can be quieted. A great deal depends upon the circumspection with which we, the people of the United States, in addition to the leaders of the political parties and of the administration, approach these problems. We, the people of the United States, I think, should exercise caution, calmness, and deliberation in these matters.

I received a letter this morning from a very worthy lady in my home State, who was very critical. She said, "What business have we 'monkeying around' even the edges of Russia? Why do we not let them alone? And then they will let us alone." I happen to know this lady. There is no finer lady in my State and none more well meaning. However, I will say she is completely devoid of any understanding of the constant and almost overpowering menace which threatens the freedom of the United States and of the free world every minute of every day, emanating from Communist aggression and Communist expansion. We must understand that if we in this country are to be able to intelligently and adequately prepare ourselves and to put ourselves in a position of security against surprise, we must know what is going on.

There are people in the country today who, I think, rather precipitously and

unwarrantedly, are criticizing in this situation. I say, Mr. President, that if a sneak attack should occur on this country today, these are the very people who would want to hang the people who had neglected to find out what was going on in the world. The security of the United States is paramount.

I wish to suggest one other thing. The continuous and uninterrupted and unprecedented espionage activities of the Communist Iron Curtain countries and of Russia in this country have gone on and have been reported to the American people for years and years. I could recite detail after detail, instance after instance, of the most flagrant espionage in this country, the most flagrant invasion of what we might call the sovereignty and the security of this country on the part of the Communist aggressors.

I merely want to say again, without drawing out the discussion at this time, that I compliment the majority leader on his very fine statement, on his statesmanlike approach, on his calmness, and on his interest in the broad best interests of the security of this country. I caution that we, as the American people, must not become too emotional about this matter, but must consider it with calmness until we know all the facts and until we know exactly what we are talking about. There are many things involved in this situation which are not at this point clear.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I want to express my appreciation to the Senator for his undeserved comments. The Senator knows of the great admiration and respect I have for him and have had since my first association with the Senator, when he was my chairman and I was a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and how deeply I appreciate his expression this morning.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I assure the Senator that everything I have said was from the heart. I mean it. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in paying respect to our distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] for his well timed remarks just given and the advice contained therein. Those of us who have had the privilege of serving with the Senator from Texas recognize him as a worthy opponent on any partisan question. However, we likewise know that on questions concerning the security or the defense of our country, he speaks as an American and not as a partisan.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Delaware. I value his friendship more than he knows.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I had in mind making a comment this morning about the so-called spy plane incident and in that connection I was told about the remarks of the majority leader. Though I did not hear them, I have just had an opportunity to read them, and I find they are a splendid contribution to this discussion. They go to what I had in mind to say this morning rather clearly, because I, too, feel, as the majority leader did, that this incident will turn out to be perhaps not as bad as we thought, and perhaps it will help rather than hurt us in the situation.

First, to make my remarks clean cut, I compliment the majority leader on the statesmanship which goes into keeping one's head when it would be easy to seek a partisan advantage, which might be momentarily attractive but would not contribute to our country's position in the world, and I join in complimenting the majority leader, for whom I have a high regard, as he and everyone else knows.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to express to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] my gratitude, though I feel I deserve no compliment for doing what any Member of the Senate under similar circumstances would do. I merely said that America must be all for one and one for all, and we cannot allow any threats or propaganda moves to divide our people at this difficult hour. I believe all Americans subscribe to that doctrine.

Mr. JAVITS. When the majority leader says it as the leader of the opposition to the party of the administration, it means more than mere words. I think we are quite right in being pleased that he spoke as he did at this juncture.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the statement of my friend from New York. He knows of my high regard for him and my deep friendship for him.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, second thoughts on the U–2 spy plane incident now show that its effect will be the reverse of what Chairman Khrushchev intended. The first flash of Mr. Khrushchev's theatricals has now worn off and reasonable men and women in the free world will have these things in mind. First, Mr. Khrushchev shows again that he wants to keep the world in the anxious seat rather than to calm its nerves. This is hardly a peace campaign or preparation for serious negotiation at the summit. Second, Mr. Khrushchev's rocket threats against Norway and Pakistan—so reminiscent of Suez in 1956—are hardly compatible with a just world secure in the opportunity for debate and the resolution of tensions through international law and negotiation. Third, the incident again recalls the unwillingness of Khrushchev to agree to President Eisenhower's open skies proposal which in turn shows American willingness to abandon secrecy and to insure the world against surprise attack. Fourth, Mr. Khrushchev highlights the danger of surprise attack and fixes attention upon the capability of one man in the Communist dictatorship by a sudden decision to plunge the world into an abyss of A- and H-bomb war.

Adult people will remember the spy networks of the U.S.S.R. which have operated for 40 years in the free world and the names of Klaus Fuchs, Pontecorvo, Igor Gouzenko, Gerhardt Eisler, and Colonel Abel. There is also evidence of U.S.S.R. aerial reconnaissance over free world areas including the United States—only we did not put on a propaganda show about it.

The U–2 incident should mobilize world opinion and bring it to bear upon the U.S.S.R. to put it in a mood to agree to pending treaties to protect against surprise attack, to end nuclear testing and for disarmament as consistently proposed by the free world nations. Second thoughts should show that the United States is not embarrassed, but that on the contrary, the free world's defensive alliances including the bases which implement them, are more necessary than ever.

As so often happens in these cases, the first impression is neither lasting nor correct. The Russian people themselves must now take careful account of what their regime means to peace. The cause and intentions of the free peoples are seen to be too deeply built to be shaken or confused by the theatricals out of Moscow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REASSIGNMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS IN THE MARINE CORPS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reassign officers designated for supply duty as officers not restricted in the performance of duty in the Marine Corps (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED SUPPLY ACTIVITIES AT SAN BERNARDINO AIR MATERIEL AREA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected supply activities at San Bernardino Air Materiel Area, Department of the Air Force, dated April 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF THE GOVERNMENT'S RIGHTS AND PRACTICES RELATING TO CERTAIN HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL SERVICES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the Government's rights and practices concerning recovery of the cost of hospital and medical services in negligent third-party cases, dated May 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROVISION FOR EXCEPTIONS TO RULES OF NAVIGATION IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO UTILIZE CERTAIN FUNDS FOR SPECIAL METEOROLOGICAL SERVICES

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments and private organizations and individuals for special meteorological services (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 502 OF GENERAL BRIDGE ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 502 of the General Bridge Act of 1946, and for other purposes (with acompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND LETTERS

A letter from the Assistant to the President, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Academy, for the year 1959 (with an acompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Finance:

"CONCURRENT RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE CONCERN OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OVER THE UNFAIR COMPETITIVE SITUATION IN WHICH THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY OF THE STATE FINDS ITSELF AND MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO TAKE IMMEDIATE STEPS TO PROTECT THIS INDUSTRY, WHICH EMPLOYS THOUSANDS OF PERSONS AND IS VITAL TO CONTINUED GROWTH AND PROSPERITY OF THIS STATE AND MANY PARTS OF THE NATION

"Whereas the textile industry of the State of South Carolina and many other States of the Nation finds itself in a highly competitive market with foreign goods priced from 20 to 50 percent under those made in the United States; and

"Whereas the reason for this great differential in price is the cheap labor of foreign countries of a much lower standard of living, which makes possible placing on the markets of the world products the selling price of which is far below even the cost of production in the United States, due to our higher wage scale and standard of living; and

"Whereas the general assembly recognizes that if the flood of cheap foreign goods is not regulated to the extent where our own industry is placed on a basis of fair competition the textile industry will be forced out of business; and

"Whereas the loss of an industry the size and importance of the textile mills will be a great blow to the progress of the State of South Carolina and other States similarly affected: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the general assembly does hereby express its deep concern over the flood of cheap foreign goods being placed on the markets of the United States and memorializes the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps to enact remedial legislation; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress and each U.S. Senator from South Carolina and each Representative from this State in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 35

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to safeguard and preserve established State and individual rights to the use of water within the separate States:

"Whereas recent decisions of the Federal courts and recent assertions from the U.S. Department of Justice have deprived States and persons of rights which the States and persons previously enjoyed to regulate and control the use of water in the respective States; and

"Whereas the decisions and assertions are further a part of a general pattern developing gradually into Federal supremacy and usurpation over water and if continued will destroy individual and States rights over water and substitute an all-powerful centralized government control: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress and the President of the United States and the Senators and Representatives of Mississippi in the Congress of the United States be respectfully petitioned to take all necessary action to —

"(a) preserve the water rights of the individual and the State and to prevent Federal usurpation of these rights;

"(b) to see that legislation is initiated and supported to reestablish to the individuals and to the States the rights taken from them by the Federal courts and the Justice Department; and

"(c) in every way possible reaffirm, renew, and defend the concepts that water rights are property rights and that those established rights to the use of water by a State or an individual should not be taken away without due process of law and adequate compensation; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the chairman of the U.S. Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senators and U.S. Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate April 29, 1960.

"PAUL B. JOHNSON,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 2, 1960.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A resolution adopted by the California Grape and Tree Fruit League, of San Francisco, Calif., relating to featherbedding practices in transportation operations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Oswego, N.Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to increase the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RESOLUTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONS OF STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of resolutions adopted by organizations of the State of New York.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE TRANSPORTATION SECTION OF THE NEW YORK BOARD OF TRADE, AND APPROVED BY THE DIRECTORS OF THE NEW YORK BOARD OF TRADE

Whereas the New York Board of Trade's transportation section is vitally interested in the preservation of all transportation systems servicing the Port of New York; and

Whereas the 10-percent tax on passenger transportation in the United States imposes an excessive and unnecessary burden upon all who travel in the pursuit of business vital to the national economy and welfare; and

Whereas this levy, imposed as an emergency wartime measure nearly 20 years ago to discourage nonessential use of an overtaxed transportation system, has long since ceased to serve any part or semblance of its purpose; and

Whereas the similar wartime excise tax on the transportation of goods was repealed in 1958; and

Whereas this unnecessary and inequitable excise tax, by adding to the cost of travel and thereby discouraging use of transportation, poses an immediate and serious threat to common carrier services essential to the health and well-being of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the transportation section of the New York Board of Trade does support the railroads, the airlines and the bus lines in their earnest request for the needful elimination of the 10-percent Federal transportation excise tax immediately and in its entirety, as this is in the public interest and essential to the national economy and places the board on record as favoring that repeal; and

Whereas this immediate and complete repeal is incumbent upon the Congress of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That the position of the transportation section of the New York Board of Trade favoring the repeal of this tax be made known to the Congress, and that the Congress be urgently petitioned to take immediate corrective legislative action.

RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OSWEGO TO MEMORIALIZE U.S. CONGRESS TO RAISE FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE TO $1.25 AN HOUR

Whereas the original Federal minimum wage law, enacted in 1936, which then provided for a minimum wage of 25 cents an hour, has been amended on three separate occasions to bring it more realistically in line with the rising cost of living and our American concept of Federal minimum wage standards; and

Whereas the present Federal minimum wage of $1 per hour is less than one-half of the national average minimum wage of $2.21 as set, determined by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics; and

Whereas wages and salaries paid at this low level make such workers a charge on the economy of the Nation, in that recipient of substandard wages are able to contribute little as consumers or purchasers of goods and services, or as taxpayers or supporters of the community welfare; more often becoming public charges on the State and private agencies; and

Whereas there are States which avail themselves of the funds and services of the Federal Treasury, and of all other Federal agencies, paid out of the Federal tax receipts collected from citizens and industries of the city of Oswego and New York State, whose employees in most cases enjoy wages in excess of the $1 minimum; and

Whereas many of the other States and their communities whose working people work for wages below $1.25 are held up as bait to industry as a reason for emigrating

from the State, thus placing Oswego and New York State in double jeopardy; and

Whereas the spirit of fair play, humanity, and minimum standards of decency, require that a legal and realistic floor be put under which workers in American industry shall not be employed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oswego Common Council go on record that the question of decent Federal minimum wages of $1.25 or over per hour shall be considered above the bipartisan political issues and in the interest of the Oswego and New York State economy, its wage earners, men and women, so that Oswego and New York State will receive its fair share of industrial expansion; and be it further

Resolved, That the Oswego Common Council memorialize Congress to pass an appropriate amendment to the Federal minimum wage of $1.25 or higher the law of the land, and also to give appropriate consideration to extending the law to the now exempt workers in American industry and commerce; and be it further

Resolved, That the common council call upon the Honorable Governor, Nelson A. Rockefeller, to use his good office to place this matter before the bipartisan congressional committee, set up by the New York State Members of the U.S. Congress, for the purpose of fostering such legislation, and copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, and Secretary of Labor, and all Members of the U.S. Congress.

RESOLUTION OF JOINT CONFERENCE OF AFFILIATED POSTAL EMPLOYEES OF GREATER NEW YORK AND NORTHERN NEW JERSEY CALLING FOR SALARY INCREASE FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Whereas the average weekly take-home pay for postal employees is only $74 per week; and

Whereas any number of impartial surveys show that an annual salary of more than $6,000 is needed today in order to be able to support an American family in a decent manner; and

Whereas the U.S. Department of Commerce, in a recent report, cited the average annual wage in the United States as above $6,000; and

Whereas the cost of living has been steadily rising to unprecedented heights; and

Whereas the annual salaries of postal employees are so low as to force over 80 percent of all postal employees to work two jobs in order to meet present-day living costs; and

Whereas wives of many postal employees have been compelled to take employment in order to make ends meet and, therefore, have had their family lives disrupted; and

Whereas this has resulted in a steady lowering in the standard of living of postal employees to a point where it is behind that of other civil servants in State and city; and

Whereas postal employees' salaries have, for a long time continued to lag behind the salaries of organized workers in private industry; and

Whereas the U.S. Government has an obligation to accord its employees the fair treatment it requires private industry to render to those it employs: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this rally of the Joint Conference of Affiliated Postal Employees of Greater New York and Northern New Jersey, which represents 35,000 postal employees of all crafts in the metropolitan area, assembled at the High School of Fashion Industries in New York City on Sunday, May 1, 1960, goes on record seeking the enactment of legislation which will establish an average $6,000 annual salary for postal employees; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Vice President Richard M. Nixon, Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen; chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, chairman of House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Speaker Sam Rayburn, Representative Charles Halleck, presidents of the National Postal Unions whose locals are affiliates of the joint conference, President George Meany, AFL–CIO; all metropolitan newspapers, wire services, television and radio stations.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CIVIL AND BUSINESS FEDERATION, WHITE PLAINS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Resolved, That the Civic and Business Federation, White Plains Chamber of Commerce, after due deliberation and consideration of all the facts pertaining to the so-called Forand bill (H.R. 4700) or any substitute thereof, opposes the adoption of Federal legislation for such purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That we are not opposed to the providing of medical care to the aged as we recognize a present need for such care, but our opposition stems from the Federal Government entering into the picture of medical care particularly as part of our social security system. This, we feel, leads us further toward the door of socialized medicine which is contrary to the principles of our American democracy and, while theoretically possible, breaks down under the practical implementation of such a program.

We feel that the immediate need for medical care for the aged, if provided, should be accomplished on an individual voluntary basis with the participants contributing toward the cost of their medical coverage.

We feel further that the following disadvantages overbalance the adopting of the types of Federal legislation proposed:

1. Revenue would be insufficient to carry out the program thereby creating greater tax imposition upon our economy and increasing our national debt.

2. The Government would be competing in the business of providing medical care, thereby putting the Government in direct competition with free enterprise, medical and voluntary insurance programs, and putting a brake on the adoption of sound medical benefit programs by industry.

3. The Government would have to set fees, name doctors, hospitals, nursing homes, thereby placing an undue influence in the medical benefits field.

4. Costs of medicines and appliances would skyrocket out of proportion increasing the cost of a program and possibly forcing the Government into allied fields.

5. Fraud would be difficult to control and we question whether or not the Government would implement sufficient investigation to uncover it in view of the fact that even in our Internal Revenue Service there is a failure to provide sufficient investigators.

6. Our country's economy would be affected. It would increase the cost of doing business without increasing productivity but it would discourage personal savings, decrease the supply of investment capital, and place an even greater burden on Government to supply the capital needed for an expanding economy.

7. The individual would lose his or her right to choose his own physician and hospital.

8. It would destroy community efforts to increase and improve health care and the desire to provide such care for the local community.

9. It would impair the voluntary help of a family to encourage self-help.

It is our opinion that most doctors have always given free medical care to the aged and indigent. Hospital clinics are ever increasing in their scope of activity. Approximately 43 percent of those over age 65 are now covered by voluntary health insurance, including group plans paid for under retirement programs and it is estimated that 75 percent of those who need and want such protection will be covered by 1965, and 90 percent by 1970."

We trust this considered expression of opinion will receive your customary careful consideration.

J. HERBERT GRIMSEY,
President.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Administrator of General Services, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DODD:

S. 3513. A bill to enable the United States to participate in the resettlement of certain refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 3514. A bill to authorize the transfer of a Bureau of Reclamation bridge across the Colorado River near Needles, Calif., to San Bernardino County, Calif., and Mohave County, Ariz.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARROLL:

S. 3515. A bill for the relief of Fotios Gianoutsos (Frank Giannos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S. 3516. A bill to admit the vessels *Fort Town, Maple City,* and *Windmill Point* to American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 3517. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to plan, construct, operate, and maintain a sanitary sewer to connect the Dulles International Airport with the District of Columbia system; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 3518. A bill for the relief of Merrill Ernest Pyle, Jr.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 3519. A bill for the relief of Henry James Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 3520. A bill to stabilize cotton price support for the 1961 crop; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KERR:

S. 3521. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the time within which a minister may elect coverage as a self-employed individual for social security purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 3522. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1948, relating to the workweek of the

Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 3523. A bill to authorize a judicial review by the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia of certain actions taken by the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PARTICIPATION IN RESETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN REFUGEES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to enable the United States to participate in the resettlement of certain refugees.

On the whole, I believe that House Joint Resolution 397 the chief measure now pending before the Judiciary Committee is soundly conceived. However, in view of our commitments to World Refugee Year, I hope that the bill which is finally enacted can be improved in a few minor ways.

I am in favor of the 25-percent matching formula contained in House Joint Resolution 397. But I am bothered by the fact that we had no refugee legislation on the books during most of World Refugee Year. In the bill which I am introducing, therefore, the 25-percent formula is rewritten so that we commit ourselves to parole into the United States, during the course of the act, 25 percent of the number of refugees resettled by other countries from July 1, 1959, the opening day of World Refugee Year, to the terminal date of the act. This provision would have the effect of bringing in, at most, another several thousand refugees. Because of the small numbers involved, I believe we can afford to err on the side of being generous by making our 25-percent commitments retroactive to the opening date of World Refugee Year.

One of the wonderful things about World Refugee Year was that nations which had previously not accepted handicapped refugees opened their doors to limited numbers of them and made special provision to assist in their rehabilitation. Australia, for example, committed itself to take 600 handicapped refugees, Canada agreed to take 100 refugees suffering from TB, Brazil offered to admit 100 TB refugee families, New Zealand took 50 handicapped refugees, Sweden took several hundred, the United Kingdom took 210 families of hard-core refugees, and so on. Of the refugees admitted to this country under the bill I am submitting, 500 numbers are allocated, to be used at the discretion of the Attorney General, for refugees who, because of age or physical handicap, are listed as difficult to resettle in the rosters of the United Nations High Commissioner, but who (a) are not institutional cases, (b) suffer from no contagious diseases, (c) can, in the opinion of the sponsoring voluntary agency, be made self-supporting with some assistance or are members of family units which can be considered self-supporting.

House Joint Resolution 397 limits admissions to refugees under the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner. I agree that this is where the primary emphasis ought to be. However, I feel strongly that the High Commissioner's definition of what constitutes a refugee is in certain respects arbitrary and that we ought to make some provision in our act for refugees not accepted for protection by UNHCR. UNHCR, for example, has refused to grant refugee status to almost two-thirds of all Yugoslav refugees who have escaped into Germany, Austria, and Italy in recent years. The High Commissioner's eligibility criteria are based on the concept of political persecution. Refugees from Hungary, Poland, and the other Iron Curtain countries are automatically granted eligibility because UNHCR accepts the fact that they have escaped for political reasons. In the case of the Yugoslavs, however, UNHCR has taken the stand that most of them escaped for economic reasons and, therefore, do not qualify. Personally, I do not buy this business of kowtowing to Tito's sensitivities. The Yugoslavs are the largest group of non-UNHCR refugees in Europe. We should not bypass them because of their lack of UNHCR status.

For reasons of equity, humanitarianism, and international understanding, my bill contains a clause which makes token provision for non-UNHCR refugees—not only for the Yugoslavs, but for various national categories like the Italian refugees from Tunisia, other Europeans uprooted and forced out of their countries by the rising tide of Asian-African nationalism; family reunion cases involving Chinese refugees in Hong Kong, and so forth. The numbers involved in this category under my bill would not be very great—all told 2,000 each year for 2 years. But I attach a lot of importance to the principle of not limiting ourselves rigidly to the High Commissioner's definition of a refugee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3513) to enable the United States to participate in the resettlement of certain refugees, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CHANTILLY AIRPORT SEWER INTERCEPTOR

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, by request I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to plan, construct, operate, and maintain a sanitary sewer to connect Dulles International Airport with the District of Columbia system.

In brief, this proposal, advocated by the White House, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and the Federal Aviation Agency, represents a far-reaching step in a long and continuing fight to keep the Potomac River sufficiently free of pollution to serve as Washington's drinking water supply.

This $28-million proposal calls for construction of a huge sanitary interceptor and trunk sewerline to extend from the District of Columbia to the Dulles International Airport, at Chantilly, Va., a distance of some 25 to 28 miles, depending on the route finally selected. Its capacity will be sufficient to provide not only for the airport and its anticipated growth, but also for the expected community growth and development in the adjacent areas of both Virginia and Maryland.

The bill provides authority for the District of Columbia government to make long-term deferred-payment loans, not to exceed $25 million, to defray the cost of the interceptor, since the system outside of the District will not be immediately self-supporting. It is proposed that the Federal Government make an outright $3-million contribution toward the development of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way for the interceptor and construction of the trunkline from the airport to the interceptor.

Mr. President, this proposal envisions that the Chantilly Airport and the Virginia and Maryland communities using the sewer system will repay the $28 million construction costs by use charges over the years. It is anticipated that this system will adequately serve all the needs of the area through which it will run through the year 2000, and that by that date 700,000 people will utilize these facilities.

This system will not cost the taxpayers of the District of Columbia a single dollar. Although the District of Columbia government is designated as the agency to proceed with immediate construction and maintenance of the necessary airport sewerlines, all costs will be borne by charges levied against the users of the facility.

It is anticipated that 1 year will be required to complete the planning phases, and an additional 2 years thereafter for construction.

For those of us who serve on the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems, this bill is indeed welcome, and represents a tangible recognition by the executive branch of what many of us believe is a proper and necessary role for the Federal Government in orderly Washington metropolitan development.

This bill demonstrates the Federal Government's initiative and good faith in trying to help solve, on a partnership basis, the problems besetting our neighboring States of Maryland and Virginia and their metropolitan satellite jurisdictions, when such problems arise as a direct result of the growth generated from the central city represented by the District of Columbia itself.

Certainly, Mr. President, this bill represents a realistically sensible metropolitan area approach to a metropolitan area problem.

I believe it incumbent upon the Congress to act expeditiously on this bill, so it can be passed before adjournment.

The proposed assignment of this project to the District government and to the Engineer Commissioner demonstrates, to my mind, the high esteem in which Brig. Gen. A. C. Welling is held by the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government and the confidence placed in him to handle effectively and efficiently this important job.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriatley referred.

The bill (S. 3517) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to plan, construct, operate, and maintain a sanitary sewer to connect the Dulles International Airport with the District of Columbia system, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

STABILIZATION OF COTTON PRICE SUPPORT FOR 1961 CROP

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as many of us here in the Senate know, existing law would allow the Secretary of Agriculture to drop cotton price supports to 70 percent of parity in 1961.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and I have studied this matter and we find that farmers cannot take such a parity cut. In the State of Alabama cotton farmers could lose as much as $14 per bale on the 1961 crop if parity were cut to 70 percent.

This $14 drop would eliminate or cut sharply into profits per bale. Accordingly, I am today introducing, for myself and my colleague, Mr. HILL, a bill which would place a floor of 75 percent of parity on the 1961 crop and delay until 1962 a change from seven-eighth Middling grade as the standard for the cotton price support base.

Under Secretary Benson's policies price supports have fallen since 1955 from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent for 1960 Choice A cotton. Further drift toward lower prices could lead us into another catastrophe like the depression of the early 1930's.

My colleague and I decided to introduce this emergency legislation because cost of production in recent years has increased steadily while the price received by the farmer has moved downward. These conditions could lead to disastrous results if supports are lowered further.

With costs trending upward Alabama farmers would have to spend somewhat more than in recent years to make a 1961 crop and at the same time face the very strong possibility that they would make approximately $14 less per bale. Rising costs and further parity cuts would also adversely affect cotton farmers in other cotton-growing States.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3520) to stabilize cotton price support for the 1961 crop, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 103 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by changing the figure "70" in the second sentence to "75".

SEC. 2. Section 108 of the Agricultural Act of 1958 is amended by changing the year "1961" in the second sentence to "1962".

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 RELATING TO COMMUNITY ANTENNA SYSTEMS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I submit a series of amendments, which I intend to propose to the bill (S. 2653) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish jurisdiction in the Federal Communications Commission over community antenna systems, when that bill is before the Senate for consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed in the RECORD, for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments, submitted by Mr. FULBRIGHT, are as follows:

On the first page, line 8, strike out "programs" and insert in lieu thereof "signals".

On the first page, line 9, strike out "programs" and insert in lieu thereof "signals".

On page 4, line 12, strike out "program services" and insert in lieu thereof "signals".

On page 6, line 20, strike out "programs" and insert in lieu thereof "signals".

On page 6, line 21, strike out "programs" and insert in lieu thereof "signals".

On page 6, line 25, strike out "programs" and insert in lieu thereof "signals".

On page 7, line 3, strike out "programs" and insert in lieu thereof "signals".

On page 7, line 8, strike out "programs" and insert in lieu thereof "signals".

Beginning on page 4, line 25, strike out "significantly facilitate the continued" and insert in lieu thereof "facilitate the".

On page 5, line 7, strike out "continued".

On page 6, line 11, strike out "continued".

One page 7, line 11, strike out "in order" and insert in lieu thereof "as may be required in the public interest".

On page 3, line 19, before the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided,* That the Commission may by rule waive the application of any section or subsection where it shall find that the public interest, convenience, and necessity will be served thereby".

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senators from Michigan [Mr. HART and Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] be added as cosponsors of Senate bill 3481, a bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide for loans to schoolteachers for summer term, where they desire to attend school for 3 months in the summer, being less than the 9-month term for which loans are now available.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Is my name included on the list as a cosponsor of that bill? If not, I should like to ask unanimous consent that it be included.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] be included as a cosponsor of the bill and that his name appear on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. His interest in education is well known in the Senate. Educators have told me they believe this amendment would be almost as beneficial as the original act itself, because teachers' earnings are so low that years and years are required to enable them to save enough money over living expenses to enable them to attend school in the summer. Thousands of our teachers are quitting the teaching profession. In my State about 20 percent each year are quitting. Statistics prove that if they can continue their learning they are less likely to quit the profession, and by making these loans available with a provision for payment in 10 years, educators believe many teachers who are quitting the profession will remain in, because by going to summer school they will increase their learning and they will increase their opportunity to earn more money. At a minimal cost I believe this measure will halt the flight of teachers from the profession, which is adding greatly to our problems.

In my own State we have 4,000 schoolteachers teaching who have only temporary certificates because school officials have been unable to get qualified teachers to teach.

Out of the 4,000, hundreds and hundreds have had no more education than a high school certificate. It is virtually impossible in the country areas to get qualified teachers because of the low pay. This is a measure which will help keep teachers in the profession and help those who are not qualified to get some training in the summer months to enable them to better fulfill their duties. I think it will be of great benefit to the educational process of this country.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

Mr. PASTORE. I think the Senator has put his finger on the nub of this problem. There has been a clamor over the years for better qualified schoolteachers. This bill will assist in that direction. I think our anxiety here should not be so much to avoid any exodus of schoolteachers from the profession, which of course should be stopped, but even more important than that is to facilitate the continuance of study on the part of these teachers into the summer months thus we can promote within the community of education a flow of better qualified teachers throughout the Nation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator. That is what the evidence we heard in 1958 indicated; namely, that some teachers are very able, but do not know how to teach, whereas other teachers know how to

teach but do not know their subject. At the present time teachers can get a loan, but they must stop teaching for 9 months. Under the bill the 3 months summer session would make them eligible for loans.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MUNDT:

Remarks delivered by Senator THURMOND, of South Carolina, in making presentation of the George Washington Award to Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, at the annual George Washington dinner of American Good Government Society on April 30, 1960.

THIRTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF J. EDGAR HOOVER AS DIRECTOR OF FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this may be a good time to observe the fact that today marks the 36th anniversary of the beginning of the service rendered by J. Edgar Hoover, the very distinguished leader of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. Hoover has had a singular record indeed, and has contributed so notably not only to law enforcement at the Federal level, but to the coordination of law enforcement between Federal, local, and State authorities.

I think the occasion can well be observed; and I was rather happy to note that the Legislature of the State of Illinois issued a proclamation to that effect, congratulating the distinguished Director of the FBI on 36 years of very distinguished service.

I ask unanimous consent that the proclamation be printed in the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

"Whereas J. Edgar Hoover on May 10, 1960, completes 36 years as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice; and

"Whereas Mr. Hoover is the outstanding man in the field of law enforcement in the United States; and

"Whereas Mr. Hoover has devoted his law enforcement career to the improvement of conditions in law enforcement throughout the United States and in the State of Illinois and has continuously worked for the utmost cooperation between all law enforcement agencies, Federal, State, and local; and

"Whereas Mr. Hoover has represented a bulwark in this Nation against the forces of subversion; and

"Whereas Mr. Hoover's leadership in the field of law enforcement has provided an inspiring example for the youth of this country, in which youth Mr. Hoover has a deep and abiding interest; and

"Whereas Mr. Hoover, through the Federal Bureau of Investigation has contributed substantially to the improvement of law enforcement in the State of Illinois: Now, therefore,

"I, William G. Stratton, Governor of the State of Illinois, do hereby proclaim Tuesday, May 10, 1960, as 'J. Edgar Hoover Day' throughout Illinois, and request the appropriate observance of the occasion and urge all citizens to commemorate Mr. Hoover's 36th anniversary as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Illinois to be affixed.

Done at the capitol, in the city of Springfield, this 6th day of May, in the year of our Lord 1960, and of the State of Illinois the 142d.

WILLIAM G. STRATTON,
Governor.

By the Governor:

CHARLES F. CARPENTIER,
Secretary of State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to associate myself in the tribute paid to Mr. Hoover by the distinguished minority leader. Mr. Hoover, in my estimation, is one of the great public servants of our time. He is a good man. He is a competent man. He personifies all that is patriotic in our Nation. He is my neighbor and my friend, and I take great pride in him.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I too want to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished minority leader and with the distinguished majority leader in paying tribute to J. Edgar Hoover. I think he is one of the outstanding Americans of our time. I think he is a great public servant, and I think the United States of America and the free world are better as a result of his services.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to join in the expressions of appreciation for Director J. Edgar Hoover, and to approve, so far as I am concerned, everything which has been said by the minority leader and by the majority leader of this body. The United States and its security owe a debt to the leadership of Mr. Hoover which probably can never be fully appreciated and can never be repaid. He has stood fast against the encroachments of Soviet espionage in this country under circumstances where strong men might have faltered because of the periodic castigation which he has received from certain elements in this country. Nevertheless, he has done his duty as an American safeguarding American interests.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to add to the tribute paid to J. Edgar Hoover. His service has been outstanding. It is difficult to imagine what would be the state of the Union were it not for the service of J. Edgar Hoover. On this, the anniversary of his entering the Federal service, he is entitled to the gratitude of the American people, and I am sure he has it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, today, May 10, 1960, marks the 36th anniversary of J. Edgar Hoover as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is wholly fitting that on this memorable occasion the citizens of the United States of America pay due homage to Mr. Hoover as a public servant whose outstanding work is a monument to his competence and to his integrity.

The story of respect for law in America holds a glowing chapter in the career of J. Edgar Hoover. It is only necessary to recall the conditions of law enforcement in the early 1920's, when he began his career, to realize the tremendous forward strides which have been made since that time in developing the strength of enforcement which gives meaning to a nation's laws. A great share of credit for that advance must go to J. Edgar Hoover, a man who has stood like a rock of character and dedication in the face of the most difficult pressures and challenges of organized crime.

Under the leadership of Mr. Hoover the FBI has grown both in service and in stature over the years. It has developed enormous and invaluable files of information about individuals, associations, and organizations whose activities require the maximum of awareness and vigilance in the public interest, and in the security of our Nation.

The justly famed FBI file of fingerprints has served a vital and ever-expanding function in crime detection throughout the 50 States. Direct reference to this file has been made available to local police, and, through an elaborate and highly efficient system of a data processing and communication, essential information is readily transmitted to law enforcement agencies in every part of America.

Through the initiative of Mr. Hoover, the FBI National Academy was founded, and has contributed importantly to the unceasing war against crime in the United States. In terms of the broader international interests of our Nation, the work of Mr. Hoover and his agency in exposing subversive elements seeking the overthrow of our free system of government remains both a high tribute to this distinguishd American, and a source of security and reassurance to the American people.

As he embarks upon another year in his long and preeminent career in the service of law enforcement and national security, it is my privilege to join with all his fellow citizens in expressing the Nation's gratitude to Mr. Hoover, and in extending heartfelt good wishes for his health and happiness.

LEADERS FAVOR CONNALLY RESERVATION REPEAL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in a world of rapid change and recurring stresses, the leadership of the United

States in the strengthening of world law has become a matter of paramount importance. In this nuclear age more than at any other time in the history of the civilized world, international law is the only realistic and practical way to settle differences and disputes among nations. It is therefore vital that we should do everything in our power to promote an intelligent understanding and respect for the operation of law.

Columbia University's Bureau of Applied Social Research recently conducted a poll of a sample of persons listed in "Who's Who in America" to determine their attitude with respect to world law. Since the discussion over repeal of the Connally amendment has raised a question in the minds of people over the opinions held by many American leaders on world law, it seems to me that the results of this poll would be significant.

A summary of the results of the poll was prepared by the bureau of applied social research on April 4.

I ask unanimous consent to have the questionnaire and the summary printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD LAW MAIL SURVEY REVEALS SUPPORT BY "WHO'S WHO" LISTEES FOR U.N. CHARTER REVISION

Over half of a nationwide cross section of prominent Americans who responded to a mail survey favor the enactment of enforcible world law under a revised U.N. Charter, according to the findings of a recent study conducted by Columbia University's Bureau of Applied Social Research.

The study of "Who's Who" listees also indicates that prominent Americans tend to favor a proposal for the United States to grant compulsory jurisdiction to the International Court of Justice, in disputes arising between the United States and other countries over international issues.

The study was conducted for the Pierce Butler, Jr. Foundation for Education in World Law. Dr. David L. Sills, the bureau's director of research, announced the results of the survey.

The Pierce Butler, Jr. Foundation was founded in 1957 to "encourage, through education, a widespread understanding of mankind's common interest in a peaceful world government by law." One of the foundation's purposes is to encourage research; the "world law poll" was sponsored by a special committee of prominent Americans consisting of Harrison S. Brown, professor of geochemistry, California Institute of Technology; Henry B. Cabot, president, board of trustees, Boston Symphony Orchestra; Norman Cousins, editor, the Staturday Review; Oscar Hammerstein II, librettist; Rev. Donald Szantho Harrington, minister, the Community Church of New York; Paul G. Hoffman, chairman, Hoffman Specialty Manufacturing Co.; Arthur N. Holcombe, professor emeritus, Harvard University, chairman, commission to study the organization of peace; Arthur Larson, director, world rule of law center, Duke University; the Honorable Herbert H. Lehman; A. J. G. Priest, professor of law, University of Virginia; Walter P. Reuther, vice president, AFL–CIO; Charles S. Rhyne, former president, American Bar Association; and Louis B. Sohn, professor of law, Harvard Law School; former Senator Ralph Flanders.

A questionnaire was sent to two samples of persons listed in the 1958–59 edition of "Who's Who in America": One sample, of 1,050, constituting a national cross section of Who's Who listees; the other, of 244 persons, from selected occupations.

The inquiry, conducted in March and April 1959, and which was directed by Bureau Staff Member E. David Nasatir, had two objectives. It sought, first, to show how the opinions of prominent persons toward two proposals for world law, as a means of preventing future wars, might be related to their beliefs concerning the likelihood of war, the policies of the Soviet Union toward other countries and the desirability of strengthening the United Nations. The study also sought to relate occupation, place of residence, and other social attributes to world law views.

The two world law proposals differ in their central features: Proponents of one proposal—the enforcible world law plan—assume that serious danger of war will probably continue to exist until both world law to prevent war, and the means to enforce it, are established. They have advocated that the United Nations be given a broad range of new powers for war prevention, including the authority both to decide disputes between nations in U.N. courts of law and to maintain a world police force to enforce the courts' decisions. The second proposal, the World Court plan, seeks to have particular nations—the United States, for example, in its relations with other countries—grant compulsory authority to the International Court of Justice (the World Court) over disputes which do not involve the domestic affairs of either contending party. The proponents of this plan argue that the Court's effectiveness is impaired because the United States and other nations reserve the right to decide which disputes they will submit to the Court's jurisdiction.

Dr. Sills emphasized that the survey's findings—the major highlights of which are outlined below—should not be regarded as necessarily representative of the views of all prominent persons in Who's Who; this limitation of the inquiry's results—characteristic of most opinion studies which use mail questionnaires—is attributable largely to the fact that not all Who's Who listees to whom questionnaires were sent returned them.

Some principal results of the study are:

1. Individuals who favor the EWL (enforcible world law) plan are by and large the same people who favor the World Court proposal; and individuals who oppose the first tend to oppose the second.

2. Relatively few individuals feel that "the practical chances will be at least fair" for the world's countries to reach agreement on either proposal "within 20 years."

3. Asked their beliefs about the chances that the Communist countries might be influenced toward enforcible world law "if the noncommitted Asian-African nations strongly favored" it, most respondents who favor the EWL plan replied that the Communists would "definitely" or "probably" be influenced; most of those who oppose it replied that the Communists would "probably not" be influenced.

4. Asked to indicate which of three different views about Russia's intentions most closely approximated their own, 78 percent of all respondents chose the statement:

"The Soviet Union is basically aggressive, and is likely to continue trying to bring more countries under its control throughout our lifetime."

(Other statements, abbreviated here, were "aggressive today, but will probably stop as the years go by" and "not really aggressive, only appear so at times for fear of attack from Western countries.")

5. Beliefs about the imminence of a new war are not closely linked to viewpoints about enforcible world law. Individuals who think that a major war involving large-scale use of nuclear weapons has at least a 50–50 chance of occurring within the next 10 years were compared, on their viewpoints toward the EWL plan, with respondents who think that a new war is not likely. The former favor the EWL plan slightly more often than the latter.

6. Physicians, educators, and clergymen most often favor either plan; lawyers, business executives, writers/editors, and social scientists least often favor either one. (Differences between the two groups are not extreme.) Younger respondents (48 years and younger) are far more inclined than older ones to favor either plan. Viewpoints toward the two proposals do not vary appreciably from one region of the country to another.

Findings in the preceding summary are based on cross-tabulations too extensive to be presented here (although included in a report to the Pierce Butler, Jr., Foundation). Following are breakdowns of replies to most of the separate items in the questionnaire. At the end is a breakdown of viewpoints toward enforcible world law, obtained by analyzing sveral questionnaire items simultaneously (as described in the report to the foundation).

1. What do you think the chances are that a major war, involving large-scale use of nuclear weapons, will occur in the next 10 years?

	Percent
Likely	6
A 50–50 possibility	32
Not likely	57
No opinion (or did not answer)	5
Total	100

NOTE.—Equals 575 respondents.

2. Do you think that in the next 10 years a limited war, say on the scale of the Korean conflict, is likely?

	Percent
Likely	33
A 50–50 possibility	45
Not likely	15
No opinion (or did not answer)	7
Total	100

3. The following statements reflect different viewpoints about Russia's intentions. Which one of the three statements most closely approximates your own view?

	Percent
The Soviet Union is "basically aggressive," and is likely to continue trying to bring more countries under its control throughout our lifetime	78
Russia is "aggressive today," but will probably stop trying to extend its control to other countries as the years go by	16
The Soviets are "not really aggressive," but only appear so at times because they fear attack from the Western countries	3
No opinion (and did not answer)	3
Total	100

4. Of the following four statements about the best way for the United States to treat disputes with Russia, which one comes closest to your own view?

	Percent
The United States, while avoiding risks to national security, should "seek out every opportunity" to negotiate with Russia	29
The United States, should remain willing to negotiate "insofar as Russia shows good faith"	43
"Only where U.S. strength is such" that Russia could not hope to gain by breaking its word should the United States consider negotiating	23
The United States should "avoid negotiating" with Russia	2
No opinion (and did not answer)	3
Total	100

5. Are there any steps which you feel should be taken, now or within the next 5

years, to "strengthen the United Nations" as an agency for the prevention of war?

	Percent
Yes	52
No	18
No opinion (and did not answer)	30
Total	100

6. Several long-range proposals to eliminate the threat of war have been advanced in recent years. One plan is to strengthen the International Court of Justice (the World Court) now at The Hague, and to have branches in different regions.

Its authors reason that, to rule out war, there must be machinery to settle international disputes peacefully, under law. Today, the World Court cannot fulfill this purpose, because nations now decide voluntarily to submit their disputes to the Court's jurisdiction—and few nations have done so.

Under this proposal, particular nations would agree to submit to the Court, on a compulsory rather than voluntary basis, certain types of serious disputes—over international, but not over domestic, matters—arising between them.

For each situation below: Do you think the United States should or should not grant compulsory jurisdiction to the World Court, over disputes arising between the United States and the other nation shown, if that country is prepared to do the same?

Over disputes between the United States and a NATO country:

	Percent
Should	65
Should not	21
No opinion	14
Total	100

Over disputes between the United States and a "noncommitted" Asian or African country, having no military pact with either the United States or Russia?

	Percent
Should	56
Should not	27
No opinion	17
Total	100

Over disputes between the United States and a Communist country:

	Percent
Should	44
Should not	37
No opinion	19
Total	100

7. When do you think the practical chances will be at least fair that the different non-Communist countries (including the United States) will be willing to give the World Court compulsory authority to settle disputes arising among themselves?

	Percent
Within 5 years	6
5 to 20	27
More than 20	9
Probably never	10
Impossible to estimate; too many factors involved	39
No opinion (and did not answer)	9
Total	100

8. When do you think the practical chances will be at least fair that the different non-Communist and Communist countries will be willing to grant the World Court compulsory authority to settle disputes between them?

	Percent
Within 5 years	1
Five to 20	11
More than 20	10
Probably never	27
Impossible to estimate; too many factors involved	42
No opinion (and did not answer)	9
Total	100

9. A second long-range proposal is to revise the United Nations Charter to give the U.N. sufficient powers to insure the security of every nation under a system of enforcible world law.

The authors of this plan reason that the threat of war cannot be overcome unless there is both a system of world law and the means to enforce it.

Suppose the large majority of nations, including the Western and Communist countries, were holding talks to consider establishment of world law under a new charter and ways to make it work.

For each of the following, which would you feel the U.N. should and which should it not be given the power to do?

1. Raise dependable revenues for maintenance of U.N. agencies by taxation of each member nation.

	Percent
Should have power to	73
Should not	14
No opinion (and did not answer)	13
Total	100

2. Control exploration of outer space and prevent its use for military purposes by nations.

	Percent
Should have power to	70
Should not	12
No opinion (did not answer)	18
Total	100

3. Decide disputes between nations, in U.N. courts of law (or in the World Court, The Hague).

	Percent
Should have power to	76
Should not	10
No opinion (and did not answer)	14
Total	100

4. Have a police force, to enforce the Court's decisions.

	Percent
Should have power to	68
Should not	16
No opinion (and did not answer)	16
Total	100

5. Implement a plan to achieve and enforce total disarmament of every nation (except for small arms carried by local police).

	Percent
Should have power to	53
Should not	26
No opinion (and did not answer)	21
Total	100

6. Open membership in the U.N. to all nations.

	Percent
Should have power to	59
Should not	24
No opinion (and did not answer)	17
Total	100

7. Abolish the veto within the U.N.

	Percent
Should have power to	68
Should not	15
No opinion (and did not answer)	17
Total	100

8. Apply world law to individuals as well as nations.

	Percent
Should have power to	29
Should not	42
No opinion (and did not answer)	29
Total	100

10. When do you think the practical chances will be at least fair that the Western and Communist countries might agree on a system of world law, incorporating those points you marked "Should" in question 9?

	Percent
Within 5 years	2
5 to 20	22
More than 20	21
Probably never	14
Impossible to estimate; too many factors involved	38
No opinion (and did not answer)	3
Total	100

11. If the noncommitted Asian-African nations strongly favored a system of world law, and were willing to join the Western countries in establishing it, do you think their attitude would influence the Communist countries toward acceptance?

	Percent
Yes, definitely	7
Yes, probably	39
No, probably not	42
No opinion (and did not answer)	12
Total	100

12. Do you think the U.S. Government should or should not advance specific proposals to establish a system of enforcible world law at this time?

	Percent
Should	66
Should not	22
No opinion (and did not answer)	12
Total	100

13. If you answered "Should" how much importance do you attach personally to whether the United States actually does advance such proposals, say within the next 10 years?

	Percent
It's essential for the United States to do this	57
It's not essential, but it is quite important	37
The United States should do this, but it's not too important	4
It doesn't really make much difference	1
No answer	1
Total	100

NOTE.—Equals 379 respondents instead of 575 as in previous questions

14. A typology of viewpoints toward enforcible world law: Obtained by combining replies to questions 9 and 12 as explained in chapter III of the report to the Pierce Butler, Jr., Foundation.

	Percent
1. Approve of the enforcible world law plan	54
Approve in full; favor all 8 U.N. powers	16
Approve with limitations; favor most powers	38
2. Misconstrue the EWL concept	13
3. Express no viewpoint toward enforcible world law	8
4. Not opposed in principle, but don't want United States to advance EWL proposals now	17
5. Disapprove in principle	8
Disapprove with exceptions; reject most powers	6
Disapprove in full; reject all 8 powers	2
Total	100

NOTE.—Equals 575 respondents.

RUMANIA INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on the eve of the summit conference it is well

to remember the nations held captive under Communist tyranny whose struggle for freedom goes on. One of these nations is Rumania, whose people today commemorate the independence from the Ottoman Empire proclaimed on May 10, 1877.

America's ties with the people of Rumania are based on a strong sympathy for their national aspirations. Decades of Communist rule have not succeeded in crushing their hope for liberty and freedom from Communist oppression, which we firmly support.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a proclamation by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, naming May 10, 1960, as Rumanian Independence Day.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER, ALBANY

"On May 10, 1877, the people of Rumania proclaimed their independence of the Ottoman Empire, and confirmed their freedom on the field of battle. The accomplished fact was ratified by the Congress of Berlin in 1878, recognized by the powers of Europe and eventually also by our own Government. "Four years later, also on May 10, Charles I was crowned King of Rumania.

"Americans of Rumanian descent understandably have a warm feeling for that day, and revere it both as commemoration of the past and as a symbol for the future: Now, therefore

"I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim May 10, 1960, as 'Rumanian Independence Day' in New York State, and I urge cooperation in its observance."

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 28th day of April in the year of our Lord 1960.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, today, May 10, is celebrated as Rumanian Independence Day.

More than 17 million Rumanians constitute one of the largest nationality groups in the Balkans. These splendid and courageous people have had the misfortune to suffer under oppressive alien regimes during most of modern times. In point of fact, they were obliged to struggle hard and fight continuously in defense of their freedom throughout their long history.

Late in the 15th century Rumania was overrun and conquered by the Ottoman Turks, and for centuries Rumanians lived under the rule of cruel Ottoman sultans. For several centuries they endured the almost unbearable yoke of these alien rulers, but they succeeded in maintaining their traditional national beliefs and ideals. In the middle of the last century they had their chance to attain their goal of independence, and after the conclusion of the Crimean War in 1856 they regained a considerable measure of autonomy under the guarantee of the great powers of Europe. Years later, during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78, they again saw their chance and seized upon the occasion by declaring their independence on May 10, 1877. This bold initiative culminated in the founding of the Rumanian kingdom in 1881.

We all are familiar with the present fate of the courageous people of Rumania. Locked behind the Iron Curtain of Communist tyranny, they stand deprived of the great gift of freedom which had been won with their blood and sacrifice. On this, the day of commemoration in the sacred history of their liberty, let us pledge never to forget the plight of the Rumanian people so long as the gates of oppression are closed upon them. Indeed, let us renew our pledge and our efforts to work for the ultimate deliverance which they yearn for and which they so richly deserve.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a brief statement which I have prepared on the Rumanian Independence Day, which is being commemorated today, May 10.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BEALL

On May 10, 1881, King Carol was crowned King of United Rumania, and since that time May 10 has been observed as the day of the founding of the Rumanian kingdom, or Rumanian Independence Day.

After the conclusion of the Crimean War, the Rumanian people regained their autonomy with the guarantee of sovereignty by the great powers of Europe. But the independence of the nation was comparatively short lived; Rumania came under the Communists, and today 17 million Rumanians live in their homeland under Communist totalitarian rule. This day is observed by Rumanians throughout the world, and especially by Rumanians living in America, but it is not observed in Rumania itself. The Communist rulers of that country have forbidden any public observance of this historic date which is so important in the hearts of Rumanians. This is part of the Communist plan to extinguish freedom.

However, the Communist rule cannot extinguish the observance of this day in the hearts and minds of the Rumanian people. Despite Communist repression, the Rumanian people's resolute courage and steadfast faith in freedom continues unbroken.

Our Nation is proud of the many persons of Rumanian descent among its population. They have contributed substantially to our culture and industry, and are among our most responsible citizens.

Let us here in the Senate—and all Americans—renew the historic bonds of friendship with the liberty-loving Rumanian people, and pray that the day will soon come when the people of that nation may again live in freedom and independence.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the American people have never forgotten the countries which lie behind the Iron Curtain. Their tragic slavery under Communist domination stirs the moral conscience of all Americans. Today, marks the independence day of once free Rumania.

Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to join with all Americans of Rumanian descent and the Rumanians now behind the Iron Curtain in observing the anniversary of Rumanian independence which was won on May 10, 1877.

Today, the proud people of this tragic land live under the crushing burden of Soviet rule. The Red tyranny is oppressive and cruel, but we know the spirit of freedom and national pride still glows in the hearts of its citizenry. Continued passive resistance to Communist objectives is acknowledged even by the oppressors.

On this occasion, we pay tribute to the courage and sturdiness of Rumanian patriots who stand steadfast for independence, and although they cannot openly commemorate this anniversay, we know their hearts are filled with devotion and love for their past liberties.

Let us assume the Rumanian people that they are not forgotten and that our prayer is the hope that not in the too-far-distant future, Rumanians will again be privileged to openly observe their day of independence and will be free from Communist domination.

BIRTHDAYS OF REPRESENTATIVES EMANUEL CELLER AND JOHN TABER OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to join with others of my colleagues in commemorating the birthdays of EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, and JOHN TABER, of New York, respectively, our senior Democrat and Republican in the New York State congressional delegation. The depth of my affection for these men has been one of the great pleasures of my congressional career.

EMANUEL CELLER, though of the other party from mine, has joined with me and I with him in many struggles in the House of Representatives, especially for civil rights and civil liberties. His devotion to the best possible relations between the United States and Israel, and the great meaning of that objective to so many of our people in New York, are very well known. I pay him the highest tribute today for the many years of honorable service, in which he has fought many fights so worthwhile for our country, no matter what might be our differences on policy which have arisen in the interim.

As to Mr. JOHN TABER, there are few who are as useful to our country. At his present ripe age of 80, his keen sense of protection of the financial situation of the country is legendary in the House of Representatives, and indeed, in the United States. Our Nation owes him a great debt of gratitude, and I hope no one will be confused by particular questions of policy when they are compared to the enormous service JOHN TABER has rendered to our country as a watchdog of the Treasury. I also pay tribute to the warmth of personality of Mr. TABER, whose friendship I have enjoyed during all the years since I first came to the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, like the distinguished senior Senator from New York, I, too, served in the House of Representatives for many years, and among my most precious memories are my associations over there. I wish to applaud and associate myself with the tribute the Senator has paid to his colleague from New York, Mr. CELLER. He is an enlightened legislator and a diligent Member of Congress. He is always affable and fair and considerate of those with whom he may disagree. I am very

proud of his friendship and of the opportunity I have had to work with him on various matters since I have come to the Senate.

I would not want the record to be closed without paying tribute to my friend JOHN TABER. I do not know of any man in government who has worked more insistently and diligently and determinedly to save the taxpayers money than has JOHN TABER. I have not always shared the viewpoint he has expressed in conference committees and in subcommittees and on the floor, but I have always known that he is an honest man and that he believes in the viewpoint he expresses. He never pulls punches, and he always exercises a good influence on Congress. I am happy that he has been privileged to serve a great State in a great body. The people of America have benefited from that service. Therefore I join in wishing him a happy birthday, and express the hope that he will enjoy many more.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the majority leader. New York State can be justly proud of these two men when they rate the kind of tribute which has just been paid them by the distinguished majority leader.

RUSSIAN ESPIONAGE IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, there is a great uproar around the world at the discovery that the Armed Forces defending the free world against the onslaught of Communist tyranny employ espionage as part of this defense.

The Red dictator, Nikita S. Khrushchev, expresses a great moral distress at this discovery. Some of our allies profess to be dismayed that we use intelligence agents to gather intelligence regarding the plans of an enemy who has brayed out that he intends to "bury us."

It is not for me at this time to dwell on what is presently occurring in this area, but I should like to explore what the headwaters of this problem really are, and to relate some of the disclosures and reports of the Internal Security Subcommittee which have been recorded through the years, and which are well documented.

Where are the headwaters of this problem, Mr. President? The answer to that question has been overflowing into the record all over the world for the past 43 years. Let me give a few summaries from that record.

I quote first from the Second Report of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of March 22, 1954, on "Activities of U.S. Citizens Employed by the United Nations":

On December 13, 1917, Lenin's handful of Bolsheviks, who had just seized the government of Russia, appropriated 2 million rubles for the needs of the revolutionary internationalist movement. Here is the language of the official ordinance as published in the Gazette of the Temporary Workers and Peasants Government, December 13, 1917, and furnished to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes:

"The Soviet of Peoples Commissars considers it necessary to comes forth with all aid, including financial aid, to the assistance of the left, international wing of the workers movement of all countries, entirely regardless whether those countries are at war with Russia, or in an alliance, or whether they retain their neutrality."

This was the original declaration of revolution against the civilized governments of the world. It was an official statement. It was implemented also by Moscow-inspired revolutionary activity on every continent of the globe.

In 1920, Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of State, Bainbridge Colby, looked at the plain facts of Communist activity, which were visible everywhere then, as they are now, and arrived at this conclusion:

"The existing regime in Russia is based upon the negation of every principle of honor and good faith. * * * The responsible leaders of the regime have frequently and openly boasted that they are willing to sign agreements and undertakings with foreign powers while not having the slightest intention of observing such undertakings or carrying out such agreements.

"They have made it quite plain that they intend to use every means, including, of course, diplomatic agencies, to promote such revolutionary movements in other countries.

"Inevitably, therefore, the diplomatic service of the Bolshevist Government would become a channel for intrigues and the propaganda of revolt against the institutions and laws of countries, with which it was at peace."

In 1921, the British Government granted de facto recognition to the Soviet Government by means of a trade agreement. The agreement provided for the prohibition of Bolshevik propaganda in Great Britain. Only 2 short years later, Britain threatened to terminate that agreement because Soviet agents were spreading anti-British propaganda in Afghanistan, Persia, and India.

In 1924, regardless of what had already happened, Britain granted the U.S.S.R. de jure recognition. Three years later it terminated both the trade agreement and recognition because the Soviet diplomatic service in Great Britain was acting as a "channel for intrigues and the propaganda of revolt," precisely as our American Secretary of State had predicted 7 years before ("Trends in Russian Foreign Policy", pp. 5, 7, 8, 10).

In 1924, China and the U.S.S.R. established "normal" diplomatic relations. Under the treaty each country was to refrain from spreading propaganda against the institutions of the other. Three years later China broke off relations because the Soviet diplomatic service, once more was acting as a channel for intrigues and the propaganda of revolt (ibid., pp. 8, 10, 11).

In 1924, Mexico recognized the U.S.S.R. In 1930, Mexico withdrew that recognition (ibid., pp. 9, 11).

In 1926 Uruguay recognized the U.S.S.R. In 1935, Uruguay withdrew that recognition, charging Communist activity in Uruguay and elsewhere in South America (ibid., pp. 9, 15).

Despite this record of Soviet perfidy, the United States extended diplomatic recognition to the Soviet Government in 1933 after an exchange of letters between President Roosevelt and Maxim Litvinov, Soviet Foreign Minister, in which Litvinov pledged that the Soviet Union would:

(1) respect the United States and refrain from interference in the internal affairs of the United States or its territories or possessions,

(2) refrain from any propaganda, or acts to disturb the tranquillity, prosperity, order or security of the United States,

(3) prevent the formation of any group on Soviet soil, which has the aim of overthrowing the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States.

This was the first agreement the Soviet Union ever signed with the United States. It was violating the agreement at the very moment that Litivinov was putting his signature to it, it has never ceased to violate this agreement, and it is still violating this agreement today, 27 years after it was signed.

Now I will continue with excerpts from the Internal Security Subcommittee document on "Soviet Political Agreements and Results."

In 1945 the Soviet Government was still our ally, in the war to establish the principles of the Atlantic Charter. In September of that year, Igor Gousenko, a Soviet diplomat, went to the Canadian Government with documents which caused an immediate investigation by a specially appointed Canadian Royal Commission. When that investigation was concluded, the Royal Commission found:

"There exists in Canada a fifth column organized and directed by Russian agents in Canada and in Russia" (the report of the Royal Commission, p. 685).

"Members of the staff of the Russian Embassy at Ottawa were actively engaged in inadmissible espionage activities" (ibid., p. 686).

The Royal Commission also stated:

"So far as the evidence discloses, the first head of the Military Intelligence espionage system in Canada after the arrival of the Soviet Minister was Sergei N. Koudriavtzev, whose official title was First Secretary of the Legation [later Embassy]" (ibid., p. 15).

"Major Sokolov, on his arrival in Ottawa in 1942, began to reform the previous organization, and was directed by Molier, who has been identified as one Mikhailev, an official of the Soviet Consulate in New York who came to Canada for that purpose" (ibid., p. 15).

On October 28, 1953, Ismail Ege, former chief of the Fourth Section of Soviet Military Intelligence, appeared before the subcommittee. He testified that the General Staff Intelligence Department of the Soviet Union used international bodies to conduct espionage. He proved his point by showing that Sergei Koudriavtzev, who had been head of the Red spy apparatus in Canada, later joined the Soviet delegation to the United Nations.

Let us also remember, Mr. President, that Judith Coplon's espionage partner, Valentin Gubitchev, was attached to the Soviet delegation to the United Nations. He was caught redhanded, in company with Coplon herself, and found guilty, but the U.S. Government returned him to the Soviet Union instead of sending him to prison.

On May 12, 1949, Kirill Mikhailovich Alexesv, who had been attached to the Soviet Embassy in Mexico, told the subcommittee that "all responsible workers of a Soviet Embassy are members of the secret intelligence service of the Soviet Government."

In 1951 the Special Committee on Un-Filipino Activities of the Philippine Government found that "the Communist Party is the vanguard of the Soviet Union here; its border patrol on Filipino shores."

In 1955, an Australian Royal Commission found that there had been operating out of the Soviet Embassy in Canberra,

a Soviet spy apparatus of the same kind that was discovered in Canada. Vladimir Petrov, the defector from the embassy who uncovered this apparatus, made a memorable statement about his country's espionage activities. Here is what he said—as quoted in the Internal Security Subcommittee Annual Report for 1957:

Espionage is a distinct and principal Soviet industry. This must be so; because the Soviet Union, alone of all the great powers, regards itself as being in a continuous and chronic state of covert warfare with the whole world outside the borders of the Communist empire. And conspiratorial techniques are natural to a regime that seized power and maintains power by conspiratorial methods. Soviet espionage has reaped a rich harvest by such methods, especially against friendly and unsuspecting countries.

I read now from the Internal Security Subcommittee publication, "Soviet Political Agreements and Results," a staff study published in 1959:

May 10, 1948: Costa Rica broke relations with the U.S.S.R., because the Costa Rican Communist Party with the help of international communism had taken control of the government, which provoked a civil war.

The same document tells us, Mr. President, that Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Venezuela, Israeli, Australia, Guatemala, and Iraq have all suspended diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R. since World War II. The same document tells us that:

The Canadian Government ordered home G. F. Popov, Second Secretary of the Soviet Embassy, because he was engaged in espionage.

The United Nations ordered home Viktor Invanovich Petrov, a Russian employee of its Secretariat, because he was engaged in espionage.

Last summer, Alexander Urevitch Kaznachoev fled from his post in the Soviet Embassy in Rangoon and took refuge in the U.S. Embassy. He told the Associated Press that the main occupation of all the Soviet Embassy staff—in Rangoon—is to spy.

Kaznachoev appeared before the subcommittee on December 14, 1959, to tell of his espionage activities under the orders of the Kremlin. He told us that his espionage chief in Rangoon was Ivan Vozsiy, who masqueraded as First Secretary of the Soviet Embassy.

J. Edgar Hoover, who knows more about this subject than any man in the United States, summarized the story in a speech made before the United American Mechanics in Charleston, W. Va., on June 16, 1959, as follows:

As the No. 1 target of worldwide communism, the United States is the prime objective of Soviet espionage. Soviet defectors are unanimous in stating that between 70 and 80 percent of Russian officials in the United States are members of the Red Intelligence Services. The importance that the U.S.S.R. is currently attaching to the value of these intelligence agents is vividly borne out by the sharp increase in the number of Soviet diplomatic personnel assigned to the United States. In May, 1954, there were 212 Soviet officials in the United States. Five years later that number has increased to 313, or an increase of almost 50 percent.

Soviet espionage activities in this country expose the fallacy of so-called peaceful coexistence in recent years; pseudo appeals for peace by Communists have been more than matched by intensified Communist espionage efforts in the United States. Using blackmail, bribery, and similar techniques, Communist agents, many with diplomatic immunity, are stepping up their efforts to obtain our military, scientific, and industrial secrets for use against us.

Mr. Hoover intently analyzed the 17th National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which was held in December 1959. The Subcommittee on Internal Security published his findings. Here is a part of what he said:

The party will remain in the future—as it has been in the past—an obedient slave of Moscow. No new personalities were brought into the party's top leadership. Rather, leadership is today exercised by the same corps of hardened, disciplined, veteran Communists who feel that Moscow represents the final goal of all of mankind's hopes. So-called rightwing Communists are not represented. They have either voluntarily resigned in complete disillusionment or been coldbloodedly purged.

The Communist conspiracy in America today is led by a man who has openly boasted that he was willing to take up arms and fight to overthrow our form of Government. Hall was convicted in Minneapolis, Minn., in 1934, in connection with a riot there when he was a member of the Young Communist League. During his trial he testified as follows:

"Question. But you would prefer the Russian—you would prefer to be in Russia?

"Answer. I prefer America with a Soviet Government.

"Question. And you are willing to fight and overthrow this Government?

"Answer. Absolutely.

"Question. And you are willing to take up arms and overthrow the constituted authorities?

"Answer. When the time comes, 'Yes.'"

Only a few weeks ago, the Subcommittee on Internal Security summoned Hall to the witness stand and read him the words I have just quoted to you and gave him opportunity to disavow them. He refused it.

Mr. President, it is my suggestion that we not lose our heads at the revelation that the free world uses espionage to defend itself.

Let us look at the headwaters of the stream.

Let us remember the words of the Communist manifesto:

The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions.

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY FORUM TO EXPLORE THE NATURE OF PEACE IN THE COMING YEARS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a rather unusual seminar which is to be held here in Washington tomorrow night. It will be cosponsored by the American Peace Society and the American University, and will be held in the School of International Service Lounge on the American University campus, Massachusetts and Nebraska Avenues NW., on Wednesday, May 11, at 8 p.m.

Participating in the seminar will be a group of distinguished experts on the subject of "The Redefinition of Peace." Dr. Stefan Possony, professor of government at Georgetown University, will discuss "The Communist Requirements for Peace." Dr. William Yandell Elliot, of Harvard University, will speak on the subject "Our National Peace Policy." Dr. Bonaro Overstreet, the coauthor of a recent bestselling book on communism, who has just returned from a trip to the Soviet Union, will speak about "New Ways to an American Contribution to Peace." The moderator for the forum will be a distinguished former Member of this body, Hon. Homer Ferguson, who now serves as chief judge of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals.

Mr. President, I urge all who can do so to attend this interesting discussion of the nature of peace in the years ahead. Fresh and imaginative thinking on this topic is of supreme importance as we approach the summit conference and the crises which must inevitably lie ahead, and I am confident much food for thought will emerge from this seminar.

The American Peace Society, which has long pioneered in this vital field, is the oldest peace society in America. Its cosponsorship of this forum is in keeping with the high traditions and leadership of the society, and I hope many people will take advantage of the opportunity represented by this forum.

WRUL BROADCASTS TO CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, several weeks ago I pointed out on the floor of the Senate that Cuba's lack of a free press had made it virtually impossible for the Cuban people to get the facts about what is happening in their homeland. I stated that in view of these conditions, it is imperative that the United States embark on a truth campaign which will bring our side of the story to Cuba.

Since making that statement on the floor, I have been advised that station WRUL, the international broadcasting station, has launched a series of truth programs for Cuba, in an effort to pierce the curtain of censorship drawn by the Castro government over all press, radio, and television in Cuba.

According to information which has been furnished to me by the station, WRUL recently began a series of nightly—Monday through Friday—broadcasts sponsored by a group of Cuban exiles who have banded together in Miami to create a program series called Por Cuba y Para Cuba—On Behalf of Cuba and For Cuba. These Spanish-language programs are broadcast from 9 to 9:30 p.m., e.s.t., on the shortwave 19 meter band at 15.38 megacycles and on the 25 meter band at 11.83 megacycles, over radio beams directed across Cuba.

The director of the program series is Andres Vargas-Gomez, the former Cuban Ambassador to the United Nations in Europe, who last month resigned in Geneva, Switzerland, after rejecting the Castro administration as Communist inspired.

The programs feature the voices of two brothers Pedro and Rene Leyva, both of whom worked on the Castro-confiscated Havana newspaper Advance.

Pedro, 32, had been a columnist for that newspaper. Rene, 46, was news editor, before both were exiled by Dr. Castro.

Each day, Mr. Vargas-Gomez and his staff cull from Cuban newspapers flown to Miami items which they know to be propaganda. The programs' producers compare these items with the verified facts and with reports from friends inside Cuba who smuggle information into the "Para Cuba" headquarters in Miami.

The programs are then recorded in a secret studio in Miami, and are relayed to the WRUL studios in New York City. They are then edited and played back at 9 p.m. over the station's powerful shortwave transmitters in Massachusetts.

Indication of the impact of these broadcasts is evidenced by Castro's recent comments against them over Havana radio. In addition, letters from Cuban listeners, testifying to a growing audience for these programs, are beginning to flow into the WRUL offices.

Beaming the truth to people who are denied access to it by government censorship is an old story to this 25-year-old station, which has become known as The Voice of Freedom.

As far back as 1940, WRUL was officially credited with being instrumental in saving 900 merchant ships from Nazi capture.

At that time the station, which has always had an extensive audience aboard ships at sea, broadcast to the Norwegian shipping fleet repeated warnings not to return to their Nazi-occupied home ports.

In 1941, this pioneer international station fed information behind the Nazi lines into the Balkans, with a view toward aiding democratic resistance units in Yugoslavia to spread truth to offset Nazi propaganda.

Following World War II, WRUL aimed programs at Italy, as part of a successful effort to keep Italy from going Communist in a critical national election.

Most recently, WRUL was effective in broadcasting to Latin America the truth about the Communist-inspired riots during the tour of Vice President NIXON.

WRUL was established in 1935 by Walter S. Lemon, president of the station, as a world radio university dedicated to the idea that a private broadcasting station could disseminate education to remote areas of the world by radio.

Approval of the sale of WRUL to the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., of New York, is pending before the Federal Communications Commission. The Metropolitan Broadcasting Co. now operates the following radio and television stations: WNEW and WNEW-TV, New York City; WIP, Philadelphia; WHK, Cleveland; WTTG, Washington; WTVH, Peoria; and KOVR, Sacramento-Stockton, Calif.

WRUL regularly beams, 7 days a week, to all of Latin America, including the Caribbean, Mexico, Central America, and South America, as well as to Western Europe and Africa. Programs are broadcast in English, Spanish, Portuguese, Norwegian, and Swedish.

Mr. President, I appreciate this opportunity to call the attention of the Senate to WRUL's important new program, which should be helpful in connection with projecting to the Cuban people the true story about the Cuban situation.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Rural Electrification Administration will celebrate its 25th anniversary on Wednesday, May 11, 1960. This is truly a great occasion for a Government program which has become a symbol of rural progress. Almost 5 million farm families throughout our Nation enjoy the benefits and accomplishments realized under the REA. It is with great pleasure and enthusiasm that I join in paying tribute, during this silver jubilee, to one of the finest and most constructive programs enacted by Congress.

Mr. President, the local rural electric systems, authorized by the REA Act of 1935, are local organizations that build powerlines and provide electric service to farmers and rural areas. They are usually owned by the local people they serve; and, as a result, they are independent business organizations. Capital is borrowed from the Rural Electrification Administration, these interest-bearing loans are repaid to the Government on a regular schedule. Approximately $4 billion of loans to local systems have been approved by REA; and the repayment record is outstanding. As of December 1, 1959, more than $823 million in principal had been repaid, and approximately $397 million in interest had been paid.

The local system obtains its electricity for resale to farmers from private power companies, Federal agencies, and other suppliers. The purchase of electric energy by the REA has increased from 300 million kilowatt-hours in fiscal year 1940 to more than 21 billion kilowatt-hours in 1958.

Today, 96 percent of our farms have electricity, and the average farm uses more than 343 kilowatt-hours a month. Only 10 percent of our farms had electricity when the REA Act was passed in 1935; but today more than one-half of all farms which have electricity are served by the REA. Our American agriculture has actually been converted from the "dark ages" of 1935, when fewer than 11 percent of our farms had electricity, to the brighter years of today, when almost all farms are being served in this way. The REA reports that there are more than 450 ways to use electricity on farms.

In the case of our own State of Mississippi, only 2,802 farms had electricity in 1935. In 1959, 191,900 farms had this service, and 78.3 percent were served by the REA. We now have 53,512 miles of powerlines. Consumption per farm has increased from 40 kilowatt-hours in 1941, and 95 kilowatt-hours in 1950, to over 207 kilowatt-hours in 1958. This illustrates the increased use of electrical equipment on farms and in the home. The REA has given our farmers new hope and a better way of life. It has given added strength to our farm economy and our national economy.

The Rural Electrification Administration was given the new job of supervising rural telephone programs. This was authorized by Congress in 1949. The rural telephone program has the same basic features as does the REA program. Both are lending programs which require that the borrower repay principal and interest within an agreed period of time. We are proud of the record which has been established for repayment of telephone loans in Mississippi. These programs are sound, and they afford to our rural population a great service which would have been almost impossible without the assistance of the REA.

Mr. President, the relationship between private utilities and the REA in Mississippi has been good. Of course, there have been some differences of opinion; but, as a whole, these differences have been resolved. It is most encouraging that the objective and the ultimate aim of both the REA and the private utilities in my State have been to give the best possible service to their customers.

I am exceptionally proud of the REA systems operating in Mississippi. Here will be found dedicated managers and employees of outstanding ability and leadership. Their primary purpose is to serve farmers. Their foresight and their determination have been responsible for the record of progress made in rural electrification.

Mr. President, I should also like to point out that these outstanding members of the Boards of Directors of the REA serve without compensation. They have given unselfishly of their time and ability, and have made great contributions to the success of this program. They have furnished guidance, direction, and sound business judgment in the operation of the local systems.

As an example of the record of progress made by the REA, I point with pride to the East Mississippi Electric Power Association, which has served my own home county since 1939. It organized with a total of 342 members and with 30 miles of line, 5 employees, a plant investment of $40,232, and a total annual payroll of $1,412. In its first year of operation it distributed 269,783 kilowatt-hours. As of April 1960 the East Mississippi Electric Power Association has 3,257 miles of line in operation, serves 12,500 rural families, and distributed 48,147,346 kilowatt-hours in the past 12 months. It now has a plant investment of $6 million and an annual payroll of approximately $281,000. This is truly great progress, and is typical of the accomplishments being made by our REA systems in Mississippi.

Mr. President, the REA has greatly changed the living conditions of rural people, by bringing to them such necessities as running water, sanitary conditions, electric stoves, electric heating, refrigeration, motors for farm labor, milking machines, and refrigeration equipment for the sanitation of milk production and egg production. The REA has made modern farm living a reality.

There are many, many other ways in which electricity has lightened farm chores. In the years ahead we shall see new and better electric machines come to farms. Electricity will continue to make a more comfortable and more profitable way of life for our farm people. We can anticipate with confidence that the REA will rise to the challenge of meeting the growing farm demands for electricity. On this 25th anniversary I salute the Rural Electrification Administration for the truly great contribution it has made to agriculture and for the outstanding leadership which has made this progress possible.

USE OF OLD SUPREME COURT CHAMBER

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may I inquire if there are other Senators who wish to have the floor for morning business? If so, I shall yield the floor to them. If not, I wish to proceed on another matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DODD in the chair). Is there further morning business?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have some morning business, I tried to make clear. I merely had the 3-minute limitation in mind.

Mr. President, for some time I have been concerned about the rather casual use of the old Supreme Court chamber. It serves as a place for parties, political meetings, banquets, committee hearings, and every other type of gathering any Senator may wish to assemble there. On inquiry, I have found that on May 28, 1934, the Senate passed Senate Resolution 193, which reads as follows:

Resolved, That the courtroom now occupied by the United States Supreme Court in the Capitol, when vacated by the Court, and the space below it formerly a part of the courtroom, shall be preserved and kept open to the public under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol with the approval of the Committee on Rules of the Senate.

That resolution, although it could have been drawn a little more tightly, is positive, and states that the room shall be preserved and kept open to the public. Certainly, the minimum interpretation of the intent of the resolution is that the room was to be set aside, reserved, and preserved as a shrine.

So far as I have been able to determine, this resolution has never been repealed, so the use of this room for the purposes I have described is in violation of the resolution. The Supreme Court vacated the chamber on June 3, 1935, to occupy its new building, and I understand that for years the chamber was preserved and kept open for the public under the requirements of the Senate resolution.

I speak partly from personal knowledge, because, when I first had the privilege of becoming a Member of this body, that was the use for which this chamber was used.

Apparently, while the Senate Chamber was being reconstructed, the older room was used, as convenience required, and an unfortunate precedent was set for the use of the room by Senators and committees.

I believe that the old Supreme Court chamber should be restored immediately, refurnished, and preserved. I believe that it should be kept open to the public as provided in Senate Resolution 193.

Although the room is usually referred to as the Supreme Court chamber, it previously served as the Senate Chamber. It was in this room that Thomas Jefferson, our first President to be inaugurated at the Capitol, delivered his inaugural address and took the oath of office administered by Chief Justice John Marshall. Many other outstanding events of national importance transpired in this room. The Louisiana Purchase Treaty was ratified there in October of 1803. The Senate occupied the chamber during the War of 1812 and the Mexican War. It was here that the Monroe Doctrine was first read; and many historic debates by true statesmen of our country have taken place within the walls of this room.

It was primarily in that room that Clay, Calhoun, and Webster engaged in their famous debates, sometimes with each other, sometimes with other Senators. It was in that room that Jefferson Davis first served as a Senator from my State. He later served in this Chamber.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it is true that the Supreme Court occupied the room for some 75 years. During this time many great judicial decisions were handed down which have affected the course and growth of our constitutional law. It was here that the electoral commission in February of 1877 pronounced the election of Rutherford Hayes as President in the greatest Presidential contest we have ever experienced. Jury trials were held in this room in cases where the Supreme Court had and recognized original jurisdiction.

The chamber was designed by Benjamin Latrobe after the model of a Greek theater. A balcony overlooked the chamber, and it was here that the press for the first time had space reserved for independent reporting of Senate deliberations on matters of national importance.

There, perhaps more than in any other one spot, grew the present proper recognition of the place of the press in reporting the daily debates and the administration of our affairs.

I have asked the Architect of the Capitol to estimate the cost of restoring and refurnishing the chamber. This estimate is in the process of preparation. It appears likely that the total cost of restoration of this chamber will be upward of $50,000, according to the plan adopted. It seems to me that we should make full restoration and that this is small cost indeed for preservation and restoration of a national shrine in which all Americans take great pride.

Mr. President, when I say "restoration," I mean restoration of the chamber as it originally was, according to the idea of the Senator from Mississippi, when it was a Senate Chamber, with the balcony restored, and with the restoration of at least some of the furniture.

I would hope that plan would include something more than an ordinary door space, so the public might partly enter, so the room would be fenced off and the floor space would be kept intact.

I have not conferred with him this morning, but I know the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is very much concerned about this matter, and has raised the point on more than one occasion, and has directed the Sergeant at Arms and others to make special inquiry as to the present situation and possible plans for the future. I am certain he joins in the sentiments of my remarks although I am not expressly authorized to attach his name to what I have said.

I believe this is a matter of the gravest concern to every Senator and to every citizen. This room is a shrine of patriotism, if I may say so, and also a shrine of culture. With all due deference to everyone who may be concerned, the present use, purpose, and practice going on in that room are in degradation of our American culture, when we, particularly in a day of materialism, ought to be taking constructive steps to expand and exalt any concept or feeling that may elevate the patriotism, culture, and other deep, finer feelings of our people. This is especially so in view of the fact that hundreds of thousands of young people, most fortunately, visit the Capitol. They are the ones who will carry on this great Nation in the future.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator, but I fear I have taken too much time already.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am very glad that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has invited attention to this matter. I must confess I have attended functions in the room, as have most other Members of the Senate. I have, confessedly, been at some functions at which I have shared some of the misgivings of the distinguished Senator.

This is a historic room, a room which is really one of our greatest traditions of this country.

As a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I assure the Senator that at the next meeting I shall be glad to bring up the matter and to invite attention to the remarks which the Senator has made. I think this should be considered very seriously by our committee.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much for his remarks. I wish to emphasize again that my remarks are not directed at any individual or any Senator. We are all guilty. It is collective guilt. We have let this happen by degrees.

This room is a very convenient place to have committee meetings and conferences, but we now have space in the New Senate Office Building and we shall have additional space in the Capitol itself. I think we can do without the space provided by this room.

I believe the resolution, Mr. President, would represent an authorization of some special appropriation, if we have Senate support, in the legislative appropriation bill, in an amount which would at least start the restoration, should that be the will of the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, today, May 10, is an auspicious occasion. It is the 10th birthday of one of our most important Federal agencies—the National Science Foundation. This Foundation was the outgrowth of the outstandingly successful World War II Office of Scientific Research and Development and the vision and efforts of the brilliant director of that group, Dr. Vannevar Bush. Many of you will remember the legislative pangs that we went through in passing this act, but no one will remember this more vividly, I am sure, than my distinguished colleague from Washington, WARREN MAGNUSON, who played such a crucial role and worked so diligently to bring the NSF to fruition. This is only one more example of the farsightedness so consistently shown by my distinguished friend.

Those of you who have had the good fortune of listening to testimony in the last 2 years in connection with our missile and space programs, will know only too well the importance of science to our well-being and our lives. Never, since Sputnik I, have we had so forcefully brought to our attention the truly critical nature of our scientific capabilities and attainments. Rarely have we become so quickly aware of how essential it is to educate our children and our people in the ways of the 20th century.

The National Science Foundation fulfills a fundamental role in our scientific efforts. More specifically, it helps to watch over and guide our efforts in the important areas of basic research. Basic research is, for the most part, strange and incomprehensible to the layman. It may lead to no practical return whatsoever. But it is—as the name implies—basic. Basic to all increase of knowledge and therefore the foundation rock of all future progress. In this third year of the space age, this is something that we cannot ignore.

The National Science Foundation has grown rapidly in 10 years. Much of the credit for this growth must go to Dr. Alan T. Waterman who has been its Director since the beginning.

Mr. President, I should like to request unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "National Science Foundation, a Ten-Year Résumé," written by Dr. Waterman, which appeared in Science for May 6, 1960, and which carefully describes the history of the NSF's first 10 years of operation. No one knows, of course, what the future holds, but I am sure that the next 10 years of the National Science Foundation will be even more auspicious than the first 10.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION: A 10-YEAR RÉSUMÉ—ITS OBLIGATIONS IN SUPPORT OF RESEARCH AND TRAINING AND IN EVALUATING NATIONAL SCIENCE POLICY HAVE MULTIPLIED

(By Alan T. Waterman, Director, National Science Foundation)

The National Science Foundation's first 6 years were analyzed with scholarly thoroughness by Dael Wolfle in Science in 1957.[1] I shall not attempt to review the factual data concerning the organization and operations of the foundation that are given in detail in his article. I shall take up the narrative essentially where he left it, at the beginning of fiscal year 1958. Whatever I have to say concerning the earlier period will be from the special point of view of one who has been intimately involved in shaping the Foundation's policies and operations during its formative years.

As visualized by Vannevar Bush in "Science, the Endless Frontier," and as defined by Congress in the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, the Foundation has two distinct sets of functions; one relates to the support of research and education through grants, fellowships, and other means, and the second involves the development of national science policy and the evaluation and correlation of the research activities of the Federal Government, as well as the correlation of its own program with those of other agencies, both public and private. There is a degree of difficulty in reconciling these two functions, because in planning and operating a research-support program the Foundation becomes to some extent an interested party with respect to the policy prescribed. Congress obviated this situation somewhat by denying the Foundation authority to perform research or to establish its own research laboratories.

In the first or operational category, planning and execution have been reasonably straightforward. Early in its history the Foundation adopted the grant as being the most flexible and effective means of support for basic scientific research. In the field of education it was decided that the graduate fellowship was the device that would produce the most immediate results in terms of trained manpower. Within the budgetary limits imposed by Congress, the Foundation immediately launched a graduate fellowship program and a research-support program which embraced all the natural sciences and, later, selected areas in the social sciences.

The policymaking functions, as well as the evaluation functions prescribed in the act were less susceptible of immediate and specific action, for reasons Wolfle pointed out.

In "Science, the Endless Frontier," Bush had visualized that a National Research Foundation would be the principal, if not indeed, the sole, point of reference for Federal support of basic or uncommitted research in the postwar period. In view of the brilliant success of the wartime Office of Scientific Research and Development, this was a logical plan for taking care of the Nation's research needs in science. So urgent were these needs, however, particularly in the mathematics, science, and engineering departments of universities, and so urgent was the Nation's need for scientific research that the provision of Federal support could not await the outcome of the 5-year congressional debate over legislation to establish the National Science Foundation.

The foresight of Secretary of the Navy Forrestal in establishing the Office of Research and Inventions—which in 1946 became the statutory Office of Naval Research made it possible for the Navy to provide critically needed support for basic research at universities. This program was followed in short order by the programs of the Federal Security Agency, notably those of the U.S. Public Health Service and the National Institutes of Health, and those of the Atomic Energy Commission. When the National Science Foundation began to operate in 1951, initial policy had been formulated and active support of science was under way; and as a result there was pressing demand for (i) impartial support of basic research and training unrelated to such practical missions as defense and health and (ii) supervision, coordination, and policy determination among the growing and splintered research-support programs of the Federal Government.

Equipped with a broad charter, a limited but growing staff, and an operating budget of $3.5 million, the new Foundation found itself under pressure almost immediately to start performing policymaking and evaluation functions. In addition, of course, it was expected to launch, as early as possible, programs in support of basic research and education in the sciences.

DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE POLICY

In this situation, the National Science Board and the Director sought to define more specifically the role of the National Science Foundation in relation to other agencies. After extensive conferences between National Science Foundation staff members and the Bureau of the Budget and other agencies, the Foundation made a series of recommendations which were incorporated in Executive Order No. 10521 of March 17, 1954.[2] The order states that the Foundation "shall * * * recommend to the President policies for the promotion and support of basic research and education in the sciences, including policies with respect to furnishing guidance toward defining the responsibilities of the Federal Government in the conduct and support of basic scientific research."

The order further directs that the Foundation shall be increasingly responsible for the support of general-purpose basic research but recognizes also the importance and desirability of having other agencies conduct their special basic research in fields closely related to their missions. The Foundation is not expected to have responsibility for the applied research and development program of other agencies; each agency is accountable for the scope and quality of its development efforts.

The Executive order of March 13, 1959 (sec. 6(b)) further clarified the Foundation's role as applying only to basic research. Within this more specialized framework, the Foundation has been steadily formulating national science policy in the course of day-to-day operations, frequently on the basis of agreement and understanding with other agencies. Those who insist that policy must

[1] D. Wolfle, Science 126, 335 (1957).

[2] This executive order was later amended by Executive Order 10807, Mar. 13, 1959.

be handed down ready made in the form of a proclamation or edict do not understand the nature of policy in the realm of science. To be workable, policy must evolve on the basis of experience; further, it must take fully into account the fundamental principles essential to the effective performance of research in science.

In carrying out its obligations regarding the development of national science policy, the Foundation started from the premise that, in the broadest sense, national policy for science is a matter primarily to be determined by the scientists themselves. The scientists of the country are unquestionably the ones most capable of deciding what is best for progress in science, in the true meaning of the word. Policy in this sense should not be masterminded by the Federal Government or any single agency.

The Foundation has advocated, and has itself adopted, the fairly general Federal policy of providing support to basic research after consultation with leading scientists in their respective fields. This would appear to be the most direct way in which progress in science in the country can be determined by the scientists themselves. It is the method that is favored by the majority of working research scientists. In carrying out this policy, a given Federal agency interjects its own interests and priorities.

In further development of science policy, the Foundation's approach has been to examine particular issues and to develop recommendations through a variety of techniques and devices, as follows:

1. The establishment of a special committee, followed by the issuance of a report. The principal example here is the Foundation's study, through two different committees, of the problems of Government-university relationships. This study availed itself of the assistance of outside individuals and groups, the Foundation staff, members of the National Science Board, and representatives of other Government agencies. Another example is the work of the Foundation's Special Commission on Rubber Research, which made recommendations on the role of the Government with respect to basic research in this field that were approved by both the President and Congress.

2. Preparation of special reports on particular subjects—for example, the Foundation report on "Basic Research—A National Resource" (1957).

3. The use of experimental programs by the Foundation as a means of acquiring information and experience to provide a basis for policy recommendations. The various experimental programs in science education, such as the Physical Sciences Study Committee, are examples of this approach.

4. Conduct of studies and issuance of reports upon request of the Executive Office of the President. The Foundation's report on the role of the Federal Government in international science, its report on Federal support of research facilities, and its recommendations regarding payment of indirect costs were prepared at the request of the Executive Office of the President.

5. Sponsorship of legislation on particular problems. An outstanding example is the successful Foundation sponsorship of legislation to extend to all agencies of the Government the authority to make grants for the support of basic research and the authority to vest title to research equipment with educational institutions. In this and other similar administrative policy matters the Interdepartmental Committee for Scientific Research and Development was helpful.

In 1959 the Foundation compiled a list of some 50 science-policy items of a governmentwide, national character that it has recommended or stressed. Drawn from a variety of public statements and published reports, these include: (i) The need for increased support of basic research; (ii) the need for increased opportunities and funds for basic research at Federal laboratories; (iii) greater stability and continuity in Federal support of basic research at universities; (iv) the need for diversity of sources of support of basic research in the Federal Government and need for basic research in support of development; (v) avoidance, to the extent possible, of large classified developmental undertakings by the Government at colleges and universities; (vi) payment of full indirect costs of federally sponsored research at universities and colleges; (vii) reasons for questioning the advisability of establishing a Department of Science and Technology; (viii) policy concerning loyalty of investigators on basic research grants.

Studies in support of policy: As background data for its own research programs and for policy formulation concerning the role of the Federal Government in the support of science, the Foundation established a continuing series of studies of the nature and extent of the national effort in research and development. Comprehensive surveys are made of the research and development effort of colleges and universities, and other nonprofit institutions and of industry. Initiated for the year 1953–54, these surveys measure research and development in terms of (i) dollars expended, (ii) professional personnel employed, and (iii) apportionment of effort between basic research, applied research, and development. With 1953–54 as the base year, future surveys will afford data to indicate trends and for other analytical purposes. These surveys are in addition to the Foundation's analyses of the support of research and development by Federal agencies, published annually in "Federal Funds for Science." The whole series carries out the Executive order "to make comprehensive studies and recommendations regarding the Nation's research effort and its resources for scientific activities."

Questions are sometimes raised concerning the value of attempting a breakdown of research and development activities in this way. The objection is made that in the pursuit of specific objectives—as, for example, by technical industries—the planning and execution involve all three categories in close coordination. Furthermore, individuals are often found who can participate effectively in all three areas. The latter are in much demand as project leaders and administrators of Government and industrial research and development.

The Foundation believes that study of these categories is warranted for a number of reasons. Leaders in science and technology feel generally that more basic research could profitably be performed by Government and by industrial laboratories. Similarly, scientists and educators have questioned the extent to which universities should engage in applied research and development, outside of certain areas such as engineering, medicine, and agriculture. Furthermore, it is desirable in any intelligent planning of science and technology to identify students with special aptitudes and to insure that such aptitudes are properly taken into account in the individuals' career plans. But by far the most important consideration is the need to emphasize the importance of basic research itself.

Under the increasing pressure to undertake and perfect critical developments in order to attain national or economic objectives, the emphasis is certain to be on the applications of science, particularly in view of budgetary and manpower limitations. **Therefore, unless a determined effort is made to support basic research, developments will inevitably be undertaken prematurely, career incentives will gravitate strongly toward applied science, and opportunities for making major scientific discoveries will be lost.** Unfortunately, pressures to emphasize new developments, without corresponding emphasis upon pure science—that is, basic research—tend to degrade the quality of the Nation's technology in the long run, rather than to improve it.

Under these circumstances the need for study and analysis of the facts is obvious.

EVALUATION OF RESEARCH PROGRAMS

A problem that matches in complexity the policy function is that of evaluation. The National Science Foundation Act makes the Foundation responsible for the evaluation of scientific research programs undertaken by agencies of the Federal Government and for a correlation of the Foundation's scientific research programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups. The Foundation has consistently pointed out, however, that it is unrealistic to expect one Federal agency to render judgment on the overall performance of another agency or department.

The Foundation has chosen, instead, to approach the problem through close liaison and exchange of information with other science agencies. The idea is to gain a comprehensive idea of the Federal programs and overall support of fields of science such as physics, mathematics, and biology. The adequacy of Federal support in each field may thus be considered. This procedure is implemented by the general technique of basing research support upon selection among applications or proposals received. By these measures the Foundation has endeavored to identify areas that are receiving inadequate support or which require attention for other reasons.

It was discovered, for example, that systematic biology and, more recently, inorganic chemistry were being inadequately supported. Word that the Foundation would be receptive to proposals in the fields of systematic biology has resulted in the rescue of this field from comparative neglect, and in all likelihood the same results will obtain with respect to inorganic chemistry.

Another example will serve to illustrate this point. A few years after the close of World War II, both the Office of Naval Research and the Atomic Energy Commission were providing considerable support to research on low-temperature physics. When the time came that neither agency felt justified in continuing its support at the existing level, the Foundation agreed to take over the major support of research in low-temperature physics.

CRITICAL AREAS OF SCIENCE

A related matter that will call for increasing attention on the part of the Federal Government and other sources of support for research and development is the question of special emphasis on particular areas of science. The issue frequently arises in determining critical areas or, from another point of view, in identifying gaps. In all developmental work, and in the search for areas of application, the importance of priorities of time and effort is an accepted fact. In pure science, the word priorities is inappropriate and misleading. No field of science can properly be said to have priority over other fields, as science. However, at a given time, in a particular field of science, it is common to find special lines of inquiry that for the moment are making rapid progress or other lines of inquiry that are meeting difficulty. These considerations can be, and indeed are, taken into account both by individual research scientists and by research agencies concerned in research support. **Thus, at any time there may develop what might be termed "critical areas" that it is currently important to foster. If the urgency**

is great, a conference on the subject may be in order, or possibly a thorough study undertaken to ascertain what special facilities, equipment, or training may be needed to encourage progress in the field. These are well-known techniques, in common use. It seems evident that, in years to come, increasing attention will be required along these lines, since there will undoubtedly be a tendency for groups of scientists to present for support plans and programs that represent their collective thinking. Agencies that provide support will then have to evaluate the needs of different groups in the light of current available information and knowledge—and funds. However, the existence of special patterns for critical areas should not be allowed to alter the view that support of research, across all fields of science, should be carried on on a continuing basis.

NEW MECHANISMS AND AGENCIES

The tasks of policymaking, evaluation, and coordination have been further clarified by the establishment of new mechanisms and agencies that did not exist at the time Dael Wolfle's article appears in 1957.

In the fall of 1957, after the launching of the first Russian sputnik, President Eisenhower called for redoubled efforts in science and technology, and steps were taken to strengthen the Government's leadership with respect both to science and technology and to education in the sciences. The position of special assistant to the President for science and technology was created. The President's Science Advisory Committee was expanded and strengthened and undertook at once a series of studies covering significant aspects of the Government's relationships to science, technology, and education.

The science activities of the Department of State, which had been allowed to lapse, were revived. A science adviser to the Secretary of State was appointed, and science attachés were again placed in key diplomatic posts.

Finally, in response to recommendations of his Science Advisory Committee, the President signed an Executive order, in March 1959, establishing the Federal Council for Science and Technology, to promote closer cooperation among Federal agencies in planning their research and development programs and to recommend ways in which the Federal Government can assist in advancing and strengthening the Nation's scientific efforts as a whole. Represented on the Council are the Departments of Defense, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Health, Education and Welfare; the National Science Foundation; the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and the Atomic Energy Commission. Representatives of the Secretary of State and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget attend as observers.

Thus, at the present time we have the following pattern: the National Science Foundation, with its National Science Board, has the primary responsibility for dealing with policy concerning Federal support of basic research throughout the country. The Federal Council for Science and Technology deliberates on matters of policy and program coordination and future planning among Federal agencies and makes recommendations to the President. The President's Science Advisory Committee, comprising nongovernmental scientists and engineers, considers important scientific and technical matters in relation to Government policy, with special reference to national security. The special assistant to the President for science and technology is available to the President at all times for advice or counsel on a wide range of scientific and technical matters.

RATE OF OVERALL GROWTH

During the first phase of its operations the National Science Foundation was occupied with its own structure and staffing, with the definition of its functions and responsibilities, and with providing a firm foundation for its two major programs—research support and education in the sciences. From the beginning it has also been steadily involved in policy determination both for itself and in terms of Federal support of science.

During its first 5 years the Foundation's appropriation climbed slowly from an initial $3.5 million for the first year to $16 million for the fifth year, fiscal year 1956. In the second half of the decade there has been a marked upswing in appropriations, from $40 million in fiscal year 1957 to the current level of $152,773,000 (see table 1).

TABLE 1.—*Total appropriations and obligations of the National Science Foundation for fiscal years 1952–60 (to the nearest thousand dollars)*

[Thousands of dollars]

Field	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
Appropriations	3,500	4,750	8,000	12,250	16,000	40,000	49,750	[1] 136,000	[1] 154,773
Obligations: [2]									
Development of graduate laboratories									2,000
Biological and medical sciences:									
Basic research	736	831	1,966	3,612	4,793	7,361	8,540	19,805	24,405
Research facilities					125	885	987	3,270	2,000
Mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences:									
Basic research	311	983	2,033	4,244	4,700	7,619	9,536	22,985	33,489
Research facilities:									
University computing facilities							200	1,500	1,500
Major engineering-physics facilities						500	450	2,000	2,000
Oceanographic research vessel									3,000
Atmospheric sciences									500
National Radioastronomy Observatory				104	147	3,431	1,587	4,419	922
Kitt Peak National Observatory				50	250	545	3,100	4,391	3,749
Other							[3] 67		
Social sciences: Basic research						289	554	853	1,925
Special international programs: Antarctic research							446	2,306	7,248
Office of special studies: Surveys and report	130	42	310	349	97	47	222	230	367
Office of Scientific Information Service: Distribution of scientific information	87	119	174	303	395	905	1,938	3,848	5,392
Scientific personnel and education: Training of scientific manpower	1,644	1,477	2,120	2,297	3,718	14,698	19,414	62,070	64,477
Operating costs	531	972	1,351	1,528	1,764	2,351	2,933	5,261	6,188
Total obligations	3,766	4,424	7,954	12,486	15,989	38,630	49,973	132,940	159,162

[1] Includes a $2,000,000 appropriation transfer from AEC for nuclear research reactors.

[2] 1960 obligations estimated.

[3] Feasibility study for astrograph.

In connection with the growth of appropriations, note should be taken of the perspicacity of Congress in endeavoring to strengthen the programs in education in the sciences at least 2 years before launching of the Russian sputnik. In the summer of 1955 the Foundation published a National Research Council study, "Soviet Professional Manpower," which drew sobering comparisons between the rates at which the United States and the Soviet Union were training scientists and technical manpower. Largely as a result of these findings Congress markedly increased the Foundation's funds for education in the sciences. The total appropriation for fiscal year 1957, $40 million, was more than double that for the preceding year.

During the 10-year period since it was established, the Foundation has successively outgrown three locations in Washington: a private residence (901 16th Street NW.), a former school (2144 California Street), and the old Cosmos Club at H Street and Madison Place. Its present headquarters, 1951 Constitution Avenue, became overcrowded almost as soon as the Foundation moved in. Additional space has recently been acquired at 528 23d Street NW., and it is expected that further expansion will be necessary.

SUPPORT OF RESEARCH FACILITIES

With increased appropriations, the Foundation has been able to expand its activities in areas that have long needed attention and for which it had previously lacked funds. One of the first areas to claim its attention was the need for basic research facilities. In response to a request from the Bureau of the Budget in 1956, the Foundation undertook a study of the subject and published its findings in a report of June 1957, "Federal Support of Physical Facilities and Major Equipment for the Conduct of Scientific Research." The study pointed out that basic research today increasingly requires the use of large, complex, and expensive research tools. Although Government expenditures for research facilities since World War II have run into the hundreds of millions of dollars, for the most part these have been committed to practical research and hence have been available only to a small degree for purposes of basic research.

Traditionally, universities and other private research organizations have provided needed research tools from their own funds or from funds available from State or local sources. Now, however, the need for such

major equipment as nuclear reactors, high-energy particle accelerators, high-speed computers, and radio and optical telescopes is too great to be met from such local resources or even from the combined resources of several institutions. The report concluded that if American science were to advance at a satisfactory rate, Federal support of needed facilities would have to be provided.

In embarking upon a program in support of facilities, the Foundation has recognized that each case must be judged on its individual merits. It is difficult to establish criteria that would be applicable in all cases. Factors taken into consideration include the urgency of the need, the national significance of the development, the availability of adequate personnel, and the degree and character of local backing. Recipient institutions are encouraged to participate financially to the extent possible. The Foundation has also recognized that in some situations the Federal Government must continue to supply funds for operation and maintenance, in addition to funds for construction.

The Foundation is presently supporting two major facilities in astronomy, the National Radio Astronomy Observatory at Green Bank, W. Va., and the Kitt Peak National Observatory at Tucson, Ariz. Both of these projects were undertaken only after intensive studies by astronomers extending over a period of several years. Determination of the types of facilities and instruments needed was followed in each case by exhaustive search for suitable sites.

Other facilities being supported by the Foundation include biological field stations, construction of an oceanographic research vessel, university computing facilities, university nuclear research equipment, and facilities needed to expand research in the atmospheric sciences.

Closely related to the facilities program is the recent graduate laboratory development program, under which the Foundation provides funds on a matching basis for the modernization and equipment of research laboratories. Studies of the situation indicate that the graduate-level research laboratories of the Nation's universities are obsolescent to a degree that is detrimental to the national basic research effort. The financial straits in which most of our institutions of higher learning find themselves make it impossible for them to provide modern, well-equipped laboratories entirely out of their own funds.

This program was initiated in a modest way in fiscal year 1960 in the amount of $2 million. The budget for fiscal year 1961 provides for a substantial increase in the support level for this area.

RESEARCH SUPPORT

The increases in the Foundation's appropriation are reflected in the research support program in several ways. First, and most obvious, is the growth in the total number of grants awarded, growth in the percentage of proposals supported, and increases in the amount and duration of the average grant (see table 2). In fiscal year 1952 the Foundation was supporting 8 percent of all proposals received, for a total of $1.074 million. In the current fiscal year, support is provided for 26 percent of the proposals received, for a total value of $57.819 million. In 1953, the average grant was $10,300, for an average period of 1.9 years. In 1960, the average grant was $30,500, for an average period of 2.3 years. These figures indicate that the Foundation, with its increased funds, is able to support individual projects more fully than before and that greater stability in support is being achieved through a gradual increase in the life of the average grant. It should be noted, however, that if the funds available for the support of research have risen, so too has the demand. To date, the Foundation has not been able to support more than one-third of all the meritorious proposals received.

TABLE 2.—*Comparison of research proposals considered and supported in the biological and medical sciences: mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences; and social sciences (weather modification and antarctic research not included)*

Fiscal year	Proposals for research grants		Percentage of support	Average amount of grants awarded	Average life of grant
	Considered	Supported			
	Thousands	*Thousands*			*Years*
1952	$13,300	$1,074	8.0	$11,156	1.9
1953	17,478	1,813	10.4	10,540	1.9
1954	27,159	3,999	14.7	11,100	2.5
1955	38,046	7,855	20.6	13,350	2.7
1956	54,133	9,493	17.5	13,641	2.1
1957	78,318	14,979	19.1	14,934	2.1
1958	126,500	18,630	14.7	17,000	2.1
1959	179,671	43,644	24.3	25,900	2.3
1960	221,118	57,819	26.1	30,500	2.3

Up to the present, support for basic research has been divided approximately equally between the mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences and the biological and medical sciences, but beginning with 1960, the balance is weighted somewhat on the side of the physical sciences.

Support for basic research in the social sciences, initially divded between the two natural science divisions, began at a very modest, experimental level below $50,000. In 1958, the program was given the status of a separate program, and support was at the level of $725,000. At the end of 1958, the National Science Board approved the establishment of an Office of Social Sciences, and in the current year support has risen to $1.6 million. Only those projects are supported that are susceptible to scientific approach and that are truly fundamental in character.

Thus, the Foundation is prepared to support research of this type in such fields as archeology, economics, philosophy of science, linguistics, social anthropology, demography, history of science, and social psychology.

Methods of research support: The general pattern under which Federal agencies support research at institutions outside the Federal Government, particularly universities, originated with the Office of Scientific Research and Development during the war and provided the means whereby the Federal Government could benefit from important research carried on outside its own laboratories. The principle was developed and expanded by the Office of Naval Research and the National Institutes of Health after the war and adopted by other agencies, such as the Army, Air Force, and Atomic Energy Commission.

Briefly, the method is this: The Government encourages or invites research proposals from individuals or groups of scientists, submitted through their institutions. With the help of individual reviewers in the field involved and of advisory panels appointed by the agency for this purpose, the Federal agency selects for support those that are judged to have the greatest scientific merit. The Foundation also has statutory divisional committees for overall review of programs in the three major areas of life sciences, physical sciences, and scientific personnel and education, and a recently appointed committee to operate in similar fashion for these social sciences.

Incidentally, the Foundation's efficiency in acting upon grants has been considerably enhanced by the congressional action last year in amending the National Science Foundation Act to permit the Board to delegate authority to the director and its executive committee to approve grants and contracts in certain situations. The delegation of authority has since been implemented by Board action.

The so-called project method of research support has a number of advantages. Properly interpreted, the plan is flexible and may be applied to narrowly defined problems in science or to broad areas. It enables the Government to move in freely with the support needed for promising and significant undertakings of current interest. It provides for a national program in the sciences, utilizes the advice of the scientists in each field, and is based upon the significance and merit of the research proposed and the competence of the investigators. Since each grant and contract requires the official endorsement of the investigator's institution, the plan has evolved with the concurrence of the Nation's universities and has had a most important indirect effect in helping to strengthen such institutions. In fact, such aid has often been of critical importance, particularly for the smaller schools.

The chief drawbacks of this method of research support are its failure thus far to provide full indirect costs and the difficulties it creates in departmental administration. It has also been criticized on the grounds that the reviewing process is slow and that the resulting program is too conservative.

In reply to these criticisms it can only be said that the slowness of the process is the price one pays for operating on the basis of consultation and advice, rather than masterminding the system from Washington. Probably it is offset by the great advantage of having the Nation's scientific research and development problems widely understood by scientists as they participate in the solution of these problems. If the final results are conservative, it is because groups in general tend to become conservative; but each agency, including the Foundation, is responsible for guarding against the conservatism that is apt to result from too much committee advice.

Breadth in project support: With the increased sums available to it for support purposes, the Foundation is now able to make more grants of the broader type, often cutting across two or more departments of a university.

Some of the recent grants in this category may be of interest. A $700,000 grant awarded to the University of Pennsylvania will further research being conducted by Britton Chance, director of the Johnson Foundation for Medical Physics, which applies concepts of chemistry and physics to the biological problem of regulation of metabolism within the cell.

A study of the slavemaking behavior of ants and its populational consequences is one part of a broad program of "Thesis Research in Population Ecology" being directed by Thomas Park of the department of zoology of the University of Chicago. The Foundation will contribute support to the extent of $46,700 for the 3-year period.

Scientists at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology will undertake a concerted attack upon the problem of the production and nature of plasmas. Included are studies on gaseous electronics processes, plasma statics, magnetohydrodynamics of compressible and incompressible fluids, ionospheric physics, and some branches of astrophysics. This program, which is under the direction of William P. Allis, is being supported by the Foundation with a 3-year grant in the amount of $932,000.

In the field of solid-state physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology has undertaken a large interdisciplinary program centered about a better understanding of the

nature of low-temperature phase transitions. Several departments will participate in this project, which is being supported by the Foundation at a level of approximately $400,000 for a 2-year period.

Two major projects in atmospheric physics will operate on similar lines. At Harvard the Foundation is supporting a program of atmospheric studies in the general area of physics, applied physics, and applied mathematics. The purpose of the program is to build a small, competent group of workers to engage in aspects of atmospheric study that can be advantageously treated by deductive scientific methods. The ultimate hope is that students trained in the disciplines of physical science will regularly enter the field. The work is under the direction of Richard M. Goody and is being supported by the Foundation for a 3-year period at the level of $172,000. At the University of Chicago advantage is being taken of the presence of a group of cloud physicists to establish a program of cloud-physics research dealing with the water resources of clouds. The research covers all the factors believed to be important in precipitation mechanisms. The Foundation grant for this program is $383,700 for a 3-year period.

TABLE 3.—*Distribution of funds for education in the sciences by major program for the period 1952–60, inclusive*

Major program	Obligations (millions)	Percentage of total obligations
Institutes	$89.8	51.2
Fellowships	43.3	24.9
Special projects in science education	21.2	12.1
Course content improvement	13.5	7.7
Scientific manpower	3.0	1.7
Other obligations	4.6	2.6
Total obligations (1952–60)	175.4	100.0

Institutional grants for research: The fact that Federal agencies have based their support of research at educational institutions on the principle of grant or contract for a particular research project judged primarily on its scientific merits has led to an increasing lack of flexibility among university science departments in the planning and administration of their own research. As an experimental approach toward a solution of this problem, the Foundation is planning to initiate institutional grants to aid institutions in fulfilling their responsibilities for developing and maintaining sound, well-balanced programs of scentific research and research-training activities without precisely specifying what activities are to be undertaken with the funds. The amount of such grants allowable to a particular institution for a given year will be 5 percent of the payments to that institution through basic research grants from the Foundation during the preceding year. Such institutional grants would be made on request and without requiring a prior statement regarding the use of the funds by the institution. A report on how the funds were used, however, would be requested. The proportion of research funds distributed by the Foundation for research purposes among all types of institutions will not be changed by this plan; the plan is designed to allow each institution to exercise a greater degree of initiative with respect to its needs in scientific activities.

PROGRAMS FOR EDUCATION IN THE SCIENCES

Between the time of passage of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, and the end of fiscal year 1960 the Foundation's Division of Scientific Personnel and Education will have obligated an estimated $175 million for the support and administration of programs directly related to the improvement of education in the sciences.

These programs have been directed toward the solution of problems in the following four broad categories: (i) support of students of science, mathematics, and engineering, including support of students at graduate levels and above, and support of programs for students at the undergraduate level and below; (ii) aid to teachers of science, mathematics, and engineering, including teachers of science and mathematics at the secondary school level and below and teachers of science, mathematics, and engineering at the college level and above; (iii) the content of science courses; and (iv) public understanding of science.

Approximately half of the available funds has been used for the training of secondary school teachers of science and mathematics. The next largest share—about one-fifth of the total—has been used in programs for the training of students at the graduate level and above, primarily in the fellowship programs. About one-fourth of the funds has been used in programs for students at the undergraduate level and below, for course content improvement, and for the training of college teachers.

The primary objective, toward which all the program activities in science education are directed, is to insure an adequate supply of competent scientists and engineers by maintaining a high level of excellence in science education in the face of expanding enrollments, rapid changes in science itself, and the growing need for the products of scientific research and development. The demands upon the educational system have been growing faster than they can be met through the traditional processes. Extraordinary methods, therefore, have had to be developed to assist the educational system in the solution of its problems.

In developing its various programs in education in the sciences, the Foundation has been guided by certain broad principles. Its first responsibility has been to work with the ablest people concerned with improving education in the sciences in defining problems to be solved and in seeking solution to these problems. All decisions with respect both to broad programs and to specific grants are made on the basis of continuous consultation with members of the scientific and educational community. The Foundation is concerned with the substance of science, mathematics, and engineering, and its programs are designed to encourage the leading scholars in these fields to take an active part in seeking solutions to problems which bear on the improvement of subject-matter instruction. The Foundation has had constantly before it the accepted American principle of local control of education and has observed this principal in its operations. Other Federal agencies, universities, private foundations, and industrial organizations are also concerned with education in the sciences and are working toward the same goal. It is our hope and objective that the activities of these several groups may supplement each other in a constructive way.

Let us consider briefly the principal Foundation programs under the Division of Scientific Personnel and Education. These include fellowships, institutes, special projects in science education, public understanding of science, course-content improvement, and scientific manpower.

The fellowship program: The fellowship program is the oldest support program of the Foundation. It was inaugurated in 1952 by the predoctoral and regular postdoctoral programs with a budget of $1.4 million—almost half the Foundation's appropriation for that year. As new needs have become apparent, additional programs have been added: in 1956, the senior postdoctoral program; in 1957, the science faculty program; in 1959, the cooperative graduate teaching assistants, and secondary school teachers programs. By the end of fiscal year 1960, approximately $43 million will have been used for support of graduate students and advanced scholars through these seven fellowship programs. After awards have been made for 1960, an approximate total of 13,000 graduate students and advanced scholars in science, mathematics, and engineering will have received awards, from among about 50,000 applications.

It should be noted, also, that the high standards of selection for Foundation fellowships have resulted in widespread interest in the applicants, with the result that many of the unsuccessful applicants for Foundation fellowships have received awards from other sources. This is particularly true in the case of applicants included in the honorable-mention lists published by the Foundation each year.

The institutes programs: The institutes programs were inaugurated in 1953 with two experimental projects for college teachers—one in mathematics at the University of Colorado and one in physics at the University of Minnesota. In 1954 the experiment was broadened somewhat to include high school teachers. In 1956 the academic year institutes program for high school teachers started with two institutes—one at Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College and one at the University of Wisconsin; and in 1959 a similarly limited and experimental program was started for college teachers. The inservice institutes were inaugurated in 1957 for high school teachers and in 1959 for elementary school teachers.

During this overall period there has been rapid growth in the funds available for the institutes and subsequently in the number of institutes that could be provided. Because of the special interest of Congress in improvement opportunities for high school teachers of science and mathematics, in recent years a substantial percentage of the funds available for education in the sciences has been devoted to the institutes programs. The high point was in 1957, when the institutes accounted for 65.6 percent of the total program. With the large general increase in appropriations and the adjustment of program support, however, the share of total funds for institutes has declined currently to 51 percent, which brings it more nearly in balance with other programs. By the close of 1960 some 72,000 teachers will have participated in these programs.

It is still much too early to be able to make a valid assessment of these programs, but it is cause for some satisfaction that through this means a significant proportion of the secondary school teachers of science and mathematics will have had some opportunity to become informed about current trends in their fields, as well as an opportunity to become acquainted with new laboratory methods.

A fundamental and long-range problem, of course, is that of providing more adequate original training for such teachers. Clearly, we cannot expect to continue indefinitely "retraining" teachers whose preparatory training has been inadequate. This, however, is a problem that lies outside the Foundation's purview and brings us back once more to the principle of local control of education; it is at the local level that the problem must be faced.

Special projects in science education: Programs included in this category are grouped generally as follows: (i) programs directed toward secondary school students; (ii) college programs and teacher-improvement programs; and (iii) public understanding of science.

Programs in the first category are designed to supplement the secondary school students'

classroom training in science by providing visiting scientists, State academies of science, and summer training for students of special ability and aptitude. The program also makes available science materials, through the media of the traveling science libraries, and traveling science demonstration lectures. It supports cooperative college-school programs and school science clubs.

Under college and teacher-improvement programs, opportunities are provided for undergraduate students in science, mathematics, and engineering to obtain experience in research laboratories, through the undergraduate science education program. Students in small colleges are brought into contact with eminent scholars from other institutions through the visiting scientists program. To assist teachers, various experimental activities have been designed, such as conferences and special academic-year programs and the program for research participation.

From a small beginning of $20,000 in 1953, support for the special projects rose slowly to something over $8.5 million in 1959 and more than $10 million in 1960. Increased support is based upon the expansion of old programs that have proved their worth and the apparent success of some of the new ones launched last year.

Public understanding of science: Progress in science depends to a considerable extent on public understanding and support of a sustained program of science education and research. At the present time, science is generally mistakenly identified in the public mind with the results of applied research and technology—spectacular developments such as space vehicles and weapons systems; with the applications of research to the cure of disease; and with the bewildering array of modern machines and gadgets that are advertised on every side.

There is inadequate understanding of the role of basic research and its fundamental relationship to progress in engineering and technology.

The Foundation has broadly construed education in the sciences to include, also, education of the public. The increasing significance of science and technology in relation to public policy, both national and international, has made it urgent that the level of scientific literacy on the part of the general public be markedly raised. In order to participate fully in the democratic process through intelligent voting, citizens must have at least a general knowledge and understanding of the nature of science and its implications for the national defense and welfare.

This is a relatively new area, and there is little experience to guide us in the choice and methods and techniques that will serve the purpose. To date, the Foundation has supported a limited number of conferences and institutes in which scientists and science writers have been brought together for the purpose of discussing the problems of communicating science to the layman. It is planned to expand these efforts and to enlist the support and advice of influential editors of the general-information media as well as the aid of the scientific community and such organizations as the AAAS and the professional scientific societies. The program was initiated in 1959 with a budget of $5,000, but as much as $200,000 may be expended for these purposes by the end of 1960.

Course content improvement: Comparable in importance to the need for aid to students and to teachers of science is the need for improvements in curriculums and course content. As a result of early studies of the subject, the dimensions of the problem began to emerge. Science must not be poorly taught at any level or in any field. Attention must therefore be given to the content of science and mathematics courses, from the elementary courses in general science through graduate courses in highly specialized fields.

The Foundation has approached this problem in a number of ways. Support has been given to relatively small projects in limited areas where useful results can be anticipated. For example, the American Meteorological Society has been awarded a grant to enable its editorial board to prepare a series of monographs on such subjects as "The Earth and the Sun," "High Atmosphere," "Climate and Man," "Oceans and Air Currents," and other subjects designed to interest high school and college students in the field of meteorology.

At the other end of the scale, a high level of support has been given outstanding investigators to enable them to attack a major problem in force. The work done by the Physical Sciences Study Committee at Massachusetts Institute of Technology is an example. This project, which was initiated in November 1956, has produced an entirely new approach to the teaching of physics, with a new syllabus, new textbooks, and a wide variety of new teaching aids and new methods and techniques of demonstration. The course was tried out experimentally in the 1957–58 school year, with eight teachers presenting the entire course.

The number of teachers using the course has increased in each succeeding year, and special summer institutes supported by the foundation have trained teachers in its use. In September of 1960 the materials developed by the committee will be made available to all interested schools through Educational Services, Inc,. of Watertown, Mass., a nonprofit organization founded in September 1958.

The success of the course revision work in physics prompted a similar large-scale effort in mathematics, guided by the school mathematics study group, operating with headquarters at Yale University. The chemistry curriculum is being worked on by two groups, the chemical bond approach committee at Earlham College and the chemical educational materials study at Harvey Mudd College. The biological sciences curriculum study has its headquarters at the University of Colorado.

Here again we have the pattern of an experimental beginning of only a few thousands of dollars up until 1957–58 (when the figures climbed above the half-million mark) and a continuing increase to the current year, in which it has seemed wise to invest $6 million in these programs.

The comprehensive review and revision of the four major science courses—physics, mathematics, chemistry, and biology—is unquestionably one of the most significant developments in the teaching of science in this country. Courses that are out of date by as much as 30 to 40 years are being brought abreast of modern developments. In the process of working together on this task, university scientists and secondary school teachers and administrators have come to see each other's problems and points of view as they could have in no other way.

SCIENTIFIC MANPOWER PROGRAM

Responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the National Register of Scientific and Technical Personnel was transferred to the National Science Foundation by the Foundation's enabling legislation. The register provides records of location and of training, scientific specializations, and other qualifications of approximately 185,000 selected scientists and engineers and is designed to insure that timely information is available, in case of need, on the numbers and characteristics of scientists and other technically trained persons in the United States. The Foundation's scientific manpower section is also engaged in continuing studies designed to provide basic data on scientific and technical personnel generally. This program is currently being supported at a level somewhat below $1 million.

Other sources of Federal support for education: In addition to the programs of the National Science Foundation, major contributions to science education are made by a number of other agencies, including the National Institutes of Health, the U.S. Office of Education, and the Atomic Energy Commission. The National Defense Education Act, for example, provides significant help under the graduate fellowship program, the student loan program, and to some extent under titles III and VII.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS IN SCIENCE

The scope of the Foundation's international activities in science broadened considerably during the second half of the decade. The International Geophysical Year marked the first time that the Foundation had participated in international scientific activities on a large scale, and it also represented the Foundation's first opportunity to coordinate a major activity being undertaken by a number of Government agencies. The scientific and technical program for the United States was developed and directed by the U.S. National Committee for the IGY, under the National Academy of Sciences. At the request of the academy, the Foundation initiated consideration of IGY support by the Federal Government and, upon affirmative decision, secured and administered Federal funds totaling $43.5 million. The Foundation also served as coordinator of Government interests in the program; these involved not only direct participation by Government agencies but also, quite often, matters of broad national policy that arise in an international program.

As an aftermath of the IGY, both individuals and Government agencies have been encouraged to carry on research that extends certain aspects of the IGY work. Under the general label of International Geophysical Cooperation, the program is being coordinated at the international level by the Comité International Géophysique of ICSU. This special committee is composed of the four unions principally involved: the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, the International Scientific Radio Union, the International Union of Astronomers, and the International Union of Pure and Applied Physics. So far as administration is concerned, the IGC is not a package program. Instead, the Foundation accepts proposals in areas where coordinated global research is of special importance, and these are then appraised as part of the regular program of research grants.

Antarctic research: A major outgrowth of the IGY has been the continuing research programs in the Antarctic being carried on by the 12 nations who participated in the IGY antarctic program. General scientific recommendations for the area are made by the Special Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) of ICSU. The U.S. program is being developed, funded, and coordinated by the National Science Foundation. The latter looks primarily to the Committee on Polar Research of the National Academy of Sciences for program recommendations, and the Foundation also considers proposals from qualified scientists interested in carrying out such research. The Foundation works with the Interdepartmental Committee on the Antarctic to coordinate the research activities of other agencies, such as the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, and the Geological Survey, and provides them with funds for their participation in antarctic research. Grants are also made to universities and various interested research organizations to complete the program of scientific activities in the Antarctic. To date, Congress has appropriated $10 million for the post-IGY program in the Antarctic.

The Navy, which has from the beginning provided all logistic support for antarctic research, continues to do so with distinction under the new program and is in command of operations in the area. The cost of this logistic support is, of course, considerably greater than the cost of the actual scientific program.

International science education: Beginning in 1959, the Foundation undertook a modest program designed to foster international cooperation and improve communications among nations with respect to problems of science education and scientific manpower. Appropriate professional groups in the various disciplines were given support for a study and evaluation of science subject matter offered in foreign educational systems, with the objective of improving science curriculums in this country. Distinguished foreign scholars were brought here to visit the various institutes sponsored by the Foundation. Advanced students and scientists have received Foundation support to permit them to participate in international educational programs. For example, a grant was made to the University of Uppsala, Sweden, for American participation in an international summer institute in quantum chemistry.

These various small programs have furnished experience that will guide us in the development and enlargement of future programs in international science education.

Other international scientific activities: Amendments to the National Science Foundation Act which were passed by Congress last year permit the Foundation to cooperate in international scientific activities, whereas previously it was limited to research activities. The amendments also permit the Foundation, with the approval of the Secretary of State, to grant fellowships or make other arrangements with foreign nationals for scientific study or scientific work in the United States. Under its existing and extended authority, and with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, the Foundation plans to expand its international activities on a modest scale.

The Foundation hopes to place, later on, appropriately qualified persons at oversea locations to carry out short-term studies in limited areas of science that are of interest and importance to both the United States and the foreign country. Eventually, it is hoped, qualified persons can be placed overseas for longer periods for the purpose of conducting and maintaining continuous contact with the scientific communities of other countries.

As funds are made available, it may be possible, also, to afford greater support to certain appropriate types of research and research facilities abroad.

SCIENCE INFORMATION

The scope and importance of the scientific information problem is something of which the Foundation has been aware since the beginning. Early attempts were made to study certain aspects of the problem, and, with the extremely limited funds available, support was given to small projects directed toward this end. This was increased as the overall appropriation grew, but a really major effort in the field of scientific information was made possible by almost simultaneous action by the executive and legislative branches of Government.

In December 1958 the White House released a special report of the President's Science Advisory Committee on "Improving the Availability of Scientific and Technical Information in the United States." After emphasizing the importance of the problem, the President's Committee recommended that the National Science Foundation expand its scientific information program to strengthen and coordinate existing governmental and private efforts in this field. This recommendation was later implemented by Executive Order No. 10807 of March 13, 1959. The National Defense Education Act of 1958, under title IX, directed the Foundation to establish a science information service. The act also provided for the establishment of a 19-member Science Information Council whose members, Government and non-Government, would represent a broad range of skills and experience in the problems of the communications needs of scientists. The Office of Science Information Service was formally established in the Foundation on December 11, 1958, and the Science Information Council first met in February 1959.

The program activities of the Office of Science Information Service fall generally in five categories: (i) storage and retrieval systems and mechanical translation; (ii) scientific publications; (iii) unpublished research information; (iv) scientific data and reference centers; and (v) foreign science information. Through these several programs the Foundation seeks to increase the dissemination of existing materials by helping to provide for prompt publication of research results, for reference aids and information centers of various kinds, and for translations of significant scientific papers in languages not widely understood by American scientists.

Research on information problems. The Foundation is supporting a slowly growing body of research on new approaches to the information problem. Most of the research is concerned with exploration of ways to use machines in information processing tasks, such as the organization, storage, and searching of scientific information and the translation of scientific publications from foreign languages into English. Before machines can process the texts of documents, however, for either mechanized information searching systems or mechanical translation systems, more precise knowledge of syntax and semantics is needed. Therefore, current research activities in these areas are extending our understanding of language in the expectation that ultimately machines will be able to handle linguistic data.

A Research Information Center and Advisory Service on Information Processing has been established jointly with the National Bureau of Standards, with some financial support from the Council on Library Resources. The purpose of the new center is to bring together research and development data on methods and equipment for the automatic processing of scientific information. The center will also endeavor to foster closer cooperation among the groups in industry, the private foundations, the universities, the professional societies, and the agencies of the Federal Government that are concerned with developing and improving methods for rapid and efficient handling of large volumes of information.

In this same area, the Foundation is issuing regularly two publications designed to disseminate information on the scientific information field and foster cooperation among research workers in that field. "Current Research and Development in Scientific Documentation" is issued semiannually as a guide to current projects both here and abroad, while "Non-Conventional Technical Information Systems in Current Use" reports on information systems that embody new principles for the organization of subject matter or employ automatic equipment for storage and search.

In the support of scientific publications, temporary or emergency aid is given to primary journals and abstracting and indexing services; also, funds are provided for the preparation or publication of significant monographs, reviews, and reference works that could not be made generally available without subsidy.

Support of this kind is granted on the basis of the needs of the scientific community and sound economic planning for the publication.

Among the scientific journals partially supported by the Foundation are two new experimental periodicals, "Physical Review Letters" and "Wildlife Disease." The first is designed to provide rapid, low-cost publication of short, up-to-the-minute articles on physics research. The latter is the first journal to be published only in microform. The purpose of this journal is to explore author, reader, and librarian reaction to microform as a means of publishing research results at greatly reduced costs.

The Foundation is also seeking to make unpublished research information more accessible. The principal sources of such information are research reports and memorandums of Government and private institutions, theses and dissertations, and papers presented at scientific conferences. An example of Foundation activities in this area is the recently initiated series of inventories of information activities of those Federal agences that operate major scientific information programs. Four surveys in this series, covering the Department of Agriculture, the Office of Naval Research, some programs of the Department of Commerce, and the Government Printing Office, have been published, and others are in various stages of preparation.

Two examples of data and reference centers supported by the Foundation are the Office of Critical Tables (OCT) of the National Academy of Sciences and the Bio-Sciences Information Exchange (BSIE) of the Smithsonian Institution. The OCT, wholly supported by the Foundation, is a coordinating and information center on projects engaged in developing critical physical data of all kinds. The BSIE, supported by the Foundation and other interested agencies, functions as a repository of knowledge on who is working on what in the biological sciences.

Plans are now being developed, with the aid of the Federal Council on Science and Technology, for broadening the information exchange at the Smithsonian Institution to include the physical sciences and possibly, at a later date, the social sciences as well.

Foreign science information: The Foundation is supporting the cover-to-cover translation of 35 key U.S.S.R. scientific journals. Support is also being given the Midwest Inter-Library Center for the acquisition of approximately 2,300 "hard-to-get" foreign biological and chemical journals.

A series of studies is being made that will provide information on the organization, characteristics, and generation of scientific information in every major geographic area of the world. Studies currently underway or planned concern the Soviet Union, Poland, Japan, Indonesia, mainland China, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Hungary.

The Foundation is coordinating a program, involving several Federal agencies, whereby foreign currencies accruing to the U.S. Government through sales of surplus agricultural products will be used to support projects abroad for translating foreign-language publications into English.

In order to provide an effective means of exchanging information among groups working in the scientific information field, the foundation issues a bimonthly bulletin, Science Information Notes. This bulletin reports national and international developments and will, it is hoped, assist in promoting increased cooperation and coordination among scientific information services.

CONCLUSION

In any assessment of the role and accomplishments of the Foundation during its first decade, it is necessary to consider the broader question of Federal policy determination

with respect to research support, research facilities, and the development and use of scientific manpower. Policy, in turn, must be evaluated in terms of (i) the general principles to be followed, (ii) the organization of the Federal Government for science and technology, and (iii) the effectiveness of the organization and operations in accomplishing the desired objectives. Let me summarize briefly the conclusions discussed above with respect to each of these points.

General principles: The first principle in national science policy, as interpreted by the Foundation, is the critical importance of basic research for progress in science and technology. It is only through comprehensive support of basic research in all the fields of science that one can discover the potentialities for application that are so important in the competitive technology of today. Because basic research is an essential factor in the advanced training of scientists and engineers, and because the university is the natural home of basic research, it is clear that major attention must always be paid to the support of basic research in colleges and universities.

The support of basic research is relatively inexpensive. The significant costs of research and development arise out of expensive developmental programs, such as ballistic missiles, especially when these are undertaken on a crash basis. Since there is bound to be an upper limit to the amount of money available for science and technology, it is obvious that needed economies should be effected through careful selection of the developments to be undertaken. But it is false economy to curtail the basic research that uncovers leads for future developments.

In the support of basic research there are three important considerations: Progress of science, development of the individual, and strengthening and development of the institutions where research is done.

By and large, the Federal Government has paid the most attention to the first two categories. The progress of science has been advanced by the so-called research projects system, which permits an individual or a group to pursue a scientific problem of its own choosing and which permits the agencies to support proposals selected from those submitted. The Government has paid considerable attention to the development of the individual through fellowship and other educational programs and through special programs to improve science teaching and science courses.

A national problem to which the Federal Government has paid relatively little attention, however, is that of support for educational institutions to enable them to develop their own capabilities in science and engineering. Institutions have benefited greatly from Government support of research projects and from awards, such as fellowships, to individuals, but they have received little aid of a sufficiently general type to enable them to carry out their own plans for growth in science and engineering and to maintain a proper balance between these activities and others in which they engage. The needs are great: Graduate research laboratories require modernization in terms of buildings, equipment, and space; the salary scale in many institutions urgently needs adjustment upward; there is a great and continuing shortage of maintenance and operating funds; in the secondary schools the salary problem is also acute, and although progress is being made, much still remains to be accomplished.

The Federal Government's policy with respect to the problems of the institutions is to point out the needs and to emphasize the importance of satisfying those needs, to the extent possible, from State and private sources in accordance with American traditions. But it is also the responsibility of the Federal Government to exercise leadership in meeting this problem. It is becoming increasingly clear that the inadequacy of the resources available to our educational institutions is a national problem and one which the Federal Government must help to meet. Another problem to which I have referred above is the growing need for evaluation and handling of competing claims in special areas of basic research which their supporters feel are critical. Atmospheric physics, oceanography, meteorology, and seismology are examples of areas that in recent years have been found to lack adequate support, trained personnel, facilities, and equipment. Special techniques may be required for handling such problem areas, but these special problems should not obscure the need for comprehensive support of basic research in all fields of science.

Organization of the Federal Government for greatest progress: In recent years there has been extensive discussion of the adequacy of the Federal Government's organization for dealing with matters of science and technology. At the present time, each Government agency has its own organization for research and development. Overall policy recommendations concerning the Nation's effort and Federal responsibilities for science in the strict meaning of the term are vested in the foundation and centered in its Presidentially appointed National Science Board. The President's Science Advisory Committee considers critical scientific and technological matters relating to the national security and welfare; the Federal Council for Science and Technology is responsible for overall long-range planning and matters of coordination in research and development activities among the Federal agencies; science in foreign affairs is represented in the Department of State by the Science Adviser to the Secretary; and finally, the Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology makes immediately available to the President advice in any of those areas bearing upon critical questions of policy or action.

Effectiveness of organization and operations: In principle, the organization thus outlined should be able to deal with most fundamental issues involving science and technology with which the Government is faced. On the record, many major issues have been met effectively, the cooperation of participating scientists has been outstanding, and progress along many lines has been noteworthy. However, part of this structure has not been operating long enough to evaluate its effectiveness.

In the meantime, suggestions have been made, especially in Congress, for a more radical type of organization—for example, a cabinet department for science and technology. If, by this, is meant a department that would assume complete responsibility for all research and development in the Federal Government, the suggestion can surely be dismissed as being completely impractical. Overcentralization of science in a department of this type would be strenuously opposed by all scientists and engineers as hostile to their basic philosophy, and by Federal agencies as usurping their essential prerogatives and responsibilities.

If, on the other hand, the suggested department of science and technology were intended to provide supervision and control over the research and development activities of other Federal agencies, it would encounter severe administrative difficulties as differences of opinion arose between it and the individual agencies. Under our form of government, no agency can be expected to exercise such a role, which properly belongs in the White House or in the Executive Office of the President.

A third suggestion, more limited in scope, is that there should be brought together in one department certain major research and development activities now operating as part of regular departments. Included would be such establishments as the U.S. Weather Bureau, the National Bureau of Standards, the Hydrographic Office, and the Geological Survey. Such a consolidation might well advance the research and development activities of these agencies but would leave the problem of what to do with their functions as service organizations to the departments in which they are presently located. It is to be hoped that inadequacies in the present situation that have given rise to this suggested plan can be remedied by constructive action of the departments concerned.

Admittedly there are problems of considerable magnitude to be solved in achieving maximum effectiveness in the organization and operations of the Federal Government with respect to science and technology. However, the greatest need at the moment, appears to be that of full support for the present organization, which is relatively new both in its overall aspects and in the internal organization of individual agencies. In the charter for the Federal Council on Science and Technology, for example, it is provided that each member will speak authoritatively for his department or agency in matters pertaining to science and technology. A simple way of carrying out this provision would be for each department to appoint as its representative an Assistant Secretary for Research and Development, or someone in an equivalent position.

It must be remembered that the problem of large-scale Government administration of science is recent, dating back only to World War II. We have had to feel our way into a whole new area of policy and operation. Scientists and engineers must be ready to accept full-time Government posts and to acquire the training and background in administration that are essential to this new role. The agencies and departments, on the other hand, must accept the growing importance of science and technology and adapt their administrative structures to meet its needs. The problem is one that calls for great understanding as well as cooperation and good will on all sides.

A final word: Irrespective of individual opinions as to the manner in which the National Science Foundation is carrying out its assigned role, it cannot be denied that the importance of science in national affairs is such as to justify the establishment of an agency dedicated to the progress of basic research and education in the sciences. Nor will it be denied that the Federal Government should be increasingly concerned with the progress of science and technology, both in its own agencies and in the Nation at large. The current estimated national expenditure of $12 billion on research and development would bear out this conclusion, even if more important considerations were not involved.

But it is also clear, that the whole responsibility cannot and should not rest with the Federal Government. It is essential that the citizens of the country understand and appreciate the importance of science and technology in all its phases, but especially the importance of basic research and education. Without the understanding and support of the people of the United States, the Federal Government will be unable to take proper measures for the adequate support of basic research and education in science. Individual voters, communities, and States must clearly recognize their responsibilities. The problems inherent in science and technology cannot be dismissed on the assumption that they can be met by the Federal Government without understanding, support, and local action by informed citizens.

NATIONAL RADIO MONTH

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President. This is National Radio Month and a good time to remember that radio provides a veritable lifeline with its prompt announcements when advance warnings are needed regarding weather catastrophes, or when emergencies develop requiring pleas for help or first aid information. Some 97 out of every 100 homes in the Nation have radios, and this valuable medium of communication plays a vital role in the lifestream of our country.

I ask unanimous consent to include a fact sheet pointing out many of the valuable services performed to all communities by this vital means of communications.

There being no objection, the fact sheet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

National Radio Month this year will be symbolized by the theme, "Radio—the Heart Beat of Main Street." Radio's vital role in the lifestream of the country will be brought to the attention of the public through a nationwide program reaching into every community.

The unstinting and generous assistance that radio contributes to every civic situation will be dramatized by local cooperative projects between radio stations and community organizations.

Radio is always in the forefront: As a lifetime during emergencies with advance warnings, first aid information, pleas for help; as a crusader for civic betterment; as an education and information medium for citizen and student; as a source of facts on our democratic processes and institutions.

Today, there are more than 155 million radios in use in the United States. Ninety-seven out of every one-hundred homes in the Nation have radios.

Americans are seldom more than an arms-length from a radio set; no matter where they are—at home, in a car, at the beach. About 39 million cars are equipped with radios. Portable radios are made to fit the pocket and purse.

Today, there are more than 4,000 radio stations on the air in the United States, an increase of 228 since last year. Their programs of information and entertainment reach the remotest areas of the country and the humblest of homes.

One survey of 5,000 women representing a cross section of U.S. households showed that they listened to radio 4 hours and 36 minutes a day.

FM (frequency modulation) is particularly effective for reaching a select audience. Most family income of FM listeners ranges upwards of $7,500, many over $15,000, a research study reveals.

Radio listening knows no bounds of age, sex, geographical location or season. More than half of the country's professional men tune in five or more days each week. More than nine out of every ten single working women tune in to radio each week. Among men and women between the ages of 50 and 65, about 9 out of 10 listen every week, nearly half of them tune in every day.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, across the Nation, observances will be held from May 1 through 31 in recognition of National Radio Month.

Historically, radio—along with other outstanding modes of communication—has made a significant contribution, not only to a better informed citizenry, but also to progress in industry, commerce, navigation, traffic control, as well as defense and other fields.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have a supplemental statement on the significance of the radio industry printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Since regular broadcasting began over 40 years ago, the radio industry has grown tremendously and the rate of growth has continued right up to the present.

In 1950, for example, there were about 85 million radio sets in use in the United States, or about 56 sets for every 100 persons. Now, there are over 155 million; approximately 88 for every 100 persons.

In 1950 there were about 41 million homes in which there were one or more radio receivers; today approximately 50 million American homes have radios, about 97 out of every 100 homes. More than 99 percent of the farm homes have radios.

There are now about 39 million car radios in use. Since 1950 car radios have increased 2.3 times. Of every 100 passenger cars on the road today, 76 have radios; of every 100 passenger cars manufactured last year in the United States, 79 were equipped with radios at the factory.

In 1950, 10 million radios of all types were manufactured in the United States. Last year (1959) some 15,622,000 were produced, an increase of 56 percent in home, car, and portable radios manufactured.

Versatility of radio is shown by the variety of types in use, such as clock radios, car radios, portable radios. The development of transistors has made possible miniaturization of portables to fit purse or pocket. About 95 percent of the portable radios produced in 1959 were transistor radios.

Overall, these facts illustrate the significant role of radio in American life—now and in the future.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1310, Senate bill 3387.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3387) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

PADRE ISLAND, A TEXAS TREASURE ISLAND, AWAITS ACT OF CONGRESS, TO BECOME NATIONAL PLAYGROUND

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in view of pending legislation to establish a National Seashore Recreation Area on Padre Island, the Senate should be particularly interested in the following report by Mr. Carl E. Cavender:

Behind the stroke of the painter's brush or the lens of the naturalist's camera, there is harbored a longing to seek out his own serenely hallowed oasis. These expanses of unmarred natural beauty are fast becoming few in number, because the waves of civilization are washing development across our lands.

Writing in the May 1960 issue of National Parks magazine, Mr. Cavender has written a most colorful and eloquent plea for preservation for public use "Texas Treasure Island."

Although time in this session of Congress is racing past, there is still time to pass the basic legislation needed for permanently preserving America's longest seashore area for use by all Americans. With each passing year the costs of the proposed project increase because the land prices climb higher. In addition, more and more of the 117-mile island is lost to public use by private development.

As Mr. Cavender writes:

Leaving Padre Island is like leaving another world—the wilderness of yesterday. This perfect playground with its sloping beaches and sometimes 40-foot-high sand dunes must be preserved in its natural state. Somewhere, some day, something good is in store for this island.

Mr. President, if the Senate will act favorably on the proposal to establish a national seashore recreation area on Padre Island, I predict that it will be creating a new park which will one day rival the scenic Yellowstone, in public popularity. With our Nation's tremendously expanding population, and in this day, when greater and greater numbers of families enjoy vacations, hundreds of thousands, many millions, more Americans will flock to the seashores and the mountains. That is one of the natural social phenomena of our times. We know, for example, that many people build a boat and put a mortgage on it even before they build and mortgage a home.

Very few places still remain in our country that are open beach land. We see more and more beaches being fenced in, as at Miami, for example. In the long stretch of 3,700 miles of coastline, from Brownsville, Tex., to the eastern cape of Maine, there are only 265 miles of public parks and beaches.

At Padre Island there is a 117 mile stretch of beach, and last year the National Park Advisory Board recommended that 88 miles of it be set apart as a national seashore area. Within the past 3 weeks the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Seaton, recommended that 88 miles be set apart as a national seashore recreation area, and has recommended that Congress appropriate $25 million to set up the Padre Island National Seashore Recreation Area and the Cape Cod Recreation Area and the Oregon Dunes Recreation Area.

Many of us have felt very free to criticize the administration for not doing something. In this project the administration is urging Congress to do something for the American people. We in Congress ought to do something for the American people by setting up this recreational area before it is too late.

At each end of Padre Island salesmen are peddling lots, trying to sell them off as fast as they can before the recreation area can be set up. We are literally racing against time. We should

certainly do something now, while the land can still be purchased at reasonable prices. We can do that if we act promptly.

The white sands of Padre Island offer the opportunity to preserve America's longest, southernmost natural seashore for all our people. I urge congressional approval of the legislation creating a Padre Island National Seashore this session.

In order that the Congress might have more complete information concerning Padre Island, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the article by Carl E. Cavender in the May 1960 issue of National Parks magazine, entitled: "Texas Treasure Island."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS TREASURE ISLAND

(By Carl E. Cavender)

Behind the stroke of the painter's brush or the lens of the naturalist's camera, there is harbored a longing to seek out his own serenely hallowed oasis. These expanses of unmarred natural beauty are fast becoming few in number, because the waves of civilization are washing development across our lands. Our systems to preserve these numbered tracts are spurred forward by a few elbow-swinging conservationists, who hope that tomorrow we may look proudly upon our land and recall its beginning.

Bordering the warm tidal currents of the Gulf of Mexico lies 117 miles of white rolling sands, that are—and have been for sometime—under consideration as a national seashore site. Padre Island is a desert, an oasis, and the perfect picture of desolation itself. To the misconceptions of a few, Padre Island could never become another Miami Beach—at least not without expenditure of millions of dollars. What then is the destiny of these sleeping dunes?

One morning, into the horizon's orange, spring sunrise, I steered my car via Corpus Christi's Ocean Drive route, 13 miles to the bow-shaped Padre Island. This was a common sight to me, a resident of the Coastal Bend; but with each trip my eyes searched out new adventure.

As I crossed the 4-mile span of causeway to Padre, my attention was captured by a flock of pelicans, about 75 in number. The white birds nestled in the glistening salt waters of Laguna Madre, that 600 square miles of inland waterway which is sometimes called the last leg of the Chicago to Brownsville Intracoastal Canal.

Laguna Madre is profusely spotted by tiny islands that are literally swamped with bird life. The more popular of these islands in this marshy area, are Big Bird and Little Bird Islands. Until recent years, many of these tiny islands were relatively unexplored by anyone other than fishermen and duck hunters. They have thus remained the perfect nesting place for birds.

Quite like our feathered friends, I too was seeking a retreat. On this particular morning my quest was for driftwood and old bottles. My destination was any part of the beach which was uninhabited and lacking the beer shanties and other eyesores from which I wanted to escape.

My car droned along the hardened sand at the water's edge, on the gulf side of Padre. I had picked the perfect time for my driftwood hunt, the tides were dropping and the winds were subsiding from a recent storm, leaving the debris-cluttered beach a beachcomber's paradise.

Cars with 16 inches of wheel clearance can be lost to the clutches of the softer sands, as I have learned from experience, so I continued to ride the wet sands near the water. I was ever dodging the trash that had been lashed upon the shore. It was hard to distinguish between a jellyfish and a bottle; there were thousands, no—there were millions of the blue-red bubbles that had been cast to their destruction upon the scorching sand.

I was amazed first by the large flock of pelicans; then there were the jellyfish (more than I ever imagined I would see in my lifetime); but here, I arrived at my destination.

The drift was piled higher than houses and extended the length of the beach. Trees, too big for a truck to move and logs of all shapes and sizes were jutting from the barrier. I found bamboo, coconuts, and several other varieties of drift that must have traveled thousands of miles to rest on Padre's shore, I also found a small raft and wondered from what distant isle it might have come.

Centuries of storms like the one just passed have made the history of this island. I had come to Padre to "get away from it all," and indeed, I was, for I was alone with history.

Padre Island's storybook had no beginning, as we know it; but it had to start somewhere. Cannibal Karankawa Indians were probably the first human inhabitants of this barren waste, and were later followed by other tribes and Spanish and Anglo-American settlers, who rid the lands of them. Pirates and smugglers, soldiers and sailors, fishermen, beachcombers, and cowboys later followed; and now come the tourists.

PIRATES AND SPANISH TREASURE

Padre was first called Isle de Santiago, then explorer Parilla named it San Carlos de las Malaguitos. It was finally tagged after the Padre Nicolas Balli who was granted the land by the King of Spain. At this time, the island was separated from its neighboring brother, Mustang, to the north, but due to shifting sands along Devil's Elbow, the Corpus Christi Pass was closed, thus joining the two islands.

At least one of the towering dunes may hoard a vast amount of treasure, according to historical reports. A violent hurricane developed in this region in 1553, and a Spanish fleet headed for Spain via the Bahamas was caught in its treacherous winds and waves. Three ships went under and 4 limped into the Bahama port, but 13 were forced by currents and high winds to the ghostlike arm of the sandbar, Devil's Elbow. Only 2 men of 300 men, women, and children survived the horrible slaughter by hostile savages in an island-long chase.

The King of Spain detailed salvage expert Don Angel de la Villafana, who remarkably recovered the booty from 12 of the ill-fated ships with the help of his crew. A skindiver myself, this seems an impossible task without the modern diving gear we use off Padre's waters today. So one ship remains somewhere along the once open Corpus Christi Pass; its estimated hoard is in the high thousands.

Another report of treasure upon Padre Island's sands is that of the $62,000 fortune believed buried by John Singer, who along with his family was shipwrecked in their yacht in 1847. An expedition in June of 1958 found remnants of a lost city and some old relics, but no $62,000.

Maybe there are no real treasures on Padre Island, but we like to think so; and tales about the pirate Morgan and smugglers of the early days give Padre an intriguing and alluring past.

We shake our heads to clear them of dreams, pick up our own little treasures of drift and decorative old bottles, and leave Padre alone with its history, as we head for home.

Leaving Padre is like leaving another world—the wilderness of yesterday. The coyote, the rattlesnake, and the rabbit live together here. This is the summer home of a multitude of migratory birds. Its waters have one of the largest variety of fishes along the gulf coast. The sea grass atop the dunes seemingly waves a goodby with the wind. But this is yesterday.

WHAT OF PADRE'S FUTURE?

The future of Padre Island lies with legalities. This perfect playground with its sloping beaches and sometimes 40-foot-high sand dunes must be preserved in its natural state. Somewhere, some day, somethin_ good is in store for this island. It has a future.

The concern for its future has been exemplified, as far back as 1937 with the first State Park bill proposal. I for one hope the elbow swinging of the conservationists will not go unwarranted and that tomorrow Padre Island will be the same sleeping dunes in all its wilderness and serenity.

JUDGE JESSE ANDREWS, THE "MR. DEMOCRAT" WHO SHAPED HOUSTON'S DESTINY, IS HONORED BY HOUSTONIANS AND THE HOUSTON PRESS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Thursday, May 5, 1960, the Houston chapter of the American Institute of Architects paid tribute to the Honorable Judge Jesse Andrews, one of the truly great Texans and Americans of our day.

Judge Andrews, who is known to many Texans as "Mr. Democrat," has had a leadership role in shaping the growth and destiny of Texas' largest city—Houston. As the Houston Press pointed out in a recent editorial:

> While he was chairman of the planning commission from 1940–56, our city grew from 73 square miles to 165 square miles, from 385,000 people to about 800,000.

Surely, no one will challenge that Judge Andrews took the lead in building Houston into one of the great cities of our Nation, and it is entirely fitting that architects should honor him for this work.

But I believe that Judge Andrews has won even greater respect and devotion by his vision and dedication as a real patriot. He has made an invaluable contribution to political enlightenment in Texas—working from the grassroots to the top echelons of government for the programs and goals which have made his city ranked among the most progressive and prosperous in the Nation. He has fought machines of entrenched greed in an effort for good government. He did not jump on bandwagons if they were wrong. He took the harder course when it was right. He sacrificed for honest government in our time.

Mr. President, recently Mr. John Barnhill of the Houston Press wrote an excellent article concerning Judge Andrews' life and work. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the story from the May 4, 1960, issue of the Houston Press, by John Barnhill entitled "Man Who Saw Houston's Destiny To Be Honored—Jesse Andrews," as well as the editorial from the Thursday, May 5, 1960, issue of the Houston Press entitled "To Jesse Andrews, a Deserved Tribute."

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Press, May 4, 1960]

MAN WHO SAW HOUSTON'S DESTINY TO BE HONORED—JESSE ANDREWS

(By John Barnhill)

The 86-year-old lawyer rubbed a wrinkled hand slowly across his brow as he leaned back in the swivel chair of his downtown office and reflected on 60 years of watching—and helping—his town grow.

As he reminisced, you could tell this was an unusual man. Gentle, modest, soft-spoken. He wasn't the dynamic personality that you might expect of one of Houston's most outstanding citizens and civic leaders.

GUIDED PROGRESS

But Jesse Andrews is responsible for guiding much of the city's progress as well as the success of one of the Southwest's largest law firms, Baker, Botts, Andrews & Shepherd.

When he hung his shingle here back in 1896 after 5 years at the University of Texas, young Mr. Andrews didn't have one friend among the 27,557 persons who inhabited the 9 square miles of Houston.

Today, a good part of the city's 1 million citizens know—or at least have heard—of Jesse Andrews in one capacity or another.

SIXTEEN YEARS A LEADER

Upon his retirement as chairman of the city planning commission 4 years ago, he completed 16 years of leadership in setting the groundwork for Houston's growth.

For the contributions during that period, the Houston chapter of the American Institute of Architects will honor Mr. Andrews tomorrow at 7:15 p.m. in the Engineers Club.

His accomplishments continue in more fields than city planning, however.

KEEPS HIS SCHEDULE

As senior partner in the Baker, Botts law firm, he keeps the same rigid 8 to 5 schedule that the 80-odd attorneys follow and, as one of his employees said, usually works harder and longer than anybody in the office. He has a number of personal clients.

Mr. Andrews said he's lived by the theory: "A man ought to work hard, be diligent, and be economical." (He's of Scotch descent and abhores waste.)

As one of the county's most prominent political leaders, he's earned the title of "Mr. Democrat," but says modestly, "it hardly applies."

His long life in Houston started after a career as a guard on the University of Texas' first football team—when a football was the only piece of equipment we had and the right end ran the team, as there was no coach.

SAW CITY'S DESTINY

Folding his hands in his lap, the veteran attorney recalled:

"Houston seemed destined to become a port—an arm of the sea. That's why I chose it as home."

The son of a horse-and-buggy doctor in Waterproof, La., he began a private practice in a strange city where a cousin was the only person he knew even faintly.

Within several years he went to work for Baker, Botts, and in 1906 was taken into the firm as a partner.

Today the firm sprawls over two floors of the Esperson Building and has some 30 partners compared to the three when Mr. Andrews started. He is also chairman of the executive committee of the Bank of the Southwest.

From 1940 to 1958 when he served on the city planning commission, Houston grew from 73 square miles and 385,000 persons to 165 square miles and a population of 725,000.

FAVORS ZONING

A strong proponent of zoning, Mr. Andrews said you can look around the city today and see what we've lost without it.

He claims it results in economic loss, depreciation in value of property, and said city planning is difficult without it.

"Take the Montrose area for example. At one time it was probably one of the most attractive subdivisions in the city, but it lost its character due to commercial development and will never be a choice residential district again."

"Had it been zoned," Mr. Andrews said, "it would be comparable with River Oaks today."

Turning to politics, which is one of his favorite subjects, Mr. Andrews predicted a victory for the Democrats this year.

"Remember there are more Democrats than Republicans in the Nation and I don't think NIXON will be a strong presidential candidate."

[From the Houston Press, May 5, 1960]

TO JESSE ANDREWS, A DESERVED TRIBUTE

Jesse Andrews is a venerable but vigorous 86 years of age.

What a wonderful life he has lived and enjoyed with the lovely wife he married 60 years ago.

Tonight he is to be paid high tribute by the Houston Chapter of the American Institute of Architects for his 16 years of outstanding service to Houston as chairman of the city planning commission. Those who know Mr. Andrews will agree on this: It would be hard to pay him too high a tribute.

While he was chairman of the planning commission from 1940–56, our city grew from 73 square miles to 165 square miles, from 385,000 people to about 800,000.

Under his forward-thinking direction the planning commission guided this huge growth and laid the groundwork for an even greater Houston of the future. The commission set up a parks and parkway system, a major street plan, a permanent policy of subdivision development, and the blueprint for our vital freeway system.

These were tough civic problems. They took vision. They took long hours of work. They took much patience and understanding. At the expense of his time as one of the State's top lawyers, that's what Mr. Andrews gave his city in abundance.

Jesse Andrews came to Houston in 1896 because he forsaw clearly the future of our city.

It is a little hard to realize that a man who goes to his law office daily in the Esperson Building was born less than 10 years after the Civil War ended—born in Waterproof, La., when the nearby Mississippi was Mark Twain's river of steamboat-landing cities and towns and cottonfields lining each bank.

It is even harder to realize that Mr. Andrews still looks to the future so eagerly. Talk to him today and what's he chiefly interested in: Saturday's election and its effect on the future of Houston and Texas. Ask him about the great work the planning commission did under his chairmanship and what does he say: He says he regrets the commission hasn't been able to win the biggest planning battle of all—zoning—because zoning, as Mr. Andrews thinks it should operate, would allow Houston greater but more orderly growth possibilities for the future.

Mr. Andrews is an amazing man. He is an inspiration to know.

That is, perhaps, the finest thing about Jesse Andrews. He makes himself easy to know. For 64 years a man of high rank in a high-ranked profession, he takes the time to do the little things that mean much to others. He is considerate. He likes other people. He shows it. He solicits their views. With dignity, he holds firm to his own. A liberal in Democratic Party politics, he has been honored by Presidents, but he prefers to work at the precinct level.

The men whose keen, trained minds and hands create and detail our projects-to-be—our achitects—could pick no more worthy man to honor than Jesse Andrews. He is a man of a grand past who peers steadily forward to help us make our future even grander.

DR. R. L. SKRABANEK, OF TEXAS A. & M., REPORTS AMERICA WILL NEED TWICE AS MUCH FOOD BY A.D. 2010

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, while the Congress is seeking solutions to the highly complex national agricultural problems—including the high costs of great stocks of surplus commodities—we must keep an eye on the future as well as the present.

Recently Dr. R. L. Skrabanek, professor of sociology at Texas A. & M. College and Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, delivered an extremely enlightening paper on our projected national needs for agricultural products for the year A.D. 2010.

On the basis of population growths and other pertinent factors, he figures that this Nation in just 50 years will need about double the amount of food and livestock it is producing today.

Dr. Skrabanek's paper was originally delivered at the annual meeting of the Texas Soil Conservation District Supervisors in Galveston and was published in excerpted form on the March 1960 issue of Soil and Water magazine. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article by Dr. R. L. Skrabanek in March 1960 Soil and Water entitled, "Food for the Future: Looking Ahead to A.D. 2010."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD FOR THE FUTURE—LOOKING AHEAD TO A.D. 2010

(By Dr. R. L. Skrabanek)

There is a great deal of thought being given to this topic by a number of very able persons in our Nation and I am glad that your program committee saw fit to include it on the program since soil conservation will play a key role in obtaining the production we will need.

I would like to discuss this topic at two different levels. The first is at the level of sociologists who are population analysts. This happens to be my field of work—sociology as it applies to the agricultural scene, and about 90 percent of my research is in the population field.

How many people we will have is one of the key factors in projecting our needs for agricultural products. I make this statement because thus far no way has been invented of increasing the amount of food consumed on a per person basis. Now some of your friends might have bigger stomachs than they did a few years ago, but on the average the total amount of food intake has remained unchanged per person in our country. In 1910, for example, the individual American citizen consumed 1,576 pounds of food per capita. A half century later, or in 1955, this figure remained around 1,758 pounds per capita. In the long run, then, those statistics tend to show that the number of people to be fed and clothed is the basic consideration in projecting agricultural requirements. While our diet habits may change, the total consumption per person is a fairly static amount. Therefore, we must depend upon

population increase for most of the expanded consumption of agricultural products in our Nation in the future.

Based on present information, there is predicted a population increase of some 50 million between the present time and 1975, and 190 million by 2010. (From 178 million in 1960 to 230 million in 1975, and 370 million in 2010). This figure represents about a 29-percent increase in the next 15 or 16 years and better than a 100-percent increase by 2010. In other words, we expect to have two people in the United States in 2010 for every one who is here now.

Using the total expected population increase and the current per capita consumption of individual agricultural products, and if we make the assumption that our food habits and types of clothing materials do not change, then we can get a pretty good picture of the additional amount of agricultural products we will be consuming in 2010. These figures can be obtained simply by multiplying the per capita consumption by the increased population, and the attached table shows these figures.

Let's adopt these as our five basic assumptions:

1. Our population will grow at a fairly rapid rate, there being 370 million people in the United States in 2010.

2. A healthy growth in our Nation's economy will prevail, with a gross national product about five times as high as in 1956 and per capita incomes about 2½ times as high in another 50 years. A per capita income of $4,900 is assumed in 2010, as compared with a per capita income of $2,000 in 1956 (based on 1957 dollars).

3. The per capita consumption of food will remain at about the same level as in 1959, but some changes in eating habits will take place toward more of the higher cost foods such as meats, milk, fruits, and vegetables, but less of the cereals, potatoes, and heavy carbohydrate foods.

4. An export level which is approximately the same as that of 1959.

5. No major wars will take place.

Now using these as our basic assumptions, these are the projected agricultural needs for 2010:

1. The utilization of farm products for 2010 is projected at a level about 2.4 times as high as today.

2. The increased output called for in meat animals, poultry, and of livestock products in general is greater than for crops as a whole. Particularly the need for feed crops is projected to rise less than livestock, production needs because of a predicted further increase of about 17 percent in the efficiency of feed conversion by livestock by 2010.

3. The overall figures for farm product utilization for the year 2010 over the 1959 base year calls for about 2½ times the total production of livestock and livestock products with the crop output needs to just about double that of today.

Among food items the biggest projected needs will be for poultry and fruits and vegetables. The need for some nonfood materials produced in agriculture, such as lumber, tobacco, grain, and oil crops, is estimated to be slightly higher than the increases needed for agricultural items which are used for food.

Projected national needs for specified agricultural products for 1975 and 2010

Product		1959 per capita consumption	Projected needs above 1959 consumption levels	
			1975	2010
Meats (carcass weight):				
Beef	pounds	81	4,412,000,000	15,552,000,000
Veal	do	6	312,000,000	1,152,000,000
Lamb and mutton	do	4.6	234,000,000	864,000,000
Pork	do	67	3,484,000,000	12,864,000,000
Poultry products:				
Eggs (ready to cook)	dozens	29.5	1,534	5,664
Chicken	pounds	29.8	1,549,000,000	5,722,000,000
Turkey	do	6	312,000,000	1,152,000,000
Milk	gallons	80	4,160	15,360
Fruits:				
Fresh	pounds	99	5,148,000,000	19,008,000,000
Processed	do	46	2,392,000,000	8,832,000,000
Vegetables:				
Fresh	do	124	6,448,000,000	23,808,000,000
Canned	do	44	2,288,000,000	8,448,000,000
Frozen	do	8	416,000,000	1,536,000,000
Potatoes	do	103	5,356,000,000	19,776,000,000
Cotton	do	26	1,352,000,000	4,992,000,000
Grains:				
Rice (milled)	pounds	5	260,000,000	960,000,000
Wheat	bushels	2	104,000,000	384,000,000

NOTE.—Based upon 1975 and 2010 population projections and 1959 per capita consumption levels; not taking into account possible changes in food habits.

COLLEGE HOUSING

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Housing for Exploding College Population," written by George W. Oakes, and published in last Sunday's Washington Star.

It deals with a subject which is pending before the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and before Congress. The author makes a very fine statement on the need for college housing, and I invite the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING FOR EXPLODING COLLEGE POPULATION

(By George W. Oakes)

More than half of all college and university housing built in this country last year was financed by the Federal Government. The college housing loan program, begun in 1951, has been one of the Government's most successful lending operations and has never had a loan defaulted in principal or interest.

Since the program's inception Federal loans totalling $1,175 million have been granted to 1,200 college and university projects. Housing accommodations totalling 285,000 has been provided at colleges, universities, and hospitals as well as nearly a hundred related facilities such as student unions, student centers, dining halls, cafeterias, and health centers.

This month Senate and House hearings will be held preparatory to congressional action authorizing additional loan funds. A real fight for the continuance of the program is anticipated because the administration has refused to include it in its budget and instead has recommended as an alternative a long-term bond program with Federal funds only for servicing the debt. Under the Eisenhower proposal the bonds would be sold through commercial channels to private investors at a higher interest rate than the colleges now pay the Government.

DEMOCRATS BACK IT

However, the Democratic congressional leadership, which has strongly backed Senator SPARKMAN and Representative RAINS in their successful efforts to keep the college housing program, is trying to reject the administration's substitute. The Democrats are being supported by the entire college and university community, which regards the continuance of the present program as essential.

The extraordinary rise in college enrollments in the last decade has created an exceptional shortage of student housing. In 1959 there were 4.4 percent more college students than in 1958 when 35.6 percent of all college-age youths were attending institutions of higher education. The Office of Education estimates that 10 years from now college enrollment will be over 6 million students, almost twice as many as now.

Even today there is too much overcrowding in college dormitories. Thirty percent of college students live in housing provided by the institutions. Commissioner of Education Derthick testified last month that "frequently three and four college students are now occupying dormitory space originally designed for two students, with a consequent loss of privacy which is essential to sound learning. Many married students and their families continue to be housed in quonset huts and structures donated by the Federal Government for temporary use which have long since outlived their intended period of occupancy.

"A significant percentage of the Nation's college buildings are overdue for repair, renovation and replacement."

This situation has been caused by rapidly increasing enrollment against a background of curtailed construction during the depression of the 1930's and World War II.

The Office of Education estimated in January that if the 6 million youths expected to enroll in college by 1970 are to have as good facilities as the 3.4 million in college now (many of whom have substandard housing), an expenditure of $4 billion will be needed for new dormitories and other residential buildings. An additional $2 billion will be required to rehabilitate present housing.

WHAT IS PROPOSED NOW

Senator SPARKMAN favors an authorization of $500 million of which $250 million would be available on passage to take care of the backlog of approved applications and a supplementary $250 million to be available on July 1. In the House Representative RAINS would like $300 million a year for 2 years, effective July 1, 1960. Present indications are that Congress will adopt in the new housing bill a program somewhere between these two proposals and then see whether the President will veto it in an election year.

The leading universities of the country like Columbia, Yale, Dartmouth, Johns Hop-

kins, University of Chicago, Carnegie Tech, and the University of Southern California have all helped meet their housing needs through this Federal loan program. In fact, its beneficiaries represent a complete cross-section of American higher education—private, public, denominational, and nondenominational.

For example, here are the programs' accomplishments in the Washington area: At Georgetown University a men's dormitory for 200 students was financed by a $1,192,000 loan and occupied in 1958. Another and larger men's dormitory for 400 students, including a huge cafeteria for 1,100 students, was completed last fall under a $2.8 million loan. Also, housing has been provided for 178 student nurses and 37 faculty members through an additional loan of $1,249,000.

George Washington University made use of the college housing program to buy and convert in 1958 two apartment houses into dormitories for 138 men and 196 women with a $1,250,000 loan.

American University has obtained loans totaling $2,534,000 which have provided dormitory accommodations for 558 men and women.

Catholic University has built a 200-man dormitory and student union mostly with a Federal loan of $1,350,000. Also, the University of Maryland at College Park, Trinity College and Dunbarton College of Holy Cross have benefited from Federal college housing loans.

HOW PROGRAM OPERATES

This is the way the program operates:

A college can borrow up to $3 million in a single year for which it nows pays 3⅛ percent on loans approved during the current fiscal year. Most loans run for a period of 40 years. These terms are considerably more advantageous than a college could arrange through commercial channels. In fact, private colleges would probably have to pay from 5½ to 6 percent interest and public colleges from 4½ to 4¾ percent interest.

At present repayments by the colleges to the Government are running at the rate of $9 million a year and no loan has defaulted. The two basic tests for a loan are the college's need for the facility and the revenue that it will produce. The colleges obtain most of their funds to meet the amortization costs of the loan from student rentals for the use of dormitories.

One interesting aspect of the program is that there has been no Federal dictation over the way the money is used. In fact there is not even a required Federal architectural standard. The college buildings are constructed entirely at the discretion of the particular institution.

FORTHCOMING RETIREMENT OF SENATOR MURRAY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it was with a saddened heart that we learned of the decision of Senator JAMES E. MURRAY to retire at the end of his term in January. He has been so much a part of this body with which we are associated for so long it is hard to imagine the Senate without him, or Senators deprived of his counsel and assistance.

In the 12 years I have been privileged to represent Tennessee as a U.S. Senator, Montana's senior Senator has often been of incalculable help to me in many ways. This was his manner. One did not have to agree with him to respect his position and his intellect in arguing it.

Senator MURRAY is a wonderful example to foreign-born U.S. citizens, for he is himself a naturalized American citizen, having come to our country's service from Canada.

He is a battle-scarred veteran of the liberal causes in our country. He was one of Franklin D. Roosevelt's strongest New Deal supporters. Leaving a successful and interesting law practice, he came to the Senate in 1934 as a successor to another distinguished son of Montana, the late Senator Thomas J. Walsh. Since then Senator MURRAY has been decisively reelected four times, a clear expression of the confidence and affection with which he is regarded in the Treasure State.

While serving in the Senate, we all know he has tremendously benefited the causes of conservation and reclamation with his painstaking, brilliant career as a member and chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. In addition, no other Senator's name stands higher than that of JIM MURRAY in the field of interest in the education of our young people. Even now, in the battles for Federal aid to education, it is the name of Senator MURRAY, along with that of his colleague from Montana, Representative LEE METCALF, which serves almost as a label to identify the liberal position on this subject.

Mr. President, while respecting Senator MURRAY'S decision to retire, and knowing that he is correct in doing so, all of us profoundly feel the loss we will personally suffer by his absence from this body. All of us wish him godspeed and a long and happy retirement from the day-to-day trials of public office, but we beg that he not allow his voice to go unheard. From our seniors like Senator JAMES E. MURRAY much counsel is needed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I desire to subscribe to the fine sentiments expressed by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I was not present in the Senate on the day when the distinguished senior Senator from Montana announced his intended retirement from the Senate. I am sorry I was not able to join in the tributes paid to him on that day.

I shall certainly miss the presence of Senator MURRAY. I have been a nearby desk mate of his for several years, and have always enjoyed his cheerfulness, his statesmanship, and his leadership.

The Senator from Tennessee remarked that the Senator from Montana is chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The Senator from Tennessee will recall that at another time the Senator from Montana served as the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. For several years, he was chairman of the Committee on Small Business, from a time just after the conclusion of World War II until that committee was discontinued in about 1948 or 1949.

Senator MURRAY has performed outstanding work in every committee position or every committee chairmanship he has ever undertaken. I remember well his work as chairman of the Committee on Small Business. It has been my privilege to call on him many times for advice and help in connection with my service as chairman of the reorganized Committee on Small Business.

Senator MURRAY has been an outstanding Senator throughout his many years of service. We shall all miss him. As he enters upon the retirement he has so well earned, I wish for him complete happiness, continued good health, and great success.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from Alabama. I know of no other Member of the Senate who has worked more closely in cooperation with Senator MURRAY for fine causes and purposes than has the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama.

TRIBUTE TO MISS MIRIAM OTTENBERG, OF THE WASHINGTON STAR

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a personal friend of many of us, Miss Miriam Ottenberg, reporter for the Washington Star, is due congratulations for having won her profession's most coveted recognition, a Pultizer Prize.

She won this award, which carries a $1,000 cash honorarium, as well as undying recognition for a series of seven articles which appeared in the Star last year exposing the unscrupulous practices of some District of Columbia used car dealers and finance companies in skinning the public.

It seems to me that this type of exposé is journalism in its highest form. It exposes an evil, arouses public indignation and leads to remedial legislation which would not have been enacted if the reporter had not exposed the condition.

As Senators know, the Pulitzer Prize was established in the will of the late Joseph Pulitzer, who was one of the giants of American newspaperdom. He published the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which is still in existence and is still fulfilling Mr. Pulitzer's lofty purposes, and the New York World, now gone but still reverently regarded by newspapermen as having represented the finest hour of American journalism.

Miss Ottenberg has been a staff writer for the Star since 1937. Her newspaper calls her an investigative reporter, and it is in the field of investigation that her talents stand out. She has written probing series of articles on phony marriage counselors, abortion rings, high food prices, juvenile crime, sex psychopaths and drug addiction, among many others.

The series on unethical used car-lot practices has been widely reprinted. The Armed Forces has distributed it to servicemen, who are often victimized by the practices exposed by Miss Ottenberg.

I do not know of any newspaper reporter more deserving of this high honor than Miss Ottenberg. Both she and her newspaper deserve the thanks and gratitude of Congress for this fine piece of work.

Incidentally, this is the third Pulitzer Prize won by Star reporters in 3 years. In 1959 the award went to Mary Lou Werner for articles on Virginia school integration problems. In 1958, George Beveridge won a Pulitzer Prize for a series of articles on "The City of Tomorrow." Few newspapers have been so distinguished, or more deservedly so.

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN NAVAL VESSELS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCARTHY in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived; and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10474) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3387) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCARTHY in the chair). The pending business is S. 3387, the bill authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, before making the opening statement, I ask unanimous consent that an additional staff member be permitted on the floor, inasmuch as the four authorized by the rules are already present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in the absence of the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], I have been delegated the responsibility by the Joint Committee to present to the Senate the authorization bill, which is the pending business.

S. 3387 which is identical to H.R. 11713 is the annual AEC authorization bill and authorizes necessary projects and funds for fiscal year 1961. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held extensive hearings on this bill on March 8, 9, 10, and 11, and on April 5, 6, and 7, 1960. The Joint Committee, after careful deliberation, reported the bill on April 19, and on last Friday, May 6, 1960, it passed the House of Representatives in the form recommended by the Joint Committee. The House vote was 321 to 2.

The bill follows the same general form as the AEC authorization bills for the past 4 fiscal years.

Section 101 authorizes $211,476,000 for new AEC construction projects, compared with $293,876,000 requested by the AEC. The Joint Committee reduced the bill by $82,400,000. A total of 39 line item projects are listed in section 101 of the bill, covering all aspects of the AEC program.

Sections 102 through 106 of the bill contain standard provisions on "limitations," "advanced planning and design," "restoration or replacement," "currently available funds," and "substitutions."

Section 107 amends two projects authorized by prior authorization acts. Project 57–d–1, the zero gradient synchrotron at Argonne National Laboratory, is increased from $27 million to $42 million, and project 60–e–12, alterations to Shippingport reactor facilities, is increased from $5 million to $9 million. This will permit construction of a heat sink and modification of the reactor plant for operation at a power level equivalent of 150 electrical megawatts under PWR Core 2.

Section 108 of the bill rescinds certain projects previously authorized which are no longer considered necessary by the AEC or the Joint Committee. A total of seven projects would be rescinded, amounting to $18,290,000.

Section 109 authorizes an additional $40 million of funds and a $5 million waiver of use-charge authority for use in the cooperative power demonstration program, under the conditions and limitations of previous applicable statutes. Of the $40 million in this section, $25 million is intended for construction of an intermediate-sized organic-cooled prototype reactor, if no satisfactory proposal is received from industry under the third round of the AEC Authorization Act for fiscal year 1960. The remaining $15 million under section 109 is available for research and development assistance for either unsolicited proposals or third-round proposals, whichever may develop. Two large-scale powerplants have reportedly been under consideration by two California utility groups, and Southern California Edison has recently announced a letter of intent to construct a 360,000-kilowatt atomic powerplant in California.

Section 110 authorized $5 million for use in the cooperative program with Canada for research and development in connection with heavy-water moderated nuclear powerplants. The United States will get all plans and technical data under this cooperative program.

The bill contains several changes recommended by the Joint Committee from the bill originally proposed by the Atomic Energy Commission.

First, the committee added, as project 61–d–10, $13 million for power reactor plants for the Antarctic. Testimony furnished the committee during the hearings indicated the extremely high cost of fuel in the Antarctic, as well as the fact that many lives and much equipment have been lost in transporting fuel and supplies to our scientific stations in the Antarctic. The $13 million authorization could provide for construction of three or four small atomic powerplants in the Antarctic, with discretion for the arrangements to be left to the Atomic Energy Commission, in cooperation with the Navy, which supplies our Antarctic stations, and the Department of Defense. Construction of atomic powerplants in the Antarctic would enhance our international prestige in that area, would help develop reactor technology, particularly for small plants, and would result in eventual savings to the taxpayers because of lower operating costs.

Second, the majority of the committee recommends, in project 61–f–7, $3 million for the design and the engineering of the linear electron accelerator at Stanford University, rather than the $107,200,000 construction authorization requested by the Atomic Energy Commission. The majority believes that the design and engineering authorization will allow the project to go ahead on an adequate basis and will result in better cost estimates before construction is authorized. We are concerned with the history of rising costs in the high energy physics program, and the changes that have been made in this particular accelerator. The committee has requested that an overall report on the high energy physics program, and more data on this proposed accelerator, be submitted by Atomic Energy Commission to the Joint Committee by January 1961. We believe the Congress would then be in a better position to consider the requested $107,200,000 construction authorization. There was offered in the House an amendment to authorize construction of the Stanford accelerator this year; but it was defeated by a decisive vote of 194 to 129.

Also, the committee added to the Atomic Energy Commission proposed bill two projects in the basic research field:

Projects 61–f–8, $5,600,000 for construction of a materials research laboratory at the University of Illinois.

Project 61–f–9, $2,200,000 for construction of a radiation laboratory at the University of Notre Dame.

Both of these projects were requested by the AEC Division of Research, but were eliminated during the budget process. The Joint Committee believes that intensified laboratory work and research in the two important areas of materials and radiation effects will be of great benefit to the atomic energy program.

The committee also increased the amount for project 61–h–1, facilities in the biomedical research field, from $4 million to $5 million, in order to provide needed facilities in the field of radiation research, including the effects of radioactive fallout.

In summary, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, through its Subcommittee on Legislation, has held detailed hearings on every project and provision in the bills. The subcommittee and the full Joint Committee gave the bill very careful consideration, made a few revisions, and reduced the total amount authorized from $293,876,000 to $211,476,000, or a net reduction of $82,400,000. The actions of the Joint Committee and the reasons for these actions are thoroughly explained in our committee report, Senate Report No. 1277.

I urge all Members of the Senate to vote for House bill 11713, in the form recommended by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I should like to supplement briefly the able remarks which have been made by the

distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has added to the bill as originally proposed by the Atomic Energy Commission some items which are of great importance to our atomic energy program.

One of these items is Project 61–d–10, power reactor plants for the Antarctic, $13 million.

Last year, I visited our Antarctic bases, and witnessed the extremely hazardous operations our people are engaged in there just to provide themselves with the fuel oil they need for heat and electricity. I found out that 80 percent of all the transportation effort was devoted to the one purpose of fuel-oil supply.

I also looked into what these extremely hazardous transportation operations in the Antarctic are costing us. It was very disturbing to find that we have already lost 17 lives in these operations. We have also lost aircraft and ground vehicles which cost nearly $11 million. I also found that the delivered cost of the fuel oil at some of our bases was as high as $10 a gallon. For example, I found that it requires 4,500 gallons of aircraft fuel to deliver each 1,000 gallons of fuel oil to our Pole Station from McMurdo Station, which is 800 miles away.

The advantages of nuclear-power reactors to meet our energy requirements in the Antarctic, as compared to conventionally fueled plants, were obvious. The compactness of nuclear-reactor fuel would reduce our transportation requirements enormously, in comparison to conventional fuel. We have already developed highly reliable nuclear powerplants of small sizes. We also have in the late stages of development more advanced compact nuclear plants.

Based on studies recently completed by the Atomic Energy Commission for the Joint Committee, we also could save a great deal of money by using nuclear power in the Antarctic, as compared to the use of conventional power. The results of these studies, which are printed in the record of the Joint Committee hearings on this bill, indicate that the savings available range between $60 million and $80 million over the life of the nuclear plants.

In addition to the humanitarian and monetary advantages attendant on the use of nuclear power in the Antarctic, we also stand to gain in the field of international prestige. As Senators know, in the Antarctic we are engaged in scientific programs with 11 other nations. The adoption of nuclear energy to further our scientific efforts and to ease the physical discomforts of our people living in the Antarctic will, I am sure, greatly increase our international prestige.

We have also added provisions for two physical research projects to the authorization bill as proposed by the Atomic Energy Commission, and we have increased the authorization requested by the Commission for radiation biology.

The Joint Committee has consistently supported the basic research programs in atomic energy. I do not think any other committee is more cognizant of the importance of basic research than is the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Joint Committee has added or increased the authorization of 20 atomic-energy research projects in the last three Atomic Energy Commission authorization bills. These additions covered all fields of research, including accelerators, materials research, and biomedical research.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will pass the bill in the form in which it has been reported by the committee; and I am confident that such action will help keep our country substantially ahead in the all-important field of atomic energy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 7, it is proposed to strike out "$211,476,000" and insert "$315,676,000"; and on page 4, in lines 19 and 20, it is proposed to strike out "Project 61–f–7, design and engineering, linear electron accelerator, $3,000,000." and insert "Project 61–f–7, linear electron accelerator, $107,200,000.".

Mr. HICKENLOOPER obtained the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I ask unanimous consent that there may be a quorum call, without the Senator from Iowa losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the roll call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the amendment which I have sent to the desk is an amendment proposing to restore to the authorization bill project 61–f–7, which authorizes the appropriation of $107.2 million for the construction of a new, unique, and very advanced linear electron accelerator at Stanford University, for further extensive and advanced experimentation in the atomic field.

This authorization and request for appropriation was approved by the Bureau of the Budget and requested by the Atomic Energy Commission. It was removed from the authorization bill by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The committee was fairly well divided in that action. I forget the exact vote, but a substantial number of Senators voted for inclusion of this project in the bill. I am told the vote was 10 to 6 for elimination of this provision from the bill.

In the authorization bill which is before the Senate, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy saw fit to insert $21,800,000 worth of projects which were not approved by the Budget. The committee inserted provision for those projects into the bill over my objection; nevertheless, they were inserted, and are now in the bill.

The committee saw fit to cut out of the bill provision for $107 million which was requested by and included in the budget, and which was requested by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. President, I believe my amendment should be adopted. It would authorize the linear electron accelerator, which, as I have said, has been requested by the President and by the Atomic Energy Commission.

I call attention to the fact that the project has been requested and urged not only by a panel of distinguished scientists, but by a number of scientific groups.

I should like to emphasize the scientific importance of the project, the unanimous support of the scientists, and our competition with Soviet Russia in this basic research field.

I shall also briefly mention comparable costs and time schedules under the bill, as compared with the full authorization, which will be developed more fully by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

SCIENTIFIC IMPORTANCE OF THE PROJECT

Most of our accelerators already in operation or under construction are proton, or heavy particle, accelerators. This will be our first high energy, high intensity, linear electron, or light particle, accelerator. This machine will make it possible to probe the basic dimensions and structure of matter. It will have great flexibility in that, being a linear accelerator, it will be possible to extract the beams at various points along the line of acceleration. It will be initially planned for 10 to 20 billion electron volts, but by a fairly simple addition, can be increased to 45 billion electron volts, and therefore have a built-in protection against obsolescence.

I should like to quote from Dr. Haworth of Brookhaven, who explained some of the advantages of this machine as compared with any other:

> Our knowledge can be effectively increased only through the use of ultra-high energy accelerators of diverse capabilities. The spectacular increase in proton accelerator energies in recent times has somewhat obscured the fact that many other parameters are also quite important. We must have electrons as well as protons; we must have intensities great enough to permit rapid observation of the various direct processes and to produce copious quantities of all transient elementary particles for use in secondary interaction studies; we must have sharply focused beams and flexibility in time and space to suit the various purposes.
>
> There is an especially acute need for very high energy electrons in large intensities and in well-focused beams. Because of easier and cheaper adaptation to circular machines, protons have been produced at energies far above those available with electrons. In contrast to the proton case where 6 Bev has been available and 30 will soon be reached, electron energies have so far been limited to 1 Bev. An important step that will fill an urgent need is being taken by construction of the 6 Bev Cambridge Electron Accelerator (CEA). However important though its potential contributions, there will

be a vital need for higher energies, far higher currents, and much more sharply focused beams than it will be able to provide. The linear accelerator proposed will effectively meet these requirements. In its initial form it will have twice the energy and some 50 times the intensity of the CEA. As in all linear accelerators and in contrast to the circular machines, a full strength sharply focused beam will emerge into free laboratory space where it will be quite accessible and can be used in many different ways. As time goes on and need arises, the energy can be increased (to as much as 45 Bev) both by increases in the power of the driving klystrons and by adding klystrons at relatively modest cost. By virtue of this flexibility, it can belong to more than one generation of machines.

Dr. Panofsky is the leading expert in the world in the use of linear electron accelerators and he has built up a team of some 20 or 30 highly qualified scientists at Stanford. The only place in the world where this machine can be built at the present time is in the United States, and the only place in the United States is at Stanford University.

The reason for that is that Stanford University is the only place not only in the United States but also in the world where the nucleus of a team of this kind has been brought together. I invite attention to the fact that if we continue to delay the construction of this very much needed scientific device, this team is apt to deteriorate, and a great deal of time will be lost.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FONG in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator concede that since the time this linear electron accelerator was first planned and considered, there have been several variations?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There have been some slight variations, which have dealt almost entirely with the foundation of the machine, the question of whether it should be in a tunnel or whether it should be what they call a "cut-and-cover" on the surface. It is a matter of geology more than anything else, not related to the scientific importance.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator further concede that since this machine was first planned there has been a serious question as to what the ultimate cost of the final project may be?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. There is always a serious question about the cost of any pioneering project.

I do not agree with some of the arguments which have been made that the possible or potential increased cost of this particular device will skyrocket to the same extent and to the same percentage it has with respect to certain other accelerators, because of the history we have in respect to the operation and to the manufacture and production of this particular general type of machine. I think we have more accurate and more reliable estimates of the cost of this type of accelerator than we have had with regard to the cost of many machines proposed for construction in the past.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator further concede that since the project was originally considered a serious question has arisen as to the cost of electric current which might be furnished for the operation of the accelerator, and that a study was undertaken, at the insistence of the Joint Committee, and that as a result new figures have been gathered, which now place us in a position where the cost of the power might be half of what it was originally estimated when the project was first considered?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not think the Joint Committee can take credit for all of the study. The Atomic Energy Commission itself instituted studies, also. The Joint Committee was very helpful along that line.

The studies were instituted. Studies are constantly going on with every plant as to the reduction of electrical cost. I think it was a routine examination of this particular element of the cost of construction which brought about the result.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not want to interrupt the line of thought of the distinguished Senator, with whom I am more often in agreement rather than disagreement. This is a rather unusual occasion, in respect to this particular phase of our program, that we are in disagreement.

I have read the record of the debate in the House of Representatives very sincerely and attentively. I have read the record of the hearings, as closely as I could, because I am not a member of the subcommittee which held the hearings.

Fundamentally, I do not think we ought to leave the impression that the committee, as such, is opposed to the building of the accelerator. There is merely a question in regard to whether we need more definitive information and data before a project of this size and this magnitude is undertaken, as a matter of authorization at this time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I agree with the Senator that the committee members who voted against the project have freely expressed themselves as believing this is an essential project and a worthy project which has to be built some time. The only reason which was given—which to me is not a sufficient reason and not a good reason—is that we need more time for a "look see" at this matter. I think we all agree it is a perfectly worthwhile project and that it will be built.

I had not intended to get into this matter at this particular point, but I will say that there are escalated costs each year, which are a factor. There are various estimates of around 5 or 6 or 7 percent of escalated costs each year we delay this, which will be added to the total cost. It is a tremendously costly operation.

The only disagreement I find, so far as I can determine, between my particular view and that of the majority of the committee members, is over the question whether the project should be built now or whether it should be built in the future.

The Bureau of the Budget believes the project should be built now, and has requested it in the budget. The Atomic Energy Commission believes it should be built now, and has requested it. I join in their opinion. I believe the project should be built now and should not have been cut out of the program.

I should like to quote again from Dr. Haworth:

In summary, those of us who have so enthusiastically endorsed this proposal have done so because this Linac is the best and indeed the only means to fill a vital need for sharply focused electron beams of higher energies and far higher intensities than otherwise available; because with minor interruptions in its use and modest capital outlay its energy can be increased to even higher values; and finally and importantly because Professor Panofsky, Professor Hofstadter, Professor Ginzton and their colleagues constitute a group of research physicists and accelerator engineers that is unexcelled in general and is unequalled in the construction and utilization of linear accelerators.

Accelerators are needed to explore the basic secrets of the universe to tell us the makeup of atoms, protons, neutrons, electrons, and strange particles. In the past, these experiments have led to discoveries of new elements and particles, some of which have been extremely important in our atomic weapon and national defense programs. This machine, according to the testimony of all our scientists, is the necessary next step in our high-energy physics program, and I quote as follows from the testimony of Dr. John H. Williams, AEC Commissioner and former Director of the Division of Research:

The 10 to 20 Bev electron linear accelerator proposed by Stanford University should be the next major step in the high-energy physics program of the country. The construction and operation of this machine will put in the hands of the U.S. physicists a most necessary tool if we are to achieve maximum scientific progress.

UNANIMOUS SUPPORT BY THE SCIENTISTS

Mr. President, this measure has the unanimous support of the scientists. Normally the unanimous support of any particular organization or group would not necessarily be governing, but when we are dealing with a matter which is as intricate as this particular matter is, the unanimous opinion of the scientists who are knowledgeable in this particular field becomes a matter of great importance indeed.

This accelerator has been reviewed since 1957 by a series of high-level panels of distinguished scientists, each of which has unanimously recommended proceeding with this machine. The most recent review was in January 1960, by a special panel of members of the President's Science Advisory Committee and the Atomic Energy Commission General Advisory Committee and I quote from the letter dated February 5, 1960, from Dr. Piore, chairman of the panel:

In particular, this panel wishes to reaffirm its recommendation to start immediately the construction of the linear electron

accelerator proposed by Stanford University, and to express its concern about the delay which has been encountered in authorizing this machine to date. All the experimental potentialities of this machine, which the panel foresaw last year, still look as attractive as they did then. In addition, new potentialities have developed for which this high-intensity, high-energy, electron machine is well suited.

I wish to call attention to certain phrases in the quotation which I just read. Dr. Piore said:

In particular, this panel wishes * * * to express its concern about the delay which has been encountered in authorizing this machine to date.

He says also:

This panel wishes to reaffirm its recommendation to start immediately the construction of the linear electron accelerator proposed by Stanford University.

Considering the rather restrained verbiage which scientific men sometimes use in their reports and in their statements, one can understand the serious and vital nature of the recommendations which they are making here. They are not given to emotional outbursts, but the language used here is very significant; it is positive and urgent.

In addition, scientists from other advanced accelerator projects, such as a group of Midwestern universities, have also supported the Stanford project. I should like to quote from the testimony of Dr. Rollefson, director of MURA, which initials stand for Midwestern Universities Research Association:

It is a pleasure for me, as a representative of the Midwestern Universities Research Association, to have an opportunity to give our enthusiastic support to the recommended authorization of the Stanford linear electron accelerator. The reasons for supporting this program have been so well and completely portrayed in the report of the special panel appointed by the President's Scientific Advisory Committee that I feel there is little of importance that I can add.

Mr. President, in this whole field we are in competition with the Russians, or the Russians are in competition with us, whichever way one wishes to consider it.

COMPETITION WITH SOVIET RUSSIA

The United States leads the world in high energy physics, but Soviet Russia has been making increased efforts in this field. High energy physics is an area which has aroused enthusiasm and excitement among many of our best scientific minds. These machines are admittedly very expensive. But in a race of this nature we can be sure that our Soviet competitors will not slacken in their efforts to catch up with us. I quote from the separate views of our committee report. Separate views were filed by several of us who disagreed with the committee report eliminating this project. In those separate views we said:

The Stanford accelerator would permit exploration into a new field (light, charged particles at high energy) not now adequately covered by the U.S. high-energy physics program or that of any other nation. By going ahead with this research tool, our scientists will be in a position, we feel, to make discoveries that will bring our country distinction in a highly competitive field among scientists throughout the world, including Russia.

The Russians have three accelerators scheduled to start up in 1960 and 1961, including a 2 Bev electron linear accelerator at Kharkov, and they have announced a 4 Bev electron linear accelerator planned for construction at Kharkov. Even discounting the Russian claims, the Stanford 10 to 20 Bev accelerator would be the acknowledged leader in this dynamic area of science, and would offer opportunity for some positive U.S. "firsts."

The Stanford accelerator will also round out our program by giving a better balance between light particle (electron) and heavy particle (proton) accelerators.

PREVIOUS STUDIES AND COST ESTIMATES

This project has been thoroughly studied, including estimates of costs. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a chronology of developments of the Stanford linear accelerator project, as prepared by the AEC.

There being no objection, the summary discussion and chronology of development was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STANFORD LINEAR ACCELERATOR PROJECT—SUMMARY DISCUSSION AND CHRONOLOGY OF DEVELOPMENT

1. The Stanford linear accelerator project has been under development for a number of years, and has been given active consideration in Government circles for about 3 years. In its early stages of development, technical as well as financial support for preliminary research and development was provided by the Office of Naval Research, with AEC participation, both through the AEC-ONR research program and through direct support of components' development.

2. On May 4, 1959, after approval of the project by the President, the project was placed under AEC cognizance. Proposed legislation to authorize an appropriation of $105 million for the project was submitted to the Congress on May 27, 1959.

3. On July 14 and 15, 1959, the Joint Committee held hearings on the Stanford authorization bill. AEC testified, as did representatives of Stanford University. The Joint Committee did not report the bill out.

4. On July 19, 1959, Chairman McCone and Commissioner Williams (Dr. Williams was then Director of Division of Research) visited Stanford University, examined the site and the plans for the facilities, and engaged in extensive discussions with university officials and staff. These discussions raised the following questions:

(a) Feasibility of the site and adequacy of the design features of the machine from a standpoint of possible earthquake damage. (It was noted that the proposed tunnels were within a few miles of the San Andreas Fault which is a source of most seismic disturbances in the San Francisco Bay area);

(b) The reliability and adequacy of the construction and operating cost estimates;

(c) Possible conflicts of interest on the part of Stanford personnel who would be assigned to the project.

It was apparent from these discussions that insufficient geological investigation had been carried out by Stanford University to give assurance on the question of seismic risk at the proposed site.

5. In the fall of 1959, AEC authorized extensive core drillings and geological studies to assess the seismic risk. These studies and drillings revealed that unexpected subsurface conditions would be encountered at the proposed site which would substantially increase the cost of the accelerator tunnels, although no evidence was developed that the tunnels would be susceptible to earthquake damage.

6. After a review of cost estimates supplied by Stanford University, AEC, in September 1959, commissioned J. A. Blume and associates, architect engineers and specialists in earthquake resistant construction, to prepare detailed cost estimates of site preparation and construction of facilities to house the machine, as well as supporting facilities, to reevaluate the feasibility of the original site, and to consider alternate sites possibly offering better and, therefore, less costly geological conditions. These engineering studies were made at a cost of about $75,000 to AEC:

(a) Blume & Associates reported that whereas Stanford had estimated the construction to cost $105 million at the original site, it would more probably cost $125,700,000. Blume did not foreclose the original site because of the earthquake hazard.

(b) Blume & Associates surveyed several alternate sites and concluded that the most feasible site is another site on the Stanford property known as Sand Hills.

(c) Blume & Associates have, therefore, recommended the above alternate site, but have proposed the elimination of the tunnels as originally designed and the substitution of less expensive cut-and-fill type of construction—possible at the new site because of different subsurface conditions. Construction costs at the new site would, in the opinion of Blume & Associates, cost $107,200,000.

7. Conflict of interests: A thorough investigation was carried out by the AEC's Division of Inspection. It was determined that certain key personnel at Stanford University had interests—financial, consultative, or managerial—in a manufacturing concern known as Varian Associates, a highly qualified manufacturer of klystron tubes and other equipment vital to the Stanford accelerator. This conflict has been resolved by Varian Associates through removing themselves as a potential supplier for any equipment for the Stanford accelerator, except at no profit and on request from the Government. The conflict problem also extended to other firms who might be suppliers of electronic components. These other possible conflicts are not of such serious moment. (Varian Associates was the principal problem.)

8. Another aspect of the conflict-of-interest problem arose from the fact that Stanford University itself receives royalties from the sale of klystron tubes. (Patent rights are owned joinly by Stanford, Varian, and Sperry Rand Corp.) This has been resolved by the board of trustees of Stanford University agreeing to waive all royalties on klystron tubes supplied for this linear accelerator.

9. The Stanford accelerator project and the decision to proceed had been part of an overall study of high-energy physics originated in mid-1958. In November 1958, a committee from the membership of the President's Science Advisory Committee and the AEC's General Advisory Committee prepared a report on the Nation's high-energy physics program. The report assigned highest priority to the completion of construction and to the operation of other high-energy physics projects in being or under construction. It also recommended the construction of the Stanford accelerator as the first new undertaking.

10. This committee again reviewed the accelerator problem early this year and submitted its report on February 5. They reiterated the importance of the Stanford accelerator and recommended its construction. They also expressed concern over what they considered to be the inadequacies of the 1960 and 1961 budgets for high energy physics.

11. The problem of high energy physics has caused the Atomic Energy Commission considerable concern because of the mounting construction costs as compared with original estimates, and the sharp upward trend in annual operating costs as compared with original estimates.

12. In summary, there are six major accelerator projects now under construction which were originally estimated to cost $72 million. They will actually cost about $182 million when completed, with modifications to permit maximum utilization. The operating costs for these projects were originally estimated at $13,700,000 per year, whereas current estimates are $68,400,000 per year. If we add to this the proposed Stanford project, with its construction cost of $107,200,000 and its annual operating cost of $15 million per year, we will be committed to $289,200,000 for construction of accelerators and $83,400,000 for their operation yearly. This, plus other research in high energy physics will result in annual expenditures of $125 million for this field of science in 1965 and years following.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of a letter dated April 28, 1960, to Congressman VAN ZANDT from AEC Chairman John A. McCone, which demonstrates that the $3 million design and engineering authorization will result in increased costs and will delay the commencement of useful experiments.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,

April 28, 1960.

DEAR MR. VAN ZANDT: This is in response to your letter of April 21, 1960. The answers to the questions raised therein have been prepared with the aid of the interested personnel at Stanford University and the staff of the San Francisco operations office of the AEC.

"1. If construction should be authorized by June 1, 1960, when, under projected schedules, would construction be completed? When could beam start up and useful experiments commence?"

Answer. If construction is authorized June 1, 1960, construction could be completed and the beam started up by July 1965. Useful experiments could commence July 1966.

"2. Same questions, on the assumption that $3 million 'design and engineering' is authorized this year and construction authorized by June 1, 1961."

Answer. If $3 million is authorized in fiscal 1960 for design and engineering and construction is authorized by June 1, 1961, all construction could be completed and the beam started up in the interval January–April 1966. Useful experiments could start in the interval January–April 1967.

A tabulation of the construction cost estimates and completion dates for the various alternatives is shown below:

Plan	Construction cost estimate	Completion (useful experiments)
	Millions	*Years*
Full authorization now	$107.2	6
$3 million authorized now, remainder authorized 1961	[1] 110.0	6½–6⅚
Delay any authorization until 1961	[1] 113.0	7

[1] The increased costs represent escalation occasioned by the estimated delay in the completion of the project. In addition, Stanford estimates that the uncertain status and inefficiency resulting from partial authorization will probably add an additional $1,000,000 to the total project cost.

If the project were authorized in this session of Congress for design and engineering only, and was not fully authorized until June 1961, it appears that the most serious effect will be in the lack of ability to recruit certain additional key scientists whom Stanford considers are essential for the development and design of the accelerator and experimental facilities. Testimony covering the views of scientific witnesses on this point was given before the Subcommittee on Research and Development and the Subcommittee on Legislation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on July 14 and 15, 1959, by Dr. Ginzton (p. 189), Dr. Smyth (p. 208), and Dr. Rollefson (p. 230).

In response to our specific query, Stanford University now states to us:

"We are experiencing some difficulty at the present time in keeping our present staff, the nucleus of the project, together, and there is serious danger that a number of the principal scientists on the staff will leave the university's employ because of the continuing uncertainty concerning full authorization of the project.

"The number of physicists and engineers presently involved in project agreement No. 1 work is 27. We had planned to increase this to an average of 60 man-years during the first year of integrated development and construction activities, in which we would also be subcontracting all work that could be reasonably done that way. Under the existing circumstances we think we could recruit only five or six more physicists and engineers than we now have. Moreover, it is not likely that these new people will be of the excellence we had intended. Undoubtedly a partial authorization will not be attractive to scientists having tenure in other institutions or who otherwise require long-term commitments. As an example it would be impossible to recruit experienced high-energy particle physicists who would be involved in more detailed calculations of shielding or study of other problems related to the utilization of the machine. This work is necessary for its design. Given full authorization this year we believe that we could staff to the extent and excellence that was originally contemplated.

"It should be noted also that a part of the Blume first-year schedule involved partial construction of laboratories, shops, etc., needed to accommodate the increasing staff contemplated for the second year. This would not be possible under the partial authorization and hence will also complicate our staffing problem in the year beginning July 1961, if construction authorization were given then."

With respect to the question of how much progress could be made in the next year under "design and engineering" authorization with the broad authorization language contained in the committee report as compared with authorization of construction, it is clear that some progress could be made which would reduce the delay in construction when full authorization for construction was approved. Design could be well along on the master site plan, site foundation studies, the klystron test laboratory and the administration and engineering and science buildings. At least preliminary design could be done on other buildings and structures and utilities and roads. Some progress could be made on the design of the accelerator components and the accelerator test section. Design on the administration and engineering and science buildings and possibly some other facilities could be near enough complete that construction could begin very soon after funds were available for this purpose. The extent of progress on design of the accelerator proper and of testing facilities would be directly related to Stanford's ability to recruit top scientific and engineering staff for development of design criteria.

In July of 1959 Dr. Williams, then Director of the Division of Research, and I visited Stanford University, examined the site and the plans for the facilities, and engaged in extensive discussions with university officials and staff. As a result of these discussions and our direct investigations, several important questions were raised. These included adequacy of the site and of design features of the machine from the standpoint of possible earthquake damage; the reliability and adequacy of construction and operating cost estimates; possible conflicts of interest in the case of certain Stanford personnel associated with a potential supplier of major components of accelerator equipment; and questions of royalties accruing to Stanford University on the purchase by the Government of klystron tubes for the accelerator.

Following the identification of the foregoing questions and after consultation with the Joint Committee and in cooperation with Stanford University, the Commission initiated a series of actions which would resolve these questions. As a consequence, when the Commission appeared before the Joint Committee in March and requested full authorization for the project, the Commission was in a position to report to the committee that these questions had been resolved. The position of the Commission, therefore, remains unchanged.

The Stanford accelerator is the next logical step in the Nation's high energy physics program. The construction and operation of the machine will provide our scientists with an essential tool with which to further our knowledge of fundamental particles constituting the basic units of all matter. The earlier it can be completed and placed into operation the sooner will its contributions be realized and the greater will be our assurance of continued U.S. leadership in this important scientific field.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. MCCONE,
Chairman.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] plans to develop these points in more detail.

Last year the Joint Committee held full hearings on the Stanford accelerator, published as a 649-page document, containing a wealth of technical data and justification support. During these hearings I discussed the Stanford accelerator with Dr. Norman F. Ramsey, professor of physics at Harvard University, and I quote from page 224 of the hearings:

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do you feel that it is a needed development?

Dr. RAMSEY. Yes.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And in the long run over the years that this accelerator will give us answers which will be vitally needed in the development of science?

Dr. RAMSEY. I do, indeed.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Of course, we have to balance from a practical standpoint the cost as against the anticipated results. If the reasonably anticipated results are very great, then the cost item settles itself only down to a matter of lesser significance.

Dr. RAMSEY. That is right.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. That is, whether we are throwing money away needlessly on certain gadgetry or not, the basic cost becomes insignificant as far as the overall good is concerned. From any point of view, if this is a machine that is greatly needed and will contribute proportionately to the advancement of our knowledge, then I think the cost item is comparatively a minor matter. We can spend $100 million on a battleship or a cruiser, $300 million on a nuclear carrier, which perhaps we need—I don't say we don't—but when one compares the cost of something like this with the cost of other things, we can well make the expenditure, I think, if the anticipated results seem to warrant.

Dr. RAMSEY. I think there is no question but what very important new information

which cannot be gained in any other way will be obtained from this machine.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The basic question here is whether the Senate will vote to proceed now with a high energy physics project unanimously recommended by our scientists, or whether we will permit only a partial authorization that will delay the project and discourage our scientists. This project is needed to round out our high energy, light particle, program, and to assure us leadership over Soviet Russia. I urge all Members of the Senate to support my amendment to authorize in full the linear electron accelerator proposed by Stanford University.

Mr. President I conclude by saying, as I have said before in my remarks, that this machine will be built. It is needed, and vitally needed. It is authorized in the budget. It is requested by the Atomic Energy Commission. It should be included in the program. I opposed many projects in the bill which were not included in the budget, but I supported putting into the program this essential scientific research tool which was included in the budget and which is demanded by the Commission.

I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I join with my colleague from Iowa in expressing the hope that the Senate will vote in favor of the amendment offered by him, to authorize in full the Stanford linear electron accelerator, as proposed by the President, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the scientific community.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has already described the unique technical promise of this machine, the reasons for the scientific support, and its importance in our competition with Soviet Russia.

I should like to point out that the majority members of the committee do not oppose the project, but favor partial, rather than full, authorization at this time. I will then demonstrate that full authorization now will save money in the long run, will save time, and that it is necessary to recruit a staff of scientists and engineers.

First. The committee majority members do not oppose the Stanford accelerator, but recommend partial rather than full authorization. Let me quote from pages 8 and 9 of Senate Report No. 1277, the report of the Joint Committee on this bill:

The Joint Committee appreciates the remarkable achievements and scientific advances that have been accomplished by these "atom smashers" in the past, and is fully confident that even more remarkable discoveries will be made in the not too distant future.

The Joint Committee recognizes that an accelerator of this type could make a valuable addition to our national high-energy physics program, but believes that more design and engineering might result in better cost estimates before construction is authorized.

I shall discuss the disadvantages of a partial "design and engineering" authorization a little later.

Now let us look at the debate on the floor of the House of Representatives on this bill last Friday, May 6, 1960. Representative DURHAM, the vice chairman of the committee, said:

I am not opposed to going on with this project in an orderly fashion. I think we ought to go into all promising research work in the accelerator field, both in regard to heavy particles and light particles.

As I said, I am not opposed to any of these projects. I made the motion to put $3 million in here and let AEC come back with a thorough study to show this body exactly what it is going to cost.

Representative CHET HOLIFIELD said, in response to a question from Representative HOSMER:

Mr. HOSMER. I have consulted my figures and I have confidence in them.

May I ask this question: In view of the unanimous testimony that a linear accelerator of this size and power is a basic tool necessary for the Nation's scientific advancement, does the gentleman feel that there is any question about eventually building that machine in this country?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman has very clearly stated that the position of the majority is not against the building of this type of accelerator at the proper time, but the question of the majority on this item is as it has been on other items, to properly and carefully look at the preparatory work that has been done and to select the timing to initiate such a gigantic undertaking. We are furnishing $3 million for them to start on their design and engineering work.

Finally Representative MELVIN PRICE, chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development said:

I personally favor further consideration of the project early next year and I personally will appreciate the opportunity within a short time of voting for full authorization for the Stanford accelerator.

So I think it is clear that the scientific merits of the project are recognized, and supported by all members of the Joint Committee. The only question is the method and timing of legislative authorization.

Second. Partial authorization will result in increased costs and delay in beginning experiments. Let me quote from the letter dated April 28, 1960, to Representative VAN ZANDT from John A. McCone, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission:

A tabulation of the construction cost estimates and completion dates for the various alternatives is shown below:

Plan	Construction cost estimate	Completion (useful experiments)
	Millions	*Years*
Full authorization now	$107.2	6
$3 million authorized now, remainder in 1961	[1] 110.0	6¼–6¾
Delay any authorization until 1961	[1] 113.0	7

[1] The increased costs represent escalation occasioned by the estimated delay in the completion of the project. In addition, Stanford estimates that the uncertain status and inefficiency resulting from partial authorization will probably add an additional $1,000,000 to the total project cost.

The Stanford accelerator is the next logical step in the Nation's high energy physics program. The construction and operation of the machine will provide our scientists with an essential tool with which to further our knowledge of fundamental particles constituting the basic units of all matter. The earlier it can be completed and placed into operation, the sooner will its contributions be realized and the greater will be our assurance of continued U.S. leadership in this important scientific field.

Let me quote also from the three-volume detailed engineering analysis by J. A. Blume & Associates:

If the project is not authorized and operations initiated so that this schedule can be followed, the cost estimates should be increased at the rate of 5 percent per year for escalation.

From the above, it seems clear to me that the method of authorization in this bill will raise eventual total costs by at least $3 or $4 million, perhaps $5 or $6 million—5 percent of $107 million—and will delay commencement of useful experiments by at least one-half to three-fourths of a year, even assuming prompt authorization next year.

For these reasons, once the technical merit of the project is recognized—as it is—and thorough engineering studies have been made—as they have—it seems clear to me that the businesslike thing to do now is to proceed expeditiously. We will save money, and time in our scientific race with the Russians, by authorizing the project in full now.

Now I come to the third and very important problem involved.

Third. Partial authorization will delay recruitment of a scientific and engineering staff for this project. Let me quote again from Mr. McCone's letter of April 28, 1960:

If the project were authorized in this session of Congress for "design and engineering" only, and was not fully authorized until June 1961, it appears that the most serious effect will be in the lack of ability to recruit certain additional key scientists whom Stanford considers are essential for the development and design of the accelerator and experimental facilities.

In response to our specific query, Stanford University now states to us:

"We are experiencing some difficulty at the present time in keeping our present staff, the nucleus of the project, together, and there is serious danger that a number of the principal scientists on the staff will leave the university's employ because of the continuing uncertainty concerning full authorization of the project.

"The number of physicists and engineers presently involved in project agreement No. 1 work is 27. We had planned to increase this to an average of 60 man-years during the first year of integrated development and construction activities, in which we would also be subcontracting all work that could be reasonably done that way. Under the existing circumstances we think we could recruit only five or six more physicists and engineers than we now have. Moreover, it is not likely that these new people will be of the excellence we had intended. Undoubtedly a partial authorization will not be attractive to scientists having tenure in other institutions or who otherwise require long-term commitments."

During the 1959 hearings on the Stanford accelerator, the possibility of partial authorization was also suggested. The discouraging effect of such an authorization was described by Dr. Smyth of Princeton University, a former AEC Commissioner.

I quote from page 208 of the 1959 hearings:

Representative PRICE. Dr. Smyth, do you feel it is desirable to authorize the full amount of the cost estimate at this time, rather than to authorize only a sufficient amount to carry on design and engineering?

Dr. SMYTH. I feel very strongly, Mr. Price, that the full amount should be authorized at this time. This is a point that I did not cover in my statement, but as I said at the beginning of my testimony, I do want to talk about it. I have had some experience in the past with situations where preliminary design was authorized or research was authorized on a project, and then there was a long delay before further authorization came through. This is extremely demoralizing. It makes it difficult to assemble a staff, and once the staff is assembled, and then there is delay in further authorization, the staff disappears and it becomes extremely difficult to reassemble the staff. In this case particularly, where the design is so fully worked out in the sense of depending on components that are already in use, and where, as I understand it, a machine could be built that would be very useful even without further development of the components, I think it would be very undesirable to give partial authorization.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me restate my three points:

First. The committee majority members do not oppose the Stanford accelerator, but recommend partial rather than full authorization.

Second. Partial authorization probably will result in increased costs and delay in beginning experiments.

Third. Partial authorization will delay recruitment of a scientific and engineering staff for this project.

For these reasons I believe we should proceed with full authorization now of this important project, and I hope the Senate will support the Hickenlooper amendment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield for a question?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am somewhat confused by the contention that by deferring action we may increase the ultimate costs of the project. As the Senator said, members of the committee were not entirely willing to proceed immediately with the project, feeling that we should move cautiously.

A year ago, the Joint Committee held a hearing on the proposed linear accelerator. For some reason, the facts were not available, and there was a delay

Is it not true that in 1959 the AEC proposed to get electric power at 9 mills per kilowatt-hour, and because of the insistence, partially, of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, during the recess the Atomic Energy Commission made arrangements to get power at 4½ mills from the Department of the Interior, thereby saving from $660,000 to more than $1 million a year? Is that not essentially true?

Mr. BENNETT. That is essentially correct; but it seems to me that that does not bear directly on the problem before us, because it will be 6 years, at best, before this project will be fully operative. In that period of 6 years, I should assume that the preliminary estimates which may have developed the cost of 9 mills would be restudied and reviewed so that it could be determined whether the project was ready for electricity, and all possible opportunities to reduce the cost of electricity had been explored, as they have been explored in the period between 1959 and now.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Reference was made to a letter received by the Joint Committee from the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, indicating that if we proceeded immediately with the authorization and construction, the completion of the entire project might take about 6 years; whereas if we merely proceeded with more caution and additional engineering surveys, it could take 6½ years. The difference in time is only 6 months.

Does the Senator from Utah feel that the time element of 6 months is so vitally important at this time?

Mr. BENNETT. I feel that this is the type of machine or type of project on which the basic engineering has been done. Stanford is operating linear accelerators now, but they are very much shorter. Having achieved that basic material, it does not seem to me that there is any reason to delay for 6 months or a year while we talk about getting more engineering information.

This particular program is in a peculiar situation. Everybody seems to want it; yet we are now divided within the committee on the question: Shall we cut the dog's tail by $3 million this year, or shall we commit ourselves to the whole project? Having committed the $3 million, as can be seen from the comments already made by the persons who supported the majority position, almost everyone expects that next year we will move in and authorize the completion of the project.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Reference has been made to the fact that last year the Joint Committee tentatively approved this project but, for some reason, was unwilling to authorize the full amount for construction.

Is it not true that because of that delay some indication developed that the original site for the project was changed, so that the slight delay did not really retard the eventual success of the project, but actually made it likely to be more successful?

Mr. BENNETT. It is my feeling that the answer to the Senator's question is the same as the answer I gave him with respect to the power problem. If the bill had been reported with full authorization before construction actually could have been undertaken, they would be making the tests which have been made pending authorization, and I am certain that some discovery would have been made, and the answer would have been the same anyway.

It seems to me that the problem of site is not quite the same as the problem of the authorization of the construction of the machine. The fact that the original site suggested proved to be an unsound one and the fact that a better solution for the place in which to put the machine has been worked out should not influence us in our ultimate decision as to whether we want such a machine. I think we want the machine.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCARTHY in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. On the very question about the judiciousness of proceeding with the haste being advocated by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Utah, let me ask a question: Is it not a fact that if we had not proceeded with caution a year ago, when the first report was filed with the committee, we would have committed ourselves to a project which would have entailed the expenditure of $126 million, to build a tunnel 2 miles long?

Now it is planned, instead, to work above the ground, rather than below ground; and the anticipated expenditure will be $107 million, or a saving of $19 million. But if it had not been for the care exercised by the Joint Committee, the tunnel, at considerably greater expense, would have been authorized. That is the point we make.

Of course we are going to have an accelerator. Some say we should have it at once. Our committee is saying that this project is of tremendous magnitude and, on the basis of the present plans, it is estimated to cost the taxpayers of the Nation $107 million. However, by the time we get through, judging by the experience had with other projects in the same field, this one may cost the taxpayers $207 million.

The Joint Committee, which is the watchdog of the people's money spent in this field, favors this project, and does not question the sincerity of those who advocate construction of the project, but asks them to make a further study of the project, and prepare a better estimate, so that when the project is finally authorized, we shall be able to say to the taxpayers, "We have spent your money judiciously."

That is all this matter amounts to; it is as simple as that.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the two comments which have been made in the course of my remarks—one by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and the other by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]—have been with respect to supplementary matters. I do not believe we have ever had more complete data on the basic machine itself that we have in regard to this machine, because, backing it up, we have the actual experience at Stanford with the operation of linear accelerators.

These projects have been developed to a size never before reached, and they involve questions of electric energy and questions of the best place for the accelerator—whether it should be placed in a tunnel, or whether it should be placed in a trench, and then covered over.

It seems to me that both of these are supplementary problems. But the fundamental problem is that we are here dealing with a machine which has been

designed by those at Stanford, where similar units have been tested with remarkable results.

So the fundamental question is whether we are going to build the machine; and, if so, when?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. This matter has been "kicking around" ever since 1957. This is not a "Johnny-come-lately" operation.

As regards every activity in which the Atomic Energy Commission has been engaged—whether in the field of accelerators, or power reactors, or other types of facilities—every accelerator and every installation in this field could, after more experience had been gained, have been made probably a little cheaper, in some way.

This situation reminds me a great deal of the well-known question and reply:

Mother, may I go out to swim?

Yes, my darling daughter. Hang your clothes on a hickory limb, but don't go near the water.

But, of course, if she never goes near the water, she never will learn to swim.

The engineering problems which arose when the first proposals for a tunnel construction were made were routine exploratory operation problems. It was proposed that a tunnel be constructed. Some borings were made. Finally it was decided that a tunnel might involve considerable hazards, because of the geological formations in that location. So it was believed that probably it would be better and less expensive to dig a trench on the surface, at another location, where the construction might be more secure.

It is entirely possible that if we were to make this authorization next year or the year after that, or whenever we might make such an authorization, engineering changes might then be required, as a result of further and more detailed investigation.

But we must proceed with the job at some time; and we cannot learn to swim unless we go near the water.

This project needs to be constructed. We have the scientific background for it. We have a vast amount of engineering research on this matter. If we continue to postpone this work year after year, some of these days we may find a linear electron "sputnik" announced somewhere else; and then the people of the country will say to us, "Why did you let the Russians get ahead of us?"

That is the situation with which we are faced. So we wish to pioneer in this important field. Are we to "get this show on the road"?

In this situation, do we wish to continue to fool around, year after year, and, as a result, perhaps be outdistanced in some of this basic scientific research, for which this tool which the scientists have studied so carefully, is so important. I think that is the problem.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, it has been said that this project "has been kicking around since 1957." Perhaps that is not a very appropriate way to state this matter.

I do not think any committee of the entire Congress acts more conscientiously than does the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; and I believe the Senate should also know that no committee of the Congress has been more progressive, I dare say, in promoting the research aspects in the field of high-energy physics than has the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Its entire history exemplifies that very philosophy.

Let me say to my distinguished friends, who say this matter has been "kicking around since 1957": Of course it has been around here since 1957. Why? Because until now the answers have not been sufficiently definitive to enable us to have a proper and sound predicate for this authorization of $107 million.

Are we rejecting this proposal? Are we refuting the thinking in connection with it? Absolutely not. We merely propose that $3 million be authorized at this time. The AEC requested appropriation of $4,200,000 for fiscal year 1961, in order to undertake this project, to begin the construction. We propose, instead, an authorization of $3 million, in order to complete the planning, so more precise answers to the various questions involved will be found.

If we had been persuaded the last time they made this proposal to us, the tunnel might by now have been under construction.

Some ask, "What difference would that have made?"

In reply, I point out that if we had accepted the previous proposal, the tunnel would now perhaps be half constructed, and $5 million perhaps would have been spent; and then at that point it would have been found necessary to do the work above ground, rather than underground. Certainly we should not make large expenditures on such a basis.

Do Senators realize that this project alone will cost more than the original costs of Brookhaven and the Argonne Laboratory put together? This project is of tremendous size and cost.

So we recommend waiting a few more months—until January 1961, not until 1963 or 1970. January 1961 will not be very long to wait—before spending these large sums of money.

In the meantime, shall we be sitting on our hands? Of course not. We propose that the authorization be made for planning the details of the design and engineering of the project, so the definitive answers can be had, in order that a wise authorization for the project can be made.

Mr. President, the Commission's letter requesting the authorization of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1961 was dated February 12, 1960. That letter came to our committee. After that request came to us from the Bureau of the Budget, and the Atomic Energy Commission, the Subcommittee on Legislation, under the chairmanship of Representative HOLIFIELD, on March 8, commenced extensive hearings on the bills, as summarized in the report.

Mr. President, I say to Senators, with special emphasis: On April 1, 1960, the Commission forwarded to the Joint Committee certain proposed revisions of the bill, principally in the high-energy physics field. If all of this proposal had been decided long before now, why were not all the details set forth in the letter of February 12, 1960? But that letter did not include the details or the proposal as to the Stanford accelerator, because those involved had not yet made up their minds. In the meantime, something happened; and it became necessary to expedite the work. So, two months later they sent to us the second request, which includes this $107 million.

I say to my distinguished friends, if the entire report was decided on and formulated and if all the details of the design were agreed upon, why did they wait 2 months before they sent us the letter?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think I can answer that question.

Mr. PASTORE. I would like to hear the answer.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The fact is that additional studies were requested last year. The scientific groups were in the process of studying the matter. They came up with the final study results late this winter, and immediately the Commission sent through this request for the construction of the project.

Mr. PASTORE. In other words, my distinguished friend is telling me we have not been kicking this matter around since 1957; we have been kicking it around since April 1, 1960. That is what the Senator is now saying.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We have been kicking it around since 1957.

Mr. PASTORE. We did not give it the best kick until April 1, 1960. That is the point I make. Let us kick it around for another 6 months. Then we will have good answers.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The committee took a good kick at it when it took the project out of the bill, against the recommendation of the Budget and the request of the AEC. The committee is not sacrosanct in these matters. There was a great big push 3 or 4 or 5 years ago toward the building of atomic power plants in the United States. It was said we were going to put the Government in the power business. Then we found what the costs would be of projects that certain Members of Congress were so enthusiastic about. We found that their projects were wishful thinking, and not practical. So plans for such projects have disappeared.

Mr. PASTORE. I wish to compliment the Senator from Iowa, because, had we listened to him, had we proceeded with more caution then, we would not have proposed such a large-scale program at that time. He gave us a great lesson. I would only hope now that he would become a student of his own logic. That is all I am trying to impart this afternoon. Had we listened to the Senator from Iowa several years ago, we would not have attempted to have gone into these projects headlong and ended up

with a change in philosophy and thought. That is the position I take.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I take no credit for and no particular satisfaction in being a prophet. I would like to go on to other things. But if the Senator will have as much faith in this matter as he has in what I predicted a few years ago, I suggest he go along with me on this proposal, because everybody says this project is going to be built. With every delay, we know there is going to be an increase in cost. The project is going to cost more next year, the year after that, or the year after that, and it will be on the basis of an escalated percentage.

There is one other point I wish to make. The Senator said a moment ago $4,200,000 was requested. That is the amount requested, and we are granting them only $3 million. However, there is a vast difference. We are not giving $3 million on an authorized project; we are giving the agency $3 million to go out and look around. The important thing on a project of this kind is to know the project is authorized and the money is being spent on a project that is under way, one that is authorized by the Congress and that is a going concern. The $3 million we are giving is not $3 million for an authorized project. It is $3 million to enable them to go out and dig around somewhere. I think we ought to authorize this project, and I think we will get the proper engineering. We will save time, we will get this magnificent tool into the hands of the scientists, and we will be taking a long leap forward in the leadership which the United States now has in atomic energy research, and which we are bound to maintain if we survive.

That is my thought.

Mr. PASTORE. I wish to thank my distinguished colleague for his observation.

Mr. President, I should like to make another observation. Some references were made to the Blume report. Let me read an excerpt from appendix M of that report:

Before final design is undertaken—

Mind you, Mr. President, before final design is undertaken; and here we are proposing to start on this project, and we do not know the final design of it—

and before the final alinement is selected, a detailed site investigation is recommended. Such investigation should include detailed geological mapping, further investigation of ground water conditions, careful study of cut and fill slope stability, and definitive analysis of excavation and foundation problems. This work would include a comprehensive program of trenching, drilling, material testing, and investigation of possible elastic strain accumulation in the subject areas. This latter recommendation is amplified and explained in the text.

During the hearings the director of the committee staff asked several questions of Dr. Ginzton, the director of the accelerator project, and I read from the hearings:

Mr. RAMEY. Are there any other changes of significance in the cost of your facility other than the matter of your tunnel aspect?

This is after they went above ground.

In other words, as we recall the original estimate was $105 million, and then taking that same estimate today it would be $126,700,000. Do some of those increases in that $126 million stay in your estimate as it is now, but you save some money by changing the site and putting it above ground?

Dr. GINZTON. Yes, this is in large measure correct. It is not the complete story. What happens is that first by abandoning the tunnels and going to cut-and-cover construction the ventilation problems in the tunnel are much different.

That is another problem.

Much of the equipment we now suggest is different from the equipment we suggested before.

That is another problem.

This includes cooling, ventilation, electrical equipment, fire protection system; many things are different. So it is not any longer possible to identify individual costs.

Mr. President, as judicious men, men who are charged with protection of the purse of the taxpayers of this country, do we begin to authorize a project under those circumstances?

I repeat, the members of the committee considered this question thoroughly. I recommend that Senators read the debate in the House. Representative CARL DURHAM, of North Carolina, has been in the vanguard of the progress on research and development in this field. He said, "Let us find out what this is going to cost."

Along that line, let me introduce into the RECORD, and I shall not take up the time of the Senate by reading it in detail, a chart which shows that, whereas the original cost of a project was estimated at only $4 million, it ended by costing about $14,700,000. Another project which it was estimated would cost $9 million will end by costing $12 million. Another project which it was estimated would cost $29 million will end by costing $40 million. Another project which it was estimated would cost $27 million will end by costing $59 million.

That experience gives us a fair idea of what kind of field we are in.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the chart in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. HIGH-ENERGY ACCELERATOR COST ESTIMATES

Construction cost estimates

[In millions]

Accelerators	Energy, bevatrons	Particle	Initial estimate	Current estimate	Estimate, additions and modifications through 1965	Total estimated construction costs through 1965
Cosmotron (Brookhaven)	3.0	Proton	$4.0	$13.2	$1.5	$14.7
Bevatron (Berkeley)	6.2	do	9.0	13.9	11.6	25.5
Alternating gradient synchrotron (Brookhaven).	25.0–30.0	do	20.0	32.5	7.4	39.9
Zero gradient synchrotron (Argonne)	12.5	do	27.0	42.0	17.0	59.0
Cambridge electron accelerator (Harvard, MIT).	6.0	Electron	6.5	11.6	1.5	13.1
Princeton-Penn accelerator (Princeton).	3.0	Proton	5.8	11.2	13.3	24.5
Total			72.3	124.4	52.3	176.7

Source: Pp. 491–492 of Fiscal Year 1961 Authorization Hearings.

Annual operating cost estimates

[In millions]

Accelerators	Energy, bevatrons	Particle	Initial annual cost estimates	Current annual cost estimates	Annual cost estimates by 1965
Cosmotron (Brookhaven)	3.0	Proton	$1.7	$4.1	$4.6
Bevatron (Berkeley)	6.2	do	2.2	11.7	25.5
Alternating gradient synchrotron (Brookhaven)	25.0–30.0	do	1.7	8.9	9.6
Zero gradient synchrotron (Argonne)	12.5	do	6.1	9.4	15.6
Cambridge electron accelerator (Harvard, MIT)	6.0	Electron	1.0	6.6	8.1
Princeton-Penn accelerator (Princeton)	3.0	Proton	1.0	4.2	5.0
Total			13.7	44.9	68.4

Source: Pp. 491–492 of Fiscal Year 1961 Authorization Hearings.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I shall yield in just a moment.

These gentlemen have said, "Let us wait 6 more months." After all, since the matter was sent to us on April 1, what is wrong with telling them to go ahead with design and engineering on this project, and then come back in January, so we can then proceed? Is that not a more businesslike way to do it?

Mr. President, the situation before us is quite a paradox, because ordinarily one would expect the junior Senator from Rhode Island to be on the other side of the question. However, we sometimes become very paradoxical, and who knows what the necessities of the times may be. However, the fact still remains that the men whom I would expect to be conservative and urge us to go slow are the very men who are urging us this afternoon to go forward with this proj-

ect, whatever the event may be, on the ground that we have the money and therefore we should build this project. Why? Because we think we should beat the Russians.

That is a rather glamorous and graphic argument, but I hope we have not reached the stage where every time we get caught in an illogical position, the argument is made that we are in competition with the Russians. We are, in truth, out to beat the Russians. We have a better program and better high energy physics than the Russians have. We have better accelerators. This is the biggest project that has come to us in a long time. We are going to have it in due time. But I say let us do it without wasting the taxpayers' money.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have one comment to make. I think the Senator, only a moment ago, disproved his own statement. The Senator said that with regard to this particular project we ought to know what the cost is going to be, that we had never before authorized something without knowing the cost of it, and then the Senator read off a list of some five projects we authorized at costs which turned out to be about twice as much as we thought they would be when the projects were authorized.

That has been the characteristic pattern of the whole new field of atomic energy. We can never find out what a pioneering project in atomic energy is going to cost, because it is a new field. As we go along with the design and engineering of these projects new problems occur which could not possibly have been foreseen because they had never occurred before.

We may expect from time to time increased costs of one kind or another. This is not the same as construction of a building, when we have built buildings by the thousands for hundreds of years and know something about design and architecture and everything involved in it. These are pioneering operations.

I merely say we should get on with the job, and get it done. It will cost us more in dollars if we wait another year or two. I think we should authorize the project, and let it go ahead with confidence. In that way we will keep the team together, and enlarge the team for its operation. We will get on with the job. I think that will be in the best interests of American leadership in atomic energy.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wonder if I might ask my friend from Rhode Island a couple of questions?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KUCHEL. First, I want to ask the Senator if he believes any delay in the authorization of the entire amount of money, as contained in the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa, would in any respect endanger the security of the country?

Mr. PASTORE. Would a delay of 6 months endanger our security? It is my considered opinion that it would not. I think that opinion is shared by the majority of the members of the committee. I do not believe there is a Senator who would take such a position. I feel the majority are as patriotic as the minority.

Mr. KUCHEL. There is no question about that.

Mr. PASTORE. There is no question about it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island. This is not specifically a defense project.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course not.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What we are providing for is a scientific research tool. If our experience in this regard is the same as the experience we have had with other research tools, this probably will give us some new answers in regard to vast new fields of which we have no concept at the present moment.

Mr. PASTORE. In the makeup of the universe.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. My point is that we had better get on with the job, as a matter of pure science and pure research. I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island that at the present moment, this does not directly affect the security of the United States or our armaments.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should not like to have any misunderstanding about the matter.

Mr. KUCHEL. I notice on page 9746 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 6 the Representative from the State of Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], a member of the committee, quoted a sentence from a communication by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, as follows:

> If the project were authorized in this session of the Congress for design engineering only and was not fully authorized until June of 1961, it appears that the most serious effect will be the lack of ability to recruit certain additional key scientists whom Stanford considers are essential for the development and design of the accelerator and experimental facilities.

On that point will the Senator comment, and indicate his view as to the validity of the statement?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not question or impugn the sincerity of Mr. McCone when he made that statement. He is a fine American, and a very worthy Chairman of the Commission. In my opinion he is a capable man.

The letter quoted was sent after this matter became a controversy. I wish to read to the Senator a letter in answer to a letter sent by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The letter quoted is dated April 14th. It is the answer to the letter of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] of April 12, 1960, on this point. This is the answer we received at that time. What is the date of the letter the Senator reads from?

Mr. KUCHEL. The page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 6 does not contain the date of the letter.

Mr. PASTORE. It is a fact that the letter was sent. I think it was read into the RECORD.

I read from the letter dated April 14:

> DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: As we stated in our letter of April 13, 1960, to Mr. VAN ZANDT, at the present time work on the Stanford accelerator program has reached the stage where the next logical step would be to proceed with the design of the overall site plan and the design and construction of general laboratory facilities to house the design and engineering group and to conduct the research and development programs.

This is the important part of the letter:

> It is the Commission's view, however, that an authorization of $3 million—

That is the authorization in the bill—

> for design and engineering in fiscal year 1961 on the Stanford linear accelerator would allow the Commission to proceed with a program that would lead to initiation of construction with a minimum of delay following full authorization of the project.

Mr. KUCHEL. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, I shall read from the same sentence he has quoted. What does the wording mean when it says, "following full authorization of the project"? Is that what we are talking about in the amendment which is pending—"full authorization of the project"?

Mr. PASTORE. Three million dollars is in the bill. The reference to "full authorization" is to the time when we get the report of January 1961, I would assume. The $3 million which is talked about in the letter is the $3 million in the bill, which the amendment seeks to raise to the original amount requested. That has no bearing on the $3 million as such. This is something subsequent.

I continue to read from the letter.

> It is the Commission's view that the amount of $3 million—

That is in the bill. That is the authorization—

> for design and engineering together with operating funds for continued development work is adequate for Atomic Energy Commission and Stanford to make progress.

And so on and so forth. That is the letter which was sent. I tell the Senator very frankly, I suppose we could look at the matter in two different ways. We have to be practical about it. There is a school of thought which believes, "Well, we ought to authorize this project now, and let it go at that."

This matter was very carefully considered by the committee. As I stated, this is a bipartisan, bicameral committee. We never proceed on political considerations. I can say that with respect to the committee. There are no political motives to be injected in the debate this afternoon. If there is any difference, it is merely a question of a difference of judgment.

The majority of the committee decided that it would be better for the overall project if we authorized the planning and the designing now, and allowed those participating to come back with more definitive answers later, because this subject has been under consideration since 1957. The proposal has been changed from time to time. We have gone from one idea to another idea.

I think the project would have better "sailing" in the future if there were

unanimity of opinion. I am afraid that if the amendment is agreed to—and I do not say this as a threat—we may impede the progress of this project. Everybody seems to be for the project. It represents a new approach.

This matter was debated in the House of Representatives. The proposal was defeated by a vote of 194 to 129. The conferees will be more or less the same people who have made the report. There is a practical question involved at this moment.

I say to Senators, the history has been made. Senators have stated their positions. Let us proceed. Let us leave the matter until the plan and the design are prepared and reported to the committee. Three million dollars is provided for doing that. I know the scientists have a task in spending $3 million usefully in 6 months, but I think in this case they will do it. We will then get the more definitive design. We will get the definitive estimates. Then we will be ready to go forward. It will be done, and I do not think we will lose important time if that course is followed. That is the practical situation.

Mr. KUCHEL. What my friend is saying is that there is a difference of opinion on the need to go forward now. So that I can understand the situation, is it fair to say that the Atomic Energy Commission favors the pending amendment?

Mr. PASTORE. I assume the Atomic Energy Commission favors the pending amendment because it asked for the project originally.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the Bureau of the Budget approve it?

Mr. PASTORE. I assume that it might, for the simple reason that it is included in its request.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Budget Bureau included the project in its request?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, in its supplemental request.

Mr. KUCHEL. So the divergence of opinion on the necessity to go forward now lies within the membership of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy?

Mr. PASTORE. Who are honorable, judicious, and wise men.

Mr. KUCHEL. I stipulate that.

Mr. PASTORE. But I want it in the RECORD at that point so there will not be any implications to the contrary.

Mr. KUCHEL. Let me repeat my stipulation. Let me ask my friend this question: Is it the theory of the majority of the Joint Committee that with the expenditure of the $3 million which, as I understand, the bill now provides, surveys will be completed during the next 6 months?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. So early in the calendar year 1961, assuming a request such as is before us now were made again, on the basis of the additional information which would accrue from the expenditure of the $3 million, is it the opinion of my friend that at that juncture the committee would perhaps unanimously look with favor on proceeding?

Mr. PASTORE. I suppose so, but to make it more explicit, insofar as I am concerned, I would certainly support it with all the vigor within me.

Mr. KUCHEL. Has the Midwestern Universities Research Associates taken any position with respect to the pending amendment?

Mr. PASTORE. Representatives of that group appeared before the committee and said they would favor the project. As to details, as the Senator knows, many people appear before a committee to testify with respect to a bill. They are for the overall objective. I admit that we are getting into the niceties of that question. The committee as such is not opposed to the project. This group is in favor of the project. I think the committee is in favor of the project. Certainly I am. I am not a member of the subcommittee. As a matter of fact, I have had to do a considerable amount of night work to bring myself up to date. I did not attend the hearings. I am not a member of the subcommittee. However, I have read the transcript of the hearings and studied the report, and what I say now is based upon not what I knew previously but what I have learned since I was told I was to have management of the bill because of the absence of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is necessarily absent from the Senate today. That is all I can add. I would certainly support the measure. I think we must do everything within our power to progress as rapidly as we can in order to promote the levels of education and science in our country; and in view of everything which has transpired, in view of what transpired in the House and what I have read in the hearings, I say the best course to follow now is to go along, and this has been decided. When we come back in January our views will be unanimous. I think then we will go along fast and we will know where we are going because we will know more about the project.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] asked a question as to whether the Midwestern Universities Research Association approves the project at this time. I call the Senator's attention to the report of the committee under date of April 19, 1960, page 20, on which appears the separate views of those of us who think the project should be authorized at the moment. I quote from the testimony of Dr. Rollesfson, who is the director of MURA:

> It is a pleasure for me, as a representative of the Midwestern Universities Research Association, to have an opportunity to give our enthusiastic support to the recommended authorization of the Stanford linear electron accelerator. The reasons for supporting this program have been so well and completely portrayed in the report of the special panel appointed by the President's Scientific Advisory Committee that I feel there is little of importance that I can add.

That portion of his testimony, I believe, answers the question of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] about MURA's attitude.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a moment. I do not think there is anyone in the Congress for whom I have a higher respect than the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], at whom I am looking. I have followed his leadership on many occasions in the Senate. I intend to do so again. This is a different subject. It is one which we who operate here as lay Senators and not members of the Joint Committee have difficulty in fully comprehending.

There is no dissent on the part of any Senator from our composite desire to lead the parade with respect to development in all the fields of atomic and nuclear energy.

After listening to the debate, I believe there are two honorable ways to look at the question.

I choose to follow the recommendation embodied in the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], to proceed at once with the authorization of the accelerator. I do so on the basis of my judgment that if error is to be made, I am going to err on that side. The President recommends this authorization. The Atomic Energy Commission recommends it. The Budget Bureau recommends it. Distinguished scientists and professors of some great midwestern universities recommend it. Other scientists of distinction do likewise. It seems to me that the position I take is a sound one, in the interest of the country, and so I repeat that I shall support the pending amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the Senator tell me whether there is any authorization of funds contained in the bill for continuing the Euratom project?

Mr. PASTORE. It is my understanding that there is nothing in the bill for Euratom.

Mr. DWORSHAK. How much has been appropriated in the past for Euratom?

Mr. PASTORE. The staff informs me that $10 million has been authorized thus far, and that all of it has been appropriated. However, there is nothing for Euratom in the pending bill.

Mr. DWORSHAK. How much has been spent of the $10 million, approximately?

Mr. PASTORE. I am informed that approximately $1.3 million has been obligated.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the Senator concede that if the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy had been a little more deliberate and cautious in considering the entire Euratom program, and the authorization for the United States to participate therein, probably we might have avoided the embarrassment and disappointment which resulted from that action?

Mr. PASTORE. Well, I hope the Senator will not press that question, because we could discuss that from now until doomsday. At the time Euratom was suggested, insofar as the political complexion of the world was concerned, in view of the situation, particularly, which then existed in connection with the Suez Canal, in view of the scarcity of oil in Europe, and the desire to cultivate and promote production of electric energy and the use of atomic energy, in view of all these conditions the situation certainly was much more precarious at that time than it is now. Of course the picture has somewhat changed and the attitude toward Euratom has become somewhat discouraging. That is the best way I can answer the Senator's question in the time available to us now, but when more time is available I should like to discuss the matter with him.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank my colleague for his comment. I should like to ask him also that if the experience of the United States with Euratom does not indicate that it is not always advisable to accept the recommendations of the Atomic Energy Commission or the Bureau of the Budget insofar as the development of atomic energy is concerned.

Mr. PASTORE. I would prefer to answer that question by saying that as elected officials of the U.S. Government, representing the people, and their tax money, we should always be judicious and should always be businesslike, and always careful in appropriating the people's money.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 11713, a House bill identical with the Senate bill which we are now considering.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11713) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 11713) was passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. CLARK. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate bill (S. 3387) will be indefinitely postponed.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to make a strong and, I hope, dispassionate and nonpolitical plea to the President of the United States to sign the area redevelopment bill which was sent to him last Friday. The bill holds out the only hope for a quick, if partial, solution of the unemployment problem which is affecting many regions of the country, including wide areas in my own State.

Moreover, the President's principal original objections to the bill passed by the Senate last year have been substantially met in revisions made by the House of Representatives and accepted by the Senate.

I have seen, as have many of my colleagues, including the nine members, from both parties, of the Special Senate Committee on Unemployment Problems, ghost towns where almost nobody has a job except the postmaster and the public welfare representative who hands out public assistance and surplus food. In fact, in company with some of my colleagues I have visited the small town of Brier Hill, Pa., which, with a population of 1,000, perched on top of an abandoned bituminous coal mine, contained hardly one man, woman, or child who had a job. It was not because the men in that community, and in many other communities, had not constantly been seeking work.

These men told us they had traveled to Pittsburgh and Baltimore and Cleveland, and all over the Northeast, in search of work, but had not been able to find it. They told us they were turned away from the plant gates as soon as they gave their age as over 40; sometimes even over 35. They told us that because they had grown up as coal miners, they knew no other business or trade or occupation, and had had no opportunity for retraining. I have seen, and so have many of my colleagues on the Senate Special Committee on Unemployment Problems, as well as many other Senators, the most praiseworthy efforts of communities, including many in my own Commonwealth—Scranton, Hazelton, Altoona, Uniontown—to lift themselves up by their own bootstraps, by raising money by popular subscription to build shell plants and then go out and find industries to occupy those plants.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana, who has served on the Special Senate Committee on Unemployment Problems, as has the present occupant of the Chair [Mr. MCCARTHY], and knows full well the truth of what I am speaking.

Mr. HARTKE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania if it is not true that the present situation in many of these depressed cities has almost come to the point where the people feel no one is concerned about their welfare, and have tried to get help so many times that they feel discouraged at the prospect of ever getting help?

Mr. CLARK. I regret to say that the Senator from Indiana is entirely correct. As a former mayor of a city where there has been substantial unemployment from time to time, he knows of the substantial local efforts that have been made in his city as in my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. But I think he would agree with me that State, local, and private efforts have pretty well exhausted the resources in many of those areas.

Mr. HARTKE. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. I particularly point out that the State of Pennsylvania has a program which is probably unique, nationwide. It is not true in my own home State of Indiana, where we have been able to do some good.

I also like to recall the visit to one of those places which have been the subject of help. In one of the communities of Pennsylvania it was pointed out that in one plant the sum total of employment was from 100 to 150 people, while the number of people who had been laid off numbered in the thousands.

Mr. CLARK. I well recall the incident to which the Senator refers. It was, I believe, outside Uniontown, in Fayette County, Pa. The Senator from Indiana joined me in a field trip in that area.

Mr. HARTKE. I also join with the Senator from Pennsylvania in the hope that the President will see his way clear to put aside any partisan considerations in the interest of humanity and the welfare of individuals, not alone those of the communities, but of the souls who live there—the women and children, and the men who, while they are not subject to starvation itself, nevertheless try to find work, but do not know where to turn. This, in and of itself, should be reason enough for the President to sign the bill.

More than that, the President sent a special message to Congress in which he stated, in general terms, that he was in favor of this type of legislation. If he favors the general, overall principle, then I hope he will not quarrel about where we dotted the i's and crossed the t's, and where we put the periods or paragraphs, but that he may agree, in the interest of humanity and the welfare of the United States, that this is an

economic problem which must be solved if the forward progress of the United States is to continue.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Indiana for his intervention, and particularly for his suggestion that this is not only an economic problem, but is also a human problem. I remember well the very moving address which the Senator from Indiana made on the floor of the Senate when we submitted the report of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems.

I revert to my comment that our cities, counties, and States—and private industry, too—have reached the end of their resources. Many of those communities never had the resources, in the first instance, to make it possible for them to rehabilitate their local economies.

I do not wish to be critical of the President of the United States. I know he is a man of good will and has a large and compassionate heart. However, he has never seen with his own eyes the situation which I have just described, and which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], who is the present occupant of the chair, and the other members of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems have seen. I know it must be very difficult, indeed, for the President of the United States to see at secondhand what, perhaps through the necessity of the arduous duties which he must perform, he has not had an opportunity to see at firsthand. But the President has a number of capable and intelligent advisers in his own party who have seen these things. I hope he will take their advice. I hope he will take the advice of his Secretary of Labor, Mr. James Mitchell, who is intimately familiar with the conditions I have been describing. I hope he will take the advice of two distinguished Members of this body, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], both of whom know these conditions at firsthand, and both of whom are urging the President to sign the bill.

I hope the President will take the advice of the present Governor of West Virginia, Governor Underwood, who has also come to see the President, and who knows these conditions at firsthand and is urging the President to sign the bill. These men understand the situation. Their advice is good, sound, hardheaded advice. I hope the President will follow it, rather than follow the advice of other men, who have never seen these conditions, such as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Treasury, fine American citizens though they unquestionably are.

The Special Committee on Unemployment Problems took thousands of pages of testimony in stricken communities across the country. We reached the unanimous conclusion—six Democrats and three Republicans—that this problem could not be solved without a share of assistance from the Federal Government. We unanimously recommended to the Senate, and by Senate action we have sent that recommendation along to the President, that the area redevelopment bill should be passed and signed at this session of Congress. Now the bill to do the job is on the President's desk.

It is a moderate bill. It calls for substantially less help than we in the Senate thought desirable. But I hope the President will sign the bill. If he vetoes it, thousands of able-bodied persons will be condemned for a further indefinite period to the industrial scrap heap.

I point out that both of the objections which the President originally made to the bill have been met in the version which Congress passed. The President criticized the Senate bill as a spending bill, but the bill we passed does not spend 1 cent. It contains no appropriation whatever. There is no backdoor financing in it. It cannot correctly be characterized as a spending measure. It establishes a ceiling of $251 million on authorizations, but the amount to be appropriated is left to the later decisions of the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate, which will unquestionably be affected by the recommendations which the Department of Commerce will prepare and which the President himself will submit to implement the authorization contained in the bill.

All the bill does is to establish a program. The President has stated that he favors such a program. The Vice President has stated that he favors such a program. The platforms of both the Republican and Democratic Parties endorsed such a program in 1956. The bill merely authorizes the carrying out of the wishes of all concerned.

If the President signs the bill, the Department of Commerce must make an estimate of the money it wants, and the President must establish an agency to make the necessary loans and, to a very small extent, the necessary grants. The Bureau of the Budget must clear the request. The matter then must be reviewed by the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses.

If anyone thinks the maximum authorization of $250 million contained in the bill will get through all those stages of the process this year, he simply has not been around Washington very long.

While the President asked for a limit of $53 million to be authorized in his own area redevelopment bill, the budget estimates for fiscal 1961 contain only $10 million of expenditures for next year. Under the bill which Congress has passed, the President can still submit an estimate of only $10 million; and if Congress appropriates more than that amount, it would be a very simple matter, indeed, for the President to impound what Congress appropriated and refuse to spend any part of it. While I myself question whether that is correct procedure and is within the spirit of the Constitution, both President Truman and President Eisenhower have on many occasions refused to spend moneys which were made available to them by Congress.

Certainly the bill cannot well be vetoed on the ground that it is a spending measure. I reiterate—and I hope the President will take this fact into account—that the bill does not appropriate a single cent.

As for the President's other objection, namely, that too many labor market areas were made eligible, this defect was largely corrected on the floor of the House of Representatives after the President sent a special message to Congress commenting, among other measures, on the area redevelopment bill. The House restored the requirement which was contained in the Senate bill, but which the House committee had struck out, that no area could qualify unless its current unemployment rate exceeded 6 percent. That provision eliminated most of the big cities. Philadelphia is eliminated; so are New York City and Louisville, and a score of other cities throughout the country.

The rest of the areas where the President seemed to feel that generosity was being extended too far will be eliminated if we ever get out of what is euphemistically referred to as the 1958 recession.

If prosperity is restored and if unemployment decreases to somewhere near what we think of as normal levels, then only the hard-core areas of chronic unemployment, which this bill is designed to serve, will be over the 6-percent mark. Then in the case of centers such as Pittsburgh, where unemployment now is well over the 6 percent mark, unemployment will fall below that figure.

But if the President is still worried, for fear that too many areas will be eligible, as he is said to be worried about too much spending, he can handle that matter, too, because under the bill he will have the job of appointing the administrator who will carry the program into effect. So if the President is afraid that funds will be dissipated in areas where the economic distress is temporary, not permanent, all he will have to do will be to instruct the administrator whom he will appoint to reserve for a reasonable length of time the funds for expenditure for the hard-core areas, until suitable applications can be filed.

So, Mr. President, I hope very much indeed that the President will hear this plea, which is made to him by the citizens of the distressed areas in the Nation, who ask only for an opportunity to work for an honest living, and ask only that moderate sums of money—most of which will be repaid, with interest, to the Federal government—be put out on loan, to rehabilitate the economies of the areas in which they have been brought up, and where they have married and have raised their families and have their homes.

I hope the President will listen to the pleas of these citizens, and also will listen to those of us, on both sides of the Capitol, who have studied this problem deeply, and have seen with our own eyes the extent of the human misery involved.

I also hope the President will not be led astray by the statements of those who say this is a spending bill, or by the statements of those who say the bill covers too many areas. I hope that, instead, the President will realize that the control of those features of the proposed legislation will lie almost completely in his own hands.

Mr. President, because I have such great confidence in the wisdom and in the compassion of the President—with

whom, unfortunately, I deeply disagree at times—I am confident that if he really studies this matter and if he listens to the advice of those who know what they are talking about, this bill will yet become law.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

INCREASED USE BY POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT OF AIR TRANSPORTATION FOR FIRST-CLASS MAIL

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, during the first session of the present Congress the Subcommittee on the Post Office Department, of the Senate's Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, devoted a substantial amount of time to the matter of the increased use by the Post Office Department of air transportation for the movement of first-class mail. Five days of hearings were held on a bill—S. 2402—submitted by the Post Office Department; and during those hearings the subcommittee heard oral testimony by 17 witnesses and received written information from 25 or 30 more.

At the conclusion of these hearings and very careful study of existing statutes and court decisions construing them, the majority of the committee was convinced that the Post Office Department has the clear authority under the Federal Aviation Act to transport all classes of mail by air.

The witnesses for the Post Office Department made very clear that the increased use of air transportation was not a matter of choice, but was a matter of necessity; and he assured the committee that the use of alternative means of transportation, including aircraft, would be made only when the means formerly used proved inadequate to the needs of the postal service.

During the last few weeks, Members of Congress have been subjected to an unbelievable barrage of misinformation, largely emanating from the railroads, with the result that many Members have a completely exaggerated idea of the extent of the proposed increase in the use of air transportation and its possible impact on other carriers. For example, one Member of the House recently stated that the Postmaster General "has been going hog wild" on the use of air transportation, and that unless the practice is halted, the railroads would be forced to discontinue passenger trains on a wholesale basis, seriously hurting the railroads and jeopardizing the mail service.

Mr. President, those who have been making statements of this kind are simply misinformed as to the facts, and I should like to take this occasion to set the record straight. In 1958, the Post Office Department moved approximately 460,000 tons of first-class mail. About one-third of this was for local delivery. Another one-third was nonlocal mail moving less than 300 miles. Of the remaining one-third, represented by first-class mail moving over 300 miles, the Post Office Department moved only a small part by air. For some time the post office has been moving approximately 25,000 tons of first-class mail by air. In the immediate future, it proposes to move an additional 15,000 tons annually, making a total of about 40,000 tons. This represents less than 10 percent of the total volume of nonlocal mail.

The airlines are receiving revenues of approximately $3 million annually from the transportation of first-class mail. The railroads are receiving annually $345 million in revenues from the Post Office Department. While the increase in airlift which is planned will increase these airlines' revenues $1½ or $2 million, railroad revenues in the coming year will increase by substantially greater amounts, even after the diversion to air of this small fraction of the total mail.

What is the reason for the increased use of air transportation? Since 1953, 1620 mail-carrying passenger trains have been discontinued; and of these, 1,216 were due solely to the voluntary action of the railroads. Since January 1, 1958, alone, 794 mail-carrying passenger trains have been discontinued, of which 561 were withdrawn by the voluntary action of the railroads. Not a single train has been discontinued as the result of air transportation of mail. When air transportation of first-class mail was begun in 1953, 11 railroad mail cars were discontinued. This took place prior to the fall of 1954, and since that time not a single railroad mail car has been discontinued as a result of air transportation of first-class mail. The Post Office Department expects the increased use of air transportation now being effected to result in the discontinuance of 17 railroad post offices, but not to result in the cancellation of a single passenger schedule.

On the same day last year that the railroad witnesses were appearing before the Post Office Subcommittee to protest the increased use of air transportation, other railroad witnesses were appearing before the Interstate Commerce Committee to protest any restriction upon their right to discontinue unprofitable passenger trains. Their position seems to be that the Post Office Department is expected to move an increasing volume of mail on a constantly diminishing number of trains, regardless of the effect that this may have on the mail service of the American people.

I respectfully refer the Senate to the report of its Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of August 25, 1959, Senate Report No. 805 of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, and to the published hearings on air transportation for other than airmail before the Post Office Subcommittee. This matter has been thoroughly studied by the committee, and the evidence is overwhelming that a modest increase in the use of air transportation for first-class mail is necessary and inevitable and will have no significant effect upon the revenues either of the airlines or the railroads. The action of the Post Office Department is in the interest of providing the American people with the best possible mail service, and I am confident that the Congress will support this action, despite the screams of the railroads over the diversion of mail or the equally pained screams of the airlines that the rates set by the CAB are inadequate.

The American people are entitled to the best mail service which we can give them. Our responsibility is to them, and not to serve the selfish interest of a particular branch of the transportation industry.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed that we do not expect the conference report on the Mutual Security bill to be considered in the House today, because of the West Virginia primary election. We will probably not receive the conference report until tomorrow, if the House acts on it early tomorrow. I should like for all Members to be on notice that there is a possibility we shall act on the report tomorrow. We are going to act on it as soon as it is messaged to us.

In addition, we expect to consider Calendar No. 893, S. 910, to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes.

This measure will be handled by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I do not know exactly when the bill will be considered, but I should like to give notice, so that I can work out a plan for consideration of the bill.

Calendar No. 950, S. 2653, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish jurisdiction in the Federal Communications Commission over community antenna systems, I expect will be considered early next week.

I should like to give notice we expect to consider Calendar No. 921, S. 2168, to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine some time this week or early next week.

The Stella School District bill, Calendar No. 924, H.R. 8315, which is a very famous bill most people have heard about, we should like to have considered. I shall attempt to arrange a convenient time with the Senator from Oregon.

Calendar No. 173, H.R. 4601, to amend the act of September 1, 1954, in order to limit to cases involving the national security the prohibition on payment of annuities and retired pay to officers and employees of the United States, to clarify the application and operation of such act, and for other purposes, is a measure as to which I understand there is considerable opposition. I think the bill will probably be considered. I should like for Senators to be on notice it may be considered.

The wheat bill, S. 2759, has not been cleared by the policy committee, but has

been reported. We expect to have a meeting of the policy group at an early date, and will consider the bill.

The military construction authorization bill we expect will be reported some time this week. I should like for all Members to be on notice that the bill may be considered. I expect it will be considered Friday. The bill comes from the Armed Services Subcommittee headed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

We do not expect to consider any bills to be reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry this week, but S. 3044, a forest use bill, may be considered next week.

We do not expect anything to be reported from the Committee on Appropriations this week. The next bill to be reported will probably be the Agriculture Department appropriation bill. Hearings have been concluded on that bill. The hearings on the Labor Department-HEW appropriation bill and general Government matters appropriation bill have not been concluded. As soon as the bills are reported we will consider them in the Senate. I should like for the staff to contact the chairmen of the subcommittees, to see if those bills can be reported soon, so that we can keep making progress. There is a 3-day rule in regard to these bills.

The Subcommittee on the Defense Department appropriations has received the Defense Department appropriation bill from the House. It will be some time before that bill is acted upon.

We may receive the Treasury-Post Office conference report this week. Any Members who are interested in that should be on notice.

The military construction authorization bill may be reported from the Committee on Armed Services Wednesday. Hearings will be held next week on a major bill to amend the Reserve Officers Personnel Act.

We expect it will be at least another 2 weeks before the housing bill is reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9662, an omnibus bill to amend the trust, estate, and partnership tax laws, will probably be reported by the Committee on Finance next week. Hearings are being held on H.R. 10 this week, but there will be no report on the bill until next week at the earliest.

The Hawaii omnibus bill may be reported this week by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Major amendments to the Mineral Leasing Act also may be reported.

S. 2584, to remove the 50-percent subsidy ceiling on ship construction, may be reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce Wednesday.

Nothing is expected from the Committee on the Judiciary this week.

Nothing is expected this week from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Executive meetings on the minimum wage bill will begin May 23.

Nothing is expected this week from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The committee will wait for House action on the pay bill.

Nothing is expected this week from the Committee on Public Works. The omnibus rivers and harbors bill is at least 2 weeks, and probably 3 weeks, from action.

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1329, House bill 10474.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10474) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR O'MAHONEY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I know of no other business to be transacted by the Senate today.

I wish to make a brief observation concerning the announcement of the very able senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] that he will not be a candidate for reelection.

Senator O'MAHONEY has served with great distinction in the Congress for many years. First he was employed in the legislative branch of the Government as secretary to the late Senator Kendrick. He also rendered outstanding service in the executive branch of the Government when he served as Assistant Postmaster General during the early days of the Roosevelt administration. Perhaps one of his most notable contributions to public service was made when he headed the TNEC study in the early thirties. This inventory of our economic system served as the basis for some of our most prudent and forward-looking legislation.

I know of no man who has been a wiser counselor or a more cooperative legislator than JOE O'MAHONEY. And at all times, he has been a true public servant—dedicated to the interests of the people. It is with the deepest regret that I learn of his decision. Of course, we shall accept his decision, but we shall accept it with great regret, and with the knowledge that few, if any, men who have ever served in this body have rendered more dedicated or more patriotic or higher quality service than has the Senator from Wyoming, JOE O'MAHONEY.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Texas that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has been one of the great and devoted public servants of his time. Even long before I had the opportunity to serve in this body, I was one of those who, from boyhood, admired his great fight to preserve and strengthen the antitrust laws, to preserve free enterprise, and to treat fairly and equitably all citizens of this country, no matter where they were placed in life, with particular emphasis on economic and social justice for the least of them all.

It is of great regret to me to hear that the Senator from Wyoming is to retire from this body at the conclusion of this term. We shall sorely miss him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate very much what the Senator from Louisiana has said. He has stated my sentiments better than I could express them, as he usually does.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am very sorry to hear that the Senator from Wyoming is to retire from the Senate at the end of this term.

Through many years he has been one of our outstanding and most valuable public servants. I have the privilege of serving on the Judiciary Committee with Senator O'MAHONEY, and specifically on the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, of which he was chairman, and of which he is now cochairman.

Senator O'MAHONEY has always stood for and fought effectively for economic freedom, for the rights of small business and middle-sized business to have a chance against concentrations of economic power. He has effectively espoused the cause of competition. As has been pointed out both in the Senate and in the House, where he has appeared before House committees, when people lose their economic freedom they sooner or later lose their political freedom.

There is no deeper student of the problems of economics and of concentrations, monopolies, and mergers than the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. In this field he has been the most eminent scholar and specialist we have ever had, in my opinion, in the Congress.

He has always been interested in younger Members of Congress. When I first came to the House of Representatives I came to know Senator O'MAHONEY. He was never too busy to take time to explain his philosophy, and to explain the meaning of legislation.

I consider also that he is one of our most eminent students of constitutional law. When he spoke it was always on the basis of sound principle; he was listened to, and was very persuasive. His work, what he stood for, and his influence will live on for many, many years. We shall all certainly miss him. I regret that he has decided to retire.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has made a very beautiful statement. I know that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] appreciates the tribute he has paid to him. I share the views expressed by the able Senator from Tennessee, who has made such remarkable contributions to the antitrust and monopoly field himself, and I wish to congratulate him on the fine work he has done and the great progress he has made and the great example of public service he has set. It should be an inspiration to every person in Congress and in public life.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank my majority leader.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, long before I came to the Senate I came to

know Senator O'MAHONEY in his appearances before the House Judiciary Committee and in several conferences between the Senate and the House, and I came to have a very great respect for his unusual abilities as a lawyer. I also became proud to be able to call him my friend. He was a friend and counselor on many occasions before I became a Member of the Senate, and has been such ever since.

I have a very deep personal affection for Senator O'MAHONEY. As a Republican I should not join in the regret that he has decided not to be a candidate again. He has, of course, a very high place in the affections of the people of his State. I certainly do regret the reasons which have given rise to his decision, and can only express the hope that his retirement from his arduous duties in the Senate will result in his complete restoration to health.

Our hearts and our prayers will be with him as long as he lives. He holds a unique spot in our affections.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the generous statements made by the acting minority leader concerning our beloved friend from Wyoming.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 11, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 10, 1960:

U.S. TAX COURT

The following-named persons to be judges of the Tax Court of the United States for terms of 12 years from June 2, 1960. (Reappointments.)

Arnold Raum, of Massachusetts.
Allin H. Pierce, of Illinois.
Graydon G. Withey, of Michigan.

Irene F. Scott, of Alabama, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States for a term of 12 years from June 2, 1960, vice Marion J. Harron, term expiring.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 10, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Joel 2: 13: *Turn unto the Lord, your God, for He is gracious and merciful, slow to anger and of great kindness.*

Eternal God, our Father, we rejoice that Thou art always willing to bestow upon us the priceless blessings of Thy wisdom to live by, Thy light to walk by, and Thy strength to sustain us.

Thou knowst that daily we are greatly disturbed and disquieted for we are being besieged by perplexing national problems and perilous international circumstances.

We penitently acknowledge that we art tempted to allow our minds to be centered merely upon tidings and things that are dark and gloomy, causing our hearts to be overcome by cowardice and cynicism.

In the vast concerns of our beloved country, for which we find ourselves unequal, wilt Thou give us a new perspective and a clearer vision of that blessed day when righteousness and justice shall be triumphant, and freedom and peace shall be the glorious possession of all mankind.

Through Christ Jesus, we offer our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the 25th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration. This great institution is not only one of good and of progress for all of the country, but it is also a monument to the life and work of our beloved Speaker, Hon. SAM RAYBURN.

I have a special order for tomorrow and I hope, if time permits, to be able to discuss some of the phases in the history of this great program, and at the same time pay tribute to the work of our Speaker in this field. If there are others who care to join me tomorrow I have 1 hour reserved for that purpose.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING PROGRAM OF ASSISTANCE IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request from the Senate, which was read:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
May 5, 1960.

Ordered, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the bill (H.R. 5421) entitled "An act to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes."

Attest:

FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the Senate will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 4 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 85]

Alexander	Farbstein	Montoya
Anderson, Mont.	Flynn	Moore
	Forand	Morris, N. Mex.
Bailey	Garmatz	Pillion
Baker	Gavin	Pirnie
Barden	Gilbert	Porter
Barrett	Goodell	Powell
Blatnik	Green, Oreg.	Reece, Tenn.
Blitch	Hechler	Riehlman
Boggs	Henderson	Rivers, Alaska
Bolton	Hess	Roberts
Bonner	Hoffman, Ill.	Rooney
Boykin	Holt	Scott
Brewster	Hosmer	Shelley
Brown, Mo.	Inouye	Sheppard
Buckley	Jackson	Simpson
Burleson	Jones, Ala.	Spence
Cahill	Judd	Staggers
Canfield	Kasem	Taylor
Celler	Kearns	Teller
Chamberlain	Kee	Thompson, N.J.
Chelf	Kilburn	Vinson
Coad	Kluczynski	Wallhauser
Collier	Kyl	Walter
Davis, Tenn.	McGinley	Weaver
Dawson	McMillan	Widnall
Devine	Macdonald	Willis
Dorn, N.Y.	May	Winstead
Dowdy	Metcalf	Wolf
Durham	Miller, N.Y.	Zelenko
Elliott, Ala.	Mitchell	
Fallon	Moeller	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 337 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR STANDARDS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous censent that the Subcommittee on Labor Standards of the Committee on Education and Labor be allowed to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Library of the Committee on House Administration may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, with Mr. KILDAY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will be recognized for 2 hours and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, on May 1 the Soviet Government captured, 1,300 miles inside the boundaries of the Russian Empire, an American plane, operated by an American pilot, under the direction and control of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, and is now holding both the plane and the pilot.

The plane was on an espionage mission authorized and supported by money provided under an appropriation recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations and passed by the Congress.

Although the Members of the House have not generally been informed on the subject, the mission was one of a series and part of an established program with which the subcommittee in charge of the appropriation was familiar, and of which it had been fully apprised during this and previous sessions.

The appropriation and the activity had been approved and recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and, like all military expenditures and operations, was under the aegis of the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, for whom all members of the subcommittee have the highest regard and in whose military capacity they have the utmost confidence.

The question immediately arises as to the authority of the subcommittee to recommend an appropriation for such purposes, and especially the failure of the subcommittee to divulge to the House and the country the justifications warranting the expenditure and all details connected with the item at the time it was under consideration on the floor.

The answer of the subcommittee is—absolute and unavoidable military necessity, fundamental national defense.

During the Second World War the United States succeeded in breaking the Japanese naval code. Through this incredible good fortune the U.S. commanders were able to read every order transmitted from Tokyo and all interfleet communications. This advance and intimate information had much to do in preparing the way and increasing the effectiveness of our great victory in the battle of Midway which broke the power of Japan in the Pacific. But some incautious member of a congressional committee or its staff leaked the information to a reporter, and 30 minutes after the next edition of his newspaper hit the street Japan changed her naval code and all further advantage was lost.

This appropriation, and its purpose, is justified by honored and established precedent. This subcommittee, including the same personnel with the exception of two members who have since died, was the same committee which for something like 3 years provided in the annual appropriation bills a sum which finally totaled more than $2 billion for the original atomic bomb. Session after session the money was provided, and the subcommittee visited Oak Ridge where the work was in progress without any Member of the House with the exception of the Speaker of the House being aware of this tremendous project or the expenditure of the money. According to the testimony of all military authorities that bomb ended the war and saved the lives of not less than half a million men who would have had to be sacrificed in the conquest of Japan. No one has ever said that the subcommittee was not justified in expending an amount that eventually aggregated more than the assessed valuation of some of the States of the Union for that purpose.

Espionage has been throughout recorded history an integral part of warfare. Before occupying the Promised Land Moses "by the commandment of the Lord" sent out from the wilderness of Paran 10 men under the direction of Joshua to spy out the land.

And no nation in the history of the world has practiced espionage more assiduously than Russia. The United States and every other allied nation today literally swarms with her secret agents. Within the last few weeks we sent to the Federal penitentiary at Atlanta a Russian spy convicted in Federal court who was regularly transmitting information directly to Moscow every night. Their spies stole from us the secret of the atomic bomb. When we were at Oak Ridge we were told there were so many Russian spies there that only by a policy of strictest departmentalism were they able to maintain the integrity of their work.

The need for espionage in this instance was exceptional and compelling. At the close of the World War in which we had saved Russia from complete subjugation we were surprised to learn that while all other nations were disarming and returning to a peacetime status as rapidly as possible, Russia was feverishly driving her factories and continuing to increase her armament at top speed. Simultaneously they announced that communism and free enterprise could not live in the same world.

Every effort has been made by American administrations to reestablish conditions under which we could discontinue excessive expenditures for armament and divert these vast sums to business and humanitarian purposes. But each year Russia has become more arrogant and threatening and more demanding.

Under our American ideals and system of government, a declaration of war against any nation, however provocative, is unthinkable. Our military authorities have no choice but to give any enemy the advantage of first attack and then depend on massive retaliation for defense. The Communists have taken every advantage of this situation.

In modern warfare surprise is a tremendous advantage. Less than a week before the Communist attack on Korea a congressional committee from this House returning from Seoul reported that permanent peace had been established and the land was returning to prosperity. There was no shadow of war; not the slightest cloud appeared on the horizon. The sudden rush of a vast army of well armed, well trained, and well munitioned Communists across the border made it necessary for us to throw precipitately into battle raw and untrained troops who were wholly unable to protect themselves or hold their positions. And there followed one of the most disastrous periods in the history of American arms.

During the hearings on this appropriation for the last 2 or 3 years, I have each year asked the CIA representative before the committee, "How could the enemy mobilize an army of such size and accumulate millions of tons of supplies and munitions and the transportation facilities necessary for its movement without our learning that such an attack was in prospect?"

And each year we have admonished the Authority, the CIA, that it must meet future situations of this character with effective measures. We told them, "This must not happen again, and it is up to you to see that it does not happen again"; that the American forces must be apprised of any future preparation for attack in time to meet it. And

the plan they were following when this plant was taken is their answer to that demand.

And I want to take advantage of the opportunity to compliment and thank Director Allen W. Dulles and his remarkable corps for the admirable way in which they have met the situation through these later years.

They are entitled to the highest commendation by the Department, the Congress, and the American people.

We cannot permit another Korea. We cannot take the risk of carnage and national devastation which might involve every American city. We cannot take the risk of the consequences which would follow a similar attack from across the Russian borders. And since the Russians refuse to cooperate in our efforts to establish permanent peace—refuse even to agree to ethical standards of warfare—we have no choice but to protect our Nation and our people through the age-old methods of defense so long in use by the Communists themselves, lest we wake tomorrow, or do not wake tomorrow, as a result of our failure to know in time what they are planning against us.

The world has been appalled by the vicious vindictiveness of Khrushchev's denunciation. He yesterday characterized the policy of the United States as stupid and blundering. His fury is incited by the fact that it is neither stupid nor blundering. On the contrary it has been infinitely successful and effective.

When we have answered his threats—and he has been very free with them on all occasions, even when he was here as our guest in our own country—when we have answered his threats by basing our Strategic Air Command in a position to defend ourselves and our allies, he has boasted that he could stop them at the border. That is why we are now so earnestly developing our submarines so that if he ever is able to neutralize our Strategic Air Command then we will have to take its place a fleet of nuclear-driven missile-firing submarines that will be just as effective a halter upon him as SAC is today.

His discovery that since 1956, for 4 years, CIA has been sending planes across his border—and as far as 1,300 miles into the interior without his knowing it—is the occasion of this outburst.

It completely disproves his vaunted ability to stop SAC at the border.

The only reason he was able to apprehend even this plane or its pilot was that it developed some unforeseen and unavoidable mechanical or physiological defect, the first in 4 years. He was unable to hit it or to overtake it at its cruising height of 70,000 feet. So in order to leave the impression that he captured this plane he distributed a picture of a pile of rubbish which those who know the plane recognized as absolutely spurious. The plane and the pilot were evidently taken comparatively uninjured. That completely destroys his claims of invulnerability against American attack. So he as usual resorts to subterfuge.

And now the most gratifying feature of the entire incident.

The world has always recognized the remarkable success of our form of government. It has been the wonder and admiration of mankind. But always they have said that it was at a great disadvantage in a war with an authoritarian dictatorship.

We have here demonstrated conclusively that free men confronted by the most ruthless and criminal despotism, can under the Constitution of the United States protect this Nation and preserve world civilization.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, that was the most magnificent and courageous speech I have heard on this floor in many a day. It is true that we have approached these summit conferences with the idea that each side must be given the right to inspect and examine what the situation might be on the other side. That is the only way we can have peace as the result of these summit conferences. We must have that right. When the leader of Russia refused us that right, the only method we had and the only chance we had was to get out and do just what was being done by this pilot. It was nothing compared to the spy work that was carried on by the Russians—nothing at all. Today, the leader of Russia knows that he could not overcome the United States with the airplanes and missiles that we have available. But we could not know what the proper targets were or know where they were or where they would be unless we had some means of checking up on them—and he left us no course to pursue except the course that we did pursue. That sort of approach was the only approach that we could make. I have served, as has the gentleman from Missouri, on the subcommittee that went into the question of the development of the atomic bomb and went into the questions of supplying the CIA and the other branches of our Government with funds necessary to take care of and protect the United States and its people. For my own part, just so long as I am here, I intend to support that position. We brought in from the Committee on Appropriations, under the leadership of the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] a military appropriation bill designed to maintain the advantage that we have today over the Soviet. Let us go on and maintain it.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that in presenting the agriculture appropriation bill it is somewhat of an anticlimax in view of the wonderful speeches that have been made today. It probably is appropriate that this presentation be preceded by those statements, because many of our problems in the field of agriculture are tied directly into the defense effort of this country.

Back in World War II, and subsequent thereto, the American farmers were asked to produce world without end. They did that magnificently. When the war was over they were not given any refunds or tax reductions. Some $15 or $18 billion were given to business after World War II. No such thing was given to the American farmers.

We bring you a bill today where we are embarrassed by its size. We are embarrassed because under the present situation it is our subcommittee that has to pick up the check "after the fact," where we have little if anything to do with the amounts that are involved. In this bill that was submitted to us we were requested to appropriate the sum of $4,135,263,190. Our subcommittee was able to reduce that by $170 million. However, may I say, Mr. Chairman, that in the budget request regular activities were something like one-third of the total. Another one-third was for restoration of the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation; another more than one-third was reimbursement for special activities, the job of handling which has been assigned to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I have before me the U.S. News & World Report for last week, which points out that the United States has entered into an agreement with India whereby we will, within the next 4 years, give to India something like $1,200 million worth of rice and grain. We have seen in the papers the fine statements made as to how wonderful this is on the part of the United States. I am not taking issue with that. But whatever that is, I do not know of anybody who feels it would lead to any agricultural markets in India. However fine it is from a good Samaritan point of view, however good it is from the standpoint of our international policy, our subcommittee will have to sign checks for it in excess of $300 million, charged up to the American farmers for each of the next 4 years. That is an illustration of what we have before us.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee has a tough job in trying to bring about reductions in the cost, because so many of them are beyond our reach. We on our subcommittees have tried to bring in a bill on which we could all agree. I doubt there is an item in this bill that suited all of us on this subcommittee. But the bill as produced represents the composite views of the whole subcommittee, I believe. I have gone over it very closely, trying to make it as sound as I was capable of doing.

I want to pay tribute to the members of my subcommittee who have worked so hard on this bill. My friends and colleagues on the majority side, Congressmen FRED MARSHALL, BILL NATCHER and FRED SANTANGELO have cooperated fully and have helped in every way. The minority members, Congressmen H. CARL ANDERSEN, WALT HORAN and BOB MICHEL have done their part to bring this bill to the floor in the best possible shape.

Now I would like to discuss some of the major factors with which we had to deal.

FARM INCOME AT LOW LEVEL

The records of the Department show that the Federal Government is now spending far more in the name of agriculture than ever before in history, and

yet income from farming in 1959, including soil bank payments, was at the lowest level since before World War II. This is true, despite the fact that national income has increased consistently each year and per capita income for all segments of the population, other than agricultural producers, is at the highest level in the history of the country.

The farm price support program was created in 1933 to preserve and maintain our soil resources, to give the farmers suitable purchasing power and to provide the consumers with an adequate supply of food and fiber. By 1952 some weaknesses began to become apparent in the laws which were enacted at that time. The Government had an investment of some $2½ billion in commodities in 1952 and was incurring some one-half billion dollars of cost per year. This came about because of overproduction.

Several factors contributed to this overproduction: First, the increased knowledge and technical know-how of farmers who were able to materially increase their production by cultivating each acre; second, lack of effective means of controlling production due to an antiquated system of acreage controls which was becoming ineffective.

Net farm income was $14.4 billion per year in 1952.

Beginning in 1953, the Department of Agriculture, reflecting the views of some people, insisted that changes should be made in the program then in effect. Since that time, the following cures have been offered, tried, and from the record found wanting, so far as solving the problem is concerned:

First. Price support reductions averaging 20 percent were made under the "flexible price support plan."

Second. A soil bank program was created to curtail production by paying farmers not to farm.

Third. Public Law 480 was enacted to dispose of surpluses by virtually giving them away overseas.

Fourth. Research and extension appropriations have been increased some 120 percent.

Fifth. Department of Agriculture personnel has increased about 28 percent and appropriations have increased around 300 percent.

Sixth. Production controls have been relaxed as price support levels have been lowered. For example, the removal of controls on corn production, beginning with the 1959 crop, has resulted in enormous increases in acreage harvested and volume of production.

THE RESULTS

Most of these so-called cures have been a heavy drain on the Treasury and have provided little to improve the deteriorating farm situation, which will grow worse if the present course is followed.

One serious result has been the impairment of purchasing power of rural America. Farm income has dropped from $14.4 billion in 1952 to $11 billion in 1959, a 24 percent reduction. The effect of reduced prices and increased costs on net farm income during this period is indicated by the following figures from the records of the Department shown on page 68, part I, 1961 hearings:

	Prices received	Prices paid	Parity ratio (percent)	Net income from farming (billions of dollars)
	(Index based on 1910–14)			
1952	288	287	100	14.4
1958	250	293	85	13.1
1959	240	298	80	11.0
4th quarter, 1959	231	297	78	10.9

The loss of this purchasing power has already affected not only those who depend on farming for a livelihood, but also those engaged in banking, merchandising, industrial production, and other business activities, particularly in the smaller communities. Since those dependent on agricultural income, either directly or indirectly, represent an important market for goods produced in the urban areas of the Nation, this loss of farm income has not only affected the economic welfare of farm sections of the Nation, but if allowed to continue is bound to have serious effects on the whole Nation.

The importance of American agriculture as a market for the Nation's goods can be appreciated when it is realized that agriculture uses more finished steel in a year than is used for a year's output of passenger cars. It uses more petroleum products than any other industry. It uses more rubber each year than is required to produce tires for 6 million automobiles. It is one of the Nation's largest users of electrical power. Its inventory of machinery alone exceeds the assets of the American steel industry and is five times that of the automobile industry.

It has been reliably estimated that each dollar of farm income produces $7 of income throughout the rest of the economy. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that the loss of $3.4 billion of farm income in 1959, as compared to 1952, resulted in a loss of domestic markets worth some $24 billion to the industrial producers of the Nation in that 1 year.

Another unfortunate result of these so-called cures has been the production of huge surpluses of many agricultural commodities, which have served to depress markets generally for agricultural products, and have been a great economic loss to the United States. Figures furnished by the Department, as set forth on page 68, part 1, 1961 hearings, indicate that total farm output has increased from the 1952 level of 108 percent of the base period 1947–49 to 125 percent in 1959. This increase in production of 17 percent, which has created the surplus problem, has to a considerable degree been due to efforts of farmers to offset reduced prices by increased output. This has placed an additional strain on the fertility of the Nation's soil. It is estimated by officials of the Department that this unneeded production has cost the grain farmers over $1 billion in extra annual production of grain alone.

COSTS TO FEDERAL TREASURY

Seven years of experimentation with reduced price supports, outmoded acreage controls, ineffective soil bank programs, and costly oversea disposals under Public Law 480 has placed a heavy financial drain on all segments of the American economy. And benefits to the farmer have been less than those received by other groups through these programs.

A summary of these tremendous expenditures resulting from excessive production while trying these so-called cures since 1952, follows:

	Billion
Reduced price supports	$8.0
Soil bank program	4.3
Public Law 480	13.5
Total	25.8

Nearly $3 billion is provided in the bill for 1961 to meet the continuing cost of these programs, as follows:

	Billion
Restoration of capital impairment of Commodity Credit Corporation (price support)	$1.226
Conservation Reserve (Soil Bank)	.310
Reimbursements to CCC for cost of Public Law 480 and other special activities	1.444
Total in 1961 bill	2.980

In addition to these heavy expenditures, the appropriations for the other programs of the Department have increased from $827.5 million in fiscal year 1952 to $1,089.2 million in fiscal year 1960, an increase of nearly 32 percent.

PRICE SUPPORT REDUCTIONS

In the past 7 years price supports have been reducted an average of 20 percent. These drastic reductions, in the face of constantly rising production costs, have had several important effects on the farm economy of the Nation. First, they have reduced net farm income nearly one-fourth between 1952 and 1959. Second, they have created tremendous surpluses which are about to wreck the entire farm program.

As has been pointed out each year by many members of this committee, farmers tend to increase their production as farm prices are reduced, in an effort to maintain income essential to meet operating cost and living expenses. Experience during the past few years has disproven the theory advocated by some that reduced prices will reduce production. The records of the Department for the past 7 years show that production has increased at about the same rate that price supports have been reduced.

One of the most definite indications of this is Commodity Credit Corporation holdings which have increased from $2.5 billion in 1952 to over $9.2 billion as of January 1960. A study of figures appearing on pages 373–387, part 3, 1961 hearings, further supports this point.

The total cost of the price support program from its inception in 1932 through 1952 was about $2.6 billion. With lowered price supports and increased production, the Department has lost another $8 billion under this program since 1952. An estimate furnished

by the Department shows that price support on surplus feed grains alone cost the Government some $3.5 billion in price support investment and $1.5 billion in carrying charges in 1959. Figuring farm costs of extra production at 50 percent of normal, this surplus cost the farmer in excess of $1 billion to produce—page 754, part 3, 1961 hearings.

SOIL BANK PROGRAM

In 1955, the soil bank was offered as a solution. Acreage was rented from farmers and taken out of production, though the record shows 23 percent had not been in production. The cost of the soil bank to date, including funds in this bill, has been approximately $2.7 billion. It is estimated that an additional $1.6 billion will be required in future years to meet long-term conservation reserve commitments entered into under existing legislation. This estimated total cost of $4.3 billion would be further increased if this program were to be extended beyond the present year.

The production records of the Department show that the program has been relatively ineffective in bringing production in line with need—pages 373–375, part 3, 1961 hearings. There seems to be little benefit from this program, unless considered as a means of offsetting loss of farm income at the marketplace. The past record proves conclusively that this program offers no future solution to the problem of overproduction, even if billions of dollars are spent each year.

As shown by the Department's testimony, 2.6 million farms are classified as small farms. These represent 56 percent of the total farms in the United States, which include about 275 million acres, but produce only 9 percent of the commercial production. Therefore, if all such farms were removed from production at an average of $10 per acre, it would cost $2,750 million a year and would reduce production only 9 percent—assuming large farms did not offset such reduction. These figures cannot be misunderstood.

PUBLIC LAW 480

The Agricultural Trade and Development Act, Public Law 480, was proposed as a means of disposing of the surpluses which reduced price supports and acreage controls had failed to control. Title I of this law provides for sales for foreign currencies, title II authorizes donations to friendly countries to meet famines and other disasters, and title III provides for barter and other means of disposal. It is to be noted that the Government pays the full costs of this program in American dollars.

It was adopted by Congress with serious misgivings on the part of many people. In view of the fact that it has done nothing toward stopping overproduction—in fact it has tended to postpone the time when Congress will deal with that problem—such misgivings appear to have been fully justified.

This program, which was first started in 1954 as an outlet for surpluses, has developed into an outlet for production overflow at practically 100 percent cost to the United States. Instead of correcting the situation, it has been followed by more and more surpluses.

The authorization for sales to foreign governments for local currencies under title I has expanded tremendously since its inception as follows:

	Total authorization—billion
July 1954	$0.7
August 1955	1.5
August 1956	3.0
August 1957	4.0
September 1958	6.25
September 1959	9.25

In addition, up to $1.4 billion is authorized for donations under title II. Title III costs will further increase this amount, although exact figures are not available. Through December 1959 over $2.9 billion of commodities have been donated and bartered under title III. Thus a total of over 13.5 billion American dollars has been authorized for expenditure since 1954 under present law. Further extensions of the act would of course increase this total cost.

This program was originally justified as a means of using agricultural surpluses to develop and promote oversea markets for U.S. agricultural products. There is evidence to indicate, however, that foreign currencies generated under this program in some instances are being used to expand agricultural production abroad, in competition with U.S. products in world markets. Further, it appears that such programs are often undertaken in countries which have no prospects of ever providing markets for U.S. products.

An example of this is a project called "Operation Beef" in Argentina. Under this program, $14.3 million is being used to increase beef production in that country to compete with U.S. meat producers in world markets. Since Argentina produces many of the same crops as the United States, the two countries are natural competitors and market prospects there are very limited. Therefore, it is hard to understand how U.S. interests are benefited by projects of this kind.

Whatever the benefits of the Public Law 480 program, in the opinion of many members of the committee, it too has failed to help the overproduction problem. As mentioned earlier, it probably has contributed to a constantly deteriorating situation for American agriculture by getting these huge surpluses "out of sight" abroad and thereby postponing action to prevent the increase in the surplus problem.

If a sufficient amount were diverted from the tremendous supplies on hand and available for use under Public Law 480, such commodities could well be the means of enabling the farmers to bring production in line with domestic and foreign consumption. If used to protect farm income while the farmer cut production 20 percent, they would reduce storage costs up to $100 million per year and would reduce price support costs—possibly $700 million to $1 billion per year. Further, they would protect farm income during the period of adjustment needed to bring production in line with demand, and would enable such a plan to be carried out at little or no cost to the Government. The commodities have already been bought and paid for by CCC and will otherwise be given away to foreign countries under Public Law 480. A full discussion of such a proposal for feed grains, the area of our greatest problem, is contained on pages 172–173, part 3, 1961 hearings.

In the opinion of a majority of the members of the committee if the Public Law 480 program is to be continued, it should be considered a foreign aid program and should be paid for in the mutual security bill.

EXPANDED RESEARCH AND EXTENSION

As pointed out previously, funds for the research and extension programs of the Department have expanded about 120 percent since 1952. A summary of this increase is as follows:

	1952	1960
Department of Agriculture research	*Million* $44.2	*Million* $104.4
State experiment stations	12.7	31.8
Extension Service	33.5	64.1
Total	90.4	200.3

The large increases for these programs have been justified by the Department and offered as an answer to the farm problem and as a substitute for protection of farm income through adequate price support levels. They have been supported by the Department on the theory that improvement of farming methods and development of new uses for agricultural commodities through research can offset reduced income and thereby enable the farmer to stay in business.

The members of the committee fully recognize the value of these essential programs. They are aware of the important benefits of research and extension work to the farmers of the Nation. They realize the fact that farmers would be much worse off financially than they now are, were it not for the improved production techniques which have resulted from the research and extension programs of the Department.

They realize, however, that the real benefits of this work are not sufficiently direct and fast enough to meet a sudden economic crisis, such as has been experienced in the past few years. They wish to point out, therefore, that these programs, as fine and essential as they are, cannot and should not be expected to offset sudden losses of farm income and related economic problems.

PERSONNEL AND APPROPRIATIONS INCREASES

It is apparent that continued increases in personnel and funds for the Department of Agriculture is not the answer to the farm income problem, where higher cost and lower prices are leading to overproduction. If such increases could improve the situation, the 28-percent increase in personnel and 300-percent increase in appropriations since

1952 would have done so. A summary of the expansion of the Department is as follows:

Personnel	
Dec. 31, 1952	67,406
Dec. 31, 1959	86,508
Increase (28 percent)	19,102
Appropriations	*Billion*
Fiscal year 1953	$1.045
Fiscal year 1960	4.045
Increase (300 percent)	3.083

REMOVAL OF CONTROLS

Along with actions taken to reduce price supports, efforts have been made by the Department to remove or curtail production controls. This also has contributed to the increased production in recent years and the ever-mounting surpluses.

While efforts to control production through acreage controls have not been effective, it appears unwise to eliminate them until some satisfactory substitute has been adopted. Mandatory price supports on basic commodities cannot work without some type of control over production.

At the recommendation of the Department, a program was adopted last year which removed all controls on corn, beginning with the 1959 crop, along with a further reduction in price-support levels. This was done over the strenuous objection of many Members of Congress who realized that the inevitable result would be to increase production substantially, fill up Government storage facilities, increase Government costs, and further depress the market.

The result of this new corn program has been to increase harvested acreage from 73.3 million acres for the 1958 crop to 84.6 million acres for the 1959 crop. Intentions to plant for the 1960 corn crop are estimated by the Department to further increase to 85.8 million acres. They could possibly increase to 90 million acres.

While it is too early to see the ultimate effect of this program, it is significant to note that production of corn increased from 3.8 billion bushels in 1958 to 4.4 billion bushels in 1959. Further increases for 1960 are probable.

A summary of Department figures placed in the 1961 hearing record relative to corn is as follows:

Corn (bushels)	Support levels (percent)	Acreage harvested (million acres)	Yield per acre	Production (million)	CCC inventory (million)	Storage and handling costs (million)
1952	90	80.9	40.7	3,292.0	$500.0	$28.3
1956	84	75.6	45.7	3,445.3	1,245.6	71.5
1958	77	73.3	51.8	3,800.9	1,857.8	140.0
1959	66	84.6	51.5	4,361.2	1,861.3	133.5

In the face of this record, it is even more disturbing to learn that the Department is now recommending the same kind of program for the handling of wheat. This would certainly compound the problem, if adopted.

CORRECTIVE ACTION URGENTLY NEEDED

Members of this committee tried to tell the Department in 1953 and subsequent years that farm income is based on "volume" times "price" less "cost." They tried to convince the Department that, if prices were reduced, the farmer—faced with increasing costs—of necessity would increase volume, and could do so since control by acreage is no longer effective. Prices were reduced, and production went up—not down.

While differences of opinion exist as to what should be done in the future, the record clearly shows what has been done during the past 7 years has been no solution. The situation becomes progressively worse for the farmer and the taxpayer, while the major benefits go to those between the farmer and the consumer. The above facts and experiences convince a majority of the committee that the problem will never be solved until Congress attacks the problem at its base, which is overproduction.

It is the belief of a majority of this committee that, for the protection of our overall economy, farm prices must reflect cost plus a reasonable return. Such prices, however, must be made contingent upon farmers holding farm production, in terms of bushels, bales and pounds, to domestic and normal foreign markets. If that is done an adequate price can be obtained at the marketplace.

This makes it imperative that present approaches to this problem be reversed if the agricultural industry of this country is to survive, and if we are to prevent a bankrupt agriculture from pulling down the rest of our economy. Further, the taxpayers are not likely to continue to finance such needless and heavy expenditures which can be avoided if proper supports based upon farm costs are restored and made contingent upon actual production being held in line. Unless present programs are reversed, they will eventully wreck farm purchasing power, and eventually the entire national economy.

Farmers themselves are suffering most from these costly and ineffective programs. They are forced to operate in a manner that causes them to deny their families an adequate standard of living and in many instances they are taking fertility from the soil that they wish to preserve for future generations. On numerous occasions they have expressed a desire to cooperate with the Federal Government to bring about a correction of the farm problem. To a large extent their pleading has been ignored because of the influence of those between the farmer and the consumer who have prospered in the farmer's name and at the cost of the taxpayer.

After the experience of the past 7 years, it appears absolutely necessary that production be brought in line with the needs of domestic and foreign dollar markets. Past approaches to overproduction must be reversed, using surplus commodities now on hand to ease the financial shock on the farmer and the general economy during the period necessary for adjustment.

And whatever we do, our investigations and hearings show we must operate the Commodity Credit Corporation on a strictly business basis, with due regard to safeguarding the assets of the Corporation in order to protect the U.S. Treasury.

THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Commodity Credit Corporation was organized October 17, 1933, under the laws of the State of Delaware, as an agency of the United States. From 1933 to 1939 the Corporation was managed and operated in close affiliation with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. On July 1, 1939, it was transferred to the Department of Agriculture by the President's Reorganization Plan I. Under the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act of June 29, 1948, it was established as an agency and instrumentality of the United States under a permanent Federal charter.

The original capital in 1933 was $3 million. The act of March 8, 1938, gave CCC its first borrowing authority of $500 million. This was increased periodically until it had reached $6.75 billion in 1950. This amount has been increased four times since 1952 and now stands at $14.5 billion.

The Corporation is managed by a board of directors, subject to the general supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, who is, ex officio, a director and chairman of the board. The board consists of the Secretary of Agriculture and six other members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Under the provisions of the Corporation's charter, its officers and employees are obligated to operate on a sound business basis and protect the assets of the Corporation. In the past, the officers and directors have been full-time employees of the Department, and thereby able to give only a portion of their time and attention to this $14.5 billion Corporation, the largest in the world, handling the greatest volume of buying and selling of any business organization known.

The policies adopted and actions taken by Department and CCC officials in recent years have been disappointing to the committee. In the opinion of many members, they have lacked complete objectivity.

As a result, the record indicates that much unnecessary cost has been incurred and much money has been wasted, all of which has to be restored by appropriations from the Treasury.

STORAGE COSTS EXCESSIVE

Many fail to realize that about half of the price support expenditures each year are for such items as storage and handling, transportation, interest and administration. Despite frequent comments concerning subsidies and price support benefits to the farmer, the amount which eventually goes to the farmer is only a portion of the cost. In

fact every group seems to be cut in on profits far beyond those received by the farmer. In fiscal year 1959, for example, storage, transportation, administrative and interest costs were 49 percent of the total losses under the price support program. And, while the rates for these nonfarm costs assure a handsome profit, amounts paid to farmers as price supports hardly cover production costs.

In 1959, storage and handling charges totaled $481.7 million. Storage charges for 1960 are estimated at $612 million. Further, unless something is done to curb this increasing cost, storage costs are expected to exceed $700 million in 1961. It should be noted that this latter amount is nearly equal to the cost of running all of the Department's regular activities in 1953, including research, marketing extension, soil conservation, crop insurance, regulatory activities, and forestry.

During this period, while support prices to farmers were being reduced by an average of 20 percent, rates paid to warehousemen for storage were being increased substantially. Further, since the farmer pays for the first year of storage, this increase in storage costs further reduced the net amount of his loan by the same amount. The total cost of storage was increased from $73.3 million in fiscal year 1952 to $481.7 million in fiscal year 1959—pages 483–486, part 3, 1961 hearings. During this same period, net income to the farmer dropped about 24 percent.

Committee investigations made in 1955 and 1956, which have been made a matter of record, disclosed various actions of the Department to increase storage costs through increased rates and benefits to private warehousemen and the use of commission merchants and forwarding agents in lieu of available Department personnel. These investigations also provided information to show that commodities were often moved from one area of the country to another, regardless of expense, in order to fill empty commercial warehouses, even though Government storage bins were left vacant. In 1955, over 16 million bushels of corn were moved from the Midwest to the west coast at a cost to the Government of over $8 million, even though vacant space remained at locations from which shipped.

A comprehensive committee investigation conducted last fall provided further information which helps to explain why storage charges have increased so much in recent years. For example, this investigation included figures showing that storage charges paid certain warehouses during the period 1957–59 were sufficiently high to allow the owners to recover their investment in buildings and equipment in a period of 2 years. In one instance, the investment was liquidated in 16 months. While uniform storage rates for uniform warehousing and storage appear sound, the same rate for inferior or low-cost warehousing cannot be justified and is far too expensive to the Corporation.

Further, during this period of price reductions for the farmer and profitable increases for all others, the Commodity Credit Corporation disposed of usable Government-owned storage bins at a substantial loss. During this same period, many CCC-owned bins were leased to private persons, some of which were rerented for storage of Government-owned grain. The figures on pages 758–759, part 3, 1961 hearings, show that as of December 31, 1957, some 31.7 million bushels of CCC storage bins were leased for three-fourths cent per bushel per month—an annual rate of 9 cents per bushel. Some of this type of space has been rerented by CCC for the standard annual rate of 16.5 cents per bushel, plus loading in and out charges.

Evidence has also come to the committee's attention that Government-owned storage space such as bins and liberty ships was and is being held vacant in order to keep private warehouse space filled at excessive storage rates.

Officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation state that these actions were taken under their interpretation of authority in section 3 of the charter of the Corporation, which reads as follows:

> That nothing contained in this subsection (b) shall limit the duty of the Corporation, to the maximum extent practical consistent with the fulfillment of the Corporation's purposes and the effective and efficient conduct of its business, to utilize the usual and customary channel facilities and arrangements of the trade and commerce in warehousing commodities.

It is the opinion of the majority of this committee, in view of the obligation of the officers of the Corporation to protect its assets and thereby the taxpayer, that these actions do not constitute "effective and efficient" conduct of the Corporation's business.

RECLASSING OF COTTON

Since 1956, the Corporation has paid out over $166 million in rebates on cotton reclassed after sale, a large part to international cotton traders who held such cotton for the Government in their own warehouses where they could easily have advance knowledge of reclassing rebates, thus preventing true competition at time of sale. A breakdown of this amount is set forth on page 314, part 3, 1961 hearings. Much of this cottton was sold by such buyers from CCC in world trade at higher than the original class, as shown by previous committee investigations.

The committee developed these facts in 1958 and the CCC stopped the practice for the past year—selling approximately 6 million bales without reclass after sale. Thus no rebate was paid. Notwithstanding this fact, yielding to pressure from those who received such rebates, the Department has again refused to reclass before sale so as to have maximum competition and treat all bidders alike. It has announced that for the ensuing year it will reclass cotton after sale on a discount basis.

In the opinion of the committee such action shows an utter disregard of the obligation to protect the assets of the Corporation and thereby the taxpayer.

FAILURE TO SELL COMPETITIVELY

For a number of years the CCC, following orders of the Department, refused to sell U.S. agricultural commodities competitively in world markets, notwithstanding unlimited authority to sell competitively for dollars. Page 148, part 3, 1961 hearings, shows the years in which commodities were not offered competitively. During that period, CCC stocks on hand increased from $1 billion as of June 30, 1952, to $3.7 billion on June 30, 1954, and $5 billion on June 30, 1955.

Finally in late 1954, at the insistence of this committee, the Department began selling some commodities competitively in world trade for dollars. Finally all commodities except cotton were offered. During this period, while cotton was held off world markets, CCC holdings of cotton increased from $418,000 in 1952 to $1,249,813,000 in 1956.

In 1955, at the insistence of this committee, the first cotton was offered for sale abroad for dollars on a competitive basis and 1 million bales were sold in a very short time. Then at the request of American international cotton merchants, the Government again held U.S. surplus cotton off world markets. Congress then passed the Agricultural Act of 1956 requiring sales for dollars. Notwithstanding this legislation, the Department in 1958 refused to offer cotton at competitive prices "in violation of law" according to the Comptroller General. Exports dropped from 7.6 million bales in 1956–57 to 2.8 million bales in 1958–59. This course has cost the CCC and the people hundreds of millions of dollars and has done great damage to the U.S. cotton producers.

In 1959, competitive oversea sales were started again and exports for 1959–60 will again increase to a total of 6.5 million bales, from a low of 2.8 million bales in 1958–59 when the CCC, under instructions from the Department, was holding U.S. commodities off world markets, increasing storage costs and holding an umbrella over increased foreign production.

Despite the success of the competitive sales program, the CCC now is using the payment-in-kind approach, the cost of which is hard to determine. Future investigations will likely show exorbitant profits to many nonfarmers.

LACK OF SALES PROGRAM

It will also be recalled that this $14.5 billion Corporation, which was purchasing increasing quantities of commodities each year, did not even have a sales organization or a sales manager until congressional action was taken to require such a program. In 1956, this committee created a special position of sales manager and directed the Corporation to set up a sales organization and undertake an aggressive sales program. The work of this sales manager has been fairly effective. However, domination by other officials of the Department and lack of authority to sell have reduced his effectiveness.

RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS IN CCC OPERATIONS

These factors have caused a majority of the members of the committee to agree that the operations of this huge Corporation must be improved. Considerable monetary savings could be made through improved operations.

The committee believes that CCC would be more effectively and efficiently run and its assets better protected, if its officers were full-time employees of the Corporation rather than officials of the Department, with full time jobs with other activities of the Department. The committee has therefore included language in the bill to require that the officers and directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation be paid from corporate funds, after February 1, 1961. This should have the effect of giving the Corporation more independence and should lead to greater efficiency in its operation and less impairment of capital, which will thereby reduce the amount of future appropriations required.

Further, since the officers and directors of the Corporation have the obligation to operate efficiently and to protect the assets of the Corporation, and thereby the Government and the taxpayers, a majority of the members of the committee believe from the record before them that certain corrective actions are necessary with regard to storage practices.

The committee urges the Corporation to decrease amounts paid for other than farmer-owned storage by at least the reduced value of the commodity stored, as determined by the reduction in price support levels and per-unit investment of the Government since 1952 in such commodities. It also urges the Corporation to discontinue the sale or lease of Government storage space to commercial concerns where such space can be used more economically to store commodities by CCC.

Further, should the Corporation's holdings be reduced to the point that competition exists between warehousemen at terminal markets or ports, a majority of the members believe that the CCC should set up guide rules or perhaps advertise for bids, in order to hold down costs and reduce the opportunity for favoritism in determining which warehouses will receive Government business at such points.

The committee does not approve the moving of CCC stocks from Government storage bins and liberty ships into commercial space in order to pay commercial warehousemen storage costs. The Government-owned facilities should be used to capacity at all times. Furthermore, the CCC should not encourage expansion of commercial storage facilities beyond community needs by offering unrealistic rates that encourage highly speculative investments on the part of inexperienced grain storers. Prior to any request to the warehouse industry to provide additional storage, the CCC should make a survey to determine the adequacy of space to handle stocks over an extended period of time.

The committee is firmly opposed to the proposal to reinstate reclassing of cotton after sale. They oppose it for two reasons: First, it adds to the capital impairment of the Corporation and increases the annual appropriations by lessening competition and funds received by CCC from sales; and second, such a practice gives a definite advantage to the large cotton buyers who also have large quantities of CCC-owned cotton stored in their warehouses and thereby are in a position to anticipate rebates from reclassing in offering bids for cotton purchases from CCC on a competitive basis.

The committee has included language in the bill, therefore, which prohibits the use of CCC funds to carry on cotton reclassing after time of sale. It is of the opinion that any reclass of cotton should be contingent upon determination by CCC that there is a need for such reclass. Further, it believes that cotton should be sold by sample or cataloged so as to give all purchasers an equal opportunity to bid. The committee notes that the Department, following such a course, sold 6 million bales of cotton this year without such reclass after sale.

NEW APPROACH TO PRODUCTION CONTROL NEEDED

The most serious problem facing Agriculture today is the continued overproduction of crops already in surplus supply. Yields per acre for nearly all crops have increased steadily in recent years. Total production has also increased, despite acreage controls and the Soil Bank.

When the present system of acreage controls was placed into effect over 20 years ago, it was fairly effective, since acreage yields were limited by the type of agriculture used at that time. In recent years, however, this means of control has become completely ineffective due to improved methods of cultivation and increased use of machinery, fertilizer, insecticides, and improved seed.

It is apparent to this committee that something has to be done. Correction must be made, both for the welfare of the farmer and the Federal Treasury.

In seeking a solution, several facts are evident:

First. What we have been doing has not worked. After spending or committing ourselves to spend nearly $26 billion, the record shows the situation to be three to four times worse in terms of surplus inventories of CCC.

Second. Farm income is now so low, even with the sale of the overproduction to the Government, that farm purchasing power must be protected from a further drop.

Third. Any future farm program must provide that farm income shall come from the production of that quantity of product necessary for domestic and foreign markets. In the interest of the overall national economy, such production must reflect farm costs plus a reasonable profit. Such income should come from the marketplace.

Fourth. To bring about correction, we have one factor which should enable us to scale back overproduction without injury to farm income or further cost to the taxpayer during the period of adjustment. This is the $9.2 billion of CCC commodities on hand which are already paid for. Commodities from these stocks should be offered to farmers in consideration for cutting back farm production.

If such a plan were put into effect, there would be a number of important benefits to the national economy—(a) the Government would save storage costs, (b) price support costs would be reduced in line with production actually eliminated, (c) farmers would save the cost of producing extra units of production for which there is no market. Further, no additional outlays of funds would be required to accomplish this objective, since commodities to be used are in Government stocks and will otherwise be given away under Public Law 480.

Once production and demand are in reasonable adjustment under this program, it would appear that fair and reasonable price supports should be provided for the farmer's share of the domestic market. Any overproduction should be eligible for foreign markets at world prices. If this course were followed, the cost to the Government would be negligible.

The other course which might be followed would be to continue price supports on total production, limited to domestic, and foreign markets. If this approach were used, the Government would continue to pay the cost of the difference between the support price to offset high American costs and the world market.

Whichever course is followed, or if some other answer is to be found, it is the belief of a majority of this committee that the Department and the Congress should get together without delay on a plan to use surplus commodities on hand to get farmers to cut total production of wheat and feed grains—the area of greatest difficulty at the present time which commodities must be considered together. Merely cutting acreage will not work, as shown by the record.

The Department should be authorized to immediately institute a program which will encourage each producer of wheat, corn, and feed grains to curtail his production up to 25 percent in any one year in return for the transfer to him from CCC stocks of an equal quantity of the commodity for which reduction was made.

Under such a plan, the Secretary of Agriculture would transfer from Government stocks of wheat, corn, grain sorghum, or other feed grains, which are otherwise available for shipment to foreign countries under Public Law 480 and similar programs, to any U.S. producer of said grains upon the following terms and conditions:

First. The producer must reduce his total production of wheat, corn, grain sorghum, or other feed grain below his average production of all of said grains for the 3 preceding years.

Second. The Secretary shall first enter into an agreement for a period of from 1 to 3 years with any such producer of wheat, corn, grain sorghum, or other feed grain, or any combination thereof, which will require upon the part of such producer that he reduce his total production of all of said grains below his average production of the 3 preceding years before such producer can qualify to receive Government stocks.

Third. The Secretary shall determine the amount of such transfer of said feed grains to be offered for transfer in any year to any one producer, but in no case shall the amount exceed 25 percent of the

average production of said producer for the 3 years next preceding the date of such agreement. Such transfer may be made by transferring warehouse receipts.

Fourth. To obtain such Government stocks, each farmer must (a) file notice with the county committee that he expects to avail himself of such offer, (b) agree in writing to reduce his total production of all or any combination of such grains for the years included in such agreement, (c) submit a statement of his production of all of said crops for the 3 preceding years, together with such additional proof as may be required by the Secretary, (d) certify that he will not increase his production of other commercial crops, and (e) supply such proof of reduced production as the Secretary may require.

Fifth. Insofar as practical, grain so transferred shall be of the same type and kind as that for which reduction in production was made by such producer. When not practical, such transfer shall be in quantities of grains of equivalent monetary value.

Sixth. The Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to issue such rules and regulations as may be essential to carry out this provision.

As a part of such a plan, a commission could well be appointed to study and prepare a farm plan for submission to the Congress after adjustment of production has been made. Such plan should be based on protecting farm income at the market place and keeping production in line with domestic and foreign markets. This approach is deemed necessary because of wide differences which now exist between farm organizations and between farm leaders, including those in the Congress.

It is believed by a majority of the members of the committee that this proposal is a start in the right direction, that is, toward a program of balancing production with market demand and the long time need to maintain soil and water resources. It would provide an effective means of controlling production through production quotas on the quantity of a commodity which may be produced and marketed. In addition, it would save farmers their present cost of production on that part of their production eliminated, and would save the Government the price support and storage and handling costs on the surplus which otherwise would be produced. It is to be noted that, under this plan, the Government would save storage costs of from 11.68 cents per annum for oats to around 16.5 cents for corn and 17.885 cents for wheat and flax, for each bushel removed from storage. Also, it should be remembered that it would cost the Government little, if anything, for commodities transferred to farmers in payment for reduced production, since such commodities are now on hand and will otherwise be given away under the "foreign aid" Public Law 480 program.

BENEFITS TO GENERAL PUBLIC

As pointed out in previous years, most of the programs of the Department are of direct benefit to every citizen of the United States and should not be considered to be exclusively for the benefit of the farmer. American consumers in general receive as large a share of the benefits from Federal funds spent for agriculture each year as do the farmers themselves. Programs benefiting the general public as much or more than the farmer include the following:

First. Improvement and protection of public health, including home economics and human nutrition research, plant and animal disease and pest control, meat and poultry inspection, school lunch and special milk programs, and donations to schools, institutions and needy people.

Second. International relations and national defense, including Foreign Agricultural Service, donations to Veterans' Administration and Defense Department, donations to needy people abroad, International Wheat Agreement, emergency famine relief, sales for foreign currencies (Public Law 480), and bartered materials for stockpile.

Third. Regulation and improvement of marketing, including marketing research and regulatory activities, market inspection, grading, classing and standards, agricultural estimates, market news services, freight rate services, the Commodity Exchange Authority, and the Farmers Cooperative Service.

Fourth. Conservation of natural resources, including the Soil Conservation Service, watershed protection, flood prevention, Great Plains program, and the agricultural conservation program.

Of the funds expended for agriculture for fiscal year 1960, it is estimated by the Department that over 54 percent will be spent for programs which benefit the general public as well as the farmer. Estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1961 indicate the same situation—page 26, part 1, 1961 hearings.

AMERICAN CONSUMER EATING BETTER

Further, it should be pointed out that the American consumer is eating more and better food at less cost than ever before in history. While per capita income in the United States has increased steadily each year, consumers are spending a smaller share of this income for food. Department of Agriculture statistics—page 85, part 1, 1961 hearings—indicate that the average American consumer is spending about 21 percent of his income for food, as compared to 23 percent in 1951 and 27 percent at the end of World War II. Figures on page 87, part 1, 1961 hearings, show that 1 hour of factory labor will buy twice as much food as it would 30 years ago. In 1929, 1 hour of labor would buy 6.4 loaves of bread, while in 1959, 1 hour of labor bought 11.3 loaves. One hour of labor will now buy 17.6 pints of milk as compared to 7.8 pints in 1929. The same relationship applies for meat, butter, eggs, potatoes, oranges, and most other agricultural items.

DONATIONS AT HOME AND ABROAD

When considering the cost of agricultural programs, it is important to realize that a significant part of the cost of the Department of Agriculture is due to the furnishing of foods to needy people, both in the United States and overseas. Since 1953, $1.3 billion of surplus foods have been distributed to the needy people of this country. This has been of direct help to States and local communities in handling their own welfare programs. In 1959, over 21 million Americans benefited from these surplus foods. Since 1953, approximately the same amount of surplus foods have been given to needy persons in foreign countries. These donations have been made through U.S. voluntary agencies in which church-affiliated organizations have played an important part.

While the cost of the Public Law 480 program, which is paid for in American dollars, is carried in the agricultural appropriation bill and, therefore, charged against the farmer by those who are unfriendly to agriculture, most of the real benefits seem to go to everyone but the American farmer. Some 85 to 90 percent of all foreign currencies received in payment for foods shipped abroad is either given or loaned back to the government of the recipient countries. These funds, which are frequently used to create or expand foreign agricultural production in competition with U.S. producers, are handled by the International Cooperation Administration as a supplement to the regular foreign aid program.

The balance of these foreign currencies are set aside for the use of the United States to meet oversea expenditures which otherwise would have to be met by appropriations from the U.S. Treasury. Under the provisions of section 104 of Public Law 480, these foreign currencies may be used for a variety of U.S. purposes abroad, including market development, trade fairs, supplemental stockpiling, educational activities, translation and acquisition of foreign publications, scientific activities, construction of U.S. buildings and operation of U.S. agencies.

The bulk of these currencies are being used overseas for such things as foreign aid operations, military housing, stockpiling, and educational and research activities. Yet the cost of the foreign currencies used for these programs has been included in the agricultural appropriation bill, rather than in the bills of the appropriate Federal agencies. On May 5, 1958, an official of the Commodity Credit Corporation pointed out that present legislation prevents CCC from even recovering interest which it must pay from those agencies which derive benefits under the barter program of Public Law 480. In connection with oversea military housing financed through this means, he stated:

Under our arrangements with the Department of Defense, CCC will receive reimbursement for its investment from savings in quarters and station allowances which would otherwise be paid to the military personnel occupying the completed housing. Based upon Department of Defense estimates, CCC will not recover its investment in the housing for a period of some 17 years.

During this time, CCC must pay interest to the U.S. Treasury on the $50 million which it has tied up in the housing. This interest cost, running to about $14 million, cannot be recovered from the Department of Defense under existing legislation and will be reflected as a charge against the farm program administered by the Department of Agriculture.

In my opinion, I would be derelict in my responsibilties if I recommended the approval of other housing projects of this kind.

THE CRANBERRY INCIDENT

The situation which developed last fall with respect to the misuse of chemicals on cranberries and caponettes on a relatively small percentage of total production points up a serious problem facing Agriculture with respect to the use of pesticides and sprays. From the standpoint of public health it should be recognized that many such chemicals are necessary to protect food. Failure to use insecticides could result in the production of foodstuffs even more harmful to human health than those heretofore condemned. Also, pesticides and sprays must be used by farmers to produce the high quality and low cost foods which the consumers of the United States are demanding. Further, the use of sprays is necessary to prevent sizable economic losses to the Nation from pest and disease damage to crops.

The development of more effective insecticides is one of the reasons why only 12 percent of the people in this country are able to feed the other 88 percent—a situation which has never before existed in the history of the world.

Farmers are continually harassed by plant and animal pests and diseases. They cost farmers billions of dollars annually. For example, the European corn borer has become one of the most injurious enemies of corn in this country. It causes substantial losses every year and in recent years these losses have sometimes ranged over $150 million annually. Cotton insects, principally the boll weevil, cause tremendous annual losses, to which must be added the cost of chemical controls. Cotton farmers must spend $75 million or more annually for insecticides. Since pioneer days, grasshoppers have caused extensive damage to both crops and rangeland. Annual losses from this pest are over $100 million. Cattle grubs are distributed over the entire country, causing losses of about $100 million annually from losses in weight and production, damage to hides, and loss of meat in dressed carcasses.

The wide variety of chemicals used for control of pests and diseases today serves only to allow a farmer to hold his own or stay even in his production. Without the proper use of chemical controls, flies would contaminate milk with filth and create a hazard to the public health. The coddling moth, phony peach disease, peach mosaic, pear blight, and the apple maggot plague the farmer by reducing the quality and quantity of his fruit crops. It would not be possible to market apples, peaches, and pears free of worms, rot, scab, and so forth, without proper use of chemicals. These are but a few of the problems which the farmer must meet in order to provide consumers with an adequate supply of safe foods of good quality.

Subsequent to the regular hearings on the 1961 budget, the White House announced that the Department of Agriculture would make indemnity payments of around $10 million to cranberry growers who sustained losses on good and wholesome berries harvested in 1959 because the market for good berries had been destroyed as the result of the unfortunate method of handling contaminated berries, which totaled less than 1 percent of the total crop. As a result of this precipitous action, cranberry sales of good berries were cut by two-thirds during the last holiday season. It is estimated that there will be a carryover of cranberries of nearly 1 million barrels of such wholesome berries into the next season, nearly a full year's crop.

The payment of such indemnities are proposed to be made under clause (3) of section 32, which reads as follows:

Such sums shall be maintained in a separate fund and shall be used by the Secretary of Agriculture on to * * * (3) reestablish farmers' purchasing power by making payments in connection with the normal production of any agricultural commodity for domestic consumption.

It is understood that payments will be limited to wholesome and edible cranberries. Improperly treated berries have been or will be destroyed. The Department justified its action in making these payments on the basis that damage to the market for good berries resulted from governmental action.

In the opinion of the majority of the members of the committee, this entire situation was uncalled for and most unfortunate. It is believed that this damage to an important industry of the Nation would not have developed had it been handled properly at the outset. Such damage can be and should be avoided in the future. If such action becomes necessary in the future, it is to be hoped that the industry affected can be protected and only those who may have violated regulations will be penalized.

Further, it is expected that responsible officials of the two Departments—Agriculture and Health, Education, and Welfare—will work together with private interests so that they can all share in the responsibility of establishing and announcing standards to be followed in the use of chemicals for agricultural purposes.

The committee also feels that the $10 million indemnity payment announced by the President is not a proper charge against Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture should not be expected to pick up the check for such damages in the future.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

Now I wish briefly to discuss the details of the bill before us. We have tried to restrict some of the requests with regard to research.

The committee recommends $67,934,000 for the research programs of this agency during the fiscal year 1961, which is $1,047,700 less than the budget estimate. The increase of $212,410 over funds appropriated for 1960 covers several essential research needs for the coming year.

One of these is research on protection from flood and erosion, which is one of the major needs of our Nation. Through various programs, the Department spends over $600 million per year for soil conservation and related work. This is exclusive of funds provided to the Corps of Engineers, and the Reclamation Service. Land owners contribute additional amounts.

For several years, this committee has realized the necessity for research to properly support the action programs of the Department. The committee therefore has provided $950,000 for establishment of four soil and water conservation research facilities; $600,000 for staffing and operation of the new Ames Laboratory which will be ready for operation in 1961; $250,000 for expanded research on tobacco; $250,000 for research on chemicals and biological measures to reduce or avoid hazards from pesticide residues; $750,000 for additional utilization research; $125,000 to enable the Department to increase research where most essential at existing soil and water conservation research facilities; and $496,400 to cover the Government's share of employee health benefits pursuant to Public Law 86–382.

The $950,000 included for additional soil and water conservation projects includes $250,000 for research on improved practices for conservation farming and ranching in the Southwest; $350,000 to establish a national center for basic research on soil-water-plant relationship in the Northeast; $200,000 to expand research on hydrology problems in the Southern Great Plains area; and $150,000 to strengthen existing research at a land-grant college in the Northwest area where an acute erosion problem is causing the loss of soil at an alarming rate. The Department is expected to put these facilities at the appropriate places. The one for the Northeast is to be located at Cornell University, I understand.

Production of tobacco is one of the major agricultural industries of the country. Tobacco is grown on a total of approximately 1.2 million acres in 22 States and is a major source of income in 8 of these States. Total production of tobacco in 1959 was about 1.8 billion pounds which brought over $1 billion cash income to producers. Tobacco produces about $2.5 billion per year in taxes, $1.7 billion of which goes into the Federal Treasury.

At the present time, the tobacco industry faces a number of problems, including fixed price ceilings, fixed acreage, and increased labor costs, which now total 65 percent of production costs. Work methods used in tobacco production are still almost entirely manual and between 400 and 500 hours of human labor is required to produce and harvest an acre of tobacco. These factors make it imperative that means be found to improve and mechanize production and harvesting methods and techniques. Therefore, the committee has added an additional $250,000 for such research. These funds should be used for planning, construction, and equipping greenhouses and special laboratories for tobacco research work at a new research center to be established in Kentucky from State appropriations of $1 million.

One of the most promising solutions to the problem of spray residues may come from the development of chemicals and biological control measures which will not leave spray residues on the food mar-

keted. In view of the need to develop better and safer pesticides and sprays, the committee has included an additional $250,000 in the bill for 1961 which should be used to evaluate, reorganize, and strengthen the programs of the Department in this general area. Such work should be done jointly with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the various private chemical producers throughout the country. Over $6 million is now being spent annually by the Department for research on insects and chemicals used in sprays and pesticides. Information furnished to the committee indicates that U.S. chemical companies are currently spending another $25 to $30 million annually for similar research.

The 1961 budget estimate includes an increase of $2,212,800 for utilization research, $1,512,800 by direct appropriation and $700,000 by curtailing various existing research activities so as to redirect funds from farm research to utilization research. The committee recommends the sum of $900,000 for this purpose, $700,000 to come from increased appropriations and $200,000 to be obtained by redirection from farm research. The committee believes, however, that existing stations should not be closed in working out this redirection of funds; also, there should be no elimination of small projects for pecan research and cotton insect research.

The amount included in the bill for utilization research would provide approximately $200,000 for research on cotton. It is recommended that, from this amount, the Department should make advance preparations for the operation of the Boll Weevil Laboratory authorized last year, by obtaining personnel to be used on existing research projects until such laboratory is ready for occupancy early in fiscal year 1962. It is further recommended that the balance of these funds be used to carry out essential research at branch laboratories located at Baton Rouge, La.; College Station, Tex., and Florence, S.C., and to strengthen mechanical stripper and gin stand research.

The special fund of $1 million of unused prior year funds established last year to provide part time subprofessional help on a contract basis has been continued for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has just referred to utilization research. There is a good deal of misunderstanding about what has been done in regard to utilization of research.

Do I understand that the committee has not stopped the work that is now being carried on by the cotton insect laboratories?

Mr. WHITTEN. We certainly have no intention, and our action does not provide for that.

Mr. POAGE. That is the way I interpreted it.

Mr. WHITTEN. In fact, we want it to be carried on. The department in its submission to us had curtailed the production research program some $700,000. That was by direction of the department. The committee in going over the matter found in some areas it might be possible to consolidate things of that sort, so we went along with a $200,000 cut, but we had no intention of cutting out the work the gentleman refers to, nor did we have any intention of cutting out the two items involving pecan research.

Mr. POAGE. I refer to the entomology laboratory at Waco, Tex. The work of the committee does not close that laboratory?

Mr. WHITTEN. No; it does not.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. In connection with research, as the gentleman from Mississippi is aware, there has been quite a considerable interest in the establishment of soil and water conservation research laboratories throughout the United States. For the fiscal year 1960, the Appropriations Committee of the other body asked the Department of Agriculture to set up a working force to tentatively locate those research facilities. Under the priority list which was submitted to the committee and in its request to the Department there was an item priority numbered 13, a laboratory at Twin Falls, Idaho, which is in the B category and that follows a laboratory of that category having a priority numbered 10 at Bushland, Tex. It is my understanding that the Bushland laboratory is included in the funds in this bill. Now, am I correct in assuming the committee will give careful consideration in following the priority and considering the establishment of priority 13 item at Twin Falls, Idaho, in its next consideration of this bill next year?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman from Idaho, I know of his deep and sincere desire to get a laboratory in his area. But I am sure the gentleman appreciates the problem of the subcommittee. We had earlier asked that these laboratories be set up on a regional basis. We were unable to get the Department to say what regions should be included. Later in the other body they submitted a list of priorities, and our subcommittee and the Congress last year went along with trying to set up these priorities.

We are spending over $600 million a year in soil conservation work. The American farmers and others are putting up additional amounts. Our committee has tried to agree on a regional basis to give the necessary research facilities to back up and implement the problem. We have approached it on a regional basis. I am sorry we did not reach the one the gentleman is interested in. The one in the Northwest has to do with a soil erosion program in another area. However, the Twin Falls, Idaho, facility will have the continuing interest of this subcommittee and will have our consideration in the coming year. It is the next category B laboratory in order of priority.

Mr. BUDGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I had not planned to interrupt the gentleman until he had concluded his remarks, but since some mention has been made of research facilities I thought this might be the appropriate time to ask a question. I am concerned particularly about an item that has been budgeted for research in pesticides. In another committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, there is being considered legislation the necessity for which has been brought about by the action taken by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

But it refers directly back to the pesticide problem. In view of the cranberry incident we had last fall and several related problems, I wonder if the gentleman feels that now is the time to terminate the research that is intended to relieve the very problem in the first place.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman, I do not think our action has terminated research at all. In fact, the records show that some $6 million is now being spent by the Department in various pesticide investigations. In the present bill we have increased that by about $250,000 to coordinate their work. In the cranberry incident, it was not a case of the insecticide not having been properly tested. It was a case of less than 1 percent of the total producers using greater quantities, against instructions, of pesticides that were properly cleared.

Now, again, I want to say that this subcommittee is as deeeply concerned as is the gentleman and that the cranberry incident was so handled as to practically ruin the market. It should not happen again. But, we do feel that merely providing larger sums of money without coordination is not necessarily the way to answer the problem. In fact, the chemical companies came to me as chairman of the subcommittee and pointed out that they are spending between $25 million and $30 million a year themselves in this area. And they said "if the Government is going to take it over, we will quit." Again I say, there is $6 million in here to carry on that work now. We give them $250,000 more and ask them to coordinate their efforts with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as well as private enterprise, in an effort to handle this problem. But, it is not lack of money that creates the problem.

Mr. AVERY. I probably should not have brought up this cranberry incident, because it brings on a lot of related matters that are not really in question. As I recall the cranberry incident, it is not related to insecticides in the first place. It was a chemical used for a different purpose. But, the point I wanted to make in the area we are moving, there is an increasing use of chemicals, both to stimulate production and also to make for better preservation and to improve attractiveness, sales promotion. Since we are in an area of increasing use of chemicals, the question comes up in my mind whether this is the right time to curtail the research program by the Department of Agriculture, in making and developing better methods to use these chemicals.

Mr. WHITTEN. We have not curtailed it. We have increased it.

Mr. AVERY. But you do not go along with the budgetary recommendation to further extend.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. And the support for the budgetary item failed to take into consideration the money that they now have and the need to coordinate their activities. The justification was that the private chemical companies were moving out and therefore the Government had to move in. I took it up with the chemical companies and they said, "No, if the Government is going to move in, we are going to move out. We cannot afford to spend $25 million or $30 million a year and then when we produce something, have it taken away from us."

So, their argument would not hold water when we took it up with the folks that said it was necessary. But, the problem still comes in the cranberry incident. It was a misuse of a proven chemical, and that is what we find in just about all of these cases. All the research in the world would not control the fellow that takes advantage and violates the rule.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I just merely wanted to say that we had testimony before our committee that showed that the commercial manufacturers of these pesticides and insecticides were spending in the neighborhood of $25 million of their own money. So that, also, is an adjunct to the work that the Department of Agriculture is doing. I think that it is very well that industry is spending money in their research on items of this kind.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to point out that any number of witnesses before our committee in seeking funds used the need for research in pesticides as an excuse for their appropriation request. We felt that there was not a proper amount of coordination between ARS, the land-grant colleges, and HEW and other places where this sort of research is being carried on. If our action does no more than get a proper amount of coordination between the requests for funds and the work that is to be done—and this is very important work—I think we will have served a very useful purpose.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I have received some protests about the closing of some pecan experimental stations, one down in Louisiana, and especially about the insecticide work that is being done at those stations. Will the gentleman enlighten us on that?

Mr. WHITTEN. I stated earlier that the committee did not intend that that work should be eliminated or curtailed. It is a small item, but very important to a small industry in certain areas. May I say that the research people were under instructions from officials at the departmental level to cut down and they applied cuts in these places. But the committee differed with them. We do not intend for that work to be eliminated.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. In other words, the money is in the bill for that purpose?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I briefly run over some of these items?

For plant and animal disease and pest control, the sum of $52,011,000 is recommended for the coming fiscal year, an increase of $2,210,400 over fiscal year 1959 and an increase of $3,235,400 over the budget estimate, largely for the brucellosis eradication program. The amount proposed includes increases of $75,000 to put on a full year's basis the regulatory activities under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act: $400,000 to expand the plant quarantine inspection staff at ports of entry, particularly those of the St. Lawrence Seaway; $150,000 for staffing the new Ames Laboratory to be opened in 1961; $2,167,700 for the brucellosis eradication program; and $306,000 for employee health benefit costs. These increases are offset by decreases of $888,300 for nonrecurring costs of screw-worm eradication and transfer of leasing costs to the General Services Administration.

During the hearings this year, departmental and other witnesses testified to the need for increased quarantine protection to prevent the introduction into this country of plant and animal pests and diseases. The committee recognizes that continually increasing travel and foreign commerce, a part of which is now coming directly into the Great Lakes area, have added to the danger of such introductions. It is expected that these trends will continue.

While the committee realizes the necessity of preventing agricultural pests from gaining entry into this country, it also believes that the problem can be met without steadily rising Federal costs for handling this problem. The Department is directed to work out with the carriers, representatives of industry, and other agencies and organizations a program, first, to place additional responsibility on the carriers to provide absolute notice to all travelers, to the end that any person who may bring prohibited articles into this country will have willfully violated such restrictions; and second, to provide a system of fines which will offset this increasing cost as well as reduce the danger.

In view of the fine relationship between this country and Canada, and the joint interest in this problem, the committee also believes that it would be far better if arrangements were worked out to check all incoming ships at the original port of entry of the St. Lawrence Seaway. This should prove more effective and more economical than the procedures presently contemplated.

The 1961 budget included $15,582,300 for brucellosis eradication, a reduction of $1,250,000 below the 1960 appropriation. A great deal of testimony was received from Members of Congress and others as to the urgent need for further expansion, rather than reduction, of efforts by the Federal Government in this area. In addition, information was presented to show that the reduced level of expenditure proposed for 1961 would not only postpone eventual eradication by many years, but would double or triple the cost of eventual eradication. In view of this very convincing evidence and strong support for the expansion of this work, the committee has included a total of $19 million in the bill for 1961.

The bill includes $21,562,000 for meat inspection for 1961. This amount provides an increase of $237,100 for employee health benefit costs. It permits the continuation of meat inspection activities of the Department at the 1960 level of operation.

The 1961 budget for the first time proposes appropriations for the use of foreign currencies generated from sales under title I of Public Law 480. Previously these funds have been spent without the usual appropriation controls. The estimates under this head include funds for market development research under section 104(a) and agricultural and forestry research under section 104(k).

The committee recommends $15,131,000 for 1961, an increase of $3,074,500 over funds expected to be used for these purposes in fiscal year 1960. Since Public Law 480 was created originally to develop and expand foreign markets for U.S. agricultural products, the committee feels that the full amount is justified. Further, it feels that the use of foreign currencies for market development and related research should have priority over other purposes for which such currencies may be used under the law.

Language was included in the Appropriations Act last year authorizing the transfer of the land used by the Entomology Research Laboratory at Orlando, Fla., from the Defense Department to the Department of Agriculture. In the report, the committee called on the Department to select possible alternative sites so as to eventually sell this valuable land for commercial use. The 1961 budget proposes an appropriation of $900,000 to provide new facilities to replace those located on the property at Orlando proposed for sale.

The committee has disallowed the proposed appropriation and has included in lieu thereof language which will permit the sale of these facilities and the use of the proceeds for the establishment of a new laboratory at whatever site the Secretary of Agriculture may determine.

An appropriation of $31,803,000 is proposed for grants to State experiment stations for the coming fiscal year. This amount includes $31,553,000 for payments to States and $250,000 for the penalty mail costs of the program.

The appropriation recommended continues available in 1961 the program provided for 1960, the appropriations for which represent an increase of 150 percent over funds provided for this purpose in 1952.

EXTENSION SERVICE

The sum of $55,715,000 has been included in the bill for 1961 for payments to States and Puerto Rico, an increase of $2 million over funds provided for fiscal year 1960.

The budget request proposed an increase of $2,865,000 for additional personnel to strengthen and expand the rural development program. The increase was requested for additional personnel, to provide rural development help in new areas similar to the work now being carried on in about 200 counties. The committee agrees that some attention should be given to this need in the other counties of the Nation not now covered. It feels, however, that the work should be performed by the regular extension agents and work force in such counties. It does not feel that the building up of a separate organization or additional staff to carry on this activity is advisable. The committee has therefore provided $2 million for such regular extension workers as may be needed in counties which desire to set up this program.

A number of States have used the substantial increases made in this item in recent years for additional personnel at the State and county levels. Many of these States have failed to maintain the salaries of county agents at a level comparable with agents in other States. In such States, the funds in this bill should be used for the present number of employees at the county level to place salaries at a level comparable with other States. Testimony before the committee indicates that salary increases are needed in 22 States to maintain comparable levels. Further, the disproportionately large amount which has been used for specialists at the State level in recent years would indicate that further increases for that purpose are not warranted at this time.

In discussing economic conditions in agriculture with the Director of the Extension Service during the hearings this year, the lack of interest by young people in farming as a means of livelihood was considered. It is significant to note the gradual decline in agricultural students. Department figures found on page 527, part 1, 1961 hearings, show that only 31,722 out of 411,437 undergraduate students in the Nation were enrolled in agricultural courses in 1959.

For retirement costs for extension agents, the bill includes $5,875,000 for fiscal year 1961, an increase of $200,625 over 1960 funds and a decrease of $86,000 in the budget estimate. The additional funds allowed will be required to cover the Federal share of retirement costs for the increased funds allowed for county extension workers.

The committee recommends $2,490,000 for penalty mail costs of State extension directors and county extension agents during 1961, as authorized by law. This is approximately the same amount as was provided for fiscal year 1960.

The Federal Extension Service provides for leadership, counsel and assistance to the 50 States and Puerto Rico. As of November 30, 1959, there were 238 employees in this organization, 231 of whom were stationed in Washington.

An appropriation of $2,255,000 is proposed for fiscal year 1961. This amount provides an increase of $12,460 over 1960 for employee health benefit costs. It is a reduction of $137,660 in the budget estimates.

FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

The Service carries on its work through three program divisions—Marketing, Purchasing, and Management Services. On November 30, 1959, the Service had 110 employees, all stationed in Washington.

The sum of $620,000 is recommended for the coming fiscal year. This includes an increase of $4,200 for employee health benefit costs. It is a reduction of $24,650 in the budget estimate.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

During the current fiscal year, soil conservation assistance has been provided for 30 new districts which have come into existence. It is expected that an additional 20 districts will be organized in 1961, which will bring the total to 2,911 districts by June 30, 1961.

The committee recommends an appropriation of $83,132,000 for the coming year, an increase of $810,000 over the 1960 appropriation and an increase of $250,000 over the budget estimate. Of the increase over 1960, $600,000 is required to cover employee health benefit costs. This is offset by a transfer of leasing costs of $40,000 to the General Services Administration. The balance of the increase, $250,000, is provided to meet the increasing needs for technical assistance, particularly for the 20 new districts expected to be organized next year.

For watershed protection, the bill carries an appropriation for 1961 of $32 million. During the 1960 fiscal year, a total of $32,276,964 is available for this program, including an appropriation of $22,750,000 and a carryover of unused funds from fiscal year 1959 of $9,526,964. The amount of $32 million included in this bill, therefore, will make available approximately the same amount for fiscal year 1961. The amount is sufficient to restore the planning funds available in 1960 and to finance a total of 42 planning parties during the next year.

Testimony before the committee indicates that more than 1,200 communities throughout the Nation have requested help in developing watershed plans. It further shows that assistance has been authorized for about 500 of these, that some 200 plans have been approved, and that construction has started on about half of these. In view of the large number of applications still awaiting plans, and in view of the large number of approved projects awaiting construction funds, the committee has increased the watershed protection funds above the amounts requested. In the opinion of the members of the committee, the amount of interest in this program in all areas of the country, and the urgent need for increased attention to the conservation of the soil and water resources of this country, warrant even larger amounts than those recommended in the bill.

For the flood prevention work in the 11 major watersheds authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944, the committee has included an appropriation of $18 million, the same as provided for fiscal year 1960.

Legislation just enacted authorizes additional works of improvement in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act in connection with the 11 watershed improvement programs provided for by the Flood Control Act of 1944. It also authorizes the making of loans to cover the local share of both the flood prevention and non-flood prevention features of these 11 watersheds. Therefore, language has been included to make the flood prevention appropriation available for these purposes.

As pointed out in last year's report, the work under this program has lagged far behind that envisioned when the program was initiated in 1944. It now appears that this flood prevention work, which was originally estimated to take 15 years to complete, will take 40 years or more to complete at the present rate of progress. If slowed down even more, as proposed in the 1961 budget, this time could be extended another 10 years.

Floods in the United States cause damages of more than $1 billion per year. The Department of Agriculture estimates that about 56 percent of all these damages occur in upstream watersheds, primarily to agricultural interests. It is estimated that the 212 approved Public Law 566 projects covering 12.5 million acres will reduce average annual flood damages of $16 million by 78 percent. In the 11 authorized flood prevention watersheds covering 30 million acres, the programs, now 30 percent installed, will reduce the $40 million annual flood bill by more than three-fourths when completed.

The severe April-June 1957 floods in Texas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas caused $159 million damages in upstream watersheds alone. Small watershed programs completed on less than 2 percent of the area prevented losses of more than $2 million. If all upstream watersheds had been treated, 70 percent of the losses equal to $109 million could have been prevented. Even though 56 percent of total flood losses occur in upstream watersheds, Federal appropriations have provided about $63 for flood control on main streams to every $1 for upstream watershed flood prevention.

For the Great Plains conservation program, the bill includes the full budget estimate of $10 million for fiscal year 1961. This will permit the continuation of the program at the 1960 level of operation.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. In regard to the money for watershed protection projects, does the gentleman from Mississippi now feel that the amount appropriated in this bill is adequate to carry on the program for the projects that have been approved already or are in the final planning stages?

Mr. WHITTEN. I think so; all things considered. In this area, frankly, we could probably use, if we had the personnel, several times the amount of money in this bill. But we have tried to be practical. We restored $7,250,000 to bring the amount of money up to this year's level. We restored the money that we felt was necessary to carry on these projects, those that are completed and ready to go. We restored money for the planning parties so that they could proceed with planning. Within limitations that we thought were sound and sensible we restored as fully as we could the moneys we thought were necessary. And it took a good deal of money to bring them up, because they had been cut.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

An appropriation of $242 million is included in the 1961 bill for payments earned under the program authorized in the 1960 Appropriation Act. This amount, which is a reduction of $600,000 below the budget estimates, is believed to be adequate to meet all commitments under the 1960 program. The amount recommended is the minimum which must be provided, however, since commitments under the 1960 program authorization are binding upon the Government and the Congress.

The committee also has restored the authorization for the 1961 program to the $250 million level. This is the fifth time since 1952 that the budget has proposed to reduce the size of this program. In every year but one, Congress has restored the full $250 million level of operations. Declining farm income makes it imperative that the Nation continue this program to prevent further depletion of the Nation's soil.

As has been pointed out in prior years, this program provides the primary financial support for the entire conservation effort of the Department. The program has about 1¼ million participants each year, which represents 25 percent of all farming units in the United States. Further, it gets conservation work done at much less cost to the Government than other programs such as the conservation reserve and the Great Plains program. The average ACP payment per participant is less than $250 and the cost per acre averages about 60 cents, as compared with payments under the Great Plains program of $4,000 per farmer and $2 per acre.

The budget proposes the elimination of the proviso inserted last year placing restrictions on the distribution of ACP funds among counties. It will be recalled that this language is designed to prevent changes in fund allocations as a means of forcing the elimination of practices which might otherwise be included by a county in its list of approved practices. The committee has retained the language for 1961. It is of the opinion that State committees can make changes from 1958 allocations on a reasonable basis by exercising their authority to reallocate funds among counties as fund requirements change.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

An appropriation of $43,153,000 is recommended for 1961, including $16,315,000 for marketing research and agricultural estimates and $26,838,000 for marketing services. The amounts proposed are $11,100 over the budget estimate and $1,685,900 over the 1960 appropriation.

The increase provided for the marketing research and agricultural estimates appropriation includes $750,000 to initiate a long-range program to improve crop and livestock estimating services; $50,000 to provide for agricultural estimating services in Hawaii and Alaska; and $102,500 for employee health benefit costs.

The increase for marketing services provides $50,000 for more effective supervision of grain inspection; $40,000 to strengthen enforcement of the Federal Seed Act; $31,000 for initiation of market news services in California and Louisiana; $500,000 for additional poultry inspection; and $207,600 for employee health benefits. These are offset by a reduction of $45,200 due to transfer of leasing costs to the General Services Administration.

A total of $10,796,000 has been included for poultry inspection during the coming fiscal year. This is an increase of $500,000 over funds provided for 1960 to be used to provide inspection at poultry products processing plants as deemed by the Department to be necessary to the protection of public health. This action has been taken by the committee in order to provide additional protection to the consumers of the Nation.

Considerable testimony has been received by the committee indicating the need for additional research funds for this agency to expand cotton quality evaluation research at Clemson, S.C., and Lubbock, Tex., and to undertake additional types of research to improve cotton fiber, to develop improved instruments for measuring cotton quality, and to learn more about how cotton fiber performs during the weaving and finishing processes.

The committee is unable to provide additional funds at this time for this purpose. It recognizes the importance of this problem, however, and feels that work along these lines should be undertaken during the next year. It recommends, therefore, that the additional work proposed at Clemson and Lubbock be undertaken by the redirection of funds from present research on costs and margins of marketing cotton, and cottonseed economic studies and evaluations. It further recommends later in this report that basic fiber research, instrument development, and studies of weaving and finishing facilities be undertaken on a contract basis through the use of Commodity Credit Corporation funds available for research purposes.

For payments to States and possessions, the full budget estimate of $1,195,000 is recommended for the coming fiscal year. This is the same amount as appropriated for fiscal year 1960. Payments under this appropriation are made on a matched fund basis to State and territorial marketing agencies for programs designed to get into practical use improved methods and practices in the marketing of farm products.

For the school lunch program, the committee recommends an appropriation of $110 million for fiscal year 1961. This is the full budget estimate and is the same amount as appropriated for 1960. In addition, the committee recommends the transfer of $45 million from section 32 funds to be used to purchase meats and other foods needed to provide balanced school lunches. This will provide a minimum of $155 million for this program for 1961, which should also be supplemented by other transfers of surplus foods from sections 32 and 416.

This program provided noonday meals to over 30 percent of the Nation's 39,480,000 school children in 1959. The program served an average of over 10.7 million children during the 1959 school year, with a peak participation of over 12 million in 1 month.

Total funds spent for school lunches and the special milk program during the current fiscal year, including Federal, State, and local contributions, and commodities furnished from Federal sources, are estimated at $1.077 billion. This represents a sizable market for agricultural products and is an important contribution to the health and welfare of the Nation's school children.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

The budget estimate provides a total of $7,176,300 for this activity during the coming fiscal year. Of this amount, $4,637,300 is requested as a direct appropriation and $2,539,000 is requested as a transfer from section 32 funds.

The committee recommends funds for fiscal year 1961 of $6,940,000, an increase of $928,700 over 1960 funds and a decrease of $190,300 in the budget estimate. Of this amount, $4,447,000 is provided by direct appropriation and $2,493,000 is provided by transfer from section 32. The increase includes an additional $800,000 to cover by direct appropriation for the first time certain attaché expenses paid in prior years from foreign currency allocations; $110,000 for new attaché posts in several Eastern European and north African countries; and $18,700 for employee health benefits.

The foreign currency appropriation, which appears in the 1961 bill for the first time, provides funds for the purchase of foreign currencies for purposes for market development under section 104(a) of Public Law 480 and participation in agricultural and horticultural exhibitions under section 104(m) of that act. Heretofore funds have been used for these purposes from Budget Bureau allocations rather than annual congressional appropriations.

An appropriation of $14,621,000 is recommended for fiscal year 1961, an increase of $8,777,622 over funds available for 1960. As explained in connection with a similar item under the Agri-

cultural Research Service, the committee feels that the use of these foreign currencies for the expansion of foreign markets for U.S. agricultural commodities, as intended by Congress when Public Law 480 was adopted, is of primary importance.

These appropriations are intended to give effect to the legislative policy established by the Congress in section 104(a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, which directs (1) that there be set aside for market development purposes from sales proceeds and loan repayments an amount not less than the equivalent of 5 percent of the total sales made under title I after September 29, 1959; and (2) that special effort be made in entering into sale and loan agreements to provide for sufficient convertibility to obtain the currencies needed for use in countries which offer a reasonable potential of becoming dollar markets for U.S. agricultural commodities.

The countries which offer the best market possibilities are frequently those where sales are made for dollars rather than for foreign currencies under Public Law 480. Therefore, foreign currencies are not always available in those countries where most needed. The funds appropriated by this paragraph are not restricted to the purchase of currencies in those countries which have excess currencies or which may be classified by the Bureau of the Budget as excess to other uses. Such funds may be used to purchase the currencies of the countries where market potentials exist or to purchase currencies which are convertible into the currencies of such countries.

In order to make certain that foreign currencies are available in those countries which market potentials and where market development work is most likely to be effective, the committee has included language in the bill to set aside currencies for this purpose as provided by the amendment to section 104(a) of Public Law 480 adopted last year.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

The bill carries an appropriation of $930,000 for fiscal year 1961. This is a reduction of $11,325 in the budget estimate. The increase of $20,500 includes $14,000 to expand investigations of abuses and unlawful market practices, and $6,500 for employee health benefit costs.

Recent investigations of trading on three different commodity exchanges have revealed rather widespread trade practice violations on each of them. The increase proposed will permit more frequent investigations of these markets and more effective enforcement of the Commodity Exchange Act.

COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE

For acreage allotments and marketing quotas, the full budget estimate of $40,135,000 is provided for 1961. This is a decrease of $400,000 below funds provided for fiscal year 1960, including $1,400,000 appropriated in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.

In addition to other activities of this program, the funds allowed will enable the Department to check up to 75 percent of the upland cotton crop during fiscal year 1961 as a basis for issuance of marketing certificates, as required by law.

For the sugar act program, the committee recommends the full budget estimates of $74,500,000 for 1961, an increase of $3 million over the 1960 appropriation. This increase for mandatory payments to sugar producers is based on a projected increase of 287,500 tons of sugar in 1960 over 1959 production.

An appropriation of $310 million is provided to pay off obligations incurred under 1960 and prior year conservation reserve programs. This is a reduction of $51,783,000 below the budget estimate and is $25 million below funds provided for fiscal year 1960.

Justifications presented to the committee indicate that a balance of $30 million of prior year appropriations will be available in 1961 for payments to producers. The 1961 appropriation has, therefore, been reduced by this amount. Further, funds included for Commodity Stabilization Service operating expenses at the national, State, and county levels appear to be overstated in the budget and have been reduced accordingly.

In a report released last December, the Comptroller General of the United States stated that 5.4 million acres, or 23 percent of the land retired under the conservation reserve had no history of crop production in prior years. He further stated that, based on a national average rental rate of $10 per acre, the payments on such land have amounted to $54 million annually, or about $270 million over the 5-year average life of the contracts. The committee is gratified to learn that, beginning with the 1960 contracts, greater restrictions have been placed on eligibility requirements for land placed in the conservation reserve. It is disappointed and shocked by the fact, however, that such large sums of money have been expended without real reduction in production.

In view of the findings of the Comptroller General, the committee contemplates that the Department will review all contracts now in force and will use every means available to recover in such cases. Where there have been misrepresentations as to prior production records, or other substantial misrepresentations, contracts should be canceled and money erroneously paid should be recovered. Where contracts represent a bad financial arrangement for the Government, even though valid, efforts should be made to work out a cancellation arrangement and settlement in order to avoid further expense to the Government. In expectation of some savings from such an effort, the committee has reduced the 1961 appropriation an additional $20 million.

The legislative authorization for this program expires at the end of the current year. Therefore, no authorization is included in the bill for a 1961 conservation reserve program.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

The 1961 bill carries an appropriation for this program of $6,376,000, which is the same amount as was provided for the current fiscal year.

In addition, authority is provided for the Corporation to spend $2,630,000 from its premium income for administrative costs in fiscal year 1961. This provides an increase over 1960 of $300,000. Employee health benefit costs will require $31,400 of this amount. The balance is required to expand this program to 35,000 new crops and 15 new counties in the coming year.

The program is operating in 865 counties in fiscal year 1960 and is expected to be extended to 880 counties in 1961. The program for 1961 contemplates 425,000 crops insured as compared to 390,000 in 1960. During the 11 years that the program has been operating on a limited experimental basis, premiums have exceeded indemnities by about $2 million.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The 1961 budget proposed authorizations of $110 million for electrification loans and $80 million for telephone loans. No contingency fund was included. The committee recommends the full budget estimate for both programs. It further recommends a contingency fund of $50 million for each program.

It is estimated that the Department will begin fiscal year 1961 with $235 million of electrification applications on hand and will receive further applications during 1961 of $217 million, making a total of $452 million for consideration in 1961. It is further estimated that $110 million of prior year loan funds will be carried over into fiscal year 1961. This carryover, plus the $160 million recommended in this bill—including the contingency fund—will provide a total of $270 million to meet this need in 1961. A total of $245 million of electrification loans are expected to be made in the current fiscal year.

For the telephone program, it is estimated that applications totaling more than $135 million will be on hand at the beginning of fiscal year 1961 and that additional applications of $120 million will be received during the year, making total applications of $255 million for consideration in 1961. The amount provided in the bill, $130 million—including the contingency authorization—will meet about half of this need. Telephone loans will total $105 million in fiscal year 1960. There will be no carryover of 1960 telephone loan funds into 1961 fiscal year.

Collections on electrification loans in 1960 are expected to be $157 million. This amount should be even larger in fiscal year 1961, and should equal or exceed the $160 million authorized for loans in the bill for 1961. The repayment record of this program is still amazingly good, despite low farm income. Delinquencies of more than 30 days are only $400,000—about thirteen-thousandths of 1 percent of loans outstanding.

The full budget estimate of $9,632,000 is proposed for administrative expenses for the coming fiscal year. This is the same amount as appropriated for fiscal year 1960.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

For the lending programs of this agency for fiscal year 1961, the bill includes total loan authorizations of $227 million. This authorization includes

$26,900,000 for farm ownership loans, $197,100,000 for farm operating loans, and $3 million for soil and water conservation loans. The amounts recommended for ownership and operating loans are the same as the amounts to be loaned in fiscal year 1960. In addition, the bill includes a $40 million contingency authorization. Not to exceed $5 million of this may be used for farm ownership loans and the balance is available for the farm operating loan program.

Evidence before the committee indicates that credit for agricultural purposes is very tight and that interest rates are increasing rapidly. In many areas of the country, commercial credit is no longer available to farmers. It is reported that some production credit associations of the Farm Credit Administration are charging up to 8 and 9 percent for agricultural credit, and the general average appears to be between 6 and 7 percent.

These factors have forced many farmers to turn to the Farmers Home Administration which was established to provide credit to farmers who had no other source of credit. It is to meet this increasing need that the committee has restored the 1960 level for loans and has provided the contingency authorization mentioned above. The committee feels it essential that this organization be in a position to assist in the adjustment many farmers are having to make due to depressed conditions in agriculture. The committee notes that the full $20 million contingency provided for 1960 has been used and more is needed.

Of the original authorization of $450 million provided in Public Law 1020 approved August 7, 1956, for farm housing loans, an unused balance of $297 million is expected to be available in fiscal year 1961. The Department estimates that it will use only $25 million of this amount in the coming year. The balance of the authorization will be available, however, if needed to meet unanticipated demands for farm housing loans.

It has come to the attention of the committee that this organization has established two sets of standards for housing loans—one set for counties which are participating in the rural development program, and another set for the other rural counties of the Nation. Many of the members of the committee feel that citizens of other than rural development counties should have the same opportunities and directs the Department to change its practices and procedures to that end.

The committee has approved $30,500,000 for the administrative costs of this program for fiscal year 1961. This is $244,750 less than appropriated for the current year and $967,650 less than the budget estimate. In addition to this appropriation, this organization will also have $1 million available in 1961 from the farm tenant mortgage insurance funds for administrative expenses. Also funds for administrative expenses are available from the disaster loan revolving fund as needed. In 1960, transfers for administration of disaster loans will exceed $3 million.

While the total loan volume of this agency continues to increase due to reduced farm income, there are still a number of areas where there are few applications and little or no need for FHA field offices. The administrative funds have been reduced, therefore, with the request that the Administrator reexamine his field operations so as to reduce or eliminate offices wherever possible.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

The sum of $3,358,000 is recommended for fiscal year 1961 for this office. The increase of $195,975 above the 1960 appropriation is provided to meet the employee health benefit costs of this organization and to handle the increased workload related to the legal work of the various marketing and regulatory activities of the Department.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

The committee recommends the full budget estimate of $2,899,500 for the coming year. This is an increase of $18,500 over 1960, all of which is required to meet employee health benefit costs in fiscal year 1961.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

The bill for fiscal year 1961 includes a recommended appropriation of $1,478,000 for the work of this office. This is an increase of $46,335 above 1960 funds, which includes $6,335 for employee health benefit costs and $40,000 to meet the increased demands on this office for information services, including, first, policy clearance and review of processed publications; second, regionalized radio tape service; and third, cataloging and distributing agricultural photographs.

Considerable interest has been expressed by Members of Congress and others in the 1959 yearbook called "Food," in view of its appeal to city consumers as well as agricultural people. The demand has become so large that a reprint appears necessary. It is estimated that it will cost $180,000 for a full reprint or $90,000 for half an edition.

The sum of $213,000 is included in the bill for printing of an agricultural yearbook. The committee recommends that half an edition of "Food" be reprinted and that the number of copies of the 1961 yearbook on seeds be reduced to permit publishing and release within the remaining funds available for yearbook purposes.

LIBRARY

The sum of $895,000 is proposed for 1961 by the committee. This is an increase of $63,100 over 1960, which includes $6,880 for employee health benefit costs and $56,220 for (a) processing gift and exchange material and making it available for use, (b) improving bibliographic service, and (c) providing for additional purchases of publications.

In order to meet the research needs of the various divisions and agencies of the Department adequately, some additional staff is required to make books and publications in the library more readily accessible and to assist scientists and researchers in locating material needed. Therefore, the committee has approved the increases proposed in the budget for 1961.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The sum of $1,226,500,000 is recommended for restoration of capital impairment of the Corporation. This includes $632 million for realized losses through June 30, 1959, and $594,500,000 for losses incurred through December 31, 1959. This is a reduction of $98,500,000 in the 1961 budget estimate.

A breakdown of the realized losses for the fiscal year 1959, for which $575 million was provided in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960, and $632 million, as included in this bill, is as follows:

[In millions]

Price support program:	
Basic commodities	$567
Mandatory nonbasic commodities	198
Other nonbasic commodities	46
Strategic materials	−6
Total, price supports	805
Commodity export program	132
Interest, administrative and other (net)	195
Special milk program	75
Total, realized losses	1,207

Data furnished by the Department shows that $620 million—about half—of this realized loss is for price support transactions. The balance represents payments to nonfarm people for storage, transportation, administration, and interest.

On March 16, 1960, the Department proposed a lower rate schedule for storing price-support grain. Estimates placed in the record, page 666, part 3, 1961 hearings, indicate that an estimated $98,500,000 can be saved if this reduction is put into effect. With the expectation that the Corporation will reduce storage charges as proposed and otherwise improve storage practices during the coming year, the committee has reduced this item by the estimated saving of $98,500,000.

The basic charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation contains authority for research on commodities with which it deals. One of the purposes of such research is to minimize or eliminate the losses on commodities in CCC inventories. Information furnished the committee shows that CCC funds are now being used for research on grain. In 1959, $146,575 was used for this purpose and it is estimated that $142,100 will be spent in fiscal year 1960.

The committee believes that the Corporation should continue this type of research, particularly with reference to the major commodities. It also feels that contracts to meet specific problems are much more sound than an overall increase of permanent employees for this type of work. It believes, however, that such research activities should be handled so as not to incur unusually excessive costs or endanger the market for existing business concerns for any industrial products involved.

Appropriations totaling $1,443,634,000 are recommended to reimburse CCC for the cost of these various special programs through June 30, 1960. The amount recommended is an increase of $175,536,500 over the appropriation for this purpose for fiscal year 1960. A further breakdown of costs for fiscal years 1959 and 1960 and funds recommended for 1961 is as follows:

Project	1959 (1958 costs)	1960 (1959 costs)	1961 (1960 estimated costs)
International Wheat Agreement	$80,800,000	$47,404,779	$32,572,000
Emergency famine relief to friendly peoples	119,270,000	96,601,678	107,094,000
Sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies	1,033,515,000	968,016,000	881,000,000
Grain for migratory waterfowl feed	18,506	17,363	18,000
Transfer of bartered materials to supplemental stockpile	82,250,335	129,000,000	422,950,000
Advances to Agricultural Research Service for animal disease eradication activities	19,390,100	1,036,192	
Advances to Agricultural Marketing Service for classing cotton and grading tobacco	1,510,870	608,926	
Unobligated balance		25,412,562	
Total appropriation or estimate	1,336,754,811	1,268,097,500	1,443,634,000

As has been pointed out previously, these activities are carried on outside of the regular functions of the Corporation. Its funds and facilities are used merely as a convenient means of financing these programs. They are not related in any way to the price support program of the Corporation.

The bill for 1961 includes an authorization of $44,726,000 for administrative expenses of the Corporation during the coming fiscal year. This is an increase of $2,326,000 over the 1960 limitation and is $3,702,000 less than the budget estimates.

The sum proposed includes an additional $326,000 for employee health benefit costs and $2 million to provide a contingency reserve to enable the Corporation to meet unforeseeable increases in workload during the next year.

The heavy workload volume of the new cotton program which was begun in 1960 is expected to continue in 1961. Acquisitions of grain in 1961 are estimated to be heavier than in 1960 due to a 384 million bushel increase in takeovers from the 1959 corn crop; wheat loans, acquisitions and disposals in 1961 are also expected to exceed those in 1960.

Since price support is mandatory for many commodities, and the volume of loans and purchases cannot be controlled, the provision of a contingency reserve as mentioned above appears necessary.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The bill includes an administrative expense limitation of $2,480,000 for the Farm Credit Administration for fiscal year 1961, which is the amount included in the budget estimates. The increase of $170,000 over the 1960 limitation is required to cover the full year cost of the transfer of 37 employees from the Federal Land Bank payroll to the Farm Credit Administration payroll authorized by the Farm Credit Act of 1959. These are employees of the Farm Credit Administration who have been paid by the Federal land banks as a matter of convenience. No increase in cost or number of employees is involved.

The bill also includes language which authorizes expenditures necessary in the liquidation of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation and the sale of its mineral reservations. All Government capital has been repaid.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. The committee's report on page 11 touching on storage costs raises a question in my mind, and that is this. Can the gentleman give any reason why a limitation should not be placed in this appropriation bill which would require funds that are expended to be used first for Government storage of surplus commodities rather than permitting it to go to private warehouses?

Mr. WHITTEN. It would be pretty hard to reach what you are talking about mechanically. This is a corporation that under the basic law has full authority to operate as a corporation, to sell and to buy. A limitation on the use of administrative funds probably could be worked out, but the Department, after our hearings and after we discussed our investigators' report, on March 16 announced it was cutting the rates back.

We approached it that way because there is such a wide variety of different situations and different kinds of things. We felt we were not in a position to write out the details of a specific contract in a specific area.

Then we implemented that by failing to restore $98.5 million which they had justified for carrying storage at the present rate. I do think under the present circumstances that is sufficient.

In our report we further told them that under the law, which states that they shall carry on an effective and efficient operation, we feel they should keep Government warehouses filled first in order to carry that out. I would say that we have gone far enough for the moment. If they do not carry this out, I would certainly be glad to cooperate with the gentleman next year to see that it is done.

Mr. YATES. I am glad the gentleman made that last point, about using Government warehouses first. I did not see that in the report. The language of the report on page 12 states:

It is the opinion of the majority of this committee, in view of the obligation of the officers of the Corporation to protect its assets and thereby the taxpayer, that these actions do not constitute "effective and efficient" conduct of the Corporation's business.

Does the gentleman indicate that the inference to be drawn from this language is that Government warehouses should be used first before private warehouses are used?

Mr. WHITTEN. Let me put it this way: If the Corporation owns a warehouse and can keep its grain in its own warehouse, certainly we do not think it should keep its own space empty and pay somebody to store the grain. At the moment I do not see that in the report, but it is in the report.

Mr. YATES. Stated specifically?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I read with a great deal of interest the report on pages 11 and 12 with respect to storage costs. Was this report made before the Commodity Credit Corporation, or whoever it was, made the cut in storage cost to eliminate the big profiteers and help the little elevator operators in some States?

Mr. WHITTEN. This report was written subsequent to the Department's original pronouncement. The course of events was that our committee had an investigation made. We took it up with the Department on February 3, and on March 16 they made their announcement.

They called me and asked if we would support them in bringing the cost down. I said that I would for myself but I could not speak for the committee. Before in the report we call on them to cut costs. We give them considerable latitude. We also mentioned farmer-owned storage. The farmer has to take his storage the first year. He has to take that loss. So we wrote our language in the report as support for the announcement.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We have in Ohio small elevators. We produce a grade and type of wheat that is not in oversupply, but it is used for the making of flour and the grain goes in and out of these elevators rather rapidly. I am advised that the average profit of the elevator operators in Ohio is only between 4 and 5 percent. There has been no profiteering. I am also advised, as late as this morning, that the cost support cut of 19 percent on all elevator storage rates will just simply close a lot of the small warehouses—and we have no large terminal warehouses in Ohio—the small elevators, and the farmers will have no place to take their grain.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman, we do not take credit for nor do we underwrite the Department's method of handling this. For instance, we see some sense in a uniform grain storage rate for uniform warehouses. Personally, I cannot see that you ought to pay the same rate to a fellow who can liquidate the total cost of his warehouse in 16 months as one or two of them have

done as to an established warehouse that gives you full protection.

What we are trying to do is to point out the things we think have been poor business. We point out the law which says this must be carried on in an efficient manner. That means pulling the costs down but giving them latitude as to how to do it. This straight across-the-board cut, to my mind, is not the way they should have handled it. But the fact I differ with them is not surprising, because I have differed with them many times as the gentleman knows.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

GREEN ACRES PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, I would like first to say it is a pleasure for me personally to work under the chairmanship of a gentleman such as Mr. WHITTEN, of Mississippi, and to be associated with a man like WALT HORAN, of Washington. By the way, JAMIE and I have been on this particular subcommittee for 17 years. We are almost making a career out of it. We have had the company of Mr. HORAN there for about 15 years and Mr. MARSHALL, another very fine gentleman from my own State, has been around for some 12 years. Our able colleague from Kentucky, Mr. NATCHER, has been with us on the committee for about 6 years and we have two comparatively new members, our colleagues the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL]. It is a pleasure to work with these gentlemen. I have always found them eminently fair, and I want to preface the remarks I am about to make by expressing my sentiments toward my fine colleagues on the subcommittee.

DEPLORABLE CONDITIONS OF OUR FARM ECONOMY

Mr. Chairman, the deplorable conditions of our farm economy discussed so eloquently by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], who is chairman of our Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, and the contents of our committee report, together with the accompanying bill, should be sufficient cause for the most serious concern on the part of every Member of Congress.

Words alone, written or spoken, cannot fully and properly describe the plight of several millions of farm people who during the last 10 years have seen prices go steadily up on the things they buy and as equally steadily down on the things they sell. Sleight-of-hand juggling of farm income figures cannot conceal the fact that our farm economy is in difficult straits and that the time for constructive and remedial action is long overdue.

In the last 10 years our gross national product has risen from $382 billion to $480 billion; national income has gone up from $217 billion to about $400 billion; labor income alone has climbed from $175 billion to about $280 billion; hourly earnings in all manufacturing jobs have gone up from $1.46 in 1950 to $2.28 today; and in virtually every segment of our economy, with the exception of agriculture, we have seen similar rises and aside from a few chronically depressed areas the whole Nation has prospered.

But look at agriculture. Net farm income stood at $13.8 billion in 1949 and the latest report shows net farm income has dropped below $11 billion. If there was ever a famine in a land of economic plenty, such a famine exists today among the farm people of our Nation.

We expend a considerable amount of money for various farm programs, many of which are actually for the primary benefit of consumers, but the one big item which relates itself directly to farm income is the appropriation to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is the banker for our price support operations. For ready understanding of the purposes of agricultural price supports I might describe them as the equivalent for farm people of minimum wage laws, unemployment insurance, labor management agreements, and so forth, for the protection of labor income. Unorganized and without the potent weapon of the right to strike, farm people must of necessity look to the Federal Government for a measure of assistance in their efforts to obtain a fair and equitable return for their labor, investment, and management ability. This we call parity.

In the bill before us there is an item in the amount of $1,325 million to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation and this represents the losses sustained in our price support operations during the last fiscal year. Last year we appropriated $1,435,400,000 for this purpose; the year before $1,760,400,000; and the year before that $1,239,800,000.

In the last 5 years we have sustained a total loss of $6,689,900,000 in our price support operations, and in those same 5 years net farm income has dropped a full half billion dollars. Although it should be obvious to everyone that our programs of price supports are not doing the job, I shudder to think where our farm economy would be today if we had not provided at least this measure of protection.

As ranking member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, as a Member of Congress representing a great agricultural district, and as a man conscious of the fiscal implications of the bill we bring before you, I must report that the rise in costs to the public in recent years has been accompanied by a corresponding decline in farm income. We cannot forever expect farm people or taxpayers generally to support such an inadequate and costly program.

Our subcommittee has been fully cognizant of these negative developments. Each year we have conducted extensive hearings—this is my own 17th year on the subcommittee—and this year you will note that our hearings total more than 2,500 pages in length. In all modesty I believe I can honestly say that the seven members of our subcommittee know more about the detailed operations of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and of our farm programs than any other group in Congress.

I believe our subcommittee has taken every conceivable action available to us in our efforts to cut the costs of these programs and make them more worthwhile to the farm people in whose interests they were first authorized. At the same time, I believe we have exhausted our capabilities and the frustrating experience of spending good money after bad compels me today to bring this whole problem before the Congress in the hope that something constructive might come of the effort.

COMPREHENSIVE NEW FARM BILL

On May 2 of this year I introduced a comprehensive new farm bill—H.R. 12000—together with my able and distinguished colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. His identical bill is H.R. 12001. This bill was not casually conceived nor was it lightly offered. Speaking for myself, its provisions were based upon many years of service in the Congress, especially as a member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, together with virtually a lifetime of experience as a farmer, and as a farm manager.

As a preliminary to the discussion of our proposal, let us first take a good look at the problem we seek to solve.

From the viewpoint of the American taxpayer, the development of a solution to the farm problem should have the highest priority. Reluctantly but of necessity I must report to the Congress that we now have in Commodity Credit Corporation accounts about $9 billion worth of surplus agricultural commodities. In the next fiscal year it will cost about $600 million to store and handle that vast storehouse of agricultural products. Added to this will be the losses through deterioration, market losses, shrinkage, and other factors leading inevitably to a loss to the Public Treasury of probably another $1 billion.

As a practical matter, we have found from experience that we cannot even give away this multi-billion-dollar hoard of agricultural commodities. In the bill before us you will find another item of $1,468,742,000 to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for various special activities such as Public Law 480, the International Wheat Agreement, and famine relief to friendly countries. Tremendous quantities of American food have moved through church and other charitable organizations from Government warehouses into empty stomachs around the world; additional amounts of staggering tonnage have been sold for local currencies which are near worthless to us; and we have thrown wide the door of our food storehouse to needy people both at home and abroad. But it costs money to even give these stocks away and from the viewpoint of the taxpayer this $9 billion stockpile is and will continue to be a most costly burden.

From the viewpoint of the farmer we purport to help, this stockpile of agricultural surpluses is a two-edged sword striking at the heart of his pocketbook. In the first place, the level of farm commodity prices at a present average of only 80 percent of parity together with the farmer's proportionate share of the total tax burden leaves the average

farmer at the bottom of the economic ladder. In the second place, the tremendous accumulation of farm commodities in the inventory of the Commodity Credit Corporation hangs like a dark cloud over the agricultural economy and eliminates completely any hope for a rise in market prices for farm products.

The proposal the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and I have laid before the Congress is designed to meet effectively and promptly both of these basic problems of accumulated surpluses and depressed farm commodity prices. Moreover, we seek to accomplish these prime objectives at little or no additional cost to American taxpayers.

The green acres program we propose contains numerous provisions previously advanced by other able and distinguished Members of Congress. The payment-in-kind features, for example, may be found in many bills now pending before the legislative committees. My cosponsor, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], along with his colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN], some time ago introduced payment-in-kind bills for corn. The distinguished chairman of my Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and my very able farm colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] recently introduced bills to authorize a payment-in-kind program covering all feed grains and wheat.

After studying many of these constructive proposals and gaining from them a number of worthwhile ideas, Mr. JENSEN and I felt that something additional was needed to accomplish a balance between production and market demands and the green acres feature was conceived for this purpose.

Having crystallized our own thinking on the general outlines of a farm measure, we took the idea directly to the farmers who would be affected for their counsel before introducing a bill and the farmers themselves gave us the answers to several questions for which we had been unable to find the answers.

I personally discussed the green acres proposal with more than 400 farmers, ASC committeemen, county agents, conservationists, livestock men, and others representing a cross section of Midwest agriculture. As a result of these discussions, the initial idea was considerably modified and several very valuable improvements were made. For example, we were concerned about the collateral effects our proposal might have upon the livestock industry and I found the answer in a suggestion made by an ASC county committeeman at the last meeting held on the subject.

The Andersen-Jensen green acres program is in a major sense the result of the combined thinking of a cross section of farm people and the leaders of responsible farm organizations, and I want at this time to acknowledge their help and express my personal appreciation for their contributions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a few minutes to describe briefly the various sections of our bill.

Section 2 of the bill provides for a nationwide referendum to permit farmers to determine for themselves whether or not they want this program to go into operation. Since every farmer in the United States who produced wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, and flaxseed would be immediately affected, all of those producers who produced one or more of these commodities in at least 3 of the last 5 years would be eligible to vote in the referendum. If two-thirds or more of the producers voting in the referendum favored the program presented to them, it would be in effect the following crop year and thereafter unless the Congress authorized and the Secretary of Agriculture conducted another referendum on this or a modified program.

I will discuss the other sections of the bill upon the assumption that the entire program would be approved in the referendum. If farmers voted to the contrary, the entire measure would be inoperative.

GREEN ACRES PROVISION

Section 3 covers the "green acres" provision and is the cornerstone of the entire proposal. Beginning with the 1961 crop, all producers of the commodities enumerated earlier would be required to put at least 20 percent of their total cropland under green cover. Farmers would receive no direct compensation for so doing, and they would be free to do anything they wanted to with these green acres other than the production of nonconserving crops. They could graze it, cut hay off of it, put it into wildlife cover, and so forth. The principal stipulation would be that it must be under green cover and not in the production of nonconserving crops.

The 20 percent figure in our bill is not a precise figure which we have determined to be the exact minimum cropland needed in green acres on each farm to do the job. It is, however, the best possible estimate we can make as to a percentage reasonably expected to accomplish the objective we seek of balancing the production of these commodities against consumer needs and market opportunities.

Because this is such an important feature of the bill, you may be interested in the basis for the 20 percent provision and some of the reasons for its importance.

It should be obvious to all that American farmers are producing too much. They were called upon to increase production during the war years, and farm programs in effect in recent years have provided no alternative. We now have in Government ownership $9 billion worth of agricultural commodities and it is costing us about $600 million a year for storage and handling. We are simply producing too much and all previous efforts to achieve the desired balance have failed.

The best advice we can obtain together with our own study of official statistics leads us to the conclusion that we have nationwide about 32.6 million too many acres currently producing wheat, rye, corn, oats, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, and flaxseed. This is a composite figure which takes into account an estimated deficit, for example, of about 3.6 million acres of oats and 0.9 million acres of flax last year.

Assuming the accuracy of this figure, and we believe it is reasonably accurate, the next step was to devise a sure means of taking this much land out of production at no cost to the taxpaying public.

Nationwide we have about 430 million acres of cropland now in production. About 136 million acres of this cropland is in hay and pasture, or 29.6 percent of the total. However, this percentage of total cropland in hay and pasture ranges from a statewide average of 13.1 percent in Kansas, to 85.8 percent in Vermont. North Dakota averages 15.6 percent of its total cropland in hay and pasture: Washington, 18.9 percent; Georgia, 20.2 percent; Montana, 20.8 percent; Illinois, 21 percent; Colorado, 21 percent; North Carolina, 22 percent; South Carolina, 23 percent; Delaware, 23.1 percent; Texas, 24.3 percent; and Minnesota, 24.3 percent.

Within the States the percentage of cropland in hay and pasture also varies widely. I have listed the States in ascending order up to and including Minnesota because I have more details about my own State. In my district, for example, I have two big-producing counties which have an average of 7 and 9 percent of their cropland now in hay and pasture. Obviously, the range within these counties is from zero to a few dairies with substantial acreage of hay and pasture.

The point I want to make is that we calculated this as best we could and came to the conclusion that 20 percent was about as reliable a figure as could be determined without intensive study of the latest census data when it becomes available. Experts in the field gave us estimates that ranged from a low of about 15 percent to a high of about 25 percent and from this we conclude that our 20-percent figure is fairly accurate. In addition, we anticipate that hearings on the bill would develop information which would either confirm this figure or lead to a more precise percentage for the green acres program.

It is our considered judgment that the establishment of this minimum figure of 20 percent of the cropland on every farm would probably raise the national average about 8 percent which would take out of crop production about 34 million additional acres. If so, and allowing for the fact that a good farmer would often select his poorer land for the purpose, we believe we would be within striking distance of balanced production.

MUST BE ABSOLUTELY ENFORCIBLE

One further point on this section. Everyone we discussed this with advised us that it must be absolutely enforcible. To make it effective we have put some real teeth into it by providing a penalty of 50 percent of the total production on any farm not in compliance with the green acres provision. This penalty would be in the amount of one-half the value of the violator's total production the year of his noncompliance

and we believe there will be little or no noncompliance.

Section 4 provides a vital incentive insofar as farmers and our rural economy are concerned. Under this section price supports on all the commodities listed would be set at 80 percent of parity the first 2 years, at 85 percent the next 2 years, and at 90 percent of parity thereafter. If our calculations are accurate, and we believe they are, the market will rise steadily in the next few years and the level of price supports will follow it up. In this section we propose in 5 years to restore the general level of farm commodity prices to the level from which they have fallen steadily in the last 10 years. The step-by-step increase will avoid sharp disruptions in our whole agricultural economy and we believe it is entirely practical to move back up in this manner.

PAYMENT-IN-KIND

Section 5 contains the provisions for the liquidation of present surpluses; the maintenance of an adequate supply for the protection of consumers, world markets, and food-for-peace programs; and the balancing of farm production in the future. The payment-in-kind program is to be entirely optional with the producer, but we have purposely set the rate at 80 percent of average, normal yields to make it attractive to producers. In addition, we have set a maximum of 50 percent of any farm which may be temporarily retired from production in the interests of farm families and the local economies. I have never wanted to see whole farms retired from production for any reason and we propose to prevent that in this program.

As one of the original coauthors of the conservation reserve program, I have consistently opposed the retirement of whole farms via this program.

As is provided in most of the other payment-in-kind proposals, our bill calls for a complete retirement of the acreage for which 80 percent of normal yield certificates are issued. These certificates will be valued as of the time of issue and will be completely negotiable. They can be used as collateral for credit. They can be surrendered in exchange for CCC stocks. They may also be sold to a neighbor or a local elevator for cash. When finally surrendered, these certificates would be exchanged for surplus stocks owned by the Government. However, these stocks would not be eligible for price supports. The retired land may either be put under protective cover with ACP assistance, left black if that is the proper thing to do from a conservation standpoint, or put under wildlife cover. However, no harvest of crops or hay would be permitted except in emergencies authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture.

There is also another payment-in-kind feature in this section relative to the "green acres" retired from grain production under section 3.

To protect the livestock economy against a flood of cheap hay, we authorize an optional 25 percent of normal yield payment-in-kind for the complete retirement of this land. This has been set at this particular rate so the farmer who has livestock and needs the hay can utilize his "green acres" and the farmer who does not need the hay or pasture can completely retire that land in return for the 25 percent of normal yield payment-in-kind. We also have reason to believe that once the present surpluses have been liquidated this feature alone might well serve to maintain the balance in production we seek under the terms of our bill. If so, the total cost would be very low because of the relatively low payment rate of 25 percent.

In this section we also afford a measure of protection to the grain trade and storage industry by directing that commodities redeemed with payment-in-kind certificates shall to the maximum extent practicable be from CCC stocks in bin sites or other Government facilities before withdrawing from commercial warehouse facilities. In addition, I would like to report that our Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee held several meetings in the Midwest on the storage question and we were told by responsible country elevator operators that they very much preferred the movement of free grain to the storage of CCC stocks as the trade in free grain is more profitable to them.

From our inquiries we came to the conclusion that the elevators will find the increased supply of grain in trade channels more to their liking than long-term storage of Government stocks.

This section includes the usual penalty for violations equal to forfeiture of all payments and an additional penalty equal to 50 percent of the amount otherwise due.

Section 6 provides that the acreage diverted either into green acres or by payment in kind shall be in addition to any acreage already in the conservation reserve. In other words, if part of a farm is now in the conservation reserve the balance of the farm would be considered as an entity for the purposes of this legislation and the green acres would have to come out of the remaining cropland in production.

Section 7 assures producers eligibility for ACP cost-share payments on their entire farms, including the green acres and land diverted under payment in kind.

Section 8 provides that the proposed program shall be administered by the farmer-elected committees which are already in existence.

Section 9 directs the Secretary of Agriculture to transmit annual reports to the Congress in order that the operations of the green acres program may be constantly reviewed. In addition, it provides that any increase in the percentage of cropland required under the green acres provision shall first be approved by Congress and then submitted to producers in another nationwide referendum. However, if we have been reasonably accurate in the determination of this percentage, it is unlikely that such action would be necessary at any time in the near future.

Section 10 guarantees to cotton, peanut, rice, tobacco, and wheat producers that no terms of this measure shall in any way affect their present programs of acreage allotments, marketing quotas, or price supports except for the 80 percent of parity price support floor under wheat.

In the first place, I would not undertake to offer legislation affecting these commodities as I know there are better authorities in the Congress representing these particular producers. However, I do want to call attention to the fact that the green acres program would be of considerable economic value to the producers of cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco, from the standpoint of higher price supports for the grains they produce on their farms.

ILLUSTRATIVE CHARTS

That, Mr. Chairman, is a section-by-section summary of the bill. I would now like to call our colleagues' attention to the four charts we have prepared which illustrate the prospective impact of this proposal upon the production and income of a representative 320-acre midwestern grain farm. These charts may be readily adjusted to various crops as well as larger or smaller farms. The 320-acre farm is simply illustrative of the program.

The first chart shows that farm in virtually all-out production in 1960 under the present program. You will note that we have estimated 25 acres for buildings, lots, roads, wastelands, and so forth, and, to be conservative, have shown 35 acres already in alfalfa. On the balance we show 160 acres of corn, producing 9,600 bushels, worth about $1 per bushel this year; 59 acres of soybeans, producing 1,500 bushels, worth about $1.73 per bushel; and 50 acres of barley, producing 1,500 bushels, worth about 70 cents a bushel. In the lower left-hand corner of the chart we show an approximation of the surplus produced on that farm, and these figures are based on the actual percentage of each commodity now in surplus production. On the right-hand side of the chart we show the total gross income in the amount of $13,800 for this all-out production.

The second chart shows that same farm in 1961 under the "green acres" program with 80 percent of parity price supports. Since this is primarily a grain-producing farm, we assume, as an illustration, that the farmer will take full advantage of the program. First, he will have to put a total of 59 acres into the green acres program. For this he may elect to receive the 25 percent of normal yield payment in kind for wildlife cover, or 885 bushels of CCC corn. Then he will be eligible to retire an additional 88.5 acres completely, for which he will receive a payment-in-kind certificate worth 4,228 bushels of corn. On his remaining acres we assume he will plant 100 acres of corn, yielding 6,000 bushels, with a price support of about $1.30; 27.5 acres of soybeans, yielding 825 bushels, with price supports at about $2.25 per bushel; and 20 acres of barley, yielding 600 bushels, with price supports at about 96 cents a bushel. At present rates of consumption, this farm would not be producing enough to meet current mar-

ket demands, and we would begin to eat into the surplus stocks held by the Government at public cost. From the income standpoint, you will note that the total gross income on that farm would rise to about $15,856—an increase of $2,000 above the previous year with reduced costs of production.

In addition, may I point out in all of these charts that the payments in kind made available to producers would in every instance assure that much minimum cash income regardless of weather or crop conditions. Since these certificates will be issued in the early spring, this cash income will contribute greatly to the whole rural economy and will help insure against local economic disasters as a result of crop failures.

Now, if you will refer to the third chart, you will find that farm producing the same crops as shown on the second chart, but this will be in 1963, when price supports go up to 85 percent of parity and the total gross income goes up to $17,139—another $1,300 with no increase in costs of production.

Then, if you will refer to the final chart illustrating the situation in 1965 you will find that we have liquidated the surpluses and that farm is back into full production with 90 percent of parity price supports and a total gross income of about $20,766. Since the costs of production are comparable with those shown in the first chart for 1960 under the present program, you can readily see that the gross income on this farm will have risen a total of about $7,000 or more than 50 percent with no additional costs to the producer or the taxpayers. With the surpluses liquidated and supply in balance the operator of this farm will contribute to the total output approximately his proportionate share of the market need and the 90 percent of parity price supports will function as an orderly marketing device at little or no cost to the taxpayers.

Although farmers are at all times to farm as they please under the "green acres" program, it should be noted that after the surpluses have been liquidated there will not even be a payment-in-kind program for those commodities which are not currently in surplus. The green acres provision will remain permanently in effect, except for national emergencies, to help maintain the overall balance of production with the payments in kind operating to adjust temporary imbalances between commodities.

COST LITTLE OR NOTHING

May I also emphasize the fact that the entire program proposed in our bill will cost the taxpayers little or nothing more than the costs of administration and the release of surplus CCC stocks which are worthless for all practical purposes and are actually costing us about $600 million a year to store. I have not had time to calculate the savings that would be accomplished under the terms of our bill but I can assure our colleagues from my years of experience on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee that the savings in total costs would be enormous, not to mention the nationwide benefits that would accrue from a prosperous and healthy farm economy.

Since the green acres bill was introduced last week, we have had a most gratifying response from other Members of Congress, spokesmen for farm organizations, and the public as a whole. However, some questions have been raised relative to our contention that the program will cost the taxpayers little or nothing other than the costs of administration and I would like to discuss that briefly.

In the first place, I do not believe the costs of administration would be substantially increased over the level of recent years because we will, by the operation of the proposed program, actually reduce and eventually eliminate some past administrative costs.

For example, the costs of care and custody of commodities in the bin sites throughout rural America will be rapidly eliminated by the distribution of these stocks as payment-in-kind.

As indicated on page 754, part 3, of our hearings, the current annual costs to the taxpayers for handling of surplus wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, and rye were as follows: $717 million for transportation, $105 million for receiving and loading out, $415 million for 12 months' storage, and $192 million for interest at a rate of 4 percent on our total investment in these commodities. In other words, in addition to the initial investment of $3½ billion in these five commodities, we are faced with an annual cost of another $1.4 billion bringing our total investment in those commodities to better than $5 billion. With the green acres program in full operation there should be virtually no surplus production and, if this were the case, we could save the $5 billion otherwise invested in the acquisition, storage, and handling of these five commodities.

Now, a word about the liberal payment-in-kind proposal in our bill. We have purposely made it liberal and would be willing to set it at a full 100 percent of average normal yield except for the fact that we want to reduce the quantity of grain on the market by that additional 20 percent. We believe the 80-percent figure will be a strong incentive for participation, and that is what we want.

SURPLUS DISPOSAL PROGRAMS

We must not lose sight of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that the $9 billion worth of surplus agricultural commodities owned by the Government are, for all practical purposes, worthless. Before anyone criticizes our proposal to release these stocks to farmers via the 80 percent of normal yield payment-in-kind route, let me remind them that agricultural commodities are not the only surpluses owned by our Government.

In fiscal year 1959, the Federal Government disposed of more than $6 billion worth of surplus stocks other than agricultural commodities. We sold $2.1 billion worth of surplus for a cash price of $99.6 million. In addition, we sold as scrap for $66 million another quantity of surplus property which had an original cost of about $4 billion. On top of that, we gave away by donations to health, educational, and civil defense organizations some $229.5 million worth of surplus property. In other words, in the disposal of other surplus property owned by the Federal Government we have realized less than 3 cents for each dollar initially invested and that is little short of actually giving it away.

In the case of American agriculture, we propose the exchange of surplus farm commodities—already bought and paid for—in return for a reduction in production in the interests of our total economy.

If the Congress is genuinely concerned about the plight of farm people, we offer a practical and workable program in our green acres proposal.

If the Congress is constructively interested in restoring the rural market for commodities manufactured and processed throughout the Nation, we suggest this means of raising the level of farm income.

If the Congress shares our concern regarding the rising costs of acquiring, storing, and disposing of surplus agricultural commodities, we offer a means of virtually eliminating that costly operation.

If the Congress recognizes the desirability of maintaining necessary reserves for the protection of consumers, for distribution to needy and deserving people at home and abroad, and for the stability of our whole agricultural economy, we present this proposal for balanced production.

If the Congress shares our desire to solve this costly problem of surplus production which depletes our soil and demoralizes our economy, then we ask that consideration be given at this session to the Andersen-Jensen green acres program.

The President in his message to Congress on May 3, 1960, said:

> I still believe that America's farmers prefer, as certainly I do, the development of legislation which will promote progress for them toward economic equality and permit them the maximum freedom.

We respectfully refer the attention of the administration to our proposal which we believe will restore our farm economy to its proper level and will do so within the confines of the President's language I have just quoted.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield to my good friend from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. The American farmer has no better friend than H. CARL ANDERSEN of Minnesota. It has been my privilege and honor to serve with this subcommittee for 6 years; and during that time I have witnessed the interest of my friend CARL ANDERSEN in all matters concerning agriculture.

I want to commend the gentleman on the fine statement he has made and to inquire as to whether or not in the opinion of the gentleman this is a sound bill from the standpoint of conservation?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I thank my colleague for his very kind remarks; and I may say to him that conservationists have already approached

the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and myself, and they have told us they were delighted with this approach to the farm problem. It is very definitely a conservation program. That is my answer to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. WHITTEN. I wish to say to the membership that in all the years I have had the privilege of serving with our friend, H. CARL ANDERSEN, no one has worked more unceasingly for the interest of American agriculture and the American farmer.

CARL ANDERSEN knows farm problems first-hand. He has had many years of experience here, and in the dealings with agriculture his interests have been sincere and never political. I wish to say to him that his bill which he has so ably discussed, in my opinion, would be a very great improvement over the laws we now have.

I do not want to make this comment without including, also, our friend on the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the joint author of this bill. I have had the privilege of serving with both these gentlemen. I have served under the chairmanship of CARL ANDERSEN, and it has been said it did not make much difference which of us happened to be presiding officer of the subcommittee. We have worked through and through, and by paying attention here to these two gentlemen because they have sponsored this bill, I do not mean to overlook other members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on my side: FRED MARSHALL, BILL NATCHER, and FRED SANTANGELO for they are sincere members who are interested in the work of agriculture and who give some thought to the economy of the taxpayers as well; nor do I want to overlook my Republican colleagues on the other side, the gentleman from Washington, WALT HORAN, and the gentleman from Illinois, BOB MICHEL. They, too, have this Nation's interest at heart. I want to say that this appropriation bill we have before us today reflects the composite views of this group trying its best to meet the problems as we see them.

I congratulate the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Iowa for having made this very straightforward statement, in calling the attention of the American public to the need in this area and the fine work in the preparation of their bill.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I sincerely appreciate the remarks of my chairman. May I call the attention of the committee to the fact that it was due to the efforts of Mr. WHITTEN, representing the minority, who joined me when I became chairman of the subcommittee and, we, together with Mr. Hope, of Kansas, put into effect the pilot watershed program without departmental or budget approval. This has now become the small watershed protection program. We commenced in this very subcommittee the small watershed protection pilot program. My chairman had the original nub of the idea and that is the way the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and I have developed this particular bill.

We are seizing on all the good ideas. We have stayed back on purpose, we have waited to see what other gentlemen produced, and we are trying to bring together in one package the suggestions made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN], and others. We have taken a number of good ideas from other authors and built them around the mandatory 20 percent that each and every farmer in the Nation must contribute as his share toward a profitable agricultural economy.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I want to point out to the committee that there is a crying need for some approach to a solution of our farm problem that we have before us today. As our chairman of the subcommittee pointed out in his remarks we are picking up the tab for $481 million for storage alone in this particular bill. It is estimated we will pay out $612 million next year for storage alone, none of which helps the farmer very much, and it is estimated next year's expenses in the storage field will be in excess of $700 million.

I want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota for at least coming out with what I think is an idea that ought to be studied fully. I may say to my other colleagues who are interested in wheat and a domestic parity that I am attracted to the outline of a farm program that is outlined in the report.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Will not the gentleman agree with me that we must approach this entire problem of small grains as one? We cannot do it piecemeal. We have found that out.

Mr. HORAN. I realize that there is a conflict in commodities and that does get in the way.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. That is correct. I might say for the benefit of the wheat producers and the wheat men in this Congress that every attempt is made to help them. For example, in this bill we do not say that a man once he has a negotiable certificate in the Corn Belt cannot pull out wheat stocks if he wants it for feed, but it will be on a relative price basis, not bushel per bushel. I might also say that the 15-acre wheat producers are not going to bother about producing 15 acres under this bill. Instead they are going to retire it for payment in kind by taking out 30 percent of their land, and they will pull back other commodity stocks. It is going to help every normal wheat farmer in America to eliminate the 600,000 15-acre farmers on a purely voluntary basis. It is going to benefit everyone concerned.

The gentleman from Washington has pointed out that this is one of the big problems facing us today, and the gentleman is absolutely right. Here it is the middle of May and not a worthwhile thing has been done for agriculture. We are trying by pushing this to at least light a fire and get some action so that back my way we will not have the disconsolate sort of economy we have today and despondent farmers.

Why, that miserable bill passed here 2 years ago happened to deal with corn. A lot of you gentlemen here voted for it. Mr. CANNON, Mr. BROWN of Missouri, and I and the late Mr. Christopher got up and fought it. We said: "Why reduce the price of corn down to a disastrous level and force the farmer to go out and produce corn from fence row to fence row to make a living?" Now, the only friend I know of in Government or elsewhere for that particular bill is Ezra Benson. He is the only man who still says it is good legislation. I fought then against it and I will fight against any principle utilizing our soil to produce 800 million bushels of corn or any other commodity that we do not need only to put it in tin cans and bring about enormous storage charges and consequent deterioration. It is not a good program for the wheat and corn producers in the Midwest. God help us if that is the best we can do here. That is why I have taken this hour today. And, this is the first time I have taken an hour under this bill, even though I have been the ranking member on the committee for a good many years. The time is getting late. The hour is getting late. Let us remember that.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I would like to commend my colleague and friend from Minnesota for the fine statement that he has made today. I would like to also reiterate that while we drew up the soil bank bill and presented it to the Congress, as my good friend has stated, it was never our intention that entire farms be taken out of production. It was our intention that the production come out of the productive areas of the country to bring about a balanced agriculture. Furthermore, if I might say further, at the time we were working on this bill, we asked the Department of Agriculture for comment on our bill. They sent in a report, and it is interesting to note at this time that they said that in order for that program to be effective it would cost in the neighborhood of $500 million annually. Since that time we have spent over $2 billion on a program that is in effect now on conservation reserve, which I personally do not agree with, because it has taken out lots of marginal land. It is not reaching the productive land of this country. We had occasion to visit some of the Midwest areas, and we know that last year we produced a 4-billion-bushel corn crop, the first time in history, in this country. And, they have told us that they were doing everything that they could to add more corn acres in this next year to the production. So I say to my good friend and colleague and Members of the House that next year we will have increasingly more difficulty in corn production, and 2 years from now you can expect the Government to blow its top off if we have anywhere near a normal crop year. My good friend and

colleague has recognized that, and he has put in a lot of work on this proposal, as has my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], because both of these gentlemen come from areas that see what is happening to this corn and feed production, and both have been stalwart promoters of soil conservation. They both know by experience that you are placing a burden on the soil, robbing the soil of the fertility to produce commodities that we do not have need for, and unless something unforeseen changes that trend, it will wreck the livestock and poultry industry in this country.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I thank my colleague from Minnesota. And, I say this, that he is absolutely right in his reference to our first idea of what the soil bank should be. The gentleman will remember that he and I were the first ones in the Congress to use that term "soil bank" away back in 1954. It has not operated along the line that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] and I intended that it should be operated, but if it had, we today would not be in the agricultural fix we are in. We never intended that we should take whole farms out of production and destroy the economy of the small communities by too many of these farms going out. We never intended that for a couple of years, at least, the soil bank program should be a field day for speculators.

We thought we had a good idea, but I do not care how good an idea is, Mr. Chairman, if you do not have the proper administration of any program you might as well throw it out of the window. We did not for the first 2 years, at least, have the proper administration of the conservation reserve.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say this further. I do have hopes for the green acres program because I know that the present Secretary of Agriculture will have nothing to do with its operation if it becomes law. He has only a few months left in office.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. I was going to say that had the proposal that my colleague and I made been put into effect, we would not be facing the problem of a 9 billion bushel surplus in stocks of Commodity Credit, nor would we be paying around $600 million in storage costs this year. And that $600 million is more than that program was estimated to cost to do the job when the gentleman and I proposed it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. First I want to commend the gentleman for coming forward with a bill. There have been so many people who criticize everything that comes up but they never come forward with a bill of their own or with anything constructive. Also I want to concur in what was said by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] and in the gentleman's own comments concerning corn. We are going to have this year alone from the 1959 carryover 600 million bushels of corn. That is one-third as much as was accumulated in all the previous years put together. That is the first year under this program that the gentleman has been talking about.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Will the gentleman further agree that in this crop year 1960 the farmers of America are going to put 85 million acres into corn, and 20 million acres of that we have no need for whatsoever?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Seed corn salesmen just this weekend told me that they have sold more than 5 percent more seed corn this year than last year.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. The gentleman mentions seed corn salesmen. I had only three objectors among the 400 business people and farmers with whom I discussed this proposal just 3 weeks ago back in Minnesota and Illinois. Two of those gentlemen were big cattle feeders who do not produce enough corn for their own needs. They honestly said that they were afraid that corn was going to go up and they would not make quite so much profit. The other gentleman was a seed corn dealer who was afraid that he would not be able to sell the amount of seed corn he had for several years. But all three of these men did not stop to look ahead into the future.

Mr. Chairman, I want to close on this. Unless we do something about this, the beef cattle men are going to go down with the feed grain people; there is no question about it. Seven years ago I said to Mr. Benson, "Don't you realize that cheap feed will eventually mean cheap livestock?" He said that I was wrong. But I think in the last year or two he has come at least part way toward my line of thinking.

The beef cattle men had better get back of some proposal like this and not insist on 75- and 80-cent corn unless they want to see their whole operation hit the economic skids.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say in conclusion why I am proud to have the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] join me in the introduction of this bill. There has been no man in the Congress more interested in soil conservation than has the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. All through this green acres bill you see "conservation." I am happy that I have a man of his caliber standing along with me urging the Congress to adopt this proposed legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I do want to say, however, that I wish I could share the gentleman's optimism in the idea that there is no one but Mr. Benson for this corn program. I have found quite a few among our colleagues.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. If the gentleman will permit, let me say there are perhaps a few other misguided souls.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions if the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. As I understand it, the gentleman does recognize that lower price supports do not actually reduce production because he says you should go to 80 and then 85 and then 90 percent of parity?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Absolutely.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Also, as I understand it, you do not have any requirement on the referendum that one must have been a producer of any certain amount of a commodity.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Yes; 3 years out of 5, then that man has the right to vote.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. In what quantity?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. If any man produces wheat, corn, all these other grains, and has a crop history of 3 years out of the last 5, then he is entitled to vote in that referendum.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. What if I produce only 1 acre?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. That is all right.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Just any small amount?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. That is all right.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. You can get down to a few stalks.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Not if you get down so far that you are not a farmer. Our bill refers to producers.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. My point is that there must be some kind of referendum.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. That is provided in our bill. I recognize and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] recognizes that certainly the legislative Committee on Agriculture on a proposition like this will have to work it over. There are many refinements to be made. We do not hold any pride of authorship, but we are holding up this green acres provision as perhaps the answer to the most vexing farm question that has been before this Congress for years. Certainly I would not anticipate that this bill would be voted out without a number of worthwhile amendments. I just hope if it does come in it will maintain in it that green acres mandatory provision, because that in the first place balances production that year with demand. It is the heart of our proposal.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I understand according to the gentleman's charts here he is proposing to reduce corn acreage by 40 percent in the first year.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. No; there is no such proposal.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The charts are not in accordance with that proposal?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. That chart is merely representative of a half-section grain farm much like my own farm in Minnesota.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The point is, you do have to get rid of the corn in the bin?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. After you get rid of the corn in the bin, then the demand in the market is going to take care of all the farmer can produce. Remember, the green acres is still in effect.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The gentleman does not think any other program is necessary, then?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. No. The green acres will do the job outside of a small Commodity Credit Corporation stock that would take care of the temporary imbalances. Sometimes you might produce 100 or 200 million bushels too much of corn. The price of soybeans would go up. Next year people would go into soybeans or barley where they could make more money. The market would do much to balance production, and a small payment-in-kind program would help make the necessary adjustments.

One of the most attractive features of the green-acres proposal is the fact that it would afford our farmers virtually complete freedom in the operation of their farms.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. As one who raised some question about that poultry inspection bill when it was before the House, and concerned as I was that it would cost a lot of money and it really was not necessary for the protection of the health of the people of the country, I would like to have the chairman of the subcommittee restate the proposition. Do I understand correctly that inspections that have been conducted—that no part of those inspections has shown anything that would be injurious to the public health?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. We have full inspection of the poultry that is handled at time of slaughter. But the law as it stands, beginning July 1, provides that we would have to have an inspector at every further processing plant where there is a piece of meat in the package. And 2 out of 300 have asked for that inspection, because by getting that they get a label. They would like the Government to pick up the cost of it.

Mr. HALLECK. What is that cost per year?

Mr. WHITTEN. About a million dollars. We have learned from the processors that they want it so that they can get a label. But the law is compulsory. It says we have to provide the money. We provide it on this basis and we think that in view of the record this is ample to meet the needs.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. We felt that what we were facing was almost double inspection of products already inspected.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, it certainly is, as I see it.

Mr. HORAN. I think the House ought to know that our total bill for meat and poultry inspection is in excess of $33 million a year, and it is an item that we thought we ought to take a look at.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks I wish to compliment the members of this committee for the good job they have done in bringing this most difficult bill to the floor of the House in the condition in which we find it today. It is a big job to initiate appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, especially under present circumstances.

I have served on the Committee on Appropriations with all the members of this committee, and I hold them all in the highest regard.

I came to Congress with my very able colleague from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN]. We have worked very closely together on all matters pertaining to farm problems, and every other problem that affects the welfare of our country. CARL ANDERSEN is a statesman of the highest order. Also the very able gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. I know his heartbeat. I know he is sincere in all of his duties as are the other members of the committee. I hold them all in high esteem.

I am very pleased especially about the appropriations for Soil Conservation Service and Watersheds, for the amount of funds which the committee recommends. America receives more present and long-time benefits from this service than from any other Federal agency. It seems there are some folks in the Department of Agriculture who are not properly sold on the great value of the Soil Conservation Service, because Soil Conservation Service request for funds is regularly trimmed down before it gets to the Budget Bureau. Now I am certain I speak for a great majority of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle when I commend the committee for the amount provided in this bill for Soil Conservation Service. I have never been accused by my colleagues of wasting the taxpayers' dollars, but I try not to be pennywise and pound foolish.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to use the balance of my time to explain our green acres farm program, which is a new approach to the solution of the vexing farm problem, which has, as you know, been proposed by Congressman H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, and myself. Mr. ANDERSEN has just most ably and correctly explained our bill to the House in full detail.

Our plan is known as the green acres farm program, and is the result of many months of study, investigation and discussion with scores of farmers, farm organizations, farm editors, county extension agents, ASC and SCS officials, and livestock feeders.

Our bills, which are identical, were introduced on May 1, last. Congressman ANDERSEN'S bill number is H.R. 12000, and is H.R. 12001. We are pleased to report that our bill has already met with much nationwide approval.

In the time allotted me I will point out the most important provisions of our bill.

The cornerstone of our green acres farm program is the requirement, after approval in a single nationwide referendum, that every farmer producing corn, oats, barley, soybeans, flax, and all other feed grains, and also wheat, in order to qualify for the benefits under our bill, must have 20 percent of his cropland in grass, hay, or pasture, green acres, so to speak.

To protect the livestock industry, every farmer will be offered 25 percent of his normal yield in payment-in-kind out of Government surpluses if he completely retires his green acres which constitute 20 percent of his total cropland, or he can use his retired acres for pasture hay, and so forth, and receive no pay on such acres.

Farmers who already have 20 percent or more or cropland under green cover would be immediately eligible for the green acres program.

Congressman ANDERSEN is the top minority member on the subcommittee which appropriates for the Department of Agriculture and all of its programs, and I am next to the top minority member on the full 50-member Appropriations Committee. Both of us have constantly advocated measures to conserve our soil, and to increase the farm income.

Early this year Congressman ANDERSEN, Congressman HOEVEN and I introduced a payment-in-kind bill for corn alone. It won much nationwide approval, and that acceptance led me into this present collaboration with my neighboring colleague, Mr. ANDERSEN, himself a farm operator at Tyler, Minn. I was raised on the farm, and for 24 years dealt almost exclusively with farmers in the retail lumber business in Exira, Iowa, my home, and since coming to Congress I have worked closely with farmers and can understand their problems.

Congressman ANDERSEN recently spent 2 weeks in the Middle West meeting with hundreds of farmers in all lines of production, and with many other interested people, and he is pleased to report that with hardly a single exception they approved our green acres program, said it was economically realistic and predicted its success if made law, which we sincerely hope it will be during this session of Congress.

The best agriculture experts we know have assured us the green acres program would in the first year bring about a balance between production and consumption of these grains. The farmer would make his green acres contribution in return for the other liberal benefits provided in our bill, and which would stabilize all farm prices on a much higher level.

To liquidate the huge price-depressing surpluses now stored at huge cost, we provide an additional payment-in-kind equal to 80 percent of each farmer's average yield for other cropland taken completely out of production, not to exceed one-half of the whole farm. We

can afford to pay the farmers liberally for reducing production when such payment is made in kind. The participant can either use such grain, or cash in his Government certificate at his elevator or bank.

Outside the green acres, our bill provides that each farmer could produce any and all of these grains, and receive a price support of 80 percent of parity the first 2 years, 85 percent the next 2, and 90 percent thereafter. Both ANDERSEN and I have been stanch supporters of 90 percent of parity for basic farm crops. With no surplus production, this price support schedule will cost the taxpayer very little, as you can see, when commodities on hand are used in lieu of cash outlay. The county ASC office has a history record for every farm in their respective county, hence administration costs will be about the same as at present.

In a few years, after present surpluses have been liquidated, American farmers, except for their green acres, could go back into full production with a parity market demand for everything they produce. We must always maintain an ever normal granary as a necessary reserve to protect the public against an emergency.

Figures furnished in support of any proposed farm program are convincingly in favor of the green acre program.

Using a 160-acre Iowa farm, for example, our best estimate of the average gross income for 1960 under the present farm program will be about $7,000. Under the green acres program in 1961, at 80 percent of parity, we estimate the gross farm income would be not less than $8,000, with a reduced cost of production due to the decreased crop acreage. In 1963, when price supports go up to 85 percent of parity, the same 160-acre farm will again produce no surpluses and we estimate a gross income of approximately $9,500. Finally in 1965, that same farm should gross not less than $11,000 due to increased prices for grain and livestock, and will be back in full production, less the green acres. Supports will be at 90 percent of parity. Production will constantly be in balance with consumption.

Farmers should have first priority to purchase Government storage bins, as such bins become empty.

This increased income is bound to come, not only because of higher grain prices, but also because of the higher hog, cattle, sheep and poultry and egg prices, which higher grain prices will generate. We believe hog prices, for example, will hit a top of at least $24 per hundredweight within a year after our bill is made law.

It will not be difficult for every farmer to calculate his increased income under the green acres program by applying the above figures proportionately to his own operations; and remember our bill is truly a family sized farm program.

We feel certain that within 5 years after our bill is made law, the green acres program will raise the average gross income on Iowa farms 50 percent, and in other States proportionately, because it will bring about a balance in production, will liquidate the present surpluses, and secure for the farmer and the rural businessman their fair share of our national income.

Congressman ANDERSEN and I, and other proponents of our bill, have urged the Agriculture Committees of Congress to approve our bill and to bring it to the floor of the House and Senate for early consideration, and we hope for its adoption during this session to assure its full operation in 1961. Everyone who is interested in the farm problem should waste no time in letting their Congressman know the kind of a farm program they believe will best solve this vexing problem for them and for all America. We feel certain that after a study of our green acres farm program, it will be the choice of the great majority.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. While we were formulating this bill I recall that often the gentleman was concerned about any possible deleterious effect it might have upon beef cattle and beef products.

Mr. JENSEN. Right.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. The price of beef cattle and so forth. The gentleman, of course, knows he and I have agreed in our consultations on this with other men that we put the support price on corn up to $1.30 a bushel instead of 98 cents, which is prevalent now in western Iowa and Minnesota. This price would make any farmer stop and think whether or not he wanted to increase his hog production because certainly no farmer wants to produce hogs just for the fun of it; it is a lot of work. I have produced a lot on my own farm. Consequently it would mean farmers are not going to produce so many hogs as they would with dollar corn in sight. Then the goal will be about 5 million fewer hogs a year instead of the much higher number that will be produced in 1960.

The fact that 5 million hogs are not produced in turn will help the entire beef market. That is the conclusion we have come to, is it not?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right. Naturally, I am greatly interested in the welfare of the hog and cattleman because the district I have the honor to represent is one of the largest hog producing and cattle feeding areas in the Nation.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. And the gentleman's district is also a family-sized farm district?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; and our bill is purely a family-sized farm program.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What does the gentleman's bill do with respect to foreign imports of meat products?

Mr. JENSEN. I wish we could stop that in this bill, but we cannot. That is legislation not appropriations as the gentleman knows we are not a legislative committee. I may say I share the gentleman's concern about the great amount of imports shipped into this country which is helping to depress farm prices no end. I am ready to raise tariffs, and plenty, to protect not only our farmers, but businesses and labor too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to pay tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], for his tremendous work on this subcommittee and for the solicitude he has shown to the members of the committee, and especially to me, not only in the asking of questions in order to educate a city member of the committee, but also to develop a program which will be beneficial both to the farmers and to the consumer.

I also want to commend the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN], and Mr. MARSHALL, who have taken a city boy in tow in the rural electrification program, in the rice paddies of Asia, and in the pens among the hogs and the pigs and the cattle in Nebraska and Illinois. Likewise, I extend my thanks and appreciation to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] for his continual assistance, and help and for the information which is basic to farm problems and which a city representative would not normally understand.

I come to you to talk about a farm appropriation bill and ask you to support it. I support this bill because I believe that it is in the interest of the farmer as well as in the interest of the consumer throughout the United States.

As a representative from the city of New York, I would like to speak to city representatives who I know feel erroneously that there has been a giveaway to the farmers and that the farmers are getting rich in the collection of storage charges of surplus grains. Insofar as payments for storage are concerned, let me state to you gentlemen from my observation and study of conditions in Illinois and in Iowa and in reading the various committee reports, that it is not the farmer who is collecting the high storage payments. Those who are profiting from the high and excessive storage rates which are a disgrace to this administration and to the United States belong to an industry whose profits have been so abnormally high that a new gang of "quick-buck" artists have entered into the industry. Because of our Government's guarantee of storage business and administrative policies which direct that grains be stored in commercial bins instead of in Government bins regardless of the availability of Government bins, storage costs have zoomed to $600 million a year. This Government policy must be ended.

Perhaps in the past there have been some farm programs which have been wasteful and did not accomplish the desired result. When we eliminated the acreage reserve program, we eliminated, in my opinion, a very expensive and wasteful program. There are still some wasteful farm programs, but as I see

it, they are at a minimum. The committee made some recommendations along these lines.

This appropriation bill reduces the request of the President's budget totaling $4,135,263,190 by $170,481,690 and recommends the sum of $3,964,781,500. The committee has decided not to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the extent of $98,500,000. The committee has demanded an investigation of the storage rates, obtained such an investigation, and after the report was submitted to the committee and discussion had with the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture announced that despite the opposition of the warehouse industry, that it is reducing storage rates by 19 percent, which will thereby reduce the total cost of storage rates by $98,500,000.

I would like to point out to the city representatives that this bill is approximately $4 billion. The farmer receives direct price support, which is measured by the amount we restore the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The total amount of capital impairment ment which we have restored in this appropriation bill amounts to $1,226,500,000, which is the direct support which the farmers receive in one form or another. The remaining sum contained in this appropriation bill is spent for benefits which are mixed. Benefits which not only the farmer, but also the city worker and friendly foreigners receive.

The mixed benefits can be classified in four categories. One is the improvement and protection of the public health, such as the inspection of meat and poultry, where we have appropriated $21,562,000 for meat inspection and $500,000 more than last year for poultry inspection. We have, furthermore, the school lunch program with its direct appropriation of $110 million in cash and $45 milllion by transfer of funds from section 32, in addition to transfer of surplus foods. We also have, as you know, the special milk program, costing $75 milllion, which goes to many people on public assistance, and we have donations of food supply to needy folk.

A second category is the improvement of international relations and in defense, such as donations to needy people abroad, emergency famine relief, sales for foreign currency and bartered materials for stockpiles, such as wheat to Brazil in exchange for thorium and rare earths. While we must restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation for these items, and these items are listed in the report as reimbursement for special activities totaling $1,443,634,000, we recognize that these expenditures serve the farmer indirectly and serve our international policy whatever that might be.

A third category of mixed benefits to our farmer and other economic segments of our population is the improvement of marketing systems, such as marketing inspections and freight rate service, which in this bill amounts to $43,143,000.

A fourth is the improvement in conservation of our Nation's natural resources, our land, in the prevention of floods, in agricultural conservation, and in technical assistance in conserving land under the soil conservation program. These programs, you will note in the committee report, cost $143,132,000.

Members of the House, these are mixed benefits. They benefit not only the farmer, whose total gross income last year has once again fallen, but also benefits our city people, our schoolchildren, our welfare recipients, and, yes, even some of our senior citizens. They also benefit the friendly foreigners whose support we seek, by our mutual security program, and by these programs. We, from the cities, must not therefore conclude that this farm appropriation bill is a one-way street. Our interests, economic and national, are intertwined, and inasmuch as I deplore the attitude of the city Representatives that price supports are giveaways to the farmer, I deplore the attitude of the farm Representatives and rural Representatives that funds for housing and depressed areas are socialistic and giveaways. We, in the cities and in the farm belt, have a common concern in preserving our national resources whether it be in the form of preservation of farms or in the protection of our water supplies. We have a common interest in aiding our people in the depressed areas of the country and our people who reside in the big cities.

We know from experience that if the farmer suffers and cannot sell his crops or commodities, he loses the purchasing power which is so necessary for him to buy the equipment to work his farm and to buy the machinery which the manufacturers of New Jersey, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania produce. We know that if the farmers go broke, they cannot buy the refrigerators, the televisions, the electrical appliances and the clothing which are produced in the factories of New York and the mills of New England, and now in some of the garment factories in the Southern States along the Atlantic seaboard. If they do not have the funds to purchase these articles, we, in the cities, cannot sell our garments, we cannot sell our appliances, we cannot sell our machinery, so we must suffer, too.

I have made during the hearings an inquiry as to the extent of the connection between the city residents and the farmers. I have been astounded to see how many appliances the 4,200,000 household membership of the REA has purchased. I direct your attention to volume 4 of the hearings of this year, pages 95–110. These will disclose the extent of the connection. This program of electrification by the REA of our farms has generated $14 billion worth of private business, with the manufacturing companies in the industrial areas of our country's selling and the farmer's buying. Without such program, I wonder how many more depressed areas we would have like the district of Congressman BAILEY, of West Virginia, or Congressman FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, or Congressman KILBURN, of New York. I am certain that there would be many.

I have looked about to find out the reason for the high prices to the consumer to determine whether the direct subsidies to the farmer is causing the housewife and the consumer to pay a higher price for the food commodities. From my inquiry I say that the fault lies not in the amount of price supports or money that the farmers are getting, but in the distribution of our surpluses, in the costs which are saddled on the price which the farmer gets. Reliable information indicates that the farmer receives only 38 cents of the consumer $1. Where does the rest of the money go? It goes in the cost of distribution, it goes in the cost of transportation, it goes in the cost of storage. I take issue with the statement of the spokesman of this administration that we, in the cities, are buying more with our dollar and that we have no reason to complain. Our dollar does not purchase more, when you compare what 1 hour of factory labor can purchase today with what 1 hour of factory labor could buy years ago. I want you to recall that the comparison does not take into consideration the taxes that we have to pay and does not take into consideration the fact that many people are nonfactory workers. We have our service trades, our nonfactory workers, and our senior citizens living on pensions who are suffering with the high level of consumer prices.

Despite price supports on wheat, corn, and other basic commodities, the small farmer must rely in a large measure on a nonfarm income to obtain the necessities of life. Farm income is low, on a real basis or on a comparable basis. Net farm income in the last 7 years has dropped from $14.4 billion to $11 billion. The consequences of low farm income manifest themselves in the flight from the farms, in the decline of small family farms, and in the drop of farm employment to the extent of 1,374,000. The unemployed farmers swell not only the unemployment rolls in the rural areas, but the relief rolls in the cities. We must, therefore, continue our aid to the farmers of the country.

I would like to discuss a program which the parents of the city have contact with and can see tangible results. I refer to the school lunch program, which is of vital importance to the school children in the cities and also to the schoolchildren in the rural areas. This bill provides for an appropriation of $110 million cash payments and $45 million obtained from a transfer of section 32 funds, which as many of you know are the funds which are derived from receipts from taxes on imports. This composite figure of $155 million represents an increase of $1,342,752 over last year's appropriation and is designed to take care of the 500,000 additional children who have enjoyed and are participating in the program since last year. I believe that this program has accomplished its objectives of extending the market for agricultural food commodities and to improve the health and well-being of the Nation's schoolchildren by providing a well balanced school lunch.

In the past 25 years there has been a tremendous expansion in school food services. In the immediate years ahead, there is likely to be further substantial expansion. By 1965 it is expected that 7½ million more children will be attending elementary and secondary schools, pushing total enrollment to the almost unbelievable total of almost 47 million. As new schools are built and as old ones are modernized, more and more school facilities will be available to meet the growing demand for lunches at school. I am pleased to note that the District of Columbia has expanded the program substantially over last year.

I am no farmer, I have no farmers in my district nor do I have any farms in my district except rock gardens and small backyard plots. I do not even represent those crabgrass weekend farmers of suburbia, but I do know and I am firmly convinced that in America there is an economic unity between the man who toils on the farm and the worker who labors in industry.

While I have been asking you to support this bill, I want you to know that in the administration of the farm program and in its allied fields, everything is not going well. The storage problem in the United States is a national disgrace and this administration must assume the blame. I have been in the corn fields of Illinois, I have studied the storage problem in the great State of Iowa where more than one-third of the corn is stored, I have inquired into the storage of wheat, and I state unequivocally that this administration has been wasteful and shamefully prodigal. We have Government bins which are 65 percent utilized. We can build bins which would not be costly. The cost to the Government for the storage of a bushel of grain per year averages about 6½ cents per bushel. Corn has been stored since 1952. This administration has adopted a policy of storing grains in commercial warehouses at a cost of 16½ cents per bushel per year when the cost to the warehousemen is 10 cents per bushel per year and less. As a result of the high profits and practices of the Department of Agriculture of this administration, men have built warehouses with guaranteed storage and have recouped their investments within a period of 1½ years and thereafter everything is profit. These are men who have never been in the warehouse business who render no service except dead storage. The administration has announced after prodding by the committee and after an investigation that it will reduce, commencing July 1, 1961, storage rates by 19 percent or 3 cents per bushel. In 1959 the cost is $481 million in storage rates. In fiscal year 1960 it is estimated that it is going to cost us $612 million. In 1961, if the rates are not reduced, it will cost our Government, through the CCC, $700 million.

Another major criticism is the disinclination or the reluctance of the administration to use the moth ball fleet which we have in the Astoria River in the State of Washington, in the Hudson River in the State of New York, and in the James River in the State of Virginia. We have over 106 ships which can store 34 million tons of wheat at practically no cost, and yet the administration continues its ill-advised policy of maintaining storage in commercial warehouses. Such a policy must and should be discontinued.

I am very pleased that the committee agreed with me on the need for appropriating funds for a soil research center to be located in Cornell University at Ithaca, N.Y. A Senate report had previously recommended that a soil research center should be set up either in Pennsylvania or New York. The Department of Agriculture notwithstanding the Senate recommendation and the admitted need was disinclined to set up such facilities. The committee after listening to testimony from both Republican and Democratic representatives from the State of New York allocated $325,000 for this research center. We know that great benefits to the State of New York, the eastern area of the United States and to soil conservation will result from this appropriation. I am delighted to have played a role in seeing that a needed and beneficial program was provided for in this appropriation bill.

I trust that this appropriation bill will be approved.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for a question; where did the gentleman get the figures on the difference in prices between the amount paid for Government storage and the amount paid for private storage?

Mr. SANTANGELO. There are figures in the record which indicate the cost to the Government. In addition to that, I have had conversations with the directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation as to the storage charges in Government-owned bins. They said it cost 6½ cents per bushel per year. They also said that the warehouse industry indicated in certain circumstances the price goes up to about 10 cents per bushel per year and then goes down to about 6½ cents. Normally the greater the storage the lower the unit cost. However, in the case of some of these big grain warehouses, on 750,000 bushels or better, the price goes back to 10 cents per bushel per year. It does not make sense, but these other figures which the Department of Agriculture has obtained are the figures which the warehouse industry has submitted in their negotiations and are substantially the figures which show that after the reduction they still have a spread of 3½ cents over the maximum cost which they say they are spending in the storing of this grain.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. This is a very important matter as far as my State of Kansas is concerned. I know the gentleman wants to be absolutely fair about this when he points out that the differential in warehousing cost is the difference between 16 cents and 6 cents, but he should also state that even though that 6 cents cost could be proven, or even 11 cents, which is the figure the Department of Agriculture furnished to me—he should recognize the Government warehouse is not charged up with the guarantee of the condition of the grain, as a private warehouseman has been. Government storage is not charged up with the quantity measurement that takes into account shrinkage, which the private warehouseman has to guarantee to the Commodity Credit Corporation, nor taxes paid. There may have been unjustified earnings. I am not taking the position that 16 cents is right, but to be absolutely fair the gentleman should admit these other costs of private industry do not occur to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Under the uniform storage agreement under section 10, there is a provision where if there is spoilage or a danger of deterioration they can ask permission to sell it and dispose of it so as not to incur a loss.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. They told us that the spoilage of grain and corn in these bins is less than a fraction of 1 percent. So the amount of spoilage that has taken place in these bins is an infinitesimal amount.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. So that the RECORD may be straight, does the gentleman agree with the figure given by the Department of Agriculture, that it costs 5.1 cents per bushel for storage and you get less than two-thirds of a cent for shrinkage, so that the cost is over 6 cents, with this item included. That does not include taxes, of course, because the Federal Government does not pay taxes. But is that correct?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I agree with the gentleman.

At this point I would like to commend the gentleman from Iowa for the fine work that he did and the information he elicited during the hearings in Iowa, where he showed the trade practice that the Government was directing them to put into private warehouse. They could just as well have put it in the Government bid and paid the private warehouse the money for storage and thereby saved the matter of moving the grain.

We have the school lunch appropriation, $110 million in cash and $45 million by transfer of funds to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to say to the membership of this House that it is in the American tradition for us to have on our Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations a member such as the gentleman from New York, and I mean

downtown New York. He is a splendid lawyer and a tireless worker, who is interested in the subject. He works untiringly not only in the committee but out in the field. He has more energy than most of our members. He has contributed greatly to the considerations of this subcommittee and he has performed great services not only on the subcommittee but also by his understanding of the problems of the industrial and city areas. He has brought essential balance to this subcommittee, which I think is a tribute to the arrangement which put him on this subcommittee. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO] has done a great service on this committee, a great service; and I am glad to say so.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman comment on the question whether or not grain stored in any of the ships in the mothball fleet would deteriorate, being in ships that are in the water?

Mr. SANTANGELO. The information which I have is that they will not deteriorate. Corn cannot be stored in the mothball fleet, but we can without any difficulty store the wheat. The proof of the pudding is in the storage. They have about 30 ships which are full, but they have 86 which are empty, and they will not use them. I say we should use those ships. They will not spoil if the grain is put in the mothball fleet.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise at this point some of the questions that I raised in the full committee in reference to the report and, more specifically, the various charts at the conclusion of the report that are a summary of the appropriations and authorizations made for the current fiscal year, the budget estimate for fiscal 1961, the amount recommended in the bill for 1961, and then a comparison of the bill before us with the 1960 amounts and the 1961 estimates.

As the chairman of the subcommittee knows, in the full committee I raised a question or two about how the committee report handled the contingency funds in the compilations at the conclusion of the written part of the report. As the gentleman from Mississippi knows, perhaps better than anybody in the House, it has been a practice for some time, I believe, that we have contingencies in this bill that are handled a little differently than contingencies in other appropriation acts. It is my understanding in this report on the bill that we have $100 million in contingencies for the REA loan authorization, $50 million for the electrification part and $50 million for the telephone part. In addition there is a $40 million contingency in the loan authorization portion of the Farmers Home Administration.

Now, as I look at the charts in the committee report I do not see those contingency funds, which total $140 million, as being included in the tabulation. They are footnoted at the bottom of the various pages in the report.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman is correct. That is the way the report is written. I would like to indicate, with the gentleman's permission, the reasoning of the committee. We have carried this for a number of years. For instance, for fiscal year 1960 we had $180 million loan authorization for the Farmers Home Administration and $20 million in the contingency fund. Last year they sent us a budget recommendation for $140 million. We had to increase it because of the demand for loans.

Here again the gentleman refers to our conversation in the whole committee. Now, here is our reasoning, and if the gentleman reads the report, he will understand it, and I think anybody else who reads the report will understand it, so I do not think there is a problem for anybody to find out what the situation is. In our report we spell it out and in our tabulations we spell it out. Here is the reason we do it. If we put the amount plus the contingency in one bill, it would leave us where we were exceeding the budget. If we put it as we have, the budget has to increase itself, in which case we and the budget are still together.

Now, it is a matter of opinion. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, but I say flatly and unequivocally that we do make it possible for them to increase the loan authority in line with what the gentleman said, but they can do it only if the Budget Bureau approves it. And, again, if the Budget Bureau approves it, they have increased the budget. So, that is our reason.

Mr. FORD. May I just point out what appears to me to be certain inconsistencies in the report:

First. In the 1960 column, under REA, the $136 million figure does not include the $25 million contingency amount for electrification, apparently, because it was not released by the Bureau of the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington.

Second. On the other hand, the 1960 REA figure of $104 million for telephone does include the $25 million contingency provided as indicated by footnote 10, apparently because it was used.

Third. In the 1960 column under Farmers Home Administration the contingency amount of $20 million is included in the table and totals as indicated by footnote 7, apparently because it was used.

Fourth. But in the 1961 committee bill column which should represent the amounts recommended, none of the figures included the contingencies totaling $140 million as disclosed by footnotes 8 and 9.

In consequence both the totals for the 2 years and the comparisons tend to be inconsistent in that they do not factually disclose the full amounts provided or recommended either in the tabulation or the footnotes.

Five. As a matter of fact, the argument that 1960 funds were not used cannot be wholly accurate as a statement until after June 30, because we are still in fiscal year 1960.

Another point that I think ought to be discussed is this. I understand that in eight instances throughout the bill items are reappropriated out of fiscal 1960 for utilization in fiscal 1961. For example, on page 6 the language is as follows:

> And any unexpended balances of funds transferred under this head in the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts.

Is there any idea from the hearings how much is involved in that instance or in any of the other eight instances?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that that is an emergency fund which is carried to meet emergency outbreaks of animal diseases and it has saved us many times. We cannot tell in advance how much demand there may be on it. We tried to restore the fund so that they can have it.

The gentleman will remember the emergency outbreak among hogs several years ago. We have had a number of such instances. Also we had the foot-and-mouth disease emergency. There is no way actually to know, so we cannot give exact figures. Agriculture, goodness knows, is charged with so much. If we charged them with something last year that they did not use, I think it is sound to bring it forward instead of counting it against both years. Be that as it may, as bad as this bill is to handle, if we have handled it satisfactory except for the points the gentleman has raised, I think we have done a wonderful job.

Mr. FORD. I know it is a tough job and the gentleman works hard at his responsibility as chairman of the subcommittee. But I think that in these instances where you are reappropriating 1-year funds for the next fiscal year we ought to have some information as to what the amount may be. All of the departments, to my knowledge, do make a forecast of what their unexpended, unobligated balances will be at the end of the fiscal year. Is there anything in the hearings which would give us at least their estimates of what these totals might be?

Mr. WHITTEN. The hearings will disclose that. Except for this emergency matter, we could supply the figures as to what the carry-over would be. In the soil bank, for instance, we brought forward $30 million. Last year when this bill was up everybody was upset because of how much money was in there for the soil bank. Agriculture took all of that wave of publicity about it. Then it developed that they did not spend it. If that money had lapsed, if it had not

been brought forward again we would have been charged with that this year. So, putting the two together, it would have left Agriculture in just that much worse shape in the public eye. So we thought it well to bring it forward, showing that last year we did not go all the way with it and we will use it next year. We have explained it in every instance.

Mr. FORD. I think it is true that when you reappropriate like this and you do not know exactly the amounts, it tends to some fiscal irresponsibility in the Department, particularly when they are 1-year funds.

The following chart or table is included to explain in detail several of the points which I have discussed:

Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1961—Revised comparative statement of appropriations for 1960 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1961

	Appropriations, 1960	Budget estimate, 1961	Recommended in bill for 1961	Bill compared with—	
				1960 appropriations	1961 estimates
Appropriations (p. 51 committee report)	$4,665,643,551	$4,135,263,190	$3,964,781,500	−$700,862,051	[1]−$170,481,690
Loan authorizations (p. 52, committee report)	466,000,000	367,000,000	417,000,000	−49,000,000	+50,000,000
Subtotal, appropriations and authorizations, per report table	5,131,643,551	4,502,263,190	4,381,781,500	−749,862,051	[1]−120,481,690
Add:					
REA loan authorization "contingencies"	[2] 25,000,000		100,000,000	[2]+75,000,000	+100,000,000
FHA loan authorization "contingency"	[2](20,000,000)		40,000,000	[3]+40,000,000	+40,000,000
Total, appropriations and authorizations	5,156,643,551	4,502,263,190	4,521,781,500	−634,862,051	+19,518,310

[1] Some of this committee reduction in new appropriations requested for 1961 is offset by reappropriation for 1961 of prior year balances that otherwise would revert to the Treasury.

[2] Contingency amounts of $50,000,000 authorized for 1960 (Public Law 86-80); $25,000,000 for 1 program only reflected on p. 52 of committee report; contingency amounts of $100,000,000 recommended for 1961 not reflected on p. 52; true comparison of 1961 bill with 1960 act, +$50,000,000.

[3] Contingency amount of $20,000,000 authorized for 1960 reflected on p. 52 of committee report; contingency amount of $40,000,000 recommended for 1961 not reflected on p. 52; true comparison of 1961 bill with 1960 act, +$20,000,000.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, there are several items in this agricultural appropriations bill for 1961 about which I should like to speak very briefly.

The first of these is the agricultural conservation program—a program which I believe to be the very backbone of this Nation's soil and water conservation effort.

I strongly oppose any efforts to effect a reduction in the ACP for 1961.

I oppose any such effort because I firmly believe that it would be a step backwards—a backward step this Nation cannot afford.

Soil is this Nation's greatest natural resource. It is from the soil that we derive our essential food, fiber, and raw products. This soil is a part of our legacy. We inherited it from our forebears and we have a sacred obligation to pass it along to those who come after us. It must be preserved.

Unlike most natural resources, our agricultural resources can be used and then at the same time restored and improved. It takes more skillful management to conserve our soil than for example it does oil, coal, or iron. Fortunately, though the process of conserving soil is a highly complex one, we do know how to do it, and have been doing a tremendous job in this field.

Congress has since 1936 recognized its responsibility in this area for it has wisely provided funds each year for the ACP. The original legislation for this program provided $500 million; however, the funds authorized have varied from time to time and in recent years have been stabilized at $250 million a year.

In my opinion, this voluntary cost-sharing type of conservation program is the very incentive needed to encourage farmers to carry out the necessary conservation practices on their lands. Because of the present price squeeze the farmer is not able to perform these measures if it were not for the ACP.

Not only is it in the interest of our farm families now living on the farms but for the conservation of the soil for future generations, that I feel no cuts must be made in appropriations for this program. The ACP has and should continue to play an important and essential role in preserving this natural heritage for us.

While records for the 1959 program are not yet available, it appears that ACP will total about the same nationally as in 1958. The following are some accomplishments under the 1958 ACP which I feel point out significantly that the ACP is obtaining the maximum amount of conservation on the Nation's farms per tax dollar invested:

ACP assisted in applying soil and water conservation practices on 1,083,706 farms and ranches. The average amount of assistance per farm was $200.

ACP assisted in establishing nearly 2½ million acres of conservation cover. In addition to protecting the land, this conservation cover keeps land out of intensive crop production for at least 5 to 7 years and, in some cases, permanently.

Assisted in seeding almost 1½ million acres of additional rotation grass or legume seedings for soil protection. This keeps the land from producing surplus crops for at least 2 or 3 years.

Assisted in planting a third of a million acres of trees for forestry purposes which permanently retired these acres from field crops and pasture.

And ACP assisted in improving 1,800,000 acres of grass and legume cover on farmland to extend its lifespan for conservation purposes. Much of this land, otherwise, would likely have been shifted sooner to more intensive use.

The effect of these shifts in land use is cumulative. The practices established will stay on and protect the land for periods ranging from the length of a rotation to permanently.

Of course, grass and tree cover are only part of the conservation investments farmers made with the ACP in 1958. Some of the other measures established with ACP cost-sharing included over 63,000 water storage reservoirs and nearly 5,000 miles of water diversions and spreaders; 54,000 acres of permanent sod waterways and nearly 856,000 acres terraced; almost a half million acres of stripcropping and nearly 1⅔ million acres of drainage for conservation farming and 1½ million acres of cropland tilled for temporary protection against wind and water erosion.

The need for the ACP in Missouri has been demonstrated repeatedly in past years by the response from farmers desiring to participate in the program. Under the 1958 ACP in my State, more than 43,000 farmers received cost-sharing assistance through the 114 Missouri County ASC offices amounting to a total of more than $10 million which means they contributed at least that much more out of their own pockets to carry out these conservation measures.

Improved grass and legume cover was established on 120,458 acres.

ACP assisted in installing terraces to control erosion and runoff on more than 30,000 acres and over 500 miles of diversion ditches and dikes to divert runoff were constructed. In conjunction with this, 709 mechanical outlets were installed as protection against erosion on these structures.

Drainage practices, such as open and closed tile drains and shaping and grading, were performed on more than 157,000 acres to dispose of excess water.

To improve grassland management, 3,528 livestock reservoirs were built.

ACP assisted farmers in establishing 137,146 acres of vegetative cover for winter protection from erosion and encouraged them to seed over 21,000 acres of cover to protect cropland throughout the crop year.

During that year, farmers were assisted with the application of liming material on 408,305 acres to insure an adequate vegetative cover for conservation purposes.

We in Missouri are proud of the steps farmers are taking to help conserve the natural resources of our Nation. However, much credit must be given to the

ACP which encourages them to perform the needed conservation measures on their farms.

Another aspect of this appropriations bill which is of particular interest to me, Mr. Chairman, is the grants-in-aid to the State experimental stations. This is badly needed for forestry research, soil and water conservation research, and research in other fields of agricultural industry.

Most of the appropriation for this activity does, however, go to the field of forestry and related fields.

The State Legislature in Missouri last May made an appropriation of $80,000 for the biennium for the forest survey. This work, of course, is being carried on in cooperation with the U.S. Forest Service. Recently the Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station approved a new full-time research position on the staff of the school of forestry, even though the increase in funds of agricultural research was relatively modest for this biennium. This position will be filled by a man who will devote full-time research in wood technology and products which is felt will be a tremendous help to the wood-using industries of Missouri. The annual cost of this position will be around $15,000 and it is mentioned to indicate the support which the State has been giving to the research program in the school of forestry. There is a need for strengthening of forest research in the forestry schools in order that these schools may be in a strong position to turn out better trained scientists for the future and in order that the State experiment stations may carry their proper share of the research activities in forestry.

I urge support of this program by the Federal Government.

Another aspect of this agriculture appropriations bill which is of concern to me also, Mr. Chairman, relates to the program of plant quarantine. It has come to my attention that our present quarantine forces are so thinly spread out that we do not have adequate protection from foreign plant and animal pests. I feel that this program is of vital importance in safeguarding agriculture in this Nation. If this program is to be effective, it must form a tight line of defense at all ports of entry. Because of the increase in the number of ports, in part brought about by the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, and the increase in traffic at these ports, adequate funds are needed to expand this much needed protective facility of the Department of Agriculture.

In addition to appropriation for REA and RTA other aspects of this legislation of interest to the people of my district are the request for funds to eradicate brucellosis, and funds for the school lunch program. Having been a public school administrator for several years I know firsthand the values of the school lunch program.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Appropriations Committee once again brings to the floor of the House, for your approval, the annual appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture.

It has been a pleasure serving with our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and the other members of this subcommittee. We were ably assisted by our executive secretary, Mr. Ross P. Pope.

For fiscal year 1961 we recommend $1,294,647,500 for regular activities, $1,226,500,000 for restoration of capital impairment, $1,443,634,000 for reimbursement for special activities, $417 million for loan authorizations under the control and direction of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farmers Home Administration, and $369,670,000 for permanent authorizations.

For the Agriculture Research Service, we recommend appropriations totaling $141,507,000; $67,934,000 of this amount is for research; $52,011,000 is for plant and animal disease and pest control; $21,562,000 is for meat inspection.

TOBACCO RESEARCH

The need for additional research in tobacco was clearly established during the hearings. Less research has been done on the mechanization of tobacco production than for other major crops and work methods used in tobacco production are still almost entirely manual. At the present time between 400 and 500 hours of human labor are required to produce and harvest an acre of tobacco. Total farm labor requirements for the 1,154,000-acre crop represents equivalent full employment for some 1,920,000 people for 300 8-hour days per year. Tobacco is grown on a total of approximately 1,154,000 acres in 22 States and is a major source of income in 8 of these States. Total production of tobacco in 1959 was about 1,800 million pounds which brought over $1 billion cash income to producers. About 750,000 farm families are engaged in the production of tobacco. The number of hours required to produce an acre of tobacco has changed very little over the past 50 years. Labor requirements for other major crops, on the other hand, have been strikingly reduced. Tobacco taxes total a little over $2½ billion annually to the support of Federal, State, and local governments; $1.7 billion goes into the Federal Treasury and this does not include indirect taxes. Prior to the establishment of the income tax in 1913, for many years the second largest return to the Internal Revenue Bureau came from the impost of manufactured tobacco and related taxes.

From time to time, we have been informed that we are pricing ourselves out of the foreign markets. Accepting this view during the present session of the 86th Congress, we passed H.R. 9664. Under this legislation the parity price for tobacco was tied to the 1959 level. The purpose of this bill is to prevent the operation of the present parity formula from pushing the support price on tobacco beyond limits which the tobacco industry believes to be reasonable at present general price levels. Under the terms of this bill, the tobacco support level for 1960 will be the same as in 1959 and in subsequent years the support price will be adjusted from the 1959 level in direct proportion to the change in the parity index, using the previous 3 years moving average as a base.

Tobacco is one of the most important cash crops in America. In terms of cash receipts from the sale of crops in the United States, tobacco in 1958 was exceeded in value by only four crops:

1.	Wheat	$2,253,000,000
2.	Cotton	1,928,000,000
3.	Corn	1,412,000,000
4.	Soy beans	1,117,000,000
5.	Tobacco	1,007,000,000
6.	Sorghum grain	569,000,000
7.	Potatoes	373,000,000

Only recently the Common Market countries entered into an agreement which places a 30 percent ad valorem tax on our tobacco. This tax does not apply to the tobacco produced in the six Common Market countries, and certainly is not only restrictive but is an unreasonable tax which has for its purpose, complete exclusion of our tobacco for the next 10 years. In addition, we know that 60 countries in the world have, during the past few years, increased their import duties on tobacco. Our own subcommittee, in its travels in the Pacific and Far East from October 23 to December 10, 1959, discovered some of the problems confronting tobacco today. In the report of the Agriculture Subcommittee's trip we have the following statement:

> We also visited the La Suerta Tobacco Co. in Manila to observe manufacturing processes and discuss use of American tobacco. While American tobacco is generally preferred, tobacco manufacturers are unable to get all they want because of a government program now in effect favoring local production of tobacco.

The tobacco industry is undergoing scientific and technological changes that have so significantly affected agriculture as a whole that it is now necessary to step up our research program for this commodity.

Certain increases for research were approved from 1953 through 1959. For livestock and products, we approved increases totaling $7,894,000. For cereal and forage, increases totaling $3,733,000 were approved and for cotton and other fabrics, we approved increases totaling $2,150,000. Increases for research during this period of time for wool and mohair totaled $715,000 and for major crops, $295,000. Increases for tobacco research from 1953 through 1960 totaled only $293,000. Increases totaling $1,015,000 were approved for oil seeds and $100,000 was approved for naval stores. Nine hundred and thirty-eight thousand dollars in increases for new crops was approved and $900,000 was approved for crop and livestock protection. From 1953 to 1960 we approved increases for fruits, nuts, and vegetables totaling $2,045,000. Research increases for all other crops during this period of time

totaled $478,000 and $6,102,000 was approved for forestry.

While the hearings were under way, the State of Kentucky, through its legislature, appropriated $1 million for use in construction of an agricultural tobacco research center and in addition, appropriated $50,000 to be used in tobacco research. Ordinarily, in setting up a research program or expanding programs, it becomes necessary to have a research laboratory building. With few exceptions, the Federal Government must bear the cost of the building as well as the equipment and other facilities necessarily required for research and for a research center. Since I have been a member of the subcommittee, some 9 or 10 laboratories have been constructed out of Federal funds, and, at no time has any State constructed a research center for use by the Federal Government. The laboratories constructed have cost the Federal Government from $500,000 to several million dollars each.

Tobacco pays its own way and certainly adequate funds should be appropriated for research at this time. Our committee recommends an increase of $250,000 for tobacco research. This amount will be used in conjunction with the $1 million for the research center and the additional sum of $50,000 for tobacco research mentioned above and will be used for planning, locating, constructing, and equipping of appropriate greenhouses with humidity and temperature control, and for appropriately equipping the special laboratories for tobacco research in the new center. Power, light, steam, and water lines and compressed air facilities must be installed for the greenhouses and for outlying field facilities. Machinery and shop equipment will also be supplied for the mechanization studies. A headhouse will be constructed in connection with the greenhouses for use in storing soil and materials in greenhouse work.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

In 1955, we decided to appropriate a small amount for rural development. This program attempts to find the means whereby rural families of low-income status can be assisted to raise their income and to enable them to enjoy a level of living commensurate with our American standards. We know that our farmer has the right to demand a standard of living in keeping with the contributions he makes to the national economy. The amount expended in the rural development program has produced great benefits to our people. This is not a handout program. It is conceived as an educational and technical assistance program where agencies and organizations band together in a group to serve people of a community, county, or area. The three pilot counties in Kentucky are Butler, Metcalfe, and Elliott.

BRUCELLOSIS

During the past few months, I have received a great many letters from farmers throughout this country requesting that our brucellosis eradication program be stepped up instead of slowed down. The Department recommended $15 million for the brucellosis program, and we have increased this amount to $19 million.

TRADE BARRIERS

Along with our many problems concerning agriculture in this country, we are faced with the problem of removing foreign trade restrictions against our agricultural commodities. It makes no difference how much time we spend on merchandising; we are simply helpless if the trade policies of our friends abroad permit our products only limited access to their markets. It is imperative that we continue our negotiations with other countries seeking to obtain lower tariffs on our commodities. Today we face stronger competition abroad than at any time during the history of this country.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

In our REA program, we now have about 4,590,000 consumers on REA financed lines. We have some 1,426,000 miles of lines throughout 47 of the States at the present time. About 95½ percent of the farms, ranches, and rural establishments of this country have the advantage of central station electric power and about one-half of these installations are served by borrowers from REA. In considering our REA program in the future, we must keep in mind that this system serves a national territory. The average number of consumers per mile is only about three and one-tenth and a large number of cooperatives average less than two consumers to a mile. Due to the fact that the cooperatives are operating in such thin territories, the amount of equity REA borrowers have accumulated is exceedingly low. According to recent reports, 50 percent of the rural electric systems have less than 20 percent equity in their facilities. The budget authorizations for our REA Administration total $110 million for electrification, and $80 million for rural telephone service. To each amount, we have added a contingency of $50 million.

RESEARCH

Our agricultural research program is one of the most important programs that we have today. This program must be geared to the problems now confronting American agriculture and be able to meet the problems in the future. A constructive research program should reduce waste and losses and improve efficiency of production. An adequate research program must also improve processing, marketing, and consumption. It should be able to develop new and improved crops and products and expand our markets for sale of our commodities. An adequate research program provides improved nutrition and better living for rural and urban people. We must expand our agricultural research program in order to meet the objectives which I have just enumerated. It is a recognized fact that the research facilities of the Department of Agriculture and of the State agricultural experiment stations are overcrowded and the majority need modernization at the present time. We must have modern, up-to-date facilities in order to meet the agricultural research needs confronting us today. In addition to buildings required for research laboratories, we must also have the necessary personnel, properly trained and skilled in the sciences to carry on our research program. Today, we must compete with private industry to obtain the necessary scientists to carry out our research program. Certainly second-rate scientists should not be a part of our research program and, therefore, we must be prepared to compete with private industry for skilled personnel in this program. It is true that our agricultural research funds have increased over the years, but the results justify the amounts expended.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE AND CORPS OF ENGINEERS' CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM

Twenty-five years ago we started our national soil and water conservation program. This program has had a tremendous impact upon American agriculture, and in my opinion it will be just as important in the year 1970 as it is at the present time. We have enough good land left in this country to keep us prosperous and well fed if we conserve and improve it. Today, we have more than 2,900 organized soil conservation districts. Soil conservation districts, which began 25 years ago as merely an experiment in local self-government, have demonstrated their value and now include 95 percent of the Nation's farms and ranches. Our people generally support our soil and water conservation program. This program has accomplished a great deal and millions of acres which were decreasing in value as a result of erosion have been restored to productive capacity. Many sections of our country which were heretofore subject to flood damage now are free from that danger. The provision for local conservation districts with local control and direction is the best way to achieve maximum results in conservation. We have every reason to be proud of our soil and water conservation program. This service is one of the great achievements of our present-day Government. Soil conservation means as much to my home State as to any State in the Union, and our soil conservation program, together with our Corps of Engineers, flood control, and navigation projects are producing results in Kentucky. Our farmers are remaining on the farms and, for the first time in a number of years, Kentucky will show an increase in population. We have 122 soil conservation districts in 120 counties in Kentucky with over 86,000 farms participating in this program. Conservation problems become more complex as population growth and technology brings about intensive uses and competition for our land and water. The estimates submitted by the Department of Agriculture for conservation operations totaled $82,882,000 and we recommend an increase of $250,000, making a total of $83,132,000. We recommend $32 million for watershed protection instead of the budget request of $27,750,000. For flood prevention, we recommend $18 million instead of the amount requested by the Department of

Agriculture of $15 million. For our Soil Conservation Service, we make recommendations totaling $143,132,000 which is an increase of $7,500,000 over the amount requested by the Department of Agriculture.

This year will be the 137th year that Congress has appropriated funds for the Corps of Engineers' civil works program. Flood control, as we know it today, started in 1924 when Congress appropriated $75,000 for the removal of snags in the Ohio River. In 1928 Congress authorized a flood control project in the Mississippi River Valley. The flood control program began on a nationwide basis in 1936 when Congress passed the first major Flood Control Act.

In 1824 Congress gave the Corps of Engineers responsibility for developing a system of roads, canals, and waterways. At this time the big problem was transportation, and the Corps of Engineers concentrated on making our inland waterways and inland and coastal harbors usable. Floods became of great concern as each year the towns and cities suffered loss of lives and heavy property damage. If, at this time, we had had a good constructive soil conservation program underway we would not have experienced this difficulty.

Today we have completed 525 flood control projects and we have 2,800 active Corps of Engineers projects. In addition, we have 1,565 miles of embankments along the main stem of the Mississippi. We have 23,000 miles of improved waterways and 500 harbors in this country today. The Great Lakes navigation system, the St. Lawrence Seaway, the Mississippi River and the Ohio River are only a few of the main inland waterways.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Our greatest asset is our schoolchildren. We recommend $110 million for fiscal year 1961 and, in addition, we recommend the transfer of $45 million from section 32 funds to be used to purchase meats and other foods necessary for our schoolchildren's lunches. This will provide a minimum of $155 million for fiscal year 1961. According to testimony received by our committee, this program served an average of over 10.7 million schoolchildren during the 1959 school year, and with 30 percent of the Nation's 39,480,000 schoolchildren provided with noonday meals.

EXTENSION SERVICE

Our extension service has been of great benefit to the American farmer and especially so in the State of Kentucky. Funds appropriated for this program are used to supplement funds appropriated by State, county, and local governments for the employment of county agents, home demonstration agents, 4–H agents, and State specialists who, in turn, bring into force additional programs of the Department of Agriculture. The extension agents and the entire service in Kentucky is composed of dedicated people who are rendering a great service. We have succeeded in securing salary increases for our extension agents in Kentucky during the past 3 years and every effort will be made to see that our extension agents are provided with adequate salaries. We recommend a total of $66,335,000 for our extension service.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, each year 4½ million farm operators decide what to produce on the Nation's 400 million acres of crop land and 700 million acres of pasture. We know that our rural people must make many adjustments in order to keep their operations on a sound foundation. Today, more than at any time in the past, the business of farming demands the application of the most recent developments in science. We must keep in mind that agriculture is an industry that changes rapidly. Such changes create new problems for our farmers.

Our committee recommends this bill to the Members of the House.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I feel constrained to make certain comments in connection with H.R. 12117, the agriculture appropriation bill.

As my colleagues well know I have been strongly opposed to the present farm subsidy bill and indeed have been forthright in speaking against Government acreage and price controls which constitute in my opinion the costliest failure in our domestic history.

I expect later on to vote against this appropriation bill as I have voted against agricultural bills in the past as a personal protest against the present program. How anyone can justify spending approximately $4 billion per annum on the farm fiasco is beyond my comprehension.

Certainly President Eisenhower was never more right than when he stated recently that in no domestic area do we have a more obvious need for corrective action than in agriculture.

Let me hasten to say that it is the farmers who have the chief source of complaint. They are the ones who suffer under the existing Federal program. I think they have a right to look to the Congress for corrective action.

Briefly I want to discuss various proposals to effect relief. I point up frequently the distressing fact that Government surpluses, even after the huge recent transactions for wheat disposal under Public Law 480, will represent a cost to the taxpayer of more than $9 billion with an annual storage charge in excess of $1 million a day. But in all honesty I must say the Farm Bureau has been practical in recommending a plan to move away from controls—rather than to abruptly terminate the program. I will go along with that general policy.

James Patton, the president of the National Farmers' Union, however, a month or so ago offered his solution. I absolutely abhor his suggestion, which was to license farmers. He suggested each licensed farmer should pay 2 percent yearly of the proceeds of his marketing to the farm organization of his choice—the Grange, Farmers' Union, or Farm Bureau—with the money going to promote sales and educate nonfarmers at home and abroad about the role of the farmer.

I wonder how the nonfarmer under such brainwashing would end up. But as for the sponsor of this plan, Mr. Patton was consistent because he said he favored a major shift of support for schools from local to the Federal level. He is for a Federal system.

We have many suggested solutions that go in the same direction as Mr. Patton would have us go, but not so far.

One is the program which I understand is favored by two of the Democratic candidates for the Presidential nomination. Under it a cartel or sort of central cooperative would be set up to control prices. The poor consumer I fear would assume an awful burden under such a monopolistic plan.

Personally, I think Congress should concentrate right now on a solution of the wheat situation because it is the most pressing.

Legislation of that nature has been introduced. It has been described as a new wheat marketing act. My colleagues from the wheat-producing areas of Washington State, WALT HORAN and CATHERINE MAY, are among those who sponsor this plan and they tell me it is both realistic and constructive. Under this wheat bill a national estimate of primary use would be established by the Secretary of Agriculture—then each State would be given an acreage allotment. Only wheat for human consumption would be regulated. Seventy-five-percent parity would be set as the price support level for the annual requirement.

Mr. Chairman, I am for restoring our farmers to a free enterprise basis and a returning to the law of supply and demand. Granted such action must be by degrees to stabilize the economy.

In the interim the provisions of the Horan-May and other bipartisan sponsored wheat marketing bills, it seems to me, would be helpful and a step in the direction which ultimately I hope will come.

Meanwhile, this legislation would reduce the cost of the program to the taxpayers; start an orderly reduction of the Government-held surplus and assure against disastrously low income levels to the wheat producers.

I hope the House Committee on Agriculture will not report out legislation just to invite a political veto.

Instead, let the House consider a bill which has a chance of being enacted into law. I will support corrective transitional farm legislation similar to the Horan-May plan because my able colleagues have convinced me of the merit of their idea until such time as consumption and supply are in closer balance.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

QUESTIONS ON POULTRY INSPECTION

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I asked the chairman of the subcommittee for this time in order to obtain answers to several questions which occur to me about this appropriation bill and

its accompanying report, which I think will be of great interest to every housewife.

First of all, on poultry inspection, may I ask if the additional $500,000 provided in the bill for poultry inspection will permit the continuous inspection beginning July 1, as required under the Poultry Inspection Act, of food items processed from poultry? It is my understanding from the officials of the Department that an additional $1 million over the current year's appropriation would be required for this necessary function, and I have seen other figures showing it would cost anywhere from $500,000 to $1 million more. Therefore, the question which I have very strongly in mind is whether the extra $500,000 provided in this bill will be enough to allow the Poultry Division to place inspectors on a continuing basis in all 300 plants now temporarily exempt from inspection because of a shortage of trained inspectors but which, under the law, must have their products continually inspected beginning with the coming July 1, and at Government expense.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentlewoman, it is my personal judgment that what is involved is what we might interpret continuous inspection to be. The committee tried to investigate fully this whole matter. It is to some degree between the Department and the processors as to protecting public health. In no instance have the inspectors in the 200 plants found anything injurious to the public health, but the processors in turn could use the stamp of the Department as part of their advertising. In fact, 200 out of the 300 do that. They definitely would like to shift the burden of that cost to the Government. The other third would like the Government to give them the inspection free so that they would be on equal terms with the others.

The Department feels, as I understand it from their testimony, that having the little plants continuously inspected is not necessary to protect the public health, but they in turn refuse to give the stamp unless they do that inspection. What we do is say to the Department, "We are giving you that much money. Inspect them to the fullest degree to protect public health, but when you do it, go ahead and issue the stamp."

We thought that was a fair solution of the problem instead of meeting it head on. Whether you have to repeal the law by providing that no funds shall be used, or whether you have a lot of inspections to get the stamp, so far as the testimony is concerned, we thought that this was the best solution we could think of, and we hope we are right.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will be patient with me the law says all processing plants in interstate commerce must have inspection. About 300 have been temporarily exempted, but beginning July 1 that exemption expires. Now will he please explain the somewhat confusing, technical language on page 17, beginning on line 2, dealing with the poultry inspection program. Does that language change existing law so far as the requirements of the Poultry Products Inspection Act are concerned? If it does not change the law, why put this language in the bill?

Mr. WHITTEN. Frankly, I would take it that it changes the law by giving the Department some say-so about what inspection is necessary to protect the public health.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. If it does change the law, as I also believe it does, is it proper for the Committee on Appropriations to change the requirements laid down for poultry inspection under legislation drafted by the legislative committee on agriculture, and enacted by Congress several years ago?

Mr. WHITTEN. If we ask for a rule and they grant it, we would have the privilege of changing it if we saw fit to do so. But, this is, frankly, subject to a point of order. We think it is better than nothing and this is the best we can do. So we have not tried to override anybody, but we do think it is the best solution that we could think of.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The law says that all poultry moving in interstate commerce should be inspected, including products made from poultry. This language in the bill on page 17, "*Provided*, That the Department is hereby authorized and directed to make such inspection of poultry products processing plants as it deems essential to the protection of public health and to permit the use of appropriate inspection labels where it determines from such inspection that such plants operate in a manner which protects the public health, and not less than $500,000 shall be available for this purpose," seems to say it would now be up to the Secretary in his discretion to decide which processed products are to be inspected, and under what circumstances the Department should assign inspectors to such processors, and also permits, apparently, some substitute seal to be used to attest to the wholesomeness of poultry which has not actually been inspected.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentlewoman will yield to me, I must say I have never been a stickler about jurisdiction. We have so many problems here that if somebody were to handle some of them, I certainly would not object. The Department cannot determine which products are to be inspected, but they can determine what inspection is necessary to protect the public health. But when a legislative committee says that the Committee on Appropriations must appropriate, it looks to me as if some other group has probably stepped a little far. I think they should inspect, but I think it should be for the protection of public health and not for the stamp. But if they say that they have inspected this plant fully and adequately to protect the public health, I do not think they should be permitted to withhold the stamp.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The point I wanted to call attention to is this: If it is to be only a spot inspection program in plants making poultry pies, poultry soups and other products containing poultry, and yet anything that goes through that processing plant would carry a seal of wholesomeness, then I think we are misleading the housewife in allowing that seal to be on the product indicating that it has been inspected when it probably has not been inspected.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not know where we should end this. But they have been inspecting 200 plants and they have not found anything that would injure the public health and according to the letters that have been sent to me, they say that they pay for it because they want to use the stamp because it is a matter of advertising. I do think if the gentlewoman would go along with this, we can work with this and see if we can resolve the situation. Again I say, only one objection and out it would go.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. But under the law, all these 300 exempted plants will have to be inspected beginning July 1, will they not?

Mr. WHITTEN. Unless the other body should put in a statement that, notwithstanding the legislation, no part of these funds can be used for such inspection. Then the law would be repealed. We do not want to do that. We try to resolve it by saying that they must inspect, but the inspection must be for the purpose of protecting the public health, and when you do inspect, to say so.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank my colleague very much for his frank answers. It is clear to me that the language in the proviso in question on page 17 relaxes the strict requirements of the Poultry Products Inspection Act insofar as that act now requires the inspection of all poultry and poultry products in interstate commerce. The act permitted temporary exemption of some plants from the inspection requirements for the convenience of the Government, because it was not considered feasible to provide inspectors at the start of 1959 for every plant in the country subject to the act. There was a shortage of trained personnel in this field.

So the act as originally passed allowed this temporary exemption for 18 months of plants for which inspectors were not available. The Secretary choose to use this administrative authority to exempt from compulsory inspection all plants doing further processing of poultry into poultry products like soups, pies, and so forth, on the assumption that he would need all the trained inspectors available in January 1959 just to cover all of the slaughtering plants.

The exemptions for the further processing plants expire on July 1. The Secretary has asked Congress to amend the law so that he can continue to exempt such plants. Congress has not done so. In the meantime, many of these further processors—200 out of about 300 exempted plants—have felt it was so important to have their products inspected for wholesomeness by the Federal Government that they have paid out of their own funds to have their products continuously inspected under a voluntary inspection program operated by the Department. Under the law, however,

they are entitled to the same kind of free inspection the slaughtering plants receive.

This bill provides an additional $500,000 to the poultry division to provide inspection at plants processing poultry products but the language of the proviso on page 17 gives the Secretary discretionary powers he would not otherwise possess after July 1 to exempt particular plants from inspection. As I understand it, the proviso would permit a spot check inspection program, with a seal attesting to the wholesomeness of poultry products not produced under continuous inspection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, few committees of the Congress spend so many long hours together as do our appropriations subcommittees. This is a natural consequence of the responsibility imposed upon us to examine not only every budget request but also the manner in which these funds have been and are being administered.

The work is long and arduous but it is rewarding because of the great opportunities it presents for lasting service and because of the associations developed in our day-to-day efforts. It is a privilege to work with such distinguished Members of Congress as JAMIE L. WHITTEN, of Mississippi; WILLIAM H. NATCHER, of Kentucky; ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, of New York; H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota; WALT HORAN, of Washington; and ROBERT H. MICHEL, of Illinois.

TRIBUTE TO CHAIRMAN

Every year I serve on the subcomittee, I become more and more impressed with the ability of our chairman; JAMIE WHITTEN is an able and conscientious representative of his district and the State of Mississippi but he is genuinely interested in the problems of all farmers everywhere in our country. The friendly and courteous atmosphere in which we work is built upon the mutual respect members of the subcommittee have for each other's problems and viewpoints. We do not always agree on what is best in every situation but we do agree that our common goal is a healthy and prosperous agriculture sharing in our Nation's growth and progress.

FARM TROUBLES REMEMBERED

That agriculture is in trouble today is too painfully apparent to need documentation. It should not be necessary to review in detail that part of our agricultural history which is remembered so clearly by every farmer who lived through it. I am speaking of the twenties and early thirties when failing farm prices, forced sales, farm foreclosures, bank failures, and dark depression forced a mighty Nation to its knees.

We fought our way back to the greatest productive effort the world has ever known. It should not be necessary to review the basic agricultural laws which made this recovery and growth possible—parity payments and loans, soil conservation and good farm management, diversion of surplus production into foreign and domestic channels, crop insurance, and credit.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTIES PROMISED HOPE

We entered the decade of the fifties with high hope and reasonable expectation that we would continue to go forward. Instead, we face the sixties with confusion and frustration. What has happened to us?

If past is prolog, it is worth our while to briefly consider the events and policies that went before. In so doing, we can penetrate some of the fantastic theories and new myths under which the realities of recent history have been buried.

NEED REALISTIC APPROACH

It is true that the farm problem has many facets and it is as complex as modern agriculture itself. Other segments of the economy are complex and face immense problems. Seldom, however, do we witness the pessimism that has gained thought among some agricultural "experts" in the mistaken notion that no solution is possible. What we need to do is look at our problems as realistically and with the same hardheaded candor practiced by other segments of our economy.

My own recollections go back to the beginnings of what has become the modern technological revolution in agriculture. As a small boy, I accompanied my father, then the first county agent in Minnesota, on some of his field trips. I heard him discuss crop rotation with the farmers in an area where the principal cash crop was wheat. I heard him discuss the need for growing a cultivated crop like corn and the advantage of putting land into legumes to restore humus to the soil. This impressed upon me the importance of technical know-how in farming operations.

GAS ENGINE AND TRACTOR

Better farm management, better disease control, and the beginning of mechanization expanded total farm output and released still other acres for the production of marketable crops. The development of the gasoline engine and the tractor together with the improvement of management practices created a new capacity.

The demand for production during World War I hastened the expansion to meet the needs of the world market cut off from other producing countries. We were prepared for the challenge and met it. When the war ended, the level of prices received by farmers plunged 43 percent between 1919 and 1921.

FARM CONFERENCE OF 1922

The general scare and heated protests finally led President Harding to call a national conference on the farm problem in 1922. This was the first such meeting in history and one of its recommendations directed the Congress and the President to "take steps immediately to reestablish a fair exchange value for all farm products with that of other commodities." It also suggested to farm organizations that they survey world supply-and-demand factors and "propose measures for proper limitation of acreage in particular crops."

The price drop eventually led to general income consequences, but for the farmer the effect was immediate and disastrous. No matter where he turned, no matter what alternative he chose, he was always the victim of lower prices and lower income. This meant a lower standard of living for himself and his family. It meant neglect of health and education and neglect of the farm itself.

PRICE OF UNWILLINGNESS

Those who still today say that government has no place in the economic affairs of the farmer might well study the economics of the twenties. As then, we can now try to solve the farm problem by an unwillingness to face facts but we must expect to reap the same consequences.

Who benefited from the unwillingness to act and the unconcern of the twenties? Consumers? A man walking the streets out of work does not benefit from low prices. Merchants? There were so many merchants with so much money on the books that any profit in operations was wiped out by bad paper. Did it help the banks? Look at the foreclosures of that period. I repeat, who benefited from the farm depression of the twenties?

M'NARY-HAUGEN BILLS VETOED

When the pressures building up for action finally led to efforts by Congress to intervene with the McNary-Haugen bills of 1927 and 1928, Calvin Coolidge twice vetoed them. Despite the shortcomings evident to us today and their shortsighted view of workable trade relationships, the bills did represent an attempt to act.

FARM BOARD FAILURE

The precedent of nonintervention was finally broken in the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929 which created a Federal Farm Board to stabilize the prices of farm products by buying when supplies were excessive and selling when shortages existed. In 3 years, despite the sincerity of effort, three-fourths of its $500 million appropriation was lost. In the face of the most devastating depression of all time, that action was too little and too late. Prophetically, the Board ended operations with a warning that withholding supplies from the market alone could not stabilize prices unless accompanied by production control.

To make matters worse, the enactment of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act totally ignored the importance of a sound trade relationship and ruined what foreign markets we had left. Its proponents chose to ignore the fact that we came out of World War I a creditor nation and we needed the two-way street of trade to maintain vital markets for the abundance of our production.

DISTRESS SPREADS ACROSS NATION

Agriculture was left to flounder while the depression deepened and the rest of the economy tasted the distress already

so familiar to farmers. No one who lived through that period needs to be reminded of the suffering and fear that terrorized the nation.

Sickened by callous inaction in the face of such overwhelming poverty, the American people swept the Republican Administration out of office with a demand for bold, new action.

SUPREME COURT KILLS HOPE

Congress passed the Agricultural Adjustment Act in the spring of 1933 in an effort to establish and maintain a "balance between the production and consumption of agricultural commodities." Using benefit payments as an inducement to control surplus production, the program was later augmented by marketing quotas for specified crops. When the Supreme Court nullified the regulation of production and the processing tax which helped to support the program in its decision of January 6, 1936, many farmers feared that the only remaining hope had been knocked out from under them.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SIX ACT OUTLINES PURPOSE

But within a year Congress responded with the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936 which provided means of controlling production and provided incentives for conservation of our soil by proper plowing, contouring, and crop rotation. Its preamble best states the new spirit of hope:

SEC. 7. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this Act also to secure, and the purposes of this Act shall also include, (1) preservation and improvement of soil fertility; (2) promotion of the economic use and conservation of land; (3) diminution of exploitation and wasteful and unscientific use of national soil resources; (4) the protection of rivers and harbors against the results of soil erosion in aid of maintaining the navigability of waters and water courses and in aid of flood control; and (5) reestablishment, at as rapid a rate as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be practicable and in the general public interest, of the ratio between the purchasing power of the net income per person on farms and that of the income per person not on farms that prevailed during the five-year period August 1909 to July 1914, inclusive, as determined from statistics available in the United States Department of Agriculture, and the maintenance of such ratio. The powers conferred under sections 7 to 14 inclusive, of this Act shall be used to assist voluntary action calculated to effectuate the purposes specified in this section. Such powers shall not be used to discourage the production of supplies of foods and fibers sufficient to maintain normal domestic human consumption as determined by the Secretary from the records of domestic human consumption in the years 1920 to 1929, inclusive, taking into consideration increased population, quantities of any commodity that were forced into domestic consumption by decline in exports during such period, current trends in domestic consumption and exports of particular commodities, and the quantities of substitutes available for domestic consumption within any general class of food commodities. In carrying out the purposes of this section due regard shall be given to the maintenance of a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities adequate to meet consumer demand at prices fair to both producers and consumers.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-EIGHT ACT BROADENS PROGRAMS

To strengthen and broaden the existing programs, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 was enacted; the basic legislation responsible for the great strides in American agriculture.

It carried forward the principles of the Soil Conservation Act of 1935 in encouraging good management of the Nation's soil resources—not only, or even primarily, for the benefit of farmers but for the direct benefit of all future generations dependent upon soil for food and raw materials.

TOOLS TO BALANCE PRODUCTION

Loans, marketing quotas, and parity payments were provided as the necessary tools to enable the farmer to bring his production into closer balance with demand without complete and total collapse of income. For the first time, farmers themselves were called upon to administer their own programs on the basis of their own experience and to meet their own realistic needs.

Surplus production was diverted into domestic and foreign channels and programs to develop new uses for agricultural products were pushed forward.

As a further stabilizing effort, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation was created to provide insurance against loss of crops. By 1942, one-fourth of all wheat farmers were taking advantage of this program.

REA SPEEDS MECHANIZATION

Another major contribution to the recovery and expansion of agriculture was in the making. Tomorrow we will observe the 25th anniversary of the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration by Executive order of President Roosevelt on May 11, 1935. Its modest beginnings did not foretell the great role it was to play in the continuing agricultural revolution.

It brought light to the rural home and with it the means of further mechanization in farm operations. By the end of 1936, almost 100 loans were approved and we had laid the basis for the labor-saving devices which enabled farmworkers to increase their output during the help shortage of the war years ahead.

The Nation has never seen a finer example of cooperation. Farmers worked with and through their Government to help each other help themselves.

MET CHALLENGE OF WORLD WAR II

Our agricultural plant was prepared for the great emergencies of World War II. Our stockpiles were a godsend to the entire free world and our farms were geared for the maximum output. The labor shortage was met with increased mechanization and production efficiency made its most spectacular gains. Once again American farmers were ready for the challenge and met it. Now some are saying they met it too well. This grisly bit of erroneous hindsight is unworthy of comment.

The world was grateful for our preparedness as the great breadbasket of democracy.

Technological advance with its increase in production efficiency was a sign to be welcomed rather than feared. We emerged from World War II and the Korean conflict with a greatly expanded potential to be turned to good or evil. We still had within our means the tools for a return to orderly production and wise use of our resources to meet immediate world needs while protecting our future capacity. Never was the opportunity so great.

END OF DISCREDITED POLICIES?

We thought we were done once and for all with the discarded and discredited policies of unhappier days. We thought these were forever forgotten in the dismal files of failure. It seemed unbelievable that anyone could consciously slip into the errors that could only result in a repetition of the sad history I have briefly recounted here.

I say to you frankly, Mr. Chairman, we failed to anticipate the unaccountable stupidity, at worst, or the incredible naivete, at best, of the men to whom we entrusted the opportunity that was ours.

DREAMING WITH EISENHOWER

In this, the twilight of the Eisenhower administration, the American farmer cannot help but ponder over the 7½ years which promised a bright dream that now seems to be only another nightmare.

If he is a corn farmer, he can recall how confidently he approached a new day at a time when all seemed well. At the plowing matches at Kasson, Minn., he had heard a great general who was a candidate for President promise:

And here, and now, without any "ifs" or "buts," I say to you that I stand behind—and the Republican Party stands behind—the price-support laws now on the books. This includes the amendment to the Basic Farm Act, passed by votes of both parties in Congress, to continue through 1954 the price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity.

PLEDGES REPUBLICAN PARTY

Whatever misgivings this farmer may have had when he recalled the disastrous farm policies of the Hoover administration were quickly dismissed by this new candidate. In Brookings, S. Dak., he spoke not only for himself but for his party when he said:

The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90-percent parity price support and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100 percent of parity, with the guarantee in price supports of 90.

SECRETARY OFFERS ASSURANCES

It seemed a great day on the farm, a bright and cloudless day without threat of impending storm. The farmer could relax with his family in the satisfaction of a hard day's labor done. The sunset promised a peaceful night and a glorious tomorrow.

Any doubts about the new Secretary of Agriculture seemed to be dispelled when he said firmly in St. Paul:

Our agricultural policy should aim to obtain in the marketplace full parity prices of farm products and parity incomes for farm

people that farmers will have freedom to operate efficiently and to adjust their production to changing consumer demands in an expanding economy.

GOLDEN PROMISES DISTURBED

Surely these golden promises would mean a bright, new day for agriculture. The farm programs that had helped him to pull himself up from the mires of depression would not only be continued but they would be improved. With his son home from Korea, the farmer could look forward to a peaceful world of growing markets that could only mean prosperity for his family and well-being for the Nation.

This was a time to sleep well and enjoy the dream of better things yet to come. A new voice interrupted this fantasy with a warning that the postwar level of prosperity in agriculture was "a dream world, and no one expected it to last." It came from Don Paarlberg, one of the chief architects of the new farm policy, in a speech at West Millbury, Mass.

FARMER RELUCTANT TO DOUBT

Our corn farmer drove the troubled thought from his mind. The gains made on his farm were real gains and certainly no one would seriously suggest a return to the dog-eat-dog economics that fed the farm depression. He remembered burning corn in his stoves because it was cheaper than coal. He remembered the neighbor who hauled 100 bushels of oats 10 miles to town to get $8 to buy Christmas presents for his children. He saw fat cattle sold on the market at South St. Paul for 3½ cents a pound. He recalled the human suffering and reassured himself that the mistakes of which it was born would never again be repeated. Not when the future promised so much.

In the cool light of morning, the uneasiness returns with the echoed warning of the Secretary of Agriculture that "every young man requires the spur of insecurity to force him to do his best."

MORE CORN SEEMS ANSWER

He has lived with insecurity before and knows the sick fear it engenders. He is restless as the hopes and dreams of the night seem to dim in the cold light of the day. He has been told to "raise his sights beyond the dollar sign, beyond material things," but he knows that he must go on with the work of the day to feed his family and pay his bills.

He is told that he is now free to make his own decisions without socialistic controls and regimentation. Listening to a morning radio program, he learns that he may be able to receive a corn loan even if he does not stay within his allotment. Of course, he will receive less for his corn but he can make up the income by planting more corn since production no longer seems to be a problem. So he goes out to his fields to plant more corn and notices that his neighbors are doing the same.

With the prospect of more corn, he decides to keep a few more brood sows. Hog prices go down but he is told that he no longer needs to bother with the corn allotment. With acreage unlimited, he decides to plow up the clover and legumes. He abandons crop rotation in order to expand his production.

UNIT TIMES PRICE EQUALS INCOME

After all, unit times price equals income. With prices down, he needs to grow more to meet the steady increase in operating costs and taxes. A bushel of corn buys less so the only hope is more bushels of corn. His neighbors, too, find themselves on the same treadmill.

Clouds are appearing on the horizon as our farmer's day draws to a close. The hope of better education and health care for his children is a vanishing dream. As the surplus piles up around him, his debts increase and his standard of living declines. What began as a day of promise is now darkened by the menacing storm clouds of an uncertain night.

WHAT DID PRESIDENT SAY?

And what does he hear from those who held out the golden promise? The answers had seemed too simple to them but now there is only confusion and uncertainty. At a Washington press conference, the President says:

Now, if there were any kind of reasonable plan that connected with other features of the thing they could bring something about that seemed reasonable and fair to the farmers, well, I would be glad to look at it and, because as I say, if it looks reasonable to me, I will approve it because I am just to this point—I know that we are in a bad fix, the farmers are, and I have had correspondence recently with some of my farmer friends because, individuals, to get statistics.

What does it mean?

With 83,000 employees in the Department of Agriculture, why is the President writing to his "farmer friends" to get statistics about the "bad fix" we are in?

THE DREAM IS ENDED

This is the troubled state of mind the corn farmer finds himself in after his day with Eisenhower.

All of this, of course, did not happen in a day. But the analogy of the bright day of promise ending with storm clouds all around is a valid one.

Our job now is to help the President understand how it happened. The experience has been too painful to be forgotten. To prevent the impending storm, we need to control the causes. We can do this only if we know the causes and recognize them.

HOW DID IT HAPPEN?

Using corn as our example, let us see what happened first to prices, then production, and finally to the whole farm economy.

When this administration assumed office, corn was supported at 90 percent of parity. During the previous year, the price of corn averaged 95 percent of parity. Prices were still holding good during the early winter of 1953.

There was no reason to expect change except for the good. The corn producer had every reason to believe that he could safety fall into a dreamlike state with nothing but prosperity to trouble him in the years ahead.

CORN PRICES HELD IN 1953

In 1953, the level of price support at 90 percent of parity for corn was $1.60 a bushel. There were no acreage allotments that year and the average price received by farmers for the 1953 crop was $1.51 a bushel.

In his farm message of January 1954 the President urged flexible supports for corn at modernized—or lowered—parity levels. He recommended a decrease of 1 percent in support price for each 1 percent increase in supply and asked for acreage allotments. For other grains, he simply asked flexible supports to be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

COMPLIANCE DECREASES

Corn marketing quotas were repealed in the act of 1954 without having been used. Price support at 90 percent of parity was continued through 1954 with a drop to 85 percent provided for 1955.

Acreage allotments for 1954 were fixed at 46 million acres but farmers grew 54 million acres. The decrease in compliance was already being attributed to the threat of flexible supports in 1955. The Secretary of Agriculture merely said:

There were certain factors that tended to reduce compliance, I believe.

He did not elaborate further in his testimony before our subcommittee in 1955.

PRODUCTION UP; PRICES DOWN

While allotments were cut back for 1955, corn production again increased as the rate of compliance decreased under pressure of the drop in support prices and in the market price.

The coming trouble was evidencing itself in 1956. This was the first year of transitional parity, the first year of a price support to noncooperating farmers in the commercial corn area, and a substantially higher price support to producers in the noncommercial corn areas.

SUPPORT UP; PARITY DOWN

In February 1956, the Secretary of Agriculture announced a price support based on transitional parity of $1.40 per bushel to growers keeping within allotments. By mid-April it was increased to $1.50, which amounted to 86.2 percent of transitional parity.

An average price support of $1.25 was offered to noncooperating farmers in the commercial area. This amounted to 71.8 percent of transitional parity.

The final rate to cooperators remained $1.50 but by fall it represented 84.3 percent of parity.

NONCOMMERCIAL SUPPORTS

The final 1956 rate to growers in the noncommercial corn areas was also jacked up—to $1.24. The 1956 act provided that noncommercial areas must get at least 82½ percent of the rate to cooperators as calculated on a national basis. Previously, the noncommercial area rate was 75 percent of the commercial area rate. The new language lasted for only two crops, 1956 and 1957.

A referendum of corn producers in the commercial area was provided by the 1956 act to determine whether they favored the old acreage allotment and price support program or a soil-bank corn base of 51 million acres. Under the

latter plan, a grower could get support with 15 percent of his acres in the soil bank. Supports were to be at the level the Secretary determined would assist growers in marketing corn in normal channels of trade without encouraging uneconomic production of corn.

SECRETARY'S PLAN VOTED DOWN

Secretary Benson announced in November that the support price under his plan would be $1.31 a bushel, if it carried. If it did not carry, the minimum support to growers in the commercial area would be $1.36 a bushel. No assurance was given that price supports would be available to noncooperators.

The Secretary's plan failed to receive the necessary majority.

In 1957, the Secretary announced that support to cooperators in the commercial area would be $1.40 a bushel—parity had increased enough to raise it 4 cents—and support to noncooperators in the commercial area was to be $1.10. Corn in the noncommercial area would be supported at $1.27. These rates remained for that season.

SUPPORT NONCOMMERCIAL, NONCOMPLIANCE

In the spring of 1958, Secretary Benson announced the minimum 1958 support at $1.36 a bushel to compliers in the commercial area. That fall he announced that the support would be made available for the third successive year on noncompliance corn in the commercial area at an average rate of $1.06 a bushel. Support in the noncommercial area went back to the old level based on 75 percent of the commercial area rate.

The act of 1958 set the pattern for 1959 and 1960. A referendum was scheduled for December to give commercial farmers a choice between the old program or elimination of the commercial area and allotments and price support at 90 percent of the average price received during the previous 3 years. Congress insisted on a minimum support of 65 percent.

SUPPORT HITS MINIMUM

This time the referendum carried. Support was $1.12 a bushel to all producers. This was 90 percent of the previous 3-year average price.

In Januray 1960 the Secretary announced corn support for this year at $1.06 a bushel. This is the minimum—65 percent of parity.

What is the result? Corn production climbed to 3.8 billion bushels in 1958 and then to 4.3 billion bushels in 1959, and another 5- to 10-percent increase for this year.

SUPPORT DOWN; PRODUCTION UP

With reasonable supports and allotments removed the 21-percent increase in corn production could have been anticipated by the Secretary if he had reviewed past experience. Following is a table showing the level of price support and the level of production in recent years:

TABLE 1.—*Support price on corn, corn production, 1953–59*

Crop year	Compliance		Corn production
	Support price	Percent support price is of parity	
			Thousand bushels
1953	$1.60	90	3,209,896
1954	1.62	90	3,057,891
1955	1.58	87	3,229,743
1956	1.50	84	3,455,283
1957	1.40	77	3,422,331
1958	1.36	77	3,800,863
1959	1.12	(1)	4,361,170

[1] 90 percent of $1.25, average price received by farmers in calendar year, 1956–58.

Source: Hearings, Department of Agriculture appropriations bill, 1961, pt. 3, pp. 193, 313.

The end result of the administration's determined effort to lower supports on corn and corn prices is a growing accumulation of corn supplies. This causes yet other serious problems which I propose to discuss. The carryover stocks are expensive to store and hang as a constant threat over the livestock market. In addition, the farmer scrambling to save himself from total collapse is diverting lands from conservation uses in order to obtain the production he needs for subsistence.

At the end of the 1951–52 marketing year, the corn carryover was 486 million bushels. The carryover at the end of the 1959–60 marketing year is expected to be 2 billion bushels.

CARRYOVER PILES UP

Except for oats, the other grains show a similar trend but nowhere is the increase in carryover more dramatic than it is in the case of corn.

The following table compares the carryover of specified grains for the marketing years 1951–52, 1952–53, and 1959–60:

TABLE 2.—*Carryover of specified agricultural commodities at the end of the 1951–52 and 1952–53 marketing years and estimated carryover at the end of the 1959–60 marketing year*

[In millions]

Commodity	Date of carryover	Carryover at end of 1951–52	Estimated carryover at end of 1952–53	Estimated carryover at end of 1959–60 [1]
Wheat...bushels	July 1	256	560	1,350
Corn.....do	Oct. 1	486	700	2,000
Rye.....do	July 1	3.9	4	10
Oats.....do	...do	283	225	200
Barley.....do	...do	73	50	160

[1] Estimated carryover at the end of 1959–60 marketing year is based partly on expected disappearance and exports for the remainder of the marketing season. The carryover actually realized at the end of the current season may vary moderately from these estimates depending on trends in consumption and exports during the rest of the season.

Source: Hearings, Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1961, pt. 3, p. 280.

Corn and feed grains today make up the No. 1 agricultural problem of this country and we have not yet felt its full force. The brunt of the storage problem will be delayed 2 years and more because much of the corn will be held on farms under ever-normal-granary loans. These are loans made on the current year's crop and include extensions of loans made on the previous year's crop.

Reseal programs for price-support loans on 1959-crop farm-stored grains have been announced on corn, barley, wheat, and grain sorghums. In addition, price-support reseal loans already in effect on the 1958 grain sorghums, wheat, corn, barley and oats, 1957 wheat and corn, and 1956 corn can be extended by producers for another year.

CARRYOVER BECOMES SURPLUS

From past experience, we know that reasonable stockpiles are necessary both from the standpoint of stabilization and emergency situations. We are reaching the point, however, that some of the carryover is actual surplus production. It is this production which hangs as a constant threat over the market. The following table describes the current situation both in terms of desirable carryover and surplus carryover:

TABLE 3.—*Indicated surplus in carryover stocks for 1960*

[In millions of bushels]

Commodity	Estimated supply—disposition, 1959–60							Desirable carryover [1]	Surplus carryover in 1960 [1]
	Beginning stocks, 1959	Production	Total supplies (including imports)	Utilization, 1959–60			Ending stocks, 1960		
				Domestic	Exports	Total			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Wheat	1,279	1,128	2,415	625	465	1,090	1,325	500	825
Corn	1,530	4,361	5,892	3,702	240	3,942	1,950	800	1,150
Grain sorghums	510	579	1,090	405	110	515	575	50	525
Barley	195	420	635	360	115	475	160	100	60
Soybeans	62	538	600	435	125	560	40	40	----
Oats	368	1,074	1,445	1,208	37	1,245	200	200	----
Rye	13	21	38	24	5	29	9	5	4
Flaxseed	15	22	37	26	7	33	4	5	−1

[1] There are no official figures for desirable carryover or surplus carryover stocks. However, under existing conditions at home and abroad, desirable carryover stocks should be approximately in line with the amounts shown here.

Source: Hearings, Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1961, pt. 3, p. 753.

The increase in Commodity Credit stocks as a result of the increasing carryover inevitably results in an increase in storage costs. These, again, are costs charged to the American farmer in almost every discussion of the subject but from which he receives little direct benefit.

STORAGE COSTS MOUNT

For example, the July 1, 1959, corn inventory of 1,043,676,000 bushels resulted in a storage cost of $133,541,000 for fiscal year 1959. The following table shows the inventory for each year and the cost of storage:

TABLE 4

Quantity of price-support corn in inventory at beginning of fiscal year and total storage costs recorded during fiscal years 1951 through 1955

[All figures in thousands]

Commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory July 1, 1950	Storage cost fiscal year 1951	Inventory July 1, 1951	Storage cost fiscal year 1952	Inventory July 1, 1952	Storage cost fiscal year 1953	Inventory July 1, 1953	Storage cost fiscal year 1954	Inventory July 1, 1954	Storage cost fiscal year 1955	Inventory July 1, 1955
Corn	Bushel	332,460	$30,577	413,423	$28,297	313,895	$19,584	228,029	$44,284	364,939	$53,626	580,724

Quantity of price support corn in inventory at beginning and end of fiscal year and total storage costs recorded during fiscal years 1956 through 1959

[All figures in thousands]

Commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, July 1, 1955	Storage cost, fiscal year 1956	Inventory, July 1, 1956	Storage cost, fiscal year 1957	Inventory, July 1, 1957	Storage cost, fiscal year 1958	Inventory, July 1, 1958	Storage cost, fiscal year 1959	Inventory, July 1, 1959
Corn	Bushel	580,724	$71,532	702,121	$116,659	803,256	$139,978	1,028,032	$133,541	1,043,676

Source: Hearings, Department of Agriculture appropriations bill, 1961, pt. 3, pp. 484, 486.

CORN RATES CLIMB

The tremendous increase in costs is not accounted for solely by the great increase in inventories. The rate paid per bushel has also increased steadily under the storage agreements. Increased costs of labor and material have undoubtedly attributed to the increase. The following table shows the change in rates for corn, which increased from 13.25 cents per bushel in 1952 to 18.89 cents in 1959:

TABLE 5.—*Annual storage rates paid per bushel of corn in commercial storage*

Year:	Rate
July 1, 1951, to May 31, 1952	$0.1325
June 1–30, 1952	.1590
July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953	.1590
July 1, 1953, to May 31, 1954	.1050
June 1–30, 1954	.1824
July 1, 1954, to June 30, 1955	.1824
July 1, 1955, to May 31, 1956	.1824
June 1, 1956, to June 30, 1957	.1889
July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1958	.1889
July 1, 1958, to Dec. 31, 1959	.1889

Source: Department of Agriculture appropriations bill hearings, 1961, pt. 3, p. 377.

Overall storage and handling costs for all commodities increased from $73.3 million in fiscal year 1952 to $481.7 million in fiscal year 1959. It is appropriate to note at this point that net income to the farmer dropped 24 percent during the same period. Estimated storage charges for fiscal year 1960 are $612 million and they are expected to be over $700 million for 1961 unless something is done to correct the situation.

As I have said, increased costs have undoubtedly made some increases necessary. Our subcommittee has watched developments closely, however, and there are questionable practices which have contributed to this situation.

EXAMPLES OF WASTE

In 1955, for example, over 16 million bushels of corn were moved from the Midwest to the west coast at a cost to the Government of over $8 million, even though vacant space remained at the locations from which it was shipped.

In other instances, we learned that storage charges paid to some warehouses from 1957 to 1959 were sufficiently high to allow operators to recover their investment in buildings and equipment in 2 years.

In some cases usable Government bins were leased by Commodity Credit Corporation to private persons and were rerented for storage of Government-owned grain.

INEFFICIENCY CHARGED TO FARMER

No one will condone such practices as the "efficient and effective" conduct of business which is required by the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Farmers themselves are the first to suffer from costly and ineffective programs which only create new problems without solving those already at hand.

The problem has meaning for a State like mine, Minnesota, in which farmers receive 74.5 percent of their income from livestock and livestock products and 25.5 percent from crops. Minnesota farmers are familiar with the agricultural adage that cheap feed means cheap livestock. This has been hammered home to them by experience.

STOCKS HANG OVER MARKET

Farmers who depend upon livestock and livestock products as a major source of income have a right to be uneasy about the mounting stocks of feed grains. Those who produce cattle, hogs, dairy products, and eggs may well be concerned if such stocks can be made available at any moment to others who could convert them into livestock and livestock products. In the past 2 years we have seen the warning signs in the violent fluctuations in feed prices because of these available feed stocks.

The following table relates corn productions and the number of hogs raised from 1952 through 1959:

TABLE 6.—*Corn production, number of pigs raised, 1952–59*

Year	Corn production	Pigs raised
	Thousand bushels	*Thousand head*
1952	3,291,994	88,829
1953	3,209,896	77,914
1954	3,057,891	86,830
1955	3,229,743	95,719
1956	3,455,283	89,572
1957	3,422,331	87,960
1958	3,800,863	94,499
1959	4,361,170	101,636

Source: Hearings, Department of Agriculture appropriations bill, 1961, pt. 3, p. 313.

What this means to agriculture in dollars and cents can readily be seen in the average prices received by farmers for these products. On November 1, 1952, the average price received for corn was $1.49. By January 15, 1960, it had dropped to 98 cents a bushel.

HOG PRICES DROP

Farmers received an average of $17.65 per hundredweight for hogs on November 1, 1952. The average price per hundredweight on January 15, 1960, was $12.10.

The same pattern is repeated for other feed grains, as well as for most of the commodities sold by farmers. This is evidence enough that the tremendous expenditures of this administration on what it calls farm programs have only contributed to one failure after another. Farmers may well question the motives of those who charge them with such great costs from which they benefit so little.

FEED PRICES STILL DECLINING

That lower livestock and poultry prices tend to further depress grain prices is evident from the recent issue of the

Feed Situation, a bimonthly publication of the Agricultural Marketing Service. The April 1960 report says:

Big feed grain supplies, lower average prices for livestock and poultry, and reduced demand for commercially prepared feeds, especially poultry and hog feeds, have been bearish factors in the market. Feed grain prices have made less than their normal seasonal rise since last fall. In mid-March the index of prices received by farmers for feed grains was 4 percent below a year earlier. The index of wholesale prices of high-protein feed averaged 8 percent lower in March this year than last.

MANAGEMENT, CONSERVATION SUFFER

The consequences do not end here. When more production is needed to maintain a bare subsistence income because of lower prices, both farm management and soil conservation suffer.

Some will say we had the soil bank with its acreage reserve and conservation reserve. This, they try to tell us, not only controlled production but conserved soil. My answer is that you do not bring production into balance with demand by setting aside all of the marginal land in the country. Very little high productive land has gone into the soil bank as it was administered. In my own State of Minnesota, we planted more acres of corn when the acreage reserve was in operation than we did without it.

Corn acreage planted jumped from 74,513,000 acres in 1958 to 85,530,000 acres in 1959. In Minnesota, during this period, alfalfa acreage dropped 25,000 acres and all hay planted was down almost 86,000 acres. The harvested acreage of all hay in the United States dropped from 75,360,000 acres in 1954 to 69,404,000 acres in 1959. During the corresponding period, all hay in Minnesota dropped by 500,000 acres.

HAY ACREAGE DECLINES

The following table, supplied in our hearings at my request, tells its own story about the trend in Minnesota and the Nation in the first year the new program on corn was in effect.

TABLE 7

[In thousands]

	1958		1959	
	Acreage (acres)	Production (tons)	Acreage (acres)	Production (tons)
Minnesota:				
Alfalfa and alfalfa mix for hay	2,253	4,957	2,230	4,906
All hay	3,505	6,663	3,382	6,403
United States:				
Alfalfa and alfalfa mix for hay	29,864	67,247	28,740	64,739
All hay	73,004	121,819	69,404	112,764

Source: Crop production, 1959 annual summary (AMS).

Hearings, Department of Agriculture appropriations bill, 1961, pt. 3, p. 547.

There is no intent to imply that the result is already disastrous. An unfortunate trend has been established, however, and it bears watching by all who are concerned in promoting sound conservation practices. It is another trend reversed and we can only hope it does not have the same meaning we have witnessed in some of the other reversals we have examined today.

INCOME ESSENTIAL TO CONSERVATION

When farmers are driven to abandon soil and water conservation practices in a desperate effort to preserve a bare level of existence, the whole Nation will inevitably suffer. Technology has provided the tools of conservation but a reasonable and stable income is one of the essentials to proper use of these tools.

Corn is a ready example of what is happening to one of our most important crops. For the past decade the value of our corn production has been at or above the $4 billion mark. It is grown on more acres than any other crop with the exception of pasture land.

CORN IS A MAJOR CROP

Corn produces more than two-thirds of a hog, more than one-third of a chicken. It produces 13 percent of a beef steer and about 8 percent of a quart of milk. The Department of Agriculture experts have told us that 1,000 bushels of corn is equivalent to enough meat, milk, and eggs to supply one person with food energy for 20 years.

The basic uses of corn are food for man and feed for livestock but it has hundreds of other uses. Products made from corn are in the books we read, the paper we write on, the rugs on our floor. Corn is used in the mines, in the steel plants, in the chemical factories, in explosives, in textiles, and in the airplanes that fly overhead.

First and foremost, however, corn remains a basic food crop and what happens to it and the other feed grains has consequence for all of American agriculture.

CORN FAILURE IS SYMBOL

What has happened to corn in the agricultural economy is just one example of the Eisenhower administration's lack of understanding and cynical disregard of farm facts. How else could it fail to profit from the experience of the Hoover administration's Farm Board?

The corn program approved and adopted by Secretary Benson is as inept and wasteful as anything we have witnessed since the failure of the Farm Board. What causes us most concern is that the worst is yet to come. If the Nation's agriculture—livestock, poultry, and crop producers—can continue to operate under this legacy of chaos it will indeed be a miracle.

THIS IS THE RECORD

The sorry record of the consequences these policies have had for all agriculture does not need to be discussed here in all of its dismal and discouraging detail. The Secretary of Agriculture himself has done this for us in a table which he supplied for the record of our hearings. It is a comparison of the average prices received by farmers in the United States on November 1, 1952, on January 15, 1953, and January 15, 1960. Mr. Chairman, sad to say, it speaks for itself:

TABLE 8.—*Average prices received by farmers for farm products, United States*

Commodity and unit	Estimated, Nov. 1, 1952[1]	Estimated, Jan. 15, 1953	Estimated, Jan. 15, 1960
Wheat, per bushel	$2.10	$2.10	$1.78
Rye, per bushel	1.76	1.65	.925
Rice (rough), per hundredweight	5.92	6.43	4.77
Corn, per bushel	1.49	1.48	.979
Oats, per bushel	.836	.821	.685
Barley, per bushel	1.42	1.37	.848
Sorghum grain, per hundredweight	2.84	2.74	1.53
Hay, all baled, per ton	25.80	26.40	22.20
Cotton, American Upland, per pound	.3541	.2979	.293
Cotton, American-Egyptian, per pound	1.08	1.00	.531
Cottonseed, per ton	70.20	65.30	39.60
Soybean, per bushel	2.71	2.69	2.01
Peanuts, per pound	.111	.100	.101
Flaxseed, per bushel	3.74	3.70	31.2
Potatoes, per bushel	2.14	2.06	2.10
Sweetpotatoes, per bushel	3.02	3.06	3.51
Beans, dry edible, per hundredweight	8.48	8.46	7.50
Peas, dry field, per hundredweight	5.78	6.09	3.92
Apples, per bushel	2.77	3.21	2.14
Grapefruit, per box[2]	1.01	.83	.95
Oranges, per box[2]	$1.50	$1.15	$2.06
Lemons, per box[2]	1.92	2.86	1.36
Hogs, per hundredweight	17.65	17.80	12.10
Beef cattle, per hundredweight	21.65	19.70	20.30
Veal calves, per hundredweight	23.70	23.40	24.00
Sheep, per hundredweight	7.49	8.40	5.74
Lambs, per hundredweight	21.55	20.30	17.80
Butterfat, in cream, per pound	.729	.683	.597
All milk, wholesale, per hundredweight[3]	5.30	[4] 4.89	4.36
Milk, retail, per quart[5]	.213	.211	.217
All chickens, live, per pound	.253	.265	.163
Turkeys, live, per pound	.333	.336	.282
Eggs, per dozen	.511	.458	.296
Wool, per pound	.501	.510	.425
INDEX NUMBERS (1910–14=100)			
Prices received from farmers	280	267	231
Parity index	282	282	299
Parity ratio	99	95	77

[1] Average of prices received Oct. 15 and Nov. 15 except grapefruit, which is Oct. 15.
[2] Equivalent on-tree for all methods of sale.
[3] Estimated average price for the month for all milk sold at wholesale to plants and dealers.
[4] Preliminary.
[5] Sold by farmers directly to consumers.

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service, Mar. 28, 1960.
Hearings, Department of Agriculture appropriations hearings, 1961, pt. 3, p. 279.

If ever there was a time for a change, it is now. Continuation of the present policies must ultimately force the American farmer into a tightly regulated and regimented system of agriculture or into economic peonage. This has been the fate of a depressed agriculture in almost every civilized nation in the world. The consequences will not be suffered only by those who till the soil but by the entire Nation. When farmers are forced by a cost-price squeeze to destroy their soil resources, the entire Nation and its future generations are impoverished.

AGRICULTURE IS BASIC INDUSTRY

Despite the disregard in which it is held by this administration, agriculture is still the most important single industry in the United States, the major source of our food and raw materials, and one of industry's largest customers.

Our Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations has been fighting alternately a delaying and then a holding action against the onslaught of administrative power. The bill before you today represents another battle in this cold war. We have tried to meet the needs of modern agriculture by writing workable laws and providing the funds to administer them. Unfortunately, we have not always won.

SUBCOMMITTEE EFFORTS OPPOSED

What comfort we have we take in consideration of how much worse things might have been. We have tried to preserve some semblance of working programs even when overwhelmed by maladministration and deliberate contempt for the intent of Congress. I say to you in all sincerity, I wish we had been more successful. I am sorry to report that some of the funds we have provided have been squandered to the detriment of the farmer and in total disregard of our purposes.

We can no longer afford the luxury of do-nothingism and the extravagance of hesitation and confusion. Not only the welfare of our basic industry is at stake. It involves the welfare of every man, woman, and child who eat their daily bread in the secure knowledge that our soil, in the providence of God, contains untold wealth if we are both wise and good in its use.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the committee that at the bottom of page 17, "Benefits to General Public," you begin to get into a question which has interested me very much. I picked up the paper the other day when this appropriations action was announced, and the headlines said, "$4 Billion Appropriated for Agriculture."

It seems to me that we too often leave the impression that every dollar spent within the Agriculture Department is spent for the benefit of the farmer. In this section you have begun to get into the question and I was hoping your committee could set forth the total amount of what might be really charged to agriculture and what to the general public, so that there will be a better understanding on the part of our populace that agriculture as such does not reap the benefit of many of the dollars appropriated in the Department of Agriculture bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I am afraid much of the press is directed to the 88 percent of the people who are nonfarmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make some observations and to perhaps have a little colloquy with my chairman.

It has been a pleasure to serve with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and the other members of this subcommittee, and I want to at this time particularly pay my respects to two of our hard-working clerks, Mr. Pope and Mr. Gunnels.

The responsibilities of the Appropriations Committee are not in themselves legislative, but we do have a responsibility to point out to the House in our report on these bills the need for amending present legislation or even the need for new legislation.

Out my way we have no Government storage at all. Up until a sorry incident of about 6 weeks ago we had a very fine record as to honesty and good storage practices.

I would like to ask the chairman a question at this point. In our dealing with this storage problem, it was not the intention of the subcommittee to handicap or in any way criticize our old line storage people, such as cooperatives and that sort of thing.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, certainly we did not. However, we did recognize the total cost and that there should be some attention given to holding the cost in line. I think the gentleman would agree with me, whether it was an old line warehouse or not, that the ideal situation would be to keep the warehouse full the year around, rather than on a 30-day basis. We tried to limit our directives to holding the total cost down. I think, however, the big warehouse might have definite means of storing grain at a flat rate per month, and that is the sort of thing we directed our attention to.

Mr. HORAN. I do not want to belabor the point too much. Of course, in a period of 3 years we will have paid out in excess of $1¾ billion of American money for storage of surplus commodities, and that certainly dictates to me the need for remedial legislation, and I hope that that is the thing that we have pointed out this afternoon.

Now, on page 216 of part II of our hearings, we have a complete report covering many pages of the operations under Public Law 480. And, on page 19 of the committee report here we have a considerable discussion of the operations under Public Law 480, and if the chairman will respond, I would like to get his reaction to what is intended. I was referring to the report on page 19 where it says, "Everybody but the farmer benefits from Public Law 480." I would like to have your comments on that at this time.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that I worked rather hard on this report. I would not say that there is no benefit to the farmer. What we are trying to say is that everybody else profits to a greater degree. Really, with what we are now giving away virtually under Public Law 480, if production were pulled back and the farmer's price related in some degree to his cost, the farmer would be a great deal better off. If, what we are now giving away under Public Law 480, we were selling so that it would follow normal channels and become available to people, it would be much less costly. As the gentleman well knows, most all the Public Law 480 sales are made to foreign governments and the governments then in turn sells them for what the traffic will bear. For instance, I know of one country where they bought the commodities and in turn sold them and reaped a tremendous profit.

Mr. HORAN. In no way did you intend to close the doors of Public Law 480 in the export field?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is beyond our control. They have the authority to dispose of these commodities, and there is nothing we can do about it except sign the check and complain. So, this is our complaint.

Mr. HORAN. We have a pretty good export market as reflected in the hearings. Our exports of agricultural commodities for the present year are expected to be $4.2 billion, of which $2.9 billion are exported for dollars. But where Public Law 480 is important, it is very important to those of us who have wheat districts, because under Public Law 480 about 64 percent of our wheat is exported. Thirty-three percent of our cotton, 49 percent of our rice and 73 percent of our cottonseed and soybean oil.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that, as long as we have our production plant built up the way it is, and as long as we have nothing except existing laws, I think the American farmer if we did not have this outlet would be in a terrible situation. I do think that we need to point out that the maximum benefits go elsewhere and that somewhere along the line we owe it to ourselves and the farmer to pull our production in line, so that the farmer will not be dependent upon this outlet, and so that the Treasury will not be financing this outlet. In other words, we need to recognize that this is an emergency program and is not a long-range cure of the problem.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the committee that last Friday the full Committee on Appropriations took what I think is a good step. They appointed a special subcommittee to study the use of these foreign currencies that are generated under Public Law 480. Our subcommittee feels that one of the primary reasons for having Public

Law 480 was the market development work and I hope that that is protected.

On page 218 of part 2 of the hearings you will see a list of the proposals to spend these foreign currencies which are resting comfortably in our Treasury now, and more or less the whole Committee on Appropriations has denied these funds except in their use for agricultural market development work.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other matter I would like to discuss here. There has been some discussion about the pesticide investigation. We had a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee when he spoke, on that subject. Of course, a lot of it was generated because of the cranberry fiasco last fall. It seemed that practically everybody who came before our subcommittee used that as an argument for justification so we did not go along entirely with the budget request, because we felt that some coordination should exist between Food and Drug, Public Health and the Department of Agriculture, that each should know what the other is doing.

The committee felt it was necessary to cut this request for approximately $1,500,000 of additional funds to carry on research to avoid pesticide residues. The committee recommends an increase of $250,000. I am sure that every member of the committee agrees that residues from pesticides and other chemicals used in agriculture are one of the greatest difficulties facing American agriculture and American consumers.

Production of commercial quantities of many of our most popular fruits and vegetables would be impossible without pesticides. The apple crop would be almost a total loss, and the same would be true for peaches. Potatoes and tomatoes would be cut drastically. The small quantities of acceptable fruits and vegetables would sell at prices way out of reach of the average American.

We might as well face the facts about the need for chemicals in our present state of knowledge concerning insects, diseases, and other pests. We also have to face the fact that it is almost impossible to control these pests with chemicals without leaving some residues that should be avoided. Recent techniques are able to detect traces of residues that were not even suspected a few years ago. The only answer to this situation is more research.

In the Agricultural Research Service today we have some of the world's most able scientists. They have already demonstrated their ability to think up new ways to control pests without chemicals, as illustrated by the eradication of the screw worm fly in Florida. They now propose a hard-hitting research program to make fuller use of biological controls, insect sterility, and new materials such as attractants, repellants, and hormones.

This new research would not take the place of that done by the chemical companies. They would continue their work of development and testing. The Department should direct its energies to finding new ways to control insects without chemicals or by developing new chemicals that do not leave harmful residues.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I take this time, Mr. Chairman, to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee. On page 31 of the report, under Foreign Agricultural Service, there is a paragraph which reads as follows:

> The increase includes an additional $800,000 to cover by direct appropriation for the first time certain attaché expenses paid in prior years from foreign currency allocations;

Does this mean that the United States Government is now going to spend dollars for certain attaché expenses that in the past have been paid for out of foreign currencies?

Mr. WHITTEN. Only to the degree that circumstances have made it necessary. In other words, heretofore we have had foreign currencies available in a number of Western European countries and elsewhere, in countries which no longer qualify for Public Law 480 commodities which generate these currencies. So we have directed this agency to use foreign currencies to the fullest extent possible. But in some of those cases, countries which were formerly financed that way do not have the currencies available. So we anticipate that out of the $800,000 they will use foreign currencies to the fullest extent possible. But we did not want the absence of such currencies to cause us to close up attaché posts in areas where it has become necessary to finance them with dollars.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Is it possible to pinpoint the areas or the countries where the additional $800,000 is going to be spent?

Mr. WHITTEN. The testimony was that they could not. One of our problems is, where there is a limited amount of currency, frequently our Government gives priority to embassies and regular operations there, and perhaps the military, so agriculture does not know just where it will stand in the list of those that are seeking foreign currencies in those countries where it is very limited in the way of priority. They could not tell us. But they have specific instructions to use foreign currencies where available.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. It is the intention of the committee that where foreign currencies are owed or owned by the Treasury of the United States the agricultural observers should use American dollars to purchase foreign currencies?

Mr. WHITTEN. They all belong to the Government. The Foreign Agricultural Service would be buying them from the Treasury and reimbursing the Commodity Credit Corporation. So the money in that instance would go to one arm of the Government and the currency be owned by the other. This happens to be in the same department of Government and would be a bookkeeping transaction.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Would these have to be 480 funds or could they not be other currencies, foreign currencies generally?

Mr. WHITTEN. We have been dealing with 480 funds and inadvertently I used that terminology. We have other foreign currencies, too.

Mr. BOW. It would refer to all foreign currencies?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes. I had reference to that. I happened inadvertently to use the term "480 funds."

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, in discussing this bill briefly I would like to commend the gentlemen of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Department Appropriations for a very fine job, indeed. They have attacked a very complex job with vigor and foresight and have on the whole accomplished a great deal in this bill.

I would like to limit my comments to two specific phases of this measure which are of extreme importance not only nationally but to my own congressional district as well. I would like to mention briefly the watershed conservancy program and the hot lunch program for the 39 million schoolchildren of our Nation.

Watershed conservancy is, in my opinion, one of the most important developments in recent years in the field of positive planning for the orderly development of our natural resources and the protection of our farmlands, our small towns and, in some cases, our bigger cities.

This vital work is aimed as keeping the water back in the upper valleys, the small streams and creeks of the Nation, holding it back during the heavy period of runoff so that these waters cannot swell the bigger streams and rivers and add to the flood damage below. It is geared, too, to the holding back of water on the land where it can be used as the dry spells of the summer make it necessary.

In my own State of Nebraska this year we suffered disastrous floods. It is estimated that roads and highways and bridges were damaged in the amount of over $3 million.

In one small area of Gage County in southern Nebraska one major source of runoff—Big Indian Creek—did damage to county roads and bridges alone estimated at $100,000. This particular area has already been organized into a watershed conservancy district and plans are under way for proper development of conservation projects. The amount of damage done in the spring of 1960 would have paid for the operation costs of these projects for a number of years.

By contrast, the watershed next to Big Indian Creek has already started construction work and is about 80 percent completed. The streams in this area did practically no damage this year. They were, indeed, very well behaved.

We have these classic examples of what can be done, the amount of money that can be saved, in every part of the Midwest. I hope that this program can eventually be spread to include every part of the Nation.

The present bill will be a major step in achieving that ambition. It provides a total of $32 million for this work, an increase of $9,250,000 over last year's appropriations and an increase of some $4,250,000 over this year's budget estimates.

Mr. Chairman, this kind of increase cannot be considered a waste of tax dollars; it is, instead, a wise investment of public funds in the future of America. It is estimated that each year flood damage costs the American people over $1 billion. Of this amount, some $500 million or more is in the form of damage to farmlands in the upper valleys, the watershed areas. If, by making an investment of $32 million we can cut down this extravagant waste of soil and other resources, we are making a major investment in America.

Every ounce of this valuable soil will someday be needed. We are a nation presently rich in natural resources, but every economist and every forecaster points to the day which is not too far distant when the United States will be straining its reserves to provide enough food for its growing population. This valuable asset must be preserved if we are to face these critical times of the future with confidence. I am highly gratified that the committee has seen fit to take the necessary steps.

Concerning the school lunch program, I feel that it, too, is an investment in the future. It is an effort to help develop our most important of all resources, the youngsters of the Nation.

I have heard many times and in many places the stories of benefits which have accrued to the Nation through this hot lunch program. I believe in it; I have always believed in it.

There are some 39 million school-age children in the United States today. Approximately 30 percent of these children benefit directly from the hot lunch program. For many of these youngsters it is the only decent meal they get during the course of the day. It is the only effort at balancing the diet of many thousands of them.

The present bill provides an outright appropriation of $110 million for this program. In addition, it provides for transfer of $45 million from section 32 funds to provide meats and so forth for the program. This makes a minimum of $155 million for the hot lunch program and it is my sincere hope that this will be augmented during the course of the year by transfer of other commodities to the program from our surplus stocks.

Mr. Chairman, both of these programs represent increases over the recommendations contained in the President's budget. I do not consider either of them to be a waste of tax dollars, or a depletion of the Nation's wealth. I consider both of them to be rather a wise and sound investment by this Congress in the future of America. I can and do most heartily recommend both of these increases to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. It is my hope that they will be retained in the bill, as is, upon final passage.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I come to the well again in this session still the low man on the totem pole so far as the composition of this subcommittee is concerned. It is no secret that during this year and the past year I have been at odds with members of the majority and sometimes even to some degree with members on my own side. I guess this stems from the fact that I try as best I can to represent the thinking of the majority of the farmers in my congressional district back in the heart of Illinois. The general philosophy of those farmers is that eventually they would like to get back to a free system. They do not like controls and they do not like allotments and they do not like Government regimentation of any sort. They want to be free to be on their own to chart their own course. So my whole philosophy reflects that thinking which is prevalent among the farmers of my district.

I am sorry that last Friday it was necessary for me to be out at St. Louis University on a prior commitment when the subcommittee was reporting to the full committee. The report of the committee was airmailed special to me and I read it on the plane coming back today.

It is in a sense the chairman's handiwork, and this is his privilege as chairman of our subcommittee. He knows that many times I disagree with him, always in good faith. It seems to me that the first 20 pages of the report are pretty much a political speech. I suspect that if I spend 25 or 30 years here I could make my own political speech, if it becomes my pleasure to author a report at some future date.

Let me go over several of the items in the few minutes I have. We find on page 2, for instance, a discussion of the decline in farm income. Farm income has declined, but it compares with the period of time from 1932 to 1952, making no mention of course that in that time there was a serious depression and that as late as 1939 there were still 9 million unemployed. Then, of course, we had World War II and then a few postwar years following the war, and again another war, the Korean conflict. All that has a definite effect, I would say, on what farmers were getting for their commodities as against the peaceful years from 1953 to the present day.

On page 4, in talking about the programs that have been enacted through this administration by this Congress, and the item of $25.8 billion of cost, $8 billion coming from reduced price supports. Of course, there is no mention made of what the cost might have been had we had rigid 90-percent price supports. There is nothing in the record that would indicate if we had rigid 90-percent price supports what the cost might be. The $8 billion could very well be double that amount with high rigid supports.

Then the soil bank program costing $4.3 billion. I differed at times with the Department in the administration of the soil bank program. My own feeling would be that Congress itself, since we are writing the laws, should have said "crop acres" or "productive acres" and not have left it up to the discretion of the farmer himself to put his creek bottom land in the soil bank or in the conservation reserve. It seems to me our responsibility here is—if we intend to put crop acres and good productive acres into the bank, we ought to say so in the law and if we do not say so, why should we criticize the people downtown when in this vast and massive program, they cannot keep on top of every single one of them?

Then on page 5, in talking about the reduced net income over a period of 7 years to the extent of 20 percent, we discount to a degree the decline in farm population which from 1950 to 1960 declined 23 percent from 7½ million to 5.8 million, and under the best predictions from the Department, we will find the farm population declining in the sixties another 12 percent.

It seems to me when we are talking about "farmers tending to increase their production as farm prices are reduced," we discount altogether the matter or the idea that a farmer regardless of what conditions prevail would not want to increase his farm production.

If we might move along to Public Law 480, and the criticism that has been leveled against the program, it seems to me that the Secretary and the Department ought to be commended for the amount of surplus commodities that we have been able to peddle overseas although I am concerned, having visited a number of foreign countries, at what is involved when we get paid not in dollars but rather in local currencies. I was glad when we were in Japan to find that one product which does sell in Japan for dollars is $100 million worth of soybeans of which we produce so much in my area and in the entire State of Illinois. When I was in Thailand we were criticized, or our Government was criticized, because of the amount of grain we were sending to Indonesia. Why? Because the export of rice from Thailand to Indonesia was their second best source of revenue.

So it is not just a simple matter for the Secretary or our officials to peddle our surpluses. There are a number of complex problems to be considered. I think they ought to be commended for what they have been able to dispose of.

On page 10, there is discussed the Commodity Credit Corporation and suggestions to the extent that the board should be full-time employed individuals of the Department rather than simply those individuals in the Department who are in the capacity of Secretary or Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary and so on down the line.

I have some mixed emotions about this particular proposal although I am very mindful that here we have a corporation with such tremendous assets, it seems to me that just about full time has to be devoted to the business of administering the business of this vast Corporation. My mind is open on this particular suggestion. But I do not think the committee erred in opening it up for discussion.

On the matter of grain storage on page 11, I think we should be temperate in our criticism. When one says we should utilize Government storage when available, rather than private storage, what happens when the Government storage is in the State of Washington and the grain is in Ohio or Indiana or Pennsylvania? Do we pay the cost of freight from one coast to the other, just in order to get it into Government storage?

Mr. WHITTEN. I think the point the gentleman makes is a good one.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. I think the gentleman was on the floor when I had a colloquy with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO] in respect to the storage matter. After I had concluded my remarks, I think the record was left in this position: That the Department of Agriculture had advised at least some Members of the House that Government-owned storage was costing only about 6 cents a bushel. I would like to propound a question to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. Has the Department of Agriculture ever furnished the committee that figure?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not have any such information. They may have supplied it to some individual. I have not had any such statement that I know of. I do not mean to be all inclusive, because there are about 8,000 employees in the Department, so what somebody may have told somebody else I do not know.

Mr. AVERY. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the committee itself had made some study of the cost of this storage?

Mr. WHITTEN. We have made about three investigations through the years.

Mr. AVERY. I mean recently.

Mr. WHITTEN. We had one this year.

Mr. AVERY. What did that reveal as to the cost of Government storage?

Mr. WHITTEN. Again I am sorry I cannot give the gentleman that information right offhand. If you leave it for 2 years it costs one amount. If you turn it over it costs another amount. So there is no set figure, but it did show that in some instances it would be much more economical, in my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MICHEL. Glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. AVERY. Does not the gentleman from Mississippi concede that it is not according to correct practice to put into a committee report that the storage rates are excessive and issue a mandate that they should be reduced when he says he does not know what the cost is?

Mr. WHITTEN. There are not many places where the Secretary and I agree, but he said they were excessive and he cut them. We say we agreed with them. So that apparently we are in agreement. He said they were excessive and cut them.

Mr. AVERY. I am trying to find out what the committee finds.

Mr. WHITTEN. I hate to quote the press, but according to the press the Secretary said his own investigation had nothing to do with it. This is done from our own studies.

Mr. AVERY. All I am asking the gentleman is, can he tell us what the study showed as to the cost of Government storage?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am not giving the details because I do not have them. They were sufficient because the Department reduced the rates. We in our report urged them to reduce them and urged them to use the Government storage when they were more economical.

Mr. AVERY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I include the following chart:

Cost of handling grain—Expense per bushel, elevators Nos. 1 and 3

	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959
Rated capacity	16,000	16,000	16,000	22,000	22,000	27,000	27,000	83,000	215,000	275,000	275,000	370,000	446,000
Bushels handled	424,877	312,667	301,119	337,161	534,246	396,837	248,999	609,765	427,199	403,134	311,883	700,470	598,913
Shrink	2,793	2,154	2,360	2,729	3,797	1,792	2,358	2,728	2,136	1,953	1,439	1,953	224
Operating expense:													
Salaries and labor	$0.01566	$0.02292	$0.02754	$0.03615	$0.02820	$0.03898	$0.05649	$0.03105	$0.03574	$0.04236	$0.05559	$0.03187	$0.04682
Repairs and supplies	.00486	.00292	.00340	.00344	.00372	.00655	.00449	.01162	.01469	.01561	.01189	.01527	.02190
Utilities	.00176	.00302	.00284	.00221	.00421	.00549	.00678	.00480	.00667	.00874	.00955	.00693	.00565
Insurance	.00267	.00369	.00383	.00336	.00286	.00451	.00842	.00390	.00883	.00943	.01999	.00998	.01207
Taxes	.00162	.00241	.00231	.00167	.00191	.00191	.00327	.00129	.00196	.00304	.00392	.00468	.00779
Other expense	.00333	.00397	.00363	.00367	.00593	.00708	.01165	.00528	.00694	.01102	.01286	.01529	.02092
Shrink	.01315	.01033	.01175	.01403	.00880	.00903	.01894	.00895	.01000	.00981	.00934	.00492	.00159
Total operating expenses per bushel	.04305	.04926	.05530	.06453	.05563	.07355	.11004	.06689	.08483	.10001	.12314	.08895	.11674
Depreciation	.00382	.00561	.00751	.01117	.00781	.00946	.01637	.00579	.01415	.02167	.02988	.03781	.03546
Total expense per bushel	.04687	.05487	.06281	.07570	.06344	.08301	.12641	.07268	.09898	.12168	.15302	.12676	.15220

Mr. MICHEL. That is very well. I would say to the gentleman from Kansas that my own position would be of course that many times we need storage and we need it now. Who is to say that the Government could build storage more efficiently at the moment than some private industry? We have to pat them on the back for supplying the storage when they did, in times of critical need, and refrain from casting a blanket indictment against all when most have acted in good faith.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. Happy to yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to say I am thoroughly in accord with what the gentleman has had to say with reference to using available storage if it is located in the right areas. Recently, however, it came to my attention that the military was withdrawing from a certain plant which was suitable for storage purposes. I took the matter up with the CCC and suggested that it might be available for grain storage. I have a letter in reply from them to the effect that public storage was not usable, that they wanted private storage even if it had to be constructed. I know the gentleman does not go along with that.

Mr. MICHEL. No; certainly not.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. But certainly if public storage is available and can be adapted to the program it seems it seems to me it should be used.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman will agree that when public storage is available and suitable for the storage of grain it should be used, but there are a number of problems involved and factors that have to be taken into consideration, such as aeration and so forth.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. But they should look into its adaptability to storage and use it if possible. They do not want public storage if it will cost a great deal to adapt public storage to the purposes indicated. I can understand that, but they should not take an arbitrary stand in the matter.

I say further to the gentleman I recently read an article to the effect that we were paying $1 million a day for grain storage, and paying $2 million a day for overall storage. If that is correct surely we should use public storage if it is adaptable for the purpose and properly located and would cost less than storage which has to be built by private enterprise for that particular purpose. The gentleman I am sure agrees with that.

Mr. MICHEL. Yes sir.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield.

Mr. BREEDING. I would like to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his stand on this matter and make the point that in our area of Kansas if it had not been for private enterprise creating grain storage we would not have had any, for there is not any public storage of any consequence available. I think a good deal of unjust criticism has been directed at the grain storage

people, saying they are riding the gravy train, and so forth, whereas if it had not been for them, if it had not been for private enterprise, we would not have had any storage in my State of Kansas; the farmers would not have had any place to store their grain.

Mr. MICHEL. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

If I might make another point it would be in the area of the conservation reserve program and ACP payments. Last year I offered a cutting amendment to the bill and I was soundly defeated by about 2 to 1 majority. This year, of course, there is no change in the complexion of the Congress and I do not know that my arguments would be any more persuasive this year than last. I still say, however, that in this bill there is no rhyme, nor sense, nor reason for the Federal Government's footing the bill on any farm for taking out hedgerows or tearing down stone fences and one thing and another, which is still the practice. When I was a boy on the farm we rooted out our own hedgerows on the farm with horses and a scraper. Many a harness and tugs were broken in this operation but I see no reason why people today cannot do the same thing on their own. If it is a matter of tearing down stone fences I do not see why we have to come to Washington to get Federal aid to tear down stone fences, but this is still a practice under the ACP program.

Mr. Chairman, in my remaining minute or two may I simply conclude by making my own little political speech in answer to the first 20 pages of our report and I would do by making these six points:

First. The Democrats bequeathed the Eisenhower administration an agricultural time bomb composed of obsolete, depression-bred, war-born farm laws. Despite endorsement of flexible supports for peacetime in platforms of both political parties, these old laws were continued until over $7 billion worth of surplus had been accumulated in 1955.

Second. The administration has repeatedly urged Congress to pass reasonable farm legislation truly beneficial to farmers. Congress has been controlled 23 out of the last 27 years by the Democrats. Most of the time Congress has talked about the problem and, in the few instances where they have acted, they have only passed a few bills that would have been another dose of what made the patient ill in the first place.

Third. Experience proves that the price-fixing and acreage-control programs have not worked, but many Democrats prefer to ignore this fact. It appears they will either not admit to the facts or else prefer to perpetuate the problem and attempt to profit politically.

Fourth. Because of efficiency and hard work, the American farmer produces for himself and 25 others. Artificial price incentives established by excess Government interference have contributed toward a superabundance in some crops. Many Democrats exemplify the greatest surplus problem—the surplus of demagoguery—when they talk but do not act. After years of attacking the administration proposals, only in recent weeks have a few Democrats come forth with a modification of the old discredited Brannan plan and the 1960 version is even more of an economic monstrosity which would impose unrealistic production cuts and slash national farm income while greatly reducing farm purchasing power.

Fifth. The Democrats for years, and regularly in campaign years, have wept for the plight of the small farmer while doing little to help him. The outmoded farm laws helped the big operators the most, who need it the least. The rural development program created by this administration and operating successfully in over 30 States is the first concerted effort to assist small, low-income farmers who need help the most.

Sixth. The Democrats compare farm prices during the Korean war period with farm prices during the 7 peacetime years of the Eisenhower administration. Actually per capita farm income has been at record high levels during this administration, exceeding even the war years. Instead of using the years 1949 or 1950, which were postwar years comparable to the last 7 years, they stress the 1951 and 1952 levels. American farmers and their sons want to drive tractors instead of tanks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] may be placed immediately following mine in general debate, so as to have them consecutive in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, the farm problem is just like the weather—we all talk about it but do nothing about it. There are many dedicated Members of Congress who are earnestly striving to find a solution to a most perplexing situation. I am one of them.

Everyone knows that agriculture is the soft spot in our national economy today. The farmer's income continues to go down while his operating expenses continue to rise. Hence, the American farmer is definitely in a price-cost squeeze. I am sure we all agree that the farmer is entitled to his share of the national wealth and productive capacity of this Nation. Our main problem and concern is to bring this about. We must all realize that we are presently passing through an agricultural revolution. Our farms are rapidly becoming completely mechanized and, as a result, farms are getting larger in order that farming may be a profitable business. We have more part-time farmers than ever before who are compelled to go into industry to augment their income. I personally regret the passing of the so-called "family size farm" and the trend toward corporation farming. This not only disturbs farm community life as we once knew it, but it is taking many people out of our agricultural communities. This certainly is not good for America.

The composition of the Congress has changed a great deal since the time when Representatives from farming districts were a potent force in enacting farm legislation. Due to the trend of population into the urban areas of this country, farm representation in the Congress is becoming less and less and, hence, it has also become more difficult to enact any kind of major farm legislation. If legislation is enacted, it must not only satisfy farmers but the people in the city as well.

Another handicap facing agriculture today is the diversity of views regarding farm legislation as expressed by our various farm organizations. If there was more general agreement among these groups as to the type of legislation actually needed, legislating in this field would not be so difficult. In this connection, I long ago advocated a White House Conference on Agriculture at which the problems of agriculture could be discussed with the leaders of farm organizations and other experts at the highest level in the hope that such a meeting might prove constructive. I still think this is a good idea.

Furthermore, I sincerely believe that the problems of agriculture should be completely divorced from partisan politics. There is no reason in the world why agriculture, the Nation's basic industry, should be kicked around by political parties in order to gain votes. The American farmer deserves better treatment than that. Members of Congress approach the question of foreign affairs and national defense on a nonpartisan basis. On these issues we stand united, but when it comes to dealing with agriculture, we continue to spar for political advantage. This is another important reason why it is so difficult to enact proper and sensible farm legislation, especially in an election year.

I will be very much surprised if the present Congress will do anything very constructive in passing adequate and proper farm legislation at this session. Aside from general consideration involving the entire farm problem, we all realize that something must be done to cut down on farm surpluses, particularly wheat. It seems to me that wheat legislation should have the highest priority as far as this session is concerned. President Eisenhower has indicated that he will approve a wheat bill if it meets the guidelines set out in his special farm message to the Congress. Therefore, if the majority leadership in the Congress really wants a wheat bill which can be enacted into law, all they have to do is meet the President's challenge. Whether or not a realistic wheat bill is passed at this session will depend upon how sincere the Democrat majority is in trying to do something about it.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, earlier today I asked the chairman of the subcommittee several questions about provisions of the bill before us dealing with poultry inspection. I think the facts clearly show that it was the intent of Congress—and it is the law of the land—that all poultry and poultry products in interstate commerce must be inspected for wholesomeness, and that must entail continuous inspection, not a hit-or-miss sampling system. If this bill provides for less than that, as I am afraid it does, then the situation requires correction. Plants making poultry soups, poultry pies, and other processed foods using significant quantities of poultry in their preparation, should be extended the free inspection service, on a continuous basis, both for their benefit and the benefit of the consuming public. Under a temporary situation which has been in effect, all such further processing plants have been exempted from the new Poultry Products Inspection Act requirement for continuous inspection, but the exemption has been for the convenience of the Government. That exemption expires June 30. After that, all plants in interstate commerce are entitled to have inspectors on their premises. This is most important. If the additional $500,000 provided for poultry inspection in the bill is not sufficient to assure such continuous inspection in all plants—including the 300 now temporarily exempt—then more money must be provided. The responsibility cannot be evaded.

However, I do want to say I am pleased that in answer to the request which I made and which several other Members of Congress also made, as well as representatives of the Meat Cutters Union and the poultry processors, that some additional funds, at least, are being provided in the bill for poultry inspection even though the President failed to ask for those extra funds. I cannot understand that failure on the part of the executive department. It seems to me it represented a case of repeal of an important provision of consumer law by the process of appropriation starvation. The committee is to be commended for recognizing that funds must be available to comply with the inspection law, even if the President did not ask for those extra funds. My concern now is whether the $500,000 is enough, and whether the technical language inserted in the bill in connection with this extra $500,000 item is, as I believe it to be, a limitation on the effectiveness of the inspection work in plants which buy chicken parts and carcasses and process them into prepared foods.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I turn to another aspect of agricultural expenditures which concerns me deeply. I refer to the distribution of surplus foodstuffs to the needy. The Department maintains, and the President seems to believe, that our Government is doing a terrific job of distributing surplus food to the needy. Even the committee report seems to swallow some of that. But the reports we are receiving from West Virginia—right now very much in the political news—are that the free food distribution system is a cruel hoax on the needy. The variety of foods distributed is frightfully inadequate to help assure even a minimum diet. It is a dumping program. And yet we have widespread farm distress because farmers cannot sell all they produce of the wonderful variety of foods grown in this bountiful country. Why must any American go hungry when we raise more chickens than we can sell and more eggs than can possibly be sold, produce more butter than we can sell, more fresh fruits and vegetables, more meat, more of everything, and while we are frantically trying to give food away overseas, as the committee report points out?

In this country we are told that technical problems of distribution make it impossible to give out fresh eggs instead of powdered eggs to our needy. We are told it is impossible to give our needy poor an occasional few pounds of chicken, yet we gave frozen chickens to Egypt. The only outlet in this country for surplus fresh foods in the form most people like to eat them is the school lunch program and some of the public institutions. Actually, we have 7 million or more Americans on various forms of public assistance who could also, through a food stamp plan, enjoy the surplus of our harvests. This would remove the necessity of processing a lot of this food for dumping overseas; for instance, of processing eggs into powder on such a huge scale. Why not fresh eggs for our needy?

The answer, of course, is that our surplus distribution machinery does not have the necessary flexibility for distributing fresh products. It is a warehousing operation, and the food must fit the mechanics of that system.

A food stamp plan, using the neighborhood grocery for distribution purposes, would make possible a continuous flow of surplus farm products in fresh and appetizing form to the very poor who cannot now afford to buy such items.

I intend to discuss the food stamp distribution system in greater detail in the near future. We have the legal authority in the law—at long last—after 5 years of administration obstructionism on it—we have the legal authority for a food stamp plan. In all reverence, I say God knows we need such a program. West Virginia is not the only place in the Nation with stark poverty and many, many needy persons.

And the food—we have more food than we know what to do with. Our vast hoard of food is a storage headache, a budgetary nightmare, a fiscal scandal, and a moral shame considering how much hunger exists on this earth. But we have the food. It could be a blessing, not a curse, if more of it could be used to feed our own malnourished people—millions of them.

I am disappointed that the subcommittee, in drafting the report on this bill, did not see fit to include the suggested language I submitted calling for administration action to institute a food stamp plan. I am also sorry the committee partially swallowed the administration propaganda about the billions of dollars worth of surplus food going to 21 million of needy Americans, when that figure clearly includes many millions of schoolchildren who are not needy—for it includes all distribution under the school lunch program.

The food stamp plan, if implemented, could do for all agriculture on a tremendous scale what the school milk program is now doing for dairy farmers. We spend almost $100 million a year on this extra milk allowance. It is not a welfare program—it is intended primarily to sell and dispose of milk—a price support program. But no one objects to it. We recognize its tremendous value in building the health of the Nation's children. Along the same lines a food stamp plan would assure better meals also for 7 million or more Americans—and thus establish a vast new market for farm products which now rot in the fields or go overseas as gifts.

Mr. Chairman, when we talk about revitalizing agriculture, why can we not recognize that the best way to help the farmer is to provide him with more customers for what he raises? A food stamp plan would enable us to use up all of our surplus items eligible for support under section 32 as well as much more of the storables. If perishables could be distributed through the neighborhood grocery, we could make full use of the more than $300 million available every year under section 32, much of which never gets spent for the purpose for which it was intended.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I think it only fair to point out that in many important respects the subcommittee which drafted the bill now before us has done an excellent job, and I do not want anything I have said to be regarded as a blanket condemnation of this bill or a blanket criticism of the report filed on the bill. I have tried to make my criticisms specific, and I think they are justified.

On the other hand, I applaud the subcommittee for again handling the school lunch appropriation with sympathy for the great importance of this program, and for once again earmarking some of the frequently unused section 32 price support funds for the school lunch program. I back up the committee on many of the statements in the report critical of our surplus disposal program. I particularly want to express my appreciation for the decision of the subcommittee to provide the full budget amount for meat inspection in the Agricultural Research Service appropriation, so that meat inspection for the red meats can continue at the same level as in the current year.

This was one of the items I stressed in my testimony before the subcommittee, in view of the indication the subcommittee gave last year that it thought further processing in the red meats did not require continuous inspection. Since the issue involved last year in

meat inspection, as discussed in my testimony, is exactly the same as now confronts us in connection with the inspection of further processing operations in poultry, I sincerely hope the outcome for poultry inspection will be the same.

It is not enough to make sure that the meat and poultry which go into processed foods were wholesome at the time of slaughter; as my testimony before the subcommittee pointed out, meat carcasses or parts—and the same holds true for poultry—can spoil in transport from one plant to another, and often do. The Federal meat inspectors each day condemn large amounts of meat intended for use in processed meat products, even though the meat was wholesome at the time of slaughter. Much can happen to it en route to final processing. The same holds true, as I said, for poultry.

Under unanimous consent, I submit at this point my testimony before the subcommittee, as follows:

THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM, MEAT AND POULTRY INSPECTION, AND THE FOOD STAMP PLAN

(Statement by Representative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri, before Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, House Appropriations Committee, March 15, 1960)

As members of the subcommittee know, I have appeared before you a number of times in past years to urge adequate appropriations for such items in the Agriculture Department's budget as the school lunch program, meat and poultry inspection, distribution of surplus foods to the needy, and various other programs of the Department of Agriculture which are important to urban areas of our country. I am happy to say that this subcommittee has usually shown great awareness of the importance of these programs even though the present Secretary of Agriculture has frequently demonstrated very little concern for the consumer viewpoint, and his budget requests have usually been inadequate for consumer-type services conducted by his Department.

I do not want to go into any great detail on the budget items this year. For instance, I know it is not necessary for me to take your time to urge fair treatment for the school lunch program. I am well aware of the fact that the only reason the school lunch program in the past several years has been as effective as it has been is that members of this subcommittee have insisted on it, and the House has demanded such action. I will support you, I can assure you, if, following your review of this appropriation request, you once again recommend more money for this program than the budget recommends.

MEAT INSPECTION

On meat inspection, however, I am not sure we see exactly eye to eye. As I recall, I was the only Member of the House to take the floor last year, during debate on the Agriculture appropriation bill, to protest some language you wrote into your report concerning the matter of further Federal inspection during processing operations of meat products containing meat which had already been inspected for wholesomeness at the time of slaughter. In your report you called for a study of the need for such continuous inspection, indicating that perhaps some money could be saved by eliminating the requirement that meat going into meat pies, and meat products of various kinds made from inspected meat must be inspected again in this secondary processing operation.

The information I have since obtained about this issue strengthens the view I expressed last year. Meat inspectors in St. Louis with whom I have discussed this matter have informed me of numerous instances in which they have spotted and condemned processed meat products which were totally unfit for human consumption, even though the meat which went into them had originally been passed for wholesomeness at the time of slaughter. Each day in St. Louis alone hundreds of pounds of meat products are condemned as tainted, sour, putrid, unsound, contaminated, rancid, poisoned by contact with certain metals, or even containing fragments of glass. So the followup inspection is most necessary.

The meatpackers whom I know are not anxious to poison the consumer. On the contrary, they work hard to assure a safe and sanitary and nutritious product. They are, I might say, among the biggest boosters of an adequate meat-inspection program and are in the forefront of demanding adequate funds for this work. Enlightened business recognizes the importance of maintaining consumer confidence in its product, and that is why the enlightened meatpackers want adequate funds for meat inspection that must include funds for continuous inspection in the processing operations. So I ask that you not attempt to save a little money by cutting this item, because a budget cut on meat inspection would be a serious thing to the consumers of this country and to the meatpackers who are anxious to assure a wholesome product. Only the unscrupulous or fly-by-night operator would benefit from shortcuts on meat inspection, and that is exactly the kind of operator we don't want to benefit from the laws we pass. So I urge the full budget amount be provided for the Agricultural Research Service item for meat inspection, including funds for inspection of processed items.

POULTRY INSPECTION

As you all know, I was one of those Members of Congress who took an active role in the enactment in the last Congress of the Poultry Products Inspection Act. This act provided for an exemption until July 1, 1960, for the output of those processors for whom the Department of Agriculture could not immediately provide inspectors. The budget for the coming year fails, however, to request the additional funds which will now be required—about $1 million—to pay the salaries of inspectors who will be needed in the 1961 fiscal year to inspect the output of processors which up to now have been exempt under this provision. I am informed that the Department has suggested new legislation continuing the exemption indefinitely for firms making poultry pies and similar processed items. I would bitterly oppose such a step. The Poultry Products Inspection Act has been of tremendous benefit to the country—to the consumers, the processors, and the farmers. We now have assurances that nearly all the poultry we eat is wholesome. Until a few years ago we did not have that assurance on most poultry. There is no reason to weaken the act by opening up exemptions Congress did not intend and has not agreed to.

Hence, under present law—under law which should not and probably will not be changed between now and July 1—the Department must provide inspectors by July 1, 1960, for about 300 poultry products plants which are at this time still exempt under the act. These are the plants which make poultry pies, soups, etc., and which were originally exempted for a short time because Congress recognized there would be difficulty in hiring enough qualified inspectors to cover all of the slaughtering plants as of the time the new act went into effect, so there was a reason to provide for temporary exemptions of this nature for processors at the convenience of the Department.

But these temporary exemptions expire as of June 30 of this year. No convincing reasons have been put forward to continue those exemptions beyond that time. Most of the exempted plants—about two-thirds of them, I understand—are already set up physically for inspection, and are, in fact, so anxious to have inspection that despite their exemption from the compulsory inspection program they are paying their own funds to have their products inspected under the voluntary Federal poultry inspection program. Obviously, then, inspectors are available for those plants. There is no reason, then, to continue exempting them. They are entitled to have inspection on the same free basis as the slaughtering plants, rather than to have to pay for it out of their own funds.

As for the 100 additional processing plants now exempt and not participating under the voluntary inspection program, we should take direct action to serve notice that as of July 1 they had better be set up for Federal inspection—including the required sanitary conditions—if they want to remain in interstate commerce after that date. The best way to accomplish that sort of warning is for the Congress to appropriate the additional $1 million which will be required as of July 1 to pay the costs of a complete inspection program for all poultry and poultry products processed and sold in interstate commerce. If we don't appropriate the funds, a lot of these uninspected plants will probably see no urgency in getting set up for inspection—getting the proper equipment and installing required sanitary facilities—and if they have to do this at the last minute, they will really be up against it. For let me repeat that the law allows for no administrative exemptions for poultry in interstate commerce after June 30.

While I am discussing poultry inspection, I might say that I am again wondering aloud as to the wisdom of the Secretary of Agriculture in placing the poultry inspection program under the producer-conscious Marketing Service rather than making it a coequal agency with meat inspection in the more independent-minded Agricultural Research Service. This latest incident of not seeking funds for inspection in the plants which are now temporarily exempted is yet another instance of tepid concern for the consumer interest. I will say that the meat inspection branch, on the other hand, has usually felt much more free to battle for the highest standards of consumer interest in its work.

SURPLUS FOOD DISTRIBUTION—AND FOOD STAMPS

Now I want to ask you to do me, and the Congress, and the American people, a big favor. I want you to write into your report on this bill language which reiterates that it is the intent of Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture utilize the authority he already possesses under law for the distribution of surplus foods to our needy under a food stamp plan, and stating that it is the intent of this committee of the Congress also.

Such a statement in the report will not in itself increase by a single cent the amount you will be appropriating in this bill. For, of course, the Secretary would still have to come back to Congress and to the Appropriations Committee to request a supplemental appropriation if a food stamp plan were actually to go into effect. I would like this subcommittee, however, in connection with the regular agricultural appropriation bill, to make it clear that the Congress is prepared to appropriate the funds for a food stamp plan, if the Department shows its willingness to carry out the intent of Congress and put such a plan into operation.

We have widespread distress among farmers; we have billions of dollars worth of surplus food and we have millions of undernourished Americans—persons not getting enough

to eat. The cost of distributing a few surplus foods to the needy at the present time is out of all proportions to the benefits the recipients obtain. Most of these costs are shouldered onto localities which find it uneconomic and burdensome to have a full-scale distribution set up for the purpose of distributing such a little bit of food—items like corn meal and flour and dried skim milk and occasionally some butter or cheese.

Under the food-stamp plan approved by Congress last year, however, these storable items—plus perishables which are removable under section 32—could be distributed directly through the regular grocery stores. The food industry, I am sure, would be delighted to participate for very little or no profit—just if their costs were covered—if the Department of Agriculture would make the effort to set up such a program, and enlist the food industry's cooperation. It would certainly help the farmer.

Therefore, since you are the subcommittee which directs the Department of Agriculture on how to use its money and what to use it for, I ask that you write wording such as this into your report:

"The committee notes that no funds have been requested by the Department for the implementation of the food-stamp plan enacted by Congress last year. While the law gives the Secretary discretionary powers in placing the program into effect, the conference report on the bill extending Public Law 480 made clear that Congress intended that the food-stamp plan should be utilized to distribute surplus food items to needy Americans. The Committee on Appropriations therefore recommends that the Department prepare and submit by July 1, 1960, a detailed plan for implementing the food-stamp law, and that it indicate the cost of putting such a specified plan into operation in the 1961 fiscal year, so that Congress can then appropriate the funds necessary to place a departmental food-stamp program in operation."

The wording is rough—I am aware that you do not need my help in writing the language of your report. I am just trying to express the thought. And I sincerely hope you will take this step as a means of ending the complacency of the Department of Agriculture over the tragic contradiction of so much surplus food, so many impoverished farmers, and so many Americans not receiving adequate diets. Thank you.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has but 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to ask a question or two to the extent to which time will permit. I would like to direct a question to the committee, and perhaps the chairman of the committee, if I may, in relation to the item of appropriation in this bill concerning the school lunch program of $110 million. May I say that I concur with the committee in its very careful consideration of this program. I should like to raise a question as to the chairman's opinion concerning the purchase policy which would be applied in relation to items which go into the school lunch program.

In view of the commentary which has already taken place here relative to the importation of food products into our markets, would it be the opinion of the committee that these funds should be directed toward purchase of American products for distribution in the school lunch program?

Mr. WHITTEN. That issue did not come before us in the consideration of this bill. But I certainly would think, in view of the fact that one of the primary sources of our contribution to the school lunch program in addition to appropriated funds is section 32 purchases, which in turn use domestic markets for perishable commodities primarily, anybody handling it could easily see they should use the appropriated funds for purchases of American food. I agree with the gentleman we would anticipate that the fund would be used for the purchase of American products.

Mr. McINTIRE. I appreciate the chairman's reply and I certainly concur with his observation. I believe it is important to have this observation as a matter of record for guidance in the purchase program.

Now, I would like to ask another question. I have searched through the report of this committee and also the legislative document. Is there in this report or in the bill accompanying the report any specific reference to the 5 percent of foreign currencies being used specifically for market development work under Public Law 480?

Mr. WHITTEN. I think there is. We had a reference to that in the report and I think we had some changes in language as to the intent of the act. We attempted to bring the use of those funds in line with the original act. It is in the report on page 32.

Mr. McINTIRE. I appreciate that response. It has been of concern to some of us on the legislative committee that certain priorities have gotten ahead of market development work. It was our intent in our last extension of the act to place emphasis on the market development work.

Mr. WHITTEN. We discuss that thoroughly on page 32. There is a definite limit as to how far this subcommittee can go in trying to restore the intent of the gentleman's committee.

Mr. McINTIRE. I thank the gentleman. I should like to call attention to the colloquy that took place with the gentlewoman from Missouri today in relation to poultry inspection. It is my understanding from that colloquy that the poultry inspection provision in this legislative document is to provide an additional $500,000 for inspection and that the language which is inserted in this bill, although perhaps a point of order could be made against it, does perhaps release the Department from the mandatory provisions of the original Poultry Inspection Act.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is modified some, but it is not mandatory. It does give the Department some discretion as to how much inspection is required, which is provided in the basic law.

May I say to the gentleman that I do not quarrel about jurisdiction. There is enough work around here for everybody to do, but I do say, as the gentleman well knows, that no matter what legislation you might pass, if we do not give the money we do not have the program. Involved here is an effort to get together on the views of all concerned.

Mr. McINTIRE. I appreciate the chairman's comment.

I would like to comment further. I follow with interest the rural resources program of the Department of Agriculture. I appreciate the fact that there is provided in this bill $2 million, but there are some people who feel that this program could well stand some further expansion, and I certainly would appreciate, as I am sure each member of the committee has already done, a careful review of this program, because I think we are on common ground in this respect.

There is one other area which causes me some concern. I am sure that the chairman and the members of the committee have given it close attention. I notice throughout this report that provision has been made for increased personnel costs, changes in grade, the wage and benefits provision under the existing Classified Employees Act. However, in the provisions made for the administrative expenses of the Farmers Home Administration there seems to be no provision for this factor. I am advised that the Civil Service Commission has required the upgrading of the clerks, which costs $150,000 annually, and a wage and benefit increase of $150,000; then some normal step increases, and that there is need for about $500,000 here to be comparable with other divisions of the Department.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that these promotions that he has mentioned will have to be made from funds available. The question arises then whether the Farmers Home Administration should have that much additional money. In view of the relatively small workload in some sections of the country, it was felt that the problems of this agency could be met by the overall funds here. Again, it will be reviewed in the other body, and we will see what they think should be done.

Mr. McINTIRE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned with the attitude apparently held by a number of my colleagues—an attitude that the farmer is in good financial condition. He is not. Preliminary census information indicates that my district of Iowa has again lost population—this is a direct reflection of agriculture's financial problem—now a problem of our small towns and cities as well.

There is need now, for broad legislation which reaches the basic causes of this situation. There are numerous proposals which would help. We will never vote on these proposals unless we are concerned with farmers rather than farmers' votes. This legislation is a first step. Beyond this we must take a long look at farm imports. Third, we should improve our agricultural reporting service to make it a truly effective guide for production.

Finally there is the job of finding new uses and new markets for agricultural products.

I do not care who introduces or supports attempts at effective legislation. Politics should not interfere with an honest attempt to find the solution.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Research: For research and demonstrations on the production and utilization of agricultural products, home economics, and related research and services, including administration of payments to State agricultural experiment stations, $67,934,000: *Provided,* That the limitations contained herein shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113a), or to not to exceed $1,000,000 to remain available until expended for the construction and alteration of buildings: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of Agriculture may sell the Entomology Research Laboratory at Orlando, Florida, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he deems advantageous and the proceeds of such sale shall remain available until expended for the establishment of an entomology research laboratory: *Provided further,* That in the establishment of such laboratory the Secretary may acquire land therefor by donation or exchange;

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the part to be read would not be subject to amendment.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I withdraw my request, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISEASES OF ANIMALS AND POULTRY

Eradication activities: For expenses necessary in the arrest and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals, or European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry, and for foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest programs undertaken pursuant to the provisions of the Act of February 28, 1947, and the Act of May 29, 1884, as amended (7 U.S.C. 391; 21 U.S.C. 111–122), including expenses in accordance with section 2 of said Act of February 28, 1947, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the bureaus, corporations, or agencies of the Department such sums as he may deem necessary, to be available only in an emergency which threatens the livestock or poultry industry of the country, and any unexpended balances of funds transferred under this head in the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be subject to applicable provisions contained in the item "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Research Service".

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this in order to propound a question to the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. Could the gentleman advise us what his plan of procedure is for the remainder of the time this afternoon? Are you going to read the entire bill?

Mr. WHITTEN. It was my hope to read the entire bill. If the session stretches out too long, of course, then we would rise, say, at 5 o'clock.

Mr. AVERY. And the gentleman hopes to complete work on the bill this evening?

Mr. WHITTEN. I certainly would hope so, but it will go over until tomorrow for a final vote.

Mr. AVERY. Well, Mr. Chairman, I, of course, am in no position to object. It was my understanding we were just going to conclude general debate this afternoon and read the bill under the 5-minute rule tomorrow.

Mr. WHITTEN. It was my understanding with the leadership that we would proceed but that any vote would go over until tomorrow. That was my understanding individually, so that I am carrying out what I understood to be the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXTENSION SERVICE

Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses

Payments to States and Puerto Rico: For payments for cooperative agricultural extension work under the Smith-Lever Act, as amended by the Act of June 26, 1953 (7 U.S.C. 341–348), and the Act of August 11, 1955 (7 U.S.C. 347a), $54,220,000; and payments and contracts for such work under section 204(b)–205 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1623–1624), $1,495,000; in all, $55,715,000: *Provided,* That funds hereby appropriated pursuant to section 3(c) of the Act of June 26, 1953, shall not be paid to any State or Puerto Rico prior to availability of an equal sum from non-Federal sources for expenditure during the current fiscal year: *Provided further,* That all of the additional funds provided herein shall be used to meet expenses at the county level.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KILDAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the House that I have again contacted the Committee on Rules, urging favorable action on House Joint Resolution 31, and similar resolutions pending before the committee. House Joint Resolution 31 provides for the establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence Matters.

The recent downing of a U.S. plane over Soviet Russia, and the conflicting reports that follow, again underscore the necessity for the approval of this proposal.

There is a drastic need for improved coordination of our Nation's intelligence activities, and for better contacts between the Congress and the executive branch in this vital field.

When I first introduced my proposal in 1953—in the form of House Concurrent Resolution 169, 83d Congress—I pointed out that over a score of separate agencies, offices, and bureaus are independently engaged in intelligence-gathering activities.

That the Central Intelligence Agency, created for the purpose of coordinating and evaluating intelligence, has not given adequate emphasis to its basic statutory functions and had become an intelligence-gathering organization in its own right.

And that intelligence matters have been handled in a piecemeal, at times almost slipshod manner from the congressional standpoint.

Those facts were in evidence in 1953, and they are still in evidence today.

Two years after my original proposal was introduced, the Hoover Commission, in its "Report on Intelligence Activities," endorsed and called for the creation of a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence.

On June 28, 1955, the Hoover Commission stated—in its one and only recommendation on the subject of intelligence activities—that our Nation needs a congressional "watchdog" committee, patterned on the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, to collaborate with the Executive on matters of special importance to the national security.

On January 17, 1955, when the 84th Congress convened, and even before the Hoover Commission submitted its recommendations, some 20 Members of this House joined me in reintroducing the proposal to establish such a "watchdog" committee.

On July 6, 1955, at my request, the Committee on Rules granted a hearing on this legislation. After 2 days of hearings, the committee took no action to place the resolution before the House but assigned a subcommittee to study the proposal.

This action was followed by a second hearing before the Committee on Rules, held on January 31, 1956. In spite of our efforts, however, the resolution did not advance to the House.

With the help of interested colleagues, I again revived the effort to bring this proposal before the House when the 85th Congress convened, by introducing House Concurrent Resolution 49, and asking for an early hearing.

I followed this by reintroducing the proposal in the 86th Congress in the form of House Joint Resolution 31 and House Concurrent Resolution 11. Both of these measures are pending before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned all these steps merely to show that the pro-

posal to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence Matters is not a rash proposal brought out by a single international incident.

It is a well-thought-out measure, which I have repeatedly brought to the attention of the House for the past 7 years.

I do not believe that House consideration of this proposal should be delayed any longer. The facts of the international situation, and the facts relating to the operations of executive intelligence agencies, speak for themselves.

I earnestly hope that the Committee on Rules will promptly schedule House Joint Resolution 31, or House Concurrent Resolution 11, for floor debate and a vote.

RELIEF OF HARDSHIP FOR DISPLACED FAMILIES AND BUSINESSES

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two housing bills, the Home Financing Act of 1960 and the Relocation Assistance Act of 1960, to serve as a frame of reference for the extensive hearings on general housing legislation to be held by the Housing Subcommittee beginning May 16. I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that these two bills incorporate a number of new suggestions and proposals to help improve our home financing programs and to bring relief to families and businesses forced to move because of the urban renewal program. I am hopeful that the ideas incorporated in these two bills will stimulate interest and discussion among the many groups who have an interest in the many facets of Government-assisted housing programs. I cannot emphasize too strongly, however, that no one should gain the impression that the subject matter of our hearing will be confined merely to the new ideas advanced in the two bills I have introduced today. We will, of course, in writing our omnibus housing bill go thoroughly into all of the problems facing existing programs, such as the need to provide additional funds for the college housing loan program, additional grant money for the urban renewal program, the question of additional units for the low-rent public housing program, the problems of military housing, the special problem of housing for the elderly, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, I am also inserting in the RECORD two brief summaries of the main provisions of the two bills. I am now having prepared a detailed section-by-section summary which will be available soon for distribution to interested persons. I would also like to announce in connection with our hearings that anyone interested in testifying should contact the subcommittee staff, room 406, Old House Office Building, CA-4-3121, extensions 4855 or 2258.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE MAIN PROVISIONS OF THE HOME FINANCING ACT OF 1960

TITLE I—FHA INSURANCE PROGRAMS

1. The bill extends the FHA title I home improvement program for 2 additional years and makes an increase in the insurance authorization for that program.

2. Another section would provide for an additional increase in mortgage insurance authority for FHA's various programs to keep them in full operation.

3. The bill would provide no-downpayment financing on low-cost homes by eliminating the present 3-percent downpayment on FHA loans on the first $13,500 of value. Also, the 10-percent-downpayment factor now applicable above $13,500 would extend up to $20,000 instead of the present $18,000 cutoff point, and in addition the 30-percent-downpayment factor on higher valuations would be reduced to 25 percent.

4. The maximum FHA loan on a single-family home would be increased from the present $22,500 to $25,000.

5. The present 30-year maximum loan maturity would be increased to 35 years. Also, the bill would give permissive authority for approval by the Commissioner of terms up to 40 years in hardship cases where the family could not otherwise meet the monthly payments.

6. The bill would make mandatory a reduction in the FHA insurance premium from the present one-half of 1 percent per annum to one-fourth of 1 percent, unless the FHA Commissioner makes a formal finding that such a reduction cannot be made without impairing FHA's reserves.

7. The present 1-percent prepayment penalty on FHA loans would be prohibited after the loan has matured for 5 years.

8. The bill also includes a number of amendments to improve the present rental housing and cooperative housing programs. One important amendment to the cooperative housing program would establish a mutual mortgage fund for cooperatives so that cooperative owners would have the same financing advantages as those enjoyed under the regular FHA sales housing program.

TITLE II—EXPANSION OF FNMA SUPPORT OPERATIONS

Part 1. Central mortgage bank

This part of the bill would make a number of important amendments to the present secondary mortgage market operations of FNMA designed to enable that agency to provide the central mortgage banking function which has long been needed to assure an adequate supply of mortgage credit to the home-building and home-financing industry. To achieve this the bill, among other things, would (a) increase FNMA's capitalization substantially, (b) authorizes the Association to make advance commitments to purchase mortgages, and (c) for the first time authorize the Association to make loans on mortgages pledged by lenders as security.

Another important amendment would establish an Industry Advisory Board of 12 members, 1 from each of the existing Federal Reserve districts. The Board would be composed of representatives of the housing industry with expert knowledge of the needs and problems in the various fields of housing activity.

Part 2. Special assistance functions

To improve FNMA's program to provide special assistance for mortgages financing specially deserving programs, the bill would (a) make par purchase a mandatory permanent feature of the special assistance operation, (b) limit the fees and charges FNMA can make on special assistance mortgages, and (c) provide additional funds for the President to support deserving programs such as urban renewal housing, cooperative housing, etc.

Another important provision would set up a special fund to give financial backing to mortgages to finance the nursing homes authorized in the Housing Act of 1959.

TITLE III—SECONDARY MARKET FOR CONVENTIONAL MORTGAGES

This title would fill an important gap in existing financial support mechanisms in the private mortgage market. Savings and loan associations are presently the largest single source of mortgage financing, and the bill would set up a new corporation within the Home Loan Bank System with the authority to purchase conventional mortgages from institutions which are members of the Federal Home Loan Bank System. The corporation would have the authority to issue debentures in the private market against its portfolio of acquired conventional loans. This should provide a much-needed measure of liquidity in the conventional loan field and help even out the availability of mortgage credit in various parts of the country.

TITLE IV—FHA INSURANCE FOR SITE PREPARATION AND DEVELOPMENT

This title would authorize an entirely new program to permit FHA to insure loans to builders and developers to prepare sites for residential construction. In many areas of the country financing for site development is extremely difficult or impossible to obtain, with the result that too often there is a monopoly situation in which land development is confined only to a few wealthy developers. Lack of availability of loans on reasonable terms for land development also has been an important contributing factor to the inflated land costs which plague home-building in many parts of the country.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS

1. In order that our housing and other urban problems may be treated at the highest levels of Government, the bill would give Cabinet status to housing by creating a new Department of Housing and Urban Affairs.

2. The functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency would be immediately transferred to this new Department and the executive branch would be directed to make further studies to determine what other functions should be included in the new Department. (The bill specifically excludes veterans affairs and the functions of the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board from the new Department.)

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE MAIN PROVISIONS OF THE RELOCATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1960

TITLE I—RELOCATION ASSISTANCE

Relocation payments

1. The bill would raise the ceiling on relocation payments to displaced families from the present $200 to $300.

2. While the present $3,000 ceiling on relocation payments to displaced business firms is adequate in most cases, it works a hardship on those concerns which have heavy equipment. In these cases the bill would permit the agency to pay total certified actual moving expenses.

3. The bill would give displaced business firms a "reasonable opportunity" to the maximum extent feasible to relocate in the urban renewal area after development.

4. The bill would authorize local redevelopment agencies to retain a full-time relocation specialist to assist displaced families and business concerns. The salary of this specialist would be paid in full by the agency under such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe, in the same way that the Federal Government now pays the full cost of relocation expenses.

Small business loans for concerns displaced from urban renewal areas

Another provision of the bill would extend relief to business concerns which are displaced by urban renewal. This would be done by authorizing the Small Business Administration to make loans on liberal terms to reestablish their new businesses. These loans would be made on the same basis as is now used by SBA in lending to firms struck by disasters such as windstorms and flood; they would have a term of up to 20 years and carry an interest rate of 3 percent.

TITLE II—LOW-RENT PRIVATE HOUSING FOR DISPLACED FAMILIES

The purpose of this title is to provide relief for those displaced families whose incomes are high enough to qualify them for public housing but yet not quite high enough to afford decent private housing. To do this the bill would authorize loans to nonprofit corporations for the construction of rental housing.

These loans would be made for the full replacement cost of the project, would have maturities up to 60 years, and would have an interest rate of 2 percent, the same interest rate which has made the rural electrification program so successful. These loans would be confined to communities which have workable programs as required by the Housing Act of 1954 for urban renewal assistance. The number of units which may be built in any community would be limited to that which the Administrator determines is necessary for the relocation of low- and middle-income families who have been displaced by urban renewal activities, and the Administrator shall publish such regulations as are necessary to give a priority in renting to displaced families.

TITLE III—URBAN RENEWAL AREAS INVOLVING HOSPITALS

The bill would make certain expenditures by hospitals eligible for inclusion as local grants-in-aid on the same terms as expenditures by colleges and universities under section 112 of the urban renewal law.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the peoples of the Balkan Peninsula differ from each other in many ways: in race, in language, in history, and in tradition. They all have, however, one great influence in common: their willingness to fight for their freedom, and in adverse circumstances they have all shared the same fate. The Rumanians, as one of the largest of the peoples in the peninsula, have of course suffered a similar fate.

Early in modern times their country was overrun by the Ottoman Turks, and they were subjected to the unwelcome and harsh rule of their conquerors. For centuries they tried hard to free themselves from the oppressive yoke of their overlords, but most of their attempts ended in failure. In the middle of the last century, however, they had better luck. At the end of the Crimean War, in 1856, they gained autonomous status and this was obtained with the guarantee of the European powers. That was the first step in the rise of modern Rumania. The next and most important move was made in 1877, in the middle of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78. On May 10 of that year Rumanians took their destiny into their hands and proclaimed their independence. Since that year, for 83 years, May 10 has been celebrated as their national holiday, their independence. I gladly join them in this anniversary celebration.

THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION TO DECIDE WHETHER THE NEW YORK TIMES' ADVERTISING "ALL THE NEWS THAT'S FIT TO PRINT" IS FALSE AND MISLEADING ADVERTISING IN VIOLATION OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter which I have today written to the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, raising the question whether advertising by the New York Times that it prints "all the news that's fit to print" is false and misleading within the meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

This morning, when I sent this letter to the Federal Trade Commission, I also sent a copy to Mr. Arthur Hays Sulzberger, publisher and chairman of the board of the New York Times Corp. Since Mr. Sulzberger may wish to make a public comment, and will not have received this letter until tonight or tomorrow morning, I am inserting the letter in the RECORD without prior release to the press, so that it will be available for the first time tomorrow morning, in which case Mr. Sulzberger may be prepared to comment, should he care to comment.

MAY 10, 1960.

Hon. EARL W. KINTNER,
Chairman,
Federal Trade Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The new and enlarged way in which the New York Times is advertising its claim that it prints "All the news that's fit to print", has prompted a serious question whether this claim is false and misleading within the meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act and thus violates the law which is intended to protect the public against false and deceptive advertising.

Surely this questionable claim has a tendency to make the public believe, and probably does make the public believe, that the New York Times is superior to other newspapers which must compete with it for advertisers' patronage and, accordingly, for readers. Competing papers, on the other hand, do not and cannot, truthfully, claim that they print all of the news that's fit to print.

The observation has been made that the New York Times certainly does not print all the news, and rarely prints all the important news, such as that concerning the operation of the Federal Government here in Washington.

Consequently, in view of the campaign to eradicate advertising which has a tendency or capacity to deceive or mislead the public—which has included ferreting out and condemning "payola," prohibiting use of the word "free," condemning claims of "former" prices which are not truly the prices previously charged, and so on—it appears the FTC should give specific attention to the New York Times' claim that it prints all the news that's fit to print.

Further, in view of your many speeches on "The Importance of Integrity in Advertising" which indicate that you are mobilizing the FTC against all falsity in advertising, it has been suggested that I call this matter to your attention for the Commission's consideration and action.

If efforts to clean up false and misleading advertising claims are to meet with reasonably prompt success, surely the place to begin is with the claims of the leading advertising media, since the character of the claims these media indulge in no doubt serves as a persuasive example for the other advertisers.

Please be good enough to advise me at your earliest convenience what conclusion the Commission reaches in this matter. In the meantime, should you need assistance in compiling evidence on the fact that the New York Times has not printed all of the news that's fit to print, please let me know, as such assistance has been offered to me.

Please be assured of my support for any legislation which the Commission should believe it needs to strengthen its powers to halt false and deceptive advertising.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

FISHERIES RESEARCH AND MARKETING

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. COFFIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain the purposes and terms of several bills identical to H.R. 12141, to amend the fisheries research and marketing provisions of the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act, introduced today by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER]—H.R. 12144—the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON]—H.R. 12147—the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON]—H.R. 12143—the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO]—H.R. 12142—the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY]—H.R. 12146—my colleague the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER]—H.R. 12145—and myself.

LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

In 1954 Senate bill 2802 and House bill 7641 became law. They amended section 2 of the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1411), by requiring the transfer of 30 percent of the gross receipts from duties collected under the customs laws on fishery products from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior. The fund so established was to be used to conduct technological, biological, and related research programs in fisheries. The Secretary of the Interior was directed as far as practicable to cooperate with other Federal agencies and with State or local governmental agencies and other groups and individuals in this program.

Part of the essence of the approach was Federal-State cooperation. As was

stated in debate on the floor of the Senate—CONRGESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 5, page 6583:

Under the pending bill, the Secretary of the Interior will cooperate with the States, which are conducting studies relative to their individual problems, such as pollution, methods of catching, industry problems, conservation measures, and other difficulties peculiar to their particular areas.

This was an admirable example of a Federal program strengthening the economy of the Nation through the use of the States as laboratories.

EXPERIENCE UNDER SALTONSTALL-KENNEDY ACT

Our experience under this act, Mr. Speaker, has fallen short of this concept of widespread State-Federal participation.

Although the original intent of the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act in providing research and marketing funds was to stimulate expanded activities in these fields, especially at the State level, each year the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has been forced to divert these funds to its regular research, formerly financed wholly out of appropriations, with the result that (a) Saltonstall-Kennedy funds have been drained away from State agencies and institutions, and (b) the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries budget has been held at an artificially low level. During fiscal year 1960, $4.4 million of the $5.1 million available for research and marketing assistance has been spent on Bureau of Commercial Fisheries operated programs. Of the remaining $700,000, approximately $460,000 was spent through contracts with educational institutions, $69,000 went to State institutions under contracts, and the remainder was handled through other institutions.

There has been considerable dissatisfaction with the program as it has operated. States have found it difficult to get increased funds from State legislatures, because members of the legislatures have suggested that funds be obtained from those available under the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act. At the same time, State agencies have felt that they are not receiving their fair share of funds under the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act.

Universities have complained because the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act makes no provision for grants, similar to those made by many other Federal agencies, for the basic research which these institutions believe they must conduct. The universities have found also that there is no assurance of continuity in the Saltonstall-Kennedy program which would aid them in their primary responsibility of producing research personnel for fisheries work.

The failure of the Law of the Sea Conference to accept the United States-Canada compromise proposal to extend territorial seas to 6 miles and the fisheries zone to 12 miles will most certainly create serious problems in this area in coming years. It is anticipated that some nations will extend the fisheries zone unilaterally. In order to work out favorable and desirable bilateral agreements much more intensive fisheries research will be required. Since this is basically a Federal problem, affecting the States, it is only fair that the Federal Government should assist the States in meeting the added financial costs which will stem from these developments.

THE PROPOSAL

Under the proposed amendment, the research and marketing funds, after deducting 8 percent for administrative costs, would be divided into thirds, with one-third going for grants, one-third for contracts and one-third for States on a matching fund basis. The allocation to the States would be based on a formula involving the volume and value of their fisheries and the number of fishermen engaged in the fisheries industry.

This amendment would restore the program to its original objective, and would enable States to do research on problems peculiar to their own fishing industries. The contract and grant provisions would allow universities to develop continuity in their own programs, training qualified personnel, supplementing the work of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, and doing basic research. The matching fund provision would increase the amount spent on fisheries by about $1,600,000 annually.

There is ample precedent for the matching fund approach, including the Dingell-Johnson and Pittman-Robertson programs administered by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in the Department of the Interior.

EFFECT ON OTHER PROGRAMS

Some objections may be raised to the proposal, on grounds that it will interfere with the regular Bureau of Commercial Fisheries research program, now financed in large part by Saltonstall-Kennedy funds. This is not the intention of the proponents. We do not wish to curtail any work which the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries is presently doing, either with regular or Saltonstall-Kennedy funds.

If this amendment were enacted, it would, for fiscal year 1962, be necessary for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to ask the Bureau of the Budget and Congress to add to its regular appropriation enough funds to carry out its regular duties. The Saltonstall-Kennedy funds would be doing the job they were intended to do and would therefore no longer be a substitute for regular appropriations. The amendment would have no effect on fiscal year 1961.

The proposed change would put all regular projects in one place, where they should be, and would not increase Bureau of Commercial Fisheries' employment or expenditures. It would use Saltonstall-Kennedy funds for those special purposes for which they were intended, such as grants, contracts, and help to the States, especially in critical or urgent situations. It would restore the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries budget to a realistic basis.

It should be noted that a somewhat similar shift of funds was approved for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, this year, when it was determined that all duck stamp funds would be used for wet lands acquisition. At the same time an increase of $3.8 million in the regular budget for an equal sum, formerly financed from duck stamp funds for wildlife research, was provided.

This legislation would not adversely affect the Magnuson oceanography bill, because it covers a much broader field of recipients—States, commercial organizations, universities, and other private institutions—and activities—market development, education, and biological, technological, and related research.

ADVANTAGES OF GREATER FEDERAL-STATE PARTICIPATION

There are several research administrative and psychological advantages to the State-Federal practice of matching fund appropriations. Among these advantages are:

First. Better coordination of Federal-State fisheries research.

Second. Better cooperation between Federal-State agencies in fisheries research.

Third. Better use of strengths of State agencies—local and background knowledge, more intimate acquaintance with industry problems, previous research, continuity of research effort, experience in resource management, experience in working with local government—and those of Federal agency—special facilities in laboratory, equipment, boats; highly specialized personnel; breadth of experience.

Fourth. Minimizing duplication of research effort.

Fifth. Establishment and definition of cooperative research responsibility of State and Federal Government.

Sixth. More careful scrutiny of research programs.

Seventh. Better use of individual agency facilities. In other words State facilities would be available for Federal use and vice versa.

Eighth. Better "pooling" of talents, facilities, installations, equipment, and so forth.

Ninth. Better use of specialists—either State or Federal—for problems which require specialists—not limited to biological problems.

Tenth. Elimination of "no man's lands" and "blind spots" in research which presently exist because neither State nor Federal agencies have been able to do the work.

Mr. Speaker, we who have introduced these bills today feel that this is constructive legislation which attempts to make a good program better. This bill contemplates no subsidy. It is a national investment in a national resource. We are hopeful that it will receive close study from the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, from the executive branch, and particularly from the State commissioners of fisheries of our 22 States which depend partly on the products of the sea for their prosperity.

In conclusion, I wish to submit the following statement by the Maine Commissioner of Sea and Shore Fisheries, Ronald W. Green, in support of this proposal:

"In spite of the rapid increase in the world's population and the resulting need for additional sources of high-protein foods,

and in spite of a general nationwide economic prosperity, the fishing industry—particularly the New England segment—is showing a continued decline. Evidence of this steady downward trend may be found in all phases of the industry: in the increasing numbers of overage vessels presently employed in the New England fleet, in the slow rate of replacement by means of new construction, in the decreasing amount of available investment capital, and in static level of the income of both producers and processors.

There are many reasons for the failure of the fishing industry to achieve the progress so obvious in other economic activities. Two of the more fundamental causes are a lack of sufficient scientific knowledge based on research, and a need for a specific, aggressive market development program which would enable the industry to meet its intensive competition.

Organized marine research is a relatively new development. In fact, only in the last decade or so have systematic studies been undertaken by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and various State fisheries agencies. Thus marine research is actually as young as space research—and by no means as well supported financially.

For the most part fishing enterprises are small, and individual firms usually lack adequate capital for either research or market development programs of their own. In addition, there has been a long-standing tendency on the part of the fishing industry to look to the past, rather than to the future. Improved marine engines and the introduction of electronic devices have not basically altered the traditional fishing methods of the past 15,000 years. Fishing is still a hunting activity dependent upon the net, the hook and the spear, just as it was in mesolithic times. Even where a departure from this philosophy has been attempted, inadequate scientific information has prevented a dependably high order of operational efficiency.

This approach has also carried over to a considerable degree into the industry's marketing efforts. It is true, of course, that duty-free imports of seafood products have created serious problems for the industry. On the other hand, those segments of the fisheries which have a marketing program geared to present-day competitive standards have enjoyed some measure of economic prosperity.

As a result of this inclination on the part of much of the fishing industry to look backward instead of ahead, much research has been based on a series of crises in the industry. The Long Island Sound oyster-starfish crisis, the Pacific salmon problem, red tide, mass mortalities of shellfish, and the decline of the California pilchard fishery are a few examples which emphasize the fact that too often research was not encouraged until after some catastrophe upset the fishery. For a sound research program, this is the worst possible approach; yet, in spite of this handicap, much valuable information has been obtained. Thus it is likely that a more adequate research program will give results as spectacular as those obtained in other scientific fields. In short, when research efforts are increased manyfold, then and only then, will we begin to meet the most urgent needs of the industry.

In the same way, a considerable proportion of the fishing industry's efforts to promote, advertise, and market its products have been based on reactions to crises. Sudden fluctuations in prices have frequently touched off hasty advertising and promotional efforts aimed only at meeting an emergency and altogether lacking in continuity or long-range purpose. Most fisheries firms simply do not have the funds with which to conduct well-planned advertising and market development programs on a nationwide scale. Further, too often such promotional efforts as there have been in the past were of the shotgun variety—a blast fired at random with no specific target in sight.

The proposed amendment to the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act, which would provide funds for joint Federal-State research and market development programs, would be a most progressive step and should do much to help solve many of the fishing industry's problems.

As far as research is concerned, such a jointly supported program would enable Federal and State fisheries agencies to coordinate their respective efforts more effectively, thereby keeping duplication to a minimum. Better use of available personnel, particularly specialists, would be possible, and in addition facilities and equipment could be pooled. A better use could be made of background knowledge possessed by marine scientists of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and of the close acquaintanceship with the industry's problems which is maintained by State agencies. Research proposals would be more carefully scrutinized, and areas where research is not being done—in the "no man's land" not now covered by either Federal or State programs—would be reduced.

As far as market development is concerned, such a jointly supported program would make possible substantial increases in current promotional and marketing efforts. Such expansion is essential, if the fishing industry is to meet the growing competition from high protein, nonfish food products such as poultry and meat. It is also essential, if the industry is to meet the increasingly stiff competition provided by imported fisheries products, many of which start out with a clear-cut advantage, thanks to their own well-established market-development programs and to Government subsidies at home.

A joint marketing program would enable Federal specialists to carry on a general campaign to increase the sales and consumption of fisheries products, while at the State level more specific projects could be conducted in close cooperation with the fisheries firms concerned. In this way a well-thought-out overall program could be developed aimed at the long-term prosperity of the fishing industry. Crash programs and stopgap emergency efforts to shore up a distressed segment of the industry would be eliminated. A vital continuity would be established, and up-to-date methods could then be applied to the advertising, promotion and sales of fisheries products, similar to those which are proving so successful in other industries today.

Perhaps one of the most attractive features of this proposal is that it will not require additional Federal funds. By earmarking a portion of Saltonstall-Kennedy money for this purpose, Congress will make available $2 for every dollar now being spent by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries—thanks to State participation. In addition, the proposed amendment will stimulate State interest and activity in an area where State responsibility is increasingly needed. It will also encourage industry and local participation in both scientific and marketing endeavors and will serve to reduce the traditional inertia produced by the lack of clearly defined policies.

In short, a close correlation between biological, economic and technological studies and programs of market research and development should do much to revitalize the fishing industry and to help it achieve solvency in a highly competitive field.

The text of H.R. 12141 follows:

H.R. 12141

A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939, with respect to the allocation of funds available under that Act, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (e) of section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation to purchase and distribute surplus products of the fishing industry," approved August 11, 1939, as amended (15 U.S.C., sec. 713c–3), is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The fund created for the use of the Secretary of the Interior under subsection (a) of this section and the annual accruals thereto shall be available for each year hereafter until expended by the Secretary of the Interior. After deducting 8 percentum for his expenses in the conduct of necessary investigations, administration, and execution of this Act the Secretary of the Interior is directed to allocate funds for the purposes mentioned in this section to the agencies, organizations, and individuals mentioned in this section as follows:

"(1) one-third in the form of grants;

"(2) one-third in the form of contracts; and

"(3) one-third for apportionment on an equitable basis, as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, among the several States. In making such apportionments the Secretary of the Interior shall take into account the extent of the fishing industry within each State as compared with the total fishing industry of the United States and such other factors as may be relevant in view of the purposes of this section.

Any State desiring to avail itself of the benefits of this section shall, through its State fisheries department, submit to the Secretary of the Interior full and detailed statements of any project proposed for that State. If the Secretary of the Interior finds that such project is consistent with the purposes of this section, and meets with standards to be established by him and otherwise approves such project, the State fisheries department shall furnish him such detailed surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates with respect to such project as he may request. If the Secretary of the Interior approves such detailed surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates, he shall so notify the State fisheries department. No part of any moneys apportioned under this subsection shall be paid with respect to any project until the detailed surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates have been approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and not more than 50 percent of the total estimated cost of the approved project shall be paid from funds made available under this section. If any funds made available for an approved project under this section are not used by the State for that project, that State shall not receive any further funds under this section until it shall have replaced the misapplied funds."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall take effect as of July 1, 1961.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, next May 18 will be a historic day in the United States. It will be just 100 years to the day since Abraham Lincoln was nominated for President of the United States on the Republican ticket. We, in

accordance with the wishes of Congress expressed in a resolution unanimously passed, have just finished a year's commemoration of the 150th anniversary of his birth. The national and international response to, the acceptance of the Lincoln story, the tribute to this great American has never been surpassed in history. Most of you will recall the joint session, February 12, 1959, which was provided for in House Joint Resolution 648 of 1958 and concurred in by House Resolution 57 in 1959, when for the first time a private citizen of the United States who has never served in a high office spoke to us in joint session and to the American people on the subject of Abraham Lincoln. This private citizen, eminent poet, historian, and scholar, spoke movingly and most appropriately to us. Not only did all of the news services in this country note this occasion but the world noted it, too. This occasion was even noted behind the Iron Curtain.

Now, you and I know that only a Lincoln could inspire and a Carl Sandburg to produce such literature.

This occasion and the lesson presented from the podium in the House by this scholar was good for each of us. It has been said that a nation may be judged by its heroes. If this be true, then it cannot be wrong for us to use this House and take advantage of every opportunity to recall our heritage and the great blessings that have been ours because we were fortunate to have such men in the crucial times of our history.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no more effective form of mass education in American history and the American tradition than the manner we used on February 12, 1959. It had the compelling impact of an immediate news event. A Lincoln, a Jefferson, a Hamilton, a Washington celebration draws into a massive cooperative mechanism the Government itself and all its branches. It puts to work the vast and farflung apparatus of all forms of communication media—radio, television, the public prints. It adds to all these the finest and noblest living spirits and organizations in American culture. It is, or can be, a brilliant interlock of public and private enterprise aimed to excite the American heritage, needed so much in these times.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, permit me to ask unanimous consent to set aside 2 hours of the proceedings of this House on Wednesday, May 18, to commemorate the centennial of Abraham Lincoln's nomination for the Presidency of the United States.

Mr. SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the implications of the action then taken by the national convention are clear to all of us. An unknown prodigy from the prairies would contend with illustrious statesmen for the highest office in the land. A compromise candidate would be elected by a minority of the people.

But this proposal for suitable observance is not made in any spirit of proprietary pride or party consciousness. On the contrary, it is intended to discover what lessons the canvass of 1860 may impart to all of us, whatever our allegiance, 100 years later, as we approach another critical, another climactic campaign.

Then, as now, decisions were fraught with difficulty and dissension. Then, as now, issues, momentous and portentous, were taut and fragile. Then, as now, passion, prejudice, and panic threatened reason. The two-party system, under which the country had flourished and prospered, could find no accommodation and finally was abandoned. Ancient loyalties were forsaken for strange, transient, and uncomfortable fealties. Anger broke the land and the hearts of its inhabitants. It was a parlous, a reckless time. "The better angels of our nature" had failed us.

Surely, from the perspective of a century we should gain wisdom, perception, and that strong, sturdy sense of steadfast reconciliation. We should confront our problems with keener minds and sounder judgments. We should be guided exclusively by principle and belief, making our choices with the detachment and objectivity which only free men can enjoy. And we should listen, attentively listen, as Mr. Lincoln reminds us:

> It is now 72 years since the first inauguration of a President under our National Constitution. During the period between then and now, 15 different and greatly distinguished citizens have, in succession, administered the executive branch of the Government. They have conducted it through many perils and, on the whole, with great success.

Our new President, whoever he may be, whatever his party, will be a greatly distinguished citizen to whom we shall all wish great success.

Mr. Speaker, on the 18th I shall discuss the importance of the decisions made at that convention and the other political conventions of that year; and I invite all my colleagues to whatever observation they may desire on how their own States influence was felt in shaping the destiny of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, at the annual meeting of the Lincoln Group of Washington, D.C., last April 28, Mr. Lloyd Dunlap, consultant for the Civil War observance for the Library of Congress and an able, dedicated, and thorough student of Lincoln, gave an excellent paper on Lincoln's nomination in which he captured the atmosphere and spirit of the convention, discussed in some detail the events that led to Lincoln's nomination and related the drama developed there and the program adopted which became so important in shaping the history of our country. Because this may be helpful to those who are planning to share with me the time that the House has so graciously extended for May 18 in planning their own remarks in relation to the importance of this event to their own State and their own political party, I am asking unanimous consent that this fine dissertation by Mr. Dunlap be placed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

A century past there were four national political conventions and one real issue. In that darkening year and in the darker ones to follow, men stood for, or against, several things; but there was no question on what the trouble was really about. Slavery was the problem; and only a few years before, the way some men felt about it had led them to leave old parties and form a new one. These men—radical, conservative, moderate—the Republicans of 1860—now were gathering in Chicago for their second national convention. Only a few weeks before, the way other men, in another city, had felt about the question had split the Democratic Party, and created a situation whereby the next President of the United States would not be the choice of a majority of the voters. In a time charged with conflict and cleavage, men would act in an atmosphere of crusade, compromise and carnival to reach a decision of vast and enduring significance to their Nation and to generations then unborn. The prayer opening the third day, with its reference to the "evil in our midst" and the hope that the action of the delegates will somehow prevail against it and shape the pattern of things to come, has a prophetic ring.

But in Chicago on Saturday, May 12, men did not busy themselves with reflection and cloudy speculations. There was work to be done. A convention and a campaign lay ahead. A morning paper sounded the call: "Come all and put a shoulder to the wheel, for tonight the ball begins to roll and the signal guns of the approaching contest between freedom and slavery will be fired."

These magnificently mixed metaphors were an invitation to the dedication of the wigwam, a crude wooden building hastily erected to house the convention. Here thousands of the partisan and curious paid 25 cents admission to listen to bands, admire the gas lighting, and cheer the oratory of half a dozen orators, including the Reverend John Johns, a delegate from Fort Dodge, Iowa, who had walked 150 miles to reach a railroad to bring him to Chicago.

Described as the largest auditorium in the United States, the Wigwam, 180 by 100 feet, was built on the southeast corner of Lake and Market Streets. Intended as a prototype of other wigwams, large and small, throughoutout the country (at least in certain parts of the country) and modeled after the Crystal Palace in New York, the structure was basically three wooden sides anchored to a brick wall. The delegates were seated in oblique rows, half facing the audience, on a large stage divided by a dais. The secretaries worked immediately in front of the chairman and on the far edge of the platform was space for the press. Facing and below the stage was a series of wide landings sloping upward. Above all was a three-sided gallery. For $7,000 the Republicans had erected, in a remarkably short time, a building which had good lighting, excellent acoustics, wide aisles and exits and, most significant, space for 10,000 people. A new dimension would be added to this convention, the contagious nature of mass enthusiasm.

The raw interior was decorated with bunting, rosettes, evergreens, a gilt eagle, abstractions of Truth and Justice, and portraits and busts of American statesmen.

Although the convention would not begin until Wednesday, by Sunday, three persons who would play a large part in what happened were in Chicago and at work.

In the elegant Richmond House, armed with confidence and apparently vast sums of

money, a New Yorker dispensed champagne and cigars. This was Thurlow Weed, who wanted to nominate William H. Seward. In the Tremont House, equipped with the influence of a great newspaper, another New Yorker gave out predictions and suggestions. This was Horace Greeley, who wanted to nominate anybody but Seward—preferably. Edward Bates, but anybody but Seward. Also in the Tremont House, utilizing the advantages of geography, the unique appeal of his candidate, an understanding of men and politics, and a flexible conscience, a portly judge from Bloomington, Ill., worked arduously to accomplish his mission. This was David Davis, who wanted to nominate Abraham Lincoln. Around Davis, the self-proclaimed and unofficial leader, dedicated to the extent of personally footing the bill and bribing of the proprietor for rooms, was a group of Lincoln's friends and colleagues—Norman B. Judd, Jesse K. DuBois, Leonard Swett, Jesse K. Fell, Ward Hill Lamon, Orville H. Browning, Gustave Koerner, and others. There is no lack of men willing to accept credit for nominating Lincoln.

On Monday, the campaign clubs were parading the decorated streets; a dozen railroads were bringing more thousands to jam the city; there was an abundance of fireworks, cannon, oratory, and occasions for another parade and more noise. For example, the early hours of Tuesday were shattered by the reception given the Pennsylvania delegation; 600 strong, including 2 bands, all traveling in the interests of a protective tariff and Simon Cameron, and through the courtesy of Col. Thomas A. Scott and the Pennsylvania Railroad.

Weed had noted the size of the Wigwam and the New York contingent required 13 cars to transport 1,000 highly vocal, aggressive, confident men, including the heavyweight champion and a remarkable reporter, wise in the ways of conventions. He wrote that the New Yorkers could "Drink as much whisky, swear as loud and long, sing as bad songs, and 'get up and howl' as ferociously as any crowd of Democrats you ever heard or heard of."

But from the small towns and farms of Illinois came the greatest number of visitors. The word had spread; the railroads had cooperated; and thousands of Illinoisans jammed the hotels, slept on billiard tables, cheered for a man they knew, and gaped at the Wigwam and the rival attraction displayed outside, ominous in its connotations. A bowie knife, 7 feet long, weighing 40 pounds, symbolized how far men from Virginia and Wisconsin were growing apart. A sharp clash in Congress had brought a challenge, acceptance, and a choice of knives for weapons.

By 11:30 on Wednesday morning, the ticketholders had been admitted, and this was the scene as the doors were thrown open:

"Three doors about 20 feet wide each, were simultaneously thrown open, and three torrents of men roared in, rushing headlong for front positions. The standing room, holding 4,500 persons, was packed in about 5 minutes. The gallery, where only gentlemen accompanied by ladies were admitted, and which contains nearly 3,000 persons, was already full. * * * Ladies to accompany gentlemen were in demand—schoolgirls were found on the street, and given a quarter each to see a gentleman safe in. Other girls * * * were much sought after as escorts. One of them being * * * offered half a dollar * * * excused herself by saying she had already taken two men in at each of the three doors."

A woman carrying a basket of washing and a souvenir-selling Indian squaw were among other escorts noted.

Edwin D. Morgan, of New York, national chairman, opened the convention at 12:10. David Wilmot, of Pennsylvania, was made temporary chairman; and after the customary speech, the routine of organization began, with many of the delegates noticeably reluctant to begin work. By 2 o'clock, when the convention adjourned, little had been done, largely because the Chicago Board of Trade had invited the delegates to an excursion on Lake Michigan, thereby setting off a series of resolutions, cheers, self-righteous reminders of business to be done, and parliamentary tangles which led nowhere.

The delegates reconvened at 5:15 with George A. Ashmun, of Massachusetts, as permanent chairman. A select committee reported that the board of trade had informed them that the steamer would leave in an hour and suggested that the convention could meet on deck and use the cabins as caucus rooms. Another lake became involved when Judd presented Ashmun with a gavel made from Commodore Perry's flagship and suggested that the convention motto be: "Don't give up the ship." In November they could further quote by wiring Washington, "We have met the enemy, and they are ours."

Ashmun's acceptance speech contained the required reference to the harmony among the delegates. The cynical observer commented that "his hearing is deplorably impaired." Certainly he could not have been among the Seward men where the mildest description of Horace Greeley was "damned old ass."

A committee on resolutions was appointed and the convention adjourned until 10 o'clock Thursday. The important events of Wednesday obviously did not take place before 10,000 people.

On Thursday morning, the Seward backers marched in confident splendor behind a band playing "Oh, Isn't He a Darling." Opposite the Tremont House three cheers for Seward were given for the benefit of Horace Greeley and the adherents of the man who was emerging as their chief rival, Abraham Lincoln.

In the Wigwam the Seward men filed into the favored positions they had occupied the day before. Gilmore's band from Boston entertained the packed house, before Ashmun opened business by clearing the stage and finding room for the delegates.

The first clash of the convention was a successful test of Seward strength. The majority report from the rules committee called for a majority of all the States to nominate; the Seward bloc insisted that the figure should be a majority of those actually present. Knowing their early strength and anxious for a quick decision, the Seward men succeeded in sending the report back to committee and getting their figure, 233, established as the total necessary for nomination.

The credentials report brought heated words. A Texas delegation, with a distinct Michigan and Seward flavor, was challenged. This raised the question of the validity of the delegations from Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, and the District of Columbia. Wilmot charged that no Republican organization existed in these States. The Border State men replied that they were the ones who had really suffered for the cause. Further, they were not attending the convention as Republicans, not under the banner of the People's Party as was a part of Pennsylvania. Charles Armour of Maryland pronounced dramatically: "We are unpurchased, and unpurchaseable. And we tell Pennsylvania to put that in her pipe and smoke it." This question was also referred to committee, and again New York prevailed when all the delegations were admitted, thereby making it possible for Virginia to cast more votes for Lincoln's nomination than did Illinois.

The afternoon session began at 3:15. Again the Wigwam was jammed and outside were packed 20,000 more who were placated by speakers sent out from the hall.

The official record is at times a most confusing document. Resolutions were put and then lost sight of, at times no one was certain of the question, and occasionally the reporter admitted frankly that he could not hear what had been said. There are also enough instances of interruptions, hootings, and laughter, and rudeness to make it obvious that the convention on occasion must have been nearly chaotic.

The confusion rose to a crescendo on the afternoon of May 17. First, there was the question of the platform. Joshua Giddings of Ohio rose to speak. David K. Cartter, also of Ohio (a hopelessly divided delegation), insisted on shutting off discussion, but no motion to adopt the platform had yet been made nor had copies of the resolutions been distributed. The crowd began to shout for Giddings; aids began handing out copies. In the disorder Cartter was voted down; questioned the votes; and was voted down again.

When Giddings could be heard he asked only that the second section of the platform be amended to include the words of the Declaration of Independence. In the debate, Cartter rudely referred to "this amendment and the gas expended upon it," and Eli Thayer remarked that he believed in the Ten Commandments but he did not necessarily want them in the platform. The amendment was voted down. The old man rose and said: "I will detain this convention no longer. I offer this because our party was formed upon it. It grew upon it. It has existed upon it, and when you leave out this truth, you leave out the party." Then, the observer continued, "the old man quickly rose, and made his way slowly toward the door. A dozen delegates begged him not to go. But he considered everything lost, even honor. * * * And now the Declaration of Independence had been voted down. He must go." But at the New York delegation Giddings was stopped and "comforted by assurances that the Declaration would be tried again."

George W. Curtis and William M. Evarts, New Yorkers, made eloquent appeals. Curtis, moving a resolution substantially the same as Giddings', asked the convention "Whether they are prepared to go * * * before the country as voting down the words of the Declaration of Independence." Frank Blair of Missouri made a point of order to reverse a decision of the Chair, the amendment was put and carried. Giddings then, according to one recollection, threw his arm around Curtis and said, "Thank God, my boy, you have saved the Republican Party."

By holding his coattails, Gustave Koerner prevented John A. Andrew of Massachusetts from rising and launching a debate on another section, and by 6 o'clock the platform was passed. The convention entered into a "transport of enthusiasm." "A herd of buffaloes or lions could not have made a more tremendous roaring."

Goodrich of Minnesota, a Seward State, moved to adjourn, but hearing cries for "Ballot! Ballot!" he quickly withdrew the motion and moved instead that "we now proceed to ballot for a candidate for the Presidency." Before there was a vote the Chair announced that the "tally sheets had not been prepared, and that it would subject the clerks to great inconvenience to proceed to a ballot at that time." Another source states that the announcement was that the sheets "would be ready in a few minutes." In any event, before Goodrich's motion was acted upon, Benjamin Eggleston of Ohio moved to adjourn. Another Buckeye, R. M. Corwine, moved to ballot; and the record breaks down to the simple statement: "Great disorder and cries of Ballot, Ballot." Then Cartter, accurately described as being "more frequent than eloquent" in the convention, got the floor and said: "I call for a division of ayes and nays, to see if the gentlemen want to go without their

supper." The record covers the events of the next few minutes with the words: "On motion, the convention adjourned." There is no record of the vote that ended what might have been Seward's day.

By 8 o'clock Friday morning the streets were full; and soon after 10, when the hall was opened, the Wigwam was again jammed. The mob outside would depend for news upon an observer stationed at the skylight and a chain of men to relay the information to the edge of the roof where it would be shouted to the crowd below.

In the audience, however, there was a difference, significant and of portent. On Wednesday and Thursday the Seward men had marched to the Wigwam and taken a favorable position inside. On this morning of decision, however, the march ended abruptly for their seats were taken, and there was nothing that many of them could do but join the throng outside. There is a recurrent story, supported by a host of recollections, that on Thursday night one, or some, of the Lincoln managers, Ward Hill Lamon or Jesse K. Fell, obtained 1,000 extra tickets, had signatures forged, and distributed them complete with instructions, and two cheerleaders.

An observer could also have noted the placement of the State delegations, an arrangement in the hands of Judd and Joseph Medill of the Chicago Tribune. New York was at the far end of the platform, surrounded only by delegations solidly for Seward. The crucial Pennsylvania delegation was seated at the opposite end of the stage, flanked by Illinois. If enthusiasm is contagious, let it infect the right parties, was apparently the thought.

When the convention opened, five men had more than token or complimentary support. In addition to Seward, they were Lincoln, Simon Cameron, S. P. Chase, and Edward Bates. By Wednesday night some observers could recognize a rapidly rising tide for Lincoln; others saw it but still gave him little chance; and late Thursday night, Horace Greeley was resigned to the inevitable and wired his paper that nothing could prevent Seward's nomination.

The balloting began at noon and what followed has been described as something requiring "rather the talents of a hog caller than those of party delegates. It was a tournament of noise, a colossal contest of yelling between the followers of Lincoln and Seward." William Evarts, in the short statement then customary, nominated Seward, and the applause was only "enthusiastic." When Judd named Lincoln, the "response was prodigious, rising and raging far beyond the Seward shriek." One supporter shouted, "Abe Lincoln has it by the sound now, let us ballot." The usually staid Stephen T. Logan reportedly announced: "Mr. President, in order, or out of order, I propose this convention and audience give three cheers for the man who is evidently their nominee." The Seward men did not accept the challenge until after their man had been seconded by Michigan and Wisconsin. Murat Halstead described the effect:

> "As all the fiends from heaven that fell
> Had pealed the banner cry of hell.

"Hundreds of persons stopped their ears in pain. The shouting was absolutely frantic, shrill and wild. No Comanches, no panthers ever struck a higher note, or gave screams with more infernal intensity * * * nothing was to be seen * * * but * * * a black mighty swarm of hats flying with the velocity of hornets over a mass of human heads, most of the mouths of which were open. * * * The wonder of the thing was, that the Seward outside pressure should, so far from New York, be so powerful."

"Now the Lincoln men had to try it again, and when Delano of Ohio seconded the nomination, the uproar was beyond description. Imagine all the hogs ever slaughtered in Cincinnati giving their death squeals together, a score of big steam whistles going * * * and you conceive something of the same nature. I thought the Seward yell could not be surpassed; but the Lincoln boys were clearly ahead, and feeling their victory * * * took deep breaths all round, and gave a concentrated shriek that was positively awful, and accompanied it with stamping that made every plank and pillar quiver.

At the close of the first ballot Seward had 173½ votes, 70 of them coming when Evarts had mounted his chair, waited dramatically for order, and cast the solid New York vote for Seward. Lincoln was far ahead of the rest with 102 votes, which was about where his managers wanted him to be. The plan was to stop Seward on the early ballots and by an impressive, steadily increasing show of strength, aline the opposition behind Lincoln. The votes cast for Lincoln, Cameron, Bates, and Chase could easily nominate any one of the four. The trick was to unite the strength behind one man. To that end Davis and his coworkers had labored with persuasion, fact, histrionics, and, almost certainly, with unauthorized promises in the pivotal vineyards of the Pennsylvania, Indiana, and New Jersey delegations. The argument they repeated was simple, practical, and double-barreled. Seward could not carry these States, and probably not the Nation. Certainly with him State tickets would lose. Their own candidates could do better locally, but not so well as Lincoln nationally. It was the second choice strategy spelled out by Lincoln in March.

In the tension preceding the second ballot, "the partisans of the various candidates were strung up to such a pitch * * * as to render them incapable of patience, and the cries of 'Call the roll' were fairly hissed through their teeth." When the complimentary votes of the first ballot began to switch to Lincoln, the New Yorkers started as if an Orsini bomb had exploded. From New Hampshire came 2; from Vermont the entire block of 10. Then Pennsylvania, which had previously given 47½ votes to Cameron and 4 to Lincoln, announced that her delegation now voted 1 for Cameron and 48 for Lincoln. Weed paled as he heard the change in the vote of Pennsylvania, startling the vast auditorium like a clap of thunder.

The vote at the end of the second ballot stood: Seward, 184½; Lincoln, 181. Far behind were Bates with 35 and Chase with 42½. Lincoln had gained 79 votes, Seward only 11, and the trend was plain.

Hundreds of informal tally sheets recorded the inexorable swing to Lincoln on the third ballot. Conceding defeat, Weed sent an emissary to Greeley with a desperate proposal—hold on for Bates, and if the third ballot produced no nomination, the Seward men would rally behind the Missourian. But while they spoke Seward backers were deserting in droves.

It was now a question of stopping Lincoln, and when his total stood only 1½ votes short of the nominating figure of 233, it was obvious what would soon happen. The ubiquitous Halstead described the next few minutes:

"I looked up to see who would be the man to give the decisive vote. * * * In about 10 ticks of a watch Cartter, of Ohio, was up * * * and everybody who understood the matter at all, knew what he was about to do. He is a large man with * * * an impediment in his speech * * * and * * * had been quite noisy during the * * * convention but had never commanded, when mounting his chair, such attention as now. He said, 'I rise (eh), Mr. Chairman (eh), to announce the change of four votes of Ohio from Mr. Chase to Mr. Lincoln.' The deed was done. There was a moment's silence. The nerves of the thousands, which through the hours of suspense had been subjected to terrible tension, relaxed, and as deep breaths of relief were taken, there was a noise in the wigwam like the rush of a great wind, in the van of a storm and in another breath the storm was there. There were thousands cheering with the energy of insanity.

The observer on the roof shouted, "Old Abe. Hallelujah" and the salute was fired, picked up by the whistles of the steamers on the lake, and made completely inaudible by the roar of voices. Only by the puffs of smoke drifting by the open doors did those inside know that a cannon was being fired. The delegates were wildly waving State placards torn from standards, except in the New York delegation where Evarts was saying ruefully, "Well, Curtis, at least we saved the Declaration of Independence."

When he could be heard, Cartter announced that Ohio's vote was now unanimous for Lincoln, State after State clamored for recognition to correct or change votes to Lincoln. During this procedure, a huge picture of Lincoln was brought in "and held up before the surging and screaming masses." When the roll was completed it was announced that Lincoln had 364 of the convention's 466 votes.

Evarts graciously and eloquently moved that the nomination be made unanimous, but the official record does not show that this motion was ever voted. Apparently it was lost in the excitement of seconding speeches, motions for adjournment, moves for balloting for Vice President, and comments from Judd and Browning.

What happened in Chicago between noon and 1:30 on Friday, May 18, was not, in a Lincoln phrase, "the result of accident." Numerous factors, of varying degrees of complexity, were involved. These combined to create a situation extremely favorable for Lincoln's nomination. Seward was to radical; Bates was too conservative; Chase and Cameron were opposed even within their States of Ohio and Pennsylvania. Only Lincoln had availability. Only Lincoln gave promise of winning electoral votes without losing control of State legislatures where U.S. Senators were named. Add to this, Lincoln's almost preternatural political talents, his record, his identification with free labor, the site of the convention, and the dedicated, practical, and amoral labors of Davis and others in Chicago, and a case could be made for the statement that it would have been more surprising had the convention named anybody else.

But in Chicago men knew only that something had changed, that something intangible and important had been established, that a corner had been turned and things would never be quite the same again.

In the Tremont House a man shouted: " 'Talk of your money and bring on your bullies with you. The immortal principles of the everlasting people are with Abe Lincoln. * * * Abe Lincoln has no money and no bullies, but he has the people, by God. * * * Go to the devil—what do I want to eat for, Abe Lincoln is nominated * * * and I'm going to live on air—the air of liberty.' And this was one of thousands," the reporter concluded.

Along the Fort Wayne and Chicago heading east that night, "At every station * * * until after 2 o'clock, there were tar barrels burning, drums beating, boys carrying rails; and guns, great and small, banging away. The weary passengers were allowed no rest, but plagued by the thundering jar of cannon, the clamor of drums, the glare of bonfires and the whooping of the boys, who were delighted with the idea of a candidate for the Presidency, who 30 years ago split rails on the Sangamon River—classic stream now and forevermore—and whose neighbors named him 'honest.' "

THE PROBLEM OF DETECTING NUCLEAR UNDERGROUND TEST EXPLOSIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, for 18 months, representatives from the United States, Great Britain, and the U.S.S.R. have been negotiating at Geneva, Switzerland. They have been exploring the possibility of a treaty agreement which would prohibit future testing of nuclear weapons.

Because of the present technical difficulty of conducting tests in far off space, and the advanced capability for detecting tests which occur in near space and the atmospheric area, the main discussion has been on the problem of detecting underground tests.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy deemed it to be in the public interest to explore the technical aspects of this problem. Representative MELVIN PRICE, chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development, and Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Subcommittee on Radiation, conducted joint hearings from April 19 to 22, 1960.

The purpose of the hearings was to place all known technical facts regarding nuclear test detection and identification before the Congress and the public. We specifically excluded from testimony the policy of whether a test cessation was desirable or undesirable. Our mission was to collate and summarize pertinent testimony from experts in the fields of seismology, geography, electromagnetics, and weapons effects, as related to detection and verification through inspection techniques.

It was appropriate to specialize on the phenomena of underground tests, as this poses the greatest and most urgent problem area at this time. Of additional concern is the problem of detecting nuclear tests in high altitudes and in space, which the hearings also covered. A great deal of research and development is likewise needed in these areas before we will have any assurance that a control system will work.

We were careful to select the witnesses who had been most active and expert in conducting the underground nuclear tests in Nevada and the chemical underground tests in Louisiana. We also selected a balanced group of scientists with opposing views as to the desirability of conducting further tests, so we would avoid the charge of bias. For instance, it is well known that Dr. Edward Teller, Dr. Harold Brown, and others favor continued testing. It is also well known that Dr. Hans Bethe, Dr. Richard E. Roberts, Dr. Jay Orear, and Dr. Harold Urey are outspoken opponents of further nuclear testing.

All of these witnesses and other expert witnesses from the commercial world of oil exploration, mining, and electrodynamics, were allowed complete freedom of expression during the hearings. They were allowed to challenge opposition testimony and invited to submit additional technical papers.

It should be understood that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is not charged with making or reviewing treaties in the nuclear weapons testing field. The executive branch of Government and another committee of Congress has this responsibility.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, however, is peculiarly fitted by experience and staff to develop and make known to departments of Government, the Congress, and the people the scientific facts related to atomic energy. The Joint Committee has carried out this type of function in various hearings during its existence. Extensive hearings on the effects of fallout from nuclear-weapons tests, the biological and environmental effects of a nuclear war on earth's population and environment, and the problem of radioactive waste disposal are instances of studies which are used as valuable textbooks in our educational, industrial, and scientific fields.

We realize collections of facts are, or at least, should be, used for the formation of policy. It is true, however, unless facts are known, the formulation of policy in the political and diplomatic fields may lack the basis for understanding or justification.

It is understandable that interpretation of the facts may vary the effect of newly discovered facts may not be welcome to negotiators who have obligated themselves to a preconceived position or objective.

We note the acceptance by the United States and the United Kingdom negotiators of additional data developed by the Hardtack II series of tests in the fall of 1959 and the rejection of this data by the negotiators of the U.S.S.R. Scientific facts, nevertheless, are cold and dispassionate realities once they are established. They cannot be eliminated by refusing to recognize them. New scientific facts do not always lend themselves to the support of political or diplomatic positions, however desirable those positions may be to their advocates.

The negotiations on nuclear-tests cessation have dragged along for 18 months in Geneva. The debate has been on a mixture of scientific and political problems that seem to be impossible of untangling. The scientific part of the problems have been based mainly on disagreement as to the capabilities for detecting and identifying hidden underground nuclear tests.

The problems of inspection of suspicious events, the number of allowable inspection trips, procedures, drilling operations, logistical problems of supply and communications, and so forth, are, of course, most difficult. These problems have never been resolved, and in most instances they have been ignored.

In view of the lack of understanding and the scarcity of reliable information in this field, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy believed it was in the public interest to explore the subject matter. We reasoned it was important to collect the information from reliable sources and publish it so we could properly relate it to our diplomatic objections.

What were the most important facts established and in general agreement by and between our witnesses?

First. It was the unanimous opinion of all witnesses that a vigorous and sustained program of research and development is necessary to improve our instrumentation and our techniques of detection, identification, and inspection of nuclear explosion tests. The witnesses agreed that the Berkner panel report of over 1 year ago to the President had not been properly implemented in this regard.

The so-called Berkner Panel, consisting of a number of eminent American scientists appointed in December 1958, by Dr. Killian, the President's special assistant for science and technology, recognized the original position taken by our scientists in 1958 on test detection capability was based on inadequate data and was wrong by at least a factor of four. They recommended an aggressive program or research to develop better detection devices and better techniques.

Our witnesses testified these recommendations had not been carried out by the President.

In March 1959, the Berkner Panel recommended a research and development program for 2 years which would cost $52.8 million. Testimony showed that over 1 year later, only $8.5 million had been allocated, and of this, only $5 million obligated.

Testimony also reflected that although $60 million had been requested for the research and development program by those in the Defense Department having responsibility for its success, these urgently needed funds were not included as a line item in the Department of Defense fiscal year 1961 budget. To be available, the money would have to be taken from other projects or sources.

Our committee brought these facts out in our hearings last month. We made available to the Executive Department—through the State Department, the Defense Department, and the Atomic Energy Commission—copies of the hearing transcripts and, as early as May 2, 1960, preliminary copies of our summary analysis of the hearings. We notified them, on May 5 and 6, 1960, our summary would be made available to the press on Saturday, May 7, for Monday, May 9, release.

On May 7, 1960, the President hastened to announce that approximately $66 million would be required in fiscal year 1961 for implementing the Berkner Panel recommendations for improving our detection capability. We approve this recognition on his part and can only speculate why he did not recognize it as early as mid-1959, when it was brought out by the panel.

The delay is inexcusable in view of the known deficit of detection capability, and in view of its importance in connection with the nuclear test cessation negotiations.

I will also be interested in seeing if, in addition to the delayed recognition, the President will now direct or authorize the Defense Department to request any of these funds as a line item supplemen-

tal appropriation, or must the money come from other also needed projects.

Second. The testimony of both Dr. Hans Bethe and Dr. Edward Teller, established the fact that the cowboy series of chemical explosion tests in Louisiana had proven the "decoupling" theory. This new technique in reducing the telltale seismic vibrations of an underground explosion by factors up to 300, was admitted to be a fact by all the scientists present. This is accomplished by exploding a chemical or nuclear device in an underground cavity rather than in close proximity to surrounding earth.

This is a most important scientific fact. It casts strong doubt on the theory of presently detecting tests of 20 to 30 kilotons. It destroys, for the present, the basis of our test cessation proposal if we relate it to our capability of detecting fully or partially decoupled 20-kiloton tests by seismic recordings of 4.75 magnitude or higher.

If the Soviets want to test tactical weapons of 1 to 10 kilotons, they can do so with impunity, without muffling under the Geneva control system as presently planned. Even with the recommended improvements in the Geneva system, it is going to be hard to identify unmuffled shots below 5 kilotons.

But with decoupling or muffling, it makes the problem of detection and identification 10 to 300 times more difficult. With full decoupling—muffling—a 10-kiloton device can be made to register about 30 tons. Even with partial decoupling a 10-kiloton shot can be made to register about 300 tons. This could be accomplished in a hole of approximately 115 feet in diameter.

There was testimony that about 250 underground cavities have been constructed in the United States alone for storage of petroleum products ranging in size up to about 218 feet in diameter—200,000 cubic yards. Larger cavities have been constructed for brine production in salt domes. Since the U.S.S.R. has salt domes and oilfields, it is prudent to assume similar cavities exist in the U.S.S.R., capable of being used for decoupling of nuclear underground tests.

The seismic recordings resulting from these low energy explosion effects change completely the distances needed between detection stations and they raise tremendously the number of unidentified seismic events.

We have been discussing with the Soviets the location of 21 detection stations in the U.S.S.R. They have not agreed to this number. Dr. Bethe testified instead of just 21 stations, we would now need 600 additional unmanned stations because of the new decoupling technique—if we wanted to detect a 20 kiloton, fully decoupled, explosion.

Dr. Bethe later changed the figure, by letter to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to an estimate of 200. His letter will be printed in full in the hearings. A notation of his new estimate number was reported in our summary-analysis.

Dr. Richard E. Roberts of Carnegie Institute testified he believed at least 125 stations would be needed. In either event, the change in numbers of detecting stations in the U.S.S.R. is substantial and must become a serious fact for diplomatic consideration.

Third. The scientific fact was established without contradiction that a whole new field of tactical nuclear weapons could be developed and proven feasible by nuclear testing up to a size of 20 kilotons. The committee did not consider one way or the other the desirability of developing additional low-yield nuclear tactical weapons. We were only concerned with the scientific facts relating to the problems of detecting and identifying tests of 20 kilotons or less and their technical significance in weaponry.

Fourth. The cost of installing a control system and developing improved seismic and other detection devices to meet the problem of cheating, was not within even a near area of agreement.

The estimates ranged from around a billion dollars to 5 billion or more dollars. The time period for such development ranged from 2 to 5 years, based on program priority and dollar support of the effort.

It was also pointed out that the art of concealing tests—of cheating—offered opportunities for improvement based on effort and dollars expended in that direction by a potential violator.

In conclusion, let me assure you these facts are not to my personal liking.

I cannot sweep them under the rug because of my hopes for a genuine program of disarmament and my fervent desire for peace—a real peace and not a "peace in our time," arrived at because of wishful thinking, ignorance of existing facts, or political expediency.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the summary-analysis of our hearings herewith as part of my remarks:

SUMMARY-ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF DETECTION AND INSPECTION CONTROLS OF A NUCLEAR WEAPONS TEST BAN

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

The possibilities and problems of detection and identification of nuclear test explosions, as a part of a test ban control system discussed at Geneva for the past 18 months, have become questions of great national and international importance. The summit meetings beginning May 16, 1960, and followup discussions at Geneva and elsewhere in succeeding weeks and months, will undoubtedly consider these matters extensively.

A large part of the basis of a control system to support a test ban treaty or international agreement depends on technical data of a rather complicated nature. Such technical information can and should have a profound effect on the establishment of an adequate control system. For example, the report of the original Conference of Experts at Geneva in July–August 1958, on which the test ban negotiations are based, has been found to be highly dependent upon data derived from the single U.S. "Rainier" underground test shot in September 1957 which subsequent tests have proved to be inadequate.

In order to clarify the technical basis of a test ban control system, the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, through its Special Subcommittee on Radiation and Subcommittee on Research and Development, held 4 days of public hearings on April 19, 20, 21, and 22, 1960. It was intended that the hearings would help dispel many of the confusing reports and conflicting statements as to technical problems and possibilities which may or may not exist as to means of detection and identification of nuclear tests.

The hearings covered the technical aspects of nuclear test detection and control, including the basis of the original proposed Geneva control system of 180 stations; analysis of the basis for improvement of the Geneva system under present knowledge; consideration of means of concealment and muffling of tests; discussion of basis of "on-site" inspections; consideration of detection and identification of nuclear tests in outer space; discussion of technical significance of further weapons development through clandestine tests and review of research and development programs aimed at improving capabilities for detection and identification of nuclear tests.

The subcommittee made every effort to emphasize the technical aspects of the test ban system, and to avoid discussions involving general policy, political, and philosophical aspects of disarmament and a test ban. Naturally, in the discussion of control systems questions of policy inevitably arose. However, insofar as possible, the discussion was confined to the technical aspects of such questions.

In accordance with past practice in the fallout hearings, the subcommittees selected a representative group of the leading scientists and technical experts in this field. Each witness was selected on the basis of his personal competence and his degree of knowledge and experience in the individual topics on which he testified. Many of the witnesses were members of or consultants to the technical delegations to the conferences and panels discussed in these hearings. Others were selected for their skills and experience in the field application of the techniques discussed throughout the hearings. A list of all witnesses is attached as appendix I. A detailed biography of each witness is included in the print of the complete hearings.

The Joint Committee in its preparation for, and conduct of, the hearings received the cooperation of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Defense, and particularly the Air Force Technical Applications Center, and various individual scientists and scientific organizations of widely differing views.

One of the highlights of the series of hearings was a panel discussion on the entire question of the feasibility and capability of test ban control systems. The panel members were a selected group from the scientific community whom the committee felt represented the most complete spectrum of opinion on these vital questions. It was considered by the committee that the bringing together of such a group would tend to pinpoint the major conflicts of opinion which exist today concerning the problem of providing an adequate control system. The panel consisted of the following scientists and engineers:

Dr. Roland Beers, seismic consultant, Troy, N.Y.

Dr. Hans Bethe, Physics Department, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Dr. Harold Brown, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore, Calif.

Dr. Dean S. Carder, Chief Seismologist, U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Alvin C. Graves, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, Los Alamos, N. Mex.

Dr. Richard Latter, Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.

Dr. Jack E. Oliver, Lamont Geological Observatory, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Dr. Jay Orear, Physics Department, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Dr. Richard E. Roberts, Carnegie Institution, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Carl F. Romney, Headquarters, USAF, Air Force Technical Applications Center, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Edward Teller, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore, Calif.

Dr. Harold Urey, University of California, Scripps Institute of Oceanography, La Jolla, Calif.

In order for the layman to understand the technical aspects of a control system, it is necessary that certain technical terms and concepts be defined in layman's language. To assist the layman a number of technical terms and concepts have been defined and appear in appendix II. To further assist in reviewing the summary-analysis certain key definitions and concepts will be discussed below.

The nub of the problem of detection and identification of underground nuclear tests is, first, to detect the event on a seismograph; second, to distinguish the difference in the recorded signature of a nuclear event and the recorded signature of a natural earthquake. The following definitions may prove helpful in a consideration of this problem:

1. Yields of nuclear weapons

(a) Kiloton: Nuclear explosive energy release equivalent to 1,000 tons of the chemical high explosive, TNT. The nuclear bomb detonated at Hiroshima, Japan, in World War II was the equivalent in size to 20 kilotons of TNT.

(b) Megaton: Nuclear explosive energy release equivalent to 1 million tons of the chemical high explosive, TNT.

(c) Low yield weapons: Those nuclear weapons ranging in yields of approximately 20 kilotons and below. This class is often referred to as "tactical weapons."

(d) High yield weapons: Those nuclear weapons ranging in yields of approximately 50 kilotons and more, to include megaton yields. This class is often referred to as "strategic weapons."

(e) Fractional kiloton weapons: The term applied to those "tactical weapons" of a yield which is a fractional part of 1 kiloton. This class of weapons is rated in yield ranges of tons rather than kilotons.

2. Detection instruments

(a) Seismograph: An instrument for detecting and recording small vibrations in the earth's crust. The detector portion usually consists of a mass suspended from a frame either by springs or as a pendulum, in such a manner as to tend to remain in one position while the earth-mounted frame moves with the earth. The relative motion of the frame and mass is usually magnified and recorded as a seismic disturbance either natural or manmade. Various types of seismographs exist, including seismographs for long periods, intermediate periods, short periods, and high frequency.

(b) Magnetometer: An instrument for measuring the natural magnetic field of the earth to discover any distortion in this field by manmade ferrous articles, equipment, pipes, etc.

(c) Electromagnetic induction detectors: An instrument which radiates a low frequency electromagnetic field and is sensitive to any distortion in this field due to the presence of conducting material such as iron or copper pipe, wire, landmines, etc.

3. Types of rock or earth considered in these hearings in which nuclear tests or earthquakes may take place

(a) Nevada tuff: A weakly cemented, rather crumbly rock, formed from volcanic ash. The underground nuclear explosions of Hardtack II, as well as the Rainier explosion, occurred in this rock. Experiments indicate the explosions in this rock produce stronger seismic signals than are produced by the same size explosions in salt or granite.

(b) Granite: A natural igneous rock formation of visibly crystalline texture. It is very hard and is believed to be more elastic to nuclear detonations than Nevada tuff, resulting in smaller seismic signals.

(c) Salt: A colorless or white crystalline compound, chemically designated as sodium chloride, occurring abundantly in deposits in the earth in solid form. It is similar to granite in relation to nuclear detonations.

(d) Limestone: A rock consisting chiefly of calcium carbonate. It is sometimes formed by chemical precipitation, but chiefly by accumulation of organic remains such as shells and coral.

4. Decoupling (muffling), coupling, and tamping

(a) Decoupling: The process of reducing the size of the seismic signals from an underground explosion by detonation of the explosive in a large hole deep underground.

(b) Coupling: In this report, coupling refers to that fraction of the total energy released in an underground explosion which is transformed into seismic waves in the earth. The greater the coupling of a particular explosion the larger will be the seismic waves and the easier it will be to detect by seismographs at some distance from the explosion.

(c) Rainier coupling: The Rainier shot (1.7 kilotons) conducted 900 feet underground in intimate contact with Nevada tuff on September 19, 1957, was estimated to have transmitted about 2 percent of its energy into seismic waves. This observed degree of energy transformation from the explosion to seismic waves in the earth (coupling) has been taken as a standard of reference for subsequent calculations of seismic signals generated by underground nuclear explosions.

(d) Tamped shot: An underground explosion detonated in close contact with the surrounding earth or rock so as to transmit to the earth or rock the largest possible fraction of its energy.

It was apparent to the subcommittees that there is a wide divergence in the degree of knowledge concerning test control systems. Moreover, much of the technical data concerning test control systems is drawn from purely theoretical calculations, while some have an experimental basis. Many of the "practical" aspects involving application of theoretical data have yet to be investigated on an extensive basis.

However, the hearings of the subcommittees did serve to narrow the differences of opinion as to certain scientific facts and judgments. Specifically, there was general agreement as to the following:

1. The Geneva control system of 180 stations will require augmentation and improvement to restore the capability for detection and identification of underground seismic events to the value of 5 kilotons estimated by the 1958 Conference of Experts (hereinafter Experts).

2. It is possible to increase the difficulty of detection and identification of underground seismic events by decoupling nuclear explosions by a factor of up to 300.

3. To establish a capability for the Geneva control system to detect and identify underground seismic events of yield equivalent to that of a 20 kiloton fully decoupled explosion, it will be necessary to increase greatly the number of stations and to improve the instruments and techniques of seismic detection.

4. A vigorous and sustained program of research and development is necessary to improve our instruments and our techniques of detection, identification, and inspection of underground nuclear explosion tests.

5. An increase in the number of stations in the Geneva control system, in order to lower the threshold of underground seismic events which it can detect and identify, will result in a considerable increase in the number of unidentified events which may require inspection.

Certain differences as to scientific facts and judgments were also brought out. These included:

1. The degree and practicality of decoupling by means of large cavities;

2. The extent and practicality of further improvements in detection networks and devices;

3. The significance of further weapons development through clandestine tests.

The subcommittees were also impressed by the importance of the time factor in relation to nuclear test cessation. The United States has not tested any nuclear weapons since its Hardtack II series in the fall of 1958. It appears from the testimony that at least for the next several years it will not be possible to identify underground events whose seismic signals record the equivalent of a nonmuffled nuclear explosion of 20 kilotons or less, although they may be detected. Further, it appears that for this same time period it will not be possible to detect muffled tests of 100 kilotons or more set off deep underground in large cavities. Therefore, it seems that for the next several years and possibly thereafter there could be a race between improved means of detection and identification as against improved means of concealing and muffling nuclear tests.

CHAPTER II. SUMMARY

The experts' system

The system of 180 control posts recommended by the conference of experts, August 1958[1] (hereafter referred to as the experts) was designed primarily with the detection and identification of nuclear explosions underground, underwater, and in the atmosphere up to altitudes of about 30 miles. The conference concluded that by the methods of acoustic, seismic and electromagnetic detection and nuclear debris sampling, supplemented in some cases by onsite inspection, there would be a fairly high probability of detecting and identifying nuclear explosions of 1 kiloton or more in the atmosphere up to altitudes of 30 miles. It was recognized that there were large areas over the oceans, particularly in the Southern Hemisphere, where the detection capability of the control system would be somewhat degraded as a result of the large distances between control posts.

For underwater explosions deep in open oceans the experts concluded that by means of the hydroacoustic, the seismic, and the nuclear debris-water sampling methods, nuclear explosions of 1 kiloton or more could be detected and identified with a fairly high probability.

The experts considered that the problem of detecting and identifying underground explosions is one of the most difficult, and that to a large extent it determines the characteristics of the network of control posts. They concluded that, by the seismic method alone, underground explosions within the continental areas of the world could be detected and located down to yields in the 1 kiloton to 5 kiloton range if the 180 control posts were established at intervals of 1,000 kilometers (600 miles) in the seismic regions and 1,700 kilometers (1,000 miles) in aseismic regions.

It was realized that the seismic method alone could not identify underground nuclear explosions. It was concluded that the seismic system could, however, identify

[1] Report of the conference of experts, dated Aug. 20, 1958, a copy of which is contained in the printed hearings to study the methods of detecting violations of a possible agreement on the suspension of nuclear tests.

about 90 percent of the earthquakes which produce seismic signals equivalent to an underground explosion of 5 kilotons or more under Rainier coupling conditions and a few percent of the earthquakes between 1 and 5 kilotons equivalent. This would leave annually a thousand or more earthquakes throughout the world between 1 and 5 kilotons equivalent (Rainier coupling) and about 100 earthquakes of 5 kilotons equivalent and above (Rainier coupling) which could be suspected of being nuclear explosions. The Soviets estimated the number above 5 kilotons equivalent as 20. Thus, the experts' report contains the estimate of unidentified events above 5 kilotons equivalent as 20 (U.S.S.R. estimate) to 100 (U.S.-U.K. estimate) on all continents annually. These numbers of unidentified events were subsequently found to be too low as a result of new seismic data from a later series of tests, Hardtack II. (On-site inspection is the best method known for identifying a seismic event which has been detected but not identified as either an earthquake or a nuclear explosion.)

The experts recognized the possibility that for underground nuclear explosions in rock media other than Nevada tuff, coupling to the earth might be larger or smaller by a factor of a few and hence such explosions might be either more or less difficult to detect.

In the case of nuclear explosions at high altitude and in space the 1958 Conference of Experts noted that various methods for detecting such explosions were possible—i.e., gamma rays and neutrons—but made no recommendations for including such techniques in the experts' system.

Detection and identification of underground nuclear tests

As a result of data from the Hardtack II series of underground nuclear explosions conducted by the United States after the 1958 Conference of Experts report, the following conclusions were made by the Berkner Panel: [2]

(a) The estimates of the experts concerning identification of underground nuclear explosions of 5 kilotons or more apply more accurately to yields of 20 kilotons or more.

(b) Estimates of the numbers of earthquakes equivalent to various nuclear yields below 20 kilotons must be revised upward by considerable amounts.

(c) The annual number of unidentified events above 1 kiloton equivalent would exceed that estimated by the experts by about a factor of 10.

In addition, subsequent theoretical predictions increased the estimated degree of decoupling (muffling) possible by firing nuclear devices in large underground cavities from a factor of 2 to 3 as agreed at the experts' conference up to a factor of 300. This was confirmed experimentally by the Cowboy series of small chemical explosions.

The Berkner Panel recommended in March 1959 an intensive program of research and development to improve methods of seismic detection. In addition they recommended the following specific immediate improvements to the Geneva system to restore the original capability of detection and identification estimated by the experts:

(a) Large arrays of up to 100 seismographs at each control post.

(b) Long-period seismographs at every control post.

(3) Seismographs in deep holes (thousands of feet).

(d) Unmanned seismic stations at spacings of 100 to 200 miles between the wider spaced control posts of the experts' system.

Technical working group II, consisting of technical experts from the United States, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. met in Geneva during November and December 1959 to reexamine the problem of underground tests and to attempt to reach agreement on techniques and instrumentation that might improve detection and identification of seismic events. The U.S. report to the technical working group II set forth worldwide earthquake statistics and criteria for identification.

Based on these statitsics and criteria, preliminary calculations were made of the estimated annual number of continental seismic events in the U.S.S.R. and the number that would not be identifiable by seismic instruments.[3] It was calculated that about 100 naturally occurring seismic events per year occur in the Soviet Union above magnitude 4.75 of which an estimated 70 could not be identified as earthquakes by seismographs of the Geneva system.

A formula was then established for determining a quota of onsite inspections on the basis of 20 percent of all estimated earthquakes above magnitude 4.75 (100). An alternative basis was 30 percent of the estimated unidentified events above magnitude 4.75 (70). The quota obtained by either method was about 20 onsite inspections to be permitted annually in the Soviet Union and was contained in the United States February 11, 1960, proposal at Geneva.

During the hearings Dr. Richard Latter of the Rand Corp. presented for the first time a report evaluating the expected performance of the Geneva system in the U.S.S.R. This report using less rigorous criteria for identification of earthquakes, and applying these criteria only to events within 600 miles of each control post, where seismic data are more reliable, stated that the annual number of unidentified events in the Soviet Union would be 53.

This report covered the effect of increasing the number of seismic control posts in the Soviet Union from 21 to 30. If the 30 stations were installed, Rand estimated that only 9 earthquakes per year would remain unidentified at magnitude 4.75 (20 kilotons, Rainier coupling) and 36 unidentified events per year at magnitude 4.35 (5 kilotons, Rainier coupling). Rand concluded that such a system would essentially restore the capability estimated by the 1958 conference of experts. The Rand study did not take into consideration the effects of decoupling.

The estimated cost of the complete Geneva control system was reported by the Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Department of Defense to be $1 billion in round numbers with an annual operating cost of about one-quarter of a billion dollars. A contractor study presented an estimate of $1 to $5 billion for installation of 22 stations of the Geneva system seismic network in the U.S.S.R. alone.[4]

Means of concealing underground nuclear tests

Seismic signals from underground nuclear tests can be reduced by decoupling in large holes deep underground. Witnesses agreed that decoupling factors of up to 120 were proven experimentally in Series Cowboy. They further agreed that an additional decoupling factor of 2½ between salt and tuff exists because of the difference in the physical properties of these two materials. Finally, they were in agreement that these two factors combined resulted in an overall factor of 300 reduction in seismic signals from a decoupled shot in salt compared to a tamped shot in Nevada tuff. These decoupling tests were conducted in the fall of 1959 by the AEC in a Louisiana salt dome. Holes in diameter of 12 and 30 feet were used. These chemical explosions ranged from 20 to 2,000 pounds in size.

Deep large cavities can be washed in underground salt domes of which exist some 200 or more in the United States and an unknown number in th U.S.S.R. Holes can be constructed by conventional solution mining or leaching by continuously pumping fresh water or sea water into the cavity through a cased-drill hole and withdrawing the salt in a brine solution.

Witnesses testified that it would not be necessary to dig the large holes required for maximum decoupling (300 to 1). Smaller holes, comparatively, could reduce the seismic signal to a level which would be difficult if not impossible to detect. For example, Dr. Albert Latter testified that a decoupling factor of 30 could be obtained in a hole one-thirtieth of the optimum volume. Dr. Bethe disagreed and contended that a decoupling factor of 30 would require a hole one-tenth of the optimum volume for maximum decoupling. Since the optimum hole volume is 91,000 cubic yards (at a depth of about 3,000 feet) per kiloton, a decoupling of a factor of 30 would require excavation of about 3,000 cubic yards, according to Latter, or about 9,000 cubic yards according to Dr. Bethe.

The diameter of holes required to provide decoupling factors of 30 and 300 were calculated by Dr. Albert Latter for each of several sizes of explosions.

Testimony indicated that nuclear explosions might also be concealed by firing them at such a time that the resulting seismic signals would be masked by the signals from large earthquakes. Theories of other possible techniques to prevent accurate location or to destroy the usefulness of the first motion criterion for identification were discussed. However, these possibilities were not considered as significant as concealment by decoupling.

Improvement in Geneva experts system

The improvements recommended by the Berkner Panel listed above under "Detection and Identification of Underground Nuclear Tests" were expected to restore the capability of the experts system to that estimated in 1958, which was based on a 21-station installation in the Soviet Union.

The committee heard several proposals for improving the detection and identification capability of the control system by increasing the number of seismograph stations.

Rand Corp. study presented by Dr. Richard Latter indicated that increasing the number of control posts, complete with 100-element arrays, to 30 stations within the U.S.S.R. would leave about 9 unidentified earthquakes within the U.S.S.R. per year above magnitude 4.75 (20 kilotons under Rainier coupling conditions). About 36 unidentified events per year within the U.S.S.R. would remain unidentified above magnitude 4.35 (about 5 kilotons Rainier coupling).

Dr. Roberts of the Carnegie Institute proposed a system of about 125 unmanned stations in the Soviet Union, spaced at 250-mile intervals, for detecting tamped explosions as small as 10 tons or decoupled explosions of about 3 kilotons. However, he pointed out that there would be no way of discriminating between these small explosions and earthquakes. He based his recommendation on his experience with 1 ton high explosive charges fired in water and on additional experiments with quarry blasts.

On this basis he estimated that 10 tons fired in rock could be detected at 250 miles

[2] The Berkner Panel was a panel on seismic improvement consisting of a number of scientists under the chairmanship of Dr. Lloyd V. Berkner. It was appointed by the Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology on Dec. 28, 1958. It reported its findings on Mar. 16, 1959, which were made public on June 12, 1959. The report is contained in the printed hearings.

[3] These calculations were made by the Office of the Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology utilizing the best information available at the time (Jan. 6, 1960).

[4] See secs. IV and V.

under favorable circumstances, particularly if small arrays of seismographs were used at each station.

Dr. Bethe proposed in his testimony before the committee on April 20, 1960, a network of about 600 unmanned seismograph stations in the U.S.S.R., at intervals of about 125 miles. This network was designed to identify a high proportion of the earthquakes equivalent in size to a 20 kiloton fully decoupled explosion (about 70 tons closely tamped).

He estimated there would be 5,000 seismic events of this magnitude in the U.S.S.R., of which about 500 would be unidentified. Dr. Bethe further stated that since we are interested only in decoupled explosions we would have to inspect only that part of the 500 unidentified events which were located in salt dome areas.

Hopefully, he reported this might involve as few as 5 events per year, since he estimates that only 1 percent of the 500 unidentified events would occur in salt dome areas of the U.S.S.R. This estimate is based on Dr. Bethe's assumption that 20 kiloton decoupled explosions could most easily be conducted in salt beds.

In a communication to the committee dated April 27, 7 days later, Dr. Bethe offered a revised statement which is printed in the appendix to the hearings. In this later statement he indicated that it would be possible, according to his new calculations, to reduce the 600 unmanned stations to 200 unmanned stations.

Engineering study of large arrays in U.S.S.R.

An engineering study of the feasibility of installing large arrays of seismographs at 22 locations in the U.S.S.R. was presented to the committee.[5] This study revealed that the maximum number of seismographs which on the average can be used in an array is more like 30 than 100. This conclusion results from the practical problems of successfully finding a large number of quiet seismic locations within the 2-mile-diameter circle determined to be optimum for a large array. Thus, it is possible to achieve in a "realistic" array installation of about 30 seismographs an improvement in signal-to-noise level of a factor of 4 rather than the theoretical estimate of a factor of 10 for a 100-element *"ideal" array.*

The study further indicated that of the 22 control post locations spaced as recommended by the 1958 conference of experts, 16 stations can be located on good geology with 6 on fair, poor, or very poor geology. Thus, 6 of the 22 stations of an actual Geneva system of seismic arrays in the U.S.S.R. can be expected to have a capability lower than that theoretically expected by the experts.[6]

The report outlines the practical problems of engineering and logistics for stations from the Arctic areas to the deserts and high mountains of the southern part of the U.S.S.R. The project is compared in engineering difficulty to the multibillion-dollar DEW line project and is roughly estimated to cost $1 to $5 billion just for control posts in the Soviet Union alone.

Onsite inspection

The 1958 conference of experts recognized the difficulty of identifying a carefully concealed underground nuclear explosion. In the experts' report they stated:

"When the control posts detect an event which cannot be identified by the international control organ and which could be suspected of being a nuclear explosion, the international control organ can send an inspection group to the site of this event in order to determine whether a nuclear explosion has taken place or not."

How many annual onsite inspections would be necessary or permitted in the U.S.S.R. has been the subject of continuous controversy between the U.S.S.R. and United States-United Kingdom negotiators at Geneva. The U.S. February 11, 1960, proposal discussed above, under "Detection and Identification of Underground Nuclear Tests" was an attempt to overcome the Soviet refusal to agree to inspection rights on all suspicious events by setting a specific number of annual inspections as a quota with a direct relationship to the technical requirement.[7] The hearings discussed the methods by which onsite inspections would be made. Inspection would consist of aerial overflight of an area of 40 to 200 square miles, subsequent ground survey of suspicious smaller areas located from the air, and, finally, actual drilling operations to locate radioactivity at the point deep underground where the explosion may have occurred.

In the first phase, aircraft equipped with conventional and infrared photographic equipment, and airborne magnetometers, would search for unusual vehicular traffic, mining or drilling activities, communication or powerlines, craters, rock slides, cracks in the earth, disrupted vegetation, etc.

In the second phase, ground examinations of selected smaller surface areas would utilize scientific equipment such as sensitive magnetometers, electromagnetic metal detectors, refraction shooting equipment, etc. The objective would be to attempt to locate, hopefully within a circle of about 500 feet in diameter, the spot directly over the suspected underground nuclear explosion. Magnetometers and induction detectors may locate remnants of cable, drill tips, or drill casing, or other construction material which may have been used in preparing for the shot. Reflection and refraction shooting may be useful in locating underground cavities. Surface inspection on foot or horseback would be required to look for unusual signs of human activities connected with preparations for the test.

The third and final phase of inspection would be drilling. This phase would not be started until the successful conclusion of the second phase. By successful conclusion is meant that one or more areas equivalent to a circle of the order of 500 feet radius can be selected for drilling operations. Drilling operations must then be conducted in each one of these localized areas. The probability of success in such operations is given in the following table presented by Dr. Gerald Johnson, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore:

Probability of discovery of radioactive zone from tamped explosions within a 500-foot circle

Yield (kilotons)	5 holes	10 holes
	Percent	*Percent*
1.7	3	12
20	26	94
100	100	100

It was variously estimated by scientific witnesses that the overall probability of success of an onsite inspection in locating and identifying a single underground nuclear explosion varies from very nearly zero to a probability of 100 percent success if the inspection were conducted in an exhaustive manner for a period of several years at a cost of tens of millions of dollars.

Detection and identification of nuclear explosions at high altitude and in space

The problem of detecting nuclear explosions at high altitudes and in space may be solved by detection equipment mounted on the surface of the earth in conjunction with detection equipment based in satellites in prescribed orbits around the earth or the sun. Techniques suggested by technical working group I (July 1959) for installation at control posts of the experts system are tabulated below:

Method:	*Approximate theoretical range (miles)*
Direct optical	300,000
Fluorescence	500,000
Backscatter radar	3,000
Cosmic noise absorption	1,000–10,000
Electromagnetic pulse	3,000

Techniques for employment on earth or solar satellites are listed in the following tables:

Method:	*Approximate theoretical range (miles)*
Thermal X-rays	200,000,000
Prompt gamma rays	300,000
Delayed gamma rays	300,000
Prompt neutrons	100,000
Delayed neutrons	10,000
Trapped electrons	30,000

Ground techniques appear to have possibilities for detection out to ranges of 300,000 to 500,000 miles. Five of the six suggested satellite techniques are similarly limited to ranges of about 300,000 miles from the satellite. At distances beyond 300,000 miles from an earth satellite system, slightly more than the distance to the moon, it is significant to note that only the X-ray technique will record radiation from a nuclear explosion. Thus, in more than 99.99 percent of space available for nuclear tests by a violator only the X-ray technique has the necessary detection range. Furthermore, this X-ray technique is subject to degradation in range by the technique of shielding by a potential violator to reduce the intensity of X-rays from the explosion. It is estimated that the above range for an unshielded explosion would be reduced by a factor of 10 or more for explosions in the megaton yield range and by a factor of 100 or more for explosions of the order of 10 kilotons in yield by shielding.

Very little is known about the natural radiation of gamma rays, neutrons, and X-rays in regions where satellites would be installed. The effectiveness and reliability of the satellite system will therefore depend greatly upon the degree to which pulses of radiation similar to those produced by nuclear explosions in space might be produced naturally.

Significance of further weapon developments through clandestine tests

As previously discussed, the witnesses agreed that the 180-station Geneva system would not have a capability of detecting and identifying seismic events below 20 kilotons equivalent as originally thought. All witnesses also agreed that seismic signals from underground tests could be reduced by decoupling up to a factor of 300. Accordingly, with the present state of knowledge, detection of an underground low-yield test by a violator attempting to conceal it will be extremely difficult if not impossible. Similarly, it was agreed that clandestine testing of high yield weapons in space could be conducted within the present scope of missile and satellite technology.

In view of this, the question naturally arises as to the importance or significance

[5] This study was made by United Electrodynamics Corp. for the Air Force Technical Applications Center, Apr. 15, 1960.

[6] It should be noted that problems of rapid and secure communication of signals and information both within the external to the test detection system were not covered to any extent during the hearings. Limitation of time prevented a discussion of this problem.

[7] The Soviets have consistently held that agreement on the quota should be settled as a political question independently of the problem of the number of unidentified events.

of clandestine tests. In the opinion of the scientists, who testified at these hearings, further underground tests at yields smaller than 20 kilotons would permit development of new weapons in the low kiloton range. They also agreed that further testing in space would permit full-scale tests of weapons developed by underground scaled-down tests, as well as permit development of improved models of high-yield nuclear weapons.

The witnesses differed, however, on the relative military significance of such developments compared to the stockpiles of sophisticated weapons presently available to the three principal nuclear powers, the United States, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. For example, Dr. Teller considers such developments of very great importance, while Dr. Bethe considers they would be of only nominal importance.

The importance to the United States of future development of low-yield nuclear weapons, as well as improvements in high-yield weapons, is determined by military requirements—strategic and tactical. These are the responsibility of various agencies in the executive branch, including the Office of the President, the Department of Defense, and the AEC, as well as designated congressional committees in the legislative branch. However, the military significance to the United States of possible future nuclear weapons must also be considered and assessed in relationship to the overall diplomatic and foreign policies of the United States. While these hearings were concerned primarily with the technical problems of a nuclear test ban, it is recognized that diplomatic and policy matters of great importance must also be considered in the final evaluation. The latter, however, were not within the scope of these hearings.

Research and development required for seismic improvement

It was the unanimous opinion of all witnesses that a vigorous and sustained program of research and development is necessary to improve our instrumentation and our techniques of detection, identification, and inspection of nuclear explosion tests.

The Berkner Panel proposed a comprehensive research program in seismology and recommended a systems development program directed toward the specification of equipment required for a worldwide seismic system for monitoring underground nuclear explosions. The March 1959 Berkner report recommended a total expenditure of $22.8 million for the first year and $30 million for the second year.

A U.S. research and development program, designated Project Vela Uniform, was assigned to the Department of Defense's Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) in September 1959. The Advanced Research Projects Agency authorized implementation of the program in February 1960 by the Air Force Technical Applications Center (AFTAC).

This program was allocated $8.5 million in December 1959, of which $5 million was obligated by April 19, 1960. Testimony indicated that there is no line item in the fiscal 1961 Department of Defense budget for this program and future funds thus would have to be obtained from other Department of Defense projects or sources.

Under Project Vela Uniform, AFTAC has undertaken the following major tasks:

(a) Equip a large number of world seismological observatories with standard calibrated seismographs and auxiliary equipment and provide for the free exchange of data accumulated throughout the continuous operation of such equipment. This program is designed to provide uniform and quantitative seismic data in support of research on the nature of earthquakes and the characteristics of seismic waves produced by them. A special panel established by the National Academy of Sciences will provide recommendations on equipment specifications and on deployment and use of this equipment. Procurement, installation, and distribution is to be handled by the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey of the Department of Commerce with the first 50 sets of equipment expected to be available in mid-1960.

(b) Stimulate basic research in seismology through the establishment of programs at universities and other research organizations to include investigations on the generation and propagation of seismic waves, studies of the structure of the earth, and the development of new types of seismic instruments. These efforts are expected to contribute to the solution of detection problem and to result in a significant increase in the number of trained scientists who would be required for the technical operations of a control system.

(c) Carry out a systems development program to include the construction and operation of a Geneva-type station recommended by the 1958 Conference of Experts and the design and operation of a systems development laboratory and seismograph station based on Berkner Panel recommendations. Characteristics of the latter station will be continually modified in the light of technical advances.

(d) Investigate the magnitude and characteristics of seismic effects from both underground nuclear and high explosive detonations for the purpose of obtaining data on the difference in signals generated, the effects of depth of burial and geology and to obtain possible additional criteria for differentiating between natural and artificial seismic events. Extensive measurements to be made at distances from a few feet out to distances as far as 2,000 to 3,000 miles from these explosions would provide data which are expected to result in major improvements in detection capabilities. (Nuclear explosions were considered essential by most of the witnesses for a research program of this nature.)

Research and development required to determine feasibility of detecting nuclear explosions in space

The March 1959 report of the Panofsky Panel[8] proposed a program of research and development to determine the feasibility of systems for detecting nuclear explosions in space. The U.S. Government is considering a major program of research and development based on the recommendations of this report. This program, designated Vela Sierra (ground-based techniques) and Vela Hotel (satellite-based techniques), is the responsibility of the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA).

Scientific opinion at the hearings unanimously supported the requirement for an intensive program of research and development to determine the feasibility of detecting nuclear explosions in space. A program of research and development was presented by ARPA which amounts to the threefold task of (1) surveying the background levels of radiation in space to be encountered by satellite detectors; (2) developing adequate detection equipment for satellites, launching, tracking, and data-reduction systems; and (3) developing equipment for detection of nuclear explosions in space from control posts of the 1958 Geneva experts system.

The program contemplates utilizing the facilities of the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in the most effective way possible to accomplish the program in the shortest possible time. It is estimated that a program of 3 to 5 years of research and development will be required to determine the feasibility of a system for detecting nuclear explosions in space.

ARPA has requested $20 million for fiscal year 1961 to pursue the program of research on surface and satellite techniques for detecting high-altitude explosions.

[8] The Panel on High Altitude Detection under the chairmanship of Dr. Wolfgang Panofsky was appointed by the Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology and on Mar. 16, 1959, submitted its final report.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S OPPORTUNITY TO STAND UP FOR FREEDOM

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today, May 10, we commemorate Rumanian Independence Day which has long been celebrated by Rumanian patriots in all parts of the world as a day of national unity.

The Rumanian Nation, history tells us, was constructed by the descendants of the Roman colonists many centuries ago. Down through history Rumania has stood as one of the strong and sturdy ramparts of European freedom and the noble cause of Christianity. As a consequence of her geographical position as well as her strong loyalty to the cause of an advanced civilization, Rumania has often been the scene of war and martyrdom.

Today this historic nation of some 20 millions of people suffers under the heavy yoke of Russian Communist imperialism. While it is true that the Rumanians have known the cruel whip of Moscow in past generations, the Communist whip now in the hands of the Kremlin masters is more cruel, brutal, and inhuman than any before lashed over the backs of the Rumanian people. All freedom-loving Americans, therefore, on this, the traditional Rumanian Independence Day, pay tribute to those loyal and sturdy Rumanian patriots who stand fast in their faith for the future of Rumania and all mankind.

Within 6 days the summit meeting at Paris, France, will be held. This meeting presents a marvelous opportunity for President Eisenhower to become the champion of freedom and national independence for all people and nations by insisting that the agenda to be considered at the meeting include the right of all nations, large and small, to determine their own destiny, their own form of government, by free and unfettered elections. Insistence upon this right at the summit meeting may be offensive to the cruel, inhuman leader of the Russian Communists and the international Communist conspiracy, Khrushchev, but it would be in strict conformity with the previous agreements signed by the Soviet Union, Great Britain, France, and the United States.

The Captive Nations Week resolution, which is Public Law 86–90, enacted by Congress and signed by the President July 17 of last year, means that we deeply share the aspirations of all the captive nations for their national independence, freedom, and individual liberty. It also signalizes to Moscow that it should make no mistake about

our spiritual alliance with the captive millions and that in no circumstances will we ever sacrifice their goals for national independence, freedom, and individual liberty in any deal.

By insisting upon the right of self-determination of nations to be included in the summit agenda, President Eisenhower will have the complete support of Congress and the acclaim of the American people and all people throughout the world who are anxious for a peace with justice.

I am confident that the God-fearing people of the great nation of Rumania, once again, given an opportunity to determine their own destiny by free and unfettered elections, would repudiate the Russian proconsuls and Russian stooges who are in control of the Government. They would replace them with loyal patriotic Rumanians worthy of the great tradition and heritage of true Rumanians.

WAGING PEACE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I would not want this RECORD to close, in the light of the remarks made earlier today, without some comment about waging peace. The events of the past 15 months have given many Americans hope that the administration was indeed engaged in waging peace, but Americans have been unnerved by the swift succession of events in the past 10 days. So much attention has been given to the flight across Soviet territory that the greater risk to the nuclear test conversations at Geneva has almost slipped from view.

In 1958, our international discussions of nuclear tests had come close to the point of an agreement. All of the scientists felt that a treaty could have been settled then, but we insisted on further nuclear explosions and, while we tested small bombs, the Russians perfected the H-bomb for carriage in a missile. We resumed conversations.

Finally on February 12 of this year we offered a new proposal calling for a program of joint research and experimentation to develop the detection of small tests underground. In the White House statement at that time it was said "the United States is determined to make all possible progress toward the ultimate objective of the negotiations," and "a joint program of research and experimentation would permit the ban to be systematically extended to the remaining areas underground where adequate control measures are not now possible to incorporate."

Out of these negotiations had come further agreement so that there remained to be settled at the forthcoming summit conferences only three major questions: The question of the length of the moratorium, the completion of the control group, and the number of on-sight inspections.

Most scientists believed that these partially political questions could be resolved in an acceptable manner at the forthcoming summit conferences and that this would be one step forward toward building a lasting peace. But, again, even as others have indicated their willingness to accept our offers, we again appear to be torpedoing our own offer.

On last Friday, the President stated that we would not have joint research but coordinated research, which is a far different thing. On Saturday he announced that we would proceed to carry out underground nuclear tests, thus indirectly withdrawing the offer of February 12 for joint research, just 4 days before the conference resumes meetings to work out joint research. In this time of tensions, Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we try to increase rather than decrease the area of trust. If we would be trusted, we must proceed in good faith ourselves. A coordinated research program in which the other parties to the research will not know fully what is being done may very well undermine the opportunity for an agreement on a nuclear test ban.

This morning's Washington Post, in a UPI dispatch from Geneva, indicates that neither the British nor American delegations had been informed in advance of the Washington move. They were obviously irked at its timing and feared months of tedious conference activities might have been wasted because of it. A Reuter's dispatch indicates that Britain is opposed to the unilateral resumption of nuclear testing by either the United States or the Soviet Union unless it is carried out within the framework of current negotiations, which is to say, under joint research. Certainly we should not act without consultation, especially at this stage.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have a right to be told the truth by their public officials. The issues with which we deal are of such great importance that deception may invite national destruction. The confidence of our adversaries in our truthfulness has already been badly shaken by the events of the past weekend. Now we risk shaking the confidence of our allies and friends as well.

I call upon the President to retract the announcement of last Saturday and to affirm his offer of February 12, to help assure that a nuclear test ban, as the first step toward world disarmament, may be achieved. President de Gaulle reminded us 2 weeks ago that this is the last moment for reaching agreement. Otherwise we may expect many more nations to join the nuclear club, we may expect agreement to be more difficult, and the risk of nuclear war, even by accident, to mount.

Mr. Speaker, I am distressed that there are public officials who in this hour preceding a world conference of heads of State would seek to justify or condone provocative acts which threaten the lives of hundreds of millions of people the world over. I invite my colleagues to read the following English translation by Tass of the remarks of Premier Khrushchev, which appeared on page 16 of today's New York Times. The uncommitted world will be listening to us as well as to Premier Khrushchev. They will be judging the actions of the United States as well as of the U.S.S.R. May our words and our deeds henceforth indicate an unswerving desire to wage peace, in order that mankind may live to enjoy freedom. Even those who have not yet experienced the freedom of the Western World have no desire to be liberated by incineration.

[From the New York Times, May 10, 1960]

TEXT OF KHRUSHCHEV'S SPEECH WARNING NATIONS WITH BASES USED BY U.S. PLANES

Dear Comrade Dvorak, Ambassador of friendly, fraternal Czechoslovakia.

Dear friends, comrades, gentlemen.

We are very pleased to attend the reception held on the occasion of the fifteenth anniversary of the liberation of the Czechoslovak Republic, the celebration of Victory Day, which indeed is a holiday for all the peoples. The Soviet people, at one with all other peoples, sincerely want that there should be no more war, that this war should be the last, that it should be remembered by the peoples and should go down in history as the last war.

We are doing our utmost to achieve this indeed. That is precisely why the Soviet Union submitted at the United Nations its proposals for general and complete disarmament. We not only insist on the necessity of reducing armed forces but already now, without waiting for such decisions by the Western countries, we unilaterally cut the armed forces of the Soviet Union by one-third.

When we have reduced our armed forces to 2,400,000, some time will pass, and we shall think it over and evidently we shall further reduce our army. Comrade Zhadov [Gen. Aleksandr A. Zhadov, deputy commander of Soviet ground forces] over there scratched the back of his head—another reduction.

No, this will not be done now, Comrade General, but later.

We shall do this if the situation favors such measures. Of course, we shall not cut our armed forces to such a level which would prejudice the security of the Soviet Union. You should bear in mind that we do not reduce our armed forces for financial reasons. No, the financial situation of our state is splendid and, if need be, could not only forbear from reducing the army and navy, but increase them. I repeat, if this were necessary we could do this without tense efforts. But as good masters we say: Why have bigger armed forces than we need?

CONTROLS NOT FEARED

If our partners agree we are willing to accept total disarmament and we shall effect it honestly. We are not afraid of control. If you please, gentlemen, then you could fly over our territory, check, take pictures, do what you please.

Such an issue as now could not arise then. The Department of State explains the incident with the downed reconnaissance plane more or less as follows: One cannot, they say, admit, nor can one deny. It turns out, as in the well-known joke, that here is a maiden who is also not a maiden for she has a child. The marriage was not registered, therefore one can regard her as a maiden in a way. But she gave birth to a child. Can one regard her as a maiden or not?

This does not happen in real life. We tell the Americans: Your plane flew over our country on an intelligence mission. We tracked its flight and it flew to the Sverdlovsk area, where it was brought down. That is how you got into a mess and you are in a mess. Pluck up your courage and say: Yes, there was such a disgraceful fact. And this is a big disgrace for America since everyone sees now how disgraced in the eyes of the world are those who committed such a

shocking act of aggression. The whole world wants peace, a relaxation of international tension while certain quarters in the United States stage such a provocation.

What were the purposes of this flight? A provocation. This is bad, very bad indeed.

TIMING FOR SUMMIT SEEN

I have already said, comrades, and now I repeat, that this was done deliberately and deliberately timed for the summit meeting in Paris. It is said that it was the work of the military. Only the military? What kind of state is this if the military do what the Government opposes? How can the Government tolerate this? If any one of our military allowed himself to do such a thing, we would pull him up immediately. The Government and the country are strong when the entire machinery functions smoothly, when everything is subordinated to the Government. Therein lies real strength. Understand me rightly: When everyone pulls in a different direction what kind of state is this and what confidence can one have in the policy of such a state?

There can be no confidence in the policy of such a state. The statement that the aggressive flight was made without the will and instructions of the Government, that nothing was known of it in the State Department, does not give credit to the Department of State of the United States. And what about Allen Dulles?

For he knew about all this and he also is a member of the U.S. Government. For this is Allen Dulles' aviation. It turns out that the State Department's reply is, as the saying has it, too thin.

It is possible, I do not know this for certain, but I do not preclude the possibility that the Government of the United States of America knew of this flight. But I, so to speak, confide it to you.

STATEMENT HELD ALARMING

In diplomatic language it would be better to say: It knew, but it stopped its ears and closed its eyes and now depicts the matter as if the Devil led astray some official. However, let it be, with this Government and with its way of issuing statements on all this.

One thing is alarming in this statement. It is vague. More, this statement blames us for not allowing to fly over or travel across our country those who want to study our defenses, to discover secrets. And that is why they, that means the American Government, had been impelled to send planes on intelligence missions. This is a very dangerous explanation. It is dangerous because it does not denounce but tries to justify such a flight and seems to say that such flights are possible in the future, too, because the Soviet Union does not think to reveal its secrets to countries that pursue unfriendly policy toward us.

Using this as the only justification, some gentlemen intend to gain the right in the eyes of public opinion to fly over our territory in the future, too, gleaning important military secrets.

I repeat once again this is very dangerous, let alone that it is wrong in principle and not in keeping with the spirit of international peaceful relations. If someone intends to fly over our territory, reconnoitering objectives and gleaning state secrets, we shall bring down such planes, just bring them down.

More, if such flights are repeated, we shall take appropriate countermeasures.

OTHER COUNTRIES WARNED

I should say this: Those countries that have bases on their territories should note most carefully the following: If they allow others to fly from their bases to our territory we shall hit at those bases. Because we assess such actions as provocations against our country.

We tell the governments of those countries, if you leased your territory to others and are not the masters of your land, of your country, hence, we shall have to understand it in our way. Those who lease your territory, operate against us from your territory. Their lands are far from us while your land is near. That is why as a warning to remote targets, we shall find the range to the near ones. Let them draw the appropriate conclusions.

I should not like to heat up passions because even in wartime people long for peace, await an end to the war and dream of peace. There is no war now. Our strength is being tested. Therefore, let us not draw conclusions aggravating relations between countries, such conclusions as would hamper us in the future, I should like to say, even in building good relations with the United States of America. Today I declare once again that we want to live not only in peace but also in friendship with the American people. The American people want no war, I am sure of this.

On the eve of the Paris meeting the aggressive circles wanted to bring strong pressure to bear upon us. We say: Let us conclude a peace treaty with Germany. Some of our former wartime allies are against this.

WEST BERLIN STAND DECRIED

But why? Plainly speaking, why need the United States of America, France, and the United Kingdom West Berlin? They need it as a dog needs a fifth leg. West Berlin does not give them anything. By the way, no one encroaches on West Berlin. It is said, freedom is at stake, but who encroaches on freedom?

Let the West Berliners continue to live as they do now and let them have the regime they like. The Soviet Government has long since declared that to select a regime is a matter for each people and that everyone should live as he prefers to. If the Western Powers do not want to sign a German peace treaty we shall have to sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic.

The point is that even after we conclude such a treaty with the German Democratic Republic they would like to exercise those rights which flow from Germany's surrender, to exercise them in defiance of the peace treaty we would have signed. But if we sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic, the terms of war will be ended and, hence, the terms of surrender will also be ended. They will cease to operate. If after the signing of a peace treaty some one would like to force his way into West Berlin which we would like to see a free city, our force will resist this force.

Aware of this, some leaders in the United States of America decided to teach Khrushchev a lesson; since it is said that force will resist force, we shall teach a lesson to the Soviet Union, we shall fly over your territory and we already flew over it and returned home.

EARLIER FLYOVER NOTED

This happened, for instance, on April 9. I have already spoken of this. Even now this flight is denied in the United States. In this case the ethics is: If the thief is not caught, he is no thief. But this time we caught the thief and now the whole world knows of it.

The reconnaissance plane should have been brought down on April 9, too. But our military, to put it mildly, let a chance slip by. And we, as one says, took them to task for it. On May 1 the reconnaissance plane was shot down. The military splendidly coped with the task when the opponent grew bold. For the American military thought like this: If the April 9 flight passed off with impunity, that means they cannot hit it at such an altitude, and the aggressive military wanted to demonstrate their strength once again 15 days before the summit meeting.

Well, Khrushchev, what are you boasting of? We fly over your country and you can do nothing about it. They expected to fly over Soviet territory this time, too, to fly over Sverdlovsk and to show that we can do nothing about it. Indeed, an unpleasant situation. And now when he hit the air pirate with a rocket, as the saying has it, it is time to dismount from the horse.

S. M. Budenny: "One must slash down to the saddle, and everything will go to pieces."

Nikita Khrushchev: "I believe that this cavalry rule is quite appropriate."

Attempts are still made to frighten us because in the West bombers are flying on round-the-clock vigil * * *.

ROCKETS ON VIGIL

I should like to tell those people: "Listen, gentlemen, we also have bombers, but they are not on vigil, in our country rockets are on vigil."

It is common knowledge that V bombers, as a rule, fly at an altitude ranging from 12,000 to 17,000 meters, they cannot rise higher because designers still cannot overcome technical difficulties. The plane which committed the diversion on May 1 flew at an altitude of 20,000 meters. They say it was an unarmed V plane. It was because it was unarmed that it could fly at such an altitude. They expected that such a plane will be invulnerable for a long time to go. They even expected that this will be almost for all time.

I shall say further, when Twining, the then Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, arrived here we welcomed him as guest and entertained him. He left our country by air and next day sent a plane flying at great altitude to our country. This plane flew as far as Kiev. The question arose: Should we protest? I proposed that no protest should be lodged. Only an animal might act like Twining which, eating at one place, might do its unpleasant business there. From such behavior we drew the conclusion: To improve rockets, to improve fighters. Our fighters can fly as high as 28,000 meters. But the difficulties of a fighter are that though it can rise high, it is not so easy and simple to find the target in the air; a plane in the air is like a needle in the ocean.

But the rocket finds its target itself. This is the advantage of the rocket and we use of it. We have both fighters and rockets. That is why I say: If there are still politicians who would like to rely on bombers, they are doomed to failure. With the up-to-date military techniques bombers will be shot down even before they approach the target. We also have good aviation. I flew to America in a TU–114. This plane is a modification of a bomber with a flying range of 17,000 kilometers. I mentioned this to the President of the United States. However, the ceiling of the bomber is within the sphere of operation of fighters. It is now not so difficult to bring down a bomber.

The Americans can do this, but we can do it even better.

That is why one should abandon this exchange of threats. It would be better to speak of peace and friendship, how mutually advantageous it is to trade, how good relations can be established between peoples, how cultural contacts and tourist travel can be developed. This would be a far more useful and lofty job and all the peoples of the world would welcome this. This is precisely what our stand is, comrades. The peoples demand tranquillity, they are against wars and military conflicts. Let us try and meet these just demands of the people.

SOVIET GOALS CITED

When we were preparing the recent session of the Supreme Soviet we did not envisage the discussion of any military questions. We drafted a law on the abolition of

taxes paid by factory and office workers and a law on the completion of the transition to a 7 and 6-hour working day. We prepared for discussion at the session the question of increasing by 25 billion to 30 billion rubles expenditures for the expansion of industry manufacturing consumer goods so as to emerge to first place in Europe during this 7-year-plan period, and to catch up with the United States 5 years later. What lofty aims from the attainment of which not a single people, not a single individual in the world, would suffer.

And here, as one says, to "cheer us up," they timed such an aggressive act for the great proletarian May Day holiday. But the aggressors themselves did not expect that they would indeed cheer us up. When Marshal Malinovsky mounted the mausoleum on May Day to make his speech, I could already congratulate him on the shooting down of the plane. He replied that he had learned this just before motoring to Red Square. This was good news before the minister's speech at the May Day parade.

Comrades, today we are celebrating the day of victory in the war in which we lost more people and wealth than any other country. We mourn over the dead but at the same time we celebrate and rejoice in our victory.

HAILS WAR VICTORY

We rejoice because our people not only rehabilitated the devastated economy but far surpassed the prewar level of development. This victory is also being celebrated in countries that were our allies in the last war. The Ambassadors of those countries are also here. We have just clinked glases with the American Ambassador, Mr. Thompson. But after our "clinking" in the air, are ringing of our glasses in the Czechoslovak Embassy—is already not the proper ringing.

I respect the Ambassador of the United States and I am convinced that he had nothing to do with this incursion, that he could not have anything to do even if he wished to.

I am convinced of the ethical qualities of this man. Since I know him I think that he is not capable of such a thing. Evidently he feels this incident as a big annoyance for his country and for himself as the representative of the United States in the Soviet Union. This must be taken into consideration.

Comrades, I propose a toast to the victory, to the nations and people who fought against Nazi Germany and with us won a great victory.

I propose a toast to friendly Czechoslovakia, to the remarkable people of Czechoslovakia, to the hosts of this house, the Ambassador of the Czechoslovak Republic, Comrade Dvorak, and his wife, to all who represent the fraternal Czechoslovak Republic in the Soviet Union.

I raise my glass to the end of wars, to the end of provocations, to peace and friendship between the peoples.

HEALTH CARE PROPOSALS

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means is presently working in executive session on possible amendments to the Social Security Act. One of the important subjects under consideration in this activity is concerned with the establishment of a health and medical care program for the aged.

Basically there are two proposed approaches presently under consideration to provide the aged with protection against health care costs. One of these approaches is the Medicare plan recommended by the administration as outlined to the committee by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Arthur S. Flemming. The other approach is contained in legislation, H.R. 4700, sponsored by my distinguished committee colleague, the Honorable AIME J. FORAND, of Rhode Island.

Important factors involved in the evaluation of the relative merits of these two approaches include eligibility or coverage, scope of benefits, cost, and financing. So that factual information may be available on these important points, I have had a table prepared presenting a comparative analysis of the administration proposal and the Forand proposal.

As a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD I will include this table so that the information contained therein may be publicly available:

	Administration proposal	Forand, H.R. 4700
I. Eligible group	All persons 65 and over who pay no income tax, or persons who do pay taxes and whose adjusted gross income, plus social security, railroad retirement benefits, and veterans benefits do not exceed $2,500 ($3,800 per couple): Total, eligible group 12,400,000 — Public assistance 2,400,000; Non-taxpayers 9,500,000; With adjusted gross income of $2,500 or less 500,000	All persons 65 years or older receiving social security plus widows over age 62 and minor dependent children eligible for social security benefits.
II. Enrollment fee	$24 per person per year. No enrollment fee for public assistance recipients.	None.
III. Old-age-assistance recipients	Covered: Total, 2,400,000	660,000 covered of the 2,400,000 total.
IV. Persons with low income	Individual with less than $2,500, or $3,800 per couple, of adjusted gross income covered: Total, 12,400,000.	Only low-income group receiving OASI would be covered.
V. Persons with higher income	Persons with an income in excess of $2,500, or $3,800 per couple, not covered: Total, 3,600,000.	All of high-income group receiving OASI would be covered.
VI. Benefits per year:		
(a) General	Pays 80 percent of all medical costs in excess of the first $250, or $400 per couple, of medical expense incurred by the beneficiary in the year.[1]	Pays only dollar cost of first 60 days' hospital care; 120 days' nursing home care, less time in hospital; surgery.
(b) Hospital care	180 days. (At national average of $30 per day less coinsurance of 20 percent, this equals $4,300.) [1]	60 days. (At national average of $30 per day, this equals $1,800.)
(c) Skilled nursing home care	365 days. (At national average of $8 per day less coinsurance of 20 percent, this equals $2,336.) [1]	120 days less total number of days spent in hospital. (Hospital admittance required prior to entrance in nursing home. Assuming 1 day of hospital care, 119 days, at $8 equals $952.)
(d) Organized home care services	365 days	None.
(e) Surgical procedures	Yes; no limit	Yes; no limit.
(f) Laboratory and X-ray services	Up to $200, less coinsurance of 20 percent [1]	None.
(g) Physicians' services	Yes; no limit	Do.
(h) Dental services	do	Do.
(i) Prescribed drugs	Up to $350, less coinsurance of 20 percent [1]	Do.
(j) Private duty nurses	Yes; no limit	Do.
(k) Physical restoration services	do	Do.
VII. Optional coverage	Yes; participants could purchase a major medical health insurance policy from a private carrier or group. If so, the Federal and State Governments would pay 50 percent of premium cost up to a maximum of $60.	Do.
VIII. Administration	State administered	Federally administered.
IX. Cost	Total estimated costs $1,383,000,000 — Annual Federal share 600,000,000; Annual State share 600,000,000; Eligible individual annual contributions 183,000,000	The first year expenditure could be $1.1 billion. Because it would be necessary to increase the payroll tax on a level premium basis, the contribution to the fund during the first year would be $1.64 billion.
X. Financing	General revenues	Payroll tax increase, based on 1st $4,800 of earnings: 1/10 of 1 percent per employee, employees cost (approximately) $750,000,000; 1/10 of 1 percent per employer, employers cost (approximately) 750,000,000; 1/10 of 1 percent per self-employed, self-employed cost (approximately) 140,000,000 — Total estimated benefit cost 1,640,000,000

[1] Public assistance recipients receive 100 percent coverage.

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in our consideration of H.R. 12117, the agriculture appropriation bill. I would like to make it plain to my colleagues why I oppose this measure.

The report issued with this bill by the House Committee on Appropriations is a telling indictment of the waste, the confusion and the loss of the income to our farmers because of our present farm policies.

May I quote directly from the report on one portion of the agriculture appropriation bill, that having to do with production controls:

> What we have been doing hasn't worked. After spending or committing ourselves to spend nearly $26 billion, the record shows the situation to be three or four times worse in terms of surplus inventories of CCC.
>
> Any future farm program must provide that farm income shall come from the production of that quantity of product necessary for domestic and foreign markets. In the interest of the overall national economy, such production must reflect farm costs plus a reasonable profit. Such income should come from the market place.

To me, there is a simple and permanent way of accomplishing this purpose as outlined by the report. It is just a case of getting the Federal Government out of the price control and subsidy business. It is a case of putting the destiny of our farmer in his own hands rather than that of the Federal Government.

Apparently, a great many members of the House Committee on Agriculture have no confidence in our farmer and his ability to compete with his goods in the world market.

This being a presidential election year, I can well recognize the fact that there is a noticeable reluctance on the part of some Members of both Houses of Congress to upset any applecarts. Yet, it is my belief that the time has long since passed when expediency should be considered national policy.

Our constituents should be told the truth. Are the taxpayers of this Nation going to be faced with supporting a large segment of our population forever? Or are efforts going to be made to permit the farmer to once again find his freedom, to live his own life as he sees fit, to get out from under restrictive and liberty destroying edicts by the Federal Government?

There are those who contend our agriculture community must be planned down to the last iota, that the lives of those who make their living off the land they love must be regulated, controlled, used as a vehicle and an excuse for hiring countless more Federal employees who will play big brother, controlling his every effort to grow what he wants, where he wants.

My answer to these people is this. Congress has not yet found a means of repealing the law of gravity. It has not found a way to repeal the law of supply and demand.

Congress does not have it in its power by joint resolution or otherwise to stop the course of the earth around the sun or the moon around the earth.

Yet we are told by those who look at the farmer as a specimen on a microscopic slide or a substance in a test tube that all that is necessary is further laboratory conditions for the farmer, further isolation of him and his family from the economic ups and downs of our national economy, further emphasis upon sterility and stagnation of the farmer's initiative and his hopes for the future.

Fortunately, farmers are not grown in test tubes, and their horizons are limited to the four walls of the social science laboratory. They are living, breathing beings with confidence in our Nation and hope for their future if we will but give them the means of having hope and the freedom to have a hand in their own salvation.

Some claim that the farmer will wilt and die if he and his family are exposed to the open air of free competition. I do not believe this to be true.

We have a huge surplus of farm goods in our warehouses, and we certainly cannot consume all that we grow.

But we cannot claim that there are not ample markets for our agricultural products in other parts of the world if our farmers were but permitted to compete for these markets on a realistic basis.

Our farmers do not want an existence in which their only hope for the future is further Federal subsidies. They want back their freedom. Our consumers do not want artificially rigged prices which cost them millions of dollars annually in higher food costs. They want to buy food at a reasonable price. Our beef and poultry producers do not want to see their profits eaten up by feed costs which have no bearing on the world market price. They want to raise their beef, their poultry, as cheaply as possible.

It is time that Congress face the farm problem on the basis of national need and benefit, rather than as a field in which political promises far outweigh accomplishments.

The best thing we can do for the farmer is to let him alone and permit him the necessity of liberty rather than trying to entice him with the luxuries of subsidies and price controls.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 68 on Wednesday, May 4, on adoption of the motion for the previous question on the motion that further proceedings under a rollcall be dispensed with, I was absent. Had I been present and voting I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 69, on a motion to dispense with further proceedings under a rollcall, I was absent. Had I been present and voting I would have voted "nay."

J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my commendations to those already expressed about J. Edgar Hoover on this the 36th anniversary year of his becoming Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Few Americans are held in greater respect and admiration than this quiet fighter against lawlessness, crime, and subversion.

His dedication to duty, his remarkable record, his personal integrity are magnificent testaments of his character and his devotion to the public service.

As an administrator he reorganized a second-rate Federal bureau, enhanced its services and facilities, and restaffed it with competent, young men.

As a leader, he drove his men hard, but smashed the gangster wave of the thirties, the backwash from prohibition and depression. In the forties and fifties his vigilance was directed against Communists and subversives with such effect that Communist party membership has been reduced to its lowest ebb and the Nation made safer as a result.

As a patriot, he has given unstintingly of his talent and time in the preservation of the national heritage.

As a man, he has won the affection and respect of the entire Nation.

It is a privilege and a pleasure to salute him today on this his 36th anniversary with the Bureau. May the years ahead continue to be blessed with his courage and dedication and may the honors that have been bestowed upon him by a grateful Nation be multiplied again and again in recognition of a great public servant and an outstanding man.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. MAILLIARD), for today, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. KASTENMEIER), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 30 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANDALL (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 10 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. SCHWENGEL, for 2 hours, on Monday, May 18.

Mr. PUCINSKI (at the request of Mr. COFFIN), for 15 minutes, on tomorow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. BRADEMAS.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARSHALL, and also to include certain charts in his remarks today in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. AVERY, his remarks in Committee of the Whole today during colloquy with Mr. MICHEL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FORD, his remarks in Committee of the Whole today and to include a chart and a table.

Mr. CANNON.

(At the request of Mr. MCCORMACK, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana.

(At the request of Mr. SMITH of California, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances.

Mr. DEVINE.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1217. An act to suspend for 2 years the import duty on certain amorphous graphite;

H.R. 1456. An act for the relief of Universal Trades, Inc.;

H.R. 1752. An act for the relief of Wilhelmina Ordonez;

H.R. 2082. An act for the relief of James Demetrios Chrysanthes, also known as James Demetrios Chrysanthacopoulos;

H.R. 3786. An act for the relief of Chan Kit Ying and James George Bainter;

H.R. 3934. An act for the relief of Mrs. E. Christine Williams;

H.R. 4562. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Grzelewski;

H.R. 4825. An act for the relief of Jean K. Simmons;

H.R. 5349. An act to provide for the conveyance to Orange County, Calif., of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property situated in Orange County, Calif.;

H.R. 6083. An act for the relief of Mary V. Jones;

H.R. 6493. An act for the relief of Robert Dolton;

H.R. 6843. An act for the relief of Daniel Wilging;

H.R. 7226. An act for the relief of Mr. Hughie D. Martin and Ione Martin;

H.R. 7254. An act for the relief of Simeen Helena Chaghaghi;

H.R. 7363. An act for the relief of Chester A. Spindler;

H.R. 8280. An act for the relief of Clarence T. Tolpo;

H.R. 8383. An act for the relief of Maj. Jack E. Hudson;

H.R. 8456. An act for the relief of Capt. Jack Rubley;

H.R. 8672. An act for the relief of Dr. Deh Chang Tao;

H.R. 8868. An act for the relief of the Albertson Water District, Nassau County, N.Y.;

H.R. 8941. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alice Anderson;

H.R. 9084. An act to repeal certain retirement promotion authority of the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

H.R. 9216. An act for the relief of Daniel C. Turner;

H.R. 9464. An act to remove the requirement that, of the Chief and Deputy Chief of the Bureau of Ships, one must be specially qualified and experienced in naval engineering and the other must be specially qualified and experienced in naval architecture;

H.R. 9476. An act for the relief of George E. Williams and William L. Johnson;

H.R. 9760. An act for the relief of Sam Doolittle;

H.R. 9861. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle or Tampico fiber;

H.R. 10045. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended;

H.R. 10164. An act to change the name of the locks and dam No. 41 on the Ohio River at Louisville, Ky.;

H.R. 10401. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961;

H.R. 10550. An act to extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for two additional years;

H.R. 11415. An act to provide for the designation of a portion of the District of Columbia as the "Plaza of the Americas"; and

H.J. Res. 598. Joint resolution to extend the time for filing the final report of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 11, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2135. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments and private organizations and individuals for special meteorological services"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2136. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a copy of the Federal Trade Commission's Annual Report for the fiscal year 1959; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2137. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to permit the Secretary of the Interior to revoke in whole or in part the school and agency farm reserve on the Lac du Flambeau Reservation"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2138. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 502 of the General Bridge Act of 1946, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

2139. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of the channel improvement feature of the authorized project for the Mississippi River and tributaries"; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5098. A bill to provide for the application and disposition of net revenues from the power development on the Grand Valley Federal reclamation project, Colorado; with amendment (Rept. No. 1594). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 11706. A bill to authorize an extension of time for final proof under the desert land laws under certain conditions; with amendment (Rept. No. 1595). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report 1596. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8860. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1597). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HENDERSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4271. A bill to validate the salary overpayments made to certain officers and employees incident to the salary adjustment provisions of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1599). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7670. A bill for the relief of Edwin A. Haddad; without amendment (Rept. No. 1598). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLIOTT of Alabama:

H.R. 12125. A bill to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 12126. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall study and investigate the desirability and feasibility of establishing and maintaining a national botanic garden; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12127. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12128. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to eliminate the distinctions in such act with respect to dependent and nondependent husbands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 12129. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax for certain employers who employ individuals 50 years of age and over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 12130. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to require proof of payment of State and local taxes as a condition to transferring a certificate or permit issued to a carrier by motor vehicle under the provisions of such part; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 12131. A bill to acquire lands to construct an approach road into the Ozette Lake region in the Olympic National Park in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R.12132. A bill to provide that certain subcontracts may be entered into only in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 12133. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to prohibit a rate increase from becoming effective, subject to bond, before a pending rate increase proceeding has been finally determined; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 12134. A bill to amend section 902 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to foreign taxes paid by certain predecessor corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

H.R. 12135. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax on the transportation of persons, effective July 1, 1961; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 12136. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12137. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease-and-desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 12138. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease-and-desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 12139. A bill to authorize the transfer of a Bureau of Reclamation bridge across the Colorado River near Needles, Calif., and Mohave County, Ariz.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 12140. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to make student loans under title II of such act available to teachers attending summer sessions in institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COFFIN:

H.R. 12141. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939, with respect to the allocation of funds available under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 12142. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939, with respect to the allocation of funds available under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 12143. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939, with respect to the allocation of funds available under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 12144. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939, with respect to the allocation of funds available under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H.R. 12145. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939, with respect to the allocation of funds available under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 12146. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939, with respect to the allocation of funds available under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 12147. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939, with respect to the allocation of funds available under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 12148. A bill to provide for a Commission on Presidential Office Space; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 12149. A bill to provide for Federal grants and contracts to carry out projects with respect to techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution, and control of juvenile delinquency, and for the training of personnel; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 12150. A bill to provide a program to test the effectiveness of promoting the consumption of fluid milk through advertising and other means; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 12151. A bill giving the consent of Congress to a compact between the State of Arizona and the State of Nevada establishing a boundary between those States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 12152. A bill to relieve hardship for displaced families and businesses by assisting in their relocation and by providing them with mortgage financing under a new low-rent private housing program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12153. A bill to promote homeownership and achieve high-level stability in residential construction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.J. Res. 703. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army to investigate and report on alternatives of the Kinzua Reservoir project, New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H.J. Res. 704. Joint resolution to remove copyright restrictions upon the musical composition "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag," and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.J. Res. 705. Joint resolution to promote the conservation of ocean fish and shellfish; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Con. Res. 689. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on National Security Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. Res. 523. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Agriculture to conduct an investigation and study comparing the operations of Federal mi'k marketing orders in the New York and New England milksheds; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 12154. A bill for the relief of Gregoire A. Kublin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 12155. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jane R. Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 12156. A bill for the relief of Dr. Kamel Said Michel Baladi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 12157. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Barbara J. Rhodes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 12158. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wladyslawa Brzezinska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 12159. A bill for the relief of Antonio Pellegrini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 12160. A bill for the relief of William J. Heffern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

456. By Mr. BARR: Petition of members of Teamsters Local Union No. 135 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America for a hearing on the right to elect

its officers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

457. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Tex Shively and other residents of Salem, Oreg., relative to H.R. 10478 and any and all similar legislation designed to impose restrictions on the right to own and bear arms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

458. By the SPEAKER: Petition of C. Nemetz, owner and manager, Hotel Pendleton, Pendleton, Oreg., requesting inquiry and investigation relative to the American Federation of Musicians Case 995, 1959–60, *Dewey Taylor* v. *The Pendleton Hotel et al.*; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Loyalty Day, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States planned to observe Loyalty Day, 1960, at Valley Forge State Park, Valley Forge, Pa., on Sunday, May 1, but because of inclement weather the program was canceled. Another effort was made on Sunday, May 8, to stage the program, but rain again interfered, with the result that it has been necessary to abandon this year's observance of May Day at Valley Forge.

Having been invited to deliver the principal address at the May Day program at Valley Forge, I am inserting in the RECORD at this time the address which I had prepared for the occasion:

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, LOYALTY DAY CELEBRATION AT VALLEY FORGE STATE PARK, VALLEY FORGE, PA., SPONSORED BY THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, SUNDAY, MAY 1, 1960

The 1960 Loyalty Day celebration recalls years of effort by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to have May 1 of each year permanently designated as Loyalty Day.

This occasion is further enhanced by the very nature of our geographical location, Valley Forge, which truly signifies heroic devotion to the principle of American loyalty.

The events that occurred here at Valley Forge almost 200 years ago have become sacred chapters in the annals of America's heritage.

It was a great honor to accept the invitation to bring you a loyalty day message and—as many of you know—my interest in this particular day holds both pride and affection.

After years of persistent effort to have May 1 of each year designated as loyalty day—in 1958 the Congress endorsed a House joint resolution which it was my privilege to introduce as a Member of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was duly signed by President Eisenhower on July 18, 1958, and thus May 1 of each year was established as Loyalty Day.

This legislation requests that the President of the United States issue an annual proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe loyalty day with appropriate ceremonies—"In which all of our people may join in the expression and reaffirmance of their loyalty to the United States."

The 1960 loyalty day proclamation of President Eisenhower reminds us that "the existence of the United States as a free Nation is dependent upon the unswerving and enlightened loyalty of its people," that "our priceless heritage of freedom is in constant danger from forces inimical to our traditional concepts of Government—among which is our fundamental principle of liberty under law"—and "that on one special day of the year we give grateful expression to our country's deep hold upon our hearts and minds."

Fellow Americans, we can do no less than give these ideals so ably expressed by President Eisenhower our earnest attention as loyal and liberty-loving citizens of this great Republic.

Before I give you some of my thoughts on the subject of loyalty—I should like to extend a well-deserved tribute to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

It had long been the goal of the VFW to secure a definite means by which we could counteract the demonstration of the Communists on May Day which often grew to large proportions in many cities, especially along our eastern seaboard.

Someone has said the VFW is not regarded as merely a lot of ex-servicemen engaged in giving more lipservice to lofty ideals.

Since its inception in 1899—the VFW has to its credit an endless list of projects which have benefited communities across our entire Nation.

The "good of the public" has been kept in mind at all times.

The VFW has realistically believed that its members want to continue their service to their country through broad activities in time of peace to help strengthen the foundations of the Nation they helped defend by bearing arms against enemies on foreign battlefields.

It was appropriate—indeed—that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States should take the initiative in establishing Loyalty Day.

This adds one more chapter to the VFW's record of patriotic service to America.

It is not incidental that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States on February 22 of this year was again honored by the Freedoms Foundation at the foundation's 11th awards-presentation program.

It was the 10th consecutive year that the VFW has been named to receive a Freedoms Foundation distinguished service award—which was based on the VFW's nationwide leadership in the observance of Loyalty Day—May 1.

Fellow Americans—what should we emphasize today in our thoughts about loyalty to our country?

Often historical illustrations are overlooked in our rush to launch another satellite or another missile, however important such efforts may be.

It has been said that Americans today are living examples of the terse comment that "the one thing we learn from history is that we learn nothing from history."

May I relate to you a very interesting coincidence of history.

Just as Edward Gibbon was nearing the completion of his monumental work, "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," a small group of men, assembled in Philadelphia, was creating a new republic in the Western World.

No writer had ever attempted a larger task than Gibbon in the history of Rome.

No one would have believed that so many pages would ever again be required for the portrayal of such an epic.

We might well ask ourselves today these questions:

(a) Will some future historian record on an equal scale the decline and fall of our Western civilization?

(b) As the years pass will there be an erosion of American ideals?

(c) As in many countries will the tide of our national ideals be turned back by a sudden reversion to a dictatorial form of government?

The Republics of Rome and America are not identical.

But some points of similarity might well give solemnity to the warning that the same fate which overtook the one might easily overtake the other.

Rome based its dominion on the powers of the Caesars, but the strength of our Western Republic is derived from the people.

Rome collapsed when it became drunk with power.

On the other hand, America faces the choice of maintaining the bulwark of its Constitution or slowly submitting to the numerous "isms" which crowd into the headlines of our lives.

Therefore, we are faced with these questions:

(a) Will the American people continue to uphold the Constitution?

(b) Can we continue to maintain our political and social equilibrium without destroying our liberty?

In considering these questions—one may wonder if the makers of the Constitution dreamed that such questions would arise in regard to that document.

The spirit of the Constitution is set forth in the words of Madison when he said that the general opinion of the Convention was to secure the private rights against majority factions—and at the same time—to preserve the spirit and form of popular government.

It is evident, therefore, that the American people must be brought to the realization that these objectives must be maintained or constitutional government will give way.

American ideals can be maintained—my fellow Americans, through the repetition of ideas—ideas that point up loyalty to our way of life.

Likewise, the repetition of ideas, which are contrary to our way of life will ultimately result in the acceptance of something less than the American form of government.

Does the average American citizen recognize that we are being literally deluged with propaganda of all kinds?

Since 1917, and with intensified force for the last two decades, the Communist masters of the Soviet Union have sought to sell the American people the thesis that the Communist system represents the tide of the future.

On the other hand, there has been a tendency in America to dwell upon our shortcomings and to place our thoughts upon the faults of our own system—a system that in reality is the envy of all the world.

It is unthinkable, yet true, that in some circles the very word "loyalty" has been frowned upon as being old fashioned and somewhat ridiculous.

It has been stated that the United States is both an obstacle to communism and a target for it.

Yes, it is an obstacle because our whole way of life reveals the falsity of the Communist claim that people find happiness and prosperity only under Communist rule.

Yes, it is likewise a target because our economic and industrial strength is built upon free institutions which Communist theory condemns as unworkable and doomed to failure.

Communist activities, therefore, should be of grave concern to loyal Americans.

To combat communism effectively we need to know how Communists are organized and how they operate.

We need to know and recognize their strategy and tactics.

The graveness of the threat to a Nation's security from Communists within its borders cannot be measured merely by their numbers.

In fact, the Communists have been a minority—and often a very small one—in the countries they have taken over.

So we cannot afford to take lightly the possible danger from Communists in this country just because the number of party members in our midst has been small.

The Communist Party in the United States was outlawed by an act of Congress—signed by President Eisenhower on August 24, 1954.

Membership in the party is not a crime.

But the Communist Party in the United States was stripped of the rights, privileges, and immunities of legal bodies created under the jurisdiction of the laws of the United States or any of its political subdivisions.

Presumably this means the party cannot hold bank accounts, obtain aid from the courts in enforcing contracts, or run candidates for public offices.

The Communist Party in action has two parts.

One appears on the surface and its actions are open to view.

The other part operates underground.

The chief underground operations are espionage and conspiracy against the Government of the United States.

The use of the printed word has become increasingly important to the Communist in light of our Government's ability to expose subversive activities of the Communists of the United States.

Congress has passed a number of laws dealing with specific problems in curbing the Reds.

For example, individuals and organizations acting on behalf of foreign powers in the United States are required to register with Federal authorities.

In addition, the Smith Act made it illegal to advocate overthrow of the Government by force and violence.

The Congress also voted to take American citizenship away from any person convicted of conspiring to advocate violent overthrow of the Government of the United States.

Today peacetime spying is subject to the death penalty.

Fellow Americans, it is common knowledge that the Soviet Union betrayed the great alliance of World War II by launching the cold war that envelops the world at this moment.

The task of the Communists everywhere in the world is to undermine resistance to the Soviet Union and Red China through their phony appeals for peace.

Nations are persuaded to disarm, and confidence of the people of a free nation in their leadership is destroyed.

In short, free nation is set against free nation.

Therefore, it is paramount that in defending ourselves against Communist infiltration and Communist fronts, we be alert to identify and expose the real enemy and not attack each other.

There are weapons the average citizen can use to combat communism.

We might appropriately call them indispensable tools designed for daily use by each loyal American.

These weapons in our arsenal are many.

For example, information is a very important weapon.

In this field, we should keep abreast of current affairs because freedom of the press and freedom of speech are essential to political liberty.

Where men cannot freely convey their thoughts to one another—no freedom is secure.

One may ask in all sincerity, "How can we distinguish truth from propaganda?"

The answer is—

(a) We must analyze rather than follow blindly the conflicting ideas that constantly enter a free society.

(b) We should maintain an intense and active loyalty to the principles upon which our Nation was founded—and finally—

(c) These principles are a splendid guide to use in determining what is true and what is false.

Another worthwhile weapon in our stockpile is "alertness."

In this connection, no one should permit himself to innocently support Communist causes.

To the contrary—we should pay more attention to what Communist leaders tell us about the techniques they intend to adopt to underline the structure of our form of government.

Fellow Americans—loyalty day is a day which should bring us to our feet to salute the flag of our country.

Also it should bring us to our feet in a state of alertness to the factions that would undermine our Nation.

There is no doubt that the trend toward stricter control and greater unity of Communist thought and action throughout the world has intensified during the past 18 months.

Khrushchev's visit to the United States in the fall of 1959 and his activities since have made it clear that though the Communist leader emphasized in general terms his desire for peace, he reacted negatively to any proposal for a compromise on the concrete issues dividing the free world and communism.

We recall his appearance before the United Nations on September 18, 1959 when he proposed general total disarmament within 4 years, but confined himself to generalities, as the Soviet Union had done in two previous proposals of a similar nature made to the League of Nations by Soviet spokesmen.

It seems that we go through periods of hope for peace and goodwill and at times grow lukewarm toward the cold war which is all around us.

Those who expected Khrushchev's visit to the United States would change in substance the issues of the cold war have been disappointed.

Mark you, disappointment often breeds indifference.

Therefore, America must remain alert to new and more provocative incidents that overnight can affect the position of the United States in the eyes of the world.

There are many bright spots on the horizon as we view our world today, but there are also many dark spots.

Unfortunately, the basic problems have not been solved.

It is appropriate at this point to recall a statement made by President Eisenhower on March 1 of this year during his South American tour when he said in Santiago, Chile:

"The peace that we all seek, in justice and in freedom, can be based only on one thing, mutual understanding. Unless we have that among peoples, and eventually governments which are always seemingly behind the people rather than ahead of them—unless we have that kind of understanding—mutual understanding—we are not going to have true peace.

"Each of you that helps in the tiniest way to bring about this understanding is thereby promoting the peace for himself, his children, and those who are to come after him."

Fellow Americans, in striving for universal justice and freedom, it is essential that we keep in close touch with America's attitude toward its way of life—and its attitude toward political and economic problems.

Our loyalty demands that we be proud of many things—but it also demands we bear in mind that we are not perfect.

Our loyalty demands that we avoid the vice of self-complacency.

We should acknowledge the fact that the American system has many safeguards.

With the proper forces at work in the minds and hearts of the American people in the future—as in the past—the spirit of liberty will flourish in our beloved land.

Finally, my fellow Americans, our loyalty must keep this country militarily strong, mentally alert, and above all, ever mindful of the heritage on which we as liberty-loving Americans base our hopes for a peaceful future.

J. Edgar Hoover—A Dedicated American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1960

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 36th anniversary of John Edgar Hoover as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I feel privileged to join my colleagues in paying tribute to this truly dedicated American on this occasion.

It was my good fortune, nearly 20 years ago, to accept an appointment from Mr. Hoover as a special agent in the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The following 5 years gave me an excellent opportunity, as a member of his team, to learn firsthand that Mr. Hoover lives by the slogan he adopted for the FBI—Fidelity, Bravery, and Integrity.

Often maligned by those engaged in activities inimical to the welfare and security of this country, Mr. Hoover has steadfastly maintained the Bureau on a high plane and has unswervingly carried on the fight in resisting communism wherever it may be found.

He has successfully demonstrated that a governmental agency can be efficiently operated free from political influences. Further, he selects his agents after careful investigation to determine whether they can meet his high standards, and they function on the basis of merit and ability, free from civil service restrictions.

Mr. Hoover is highly respected, not only in this country, but around the world. He has earned this respect by his true dedication to the highest principles of law enforcement. Cooperation with local law enforcement bodies and his resistance to a national police force have added to his fine reputation.

The men of the FBI have great admiration for their Director because he

never requests any agent to perform any function that he himself has not or will not do.

The members of Congress should be proud to single out J. Edgar Hoover as the perfect example of a successful dedicated American who has devoted his life to useful service to his country.

Senator Thurmond's George Washington Award Speech to Senator Goldwater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 10, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, at the annual George Washington Awards dinner of the American Good Government Society on April 30, attended by many of our colleagues in the Senate and the House, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, and Congressman GRAHAM BARDEN, of North Carolina, were the award recipients. It was a great occasion attended by nearly 700 distinguished Americans.

Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, made the awards presentation speech to Senator GOLDWATER and I ask leave at this point to have his address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR THURMOND IN MAKING PRESENTATION OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON AWARD TO SENATOR GOLDWATER AT THE ANNUAL GEORGE WASHINGTON DINNER OF THE AMERICAN GOOD GOVERNMENT SOCIETY, APRIL 30, 1960

I feel very highly honored tonight to have the privilege of making the presentation of a George Washington Award of the American Good Government Society. This award carries much distinction and honor because it is presented by a great organization which stands for the highest American principles and traditions and also because the award is based on the lofty ideals of the greatest American, the Father of our Country, George Washington. I am particularly pleased to have the opportunity to make the presentation of this award to one of my most valued friends, a man who has never hesitated to place principle above expediency, country above party, and honor above profit.

This man possesses all the basic qualities which are so vital in winning and holding the respect and confidence of his fellow man. He is a man of great intellect, wisdom, judgment, industry, integrity, sincerity, and courage. In addition, he is one of the most handsome and personable gentlemen in public life. All of these qualities have played an important part in the outstanding success he has attained as a businessman, an Air Force Reserve officer, and as a public servant.

Of all the qualities I have mentioned in describing the recipient of this award, there is one upon which we must place a premium in our country today, especially for public servants, and that quality is courage. Winston Churchill has well said that "courage is rightly esteemed the first of all human qualities because it is the quality which guarantees all others."

I do not know of any man who has demonstrated this priceless quality to a greater extent in performing his duties as a U.S. Senator than the recipient of this award. He has opposed the demands of special interest groups when their demands were not in the interest of the public. He has exposed and moved to correct the corrupt practices of big labor bosses in the interest of the working people even in the face of attempts by the labor bosses to retire him from public life. He has fought to preserve personal liberty during this period when conformity appears to be the order of the day. He has defended our great free enterprise system against the rising tide of socialism. He has stood up for the Constitution and the rights of the States as against usurpation of power and a centralization of government in Washington. He has spoken up against deficit financing and in favor of fiscal sanity and a balanced budget. He has advocated a program of national defense which would insure adequate strength and readiness to cope with the aggressive intentions of any enemy power. And he has proposed a bold foreign policy program of strength and wisdom in seeking victory for the free world in our struggle against the dictatorial and godless forces of communism.

The Republican Party of South Carolina, as well as his home State party, recently selected this man as their favorite nominee for President. Knowing the southern people as I do, it is my opinion that if he should be selected as the nominee of either major political party, he would carry the South; and if elected, he would make a great President.

It is a unique and distinct pleasure for me to present this very coveted award to an able Senator, an outstanding soldier, a dedicated statesman, a true patriot, a distinguished citizen, and a great and courageous American, my good friend, BARRY MORRIS GOLDWATER.

TEXT OF CITATION ON SCROLL—RESOLUTION OF TRIBUTE AND HONOR

BARRY MORRIS GOLDWATER

Merchant and soldier, statesman and political leader, has dedicated half of his adult years to the service of his fellowmen—in the Army Air Corps, in the city council of Phoenix, and in the U.S. Senate.

Knowledge, energy, integrity, and courage characterize the service of this distinguished Senator. His belief that the protection of God-given personal liberty is the first purpose of national independence has made him a leader of those who would revive and restore the blessing of liberty in this country.

Instilled with the American heritage of Anglo-Saxon law, he is a resolute foe of those who would erase the sacred rights of mankind. Thus, he repudiates the idea that our National Government can delegate a sovereign power to tax men and to rule commerce and industry to trade unions. Senator GOLDWATER has enriched the field of politics, the noblest calling any man can choose.

The Wall Street Journal Opens New Printing Plant in Chicopee Falls, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the nationally respected business daily newspaper, the Wall Street Journal, achieved a new milestone in its history Sunday when its seventh printing plant began operations in Chicopee Falls, Mass.

Thus, the eastern edition's printings of this great newspaper now speed to subscribers along the east coast from three different cities, New York, Washington, D.C., and Chicopee Falls, to keep pace with the ever-increasing demand for the Wall Street Journal.

The highly automated facility in Chicopee Falls is a near-duplicate of the Journal's new plant in Cleveland, Ohio, where publication began 5 weeks ago. Operations at Chicopee Falls will be coordinated completely with all other editions of the Journal.

The central control over editing, layout, and other news and advertising functions will be maintained by the Wall Street Journal in New York, but once these tasks have been accomplished, the Chicopee Falls plant is fully equipped to produce a complete newspaper to serve subscribers in New England, upper New York, and eastern Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to welcome the Wall Street Journal and its plant manager, Assistant Managing Editor Larry Farrell to our community and the Second Congressional District of Massachusetts.

Tribute to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the world looks upon the United States and others of the free nations as champions of the cause of liberty for peoples everywhere—and rightly so. America has fashioned down through the years a glorious record of both symbolizing freedom and fighting to preserve it.

But it occurs to me that a nation does not necessarily have to enjoy political, social, religious, and economic freedom in order to make a major and continuing contribution to the achievement of this goal.

A notable case in point is Poland. The courageous people of that country, despite enslavement behind the Iron Curtain by ruthless communism, never have yielded their hearts and minds to their godless captors. At gunpoint they have existed in unwilling submission to the material might of the materialistic Soviet hierarchy. They never have abandoned their concept of and dedication to liberty, nor accepted as their way of life the Communist ideology. It is this fearless adherence to principle that serves as inspiration to those on both sides of the Iron Curtain in their quest for universal freedom.

For the past 20 years Congress has taken time out annually to recognize the anniversary of the May 3 Polish Constitution of 1791. I heartily join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the people of this great country. The celebra-

tion in 1960 of this anniversary is particularly significant. It follows by one day House approval of a concurrent resolution espousing the fundamental freedoms and human rights of the people of the captive nations. This resolution was passed by the House of Representatives without a single dissenting vote, which reflects the profund understanding of the Congress of the tragic situation into which Poland and its sister nations have been forced, and a firm resolve to speed the day when freedom will be restored. Further, the resolution reaffirms the belief of Congress in the inalienable right of the people of the captive nations to live under governments of their own choosing, and urges the President to pursue energetically at the forthcoming summit conference the restoration of the fundamental freedoms and basic human rights of the people of all captive nations.

The 1960 observance is significant also because this year marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of one of the world's greatest musicians, Ignace Jan Paderewski, beloved in America and Poland as a great patriot, statesman, and humanitarian as well as artist. And 150 years ago Frederic Chopin was born in Poland, and the world will never cease to be grateful for the glorious music of that gifted composer.

There is unfinished business in Poland, and it will remain unfinished until liberty returns. In this business, all free peoples are joined with their Polish friends in a partnership that will not fail.

Supremacy of the Nuclear Submarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1960

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Navy's largest nuclear-powered submarine, the U.S.S. *Triton* returns to her home port at New London, Conn., having completed history's first submerged circumnavigation of the world. Retracing the route of Magellan, the *Triton* made a nonstop submerged voyage that covered a distance of 41,517 miles in 84 days at an average speed of about 18 knots. The purpose of this voyage was to gather geophysical and other scientific information regarding the subsurface regions of the oceans. On behalf of the House Appropriations Committee I wish to extend congratulations to Captain Beach and the fine crew of *Triton* for their historic accomplishment.

The magnificent performance of the *Triton's* nuclear propulsion plant is a great tribute to the significant technical accomplishments of Admiral Rickover and his staff. The voyage of the *Triton* is indicative of the lead which we now have in the field of nuclear-powered submarines. It further emphasizes the vital importance that the executive branch of the Government must give to steps which will free our technical leaders of the administrative harassments which prevent these leaders from attaining even greater technical accomplishments—accomplishments which are necessary if this country is to achieve better than second place in competition with the Soviets. This committee has given, and will continue to give, its full support to Admiral Rickover and the expansion of our nuclear-powered Navy.

Citizenship—Free and Responsible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the United Churchwomen of Altoona, Pa., observed May Fellowship Day on May 6, 1960, at the Westminster Presbyterian Church in that city.

With representative groups of churchwomen present it was my privilege to deliver the following address:

CITIZENSHIP—FREE AND RESPONSIBLE

(Speech by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress, 20th District of Pennsylvania, for the May Fellowship Day program, sponsored by the United Churchwomen at Westminster Presbyterian Church, Altoona, Pa., May 6, 1960)

It is a privilege to be invited to participate in the May Fellowship Day observance sponsored by the Christian social relations committee of the United Churchwomen of Altoona.

The theme "Citizenship—Free and Responsible," adopted for May Fellowship Day 1960, is timely since the joys of citizenship and freedom have been lost by over a billion of God's children now living in servitude under the banner of world communism.

We are reminded by the theme of this May Fellowship Day of the priceless possession we enjoy in being citizens of a freedom-loving nation and of the responsibility we are charged with in safeguarding our birthright of liberty and freedom.

Since 1960 is a national election year this program gives added emphasis on the necessity of taking inventory of our efforts to preserve our glorious heritage of American citizenship.

The extent of a Christian's responsibility in this day and age has not changed from the responsibility prescribed when God gave Moses the Ten Commandments as an eternal rule of love and faith.

That rule of life designed for all generations of mankind was further exemplified when our divine Lord said in defining the first commandment "and Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind—and with all thy strength * * *."

And the second is like; namely, this, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, there is none other commandment greater than these"—Mark 12: 30–31.

Despite this divine injunction when we discuss the responsibilities of citizenship from a Christian standpoint we find it becomes a controversial subject filled with misunderstanding and too often avoided in discussions.

I do not know all the answers, but it is my sincere hope that today we can in some measure take home a little "food for thought" from your well-planned meeting.

Someone has said that christianity does not remove a person from the world and its problems; it makes one fit to live in the world, triumphantly and usefully.

It is on that thesis that we can proceed to discuss your theme for this May fellowship day—"Citizenship—free and responsible."

To further clarify this occasion, I speak to you as a layman on the Christian's responsibility to the state.

We live in a nation where church and state are entirely separate, but this fact was never intended to mean that Christian citizens should not actively participate in politics.

Indeed, throughout our history, our political leaders and statesmen have emphasized the need for Christian citizenship in these United States.

In 1954 the words "under God" were added to the pledge of allegiance to our flag.

This was accomplished through passage of legislation by Congress and subsequent Presidential approval.

I recall there was some objection from some corners of our country to the addition of the words which revised the pledge to read "one Nation under God, * * *"

There was warning that by adding the words "under God" we were not keeping church and state separate, that we were acting contrary to existing principles.

It will be 4 years next June 14, Flag Day, since "under God" was added to the pledge of allegiance, and I trust that anyone who objected has now learned that our citizenship is of no real value to us unless we can open our souls before God and before Him conscientiously say, "I am an American."

Upon every coin of our Nation, down to the last penny, we impress the words "In God we trust."

If we remain true to this motto, we will uphold and obey our laws; strive without malice and indifference toward the things we know to be right; live and work for the American principles of freedom, justice, and equality.

Then our lives will be a vindication of our faith.

Our citizenship will be a credit to us.

Perhaps what I have just said will in some measure clarify my opinion of our theme.

There have always been people who have echoed one of the complaints which we often hear, namely, that religion and politics do not mix."

You recall that one of the charges against Jesus was that he threatened the stability of the Roman Empire and its stranglehold on downtrodden peoples like the Jews.

Whatever else His death represents—and it represents a great deal more—it represents in part the attempt of the Roman Empire to get rid of someone who was fast becoming a political nuisance.

John Calvin and John Knox—and all the reformers—got into difficulty themselves when they discovered that to take the Christian faith with full seriousness meant that full involvement in political life, political decisions, and political responsibility was inevitable.

In our own day, there have been ministers, for example, who have discovered that to preach Jesus Christ means preaching about the political and economic situation in which their congregations live.

They have also discovered that the people who control the political and economic situation—whether Nazi or Communist—take a very dim view of this sort of thing, with the result that a great many ministers in Germany especially, have had to answer with their lives for speaking with such boldness.

It is apparent that one of the reasons people keep on insisting that "religion and politics do not mix" is that they are not at

all sure they will like the result that emerges from the mixing.

They have a right to be perturbed.

The times of greatest vitality and strength in the history of Christian faith have been the times when it was recognized as a revolutionary faith—as a faith that made demands—that challenged the status quo—the way things were going politically.

But this kind of talk can remain very abstract.

We want to come down to earth and talk of some of the ground rules of Christian citizenship.

A current writer has suggested that Christianity gives no precise answer to any of the problems of life—certainly not the political ones.

But it provides what is more important: direction, understanding, commitment.

There is no exact Christian position in the U.S. House of Representatives, but there are better and worse positions, relatively just and relatively unjust acts.

The Christian should seek what is good and just.

A Christian citizen in the United States has the most compelling reasons to concern himself with politics.

It is a major error for any Christian citizen to look down on politics because he regards the whole political world as a bit shady.

However well or badly the political affairs of the Nation may be conducted, politics is the process by which a nation or a community makes decisions.

The decisions that are made by political means often have momentous moral significance.

As a Member of your Congress I am singularly aware of this.

In this 20th century world, government has become more important than ever before, it touches all our lives every day.

The sort of world in which we live, the kind of jobs that are available, the education our children receive, the extent of freedom and security we enjoy, are all vitally affected by government.

Politics is the human activity which creates government.

We cannot escape politics.

If we try to ignore politics, it will not ignore us.

Taxes, roads, schools, housing, and atomic power are all political problems.

The question is, therefore, are you willing to sit back and let others make the basic decisions which will control your destiny?

The individual who does is both foolish and irresponsible: foolish because he lets others run his life for him; irresponsible because he refuses to accept the obligations and duties which our Republic requires of its citizens for the continued enjoyment of rights and privileges.

Political decisions may determine whether we will have war or peace.

Political decisions may determine whether ours will be a nation in which certain factions are intimidated or a nation whose citizens preserve civil liberties and preserve a general atmosphere of freedom.

Certain political decisions profoundly affect the efforts of our country to move into the area of lasting peace.

Christianity most certainly has a stake in such issues.

I have said there is no "Christian position" in the Congress.

I would like to amplify that observation.

We can expect Christians to differ in their choices of political parties, in their choice of emphasis in regard to social goals.

This is apparent, for example, in the constant problem of aid to underprivileged nations.

It is possible for two Christian persons—two members of the same denomination, in fact—to hold a difference of opinion on many issues.

William Lee Miller has written a little volume entitled "The Protestant and Politics" which is published by the Westminster Press.

While I do not agree with all the theories set forth by Mr. Miller, I would like to quote the following:

"Morally earnest Americans often say that they are independent in politics, and not tied to any party: 'I don't vote a straight party ticket, the way a party tells me to; I vote my honest convictions.'

"The implication seems to be that conscientious citizenship necessarily requires independence of political parties and that independence is morally superior to party allegiance. But it is not.

"There are, of course, many different positions that Christians may, and do, take in American politics.

"These include allegiance to one of the major parties (Republican or Democratic) independence of any party, allegiance to a minor party (Socialist or Progressive), or even good old-fashioned apathy."

These are all possibilities.

However, I cannot believe that apathy, or the more extreme or violent political positions taken by some of the political parties cited above by Mr. Miller would coincide with the political beliefs of a Christian citizen.

Have you ever noted that on occasion some Christians are shocked to see that there is conflict even in a Christian community.

A student at a youth conference, shaken after the first day of floor debate came to the chairman to say that he had never believed Christians could fight with one another that way.

But they can as any battle-scarred veteran of church meetings knows.

In certain contexts, they should.

It is the obligation of a Christian to defend what he sees to be true and valuable.

There is a common feeling, my friends, that political parties and the type of political life that is lived close to party organization must always be so much involved in compromise, or so close to corruption, that a Christian citizen would do well to assume the role of the independent voter.

There is no doubt that the independent voters do have some wholesome influence on our political party system—they keep both parties worried.

Perhaps there are people who by temperament or vocation should be independent voters.

Idealistic Christians should come to realize the enormous importance of party organizations as instruments for creating a consensus that is necessary for decision and action.

Also, they should see that while the independent voters do have some influence on party organizations from the outside, they are limited in their choice to candidates and programs.

Candidates and political platforms emerge from areas of controversy within the party.

Intraparty debate and struggle bring out the best party candidates—the best party policies.

Actually, the independent voters leave the most difficult, the most unappreciated, work to the faithful party members in local clubs and committees.

In any threat to free government in America, religious people have more to lose than any other class.

If the basic freedoms were to go, not only would the churches be closed, but the mouths of believers as well.

If the church people will vote during the week as they vow on Sunday, representative government will gain a victory, whichever candidates win.

Many a great American out of our past has spoken in eloquent terms concerning this subject.

John Quincy Adams said:

"My own deliberate opinion is that the more of pure moral principle is carried into the policy and conduct of a government, the wiser and more profound will that policy be."

Henry Clay said:

"Government is a trust, and the officers of the Government are trustees; and both the trust and the trustees are created for the benefit of the people."

William Jennings Byran has been recorded as saying:

"The humblest citizen of all the land, when clad in the armor of a righteous cause, is stronger than all the hosts of error."

More recently Herbert Hoover stated:

"A citizen has a complex duty.

"He ought to learn to express his opinions and to make up his own mind on the principal public issues.

"He ought never to miss the ballot box.

"And when he casts his vote for somebody, he should weigh that somebody in the scale of morals—which includes intellectual integrity."

The Christian citizen can have no part in a partnership which breeds bitterness and untruth; which leads politicians to raise false issues or to trifle with grave matters of policy for a political advantage.

True partisanship requires much moral patience; it must accept a strange assortment of bedfellows.

But it should remain self-critical and in sight of the purpose of the whole process.

It should seek to make the party a more consistent instrument of that purpose.

The belief in a judging and forgiving God—who stands beyond all our human enterprises—should introduce a certain modesty and bring a greater immensity to Christian citizenship.

It has been suggested that evil does not have one address, like Moscow, or just one instrument, like war, communism, or corruption in a Federal office.

The evils of our time—which free and responsible citizenship should be the first to recognize—reappear in constantly changing forms.

Citizens are humans—not gods—and for this reason alone the free and responsible citizen should recognize the need to apply Christian principles to the control of our destiny.

If Christians are to hold on to free and responsible citizenship they must participate successfully in government and politics.

Further they must know what is happening around them.

The blessings of our country were gained long ago by struggle and vigilance on the part of those who have gone before us.

We must safeguard our American heritage with the same enthusiasm, with the same determination and with the same political insight.

The oft-quoted line "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" is never out of date.

Christians can make a great contribution to a community by assisting in maintaining spiritual health, without which politics become hopelessly corrupt.

By the same token Christianity will not make its best contribution to politics unless it encourages Christian citizens to associate themselves with the machinery of politics and take an active part in the political life of the community.

Free and responsible citizenship takes more than repeating the pledge of allegiance to the flag and repeating the Lord's Prayer.

In these stormy times things of momentous importance to future generations are afoot.

Often the issues are not discernible amid the noise.

However, we do have the benefit of the faith and character of our forefathers at their best.

Will posterity wonder why we, who have the privilege of living now, did not better understand the spiritual, social, and economic problems of our time?

These are years of tremendous change.

Not long ago nations, races, and religions were fairly well capsuled by geographical isolation.

Each nation could live for itself.

But at times it seems that the peoples of the world have suddenly been poured into one container.

We can be certain of one thing.

We cannot get out of the cold war and solve our other problems in a hurry.

But the abiding factors of this last half of our 20th century are its vitalities: Our ideals, our demands for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, our endeavors to better our conditions.

Serene incidents have not been the creative epochs in human history.

Serene incidents did not bring forth the dawn of Christianity—or the birth of the Presbyterian Church.

Nor did serene incidents bring forth the birth of our own Nation.

Responsible Christian citizens cannot avoid the conflict.

They cannot avoid the throbbing issues that through satisfactory solution will culminate in continued freedom for America.

We often hear this period of our history classified as an age of abundance, in contrast with past ages of economic scarcity.

The promises of America's political future are great. But its perils are so real that we cannot evade the challenge which this new age brings to the Christian conscience.

To the shallow expression "We have never had it so good," the free and responsible Christian must reply, "We have never had such heavy demands upon the Christian conscience."

Formal Presentation of Official Flags of the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps to the Committee on Science and Astronautics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on April 29 it was my great pleasure and honor as chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics to accept on its behalf the formal presentation of the official flags of the U.S. Navy and the Marine Corps.

These flags have now taken their place on the rostrum of the committee, alongside the American flag and the official emblems of the Army and the Air Force, which were previously presented to the committee.

The flags of the Navy and Marine Corps were presented to the committee by the Honorable William B. Franke, Secretary of the Navy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD the statements made on this occasion by the Secretary and myself.

Secretary FRANKE. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, on April 24, 1959, the President signed an Executive order which gave the Navy its first official flag in its 184-year history. Prior to that time the U.S. Navy infantry flag was the one used during ceremonial parade and display occasions. In contrast, the Marine Corps has for many years had its own distinctive banner, its familiar red and gold flag, which has inspired men and thrilled the hearts of onlookers on many occasions.

It is an honor and a privilege for me to present to this committee these flags. One very new, one hallowed by years of tradition; flags that are truly representative of the Navy and the Marine Corps.

When we see flags such as these, we see not only the bunting, and the distinctive insignia, but we also see and are reminded of the organizations they represent, the U.S. Navy and the U.S. Marine Corps.

I see in these flags almost two centuries of sacrifice made by men and women in the naval service in defense of this great Nation of ours.

I am reminded of the sincere dedication of spirit and effort of these people, not only for our own freedom, but for the entire free world.

These flags remind me of naval and marine units deployed to the far corners of the earth at this very moment. The men of these farflung units are going about the world taking care of the day-to-day tasks of our country in readiness for defense, and in the serious business of being good will ambassadors.

I think it is fitting therefore that these flags be placed in this committee room, beside our national flag and the flags of our sister services.

It is a fitting place for our Navy and Marine flags because this committee and this room are symbolic of man's desire for knowledge and freedom.

It is fitting because this committee has such an important part and responsibility in reviewing and passing upon the scientific programs of our country.

I ask you to accept these flags as a token of the Department of the Navy's solemn pledge to continue to extend the maximum effort in concert with our sister services and all of the agencies of our Government in the extension of knowledge and in the defense of our country and the free world.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

This is indeed a beautiful and a historic moment, when you formally, accompanied by representatives from the services of the Navy and Marine Corps, appear before this committee to present us two flags, one from the Navy and one from the Marine Corps. It is true, as you say, that one flag is entirely new and one is hallowed by years of tradition and service.

On the other hand, to my mind, and I am sure to the minds of the members of this committee, both flags are hallowed by the service, traditions, personnel, and the exploits of the men of the Navy and the Marine Corps. This committee itself, it is true, Mr. Secretary, has an obligation to advance new ideas, new inventions, new developments, new devices that will assist this Nation in its defense. In performing these duties we work with pleasure with men of the Navy and of the Marine Corps to the unified effort that we give proper defense to the United States of America.

Your service, Mr. Secretary, as represented by the Navy and the Marine Corps, has already done a magnificent job in research and development.

You, for instance, represent that Naval Research Laboratory that had the responsibility during the first International Geophysical Year over the Nation's first satellite program, the Vanguard. You placed into orbit Vanguard No. I, which will circle the earth for hundreds of years.

At this very moment Navy Vanguard I is sending back to earth its signals that already have changed fundamental scientific concepts regarding the nature of the earth. It is also the Navy that has developed in research and development the Polaris, which is not only a missile, but is a new concept of warfare. Your service has pioneered and developed a new means of defense for our country.

The Marine Corps, through its precept and example, has given all America a firmer feeling of devotion for the principles of freedom which we share with the Western World.

So, on behalf of the committee, I take much pleasure in accepting these flags, the one from the Navy and the one from the Marine Corps. They will join the flags of their sister services on the rostrum of this committee.

This is merely a temporary committee room, Mr. Secretary, but as time moves on we will have a new building across the way. We have splendid quarters set aside for this committee in the new building to the west of us. We already have selected a place in the permanent rooms of the committee for these flags which are symbolic of the cherished devotions to freedom which guide the United States.

Thank you very much.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 7, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, May 7, 1960)

The Department of Defense appropriation, 1961, was the focal point of a full legislative week which showed an increased tempo in House activity. The appropriation bill, of approximately $39.3 billion ($39,300 million) is our largest annual spending bill, equaling half the total national budget. Personnel, pay and allowances, get $11.8 billion, split among Army, 870,000 Active, 700,000 National Guard and Reserve; Navy, 794,000 Active and 174,000 Reserve; Air Force, 825,000 Active and 134,000 Guard and Reserve. Operation and maintenance take $10.3 billion. Procurement (of equipment and supplies) gets $13 billion. Research and development, testing and evaluation get $4.2 billion. These funds allocated by service branch are as follows: Army $9.4 billion, Navy $11.9 billion, Air Force $16.8 billion, and Office of Secretary of Defense $1.2 billion.

Our military objective is to maintain "adequate deterrent forces" so adequate or strong that no nation or combination of nations will dare attack, thus risking their almost certain destruction by our forces. So it is that we must maintain a mixed attack force so that our forces at no time could be wiped out no matter of what nature the surprise attack. Our Strategic Air Command bombers (airborne missile launching platforms), our unmanned bombers, the missiles of all types (short, intermediate, and long range), our nuclear submarine forces are some of these mixed attack forces, so maneuverable and flexible they could not be simultaneously destroyed, but would in combination retaliate to destroy the attacker. All of this retaliation rests on our warning systems so we continue to improve these systems to give us time between attack origination and hitting us. Research, of course,

underlies all these efforts. Here the factor of "time lag" enters, the time between discovery of a practical new weapons, or warning system and the time of readiness for use. Here, too, is a large part of the cost through obsolescence and surplus.

Our military preparations are basically wasteful, since we must always be in readiness and then discard the weapons and ammunition never used, and be glad. The missile gap (if there is one will be closed by 1963), the airborne alert, the airlift, the sealift, all were part of the debate and received careful attention.

Yet valid criticisms remain involving unnecessary waste and duplication by the military, including unbusinesslike supply management, wasteful handling of surplus goods, uneconomic ownership and operation of real estate and other business properties, excessive travel and living allowances, and others. All excessive spending should be trimmed and the military leaders be held accountable to the taxpayers.

Most important of all, as I see it, is the need to remember that a strong military position rests on a strong economy and our economy rests on free enterprise and private initiative, not federally planned bureaucratic regimentation of our lives. If we fail to eliminate nonessential, nonmilitary expenses (as well as military waste), and our taxpayers end up under Federal domination—in or out of war emergency—we have already lost the fight for freedom.

The Area Redevelopment Act was the prima donna bill of the week. In the effort to delay or kill it on Calendar Wednesday, 14 separate rollcalls were demanded, 11 of them being votes, 3 attendance quorums. The House did not adjourn until 9:40 p.m. The bill passed 201 to 184. It would authorize a new Administrator to designate depressed areas, industrial or rural, and Federal funds would be provided with almost no limitation, as to who gets it, except the amount of money on hand. At this time the amount asked was $251 million. There would be Federal help for hardship resulting from technology change (so we'd have subsidized buggy makers when autos came in), migration of industry to other areas, shifts in demand, and depletion of resources. Under this act, employees in summer resort areas could be subsidized the rest of the year. Beyond the obvious fallacy of this not being the role of Federal Government, there were many others. The same criticism condemns equally an administration effort (although only one-fifth as much in cost as the Democrats' bill) to provide a palatable solution.

The administration medicare program of help for the aged is a new development in the health field, in which the AFL–CIO is trying to brew up a political storm and an election issue by backing the Forand bill. The Forand bill would impose a special payroll tax on the first $4,800 of everyone's pay to provide Federal health care for those over 65 and covered by social security. The medicare program will permit those over 65, who do not pay income tax (i.e. whose income is less than $2,500 or $3,800 per couple) to pay $24 enrollment fee and then be eligible for extensive insurance coverage providing they pay the first $250 per person ($400 per couple) and 20 percent of the entire cost. This rather ingenious system is quite a different approach and deserves careful study. Enclosed is a statement I put out earlier in the week when the plan was first proposed.

STATEMENT OF BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS, MAY 4, 1960, RE ADMINISTRATION MEDICARE PLAN FOR THE AGED

For my part, I am not categorically for or against this new suggestion since there are Federal and State problems—medical and insurance viewpoints—and taxpayers to take into account before evolving final legislation.

I do not agree with Secretary (Flemming) statement that "Executive branch of Government fully recognizes and accepts the fact that the Federal Government should act in this field. A careful consideration of facts such as the following can lead to no other conclusion." The hearings on the Forand bill did not establish an area of need. As a matter of fact, the medically indigent and needy are already taken care of by government under Federal-State public assistance under social security. To that extent the Government is indeed in the field already and is meeting the need aided by the most important contribution of local efforts, community chest, churches, charities and free medical care for anyone who cannot afford to pay.

I am interested in this proposition because it avoids many of the basic flaws of the Forand bill which would not help those who need the help. I am interested because this could be a more businesslike approach to public assistance and not a further pyramiding of Federal programs, rather a replacement or shift of cost currently paid by Federal tax money.

The only Federal program even needed is one that better does the job. Can this one do a better job that needs to be done by Federal Government? Is this a better way to care for the medically indigent? If it is and the cost is shifted in public assistance rather than generate new spending programs the budget may not be jeopardized.

The answer to these questions and others can come only from study of the facts, judiciously without political expediency. The facts can come from hearings where all interested parties can be heard. The Ways and Means Committee has a responsibility to Congress and our people to do this job and do it well. This administration approach deserves our full study and consideration. No final answer is possible until the Secretary provides us more information. This includes at the least his analysis of State share of costs, State by State, the Federal-State equalization formula, further data on administration costs, including personnel, information on present State programs of public assistance and more detailed information on total cost.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the 10th of May marks, for free Rumanians all over the world, the date when Rumania finally shook off the shackles of Turkish domination and became a free kingdom in 1877. Its observance provides an occasion for recalling the country's historical steps toward independence, steps which have been nullified by the virtual colonization of the country today by Soviet Russia.

Observance of the 10th of May as Rumanian Independence Day gives us an opportunity to draw world attention to the present enslavement of the Rumanians, and to note that its people continue to struggle for the restoration of true freedom. The Soviets who now dominate Rumania hope to dim the significance of this day by substituting another day as the important national holiday and thereby erase this symbol of freedom.

The Rumanians, however, join other captive peoples in refusing to accept communism and in clinging to their hope for freedom. In the free world there are organizations such as the Rumanian National Committee which are dedicated to keeping this hope alive. It is nourished by the knowledge that the American people will never be satisfied with a world order that leaves the peoples of Eastern Europe under the domination of a foreign power and an alien way of life.

"The Federal Government and Higher Education"—Address by Senator Joseph S. Clark, of Pennsylvania, at the 17th American Assembly, May 7, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege last week to take part in the 17th American Assembly which was held at Arden House, Harriman, N.Y., to discuss the subject of "The Federal Government and Higher Education."

A cross section of educators, businessmen, labor leaders, and public officials listened to an excellent address on the subject of the conference delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOSEPH S. CLARK.

Senator CLARK's keen analytical mind and his appreciation of the profound importance to American society of higher education makes his address one of the most valuable discussions of this problem I have ever heard. As Senator CLARK said at Arden House, "The purpose of higher education is the staffing of freedom."

I commend to Members of Congress the reading of Senator CLARK's remarks:

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Reasonable men cannot study American higher education in any depth without concluding that drastic steps must immediately be taken to equip our colleges and universities to turn out more and better educated students in the years ahead.

Reasonable men who study higher education must also agree that such steps must facilitate:

1. A much larger, much better trained and much better paid corps of university and college professors and instructors.

2. A very large expansion of academic facilities—libraries, laboratories, and classrooms.

3. The admission into college, and the maintenance through graduate school, of all high school graduates who have the capacity and character necessary to assimilate college and graduate work.

Since you are all reasonable men and since you have been considering American higher education for the last 2 days at Arden House, I will assume that you have reached these conclusions. I shall accordingly not reiterate the obvious but devote the time we have together to discussing how we can do what needs to be done about higher education in America.

WHERE ARE WE GOING TO GET THE MONEY?

It is obvious that while money alone will not solve the problems of our colleges and universities, these problems are not going to be solved without a lot more money than is now available. Some years ago there was a Congressman from the central part of Pennsylvania who used to enter every debate on the floor of the House which involved the expenditure of Federal funds with the inquiry: "Where are you going to get the money?" So perhaps we should start our discussion with the same question: Where are we going to get the money?—you and I and the millions of other Americans who understand that in the immortal if tautological words of one of my congressional colleagues: "This is no ordinary crisis which confronts us."

I would answer that we are going to have to get the money we need from wherever we can lay our hands on it. For, in all likelihood, the total amount we can raise from all sources, at least in the next decade, is not going to be enough.

In our democracy there is always in peacetime, and sometimes even in war, an inordinate lag between challenge and response—between the acknowledgment of a need in the minds of the well informed and a meeting of that need by the considered action of our free society.

WE CANNOT AFFORD TO WAIT A GENERATION

As I had occasion to remark some years ago: "The philosophy of the reformers in the universities becomes the action platform of the liberal politicians of the next generation." The trouble is, we cannot afford to wait a generation to do what so many of you know must be done in the field of higher education.

The need in dollars has been well established, nowhere more clearly than by Messrs. John A. Perkins and Daniel W. Wood in their penetrating study "Issues in Federal Aid to Higher Education" which all of us have recently read. Let us accept their figures and assume we will need to triple the annual level of expenditures for operations during the next decade—rising to a level $6 to $9 billion higher than the present $3.5 billion—add another $15 to $33 billion for capital growth over that period to provide America with a first-class system of higher education by 1970. I repeat the question: Where are we going to get the money?

I reply: Some of it will come from the annual gifts of the graduates and friends of our colleges and universities. But most of this kind of money will help the richer institutions to do better the good job they are already doing. It is not a source which will spread the wealth where it is most needed.

Some of it will come from bequests from the wealthy. This will be largely, though not entirely, for facilities rather than operations. And, again, it will tend to go to richer institutions which are already doing a first-class job in terms of quality, and whose capacity and desire to handle increased enrollment are limited.

Some of it will come from tuition and other payments by more students. Some may come from increases in these charges, but there is not much liquid in the bottom of this barrel and there are strong reasons of sound national policy for making higher education cheaper, rather than more expensive, as Messrs. Perkins and Wood have well pointed out.

CORPORATE GIVING FOR EDUCATION A LIMITED SOURCE

Some of it will come from corporate giving—in fact, quite a lot of it. I would hope that educational administrators and fund raisers would intensify their efforts to obtain money from this source—thereby, because of our Federal tax exemptions, making Uncle Sam a silent partner to the extent of more than one-half of each gift. Again, we must note the limitations of this source of funds: the gifts will tend to fluctuate substantially in amount with the ebb and flow of our economy. And they will tend to enrich schools of business and the natural sciences at the expense of the humanities and the social sciences. Thus it will cover only a part of a part of the need.

Some of it will come from private foundations and, on balance, this kind of money comes closest to being spent where the need is greatest. But no one will contend that the private foundations can do the whole job.

Some of it will come from State taxation. The States are not presently doing enough. They will have to do more. But most of them are incapable, as a practical matter of doing much more quickly. The reasons are obvious—regressive tax systems frozen by outmoded constitutions which are well nigh impossible to change; domination of State legislatures by conservative elements who have little understanding of the need; a heavy demand for other State services which are not being adequately provided, among them the requirements for aid to local school districts; and, finally, the ordinary selfish motivation of ordinary decent citizens who hate taxes and don't understand the problem.

Not much of it will come from local taxation, although here and there a community college will be helped. The resources of many a school district are already spent or pledged, or both, to the limit. The others will have a hard enough time keeping up with primary and secondary education requirements. And, by and large, their tax systems are even more regressive than those of the States.

THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT USED BY A FREE PEOPLE TO SOLVE NATIONAL PROBLEMS

So what have we left? Only the Federal Government. Government is the agency which, you will recall, Lincoln referred to as existing to do for people that which they cannot do or do as well for themselves. The National Government is the usual means by which a free people tackles a problem public in its character and national in its scope.

We use our Federal Government to wage war, to conduct diplomacy, to guide the national economy in a score of areas. We use it to operate a nationwide system of social security, to construct great public works, and to support our industry and commerce in many different fields. It operates our post offices and our national parks. It helps build houses and clear slums. It helps build hospitals and engages in extensive welfare operations. Without it, most of the progress we have made in this country during the 20th century would have been quite impossible.

Yet, whenever the suggestion arises that we use our Federal Government to tackle a new problem—any new problem—a cry of horror arises. When Federal action is proposed to help solve the crisis in higher education, the outcry comes from many sides, including such strange allies as the United States Chamber of Commerce and certain of the more lush groves of academe.

This stereotyped reaction deserves some basic attention. Why are we Americans, perhaps alone among the civilized peoples of the earth, so reluctant to use this great instrumentality which we control and which lies at our disposal?

Surely democratic government is a tool to be used by the people to solve their collective problems and to improve their collective lot. Yet a multitude of influential Americans regard their National Government with that same measure of suspicion and hostility with which the ancient Aztecs greeted Cortez and his Spanish army in the mountains of Mexico. One would think, to hear the talk, that to turn to Washington in a time of need would be more like surrendering to a foreign power than utilizing one's own resources. The conventional wisdom in America still agrees with Jefferson that "that government is best which governs least." If chaos results and problems are swept under the rug, never mind, we are the same free people who drove the minions of George III into the Atlantic.

DISTRUST OF GOVERNMENT CAN BE DANGEROUS IN 20TH CENTURY

This inbred and deep-seated distrust of government may have had sound historical roots in the 18th century, but it is dangerous indeed in the 20th. For it is only our National Government that can mobilize and direct the resources of our society when they must be mobilized. And we should all ponder whether the United States as an unmobilized society can long compete with the determined, mobilized, aggressive society that confronts us today from the other side of the Iron Curtain.

This district of government has always been present in American thought, going back, as noted, to our unfortunate experiences with King George III, heightened by the excesses of the French Revolution and of Bonaparte, and strengthened by the physical distance between the frontier and Washington, D.C. But the distrust did not break out into open warfare until the days of Franklin Roosevelt, when—from the standpoint of many powerful persons in our society—the worst suspicions anyone had held about the evil nature of the National Government were confirmed. Mr. Roosevelt set out, through the Government, to regulate the stock exchange, to impose a death sentence on utility holding companies, to use the taxing power as a means of coercion and regulation, to engage in direct competition with the electric power and the lending industries, and, most important, to proclaim what he called a Magna Carta for labor's right to organize. Being unable to prevent or repeal these specific invasions of government into the domain of the plutocracy, powerful opponents of the New Deal set out to discredit government itself.

Thus, in the publications which they controlled—and these were legion—the fine old term "public servant" disappeared from the lexicon and the derogatory word "bureaucrat" took its place. "Citizens" became "taxpayers"—usually depicted by cartoonists as clad only in a barrel. The word "taxes" was rarely seen without the prefixed adjective "confiscatory" or "crippling" or the synonym "burden." Public spending was referred to always as a "cost," never as a benefit, and normally with the prefix "wasteful." Government activities of all kinds were freely termed "socialism," with dark allusions that beyond the so-called "socialism" of the New Deal lay communism. Ultimately, you will recall, the groundwork was so well laid that when the McCarthy witch hunt was on and public servants were burned alive at the stake of publicity, a

large portion of the American public celebrated as though we had just defeated the Communists on the battlefield.

LIPPMANN, STEVENSON, FULBRIGHT CRITICAL OF STARVATION OF PUBLIC SERVICES

We have recovered a bit from the worst of the anti-Government crusade. There are now thoughtful and sensitive men, like Walter Lippmann and Adlai Stevenson and Senator Fulbright, suggesting that the fiscal starvation of public services like education is a matter for national shame rather than national pride. Yet the conventional wisdom has not been greatly modified. I speak with assurance, because the conventional propaganda output flows across a Senator's desk by the ream.

To support the conventional thesis that the Federal Government is essentially evil and should be dismantled, a whole school of economics has grown up.

We are told that the oppressive weight of Federal taxation is destroying enterprise and stifling investment—even though the Federal Reserve Board believes it necessary to pursue a stringent tight money policy to curtail investment and restrain enterprise.

THE ANTI-GOVERNMENT CRUSADE

We are told that Federal debt is climbing out of control and threatening the soundness of the dollar—even though our debt burden, in relation to our income, has steadily declined and is now but half the percentage of our gross national product that it was a little more than a decade ago.

We are told that Federal spending is dangerously inflationary, even when the budget is balanced. And this comes from the same people who are constantly encouraging private citizens through every medium of communication to go into debt spending money they don't have for things they don't need and didn't know they wanted until the "hidden persuaders" went to work on them.

We are told that the Federal Government is costly and inefficient and therefore the States should do the job—when every objective test shows that Federal employees are better selected, better trained, and better supervised on the average than State employees, and that the Federal tax system is more equitable and more efficient than State tax systems.

Thus the case is put together against action by the Federal Government at any time for any purpose.

THE NEW ANARCHY

I have called this anti-Government fixation "the new anarchy." And if anyone present doesn't believe these neoanarchists exist, just let this assembly go on record tomorrow in favor of comprehensive Federal aid for higher education. Then you will hear from them. I can tell you in advance that nearly every major business organization in the country will oppose you. So will the journals of plutocratic opinion which guide and reflect the conventional wisdom of the business community.

I assume that in this conference we are prepared to brave the wrath of the neoanarchists. I assume also that we are prepared to follow where the facts of the crisis, rather than our prejudices, lead us. If the projections of needs and resources told us that Federal aid is not required, no one would have been happier than I. But despite the labored statistics of the Council for Financial Aid to Education, Inc., and the wishful thinking of the Committee for Economic Development, they don't. Since the facts lead us toward the Federal Government, let us be calm. Let us keep our heads and repeat together:

"The Federal Government is not our enemy, it is our friend. It is not an alien power, it is the creature of the American people. It will do what they want it to. It is not a monster which can ignore their will."

I will not dwell at length with the objection that Federal aid will lead to Federal control, as so often asserted by those who fear change. I am sure you have analyzed this argument fully in the last 2 days. I will only say that, in my opinion, it is a myth that Federal aid means Federal control. Truly we are wise enough to legislate and to administer so as to prevent an end result we don't desire. I will only say to those who oppose Federal assistance: What is your alternative, and is it not clear that the only real alternative is a second-class educational system?

HOW CAN FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION BE PROVIDED?

Let us turn, then, to how Federal aid to higher education can best be provided.

You will be disappointed, perhaps, when I start by saying that finding the answer to this question is more your job than mine. Government programs do not ordinarily spring full-grown to life from the brows of Senators. A public need must be established. So must public awareness of that need and public support for its satisfaction.

Leadership must come from people who are determined and informed.

We got a Federal aid for public schools bill through the Senate this winter because the National Education Association knew what it wanted and lobbied its program across.

Something like the Forand bill, providing health insurance for the elderly will, in all likelihood, pass the Congress largely because the AFL–CIO knows what it wants and is working hard to get it.

The Hill-Burton hospital construction plan sails through Congress with new appropriations each year because the organized hospital administrators and their trustees worked out a sound plan and lobbied to get it passed.

We have a college housing program because the colleges and universities are united in support of it.

CITIZENS INTERESTED IN HIGHER EDUCATION MUST ACT

Unfortunately, citizens interested in higher education do not yet seem to know what else they want. And this includes trustees as well as college presidents and their faculties.

Let me give you an example of what I have in mind. Three years ago the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, chaired by my good friend, Devereux Josephs, presented a series of recommendations. Included was a proposal for Federal grants for higher educational facilities on the pattern of the Hill-Burton Act.

Now, Hill-Burton Act grants for hospitals are made pursuant to a carefully worked out plan to meet hospital needs prepared with the cooperation of the American Hospital Association and other hospital groups. It cannot be transposed to the higher educational field without careful rethinking which must be participated in by the universities themselves.

Yet that rethinking has never been done. The idea put forward by the Josephs Committee 3 years ago died as completely as if it had never been born. Why did higher education drop it? Wasn't there anybody in the field with interest or initiative enough to pick up the thought, refine it, agitate for it, and eventually get it seriously considered by both the President and the Congress? Apparently not.

I don't know myself whether the suggestion of the Josephs Committee is feasible, but the higher educational community should know and, if it does not, it ought to find out.

Politicians should be out in front of the people, I agree. We have a duty of leadership. But we cannot afford to get too far ahead of the people we lead. For if we do, there is a great risk we will be shot down from behind on election day.

CAN EXISTING EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS DO THE JOB?

I wonder whether existing organizations in the field of higher education are set up to do the needed job of working out a proper plan for Federal aid and then lobbying vigorously for it? I suspect that, to some extent, they are immobilized by internal divisions on the basic questions, first, of whether Federal aid in any form is desirable and, second, if so, who should get it? The American Council on Education, the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities, the Council for Financial Aid to Education, Inc., the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Universities, the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, the Association for Higher Education of the National Education Association, and the American Association of Junior Colleges are a rather heterogeneous group to unite on a legislative program. Would it not be desirable to organize an ad hoc committee of leading educators and other citizens who are convinced of the need for Federal aid so that, when they meet, they need not argue whether, but only how?

Let us remember that educators are not monks who take a vow of poverty, both for themselves and for the institutions they serve. They, too, are American citizens with the right, indeed the duty, to petition for redress of grievances and to indicate to their elected representatives how they would like those grievances redressed.

SOME TIMID SUGGESTIONS FOR A CITIZENS ORGANIZATION FOR FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Were such a citizens organization for Federal aid to higher education to be organized, I should like to sit down with it and be presumptuous enough to offer a few timid suggestions:

First. The "educational foundation" approach suggested by Messrs. Perkins and Wood deserves careful and detailed exploration. So does their view that allocations by such a foundation should include both operating and facilities moneys paid directly to recipient institutions. Faculty salaries should, in my judgment, have the highest priority; academic facilities the next. When these problems are reasonably well solved, it will be time to turn our attention to further scholarships and loans to students. There isn't much to be gained in substituting a slightly brighter boy or girl for one who now wins admission to college if, when our bright student arrives on the campus, there is no place for him to sit or lie down, no books or laboratories available and not enough professors really qualified to teach him what he needs to know.

PENNSYLVANIA SITUATION CITED

Second. The hardest thinking must be done in the field of who gets how much aid. The situation in Pennsylvania is a good illustration of the difficulty.

My State has 109 different institutions of higher education. But those 109 include no public community college, no public liberal arts college, and only one State university. Less than 2 percent of our college students are in junior colleges, none of which is public.

State aid goes principally to four large universities: Penn State (which is also a land-grant college receiving Federal aid); the University of Pennsylvania, a reasonably well-endowed Ivy League institution, with Federal Government research contracts in substantial amount; Temple University, founded since the turn of the century as a community college, which has grown into a full-blown university; and the University of Pittsburgh, with its support from the Mellons and its Cathedral of Learning.

However, 14 teachers' colleges are supported entirely by the State and located principally in rural areas. Tuitions and faculty salaries are low, curriculum necessarily limited. Between these extremes are 91 private institutions which, by and large, defy classification. Some are rich; most poor. Some are widely renowned; others so small that they cannot support a strong faculty or a broad curriculum. They are Baptist, Methodist, Lutheran, Catholic, Quaker, and nonsectarian.

If someone in the audience will tell me how public aid should be distributed among such a complex variety of institutions, I would be happy to report it to Governor Lawrence's committee on education, which is presently wrestling with just this subject. Frankly, I haven't the faintest idea.

All I know is that if Pennsylvania does not substantially increase its State aid to higher education and get substantial additional help from the Federal Government, we are headed straight for trouble. To reiterate, this is no ordinary crisis which confronts us.

Third. Federal aid should not be limited to special projects, or research, or science, or defense-related subjects. It should be across the board. It should go to the heart of the university, not just to its periphery. In the civilization of the future, the natural sciences may well predominate pragmatically, as C. P. Snow has recently suggested in his stimulating Rede lecture on the Two Cultures, but the social sciences and the humanities are of equal importance, remote though the latter are sometimes thought to be from practical application to the modern world. Assuredly, man does not live by bread alone.

THE PURPOSE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IS THE STAFFING OF FREEDOM

I suspect you will agree that in these 3 days at Arden House we will not have solved the problem of the Federal Government and higher education. But I hope we have crossed one bridge over which we will not return. The river of doubt over which that bridge was built asked the question as it flowed under us: Is Federal aid to higher education necessary? I hope that bridge will be burnt here tomorrow so that none of us can return.

There are other rivers of doubt ahead. They ask the questions of how much, how, to whom and what for. I am confident that bridges can be built also across these rivers, fabricated from sound answers to these puzzling questions.

In fact, we have to build these bridges and cross them. For the purpose of higher education in America is the staffing of freedom. If we cannot staff freedom adequately, history will again take note before the end of this century, as it has before, that an unmobilized society cannot compete successfully with one that is fully mobilized.

This is a conclusion to which no free American living in the richest country the world has ever known, in a society founded on the Magna Charta, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States can willingly accept.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 1960

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, bewildered by the wild confusion of this clamorous world, at noontide we would wait in quietness, that the roiled waters of discussion may become clear and our disturbed spirits tranquil pools of prayer and peace.

Thou knowest our hearts. Thou seest that in spite of the worst things in us, which we despise, in our highest hours when we look unto the hills of vision, our deep desire is to be the true servants of Thy will in this troubled time.

Amid the tempests of the temporal, may we keep clear the ultimate sovereignty of the eternal.

In the unending struggle of truth and error, liberty and tyranny, give us the comforting assurance that we are not alone, that we do not stand alone, that we do not fight alone, but that Thy increasing purpose is bound up with all this human struggle toward the shining goal of earth's redemption from ignorance, misery, suffering, and fetters of the mind and body.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 10, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Dodd M. Fisher, to be postmaster at Mount Storm, W. Va., which nominating messages were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 1217. An act to suspend for 2 years the import duty on certain amorphous graphite;

H.R. 1456. An act for the relief of Universal Trades, Inc.;

H.R. 1752. An act for the relief of Wilhelmina Ordonez;

H.R. 2082. An act for the relief of James Demetrios Chrysanthes, also known as James Demetrios Chrysanthacopoulos;

H.R. 3786. An act for the relief of Chan Kit Ying and James George Bainter;

H.R. 3934. An act for the relief of Mrs. E. Christine Williams;

H.R. 4562. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Grzelewski;

H.R. 4825. An act for the relief of Jean K. Simmons;

H.R. 5349. An act to provide for the conveyance to Orange County, Calif., of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property situated in Orange County, Calif.;

H.R. 6083. An act for the relief of Mary V. Jones;

H.R. 6493. An act for the relief of Robert Dolton;

H.R. 6843. An act for the relief of Daniel Wilging;

H.R. 7226. An act for the relief of Mr. Hughie D. Martin and Ione Martin;

H.R. 7254. An act for the relief of Simeen Helena Chaghaghi;

H.R. 7363. An act for the relief of Chester A. Spindler;

H.R. 8280. An act for the relief of Clarence T. Tolpo;

H.R. 8383. An act for the relief of Maj. Jack E. Hudson;

H.R. 8456. An act for the relief of Capt. Jack Rubley;

H.R. 8672. An act for the relief of Dr. Deh Chang Tao;

H.R. 8868. An act for the relief of the Albertson Water District, Nassau County, N.Y.;

H.R. 8941. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alice Anderson;

H.R. 9084. An act to repeal certain retirement promotion authority of the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

H.R. 9216. An act for the relief of Daniel C. Turner;

H.R. 9464. An act to remove the requirement that, of the Chief and Deputy Chief of the Bureau of Ships, one must be specially qualified and experienced in naval engineering and the other must be specially qualified and experienced in naval architecture;

H.R. 9476. An act for the relief of George E. Williams and William L. Johnson;

H.R. 9760. An act for the relief of Sam Doolittle;

H.R. 9861. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle or Tampico fiber;

H.R. 10045. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws", to increase the amounts authorized to be expended;

H.R. 10164. An act to change the name of the locks and dam No. 41 on the Ohio River at Louisville, Ky.;

H.R. 10550. An act to extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for 2 additional years;

H.R. 11415. An act to provide for the designation of a portion of the District of Columbia as the "Plaza of the Americas"; and

H.J. Res. 598. Joint resolution to extend the time for filing the final report of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour, and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO FILE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services have until midnight tonight to file the report on House bill 10777, the military authorization bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Finance were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

FAMILY FARM DEVELOPMENT ACT—PETITION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, about a week ago I was visited by a group of farm people from the State of Minnesota, headed by one Edwin Christiansen, president of the Minnesota Farmers' Union, who acted as chairman of the group. He brought to me the petitions which I have on my desk. The petitions contain the signatures and addresses of 15,000 farm people in Minnesota. Every one of them is a farmer. The petition reads as follows:

REQUEST TO CONGRESS

The undersigned do hereby urgently request the Members of Congress of the United States to give their earnest attention to the price, income, and marketing problems facing agricultural producers.

BENSON PROGRAM A FAILURE

We respectfully point out that the present Benson farm program has brought about a reduction in farm purchasing power to the lowest point in 20 years. There is nothing to be gained by more of the same Benson policies.

BETTER PROGRAM NEEDED

We urge that the Congress recognize the failure of the Benson corn program of low prices and unlimited acreage and reject this plan with regard to any other farm commodity, and replace this type of program with one of price supports or direct payments at a fair level, together with authority for farmers to vote on application of workable crop or marketing allotments.

REPLACE THE SOIL BANK

We recommend that the soil bank conservation reserve be replaced by a land-use adjustment program under the ACP, designed to fit into good cropping and conservation practices.

FARM COMMODITY PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

We recommend that producers of the various major farm commodities be given opportunity to participate through duly elected representatives in the development of price and market stabilization programs.

Mr. President, the recommendations which have been made in this petition support, in the main, a bill I introduced last year known as the Family Farm Development Act. The proposal emphasizes the importance of the farmers themselves designing farm programs in cooperation with the technical services of the Department of Agriculture, and provides that the programs ultimately be placed before the farm producers in a national referendum. If two-thirds of the producers agreed to the program, it would become operative, unless Congress, within 30 days, overruled it. Congress would, thereby act as the guardian of the public interest.

The Family Farm Development Act also would provide for national goals of farm production. It would provide for expanded land use, a conservation program, and a program for certain types of assistance loans for marginal farm producers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the petition be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the petition was received and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

RESOLUTIONS OF UPWA–AFL–CIO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO. 2

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, District Council No. 2 of the United Packinghouse Workers of America, AFL–CIO, at its meeting in Albert Lea, Minn., April 1 and 2, approved two resolutions: one, commending the work of the U.S. Meat Inspection Service and the other, urging that the Food and Drug Administration help consumer, farmer, and packinghouse worker alike by requiring that an increased amount of pork be put in every can of pork and beans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON MEAT INSPECTION

Whereas the United Packinghouse Workers of America, AFL–CIO, are well aware of the fine and valuable work of the U.S. Meat Inspection Service in protecting the health of the consuming public and assisting meat producers and meat processors in supplying a wholesome, safe product: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That District Council No. 2, UPWA–AFL–CIO, in convention assembled at Albert Lea, Minn., reiterate our approval and appreciation of this service and request that Congress continue to provide adequate funds for its efficient operation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the 12th constitutional convention of the International United Packinghouse Workers of America, AFL–CIO, to effectuate this resolution.

RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE PURE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION TO LEGALIZE THE AMOUNT OF PORK TO GO INTO A CAN OF PORK AND BEANS

Whereas there is no legal quantity of pork specified by the Pure Food and Drug Administration to go into a can of pork and beans; and

Whereas present consumption of the product labeled as "pork and beans" amounts to a billion pounds annually, or six pounds for every man, woman, and child in the United States; and

Whereas the pork content in a can of pork and beans presently is of the minimum and is there only to give credence to the label "pork and beans"; and

Whereas if the amount of pork in a can of pork and beans was only increased to a 2-ounce piece of pork for every pound of beans, the consumption of pork by the American public would increase annually by about 125 million pounds and thereby would assist economically the packinghouse workers, the farmers, and the consumers alike: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That Local No. 50, United Packinghouse Workers of America, AFL–CIO, go on record requesting the Pure Food and Drug Administration to make every effort to take whatever steps are necessary to increase the pork content in a can labeled "pork and beans"; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Congressmen and Senators requesting them to use their offices to effectuate this resolution; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the 15th annual district No. 2 convention of the United Packinghouse Workers of America, AFL–CIO; the 12th constitutional convention of the International United Packinghouse Workers of America, AFL–CIO; the national AFL–CIO; the State labor organizations in the livestock-producing States; and all farm organizations requesting them to take similar action.

RESOLUTION OF ST. PAUL AFL–CIO TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, America's industrial strength is great for many reasons and one of the most important is the skilled craftsmanship of our laboring men and women. This skill and pride of craftsmanship is the direct fruit of the apprenticeship system.

To pay appropriate tribute to this system and its great value to our economy, the St. Paul AFL–CIO Trades and Labor Assembly has proposed a U.S. postage stamp commemorating "The Nucleus of Craftsmanship: Apprenticeship."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Trades and Labor Assembly resolution proposing this stamp be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To print a U.S. postage stamp—"the Nucleus of Craftsmanship: Apprenticeship"—recognizing the basic philosophy of

bona fide apprenticeship and bringing to the attention of the American public the value of the apprenticeship system to our national economy.

Whereas millions of our fellow workers, throughout the years, have given of their time and effort in the promotion of this philosophy, for the purpose of training competent craftsmen for the industrial welfare of our Nation; and

Whereas the future status of skilled manpower in the United States is becoming increasingly dependent upon apprentice training; and

Whereas there is a need to acquaint the American public with the gigantic strides, activities and efforts in establishing the philosophy of bona fide apprenticeship, and the efforts that are being taken by Labor and Management to provide the public with the highest possible grade of products and services in conformity with approved practices of safety and skilled craftsmanship; and

Whereas it is the desire of the St. Paul AFL–CIO Trades and Labor Assembly to pay tribute to these fellow workers, apprentices, and to Labor and Management representatives who have voluntarily contributed their time and effort to this very necessary industrial activity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the St. Paul AFL–CIO Trades and Labor Assembly go on record as approving, and to petition Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield to have printed, a U.S. postage stamp using a facsimile of the imprint on this resolution and the attached analogy; also to request our congressional delegation to so petition the Postmaster General.

RESOLUTIONS OF INTERCOLLEGIATE OUTING CLUB ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at the 1960 spring conference of the Intercollegiate Outing Club Association, delegates of 100 affiliated clubs discussed many issues of interest not only to naturalists but to all interested in our natural resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions of this conference held April 23 at Camp Skymont in Bentonville, Va., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON THE WILDERNESS BILL

Realizing that wilderness is an exquisite resource, rare and irreplaceable, needed for the spiritual and recreational well-being of this and future generations. If not preserved by the authority of a national legislative policy, it will be bartered and forever lost to materialistic "progress"; and

Extensive hearings have been held throughout the Nation on the wilderness bill, and careful Senate committee and staff endeavors have rewritten the bill to meet all reasonable administrative, congressional, and public objections; and

Present obstruction of the wilderness bill in the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is not logically justified and must be condemned as an attempt to frustrate and defeat the real purpose and needs of this legislation:

The 1960 conference of the Intercollegiate Outing Club Association respectfully insists that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs report the wilderness bill out at once.

Furthermore, realizing that every year of delay causes an irreparable loss of wilderness to Americans of an infinite future, the Intercollegiate Outing Club Association urges the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to consider and report out at once H.R. 10621 before this 86th Congress adjourns.

RESOLUTION ON THE ALLAGASH WILDERNESS

Realizing that the finest remaining wilderness east of the Mississippi lies in the Allagash region of the State of Maine, and that this region contains incomparable canoe trails, famed since the days of Thoreau; and

A dam at Rankin Rapids and its reservoir would obliterate 97 percent of the Allagash River, and a highway from Daaquam in the west to Ashland in the east would bisect this primeval wilderness and open its heartland to unsightly highway developments:

The Intercollegiate Outing Club Association, which for 30 years has enjoyed canoe and hiking trips in the Maine wilderness, urges that Big Rapids Dam and Lincoln Dam, which would preserve the Allagash, be constructed instead of Rankin Rapids Dam, and that no highway be constructed through the heartland of the priceless Allagash wilderness.

RESOLUTION ON RAINBOW BRIDGE NATIONAL MONUMENT

Realizing that Public Law 485, 84th Congress, states that no dam nor reservoir in the upper Colorado River storage project is to lie within any national park or monument, and specifically precludes Rainbow Bridge National Monument from impairment by the construction of Glen Canyon Dam; and

If a diversion dam is not built to protect the Monument, backed up waters from Glen Canyon Dam will flood into the monument and at high water, under the arch itself, killing all plant cover, staining the rocks and natural geological formations with an unsightly "white zone," and depositing large quantities of silt and debris—thus ruining the aesthetic and wild qualities of Rainbow Bridge National Monument; and

Congressional law requires that adequate protection for Rainbow Bridge National Monument be assured:

The Intercollegiate Outing Club Association respectfully urges that adequate funds to build a diversion dam and tunnel at site B be appropriated by the 86th Congress, and that construction of Glen Canyon Dam be postponed until protection of the monument is completed; and

The Intercollegiate Outing Club Association condemns violation of the natural condition of any park or monument, realizing that a violation of one will be a threat to all.

RESOLUTION ON KINZUA DAM

Realizing that the city of Pittsburgh and environs needs protection from flood conditions on the Allegheny River; and

The Kinzua damsite proposed by the Corps of Engineers would devastate a recreation area vital to New York and Pennsylvania populations, and would lawlessly abrogate a Federal treaty signed by George Washington with the Seneca Indians; and

The Corps of Engineers has not given a full examination to the alternative Conewango site for a flood-control dam:

The Intercollegiate Outing Club Association requests that the historical treaty with the Seneca Indians be regarded, and that no appropriations be permitted for construction of Kinzua Dam until the Conewango damsite has been justly, fully, and impartially studied.

RESOLUTION ON THE NORTH CASCADES

Realizing that the North Cascades area of the State of Washington, with its tumbling glaciers and towering forests, contains the most spectacular mountain scenery in the United States; and

The 1959 Forest Service Glacier Peak wilderness area proposal for this region is entirely inadequate for the preservation of the ecological and scenic unit of the wilderness area because it eliminates the forested valleys of the Seattle and Agnes Rivers, and the whole scenic area north of Cascade Pass; and

The wilderness values of this region are far greater and more permanent than temporary monetary gain from the sale of valley timber:

Since the present administration of the U.S. Forest Service is unwilling to preserve the scenic and ecological unity of this area, the Intercollegiate Outing Club Association, believing that preservation of this rare wilderness for the future is of far greater import than a question of which Federal administrative agency will have jurisdiction over it, urges that the National Park Service make a survey of the potentialities of the North Cascades area for inclusion in the National Park system, and report its findings to Congress and to the people.

RESOLUTION ON NATIONAL SEASHORE AREAS

Realizing that natural seashores, where man can leave his footprints in the sand and gaze over the infinite surface of sea, are quickly disappearing as industry and population expand:

The Intercollegiate Outing Club Association endorses the Federal proposal to establish the Cape Cod, Padres Island, and Oregon Dunes National Seashores, and recommends that further national seashores including: Huron Mountain, Sleeping Bear Dunes, Picture Rocks, Cape Flattery, Channel Island, Point Reyes, Cumberland Island, and Fire Island, be legislatively preserved as soon as surveys and public hearings have been adequately held.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES—LEAGUE OF WISCONSIN MUNICIPALITIES ENDORSES S. 910

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the problem of nontaxpaying federally owned properties in communities throughout the country—many of which today are hard pressed to find sources of revenue to provide the necessary services—continues to be a serious one.

Currently, the bill, S. 910, pending before the Senate, proposes to deal with this situation by providing Federal payments in lieu of taxes to the local communities.

We recognize, of course, that Uncle Sam is already saddled with tremendous costs for a wide variety of programs, and also has difficulty in finding adequate sources of revenue.

However, a serious question arises as to whether areas in which federally owned properties are located should bear the special burden resulting from the existence of such property—often occupying choice sites in the city or community.

Recognizing this serious problem, I joined in cosponsoring the original bill,

S. 910, proposing to offset losses by providing Federal payments in lieu of taxes.

I believe that Congress should now act expeditiously to provide an equitable solution to this situation.

Today, I was pleased to receive from Ed Johnson, executive director of the League of Wisconsin Municipalities, a letter expressing this fine organization's support for enactment of S. 910.

Reflecting the views of this splendid association of Wisconsin cities and villages, I request unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAGUE OF
WISCONSIN MUNICIPALITIES,
Madison, Wis., May 9, 1960.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It is my understanding that there is a good possibility that S. 910 will be on the agenda of the Senate sometime in the near future. As I am sure you are aware, this bill is a result of many years study and represents a compromise between the positions taken by the Federal agencies and by representatives of local governmental units. It would establish certain in lieu of tax payments and special assessment liability for some types of federally owned properties.

I will not belabor you with the arguments as to why I think such legislation should be passed. The impact of federally owned property on individual communities can sometimes be tremendous. It seems only just that such communities should not be made to bear the burden for Federal operations which benefit millions of people living outside of those communities.

Your support of S. 910 will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

ED JOHNSON,
Executive Director.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

H.R. 10777. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1338).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. 3036. A bill to authorize the distribution of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to former Members of Congress requesting such copies (Rept. No. 1339);

H.J. Res. 502. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune (Rept. No. 1340);

H.J. Res. 546. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to present to the Senators and Representative in the Congress from the State of Hawaii the official flag of the United States bearing fifty stars which is first flown over the west front of the United States Capitol (Rept. No. 1341);

S. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution authorizing the reprinting of additional copies of hearings before the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on Amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 with respect to exchange of military information and material with allies during the 2d session of the 85th Congress;

S. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a committee print containing the reports of the States to the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources on their water resources and problems;

S. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Internal Security Manual as a Senate document; and providing for additional copies;

S. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution authorizing the reprinting of additional copies of the Joint Committee print entitled "Summary-Analysis of Hearings, June 22–26, 1959, on Biological and Environmental Effects of Nuclear War," printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the 86th Congress, 1st session;

S. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies on United States-Latin American relations;

S. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies on United States foreign policy;

H. Con. Res. 558. Concurrent resolution providing for printing additional copies of the panel discussions entitled "Income Tax Revision";

H. Con. Res. 579. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a "Veterans' Benefits Calculator";

H. Con. Res. 586. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on civil rights;

H. Con. Res. 607. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?";

S. Res. 277. Resolution to print for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business additional copies of its 10th annual report;

S. Res. 278. Resolution to print additional copies of the report on the problem of the aged and aging;

S. Res. 279. Resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Government Operations;

S. Res. 281. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report No 807, 86th Congress, entitled "Federal Disaster Relief Manual";

S. Res. 299. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the question-and-answer review of the St. Lawrence Seaway;

S. Res. 303. Resolution to print for the use of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems additional copies of its final report;

S. Res. 306. Resolution to print additional copies of hearings on "Organizing for National Security";

S. Res. 307. Resolution to print, with illustrations, a study entitled "Exports, Imports, and the United States Balance of International Payments," prepared by Dr. Howard S. Piquet; and

S. Res. 310. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures for hearings before the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 302. Resolution to print for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare a staff report on labor-management relations on certain Federal projects;

S. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the final report and indexes to hearings and reports of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field; and

S. Res. 305. Resolution providing for a study of the uses of Government licensed media for the dissemination of political opinions, news, and so forth (Rept. No. 1342).

ELIZABETH M. HICKEY, EDWARD D. MURPHY, AND WALTER D. MURPHY

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 312) to pay a gratuity to Elizabeth M. Hickey, Edward D. Murphy, and Walter D. Murphy, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Elizabeth M. Hickey, daughter of James W. Murphy, and Edward D. Murphy and Walter D. Murphy, sons of James W. Murphy, an Official Reporter of Debates and Proceedings of the United States Senate at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to four months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ILLYENE MARDEN, VERA DAVIS, RAY McGUIGAN, AND ART McGUIGAN

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 313) to pay a gratuity to Illyene Marden, Vera Davis, Ray McGuigan, and Art McGuigan, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Illyene Marden and Vera Davis, nieces of John J. Kenney, and Ray McGuigan and Art McGuigan, nephews of John J. Kenney, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to two months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

MARY A. RUESCH

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 314) to pay a gratuity to Mary A. Ruesch, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary A. Ruesch, sister of Belva M. Ratchford, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to seven months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ELLA JOHNSON

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 315) to pay a gratuity to Ella Johnson, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay,

from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Ella Johnson, widow of Robert Johnson, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

CONNIE YOUNG

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 316) to pay a gratuity to Connie Young, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Connie Young, widow of Charlie A. Young, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

MARY NELL SISSON

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 317) to pay a gratuity to Mary Nell Sisson, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary Nell Sisson, widow of W. D. Sisson, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to three months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PRINTING OF 61ST ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 318) to print the 61st annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1958, as a Senate document, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the sixty-first annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1958, be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document.

PRINTING OF 62D ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 319) to print the 62d Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1959, as a Senate document, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sixty-second Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1959, be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document.

AUTHORIZATION TO PRINT A REVISED EDITION OF THE "ELECTION LAW GUIDEBOOK"

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 320) to authorize the printing of a revised edition of the "Election Law Guidebook," which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That a revised edition of Senate Document Numbered 97 of the Eighty-fifth Congress, entitled "Election Law Guidebook," be printed as a Senate document.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of March 1960. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, MARCH 1960

INTRODUCTION

This is the fourth in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories under the Department of Agriculture, General Services Administration, and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. It is for the month of March 1960.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the agencies involved.

The three agencies reported that as of March 1, 1960, the cost value of materials in their stockpile inventories totaled $15,638,231,000 and as of March 31, 1960, they totaled $15,603,074,000, a net decrease of $35,157,000 reflecting acquisitions, disposals, adjustments, etc., during the month.

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantities of commodities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, and 3, but the cost value figures are summarized by agency and program as follows:

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories

[In thousands]

Agency and program	Beginning of month, Mar. 1, 1960	End of month, Mar. 31, 1960	Net change, reflecting acquisitions, disposals, adjustments, etc.
Department of Agriculture:			
Price support program:			
Agricultural commodities	$6,980,146	$6,933,542	−$46,604
Exchange commodities—strategic and critical materials	79,544	95,349	+15,805
Total, price support program	7,059,690	7,028,891	−30,799
Defense Production Act program	3	3	
Total, Department of Agriculture	7,059,693	7,028,894	−30,799
General Services Administration:			
Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile	6,193,619	6,188,123	−5,496
Federal Facilities Corporation, tin inventory	9,519	9,519	
Defense Production Act program	1,449,587	1,450,833	+1,246
Supplemental stockpile	693,767	693,546	−221
Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit	60,196	60,196	
Total, General Services Administration	8,406,688	8,402,218	−4,470
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization: Civil defense stockpile	171,850	171,962	+112
Grand total	15,638,231	15,603,074	−35,157

Detailed tables in this report show opening inventories at the beginning of the month in quantity and cost, transactions during the month, and the closing inventories at the end of the month. Each inventory is shown by commodity except the national stockpile, for which commodity detailed is classified.

Pertinent information and explanation are set forth in notes accompanying the respective tables. Statutory authority and program descriptions are shown in the appendix to the report.

The inventories covered by the report are tabulated in detail as follows:

Table 1: Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, March 1960: Including agricultural commodities, strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter, and special acquisitions under the Defense Production Act.

Table 2: Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, March 1960: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile.

Table 3: Civil defense stockpile inventory under the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, March 1960.

TABLE 1.—*Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, March 1960: Including agricultural commodities, strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter, and special acquisitions under the Defense Production Act*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Department of Agriculture defines the content of the columns as follows:

Program and commodity: Lists each commodity in the form in which it exists when extended support, and in some instances in a form to which the supported commodity is processed or converted to increase marketability. The commodities are grouped under the appropriate statutory subclassifications as "Basic," "Designated nonbasic," "Other nonbasic," and "Exchange."

Unit of measure: The applicable unit used in the accounting records and reports of the Corporation.

Inventory, beginning of month: Quantity: In number of units. Cost value: All inventories are recorded in the accounts at cost. "Cost value" is comprised of the initial cost of the commodity plus storage, handling, transportation, and accessorial expenses paid or accrued up to the date of reporting. The initial cost of inventories acquired by delivery of collateral securing loans is the unpaid balance of the notes plus storage and other charges advanced, any equities due or paid to producers on warehouse-stored collateral (by Public Law 85-835, and beginning with 1959 crop production, the Corporation will not make equity payments to borrowers on unredeemed price support loan collateral, title to which it acquires on or after maturity of the loans), and the net value of any quantity or quality differences determined upon delivery of farm-stored collateral. Amounts paid to lending agencies participating in the loan program for crop years prior to 1958 were recorded as a part of inventory cost.

Adjustments: Warehouse settlements, exchanges and transfers (net): Warehouse settlements include the net differences in quantity and/or value represented by the net of overdeliveries, premiums, underdeliveries, and discounts arising from movement of commodities. Exchanges represent the net change in quantity and/or value for inventories exchanged or in process of exchange. On completed exchanges, the change in value represents differentials due to location, quality, and quantity. Unprocessed commodities removed from inventory for conversion or processing (on a contractual or fee basis and excluding conditional sales) are included as a reduction of inventory. Processed commodities acquired as a result of this conversion or processing are included as an addition to inventory.

Acquisitions: As reflected in accounting records and reports; and includes commodities acquired by delivery of collateral securing loans, commodities purchased under terms of purchase agreements, commodities purchased directly from producers or processors as a part of the support operation but not under purchase agreements; and processed commodities acquired by purchases which offset conditional sales of unprocessed commodities from inventory. The cost value of acquisitions is described under the explanation of the cost value of inventory.

Carrying charges added to investment after acquisition: Total costs of storage, handling, transportation, and other accessorial expenses incurred during the month.

Disposals: As reflected in accounting records and reports. Inventory transactions generally are recorded on the basis of transfer of title. Disposition commitments are not reflected in the accounts. Cost value: Represents acquisition value plus applicable amount of carrying charges. The amount of cost allocated to commodities removed from inventory is determined with the view of retaining in the inventory accounts the cost of commodities remaining on hand. The cost allocated to commodities removed from price support inventory is generally computed on the basis of average unit cost of the commodity reflected in the inventory accounts for the applicable crop year and general storage location. In the case of commodities generally stored commingled (e.g., bulk grains and bulk oils) the crop year is determined on the first-in, first-out basis. In the case of commodities stored in identified lots, the crop year is determined by lot identification.

Inventory, end of month: Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Mar. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Mar. 31, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Carrying charges added to investment after acquisition	Disposals		
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Price support program:												
Agricultural commodities:												
Basic commodities:												
Corn	Bushel	1,222,851	$2,163,865	−152	−$236	−282	−$356	$12,850	12,511	$28,752	1,209,906	$2,147,371
Cornmeal	Pound					65,265	2,493	−1	65,265	2,492		
Cotton, extra long staple	Bale	54	15,398					23		60	54	15,361
Cotton, upland	do	5,817	1,016,876			49	7,720	1,650	307	53,615	5,559	972,631
Peanuts, farmers' stock	Pound	26,793	2,601	−4,829	−699	77,215	6,962	456	8,014	628	91,165	8,692
Peanuts, shelled	do	70,677	11,578	+4,829	+699	3,943	483	108	7,566	1,155	71,883	11,713
Rice, milled	Hundredweight	3,402	36,929			(1)	−1	259	539	6,125	2,863	31,062
Rice, rough	do	2,382	13,647	(1)	−1	4,576	22,098	292	1,067	6,138	5,891	29,898
Tobacco	Pound	4,203	2,910			1,839	1,129	2	4,001	2,625	2,041	1,416
Wheat	Bushel	1,085,205	2,843,972	+272	+706	2,788	5,297	18,138	13,775	46,589	1,074,490	2,821,524
Wheat flour	Pound	60	3			185,802	9,966	−3	185,802	9,963	60	3
Total basic commodities			6,107,779		+469		55,791	33,774		158,142		6,039,671
Designated nonbasic commodities:												
Barley	Bushel	61,378	73,872	−47	−42	102	93	1,263	1,740	2,791	59,693	72,395
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	268,468	712,790	+147	+273	2	6	7,266	563	1,461	268,054	718,874
Honey	Pound	1,352	144					37	321	50	1,031	131
Milk and butterfat:												
Butter	do	21,786	12,798			29,439	17,047	255	6,976	4,185	44,249	25,915
Cheese	do	16,339	5,823					147	4,686	1,802	11,653	4,168
Milk, dried	do	113,767	16,429			83,194	11,625	710	23,138	3,822	173,823	24,942
Milk, fluid	do					16,712	685		16,712	685		
Oats	Bushel	13,650	10,207	−62	−42	2,876	2,069	414	2,407	2,340	14,057	10,308
Rye	do	2,870	3,730	+4	+2	3	4	56	68	125	2,809	3,667
Tung oil	Pound	25,495	5,464	−19	−4			16	1,482	319	23,994	5,157
Total, designated nonbasic commodities.			841,257		+187		31,529	10,164		17,580		865,557
Other nonbasic commodities:												
Beans, dry, edible	Hundredweight	(1)	2			181	1,159	(1)		(1)	181	1,161
Flaxseed	Bushel	7	19	+2	+5	−1	−7	19	1	16	7	20
Linseed oil	Pound	55,616	6,707					20			55,616	6,727
Rosin	do							3		3		
Soybeans	Bushel	10,579	24,382	−2	−16	22	−24	138	1,842	4,074	8,757	20,406
Total, other nonbasic commodities			31,110		−11		1,128	180		4,093		28,314
Total, agricultural commodities			6,980,146		+645		88,448	44,118		179,815		6,933,542
Exchange commodities: [2] Strategic and critical materials: [2]												
Aluminum oxide, abrasive, crude	Pound	38,450	2,555			2,453	127	7			40,903	2,689
Antimony, metal	do	580	135			220	50				800	185
Asbestos, amosite	do	4,796	607					3			4,796	610
Asbestos, crocidolite	do	4,040	665								4,040	665
Bauxite	do	1,008,165	5,847			755,009	4,931	58		28	1,763,174	10,808
Bismuth	do					260	546				260	546
Beryllium copper master alloy	do	455	908			279	561	−4		−3	734	1,468
Borate	Carat	1,000	2,550			34	86				1,034	2,636
Cadmium	Pound	277	350								277	350
Chrome ore, chemical grade	do	151,344	1,097			27,109	460	19			178,453	1,576
Chrome ore, refractory grade	do	11,812	156					4			11,812	160
Chrome ore, Turkish, metallurgical	do	46,972	1,235				−1				46,972	1,234
Chromium metal	do	772	743			547	524	7		4	1,319	1,270
Colemanite, Turkish boron minerals	do	11,491	304				−8	5		2	11,491	299
Columbite	do					123	87				123	87

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, March 1960: Including agricultural commodities, strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter, and special acquisitions under the Defense Production Act*—Continued

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Mar. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Mar. 31, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Carrying charges added to investment after acquisition	Disposals		
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Price support program—Continued												
Exchange commodities, etc.—Continued												
Diamonds	Carat	956	$13,365			36	$601				992	$13,966
Ferrochrome, high carbon	Pound	82,266	14,747			10,412	1,603	$110		$23	92,678	16,437
Ferrochrome, low carbon	do	36,525	7,836			655	143	16		3	37,180	7,992
Ferromanganese	do	1,492	142						1,492		1,492	142
Fluorspar, acid grade	do	14,972	274			21,350	385	7		5	36,322	661
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade	do	65,057	931								65,057	931
Lead	do	10,047	1,022					−1		1	10,047	1,020
Manganese ore, chemical grade	do	49,852	2,060								49,852	2,060
Manganese ore, metallurgical grade	do	319,705	6,531			122,617	2,445	40			442,322	9,016
Manganese ore, natural, battery grade	do	30,769	1,455			6,666	338	1			37,435	1,794
Mica	do	44	80								44	80
Quartz crystals	do	113	1,749			−22	−353	5			91	1,401
Silicon carbide	do	8,708	805			7,054	641	19		14	15,762	1,451
Thorium nitrate	do	1,630	3,715					5		1	1,630	3,719
Tin	do	5,347	5,417			2,265	2,289	1	2	1	7,610	7,706
Titanium sponge	do	1,500	1,941				121	3			1,500	2,065
Zinc	do	2,851	322					40		37	2,851	325
Total, strategic and critical materials			79,544				15,576	345		116		95,349
Total price support program			7,059,690		+$645		104,024	44,463		179,931		7,028,891
Defense Production Act inventory: Cotton, American-Egyptian	Bale	(1)	3								(1)	3
Total, Department of Agriculture			7,059,693		+645		104,024	44,463		179,931		7,028,894

[1] Less than 500.

[2] See appendix, p. 14, for notes relating to reporting of strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 2.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, March 1960: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The General Services Administration defines the content of the columns as follows:

Program and commodity: Identifies the program and the minerals, metals, fibers, and oils acquired under the program.

Unit of measure: The standard weight or measure of minerals, metals, fibers, and oils determined to be the stockpile unit of measure.

Inventory, beginning of month: Opening inventory represents quantity and cost of material in storage at the beginning of the accounting period.

Adjustments: Represents increases (+) or decreases (−) of material in inventory other than increases from acquisitions or decreases from disposals. Decreases occur from theft, loss incurred while in transit to stockpile location, repacking from one type of container to another, beneficiation of a low-grade material to a higher grade, and the removal of material for sampling and testing purposes. Increases occur from return of material previously removed for sampling and testing purposes and from quantities received at storage locations in excess of quantities billed by the contractor. A new chemical analysis of the materials may cause an increase or decrease where the weights are based on chemical and moisture content. Increases or decreases are also made from findings of audits of inventory and accounting records.

Acquisitions: For the National Stockpile and Defense Production Act acquisitions include open market purchases at contract prices; intradepartmental transfers at market or appraised value at time of transfer; transportation to first permanent storage location; and, beneficiating and processing cost in upgrading materials. For the supplemental stockpile acquisitions include the market value or CCC's acquisition cost whichever is the lower at time of transfer from CCC.

Disposals: Cost of disposals are calculated at the average unit price of inventory at time of removal from inventory. For the national stockpile inventory disposals consist of sale of materials that by their nature would deteriorate if held in storage for lengths of time; and, sale of materials that have been determined to be obsolete or excess to the needs of Government. For the Defense Production Act inventory disposals consist of sale of materials that have been determined to be obsolete or excess to the needs of Government.

Inventory, end of month: Closing inventory represents quantity and cost of material in storage at the end of the accounting period.

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Mar. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Mar. 31, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
National stockpile total (classified detail omitted)			$6,193,619		+$2,742		$839		$9,077		$6,188,123
Federal Facilities Corporation: Total, tin	Long ton	4	9,519							4	9,519
Defense Production Act:											
Aluminum	Short ton	716	362,959			10	4,915			726	367,874
Asbestos, chrysotile	Short dry ton	2	2,103							2	2,103
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type	Long dry ton	1,370	18,168							1,370	18,168
Beryl	Short ton	2	1,005	(1)						2	1,005
Bismuth	Pound	23	52							23	52
Chromite, metallurgical grade	Short dry ton	805	29,229			11	404			816	29,632
Cobalt	Pound	21,073	44,747			2,402	4,302			23,475	49,049
Columbite	do	10,456	50,548		−252	35	167			10,491	50,463
Copper	Short ton	136	75,608							136	75,608
Cryolite	do	39	10,676							39	10,676
Fluorspar, acid grade	Short dry ton	20	1,394							20	1,394
Graphite, lubricating	Short ton	1	178							1	178
Lead	do	8	3,150	(1)	−114					8	3,036
Manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide	Short dry ton	4	2,524							4	2,524
Manganese, metallurgical grade	do	2,981	169,905			31	1,956	34	819	2,979	171,042
Mica, muscovite block, strained and better	Pound	5,533	30,477			80	692			5,613	31,169
Mica, muscovite film	do	97	532			3	16			100	548

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 2.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, March 1960: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile*—Continued

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Mar. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Mar. 31, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Defense Production Act—Continued											
Nickel	Pound	139,371	$126,911			6,625	$4,737	9,369	$8,081	136,628	$123,567
Palladium	Troy ounce	8	177							8	177
Rare earth residue	Pound	6,086	653			96	9			6,181	662
Rutile	Short dry ton	8	1,475			1	112			8	1,587
Thorium	Pound	778	38	+13	+$1					791	39
Tantalite	do	1,529	9,734							1,529	9,734
Tin	Long ton	1	1,038							1	1,038
Titanium	Short ton	22	167,649		+4					22	167,653
Tungsten	Pound	79,810	325,461							79,810	325,461
Subtotal, DPA commodities			1,436,390		−362		17,310		8,899		1,444,439
Machine tools inventory:											
In storage	Tool	1	8,711					(1)	6,807	(1)	1,904
On lease	do	(1)	4,466							(1)	4,466
On loan	do	(1)	20				4			(1)	25
Subtotal, DPA machine tools			13,197				4		6,807		6,395
Total, Defense Production Act			1,449,587		−362		17,314		15,706		1,450,833
Supplemental stockpile:[2]											
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude	Short ton	101	12,784							101	12,784
Antimony, metal	do	7	3,973							7	3,973
Asbestos, chrysotile	Short dry ton	5	3,499							5	3,499
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type	Long dry ton	1,865	26,871	(1)	+1,785					1,865	28,656
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type	do	475	6,846		+455					475	7,300
Beryl	Short ton	7	14,268		−16					7	14,252
Bismuth	Pound	1,146	2,579							1,146	2,579
Cadmium	do	6,248	10,287		+192					6,248	10,479
Chromite, chemical grade	Short dry ton	17	11,067		−213					17	10,855
Chromite, metallurgical grade	do	1,032	162,464	+3	−292					1,035	162,172
Chromite, refractory grade	do	153	4,382							153	4,382
Cobalt	Pound	1,077	2,169							1,077	2,169
Colemanite	Long dry ton	40	1,571		+169					40	1,740
Columbite	Pound	34	190							34	190
Copper	Short ton	9	6,265		−3					9	6,262
Diamond, industrial; stones	Carat	7,010	91,823							7,010	91,823
Fluorspar, acid grade	Short dry ton	445	25,145		−680					445	24,465
Graphite, natural Ceylon, amorphous lump	do	1	341							1	341
Iodine	Pound	242	231							242	231
Lead	Short ton	192	52,810		−469					192	52,342
Manganese, battery grade, natural	Short dry ton	35	3,260		+53					35	3,313
Manganese, chemical grade, Type B	do	17	1,340							17	1,340
Manganese, metallurgical grade	do	1,048	100,513		−58					1,048	100,455
Mercury	Flask	16	3,397							16	3,397
Mica, muscovite block, strained and better	Pound	197	584							197	584
Mica, muscovite film	do	26	284		−81					26	203
Mica, muscovite splittings	do	4,565	5,457		+126					4,565	5,584
Palladium	Troy ounce	488	8,799		−1					488	8,798
Quartz crystals	Pound	82	1,099							82	1,099
Rare earths	Short dry ton	2	2,427							2	2,427
Ruthenium	Troy ounce	15	533							15	533
Selenium	Pound	60	419							60	419
Silicon carbide, crude	Short ton	53	10,523		−114					53	10,409
Tontalite	Pound	8	45							8	45
Thorium nitrate	do	1,200	2,698							1,200	2,698
Titanium	Short ton	5	21,879		−820					5	21,059
Tungsten	Pound	4,485	15,627							4,485	15,627
Zinc	Short ton	306	75,324		−256					306	75,068
Total, supplemental stockpile			693,767		−221						693,546
Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit:[2]											
Antimony, metal	Short ton	1	362							1	362
Bauxite	Long dry ton	398	5,801							398	5,801
Beryllium copper master alloy	Short ton	(1)	1,244							(1)	1,244
Cadmium	Pound	84	113							84	113
Chromium metal	Short ton	1	979							1	979
Colemanite	Long dry ton	5	275							5	275
Diamonds	Carat	2,149	24,149							2,149	24,149
Ferrochrome, high carbon	Short ton	11	3,962							11	3,962
Ferrochrome, low carbon	do	5	2,153							5	2,153
Ferromanganese	do	1	167							1	167
Fluorspar, acid grade	Short dry ton	19	718							19	718
Lead	Short ton	25	4,899							25	4,899
Mica	Pound	499	860							499	860
Palladium	Troy ounce	60	1,016							60	1,016
Selenium	Pound	97	618							97	618
Silicon carbide, crude	Short dry ton	11	1,944							11	1,944
Thorium nitrate	Pound	1,254	2,837							1,254	2,837
Tin	Long ton	2	4,325							2	4,325
Zinc	Short ton	16	3,776							16	3,776
Total, supplemental stockpile inventory in transit.			60,196								60,196
Total General Services Administration			8,406,688		+2,159		18,154		24,783		8,402,218

[1] Less than 500.

[2] See appendix, p. 14, for notes relating to reporting of strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense stockpile inventory under the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, March 1960*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization defines the content of the columns as follows:

Commodity: Composite groups of many different items.

Unit of measure: Shown only for engineering supply units and hospital functional units; not feasible by other composite groups.

Inventory-quantity: Shown only for two items, namely, engineering supply units and civil defense emergency hospital functional units. It is not feasible to furnish quantity figures on the other commodity groups because they are composite groups of many different items. To report quantities, it would be necessary to list several hundred different items.

Inventory-cost value: The dollar value figures on commodities in the civil defense stockpile inventory reflect essentially the actual costs of the commodities. No transportation, delivery, or storage costs are included. However, these statements should be qualified by the fact that the total inventory includes Government excess property items valued at over $2 million (a little more than 1 percent of the total), which were acquired by Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization at little or no cost. These materials are received into the inventory on one of three value bases: Items similar or identical to items purchased in the open market for stockpile purposes are accepted at the average unit cost for similar items purchased; the remaining items are accepted at a current fair value, if such has been determined, or at the original acquisition cost to the Federal Government, if a current fair value has not been determined.

Adjustments: Represents inventory pricing adjustments resulting from recalculation of fixed average unit prices, transfers of commodities from one composite group to another, etc., during the month.

Acquisitions: Materials placed in inventory during the month, including return to inventory of items previously released from inventory for reworking, etc. Value stated in terms of actual costs of the commodities.

Disposals: Materials removed from inventory during the month, including items released from inventory for reworking, etc. Value stated in terms of average unit costs.

Inventory at end of month: Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Mar. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Mar. 31, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Engineering stockpile (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe and fittings).	10-mile units	(1)	$6,625		[2] +$181					(1)	$6,806
Medical bulk stocks and associated items at OCDM locations.			103,285		−559		$451		[3] $9		103,167
Medical bulk stocks at manufacturer locations			4,497						[3] 70		4,427
Chemical and biological equipment			1,193		−324				[4] 12		856
Radiological equipment			6,118				28		220		5,926
Civil defense emergency hospital functional costs	each	2	38,506							2	38,506
Replenishment units for hospitals			11,627		+647						12,273
Total, civil defense stockpile			171,850		−55		480		311		171,962

[1] Less than 500.
[2] Includes adjustment necessitated by price reevaluation.
[3] Inventory write-off (certificate of destruction).
[4] Granted to States and to other Federal agencies.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

APPENDIX

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The price support program

Price-support operations are carried out under the Corporation's charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714), in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958 and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1962. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations, and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producer's commodities serve as collateral for price-support loans. With limited exceptions, price-support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgaged collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursements for price-support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program result from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loan, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with sections 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and other applicable legislation, particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour, and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales of livestock feed in emergency areas.

Defense Production Act program

The programs authorized by and certified to the Secretary of Agriculture under the provisions of the Defense Production Act are administered and operated through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

All present and past programs involve the acquisition and disposition of agricultural commodities or products thereof. Commodities acquired are entered in and maintained through the inventory accounts of the Corporation. As the commodities are disposed of, the realized gains or losses are recorded by CCC as a receivable against the Secretary of Agriculture. Administrative expenses of the Corporation are recorded in this receivable; and interest is computed monthly on the total amount of CCC's investment at the same rate per annum as that paid by the Corporation on its borrowings from the Treasury.

The net total of realized gains and losses, CCC's administrative expenses, and CCC's interest expense represented a payable item under the revolving fund.

The recording of realized gains or losses represents a cash basis, inasmuch as the amounts recorded represent the net results of actual dispositions. Values of inventories on hand at reporting date are not included in these fund accounts and therefore allowances for losses are not included. Administrative and interest expenses are accounted for on an accrual basis. All values are at cost.

When a program is completed, the Secretary of Agriculture secures funds by issuing interest-bearing notes to the Treasury and reimburses CCC. Interest on the notes issued by the Secretary is accrued monthly, compounded semi-annually, as an accrued liability of the revolving fund.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION—STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCKPILING AND RELATED PROGRAMS

1. National stockpile

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. GSA is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance. These functions are performed in accordance with directives issued by the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OCDM. In addition, GSA, is responsible for disposing of those

strategic and critical materials which OCDM determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V–7, issued by the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

2. Tin received from Federal Facilities Corporation

Public Law 608, 84th Congress (50 U.S.C. 98 note), provided, among other things, for the continuation of operation of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., from June 30, 1956, until January 31, 1957. It provided also that all tin acquired by the Federal Facilities Corporation by reason of such extension should be transferred to GSA.

3. Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, GSA is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

4. Supplemental stockpile

As a result of a delegation of authority from OCDM (32A C.F.R., ch. I, DMO V–4) GSA is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191–2195), which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION—CIVIL DEFENSE STOCKPILE PROGRAM

This stockpiling program, under authorization of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, section 201(h), is designed to provide some of the most essential medical and engineering supplies for emergency use in event of enemy attack. Materials and equipment not normally available or not present in the quantities needed to cope with such conditions are stockpiled at strategic locations. The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization stockpile procured to date including medical supplies, emergency engineering equipment, and radiological instruments is stored and maintained in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of medical and general storage facilities.

EXPLANATORY NOTES RELATING TO THE REPORTING OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS ACQUIRED BY EXCHANGE OR BARTER OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Surplus agricultural commodities in the Commodity Credit Corporation's price-support inventory may be exchanged or bartered for strategic and critical materials under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480), and other basic legislation including the CCC Charter Act, as amended, the Agricultural Act of 1954, and the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Except for small amounts which may go to the national stockpile, the strategic and critical materials acquired by Commodity Credit Corporation under the barter program are transferred to the supplemental stockpile.

Direct appropriations reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for materials so transferred from the price-support inventory.

The General Services Administration is charged with the custody and management of strategic and critical materials, and becomes the responsible reporting agency when title to these bartered materials is placed in the supplemental stockpile.

For purposes of this report, strategic and critical materials acquired by barter may appear in three inventories, reflecting the stages of the transfer of title.

1. The Department of Agriculture reports those to which the Commodity Credit Corporation still has title, prior to transfer to the supplemental stockpile.

2. The General Services Administration reports those which have been transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation exchange inventory in two parts:

A. Materials for which title is "in transit" from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile.

B. Materials for which title has passed to the supplemental stockpile.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost value of materials in nine Federal stockpile inventories as reported by the Department of Agriculture, General Services Administration and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, on March 31, 1960, totaled $15,603,074,000. March activity in these stockpiles resulted in a net reduction of $35,157,000.

The net change in these stockpile inventories reflects acquisitions, disposals and adjustments. The March activity and the end-of-the-month totals are summarized as follows:

[In thousands]

Inventories by agency and program	Cost value, March 1960	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Department of Agriculture:		
Price support program:		
1. Agricultural commodities	−$46,604	$6,933,542
2. Exchange, strategic, and critical materials	+15,805	95,349
Total, price support program	−30,799	7,028,891
3. Defense Production Act program		3
Total, Department of Agriculture	−30,799	7,028,894
General Services Administration—		
Strategic and critical materials:		
4. National stockpile	−5,496	6,188,123
5. Federal Facilities Corporation, tin inventory		9,519
6. Defense Production Act program	+1,246	1,450,833
7. Supplemental stockpile	−221	693,546
8. Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit		60,196
Total, General Services Administration	−4,470	8,402,218
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization:		
9. Civil defense stockpile	+112	171,962
Grand total	−35,157	15,603,074

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies involved as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

INCREASES AND DECREASES

Major net decreases in cost value during the month were reported as follows: $44 million in cotton, $22 million in wheat, and $16.5 million in corn.

These decreases were partially offset by major net increases including: $20 million in milk and butterfat, $12 million in aluminum and aluminum ores, and $10 million in rice.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Of 23 agricultural commodities in Commodity Credit's $6.9 billion price support inventory on March 31, 1960, those leading in cost value include:

Wheat, with 1.1 billion bushels at a cost of $2.8 billion;

Corn, with 1.2 billion bushels at a cost of $2.1 billion; and

Cotton, with more than 5.6 million bales at a cost of $988 million.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Strategic and critical materials are shown in 6 inventories totaling $8.5 billion, including the $6.2 billion national stockpile for which itemized detail is classified. Combined figures from the other five inventories show materials (in all grades and forms) leading in cost value as follows:

Aluminum, bauxite, etc., with 5.8 million tons at a cost of $454 million; tungsten, with 84 million pounds at a cost of $341 million, and manganese and manganese ores, with 4.4 million tons at a cost of $292 million.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

The civil defense stockpile is shown in seven composite groups totaling $172 million. Nearly 63 percent is in medical bulk stocks valued at $108 million.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 94 officers for temporary and permanent appointment to brigadier and major general in the Air Force. I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations placed on the Executive Calendar are as follows:

Maj. Gen. Robert B. Landry, and sundry other officers, for temporary and permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably a total of 2,301 nominations in the Army and Air Force in the grade of major and below. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk, for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations ordered to lie on the desk are as follows:

Arthur C. Aho, Jr., and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Air Force.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by

unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 3524. A bill to provide for a Commission on Presidential Office Space; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3525. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit the exclusion, in computing the average monthly wage of certain veterans, of certain periods during which they were on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3526. A bill for the relief of Rene Tibi and Emile Jarmon Tibi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3527. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code for the protection of members, officers, and employees of the Interstate Commerce Commission;

S. 3528. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to provide the Federal Communications Commission with certain additional authority in enforcing the provisions of such act; and

S. 3529. A bill to amend Sec. 302(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 747), to establish the wartime relationships between the Federal Aviation Agency and the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 3530. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to maintain records of fraudulent and other unethical business practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 3531. A bill for the relief of Ok Soon Choi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 3532. A bill to provide for the striking of medal in commemoration of Century 21 Exposition to be held in Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 3533. A bill to protect farm and ranch operators making certain land use changes under the Great Plains conservation program against loss of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 3534. A bill to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S.J. Res. 191. Joint resolution providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national monument; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

ELIZABETH M. HICKEY, EDWARD D. MURPHY, AND WALTER D. MURPHY

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 312) to pay a gratuity to Elizabeth M. Hickey, Edward D. Murphy, and Walter D. Murphy, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ILLYENE MARDEN, VERA DAVIS, RAY McGUIGAN, AND ART McGUIGAN

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 313) to pay a gratuity to Illyene Marden, Vera Davis, Ray McGuigan, and Art McGuigan, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HAYDEN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

MARY A. RUESCH

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 314) to pay a gratuity to Mary A. Ruesch, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HAYDEN, under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ELLA JOHNSON

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 315) to pay a gratuity to Ella Johnson, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HAYDEN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

CONNIE YOUNG

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 316) to pay a gratuity to Connie Young, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HAYDEN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

MARY NELL SISSON

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 317) to pay a gratuity to Mary Nell Sisson, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HAYDEN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

PRINTING OF 61ST ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 318) to print the 61st Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1958, as a Senate document, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HAYDEN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

PRINTING OF 62D ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 319) to print the 62d Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1959, as a Senate document, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HAYDEN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AUTHORIZATION TO PRINT A REVISED EDITION OF THE "ELECTION LAW GUIDEBOOK"

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 320) to authorize the printing of a revised edition of the "Election Law Guidebook," which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HAYDEN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL OFFICE SPACE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for a Commission on Presidential Office Space. The bill is cosponsored by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], who were members of the Advisory Commission which studied this problem in 1957. The bill would authorize a Commission to initiate and carry out features of the program recommended by the Advisory Commission.

Attention has again been called to the matter in the President's message of May 3, which said:

> I add two proposals of special importance to future Presidents of the United States. First is provision of presidential office space. The Congress has met its own space requirements and those of the Supreme Court. Requirements for modern office facilities for the President, his staff, and the news media assigned to the White House are no less necessary and urgent.

Mr. President, I am introducing the bill at this time and urging prompt consideration in the belief that this is the session of Congress which should take action.

President Eisenhower, obviously, will not be in the Chief Executive's Office to enjoy any space improvement. He has made this recommendation for more

usable office space as a result of his own experience of the need—and he wants his successors to have the benefit. More properly, perhaps, I should say that it is the Nation that will have the benefits, as the Study Commission found, which can flow from adequate and well-arranged office space for the executive staff.

It is also appropriate that action be taken now, so that any incoming President, whoever he may be, will not be subject to any cheap criticism of seeking space for his own convenience.

I hope the bill will receive early attention by the Committee on Public Works so that action can be completed in this session of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3524) to provide for a Commission on Presidential Office Space, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. HRUSKA), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO PROTECTION OF MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code for the protection of members, officers, and employees of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3527) to amend section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code for the protection of members, officers, and employees of the Interstate Commerce Commission, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1960.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAGNUSON: I am submitting herewith for your consideration 20 copies of a draft bill, together with a statement of justification therefor, which would amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, to protect members, officers, and employees of the Commission against assault while engaged in the performance of their official duties.

Your assistance in having this bill introduced would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. WINCHELL,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

JUSTIFICATION

The purpose of the attached draft bill is to protect the members, officers, and employees of the Interstate Commerce Commission against assaults while engaged in or on account of the performance of their official duties.

The present provisions of section 111 of title 18 of the United States Code make it a Federal crime to attack any person designated in section 1114 of the same title while engaged in or on account of the performance of his duties. Those designated are Federal judges, U.S. attorneys, post office inspectors, officers and employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Bureau of Narcotics, the Secret Service, and certain other Federal officers and employees. The general intent of these sections is to create a strong deterrent against physical attacks on persons exposed to them because of the nature of their official duties and activities. Members, officers, and employees of the Interstate Commerce Commission, however, are not covered therein.

The proposed bill goes somewhat beyond the general tenor of section 1114 insofar as it would be made to apply to Commission personnel. It would embrace all persons in the Commission and not just those whose activities are most likely to result in their being attacked. To restrict coverage in the bill by enumerating specific classes would be difficult and impractical. For example, the Bureau of Safety and Service has safety and service agents, safety supervisors, locomotive inspectors, and hours-of-service inspectors; the Bureau of Motor Carriers has district supervisors, safety inspectors, and rate agents; the Bureau of Inquiry and Compliance has special agents; the Bureau of Water Carriers and Freight Forwarders has district supervisors; and the Bureau of Accounts, Cost Finding, and Valuation has accountants—all of whom regularly conduct inspections and investigations in the field. These job titles or classifications are of course subject to change. If changed, the individuals affected might well be excluded from protection by any detailed and exclusive statutory designation of persons covered.

The above-mentioned employees do not constitute an exhaustive list of the categories of Commission personnel requiring Federal protection, for it is not only the "field employees" who are authorized to conduct inspections and investigations. Sections 12(1), 20(5), 220(d), 313(f), and 412(d) of the Interstate Commerce Act authorize the Commission or any duly authorized special agent, accountant, or examiner thereof to enter upon, to inspect and examine any and all lands, buildings, and equipment of carriers and other persons subject to the Interstate Commerce Act and related acts, and to inspect and copy any and all accounts, books, records, memorandums, correspondence, and other documents of carriers, and other persons subject to the act. By an order of the Commission dated March 24, 1959, the duties of the following officers included those of special agent, accountant, or examiner with the corresponding authority to conduct inspection as described above:

Directors and Assistant Directors of the Bureau of Accounts, Cost Finding, and Valuation, Bureau of Inquiry and Compliance, Bureau of Motor Carriers, Bureau of Safety and Service, and Bureau of Water Carriers and Freight Forwarders.

Moreover, at times, the members of the Commission as well as its permanent staff of hearing examiners conduct hearings in the field. These are generally not held in a courthouse, so that court officers are not present to maintain order and respect. It is conceivable that an assault might occur at such a hearing.

The Commission's need for protection is aptly illustrated by a recent occurrence in Fort Worth, Tex. On March 8, 1960, one of the Commission's district supervisors was investigating alleged illegal transportation from Houston to Fort Worth. In the process he called upon a consignee to obtain his shipping records for inspection. On returning the records the following day, he was assaulted by the irate consignee who objected to this lawful inspection. A similar assault was made on a Commission supervisor investigating alleged illegal transportation, again in Fort Worth, in March of 1948.

While these are the only instances of consummated assaults, the activities of many of the Commission's employees are performed under conditions where physical violence could occur. The following incident exemplifies the explosive atmosphere which may surround Commission inspections and investigations. In February of 1958 a special agent of the Commission was investigating alleged false claims by a consignee against a railroad for damage to his interstate shipment. The consignee had a local reputation for employing "goon tactics" to achieve his ends. Furthermore, the claims adjuster for the railroad had reported to the special agent that the consignee had made considerable threats of physical violence in soliciting payment of the claims. With this as a background it was not unreasonable for the agent to believe that he, too, might be threatened or attacked by the consignee and his "goons." He wasn't—but he could have been.

Enactment of this proposed amendment would remedy the existing situation under which the members, officers, and employees of the Interstate Commerce Commission are performing their duties without the benefit of the deterrent protection against assaults afforded by Federal statute to certain other Federal officers and employees.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY FOR FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to provide the Federal Communications Commission with certain additional authority in enforcing the provisions of such Act. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3528) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to provide the Federal Communications Commission with certain additional authority in enforcing the provisions of such Act, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 18, 1960.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Federal Communications Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program proposed

amendments which would amend the Communications Act to authorize the Commission:

(a) To suspend licenses or impose forfeitures in appropriate cases (47 U.S.C. 312, new 313, and renumber present 313–329); and

(b) To issue temporary restraining orders in appropriate cases (proposed new section to Title 5 of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. ——).

Attached are copies of our justification and proposed language to which we hope the Congress will give favorable attention. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the submission of this material to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK W. FORD,
Chairman.

JUSTIFICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE COMMISSION TO SUSPEND LICENSES OR IMPOSE FORFEITURES IN APPROPRIATE CASES

The only sanctions presently available to the Commission, except in certain cases involving common carrier matters and licenses of ships radio stations, is revocation of the station license. This sanction is drastic. The revocation of a license to operate a broadcast station can have a far-reaching effect on the community it serves as well as upon the licensee of the station.

The current problems which have recently come to light in broadcasting make it apparent that some less drastic but effectively deterring sanctions should be available to the Commission. Accordingly, it is recommended that the Communications Act be amended to authorize suspension of station licenses and construction permits.

We would accomplish this by modifying section 312 of the Communications Act to read as follows:

"SEC. 312. (a) Any station license or construction permit may be revoked or suspended for a period not to exceed ninety days, and any such license or construction permit may be revoked or suspended:

"(1) for false statements knowingly made either in the application or in any statement of fact whch may be required pursuant to section 308;

"(2) because of conditions coming to the attention of the Commission which would warrant it in refusing to grant a license or permit on an original application;

"(3) for willful or repeated failure to operate substantially as set forth in the license;

"(4) for willful or repeated violation of, or willful or repeated failure to observe, any provision of this Act or any rule or regulation of the Commission authorized by this Act or by a treaty ratified by the United States;

"(5) for violation of or failure to observe any cease-and-desist order issued by the Commission under this section.

"(b) Where any person (1) has failed to operate substantially as set forth in a license, or (2) has violated or has failed to observe any of the provisions of this Act, or (3) has violated or failed to observe any rule or regulation of the Commission authorized by this Act or by a treaty ratified by the United States, the Commission may order such person to cease and desist from such action.

"(c) Before revoking or suspending a license or a permit pursuant to subsection (a), or issuing a cease-and-desist order pursuant to subsection (b), the Commission shall serve upon the licensee, permittee, or person involved, an order to show cause why an order of revocation or suspension or a cease-and-desist order should not be issued. Any such order to show cause shall contain a statement of the matters with respect to which the Commission is inquiring and shall call upon said licensee, permittee, or person to appear before the Commission at a time and place stated in the order, but in no event less than thirty days after the receipt of such order, and give evidence upon the matter specified therein; except that where safety of life or property is involved, the Commission may provide in the order for a shorter period. If after hearing, or a waiver thereof, the Commission determines that an order of revocation or suspension or a cease-and-desist order should issue, it shall issue such order, which shall include a statement of the findings of the Commission and the grounds and reasons therefor and specify the effective date of the order, and shall cause the same to be served on said licensee, permittee, or person.

"(d) In any case where a hearing is conducted pursuant to the provisions of this section, both the burden of proceeding with the introduction of evidence and burdens of proof shall be upon the Commission.

"(e) The provisions of section 9(b) of the Administrative Procedure Act which apply with respect to the institution of any proceeding for the revocation of a license or permit shall apply also with respect to the institution, under this section, of any proceeding for the issuance of a cease-and-desist order."

The Commission is of the view that authority to impose a monetary forfeiture on broacast licensees would provide it with an effective tool in dealing with violations in situations where either revocation or suspension does not appear to be appropriate. The Commission has already submitted legislation to the Congress, designed to provide it with authority to impose forfeitures for violations in services other than broadcasting (S. 1737 approved by the Senate August 21, 1959), so the proposal here submitted is limited only to permittees and licensees of broadcast stations. It is suggested that a new section 313 be added to the Communications Act to read as follows:

"In any case where the licensee or permittee of a broadcast station has willfully or repeatedly failed to operate his station substantially as set forth in his license; or has willfully or repeatedly violated or failed to observe any of the provisions of this Act or of any rule or regulation of this Commission authorized by this Act or by any treaty ratified by the United States; or has willfully or repeatedly violated or failed to observe any cease-and-desist orders issued by this Commission; the Commission may order such licensee or permittee to forfeit to the United State a sum not to exceed $1,000 for each day during which the Commissions finds that such violation or offense has occurred."

In order that the Commission might take advantage of the procedures already established in the Communications Act for the collection of forfeitures, subsection 504(b) should be amended by deleting the words (parts II and III of) from the first line of that subsection. The addition of the new section would necessitate the renumbering of existing sections 313 through 329 as sections 314 through 330.

These modifications would give the Commission authority to suspend a license or a construction permit for a period of not more than 90 days or, in lieu thereof in appropriate cases, to impose a forfeiture, payable to the Treasury of the United States, upon any licensee or permittee who deviates from the requirements of the Communications Act or any rule or regulation of the Commission. The proposal permits the Commission to vary the severity of the forfeiture to suit the nature of the offense, except that the proposal does not permit a forfeiture to exceed $1,000 for a particular offense. The proposal affords any person against whom a forfeiture is levied an opportunity to request remission or mitigation of such forfeiture. If, after consideration of any applications for remission or mitigation, the forfeiture is not paid, it would be recoverable by civil suit in an appropriate U.S. district court as provided in subsection 504(a) of the Communications Act.

JUSTIFICATION FOR AMENDMENT TO THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE ISSUANCE OF TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDERS IN APPROPRIATE CASES

Section 312 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, provides for the revocation of a station license upon making certain findings after notice and opportunity for hearing. That section also provides that the Commission may, after notice and opportunity for hearing, enter a cease-and-desist order against any person who (1) has failed to operate substantially as set forth in a license, or (2) has violated or failed to observe any of the provisions of this act, or (3) has violated or failed to observe any rule or regulation of the Commission authorized by this act or by a treaty ratified by the United States.

These sanctions are severe and the rights of the licensee are well protected by the hearing requirements of the act. In most cases this is as it should be; however, in some situations a more expeditious means of dealing with an undesirable situation appears to us to be in the public interest. The Federal Trade Commission is authorized in some situations to request the courts to enjoin or restrain an offending practice pending a final determination of the matter in an appropriate agency proceeding. In our view, comparable legislation for the Federal Communications Commission would be in the public interest. Accordingly, we recommend that a new section be added to title V of the Communications Act to read as follows:

"Whenever the Commission has reason to believe—

"(a) that any person or station licensee is engaged in, or is about to engage in, any willful violation of this Act or failure to observe any of the provisions of this Act or any rule or regulation of the Commission authorized by this Act or by a treaty ratified by the United States, or for repeated failure to operate substantially as set forth in the licensee's instrument of authorization, and

"(b) that the enjoining thereof pending the invoking of the provisions of section 312 of this Act and until a show cause order shall have been dismissed by the Commission or set aside by the court on review, or the order of the Commission to cease and desist made thereon has become final, would be in the public interest, convenience, or necessity, the Commission may, by any of the attorneys designated by it for such purpose, bring suit in a district court of the United States or in the United States court of any territory to enjoin such offense or violation. Upon proper showing a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction shall be granted without bond. Any such suit shall be brought in the district in which such person or licensee resides or transacts business."

This new section would enable the Commission to move more expeditiously in critical cases without depriving our licensees of due process.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WARTIME RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 302(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 747), to establish the wartime relationships between the Federal Aviation Agency and the Department of Defense. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from

the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3529) to amend section 302(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 747), to establish the wartime relationships between the Federal Aviation Agency and the Department of Defense, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1960.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In compliance with section 302(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a draft bill, "to amend section 302(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 747), to establish the wartime relationships between the Federal Aviation Agency and the Department of Defense."

The primary purpose of this legislation is to establish the wartime relationships between the Federal Aviation Agency and the Department of Defense. In addition to continuing the authority of the Administrator to develop plans for the effective discharge of Agency responsibilities in the event of war, this legislation specifically authorizes the President in time of war or national emergency to designate the Federal Aviation Agency organizationally intact as an adjunct of the Department of Defense, or to place selected elements of the Federal Aviation Agency under the operational control of the Secretary of Defense to the extent deemed necessary by the Secretary in the discharge of his responsibilities. The proposal also provides for the retransfer of the Agency and its elements out of the Department of Defense whenever the President so directs.

In the event of general war or a surprise attack on the United States, the continued operation of all air traffic control and air navigation facilities in the Federal Aviation Agency system would be essential to the accomplishment of military missions. Defense and retaliatory aircraft would rely on these facilities for guidance. The identification of friendly and unfriendly airborne vehicles would rest in large part on this Federal Aviation Agency system. The Federal Aviation Agency would supply the Air Defense Command with complete information concerning all aircraft movement over the United States, and would further provide weather and communication services to military air traffic.

Since these systems and services would be essential to the war effort, it is apparent that the Secretary of Defense, who has direct responsibility for all military operations, must have primary call upon them when the need arises. This legislation supplies the necessary authority for the President to designate the Federal Aviation Agency organizationally intact as an adjunct of the Department of Defense or to place selected elements of the Federal Aviation Agency under the operational control of the Secretary of Defense, and provides a vehicle for the retransfer out of the Department of Defense whenever the President so directs.

In addition, the legislation establishes the Administrator's responsibility when the Federal Aviation Agency functions as an adjunct of the Department of Defense. He will be responsible directly to the Secretary of Defense and subject to the Secretary's authority, direction and control, to the extent the Secretary deems necessary in the discharge of his wartime responsibilities.

It should be noted that the above provision limits the authority, direction and control of the Federal Aviation Agency by the Secretary of Defense to functional areas in which there is a legitimate Department of Defense interest. Other Federal Aviation Agency functions, such as safety regulation of air carriers, certification of aircraft and air crews, and management of the airport assistance program, will remain the independent responsibility of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. It is felt that this limitation is in accordance with the intent of Congress expressed in the Federal Aviation Act—that a civilian agency should be responsible for such functions.

The legislation further authorizes the Secretary of Defense, when the Agency is functioning as an adjunct of the Department of Defense, to direct the Administrator to place operational elements of the Agency under the direct operational control of appropriate military commanders. It defines operational control as "the assignment of tasks, the designation of objectives, and such authoritative direction as is necessary for the effective coordination of the Administrator's function with military actions."

It is apparent that in the event of war the Federal Aviation Agency personnel performing essential services must be placed in strategic positions. This will necessitate the assignment of certain Federal Aviation Agency operational units, particularly those concerned with air traffic control, in the field with operating military units. Since the military commanders of such units will have direct responsibility from the Secretary of Defense to carry out the strategy and tactics of waging the war effectively, they must have authority over all segments of the forces assigned to them. This legislative proposal will supply necessary authority for military commanders to exercise appropriate control over Federal Aviation Agency units operating under their control.

It is requested that the attached draft bill be introduced in the Senate as soon as possible. This Agency stands ready to supply any additional information or facts that may be required for use in hearings in order to expedite passage of this legislation.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that passage of this legislation would be in accordance with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. PYLE,
Acting Administrator
(For E. R. Quesada, Administrator).

PROPOSED ANTIBUSINESS FRAUDS LEGISLATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to maintain records of fraudulent and other unethical business practices. An identical bill is being introduced in the other body by Representative LINDSAY, of New York.

This proposed legislation is based on recommendations of the attorney general of New York, the Honorable Louis J. Lefkowitz, who has done pioneering work in alerting the American public to the problems raised by unscrupulous business firms.

Crooked business schemes promoted by only a minute percentage of the business community, mulct consumers of hundreds of millions of dollars each year. These operations are as vigorously opposed by legitimate businessmen as by any segment of the population.

One of the chief difficulties in combating these economic parasites is the absence of any national clearing house of information on their activities. This means that by moving from State to State, the culprits behind these schemes can stay in operation indefinitely. This is another of many examples of the way in which unscrupulous elements take advantage of the geographical jurisdictional limits on law enforcement in this country. Our bill would go a long way toward overcoming this obstacle to law enforcement by establishing a national repository of information about such operations.

The Department of Justice is presently authorized to employ personnel "for the acquisition, collection, classification, and preservation of identification and other records." The proposed bill would broaden this authority to include records of injunctions, dissolutions, and other civil or administrative actions involving unethical or fraudulent business practices. This information would be classified in a manner similar to the Federal Bureau of Investigation's documentation of criminals and criminal activities. All such information would be made available to Federal and State law-enforcement and other agencies attempting to curb unlawful business practices.

The objective of the bill is to make it easier for the authorities to keep tab on business rackets and to make it as difficult as possible for the promoters of these ventures to set up fly-by-night operations in locality after locality throughout the country. With the help of a central file of information, local officials will have immediate access to past records of cheating the public and will be able to crack down on these business thieves before it is too late.

This is a very moderate measure, but one which would be very effective in combating these phony business schemes. I know it will be welcomed by the overwhelming majority of the business community, since the few unprincipled operators against whom the measure is directed are a menace to legitimate businessmen, as well as to consumers and the public generally.

I hope that the bill will be given early committee consideration and that it will be enacted before this Congress adjourns.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill may be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

The bill (S. 3530) to authorize the Attorney General to maintain records of fraudulent and other unethical business practices, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the

Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Attorney General is authorized to provide, within the Department of Justice, for the acquisition, collection, classification and preservation of records of injunctions, dissolutions and other civil or administrative actions involving unethical or fraudulent business practices.

SEC. 2. Any records acquired, collected, classified and preserved pursuant to the provisions of this Act may be made available by the Attorney General for exchange with, and for the official use of, any duly authorized official of the Federal Government, of States, cities, and other institutions.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, recently Governor Rockefeller of New York, and Attorney General Lefkowitz, participated in a statewide telecast in New York on the problems of protecting consumers.

This program, one of a series of broadcasts to the people of New York by Governor Rockefeller and leading State officials, is particularly pertinent to the subject matter of the bill introduced today. It is apparent from the transcript of the program that the Governor and Attorney General Lefkowitz are deeply concerned with problems in this field and are taking dynamic and effective steps to safeguard consumers against fraud and other illegal and unfair practices. The leadership taken by Governor Rockefeller and his team on this issue is typical of the progressive and vigorous administration which now guides the Empire State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the transcript of their broadcast be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF STATEWIDE TELECAST ON CONSUMER PROTECTION IN NEW YORK STATE BY GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER, ATTORNEY GENERAL LOUIS J. LEFKOWITZ, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 23, 1960.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. Hello friends. With us here this evening is Louis Lefkowitz, the attorney general of the State of New York, your lawyer to protect your interests.

Now, this evening I would like to discuss with Louis a matter that's very close to his heart, that is, protection of the consumers of this State. I don't think anyone in the country has done more in this field than Louis, and perhaps the reason is because he has tremendous warmth and great human understanding.

Now, Louis, I'd like to talk a little bit with you about this for the benefit of the group who are with us on the TV tonight. First, let's take up the need for consumer protection. Then, let's cover how the State protects the consumer, and then, third and last, let's have a word on legislation for additional protection.

Louis, let's take up, first, need for consumer protection. What really is the problem as you see it?

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. Today, more than ever, the consumer needs protection. These new changing times, with people now being asked to buy gadgets and devices, and scientific implements. Years ago they would buy, Governor, say a horse or a table or a simple carriage, or a washboard. Today, with the changing times, people are being asked to buy devices about which they have no peculiar knowledge. They have to rely more and more on the persons who are selling it.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. You mean these things are so complicated that they really can't see as they could go and look into the horse's mouth in the old days?

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. Exactly, they can't take it apart and they refuse to buy it at the same time.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. And if they did, they couldn't get it together again?

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. That is correct, and people are taking advantage of them and using these deceptive practices and misrepresentation to induce them to buy these articles. That is the reason today, more than ever, Governor, for need to protect the consumer.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. Now, Louis, let's go over here and take a look at this list of different areas in which this protection is so important. Perhaps we can kind of get all of us focused on this thing by looking at this list.

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. Well, you take bait advertising. That's a common form of deceptive practice. Advertising appears in the newspapers, and it has a price to attract people to come around and buy it. When they come to the store, they can't get it. Either they are told it is not available, or they are shown it in such a defective form. That is a come-on to buy something else of higher value. The first thing you know someone is buying an article for which they have no financial means to buy, and that is one of the very common forms of deceptive practices.

Fraudulent labeling, Governor. Oh, we have had many cases where there will be a label 100-percent pure wool, and it turns out to be cotton. The person on the scene has no way of telling and we have had that type of case.

You take on these misrepresentations and guarantees, so many people have been induced to sign contracts in blank, later on, after they sign their name, the amount of the purchase is put in, as well as the payments. In most cases they can't begin to comply, not only with the total price, but even with the weekly payments.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. And so often people who get caught on this are the ones who can least afford to pay.

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. Exactly. Very often people call on them at home and say look, you are only taking this on approval. In fact, they are not getting it on approval, they have actually signed a binding contract. Now, in stock frauds, it breaks my heart, Governor, with the cases we get, to see so many people on a mere telephone call from a stranger, or from literature through the mail, parting with hard-earned money, life savings, a thousand, two thousand, five thousand dollars when people attempt to sell them stocks behind which no assets, no existing company, and yet people are doing it.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. And more and more people are coming into the stock market to buy securities?

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. Everybody is in the market.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. Which is a good thing in the sense that they are putting their savings into investments. But they have to be sound investments.

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. Right, everybody is in the market today whether it is the individual, banks, and insurance companies use your money and my money, within limitations of lawful investment, and union funds today are being invested as well in the stock market. There is a great need for as much protection as possible, and that's what we are trying to do.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. What about charity funds, Louis?

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. Here is another thing, so often people will give money to what looks like good charities. What is done, the people who get this money use about 90 to 95 percent in their own pockets for what they call administration expenses, and a very small percentage goes for the intended recipients of the charity.

We had a case here recently where people called home people and said, "Will you let us have your clothing, we will give it to the blind."

What happened, Governor, after getting the clothing, they went out and sold the clothing, kept about 95 cents of each dollar received, and turned over 5 cents to the intended people to be benefited, the blind people.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. It is tragic, and just breaks your heart, these situations.

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. It is tragic because so many people are working hard for their money. They want to do what is right. They don't even get what I call an even break.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. Louis, let's talk a little bit about how the State actually protects the consumer against this. This is what I'd like to know, and I think the public would like to know just what we do in the State. You and I have worked on this a great deal, and I think the public would like to know.

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. Well, in 1957 we organized in my office a consumer frauds protection office. We have a staff there. The person on the street can come in and register a complaint wherever fraud has been practiced. The men and women in my office receive these complaints, we analyze them, and if we find fraud present, we take proceedings to rectify or cure the fraud.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. And you have these offices in different parts of the State?

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. That is correct, Governor.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. Louis, let's take a case in point. Let me take a specific ad here that I know you are acting on right now, and perhaps you could tell the public just a little bit about this particular one.

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. Well, in this case, people were told we have an antenna for you that will cost about $3.98, but for a special model, $4.98, and if you buy this antenna, you will get the best type of vision.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. In your television set?

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. In your television set, and you will have no more headaches about vision and clearness. So a lot of people bought it, and it turned out they were getting worse reception than they had before.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. You mean there was nothing to it?

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. Nothing to it. It was just a fake and poorer reception than they had when they didn't have an antenna.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. With a full page ad?

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. Full page ad. They are slick. Oh, they do a good job. The language is there and pictures are there to induce people to buy it.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. You have this case before you right now?

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. This is before us right now in the courts where we immediately moved in to get a receiver appointed to restrain the people from further advertising and from the further sale of these devices and gadgets which are out-and-out frauds.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. Well, Louis, we have seen a couple of examples, let's take here the enforcement program, this list of items as to how you just actually go about this.

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. Governor, I would like to say, too, that part of the good work being done in the office is thanks to you. On your recommendation we received additional funds which has enabled my office to add some extra help, investigators, interpreters, and lawyers. Because of the implementation of your recommendations of extra money, I think our office has been made much more effective in this human work which we must do for the householders.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. You are nice to give me some credit, but this is your program and you started it, and I am backing a good man.

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. You backed me with it and I am very grateful and I know the people of the State are grateful to you as well.

Now, on the legal proceedings, Governor, we can do any one of several things. We can bring injunction proceedings to restrain the people. This is a swift proceeding to restrain them from perpetrating the frauds. We also ask as part of that relief to completely put them out of business. We can dissolve the corporation.

Now, that too, dissolving them completely puts them out. We have a receiver appointed to marshal the assets. If any assets are left, we try and see that those assets go back to the people who were victimized.

Now, there is one thing we recently did in connection with violations of tenement houses. Here again, while it doesn't involve the purchase of goods or services, Governor, wherever these buildings have had these long violations on them, and the landlords refuse to remove the violations and cure them, we have started some proceedings and we have been successful. We have obtained our first decision where we have a receiver put in and the receiver is now going to use the money collected from the tenants for rents to clear up the violations which the landlord, the slum landlord refused to do.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. Well, Louis, how do you organize the question of getting to the people so that they know about this?

Let's talk just briefly, because our time is short here, about your Advisory Committee on Consumer Protection, and this committee of a hundred housewives which you have.

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. Well, I organized this committee of a hundred housewives in each county throughout the State. We have ladies who have volunteered to serve, and they are the so-called eyes and ears of my office. They alert us to any frauds that take place in the county. They go around making speeches to various civic groups.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. So people know what they can do and how to look out for these situations.

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. Exactly the point. We find if you educate people this is the best deterrent against these frauds.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. So that the education really is your strongest factor?

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. Exactly, and we have this advisory committee with business, labor, newspaper people, radio, that is always sitting down with me to think of new legislation, and new ways of educating the public.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. Louis, let's just, to wrap this up, let's just have a word on additional protection that you have come up with for this session of the legislature.

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. Well, additional protection. We have found a series of people who are compelled or induced to sign lifetime contracts for dancing instruction, or reducing treatments, or physical educational training courses.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. You go into every area.

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. Anything that affects the person throughout the State. The people of the State are entitled to as much protection as you and I can give and in any area where they are affected.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. Or getting gypped or taken.

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. Exactly, and we have a bill pending to outlaw lifetime contracts. We had some cases where people put down deposits to purchase homes, and somewhere in the middle, the person building the home ran out of money, and they are out their deposits with no home completed. We have a bill in to require this money to be kept in trust, and also to give them a lien for any deposits they make for the construction of a new home.

We have another bill to require people who sell appliances, sets at home, anything, to have on there whether it is new or whether it's been used, because too often we have these cases where people think they are buying something new, which in fact is a used article.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. Well, Louis, I hate not to go into more detail with you on this, but our time is running out. I just want to say how much I appreciate the opportunity of working with you so closely on this program which is protecting the people of our State from being taken, from being gypped, from being sold these articles. I know the legislature is going to go along with a wonderful program that will give you the teeth in the work that you are doing.

Attorney General LEFKOWITZ. I appreciate your cooperation, Governor.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. Well, Louis, thanks very much for coming.

I would just like to say in closing, friends, that the work that Louis Lefkowitz is doing isn't confined to the great State of New York. I'd like to read you a letter of the leadership that he is giving in this field on a national basis. He was in a conference last week in Washington, and here's a letter from the president of the National Association of Attorneys General. Louis was, of course, there with this group and, as a matter of fact, was the leader of the conference.

This is from the president of the Attorneys General Association.

"Your outstanding contribution to the Conference on Consumer Investment Protection, in Washington, D.C., last week, represents a great landmark in public service. In this field you have made the greatest individual contribution of any public official. In the annals of the Nation's history your work will be recalled for many years to come."

Signed by Dick Ervin, the Attorney General in Florida.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me just say that high on the priority of New York State's efforts, the efforts of this administration, is your protection in the goods, the services, the stocks and bonds which you buy. Here's a little pamphlet that Louis put out—over a million copies have been distributed. "Progress in Consumer Protection—Your Guide to Careful Buying."

And let me just say, any time you find anything that you are suspicious about, or that you think you are being gypped in the purchase of something, or some friend of yours is being taken advantage of, or they are working on them because they have an illness in selling them something which is falsely labeled as going to cure that ill when you know it's not, take it up with one of the attorney general's offices and let them know. The offices are in Albany, Auburn, Buffalo, New York City, Plattsburgh, Rochester, and Syracuse. And let's all work together to protect the consumers of New York State.

ESTABLISHMENT OF HOME OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON AS A NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to declare the Hamilton Grange, once the private home of Alexander Hamilton built in 1801 in Manhattan, a national monument and authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take whatever steps may be necessary for its preservation.

New York City, my home city, is famous as the business and financial capital of the world, a role to which it aspired from our earliest days as a Nation, when Alexander Hamilton accepted appointment by President George Washington to serve as the first Secretary of the Treasury. All of us who make our home there today feel an especially keen duty to see to it that the Hamilton Grange, the only home that Hamilton ever built and owned, should be saved and restored to the architectural masterpiece that it once was.

This house was built by Hamilton following his retirement from public service. As one of our most famous Founding Fathers, Hamilton's contributions began with his service as a delegate from New York to the Annapolis Convention in 1786, where he drafted the report which led to the convening of the Constitutional Convention in the following year. He worked tirelessly for the ratification of the Constitution. He wrote more than half of the "Federalist Papers," and won, almost singlehanded, the support of the New York convention, despite heavy opposition. From 1789 to 1795, when he served as Secretary of the Treasury, he established the U.S. fiscal system; and he is well remembered for his strong emphasis on Federal fiscal responsibility. When he resigned from the Cabinet, he resumed law practice in New York; and he was living at the Hamilton Grange in 1804, the year when he was fatally shot in a duel with Aaron Burr.

The Grange is one of seven buildings still standing in New York City which represents the architecture of the Federal period. It was, in fact, designed by the same architect who was responsible for the city hall. Today it is wedged between a church and an apartment house on Convent Avenue near 141st Street, in upper Manhattan, in the 21st Congressional District which I represented for many years. It has been moved once from its original location, and it has been necesary to remove all the interior pieces to museums for safekeeping. The American Scenic & Historic Preservation Society, which owns the house, has been unable to raise enough funds to undertake the restoration necessary; but the city authorities have agreed to provide a suitable site for the Grange on the grounds of City College, if a way is found to move it.

Therefore, the time has come when assistance from the Federal Government is clearly needed. In this connection, it is very important to note that the Advisory Board on the National Parks, His-

toric Sites, Buildings, and Monuments to the Secretary of the Interior some years ago declared "the Hamilton Grange worthy of preservation." It approved it as having "exceptional value in commemorating or illustrating the history of the United States." It also recommended that the home be given further consideration from the standpoint of suitability for addition to the National Park System.

Under the terms of the joint resolution I am introducing, Hamilton's home would be designated as "The Hamilton Grange National Monument and shall be set aside as a public national memorial to commemorate this historic role played by Alexander Hamilton in the establishment of this Nation." This measure would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take such action as may be necessary to establish this national monument, and would authorize the appropriation of such sums as may be required to preserve this historic American site.

The new skyscrapers which seem to leap into the New York City skyline and the sounds of modern construction have not made New Yorkers forget our great historical heritage. Federal aid to help New York City preserve the historic home of this truly great American is very much desired in New York. The name of Alexander Hamilton will never be missing from our history books, and the landmark which once was his home should not disappear from the sidewalks of New York City.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 191) providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national monument, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, I am pleased to join my senior colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] as a cosponsor of proposed legislation to preserve the former home of Alexander Hamilton in New York City as a national monument. Favorable action on this proposal will enable the Nation to save the dwelling house of one of its most distinguished leaders.

Alexander Hamilton will go down in history as the founder of America's fiscal system, champion of integrity in the field of public finance, and a leading light among our Founding Fathers. As our first Secretary of the Treasury he set precedents and an example which are marked indelibly on our Nation's heritage.

Regrettably, the only home Hamilton ever owned, which he purchased in 1801, 3 years before his duel with Aaron Burr, has fallen upon dark days. It is one of the few surviving houses of the Federal period in New York City, as well.

The house, which is known as The Grange, is located on Convent Avenue, near 141st Street. It is squeezed between a church and an apartment building, and is in need of repair.

By means of the proposal introduced today we can contribute to the saving and preservation of this lasting memorial to a man who played such a large role in the founding of our Nation.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have been authorized by the Committee on Rules and Administration to ask that the amendment of the House to Senate bill 2778 be laid before the Senate; and when that is done, I have been authorized to move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that the House amendment to Senate bill 2778 be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2778) to amend the act relating to the Commission of Fine Arts, which was, to strike out lines 6, 7, and 8, inclusive, and insert:

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3481) to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to make student loans under title II of such act available to teachers attending summer sessions in institutions of higher education, which I introduced on May 5, 1960.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 6, 1960, the names of Senators HENNINGS, JACKSON, and PASTORE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3503) to provide for the payment of hospital and other health services furnished to aged retired individuals, and to provide for a continuing study of the health needs of such individuals, introduced by Mr. MCNAMARA (for himself and other Senators) on May 6, 1960.

GRANT OF FURTHER TARIFF REDUCTIONS IN FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of May 4, and May 9, 1960, the names of Senators CURTIS, DWORSHAK, ALLOTT, and JOHNSTON of South Carolina were added as additional cosponsors of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 104) expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes, submitted by Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. THURMOND) on May 4, 1960.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE PREVENTION OF POLLUTION OF THE SEA BY OIL (EX. C, 86TH CONG., 2D SESS.)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that the Committee on Foreign Relations will hold a public hearing Tuesday, May 17, 1960, at 10:30 a.m., in room 4221, New Senate Office Building, on the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil (Ex. C, 86th Cong., 2d sess.).

Persons desiring to be heard should communicate at their earliest convenience with the clerk of the committee, room F-53 in the Capitol.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, today we are observing one of the most significant anniversaries in our history—the 25th year of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Throughout history, there have been events that changed the shape of the world. But very few have had such a profound effect upon a nation as the Executive order Franklin D. Roosevelt signed on May 11, 1935, which brought electricity to the rural areas of America.

The changes that took place in the short span of 25 years are so tremendous that few people today can even recall what life was like in the days before electricity was brought to the farms.

Before REA, farming was a hard and exacting way of life. It meant long hours of toil; inadequate facilities for living; a manner of existence which was the subject of jokes by comedians on every stage in America. The universally recognized symbols of agriculture were the kerosene lamp, the zinc washtub, and the outdoor toilet. These were considered inseparable from the people who raised the food and the fiber that fed and clothed America.

That was a way of life that people insisted was perpetual. Whenever anyone proposed bringing electricity to the farmers, there was a loud chant: "It cannot be done." People insisted that it was too expensive to run power lines to the farms. A few farmers—of extreme wealth—could afford the high cost of a power line. A few farmers close to big cities were able to get electricity out of the urban systems.

But aside from those, agriculture was supposedly doomed to eternal darkness.

There were men, however, who thought that it could be done; and there was a President who had the courage to try.

Congress passed the Rural Electrification Act, and it was signed into law. I am proud that the distinguished Speaker of the other body was one of the authors of that law.

Overnight, rural cooperatives were formed. The power was purchased. And the people who bought that power were able to repay it many times.

Not only did they repay the loans which they had received, but through increased income and larger opportunities they became taxpaying citizens who added to the wealth of America.

Mr. President, in all history, few events have been so significant as that which we celebrate today. And the Nation will be forever grateful to the wise and farseeing men who did so much to raise the standards of agriculture and thereby the standards of all America.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR AIKEN IN COMMEMORATION OF 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ELECTRIFICATION LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the very able, influential, and beloved senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is to speak this afternoon in connection with the 25th anniversary of the rural electrification loan program. No Member of either body has done more for the farmers of America or for the rural electrification program or for the comprehensive development programs on the rivers throughout the Nation than has the able senior Senator from Vermont.

Therefore, I should like all my colleagues to have an opportunity to read his very succinct, pointed, and well-considered statement; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR AIKEN ON RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL OBSERVANCE IN COMMEMORATION OF 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ELECTRIFICATION LOAN PROGRAM

I work in an atmosphere of moderated frustration.

As a Member of the U.S. Senate, I find it difficult at times not to be a cynic.

Washington is a beautiful city. It is a city of powerful influence and wonderment, of sweet dreams and blasted hopes. To this beautiful Capital City come men of all countries and creeds and characters. They come from every State in our Union. Too many of them come with thoughts of selfish gain. They seek to secure for themselves that which belongs to other people. Some of them hope to build economic empires on the rubble of the blasted efforts of others. They justify their attitude in the name of competition.

We, who are Members of the Congress, see them day after day. Some days it seems that their name is Legion and whenever we are approached by one of them we instinctively ask ourselves—"What is he after now?"

The United States is the richest country on earth. It is envied by all nations—respected by most—and feared and hated by some. Yet, under the umbrella of natural and accumulated wealth, there are many difficult problems and festering needs.

Your Member of Congress sees these things. He wants to correct the ills of the present and lay foundations for greater futures.

The path of progress seems insurmountably rough and new obstacles are constantly being added to those already in the way. The distance to our objectives seems interminable and progress develops at a snail's pace. That is when frustration sets in.

I have a remedy for such cases of frustration. It is almost a sure-fire cure. I just stop looking at the rocky road ahead and look back over my shoulder to the places from which we have come.

And, when I do this, I see that not all the people who come to Washington are motivated by greed. I see good people—farsighted people—people with courage and a desire to build in order that others may taste more generously of the better things of life. Their accomplishments are so numerous that the frustrations which plagued us in the past seem lost in the maze of victories.

Today we look back 25 years to May 11, 1935, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the Executive order which brought the Rural Electrification Administration into being. It was one of the most momentous documents ever signed by a President of the United States. It predestined a new era of development for our country.

Just as Abraham Lincoln's signature to the Emancipation Proclamation brought freedom to a host of bondsmen, so did President Roosevelt's signature to the order creating the REA bring hope, and light and freedom from economic servitude to millions of rural Americans who were even then living in darkness, poverty, and despair.

Just over 1 year later, on May 20, 1936, the Norris-Rayburn Act was signed into law giving legislative sanction to this great program which has now become a permanent part of our economic system.

Franklin D. Roosevelt and our old friend George Norris have long since gone to their reward—and may that reward be great—but SAM RAYBURN is here today. I can think of no more satisfying honor than being permitted to share this program with this great man. All his life SAM RAYBURN has known people, loved people, and worked for people. The Nation's debt to him cannot be fully repaid.

The days of the midthirties were rather desolute ones—10 million people were unemployed—dust storms were bringing noonday darkness to the States of the Central West—decent markets for farm commodities were nonexistent—most farmers were heavily in debt and hand labor or draft animals were still the principal sources of power on farm.

America had to have a miracle and the REA was born to meet that need. The infant prodigy was a little wobbly on its feet at first. The $75,000 which President Roosevelt appropriated to start the program would hardly buy a nursing bottle for the lusty $3½ billion baby which Dave Hamil is guardian for today.

The REA grew so rapidly that it was able in 25 years to bring light and power either directly or through competitive example to 97 percent of our rural homes and farms. This achievement is due largely to the fact that it has constantly had conscientious, efficient, and crusading administrators.

From Morris Cooke's term through the terms of his successors—John Carmody, Harvey Slattery, Claude Wickard, Ancher Nelsen, and Dave Hamil—the REA has been administered by men whose heart was in their work and who have been supported by able staffs and loyal employees.

And every one of them has had to fight against odds to keep the work going forward.

By the end of World War II over a million farms were receiving central power service from REA cooperatives. This was an important, an almost vital factor in the winning of the war. Technology had moved to the farm.

Milking machines and milk coolers, stable cleaners and chick brooders, water pumps, and feed mixers—all electrically operated—took the place of millions of farm laborers who could not be hired anyway at any price.

Even more miraculous than the labor saving equipment on the farm has been the electrical revolution which has taken place in the rural home. Electrically controlled heating plants, quick freezers, kitchen equipment, and television have served to make the farm home the most attractive place to live.

It is now estimated that the average farm use of electricity which 25 years ago was about 600 kilowatt-hours per year and which has now increased to nearly 4,000 kilowatt-hours will in 15 years reach the challenging total of over 10,000 kilowatt-hours per year. I say it is a challenging figure, because it shows how far from completion is the work of the REA.

Where will we get the necessary amount of power? How can we hold the cost within reason? How can we be assured that REA cooperatives will have equitable access to the giant power pools of the future?

No, our work is nowhere near done. It never will be done for the inexorable technological changes that take place—beneficial as they are—simply challenge us to keep pace or else let agriculture, which George Washington called the "noblest occupation of man" lapse into the position of a third-rate industry.

Nor is it agriculture alone that looks to the REA to assure its future. A great spreading out of our population is imperative if our high level of prosperity is to be maintained and our national security is to be asssured.

I am glad that the REA has made it possible for millions of nonfarmers to make their homes in rural areas. I am glad that many small industries now find it possible to locate along rural electric lines where results are both profitable and pleasant.

Too many people are satisfied with the status quo today. Too many people fail to realize that it is possible to expand their own businesses without taking it away from others. America is still a growing country and the limits to our growth are still indiscernible in the haze of far distant horizons.

Let us on this day take a deep satisfaction in the part that the Rural Electrification Administration has played in the unprecedented development of our country over the last 25 years. Let us congratulate ourselves on a work that has been well done albeit a work that is only well begun.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the acting minority leader.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to join the able majority leader, not only in paying tribute to the great national program of rural electrification on its anniversary, but also in the tribute he has just now paid to the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], whose activity in this field has continued over the years, and has been crowned with success. I would not want the RECORD, on this matter, to close without indicating the unanimity of thought here with respect to the comments made by the majority leader.

THE REA IN VERMONT

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, today, as the Rural Electrification Administration celebrates its silver anniversary, I should like to recall some of the changes that have been brought into my State of Vermont through the electrification of farms and rural communities during the past 25 years.

These changes have been brought about through the combined efforts of the REA and the privately owned public utilities. The REA has had a catalyzing effect. It has also served as a yardstick for both service and rates.

At the time when the REA was created on May 11, 1935, only 7,945 farms in Vermont, or 29.4 percent, were receiving central station electric service. Current REA estimates show that 15,700 farms in the State, or 98.2 percent, were being served, according to figures compiled about a year ago. Of these farms, about 18.9 percent are being served by REA borrowers.

The REA program in my State is small, but effective. The three REA electric cooperatives have proved that they can offer good, reliable service at reasonable rates; and they are excellent examples of local enterprise. Only 2 days ago the Washington Electric Cooperative, at East Montpelier, was approved for a $100,000 section 5 loan. This means that the co-op, which serves members in the four counties of Washington, Orange, Caledonia, and Orleans, will use the money to reloan to consumers, to help them wire their farms, and purchase electrical appliances from privately owned firms.

Up to the beginning of this year the Rural Electrification Administration had approved a total of $6,152,918 in loans to the three electric cooperatives of Vermont, to enable the borrowers to construct 1,939 miles of line and other electric facilities to serve 7,158 consumers.

Funds actually advanced to these borrowers by the start of the year amounted to $4,548,669. With the help of this financing, the locally owned and managed systems had placed in operation 1,393 miles of line and were serving 6,229 farm and other rural consumer outlets. The average monthly consumption of electricity by these consumers increased from 197 kilowatt-hours in 1950 to 443 kilowatt-hours only 8 years later.

These REA borrowers in Vermont have repaid $1,227,336 on the principal and $754,109 in interest, of which more than $2,000 was ahead of schedule. As of January 1, 1960, no borrower in the State was overdue in its loan payments.

The electrification of rural areas is serving to attract new people and new enterprises to my State and to all of rural America. Factories, stores, and processing plants cannot operate without modern, reliable electric and telephone service. These private enterprises provide more payrolls and much needed off-the-farm employment. The coming of the kilowatt to the country has also given an important boost to the summer and winter recreation and vacation business, so important to a State like Vermont, which has so much natural beauty.

The first REA electrification loan in Vermont was approved in July 1938; and the first REA-financed line was placed in operation on May 13, 1959, by the Vermont Electric Cooperative of Johnson. At that time my colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], was Governor of the State; and his interest, enthusiasm, and cooperation served as an inspiration, not only then, but ever since, to the electric cooperatives of the State.

On this occasion of the REA's 25th anniversary, I should like to congratulate all the rural people in Vermont and in 45 other States who have worked so tirelessly to build the fine local service organizations which, together with the privately owned power companies, bring them the light, heat, and power they need for their progress and prosperity.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I should like to join in what has been said today on this the 25th anniversary of rural electrification and the REA in general. In my personal opinion, no other piece of legislation passed by the Congress has done as much to improve rural life in America as the order creating and the act establishing the Rural Electrification Administration.

I know what REA service means in my own home. Our house is both lighted and heated by the REA. The homes of the workmen are lighted, their food is protected, the barn and yards are lighted by REA.

I know what it has done in my own State generally. It has changed South Dakota from an agricultural area where chores were done by lantern light to one where a farmer can work not only by good light in the early morning but also in the dusk of the evening. The daily burdens of the farmer's wife, as well as the work of the farmer himself, have been lightened.

REA has been a great contribution to the making of America and I join in the salute to the senior Senator from Vermont [GEORGE AIKEN] and to all the others who have been in the forefront of the REA movement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the mark of a real friend to any cause I think can be detected in the courage and the fortitude which he displays when that cause or that function or that program sometimes goes slightly adrift or develops weaknesses which ought to be cured, or mistakes which ought to be criticized.

I think it can be said of the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that my recollection goes back to days when he could see some weaknesses in the REA program, and was ready, publicly and privately, to criticize it when that criticism was merited and justified. And that kind of person, in my judgment, constitutes a real advocate of a cause. That I remember out of my own experience and my interchanges with the Senator long ago.

So it can be said that the Senator from Vermont is one of those truly redoubtable public servants deeply interested in lighting rural America, watching this function grow and extend into every area of the country, taking it by the hand when necessary, gently and yet firmly, whenever it has been required, in order to make sure this function will grow strong and great and be established on a solid foundation.

So I salute the Senator from Vermont as a truly great friend of REA, whose friendship has been of the really durable kind.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I had intended to make a few brief extemporaneous remarks regarding the REA program, whose birthday we celebrate today. However, after listening to the majority leader, the minority leader, and other Senators, I hardly know just what to say. I certainly appreciate the references which have been made to me. The REA program has been one of the programs that has done more to promote the development of rural America, and our national economy as a whole, than has almost any other program which has been devised within my memory.

I have seen the REA come into my own State. I was Lieutenant Governor at the time legislation was enacted which authorized the REA to operate in the State of Vermont, and I saw the lines of the REA come into the State. I saw cooperatives formed by far-sighted, courageous people who realized that something had to be done in our rural communities if they were even to continue their existence. The lines did come into those areas. On farm after farm, where the owner had been ready to give up, he received renewed hope, faith, and income after he obtained electricity.

At the time the REA was established, only a small percentage of the farms in my State had electricity. Today something over 98 percent of the rural residents of Vermont have electricity. I saw the REA set an example for the utility companies, which had previously thought and believed they could not profitably serve some of our rural areas. With the example set by the REA, they found they could cut the cost of providing a line from $2,200 down to $800 or $1,000 a mile. It costs a little more now, but they saw they could cut the cost in half. As a result of the example set by the REA, the utility companies did go into areas they previously thought they could not serve.

I have been honored by being privileged to speak today at the official celebration of the 25th anniversary of the REA. The majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], has very graciously inserted in the RECORD the remarks which I shall make this afternoon. In those remarks I shall pay tribute to the Speaker of the House, the great Representative from Texas, who was so instrumental in making the REA a permanent and going organization. For that reason I was glad that a fellow Texan of his inserted my remarks in the RECORD this morning.

Again I express my thanks to the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for what he has said. I have always wanted the REA to succeed and to do the work it was intended it should do. I have not hesitated to give the agency advice, either by word or by vote, when I thought it had an inclination to "get off the reservation" a little. It is because the agency has had good management, good cooperation from Congress, and good cooperation from the executive, that it has been able to perform the function it has handled up to this time.

It is estimated that the REA program alone has added over $14 billion of new business to the economy of this country. If anything, I would say that is an underestimate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield, if I have any time remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have an extra minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Vermont in what he has said about the REA. The Senator has pointed out that 98 percent of his State is now electrified because of the REA. The figure is not quite that high for the State of Montana, but it is above 90 percent, with the difficult areas still to be covered.

I think the Senator is correct when he states that the application of the REA facilities to the farms of America has been a boon in a certain sense for private industry, because as we electrify the farms we make it possible for electrical machinery to be brought in.

In my opinion, this is probably the best legislation which has ever been passed by the Congress in behalf of the farmers. I am delighted to join with the Senator from Vermont on this occasion, celebrating the anniversary of the REA.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]; the assistant majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]; the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]; the assistant minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]; the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]; the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]; and other Senators who are in the Senate Chamber, on this day, which marks the 25th anniversary of the day President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the Executive order which created the Rural Electrification Administration.

This enlightened program is only one of the many indelible imprints Franklin D. Roosevelt left on the pages of history and in the hearts of his countrymen.

To millions of Americans living on farms and in rural areas, the Rural Electrification Administration has brought the untold blessings of electricity. To these people it means light where before there was darkness. For the farmer it has made possible the mechanization of his farm, and it has saved him hours of backbreaking labor. The rural housewife has been freed from the drudgery of pumping water by hand, washing on the old scrubboard, and a multitude of other tasks now accomplished by electricity. For their children the REA has provided better health, with electric lights to study and play by instead of dim kerosene lamps.

It would take considerable searching to find a single program which has meant as much to rural America as the rural electrification program.

In this program farmers have worked with and through their Government to help each other and themselves. It is one of the finest examples of cooperation between a citizen and his government and the wonderful benefits which can result to the advantage of both.

Largely as a result of REA, our farms were prepared for the maximum output during the emergency of World War II. The food produced by our agricultural plant helped to feed the entire free world. The laborsaving devices made possible by REA helped to free hundreds of thousands of young farmers for service in our Armed Forces, without impairing our ability to produce the food needed for the war effort.

Today our REA program has almost 4,600,000 consumers on REA-financed lines. This means that 14 million Americans in farm families have the benefit of electricity where there was none before. Over 95 percent of the farms, ranches, and rural areas of the Nation have the benefit of central station electric power, and about one-half of these installations are financed by REA.

We in Ohio are proud of the fact that a group of farmers in Miami County, Ohio, were the first in the Nation to organize an electric cooperative, and that the first REA loan was made to this group.

Today there are 29 electric cooperatives in Ohio. They have borrowed $80 million, and have repaid over $20 million, plus about $10 million in interest. None are now delinquent in payments. To my knowledge none has ever been delinquent on interest or principal payments.

In Ohio the cooperatives are now serving 130,000 rural consumers and their families. In 1958 alone, they paid State and local taxes in excess of $1,200,000.

It is difficult to estimate how many millions of dollars worth of increased business rural consumers have given to businessmen in the last 25 years because of increased farm productivity. This, in itself, has meant a great deal to the economy of the Nation.

Mr. President, I have a happy personal recollection that 25 years ago, as a Representative at Large from the State of Ohio, I voted in favor of the enactment of the rural electrification law. There were those in the other body at that time who expressed the belief that the kerosene lamp and wood stove were good enough for the farmers of this country. We have come a long way since that time. During my succeeding terms in the House of Representatives, on every rollcall in respect to rural electrification my vote was recorded in favor of that great Administration and that great piece of legislation which, Mr. President, has done more for the family farmers of this Nation than any other legislative enactment.

In behalf of the family farmers of Ohio, whom I am trying to the utmost of my ability and energy to represent in the Senate, I express their thanks and my thanks for the Rural Electrification Administration.

Throughout these 25 years many, many millions of dollars, it is safe to say, have been brought into the Treasury of the United States in income taxes because of the fact that the farmers of America have had the help of rural electrification. The farmers and the farmers' wives have been contented and have gone on to greater service to our Nation.

I join with all other Senators in expressing my best wishes to the Rural Electrification Administration. REA has meant a better life not only for the farm families of America, but also for all Americans. It is with great pride that I salute this remarkable achievement on its 25th birthday and pay tribute to the millions of Americans who have made its success possible.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I am indeed pleased to join with my colleagues in saluting the Rural Electrification Administration today on its 25th anniversary. I also wish to extend my congratulations and appreciation to the many farseeing farmers who, since 1935, have very vigorously supported and effectively operated this outstanding program.

Just 25 years ago today, the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, by Executive order, created the Rural Electrification Administration. While much groundwork was done during the first year of this program, it was authorized in its present form by act of Congress in 1936. Since that time the REA has done much to lighten the workload, not only of farmers but of the farmers' wives. It has made for much greater efficiency in farming operations. It is a thrilling sight to drive at night through rural areas of our country and see the many farmsteads all lighted by electricity made available through this fine program. In 1935 when this program was instituted, Mr. President, only 10.9 percent of all our farms had electricity. At the present time estimates are that 4.5 million farms, or 96 percent of the farms recorded in the 1954 census, were electrified.

The Rural Electrification Administration does not generate or distribute electrical energy. It is a lending agency providing money in the form of loans, largely to farmers through their own organizations, to build and operate power generation and distribution facilities. Mr. President, in the years that the REA has been in operation, it has approved more than $4 billion in loans to electrification borrowers. These borrowers have an unusually good repayment record. Of the 1,085 borrowers at the present time, only 1 is overdue in its payments to the Government.

Mr. President, the first REA electrification loan in North Dakota was made in December 1936, to the Baker Electric Cooperative at Cando. At that time only 2.3 percent of the farms in North Dakota were electrified through distribution systems. I am proud to say that at the present time virtually every farm-

er in my State who desires electrical service has it available to him. In the years since 1935 the Rural Electrification Administration has approved a total of $119,118,527 in loans to borrowers in North Dakota, all but one of which are local independent REA cooperatives. Mr. President, it is indeed gratifying to be able to call to the attention of the U.S. Senate the fact that not a single borrower in North Dakota is overdue in its loan payments to the Federal Government. In fact, they are almost $4.5 million ahead of schedule in their repayments.

In these days when everyone is criticizing Federal expenditures, it is especially gratifying, Mr. President, to point out again that the appropriations to the Department of Agriculture for the Rural Electrification Administration are for loans that must be repaid and which are being repaid at an excellent rate.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to again express my congratulations to the Rural Electrification Administration the REA cooperatives, and the many stanch supporters of REA throughout the country.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it is good to see so many of the Senators rising in their places to extend a happy birthday to REA on the occasion of its 25th birthday, and to point out the great service it has rendered to rural America.

Mr. President, dependable communications and available electricity are as important to farm families today as warm homes and a rifle for protection against predators were essential to our pioneer families. The Rural Electrification Administration which has done so much to bring the necessities to our farm families today marks its 25th year of existence and reflects with pride on its past accomplishments.

Except for the first 3 years of REA, I have been a Member of Congress throughout its existence and I am proud of the fact that I have voted for every dollar spent or loaned to develop rural electric and telephone service for South Dakota farmers. Since serving in the Senate, I have been a member of the appropriations subcommittee approving all these funds.

Until creation of REA in 1935, farm electrification had advanced very slowly during the 53-year period from 1882, when the first central generating system went into service. Only 10.9 percent of all farms in the United States had electric service in 1935. The past 25 years witnessed this 10.9-percent figure leap to a striking 97 percent mark as of January 1, 1960, leaving 3 percent of the farms in America without electricity.

In South Dakota, when REA was created in 1935, only 2,939 farms, or 3.5 percent, received central station electric service. REA estimates that approximately 88 percent of all farms recorded in the 1954 census are being served today; 91 percent of all electrified farms in our State are served by REA-financed facilities—one of the highest percentages in the country. South Dakota's first REA loan was approved in May 1936 and the first REA-financed line was placed in operation on October 3, 1937, by the Clay-Union Electric Cooperative, of Vermillion. Since that time, as of April 1, 1960, REA has approved $103,977,856 in electric loans in South Dakota to 34 borrowers, all of which are cooperatives. The loans were made to enable borrowers to build 50,962 miles of line and other rural electric facilities to serve 78,566 rural customers.

Farmers enjoy and appreciate the use of power and modern telephones, which have done much to help hold the young generation on our farms. In 1952, the year of the first REA telephone loan in South Dakota, only 55.5 percent of the farms in South Dakota had telephones. By the end of 1958, it was estimated that 41,000 farms or 66 percent of all farms in the State had telephone service and the number is constantly increasing.

Mr. President, the REA and the RTA are manifestations of private enterprise through cooperative organizations and associations at its best. Sometimes critics of the program of REA and RTA, especially in the earlier years, tried to condemn it and defeat it as being socialistic or as being an exemplification of public power. I think we cannot repeat too often, Mr. President, the fact that REA is not public power and it is not socialistic. It is private power, financed by loans which the Government makes in a banker's capacity to private cooperative associations who, upon payment of their loans, own and operate the enterprise the same as they would a cooperative creamery, a cooperative oil station, a cooperative elevator, or any other cooperative enterprise.

Public power denotes that the Government owns and operates the generating plants and the distribution lines, as well as the agencies selling the power to ultimate consumers.

That is not the case of REA. Sometimes REA has its own generating plant; sometimes it buys its power from private utilities; and sometimes it gets it from our great hydroelectric reservoirs. But just as REA purchases power from publicly financed hydroelectric reservoirs, so on frequent occasions do private utilities buy power from the same sources and in the same way. It is just as illogical and unjust to call REA socialistic or to describe it as public power because on occasion it buys some of its power from the publicly financed hydroelectric dam as it would be to call a private utility company socialistic or public power because it also buys some of its power from a publicly financed hydroelectric dam.

South Dakota's cooperatives, in making payments ahead of schedule to the Government on their loans, exemplify the trend evident through the Nation. By January 1, 1960, South Dakota electric borrowers had made payments on their loans of $28,270,509. This included $14,840,729 repaid on principal and $9,617,056 paid in interest, and $4,812,723 of that was paid in advance. Nationally, payments of REA borrowers on principal, in interest, and ahead of schedule have surpassed the $1.2 billion mark.

REA has been a boon for South Dakota in the past 25 years and will underscore spectacular achievement in the next quarter century. America's hats are off to rural America today as it commemorates its grandest hour in rededication of a program that has truly "turned on the lights" for our farm people.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, of all the great, good and progressive steps this Nation made under President Franklin D. Roosevelt's dynamic New Deal for the American people none had more impact in the daily lives of rural Texans than his rural electrification program.

Today, May 11, the 25th anniversary of the REA program is a fitting time to consider how President Roosevelt's superb plan to allay drudgery and bring light to farm families has produced a miracle in our time.

It may seem to some that perhaps we speak too much about REA on this 25th anniversary, but if we look at the advertising campaigns which have been carried on by the large illustrated magazines in America in the last 6 months showing the REA to be a socialistic scheme to rob the taxpayer and to socialize America, we know that these tributes are timely. There are not too many of them, and the record is not encumbered because there is a great campaign being carried on in America today, with highly paid ads and slick advertising, to try to make the American people think they are being bilked out of billions of dollars in the building of REA plants. That is the fact.

Because of Texas' size and proportionately large rural population, the REA has meant more to Texans in terms of better living—comfort and prosperity—than it has to residents of most other States, although there is not a single State where people have not been benefited.

President Roosevelt signed the Executive order creating the REA on May 11, 1935, and the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, who has served America and Texas so long and well, led in passage of the REA Act in 1936. Texas' first REA co-op, the Bartlett Electric Co-op, received its loan approval in September of 1935. At that time, only 11,466 Texas farm families—just 2.3 percent of our farm families—had electricity for lights and power.

Mr. President, this strikes very close at home to me, if I may be permitted this personal reference, because the late beloved Judge James B. Allred was at that time Governor of Texas. We had passed an act in the Legislature of Texas to create the Lower Colorado River Authority patterned on the TVA, but a State agency. It was created. Governor Allred appointed me in February 1935 one of the original directors of that public authority. We started building then, and that authority has built six great dams on the Colorado River of Texas. That is where these rural co-ops started in Texas in 1935. We let our contract for the first dam even before President Roosevelt signed the Executive order, and

as we started those dams, we were watching closely the creation of REA on a national scale because we were dependent upon REA for an outlet for the power of those public dams.

What the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] just said reminded me of my talks in central Texas for the Lower Colorado River Authority. I pointed out that in Holland over 90 percent of the citizens had electricity; in Denmark 95 percent; in Sweden, 95 percent.

People came to me and debated the issue with me. They stood up in the crowd and said, "RALPH, this is socialism. This will not work on the plains. People will go broke. We have counties in Texas which are bigger than all of Holland. This will not work." They said, "This will bankrupt the Government." That was what the people actually said.

I am happy that in the course of time, now 25 years later, the plan has proven workable. It is workable and economically sound, and it has not cost the Government any money.

By contrast, on this 25th anniversary of the REA program, 277,800 Texas farm families now have electricity and nearly 70 percent of this power was furnished through the REA plan. Texas REA co-ops, of which there are now 97, have invested over $274 million, have built 148,048 miles of line, and are serving 352,318 customers. All in all, Texas REA co-ops serve more people over a greater area of distribution than such systems in any other State in America. There are more REA service connections in Texas than any other State in the Union.

Mr. President, these REA co-ops are local owned and operated independent business organizations founded under the REA plan to bring light and strength to the farms of America. Despite bitter and powerful opposition at its inception, and continuing opposition to the REA by special interests even up to today, the REA has become one of the great landmarks of human achievement in our Nation's history. Few things, even in this fabulous era of technological advancement, have meant so much to so many people in the last quarter century as has President Roosevelt's plan to bring light to rural America.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as a Member of the House, I voted for the bill creating the Rural Electrification Administration, and have ever since supported that program. The silver anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration offers an appropriate occasion for all of us to pause and reflect on its accomplishments in the past quarter century.

The economic implications, alone, are impressive enough to warrant considerable attention. Electricity, for its users, is simply energy in its most usable form. Once a farm is supplied with this silent, flexible, versatile means of energy, it automatically becomes a potential market for all the products that have been devised to harness it for useful work.

No amount of persuasive salesmanship on the part of any electrical appliance dealer could transform a farm family into a customer for his products without an available form of electric energy.

Once a farm is electrified, however, it becomes a potential customer for electric stoves and heaters, for lamps and washing machines, for ironers, radios, television sets, milking machines, and modern plumbing operated by electric pumps. The list of products that an electrified farm is in a position to buy is almost endless. The impact on our economy of this still-developing market is directly beneficial to thousands of stockholders and millions of our industrial workers, some of whom may never have been on a farm at all.

But rural electrification, for all its direct aid to our expanding industrial economy, is best measured in human terms—in what it means to the comfort and well-being of men and women and boys and girls who are freed from the cheerless drudgery of hand labor.

Prior to the advent of rural electrification, virtually all the work on a farm was done by musclepower alone. Only the farm wife, who formerly washed clothes by hand on a scrubboard, can truly appreciate the value of a modern, automatic electric washing machine. Only the girl who formerly carried water from the well or the spring, a bucketful at a time, can realize fully what a piping system, powered by an electric pump, means to her comfort and convenience. Only the boy who laboriously chopped the wood for the old cookstove can fully appreciate the value of a modern electric range.

Most of the tools of better production, enabling the farmer to raise more crops and feed more people with greater efficiency—while still insuring some measure of relaxation and comfort for himself—depend directly or indirectly on the power transmission lines that bring the versatile servant of electric energy onto his farm.

The use of this electric energy to replace musclepower and to operate new appliances that musclepower alone could never operate has freed more and more of our farm people for productive enterprises that lead directly to a richer, fuller life for all of us.

I am proud to join my colleagues in the Senate in marking the 25th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration for the better life it has made possible for all our citizens.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to join in commemorating the signing of the Executive order establishing the Rural Electrification Administration 25 years ago today. At the time that order was signed by President Roosevelt, only one-tenth of America's farms had central station electricity. The reason was quite simple. Rural electrification was not an economical business. Farmers could not pay the high charge for the lines and equipment needed to bring expensive power from the highline to the farmstead.

The Executive order and the Rural Electrification Act which followed a year later, made it possible for farmers to create nearly 1,000 rural electric cooperatives which now serve more than 4½ million farms, homes, and other rural establishments. They helped rural people help themselves obtain electric service, and thereby, many of the conveniences of the city which they could not afford in the pre-REA era.

Had the cooperatives which were formed in the early days had to depend on the private power companies for all of their wholesale power, the remarkable progress this program has made would not have been possible. Fortunately for the rural electric program, and for that matter for the country as a whole, rural electrification was developing at the same time our forward-looking national administration, and an equally forward-looking Congress were making provisions for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and later the Bonneville hydroelectric projects, the Missouri River basin dams, and other developments. From these projects flowed electricity at reasonable wholesale costs. Also, there appeared a powerful competitive influence known as the Federal power yardstick by which the American people were able to measure the fair and possible costs of electricity, even outside the areas of public power development.

Five years ago on this day I stood here and enumerated a list of benefits rural electrification had brought to American farm men and women and their families. As time goes on we tend more and more to take these benefits for granted; therefore, I feel today as I did 5 years ago when we were commemorating the 20th year of rural electrification progress, that we should from time to time, stop and consider the improvements in rural life and agricultural production that have resulted directly from this great program. Rural electrification progress has come so rapidly that there are few among us who cannot think back to their boyhood days, to life on the farm or life on farms we visited; and I daresay there are many among us who can well remember having to help pump water by hand, carry feed to livestock, milk cows, clean out barns, and do the thousand and one other chores about the farms that we knew. If we visited those farms today we would find that the farmers and their families have been freed from this drudgery. Life is better.

The benefits of rural electrification, however, have spread far beyond the farm and rural home. To date, about $3½ million have been spent in building rural electric lines. That has meant work for thousands of people in the construction industries and a significant order for such items as poles, transformers, conductors, and other materials.

REA appraised the relationship between the cost of supplying electricity to rural consumers and the use of electricity by those consumers, and they found that for every dollar spent in construction of facilities, about $4 were spent by the consumers for apparatus that utilized electrical energy. That has meant that a big new market for appli-

ances and farm equipment was created by this program. It is estimated that the annual market for this equipment is running at about the rate of $1 billion per year. With new appliances being put on the line as new uses of electricity are discovered, this expenditure for consumer goods will increase even more. I am told that in maintaining these rural electric systems, well over a million power poles are purchased annually and over a million and a half miles of conductor have been strung to serve the 16-million-plus people who are receiving electricity as a result of this program. The boost to the industries involved in making electrical apparatus and equipment that has resulted from this program has been significant. Obviously, all industries and people in all occupations benefit by the boost this gives to our economy.

My own State of Minnesota has been a true pioneer in the rural electric cooperative movement. Many years before REA, as we know it today, came into the State, a cooperative known as the Stoney Run Electric Cooperative was in operation near Granite Falls, Minn. The first Minnesota rural electric cooperative under the REA Act was the Meeker Cooperative Light & Power Association organized in 1935 at Litchfield. In 1936, a statewide association, the Minnesota Rural Electric Association, was formed and Irving J. Clinton, of Litchfield, was elected as its first president. When the present statewide association, the Minnesota Electric Cooperative, was formed at a reorganization in 1940, Mr. Clinton was also elected president of this newer group.

Minnesota is the home of the first nuclear power reactor for rural electric cooperatives. This reactor will go into production in November of this year. It is owned by the Atomic Energy Commission and will be operated by the Rural Cooperative Power Association of Elk River, Minn. The electricity produced from the reactor steam will eventually reach the 40,000 consumers of the 6-member cooperatives who own the Rural Cooperative Power Asosciation.

Another Minnesota first in the rural electric cooperative movement was the organization in 1949 of the cooperative power association for the purpose of obtaining and maintaining an adequate wholesale power supply for its co-op members at the lowest possible cost. Incorporated in 1956, the association started active operation in December of 1957. To date the association has succeeded in organizing and operating a power purchasing pool for its members which provides them the lowest cost wholesale power available to Minnesota cooperatives. The association has succeeded in this by delivering Missouri basin hydroelectric power to cooperative load centers in a very wide area over extended Federal transmission lines and also over lines of commercial utility companies under contractual arrangements.

Virtually all rural electrification in Minnesota has been carried out by nonprofit cooperatives operating under the REA program—83 percent of all electrified farms are served by such cooperatives.

Today, the first phase of rural electrification on a national scale is being completed. More than 96 percent of all formerly unserved rural residents now have power. The next, and equally important step in rural electrification is to meet the rapidly growing demand for electricity on these farms with abundant and reliable sources of electric power at reasonable rates. With the use of electricity on rural electric lines doubling every 5 years or so, the problem of meeting these needs becomes extremely important. New steam generation plants will be needed to supplement existing hydroelectric generating systems. Distribution systems will have to be changed over to handle heavier loads than any carried before. Thus, as the use of power increases it is necessary for all of us to put our support behind the development of new power sources; we must find ways of keeping costs down to insure low retail power rates and continue our support of adequate loan funds for REA at reasonable rates of interest.

The American farmer through his rural electric systems has been a foremost advocate of developing all of the feasible hydroelectric power possible. He has been in the lead because more than any other group, he learned the hard way that the key to obtaining the greatest benefit from electricity is keeping the costs down.

In the 5 years since we spoke in commemoration of rural electrification's 20th birthday, a number of attacks have been made on this great program and a number of bills have been introduced and proposals made which would do it great harm.

In recent years we have seen a shadow fall across this great program. The REA Administrator no longer can judge an important loan application on its merits or make the loan himself. Under administrative orders sent down from the Secretary of Agriculture, the Administrator must submit all large loan applications and all new applications to the Director of Agricultural Credit Services in the Secretary's office for review and approval. The bill, S. 144, which I introduced and which was approved by the Congress would have corrected that weakness in the program, but for the President's veto. Here in the Senate, by more than a two-thirds majority, we overrode the President's veto but in the other body, the veto was sustained by just four votes. We made a gallant stand and not wholly a losing one, for by our strong showing, we served notice on this administration that the Congress will not stand for any tampering with this program.

Last year the Senate unanimously adopted a resolution, Senate Resolution 21, which reaffirmed the sense of the Senate with respect to REA operations. In effect, the Comptroller General who, by decision attempted to restrict the operational scope of the program, was told that we wanted the rural electrification program carried on in the future as it had been in the past, serving all unserved residents of rural areas wherever they might live.

With such support based on an understanding of both the social and economic values embodied in the program, Congress has contributed greatly to the success this program has enjoyed during its first 25 years. If rural electrification is to survive and prosper the vigilance of Congress is necessary now and in the future. With our support rural America can make the golden anniversary, in 1985, an even more memorable occasion than this, the 25th.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to add my tribute to the many being paid rural electrification on this the 25th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration.

My feeling in this matter is highly personal. I remember my own State of Tennessee before the Tennessee Valley Authority and before REA's.

I remember the picturesque but weak and flickering coal-oil lamps.

I remember the nostalgic but clumsy cook stoves.

I remember the back-wrenching chores forced upon the womenfolk of the farm families—as well as of the men—because there was only musclepower to operate machines, do the jobs, light the lamps.

These rural scenes were in sharp contrast to the electrified towns and cities. It was a factor stagnating rural society in comparison with the progress of the cities.

Statistics show that 3½ percent of Tennessee's farms had electricity at the advent of REA. More than 95 percent of my State's farms are now electrified. This statistic is interesting. It is pertinent. But it does not tell the human story of what electric power has meant to Tennessee farmers, or to the Nation's farmers, for the experience of Tennessee has been the experience of all of rural America.

Figures simply do not tell the whole story of the lessened labor and the increased income and leisure.

Figures do not tell of the increased well-being of a thousand small communities whose businesses are wholly or partially farm based.

These things the rural areas of the Nation know and do not have to be told—at least, not those residents who are of my generation. The lessened labor and fuller life created by rural electric power are the basis for REA's unqualified support throughout the areas of its service.

As a Tennessean, I am naturally proud of the fundamental part my State played in the birth of this program. From TVA sprang the idea of rural electrification. From the cooperative user-owned electric systems set up in conjunction with TVA sprang the system of REA's which electrified the whole Nation at no cost to the Government and minimum cost to the users.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt's decision to launch a rural electrification program was in many ways a social decision. It was designed to bring the economic—and social—benefits of power to

areas of our Nation which private power companies had ignored because of the supposed high cost of service. One private power company's president was quoted as placidly saying that all Tennessee farmers who could afford electricity already had electricity.

President Roosevelt saw the program in another light. Cheap, abundant power was vital to agriculture as an economic tool to help it get out of its depression. Further, it was vital to farm people as a social tool, if this country was to continue its progress toward an abundant and enlightened life for all its people.

The rural electrification system was first visualized by the New Deal as an assist to private capital—a method by which private companies could give electric service to areas which private capital claimed was economically unserviceable. The private companies, however, failed to take advantage of the offer. President Roosevelt then turned to a plan of user-owned electric cooperatives which was already being developed in the Tennessee Valley as a means of distributing to local people the abundant power being generated there. In this plan Mr. Roosevelt found a model for the nationwide system of cooperatives which allowed rural people to help themselves to the cheapest possible power at no cost to the Federal Government.

It meant power to operate farm equipment. It meant power to draw water, to cook, and to lighten every household chore. It meant precious light by which to read, play cards, visit—or to finish farmyard chores. It meant increased study opportunities for the young people in the household, and for the adults, too, for that matter.

It meant, basically, the raising of rural-life opportunity to par with city living.

The REA was nothing short of a social and economic revolution in rural and isolated America.

It was cement to bind our Nation more closely together.

The establishment of REA just 25 years ago was one of the most significant social and economic steps in American history and was one of the New Deal's signal contributions to our people. It seems so to me now, and I am confident that historians will agree in the future.

The Reverend Francis B. Sayre, dean of Washington Cathedral, summed up the achievement almost poetically last year when he said:

> Mankind must thrill to the achievement of electricity carried to the humblest cabin, conferring there not merely respite from toil, but the self-respect of jointly owning the instrument which can so bless a whole community.

To that I can only add amen—25 times, once for each year of REA.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a timely address delivered by Mr. Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at the association's 25th anniversary celebration of the rural electrification program, in Warm Springs, Ga., on May 11, 1960.

Mr. Ellis has done outstanding work on behalf of rural electrification and deserves our thanks for his direction of the REA association and for his continued defense of the REA from assaults upon it.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROMISE OF ABUNDANCE

(Address of Clyde T. Ellis, general manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association)

This is a notable day for rural America.

Across the land, through newspapers and magazines, radio and television, people are reliving the story of these past 25 years. At this moment, in Washington, the Congress of the United States is assembled to honor the rural electrification program and pay tribute to the coauthors of the REA Act—Speaker SAM RAYBURN and the late Senator George Norris. Many State and local observances are in progress, too.

Here at Warm Springs, we gather to celebrate the birthday of an undertaking which, for many of us, has been a lifework. Here we honor former Congressman Steve Pace, who, as subcommittee chairman, sponsored and fought for the amendment which made area coverage rural electrification possible.

By his featured role in these ceremonies, we honor, too, the former able, longtime Administrator of REA, Claude Wickard. Without his determined leadership in the crucial postwar years, we probably would not be here today.

It is also significant that we meet at this place where President Franklin Roosevelt said the rural electrification program was born, when he first came face to face with the rural rate policies of the power companies.

So, in a way, we come home today—in the spirit of a family reunion.

For a few moments, I want to speak as a member of the family. For some 17 years I have been privileged to serve you as general manager of NRECA—the farflung rural electric service organization—which also has deep roots in the soil of Georgia, and to which this State has contributed the leadership of many great men, including our illustrious president, Walter Harrison.

During these years, and earlier, as a member of the Arkansas Legislature and the U.S. Congress, I have lived with the problems of this program. In that time, we have had three national administrations, four REA Administrators, and a passing parade of Congressmen. I've seen men like Senator DICK RUSSELL of Georgia provide the spark of leadership needed to save the program. I've seen other men try to destroy everything you have built up.

With these remarks as a sort of preface, I want to give you some of my personal observations and convictions as we pass this important milestone.

My frame of reference is the promise of abundance—the abundance of low cost electric power in our economy, particularly the rural economy. Since the earliest days of NRECA, this has been our objective.

No man of vision, I think, can consider the initial extension of electricity to a rural home as an end result.

A rural family may have electricity available, but that fact alone does not satisfy our concept of rural electrification. The electricity must be present in great abundance, and at a cost so low its use will be almost unlimited.

We say that rural electrification has performed miracles, and so it has. But we have yet to scratch the surface. For most people, electricity is still relatively high priced. This is especially true in rural areas far removed from the great public wholesale power systems like TVA and Bonneville.

Except in a few areas, we have not been able to realize our long-range goal of 1-cent electricity for every consumer. We have progressively brought the cost of electricity down, largely through greater use, but we have no reason to be complacent.

One-cent electricity is available now in Alabama, Tennessee, and Washington. This proves it can be done. We need public policies which will make it feasible everywhere. At present, the average cost on rural electric systems is about 2½ cents per kilowatt-hour. We will never have full rural electrification until we succeed in cutting that average at least in half. When we do that, the promise of abundance can be realized—the family farms of America and the areas in which they are located will begin to bloom again.

So long as electricity remains high priced, its use will be restricted. The poor will go on without refrigeration, without indoor plumbing, without hot and cold running water, even without proper lighting.

Those who are better off will continue to neglect electricity as a production tool, and as an instrument for a fuller, richer life.

Even at existing prices, our rural electric consumers—some 16 million rural people—are doubling their use of electricity about every 5 to 7 years. At low prices they would perhaps double this speed. Incidentally, since electricity can be used only through appliances, our rural electric consumers are paying out over $1 billion a year for new appliances.

We must also use low-cost, abundant power as stimulus to industry in the always depressed rural areas. Our family farm people must have further and supplementary places to work. One of the tragic blights I see throughout the country are the vacant farmhouses, and they exist right now by the hundreds of thousands on the lines of rural electric systems.

Where are the people? The people are in the cities, swelling the ranks of the unemployed, living, all too often, in squalid areas sneeringly referred to as hillbilly heights. When they are able to find work, they often displace natives of the city who also have families to feed.

Surely this is no solution to either the farm problem or the labor problem. With half the world hungry, the harsh philosophy that the family farmer should give up and move to town is cruel and cowardly. It seeks to shuffle human beings like a deck of cards, in defiance of all reason—and when the shuffling is done, the same people remain, fighting to live while others starve.

Ahead of us in this country is enormous growth. By 1975, our country will have about 230 million people. This means new agricultural processing plants, new industries, new concepts of production, and distribution.

We can make no greater contribution to the consumers who own our systems, or to the Nation, than to do everything in our power to attract these new activities to our service areas—where they will employ and serve our people.

One thing our rural electric leaders can do, if necessary, is to use their 25-year experience with successful cooperatives as a pattern for some of this future development. In many of our service areas, the prospect of a decent profit is too thin to attract businesses and activities which must operate for profit. But there is no reason many of these future activities could not be operated cooperatively, to the benefit of the entire community—particularly plants for the processing of products of the soil and products for rural use.

We have proved that rural people can organize themselves and successfully oper-

ate complex and technical businesses. We will make an invaluable contribution to the future development of rural America—yes, to the free enterprise system itself—if our leaders will use this know-how to help themselves and our members generally in other areas of activity.

There are many challenges which must be met before we can hope to realize the promise of abundance in underdeveloped rural America.

For one thing, we must preserve the integrity of our rural electric service areas. Some other electrical suppliers have announced publicly that they intend to take from us every industry, even those which locate on our lines. Some are already doing it, without any fanfare. This must be stopped.

One power company official has noted happily that the law restricts the area we can serve, but that his company can serve anywhere. In other words, he can pick off our good users without fear of reprisal.

We can never have dependable low-cost power on any such basis. When laws are inadequate, they can be changed, as you demonstrated in Georgia this year. Many other States need to follow your example.

There are other laws which we must protect. We must protect the Pace amendment. The administration in Washington has propagandized for various proposals which would destroy the Pace Act and double or triple the interest rate on our rural electric loans. It has propagandized for sending us to the money market for our capital. These proposals would add substantially to the operating costs of all systems; they would kill the generation and transmission program; they would force untold numbers of systems to increase their already high rates; they would destroy area-coverage; they would put many rural electric systems out of business entirely.

This is not the road to low-cost power. The 2 percent REA rate, in light of all the facts and circumstances, is fair to both the borrowers and the Government. During the debate on the Pace amendment, Congressman BOB POAGE, who handled much of the technical discussion for the House committee, pointed out that interest costs might go up or down over the life of a loan, but the fixed 2 percent rate would be about the average. History bears him out. During the 25-year life of our program, the average annual interest cost of carrying the marketable public debt has averaged just about 2 percent per year.

Moreover, let us never forget that Congress permitted us to serve only in the marginal rural area and at the same time required us to serve everyone, whether they could pay their own way or not. And perhaps half of those served don't pay their own way. The others have to pay a little more.

We must also take the necessary action to assure ourselves of an adequate supply of low-cost wholesale power. Throughout the country our private suppliers are increasing our wholesale costs and adding limitations on our use of the power as new contracts are negotiated. In some instances they are in effect blackmailing our systems into accepting steep increases by threatening to insert contract clauses which would restrict our right to serve desirable loads in our areas. Many such restrictions have already been forced upon us.

We must continue to work for giant generation and transmission systems, public and private, which can achieve the efficiencies necessary for low-cost power. The Russians are doing it. Those of us who made up the Senate inspection team last fall saw with our own eyes their enormous plants and power grids, their crash construction program, including some efficiencies not yet achieved in our own country.

Thus far, we have been unable even to get public and private interests to join together in such undertakings—like, for instance, is being done in Western Europe. For the consumer's sake, these things must be done.

We must overhaul our regulatory agencies and make them responsive to the public need. I think it is disgraceful that William Connole, the only member of the Federal Power Commission who seemed to give a hoot about the consumer, was dropped so blandly by President Eisenhower recently. The giant utilities which the FPC is supposed to help regulate did not like Connole. They managed to get rid of him. The people of the country can't afford to tolerate such a shabby thing.

We can no longer neglect the development of our natural resources. There is no greater waste than the waters of a river flowing unharnessed to the sea. Our rivers must be developed on a comprehensive, multiple-purpose basis. We have the great example of TVA. We need other TVA's or their equivalents with transmission grids tied together for maximum efficiency.

Finally, we must develop atomic energy as a natural resource which belongs to the people just as, under the Constitution, the rivers belong to all the people. The day will come when the technical problems will be solved, and the incredible power of hydrogen fusion will be used to generate electricity. Then we shall surely have electric power in undreamed-of abundance—at a price which a former Atomic Energy Commission Chairman once described as too cheap to meter.

We must be very sure that monopoly interests are not allowed to capture atomic energy and turn the staggering atomic energy investment of the American people into a tool for private monopoly exploitation.

In summary, we must diligently pursue all the avenues which merge finally in the goal of low-cost electricity. We humbly ask the commercial power companies and all other power suppliers to join us in this pursuit. Experience proves that, if they will do so, the resulting high usage of electricity will insure their prosperity.

The promise of abundance, I believe, is as great a challenge to rural electrification leaders of the future as the promise of availability was 25 years ago. It can further transform rural America and help build an economy which will be a Godsend to our own people and an asset to all Americans.

Surely there could be no more appropriate occasion than this to rededicate ourselves to this goal.

PRESENTATION OF DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD

Mr. C. F. Palmer, chairman of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Warm Springs Memorial Commission, is here on the platform. Mr. Palmer, will you come to the podium, please?

The board of directors of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association decided to on this occasion present the association's Distinguished Service Award to Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The award is inscribed with this quotation by Mr. Roosevelt himself: "It can be said that a little cottage at Warm Springs, Ga., was the birthplace of the Rural Electrification Administration."

We stand now on the front porch of that cottage.

The rest of the award reads as follows:

"The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and the 16 million rural people it represents pay tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt who created the Rural Electrification Administration and thus brought about the vast program of electrifying rural America."

It was felt that the award might appropriately be placed here at Warm Springs. Mrs. Roosevelt was invited to accept it, but regretfully could not come. It is with great honor and humility that through you, Mr. Palmer, I present, posthumously, to that great American, Franklin D. Roosevelt, this best token we have within our power to give.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, today, May 11, 1960, Congress is commemorating 25 years of progress made by the Rural Electrification Administration in electrifying rural America.

This has been a significant achievement resulting in the bringing to millions of rural residents the many comforts and conveniences afforded only a quarter of a century ago to those residing in cities and more densely populated areas.

Mr. President, Ohio, and in particular Miami County, has a keen awareness of the significance of this date, for it was in this Ohio county where a group of farmers were the first in the Nation to organize an electric cooperative, and the first Rural Electrification Administration loan in the Nation was made to this group.

This loan was known as Pioneer I, and just outside the city limits of Piqua, Ohio, on U.S. Route 25, there is a plaque designating the spot where the first pole was set that was to carry lines delivering power to farmers in that area. This cooperative is now the largest in the State of Ohio, having 6,717 members.

Since this program started, the 29 electric cooperatives in Ohio have borrowed $79,884,370, and on this total loan, have paid $9,607,484 in interest, and have repaid $20,162,445 on the principal. Ohio cooperatives have an outstanding record, as none is delinquent in payments of either interest or principal. With this borrowed capital, these cooperatives have built 30,026 miles of distribution lines, and have approximately 600 miles of transmission lines. With this system, they are serving 129,422 rural customers. In 1958, these cooperatives paid State and local taxes amounting to $1,205,411.

Mr. President, it is difficult to estimate how many millions of dollars worth of business these rural consumers have given to the businessmen of Ohio in the last 25 years. It is conservatively estimated, however, that each rural consumer spent for electric appliances, wiring, pumps, farm chore equipment, and so forth, $10 for every $1 invested in the rural electrification system. This would mean that the rural people served by these cooperatives have spent nearly $1 billion for equipment that uses electricity. This in itself has meant a great deal to the economy of this State, and of course, we cannot overlook the fact that health standards, too, have been raised.

AMERICAN SUCCESS STORY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the success story is a part of our American tradition. It has enriched our folklore and woven itself into our frontier heritage.

I wish to pay tribute to an American success story which has special significance today. I wish to comment on a Government-sponsored program and some of the people behind it.

Twenty-five years ago, rural America was still a dark land, with only 1 farm in

10 receiving electric service. Today the rural electrification program has brought light and power to 97 percent of the farms in this Nation, and to thousands of rural communities.

May 11, 1960, marks the silver anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration. REA has become a household symbol to millions of rural people as the electric lights have been turned on at one farm after another. REA has become synonymous with rural electrification, although the Federal agency which made the program possible has never owned a mile of line or operated a single transformer station.

The Rural Electrification Administration makes long-term loans under provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended by the Congress from time to time. This legislation and this agency of the executive branch, true to our American way of doing things, enables our citizens to use the resources of their Federal Government to accomplish something as groups of neighbors which they could not achieve individually.

The men who created REA knew that American farm families and other rural people wanted the benefits of electricity that city people had enjoyed for many years. The Senators and Representatives who drafted the Rural Electrification Act realized that America's farmers were willing to pay for their electricity, that they did not expect it as a gift or a handout.

Through the years since May 11, 1935, REA has lent the money to build the lines, to set the poles, and to buy the transformers. In most cases, the farmers themselves formed nonprofit cooperatives to build and to operate the electric facilities.

Of course, we know that REA has been more than a lending agency. From its reports to Congress and from the messages we get from our constituents back home, we know that REA is made up of people, and that these people have a mission. I wish to tell Senators something about that mission, and then to say a few words of commendation for the people who are REA.

The mission, spelled out by the Congress, was to see to it that isolated ranchers as well as people in rural areas close to the towns and highways obtained electricity if they wanted it. This broad goal of REA and its borrowers has been summed up in the term "area coverage." Area coverage is a big idea, as ideas must be in this big country of ours. Area coverage became the heart of the rural electrification program. It became a basis for designing consumers' rate schedules and for promoting greater use of power. Isolated consumers were not denied power or assigned a penalty rate for it, and thinly settled areas as well as the thickly populated ones enjoyed electric service at fair rates. This was possible because the people responsible for REA realized that the test for building an electric system was not the cost of any single line, but rather the amount of power that would be consumed and paid for. An isolated rancher who uses a thousand kilowatt-hours of electricity a month to satisfy his many needs can be just as desirable a consumer as the fellow who lives right alongside the powerline and uses only a modest amount of power. REA and its borrowers maintain a vigorous power use program to encourage full exploitation of their "wired hands." This has been a vital contribution to our agricultural economy in the years when hired labor was becoming scarce and costly.

Rural electric systems pay their own way. In 25 years of REA's lending program, 1,086 borrowers have actually drawn down a little over $3½ billion from total loans amounting to $4 billion. On this $3½ billion in REA financing that has gone into the construction of rural electric systems, the borrowers have made payments to the Federal Government of principal and interest amounting to almost $1¼ billion. About $155 million of this represents a current balance of payments in advance of due date. Only one electrification borrower is in arrears on its debt service. This is truly an amazing repayment record, and one that might be the envy of private lending institutions the world over. What is even more remarkable is the nature of these loans. REA loans for rural electrification are 100 percent loans, with no other equity and security than a mortgage on the system to be built. Trust in the farmers themselves has provided the real security for these REA loans. And the farmers and other rural citizens have kept that trust.

Farmers and other rural people own these electric systems. Because consumers often refer to their local rural system as the REA—a tribute to the source of the financing—the local ownership is sometimes overlooked. It should be a source of deep and abiding pride to us that 985 of the 1,086 borrowers are cooperatives. The others are public power districts, municipals, and power companies. The cooperatives are organized, owned, and operated by individual citizens. The rural electric cooperative is an independent, local business enterprise, incorporated under the laws of the State in which it operates. Each member exercises a single vote in electing a board of directors from among the membership. The board hires a manager to run the electric system. A portion of each member's payments on his electric bill is used to pay off the indebtedness to REA.

In my own State of Colorado there are 25 of these home-owned rural electric cooperatives. Up to January 1, 1960, the beginning of REA's 25th year, they had borrowed a total of $121,167,157 to construct 34,495 miles of line and other electric facilities to serve 86,677 consumers.

Back in 1935, at the time REA was created, only 7,145 farms in Colorado, or 11.2 percent, were receiving central station electric service. Today's total is up around 36,000, or about 90 percent of all farms recorded in the last census. One of the figures we are proud of is the consumption of electricity. The average monthly use of power by each consumer on the lines of Colorado's rural electric cooperatives was 180 kilowatt-hours in 1950. By 1958 that had jumped to 334 kilowatt-hours, and it is still growing as farmers and other rural consumers find more and more ways to step up production and improve their living standards with reasonably priced electricity.

In Colorado, as in our other States, an increasing proportion of each year's REA loans goes into heavying up existing rural powerlines to accommodate the increased powerloads. And a larger share also goes toward construction of generating plants and transmission lines to assure ample power for rural areas that cannot purchase enough dependable electricity at a reasonable price from existing sources.

Another figure I am proud of in Colorado is the repayment record of our rural electric cooperatives there. It is even above the very fine national record. In my State, on $97½ million actually advanced by REA, the borrowers have repaid $12½ million on the principal. In addition they have paid $8¼ million in interest and more than $5½ million in advance of due date.

When we get to talking about statistics in the REA loan program itself, we must not lose sight of what it has done to boost other segments of our economy. It is estimated that for every dollar that REA has advanced in loan funds for the construction of rural electric systems, the consumers on those lines spend $4.50 for electric wiring, equipment, and appliances. This runs close to the fantastic sum of $16 billion, and more billions are going to be spent each year by consumers eager to keep their electric power at work. REA borrowers have created local payrolls, they pay local taxes, and in many places they have built the most modern building in the county seat.

All of this is American enterprise in the pioneering tradition. As a Republican and a strong supporter of the REA program, I take pride in the role my party has played in this frontier of service to the American public. It was a Republican, Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, who authored the Senate bill which became the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

The record of REA and its borrowers since 1953 has been outstanding. Let me point to several significant figures that are typical of this administration's backing of rural electrification. Since January 1, 1953, REA electric loans approved total $1.4 billion. That record, achieved in 7 years, represents one-third of the total loaned in 25 years. REA has approved loans providing more generating capacity during the last 7 years than was provided for in loans during all the preceding years.

Of particular significance is the improvement in the financial position of the REA-financed rural electric systems under the present administration. Since January 1, 1953, the number of electrification borrowers behind in their loan payments dropped from 45 to 1. In the same period, the balance of payments in

advance tripled. Total net worth of the electric borrowers in these 7 years more than doubled, from 7.7 percent of assets at the beginning of 1953 to 18.2 at the start of 1960. At the same time, the cost of electricity to consumers on the lines of REA borrowers went down. The average price is now 2.65 cents per kilowatt-hour, lowest in REA history.

I have been describing the progress of rural electrification in terms of statistics. This has to be done to give us some measurement of the success of this undertaking. But the real measurement of REA's success is in the people. In observing the first 25 years of progress in rural electrification, our admiration and our gratitude go out to the thousands of rural leaders who set up the rural electric cooperatives. Millions of people can share the feeling of accomplishment that we now survey.

Prominent among those who are responsible for this excellent program are the engineers, the accountants, the technicians, and the clerks and typists in the Rural Electrification Administration. They are dedicated people, and they have worked long and hard and well under their several Administrators.

As a Republican I want to call particular attention to two Administrators who have been responsible for the remarkable record of REA in these last 7 years. The first of these was ANCHER NELSEN, of Minnesota, now a Member of the House of Representatives. The present Administrator is David A. Hamil from my own State of Colorado.

Dave Hamil, as he is known to everyone, became Administrator of REA on June 26, 1956. He came to Washington with practical business experience. For many years he has been a rancher in the cattle feeding business in Logan County, Colo., where he was born.

He came to Washington with administrative know-how. At the time of his appointment, he was speaker of the Colorado House of Representatives, a position he had held since 1951. He was first elected to the Colorado General Assembly in 1938, and with exception of a 2-year term in 1948–49 had served in it continuously.

He came to Washington with experience in rural electrification. Mr. Hamil became active in the REA program back in 1939 when he helped sign up members and organize a section of the Highline Electric Association of Holyoke, Colo. He served as a director of the cooperative for 5 years. He has seen its membership grow from 180 consumer-owners to more than 4,200.

Let me quote what this practical businessman, what this Administrator with know-how, what this experienced leader in rural electrification—and above all, what this warm, friendly, understanding man—says about the program he runs:

The end product of REA's rural electrification program is a human one, and it cannot be measured in statistics.

In human terms, rural electrification means a light to read by on a dark winter night in North Dakota.

It means a radio and a television set, broadcasting a frost warning in Georgia or a late market report in Iowa.

On an Arkansas farm, it means ironing a Sunday shirt in July without first stoking a range red hot to heat the flatiron.

It means that a youngster in Colorado changes his mind about seeking his fortune in the city, and plans to stay on the ranch after he graduates from ag school.

It means better food on the table year-round, for both city and country people.

It means that a farmer can intensify and diversify his operations.

It means a cooperative annual meeting, where thousands of rural families have turned out to elect directors to run the electric system they own.

It means more pride, greater self-respect for millions of rural people.

This is the real meaning of rural electrification, and it is for these things that we give thanks as we observe the silver anniversary of REA on May 11, 1960.

I am very happy to pay tribute, on this 25th anniversary of REA, to all who have contributed so much to actually changing the face of farm life in America.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, today the Rural Electrification Administration, over 4 million rural families, more than 1,000 electric and telephone cooperatives which serve them, and the people of our country, celebrate the 25th anniversary of the birth of the REA and the rural electrification program.

The accomplishments of the rural electric and telephone programs are well known. I will not take time to repeat the figures which document this tremendous record of accomplishment—numbers of members served, miles of line, the consumption of electricity, record of repayment—for the growth and success of this program has made REA a household word and an example to the world. I can give one example by saying that in Kentucky, 3 percent of our farms were reached by power lines in 1935, while today only 3 percent remain to be electrified.

Kentucky was one of the first States to join the program when, in October 1935, the loan to the Henderson-Union REC was approved. Kentucky exceeds its neighboring States in the percentage of farms served by REA cooperatives, and is matched by only four other States in the Nation in this respect. The East Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperative, at Winchester, is the second largest REA generating and transmission facility in the Nation, with one plant operating at Ford, on the Kentucky River. And a few weeks ago it announced plans for an additional plant at Burnside, Ky., on the Cumberland Lake. Kentuckians, and the Nation, have every reason to be proud of the Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperative Corp. and the 26 rural electric cooperatives which serve 235,000 members over 51,000 miles of line.

The program was conceived and initiated during the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. It was continued during the administration of President Truman, and it can be pointed out that much of this growth has taken place in recent years. I think it is proper to point out that approximately one-third of all rural electric loans and nearly all of the rural telephone loans have been approved in the last 7 years, under the administration of President Eisenhower.

But much yet remains to be done, for the increasing use of electric energy calls for heavier equipment and enlarged facilities to provide and carry the power which modern rural life demands today.

With respect to proposals to increase the 2 percent interest rate on REA loans, I would like to point out that many cooperatives have extended services to wide areas, at high cost, to fulfill the purposes of this act. Others must extend their service to remote farms and areas if the full purposes of the act are to be realized. Cooperatives now are engaged in the construction of generating and transmission facilities, authorized by the act. These activities have been based on the 2 percent rate fixed by section 4 of the REA Act. If interest rates were raised it would limit, and in some cases prevent, these advances by local cooperatives. I am opposed to an increase at this time in the 2 percent interest rate for these reasons.

The REA cooperatives in Kentucky understand this problem and in a resolution adopted at their annual meeting have indicated their willingness to make adjustments in the interest rate when they are able to meet the needs of the program. I will support them in this course of action.

I have strongly supported the rural electric and telephone programs in each of the three terms I have served in the Senate. I am especially glad to be serving now as a member of the Rural Electrification Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, for it gives me the opportunity to continue this interest and to consider all legislative proposals for the future of the program.

It has been my great pleasure to work closely with leaders and members of the Kentucky rural electric cooperatives for many years. They have been constructive, forward looking and realistic in their appraisal of programs which will serve their members and which are also in the best interests of the country as a whole. The tribute of this day belongs to them, to the farmer directors of the electric cooperatives and to the rural telephone companies and cooperatives and their members. They have built this great instrument for bringing a better life to the people of rural America.

The production of food and fiber during World War II was a testimonial to the contribution of rural electrification to the Nation's security.

And beyond agriculture, it has made it possible for thousands of people to live in the country and enjoy a better life. It has encouraged small industry along rural powerlines.

Rural electrification has brought light into the lives of millions—literally. It goes to the most basic essentials of family life—better food and shelter—and to the ordinary conveniences which now join nearly all our people in a way of life unique in the history of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement by my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], on the 25th anniversary of the rural electrification program.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORTON

The success of the Rural Electrification Administration program in making electric power available to the rural areas of our Nation constitutes a remarkable accomplishment in the history of rural America, and it is appropriate on this the silver anniversary of REA to recognize the splendid record of progress of the REA program and its hundreds of member-owned and member-operated cooperatives throughout the country.

When REA originated 25 years ago, only 10 percent of all American farms received central station electric service. Now, in 1960, nearly 97 percent of our farms have such service, with REA cooperatives serving more than half the total number of electrified farms. The REA goal is 100 percent electrification, an objective which appears to be close at hand.

I would like to direct special commendation to the outstanding performance of the REA program in Kentucky—to the leadership and members of the 26 power distributing cooperatives and to the Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperative Corp. More than 235,000 customers in 112 of the State's 120 counties now receive RECC-distributed power over 51,000 miles of lines. The achievements of the Kentucky program are especially noteworthy because many of the cooperatives serve areas where access is extremely difficult.

At REA's inception, some 8,900 Kentucky farms, or 3 percent, were receiving central station service. Present estimates show that 189,000 farms, or more than 97 percent, are electrified. Of this total, REA borrowers serve about 80 percent.

Loans totaling $153.6 million have been advanced to Kentucky co-ops since 1935. Every cooperative is current in its obligations to the Federal Government, and most of them are well ahead of their repayment schedules to REA. To date, some $43 million in principal, interest, and advance repayment has been returned to the Federal Government.

Kentucky also is benefiting from the rural telephone program, and 18 borrowers, including 10 commercial companies and 8 cooperatives, have received about $25 million to extend telephone service to rural areas. Since 1950, Kentucky's farm telephone coverage has increased from 21 percent to approximately 45 percent. REA loans will finance service to 43,000 new customers and improve service to 23,000 subscribers over 13,000 miles of lines.

REA has not reached its present stature without criticism. The most sensitive area, as my colleagues know, is the disparity of interest rates—the difference between the 2-percent interest rate paid by borrowers and the high interest rate the Government must pay in order to fund the REA program.

I believe that, by and large, the American people have accepted REA as a necessary function in improving our rural areas, and I feel that the attitude and position of the cooperatives and their State and national associations toward interest rates will largely determine whether this public acceptance will continue.

The Kentucky RECC is to be highly commended for responding to the interest rate challenge in a responsible and forthright manner. During its 13th annual meeting last September in Louisville, the Kentucky RECC adopted a resolution endorsing payment of the fair cost of money to the Treasury.

I would like to quote the resolution for the information of my colleagues:

"INTEREST RATES

"We realize that one of the most difficult points of criticism of the entire rural electric program derives from the interest rate on REA loans. We, therefore, feel duty bound to state our position on this controversial point. Our position is that we think we should pay the fair cost of money to the U.S. Government on REA loans.

"We urge that NRECA (National Rural Electric Cooperative Association) institute a study to ascertain this cost. As soon as the study is complete, we urge NRECA to submit proposed legislation for approval by the cooperatives, requiring payment of the fair cost of money on REA loans. We further indicate our approval of this legislation to be presented to the Congress in its session beginning January 1960."

Considerable credit for the great progress of recent years should be accorded to the REA itself and to the very capable leadership of Administrator David A. Hamil. The encouragement extended to the cooperatives, the constructive and cooperative attitude within REA, and a determination to fulfill the intent and purpose of the program have enabled the co-ops to meet their service obligations during a period of great demand.

I congratulate the REA and the member cooperatives for their part in bringing a better way of life to rural Americans.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, this is an historic day. It marks the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Rural Electrification Administration—one of the monuments to a great President, Franklin Roosevelt, and itself a great program to bring electricity to rural America.

In Indiana we are extremely proud of the rural electrification membership cooperatives and the businesslike manner in which they have functioned while bringing current to the farms of our State. We are also proud of the fact that our own Claude Wickard was a pioneer in the REA.

Recently an Indianapolis newspaper published an editorial entitled "Look to Boone County." It was a favorable comment on the annual report of the Boone County REMC, a system owned by the members it serves.

This electric system was constructed and put into operation with funds loaned to a group of rural cooperative leaders by the Rural Electrification Administration. In 1955, these borrowed funds were completely repaid with interest. The editorial states:

The record of the Boone County REMC for service and financial stability is excellent.

Other REA REMC's in Indiana and the Nation would do well to follow the outstanding example of the electric cooperative in Boone County.

The Boone County Rural Electric System like the other REA borrowers in Indiana that have repaid their loans to the Federal Government in full, with interest, are to be congratulated. They have achieved the goal that every one of the almost 1,000 borrowers of funds from REA across the Nation hopes eventually to reach.

It is all very well and good to encourage all REMC's to follow the example of the Boone County co-op. However, there is more involved in repaying in full an REA loan than merely having the desire to do so.

Every rural electric system is dedicated to the objective of providing its members abundant and reliable electric service at the lowest possible cost. Also, they all have a desire to repay their loans as rapidly as possible, consistent with the first objective and with prudent business practice. But at this point similarity often ceases. No two REMC's have the same income, expenses, advantages, or problems. Some have a large number of consumers in total and per mile of line; others have a small number. Some systems serve a high percentage of residential and farm consumers, others may serve several commercial and industrial users. These and many other factors determine income and expenses, and an early or a late date of full debt repayment.

The REA Annual Statistical Report for 1954, the last full year of operation before the Boone County REMC repaid its loan in full, shows that only one electric cooperative in Indiana had higher revenue per mile of line than Boone County REMC. This was a factor favoring early repayment of the loan. Was this a result of good management or of other circumstances? Probably both.

We are proud of the Boone County REMC for being one of the first electric co-ops in the State to repay its loan. Not all of our systems can be first, but they are all giving good service while repaying their debt, on schedule, or sooner.

The most recent Annual Statistical Report of the Rural Electrification Administration, published in July 1959, shows that the 39 rural electric membership cooperatives in Indiana are making excellent progress in this direction. Every one of these cooperatives has not only paid the principal and interest due but has also made payments ahead of its due date.

On this 25th anniversary of the founding of the REA, we may ask why it is that the members' owned and operated rural electric systems have succeeded so well in spite of low consumer density, the high cost of wholesale power, and other handicaps.

I am convinced they are succeeding because of three factors:

First, management has been good; their democratic form of organization has called some of the best community leaders into service as members of their boards of directors; second, the cooperative form of organization has assured service-at-cost, nonprofit operation; and third, REA credit has been available on reasonable terms.

Change any one of these factors, and success can turn to failure. Unchanged, our REMC's will follow in the footsteps of Boone, Hendricks, Henry, and Noble County REMC's, all of which have repaid their loans to the Federal Treasury, in full, and with interest.

Mr. President, to illustrate the financial progress of rural electrification in my State, I ask unanimous consent that the table entitled "Repayment Record of Indiana REMC's" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Repayment record of Indiana REMC's

Location and name	Total funds advanced, all purposes	Interest due and paid	Principal due and paid	Advance payments
Albion, Ind., Noble County	$525,000			
Danville, Ind., Hendricks County	990,095			
Indianapolis, Ind., Public Service Co	430,000	(1)	(1)	(1)
Lebanon, Ind., Boone County	727,926			
New Castle, Ind., Henry County	655,674			
Poland, Ind., Tri-County	[2] 5,295			
Angola, Ind., Steuben County	824,655	$150,360	$348,865	$209,771
Bloomfield, Ind., Utility District of Western Indiana	2,428,458	434,808	794,737	103,304
Brownstown, Ind., Jackson County	2,937,332	430,696	958,353	275,409
Columbia City, Whitley County	1,766,566	221,892	759,542	175,177
Columbus, Ind., Bartholomew County	535,344	99,743	270,031	215,108
Corydon, Ind., Harrison County	1,948,021	272,137	739,687	14,447
Delphi, Ind., Carroll County	982,100	223,097	410,636	63,160
Franklin, Ind., Johnson County	724,500	135,715	405,594	26,936
Greenfield, Ind., Hancock County	898,008	157,283	299,273	21,760
Greensburg, Ind., Decatur County	1,366,666	212,171	428,649	51,977
Huntington, Ind., Huntington County	917,000	160,152	441,782	69,753
Jasper, Ind., Dubois Rural Electric Cooperatives, Inc	1,528,256	261,488	353,549	41,516
Kentland, Ind., Newton County	545,000	91,676	213,009	75,156
Lagrange, Ind., Lagrange County	664,668	93,160	223,063	68,113
Liberty, Ind., Fayette-Union Counties	771,358	135,136	251,383	16,972
Linden, Ind., Tipmont REMC	2,249,663	374,734	878,285	116,674
Martinsville, Ind., Morgan County	$3,721,671	$418,243	$565,884	$137,221
Monticello, Ind., White County	1,260,000	208,414	460,801	137,855
Orleans, Ind., Orange County	1,239,132	208,898	362,707	28,227
Osgood, Ind., Southeastern Indiana REMC	4,312,593	619,734	829,960	47,993
Ossian, Ind., Allen-Wells Counties	905,235	118,115	261,209	68,619
Peru, Ind., Miami-Cass Counties	1,174,934	153,482	302,778	65,897
Plymouth, Ind., Marshall County	773,542	158,136	373,586	73,258
Portland, Ind., Jay County	1,736,729	247,472	828,073	462
Rensselaer, Ind., Jasper County	1,286,490	196,184	372,444	36,971
Richmond, Ind., Wayne County	1,113,042	206,494	550,787	14,906
Rochester, Ind., Fulton County	1,032,200	194,753	448,442	166,073
Rockville, Ind., Parke County	2,179,005	379,767	734,782	52,401
Rushville, Ind., Rush County	1,187,341	223,574	323,962	47,688
Sellersburg, Ind., Clark County	975,804	167,455	299,920	19,083
Shelbyville, Ind., Shelby County	1,196,106	238,142	511,656	1,151
Sullivan, Ind., Sullivan County	1,443,314	207,683	444,083	98,793
Tell City, Ind., Southern Indiana REC, Inc	1,606,956	242,654	389,351	12,987
Vincennes, Ind., Knox County	2,463,761	318,408	1,610,019	231,922
Wabash, Ind., Wabash County	627,650	118,571	362,353	34,649
Wanatah, Ind., Kankakee Valley	1,036,405	187,793	482,394	177,689
Warsaw, Ind., Kosciusko County	717,225	170,807	387,144	82,912
Washington, Ind., Daviess-Martin Counties	1,648,500	282,997	493,368	58,753
Williamsport, Ind., Warren County	1,177,268	180,131	783,016	56,257

[1] Loans repaid in full.

[2] Never became operational.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, it was my privilege to have been a Member of the U.S. Senate 25 years ago when the Rural Electrification Administration was brought into existence under Federal law.

I am pleased to join those who today are congratulating the REA on the occasion of its 25th anniversary. It has been a quarter of a century of good work.

As a farmer, as a man who has great admiration for those who follow the rural life, and as one who has sympathy for the problems which confront them, I know the great blessing of rural electrification.

The REA has made tremendous contributions to our national economy and welfare, especially in bringing electricity to areas where services by the private power companies was not feasible.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, as we on the floor pay our tributes to the accomplishments of the REA in the last quarter century, at least one of our colleagues is speaking at his own State's silver anniversary celebration back home, and I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the speech of the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] made this afternoon at a statewide celebration in Oklahoma City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR A. S. MIKE MONRONEY AT THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY, OKLAHOMA STATEWIDE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ASSOCIATION, OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., MAY 11, 1960

What a happy occasion it is to be here to mark the silver anniversary of REA. Here in this big statewide meeting, the friends of this great farmer-owned and farmer-operated movement have the supreme right to claim an achievement that ranks with the miracles of the 20th century.

Certainly we have astonished ourselves and the world with the pace of our achievements in many lines: electronics, science, outer space, aviation, atomic energy exploration, and automation. These breakthroughs into new fields are amazing and at times awesome. But none of them has had as much impact upon the lives of Americans as has rural electrification, the 25th anniversary of which we celebrate here today.

Throughout America and in Washington, too, the same recognition of this silver milestone is taking place. In nearly 5 million farm homes in 46 States and the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, expressions of gratitude will be given in almost prayerlike manner, because a great program was born that declared that there shall be light for rural America.

In 1879 Thomas A. Edison invented the incandescent lamp. The first central station generating plant in the world was established in 1882 to serve a few score customers within a 12-city-block area. It generated a capacity of only 1,200 horsepower and was used mostly for lighting. The first commercial use of electricity for motors on record was to grind coffee in a nearby grocery store.

By the early 1920's this great innovation in American life—electricity—had reached almost all the towns and cities of the Nation with central station service. Few were the homes within city limits that did not have ready access to all the electric service they wished to buy.

But this great innovation, in its progress, had passed by one of America's most important groups. Our farm population was forgotten in this march of progress. Within 40 years after the first electric service had begun, there was almost complete electrical service for the city family. Yet only 2 out of every 100 farm families in the United States were served by central station power.

In Oklahoma this period of the kerosene lamp extended to 55 years after the establishment of the first New York electrical plant. Then in 1935, the year that REA was born, only 2.6 percent of the Oklahoma farms had central station electricity. This meant that fewer than 3 out of every 100 farm homes had been brought into the electrical age of the 20th century.

Nationally the figures were somewhat better, but a gaping chasm of darkness was still the way of life for 89 out of every 100 American farmers.

The miracle of REA is that in 25 years—a quarter of a century—this expanse of darkness in the 97 percent of Oklahoma's farm homes is now transformed to an electrically lighted brightness in 93 percent of those same homes. Nationally the figure stands at 96 percent electrified.

How did it happen that it took more than 50 years to electrify only 3 out of each 100 Oklahoma farms, and that under REA in 25 years 93 out of each 100 have electricity?

Here was a job that was so challenging that only the interest of Government could meet the need. Twenty-five years ago REA Administrator Morris Cooke called on power officials to survey the extent of rural electric development and its capability. The answer was "There are very few farms requiring electricity for major farm operations that are not now served."

Since private industry saw no need for this service, so vital to the welfare of some 32 million Americans who lived then on the farms, it was necessary for Government to act. Two great Americans, whose achievements for our Nation's welfare are legion, fathered the REA. President Roosevelt signed the bill 25 years ago today. Its author was the great Speaker SAM RAYBURN—then the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It was Mr. SAM who designed the program and guided it successfully to its passage. And, I might add, who has acted as its guardian ever since.

Even as late as 1938 when I entered the Congress as a freshman, it was regarded by the private power companies as a boondoggle—certain to be a big failure and a fantastic drain upon the U.S. Treasury. How little these experts realized that the job that big business said couldn't be done—would turn out to be the most successful business expansion of the last quarter of a century.

America is richer, not only in the great service of bringing more than 30 million of our people into the electrical age, with all the benefits and convenience that its service

brings to home and family life, but it is richer in dollars because of its courage in expanding this service to our farm population.

Let me emphasize again and again and again that this has been a spectacular example of wise Government cooperation with private industry.

Here was a market of more than 30 million people desiring electrical service, who after 50 years saw only 11 percent of their people served. It was not Government competition with free enterprise—but Government effort to fill a long neglected need. The market is now proven as a result of REA's 25 years of successful operation. It has not only helped the REA cooperatives, these farm-owned and farm-managed business organizations, but it has helped the private utilities themselves.

As a result of REA's proving the need for and the value of the farmer as a customer, more than 2 million farm homes are now wired and served by private utilities. In addition, the REA cooperatives in most sections have become the biggest users of private power supplied at wholesale. Thirty-nine percent of all power sold by all REA co-ops was so purchased from private power companies. And I might add at an 8 mill rate that must mean added profits for these power companies.

The total of REA loans already made throughout the United States is $3.4 billion. All of this money has found its way into thousands of private industries. The posts, the wire, the insulators, the transformers, the switching systems, the service trucks—everything that the REA buys has gone into channels of private industry.

In Oklahoma this has meant enough line to stretch 65,439 miles. All the materials as well as labor for its construction were placed through private contractors and Oklahoma businessmen. The REA loans have brought $140 million of new construction to our State.

But private contractors and electrical equipment manufacturers are not the only ones who have profited from these Government loans for REA investment. For every dollar spent in construction of the lines, it is conservatively estimated that the farmer has spent from $4 up on additional business for the merchants for appliances, home wiring, water systems, washing machines, TV sets, heating, and a thousand and one other uses to make farm home life equal in comfort to city living.

A recent national survey showed that rural electric consumers will buy over a billion dollars worth of appliances in 1960. There are more than 400 known uses for farm appliances and equipment and every day the list expands as Willie Wired Hand takes on new chores for his boss.

In 1930 one farm worker produced enough food and fiber for less than 10 people. Today, with the help of electricity, he produces enough for 25. Agricultural experts forecast that by the end of the century he will be producing enough to supply the needs of 50 people. Yes, REA has brought about a revolution in the record of farm production, and one farm worker today has the output of three men in 1935.

Not only does the REA dollar, both the one invested and the one spent by the farmer to pay his service bill, find its way into stimulating new industry and sales, but the national REA systems add another $200 million to $300 million to the annual payrolls of the country for maintenance of lines and facilities.

Surely an enterprise such as this, that has helped not only the farmer but so many businesses of diverse nature, cannot be the ugly image or threat of socialism that its enemies claim that it is.

We need and I am sure you will have the understanding support of all the people when the true facts of this great and successful operation are known.

And with all the fine results that have been obtained, the best final answer to its worth has been that it has not cost the Public Treasury a single cent. Rather, it has returned to the Treasury in interest and principal more than one-third of the total money loaned the REA borrowers during the past 25 years.

Of the $3.4 billion loaned, $1.2 billion have been repaid, including $669 million on principal and $397 million in interest.

The amazing result of the job being done by the farmer-managed cooperatives is that they have already paid $154 million ahead of schedule. Out of all the thousand REA borrowers, only one is overdue in its payments—a total overdue of $97,600. This is the most amazing record of Government lending I have seen in my 22 years in Congress.

And they continue to do well in their efficiently managed services to the American farmer. The net worth of all the REA systems—that is assets above all debt—totaled $602 million in December 1959, an increase of 1.6 percent over 1958. Operating revenues increased by almost 10 percent to a total of $618 million in 1959.

Oklahoma's repayment picture is equally good. Not a single payment from an Oklahoma co-op is as much as 30 days overdue and they have paid ahead $5,915,482. Of the total of $139,981,277 loaned to Oklahoma in the past 25 years, a total of over one-fourth, or $35,819,480, has been repaid. Of this amount, $21,022,689 was paid on principal to retire their debt and $14,796,791 was paid in interest.

With a record of repayment like this, you would think that even our critics would express their approval for the capable management these organizations have rendered. But instead, we see them attack our interest rate as subsidized. You see, if it isn't one thing, then it is another.

Let's look at the record again and examine the interest picture.

Again it has been the Government which has profited from association with REA. During 16 of the 24 years the REA rates have been at a level that paid the Treasury of the United States a profit on their loans.

Only during the last 8 years of this Administration have the rates of interest failed to yield a profit to the Government on the cost of borrowing its money. During this 16-year period the rates to the Government were often far below that charged REA as a flat rate of 3 percent until 1944. From 1944 the flat rate of 2 percent was charged but during that period the Government interest rate was at an alltime low.

Now the drive is being made on two fronts against the REA systems. One is that their interest rates must be greatly increased. Some proposals put it at the highest rate for the most recently sold bonds. This would double the interest charge and would result in rates so high that the expanding uses of electricity on the farms would be curtailed. Some of the REA's would undoubtedly be forced out of business and some would have to sell the most profitable parts of their systems to the private power companies. Thus the great principle of providing service to all farmers, whether the line extension was profitable or not, would have to be abandoned.

The other threat to the existence of the operation of these co-ops is the pressure for constantly increasing the cost of wholesale power. The national rate from private utilities is 8 mills and from Government power sources averages 5.4 mills. Thus it has been the 46.5 percent of the wholesale power furnished by public power suppliers at this lower cost that has kept the rates within reason.

Now efforts are constantly being made to pack the cost of power from Federal dams with added but fictitious costs to push up these rates. Various formulas are used, such as "taxes foregone," "overloaded costs of the project charged to power generation," maintenance and overhead packing, and a variety of others. It is to the end of preventing these charges from being levied that your fine statewide organization has supported the Trimble bill to provide for a fair and equitable system of cost accounting on the amount of project charges allocated to power generation. This bill needs to be passed, but I doubt if under this administration it will be permitted to become law.

Power that you sell must be bought at wholesale at a reasonable rate if additional uses may be found on America's farms. The estimate is that the rural systems will require a doubling of the wholesale power supply every 5 years. In Oklahoma alone our power use has doubled since 1958. Nationally it has grown 2½ times.

Therefore the two greatest costs on your electric bill must be held to a reasonable figure. The cost of your interest and the cost of your wholesale power. Unless the upward pressure on both of these vital costs is held within reason, the great success of REA during its first 25 years may be reversed. Then failure—instead of success—will be the result, and the Nation, as well as the farmer, will suffer.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the Rural Electrification Administration celebrates its 25th anniversary.

During its quarter-century lifetime, the program has made a splendid contribution not only to rural, but also to small community life. In effect, it has "lighted the way" to better living for farmers and people in small communities by providing electricity for light as well as power for tools, household appliances, telephone service, and equipment—to make work easier and more efficient, and promote better living.

We recognize, of course, that through the years private industry has done a splendid job in meeting the needs of the American people.

As a supplementary program, however, the REA has succeeded in bringing electricity to a great many areas—particularly the so-called fringe regions—where it has not been profitable for private enterprise.

In extending electrical services in my home State of Wisconsin, for example, our cooperatives have done a splendid job. Today, we have more than 30 rural power cooperatives. As a result of private power, as well as REA services, more than 97 percent of the farms in the State now benefit from access to electricity.

Nationally, too, the REA is having a tremendous impact on the lives of our rural people. More than 95 percent of the farms are electrified, with REA serving slightly more than half of these. Residences, industry, commerce, and other nonfarm developments and activities are also benefiting from the program. Currently, consumers are being added to the system at the rate of about 100,000 a year.

On this 25th anniversary of REA, the administrators, cooperatives, leaders, and workers who have helped to extend and make the program a success deserve real commendation for an outstanding job of helping to provide a better life for millions of people in our country.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, today marks the silver jubilee or

the 25th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration. Over this quarter of a century our country has derived tremendous benefits from spreading electrical power through our more sparsely populated areas.

It gives me special pleasure and satisfaction to rise today to recount the accomplishments of the rural electrification program in my State of Louisiana.

In 1937, only 2,826 of the 170,216 rural homes and farms in Louisiana had electricity. These represented only 1.7 percent while the national average was 10 percent. Today, in 1960, the 13 REA-financed co-ops in Louisiana provide electricity for 98 percent of the rural homes and farms. This figure is a national record in total percentage of members served. These co-ops in Louisiana serve more than one-half million rural people, their farms, businesses, and small industries.

Rural electrification in Louisiana is greatly benefiting not only the farmers, but also the dairying and fishing industries, who are so dependent on modern refrigeration, and a host of small rural industries, all created by the new markets, methods, production, and so forth, of rural electricity. Rural electrification in Louisiana has created new jobs, increased productivity, and a stronger economy in Louisiana.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it was my pleasure on February 23 of this year to address the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in St. Louis, Mo., marking the 25th anniversary of the founding of that organization. Today marks the 25th anniversary of the signing into law by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt of the National Rural Electrification Administration Act.

The success and growth of rural electric cooperatives in South Carolina, as well as in the United States generally, has been a matter of personal interest to me.

I grew up as a boy on a farm and studied and read by the light of candles, lamps, and the fireplace. It was with a jealous eye that we country boys viewed electric lights in the big cities and dreamed of the day when we would get electric lights in our homes. Even when I was elected Governor of South Carolina in 1934, approximately 97 percent of the farms in my State had no electricity.

During all the years until I became a candidate for Governor, roughly only 3 percent of the rural people of my State had been able to obtain electricity for their homes. Even before the Rural Electrification Act became a legislative reality in the Halls of Congress—yes, even before I took office as Governor—I came to Washington, D.C., to see President Roosevelt, seeking funds to help make a study looking to the possible creation of a State-wide rural electrification program in South Carolina.

I argued that the money used in this direction would be much better spent than in any other way then devised for promoting economic recovery in those depression days. South Carolina received $100,000 under that program, and early in 1935, before the Nation as a whole had acted, we had created our own State rural electrification machinery.

Today, 25 years later, it is with great pride that I look back over the never-ending progress which has resulted from those first efforts. No people in the history of this Nation ever undertook a cooperative movement, hand in hand with their Government, and succeeded so well as have the rural people of this Nation.

There has never been the slightest glimmer of corruption or waste connected with the rural electrification program. There is only the bright story of success to tell. In South Carolina, for example, where once darkness prevailed across the countryside, there is now light. Where once 97 percent of the farms in my State had no electricity, today 97 percent have electricity.

The picture is the same for the rest of our Nation. The bright cities today are even brighter, but, most importantly, they are linked with shimmering chains of lighted farms.

Mr. President, so it is with deep sincerity that I extend my warmest congratulations to the rural electric cooperatives of America and to the loyal employees of the Rural Electrification Administration who have worked hand in hand over the past quarter of a century to lighten the darkness across our rural countryside.

It behooves Members of Congress to remember that this progress of the past 25 years is not the complete picture, for we must continue to support the programs which will keep the rural electric cooperatives alive and capable of meeting the growing needs of our growing Nation.

I, for one, pledge myself to continue my wholehearted support of the rural electrification programs which have benefited our entire Nation to such a great extent.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, just 25 years ago today, May 11, 1935, President Roosevelt signed the Executive order creating the Rural Electrification Administration.

This was the beginning of a series of events and developments which have brought the benefits of electricity to more than 96 percent of all farms, homes, churches, schools, and businesses throughout rural America.

From this Executive order there followed the passage by Congress of the Rural Electrification Act, the formation of more than 1,000 locally owned electric systems, and the rural electrification program as we know it today.

As much as any other program, the rural electrification program has contributed to a better way of life for farmers and others, all over rural America.

In my own State, at the time the REA was created only 6 percent of the farm families were receiving electric service. Now, more than 95 percent of Missouri's farms are being served by this great institution.

These accomplishments of the rural electrification program show what can be done when individual farmers, working in cooperation with their neighbors, with the assistance of their Government, set out to do a job.

On this 25th anniversary of the beginning of this great program, I wish to pay tribute to President Roosevelt, Members of Congress, farm leaders, and especially to the farmers themselves, whose leadership and effort have brought the blessings of electric power to rural America.

As we applaud the accomplishment of the past 25 years, we must not overlook the challenges that lie ahead. Instead of resting, we must build on the achievements of the rural electrification program. To this end I pledge my continued support.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the rural electrification program on its 25th birthday. This is the year of its silver jubilee. The story of its success is one of the most thrilling and inspiring ever written by our Government and the Nation's host of patriotic, devoted farm population.

The program of REA has been especially successful in Oklahoma—when it was born 25 years ago only 5,600 Oklahoma farms had electricity. Today more than 110,000 farms or over 93 percent of our total number are served with electricity.

This has been brought about by the cooperative efforts of our farmers and their Government—the rural electric cooperatives in Oklahoma as elsewhere are privately built, owned and privately operated by our own farm people. Farm life in Oklahoma has thus been improved, enriched and reinforced. Commitments to the Federal Government are being met on schedule or ahead of schedule.

Mr. President, I am proud of the great record made and now being made by Oklahoma farmers in building rural electrification, and, Mr. President, I am grateful to Oklahoma farmers who have helped keep me as a Member of this body for these past years where I have been permitted to serve my State and its farm people in contributing to maintaining and expanding our country's program of rural electrification.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I rise to salute the rural electrification program on its silver anniversary, May 11, 1960.

The achievements of REA can be told both in cold figures and in human, family terms in my own State of Colorado.

At the time the Rural Electrification Administration was created on May 11, 1935, only 11.2 percent of all the farms in Colorado—only 7,145 farms in all—were receiving central station electric service. Current estimates by REA now show that 89.7 percent of all the farms and ranches recorded in the 1954 census are being served—a total of 36,550 farms and ranches. Of the total, REA co-ops serve more than 60 percent.

Up to January 1, 1960, the beginning of REA's 25th year, the Agency had approved a total of $121,167,157 in loans to 25 electric co-ops in the State. These loans permitted the co-ops to construct 34,495 miles of line and other electric facilities to serve 86,677 consumers.

How are these loans being repaid? As of January 1, 1960, not one REA electric

co-op in the State was overdue in its loan payments. The REA electric borrowers had repaid $12,405,643 on the principal of their Government loans; $8,244,778 in interest; and $4,749,698 ahead of schedule.

In only 8 years—1950 through 1958—eight REA telephone loans were advanced in Colorado. In 1950, the year the first REA telephone loan was approved, 59.3 percent of the farms in Colorado had telephones; by the end of June 1958, this had risen to 73 percent of all the farms in the State. The REA loans are enabling the borrowers—4 co-ops and 4 commercial companies—to serve 2,813 new subscribers, and to provide improved service for 5,819 existing subscribers over 4,091 miles of line.

So much for the cold statistics. On the strength of them alone, REA would stand as a monument and testimonial to the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration and the Democratic Congress that created REA in 1935. But in terms of people and the way they live their lives, the story is infinitely more important. I know of nothing that has made rural life more attractive than REA.

A fellow citizen of my State is David A. Hamil, present Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration. Mr. Hamil recently put the facts in human terms so well that I would like to paraphrase what he said.

He said rural electrification means a light to read by on a dark winter night; a radio and a television set broadcasting a frost warning or a late market report; a chance to iron a Sunday shirt in July without first stoking a range red hot to heat the flatiron; a youngster changing his mind about seeking his fortune in the city, and planning to stay on the ranch after he graduates from agricultural school; better food on the table the year around, for both city and country people; an opportunity for the farmer to intensify and diversify his operations; a cooperative annual meeting, where thousands of rural families turn out to elect directors to run the electric system they own.

"It means," he concluded, "more pride, greater self-respect, for millions of people. This is the real meaning of rural electrification and it is for these things that we give thanks as we observe the silver anniversary of REA on May 11, 1960."

To those words, Mr. President, I add a hearty, "Amen."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the day of May 11 has a very special significance this year to millions of rural Americans. This day is the 25th anniversary of the creation of the rural electrification program. Today, more than 4¾ million homes, farms, and other rural establishments are served by electrical systems financed by the Rural Electrification Administration.

It was May 11, 1935, that President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the Executive order that created the Rural Electrification Administration. This act set up a long-term program which made it possible for groups of rural people to work together to bring the modern miracle of electric service to their homes and farms.

Only 3 percent of American farms were electrified by 1925, and barely 11 percent at the time REA came to life in 1935. Today 96 percent of all farms in the United States are electrified.

The real meaning of these statistics is dramatically clear to those who knew rural life before electricity changed the entire outlook of rural people. Electricity has been a tremendous national unifying force by making the good life of urban America available to the farm. As the ways of living of all Americans have thus become more truly similar and equal, our personal interests have converged and our understanding of each other has grown.

America's rural electric systems will continue to face great problems of growth and integration into the national economic organization in the future. The program will be attacked for varying reasons from varying sources. In order that America's rural electric systems do not remain victims to misunderstanding on the part of the general public, it is especially appropriate on this anniversary that the Nation take notice of the contributions to our entire national welfare and to our national growth and prosperity which are to the credit of the rural electric systems. It is likewise appropriate that we recognize and salute the strength and high caliber of the leadership and organization which the REA program has enjoyed over the years.

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent that portions of a booklet prepared and released by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association be published in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the booklet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM RURAL ELECTRIC FACT BOOK

(By Jerry L. Anderson and Dr. Paul Nelson)

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM

The rural electrification program is the term commonly used to embrace the many segments of the nonprofit industry supplying electricity to rural areas.

Sometimes it is simply called "the REA program"—after the Government agency which lends funds for rural electrification.

Used in this sense, however, "REA" is an oversimplification. The Rural Electrification Administration is a vital part of the overall program, but it is only a part.

Parts of the whole

Here is a brief summary of the organizations which together make up the "program." Detailed information on each will be found in other sections of this book.

Rural electric systems. These are the local organizations that build power lines and maintain electric service to their members. Most of them are cooperatives. The word "systems" is used because in some areas (Nebraska and the Northwest) public power districts borrow from REA and carry out rural electrification.

The co-ops are locally owned by the people they serve, and each is an independent business organization. They borrow money from the Rural Electrification Administration and repay it on regular schedules, with interest. They use the loans to build lines and other necessary facilities. A portion of each consumer's bill is used to pay off the loan. There are about 1,000 of these systems in the country, serving 4,700,000 consumers.

Rural Electrification Administration: This is the real REA. It is a Government agency, created in 1935 to lend money to local organizations for the construction of rural power lines. Most of its borrowers are rural electric systems.

REA loans must be repaid over a 35-year period, with interest at 2 percent. The relationship between a rural electric system and REA is about the same as that between any business and its banker. REA is interested only in making loans and collecting them. It does not hire the manager of local systems, set rates, or dictate policy. All of these things are done locally.

Statewide associations: In most States the rural electric systems have joined together in statewide associations. Some of these organizations are small, with only three or four employees who publish a consumer newspaper or magazine and work for the interests of the systems in the legislature. Others have large staffs that provide a variety of services, including central purchasing of supplies and equipment, central billing, public relations, etc. In all cases membership in these associations is voluntary, and local systems join if they choose to do so.

NRECA: The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association is the national service organization of the rural electric systems. It functions on the national level much as the statewides do on the State level.

NRECA has its own modern building in Washington and provides a variety of services for its member systems. These include insurance programs for employees and directors, management institutes and consulting service, group purchasing, public relations and publications assistance, and congressional representation.

NRECA representatives testify before committees of Congress on matters of interest to rural electrification, and in general, maintain close relationships with Congressmen and administrative agencies.

Membership in NRECA is completely voluntary, but the services are such that more than 90 percent of the rural systems have joined.

Generation and transmission co-ops: The securing of adequate amounts of wholesale power at reasonable rates has always been a difficult problem for rural electric systems. They have helped to solve it in many areas by joining together in State or regional cooperatives to generate and transmit their own power.

The G & T's, then, are federations of local rural electric systems, and are owned and controlled by them. Like the local systems, the G. & T.'s borrow from REA.

Other organizations and agencies have played important roles in rural electrification. These include the many Federal power projects which sell wholesale power to rural electric systems.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, for example, is the sole power supplier for more than 50 rural electrics in that area. Cooperatives in the upper Missouri River Basin are to a great extent dependent on Bureau of Reclamation dams. In other areas, the flood control dams of the Department of Interior provide invaluable power sources.

Along with the G. & T.'s, these Federal projects provide the only competitive element in the wholesale power field. Without them, rural electric systems would be at the mercy of noncompetitive commercial suppliers.

This is why the rural electrics, in the interests of their members, vigorously support both generation and transmission loans, and the Federal power program.

RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS

America's nonprofit rural electric systems now distribute electricity to almost 5 million families, churches, schools, and other establishments. They provide service to just about half of the Nation's farms.

Most of the other farms have electricity now, too. Nationwide, 96 percent of the

farms are electrified. Those not served by rural electrics receive power from commercial power companies, city-owned systems or other suppliers.

All of this has come about in a relatively short time.

In 1935, only 10 percent of America's farms were electrified. The remainder had little prospect of getting service at a price they could afford.

Power company practices

In those days, it was common practice for commercial companies to ignore rural residents. The power companies could see no profit in building long extensions through sparsely-settled countryside.

When the companies did offer service, it was common for them to require the farmer to pay the cost of the line, and turn title over to the power company.

In other cases the farmer was asked to contribute several hundred dollars, or even a thousand or more, to the company before the line was built.

Even when they could get a line built, many farmers were asked to guarantee that they would use a large amount of power each month.

The REA Act

When farmers became more and more indignant about such practices, Congress finally acted. Responding to the leadership of Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, and Representative SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, Congress passed the Rural Electrification Act in 1936.

This act established the fledgling Rural Electrification Administration as a full-scale agency of the Government (see chapter on Rural Electrification Administration). REA had been created the year before by President Franklin Roosevelt, partly as a make-work project.

When the commercial power companies refused to take advantage of REA loans to build rural lines, the Agency turned to the promotion of local electric cooperatives.

REA fieldmen worked with county agents, farm organization officials and prominent rural citizens to set up the non-profit, consumer-owned organizations.

The country abounded with "prophets of doom." Established commercial companies sneered at the idea that farmers could run their own electric businesses.

But while the cynics laughed, the rural electric co-ops kept working, building, planning.

By 1938, there were 248 of them, providing service to 104,000 rural families who had never had electricity before. By 1940 the number of co-ops had more than doubled, providing service for half a million families.

"Spite" lines

By now, the laughter had died. The power companies began to realize that the upstart co-ops had a chance of succeeding. Even spite lines had failed to stop the forward surge of rural electrification.

The "spitelining" tactics of the power companies are a matter of record in virtually every part of the country. It went like this: After a co-op was organized and mapped, the power company would quickly build lines to the most thickly settled areas of the co-op territory. By taking the villages, they hoped to destroy the feasibility of the rest of the co-op.

These practices caused bitterness and distrust between the new co-ops and the established companies. In many areas of the country it set a pattern of relations between the two types of suppliers that has not completely disappeared to this day.

The rural electric systems, however, were having problems of their own. Because of their nature, they were restricted to marginal, outlying areas. Even today, they serve an average of fewer than four consumers per mile of line.

Among other things, they discovered that powerlines are of no use unless wholesale power is available in adequate quantities at reasonable rates. In the early 1940's, they were forced to pay the commercial companies an average of approximately 1¼ cents per kilowatt-hour, wholesale.

Then came World War II, and line materials became almost impossible to get. The rural electrics got precious little of the supply that was available.

The co-ops began to realize that individually they were small and carried little weight in congressional and administrative circles. But together they had a potential strength that was enormous.

In 1943 a group of early rural electric leaders organized the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (see chapter on NRECA).

With the formation of their own national organization, the young co-ops were able to speak with a unified voice.

The Pace Act

One of their first joint ventures was a tremendous success. In 1944, through NRECA, they were able to persuade Congress to pass the Pace Act.

This action has a special significance in the history of the rural electrics. The Pace Act extended the repayment period for REA loans from 25 to 35 years. It established REA as a permanent agency. It set the interest rate at a flat 2 percent.

In return, Congress made it clear that it expected the co-ops to provide "area coverage."

Area coverage

This concept, revolutionary in the utility industry, held that everyone in an area served by a rural electric system should receive electrical service if he wanted it, no matter where he lived.

The liberalized provisions of the Pace Act and the end of World War II combined to unleash the drive to electrify rural America.

Throughout the Nation the cooperatives raced to build lines and connect new consumers. Aided by a sympathetic and aggressive REA, they built over 500,000 miles of line between 1946 and 1950, bringing service to 1,700,000 families that had never had electricity before.

By mid-1952, 3,769,000 rural consumers were being served by REA borrowers. The bulk of the initial construction work had been completed.

In the years since then, the rural electric systems have been occupied with the difficult task of extending service to the more remote areas. They take seriously their obligation to provide true area coverage.

A measure of their success is the fact that today more than 96 percent of the Nation's farms are electrified. Rural electric systems serve more than half of these, averaging nationwide just over three consumers per mile of line.

Internal growth

As their systems have grown physically, the rural electrics have had to cope with the parallel problems of internal growth. In many respects, these new problems are more difficult to solve than the earlier ones.

The problem of finding adequate sources of wholesale power, for example, has continued to plague the systems, and becomes more acute as consumer demand for electricity grows (see wholesale power section below).

In recent years, the systems have also had to be concerned about the source and cost of capital. The present administration has campaigned openly for higher REA interest rates. Specifically, the administration has advocated a new interest formula which would more than double the statutory 2-percent rate (see section on interest rates).

The rural electrics have opposed such an increase, pointing to studies which indicate that even a slight interest rise would endanger many struggling systems, the generation and transmission program, and the rural telephone program. Few, if any, systems could survive if the interest rate should be drastically increased.

Private financing

The systems have also opposed a companion administration proposal that they seek their loan funds in the open money market. They point out that both private and Government economists agree that if such funds could be found at all, the interest rate would be about 6 percent or higher. Few rural electrics could pay such a rate and survive.

Other problems have included territorial integrity, campaigns to impose punitive taxes on electric co-ops, and the perpetual necessity of keeping the electric plant up to date.

The systems are managing to meet and solve these problems, partly through improved modern management techniques, and partly through joint action carried out by their State and National associations.

Financial position

So far as national statistics are concerned, rural electric systems are in stable financial condition. Some systems, of course, are in much better shape than others.

In some areas, low consumption, high cost wholesale power, idle services, and other contributing factors keep systems at, or just over, the break-even point.

In 1958, 47 borrowers reported deficits in their net margins, an important index to the financial health of a rural electric system.

In other areas, more favorable conditions result in a more successful operation.

In general systematic growth is typical of most borrowers. Starting with nothing but debt, they are slowly achieving sound financial status.

One reason is that rural people are using power in great quantities, for a wide variety of uses (table 7). Total consumption has been doubling every 5 to 7 years. Scientific surveys of the rural electric market indicate that consumers served by the systems will buy $1 billion worth of appliances and equipment in 1960. Electric sales totaled 25.3 billion kilowatt-hours in 1959.

As sales rise, operating revenues go up, too. During 1959, operating revenues of the systems reached $618.3 million, according to REA estimates.

In 1959, the average residential consumer paid a bill of $8.64. A part of the bill of all rural electric members goes to make payments on the REA loans.

Net worth

Thus member equity slowly replaces borrowed funds, and the net worth of the system rises.

Net worth is defined as the equity owned by the members, and it is obtained by subtracting total liabilities from total assets.

The net worth of all rural electric systems now averages 18.2 percent (see chart).

Averages tell only part of the story. A few systems have repaid all their loans from REA. Some now have net worths in excess of 50 percent.

On the other hand, 130 systems had negative net worths in 1958. They owe more than they own.

This is typical of the vivid contrasts in the condition of the systems. In this field, averages usually tell only part of the story.

For example, REA has an index to the health of its borrowers called "Debt Service to Earned Ratio." This measures the borrower's ability to meet its repayment obligations out of current revenues.

In 1959, 148 systems failed to make debt service under the DSER formula.

Repayment record

By standards of any financial institution, however, the repayment record of the rural electric systems is excellent.

They made payments to the Government totaling $145 million during 1959. This figure includes payments of principal and interest due, plus an additional $15.2 million in payments made in advance of due dates. The systems have now paid REA $154.1 million in advance.

Including advance payments, the systems have repaid more than $823 million on the principal of their loan obligations. They have also paid $397 million in interest.

At the end of 1959, only one REA electric borrower was delinquent in payments, amounting to only $97,579.

COMPULSORY RETIREMENT OF AIRLINE PILOTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I continue to be distressed at what I feel to be arbitrary action by the Federal Aviation Administration in the matter of compulsory retirement of airline pilots at age 60, regardless of medical examinations.

I have had many provocative and interesting letters opposing this new proposal. None have been more thoughtful and informative than two letters, one from the Reverend John O'Toole, editor of Our Northland Diocese, official publication of the diocese of Crookston, Crookston, Minn., and Capt. L. E. Wagner, a pilot of Northwest Airlines, with whom I have talked a number of times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two letters be printed at this point in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed immediately following the letters a copy of my letter addressed to Lieutenant General Quesada, the Administrator of the FAA, on August 31, 1959.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NORTHLAND DIOCESE,
Crookston, Minn., April 11, 1960.

The Honorable Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Since I am a fairly active pilot I do try to keep informed as much as possible about the aviation industry, particularly from the standpoint of the nonprofessional flier.

I have nothing but praise for the flight service of the Federal Aeronautics Administration, but I feel they are far too arbitrary in their policymaking activities.

The example of this arbitrariness to which I refer was a hearing held February 11, 1960, concerning the medical examinations for private pilots.

In recent years, a nonprofessional pilot could obtain his medical certificate for flying from his family doctor. Now, however, the FAA has declared its intention of requiring all flight examinations to be given by special medical examiners officially designated by the FAA.

Though the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association attended the February 11 hearing, no apparent consideration was given their testimony by the FAA.

Though the FAA has the official backing of the American Medical Association, I do not believe that they have the backing of the rank and file doctor and certainly not of thoughtful people in the aviation industry.

During the past year the medical officers connected with the FAA have shown themselves to be bureaucratic if not coldblooded in their approach to aviation medicine. Their banning of commercial flight activity to airline pilots past 60 is a case in point.

It seems to me just as foolish to say that a person loses his physical fitness at 60 as to say that he acquires it at 21.

Not only a great deal of inconvenience will be caused private pilots if they are required to seek out designated examiners, but judging from past experience, they are going to run into considerable arbitrary treatment on the part of such examiners.

In talking to two doctors from this area I discovered that they do not approve of the regulation either.

Both seem to resent the proposal as somehow being a questioning of the medical competence.

Both also felt, as I do, that the family doctor can actually do a better job of giving aviation medicals since he not only has the applicant's case history available but also most likely knows his character and personality. This type of knowledge would be applicable in deciding whether or not a diabetic or a coronary could fly. The family doctor might also know of some personality quirk which would not show up in the routine exam of the designated medical person.

In this matter of the medical exams and in its general attitude the FAA seems to me and to many others interested in flying to be more concerned with the machinery of their own organization than they are with the future of aviation.

If given a chance there is no reason why aviation cannot eventually become equal in importance to the automotive industry. As our highways become more and more overcrowded there is no place to go but up—unless we want to dig tunnels.

If you would like further information about the FAA situation you could contact Mr. J. B. Hartranft Jr., president of the Owner's & Pilots Association, Box 5960, Washington, D.C.

Sincerely,

JOHN T. O'TOOLE.

P.S.—I received your note re the news items. Thanks.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 25, 1960.*

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Several thousand airline pilots flying the airlines of the United States are desperately in need of your help. On December 1, 1959 Mr. Quesada, Administrator of the Federal Aeronautics Administration (FAA) issued an order to all airline companies that after March 15, 1960 they could not employ pilots in scheduled airline operation after they pass their 60th birthday.

Since March 15 about 60 pilots who have passed their 60th birthday have been grounded and out of a job.

The Airline Pilots Association immediately filed for an injunction to stop the implementing of this order but on March 14 the injunction was denied by U.S. District Court Judge Alexander Bicks. Then the case was taken to the U.S. Court of Appeals which upheld the FAA order on April 22, 1960. The airline pilots feel that it is illegal, unconstitutional, dictatorial and not within the power of any Government agency to chop off a man's career at 60 and take away his means of livelihood 5 years before he is eligible for social security. There is absolutely no evidence to indicate that a pilot is not as healthy and competent to fly after 60 than he was before reaching that age. All airline pilots are required to pass the same physical examinations twice a year and demonstrate their flying ability six times a year to FAA approved check pilots and FAA inspectors.

I think that the reason that Mr. Quesada issued this order was to appease the public because since he was appointed Administrator of the FAA by President Eisenhower late in 1958, there have been more major airline accidents, killing more people than ever before in the history of aviation. In all these accidents the pilots were of all ages but not one was over 60 and none of the accidents could be blamed on the pilot. It was necessary for Mr. Quesada to make some kind of move to placate the public so he decided to prove that he was on the job by pointing his finger at the older pilots. These pilots have been condemned without a hearing and it certainly isn't in accordance with our way of American justice. Mr. Quesada is assuming the power of a dictator in the agency of the U.S. Government.

The Airline Pilots Association will carry this case to the Supreme Court but I am quite sure that unless we can enlist the aid of men like you, who aren't afraid to speak their mind we will lose the case.

I think this would be a very good opportunity to tell the people of this country that President Eisenhower and the Republican Party have let dictatorship take over a Government agency. If this case could be publicized and brought before the American public I am sure they would get behind us and write thousands of letters in our support.

If we do not win this case, it will establish a precedent so that at some later time he could lower the pilots age limit to 50 or even 40. Also, this case could be used by other Government agencies to set the age limit for other groups of people who in any way are controlled by the Government, such as railroad men, etc.

The people of this country do not like dictators and do not want to be told when they have to retire.

The Airline Pilots Association have plenty of proof that the veteran pilots of our airlines are as healthy and as competent as any other group of pilots and in addition have had the benefit of more years of experience.

I am 57 years old and have been a pilot on Northwest Airlines for 25 years and also have met you many times when you were on my flights. The retirement age in our company is set at 65 and all my planning for retirement has been set at that age.

We need help and we cannot wait for the Supreme Court to make a decision. Please help us.

Very sincerely yours,

L. E. WAGNER.

AUGUST 31, 1959.

Lt. Gen. ELWOOD R. QUESADA,
Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL QUESADA: I wish to forward on to you one letter among many which I have received from airline pilots pointing out that the proposed FAA regulation providing for compulsory retirement at the age of 60 of all airline pilots, and preventing airline pilots over 55 from being checked out in jet-type aircraft, is an unnecessary limitation to place on pilots.

I surely feel that providing that the mental and physical health standards are maintained at a very high level, compulsory retirement should not be set at any arbitrary age level.

I would appreciate your serious consideration of these protests against the proposed regulation.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

AMERICA'S PURSUIT OF EXCELLENCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the able Mr. Elmo Roper, in an address at

the University of North Dakota on April 19, 1960, most vividly and with great clarity pointed out the need to measure our national strength not in the number of our bombs but in the number of our learned men and women.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Roper's excellent address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ELMO ROPER AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA, APRIL 19, 1960

It is an honor to be invited by a great American university to speak on the relationships between the pursuit of excellence and the problems we face in the world today. I am happy to have this chance to talk about the learned man, because it seems to me that he is the most important—and despite the shocks of the last few years, perhaps the most neglected—person in America today. By the learned man I don't mean the scientist, at least I don't mean to emphasize the scientist, who has come in for perhaps more than his share of attention recently. I mean the man of wide and profound learning, the man who is at home with the culture of the past, and who is able to reflect thoughtfully and intelligently on both the universal and immediate problems of life on this perilous planet. I suppose I am actually talking about the truly civilized man—certainly I am talking about the liberal arts product, rather than any one of the specialties. I don't think I would dare to name any living man who was illustrative of just what I mean when I talk about the learned man because that would involve us in all kinds of controversy. I can, however, illustrate from the past. Certainly Francis Bacon would qualify, and so would our own Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin.

Since these words were written—yesterday, in fact—our Nation has suffered the loss of one of the most ingenious and imaginative minds of the 20th century—Beardsley Ruml. Now—but with great personal sorrow—I can update that short list with a truly learned man of more recent vintage—Beardsley Ruml—an intellectual giant during a period in our history when America sorely needed intellectual giants.

I want to talk about the learned man because I am afraid that not enough people realize that this country's future lies in his hands. I am afraid that too many people think the scientists can save us, that expert and technical knowledge is the answer to the problems of our time. But specialized technical knowledge can only tell us how to do whatever we decide to do; it cannot tell us how to make our basic decisions. I am not terribly worried about how we stand in regard to the development of science, for we have already perfected the means to blow up most of the world in a few minutes, and that seems to me sufficiently all-inclusive and sufficiently fast. I am worried about the status of learning and men of learning, for it seems to me that whether or not we will in fact blow up the world is greatly dependent on that status.

It is easy to find evidence of the low status that learning presently enjoys in the United States; for example, it comes out very clearly when we examine the status of books. In 1957, a national cross section of people were asked about their reading, and only 17 percent reported that they were currently reading a book. The comparable figure for Canada was 31 percent, for Australia 33 percent, for West Germany 34 percent, and for England 55 percent. So the vast indifference to books in this country is not normal, is not universal, is not a function of recalcitrant human nature: it is a distinctly American phenomenon. It is an attitude which has deep roots in our pioneer past, which was in part a successive peeling off of the layers of European culture as we pressed ever deeper into the western wilderness. Seeking to find and develop this country's own character, generations of Americans found it necessary to throw off the intellectual yoke of their European past and to glorify a kind of down-to-earth practicality and common sense. This approach has, in fact, worked technical wonders in this country's physical development, but it has often left something to be desired as a way of tackling the more profound problems of life and society.

In seeking an understanding of the low estate to which learning has fallen—and it has fallen, because our Founding Fathers were intellectuals and proud of it—I think it will help to turn to quite another subject—baseball. If you will permit me to make an apparent digression, I think I can make my point. I suppose that many of you have marveled, as I have, at the superlative skill of big league baseball players. I'm going to risk getting into slightly purple prose in order to say what I want to about these young men. As you watch them, fantastic feats of speed and coordination blend into the graceful sort of motion that combines the ruggedness of sports with the beauty of the arts. Fierce competitiveness blends with observance of a complex code of rules in a way that releases aggressiveness within the boundaries of discipline. Creative ingenuity blends with custom and deeply ingrained habit in a way that allows intuition to rise from a platform of habits. The end performance is without parallel in its field. It excites the population at large, it is admired without envy, it is spurred on by true connoisseurs, and it becomes a national rallying point. Sharecroppers, factory workers, housewives, merchants, politicians, schoolteachers, financiers, Presidents, everybody gets into the act regarding baseball.

Now, how does this sort of thing come about? I suspect that an important part of the answer is what has been referred to as the folk status of baseball in our society. Through the length and breadth of the land, and up and down the social and economic brackets, it is considered a good thing for a father to play catch with his son. It is a good thing for a boy to get outside and play ball with the other kids. Churches, volunteer firemen, trade unions, and country clubs all sponsor little leagues. A home run is a thing of value whether it is hit with a broomstick and soars over the barn or is hit with a regulation bat and clears the bleachers. There is a folk tradition that touches our whole population, that seeks out talent, that nurtures it toward its potential, that prods and praises and disciplines exceptional ability, that recognizes achievement at various levels between the sandlot and the world series, and that selects and honors and rewards according to the outcome of uncompromising competition. A few hundred big league players are at the apex of a seething social pyramid with a base composed literally of millions of hopefuls who do their best, progress according to their ability, and then move on to continue their interest as the fans who pay the freight for the pros.

Baseball has folk status in our society. So does show business, and so also does business management. But what about intellectual achievement? Does it have a comparable folk status in our society? I think you will agree with me that it does not. It is true that nearly all parents want their children to be able to read and write and do a bit of arithmetic. It is thought desirable, throughout our society, to get enough education to get a good job. There is a growing segment of the population that recognizes college as required training for the good jobs, or that sees college as a useful device for gaining social status or business connections or an appropriate spouse. But intellectual achievement, beyond the point where it yields an immediate practical return, is rather generally viewed with reserve and sometimes with a bit of alarm.

There is no widespread folk tradition that seeks out and trains and sponsors and takes pride in exceptional intellectual talent. There are no little leagues at the mind. It is good if a child gets high grades on his report card—but beyond that, a love of abstract ideas, a thirst for knowledge, a gnawing intellectual curiosity—these are more likely to be regarded as worrisome symptoms than as promising abilities. We cling to the old wives' tale that the highly intelligent are especially prone to neurosis or insanity We delight in calling our most intelligent people eggheads and we honor our psychiatrists with the title of headshrinker. We chuckle at Shaw's observation that "He who can, does. He who cannot, teaches." Students can hardly be blamed if they sometimes conclude that if they can just get that sheepskin, their education will be complete—done. They pick up that illusion from adults. And adults, at least intelligent adults, should know better.

Where does a potentially great chemist or mathematician or artist or historian or composer get the kind of stimulation, nourishment, motivation, and deference from his community that the bush league pitcher or the high school quarterback gets? The question itself seems ludicrous. Our grassroots society simply does not recognize or promote or value or respond to intellectual achievement as it properly does to athletic achievement. Let's face it: Intellectual achievement and the intellectual elite are alien to the main stream of American society. They are off to the side in a subsection of esoteric isolation labeled odd ball, highbrow, doubledome.

Our ribbing of intellectual preoccupation is a well-established American tradition. It has been considered deplorable or good clean fun, depending on your point of view—up until a couple of years ago. But there has been a change. Let me repeat a question that I characterized as ludicrous a moment ago: Where does a potentially great chemist or mathematician or artist or historian or composer get the kind of stimulation, nourishment, motivation, and deference from his community that the bush league pitcher or the high school quarterback gets? You know the answer, and that answer is stark and practical and dangerous and, I think, more than a little humiliating. The intellectually talented are nurtured and recognized in this way in the Soviet Union—in, of all places, a police state And I hardly need to add that it is paying off—for them.

The dissemination of the facts about Russian education has created in this country a shamed determination to "show the Russians" that "whatever they can do, we can do better." We have therefore become concerned about toughening up our own educational system and expanding the teaching of science and mathematics. There is no question that our educational system needs this intensified public interest; but it is evident at the same time that in too many minds, the only reason for making any educational changes is to keep pace with Russian achievement. We are in danger of falling into the pitfall, so often in evidence in our approach to foreign policy, of taking all our cues from the Russians, and simply stumbling along behind. As Robert Hutchins remarked in a recent speech, "The stresses and strains in our society are obscured for us partly by our preoccupation with Russia, which plays a curious double role as the devil in our world and the standard by which we measure our progress. If we weren't getting ahead of Russia, or falling behind her, how could we tell where we were?"

The plain fact is that if Russia sank into the sea tomorrow, most of our—and most of the world's—problems would remain. America would still need to find its way to a more mature attitude toward education and learning, through expanded and improved schools and colleges, and through the development of a different climate of opinion in the society at large.

To give just one example of the way the development of our national character and the realization of our national ideals depends on education, here is a typical opinion research finding, on what is probably the most crucial internal problem this country is now facing—and one wholly non-Russian in origin—the implementation of the Supreme Court decision on school integration. Among those people with 8 years or less of schooling, 40 percent think the Supreme Court decision was a mistake and that white and Negro students should never be forced to go to the same schools. Among people with some high school education, that figure fell to 24 percent. Among people who had some college, only 20 percent were flatly against school integration, and among college graduates, the number thinking the Supreme Court decision was a mistake was only 15 percent.

On a scale of tolerance developed by Dr. Samuel Stouffer of Harvard, for a study sponsored by the Fund for the Republic, 66 percent of college graduates ended up on the more tolerant end of the scale, while only 42 percent of high school graduates and only 16 percent of people with only grade school could be classed as "more tolerant." This is not surprising, for ignorance and fear are intimately connected, and those people who, knowing little, suspect and distrust anything unfamiliar, are ill equipped to adjust to a world in motion.

We have reached the turning point in our attitude toward the mind and its uses. We won our political independence in 1776 and in the nearly 200 years that have followed we have—or ought to have—won our spiritual and intellectual independence. Yet we are still rebelling against the civilizing force of intellect as if afraid of succumbing to an alien influence. We have shouted down its penetrating voice like rebellious adolescents tired of parental lectures. But we are our own people now and in possession of our own minds. It is simply a matter of putting them to use, to formulate our own unique view of life and history, and at the same time to draw nourishment from the rich stream of human wisdom expressed in the thought and writing of the ages.

I think that if we stop seeing the mind as the product of a strange or an alien culture, an artificial layer to be pasted on for a few years in school and later to be peeled off with a sigh of relief, a medicine whose therapeutic value is enhanced by its bitter taste, we might go some distance toward dispelling our current apathy toward its fruits. If we begin to understand that intellectual curiosity, the desire for understanding, is a natural impulse common to all children and potentially to most adults, and that learning is not just cramming a mind full of facts but a lifelong deepening of understanding, the life of the mind will begin to take its rightful place in American society.

And high time it begins to do so. The United States must experience an intellectual renaissance or it will assume a fatal rigidity that will bring about its downfall. The nurturing of intellectual excellence is no longer optional. The search for wisdom and the love of knowledge for its own sake can no longer be left to a gifted and stubborn few of our own people together with the great intellects that foreign dictators have hounded out of their own countries and to our shores. It is not enough to pluck a few bright adolescents out of their home communities and plunge them into a few frantic years of intellectual forced feeding in a restricted area of specialization. The intellectual renaissance must begin in the homes of our country. It must become part and parcel of our whole way of life if our full potential is to be realized.

For we have been robbing ourselves of a part of that most precious of all our natural resources, our own minds. Meanwhile, we have accomplished much, we have produced much, we have amazed the world. But it is time for us to amaze the world in a new way, by showing that we know how to use our mighty powers with wisdom and humility. This wisdom and this humility can only come through learning the lessons of the past, reflecting on our present historical predicament, and grappling with the problems the future is thrusting upon us at jet speed.

The first fact we must face and reflect upon is that war has become absurd. War was once an instrument of national policy—an instrument that might be used for national defense or to achieve national goals. The development of modern weapons—and the weapons arriving so swiftly in the future that is now upon us—compels us to realize that President Eisenhower was right when he said there could be no alternative to peace. The weapons we now have—and the weapons our competitors also have—already have erased the line between national defense and national suicide. The weapons we are creating—and the weapons our competitors are creating—will make any war truly the thing Shakespeare called an idiot's delight.

Once we have fully realized this fact—and the realization seems to be dawning both here and abroad—we will seriously concentrate on the problem of eliminating war—before it eliminates us. We must close in on this problem from several angles. I notice that all declared presidential candidates are for continuing the ban on atomic testing. That is a beginning. We must also begin whole-heartedly to work toward reaching agreements with Russia to end or control the arms race. Because, leaving aside the question of evil intention, the world could become overnight victim to an accidental nuclear explosion. As Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, of Oregon, put it: "Given the prevalence of such human errors and weaknesses as drunkenness, mental breakdown, misinterpretation, misguided idealism, venality or treason, an accidental nuclear explosion is probable."

We must also attack the problem at a much deeper level—at the basic structure of international relations. We must begin to move beyond the claims of conflicting nationalisms to establish a genuine rule of law in the world. Facing Communist implacability, we cannot hope now for anything as utopian as world government. We can work toward closer ties between the world's democracies, which could form an expanding framework for the rule of democracy and law. We can consider such proposals as the strengthening of the World Court so that it could become of real use in settling international disputes. We can put our new-found thoughtfulness to work in finding other new ways to replace the caprices of national policy with the greater consistencies of legal procedure—historically the only guarantee of peaceful relations.

Simple survival dictates our concern with these problems. Beyond this primary and primitive consideration, we face the problem of defining our country's goals—the purposes of our Nation in the 20th century. In fact, the effort to survive and the effort to say what we are surviving for are deeply intermingled. A nation with a stale or deficient vision of its national destiny stands little chance among the catapulting aspirations of the peoples of today's world.

One of the most important things we must decide in our platform of national purpose is just the thing I have been talking about today—the place of learning and education in our life. We must thereupon make some hard practical decisions about the kind of educational system we want and how we are going to get it. In this connection I can report that the public as a whole is concerned enough about getting the country's schools into shape for its swelling child population that 73 percent think some form of Federal financing is in order. But much deeper is the question of what kind of education our schools and colleges should provide: How much science, how much humanities, how much theoretical, how much practical training, how much general education, how much specialization?

Another question we must decide is how much of our economy should be devoted to private and how much to public purposes. Professor Galbraith, of Harvard University, has charged in his book "The Affluent Society" that in present-day affluent America our preoccupation with high and increasing production is outdated and has resulted in a serious social imbalance whereby the production of public services such as adequate schools, parks, sanitation, public safety, etc., stays much too low. In Galbraith's opinion, the real reason we are so concerned with high production is no longer our need for goods but our concern that everyone is kept employed, and he thinks a better solution is needed for the very real problem of full employment. In his opinion, also, we are rich enough to devote a good deal more of our national wealth to services that benefit us all, so that we aren't in effect forced to drive shiny private cars through dirty public streets. Galbraith's proposals have stirred up a heated debate in Washington, one that will continue, I am sure, for some years to come. And all to the good. For it concerns one of the essential problems with which we have to come to terms if we are to continue to develop as a nation.

And something we must always keep at the front of our minds as we shape our sense of national purpose is that we are part of a world community, that our own development will be meaningful only if we participate in the healthy development of that community. Dribbles of economic aid to underdeveloped nations are not enough. We must respond wholeheartedly to the desire of long-deprived peoples for political independence and economic growth. Without forcing our ways on others, we must make our wealth, our technical skill and our political experience available to help developing nations realize their potentialities. If instead, we clutch our wealth and wisdom to ourselves, fearful of losing what we now possess, we will end up isolated and spiritually bankrupt, an island of sterile prosperity in a hungry world. And one day that island may be taken from us.

These are some of the things we must think about. In doing so we must avoid two pitfalls. The first is surrendering to the oversimplifications of a passionate leader with a program for action. That pitfall, however, seems remote. No passionate leader appears upon the American scene today. We have many good, energetic, intelligent Senators and Governors. We have an amiable President, who likes to travel and tries to speak everybody's language. We have a sober, serious, careful Vice President who works long hours and wants very much to be President. But there does not seem to be much danger that Americans will be swept off their feet by any of the leaders now in sight.

The other danger is falling prey to a feeling of helplessness and despair as we confront our difficulties. Our problems have become so complex, so large in scale, and so subject to sudden change that we may be excused for wondering whether the power of human intelligence is adequate to cope with them. It may not be; but it is all we have. Relinquishing the pursuit of insight

and intellectual excellence means giving way to historical currents which will sweep us onto the dustpile of history.

And so we must think. We must as a nation make a thoroughgoing reevaluation of the intellectual life, so that our best people will be drawn to it and so that Americans as a whole will be receptive to its contributions.

And in the long run, more people will begin using their minds only as the general climate of opinion becomes more favorable to doing so. Intellectually difficult tasks, like many other hard jobs, become more rewarding when doing them wins social approval. Most people do not like to be thought queer, and as long as cerebral activity is socially suspect, its intrinsic rewards will not be enough to command much of a following. But once the stigma is lifted, and the intellectual stirrings of the young are actively encouraged by those around them, the door will be opened to an enrichment of private and public life.

This does not mean that genius will spring up around us overnight. Intellectual excellence will never be a "quick and easy" process; wisdom will never be mass produced. Intellectual skill will always be an achievement, and that combination of intellectual mastery, creative imagination, and humane understanding which is characteristic of the truly learned man will remain a relatively rare accomplishment. We cannot guarantee that accomplishment, but we can create conditions favorable to it.

You are members of a new generation, one that will, I believe, develop a new current in the American way of life, a new strain of reflectiveness. There are signs that this change is already taking place. Among those I have noted are these: The successful introduction by the Saturday Evening Post of a series of thoughtful articles under the general heading of "Adventures of the Mind." The views expressed by young executives of corporations in a recent survey indicated a shift in emphasis in the qualities sought by young men in their wives. The participants in this survey said they wanted their wives to be able to discuss books and ideas, and they valued such intellectual ability above home economics, party-planning, self-beautification and the social arts. The steady rise in the sales of high-quality paperbound books—reprints of works written by philosophers, professors, literary critics, sociologists, economists grappling with hard problems—has shown that there are millions of Americans who want to face the realities of our times. On a more frivolous level, I cite the use of the phrase "a thinking man's filter" by one of our large cigarette companies in its advertising as another indication that many of us want to be treated as thoughtful citizens, whether we are or not.

I am told by several college president friends of mine that learning is more highly regarded in our colleges and universities than it has been within their memory. I have even heard that football heroes no longer have their pick of the more desirable females on campus. Apparently today's generation of college students are initiating an exciting intellectual renaissance. What you are doing here today bears that out; you are honoring people who have learned to think; you are honoring learned men and women.

I am willing to accept at face value this evidence of a very considerable revival of respect for intellectualism in our colleges and universities. And I am sure that this, like most ideas, will spread from the centers of education outward. But I'd like to see our Federal Government do something to hasten that spreading. Perhaps a means could be found whereby 50 people would be selected who would represent this breadth of knowledge and intellectual interest I am talking about, would be truly an intellectual elite, and perhaps they could be called permanent advisers to the President, and perhaps they could be paid $15,000 a year by our Government for as long as they live, and perhaps the President, whoever he may be, should see them in small groups from time to time. Perhaps there should be another 50 each year until there's 500 or so. The fact that they were advisers to the President and called to Washington would give them one kind of prestige, and I don't think I need to argue the case with you that a guaranteed salary of $15,000 a year on top of whatever else they might be earning would give them another kind of prestige—or at least prestige in another quarter. I'm not contending this is the only way or even the best way to hasten the spread of respect for the truly learned people of our Nation. I'd welcome a better plan. I simply mention this to show how far and how fast I think we need to go in this direction.

For there is an urgent need—in fact a national survival need—for invigorating intellectual life, for upgrading the general regard for intellectual excellence, for broadening the base of intellectual interests—for a renaissance that establishes a genuine folk status for things of the mind—a respect for the learned man. We will be saved—if we are that lucky—by men and women who are able to use all that is in them—their hearts, their senses, and their minds—as fully developed, mature human beings.

The time cannot be far off—if indeed it is not already here—when the strength of a nation, measured in terms of any kind of world competition, will depend less on the number of its bombs than on the number of its learned men and women.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who preceded me in speaking about the value of the rural electrification program, has returned to the Senate today.

Throughout yesterday and until late last night, the Senator from Minnesota was interested in a primary election being held in West Virginia. He lost the primary election, but he has shown himself to be a man who can take defeat with grace and with a smile, and who can continue with his work in the Senate.

Being one who, in 1956, had a similar experience, I say to the Senator from Minnesota that he has a great following throughout the United States. He has made many friends, and has not lost any of them by reason of having engaged in the recent primary contests, the last of which has just been concluded.

I think that by entering the primaries the Senator from Minnesota rendered a great public service. He illuminated public opinion by discussing the issues and bringing to the attention of the public the problems which our Government faces today. All of that is important in the formulation of public opinion.

While the Senator from Minnesota lost the primary of yesterday, he can be proud of the great contribution he has made to the public thinking on political, economic, and international issues, and of his performance of a great public service, for which many people throughout the Nation are grateful.

Also, Mr. President, all of us have observed that his wife, Muriel, has been by his side during his various efforts. She has interested the women voters in greater participation in politics. For her contributions and her efforts in helping her husband, I know all of us pay her our highest respect.

I am sorry that a greater number of Senators are not now in the Chamber, because I know that many of my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, would join me in paying our highest respects to the Senator from Minnesota, and in saying that his job has been well done, and that his great host of friends are still with him and are appreciative of the fine showing he has made in the primaries in which he has been engaged.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to thank my good friend, the Senator from Tennessee, for his kind words of friendship and understanding. I can think of no one from whom I would rather receive words of praise and words of friendship and consolation.

The Senator from Tennessee is one of the truly courageous men of our country. He has repeatedly demonstrated that by his votes and by his personal performance in public life. It is my fond hope that his own career will be filled with the utmost of success, and that the people of Tennessee will remember that in him they have a stalwart champion of all that is good for this Republic and for this world.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his very much appreciated words of friendship, today. They touch my heart, and I am extremely grateful.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CHURCH subsequently said: Mr. President, inasmuch as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is now presiding, I think it would be appropriate for me to say at this time that I should like to join in the tribute he has just paid to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. Senator HUMPHREY has been a fearless, forthright, articulate spokesman for the liberal cause. Certainly he is one of the outstanding public servants in our political life today. The Democratic Party is fortunate indeed to have him as a member, even as the country is fortunate to have the benefit of his services in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I rise to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who is now presiding over the Senate, and the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] in saying a few words about our colleague, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY.

Senator HUMPHREY has announced his withdrawal from the presidential race. I wish to say that, in my opinion, Senator HUMPHREY has performed a real service for the country and for the Democratic Party, because in the primary campaigns in which he engaged he tried to bring to the attention of the people of this country, and more particularly to the people of the States involved, the issues which will confront them next November.

Senator HUMPHREY has waged a gallant, determined, and dogged fight, and

I honor him for the honesty he has shown, for persistence he has evidenced, and for the ability and intelligence he has indicated in his discussion of the problems which confront us all.

Senator HUMPHREY is a man who has made his mark in his own right. While I can appreciate the results which have caused him to announce his withdrawal, because I have a high personal admiration for Senator HUMPHREY, nevertheless, I feel the Senate will be better off because we shall have the value of his continued advice, his continued counsel, and his continued ability to participate in all matters which will come before this body.

So in announcing his retirement from the race for the Democratic presidential nomination, I wish to commend and congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota for the efforts he has put forth and for the gallantry he has shown toward the man who defeated him in West Virginia. I salute him also for his graciousness and understanding when the results of the West Virginia primary were made final.

I am quite certain these two distinguished colleagues of ours will work well together, and I know Senator HUMPHREY will give the Democratic candidate, whoever he may be, his full support and his untiring devotion in the months ahead.

Mr. PROXMIRE subsequently said: Mr. President, the hour is late, and I shall take only a moment to say what I wish to say on this subject. I feel the attention of the Senate should be called to what I think was a remarkable display of courage, devotion, and fortitude on the part of the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. It is well known that the Senator from Minnesota has just finished an excellent but heartbreaking campaign in West Virginia. He was up all night, and it must have been one of the saddest nights of his life, and yet he came to the floor today, and not only was he in attendance, which in itself would have been remarkable, but he led the fight for his bill. He was the floor manager of the bill, and he did a magnificent job. This kind of action is so remarkable and unusual that it deserves attention and a tribute.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the able Senator from Wisconsin. The Senator's action demonstrates the character, the intelligence, and the leadership of HUBERT HUMPHREY. His display on the floor this afternoon shows the character and leadership of one who, in my opinion, is one of the great Senators.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I should like to associate myself with everything the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] have said. There was a remarkable demonstration today on the part of the senior Senator from Minnesota, who seemed to possess—and who did indeed possess—boundless physical energy, as well as a mental acuteness which was remarkable.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I, too, wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues about our dear friend the senior Senator from Minnesota; and, if he has occasion to read these words in the RECORD, I hope he will appreciate that he comes back to the Senate to practically 100 friends, to many who have deep and abiding affection for him, and who are disappointed that his task has not carried through to victory because we love him so much. We are happy to have him back here where I know he will add so much to the deliberations of this body until the day of adjournment.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Does not the Senator from Wisconsin agree, inasmuch as he and I have had some experience in being knocked down?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I heartily agree. The Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Wisconsin have both been knocked down repeatedly in action.

What impressed me so deeply about the Senator from Minnesota is that I know how it must feel to stay up all night and lose an election, when all one wishes to do is to sleep, get a little vacation, and recuperate. The Senator from Minnesota had the courage, dedication, conscientiousness, and devotion to come to the floor of the Senate and fight his heart out for a bill. He gave a very remarkable display of senatorial conscientiousness.

Mr. CARROLL. In a very brilliant fashion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In brilliant fashion, indeed.

Mr. CARROLL. In accordance with the best Senate traditions.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Indeed.

PROGRESS IN RECONCILIATION OF EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET AND EUROPEAN FREE TRADE ASSOCIATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, newspaper reports from Luxembourg state that the Foreign Ministers of the European Economic Community agreed late last night to accelerate the integration of the Common Market by beginning the establishment of a common external tariff as of December 31, 1960. This is 12 months ahead of the original tentative schedule; but it should be noted that it is a 6-month delay from the July 1 acceleration proposal which caused such great fear of a trade split between the European Common Market countries and the nations of the newly formed European Free Trade Association.

This 6-month delay, referred to as a trade truce, should provide time for the kind of reconciliation between the two groups which I envisaged in my report to the Senate on May 5, following my return from Strasbourg, France, where I addressed the Council of Europe on the Western Community's trade-aid problems. At that time I reported to my Senate colleagues that I believed these two groups would, in time make a suitable arrangement to avoid a trade split in free Europe. I also expressed the hope that the proposed Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, which I believe the United States should join as a full member, would serve as a meeting ground where the trade problems of free Europe could also be considered.

This hope is now strengthened by the report that a letter, signed by the ministers of the European Common Market countries, has been sent to the Outer Seven countries, and that the letter suggests that these problems be discussed on the occasion of a forthcoming organizational meeting to be held by the prospective members of the new economic organization for Europe and the United States and Canada to which I have been referring.

Mr. President, we are seeing some of the most historic actions ever taken in respect of the foreign economic policy of the United States, and I bespeak for these actions the continued beneficent attitude of the United States and the willingness of the United States to participate, through membership in this new economic organization and otherwise, in any European solution of these problems, just as we did in making possible the Marshall plan. I believe we may say with pardonable pride that this may go down in history as the fruition of the Dillon plan, just as Europe was saved from the real Communist menace immediately after World War II by means of the Marshall plan. The Dillon plan is named after Douglas Dillon, our Under Secretary of State, who first proposed these ideas to the European countries.

Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the European officials for their efforts to make the maximum progress in cooperative action for aid and trade.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two newspaper reports on this situation which is so vital to U.S. trade and foreign economic policy interests.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 11, 1960]

COMMON MARKET DELAYS ON TARIFF—MINISTERS AGREE TO POSTPONE MOVE TOWARD UNIFORMITY FROM JULY 1 TO JANUARY 1

(By Harry Gilroy)

LUXEMBOURG, May 10.—The six European Common Market nations agreed today to start building a uniform tariff wall by January 1, 1961. That is a year ahead of the time planned for this action in the treaty that forced the bloc.

Cabinet ministers of the six states—Belgium, France, The Netherlands, Italy, West Germany, and Luxembourg—took the decision unanimously at a meeting here today.

In general the ministers approved a speed-up plan proposed 3 months ago by the Common Market. The commission suggested July 1 as the time to take the first tariff action but the Council of Ministers held that date was too soon.

Spokesmen for all six countries agreed in talks outside the meeting that the action demonstrated an intent to go ahead quickly with the construction of their planned customs and economic union.

However, there was a difference of opinion about the effect on the trade discussions that are shaping up in Europe. Britain and her partners in the European Free Trade Association, known as the Outer Seven, have warned that acceleration of the Common Market might split European trade. The other members of the Outer Seven are Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Portugal, Austria, and Switzerland.

A French spokesman said the display of unity by the six nations would show Britain that there was no hope of disrupting the Common Market and that this should improve the chances of achieving trade harmony through negotiations.

A German took the point of view that now it would be easier for the six states to negotiate with Britain because the time for the speedup program had been put off until the beginning of next year.

The ministers made plain that they all wanted to avoid a trade war with the rest of Europe and with the United States. They said they felt their economic union was compatible with this purpose.

The delay in the first move toward the common external tariff appeared to have been dictated as much by necessity as by any desire to negotiate with Britain. Both the Italian and German representatives said in the meeting that it would take 6 months for their parliaments to approve necessary changes in tariff laws.

The ministers expressed their approval for the following measures:

By January 1, 1961, the six states will adjust their present tariffs on goods from outside the Common Market. Those with low tariffs will lift them and those with high tariffs will cut them, both moving toward a uniform set of rates.

This first step will take all the states, with the exception of West Germany, 30 percent of the way toward the uniform tariff.

West Germany lowered some tariffs by 25 percent in 1957 and now will have to lift them again.

[From the Washington Post, May 11, 1960]

SIX MARKET NATIONS ASK BRITISH PACT

LUXEMBOURG, May 11.—Foreign ministers of the six Common Market nations early today called for a trade truce with the rival British-led European Free Trade Association (EFTA).

After a ministerial council meeting lasting late into the night, a spokesman said the ministers signed a "declaration of intent" for talks with EFTA members.

They also approved the text of a letter to the EFTA president suggesting the talks be held within the framework of the 18-nation organization for European Economic Cooperation with the United States and Canada included.

The 20-nation group meets next month in Paris and the letter suggests the truce talks be held then, too.

The council spokesman said the ministers failed to reach complete agreement on the status of agricultural products under the tariff proposals of Executive Commission President Walter Hallstein.

He denied an earlier statement by a colleague that a compromise solution had been reached. He said the ministers will meet again in Brussels Thursday to continue agricultural talks.

Until an agreement is reached, he said, the declaration of intent to negotiate with EFTA and the letter of invitation will not be published.

The spokesman also said that whatever the result of the talks between the Common Market and EFTA, the Hallstein plan for speeding up integration within the Common Market will be implemented with deadline of December 31, 1960.

The ministers yesterday gave up the idea of putting the plan into operation on July 1—18 months before schedule—by taking the first steps in "walling up" the Common Market with a common external tariff.

Official reasons for the delay were that West Germany and Italy need time for having the tariff changes involved ratified by parliament and customs authorities will need from 5 to 6 months to bring in line with the new tariff levels some 3,900 customs headings.

Conference sources last night said the soft-pedaling of the Hallstein plan will bring a "tacit trade truce" which could be used to seek a rapprochement with Britain and her free-trade partners.

All decisions concerning the Hallstein speedup proposals were hampered by a controversy between the Netherlands and West Germany on whether or not to include agricultural products in the speedup scheme.

The Netherlands wanted them in while West Germany opposed their inclusion. The Ministers sat throughout yesterday and after a brief interruption went into an all-night session discussing details of the acceleration plan.

At the same time a special drafting committee in another room was trying to work a compromise agreement for the Dutch-German dispute.

In the small hours of today, as weary ministers came out of the conference room from time to time to speak to reporters, no agreement was in sight.

One delegation source talked openly about a "grave crisis" which threatened the unification of the six. Others said the Dutch and the Germans were "actually filibustering" and "not unintentionally obstructing the acceleration plan."

Both the Netherlands and West Germany are outspoken in their alarm that the Common Market's speedup plan carries a serious threat of economic and political division in Europe.

FORTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am happy to join in the celebration of the 42d anniversary of the independence of Armenia, which occurs on May 28. Armenia's brief existence as an independent nation in modern times came to an end on December 2, 1920, after 2 years of self-government, when she fell victim to Communist aggression. The brave people of Armenia have steadfastly maintained their hope for independence; and no conqueror has ever been able to crush their determination to be free.

Armenia's ties with the people of America are based on much more than sympathy and understanding. Many of our citizens trace their ancestry to this ancient land, and have always kept firm these ties of blood. For all these reasons, Americans everywhere strongly support the national aspirations for liberty of the Armenian people and their unquenchable desire for freedom from tyranny.

I deem it a privilege to be able to contribute my voice in some small measure to this heroic struggle.

Many people in this country value most highly the brief period of Armenian independence. In view of the real necessity to affirm our belief in self-determination for the small nations whose independence has been snuffed out by Communist forms of imperialism and aggression, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to this event.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR O'MAHONEY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the announcement by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] that he will retire at the end of his present term, January 3, 1961, must be accepted reluctantly by his colleagues. We have suffered with him in his illness and that of his beloved wife. We have been aware of their close devotion through the years. More recently, we have watched this iron-willed man pull himeslf back to full duty in the Senate, after a stroke which would have felled lesser men.

Senator O'MAHONEY has earned retirement. His 25 years of service on the national stage have been highlighted by his unfaltering opposition to monopoly, his effective leadership in furthering the cause of independent business, the development of the rivers and the reclaiming of the deserts of the West, the wise management of our vast public domain, and—most of all—by his dedication to the Constitution.

It was this last attribute which I observed firsthand when his penetrating arguments persuaded the Senate to adopt the jury-trial amendment to the civil rights bill of 1957. In the high privilege I then had of working at his side, I saw how richly deserved was his reputation as a great lawyer and constitutionalist.

It was his sensitive appreciation of the separation of powers spelled out in our Constitution, coupled with his independence of spirit, which caused Senator O'MAHONEY, while still in his first term, to rise to national eminence as a leader in defeating the effort of a strong-willed Executive to change the makeup of the Supreme Court.

The monumental work of the Temporary National Economic Committee under Senator O'MAHONEY's leadership will be remembered and applauded through many years to come.

I am grateful that my service in the Senate has occurred at a time when it has been possible for me to know Senator O'MAHONEY. The spirit of the Senate is continuity; and as each of us comes newly into this Chamber, we partake of the wisdom and experience of our seniors.

The whole Senate is the richer in the wisdom and experience Senator O'MAHONEY has imparted and in the generosity and the gentleness with which he has shared them with all of us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho. I too am deeply sorry that the great constitutionalist, as he has been aptly termed by the Senator from Idaho, has decided to retire voluntarily from this body.

Senator O'MAHONEY has long been known as Mr. Wyoming, but Senator O'MAHONEY is a man of national and international stature. I know the decision was not an easy one for him to make, but I agree with the Senator from Idaho that his retirement from the Senate will leave a void which will be hard to fill. We shall miss him, but we have learned much from him during the course of our service together in the U.S. Senate. To Senator and Mrs. O'Mahoney, a devoted and lovable team, we all wish the best of everything in the years ahead. They have earned, many times over, their well-deserved and merited voluntary retirement.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. SYMINGTON subsequently said: Mr. President, it is difficult for me to visualize the U.S. Senate without the personality and ability of the great senior Senator from Wyoming.

His decision to terminate his illustrious career in this body is one that cannot help but sadden his many friends and admirers.

JOE O'MAHONEY is an outstanding example of a man who lives what he believes.

He believes in fair play; he believes in fair competition; and he believes in fair treatment for the unfortunate no less than for the fortunate.

The vigor, the honesty, and the outstanding ability with which he has opposed monopolistic concentrations of economic power have long stood, and should always stand, as a model for all to strive to equal. It would be presumptuous for anyone to think he could surpass that record.

I have come to respect my friend from Wyoming as a learned lawyer, an able debater, a dedicated liberal and, above all, a constructive patriot.

NUCLEAR TESTING

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the humiliating disclosures of the past few days are a spectacular demonstration of the administration's penchant for not letting its right hand know what the left hand is doing. The disturbing developments on the cloak-and-dagger front, unfortunately, have diverted public attention from the problem of nuclear testing, where once again the administration's ineptitude is prejudicing our national interests.

The terrible dangers of uncontrolled nuclear weapons constitute the gravest peril which the human race has ever faced. The awesome power of these inventions must be regulated if civilization, as we know it, is to endure. Recognition of this fact on both sides of the Iron Curtain has led the three nations which presently possess this weapon to try to work out a system for detecting nuclear explosions—the first step toward a comprehensive plan for controlling the use of these weapons. For 18 months, representatives of the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union have been meeting at Geneva in long, difficult negotiating sessions. A great deal of progress has been made at Geneva; many observers feel that concessions made by the Soviet negotiators have brought us close to a workable plan for detecting nuclear explosions.

But this progress has been achieved in spite of a bureaucratic guerrilla warfare campaign conducted against these negotiations by those elements in the administration who oppose any sort of agreement. We now read in the newspapers that the recent announcement that we would resume underground nuclear testing came as a surprise to our representatives at Geneva and embarrassed them greatly. Once again the appalling failure of coordination within the administration makes the American Government look like one of those South Seas idols, with 10 arms going off in 10 different directions.

This confusion has been described in an excellent column by Marquis Childs which appeared in the Washington Post for May 11, 1960, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES ON THE SPOT IN GENEVA TALKS

(By Marquis Childs)

GENEVA.—The incidents of the past few days are readymade for those who want to continue the cold war and who have persistently by every means sought to prevent any meaningful negotiation with the Soviet Union. Here in Geneva, where a negotiation has been going on for 18 months, this is seen in the sharpest and most dramatic fashion.

The announcement from Gettysburg by President Eisenhower that the United States intends to resume nuclear explosions for research purposes fits the pattern. It was made without any notice to the American delegation. More important, it came as the three powers—Great Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union—were trying to get agreement on a joint program of research into improved methods for detecting nuclear explosions.

What is little understood is the way in which the Soviets have made one concession after another, coming around time after time to the Western view. They began by saying they would not discuss any control system until after a treaty on general principles had been signed. After 4 months they agreed to talk about how a control system would function in the Soviet Union and the United States.

They came around to agreeing to a discussion by scientists from each country on the problem of underground identification. Having said they would never agree to a threshold and a moratorium outside a nuclear test treaty on explosions below that threshold, they finally accepted this position. They would never accept our criteria for detection which they called "absurd," but they accepted them.

With literally dozens of concessions by the Soviets, the outline of a treaty has evolved. Major issues—the number of inspections in each country, the makeup of a control commission, the length of the moratorium—remain to be determined presumably by the heads of government when they meet in Paris.

The American negotiator through all these long, trying months has been James J. Wadsworth, who is deputy head of the American delegation to the United Nations. Wadsworth's Western colleagues say he has shown more skill, patience and persistence in dealing with the Russians than any other American since the end of World War II.

What has made Wadsworth's position doubly difficult is that, while inching the Russians up little by little to the Western view, he has constantly been fighting a rearguard action with those in Washington who have been determined to block any treaty. In this context the Gettysburg announcement is seen as the latest attempt to sabotage the negotiation. While no one will say this officially, it is the view of observers close to the conference for many months.

No one would accuse President Eisenhower of such an intention. But since he has not followed at close range the complex negotiations he must take his lead from one faction or another. And while the committee of principals dealing with this matter at the top level of Government in Washington is reportedly in favor of a test treaty with proper inspection and control by a majority of 4 to 1, the minority in the Pentagon and the Atomic Energy Commission has shown great resourcefulness in blocking tactics.

There should be no illusions back home about the situation the United States confronts. If a treaty fails to be agreed to because of what seem to be obstructionist tactics from the American side or if a treaty is rejected by the Senate, the Western alliance will be split apart and the United States put in the position of standing almost alone in the world. Here are the reasons why:

The Conservative government in London has never wavered in the determination to get a treaty that would mean the beginning of inspection behind the Iron Curtain and perhaps the beginning of a pattern of disarmament. They concede the risk of some cheating under any control system, but they believe this is minimal and is heavily outweighed by the gain of a beginning at inspection and control.

Opinion in Britain is virtually unanimous on this score, as it is in the Scandinavian countries, West Germany, and most of Asia and Africa. Furthermore, the British here believe that it would have been possible to get a treaty with adequate guarantees any time during the past 9 months if it had not been for America's delaying tactics.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEFAUVER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COLORADO MEDICAL PLAN POINTS THE WAY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, discussion regarding the course this Congress should take respecting medical assistance for the aged has mounted daily. We are confronted with a variety of plans involving great sums of money and offering many different benefits for old age people.

We in Colorado are proud of the fact that we have a workable, functioning old age pension plan which brings help and comfort to thousands of people. Within the framework of this program are coordinated such medical organiza-

tions as Blue Cross, Blue Shield, and others. The Colorado old-age pension plan serves as an example of what can be done by the State.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, we in the Congress must still face the problem of what to do, if anything, on a national scale. Without suggesting my support for all it has to say, I recommend as food for thought a very scholarly article on this subject written by Bob Tonsing in the May 8, 1960, edition of the Denver Post. Mr. Tonsing describes the various suggested Federal assistance programs against the background of the one now operating in my own State of Colorado.

So that my colleagues may have the benefit of this study, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post, May 8, 1960]

COLORADO MEDICAL PLAN POINTS THE WAY—STATE EXPERIENCE IN HEALTH CARE FOR AGED MAY PROVE USEFUL IN NATIONAL PROGRAM

(By Bob Tonsing)

A national medical care program for the aged? Colorado's plan for pensioners might be just what the doctor ordered.

Now in its third year, the plan has been widely praised as a gem of efficiency and effectiveness in a field often characterized by administrative waste and tragic futility.

The program, a daring experiment in State-financed medical care for pensioners, is unique in the Nation.

But it may not be unique for long. State welfare officials have been barraged with requests for details on how the Colorado program works.

Welfare officials from as far away as British Columbia have dropped in for personal inspections.

And 3 weeks ago Guy R. Justis, Colorado welfare director, was called before the House Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging in Washington to explain the State's pension program—particularly the medical part of it.

The program has been so successful that many Coloradans are unaware of it. Since the program was made possible by a constitutional amendment 3 years ago, it has been conspicuous by the lack of controversy.

Today the plan enjoys the simultaneous approval of the Colorado Labor Council (AFL–CIO), the Denver Chamber of Commerce, the Colorado League of Women Voters, the National Annuity League (the State's largest association of pensioners) and the Colorado State Medical Society.

The Colorado Welfare Department has a fund of $10 million earmarked for annual expenditure in the medical program for pensioners.

About $3 million of this is handled by the Welfare Department for pensioners' care in nursing homes, drugs for patients in nursing homes and several miscellaneous programs amounting to less than $100,000 each.

The rest—about $6.5 million—is spent for a medical care program with benefits similar to those of good medical insurance plans of the kind many younger people are enrolled in.

As a matter of fact the program is even administered by the people who run the Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans in Colorado.

But it is not insurance. It is a sort of cost-plus plan under which Blue Cross-Blue Shield picks up the medical bills as they come in. The State, in turn, reimburses Blue Cross-Blue Shield and gives it a little something extra for its trouble.

The extra amounts only to actual expenses incurred in dealing with the pensioners, the doctors and the hospitals, since Blue Cross and Blue Shield are nonprofit organizations.

Incidentally, in 1959 these administration costs ran only 2 percent of the entire bill. If the State were to handle the paperwork of the program itself, some experts say these costs might run from 10 to 15 percent.

Thomas M. Tierney, executive vice president of the Colorado Hospital Service (Blue Cross) believes the taxpayers may be paying little or nothing for this administration.

"We handle the pensioner program with the same administrative machinery perfected for our own benefit plans," Tierney said. "Certain savings are possible under the hospital contracts we hold—savings which the State itself probably wouldn't realize without us.

"We feel that our bill for administration is more than absorbed by the efficiency we are able to offer."

Here's how Colorado's unique medical care program works:

All 52,000 Colorado pensioners are issued identification cards. Any pensioner is eligible, whether he's getting the maximum $106 cash payment a month or a mere $1 a month.

The card tells hospitals and doctors that the bearer is entitled to benefits comparable to Blue Cross' comprehensive plan and Blue Shield's standard A plan.

Translated, this means a pensioner gets fully paid care in a semiprivate room (not a ward), with all hospital, surgical and medical costs covered.

He can stay 30 days normally, but if the trouble warrants the welfare department can authorize periods of full hospital coverage.

The card also entitles a pensioner to doctors' visits outside the hospital. He may summon a docotor to his home, or go to the doctor's office, two times every 3 months; the State, through Blue Cross-Blue Shield, will pick up the tab.

In addition, the Blue Cross-Blue Shield office handles administration of doctors' calls to pensioners put up in nursing homes.

The State will pay for as many as 6 routine doctors' calls at nursing homes every 3 months, or 12 calls during that period if the patient's health demands it.

The program is liberal. It treats the pensioner like an insurance beneficiary, not a ward of the State.

This fact aroused some fears in the early months of the program that malingering might become a problem.

But it has not. On the contrary, Colorado's senior citizens have been staying in the hospital only an average of 11.72 days per admission. This is 2 days less than the national average for persons of 65 and older.

What about the doctor's office privileges? Do the pensioners use up their excess visits for socializing?

Blue Cross says they don't. Theoretically Colorado's 52,000 eligible pensioners could use up a total of more than 400,000 visits a year. They've been seeing the doctor only about 90,000 times a year, the records show.

How much is all this costing the Colorado taxpayer?

In 1959, the services managed for the State by Blue Cross-Blue Shield came to $6,562,188.69, plus $131,194 for administration costs.

This meant that the administration costs ran about 2 percent of the program's overall expense.

For the item of Blue Cross-type hospital care, the State was charged just $42,818—a mere 0.8 percent—for the processing of 21,409 hospital admissions.

It has been estimated that in New York, where the State handles all of the administration details for pensioner medical services, Colorado's $6,526,188.69 outlay would have run up a paperwork bill of more than $700,000—a far cry from the $131,194 that Colorado actually had to put out.

The difference? Apparently it's professional management.

Dr. Paul Hartendorp, director of medical services for the State welfare department, might be running a complicated bureaucracy if he and the other founders of Colorado's plan hadn't decided to keep the State mostly out of the paperwork.

But he has no ambitions to run a bureaucracy.

"There are only four people in my office, and that's the way I like it," Hartendorp said. "Every dollar lost in a bureaucracy would be a dollar taken away from the pensioners, and goodness knows they need everything they're getting.

"No, after 2 full years of trial I'm convinced that our program is the best—and most efficient—in the Nation."

Hartendorp, a longtime Denver physician, said he fears neither socialized medicine nor bad practices in Colorado's plan.

"Blue Cross-Blue Shield does most of the paperwork," he said, "but the welfare department still makes the decisions. And we're just as sure about the disbursement of funds as if we were doing it ourselves. We have complete access to the books at all times, and the books are in excellent order."

Hartendorp said the welfare department would like to expand the program to provide services such as dental care and more doctors' visitations for pensioners who need more than the two-per-quarter allowance. But the $10 million budget won't allow it.

One dividend of the program has been a jump in pensioner morale.

Being assured of medical insurance-type protection has meant peace of mind to many a Colorado pensioner.

But there's another morale builder at work. It's the privilege of being able to choose any hospital for medical care.

When Colorado cared for its pensioners on a routine welfare basis, illness usually meant admission to Denver General Hospital or Colorado General Hospital.

The care was good enough, but often—especially in the case of Colorado General—the patient had to travel from another section of the State. Being hospitalized was unpleasant enough, but being separated from familiar surroundings and families was almost more than the pensioner could bear.

Denver General and Colorado General statistics best show what has happened.

According to Richard N. Christy, administrative assistant at Denver General Hospital, the number of pensioners admitted to DGH has dropped in half since the present State program started.

Colorado General's drop, according to Peter Samac, assistant to the administrator, has been about 10 percent—and this during a period when total admissions to the hospital were steadily rising.

The drops at the two hospitals indicate that, across the State, hundreds, perhaps thousands, of pensioners are entering hospitals of their choice—places where loneliness can be combated by friends and relatives.

Morale is hard to measure by cold statistics, but it is one of the factors which make Colorado's program exciting to an amazing variety of people and organizations.

Here are some opinions of the program by Coloradans who would split sharply on some of the national medical care proposals:

Charles E. Bloedorn, director of the National Annuity League:

"Colorado has by far the finest old-age pension program in the country, and the medical plan is an excellent companion.

"The league heartily endorses the plan; the principles used in it are perhaps the most workable of any in the Nation.

"But if the league finds shortcomings, it is in the scope of the program and not in the administration. We think it ought to provide a more flexible system for doctors' visitations, free drugs and pharmaceuticals and items like dental care, hearing aids and the services of chiropractors."

R. C. Anderson, executive vice president of the Colorado Labor Council (AFL–CIO):

"We view the Colorado program as a great step forward in the care of the aged. We think it has turned out to be both practical and workable. The council was for the plan at the outset. We still endorse it."

Harvey T. Sethman, executive secretary of the Colorado State Medical Society:

"We consider the Colorado program excellent. No plan is perfect, and this one is no exception, but by and large an overwhelming majority of old age pensioners are getting excellent care, and an overwhelming majority of the physicians are satisfied. We believe the State welfare administration has done a very good job; they are to be applauded for having handled the program in a calm, efficient, public-spirited manner."

Would Colorado's program be applicable on a national scope?

Justis thinks it would.

"We have a plan unlike any other," he said, "and in my opinion it is working better than any other State medical care program for the pensioner.

"It is not a perfect plan, but we think it has worked out remarkably well. It might work out just as well if it were modified for the needs of the Nation. There's a lot to be said for any plan where you get groups like the chamber of commerce, the League of Women Voters, the AFL–CIO, the doctors and the pensioners themselves to approve it."

The broadening of the Colorado plan to cover a national need would require considerable reworking.

The main problems would be choosing the avenue of financing—social security or direct congressional appropriations—and determining who, outside of State pension rolls, should be eligible for free medical coverage and who should pay.

But the two key features of Colorado's remarkable plan—establishment of an adequate earmarked fund and relegation of management to an organization like Blue Cross-Blue Shield—would be retained.

What would happen if Congress enacted a bill far afield from Colorado's plan?

There would be a danger that Colorado would have to upset its own program to qualify for the Federal matching funds. Or there might be the alternative of turning down the Federal program altogether.

Colorado welfare officials are watching Washington developments closely to see if the outcome is detrimental to Colorado's pensioners.

The fight in Washington has been bitter.

Most of the battle noises have come from the Forand bill arena. The bill, drafted by Representative AIME J. FORAND, Democrat, of Rhode Island, would set up hospitalization and medical care benefits for most of the Nation's 16 million citizens in the 65-and-over age group.

It would be financed and administered entirely under the social security program.

"Socialized medicine," cried the American Medical Association when it scanned the Forand bill. Most Republican leaders, medical insurance organizations, and businessmen's associations tended to agree, and they wanted no part of it.

The AFL–CIO, which liked the bill, saw Machiavellian schemes in the anti-Forand outcry. So it asked its 13 million members to pressure Washington for enactment of the bill.

Meanwhile, the United Auto Workers, in a burst of carefully timed indignation at Forand opponents, sent out thousands of postcards with the Biblical quotation:

"Cast me not off in the time of old age; forsake me not when my strength faileth."

The AMA counterattacked. Several weeks ago Dr. Louis M. Orr, president of the medical group, fired an angry letter at AFL–CIO President George Meany accusing organized labor of deliberate distortion of the truth, perversions of the truth and outright untruths in its attacks on the Forand bill opposition.

Anti-Forand bill people also didn't take kindly to the UAW postcard.

"Blasphemy," cried Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri.

Last Wednesday the Eisenhower administration entered the dispute with a plan of its own. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur Flemming announced a proposed $1.2 billion medical care program to be paid for by Federal-State matching funds—and sizable contributions by beneficiaries of the plan.

Cold shoulders immediately popped up all over the land—and they didn't belong entirely to the Forand bill partisans, either. The administration bill, though it offered sop to the foes of socialized medicine, was judged weak on many counts.

Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, for one, didn't like it. He suggested changes which would make the plan look suspiciously like the Forand bill.

Other Republican Governors have been equally dubious—some of them on the grounds their States couldn't afford the privilege of splitting the costs with the Federal Government.

Others have said the plan is faulty because it would bequire payment of a fairly heavy portion of hospitalization costs by the hard-pressed patient himself in all but the most serious cases.

All in all, it looks as if the administration proposal is in for even more static than the Forand bill.

Some Colorado observers believe that a combination of programs might work best.

Take the administrative cleanliness of the Colorado program, they say, and build from there with the best features of the Forand and administration proposals, and something workable might emerge.

Who would administer such a program?

At the present time no one organization is in a position to run the program on a nationwide basis.

Colorado probably would give its vote to Blue Cross-Blue Shield, although there are a number of other medical and hospitalization organizations in the country which might qualify.

Blue Cross-Blue Shield would be hampered by the fact it is made up of many State organizations, each with its own variations on benefit plans and its own rates.

But the Blue Cross-Blue Shield organizations are rumored to be studying closer alliances and standard rates and plans for the entire Nation.

If so perhaps they would be in a good position to serve a national medical plan for the aged as Colorado Blue Cross-Blue Shield administers the State's fine program.

PROLONGATION OF MONITORSHIP OF TEAMSTERS INTERNATIONAL UNION

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I rise to express my deep concern that the membership of the Teamsters International Union has been unable to conduct an open, free election because of the prolongation of the monitorship. I have been receiving telephone calls and letters on this matter, and only the other day a petition signed by several hundred rank-and-file members, many of whom are friends of mine, of the Teamsters Union, Local 996, with headquarters in Honolulu, which reads as follows:

> The undersigned rank-and-file members of the Teamsters Union, Local 996, in good standing, hereby petition Congress for redress of grievances as guaranteed under the first amendment. The undue prolongation of the monitorship over the Teamsters International Union has cost approximately $1 million and the operation of such monitorship under the supervision and direction of Judge Letts is a clear denial of our rights under the first amendment.
>
> Our basic right to a convention to elect officers of our own choosing is guaranteed by the Landrum-Griffin law. We urge you to use your good office to bring this matter to the attention of Congress and secure hearings before an appropriate committee to investigate the misconduct of the monitorship and start remedial legislation.

I do not take sides as to any personalities involved in this matter, but I feel very strongly that the rank and file of the union have a right to express themselves in democratic fashion and to hold an election.

The Landrum-Griffin bill, which was passed last year, was intended to give to rank-and-file members the right to be heard and the right to elect their officials in free and open elections. I sincerely hope that the Teamsters will be given the right to hold an election at the earliest possible date, and that the monitorship will be discontinued as soon as possible.

I hope and I urge that the matter be given immediate study by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PRESENTATION OF KOREN KOLLIGIAN, JR., AWARD TO NEW YORK AVIATOR

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, at the Pentagon this morning a young Air Force officer from Cattaraugus, N.Y., 1st Lt. Ronald L. Warner, received the Koren Kolligian, Jr., Trophy. This trophy is presented annually by the Air Force for flying safety accomplishments.

Lieutenant Warner was pilot of an Air Force transport plane which was carrying passengers from Okinawa to Guam last September 4. With one engine suddenly disabled, he was faced with the decision of ditching in the open sea or gambling on nursing his crippled aircraft to Iwo Jima. Lieutenant Warner decided on the latter course and with great flying skill succeeded in reaching his destination with only minutes of fuel left.

The people of New York State are extremely proud of this courageous young officer and I personally am delighted at the recognition which his gallant feat received.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the official Air Force citation which accompanied Lieutenant Warner's award be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION FOR THE AWARD OF THE KOREN KOLLIGIAN, JR., TROPHY

The Koren Kolligian, Jr., Trophy is awarded to 1st Lt. Ronald L. Warner, U.S. Air Force, in recognition of his accomplishment of an outstanding feat of airmanship.

On September 4, 1959, Lieutenant Warner was flying as pilot of a C–119 aircraft transporting passengers from Okinawa to Guam. At a point midway to Guam, while cruising at 9,000 feet, the aircraft suddenly experienced a runaway propeller on the right engine. Severe vibration of the aircraft and an uncontrollable loss of altitude posed the immediate threat of abandoning the aircraft over the perilous open sea.

Unable to feather the defective propeller, Lieutenant Warner alerted the passengers and dispatched emergency distress signals. By slowing the aircraft to an airspeed slightly above a stall, Lieutenant Warner was able to regain sufficient control to remain airborne. A critical appraisal of the situation revealed that, under these conditions, the aircraft had insufficient fuel to reach the nearest landing facility. A nearby atoll offered the prospect of bailing out the passengers, to reduce the weight of the aircraft, and thereby assure sufficient endurance to reach safety. However, rather than risk the lives of his passengers to the uncertainties of a bailout over the small treacherous atoll and surrounding shark-infested waters, Lieutenant Warner decided, in the face of overwhelming odds, to attempt the hazardous 4-hour flight to Iwo Jima. Having made his decision, he ordered all possible equipment jettisoned. Thereafter, with the success of the flight dependent on the continued operation of one engine, a runaway propeller causing severe aircraft vibration on the other, and a serious shortage of fuel, Lieutenant Warner skillfully piloted his aircraft to a safe landing at Iwo Jima with only minutes of fuel remaining.

Lieutenant Warner's outstanding feat of airmanship in coping with an airborne emergency situation conforms to the high standards established for the Koren Kolligian, Jr., Trophy and reflects great credit upon himself, the Pacific Air Forces, and the U.S. Air Force.

RECOVERY BY U.S. GOVERNMENT OF COST OF HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL SERVICES IN NEGLIGENT THIRD-PARTY CASES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a report by the Comptroller General of the United States entitled "Review of the Government's Rights and Practices Concerning Recovery of the Cost of Hospital and Medical Services in Negligent Third-Party Cases."

It was forwarded to me as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by Comptroller General Joseph Campbell, under a letter dated May 6, 1960.

I ask unanimous consent that my analysis and comment on this review be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, OF VIRGINIA

The Comptroller General of the United States has found at least several million dollars a year slipping through legal loopholes which prevent the Government from recovering costs in accident cases involving thousands of persons receiving Federal hospitalization, medical treatment, etc.

This finding was made in a review of the Government's rights and practices concerning recovery of the cost of hospital and medical services in negligent third-party cases, which Comptroller General Joseph Campbell today forwarded to me as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

The review developed that while provision is made for recovery of these costs in other areas, the law without apparent reason is silent or insufficient with respect to accident cases involving injury to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents, the Coast Guard, merchant seamen, veterans and others for whom Government medical care is furnished.

The magnitude of these errors of omission is shown by the Comptroller General's examination of Department of Defense records which reveal that in the 30-month period ending June 30, 1959, there were 13,500 accidents involving privately owned automobiles in which military personnel were injured.

The Comptroller General estimated that costs of Federal medical and related services in these cases averaged $10.5 million a year, or some $26 million for the 30-month period; but lacking specific authority, and under a 1947 Supreme Court decision, the Defense Department made no effort to recover any of these costs.

The Comptroller General found so-called third-party negligence reasonable to assume in 5,400 of the 13,500 accident cases because the injured military personnel were passengers or pedestrians. The unrecovered costs of medical and hospital services in these cases were estimated at an average of $4.2 million a year.

The military personnel injured in the other 8,100 accident cases were drivers of vehicles involved, and the Comptroller General said while incidence of "third-party liability in these cases is not known, it is reasonable to assume that it was present in a significant number of instances."

In the same review the Comptroller General found that the U.S. Public Health Service does not recover from negligent third parties the costs incurred by the Government in the treatment of injured Coast Guard personnel, merchant seamen, and others who are entitled to care in PHS hospitals at Government expense.

He found further that the Veterans' Administration, while successful in some degree in proceedings under general provisions of the Veterans Benefits Act, also lacks specific authority to recover medical costs from negligent third parties for accident cases treated through VA facilities.

The review found in some cases injured personnel may recover from negligent parties, but the Government can not recover from either party in the absence of specific legal authority. In other cases injured parties, having received medical care at Government expense, do not include such costs in their claims.

I concur in the Comptroller General's conclusions that Government medical care in these cases is not intended to relieve any one of any accident liability, and that the right of recovery should be uniform throughout the Government, with no exceptions. I shall introduce appropriate legislation as soon as it can be drafted.

Such legislation should be enacted promptly. The right of recovery in accident cases is already provided under the Federal Employees Compensation Act, and under Federal law relating to railroad employees, longshoremen, and harbor workers. The Defense Department and other agencies involved have concurred in the Comptroller General's recommendation for further legal remedy.

NATIONAL BROTHERHOOD AWARD TO SENATOR FONG FROM NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last Thursday evening in Providence, R.I., the senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] was presented the National Brotherhood Award by the National Conference of Christians and Jews for outstanding and devoted leadership. This is a very fitting and well-deserved tribute to one whose entire life has been devoted to promoting true understanding to the end that all men may live in harmony.

In his native Hawaii, our newest State of the Union, the aloha spirit pervades. Brotherhood is a living reality. Hawaii is a showcase of fine race relations and religious tolerance on display to peoples of both the Eastern and Western Hemispheres, who can learn from Hawaii that brotherhood is not only desirable but attainable.

In accepting the award the Senator from Hawaii delivered a notable address, in which he analyzed the factors contributing to racial harmony and cooperation in Hawaii and to the efforts of the people of Hawaii to hasten the brotherhood of man elsewhere. I commend this fine address to my colleagues and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY U.S. SENATOR HIRAM L. FONG, BEFORE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS, PROVIDENCE, R.I., MAY 5, 1960

It is indeed a great honor and a great privilege for my wife Ellyn and me to be with you this evening—to sit down with you and to break bread with you and to make your friendship.

To receive from you, friends I have just come to know, through your national president, Dr. Louis Webster Jones, this bronze award signifying service to the cause of brotherhood, moves me very, very deeply. I am doubly thankful for your kindness and for selecting me for this honor which I know I do not deserve.

My father and mother were Taoists. Were they living and here tonight amidst your warmth and friendliness, witnessing the receipt by their son of this very coveted service award from the National Conference of Christians and Jews, they would undoubtedly have remarked, "This is truly in accord with what Confucius has said, 'Under heaven all men are brothers.' "

That we should be meeting here in historic Providence, one of the queen cities of New England, pleases me greatly. I feel very much at home, for you see New England is a part of me. Three long, hard, but rewarding years of my formative life between 1932 and 1935 were spent not far from here, at Cambridge, Mass., as a Harvard Law School student. But even before Harvard, I was acquainted with New England. Its influence has been felt in my native Hawaii for 140 years—since the arrival in 1820 of the first group of 12 communities of Christian Congregational missionaries from New England.

It is amazing how tremendous was their and their children's contribution to the development and stability of Hawaii and how their Puritan philosophy has influenced Hawaii's outlook and life.

Through their influence, the Hawaiian language was reduced to writing, the Bible was translated, and schools were established. Through their influence, the first written constitution was approved in 1840, creating a supreme court and a representative body of legislators elected by the people.

Through their influence, prohibition was placed on immorality, gambling, drunkenness, theft, and violation of the Sabbath, much to the resistance of foreign sailors who, on several occasions, demonstrated by armed riots, not against the natives, but against the missionaries. Into the home of one of them several cannon shots were fired.

Architecturally, too, New England has left its visible mark on Hawaii. Even today, it is not unusual to see a Cape Cod cottage on any one of the seven inhabited islands.

New England's influence on me has been quite personal. Besides being a graduate of Harvard Law School, I am a graduate of the public school system which the Congregational missionaries inaugurated. My name of Hiram is taken from the Reverend Hiram Bingham, leader of the first group of missionaries. My religion is Congregational.

So, it is indeed a distinct honor and a great privilege for me to be speaking here tonight in New England, for to me it is in a sense in more ways than one, like returning home.

Your regional director, Mrs. Rozella Switzer, has asked me to discuss Hawaii's role in human relationships and I am happy to accede to her wishes.

Hawaii, it is claimed by historians, was discovered by Capt. James Cook, an Englishman. This claim, however, is disputed by the Chinese who relate this very plausible story. Ten years prior to Captain Cook's visit, a Chinese junk left the harbor of Hong Kong and sailed eastward across the vast Pacific. Dropping anchor at Waikiki, the captain pulled out his spyglass and scanned the shore. This is what he saw—beautiful Hawaiian maidens, dressed in grass skirts, dancing to the tune of ukuleles. Putting his spyglass down, he turned to his men and said, "Men, we must sail on, there is no laundry to be done here." And this is the reason there are so many Chinese laundries in New England.

The cook on the ship, however, was not convinced. He, too, picked up the spyglass and scanned the shore. What he saw, he liked. Putting down his spyglass, he jumped overboard and swam to shore. As he was a good cook, the captain would not sail without him.

After a whole week of search, he was found in the loving arms of a very amorous Hawaiian maiden. Yanking him from her charms, the crew took him down to the beach where, to make an example of him before all the men, the captain made him put on heavy boots and marched him up and down. With every step he took, the captain gave him a kick. After many kicks, the cook turned around and said, "Why kickee me?" And that is how Waikiki got its name.

Essential to a deeper understanding of Hawaii is a knowledge of its history, its geographical location, and of the peoples who settled there. Situated in the vast Pacific Ocean which covers one-third of our globe, the Hawaiian Islands number just eight out of the thousands of islands comprising Malaysia, Melanesia, Micronesia, and Polynesia. Archaeologists, anthropologists, and historians of these oceanic people and their culture virtually agree that stone-age Caucasian people in successive waves of migration from the Indochina Peninsula pushed eastward into Malaysia, then from there to Melanesia, then to the islands off and surrounding Tahiti, the heart of Polynesia. From Tahiti in great single and double canoes, they dispersed 2,500 miles north to Hawaii, southwest to New Zealand, and southeast to Mangareva, Pitcairn, and Easter Island.

Charcoals recently discovered in fireplaces used by the early settlers of Hawaii have been determined by the radio carbon method to date back a thousand years.

It is generally conceded that the first Polynesians landed on Hawaii some 1,200 years ago.

Little is known of the history of Hawaii until Capt. James Cook, of Great Britain, discovered the islands in 1778, and brought to a close the period of Hawaiian isolation which had existed for 10 centuries. Thereafter, fur traders of the Northwest and California, on their way to sell their furs in China, together with the demand for Hawaiian sandlewood and the outfitting of whaling fleets, made Hawaii an important port of commerce.

The strategic significance of Hawaii as a Pacific outpost became apparent in the middle of the 19th century, when a power struggle for dominance of the islands took place between England, France, and the United States.

Hawaii today could easily have been an English colony by right of discovery or by cession, or a French colony by force of arms.

A British naval force seized Hawaii and for 5 months the British flag flew over the islands in 1843. However, by that time, the influence of Americans in the islands and the gaining strength of the United States in the Pacific, assured the Hawaiian kingdom of its independence.

From 1795 when Kamehameha, a Hawaiian chieftain, took control of Hawaii, Maui, and Oahu, to 1893, a period of almost 100 years, the Hawaiian Islands were under the rule of seven kings and one queen. In 1893, Queen Liliuokalani was dethroned and a provisional government was formed. The Republic of Hawaii was established the following year.

Hawaii was annexed by the United States in 1898 and from 1900 to 9 months ago, it was an incorporated Territory of the United States with a representative legislature elected by the people but with an appointed Governor.

Ethnically, Hawaii is composed of many nationalities. The early settlers were the Polynesians. Caucasian sailors, adventurers, whalers, traders, and missionaries were second comers. Then followed Chinese contract laborers recruited to work the sugar plantations as the Hawaiians were not inclined to hard labor.

With the annexation of the islands to the United States in 1898, Chinese labor immigration was completely prohibited as the laws, which were then in force excluding Chinese laborers to the United States, were made applicable to Hawaii.

Japanese contract laborers in great numbers were also imported from 1885 until their exclusion in 1924.

Portuguese, Swedes, Germans, Koreans, South Sea Islanders, Puerto Ricans, and Filipinos also comprised immigrant groups brought in for the cultivation and the processing of sugar.

From these heterogeneous and diverse ethnic groups has evolved a homogeneous community—a community which has been termed by students of sociology as a "21st century society" where racial harmony and cooperation are normal and accepted conditions of life. This spirit of working together pervades civic, business, political, and cultural endeavors. There is sincere respect for, rather than mere toleration of, each other's nationality, traits, characteristics, and cultures.

Living in an island paradise, tropical and balmy, with high standards of health and livelihood; with a good, free educational system; a stable, democratic government; where no group constitutes a racial majority; with peoples on one hand steeped in Christian Puritan outlook and justice, and on the other, imbued with Buddhist and Confucian philosophies stressing human and moral conduct; cemented together and mellowed by the generous open-heartedness and carefree aloha spirit of its native Hawaiian people, we in Hawaii would like to believe that we are giving life to a community approaching the ideal of a world at peace and in concord.

President Eisenhower said to the people of India during his recent trip, "Hawaii cries insistently to a divided world that all our differences of race and origin are less than the grand and indestructible unity of our common brotherhood. The world should take time to listen with attentive ear to Hawaii."

Hawaii is indeed a showcase for true brotherhood. Elsewhere, even as in ancient days, massive discrimination continues to blight human relationships. Our news media carry daily evidence of man's inhumanity to man, evidenced by oppression, fear, hatred, bias, and discrimination in all quarters of our globe.

Behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, religious and political persecution persist. In Tibet, the Red Chinese regime continues mass genocide of the civilian population. Large numbers of people still flee East Germany and Red China, at risk of life and limb, to seek sanctuary in more tolerant oases. Anti-Semitism and anti-Christianity erupt as atheistic communism seeks to wipe out religious worship.

Belligerent nationalism is more the rule than not in modern struggles to throw off the yoke of colonialism. Too often such nationalism provokes wholesale bloodletting, with guns replacing ballots as the means of attaining parity and settling disputes.

Unmindful of man's growing yearning for equal status, many cling to senseless caste systems of the discredited past. As in South Africa, the ruling race shocked the world with its brutal methods to enforce apartheid.

There is something barbaric in today's repression of man's natural passion for equity.

Here in the United States we are not yet purged of intolerance and prejudice. Denial of voting rights; desecration of churches, schools, and public buildings; discrimination in employment and in public accommodations point up the urgent need for further progress in learning to live peaceably together. In connection with recent sitdown demonstrations at lunch counters, it is significant to note that many whites who object to Negroes sitting as customers on one side of the counter do not object to Negroes on the other side of the counter cooking and serving the food they eat. Irrational from a standpoint of logic, this attitude is bewildering from a standpoint of emotion as well.

In our glasshouse that is America, our discrimination and bigotry are in full view of a critical world. We receive considerable adverse comment for our shortcomings—and perhaps not enough recognition for the undeniable progress we are making. Unlike some of our critics, we are not sweeping our problems of civil rights under the rug. We are facing up to them.

This year, in the Senate of the United States, 100 representatives of 179 million Americans aired our civil rights disagreements in public over a period of 8 weeks. If ever opinions were thoroughly ventilated, these were. And when all the smog had lifted, what was the outcome?

Of the 100 Senators, 82 supported passage of corrective and progressive civil rights legislation. Only 18 voted for the status quo.

In school, we usually consider 70 a "passing" grade. While 82 may not elevate us to honor roll, it certainly is a very respectable score.

In terms of public sentiment, the 82 percent of the Senate favoring this year's civil rights bill represents a sizable majority of American people. Without such widespread approval, this civil rights milestone would not have been achieved. Although the bill does not go far enough to suit some people and goes too far to suit others, it does denote real progress.

To those who are impatient with our speed in achieving true brotherhood, let me point out that, until 1957, more than 80 years elapsed without passage of a single significant civil rights law. Now, just 3 years later, we have enacted a second major civil rights statute. Unquestionably, this reflects significant transformation in American attitudes.

In many areas of the United States, of course, we still have not matched the tolerance found in Hawaii where acceptance, without regard to race, color, or creed, and based on individual merit and standing is the general rule—the unwritten rule. Acceptance comes from the heart. It is not superimposed by such means as legislation, judicial process, or promotional campaigns.

For example, discrimination does not exist in Government employment. The Department of Public Instruction, administered by seven commissioners, has for its chairman, an American of Japanese descent, a commissioner of Chinese descent, and one of part-Hawaiian descent and four of Caucasian descent.

The University of Hawaii, with more than 8,000 full-time students is under the control of a board of regents of nine members—four of whom are of Caucasian ancestry, two of Japanese, two of Chinese, and one of Hawaiian ancestry.

The nine Public Housing Authority commissioners are composed of five of Caucasian, two of Chinese, one of Korean, and one part-Hawaiian ancestry operating dwellings housing more than 4,000 families.

Intermarriage between members of different ethnic groups has been and is common and has produced fine, outstanding people, many of whom are leaders in the business, professional, political, and religious life of the Islands.

In the matter of voting, Dr. Andrew W. Lind, professor of sociology at the University of Hawaii, states that "racial bloc voting, in the mainland sense of the vigorous control over an entire bloc of voters of a common race, does not occur in Hawaii, and even in the more restricted sense of voting exclusively for members of one's own ethnic group, it is so slight as to be inconsequential." He observed that "any politician of the slightest sagacity soon learns, if he does not already know, that the surest route to political suicide is an appeal on a racial basis."

I must confess there is some racial discrimination practiced by some social groups in Hawaii but in recent years, more and more private groups are opening their memberships to persons of all races. It may not be too long before racial bars are lifted altogether.

In the field of public accommodations, all of our restaurants, theaters, hotels, public parks, public beaches, public swimming pools, golf courses, tennis courts, and transportation facilities are free of any discrimination based on race, color, religion or national origin.

Justice is dispensed with equity. There has been no reported case in which any question of discrimination in the administration of justice appears to have been raised.

Even though racial harmony prevails in Hawaii, there are groups dedicated to furthering inter-racial relations such as the Hawaii Chapter of World Brotherhood, the Honolulu Council of Churches, and the Pacific and Asian Affairs Council. While we do not have a chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in Hawaii, efforts in behalf of racial and religious understanding are carried on by the Council of Churches and World Brotherhood.

In addition, business organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce, Board of Underwriters, Commercial Club, Employers Council, Home Builders Association, and the Retail Board are comprised of individuals of varying racial extractions.

This is also true of civic, political, educational, fraternal, health, medical, veterans, and welfare groups.

Again this is true of the more than one dozen service organizations for young people.

The Honolulu Symphony Orchestra and the Community Theater include in their membership individuals of many races. I recall Community Theater productions that have had a Filipino Anna in the musical verson of "Anna and the King of Siam," better known as "The King and I." Another time a young lady of Japanese extraction as Kate in "Kiss Me Kate."

To bridge the gap between the two hemispheres, Hawaii has done many things. For instance, Hawaii sponsored an Afro-Asian student leader seminar where three dozen talented young college men and women from nearly as many countries on three continents conferred for 4 weeks on the place of higher education in society today.

Hawaii held an International Conference on Race Relations to discuss the conflicts and tensions which exist throughout the world between imperialistic powers and peoples imbued with the spirit of self-determination, with emphasis on the effect of economic change and nationalism on race relations in Africa, Asia, and the Western Hemisphere.

Hawaii held three East-West philosopher's conferences where an Asian conferee remarked that these meetings were the only ones in which Asians had felt free to express themselves frankly and did so.

For six years, the University of Hawaii has conducted an Asian Orientation Center for Mundt-Smith and Fulbright grantees headed for graduate study at mainland U.S. universities.

Last month, three prominent citizens of Hawaii accompanied by their wives began a tour of southeast Asia and India. Their mission is to meet and mingle informally with the peoples of the Pacific area. Each of the group represents a different race of the Pacific. Each has prospered through his individual merit in Hawaii's climate of racial understanding and harmony. In turn, each has contributed to Hawaii's growth and stature.

Chairman of the group is a Chinese attorney and businessman who served as the president of the senate in the last legislature of Hawaii before statehood.

Another is a Polynesian—Duke P. Kahanamoku, world renowned sheriff of Honolulu County and former Olympic swimming champion. He is accompanied by his wife, a Caucasian.

The third is a State senator of Japanese extraction who had been a county judge.

As representatives of the State of Hawaii, they have vital information to impart on their tour. They can speak from personal experience of America's growing feeling of racial understanding so well in evidence in Hawaii. They can cite specific accomplishments in Hawaii resulting from this understanding.

A group of three University of Hawaii students, one a mother of three, last week launched a statewide fund-raising campaign to finance scholarships for Asian students. They hope to expand the program eventually to include an undergraduate student exchange program. By September, these students have scheduled to operate a cultural exchange with Asian universities, beginning with Keio University, one of the largest private schools in Japan.

Nearly 2,000 elementary schoolchildren are participating in a "neighbor" language program to promote understanding through better communication. They are learning languages of the Far East under a program sponsored and conducted by the Hawaii Department of Public Instruction.

To promote better relations and understanding among the United States and the Nations of Asia and the Pacific, the Senate of the United States last week authorized a 3-year expenditure of $30 million to establish in Hawaii a Center for Cultural and Technical Intercharge between the East and the West. I hope that the House of Representatives will concur and make it a reality.

The Center is to have two major divisions: an International College where students from overseas and the United States can study together and an international training facility to provide technical instruction through on-the-job and inservice training for participants from other nations. It is expected to start off with 125 scholarship students and is to be increased to 2,000 after 5 years. Three-fourths will be from overseas and one-fourth from the United States.

The reason cited for the establishment of the Center in Hawaii was the uniquely favorable atmosphere there; a physical and a cultural climate in which students from the Orient can be at their ease; a community eager to participate in the program by opening its offices and homes to these students; and a community which itself displays the best qualities of East and West.

It is therefore manifestly evident that Hawaii, with its rich multiracial human resource, long and amicable history of ethnic integration, happy cultural interchange and strategic geography, has not in self-contentment and with detachment withdrawn herself into her own island sanctuary, but has diligently pursued numerous ways to contribute her good fortune and know-how to bring closer cooperation among her neighbors.

Clothed with the dignity of a sovereign state, she is confident that her people, few as they are, can effectively help to hasten the millenium of the brotherhood of man.

This we have accepted as the ultimate unfolding of our destiny, our great contribution to America. This we know is our transcendent mission. We live brotherhood, we believe in it, and we know it has real prospect for success nationally and internationally, for it satisfies the soul and has the force of logic.

We in Hawaii do feel a sense of history—not just of a dramatic past, great as it may be, but of a dynamic future with its promise of richer achievement benefiting humanity and auguring peace.

What we have accomplished in Hawaii in so short a period can well be duplicated by all communities. Many and propitious may have been the factors for Hawaii to so quickly attain a happy homogeneous community. Yet the lack of some of these factors should not render that attainment impossible elsewhere. It may perhaps take longer.

All communities are endowed with the substantive factors for success in human

relationship. All they need is to catalyze and to synthesize them. In Hawaii we have found it. You, I know in a great measure, have also found it. Surprisingly so, it is everywhere in some measure. In the Old Testament, a Book so dear to Christians as well as to Jews, Third Chapter of First Kings, we are told that the Lord appeared to Solomon in a dream and asked him what he would want and Solomon replied, "O Lord, my God, give thy servant therefor an understanding heart to judge thy people, that I may discern between good and evil; for who is able to judge this thy so great a people?"

It pleased the Lord, that Solomon had asked this thing and God said unto him, "Because thou hast asked this thing and hast not asked for thyself long life or riches or the life of thine enemies; but hast asked for thyself understanding to discern what is right, behold, I have done according to thy words. Lo, I have given thee a wise and an understanding heart and I have also given thee that which thou hast not asked, both riches and honor."

I thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1329, H.R. 10474.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10474) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10474) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the report, justifying the need for the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were orderd to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill would authorize the construction of 8,000 tons of amphibious warfare vessels and landing craft, 4,000 tons of patrol vessels, and 20,000 tons of auxiliary vessels.

VESSELS TO BE CONSTRUCTED

Amphibious transport, dock	1
Escort vessels	2
Fast combat support ship	1

REASON FOR AUTHORIZATION

The Navy's shipbuilding and conversion program for fiscal year 1961 involves 35 ships and 22 craft.

From prior shipbuilding authorization acts the Navy has sufficient authority to construct all of the vessels included in the 1961 program except for the tonnage involved in this bill.

The shipbuilding and conversion program of the Navy for fiscal year 1961 is directed toward the continued improvement and modernization of the Navy to enable it to discharge its assigned missions in the national defense.

Most of the ships now in use by the Navy were laid down during World War II. Many of them have already passed the midpoint of their useful lives. The shipbuilding program of the Navy is intended to provide a proper balance between old and new facilities and to avoid block obsolescence of the fleet.

It is elementary that control of the seas is a major consideration in the national defense plans.

DESCRIPTION OF VESSELS

Amphibious transport, dock

The amphibious transport, dock, will carry transport helicopters and landing craft. It was designed to replace the attack transport (APA) and attack cargo ship (AKA). The big advantage is that the men and their equipment will both be carried in the same ship. It will combat load, transport, and land about 900 troops and their equipment via helicopters and landing craft. It can carry six of the large transport helicopters, one large utility landing craft, and three of the smaller personnel landing craft or other equivalent combinations. Both the landing craft and the helicopters may be launched when the ship is underway or stopped.

The first of the LPD type was included in the fiscal year 1959 program, and the second was in the fiscal year 1960 program. This is the third of this type. It is essentially a repeat of the one included in the fiscal year 1960 program. The first one will be in the fleet about June 1962.

The amphibious transport dock (LPD) is a new 20-knot ship which was developed by the Navy and Marine Corps, especially for use in assault by vertical envelopment.

Escort vessels

These escort vessels are specially designed for optimum performance in locating and destroying enemy submarines. They can operate as part of a hunter-killer group, screen amphibious forces, patrol coastal waters for missile-firing submarines (continental defense) or escort convoys.

These two ships are essentially repeats of the two in the fiscal year 1960 program, which have improved seaworthiness plus signficantly increased antisubmarine warfare capabilities over previous escort vessels. One, and possibly both, will be fitted with a newly developed pressure-fired boiler.

They will carry the integral bow-mounted long-range sonar and the drone antisubmarine helicopters (Dash). An antisubmarine rocket launcher and antisubmarine torpedo launchers are provided for destruction of submarines at medium ranges. The drone helicopters carrying ASW torpedoes will be used for long-range attacks.

The armament of one 3"/50 RF twin forward and one 3"/50 RF single aft will provide for limited self-defense.

The first two of this type DE were in the fiscal year 1960 program. Two of this type DE are in the fiscal year 1961 program. Thirteen Dealey class DE and four Claude Jones class (diesel) have been authorized since World War II. These will give the Navy a total of 21 new escort vessels.

Fast combat support ship

The fast combat support ship is of a new design. It will operate as an integral unit of a fast task force to provide continuous replenishment of black oil, aviation fuel, diesel oil, conventional ammunition, fleet missiles up to and including Talos, selected underwater ordnance, special weapons and provisions and fleet freight for selective issue. The AOE's replenishment capability is about equivalent of 1⅕ the capacity of the large fleet oiler and one-fourth the capacity of the new ammunition ship and in addition, it will carry 250 tons dry cargo and 250 tons frozen foods.

SUMMARY OF THE 1961 SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION PROGRAM

The following information relates to the current shipbuilding and conversion program of the Navy. Much of it is not directly related to the authorization proposed by this bill, but is set out here for informational purposes.

Construction and conversion in 1961 program

Category	Number of ships	Tonnage unit	Required total
NEW CONSTRUCTION			
Combatant:			
Warships:			
Attack aircraft carrier (CVA)	1	61,000	61,000
Guided-missile frigates (DLG)	3	5,200	15,600
Guided-missile destroyers (DDG)	2	3,360	6,720
Nuclear-powered submarines (SSN)	3	3,600	10,800
Fleet ballistic missile submarines (SSBN)	3	6,600	19,800
Total, warships	12		113,920
Amphibious warfare and landing craft:			
Amphibious transport, dock (LPD)[1]	1	7,800	7,800
Landing craft, mechanized (LCM (6))	20	23	460
Total, amphibious warfare and landing craft	21		8,260
Patrol vessels: Escort vessels (DE)[1]	2	1,850	3,700
Total, combatant	35		125,880
Auxiliary vessels:			
Escort research ship (AG)	1	1,550	1,550
Oceanographic research ship (AGOR)	1	1,020	1,020
Auxiliary submarine, deep diving (AG(SS))	1	550	550
Fast combat-support ship (ACE)[1]	1	19,200	19,200
Combat store ship (AFS)	1	9,450	9,450
Total, auxiliary vessels	5		31,770
Service craft: Harbor tug, large (YTB)	2	270	540
Total, new construction	42		158,190
CONVERSIONS			
Destroyer (DD)	14	2,500	35,000
Auxiliary submarine (AG(SS)) (*Albacore* conversion)	1	1,345	1,345
Total, conversions	15		36,345
Total, 1961 program	57		194,535

[1] Contained in this bill.

STATUS OF SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION PROGRAMS FROM PRIOR YEARS

On January 1, 1960, 88 naval vessels were being built, or were awarded or assigned but not yet under construction. In addition, 17 vessels authorized were not yet awarded or assigned. Among the 88 vessels being built or awarded 73 are classified as major combatant ships (aircraft carriers through escort vessels) in the following types:

	Number
Forrestal-type aircraft carriers (CVA)	2
Nuclear-powered aircraft carrier (CVAN)	1
Nuclear-powered guided missile cruiser (CGN)	1
Guided-missile frigates (DLG)	18
Nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate (DLGN)	1
Guided-missile destroyers (DDG)	18
Escort vessels (DE)	1
Submarines (SS)	2
Nuclear-powered attack submarines (SSN)	15
Nuclear-powered guided-missile submarine (SSGN)	1
Fleet ballistic missile submarines (SSBN)	8
Amphibious assault ship (LPH)	8
Amphibious transport, dock (LPD)	2
Total	73

AVERAGE VESSEL COSTS

The average estimated unit cost of the six *Forrestal*-type aircraft carriers authorized to date is $217,703,800. The other major combatant ships have averaged estimated unit costs as shown below:

	Millions
Nuclear-powered guided missile cruiser (CGN)	$261.5
Nuclear-powered aircraft carrier (CVAN)	444.0
Guided-missile destroyer (DDG)	36.4
Escort vessel (DE)	11.2
Guided-missile frigate (DLG)	58.8
Nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate (DLGN)	148.1
Submarine (SS)	22.1
Nuclear-powered attack submarine (SSN)	58.7
Fleet ballistic missile submarine (SSBN)	102.2
Nuclear-powered guided-missile submarine (SSGN)	70.0
Amphibious assault ship (LPH)	56.7
Amphibious transport, dock (LPD)	39.2

The *Forrestal*-type carriers take approximately 3 years to build; one will be completed in 1960 and one in 1961.

NUCLEAR SUBMARINES (INCLUDING POLARIS)

There have been 37 nuclear-power submarines authorized (and one conversion) in the past. Of these, nine are Polaris submarines. The non-Polaris submarines are in stages of development as follows:

Completed, including the *Seawolf* (conversion)	9
Under construction	15
Construction not started	4

The Polaris are in stages of development as follows:

Completed	1
Under construction	8

NUCLEAR-POWERED SURFACE SHIPS

There are three nuclear-powered surface ships in the current shipbuilding program, the *Long Beach* (CGN–9), the *Enterprise* (CVAN–65) and the *Bainbridge* (DLGN–25).

COST

The estimated cost of the authorization contained in this bill is $157,900,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 10474) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 11713) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 893, S. 910.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 910) to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 910) to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Payments to Local Governments Act of 1959".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) Although the United States is under no constitutional obligation to pay taxes, or to make financial contributions in lieu of taxes, to any State or any political subdivision or instrumentality thereof with respect to any property of the Federal Government, the Congress hereby declares that it is national policy to avoid demonstrable financial hardship upon such local governments caused by the exemption of Federal real property from taxation by local governments.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to provide for the conduct of a comprehensive study to ascertain (1) the nature and extent of any continuing need for Federal contributions to those governments to relieve such hardships, and (2) the ways and means whereby any such hardship may be alleviated most effectively and economically. It is further the purpose of this Act to make temporary provision for the relief of those governments from such hardship, pending the completion of that study, by authorizing the making of certain Federal contributions to local governments in lieu of the payment of—

(1) special assessments levied after the effective date of this Act upon real property situated in urban and suburban areas to defray the cost of local public improvements;

(2) taxes with respect to Federal real property in the custody or control of taxable persons under lease, contract, or permit arrangements, to the extent that taxes with respect to that property are not paid by such taxable persons; and

(3) taxes upon Federal real property acquired after June 30, 1950, which is in the custody or control of any Federal agency for industrial or commercial use.

(c) In consideration for the payments authorized by this Act, the Congress expects that the recipients thereof will make all public services normally provided by them available to and with respect to the Federal Government, its property, and its officers and employees and their families, upon the same terms and conditions as such services are made available to or with respect to other property and individuals.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Federal agency" means any department, agency officer, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government of the United States, and any corporation now or hereafter subject to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 846);

(b) The term "Federal property" means any real property the legal title to which is held by the United States or any Federal agency;

(c) The term "real property" means any interest in land, and any improvement thereon, if such interest or improvement constitutes real property under law in effect within the State in which such property is situated;

(d) The term "controlling agency", when used in relation to any Federal property, means the Federal agency which is charged with the duty of administering such property;

(e) The term "Board" means the Federal Board for Payments to Local Governments established by this Act;

(f) The term "State" means any State of the United States;

(g) The term "tax authority" means any county, city, municipality, tax district, or other political subdivision or public entity of any State having authority under the law of such State to levy within its territorial jurisdiction any tax or special assessment upon real property;

(h) The term "tax" (except as otherwise specified) means any tax of general application levied according to value by any tax authority upon real property situated within its territorial jurisdiction, but does not include any tax levied upon the manufacture, purchase, sale, transfer, or use of any property or upon any income derived from any property;

(i) The term "taxable person" means any individual, partnership, private association, private corporation, or other nongovernmental legal entity;

(j) The term "special assessment" means any levy, other than a tax, imposed after the date of enactment of this Act by any tax authority directly upon real property situated within its territorial jurisdiction to defray the cost of any public improvement;

(k) The term "public improvement" means any street, road, bridge, sewer, water distribution system, drainage project, or other public improvement undertaken by or on behalf of any tax authority for the benefit of

residents of the geographical area over which such tax authority has jurisdiction; and

(l) The term "industrial or commercial use", when used in relation to any Federal property, includes any use made of such property for (1) the mining, manufacturing, fabrication, or repair of any article or commodity, (2) the generation of electrical energy, (3) the transportation of individuals or property, (4) the sale or leasing of any property, commodity, or service, and (5) the storage of property incident to any of the uses heretofore enumerated, but does not include the use of any such property for (A) the housing of individuals for which rent is received, (B) the storage of any agricultural commodity, or (C) any purpose for which the property, if privately owned or used, would by person of its use be exempt from tax under laws applicable within the tax authority of its situs.

FEDERAL BOARD FOR PAYMENTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established the Federal Board for Payments to Local Governments (referred to hereinafter as the "Board"), which shall be composed of five members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall serve at the pleasure of the President. Not more than three members of the Board may be members of the same political party. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Board.

(b) A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Board, and three members shall at all times constitute a quorum. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) Each member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Commissioners of the United States Court of Claims, and no member of the Board may engaged in any other business, vocation, or employment while serving as such member.

(d) The Board shall cease to exist on December 31, 1966.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE BOARD

SEC. 5. (a) The Board shall exercise the powers conferred upon it, and perform the duties imposed upon it, by this Act.

(b) In the performance of its functions under section 6 of this Act, the Board in its discretion from time to time may consult with the Advisory Committee established under section 7 of this Act to receive its advice and recommendations with regard to problems encountered by the Board in the performance of those functions. The Board shall consult from time to time with representatives of tax authorities and State governments, and such other persons as it may deem appropriate, in carrying out the provisions of this Act. The Board is authorized to pay to such representatives and persons, while serving without compensation for purposes of consultation pursuant to this subsection, transportation, and per diem as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b–2).

(c) As soon as may be practicable after the end of each period of six calendar months, the Board shall submit to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, a report concerning its operations during such period. Each such report shall contain full and complete information concerning the applications received and the payments ordered by the Board during such period under section 8 of this Act, together with such other information as may be helpful to the Congress in evaluating the operation of this Act and all other provisions of law authorizing the payment of taxes, or the making of payments in lieu of taxes, to States and to tax authorities.

(d) The Board may make such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, as may be necessary for the performance of its duties, including such uniform rules, regulations, and forms as it shall prescribe for (1) the filing by tax authorities of applications for payments authorized by this Act, (2) the examination of such applications and the conduct of hearings thereon, and (3) the determination of action to be taken upon such applications.

(e) Subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, the Board may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

(f) The Board is hereby authorized to procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55(a)), at rates not exceeding $50 per day for the personal services of individuals.

(g) Subject to provisions of law and regulations relating to the classification of information in the interest of national security, the Board is authorized to secure from any Federal agency any information necessary to carry out its functions under this Act, and each Federal agency is authorized to furnish such information to the Board upon request made by the Chairman thereof.

SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS

SEC. 6. (a) The Board shall conduct a comprehensive comparative survey to determine the nature and effect of—

(1) provisions of law in effect within the several States relating to the taxation of real property by such States and by tax authorities thereof; and

(2) existing provisions of Federal law providing for—

(A) the payment to any State or to any tax authority thereof of any tax or special assessment with respect to any Federal property or any personal property of any Federal agency;

(B) the making of any payment to any such government or authority in lieu of the payment of any tax or special assessment with respect to any such property; or

(C) the rendition of assistance to any State or to any tax authority thereof through the making of grants-in-aid, the sharing of revenues derived from properties of the United States, or through the furnishing of services or facilities by any Federal agency.

(b) The Board shall conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the extent to which States and tax authorities thereof derive benefits directly or indirectly through payments made to them (1) under the provisions of law described in section 6(a)(2); (2) by persons residing or employed upon Federal property; and (3) for or in connection with any property, trade, business, occupation, or transaction situated or occurring upon Federal property.

(c) The Board shall conduct a comprehensive investigation to determine the extent, if any, to which there is need for additional legislation by the Congress to provide continuing financial assistance for States or tax authorities thereof to relieve hardship incident to the tax-exempt status of Federal property. Such investigation shall include inquiry to determine—

(1) the classes of Federal property, if any, with respect to which any such additional continuing assistance should be granted;

(2) the nature and extent of any such additional continuing assistance;

(3) the conditions, if any, under which such additional continuing assistance should be granted;

(4) the annual cost to the United States for providing such additional continuing financial assistance with respect to each such class of Federal property and with respect to all such classes of Federal property; and

(5) ways and means whereby States and tax authorities thereof may be accorded effective right to apply personal property taxes in effect within their several jurisdictions to industrial plant equipment, materials, supplies, and inventories owned by taxable persons and used by them for commercial purposes within plant facilities owned or controlled by departments and agencies of the United States Government.

(d) Within two years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Board shall submit to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, a comprehensive report containing—

(1) the text of all provisions of law referred to in subsection (a), together with an analysis of the purpose and effect of each such provision;

(2) the findings of the Board as to the facts disclosed by its studies and investigations made under subsections (b) and (c) of this section;

(3) its recommendations as to any additional legislation the need for which has been disclosed by its investigation under subsection (c) of this section;

(4) a detailed analysis of the relationship between any recommendations so made and the provisions of existing law referred to in paragraph (2) of subsection (a); and

(5) specific recommendations with respect to the future treatment of properties for which payments are temporarily authorized by title VII of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 7. (a) The President shall establish an advisory committee on Federal payments to local governments composed of twelve members appointed by the President, of whom six shall be officers or employees of Federal agencies, three shall be representatives of State governments, and three shall be representatives of tax authorities. One member shall be designated by the President to serve as chairman of the committee.

(b) It shall be the duty of the committee to—

(1) study the administration of this Act and all other Federal legislation authorizing the payment of taxes, or the making of payments in lieu of taxes, by Federal agencies to tax authorities, and problems arising in connection therewith;

(2) consult with the Board, upon its request, in an advisory capacity in the solution of such problems; and

(3) transmit from time to time to the Board and to the President for transmittal to the Congress a report containing a summary of the results of its studies, together with its recommendations for administrative or legislative changes which it may consider necessary or desirable for the efficient, economical, and equitable administration of such provisions of law.

(c) Members of the committee who are officers or employees of any Federal agency shall receive no additional compensation for service rendered under this Act. Other members may receive such compensation, not in excess of $50 for each day of service, as the President shall prescribe. All members shall be reimbursed for travel and other expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of their duties under this section in conformity with the provisions of section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b–2).

TEMPORARY AUTHORIZATION FOR PAYMENTS TO TAX AUTHORITIES

SEC. 8. (a) Subject to the provisions of sections 9 and 11 of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be paid to any tax authority, upon its application made in conformity with the provisions of section 9 of this Act, for any period such amount as the Board may determine to be equal to the sum of—

(1) the amount which would be payable to such tax authority, with respect to all Federal property situated in any urban or suburban area within the territorial jurisdiction of that tax authority, upon any special assessment levied after the date of

enactment of this Act to defray the cost of any public improvement, if such property were owned by a taxable person, except that no such sum shall be payable unless such special assessment in fact was levied upon real property owned by taxable persons;

(2) the amount of the real property tax which would be payable to such tax authority, with respect to all Federal property situated within the territorial jurisdiction of that tax authority which is in the custody or control of a taxable person pursuant to a lease, contract, or permit executed by a Federal agency, if such property were owned by a taxable person, diminished by the amount of any real property or other tax measured by the value of such property which is payable by the taxable person having custody or control thereof to such tax authority for such period with respect to that property, or for or on account of the possession or use thereof; and

(3) such amount, if any, as the Board may determine to be payable in conformity with subsection (b) as to all Federal property situated within the territorial jurisdiction of such tax authority which (A) has been first acquired by any Federal agency after June 30, 1950, (B) is in the custody or control of a Federal agency, and (C) is devoted to or held for predominantly industrial or commercial use.

(b) Subject to the provisions of subsection (c), the sum referred to in subsection (a)(3) shall be a sum equal to—

(1) the nominal Federal liability, which shall be the amount of the real property tax which such tax authority would have been entitled to receive for such period on account of such property if it had been owned by a taxable person; increased by

(2) the specific Federal liability, which shall be the aggregate amount of the expenditures necessarily incurred by such tax authority during such period in furnishing directly to or on behalf of such property any facilities or services of kinds not customarily furnished by such tax authority to or on behalf of other properties of like class; and diminished by

(3) the credit against Federal liability, which shall be the aggregate value of governmental services of kinds normally furnished by tax authorities which, during such period, were furnished within the territorial jurisdiction of such tax authority by Federal agencies controlling such property, computed upon the basis of the unit cost incurred by such tax authority in providing like services, or (in the absence of such data) the unit cost incurred therefor by comparable tax authorities in the same vicinity; and further diminished by

(4) any additional credit against Federal liability, which shall be such sum as the Board may determine to be required to assure equitable treatment of Federal property situated within the territorial jurisdiction of any tax authority which, under State or local law or public policy, grant any exemption or immunity from the payment of any tax of any kind, or any reduction in the rate or amount of any tax paid, with respect to real property of any taxable person as an inducement to such taxable person to engage in industrial or commercial activities within the territorial jurisdiction of such tax authority.

(c) No payment determined pursuant to subsection (b) to be payable with respect to any Federal property situated within the territorial jurisdiction of any tax authority shall exceed the amount which the Board finds to be equivalent to the tax which would be payable with respect to such property if it had been developed and used by a taxable person for a similar private industrial or commercial use within the territorial jurisdiction of such tax authority or in nearby comparable communities, as determined by the Board.

APPLICATIONS AND PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINATION AND PAYMENT

SEC. 9. (a) Each application made by one or more tax authorities for any payment under section 8 of this Act with respect to one or more parcels of Federal property situated within the territorial jurisdiction of such tax authorities shall specify (1) the Federal property or properties with respect to which claim is made for such payment, (2) the basis upon which such claim is made, and (3) the period of time for which such claim is made.

(b) Each application made by any tax authority for any payment under this Act shall be for a period not in excess of twelve months, beginning not earlier than January 1, 1960, and ending not later than December 31, 1964. No tax authority may file with the Board more than one application for any period with respect to the same Federal property. Each application for payment for any period must be filed within six months after the end of such period.

(c) Upon the filing of any application under this Act by one or more tax authorities for any such payment, the Board shall—

(1) examine such application to determine whether it states a probable basis for the making of any such payment;

(2) if such probable basis is found to exist, conduct a full and fair hearing upon such application;

(3) upon the basis of evidence received at such hearing, or obtained by such field investigation as the Board may determine to be appropriate, or both, prepare its report in which it shall set forth its findings of fact and its conclusions as to the merits of such application; and

(4) enter its order thereon, prescribing the amount, if any, awarded to each applicant who joined in such application, and the portion thereof to be paid under this Act by each controlling agency administering real property chargeable in whole or in part for such award.

(d) Upon the entry of the order of the Board upon any application for any payment under this Act, the Board shall give notice thereof to each tax authority which was a party to such application. Each such order shall become final upon the expiration of a period of sixty days after its entry, unless the Board during such period has granted a rehearing of such application upon request made by any applicant who joined therein. Not more than one rehearing shall be granted upon any application, and any order entered by the Board after a rehearing of any application shall become final upon its entry. A certified copy of each final order of the Board shall be transmitted (A) to such tax authority joining in the application upon which such order was entered, and (B) to each Federal agency charged thereby with the payment of any part of any award made thereby.

(e) Upon the certification by the Board to any Federal agency of any final order of the Board awarding to any tax authority any payment under this Act with respect to any Federal property controlled by such agency, such agency shall pay to such tax authority the amount specified in such order.

(f) Each final order made by the Board under this Act for the payment of any award shall be final and conclusive upon all tax authorities and upon all Federal agencies, unless such order is modified or reversed by a court of competent jurisdiction or is adjudged invalid in whole or in part by the General Accounting Office.

HEARINGS CONDUCTED BY THE BOARD

SEC. 10. (a) The Board (or any duly authorized member thereof or any examiner duly designated thereby) may conduct any hearing or investigation authorized by this Act; administer oaths and affirmations; examine witnesses and receive evidence at any place in the United States; and require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, relevant to the matter under inquiry. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such documentary evidence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing. Witnesses summoned shall be paid the same fees and mileage paid to witnesses in the district courts of the United States.

(b) In the case of any disobedience by any person to a subpena issued under subsection (a), the Board may invoke the aid of a district court of the United States in requiring the attendance and testimony of such person, or the production of documentary evidence by such person, or both. The district court of the United States for any judicial district within which any such inquiry is conducted may, in the case of the contumacy or refusal of any person to obey a subpena issued under subsection (a), issue an order requiring such person to appear (and to produce documentary evidence if so ordered) and to give evidence relating to the matter in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. For the purposes of this subsection, the order or process of the district court for any judicial district may be served and shall be effective within any other judicial district of the United States.

(c) Hearings conducted under subsection (a) shall be open to the public. In any such hearing upon any application made under section 9, each applicant shall have the right to present its case with the assistance of counsel; to offer oral or documentary evidence; to submit rebuttal evidence; and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. An accurate stenographic record shall be taken of the testimony of each witness in each hearing conducted by the Board, and a transcript of such testimony shall be filed in the office of the Board.

LIMITATIONS AND SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 11. (a) No payment may be made under this Act to any tax authority with respect to any parcel of Federal property for any period for which such tax authority is eligible to receive from any Federal agency any payment with respect to such property under (1) any other provision of law which authorizes any payment of real property tax or any payment in lieu of the payment of real property tax, or (2) any revenue-sharing arrangement.

(b) No payment may be made under this Act to any tax authority with respect to (1) any power property owned or controlled by the Tennessee Valley Authority, or (2) any portion of any multipurpose property owned or controlled by such Authority which is allocated to power purposes. With respect to those properties and parts of properties, such Authority shall continue to make payments to States and to tax authorities, as a charge against its power operations, in accordance with section 13 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 66, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 831L). With respect to other properties and parts of properties owned or controlled by the Tennessee Valley Authority, such Authority shall make payments in accordance with the provisions of this Act in addition to the payments required to be made under section 13 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933.

(c) Nothing contained in this Act shall bar the making of any payment under any provision of law or revenue-sharing arrangement referred to in subsection (a) or subsection (b).

(d) The failure of any Federal agency to make, or to make timely payment of, any payment authorized by this Act with respect to any Federal property shall not subject—

(1) any Federal agency, or any purchaser of such property from any Federal agency, to the payment of any tax, penalty, penalty interest, or other charge; or

2) such property to any lien, attachment, foreclosure, or other proceeding not specifically authorized by this Act.

(e) Nothing contained in this Act shall limit or impair any power which any tax authority may have under any other provision or principle of law to levy upon or collect from any taxable person any tax upon any interest in Federal property possessed by such person, or with respect to the possession or use by such person of any Federal property.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Board, and to each Federal agency controlling any Federal property, such sums as may be required for the discharge of its duties and obligations under this Act. Any sum determined by the Board to be payable under section 8 of this Act by any Federal agency shall be considered to be a necessary expense of such agency.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am happy to open the discussion and debate on S. 910, which was introduced on February 3, 1959, on behalf of a number of Senators. I ask unanimous consent that a list of the sponsors of S. 910, calendar 893, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list of sponsors was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. BUSH, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. WILEY, Mr. CANNON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. HART, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. GRUENING.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, S. 910 would authorize, for a 5-year period, from January 1, 1960, through December 31, 1964, first, a very limited program of payments in lieu of taxes on industrial or commercial real property acquired by the Federal Government after June 30, 1950; second, payments in lieu of special assessments levied after the effective date of the act in urban or suburban areas, if such assessments were also levied on real property owned by other taxable persons; and, third, payments in lieu of taxes on the interest of the Federal Government in real property in the custody or control of taxable persons under a lease, contract, or permit to the extent that taxes on that property are not already paid by taxable persons.

The program would be administered by a five-member, bipartisan Federal Board for Payments to Local Governments, appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation. A taxing authority would be required to file an appropriate application, specifying the Federal property involved, the basis of its claim and the period for which the claim is made—not to exceed 12 months in any single application. The Board, after determining the existence of a probable basis for the claim, and conducting a hearing if a basis is found to exist, would be required to determine and certify to the controlling Federal agency the amount of payment to be made to the local taxing authority.

In the case of special assessments, the amounts payable would be the same as that payable if the property subject to such assessments were owned by a taxable person. The amounts payable on Federal property which is in the custody or control of taxable persons, pursuant to a lease, contract, or permit, would be the same as that payable if the property were owned by a taxable person, diminished by the amount of any tax measured by the value of the property which is payable by the taxable person having custody or control. The payment to be made, with respect to industrial or commercial property which was acquired by the Federal Government after June 30, 1950, and which remains in Federal custody or control, would be based upon the amount of local taxes which would have been payable had the property been privately owned, increased by additional expenditures incurred by the taxing authority in furnishing certain services to the Federal property, and diminished by the aggregate value of local-type governmental services furnished by the controlling Federal agency, further diminished by any additional credit against Federal liability resulting from any exemption, immunity, or reduction in the tax rate or amount, if such are available, under State or local law, to private persons as an inducement to engage in industrial or commercial activities within the territorial jurisdiction of the particular tax authority. The Board's decisions are made final and would be conclusive upon all tax authorities and Federal agencies, unless such order is modified or reversed by a court of competent jurisdiction, or is adjudged invalid in whole or in part by the General Accounting Office.

I should state here that provision is made for what is called judicial review or judicial appeal. I make that statement because I recall that in committee, in our deliberations on the bill, there was insistence that such a provision be included. I am not certain, but I believe it was the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] who asked that such a provision be included.

An important feature of this bill is a provision designed to aid the Congress in determining whether additional permanent legislation in this field is required. To accomplish this purpose, provision is made for the Board to conduct a comprehensive study and make a case-by-case analysis of virtually every phase of fiscal and related problems of local taxing authorities arising out of Federal immunity from local real and personal property taxes, including the operation of existing programs. Included in the study would be a complete compilation of all State tax law relative to real property taxation and all Federal law relative to Federal payments to State and local taxing authorities. The Congress would receive semiannual reports from the Board on the operation of the program and, within 2 years after the date of enactment, a comprehensive report, embodying the results of its very broad study, accompanied by appropriate proposed legislation, detailing its recommendations with respect to any future legislative program.

This broad and comprehensive study authority of the Board is designed to provide, for the first time, a forum to which local taxing authorities may present their cases, regardless of whether or not they may be entitled to any payments. It is the purpose of these study provisions to enable the Board to compile all of the factual information needed to enable the Congress to legislate effectively in this field and to evolve a uniform program on a national basis which will provide local taxing authorities with the relief to which they may be entitled without unduly burdening the Federal Treasury.

Mr. President, the bill represents the culmination of more than 10 years of continuous efforts by the Committee on Government Operations to develop a program which would afford some measure of relief to local communities which have suffered losses as the result of the presence of Federal tax-immune property in their jurisdictions, but which would not do violence to the principle of Federal tax immunity or constitute an undue burden on the Federal Treasury. Through the years, many hundreds of witnesses have been heard.

I might add that I have listened to all of them. I have been handling the proposed legislation for the past 10 years, having served as a member of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, being appointed by President Eisenhower after an act of Congress called for the establishment of the Commission. I was one of the senatorial members of the Commission and gave considerable time, and I hope constructive thought, to the problems of local governments and their relationships to the Federal Government, particularly in the field of financing, in Federal and State tax matters and other matters pertaining to the so-called tax immunity features of Federal properties. Many volumes of testimony have been compiled, and numerous reports have been made by interested groups, all of which have been carefully studied by the committee.

Based upon these many years of study and consideration, the committee has come to the following conclusions:

First. There is an urgent need for immediate legislative action to relieve local taxing authorities from unjustified and inequitable burdens and hardships which have been imposed upon them as the result of large-scale Federal acquisition of various types of property which

has operated to remove such property from the local tax rolls. This, of course, means a reduction in local tax revenues.

Second. Because of the extremely complex nature of the subject and the many variables which are involved, it is not possible to devise a comprehensive program which will operate in a fair and equitable manner, and which is not likely to involve huge expenditures of Federal funds and possible windfall payments to communities which have actually been benefited rather than harmed by the presence of Federal installations.

Third. The only equitable type of program which is possible is one in which payments are based upon individual cases and situations as they are presented individually and documented individually, and as information relative to each situation is compiled, evaluated, and assessed on its merits. That is the purpose of the Federal Board to which I referred earlier.

Mr. President, S. 910, as amended, would provide for the beginning of such a program, on a 5-year trial basis. It would permit modest payments—I might add, very modest—in limited areas, subject to several limitations which have been carefully worked out. It has the support of all of the major organizations representing taxing authorities, including the National Association of County Officials, the American Municipal Associations, the National Association of Tax Administrators, and 35 Members of the U.S. Senate, including Senators from the eastern public lands States.

In addition, this bill would implement, in principle, many of the major recommendations of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, to which I referred a moment ago, and upon which I serve as a member, relative to payments in lieu of taxes. Furthermore, nothing contained in this bill would have any effect upon existing payments or revenue-sharing arrangements authorized by law.

I desire to state very emphatically, Mr. President, that S. 910, as amended, is most definitely not a giveaway program; it will not open the gates to unlimited and unrestrained payments by the Federal Government to local communities; and it is not discriminatory.

Great care has been taken to incorporate in the bill adequate safeguards and various protective measures to insure that no community will receive payments to which they are not entitled. Some of these protective measures are, first, a provision denying payments to any community which is receiving a Federal payment for the same property under another Federal program; and with respect to commercial or industrial real property; second, a provision denying payment to any taxing authority on any Federal property in the custody or control of taxable persons pursuant to a lease, contract, or permit executed by a Federal agency, if the lessee, contractor, or permittee is taxed on that property; third, a provision insuring that no Federal payment will be required by the bill with respect to any TVA property allocated to power purposes; fourth, a provision that no payments in lieu of special assessments will be made unless such assessment was also levied on real property owned by other taxable persons; and, fifth, with respect to commercial or industrial property, (a) the 1950 cutoff date; (b) a rigid formula for determining the amounts of payments, in the event of a showing of eligibility and entitlement; (c) a provision that in no event can the Federal payment exceed an amount equivalent to the amount of the tax, had the property been privately owned by taxable persons; and (d) a provision that the Federal property will receive the same tax benefits offered by a taxing authority to private taxable persons.

It has been alleged that the bill is discriminatory. I have said it is not, and I believe the facts bear me out. Such an allegation is entirely without merit. It is true that the coverage of this bill is limited, and that numerous communities will not receive payments if the Federal industrial or commercial properties in their jurisdictions were acquired after June 30, 1950. However, without a cutoff date, the cost of this program would be exceedingly high—I should think even so high that it would not be acceptable; the 1950 date represents the beginning of a period of expanded Federal acquisition; and a large number of communities have been able to accommodate themselves to the effect of Federal acquisition prior to that date. Moreover, because this bill covers only a limited category of property, that does not make it any more discriminatory than the 55 existing laws which authorize some type of Federal payments to local communities, covering some and excluding others. Finally, it is stressed that this is not permanent legislation, although it is hoped that it will point the way to permanent legislation, in the event that the Congress deems it desirable, and if the facts necessitate it. If there are defects in the operation of this program, as applications and evidence which are presented to the Federal administrative Board are analyzed and developed, the Board will make reports and recommendations to the Congress for improvements, and the Congress will be in a position to make the final determination, in each area, based not upon abstract, theoretical studies, but upon concrete, documented evidence concerning the problems which face communities throughout the Nation.

Mr. President, I believe that every Member of this body is well aware of the dual nature of his responsibilities. As Members of the U.S. Senate, we owe a duty to the people of this great Nation to safeguard the Federal Treasury. At the same time, we owe an equally important duty to the people and governments of the States which we represent. Many of us in this body have been privileged to serve as State or local government officials. During that service, we have become very familiar with the serious fiscal problems of local governments. Their sources of revenue are extremely limited, but the demand for services goes on. The basic source of income to provide these services to the taxpayers of each community throughout the land is the tax on real property. From this source, communities must pay the cost of schools, police, fire and numerous other necessary services. However, the Federal Government has been continuously acquiring real property in numerous communities, taking it off the tax rolls, and depriving the local taxing authorities of vital income. In some instances, an overall benefit results to the community from the presence of the Federal installations. In other instances, however, the community is required to furnish additional services to such installations, thereby burdening the community further, while removing substantial portions of its revenue-producing property.

It is this situation, Mr. President, that this bill aims to correct. Bear in mind, however, that no community will be able simply to walk in and tell the Federal Board that the Federal Government has acquired real property and that the local taxing authority should be reimbursed. On the contrary, the local taxing authority will be required to establish the existence of a probable basis for a claim—in other words, the burden of proof will rest upon the local taxing authority; and only after a careful examination by the Board of all aspects of the situation will the local taxing authority be able to obtain a payment; and even that payment will be subject to a carefully designed formula, which will insure that the community will receive no more than the amount to which it can prove entitlement.

Another consideration is involved in this bill: As I have indicated previously, the real-property holdings of the Federal Government have reached enormous proportions, and entail tremendous expenditures. If Federal agencies are required, in proper cases, to make such payments, as are provided for in this bill, that should serve as an incentive to these agencies to dispose of numerous substantial holdings of commercial and industrial real property which should be in the hands of private industry and on the tax rolls of the communities in which they are located.

In other words, this bill would be an economy measure, by providing an incentive for the Federal Government to release some of its holdings and sell some of them to private groups and industries, thereby putting those holdings back on the local tax rolls, and at the same time relieving the Federal Government of the cost of the maintenance and care of the facilities. I believe that if this bill is passed, the agencies of the Federal Government will reexamine their real-estate holdings, for example, and their industrial and commercial properties, having in mind the objective of being able to divest themselves of as many of these properties as would be prudent and economically desirable.

Mr. President, Senate bill 910, as amended, represents the firm conviction of the Committee on Government Operations that no comprehensive program is possible—at least, at this time—and that the only feasible approach to a solution of this troublesome problem is by means of a limited program of payments in lieu of taxes, coupled with a case-by-case

consideration by an administrative board of the relative merits of individual cases and situations, within limitations established by law. It is also our firm conviction that any further studies of this problem which are unrelated to specific situations are simply futile and meaningless. Virtually all the existing statutes which provide either for payments of taxes, in lieu of taxes, or shared revenue arrangements have been tailored to meet specific needs which became apparent in connection with consideration of other legislation. It is quite apparent that any future legislation must be based upon the result of the case-by-case studies made by the Board which would be established by this bill.

Mr. President, I have studied this problem for many years, as mayor of a good-sized city; as a member of the Committee on Government Operations, and at one time chairman of its Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations; and as a member of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and its Study Committee on Payments in Lieu of Taxes and Shared Revenues. I am not exactly what one might call a "Johnny Come Lately" in this field. Based upon this experience, it is my sincere conviction that Senate bill 910, as amended, is a reasonable, sensible, and logical approach which will enable the systematic compilation, on a case-by-case basis, of information relative to the needs of each community in which Federal property is located. The Congress will have the benefit of a report from the administrative Board, detailing its activities, every 6 months; it will have a comprehensive report from the Board, based upon the cases adjudicated by it and the field studies conducted with respect to other types of cases, within 2 years after the effective date of this act; and the Congress will have a solid foundation upon which to base further policy determinations.

I should like to say a few words with respect to the probable cost of the program provided for by the pending bill. The numerous variables involved in determining cost make any accurate estimate extremely difficult. That can only be determined as each application comes in. In other words, the cost will be related directly to the ability of the local taxing authority to prove its case under the severe and direct limitations provided by the bill, in which there is provided a formula, a limitation by means of the cutoff date of June 30, 1950, and also several other limitations in regard to payments in lieu of taxes.

Concerning industrial or commercial real property acquired by the Government after June 30, 1950, although the properties falling into this category are generally identifiable, the potential cost of Federal payments on such properties cannot be determined without a prior determination of, first, their assessed value; second, applicable local tax rates for each specific piece of property; and, third, the adjustment which would be applicable under the formula provided in section 8 of the amendment. With respect to the assessed value of the properties involved, although the cost to the Federal Government of each property is known, assessment practices in the thousands of assessment districts throughout the United State vary widely; and even in a single assessment district, the ratio of assessed value to full value may differ for similar properties. Finally, even if the Federal Board finds that an applicant qualifies, the application of the formula contained in section 8 of the amendment makes it impossible to provide a cost estimate, since no forecast may be made as to which factors will be applicable in any given case, which cases will be entitled to payments following the application of the formula, or the amounts which finally will be payable.

With respect to the other two categories for which payments may be made under the program, it is impossible to forecast the special assessments which local taxing authorities are likely to levy on Federal property in the future. I qualify that by saying that special assessments for improvements on Federal property are no different from those for improvements on private property. There will be no discrimination in that connection. But no one can predict what assessments will be levied on private property in Minneapolis, Minn., for example, because of improvements by way of streets and sidewalks, as compared with assessments for improvements made on property owned by the Federal Government in particular communities.

It is difficult to estimate the cost of Federal payments on Federal real property in the custody or control of taxable persons under lease, contract or permit arrangements, since State and local law applicable to such property varies considerably, and the value of the Federal interest as well as the tax equivalent are difficult to estimate.

Bearing the foregoing limitations in mind, the Bureau of the Budget, in 1956, when a virtually identical measure, S. 4183, was under committee consideration, estimated that the payments for special assessments would probably range between $200,000 and $300,000 per year; payments for property in the custody of private persons under lease, contract or permit might amount to several million dollars per year; and payments on commercial or industrial property might run between $10 and $20 million annually. It was stressed, however, that the numerous individual differences and imponderables involved made these estimates more in the nature of a guess, rather than a reliable estimate.

It appears obvious that these questions can never be resolved either in the abstract or by a general study, but can only be determined by an administrative board, on the basis of its consideration of all the factors involved in each case which comes before it. In fact, I believe that anything less than a full-time study by a quasi-judicial body will be futile.

Mr. President, the time has come when we must face up to this problem in a forthright, realistic manner. We have studied this subject to death. What we need now is action. Certainly, a modest, experimental approach to this serious problem for a 5-year period, such as this bill would establish, is not too much for hard-pressed communities to expect from the Federal Government.

It is true that we need more information. But the committee is convinced, after 10 years of study, that the information we need can only be compiled in the manner provided for by S. 910, as amended. We do not contend that this bill is perfect. We are convinced, however, that it represents the only realistic approach. We are confident that if each Member of this body searches his conscience, he will come to the conclusion that it is incumbent upon us to take some action right now. We are also confident that the reasonableness and moderation which characterize this bill make it possible for a large majority of the membership of this body to support it.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, authorities of the town of Jericho, Vt., contacted me a few years ago concerning the possibility of obtaining some compensation from the United States for the loss of tax revenue resulting from some 51 land condemnations in the creation of a military range which lies within the towns of Jericho, Underhill, and Bolton.

The original taking of the land goes back to the 1920's, and further condemnations were made in the decades following the twenties.

I have before me a table which shows that between 1929 and 1956, the town of Jericho, Vt., lost almost $85,000 because title to all of this farmland went to the Federal Government.

To give Senators an idea of what a serious tax loss Jericho has suffered, I point out that the town contains about 21,243 acres of land, and approximately 5,000 acres have been taken through 51 separate condemnation proceedings. This means that Jericho has suffered a loss of approximately one-fourth of its tax revenue through the years.

Jericho, Underhill, and Bolton, Vt., considered together, have lost tax revenues from 11,000 acres. I understand that the Jericho loss was greater than the others because much of this land was arable and under cultivation. From time to time the range land condemned by military authorities has been used by the General Electric Co. plant at Burlington in connection with defense production, but this use has in no way produced either direct or indirect income to the town of Jericho.

I do not have figures which would show what the tax loss at Jericho has been during the past 4 years, but, based on previous figures, it is safe to say that for these 4 years the tax loss would run in the neighborhood of about $32,000. This, coupled with a loss of about $85,000 between the years 1929 and 1956, means that Jericho has been deprived of about $116,000, which could be put to excellent use by this small community.

The lands which I have been talking about, which were condemned by the Federal Government, were acquired for an Army range, and were later transferred to the Air Force, and subsequent acquisitions for the Air Force range have all been acquired from private parties.

The Department of the Air Force has been operating units in the past at Ethan Allen Air Force Base, but these units are being withdrawn.

The problems which have existed in the past will continue to plague Jericho and neighboring communities, because title to the 11,000 acres of land I mentioned previously is still in the hands of the Federal Government.

I note from reading the provisions of S. 910, the bill now before the Senate, that the purpose of the bill is to make temporary provision for the relief of those local governments which have suffered hardship because of Federal land acquisitions.

I note further that the bill authorizes the making of certain Federal contributions to local governments in lieu of the payment of special assessments levied after the effective date of the bill upon real property situated in urban and suburban areas to defray the cost of local public improvements.

I have been in touch with staff members of the Committee on Government Operations and am advised that Jericho, Vt., and neighboring communities would undoubtedly benefit from the provisions in S. 910. The provisions to which I refer are in section 8 and would permit Federal contribution when a special assessment has been levied upon real property in a jurisdiction where there is located Federal property.

Just so there will be no misunderstanding about the situation, I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, the following question:

Since the Federal Government owns and makes some use of 11,000 acres of land located in Jericho, Vt., and surrounding communities, would not Jericho and these neighboring towns be entitled to a financial contribution from the Federal Government when assessments are levied for public improvements such as street, road, bridge, sewer, water system, and drainage?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The answer to the question is: Yes, provided all taxable property of the area were subject to the same assessment or levy—in other words, so long as it is not discriminatory.

Mr. PROUTY. I understand that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's question is answered in the affirmative.

Mr. PROUTY. I thank the Senator.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his observations on the bill.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, 25 years ago, when the Rural Electrification Administration was born, some of its detractors were ready to bury it promptly as an impossible venture. They claimed that the rural cooperatives would never pay for themselves and would have to be liquidated in short order.

Today, REA is very much alive. It serves 2.5 million farms in the United States. More than 4 million rural consumers know what it means to have light and power as close as the nearest electric switch. This means not only more security and comfort for farm families; it means that farm production is more efficient, it costs less, and the end product is likely to meet or exceed modern-day quality and sanitation requirements.

These electric wonders have not been achieved on the public dole. Loans to rural electric cooperatives have been repaid faithfully and with interest. In my own State of Nebraska, REA borrowers are ahead of their repayment schedule, on the principle and with interest. The REA reports that, as of January 1 of this year, not one borrower in the State was overdue in its loan payments. This is the REA story everywhere.

Nebraska has been served by rural electrification throughout the full quarter-century of its existence since it was inspired by Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, in 1935. When REA began, Nebraska farmers were, quite literally, "in the dark." Only 7.1 percent of Nebraska's farms had electric service. Today, 95,750, or 94.9 percent of all the farms reported in the 1954 census, were being served. This is a record for which we can be proud and grateful.

The extension of REA service to farm homes on a sound economic basis in the past 25 years has far exceeded all predictions. The REA record reflects the competent management by farmers and rural area businessmen and their dedication to the program's constant objectives. In recent years, it also reflects the continued active support of the Eisenhower administration and the nonpartisan cooperation of Congress.

It is my confident belief that we can look for REA to maintain its tradition of responsible service to rural areas. It is my hope that its program can continue to depend on the encouragement of responsible public leadership in Congress and in the White House.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as one of the cosponsors of S. 910, I should like to urge that the Senate pass this legislation, which could be of tremendous benefit to States, counties, cities, and school districts throughout the Nation.

The problem arising from the fact that the Federal Government often takes large sections of real estate off the tax rolls of a county or city, often with little or no real benefit to the community, is one with which Congress has been wrestling for 10 years. The present bill is a modest approach to this problem, and provides only a limited program, but it is an important first step and one which should be taken immediately.

It is interesting to note that about half of the cosponsors of S. 910 are from Western States. This is simply because the Western States have suffered more from the problem of Federal withdrawal of real estate from the tax rolls than have the Eastern States. But the problem is not limited to any one region. School districts, tax districts, counties, and other political subdivisions in almost every State face this problem in varying degrees.

Admittedly, when a Federal installation is set up in or near a community, it often has many benefits, and in some cases these would outweigh the loss of revenue resulting from Federal ownership of the lands and buildings involved. However, there are many cases where the county whose property is seized is not the chief beneficiary of the Federal installation. Frequently, the resulting increase in employment and business activity is felt by a neighboring community. Furthermore, there are many cases where the increased services demanded of the municipality far outweigh the benefits accruing directly to it.

This problem is becoming intensified with the current trend toward suburban living, where a large percentage of the employees of a Federal installation may live in one community and commute to work in another.

Of course, efforts have been made on a piecemeal basis to correct the problem in some respects. The bill providing financial aid to federally affected school areas has helped to alleviate the tremendous impact on schools when a military installation is suddenly placed in a community. There are 54 other programs which provide payments in lieu of taxes for various Federal programs.

This uncoordinated and poorly planned patchwork of laws is unnecessarily complex and not comprehensive enough to do the job which needs to be done. On the other hand, there is no question that a broad bill providing Federal payment in lieu of taxes in all cases where a problem exists would be unwise. Circumstances vary tremendously from one case to another, and it is imperative that a program be set up which can make decisions on a case-by-case basis. That is what is provided in S. 910.

Another limitation of S. 910 is that payments will be made only on Federal real property acquired since June 30, 1950, the start of the Korean war. As I indicated in my testimony before the Government Operations Committee, I believe this limitation should be extended and that the outbreak of World War II should be accepted as the delimiting date.

Since the problem faced in Utah is typical of that in many States, I should like to examine the position of Utah in this connection. The Federal Government now owns 36,558,669 acres in Utah out of a total acreage of 52,701,440 in the entire State, or nearly three-fourths of the total acreage in the State. On this land, there are 160 Federal installations, with a total of 3,984 buildings. The Government carries this property on its books at the nominal acquisition cost of $371,480,000. Actually, the property is worth far more, because of appreciation of property values. The removal of this property from Utah's State, county, and municipal tax rolls has meant the loss of an incalculable amount of money in property taxes, and of course, property taxes are the most important source of revenue for counties and cities.

In a time when the Federal Government is steadily encroaching on State and local governments, assuming more and more of the responsibilities which rightfully belong to them, I think it is imperative that we do everything we can to help to keep our State and local governments strong. In the area of fiscal matters, this involves keeping the Federal Government, so far as possible,

from usurping revenue sources which rightfully belong to States and municipalities. And in cases where this does happen, the payment of funds in lieu of taxes, as provided in S. 910, seems the most equitable method of assuring that these important governmental units will not be unjustly deprived of needed revenue.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it is a privilege to speak in behalf of S. 910, a modest bill, designed to authorize the payment to local governments in lieu of taxes and special assessments on a very limited category of real property which is not currently subject to local taxation because of Federal acquisition, ownership, and use. It is restrictive in its terms. It bears the stamp of approval by the Treasury Department. It is endorsed by local governments in America. It ought now, at long last, be enacted into law.

I am coauthor with the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] of this long-overdue legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to my able friend.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hesitate to let the Senator make a statement which seems so modest. I know the Senator is a modest man, but the Senator is much more than a coauthor of the bill. The Senator from California has been one of the driving forces for getting the bill written, for getting subcommittee and committee action upon the bill, for offering his own testimony and advice and counsel upon the bill, even though not a member of the committee, and for getting action on the bill in the Senate. I believe when a man contributes his effort as the Senator from California has in behalf of this proposed legislation, his work should be acknowledged and should be praised. I do not do this simply to be gracious and kind to my good friend, but I do it because it is a matter of record, from my experience, my memory, and my service on the Committee on Government Operations, that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] has been a tower of strength for the proposed legislation.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am most honored to have the very fine and able Senator from Minnesota make that statement. I am not sure it is deserved.

Mr. President, the Senators who have coauthored this proposed legislation are Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BUSH, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. WILEY, Mr. CANNON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. HART, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. GRUENING.

Mr. President, S. 910 will provide for financial contributions in lieu of taxes on the part of Federal agencies in which the United States has acquired property. The proposed legislation has been before the Congress 4 times in the last 7 years. The need for it now is greater than ever. Legislation of this type is essential to stop the undermining of the revenue structures of the many local governments throughout the country—the Nation.

The problem, especially so far as local governments are concerned, stems from the fact that they are largely dependent on the property tax for their revenue, as we well know, Mr. President. Whenever a large tract of any kind or a small tract of especially valuable property goes off the tax rolls, the local governmental unit is endangered. School districts, counties, municipalities, and other assessment areas like water districts, are bound to feel the effects adversely. At the same time that tax revenue sources are withdrawn, a new Federal activity is bound to add to the burdens of the local governmental unit. And while a Federal payroll may bring many advantages to a community, it is not likely to produce enough revenue to overcome the real property loss. The problem may become particularly severe when a local government has reached the limits of its bonded debt, and then finds itself without authority to tax property formerly privately owned but now under the control of the Federal Government.

The Federal Government is the largest landowner in the United States. It now owns approximately one-fourth of the total land area of the Nation. In my own State of California, little more than half the area of the State is available for assessment by local governments. The rest of California is held by the United States. Of California's approximately 100 million acres, the Federal Government is the tax-exempt owner of 46,311,044 acres of land. Consider the effect of this situation on county boards of supervisors, city councils, and school district officers. In our State, confronted with staggering population increases, local school districts are especially hard hit by the withdrawal of taxable lands. It is becoming increasingly difficult to find the revenues needed to support the vast educational plant needed for California's school-age population.

Mr. President, from data compiled by the California State Board of Equalization, the estimated value of Federal land holdings is $294,108,268. The estimated value of improvements on only the portion of property acquired since 1938 is another $244,921,255. These are conservative estimates. But even on the basis of these incomplete statistics, the Federal Government is the owner of lands and buildings in California with a valuation of $539,029,524. At the average State tax rate of $5 per $100, the revenues from the Federal holdings would amount to $26,950,000.

California runs the gamut of diversity as far as Federal land holdings are concerned. There are extensive areas of nearly worthless land, and also extremely valuable small sections or sites. Some of the lands are arid, some are mountain tops, and some are very fertile. There are highly improved urban locations, strategically located industrial plants, and costly dams and power installations.

Some Federal properties are very valuable; others may be of little or no value. Federal property is used for a variety of purposes, such as the general administration of Government, services to the local public, care of wards of the Government, national defense, development and protection of commerce, land utilization and conservation, low rent and defense housing, Indian welfare, conservation and utilization of water resources, research and experimental work, and for many other purposes.

The impact of these property uses on the State of California has been most pronounced since the Second World War. Federal property acquired since 1938 is valued at approximately $73 million. Improvements on this real estate alone have valuations of $26,083,0836. In the case of Contra Costa County, the value is $56,250,500; in the case of Los Angeles County, $20,040,000; in the case of San Bernardino County, $18,004,133; in the case of San Francisco County, $39,275,000; and $50,050,000 in the case of Solano County. These figures are based on information now 4 years old.

Much of the vast Federal holdings are in rural areas. Even under S. 910, no payments in lieu of taxes would be made to the local governments where much of this property is located. For example, Federal rural holdings in California amounted to 46 million acres, the third greatest total in the Nation according to the 1950 census. A very substantial part of this land is public domain land that would not be covered by the proposed legislation which Congress ought to enact this session.

But this is all the more reason for the Federal Government to recognize its obligation to provide some form of compensation to local governments. Failure to provide some relief as quickly as possible for the affected governmental units may well produce the effects which a spokesman for the National Association of County Officials predicted a few years ago:

> If local governments become unable to finance their various programs, the inevitable result will be that the State and National Governments will take over these functions. The inability of a considerable number of local agencies to do a job because their tax base has been destroyed by Federal tax immunity may be urged as justification for transfer of functions to the State or Federal Government. When such transfers are made, local governments will lose another portion of their hard-won home rule. The strength of local government depends on the vitality of all its parts. The inordinate and unnatural growth of federally owned property at the expense of the normal tax base has weakened local control and contributed to a potentially dangerous centralization of our Government.

The impact of Federal holdings in an urban area is illustrated by the city of San Francisco. From testimony given at a prior hearing, it was stated that:

> The Federal Government owns approximately 6½ square miles of San Francisco's small area of only 44 square miles. Deducting State-owned property, it would own 6½ square miles out of 28. Federal real prop-

erty in San Francisco is valued at about $170 million with a minimum present tax loss to San Francisco of about $5 million, a severe burden to San Francisco and its other property owners who must pay higher taxes. In view of San Francisco's confined peninsula-type location and its built-up condition, there is a serious shortage of property and therefore any property released by the Federal Government could be immediately used by private industries or homeowners and would give rise to private payrolls and increased property-tax returns.

The bill is not an overall solution to the problems of raising revenue for local government. It is a modest, moderate approach to a complex problem. This bill would authorize for the 5-year period from January 1, 1960, through December 31, 1964, first, a very limited program of payments in lieu of taxes on industrial or commercial real properties acquired by the Federal Government after June 30, 1950; second, payments in lieu of special assessments levied after the effective date of the act in urban or suburban areas, if such assessments were also levied on real property owned by other taxable persons; and third, payments in lieu of taxes on the interest of the Federal Government in real property in the custody or control of taxable persons under a lease, contract or permit to the extent that taxes on that property are not paid by such taxable persons.

The program would be administered by a five-member bipartisan Federal Board for Payments to Local Governments, appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation. A taxing authority would be required to file an appropriate application, specifying the Federal property involved, the basis of its claim, and the period for which the claim is made—not to exceed 12 months in any single application. The Board, after determining the existence of a probable basis for the claim, and conducting a hearing, if a basis is found to exist, would be required to determine and certify to the controlling Federal agency the amount of payment to be made to the local taxing authority.

This bill would serve to demonstrate to the thousands of local governments concerned with this problem that the Federal Government has finally begun to recognize a moral obligation which has arisen in many widespread areas of our country.

The three specific hardship types of cases singled out by S. 910 are clearly ones where immediate relief is indicated.

Mr. President, representatives of local government organizations, such as the National Association of County Officials, have been appearing before committees of Congress for long years in behalf of legislation such as this. S. 910 makes a start on solving the troublesome problems arising from the tax exemption of Federal property. It should enable us to find an equitable solution to the problem so as to preserve financially healthy local governments. The Federal Government must contribute its just share if local government is to continue to function as an integral, essential segment of our unique system of self-government.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of S. 910, and as a longtime proponent of action to rectify the present unjust situation, I am delighted this measure has been called up for action. This bill would establish a temporary program for payments in lieu of taxes and special assessments on limited categories of Federal property now exempt from local property taxes. This measure would create a temporary board to administer the program and to conduct numerous important surveys and investigations.

S. 910 implements, in principle, many of the major recommendations on this subject which were made in 1955 by the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. It also takes into account many of the later views of the Bureau of the Budget.

Although this measure is by no means perfect, it does represent a substantial step in the right direction. It represents progress toward correction of a real injustice in Federal-State tax relations.

Clearly, there are glaring inequities as a result of the tax status of much Federal property today. Most of the properties affected by this bill were acquired in recent years by the Federal Government. They are of particular importance because many are in valuable urban and suburban locations.

Thirteen years ago, as a Member of the House of Representatives, I sponsored a bill seeking the same objectives sought today. There is still the same need—aggravated by the passage of time—for providing relief to communities struggling to finance normal governmental services with revenues seriously impaired by the exemption of millions of dollars of Federal properties.

Mr. President, I note with interest that 32 other Senators are listed as cosponsors of S. 910. This is certainly an eloquent testimonial to the concern about this problem and to the determination of Senators from all over the country to work out a sound and equitable solution.

As reported by the Government Operations Committee, the bill is changed somewhat from the form in which it was originally introduced. I testified in support of that measure and I actively support it today in its amended form. I hope it will receive the overwhelming approval of the Senate.

Mr. President, one measure of a nation, even as a measure of a man, is the willingness to recognize moral responsibilities as well as those which are strictly legal. There is no constitutional obligation requiring the Federal Government to pay property taxes to any city or other local government. But when a city furnishes exactly the same services to a Federal installation as it would furnish to a taxpaying privately owned enterprise, the Federal Government is getting free services to which it has no moral claim. If the exemption of valuable Federal properties causes severe hardship to a particular city, I believe there is a moral obligation for the United States to alleviate that hardship.

When I say that this problem has been with us for a score of years, I do not seek to reproach our Government. The problem is indeed most difficult and complex. We do not yet have all the answers in spite of years of study. The difficulty has been to recognize cases with merit and reward them, while avoiding unwarranted raids on the Federal Treasury. While it must be recognized that Federal tax immunity often results in serious financial hardships to local governments, the presence of Federal installations also quite often result in benefits which more than offset the burdens imposed. Hence, as we see the answer now, there is a need for a case-by-case examination. Long years of investigation have taught us that no one overall approach is capable of providing a just and equitable solution.

Since we admittedly do not know all the answers at this time, S. 910 offers a rather modest program. We who have been concerned with this problem plan to proceed with caution. We do not propose a broad program encompassing all kinds of Federal property. Actually, from one point of view, our major recommendation is continuing study. But study should be blended with practical experience, and that we provide. The two together will, we hope, eventually result in a program of relief for all cases in which it is warranted.

I must not fail, however, to impress upon the Senate the seriousness of the difficulty for numerous communities. They have been subjected to very great hardships as a result of the Federal ownership of valuable urban and suburban properties. The old theory that exempting the holding of Federal property from local taxation would work out as a substantially equitable contribution by all local communities to the overriding national interest, no longer works. The concentration of Federal property within some cities produces an unequal distribution of the cost of services to the Federal Government. In some cases it has meant that properties once on the tax rolls have been removed. Instead of fewer local services being required, new important services without compensation must be rendered.

It has long been my feeling, as illustrated by the bill I first introduced in 1947, that when any Federal property—other than property used for strictly governmental purposes—enjoys the local services accorded to taxpaying private property holders, the National Government should contribute a fair share.

The bill before the Senate enunciates this same basic principle which I have espoused for years. It provides an effective means for coming to grips immediately with this very grave problem. At the same time, it provides sufficient flexibility to implement the changes which inevitably must be made in any payments-in-lieu-of-taxes program. We have carefully provided the machinery for learning what must subsequently be done.

The modesty of the proposals will appeal to Members. There are three types of situations under which the claim of a city or other local authority will be met. The first relates to special assessments hereafter levied. However, they will be paid only when similar assessments are paid by real property owned by taxable persons. The payment authorized is an

amount equal to the sum that would be due if the property were privately owned. I do not believe that one can reasonably object to this. The work leading to the special assessment results in an ultimate improvement adding to the value of the Federal property. There is no reason why Federal agencies should not pay for property improvements in the same manner as taxable persons.

The second category of payment relates to real property federally owned but leased to taxable persons. Here we have a case of property being used for private purposes and operated by private persons. The interest of the United States is only that of a landlord or titleholder. The tax to be paid by the owning Federal agency will be reduced by the amount of any real property tax payable by the lessee.

The third category affected—and this is quite important—is commercial and industrial property acquired by the United States after June 30, 1950. The guiding consideration here is the fact that Federal property is often being used for purposes identical to that of private industry. The June 30, 1950, cutoff date was chosen because this date roughly marks the beginning of increased Federal acquisition of real property for industrial and commercial purposes incident to the Korean war. I am convinced that where federally owned property is used to produce commodities or services that are normally provided by private enterprise, that property should be subject to local taxes comparable to those paid on similar privately owned property.

In drafting the authority to make payments on this third category of property, we were not content to establish an unlimited blanket authority to pay taxes assessed. We direct a little adding and subtracting first. We start with a payment equal to that which would have been made by a private person. This nominal liability is increased by the aggregate amount of expenditures necessarily incurred by the tax authority in furnishing unusual services to the Federal facility. We then reduce this sum by the value of local-type governmental services furnished by the Federal agency controlling the property.

Claims for payments under any one of the three categories will be permitted only for the 5-year period beginning January 1, 1960, and ending December 31, 1964. The measure thus is only a temporary one.

The mere filing of a claim by a local taxing authority does not mean that payment shall be made as demanded. Rather the proposed legislation establishes a Board which shall consider and judge each case on its own merits. After a hearing, the Board will determine the amount due, and this is the amount the Federal agency shall pay. The Board's decision is final unless reversed by a court of competent jurisdiction, or the Board's order is adjudged invalid by the General Accounting Office. Every 6 months, the Board shall file a report of its operations.

I want to emphasize the cautious way in which this bill has been drawn up. We are truly feeling our way. Many will conclude that we have been much too cautious, that we have overlooked many cases of hardship which will not be given relief. I fully concur. Our approach is, indeed, a narrow one. But the reason why relief of broader scope has not been provided is we have not yet been able to devise a formula free of inequity and not subject to major abuse. That is why this proposal also imposes on the Board the task of making studies which will enable us to come up with better answers in the future.

Although I am quite sure that many Members of the Senate will feel that we have been overconservative in our approach, there may be some who will feel that payments under this act will be just one more Federal subsidy. I ask those Members, particularly, to see the picture from the point of view of the local governments. At the present time, they furnish the same services to tax-free Federal property as they furnish taxpaying private persons. They, in effect, are subsidizing the Federal Government. I agree that all parts of our country must share in the cost of our defense program, but it is most unfair and unrealistic to expect selected local governments to assume a greatly disproportionate load solely by reason of the presence within their limits of a missile base, an aircraft plant, or a shipbuilding yard.

Let me say a few words more about the Board which would be created by this bill. It will be a five-member, bipartisan Federal Board for payments to local governments. Each member is to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Each will serve at the pleasure of the President. The Board will cease to exist at the end of 1966. As I have aready mentioned, this Board will administer the temporary program for payments in lieu of taxes. In addition, it will have several survey and investigative functions of key importance.

A major function of the Board would be to continue to survey the field with an eye to future action. It is to compile much pertinent information on State laws affecting the taxation and exemption of Federal property. It will inquire into existing State tax laws, Federal in-lieu payments, and other grants-in-aid to the States. In fact, the Board is directed to look into virtually every phase of fiscal and related problems of local taxing authorities arising out of the immunity from local real and personal property taxes, including the operation of existing programs. It is especially directed to investigate the need for additional legislation to provide continuing financial assistance to the States and their local subdivisions to relieve hardship incident to the tax-exempt status of Federal property. These surveys and investigations must be completed within 2 years, when a report shall be made. I enthusiastically endorse this proposal for a comprehensive report within 2 years.

The Board is expected to solicit and receive advice from others. In fact, the Board is directed to consult, from time to time, with representatives of tax authorities and State governments and other appropriate persons. It is to secure necessary information from Federal agencies.

We also provide for a special advisory committee to assist the Board. This advisory committee shall consist of 12 appointees of the President, including 6 Federal officers, plus 3 from the States and 3 from local governments. In addition to advising the Board, it will also study the administration of this and all other acts providing for Federal payments of taxes, or in lieu of taxes, and transmit a report of its studies and recommendations for administrative and legislative changes to promote the efficient, economical, and efficient administration of the laws.

I am hopeful that with this battery of information and talent, we can finally come up with a comprehensive program which we can all support. I hope that it will be one which will do justice to the thousands of injured local governments throughout the Nation.

I am well aware that in this presentation, I have told only what will be done. I have said little or nothing about what will not be done. Some may fear what has been left unsaid. I wish at this point to allay fears which may logically come to mind. For example, nothing in this bill has any effect upon existing payments or revenue-sharing arrangements authorized by law. No Federal liability will be incurred in cases of federally owned leased property where the lessee is taxed on such property. This bill will not require any payments with respect to any TVA property allocated to power purposes. TVA procedures under existing law will not be disturbed.

As I interpret the provisions of S. 910 it will give little or no benefit to certain areas of the Nation which have been particularly affected by the presence of federally owned property. These include Arlington County, Va., the State of Alaska, and certain of the public-lands States. The Board in its studies should give close attention to the peculiar needs of these areas, and I would hope it will offer remedial legislation to alleviate the fiscal hardships imposed as a result of large Government holdings.

In closing, Mr. President, I wish to pay special tribute to the principal sponsor of this measure, the indefatigable senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. He has devoted much time and study to this problem, and clearly the enactment of this proposal will stand as a lasting monument to his perseverance and perspicacity, no matter what the future may hold in store for this distinguished colleague.

I also wish to salute the staff of the Committee on Government Operations, particularly my constituent, Eli E. Nobleman, who has worked on this measure for such a long time. The committee has also received invaluable aid from various outside experts.

The result of their labors is a sound and substantial answer to a very sticky problem. The proposed law is temporary and limited, as befits the complexity of the situation.

From the experience gained in the administration of this law, together with

the studies which are directed to be made, I am extremely hopeful that more satisfactory general answers can eventually be found. Careful application of this law, combined with future changes as our knowledge and experience with this problem increases, can go a long way toward removing a substantial inequity in present Federal-State-local relations.

In the long run, our Federal system will be strengthened and our Nation's progress will be speeded by means of this proposal. I hope it will gain the overwhelming support of the Senate without further delay.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I support S. 910, the bill now before the Senate, and express the hope that it will be passed by an overwhelming vote.

This is a reasonable approach to a problem which has plagued local governments for many years. Before I became a Member of the Senate, I served as a county official and, at one time, as a city official. I am, therefore, aware of the fact that the problem of Federal encroachment upon the real estate holdings of local subdivisions or local tax divisions was yearly growing more acute. As the Federal Government increased its holdings in various areas, many inequities and imbalances arose.

The bill is a sound, reasonable effort to overcome the inequities and imbalances which occur. I think that anyone would concede, as a matter of equity, that the Federal Government should contribute its reasonable share to the cost of the local administration of government at the city and State levels. The bill would have that effect.

I pay tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and other Senators who have worked so diligently on the matter over a long period of time. I appeared before the committee more than a year ago to discuss the matter, and I know it has been under constant revision and study since that time.

I believe the bill offers a very sound, reasonable program. It is temporary in nature, but it is simply a beginning. Certainly a start can now be made to remedy the inequities which have grown up over a long period of time.

I urge all Senators to support the passage of S. 910.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senate bill 910. I wish to add my compliments to those already paid to the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the author of the bill, who has assiduously pursued his efforts for the solution of this long-standing problem.

I wish to call attention to the fact that this bill, which was introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], is cosponsored by the following Senators: Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. BUSH, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. WILEY, Mr. CANNON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. HART, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. GRUENING.

The sponsorship of the bill indicates the wide knowledge of Members of the Senate of the problem which is sought to be dealt with and solved by means of this measure.

For a number of years, as chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I was either the cosponsor or the author, in the House of Representatives, of similar proposed legislation, although the bills which I introduced or cosponsored on those occasions were much broader than the bill now before us. Unhappily, we were unable then to resolve the problem of determining what Federal property will be subject to payments in lieu of taxes and what Federal property will not be subject to payments in lieu of taxes.

Those of us who represent the great natural resources of the Nation—the national parks, the national forests, and the public-domain lands—have always felt that if our areas were to be the stockpiling areas for the natural resources of the Nation, the beneficiaries of those stockpiles, namely, the people of the entire country, should help carry the tax burden caused by creating those reservoirs or those stockpiles of natural resources, whether they happen to be timber, minerals, scenic areas, or grazing lands.

However, we recognized some difficulty when we endeavored to determine whether Federal payments in lieu of taxes should be made on other types of Federal property.

It was always conceded that post office buildings, administration buildings, and other buildings used directly by the Federal Government in its operations as such should not be required to be the subject of payments in lieu of taxes.

In dealing with those two groups, in other words, the properties held by the Federal Government for the purpose of the functions of the Federal Government itself, and the properties held by the Federal Government in a proprietary sense, we got into the in-between cases which create the difficulty, for instance, military bases and other types of Federal landholdings. The complexities of that problem and the difficulty of solving it to the satisfaction of the Federal officials involved, the Bureau of the Budget, and the local tax agencies, made it impossible for us to move forward with the enactment of legislation of this type.

So, Mr. President, for more than 20 years Congress has engaged in a struggle to give some relief to local communities suffering serious losses of revenue because of the Federal tax-immune properties in their jurisdictions. It has been a struggle to find an answer to this complex problem without flying in the face of the principle of Federal tax immunity or causing an undue burden on the Federal Treasury. As I have said, I have personally been involved in the problem for 10 years and have seen too many sessions of Congress end in a complete impasse on this question.

But the 86th Congress has brought with it some hope for breaking the impasse. This hope lies in the enactment of Senate bill 910, which I have cosponsored. Senate bill 910 is admittedly modest in scope, but I am convinced that it is a sound beginning.

As I have stated, the bill has been piloted thus far by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. The bill provides for a 5-year program of payments in lieu of taxes and special assessments on a limited category of federally owned real property which has been removed from the local tax rolls. True, the major category of affected local governments will get relief only at the discretion and judgment of a Federal Board, and subject to specific safeguards. But the bill also gives the same Board the responsibility of making a thorough study and a case-by-case analysis of every phase of the problems of local taxing authorities arising out of Federal immunity from local real and personal property taxes. This is perhaps the bill's most significant provision.

In this respect, Mr. President, I may say that very recently in California we faced this problem in the case of the great aircraft industry there which is building aircraft for the Federal Government or is building such aircraft under defense contracts, when those engaged in that activity placed in the Federal Government title to the basic materials required for the construction of the aircraft, and thus exempted that property from local taxation. As a result, the local school districts, the counties, and the cities there were deprived of the taxes which otherwise would have been levied on property of that type.

This is only one illustration of how the Federal Government may hold title to such property in a proprietary capacity, more or less, or, in my opinion, through a fiction in this instance, where the title to the parts or to the basic materials which go into the construction of aircraft was placed in the Federal Government, and thus that property was rendered not subject to taxation by the local authorities. This is one of the problems and one of the types of problems the new Board will consider.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield for a question.

Mr. JAVITS. First, I should like to suggest to the Senator from California that recently the Legislature of the State of New York enacted legislation generally to the same effect; and I thought that fact might be of interest to the Senator.

In addition, if he will consent to it, I wish to ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a memorandum in regard to the bill passed by the New York Legislature, and signed by Governor Rockefeller, of New York, on April 20, 1960. That bill is generally to the same effect as the bill which now is before us.

Mr. ENGLE. Certainly.

Mr. JAVITS. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum filed with the New York State Legislature bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks in favor of enactment of the pending bill.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM FILED WITH ASSEMBLY BILL 4667, "AN ACT TO AMEND THE REAL PROPERTY TAX LAW, IN RELATION TO PROVIDING STATE AID IN RESPECT TO REDUCTIONS IN TAXABLE ASSESSED VALUATIONS OF PROPERTY OWNED OR ACQUIRED BY THE STATE"

This measure, prepared by the State board of equalization and assessment, is of major importance to those communities in which State-owned land is located. It provides for State aid payments in lieu of real property taxes in situations where specified State actions result in a reduction of 2 percent or more in the total taxable assessed valuation within a tax district.

In some instances, the acquisition of land by the State or a reduction in the assessed valuation of taxable State lands results in a highly disruptive shifting of the impact of real property taxes to private lands. Under this measure, State aid payments will limit the effective reduction each year in assessed State land to 2 percent of the total taxable assessed valuation of a tax district.

These payments will result in a gradual tapering off of State taxes paid to a locality so that no more than 2 percent of the local taxable assessment roll would be in jeopardy in any one year. Enactment of this measure reflects the concern of State government with the problems of sound fiscal management in our localities.

The bill is approved.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

APRIL 25, 1960.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I do not believe the pending bill goes far enough, but I am satisfied that it constitutes a long step on the right road. In terms of immediate dollars and cents, a good many local governments are left out in the cold, under this bill. But in terms of the benefits that will come as a result of the studies and findings to be developed by the Federal Board, all units of local governments will gain substantially. In other words, the bill is only a small start, but it will cause a great deal of light to be thrown on this problem.

The State of California, with its great concentration of defense industries, has been a real victim in this situation. Because of the presence of tremendous Federal holdings, only half of the State of California is subject to assessments by local governments. At the average State tax rate of $5 per $100, the losses in revenue to the local governments because of the tax-immune Federal properties add up to more than $27 million. County and city governments which have been major victims of this enormous loss in revenue have been forced either to lower the quality and quantity of their community services or to penalize their private citizens unreasonably. Trapped between a growing demand for services and a dwindling intake of taxes, towns and cities have become second-class communities—with inferior schools, bad roads, inadequate services generally.

When we take a look at these federally hit communities, it is hard to understand the argument of the opposition that these communities, in asking for payments in lieu of taxes, are seeking to be "subsidized" by the Federal Government. Federal tax-immune facilities receive the same county and city services as those received by tax-assessed private properties; yet the Federal properties for the most part go scot free of their fair share of the burden. My answer to this specious argument of the opposition is that the argument should be turned around—that the Federal Government, not the local government, is being subsidized. Assuredly, all local governments must share in the defense program of the country; but it is unfair and unrealistic to expect a local governmental unit to assume the precipitous load brought on it by the impact of a missile base or an aircraft plant or a shipbuilding yard. Our national needs must be charged against the national tax base.

Mr. President, I repeat that our national needs must be charged against the national tax base.

Let me go further, and say that when major defense installations impose improper burdens on the local governments, in some instances we have already taken care of those problems—such as those which arise when Federal installations cause on local communities impacts which make it impossible for the local school districts to take care of the education of the children of the Federal workers who establish themselves there.

In those instances we have, by Federal law, provided for Federal assistance. I would say when one of those programs is put into effect, we need not imply in this legislation that the program will be permanent. That is, if the time ever comes when the tax assets resulting from the placing of the Federal installation equals the tax assets that are lost by reason of the Federal installation, then, it seems to me, it would be proper to withdraw Federal payment.

The problem has reached the crucial stage in many communities, and we cannot delay any longer in taking affirmative action. S. 910 is a sound answer to the urgent immediate situation—and the atmosphere in Congress is ready for it. The bill has bipartisan support. It has the support of local governing bodies. And it has the support of the National Association of County Officials, the American Municipal Association, and many other organizations concerned with local government.

I may add that as a former county official I have worked very closely with the National Association of County Officials on this problem over a number of years.

S. 910 is, I repeat, not the final answer to the problem. But it embodies features that have great appeal for both sides of the issue. It gives us a "beginning" system of payments in lieu of taxes that will open the door to a broad realistic plan for the future. By making it necessary for a major category of local governments to prove their eligibility for payments before the Federal Board, the bill should satisfy the strongest opponents of payments in lieu of taxes. The bill's greatest appeal is, of course, in the establishment of a Federal board charged with studying and analyzing the variegated and complex problems and with coming up with some solid answers. In this bipartisan objective board, we have an ideal forum in which all points of view and all phases of the situation will get a full and fair hearing.

In short, we have in this bill a neat start toward a broad and conclusive solution to the problem, and I urge the Members of Congress to act quickly and favorably on this measure.

In closing, I should like to call attention to one amendment placed in the bill by the committee. The amendment is section 9(f), on page 37 of the bill, and reads as follows:

(f) Each final order made by the Board under this Act for the payment of any award shall be final and conclusive upon all tax authorities and upon all Federal agencies, unless such order is modified or reversed by a court of competent jurisdiction or is adjudged invalid in whole or in part by the General Accounting Office.

The original language in the bill as introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota read as follows:

Each final order made by the Board under this Act for the payment of any award shall be final and conclusive upon all tax authorities and upon all Federal agencies, and shall not be questioned by any court or by any accounting office of the Government, except that nothing contained in this section shall limit or impair the authority of the General Accounting Office to audit expenditures under this Act.

The difference between the section as originally in the bill and the section in the bill as it was proposed to be amended and was voted out of committee is that in the bill that was voted out of committee the order of the Board can be modified or reversed by a court of competent jurisdiction. The fear has been expressed that such a provision may open up the gates for all sorts of litigation and that, actually, awards made under the legislation may be completely frustrated by long and interminable litigation, if a court review is permitted.

We have a precedent for the making of orders by a board without court review. During the last war, the War Risk Litigation Board was authorized to make awards within its jurisdiction specifically without any court review. That act was reviewed by the Supreme Court, which held that the due process clause was not violated by cutting off court review so long as there was some procedure provided in the act itself for review of those decisions.

Mr. President, I am not going to press for the consideration of an amendment to restore the original language of the bill, but the matter is one of concern to the local governments involved; and I hope that the language placed in the bill will be given very careful consideration in the other body, when the measure comes before the committee in the other body, and finally by the conferees, when they arrive at the final language of the bill, which no doubt will need some adjustment in conference between the two Houses.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I am very happy to yield to the senior Senator from Minnesota. I am sorry he had stepped off the floor when I complimented him for the effective and intelligent way in which he has pressed to get this bill on the floor, after

so many of us struggled for so many years and made no progress at all.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I may say to the Senator that I stepped off the floor to answer a personal telephone call. My daughter is going to be married, and I had a little consultation with the head of the household about that matter.

Mr. ENGLE. That is a very important matter, and I have no doubt it will take a great deal of consultation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The observation made by the Senator from California relating to the amendment on judicial review is, to my mind, a very sound and valid criticism of the bill. The Senator from Minnesota, in committee, felt it was an unwise move to include the amendment; but the majority of the committee felt to the contrary. As the Senator from California knows, when a Senator in charge of a bill brings it to the floor as a bill representing the thought of the committee, that Senator is representing the committee bill, and it is his duty to present the bill as it was reported from the committee.

I am pleased the Senator from California has seen fit to withhold his amendment to strike the portion under discussion from the bill, because I believe, as the proposed legislation proceeds through the other body, we shall have an opportunity to make whatever corrective adjustments are needed. I shall be mindful, in my role as a Senator, and not as a subcommittee chairman, to try to get that portion of the bill changed, because I believe there is adequate protection and protections that go far enough, through the General Accounting Office procedures, without trying to limit the effectiveness of the bill by long court procedures which, for all practical purposes, would nullify any relief.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. ENGLE. I appreciate the remarks of the senior Senator from Minnesota. I can understand why some persons would say it is rather strange to cut off court review. That was the reason why I cited the precedent to which I referred. We have that precedent for cutting off court review of a matter finally determined by a Board. That does not relieve the fears, I suppose, of some persons who think that the courts always are to be open, under all circumstances. However, I am afraid the provision in the bill will simply result in no awards being made at all, because the matters could become the subject of extensive litigation. Inasmuch as the Federal payment is in the discretion of the Federal Board, and inasmuch, further, as the Federal payment is subject to review by the General Accounting Office, it seems to me the Federal end of the case is sufficiently safeguarded. So far as the local governments are concerned, all that this litigation procedure would do, in my opinion, would be to put some of these awards in litigation for a number of years.

I hope the matter will be thoroughly considered by the members of the committee when the matter comes before them again, and that it will be carefully considered by the committee in the other body when this bill is before that committee, as well as by the House of Representatives itself.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I commend the junior Senator from California for his remarks upon S. 910.

Several counties within my State of South Carolina are suffering at the present time because of the fact that a great deal of land in the counties has been taken by the Federal Government for its own use. I recall one instance when 250,000 acres were taken, most of it from one county. No county can permit that much land to be taken without suffering a great deal.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The principle of this proposed legislation has much merit, but I believe the proposal would not take care of some hardship cases, at least for a long time.

There is in Nebraska a situation which came about during World War II. The Navy acquired one-fourth of one county, which meant that the cost of supporting the county was thrown on the other three-fourths. This disrupted the entire school district. Whether there was a bond program in the county or not, I could not say.

At the present time this naval ammunition depot is on a standby basis. Ammunition is still stored in the igloos, but there is no payroll. No one is employed, other than the custodial force and a small force for inactivating the ammunition, yet the Government holds the entire amount of land. The land is not being sold.

Part of the land is leased for farming purposes, but part of it is not.

I disagree as to two provisions in the bill. First is the cutoff date of 1950. That would mean we would leave out certain situations where the local community has suffered the longest.

I also question the definition of industrial or commercial property. If a community has the benefit of a Federal activity, with people working who are earning money and spending it in the community, perhaps that community is in less need of help than if the Federal Government owned some property which simply was situated in the community. The land in that case is not productive from the standpoint of a payroll, nor is it turned back into private ownership, to again go on the tax rolls.

In the case of this particular depot I have mentioned, it will take 7 years to demilitarize the ammunition which is stored there. I am told this process is cheaper than paying freight on the ammunition, so that it could be hauled out and dumped in the ocean.

All the bill under consideration would grant such a community, I believe, after limited study, would be a right to go before a board and to talk about its grievance.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, so that I may answer the Senator?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is my construction correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; it would lay down a precedure for the community to go before the board and to seek whatever payment in lieu of taxes it might be entitled to receive. I add, in regard to the cutoff date, that the property to which the Senator from Nebraska refers would not be affected by the cutoff date. That refers only to the industrial and commercial properties. The other properties are not affected.

Mr. CURTIS. Let us suppose the bill were passed. Would it permit the payment in lieu of taxes for agricultural land owned by the Federal Government, which was acquired, let us say, prior to 1950 but after 1939?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If there were any special assessments to be made relating to that land, or to any improvements thereon or abutting thereto, the bill would require that the Federal Government pay the special assessments. If the land is classified as real property in the legal definition, the bill would permit the taxing authority to go before the board to seek what we might call, for the purpose of convenience, some tax relief.

Mr. CURTIS. But all the people would be able to seek would be a determination of their status.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Both.

Mr. CURTIS. They could not get any payment without further legislation, could they?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the board determined that the piece of property was within the purview of the requirements of the language, first the people could receive a determination of their status, and, second, they could receive relief.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the contention of the distinguished Senator that the language is limited to commercial or industrial property?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, it is not limited only to commercial or industrial property.

Mr. CURTIS. Would it be the intent of the Congress to include agricultural land?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. It would not be the intent of the Congress to include at this stage what we might call public lands. If one acquired for the purpose of agricultural production a piece of property upon which the Federal Government was conducting an operation, that land would fall within the purview of the language.

Mr. CURTIS. In the case I have cited the land was acquired not for agricultural purposes, but for the manufacture of and the storage of munitions. But the basic purpose of the land is agricultural. That is the use to which the land would revert, if turned back into private ownership. Would that be agricultural land, or commercial or industrial land?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the land being used today for an agricultural purpose?

Mr. CURTIS. A little of it is, around the perimeter, on a rental basis.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the federally owned land being used, for example, for the storage of agricultural commodities?

Mr. CURTIS. No. The Federal Government is leasing some of the land to individuals, who in turn farm this part of the land around the perimeter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand.

Mr. CURTIS. My question is this: What determines whether the land is industrial or commercial? Is it the purpose for which the Government acquired the land, or the purpose for which the land is best suited?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is the purpose for which the Government acquired the land or for which the Government is currently using it.

A second point is in regard to the definition of real property. The land to which the Senator refers could be subject to the review of the board for a payment.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator, and I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. I did not realize I would take so much time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Contributions to State and Local Governments Act".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC 2. (a) Although the United States is under no constitutional obligation to pay taxes, or to make financial contributions in lieu of taxes, to any State or to any political subdivision or instrumentality thereof with respect to any property of the Federal Government, the Congress has recognized that the exemption of Federal property from taxation by State and local governments has worked hardship upon such governments in a number of instances, and heretofore has enacted a number of legislative measures providing relief in varying forms for such governments.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to provide for a comprehensive study of the nature and effect of such previous enactments, and for an investigation to determine the nature and effect of any further legislation which may be required for the relief of State and local governments from such hardship.

(c) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that no such additional relief shall be made to any State or local government with respect to any Federal property devoted to any Federal activity the establishment or retention of which within the territorial jurisdiction of such State or local government at any time has been solicited by such State or local government.

COMMISSION ESTABLISHED

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established within the executive branch of the Government a Commission on Federal Contributions to State and Local Governments (referred to hereinafter as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of five members appointed by the President, selected from among individuals of public stature who have had wide experience in governmental and fiscal affairs and who are representative of the general public interest.

(c) The President shall appoint the Chairman and the Vice Chairman from among the members of the Commission. A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Members of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum, and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties of the Commission.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive study of the nature and effect of all previous enactments of the Congress providing for—

(1) the payment to any State or local government of any tax or special assessment with respect to any Federal real or personal property;

(2) the making of any payment to any such government in lieu of the payment of any tax or special assessment with respect to any such property; or

(3) the rendition of assistance to any State or local government through the making of grants-in-aid, the sharing of revenues derived from properties of the United States, or through the furnishing of services or facilities by the United States.

(b) The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the extent to which State and local governments derive benefits directly or indirectly through payments made to them (1) by persons residing or employed upon Federal property, and (2) for or in connection with any property, trade, business, occupation, or transaction situated or occurring upon Federal property.

(c) The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive investigation to determine the extent, if any, to which there is need for legislation by the Congress to provide additional financial assistance for State and local governments to relieve hardships incident to the tax-exempt status of Federal property. Such investigation shall include inquiry to determine—

(1) the classes of Federal property, if any, with respect to which any such additional assistance should be granted;

(2) the nature and extent of any such additional assistance;

(3) the conditions, if any, under which such additional assistance should be granted;

(4) the annual cost to the United States of providing such financial assistance with respect to each such class of Federal property and with respect to all such classes of Federal property; and

(5) ways and means whereby State and local governments may be accorded effective right to apply property taxes in effect within their several jurisdictions to industrial plant equipment, materials, supplies, and inventories owned by private parties and used by them for commercial purposes within plant facilities owned or controlled by departments and agencies of the United States Government.

(d) On or before March 1, 1960, the Commission shall submit to the President, an interim report for transmittal to the Congress, on or before December 1, 1960, a comprehensive final report containing—

(1) the text of all provisions of law referred to in subsection (a), together with an analysis of the purpose and effect of each such provision;

(2) the findings of the Commission as to the facts disclosed by its studies and investigations made under subsections (b) and (c) of this section;

(3) its recommendations, consistent with the policy prescribed by section 2(c), as to any additional legislation the need for which has been disclosed by its investigation under subsection (c) of this section; and

(4) a detailed analysis of the relationship between any recommendations so made and the provisions of existing law set forth in compliance with paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(e) Upon the transmittal of such report to the Congress, the Commission shall cease to exist.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) To carry out the provisions of this Act, the Commission, or any duly authorized member or employee thereof, may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission, or such member or employee, may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission or any duly designated member or employee, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Commission is authorized to request from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Government such information or assistance as the Commission may deem necessary or desirable to enable it to carry out its duties under this title and such department, agency, and independent instrumentality is authorized to cooperate to the extent permitted by law.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to establish in the executive branch of the Government a temporary Commission on Federal Contributions to State and Local Governments."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, several of my colleagues have been inquiring as to how long I propose to discuss the amendment and whether or not I should like to have a yea-and-nay vote on it. The answer to the second question is "Yes." I do not intend to discuss the amendment at any great length. In order that we may determine whether or not there are enough Senators available to vote on the amendment whether they hear the arguments for and against it or not, I think it would be well to determine at this point whether or not there are enough Senators willing to have a yea-and-nay vote on it. For that reason I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment as to date, by virtue of the fact that the Senate is considering the proposed legislation much later than was anticipated. I ask that on page 5, line 23, I may strike out "March 1, 1960," and insert in lieu thereof "February 2, 1961"; and on page 6, line 1, strike out "December 1, 1960," and insert in lieu thereof "June 1, 1961".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Senate is considering a very significant measure. I am something of a realist, and I realize the impracticability of trying to hold forth at great length in opposition to a bill which is cosponsored by 35 Senators at a time when it has been possible to have only a dozen Senators to come to the floor of the Senate. Even if, by some strange system of forensic legerdemain, I were to convince all who are present to hear me, that would be inadequate. However, I believe the record should be clearly made because I feel very definitely, as a member of the committee which considered the bill, that there are some perils involved which Senators should clearly understand before they vote for the passage of S. 910. I think they are perils which should be made abundantly clear to the public, to the Members of the other body, and to all persons concerned with the fiscal integrity of the country.

I might begin by pointing out that this is not a simple bill, and that this is not the first time it has been before the Senate. My congenial and friendly neighbor, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and I have argued this point many times. The same bill, with a different number, was debated by the Senate on July 27, 1956, almost 4 years ago. At that time, after some consideration, the Senate returned the bill to the committee from whence it came. I believe that the arguments which were made against the bill in 1956 are as valid now as they were then, and are, in fact, much more significant, because the financial problems confronted by the Federal Government are, if anything, more serious now than they were then. For those who are interested in going back into the history of the proposed legislation 4 years ago, when the Senate did not pass the bill, but returned it to the committee, the debate can be found in volume 102, part 11, pages 15051–15067 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with some scattering remarks on the succeeding pages.

I do not propose today to detain the Senate by reading all the arguments which were used then, except to say that those who are interested in searching the RECORD and finding the record of the facts will find, I feel certain, that the arguments made then are just as pertinent today.

There are various ways in which the welfare of a great Republic like ours can be destroyed or jeopardized. One way is by careless spending on the part of Congress. We can become freewheeling spenders and vote for every attractive suggestion or proposal, regardless of the billions of dollars which it will put the country into the red. I think we all recognize that that line of activity, if followed far enough, can create such a spiral of inflation as to cause disaster and distress to hundreds of millions of our fellow citizens, to say nothing of jeopardizing the solvency of the Government itself, and can cause a weakening of our position abroad at a time when fiscal sanity and fiscal strength are as essential to the survival of the free world as is a sound military establishment.

A second way in which the fiscal structure of a great country like this can be attacked is by Members of Congress generally adopting the tactic of a demagogue, who says, "I vote for all appropriation bills and against all tax bills; consequently, I should be returned to Congress over and over again." Here, indeed, is a manifestation of generosity and consideration for the people. In effect, such a person is saying, "Anything I can get for you, I will get by voting for an appropriation. But I will protect you against taxes sought to be levied by any of my associates."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I take it the Senator is not referring to any Member of this body.

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly am not going to particularize any generalities in which I have engaged.

There is a third approach, and it is the one to which I wish to call the attention of Senators who are present, and as to which I hope to leave my words echoing in that great plethora of empty chairs which I observe in the Chamber as we consider this tremendously significant spending program. That third way is to provide a whole sequence of back-door expenditures, whereby a great many channels are opened to uncontrolled and uncontrollable expenditures which are attached to the taxpayer, and which tend to pyramid the national debt. It has exactly as much impact on the cancerous situation called inflation as though Congress had actually appropriated the dollars specifically. It is in this third area that we are dealing here today—the back-door spending, the uncontrolled spending. It is the attempt by S. 910 to establish a new and third appropriations committee of Congress, except that this one would not be elected by the people, but would be appointed by the President.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Briefly, what does the Senator's amendment do?

Mr. MUNDT. It proposes that instead of making an unguided tour up into the fiscal orbit, instead of passing now a bill which requires payments in lieu of taxes, as they are defined and established by an appointive board, we recognize that there is a problem in this area; we recognize that there are inequities; and that we establish a presidential board which, a year from next June, will make a report suggesting an approach which can be made within the constitutional procedures of the Government to assist, on an equitable basis, communities which have need for assistance.

Mr. CURTIS. The Board will have to report by June——

Mr. MUNDT. It will have to make a preliminary report in March, and a final report in June.

Mr. CURTIS. In June of what year?

Mr. MUNDT. In June 1961, so that before Congress adjourns that year, the Board will have presented us with a well-rounded version of an approach to meeting the problem.

In my minority views I point out five or six specific reasons why enactment of Senate bill 910 would create a great many more problems than it conceivably could cure.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCARTHY in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield again to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Should a vote for the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota be considered as being against the making of any payments of this sort, ultimately?

Mr. MUNDT. No; a vote in favor of the adoption of my amendment should be considered as being against the making of any payments of this sort until we know what the Board finds—in other words, to wait until a year from now, when we can know what payments will properly be covered by the umbrella of the proposed legislation.

Mr. CURTIS. When could the payments begin?

Mr. MUNDT. In the case of rural areas, such as those which the Senator from Nebraska and I represent, I do not believe the payments could conceivably begin—under the terms of my amendment—until the Board's report was made, assuming that the Board found that such payments could justifiably be made at all, because—curiously enough—the bill provides for the making of payments to urban areas but generally relegates to further study by the Board the making of payments to other areas; and, of course, no one can know now what the Board in due time would determine as to them.

But there are several reasons which I hope will influence Senators to vote for the adoption of this amendment, so as to have a further study made before this venture is begun.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from South Daktota has said that the bill applies, especially as regards the properties in category one, to properties located in urban and suburban areas. I looked carefully at the bill, in an effort to determine what connotations it gives to the terms "urban" and "suburban." But the bill does not contain any definition of those terms. Will the Senator from South Dakota state his understanding of the meaning of the terms "urban" and "suburban"?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be happy to do so, because in the absence of such definitions, I suppose we must revert to the common usage and to the definitions in the dictionary. Certainly both by common usage and by the definitions in the dictionary the terms "urban" and "suburban" are connected with such terms as "metropolitan" and "big cities." They refer to the larger gatherings of communities which operate under municipal law. I suspect that the Board could hold that the bill would apply to any community of a million or more persons, or perhaps to any community of 500,000 or more persons, but not to a community of much less than 500,000 persons. At any rate, here is one of the reasons, as I shall explain further later on, why I think a Board appointed by the President and charged with this responsibility should arrive at some precise language for such a measure.

Certainly I would hate to be the mayor of a city who was trying to obtain payments for his city under a measure similar to the pending one, and who was told that, unfortunately, his community was 500 persons or 100 persons short of the requisite size, and therefore no payment under the bill would be made to it, but, instead, that it would only have a chance to make a presentation to the Board, whereas a community which was 100 persons or 500 persons larger would definitely receive the payments, without being subject to challenge.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield further to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then, under the bill, the board would have to speculate as to the meaning of the terms "urban" and "suburban," would it not?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, that is all anyone could do in those circumstances.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe the bill should cover metropolitan areas.

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly it should.

Mr. LAUSCHE. However, the bill would seem to leave that field to whatever interpretation the Board might make.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct; and the interpretations and the findings made by the Board would not—curiously enough—be subject to challenge by the Congress, and never would be submitted to the Congress.

Furthermore, two of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle deplored, a little while ago, in the course of debate, the fact that the bill provides that such findings would be subject to review. They proposed that the provision for such review be eliminated from the bill—which would mean that the Board's findings would not be subject to challenge by anyone, anywhere, at any time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield further to me?

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The bill includes definitions of the terms "Federal agency," "Federal property," "real property," "controlling agency," "Board," "State," "tax authority," "tax," "taxable persons," "special assessment," "public improvement," and "industrial or commercial use." But the bill does not define the terms "suburban" and "urban." In other words, according to the whim of the Board, it could give to the terms "urban" or "suburban" whatever connotations it might decide upon.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Ohio is exactly correct. I suppose that ultimately those questions would be carried to the courts by some aggrieved communities which felt they were urban, althought the Board felt they were not urban, with the result that the Board left them out in the cold, instead of bringing them into the warm embrace of these Federal funds.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Inasmuch as so many terms are defined by the bill, and inasmuch as the terms "urban" and "suburban" are certainly of considerable significance, should they not also be defined by the bill?

Mr. MUNDT. I entirely agree with the Senator from Ohio. However, he is directing attention to only one of a great many ambiguities which are to be found in the bill—all of which constitute an additional reason, in my opinion, why a proper and prudent approach to this matter would be to have a Federal board make findings in this area, and then come to Congress with a suggested program which could be approved by the Bureau of the Budget, instead of one which is seriously condemned by the Bureau of the Budget and also by the fiscal authorities of the country as being a glaring example of fiscal irresponsibility.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield further to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It seemed to me that, in these circumstances, reference should be made at this point in the debate to the desirability of having the bill include definitions of the terms "urban" and "suburban."

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly that is the case; and let me state that I appreciate very much the significant contributions the Senator from Ohio has made. As always, they are helpful and informative.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator's amendment deal with the public domain in the Western States?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. My amendment provides that the board shall make a study of the entire area involving public ownership, because, strangely enough, and, in my opinion, most unjustly, the so-called public-land States would be permitted, by means of the bill, to pay the additional tax burden, but would not be permitted to receive any of the benefits. I am sure no one would consider Idaho a highly urbanized area; and I am sure the same is true as to Arizona or Nevada.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield further?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. It seems to me there would be inequity and discrimination if the tax program proposed by means of the bill were to go into effect, in view of the fact that the program would overlook the interests of States such as my own, in which the Federal Government owns 65 percent of the total land area. Something should be done to recognize the need for equitable treatment and for equalization of such assistance and payments in lieu of taxes.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. Of course, one of my objections to passage of the bill in its present form, instead of the making of a study, is that a whole saga of inequities and inequalities—of which the Senator from Idaho has mentioned one—would develop.

The Senator from Ohio placed his finger on another possibility—as between the urban and the nonurban communities.

Then there is this startling one, which is written in boldfaced type in the bill; namely, that the benefits in a whole series of categories would be made available to such communities only when such properties were acquired by the Federal Government after June 30, 1950. Later in my remarks I shall discuss this point in greater detail. But for the moment let me ask how any Senator would like to be confronted with so unjust a program. For instance, how would any Senator like to be the Governor of a State in which were located two urbanized communities, in one of which a Federal installation had been established on June 21, 1950, and, in the other, on July 2, 1950, less than 30 days apart, and then find that the program under the bill was to be applied to them or was to be decided as to them on the basis of the definite cutoff date provided in the bill. One gets a plush payment from Uncle Sam, this type of payment in lieu of taxes. The other is in the unhappy situation of having to pay higher income taxes to provide for the plush payment.

Mr. President, I do not disagree with the intent of this bill. I did not when I led the fight against a similar proposal on July 27, 1956, when I said, as appears in volume 102, part 11, page 15051 of the RECORD, that we are dealing with problems created by the Federal ownership of so much property in the United States, and I suggested then that we have a commission to make a study of the problem, which, if we had done it then, would have long since resolved the inequities.

Let me point out another factor. In the first place, this bill authorizes what is tantamount to an open-end appropriation, with no limit whatsoever. I do not have an educated guess as to what it is going to cost, because nobody knows. Somebody said it would cost $300 million

the first year. Another has said it would cost $30 milllion the first year. Nobody knows. This is something new and novel. It is something we should be reluctant to enact today, when taxpayers are asking us, "What are you doing to protect the Treasury? What are you doing to fight inflation? Are you attempting to balance the budget? Are you going to establish a reputation for fiscal irresponsibility in this Congress, or are you going to maintain a close watch on the people's dollars?" Here we are asked to appropriate nobody knows how much the first year, and it obviously is going to increase steadily.

I should like to point out something further. When we begin to make, in certain categories, payments in lieu of taxes, when we begin to make cash payments in others, there will be no turning back. After contributions are started in this area, we shall not be able to turn back. Once we enact this legislation, we shall be beyond the point of no return.

During the life of this bill, it will cost many hundreds of millions of dollars, and I predict it will cost us well over $1 billion in the first 5 years, and perhaps twice as much as that.

I do not believe any one of us, as the director of a private corporation, would consider for 1 minute being in favor of a 5-year program without having some idea of what the costs are going to be. Still we have no reasonable estimate so far as costs are concerned.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure the administration, likewise, fully appreciates the problem that confronts the municipalities and the displacement of certain taxable values when they go into the hands of the Federal Government. That appreciation is borne out by the fact that, on a qualified basis, the administration was willing to go along with some kind of program, to be sure, limited in character.

When, however, the decisions in the Wisconsin and Michigan cases came down from the Supreme Court in 1958, I think for the first time the administration got some notion of the magnitude of the problem and what it might cost the Federal Government. I believe the lowest estimate was $500 million, but there was an estimate which bears out the contention of the Senator from South Dakota that this program could conceivably cost $1 billion a year. So there was a change of the administration's position on this matter. I think after the decisions in the cases involving the leasehold and the contractors were handed down, because of the burden taxed back against the Federal Treasury, for the first time they realized, budgetwise, that this program could have a tremendous impact on the well-being and the economy of the country.

I think that realization was borne out by the message of the President on the 1961 budget, because in that, among other things, he said:

> There are many problems requiring attention of the recently established Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Foremost among these are the problems of allocation of tax sources among various levels of government and rapid growth of metropolitan areas.

Then there was this concluding sentence:

> An aspect of intergovernmental relations requiring attention in both the legislative and executive branches involves a series of court decisions permitting local taxation of federally owned property in the hands of contractors and leaseholders. This matter should be resolved in the context of the broader subject of Federal payments in lieu of taxes.

On that basis, the administration itself supports the contention made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota when it says some further study should be given to this matter.

I think there are other involvements and other complications which also merit further attention. I hope that the substitute proposal offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota will prevail.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator very much for his very constructive contribution.

I point out that in the minority views which Senators have on their desks, at page 46, they will find detailed references to the Supreme Court decisions, which have altered the situation substantially since the proposed legislation was introduced by the Senator from Minnesota.

I may add to Senators who may happen to have their names on the bill that they may take that fact into consideration, also, because there is a new factor, a study of which and possible repercussions from which have substantially altered the situation, to such a point that the Budget Bureau, originally being in favor of a modest approach to this problem, has examined into the situation and has said that if we ever go into this fiscal adventure we shall have no opportunity to return. Who knows what impact it would have on the Federal budget once we get into the business of making payments in lieu of taxes in every one of the 50 States? We would open up a Pandora's box of expenditures of which there could be no foreseeable end.

After 150 years as a Republic, it is proposed that we make a change in public policy, on a sleepy afternoon, with scarcely a sufficient number of Senators on the floor so we can get the required 11 to get a yea-and-nay vote ordered on the amendment.

Mr. President, I think such a situation is dangerous. It is irresponsibility in action. There should be a sustained debate. I think opportunity should be given to all Senators to know what has happened in the Federal courts. I think we ought to know where we are headed and where we are going. If we pass an open-end appropriation bill as gigantic as this, I am sure future historians will look back upon this day and consider it as a very dark Wednesday in American history.

In the first category, my amendment proposes we study and ascertain the facts before we undertake to rewrite the course of American history in perpetual red ink.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. This afternoon statements were made on several occasions to the effect that this is a temporary measure.

Mr. MUNDT. Five years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And that it will come to an end in 5 years. Will the Senator from South Dakota give his interpretation of the possibilities of this program being ended at the conclusion of 5 years?

Mr. MUNDT. The distinguished Senator from Ohio is as astute an observer of public opinion, in my opinion, as we have in the Senate. The Senator was the Governor of a great State for many years. I am sure the Senator from Ohio must agree with me we cannot alter the budgetary processes of municipalities, of counties and of States by letting flow into their budgets from the Federal Treasury for 5 years an abundance of the people's money, and ever again expect to shut it off. Once these people have readjusted their spending programs, their budgetary methods, and their tax programs to the available Federal money, at the end of 5 years we can be assured we will be asked for more money rather than be able to shut off the money.

Mr. President, we ought to know what we are going to do before we start. I cannot recall any instance before when we have been considering a measure such as the one now under consideration, when even the sponsors of the proposal, who are honest and honorable men, are as perplexed as I am, and do not know what the measure will cost. The Bureau of the Budget does not know what it will cost.

How are we going to develop some clairvoyance, to determine how generous the Board is going to be in determining how much Federal money will be paid in lieu of taxes? After the appointment of the board we will not know. After confirmation of the nominations we will not know. Once we find out what the cost will be, it will not make any difference, because we are asked to give this Board supreme power.

I note that some associates of mine on the Committee on Appropriations are present in the Chamber. There is plenty of room left for more Senators, but I am glad to see them present.

Mr. President, I point out that members of the Committee on Appropriations are normally pretty jealous of their responsibilities, and face up to their responsibilities pretty seriously, be they Republicans or Democrats.

If we vote to pass this proposed legislation we vote to vacate permanently our responsibility and our authority in this whole area of expenditures. We shall never vote again on how much will be spent. Some board downtown will determine how much money is to be spent, and the Congress will never have a chance to OK it, to deny it, to increase it or to reduce it.

If the chief proponents of the bill have their way, they will take away the opportunity of the courts to review the matter. This is to be a board which

will have as much authority, it seems to me, in our great democracy, as any totalitarian oligarchy which could be established in any totalitarian country in the world.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator referred to the fact that S. 910 was introduced by 35 Members of this body. However, is it not true that the bill, as reported by the committee to which the bill was referred, is a complete substitute, with none of the bill continued as it was originally introduced?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; the Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY rose.

Mr. MUNDT. I will yield in a moment to the Senator from Minnesota, a tired gentleman who suddenly became activated.

I must say, while the bill is an entire substitute, it has not been changed materially.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was not going to interrupt while the Senator from South Dakota was simply giving his personal opinions, but when a question of fact comes up it should be answered factually.

The substitute was written for the purpose of taking into consideration three or four committee amendments which limited the bill rather than expanded the bill. In no way does the substitute get away from the fundamental purposes or objectives which were laid down in the original bill. I appreciate the fact that the Senator from South Dakota has stated that is so.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MUNDT. I will yield, but before I yield I wish to say that if I were someone who had put his name on the bill before all of the facts had become available, and really wanted to be of service to my folks back home in this connection, I think I could in good conscience vote for the amendment in the nature of a substitute, because it seeks to achieve the same objective.

After all, those Senators who initially introduced the bill and brought it to the floor in 1956, many of whom are the same Senators whose names appear on the bill now, did so before the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, which has entirely altered the arithmetic, the conditions and the potentialities of this proposed legislation.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The argument has further been made that the bill deals with three inconsequential instances in which payments will be made in lieu of taxes, and that the bill is only temporary in its application, for a period of 5 years.

I wish to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question in this regard. In the minority views the Senator stated:

> Once started, the pressure would all be for the almost endless expansion of this concept of Federal payments to local communities with similar conditions or to other communities with different problems of like intensity and need.

How does the Senator from South Dakota envision that the inconsequential provisions now contained in the bill will be expanded in the future?

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate the Senator's question. I should like to first call as my witness the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], who, in the course of his remarks a few minutes ago, gave me a text on this subject were I disposed to preach a sermon. The Senator said—and I wrote it down as he spoke:

> This is not perfect legislation, but it opens the door.

It opens the door. It opens the door to other measures of this type. What are they going to be? I will tell Senators. Every community in America which happens to have a Federal installation which was acquired prior to June 30, 1950, will come to Congress before the ink is dry on the legislation. Any Senator or Representative who is worth his salt is going to have to vote to start the program with the beginning of America. We cannot justify having two tax schedules in America, one for communities with installations taken over since June 30, 1950, and one for communities with installations dating before that time. No Senator could go home to face his people and say, "I thought it was all right to take care of the more recent acquisitions, but we are going to do nothing for you people who have had the installations for a long period of time."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], who joined me in writing the minority views 4 years ago, used a good phrase. I wish to tell Senators what was said. The Senator used a very good analogy. He said:

> This is a philosophy I cannot accept.

The Senator was talking about two standards of morality; first, payments in lieu of taxes for communities with new Federal installations; and, second, extra tax burdens for communities with old Federal installations.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] said, as appears in volume 102, part 11, page 15080 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 27, 1956:

> This is a philosophy I cannot accept. This is a philosophy that if a man has been blind for some time he is accustomed to his blindness and therefore should not be helped to regain his sight.

I think that is pertinent, Mr. President. Senators ask, Where are these pressures going to arise for extending the $1 billion to $2 billion, or nobody knows how much? If we start picking up the tax bill for post offices and the tax bill for Federal installations and factories, we are going to have to pick up the tax bills also for the rural people of America, sooner or later. The people on the farms and ranches of America are going to say, "Why do you not pay taxes for the Indian reservations? Why do you not pay taxes for these great reservoirs which inundate hundreds of thousands of acres, when that land is the best farmland, the rich bottom land of America? Why do you not make payments in lieu of taxes for the grazing units? Why do you not make payments in lieu of taxes to help communities to eradicate the weeds along the highways which pass the great Federal installations of America?"

What will be done about the Federal forests? What will be done about the parks? Where will we stop, Mr. President? Where are the pressures going to arise They will come from the taxpayers who will rightfully feel aggrieved because, under the proposed legislation, they will be compelled to pay more taxes so that some others can receive benefits in the form of payments in lieu of taxes.

Perhaps this is what America wants. Perhaps we want all of the taxes to be paid by Uncle Sam. I submit that before we start out on a starry-eyed adventure of this kind we at least ought to have a study by competent fiscal experts in America. We ought to have a bill before us which deals equitably with the different classes and varieties of people, and the different types and sizes of cities, and we ought to discuss it, Mr. President, in the presence of more Senators than would be required for a jury in a county courthouse in South Dakota, when there is an investigation as to whether some man should be put in jail for drunken driving.

This is serious business. This proposal could change the whole character of American fiscal history. I see some of our Southern friends present. I can remember the glorious day of the South when they made a determined fight for the rights of States. Do those Senators wish to nullify, scrap, and scuttle forever any concept of the rights of States? By enacting the proposed legislation, the taxpaying and tax-returning function of the Government would be placed in the hands of the Federal Government, and the function of the States would be reduced to a ceremonial function of no consequence, because ultimately the hand which pays the taxes will control the way in which the moneys of America are spent. Short of bankruptcy, we can do no less.

Mr. President, I come to my second objection. I have discussed the fact that this is a blind flight into outer space financially. I wish to emphasize the discriminatory features, as between communities which acquired Federal properties before June 1950, and those which have acquired them later. I point out to my good friends from California, who are under the illusion that the great San Diego Air Base is going to come within the blanket of payments made available here, that such is not the case because it was created and installed a long time before 1950.

Mr. President, I believe we ought to treat like circumstances with like remedies when they are caused by identical activities of the Government. There is no significance in a calendar date which may be inserted to discriminate among people and among taxpayers and among communities. I point out that under the proposed legislation our farmers would be deeply affected. How many Senators stood on the floor today and said "Hur-

rah for the farmer. Hurrah for REA. Hurrah for RTA. How glad we are that 25 years ago America did something for the farmers." What a birthday present for the American farmer. What a birthday present if on the 25th anniversary of that wonderful development called REA we now tell the farmer, "We are coming at you with a new concept of taxes, and we are going to make payments in lieu of taxes to urban and suburban areas for industrial and commercial purposes, but we are not going to make any of these fees available for Federal grazing lands. We are not going to make them available for game refuges or Indian reservations."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the able Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator knows very well there are shared revenues on Federal forests. The Senator knows there are leases on Federal grazing lands on which the Federal Government makes money. Why does not the Senator speak more accurately on that subject?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator may know that in committee yesterday, although he was not there, though I know his heart was there——

Mr. HUMPHREY. My heart was there.

Mr. MUNDT. Yesterday when the Senator was understandably absent we renewed for the third or fourth time consideration of a bill for payments in lieu of taxes which would be available for GSA properties all over the country, industrial or otherwise, but such proposed legislation would not contain any discriminating features. The proposed legislation would deal only with purchases of property on which taxes were formerly paid and which were taken off the tax roll and made available. This standard legislation has been in operation for about 6 years and costs us, on the average, $3,300,000 a year. It is a quid pro quo for what the Senator is talking about so far as concerns forests, Indian reservations, and public grazing lands, some of which are located in the wonderful State of Minnesota, as well as in the State of South Dakota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has just said that under the proposed legislation, with respect to GSA properties on which taxes were formerly paid and which were taken over by the Federal Government, there would be a payment in lieu of taxes. Is that correct?

Mr. MUNDT. No. I said we had passed legislation which dealt with the problem, meeting it for 6 or 7 years, giving us time to make the kind of study required to determine whether or not anything additional is needed. That is something quite different from the multi-hundred-million-dollar proposition proposed in S. 910.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We shall come to that a little later, but what the Senator is really saying is that in legislation relating to General Services Administration property, payments in lieu of taxes are required. That is what the Senator wants?

Mr. MUNDT. No. This is a bill which operates under sharp restrictions and under an altogether different concept.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator explain this to his slow-learning friend?

Mr. MUNDT. It has no connection with S. 910, but it does provide the type of situation which is operative now with respect to certain national forests and certain operations of that type.

Mr. President, turning to the third reason why I feel the proposed legislation should not be enacted at this time, a careful study of the situation should be made.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand that an installation of an identical type and used for an identical purpose will be dealt with differently on the basis of the date of June 30, 1950.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is exactly correct. In one case the community will receive payments in lieu of taxes. In the other case the community will receive an extra large tax bill because it has to help to pay the taxes which community A receives, and nothing more.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would mean that if there were two communities in Ohio with identical property holdings by the Federal Government, community A having had the installation on January 1, 1950, and community B having property acquired by the Federal Government on July 1, 1950, they would be dealt with differently?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct. There would be so much difference that the proposal would take away from one and give to another. That is about as great a difference as is possible.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Community A, the property of which was used before June 30, 1950, would get no payment in lieu of taxes, but would have to pay money to the Federal Government so that community B could receive the tax benefit.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So the first community would be benefited; the other would be burdened to provide the money to pay the first one the benefit.

Mr. MUNDT. That is precisely one of the reasons why the Budget Bureau and those who have studied this problem look at it with great concern, and why I have suggested in my amendment in the nature of a substitute that a board of fiscal experts devise some program so that if it were considered desirable to help community A, community B would be treated precisely the same. If anything, it seems to me, the community with the older establishment is more likely to need relief than the one with the newer facility, but I would be equally against the proposed legislation if the discrimination were reversed. I do not think we can afford in America to start discriminating against communities on the basis of some date picked out of the sky. Where the date was obtained, I do not know. Any other date would have served just as well; but the particular date was selected as the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] said, as a part of the technique to open the door. The door must be opened somewhere. This proposal would open it and, of course, the rest would come rushing in.

Third, the proposed legislation fails entirely to provide for congressional review. I do not know of any other place where such legislation could be found. A project is authorized in the development of public works by the Committee on Public Works, of which the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], is a member, and after that committee gets through with the measure it is sent over to the Appropriations Committee, which is headed by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. After the Committee on Appropriations gets through with it, it goes to the Senate. It goes through a similar process in the House of Representatives, and then it is probably considered in the conference committee.

What would happen under this proposal? This is an open-end authorization bill which says at the end of it, "Goodby, my dollar, goodby," because never again would Congress have an opportunity to act upon it. Never again does it come back. The proponents mention in the proposed legislation time after time—and they would use italics if they could—that the action of the proposed Board is to be final. If it does a good job, that is wonderful. If it wrecks the economy of the country, that is too bad. If there is discrimination among people forever, nothing can be done about it. The proposed legislation would turn them loose and let them function as third appropriation body of the U.S. Congress. No one in Congress would have a chance to stop any excesses in which they might engage. If the Appropriations Committee acts badly, we can change its action. We can reduce the appropriation. The President can veto the appropriation bill. But if the same kind of human error or extravagance should creep into the operations of the proposed Board, no one could do anything about it.

The General Accounting Office can check on the accuracy of the facts, but not with respect to policy. They can check only with regard to the bookkeeping that is involved.

The sponsors did insert a provision in the bill, while the bill was under consideration in committee, for a court review, so that the provisions in the bill, if enacted, will be in conformity with the law. However, two of the most ardent supporters of the bill have said on the floor of the Senate today that that looks as though they were holding back the hand of the Board too much. They said, "We will take away the court review provision. We will not do it here. We do not like to discuss that point very much. We will slip it through without a rollcall vote, and then we will try to knock out the court review provision in the other body."

My further objection is that this is dangerous legislation in the extreme. We are asked to engage in a carnival of

back-door spending so broad that we will not only shovel the money out the back door, but we will knock out the whole back end of the Treasury Building, and let the money roll out. Nobody will be responsible for an accounting of the expenditures as the spending goes on.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand that the bill provides for a five-man Board, the members of which are to be appointed by the President. Is that correct?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would the Board have discretionary power to determine what payment shall be made in lieu of taxes?

Mr. MUNDT. It would have complete, total, and final power. The Board would make the decision. That procedure would be unlike the procedure followed by the Indian Commission, which is set up along the same general lines, but of course the Indian Act treats Indians differently. The Indian Commission must make recommendations to Congress, and Congress ultimately passes on the recommendations. But with respect to the pending bill—this is it. The Board hands out the money.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Are any standards set up in the bill to limit the discretionary power of the Board in fixing the amount that will be paid?

Mr. MUNDT. I believe there are some standards set up. I wish to be fair to the sponsors. Yes; there are some standards set up, which may have some impact on the Board.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Where in the bill are the standards set up?

Mr. MUNDT. The Board has total control. There is some provision about surveys and investigations.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The bill refers to rules and regulations. However, where are the standards set up in the bill which limit the ceiling and floor within which the Board must operate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator. Some standards are fixed, although they are very vague.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is hard to fix a standard as to what a tax shall be on a given piece of property unless we know what the assessed valuation of the property is. All that the Senator from South Dakota is saying is that he does not believe the local governments ought to have the revenues to which they are entitled and which they deserve to have. The Senator is saying that Uncle Sam ought to be excluded from paying his share of local government costs. That is not going to sound very good when he gets back home.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That does not answer my question.

Mr. MUNDT. I do not want property acquired after June 30, 1950, to be treated any differently from property acquired prior to that time. I do not want the property acquired later to shoulder the cost with respect to the other property.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What the Senator from South Dakota is asking for is more study and more study. Apparently he does not know that the administration is a slow learner and has been studying this matter for some years. The present administration has been studying it for 7 years. The previous administration studied it for 13 years. The Senator from South Dakota wants a study to go on for years and years. He wants the study to go on for 5 more years. In the meantime the local governments are going to lose the revenues. I know the Senator is dedicated to education. However, I should like to say to him that education is generally helpful.

Mr. MUNDT. I must interrupt the Senator at this point to say that when he said I want a study made for an additional 5 years, the Senator from Minnesota is 500 percent wrong. My substitute provides for an interim report by March and the final report by December.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It takes more than that time to get a commission started. It required 13 months to establish the Commission on National Goals, which was suggested by the President. The Senator is asking for a few more months.

Mr. MUNDT. The procedure for appointing the commission I suggest is exactly the same as the procedure the Senator from Minnesota suggests for the establishment of his commission.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. If that commission can come into action and start getting results under one category, it can do the same in the other.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say most respectfully that the difference is in the life of the commission. The Senator wants the baby to be born and have a quiet demise. I would like to have the baby born and then have it grow up and be able to produce some results. It takes a little time for the Commission to be established and to become acquainted with the facts, and then bring the facts to the attention of Congress. The Senator knows, as well as any other Member of the Senate, that a commission established for 1 year takes some time to be appointed, and that before it can get into action it will have to have its life extended.

The Senator gave us a very exciting picture of a governmental agency going on and on. What he is talking about is the proverbial camel's nose getting under the tent flap, because it will not be too long before the whole camel is in the tent. Then it will take another shove, next year, to keep the commission going.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not sure about the point the Senator is trying to make. However, the commission I propose shall, by next June, a year from now, come up with a report and come up with proposed legislation to meet these problems on an equitable basis. The Senator, in his bill, recommends a study, which I recommend in my substitute. The major difference is that, under the Senator's bill, payments are made as the study goes on.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The proposal before us requires that in 2 years a report shall be made to Congress. That is provided in the bill as reported by the committee. The Senator's substitute provides that procedure within 1 year. That is the first difference.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The committee bill provides that in the 2-year period of time the Board will actually get some experience. It will not deal with theory only.

Mr. President, we have had 20 years of theoretical studies. We have spent more than $400,000 for a theoretical study by the Intergovernmental Relations Commission. What we need now is to deal practically with problems in communities which have Federal property located within their confines, and to have those communities present to the Board the facts in these cases. The local taxing authority would come before the Board, with the burden of proof on the local taxing authority to prove to the Board that it has a valid case and that the property in question is entitled to a payment in lieu of taxes. The Board would review that case and come up with a recommendation.

The Senator wants to make some more studies and employ a great many people who would look into these matters in this theoretical atmosphere, and then come up with some more recommendations. I say to the Senator that we have enough conclusions now to fill this Chamber. What we need is experience.

The bill reported by the committee would limit payments in lieu of taxes to three categories over and above what we have now. These categories are spelled out in terms of real property, commercial and industrial property, and special assessments. It seems to me that if we are to get any experience, it must be obtained through the provisions of our bill. Let us suppose a piece of Federal property is located on a street on which there will be provided gutter and curbing, with a special assessment to be made on the properties located on that street. Such a special assessment would be made, for example, on the grocery store located next door to the Federal installation, and on the hardware store located on the other side of the Federal installation. There is no reason why the Federal Government should not pay its share of the assessment for gutter and curbing.

What the Senator is saying is that the little hardware store and the little grocery store should pay for the Federal Government's share of the assessment.

The Senator from South Dakota is saying that the Federal Government should get a free ride at the expense of the other property owners. I point out to the Senator that 85 percent of the people in this country live in metropolitan centers. I am for the farmer, just as much as my friend from South Dakota is for the farmer. However, 87 percent of our population lives in urban centers. Those people are entitled to fair treatment just as much as the people in rural areas are entitled to fair treatment. The committee bill before us does not deny the people in rural areas fair treatment. The Sena-

tor's substitute amendment asks for more study. The committee bill provides for action as well as more study.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator has asked me several things. I cannot very well answer him until I get the floor back from him.

What the Senator from South Dakota is saying is that if there is justification for taking care of the problem of the Federal installation between the hardware store and the grocery store, in a city in America, it is no more logical to ask that we also take care of a situation in rural America where there is an assessment for road construction and weed eradication and some other identical problems.

In one case we say, "Let us study the farmer's problem;" in the other we say, "We are going to get some experience by paying out cash to rural areas." It will be awfully costly experience, Mr. President.

The poor American taxpayer will really have an experience when he starts out on this new project. He cannot back up. The Board can, but he cannot.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator indicating that the people back home, who pay property taxes, which constitute the heaviest load of taxation, are not taxpayers? There is no one who escapes paying taxes. Anyone who smokes a pack of Bull Durham or who buys a Cadillac is paying a tax. Whether he buys a bottle of vodka or a bottle of bourbon, he pays taxes.

The question is whether the man who carries the tax load on real property in his hometown will have to carry the load of the Federal Government, or whether the Federal Government, which can tax corporations, which can secure revenue from tariffs, which can impose high income taxes on those who can most afford to pay them, will be required to pay.

Consider the big town, or the small city, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak. Is the Senator from South Dakota saying that Sioux Falls is so big that it can impose taxes for gutters and curbs without requiring the Federal Government to pay its share? Is he saying that Du Pont, General Motors, or General Dynamics, who pay their fair share of the Federal revenues on a corporate income tax basis, are to get better treatment than John Doe for gutters and sidewalks, and that John Doe will have to pay an extra load of tax for the Federal installation? I am surprised. I did not know the Senator from South Dakota did not think more of his constituents than that.

It seems to me that if there is a Federal installation on the street next to the hotel in Sioux Falls, the Federal Government ought to be asked to pay its fair share of the cost of the municipal government.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator from Minnesota will take his seat and restrain his surprise, I will try to answer him.

I am very definitely concerned about the taxpayers of America. Where the Senator gets any idea that I think people do not pay taxes, I do not know. I am trying to place some kind of control on taxation by experience, by saying that there should be some scientific study or research on this proposal before we launch ourselves on a ride from which we cannot turn back, because once we have started to act, the acts in which we engage now will create precedents from which we cannot extricate ourselves.

So far as the people of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., are concerned, I hope the legislative record will show that in the opinion of the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from South Dakota, Sioux Falls is an urban community.

I am a little skeptical. Its population is about 65,000.

If a curb is put in front of the post office there the city might well earn a few Federal dollars as payments in lieu of taxes but the citizens of Sioux Falls would have their income taxes increased much more or continued much longer to compensate the Federal Treasury for the great program of Federal payments, generally established by S. 910.

Insofar as other payments are concerned on Federal installations, the favored citizens who would receive them from June, 1950, I am sure would so load up extra taxes for a city like Sioux Falls they would never be able to figure much of a dividend from the hundred dollars or so they might get from putting a curb in front of a post office.

Besides, there are tremendous areas of public lands and country areas which are, by definition excluded from being included as suburban areas or urban areas and so would reap no benefits from this discriminatory legislation.

In my opinion, it is necessary to have a commission study and consider the needs of the country as a whole, in order to meet these problems equitably. This is very real and understandable. When the Senate debated this matter in 1956, I suggested that the matter be submitted to a board or commission for survey, study, and research. I suggest now that with the additional information, and with the whole new argument of the Supreme Court decision, after study for a year a board could come up with suggestions which would be equitable. It will then be possible to treat all cities and areas alike.

I should like to have some of the proponents of the bill give me a better reason, than the mere fact that it is a key to "opening the door," as to why they selected 1950 as the beginning of the world, so far as taxes are concerned, and that those with problems which developed since then can charge them off to the Federal Government, but those who had them earlier simply have to dig a little deeper into their pockets to pick up more taxes to pay the favored few. I cannot fathom any logical reason for that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My observation is that the bill authorizes the making of certain Federal contributions to local governments in lieu of the payment of, first, special assessments levied after the effective date of the proposed act upon real property situated in urban and suburban areas to defray the cost of local public improvements.

The definition of "public improvements" as contained in the bill covers not merely gutters and sidewalks in front of Federal properties, but "any street, road, bridge, sewer, water distribution system, drainage project, or other public improvement undertaken by or on behalf of any tax authority." That includes quite a gamut of activities.

In Ohio, water distribution systems are financed by a general tax; but there are States in which they are financed by special assessments. My query is, how will such assessments be levied on the basis of the tax value of the Federal property, or how?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will give the Senator the answer.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have the floor. I want to answer the Senator's question.

So far as I can see, this is one of the determinations which would be left up to the Board. It is much more appropriate that action be taken as a result of a study in legislative language, because I am certain the Senator from Ohio and I both agree that when we can have government by law instead of government by men, we operate on sounder grounds.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not want a Board created, regardless of how beneficent and humane we may expect them to be, without a limitation on its power, fixed by Congress. I do not want in existence a Board which would be subjected to the pressure of mayors, county commissioners, governors, Members of the House of Representatives, or Members of the Senate, in recognizing the divisions which will be made by the various local communities.

Mr. MUNDT. That is exactly what we will get with a Board which will not be subject to congressional review. No diminishment or expansion of funds can be enacted. There will be a complete abrogation of what I consider to be the constitutional responsibility of Congress to control acts of appropriation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the record ought to be made clear that any special assessment which has to be paid by the Federal Government as a result of the action of the Board must first be decided by the Board to be a special assessment which is in no way discriminatory against the Federal Goverment. In other words, if a special assessment is made on Mr. Smith's restaurant, Mr. Jones' hardware store, and Mr. Henry's garage, it will be on Mr. U.S.A.'s property at the same rate and with the same type of evaluation and same assessment being used at the local level. The bill specifically states that special assessments must also be levied on real property owned by taxable persons. If it is levied only on the Federal property, there would be no payments.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is speaking about paragraph 1, is he?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree.

Mr. HUMPHREY. When it comes to an assessment, there is to be no discrimination in favor of or against the Federal Government. The Federal Government will be treated the same as will be all other persons for purposes of special assessments. I think that point should be made clear; otherwise, the record seems to be distorted.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; that is clear. But that, in itself, is not a very good safeguard, because if the Federal building occupied two-thirds of the block, the tax or the assessment for curbing or for other improvements in that block could be imposed at a rather high level.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But I do not think the local government would be that dishonest. In any event, if the assessment were not made on the property of taxable persons, there would be no Federal liability.

Mr. MUNDT. I do not think so, either. But that would be possible.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the local board or assessing authority would do an honorable job.

But my point is that there could not be discrimination. The rates would have to be equal, and the assessment process for both Federal properties and taxable properties would have to be the same.

Mr. MUNDT. Furthermore, the pending bill constitutes a finding by Congress that hardships exist in certain situations, but without any evidence to support such findings, and without giving consideration to variations in regard to the types of construction and the types of area, whether urban or rural. Furthermore, the cutoff date of June 30, 1950, would be applied. The bill does not contain any clear definition of a situation which would create hardship. The result would be that although some communities would become prosperous as a result of the Federal installations, and other communities would find that hardships would be created for them, because of the Federal installations, the Board would make the final determination as to both of them. The Board might say, as to one of them, "This Federal installation does not cause you a hardship, so you will not receive any of these payments." And the Board might say to the other community, "This Federal installation does result in hardship to you, and you will receive the maximum payments."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUSK in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Consider the situation of a Louisiana community in which a Federal installation had been established, but later was closed, but where the local people had, during the operation of that Federal installation, bonded themselves up to the very limit, in order to provide schools for the children of the servicemen who lived there during the operation of the Federal installation, which later was closed. In that event, the local community would be head over heels in debt; but if the base had been established a long time ago—before the cutoff date provided by the bill—then, in the event the base were later closed, that heavily bonded community would have no recourse under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. MUNDT. The determination would be made on the basis of the cutoff date of June 30, 1950, of course.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the case of a special assessment for improvement of the community or for the construction of the necessary facilities, the Federal Government would be required, by means of the bill, to make payments in accordance with the assessment standards provided for the entire assessment district.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But what would be the situation in the case of a community with a large bonded indebtedness?

Mr. MUNDT. I think the Senator from Minnesota and I agree that the distinction would not apply as to it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But if the base were closed, the Federal Government would still own the property; but, because of the closing of the base, business activities would be greatly curtailed, and no doubt on the main street of that town there would be more closed stores than open stores, and there would be great economic hardship in the town. My guess is that in such circumstances, the people of the town would be delighted to pay the taxes, if only the base were reopened.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No doubt.

Mr. MUNDT. As to such communities, I think only the study provisions of the pending bill would apply.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But such communities would not, under the provisions of the bill, receive such financial assistance, although communities in which such bases continued to operate would receive the payments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Under the bill, the taxing authority in the parish or the community or the county would be able to appear before the Federal Board and show that in that community there was a Federal installation which resulted in certain costs to the local government, in order for it to provide the public services the Federal installation required. Then it would be able to ask the Board to decide that, in view of the presence of the Federal installation, a payment in lieu of taxes should be made to that community. At least, the taxing authority would have the right to ask the Board to provide redress for its grievance; in other words, the community could ask for a payment in lieu of taxes.

But in the present situation no such right exists.

Furthermore, the bill would permit the Board to make a thorough study of such situations, which are encountered by many communities. In many communities, air bases, Army camps, and military installations for both production and for recruiting are being closed. This bill will be the first means of having a really conscientious and intelligent and thorough review made of what should be the Federal policy—first, as to individual cases, and, second, as to the general field.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me point out that if the pending bill is enacted, such Louisiana communities would have to pay their proportionate share of new taxes to help communities which would directly benefit by means of the cash payments which would be provided under the provisions of the bill, while the Board was studying the question of what program should be applied to those Louisiana communities.

My amendment calls for the making of the study by June 30 of next year; and that study would be made of the very problem the Senator from Louisiana has mentioned.

But under the provisions of the pending bill, such communities would only have the benefit of a study, whereas the more fortunate communities—those in which the Federal installations continued to be operated—would be able to receive payments in lieu of taxes, subject only to the cutoff date of June 30, 1950.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But the bill proceeds on the assumption that new Federal facilities, which bring in large payrolls, will cause great hardships. Actually, I find that, in general, such communities are very fortunate, and in many cases the Federal installations bring to those communities more benefits than the ones which would come from what we regard as industrial areas.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But, by contrast, the communities in which Federal installations have been closed have been practically destroyed, insofar as new business is concerned; yet they would have made large investments in order to provide the necessary facilities in connection with the Federal installations. The real hardships come—in short—on the communities in which the Federal installations have been closed, not on the communities in which new Federal installations have been developed and are in operation.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me point out that the reason why I am waging this rather lonely contest—and of course it is difficult to recruit a large army to shoot Santa Claus—is that I recognize that many real problems in this area are involved. I am primarily motivated by the realization that, under the pending bill, this problem would begin to be dealt with on the basis of a double standard, under which some communities would receive cash payments; but other communities would only be subject to the making of additional studies; and a third group would be subjected to whatever interpretations a Board—not yet chosen—might make. Of course, none of us can predict what those interpretations might be. Such a measure would be far less satisfactory than one which would result in the establishment of a board of fiscal experts—as I suggest—under a mandate to report to Congress its proposals for meeting these problems, and to do so by next June, so the Congress could pass on the problem at that session, and could bring about the enactment of a really effective piece of legislation fair alike to all concerned.

So far as timing is concerned, certainly the proper time to solve the problem is before the payments begin; the time to perfect the proposed legislation is before it is passed and placed in operation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that as regards the installations to which the Senator from Louisiana has referred, no cutoff date will be applied, for they are in category 1 or category 2 of the bill. The cutoff date will be applied only to factories, or other industrial or commercial-type properties built by the Federal Government, and not now subject to payments in lieu of taxes. The only purpose of the provision for the cutoff date of June 30, 1950—and of course any cutoff date can be provided, as Congress may decide—is to save money for the Federal Treasury. June 30, 1950, marked the beginning of large-scale acquisition of industrial or commercial-type property by the Federal Government at the beginning of the Korean war. But if the Congress so prefers, a date in 1900, or even a date in 1800, could be used. My only purpose in preferring the date set forth in the bill is to save the Federal Government a great deal of money. The use of an earlier cutoff date would cost the Government a great deal more money.

Category 3 relates to commercial and industrial facilities, not to what we refer to as air bases, military installations, training schools, or the host of other activities, including navy yards, and so forth.

For instance, the Federal Government built the Twin Cities Arsenal, at Minneapolis-St. Paul. When the Federal Government owns the property, and builds the facilities, and then leases them to private concerns, they would be subject to payments in lieu of taxes if the taxing authority is able to prove its case. That is the difference.

But in Minnesota there is also Fort Snelling, located on a piece of real property which would not be affected in any way by the cutoff date provided in this measure. The taxing authority would not be able to make its application in regard to Fort Snelling, which was established in 1821, or to request payments in lieu of taxes, except if a special assessment is involved.

The only difference between the position of the Senator from South Dakota and my position relates to the limited payment provisions. The study portions of the bill and the commission which will make the studies are the same. In those respects, the pending bill and the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota are practically identical.

In fact, we took the suggestions of the Senator from South Dakota with respect to the study and investigatory powers of the Board. The Senator from South Dakota wants the Board to report back in 1 year. The Senator from Minnesota and the committee say it should be done within 2 years. We say it shall report twice a year to the President and the Congress with respect to the progress of the Board.

Mr. MUNDT. Also the proposal of the Senator from South Dakota does not provide for any payments during that period.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The difference is that, during the 2-year study period, the pending bill also gives the Board some experience in dealing with the practical situation of making payments in lieu of taxes on limited categories, which was a recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget in 1956.

Mr. MUNDT. Since withdrawn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Bureau of the Budget recommended it in 1956.

Mr. MUNDT. It has been since withdrawn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Bureau of the Budget, with Mr. Stans, says there are some court cases which alter the situation—which is not the fact. The Supreme Court case involving the Michigan statute merely held that where a State statute requires payments of a use tax by a lessee or contractor or permittee, the Federal Government shall pay them; that it is a private operation. That simply means that the Federal Government, in its lease arrangement, will add that much more to the rent it charges the contractor, and it will merely turn that back.

With respect to the study sections of the two proposals, they are practically identical. The difference between the two versions is that in the 2-year period the Senator from Minnesota and the majority of the committee say this five-man Board, with very severe limitation as to its jurisdiction, will be able to make token payments if the taxing authority of a State or local community can prove its case, within the limitations, under the proposed statute.

For example, if a taxing authority can prove that a hardware store is being charged $200 as its assessment for a new street, water system, or sewage plant, and there happens to be alongside of the store a Federal building that is not paying any assessment, that Federal building will be assessed for that special assessment on the same basis as the hardware store, on a nondiscriminatory basis.

We are going to get some experience in that field. The tax is levied in certain categories. The Atomic Energy Commission handles the situation under a special law. The General Services Administration already does it under a special law on some types of property. The TVA already does it under a special law. But let us say there is a commercial building and a Federal court building in a certain town and a new street is being put in, not just in front of the Federal building, but on either side of it, for a mile. The Federal building pays nothing. All the merchants on the street pay for the section in front of them. Under the pending bill, the taxing authority can go before the board and claim from the Federal Government its share of the special assessment.

In the second place, if the Federal Government leases property to a taxable person the taxing authorities may make claims for the amount of tax which would be payable if such property were owned by a taxable person. Also, the bill provides that the Federal Government shall be liable, if the taxing authority can make its case, for payment in lieu of taxes on the Federal commercial and industrial properties acquired after June 30, 1950.

The argument made against this proposal is that 1950 is a bad cutoff year. Any year is a bad cutoff year. We could go back to 1900, and the argument could be made that buildings were in existence before that year. The point is that we have to start somewhere. The committee does not say the bill is perfect. It is an experiment.

Congress can stop the operation of this law the first year. Agencies would have to come before the Appropriations Committees and show the amounts that would be required to make these payments in lieu of taxes.

Mr. President, this is not an unusual procedure. The Federal Court of Claims levies on people of the United States for claims. What we are trying to do is get both a study and a decision. This is not the greatest issue before the country, but many local governments are facing hardships in obtaining revenues. This bill provides for a complete, comprehensive study and report, due in not more than 2 years.

The bill, as reported from the committee, provides that the General Accounting Office shall review every single payment. The bill as reported by the committee provides for judicial review. The majority of the committee wanted that review available.

Mr. MUNDT. Does the Senator from Minnesota favor that provision?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota voted against it, but I am chairman of a subcommittee, and I am here defending the bill as reported by the committee. I have taken the bill reported from the committee as is, and I am responsible for it. That is the way we legislate here.

I say we need this experience. We have had 20 years of study. We have had the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations study the matter. The Bureau of the Budget worked with me and other Senators for many weeks and months on the proposal now before the Senate, which is practically identical with the Bureau of the Budget proposal of 1956, and which was worked out by the Committee on Government Operations. We now come before the Senate asking for some results.

I must say it appears to me that Congress is not going to lose control of the matter. In the first place, all Congress would have to do would be to repeal the law. In the second place, money must be appropriated, and Congress does not have to appropriate it if it does not think the board is doing its job. In the third place, the board must report to the Congress and the President twice a year. I think we have provided for a good check over the board.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall yield in just a moment. I wish to reply to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, the legislation will not expire in 2 years. The measure is a 5-year bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the report must be made within 2 years.

Mr. MUNDT. The study report must be made in 2 years, but the payments go on for 5 years. It is a 5-year payment authorization, and a 2-year study authorization, as against a 1-year study authorization and a no-payment proposal made by the Senator from South Dakota.

The Senator from Minnesota has said these are token payments. He has said that the payments to be made in those 2 years are token payments. If these are to be called token payments, I say they are going to be the biggest token the eye of man has ever looked at since the King of Egypt looked at the pyramids and said, "What a wonderful token the people have given me."

There is no limitation on amount. It is a question of the dexterity and the energy displayed by the local groups making their representations in this area on the three bases properly defined by the Senator from Minnesota, and those that happen to have, luckily, a calendar date which is of significance to them.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; I shall yield as soon as I finish my comment in reply to what was said by the Senator from Minnesota. I shall yield first to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The Senator from Minnesota has said there is a check on this program. It does not go back to the Appropriations Committees or to the Congress. I am talking about the money.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Every item must be budgeted, and all the agencies must appear before the Committee on Appropriations with a budget request.

Mr. MUNDT. Let us see how it operates.

I read from page 37 of the bill, subsection (e).

(e) Upon the certification by the Board to any Federal agency of any final order of the Board awarding to any tax authority any payment under this Act with respect to any Federal property controlled by such agency, such agency shall pay to such tax authority the amount specified in such order.

True, the Congress can come along and abolish the agency; but the agency just lives within the law. The law tells the agency to do that. The law provides for the establishment of the Board. Is there any Member of Congress who is going to cut off the head of any agency which just does that which Congress says is established by the law? There is no screen, no veto, and no modification. Congress will have no control. The payment will be made by authority of law.

I now yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. That is a question which I was going to ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota to answer, as to exactly how this would work. I should like to know whether the money to be appropriated would be predicated upon claims to be decided, or whether the money would be appropriated according to claims already decided. I would understand there would be an obligation on the part of the Congress, inasmuch as the Congress passes the laws, to honor the claims once the Board decided them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. At the same time the item is budgeted and the Appropriation Committee would be entitled to review the entire matter. It is exactly like a Court of Claims appropriation.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Court of Claims places a claim before the Congress of the United States.

Mr. PASTORE. I am not questioning the procedure at all.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is shown on page 41, in section 12, under "Appropriations."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I now yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I was interested in the argument of the Senator from South Dakota to the effect that the sky is the limit on the expenditures the bill would permit.

I wonder if the Senator places any reliance at all on the estimates made by the Bureau of the Budget, which are shown at page 23 of the committee report? It is there stated that the payments for special assessments would probably range between $200,000 and $300,000 a year; that the payments for property in the custody of private persons under lease, contract, or permit might amount to several million dollars a year; and that the payments on commercial or industrial property might run between $10 million and $20 million annually.

I realize it is stated later that these figures are more in the nature of a guess than a reliable estimate, but do those figures not give to the Senate some general idea as to how much the bill would cost?

Mr. MUNDT. I think it depends a little bit upon how one defines the word "general." The guess is stated. It is stated frankly as a guess.

We can be pretty accurate on the small, token aspects of the bill, the payments for gutters and sewers, and so forth. As to the rest of it, nobody knows where it will lead.

I have seen estimates and have discussed estimates as high as $330 million for the first year. Some are even higher. I certainly do not toss that figure out as anything other than a guess.

Mr. CLARK. Even if the guess or the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget were doubled, the annual cost of the bill would not exceed $50 million, would it?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. If the costs were doubled it could exceed that figure. However, the figure could be quadrupled, or could be multiplied tenfold. How can anybody guess—the Bureau of the Budget or anyone else—what will be the thinking of the men whose decisions are to be final, or what will be the energy and the activity of the communities and the individuals who seek to benefit?

I should like to finish out the discussion of the appropriation part of the measure, if I may. This should be in the RECORD.

On page 41 we find section 12 of the bill. Let us see how completely the Appropriations Committee is excluded, the Constitution of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding, from having any control over what is done with the taxpayers' money:

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Board, and to each Federal agency controlling any Federal property, such sums as may be required for the discharge of its duties and obligations under this Act. Any sum determined by the Board to be payable under section 8 of this Act by any Federal agency shall be considered to be a necessary expense of such agency.

I can well imagine a situation which would arise when some community made its case and the Board gave an award, when there was insistence upon a payment from the agency. The legitimate and normal operations of the agency would have to be slowed down to half gear, or the agency would have to come to the Congress with a supplemental appropriation request, because, as I envision the language, it puts a first claim on the agency for first use of money which happens to be available for general purposes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to direct a question to the chairman of the subcommittee and to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. That is all right with me, if it is all right with the Senator from Minnesota. We are proceeding on an informal basis, trying to get the facts.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I invite attention to category 1, page 20 of the bill. The language deals with special assessments levied to finance local public improvements.

Local governments of Ohio finance some of their public improvements through general taxation. There are local governments in other States which finance certain public improvements, such as water distribution plants and sewage disposal plants, through special assessments.

My question is this: Is it not a fact that under the language contained in category 1 those States which finance through special assessments will receive the benefit of this provision and those States which finance through general taxation will not receive the benefits of it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator like to have me answer the question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say to the Senator from Ohio, the language is quite specific. One of the reasons why the language is specific is the desire to limit the initial effect of the bill and to hold down the cost, while we get some experience.

The language relates to special assessments; there is no doubt about it. It is

also stated that the whole subject shall be studied. It is entirely probable that we may, after a year, or 6 months—and not later than 2 years—have a recommendation to curtail the authority or to broaden it. We wished to get the program started. There is categorical evidence throughout the United States that the communities, the cities, the towns and villages have suffered because of Federal installations where no special assessments are being paid by the Federal Government. Because of the evidence, we tried to remedy the situation. We do not seek to take care of everything. Social security does not cover everybody, but we do not stop the program because of that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is not an answer to my question, I respectfully say to the Senator from Minnesota.

My question is, the State which finances through special assessments will receive the benefit of this provision?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And a State such as Ohio which finances through taxation will not receive the benefit of the provision. If that is a fact, then the proposal will not operate uniformly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What I am trying to say to the Senator is that this is an initial attempt to try to find out how we can best provide for payments in lieu of taxes. We have limited it to the one category, to special assessments. Every State has special assessments. Whether all States finance all of their projects with special assessments I do not know, but I do know, I will say to the Senator, as a result of the work of the Intergovernmental Relations Commission, that every State has special assessments.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is true. I know that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Therefore, what we are seeking to do is to take care of one area.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield further.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us assume that there is a city which is urging the construction of a Federal post office building, and that the Representatives and Senators from the State desire to have the post office building. Would the bill, in effect, provide that for the building there would have to be payment of an amount equal to taxes which would have been imposed generally, such as to finance a water system?

Mr. MUNDT. I would say "yes" to that question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If that is so, we have a paradoxical situation of people begging for an improvement and then saying, "You have to pay the taxes to put in the improvement."

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is exactly correct. The Senator is anticipating the fifth point which I will make against the adoption of S. 910 today and in favor of my substitute proposal, which provides for a careful study, which will provide us with indisputable answers to all the imponderables and questions which have been mentioned.

So far as the Senator's question is concerned, the answer has to be "yes."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. The reason the answer has to be "yes" is that if a special assessment is levied upon some real property situated in an urban or suburban area, and I think Cleveland, Ohio, would come under that classification, after the effective date of the act, if the bill is passed—and I would assume it would be after the effective date of the act—to defray the cost of public improvements, the Federal Government would have to pay its share.

I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. It is exactly as if the Senator were building a new house under an FHA mortgage guarantee. The streets must be put in. As a homeowner, the Senator would have to pay the special assessements. I have been doing that in Montgomery County.

If we build a new post office building, I assume there is some mail which must be delivered. I assume it would be a required public service. I assume it would not be simply some "boondoggling project" of the administration, to see if it could make somebody happy. I assume that the Congress is sufficiently responsible so that when it authorizes the construction of a Federal building it will be able to justify it to the people of the community.

Why should the Federal Government put up a building where there is a requirement of streets, water, and sewage and not have to pay its share of the expense? What is so sacrosanct about the Federal Government in that instance?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has answered a part of my question. The second part is this: If the public improvement, be it a sewage disposal plant or a water distribution system, is to be constructed out of general taxes, will the city be entitled to reimbursement? I put the question to both the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Minnesota. We agree on the assessment.

Mr. MUNDT. We agree on the assessment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Where in the proposed legislation are those cities to be paid for projects constructed out of their own taxes?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not think they would be.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My understanding is that the language of the bill does not specifically say they would be, but the language of the proposed legislation is such that the community would have a better break if the legislation were enacted than it has today, because the taxing authority can go to the Federal Board and say, "We believe we are being discriminated against. There is a situation in Ohio in which there are general taxes rather than special assessments. We would like to have favorable consideration."

At least a hearing is available under the proposed legislation, and it is not a hearing before someone who wants to send someone to college or enroll him in a study course. The hearing would be before someone who could give relief or make recommendations to the Congress or to the President.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to add that while a State may get a better break under the proposed legislation of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] than if nothing were done, a State would get an infinitely better break under my proposal than it would get under either the status quo or under the measure proposed by the Senator from Minnesota, and I shall explain why.

Under my proposal the situation I have described, about which we are in agreement, and which is not included in the bill, would be studied under his bill or studied under my amendment; and under my bill if the study revealed an answer which was unsatisfactory, Congress could still write the legislation and make the corrections. Under the proposal of the Senator from Minnesota whether the Board say yes or no, the findings of the Board are final insofar as the application of the city is concerned, and even Congress cannot stop it. Even the President would be powerless.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If what has been said is true, the Board, without any legal justification, might say to an applying committee, "We will give you money even though the law makes no specific provision for it." I do not believe that can be done, but if it can be done, it ought not to be done.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree, because that is going back to government by men instead of government by law.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a request for a unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield, and will listen to it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest, in the light of some earlier consideration, a unanimous-consent agreement by which the time on each side for consideration of the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] would be limited to 10 minutes on each side.

Mr. MUNDT. I did not quite understand the Senator's request.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I object. I have some questions to ask, and I have not had an opportunity to do so.

Mr. President, may I have permission to address a question to both the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is not asking me to yield the floor?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not.

Mr. President, I note in connection with the power to levy non-Federal taxes that under subsection 3, line 3, on page 21 of the bill, taxes may be levied—

(3) taxes upon Federal real property acquired after June 30, 1950, which is in the custody or control of any Federal agency for industrial or commercial use.

I note also that in the definitions of "industrial or commercial use" which are found on page 23, there are quite a number of classifications. We find one in line 15: "the generation of electrical energy." Do I correctly understand that under the proposed legislation, provided a big power dam is constructed on property acquired after the cutoff date in

1950, the Federal Government could be taxed by the State and the local units of government which have jurisdiction at that place for the value of the powerplant which was paid for entirely by Federal funds?

Mr. MUNDT. I am very happy the Senator asked that question, because this is something which has crept into the bill in the last 4 years, with respect to which the history is not very clear. I believe it should be discussed on the floor today. I hope the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] will give us his version, because I suspect if it means what it could mean, that the State of South Dakota would be permitted to tax these multimillion dollar reservoirs and generating plants and collect taxes for the hundreds of thousands of dollars of inundated acres. If so, perhaps the Senator from South Dakota would then have to quickly vacate his position in opposition and join the 35 Senators who have cosponsored the proposed legislation, because this could then become the greatest bonanza ever for South Dakota that anyone could envision.

However, I cannot believe that is the intent of the bill, because it seems to me this would run the cost into such astronomical proportions that while South Dakotans might have a temporary carnival of joy about the fact that Uncle Sam would support their State in toto. it would not last long because it would bankrupt the Treasury and we would all be broke together.

However, I should like to have the proponents of the bill explain how they interpret this language which has crept into the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator feel this would be a bonanza for a relatively flat State, such as I represent, in part, which has no facilities for the generation of hydroelectric power?

Mr. MUNDT. No, I believe this bill would be a bonanza for the State of Florida, because it is an old-established State which has some of the long-established installations because climate and natural attraction have taken them down there. There are many important taxpayers in Florida who would have tremendous taxes to pay for payments in lieu of taxes to people living in other areas of the country.

Mr. HOLLAND. To make the matter clear, is it the Senator's opinion in the case of dams, meaning the structure, meaning the power plant, meaning the overflowed area which is covered by the lake that have been acquired since the cutoff date of 1950, paid for entirely by the Federal Government, perhaps at the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars, that the local units of Government affected there and the State in which those properties are located could under the provisions of this proposed legislation which I have cited have the right to be paid taxes notwithstanding the fact that they are the principal recipients of the undoubted benefits coming out of those improvements in the way of smaller power rates and also developments which have come to their areas because of the location of those great power installations there?

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to have the chairman of the subcommittee express himself on that question, but it seems to me, as we read the language, assuming it comes within the right calendar year, that that seems to be implied. It conceivably could shoulder off on Uncle Sam the whole tax burden of some of the States of our Union which have tremendous hydroelectric installations provided other legislation does not touch them and if they were authorized after 1950. I cannot conceive that is the intent, but I would be happy to have the intent described in terms of what the subcommittee chairman had in mind, because it does seem to me some startling and speculative possibilities are raised by this new provision in the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. One more question and I shall be through, and, if I may secure consent, I should like to address the same questions to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. Is there any other need, in the Senator's opinion, for the provision of this bill specifically excluding the power installations in the TVA other than the fact that these installations were otherwise included, provided the particular property had been acquired after 1950?

Mr. MUNDT. I think what the Senator says strengthens the sinews of his argument, for taking the two together, we must necessarily arrive at the conclusion that there is in contemplation some kind of fee or some kind of tax to be paid for through the generation of electric power. However, it is a rather ambiguous term. The provision could have been stated much more meticulously and precisely. I do not know whether by that language is meant all the inundated acres. I do not know whether by that language is meant the original tax base. I do not know whether it means the great structure which holds back the reservoir or whether it is stated in terms of the value which is set on the generation of power. Nor do I know which reservoirs and which hydroelectric projects would be included in—if any—and which would be included out. This is one more reason such a high level Commission as my amendment provides is needed to make recommendations which we all can understand.

However, if the Senator from Florida is going to ask the same questions of the chairman of the subcommittee, perhaps the chairman will be able to throw some additional light on this confusing but highly important subject.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the kindness and cooperation of the Senator from South Dakota. If I may, I should like to address the same questions to the Senator from Minnesota. I should like to ask unanimous consent to do that.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is familiar with the questions, which have to do with whether, under the bill as drafted, improvements constructed with Federal money for the purpose of generating electrical energy—"generation of electrical energy" are the words used in the bill—would be the subject for the making of claims and making of payments of Federal money to State and local governments in lieu of taxes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand the Senator is referring to lines 12 through 25 on page 23 of the bill, in subsection (L).

Mr. HOLLAND. Subsection (L), and particularly——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Item 2 in subsection (L).

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; item 2 in that subsection; and in relation to category 3 found on lines 3, 4, and 5 of page 21.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The items in lines 12 through 25 on page 23 of the bill, defining industrial and commercial use when used in connection with the generation of electrical energy, are to be interpreted as follows:

With the exception of these generating facilities which are already covered by Federal law, such as in the case of TVA and Grand Coulee and others, which are already provided for in terms of earned revenue or payments in lieu of taxes, the language in the bill to which I have referred will apply to other facilities.

For example, if a Federal generating plant were constructed today for some commercial-type installation it would be within the meaning of this bill, if the Board, after hearing the taxing authority, agreed that this was a commercial and industrial property.

In other words, if there is a Federal electrical generation facility which is engaged in a commercial or industrial activity, and which is not covered by another statute—and most of them are—then the Board, after listening to the plea of the local taxing authority, would be permitted to grant payment in lieu of taxes, provided the property was acquired by the Federal agency after June 30, 1950.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator this further question. Is it not true that most of the great installations which we have created by Federal investment for the purpose of producing electrical energy produce it for industrial and commercial use, as defined in the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, that is the fact, but most of them are already covered by existing statutes. TVA is exempted because it is covered by a generous payment in lieu of taxes law. If my memory serves me correctly, Grand Coulee is likewise exempted for the same reason.

However, in case there is, after 1950 a new facility which is not covered by special legislation, the Board, upon hearing the plea of the local taxing authority, could grant payment in lieu of taxes.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota one more question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Why, if it was necessary specifically to exempt TVA, was it not equally necessary to exempt the other large installations of the Federal

Government which have been created for the production of electrical energy for industrial and commercial use, of which we have many dozens in the country?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not think it was necessary to give a specific exemption to TVA, because it was already covered by special statute. However, TVA wanted to be absolutely sure that there was no misunderstanding about it. Therefore, the exemption was taken care of in this way. However, every one of the large major generating facilities of the Federal Government is covered by a special statute dealing with profits from the installation going into the Federal Treasury and payments in lieu of taxes. That is also true of the Atomic Energy Commission. There are some 55 special statutes relating to payments in lieu of taxes and shared revenues.

However, where certain other cases are not covered, we are trying to grant equality of treatment in those instances.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. There is one more general question which I should like to ask him.

Some States, of which one is my State of Florida, have no property tax for State purposes. How would it be fair for the people of my State, through their appropriate contribution to Federal tax money, to pay anything to States in ad valorem taxes on property, when the people of my State cannot get back a single dime, because our constitution prohibits levying taxes on property for State use?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator will surely agree that the counties and cities and towns practically live off property taxes. It is to them that special consideration is being given under the proposed legislation. This is a local government bill.

If, for example, a State has a special assessment, then it would be included. Of course, a special assessment is generally made on the basis of a local government. On the other part, on real property, the Senator would be correct. Where the total tax in a particular area includes the State property tax and the local tax, if a State did not have that property tax, it would not share in that benefit.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator from South Dakota permit me to make a brief statement?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to make a brief statement without his losing his right to the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield, with that understanding.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida, when he was serving as Governor of his State, served on a committee which appeared before Congress, in an effort to get something done in this field for the benefit of States which were, we felt, being improperly deprived of the taxing power by reason of an unduly great spread of the Federal Government in its property holdings. There was nothing even remotely suggested in that effort at that time to bring such discrimination as is suggested here into the picture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to correct a statement. The Senator is very courteous in yielding to me at this point. The bill is limited entirely to local governments making application for relief for payments in lieu of taxes. The Senator will note that at page 20 of the bill, in line 6, the words "exemption of Federal real property from taxation by local governments." In line 17 there appear the words, "Federal contributions to local governments in lieu of the payment."

Then the bill sets out three categories in which payments will be made. It relates to applications of local governments. I thought I should correct that point.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. It seems to me that the Senator from South Dakota is correct in his position that not sufficient study has been given to this subject to start with a program which is on its face not fair as between all the areas in this Nation.

Believing that, of course, I cannot vote for the bill. I regret that that is the case, because I think this is a subject matter which requires corrective action. I hope that at the very least a measure may come from Congress which will institute a study of sufficient duration and will be headed by persons of sufficient experience and representative quality and dignity to propose a program which will better appeal to the conscience of the Senate than does the program now presented, at least so far as I am concerned.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I express appreciation to the Senator from Florida. He has demonstrated his usual prudence and careful approach to legislative matters of this kind.

I simply wish there were some way in which to get the facts before the rest of the Members of the Senate, because I know Senators well enough to believe that they would not try to rewrite U.S. fiscal history without any more study than has been given to this bill, dealing with a matter which is uncertain and is filled with imponderables, taking action we cannot reverse, once we have set it in motion.

It is manifestly unfair to expect a State or city to start receiving payments by the Federal Government, on which it, in turn, bases its own tax schedules and its own budgetary methods, and then try to take the money away from the recipients after 5 years of benefits from the Federal Government.

The fifth specific reason why I favor the amendment in the nature of a substitute, besides the necessity for scientific study, is that as it is at present written the bill provides a bonus to the successful communities, those which have been able to come to Washington and induce the Federal officials to place Federal installations in their midst. Having gotten chambers of commerce to appear, and having worked with the Senators and Representatives, and having been able to demonstrate the merits of the location, then, after the honeymoon is over, and they have gotten the benefit of the fine, new installations and the new employment, they then say, "Would it not be fine if we could get the Federal Government to pick up the tax check, too?"

That is all very well for community A, which has succeeded in getting the installation. But community B, which also came to Washington and also wanted an installation, and also talked to its Senators and Representatives, lost a close decision, because the military people said the installation would go to community A. They are told, "You did not get the installation, the new employment, the new taxpayers, but you will have to pick up the extra share of the tax burden in order to pay the extra taxes which the Federal Government will pay to community A."

It seems to me that if we set in motion that kind of program, and are ultimately going to pay the taxes for the Federal installations, it will not be possible to buy an airplane ticket into Washington for 6 months, because every chamber of commerce will be coming here to get in on the act. They will not only have secured a Federal installation, but they will be able to have Uncle Sam pick up the tax bill and pick up the levies and assessments, and have the Federal Government pay the tax, while the rest of the country suffers. To me, that is manifestly unfair.

I think of a situation in my own State, where there are two equally fine communities, each deserving a Federal building—a post office. Only one such building is to be built this year, and only one community will get it. The other will not.

The community that gets it this year will open it with a ribbon-cutting ceremony, while the community which did not get the new Federal building this year would have to pay the taxes for the construction of gutters and pavements in front of its neighbor's new building, and, while it may continue to hope that it will get a Federal building next year, it will nevertheless continue to suffer.

I think that when Congress passes legislation of this kind, it simply has to be equitable all across the board, regardless of date, regardless of type of structure, regardless of the size of the city, regardless of whether it is a commercial institution in a big town, or an Indian reservation, or whether it is public grazing land, or there is a fee assessed for weed eradication along some country road.

I do not believe Congress should arbitrarily try to twist and pervert the tax procedures of the Nation, and do further injury to the rural people, by putting the budget in peril permanently, because there will be delegated to the Presidential Board more powers than either of the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate have under the Constitution. The Appropriations Committees have their findings subjected, and properly so, to the consideration of Senators and Representatives, but the appropriations made by the Presidential Board would be subject to no control whatsoever—no check, no correction, no surveillance. The Board would simply make them, and the country as a whole would have to pay the bill.

I think the prudent thing for us to do, to assure a solution of the problems in this field, is to adopt my amendment in the nature of a substitute, which provides that a careful study shall be made, and then set in motion, when we do act, legislation which will deal equitably with all the taxpayers of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachustts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senators from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 53, as follows:

[No. 195]

YEAS—24

Allott	Butler	Case, S. Dak.
Bridges	Byrd, Va.	Cotton
Brunsdale	Capehart	Dirksen
Dworshak	Holland	Robertson
Fong	Lausche	Russell
Goldwater	Lusk	Stennis
Hayden	Martin	Thurmond
Hickenlooper	Mundt	Williams, Del.

NAYS—53

Aiken	Frear	McCarthy
Bartlett	Gore	Magnuson
Beall	Green	Mansfield
Bennett	Gruening	Moss
Bible	Hart	Muskie
Bush	Hartke	Pastore
Cannon	Hill	Prouty
Carlson	Hruska	Proxmire
Carroll	Humphrey	Scott
Case, N.J.	Jackson	Smathers
Church	Javits	Smith
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Cooper	Johnston, S.C.	Symington
Curtis	Keating	Talmadge
Dodd	Kefauver	Yarborough
Douglas	Kerr	Young, N. Dak.
Engle	Kuchel	Young, Ohio
Ervin	Long, La.	

NOT VOTING—23

Anderson	Kennedy	Murray
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, Hawaii	O'Mahoney
Chavez	McClellan	Randolph
Eastland	McGee	Saltonstall
Ellender	McNamara	Schoeppel
Fulbright	Monroney	Wiley
Hennings	Morse	Williams, N.J.
Jordan	Morton	

So Mr. MUNDT's amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. GRUENING moved to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I support S. 910 and I should like to speak briefly about the bill, and then ask a question of the Senator in charge of the measure concerning the provisions of the bill.

Several counties in Montana have within their borders thousands of acres of land which were acquired by the Federal Government under title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933. These lands are under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, to be administered for the benefit of various Indian tribes or groups.

These lands are, of course, not on the tax rolls. Hearings have been held by the Senate Indian Affairs Subcommittee on legislation which provides that these Bankhead-Jones lands be held in trust for the Indians in the area and become part of their reservations.

Three Montana Indian reservations are involved—the Blackfeet, Fort Belknap, and Fort Peck. More than 85,000 acres of land are in the Roosevelt County area, and are now being administered for the benefit of the Fort Peck Tribe. County and school officials in Roosevelt County and the Montana Association of County Commissioners have called attention to the hardship on local taxpayers because so much of the land within counties affected is not on the tax rolls.

As I read S. 910 and the Government Operations Committee report on the bill, Report No. 869, this legislation will provide for investigation of the tax injustice to which I have referred, testimony from local officials, and a report to Congress within 2 years of the date of enactment. This comprehensive report will embody results of the study and be accompanied by appropriate proposed legislation.

My impression of the bill's intent follows from this excerpt from the committee report, appearing on pages 1 and 2:

To aid the Congress in determining whether additional permanent legislation of this kind is required, the bill also provides that the Board shall conduct a comprehensive study and make a case-by-case analysis of virtually every phase of fiscal and related problems of local taxing authorities arising out of Federal immunity from local real and personal property taxes, including operation of existing programs.

This broad and comprehensive study authority of the Board is designed to provide, for the first time, a forum to which local taxing authorities may present their cases, regardless of whether or not they may be entitled to any payments. It is the purpose of these study provisions to enable the Board to compile all of the factual information needed to enable the Congress to legislate effectively in this field and to evolve a uniform program on a national basis which will provide local taxing authorities with the relief to which they may be entitled without unduly burdening the Federal Treasury.

I would appreciate comment on this point from the Senator in charge of the bill. I ask my colleague, Is it correct that if S. 910 becomes law, the county and school officials in Montana, whose tax base is small because of the large acreages of this type of Bankhead-Jones lands in their area, may present their cases to the Federal Board, which will make a thorough study of these problems, and then, within 2 years, make specific recommendations to Congress?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, may I hear the question? I cannot hear a single thing the Senator is saying. I would like to know what the question was so I can understand the answer. May I ask the Senator to repeat?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be glad to repeat the question.

I ask the Senator from Minnesota, Is it correct that if S. 910 becomes law, the county and school officials in Montana, whose tax base is small because of the large acreages of this type of Bankhead-Jones lands in that area, may present their cases to the Federal Board, which will make a thorough study of these problems, and then within 2 years, make specific recommendations to Congress?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement by my distinguished senior colleague from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY ON S. 910—PAYMENTS TO THE STATES IN LIEU OF TAXES

I wish to concur in the remarks made by my distinguished colleague, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, in expressing support of S. 910, a bill which authorizes Federal payments to the States in lieu of taxes. This legislation is of particular interest to States like Montana with large Federal property holdings.

Perhaps one of the most controversial issues that exists in Federal-State relations is Federal immunity from local real and per-

sonal property taxes and the operation of existing programs. This is especially important at this time when many of our States are finding it difficult to finance their own operations and services from State and local taxes.

The Federal Government is cast in a role somewhat like a monster as depriving States of taxes which are justly due them. The provisions of this bill will establish a bureau which will get to the heart of this problem and set up a criteria to judge whether the Federal Government is obligated to make payments to the States in lieu of taxes. If this legislation is enacted into law I am confident that it will go far in harmonizing the relationship that exists between the Federal Government here in Washington and the State, county, and local ruling bodies.

On the basis of my study of this proposal this does appear to be a good bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, on page 20, line 19, following the word "assessments," to add the words "and taxes."

With my amendment the language would provide that special payments in lieu of taxes may be made both in cases of assessments and taxes.

What I wish to point out is that, under the present provisions of this section, the benefits will vest in those States where public improvements are made through the laying of special assessments. In those States where public improvements are made through general taxes, the benefits will not vest.

I think there ought to be uniform operation of this provision. If a bridge, sewage disposal plant, or water distribution system is built through special assessments, under the proposed law those areas will receive the benefits; but if such projects are constructed through general taxes, the benefits will not be received. I think the provision as now written is discriminatory.

I ask Senators to search their minds and decide whether in their States public improvements are made through general taxes. In Ohio that is done. Under the language proposed in the bill, Ohio would receive no benefits.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Ohio has made a very valid case, in reference to his State in particular. I regret that this matter was not carefully considered with reference to the State of Ohio. Perhaps some other States may be in the same predicament. As the Senator in charge of the bill, I support the amendment of the Senator from Ohio and hope it may be adopted.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I do not propose to take any time opposing this particular amendment, because if we are going to engage in this kind of fiscal irresponsibility, certainly the equity of the position of the Senator from Ohio is evident. If we are going to start in on a career of transferring to the Federal Government the obligation of unestimated and unpredictable payments in lieu of taxes, it is certainly manifestly unfair to discriminate.

I simply take the floor to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he can give us even a wild guess as to how many extra millions of dollars will be added to the cost of the taxpayers under the bill by the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall be more than happy to respond. This would apply in the States where there are taxes instead of special assessments. As I understand, that is the purpose of the legislative history with regard to the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. I understand the purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would also give equity to those areas where the special assessment procedure is not used in local government. Therefore, I do not think it would cost any more money, because the whole purpose of the special assessment procedure is to take care of the type of financing of local improvements in local communities we have in mind.

Mr. MUNDT. It obviously would cost more money, because the purpose of the Senator's amendment is to make eligible for the payments certain States and certain communities which would not otherwise be eligible.

I am seriously concerned about this. I am sorry there were so few Senators present in the Chamber when we debated the issues involved. I do not want this Congress to be charged with being fiscally irresponsible, any more than does any other Member of the Senate.

I know that when we start engaging in backdoor funding of this kind, without even a prediction as to what it will cost, transferring the power of appropriations to a Presidentially appointed board, with no recourse to and no review by Congress, we are rewriting the fiscal history of this country pretty recklessly in this session of Congress.

I wish we could have the whole debate transferred over until tomorrow, so that the Senators who were not present on the floor this afternoon could read exactly what we are being asked to commit ourselves to do. My purpose in raising the question is to ask if anybody has an estimate as to the price tag of this new venture.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to my colleague from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In addition, it seems to me that what we are asked to do is to subordinate the Federal Treasury to the whim, the caprice, and the attitude of local taxing bodies. The local commissioners, council members, boards of county commissioners will be determining the demand upon the Federal Treasury. They will make the levies and the assessments which the Federal Treasury will be obligated to pay.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is exactly correct.

I should add one other thing, because it has not been stressed. There are enough Senators present now to help write the course of history. An appropriation is requested to be made entirely outside the realm of the Appropriations Committee, not to be reviewable by the Congress and not to be subject to a presidential veto. We are being asked to open up a whole new mechanism for pouring money out of the public purse, at a time when Senators are traveling around the country talking about being in favor of economy.

I do not think this Congress, which is ably led and which has had a good record up to now, should engage in this kind of reckless legislation. At least, we should not act until we have had 24 hours to study the record and to know what we are doing.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I commend the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for the fight he has made today. The Senator was not successful, but I will say that if this measure is passed the people of this country will live to regret it, and so will the Members of this body who vote for it, because it will be fiscal irresponsibility.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur with the views advanced by the Senator from South Dakota. I engaged in a discussion with the Senator this afternoon.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator made a valuable contribution.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I feel that this measure is generally ill advised. However, if it is to be passed, there should not be discrimination against those communities which make public improvements through general taxation in favor of the local communities which do so through special assessments.

Mr. MUNDT. I quite agree with the Senator. I am not going to oppose the Senator's amendment, because if we are going into a new era of ignoring States rights, community rights, and taxpayers' rights, and if we are to transfer everything to a new totalitarian concept of government so far as the fiscal relationships are concerned, everybody should get under the tent. It should not be a certain select group. I am not going to oppose the Senator's amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I commend the Senator from South Dakota for the very valiant fight he is putting up to save the fiscal responsibility of this body. I am very happy I had the opportunity to vote for the Senator's amendment. I shall most certainly vote against passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I should like to get the record clear on this point. I think the record is not clear.

I think the Appeal Board and the people who are filing applications ought to know what they are doing and what they can expect to be done.

This amendment has been offered by the Senator from Ohio. I think we have to define what it would do.

In Colorado a special assessment may deal with an alley paving district. If I correctly understand the amendment of

the able Senator from Ohio, the taxes would have reference to the alley paving district. If there were a curb or a road involved, there would be reference to that particular area and not to the whole program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I can answer the question. I invite the attention of my colleagues to page 23 of the bill, paragraph (k), which reads in part:

> The term "public improvement" means any street, road, bridge, sewer, water distribution system, drainage project, or other public improvement.

Therefore, if one of those improvements is made with a special assessment and the community is entitled to receive the benefits of the law, another community should be entitled to receive the benefits if it makes an improvement through taxation.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Ohio in that regard 100 percent. That is why I thought we ought to make a legislative history. There is a broad term, on page 20, in the language, "to defray the cost of local public improvements."

What does "local" mean? That word is too broad in meaning. That is why I think we need to have the record.

This is a reasonable and sensible proposal, and we should vote for it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of someone who is familiar with the provisions of the bill.

I notice that the advisory committee which is to be established is to be composed of 12 members appointed by the President, of whom 3 shall be representatives of State governments and 6 shall be officers or employees of Federal agencies.

Three members shall be representatives of tax authorities. What tax authorities?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Local.

Mr. AIKEN. Local tax authorities?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr AIKEN. The law would apply to property acquired after 1950?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Insofar as industrial or commercial property is concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the law apply to property acquired prior to 1950?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would permit the local taxing authorities to make an appeal before the Federal board in regard to properties other than commercial and industrial properties.

Mr. AIKEN. The language is wholly permissive, and the board could determine whether any contribution should be made in lieu of taxes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct, except for the special assessments and the item we listed.

Mr. AIKEN. Did the authors of the bill consider setting up some guidelines for the board to use in determining the matter?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. Those are very well listed in the policy statement. The purpose is to avoid demonstrable financial hardship upon local governments, which the Bureau of the Budget recommended. We set up the definitions of what we mean by each of the items; such as "public improvement," "special assessment," "taxable person," and "industrial or commercial use."

The powers and duties of the board are described on pages 24, 25, 26, and 33 of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand the proposal, a study committee is to be set up.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. To study the effects of the measure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. In the meantime, the Board can make temporary payments to communities in lieu of taxes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, under the restricted three categories.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Assuming that the Board decides to pay a community $10,000 in lieu of taxes, and that later a study group finds it is not feasible and should not be done, what will become of the $10,000?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Board has two functions. Not later than 2 years, after amendment of the act, the Board must present a study to the Congress and to the President. In the meantime, the Board is authorized to make certain payments in the three categories which are listed.

Mr. AIKEN. What are those?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The categories relate to those where there are special assessments, to real properties which are leased for private purposes, and to commercial or industrial properties acquired after June 30, 1950.

Mr. AIKEN. The proposed legislation would cover real estate on which Federal buildings and new post offices have been built?

Mr. HUMPHREY. For special assessment purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. Only for special assessments?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. The real estate itself would not be covered?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not unless it is used for commercial or industrial purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. To consider an example familiar to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], what about the Fort Snelling property?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would not be covered unless there were a commercial or industrial purpose or special assessments to be levied relating to that property. Of course, if something were built on the property after 1950 for industrial or commercial purposes the proposed legislation would apply.

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask one further question? Would the proposed legislation cover real estate taken from the national forests and the national parks?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would not, because the Forest Service already has a system of shared revenues.

Mr. AIKEN. That is with respect to the national forests. I do not know about national parks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. National parks are not covered as so-called income-producing properties, and therefore would not be covered.

Mr. AIKEN. Nor would the proposal cover property which had never been held by the State?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. AIKEN. It would not cover any property which had always been Federal property and not held by the State?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not for payment, but for study.

Mr. AIKEN. The proposal does not cover any public lands.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not for payment, but for study.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not have the floor but I will yield just the same.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] did not get an answer to his question about the $10,000 which some eager, active, energetic, farsighted, and perhaps somewhat acquisitive community might get from a board of this kind. If they get it, they have it and no one can take it away from them. Congress cannot stop them and the board can rule it will not do so in the future, but that community has its $10,000 for all time to come. Even the President of the United States cannot veto it, because the Senate is now going on record—in a yea-and-nay vote, I hope—saying that in its opinion we are to have a third appropriating committee of Congress. There will be one in the House, one in the Senate, and one selected by the President of the United States, and the one selected by the President of the United States will not have to submit its appropriations to the Congress. Its appropriations cannot be vetoed by the President. If that does not epitomize financial irresponsibility after 175 years of American history, it will do in my book until something better comes along.

Mr. BRIDGES. The proposed legislation would give to the board much more authority than the Appropriation Committees of Congress have.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from New Hampshire is a distinguished and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, and he voted for my amendment, as did the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and as did, I am happy to say, practically all members of the Appropriations Committee who were here listening to the debate which has occupied us this afternoon.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] another question: Would the proposed legislation, if it should become law, apply to property acquired for missile bases?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, not unless a special assessment were to be made, as is defined in the bill, for the local improvements related to that Federal property. Then it would. The categories are listed specifically—special assessments, taxes with respect to Federal real property in the custody or control of taxable persons, as if it were private enterprise and, thirdly, taxes upon Federal real property acquired after June 30 for industrial or commercial use.

This is a very limited bill in terms of its payments, but in terms of its study,

it is identical to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. AIKEN. Would the bill apply to land acquired for radar installations?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would not except for special assessments.

Mr. AIKEN. I was attempting to think of some installation in Vermont to which it would apply and I have been unable to do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If by chance at a radar base, a locality had to supply sewage, water, electrical energy, and streets, and there was an assessment made upon all the land around it, then the Federal agency that was in that particular area would pay its fair share without discrimination.

Mr. AIKEN. That would apply only where the public furnishes the electrical energy or water facilities and not where such facilities have been privately installed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 19, after the word "assessments," it is proposed to insert the words "and taxes," so as to read "special assessments and taxes levied after the effective date," and so forth.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 21, line 3, it is proposed to strike out the words "acquired after June 30, 1950."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I will take only a moment. If this is a good amendment and a good bill and it ought to apply to all industrial and commercial users, why is it limited to property acquired after June 30, 1950? I repeat the question. If it is a good bill and ought to be passed, then why is it limited to property acquired after June 30, 1950? Why should it not apply to property acquired 20 years ago, 30 years ago, or 40 years ago?

Mr. BRIDGES. The answer is plain and simple. It is not a good bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota is temporarily off the floor, but I believe I can answer the question. This has been a pretty complicated problem, which has been studied for a number of years. The important consideration is not to commit the Federal Government to too heavy a cost.

Mr. President, I now defer to the Senator from Minnesota, who has returned to the Chamber. He is much better qualified to answer the question. The question has been asked why this bill is limited to 1950.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was absent from the Chamber when I offered this amendment. The amendment was to strike, on page 21, line 3, the words "acquired after June 30, 1950."

Mr. HUMPHREY. The answer is quite simple. First, it was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget—not that that should be controlling, but at least it was a recommendation. In 1956, when a similar bill was before the Senate, they made that recommendation.

Second, this is a trial run. It is a fact that we have had little experience in these matters, and we thought we should get actual cases before the Board rather than academic discussions.

Third, in the light of the concern of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] with respect to financial and fiscal irresponsibility, we thought we would limit it to commercial and industrial enterprises of recent years, starting with the Korean war. We could go back to 1800, or any other date we might wish, but the further we go back, the greater the cost would be, and the purpose of limiting it was to find a base point, which is not uncommon in legislation, to find some place after World War II and before the beginning of the Korean war to start with this proposal, and it seems to me by so doing we will receive the experience we need while the Board is making its study. In this way we answer some of the local government problems.

Mr. CAPEHART. Has not the Senator from Minnesota made the best argument in the world for postponing consideration of the bill until tomorrow, and perhaps table it and postpone further consideration for 6 months so that more study can be made? He admits it is a trial run. Why do we in the Senate turn over to the administration the responsibility for a trial run? Why do we not keep the responsibility in our own hands. If this is a good bill, let us pass it someday, but let us not pass something purely for the purpose of a trial run.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the sincere concern of the Senator from Indiana. He always demonstrates real concern over these matters—and I think properly so. This matter has been studied for 20 years.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This has been studied by the Bureau of the Budget. It has been before us on four or five occasions, that I recall. The President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations was established by President Eisenhower on the basis of an act of Congress, and it was my privilege to serve on that Commission with other Members of this body, and they made this recommendation. We would establish a board which would make a comprehensive study of the whole problem of payments in lieu of taxes while it is on the job. We would take three limited categories where there is a real need for payments in lieu of taxes, and have the board start there.

One of them is where a special assessment is made. Anyone who has ever been a local government officer knows about special assessments. Why, in the name of commonsense, if a new Federal court building is built, which requires tearing up the streets and remodeling the whole area, and requires putting in new streets and new gutters and new curbing and new sewers and new storm sewers, should we charge the assessment to the hardware store, to the general merchandise store, to the bank, by way of special assessments, but not to the Federal Government?

If the taxing authority has a case, with the burden of proof resting upon the local taxing authority, and it can come before the Federal board and convince the Federal board that a payment in lieu of taxes should be made, why should not that procedure be followed?

Second, if there are properties which were built by the Federal Government, or acquired, but which are now in the hands of private individuals for private purposes, we say that those properties likewise shall be subject to payments in lieu of taxes.

The bill would equalize competition. I am rather surprised that some people would be against it.

Lastly, if the Federal Government acquires or builds a factory in a community or builds an industrial or commercial concern since 1950—and if Senators wish to do so, they can set any date they wish to set—we decided we would limit it to those enterprises built since 1950. If there is such an industrial or commercial facility, and the local taxing authority comes before the Board and says, "Look, we have the International Harvester Co. plant here, and those people are paying taxes, but over there you have a Federal Government factory, which is making supplies, but that property is not paying any property taxes," why should not the local taxing authority be able to make that case before the Board? This involves no discrimination in assessments. It is a commercial facility that we are talking about.

Mr. CAPEHART. Many local governments of Indiana, if we are to exempt property in accordance with the present provision of the bill, which have property acquired in 1949, will be very unhappy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If we set the date back to 1922, they will be unhappy too. A great many people will be unhappy if they get nothing.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why should it be limited to June 30, 1950? Why do we not provide the same exemption for all property?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Because of the very fact that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] talked about a while ago, because it costs too much. We are being prudent. Why did we not set the disability age in the Social Security Act at age 20 instead of age 50? Why did we not make the minimum wage law universally applicable?

Mr. CAPEHART. Why should not the date be June 30, 1960?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator wishes to make it that date, he is at liberty to offer an amendment to that effect. The date we provide in the bill was agreed to by the municipalities. Every local government organization in the United States has gone over the bill very carefully. They did not all get what they wanted, but they support the bill. I do not want to have irresponsibility placed on my shoulders. I do not want to be caught up in the dragnet the Senator from South Dakota talked about. I want the bill to be responsible.

Mr. CAPEHART. Apparently the Senator wants to have only a little irresponsibility.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to have responsibility. I want to be able to say to the people who live back home that if the Federal Government continues to acquire more and more property, and if the Federal Government continues to have more and more commercial industrial property, the Government will at least be called upon to contribute its fair share in lieu of taxes, in a proper case. I may add, further, that some of these agencies will get rid of some of their property and start to sell it off, it will get back on the tax rolls.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator be willing to make the date June 30, 1930?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not want to be that irresponsible.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana if he does not think his amendment ought to go further and apply to special assessments, as well as to taxes.

The clause which has already been amended relates to special assessments levied after the effective date of this act. If we are going to change the date, why should we not add special assessments which have been levied since June 30, 1950, to get uniform treatment?

It seems to me that the language of the bill would serve notice on all municipalities and communities not to make any improvements until after the effective date of the act.

Between the day on which we pass the bill, if we pass it, and the effective date of the act, any municipality that is prudent is not going to make any improvements, but will wait until the effective date of the act.

Let me read that clause on page 20, line 19:

> 1. Special assessments levied after the effective date of this act upon real property situated in urban and suburban areas to defray the cost of local public improvements.

If we pass the bill, why should any municipality make any improvement until the effective date of the act? If they will wait 30 days or 60 days, or until the bill becomes effective, they can come in then.

Mr. HUMPHREY. A municipality makes improvements because they need to be made. It builds sewers and provides water because that must be done. Under the bill the Federal Government will be asked by the local taxing authority to pay its fair share. It is possible constantly to bring up arguments against the bill. The real argument the Senator from South Dakota makes is that he does not want the bill. He does not want the local government to receive any help.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No, no; I do not want to have the sovereignty of the Federal Government in its taxing power subordinated to county commissioners and city councilmen and others, who do not have the responsibility for balancing the Federal budget. I do not want Congress to surrender its authority to an appointed board.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say most respectfully to the Senator that if the Senator feels that way, he should introduce a bill to do away with the Federal Court of Claims, because the Federal Court of Claims makes levies, and agencies are required to pay them. What the Senator is talking about is not wanting to have any payments in lieu of taxes to local governments.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Federal Court of Claims has the power to measure amounts of damage. Under the bill the Board would not measure the value of local improvements. The Federal Board would not measure the validity of a tax levy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What the Board would do would be to see to it that the Federal Government was not discriminated against and that the local government was not discriminated against. I would not like to go back to my constituents and say that I had a chance in Congress to see to it that the Federal Government—which gets its revenues, not from taxes on real property, but from income taxes, excise taxes, tariffs, and taxes on big corporate wealth, and whose commercial enterprises compete with private enterprises—paid part of its fair share, but that I was one of those in Congress who said, "No; I am going to let those commercial enterprises go scot free from taxes."

Mr. President, I am not a socialist. I am surprised that some of my friends on the other side of the aisle should take the attitude they assume, particularly those who are supposed to be conservatives, and that they should argue for an exemption for the Federal Government on Federal property.

We have seen statements like this in newspapers: "This private utility pays taxes. This Federal installation pays none."

The Senator from Minnesota says that Members of Congress should vote for the bill, so that if there is a competitive commercial enterprise owned by the Government of the United States in a free enterprise economy, a payment will be made in lieu of taxes so long as that payment is not discriminatory. I believe in free enterprise. I do not simply talk about it; I believe in it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I would just as much dislike facing a city council or a county taxing unit in Indiana and saying that the Federal property was acquired in 1949 and, therefore, the law does not apply. If it is a good law, I repeat, it ought to apply to all persons equally. Why discriminate against a city in which the Federal Government acquired property in 1949, and say, "The law does not apply to you," but say to a city 10 miles away, where the Federal Government acquired some property in 1950, "The law applies to you"?

Mr. MUNDT. I can give one additional answer to the statements from the other side of the aisle. Earlier in the debate, the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], with his customary candor, and representing, in part, as he does, a great State, which should be one of the recipients of this bounty, referred to San Diego, with its tremendous naval base, and which was included in the act originally. However, it was decided that San Diego was too big, so the committee started these payments in 1950, and it is out, temporarily.

The Senator from California, thinking of the homefolks, as all of us do, says this is not a perfect bill; it does not cover all the projects it should, but it serves to open the door. Those were his words—"serves to open the door." So 1950 was chosen, because it "serves to open the door." Now they are all coming in. I quite agree with the Senator from Indiana. If we are to transfer our whole concept of government to the States and cities, we shall have one big, centralized power.

Where are all the advocates of States rights, whom we heard talk so much during the debate on civil rights? Where are all of those who sought to maintain some semblance of State rights and State functions? Where are they now? Here are the issues. It is not a matter of voting rights now; it is a matter of paying taxes and of determining who is to control what will happen to the money of the country.

If we are to "buy" this, let us "buy" it from the beginning of time. Let us not tell people who happen to be fortunate enough to have had an installation since 1950 that they will get the benefit, while we tell the people on the other side of that date that they will have to pay through the nose to help the fortunate people who got their Government installations since 1950.

I think the Senators from California are justified in making impassioned speeches defending San Diego, because San Diego has sustained a burden and is entitled to relief if other parts of the country are to get it. But we should have a set of procedures equally applicable to all.

If we are to transfer the tax burden and give the Senate a mark of irresponsibility, either in one fell swoop or on the installment plan—it does not make any difference—we shall be making our decision tonight. If we are going to do it, why not do it equitably and let all the cities participate? If we are going to establish this kind of procedure, there is not a Senator who does not realize that eventually we shall have to turn the clock back from 1950 to 1940 or to 1900 and to dates even earlier.

My good, candid friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], says

it would cost too much money, and that we must have a point at which to start. I appreciate that. That was the first thought of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from South Dakota has talked about irresponsibility. I read from item (3), on page 21:

> Taxes upon Federal real property acquired after June 30, 1950, which is in the custody or control of any Federal agency for industrial or commercial use.

The San Diego Naval Base is not industrial or commercial use. We did not take words out of a catalog to determine how the bill would apply with respect to special assessments.

I think, at this point, this is a fair requirement. The study commission proposed in the committee bill, which is the same as the study commission of the Mundt proposal, might very well want to make a further recommendation. It might want to recommend a change of date. It might want to broaden the bill. It might want to restrict it. But the evidence is replete that there is a need for some consideration of special assessments.

Second, I cannot believe that the distinguished Republican Senator from South Dakota wants Federal Government activity—industrial or commercial—which is comparable with private enterprise activity, and not have the local government be enabled to come before a duly appointed board to try to get a payment in lieu of taxes. Otherwise, how can private enterprise be expected to survive?

The third point is that where Federal real property is in the custody or control of any Federal agency for industrial or commercial use—which is, in fact, private enterprise operating on a leased basis in Federal installations—it seems to me that there ought to be payments in lieu of taxes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have no quarrel with the Senator from Minnesota. I agree with him 100 percent, except that I do not want to discriminate between a city which received a Federal installation in 1949 and one which received one in 1950, because in my State I know of no property which has been acquired since 1950. Perhaps that may be true in other States. If it is good for the goose, it is good for the gander. If it is good from 1950 to 1960, it is good from 1940 to 1950.

Mr. President, I am ready to vote.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota to clarify the phrase on page 23, line 15, "generation of electrical energy." Will the Senator state exactly what that means?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand an amendment will be offered by the Senator from Florida concerning that langauge. It relates to electrical generating facilities which may be owned by the Federal Government, other than those which are at present covered by Federal statute. For example, the TVA is covered at present; therefore, it is excluded from the provisions of the bill. Grand Coulee is covered; therefore, it is exempt from the provisions of the bill.

However, let us assume that somewhere along the line the Federal Government builds a generating plant, and does not have applying to to it a special statute relating to shared revenues or to payments in lieu of taxes. In that case, the Federal Board could receive a request from the local taxing authority, on the basis of the local tax rates, for a payment in lieu of taxes. This language is a protective mechanism.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I can understand the need for some element of equity as between the generation of electrical energy by public plants and such generation by private plants; but in the case of the Bonneville area of the Great Northwest, for instance——

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is covered.

Mr. DWORSHAK. There is an accepted rate of 2 mills per kilowatt hour. If the Federal Government were compelled to make a payment in lieu of taxes in those areas of, say, 2 mills, how could the Federal Government pay 2 mills when it receives only 2 mills for the power?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The large power projects are already covered by special Federal statutes. There are some 55 special statutes relating to payments in lieu of taxes. They are not touched at all.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The language reads "the generation of electrical energy"; there is no limitation whatsoever.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is a definition of the term "industrial or commercial use." This is a definition of the term, but the bill also makes it quite clear in section 2 that the statutes which are currently in operation will continue to apply.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Lest the Senator from Minnesota think he has no friends on this side of the aisle in this argument, I wish to compliment him on the splendid way he has handled the bill this afternoon.

I fully endorse what he has said concerning the necessity of passing the bill, of which I am a sponsor. I reject completely the charge of fiscal irresponsibility. On the contrary, I assert that by the passage of the bill Congress will only be recognizing its clear responsibility to the overburdened communities which have been invaded by the Federal installations for industrial and commercial use.

They come into our communities and grind up the streets and overtax our services, and become burdens, instead of assets, to the communities. I think it only fair that they carry their fair share of the load; and that is all the bill provides for.

So the bill calls for recognition of a responsibility which must be assumed; and I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota on his able handling of the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to join in extending congratulations to the Senator from Minnesota. I am a cosponsor of the bill, which attempts to take sound steps in regard to these problems of the cities, counties, school districts, and local communities.

Earlier in the day I placed in the RECORD a memorandum used by the Governor of New York in approving a similar bill by which the State of New York assumed its share of the responsibility for such facilities in its municipalities.

I join the Senator from Connecticut in affirming the propriety of the position taken by the Senator from Minnesota on the bill; and I hope the bill will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I understand that the pending question is on the final passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then I withdraw my request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before the vote on the amendment is taken, let us clearly understand that the amendment will call for a considerably increased cost, contrary to the position taken by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to my amendment, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I submit an amendment which I send to the desk.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I propose at this time to move that the bill be recommitted. I shall do so for a very simple reason—namely, 10 months ago the Bureau of the Budget sent here a letter in which it stated that the Federal contractors had already been presented with $128 million in taxes, under this proposal. The latest estimate I saw this morning is that this can run to between $500 million and $1 billion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois withhold his motion, so I can offer an amendment which will take only 2 minutes to discuss?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I wish to offer before the final vote is taken.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment I have sent to the desk be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I withhold the motion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask that my amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 37, it is proposed to strike out paragraphs (e) and (f), constituting lines 5 through 16.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I merely wish to read what my amendment will strike out of the bill. The amendment will strike from the bill the following, on page 37:

(e) Upon the certification by the Board to any Federal agency of any final order of the Board awarding to any tax authority any payment under this Act with respect to any Federal property controlled by such agency, such agency shall pay to such tax authority the amount specified in such order.

(f) Each final order made by the Board under this Act for the payment of any award shall be final and conclusive upon all tax authorities and upon all Federal agencies—

I suppose that means the Treasury Department—

unless such order is modified or reversed by a court of competent jurisdiction or is adjudged invalid in whole or in part by the General Accounting Office.

When the Board has made its award, it will be final; and the money will have to be paid out of the Treasury.

Mr. President, I now withdraw my amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I submit an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Florida will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, in lines 15 and 16, it is proposed to strike out "the generation of electrical energy."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there are many controversial features of the bill; but I think this is a part of the bill which all Senators will wish to have stricken from it. This provision means that property used for the generation of electrical energy, and acquired by the Federal Government after June 30, 1950, shall be subject—provided the Supreme Court says so—to the payment to the various taxing units, municipalities, counties, school districts, and the like, of taxes which come from the Federal Treasury—in other words, taxes paid by all the people of the Nation. That means that such a community itself, which is the one most greatly benefited by the investment—and in some instances these projects have cost hundreds of millions of dollars—will be entitled to receive tax funds paid by all the people of the Nation to all its local agencies, when that particular community is the one that is really benefited; for it receives the benefit of the low rates, and it receives the benefits which accrue from the establishment in its area of industries which locate there because of the low rates, and it receives all the principal advantages which accrue from the location and the construction of the facility.

The distinguished sponsor of the bill has stated here on the floor, in response to questions—and I am sorry that not many Senators were present at the time; but I shall now quote the Senator from Minnesota, and if he thinks that I quote him incorrectly, I suggest that he immediately make that known—that if the property was acquired and if the power unit was constructed after June 30, 1950, and was selling power generally—that is to say, commercially—there would be no question but that the counties and municipalities and school districts involved and all other local taxing units involved would have a right to apply for and, if permission was given, to receive taxes from the Federal Treasury, because of the location of that beneficent development in that community. Mr. President, such procedure makes no sense to me.

I happen to represent, in part, a State which can have no hydroelectric power. We are perfectly willing to accept that situation, because we have to. But why should we be called upon to pay to the Federal Government taxes which, in turn, would, under the arrangement proposed by this bill, go to cities, school districts, and counties in areas which have been benefited by these huge Federal investments? The group to be benefited would be a limited one.

If I correctly understood the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, he stated that elsewhere in the bill there appears a provision which expressly exempts the TVA, and also stated that as to any of the great power facilities which already have received the benefit of legislation which requires contributions, the pending measure will not apply to them. I accept that distinction; but that does not change either the principle or the fact, because the principle is as I have already stated it, and the fact is that there are some electrical energy generating installations which would come within this provision.

Mr. President, I shall not talk about either fiscal responsibility or fiscal irresponsibility. But this provision was not contained in the original bill, as I read it hurriedly—and, again, the Senator from Minnesota should promptly correct me if I am in error. However, through some mistake or inadvertence, this provision must have gotten into the bill.

I do not believe the committee meant this provision to be included. I do not think the inclusion of this provision is justified. Therefore, my amendment calls for striking out this part of the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I must say that, privately, I agree with the Senator from Florida. But this amendment was asked for some years ago by Members of this body who are somewhat more conservative than I am.

I think the Senator from Florida has made a valid case for the adoption of his amendment. But this part of the bill simply provides a definition of the term "industrial or commercial use." I think it would not really have any effect, because the large power projects are already included in what we call revenue sharing agreements or under provisions for payments in lieu of taxes.

I think the Senator from Florida has made a good case in favor of the adoption of his amendment. I am not at liberty to speak for the committee in regard to the amendment, but, privately, I would be willing to join the Senator from Florida in his position on the amendment.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of the bill and a member of the committee which reported the bill; and I favor the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand there are other amendments to be offered, and a motion to recommit will be made, and there will be a vote on final passage. I have given no advance notice that the Senate would stay in session late this evening. I have just been reminded by one of my considerate friends that I should have alerted him to bring his pajamas if I expected him to stay very late this evening.

I wonder if we could have an agreement on a time limitation tonight or an agreement to go over?

Mr. MUNDT. If the bill is to go over until tomorrow, so far as I am concerned, I, in opposition, will agree to any limitation of time tomorrow that suits the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How about tonight?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not think so, because I would have to review the arguments whereas Senators could read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow if it goes over until tomorrow. In the event I misunderstood the majority leader, I will agree to closing the session tonight until tomorrow, and to first making a unanimous agreement on voting tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thought I might get an agreement on a limitation of 2 or 3 hours tonight, so that we could have a vote by 9 o'clock, perhaps.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senate wants to remain in session that long, it will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I remember that when an almost identical bill was before the Senate in 1956, the Senator from South Dakota conducted a one-man filibuster on the bill near the end of the session. I was to attend to matters concerning the marriage of my daughter, but I will not be run out by delaying tactics, because I happen to think that the bill before us is an important measure. There is not one thing wrong with it that cannot be corrected in pretty short order.

I shall abide by the will of the majority leader, because he has been very considerate; but if the Senator from South Dakota thinks he is going to delay action on the bill indefinitely, he has in the Senator from Minnesota a fellow who can stay here from now to kingdom come.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I just got through saying I was perfectly willing to agree to any unanimous-consent request by the majority leader to end the session now and go over and vote to-

morrow under a unanimous-consent agreement, or, if the Senate wants to debate and vote on the bill, while we have so many Senators present, I am willing to do that tonight.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, in all kindness that we have abided his absence and we have not been bothered by whatever inconvenience there may have been in his absence over a protracted period of time. There have been no aspersions cast, and no provocation or inconvenience has been noted during his absence. I think the convenience of other Senators should be consulted. They have stayed in the Senate pretty religiously all day. It is now after 7 o'clock. I would much prefer not to stay until a late hour. I think I would be compelled to object to a request that the Senate remain in a late session this evening. I am quite content to come in earlier tomorrow, if that we must do; but I think the conveniences of Senators, their well-being, and the fact that they have engagements, should be considered. Several Senators on both sides of the aisle have already asked me about the matter, and they should be consulted. Therefore, I would certainly not agree to run into a late session. If it is desired to obtain a reasonable time limitation for tomorrow, it is perfectly agreeable to me. I shall try to be here. If I cannot be here, I certainly would not ask the Senate to abide my pleasure in the matter, because if I miss a rollcall, it is my fault.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I had the floor and yielded to the majority leader, I believe, to present some parliamentary inquiries. I am perfectly willing to continue to yield, but if we are to go back to a consideration of the bill before the Senate, I propose to hold the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to propose a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly; I yield for that purpose.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 10 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate convene at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning; that we have a morning hour; that at the conclusion of the morning hour we have a time limitation on the pending bill of not to exceed 30 minutes on any amendment, motion, or appeal, and not to exceed 1 hour on the passage of the bill, the time to be equally divided between the proponents of amendments or motions and the majority leader, if he is opposed; if not, by the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock——

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I withhold that motion, if Senators wish to make insertions.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Thursday, May 12, 1960, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill S. 910, cited as "Payments to Local Governments Act of 1959," debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

DEATH OF JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER, JR.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I announce to the Senate the death today of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., the father of the Governor of New York, and of five other children, Mrs. Jean Mauze, John D., III, Laurence S., Winthrop, and David, who have made their mark in the philanthropic, economic, and cultural life of our Nation. He and Mrs. Rockefeller established an outstanding family with a great tradition.

John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and the elder Rockefeller, contributed almost a billion dollars to philanthropy. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., was a very eminent citizen of my State of New York and made an outstanding record in war work. He helped to found the United Services Organization.

He was especially distinguished in the field of personal relationships in industry, and was the author of the book "The Personal Relation in Industry."

John D. Rockefeller, Jr., was especially outstanding in the field of medical research, having served as a trustee of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research from 1901 to 1954.

Mr. Rockefeller lived a good, fruitful, long life. He established the tremendously important and eminent family tradition of utilizing wealth for the highest purposes of public service. His death will be felt by the people of America; indeed, his passing will be mourned by people everywhere. He was an honored, distinguished, and most useful citizen of our State and Nation.

I express my condolences and sympathy to the family, and particularly to the Governor of our State, the Honorable Nelson Rockefeller.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I join with my distinguished colleague from New York in expressing deep sorrow upon the passing of John D. Rockefeller, Jr. Mr. Rockefeller has done a great deal for our Nation and for the State of New York through his many cultural activities and through his generous and unflagging philanthropic efforts to improve the lot of thousands of people throughout our land.

Mr. Rockefeller, as my distinguished colleague has just noted, was particularly active in the work of Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research among his many other philanthropic pursuits. He was also deeply interested in his alma mater, Brown University, and served her well. In sum, he was a citizen of the first rank.

Mr. President, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., lived a life of great achievement and thereby left a proud tradition for his distinguished sons, who are indeed following in his footsteps.

I express to all of the members of Mr. Rockefeller's family my deepest regret and sincere sympathy upon his passing.

FOOD AND CONTAINER INSTITUTE, QUARTERMASTER CORPS, U.S. ARMY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am informed that the military construction bill will be before the Senate on Friday, and I wish to put in the RECORD certain documents connected with authorization of $3,628,000 to transfer the Food and Container Institute from Chicago to Natick, Mass.

I wish to place in the RECORD a letter which I wrote this afternoon to our able colleague from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the chairman of the subcommittee, bringing out certain facts in connection with this matter; also as a supporting exhibit, a letter from the vice president, R. J. Spaeth, of the Illinois Institute of Technology, giving a cost figure for an identical new building and moving costs in Chicago; namely, $3,690,170, only $62,000 more than the Natick figure; a memorandum from the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry showing the heavy concentration of the Food and Container Institute's contracts in the Midwest and West; a statement by officers of leading food and container industries about the proposed transfer; another full memorandum from the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry; together with a fifth exhibit which is a statement presented to the subcommittee by Raymond J. Spaeth, vice president of the Illinois Institute of Technology.

I ask unanimous consent that all this material may be printed as a part of the RECORD, so it may be available for the information of Senators when the military construction bill comes before the Senate.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1960.

Re Food and Container Institute (military construction bills H.R. 10777, S. 3006).

Hon. JOHN STENNIS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Senate Armed Services Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STENNIS: I have just been informed that the Senate Armed Services Committee is proceeding to a consideration of the above bills for military construction authorization legislation, which in the Senate version, you will recall, includes an item for "Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center, Massachusetts: Research, development and test facilities, and troop housing $3,628,000" (p. 3, lines 3–5).

At the conclusion of the hearing in which you kindly received our testimony and that of other spokesmen from the Middle West in opposition to this item and in favor of retaining the Food and Container Institute in the Midwest, you may remember that an opportunity was expressly given for the presentation of further data to the committee concerning the costs of building comparable facilities in Chicago, and other material which might be relevant to the decision on this item. I am therefore enclosing for your information at this afternoon's meeting a letter which has just come from Mr. R. J. Spaeth, vice president of the Illinois Institute of Technology, which I believe to be of great importance to the recommendation which you may make from your subcommittee to the full committee.

It is clear from this letter that the earlier, higher estimates of construction costs in Chicago were based upon very informal conversations, for an area of space nearly 2 and 3 times the amount now being discussed at Natick and without benefit of any specifications provided by the Quartermaster Corps. The Illinois Institute has, therefore, recomputed these figures on the basis of 121,235 square feet as proposed for the new installation at Natick, and on the basis of a construction cost of $22 per square foot, which is soundly rooted in the costs of a research building currently under construction in Chicago.

With the savings in the smaller costs of relocation, the construction cost figures come to only slightly more than the figures recommended by the Quartermaster Corps in the pending bill; namely only $62,000.

If these costs are therefore so nearly the same (which I had hoped your staff might have a little more time to determine more completely), then the other factors of convenience of location to the food and container industries and the principal research establishments in these fields would seem to me to prove conclusively that this installation should be kept in Chicago, as urged by so many representatives of those industries.

In addition, I am enclosing a second item furnished to me by the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, which shows that the great preponderance of contracts let by the Food and Container Institute for research outside of its own facility are with firms in the Middle West and West. This merely confirms the obvious fact that the location of the Food and Container Institute will be more convenient in Chicago for the outside contracts which must be let as a part of its work.

May I express to you and to the other members of your subcommittee and of the full committee my earnest hope that the, to us, obvious advantages of maintaining this facility in Chicago will be given your most careful consideration. I only regret that the Quartermaster Corps did not give the Illinois Institute or those in whose behalf I requested it from the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry a full opportunity to go into all of these details last fall before they ever brought up this recommendation to your committee.

With kindest regards,
Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

EXHIBIT 1

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Chicago, May 9, 1960.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: In your letter of April 28, 1960, to the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry regarding retention of the Food and Container Institute of the Quartermaster Corps of the U.S. Army in Chicago you asked that the Institute check its earlier figures on the relative costs of building this facility in Chicago, and then prepare a new proposal based upon using the same square footage and type of facilities in Chicago as the Army proposed at Natick, Mass.

One of the Institute's problems in negotiations with the Quartermaster Corps was our failure to get a set of specifications of their requirements. As a result, we have never been able to provide the Quartermaster Corps with a specific proposal. The Institute's proposals were in informal conversations.

The report to the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, by the Comptroller General of the United States, in April 1960, on page 29, first paragraph, stated that the facilities and equipment cost of the installation at Illinois Institute of Technology would be an estimated $5,940,000. The following paragraph states that the construction cost of these facilities at the Institute was considered to be on the order of $9,700,000. The Institute has no idea of how either of these two figures was determined, although general discussions mentioned a facility providing from 200,000 to 300,000 square feet of space. This amount of space with the necessary equipment might justify figures of this size.

The proposal submitted to Congress by the Quartermaster Corps, however, page 53 of the backup book, Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center, Mass., research and development, test facilities, and troop housing $3,628,000, requests facilities as follows:

	Construction	Equipment
Office and heavy laboratory building, partially air-conditioned, 59,375 square feet, at $21.25, plus site and utility costs	$1,336,000	
Relocation of equipment		$141,000
New equipment		306,000
Development building, addition and conversion, 52,800 square feet, at $16.75, plus site and utility costs	991,000	
Relocation of equipment		235,000
New equipment		517,000
Animal laboratory, 7,000 square feet, at $21.50, plus site and utility costs	155,000	13,000
Barracks for 16 men, 2,060 square feet	34,000	
Total (121,235 square feet)	2,516,000	1,212,000
Total project	3,628,000	

If the above is a correct statement of the needs of this facility, then it could be built adjacent to the institute campus practically within the budgeted figures requested.

The institute currently has under construction a research building substantially better than the space described in the Quartermaster Corps request to Congress. The institute building is entirely air conditioned, consisting of 60,000 square feet, with a total cost, including architect's fees, site preparation, utility extensions, and full construction of $21.10 per square foot. Allowing for a small increase in construction costs and the fact that this building will require some extended utility lines, but also providing better space than anticipated, we estimate the following costs:

121,235 square feet at $22	$2,667,170
100,000 square feet of land	100,000
Total construction and land costs	2,767,170
Probable savings in relocation of equipment from amounts budgeted:	
Estimated cost Chicago to Natick	376,000
Less probable savings in cost of	275,000
Trucking from 39th Street to 31st Street in Chicago	100,000
New equipment, same as in congressional request	823,000
Total	3,690,170

The Institute was visited last week by a site selection committee for the food radiation laboratory, which laboratory rightfully belongs immediately adjacent to the Food and Container Institute and food research program of the Quartermaster Corps. They state this laboratory would require an area of approximately 20,000 square feet. If this 20,000 square feet were added to the above project at a cost of approximately $22 per square foot, the entire Food and Container Institute and radiation laboratory could be housed in Chicago for a total construction and land cost of approximately $3,250,000.

We hope that these figures will be of help to the Quartermaster Corps and Congress in their consideration of retaining these facilities in Chicago.

Sincerely,

R. J. SPAETH,
Vice President and Treasurer.

EXHIBIT 2

CHICAGO ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 2, 1960

RELOCATION OF FOOD AND CONTAINER CONTRACTS

Through research assistance from private industry, the Government saves countless manpower hours each year. Sixty percent of the institute's cost contracts and over 55 percent of its no-cost agreements are with firms in Chicago or the Midwest. If the institute were moved to Natick, there would be a tremendous increase in the cost of supervising these contracts resulting from increased travel and telephone expense as well as travel time required. A breakdown of contract locations follows:

A. Cost contracts based on dollar value:

Midwest	$1,039,334.37
East (including New York, Pennsylvania, Washington, D.C.)	422,301.00
West coast	888,602.00
South (Georgia, Florida, West Virginia)	189,665.87

(These figures do not include an item for the Surgeon General in the amount of $849,000 because the work is being done at Fitzsimons General Hospital, Denver.)

B. Cost contracts based on percentage of total number of contracts:

	Percent
East	22.5
Midwest	49.3
West	22.5
South	5.7

(The item for the Surgeon General is not included in these figures.)

C. No cost contracts:

	Firms
Midwest (mostly Chicago)	17
East	4
West	4

EXHIBIT 3

STATEMENT OF THE FOOD AND CONTAINER INDUSTRIES ON THE PROPOSED MOVE OF THE QUARTERMASTER FOOD AND CONTAINER INSTITUTE FROM CHICAGO TO NATICK, MASS.

We, the undersigned, representing the major food and container organizations located in the Midwest, oppose the proposed move of the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute from Chicago to Natick, Mass,. for these reasons:

1. The Midwest has been for many years and is today the center of food and container research and development for the Nation because it is also the chief source of supply of the basic raw materials involved. Private laboratories of corporations, universities, and trade associations located in the Midwest are readily accessible to the Institute. The close liaison between these laboratories and the Institute aids it materially in the efficient, economical performance of its mission.

2. Nationally, Chicago is centrally located and easily reached by all forms of transportation. This is essential to the success of frequent scientific conferences, meetings, and consultations held by the Institute for representatives from private industry.

3. Recruiting technical personnel, a difficult job in any location, is simplified in Chicago because institutions doing graduate work in food and packaging technology are more numerous in the Midwest than in any other part of the country.

In summary, removal of the Institute from Chicago would deprive it of the knowledge and services of basic food and packaging science centered in the major food and container industry laboratories and institutions of the Middle West.

Daniel F. Gerber, President, Gerber Baby Foods, Fremont, Mich.; William A. Beich, Vice President, Paul F. Beich Co., Bloomington, Ill.; Russell D. L. Wirth, President, Red Star Yeast & Products Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; J. Clyde Loftis, President, Kraft Foods Co., Chicago, Ill.; Daniel J. Uhrig, President, American Bakeries, Co., Chicago, Ill.; R. G. Lucks, President, California Packing Corp., San Francisco, Calif.; K. W. Brighton, Vice President and General Manager, American Can Co., Barrington, Ill.; Roscoe G. Haynie, President, Wilson & Co., Inc., Chicago, Ill.; Herbert R. Stratford, Executive Vice President, Morton Salt Co., Chicago, Ill.; Dale W. Johnson, Manager, Edible Protein Products, Central Soya Co., Inc., Chicago, Ill.; A. V. Williams, Vice President, Lawry's Products, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.; G. F. Atkinson, General Manager, Durkee Famous Foods Division, The Glidden Co., Chicago, Ill.; C. S. Bridges, President, Libby, McNeill & Libby, Chicago, Ill.; W. G. Mason, Vice President, Marketing, the Quaker Oats Co., Chicago, Ill.; P. K. Bates, Ph. D., General Manager of Research, Carnation Co., Van Nuys, Calif.; G. C. Scott, Vice President, Research, Green Giant Co., LeSueur, Minn.; J. B. Pardieck, President, California Vegetable Concentrates, Inc., Huntington Park, Calif.; Douglas S. Steinberg, President, National Confectioners Association, Chicago, Ill.; John T. Walsh, Director, American Dry Milk Institute, Inc., Chicago, Ill.; M. A. Peterson, General Manager, Idaho Potato Growers, Inc., Idaho Falls, Idaho; George L. Sternfield, Executive Vice President, Kitchen Art Foods, Inc., Chicago, Ill.; C. L. Griffith, President, the Griffith Laboratories, Inc., Chicago, Ill.; Robert W. Reneker, Vice President, Swift & Co., Chicago, Ill.; Arthur T. O'Connor, Secretary-Treasurer, Dean Milk Co., Franklin Park, Ill.; Robert J. Greenebaum, President, Inland Steel Container Co., Chicago, Ill.; R. Bruce Holmgren, Editor, Package Engineering, Chicago, Ill.; Harold M. Mayer, Vice President, Oscar Mayer & Co., Chicago, Ill.; Dwight P. Joyce, Chairman and President, The Glidden Co., Cleveland, Ohio; Philip N. Wrigley, President, Wm. Wrigley, Jr., Co., Chicago, Ill.; H. L. Slaughter, Vice President, Durkee Famous Foods Division, The Glidden Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

EXHIBIT 4

CHICAGO ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY, CHICAGO

Subject: Relocation on the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute for the Armed Forces.

I. THE PROBLEM

A. Relocation of the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute for the Armed Forces from 1819 West Pershing Road, Chicago, to the Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center, Natick, Mass., is now being considered. We believe there are distinct advantages to the Government in maintaining the Chicago location.

B. Producing and packaging new and improved foods presents practical problems as well as a need for basic research. To perform its mission efficiently the Institute must maintain frequent contact with commercial researches in the food and container fields and administrators of companies producing food and containers. Close cooperation with scientists and research workers in specialized fields and proximity to well-staffed laboratories are also important. Adequate libraries are essential.

II. THE INSTITUTE IN CHICAGO

The Quartermaster Subsistence School, forerunner of the Institute, was established in Chicago in 1921. Two factors dictated this location: (1) Proximity to the military procurement agency; and (2) proximity to research facilities at nearby universities and food and packaging industries.

After a consolidation during World War II, the Institute emerged in 1950 as an organization for research and development in foods and food packaging for the Department of the Army, reporting to the Quartermaster General. Three years later, when the Quartermaster's Research and Engineering Command was activated at Natick, Mass., the Institute was placed under its command.

The Institute partially occupies one of three 6-story buildings owned by the Government and called the Chicago administrative center. Last year (1959) the budget allotment to the Institute to cover cost of space it now occupies (including heat, electricity, janitorial service, and other housekeeping facilities furnished by the center) was about $265,000. Another half million dollars is allotted for maintenance of equipment, purchase of new equipment, perishable supplies, administrative travel, etc. The Institute presently employs about 246.

III. THE MISSION OF THE INSTITUTE

It is the mission of the Institute to:

A. Provide and/or coordinate the research, development, and engineering for Armed Forces rations and subsistence items and for containers.

B. Develop specifications and related standardization documents for the manufacture of supplies and containers.

C. Provide the technical and engineering services required to maintain rations and containers in the supply system.

IV. WHAT PROPONENTS OF THE MOVE CONTEND

Although it is also argued that the current facilities are unsuited to the research mission involved, relocation of the Institute has been proposed primarily to save money. The Army contends that since the Institute is no longer a tenant of a larger organization (as it was in 1952 when a similar move was considered) it can be more economically supported by consolidation with other Quartermaster research and engineering functions.

The Army states that the Chicago Administrative Center (which houses the Institute) has become "inefficient and excessively costly to operate" and that the move of all tenants of the center is "highly desirable." It is estimated that inactivation of the center will save the Quartermaster Corps in the neighborhood of $1,150,000 a year. Approximately one-third of the total cost will be saved by co-locating the Institute with the Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center in Natick.

V. WHY CHICAGO?

These are the six primary reasons for maintaining the Institute's Chicago site:

A. Unlimited research facilities are immediately available. The Institute now maintains close liaison with the University of Chicago, Northwestern University, Illinois Institute of Technology (and the Armour Research Foundation), the University of Illinois Medical Center, and Argonne National Laboratory, all located nearby. The John Crerar Library, in Chicago's Loop, is one of the great scientific libraries of the world.

B. Recruiting technical personnel, a difficult job in any location, is simplified in Chicago because institutions doing graduate work in food technology are more numerous in the Midwest than in any other part of the country. Convenient to Chicago are the University of Illinois at Urbana, Michigan State University, the University of Wisconsin, the University of Minnesota, Iowa State University, Kansas State University, and Purdue University.

C. Contacts with food industries, those with which the Quartermaster Corps spends it largest amounts of money each year, are easily maintained in Chicago, undisputedly the Nation's center for food production. Chicago produces more meat products than any other city in the Nation and ranks second in grain mill products.

It also is the country's major producer of containers of all kinds. The food and packaging industries maintain their principal laboratories in the Chicago area. The Government saves a great deal of manpower hours each year from assistance of industry food and packaging technologists furnished through industry advisory committees. There are 17 industry advisory committees and 29 task groups cooperating with the Institute. Members attend committee meetings at their own or their firm's expense.

More food and container trade associations, an important means of contact with the industries, are located in Chicago than in any other city in the United States. Many of these associations have their own research facilities.

D. Chicago is centrally located and easily reached by all forms of transportation. Communication, not only with the rest of the United States, but with the whole world, is convenient. With the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway and establishment of direct flights between Chicago and European capitals, Chicago is no longer merely an inland city. All of this encourages nationwide food and packaging industry meetings and helps attract qualified personnel for the Institute.

E. A Chicago site would enable the Institute to maintain, at nominal cost, its close relationship with the Military Subsistence Supply Agency (MSSA) and the Army Subsistence Center. The Institute has daily contact with MSSA, located at 226 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago. There are weekly conferences and daily telephone calls between the two agencies; it is estimated that there are several hundred calls weekly.

Any improvement or development of rations culminates in new or revised specifications used by the MSSA for procurement of subsistence supplies for the Armed Forces. Thus, it is of the utmost importance that the Institute be located in close proximity to the MSSA.

F. Unless its present activities are greatly curtailed, the Institute can be operated at less cost to the Government in Chicago than at Natick.

1. The Illinois Institute of Technology has land available and can arrange financing to provide a suitable facility to house this operation at a comparable, if not substantially less, cost than the same physical facilities can be provided and operated at Natick.

2. All services presently furnished by the Chicago Administration Center and allocated to the Institute (e.g., heat, electricity, janitor service, and other housekeeping facilities) will be required at approximately the same cost wherever the Institute is located. Any savings claimed in this category as a result of the proposed move are fictitious. (In fact, administrative travel and telephone costs will probably increase because of the need for close contact with MSSA.) Savings to the Quartermaster Corps may result but Government expenditures would not be appreciably reduced.

3. Relocation would involve a direct outlay by the Government of about $6 million.

(*a*) The Research and Engineering Command does not presently have sufficient space at Natick to adequately house the Institute. Estimates for proper facilities vary from $4 to $5 million.

(*b*) The movement of equipment and personnel (present strength about 246) would cost about $1 million.

I. MISSION AND PROGRAMS: QUARTERMASTER FOOD AND CONTAINER INSTITUTE FOR THE ARMED FORCES

A. Mission:

1. Provide and/or coordinate the research, development, and engineering required for Armed Forces' rations and subsistence items and for containers for quartermaster supplies (except fuels and lubricants) to meet anticipated tactical and logistical requirements.

2. Develop specifications and related standardization documents to guide procurement of these items.

3. Provide technical and engineering services required to maintain these items in the supply system.

A current official statement of the Institute's mission is provided in C below.

B. Program:

1. Research and development (primarily directed toward meeting future military requirements).

Food acceptance study.
Radiation preservation of food.
Food research.
Food products development.
Simplified food logistics.
Container development.
Aerial delivery equipment (one task only).
Support services:
Direct: Command and staff.
Indirect: Housekeeping, finance and accounting, transportation, communications, etc.

2. Operations and maintenance (primarily directed to present supply system).

Applications engineering.
Standardization.
Materiel exploitation.

C. An official statement of mission:

"Accomplishes that part of the command mission, as reflected in programs and/or technical projects which are approved and assigned by the Headquarters, Quartermaster Research and Engineering Command, including, but not limited to, the following:

"1. Executes a research and/or development program concerned with:

"(a) basic research in food nutrition, stability, and acceptance;

"(b) design, improvement, development, evaluation of military rations and food products for the Armed Forces;

"(c) design, development, and evaluation of containers for which the Quartermaster Corps has assigned responsibility;

"(d) research and development on irradiation preservation processes, and the establishment of the wholesomeness of foods so processed.

"2. Effects the command standardization program, as applicable.

"3. Provides technical services and engineering support to other elements of the Quartermaster Corps, Department of the Army and Department of Defense, as required." (From Organization Manual, Quartermaster Food and Container Institute for the Armed Forces, dated May 1958.)

D. Applications engineering program fiscal year 1959:

1. Technical and engineering services to the following:

Military Clothing and Textile Supply Agency.
Army Subsistence Center (Chicago).
Military Subsistence Supply Agency (Chicago).
Subsistence Division, OQMG.
Procurement Activity, Columbus General Depot.
QM Equipment and Parts Commodity Center.
Operations Control Office, OQMG.
Military Personnel and Training Division, OQMG.
Exhibits and displays.
Boards, etc.

2. Problem solution areas:

Radiation preservation of food—support to long-term animal feeding studies.
Time-temperature indicator for frozen food utilization of canned and glass-packed subsistence.
Moisture test for low-moisture fruits and vegetables.
Chemical and physical procedures for defining quantitatively the degree of smoking meat products.

E. Standardization program areas, fiscal year 1959:

Review of detailed plans as participating and interested activity.
Standardization projects:
Coordinated projects completed or in process as preparing activity:
Specifications.
Standards.
Studies.
Projects reviewed as custodian and interested activity.
Qualified products list projects.
Other standardization activity:
Preparation of purchase descriptions.
Miscellaneous.

II. HISTORY: QUARTERMASTER FOOD AND CONTAINER INSTITUTE FOR THE ARMED FORCES

A. Creation in 1936:

1. Established in July 1936, the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute for the Armed Forces was first known as the Subsistence Research Laboratory. Generally, its mission was to give the Office of the Quartermaster General technical advice on merits of the various food products it was asked to buy.

2. Originally housed on the first floor of Building A, Chicago Quartermaster Depot, in the space occupied from 1920 to June 1936 by the Quartermaster Subsistence School, the Subsistence Research Laboratory began its operations with two civilian members and one office. By September 1941 the technical staff numbered 13, and a rough division of responsibility was effected in terms of commodity groups. The tremendous increase in workload and a lesser one in personnel since World War II began necessitated establishment of separate commodity branches and delegation of responsibility and authority to them. New branches were established when the workload required and personnel could be obtained for them.

3. On December 14, 1942, the Subsistence Research Laboratory, initially a division of the depot and part of the Supply Division, Office of the Quartermaster General, became responsible to the subsistence and packaging section, Research and Development Branch, following establishment of the recently created Military Planning Division. For such administrative matters as personnel, supply, travel orders, and janitor services, it remained under the Chicago Quartermaster Depot. To alleviate overcrowding of the Subsistence Research Laboratory, a new laboratory was constructed on the sixth floor of Building B and was dedicated January 8, 1944.

4. Shortly after moving into its new quarters, the Subsistence Research Laboratory was redesignated the Quartermaster Subsistence Research and Development Laboratory. Far from the small, ill-equipped group it had been at the start of the war, the Subsistence Research and Development Laboratory, with accelerated activity, underwent new organizational changes. In the fall of 1944 its Director became, in addition, Director of the Subsistence Section in Washington, requiring him to divide his time between Chicago and Washington. Accordingly, he appointed two assistant directors, one for commodity development and one for technical services, to coordinate activities of the development and technical branches, respectively. In February 1945, a Project Control Board of Subsistence Research and Development Laboratory staff members was appointed to review and coordinate internal projects; at the same time, a Committee on Food Research was established by the Subsistence Section to set up and administer an external research program.

5. The laboratory's wartime activity was at its height by July 1945. Its personnel numbered 285, of whom 68 were military; it dealt directly with hundreds of food and food-packaging concerns, with university research groups; and had both formal and informal relationships with several other Government agencies.

In November it was made a class IV, later a class II, activity, and its wartime Director became its first commanding officer.

B. Major organizational changes in 1946:

1. Additional missions were assigned early in the postwar period, among them to provide research and development for containers of all Quartermaster supplies, except fuels and lubricants. The Subsistence Section in Washington was deactivated and its responsibilities transferred to the Subsistence Research and Development Laboratory. In recognition of its increased duties, the Subsistence Research and Development Laboratory was renamed the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute for the Armed Forces in 1946. Many organizational changes have been made since then—consolidation of a major portion of the wartime activities and some additional ones in the Food Laboratories, incorporation of the Committee on Food Research into the Scientific Liaison and Advisory Council where provision was made for container research as well, and incorporation of members of the group into the National Research Council Committee on Foods and Committee on Containers.

2. On October 1, 1953, the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute for the Armed Forces became responsible to the newly established Quartermaster Research and Development Command at Natick, Mass. Because physical facilities at Natick had not been completed at that time, operational control remained within the office of the Quartermaster General until February 1, 1954, when it was transferred to the Headquarters, Quartermaster Research and Development Command.

3. The Quartermaster Corps in 1953 began an extensive research and development program in the use of ionizing radiations for processing foods. This led to further organizational changes in the Institute. By late 1955, this program had assumed such significance that a separate branch was established in the Food Laboratories and a special office created under the Scientific Director. By early 1958 this office was reestablished as a division, organizationally on the same level as the Food Laboratory and Container Laboratory. Another new undertaking, applications engineering as distinct from research and development, begun by the Quartermaster Corps in 1955, led to organizational changes within the laboratories to reflect this distinction. As experience was gained with this new activity, it became apparent that applications engineering work could probably be conducted more effectively without organizational separation on the operating level. Accordingly, early in 1958, applications engineering elements within the laboratories, redesignated as divisions, were consolidated with research and development.

C. Chronology:

In 1920: QM Subsistence School activated in Chicago.

June 1936: QM Subsistence School deactivated (change 1, AR 350–910, April 1936).

July 1936: QMC Subsistence Research and Development Laboratory established in Chicago (letter from the Quartermaster General to commanding officer, Chicago Quartermaster Depot, July 24, 1936).

February–March 1946: Research and development of subsistence, subsistence packaging and containers for QM supplies (except POL) consolidated in Chicago at QMC Subsistence Research and Development Laboratory, the title of which was changed to Quartermaster Food and Container Institute for the Armed Forces (ASF Circular No. 46, p. 2, par. IV, Feb. 26, 1946; letter from OQMG to CO, QMF & CLAF, Feb. 26, 1946).

1950: Cognizance for research and development in the field of food (including food packaging) delegated by Department of Defense to the Department of the Army, which redelegated to the Quartermaster General. The QMF & CIAF was named as the implementing organization (RDB 251/5.1, May 22, 1950; G4/F1–30447, Jun 16, 1950; RDB 133/11, July 12, 1950; EFD 6/7, Nov. 24, 1950; and RDB 251/8, Feb. 5, 1951).

1953: QMR & E Command activated at Natick, Mass., and QMF & CLAF, formerly reporting directly to OQMG, placed under its command (DA GO No. 73, Sept. 28, 1953).

III. BOARDS, COMMITTEES, AND COUNCILS: QUARTERMASTER FOOD AND CONTAINER INSTITUTE FOR THE ARMED FORCES

A. Committees on Foods and Containers of the Advisory Board on Quartermaster Research and Development, National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences:

1. Established as a private, nonprofit corporation by legislative enactment in 1863, the National Academy of Sciences renders upon request, advisory services in the fields of the natural sciences and their application to agencies of the Federal Government and to others in programs of research directed toward the national safety or the general public welfare. The National Research Council was established in 1916 in response to a request by President Wilson that the base of the advisory services undertaken by the Academy be broadened.

2. The Quartermaster General in 1943 requested independence advisory service on his research and development program and for this purpose established a formal contract with the Academy-Research Council. To fulfill the terms of this agreement, the Committee on Quartermaster Problems was organized by the National Research Council under the Division of Engineering and Industrial Research.

3. In 1948, the scope of the quartermaster advisory activity was broadened, and the Committee was reorganized as the Advisory Board on Quartermaster Research and Development.

4. The Committee on Foods is one of a number of technical committees organized by the Advisory Board to provide advice in specific areas of quartermaster research and development. Its primary function is to advise the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute on the nature, scope, and conduct of the food research and development program directed toward most efficient achievement of its assigned missions. The Committee on Foods is organized into the following subcommittees:

Acceptance.
Animal products.
Cereal and baked products.
Dairy, oil, and fat products.
Experimental cookery.
Food stability.
Fruit and vegetable products.
Microbiology.
Nutrition.
Radiation preservation ad hoc on high level dosimetry.

5. The Committee on Containers is another of the technical committees organized by the Advisory Board to provide advice in specific areas of quartermaster research and development. It counsels the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute on the nature, scope, and conduct of the container research and development program directed toward most efficient achievement of its assigned missions. The Committee on Containers has two subcommittees—Subsistence Packaging and Container Research.

B. Quartermaster Corps industry advisory committees:

1. Industry advisory committees are established by the Quartermaster General at the request of the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute to furnish industry advice to the Institute on specific problems arising in research and development and applications engineering work on quartermaster items. These committees are composed of individuals representing specific industries.

2. These committees and task groups have been created by the Quartermaster General to advise the Institute:

(a) Food acceptance: Sensory testing methods.
(b) Animal products:
Canned fluid foods.
Canned meat.
Dehydrated meat.
Frankfurters.
Frozen breaded shrimps.
(c) Cereal and baked products:
Active dry yeast.
Canned steamed puddings.
Crackers, biscuits, and cookies.
Prepared bakery mixes.
Fresh pastries.
(d) Dairy, oil, and fat products:
Cheese.
Dry milk.
Fat spreads.
Milk products.
Shortening.
Frozen cottage cheese.
Mayonnaise and salad dressing.
(e) Food evaluation: Precooked frozen meals.
(f) Fruit and vegetable products:
Dehydration of fruits.
Dehydration of vegetables.
(g) General products:
Chocolate and cocoa.
Confections.
Instant coffee.
Prepared pie fillings.
(h) Nutrition: Vitamins.
(i) Radiation preservation of foods: Radiation preservation of foods.
(j) Food stability: Critical storage temperatures of frozen foods.
(k) Container:
Interior enamels for cans for meat and meat products.
Multiwall bags.
Mechanical appliances for demountable containers.
Flexible containers for processed foods.
Packaging of soaps.
Coatings and cold spray-type strippable coatings.
Standards for classification of defects on outside coated can.
Volatile corrosion inhibitors.

C. The Institute's freeze dehydration project, illustrating close cooperation between the Institute and scientific and industrial research organizations:

1. Extensive research, supported by numerous field trials, has clearly established the advantages of freeze dried meats for military personnel where refrigeration is inadequate or undependable. Freeze dried meats reconstitute within 10 to 15 minutes after the addition of water to provide a product virtually indistinguishable from the product prior to freeze drying, even though it is subjected to prolonged storage without refrigeration.

2. Freeze dehydration makes it possible to offer the soldier a greater variety of meat, including poultry and fish, than is possible with canning as a method of preservation. Precooked dehydrated meals can be prepared under field conditions in 10 to 15 minutes without trained personnel or special equipment enabling the Armed Forces to feed highly mobile, well-dispersed fighting units. From the logistical viewpoint, dehydration is being assigned increased importance, especially when supplying troops by air is required; there is a significant reduction in weight (on the average about 65 percent) and volume.

3. Development of dehydration techniques results from the close teamwork of the Institute and scientific and industrial research organizations.

(a) Basic laboratory work was, and still continues to be, conducted at the American Meat Institute at the University of Chicago. The University of California at Davis made significant contributions; valuable technical support came from the University of Illinois and Ohio State University. Current contracts require close cooperation with the American Meat Institute Foundation, Northwestern University, the American Institute for Biological Research in Madison, Wis., the University of Illinois, Illinois Institute of Technology, Rutgers University, Purdue University, Oregon State College, and the University of California.

(b) In the meat industry, Wilson & Co. has been active in developing freeze dried meat products and an efficient method of utilizing beef carcasses. Freeze drying facilities at Armour & Co. played an important role in the Institute's experimental program and Swift & Co. currently holds a contract for the development of a special prefabricated precooked steak.

Wilson, Armour, and the Courtland Laboratories of Los Angeles have been the sources of supply of freeze dried meat for field tests. These same organizations have also contributed substantially to the Armed Forces knowledge of production, procurement documents, and product testing. Anticipating future requirements of the armed services and the Institute, both Armour and Wilson are expanding their freeze drying facilities. A new Armour facility will open in March 1960, in Bellwood.

D. An example of the Institute's cooperation with the container industry:

Beginning after World War II, and on a continuing basis, Institute container technologists have worked closely with the research divisions of the two major can companies located in the Chicago area to review possibilities of reducing tinplate requirements for military canned ration items.

This cooperation has resulted in large reductions in tinplate requirements and a saving of literally millions of dollars in Armed Forces expenditures.

"[From Food Technology, 1959, vol. XIII, No. 11]

"MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL LIAISON

"A RECAPITULATION OF ITS VALUES IN IMPROVING RATIONS AND CONTAINERS

"Modern firepower—missiles, atomic bombs, and all the fantastic hardware developed in the last 10 or 15 years—tends to overshadow a very basic fact. Warfare tomorrow will be conducted by highly industrialized nations. Not for any personal reasons, but because I feel it urgently important, I would like to illustrate the importance of military-industrial liaison in wartime by a few observations on what was accomplished through the joint efforts of the military and the U.S. food industry in researching, developing, manufacturing, and distributing the rations of World War II. It was my privilege to be closely associated with this effort.

"PUTTING A NEW RATION SYSTEM ON A WAR FOOTING

"When the Subsistence Research and Development Laboratory, predecessor of the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute for the Armed Forces, Chicago, came into being in 1939, it quickly became evident to my small staff and me, that whether we liked it or not a part of our assigned task was to put Army rations—a whole new system of rations—on a war footing. Our immediate task was developing a food and packaging research and development facility capable of systematizing and improving the largely obsolescent and certainly inadequate ration system that existed. But research and development problems were not the only problems we had to keep in mind. We had to ascertain if we could, and to make some shrewd guesses if we could not, as to the time and the place and the forces who would be using World War II rations. It was evident, even before the United States entered the war, that this was to be a different kind of war—far more mechanized than World War I and with a third dimension, airpower, added to the picture.

"It was also evident that the industries—in our case the food and packaging industries—would be full partners in the effort.

"You cannot enter a war and then decide to revolutionize an industry in order to make it more responsive to military needs. During a war you make as few changes in the middle of the stream as possible. You learn how to use the industrial plants that you have, not to redesign them. You work with the veteran leaders of industry who have developed a great deal of sagacity in the manufacturing and distribution of food.

"It was reassuring that our laboratory was located in Chicago. A few blocks away were the Union Stockyards and the plants of Armour, Swift, Libby, and Cudahy. Outside our windows to the south were the spurlines that bore the packinghouse products out to the consumers. A few blocks to the east was a branch establishment of the Continental Can Co. The American Can Co. had a plant west of us. Within easy range were spice companies, coffee manufacturers, the Fulton Street markets, refrigeration companies, yeast companies, the Short Milling Co.—even a brewery.

"We in the United States because we hate war, have never located our industries and transportation systems in accordance with strategic military planning as was done in Germany to some extent before World War II and, more recently, in Russia. Therefore, to have our laboratory, which became during World War II an information and liaison center for the food and packaging industries, in Chicago was an undisguised blessing. We could not have handled the "crash" problems that poured in on us during the war without having at our elbow for immediate consultation the food experts available at the Union Stock Yards, the can companies, the canning companies, and the food plants, large and small, that stud the Chicago area and the Midwest. It is worth mentioning, in this regard, that two-thirds of lend-lease supplies delivered to our allies, flowed from the Chicago Quartermaster Depot, where we were located.

"BUILDING AN EFFECTIVE MILITARY-INDUSTRY LIAISON

"How do you go about building an effective liaison with industry during an emergency? There is never any question as to the patriotic desire of industry to cooperate, but there is a world of difference between desire and action. In tackling our problems—designing, developing, and getting into volume production the kinds of rations required for a new kind of war—one of our very first objectives, even before we got into World War II, was to get across to the food industries the nature and scope of the overall problem. Through letters, conferences in our laboratory experimental kitchen, talks before industrial groups—we made it known that this would be a new and different kind of war and that it would be necessary to probe deeply into the requirements underlying the use of rations in completely new combat and combat-related situations. It was not too well recognized prior to World War II that storage, transportation, and issue would be far more complicated, that the preparation and consumption of food would take place in all kinds of strange places, that new equipment, specifications, manufacturing techniques, would be involved, and that the volume of food going to the Armed Forces would exceed anything known before. Should another war come, however, the problems will be even greater.

"In these preliminary efforts to develop interest in military problems we met with virtually complete cooperation from the industries—the few instances of disinterest being due to a certain reluctance to face the fact that 'a war was going to be on.'

"But the war came and our job was quickly increased to a size far beyond what we had forecast. In fact, we began receiving, almost at once, very specific requests—requests for rations to meet the variables of climate (the subarctic, the desert), of terrain (mountains, jungles, etc.), and types of operation (paratroop drops, beachhead landings, etc.). Hindsight tells us that we should have broadened the field utility of some of these rations, but who would know that the K-ration with a caloric value of 2,700, designed for a maximum use of 5 days, would be issued interchangeably with C-ration without regard for time? But as time went on, the shakedown testing of actual combat gave us a more accurately adjusted view of the requirements, and before the war closed the general principles of feeding men for a war of the type of World War II were clear. In the main the rations developed and supplied the troops during World War II fulfilled their purposes. But I must emphasize again that our basic principle was working with the food and packaging industries as partners.

"WHY IS MILITARY-INDUSTRY COORDINATION OF SUCH IMPORTANCE?

"A brief answer to this question, based on the experience of World War II may be useful to have on record. As my many associates, military and civilian, who were engaged in food research and development in World War II will agree, there was virtually no aspect of military foods and feeding that did not demand our joint attention. In general, however, the areas that demanded closest coordination with industry were three: (1) the adaptability of foods and packaging to specific military operations, (2) the stability of foods and packaging under extremes of climate and military types of handling and storage, (3) the eating quality of foods. It is gratifying that these three areas—in terms of a possible future conflict—were covered at a 2-day conference last September, held at the Stockyard Inn. The proceedings of this conference are available in limited quantity at my office.

"Adjusting foods and packaging to 'military life' is more difficult in many ways than adjusting raw recruits to military ways of doing things. To do so requires a knowledge of the performance capacity of soldiers under stress, how ration systems fit into military operation systems, the potentials of the food and packaging industries for meeting the often exacting requirements of packaged rations—and a constant, day-after-day attention to the chemical, microbiological, physical, and psychological aspects of food. This is a large order as the outstanding group of men and women who made up my staff, and I myself, found out. It takes organization, it takes patience, it takes a stable program well supported by higher echelons to do the job. All of these things we had in World War II—and all of these things we shall need if another holocaust descends on us.

"In concluding, I would like to pay tribute to the able and dedicated people, military and civilian, who made up the SRDL of World War II. Not only did they advance the science and technology of rations and packaging but they also helped to create the understanding and ready communication among military, industry, and institutional groups that is being perpetuated today at the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute for the Armed Forces.

"ROHLAND A. ISKER,
"Colonel, Quartermaster Corps (Retired), Research and Development Associates, Food and Container Institute, Inc., Chicago, Ill."

IV. PHYSICAL PLANT AND SERVICES: QUARTERMASTER FOOD AND CONTAINER INSTITUTE FOR THE ARMED FORCES

A. Present physical plant, budget and staff:

1. The Institute presently occupies about 188,000 square feet in a facility called the Chicago Administration Center at 1819 West Pershing Road, Chicago. The Government-owned plant consists of three six-story buildings and a garage which were used as a supply depot from World War I to 1955 when the center was activated. Ten Government offices were housed in the center.

"A" building is partially occupied by the Quartermaster Chicago Administration Center, U.S. Army Subsistence Center, 5th Army Statistical and Accounting Division, 5th Army Veterinary Food Inspection Service, and by the Post Office Department Supply Center.

"B" building is partially occupied by the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute and the Military Subsistence Testing Laboratory.

"C" building is partially occupied by the Department of Agriculture Dairy Branch Laboratory, 5th Army Finance and Accounting Office and the U.S. Army Meat and Dairy Hygiene School.

2. In 1959 the budget allotment to the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute amounted to about $265,000 as payment for space it now occupies including heat, electricity, janitor service, and other "housekeeping" facilities furnished by the Chicago Administration Center. Approximately $500,000 is allotted for maintenance of equipment, purchase of new equipment, perishable supplies, administrative travel, etc.

3. The Institute presently employs about 246.

B. Support services provided by the Chicago Administration Center to the Quarter-

master Food and Container Institute for the Armed Forces:

1. General administration: Security measures; fire prevention regulations; establishment of a regular workday; declaration of holidays; general regulations; and customs of the installation.

2. Special staff services: Command inspection; intelligence; public information; claims and safety.

3. Management assistance services: Management studies and analysis; statistics and statistical analysis; personnel strength control; organization control; reports and forms control; and consultant.

4. Budget and funds control services: Personnel funding estimates and control; mission and local procurement funds estimates and control.

5. Finance and accounting services: Payroll, personnel, mission, and local procurement funds accounting; and cost accounting.

6. Machine accounting services.

7. Civilian personnel services.

8. Administrative services: Mail and records, records administration, messenger service, telephone, teletype, central reproduction, and motor pool.

9. Local logistic services: Supply operations, self-service supply center, purchasing and contracting, service unit (receiving).

10. Housekeeping services: Custodial (office areas); organizational and field maintenance of furniture and typewriters and office appliances; security (guards); fire protection; and repairs and utilities.

11. Common services: Medical (dispensary); salvage; packing and crating; transportation (except typing orders); labor and MHE equipment.

12. General auditing.

13. Local welfare services: Troop information and special services activities.

14. Restaurant.

V. PROPOSAL OF SITE FOR THE QUARTERMASTER FOOD AND CONTAINER INSTITUTE BY THE ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

A. General proposal:

Illinois Institute of Technology (IIT) has offered to construct and finance a building (or buildings) sufficient to house the Institute on its campus on Chicago's near South Side. Facilities would be erected according to specifications of the Quartermaster Corps and under its direction and leased to the Institute (or an appropriate Government agency) for a period ranging from 10 to 25 years to allow a reasonable scheduling of amortization. Adequate parking facilities would be provided and housing for staff of the Institute on a preferential basis would be available in apartments owned by IIT in the vicinity of the campus. IIT would furnish all essential services at cost plus a small overhead fee.

The officers and members of the board of trustees of IIT believe that a mutually attractive agreement can be concluded. They are "flexible in their thinking" and will cooperate with the Quartermaster General and other responsible officials in developing a working relationship.

The Duke University contract with the Army Ordnance Corps is favorable precedent for this proposal. The Office of Ordnance Research, which administers an annual program of $5 million in basic research, is housed in a building on the Duke campus which was constructed by the university and leased to the corps.

B. Location:

IIT is located about 3½ miles south of Chicago's Loop between 30th and 35th Streets and extending between Federal Street and Michigan Avenue. The campus, served by frequent rapid transit and bus service, can be reached from the Loop in less than 15 minutes. Thirty-fifth and Thirty-first Streets will be interchanges on the new South Expressway connecting the Calumet Skyway and the Calumet Expressway on the south with Southwest, Congress, Northwest, and Edens Expressways on the north.

A site for the Institute is immediately available at the corner of 30th Street and Michigan Avenue. Land reasonably contiguous to this site has already been redeveloped and bordering properties are scheduled for redevelopment soon.

C. Services and other facilities:

All essential "housekeeping" services, including maintenance and repairs, janitor and guard service, steam, electricity, and heat, would be furnished by IIT at cost, plus a small overhead fee. Cafeteria or restaurant and private luncheon facilities, small meeting rooms and auditoriums seating from 250 to 750 would also be available.

Unique and costly equipment at IIT could be used by the Institute. Included is a nuclear reactor designed specifically for industrial research, a nationally recognized computer center, and a gas fission product source.

D. Estimated cost of new facilities:

Here is a first "crude" estimate of cost of facilities to house the Institute on the IIT campus:

Building: 180,000 square feet at $28 per square foot	$5,040,000
Laboratory equipment and installation: 180,000 square feet at $5 per square foot	900,000
Total	5,940,000

Facilities could probably be completed about 18 months after the final plans are submitted.

E. The future of the Institute at IIT:

Shortly after its formation in 1940, IIT began development of a completely new 110-acre campus called Technology Center. The program is now well under way—34 new buildings have been constructed or are under construction. They include a new $3.5 million chemistry building and facilities for the John Crerar Library, which will move from its present Loop site to the IIT campus. When completed, Technology Center, in the functional design of Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, the internationally recognized architect, will be one of the world's most modern campuses and one of the few ever designed as a unit. The center already houses, in addition to the IIT staff of 2,300 (1,200 of whom have advanced degrees in engineering and/or the sciences), the Armour Research Foundation, the Institute of Gas Technology, and the central research laboratory of the Association of American Railroads.

F. Notes to enclosures 1, 2, and 3 on pages immediately following:

Enclosure 1: Aerial view of campus, Illinois Institute of Technology. Elevated railway line is in right foreground. Site of new John Crerar Library building is in blue. One of the sites proposed for the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute is in red.

Enclosure 2: Map of Technology Center.

Enclosure 3: Map of Chicago throughways (completed and projected). IIT campus is in red. It is strategically situated for motor, bus, and elevated railway transportation.

(NOTE.—Enclosures 1, 2, and 3 are included in the files of the committee.)

VI. QUESTIONS PERTINENT TO PROPER USE OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE QUARTERMASTER FOOD AND CONTAINER INSTITUTE FOR THE ARMED FORCES

A. What is the basis for alleged savings resulting from the move?

1. Is any part of the alleged savings a "wash" entry applicable without regard to location?

2. If "repairs and utilities" costs are part of alleged savings, how does this cost per square foot of space at the Chicago Administration Center compare with cost at the Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center?

3. Does any part of alleged savings result from lower costs applicable without regard to location?

4. Is any part of alleged savings based on reduction in mission applicable without regard to location?

(a) If no reduction in mission is assumed, was consideration given to cost of—

(1) Replacing research facilities available at food and packaging industries and other institutions in the Chicago area?

(2) Maintaining communication with the Army Subsistence Center and Military Subsistence Supply Agency (which presumably will remain in Chicago)?

(b) If a reduction of the Institute's mission is contemplated, will it result in requirements for additional personnel and/or facilities for research and engineering in food and rations by the Navy, Air Force, Military Subsistence Supply Agency, or Army Subsistence Center?

B. Were alternatives to the move adequately explored?

1. Was a study made of the possibility of reducing costs at the Chicago Administration Center by moving any of these other Chicago Government agencies now leasing space in the Loop or elsewhere in the Chicago area to the center?

(a) Military Subsistence Supply Agency, 226 West Jackson Boulevard.

(b) District Engineer, U.S. Army, Merchandise Mart.

(c) Regional Engineer, U.S. Army, 536 South Clark Street.

(d) Chicago Ordnance District, South Wabash Avenue.

2. Were private institutions in Chicago, such as Illinois Institute of Technology, considered as possible sites for the Institute?

If so, what criteria were used?

C. Were other agencies involved in the move consulted regarding it?

1. The General Services Administration.
2. Air Force.
3. Navy.
4. Army Subsistence Center.
5. Military Subsistence Supply Agency.

D. Were any benefits to mission alleged as a result of the move?

1. If so, in what respect is the Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center superior as a site to the Chicago Administration Center?

If so, in what respect is Natick superior as a site to Chicago?

VII. EXPANSION OF CERTAIN ARGUMENTS FAVORING A CHICAGO SITE FOR THE QUARTERMASTER FOOD AND CONTAINER INSTITUTE FOR THE ARMED FORCES

A. Unlimited research facilities are immediately available:

1. Major scientific research facilities in the immediate locality include:

(a) The University of Chicago and the American Meat Institute on the South Side.

(b) Northwestern University Technological Institute, in Evanston.

(c) Illinois Institute of Technology and the Armour Research Foundation—just south of the central business district.

(d) The University of Illinois Medical Center, west and south of the central business district.

(e) Argonne National Laboratory, operated by the University of Chicago and located in Lemont.

NOTE.—Two major research facilities not located in the immediate locale of the Institute are nevertheless convenient and much used—the Forest Products Laboratory, maintained by the Department of Agriculture at Madison, Wis., and the Institute of Paper Chemistry in Appleton, Wis. Because it is a Government agency, the laboratory would be contacted by the Institute wherever it

was located, but proximity of the laboratory to Chicago has made close cooperation between the two Government functions possible.

2. Industrial research laboratories in the food and container fields are numerous in Chicago and the surrounding area because of the large number of food and container industries located here.

A list of industrial research laboratories in these fields follows this part (VII) of the appendix as enclosure 1. The Institute also obtains a great deal of information and assistance from General Mills, Inc., and the Pillsbury Co. in Minneapolis and Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., St. Paul.

3. Technical libraries in the area offer a huge reservoir of literature on subjects of interest to the Institute. In addition to libraries at the major universities (Chicago, Illinois, and Northwestern) these are also available:

(a) The John Crerar Library. Founded in 1894, this is one of the greatest scientific libraries in the world. Its medical collection, comprising over 150,000 volumes, is the most comprehensive in the Midwest. Other extensive collections include the basic sciences (especially chemistry, physics, and geology), tehnology, and agriculture. They are supplemented by current subscriptions to 10,000 periodicals and other serial publications.

(b) Illinois Institute of Technology and Armour Research Foundation.

(c) Special libraries maintained by industries in food and packaging fields or at national headquarters by trade and professional associations.

(1) These libraries are devoted primarily to science-technology:

Armour & Co., 1355 West 31st Street, Chicago, Ill.

Victor Chemical Works, 11th and Arnold Streets, Chicago Heights, Ill.

Argonne National Laboratory, Post Office Box 299, Lemont, Ill.

Illinois Farm Supply Co., 100 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

American Can Co., 433 North Northwest Highway, Barrington, Ill.

Corn Products Refining Co., Chemical Division Library, Box 345, Argo, Ill.

American Institute of Baking, 400 East Ontario Street, Chicago, Ill.

Abbott Laboratories, 1400 Sheridan Road, North Chicago, Ill.

Baxter Laboratories, Inc., 6301 Lincoln Avenue, Morton Grove, Ill.

American Meat Institute Foundation, 939 East 57th Street, Chicago, Ill.

Libby, McNeil & Libby, 13636 South Western Avenue, Blue Island, Ill.

The Upjohn Co., Kalamazoo, Mich.

Dearborn Chemical Co., 1029 West 35th Street, Chicago, Ill.

National Dairy Products Corp., 923 Waukegan Road, Glenview, Ill.

Miles Laboratories, Inc., Myrtle & McNaughton Streets, Elkhart, Ind.

Velsicol Chemical Corp., 330 East Grand Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

American Dry Milk Institute, Inc., 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Lewis College of Science and Technology, Route 66A, Lockport, Ill.

Wilson & Company, Inc., 4200 South Marshfield Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

National Confectioners' Association, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

G. D. Searle & Company, Skokie, Ill.

(2) These libraries have collections in the biological sciences:

American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

(3) These libraries relate primarily to metals:

Acme Steel Co., 100 Acme Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

United States Steel Corp. (south works), 3426 East 89th Street, Chicago, Ill.

Fansteel Metallurgical Corp., 2200 Sheridan Road, North Chicago, Ill.

Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Institutions doing graduate work in food and container technology are more numerous in the Middle West than in any other part of the country:

The following are within easy reach of Chicago:

1. Institute of Meat Research of the University of Chicago.
2. Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago.
3. Armour Research Foundation, Chicago.
4. University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
5. Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.
6. University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
7. University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.
8. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.
9. Kansas State University, Manhattan Kans.
10. Purdue University, West Lafayette, Ind.
11. Bradley University, Peoria, Ill.
12. Wayne State University, Detroit, Mich.

C. Contacts with the food and packaging industries are easily maintained in Chicago:

1. Chicago is the center for the Nation's food production. The area is second in the United States in total value of food products manufactured for the consumer. In 1958 gross sales of food products amounted to $3.7 billion in the Chicago metropolitan area.

(a) Chicago is the center of distribution for the dairy industry. Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan produce half of the Nation's butter and more than a third of its fluid milk. Wisconsin makes almost half of the country's domestic cheese. Most firms which distribute dairy products nationally have either main offices or processing facilities here. They include Kraft Foods Co., the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Wilson & Co., Swift & Co., Beatrice Foods Co., and the Borden Co.

(1) Among the biggest milk distributors in Chicago are the Bowman Dairy Co., one of the Nation's largest independents, Borden and Hawthorne-Mellody Farms Dairy.

(2) The Chicago Mercantile Exchange operates as the Nation's leading "futures" market in butter (and eggs and onions as well).

(b) Poultry and eggs, both highly perishable commodities, are produced in quantity nearby and shipped out of Chicago to markets around the Nation. Iowa is first among all States in production of poultry and eggs; Minnesota is second in egg production and fourth in the production of chickens; Minnesota is second in turkey raising, and Iowa is fourth.

(c) A major portion of America's fruit and vegetables funnel through Chicago; in fact, more fresh produce passes through Chicago than through any similar center anywhere in the world because of its central location and the availability of refrigerated warehouse space. Chicago has nearly 34 million cubic feet of cooler and freezer space in public warehouses and about 20 million feet in private warehouses.

(d) Chicago handles enough grain to be known as the Nation's third largest granary. The value of crops harvested within a 500-mile radius of Chicago is 41 percent of the national total. Grain storage capacity in Chicago is nearly 80 million bushels. It manufactured over $56 million worth of grain mill products in 1954, second only to Buffalo, N.Y.

(1) Among the large firms in the baking industry located here are Continental Baking Co., Schulze & Burch Biscuit Co., Ward Baking Co., Gordon Baking Co., Piper Baking Co., the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., United Biscuit Co., Jewel Tea Co., Salerno-McGowen Biscuit Co., Consolidated Foods Corp., Carr Consolidated Biscuit Co., National Biscuit Co., Sawyer Biscuit Co., and Burny Bros., Inc.

(2) The Chicago Board of Trade has always been the world's leading market in "futures" trading.

(e) The city ranks first among all metropolitan areas of the Nation in meat production. About 47 percent of the Nation's livestock is produced within a 500-mile radius of the city. The Union Stock Yards in Chicago can handle more than 40,000 cattle and 120,000 hogs a day and turn out meat at the rate of 10,000 pounds a minute during an 8-hour day.

Despite decentralization in the industry, Chicago is still the national center of the sales market. In 1954 sales of meat was close to $149 million; New York sold about $67 million worth of meat in the same year. Leading Chicago manufacturers of meat products include Agar Packing Co., Inc., Armour & Co., the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Hygrade Food Products Corp., Illinois Meat Co., Oscar Mayer & Co., Swift & Co., and Wilson & Co., Inc.

(f) Chicago is the center of the confectionery industry in the United States and produces about 25 percent of all candy manufactured in the country. E. J. Brach & Sons, Bunte Bros., Mars, Inc., Curtiss Candy Co., and Walter H. Johnson Candy Co. maintain headquarters in the city.

2. The Chicago area manufactures more containers of all types than any other area in the Nation because, as in the case of food products, it is close to sources of supply. Major manufacturers include the Container Corp. of America, which has its home office and five plants here, the American Can Co. (seven plants plus research and technical service department), and the Continental Can Co. (nine plants, Metal Research and Development Division, Central Research Division and six subsidiaries manufacturing paper and plastic containers).

(a) In tin cans and other tin wear, Chicago in 1954 stood first with a production valued at almost $97 million, compared with about $55 million worth for New York. No other metropolitan area had more than half the production of New York City.

(b) Only two areas in the the Nation produce more paperboard containers (specified for shipping 80 to 90 percent of Quartermaster Corp. items) than Chicago. Among the large manufacturers located here in addition to the three mentioned above are: Olin Mathieson Chemical Co., Owens-Illinois (National Container Corp.), Rheem Manufacturing Co., Stone Container Corp., United Biscuit Co. (Chicago Carton Co.) and Standard Brands, Inc. (Traver Partition Corp.).

Geographic representation on a current Institute industry advisory committee indicates the concentration of technical services of the fiberboard industry in the Midwest. When the industry was canvassed for technical professional personnel, the volunteer committee was composed of representatives from these cities:

East Walpole, Mass.
San Francisco, Calif.
Keokuk, Iowa.
Rittman, Ohio.
Toledo, Ohio.
Atlanta, Ga.
Indianapolis, Ind.
St. Paul, Minn.
Sandusky, Ohio.
Chicago, Ill.

3. Chicago is the headquarters of all major trade associations in the food industry and a large percentage of their national meetings and conferences are held here. Ninety-eight trade associations related either to food or containers are located in Chicago. There are 30 associations in the field of produce, dairy products, and general agricul-

ture; 10 in the field of meat products and livestock; 49 in the field of groceries, confectionery, bakery products; 5 in the field of flavoring extracts, sirups, and soft drinks; and 4 in the field of paper boxes and paper cartons.

(a) Meat and livestock associations in the city include the American Meat Institute (which represents about 500 members handling between 85 and 90 percent of all meat and meat products commercially produced in this country), the National Livestock and Meat Board, the National Association of Retail Meat Dealers, the National Association of Retail Grocers, and the National Livestock Producers Association. In the milling field, 5 of the 8 with large staffs are located here; in dairy, eggs, and poultry, 8 of the 11 with larger than average staffs have offices here.

(b) Major Chicago trade associations in the food and container fields are listed in enclosure 2 following this part (VII) of the appendix.

ENCLOSURE 1. INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH LABORATORIES IN THE CHICAGO AREA

(Source: Industrial Research Laboratories of the United States (10th ed.) Publication 379, National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council Washington, D.C., 1956.)

A. FOODS

American Bakeries Co., 919 North Michigan Avenue.
American Dry Milk Institute, Inc., 221 North La Salle Street.
American Institute of Baking, 400 East Ontario Street.
American Meat Institute Foundation, 939 East 57th Street.
American Research & Testing Laboratories, 32 North State Street.
Armour & Co. Research Division, Union Stock Yards.
Armour & Co. Auxiliaries Division, 1355 West 31st Street.
Beatrice Foods Co., 1526 South State Street.
Best Foods, Inc., the, 2816 South Kilbourn Avenue.
Chicago-Allis Manufacturing Co., 113–125 North Green Street.
Chicago Dairy & Food Laboratories, 6930 North Clark Street.
Chicago Pharmacal Co., 5547 North Ravenswood.
Columbus Laboratories, the, 31 North State Street.
Continental Can Co., Inc., Metal Division, 76th and Loomis Boulevard.
Continental Coffee Co., 641 North Orleans Street.
Cook Chocolate Co., 4825 South Rockwell Street.
Dawes' Laboratories, Inc., 4800 South Richmond Street.
Dickinson Co., Albert, the, 2750 West 35th Street.
F. & F. Laboratories, Inc., 3501 West 48th Place.
Fermco Chemicals, Inc., 4941 South Racine Avenue.
Feuer & Associates, Bertram, 664 North Michigan Avenue.
Food Technology, Inc., 5903 Northwest Highway.
General Foods Corp. (Perkins Products Co.), 7400 South Rockwell Street.
Glidden Co., the, Food Division (Durkee Famous Foods), 2670 North Elston Avenue and 3702 Iron Street.
Griffith Laboratories, Inc., the, 1415 West 37th Street.
Hales & Hunter Co., Red Comb Laboratory, 140th and Stewart Avenue.
Independent Biscuit Manufacturers' Co., 7002 North Clark Street.
Industrial Bio-Test Laboratories, Inc., 4122 South Union Avenue.
Institute of American Poultry Industries, I.A.P.I. Egg Products Laboratory, 110 North Franklin Street.
James Laboratories, the, 189 West Madison Street.
Johnson Products Co.—Keto Laboratory, 4603 South State Street.
Kitchen Art Foods, Inc., 2320 North Damen Avenue.
Kohnstamm & Co., Inc., H., 11 East Illinois Street.
Laboratory of Vitamin Technology, Inc., 7737 South Chicago Avenue.
Liquid Carbonic Corp., the, 3100 South Kedzie Avenue.
Long Co., W. E., 188 West Randolph Street.
Miner Laboratories, the, 9 South Clinton Street.
Morton Salt Co. Development Division, 1357 North Elston.
Peter Hand Foundation, 1632 North Sheffield Avenue.
Quaker Oats Co., the, 345 East 25th Street.
Reliable Packing Co., 1440 West 47th Street.
Scientific Oil Compounding Co., Inc., 1637 South Kilbourn.
Siebel Sons' Co., Inc., J. E., 4055 West Peterson Avenue.
Stange Co., William J., 342 North Western Avenue.
Swift & Co., Union Stock Yards.
Synthetical Laboratories, the, 5558 West Ardmore Avenue.
Vico Products Co., 2817 North Oakley Boulevard.
Vitamins, Inc., 809 West 58th Street.
Wahl-Henius Institute, 1135 Fullerton Avenue.
Wilson & Co., Inc., 4100 South Ashland Avenue.
Wrigley Jr. Co., Wm., 301 East Erie Street.
Corn Products Refining Co., Argo, Ill.
Jewel Tea Co., Inc., Barrington, Ill.
Wilson & Co., Inc., Calumet City, Ill.
Victor Chemicals Works, Chicago Heights, Ill.
General American Transportation Corp., East Chicago, Ind.
Fearn Foods, Inc., Franklin Park, Ill.
Furst-McNess Co., Freeport, Ill.
National Dairy Products Corp. Kraft Foods Co., Glenview, Ill.
Grayslake Gelatin Co., Grayslake, Ill.
Pratt Food Co., Hammond, Ind.
Armour & Co., Kankakee, Ill.
Allied Mills Inc., Libertyville, Ill.
American Can Co., Maywood, Ill.
United Biscuit Co. of America, Melrose Park, Ill.
American Maize-Products Co., Roby, Ind.
Dean Milk Co., Rockford, Ill.
California Packing Corp., Rochelle, Ill.
Julep Co., the, Sycamore, Ill.
Koller & Koller, Villa Park, Ill.
Wander Co., the, Villa Park, Ill.
Morton Salt Co., Woodstock, Ill.

B. CONTAINERS

Celotex Corp., the, 205 West Monroe Street.
Chicago Carton Co., 4200 South Pulaski Road.
Container Corp. of America, 10 North Clark Street.
Container Laboratories Inc., 112 West Kinzie Street.
Continental Can Co., Inc., Central Research & Engineering Division, 7622 South Racine Avenue.
Continental Can Co., Inc., Millsplastic Laboratory, 2930 North Ashland Avenue.
Cracker Jack Co., the, 4800 West 66th Street.
Cromwell Paper Co., 4801 South Whipple Street.
Daubert Chemical Co., 4700 South Central Avenue.
Ekco Products Co., 1949 North Cicero Avenue.
Glidden Co., Protective Coating Division, 1856 North LeClaire Avenue.
Inland Steel Container Co., 6532 South Menard Avenue.
Liquid Carbonic Corp., the, 3100 Kedzie Avenue.
Meyercord Co., 5323 West Lake Street.
Precision Scientific Co., 3737 West Cortland Street.
Rapid Roller Co., 2550 South Federal Street.
Stone Container Corp., 4200 West 42d Place.
Transparent Package Co., 3520 South Morgan Street.
Triangle Package Machinery Co., 6655 West Diversey Avenue.
Visking Corp., 6733 West 65th Street.
White Cap Co., 1819 North Major Avenue.
Apollo Metal Works, Bedford Park.
Dearborn Glass Co., Bedford Park.
Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., East Chicago, Ind.
Borg-Warner Corp., Marbon Chemical Division, Gary, Ind.
Glidden Co., the Chemical, Metal, and Pigment Division, Hammond, Ind.
Dearborn Chemical Co., Lake Zurich.
American Can Co., Maywood.
Atlas Powder Co., Zapon Finishes Laboratory, North Chicago.
Millers National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard.
Association of Vitamin Chemists, Inc., 7737 South Chicago Avenue.
American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin Street.
American Dairy Association, 20 North Wacker Drive.
American Dry Milk Institute, 221 North La Salle Street.
American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart.
Evaporated Milk Association, 228 North La Salle Street.
Illinois Dairy Products Association, 309 West Jackson Boulevard.
Milk Foundation, Inc., 28 East Huron Street.
National Cheese Institute, Inc., 110 North Franklin Street.
National Dairy Council, 111 North Canal Street.
National Poultry, Butter & Egg Association, 110 North Franklin.
National Soybean Processors Association, 3818 Board of Trade Building.
Poultry and Egg National Board, 185 North Wabash Avenue.
Pure Milk Association, 343 South Dearborn Street.
American Bakers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive.
American Institute of Baking, 400 East Ontario Street.
American Society of Bakery Engineers, 121 West Wacker Drive.
Associated Food Retailers of Greater Chicago, Inc., 500 North Dearborn Street.
Bakers Club of Chicago, 112 West Randolph Street.
Canned Chop Suey Foods Industry, 332 South Michigan Avenue.
Chicago Paper Box Suppliers Association, 1210 Ridgewood Drive, Northbrook.
Fibre Box Association, 224 South Michigan Avenue.
Folding Paper Box Association of America, 222 West Adams Street.
Paraffined Carton Association, 111 West Washington Street.

ENCLOSURE 2. MAJOR CHICAGO TRADE ASSOCIATIONS IN THE FOOD AND CONTAINER FIELDS

A. FOODS

Chicago Candy Association, 306 North Union Avenue.
Independent Grocers' Alliance Distribution Co., 131 South Wabash Avenue.
Mayonnaise & Salad Dressing Manufacturers Association, 100 East Ohio Street.
National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue.
National Association of Retail Meal & Food Dealers, Inc., 500 North Dearborn.
National Cheese Institute, Inc., 100 North Franklin Street.
National Confectioners' Association of the United States, Inc., 36 South Wabash Avenue.

National Fruit & Syrup Manufacturers Association, 38 South Dearborn Street.

National Pickle Packers Association, 202 South Marion Street, Oak Park.

National Retail Tea & Coffee Merchants Association, 222 West North Bank Drive.

National Soup Mix Association, 125 East Church Street, Libertyville.

National Split Pea Association, 332 South Michigan Avenue.

Research & Development Associates, Food & Container Institute, Inc., 1849 West Pershing Road.

Salt Producers Association, 231 North La Salle Street.

American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street.

American Meat Institute Foundation, 939 East 57th Street.

National Live Stock Producers Association, 139 North Clark Street.

National Live Stock & Meat Board, 407 South Dearborn Street.

Packers & Sausage Manufacturers Association, 100 West Monroe Street.

American Corn Millers Federation, 140 South Dearborn Street.

Cereal Institute, Inc., 135 South La Salle Street.

Chicago Association of Stock Exchange Firms, 120 South La Salle Street.

EXHIBIT 5

STATEMENT OF RAYMOND J. SPAETH, VICE PRESIDENT, ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, ON THE QUARTERMASTER RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING CENTER

The motivation for this move is most commendable—it is being undertaken in the spirit of economy. The economies to be effected, however, will result from the closing of the 1819 West Pershing Road Depot, of some 1,868,280 square feet, of which the Food and Container Institute requires only approximately 148,000 square feet, or only 8 percent, and not from the specific relocation of this activity in Massachusetts.

The proposed move of the Institute from Chicago will probably result in large new capital outlays and larger annual operating costs than if the facility were retained in Chicago.

It may be said that economies from centralized administration are possible at Natick. Research experience has proved, however, that decentralized research is not only effective, but even desirable, if it is necessary for the proper environment.

Chicago is the geographical center of the Nation's food industry. It is more accessible and readily available to all parts of the country, all of which is engaged in some aspect of the food industry. Chicago is the location for the Military Subsistence Supply Agency and the Army Subsistence Center, both of which of necessity must work in close collaboration with the Food and Container Institute.

Effective research requires effective communication—the costs of added travel to the distant location on the east coast by representatives of the food industry, by representatives of the Government agencies using these facilities, and by those Government and public individual research workers, all of whom must be in constant touch with this facility for effective results, will substantially exceed expenditures necessary for these contacts in Chicago. These added costs alone will more than offset any possible operating economies of the proposed location.

The cost of a new facility for this operation, including land, buildings, and equipment, would be no more, if not substantially less, in Chicago than in Natick. The cost of transporting present staff, recruiting new staff, disrupting and reactivation of the present program, could be avoided. Annual operating costs at Chicago would be less than at Natick.

Illinois Institute of Technology, one of the Nation's outstanding technological and scientific institutions, has sufficient land available immediately adjacent to its 110-acre campus for this activity. The institute's campus is part of Chicago's great urban renewal program, and is located just 3 miles south of Chicago's Loop. It is readily accessible to all forms of the city's transportation system. The campus has direct entrances to the city's new South Expressway, a part of the Federal Highway System.

A scientific and engineering staff of 2,200 and 7,500 students provide a constant pool and source of scientific manpower. The research facilities of the Association of American Railroads, the Institute of Gas Technology, and Armour Research Foundation are located on the campus. Of an eventual building program of some 60 new buildings, estimated to cost in excess of $60 million, some 36 new buildings, estimated to cost in excess of $60 million, some 36 new buildings, costing in excess of $30 million, have already been built or are under construction. Included in these is the new John Crerar Library, the largest technological library in the United States.

Already available on the campus are the necessary utilities such as steam for heating and processing, virtually every form of research services from glassblowing to all forms of metal process shops, and specialized laboratories, including large computers and a nuclear reactor. All of this manpower and facilities are available at their net cost to this possible new Government laboratory.

If the Government does not care to appropriate the same or a substantially less amount for the construction of this facility in Chicago, the institute can, and is willing to, finance the construction of this necessary building, the physical facilities built to the Government's specifications, and make it available to the Government on terms which will just cover the cost involved.

The institute has already provided the Army with a detailed proposal for a facility at the Illinois Institute of Technology campus.

We urge your committee to reconsider this move—and believe the retention of this operation in Chicago will, over the years, result in a more economical operation, a more effective research program for the food and container program of the Armed Forces and be more in the best interests of the food industry and the Nation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in brief, may I say the Food and Container Institute has been in Chicago many years, has given good service, is in the heart of the region where both the processing and growing of food is concentrated, is in the heart of the container industry; and I am at a loss to understand this proposed transfer.

The Quartermaster Corps, I think, has been guilty of some pretty fast pitching on this matter. In discussing with the Illinois Institute of Technology their estimates of cost of a suitable new building in Chicago, the size of facility said to be needed was between 200,000 and 300,000 square feet of space. The cost estimate of the Illinois school then came to something over $6 million. The Quartermaster Corps then produced figures for only 121,000 square feet in Natick, at a cost of $3,628,000, and then said the Natick building would be much less expensive than the Chicago building. But the point is they were comparing space in Natick which was just about half the space that the Chicago estimate had been based upon.

We received only this afternoon the final figures from the Illinois Institute of Technology on comparable space; namely, 121,000 square feet. The figures show the Chicago estimate is virtually identical with the Natick estimate, there being a difference of only $62,000 out of a total of $3,600,000, or less than 2 percent.

I think it is ridiculous to locate a food research institute in Massachusetts. One might just as well locate an institute for the study of arctic diseases in Puerto Rico.

I am sure my good friends from Alaska would protest on that point.

CONFUSING RULINGS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a chain is no stronger than its weakest link. The chain of the National Government's operation is approaching the breaking point because of its weak link, the Supreme Court. Although the crescendo of criticism and expressions of alarm at the lawless, illogical, and inconsistent decisions of the Court have lost their news value to a large extent because of the long period of their continuance, the American public has not been any less aware of the continued unreliability of the Court.

The Congress has the duty and responsibility, as well as the authority, to correct the weakness of the Court. A number of bills are pending in the committees of both the Senate and the House which would establish reasonable qualifications for appointees to the Court, would limit the jurisdiction of the Court, and would insure that the Court cannot continue to flagrantly misconstrue the intention of Congress with respect to legislation which is passed. Action on these bills by Congress is long overdue, and it is high time that these bills were given the high priority they deserve by the committees to which they have been committed and by the leadership of both political parties.

On Monday, May 9, 1960, there appeared a column in the Greenville News, published in Greenville, S.C., entitled "Recent Rulings Baffle, Irk Lawyers, Laymen," written by the able columnist, Ray Tucker. Mr. Tucker points out the continuing inconsistencies in the Court's decisions and the apparent complete lack of legal ability by the members of the Court. I ask unanimous consent that this column by Mr. Tucker be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, May 9, 1960]

RECENT RULINGS BAFFLE, IRK LAWYERS, LAYMEN

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON.—Although the sizzling presidential campaign has distracted public attention from the 1960 session of the Supreme Court, its recent rulings on important labor, civil rights, and foreign policy questions have baffled and irritated judges, lawyers, and laymen, including President Eisenhower, Secretary Herter, Attorney General Rogers, and the National Labor Relations Board members.

The High Tribunal has been accused of showing complete inconsistency and too rigid a regard for statutory technicalities when they collided with common sense.

Although it has frequently applied extra-legal and psychological principles in important cases, notably in the school segregation controversy, it has seemingly strained statutes or interpreted them so literally that the practical result has been harmful.

FIVE-TO-FOUR VOTES

Supporting this conclusion is the fact that there have been numerous 5-to-4 decisions and sharp exchanges between the majority and the minority—a division distressing to lawyers and jurists in lower courts.

It is probable that Chief Justice Earl Warren and his associates will set a record for many and massive dissents.

Several rulings on alleged victimization of individual freedom are cited as evidence of inconsistent interpretation.

A 51-year-old house painter in Portland, Oreg., who was brought here from Finland when he was a year old, was accused of having been a member of the Communist Party when he was 29. There was no evidence that he had taken any real interest in its affairs or activities.

NO ALLOWANCE

Since he had not become an American citizen, the law requires that he be deported, and so the Supreme Court held by a 5 to 4 vote. It is true that the statute, reenacted at the height of the Korean war, makes no allowance for extenuating circumstances.

But although a majority indicated in the housepainter's case that it was unsympathetic to the statute, it did not bother to suggest amendment, as it frequently does.

Dr. Willard Uphaus is spending a year in a New Hampshire jail because he refused to answer an Attorney General's questions about his guests at a "World Fellowship Center." The 69-year-old Uphaus calls himself a world pacifist.

NO ILLEGALITY

There was no evidence of illegality at the center. The defense argued that the Attorney General's questions were for the purpose of "exposure for exposure's sake," and not for a legitimate end. The Supreme Court minority agreed with this contention. But the majority upheld the State, and Uphaus remains in jail.

However, in a Little Rock case, the jurist freed two women refusing to reveal the names of members of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People to city officials. The majority found that such a disclosure might cause harassment and encroach on individual freedom.

Here, it is possible that the jurists were swayed by whatever tenseness remains from the use of Federal troops in the Arkansas capital, a practical consideration that they did not apply in the Portland or Uphaus cases.

DISTURBING

President Eisenhower and Secretary Herter are seriously disturbed by another Federal court's peculiar ruling in a maritime controversy of great international importance.

But it followed the precedent set by the Supreme Court of when it refused to prohibit a union picketing of a "flag of convenience" vessel on the west coast.

The laws court found that union picketing of an Egyptian freighter at New York was lawful because it was not a labor dispute. The embargo on unloading was inspired by Egypt's refusal to permit Israeli ships to pass through the Suez Canal. The decision has led to a general boycott of American vessels in Middle East ports, and, as Herter said, inflamed an already dangerous situation in this key area.

IRRESPONSIBLE ACTION BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, every public official is under an obligation to act in a responsible manner in the discharge of his duties. Those public officials who hold their offices by virtue of election at the ballot boxes are more conscious of this obligation, for their continuation in office might well be contingent on their ability to act responsibly. In some instances, however, appointed officials lose sight of the obligation to act in a responsible way. We would like to think that these lapses are unintentional and mistakes of judgment. Occasionally, however, there is demonstrated such a complete lack of responsibility on the part of appointed officials, that, when coupled with surrounding circumstances, it leaves no room for doubt that the irresponsibility is intentional and for an ultra vires purpose.

Such an irresponsible act was committed by the U.S. Attorney General on May 9. On that date the Attorney General, professing to act under the terms of the so-called civil rights bill signed by the President last Friday, announced his intention to investigate voting records in four southern counties—and I quote the Attorney General—"in States where constitutional rights of citizens may have been infringed by discriminatory practices." The Attorney General also made the statement that each of the counties he named had a large Negro population but none on the election books.

The Attorney General's statement to the press was the height of irresponsibility, and unequaled for inaccuracy. By innuendo, the Attorney General has accused the election officials of these States and counties of discrimination against Negroes in the voting field, and worse, implied that they have committed violations of laws protecting the right to vote. This announcement was admittedly made before any investigation had been made.

One of the counties designated by the Attorney General is McCormick County, S.C. Incidentally, this is the county in which I was first employed after graduation from college as a teacher in the public schools. Although I have no specific knowledge about the other counties, all in States other than South Carolina, named by the Attorney General, I do know about this one.

Mr. Rogers, the Attorney General, stated categorically that there were no Negroes registered in McCormick County, S.C. That statement is not true. There are Negroes registered in McCormick County and, in fact, no Negro has ever been refused a registration certificate for any reason, or question of qualification. The election and registration books of this county have not been hidden, but have been open to public inspection at all times. The Attorney General made no attempt to get the facts before making his accusation, although the facts were available to him without any legal procedure, or any additional legislation such as that passed by the Congress recently. All that was necessary was an inquiry. This the Attorney General never made. Nor did he take the trouble to have one of his agents look at the registration books which have always been kept, when not in actual use by the board, in the public records section of the clerk of court's office in the county courthouse, and were not only open to inspection by the Attorney General, but also to any citizen who desired to see them.

Subsequently, the Attorney General has admitted that he had not received any complaint from anyone in McCormick County that he had been denied the right to register. He said that the information on which he acted was furnished by the Southern Regional Council and the National Association for Advancement of Colored People. No more unreliable source could have been found, and yet the Attorney General did not even bother to make a casual check for confirmation before making his slanderous statement.

This action was completely irresponsible. No bill passed by Congress authorizes the Attorney General to make false accusations against public officials, and as abusive as were some of the so-called civil rights proposals, none of them went this far. The statement of the Attorney General was false in several particulars, and was slanderous of the State of South Carolina, the county of McCormick, and individual officials of those governmental entities. His action was clearly motivated by a desire to appeal to the hate-mongering organizations which falsely profess to represent the Negro race and to control their vote. In short, it was a contemptible display of political demagoguery, without regard for the rights of the officials involved nor the responsibilities of his office.

Despite his loud proclamation, it is interesting to note that even as late as this afternoon, the Attorney General has still not informed himself by having the records of McCormick County inspected. All the officials of the State and county know at this point of the Attorney General's announced investigation is what they read in the newspaper. This lends emphasis to the conclusion that it is publicity to please the NAACP, and not substantive accomplishment of his duties, which prompted the Attorney General's announcement.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is a basic moral obligation of a people and of a country to insure that its elderly citizens do not want for medical care when they have reached the stage of life when medical care is most needed. Nothing short of callousness could describe the attitude of those who view with unconcern the plight of senior citizens who have reached the twilight zone of life and who are faced with financing burdensome medical bills with only limited means. Admonitions that such citizens should have foreseen the inevitable and

made preparations accordingly afford little comfort to those who are faced with such financial burdens in this area and offer no solution to this vexing problem. It is encouraging to note that many of our elder citizens have made preparations for this period of life to insure against financial ruin by catastrophic illnesses. According to the Health Insurance Association of America, about 43 percent of our over-65 people are now covered by health insurance. It is estimated by this organization that the proportion of coverage for those who want and need it will reach 75 percent by 1965, and 90 percent by 1970.

It is at once apparent, Mr. President, that much is being done in this area by those who will be directly affected—namely, the elderly themselves, and those who foresee the day when the age of retirement has been reached. However, much more can be done to assist the elderly in a manner which reflects dignity on those who are receiving such assistance.

It would be extremely unwise for the Congress to seek a solution in this area which will result in the expansion of the present social security program. The so-called Forand bill, which would bring old age health insurance into the social security program, is, in my opinion, an extremely unwise approach. The first objection to such a proposal is that the Federal Government would once again embark on a program which would carry this country closer to a socialistic form of government. Washington would irrevocably be placed in the health insurance business on a massive scale, for no private insurance company could compete against the Government. The second objection is that the social security program would be converted into something for which it was never intended. Up until the present time, the program has provided benefits in money alone. The effect of the Forand bill would be to convert the program into one of a compulsory health insurance nature, and, in effect, reduce the money benefits in proportion to the individual's and employer's investment.

Mr. President, a judicious legislative approach to the solution of assisting our elderly citizens with onerous medical expenses which I have advocated for some time is the easing of the tax burden, not only on those who have attained the age of 65, but also on those who would assist those who have attained that age.

At the present time, there is a bill awaiting the President's signature which adopts the approach I have advocated and which would go far in providing for the health care of the aged. H.R. 9660, which passed the Congress on May 5 of this year, contains provisions which will be a further inducement to those who are presently assisting their aged parents with medical expenses.

Section 3(a) of the legislation which is awaiting Presidential signature would amend section 213(a) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to allow a taxpayer to deduct, without regard to a 3-percent medical and dental limitation, expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the care of his dependent mother or father or the dependent mother or father of his spouse, if such dependent has attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year.

In approaching the problem of medical care for the aged in this manner, individual independence is preserved, better medical care is afforded, and the Government is not launched into a new program which will initially cost an estimated $2 billion a year.

I urge the President to affix his signature to this legislation.

THE FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD—A LEOPARD DOES NOT CHANGE HIS SPOTS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I have very recently received a letter which once again proclaims the truth of the old adage that a leopard does not change his spots. I refer to the Federal Maritime Board.

On April 14 I made a speech on the floor of the Senate in which I praised—with faint damnation—the Federal Maritime Board and its new look with respect to its attention to the public interest in shipping rates. At that time the Federal Maritime Board had suspended proposed rate increases affecting the territory of Guam. Some months previously a similar rate increase had been protested by Alaskans. The Federal Maritime Board allowed the increase to become effective without hearings. The Board stated that its suspension powers were limited to 4 months and that 4 months would not afford adequate time for a hearing. Therefore, when I was informed that when the Guam rate increases had been suspended by the Board, I felt called upon to make a statement congratulating the Board on its new attention to the public interest, regretting that it came too late to relieve the people of Alaska from the unwarranted trouble and expense to which they have been exposed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the letter to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWELL, DORSEY, BLUM & WHITE,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1960.

Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: I read with interest your Senate speech of April 14, 1960 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8031), regarding the proposed new freight tariffs for Guam. I represent Guam Associates, protestants and intervenors in the case, and should like to inform you as to the current status of the case (F.M.B. Docket 901).

When the proposed tariffs were posted, upon protest, the Federal Maritime Board suspended the increases until April 29, 1960. Under section 3 of the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, as amended (46 U.S.C. 845), the Board is empowered to suspend such rates for a period of 4 months in which to conduct an investigation and hearing. In the case of the Pacific Far East tariff the suspension could have been until July 22, 1960, and until August 8, 1960, for the American President Line tariffs. However, the Board elected to suspend only about 5 weeks, or until April 29, 1960. (It is interesting to note that a pending bill, S. 3005, would extend such suspension period to 7 months.)

Under the various maritime statutes the burden of proof is upon the carriers during the investigation and hearings to sustain such proposed increases. In this case the increases are not uniform and are very numerous and complex; one tariff is an entire new document running over 100 pages, another about 80 pages, the third over 40 pages. Obviously a thorough investigation as warranted by the public interest would be very lengthy.

At the request of intervenors, Guam Associates, the Board granted a special hearing for oral depositions to permit the Acting Governor of Guam, Mr. Marc Boss, and the Speaker of the Guamanian Legislature, Mr. A. B. Won Pat, who were then in Washington, to be heard. The hearing was expressly "limited to the public policy area of the impact of such [proposed] increases on the economy of Guam." The carriers cross-examined the witness but introduced no evidence at that time. There have been no further intra parte hearings before the Board.

On April 28, 1960, the Board, apparently on its own motion, issued the third supplementary order in said case, in which it permitted the suspension to terminate and required an accounting procedure to be set up by carriers similar, I believe, to that used in the Alaska rate case.

I am petitioning the Board requesting that the suspension be continued and the said order be modified, pointing out the hardship to the people of Guam, and that (1) under the 4-month rule the suspension has still almost 3 months to run; (2) that although the burden of proof is on the carriers, they have produced no evidence, to intervenors' knowledge; (3) that intervenor has information tending to indicate that certain increases in foodstuffs may be in excess of 55 percent; (4) while, under the 4-month proviso it is still within the power of the Board to relieve and mitigate the hardship on the people of Guam, why must this course of action be pursued, which accrues only to the benefit of the carriers who receive the use and benefit of any excess money, although it has not yet been determined that their right to such excess money is warranted or lawful; and (5) that the arrangement ordered by the Board, while it may provide some ultimate benefit to shippers, places a heavy burden on consumers who have no recourse.

Guam Associates deeply appreciate your interest in their plight and think you may find the above of interest.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

ROBERT M. KILGORE,
Attorney for Guam Associates.

Mr. BARTLETT. Alas, Mr. President, I find that my enthusiasm was premature.

It appears that the citizens of Guam are receiving the same type of treatment by the Federal Maritime Board accorded the citizens of Alaska previously. In point of fact, in view of the action of the Board in this case and the circumstances in this case, the citizens of Guam have received an even more cursory treatment from the Board than the citizens of Alaska if that is possible.

Mr. President, it was my fond hope that the protests raised by us Alaskans at the procedure followed by the Board in the Alaska proceedings had contributed to a "new look" on the Federal Maritime Board. This hope was encouraged by the procedure adopted by the Board originally in the Guam case. Its subsequent action however points up

once again the truth in the old adage that one cannot expect a leopard to change his spots.

In the Guam case the Board, under the statutes, had the power to suspend the increased rates for a period of 4 months. For reasons of its own it chose to limit that suspension to only about 5 weeks. Then, even after a hearing in which the difficulty and hardship which would be imposed upon the people of Guam if the increases were allowed, were clearly brought out, the Board then terminated the suspension. The Board could have maintained the suspension for almost 3 months more while the investigation continued. However, without completing the investigation and for no stated reason the Board decided to terminate the suspension. Now the citizens of Guam as well as the citizens of Alaska must pay increased rates, the legality or reasonableness of which has not been determined.

Now, Mr. President, let us examine the splendid alternative elected by the Board to safeguard the interests of the public while a determination is made as to whether the rates the public is paying are legal or not.

The Board requires the carriers to maintain an accounting of all moneys received under the increased tariffs while the investigation continues. If subsequently it is determined that certain of the fees received are in excess of fees determined by the Board to be lawful, then the carriers must make refunds to the shippers who paid such fees. At first glance this would seem to be a fair arrangement. While the carriers receive the use and benefit of such excess fees while the investigation is being carried on, they may not keep such funds as a windfall if the increased rates are determined to be illegal, but must disgorge such illegal gains back to the shippers who paid the increased rates.

However, Mr. President, let us look at the real situation created by this arrangement. When the shippers must pay the increased rates, they add such increases to their costs which in turn are passed on to the wholesaler and retailer and ultimately to the consumer. Therefore, the burden of the increased rates is really borne by the consumer. If the rates are determined to be illegal, the carrier must refund the excess to the shippers. The general public, the consumers, do not share in this refund; they have no recourse but must simply bear their loss. So, in the final analysis, the arrangement creates a windfall for the carrier during the investigation, and afterwards at least a part of that windfall may be had by the shippers if the increased rates are found to be illegal. But the consumers are without protection or recourse under this arrangement.

Mr. President, I want to make my position crystal clear—I do not know whether the increased rates in the Guam case should be granted or not, but I deplore the practice of the Federal Maritime Board that permits this present situation to exist.

And so, Mr. President, in summary, it is my painful duty to inform the Senate that the "new look" in the Federal Maritime Board was only a "flash in the pan" and that the Board has returned to its former patronizing attitude toward the general public.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the President of the United States still has before him for consideration the area redevelopment bill, which has been passed by the Congress and is now awaiting action in the White House.

In the hope that he may be persuaded to sign the bill, and thus bring some solace into the lives of so many presently unemployed Americans, I should like to place in the RECORD a series of statements and editorials from my State urging the President to sign the bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from the Governor of Pennsylvania, David L. Lawrence, and an editorial entitled "Distressed Area Legislation Deserves Full-Scale Support," published in the Harrisburg Evening News of May 6, 1960. I point out that this particular newspaper is a strong Republican journal whose publisher was chairman of Citizens for Eisenhower during the 1956 campaign. I also ask to have printed an open letter to the President appearing in the Uniontown Evening Standard, Uniontown being the city in Fayette County where there is, I believe, the highest percentage of unemployed people of any place in my Commonwealth; a personal letter from Arnold Goldberg, editor of the Uniontown Evening Standard, to President Eisenhower, urging him to sign the bill; an editorial entitled "Area Redevelopment," published in the Uniontown Evening Standard of April 5, 1960; an editorial entitled "It Is Up to Ike Again," published in the Scranton, Pa., Times of May 5, 1960; and finally, a series of comments relative to the depressed area legislation, prepared jointly by the Pennsylvania Departments of Commerce, Labor and Industry, Public Instruction, and Agriculture, in connection with the Governor's office.

There being no objection, the various matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 6, 1960.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

Earnestly urge your approval of bipartisan area development bill (S. 722) which will do much to relieve serious chronic unemployment problems in the Nation. No other piece of legislation is more vital to the economy of your home State.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE,
Governor of Pennsylvania.

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Evening News, May 6, 1960]

DISTRESSED AREA LEGISLATION DESERVES FULL-SCALE SUPPORT

Nowhere this session, not even during the civil rights battle, has the obstructionism of Dixie Democrats and diehard Republicans shown up more vividly than during the House action on the depressed areas bill.

The countdown started with the familiar filibustering of the southern Democrats, aided and abetted in this instance by the conservative Republicans. It was necessary to resort to a parliamentary device, Calendar Wednesday, to get the depressed area redevelopment legislation out of the Dixie-dominated Rules Committee because southern Democrats and conservative Republicans on the committee refused to clear the bill.

After attempting to force the majority of Representatives into voteless helplessness with all of the familiar dodges—time-consuming rollcalls and points of order—the Dixie Democrats backed off and permitted reasonable debate and responsible voting.

Here is probably the most vital piece of legislation, from the standpoint of Pennsylvania, that will come before this session of Congress. It is indeed a measure of our Commonwealth's tremendous stake in this legislation that Republicans and Democrats alike in the Pennsylvania delegation joined in forcing the issue.

Of the 28 Pennsylvania Congressmen, only 4 arrayed themselves with the Dixie Democrats, who in this case were fighting to protect the appeal of their low-pay, low-living-standard States for some new industries.

Voting against the best interests of 11 million Pennsylvanians on this issue were Harrisburg's Representative WALTER M. MUMMA and Representatives PAUL B. DAGUE and WILLIAM H. MILLIKEN, all three of them Republicans. A fourth Republican, Montgomery County's JOHN A. LAFORE, was paired against the bill. (Congressman LAFORE, although organization supported, was defeated just a few days ago in the GOP primaries by a young Republican candidate who made LAFORE's ultra-conservative voting record, including his previous stand against depressed area aid, the issue of his campaign.)

Every other Pennsylvania Republican and every one of our Commonwealth's Democrats, including Greater Harrisburg's Representative JAMES M. QUIGLEY, voted for this extremely worthy and desperately needed program.

The $251 million House bill and the $379 million Senate passed legislation now go to a conference committee. There is every indication and every hope that the more appealing House bill will prevail and will go to President Eisenhower. If he vetoes this bill, with its overwhelming emphasis on loans designed to help struggling communities help themselves, the President will be badly advised and woefully mistaken indeed. And he will be backing away from, if not downright breaking, a promise given in every campaign of recent years, both by his administration and his party, to set up a point 4 program for Americans and American communities who need help—and need it badly. The House passed bill deserves conference committee support and Presidential approval.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Times, May 5, 1960]

IT'S UP TO IKE AGAIN

House Democratic leaders who engineered the strategy which brought about the passage last night of the $251 million depressed area bill are to be congratulated on their victory. They had to fight not only almost solid Republican opposition but a block of their own party members, chiefly from the South, in getting the measure through by a vote of 201 to 184.

Our own Congressman STANLEY A. PROKOP and Luzerne County Congressman DAN FLOOD, the latter a veteran in the fight for financial help from Washington for the Nation's economically distressed communities, were at the head of the Democratic forces which put the bill across. On the rollcall, 115 Republicans cast their votes against the measure, as did 69 Democrats. A coalition of 178 Democrats and 23 Republicans provided the strength needed to approve the measure.

Immediately, of course, the threat of a veto by President Eisenhower was raised. In 1958 the President killed, by pocket veto,

a depressed area bill carrying approximately the same amount in Federal funds. This year, as then, he favored an appropriation of not more than $55 million. Yesterday Republican spokesmen told the House that Mr. Eisenhower would approve a bill doubling the amount provided in the administration measure. The House was in no mood for such surrender, however, and in rapid succession rejected compromise proposals for $150 million, for $158 million, and for a $200 million fund that would be confined to loans.

Supporters of the more adequate bill won a battle yesterday, but they had not yet won the war. The Senate had favored a fund of $389,500,000 in the bill which it passed by an almost unanimous vote. The House version adopted yesterday, cutting the figure to $251 million, must now go back to the Senate for concurrence. If the upper branch does not accept it in its present form and sends it to conference committee, the measure would once more have to clear the House Rules Committee, which had kept the original Senate bill bottled up until the drastic Calendar Wednesday parliamentary tactics resorted to yesterday pried it loose.

The Senate would be well advised to approve the measure as it passed the House yesterday and send it without delay to President Eisenhower. While the talk of a veto is strong, the administration's radical reversal of its stand on the issue of medical care for the aged as disclosed yesterday indicates that the President is not above political expediency in a national election year. A veto of the depressed area bill could seriously hurt the Republican ticket next fall. If Mr. Eisenhower's brain trusters are smart, they should advise him to sign it, as he should with no consideration for politics.

[From the Uniontown (Pa.) Evening Standard, May 7, 1960]

OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. President, on your desk, awaiting your signature, is an area redevelopment bill.

Early this week the House passed the bill asking for $251 million in Federal aid to encourage industrial development in chronic unemployment areas.

This bill has been called the Douglas-Clark-Flood area redevelopment bill in the Senate. Yesterday it passed the Senate.

The measure, Mr. President, carries the authorization for Federal loans and grants aimed to create jobs in depressed industrial and rural areas in the Nation. It sure would give this district a lift.

Two years ago you vetoed such a bill as being too costly to the Federal Government. You proposed a similar measure and established a figure of $53 million.

It may be costly in your understanding of costs but to us here in Fayette County those millions of dollars are far more important than the expensive Federal aid program overseas or the national security budget.

Mr. President in your tours across the seas you have seen depressed areas. But you haven't traveled through this Nation of ours and seen depressed areas not very far from the White House in Washington. Just a couple hundred miles, Mr. President, and you will be in Fayette County.

Come to visit us and we will show you why there are one out of every four persons who should be working but who is unemployed. That's 25 percent. They are unemployed not because they do not desire to work but because there are no jobs for them.

We have the highest unemployment rate in all of Pennsylvania, indeed among the highest in the Nation.

It is up to our leaders in business, industry, and Government to initiate a vigorous program to combat this economic distress. We need a comprehensive program like that envisioned in the area redevelopment bill to alleviate the suffering from unemployment.

Our people in Fayette County, Mr. President, do not want handouts. They accept relief because they must eat, they accept surplus food because their families must be nourished.

What our unemployed want, are productive jobs where they can use their skills and their talents to earn a decent living.

We have a labor surplus here, Mr. President. Many of the men are former coal miners who have lost their jobs because the mines in the county have closed. The coal is gone.

Our labor can quickly learn new industrial skills. Most of the men have technical and mechanical backgrounds.

All they need are plants in the area to give them the chance to work.

Unfortunately in Fayette County we have become experts on unemployment.

We are in the unenviable position during the years since the end of the Korean war of consistently having one of the highest rates in prosperous United States.

We have been struggling with this problem. We have been helping ourselves with aggressive industrial fund campaigns. We have raised $700,000 in the past few years to bring new industry to the district. Now we are running out of money.

That's why we need Federal help. The area redevelopment bill would provide that assist.

Federal assistance in loans to depressed areas, added to the 30 percent in loans from State organizations like the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority would give Uniontown and Fayette County the financial push it would need to attract more new industry.

Communities, like ours in Fayette County, are making substantial contributions to new industry. But many of them, have almost exhausted their financial resources.

Our community leadership has been magnificent. We have achieved much through the cooperative efforts of all segments of our community regardless of their position in life and of their political views.

Mr. President, this bill is again on your desk for signing or veto.

Sign it, please. It is the type of legislation that could be our salvation.

It is designed to have people help themselves. The more prosperous States would be benefiting those less fortunate. We are one Nation, not a country of 50 separate economic units. Prosperity should be enjoyed by all.

Labor surplus areas are not good for the future of the land. They make our prosperous periods more inflationary and our recessions more severe. They must be removed.

An area redevelopment bill, to us in Fayette County, is the most immediate piece of legislation that the Federal Government can now institute to eliminate some of our chronic labor surplus areas.

We here ask you to endorse this legislation.

We ask you to sign such a bill into law so we in Fayette County can live once again, standing on our own two feet, working daily to earn the livable wage that through the years has made America the most powerful Nation in the world.

THE EVENING STANDARD,
Uniontown, Pa., May 7, 1960.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On your desk is the area redevelopment bill recently passed by both the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate. Passage of this measure authorizing Federal grants and loans aimed to grant jobs in distressed industrial and rural areas could be the economic salvation for areas like Fayette County, Pa., of which Uniontown is the county seat.

With an unemployment rate of 23.8 percent, Fayette County has the highest rate in Pennsylvania and one of the highest unemployment rates in the United States.

We have been helping ourselves with an aggressive industrial fund campaign. We have raised over $700,000 in the past 6 years to bring new industry to this district. Now we have run out of money.

We are desperate for loans and grants. The area redevelopment bill would assist us in our drive to revitalize our area which has been in a depressed state due to unemployment. When our bituminous coal mines closed, thousands of skilled miners lost their jobs.

New industry would be our salvation. We trust that you will sign the $251 million area redevelopment bill.

Yours very truly,

ARNOLD GOLDBERG,
Editor.

[From the Uniontown (Pa.) Evening Standard, Apr. 5, 1960]

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

A letter from State Secretary of Labor and Industry William L. Batt, Jr., urges the passage of the Douglas-Clark-Flood area redevelopment bill (Senate bill 722) because it offers the brightest hope yet to clear the way for new jobs and new growth.

The bill has been passed by the Senate and is now awaiting action in the House of Representatives.

This bill we have spoken about on many occasions. One of the features would be Federal loans for industrial projects. These would be limited to a maximum of 65 percent of the total investment in such projects. Of course, local and private capital would also be used.

But 65 percent of the cost of a new plant on a Federal loan would give a community, such as Uniontown, added money as a selling point when it seeks new industry.

Many firms have contacted the industrial fund about locating here. The difficulty is getting together sufficient capital to purchase the land and make it suitable for industry. This must be done to compete with other communities also in the struggle to bring in new plants.

There would be Federal loans, under the bill, for public facilities like sewage disposal plants and water systems where improvements are essential to the success of the program and sufficient private capital is not available.

Another feature would be vocational retraining for the unemployed where needed with subsistence payments during the training period for those not entitled to unemployment compensation.

The greater part of the Federal Government's participation would be in the form of secured loans, repayable on established terms of interest. It involves no raid on the National Treasury.

The bill would establish specific definitions for "redevelopment areas" eligible for assistance. Generally speaking, these would be areas where unemployment of 6 percent or more has persisted for a long period.

Pennsylvania has its share of these areas, including the Uniontown-Connellsville district.

Others as listed in a booklet called "The Enduring Problem" are:

Altoona, Berwick - Bloomsburg, Butler, Clearfield-Du Bois, Erie, Indiana, Johnstown, Kittanning-Ford City, Lewistown, Meadville, New Castle, Oil City-Franklin-Titusville, Pittsburgh, Pottsville, St. Marys, Sayre-Athens-Towanda, Scranton, Sunbury-Shamokin, Mount Carmel, Wilkes-Barre-Hazelton, Williamsport.

In neighboring West Virginia the areas of Morgantown, Fairmont, Wheeling, Clarks-

burg, and Parkersburg are included. About every population sector in West Virginia is listed.

It is important that a bill such as the Douglas-Clark-Flood measure be approved by the House.

Its prompt enactment is urgently necessary.

SERIES OF COMMENTS RELATIVE TO DEPRESSED AREA LEGISLATION, PREPARED JOINTLY BY THE PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, LABOR AND INDUSTRY, PUBLIC INSTRUCTION AND AGRICULTURE, IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE

It will shortly be the responsibility of President Eisenhower to decide the fate of a measure that the majority of Congress has tried for more than 3 years to enact into law—the Douglas-Clark-Flood area redevelopment bill, S. 722.

This week the bill finally passed with the nearly unanimous bipartisan support of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation and it passed the Senate by a vote of 45 to 32. Both Senators CLARK and SCOTT favored the measure.

It now goes to the White House, where the President has indicated he will veto it—as he has once before.

However, Mr. Eisenhower's expressed opinions of the bill have indicated that he has not had a full briefing to date. It is confidently assumed that the broader point of view, if brought to the President's attention, will yet prevail.

To be effective, however, this point of view must be conservative, and expressed by spokesmen recognized by the President as proponents of conservatism.

What then is the broader, conservative point of view?

It is, briefly, that Pennsylvania is plagued with long term unemployment far beyond the national levels of unemployment; that the State and every municipality has done everything possible to eliminate these pockets of chronic labor surpluses, but without appreciable effect; that the areas of comparatively high business activity and employment have been burdened disproportionately with taxes to provide relief for communities suffering from chronic unemployment; that the history of Pennsylvania's efforts to solve the problem is lengthy, unremitting, intelligent—but unavailing.

Pennsylvania's own Operation Bootstraps, the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority (PIDA) has been an excellent example, on a relatively small scale, of what this type of legislation can mean.

Since July 1956, PIDA has granted loans of $15 million to assist the financing of 116 industrial plants in more than 60 hard-hit Pennsylvania communities. Community funds of $9.3 million and first mortgages of $23.2 million bring the total value of PIDA developments to $47.5 million.

These projects have created 23,000 new jobs with an annual payroll of nearly $82 million, in areas where unemployment for 3 and 4 years has run as high as 25 percent.

The Commonwealth's investment is earning interest, and is being returned to a revolving fund. Meanwhile, the administrative cost of the program has been only $201,435—$189,299 of which went into engineering and legal fees. This works out to $8.75 per job.

It has cost enormous amounts to subsidize these surplus areas of unemployment in Pennsylvania. As Governor Lawrence pointed out in his press conference of April 7, "If we had solved chronic area unemployment in Pennsylvania in the last 7 years, we could have saved $360 million in unemployment compensation and $80 million in public assistance, or an average of $63 million a year."

These are demonstrable facts. If Pennsylvania's resources were sufficient, and if the problem of chronic unemployment were limited to Pennsylvania, we would be able to solve the problem by ourselves.

But long term, critical labor surplus areas are scattered throughout the Nation, in all directions. Pennsylvania, however, has more than any other State in the Nation. And Pennsylvania's resources are far from unlimited. Only about $4 million of PIDA's investment funds remain to be used.

The Douglas-Clark-Flood area redevelopment bill establishes what, in effect, is to be a National PIDA. The need for this kind of action on a national basis is undisputed; the difference of opinion lies only in the size of the program.

The President indicated that he favored a program in the neighborhood of $55 million, but later seemed willing to revise that figure upward. The Senate originally called for a fund of $389.5 million. The House of Representatives, in an effort to obtain White House approval, cut this figure by $140 million to a total of $138.5 million.

The bargaining and compromising have now ended. Either the President will accept the $251 million figure, or he will veto it.

The question can properly be raised: Is $251 million too much for the need? It will help to look at the problem in the same perspective as Pennsylvania's experience with PIDA.

In 44 months, Pennsylvania has advanced $15 million from a fund which started at $5 million and has since been augmented three times by legislative action. We have created jobs for 23,000 people, but there are still 199,100 unemployed in just 22 of the State's 36 critical labor areas which would qualify for assistance under the Douglas bill.

A Presidential veto will leave the Nation with 175 distressed labor markets as a drag on the national economy.

Presidential approval of the bill, on the other hand, will provide Pennsylvania with great assistance, over and above the stabilizing influence of PIDA, our local industrial development corporations, and the banks in these areas. It will also provide the rest of the country with a means of creating jobs that will put their own jobless people back to work in those areas where concentrations of long-term unemployment exist.

Without a Federal mechanism, such as the Douglas-Clark-Flood bill provides, Pennsylvania would be powerless to completely remedy the problem. We no longer live in a Nation, an age, or an economy where there is any hope of isolation. A factory closing in Des Moines affects people in Altoona. We could provide jobs for every available worker in Pennsylvania, and still be in difficulty if the rest of the Nation—and, most particularly, our neighborly and most competitive States—continued to suffer from chronic unemployment.

Pennsylvania has proved that the kind of activity to be established on a Federal level under the Douglas bill can work. It has also proved that, while the financial provisions of the bill are less than desired, there is a need for at least this much appropriation, and that the money can be profitably and wisely invested.

A veto of S. 722 would be the antithesis of constructive Government action. It would be a blow to good business and to the prospects of a continued rise in the economy of our State and Nation.

If these facts are made clear to the President by the conservative leadership in which he has confidence, there is every hope that he will sign S. 722 into law.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, pursuant to the order heretofore entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, May 12, 1960, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 11, 1960:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Morris A. Hirsch, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Director of Budget and Reports in the Department of the Navy for a term of 3 years.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Alfred J. Cler
John H. Huhn
Robert S. McAfee

Robert M. Walters, midshipman (Naval Academy) to be a permanent ensign in the restricted line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Supply Corps as previously nominated, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Charles L. Terry
Alton K. Thompson

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

James R. Barnes	Charles M. Ludwigsen
Barry T. Bates	Henry L. Luschen
Thomas J. Brock	Lee R. McDonald
Edwards L. Brockway	John J. McKenzie
Charles K. Brown	Michael J. McShea
Marion L. Brown	Philip E. Mackey
Richard B. Campbell	Danno F. Mahoney
Glen E. Clover	William F. Meyer
Dorvan G. Conell	William T. Mitchell
Thaddeus C. Cox	John P. Moran
John W. Crawford	Richard S. Morey
Stephen A. Diamond	Macy E. Overstreet
Burton A. Dole, Jr.	Hugh A. Reeder
Ted R. Fitzsimmons	Walter F. Schnabel
Roger H. Folts	Carl D. Scott
Robert L. Friedlander	Ronald C. Serviss
Donald P. Grant	Murle W. Shiveley
Joseph M. Hawes	Hugh L. Shoemaker
Raymond G. Hepburn	Melville Straus
Larry R. Hertzog	James D. Tadlock
William S. Hood, Jr.	Richard F. Veazey, Jr.
Richard E. Holloway	Richard W. Wallace
Carroll E. Jones	Rodney G. Wells
Neil W. Jones	John A. Westman, Jr.
David C. Kurtz	John R. Young
Marcus G. La France	

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be permanent ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

A. Donald Anderle	Ronald B. DeNeuf
Bruce R. Anderson, Jr.	John R. Dolina
Daniel B. Aron	Paul S. Finden
William D. Bain	Ted R. Fitzsimmons
Robert N. Berkopec	James R. Gear
David R. Bickerstaff	Kenneth W. Gilchrist
William L. Booth	Donald E. Godbey
Joseph A. Bosco	Thomas R. Gramins
James N. Bryant	Charles C. Griffith
Edward J. Budill	James T. Hannan, Jr.
Laird C. Cleaver	Alan R. Haugner
Russell M. Coombs	William L. Hinckley
Glenn C. Craig	William E. Horton
Robert C. Crites	Richard N. Howard

David A. Huey
Kenneth E. Kittock
Peter N. Larson
Richard N. Latzer
Trevor C. Lewis, Jr.
Stephen K. Liebmann
John C. Loustaunou
Milner W. McVadon
Weldon S. Meier
Leslie W. Michael
Clifford Mitman, Jr.
Robert A. Murphy
Paul T. Nagano
Edwin F. Nicholson
David W. Oakley
Robert E. Price
Jon N. Richardson
Frederick A. Roesch
Bruce S. Romney
David R. Sadtler
Carl D. Scott
Larry J. Shima
Stefan P. Shoup
Larry G. Showley
Robert E. Spratt
Edward P. Stone
James L. Uhles
David G. VanPatten
Brents R. White
Royce S. Williams

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be permanent ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

James S. Balloun
James H. Blanchar
Richard B. Campbell
Ramsey L. Cronfel
Stephen A. Diamond
James C. Doebler
Edgar W. Fasig, Jr.
David L. Forney
William F. Frazier
Raymond G. Hepburn
Larry R. Hertzog
Richard E. Holloway
Robert T. Jackson III
Paul L. Key II
William M. Killen
David C. Kurtz
Billy B. Lowrey
Glen P. McCurdy
Richard E. Norton
Willis C. Pflugh, Jr.
Hugo P. Pomrehn
Joseph R. Ramos
Ralph R. Reynolds
William A. Sitnik

The following-named graduates from naval enlisted scientific educational program to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

George W. Fang
Jay E. Hinkel
Alfred E. Johnson

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Julian L. Ragsdale
Ralph N. Salatino

The following-named Naval Reserve Officers to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Carter S. Bagley
Warren M. Barrett
James W. Brough
John R. Clark
John R. Gaskill
Joseph C. Tatum
John W. Thompson
James T. Wilson

Henry E. Rasmussen-Taxdal, Reserve officer, to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Marvin G. Caldwell, Reserve officer, to be a permanent lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy, and to be promoted to lieutenant when his line running mate is so promoted, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

William H. Standley, Jr., U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent captain, in the line of the Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

Warren A. Wright, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy for temporary service, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

The following-named officer candidates to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

James H. Ansley
Leroy R. Bannach
Niles W. Berry
Duane E. Buck
John E. Caler
James F. Callahan
Theodore R. Campbell
Vernon Clark
David L. Dawson
George F. Farnan
Gerald Forstner
Robert H. Fred
Christopher W. Galbreath, Jr.
Holmes B. Germany
William J. Gertz
John K. Hemmer
Roger W. Hightower
Donnell R. Kidder
Robert Kurz
Carl E. Lambach
Richard W. Lawrence
William W. Manlove
Samuel D. McLeod, Jr.
Jack L. Melton
Edward L. Owens
Gerald T. Parker
Eugene E. Perry
Carl E. Richno
Richard Riedel
Donald A. Rigg
James D. Ritchie
Anthony M. Rybarczyk
John P. Sandlin
Gordon E. Scott
Edman L. Sipe
Thomas G. Torkleson
James R. Wehner
Holman S. Whitford
Ward W. Wier
Richard E. Wood

The following-named officer candidates to be permanent ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Charles U. Allbaugh
James F. Bauer
Ronald L. Foltz
Bobby L. Gibson
Alfred C. Grosskurth
Keith D. Kaylor
Belton J. Littlefield
Arthur L. Matheny
Robert N. Varner
Phillip N. Tapia

Orrin B. Ross, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and in the temporary grade of lieutenant:

John E. Dougherty, Jr.
Leonard G. Duffy
Charles H. Erwin
Robert P. Perry

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

Donald L. Moore
Harold S. Westphal

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permament grade of ensign:

Phillip F. McNall
John E. Maxwell
Harvey W. Nix, Jr.

The following-named line officers of the Navy, selected as alternates, for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps in the permanent grade of ensign:

Carl W. Amick
George T. Bauer
Walter C. Ebmeyer
George R. Holdeman
Graves B. Stephenson

The following-named officers for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the Supply Corps of the U.S. Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Scott, William W.
Westphal, Harold S.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps as indicated:

LINE

Simpson, Philip M.
Turner, Sherman W.
Hagen, James R.
Moore, Mark H., Jr.
Pendergraft, George W., Jr.
Warren, Billy R.
Kelly, James M.
Trabue, Howard W.
Singer, Freeman J.
Miller, Kenneth F.
Bruner, James R.
Cooper, Donald H.
Welling, Alan S.
Slawson, Ralph L.

MEDICAL CORPS

Highly, Francis M., Jr.
Prescott, William C.

SUPPLY CORPS

Johnson, Lloyd R.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Fitzgerald, Owen R.

DENTAL CORPS

Rice, George W., Jr.
Romaniello, Ronald M.

The following-named officers of the Navy to be temporary lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, in accordance with section 5788(b), title 10, United States Code:

Abbott, Frank H.
Achord, Earl W.
Adamcewicz, Francis A.
Adams, Joseph D.
Adkins, William, Jr.
Albritton, James L.
Alexander, John C. J.
Allen, Aquilla J., Jr.
Allen, Thomas R.
Amero, Neil J., Jr.
Ammons, Clarence M.
Anderson, Archie A.
Anderson, George E.
Anderson, Lee R.
Archibald, Robert M.
Arenth, Ronald W.
Armbruster, Robert B.
Arnett, Chester L.
Ault, Russell S.
Backstrom, Einar W.
Baker, Harry J.
Baldwin, Jack V.
Baldwin, Richard T.
Ball, Robert N.
Barclay, Gordon J.
Barnett, Harris
Barrett, Maurice J., Jr.
Bartee, William J.
Bates, Lawrence, Jr.
Baumgartner, Harry O.
Beach, Edwin C.
Beahm, John H., Jr.
Beckman, Robert J.
Beedle, Leland "S," Jr.
Bennett, Wesley L.
Bernstein, George
Bertelsen, Ralph I.
Bibbee, William C.
Bishop, Benjamin M.
Blaisdell, Sela A.
Blakeslee, Dean T.
Blanton, Ernest P.
Blazevic, Raymond L.
Blount, Byron A.
Blum, James R.
Blumenthal, Richard W.
Bornowski, John G., Jr.
Bouchard, Joseph S.
Bouton, Samuel L.
Bowser, Paul G.
Boxwell, William R.
Boyster, Arnold E.
Braastad, Wayne A.
Brackin, James K.
Brady, Allen E.
Brainard, Hubert E.
Brand, Joseph N.
Branin, John W.
Brewer, James V.
Brink, Charles W.
Brough, Donald J.
Brown, Clarence E., Jr.
Brown, Howard S.
Brown, Randolph M.
Brown, Stanton L.
Buechel, Joseph L.
Burchfield, Mitchel T.
Burdett, Calvin E.
Bures, Joseph C.
Bush, Albert G.
Bush, Lowell E.
Bussmann, Richard J.
Buyers, Clarence
Byers, David I.
Cahill, Edward H.
Cameron, Edward J.
Canter, Richard D.
Carder, Harold D., Jr.
Carl, James P.
Carpenter, Wayne D.
Carr, Albert J., Jr.
Carroll, Joseph W.
Carter, Charles S.
Carter, Lawrence H.
Carter, Morris C.
Casselberry, Frederick J.
Caudry, Arthur R.
Chavar, Samuel M.
Chayer, Arthur E.
Cheek, Wiley J.
Cheney, Frank J., Jr.
Clark, John D.
Clark, Thomas B.
Clarke, Lyle E. Y.
Clary, Robert A.
Clay, Harry B., Jr.
Coburn, Harold E.
Cocchi, James G.
Coe, Walter R.
Cole, Wade A.
Cole, William F.
Coltrin, Wayne E.
Cook, Paul T.
Corsnitz, Robert E.
Cosgrove, Joseph J.
Covert, Dana P.
Cranford, William J.
Craven, John A.
Crihfield, Raymond L.
Cross, Raymond
Crouch, W. L. Lamon
Crumm, Richard D.
Cummings, Billy W.
Curry, Raymond L.
Davis, Robert L.
Davison, James G., Jr.
Dayhoff, James R.
Deagan, Thomas D.
Dearman, James M.
Deesch, Earl H.
Delross, Joseph F.
Dimond, Thomas E.
Dishon, William E.
Dodd, Donald C.
Doherty, Joseph F.
Donnelly, John J.
Dootson, Eugene
Dowling, Lester C.
Driscoll, Joseph D.
Duba, Francis T.
Duncan, Garnett D.
Dunn, Charles E.
Duvall, Robert A.
Dyer, Joe L., Jr.
Dygert, Robert L.
Eaton, Joe W.
Edwards, Donald L.
Edwards, Jeremiah, Jr.
Edwards, Melvin J.
Edwards, Peter
Ehrhart, Richard B.
Elliott, Thomas J.
Elliott, William B.
Engle, Raymond E.
Epley, John K.
Evanoff, John D.
Evans, James C.
Evered, William H.
Faires, Elbert W.
Farnsworth, Frederick F.
Farrell, Richard C.
Felts, Robert W.
Fenton, William T., Jr.
Fergerson, Franklin E.
Ferlet, Leo G., Jr.
Fields, Cecil O.
Fields, Chester J., Jr.
Fine, Morton B.
Fitzgerald, Bernard M.
Fitzpatrick, Chester L.
Fleming, Cecil H.
Fleming, Richard C., Jr.
Flickinger, Dean F.

Folkins, Harry A.
Fondren, George
Forte, William R.
Foulk, William H.
Frank, Walter E.
Frear, Donald L.
Fredericks, Harold A.
Fulfer, Richard H.
Fuller, Charles A.
Fuller, Roger W.
Gardner, Stanley W., Jr.
Garrett, William K.
Gass, Joseph
Gaudette, Merton E., Jr.
Gaudry, Byron A.
Gellenthin, George A., Jr.
Gessner, Winton S.
Gibson, Carl
Gibson, Donald "C"
Giganti, George M.
Giovanetti, Robert A.
Godfrey, Jack L.
Gofus, Joseph G., Jr.
Gold, Edward F.
Gomer, Roy D.
Gorecki, Francis
Goslin, Ralph A.
Gossard, Charles A.
Greaney, William M.
Green, Bernie L.
Grisbaum, Frederick "G"
Griswold, Charles D.
Grosscup, Stephen J., Jr.
Guimond, Ernest E., Jr.
Guindon, Emmett T.
Gundersen, Matthew W.
Hagen, Robert F.
Hall, Irving G., III
Hall, Stanley J.
Hannify, Michael F.
Haralson, Joseph E.
Haralson, James B.
Hardenstein, Howard J.
Harkins, Lawrence E.
Harkness, William L.
Harkreader, John R. Jr.
Harley, John K.
Harper, Frances M., Jr.
Harrington, John R.
Harris, James O.
Hassey, Milam B.
Hawkins, Carl L.
Hayden, Leroy M.
Hayter, Roscoe, Jr.
Hebble, George C., Jr.
Hefferman, Albert L.
Henderson, William L.
Heppard, William E.
Hewett, Donald H.
Heyde, Robert C.
Heydenberk, Delbert F.
Heying, Paul J.
Hill, Eugene L.
Hill, John F.
Hillman, Bernard M.
Hills, Robert E.
Hoffman, Albert L.
Holland, Frank C., Jr.
Holland, William G.
Hood, James W., Jr.
Hoole, Frederick
Hopwood, Walter, Jr.
Horn, Benjamin
Houck, Charles E.
Howard, Frank A.
Hughes, Robert L.
Humphrey, William J.
Hurd, John R.
Huseman, Frank W., Jr.
Huth, Alton J.
Ingalls, James K.
Inman, Raymond E.
Jacobs, John D.
Jacobsen, Philip H.
Jefferson, Donald G.
Jennings, John L.
Jewell, Arthur L.
Jewell, Harvey E.
Johnson, Edward D.
Johnson, Norman H.
Johnson, Paul C.
Johnston, Clarence A.
Jones, Benjamin W.
Jones, Francis P.
Jones, Freasie "L", Jr.
Jones, Roy L.
Karmenzind, William P.
Keir, Stephen D.
Kelley, Wayne R.
Kelso, Howard
Kennedy, Charles A., Jr.
Kesterson, Aubrey V.
Keyes, Wayne P.
Kilmer, James "J"
Kincade, Paul B.
King, John W.
Kivelle, William A.
Koehler, Jay D.
Kofnovec, Robert G.
Kozak, Eugene J.
Krause, Edwin L.
Kunz, Herman S.
Kuske, Loren L., Jr.
Laboone, John A., Jr.
Lafever, Jesse H.
Laird, Travis H.
Lamb, Ellis R., Jr.
Landaker, John A., Jr.
Landon, William E.
Lang, William J.
Larkin, Russell J.
Lasko, Harvey D.
Lastrico, Frank A.
Lauf, Joseph W.
Leblanc, David C.
Lemerande, Lloyd R.
Leonard, William J.
Lesko, Edward E.
Lewis, Roy R., Jr.
Lipke, Allan E.
Little, Donald W.
Lockshire, Robert A.
Long, Carl H., Jr.
Long, William T.
Loose, Rudyard K.
Luedtke, Oscar F., Jr.
Lufkin, Richard M.
Lunder, Hans W.
Lynch, James J.
MacLeod, Wallace F., Jr.
Maddox, Rex A.
Mamele, Clayton C.
Markley, Harold R., Jr.
Marshall, Robert F.
Martin, Harlen J.
Martin, Paul W.
Martin, William T.
Matarazza, Ralph A.
Mathieu, Roger A.
Mayer, Richard T.
McCollough, Willard L.
McDaniel, Robert S.
McFarland, Thomas G., Jr.
McGraw, Lloyd H.
McGuirk, William E.
McIntire, Charles R.
McIntyre, Patrick J., Jr.
McInvale, Joe B.
McKay, Harry
McKeithan, Alton L.
McKeon, Robert N.
McKinnon, Edward W.
McKnight, David R.
McNamara, Laurence V.
McPherson, Robert E.
Medugno, Vincent R.
Meenan, Robert L.
Megyesi, Charles B.
Meisner, George L.
Merry, John F.
Michael, David B.
Michel, Dehlbert C.
Miller, George W., Jr.
Million, Daniel J.
Mills, Edward
Mills, Marvin L.
Monteleone, Vito J.
Montgomery, Herbert E.
Moore, John T.
Moore, Rufus B.
Morgan, Lester A.
Morgan, Robert W.
Morris, Bernard G.
Morrow, Roy C.
Mosman, Raymond A.
Moyer, Donald W.
Mullaly, Raymond K.
Mullins, Kenneth P.
Murdoch, William
Murphy, Joseph M.
Mutz, "H" "O", Jr.
Nall, Harold W.
Nania, John J.
Nelson, William J.
Newby, Burton C.
Newton, Addison W.
Nielsen, Kenneth C.
Nohlburg, Edward "B"
Nonni, John, Jr.
Nordell, Dean E.
Norman, Roy A.
North, Richard D.
Northrop, Arthur L.
Notbohm, Lester W.
Nott, William J.
O'Brien, John B.
O'Brien, Lawrence B.
O'Brien, Walter H.
O'Donnell, John J.
O'Keeffe, Frank P.
Oliver, Earl L.
Olson, Joseph D.
Painter, Cecil W.
Painter, Orville E.
Papi, Lawrence A.
Pappas, Albert J.
Park, Newell D., Jr.
Parsons, Robert A.
Patrick, William M.
Patterson, Jack L.
Peirson, Robert A.
Peterman, John J., Jr.
Petty, Ronald F.
Phillips, Samuel B.
Piasecki, Edmund A. D.
Pierce, Wayne M.
Pierson, Irwin B.
Pigg, Bobby J.
Pioske, William C.
Polk, Lloyd E.
Poole, Ralph S., Jr.
Potts, Nicholas T.
Pouliot, Donald J.
Prenzlow, Roger E.
Prevo, Kyle T., Jr.
Priest, Robert E.
Pruitt, Arnold W.
Pruitt, Harold P., Jr.
Putman, James L.
Quick, Robert A.
Rabb, Uil G.
Rachiell, Harold W.
Ragone, Vito N.
Randall, Herbert T.
Randle, Benjamin W.
Randolph, Billy R.
Rasberry, Thomas H.
Rathbun, Denny R.
Reck, Joseph W.
Reed, Ned W.
Reitmeier, Bernard S.
Reno, William J.
Repp, Robert W.
Reynolds, John T., Jr.
Rice, Oscar "G"
Richardson, Howard V., Jr.
Richmond, Edgar E.
Richter, Eugene, Jr.
Riley, William E.
Robbins, Doyne C.
Roberson, Robert B.
Roberts, Charles A.
Roberts, Earl L.
Roberts, George L., Jr.
Robertson, Robert D.
Rodke, Larry R.
Rogers, William F.
Roll, Charles A.
Romans, Robert W.
Romero, Melvin D.
Roxburgh, Kenneth M.
Roy, Herman E.
Russell, Cleveland H.
Ruthford, Donald C.
Sailor, Edward A.
Sallee, Ralph W.
Sanborn, Robert R.
Santoro, Paul J.
Sapp, Edford W.
Sayers, Thomas E., Jr.
Sayles, Paul H.
Scheidt, Peter J.
Schoonover, Richard T.
Shaffer, Bradford K.
Sharp, Bill W.
Sharp, Walter H.
Shaw, Frederick A.
Shearon, Warren B.
Sheelor, Robert E.
Shipman, Joseph
Sibson, Tom R.
Silvey, William E., Jr.
Sistrunk, Allred, Jr.
Skiff, Phillip H.
Sloan, Roy A.
Smith, Bennie J.
Smith, Leonard T.
Smith, Lewis F.
Smith, Robert H.
Snyder, Carl T.
Southworth, Thomas E.
Spear, Jimmie E.
Speed, Laverne W.
Spitzner, Charles E.
Springer, Virgil E.
Stanfield, Donald G.
Stansbury, Donald O.
Starr, Joseph R.
Steine, Zachary
Sterling, Robert F., Jr.
Steventon, Raymond L.
Stickney, Maurice M., Jr.
Stockhausen, Edward L.
Strangfeld, Henry R.
Stroup, Paul C.
Strunk, David W.
Sturdivant, George W.
Sturm, Junior C.
Sullivan, Homer H.
Sunda, Lester R.
Swahn, Charles N.
Swaringen, Clarence S., Jr.
Swayne, William T. J.
Syverson, Maurice S.
Tebbetts, William H.
Terry, Morris K.
Thompson, Harold L.
Thompson, John W.
Thompson, John S.
Thompson, Marrion R.
Thompson, Robert L.
Thorp, Victor G.
Toney, William C.
Torres, Louis J.
Townsend, Gordon E.
Tracy, Earl V.
Truitt, Harry D.
Tylee, James G.
Underwood, George C.
Urry, Raymond L.
Vancil, Carl L.
Van Doren, Frank C.
Vann, Kenneth E.
Van Outrive, Harold J.
Vaughan, William H.
Venable, David B.
Victor, James A.
Vroman, Theodore J., Jr.
Wagner, Harry E.
Wagner, John
Waldner, Clarence G.
Walker, Muthey D., Jr.
Wall, Robert R.
Walton, Charles R.
Ward, Donald, Jr.
Ward, James J.
Watkins, William D.
Webster, Audrey C.
Weidetz, Carl J., Jr.
Weiser, Conrad W., Jr.
Welch, Richard L.
Wells, Carl C., Jr.
Whitaker, "J" "B"
White, Alfred H.
White, Ray A.
White, Robert W.
Whitmer, Benjamin F.
Wiktorski, Peter A.
Wilkerson, William A.
Wilkison, Teddy P.
Williams, Charles L.
Willyard, Maurice D.
Wilson, Eldon C.
Wilson, Warren C.
Winkeler, Joseph A.
Woidyla, Frank J.
Wood, John D.
Worrall, Joseph A.
Wright, Kenneth D.
Wright, Robert L.
Wright, Russell W.
Yessak, Lawrence G.
Young, Arthur E., Jr.
Young, Billie R.
Young, Sol
Yuskis, Edward C.
Zorbach, Anthony J.
Zurfluh, Robert M.
Zuver, Ralph M.

SUPPLY CORPS

Agee, "D" "C"
Andersen, Thomas C.
Ayers. Leo R., Jr.
Barbary, Howard J.
Beaman, Thomas S.
Bell, Ralph W., Jr.
Benvenuto, Thomas, Jr.
Chambers, Jerry R.
Christian, Roy F.
Combs, Floyd E.
Costa, Richard D.
Crutchfield, Lawrence
Dietz, John H.
Dixon, Maurice E.
Dodson, Dale E.
Erickson, James L.
Fitzgerald, Elonza B.
Frankeny, Robert U.
Getrige, John J.
Hardy, Allen
Hendren, Richard R.
Hunt, Elmer G.
Hunt, Rutherford E.
Hutton, Raymond E., Jr.
Irvin, Floyd L.
Irving, Carl F., Jr.
Itzkowitz, Harold B.
Jenkins, Vernon R.
Jensen, Nels P.
Liter, Theodore G.
Martell, Richard A.
Matthews, Orville D.
McClure, Mason B.
Moore, Robert H.
Murphy, Allen R.
Pacofsky, Bartholomew
Parke, William H., Jr.
Pata, Michael
Pettypool, Loyal B.
Reese, Richard A.
Robinson, Colonel P.
Rose, Robert P.
Roth, Arthur
Schoolcraft, Harold R.
Squibb, Rodney K.
Stead, Robert H.
Stripling, Donald E.
Swartz, Alex E.
Thietten, Dwight O.
Tilley, Philip L.
Utrup, Ralph A.
Vann, Louis E.
Vincent, Howard A.
Vogele, James V.
Walker, Paul D.
Weaver, Johnnie R.
Webster, Harry G.
Wiggins, Don J.
Worth, George W.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Schoenholzer, William J.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abbott, William A.
Abram, Donald E.
Adams, Charles P.
Adcock, Charles W.
Aderholt, William L., Jr.
Ailes, Robert H.
Alberty, Roger E.
Aldana, Louis P.
Aldrich, Robert F.
Alexander, Bruce G.
Alexander, William T.
Allen, David L.
Allen, Dean K.
Allen, William C., Jr.
Allison, Kenneth L.
Allman, Thomas L., Jr.
Almgren, David W.
Almstedt, Theodore A., Jr.
Altergott, Harvey K.
Alvarez, Franklin F.
Ambos, Brooks L., Jr.
Andersen, Gordon W.
Anderson, Anders T.
Anderson, Benny A.
Anderson, Donald C.
Anderson, Edward E., Jr.
Anderson, George W., III
Anderson, Norman D.
Anderson, Richard C.
Andrews, Charles H., Jr.
Andrews, Thomas W.
Anewalt, Robert E.
Antonides, Gary P.
Arcuni, Philip
Armbruster, James H.
Armstrong, David L.
Arthur, Stanley R.
Artim, Ronald N.

Ashford, George W., Jr.
Atkinson, Donald S.
Atkinson, Harvey B., Jr.
Atwell, Robert F., III
Aubert, Donald F.
Avis, Dwight E., Jr.
Awtrey, Bernard S., Jr.
Baddley, William H.
Badger, Terry M.
Baechler, Charles A.
Bailey, Frank B.
Bailey, Samuel M., Jr.
Baker, James C.
Baker, Lawrence C., Jr.
Baker, Peter A.
Baker, Ronald E.
Baldes, Joseph J.
Baldwin, Oa F.
Baldwin, Roger L.
Ball, John E.
Ballantine, James C., Jr.
Ballou, Joseph F.
Bangert, James E.
Bank, Milton H., II
Barbee, Walter E.
Barber, James S.
Barger, James E.
Barker, Ernest W.
Barker, Harold D.
Barker, Nathaniel C.
Barker, Richard H.
Barnes, Frank W.
Barnes, Paul D.
Barnum, Craig L.
Barron, Michael J.
Barrows, John W.
Barry, Gerard E.
Barry, Richard J., III
Barry, Robert L.
Bartlett, Donald W.
Bartlett, Larry D.
Bartocci, John E.
Barton, Bryan W.
Bassett, Charles H., Jr.
Bassin, Paul H.
Bateman, Kenneth W.
Bates, Homer R.
Bates, Richard H., Jr.
Bator, Stanley E., Jr.
Bauer, Herbert
Bauer, Paul F., Jr.
Baugh, Bernard R.
Beasley, Charles J.
Beatty, Don G.
Beatty, James R., III
Beatty, William H., III
Beck, Donald E.
Beck, John R.
Beckwith, Walter G.
Beeler, Robert R.
Behrends, Paul O.
Bell, Robert T.
Belville, Lance S.
Bender, James E.
Bendix, William E.
Benjes, William B.
Bennington, Bruce A.
Benson, Burton O.
Benz, Valentine G.
Berghane, Charles A., Jr.
Berrier, David J.
Berry, William H.
Betterton, Thomas C.
Betts, Francis M., III
Beury, Harold R.
Bevan, John A., Jr.
Bibb, James W.
Bickmore, Edward C., Jr.
Biele, Charles E., Jr.
Billings, Charles H.
Binder, Gordon M.
Binger, James D.
Binsfeld, Arthur J.
Bishop, Frederick W.
Bishop, Harold F.
Black, Arnold E., Jr.
Black, Herbert L., Jr.
Black, Richard O.
Black, Robert J.
Blackner, Ronald K.
Blankenship, Michael G.
Blasko, John E.
Blessing, George R.
Bletch, James W.
Blue, John J., III
Bluestein, Jack
Boerner, Delbert D.
Bogert, Howard Z., Jr.
Boggs, Harold A., Jr.
Boice, Frank B.
Boisseau, Thomas A.
Boling, James R.
Bolinger, Stuart W.
Bolze, Ray S.
Bond, Charles S.
Bonhag, Walter D., Jr.
Boodell, Thomas J., Jr.
Bornstein, Paul A.
Bostick, James H.
Boswell, Robert L.
Bower, Bruce B.
Bower, Richard D.
Bowers, Robert L.
Bowles, Robert E.
Bowman, Addison M., III
Boyce, Heyward E., III
Boyle, Ronald R.
Boyne, Peter B.
Bradley, Frederick L., Jr.
Brandenburg, Robert L.
Brandon, William D.
Brazzon, Robert
Breckon, Richard L.
Breed, William L.
Brennan, James J.
Brenner, Leroy E.
Brewton, Edward A.
Briggs, Richard W., Jr.
Brobst, Richard A.
Brode, David M.
Brookbank, Ronald A.
Brookes, Allan G., Jr.
Brooks, Dennis M.
Broome, Bobby S.
Brown, Donald C.
Brown, Donald G.
Brown, John S.
Brown, Kenneth C.
Brown, Parke L., Jr.
Brown, Randall R.
Brown, Thomas S.
Brown, Walter C.
Brown, William T.
Browne, Thomas M.
Brownell, Paul E.
Browning, James D.
Browning, Wayne B.
Brownlow, William J.
Brunell, David
Bryans, Brian K.
Bryant, George W.
Buchanan, William B.
Buck, David E.
Buck, Wilbur P.
Buckner, James A.
Bull, John S.
Bullene, Richard E.
Bullock, Harold O., Jr.
Burcher, Philip E.
Burchett, Chester W.
Burgess, John E.
Burke, Thomas J.
Burleigh, David P.
Burnett, John W., Jr.
Burnett, Stanley R.
Burns, James M.
Burns, John D.
Burrows, James B.
Burton, Robert A., Jr.
Busch, Marvin L.
Bussard, Robert H.
Butler, John P.
Butler, Robert P.
Butterfield, David L.
Byers, Carl A.
Byers, John M.
Bynon, Robert W.
Caciola, James J.
Cahill, Lionel A., Jr.
Caldwell, W. H. Gerald, Jr.
Calvin, Kim J.
Cameron, Thomas S., Jr.
Campbell, John R.
Campbell, Robert B.
Campbell, Robyn M. Jr.
Campbell, William, Jr.
Carleton, Reid P.
Carlin, Raymond F., Jr.
Caron, Robert M.
Carpenter, Jann W.
Carpenter, Rex N.
Carr, Samuel L.
Carroll, Charles S.
Carroll, John L.
Carroll, Peter A.
Carroll, Richard P.
Carson, William G.
Carter, Sanford P.
Case, Robert G.
Cates, Walter E.
Catri, Leonard J.
Cave, James W.
Cella, Glenn R.
Chaffee, Roger B.
Chambers, John T.
Chanslor, Richard M.
Chapdelaine, Paul L.
Charles, Richard N.
Christensen, John E., Jr.
Christensen, Ejnar S., Jr.
Christenson, Robert W. S.
Church, James D.
Cierzniak, James J.
Clancy, Wilbert C.
Clark, Allen H.
Clark, Loren L.
Clarke, Douglas L.
Clason, Robert G.
Clements, Robert B., Jr.
Clevenger, Redmond L.
Clifton, Ralph B.
Clifton, Roger L.
Clock, Harry S.
Coats, Andrew M.
Cobi, Frederick B.
Coen, Francis M.
Cohen, Lawrence
Colburn, Frank F.
Cole, George F., III
Cole, William M., II
Coleman, James J.
Coleman, Joseph S., Jr.
Collard, Edward J.
Collier, William N., Jr.
Collins, David M.
Collins, William H., Jr.
Comer, Robert F.
Comstock, Eldred H., Jr.
Comstock, Roger W.
Conner, Eugene D.
Conner, James B.
Connor, David M., Jr.
Conron, Michael A.
Converse, Henry B.
Coogan, Patrick D.
Cook, David W.
Cook, Edward H.
Cook, John H., III
Cook, Thomas L. P.
Coolbaugh, Jesse D.
Cooper, Daniel L.
Cooper, David S.
Cooper, John C.
Cooper, John D., Jr.
Copeland, John H.
Copeland, Robert E.
Corbell, Rodolphe N.
Cordek, David
Cordle, "J" "T"
Corwin, Gordon W.
Coulbourn, Samuel W.
Cowan, Charles L.
Cowan, Terrance E.
Cowles, Kenneth H.
Cox, Darrell Z.
Cox, Edward L.
Cox, James P.
Cox, Joseph F.
Cox, Robert G.
Cox, Robert L.
Cox, William B.
Coyne, William L.
Craig, Harry E.
Crain, Samuel R., III
Cramer, Erich H. E.
Crandall, Donald R.
Crawford, Forrest S.
Crew, Perry L.
Crichton, Ian R.
Cromer, Charles C.
Cross, Claude C.
Crowe, William M., Jr.
Crowell, Alton I., Jr.
Crozier, Ronald L.
Crutchfield, Jack D.
Culhane, Joseph R., Jr.
Cumblidge, Kenneth E.
Cundari, Francis L.
Cunningham, Shaun
Cunningham, Robert G., Jr.
Cunningham, Shane A.
Curlee, John L.
Currie, David S.
Currie, William N.
Curry, Newell L.
Curry, William H., Jr.
Dague, Leonard P.
Dale, James C., III
Dallas, Gerald M.
Dallon, Dale S.
Daly, Frederick T., III
Dammann, Frederick O.
Daniels, Louis D.
Danielson, Herbert V., Jr.
Dante, William M.
Darby, Thomas E., Jr.
Darragh, Charles T., Jr.
Daughenbaugh, Robert L.
Davenport, Charles A.
Davenport, Theodore M.
Davidson, John M.
Davis, Charles L.
Davis, Craig H.
Davis, Jackson K., Jr.
Davis, James F.
Davis, Jimmy W.
Davis, John W., Jr.
Davis, Philip C.
Davis, Ray E., Jr.
Davis, Robert E.
Davis, Robert A.
Dawkins, William P.
Day, Raymond D.
Dean, Bill C.
DeBuys, Laurence R., III
Decarlo, John A.
Deegan, Robert F.
Defibaugh, Carl F., Jr.
DeGress, Francis B., III
Dekinder, Robert E., Jr.
DeLashmitt, Robert E.
Delo, David A.
Demarest, Joseph G., III
Demars, Bruce
Demetrios, Michael B.
Dennis, Jefferson R., Jr.
DeSimio, Charles D.
Devries, John B.
Dial, Douglas A.
Diamond, Horace W., Jr.
Dickens, Russell D.
Dickey, James P.
Didier, Jacob P., Jr.
Diehlmann, Charles J.
Disher, John S.
Dixon, Donald D.
Dixon, John C.
Dixon, Ned E.
Dodd, Jimmy J.
Doherty, Charles M.
Doll, Herman A., Jr.
Dollenmeyer, James K.
Dolliver, Richard H.
Donnan, Earl L.
Donnelly, Thomas F.
Doragh, Robert A.
Dorsey, Frank C.
Dotson, John P.
Doughdrill, Charles W.
Dove, Ray W., Jr.
Dowling, Robert J.
Doyle, John K., Jr.
Drumm, Thomas F., Jr.
Dudas, Daniel L.
Duffy, Leonard C.
Dugan, Ferdinand C., III
Dulik, Andrew F.
Duncan, Richard L.
Dunham, William C.
Dunlap, Stanton P.
Duppenthaler, Robert J.
Durham, William E.
Durnan, Denis D.
Durr, James E.
Dyer, Barry J.
Dyer, Henry C., II
Dyer, Thomas E.
Eades, Thomas A.
Eagan, Robert K.
Eason, Ward R.
Ebmeyer, Walter C.
Edenfield, James C.
Edney, Leon A.
Edson, Robert W.
Edwards, Daniel J.
Eidson, Fred G.
Ekblad, Richard W.
Eley, Clifford H., III
Elich, Robert L.
Elliott, Richard W.
Elliott, Robert J.
Ellsworth, Warren R.
Emery, Terry E.
Emmett, Richard F.
Emrich, Jerry K.
Engler, Raymond V.
Enkeboll, Richard E.
Enstam, Robert C.
Erikson, Theodore W.
Erwin, Samuel L.
Erwine, Richard G.
Essig, John R.
Estes, William B., Jr.
Evans, Isaac T.
Everding, Edward J.
Fahey, John J., Jr.
Fahrney, David L.
Fallai, William G.
Fannin, Grover F.
Farley, Edward B., Jr.
Farrell, Lawrence M.
Fazzio, Raymond J.
Feinroth, Herbert
Felderman, Stanley R.
Feldman, Paul L.
Felt, Bruce C.
Fendler, Francis J., Jr.
Ferguson, Robert L.
Fernald, Lloyd W., Jr.
Feron, Thomas H.
Ferrari, John R.
Ferri, John F.
Fickenscher, David B.
Fidlar, Richard A.
Field, Benjamin H.
Fields, David E.
Finley, John L.
Finley, William T., Jr.
Finn, William A.
Fischer, Warren H.
Fishburn, John H.
Fishburn, Thomas F.
Fisher, Harvey E.
Fisher, John W.
Fisher, Richard L.
Fisher, William C.
Fitzgibbons, George P.
Flinn, Irvine D.
Floyd, Rodney R.
Flynn, Samuel C., Jr.
Follmer, Lloyd D., Jr.
Fong, Clarence
Foote, Ernest D.
Foote, Robert R.
Ford, Frank R., Jr.
Foreman, Merlin L. R.
Foresman, James H., III
Foss, Robert N.
Foster, Naylor C., Jr.
Fowler, Norwood V., Jr.
Fowler, Ronald L.
Fowlkes, Donald W.
Fox, Otis O.
Fox, Robert F.
Fox, Thomas R.
Frankenberger, Paul F.
Franz, David G.
Fredericks, Robert J.
Fredrickson, George M.
Freedman, Gilbert M.
Freeman, Albert M., III
Freidheim, Cyrus F.
French, Douglas "E"
Friederich, Bruce
Fritz, Wayne R.
Frommer, Paul S.
Fry, Connie M.
Fuller, Dale G.
Fuqua, Charles J.
Gant, James R.
Gaouette, Dudley A.
Garcia, Rodolfo C.
Gardner, Donald R.
Gardner, Frederick
Gautier, Walter J.
Gawarkiewicz, Joseph J., III
Gearin, Billy D.
Geddes, James J.
Gentz, Richard C.
Gerstner, Joseph, Jr.
Geyer, Richard L.
Giambattista, Michele D.
Gibson, Alfred P.
Gibson, Douglas B.
Gibson, Ronald B.
Gibson, Ronald C.
Gibson, Vernon W., Jr.
Gifford, Sherwood E., Jr.
Gilbert, Bertrand M.
Gilbert, James H., Jr.
Gilchrist, William F.
Gillen, James F.
Gillespie, Roy N.

Gilliland, Lawrence A., Jr.
Gillmar, Stanley F.
Gimber, Harry M. S., III
Gistaro, Edward P.
Glancy, Robert J.
Glickman, Thomas W.
Godsey, Shirley T.
Godwin, Joseph R.
Goldstein, Lawrence B.
Goldstone, Ronald G.
Goodell, Joseph P. N.
Googe, James P., Jr.
Gordon, Samuel
Gordon, Walter J.
Gothard, Grady L.
Gott, William B.
Gowans, George K.
Graf, David L.
Graf, Donald V.
Graff, Howard B.
Graff, Paul E.
Graham, George D.
Grant, Edward J.
Gray, Garland A., Jr.
Green, Richard F.
Greeneisen, Kermit W.
Greenhoe, Duane F.
Greiling, David S.
Griffin, David H.
Griffin, John I.
Griffin, Roger F.
Griffith, Dwaine O.
Grigsby, Robert T.
Grossman, Dean A.
Gruendl, Paul L.
Gubitosi, Michael J.
Guernsey, Charles H.
Gulliver, Victor S.
Gunderson, Donald H.
Gustafson, Charles B.
Gutsch, Larry S.
Hackett, Vincent T.
Hackler, Gerald L.
Hadley, Delmont C.
Haeckler, William K.
Hagedorn, Paul A.
Halberg, Paul V.
Hale, Charles M.
Hall, Charles R., III
Hall, David S.
Hall, Gordon B., Jr.
Hall, John P., Jr.
Hall, Richard O.
Hamilton, Charles D.
Hamilton, John E.
Hammond, William E.
Handley, Paul L.
Hanemann, James, Jr.
Hanessian, Souren, Jr.
Hanley, Bryant M., Jr.
Hanna, Ira R.
Hanna, Ronald F.
Hannah, Elmore K., Jr.
Hannah, Theodore B.
Hansen, David W.
Hansen, John A.
Hanson, Ralph E.
Hargrave, Lee E., Jr.
Harjehausen, Lawrence O.
Harker, John V.
Harkness, Daniel H., Jr.
Harner, Charles F., Jr.
Harper, John O.
Harris, Eugene S.
Hartfelder, Richard F.
Hartman, Phillip G.
Hartman, Richard D.
Haruch, John
Harvey, Walter D.
Hastie, Robert K.
Hatcher, Jerry M.
Hatfield, Duran T.
Hathaway, Paul L., Jr.
Haven, Robert R., Jr.
Havens, Harry S.
Haviland, Carlton E.
Hawk, Allan H.
Hawk, Ash M.
Hawkins, Leroy T.
Hawkins, Sam H.
Haworth, Alvin G., Jr.
Hayes, Richard S.
Hayford, James E.
Haynes, Harald J.
Hays, Charles L., Jr.
Heald, Jesse H., Jr.
Heisner, Robert I., Jr.
Helgeland, Walter
Hellebusch, Arthur A.
Hellewell, John S.
Helm, John T., III
Helms, John A.
Hemphill, Allen P., Jr.
Henderson, David C.
Henderson, Gordon W.
Henderson, George R.
Hendrickson, Tom A.
Henken, Raymond N.
Henry, Patrick, Jr.
Henry, Thomas J.
Henshall, John H.
Herbert, Leo E.
Herlihy, John W.
Herring, George W., III
Hess, Armand M.
Hester, James H.
Heth, Gene A.
Hewitt, Wesley C.
Heyde, John S., Jr.
Heyward, Shannon D.
Hiebner, Robert J., Jr.
Hiett, Orrie G., Jr.
Higgins, Lyle J.
Higgins, Theodore K.
Higgins, William H.
Highfill, John H., III
Hildenbrand, Daniel C.
Hill, Frank S., Jr.
Hill, Victor R.
Hill, William W.
Hillerman, Neal H.
Hillyer, Robert M.
Hilyard, Bruce W.
Hines, Dean H.
Hirst, Arthur R.
Hlava, Richard J.
Hobbs, Peter W.
Hobler, William J., Jr.
Hodges, George A.
Hodges, Virgil C.
Hoerle, Robert F.
Hoeven, Franklin R.
Hogan, Donald F.
Hogan, Lawrence M.
Hohman, Glenn W.
Holdren, Larry L.
Holick, Jan P.
Holmes, Henry D., Jr.
Holmes, Wayne M.
Holt, John A., III
Holt, Shirley W.
Holtzclaw, John W.
Holzschuh, Jacob R.
Honeycutt, George H.
Hooper, John R., Jr.
Hoover, Alan E.
Hope, James B. H.
Hoppe, Herbert L.
Horsefield, John E.
Hough, Richard A.
Houldsworth, John C.
Howard, Robert W.
Howe, Frederic N., Jr.
Howe, Jonathan T.
Hower, James J.
Howland, John H.
Hughey, Ira A.
Hundley, Franklin M.
Hunsicker, Edmund K.
Hurley, William R., Jr.
Hurst, Charles R.
Hutchinson, Charles E.
Hutchison, Cecil R., Jr.
Hutchison, Charles E.
Hyatt, Leo G.
Hyatt, Philip W.
Hymes, William W., III
Ike, William F.
Isquith, David A.
Jackson, Jack M.
Jackson, James P., Jr.
Jacobson, Lennart R.
James, Thomas P., Jr.
Jamison, Vencin L.
Jarrett, Edwin B.
Jasperson, Michael
Jaynes, David W.
Jennings, Edward M., III
Jennings, Samuel L.
Jensen, George W.
Jermstad, Glen L.
Jerome, John D.
Jesse, Roger D.
Jilg, Eugene T.
Johnson, Allyn E.
Johnson, Donald M.
Johnson, Henry C.
Johnson, Kenneth W.
Johnson, Leonard W., II
Johnson, Richard B.
Johnson, Robert A.
Johnson, Robert O.
Johnson, Ronald L.
Johnson, Theodore R., Jr.
Johnstone, Duane C.
Jones, Colin M.
Jones, Courtney S.
Jones, Thomas N.
Jordan, Dennis R.
Jordan, Steven A.
Jordan, William M.
Joynson, Jack E.
Judge, Joseph I.
Junghans, Peter A.
Kadas, Steven E.
Kail, Norman H.
Kaiser, Edward R., Jr.
Karger, Ernest W.
Kasid, Alfred L.
Kassoy, David P.
Katz, Bennett D.
Katzen, Murry
Kaufer, Richard A.
Kauffman, William A.
Kay, William G.
Keating, Timothy E.
Keaveny, Thomas L., II
Keller, Kenneth H.
Kelley, John J.
Kelliher, Francis J.
Kelliher, Lawrence P.
Kellogg, Augustus G., Jr.
Kelly, Edward W.
Kelly, Hugh F.
Kenney, Daniel J.
Kensinger, Roy A.
Kentopp, Donald E.
Kerr, William A., Jr.
Kershner, Robert L.
Keyes, Jonathan M.
Kiefer, Martin D.
Kiel, Richard H.
Kifer, Russell S., Jr.
Killingsworth, Monte L.
King, Carleton J., Jr.
King, James W.
King, Robert C.
Kinsley, William D.
Kirk, William P., II
Kirkland, Thomas J., III
Kirscher, John C.
Kirschten, Joseph D.
Klein, Donald S.
Knack, Wallson G.
Knapp, Daniel L.
Knapp, Montelle N.
Knapp, Norman E., Jr.
Knauf, Fredrick C.
Knauf, Richard H., Jr.
Knight, Richard N.
Knodle, William C.
Knutson, Jerry G.
Koch, Joseph W., Jr.
Kohn, Arthur F.
Kolodziej, Richard J.
Komp, Richard L.
Kooyman, William J.
Kopp, George E.
Kopp, Robert W.
Koster, Alfred M., IV
Koupal, Dennie J.
Kozlov, Leonard T.
Kraft, Michael B.
Kraft, Robert M.
Kramer, David
Kramer, Theodore R., Jr.
Krause, Alfred W.
Krebs, Dickson E.
Kreitzberg, Richard A.
Krieckhaus, Robert C.
Krieg, Edwin H., Jr.
Krilowicz, Thomas J.
Kriz, Thomas A.
Kronzer, William W.
Kroupa, Walter W.
Kruppa, Richard F.
Kuhn, John F.
Kulka, Paul R.
Kullander, Karl R.
Kunkel, Larry D.
Kurihara, Thomas M.
Kurtz, Theodore H.
Kurtz, William P.
Kust, Roger N.
Ladd, Dwight R.
LaFranchi, Charles H.
Laing, James D.
Lamay, Urban R., Jr.
Lampert, George E., Jr.
Landry, Richard E.
Lang, Edward M., Jr.
Lang, William R.
Lange, William G.
Langer, Rudolph S.
Langford, George S., Jr.
Lanman, George M.
Lansing, Paul B., II
Larabee, Kent W.
Larsen, Donald K.
Larson, Donald R.
Larson, John M.
Larue, Alan W.
LaRue, William W.
LaSalle, Rene R.
Lauer, James W.
Lavoie, Louis A.
Lawler, Casimir E.
Laws, Donald M.
Lazar, Alan E.
Leach, Lyle B.
Leahy, Richard N.
Leahy, Vincent J.
Leavenworth, Robert A.
Leblanc, Jamil G.
Lehman, Melvin E.
Leiding, Kenneth W.
Leitzinger, Paul E.
Lenhart, Mark M.
Leonard, Rex L.
Leopold, Paul R.
LeSage, Leo G.
Leslie, William N.
Lester, William E.
Lethco, John D.
Leuschner, Robert L., Jr.
Levin, Richard R.
Lewis, Edmund F.
Lewis, Marwood D.
Lewis, Richard B.
Licari, Philip R.
Lieberman, Sol M.
Lindstrom, Harry E.
Lino, Norman J.
Lisa, Donald J.
Little, Joseph W., Jr.
Little, Paul R.
Livingston, William C., Jr.
Livingston, Gill F.
Llewellyn, Fred W., III
Locke, Stanley J.
Lockwood, Robert K., Jr.
Loewenthal, Robert G.
Logan, Patrick C.
Loman, Cleve E., Jr.
Longerbeam, Gordon T.
Longton, Andrew P.
Lonnegren, Robert C.
Loucks, James F., II
Lowe, Gary B.
Lowrance, Douglas L.
Lucey, John W.
Ludwig, John M.
Lueker, Wendell H.
Luke, Charles T., Jr.
Luke, Robert A.
Lundstrom, John W.
Lynch, Albert W.
Lynch, Clayton W.
MacCubbin, George E., Jr.
MacDermott, Donald R.
Machlan, James O.
Mackay, Richard W.
MacKnight, John W.
MacNish, Robert D.
Madara, Richard J.
Maddox, Ralph R.
Madouse, Richard L.
Magner, Lawrence R.
Maguire, Thomas J.
Mahler, Rolf V.
Mahon, Edward J., Jr.
Mahoney, Charles A., Jr.
Mahony, Terrence M.
Major, Irwin R.
Mallette, Frank
Malley, Kenneth C.
Malmquist, Emil D.
Mammano, Robert A.
Mandel, Philip N.
Mangham, Arnold
Mann, Richard D.
Manning, James A.
Manzi, Thomas A.
Marcom, James C.
Margedant, John W.
Marin, Richard
Marnane, Thomas A.
Marryott, Ronald F.
Marsh, David R.
Marshall, Harris A., Jr.
Marshall, Harold C., Jr.
Marshall, Norman P., Jr.
Marshall, William G.
Martin, Albert J.
Martin, James A.
Martin, James J., Jr.
Martin, John S., Jr.
Martinson, George P.
Marvil, Joel D.
Marxer, Hugo E.
Mason, William L.
Massimino, Andrew S.
Masten, Lawrence E.
Masterson, James E.
Matherne, John S.
Matney, William B., Jr.
Matthews, Gary D.
McBride, Donald U.
McCabe, David T.
McCabe, Ebe C., Jr.
McCahon, Richard J.
McCandless, John E.
McCarthy, James F.
McCauley, Hugh W.
McClary, Richard C.
McClellan, Joseph G.
McClure, Gilson K., Jr.
McConnel, Richard A., Jr.
McConnell, Peter J.
McCorkle, James L., Jr.
McCown, Henry Y., Jr.
McCracken, Richard L.
McCuiston, Ronald S.
McCullough, Lawrence
McCullough, Robert F.
McCutchan, Milton L.
McDonald, Gerald W.
McDonald, John G.
McGahey, Jack M.
McGalliard, Russell L.
McGee, Donald J.
McGill, James A.
McGinty, Thomas J.
McGlasson, Daniel E.
McGrail, Charles R., Jr.
McGrath, Francis J.
McGuigan, David B.
McHugh, John T.
McHugh, William M.
McIlvain, William C., Jr.
McIver, Robert C.
McKee, Junious A., Jr.
McKenna, Michael F.
McKinley, Alton P., Jr.
McLaughlin, Warren M., Jr.
McLaughlin, Clyde L.
McManes, Albert S.
McManes, Kenmore R.
McMerty, Edward A.
McMichael, George L.
McMorris, John A., II
McMurtry, Thomas C.
McNeese, Carter V.
McNeill, James D., III
McNerney, James L.
McNichols, John P., Jr.
McPherson, Roger B.
McRight, Clarence, Jr.
McVay, Wesley J., Jr.
McWhorter, William C.
Mead, Allen
Mears, William N.
Meaux, Richard P.
Mechling, Wallace B.
Megehee, Louis D., Jr.
Megonigle, Carl E.
Melnick, Norbert W.
Menes, Elbert L., Jr.
Meneke, Kenneth N.
Mericle, David L.
Meschler, Paul A.
Mettert, Paul M.
Metzger, Nathan, III
Meukow, Walter T.
Meulbroek, Donald W.
Meyer, David A.
Michel, Robert F.
Mickey, Daniel A.
Mickle, William M.
Middleton, John E.
Miefert, Milton D., Jr.
Miklos, Thomas J.
Miller, Donald L.
Miller, Harold E.
Miller, Peter R.
Miller, Robert C.
Mills, Leon R.
Mills, Neal O.
Miniter, Howard E., Jr.
Minnerly, Robert W.
Missailidis, Stephen
Mitchell, Clyde L.
Mitchell, David L.
Mitchell, Donald L.
Mitchell, Henry H.
Mitchell, Ralph C., III
Mitchell, Raymond F., Jr.
Mitchell, Robert D., Jr.
Mitchell, William T.
Modeen, Victor D.
Moffatt, David B.
Monteleone, Anthony J.
Montgomery, Donald J.
Moody, Philip M.
Mooers, Christopher N. K.

Mooney, Harold L., Jr.
Moore, Anthony M.
Moore, Aubrey A., Jr.
Moore, Donald L.
Moore, Harry R., Jr.
Moore, Jimmie R.
Moore, Thomas R., Jr.
Morcerf, Lester A., Jr.
Morency, Conrad R.
Morgan, Edward A.
Morris, Ronald S.
Morrison, John H.
Mott, Louis D.
Moulder, Frederick W.
Moyer, William J.
Mudge, Bruce B.
Mueller, Denis A.
Muhl, Charles P., Jr.
Mumaw, Myron J.
Mumford, Robert E., Jr.
Murdoch, Richard P.
Murphy, David R.
Murphy, George S.
Murphy, Gerard F.
Murphy, James H.
Murphy, John F.
Murphy, Michael A.
Murphy, Nicholas M.
Murphy, Ronald D.
Murray, Gerald W.
Murray, John A., Jr.
Myers, John P.
Myers, William D.
Nace, Larry D.
Nagel, Richard C.
Narehood, Kenneth E.
Natalie, Ronald B.
Neary, Joseph F.
Nellums, Marcus E., Jr.
Nelson, David O.
Nelson, John H.
Nelson, Neil O., Jr.
Nevin, Robert F.
Nevitt, James E.
Newell, John W.
Newton, Clifford A.
Newton, Daniel B.
Ney, Kenneth L.
Niccoli, Lino G.
Nicholas, Joseph
Nichols, Julian C.
Nichols, Lee H.
Nider, Kenneth E.
Nielsen, Niel P.
Niering, Francis E., Jr.
Noblitt, James S.
Nolan, Bruce F.
Nolan, John K.
Nolen, Heflin T.
Noll, Charles F.
Nommensen, Gene O.
Normand, Eugene J.
Norris, Ralph P.
North, David M.
Nutt, Frederick W.
O'Brien, George E.
O'Connell, Daniel J.
O'Connell, James J.
O'Connor, Francis E.
O'Connor, Otis L.
O'Connor, Paul
O'Connor, Robert E.
Odea, Thomas V.
O'Hara, James P., Jr.
Olszewski, Oscar W.
O'Neill, Brian E.
O'Neill, James P., Jr.
Ordahl, Stafford N., Jr.
O'Rourke, Bernard F.
O'Rourke, Thomas F. X., Jr.
Osberg, John W., III
Ostrander, Leroy C.
O'Sullivan, Joseph F.
Overholser, Merlin K.
Paasch, Gene A.
Page, Henry H., Jr.
Palmer, Edward J.
Palmer, Richard A.
Palmer, Stanley B.
Palmer, William N., II
Pancook, Arthur J., Jr.
Parcell, Kenneth H.
Parker, Frank W.
Parker, Harry L.
Parker, Walter W., III
Parks, David N., Jr.
Parnell, Ural C.
Parsons, Marland W., Jr.
Partlow, James G.
Pasternak, Edward J.
Pastore, Angelo L.
Patberg, Stewart K.
Patterson, Dale W.
Patterson, Ralph A., Jr.
Paul, John S.
Paulk, James "D", Jr.
Peace, John D., III
Peacher, Robert W.
Peacock, Noel L.
Peerenboom, William H.
Pelphrey, Gary R.
Peresluha, Edmund J., II
Perry, Peter B.
Perry, Richard C.
Peters, Frank J., Jr.
Peters, John R., Jr.
Peterson, Kenneth D.
Peterson, Paul A.
Pharis, Wade J.
Phillips, George
Phillips, Lindsay F.
Piche, Paul D.
Pico, Arturo A.
Pierson, David C.
Pistotnik, James J.
Pitney, James F.
Pitt, Woodrow W., Jr.
Poole, James R.
Pope, James D.
Porter, Donald H.
Porter, Henry C.
Porter, Richard G.
Potter, Robert H., Jr.
Pounds, Philip C., Jr.
Powell, Daniel G.
Prettyman, Edward C.
Pritchard, Douglas F.
Pritchett, Mebane M.
Prock, James E.
Prosser, Norman E.
Pruett, Ronald L.
Prushan, Victor H.
Puerling, Peter N.
Purvis, Samuel M.
Putkonen, Edwin A.
Pyle, David G.
Quantock, Charles W.
Quast, Harry S.
Quenell, Gerald T.
Quinn, James H.
Quint, George M.
Ragan, Charles P.
Rakouska, Kenneth D.
Ratliff, John T., Jr.
Rau, Ronald E.
Rauber, Carl A., Jr.
Raudenbush, Peter V.
Rawson, David R.
Ray, William J.
Raymond, Calvin D.
Reardon, John R.
Reed, Robert B., Jr.
Rees, James D., Jr.
Reeve, William F.
Reich, Joseph A., Jr.
Reichart, Harold L., Jr.
Reichler, Richard
Reid, James R., III
Reische, Richard M.
Reiser, Thomas F.
Reisner, George H.
Rempt, Henry F., Jr.
Remy, Tracy V.
Renner, Richard B.
Rice, Edward J.
Rice, Lloyd A.
Rice, Loren M.
Richards, Edward F., Jr.
Richards, James H.
Richardson, John D., Jr.
Richter, Ralph, Jr.
Rigg, Richard G.
Rij, Michael A., Jr.
Ringer, William A.
Ritchey, Robert T.
Ritchie, Sherwood L.
Robbins, David B.
Roberson, Harold J.
Roberts, James J.
Roberts, Martin S., III
Roberts, Paul E.
Robertson, Ian E. G.
Robertson, John A.
Robertson, Lester S.
Robinson, Gene A.
Robinson, John W.
Robinson, Kenneth F.
Robinson, Ronald K.
Robinson, Robert G.
Roble, Raymond G.
Roche, Denis P.
Rockmore, David M.
Roe, Alexander M.
Roeser, Walter V., Jr.
Roltsch, Clifford C.
Romberg, Harland F.
Romoser, William K., Jr.
Rook, Wilson C.
Rosenthal, Stephen E.
Rositzke, Robert H.
Ross, James W.
Ross, Norman A.
Ross, Thomas E.
Ross, Wendell R.
Rosseau, Leon B., Jr.
Rosser, David J.
Rotondi, Roger H.
Roubik, Arthur F.
Roudebush, Daniel L.
Round, Fay O., Jr.
Rovin, Alyn
Rucker, William A., III
Rue, Roger L.
Russell, Earl H.
Russell, Richard W.
Ruston, Barr E.
Rutemiller, Oren G., Jr.
Ryan, George W.
Ryburn, Joseph A.
Rydzewski, James C.
Saari, Paul T.
Sakey, Leyon D.
Salley, Alexander M.
Saltzman, Glenn A.
Salvator, Louis R.
Sandlin, Steven M.
Saracco, Robert L.
Sauter, George D.
Sawyer, Tommy D.
Scales, Gerald K.
Scales, Richard H.
Schafer, Dennis N.
Schaffer, David G.
Schaper, Delmar O.
Scheetz, Karl G.
Scheible, Jack W.
Schell, John J.
Schenk, Parley G.
Schenk, Ralph O.
Schermer, Richard L.
Schick, Alan A.
Schilling, Noel K.
Schillinger, Joe D.
Schimming, John G.
Schiwitz, Preston G., Jr.
Schlapkohl, John E.
Schneider, Henry J.
Schneider, Kenneth L.
Schneidewind, Gilbert P.
Schoen, Thomas J.
Schrank, Carl H.
Schwemer, Cullen R.
Scott, Douglas L.
Scott, Lawrence J.
Scott, Milton M.
Scott, Robert S.
Scott, Thomas D.
Scully, Cornelius D., III
Seaman, Roy E.
Searcy, William P.
Seaton, William W., Jr.
Secor, Richard A.
Sedor, Gerald
Segelhorst, Herbert E.
Seibold, Frederick W.
Self, Carvwin "Y"
Self, Norman D.
Severance, Laverne S., Jr.
Seymour, Kent S.
Shank, Roy
Sharbrough, Wayne D., Jr.
Shaw, Stanley S.
Shay, James E.
Shea, James R.
Shelley, Edwin A., Jr.
Sherck, David L.
Sherman, David D.
Sherrill, John T., Jr.
Shewmaker, John B.
Shields, Ronald M.
Shirley, Gerald B., Jr.
Shiver, James H.
Shoemaker, Charles S.
Sick, Gary G.
Siegmund, Harry M.
Silvia, Charles P.
Simmons, Robert R.
Simonton, Bennet S.
Simpson, Bryan L., Jr.
Simpson, James H.
Simsarian, James R.
Sipes, John D.
Skelly, John F.
Slater, LaRue D.
Sloan, Dennis Y.
Sloane, Stephen B.
Small, Barton L.
Smith, Allen, III
Smith, Albert R.
Smith, Bertram D., Jr.
Smith, Charles P., Jr.
Smith, Clarence E., Jr.
Smith, Clarence L.
Smith, David R.
Smith, Dean L., Jr.
Smith, Don L.
Smith, Fred E., Jr.
Smith, Gerald S.
Smith, Glenn A.
Smith, Howard E., Jr.
Smith, Jess J., Jr.
Smith, Jimmy F.
Smith, John B.
Smith, Leon L., Jr.
Smith, Leroy B.
Smith, Robert E.
Smith, Ronald D.
Smith, William S., Jr.
Smith, William E., Jr.
Smith, William J.
Smithey, William J. H.
Smock, Samuel J.
Smotzer, Joseph, Jr.
Smyth, Francis J.
Snell, William F.
Solomon, Selig
Sonon, David E.
Sorsby, Richard L., Jr.
Southern, Wilson E.
Spillars, Harold S.
Spinks, Billy J.
Spousta, Allen F.
Spring, Arthur T.
Stacey, John L.
Staehle, Roger W.
Stallman, George L., III
Stampfli, Donald M.
Steelnack, Robert A.
Stegall, Woodie C., Jr.
Steinbrink, Earl E.
Steiner, Frederick N.
Stephens, Charles T.
Stephens, John R.
Stevenson, Frederick R.
Stevenson, Leon M., Jr.
Stewart, Edward L., Jr.
Stewart, John E.
Stewart, Michael M.
Steyer, Francis J.
Stiller, David J.
Stober, Richard C.
Stoetzer, Raymond N.
Stokes, Bobby J.
Stong, Russell J.
Stoodley, Francis H.
Stoodt, William A.
Stover, Robert F.
Strahm, Kenneth A.
Strange, Robert O., Jr.
Strausbaugh, Rolland I.
Strickland, Stanley P.
Stuart, Moore A.
Stuart, Richard R.
Sturges, Wilton, III
Sullivan, Eugene T.
Sullivan, James F., Jr.
Surrett, John B.
Sutherland, William R.
Sutphen, Harold J.
Sutphin, Christopher F.
Swain, Donald D.
Swallows, Andrew L.
Swan, Floyd C.
Swan, Ronald L.
Swanson, David P.
Sweat, Wesley A., Jr.
Swepston, Thomas D.
Swift, Charles J., Jr.
Swimm, Kenneth R.
Szoke, Ernest G.
Tack, Oscar C., Jr.
Taft, Franklin L.
Tankel, Jerome K.
Tappan, James C.
Tapper, Bruce R.
Tatro, Peter R.
Taunt, Melvin E.
Taylor, Douglas G.
Taylor, Robert M.
Tema, Robert P.
Texido, William J.
Theriault, Willard
Thiele, Edwin R.
Thoman, George F., Jr.
Thomas, Bruce A.
Thomas, David M.
Thomas, David D.
Thomas, George M., III
Thompson, Glynn M.
Thompson, Howard D.
Thompson, Roy D., Jr.
Thomson, Larry D.
Thornton, Manly P.
Thornton, Melvin C.
Thorpe, Paul J.
Thouin, David E.
Tietz, Ronald E.
Tims, Robert E.
Tish, Samuel A.
Todd, Calvin L.
Tolle, William M., Jr.
Tompson, Richard S.
Tonnessen, Herbert G.
Toole, Morton E.
Touchton, John H., Jr.
Trammell, Arthur B.
Trent, James A.
Troxel, Ralph E.
Truesdale, William B.
Truxall, Charle W., Jr.
Tucker, Clifton R., Jr.
Turner, John J., Jr.
Twesme, David C.
Twitchell, Lawrence W.
Ulrich, John L.
Underhill, Samuel G.
Vance, Paul D.
VanLandingham, Clyde H., Jr.
Varnadore, James
Varshock, George A.
Vaughan, Edward B., Jr.
Vaughan, James W., Jr.
Vaughn, Alton L.
Vaughn, Charles G.
Veak, John J.
Veek, Eugene B.
Velden, Edward L.
Venezia, Howard
Viessmann, Alex J.
Vieweg, Walter V. R., Jr.
Vohr, James C., Jr.
Vollmer, Thomas H.
Vosseller, Richard T.
Waldman, Jay R.
Walker, Clarence L., Jr.
Walker, Richard A.
Walker, Thaddeus O., Jr.
Wallace, Thomas F.
Wallace, William A.
Walston, Jerry D.
Walter, Clyde M.
Walter, Donald F.
Ward, Newton E., Jr.
Warden, Kenneth J.
Waring, Norman D.
Warnock, David R.
Warters, Robert L.
Waterman, Harold W.
Watson, John A.
Wattay, Alexander E.
Watts, Robert B.
Weaver, Charles H.
Weaver, Donald E.
Weiffenbach, James M.
Weil, Robert P., Jr.
Weiland, Robert F.
Weiner, Robert M.
Weinmann, Raymond G.
Weise, Edwin A.
Weiss, Frederick C., Jr.
Wellborn, Robert M., Jr.
Weller, Francis J., Jr.
Wells, Charles T.
Welsch, Robert E.
West, Herbert J., Jr.
West, William W.
Westlake, William R.
Weston, Jack L.
Wey, Mathias J.
Whalen, John M.
Whaley, Thomas P.
Whipple, Walter
White, Charles E.
White, George W., Jr.
White, Gerald A.
White, John R.
White, Robert B.
Whitelock, Harry E.
Whitlinger, Gregory L.
Whitmire, Wilson R.
Wible, William K.
Wichmann, Robert H.
Wicks, Lester H., Jr.
Wiener, Malcolm H.
Wilbur, Charles H.
Wilburn, Luke J., Jr.
Willey, Bruce T.
Williams, Albert P., Jr.
Williams, Carl E.
Williamson, Thomas G.

Willis, Clyde P.
Wilson, Bruce D.
Wilson, Garry L.
Wiltsie, Ronald J.
Wing, Rodney C.
Winkler, Stuart M.
Winner, Don R.
Wise, Arthur R., Jr.
Witmer, Lawrence E.
Witt, Robert T., Jr.
Wolfe, Robert J.
Wolfe, Roderic L.
Wood, David G.
Woodrow, Warren A.
Woods, Francis G.
Woods, Walter E.
Woodworth, Benjamin B.
Woolman, Joseph C.
Worrell, Dwight I.
Worrell, John S.
Worthen, Thomas B.
Worzala, Joseph A.
Wright, Arthur S.
Wyatt, Raymond E.
Yarbrough, John M.
Yenni, Kenneth R.
Yockey, Harry M.
Yoho, Hugh L.
Youmans, Virgil D., Jr.
Young, Robert B.
Younger, William M.
Zaayenga, Ralph
Zachman, John A.
Zambrano, Raymond A.
Zelley, Richard N.
Zezza, Carlo F., Jr.
Ziegler, James F.
Zimmer, Emory P.
Zollars, Allen M., Jr.
Zweifel, David E.

LINE—WOMEN

Barker, Cathryn J.
Calene, Mary L.
Clark, Patricia A.
Costas, Maria I.
Elpern, Shirley B.
Ferrera, Elinor
Grantham, Diana B.
Green, Jeannette E.
Higgins, Maria S.
Johnston, Edith E.
Kirk, Mary E.
McDermott, Mary M.
Mombrun, Iola M.
Moore, Ida R.
Reardon, Helen J.
Sullivan, Jean P.
Tombes, Suzette B.
Two, Doreen J.
Wadsworth, Evelyn C.
Williams, Barbara M.

SUPPLY CORPS

Abele, Robert B.
Adams, Richard G.
Adelman, Frank J.
Aldenderfer, William D.
Allen, Johnny L.
Anglim, David L.
Avis, Bruce W.
Baer, Burton E.
Balding, David W.
Barstad, Clarence H.
Basse, Warner P.
Battelle, Richard L.
Beck, Larry A.
Bilodeau, James H.
Briggs, John M.
Brown, Edward J., Jr.
Buscher, Bernard A., Jr.
Carpenter, James E.
Carter, Eugene T.
Cassimus, George D.
Cepel, Frank R.
Champion, Andrew A.
Cline, Richard G.
Coon, Paul D.
Cowan, Hugh B.
Craig, James J.
Craig, James E., Jr.
Crain, Richard H.
Croeber, Hans R.
Crouch, Robert L.
Dayries, Arthur P.
Delduca, Ronald M.
Deshaney, Donald J.
Donalson, Allison B.
Duffy, Joseph J., Jr.
Elosua, Raymond A.
Farris, Robert B.
Field, Harvey E.
Fields, Simeon
Fint, Donald J.
Flinn, Robert N.
Fowler, Robert L., Jr.
Freeman, William H.
Furiga, Richard D.
Gann, Archibald, Jr.
Gibson, David E.
Girod, Albert P., Jr.
Gleason, Bernard L.
Hall, Ronald T.
Harding, Frank F.
Harlow, Charles E.
Hauter, Jerry J.
Heiberg, James E.
Herstein, Harvey N.
Hinds, Douglas J.
Hines, Louis C.
Hollingswoeth, Charles E.
Holmen, Philip C.
Hooper, Gerald G.
Houghton, Donald W.
Jackson, Ronald L.
Jahn, Donald R.
Johnson, Rodwell C.
Jones, Jack L.
Jones, Kenneth W.
Jones, Leland B.
Jordan, John A., Jr.
Kachigian, George N.
Kase, Robert H.
Keith, Garnett L., Jr.
Kelly, Arthur W.
Klein, Carl C.
Koch, Karl W.
Koppa, Charles R.
Kulikowski, Jack A.
Lane, Dean S.
Lane, Kenneth L.
Laycock, Larry G.
Lee, Gerald L.
Leeb, Eugene A.
Leney, William H.
Lutz, Robert T., Jr.
MacAfee, Douglas C.
Malecki, James H.
Malzahn, Walter G.
Marcotte, Stuart W.
Martin, James E., Jr.
Martineau, Paul J.
Mayer, James H.
McMillan, John W.
Meeker, William A.
Miller, Winston B.
Milliken, Gail L.
Moore, Richard C.
Mouton, Earl F.
Mummert, Dale R.
Nace, Richard H.
Nelson, John E.
Nichols, Frank M., Jr.
Nielsen, David E.
Nolan, John E.
Nuss, Gary B.
Nygaard, Richard B.
Ogletree, Robert A.
Opitz, Roy B.
Patterson, Jerry G.
Peterson, Jared H.
Phillips, Robert A.
Pierce, Leon L.
Pinnell, Joseph K.
Poorbaugh, Earl E.
Popik, Charles T.
Prahalis, Constantinus P.
Pruess, Robert W.
Rankin, Ronald W.
Reilly, Joseph V., Jr.
Robinson, Ronald D.
Robinson, Robert L.
Rook, Eugene C., Jr.
Rosselott, John D.
Schulte, Conrad P.
Seely, James G., Jr.
Shea, Frederick G.
Sheehan, John E., Jr.
Shirley, Kenneth R.
Shoemaker, Leroy E.
Shroeder, John, Jr.
Sims, Thomas M., Jr.
Smith, Charles A.
Smith, Thomas J.
Sodrel, Donald L.
Spaulding, Frank H.
Spillane, James J.
Steans, Harrison I.
Stephenson, Matthew A.
St. Martin, Robert W.
Stoltman, James B.
Storm, Charles E.
Sulzer, Stanley
Templeton, James R.
Thompson, Robert L.
Van Patten, Edward R.
Walker, Richard W.
Weber, Frank E.
Weissinger, Thomas R.
Welsh, John F.
Whittaker, James B.
Wilber, James R.
Wilder, Samuel J., Jr.
Wilson, James F.
Woods, Joseph M., III
Wright, Robert E.
Zuckerman, Paul H.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Allgaier, Donald D.
Barczak, Jerome J.
Bardin, William J., Jr.
Bauer, John G.
Bligh, James E.
Chabay, John L.
Chimenti, Edward T.
Clearwater, John L.
Corley, Wentworth H., Jr.
Daugherty, Jack D.
Delage, Paul M.
Derr, Frecerick M.
Dewane, John R.
Dunn, Jerome R.
Earnst, Rossell A.
Engle, Richard M.
Fraser, John C., Jr.
Frazier, George E.
Frevert, Edward C., Jr.
Gabbard, Curtis S.
Gorrie, Magnus M.
Gould, Charles H.
Grady, Noel "A", Jr.
Haddock, Hector L.
Hartnett, Joseph J.
Hodges, Paul
Hunter, James "H," III
Huson, John J.
Kirkpatrick, James D.
Klingler, Donald E.
Knorr, Richard W.
Landes, William G.
Ledder, William R.
Mansfield, Douglas J.
Martin, Jimmie L.
Marvin, Eugene L.
McMenamin, Lester E., Jr.
Schiffgens, Joseph J.
Seeber, Earl R., Jr.
Shafer, Richard V.
Somerset, Harold R.
Thomas, Lee W.
Thompson, Arthur J.
Watwood, Vernon B., Jr.
Westcott, John A.
Winkel, Thomas A.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Aaron, Alvin "J"
Baldauf, George W.
Bertka, Robert E.
Blankenship, William L.
Bolton, Richard B.
Bowden, Ronald R.
Bowdren, Laurence P.
Brideau, Donald J.
Bryan, James O.
Bryant, Eugene M., Jr.
Casler, Wilfred I.
Chastain, Howard T.
Collier, Patrick J.
Condon, Earl N.
Correll, Joseph M.
Crebs, Rollin L.,
Dietz, Bruce J.
Dunham, Chester J., Jr.
Eckerman, Weldon R.
Ellis, Glenn M.
Erickson, Glenn R.
Erwin, Richard E.
Fernandez, Manuel S. P.
Flower, Norman L.
Ford, Gerald R.
Francis, Raymond D.
Freeman, Benjamin C.
French, James A., Jr.
Gobbel, Henry D.
Gonsalves, John H.
Gouldman, John R.
Hatch, Emery J.
Heaton, Harley L.
Hoover, Donald E.
Jenkins, Benny J.
Kane, George P.
Kemp, James E.
Kessler, Raymond B.
Lanier, Bobby M.
Lawson, Donald R.
Leadford, William M.
Lecas, Kenneth E.
Littner, Henry D.
Lowe, Samuel C.
Lowi, Bertram H.
Martin, Douglas M.
Mayo, Myron F.
McAuliffe, Terrence J.
McClung, Denzel H.
McDermott, Roland W.
McFee, Charles A.
Millard, George W.
Moore, Charles J.
Mullinix, Chloe A.
Nourigat, Earl R.
Novak, Paul J.
Nowak, Frederick F.
Pearce, Charles J.
Peckenpaugh, Normand L.
Pelletier, Louis E.
Ramsey, George W.
Robinson, Jack V.
Rucker, Thomas J.
Sanderson, Roy D.
Seminara, James
Simmons, Carl B.
Sowers, Hubert H., Jr.
Stephens, Bobby L.
Stephens, Charles T.
Stitzel, Forrest D.
Surface, Robert L.
Swindall, Victor A.
Tandy, Roy W., Jr.
Tefft, Robert R.
Thompson, Russell J.
Webb, Laurence H.
Wherry, Robert J., Jr.
White, Robert L.
Woomer, Edward F., Jr.
Young, Arthur L.
Zimmeht, John A., Jr.

NURSE CORPS

Gedrys, Patricia C.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

James N. Bacon
William J. Bunch
Richard T. Kerrigan
Donald L. Lamb
Lawrence R. Moore
Thomas A. Nolen
Wendell A. Parks
Donald L. Raper
Kelly J. Sanchez
Clyde R. Snodgrass
Bobby G. Turbeville

The following named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Garrett W. McClanahan

The following named (Army Reserve Officers Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

George W. Burkley
Philip A. Forbes, Jr.
Charles B. Gay, Jr.

The following named (U.S. Air Force Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert L. Baker
James A. Kerr, Jr.
Charles M. McCain
James D. Mills
Wayne A. Peterson
Howard M. Whitfield

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Raymond C. Albro, Jr.
Richard P. Backus
Henry G. Beamer
Milton H. Bevis, Jr.
James L. Blake
Robert C. Braun
Arthur P. Brill, Jr.
Joseph C. Burger, Jr.
Arthur E. Burkhart
Robert D. Burnette
William A. Burtson
James T. Carroll, Jr.
Joseph D. Celata
David D. Colcombe
Donald G. Cook
Donald H. Cormack
Thomas K. Croson
James R. Curl
Lonnie G. Dalton
John R. Dewan
Richard C. Drake
William B. Draper, Jr.
Patrick E. Duffy
Peter T. Duggan
Ronald F. Dziarnowski
Leo R. Elwell, Jr.
Larry M. Farris
Benjamin W. Gardner
John S. Gavis, Jr.
Joseph F. Girodano
Donald A. Glenton
William J. Griggs, Jr.
Jack F. Hansston
James H. Harte III
Arthur E. Held
Charles E. Hester
John J. W. Hilgers
John T. Hopkins, Jr.
William H. Horner, Jr.
Gordon E. Howell
Richard D. Hughes
Howard D. Jackson
Audrey A. Janssen
David E. Jersey
Louis C. Jezsik
Harry L. Johnson
Sven A. Johnson
Arthur L. Jones III
John K. Jones
Thomas P. Kilday
David W. Kinard
George A. Knudson
Charles D. Laaksonen
Emanuel S. Lawbaugh, Jr.
John B. Legge
William H. Leonard
John D. Little
Joseph P. Losack
Thomas V. Lovejoy
William B. Ludwick
David C. Magleby
David C. Mannis
William J. P. Mannix
Robert J. Martin
Susano Mascorro
James H. Matthews
Daniel J. McCauley
James L. McDaniel
Alexander F. McGimpsey
Larry K. Michael
Kenneth P. Millice, Jr.
Edward M. Mockler
Robert J. Modrzejewski
Calvin M. Morris
James W. Murray
Gregory Neal
James M. Nolan
Wayne F. Nordell
Francis W. O'Brien
Martin E. O'Connor
John J. Paganelli
Dennis L. Pardee
Raymond F. Perry
Robert A. Phillips

Ferrell F. Powell, Jr.	John P. Slater
John B. Pozza	James J. St. Clair
Joseph F. Prochaska	Douglas P. Stewart
Harold D. Read	Louis W. Sullivan
Carl A. Reckwell	Billy M. Summerlin
William A. Renner	Merrill A. Sweitzer
Angus S. Reynolds, Jr.	James S. Tardy
Thomas W. Rich, Jr.	Alfred H. Tebault, Jr.
Ronald G. Richardson	Dale R. Thibault
Richard J. Rigg	Daryl W. Thompson
Alfred M. Roberts III	James H. Tutterrow
Joseph D. Ruane	George E. Twidwell
Donald R. Ruggles	William H. Walters
Charles Sabatino	William C. Warren, Jr.
Francisco U. Salas	Charles M. Welzant
Frank Scialdone, Jr.	David A. Wiebrecht
Roger L. Shafer	Carroll Williams
John M. Shay	Melvin I. Williams

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Thomas H. Aiken	Alan N. Harvey
James R. Allen	Charles R. Keith
Ray W. Bowles	Robert C. Knowles, Jr.
Roy G. Breitenbach	Jimmy B. Lemmons
Larry K. Brown	Robert L. McLaurin, Jr
Charles W. Burns	Thomas J. Mulcahy
Jerome G. Cooper	Gerald F. Reczek
Charles P. Corn	Paul F. Sheridan
William C. Ferguson	Sanford B. Wanner
Adrian Gilligan	

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 11, 1960:

POSTMASTER

Dodd M. Fisher to be postmaster at Mount Storm, in the State of West Virginia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Colossians 4: 5: *Walk in wisdom toward them that are without, redeeming the time.*

Almighty God, in this moment of worship may there come into our bewildered minds and troubled hearts a reassuring sense of Thy presence and power, inspiring us with feelings of serenity and stability.

Grant that whenever we enter the sacred retreat of prayer our faltering spirits may be lifted from the lowlands of doubt and fear to the lofty heights of faith and courage, confident that our dream, of peace on earth, though delayed, will not be defeated.

Show us how we may help men and nations everywhere find the fellowship of Thy love and follow the light of Thy truth and walk together in the paths of mutual trust and good will.

We earnestly beseech Thee that our President, our Speaker, our Congress, and all who guide the affairs of our national and international life, may have a clear vision of Thy divine purpose and the wisdom and the will to pursue it faithfully.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11713. An act to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

AUTHORIZING RESALE OF CERTAIN SHIPS TO THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GARMATZ submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8042) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to resell four C1–SAY–1 type vessels to the Government of the Republic of China for use in Chinese trade in Far East and Near East waters exclusively.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, May 10, was Rumanian Independence Day, a day which marks Rumania's achievement of national unity and independence. This day was appropriately observed in the House by speeches of Members of Congress, and elsewhere by public gatherings throughout the Nation.

The city of Cleveland includes a large number of persons of Rumanian descent among its populace, and I am privileged to represent many of them in my constituency. They have contributed significantly to every aspect of community life, and are among those who most conscientiously discharge the responsibilities of citizenship.

I am informed that the Cleveland Rumanian Independence Day rally will be held on Sunday, May 15, in the Carpatina Hall. This celebration will provide opportunity for the many friends of Rumania to join in honoring a courageous and resolute people, who have maintained their love of liberty in the face of harsh totalitarianism.

Despite every effort by the Communist rulers to extinguish freedom permanently from Eastern Europe, the Rumanian people retain a steadfast faith in liberation. On the occasion of this Independence Day commemoration, let us renew our historic bonds of friendship with a liberty-loving people and pray that they may soon again live in freedom and independence.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 12117, with Mr. KILDAY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk had read down to and including line 11, page 8 of the bill when the Committee rose last evening. If there are no amendments, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Conservation operations

For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a–590f), including preparation of conservation plans and establishment of measures to conserve soil and water (including farm irrigation and land drainage and such special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs); operation of conservation nurseries; classification and mapping of soils; dissemination of information; purchase and erection or alteration of permanent buildings; and operation and maintenance of aircraft, $83,132,000: *Provided*, That the cost of any permanent building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same to any such building and with the exception of buildings acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for other purposes, shall not exceed $2,500, except for eight buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building and except that alterations or improvements to other existing permanent buildings costing $2,500 or more may be made in any fiscal year in an amount not to exceed $500 per building: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the construction of any such building on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations under the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a–590f), in demonstration projects: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $5,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a): *Provided further*, That qualified local engineers may be temporarily employed at per diem rates to perform the technical planning work of the service: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $600,000 of the amount appropriated under this head for fiscal year 1960 may be used to employ conservation aides and other nonprofessional personnel on a part-time or contract basis, and the amount so used may be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting]. Seventy-four Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 86]

Alexander	Barden	Brewster
Alford	Baring	Brown, Mo.
Anderson, Mont.	Blitch	Buckley
Anfuso	Bonner	Canfield
	Boykin	Cederberg

Celler	Johansen	Scott
Chelf	Johnson, Colo.	Shelley
Coffin	Kelly	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Kilburn	Smith, Kans.
Diggs	Lesinski	Spence
Dooley	Metcalf	Sullivan
Dowdy	Miller.	Taylor
Durham	George P.	Thompson, N.J.
Elliott, Pa.	Mitchell	Vinson
Flood	Montoya	Walter
Forand	Morris, N. Mex.	Weaver
Hagen	Porter	Willis
Hogan	Powell	Winstead
Holifield	Rooney	Young
Jackson	Scherer	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KILDAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 12117, and finding itself without a quorum, he has directed the roll to be called, when 374 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM SERVICE

Agricultural conservation program

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the program authorized in sections 7 to 15, 16(a), and 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590g–590(o), 590p(a), and 590q), including not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States, $242,000,000, to remain available until December 31 of the next succeeding fiscal year for compliance with the program of soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized under this head in the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration Appropriation Act, 1960, carried out during the period July 1, 1959, to December 31, 1960, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $26,832,950 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses for carrying out such program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $5,458,900 shall be transferred to the appropriation account "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information at the county level to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1961 program of soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended (amounting to $250,000,000, including administration, and no participant shall receive more than $2,500, except where the participants from two or more farms or ranches join to carry out approved practices designed to conserve or improve the agricultural resources of the community): *Provided further*, That no change shall be made in such 1961 program which will have the effect in any county of restricting eligibility requirements or cost-sharing on practices included in either the 1958 or the 1959 programs, unless such change shall have been recommended by the county committee and approved by the State committee: *Provided further*, That the proportion of the State fund initially allocated to any county for the 1961 program shall not be reduced from the distribution of such funds for the 1959 program year: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the 1961 agricultural conservation program for any county may, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, be withheld and allotted to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program in the participating counties, and shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such counties, and in addition, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, not to exceed 1 per centum may be made available to any other Federal, State, or local public agency for the same purpose and under the same conditions: *Provided further*, That for the 1961 program $2,500,000 shall be available for technical assistance in formulating and carrying out agricultural conservation practices and $1,000,000 shall be available for conservation practices related directly to flood prevention work in approved watersheds: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming material, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department, shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1913, to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 13, line 24, after the word "program", strike out "for any county may," and strike out line 25 and page 14, line 1, strike out the words "approval of the State Committee".

On page 14, line 6 strike out "in such".

On page 14, line 7 strike out "counties" and "on the recommendation of such".

On page 14, strike all of line 8, except the word "not".

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment which would change the present procedure whereby the county-by-county transfer of 5 percent of ACP money to SCS when they give technical assistance to ACP would be changed to a direct appropriation. There is strong support for this proposal in my State. I can read to you a resolution, which is short, from our Minnesota Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts:

Whereas the 5 percent transfer of ACP funds has proven inadequate to pay for the additional workload of the local soil conservation district; and

Whereas this 5 percent transfer has caused dissension between districts and ASC committees and whereas additional Federal funds for technical assistance to districts are not available: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the practice of 5 percent transferral of funds be discontinued and that the Soil Conservation Service be appropriated sufficient funds to adequately process all ACP referrals.

What this proposal I have made would do is to provide for the expeditious use of this money so that it would not depend on the county-by-county transfer arrangement.

I notice in the hearings, part I, page 555, the testimony of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Peterson:

TRANSFER OF ACP FUNDS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

From time to time we have discussed with this committee the problems associated with the transfer of agricultural conservation program funds to reimburse the Soil Conservation Service for technical services rendered in assisting farmers with the establishment of certain conservation practices for which cost sharing is available. Last year your committee suggested that the Department give further study toward the simplification of (1) the processes involved in estimating the needs for technical services to be furnished by SCS and (2) the actual determination of costs of technical services rendered to ACP. It was suggested that the study include the feasibility of using a flat charge per hour for the reimbursement of technical services rendered.

The Department has since made an extensive study of this problem and has established new and simplified procedures which are being used in connection with the 1960 agricultural conservation program. The new procedures are substantially simpler on both points recommended by the committee. We have adopted State by State a flat per hour charge for the reimbursement of technical services. We have also adopted State by State a fixed percentage of the amount of the cost of technical services which is to be absorbed by the Soil Conservation Service from its regular funds. Both of these determinations are made on the basis of past history in each State.

We believe these simplified procedures will substantially reduce the paperwork involved in the transfer of ACP funds to SCS. Under the new procedures there is less paperwork involved in developing the transfer agreement county-by-county and we have eliminated the referral-by-referral accountability for transferred funds.

We believe these new procedures are about as simple as they can be made under a county-by-county transfer arrangement. As we have expressed to this committee before, however, we believe that substantial savings could be made if the financing of this work was provided for at the national level.

The transfer of ACP funds for needed technical services seems to have become stabilized for the past several years. Nationwide the transfers have been holding steady at a total of between $7 and $8 million annually. We believe it would benefit both programs and afford more services to farmers if a specific dollar amount of ACP funds would be earmarked for technical services in the appropriation act in lieu of the provision for county-by-county transfer arrangements.

The Department of Agriculture is proud of the soil and water conservation progress that has been made in recent years. The programs conceived by the Congress are sound. Our legislative tools, I believe, are adequate. And firsthand observation in the field during the last 5 years convinces me

that the programs the Congress has authorized are being carried forward vigorously and efficiently, both by the soil conservation districts and other local organizations, and the Soil Conservation Service. I believe the budget we have proposed will permit us to continue this great work, at a reasonable rate of speed, in fiscal year 1961.

So you see that Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Peterson recommends that this change be made. He states that last year recommendation was made by the committee that the Department make a study of transfer simplification. This has been done. He further says:

We believe these simplified procedures will substantially reduce the paper work involved in the transfer of ACP funds to SCS.

He said that these new procedures are about as simple as they can be made under the county-by-county transfer arrangement, but he goes on further to say that he believes there should be a change. The Department believes it would benefit both ACP and SCS programs and would afford more services to farmers if a specific dollar amount of ACP funds would be earmarked for technical services in the appropriation act in lieu of the provision for county-by-county transfer arrangements.

My amendment would allow the full 5 percent moneys as has been the custom in the past to be used for this technical assistance by SCS. As I stated, it would be a more expeditious way.

The only disagreement I have been able to find so far in the discussions I have had is the feeling that if we make direct appropriations of the 5 percent ACP funds, the SCS funds may be cut. I do not believe this would be a serious difficulty as long as we agree that 5 percent of the ACP funds go over to SCS. We must provide the funds necessary for technical assistance needed in the ACP projects. I believe strongly that this change would be the most desirable position for us to take.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, have received resolutions through the years like that referred to by the gentleman from Minnesota. The Soil Conservation Service would like to get its hands on this money if it could. We have had a good deal of experience and difficulty with these programs in past years. The Soil Conservation Service was supposed to supply the technical assistance for the ACP work. The ACP started out setting up qualifications. The ACP was supposed to determine where they wanted the work and the SCS had to get the money from them to do the work.

This amendment would throw us back to where we were before the committee took hold of it and changed the requirements as they are in the present bill and program. This money is provided for ACP work down at the county level. But the way it has worked in the past, the ACP organization was the last on the list to get the money.

It was our committee that changed the situation. We feel the local people should determine where they want to spend their money for this assistance and not have somebody take it away from them at the State level.

Mr. QUIE. The county has to get approval of the ACP groups and SCS will do the work.

Mr. WHITTEN. I know the gentleman is doing what he thinks is right.

Mr. QUIE. ACP does not want a transfer of the funds, and so forth.

Mr. WHITTEN. SCS wants to get it without strings attached.

Mr. QUIE. Both parties have to agree. I grant the gentleman's statement is true before we had that reorganization, before there was coordination between the two, perhaps. They were completely apart for a while. We have brought them together.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman with all modesty it was this committee that brought them together, and we did it with this vehicle. I do not want to return to what the gentleman advises.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUBSER: On page 15, line 11, after the word "channels", strike out the period and insert ": *Provided further*, That no part of any funds appropriated for the agricultural conservation program shall be utilized to survey acreage which has been certified by a member of the Society of Professional Engineers."

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, may I say that I fully realize the subject matter of the amendment I have offered has not been considered by the subcommittee and I also admit that it is a matter which should be considered in hearings. I am, therefore, offering this amendment solely for the purpose of focusing attention on the problem in the hope that in the committee hearings next year this proposal will be considered.

A few weeks back members of the Society of Professional Engineers pointed out to me that county ACP committees have refused to accept certified surveys of acreage which had been made by professional engineers and that the county committees have been using their own personnel at Federal expense to conduct surveys.

The professional engineers feel this is a duplication of service and a waste of public funds.

I respectfully request that in the event this amendment is voted down the committee give consideration to this problem next year.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the frankness of the gentleman who offered this amendment. Our committee will naturally be interested in going into the matter thoroughly. We realize when you describe by name a particular organization certain questions come up.

I am hoping that the gentleman will withdraw his amendment on my assurance the committee will look into the subject thoroughly next year.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Marketing services: For services relating to agricultural marketing and distribution, for carrying out regulatory acts connected therewith, and for administration and coordination of payments to States, $26,838,000, including not to exceed $25,000 for employment at rates not to exceed $50 per diem, except for employment in rate cases at not to exceed $100 per diem pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), in carrying out section 201(a) to 201(d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1291) and section 203(j) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946: *Provided*, That the Department is hereby authorized and directed to make such inspection of poultry products processing plants as it deems essential to the protection of public health and to permit the use of appropriate inspection labels where it determines from such inspection that such plants operate in a manner which protects the public health, and not less than $500,000 shall be available for this purpose.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language beginning in line 2, page 17, commencing with the word *"Provided,"* right down through the end of that paragraph on page 17, line 9.

This constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the entire paragraph, beginning in line 15, page 16, through line 9 on page 17, on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the committee does not care to oppose the point of order. I do not think there is any question but what points of order lie.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KILDAY). The gentleman from Mississippi concedes both points of order. The Chair sustains the point of order of the gentleman from Minnesota and the entire paragraph is ruled out as legislation.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses for the Foreign Agricultural Service, including carrying out title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1761–1768), and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, including not to exceed $25,000 for representation allowances and for expenses pursuant to section 8 of the Act approved August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1766), $4,447,000: *Provided*, That not less than $400,000 of the funds contained in this appropriation shall be available to obtain statistics and related facts on foreign production and full and complete information on methods used by other countries to move farm commodities in world trade on a competitive basis: *Provided further*, That, in addition, not to exceed $2,493,000 of the funds appropriated by section 32 of the Act of Au-

gust 24, 1935, as amended (7 U.S.C. 612c), shall be merged with this appropriation and shall be available for all expenses of the Foreign Agricultural Service in carrying on the purposes of said section 32.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LIPSCOMB: On page 18, line 10, after "$4,447,000", insert the following: ", of which not less than $800,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States".

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides that of the $4,447,000 for necessary expenses of the Foreign Agriculture Service, $800,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States.

The amendment places a limitation of $800,000 on the direct dollar appropriation use, and applies to the increase recommended by the committee for certain attaché expenses.

In prior years these attaché expenses were paid from foreign currency allocations, and this is the first time these are to be paid by direct dollar appropriation.

The language as proposed by this amendment to this bill is the same as the language included in H.R. 11666 making appropriations for the Department of State, and passed by the House.

From a reading of the hearings there appears to be no evidence that this limitation will hinder the operations of the Foreign Agriculture Service in any way.

Through a limitation of this kind the Congress can help assure that dollars will not be used when foreign currencies are available from the Treasury of the United States.

This amendment is offered, in the last analysis, to protect the interest of the American taxpayer. Certainly every precaution must be provided to assure maximum utilization of foreign currencies owed to or owned by the U.S. Treasury for the operation of this program, rather than, instead, opening the door for possible needless expenditure of dollars. I believe this amendment will provide a necessary safeguard.

Mr. Chairman, I ask favorable acceptance of the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly am in accord with the purpose of the gentleman who sponsors this amendment. As I said yesterday, as chairman of the committee, we felt that they certainly should use this money to buy foreign currencies and use the foreign currencies to the fullest extent that they can.

Mr. Chairman, in some of the countries where formerly we had available foreign currencies, now that they have gotten back on their feet and are now able to buy some of these surplus commodities, we do not have this great amount of foreign currencies like we did formerly. We used to have considerable foreign currencies in West Germany, for example. However, now no foreign currencies are available in some of those countries, and there is competition between the State Department and various other Departments for what may be available. It is hard to tell at this time just what countries will have currencies and what will not. Now, to say that this money is only available to purchase foreign currencies, I think it will go much further than we should. I say again that we feel the Department should use all of its foreign currency if it can be done, but we do not want by indirection to cancel out some of this work which we think is essential. May I say that the foreign currencies are probably more important to us in these areas where they have dollars and where we can sell, than in some of the countries where they have no currencies and we have to give commodities to them. So, I therefore hope that the amendment will be voted down, and I assure the gentleman that the department is seeking to do the best possible job and to do what the gentleman seeks to do by his amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was not aware that this amendment dealt with representation allowances. May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee if it does so deal and if there is there $800,000 worth of representation allowances in this bill?

Mr. WHITTEN. As to representation allowances, no. This takes care of expenses of operation; travel, secretarial services, costs of preparing reports. The gentleman will remember that a few years ago we arranged, and I think we made great progress, in having agricultural attachés report directly to the Department of Agriculture. They gather statistics in foreign countries on what production is there, as to probable markets, movement of crops and various other matters. I think they have done a splendid job. This is a part of the cost of their work.

Mr. GROSS. I have been unable to find more than $25,000 for representation allowances, and it is set out as a line item.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is limited to that in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Twenty-five thousand dollars is all that has been set out as a line item for liquor and entertainment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes. But so far as the committee is concerned, we have had no detailed information along the lines the gentleman refers to. You know, these farmer representatives do not go in for all the kinds of entertainment that some of the others do.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that after the information obtained when the Defense Department appropriation bill was before us last week, that there was $1,300,000 of representation allowances in that bill, and it was to be found under operation and maintenance, as well as various other titles, I do not feel constrained to oppose this very strongly. However, I assure the gentleman and any other chairman of a subcommittee that next year, if I am fortunate enough to be reelected, I am going after each one of these. And I shall tell the gentleman why.

I discovered a day or two ago that the Government is spending the taxpayers' money to finance nine sociologists to study behavior at cocktail parties.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to ask the gentleman what he is kicking about if the farmers are learning about cocktail parties. I thought the gentleman was for the farmers.

Mr. GROSS. I am not opposed to farmers learning about cocktail parties.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is he against their exercising their civil rights to attend cocktail parties?

Mr. GROSS. I want them to enjoy all their rights, civil and otherwise.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is not the gentleman for the farmer?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then why should they not know about cocktail parties?

Mr. GROSS. They should.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, all right.

Mr. GROSS. But I would like them to spend their own money to learn.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, well, everybody else is getting Government money.

Mr. GROSS. According to a magazine article these analysts have found "that the room in which the bar is situated tends to become crowded; that there is a variety of guests, who will cringe in corners, while others sing, dance, slop martinis on the piano, and pursue members of the opposite sex to the pantry or beyond."

According to the magazine article, this study of cocktail parties is one of a series of studies being made by the U.S. Public Health Service on "Functions of Play in Developing Adult Behavior." How much has been spent on this behavioral business, I do not know, but the article says the total cost to U.S. taxpayers for the series of studies on this subject is $89,811.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that I am glad that he pointed out that this is a Public Health Service matter and not attributed to the Department of Agriculture. But in view of that, this committee is going to look into this matter closely to see that we do not use any money in this area along the lines of the article that the gentleman has just read.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have another one which I hope the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] will look into; and I would like to take just a moment, with the indulgence of the House, although it does not bear upon this particular subject. This is an Associated Press item of May 6 from Roanoke, Va. It says that:

Nine beagle puppies, all from good canine families, won a 10-weeks' study course on the campus of Hollins College for Girls.

Dr. Allen D. Calvin, associate professor of psychology, will teach them a course in discipline on a grant from the U.S. Public Health Service.

They will live in air-conditioned pine-paneled quarters and eat a special diet.

I call the attention of the House to this because it involves another grant from the U.S. Public Health Service, which means, of course, that American taxpayers are putting up the money.

Mr. Chairman, I predict the day will come when the taxpayers will rise up and demand an end to the use of Federal funds for the study of behavior at cocktail parties and teaching discipline to dogs in colleges. I am afraid, however, that the uprising of those who pay the bills will come too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LIPSCOMB) there were—ayes 22, noes 52.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa has gone into the question of representational allowances. I would like to try to get in this record what we are trying to do with this bill.

First of all, I should like to congratulate the committee and especially the staff for a beautifully written report. This is a very understandable report. We had defense up last week, and frankly, it might as well have been written in Turkish. I simply could not understand it. But after reading this report, I should like to ask a question of the committee.

I have almost no farmers in my congressional district. There are literally no farmers in my district. I represent a great urban district which pays $355 million a year in Federal taxes. After reading this report, may I ask if the committee is urging someone like me to vote for this appropriation? I want to be sure.

Let me go through the report and see if I have the figures straight. I should like to be corrected if I am possibly wrong. As I understand the report and statement of the committee, the United States has spent about $26 billion since 1952 on the farm program. In that period of time farm income has dropped from an annual average of $14.4 billion in 1952 to about $11 billion in 1959. So this $26 billion has not kept up farm income.

Second, it does not seem to have kept the farmers on the farm. Farm population is down about 3 million, as I understand it, from the last figures I have. It does not seem to have protected the small farmer.

Lastly, this $26 billion, I presume, was designed to bring our agriculture into some sort of stability, but I notice from your figures our surpluses have jumped from $2.5 billion in 1952 to $9.2 billion in 1960.

The cost to my congressional district, our part of this $4 billion appropriation, is about $100 per family.

The question in my mind is, Should I vote "aye" when my name is called on this bill? The report would seem to indicate we have been pouring money down a rathole here.

Mr. WHITTEN. Is the gentleman asking a question?

Mr. BARR. Yes.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that a big part of this bill is commitments where we now have contracts, so we have to pay them. Our report points up the feeling we have, which is very similar to that of the gentleman, that we need to do something. On the other hand, until we get an improvement over what we have, if we did not pass this bill, I think we would wreck American agriculture. If we did wreck it, do not think it would not pull down the gentleman's section and the industrial sections and everybody else. The point is that we are getting into more and more trouble, and, in spite of the cost, the farmer's situation is getting worse. We point that out in an effort as best we can to push forward some improvement.

But I do not think we would be doing the right thing not to pass this bill—we would be violating contracts and we would be making bad matters worse. But we certainly need to improve the way in which we are handling this.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I believe I have the same type of district as the gentleman from Indiana. I do not know whether the gentleman was on the floor yesterday when I pointed out certain elements involved in this appropriation. I believe you still have some schoolchildren who are sharing in the school lunch program; is that not correct?

Mr. BARR. That is correct.

Mr. SANTANGELO. And your people are also sharing in the special milk program; is that not correct?

Mr. BARR. That is correct.

Mr. SANTANGELO. People in the gentleman's district are sharing in food donations for needy people. Therefore, to a large extent, the people from the city districts are sharing in this abundance that the farmers are producing. Therefore, to that extent your people are deriving some benefits in this area. I also pointed out yesterday, if the gentleman recalls, that many of these benefits are mixed benefits and that the farmers to the extent of the $1,200 million, which is the sum for the restoration of the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation, are getting that direct benefit—and only that direct benefit. Does the gentleman believe that helping foreign countries to develop themselves is not helping us indirectly? If so, then I think the gentleman is missing the point insofar as the benefits which the United States derives from the aid to agriculture. I submit that point for the gentleman's consideration.

Mr. BARR. I would just like to point out to the gentleman who represents a city district just like mine that we are perfectly willing to help; but I think if we keep on helping like this, we will wind up not having any farmers left.

May I ask one more question here with reference to personnel? I notice that the personnel in the Department of Agriculture has jumped from 67,000 in 1952 to 86,000 today. At the same time farm families have dropped around 700,000 and the farm population has dropped 3 million. Would someone explain to me why we need more people in the Department, when we have a smaller number of farmers to work with?

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman will remember that we wrote this report and pointed these facts out because we have some question about it, too.

Mr. BARR. You pointed it up, but I cannot understand why you did not explain what happened and how they got up that high.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is done by the action of the Department and the Congress, frankly, because we have more peaple dealing with many programs such as brucellosis eradication and more people on meat inspection work to protect the public health. There are more people in the soil conservation districts. Newly organized districts under the basic law are entitled to have additional personnel. So this is the combined responsibility so far as these increases are concerned of the Congress and the Department. We do point out that while they have done well with the additional people, all this does not necessarily answer this problem.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARR. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I want to say in support of what the chairman of this subcommittee has said that we have many programs that were voted for in the last several years by this Congress of which you have been a Member and the preceding Congress. There is the poultry inspection program, the soil bank program, and so forth. All of these programs require personnel to make them go. If the gentleman was here and heard the debate yesterday, he knows that we believe Congress has a responsibility to correct some of these things. Maybe we can cut out some personnel, but when the Congress votes for certain programs we on the Committee on Appropriations must recommend the funds for such an activity and for such programs.

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman. I do want to congratulate the committee again. They were extremely candid in this report. In fact, they were so candid I am almost tempted to vote "no."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when I came here in 1935, I thought the best way to serve my people and the people of the country was to—well, I guess I was an isolationist and I thought if we stayed out of foreign entanglements, as the first President advised, and each of us attended to his own business here at home and let the other fellow do the same, we would get along pretty well. I have learned since—or at least I have been told—that the Lord did not make the world as he should have made it and that each of us knew better how to operate the other fellows' affairs than he did and that we

ought to remake the whole universe, and as a start remake nature's laws. Now the gentleman asked about city folks and how they should vote on this farm bill. Another gentleman replied, "Well, we are giving you free food—vote for it." That is not all the Federal Government is giving you. You would be surprised at what all you are getting if you would add it all up. Some of your gifts were called to my attention this morning by the editorial in the Chicago Tribune of this morning entitled "Unwed Mothers on ADC." It starts with comments about an unwed mother who let four children burn to death while she was in a saloon drinking liquor. It then goes on to complain about the cost to Cook County. One gentleman said the program was costing the people of his district about $20 million. ADC is costing the taxpayers of Cook County $52 million a year. The editorial intimates congressional meddling is responsible for what has happened in Chicago and other cities.

We encouraged the colored folks to go to Chicago where they lack jobs, homes, and practically everything else necessary to enable them to care for themselves.

The Tribune says this:

The chief cause of the high cost is well known. It is the migration to Chicago of thousands of Negroes from the rural South who lack a tradition of normal family relationships and who have difficulty getting jobs and economic security.

I will put the editorial in the RECORD. It goes on to show that every time we monkey with nature or with the world the way the Lord created it, we get into trouble. We not only have a surplus of wheat and cotton—I remember a member of a committee that I was once on who drew several thousand dollars one year for cotton surplus. One year he drew $130,000. Now here they have a surplus of individuals. Foreign nations will not take them as it will wheat or other crops. So Chicago has to support them. The surplus under ADC, I am wondering, whether after all, it might not be well to accept some things as they are and let the Lord run the universe for a while—let the South solve some of its problems. There is a possibility it can do a better job than we can. They at least have had experience. One result of our intermeddling has been to cost the city $52 million a year to care for illegitimate and other children—and I call the attention of the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. JONES, who spoke quite eloquently on this subject, at a hearing in North Carolina. How would it be if we just let the Lord and nature get along as best it may for a year or two? Do not refuse to help; just give the Lord a chance for 6 months or 9 months, and see how things come out.

It seems to me, in view of this editorial and our meddling in the affairs of every one, perhaps if we put our trust in Him and let Him do it, instead of trying in just a few months to remake the whole world, we might get along a little better. Perhaps if we let the farmers alone they may get along all right. Think it over. But read this editorial:

THE UNWED MOTHERS ON ADC

Judge John Gutknecht dismissed manslaughter indictments against an unmarried woman whose four children died in a fire while she was drinking in a saloon. He expressed regret that no criminal prosecution against the woman was possible and denounced the State of Illinois for supporting her on aid to dependent children while she produced the four children.

"I know that children have to be taken care of," said the judge, "but after the first illegitimate child comes the mother should be locked up."

We share Judge Gutknecht's indignation over the death of the children and the misconduct of their mother but doubt that his proposed remedy is a practical one. There is no easy solution of the bastardy problem and no quick way to relieve the taxpayers of the enormous cost of supporting illegitimate children on ADC.

Each session of the legislature has considered the ADC problem and study after study has been made by other groups. Currently, a study is being made by a firm of management consultants hired by a citizens' committee appointed by the Cook County board. It will be surprising if the consultants come up with anything new.

In this county, ADC is costing the taxpayers $52 million a year. The chief cause of the high cost is well known. It is the migration to Chicago of thousands of Negroes from the rural South who lack a tradition of normal family relationships and who have difficulty getting jobs and economic security.

Bastardy is involved in 38.5 percent of the Negro families on ADC as against 9 percent of the white families. The relief authorities are beginning to report second and third generation ADC clients of unmarried parenthood.

A first-rate report on the situation has been written by Jefferson G. Ish, secretary of the Illinois Public Aid Commission and vice president of the Supreme Liberty Life Insurance Co. It was read originally before a Chicago chapter of a national fraternity of Negro business and professional men, and later was published in the public aid commission's magazine.

Mr. Ish pointed out that as Negroes get job security and establish normal family homes they adopt a code of sexual morality that is usually stricter than that of the community as a whole. He urged the Negro community to take the lead in making known the distressing facts about the ADC program and in promoting all steps to improve it.

Proposals like Judge Gutknecht's to lock up all unmarried mothers do not contribute to public understanding of this question. Real encouragement, however, may be drawn from the signs that Negro leaders are beginning to face the problem and to seek solutions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

To carry into effect the provisions of titles I, II, and the related provisions of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1000–1031); the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1001, note; 31 U.S.C. 82h; 12 U.S.C. 371; 35 D.C. Code 535; 60 Stat. 1062–1080); the Act of July 30, 1946 (40 U.S.C. 436–439); the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590r–590x—3), for the development of facilities for water storage and utilization in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States; the provisions of title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1471–1483), relating to financial assistance for farm housing; the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation Trust Liquidation Act, approved May 3, 1950 (40 U.S.C. 440–444); the items "Loans to farmers, 1948 flood damage" in the Act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1038), and "Loans to farmers, property damage" in the Act of May 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 82); the collecting and servicing of credit sales and development accounts in water conservation and utilization projects (53 Stat. 685, 719), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 590y, z—1 and z—10); and the Act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, approved September 6, 1950 (7 U.S.C. 1033–1039), as follows:

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to direct a question to the subcommittee which has to do with a wire which I received from the chairman of the Extension Directors Subcommittee on Legislation. This wire reads as follows:

EATONTON, GA., *May 9, 1960.*

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

In response to a request that I furnish you statement in regard to proposed earmarking of Federal funds, we believe that the cause of the wide variation of budget and needs of the 50 States that earmarking of funds limits flexibility necessary for effective administration of program and needs of the extension work. We recognize the urgent need for salary adjustment of county extension workers. Twenty-two States have indicated need of Federal fund to raise salary of extension staff. However, in some States the county salaries are comparable to similar position in the State.

W. A. SUTTON,
Chairman, Extension Directories Subcommittee on Legislation.

I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee would comment on this wire which makes sense to me.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will be glad to. The Association of Land Grant Colleges, for whom Mr. Sutton speaks, requested the Department and the Budget, I believe, to allow a $6 million increase for the Extension Service. There have been many increases for the Extension Service during the last 7 years, about 90 percent. The Extension Service, the Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of the Budget requested from the committee $2,865,000 for rural development, all of it for additional people. The committee in reviewing the situation, and the increases of the past, determined that at the Federal level we have had something over 20 percent increase in supervisory personnel in the Extension Service. At the State level there had been an increase of over 20 percent in supervisory personnel.

Further, it was the committee's feeling that this rural development type of work was in line with the type of work the county extension workers are now doing. In some of the States in recent years the increases have been used for more people, and the need to raise the salaries of local agents has increased and the need for additional people has gone down.

So the committee has gone along with a $2 million increase. The committee feels that it should be used at the county level where the need really exists.

Mr. LAIRD. But in those States where the county and State salaries are presently on a comparable basis, these funds

can only be used for increases as far as the county is concerned?

Mr. WHITTEN. As far as the bill is concerned, it can be used at the county level for either new employees or salary increases.

Mr. LAIRD. But it cannot be used to pay State salaries if they are on the same salary scale with the counties.

Mr. WHITTEN. It has to be worked out at the county level. Our report points out what the States are paying at the different levels.

Mr. LAIRD. It would apply at the county level only?

Mr. WHITTEN. This provision requires a State matching of funds; and where needed the State presumably would match the funds.

Mr. LAIRD. So the funds would not be available to those 28 States?

Mr. WHITTEN. If they do not need more people and if they do not need salary increases, I do not know whether they would or not.

Mr. LAIRD. They would need it if they were on a comparable State and county salary scale.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the people are being paid adequately, I cannot conceive what they would want it for, especially when the State has to match dollar for dollar.

Mr. LAIRD. They would have to put up 100 percent as far as salaries of State employees are concerned. Is that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. It has to be matched; yes.

Mr. LAIRD. Could they match this money to pay State salaries?

Mr. WHITTEN. No. This increase is for work at the county level.

Mr. LAIRD. They cannot match and pay salaries of the State employees?

Mr. WHITTEN. Not with this small increase here. The balance of the appropriation is not involved.

Mr. LAIRD. So if they were to change the salary scale within the State they would have to pay 100 percent of the increase for the State employees and on a matching basis for the county employees?

Mr. WHITTEN. There has been a 90-percent increase in the Extension Service in recent years. This request for 1961 was for aid to the rural development program in the counties. There have been ample funds at the State and Federal level for supervision, so we are appropriating this additional money that has been requested for rural development to the counties. We tie it down to the counties so it would not be used to pay a lot of additional State supervisory personnel.

Mr. LAIRD. But you earmark just the $2 million on a different basis than the authorizing legislation.

Mr. WHITTEN. In a different way from the other part of the appropriation, but it is in line with the gentleman's position and the authorizing legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, during general debate yesterday there was considerable discussion of various farm programs designed, I take it, to obviate the necessity for tremendous appropriations such as are contained in this bill. The committee report, page 9, in one paragraph, sets forth the guidelines for excellent farm legislation. Let me read this paragraph:

> It is the belief of a majority of this committee that, for the protection of our overall economy, farm prices must reflect cost plus a reasonable return. Such prices, however, must be made contingent upon farmers holding farm production, in terms of bushels, bales, and pounds, to domestic and normal foreign markets. If that is done an adequate price can be obtained at the marketplace.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] to the fact that years ago the Congress twice passed the McNary-Haugen bill, and it was twice vetoed by then President Calvin Coolidge. May I say to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House if he would pull that bill out, dust it off, and revise it to conform to present conditions, it would be the most effective farm legislation that could be enacted. It should carry, in addition to cost of production plus a reasonable profit at the marketplace, a provision, and a stringent one, against the importation of agricultural products that are in surplus or in adequate supply in this country.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman have any reason to believe that the present Secretary of Agriculture would approve that bill?

Mr. GROSS. I would not care whether he approved or did not approve it.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I would like to commend what the gentleman has said with regard to the guidelines suggested in this excellent report by our committee. I would also call the gentleman's attention to the fact that a bill which would do substantially what this report recommends was introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and about 20 other Members of the House in this session. That legislation is now pending before the committee. I am hoping that the gentleman and others on his side will join with us in helping pass that legislation.

Mr. GROSS. I must disagree with the gentleman to this extent: I do not see too much resemblance between the Poage bill and the McNary-Haugen bill.

Mr. McGOVERN. But it does follow the guidelines that the gentleman has just underscored in the committee report in helping farmers adjust their production to what the market will absorb at a fair price.

Mr. GROSS. I hope that the Committee on Agriculture of the House, as I said before, will dig out the McNary-Haugen bill, bring it up to date, insert needed features, and put marketing controls on bushels, pounds, and bales, not on acreage. Acreage controls will not work, but production can be controlled through allocated marketings. In exchange for effective controls, there must be cost of production plus reasonable profit prices, paid in the market places for the products of American farms.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to propound an inquiry of the chairman of the committee relative to the bottom line on page 22 of the report, which reads:

> The committee believes, however, that existing stations should not be closed in working out this redirection of funds.

This refers to agricultural experiment stations. We have had a considerable amount of anxiety in our State because of a report emanating from the other body suggesting that our agricultural experimental station at Newell, S. Dak., be abandoned, and possibly a larger station established in a neighboring State. It seems to us this would be an unwise act to lose the existing investment that the Government has at the Newell station. If there is to be any enlargement of the function of that station, it ought to be built on the foundation that is already there rather than being developed in some other nearby area. I am wondering if the language in the report would cover our situation and give us some assurance that the committee is saying in effect that this important station at Newell should be retained.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, when the committee reviewed the request from the Department of Agriculture we felt that it would be unwise to close many of these stations which have done such a worthwhile job for agriculture. It is true, however, that some money will have to be absorbed, but it is not the intention of the committee that we close them, and we indicated that we thought it would be unwise to close these stations.

Mr. McGOVERN. I appreciate that because I think it would be false economy either to close down or curtail the important work being done at Newell. We ought to be moving in the other direction.

The Clerk read as follows:

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Nothing in this Act shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program authorized by law: *Provided*, That not to exceed $44,726,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That $1,000,000 of this authorization shall be available only to expand and strengthen the sales program of the Corporation pursuant to authority contained in the Corporation's charter: *Provided further*, That not less than 7 per centum of this authorization shall be placed in reserve to be apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for use only in such amounts and at such time as may become necessary to carry out program operations: *Provided further*, That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation

or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further,* That no part of these funds may be used to formulate or administer a program which provides for reclassing of Commodity Credit Corporation cotton after time of sale to private individuals or organizations: *Provided further,* (1) That no part of this authorization shall be used to formulate or carry out a price-support program for 1960 under which a total amount of price support in excess of $50,000 would be extended through loans, purchases, or purchase agreements made or made available by Commodity Credit Corporation to any person on the 1960 production of any agricultural commodity declared by the Secretary to be in surplus supply, unless (a) such person shall reduce his production of such commodity from that which such person produced the preceding year, in such percentage, not to exceed 20 per centum, as the Secretary may determine to be essential to bring production in line within a reasonable period of time with that necessary to provide an adequate supply to meet domestic and foreign demands, plus adequate reserves, or (b) such person shall agree to repay all amounts advanced in excess of $50,000 for any agricultural commodity within twelve months from the date of the advance of such funds or at such later date as the Secretary may determine, (2) that the term "person" shall mean an individual, partnership, firm, joint-stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or other legal entity, or a State, political subdivision of a State, or any agency thereof, (3) that in the case of any loan to, or purchase from, a cooperative marketing organization, or with regard to price support on an agricultural commodity extended by purchases of a product of such commodity from, or by loans on such product to, persons other than the producers of such commodity, such limitation shall not apply to the amount of price support received by the cooperative marketing organization, or other persons, but the amount of price support made available to any person through such cooperative marketing organization or other persons shall be included in determining the amount of price support received by such person for purposes of such limitation, and (4) that the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue regulations prescribing such rules as he determines necessary to carry out this provision.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], about the dates that are employed on page 30 relative to certain restrictions on the administrative expenses of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The gentleman is well aware, I am sure, that those are the same dates that were included in the appropriation bill for 1960. The same two dates that are included on line 13 and again on line 16 in the 1960 appropriation bill.

So, my question is this: Why do we use those same dates in the appropriation bill for fiscal 1961?

Mr. WHITTEN. Last year the gentleman from Kansas offered an amendment that was intended to do what this does. Later it became part of the bill. The language as it now appears is the product of the conference of last year. This was new language. This year the department has had the job of working up regulations and providing means for carrying them out.

The Department sent up this language exactly as it appears here for the remainder of this year, presumably on the basis that if you did not have the language in this bill it would expire the 1st of July. The funds to which this language would be tied themselves would lapse the 1st of July. So this is essential to carry it on for the remaining 6 months.

The Department is of the opinion, so the individuals I discussed it with say, that if this language stays as it is, it will control this year. In next year's bill, it will be early enough after a year's experience to see whether this exact language should be carried forward, even if we attempt to do the thing that this does. So they have carried it forward for the remainder of this calendar year in order to have a year's experience before they will recommend whether this particular approach should be continued or not.

The committee went along exactly with the language that the Department sent up for the reasons that I have mentioned to the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. If I may interpret what the gentleman from Mississippi has said, it means this; that despite the fact that there will be no limitation on loans for production in 1960, because most of these programs were developed back in fiscal year 1959—I am thinking primarily about corn, wheat, and I presume cotton—those programs were developed and announced in fiscal 1959, in May of last year. Therefore, since we are talking about a limitation on administrative expenses, the Comptroller General has ruled that there will be no limitation on any program that was developed prior to July 1, 1959, because we legislated for the fiscal year 1960 last year.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that, while the language is in there to develop and pay, if you had the language controlling the making of the loan, it would be just as effective if you did not have the other part. So, since the payment or the extension of the loan would follow after July, it is my sincere opinion that anything you did next spring, after they have had a year's experience and have a chance to recommend to the Budget any changes that would be in order, it would be ample time to deal with the situation in next year's bill. The controlling factor is in the fall of the year when the loan is made.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, the Comptroller General has ruled just the opposite, that the year of production is immaterial, or when the loan is made; it is when the program is developed, because this is administrative expenses we are talking about. So he has ruled that that is not important as to when the loan is made. It is when the program is developed and announced, therefore, there is no limitation on most of the production in 1960.

Mr. WHITTEN. The announcement is made about price support levels.

Mr. AVERY. And acreage allotments.

Mr. WHITTEN. Anyway, I am following the Department in this. This is the Department's recommendation. The committee took it lock, stock, and barrel without changing it. It was sent up, as I have explained, on the basis that I have pointed out.

Mr. AVERY. The gentleman can give us assurance, then, that there is no thinking on the part of the committee that this language would escape a restriction on the 1962 production—the program will be developed in fiscal 1961 as appropriated in this bill; this mention of 1960 would not preclude that limit?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not think so. It was so presented to us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] has expired.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman, I do not think this is sound legislation.

Mr. AVERY. I understand.

Mr. WHITTEN. And I am opposed to it now as I was before. But I have tried to explain to the gentleman the basis of it.

Mr. AVERY. One more question, if the gentleman permits. On line 16 he will notice, in the bill before us today, we refer back again to 1960 production. We are talking about primarily 1961 in this bill. The Comptroller General has ruled year of production did not prevail—that is, 1960 production limitation did not prevail this year because we are talking about administrative expenses which for 1960 crops were expended largely in fiscal 1959. But since the year 1960 is used in the bill, and they will be working in 1961, that provision in line 16 will not preclude such subsequent limitation?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is my understanding. And may I say this; while I oppose this language and this approach, because I think personally it is unsound, certainly I cannot speak for the subcommittee. The subcommittee's action is not in any way to end this provision at this time. If it should develop we are in error about this, certainly as a spokesman for our subcommittee, I could not take it that we had intentionally eliminated this restriction, much as I would like to.

Mr. AVERY. I appreciate the position of the gentleman from Mississippi, and I further appreciate his inclusion of this provision in the bill despite his opposition to it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: On page 30, beginning on line 6, strike out, "*Provided further,* That no part of these funds may be used to formulate or administer a program which provides for reclassing of Commodity Credit Corporation cotton after time of sale to private individuals or organizations."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important amendment which I propose. I hope I may have the attention of the Members of the House as I present my views concerning the limitation which I now propose to strike out.

I do not question for one minute the fact that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations is a devoted friend of agriculture. I do not doubt that he was prompted by the purest of motives in placing this limitation in this appropriation bill. But I do seriously question his wisdom. Unfortunately, only one member of his subcommittee is particularly interested in cotton as a commodity.

We have a cotton program which has been in operation for many years. Unfortunately, in former years, because only some of the cotton sold was reclassified, some of the cotton merchants were granted a refund, a substantial refund, in toto amounting to about $166 million. I certainly do not approve of that procedure. Neither does any member of the House Committee on Agriculture approve of the granting of these huge rebates to cotton merchants. But we do approve of a reclassification of cotton at the time of delivery, and that is exactly what the Department of Agriculture now proposes to do. Here is a statement from the Department announcing this program:

CCC To Sell 1959 and Prior Crop Cotton on Basis of Reclassification

Beginning August 1, 1960, the Commodity Credit Corporation will offer all 1959 and prior crop upland cotton for sale subject to reclassification before final settlement, the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced today.

Detailed provisions regarding sampling, classification, and settlement for the 1959 and prior crop cotton are now being developed. They will be contained in a cotton sales announcement to be released from the New Orleans Commodity Stabilization Service Commodity Office in sufficient time to begin sales under the new provisions on August 1, 1960.

Cotton from the 1960 crop purchased by CCC under the Choice A program will be offered for sale by local sales agencies and by the New Orleans office on the basis of the quality assigned the cotton by USDA Boards of Cotton Examiners prior to its purchase by CCC.

This will result in the 1960 crop of Choice A cotton being handled during the 1960–61 marketing year on the same basis as the 1959 crop of Choice A cotton was handled during the 1959–60 marketing year.

This matter came up last fall. I attended a meeting in New Orleans which was attended by reputable representatives of all segments of the cotton industry. After a thorough discussion, substantially all those in attendance were in complete agreement that all CCC cotton should be reclassed at the time of sale.

Thereafter we called another meeting here in Washington in December. It was a joint meeting between the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture. That committee meeting was held in our committee room. At that time a very distinguished subcommittee of the cotton industry made certain recommendations, one of which was that the Secretary should provide an equitable program for the reclassification of cotton at the time of delivery.

The matter was then brought to the attention of the Department of Agriculture and after consideration by officials in the Department of Agriculture one of the officials in high places indicated to us that he wanted to put into operation this recommendation of the cotton industry.

Here is the recommendation: "Work out an equitable reclassification privilege for the purchase of CCC stocks."

Now then our Subcommittee on Cotton of the Committee on Agriculture unanimously urged the Department of Agriculture in a formal letter to adopt this recommendation. Here is the text of that letter:

JANUARY 6, 1960.

Hon. MARVIN MCLAIN,
Assistant Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCLAIN: Representatives of the cotton exchanges and the Cotton Merchants Association have reported to our committee the progress made in working with the Department on the five points which they and other segments of the cotton trade believe are necessary to the operation of the exchanges and an effective private merchandising system in 1960–61.

We are pleased to know that you are giving careful consideration to each of the five points presented to the Agriculture Committee in December, and that definite progress is being made toward satisfactory solutions.

With respect to classification at the time of sale, it is inconceivable to us, as you stated it was to you, that buyers of cotton or any other commodity sold on description should be denied the right to have the actual quality checked at the time of delivery. Departmental technicians have testified to us that cotton in storage does change in color and that Government stocks are subject to a continued culling process which emphasizes occasional and unavoidable classing errors. The resulting commercial risks of buying on catalog description are sufficiently great that prospective purchasers are compelled to protect themselves in the prices they will pay and the loss to the CCC is substantial. Failure to sell on terms which assure the buyer he will get what he has bought not only costs the Government heavily but delays the disposition of Government stocks directed by section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1956. It ignores numerous congressional directives to sell on terms and conditions that will promote utilization of ordinary private channels of trade and to protect small business firms.

As our committee sees it, the record before us shows that the cotton can be sampled at time of delivery and that the purchase price based on the quality determined by Government classers, subject to established departmental appeal procedures, can be collected by draft against a bank letter of credit with full protection of the Government interest and assurance to the purchasers that they can bid for CCC cotton knowing they will get cotton of the description bought.

Some such provision to permit accurate checking of quality at the time of delivery would have the added advantage of reducing costs (only the bales which are sold would be sampled) and by using the letter of credit method of payment would protect the Government investment without resorting to any refunds, which are always likely to involve public misunderstanding.

HAROLD D. COOLEY, W. R. POAGE, GEORGE GRANT, ALEXANDER PIRNIE, DON L. SHORT, JOHN L. MCMILLAN, THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, CARL ALBERT, BILLY MATTHEWS, CLARK W. THOMPSON, W. PAT JENNINGS, E. C. GATHINGS, HAROLD B. MCSWEEN.

The Department officials indicated to us they would adopt the recommendations, but that because of some conversations which Department officials had had with the chairman of this subcommittee, they seemed to be somewhat reluctant to put the program in operation. Thereupon we called a special meeting of the full Committee on Agriculture. A resolution was presented and unanimously adopted recommending the initiation of this new program. Here is the text of the resolution:

Whereas this committee has had under consideration for the past several months questions relating to the reclassing and sale of cotton owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation; and

Whereas the views of cotton producers, cotton users, and the cotton trade generally appear to be virtually unanimous that CCC cotton should be reclassed at the time of sale: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is urged to put into effect as expeditiously as possible the uniform policy of reclassing all CCC cotton at the time of its sale and that this be done in such manner that the procedure will not involve rebates to the purchaser but that, instead, the final price of the cotton which the purchaser will be obligated to pay will be determined by the reclassing carried out at the time of sale and that all of every lot of cotton sold shall be reclassified.

It was sent to the Department notwithstanding the objections of the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the subcommittee, and although the Department was somewhat reluctant to disagree with his views, the Department announced the program. Now the gentleman from Mississippi will know what was said. I only know by hearsay what was said in that conversation. Without attempting to quote that conversation verbatim, we were told that the officials in the Department were told by the gentleman from Mississippi in effect: "I write the checks—I write the checks and if you do not do this, I will not write the check and you will have no money to pay the employees of the Department of Agriculture engaged in this program."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Now if the gentleman wants to deny he made that statement—I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. First, I do categorically deny it. But I would also like to have the name of the person you said told that to you. I would like to know who he is.

Mr. COOLEY. I thought I heard the gentleman say here on the floor yesterday, "I write the checks and you endorse them." Is that not in the RECORD?

Mr. WHITTEN. As a matter of fact, I said that we do—and it is a fact that we do.

Mr. COOLEY. When did you start writing the checks? Congress writes the checks. You are supposed to carry out

the intent and purpose of the legislative committees of the Congress.

Mr. WHITTEN. Read the bill and read the report. You will find the names of the Members on the report.

Mr. COOLEY. I read the report and I read the bill. This man who talked to us, I do not think was talking to us in confidence.

Mr. WHITTEN. Will you give me his name because he told you an unmitigated lie and I would like to know his name.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not want to start a fight now between the gentleman and any official of the Department of Agriculture. The gentleman knows whether he said it or not. It is almost identical with the language that the gentleman used here on the floor yesterday—"That our committee writes the checks."

Mr. WHITTEN. Unfortunately, we do have to write the checks.

Mr. COOLEY. And the gentleman said on the floor, "You are just merely endorsers of the check." Now here you have it—that an administrator in the executive branch of the Government wants to do something and he is intimidated.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Now I did not say that you intimidated him, but he was intimidated to the point that he did not issue this order until our legislative committee had unanimously urged him to do it and commended him for his efforts. He issued the order which is, in effect, why the gentleman from Mississippi and his committee want to cut off the money.

Since when did the Appropriations Committee arrogate to itself such mighty power as to say that Congress authorizes an act but we will cut it off, notwithstanding the views, the unanimous views of all the Committee on Agriculture, Republicans and Democrats alike? It seems to me this is a kind of test. Who is going to run the Department of Agriculture? The Subcommittee on Appropriations or the legislative committees of this Congress and the Members of Congress themselves? If we yield to this limitation, then we have our only forum thereafter in the star chamber sessions of the Committee on Appropriations. You cannot even get into that room without special permission.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. I attended the gentleman's joint session last fall. The gentleman referred to meetings held last fall in my district in Louisiana, and later here in the gentleman's committee room on agriculture, which was a joint meeting of the two Committees on Agriculture. It was my recollection, coming to the merits of the issue before this body, that this representation on reclassification was sponsored by everyone.

Mr. COOLEY. And the Department is trying to carry out the wishes of the people who are most concerned with the stability of the cotton crop, and of the Committee on Agriculture, providing for a fair and equitable basis of sale, so that the cotton buyer will not have to buy a "pig in a sack."

Mr. BOGGS. When the gentleman talks about reclassification, he simply means that when he comes in to buy a given item the item is as represented; is that correct?

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. COOLEY was granted 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BOGGS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. It is very interesting that at this moment a hearing is going on in the other body involving the sale of drugs, and one of the issues involved is whether they are selling what is represented.

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct.

Mr. BOGGS. So what is involved here is that Congress is arrogating to itself the right to say when an industry cannot make proper representation of what they are selling.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. And I want to know why cotton has been singled out.

Mr. BOGGS. If you sold an automobile or grain or anything else, and you misrepresent it, you would be subject to accounting in the courts?

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly. All we want is to have the same integrity in Government transactions that you now have in private trading.

I have here a telegram from a large number of cotton merchants. They are all in favor of striking out this amendment. There are letters from the American Cotton Producers Association, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and so on. I will not take the time to read them but will insert them in the RECORD at this point:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1960.

The Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: We believe that the House Agriculture Committee was right when they asked the U.S. Department of Agriculture to institute a procedure for 1960 and prior crops of CCC cotton whereby purchasers of such cotton could get it reclassed.

In our opinion, cotton should be sold on the basis of weight and class at the time of sale. This is customary in all normal merchandising procedure with which we are familiar. Where a purchaser requests reclassification of CCC cotton, we suggested to the Department that the entire purchase be reclassed.

We hope that nothing will be done by the Congress to countermand in any way the action of the Department with regard to reclassification of CCC cotton.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. LYNN,
Legislative Director.

NATIONAL COTTON
COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1960.

The Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COOLEY: We have just learned that the House Committee on Agriculture passed a resolution urging the Secretary of Agriculture to reclass all cotton sold by Commodity Credit Corporation at the time of sale and wish to commend the committee for its action. We hope the Agriculture Committee will continue to press the Secretary to act on this.

The National Cotton Council strongly supports this principle and has also urged the Department of Agriculture to authorize reclass at the time of delivery. At its recent annual meeting in Dallas, the council unanimously approved the following resolution which was recommended by both its committee on production and marketing and its committee on foreign trade:

"8. That the council urge the U.S. Department of Agriculture to recognize the right of purchasers of carryover cotton from CCC stocks to obtain a fair delivery equal to the quality bought by means of reclassification by a regular Government classing board at the time of delivery and, if the quality is different from that advertised, an adjustment of price upward or downward."

It is an established fact that cotton often deteriorates in storage. The extent of deterioration, of course, depends on the conditions under which the cotton was grown, harvested and ginned and the condition of it when it went into storage and the storage conditions. There is no way to determine in advance the change that will occur and it is impossible to determine the change that has occurred without reclassing the cotton.

It is also inevitable that some cotton will be improperly classed because of human errors.

Except in the case of cotton all major commodities sold by CCC are sold on the basis of the quality being equal to that for which the buyer pays. There should be no exception to this principle of the right to a fair delivery.

As long as there is a possibility that the value of the cotton received in a purchase from CCC may be less than the amount paid, there is a risk involved on the part of the purchaser. The cost of the risk must be included in the price.

The increased cost will be reflected in a higher price to mills at home and abroad. The effect of this will be to place cotton at a further disadvantage at home with man-made fibers and to increase the cost of the export program abroad. We believe this further disadvantage is not in the interest of the farmers nor the other segments of the industry.

Inasmuch as CCC still has approximately 6 million bales of cotton to dispose of, it is important that sales practices be adopted which are fair and reasonable and which will not be a deterrent to the expansion of consumption.

We appreciate your efforts in this regard.

Sincerely,

WM. RHEA BLAKE,
Executive Vice President.

PLAINS COTTON GROWERS, INC.,
Lubbock, Tex., May 9, 1960.

Congressman HAROLD D. COOLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COOLEY: Enclosed with this letter is another one from Mr. Wilmer Smith, president of the American Cotton Producer Associates, concerning the important question of reclassing of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

The Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., has gone on record opposing reclassing after sale which would permit refund to shipper. Our position is exactly that as outlined in Mr. Smith's letter for the majority of the ACPA members.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. PFEIFFENBERGER,
Executive Vice President.

HOUSTON, TEX., *May 10, 1960.*

Hon. H. D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Appropriations Committee on Agriculture Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We understand House appropriation bill for agriculture to be considered possibly Tuesday contains provisions prohibiting reclass of Government-owned cotton after sale to cotton trade. Since it is a well established fact that cotton deteriorates in grade while in storage, and since numerous clerical errors in classing and cataloging occur, we, the undersigned cotton merchants and brokers of the Houston Cotton Exchange, both large and small, think this provision very harmful and contrary to accepted trade practice, and we solicit your help in getting it deleted from the bill before final passage. In our opinion the buyer is entitled to receive the quality he buys based on classification at time of delivery rather than some earlier classification which may not be correct at time of delivery.

S. B. Locke & Co., Ernst Cohn & Co., Geo. H. McFadden & Bro., Inc., Reinhart Co., Anderson Clayton & Co., Emmet V. Clark, P. G. Pauls & Co., K. Dean & Co., Otto Goedecke, Inc., F. Hart & Co., Hendeson Cotton Co., V. A. Maudr & Co., Frank Mayes & Co., Miller Cotton Co., Houston Cotton Co., Weil Bros. Cotton, Inc., W. J. Schmitz & Co., John I. Steen, W. H. Strickland, H. T. Witherspoon, W. R. Wilson & Co., W. A. Willis.

AMERICAN COTTON
PRODUCER ASSOCIATES,
Lubbock, Tex., May 9, 1960.

Congressman HAROLD D. COOLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COOLEY: In view of recent developments regarding the reclassing of Commodity Credit Corporation cotton, we wish to reiterate the stand of the American Cotton Producer Associates on this question.

The majority of the members of the ACPA are opposed to reclassing of cotton after sale in such a manner that would permit or require refunds from CCC to the shipper. In the past this has led to unjust and unfounded criticism of the entire agricultural program, and this we want to avoid at all costs. We are opposed to the "pick and choose" method of reclassing selected bales in any given purchase.

We are not opposed to reclassing if it is done before sale, and if the entire lot being purchased is reclassed. We believe this reclassing before sale should be automatic in all cases. The chief item we are concerned with is that there be no refunds.

I trust this will clarify the position of the majority of the ACPA members.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WILMER SMITH,
President.

Now, why should this committee apply to cotton some rule or regulation that is not applicable to wheat and corn, or any other commodity? Why should a merchant be forced to accept something that has actually been misrepresented? The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], may say that cotton does not deteriorate in storage. All the evidence shows that it does deteriorate in storage. He may say that he is against these refunds. Our committee will say we are against refunds, too, but under the proposal of the Department of Agriculture there cannot hereafter be any more refunds. The purchaser pays 85 or 90 percent of the purchase price in cash, and the other is paid when the grades are determined and accepted. So that there are no refunds.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the gentleman who is presenting these figures to us and tell him I commend him for his position and assure him that we in Dallas, which is one of the largest cotton exchange centers in the country, fully share his view and his concern as he expressed it to the House. I merely join with him in agreeing with his statement on reclassification. It is right and correct.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank my colleague. I think people all the way from New York to Galveston agree that this limitation should be taken out and the Department of Agriculture should be permitted to put into operation and effect an equitable reclassification program which will guarantee to the purchaser that he will receive the quality of merchandise that he obligates himself to pay for.

I hope this amendment will be adopted and that we will proceed with the program that the Department of Agriculture after careful consideration has decided to put into operation.

I know some other members of our committee will explain in detail just how the program will work. I would like for the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] who is chairman of our cotton subcommittee, to consume time to explain it, because he has worked on it faithfully and diligently. Members on both sides of our committee feel that the limitation should be stricken out.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on every occasion that I have appeared before the legislative Committee on Agriculture I have always been treated with the utmost respect, and I was somewhat amazed to hear the remarks that were made a few minutes ago about the attitude of our committee.

We have tried in every way possible to be fair with the members of the Agriculture Committee when they have appeared before our committee. I know that we have sat long hours and listened to a lot of testimony.

I want to say to the Members of the House that as far as this matter is concerned this is not a matter of just one member of the committee; our committee is just as unified, or even more so perhaps, than the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman will not deny my statement to the effect that you hold star chamber sessions behind closed doors.

Mr. MARSHALL. We certainly do. That has been customary for a long time.

Mr. COOLEY. Why should the custom be continued?

Mr. MARSHALL. And, yet every person who has asked for an opportunity to appear before our committee has been given that opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to get into the meat of this thing. Our committee has a responsibility too; we have a responsibility to the taxpayers of the country as well as we do to the cotton-growers and the warehousemen; we have that responsibility. We have a responsibility that the House has delegated to us, to go into these matters to find out about them.

The distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture was giving you an opinion that we were using cotton somewhat differently. I would like to say to the distinguished Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture that my people, the warehousemen, who deal in corn and wheat and those commodities, would be most happy to have this kind of arrangement. Our committee found some astounding things that took place.

What do we do with this reclassification of cotton? The Government classifies this cotton; the buyer buys the cotton; he asks for a reclassification; he gets a reclassification of that cotton. It is reclassified and is a lower grade. What does the Commodity Credit Corporation do? They give him a rebate. Then many times these warehousemen export that cotton. What has happened? The thing that has happened is that it is then reclassified again at a higher grade.

We are not dealing in small items in this particular thing; what we are dealing with is shown by these figures: In 1956 there was a refund of $4,544,751; in 1957 it was $7,927,254.

Now listen to this. We come up to 1958 and we get a refund of $62,474,370; in 1960 we had a rebate of $11,639,154. We dropped down because we did something about this reclassification. Can a man who buys corn which has been graded by the Commodity Credit Corporation obtain a rebate on the grade of that corn? Of course he cannot. Can the man who buys wheat from Commodity Credit come in and ask for a refund because he disputes the grade? No; he cannot. Those commodities are sold on the basis of the grade which is presented.

The question is clear, and it is just as simple to me as day and night. If this Congress wants to permit the people who handle this cotton, and many of them are huge exporters, to come in and get a rebate on a grade which has been as fairly established as it can be, then you vote for this amendment which has been offered. But if you want to conduct the Commodity Credit Corporation operation in cotton in the same manner in which it is conducted in the case of other commodities, then you vote down the amendment. If you want to open up the Treasury of the United States to where you can say, "Come in with a shovel, we are going to give you gold on the basis of a rebate," vote for this amendment.

If you want to protect the farm program, if you want to have a farm program, then the things we are talking about in this amendment must stop and they must stop now.

This is not a matter of the chairman of our committee. It is a matter which came before our entire committee and it is one on which we are in accord.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I want to state to the Committee that I am in full agreement with what my colleague from Minnesota has just said.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. May I say that when our committee saw these huge raids on the Treasury of the United States, we wanted to sort of close the door as best we could against it.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank the gentleman. I urge the Members of the Congress to weigh the facts in this particular matter and vote down the amendment, as I am sure you would if you understood all of the facts.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree we want to close the door, but under the proposal of the Department so that there will be no more rebates.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. As a member of this subcommittee, certainly I do not profess to be an expert on cotton, but I want to say to the members of the Committee if you want to dissipate the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation here is the place to do it. All you have to do is to adopt the pending amendment. There has been $166,585,849 paid in rebates since 1956. Who received the rebates? In a number of instances warehousemen and big operators who have the cotton under their jurisdiction. I say again, if you want to dissipate the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation here is the place to do it. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MARSHALL. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, as far as we are concerned, in trying to treat the taxpayers of this country fair and to fulfill our responsibility as delegated to us by the Congress, we are calling this matter to your attention and taking the stand that we have, at a time when we hear so much about the cost of the Commodity Credit Corporation, your Committee on Appropriations could take no other course than we have taken. I hope you will sustain the course we have taken to protect the assets and the integrity of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations went into this question, and as the result of their recommendation and that of the General Accounting Office, the Department changed its plans on reclassifying cotton. Now, at that time, when they changed the plan for the current year, which they did, being effective August 1, 1959, what did they do? They went back and reclassed all of the cotton from 1957 and years earlier, and in reclassing that cotton it showed that it was $12 a bale lower in value. That is under the plan of the gentleman from Mississippi and this Subcommittee on Appropriations—$12, in round numbers, a bale lower in value. Of course, it does lose its quality when it is in storage for any length of time of a few months or more.

As a matter of fact, during the number of years that $166 million that has been referred to by the gentleman from Minnesota was refunded, the average loss on that cotton for those years—you move an awful lot of cotton out of the CCC—was $11.02, which means an additional cost to the taxpayer. Everyone recognizes that cotton is going to deteriorate in storage, particularly in damp areas. The facts show it. The only thing that is now being urged by the gentleman from North Carolina in striking this language is to approve the program that the Department of Agriculture wants to put into effect. Under that program only the cotton that is sold shall be reclassed, and you buy exactly what you pay for. Under that plan, if the grade deteriorates, you will pay less for it than when it went into the CCC's stock originally from the farmer's hands. It would be less if it deteriorates. But, if the grade shows a quality rise, why, whoever buys that cotton would have to pay more for it. It is just that simple.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Would the gentleman make it plain that there is no refund under the program proposed by the Department of Agriculture and which our committee recommends, it simply says that you take the cotton at the time you buy it, class it out, and pay for what you get, and there will be no refund?

Mr. GATHINGS. No refund at all, because here is what happens under this plan that the Secretary of Agriculture wants to put into effect. Eighty-five percent of the value of that cotton that went into the CCC originally, 85 percent of that class you pay in cash on those bales of cotton, and then they draw down these samples and reclass it. The buyer would be required also to deposit with CCC, pending the reclass of the cotton being purchased, an irrevocable letter of credit to pay whatever balance would be due when the value is determined as a result of the regrading.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Would it be fair to say that the gentleman speaking represents perhaps the biggest cotton-producing district in the United States? The gentleman will certainly say that he is not speaking at the behest of the larger shippers or exporters of cotton.

Mr. GATHINGS. I agree with the gentleman. The American Cotton Producer Associates is in favor of the plan of the Department of Agriculture in this instance, and I want to say that various other producer organizations also favor it, among them being the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. BOGGS. Let me ask another question, because I am in a position of being a layman in this matter in which the gentleman is expert. When the gentleman from Minnesota got so emotionally involved here a moment ago about the refund, is it not a fact that if a businessman went in and bought a bale of cotton that was classified as top or what have you, but which turned out to be spotted, what the refund provision meant was that he only paid for what be got?

Mr. GATHINGS. Certainly. Here is the situation. At that particular time the buyer of that cotton had an option to have a part of his purchase reclassed, that part that he determined that he wanted to have reclassed only. Under the plan now that the Department wants to put into effect, all this shall be reclassed and the buyer just pays what the reclassification shows it was at the time of delivery.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman's amendment is approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. One of the subcommittees of which I am a member, in looking into some of the Public Law 480 sales, discovered that the Department of Agriculture was accepting the exporters' grading or classification of cotton in determining how much refund should be given. But that has nothing to do with this.

Mr. GATHINGS. None whatever. The Agricultural Marketing Service, and the Agricultural Marketing Service only, the Cotton Class Division of the AMS, is the agency that is charged with the responsibility of reclassing the cotton.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Large refunds were made due to the fact that they permitted the exporters to do the reclassifying. That has nothing to do with this amendment?

Mr. GATHINGS. No. The Agricultural Marketing Service itself makes this classification.

The Department plan to reclass at the time of sale has overwhelming support because it recognizes the essential obligation of the Government to deliver to buyers that which is sold to them and collect the correct price for the cotton delivered.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, one of the things to be regretted in situations that we face on occasion is that personalities seem to get into these discussions. I have no personal animosity in any direction, departmentalwise or otherwise. I do have a responsibility and an obligation as chairman of a subcommittee, by appointment of the House of Representatives, to do the very best I can to bring together these various matters; to recommend to the subcommittee first and then to the Congress what I consider to be the soundest approach that we can make.

I will succeed only as I get support.

I am sure that my friends and colleagues, who seem to feel very strongly about this matter and who indicate that there is some competitive situation between positions—and, goodness knows, I want to assure everyone there is no such feeling on my part; but I do know that all of us are a little quick tempered right now. I do not appreciate the statements made, with no name given. It is hard to agree on legislation. It is hard to get together on a farm bill. I know there are those who have not had a chance, perhaps, to read our hearings; but here are the facts in this matter.

Many of your big international cotton merchants are, in addition, big warehousemen. They have made millions of dollars a year storing cotton which belonged to the Government in their own warehouses. When we finally, against the opposition of these international cotton merchants, when they were holding cotton off world markets while they were getting rich in Mexico and elsewhere—got the Department to offer cotton in world markets—these same international cotton merchants who had opposed sales became the chief buyers, frequently buying cotton that was in their own warehouses where they had the opportunity to know what they might get in a reclassing of that cotton, which is a tremendous advantage.

We had an investigation of this matter. Believe me, I wish that my friends on the legislative committee on most of these occasions had my job, because it is not a task for which you get much thanks. I wish they would take it over because, goodness knows, they would quit spending much of what they commit us to.

Our investigation showed that some of these merchants had gotten as much as $12 and $15 million a year in rebates on cotton that they bought, which they had in their own warehouses. Some of that cotton was reclassed for the Government by classers who worked, normally, for the buyer who would benefit from any down class. The names are shown in our hearings of 2 years ago.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman knows that to be a fact, does he not think that the Government has a case of fraud? And does the gentleman not think that his committee has the responsibility of seeing that that is prosecuted? What the gentleman has said clearly outlines a criminal offense.

Mr. WHITTEN. You know, I have just been accused of going far beyond my authority. But I do not have any control over the Department of Justice.

Let me say to my friend from Missouri, we printed these investigations. They were printed. They are in the hearings. I know the gentleman, like myself, does not have time to read all the hearings; I do not have time to read hearings from other committees sometimes, too. But may I point out to him that insofar as the testimony showed, much of this cotton that had been reclassed and on which these rebates were given was, in turn, sold in world trade at higher than the original class. This is a matter of record.

We are told that under this amendment, if it is adopted, you will not have any rebates. That is technically right but misleading, because if the present plan goes through they will not get rebates but will obtain discounts, because they will pay you 85 to 90 percent to start with, and you get a discount. Is not that something, to shift from a rebate to a discount?

What are we doing in this bill? We talk about a frank and fair market. In our limitation we say, "Reclass this cotton if you want to and put it on the counter and let everybody have the same chance to bid, not only the fellow who has it in his warehouse and has the opportunity to know what he is buying." We say, "Reclass at the time of sale if you want to, but do not sell it and then reclass."

The big shipper has an advantage. The Government pig is in his warehouse, in his poke, so he buys it sight unseen to the Government, sight unseen to his competitor. He knows what he is getting. Where he once got a rebate, now he would get a discount. We would still have to sign the check. Now he would come in and get his discount. We sign the check to restore impairment to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Let us see what is involved here. I do not want to get excited about this, but it is quite hard not to in view of some of the statements that have been made about me personally. Goodness knows, somebody had better start trying to run something. Our Committee on Agriculture sent a resolution down to the Department. Let me read what it said:

> Whereas the House Committee on Agriculture has had under consideration for the past several months questions relating to the reclassing and sale of cotton owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation; and
>
> Whereas the views of cotton producer, cotton users, and the cotton trade generally appear to be virtually unanimous that CCC cotton should be reclassed at the time of sale.

We do not do that. We do not even try to prevent reclassing at the time of sale if that is possible.

The producers, the users, and the trade generally are mentioned, as having agreed, but the taxpayer is not mentioned.

I am afraid what is wrong with this now is that we have a national farm program whereby we divide up these apples and give everybody in the deal a part of it. In this bill here today our committee has had to sign checks for about $4 billion. We had to pay back what the Commodity Credit Corporation has paid out. Actually the producers are not opposed to our position. Let me quote them. The North Carolina Cotton Promotion Association, Inc., on March 29, 1960, sent this telegram to Secretary Benson. I quote:

> North Carolina cotton producers urge 1960 regulations on reclass of CCC stocks of cotton reflect fairest price to farmers in operation. It is strongly recommended these regulations be framed to prohibit rebating purchasers following final sale.

Let me quote the message of the Tennessee Agricultural Council:

> Following wire sent today to Agriculture Secretary Benson: "Due your current consideration involving reclass of CCC cotton stocks we wish to reaffirm our previously expressed opposition to reclass except where determined to be necessary by USDA and then only before being offered for sale."

So everybody will have fair treatment.

Then I quote the Louisiana Delta Council, which sent this telegram to Secretary Benson:

> In view of continued discussion of reclassing CCC cotton stocks, we would like to restate position of this and other organizations affiliated with the American Cotton Producer Associates: "Continue prohibition against reclassing of CCC stocks after sale."

Mr. Chairman, somebody is being taken when it is said the farmers are for the huge sums being paid to the cotton traders which are charged to them.

Mr. Chairman, I apologize for being excited about this matter but it was pretty hard to take a while ago to be accused of threatening anybody. I do not believe anybody who has known me in my 19 years of Congress would say that I have ever resorted to a threat.

If you vote for this amendment, it is not going to change my feeling toward you. I will have done my best. I do say, if you vote for this amendment, you are continuing to give an unfair advantage to the big American international cotton interests who have warehouses and who have this cotton in their own warehouses. Again our committee urges the Department to reclassify cotton where it finds it necessary. Reclass it if need be and lay it on the counter and give every bidder an equal chance, and thereby protect the Government's investment. What is wrong with that? Read our limitation again. It says only that the cotton cannot be reclassed after the time of sale. You cannot sell it to somebody, and after it is the buyer's cotton go out and reclass it and give him a discount as they would now, or a rebate as they formerly did. My friends, if ever there was a time in history, if you are interested in American agriculture, now is the time to begin to protect the assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation. If you do not find some way to do it, it is not only the cotton trade that will go down but the cotton farmers as well. We have brought to

you our honest and sincere judgment with respect to this matter. We are asking for fair treatment to every bidder and buyer. Let all cotton be reclassified. Lay it on the counter. Give them all a chance. We do not believe in this extra advantage—it cost us $166 million since 1956. Again I ask you to think this matter over carefully. In this meeting that they talk about, we asked whether these buyers who would get a reclassification and a discount would sell the cotton in the world markets and in world trade at the new rate. They said, "Oh, no." We asked them if they would show us their books because they said that they lost money. There again, they said, "Oh, no." They claimed they wanted a reclassification at the time of sale. We authorize that in the bill.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Does the gentleman mean to say he contends it would be all right to reclass at the time of sale—and that is all we are proposing?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly.

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman means that a reclass is made when these people bid—and they bid on the catalog and they have the bales delivered to them—if the bales are to be reclassed when they are delivered, I do not think there is any difference of opinion between us.

Mr. WHITTEN. My friend shifted words on me.

Mr. POAGE. Is not that at the time of sale?

Mr. WHITTEN. You say, "Delivered" and I say again if there is to be a reclassification, do not let the fellow who buys the cotton that is in his warehouse who can know what he has and then reclass the cotton after it is delivered to him—which means you just give him the warehouse receipt and the cotton stays in his warehouse.

Mr. POAGE. When do you want the reclassification?

Mr. WHITTEN. Prior to the sale.

Mr. POAGE. Prior to the sale—that is the point.

Mr. WHITTEN. Here is the point—there is no such thing as a reclass at the time of sale or so I am advised. It has to be before or after. All the wires and telegrams that I received were to the effect that they wanted the reclassification at the time of sale. But, when you analyze it, there is no such thing. The reclassification is made either before it is offered for sale or after it is sold to somebody and it has been reclassified after he has made a firm sale. We say—do it in advance and give everybody an equal opportunity and let us stop this unfair practice which is costing us $166 million per year.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. I understand that you want to reclass all the cotton in the CCC stocks; is that it?

Mr. WHITTEN. I want the CCC to make its own determination.

Mr. GATHINGS. You would want to reclass the cotton before sale and not after the sale?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly.

Mr. GATHINGS. In other words, you want to reclassify the cotton before sale. As a matter of fact, there will not be too much cotton moving out of the Commodity Credit Corporation because in 1960, because of the fact they have that 115-percent support level on B cotton, it has to come out of the 115 percent above the support level of B cotton, and there will not be too much cotton moving out. If you are going to spend millions and millions of dollars here reclassifying all these stocks of cotton and then if only a little cotton is sold, and 6 months later you have to reclassify the stocks again and 6 months later you have to reclassify it again——

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I cannot yield further to my colleague. I can understand that where $166 million in rebates are concerned, they will fight very, very hard to get that right back whether it is in the form of discounts or otherwise. May I say this—the cost of reclassifying cotton is peanuts as against $166 million. Not only that but the Department says, if we reclass it we can include those charges in our selling price. They testified that they can pass it on. Let me say again, if you do have to reclass every 6 months, do not reclass at all. But, if so, then let us treat everybody alike, including the taxpayers.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. How about corn and wheat and rice that the farmers sell?

Mr. WHITTEN. If you are going to vote for this amendment, you ought to change your method of selling wheat and corn. You have not had this benefit. If these big cotton firms take this on, you can rest assured that these other big merchants in corn and rice and wheat will take it on. We cannot stand it. We are just about bankrupt. I hope you will vote down this amendment which will provide millions in discount or rebates, charged up to the farmers.

Most Members seem not to realize that we are about to lose a farm program because of payments to nonfarmers, who advocate abolishing the price support system.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I feel sorry for those who do not understand this any more than I do, and I have had some experience with it. I am going to try to make two or three statements which I hope will be helpful.

In the first place, when this cotton is originally graded, it is classed by hundreds of people employed by the U.S. Government. During the cotton season there are many people who perhaps are not as well trained in the grading of cotton as they should be. It goes into the loan as being of a certain grade, staple, or whatever it is. Then, when we get ready to have a sale of cotton, the people make a bid, and they are bidding on a certain grade, whether it is 1 inch or whatever, and naturally they expect to buy the grade which they think they are buying. As a matter of equity, if you go into a store and say you want to buy a particular grade of a product and you pay for it on that basis and you get home and you find there was a flaw or something in there, you would go back to the merchant and show him the flaw, and if he did not make you a refund I think you would have just cause to lose confidence.

What has happened in the past is this: Under the CCC sales program, when a purchaser bought cotton he looked it over. When he found that some of the cotton was overclassed he made demand for a refund, but if he found that some of it had been underclassed and he got a better bargain, he did not say anything about it. So the only cotton that was reclassed was that which had been overclassed, and it was an honest mistake that somebody made. Because it had been overclassed, a refund was made.

Now, we have said when we reclass this cotton we are not going to accept the obligation to reclass only that which the buyer picks out but it will all be reclassed, and then if some of it has been undergraded, we will get a higher price than the Government had made a loan on.

Another thing I think we should bring out is the fact that this section of this bill, whether the committee admits it or not, is legislation in an appropriations bill. I submit to you that if we are going to operate under our system of committees—I do not say that every member of the House Committee on Agriculture is an expert—I know I am not an expert, but I do believe that if I put in a lot of time and try to inform myself, on things that pertain to the agricultural economy that are referred to the Committee on Agriculture, I think the decisions on policy should be made there. Because there might be a difference of opinion between the Committee on Appropriations or the individuals on that committee—I have the greatest respect for all those on the committee—the chairman, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. ANDERSEN, and all of the other gentlemen on the committee. I do not doubt their sincerity at all. But I do say, with all sincerity, that I think the Committee on Appropriations has encroached upon the duties of the other committees of Congress. I think that policy is growing too much. I do not think that could have been sustained on a point of order, but I think anyone reading this section will admit that it is legislation.

They are legislating in this appropriation bill, which is contrary to the rules of the House.

Another statement has been made here which I think has been misleading and confusing, and I want the chairman of the committee to pay particular attention to this. The officials of the Department of Agriculture when they were before our committee when we were considering this and before our committee adopted unanimously a resolution asking the Department of Agriculture to reinstate this practice of reclassification, we asked about other commodities; and I think I am correct when I say that if

I as a purchaser go to the Department of Agriculture and buy 10,000 bushels of wheat supposed to be of a certain grade, make the purchase on that grade, but when the wheat is delivered to me it grades lower, that I do not pay the amount I originally agreed; I pay the amount based upon the class of wheat at the time of delivery. I ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] if that is correct? The gentleman made a statement a minute ago. Can he not answer my question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. JONES of Missouri was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman from Missouri I join with the gentleman from Minnesota. I was quoting him. I was also speaking my own understanding of the matter, but I am not an expert on that.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Let me rephrase my question. I do not want to be misleading. The chairman has made a statement here. He is a good friend of mine and much as I admire him on many things I think sometimes he, like the rest of us, gets a little confused.

As a matter of equity, would it be fair for the purchaser to pay the price for the commodity at the time he was buying or to pay the price for the commodity at the time it was delivered. Which would be fair?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I answer that in my own way?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Classifying is an art, not a science. The same classifier will class the same bale one way one day and another way another day.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman is evading the question. I am not going to yield further. I asked a straight question. Is it or is it not? Is it right or is it wrong? And the answer can be yes or no, or right or wrong. You are trying to get in an argument about the art of classifying cotton. That is not the question. The question is one of fact: Should a man pay for something he does not get?

Mr. WHITTEN. He bought cotton of a certain class that is offered in the catalog. This is from the stock. There is no guarantee by the catalog that they will deliver that. There is a need to reclass cotton, but the catalog does not guarantee that, on the day you get it, it will be that. It is listed in the catalog, showing the day it was classed. That governs.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I wish to yield now to the gentleman from Minnesota to answer the question about wheat and corn.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman from Missouri asks me a question concerning statements I made relative to the grading of wheat and corn?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MARSHALL. I will say to the gentleman that the buyer of stocks from the Commodity Credit Corporation buys those on the basis of the grade; he pays for it on the basis of that grade, and they are accepted on a basis of that grade. If they grade at a lower grade in his estimation he can ask for an appeal of that grade, but it does not usually affect the price which he pays for that commodity.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. What does he appeal to?

Mr. MARSHALL. He appeals to the Federal Grading Authority.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. And then if it is graded lower does he get a refund?

Mr. MARSHALL. No.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. What does he get to make up for it?

Mr. MARSHALL. I do not know of any instance on record for cotton where a rebate has been made for change of grade.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Do they give him more wheat for it? Do they give him something? My point is this: If I buy wheat and it turns out to be a lower grade than I paid for, does the gentleman mean I do not get a refund?

Mr. MARSHALL. You do not.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Why does a person appeal from a grade then? That is what I want to know; what does he get on an appeal?

Mr. MARSHALL. Attempts have been made to re-collect on that basis. To my knowledge they have not been able to do so.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If you have corn that has molded, it might be taken in as No. 2 corn. If it has deteriorated in a bin it is not going to be sold except as such.

Mr. MARSHALL. He has accepted the grade of that corn on the basis of purchase, and he accepts it on that basis. That corn may be shipped in a car for 2 weeks, then he takes an appeal, the grade is appealed, and the grade is lowered. Can the Government back up that kind of a setup?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I refuse to yield further. Let me make this statement: The gentleman has said that there is an appeal. I leave it to your reasonable judgment. If there is a provision for appeal and there is no provision for a refund what is the use of having an appeal? Does that not make sense?

Another thing. Let me say this: I am not smart, but I can listen sometimes. I do know that the representatives of at least two divisions of the Department of Agriculture have appeared before our committee this past week. I asked them specifically about this and they told me unequivocally that in the case of wheat or corn or grain if the Government made a sale and that wheat, corn, or grain did not measure up to the standards that the purchaser was paying for, there was a refund.

I make that statement unequivocally.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I direct my attention to representatives of the city who perhaps have been as confused as I have been in the past. If this amendment is adopted it will be one of the greatest boondoggles and giveaways that this Congress has ever made. We have seen the extent and the enormity of it to the tune of $166 million-plus. There have been some conversations by the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from Alabama that it is unfair for these people to get a lesser classification or lower grade than they bargained for. That is not the case, however. They know what they are getting because the representation to them is that it is a certain class on a particular date. Many of the people who are buying these commodities are warehousemen who have the cotton in their warehouses and they know the condition, they know the true classification.

Let us see what the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. McLain has to say. On page 456 of the hearings, part 3, a question was asked by Mr. WHITTEN:

> Do you just say that it is what you classed it on that day it appears in the catalog?
>
> Mr. MCLAIN. We just say "This is what it was the day it was classed."
>
> Mr. WHITTEN. So there is no misrepresentation to the buyer, is there?
>
> Mr. MCLAIN. In that sense, no.

There is no representation. They know the custom is they are buying it on the date it is classified. There may be a change, but in the past they have come in and asked for a rebate and now it is a discount, and that has cost the Government, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, $166 million.

If you continue this type of practice, the city folks will say, "Well, a plague on both your houses," and it will destroy the farm program. The farmers will be in another terrible fix.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. May I say to the gentleman that our committee has made no such proposal. Our recommendation was to the effect that the procedure should not involve rebates to purchasers. We abhor that $166 million rebate just as much as your committee does, but what we are saying is that a man should not be forced to buy a pig in a sack.

Mr. SANTANGELO. The gentleman knows and the trade knows that they buy it as it is classified, and if you will look at page 458, you will find out the number of warehousemen who have the cotton stored in their warehouses, and they know what it is. They are not being deceived or fooled.

Mr. COOLEY. You are talking about something that is water over the mill. Let me read a statement, and this is important. This is language of Mr. McLain:

> I have been pretty close to the grain business all my life and know that all grain is bought and sold on the basis of what it is the day that you buy and sell it.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Apparently he is telling the legislative committee one thing and then telling the Committee on Appropriations another thing. I trust this amendment will fail.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. One short question. I am asking this in all sincerity. Does the gentleman believe that

the recommendation made by the House Committee on Agriculture that the Department adopt a certain procedure, or to put it in another way, do you think that we are asking them to go back and do exactly as they did, say, 2 years ago?

Mr. SANTANGELO. The gentleman from North Carolina answered that question. He said you are asking not to go back. That is the answer to your question. But, what we are saying, it should be classified before it is sold so that they will be protected more than they have been protected in the past, but they know that up to this point they are buying the thing as it was classified when it is in the catalog.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Do you think we have not made some provision in there to protect against the very thing that you are saying and we are not reverting to the past practices but asking for equity?

Mr. SANTANGELO. We are asking that the farmer be protected and also the purchaser; that the cotton not be classified after sale, with none of these rebates or discounts, which is discrediting this farm program.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I come from a cotton growing district made up of very small cotton farmers. I believe I represent in the State of Mississippi more cotton farmers—not more cotton acres, but more cotton farmers than any other Member from our delegation.

I am not in the slightest affiliated with nor interested in international cotton shippers, cotton merchants or any of the so-called big-business cotton people. However, my philosophy of government is such, it has been and always will be, that I believe my Government ought to deal rightly and fairly with all people, irrespective of their size or whomever they happen to be. It is my feeling that American citizens should all have equitable treatment at the hands of their government. It is with that philosophy, and that view that I address myself to this amendment, that I support it and beg you to support it. I believe it is right. I believe it is fair; and I believe it is in the interest of the cotton industry, particularly the cotton farmers of my congressional district.

I have the highest regard for my colleague from Mississippi, an able member of my delegation, and an able and effective Member of this House. I concede to him that he was motivated by the highest of principles when he included the language in this bill which we propose to strike. It just happens that my committee, all 34 members thereof, completely disagree with him and his colleagues on the Appropriations Committee.

What are we asking this House to do? We are asking you to permit the establishment of a program for the disposal of Commodity Credit cotton in identically the same manner that it disposes of other commodities to which it has taken title. What we seek is to bring the cotton disposal program in line with the disposal of wheat, corn, feed grains, and all other commodity stocks. We are asking that the Department apply the same rules and the same regulations to all commodities alike, which rules and regulations we firmly believe to be sound and equitable and which we also believe will be in the best interest of our farmers. We do not seek special privileges for anyone. In fact, these are things which we protest and abhor. We would not under any circumstances be a party to such.

With all deference to those who have contended to the contrary, I can assure you that if you go to the Commodity Credit Corporation and purchase wheat or corn of a certain quality and a certain grade, if the Corporation does not deliver to you the quality or grade which you purchased, then you are entitled to and you will receive an adjustment. As my colleague from Missouri [Mr. JONES] pointed out a few minutes ago, there is a systematic means of appeal made available for that specific purpose. The Government is bound to make good on its representations. The only sort of Government which refuses to make good on those conditions is found behind the Iron Curtain.

How does the proposal which we support function with reference to cotton? The cotton is cataloged according to staple and grade. It is offered for sale according to staples and grades. When a purchaser orders from that catalog he is entitled to have delivered not only the quantity ordered but also the cotton of the staple and grade which he ordered.

Let us compare the situation to that of a wholesale hardware house which lists items for sale according to quality and grade in its catalog. Therein you will find listed certain sizes and grades of pipe. Let us say that from the catalog you ordered 6-inch pipe. They shipped it to you but when it is delivered you find it is 8-inch pipe. If the delivery happens to be of a better grade as in this case and a higher priced pipe than that which you ordered, then you should pay the difference, that is, if you keep it. That is what we propose in the amendment we offer here today. If it is of a cheaper grade, such as 4-inch pipe, then you are entitled to a credit, that is, if you retain it. That is exactly what we support here today with regard to the disposition of Government stocks of cotton. If you order from the Government's catalog a particular bale of cotton which you cannot see (and you cannot see it because the stocks are stacked in warehouses, four, six, or eight bales in height, spread over an area of acres and acres), then you are entitled to have delivered exactly the quality which you ordered.

If it is found upon delivery that the purchaser has received a higher quality cotton than that which he ordered, then our amendment requires him to pay for it, in full. If the delivered order is found to be of a poorer quality then the purchaser is required to pay only for that which he received.

This is exactly what the Department of Agriculture is proposing in its disposal program. Certainly the equity of it cannot be challenged. And we of the legislative committee support it because it is equitable. I have never found that we got in trouble when we deal rightly and fairly with our people.

There may be some in our country—and unfortunately there are a few—who offer to sell goods of a certain quality and then deliver goods of a poorer quality. In some instances they get by with it. But that does not make it right.

Do you think your Federal Government should be permitted to do that? Do you think it is right? Do you think it is fair? Do you think it has merit? Is it the sort of example you would have your Government establish? Or be a party to? Are you going to force the establishment of a sales program which would deny the great Government of the United States of America the privilege of making restitution for its mistakes? Or will you require our Government to live up to the same principles that we expect of ourselves as citizens? Actually this issue is just that simple.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about this $166 million refund. What is the truth about it? These refunds were made possible under another program, under another set of rules. We do not approve that program or system, either. We do not seek its reinstatement as has been inferred. We agree it was wrong, and we congratulate our colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations for complaining about it. We salute them for uprooting and putting a stop to it. We think they rendered a fine service to our Government and also to our farm people. All of us stand foursquare on that point.

Under the old program, these merchants bought cotton from the Commodity Credit Corporation. On delivery they picked out the good bales and said, "Oh, we have a premium here so we are not going to ask that these higher quality bales be reclassed. We will just retain these." But some of the cotton delivered was not up to the quality of that which they purchased. So, they sought and regained a reclass of this particular cotton. Thus the rebates of $166 million.

That program was a mistake. We fully agree with that. Such should never have been permitted. The administrators of the program made a mistake and a bad one. They are not proposing to return to such a disposal program and we would not condone or tolerate it if they did.

We have now recommended to the department that it put into effect a disposal program which has been endorsed from one end of the cotton belt to the other—the cotton farmers, the cotton trade and everybody that I know of—including the American Farm Bureau Federation which is the largest farm organization in America.

We are seeking the institution of a program which will require the entire delivery to be reclassed, not just a part but all of it. If the grade delivered is better than that which the purchaser bid

for, then he will be required to pay for the better grade; if it is of a lower grade then he will be required to pay only for the lower grade. Is that not right? Is that not what should be done?

Now, my friends on the Appropriations Committee themselves say they do not object to a reclass. In fact, they recommend it. But they say reclass all of the Federal stocks before every sale. Nothing could be more costly or impossible.

I think I can straighten you out on that. Do you know how many bales of cotton there are in storage today? I understand that there are about 8 million now stored in Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

Do you know how often they have these sales? As often as once a week, several sales each month.

Are you going to require the Government to spend 69.7 cents a bale—which is the approximate cost—to reclass every bale when we know only a small portion will be sold? And then follow this up, week after week, sale after sale? It would cost better than $5 million to reclass every bale right now? Is this to be done over and over and over before each sale? Why it would soon wreck the Commodity Credit Corporation. If the entire stock moved out on one sale the proposal would have merit. But on the contrary only a small amount is bid off at each sale.

Of course, you are not going to require such as that, but that is what our friends on the Appropriations Committee have contended should be done. It is most impracticable and too costly. We ask that they reclass only the amount which was purchased by the merchant.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thank my distinguished chairman. We ask that the reclassing be limited to only that which the purchaser bought.

Who is going to pay for the reclassing under the program which we, on the legislative committee, are supporting? Would the Government have to pay? No; the Government would not pay one dime of it. But that is what the Committee on Appropriations is recommending. They not only recommend that the Government reclass at its expense the entire 8 million bales of cotton before the next sale, but they recommend that this be the practice before every sale. Mr. Chairman, we are confident they just have not studied this matter through. Under the program which we of the legislative committee support and which the Department has announced, this costly expense would be avoided completely, and the cost of reclassing all purchases will be paid for by the purchaser.

Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that this hassle has taken place this afternoon. Maybe it is not quite correct to describe it as a hassle because I recognize the sincerity of everyone and the existence of honest differences of opinion. I concede to those who differ with us the right to their views and I have no doubt but that they concede the same to us. I regret that the issues could not have been fought out in the committee rooms. As for our committee we had no knowledge that the Appropriations Committee would tack a limitation on its bill which is nothing short of legislation and actually the prerogative of the legislative committee. Therefore, we would have been derelict in our duty and responsibility if we had not met the issue head on.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I want to repeat, all we are asking you to do is to require the Government of the United States, of which you and I are a part and an arm thereof, to live up to its representations and to the same degree of scrupulous dealings that is expected of its citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] has expired.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture nor a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I have the highest affection and the most profound regard for both the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the chairman of the subcommittee presiding over this legislation. If it were not for the fact that the office of the Commodity Credit Corporation which handles this program is located in my city, and if it were not for the fact that many millions of bales of this cotton move through the port which I represent, I would not presume on this body to enter into this debate. But in view of the fact that this is the case, I hope you will bear with me for just a few moments.

I was much interested in the remarks of my good friend from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO] when he referred to the basic difficulties confronting people who represent urban districts in connection with the farm program generally. It happens that I represent a district that is almost as urban as that represented by the gentleman from New York. I would say to the gentleman and to the chairmen of this committee and the Committee on Agriculture that what we are concerned with is a Pandora's box of a program which has turned over the entire cotton industry to the Federal Government.

This problem being discussed would not have arisen if we had normal channels of trade and commerce for the disposition of cotton. Formerly the producer, the trader, the merchant, the textile mill all did business across the table.

Were that the case now you would not have this trouble. But the truth is the Government today is the main factor in all cotton operations.

I was quite amazed last year to learn that on a day when for the first time in modern history no cotton moved on the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, on that very day the Community Credit Corporation, or the Government of the United States, sold something like a half million bales of cotton. So that at the time when the merchants and exchanges, and all the rest of them, were laying off personnel because they had no work for them to do, the Commodity Credit Corporation in New Orleans was putting on hundreds of extra people to handle this program.

So that if there ever was a program—and I say this without being critical of anyone—where the Government has taken over lock, stock, and barrel, it is the cotton program. This is what happens when you have almost complete Government operation. I do not know what the solution is. I do not pretend to give you a solution, but I do know that we have opened up all kinds of Pandora boxes. And I know that the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina is fair and necessary if the cotton exchanges could function we would not need the amendment because the Government would not own all the cotton.

I heard my good friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PILCHER], who sits on the Foreign Affairs Committee, talking about the great international merchants; and I have heard all these names thrown around, all of these comments about boondoggling, and so on and so forth.

I am not too much influenced by them, for all of you know people use these adjectives to discredit or credit an operation. But I will say that if there ever was a boondoggle it is this differential that for some reason or other we have had to create so that if you buy cotton for consumption in Japan you pay 6 or 8 cents less than you do for cotton for consumption in Georgia or in North Carolina or in South Carolina. We have had to do this, we are told, in order to get this cotton into channels of world trade. The so-called international merchants are the ones who moved about 6 million bales of it this year under this program. This comes back to our Committee on Ways and Means, because the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] complains, and probably with some justification, if not a great deal, about the discrimination against the textile industry in the United States as a result of this price differential for foreign textile mills.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Reserving the right to object, and I do not want to, I would like to have some indication about how many Members wish to speak on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, the last 5 being reserved to the Committee.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would like 10 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. I cannot agree to that, the gentleman understands.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I sat here patiently all afternoon listening to the debate on the other side of the aisle and have had no opportunity to speak. I re-

spectfully request that I be afforded 10 minutes' time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my consent request; I do not want to preclude the gentleman if he wants later to get recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana that he proceed for 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, the reason I mention all this is because I think it is pertinent. I hear much talk about scandal in warehousing. I do not know whether there is any scandal in it or not, although I hear people talking about it; but, after all, we know that cotton textile mills used to pay for warehousing cotton. If the Government of the United States pays for it—and today the Government is the biggest warehouser in the business—the mills will not. Now the Government pays.

All this means that today the question is: What kind of merchant is the Government? That is really what is involved here.

Is reclassification something new in the cotton business? I do not think so. As far as I know it has been going on ever since people have been trading in cotton; and as far as I know it was carried on until July 31, 1959, by the Commodity Credit Corporation. I can assure the gentleman from Minnesota that I am as much opposed to rebate, to fraud, to boondoggling as he is; but I also believe in fairness, in equity, and justice. The gentleman in response to the question of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] regarding grain made certain assertions. I will read to the gentleman from testimony on the 1960 cotton program, a joint hearing before the Subcommittee on Cotton, and so forth, Committee of the U.S. Senate, testimony of Mr. McLain, in response to a question which I asked. I asked the identical question the gentleman from Missouri asked; and Mr. McLain, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, said this:

Congressman BOGGS, grain is sold on the basis of the grade the same day it is sold. You would not think of selling a carload of corn unless the fellow you sold it to had a right to get a grade the day he sold it. He would think that you were stupid if you talked about anything else.

I do not know whether there are any grainmen here, but this is true.

The cotton people think this is a privilege they ought to have. I personally, and I am speaking personally now, have a lot of sympathy for that point of view.

I said:

How is grain sold?

It is sold in many ways.

I said:

I do not know. Tell me about it.

He said:

I have been around long enough to know when people buy grain that they like to know what they are buying, not what the grade was at 6 or 3 months ago, but today.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I am so much pleased that the gentleman called that to my attention because that is exactly what I intended to say. The grain we have been talking about is graded on the day it is sold, not 3 months afterward.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to inject myself into the heat that seems to be involved here between these two great committees. As I said in the beginning, I have profound respect for both of them. The thing that concerns me about the language written into the legislation by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is that it is an absolute prohibition against the trade practice which I think is completely legitimate and which has been carried on by the trade ever since it has been in existence.

The language suggested by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] may have some defects, I do not know, but it permits this body working in conjunction with the other body to work this thing out so that it can be fair and equitable to the people who purchase cotton. I say this is what we should do.

In conclusion and in reiterating what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] says, may I say that this is what the Government of the United States should do. If the Government of the United States has become the biggest warehousemen, the biggest storer, the biggest seller, the biggest exporter, then the Government of the United States owes the same degree of integrity as any other vendor and for us to do less than that is simple dishonesty.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cooley amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] to proceed for an additional 5 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to clarify the RECORD as to the grading of corn and wheat. I think there should be no question that every bushel of grain delivered in this country is at the grade at the date of delivery. Now, when the Commodity Credit Corporation sells grain, the purchaser pays for the actual grade delivered by the Commodity Credit Corporation. If a warehouseman storing grain for the Commodity Credit Corporation delivers grain of a higher grade than called for by Commodity Credit Corporation warehouse receipts, the excess value is credited to a premium account. Later, if he delivers a lower grade than called for by the Commodity Credit Corporation warehouse receipt, the discount which would be assessed against him is offset against this premium account. Cash is not paid for deliveries of grain to the Commodity Credit Corporation if of a higher grade than called for by the warehouse receipt. I hope that will clarify the RECORD.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not pose as an expert on cotton. In fact, I know very little about it, although I have learned a lot about that commodity during my several years as a member of the Committee on Agriculture. The procedure for Commodity Credit Corporation cotton sales has for some time now been a point of dispute between the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee on one side and the House Committee on Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture on the other side. Naturally the members of the Committee on Agriculture, the legislative committee, are jealous of our rights and prerogatives. It has been clearly indicated heretofore, that there has been entirely too much of this usurpation of the committee's rights and prerogatives.

Section 408 of the bill is also controversial. That section is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency. It seems to me that the legislative committees of the House should establish policy and do the legislating and let the Committee on Appropriations appropriate the money.

The proviso in the bill relating to reclassing of cotton would, in effect, reverse the announced method that the Commodity Credit Corp. will use in selling its cotton, and it would require a return to "catalog buying," which practical experience has proved unsound. Under the announced method of operation, the Commodity Credit Corp. will take in cotton from farmers under nonrecourse loans, and by direct purchaser, under the "A" program. After the required period of time has expired and if farmers have not repaid their nonrecourse loans, the Commodity Credit Corp. will take title to the cotton. This cotton is classed and graded at the time it comes under loan, or is purchased. At a later date, which is often several years, the Commodity Credit Corp. will sell the cotton by competitive bids but will guarantee a certain quality. Even under ideal storage the quality of cotton tends to deteriorate with age. After the sale the cotton will be reclassified at the buyer's expense, and if it does not meet the guaranteed quality, the Commodity Credit Corp. will make an adjustment for the buyer. If the quality is above that guaranteed quality, the Commodity Credit Corp. will receive an adjustment from the buyer. This is completely fair, equitable, and just.

Mr. Chairman, it may be rather unique for a corn farmer to take the floor in behalf of the small cotton farmers, and shippers. What we are proposing to do here by striking this provision from the bill is for the benefit of the small cotton

farmer. The big cotton farmer can take care of himself. He knows the ins and outs of the trade. It is the little fellow who needs our protection.

The present announced procedure is better, first, because it treats all commodities alike. Commodity Credit Corporation sells its other commodities on the basis of reclassification at the time of sale. It is sound administration to treat cotton in the same manner.

Secondly, it is a sound and equitable method of doing business. It is fair to both the buyer and the seller. The buyer knows what he is getting rather than buying a "pig in a poke" as proposed by the bill.

And, thirdly, the procedure under which adjustments are made is a two-way street. If cotton reclasses higher than that agreed upon, the buyer must reimburse CCC. What could be more fair and equitable and just?

Reclassification before final settlement is necessary to assure purchasers that they will receive what they pay for. This is particularly important to small shippers. Large merchants can operate better than small merchants when reclassification is not permitted, since they can operate on the basis of averages on a large volume of cotton. Small merchants handling limited quantities of cotton find it difficult and could incur substantial losses on particular lots of cotton. Therefore, it is highly desirable to keep small merchants in the program to the maximum extent practicable.

As to saving some money, the Department of Agriculture is convinced, and I am convinced, that selling cotton subject to reclass yields a higher net return to CCC on its investment and minimizes rather than adds to the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation. While an adjustment is required when cotton is sold in this manner, it is believed that, if cotton were not sold subject to reclass, buyers would have recognized the fact that the cotton may deteriorate after extended storage periods and protect themselves by submitting lower bids.

And so approval of the amendment is going to save the CCC some money. Both the Committee on Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture feel that the proviso set out in the bill is unsound because it would again, as I say, require "catalog buying," buying a "pig in a poke," which would be detrimental to the small shipper when the purchases from a great big pile of stored cotton in the warehouses, he knows he has to gamble, whereas the sharp, big operator, the big shipper, knows what he is doing, and can afford to put in a lower bid.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. I do not quite understand; after a reclass, is there a protection to the taxpayer and the Government against a windfall just as there is to the purchaser?

Mr. HOEVEN. There is; if the quality is above a guaranteed quality, CCC receives an adjustment from the buyer. It works both ways.

Mr. PELLY. Under the Cooley amendment?

Mr. HOEVEN. Yes. It saves the taxpayer money and saves the CCC money. The proposed amendment is fair, equitable, and just and should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I think there have been altogether too many things said this afternoon but some things still need to be said. I have no ill feeling toward anyone. I do not charge any improper action, but I do feel that the subcommittee has exercised unsound judgment.

I think we should point out clearly that what we of the Agricultural Committee are asking the Government to do is exactly what that same Government requires of individuals. When individuals make sales of this kind they have to make good, they have to deliver what they purport to offer. I think a good many of our Members do not understand, even after the prolonged discussion, as to how CCC cotton is sold.

Cotton is sold from a catalog, a book, a big book like the telephone book. It says that 500 bales of Strict Middling cotton is in a warehouse at Waco, Tex. Cotton buyers all over the country are invited to bid. They have no way of seeing the cotton. They must bid on the representations in the catalog. If they bid as much as the minimum they will be considered. If anybody bids above the first bid, the high bidder gets the cotton. They are bidding on something which is described to them by their Government. They are told that this is Strict Middling cotton, and if it turns out that it is Low Middling, they are certainly not getting what they bid on. Is it fair for the U.S. Government to sell cotton that way? I think the gentleman who preceded me explained it very well. Certainly the big cotton firms are going to know about how much of this cotton will be overclassed and how much underclassed. They will know the average, by which all cotton may be expected to fall under the catalog grades, and they will bid low enough that overall they will suffer no loss. The law of averages—the basis of all insurance will protect the large cotton firms—at the expense of the Government. Surely the Government will get less for the commodities it sells when there is an uncertainty as to the quality of what it sells. Surely, the small cotton buyer cannot protect himself because the law of averages offers him no help. If you or I were to buy 1,000 bales of cotton thinking it to be Strict Middling, and it turned out to be Strict Low Middling, it would break us. That is why the big firms can live under the subcommittee's proposal while the small buyers cannot.

If we do not believe in maintaining grades we ought not to have grades in the United States. The reason we have grades in all commodities is that we believe it enables the producer to get a fair market and for the buyer to know just what he is buying. That is the only purpose of having grades. If we are to describe cotton by grade and then not have the U.S. Government live up to the announced grades, then it seems to me we had better quit grading any commodity.

There are a number of other fields of misunderstanding, but in only 2 minutes I cannot go into many of them. The gentleman from Minnesota is under a severe misapprehension when he tells us that wheat and feed grain grades are not made good. The U.S. Government sells wheat and feed grains on the basis of the grade at the time of the sale. The grade is taken at that time and that is all that we are asking for cotton. Grain is graded at the warehouse at the time it is weighed out to the buyer; we ask that cotton be graded at the time it is delivered. We do not sell grain by catalog. There is no such thing as selling these grains by catalog. They are sold by actual inspection, and it is made at the time of the sale. That is all in the world we are asking for cotton.

Mr. MARSHALL. If the gentleman will yield, I want to concur in what the gentleman says. That is what I have been trying to say, too.

Mr. POAGE. That is all we ask for cotton; that it be classed at the time it is sold. We just ask for cotton that the buyer should be able to see what he is getting at the time of delivery—he cannot see before delivery—and that if it develops that the Government cannot deliver what it advertised that it should adjust the price in line with what is actually delivered. If you are not going to allow cotton to be classed at the time it is sold you are asking it be classed a long time before it is sold. The result must be to cause the bids to be considerably less than they would otherwise be.

When you seek to involve your Government in some sharp practices which would not be tolerated in private business you must expect the Government to lose in the long run. I urge you to do the fair and the honorable thing. I urge you to let those who buy cotton from their Government have the same assurance of truthful representations that they would have if they were dealing with private business, or even if they were buying grain from the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE].

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express support for the amendment that has been proposed. I also want to express to the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture my appreciation of the courtesies they have extended to me from year to year in the opportunities to present testimony before them. I sincerely appreciate it.

I was interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] in which he comments on the fact that cotton finds itself in a situation where Government is now the biggest exporter, Government is the biggest warehouser of cotton, and Government is the biggest seller of cotton. This is a fact in relation to the commodity cotton in which many of us have been very much concerned as we analyze new farm pro-

grams. I think his remarks to that point are a good warning to those who think Government planning for every commodity is the only answer to American agriculture.

This predicament in which cotton finds itself repeatedly, as exemplified by the confusion in the discussion of this detail this afternoon, is a very good point to keep in mind as we think of farm programs which are supposed to be in the best interest of the American farmer.

I urge support of the proposed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, not being a member of either of the committees involved in this discussion today, I am a little reluctant to inject my remarks into the program. However, coming from an area which is both a heavy cotton producing area and the heaviest cotton manufacturing area in the United States, I believe I have a bona fide interest in this matter. As I understand the Cooley amendment, its effect would be to put a purchaser from the Government in the same position as a purchaser from a private seller.

Some of you gentlemen, perhaps, are not familiar with the customs of the cotton trade. When a cotton manufacturer or a cotton buyer purchases cotton from a seller, it is subject to classification—or reclass, if you desire to call it that. Then if the parties are unable to agree on the reclass, under the standard cotton contract the classification is then submitted to arbitration.

The parties are bound to abide by the decision of the arbiters.

As I understand this amendment, it would merely say when an individual buys from the Government on the basis of a catalog quotation, saying that the cotton is Strict Middling of a certain staple length, then if it does not come up to that specification, the purchaser is entitled to have a classification and to get what he has agreed to buy from the Government in the first instance. That is to say, the buyer should only pay a price commensurate with the quality of the cotton delivered to him. I submit to you that this is merely fair play. It is consistent with the customs of the trade.

I cannot see how the adoption of the Cooley amendment will in any way prejudice the position of the farmer who, in the first instance, is selling this cotton to the Government. His transaction is over. He sold it at a certain classification which, apparently, was agreeable to him—or he put it under the loan program. The farmer is not injured in any way. If it is injurious to purchaser, then the Government should live up to its contract and to its agreement with the purchaser. Our Government should do the right thing with those people who are purchasing on a quotation from the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I hope we can bring this question into a little better perspective. Many accusations have been hurled by people who, I think, have honest differences of opinion. But first of all, I would like to make it clear that the members of the legislative committee are not in any way connected with the large exporters or with the warehousemen, as has been charged here today. I am not a member of the cotton subcommittee, but it was my privilege to listen to the testimony throughout the hearings. I listened to the testimony, I feel, with an open mind and impartially. First of all, these hearings were conducted in a very fine and open manner. Everyone who was interested in this problem was asked to testify. Both the chairman of the legislative committee and the appropriations subcommittee were present. The resolution that was adopted by the legislative committee was read in part, but all of it was not read, and I would like to read it at this time:

> Whereas this committee has had under consideration for the past several months questions relating to the reclassing and sale of cotton owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation; and
>
> Whereas the views of cotton producers, cotton users, and the cotton trade generally appear to be virtually unanimous that CCC cotton should be reclassed at the time of sale: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is urged to put into effect as expeditiously as possible the uniform policy of reclassing all CCC cotton at the time of its sale and that this be done in such a manner that the procedure will not involve rebates to the purchaser but that, instead, the final price of the cotton which the purchaser will be obligated to pay will be determined by the reclassing carried out at the time of sale and that all of every lot of cotton sold shall be reclassified.

As I understand it, that is exactly the same procedure that is asked for and is given to the grain trade.

This is the testimony of Secretary McLain before the committee:

> I have been very close to the grain business all my life and know that all grain is bought and sold on the condition of what it is the day that you buy it and sell it.

That is everything in the world we are asking for under this Cooley amendment, that this cotton be classed what it is the day you buy it or the day you sell it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] is recognized.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I think it has been established that this language sought to be stricken is not legislation, and that the Appropriations Committee is completely within its rights in putting in a restriction against the possibility of loss to the American taxpayers of $166 million in the future. The other committee has this correspondence with the Department, but why in the world we should not take a firm stand and have something written in ink instead of water is beyond me. I think this language should be allowed to remain in the bill. I think this language is fair. Certainly it is fair to the American taxpayers, and it ought to be allowed to remain in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] is recognized.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of either of the committees that have been discussing this bill, but I am concerned with this provision because it is the understanding of the people in my area that this language would tend to preclude the movement of cotton out of Commodity Credit warehouses and would simply cause potential buyers to lay off and refuse to purchase cotton.

I think that basically we agree in principle. We agree that some of these rebates and some of the things they have found to have happened in their investigations have certainly not been good. They are things that should be prohibited. But it seems to me that the language which has been used here is not in the best interests of the cotton industry. If allowed to remain exactly as it is in the bill, it could preclude the movement of a lot of cotton from the Commodity Credit warehouses.

In handling cotton, if a potential purchaser desires to buy 10,000 bales of cotton and makes an offer of a certain price, say 30 cents per pound for middling inch cotton, and the Government says, "We will take it on that basis," then of course the purchaser wants to know that he is going to receive value in line with what his offer is. This language which says "after the time of sale" becomes rather important. When is the sale consummated? I would like to ask the chairman that question.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say what our intent was. At the time the trade is closed. That is the time of sale. We mean it is reclassed in time to offer it to all business. There is no question as to what we intended.

Mr. SISK. As a practical matter, it seems to me you are saying that the Government would have to go in constantly and reclassify this cotton every month or every year in order to have it available for sale. Otherwise, the purchaser would have no way of knowing exactly the grade at that particular time.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that the section dealing with poultry inspection was stricken from the bill on a point of order. It is my hope that the other body will restore this language and further my understanding that the members of the subcommittee will accept the provisions in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] is recognized.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, sometimes you get to the point in debate where you get a little bit away from the subject, although I must say this debate has generated a great deal of discussion and much of it has been to the point.

I would like to read the language that has been objected to and which the amendment would strike out:

Provided further, That no part of these funds may be used to formulate or administer a program which provides for reclassing of Commodity Credit Corporation cotton after time of sale to private individuals or organizations.

What is wrong with that language? Just what is wrong with it? It means exactly what it says, that it is sold at the time of sale and no reclassifying to permit rebate after that time. If you want to open up the door—this is the Treasury, remember—you are starting a precedent here. How can you hold the line on wheat, corn, and all the rest of the commodities the Commodity Credit Corporation holds on a basis of that kind? I could not venture to guess how much that would cost the taxpayers of this country.

I think this debate has been wholesome; I think it has been good. I admire all my friends on the committee and have as much respect for them as I ever did. It is a good committee.

Much has been said about jurisdiction. Having served on the Committee on Appropriations I must say that we are subject to criticism. There are numerous times when we on appropriations do things we know in the eyes of many people are unpopular, but we feel duty-bound, with the responsibility you have delegated to us, to watch for what we think are loopholes and those things that we think will render programs more economical and more efficient. Your Appropriations Committee, not only our subcommittee, but other subcommittees, have saved literally millions of dollars to the taxpayers of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

(By unanimous consent Mr. Bow was allowed to yield his time to Mr. WHITTEN.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized for 7½ minutes to close debate on this amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say that in the heat of debate we say lots of things, but I want to say again what some of my friends may have heard me say frequently before: I have never tried to threaten or throw any weight around. I learned long since that not all people on the committee or subcommittee will agree with me. While our efforts have been successful many times, there have been others where we have not succeeded. I learned a long time ago not to say, "I will do so and so." I have never hesitated to say where I will stand, but I have never threatened anybody in the Department of Agriculture, I have not indicated that I would take anything out or that I would put something in; but I have said I would stand for what I think is right.

Let us see again where disagreement comes about. Most arguments come up because folks do not agree on what the facts are. Let me say again that cotton classing is an art, not a science; it is not an exact science in the least.

It is testified repeatedly before our committee that you can have the same bale of cotton classed by 10 classers, and they will differ among themselves; and you can have it reclassed a month later, the same bale, and if they did not know it, the same classers would differ again. It is a matter of judgment.

Again, we have millions of bales of cotton that are stored in warehouses. The Government pays the warehouse charges. Your big international cotton traders own much warehousing. They have the CCC cotton in these warehouses. I would recall to your minds the quotation read by my colleague from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO]. The Department testified that there is no misrepresentation in offering any of this cotton. A few years ago they had cotton which had been on hand for 7 or 8 years. Perhaps reclass was essential. However it is essential that it be listed in a catalog so all bidders can bid with full knowledge.

Let me say that all cotton is classed. The catalog shows when and what the judgment of the classer was at the time of classing. There is no misrepresentation nor any guarantee.

A man who buys cotton from CCC takes that fact into consideration when he bids.

Here is what we tried to do. I have heard everybody on the floor say, and I have done it, and our report points it out, that we have spent $26 billion in the name of agriculture and that perhaps everybody in the world is getting something out of it, yet the farmer today is much worse off. He needs farm legislation, perhaps worse than does the Treasury.

Our committee did have an investigation made of the sale of cotton to these cotton traders after we had virtually forced competitive sales, and it was found that $166 million was paid out in rebates to shippers. This showed up as a loss to the Commodity Credit Corporation and thus has been charged to farmers, big and little, where others got the money.

I said earlier I am not bragging about the signing of any checks. Sometimes I am ashamed that I cannot hold the expense of the Department down better than we have been able to do. Unfortunately frequently the horse is gone, when we get called in.

The trade insisted we would ruin everything if we stopped reclass after sale.

Do you know how we stopped it? We pointed out the facts to Secretary Benson and he stopped it for a year. And in that year when they reclassed all cotton, as our subcommittee recommends, they sold 6 million bales of cotton. There was no reclass, no discount. It worked very effectively and the Government received more cash.

The same group that got the $166 million has conceived the idea now that they will not ask for a rebate, they will ask for an arrangement whereby they may pay 90 percent of the purchase price, and then adjust, based on reclass after the cotton is theirs.

I have the highest regard for the Legislative Committee. I do not appreciate some things said here today. If the question here is a matter of which committee runs the Department it is not of my making. The facts are that for years the Department has done precious little listening to us. We have differed with them, but we cannot run them.

What can be more fair than this? Everybody within the sound of my voice knows that the Commodity Credit Corporation has a tremendous investment and that the officers of the Corporation owe it to the people to get as much as they can for the commodities they have. They can get better bids if they reclass, lay it out on the counter so that everybody can bid. Do you not think we have an obligation to say if you are going to reclass this cotton, please reclass it and lay it out on the counter so that there will be some competition in the sale.

These shippers do not want equal treatment, they want an advantage. They are unwilling to let the Government lay it out on the counter at a new class. They are unwilling to bid against their competitors. In our provision we say to the Department if you want to reclass, do so, but please lay it out and have some competition in its sale, and we will not have so much depletion of the capital of the corporation under those circumstances. To refuse that appears to us to be asking an unfair advantage.

Let me say one other thing. Here is the difference between cotton, corn and wheat. In reclassing corn and wheat, when you have it reclassed and export it, the exporter has to offer in world trade at the new class. Where cotton shippers have gotten reductions through reclassing in the process they have picked up from $14 to $20 a bale in some instances, and they have sold in world trade at higher than the first class. These facts are clearly shown in our investigators' reports which are included in the hearings. They do not offer such CCC cotton in world trade at the new class as is required with grain.

Now, there has been much ado and argument made on jurisdiction. We do not have it so far as running the Department is concerned. This is simply a limit on the use of funds, which is within the rights of our committee, if we can sell it to the Congress. That is all it is. Somehow, I sense the outcome. It has been said you can defeat anybody on merit, but it is difficult to defeat anyone where millions of dollars are involved.

However strong the hopes of our colleagues on that committee may be as to what the Department will now do, if their amendment is adopted the language goes out and we will not have a thing in the world to prevent their going back to the system of rebates.

Here today we decide whether we will begin to bring some economy in the running of our agricultural program. We must, first because it is right, and because if we do not we will lose our farm program, at least in my opinion.

If the amendment is approved it will be up to the Department. The Department can do as it pleases, and again, if they do not go back to rebate but try this new system of selling and collecting 85 percent, reclassing, then giving dis-

counts, it is tweedle-dee and tweedle-dum, as I see it. That is the same as rebates.

Mr. Chairman, in our bill we give them everything they said they wanted. We merely would prevent reclass after title has passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-five Members are present, a quorum.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COOLEY) there were—ayes 85, noes 65.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. COOLEY and Mr. WHITTEN.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 116, noes 67.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 31, line 23, after the word "provision", strike the period, insert a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to formulate or administer any program which does not provide for maximum use of Government-owned facilities for storing surplus commodities."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to do a vain thing. I would just as soon have a ruling on the point of order and not make a speech in the event the point of order is sustained.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman showed me the amendment. I reserved the point of order so he could explain it. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Yates amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. I shall not press the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is obvious. One of the most staggering costs of the farm program is the amount of money that is expended for storage. As was pointed out in the report of the committee, in 1959 storage and handling charges totaled $481.7 million. For 1960 storage charges for surplus commodities are estimated at $612 million. For the fiscal year which is the subject of this bill storage charges are expected to exceed $700 million.

The Government itself owns facilities in which there can be stored 985 million bushels. These facilities are not being completely used. When I mentioned my amendment to a number of Members, they said, in surprise, "Aren't these facilities being used at the present time?" The answer is no. These facilities are being used only partially at the present time. They are being used to the extent of only 65 percent.

Next year storage charges are going to be increased drastically. Why should they not be kept to a minimum? Why should not the taxpayers be protected by making sure Government storage facilities will be used? There is no reason why commercial facilities should be utilized when Government space is available at a much lower cost.

May I read from the hearings at page 549 the colloquy between the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] and Mr. Berger, Administrator of the Commodity Stabilization Service. Mr. MARSHALL said:

It has also been said that it is the policy of the Department of Agriculture to automatically use newly constructed private facilities for takeover gain in preference to existing Government-owned facilities regardless of whether there was any need for that in the area or not. Are these reports correct?

Mr. BERGER. That is true.

A little later Mr. MARSHALL said, and there is a wistful quality in his voice as I read it:

It seems a little strange that the taxpayer should be called upon to pay for this storage in a newly constructed private facility when there is already plenty of space in the Government elevator.

The gentleman's amazement is understandable. Should these surplus commodities be sent to commercial warehouses when Government facilities are available? Do you know what the difference in cost is? According to the hearings of this committee and also in the report of the Fountain Subcommittee on Government Operations, it costs 5 cents plus a fraction to store the surplus commodities in a Government facility. Do you know what it costs to store them in a commercial facility? Sixteen cents-plus. The cost of storage in Government facilities is only one-third of what it is in commercial facilities.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. The language of the gentleman's amendment reads "maximum use." How would the gentleman define maximum use?

Mr. YATES. The maximum use possible.

Mr. MICHEL. Would that still be at the discretion of Commodity Credit? When one says maximum, would you expect that it would be the very last Government bin available. The last bin could be in the State of Washington, as I pointed out yesterday and the grain to be stored could be in some State like Ohio or Pennsylvania, and it would have to be shipped completely across the country.

Mr. YATES. I suggest to the gentleman that the administration's handling of the program has not been one that would give confidence. They are not administering it most efficiently and economically at the present time, but we have no alternative. We must leave it to their discretion. That is why I would say to the gentleman, that the term "maximum" means the maximum extent possible. There is discretion on the part of the corporation, but they must use the Government facilities that are available in preference to comparable commercial facilities. The term 'maximum" as I construe it, means to the greatest maximum possible.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WOLF. I would like to point out for the information of the Members that grain in many Government bins in the State of Iowa is moving just a few miles into private storage. That was brought out recently in hearings in Iowa. I believe that is what the gentleman from Illinois anticipates.

Mr. YATES. I think one has only to look at the report of the committee to see why this amendment is so necessary. This committee made a thorough investigation of the storage situation and was shocked with much of what it found. In the course of its investigation it discovered that tremendous quantities of grains are being moved from one part of the country to another without reason. In 1955, even though storage was available in the arid West, grain was moved to the West Coast. Why? The corporation does not want to use Government storage. I hope this amendment is agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not question the purpose of the gentleman, and I think the gentleman has a very fine purpose in mind, but I doubt very much that the program could work under the gentleman's amendment. You refer to maximum use of Government-owned facilities. Suppose you have a warehouse located in Seattle, Wash., and you have a commodity down in Savannah, Ga. You would not want to ship the commodity from Savannah, Ga., to Seattle, Wash., because you had a warehouse there?

Mr. YATES. Of course not, Mr. Chairman. But, I want to point out that is exactly what the administration has been doing much too frequently. That is the reason for my amendment, to eliminate wastefulness.

Secondly next year will bring an enormous increase in storage charges.

There will be a tremendous corn crop. There will be great quantities of other products to store. The cost will exceed $700 million. Certainly every effort should be made to reduce costs wherever possible. This can be done through maximum use of Government facilities. I see no reason why they all cannot be used during the next year.

Mr. COOLEY. Could you not improve your amendment by putting in the words "comparable Government facilities and at comparable cost"?

Mr. YATES. It is my intention that my amendment be reasonably applied and reasonably administered. Where the corporation has a reasonable choice between Government and commercial facilities, it should obviously select the Government facilities. My amendment was originally drafted in the form suggested by the gentleman, but it would have been subject to a point of order. That is why I changed it to the language I used.

Mr. COOLEY. Of course, I would much prefer to use Government facilities wherever it is feasible and economical to do so.

Mr. YATES. Everybody agrees with us on this point. The committee itself says so in its report. The purpose of my amendment is to make sure that the recommendations of the committee are carried out by putting in the bill that which is contained in the report.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, if a private warehouse is available and a Government warehouse is available in the same locality, then you suggest that the Government warehouse be used.

Mr. YATES. I do, indeed. That is the purpose of my amendment to make sure that the program is operated as efficiently and as economically as possible. The use of Government facilities will reduce storage costs by millions of dollars.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am in accord with what the gentleman is trying to do, but I think you have possibly overlooked something. You have used the words "no funds appropriated shall be used to formulate or administer any program." I am for the prohibition as to the formulation of a program hereafter, but I think it might run into some trouble when you use the words "administer any program," as the chairman pointed out, where you already have a program. In other words, if the word "administer" is included, then I am afraid you might get into trouble.

Mr. YATES. May I suggest to the gentleman that this is an appropriation bill for the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1960. It applies only to expenditures in that fiscal year. It is only for 1 year.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. But you are administering a program which is already in effect which will be carried over until that year, and that is where I am afraid you are going to get into trouble.

Mr. YATES. Insofar as the operation of my amendment is concerned, it would only be applicable for the next fiscal year. I think it should be in the permanent law, and I suggest your committee might want to draft a bill to make it permanent law. It is most desirable.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Just for the purpose of adding something to the legislative history on this matter, let me pose another illustration. Suppose there are two storage facilities in the same neighborhood and some grain or commodities are moved out of the Government-owned facility so that it is empty.

Do you think that under your amendment the Administrator of this program ought to move surplus commodities out of the privately owned warehouses into the Government-owned warehouses in order to get maximum use of the Government-owned warehouses?

Mr. YATES. If it saves the Government money I think it would be a desirable thing to do.

Mr. JUDD. So it would depend upon the situation; only if it would save money or be advantageous to the Government, it should be done?

Mr. YATES. If it saves the Government money it should be done.

Mr. JUDD. I am glad to have a statement of the gentleman's intention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has expired.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to support this amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

As I calculated, this will save the taxpayers a great deal of money in storage charges; it will save, even at the reduced rates, $30 million.

The potential storing capacity of the Commodity Credit Corporation today is 985 million bushels of grain. We are storing today in Government-owned bins and facilities operated by the Commodity Credit Corporation, about 600,030,000 bushels of grain. We are 32 percent under its capacity use. As you know, proper management requires a warehouseman to leave about 10 percent free for air conditioning of the grain. So it leaves 22 percent differential between capacity and what we are using. We can store in Government-owned warehouses 285 million additional bushels of grain. It costs the Government 6½ cents a bushel per year as opposed to 16½ cents a bushel in private warehouses.

The chairman of the subcommittee which went out to Des Moines, Iowa, Mr. SMITH, held an investigation that disclosed that the Government policy was to take grain out of Government bins and put it into private-owned warehouses, even though there was available space in Government bins, only for the sake of transferring it, at a cost of 3½ cents a bushel in transferring it. It is this administration's policy to take grain out of Government bins and put it into commercial warehouses. It has cost $612 million to the taxpayers in 1960, and it will cost $700 million in 1961. In addition to that, the Government is refusing to use the mothball fleet which we have throughout the United States. We have ships which have been turned over by the Maritime Service in the James River in Virginia, in the Astoria River in Washington and also in the Hudson River in New York. The Government has taken out grain from 30 ships, a total of over 10 million bushels of wheat. They have 86 ships which are now being used for the storage of wheat. They have 86 ships which are completely vacant. We can store 22 million bushels of wheat in those particular ships at practically no cost to the Government and yet the Department of Agriculture is disinclined or very reluctant to use those storage facilities which the Government has, which would cost the people of the United States very little money. The Department is dedicated to the proposition that storage must go into private warehouses. I say it is time we stopped this staggering cost of warehousing costs so that we can give some relief to the taxpayers of the United States.

I hope this amendment will prevail.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the objections raised are rather sound. I discussed with the author of the amendment the suggested language that I think would make it in line with the committee report. We had not put it in the bill. Personally, if the gentleman were to consent to add to his amendment the words "consistent with the economical operation of the corporation," I, individually, would have no objection.

Mr. YATES. I am willing to accept such a modification, and I ask unanimous consent that the words suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi be added to my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification referred to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the period, substitute a colon and add: "Consistent with the economical operation of the corporation".

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, may we have the entire amendment read?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the modified amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 23, after the word "provision", strike the period, insert a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to formulate or administer any program which does not provide for maximum use of Government-owned facilities for storing surplus commodities, consistent with the economical operation of the corporation."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out something I think the Committee should take into consideration at this time. First of all, if we start watering down this amendment it will mean nothing. There is nothing to prohibit the Commodity Credit Corporation today from using Government storage where it is available.

Let me point out another thing: Today we have oldtime operators and cooperators who know what they are doing and are doing it at the minimum charges. They pay taxes, both income and property, in their communities; your Government bins and warehouses do not. When it comes to figuring out how much you are going to save you must take into consideration the income and property taxes the warehouseman pays, both the grain warehouseman and cotton warehouseman. I think that is

a very, very important factor. It is obvious that if you have empty bins and they are being wasted that should not be, but I am told by those in the corn business that we are going to need all of the bins that exist in another year unless we have legislation out of this Congress that will correct some of the things wrong today with our farm program, and I do not think you are going to waste this Government storage. But you might be making a very, very big mistake if you put the Government bins ahead of income- and property-tax-paying Americans.

I think one further observation very much in point is that there is no guarantee——

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. MICHEL. I think there is one further observation the gentleman could very well make and that is that the Government does not assume the obligation the private warehouseman assumes in the matter of guaranteeing like kind and quality of the grain he delivers. When grain deteriorates in Government-owned bins it is a direct loss to the taxpayer. If grain deteriorates in the hands of a private warehouseman he suffers the loss. Only recently one of the grain elevators in my district paid $40,000 to CCC for deterioration of grain in its keeping.

Mr. HORAN. And if I might go further, we have no guarantee that the bureaucrat operating a Government warehouse is as smart as the man who has been all his life in the grain business or the cotton business and knows what is involved in storage.

I think if you water this amendment down a little bit further so it means nothing, I might be able to vote for it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I would say to the gentleman that the adding of those words was not done with the intent of watering down the amendment.

Mr. HORAN. Then I am violently opposed to it.

Mr. YATES. Its one purpose is to add a certain amount of discretion to the administration so that it is not straitjacketed by the terms used. This is a program that requires some flexibility and that is the only purpose in adding the words that were added. It is the intention of the amendment to have Government utilities used to the greatest extent possible.

Mr. HORAN. I have been around here long enough to know that this House can act foolishly sometimes. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that if we do not adopt this amendment, we can expect the Department to continue the policy of preferring warehouses that are not yet built. The policy of the Department of Agriculture at this very minute is to prefer warehouses that are not yet built today over empty Government bins that are in the country today.

Mr. HORAN. Where is there any prohibition against the use of the empty bins?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There is no prohibition, but the policy of the Department is it will not use the Government warehouses.

Mr. HORAN. But there is no prohibition against using them, is there?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The very purpose of the amendment is to get them to use Government-owned space and discontinue the inflexible policy of encouraging overexpansion in areas where it is not needed.

Mr. YATES. I agree with the gentleman entirely. Because of the statement of the gentleman from Washington as to what the attitude of the Department of Agriculture is it is necessary to have an amendment of this type to show what the congressional intention is, namely, that Government-owned facilities shall be used to the fullest extent possible.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If we do not have this amendment adopted there will be no alternative for many elevator operators but to expand capacity beyond reasonable future needs in many communities where it is not needed. The legitimate elevator operator with adequate storage must build additional warehouse space if a fly-by-night competitor comes along and decides to build. He has to protect his own business and build additional warehouse space in order to minimize the cutthroat competition that will in future result from an operator with a warehouse paid for by the Government. The policy is to use those warehouses in preference to the empty Government bins as long as anybody has warehouse space vacant, even where the warehouse space in the community greatly exceeds the space reasonably needed in the future in the regular grain merchandising business.

I want to point out when you use the argument of preparing warehouses in that because they pay local property taxes you are in favor of Federal aid to education because, after all, it is the local property tax that goes for education. I am not saying that it is a bad thing to have Federal aid to education, but I want to point out to those who oppose Federal aid to education that when they use the tax excuse they are favoring Federal aid to education.

May I also point out that the operators who are operating the Government storage program have had a good experience in handling grain and they have shown, as a matter of fact, that they can operate warehouse facilities with less loss than most of the warehousemen in the business. Do not be mislead by the argument previously made that the technicians do not know how to handle Government grain. The actual deterioration is less for them than it has been for most of the operators. I was acting as chairman of a subcommittee which last December secured evidence and testimony showing that the policy of the Department had gone so far as to provide for emptying Government bins to fill new warehouse storage that was not even built by a regular elevator operator.

There seems no question that additional storage will be needed this fall. Unless the policy is changed, additional grain will be placed in new warehouses which reluctant warehousemen were forced to build to protect themselves against a fly-by-night operator and the result would be bad for both the taxpayers and the legitimate warehouse operator. This amendment will help assure the use of 300 million bushels of empty Government space during the next year when the additional space is needed in addition to existing warehouse space. The amendment will, of course, only be effective for a 1-year period.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would like to point out to the gentleman that this policy of the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation of preferring private facilities over Government-owned facilities is just another expression of the policy of the Bureau of the Budget as enunciated in its bulletin last year, about which I complained in the Congress in debate on the defense bill. The Budget has directed these agencies to prefer private facilities to Government-owned facilities. That applies to agriculture as well as defense.

I am heartily in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that the amendment the gentleman offered is to a great degree in line with the committee report. I also agree with the point made by my colleagues on the committee on the Republican side. We want to be sure the language carries out the intent of Congress, and that it will not result in increased costs or needless harm to private industry.

I therefore felt I could not oppose the amendment because it is in line with what we wrote in the report, and I just want to reassure my colleagues that in conference we will try to modify the language, if necessary, to carry out the views of the subcommittee.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 408. No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee or officer of the Department, except the Secretary of Agriculture, who, in addition to other regularly assigned responsibilities, serves as a member of the Board of Directors or as an officer of the Commodity Credit Corporation after February 1, 1961.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, section 408 provides that none of the funds appropriated by H.R. 12117, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit

Administration, shall be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Department—except the Secretary—who serves as a member of the Board of Directors of CCC, or as an officer of CCC, in addition to other regular duties with the Department.

This reverses a decision made by the Banking and Currency Committee and the Congress in 1949, when the CCC Charter Act was amended to strike out a similar restriction which had been enacted in 1948. It is, therefore, legislation, and the mere fact it is put in the form of a limitation on the use of funds appropriated by the bill does not save it. As paragraph 1691, volume 7, of Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives puts it:

> The purpose rather than the form of a proposed limitation is the proper criterion by which its admissibility should be judged, and if its purpose appears to be a restriction of executive discretion to a degree that may be fairly termed a change of policy rather than a matter of administrative detail it is not in order.

Again in paragraph 1606 of the same volume, the following is found:

> Whenever a purported limitation makes unlawful that which before was lawful or makes lawful that which before was unlawful it changes existing law and is not in order on an appropriation bill.
>
> A proper limitation is negative and in the nature of a veto, and when it assumes affirmative form by direction to an executive in the discharge of his duties under existing law it ceases to be a limitation and becomes legislation.

Section 408 in effect requires the Secretary to take affirmative action. To carry out the farm programs financed by CCC, the Secretary would have to appoint new Board members, recruited from private life, to replace the six Department officers other than himself who now serve on the Board. He would also have to recruit and appoint new personnel to serve as officers of the Corporation. This not only means the section constitutes legislation, but also means it is not entitled to the protection of the Holman rule, because it would not save the Government money. On the contrary, it would require hiring new employees at additional expense to the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the section clearly provides a limitation on the use of funds that are appropriated in this bill. It does not change the Commodity Credit Corporation charter. It does not change any basic law. It just simply limits what the money in this bill can be used for. It has been my experience and observation during the years here that the Chair has many times said that it is a negative limitation on the use of money and that it is clearly in order, and on that I rest the committee's position.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KILDAY). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] makes a point of order against the language in section 408 of the bill on the ground that it constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair has had an opportunity to examine the precedents in this connection, including the precedents to which the gentleman from Georgia has referred and from which he has read. The Chair would also refer to paragraph 1694 of Cannon's Precedents, volume 7, the language being:

> While a limitation may not involve change of existing law or affirmatively restrict executive direction, it may properly effect a change of administrative policy and still be in order.

The Chair has examined additional precedents bearing on this question. The Chair is constrained to hold that section 408 is a restriction on a manner in which the funds can be used, and constitutes a negative limitation, and, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Georgia: On page 34, line 8 through line 14, strike out section 408.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, section 408 of the bill would reverse a decision made by the Congress and the House Banking and Currency Committee in 1949. At that time, after a year's experience with a provision of law that required that two of the members of the CCC Board be outside members; that is, not officers or employees of the Government; the Congress repealed this restriction. Instead, the Congress in 1949 restored to the Secretary of Agriculture the power to appoint the members of the Board, and to appoint officers and employees of the Department as Board members. This practice was followed for years, until 1948, when the requirement for two outside members of the Board was written into the law. Less than 1 year later, after experience had proved that the provision was no workable, the experiment was abandoned.

I regret that the Appropriations Committee has undertaken to rewrite the law in this manner. This is a matter within the jurisdiction of the legislative committee, the Banking and Currency Committee. It is a matter that the Banking and Currency Committee has fully considered in acting on the law as it exists today.

The amendment will not save money; on the contrary, it will require the Secretary of Agriculture to go out and hire new people to run the Corporation. It will result in conflicts and confusion between the Corporation and the Department. It did not work when it was tried before, and I am convinced it will not work now.

Furthermore, this provision would, on the basis of past experience, cause a major and costly reorganization within the Department of Agriculture. It would not only result in no improvement in operations, but would result in division of responsibility, duplication of effort, overlapping of authorities, inability to obtain informed consideration of major policy matters, and confusion in field operations affecting almost every segment of commercial trade relating to agricultural commodities. It would make the CCC subject to more and more pressure for actions to the special benefit of individual groups.

The CCC is a facility of the Department of Agriculture created for the specific purpose of providing a workable mechanism for carrying out price support programs as directed by Congress. Whatever the provisions of statutes governing price support, this mechanism must be left in a workable condition. It will not function in a vacuum, and it must operate in concert with the other major activities of the Department. Section 408 should be eliminated from the bill.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Section 408 of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1961, provides as follows:

> SEC. 408. No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee or officer of the Department, except the Secretary of Agriculture, who, in addition to other regularly assigned responsibilities, serves as a member of the Board of Directors or as an officer of the Commodity Credit Corporation after February 1, 1961.

This provision, if enacted into law, would nullify the deliberate action of Congress in amending the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in 1949 to permit members of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation to be otherwise employed in the Department of Agriculture and to permit the staff of executive officers of the Corporation to have duties not only in connention with Commodity Credit Corporation but also in connection with related operations of the Department.

The Charter Act as originally enacted on June 29, 1948, provided in section 9 that:

> Employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not comprise, in the aggregate, more than three of the members of the Board.

It also provided in section 10 that:

> Responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the business of the Corporation shall be vested in a staff of executive officers, headed by a chief executive appointed by the Board and responsible to the Board. Members of the executive staff shall devote their full time to the affairs of the Corporation.

In 1949 the Secretary of Agriculture recommended that the restrictions of sections 9 and 10 of the charter quoted above be eliminated. In his letter of March 9, 1949, to Senator Thomas, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Secretary stated, in part, as follows:

> The changes involving the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture and the internal organization of the Department which are proposed in S. 900 will make it possible for the Secretary to discharge effectively his responsibility for the formulation and administration of the agricultural programs of the Federal Government and to coordinate and integrate all the activities of the Department.

The Secretary of Agriculture recommended, among other things, that section 9 of the charter be amended so that the Board members could hold other

offices or positions in the Department and could be given other duties by the Secretary of Agriculture and that section 10 be amended to remove the requirement for an executive staff which would be prohibited from performing duties other than those concerned directly with the Corporation.

Full hearings on the Secretary's recommendations were held before the House Committee on Banking and Currency and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. As a result an amendment to the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act was enacted on June 7, 1949, which carried into effect the recommendations made by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Section 9 of the CCC Charter Act, as amended, specifically provides that:

> In addition to their duties as members of the Board, such appointed members shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at such rate not in excess of the maximum then payable under the Classification Act of 1949, as may be fixed by the Secretary, except that any such member who holds another office or position under the Federal Government the compensation for which exceeds such rate may elect to receive compensation at the rate provided for such other office or position in lieu of the compensation provided by this section.

In order to give the Secretary the benefit of the appraisal of the Corporation's policies by a group of outside individuals, section 9 was also amended to provide for an advisory board "reflecting broad agricultural and business experience in its membership."

Section 10 was amended to eliminate the requirement that the Corporation's business be conducted by executive officers required to devote their full time to the affairs of the Corporation. As amended, section 10 provides, in part, that:

> The Secretary shall appoint such officers and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the Corporation, define their authority and duties.

It is apparent, therefore, that section 408 of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1961, would nullify the existing legislation with respect to the management of the Corporation and would impose the very requirements which Congress deliberately sought to eliminate from the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act by the amendments made therein in 1949.

Denying payment to Department officials who may now serve in dual capacity on the Commodity Credit Board would eliminate the services on the Board of top officials in the Department of Agriculture, except for the Secretary, as now provided in the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The Commodity Credit Corporation Board is composed of the following: Secretary of Agriculture, Chairman; Under Secretary of Agriculture, President; Assistant Secretary—Agricultural Stabilization; Assistant Secretary—Marketing and Foreign Agriculture; Assistant Secretary—Federal-States Relations; Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service; and General Counsel of Department of Agriculture.

If section 408 remains in the appropriation act, all these officials, except the Secretary, could not serve after February 1, 1961.

The proposed new section 408 would also eliminate as officers of the Commodity Credit Corporation those who also hold other offices within the Department of Agriculture. This will eliminate the use of such men as officers as Under Secretary of Agriculture as President; Administrator of Commodity Stabilization Service as Executive Vice President; Associate Administrator, Commodity Stabilization Service, Vice President; Deputy Administrator, Price Support, Commodity Stabilization Service, Vice President; Deputy Administrator, Operations, Commodity Stabilization Service, Vice President; Deputy Administrator, Production Adjustment, Commodity Stabilization Service, Vice President; General Sales Manager, Commodity Stabilization Service, Vice President; Executive Assistant to the Administrator, Commodity Stabilization Service, Secretary; Director, Fiscal Division, Commodity Stabilization Service, Controller; Deputy Director, Fiscal Division, Commodity Stabilization Service, Treasurer; Deputy Director, Fiscal Division, Commodity Stabilization Service, Chief Accountant.

All the Board members and offices of the Corporation receive only one salary, that is, the salary of the position which they hold as an employee of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The history of the present Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, as amended, does not contemplate such arrangement as section 408 would impose.

If only part-time Board members, from outside the Department of Agriculture, are used in these capacities, such serious difficulties as the following would be encountered:

They would be unfamiliar with much of the operations involved; there would be delays in Board actions, which at times are required on relatively short notice; there would be added salary, travel, staff and other costs.

If full-time Board members and officers who have no other functions within the Department are required there will be created another echelon of highly paid Government employees.

There would be two major areas of operations and responsibilities, to a large extent duplicating, within the Department of Agriculture: Secretary of Agriculture and Commodity Credit Corporation Board and its officers. Major conflicts and confusion may result.

I urge the adoption of the amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Georgia to repeal section 408 of this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I just want to state that I am in accord with the views expressed by the gentleman as well as the views expressed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]. I hope this amendment is adopted.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. The statement is made that none of the funds for the Department of Agriculture can be paid to these men. These gentlemen are paid now from funds of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. McDONOUGH. They are paid—that is their regular salary.

Mr. WHITTEN. This provision says that the funds of the Department can no longer be paid to an official who runs the Corporation. The Corporation officer would be paid from the Corporation's funds if this became effective.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment to repeal section 408.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, this is obviously another effort on the part of this Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations to take over the Department of Agriculture and to defeat the intent and purpose of Congress in the passage of laws which are now in operation.

In the opening section of the act of 1949, on basic agricultural commodities, the Congress said this:

> The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to make available through loans, purchases, or other operations, price support to cooperators for any crop of any basic agricultural commodity, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas for such crop, at a level not in excess of 90 per centum of the parity price of the commodity nor less than the level provided in subsections (a), (b), and (c) as follows.

Again under a title, "Designated Nonbasic Agricultural Commodities," the Congress said this:

> The Secretary is authorized and directed to make available * * * price support to producers for tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat as follows.

Under another title, "Other Nonbasic Agricultural Commodities," the Congress said:

> The Secretary is authorized to make available through loans, purchases, or other operations price support to producers for any nonbasic agricultural commodity not designated in title II.

In the Agricultural Act of 1954 the Congress said, in title I, "Set Aside of Agricultural Commodities":

> The Commodity Credit Corporation shall as rapidly as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine to be practicable, set aside within its inventories not more than the following maximum quantities and not less than the following minimum quantities of agricultural commodities.

Then in title VII, "National Wool Act of 1954," Congress said in section 703:

> The Secretary of Agriculture shall, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, support the prices of wool and mohair.

So it is clear to see that Congress has charged the Secretary of Agriculture

with certain responsibilities and by the acts of Congress he is required to exercise these authorities and responsibilities through the Commodity Credit Corporation. Section 401 of the act of 1949 says:

> The Secretary shall provide price support authorized or required herein through the Commodity Credit Corporation and other means available to him.

We have directed him to use the Commodity Credit Corporation as an instrumentality and agency through which he will administer these programs which are now in operation. Why should we now divorce the Secretary of Agriculture from the Board of the Commodity Credit Corporation? In other words, in effect, you would have two Secretaries of Agriculture—one would be Mr. Benson and the other would be some outsider who might be brought in by the CCC Board as President of the Corporation and be charged with these responsibilities which the Congress has vested in the Secretary of Agriculture. It seems to me there is no getting around it that this, in effect, is an insult—an insult to the Secretary of Agriculture. Now not that I mind him being insulted, but I do not want him to be insulted on this occasion.

I say in all seriousness this amendment would increase the cost of the farm program. All members of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation serve without pay. They are appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Nothing that I am aware of has developed that would indicate that any of the Board members now in office are corrupt individuals or that their jobs could be performed any better by persons outside the Department of Agriculture having no responsibility for the working of farm programs.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Is this an invasion of the authority of the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly it is. That is the committee that is responsible for the creation and financing of the Commodity Credit Corporation, through which agency all of these programs operate.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. DIXON. Under the arrangement in this bill, the Secretary would be held responsible for the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. COOLEY. He would have no control over the members of the Board.

Mr. DIXON. So where would you place the responsibility in a situation like that?

Mr. COOLEY. That is what I say. I hope the Brown amendment will be adopted. I hope the Commodity Credit Corporation will continue to operate in the future as it has in the past.

Section 408 of this bill, if enacted into law, would nullify the deliberate action of Congress in amending the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in 1949 to permit members of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation to be otherwise employed in Department of Agriculture and to permit the staff of executive officers of the Corporation to have duties not only in connection with Commodity Credit Corporation but also in connection with related operations of the Department.

The Charter Act, as originally enacted on June 29, 1948, provided in section 9 that:

> Employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not comprise, in the aggregate, more than three of the members of the Board.

It also provided in section 10 that:

> Responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the business of the Corporation shall be vested in a staff of executive officers, headed by a chief executive appointed by the Board and responsible to the Board. Members of the executive staff shall devote their full time to the affairs of the Corporation.

In 1949 the Secretary of Agriculture recommended that the restrictions of sections 9 and 10 of the charter quoted above be eliminated. In his letter of March 9, 1949, to Senator Thomas, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Secretary stated, in part, as follows:

> The changes involving the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture and the internal organization of the Department which are proposed in S. 900 will make it possible for the Secretary to discharge effectively his responsibility for the formulation and administration of the agricultural programs of the Federal Government and to coordinate and integrate all the activities of the Department.

The Secretary of Agriculture recommended, among other things, that section 9 of the charter be amended so that the Board members could hold other offices or positions in the Department and could be given other duties by the Secretary of Agriculture and that section 10 be amended to remove the requirement for an executive staff which would be prohibited from performing duties other than those concerned directly with the Corporation.

Full hearings on the Secretary's recommendations were held before the House Committee on Banking and Currency and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. As a result an amendment to the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act was enacted on June 7, 1949, which carried into effect the recommendations made by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Section 9 of the CCC Charter Act, as amended, specifically provides that:

> In addition to their duties as members of the Board, such appointed members shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at such rate not in excess of the maximum then payable under the Classification Act of 1949, as may be fixed by the Secretary, except that any such member who holds another office or position under the Federal Government the compensation for which exceeds such rate may elect to receive compensation at the rate provided for such other office or position in lieu of the compensation provided by this section.

In order to give the Secretary the benefit of the appraisal of the Corporation's policies by a group of outside individuals, section 9 was also amended to provide for an advisory board "reflecting broad agricultural and business experience in its membership."

Section 10 was amended to eliminate the requirement that the Corporation's business be conducted by executive officers required to devote their full time to the affairs of the Corporation. As amended section 10 provides, in part, that:

> The Secretary shall appoint such officers and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the Corporation, define their authority and duties.

It is apparent, therefore that section 408 of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1961, would nullify the existing legislation with respect to the management of the Corporation and would impose the very requirements which Congress deliberately sought to eliminate from the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act by the amendments made therein in 1949.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Brown amendment which would strike section 408. It should be apparent to everyone that if this provision remains in the bill it will mean duplication of effort, more cost to the taxpayers, and more confusion.

The history of the present Commodity Credit Corporation Act, as amended, certainly does not contemplate such an arrangement as section 408 would impose. You would have only part-time Board members. They would likely be from all over the country. They would be paid a per diem and expenses for flying back and forth between their homes and Washington. Sometimes immediate decisions have to be made by the Commodity Credit Corporation Board, and waiting for Board members to arrive in Washington might prove very costly when important decisions have to be made without delay. These outside Board members would not be familiar with much of the operations involved and great confusion might result.

To those of you interested in economy in government, may I point out that there would be added salaries, travel, staff, and other costs. As presently constituted, the Commodity Credit Board costs the taxpayers no additional money. They are employees in the Department of Agriculture on regular salaries. They receive no additional compensation. It looks like utter folly to go back to a system repudiated by Charles Brannan when he was Secretary of Agriculture. There would be two major areas of operations and responsibilities duplicated within the Department of Agriculture. You would have a Secretary of Agriculture under section 408 who would be the President of the Board. Then on the outside, looking in, you would have a new Commodity Credit Board and its officers. This can only result in a lot of conflict and confusion. Certainly it would not be for the best interests of agriculture.

Anyone who wants to be fair must admit that the affairs of the Commodity Credit Corporation belong in the Department of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture, as head of the Commodity Credit Corporation, is responsible. He should have the Board available at all times within the Department, so that the Commodity Credit Board can function as the Congress intended when the basic law was enacted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is recognized for 3 minutes.

(By unanimous consent Mr. POAGE yielded his time to Mr. MULTER.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to reassert an argument I made on this floor in the 81st Congress, in April 1949, on the identical subject. At that time, too, there was an attempt to bypass the Banking and Currency Committee which has jurisdiction by the rules of the House over the Commodity Credit Corporation and the basic legislation under which it operates. At that time, too, there was an attempt to take the powers vested in the Commodity Credit Corporation by its charter, away from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, it is no secret that I have been less than charitable in some of the remarks I have made about the present gentleman who occupies the high office of Secretary of Agriculture, not that I do not like the gentleman, but I did not like and I do not like many of the things he does in connection with the operation of that important office; and I am sure I will have occasion again to find fault with some of the things he does as Secretary of Agriculture. However, I am now speaking, not in favor of the Secretary of Agriculture, I am speaking in favor of the orderly process of legislation and in favor of the orderly process of government. If you want responsible executive agencies then your legislative committees must bring to you the legislation which empowers the executive to act. The executive should act in accordance with that legislation and be responsible to the Congress accordingly.

If the Brown amendment prevails then we will have orderly process of legislation and we will have orderly government in operation. The Appropriations Committee has sought by section 408 in this bill to take away from the Commodity Credit Corporation the very things given to it by the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation—and, mind you, this is not the time to argue whether we want the Commodity Credit Corporation—I can agree with some that we can improve its operation and I can agree with others that we may be able to dispense with it entirely—but since we have it let us legislate for it properly and not through the Appropriations Committee or through an appropriation bill.

It has already been said to you that unless the Brown amendment prevails you are going to get duality of government, you are going to get outsiders who are not in the Department of Agriculture trying to run the agricultural program. I think it is a tough enough job for the Agriculture Department to do that without the outsider who is not responsible to the Congress trying to do it. Section 408 will not only dissipate the control that should be vested in the Department of Agriculture, but in addition to that it also will make it extremely costly.

The history of the present Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act does not contemplate any such arrangement as section 408 contemplates and intends to put into operation and which will go into operation unless the Brown amendment prevails.

If only part-time Board members from outside the Department of Agriculture are used in these capacities then we will encounter serious difficulties, caused by persons who are unfamiliar with the required operations. There would be delays in Board action which at times are required to be done on relatively short notice. There would be additional salaries, travel, staff, and also additional incidental expenses and other unnecessary costs.

One of the main faults I found with the operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation was that there is too much waste there now. Let us not as legislators indicate our approval of any more waste. Let us try to make the operation as economical as possible. If full-time Board members and officers who have no other functions within the Department are required, then by the section of the bill, now sought to be eliminated, there will be created another echelon of highly paid Government employees. If you are going to get the job done it has to be done by paid employees. But let us not have two sets of them. One is enough. The job should be done by the Commodity Credit Corporation. There will be two major areas of operation and of responsibilities, to a large extent duplicated within the Department of Agriculture unless the Brown amendment prevails.

I think it is quite sufficient to say that the Committee on Agriculture rightfully complains that its jurisdiction is being invaded. It is quite enough that the Banking and Currency Committee urges that its jurisdiction is being invaded. But beyond those two good reasons for taking out section 408 there are all the other very valid reasons I have stated for concentrating control and power where it belongs and eliminating waste and saving expense. I urge that the Brown amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND]

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, here we have a matter of organization. I very much dislike to disagree with my good friend, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, and I appreciate the work that the Committee on Appropriations has done. I have been voting with them and backing them up 100 percent of the time. But here, Mr. Chairman, comes a case where we are going to be involved in more money instead of saving money, and there I feel constrained to support the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was organized under Banking and Currency because of its large loan necessity. It was felt at that time that the general control should have been under Banking and Currency, and it is still. I believe the point of order should have been sustained because this not only limits an appropriation but it also changes the effect of the legislation. It divorces the responsibility from agriculture where it should be. The Corporation's activities are not an end in themselves, but a means of implementing farm programs. I think that is very important.

The Department of Agriculture has to operate the Commodity Stabilization Service, it has the responsibility for acreage allotments, market quotas, the Wool Act, the Sugar Act, and other departmental activities which are closely related to the price support program. If you take away the responsibility of that, they have no authority over a farm program whatsoever.

Conceivably there will be many executive decisions made by the top Agriculture Department officials which, if this amendment is left in the bill, could then be vetoed by another Bureau. We would be setting up a new and a different Bureau and, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to that. These executive decisions must be implemented. They must be implemented by people who have the authority to implement them. If we take away that authority, we are weakening the whole program. I do not defend everything about the program, but certainly those in charge should have the power to administer it.

Again, Mr. Chairman, let me reiterate that this was tried and it failed. Congress reversed itself. I hope that the amendment to kill this section 408 is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, this language was put in by the Committee on Appropriations for many of the very reasons that the people are saying it ought to be taken out for now. We put it in because we felt that a corporation of this size ought to have people who were working full time taking care of the assets of that corporation. These people who are members of the Board now are people who are full-time employees of the Department of Agriculture. Those people have their hands full working with the activities of the Department of Agriculture.

Furthermore, they are very often placed under pressures which interfere with the operations of the Department

of Agriculture. Many times they are called out of town to make decisions. There have been times that the Commodity Credit Corporation board has been in difficulty meeting to make decisions because these people have been out of town. We thought from the standpoint of good administration and good sound administration and saving the assets of the Corporation, that it was time that some attention was paid to those things. It was not our purpose to take any slap at anybody. Why would we do that? We work with the people of the Department of Agriculture, and we have repeatedly said that those people are dedicated people. We have repeatedly said that they are fine people.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. Did your committee find any evidence that the employees that constitute this Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation were being imposed upon working for Mr. Benson and would be in an unfavorable position to disagree with the Secretary of Agriculture, or would there be a tendency to go along with their boss?

Mr. MARSHALL. Certainly, where you have a man who is the head of the department, a policy department, it would be expected that that man would have an influence over anybody who was working in the department. We have heard some testimony that that might not be the most wholesome thing. The pages of our hearings are filled with places where there has been poor judgment used. We do not say that anybody is to blame for making some of those decisions. But, a number of those top people in the Department who are working with those things have other things to do. They have $9 billion worth of commodities on their shelves.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation provides that it shall consist of six members in addition to the Secretary who shall be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. These people are not picked by the Secretary of Agriculture. They are appointed by the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate, and, therefore, they should be devoted to the task to which they are appointed.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, in summary I support the Brown amendment which would eliminate section 408 for reasons as follows:

First, it would place the CCC Board outside of the Department of Agriculture.

Second, that violates the first principle of all effective administration, which is unity of command. You cannot place responsibility on either the Board or the Secretary if you do this.

Third, a somewhat similar arrangement was made under Secretary Brannan. He came to the Hill and asked its repeal because it was absolutely unworkable. And it was repealed.

Fourth, it would cost a great deal more money because at present the Board consists of the Secretary, the Under Secretary, the Assistant Secretary for Stabilization, the Assistant Secretary for Marketing, the Assistant Secretary for Federal-State Relations, the Administrator of Marketing, the General Counsel of the Department. They are on the Board. They are serving at no extra expense for this activity.

In addition to that, it would take out 10 more officials who are already being paid by the Department who would have to be replaced. I doubt that they could be replaced anywhere with the type of men we have working for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Really, this is one of the greatest corporations in the whole world. We cannot trust it to bring in unprepared outside people who possibly will have vested interests or would be asked to rid themselves of these conflicting interests. That absolutely could not work as well as the arrangement we have now. We tried this arrangement once and it did not work and it will not work again.

I certainly favor the Brown amendment and favor striking section 408 out of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] to close the debate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that our subcommittee gets accused of trying to usurp jurisdiction, which really we have not done. If we have tried to do that, we have not been very successful, so I do not think any harm has been done. Actually I might say facetiously, if we had, it would have been in areas which these committees have abandoned. The facts are that we have not done that in any of these instances. It is clearly within the rules to write restrictions on the use of funds. It is effective only as the House may approve it and Congress may approve it. Perhaps in our efforts we have challenged these two committees to exercise their jurisdiction to save a country.

Both of these provisions have been held in order which means that they were within the rules of the House, and they are clearly within the jurisdiction of this Appropriations Committee. Again, they will be effective only as the Congress approves it. The other was disapproved. It seems impossbile to get out a farm bill or to cut down our expenditures. Too many seem to have a vested interest. If we have succeeded in pointing up what we consider our failures we will have had some success. We lost on the other effort. I anticipate we will lose this one.

But I want to say again—and I would like the gentleman from California to listen to this; he just read the law which says that the officers of this Corporation shall be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. If you adopt everything in this bill, that would still be the law. All we are saying is, having reviewed these tremendous expenditures and again, having had to sign the checks and read the papers which condemn the cost of agriculture, and after hearing all the speeches about how we are spending this country into bankruptcy through this Corporation—we are just saying that a $14½ billion corporation is too big to expect these full-time employees in the Department to run it in their offhand moments.

For instance, here are the present directors—and I cast no reflection on them. Mr. True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture, who has to say grace over the whole operation of the Department. He also in his spare moments has to supervise this $14½ billion Corporation.

If that Corporation had been run so well that it had gotten to where it came to your committee and asked to reduce its borrowing authority through the years, I might understand that; that would be all right. But the only jurisdiction that I think my friends on the Committee on Banking and Currency have exercised in recent years is that they met every year or two and increased the borrowing authority of the Corporation at the taxpayers' expense.

As the chairman said, the Agriculture Committee has directed the Secretary of Agriculture to spend funds of the Corporation. He certainly has done so. Between that course and other compulsory programs we have spent $26 billion and the Corporation, instead of having $2.5 billion worth of commodities on hand, as it had in 1952, now has $9 billion worth; and it gets worse and worse, largely because every group gets its cut and farm income has dropped $3 billion in 7 years.

I hope those committees who think we have tried to invade their jurisdiction, and we have not, will not think I am out of order when I say that I surely hope, if you are so jealous of jurisdiction, you will take action. We, the people of the Nation, could really stand a new farm bill which would restore farm income and prevent us from spending the $3 billion-odd in this bill. We point out the fact that it gets costlier and costlier and costlier and costlier, and our friends on the Agriculture Committee seem to get wider and wider apart so far as bringing anything in the way of a sound farm bill before us. Today is the first time I have seen any unanimity among our friends on the legislative committee in a long time. It is about the first time I have heard of where they agreed on anything, and that was to agree to knock out our efforts to save $166 million in the future. That is all right but if our efforts have served to unite this committee, I hope they will continue to be united tomorrow, tomorrow, and tomorrow, and perhaps then we will get some new farm legislation which is so badly needed by the farmer and by the Nation. I hope you will read our report.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman said the present board is occupied with other duties. He has not informed the committee how he can economize by picking people from the outside who are

not even part of the Department and know nothing about its operations.

Mr. WHITTEN. With all due deference, I think the gentleman would agree that the Commodity Credit Corporation was organized as a corporation so it could have the right to buy and sell, so it could be run on a business basis. The officers are sworn to protect the assets of the Corporation, because they in reality are protecting the people of the country. Let me list the regular duties of the Directors of the Corporation.

DIRECTORS OF CCC

Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture.

True D. Morse, Undersecretary of Agriculture.

Ervin L. Peterson, Assistant Secretary for Federal-States Relations—including research, extension, soil conservation, Farmer Cooperative Service, Forest Service, and ACP—56,000 people.

Clarence L. Miller, Assistant Secretary for Marketing—including marketing research and service, Commodity Exchange Authority, Foreign Agricultural Service—10,000 people.

Marvin L. McLain, Assistant Secretary for Agricultural Stabilization—including acreage controls, price supports, Sugar Act, conservation reserve, crop insurance, Commodity Credit Corporation—9,000 people.

General Counsel—in charge of all legal activities for the entire Department.

Oris V. Wells, Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service—including marketing research, statistics, crop estimates, market regulation, market news service, school lunch program.

Take Mr. Peterson. How he has time for anything I do not know.

Mr. McDONOUGH. His judgment as a Director of the Corporation is better for these other things, because he decides what the prices shall be and what the warehouse costs shall be, and he is buying and selling these commodities.

Mr. WHITTEN. The Corporation is buying and selling and storing and incurring expenses and trying, I trust, to protect the assets of the Corporation. If you spend all your time dealing with forestry agents and county agents and ACP people I do not think it would particularly equip you to run a $14.5 billion corporation; and I do not mean to reflect on Mr. Peterson.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to lose this fight, as we did the other. To me it means the Congress is not going to change the present law, nor the present course. Too many groups are getting a cut, so to speak, in this overproduction. To me it is tragic that we must have a boom and bust before we will face up to the situation.

Mr. Chairman, members of our subcommittee will at least have the comfort of spelling out the facts in our report and of at least making an effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will vote no emphatically on this appropriation bill in protest against the backbreaking and senseless farm program which Congress seems blindly committed to perpetuate. Our congressional experts do not like what Secretary Benson and President Eisenhower send up here, but they do not seem to have any disposition to face facts themselves. Under a program of high price supports without any relationship to the market price, the Congress—and no one else—has imposed this monstrous burden on the American people. If reports from the so-called farm belt in the Midwest are true, these congressional experts know their business in exploiting political issues. The rugged self-reliance of the big wheat farmers seems to have gone—smothered and stifled by the heavy hand of our Washington experts.

It may be that these owners of farm factories will vote for no one who does not promise them a handout, but there is still some spirit left in our other farmers in this country. In the long run you will strangle not only the big wheat farmers, but our whole system of free agriculture if you continue down the desolate road of political expediency. If I did not cry out in pain and anger at such a prospect, I could not face the people back home. Let us stop making political hay and stand up to the farm issue with some courage and honesty. The people need solutions, not issues.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the debate today on the appropriation measure for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration there was a point of order sustained striking the provision entitled "Marketing Services." In particular this deals with the Federal Poultry Inspection Act. I want the Members to know the great impact this will have on the poultry industry, especially on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. In my district this is considered a $200 million industry and a most important segment of our local economy. I wonder, therefore, if the Members realize just how far reaching the elimination of this section proves and the seriousness of its consequences.

As I understand this bill as now amended, we will continue with compulsory Federal inspection of poultry, but the Department of Agriculture will no longer make a contribution toward the expense of this inspection service. At the same time, the Government continues to defray the inspection costs for meats. This I consider to be discriminatory to our poultrymen and as long as I am in Congress I shall continue to protect their interest.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that the poultry industry today is so highly competitive that unless some substantial appropriation is made available for Federal inspection of poultry, our plants may be financially jeopardized. When you place this additional expense on our poultrymen, which amounts to one-half cent or more per pound, it is just an added burden that I fear our people cannot absorb. It was Congress who required this mandatory inspection which began about a year ago and from all reports, it is working rather well and without too much criticism. I cannot justify my position in voting for this agricultural appropriation bill without the Government defraying its share of the expense of the mandatory inspection service. I sincerely hope, therefore, that this committee will work with the committee of the other body and in turn restore sufficient funds so that the Poultry Inspection Act may be continued without undue hardship to my people and the other poultry areas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I would like to assure the gentleman, and I am sure I am speaking the sentiments of other members of the committee as well, that we are interested in doing just what the gentleman and the Congressman from Delaware have recommended. We want these programs to continue in as economical and efficient a manner as possible just as the gentleman does. We are going to work in every way possible to see that we accomplish that purpose. The gentleman from Maryland has talked to me several times today about this. He is a dedicated Member of the Congress and looks out for the interest of his constituents. I think it is a real privilege for his constituents to have him here representing them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota. It is gratifying to hear that the committee will cooperate in the restoration of these funds.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. McDOWELL. I wish to commend the gentleman, my colleague from the Eastern Shore of Maryland, which is a part of the great Del-Mar-Va poultry producing area. I agree with him that this is a most unfortunate action in the House today that these poultry inspection funds have been stricken from the bill. I, too, hope that the committee of conference or the other body itself in their wisdom will restore these funds so that not only the industry may benefit from poultry inspection, but that the consumers may have this protection, the same protection that all other agriculture products have today under this act.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I presume that in some quarters a vote against the 1961 Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration appropriation bill—H.R.12117—will be considered an act of legislative irresponsibility. Maybe so, but, for so long as the present politically inspired congressional deadlock that prevents the passage of constructive legislation in the price-support field continues, I shall feel constrained to vote against any and all agricultural appropriations bills. It seems to me that to do otherwise would be an act of greater legislative irresponsibility.

I have studied the committee report that accompanies H.R. 12117 with interest. It is indicative of a great deal of hard work on the part of the members of the Committee on Appropriations who have struggled with this problem which is, in my opinion, the most difficult domestic economic issue that we face. At the same time, it is also indicative of the partisan philosophical split that prevents this Congress, as it has past Congresses, from finding the courage and common sense to accept the inevitable and to seek a radically new approach.

What is that approach? Mr. Chairman, I confess I do not know the specifics of the way we should take, but I do know that it was a sorry day for the American farmer when this body embarked upon a course of seeking to find political solutions for the problems of agriculture. The program that Congress put together a generation ago in the dark days of the great depression, and that subsequent Congresses have been embroidering upon ever since, goes way beyond the proper role that government, as I see it, should play in assisting in the orderly marketing of agricultural products by providing protection against inevitable seasonal changes in supply and demand, and in leading the way through research and development toward new markets and new marketplaces. It seeks instead to disregard self-restraint and to substitute the easy-seeming virtues of governmental guarantees. The results have been self-evident and all add up to such an overwhelming picture of disastrous failure that they can no longer be obscured by any amount of political buck-passing or finger pointing.

It has been a well-meaning effort by men of good will but it has hurt the most the little family farmer it was intended to help, and at the same time has enabled other natural opportunists to make fortunes out of his misery. It has left that same family farmer foundering in a confusing sea of political decisions over which he has less and less control, and improperly marked him, in the eyes of the consumer and the taxpayer, as a economic parasite they must somehow get off their backs.

By ignoring what would seem to be a basic precept that farm production can never be balanced with effective market demand by legislation so long as increased production is encouraged by guaranteed prices, that same program has produced for us virtual harvests of insanity that we can neither sell or give away and that cost us over a million and a half dollars a day, each and every day of the year including the extra day of this leap year, just to store.

Mr. Chairman, the committee report is replete with conclusions to the effect that, and I quote, "What we have been doing has not worked." I could not agree more. It is also replete with urgent demands to the effect that, and again I quote, "something has to be done." Once again, I could not agree more.

However, when it comes to the question of what must be done, outside of the statement that this Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture ought to "get together" without delay, one can search the report in vain without finding any specific suggestion for improving the situation worthy of grasping for as a drowning man might grasp for straws. Thus, that same student of this report must turn to the Committee on Agriculture itself in an effort to find what is in the wind; whereupon, if he reads the signs accurately, the only legislative proposal of the many before that committee that seems to have a chance is something called by the high-sounding name of The Family Farm Income Act of 1960. This sounds pretty good for the embattled farmer constituent. In fact, its sponsors call it an enlightened and new approach. That also sounds pretty good, but every study of this bill seems to indicate only that it is a dusted-off repackage of what used to be called the Brannan plan, which would bring the three-fifths part of American agriculture presently free of governmental controls under strict Federal regimentation, and go a little further toward making virtual serfs of all our farmer constituents. Mr. Chairman, I am positive that my farmers want no part of any such additional help. They want, instead, each a chance to stand on his own two feet again, without being dependent on Government or anybody else, striking out vigorously in organized ways to seek solutions for their own problems. They realize this might hurt for a while, because they are now well aware that someone always gets hurt during the course of an economic revolution such as American agriculture is now undergoing, but they think that the long-range benefits for them, as well as for America itself, will make that courage on their part well worth the cost and pain. If they can exhibit that sort of faith in the free enterprise system, I want to stand with them.

Mr. Chairman, does it make sense for the Congress to continue to prescribe massive doses of the same sort of medicine, namely, governmental tinkering with the operation of the natural laws of supply and demand, when it should already be evident to everyone here that such a prescription is only making our patient's condition more critical? I think not, and it is for that reason that I have introduced in this Congress a bill which would terminate the price-support program. My bill is known as H.R. 9781, and though I realize it would not go anywhere, it is there, along with several others like it, for anyone to hang their hat on who may care to do so. I also realize that Uncle Sam cannot and should not let go of both of the farmer's hands at once, as my bill would purport to do, and that, instead, there would have to be carefully worked out specific governmental aids to help him through the period of adjustment that would necessarily follow any gradual withdrawal. But, these things can and should be worked out, if we but have the wisdom and the desire to do now what we will inevitably have to do some day in the not-too-distant future.

Let me make clear that there are many provisions and programs in this appropriation bill that I fully support, including, I am happy to note, a partial funding of the much-needed National Soil and Water Research Center scheduled for construction at my alma mater, Cornell University, at Ithaca, N.Y. However, feeling as strongly as I do about the utter foolishness of continuing the present price-support program merely because we are unwilling to accept the handwriting on the wall with respect thereto that clearly says, "Failure, failure, failure," I must cast my vote against the whole measure.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I notice in the committee report that $19 million is recommended for further work toward eradicating brucellosis during the 1961 fiscal year.

I certainly agree that the eradication of brucellosis in cattle is a worthwhile and highly desirable objective. It is a program of concern to both the State and Federal Governments. Over $3.5 million in State and Federal money has been spent in my own State of Florida since 1954 in an attempt to eradicate brucellosis on roughly a matching basis. As of June 30, 1960, it is estimated that 29 out of 67 Florida counties will have been certified modified-free from brucellosis. This means simply that in those counties which are so certified, infection has been reduced to the point where not more than 1 percent of the cattle and not more than 5 percent of the herds show evidence of the disease.

The complete cooperative brucellosis eradication program carried on under the auspices of the Animal Disease Eradication Division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture consists of two parts. The first part of the overall program involves calfhood vaccination and the other part involves testing of all herds and cattle on an area basis and elimination of infected animals. Federal funds are available only to those States, the counties of which are willing to accept the whole eradication program, that is, both calfhood vaccination and test and slaughter.

The counties in Florida which have accepted the complete program are located mostly in the north and northwestern part of the State where the herds are generally smaller and the conditions different in contrast to those which prevail in the vast range lands of central and southern Florida.

Because of this unique situation in some areas of central and south Florida, the Florida Cattlemen's Association has endorsed the calfhood vaccination approach to combating the disease. In a series of resolutions dating back to May 1958 this group has advocated a suspension of the test and slaughter phase of the program and has asked the Florida Livestock Board to initiate a program of compulsory calfhood vaccination.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to include in the body of my remarks portions of three resolutions adopted by the Florida Cattlemen's Association. The first of these, dated May 1958, reads:

Whereas the range cattlemen in many areas of Florida are not yet ready for a compulsory test and slaughter eradication program for brucellosis; and

Whereas, in any event, this program has not been proved to be 100 percent effective in other areas: Be it

Resolved, That the Florida Cattlemen's Association hereby requests the Livestock Board to concentrate its efforts in this field on an extensive calfhood vaccination program in lieu of its present county-by-county modified brucellosis-free program.

The second of these resolutions, adopted in May of 1959, reads as follows:

Be it resolved, That the brucellosis committee of the Florida Cattlemen's Association recommend to the Florida Livestock Board that the further extension of the test and slaughter program be temporarily suspended and that we request the cattle industry of Florida to endeavor to have passed a law permitting the Florida Livestock Board to inaugurate a compulsory calfhood vaccination program.

The third resolution, adopted in October of 1959, reads:

Whereas the brucellosis regulations of the several States relative to the entry of breeding animals from other States are quite varied; and

Whereas the Council of Southern Cattlemen's Association Presidents has agreed to seek approval from the livestock sanitary authorities of each southern State for a uniform regulation allowing calfhood vaccinates to move into each State without further tests, regardless of age and the brucellosis-free status of the county of origin: Be it

Resolved, That the Florida Cattlemen's Association, meeting in Silver Springs, Fla., on October 29, 1959, hereby endorses this effort and asks the Florida Livestock Board to take whatever steps are necessary to put into effect this simplified imports requirement for breeding animals entering Florida.

Also, I would like to quote a portion of a letter I received from Mr. J. O. Pearce, Jr., president of the Florida Cattlemen's Association. It reads, in part:

We have studied very thoroughly the effects and results of the brucellosis program on the cattle industry of our State and found that calfhood vaccination is the best way to control brucellosis in Florida. Therefore, these resolutions have been adopted.

Immediately after the adoption of the resolution in May of 1959, the USDA withdrew all money from the program except where the full test and slaughter program was in effect. We had spent years trying to get cattlemen in central and southern Florida on the calfhood vaccination program. Then suddenly it was withdrawn, leaving the cattlemen in the central and southern part of the State with no program at all. Any cattleman that vaccinated calves had to hire a veterinarian to do the work for him.

During the past year, of the calfhood vaccinates tested in Florida, less than 2 percent were reactors. We feel that any time you get over 98 percent protection by immunization you are on the road to eradication of that disease.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the position of the Florida Cattlemen's Association in the record to show that an honest difference of opinion exists as to the best way to eradicate brucellosis—at least, in a large portion of the State of Florida. The record will indicate a sincere desire on the part of our State officials and our cattlemen to rid Florida cattle of this disease. The Department of Agriculture is insistent on State acceptance of a complete program before Federal funds are forthcoming. I would simply like to point out that a program which is adaptable in one part of the country may not meet the needs of another section. I would ask that the Department reexamine the brucellosis program in Florida in an effort to arrive at a solution which will best meet the needs of our Florida cattlemen.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, at his press conference on February 10, 1960, President Eisenhower was asked about the school support bill passed by the other body. His reply included these words:

I do not believe the Federal Government ought to be in the business of paying a local official.

During debate on the Interior Department appropriation bill, I pointed out that the measure under consideration provided money to help pay the salaries of at least 95,653 local officials. During debate on the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Labor Department, I noted that Federal money would help pay the salaries of at least 562,000 State and local officials, including some 316,666 public elementary and secondary schoolteachers. The total of the State and local officials paid at least in part with Federal funds provided by those two bills is minimum of 657,653.

Under the bill before us today, Federal money would help pay the salaries of at least 71,665 State and local officials. They include 15,000 extension service employees, extension agents and extension service workers and 5,500 extension service clerical employees, in all 50 States; 9,165 members of State ASC committees and program staffs, and 22,000 ASC clerical employees, also in all 50 States; plus some 20,000 State experiment workers in those States which have land-grant colleges.

These three bills include a total of at least 729,308 State and local employees paid at least in part with Federal funds.

As I have said before, I favor the use of Federal tax funds for paying these local officials, including schoolteachers. Before action on this bill in the other body, I hope someone will ask the President to make his position clear. Does he want these local officials, including hundreds of thousands of teachers, to continue to be paid in part with Federal funds, or does he want Federal support withdrawn from these programs?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KILDAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the so-called Cooley amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put the remaining amendments en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, beginning on line 6, strike out "*Provided further,* That no part of these funds may be used to formulate or administer a program which provides for reclassing of Commodity Credit Corporation cotton after time of sale to private individuals or organizations:".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

By unanimous consent the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

FLIGHT SAFETY FOUNDATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Flight Safety Foundation, whose opinions, I believe, carry considerable weight in the field of aeronautical research and survey, has stated that "the most critical problem in aviation today is the maintenance of separation between aircraft." For some time I have been forced to the same conclusion by the revolutionary changes that have come about in aviation, particularly the unparalleled congestion on our airways and the introduction of aircraft of fantastic speeds. These changes have placed an enormous responsibility upon our country's air traffic control service.

In a message to the national meeting of the Air Traffic Control Association, held in Oklahoma City, Okla., on October 9 of last year, I said:

The modernization and strengthening of this service, therefore, in order that it may be able to grapple successfully with the highly complex problems of this jet age, has become the primary aviation problem of our time. Since this problem affects the vital interests of our commerce, our national defense and the lives of the millions of men, women and children who travel by air, its sound solution should be the concern of all our citizens.

The air traffic control problem, as I see it, calls for modern control facilities, equipment and methods of control, all of which are essential to its sound solution. But the heart of the problem is the human element—the controller himself, the man on whose traffic separation decisions the lives of so many people are dependent. I was delighted to learn recently that the Air Traffic Control Association not only recognizes the need for a modernized control system, but also proposes that these dedicated men of the control towers and centers shall be given a sound, professional status with adequate compensation, retirement and other appropriate protections.

You of the Air Traffic Control Association have my best wishes for the success of your worthy and enlightened efforts to safeguard the air traffic problem, for that is of primary importance.

Now 2 years ago the Congress recognized the seriousness of this personnel problem by writing into the new Federal Aviation Act of 1958 section 302(g). That section directed the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to make a study of this personnel problem, giving due consideration to the need for special qualifications and training, special provisions as to pay, retirement, and hours of service, and special provisions to insure the availability and responsiveness of the air traffic control personnel in fulfilling national defense requirements. The Administrator was directed to report the results of the study, with his recommendations, to Congress on or before January 1, 1960. The Administrator completed his study substantially in due time, but the report has not yet reached the Congress because it has been under study by the Bureau of the Budget.

The report of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, which was submitted by its chairman, the able Senator from Oklahoma, Senator MONRONEY, emphasized the urgency of the problem with which section 302(g) is concerned. The report stated:

Aside from the question of unified service and provisions for war emergencies, a study is urgently required of special personnel problems affecting the present CAA air-traffic control operators. It is therefore the intention of your committee that the personnel study called for in section 302(g) include early consideration of ways and means for strengthening the present air traffic control service through special pay, retirement, and other incentive measures.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the note of urgency which runs through the Senate report—Report No. 1811—reflects the importance of this problem to the 50 million airline passengers and the many additional people using private, executive, and other-than-airline planes, who annually travel our airways. The dedicated men of air traffic control have maintained up to this time an amazingly high record of safety against midair collisions, despite the handicaps under which they have had to work; but the ravages of time and, more important still, the devastating effects of the stress and strain of their nerve-wracking task, are building up conditions that are certain to jeopardize safety unless corrective measures are taken.

The question of a realistic retirement policy, such as Congress provided a number of years ago for the men of the FBI, and the question of limitation of the hours of work which Congress provided in principle for the airline pilots 22 years ago, are perhaps the two most important issues involved and presumably dealt with in the Administrator's report which we have not yet received.

I bring this matter to the attention of the House because I believe it possesses urgency and importance to the members of the air-traveling public. I believe that we should act to avert possible future tragedies rather than wait for air disasters to provide a motive for action. I hope and urge, therefore, that the executive branch make available to the Congress the results of its study at the earliest possible moment.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, this is the 25th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration. The past 25 years have witnessed the building of electrical transmission lines throughout the country that have had the effect of completely revitalizing the rural areas of our Nation. Obviously, the greatest impact of the program occurred during the first few years after its authorization, but the services of the Rural Electrification Administration continue to expand.

One of the most significant aspects of the growth of the Rural Electrification Administration is the tremendous amount of work that has been donated by nonpaid but interested farmer-members throughout the United States, especially in the early days of this organization when there was considerable reluctance and apprehension on the part of some farmers to commit themselves to an added expense during a period of depressed prices that prevailed from 1932 until the advent of World War II. It was largely through the courage and conviction of these dedicated farmer-members that the practicability of distributing electricity through the rural areas was established.

After its acceptance and the reasonable cost had been established, its growth and expansion was very rapid. This growth and expansion was interrupted only by World War II.

I think it is especially appropriate to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that one of the most outstanding administrators of the Rural Electrification Administration is a Member of the House today from the great State of Minnesota, the Honorable ANCHER NELSEN. It was during his administration that most of the policy questions revolving around REA were resolved to the near satisfaction of all interested parties, both Government and nongovernment. There has been noticeably less conflict around this Agency since Mr. NELSEN's tenure as its Administrator.

In my State of Kansas a good friend of mine, Mr. Fred Yarrow, was a pioneer in the development of rural electric co-ops and I am glad that he is in Washington at this time to attend this anniversary.

It is of further interest to note the fine record made by the Rural Electrification Administration and the REA's telephone program last year.

During 1959, REA's electric borrowers connected 132,000 unserved rural establshments. Three-fourths of these were nonfarm consumers. At the same time, the average use of electricity continued to rise, and REA borrowers sold nearly 14 percent more electric power in fiscal 1959 than they did in 1958.

During the year, 250 electric loans were approved amounting to $177,292,100, bringing total loans since 1935 to more than $3.94 billion. Principal and interest payments to the Government rose to more than $1.1 billion, and over $146 million of this sum represented payments made in advance of due dates. Only two borrowers were delinquent in payments more than 30 days as of June 30, 1959. Net worth of borrowers amounted to 16.6 percent of their total assets at the end of calendar 1958.

REA telephone loans in 1959 set a new record of $99 million. A total of 223 loans were approved, including loans to 54 new borrowers. They brought the total number of telephone companies and cooperatives participating in the program to 665.

Loans since start of the telephone program in 1949 rose to $575 million by the end of 1959. When construction is completed, this money will provide modern telephone service for 1.2 million subscribers. More than 180,000 new subscribers were connected during 1959.

Telephone borrowers made payments to REA of more than $8.8 million dur-

ing 1959. At year-end, 95 borrowers had a balance with REA of nearly $1.6 million in advance payments, and the number of borrowers delinquent more than 30 days in their payments had been reduced to 13.

AWARD OF KOLLIGIAN TROPHY TO 1ST LT. RONALD L. WARNER

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on the 11th of this month, today, 1st Lt. Ronald L. Warner was awarded the U.S. Air Force's Koren Kolligian, Jr., Trophy by Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Vice Chief of Staff.

It is a source of great pride to me that the Kolligian family lives in my congressional district. This is the third award of that trophy I have been privileged to witness. I am so grateful to the young Kolligian pilot who gave his life for us and to his family for their appreciation of the heroism of other pilots.

Lieutenant Warner lives in the district of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL]. Mr. GOODELL also attended the award and I know he feels great pride in his constituent.

I set forth at this point the Air Force release from the Pentagon relating to this award:

AIR FORCE AWARDS KOLLIGIAN TROPHY TO TRANSPORT PILOT

The third annual award of the U.S. Air Force's Koren Kolligian, Jr., Trophy was made this morning to 1st Lt. Ronald L. Warner by Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Vice Chief of Staff, in ceremonies held at the Pentagon.

The trophy, presented each year to the aircrewman who most successfully copes with an emergency situation in flight, was awarded to Lieutenant Warner for exercising unusual courage, airmanship, and judgment in landing a crippled C–119 during an overwater flight between Okinawa and Guam on September 4, 1959.

Lieutenant Warner, 25, of Cattaraugus, N.Y., was piloting the cargo-type aircraft with 27 passengers aboard when a malfunction occurred in the right propeller, causing the aircraft to lose altitude rapidly. The plane was midway between Okinawa and Guam, with insufficient fuel to reach a suitable landing area. With the aircraft operating at reduced speed due to the defective propeller, Lieutenant Warner managed to get it under control and maintain a flyable altitude.

Knowing he could not reach Guam, Okinawa, or Iwo Jima, Lieutenant Warner made radio contact with two escort aircraft, then jettisoned five 6-man life rafts and associated survival equipment and eventually landed the plane and passengers at Iwo Jima successfully with practically no fuel left in the tanks.

In citing Lieutenant Warner for this operation, the Air Force said "his courage and determination together with his superior knowledge, skill, and professional airmanship enabled him to cope successfully with an in-flight emergency situation and undoubtedly resulted in the saving of many lives, as well as preserving his aircraft."

Lieutenant Warner is assigned to the 6313th Air Base Wing of the 313th Air Division, Pacific Air Forces, Okinawa. He attended Alfred Agricultural and Technical Institute before entering the Air Force as a flying cadet in 1954. He is married and has one child, a baby boy a few days old, named Ronald L. Warner, Jr.

The Koren Kolligian, Jr., Trophy was donated to the Air Force by the Koren Kolligian family of Winchester, Mass., in the name and memory of 1st Lt. Koren Kolligian, Jr., USAF, who was declared missing in a T–33 jet aircraft off the Farallon Islands near San Francisco in 1955. He was assigned to McClellan, AFB, Calif., at the time. The Kolligian, Sr., family attended today's ceremony.

MRS. ANNE MORGAN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1607) for the relief of Mrs. Anne Morgan, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "Act" and insert "Act: *Provided, however,* That the passage of this Act shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks following mine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago today was a great day in America. President Franklin D. Roosevelt ordered the lights turned on in rural America.

It was on May 11, 1935, that the President placed his signature upon an Executive order creating the Rural Electrification Administration. This was an historic day. It was a great and good day not only for farmers but for all Americans.

The Rural Electrification Act of 1936 gave REA permanent status.

I remind the House that it was our great Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, then chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, who led the fight in the House for this legislation. I am proud to have been at his side in this battle. The drive for REA in the Senate was sparked by that great Senator from Nebraska, George W. Norris.

Thus, in 1936, the Congress joined Franklin D. Roosevelt in directing that the modern miracles of electricity should be taken down the country roads and the lanes to the then remote rural homes of our country.

Those were the dark days of the Great Depression when, in our urgent necessities, the Nation was awakening to a new concept of its responsibility for the well-being, and the dignity, of all its citizens; and our Government boldly and courageously accepted the challenges of the times. It was in such times, along with other measures relating to the God-given rights and aspirations of all the people, that REA was born.

We have come a long way in this quarter of a century.

Many of you here can remember the day when we never saw an electric light except when we slicked up and went to a city. I can clearly recall the cleaning of the shades and the trimming of the wicks of the kerosene lamps in the days of my childhood, and well do I remember what a blessing it was when the lights were turned on at our house.

We can recall the rugged way of farm life, especially for the farm wife, when rural homes possessed none of the conveniences and comforts that electricity already had bestowed on homes in the cities. These were the days when our rural people aged ahead of their years, when farmers were set apart, because they were so poor; and other people pitied—or did not envy—them. Farming was deemed to be a hard way of life, filled with drudgery.

Some of you here were youngsters back on the farm in the 1930's.

Do you recall how young people wanted to get away from the country—how they longed for the lights and comforts of the glittering cities? They wanted a way of life and opportunities that the farm then did not seem to offer.

A quarter of a century ago America had entered the electrical age, and our farm people had been left behind.

Our free enterprise system has made America the greatest of all nations. We all know that this system will deliver to any man's door most any material thing that he is able and willing to pay for. The farmer was left behind when the Nation entered the electrical age because he was so poor. He simply did not have the money to bring to his home the conveniences and comforts enjoyed in the cities.

But in the 1930's the Nation installed in Washington a President and a Congress capable of meeting the challenge.

We established the Rural Electrification Administration to take the power line to the farmer's home.

We established a farm program which improved farm prices and incomes and enabled the farm family to enjoy the conveniences and comforts and the security of homes in the cities.

In this quarter of a century a miracle has been wrought, indeed.

In 1935, when REA was born, only one or two or three farms in a hundred, in some States, enjoyed the blessings of electricity. For the Nation as a whole only 1 farmstead in 10 was electrified.

Today there is hardly a farm in America without electricity, except in the remotest and most isolated areas. Some 97 percent of all farms have electricity.

Moreover, we have given the REA the job of taking telephone service to rural America and hundreds of thousands of farm homes now enjoy this convenience.

Looking back, Mr. Speaker, we must wonder how it was that any man could have stood then against such a program which not only has blessed our farm people but also has been a boon to our workers in the cities, for our farmers now provide a multi-billion-dollar market for the appliances, the devices, and the gadgets produced in the cities. But you will recall the battle here on this floor, as selfish influences were brought to bear, and some ruthless people sought to tie a tag of "socialism" on every forward-looking piece of legislation.

In this connection I would remind the House that it never was the intention of the sponsors of REA that it should replace established private power services, or duplicate such services. REA was brought into being to take powerlines down the country roads and lanes where private power, back in those days, did not venture such expansion. In my own State of North Carolina private power has also accomplished miracles in service to the people.

I am proud that now, 25 years since President Roosevelt signed the REA Executive order, the whole Nation—except, of course, for a few incorrigible dissidents—looks upon the REA as a boon and blessing within the framework of free enterprise—as American as fried chicken or apple pie. The accomplishments of REA have exceeded even our most hopeful expectations of a quarter of a century ago.

But, Mr. Speaker, on this occasion of celebration we are compelled to inject an ominous and foreboding note.

Agriculture, recently so hopeful of economic equality with the people in other pursuits, has been plunged into another crisis. The farm price support and production adjustment program, based upon the parity principle, has been virtually destroyed, and the Nation's agriculture again is in desperate straits.

For 11 consecutive years prior to 1953, during which major crops were supported at 90 percent of parity, the average prices for all farm output in the marketplaces were at 100 percent of parity or better, and farm program costs were negligible. This, indeed, was the golden era of agriculture—the most prosperous years for farmers in all our history.

Then, for reasons still unclear and unexplained, there was an abrupt change in the executive department's attitude toward farm policy and programs. We were shifted from a system of firm price supports to flexible or lower supports and freedom was urged for farmers to produce to the limit, irrespective of the piling of surplus upon surplus at great cost to the Government.

The tragic consequences are felt in virtually every farm home in America.

During the last 7 years the net income of all of agriculture has been $20 billion less than in the 7 previous years, in a time when income and prices in other areas of the economy have advanced spectacularly.

Farmers' net income in 1959 was at the lowest level, in relation to volume of their sales, of any year since the Department of Agriculture began keeping records in 1910.

Average farm prices in December 1959 reached their lowest, in terms of parity with other prices, for any December since 1933.

Per capita annual income of people living on farms in 1959—including subsidies and also their earnings from off-farm work—was less than one-half that of nonfarm people. The per capita income of farm people totaled $960, compared to $2,202 for nonfarm people.

In 1959 American consumers bought 16 percent more farm-produced food than in 1952, yet our farmers received $100 million less for that larger volume than for the most limited volume in 1952; and, in contrast, consumers paid food processors and marketing middlemen $10 billion more in 1959 than in 1952 for hauling, processing, and handling the food between the farm gate and the retail counter.

I have no intention of injecting on this occasion any controversy over specific farm program proposals, but I do feel it is appropriate, and that it is incumbent upon me as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, to direct the attention of the House and the Nation to the conditions of penury now settling again upon our farm people. It is my painful duty to admonish that the hopes of bringing agriculture into a parity position, in our economy and in our democratic society, are being shattered.

Mr. Speaker, the circumstances of our farm people are such that action is imperative. The day demands vision and dedication. These are the qualities that, in the mid-1930's, guided our Government to measure up to its responsibilities to the people who produce our food and fiber and who have made us the best-fed Nation on this earth.

I commend to this House, Mr. Speaker, the example you have set for us, where the well-being of the families on these broad lands of ours is concerned. We celebrate today the great achievements of the Rural Electrification Administration. In so doing, we salute you, and we pay tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt and to such other great men as George W. Norris.

It is the prayer of the farm people of America, and of all who are devoted to their well-being, that our Government—guided by the same vision and dedication that brought light to the dark nights of our great American countryside a quarter of a century ago—may now proceed to reestablish the proposition and the principle that our farm people have a right and ought to share in the rewards and all the blessings of this free-enterprise capitalistic system, on a parity and in equal measure with all Americans.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate and commend you and all of those who have worked with you in bringing this great program to the farm people of America, turning on the lights in the rural areas of our great Nation.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues in the celebration of the 25th anniversary of the rural electrification program. I know of no other program authorized by Congress that has brought more happiness and comfort to rural America. I take this opportunity to congratulate all of those who conceived this program, and those who have developed the REA movement over the years. They have the eternal gratitude of millions of our citizens living on farms and ranches in this country, who are now enjoying the advantages of electricity in their homes and on their farms as a result of this legislation.

The State of Colorado takes unusual pride in this silver anniversary celebration because of the fact that the present Administrator, Mr. David A. Hamil, is a Colorado man. Mr. Hamil has had an outstanding record of public service, as well as being a successful farmer and stockman. Mr. Hamil served for many years in the Colorado State Legislature and was honored by being elected Speaker of the House. He has made a splendid record as REA Administrator, and enjoys the confidence of all groups, many of whom have passed resolutions expressing confidence in his administration. We are very proud over the record being made by Mr. Hamil, and I want to wish him continued success in all of his plans for future REA development in this country.

Since coming to Congress I have given the REA program my full support. I have been very pleased to see this program expand and develop, not alone in Colorado, but in the entire Nation, where 4,736,000 rural consumers now enjoy electric service.

I am proud to have three REA cooperatives in my district. These cooperatives have been well managed and have been very successful, although facing many problems over the years. I want to commend their directors and managers, both past and present, for their outstanding achievements.

I wish to mention Mr. James N. Myers, who is manager of the Southeast Colorado Power Association with headquarters at La Junta; Mr. Edward E. Gaither, manager of the San Isabel Electric Association with offices at Pueblo; and Mr. Ray W. Villyard, manager of the San Luis Valley Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc. at Monte Vista. All three are recognized as outstanding REA leaders in Colorado.

In addition to these three cooperatives, two others also serve patrons in my district, although their headquarters are located outside of the third district. I refer to the Mountain View Electric Association, Inc., of which Mr. Ralph E. McMillan of Limon is manager; and to the Sangre de Cristo Electric Association, Inc., of which Mr. Norman S. Knudsen of Salida is manager. All of these co-ops are doing a fine job in making electric service available to their customers.

I have also been happy to support the REA telephone program. These telephone loans have been made to REA cooperatives in Colorado, and some of these lines are located in my district. I understand that as of January 1, 1960, REA had loaned $5,378,000 to eight borrowers in the State of Colorado, four of which are commercial companies and four are cooperatives. I am sure that the telephone program will continue to grow and expand over the years, and will make telephone service available to thousands of farmers and stockmen who would otherwise be unable to enjoy this convenience.

I feel very proud over the record made by REA cooperatives in Colorado; 89.7 percent of Colorado farmers are now receiving electric service, either through REA cooperatives or private utilities. Colorado's 25 rural electric co-ops have built more than 31,500 miles of electric powerlines at an average cost of $2,000 per mile to bring modern electric convenience to over 70,000 rural homes, ranches, and farms, as well as business concerns and other installations.

At the beginning of this year the Rural Electrification Administrator had approved a total of $121,167,157 in loans to 25 electric cooperatives in the State of Colorado. These loans were authorized in order to enable these borrowers to construct some 34,495 miles of line and other electric facilities which will provide electric service for approximately 87,000 consumers.

These REA cooperatives have repaid more than $12 million on the principal of their loans, in addition to over $8 million in interest, and are now almost $5 million ahead of schedule in interest payments. At the first of the year there was no REA cooperative in Colorado which was overdue in its loan payments. I think this is an outstanding record, and all of those who have participated in the management of these cooperatives deserve great credit for what they have accomplished.

I wish to state that we have always had very harmonious and pleasant relations between the REA cooperatives and the private utilities in my district. Up until a few years ago all of the power distributed by the cooperatives was purchased from these private companies. In recent years public power from the Colorado Big Thompson and other Federal projects has been made available by the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Southeast Colorado Power Association, the San Isabel Electric Association, and the Sangre de Cristo Electric Association organized the Arkansas Valley G. & T., Inc. for the construction of a powerplant at Canon City, which is operated by the Southern Colorado Power Co., a private utility. This enables these three cooperatives to obtain power at a cheaper rate and has been a very satisfactory arrangment for everyone concerned. This plant has been a great success, and the construction of a second plant is under consideration at this time.

Colorado's rural electrics have a vital interest in the social and economic growth in the communities they serve. Rural electric lines reach Colorado's isolated mountains and plains, providing convenience as well as employment opportunities to Colorado's rural families. These associations are making a most important contribution to the economy of their respective areas.

I am confident the REA movement will continue to grow and prosper in the years ahead. I have greatly enjoyed my association and work with all of those connected with the REA program. I hope the time will come when every farm in America will be able to obtain electric service. I believe that this goal will eventually be reached. It is a distinct privilege and pleasure to extend these good wishes to REA on its 25th birthday. I want to wish everyone connected with the REA program success in their plans for the future and I pledge to them my continued cooperation and support.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my distinguished colleagues in praising rural electrification, one of the most democratic programs which this great Nation has had the good fortune to develop.

I personally was born and raised in an urban community but many of my friends in the First Congressional District of Virginia knew the darkness and drudgery that existed before the birth of the Rural Electrification Administration. Many of the families I know still can remember waiting for the lights to come on and the lighting of the countryside remains indelibly stamped on the memories of many rural families.

Electric energy is the lifeblood of a rural community and rural electrification has made this lifeblood flow abundantly. Its contributions to the economic progress of the Nation cannot be overemphasized. Many of these contributions are self-evident—farm efficiency has been substantially improved and rural education, health and recreational facilities have been expanded and the farm family has more leisure time to enjoy the fruits of its labors.

Electric power takes the place of increasingly scarce farm labor. There is a two-way benefit in increased electrical mechanization of the farm. On one side, managing the farm has become less laborious. On the other, young men and women have been freed to leave the farm if their personal inclinations lie in some other direction. The rich supply of manpower that was once tied to menial farm tasks has now been freed into the broader market of engineers, scientists, factory workers and teachers.

I would like to join REA cooperatives in Virginia and across the Nation in celebrating their 25th anniversary.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, one of the great achievements of the Democratic administration has been the Rural Electrification Administration. Today is the silver anniversary of the REA. Just 25 years ago today, May 11, 1935, President Roosevelt, by executive order, established a temporary Rural Electrification Administration. This order was designed to carry out an authorization of the Congress contained in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, permitting $100 million of the emergency relief funds contained in the act to be used for rural electrification purposes. The skeptics thought it was just one of those temporary things which would disappear in a short time. However, in 1936, legislation which was introduced in the House by you, Mr. Speaker, and in the Senate by the late Senator George Norris of Nebraska was passed providing for the setting up of the Rural Electrification Administration as a permanent agency of the Federal Government and authorizing a 10-year rural electrification loan program. This legislation became known as the REA Act of May 20, 1936.

As I look around me today, I am very proud of my privilege to serve with those Members of this body who, along with our Speaker, played a part in the creation of this agency which has meant so much to millions of rural people. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] was a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which favorably reported this bill to the House. Some of the other Members of that history-making 74th Congress with whom it is my privilege to serve in this, the 86th Congress, are former Speaker of the House JOE MARTIN, our majority and minority leaders, Mr. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, and Mr. HALLECK, of Indiana; Mr. COOLEY, of North Carolina; Mr. VINSON, of Georgia; Mr. ARENDS, of Illinois; Mr. CANNON, of Missouri; Mr. MAHON, of Texas; Mr. TABER and Mr. CELLER, of New York; Mrs. ROGERS, of Massachusetts; Mr. SPENCE, of Kentucky; Mr. SMITH, of Virginia; Mr. COLMER, of Mississippi; Mr. ALLEN, of Illinois; Mr. BARDEN, of North Carolina; Mr. HOFFMAN, of Michigan; Mr. PATMAN, of Texas; and Mr. WALTER, of Pennsylvania. With such a distinguished list of godparents, there is little wonder that REA is held in such high prestige in the Congress today.

In reporting the REA bill to the House in 1936, no minority views were filed by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Mr. RAYBURN, in submitting this bill to the House, filed a general statement on behalf of the committee. I quote a part of the Speaker RAYBURN'S statement:

> The widespread interest in rural communities for the rural electrification program indicates that few things will add more to the comfort, satisfaction, and happiness of the rural population than the electrification of farm homes. The farmer should become a much better consumer of electricity than the dweller in the city. The farmer has use for all the household electrical appliances which can be used by the city dweller, but, in addition, he is a large user of power in his business. Water pumps, feed grinders, milking machines, small motors for many uses, and refrigeration are among the many uses of electricity which mean a saving of money and a relief of the drudgery of farmwork.
>
> No grant or subsidy is provided for in the bill. It is the intention of the bill that all of the money loaned for any of the purposes specified shall be returned to the Government, with interest as provided. It is believed that these loans are perfectly safe. In the hearings before the committee, it appeared that of the 6,800,000 farms in the United States, about 6 million are not receiving central-station service. It was estimated that the funds made available by this bill might result in reaching about 1,900,000 of this number, and that this number of farms is well within the number than can

be served upon a self-liquidating basis. Experience of other agencies engaged in making loans for household appliances has demonstrated that such loans are promptly repaid. The value to the farm of electric service and the appliances for its use is such that the service obtained is continued as one of the basic necessities of farm life.

The bill has received the endorsement of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Administrator of the present Rural Electrification Administration. The bill has also received the endorsement of all of the leading farm organizations of the United States.

There is no reason why the farmers of America should not have the conveniences, economies, and comforts which are a part of the modern, electrified home. It is believed that the 10-year program provided for by this bill will aid greatly in establishing the much-needed balance between urban and rural standards of life.

In 1944 the REA program was extended indefinitely. From 1935 until 1939, REA was an independent agency of the Federal Government. Since 1939, it has been an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The Administrator of REA is appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation. The first Administrator of the REA was Mr. Morris L. Cooke. He was followed by Mr. John Carmody. The third Administrator was Mr. Harry Slattery; the fourth was Mr. Claude Wickard; the fifth was Mr. Ancher Nelsen; and the sixth and present Administrator is Mr. David A. Hamil, who has served since June 26, 1956.

The Rural Electrification Administration was authorized to make loans for rural electrification, to furnish elctricity to persons in rural areas who were not receiving central-station service. These loans would be made for a period of not exceeding 25 years, with interest at 3 percent, or less. The 1936 act provided that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was authorized to advance $50 million for the fiscal year 1937, with interest at 3 percent, repayable in 25 years. In addition, $40 million was authorized annually as a direct appropriation from funds in the Treasury of the United States for each of the next 9 years, 1938 through 1946. Although under the 1936 act, REA was to be financed by the RFC for only 1 year, actually, this method was continued through the fiscal year 1947. A total of $931,500,000 was authorized to be borrowed from the RFC from 1936 through 1947. Since the Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1948, REA loan funds are derived directly from the Treasury of the United States. Loans made under the Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1948 and subsequent acts are made at an annual rate of interest as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, but not to exceed 2 percent, repayable in 35 years. Since 1952, borrowings from the Treasury have been at 2 percent. A part of each consumer's monthly payment for electric or telephone service is used to repay the loan from the Government and all REA loans are repaid from the operating revenues of the borrowers who are financed.

After the Rural Electrification Act had been in effect a few years, the rural residents of our country wanted another type of service aid in the form of loans from the Federal Government, and that was modernization and extension of rural telephone service. Late in 1949, Congress amended the Rural Electrification Act and gave REA authority to make telephone, as well as electrification, loans to qualified borrowers. The act provides that preference shall be given to nonprofit and cooperative organizations in making loans. When REA was first established, there were few existing organizations to which loans could be made, so the farmers, acting under State laws, formed their own cooperative associations and applied for loans. REA has made more than 95 percent of its electrification loans and about half of its telephone loans to cooperatives organized by rural residents.

Before the establishment of REA, most of rural America was in kerosene darkness. In 1937, only 10 percent of all farms in the United States were receiving central-station electric service. The 1950 census listed 4,740,849 farms and on June 30, 1952, REA estimated that 88.1 percent of these were electrified.

In my State of Louisiana there were 170,216 rural homes and farms in 1937 and only 2,826 of these farm homes had electricity—1.7 percent—as compared with a national average of 10 percent. The first member-owned REA financed cooperative in Louisiana was organized in St. Mary Parish in 1937. It was called the Teche Electric Co-op. The Valley Electric Membership Corp. was organized in the Natchitoches Parish soon after, and shortly thereafter, the Southwest Louisiana Electric Membership Corp. was formed in Lafayette Parish. Today, 23 years later, there are 13 REA-financed cooperatives in Louisiana, providing 98-percent area coverage, as compared to 1.7 percent in 1937. This is a national record in total percentage of members served. They serve more than one-half million rural people, their farms, businesses, and small industries. The 13 cooperatives have more than 25,000 miles of rural lines, averaging around 4.5 members per mile for the State of Louisiana, whose kilowatt-hour consumption has jumped from about 45 kilowatt-hours per consumer in 1940 to an average of 245 kilowatt-hours per consumer in 1959. This increased consumption has required the rephasing and rebuilding of practically all the lines since 1950.

The REA cooperatives are controlled by member-elected boards of directors which are composed of outstanding local citizens and, contrary to the belief of many that member-owned cooperatives are government agencies which are existing on taxpayer handouts, they have a remarkable record of repaying REA loans. Since 1937 the 13 cooperatives in Louisiana have been advanced slightly over $55 million by REA, and as of December 31, 1959, they have repaid $19,983,256, of which $5,809,379 was interest on the Federal loans. In addition, and not included in the figure I just gave you, they had repaid $4,831,719 in advance of schedule.

Perhaps the greatest achievement of rural electrification is to be found in the improved standards of living of our farm families. REA loans were approved in the belief that farm people would apply electric power to a wide range of farm and home chores. To teach people to use their strange new servant effectively, county agents, home extension specialists and REA power-use representatives waged a ceaseless educational campaign. Not only has farming become more attractive and livable, with back-breaking drudgery gone, but it, also, has become more efficient and profitable. Electric service made possible running hot and cold water and plumbing in every farm home; it preserved food and provided better meals; eyes are protected by better lighting, and in many ways, the family's health has been improved. Probably the most popular appliance in rural America when homes were first served with electricity was the elecric iron. A close second in popularity was the radio, which helped end the feeling of isolation which had depressed countless farmers and their families. Now, I am sure, the television is one of the most popular appliances. Equally important to the rural family is the telephone, which enables the family to keep in touch with its neighbors, its community, and its Nation.

It is shortsighted to think of rural electrification as having helped only the farmers. The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that for each dollar invested by the cooperatives, their members have spent $6 for appliances alone. But this is only the beginning. Think of the great dairying industry, a direct contribution of rural electrification; the fishing industry, dependent upon modern refrigeration; and a host of small rural industries, along with many new main street businesses and industries which have been created by the new markets, methods, production, and so forth, made possible by rural electricity.

Besides altering life on the farm, the availability of electric power in rural areas has brought about profound changes in the character of rural America. Suburbs have been built on the fringes of towns and cities; retired people and commuters have been moving into rural areas; recreational sites, summer homes, camps and other facilities are enjoyed by urban as well as by rural people.

Another benefit of great importance to our whole Nation is that the development of all these small industries, and so forth, made possible by the Rural Electrification Administration, has given employment to many, many persons. I know that the REA has had a big part in bringing about the increased productivity and a stronger economy in my own State of Louisiana. And I feel that, truly, everyone has benefited.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 25th anniversary of the establishment of the rural electrification program which in the past quarter century has brought the priceless asset of electricity to America's rural population.

Five rural electric cooperatives have their headquarters in the Sixth Congressional District of Missouri and each has

done an outstanding job in providing service to our farm people.

These electric cooperatives are the Northwest Missouri Electric Cooperative at Savannah, Mo.; the Farmers' Electric Cooperative, Inc., at Chillicothe, Mo.; the Nodaway-Worth Electric Cooperative, Inc., at Maryville, Mo.; the Atchison-Holt Electric Cooperative of Rock Port, Mo., and the Platte-Clay Electric Cooperative, Inc., at Platte City, Mo.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a fine statement regarding the activities of the Farmers' Electric Cooperative prepared by Ernest C. Wood, manager of that cooperative:

At the statewide level, rural electrification, as of May 11, 1935, is officially established at 6.4 percent. Present figures released by REA would reflect that Missouri is 96 percent electrified rurally, and I think that northwest Missouri would be between 98 and 99 percent. The rural electric cooperatives of the State deserve a pat on the back in that they have accomplished approximately 80 percent of the total job in the State.

It is a completely erroneous assumption for anyone to think that now that the job is nearly 100 percent completed that the REA program and its need for loan funds is ended. As an example, Farmers' Electric has had advanced, to date, from REA, $5,698,000 under its loan contract. These figures are as of January 1, 1960. With these loan funds, we have built 3,074 miles of line and have had a peak connected consumer count of 7,273.

To look into the future, we have had an engineering firm design on blueprint a system projected to deliver 1,500 kilowatt-hours per month per consumer. It is anticipated that this level will be reached in 20 to 25 years. The engineers have calculated that we will spend an additional $6,084,000. You can readily see that loan fund requirements will not diminish. In fact, we will just about double our investment in the equivalent period of time that we have been operating inasmuch as our cooperative first energized in April 1940.

The problems of the various cooperatives are different, and our cooperative, being more rural than many because of not being close to a major city, has suffered a net decline in consumers for the past 5 years. This decline has been more severe than average during the year 1959 and things to date in 1960 are still more drastic than in 1959. Two tables, both of which are self-explanatory are attached reflecting some average figures and also reflecting net consumer losses. The general farm situation and especially products farmers receive influence my thinking that the situation, so far as total connected consumers is concerned, will become steadily worse, in our cooperative, which is basically rural in its total service area.

On the optimistic side, there are several factors that add up on the optimistic side. Of course, the important thing is that rural electrification has transformed rural areas from darkness into light. This is literally true, so far as electric service is concerned and you can add to it the many other physical and cultural advantages which result from rural electrification to establish for the program a very satisfactory achievement.

Another big plus factor resulting from rural electrification is the tremendous contribution it has made financially and in the labor market. Research has developed that for each dollar spent by a rural electric cooperative, each of its consumers will spend approximately $4. Therefore, the nearly $5,700,000 spent by the cooperative would indicate that our consumers have spent approximately $22,800,000 for wiring, plumbing, and related fixtures and appliances.

Summed up, the cooperative and its consumers have spent approximately $28,500,000 which certainly has been a big boost in employment, manufacturing, construction activity, and related economy benefits.

Summed up, it would probably be impossible to put an evaluation on the REA program. Not only has it contributed in a major way to the economy of the country, but probably more outstanding is the social contribution to which the program has contributed. Prior to rural electrification, the rural areas of our country were certainly in the dark in every respect and the many advantages to rural people which have been made available with rural electrification has contributed immeasurably to the raising of the rural social standards.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, many of us have witnessed federally sponsored programs develop. Some have been outstandingly successful and some have failed.

The rural electrification program has been an excellent example of a program that has made great contributions to rural America and to the economic growth of the country.

Today, May 11, marks the silver anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration—25 years old, and going strong.

Many times people take for granted the conveniences that modern technology has produced, but the farm families that carried the kerosene lantern around the barn at chore time; that cleaned the globe of the kerosene lamp on the dining room table—and if they were particularly fortunate the old handcrank telephone hung on the wall—this group of people are especially proud, happy and thankful for the rural electrification program which today has transformed rural America into a more pleasant place to live.

I can say these things with considerable feeling, having experienced all of the things that I cite, and I look back now to the early days of the organization of the system that serves my farm, look back to the hours spent with the board of directors, and later to the opportunity for service with the REA Administration itself.

All of these things I appreciate very much because this program has made contributions that we can all be proud of.

Let us look at people, first of all, because the Congress created REA in the first place to help people. The Rural Electrification Act was written to provide the long-term loans that groups of farmers and other rural people needed in order to bring electric power into their homes, their farm buildings, their schools, churches, rural industrial plants, and village shops.

In its 25th year, REA loans were directly responsible for dependable electric service to 4¾ million consumers and for modern dial telephone service to close to 1 million subscribers. An estimated 139,000 new consumers were added to the lines of REA electrification borrowers during 1959. Telephone borrowers connected approximately 200,000 subscribers during the year. The influence of the REA lending programs has stimulated other utility systems to extend service to additional millions of people over these 25 years, so that today we can take pride in stating that 97 percent of America's farms have electricity and better than 60 percent have telephones. This is a startling contrast to the record before REA, when only 11 percent of our farms had electric service and 38 percent had telephones. And let me point out, further, the measure of these last 7 years of REA progress under the Republican administration. In mid-1953, an estimated 90 percent of farms had electricity and an estimated 44 percent had telephones.

Another measure of growth in rural electrification and rural telephone service is the total dollars of investment. Under the present administration, REA has approved nearly $2 billion in electric and telephone loans. Of the total of $4 billion in electric loans approved since REA began its lending operations 25 years ago, almost $1½ billion, or about 35 percent, has been approved since the start of 1953. Telephone loans approved since January 1953 amount to nearly $575 million, or more than 87 percent of the total of $655 million approved during the life of the program. Electric loans during 1959 amounted to $172 million and telephone loans for this last calendar year came to a little over $107 million.

REA approved loans providing for more generating capacity during the last 7 years than was provided for in loans during the preceding 17½ years. Between mid-1935, when REA began, and the end of 1952, loans provided for a generating capacity of 1.14 million kilowatts. Since January 1, 1953, loans have been approved to provide for an additional 1.2 million kilowatts of capacity. Generation and transmission loans have accounted for around 32 percent of all REA electric loans under the last two Administrators, compared with 19 percent before 1953. In 1959, more than 27 percent of REA's electric loans were for these facilities.

In the telephone program, REA estimates that on January 1, 1960, a total of 2,259 modern dial telephone exchanges had been placed in service through REA financing. Less than 100 had been completed before 1953.

The repayment record on REA loans is a most important measurement of progress. Since January 1, 1953, the number of electrification borrowers delinquent in their loan payments dropped from 45 to 1. And in the telephone program, delinquencies dropped from 31 out of a total of 240 borrowers in December 1953 to 9 out of a total of 689 borrowers today. I think this is a truly outstanding achievement. It suggests to me two things: First, that the people at REA are on the ball; and, second, that the borrowers themselves are doing better today than they were a few years back.

Both of these points are in themselves measures of progress. I call to your attention the fact that REA today runs two loan programs—the electric and the telephone—with fewer employees than it used to take to run one program. In

fiscal year 1949, before the telephone loan program began, it took 1,076 man-years to operate the rural electrification loan program. In fiscal 1959, however, it required only 1,018 man-years to keep both programs humming along at peak efficiency. At a time when we are beset with requests for additional administrative funds to maintain our Federal programs, it is refreshing to find an agency that can do more with less.

Citing the progress of the program and the accomplishments of the REA Administration, I wish to make it very clear that I do not believe that you measure success by the number of dollars loaned or by the growth of the size of an agency.

Many of the REA systems are presently financing their expansion out of earnings. A sizable number have repaid the total Government loans that have been advanced and are on their own. This is a sign of maturity, and certainly a goal that we all hope to attain.

The utility business is not a static one as far as capital investment is concerned; it continually grows, and capital of expansion is always needed.

Looking to the future, it is my hope that the REA and RTA systems may develop programs where we will no longer be completely dependent on Government funds, but have a system of financing set up that can be managed by the rural people themselves. Under such circumstances we would not be subjected to the political winds that blow during election years.

Going back to the point of how the REA borrowers are getting along with their own operations as locally owned, independent business enterprises—substantial progress can be measured in the rural electrification program.

Operating revenues of approximately a thousand REA-financed electric systems last year climbed 9.8 percent over 1958 levels, reaching an estimated $618 million for the year. Revenues were about $297 million higher than they were in 1952. These same REA borrowers sold 15.5 percent more electric power to consumers in 1959 than they did in 1958. Sales last year totaled 25.3 billion kilowatt-hours, compared with 21.9 billion kilowatt-hours the year before.

Consumers on these rural systems continue to use more and more electric power for their farm, household, and other needs. The average for all consumers on REA-financed lines rose to 5,200 kilowatt-hours for 1959, up from 4,720 kilowatt-hours the year before.

While consumption of electricity was climbing, the average price was dropping. It fell from an average of 2.48 cents per kwh for all consumers on the lines of REA borrowers in 1958 to a record low of 2.36 cents per kwh in 1959.

Net worth is one of the most important indexes of the financial strength of REA borrowers. It has been rising steadily in recent years. Total net worth of REA-financed electric borrowers stood at $602 million—or 18.2 percent of total assets—on January 1, 1960. It was up from 16.6 percent a year earlier. As recently as January 1, 1953, the average net worth of REA electric borrowers was only 7.7 percent of assets.

Every yardstick we apply to the rural utility programs measures growth and improvement. And the trend of progress should continue, if enlightened leadership and supervision is maintained. REA statisticians predict a tremendous increase in power sales by rural electric systems during the next 15 years. The increase will come both from the power demand of new consumers and the greater use of power by existing consumers. REA estimates that by 1963, the average user on rural lines will be putting to work some 7,000 kwh a year, and the number of consumers served by REA-financed lines will swell to over 5 million by that time.

This is indeed an encouraging measurement of the rural electric and telephone programs on REA's 25th anniversary. All of us in the Congress can share with the rural people who own and operate these electric and telephone systems the satisfaction in a job that is being well done and continuing into a bright future.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the REA on its 25th birthday. This agency of Government has a record of achievement and accomplishment of which we are all very proud. Its program has resulted in bringing rural electrification to the farm areas of this country, thus providing our rural people with the same farm benefits and conveniences afforded the people of our urban areas. Many rural sections of the country are now almost completely electrified and rapid progress is being made in even the most remote areas. When REA was created in 1935, only 10.9 percent of all farms in the United States had electric service. As of January 1, 1960, more than 96 percent of all farms were being served. The REA record of repaying its loans is also most commendable. Losses have been few and in many instances loans have been repaid before their maturity dates. This is somewhat unique in the history of Federal lending agencies. The present REA Administrator, David Hamil, as well as the REA cooperatives throughout the country are to be congratulated on a job well done.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the story of rural electrification in South Dakota is one of cooperation—cooperation among farm people, cooperation between farmer and villager, and cooperation between rural people and their Federal Government.

The job was not done overnight. Although the Rural Electrification Administration was established in May 1935, by 1940 there still were only five rural electric cooperatives in South Dakota, and four of these were in the southeastern part of the State.

During the war years—and immediately after—farmers in other parts of the East River country organized another group of cooperatives, but it was not until 1950 that the great goal of area coverage—of electric power for every farmer and rancher in South Dakota—came close to being realized. Then the giant rural electric systems were organized in the West River country. You can get some idea of the size of this undertaking when you realize that six REA-financed co-ops in the West serve about half of the area of our State with electricity. The job was done in true cooperative spirit. The new cooperatives in the West acquired all the small, crossroads utilities in their area, so that the people in these more densely settled villages helped to make feasible the extension of lines to the sparsely settled farm and ranch country.

Today—on this 25th anniversary of REA—more than 87 percent of all farms in South Dakota have central station electric service. Rural electric cooperatives serve 91.2 percent of these electrified farms, and practically all the power they distribute is purchased either from the Bureau of Reclamation or from REA-financed generating facilities. This is evidence of the progress achieved by electric cooperatives in bringing the benefits of electric power to our farmers and other people in rural areas.

REA LOANS IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Up to April 1, 1960, REA had approved a total of $103,977,856 in loans to 34 electric borrowers in South Dakota—all of them cooperatives. Of the loans approved, $92,353,628 has actually been advanced to the cooperatives and invested by these locally-owned and managed systems in the construction of 50,962 miles of line—and other electric facilities—to serve an ultimate 78,566 rural consumers.

PROGRAM IN SECOND DISTRICT

There are nine REA-financed electric cooperatives with headquarters in the Second Congressional District of South Dakota. They are West River Electric Association, Inc., Wall; Black Hills Electric Cooperative, Inc., Custer; Butte Electric Cooperative, Inc., Newell; Rosebud Electric Cooperative, Inc., Gregory; Lacreek Electric Association, Inc., Martin; Moreau-Grand Electric Cooperative, Inc., Timber Lake; Grand Electric Cooperative, Inc., Bison; Cherry-Todd Electric Cooperative, Inc., Mission; and West Central Electric Cooperative, Inc., Murdo.

REA loans approved to these borrowers had, by April 1, 1960, reached a total of $30,428,800. Together, the loans provide for the construction of 16,959 miles of line—and other electric facilities—to serve 22,723 rural consumers in 23 counties which make up the second district.

GROWTH IN CONSUMPTION

In 1950, farmers served by REA-financed cooperatives in South Dakota consumed an average of 153 kilowatt-hours of electricity per month. By 1959, this average monthly consumption per farmer had jumped to 426 kilowatt-hours per month—an increase of 273 kilowatt-hours in 9 years.

REPAYMENTS

REA-financed cooperatives in South Dakota, like those elsewhere, have achieved an outstanding record in repaying their REA loans. By January 1, 1960, South Dakota electric borrowers had made payments on their loans of $28,270,509. This included $14,840,729 repaid on principal, $9,617,056 paid in interest and $4,812,723 paid in advance

of due dates. No borrower in the State was behind in meeting its payments. Nationally, payments by REA borrowers on principal, in interest and ahead of schedule have surpassed the $1.2 billion mark.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to add my views to those taking note of the 25th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration.

One of the most significant changes in this fast-moving 20th century has been the spread of electrification. Today's youth takes it for granted, but only silghtly more than a generation ago millions of American families, especially rural families, were still without the light and power of electricity.

Electricity has done much more than merely light the homes of farm families; it has revolutionized farm practices. It has been put to work to increase farm production and to help handle and store farm products.

The Rural Electrification Administration was created by Executive order on May 11, 1935. The problems of spreading the powerlines out from the cities to our farm areas were many. The costs involved were great, and the risks were such that utility companies preferred to avoid them in many areas. As it became more apparent that our farm families needed power the Government attempted to help them in achieving it.

The fledgling Rural Electrification Administration ran into many difficulties in its first year. The motivation behind it had been largely to create an additional economic stimulus during the depression. To effect something constructive in rural electrification could not be done in the same manner as public works projects undertaken to provide employment.

In 1936 legislation was provided to create a continuing program of loans for construction and operation of generating plants, transmission lines, and distribution lines. Cooperatives applying under this program began to make headway and have continued to do so, despite setbacks occasioned by World War II and the Korean war when materials were scarce. The success of the cooperatives showed the feasibility and desirability of this service to the utility companies, and they responded with much expansion into rural areas.

The 25-year total is impressive. In 1935 90 percent of America's farms were without electricity; today better than 90 percent have it. REA loans approved since the beginning of the program exceed $4 billion. Last year only one REA borrower was behind in its loan payments. All in all, 1,053 rural electric systems have been financed with funds borrowed from the REA.

I have had occasion to know well the officers and directors in REA cooperative activities, especially those in my home county and district. They are an outstanding group, and would be a credit to any business enterprise.

We know what this development has meant to rural family life—the great convenience of electric light; the comfort of heating regulated by electricity, water pumps, cooking, refrigeration, and laundry, and the entertainment of radios, record players, and television. Inside the farm, home life has certainly changed from the average of a generation ago.

Electricity has also become a new hired hand, entrusted with such jobs as milking cows, sawing wood, warming pigs, hatching eggs, brooding chicks, drilling holes, and sharpening tools. Farming is greatly mechanized today, and a machine shop is a necessity to maintain the tools of production.

In 1939, in Kentucky, a pullet in a newly lighted chickenhouse responded to its environment by laying an egg shaped like a miniature light bulb. It was the subject of many humorous news stories but it was also symbolic of the spread of electric power to the farms.

Today electricity is no novelty to rural America. This has largely been the accomplishment of the Rural Electrification Administration and its 25th birthday should indeed be a happy one.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, officials of rural electric cooperatives in northwest Missouri are justifiably proud of their part in bringing electric power to our farms under the rural electrification program which is 25 years old today, and under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include brief statements of their activities by two electric cooperatives in my district:

ATCHISON-HOLT ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE

As the Rural Electrification Administration celebrates its silver jubilee nationally, the Atchison-Holt Electric Cooperative of Rock Port, Mo., which serves seven counties in Missouri, Iowa, and Nebraska, has reached the 22d year of its service to more than 2,800 members. At Atchison-Holt headquarters, plans for the summer work program are under way, but the board of directors and Manager B. S. Gibbs have taken time to pay tribute to the 13 men who were incorporators of the cooperative, and who were directing the policies when the first Atchison-Holt office was opened in Rock Port in September 1938.

The incorporators were John E. Buck, Corning; Edmund J. Roup, Watson; M. H. Grubb, P. A. Oswald and W. C. Scamman, all of Rock Port; Mr. Gibbs, who lives on a Watson route; Benson Gaffney and Peter Blohm, both of Craig, and Erich Ernsting, who now lives in Springfield. Deceased incorporators are M. A. McNeal, Watson; T. G. Walker, Fairfax; E. H. Kimberling, Rock Port, and C. B. Lawrence, Craig.

It is interesting to note that five of the original incorporators are still active members of the board of directors. They are Mr. Buck, who has been president of the board for a number of years; Mr. Roup, Mr. Grubb, Mr. Gaffney, and Mr. Blohm. They have seen the cooperative grow from a relatively few miles of lines to an organization which furnishes power to more than 2,800 members on 1,211 miles of distribution lines.

It was just a year ago that Atchison-Holt Electric Cooperative moved into its new headquarters building at the northeast edge of Rock Port, where the business office, equipment, and supplies are housed.

On its 1,211 miles of distribution lines are more than 2,700 farms, as well as town members, commercial establishments, schools, churches, and utilities. The cooperative serves some of the most modern farms in the Middle West, as well as a country store east of Fairfax that has been in business 104 years.

Each month some members add electric house heating to their multiple uses of power. As the mechanization of agriculture increases, more electric motors are installed on farms, and more uses are found for the power supplied by Atchison-Holt.

Today the board of directors is composed of Mr. Buck, Mr. Roup, Mr. Grubb, Mr. Gaffney, Mr. Blohm, Ernest Nennemann of Hamburg, Iowa; Walter Muller of Clarinda, Iowa, and Charles Martin of Watson, Mo. One vacancy exists on the board.

PLATTE-CLAY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE

The Platte-Clay Electric Cooperative at Platte City, Mo., was organized in August 1938 for the purpose of furnishing central station power to its members. The first lines were energized in May 1940. At that time, 425 members were served. For the first few months they had an average consumption of 45 kilowatt hours per member. Since that time, the membership has increased to 4,500 members who are consuming an average of 425 kilowatt hours per member.

The organization has been operated as a cooperative. All savings and margins accumulated have been allocated to the membership. As of January 1, 1960, the members had an equity of $640,000 in the cooperative. The total plant investment is $2,858,000. The lines and operating equipment have been financed with loans from the Rural Electrification Administration totaling $2,893,000. Of this amount, $650,000 has been repaid in regular payments and in advance payments.

The cooperative has been a very important factor in the development of the Sixth District of Missouri. Since its inception, we have seen coal oil lamps and the washboard replaced by electric lights and the electric washing machine. The electric motor is becoming a very important tool in the farm operation. It is used to pump water, convey feed and endless other tasks formerly done by human power on the farm.

As of this date, 120 rural homes are heated with electricity with several more in the process of converting to electric heat.

This cooperative is located within a few miles of the Kansas City industrial district and many of its members who live on these electrified farms have found employment in industry. Through a combination of earnings in industry and income from the farm, a healthy, stable economy has been developed in the area.

Howard Alexander is manager of the cooperative.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today we are marking the silver jubilee of the rural electrification program, that economic and social miracle which has brought light and power to more than 16 million Americans who were literally living in darkness only a quarter of a century ago.

The electrification of our Nation's farms is one of the greatest blessings of our times—for farm families and city dwellers alike. Rural electricity has played a major role in making American farms the most productive in the world. During the past 25 years, electricity has helped to triple food production in the United States. Today's farmer produces food aplenty for 25 people. Our citizens are the best fed in the world, and we have food left over to help less fortunate people in other lands.

Actually, the REA program has proven of value to people far beyond the reaches of our farms. A recent survey by the National Rural Electric Co-op Association indicates that 1960 will see a billion-dollar market for major electrical appliances among the users of rural electricity. This survey shows that half-a-million farm folks anticipate buying an

electric refrigerator and as many expect to buy an electric water heater this year. Such expenditures create thousands of jobs for city people.

Without a doubt, the REA loan program has generated a tremendous market for American industry. Each dollar loaned under the REA program has led to the sale of about $4 worth of electrical equipment, appliances, and wiring.

An impressive record has been chalked up by the rural electric co-ops on prompt repayment of the money they have borrowed from the Rural Electrification Administration. As of January 1, 1960, electric co-op borrowers had paid to the Government a total of more than $1.2 billion on their REA loans. This includes $669 million repaid on principal, $397 million paid in interest, and $154 million paid ahead of schedule. Only one of REA's almost 1,000 electric borrowers is behind on scheduled payments of principal and interest, and that one isn't very far behind either.

In my home State of Wisconsin, 31 rural electric borrowers are serving 87,338 consumer-members on 30,710 miles of line. Of the $118,912,492 in REA loans advanced to these electric co-ops, $21,740,945 has been repaid on the principal and $14,267,982 has been paid in interest. In addition, advance payments on principal have been made to the tune of $3,458,718.

On March 28, 1960, I had the privilege of addressing the 24th annual meeting of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative, our statewide association of rural electric and telephone cooperatives. At this time, I would like to include that speech in the RECORD:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION—WORTH HAVING, WORTH KEEPING

It was with a great deal of pleasure that I accepted the invitation to speak at this, the 24th annual meeting of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative. In the 25 years since President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed an Executive order which launched the REA program, the rural electrification movement has changed the face of rural America. No other federally sponsored program has done so much to help this country's farmers help themselves to achieve a higher standard of living and a more efficient way of farming.

You are all familiar with the figures which chart the progress of the REA program. You have lived with this program, and each statistic has a special meaning. The fact that only 10 percent of the Nation's farms had central station electricity in 1935 meant that you were struggling along with kerosene lamps or, at best, a bulky Delco plant. The fact that 95 percent of our farms are now electrified means that you are living better and farming better, thanks to a hundred and one electrical helpers.

Those of us who watch rural electrification closely can easily see the many intangible benefits it brings. Once a rural home has power, the standard of living for the family rises sharply. But how can you explain with statistics the human benefits of hot water, indoor plumbing, refrigeration, electric cooking, radio, television, and just light itself?

I am particularly proud that the congressional district which I represent has more electric and telephone cooperatives than any other congressional district in Wisconsin. The 11 counties of the Ninth District have 10 electric and 4 telephone cooperatives.

All 10 of those electric co-ops get their wholesale power from their own generation and transmission cooperative, Dairyland Power Co-op. Its organization was a monumental achievement. Dairyland Power stands as a living and growing symbol of the spirit of cooperation which is the prime ingredient in the REA success story.

When the REA bill became law, its backers assumed that the private utilities would take advantage of the REA loans to extend lines into rural areas. It didn't happen. The power companies were not interested in serving the so-called skim-milk areas when they already had the cream in the cities.

At this point, the REA program, which had been launched with such high hopes, was in danger of thudding to earth like a lead balloon. But you didn't let it happen. You wanted electricity, and you believed it was possible to have electricity. You worked together with your neighbors in the finest American tradition to organize your distribution cooperatives. And when the power companies refused to sell you wholesale electricity at a reasonable rate, you again applied the democratic principle of cooperation to the problem. You joined your neighboring cooperatives to organize what is now the largest generation and transmission co-op in the world.

Almost 200 years ago, Benjamin Franklin said: "We must all hang together or assuredly we will all hang separately." His words are as true today as they were then. The electric and telephone cooperatives of this State hang together and speak together through your statewide association, Wisconsin Electric Cooperative. Your joint efforts have made possible your excellent magazine, Wisconsin REA News, and many other important services. They range from engineering to public relations to transformer repair.

Nationally, you hang together and speak together with nearly 1,000 rural electric cooperatives across the country through your national organization, the National Rural Electric Co-op Association. During my 7 years on Capitol Hill, I have had the pleasure of working with NRECA's capable general manager, Clyde Ellis, and his dedicated staff. They are doing a fine job in representing you on the national level.

Ironically enough, the more successful the REA program becomes, the harder your enemies try to destroy it. I am reminded of the old saying that nobody throws stones at an apple tree unless it has apples on it. Thanks to years of painstaking work, the rural electrification tree has produced an abundant crop. Unfortunately, there are those who do not want to see you benefit from the harvest.

Today, the REA program is faced with an enemy within and an enemy without. The work of the latter is easy to see. You can find it in the slanderous propaganda ads which have been run by the power companies in the slick-paper magazines. Misleading, inaccurate, and filled with twisted half-truths, these advertisements are spread before the citizens of this country week in and week out in a gigantic brainwashing campaign.

I feel that the power companies hit a new low in their smear campaign with their ad which is headlined, "Will You Leave These Freedoms to Your Children?" In it, they implied that the rural electric cooperatives and the public power program were attempting to deprive Americans of your constitutional rights to freedom of religion and speech, freedom from unlawful search and seizure, and freedom to vote for elected officials of your choosing.

Have the rural electric and the Federal power programs ever done anything but strengthen these basic American rights? In fact, these programs have conferred upon the American people two very important additional rights. They have conferred upon millions of Americans the right to have electricity on their farms and in their homes, businesses, and factories. These programs have also conferred upon you the right to be free from the economic dictatorship prescribed by a monopoly-controlled, investor-owned utility industry.

The perversion of the Christian concept embodied in this advertisement transcends the bounds of all civilized decency. It is a disgrace to America and to American journalism.

The power company ads contain many references to "unnecessary tax spending" for Federal power projects. Phrases such as "a waste of taxes" are used. One of the power company ads is headlined "Would You Sign This $10 Billion IOU for Unnecessary Taxes?" Here is deliberately misleading propaganda. There is no "waste of taxes" when the Government invests money in water resources development projects.

According to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, flood control dams and projects have prevented damages which would have come to nearly $9 billion. The Bureau of Reclamation reports that the cumulative total value of crops produced in reclamation projects areas is $14.2 billion—or nearly five times the net Federal investment in reclamation.

The Federal investment in power is required by law to be repaid with interest, just as your electric co-ops repay with interest their REA loans. And even more fundamental, the Nation must make wise and effective use of its water resources for today's and tomorrow's needs. Electric power, which is the paying partner in these projects, often makes available added nonpower benefits that would not otherwise be available. These benefits come without cost to the taxpayer as a result of these multipurpose Federal power projects.

Taxes occupy much of the space in the power companies' ads. They made the claim that the private power companies function "without your tax money". This statement is open to serious question. Today, the private power companies are enjoying the benefits not only of rapid tax writeoffs but also of the "liberalized depreciation" provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. In other words, the private utilities scream that the rural electric and Federal power programs cost the taxpayers money * * * while at the same time, the private utilities themselves are accepting billions of dollars in Federal subsidies.

Another favorite line taken by the power companies is that the rural electric cooperatives do not pay taxes. Last year, the 30 electric cooperatives in Wisconsin paid a record tax bill estimated at better than a million dollars. Largest item in your tax bill was the $545,136 license-fee tax paid by your co-ops to the State government. Since this license-fee tax is based on the gross receipts of your cooperatives, it will continue to increase as your power sales increase.

The power companies defend their propaganda advertising on the basis of their right to freedom of speech. But freedom of speech does not mean license to brainwash the American public and, worst of all, make the American public foot the bill for the brainwash job.

During the last session of the 85th Congress, I introduced two bills to stop private power companies from charging ratepayers for the cost of propaganda advertising and to keep the companies from deducting such expenses from income before taxes. Although the House did not act on these bills, their introduction served to focus the spotlight on the propaganda advertising problem and prompted the Federal Power Commission and the Internal Revenue Service to launch investigations into the matter. I have followed these investigations closely and feel that they will accomplish the aims of my bills on the subject.

After examining the 27 slick-magazine ads run by the power companies in 1957, the Federal Power Commission found that 9 of those advertisements were political in nature

and would have to be paid for out of profits. At a hearing in January of last year, the power companies protested the FPC's stand and made it abundantly clear that they intended to drag the public versus private power controversy into the Commission's hearings on the proper accounting methods for the power companies' advertising program. The hearing examiner ruled that only bookkeeping questions would be considered. The power companies appealed this decision to the full Commission. It also ruled against them.

In addition, the Federal Power Commission dismissed power company charges that the ruling deprived them of freedom of speech. As the Commission pointed out, power companies are free to make such advertising expenditures, but the cost should come out of the pockets of stockholders, not ratepayers.

A final ruling by the full Commission on this matter is expected momentarily. Since the FPC staff has already ruled against the power companies which have participated in this propaganda advertising program, it seems almost certain that the full Commission will rule that propaganda ads must be paid for by the companies and not the consumers. The Federal Internal Revenue Service has already issued a similar ruling that the cost of the ads in question cannot be deducted as operating expense on the companies' income tax statements.

I am sure there is no doubt in anyone's mind as to how the present administration feels about the rural electrification program. Time and time again, you have seen this administration try to shackle and diminish and destroy your program.

You have seen your REA Administrator stripped of his authority to approve major loans without first getting the Secretary of Agriculture's blessing on each loan. You have seen the Comptroller General concoct a ruling on REA which would have prevented you from serving anybody a power company wanted to serve. This ruling would also have cast doubt on the legality of millions of dollars which you had borrowed and used in good faith.

During the 1st session of the 86th Congress, my good friend Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY of Minnesota and Congressman MELVIN PRICE of Illinois introduced bills to restore all loanmaking authority to the REA Administrator. At the time of the House debate on the Humphrey-Price measure, I observed that it was not the intent of Congress to have a well-paid and competent Administrator of the REA program sitting on the knees of the Secretary of Agriculture, taking his orders and mouthing his words like a well-trained Charlie McCarthy. Two hundred and fifty-three of my colleagues shared my opinion, and we passed the bill in a 254 to 131 vote.

The Senate had previously approved the measure by a 33-vote margin. However, we ran into an all-too-familiar stonewall of opposition from the administration, and Government by veto continued.

Happily, we were more successful in disposing of the Comptroller General's REA ruling. I joined Congressman JAMIE WHITTEN, of Mississippi, in introducing a resolution calling for an investigation of the Comptroller. Under the provisions of this resolution, a congressional committee would be appointed to look into all decisions rendered by the Comptroller which attempt to change the interpretations of existing laws after years of congressional acceptance of those interpretations. The committee would also check the extent to which the Comptroller's decisions are influenced by the policies and requests of the executive department.

On the Senate side, Senator GEORGE AIKEN of Vermont sponsored a resolution which stated that the REA program should be administered as it has been in the past rather than the way the Comptroller wants it done. The Senate passed an amended version of that resolution. And while the House has not yet acted on the Whitten-Johnson resolution, the very introduction of this resolution has served notice on the Comptroller to stop trying to alter basic points in the laws of the land. I might add that we haven't heard anything from him on the subject of REA since.

Unfortunately, we have been hearing plenty from the administration on the subject of raising the interest rate on REA loans. For months, the administration push has been on to impose the high-interest, tight-money policy on REA. Your program has been singled out for all this attention because REA stands as the last bulwark against the spiraling cost of money. One by one, the veterans, homeowners and farm credit groups have fallen victim to the administration's basically unsound policy of high interest and tight money.

In every segment of our economy, interest is very definitely a cost item, for interest is the price of money. The administration is attempting to sell its high-interest, tight-money policy on the basis that such a policy will check inflation. Actually, high interest is inflationary, for higher interest rates increase costs without increasing output.

In 1959, the high-interest, tight-money policy increased the cost of carrying the Federal debt by $1.4 billion over the previous year. This represents a $4 billion increase over 1952. Just think what could have been done with those extra billions if we could have used them for reducing taxes, starting new resource projects or improving the educational facilities of our children.

The total amount required in this year's Federal budget for interest on the debt has grown to $9 billion. This figure is greater than the entire Federal budget prior to World War II.

In today's budget, interest is the second largest item. It is larger than the combined total for aid to housing and business plus spending or investment on labor, welfare, education, dams, rivers and harbors. It is indeed startling to realize that in 1 year we are paying nearly three times as much in interest as we lent under the REA program in 25 years.

Higher interest hits each and every one of us. It has added the cost of an extra set of tires to your car. You don't get the tires, but you pay for them just the same. On a new 20-room school, the higher interest rate has added the cost of 6 classrooms which you pay for but you do not get.

Higher interest makes homes more costly. In 1952 a $10,000 Government mortgage at 4 percent interest would be paid off over 25 years at a total cost of $15,840. Today, the same mortgage at 6 percent interest will be paid off over 25 years at a total cost of $19,330. The increase of $3,490 would have been enough to pay for two more bedrooms and a bath.

Higher interest rates add to the cost of farmers and small businessmen and lead to more liquidations and bankruptcies. Higher interest makes home appliances more costly. It raises the cost of living and cuts the standard of living. If this is sound fiscal policy, as the administration claims, then I'd hate to see an unsound policy.

The enemy outside of the rural electrification program is relatively easy to identify. It is harder to put your finger on the enemy within the program. Probably this enemy could best be called indifference, or complacency, or the feeling that you have arrived at your destination. This year, as you celebrate the silver jubilee of the REA movement, you have every right to look back with pride at the achievements of the past 25 years. But you must remember to look ahead as well.

A program such as yours never stands still. It either advances or it starts downhill. You have invested too much of your time, your hopes and your dreams in the REA movement to allow it to dwindle away through unthinking neglect. Those of you who pioneered in this field know the effort that went into the organization of your electric cooperatives. You can still recapture the thrill of flicking the switch and lighting your home with electricity for the first time. But how are the young people to value the cooperative tradition they will inherit unless you tell them what it means?

It pleases me to see that many of your electric cooperatives work with your young people through high school essay contests and junior boards of directors in an effort to acquaint this new generation of cooperators with the whys and wherefores of the program. Your Minutemen are doing a good job of telling the REA story to their friends and neighbors.

The story of rural electrification is the story of a grassroots movement but some of its biggest battles have been, and always will be, fought in Washington. I cannot emphasize too strongly the need for you to keep informed on the current issues before Congress. Let your Representatives and Senators know how you feel about these matters.

Appropriately enough, your motto for this meeting reads: "What's Past Is Prologue." The same words are engraved on the Archives Building in our Nation's Capital. While sightseeing there, a visitor asked his taxi driver just what the motto meant. Glancing at his meter, the cabdriver replied: "It means you ain't seen nothing yet."

Like the Washington sightseer, you ain't seen nothing yet when it comes to what the rural electrification program can do in its next 25 years.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, one of the fine rural electric cooperatives in my district is the Nodaway Worth Electric Cooperative at Maryville, Mo.

Under leave to extend my remarks on this occasion of the 25th anniversary of the rural electrification program, I include a statement prepared by Curtis L. Funston, manager of this cooperative:

The Nodaway Worth Electric Cooperative, Inc., with headquarters in Maryville, Mo., has been in operation since 1939.

On this 25th anniversary of REA, it is fitting to pause and reflect on the achievements of this organization since its establishment.

From a humble beginning, this cooperative has grown in size until its 1,750 miles of line today serve nearly 4,000 farm members in Nodaway, Worth, and Gentry Counties in Missouri and parts of Taylor, Page, and Ringgold Counties in Iowa. The cooperative reached "area coverage" in 1954. It was during this year that service lines were made available to everyone within the cooperative area who wanted electricity.

Since the completion of "area coverage" the cooperative's principal activity has been a comprehensive program of improving and upgrading the quality of service to its members. While the farm membership has continued to decline the past few years with the consolidation of smaller farm units into larger ones due to a depressed agricultural economy, the electric demand has been steadily increasing on the system. In fact, the average farm usage of electricity has jumped from 124 kilowatt-hour-month per member in 1950 to an anticipated 375 kilowatt-hour for 1960, a threefold increase in 10 years.

While the progress of the Nodaway Worth Electric Cooperative can be described in statistics, the real progress can best be described in human terms. Our cooperative means lights to read by on a cold winter

night. It means radio and television to broadcast entertainment and weather reports. It means clean, economical heat for cooking and ironing on hot summer days. It means elimination of the drudgery of carrying water, milking cows by hand, scooping grain, and a host of other farm tasks.

This, we believe, is where the real meaning of this cooperative lies.

The Nodaway Worth Electric Cooperative looks forward to the next 25 years of operation with pride in its past accomplishments and confidence that the next quarter century will yield continued benefits to its member-owners.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago today, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the Rayburn bill creating the Rural Electrification Administration. During your long and illustrious tenure I doubt if you have sponsored any legislation, Mr. Speaker, which has given you the satisfaction or which brought to the people of the United States the degree of pleasure that this legislation has brought. Twenty-five years ago today, only 3 rural homes out of 100 in our home State had the convenience of electricity. Only about 10 percent of the rural homes in the United States enjoyed this convenience, and practically all of them were really suburban and not truly rural homes. The privately owned electric power companies had before your own committee, Mr. Speaker, stated: "There are very few farms requiring electricity or very few major farm operations that are not now served." Remember the date—that was 1935.

At that time the private power companies of America felt there was no profit to be made serving rural areas. They frankly did not want the rural business. Of course, since that time they have found this business is good business and some of the companies have done everything they could to prevent the development of the local rural electric cooperatives which grasped the opportunity to borrow from the REA—an opportunity which was and still is wide open to the private companies but which very few of them have been willing to accept. Even today in our home State, Mr. Speaker, the power companies are seeking to eliminate the cooperatives which extended REA service to the "head of the creek" and back away from the highway. These same power companies are demanding, and in the past they have received considerable support from various official sources in Texas, that as soon as a territory is developed by a cooperative and is taken into a city the cooperative should give up its business and let the company that did not want to serve the territory when it was not an attractive market take over the newly developed urban area.

It is my understanding that an overwhelming majority of the members of the legislature who were nominated last Saturday have pledged themselves to correct this situation, but the last two sessions of the legislature have not corrected it. I trust that the men and women of the 57th legislature will be more considerate of the cooperatives providing services for our rural areas.

Obviously, if these cooperatives are to be continuously robbed of their most thickly settled areas and are never to enjoy any business except that which the private companies have publicly stated was not profitable, they cannot long continue. The situation is serious in Texas, but I believe that the people of our State and the people of the United States have seen enough of the fine work of these REA financed cooperatives to give them the opportunity to continue to serve.

Today there are probably not more than 3 percent of the rural homes of Texas, or of the United States, which are not served by central station electricity. Possibly two-thirds of them are served by cooperatives which are borrowing from the REA. About one-third of these rural homes are served by private power companies, but it should be remembered that they would never have had this service had it not been for the establishment of REA.

From these figures one might decide that the work of the REA was largely done; that there would be little or no need for further loans; but such is far from being the case. Each year the use of electricity increases. Where a few years ago many cooperatives had an average load of no more than 25 kilowatt-hours per customer, average loads of 250 to 500 kilowatt-hours are not now unusual. These loads will increase. To deliver this volume of electricity it is necessary to constantly replace both generating facilities and transmission lines. The need for REA is as great today as it was 25 years ago, and what of the future?

In 1985, just 25 years hence, I imagine every rural home may well receive its power from atomic or other solar sources. We may still be using wires to transmit power but I think it is entirely possible that our power needs will be delivered by some type of waves. I anticipate that many of our local cooperatives will have paid off their indebtedness to REA. Indeed many have already done so, but even then many will still be installing new equipment and I think the need for REA will still exist. Our people, rural as well as urban, will still need and will still use ever-increasing amounts of power. Our cooperatives and our private power companies will all be serving more people with more power and will be serving it more effectively and more cheaply than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, although there were few, 25 years ago, who envisioned the great steps that have already been taken by rural electrification, there are still fewer who can envision the tremendous role of REA on May 11, 1985. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you are one of those few. I congratulate you for what you have already done and like all other friends of REA, I lean heavily on you for the development of our great program in the years to come.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in congratulating the rural electrification program for the tremendous strides that have been made in the past 25 years. This program has enjoyed bipartisan support in the Congress. It has been one of the most successful programs we have undertaken. In 1935 about 10 percent of the farms of America had electric power. Today 97 percent enjoy the benefits of electricity. This indicates what the program has accomplished.

In addition, we should not forget the economic contribution that it has made for the well-being of the country as a whole. The farmers have been investing more and more for equipment and appliances. This means that factories have produced equipment, factories have produced jobs, and the dollars have moved in trade in our country, which of course has stimulated the economic growth of our country.

The success of this program has been outstanding. It is outstanding because of the efforts of a great agency of dedicated people and because of the ingenuity of the American farmers who have assumed the responsibility of the management of this great program. Already we find some of the REA systems have paid their entire loan obligations to the Government of the United States. Many of them are providing their own capital for the expansion of their systems. Practically all of them now assume the responsibility of engineering, management and auditing, which in the beginning of the program was necessarily provided by the Government.

My hearty congratulations to those who have handled this program. It is a job well done. It has my endorsement. It has bipartisan support. It is a great program.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, today, May 11, 1960, the Rural Electrification Administration celebrates its 25th anniversary of service to the rural communities of our Nation. My own congressional district is one of the most rural in the entire United States and as I have driven up and down its valleys and over its rugged hills these past few years, I have often seen electric lights shining in many humble homes where there were only candles or oil lamps flickering before the advent of REA.

One verse almost at the beginning of the Bible has these words: "Let there be light." So, on this 25th anniversary of REA, we are reminded that this organization said a quarter of a century ago that there should be electric light and power for America's rural homes and we are also reminded that since that time there have been both light and power in a tremendous number of those homes that needed such improvements very greatly.

I have been told that in my own State of Kentucky, at the time the Rural Electrification Administration was created on May 11, 1935, only 8,480 farms in our State, or 3 percent, were receiving central station electric service, while current REA estimates show that 188,900 farms in the State, or 97.6 percent of all farms recorded in the 1954 Census, were being served by June 30, 1959. I understand that REA borrowers serve about 80.2 percent of these electrified farms.

Also, I was informed that the first REA electrification loan in Kentucky was approved in October of 1935 and that the first REA-financed line was placed in operation on December 22, 1937, by the Henderson-Union Rural Electric Cooperative of Henderson.

From its humble beginning 25 years ago, REA service now extends into 112 of the 120 counties in the State and many rural homes, farms, churches, schools, and industries in 80 of these 112 counties receive their power from the East Kentucky generating plant near Winchester, Ky., which now produces at the rate of 430,767,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity per year. By 1970, it has been estimated that the monthly average use of power by Kentucky farm consumers served by the rural electric systems will have jumped from 116 kilowatt-hours in 1950, to 650 kilowatt-hours in 1970, while the average consumption per member, at the time of the energization of the REA-financed lines in the State, was only 40 kilowatt-hours per month, back in 1937.

Congratulations to REA because this organization said 25 years ago, "Let there be light." And since that time there has been much light in many rural homes of our country, including quite a great number of them in my own congressional district in southeastern Kentucky.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the signing of the Executive order creating the rural electrification program. On this occasion I want to express for myself and for the people of South Dakota whom I represent, appreciation to Members of this and earlier Congresses and to present and former administrators of Government agencies who, by their support, enabled rural America to make the REA program the dynamic success that it is today.

No State or Federal program has brought as many benefits to the people of South Dakota as rural electrification. In 1935, the year the program was launched, less than 4 percent of our rural people had central station electric service. Our wide-open spaces made the power companies shudder when they thought of bringing service to our sparse population over lines subjected to high winds, sleet, and snow. They said this kind of business would never pay. Had not REA come along, most of our State would still be waiting for electric service. The co-ops did not know whether it would pay but farmers needed light and power and REA provided the instrument whereby they could secure these blessings through cooperative action.

Today, nearly 90 percent of all our rural areas are served and they are paying their way. For the United States as a whole, 52 percent of all rural electrification has been done by nonprofit REA-financed systems. In South Dakota 91 percent of all electrified farms are served by REA cooperative systems. Only North Dakota has a higher percentage of REA service.

THE EARLY YEARS OF REA

The early days of rural electrification were difficult ones in South Dakota. We issued our first charter for an electric cooperative only 6 months after President Roosevelt signed the REA Executive order; but because of low population density our early cooperatives encountered staggering construction costs per connected consumer. Rates were high and as a result the use of power was held down. Interest rates were also high and the payout period was too short. Wholesale power was scarce, sometimes nonexistent, and always very expensive. The future of our small struggling systems was threatened.

Thanks to an understanding Congress and administration, the Pace Act was passed, reducing the interest rate from 2.6 percent to a realistic 2 percent and extending the payout period from 25 to 35 years. Then we started promoting the Missouri River dams—Fort Randall, Gavins Point, Oahe, Garrison in North Dakota, and now Big Bend. As power began to come from those projects rural electrification reached a turning point. Success of the program was assured.

WASTEFUL RELEASES OF MISSOURI RIVER WATER MUST BE STOPPED

The administration of those projects, however, is not the complete success Congress had envisaged. It is time for Congress to take a new look at the Interior Department's administration of those projects. It is time we seriously consider the slack water navigation proposal I made last August, for, as I said at that time, the REA cooperatives and the municipalities are being deprived of hundreds of thousands of kilowatts from our dams because the water is not permitted to flow through the generators during the wintertime when the power is needed, but is stored to be released during the navigation months to benefit certain shipping interests which do not contribute one cent toward the repayment of the project. But this is just one example of many that could be cited to show that eternal vigilance remains our duty, even with so successful a program as rural electrification. There are always those who because of selfish interest would destroy even our best time-tested programs.

We have held the line on the various proposals to raise REA interest rates. Secretary of Agriculture Benson proposed that rural electric co-ops go into the open money market for funds. Not one Member of Congress has dignified that proposal by drawing it up as a bill.

In these and other ways we have guided and protected this great program. It deserves our continued support.

BENEFITS OF REA TO SOUTH DAKOTA

The benefits of electrification to the farm and rural home are well known. Many of them will be reviewed here today. These are benefits that have meant the most to my State; but, others also are important.

In a State so predominantly rural as South Dakota it is easy to forget the benefits that REA has brought to our cities, towns, and other community centers. About 150 small towns and communities in the State are served by rural electric cooperatives. Each of these communities now has a modern, safe, and reliable distribution system in contrast with small, inadequate, and uneconomic generating systems which were used before REA came in.

But this is only the beginning of the story. Hundreds of our rural schools and churches now have electricity, few had before. Electric light and power in rural areas has made possible the establishment of dozens of new businesses. With the development of our new reservoirs, recreational activities have mushroomed, year-round and seasonal cottages have sprung up on every lake and stream. Most of them have electric service. These are some of the direct benefits.

The most significant indirect benefits arise from the fact that for every dollar spent to build the lines and the facilities to get electricity to our farms, the farmer has spent about $4 wiring his farm and buying farm equipment and home appliances. This means that over the years rural electric members in South Dakota, about 72,000 of them, have spent well over $300 million in improving their farms and homes. This has meant good business in the towns. It has meant good jobs in the cities. It means money in the bank for businesses that sell equipment and services. Most of this money has been spent at home. The rural electric cooperatives' annual payrolls are approximately $2 million; this money, too, is spent at home.

These co-op employees live and work in the State. Many of them own homes, all of them pay taxes and patronize local businesses.

SOUTH DAKOTANS GRATEFUL FOR REA

Rural electrification has brought a better life to rural people; but, all along the highways and byways of our State other people in all occupations benefit from the program. If all of our people could be here today they would express more eloquently than I their appreciation for those who set the program in motion 25 years ago and to those who have strengthened and defended it down the years. The farm housewives would express their gratitude for home appliances—refrigerators, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, electric irons—that remove much of the drudgery of earlier years on the farm. The farmer would express his appreciation for the labor-saving power equipment made possible through electrical energy. Farm families who remember the kerosene lantern would be especially grateful for electrical lighting. They would say "Thank you" to all Members of Congress and others who support their program. They would give special thanks to those who support rural electrification because they believe in its social and economic values rather than because it is politically expedient to do so. Rural electrification brought dignity and self-esteem to all rural people; its continuing stream of benefits make rural living more rewarding and our farms more productive.

REA has made a remarkable record of accomplishment in its first 25 years. Let's make the next 25 years even better.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 25th anniversary of the establishment of the rural electrification program which made possible the electrification of rural America.

The need and acceptance of this great idea is best illustrated by the tremendous growth of rural electric systems since the inauguration for the REA program May 11, 1935. This social and economic miracle has made it possible for over 1,000 locally owned electric systems to provide

electric light and power to more than 16 million rural Americans. In 1935 only 11 percent of the farms had central station electricity, but then came the REA program and today 96 percent of all farms in the United States are electrified. What a wonderful record of accomplishment. What a wonderful change from darkness to light, from drudgery to joy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include with my remarks the following article from the Iowa Rural Electric News, a publication of the Iowa Electric Cooperative Association. This article tells the story of the first cooperatively electrified farm in Iowa.

I am indeed proud that the farm which holds this distinction is located in my congressional district. The article follows:

IOWA'S FIRST COOPERATIVELY ELECTRIFIED FARM—WRIGHT COUNTY FARM WAS FIRST IN IOWA TO GET POWER THROUGH AN REA-FINANCED COOPERATIVE

(By Keith Remy)

December 6, 1936, dawned just like any winter day in north central Iowa—cold, windy, and dreary. But that day became significant in the history of cooperative rural electrification in Iowa.

For on December 6, 1936, the first farm in Iowa to receive power from an REA-financed electric cooperative was energized.

Friends, power officials, and pioneer members of Boone Valley Electric Cooperative at Renwick gathered at the W. H. Helmke farm in Wright County to witness the actual connection.

At the end of the day, the Helmke's carbide lamps, the gasoline-powered milking machine, the scrubboard were antiquated. Electricity had come to the 325-acre Oakdale farm.

The day was a rewarding one for Helmke and his neighbors who had been instrumental in pioneering cooperative rural electrification in their area.

Nearly a decade before—in 1928—Helmke and 10 of his neighbors began negotiating with a profit power company for electric service. It would have cost them at least $300 each to get service. The high cost and the coming of the depression doomed this early attempt.

In 1935, when the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) was established, Helmke and his neighbors immediately went to work.

They contacted REA officials in Washington. They hired an attorney. Bylaws were drawn up. And Boone Valley Electric Cooperative was organized. Helmke was elected president, a position he held until 1954.

Application for an REA loan was made. It was granted, and during 1935 and 1936, contracts were let and construction started. By December 1936, 43 miles of lines were ready for service. And Oakdale became the first farm in Iowa to enjoy the power supplied by an REA-financed electric cooperative.

"When we energized, we bought our power from Renwick Municipal. Now the town buys its power from Corn Belt Power Cooperative through Boone Valley Electric Co-op," explains Helmke.

Helmke has retired from active farming and is living in Renwick. His son, Norman, has taken over the operation of Oakdale and specializes in raising purebred Duroc hogs.

He uses heat lamps and hover brooders exclusively for getting pigs off to a healthy start.

Because of the increased electrical demands of modern farming, the Helmkes replaced the original 60-ampere meter loop with 100-ampere service 2 years ago.

In the farm home at Oakdale, a full line of major electrical appliances helps with the household chores.

Farmstead applications of electricity include a fully equipped farm shop, complete with welder and power tools. A large granary has an inside elevator powered by a 3-horsepower electric motor.

A 5-horsepower motor operates a double-fan natural air dryer in the hay barn.

Helmke is gradually rebuilding the once-large dairy herd. A can cooler is used for milk storage.

The farm has three water systems. Two of them have one-half horsepower deep well jet pumps. A flowing well uses a small piston pump to deliver water to hogs on range.

Oakdale depends on electricity.

Another pioneer instrumental in organizing Boone Valley Electric Cooperative was Helmke's neighbor, C. M. Gillespie. Gillespie was elected secretary-treasurer of the cooperative in 1936 and still holds that position. His son, James Gillespie, is co-op bookkeeper.

"The growth of electric use on our farms has been phenomenal," reports James Gillespie.

"The first year after we energized, we averaged 60 kilowatt hours per farm per month. Last year (1959) our average was 634.7 kilowatt hours per farm per month with the high month averaging 991 kilowatt hours per farm," he continues.

Gillespie checked back in the early record books. He found that Helmke's Oakdale farm used a total of $124.15 worth of electricity the first 13 months after being energized.

In February 1959, with electric brooding at a peak at Oakdale, consumption hit an all-time high of 6,070 kilowatt hours for the month. Total cost for the single month was $111.

"Boone Valley may be one of the smallest electric co-ops in Iowa with its 172 members, but I'll bet those members are as enthusiastic and as active as any others. There's a lot of pride in our cooperative," say L. N. Henriksen, president of Boone Valley Electric Cooperative.

And now, 24 years after the first cooperative current flowed over the lines, Boone Valley and 54 other electric co-ops in Iowa serve more than 132,000 rural Iowa families.

The silver jubilee year is a tribute to these power pioneers and their foresight—a tribute to cooperative rural electrification—truly a private enterprise "good for all Americans."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, May 11, 1960, marks a quarter century of progress in bringing the benefits of electric power to rural consumers throughout the Nation. Since the signing of the Rural Electrification Administration Act on May 11, 1935, farmers all across the United States have helped to make the rural electrification program an outstanding success.

My own State of Colorado provides an excellent example of the achievements of the REA program, which got under way in Colorado in June of 1936, when the first REA loan was approved. The first REA-financed line was placed in operation on September 17, 1937, by the Grand Valley Power Line of Grand Junction, in my congressional district.

When the REA was created in 1935, only 7,145 farms in Colorado—just 11.2 percent, were receiving central station electric service. Current REA estimates show that 36,550 farms in the State, or 89.7 percent of all farms recorded in the 1954 census, were being served as of June 30, 1959. REA borrowers serve about 60.2 percent of these electrified farms in Colorado.

Up to January 1, 1960, REA had approved a total of $121,167,157 in loans to 25 electric borrowers in Colorado, all of which are cooperatives. The loans were made to enable the borrowers to construct 34,495 miles of line and other electric facilities to serve 86,677 consumers.

REA electric borrowers in Colorado have repaid $12,405,643 on the principal of their Government loans. In addition, they have paid $8,244,778 in interest and $4,749,698 ahead of schedule. As of January 1, 1960, no borrowers in the State of Colorado were overdue in their loan payments.

Mr. Speaker, it is also significant to note that Colorado's electric co-ops are among the largest property taxpayers in the 61 counties in which they operate in the State of Colorado. In 12 counties, electric cooperatives are the only electric taxpayers. In 1958, more than $600,000 was paid in property taxes alone by Colorado rural electrics.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in my remarks the following statistics relative to the first 25 years of the REA program in Colorado:

DATA OF THE FIRST 25 YEARS OF THE REA RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM IN COLORADO

Percent of farms electrified by all suppliers

Jan. 1, 1935	11.2
Jan. 1, 1940	28.8
Jan. 1, 1945	48.6
Jan. 1, 1950	72.0
Jan. 1, 1955	87.0
June 30, 1959	89.7

NOTE.—About 60.2 percent served by REA borrowers.

Cumulative REA loans and advances

	Number of borrowers who received loans	Net total loans	Net total advances
Dec. 31, 1935	1	$46,100	
Dec. 31, 1940	17	5,492,000	3,228,964
Dec. 31, 1945	19	13,329,551	9,157,296
Dec. 31, 1950	23	44,011,976	30,123,520
Dec. 31, 1955	24	90,001,158	65,811,076
Dec. 31, 1958	25	119,534,157	90,249,434
Oct. 1, 1959	25	121,167,157	96,091,562

Miles and consumers (REA borrowers)

	Miles energized	Consumers served
Dec. 31, 1935		
Dec. 31, 1940	3,055	6,337
Dec. 31, 1945	7,571	21,736
Dec. 31, 1950	16,528	44,566
Dec. 31, 1955	30,816	71,392
Dec. 31, 1958	32,517	78,109
June 30, 1959	32,825	79,189

Growth of sales and average annual kilowatt-hour consumption (REA borrowers)

Calendar year	Total kilowatt-hours sold [1]	Average annual kilowatt-hour consumption [2]
1941	16,814,442	2,007
1945	37,919,730	1,867
1950	121,438,960	2,820
1955	331,498,029	4,800
1958	426,542,600	5,496

[1] Excludes sales by generation and transmission borrowers.
[2] All classes of consumers.

Cumulative payments on electric loans in Colorado

	Principal	Interest	Balance	Advance payments, total
At June 30—				
1945	$438,095.02	$615,947.20	$1,054,042.22	$168,166.39
1950	1,892,398.00	1,784,640.79	3,677,038.79	140,232.92
1951	2,349,408.80	2,106,102.80	4,455,511.60	313,252.08
1952	2,90 ,925.48	2,488,894.87	5,390,820.35	532,528.35
1953	3,580,781.88	2,885,511.90	6,466,293.78	652,159.49
1954	4,341,981.21	3,351,581.10	7,693,562.31	1,122,094.02
1955	5,251,325.31	3,871,661.92	9,122,987.23	1,705,291.12
1956	6,658,508.75	4,549,926.18	11,208,434.93	2,146,639.34
1957	7,997,907.78	5,361,332.62	13,359,240.40	3,296,294.23
1958	9,611,557.08	6,411,246.48	16,022,803.56	4,083,170.95
1959	11,423,379.78	7,591,471.03	19,014,850.81	4,490,232.18

NOTE.—If payments for any one year are desired, subtract the cumulative balance of the prior year from the cumulative balance at the year desired.

Outstanding balances at June 30, 1959:

Principal	$83,334,785.51
Accumulated interest	3,632,220.12

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, since the rural electrification program was launched 25 years ago today, 96 percent of the farms of America have been electrified, demonstrating how free enterprise and a sympathetic Government can work together to solve vexing and difficult problems for human beings. Those who have been active in the rural electrification movement, know from the history of REA that rural electrification has been a real fight all during its history and even before the Rural Electrification Administration was born. Leaders during the formative period of the program as well as those today also know that the REA program and the American farm family have a close relationship.

Mr. Speaker, I will never forget the joy and excitement which came into the farm home in Ohio, where my family and I still live, when the lights were turned on in the 1930's. A large percentage of the families who get their electricity from rural electric systems live and operate family-type farms. Because rural electrification has made possible a level of living comparable to urban living, the farm family has become more content with their environment and I feel electrification has been an important factor deterring the flight of young people from farms to other occupations. Farm boys and girls can now be proud of their homes and their way of life. Of course, many young people have left the farm in recent years, mainly because of relatively low farm incomes; but, I believe that had not electrification come to agriculture the movement would have been much more rapid. If the income of the family farm can be brought in line with other occupations the family farm will continue one of our proudest and most respected ways of life. Thus, the problems of the family farm and of the rural electric systems are intertwined; their fortunes go up and down together; policies affecting the well-being of one cannot help but affect the other.

The battles waged by our beloved and distinguished Speaker Rayburn, the late Senator George W. Norris, the great independent of Nebraska who for 25 years reigned supreme in the Senate as a man who worked for the future of his country and its resources, former Congressman John Rankin, of Mississippi, and others, were battles of no greater importance than those which have come before the 86th Congress and will come before succeeding Congresses.

Mr. Speaker, the success of the rural electrification program has been so overwhelming that many opponents no longer try to attack it openly, instead they are coming forth with proposals labeled "Improvements" of the program.

Here are a few examples of these improvements:

The REA has suffered a downgrading of its Administrator. The Secretary of Agriculture in 1957, instituted a procedure of having a political appointee in his office pass on all major loans before the Administrator is given permission to act on them. This action so aroused Congress that we mustered almost a two-thirds vote expressing disapproval of so flagrant an injection of politics into the program.

The rural electric systems suffered an attempted curtailment of the Administrator's loan-making authority by the Comptroller General in 1958; the Comptroller General issued a ruling that would have seriously limited the use of REA loan funds to finance lines to rural consumers which the power companies considered desirable. The Senate, however, by unanimous vote reversed this ruling.

Bills to impose the high-interest policy on REA have been offered and backed by the full force of the White House, the Budget Bureau and the Department of Agriculture. A concerted campaign to build up pressure in Congress for such legislation has been carried out by the Secretary of Agriculture and others. But the REA high-interest push is merely a part of a broader tight-money drive, and it has been a stubborn one.

Tight-money policies have already been successfully put across against the Veterans' programs, housing programs, Farmers Home Administration, Federal Land Banks, and the Production Credit Association, to mention a few. So far we have held the line where REA has been concerned.

Another example: The Secretary of Agriculture has argued for, and has drafted and sent to Congress, proposed legislation which would abandon the REA program of the past 25 years and substitute in its place a plan for sending the rural electric systems to Wall Street for their long-term financing. This proposal was so drastic, I might say fantastic, that no Member has been willing to fight for it, or for that matter, even to introduce it.

These are the problems rural electrification has been facing in recent days. I am proud to be included among those who have defended the rural electrification program against these damaging attacks; I am proud that I have supported legislation which strengthens the program and keeps REA on the same successful track that it has followed for 25 years. It behooves us, I believe, to remember the stalwarts who made this program possible and who by their stanch support defended it during its early period; we can gain strength from their struggles and their victories for present battles and those that may lie ahead. Today on the occasion of the 25th anniversary, we should here dedicate ourselves to the philosophy that the early legislators on rural electrification incorporated in the program—local leadership, responsibility, and control with Federal administration keyed to human needs of rural America rather than to the financial desires of vested interests.

As we honor rural electrification for the advantages it has brought to rural America, we should never lose sight of the benefits it has brought to the electrical manufacturing industry, to all other industries, in fact, to the country as a whole. An important result of the rural electrification program is the increased business it brings into rural communities; it stimulates private business both locally and nationally. Surveys indicate that for every dollar invested in rural power facilities farmers invest $3 to $4 in wiring, plumbing, and electrical appliances. Also when power is available, the establishment of industry in rural areas is encouraged.

Back in 1935, when the REA experiment was just beginning, it was argued that all farmers who wanted electricity had it and that there was no market for power out in the country. Experience in the past 25 years has demonstrated how wrong this contention was. At this point, I want to include a fine article by Virginia Cruikshank, contained in the March 26 edition of the Delaware (Ohio) Gazette in my district, which carries a graphic account of how REA has changed the face of America:

ELECTRICITY IS BOON TO FARMERS

(By Virginia Cruikshank)

Some of us may have forgotten just how rugged life was in the rural areas before we had electricity.

Remember the coal stoves, kerosene lamps, washboards, water buckets, hand milking, and all the other hand-powered chores that made the farmer and his wife old before their time?

No one would want to return to that kind of rural living, although we may sometimes wax sentimental about the old days. We are even digging around in the attic and cellar for some of those items mentioned above because our city neighbors who are moving to the country prize them as antiques.

Electric power has changed the face of all rural America. Not only has it brought an end to a lot of the drudgery, but it has changed the entire outlook of rural people. They are no longer country hicks. Their life has become the envy of many city people.

This year the Nation is paying tribute to its rural electric system on the 25th anniversary of REA. President Roosevelt signed the Executive order May 11, 1935, that brought the Rural Electrification Administration into being.

Use of electricity today has passed the wildest dreams of 1935. USDA researchers have found that there are 450 ways to use electricity on the farm and in the farm home.

And just wait until we get all those bulk tanks installed around here in the next year. Consumption of power will zoom.

Only about 4 percent of the farms in the United States are still without electric power. In the territory of the Delaware Rural Electric Cooperative, there are only two farms and two houses without power, but the company is willing to build the lines to them whenever the owners are ready.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Rural Electrification Administration.

The Congress can be proud of the fact that it had the foresight and wisdom to create this agency 25 years ago. I can think of no other single piece of legislation that has meant more to millions of farm families throughout the Nation.

I personally can testify to just what REA has meant to farmers. I still live on a farm in southwest Kansas. We now enjoy electric and telephone service, both of which were made possible by the Rural Electrification Administration and its younger brother, Rural Telephone Administration. These two modern conveniences have made farm life much more pleasant and satisfying. They have, I am convinced, been a major factor in persuading many families to remain on the farm.

It is significant, I think, that very few if any Members of this or the other House would seriously consider a proposal to abandon our great rural electrification program. There may be disputes over the administration of the program or details as to its financing, but as to the program itself and the philosophy behind it, there is almost no dispute.

The program has worked. The fact that 95 percent of the farms are now electrified is proof of this. Farmers have been able to install many labor-saving devices and machines. Electricity has taken a lot of the drudgery out of farming. It has literally and figuratively brightened the lives of farm families.

Also, it is interesting to note that on this 25th anniversary not one loan made by the Government to finance a cooperative electric system is in default. In fact, repayments are ahead of schedule.

I am proud of the cooperatives which have been built to operate electrical and telephone systems. These cooperatives are member owned. They are in business to provide a service to farm families.

The success of these institutions is due in a large measure to the dedication of the men who serve on the boards of directors and make the actual decisions as to how they will operate. This is a labor of love on the part of these men and women. They want to provide their members with the best possible service at the lowest cost consistent with good and sound business practices.

Thanks to the REA and to the thousands of dedicated men and women throughout the Nation who devote many hours each year to running the locally owned cooperatives, the lives of our farm families have been greatly improved and enriched. The REA has helped make America a much better place in which to live for millions of our people, by bringing the American standard of living to the American farm.

I am happy to salute REA on its 25th anniversary.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the rural electric program of the Nation marks its 25th anniversary this week.

This program has developed over the years into a significant service bringing electrification to vast numbers of rural homes and communities. In my own district cooperatives have been formed to serve the needs of the families. I should like to point out the development which has occurred in the operation of one of the cooperatives with which I am familiar. Today the Guernsey-Muskingum Electric Cooperative is extending service not only in Guernsey and Muskingum Counties in Ohio but to members in Morgan, Noble, Coshocton, Licking, and Harrison Counties as well. The cooperatives 6,000 members consumed almost 28 million kilowatt-hours of electric power last year. Their average member during the year used 4,580 kilowatt-hours, an increase of 258 kilowatt-hours of power over the average utilized in 1958. For this service in 1959, the cooperative received $717,817.97, an increase in income of $37,258.51 over the previous year.

The first loan from REA was received by the Guernsey-Muskingum Electric Cooperative in 1938. During the intervening years, the organization has borrowed $2,909,714.23. Of this sum, it has repaid $965,054.11. With the funds at its disposal, over 1,800 miles of rural distribution lines have been constructed and 6,800 services have been installed. Last year 184 new services were connected and another 200 new services are expected in 1960. The expansion of new services requires approximately $200,000 in new capital each year.

The cooperative serving such a large portion of the 15th Congressional District has a staff of 36 regular employees with an annual payroll of more than $163,000.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to join in congratulating the Rural Electrification Administration on its 25th birthday. Its creators and administrators can look back on a brilliant record; they have lighted and powered rural America.

When the REA Act was passed in 1935 only 1 Montana farm in 20 had electricity. At that time, life on the farm meant pumping and carrying water by hand, chopping wood for the cookstove, bending over a washboard, and poor light for reading, and for farm jobs after dark.

Today, almost 9 out of 10 Montana farms have electricity and roughly 2 out of every 3 of them are served by one of Montana's REA-financed power systems. These systems were built by men and women who banded together to provide for themselves the electricity which commercial utilities either could not, or would not, make available. They borrowed money from the Federal Government, loans on which we taxpayers have made millions of dollars.

Their job is still far from being done. Experience shows that electric power consumption doubles every 5 years. So the REA program must continue. That is, it must continue if our co-ops are to "heavy up" their lines to meet the growing needs of their members. I know our colleagues will be interested in the following clippings from the May issue of the Montana Rural Electric News and the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune. I also wish to call attention to the statement in support of the REA program by President George Meany of the AFL–CIO:

[From the Montana Rural Electric News, May 1960]

EIGHTY-NINE AND ONE-TENTH PERCENT OF MONTANA FARMS HAVE ELECTRICITY

At the time the Rural Electrification Administration was created on May 11, 1935, only 2,768 farms in Montana, or 5.5 percent, were receiving central station electric service. Current REA estimates show that 29,450 farms in the State, or 89.1 percent of all farms recorded in the 1954 census, were being served by June 30, 1959. REA borrowers serve about 64.7 percent of these electrified farms.

The first REA electrification loan in Montana was approved in May of 1936. The first REA-financed line was placed in operation on December 5, 1937 by the Lower Yellowstone Rural Electric Association of Sidney.

Up to January 1, 1960, the beginning of REA's 25th year, the agency had approved a total of $61,045,733 in loans to 25 electric borrowers in the State, of which all are cooperatives. The loans were made to enable the borrowers to construct 29,910 miles of line and other electric facilities to serve 44,401 consumers.

Loan funds actually advanced to these borrowers amounted to $53,465,147 by January 1, 1960. With the help of this financing, the locally owned and managed systems had already placed 29,671 miles of line in operation and were serving 44,100 farm and other rural consumer outlets. The average monthly consumption of electricity by these consumers had increased from 283 kilowatt-hours in 1950, to 547 kilowatt-hours in 1958.

REA electric borrowers in Montana have repaid $8,964,709 on the principal of their Government loans. In addition, they have paid $5,564,906 in interest and $3,891,578 ahead of schedule. As of January 1, 1960, no borrower in the State was overdue in its loan payments.

[From Montana Rural Electric News, May 1960]

TEN PHONE CO-OPS NOW IN MONTANA

In 1950, the year the first REA telephone loan was approved, 28.5 percent of the farms in Montana had telephones. By the end of June 1958, it was estimated that 21,000 farms or 60 percent of all farms in the State had telephone service.

The first REA telephone loan in this State was approved on March 14, 1952, to the Mid-Rivers Telephone Cooperative, Circle, Mont.

As of January 1, 1960, REA had approved a total of $16,256,000 in loans to 10 bor-

rowers in the State (one commercial company and 9 cooperative associations).

These loans will enable the borrowers to serve 13,682 new subscribers, and to provide improved service for 4,427 existing subscribers over 15,036 miles of line. Work is progressing rapidly on the new REA-financed facilities, and 9 borrowers report that a total of 73 exchanges have been cut over to dial.

Loan funds actually advanced to the borrowers on January 1, 1960, amounted to $11,289,934. On the same date loan applications on hand from telephone organizations in the State amounted to $1,060,000.

On January 1, 1960, the State's borrowers had paid $256,327 in interest and repaid $305,415 of principal on their Government loans. They had also paid an additional $68,673 ahead of schedule.

[From the Montana Rural Electric News, May 1960]

IN THE BEGINNING

(By Max Mathews, manager, Yellowstone Valley Electric Cooperative)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Max Mathews, veteran manager of the Yellowstone Valley Electric Cooperative of Huntley, was the project engineer on the first REA construction project in Montana in 1937. The Montana Rural Electric News is proud to print the following exclusive article about his experiences through the years.)

The 17 years following my discharge from the Army in September 1919, after 2½ years overseas in World War I, found me engaged in the retailing of building materials and then in various construction activities—then in July 1937, quite by accident, I got into the construction of rural electric cooperative powerlines in Montana—a pioneering project that was designed to bring the better things of life to all rural people and was to give me, personally, an opportunity to fulfill a lifelong ambition to superintend in the field of construction.

My first job was with the Manning & Noyes Construction Co., building the original lines for the Lower Yellowstone REA Cooperative at Sidney, Mont. Later building the second section for the Yellowstone Valley Electric Cooperative in Huntley. The first REA loan in Montana was made to the Yellowstone Valley Electric Cooperative in Huntley in May 1936, however the first lines constructed in the State were for the Lower Yellowstone at Sidney. Their first lines being energized just before Christmas in 1937. My job continued with construction of lines for the Park Electric Cooperative at Livingston and for Vigilante Electric at Dillon, finishing there in July of 1940. Many new cooperatives have been formed in Montana since, there being 24 active at this time.

The actual construction of electric cooperative lines in those early years was quite different than that of today. The poles were shipped unframed and unroofed, the holes had to be bored by hand and the gains and roof cut by hand as there was no power for power drills and electric saws. Most of the holes were dug by hand and in many instances the poles were raised by hand and the use of pikes and main strength. The hole digging machines at that time were not nearly as efficient as they are today and were of little use in most areas of Montana.

Experienced linemen were hard to come by and the general practice was to pick the most promising men from the crews and develop them into linemen. Many of these self-made linemen later became the backbone of the maintenance crews for the various cooperatives—men with a great deal of pride in their work and part they had played in this now most successful enterprise. There were plenty of laborers in those early days and sometimes so many wanted work that they would draw straws to see who would get the job.

The lines were completed and still there was a selling job to be done—farmers were not used to the idea of using electric power in so many ways and the main thought seemed to be that the current would be used just for lights and refrigeration and there were doubts in many minds as to whether they could possibly use 40 kilowatt-hours per month and if they really could afford to pay the $3 minimum monthly bill. Most of the transformers hung were 1½ kilovolt-amperes, some were 3 kilovolt-amperes, and once in a great while it seemed necessary to hang a 5 kilovolt-amperes for an exceptionally large load.

When I first became manager at Yellowstone Valley Electric Cooperative in 1940, there were 80 idle services where the potential consumers felt financially unable to have their premises wired so that they could use power. Strange as it may seem today, here was a situation that required some real encouragement and it probably fostered the original "power use" department in the State as we felt it necessary to send our employees out into the field to set up meetings to "sell ideas on how the use of power could save labor and time and in addition make more income on the farm."

With the onset of World War II the picture changed—manpower was scarce and electric power meant the difference between staying in business or having to quit in many cases. But here too came the problem of hard-to-get materials, appliances, and the shortage of manpower to construct and maintain lines—but as is always the case—it sharpened the determination and everyone pulled together to see the thing through.

The postwar boom in the use of electric power on the farm swept over the country until today we find the average farm consumption to be 700 kilowatt-hours per month and apparently we have only scratched the surface of the many uses for electric power—the most recent upswing being in house heating.

The pledge to see that all rural families have central station power is rapidly being fulfilled and on this 25th anniversary of the Rural Electric Administration we find 24 active electric cooperatives in Montana serving 43,556 consumers with an investment of approximately $53,208,000 in 29,180 miles of line.

Looking back on a successful program of this magnitude causes one to reflect on the human interest aspect and in so doing I find some of my greatest satisfactions have come from being in on the ground floor and being privileged to see the faces of proud and pleased families who eagerly watched the "lights come on" for the first time and then returning to these same homes a year or so later to see how they had grown up with their new servant and were continuing to enjoy their new standard of living—the look ahead seems of even greater magnitude as there is no end in sight—rural electric cooperatives are here to stay and serve rural families of America.

[From the Great Falls Tribune, May 8, 1960]

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION—AN END TO DARKNESS

REA PROGRAM TO BE 25 YEARS OLD MAY 11

It's hard to explain to a child of today that there was no television 25 years ago.

It's even harder to explain that a great many farm homes in Montana were lit by gasoline or kerosene lamps even less than 25 years ago, and that most farm and ranch families had nothing but battery-powered radios because there was no electrical power line near their homes.

All this began to change 25 years ago with the founding of the Rural Electrification Administration on May 11, 1935. It didn't change overnight, however. The first REA-financed powerline didn't go into operation in Montana, near Sidney, until 1937.

Since then, 29,910 miles of REA line have been erected in Montana to serve 44,401 consumers of 25 electrical cooperatives. The number of farms served by electricity in this State has risen from 2,768 to nearly 30,000, which is almost 90 percent of all farms recorded in the 1954 census. About 65 percent of these electrified farms are served by REA borrowers.

This was still a dark land when REA began in 1935. Only 1 American farm in 10 had electric service. Now nearly 97 percent of all U.S. farms and ranches are electrified, with more than half served by 1,053 rural utilities financed by REA.

REA, an agency of the Department of Agriculture, is one of the most successful cooperative efforts in the history of the Nation. Its loan program builds electric systems, not only for farms and ranches, but for hundreds of thousands of other rural establishments.

REA has only two representatives in Montana. Harry Reising of Livingston is operations field representative and Ben Wallace, Lewistown, is field engineer.

REA has not only made farm and ranch homes more comfortable and convenient, it has provided power to take over hundreds of farm chores, especially in dairying, poultry and egg production and in feeding meat animals.

While it has provided more leisure for farmers and ranchers, it has given them the means of enjoying that leisure. While part of the family watches television, others may be working in the basement with power tools or photographic darkroom equipment, or in the garage with electric welders and metal lathes.

That's why it's hard to explain to a child of today that the dark ages didn't end too long ago.

REA PHONE PROGRAM NOW IN 11TH YEAR

REA's telephone program was established by Congress in October 1949, and the first telephone cooperative loan was approved in 1950.

Two years later Montana's first REA phone loan was approved to the Mid-Rivers Cooperative at Circle. Since then one commercial company and eight other cooperatives in the State have received loans.

These loans will enable the borrowers to serve 13,682 new subscribers and to provide improved service for 4,427 existing subscribers over 15,036 miles of line. Nine of these borrowers report that 73 exchanges have been cut over to dial service.

To help provide the best possible rural telephone service, REA has a small staff of telephone engineers in Washington, D.C.

Among other things, these engineers developed construction assembly units for all telephone plant items, permitting contractors to bid competitively on construction of borrowers' telephone plants.

The staff also developed standard technical specifications for automatic dial switching equipment. This also enabled equipment makers to bid on central office equipment on a truly competitive basis.

REA has played a key role in developing plastic-insulated cable for rural use and a new plastic cable and wire suitable for burial in the ground.

Some of the engineers' most successful work has been in the field of subscriber carriers. The typical rural telephone subscriber line will carry only one conversation at a time. Since start of the telephone program, REA engineers have worked closely with makers of electronic equipment to perfect the use of "carrier current techniques" so that as many as 8 or 10 conversations can

take place simultaneously over one subscriber line. The voice is transmitted by radio and the signal travels along the same pair of wires used for an ordinary telephone conversation.

R. J. Justice of Lewistown is operational field representative for REA phone service in Montana. Road Peterson, Great Falls, is field engineer and Peter Schwan, Havre, is field accountant.

AFL–CIO President George Meany today (May 11, 1960) issued the following statement hailing the 25th anniversary of the Rural Electric Cooperatives:

"America's workers join with the farmers and the public in general in hailing the Silver Jubilee of our country's rural electric cooperatives.

"Since May 11, 1935, when President Roosevelt signed the Executive order creating the Government's rural electric program, the benefits to every segment of the population have been obvious. Today, thanks in large part to the rural electric co-op program, more than 95 percent of America's farms are served by electric powerlines. That availability of low-cost electric power has meant a lifting of some of the work burdens for farm families, a great increase in the productivity of the farms, and a tremendous rise in the buying power of the people of rural America. Much of that buying power is used to purchase the products which union members manufacture and the services they provide.

"America's prosperity must always be based on the economic well-being of both its industrial workers and its agricultural producers. The rural electric cooperatives have achieved great success in their first 25 years of helping extend the benefits of America's economic growth to all the people of our country. In the years ahead, they carry our best wishes for continued service to the national community."

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, last week, on May 11, 1960, the Rural Electrification Administration observed its 25th anniversary throughout the Nation. Many news publishers have been paying tribute to the effective work of the REA over its quarter century of operation.

It is my pleasure to call to the attention of the House membership a fine editorial, which appeared on Thursday, May 12, 1960, in the Collinsville (Ill.) Herald. The publisher of this newspaper is the Honorable James O. Monroe, who was among the dedicated group of men throughout the Nation who gave life and support to the program of the New Deal back in the days when REA and many other helpful agencies of the Government were created—agencies that rescued the people of the country from the depth of the Nation's most serious depression.

REA is not the only successful Government agency created by the New Deal in the interest of all of the people of the country. We can recall the very successful operations of the Home Owners Loan Corporation, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and many others. These were the days when the Government acted in the interest of the people.

It has been conceded by even the most bitter opponents of this type of social legislation that was enacted 25 years ago that such programs as REA, social security, and the others which I have mentioned has formed a cushion to protect our country against repetitions of the crises that existed when the people of the Nation turned to the Democratic Party in November of 1932.

I well remember editor Monroe as being in the forefront of those who assisted in the successful campaign of 1932. He remained a crusader in the interest of the people and vigorously supported the strong legislative program of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The editorial follows:

TWENTY-FIVE-YEAR SOCIAL REVOLUTION: REA

The Rural Electrification Administration observed its 25th anniversary on May 11, 1960, with nearly 97 percent of all U.S. farms and ranches electrified. A little more than half of these farms, together with hundreds of thousands of other rural establishments, are served by 1,053 rural utilities financed by REA.

This was still a dark land when REA began in 1935, with only one American farm in ten receiving electric service. During the years that followed, the lights were turned on in one farm after another through one of the most successful cooperative efforts in the history of the Nation. REA, an agency of the Department of Agriculture, made loans to build electric systems and offered technical advice. In most cases, farmers organized their own cooperatives to construct the systems and distribute the power. Today these rural utilities, financed by the Government and owned and operated by local people, served more than 4.7 million consumers in 46 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Southwestern Electric Cooperative, Inc., with headquarters at Greenville, Ill., is one of the borrowers of REA. Southwestern Electric serves approximately 7,500 rural members in Madison, Bond, and Fayette Counties.

As 1960 began REA has approved loans of more than $4 billion for rural electrification, including all kinds of facilities. For their part, the rural utilities which obtained the loans have proved financially responsible and good credit risks. So far, they have made payment to the Government in excess of $1.1 billion, including a balance of $154 million pair ahead of schedule. On January 1, 1960, only one borrower was behind in its payments more than 30 days.

As borrowers have gained in strength, the technical and management assistance rendered by REA has gradually diminished. This is in line with REA's guiding policy toward its borrowers, which is to encourage rural utilities to look after their own affairs as soon as they are able.

History has proved that farmers and other rural people use as much or more electricity than their neighbors in the city. This fact, more than any other, accounts for the tremendous success of the REA program. The first REA-financed lines were built on the assumption that farmers might use as much as 100 kilowatt-hours of electricity a month. Today farm consumers use an average of 350 kilowatt-hours per month, and the monthly average for all consumers on REA financed lines is up to 433 kilowatt-hours per month.

Much of the electricity is used to operate household appliances and equipment, such as washers, ranges, and vacuum cleaners. In recent years, a number of rural people have started heating their homes electrically. But electric power also has been harnessed to perform hundreds of farm chores. The greatest changes have been wrought in dairying, poultry and egg production, and in feeding meat animals. Electricity is revolutionizing these fields, permitting one man to care for many more birds or animals. By 1975, REA estimates that each consumer on rural lines will be using an average of 14,400 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year.

Besides altering life on the farm, the availability of electric power in rural areas has brought about profound changes in the character of rural America. New business firms and industries have appeared in the country. Suburbs have been built on the fringes of towns and cities. Retired people and commuters have been moving into rural areas. In some places, resort booms are under way. In 1959, 139,000 consumers were added to REA-financed lines.

These two trends—more consumers and greater average use of power—mean that REA borrowers will have to increase greatly the capacity of their systems in future years. They will need increasing amounts of new capital to do the job. Rural utilities already are making both financial and engineering plans for the years ahead.

The member-owned systems have proved themselves efficient organizations. They have proven themselves capable of distributing electric power on an areawide basis to even the most thinly populated parts of our country. They have proven their right to serve. If all REA-financed systems continue to concentrate on service in the future as well as they have in the past, there appears to be no reason why they should not be a permanent part of the utility industry of the United States.

Private, free enterprise power companies have fought REA at times, pointing out with considerable truth that it smacks of socialism and urging that it gives them unfair competition. They may be able to prove their premises, but it would be difficult to convince millions of Americans that REA is a bad thing.

A rather obvious proof that it is beneficial is that the private power companies have managed to thrive and expand. Competition hasn't hurt them and in fact some of them sell large amounts of power to the REA companies. The socialism argument is countered by the obvious fact that no matter how socialistic the power in their lines may be, our rural population does not feel like the REA is overturning the free enterprise system. Our rural population still feels and votes ruggedly capitalist even though their life is shot through with governmental action.

SILVER ANNIVERSARY OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, to include newspaper articles, editorials, and other extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion of the silver anniversary of rural electrification, I join the distinguished gentlemen who have preceded me in saluting this great program. Twenty-five years ago today President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed Executive Order 7037 creating the Rural Electrification Administration. This action of the President set in motion a movement which has literally transformed American rural life. Of all the things that the Government has done in the field of agriculture, in my judgment, rural electrification has been the most

important. It has brought the 20th century to the American farm.

Following the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration by Executive order, the Congress in 1936 in one of the most important acts in its history, broadened the agency's scope and gave it permanent legislative sanction. We, who are privileged to serve in the House today, are entitled to take great pride in the fact that the guiding genius of the first Rural Electrification Act passed by this body was the distinguished American who now presides over it. Speaker RAYBURN was the joint author of the Norris-Rayburn Act, the first and most auspicious rural electrification bill ever to pass the Congress. So, Mr. Speaker, this occasion commemorates not only a milestone in the life of rural America, but also a significant milestone in the legislative career of the most eminent and illustrious legislator in American history—Speaker SAM RAYBURN. The Speaker has broken so many records and has set so many records in this House—he has been associated with so many important events over the past half century—his name has been connected with so many major bills that it is all but impossible to single out one piece of legislation as being among his most significant achievements. I do believe this, however, Mr. Speaker, that had your service in this House been limited to the joint authorship and sponsorship of the first rural electrification bill, that alone would have been sufficient to give immortality to your name.

The Rural Electrification Act of 1936 could not have been passed without the exercise of the Speaker's special talent for winning acceptance of a controversial measure by reconciling the judgments of men of strong conviction but of opposite views. The passage of this bill demanded his very special combination of commonsense and uncommon judgment—of practical politician and far-seeing statesman.

Mr. Speaker, your footprints are in every American countryside. We see them in every household where the magic of electricity has lifted the burdens and drudgery that were typical of American farm life. We see them in the thousands of miles of lines carrying electricity to more than 96 percent of American farms, as compared to 10 percent 25 years ago. We see them in the farmer-operated cooperatives found in every section of the country. We see them in the success of a program that many had doomed to failure before it was started.

Mr. Speaker, you have literally created a new society in rural America. You have given rural life a new dimension. You have made a spacious future for farm people in which they can share equally, work in dignity, and live in peace.

The rural electric cooperatives of Oklahoma are justly proud of the record which they have made. A fitting tribute has been paid to the leadership of the rural electrification movement in my State in the silver jubilee edition of the Oklahoma Rural News for May 1960 in an editorial entitled "A Most Favorable Impression." Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of this editorial at this point:

A MOST FAVORABLE IMPRESSION

What kind of people are behind your electric cooperative?

After 6 months of association with local directors, managers and employees, some conclusions can be drawn.

First, let us review for a minute the men cooperative members elect as directors. Without exception, these men are sincere, honest, dedicated and loyal to the program that has erased the darkness that prevailed so long in rural America. With no previous experience in utility direction they accepted a challenge that the commercial companies termed "uneconomical or impossible."

Serving without pay, they have neglected their own farm operations to serve their neighbors and community. Area members have made wise decisions in selecting good, responsible, and loyal leadership.

Managers in all instances approach their daily responsibilities enthusiastically as well as cautiously. They realize that to serve every customer no matter how large they may be or how far they are from the nearest line is a great task. Meeting present requirements as well as planni_g for future demands requires constant review of their operations. A great portion of the success of the rural electrification program in Oklahoma can be credited to good management.

Office as well as field employees are eager to do a full day's work for a day's pay. From the time the member is received at the information desk until he is greeted by the meter and service personnel they are made to feel they are the most important person in the cooperative.

Cooperation and a recognition of individual responsibility is found in every 1 of the 26 distribution and 2 G. & T. operations.

With about $150 million invested in 64,000 miles of line and equipment, approximately 96 percent of the farms in the State now have electricity. Every Oklahoma electric cooperative is on a sound financial basis. Many have made advance payment on their loans. Reserves for tornadoes and ice storms have been developed. Capital credits are being determined and in some cases paid to the membership.

A combination of sincere direction, informed management and cooperative employees supported by loyal members, a capable REA staff and an understanding congressional delegation have achieved objectives beyond one's greatest expectation.

All Oklahomans can be proud of those who have led the way to 25 years of success in the rural electric program in this State. C.D.L.

The same edition shows that what is past is only prologue in the rural electrification movement. In this connection, I include under leave to extend my remarks another editorial from the same paper entitled "Rural Electrification Is On the Move." The editorial is as follows:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IS ON THE MOVE

With plans for capital improvement during the next 5 years totaling $47 million, Oklahoma's rural electric cooperative leaders are optimistic about the future.

Oklahoma is on the move. We have great confidence in the rural people. They have displayed their outstanding ability during periods of war and peace. With electricity, they are better prepared to meet future crises.

Examples of the need for this continued growth are Electric Cooperatives to extend service to 2,126 farms the recent approvals for loans to Kay, Indian, and Caddo that do not have electricity at the present time. Several thousand more farms in Oklahoma are still without electricity.

As farmers find that electricity can save hours of time in performing numerous chores around the farm, they are adding new equipment. New timesaving appliances are also being installed. All of this adds to the load on the line.

Early estimates by engineers on the power needs of the rural areas were too low. New lines, transformers and other equipment must be installed to insure adequate voltage. This will require several million dollars to accomplish.

These extensions and improvements will also create new markets for over $200 million in appliances and equipment. Every city and town in Oklahoma will be benefited by this additional business. C. D. L.

Most of the Members of the House are aware of the great benefits that electricity has brought to the farms of this country. I doubt that many realize what a gigantic new industry this program has added to the business community of our country today. I am pleased to quote another editorial from the Oklahoma Rural News entitled "Rural Cooperatives Are a Big Business Today":

RURAL COOPERATIVES ARE A BIG BUSINESS TODAY

A $150 million industrial plant employing 1,099 persons with an annual payroll of $4,613,156 would be an accomplishment of great acclaim for the State of Oklahoma.

Add to this a business stimulant that created a market for electrical equipment and appliances valued at over $675 million and everyone would celebrate a great victory.

A firm that has paid out over $47 million in payroll in less than 25 years would be highly honored and praised.

These are only a few of the contributions the rural electric cooperatives have made toward the economic growth of Oklahoma. Yet many Oklahomans have not stopped to think of this program in this regard.

This group was responsible for a sizable portion of the extra push in business following World War II that resulted in an expanding economy instead of a depression. C.D.L.

Along the same line is an article in the same paper showing the tremendous volume of business rural electric cooperatives have brought to appliance dealers. This article from the Oklahoma Rural News is as follows:

COOPERATIVES HAVE BROUGHT TRADE TO APPLIANCE DEALERS

One of the most important generating forces in the appliance business in Oklahoma during the past 15 years has been the rural electric cooperative program.

Records reveal that Oklahomans living in areas served by the rural electric cooperatives have bought over 416,000 major appliances. These include such major items as ranges, freezers, electric water heaters, dryers, washers, refrigerators, TV sets, and water systems.

It is conservatively estimated that this $200 million in business would keep 2,312 appliance dealers in business for 1 year. To reduce this down it would be good business for 462 appliance dealers for a 5 year period.

These fantastic figures do not include such common household appliances as irons, toasters, percolators, sewing machines, electric blankets, heaters, mixers, waffle irons, radios, electric clocks, skillets, sweepers, and numerous appliances operated electrically.

Oklahoma appliance distributors advise that this program has been the primary source of customers for hundreds of their dealers throughout the rural areas of the State. We are expecting a continuation of this for many years to come, they reveal.

A breakdown of more common heavy electrical appliances found in the home of the members of 25 electric cooperatives is as follows:

Televisions	82,000
Refrigerators	98,000
Ranges	28,089
Freezers	42,826
Water heaters	11,556
Dryers	9,830
Washers	71,999
Water systems	71,795
Electric heating	1,915
Total electric homes	246

For all its obvious success, the rural electrification program has not been a burden upon the taxpayers. Quite the reverse is true as is shown in the following article from the same paper which reports that the 28 rural electric cooperatives of Oklahoma have paid more than $6.333 million in taxes since the inception of the program:

OKLAHOMA COOPERATIVES HAVE PAID $6 MILLION TAXES

A tax bill of over $6,333,000 has been paid by the 28 rural electric cooperatives in Oklahoma. The current rate of taxes paid by this same group is over $700,000 annually, a recent survey by the organization's State association office reveals.

Based on the present rate of growth these same cooperatives will pay about $10 million in taxes during the next 10 years. The major portion of the gross sales and a large portion of the motor vehicle taxes go to school districts in all 77 counties.

This certainly contradicts the usual misunderstanding by most people about the rural electric cooperatives paying no taxes.

Tying this figure of almost $6½ million to something tangible, it would build Oklahoma City's Northwest Classen and John Marshall High Schools and Taft Junior High School. These are three of the largest schools in the Southwest.

The recent park development program of the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board was only slightly more than this amount. It included the beautiful lodges at Sequoyah State Park, Lake Texhoma, Lake Murray Lodge, Quartz Mountain Lodge, Roman Nose Park, and many other projects that received nationwide praise.

This amount of taxes paid by Oklahoma's rural electric cooperatives would have constructed the massive Student Union Building and the outstanding library on the campus of Oklahoma State University.

These taxes would have built the buildings on the Cameron College campus and the beautiful new high school in Lawton.

Still another article from the Oklahoma Rural News describes the fine repayment record which rural electric cooperatives have made in Oklahoma and the impact of the program upon the economy in general:

THE REA PROGRAM IN OKLAHOMA

REA electric borrowers in Oklahoma have repaid $21,022,869 of the principal of their Government loans. In addition, they have paid $14,796,791 in interest and $5,915,482 ahead of schedule. As of January 1, 1960, no borrower in the State was overdue in its loan payments.

At the time the Rural Electrification Administration was created on May 11, 1935, only 5,648 farms in Oklahoma, or 2.6 percent, were receiving central station electric service. Current REA estimates show that 110,800 farms in the State, or 93.1 percent of all farms recorded in the 1954 census, were being served by June 30, 1959. REA borrowers serve about 77.3 percent of these electrified farms.

The first REA electrification loan in Oklahoma was approved in November of 1935. The first REA-financed line was placed in operation on May 4, 1936, by the Earl W. Baker Utilities Co. of Bethany.

Up to January 1, 1960, the beginning of REA's 25th year, the agency had approved a total of $154,296,919 in loans to 28 electric borrowers in the State, of which 27 are cooperatives. The loans were made to enable the borrowers to construct 65,439 miles of line and other electric facilities to serve 167,302 consumers.

Loan funds actually advanced to these borrowers amounted to $139,981,277 by January 1, 1960. With the help of this financing, the locally owned and managed systems had already placed 62,917 miles of line in operation and were serving 142,184 farm and other rural consumer outlets. The average monthly consumption of electricity by these consumers had increased from 98 kilowatt-hours in 1950, to 189 kilowatt-hours in 1958.

Mr. Speaker, rural electrification has spelled progress to Oklahoma as is well demonstrated in the following article from the silver jubilee edition of the Oklahoma Rural News:

ELECTRIFICATION HAS SPELLED PROGRESS TO OKLAHOMA

How would the rural areas of Oklahoma look today if electricity had not been provided by the rural electric cooperatives? What would be the population of the State?

How much taxes would be lost annually if thousands of the now occupied farms had been vacated? What would the price of land be if all of these farms had been put up for sale?

Definite answers of course cannot be obtained; however, one can use good judgment and imagination.

Dozens of the small towns would have completely disappeared. Instead of living in rural areas, those now commuting 25 to 150 miles a day to work, would have moved to the point of employment. Others would have ended up in California with many of their former neighbors. This would have had an extremely adverse effect on the economy of the entire State.

Millions of dollars in taxes would have been lost in the rural counties and the price of land could be down considerably below depression prices.

It could have meant the losing of many industries, another Congressman, and thousands of Oklahoma's most valuable resources—its people.

Hundreds of millions of dollars from the sale of agricultural products would have hurt every person in every city, town, and village in the State.

The rural electric cooperatives have had a far greater effect on the overall economy of Oklahoma than the average citizen can possibly imagine.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STUBBLEFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago this week, May 11, 1935, President Roosevelt issued the Executive order creating the Rural Electrification Administration. At that time, only 8,480 farms in Kentucky or 3 percent were receiving regular electric service. Currently, 188,900 farms or 97.6 percent of all farms in Kentucky are being served with electricity. More than 80 percent of the electrified farms in Kentucky are served by rural electric cooperatives organized under the REA program. The first rural electrification loan in Kentucky was approved in October 1935. From that date to the present, REA loans totaling over $154 million have been made to 28 electric borrowers in the State, of which 27 are rural electric cooperatives.

The loans enabled borrowers to construct 53,000 miles of lines and to serve 263,000 consumers. As of January 1, 1960, no borrower in the State of Kentucky was overdue in its loan payments. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the borrowers were $4,875,000 ahead of schedule. The REA program with its combination of technical assistance and loan funds has not only brought tremendous benefits in the way of better living conditions and a better way of life to our farm people, but it has greatly benefited the economy of the Nation as a whole.

We know, for example, how serious is the plight of our coal miners and the coal industry generally, but it is hard to visualize how much more difficult and tragic the circumstances in the coal mining areas would be were it not for the tremendous amount of coal which is mined and used to produce the electric power which supplies the farm homes to which the REA program has brought electricity. Rural electric service extends into 112 of Kentucky's 120 counties, but to present fully the picture of the increased use of electricity, let us compare for a moment the amount of power used by the individual farm family with the amount used when this program began. The average farm home used only 40 kilowatt-hours per month in 1937. By 1950, this rate had jumped to 116 kilowatt-hours per month, and the projected 1970 rate is 650 kilowatt-hours.

The 332,000 member users of rural electric service in Kentucky have a tremendous interest in the welfare of all of Kentucky. They want to see Kentucky prosper and grow and are interested in bringing industry to Kentucky for a more balanced economy. They are working with other organizations to that end. They are working with the high schools throughout the State in connection with the home economics program. Under this program, equipment is loaned to the school home economics departments for instructional purposes at no cost, and is replaced annually with new equipment.

The rural electric cooperatives with only one exception, own modern, up-to-date office buildings and headquarters facilities with attractive auditoriums which are made available to the people as a community center. Cooperatives employ personnel and staff who work with the member users on ways to make more effective use of electric service.

The rural electric cooperatives in Kentucky are operating as successful business organizations—meeting their loans and providing low-cost, dependable electric service to their member users. They also make a big contribution toward the general economic welfare of the State. It is estimated that for each dollar invested in line facilities, approximately

$7 is now being invested in equipment for use of this electrical service. This is helping the merchants on main street and is helping factory workers who produce the electrical appliances and other equipment which go along with electrical power.

The rural electric program in Kentucky has grown from nothing 25 years ago to where it now represents $175 million investment. Five of the twenty-seven rural electric cooperatives in Kentucky serve families in the First District, which I have the honor to represent. These five are: Jackson Purchase Cooperative, Paducah; Hickman-Fulton, Hickman; West Kentucky, Mayfield; Pennyrile, Hopkinsville; and Warren County, Bowling Green. We are proud of these cooperatives, proud of the quality of their management and of the high type of leadership reflected in their boards of directors. The REA program and its success is a living monument to their ability and their leadership. I pledge my continued support to this great program and am honored to join with my colleagues in saluting REA on this 25th birthday.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this observance of the 25th anniversary of the founding of the rural electrification program. During the third year of the first term of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the President was presented with the results of a survey of the number of electrified farms in rural America. This survey revealed that only 10 percent of the farms in America had electricity. Thereupon President Roosevelt on May 11, 1935, by Executive order established the Rural Electrification Administration and handed it the responsibility of electrifying the farm homes in America. This was a significant day not only for rural America but for all the Nation. Within the 25 years immediately following, America found itself engaged in a global war, in a war in Korea, and in a prolonged cold-war siege which combined to make it mandatory that America's farms produce not only for its own people and in the interest of national defense but equally as important to help in feeding millions of peoples across the length and breadth of the globe whose lives and fortunes had been destroyed by war and the subsequent dislocation which took place. In this mammoth effort, REA has played a significant and tremendously important role.

It is to be noted that the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives was instrumental in sparking the interest in this body which resulted in the year that followed, in the passage of the REA Act which made rural electrification a long-range program. REA is just another of the major accomplishments of Speaker Rayburn during his years of rich service.

This was just a quarter of a century ago and as REA celebrates its silver anniversary we find that approximately 97 percent of all the farms in America enjoy the benefits of modern electric service. From 10 percent to 97 percent is a tremendous stride in just 25 years. The farmer of America owes all of this to the REA which has financed around 1,000 rural electric distribution systems. The result has been that from this program established 25 years ago by a group of farsighted men, has come the electric power which has made America the greatest agricultural nation the world has ever known.

It would be next to impossible to enumerate in these moments the many benefits which have ensued as this program has grown. It has, for example, meant more jobs. Farmers are buying television sets, water heaters, refrigerators, electric motors, and other electrical appliances. This represents millions of dollars of sales each year and creates new jobs as the market for these services increases. Thus our cities have profited by the program set into operation 25 years ago by President Roosevelt and continued each year since then by the Congress.

Not only have the people of the cities benefited but the whole face of rural America has changed as power has been brought to the farms. Electricity has made great changes in their way of living. The first REA loan was approved in July 1935, and since that date, gone are the days of much drudgery and backbreaking toil of pitching hay with a fork, carrying water by the pail, and firewood by the armful. Kerosene lamps, lanterns, pump handles and sadirons have lost their meaning to most youngsters in high school today. The woman on the farm now has a more liveable life. Her husband formerly had to use only musclepower to accomplish numerous tasks of farm life. Now we are told that there are over 400 different tasks that electricity can perform on the farm that formerly farm folk did the hard way.

Mr. Speaker, there are within my own congressional district six electric co-ops—the Black River Electric Co-op, Ironton; the Intercounty Electric Co-op, Licking; the Howell-Oregon Electric Co-op, West Plains; the Gascosage Electric Co-op, Dixon; the Crawford Electric Co-op; Bourbon; and the Citizens Electric Corporation, Ste. Genevieve. I give some statistics on two of these operations only just to save time. They are typical of the other four within the district.

The Citizens Electric Corporation in Ste. Genevieve is an REA-financed utility operating under the jurisdiction of the Missouri Public Service Commission. The area served comprises all of Ste. Genevieve and Perry Counties, and the northern part of Cape Girardeau County. The unusual organizational character of the corporation was brought about by the fact that it serves two cities of more than 1,500 population. In all other respects, the corporation is identical to the typical REA cooperative. It is owned and directed by those it serves. Under a capital credit contract with all consumers, it is obligated to allocate any margins or earnings back to the credit of the consumer.

The amount of loans to the Citizens Electric Corporation under note from the Rural Electrification Administration stands at $7,551,228.10. This facility has 1,963 miles of transmission and distribution lines which is an effective part of the overall task of bringing electric service to all our people in the rural areas as well as the towns and villages. This corporation supplies 9,963 consumers of which approximately 50 percent are farms and other classes of rural service. The rates charged by the corporation are the lowest possible, consistent with the rendering of a high quality and adequate electrical service. This facility, Mr. Speaker, is continuing to make a tremendous contribution to this rural area of America and has paid dividends to the Nation as a whole.

It is of interest also to note one of the other six cooperatives within my district—the Crawford Electric Cooperative, Bourbon, Mo. This facility now serves some 6,500 members on approximately 2,130 miles of line in six Missouri counties. In 1949 the kilowatt usage was approximately 4 million. By 1959 this had risen to the total of over 17 million. It is of significance to note that one of the most important loads within this cooperative is the U.S. Army Nike Base at Catawissa, Mo.—another defense contribution of REA to the welfare of the whole Nation.

What has held true for my own Eighth Missouri District is equally as true for the State of Missouri. In 1935 there were just 17,893 farms electrified within the State of Missouri. This was approximately 6.4 percent of the farms in the State. By 1959 there were 193,950 farms electrified or a total of approximately 96.2 percent. Of these 79.3 percent are served by an REA cooperative.

It is to be stressed, Mr. Speaker, that these co-ops are voluntary, democratic organizations set up to perform a service for their members. They are owned by the members they serve. These rural services would not have been likely had it not been for the REA and its empowerment by the Congress 1 year after its creation by Executive order to make loans for the construction of these facilities. These REA-financed loans have been repaid at a record that is nothing short of fantastic. Over $4 billion has been loaned in the past 25 years. To date over $1.1 billion has been repaid. This includes $628 million repaid on principal, $375 million on interest, and $146 million paid ahead of schedule. Only one REA borrower out of a thousand across the Nation and that not in Missouri, has been delinquent in repaying its loan. This is a record of fiscal responsibility hard to match elsewhere.

A 25th anniversary is necessarily a time for looking backward but equally so a time to look forward. There are, Mr. Speaker, those who would have us terminate the REA and render the accolade, "Well done." The present Administrator of the REA has summed up the future for REA in three phases: First, more people; second, increased consumption of electricity; third, heavier plant

facilities. He predicts that these trends seem certain to continue for at least 20 years more.

And so it is Mr. Speaker, that we might say that the first goal of REA has been met—rural America has had electricity brought to its doors. Now as we enter a phase of change and redevelopment in rural America, REA looks confidently to the future with the assurance that it can continue to meet the challenge of furnishing a constantly high quality of service to all rural consumers in whatever amounts they may require and at the lowest possible cost consistent with sound management.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, 25 years of experience with REA leads all of us to say that rural electrification is good for all Americans.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a real sense of pride—pride as a Member of this body, as a Representative of a great rural area, and as an American—that I rise to add my voice to the others being raised here this afternoon in tribute to the rural electrification program which is this year celebrating its silver jubilee. We pay tribute today to the vision of those who wrote and enacted the basic legislation which established this program. There are, as it happens, 25 Members of this body today who were also Members of this body when the Rural Electrification Act was passed and I know that, high on the list of his many accomplishments, our beloved Speaker ranks his sponsorship of that historic piece of legislation.

We also pay tribute to the dedicated men and women who have served in the Rural Electrification Administration. The names are of course legion, from the late Morris L. Cooke and his successor, John Carmody, down through the years and through the ranks of the Agency, from the Administrator to the newest stenographers and typists.

But, most of all, we pay tribute to the farmers of America whose program it really is, and whose efforts have made it a major and continuing achievement. In the words of the song which they sing each year at their annual meeting, these people from the real grassroots of America have worked to help each other, and in so doing they have shown the world what happens when the farmer takes a hand.

The record of the rural electrification program is written in the statistics with which we are all familiar—the nearly 1½ million miles of distribution lines that now carry the benefits of electrical power to more than 4½ million farms, homes and other rural establishments, the increase in the proportion of American farms electrified from only 10 percent in 1935 to more than 96 percent today. In my own State of Oregon the story is equally one of accomplishment for which we can be proud—more than 11,000 miles of distribution lines serving almost 35,000 consumers with better than 97 percent of Oregon farms now electrified. In my own District, there are currently about 11,000 farms being served by some nine rural electric systems.

But more important than these statistics, impressive as they are, is the record which the rural electrification program has written in terms of what my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON], has called "the quiet revolution that has changed the face of rural America." It is in terms of increased productivity, lightened work loads for farmers and their families, and that immeasurable intangible of a "better life" which has replaced so much of the traditional drudgery of life for farm families that the record of the rural electrification program is really written.

As I have said, this is a record of which all of us are justifiably proud. But it is a record that has not been established in a vacuum and I want to take a few moments to talk about an aspect of the rural electrification program of which we in the Pacific Northwest are particularly conscious. The rural electrification program and its outstanding achievements must be seen in the context of the whole program of full resource development which is so vital to our Nation.

The rural electrification program is bringing the benefits of low-cost electric power to rural America. It is doing so through the use of the people's own credit, made available by the REA—a fundamental example of using public credit for public purposes. The great success of this program has been made possible, in large measure, by a parallel program of developing the people's resource heritage in the interest of the public good—through the Federal power program.

I call your attention to two aspects of the rural electrification program in our own State of Oregon. Oregon rural electric consumers have the second highest per member consumption of electricity in the Nation. Rural electric systems in Oregon also have the second-lowest per-kilowatt cost for wholesale power purchases in the Nation. In both instances, the top-ranking State is our sister State of Washington and the key to this ranking for our two States is, of course, the tremendous resources of the Columbia River Basin which are being harnessed for all the people through the multiple-purpose development program of the Federal Government.

The vital importance of the Federal power programs to the rural electrification program is not characteristic only of the Pacific Northwest. Across the entire country, 450 rural electric systems purchase all or part of their electric energy from Federal power marketing agencies. In fiscal 1958, these purchases totaled about 9.1 billion kilowatt-hours at a cost of some $45 million. This was roughly 40 percent of the total cost of power to all rural electric systems. A similar amount of power was purchased in that year from investor-owned private power companies, at a cost of some $72.5 million. This means that rural electric systems got about 60 percent more power per dollar of expenditure from Federal power marketing agencies than from investor-owned private power companies. In addition to this direct benefit to the rural electrification program, there is the substantial saving which has come in their purchases from private power sources as a result of the competitive yardstick effects which are such an important aspect of the Federal power program.

The evidence that our program of full resource development is essential to the success of the rural electrification program is not confined to the figures I have just cited. Between 1958 and 1959, sales of electricity by rural electric systems increased by 15½ percent—a rate that means their power loads are roughly doubling every 4 to 5 years. In contrast, sales of electricity by the industry as a whole are increasing at a rate which represents a doubling of loads in about every 7 to 10 years. Not only can rural electric systems better carry out their mission of bringing low-cost power to rural America if they are independent from high-cost private power supplies, but private sources of supply are not adequate to the expanding needs of the electric cooperatives. I would remind those who might take exception to this point that 25 years ago representatives of private power companies were saying that all the farmers who wanted electricity were already receiving it from their firms. The record of the rural electrification program since that time furnishes a complete rebuttal to their contention.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that if the rural electrification program is to continue to build on the record of the past 25 years which we are honoring today, it can do so only if we here continue to keep faith with the people of America and with their and our great resource heritage—only if we continue the job of developing that heritage in the proud tradition of full multiple-use for the greatest good for the greatest number. We are justifiably proud of the past 25 years of achievement, but we must continue to write the record in the years ahead along the lines that have been established in law and practice—in the spirit of those principles enunciated and adhered to by Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot, by George Norris and Franklin D. Roosevelt, and by all the people, famous and unknown, who have created the context of resource development which has made the proud record of the rural electrification program possible.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to state at the outset that the people of the Seventh Congressional District of Kentucky are proud of the good work of the rural electric cooperatives. Since 1935 most of the farms in eastern Kentucky have been able to receive central station electric service.

The district that I am privileged to represent is served by the Big Sandy RECC at Paintsville; Grayson RECC, Grayson; Clark RECC, Winchester; Jackson County RECC at McKee; Cumberland Valley RECC, Corbin, and Licking Valley RECC at West Liberty. Some of these co-ops do not reach too far into the Seventh District. For instance, Cumberland Valley Co-op in Corbin serves a part of Letcher County, Clark RECC at Winchester serves parts of Bath and Menifee Counties. All, however, have a fairly heavy saturation of rural electric service; some counties are served extensively by the rural electric co-op lines—for example, Morgan County serves 2,300 rural electric consumers, Wolfe County, 1,700; Magoffin County, 1,252; Elliott County, 1,850, and Greenup County, 1,625, and so forth.

The people in the district appreciate the amount of money that has been loaned to the co-ops in order that they could provide this service. As of the end of the year 1959, Big Sandy Co-op loans amounted to $2,488,466.92; Clark RECC, $3,947,429.15; Grayson Co-op, $3,799,729.61; Licking Valley, $3,318,424.44; Jackson County RECC, $6,972,772.10; Cumberland Valley at Corbin, $3,602,432.37. All these co-ops, with the exception of Grayson and Big Sandy Co-ops buy their wholesale power from east Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperative at Winchester—this is the generation and transmission cooperative in the State. Big Sandy and Grayson Co-ops purchase their power on a wholesale basis from the Kentucky Power Co.

The district that I represent has the unique distinction of having the youngest rural cooperative in the State—the Grayson RECC whose manager is Hobert Adams, and this co-op is the last to be established in Kentucky, making the 26th in the State. This area was served by the Fleming-Mason RECC at Flemingsburg until about 10 years ago when it was decided that the territory was then large enough to be operated as an independent cooperative; as a result, the Grayson Rural Electric Co-op was established, bringing the total distribution cooperatives in Kentucky to 26.

It has been my observation that all of the rural electric cooperatives in the Seventh Congressional District are trying to do everything possible to aid the areas in which they operate. For example, they now have a school equipment plan in operation where equipment is loaned to the high schools in the areas served by the cooperatives for use of their home economics departments for instructional purposes. This equipment is changed out at the end of each year and new, up-to-date equipment installed so the teachers and the children will have new equipment available for their use. This equipment is loaned at no cost to the school—the co-ops feel that this is a worthwhile contribution to the welfare of the school program and will benefit the children of the respective areas.

Then again, each rural electric cooperative owns and operates its own office building—each building has an auditorium that is available for all types of meetings—this is a community enterprise and has been carried on for many years.

Each of the co-ops provide a financial program for its members for the purchase of electrical equipment—this enables the members to stretch their dollars a little bit in order to improve their standard of living and to enjoy the benefits of their electric service.

I do want to state on this 25th anniversary that each co-op in the Seventh Congressional District is meeting its obligation on loans from REA, and at the same time, providing adequate low-cost electric service to the members. In conclusion, I want to state that I have always observed that each of the co-ops is dedicated to the objective of providing low-cost dependable electric service to the people throughout the respective areas of the State, and this service has improved the standard of living of hundreds of thousands of families.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, this is a notable day in the history of our country. A day when we celebrate the 25th anniversary of the initiation of the Rural Electrification Administration and salute our devoted Speaker for his part in its beginning.

I know of no domestic program which has done more for rural America and the country as a whole than rural electrification. I know firsthand what it means to a mother and a housewife to care for her family without running water in the home, either hot or cold, to have no washing machine, no electric stove, no refrigerator, no freezer, and no electric lights. I know, too, how she worked from early in the morning until late at night and died early in life from overwork.

Now the rural mother and housewife has in her home all the conveniences which electricity brings. She has the same labor-saving devices which her sister in the cities knew earlier, and life for her on the farm is not the same any more.

There are those who would hinder and hamper this great program. It is my hope that they are few in number, and my prayer is that they will not succeed in their efforts.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the American agricultural revolution is surely one of the great advances in human history. Living in the midst of it, as we do, we are sometimes unaware of its existence or overwhelmed by its problems.

Today, in observance of the 25th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration, we pay tribute to the home-owned rural electric systems which played so important a role in this continuing revolution. Like the development of the gasoline engine, the use of electricity on the farm set the stage for another great advance in efficient production of the food and fiber so necessary to national growth.

The modest beginning on May 11, 1935, did not foretell the technological advances REA would bring to farm operations. Nor did we realize the tremendous contribution electric service would make toward meeting the production demands of World War II with limited manpower resources.

We have good cause to be grateful for the foresight of President Roosevelt when he signed Executive Order 7037 on May 11, 1935, to inaugurate this program. A share of this gratitude goes, too, to our great Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN, and to the late Senator Norris for their contribution in carrying forward a long-range program.

The tremendous impact of dependable, low-cost electric power on farming is in evidence everywhere in our country. Its impetus to mechanization has tripled the output per farmworker in just 25 years. The record of American agriculture does not need to be recounted here nor need we belabor the contribution of electricity to that record.

The revolution in production was inevitably accompanied by great changes in rural living. It is hard to realize that just a quarter century ago, 16 million Americans were without light. Many young Americans and many young farm families barely recall the days of kerosene lamps, coal stoves, lanterns, pump handles, and flatirons.

Most of us, however, remember the back-breaking work and the drudgery in even the simplest jobs around a farm—pitching hay with a fork, carrying water by the pail and firewood by the armful.

The life of a farm wife was one of long hours and hard work. Her sisters in the city were using the new appliances but she washed with a washboard and heated her flatiron on the wood or coal stove. She sewed and mended in the dim light of the lamp that smoked up.

Preserving food meant many hours in preparation for canning—hauling water and wood, and standing over a hot stove to attend to every step.

With almost all of our farms electrified today, farm families themselves sometimes forget how much they depend upon electric power—until the power goes off. Things are easier today, everyone agrees, because the use of electricity is so commonplace that we take it for granted.

The pioneers in our rural electric system who fought to bring light and power to farms and farm homes may well regard this commonplace acceptance as a high tribute to their successful work. They have changed the face of rural America and brought to farms a steadily improved standard of living which was denied to rural people simply because of distances that are a part of agriculture.

As so often happens, when farmers benefited, the whole rural community and finally the national economy shared in the benefits. We need only consider what a great boon rural electrification has been and continues to be for business and industry. It has opened almost unlimited markets for machinery and appliances that are no longer considered luxuries but as necessities of everyday work.

The rural electric program is one of the finest examples of cooperation between people and their Government. It helped farmers help themselves to accomplish what they were unable to do by single efforts alone. An entire Nation has benefited.

This should be a reminder to us that there are still opportunities for people to work with and through their Government to do together the jobs we cannot do alone.

When we pay tribute to REA today, we pay tribute to the millions of farm families who made it work. They are properly the ones to be commended on this anniversary and I am happy to join in offering my congratulations on a job well done.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not recall just when electrical energy became available for light and power and heat and refrigeration in our factories and on our farms and in our homes; but, as a practical matter, in rural America that time was only a quarter of a century ago. That was when, in 1935, the Rural Electrification Administration was established. And during the 25 intervening years, the program of REA has been of tremendous importance to our rural people and to the economy of the entire Nation.

Only 23 years ago in my own great State of Louisiana merely 2,826 of a total of 170,216 rural homes and farms had electrical service of any type. The national average of rural farms and homes with electricity at that same time was only 10 percent of the total number.

That was the year 1937, when the first member-owned, REA-financed electric cooperative was organized in Louisiana. Today there are 13 of these cooperatives in our State, and they provide 98 percent area coverage; which, I have been told, is a national record in total percentage of members served.

Louisiana's REA-financed electric co-ops now serve more than half a million people, their homes, businesses, and small industries. These 13 co-ops have more than 25,000 miles of rural electric lines, averaging about 4.5 members per mile for the State.

The average electrical consumption on these lines has jumped from about 45 kilowatt-hours for each consumer 20 years ago to an average of 245 kilowatt-hours per consumer last year. It is readily understandable, of course, that this increased electrical usage in these systems in Louisiana has necessitated the rephasing and rebuilding of practically all of the lines during the past 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of this body certainly understand that, contrary to erroneous claims made by some interests, the member-owned electric cooperatives are not Government agencies, and they do not exist on taxpayers' handouts. They were organized by leading rural citizens who, to state it simply, desperately wanted electricity. They are controlled by member-elected boards of directors.

Nationwide, these co-ops have a remarkable record for repaying REA loans. Let me cite the record for my own State: Since 1937, the 13 cooperatives in Louisiana have been advanced $55 million, in round figures, by the Rural Electrification Administration. As of December 31, 1959, they had repaid, in round figures, $20 million on these loans, nearly $6 million of which was interest to the Federal lending agency. But there is more: In addition to those payments, Louisiana's co-ops had paid nearly another $5 million to the REA in advance of schedule.

Rural electrification has certainly helped farmers, but it has indeed done very much more than that. The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that for each dollar invested by the rural electric cooperatives the members of those co-ops spend $6 for appliances alone. And that is merely the beginning. Think, for example, of the vast dairying industry and its dependence upon rural electricity; the great fishing industry, dependent upon modern refrigeration; and of innumerable small rural industries, along with countless new main-street businesses, all created as a result of the new markets, methods, production, and related factors of rural electricity. Think of the rural development, the recreational sites, the summer homes and camps, and other facilities enjoyed by urban as well as rural people. And think, surely, of all the jobs, the increased productivity and stronger economy of my State, of your State, and of all our States. Everyone has benefited from rural electricity.

It is pertinent, I believe, Mr. Speaker, for me to add to my remarks here today that I am a strong believer in our free enterprise system, and I have no quarrel with our privately owned public utilities. But I think it is well that the public should understand that not only the co-ops, but private businesses, municipalities, and other public bodies also borrow REA funds for rural electrification and rural telephones, at the same interest rates charged the cooperatives. I shall not proceed further with this point other than to state emphatically that the rural electric co-ops are not Government agencies, any more than are the other utilities which borrow REA money; and they, of course, are not Government agencies in any sense of the meaning.

The rural electric cooperative is a service organization. It must deal with problems such as building and maintaining lines stretching for miles through woods, swamps, hills, and other isolated areas, with no thought of commercial profits. Yet, as has been so abundantly demonstrated during the past 25 years, the electric co-op certainly does a wonderful job of bringing the practically limitless benefits of electricity to our fine rural people.

I feel sure that one of the most important reasons for the success of our rural electric co-ops is the democratic, American-type cooperation among the owners, who are the rural folks who use the electric power provided to them by the co-op. They are surely much more than customers for, or consumers of, electricity. The owners are the members of the co-op, the stockholders in a modern enterprise which has perhaps done more than any other one thing to lift the face of our country.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, it should be remembered—by the public and by both the executive and legislative branches of our Government—that REA is a business enterprise, not an old-line Government activity. It needs business, and not political administration.

Unless the business management of the REA is to be impaired every time a hostile political administration comes into power in the executive branch, the agency must have consistently nonpolitical direction. REA, it should be remembered, can lend only as much money as Congress says it can lend, and then only when the loan meets the conditions specified by Congress.

In my opinion, Congress cannot too soon get REA back in the hands of administrators who are dedicated to the progress of rural electrification. We must restore REA loan authority to the place where it belongs—the management of the agency—where it was prior to 1953, and take it away from political domination by any administration.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WATTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the 25th anniversary of one of the most successful programs ever undertaken by the Federal Government in cooperation with the rural people of this country. It was on May 11, 1935, that President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the Executive order creating the Rural Electrification Administration. This was an event of tremendous significance for the rural people of Kentucky and for the people of 45 other States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

In 1935 thousands of farmers and their families had given up hope of receiving central station electric service during their lifetimes. Despite the fact that our towns and cities had taken electricity for granted for several decades, only 11 of every 100 farms in the United States were electrified 25 years ago. Farmers literally were living in the dark ages. They read by kerosene lamps; they cooked over wood or coal; they had no refrigeration; they were denied the use of the radio.

When REA was created, only 3 percent of the farms in the State of Kentucky were electrified. These few were located, by and large, close enough to towns to obtain municipal service.

Today, on REA's silver anniversary, it is estimated that nearly 98 percent of all Kentucky farms have electricity, and more than 80 percent of these farms are served by 28 REA borrowers. Nationally, about 1,000 REA borrowers serve more than 4½ million consumers, and 97 percent of U.S. farms are electrified.

This tremendous achievement in a single generation was accomplished without a single grant or handout. The Rural Electrification Act of 1936, which was introduced in the House of Representatives by Speaker SAM RAYBURN, established REA as a lending agency. The dollars which have gone into rural electrification are being repaid to the Government, with interest.

Of the 28 REA borrowers in Kentucky, 27 are cooperatives, organized and owned and operated by the rural people they serve. It was no small task for farmers who were inexperienced in the electric power business to form their own organizations to get that power. But Kentucky farmers proved that they were good businessmen in the power business, as well as in the business of agriculture. They not only built the co-ops, but they built them on a sound financial basis. Anyone who has had the privilege of living on a co-op power line knows that there is no better, no more reliable, electric service delivered anywhere in the Nation than over REA-financed lines.

The first REA electrification loan in Kentucky was approved in October of 1935. The first REA-financed line in my State was energized on December 22, 1937, by the Henderson-Union Rural Electric Cooperative, of Henderson, Ky.

As 1960 began, REA had approved more than $174 million in electrification loans to our 28 borrowers. In turn, these local cooperatives have built more than 52,000 miles of line and other facilities to serve 263,487 rural consumers.

So far, Kentucky borrowers have repaid $23,688,279 on the principal of their REA loans. In addition, they have paid $14,367,500 in interest and $4,874,944 ahead of schedule. No borrower in Kentucky is overdue in its loan payments to REA.

To those of you who lived on farms before electrification, there is little need to describe the changes that power has brought to rural America. Those of you from towns and cities will have difficulty in imagining what life was like in those dark days. Electricity has brought so many changes to Kentucky that it would take me all day to recount them.

To name but a few:

Electricity meant that the farmer and his family could have running water, indoor plumbing.

It meant an end to his isolation, as first the radio, and then television, brought him in touch with the world.

It brought electric lights. A single 100-watt bulb today is 100 times as bright as an old kerosene lamp.

For the farmer's wife, electricity meant a washing machine, an electric iron that didn't have to be heated on a stove. It meant an electric range. Electricity improved the farmers' diet, by making refrigeration possible.

As electricity took over many farm chores, it was possible for rural children to complete their schooling. The schools themselves were greatly improved after electric power came along.

A number of agricultural pursuits have been revolutionized by rural electrification. Milk production and poultry raising have been mechanized. Stock feeding has been electrified. These changes, and the savings in human labor which accompanied them, have enabled many farmers to diversify or intensify their operations, for greater production and profit.

In recent years, the availability of electricity in rural areas has sparked new changes in rural America. These changes are just beginning, but they hold new promise for all rural people.

Large numbers of nonfarm rural people are moving to the country. New kinds of enterprise are developing in the country, too. Business firms, industries, processing plants, professional people, are discovering that you can do anything in the country today that you can do in the city—and you can frequently do it better. These new enterprises hold out the hope of more off-the-farm employment, which is needed so vitally in many low income rural areas.

Hastening this rural development is a newer REA program: the rural telephone loan program. Started in 1949, it already has assisted 18 borrowers in Kentucky to provide rural people with modern dial telephone service. Since the program began, the percentage of Kentucky farms with telephones has risen from 21 percent to 41 percent. This modern communication service also is helping to attract new enterprise to our rural areas.

As REA celebrates its 25th anniversary today, I want to congratulate all those men and women in Kentucky who have given so generously of their time and energy to develop our fine rural electric and telephone systems. There are many of them, and all rural people owe them a debt which can never be repaid. My congratulations also go to the employees of the Rural Electrification Administration, who have worked closely with the cooperatives over the years and who have seen to it that the program was operated to benefit rural people. I feel sure that future historians will record the REA programs as two of the most significant things that ever happened in rural America.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the 25th anniversary of the rural electrification program, a social and economic achievement which by 1960 has brought electricity and power to more than 16 million Americans.

It was on May 11, 1935, that the President of the United States signed the Executive order that created the Rural Electrification Administration.

In August 1938 a group of rural Americans heard the warm, familiar voice of their President dedicating the Lamar Electric Membership Corp. at Barnesville, Ga. The President explained the events that led to his signing the Executive order, the silver anniversary of which we are celebrating this month, and concluded with these words:

> So it can be said that a little cottage at Warm Springs, Ga., was the birthplace of the Rural Electrification Administration.

With these simple words President Franklin Delano Roosevelt described what has come to be recognized as one of the principal accomplishments of his administration.

REA ONE OF SAM RAYBURN'S GREAT CONTRIBUTIONS

The rural electrification program must also be regarded as one of the greatest of the many contributions to the American people of our beloved Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, for the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 was introduced by the then Chairman RAYBURN of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and the late Senator George Norris, of Nebraska.

We in Indiana are particularly proud that the Honorable Claude Wickard of our State, Secretary of Agriculture under President Roosevelt, was Administrator of the REA program for 8 years. Mr. Wickard was selected as the principal speaker at the silver anniversary observances held on May 11 this year at Warm Springs, Ga.

Mr. Speaker, many citizens of the State of Indiana and of the Third Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, are today receiving the benefits of REMC-financed electricity.

REMC'S SERVE THE PEOPLE OF LAPORTE AND MARSHALL COUNTIES

For example, there is the REA-financed electric system with headquarters in Plymouth, Ind., the Marshall County Rural Electric Membership Corp. The president of the cooperative is Gordon Smith and the manager is Clayton E. Robinson.

The first REA loan to the Marshall County REMC was made on October 12, 1936. Since then REA has approved a total of $1,195,000 in loans to this borrower of which about $850,000 has been advanced. The loans were made to finance the construction of 738 miles of distribution line to serve 3,014 rural consumers in Marshall and St. Joseph Counties.

Portions of LaPorte County, also in my district, are included in areas served by the Kankakee Valley REMC of Wanatah, Ind.

REA'S FINE RECORD IN INDIANA

Mr. Speaker, at the time the Rural Electrification Administration was created on May 11, 1935, only 23,476 farms in Indiana, or 11.7 percent, were receiving central station electric service.

Current REA estimates show that 152,850 farms in the State, or 99.5 percent of all farms recorded in the 1954 census, were being served by June 30, 1959. REA-financed rural electric systems serve about 64 percent of these electrified farms.

Through April 1, 1960, REA had approved a cumulative total of $69,989,393 in loans to 47 electric borrowers in Indiana, of which 46 are cooperatives.

The REA loans were made to enable the borrowers to construct 37,726 miles of line, and other electric facilities, to serve 164,584 consumers. Loan funds actually advanced to the borrowers amounted to $62,565,284 by April 1, 1960. With the help of this financing, the locally owned and managed systems had already placed 38,151 miles of line in operation and were serving 170,513 farms and other rural consumer outlets. The average monthly consumption of electricity by these consumers had increased from 200 kilowatt-hours in 1950, to 427 kilowatt-hours in 1959.

REA electric borrowers in Indiana have repaid $26,487,077 on the principal of their Government loans. In addition, they have paid $10,366,710 in interest and $3,033,659 ahead of schedule. No borrower in the State is overdue in its loan payments.

In 1950, the year the first REA telephone loan was approved, 61.8 percent of the farms in Indiana had telephones. By the end of 1958, it was estimated that 122,000 farms, or 81 percent of all farms in the State had telephone service.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION HAS HELPED BOTH RURAL AMERICA AND MAIN STREET

Mr. Speaker, rural electrification has meant greatly improved standards of rural living, health, and sanitation and a new and undreamed of efficiency in farm production. The REA loan program has, moreover, generated billions of dollars of business for people who do not live in rural areas. This includes the billions of dollars invested in electric lines and facilities as well as the lengthy list of appliances and equipment for farms and homes.

These purchases and the labor required to build the lines and do the wiring have made jobs for millions, and profits for merchants up and down every main street in America.

Mr. Speaker, the REA program has helped change the face of rural America, and change it for the better. I am proud to be a supporter of the REMC's of my State and I take this opportunity to salute you, Mr. Speaker, for your historic role in bringing locally owned REA to the American people, and to salute as well the members of the REMC's of Indiana for their fine demonstration of democracy in action at the grassroots level.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an address of Claude R. Wickard at the REA silver anniversary in Warm Springs, Ga.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, this is an important day for rural America. Rural electric cooperatives in nearly a thousand crossroad towns in 46 of our 50 States are proudly commemorating the establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration in 1935.

Americans take pride in success. As we honor the REA today we honor a program that is successful. In 25 years there has never been a hint of scandal or impropriety raised about the REA program. It was a program destined for progress because it was conceived by dedicated Americans, nurtured and strengthened by dedicated Congresses and put into operation by dedicated men and women willing to work to bring a better life to every rural resident in the country. There is no place for payola in a locally owned and operated business where good service at cost is the only aim.

It is good that from time to time in our busy schedule we pause as we have today for a moment of reflection. As we review the past we refresh our memory of farm life that was always hard and often unrewarding. Only by such backward looks are we aware of the progress we have made. When we realize the magnitude of change brought about in rural living by the introduction of electricity we become aware that the REA program was built on the soundest of foundations. The great leaders who laid those foundations will go down in the history of our country as devoted statesmen who placed the welfare of our American people above the sometimes selfish motives of any individual or group.

The names of our great Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, and the late George W. Norris which appear on the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 will always be synonymous with good government and the development of human and natural resources.

Today as I looked over the rosters of the Senate and the House of Representatives, I found there are 5 Senators and 25 Congressmen sitting in these Chambers today who were here at the time the rural electrification program was launched. The REA has developed into the success it is today because of the support of these stalwart, long-suffering Members and others who have left these halls. May the RECORD show that these public servants share the honors being paid the rural electrification program today.

With your indulgence I would like to read a brief address by the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, former Secretary of Agriculture and long an able Administrator of REA, who at this very time is speaking at the REA silver anniversary observance in Warm Springs, Ga., the home of the rural electrification idea:

ADDRESS OF CLAUDE R. WICKARD AT REA SILVER ANNIVERSARY OBSERVANCE, WARM SPRINGS, GA., MAY 11, 1960

Thirty-six years ago—to use some of his own words—"a Democratic Yankee came here to Warm Springs in search of a pool of warm water wherein he might swim his way back to health." Twenty-one years later this man died in this cottage he loved so much. In that interim his name and fame had spread to all corners of the world as no other man's has ever done.

More people throughout the world mourned his passing than that of any other man. A high official of the Canadian Government told me at the time that there was more mourning in his country than he had ever witnessed.

A man who was in a South American city when the news of this great man's death came described to me how people stood in the streets stunned with grief, many weeping silently.

Our men and women in the Armed Forces all over the world were impressed by the way their grief was shared by the people of other nations.

I shall never forget the unrestrained weeping of the thousands of people who lined the streets in Washington as his body was being taken to the White House to lie in state.

There are many reasons why Franklin Roosevelt's death was so widely and deeply mourned. In overcoming the handicaps of crippling disease he became dedicated to the objective of helping others avoid its effects. He gave the Nation courage and leadership when our people had almost lost faith in our democratic institutions, and even in themselves.

As a war leader, he was foremost in the fight against tyranny. In peace or war he was a crusader against bigotry, greed and oppression.

To me the underlying reason why so many people admired and loved Franklin Roosevelt was their realization that he was so deeply concerned with the welfare of people and that he tirelessly and endlessly strove to aid people who needed help. People instinctively knew that no opposition was ever strong enough to deter him in his efforts to give them more opportunity and security.

It was my great privilege to serve in varying capacities for almost 12 years in Franklin Roosevelt's administration. In all of those years the guiding principle for determining policy or making administrative decisions was simply this: Would the proposal contribute to the welfare of the people? If it met that test, no opposition was too great to prevent its adoption and execution. That test and that standard was established by the man in the White House. In these later years that fact has become all the more significant to me.

Today we commemorate the 25th anniversary of the birth of one of the greatest programs ever created for the purpose of bringing people opportunity and security. The REA program has enjoyed the greatest of popularity at home and abroad because it has so effectively achieved its objective. Most Americans—unfortunately not all—have become aware of what has been accomplished despite the handicaps and the ever present opposition. This REA program has become what might be termed a classic example of the Government helping people helping themselves attain something essential to their welfare by giving them aid that was not otherwise available.

When I attended a World Power Conference in New Delhi, India, 10 years ago, I was surprised to find how the fame of REA had spread to other nations, throughout the world. I was impressed by the number of inquiries I received from representatives of other governments as to why and how so much had been accomplished. I am not unmindful of the difficulty of its attainment, but I am sure that if every nation had an effective REA, there would be much less discontent and misunderstanding among the people of the world.

When Franklin Roosevelt came to Warm Springs in search of health, he became acutely aware of the need of rural people for adequate low cost electric service. That was the kind of need to which he responded quickly and positively. He said and here are his words: "So it can be said that a little cottage at Warm Springs, Ga., was the birthplace of the Rural Electrification Administration."

Twenty-five years ago today Franklin Roosevelt signed the order creating REA. Almost immediately the program met with strong and determined opposition. But he knew the source of the opposition was greed and selfishness, and it did not daunt him in his efforts to promote the program. Neither did it deter him in his plans to give people adequate low-cost electric power through the development of the Nation's hydroelectric sites.

President Roosevelt never lost sight of his objective of giving people more opportunity and security even during the stress of the war years. In his mind so much remained to be done. This realization led him to include the following paragraphs in his state of the Union message delivered to the Congress on January 11, 1944—I am quoting them because they should have a deeply significant meaning for us in light of today's events:

"We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights, under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all, regardless of station, race, or creed.

"Among these are:

"The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation.

"The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation.

"The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living.

"The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies, at home or abroad.

"The right of every family to a decent home.

"The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health.

"The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment.

"The right to a good education.

"All these rights spell security; and after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward in the implementation of these rights to new goals of human happiness and well-being."

High on President Roosevelt's list of postwar projects for making the second Bill of Rights effective was the rapid development of the rural electrification program. He asked me as Secretary of Agriculture to see to it that plans were formulated for the rapid expansion of the REA program as soon as the war ended.

Plans were made and legislation was introduced in the Congress to further these plans. Hearings before congressional committees on this legislation were held months before the end of the war.

As in the beginning of REA, 10 years before, organized opposition became active. Misleading testimony was given. I distinctly remember how a leading representative of the opposition testified that a study had been made, which showed that not more than $35 million was needed by REA, to finish the job of rural electrification. This ridiculously low estimate is only overshadowed by the opposition's blindness to the fact that the job of rural electrification will never be finished. The struggle for adequate low cost electric power for rural people will never end.

It is fitting that we have come here to this shrine at Warm Springs, to commemorate the 25th anniversary of REA and to pay homage to Franklin Roosevelt who did so much to help people everywhere. As noble and desirable as this commemoration and this paying of homage is, it is not enough. Each of us in our own capacity have the obligation and the duty of carrying on the never ending fight for more opportunity and more security for all people.

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read just a paragraph from the Fact Book that has been published by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and then make a very brief comment. I would like to read this paragraph of one of the basic facts as set out in this publication.

Electric systems financed by the Rural Electrification Administration connected 139,000 new consumers during 1959, now serve 4,736,000 homes, farms, and other rural establishments.

REA has 987 active electric borrowers; 983 of them are consumer owned. REA has made electric loans to 24 profit power companies, totaling $20,067,200. Four of the power companies are active borrowers at this time.

Rural electric systems serve consumers in every State except Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Hawaii.

More than 96 percent of America's farms are now electrified, compared with 10 percent when REA was established in 1935. More than half are served by REA borrowers.

I just wish to comment that in my judgment the Rural Electrification Administration is one of the greatest and most beneficial agencies that has ever been established in this great and glorious country of ours.

In connection with this publication that was sent to me may I say that I have received a newspaper published recently which on its front page bears a big headline, "Rural Electrics Celebrate First 25 Years."

There is a picture of the great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, of our great and beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn, and of the late great and beloved U.S. Senator, George W. Norris, of Nebraska.

Below this picture is the statement:

Above: Rural electrification is born as President Franklin D. Roosevelt signs Executive order creating REA, May 11, 1935. Champions for rural people, Congressman SAM RAYBURN (left above) and Senator George W. Norris sparked REA Act of 1936, making rural electrification a long range program.

May I say in conclusion that this paper I have mentioned has a picture of three immortals in our Nation. There is no question in the world in my mind but that these three distinguished Americans, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Sam Rayburn, and George W. Norris, will live in the history of our great country as three of the very greatest men America has ever produced.

It is certainly a pleasure for me to make these comments about this great facility among us. I am very grateful to my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma for yielding to me to make these comments.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma and congratulate him on the fine service he has rendered today to the cause of REA.

Within this year—the 25th anniversary of the founding of the rural electrification program—we will hear many speeches about the great wonders it has wrought in our country. Perhaps no program ever designed by the Congress, embodying as it does the best of all social and economic precepts, has met with greater success.

In this silver anniversary year we will hear many statistics bandied back and forth which attempt to tell the story of the great success of rural electrification. For example, in 1935 only about 11 percent of our farms were electrified. Now that figure is more than 96 percent. In Oklahoma, when the first REA loan was made in November 1935, only 2.6 percent of the farms, about 5,600, had electricity. Today we find that over 93 percent of the farms in Oklahoma have electricity and, of these, 77 percent are served by rural electric cooperatives.

But pure statistical rendition is dull, dry, and uninteresting. Recitation of figures means little. What counts is the way of life that they illustrate. And the transformation of our countryside by the magic of electricity defies description.

How can one justly describe the drudgery spared the rural housewife through the help of electricity in her household chores? How can one tell of the effect of bringing news and entertainment instantly into rural America over the airways, which could not have been done without electricity? How do we measure the impact of the betterment of the health of our rural people, which has come in large part because electricity is now available to them? On and on we could go, setting forth specific instances of new activities which have come about because of the increased intellectual and technical skills that rural America has acquired—all as the result of bringing one of the wonders of the world—electricity—into our countryside homes, farms, schools, and churches.

No Federal program has a better repayment record than the rural electrification. The REA borrowers have been repaying their loans on time and with interest throughout their history. Many of them have made advance payments to the Government. The rural electrification program stands not only in the forefront of Federal activities in regard to repayment of its loans with interest, but it is also one of the best examples we have in this country of being a completely unsubsidized program.

The introduction and continued use of electricity in farm operations have substantially reduced the cost of production of farming activities, which has been of great benefit to the entire Nation.

The tax base of State, local, and Federal governments has been vastly increased as a result of the rural electrification program. It has been conservatively estimated that in the past 25 years at least a billion dollars in income and excise taxes have been paid to the Federal Treasury alone by manufacturers and retailers on approximately $14 billion of appliances and electrical equipment which consumers served by REA borrowers have purchased. This is

quite an accomplishment when we realize that the Federal Government has invested only $3.5 billion in the rural electric systems. And remember, too, that this is a loan—an investment—which is being paid back to the Government with interest by the borrowers.

The rural electric cooperatives throughout the United States have created a billion dollar a year market in the electrical appliance industry. A recent survey shows that in 1960 members of rural electric cooperatives will purchase over $1 billion worth of these electrical appliances. Just think what this means to employment in our urban areas which manufacture such goods and equipment. The extent and economic potency of this market have been recognized even by the President of the United States. Many of you will recall that during the recent recession the President made a special plea to members of rural electric cooperatives to purchase electrical appliances in order to help snuff out depression in the electric appliance industry.

But all I have said so far speaks of the past. Certainly the past proclaims the future. But let us not make the same mistake as Lot's wife. Let us not yield to the temptation to look back at the wrong time, and by so doing lose what the future holds for us.

One of the most effective things we can do to assure the continuing health of the rural electrification program is to enact the Trimble bill. In the last 7 years administrative agencies have been juggling the cost allocation figures of multipurpose dams so that power facilities are paying far more than their share. This was a major factor in the 27½-percent rate increase of the Southwestern Power Administration in 1956 against which we in the Oklahoma Democratic delegation fought so hard. The Trimble bill, H.R. 8, would correct this. It would reassert the right and responsibility of the Congress to set these allocations, thereby aiding to assure availability of future power facilities so vital to the development of the Southwest.

One need only look at the record to see that the primary support—one could almost say the sole support except for some significant individual exceptions—for this great program has come from those Members of Congress who represent the Democratic Party, which was in power when it was founded. One need only check, as far as my State of Oklahoma is concerned, the voting records of the Democratic Members to see that we have given this program 100 percent support.

Over the past several years, we have seen many serious attempts to enact legislation which would spell the death knell for the rural electrification program. We have seen many suggestions made to force the interest rate up for REA borrowers and send them to the private money markets for their source of funds. We know that if this ever occurs, the rural electrification program will be spoken of in the past tense.

We have seen attempts made on the floor of this House to ridicule the REA cooperatives and spread propaganda against them. We have heard many unfounded statements made that the cooperatives are borrowing money from the Federal Government and turning around and investing it. I say unfounded statements because even the REA Administrator—a member of the current party in power—has said this is not true.

We have seen legislation introduced which would preclude the cooperatives from operating in a businesslike way. I make reference to legislation which says that if the cooperatives invest their funds in Government securities which yield a rate of return greater than the interest rate they pay on the funds they borrow from the Federal Government, they will no longer be able to borrow such funds. Such proposed legislation would only hamper and cut back the progress being made by the rural electric cooperatives. Indeed, if it were passed, just as in the case of private financing type legislation, those who have consistently opposed the rural electrification program would have won their battle, because this would herald the beginning of the end of the program.

In speaking of the crisis now facing the rural electrification program one must also mention the drastic effects of the tight-money, high-interest rate policy. To be sure this contrived policy affects all farmers, consumers, and small businessmen and laborers. But speaking of its effect on the rural electrification program, we can say that this policy of jacking up your interest rates and at the same time, making it harder and harder for you to borrow, lies at the base of the various attempts that have been made to increase the REA interest rate and send you to Wall Street for your funds. If we were to take the bold steps needed to change this situation and introduce a sane and equitable monetary and fiscal program in our National Government, much of the rationalization that is being used to support legislation to seriously hurt the rural electrification program would be removed.

I do not believe that the time will ever come when the people who make up the rural electrification program will be able to say, "We now do not have to worry about anyone trying to eliminate our program. We may devote all of our energies and resources exclusively toward finding ways to bring lower cost power to our member-consumers." Rural electrification people must continually be aware and on guard against those who would do harm to their program. Each time you add a consumer, each time the program attempts to erect another generation and transmission facility, indeed, each time the strength of every individual rural electric cooperative is increased by that degree, the opposition increases.

It is mandatory, therefore, that the leaders in the rural electrification program and each and every member of every rural electric cooperative continually be aware of the problems they face and the great job ahead that still remains to be done. It is a full-time job—one which does not pay off possibly in monetary terms, but one which certainly gives each individual including every Member of Congress who has supported the program a deep sense of pride in knowing that we have been a part—small though it might be—of truly, the greatest social and economic program which the Congress has ever designed.

I can think of no better advice than that voiced by the Speaker of the House, Honorable SAM RAYBURN, cosponsor of the act of 1936 which established the Rural Electrification Administration. In setting the cornerstone of the national headquarters building of the rural electric cooperatives here in Washington, Mr. RAYBURN gave this counsel:

> It is well to reflect on your achievements, but it is no time to sit; now is the time to go forward and further forward.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I appreciate this opportunity to join my distinguished colleague from the Third District in this tribute to the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. Speaker, every citizen of Oklahoma is proud of the great contribution which our REA cooperatives have made to the progress of our State.

Under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, the Oklahoma countryside has literally been transformed, and a new way of life has been brought to our rural people.

The contribution which the rural cooperative has made to the comfort, convenience, and safety of farm life has been almost incalculable.

The increase in farm efficiency, and in the productivity of the average farmer and dairyman, is beyond estimation.

Today we can truthfully say that the great advantage which the American farmer enjoys over his world competitors is due in greater measure to rural electrification, than it is to any other fact or factor.

This is not only a tribute to the program, but also to the men and women who make up the membership and official leadership of the REA cooperatives in America.

In almost every farm community, people point with pride to their REA cooperative and its leaders, and look to these same leaders for assistance and leadership in every worthwhile civic project.

It is a further tribute to our REA cooperatives that they are always ready to help in the advancement of their communities, their State, and their Nation.

Both our Nation and our State are stronger because of REA, and this a glorious day for that great program.

I welcome this opportunity to join in a most well earned tribute to REA.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I should like to associate myself with the remarks made here with regard to the Rural Electrification Administration. I should like

especially to associate myself with the remarks made about the great Americans connected with the formation of REA, especially the officer who has presided over this body longer than any other Speaker in the history of our country. He has not only led in bringing about this great program but he has shown us in many other ways his service to this country.

I am delighted to have this opportunity to speak on the subject of the REA on the 25th anniversary of its service.

I grew up with cooperatives. I have had the privilege of working for and with several of them. I am a co-op booster—always have been—and I am proud of it. Sound co-ops have long ago and many times over proven their place in the free enterprise system. They have received the repeated endorsement and encouragement of the Federal Government.

The accomplishments of the rural electric cooperatives are very impressive. I remember so well, as a youngster on a farm in Iowa several years ago, milking cows by hand, carrying water by the bucket, and studying my lessons by the light of a kerosene lamp. We had no radio or television, no refrigerator or freezer, no milking machine or water pump, no electric lights or telephone.

And I remember how enthusiastically the people of my neighborhood in Franklin County, Iowa, hailed electric power when it came. I know what it meant to many mothers to have electric power at their fingertips. I know what it means to farm boys and girls to have enough light to read or study by at night. I have seen the faces of farm men and women glow with new life at the mere prospect that electric power would soon be available.

I have been a firm believer in the objectives of REA from its very inception. I take great pride in the progress of REA during the past 6 years. This administration has been very much in sympathy with the REA program. Yes, I am especially proud to have been associated with what REA has done in the past 6 years under the leadership of ANCHER NELSEN, now a Member of this body, and Dave Hamil, the present Administrator.

The REA has been in existence for about 25 years. Almost one-third of all its electric loans have been made in the past 6 years.

The telephone program has been in existence 10 years. Four-fifths of all telephone loans have been made in the past 6 years.

On January 1, 1953, 45 electric borrowers were delinquent in payments; on June 30, 1959, just two were delinquent.

The net worth of REA electric borrowers has more than tripled in the past 6 years.

The authority of REA to make generation and transmission loans is a vital part of the rural electrification program. Since January 1, 1953, these loans have accounted for about 30 percent of the total loaned for rural electrification, compared with 19 percent before that date.

We can all be proud of that record of accomplishment.

The rural electric cooperatives are pledged to one of the highest ideals of neighborliness. I am talking about the principle of area coverage. That principle obligates these REA systems to try to find a way to serve everyone who wants electricity within their service area. When it was first proposed this area coverage idea sounded to many people like the wildest kind of dreaming. Today area coverage is an accomplished fact, and all of us can stand a little taller because REA leaders set their service goal so high.

It pays to aim high. If the service goals had been lower we might not have built such successful cooperatives. A cooperative is in business to give service; and the better it serves, the more successful the cooperative will be.

Dedication to service is the source of REA strength in the electric utility industry. I remember very well, as many here do, how some people at first ridiculed the idea of a Rural Electrification Administration. They said that the utility business calls for specialists and trained administrators—and that seemed logical. They said that farmers were amateurs in the utility business—and that, too, seemed logical. How could amateurs, they asked, accomplish a job that the experts said could not be done?

Well, looking back, we readily see how it was done. It was done by farm men and women of this country so intent on their goals that they overrode the obstacles. It was done by a combination of self-reliance and cooperation. Government helped—but Government did not do the job.

Yes, there are many factors that explain the success of rural electric cooperatives. In addition to the fact that the American farmer comes from a long line of self-reliant cooperators, we can point to the overwhelming demand for electricity on the farm. The consumption of electricity on the farm today far exceeds original expectations. Many good farm families in the late 1930's were wondering how on earth they were going to use 40 kilowatt-hours a month. Now farm families on systems financed by REA use an average of more than 300 kilowatt-hours a month, and the figure climbs every year.

But most of all, the cooperatives owe their success to a high standard of service. The members of REA—the rural men and women they serve—are practical people, and if their rural electric cooperatives had not proved a good reliable way to get electricity they would have turned to some other method. Let us never forget that.

The basic strength of a cooperative is its membership. I hope that every REA cooperative will maintain a strong program aimed at keeping its members well informed and active in its affairs. Many of the younger members and perhaps many who have moved into your service areas from cities do not know the REA story. At all times, members need to be assured that their ownership rights in the cooperative have been properly safeguarded and that their individual investment and equities are adequately recorded.

Let us examine a few assets on this the 25th anniversary that have come to us.

First, let us note that our hardest trials are behind us. The legal difficulties, the early trial-and-error days of cooperative management, the endless meetings, collecting signatures on easements, the strange new language of utility engineering—all these are history. That is REA's first asset.

Second, the REA has a tremendous physical plant. They have built more than 1.4 million miles of line to serve nearly 4.6 million consumers in 46 States, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico. Loans have been approved to bring the total consumers served to almost 5.2 million. They are increasing the capacity of their plant each year and improving the quality of their service. More than 70 REA borrowers presently generate all or part of their power requirements. This is more than a big plant; it is a good plant. There is no better electric service anywhere than that delivered over REA-financed lines.

Third, they now employ thousands of skilled and loyal people in their cooperatives. In the early years, all will remember, systems were plagued by an almost chronic shortage of the many skills needed by a modern utility. REA was not slow in recognizing the need for vigorous action. National, State, and local training programs have done much to assure the systems the trained manpower they need to meet the growing demand for electricity.

A fourth asset is the quality of their direction and management. They may have been amateurs at first, but they are professionals today. I know that directors give many hours away from their farms and businesses, not only to direct the affairs of the cooperative, but also to train themselves better for that task. And let me pay tribute also to the ability and skill of the REA staff in Washington. I am confident that the future of the REA systems is in good hands.

Fifth, the rising demand for electricity in rural areas is a great asset. Everything I hear, see, and read leads me to agree with those who forecast a growing need for electric power. New industries and businesses are springing up in the country. City workers are moving into rural areas to provide their families with more living space. At the same time, farmers are making greater use of electric power to help them increase production, improve the quality of their products, and cut labor costs. Everywhere, among all groups, one can see signs of that typically American determination to move with the times and to share in the new advances of rural living.

Just in passing, let me point out that this determination to share in American progress is the driving force behind the rural development program, which already has received the enthusiastic support of thousands of rural families. The people who manage and direct rural utilities are old hands in this business of community development. They have

been instrumental in building much nonfarm load, which in turn has created substantial off-farm employment in rural areas. They have the experience, the organization, the physical resources, and the contacts throughout their service areas to improve still more the economic and social life of our communities.

Administrator Dave Hamil and his staff have supported the rural development program from its start. The Washington staff devotes much time to the program. Electric cooperatives in various States have generously used their publications to show rural development progress and to give leadership to the program.

A sixth asset is the credit record. REA electric borrowers have made payments to the Federal Government of more than $1.1 billion in principal and interest, and this includes nearly $146 million paid in advance of due dates. I repeat that, as fiscal year 1959 ended, only two rural electric systems were behind in payments. This record is proof of the fine sense of financial responsibility and of the wisdom of those who had faith in the REA.

They have a seventh asset—The tremendous reservoir of good will—the good will of their members and the good will of the American people generally. In most companies, goodwill is calculated on the books at $1, but the goodwill for rural electrification is worth millions. One can judge it from the willingness with which the members respond to any call for help. One can estimate it by the unswerving support through the years which the REA program has received from both political parties. REA was never intended to be, is not now, and must never become a political organization.

This asset of goodwill is not based on sentiment. REA has earned it, through service to its customers.

When one looks at these assets during the 25th anniversary of this program, the liabilities appear small by comparison. They will have a sizable debt to retire to the Government. Many of them face the challenge of keeping new customers happy, consumers with town and city backgrounds. But, in perspective, the liabilities are small.

Now, what about the future?

I do not doubt for a moment, nor does any Member of Congress, that they will continue to increase their assets and whittle down their liabilities. The REA will continue to write one of the most amazing success stories of the 20th century. All of us should say, good luck to all who have the interest and destiny of the REA in their hands.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I commend the gentleman for the remarks he has made. I am certain he knows from his personal experience of the great changes the Rural Electrification Administration has brought to this country. Twenty-five years ago I was one of those young men in their teens who were living on farms that did not have electricity. I well remember that at that time the electric light company would say to many farmers, "You will never get electricity. You might just as well forget about electricity ever coming to the farms. You can never possibly profitably supply the farms with electricity."

Along came the REA and through the reasonable interest rates that the REA has it is possible to take this unprofitable lower segment of electrical business and provide them with electricity and pay for the equipment over a period of years. I think a lot of people forget this today when some are trying to promote higher interest rates for the REA. REA is limited primarily to the unprofitable end of the electric industry, and certainly they cannot pay the going investment rates and still pay for the investment. I, certainly, am one who will never be able to fully express my appreciation for what the REA has meant to the people in my part of the country and to the people who grew up during my time.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman for his fine address this afternoon. I would like to associate myself with his remarks and also advise the Members of the House what a wonderful job the REA has done for North Dakota. The REA has revolutionized the whole field of agriculture. It has made farm living wholesome and worthwhile in my State. I cannot think of one single farm program other than, perhaps, the price support programs that has done more for agriculture in North Dakota. This is a great day that we mark here today, the 25th anniversary of this addition to wholesome farm life in America.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, farm life in America was the epitome of hardship and strife. The 1930's found the rural areas lagging far behind the urban centers in modern conveniences and laborsaving devices—and farm income had declined drastically. In the urban centers, there were many unemployed who were living off the surplus farm products, but this did not enhance the income of the farmer. Yet, in the past quarter of a century, farm life has undergone one of the most complete and far-reaching revolutions which it has been our good fortune to witness. We have seen amazing and rapid progress in those years through a workable program of rural electrification—a much needed stimulant to the mechanization of the Nation's farms.

No doubt the benefits of the industrial revolution would have eventually reached into our rich suburban lands, but progress does not wait for eventuality.

Our late and beloved President Franklin D. Roosevelt had the infinite wisdom to recognize the dire need for progress on the farm and, in his annual message to Congress on January 4, 1935, he made clear his intentions to include rural electrification among proposed emergency relief projects. He described the objectives of rural electrification as follows, "to bring the economic benefits and the living comforts of electricity to farms and farmers; to promote national recovery by creating new and profitable industry for producers of electrical supplies and appliances; and to provide jobs on these projects for the largest number of workers."

Thus, rural electrification was first envisioned as a relief measure, which would provide markets for electric goods and work for the thousands of unemployed. One fact was eminently clear to President Roosevelt and the others who worked so diligently to remedy the abuses, inequities, and instabilities plaguing our economic system in the 1930's—widespread rural electrification could only be achieved through Federal assistance and leadership.

In support of his belief, the President issued an Executive order—No. 7037—on May 11, 1935, which brought into being the Rural Electrification Administration. This Executive order proposed the electrification of rural America by experienced private utilities. This was a logical plan, since no other type of organization existed which could assume the responsibility.

Commercial utilities professed an interest in rural electrification but claimed that costs were prohibitive. By the end of 1935 it was clearly evident that the commercial electric companies were not the least bit inclined to avail themselves of the REA loans. But rural electrification was not to be stymied by lack of interest on the part of commercial power interests. Farmers and farm organizations began to press for a program which would effectuate the extension of electric lines into those rural areas which commercial utilities had refused to serve for the primary reason that it was not economically feasible. In recognition of the interest and support of the farm groups and the need to raise the standard of living of rural families, our speaker—Mr. SAM RAYBURN—and Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, simultaneously introduced bills which would provide appropriate legislative authority for granting loans to properly organized farmer cooperatives and public bodies.

Speaker RAYBURN labored long and hard in support of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. There were cries of socialism on the one hand; and, on the other, there was strong opposition to granting loans to the private companies which had refused to use their own funds to extend rural lines. It was through his effective leadership that the final legislation gave preference to nonprofit organizations and municipalities, but also permitted loans to private power companies. The foresight of Mr. SAM, in fighting the efforts to exclude private utilities from the benefits of the REA loans, had proved wise, indeed; for, the job of rural electrification has proceeded

at a much more rapid pace, with all segments of the industry taking part. Few private utilities availed themselves of REA loans. This was not surprising for, clearly, it was the sense of the act that widespread, low-cost electricity would only be possible through the cooperative efforts of nonprofit groups. Nevertheless, history records that, during the first 2 years following the establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration, the private electric companies built rural lines faster than ever before. Realizing that cooperatives and public bodies were rapidly equipping themselves to bring electricity to the farms of the Nation, the private electric power industry had a sudden change in attitude. Actions of private utility companies, which included skimming off the cream of rural areas and driving spite lines through proposed co-op areas, were less than creditable and hardly bears observing; nevertheless, a substantial portion of the progress made during the early years of federally supported rural electrification can be attributed to the efforts of the private utility companies.

The honorable SAM RAYBURN sensed that no avenue to rural electrification should be left unpaved if the farmers of America were to raise their standard of living. His thinking is well summed up in a statement made in 1936 in support of passage of the REA bill:

> Electricity at a proper price is cheaper than oil and lamps. We want to make the farmer and his wife and family believe and know that they are no longer the forgotten people, but make them know that they are remembered as part of—yea, they are the bulwark of the Government.

I pause to salute that great lawmaker who has presided over this Chamber longer than any other man in the history of the country and who has so consistently acted to promote the welfare of all Americans and whose able leadership helped set in motion a program which was to completely revolutionize agricultural society in the United States—rural electrification.

Bringing electric power to rural America was a laborious but rewarding task. Most farm cooperatives had no previous experience in borrowing and accounting for funds secured from the Government, and the REA personnel in the Washington offices had much to learn before they could render expert and efficient supervision and consultation. Then, too, there was the practical matter of cost.

Before REA, rural lines cost anywhere from $1,500 to $3,000 per mile of line. Few rural communities could afford such high costs, and many areas had to postpone electrification until cost-reducing methods had been discovered. But the pioneering spirit upon which this Nation was founded had prospered on the farm, and it was this basic characteristic, combined with ingenious innovations, which rose to the fore to foster the self-help cooperative, and eventually led to bringing the cost of rural construction down to a level which would permit the enjoyment of electricity by the greatest possible number of rural communities.

The progress made in my home State of Tennessee is illustrative of the achievements of REA borrowers throughout the country. In 1935, the U.S. Bureau of the Census reported that less than 4 percent of Tennessee's rural homes were wired for electricity, yet, across the Nation, 11 percent of all farms had electricity available. By 1940, the percentage of electrified farms in Tennessee approached the national average; but now, just two decades later, 97 percent of Tennessee's farms are blessed with central-station electric service. It is our hope that the next few years will see 100-percent coverage of the farms in Tennessee, and the rest of the Nation. The job of rural electrification cannot be completely successful, gentlemen, until all farms, regardless of how remotely located, enjoy the convenience and efficiency of electric power. It is not a finished task until all farms have enough available power to meet all of the needs of the farmer and the farm housewife.

I am particularly proud of the progress made by the cooperative which serves my district. The Meriwether-Lewis Electric Cooperative at Centerville did not receive its first loan until 1939. Yet, today, it has 1,760 miles of line, serving 13,382 rural consumers. My district is predominantly a farm area, and electric power distribution plays an important part in stabilizing the incomes of the district. The Meriwether-Lewis Cooperative has helped to raise farm income and has made possible modern schools and churches, productive rural industries, profitable crossroads businesses, and a high standard of living for the rural families in my district.

The State of Tennessee ranks high in both industry and agriculture. We are, indeed, fortunate to be served by the low-cost electric power generated by the vast TVA system of dams and steamplants. The rural electrification system of Tennessee carries power to every remote area of the State. The rate of economic progress which we have experienced in recent years was only possible because of the network of electric power systems, both public and private, which blankets the State.

The history of rural electrification in this country is truly one which reflects the basic principles undergirding our dynamically progressive economy. It is a saga of pioneering, hardship, cooperation, ingenuity and all of the other characteristics which have helped to build our great Nation. It is a story of the lightening of physical labor and the illumination of areas long resigned to continued darkness. It is the story of high and efficient agricultural productivity which has fed and clothed an ever-expanding population.

The dawn of the 20th century, which brought such distinct transformations to the way of life of the city folks, had practically no effect on the U.S. farmer. While the city dweller had his refrigerator for storing his food, his electric washer, and other conveniences, few farm homes could boast of electric current unless the farm income was high enough to afford the purchase of a diesel engine to generate current, or the farm was in close proximity to an urban utility company. Yet it is hard to believe that such backward conditions were the lot of American farmers when history records that the first electric fan was invented in the late 1800's, the first electric flat iron was invented in 1882, and the first electric sewing machine was manufactured as early as 1889.

Of course, not all of the city folks had every available electrical appliance, but the choice was there. Until the establishment of the REA, few farm housewives had any choice of methods for cooking, sewing, washing, or ironing. Without electricity, you pumped the water by hand, you carried the water from the well to the woodstove for heating; and you stood over the washboard scrubbing each piece of clothing separately. You built a roaring fire, regardless of how hot the day, and heated your flat irons to iron the family wash.

Before REA, the farm housewife preserved the family's food by storing it in a cold, dark cellar. In the winter, the fare was limited to those food items which could withstand the longest periods without refrigeration, such as eggs in waterglass, cooked pork, and lard.

Under these circumstances it is utterly astounding that, in July 1935, a committee of experienced but shortsighted commercial company representatives advanced the conclusion that:

> There are very few farms requiring electricity for major operations that are not now served.

In retrospect, this becomes one of the most ridiculously shortsighted, selfish conclusions ever reached by a respectable group of businessmen who were presumed to be competent in their field. Just 1 year later, Rural Electrification Administration technicians composed a list of 200 possible uses for farm and home use of electric current and today there are more than 400 ways in which the farmer and the farm housewife can utilize that powerful hired hand—the electric kilowatt. It is, therefore, extremely doubtful that these major utility executives had the best interest of the Nation's economy at heart. We should be very thankful for the Rayburns, the Norrises, and others who were genuinely interested in promoting the welfare of the farm population, in recognition of the indisputable importance of the agricultural industry to our social and economic well-being.

The creation of a sound program for rural electrification has had a telling effect on every city, every town, and every individual in the United States. It continues to enlarge the market for wholesale power; it has fostered the invention of varied appliances and highly mechanized farm equipment and has made possible unlimited expansion and relocation of industries. Words of commendation and praise are not adequate to express appreciation for our achievements under the Rural Electrification Administration's program. Continued support of this program will represent a

concrete expression of our cognizance of the benefits which have emanated from this democratic project—and I, for one, wish to go on record as opposing any attempts to decrease the program's effectiveness. We cannot afford to resort to primitive conditions on our farms. Supplying the remaining 4 percent of our farms with central-station service, and assisting in the task of "heavying up" the lines of some of the REA borrowers whose systems are becoming overtaxed, is small enough a chore for us in comparison with the obvious returns we will reap in both human and economic terms.

Thank you.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very appropriate that today we pay tribute to the Rural Electrification Administration on its 25th anniversary.

Although I have been in this body a short period of time I know firsthand of the great work the Rural Electrification Administration has done for the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee which I have the honor to represent.

The great development of our congressional district has been through the efforts of the church, the homes, and the schools, and next in line, I would say, was the Rural Electrification Administration. Had it not been for this great organization we could have never kept the young men and women on the farms that are there today enjoying, as all the people on the farms of our district are enjoying, the modern conveniences of city life.

Those great leaders of the past and Members of this body and of the other body who had the foresight and vision for the establishing of this great agency, I want to commend for their great work.

To you, my colleague, Mr. BASS, I want to express my appreciation for your giving me an opportunity to say a few words on this occasion.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

REA POINTS A WAY TO PROGRESS

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, in these years of opposition to public action in national efforts to conserve and to more wisely use our natural resources, the REA silver anniversary serves as a reminder of the common sense of such long-range programs.

When we try to take action in the fields of power, water pollution control, and flood control, to make more effective use of our natural and human resources, our efforts are attacked. The prevailing philosophy is that if it is worth doing, then private enterprise should do it for private profit or if there is no profit, then let local governments do it. This philosophy too often fails to acknowledge that there are national problems that even the best local efforts cannot solve. Such situations are viewed through the wrong end of the telescope by those who would have us save pennies today and waste dollars tomorrow.

Think of the loss that we would have suffered as a nation if REA had been sidetracked by such a philosophy 25 years ago. Suppose our farms were not 97 percent electrified as they are today. Think of the drudgery that would be involved to turn out an adequate amount of food for our growing population. Never could we have produced the food needed to feed ourselves and much of the world during World War II, no matter what financial supports or incentives we had offered.

There are certain things that private enterprise will not do. Electrifying the rural areas was one of them. They called it an impossible job. Apparently it was an unprofitable job. But this is the short-range view of profit. Rural cooperatives, public utility districts, and even private power companies have, altogether, borrowed $3.5 billion from REA, of which more than $1 billion has been repaid in principal and interest and uncounted billions more regained in production. Think of the market for electrical equipment that rural electrification has made possible—everything from lights in the barns to radio and TV sets. Today, electricity is used in more than 400 different ways in the farm home, barnyard, and field.

The tremendous job which the REA has done for America is a beacon light to guide our course in similar fields of natural resource development. The lesson which this courageous experiment taught us is that the shortrun view is a longrun defeat for America—as well as for the world that looks to us for leadership in development of natural resources. It must not be forgotten, in our deserved praise of the American free enterprise system, that some of our strength today came from just such long-range public development of our natural wealth as the REA program represents. It is obvious that public initiative frequently spurs private enterprise to expand its activities and thus helps the latter as well as the national economy and well-being.

We must not forget that most of the world today faces what we faced 25 or more years ago. They are looking for solutions to their problems in resource development to provide a good life for their people. Should it be said that our solution to the rural electrification problem is not good enough to extend to other areas?

If we are to truly commemorate this occasion, it should be by renewing our effort to seek long-range solutions to national problems involving our natural and human resources in such fields as power, water pollution control, flood control, slum clearance, education, and health.

What better commemoration than to initiate programs now, of which it may be said 25 years hence, "We could not have done without them," as we say today of rural electrification.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in commemorating this silver anniversary of the Rural Electrification Act. In my State of Tennessee, as in the other parts of the Nation, the passage of the REA Act in 1953 has made possible a new and better way of life for thousands of our rural families.

Today more than 4,700,000 families are being served through our extensive REA cooperative systems and their enjoyment of the many benefits and services provided by electrical power are indeed a tribute to the Congress which passed the REA Act and in particular to the leaders of that Congress. Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress and the Nation as a whole are fortunate to find the father of the REA Act still serving the people of this Nation through his leadership in the Congress. Our esteemed Speaker of the House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, deserves much of the credit for making the REA Act and program a reality. Today in paying tribute to this great system which has served our Nation for 25 years we also pay tribute to our distinguished Speaker.

We cannot celebrate the birthday of the REA without paying tribute to the REA cooperatives who have translated the ideals and the principles of the REA Act into a practical and workable program of service for the people and the Nation.

We all recall that at the time the REA Act went into effect the private utility industry had insisted that it was economically impractical and even impossible to serve rural areas of our Nation. They were so thoroughly convinced of this that, although the REA Act provided that loans could be made to private utilities as well as to co-ops, very few private power companies availed themselves of the opportunity to borrow funds to extend their services to the rural areas. Today, 25 years later, the record confounds these pessimistic predictions. The REA's have been financially successful. They have not only been able to operate in the black but, particularly in our area, they have been so efficient that they have been able to reduce their rates.

Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to the leaders who made possible the passage of the REA Act, and to the many people whose work and dedicated service have assisted in the carrying out of the provisions of the REA Act, and also to the leaders and managers of our rural

electric cooperatives whose dedication to proficiency and service have made possible the successful functioning of this vast program. The REA stands as a living monument to the service a democratic government can provide its citizens in the public interest and on this 25th anniversary we say, Congratulations.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in honoring the rural electrification program on the occasion of its creation 25 years ago today. At that time, only 1 farm in 10 enjoyed the benefits of electricity. REA, through loans to locally owned electric cooperatives under the excellent management of local owners and officers, today provides electricity to approximately 96 percent of our rural people.

In Missouri, 96.2 percent of our farms and rural establishments have central station service, in contrast with only 6.4 percent when the program was inaugurated. The REA program has been especially important to the State of Missouri. With 48 rural electric borrowers, Missouri ranks fourth in the United States. Our 251,000 consumers also put us in fourth position in the country. We feel justifiably proud of these statistics and of the 85,000 miles of line that our rural people through their own effort have installed to serve themselves.

Because our people have done this themselves, I am sure they would agree with me in calling rural electrification in Missouri, and in the United States as a whole, our most successful do-it-yourself program. In pointing out these statistics of accomplishment we must not overlook the record our Missouri cooperatives are making in the repayment of loans they have received. They have repaid $36 million in principal, $25 million in interest, and more than $7.5 million in principal in addition in the form of advance repayments. Two of our rural electric systems have paid off their loan in full, and at this time not one borrower in our State is delinquent on payments due the Government.

Although the Federal Government, through REA's loans to cooperatives and other nonprofit associations, plays a key role in the development of this program, the facilities of these cooperatives are owned by the persons whose homes and farms are benefited.

Besides the reputation that Missouri people have acquired, to the effect that they have to be shown, our rural people have many other sterling qualities. In many ways they are an independent group—frugal in nature and with an ability to manage their business so as to secure from it the most at the least possible cost. The ownership of rural electrification facilities by individuals and groups like this has led to a vigorous program—one that has met the national goal for REA, that of providing rural people with abundant and reliable power at the lowest possible cost.

Sometimes, however, conditions beyond the control of the management make it impossible for them to maintain fair and equitable rates. In Missouri many of our cooperatives receive Federal power from the Southwestern Power Administration which for a time provided this power at a reasonable rate. But in 1957, the Department of the Interior arbitrarily raised the cost of wholesale power to cooperatives by 28 percent. Interior's only justification for this drastic change sprang from the fact that Interior had changed the allocation of reimbursable costs of the SPA project. Under the new allocation the power features of the project were forced to assume new and greater responsibilities for paying the costs of the project.

Thus an administrative agency of Government by an out-of-hand resource development decision worked extreme hardship on thousands of rural families in the States served by SPA and thereby thwarted the intent of the Congress.

Representative TRIMBLE, my esteemed colleague from the State of Arkansas, has introduced legislation that would reduce the opportunity for administrative agencies of Government to arbitrarily change the cost allocations on Federal water resource projects. Our fine words and sentiments about rural electrification should be backed up with action. As a first step, I urge all Members of Congress to support early consideration and enactment of the Trimble bill, or similar legislation.

To the people of Missouri, and I think to all rural people in this country, the REA program stands as one of the greatest accomplishments in modern times. It is particularly important in that it stands as a monument to genuine cooperation between the people and their government. It is a model of a successful working alliance between a government and its people.

We in Congress must not tolerate a tampering with this system which is working so well. Yet in recent years we have seen attempt after attempt to change, yes, weaken this program. I take pride in having supported all legislation defending and strengthening the rural electrification program and of all public works authorizations which directly influence its success or failure.

There are still some rural families and rural establishments in the Nation who as yet do not have electric light and power. When power is brought to these people the work of electrifying rural America will only have been partially completed. New uses of electricity are doubling its consumption every 5 or 6 years and the cooperatives have a responsibility to meet this growing new demand. The men and women who have devoted their lives to the rural electrification program and the consumer-members of our electric cooperatives deserve all of the support we can give the program to insure that it will grow as the need for its service will increase. We must continue to provide the assistance that is necessary to insure that the program will retain its vigor.

Many complex problems lie ahead; we should guarantee the territorial integrity of our rural electric systems, and we can and must provide loan funds at reasonable rates to enable this great program to continue its mission.

A SALUTE TO REA

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, 25 years of REA have caused a revolutionary change in American farm life, and unless you have actually watched that momentous change take place you do not have any deep realization of what it has meant to millions of American farmers. With constantly increased consumption of electricity, life on the farms throughout our land has become more pleasant as electricity takes over chores which were once drudgery. Farm isolation has been defeated by the use of farm telephones, radio, and television.

On May 11, 1935, the Rural Electrification Administration was established pursuant to Executive Order 7037, and at this time only 10 percent of our farms had electricity. Our REA loan program began on June 30, 1936, and today we have 4,590,000 consumers on REA financed lines. About 95½ percent of the farms, ranches, and rural establishments of this country have the advantage of central station electric power. More than $1 billion in principal and interest has been repaid to REA and this includes some $139 million paid in ahead of schedule.

The first REA loan in Kentucky was made to the Henderson Union Rural Electric Cooperative which is located in the Second Congressional District. Today, in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, we have over 220,000 consumers in 110 of the State's 120 counties. No State in the Union has benefited more from REA than my home State of Kentucky.

The rural electrification program is one of the great achievements of our present-day Government. It is imperative that we keep in mind that REA serves a national territory, and the average number of consumers per mile is only about 3.1. In considering the number of customers per mile along the 1,426,000 miles of line throughout 47 of the States, we must also remember that in many instances a large number of cooperatives have on the average less than two consumers to the mile and in some cases less than one consumer to the mile. Due to the fact that these REA cooperatives are operating in such thin territory the amount of reserve that the borrowers have accumulated is very small, and, according to a recent survey, 50 percent of the rural electric systems have less than

20 percent equity in their systems. In planning our REA program for the future, we must keep these facts and figures in mind.

When the cooperatives accepted the responsibility of providing electric service to rural America, they themselves did not realize the magnitude of this job. In the beginning of REA many projects were constructed to provide a capacity of less than 100 kilowatt-hours monthly to its members. Use of electricity is doubling every 5 years, and REA borrowers must meet this growing service responsibility. Electric service, if it is to mean anything, must be a continuing service and a dependable service. Our REA program is one of the most successful economic programs ever initiated by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, our REA program has brought rural America out of the darkness into the light of American prosperity. It is indeed a pleasure to extend my best wishes to all persons connected with the rural electrification program on the occasion of its 25th anniversary.

REA ANNIVERSARY

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, 25 years go today—May 11, 1935—President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed an Executive order which created the Rural Electrification Administration. This was a momentous day in the lives of farm families throughout our Nation, but the importance of the day is even more significant now, as we look in retrospect upon the achievements of the past quarter century.

The concept of rural electrification grew out of a great need in our rural areas—a need for power to bring them into closer association with the urban areas, and, indeed, with the world at large. It is difficult for many of us to remember that just 25 years ago, many of our farmers were living in the kerosene age. Electric companies, by and large, did not have the resources or were not willing to extend their service into rural areas because they did not see the possibilities of an adequate return on their investment.

As a result, only 11 percent of the farms in America had electricity in 1935. In my State of Virginia, the percentage was even less. At the time REA was created, only 7.6 percent, or 14,934 farms in Virginia were electrified.

By contrast, today 97 percent of the farms in America have electricity and 95.2 percent of the farms in Virginia are electrified.

The figures alone tell the story of achievement, but behind the cold statistics there is a warmth of human endeavor. Many people from all walks of life have shared in making this progress possible. It is an achievement which has far bigger meaning than the mere serving of conveniences to the farm families of the Nation—although this has been a dramatic story in itself. In many respects, this has been a revitalizing force for the entire Nation.

Without the great progress which has been achieved in the past 25 years in providing electricity to the great rural areas of America, there would have been no market for the home conveniences which have been sold by the millions in recent years. To millions of rural people, REA meant electric lights, modern refrigeration, running water, radio, television, indoor plumbing, and a host of home appliances which might never have been theirs had it not been for the coming of this new force in America.

One needs only to sit in his home and gaze around the room to realize the tremendous impact of electricity. Without it, our whole mode of life would be changed—and, turning the clock back, we get a better picture of what the coming of REA meant to those who directly benefited by it.

The Presidential Executive order brought REA into being, but a year later legislation was introduced in both the House and Senate to create the Rural Electrification Administration as it exists today. The late Senator George Norris, in the Senate, and our own Speaker RAYBURN, in the House, led the forces which legislated REA into a permanent status, and the President signed the bill on May 20, 1936.

I have long been vitally interested in the work of the electric cooperatives, which work through the REA program. By personal observation over the years, I have watched the great progress which has been made in Virginia. From a meager beginning, they have branched out into a great force for the betterment of our State. Today, we have 16 electric cooperatives in Virginia, with a total membership of 104,000. These co-ops serve our rural people by 26,335 miles of line.

The first cooperative in Virginia was the Virginia Electric Cooperative, at Bowling Green, which started in January 1936. In my own district we have some of the finest cooperatives in the country. The excellent leadership which these co-ops have enjoyed over the years has been an important factor in their development. These cooperatives are sound business undertakings and through wise administration they have enabled our rural families to enjoy the benefits of electric service while at the same time protecting the interest of the co-ops and the interest of the Government funds invested therein. In 1958 the cooperatives in Virginia paid a total of $729,344 in taxes.

It has been my pleasure over the years to be associated with the fine leadership of these organizations and I commend them highly for the excellent work they have done in our State. Since 1944 the Virginia Association of Electric Cooperatives has been functioning as a statewide organization in behalf of the individual co-ops. Associated with this organization also are the two co-ops in Maryland and one in Delaware.

I join in the anniversary salute to the REA, both in memory of the fine work it has done over the years and in the hope that through wise and effective management, it will continue to merit the admiration of our Nation.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ANNIVERSARY

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of thousands of my constituents in rural areas especially I congratulate the REA upon its 25 years of most effective work in providing light and electricity for power.

The program has made these much needed facilities available in areas where private industry could not go with profit and helped to build up the economy where such a lift is needed most.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ANNIVERSARY

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on this 25th anniversary of the inauguration of the REA program, I think it highly fitting and proper that we here in Congress point with pride to the accomplishments of REA. I doubt that any program ever conceived by Congress for the benefit of farmers has ever been more successful in achieving its purpose.

Today some 96 percent of the farms of this Nation enjoy electrification. It is difficult to conceive of any facility that has contributed more to the comfort and efficiency of farm life than the availability of electric power. No longer are those living in rural areas subjected to second-class living conditions. A farm or ranch home can, with the availability of electric power, now be equal in comfort and efficiency to any home to be found anywhere. This is as it should be since people who desire to live in rural areas should have the same opportunity for modern comforts as those who live in urban areas.

Not only has electricity contributed to the comforts of rural living, but it has increased immeasurably the efficiency of the American farms and ranches. Jobs that without electric energy were long and arduous are now performed by electric motors and free farm people for more productive tasks or for the enjoyment of more well-deserved leisure time.

I believe that we should on this day also commend those who have managed and directed the REA program during these past 25 years to its present high degree of fulfillment of the original objective of bringing electric power to rural areas.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has already been said, and a great deal more will be said before the end of this session of Congress, about medical care for the aged. Hardly a day goes by that a new plan is not offered by one group or another, within or without the Congress. Some plans would be financed by increasing the social security tax on employees and employers, and some would be financed out of general revenues of the Federal and State Governments.

All of these plans have two things in common. First, they are all designed to take care of a genuine human need. That is, to defray in whole or in part the cost of medical service for elderly people. This is the segment of the population that generally has the highest medical bills and generally the lowest income with which to meet them.

The second factor that the plans have in common is that they are all tremendously costly. Just last week Secretary Flemming estimated that the administration's proposal would cost the States and the Federal Government approximately $1,200 million annually. The estimated cost of the Forand proposal is even higher at $1,600 million annually. Under present law the total social security tax will increase 1 percent every 2 years until it reaches 9 percent in 1969, or 9½ percent if medical care for the aged is superimposed on the social security system at the rates contained in the Forand bill. This would raise the annual social security cost per employee from the present level of $288 per year to $456 per year in 1969.

If the Congress were to adopt a medical care program financed by social security payments, employers and those persons working, and their children, would have to pay the entire cost for the estimated 12 million people who would be eligible for these benefits today. Even though the Social Security Act has been in effect for 25 years, a person who paid the maximum tax from 1937 through 1958 would have contributed only $1,026 in taxes—$1,335 at 3-percent compound interest. If he retired in 1958 his expected benefits for himself and his wife would have been $30,406—or $23,941 when discounted at 3-percent interest. The younger people now working and their employers already have to make up this difference of more than $22,500 for each individual who retired in 1958 and the cost to them would, of course, be increased by any plan financed by social security taxes.

Perhaps after the Congress has considered all of the evidence it will determine that the benefits of one of these plans outweighs its cost. Before it reaches this determination, however, I hope it will look carefully at what has been accomplished in the last few years voluntarily. Just a week ago Congressman WOLF, of Iowa, on the floor of the House congratulated the Communications Workers of America and the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co. for adopting, through collective bargaining, a contract providing for major medical insurance covering the employees of the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co. and their dependents. At the same time the company announced that a comparable program would be extended to persons who are retired from company service.

These remarks aroused my curiosity because the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co. is a part of the Bell System which employs approximately 725,000 persons and pays pensions to 60,000 persons who are retired. In the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co., like the other companies which comprise the Bell System, basic hospitalization and surgical insurance are available to the employees and pensioners. The premiums and the benefits generally are the same for active employees and pensioners.

Both the employee and the pensioner of Northwestern Bell pay the cost of this basic medical insurance which takes care of usual hospital and surgical costs. The plan to which the CWA and the Northwestern Bell agreed on April 30 takes care of emergency or catastrophic medical expenses which can wipe out the savings of a lifetime. This major medical insurance is paid for by the company for both active employees and for pensioners. It will not cost the Federal or State treasuries a thin dime for medical costs. It will not increase the social security tax. It will not require additional Federal or State employees.

At the end of my remarks I should like to insert in the RECORD a 3-column comparison showing the basic details of the Northwestern Bell plan, the medicare program and the Forand proposal. The Northwestern Bell proposal certainly does not provide all of the benefits we might find in Utopia, but neither do the other programs. I recommend it for particular attention as the product of a number of years of study. This major medical plan, like many which have been adopted in industry—it has been estimated that 80 percent of the aged would have some form of hospital insurance within the next 5 years without Government intervention—will not apply to an individual until he has exhausted all Government benefits which may be provided under laws adopted by the Congress or the several States. In short, it appears that Federal legislation in this field will have the effect of undermining the tremendous efforts that have been made without Government intervention in the last few years.

I think that almost all of the Members on both sides of the aisle are in agreement that medical care for the aged is a very real problem which we must face. I hope that we can do the job thoroughly and not in a spirit of partisanship or shortsighted political gain. Let us look briefly at a few of the more serious determinations that we have to make. The first, it seems to me, is the question, Who will be covered by the program? The Forand proposal would cover everyone entitled to social security whether they needed this coverage or not. The Medicare program would cover individuals over 65 with an income of less than $2,500 and husband and wife with an income of less than $3,800. Both the Forand and Medicare programs would leave without protection roughly 4 million people although the two groups, of course, are not composed of the same individuals. In his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, Secretary Flemming said that at a conservative estimate the medical expenditures for a person who was continuously ill for an entire year would amount to $6,000. We might ask would this not constitute a catastrophe for an individual over 65 years of age with an annual income of $2,600? Or, indeed, would it be any less of a catastrophe for an aged person with $1,000 annual income who is not eligible for social security and therefore outside the Forand bill? Private insurance programs, like the Northwestern Bell plan, did not come into existence on any broad scale until 1957, and yet they have grown tremendously because of their ability to cope with catastrophic costs for anyone who chooses to subscribe.

The second major problem to which we should address ourselves is that of cost. The sponsors of the Forand program have estimated that it could be financed by an increase of one-fourth of 1 percent in the social security tax on employers and employees. Others have estimated the total cost to be closer to a 1 percent increase in the social security tax. If this prediction should be accurate, the total social security levy for each individual covered would amount to $480 a year in 1969 without any increase in the tax base or any increase in rates for other benefits.

The Medicare program has been promoted on the basis that it is voluntary whereas the Forand approach calls for a compulsory increase in the social security tax. To me this argument has little substance when Secretary Flemming testifies that the annual cost will be $1.2 billion in Federal and State tax revenue. The Medicare program is voluntary in the sense that any elderly person does not have to pay the enrollment charge of $24 a year if he does not want to be covered but there is not much freedom of choice for the Federal and State taxpayers who have to raise an additional $1.2 billion to pay the bill.

I have no panacea to suggest—I wish I had. I do, however, urge the membership of the House to give serious consideration to the real need before us and not play politics with this issue. In my opinion, the older citizens of the country are not looking for a handout. They expect to pay the normal cost of a usual illness. The real need, as I see it, is to assure to them through private insurance or otherwise protection against the catastrophic illness which can wipe out in a few short months the savings of a lifetime.

Comparison of extraordinary medical expense plans

ELIGIBILITY

Northwestern Bell Telephone plan	Medicare program for the aged	H.R. 4700 (Forand bill)
All employees having 6 months' service; all pensioners; relatives, as broadly defined, of either; no income limitation; no fees charged.	Persons over 65 with gross income including social security and railroad retirement below $2,500 ($3,800 per couple) upon payment of enrollment charge of $24 per year (no charge for public assistance recipients) no separate coverage for relatives.	Individuals entitled to benefits under the Social Security Act. (In general men on reaching age 65, their spouses at age 62 and children under 18.)
METHOD OF PAYMENT		
Insurance policy—no cost to employee	Cost above enrollment charge paid by matching Federal and State funds.	¼ of 1 percent increase in social security taxes (matched by employer). Payments made from F.O.A. & S.I. direct to hospital, physician, or nursing home furnishing services.
DEDUCTIBLE AMOUNT		
In any 12-month expense period amounts payable under designated basic plan (e.g., Blue Cross and Blue Shield) plus 4 percent of annual pay or pension (at least $100 but not over $500).	$250 ($400 for couple) in any year—none for public assistance recipients.	None. However, payments only as per schedule of cost for specified services as set forth in agreement between trust fund and hospital or nursing home furnishing services.
PAYMENTS ABOVE DEDUCTIBLE AMOUNT		
Northwestern Bell Telephone plan	Medicare program for the aged	H.R. 4700 (Forand bill)
80 percent of covered medical expenses (50 percent for mental care outside institutions) up to $15,000 lifetime limit for active employees or relatives under 65, and $2,500 for pensioners or their relatives. Limit for active employees subject to reinstatement on showing of insurability or 13 weeks' full-time telephone company employment.	80 percent (100 percent for public assistance recipients) of expenses listed (e.g., 180 days in hospital, 365 days in nursing home, unlimited medical, dental and surgical, drugs up to $350, laboratory and X-ray up to $200) in any year.	60 days of hospitalization per each 12 months' period; up to 120 days of nursing home care (less number of days of paid-for hospitalization) for each 12 months' period; surgical benefits.
EXCLUSIONS		
As listed in policy, such as nursing home care, payments under all government programs, payments under other insurance arrangements contributed by employers or subject to payroll deduction, dental care and cosmetic surgery other than due to injury, etc.	Payments only as per schedule without specific exclusions.	Surgical services of an elective nature; care in tuberculosis sanitariums or mental hospitals; injuries or conditions covered by workmen's compensation. Services required by law to be provided at public expense.
OPTIONAL INSURANCE		
Not covered by plan—commercial insurance available at employee cost.	Eligible individuals may elect private major medical insurance under standards to be fixed by States—half premium up to $60 by Federal-State matching funds.	No provision for optional insurance.

CONGRATULATIONS TO REA ON QUARTER CENTURY OF PROGRESS

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I would surely like to extend my congratulations to the REA cooperatives of the First District, the State of Minnesota, and the Nation on the 25th anniversary of the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration. The accomplishments of this vital Government agency are of a national scope, but it is only natural, Mr. Speaker, that I point out that the participation on the part of cooperatives of the First District are in the finest traditions of the program. First District people are proud that the cooperatives have rendered great service to our farm families, and have at the same time discharged their obligations to the Federal agency in the highest possible degree.

This anniversary carries with it great meaning for rural America. The Rural Electrification Administration has enabled farmers not only to provide electric service for widespread areas of our country—but to light the way to an impressive future. And, Mr. Speaker, this is a future exemplified in Minnesota by the first atomic powerplant built on an REA-financed system at Elk River.

The achievements of the REA program can be a source of great satisfaction to our country. Ninety-seven percent of all farms and ranches are electrified and REA-financed farms are responsible for more than half of these electrified farms.

Statistics have a reputation for being dull, but they have great meaning especially when they refer to the people, Mr. Speaker. During 1959, approximately 139,000 new consumers were added to the list of REA users. Nearly 200,000 telephone subscribers enjoyed the benefits of modern communication as result of the REA rural telephone program.

Behind the statistics of service stands the framework of sound administration. REA has streamlined its procedures to speed processing of loans, to give improved service to borrowers and to reduce administrative costs. And astonishing but true is the fact that REA is administering much greater electric and telephone programs with approximately 11 percent fewer employees than in 1952.

Such is just a portion of the record—but this is representative of the program. Because of this record, rural America's confidence in an REA-powered future is justified.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. VANIK, for 15 minutes, tomorrow, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. KASEM, for 1 hour, tomorrow.

Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. SMITH of California), for 1 hour, on May 25.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LENNON and include a speech by Mr. WHITENER.

Mr. DAGUE.

Mr. WHITTEN, to revise and extend his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. ALBERT, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. CELLER in two instances.

(At the request of Mr. SMITH of California, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. WIDNALL in two instances, in one to include tables.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 11713. An act to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1217. An act to suspend for 2 years the import duty on certain amorphous graphite;

H.R. 1456. An act for the relief of Universal Trades, Inc.;

H.R. 1752. An act for the relief of Wilhelmina Ordoñez;

H.R. 2082. An act for the relief of James Demetrios Chrysanthes, also known as James Demetrios Chrysanthacopoulos;

H.R. 3786. An act for the relief of Chan Kit Ying and James George Bainter;

H.R. 3934. An act for the relief of Mrs. E. Christine Williams;

H.R. 4562. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Grzelewski;

H.R. 4825. An act for the relief of Jean K. Simmons;

H.R. 5349. An act to provide for the conveyance to Orange County, California, of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property situated in Orange County, Calif.;

H.R. 6083. An act for the relief of Mary V. Jones;

H.R. 6493. An act for the relief of Robert Dolton;

H.R. 6843. An act for the relief of Daniel Wilging;

H.R. 7226. An act for the relief of Mr. Hughie D. Martin and Ione Martin;

H.R. 7254. An act for the relief of Simeen Helena Chaghaghi;

H.R. 7363. An act for the relief of Chester A. Spindler;

H.R. 8280. An act for the relief of Clarence T. Tolpo;

H.R. 8383. An act for the relief of Maj. Jack E. Hudson;

H.R. 8456. An act for the relief of Capt. Jack Rubley;

H.R. 8672. An act for the relief of Dr. Deh Chang Tao;

H.R. 8868. An act for the relief of the Albertson Water District, Nassau County, N.Y.;

H.R. 8941. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alice Anderson;

H.R. 9084. An act to repeal certain retirement promotion authority of the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

H.R. 9216. An act for the relief of Daniel C. Turner;

H.R. 9464. An act to remove the requirement that of the Chief and Deputy Chief of the Bureau of Ships, one must be specially qualified and experienced in naval engineering and the other must be specially qualified and experienced in naval architecture;

H.R. 9476. An act for the relief of George E. Williams and William L. Johnson;

H.R. 9760. An act for the relief of Sam Doolittle;

H.R. 9861. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle or Tampico fiber;

H.R. 10045. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws" to increase the amounts authorized to be expended;

H.R. 10164. An act to change the name of the locks and dam No. 41 on the Ohio River at Louisville, Ky.;

H.R. 10401. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961;

H.R. 10550. An act to extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for 2 additional years;

H.R. 11415. An act to provide for the designation of a portion of the District of Columbia as the "Plaza of the Americas";

H.R. 11713. An act to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 598. Joint resolution to extend the time for filing the final report of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 12, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2140. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, relative to a proposal by the Department of the Navy to transfer *Sandpiper* (MHC–38) to the Miami Power Squadron, Inc., Miami, Fla., pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2141. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the quarterly report of Federal contributions for the quarter ending March 31, 1960, pursuant to subsection 201(i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2142. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2143. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, and the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, as amended, so as to bring within the provisions of such acts any person operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of a drug rendering such person incapable of operating the motor vehicle safely"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2144. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of the pricing of fuel booster pump repair kits under Department of the Air Force negotiated contract AF 01(601)–20268 with Thompson Ramo Wooldridge, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2145. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend the National Housing Act to remove certain limitations on the aggregate amount of outstanding mortgage insurance"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee of conference. H.R. 8042. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to resell four C1–SAY–1 type vessels to the Government of the Republic of China for use in Chinese trade in Far East and Near East waters exclusively (Rept. No. 1600). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 9890. A bill to make permanent the temporary increases in rates of basic salary provided for employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1601). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 12161. A bill to promote homeownership and achieve high-level stability in residential construction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12162. A bill to relieve hardship for displaced families and businesses by assisting in their relocation and by providing them with mortgage financing under a new low-rent private housing program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 12163. A bill to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to improve the effectiveness of the Veterans' Administration loan guaranty program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 12164. A bill to relieve hardship for displaced families and businesses by assisting in their relocation and by providing them with mortgage financing under a new low-rent private housing program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOWLES:

H.R. 12165. A bill to provide for the construction of a shellfisheries research center at Milford, Conn.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 12166. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 12167. A bill to establish a national wilderness preservation systems for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 12168. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for housekeepers and other individuals performing domestic service who are compensated for such service in media other than

cash; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12169. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for an individual performing service (other than domestic or casual service) in the employ of his or her son, daughter, or spouse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 12170. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to eliminate the conflict and duplication between that act and the several labor standards acts applicable to persons doing business with, or engaged in activities assisted by, the Federal Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 12171. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 12172. A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12173. A bill to authorize use of additional funds, to the extent specified in appropriation acts, for public facility loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12174. A bill to authorize the use of additional funds, to the extent specified in appropriations acts, for the purchase of mortgages by the Federal National Mortgage Association under its special assistance program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 12175. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 12176. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DIXON:

H.R. 12177. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 12178. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey all lands comprising Fort Dearborn, Rye, N.H., and Rye Air Force Base, Rye, N.H., to certain former owners of such lands; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 12179. A bill to provide for the construction of a shell fisheries research center at Milford, Conn.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 12180. A bill to amend certain laws relating to the conservation and improvement of private housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 12181. A bill to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 (relating to urban planning grants), and title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (relating to public facility loans), to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in improving mass transportation services in metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 12182. A bill to protect farm and ranch operators making certain land use changes under the Great Plains conservation program against loss of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 12183. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of North Dakota to the city of Bismarck, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12184. A bill to protect farm and ranch operators making certain land use changes under the Great Plains conservation program against loss of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 12185. A bill to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to improve the effectiveness of the Veterans' Administration loan guarantee program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 12186. A bill to amend title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FLYNN:

H.R. 12187. A bill to extend the veterans' home loan program to February 1, 1965; to provide for direct loans to veterans in areas where housing credit is otherwise not generally available; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 12188. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to maintain records of fraudulent and other unethical business practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.R. 12189. A bill to provide minimum acreage allotment and price support levels for the 1961 crop of upland cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.J. Res. 706. Joint resolution to promote the conservation of ocean fish and shellfish; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Con. Res. 690. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Res. 524. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document the biography of Taras Shevchenko; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 12190. A bill for the relief of Isidoro G. Montiel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 12191. A bill for the relief of Utanosuke Fujishiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12192. A bill for the relief of Kyozo Tanimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 12193. A bill for the relief of Amelia Andreoli D'Attorre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 12194. A bill for the relief of North American Manufacturers Export Associates, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 12195. A bill for the relief of Danica Canjar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

459. By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of Cecelia Ramos and sundry residents of Massachusetts favoring H.R. 4488, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

460. By Mr. SCHENCK: Petition of Townsend Club No. 3, of Dayton, Ohio, Josephine Siebenthaler, secretary, and 57 others, urging favorable consideration of H.R. 4000, the Townsend bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

461. By Mr. ULLMAN: Petition of the East Oregon Tri-County Building Trades Council favoring issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the nucleus of craftsmanship—apprenticeship; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Figures Don't Lie (?)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received the May 9, 1960, political memo from COPE, published by the Committee on Political Education of the AFL–CIO. In the first paragraph under a title "Living Costs Hit Alltime Record," it is stated that the cost of living in March reached an alltime record "just as it has almost month after month after month since the Eisenhower-Nixon administration has been in office."

It further states that in March "the average family was forced to pay $12.57 for the same goods and services which cost only $10 in 1947–49, according to Government figures." Once again we see the deliberate omission of unfavorable figures that would be attributed to a previous administration.

I contacted the Bureau of Labor Statistics and obtained the following unreported figures for the last 3 years of the Truman administration.

In 1950 the same goods and services cost $10.38.

In 1951 the same goods and services cost $11.10.

In 1952 the same goods and services cost $11.35.

These figures show that at the time the Eisenhower administration took office the figure of $11.35 was the figure to be compared with the present cost of $12.57. The American people are entitled to the whole truth. In 7½ years of the Eisenhower administration there was a rise from $11.33 to $12.57 or $1.22 for 7½ years. In comparison, the rise during the last 3 years of the Truman administration was from $10 to $11.35 or $1.35.

The same type of omission of full data took place in the Report of the

Majority of the Joint Economic Committee and this was violently objected to at the time by the republican minority members.

Since the Committee on Political Education of the AFL-CIO appears to be watching economic figures rather closely, we should expect that the next political memo from COPE will include the following important information disclosed by the President today in Washington. In April 1960:

First. Gross national product tops $500 billion.

This figure is 2 billion larger than the President's economic advisers estimated earlier in the year.

Second. Consumer Price Index varied only one-fourth of 1 percent in 6 months.

Third. Employment reached 66,159,000, a phenomonal increase of 1,892,000 over March 1960.

MOST IMPORTANT

Fourth. Unemployment lowered to 3,660,000—a decline of 546,000 from March.

The above facts and figures from the record speak for themselves.

Sanford H. Bolz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1960

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include statements made at the farewell luncheon for Mr. and Mrs. Sanford H. Bolz, Tuesday, May 3, 1960, at the National Press Club, under the auspices of the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington. This luncheon was given on the occasion of the departure of Mr. and Mrs. Bolz for Salinas, Calf., where Mr. Bolz will enter a law partnership, after having served as Washington counsel for the American Jewish Congress. The statements follow:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE EMANUEL CELLER

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, friends of Sandy, Sandy and Joy, it is a distinct pleasure to have this opportunity to express publicly my affection and regard for Sanford Bolz, known, of course, to all of us as Sandy.

Sandy is not a "nice" guy, Sandy never agrees for the sake of being agreeable. Sandy never lets the dust lie lest he be called impolite. In short, Sandy is a fighter—a fighter for all of those causes which are an integral part of his being. I've seen Sandy light up with the flames of indignation at the knowledge of any injustice done. He has taken time out from his practice of law to represent the interests of all minority groups—the preservation and extension of the Bill of Rights is a personal passion with him. I have known Sandy, as a representative of the American Jewish Congress, since 1948, but I also have known Sandy, in his own person, as a man of the keenest integrity and untarnished ideals.

Today, Sandy is 45 years old, and it is a happy coincidence, indeed, that this luncheon, in his honor, take place on his birthday. These 45 years of his are rich with friendships, are rich with doing battle for the oppressed and needy. Few men of 45 can say as he can, that the world is a better place for his having covered that span of years.

I shall sorely miss the good counsel and judgment of Sandy Bolz—more particularly when the issue of civil rights legislation arises again as it inevitably must, and, indeed on all legislation dealing with human rights and needs.

I wish you Godspeed, much happiness, and much success in your new venture, Sandy. I am sure, however, that this is not goodby and that you will continue, if not in person, then by any other means at your disposal, to continue to give us the support and the encouragement whenever the good fight is being fought.

STATEMENT BY ISAAC FRANCK, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF GREATER WASHINGTON

Mr. Chairman, Sandy and Joy, Congressman CELLER, ladies and gentlemen, for whatever the reasons may be, the chairman advises me that, unlike the speakers who preceded me, I am not bound by the 2-minute rule, and it is therefore my privilege to make some more extended remarks as part of our saying farewell to Sandy and Joy. I shall not utilize this occasion to unloose upon Sandy an avalanche of encomiums, for two reasons. First, this is no time for a eulogy. Eulogies will be in order many, many years from now, when Sandy will have been gathered to his forefathers, at a ripe old age, sated with years, and having bequeathed to posterity a lifetime of accomplishments. Secondly, I am aware of the admonition given by the 10th century Biblical commentator, Rashi, to the effect that one is supposed to tell only part of man's praise in his presence, and full praise only in his absence.

It seems to me more appropriate, on this occasion, to reflect together upon the issues and causes which Sandy espoused, and upon which he lavished his talents and his energy. This seems to me worth doing, not so much because he was active in these areas, and on behalf of these causes, not in order to highlight what he did, but rather for the purpose of reviewing for ourselves Sandy's impact upon us, his influence on our community's thinking, the stamp he has left on our community's policies.

Sandy has been a champion of civil rights, civil rights not only for Jews, but for all human beings. He was one of the chief architects of the amicus curiae briefs in the Thompson Restaurant case, as the case progressed from the lowest court to the U.S. Supreme Court, and thus helped make a signal contribution to the desegregation of restaurants in Washington. He was also one of the architects of the amicus curiae brief submitted to the Supreme Court in the District of Columbia public school segregation case. When we recall that one of these briefs was signed by 18 community organizations of all descriptions, and the other brief had on it the names of 22 religious, civic, and community organizations, the extent of Sandy's impact on our collective thought is made abundantly clear.

Sandy has been a defender of religious freedom and of the American principle of the separation of church and state. This has meant dealing with problems of religion and the public school, and other manifestations of the threatened erosion of the separation principle. In this complex and sensitive area, Sandy's leadership has provided clarity, diplomatic persuasiveness, and steadfast courage and good judgment. I remember very clearly our appearance before one of the suburban boards of education, about 9 years ago, in opposition to a proposal that public school machinery be utilized for the distribution of Bibles to public school pupils. A Congregationalist, Methodist, and a Seventh Day Adventist leader were among those in the delegation, and Sandy Bolz was our spokesman. The quiet dignity, the persuasiveness, and the legal scholarship displayed by Sandy on that occasion, brought honor not only upon him, but upon all of us.

Civil liberties, personal freedoms, freedom of ideas and freedom of speech, are among the ideals espoused by Sandy, and their safeguarding has been among the objectives pursued by our Jewish community council under his stimulation and guidance. And Sandy has been as concerned about the freedom of ideas repugnant to us, as he has about freedom for the ideas we hold dear. He has drummed into us the understanding that the surest way of safeguarding freedom for the ideas we are committed to is the safeguarding of freedom for the ideas which in our view are most reprehensible.

Outstanding in the council's work has been Sandy's devotion to the needs of Israel, and to the interpretation of Israel's great significance in the life Judaism. For in the rebirth of Israel Sandy sees not only the establishment of a home for the driven and persecuted of our people, not only a means of restoring freedom and dignity to human beings, but also the erection of a laboratory for Jewish ideals of social justice and cooperative living, and a citadel of Jewish spiritual and intellectual creativity which can help enrich the spiritual life of Jewish communities everywhere.

And finally, Sandy has been a champion of democracy in the Jewish community. And let me assure you that this is not an easy or unhazardous task. It is much easier to espouse democracy in and for the political organization of a state. which has the authority to govern people's lives. In a voluntary association, which is what the Jewish community is, the champion of democracy faces many dangers from the powers that be and that would be inclined to perpetuate their dominance and control.

Sandy has done these things, and pursued these goals in our midst, for three reasons. First, because he is the kind of person he is. Second, because he takes seriously his citizen responsibility, and wishes to lead others toward similar seriousness about their citizen responsibilities. However, it seems to me that there is a third reason, and this is Sandy's taking seriously the matter of his being a Jew. Sandy has been trying to work out for himself, and to help all of us think through and work out what it means to be a Jew in mid-20th century America. He echoes the question of the ancient Hebrew prophet, "What does God require of you?" What does it mean to be a Jew, not only in the sanctuary, but out in the community, in the marketplace, in the give-and-take of our daily relations with people. Of course, he has not been indifferent to the ritual requirements of Judaism, or to the Judaism of the sanctuary. I recall a minor episode some 4 or 5 years ago, when Sandy lost his father. Sandy and someone else were at my house, probably for a meeting on some Jewish community council matters. During a break in the discussion, Sandy asked us whether we would suspend the meeting for a few moments and recite with him the memorial prayer for the dead, the Kaddish. Having been raised in a home where traditional Jewish observances were the norm, and in which it was assumed that the mourner's Kaddish is recited only by the actual mourner, and only as part of the regular religious service in which at least a quorum of 10 men participate, I found this a strange experience. None the less we rose, faced the east and together with Sandy recited the mourner's Kaddish. I remember this minor episode because that moment was an experience in holiness, and my home became truly a miniature sanctuary.

In espousing these causes, and in furnishing leadership on their behalf in our midst, Sandy succeeded in teaching us an important lesson in the strategies of community relations, and of his type of social engineering generally. He taught us that most often the best strategy is adherence to principle. At least he taught me that. If we adhere to principle, then, in any negotiations which may require compromise, our compromises would be a retreat from principle, but a retreat of only a certain distance. Contrariwise, if we do not adhere to principle, but negotiate in terms of compromises, then much more compromising is bound to be forced upon us than should be the case either ideally or pragmatically.

Let me add one final comment. I think I should say, in all candor, that in working in our midst on all these issues and principles, Sandy has not always been easy to live with. Indeed, he has often been quite difficult to live with. He has often been inflexible, obstinate. And this brings to mind an interesting linguistic observation made by Bertrand Russell in one of his philosophical papers. Russell points out that the verb "to be firm" has a rather unusual conjugation. In the English language the verb "to be firm" is conjugated as follows: "I am firm. You are stubborn. He is pig-headed." Now, I would not go to the extreme of saying that Sandy has been pigheaded, but he has been obstinate, rigid, inflexible, difficult. However, I must confess, in equal candor, that there is another being, another entity, in my life that displays these same irritating qualities, and that is my conscience, my moral conscience. My conscience too is obstinate, rigid, inflexible, and often very difficult to live with. But I would find it much more difficult to live without my conscience than to live with it. Similarly, I am sure that we shall all find it much more difficult to live without Sandy than we have to live with him. For, Sandy has been part of our collective moral conscience, and in his going to California part of our conscience is being wrenched away from us.

It seems to me that the best farewell gift we can offer to Sandy and Joy is our solemn promise that, after they leave our community, we shall not settle down to a smug, comfortable, self-satisfied existence; that we shall find in our midst new resources, new forces of conscience, which will keep us restless and unhappy unless we diligently continue the pursuit of those social and religious ideals to which he so unselfishly dedicated himself in our midst.

RESPONSE OF SANFORD H. BOLZ

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, all my good friends, my heart is full to overflowing—much too full to let me say all that I would like to say on this occasion. But I know that you would never believe me if I told you I was at a loss for words—so I shall try to respond, but briefly, as I would not for the world want to spoil the shining image that has been drawn of me today.

First, let me thank you from the bottom of my heart for this marvelous and memorable occasion. You have done me—and my family—great honor, and we shall remember this day as long as we live. I must say it is the most wonderful antidote any man could have to becoming 45. You know, as I sat here listening to these tributes, with what I hope was becoming modesty—even if you may have noticed now and then a shameless flash of agreement steal across my face—I could not help thinking of two remarks. One is attributed to a famous British diplomat, but I first learned it from a famous Israeli diplomat, my good friend Mike Arnon, who used it on an occasion when he was introduced to an audience in very glowing terms. It goes like this: "Compliments are like perfume—pleasant to inhale but dangerous to swallow." So you may have noticed that during the speeches I was inhaling mightily, but swallowing very little.

The second remark relates to the fact that this is a most unaccustomed position for me to be in. You know, I never thought I'd ever have a testimonial—I always thought I was much too young for that. You usually get them when you are either old or rich—and I was sure I would never be either. But I have attended many of these affairs, and usually I have sat out where you are, watching some other poor devil undergo this ordeal by tribute. (But I have loved every bit of it—and I would have it no other way). And it reminded me of the fellow who was being tarred and feathered and ridden out of town on a rail, who remarked that "If it weren't for the honor of the thing, I think I'd rather walk."

So much for jest. As I stand here, I can't help reflecting on how very much I owe to Cornell. If Albany gave me birth, surely Cornell nurtured the seeds which I hope have grown to maturity here in Washington. For Cornell gave me, first of all, a friend like Al Arent, whose leadership and dedication to good causes I always admired, and in whose footsteps in those causes I have somehow managed to follow pretty well, ever since the days when I was a lowly freshman and he was the most respected senior on the campus.

Second, it gave me during law school the friendship of Jack Abramson, whose warm and generous call to me to share his fine practice in California is one of the rare things that would ever lead us to leave this wonderful town and all the warm hearts and good heads that we number among our friends here.

Third, it gave me, first as teacher and then as friend, a very great man, who has been an ideal and an inspiration to me throughout my career—and ever will be—and who has come to be with us today to do me honor. I mean, of course, my warm good friend, Judge Henry Edgerton.

And finally, Cornell gave me the greatest treasure that any man could have—my wife—for her price is far above rubies. She has been my constant companion, support, help, and balance wheel now for almost 20 years—and I think God never made a more wonderful woman. All of you who have worked with me in community affairs I am sure must know that I could never have done whatever I have been able to do without her steady support and understanding and willingness to accept whatever adversity—as well as honor—might come to us out of my dedication to such causes. And I would be less than deserving of the tributes you have paid me today if I were not sensible of the fact that this tribute is intended as much for her as it is for me. And I think I speak for you as well as for myself when I say that this community will miss her sweetness, her beauty, her never-failing good nature, and her deep, true goodness. And thank God, I shall have all of them with me, because I don't know what I would ever do without them.

There is much more that I would like to say, but there are neither words nor time. We shall never forget this moment—this day. To leave Washington, as you have shown us today we do, with the respect and affection of this community is reward enough for any man. I shall ask for no greater riches. And if there is one thought that I could leave with you by which you might, perhaps, remember me, I would make this my valedictory: That it matters little what vaulting temples and structure you may build in this community. And it matters little what riches you may contribute to our fellow Jews and our fellow men. It matters only that, through dedication to the finest tradition of Judaism, you keep burning always at white heat the living fire of fortitude and the bright flame of justice. For if they go out, the rest shall be without meaning and as if it had never been.

If you will remember this of me at times when there may be temptation to fail or flag in keeping these fires constantly rekindled, then I know that I shall not be forgotten here. Thank you all again from the bottom of our hearts—come see us in California—goodby and God bless you all.

Areas Eligible Under the Depressed Areas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday when the House passed the Depressed Areas bill, an amendment was offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], making it necessary that an area have 6 percent or more unemployment at the time an application for assistance was made. The author of the amendment, as his sole explanation of the amendment, stated, "Mr. Chairman, this is merely a perfecting amendment. I do not want to make a speech about it. I submit it to the Chairman and I hope he will accept it." The amendment was adopted. I endeavored to obtain an explanation of the effect of the amendment, by seeking recognition, but did not receive it until after action was taken. I then stated, "Mr. Chairman, I should like to find out what this amendment does to the bill. I presume from what was said by the majority leader, he fully approved the original Spence bill as it applied to many areas throughout the United States. As I understand this amendment, it would materially curtail the number of eligible areas. I think it ought to be so understood." Mr. Speaker, I asked the Department of Labor to prepare a new list of the areas that would appear to qualify under the bill as it passed the House and the Senate and was sent to the President. In order that Members may have the benefit of this information, I will insert the new list at the conclusion of these remarks. The bill, as it came from the committee, made 192 industrial areas eligible. The bill as it passed the House with the Flood amendment, reduces that number to 143 areas. On that basis, if we had had three or four more "perfecting" amendments, we would have done away with the problem entirely.

I am sure Members will be interested in noting that included among the areas that must be declared to be depressed areas are Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Louisville, Kentucky, and Atlantic City. Inclusion of Philadelphia as a depressed area is of particular importance. That area's unemployed total of 119,300 persons exceeds the unemployed total—approximately 100,000—in all 12 of the

areas in Pennsylvania on which there is general agreement that they are areas suffering from chronic unemployment. In other words, the hard hit areas now must share with Philadelphia dollar for dollar the assistance that was supposed to go to the truly depressed areas. On a straight pro rata basis, Philadelphia would be entitled to slightly more dollars of assistance than all the depressed areas in the whole State of Pennsylvania.

The list follows:

Tentative list of urban areas that may qualify for Federal assistance as areas with substantial and persistent unemployment under various legislative proposals [1]

[Revised May 1960]

MAJOR AREAS [2]

Administration (Kilburn) bill H.R. 4278	Area redevelopment bill (as passed by Congress)
(16 major areas)	(40 major areas)
Connecticut:	Connecticut:
	Bridgeport.
	New Britain.
Indiana:	Indiana:
Evansville.	Evansville.
Terre Haute.	Terre Haute.
Kentucky:	Kentucky:
	Louisville.
Maine:	Maine:
	Portland.
Massachusetts:	Massachusetts:
	Brockton.
Fall River.	Fall River.
Lawrence.	Lawrence.
Lowell.	Lowell.
New Bedford.	New Bedford.
	Springfield-Holyoke.
	Worcester.
Michigan:	Michigan:
Detroit.	Detroit.
	Flint.
Minnesota:	Minnesota:
	Duluth-Superior.
New Jersey:	New Jersey:
Atlantic City.	Atlantic City.
	Newark.
	Paterson.
	Trenton.
New York:	New York:
	Albany-Schenectady-Troy.
	Buffalo.
	Utica-Rome.
North Carolina:	North Carolina:
	Durham.
Pennsylvania:	Pennsylvania:
Altoona.	Altoona.
Erie.[3]	Erie.
Johnstown.	Johnstown.
	Philadelphia.
	Pittsburgh.
Scranton.	Scranton.
Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton.	Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton.
	York.
Rhode Island:	Rhode Island:
Providence.	Providence.
Tennessee:	Tennessee:
	Chattanooga.
Texas:	Texas:
	Beaumont-Port Arthur.
	Corpus Christi.
Virginia:	Virginia:
	Roanoke.
West Virginia:	West Virginia:
Charleston.	Charleston.
Huntington-Ashland.[3]	Huntington-Ashland.
	Wheeling.

[1] This listing is preliminary and tentative, and is based largely on bimonthly or semiannual data compiled from area labor market reports prepared in connection with the Bureau of Employment Security's program for the classification of areas according to relative adequacy of labor supply. Data used cover a 2- to 5-year period, generally extending through March 1960. Later data, now becoming available for some areas, could result in several changes in the above listing. A more comprehensive review of area data on a monthly—rather than bimonthly or semiannual—basis, and in the light of whatever criteria may be included in the bill finally enacted, would be required to determine which areas are eligible for assistance as areas with substantial and persistent unemployment.

[2] Major areas are areas included in the Bureau of Employment Security's regular area labor market reporting and classification program. This program covers 149 of the country's leading employment centers. Unemployment and labor force data for these areas are generally available on a bimonthly basis.

[3] Borderline.

Tentative list of urban areas that may qualify for Federal assistance as areas with substantial and persistent unemployment under various legislative proposals—Con.

[Revised May 1960]

SMALLER AREAS [4]

Administration (Kilburn) bill H.R. 4278	Area redevelopment bill (as passed by Congress)
(48 smaller areas)	(103 smaller areas)
Alabama:	Alabama:
Florence-Sheffield.	Florence-Sheffield.
	Gadsden.
Jasper.	Jasper.
	Talladega.
Alaska:	Alaska:
Anchorage.	Anchorage.
Connecticut:	Connecticut:
	Ansonia.
	Bristol.
Danielson.	Danielson.
	Meriden.
	Middletown.
	Norwich.
	Thompsonville.
	Torrington.
Illinois:	Illinois:
Centralia.	Centralia.
Harrisburg.	Harrisburg.
Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort.	Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort.
Litchfield.	Litchfield.
	Mount Carmel-Olney.
Mount Vernon.	Mount Vernon.
Indiana:	Indiana:
	Connersville.
Vincennes.	Vincennes.
Kansas:	Kansas:
	Coffeyville-Independence-Parsons.
Pittsburg.	Pittsburg.
Kentucky:	Kentucky:
Corbin.	Corbin.
Hazard.	Hazard.
Madisonville.	Madisonville.
Morehead-Grayson.	Morehead-Grayson.
	Owensboro.
Paintsville-Prestonsburg.	Paducah.
Pikeville-Williamson.	
Maine:	Maine:
Biddeford-Sanford.	Biddeford-Sanford.
	Lewiston-Auburn.
Maryland:	Maryland:
	Cambridge.
Cumberland.	Cumberland.
Massachusetts:	Massachusetts:
	Newburyport.
North Adams.	North Adams.
Michigan:	Michigan:
Bay City.	Bay City.
Iron Mountain.	Iron Mountain.
	Marquette.
Monroe.	Monroe.
Port Huron.	Port Huron.
Mississippi:	Mississippi:
	Biloxi-Gulfport.
Missouri:	Missouri:
	Flat River.
	Joplin.
	Washington.
Montana:	Montana:
Butte.	Butte.
	Kalispell.
New Jersey:	New Jersey:
Bridgeton.	Bridgeton.
	Long Branch.
New York:	New York:
Amsterdam.	Amsterdam.
Auburn.	Auburn.
	Elmira.
Gloversville.	Gloversville.
	Jamestown-Dunkirk.
	Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon.
	Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone.
	Plattsburgh.
	Wellsville.
North Carolina:	North Carolina:
Fayetteville.	Fayetteville.
	Hendersonville.
	Lumberton.
	Mount Airy.
Ohio:	Ohio:
	Portsmouth-Chillicothe.
Oklahoma:	Oklahoma:
	Ardmore.
McAlester.	McAlester.

[4] Smaller areas: Areas with a labor force of 15,000 or more which are officially classified as "smaller areas of substantial labor surplus" by the Bureau of Employment Security. Data for such areas are generally available on a semiannual basis. Information for smaller areas which are not classified, or for areas with a labor force of less than 15,000, is not available in Washington on a consistent basis.

Tentative list of urban areas that may qualify for Federal assistance as areas with substantial and persistent unemployment under various legislative proposals—Con.

[Revised May 1960]

Administration (Kilburn) bill H.R. 4278	Area redevelopment bill (as passed by Congress)
(48 smaller areas)	(103 smaller areas)
	Muskogee.
	Okmulgee-Henryetta.
Pennsylvania:	Pennsylvania:
Berwick-Bloomsburg.	Berwick-Bloomsburg.
	Butler.
Clearfield-Du Bois.	Clearfield-Du Bois.
	Indiana.
	Kittanning-Ford City.
	Lewistown.
	Meadville.
New Castle.	New Castle.
	Oil City-Franklin-Titusville.
Pottsville.	Pottsville.
	Sayre-Athens-Towanda.
	St. Marys.
Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel.	Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel.
Uniontown-Connellsville.	Uniontown-Connellsville.
	Williamsport.
Tennessee:	Tennessee:
La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell.	La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell.
Texas:	Texas:
	Laredo.
	Texarkana.
Virginia:	Virginia:
Big Stone Gap-Appalachia.	Big Stone Gap-Appalachia.
	Richlands-Bluefield.
Washington:	Washington:
	Aberdeen.
Anacortes.	Anacortes.
	Bellingham.
	Bremerton.
	Port Angeles.
West Virginia:	West Virginia:
Beckley.	Beckley.
Bluefield.	Bluefield.
	Clarksburg.
Fairmont.	Fairmont.
Logan.	Logan.
	Martinsburg.
Morgantown.	Morgantown.
	Parkersburg.
Point Pleasant-Gallipolis.	Point Pleasant-Gallipolis.
Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs.	Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs.
Welch.	Welch.
Wisconsin:	Wisconsin:
	La Crosse.

ATTACHMENT TO MAY 1960 TENTATIVE LIST OF ELIGIBLE URBAN AREAS UNDER PROPOSED AREA ASSISTANCE LEGISLATION

Summary of eligibility criteria used

The administration (Kilburn) bill (H.R. 4278):

1. Unemployment is now 6 percent or more of the labor force discounting seasonal or temporary factors.

2. The annual average unemployment rate in the area has been:

(a) At least 50 percent above the national average for 4 of the preceding 5 calendar years.

(b) At least 75 percent above the national average for 3 of the preceding 4 calendar years.

(c) At least 100 percent above the national average for 2 of the preceding 3 calendar years.

Area redevelopment bill (as passed by Congress):

1. Unemployment in the area is now 6 percent or more of the labor force.

2. Local unemployment rates have been:

(a) At least 6 percent during 18 of the preceding 24 months.

(b) At least 9 percent during 15 of the preceding 18 months.

(c) At least 12 percent during the preceding 12 months.

Col. Albert E. Herrmann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege for me to take this occasion to pay tribute to an outstanding citizen and veteran leader of my home State of Pennsylvania—a stanch American who has given much of his energies and devoted service to the betterment of our Nation and its veterans.

This distinguished citizen is Col. Albert E. Herrmann of Philadelphia, Pa., and it seems particularly appropriate to recognize his outstanding contributions to the general welfare on this occasion since tomorrow is his natal day when he will celebrate the 61st anniversary of his birth.

Pennsylvanians are indeed proud of Al Herrmann's record of service in veteran circles. Starting with yeoman service as post commander of the George H. Imhof Post No. 153, the American Legion, of Philadelphia, in 1921 and again in 1926, he has steadily broadened his sphere to include service in Philadelphia County Committee of the Legion—on which he has served as a delegate for 40 years—in the capacity of county adjutant, county treasurer, and culminating in county commander in 1945–46. For the past several years he has been chairman of the county committee's rehabilitation and hospital visitation committees and in addition has found time to serve as executive secretary of the Post County Commanders Association of the Legion in Philadelphia.

In 1930–31 Colonel Herrmann served as national commander of the U.S. Army Ambulance Service Association and at present is serving as national service and hospital welfare officer of the U.S.A.A.C.'s. In World War I he served with section 567 and Headquarters Company 650 of the U.S. Army Ambulance Service with the Medical Corps, in which he was wounded, and because of those wounds is today listed as a totally disabled veteran. During World War II he served with Draft Board No. 27 in Philadelphia. He has been active in the DAV of World War I, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Philadelphia Municipal Employees War Veterans Association.

In the Historical Old Guard, city of Philadelphia, he served as colonel commanding from 1938 to March 1955, and since then he has served as executive officer of that organization. As a member of the Centennial Legion of Historic Military Commands of the Thirteen Original States, he has served as the delegate to this historic military organization, and in 1956 was elected national director of the C.L.H.M.C. and has been reelected each year by the centennial legion.

Colonel Herrmann has been an active member of the West Philadelphia Republican Club of the 27th ward of Philadelphia, and served the city of Philadelphia as its deputy city controller. Under Mayor S. Davis Wilson, he served a term as assistant director of supplies and purchases, and while serving in that office, Colonel Herrmann was honored by many civic organizations of Philadelphia for his work in charge of the upper Pennsylvania flood relief work, and his management of the Philadelphia flood relief force in Louisville, Ky.

In his community of the 27th ward of Philadelphia, he has served on many community welfare service agencies as ward chairman of the Red Cross, Salvation Army, and Community Chest drives.

On Colonel Herrmann's birthday in 1935, Hon. Marcel De Verneuil presented to Colonel Herrmann the decoration of Officer d'Academie by the French Government at the Penn Athletic Club.

Throughout his very active life, Colonel Herrmann's accomplishments have been many, but I would like to call particular attention to one endeavor that might well be emulated in other areas of our Nation.

During World War II and the conflict in Korea, right down to the present, he has been mailing magazine subscriptions to our Armed Forces hospitals overseas, as well as to U.S. Veterans' Administration and Armed Forces hospitals in this country, thereby bringing sunshine and get well greetings throughout the year to our disabled and hospitalized service people. This work of bringing sunshine to our disabled veterans is a service embracing all Government hospitals, and includes stamps so that the hospitalized veteran can keep in touch with his loved ones.

On behalf, therefore, of his many friends and admirers I would like to extend to him, his lovely wife, and his charming daughter our best wishes for an abundance of good health and continued opportunities for fruitful service in the years ahead.

A Tribute to John Taber on the Occasion of His 80th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1960

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, JOHN TABER is dear to all of us. His years of service have inspired us with greater affection for him.

Here is a man who, in the words of Grover Cleveland, regards "public office is a public trust"; hence our uttermost confidence in all he says, all he does.

You know, I particularly like JOHN because he is unafraid—unafraid at times even if he is all alone. He knows ofttimes one man with courage is a majority. He does not care, even if it is unorthodox, so long as he feels it is right.

They say JOHN is old. Nonsense, he is young at 80.

What is the secret of JOHN's longevity? Does the clock stop for him? What vitamins does he take? From what fountain of youth does he drink? He has no "tired blood" and no need for Geritol. What is his secret? Did he make a pledge to Mephistopheles as did Goethe's Faust? Of course not. What is the answer? Well, he allows each additional day to help him grow more like himself—JOHN TABER.

When I first knew him 38 years ago—when we were freshman Congressmen—he seemed to me then to be rather hard-boiled, as though he could break but not bend, but gradually I recognized that the toughness was but a facade. Underneath he was kind and amiable.

He never seems to suffer from combat fatigue. His unflagging spirit is ever present to conserve our financial strength. He is the Cerberus of the Treasury.

His is the best example of the process of a congressional career. It is an endless process. You continually turn the last page of a chapter of an assignment only to be confronted with another chapter of tasks to be completed. A congressional career is not a mere course to be finished or a prize to be achieved. It is continuous and involves blood, toil, tears, and sweat.

Viewing JOHN's character, I find it good. Does not the psalmist say: "Better is the fragrance of a good name than the perfume of precious oils." JOHN has a good name. And you know, character is what you are when no one is looking. JOHN is indeed worthy, when unattended, when alone.

He has wondrous capacity for work—despite the weight of years. I am sure he says, "While the candle burns, there is so much to be done."

And he still cares, still dares. He knows, too, that "even the oldest tree some fruit will bear."

He has drunk fully of the wine of life. He follows what Mark Twain said:

> So live your life that when you go, even the undertaker will be sorry.

I have observed his wise practicality. He knows that if you want the rose you must put up with the thorns.

Charles de Gaulle stated:

> We may well go to the moon, soon, but that's not very far. The greatest distance we have to cover still lies within us.

In other words, one must know oneself. JOHN does. He knows the long, arduous, spiritual road to travel within himself.

JOHN just grows, learning something new every day. He knows that to be 80 years young is more cheerful and hopeful than to be 40 years old. JOHN is cautious and wise. He knows that the fool often crosses the stream while the sage ponders.

Growing old is as individual and as personal as the kind of woman you marry or the wine you drink. There are those old at 30 and others young at 90. The old, at whatever age, say, "It's too late"; the young, at whatever age, say, "It's never too late."

Cato learned Greek at 80. Sophocles wrote his immortal "Oedipus" when he had numbered more than his fourscore

years. Theophrastus began his book, "Characters of Men," at 90. Goethe completed "Faust" when he was 80. Chaucer, that mighty youngster at 60, composed his "Canterbury Tales."

So to you, John, at 80, I say you have the youth, the enthusiasm, the convictions to carry you through in triumph—at the very least—another score.

How do I know this? Because we youngsters, members of the same club, have drunk from the same spring—the waters of work, of purpose, and of faith.

Address by Hon. Basil L. Whitener Before Gaston County Democratic Convention, Gastonia, N.C., May 7, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALTON LENNON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1960

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 7, 1960, our colleague, Hon. BASIL L. WHITENER, Representative from the 11th Congressional District of North Carolina, delivered the keynote address at the Gaston County Democratic convention held in Gastonia, N.C.

As one who has had the privilege on numerous occasions to visit Gaston County, one of North Carolina's banner Democratic counties, I can say that my only regret is that I was not able to be present with my many friends there at their convention. I know it must have been an outstanding affair, and I compliment our colleague upon the address which he made.

Since I feel that many of the facts contained in Congressman WHITENER'S speech will be of interest to Members of the House, I request unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY BASIL L. WHITENER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 11TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. Chairman, fellow Democrats, and ladies and gentlemen, I consider it a high honor and a distinct pleasure to have the privilege to address this convention.

As a Gaston County Democrat, I know of no greater honor that could come to me than to have the opportunity to discuss our great party with you.

My friends, I share your great pride in being a Democrat. For being a Democrat is more than being a member of a political party. We Democrats share a unity of desire, a common purpose, and a zeal for a better America to which no other political party can lay claim.

We are truly the party of the great idealistic and humanitarian Jefferson. We are also of the party of that fighting American who spent his life in the service of the common, everyday American—our own indomitable North Carolinian, the great Andrew Jackson.

As believers in the ideals and principles of the party of Jefferson and Jackson, we have roots in the common heritage of our Nation that stretch back into history much further than any other political party existing today.

It is no accident of history that North Carolina Democrats have, since the very beginning of the United States, adhered to the philosophy and ideals of government exemplified by Jefferson and Jackson. In their desire to be of service to all of the people of our country these two great Americans were immune to the prejudices of sectionalism and the bitterness of class hatred.

Now, my friends, the Republican Party cannot lay claim to the type of heritage enjoyed by us. It came into being as a sectional party, a party born out of the strife and bitterness of a great internal conflict in American history. It has always been a sectional party, and the evidence of the past few years serves only too well to dramatize this fact in our minds.

My Democratic friends, there may be some in this audience who remember all too vividly what Republican sectional rule did to North Carolina and the South during the last century. Republicanism in North Carolina is a legend of misrule and outside intervention that must never again be repeated in the history of our proud State.

Now I want to talk a few minutes about the Republican Party and its lackluster record of service to the American people. History offers very little encouragement for those who search for a dynamic, progressive national administration within the Republican Party. The reason is very simple.

The Republican Party historically has been a party of complacency. The carefree administration of Taft, the corrupt regime of Harding, the do-as-you-please administration of Coolidge, and the "who cares for the common man" philosophy of Herbert Hoover's ill-fated term as President are historical facts.

Complacency has always been the policy of the Republican Party when it has been in control of the destiny of our Nation. It was true in 1906, 1925, and it is true today.

I was amazed last year when I read in the February 14 edition of the New York Mirror a statement by Republican Senator AIKEN of Vermont. He seemed to express the general feeling of disenchantment shared today by many Republicans within their party.

Senator AIKEN said: "Unless the Republican Party demonstrates greater faith in the future of America than it has been doing recently, we cannot expect the voters to have faith in the Republican Party, and we cannot expect to win elections."

My friends, I think Senator AIKEN very ably summed up the basic weakness of the Republican Party in his statement. We don't have to be a U.S. Senator to know that the Republican Party has no faith in the future of America. This wait and see—this policy of drift and wish for a miracle in Government—of the present administration, has cost the American people billions of dollars during the past 8 years and has seriously impaired the security of our country. The Republican Party has consistently said that we are the party of the do-gooders, the party of the spenders, and the party of fiscal irresponsibility. On the other hand, the Republicans have never lost an opportunity to proclaim that they are the businessman's party and the party of financial integrity and economy in Government operations.

Well, as Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record." Let us take a look at what our Republican financial wizards have done to our country.

From 1789 through 1952—a period of 163 years—the cost of operating our Government, including all of our great wars and our bitter depression, amounted to $808,517,385,381. From 1953 through 1959, however, the present administration spent the staggering sum of $495,222,848,970. Thus, the last 6 years of national Republican rule has cost this Nation more than half the amount of money it took to operate our Government for the first 163 years of our history.

Can you call that fiscal responsibility? Is that an example of a businessman's government?

Let us examine the record again. The cost of carrying the national debt is the second highest expenditure of the Federal Government, exceeded only by our expenditures for national defense. You will be amazed to know that the interest charges on the national debt have increased from $6,240 million under Mr. Truman in 1952 to $8,456 million under the present Republican administration in 1959. This is an increase of 36 percent in 7 years.

At the same time, there has been a steady increase in our national debt. In 1952 our national debt was $267,400 million. In December 1959 the gross public debt of the United States stood at $290,900 million.

We hear our Republican friends talk about a balanced budget, and well they might talk about such a budget. The fact is that a balanced budget is something unknown to the present Republican administration. It has set an alltime high of budget deficits in peacetime. In 1959 the deficit was $12,500 million. By contrast, President Truman achieved a net surplus of over $4 billion during 4 peacetime years of his administration.

The truth about the matter is that although the Republican Party has proclaimed to the world that it is the party of fiscal stability, it is actually the party of bankruptcies and business failures.

Let us look at the record again. The 70,049 bankruptcies under Mr. Hoover in 1932 made a 56-year record. This record was not broken until 1957 when 73,761 bankruptcies occurred. Bankruptcies in the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1959, totaled 100,672. This is the record for all time. The previous alltime high came in 1958 when there were 91,668 bankruptcies.

Our Nation has been allowed to drift dangerously near the brink of economic disaster under the present national administration. With business failures and Federal taxes at an alltime high, we are witnessing a steady increase in inflationary pressures. As the value of the dollar decreases, the cost of living continues to rise.

Since 1952 the cost of living has increased 10 percent. Consumer debt in our Nation is up 83 percent. Installment debt is up 100 percent, and personal loans have increased by an alarming 136 percent.

To the American farmer, Republican control of the National Government has meant economic hardship. Farm income is down 25 percent since 1952. The purchasing power of the farmer is at its lowest point since the 1930's.

The rural depression of the 1950's has spread to many small businessmen, professional people, and workers in service trades and industries whose economic base is agricultural income. Six Republican vetoes of Democratic farm bills have thrown the American farmer and his family into deep economic distress.

In just 6 years Agriculture Secretary Benson has spent more than $31 billion. You will be astounded to learn that in this short period of time he has spent more than all of his predecessors in that office have spent since the Department of Agriculture was created 97 years ago. The size of surplus commodities in Government hands has been multiplied over seven times to almost $8 billion. And, in passing, I might add that the payroll of his Department has been increased from 65,000 employees in 1952 to over 85,000 in 1959.

The American farmer deserves a better deal than that which he has secured under the present national administration. Unless there is a radical change in our farm policies the future is indeed gloomy for this great segment of our population.

The domestic economic picture is certainly not a pleasant one under this Republican administration.

There is another area wherein this administration has failed to keep faith with the American people. I refer to our foreign policy and our efforts to have a strong national defense against foreign aggression.

When Mr. Truman left the White House, the United States was the strongest nation in the world. Our military power was not questioned. During the past 8 years, however, we have drifted dangerously close to the point where our national security is threatened.

Gen. Thomas D. White, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, says: "The United States is behind the Russians in developing intercontinental missiles." And Dr. Von Braun, Chief of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency's Development Operations, has stated, in speaking of the Russians: "The frightening thing is their rate of progress. It will take 5 years to catch the Russians." I give you these statements, not to alarm you, but because I feel you should know what these great leaders have said about the state of our national defense.

Mr. T. G. Lanphier, Jr., who was Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Air Force from 1949 to 1950 and Special Assistant to the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board from 1950 to 1951, made a speech on March 29, 1960, to the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., in which he made this significant statement:

"We are not sufficiently armed in any one of these categories: an invulnerable deterrent; a limited war deterrent; or a Home Guard—let alone all three. The fault for this lies basically with all of us. Yet the person who represents us, and who is responsible to us for our defense, is the President. Over the past years, with the best intentions in the world, he has led us to a point where we are in jeopardy of our national life."

Mr. Lanphier's statement takes on added significance when we consider a recent statement by Khrushchev. The Soviet leader said: "The people of the United States have never fought in their own territory. They must understand that the next war will not be fought in Africa, or Europe, or Asia, but from the very outset it will be fought on United States soil."

This statement by Khrushchev carries a threat that can only be met by a strong and well-armed America. If for no other reason than to protect our very security, the American people should overwhelmingly support a change in our present national administration.

The foreign policy of the United States has also followed a complacent "wait and see" course. We have attempted to buy friends overseas through billions of dollars in foreign aid. During the present administration over $41 billion of the American taxpayers' money has been spent overseas in connection with various foreign aid programs.

This has proven to be an unwise and unrealistic policy. We have only to look at what has happened recently in Korea and Turkey to realize the truth of this statement.

We need a strong firm hand at the helm of our State Department. Unless the American people bring about a change at the next general election in the national administration, I can only see a continuation of our present rapidly deteriorating influence in world affairs.

Vice President NIXON indicated recently that he differs with the administration's policies on some national issues, but he says that he will not spell out the differences until he has been named the Republican candidate for President. "Only when I become the nominee can I appropriately express individual views that I might have," said Mr. NIXON.

I might add that Mr. NIXON's position is shared by many prominent officials in the national Republican administration. They know that the course of their administration is not in keeping with the best interest of the American people. Through lack of leadership at the highest level, however, these Republicans are powerless to reverse the trend of events.

We Democrats, however, have it within our power to reverse the present unhappy course of events in our Nation's history. United as a party we can go to the polls this November and elect a national administration that will express the will of all of our people. We can, by our efforts, place in power an administration that will again make the United States the strongest and richest Nation on earth.

The time is growing short. Unless the present course of events is altered I fear that in the near future we will find ourselves in the position of a second-rate power among the nations of the world. If that unhappy event should ever occur, our security and our liberty will be at an end.

We can secure a great victory this fall. We must secure a great victory for the preservation of our American way of life. Let us all exert our maximum effort toward success in November.

I thank you.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1960

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. K. K. Haddaway, minister, Wesley Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we praise Thee for the creation of this wonderful world and for life which is resplendent with Thy glory. We do not understand the mysteries of life, but we rejoice in the great possibilities of knowledge as the vast unknown unfolds itself to all who seek.

We thank Thee for faith which enables us to march breast forward, for love which bears all things, for purity and goodness which are the strength of character, and for justice and truth which are the foundation of all human relations.

We pray for our beloved land and for all the children of the earth, for the sharing of the benefits of life, for the alleviation of suffering, and for a sure and lasting peace.

We pray for the Members of this assembly, that, realizing the privilege and opportunity which is theirs, they may go forward, believing in Thee. God grant that they may hold aloft the ideals of our great Nation and lead the world to a better day. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 11, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1607) for the relief of Mrs. Anne Morgan.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The Special Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The Judiciary Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROTESTATIONS OF PREMIER KHRUSHCHEV

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it would seem to me that Premier Khrushchev is overplaying his hand. It is somewhat ridiculous for him to be making such pious protestations of outraged innocence when the whole world knows what the Soviet Union has been doing for years.

It is time that he stopped being sanctimonious and prepared to discuss the real issues that divide the world.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS BY CERTAIN PERSONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize certain persons to administer oaths and to perform notarial acts for persons serving with, employed by, or accompanying the Armed Forces outside the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF MINESWEEPER TO MIAMI POWER SQUADRON, INC.

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Department of the Navy proposes to transfer *Sandpiper* (MHC–38) to the Miami Power Squadron, Inc., Miami, Fla., for use as a training ship; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACT, 1925, RELATING TO OPERATION OF A MOTOR VEHICLE WHILE UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF A DRUG

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, and the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, as amended, so as to bring within the provisions of such acts any person operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of a drug rendering such person incapable of operating the motor vehicle safely (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF AIR FORCE CONTRACT WITH THOMPSON RAMO-WOOLDRIDGE, INC., CLEVELAND, OHIO

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of the pricing of fuel booster pump repair kits under Department of the Air Force negotiated contract AF 01(601)–20268, with Thompson Ramo-Wooldridge, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio, dated May 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PERMISSION FOR SECRETARY OF INTERIOR TO REVOKE THE SCHOOL AND AGENCY FARM RESERVE ON LAC DU FLAMBEAU RESERVATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit the Secretary of the Interior to revoke in whole or in part the school and agency farm reserve on the Lac du Flambeau Reservation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of the channel improvement feature of the authorized project for the Mississippi River and tributaries (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

MEMORIALS

Memorials were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Memorials signed by Mrs. James King and sundry other citizens of the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the adoption of the resolution (S. Res. 94) relating to the recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in certain disputes hereafter arising; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

H.R. 9449. An act to amend certain sections of title 14, United States Code, relating to personnel matters in the U.S. Coast Guard, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1345).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 1545. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize elimination of a hearing in certain cases under section 408 (Rept. No. 1344);

S. 2375. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide an exemption from the provisions of such part for the emergency transportation of any motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce by towing (Rept. No. 1343); and

S. 2867. A bill to give effect to the convention between the United States of America and Cuba for the conservation of shrimp, signed at Habana, August 15, 1958 (Rept. No. 1346).

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT, RELATING TO ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN AFFIDAVITS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on behalf of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 2929) to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to repeal certain provisions requiring affidavits of belief, and I submit a report (No. 1347) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with minority views of Senators GOLDWATER, DIRKSEN, and BRUNSDALE, and the individual views of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar, and the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3535. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit certain ministers who have heretofore elected coverage as self-employed individuals for social security purposes to have their election for such coverage made effective with respect to their first taxable year after 1955; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 3536. A bill for the relief of Yee Mee Hong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

S. 3537. A bill to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 3538. A bill for the relief of Aurelia Viernes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3539. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments and private organizations and individuals for special meteorological services; and

S. 3540. A bill to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) (by request):

S. 3541. A bill to provide additional financial facilities in the Federal National Mortgage Association, to provide for the incorporation of Federal mortgage investment companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3542. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act by excluding express companies from the provisions of the fourth section; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RESOLUTION

STUDY FOR DETERMINATION OF POLICY ON NATIONAL CEMETERIES

Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MOSS, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. MCGEE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 321), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to national cemeteries with a view to establishing and effectuating a uniform national policy with respect to the establishing and maintaining of such national cemeteries.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from the date on which this resolution is agreed to until January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

UTILIZATION BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE OF CERTAIN FUNDS FOR METEOROLOGICAL SERVICES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments and private organizations and individuals for special meteorological services. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3539) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments and private organizations and individuals for special meteorological services, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1960.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are attached four copies of a proposed bill "to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments and private organizations and individuals for special meteorological services."

There are also attached four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that it would interpose no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP A. RAY,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO UTILIZE FUNDS RECEIVED FROM STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS FOR SPECIAL METEOROLOGICAL SERVICES

The Weather Bureau has often been requested by various State and local governments as well as private organizations and individuals to provide or undertake special meteorological investigations, tests, services, development projects, technical evaluations and other similar activities which the personnel and facilities of the Weather Bureau are specially capable of carrying out. It has become increasingly difficult for the Weather Bureau to perform such functions, which ordinarily cannot be effectively undertaken by any other organizations, because of the lack of adequate statutory authorization to utilize funds for these purposes which the requesting public or private agency would be willing to provide. The purpose of this proposed legislation is to enable the Weather Bureau to accept and use funds provided by State and local governments and private organizations and individuals for special services required by them which cannot be financed from available Weather Bureau resources.

Some instances in which the authorization herein proposed could be utilized for the benefit of local needs are as follows:

1. The State of California is embarking on a large-scale water resources program (headed by its new department of water resources) for which it requires a large increase in precipitation stations, in reporting, in maintenance, and inspection of stations, and in processing of data. The Weather Bureau's responsibility is national, with its available funds actually insufficient to cover the local needs of California. The State is willing to pay for the increase required to meet its needs. The necessary funds cannot be accepted and utilized by the Bureau unless the proposed legislation is enacted.

2. In 1955 the Kansas Water Resources Factfinding and Research Committee recommended to the Governor and legislature a "cooperative program with the U.S. Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Geological Survey, U.S. Weather Bureau, and U.S. Soil Conservation Service for comprehensive research in hydrology of small watersheds, requiring detailed data on all aspects of the water cycle and effects of man's operation. Estimated State funds, $150,000 per year for 20 years to be matched by Federal funds." But of the four Federal agencies mentioned, only the Weather Bureau cannot now accept and utilize the State funds.

3. Many thousands of communities on lesser tributaries and in headwater areas suffer devastating flash floods. With the support of the Weather Bureau's national main stem and tributary flood forecasting system and its developing radar network, these communities could be warned effectively in many cases after establishment of special local observational and reporting networks and communications, development of localized forecast and warning procedures, and educational liaison in planning actions based on warnings. The costs may average only a few thousand dollars per community per year. There are thousands of such communities, and the Bureau is able to serve only a token few with its available funds. The job could be done wherever the community felt it was sufficiently needed to pay for it—if the Bureau could accept and use funds made available by the community.

4. Fire-Weather Service of the Weather Bureau is another service which operates on a cost-sharing basis in many instances and which is handicapped in its operation by lack of adequate legislative authority. The service provides day-to-day forecasts and advices during the fire season and issues detailed localized operational forecasts for going fires. The Bureau is subject to a heavy demand from forest protection agencies for an expansion of this service to new areas. In most cases it is unable to provide the needed assistance. Enactment of the proposed legislation would greatly facilitate arrangements to provide additional badly needed services of this nature where Federal funds are not available but State or local governments are willing to help.

5. Agricultural weather services, particularly those requiring highly localized and detailed forecasts and special instrumentation, would be greatly benefited by enactment of the proposed legislation. This type of service cannot be adequately handled through the general forecast service and as a rule it is of direct benefit to a relatively small segment of the population. Accordingly, such services are often arranged on a cost-sharing basis where the recipients of the service assume a share of the costs involved.

The Horticultural Protection Service which operates in Florida, California, Washington, Oregon, and a few other States is a good example of a specialized weather service that often uses cost-sharing procedures. Under present law the cooperating agency is limited to furnishing such items as communication expenses and office quarters while the full salary of the employee must be paid by the Federal Government. This seriously limits the number of points where such service can be provided since the major expense must continue to be handled by the Federal Government. The Bureau has had many requests from all parts of the country for more agricultural weather service of the abovementioned type. Although cost sharing is one good way of furnishing more service of this kind, the Bureau is seriously handicapped by the present inability to utilize funds which the localities would be willing to furnish.

6. The Weather Bureau has, in the past few years, received several requests for special observations and assistance in the field of air pollution. Two specific examples of recent origin are the reques^ from the Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District for the reinstitution of intermediate upper air soundings at Santa Monica, Calif., and the request from the San Diego County Air Pollution District for additional wind installations and additional upper air soundings in the vicinity of San Diego. There have been other similar requests in the past. The Bureau has generally met such requests either by declining on the basis of inadequate funds or, where consultation work and a minimum of observations would suffice, arranging for support through other agencies such as the Public Health Service or the Atomic Energy Commission. In light of the increased interest in air pollution, it can be expected that the number of these requests will increase, particularly for specialized observational data such as low-level radiosondes and additional wind measurements. The Bureau will be unable to accommodate most of these requests unless it can accept reimbursement.

On December 22, 1955, the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy recommended "continued cooperation with States and municipalities should be encouraged. Such cooperation serves to supplement the basic data programs of the Federal Government in fields in which there is substantial joint interest. State and local participation contributes to the fundamental programs for interpretation, analysis, and research which are primarily national in character and extent beyond the interests of any single geographical area. Federal matching of State financial support for data programs on a 50–50 basis has been mutually satisfactory and should continue to be a sound basis for such cooperation. Authorization for cooperative participation should be provided if necessary authorization is lacking."

The Bureau cannot provide the cooperation proposed unless legislation is enacted authorizing it to utilize State funds.

Harvey O. Banks, director of water resources, State of California, in supporting legislation such as here proposed, said: "In many areas, there is need to supplement the basic information now gathered in order that more detailed evaluation may be made of the nature and occurrence of water supplies. California is most vitally interested in the most efficient and complete control and utilization of its water resources to meet the needs of all beneficial uses.

"Therefore, it is the recommendation of the State of California that legislation be enacted by the Congress which would per-

mit agreements permitting cooperative financing between the Weather Bureau and non-Federal agencies under which the trained personnel of the Weather Bureau might be assigned to these cooperative endeavors to obtain and develop information and to make analyses thereof, in addition to that gathered under the Bureau's present basic responsibilities. If this legislation is enacted, we expect to take advantage of it, by entering into such a cooperative agreement at an early date."

Enactment of the bill transmitted herewith will make it possible for the Weather Bureau to provide more effective service to our localities and industry. We urge its prompt, favorable consideration by Congress.

EXCEPTIONS TO RULES OF NAVIGATION IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Under Secretary of Commerce, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3540) to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1960.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Department of Commerce has prepared and submits herewith, as a part of the legislative program for the 86th Congress, 2d session, a draft of proposed bill to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases.

The proposed legislation is intended to permit the relatively few vessels having lights and day signals which extend vertically above the understructure of a bridge to depart from the rules of navigation that are ordinarily applicable on the particular waterway. It is proposed that the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating be authorized to prescribe such special rules, to be observed by vessels navigating under or near certain bridges, as in his judgment the public safety may require for the prevention of collisions.

The need for legislation along the lines of the proposed bill is established in the Department of Commerce report on "Navigational Clearance Requirements for Highway and Railroad Bridges," published in February 1955. The Bureau of Public Roads of this Department has been striving during recent years to obtain reasonable reductions in the navigational clearances required for highway bridges constructed with Federal-aid highway funds, with the objective of reducing the cost of the navigational increment of highway bridges whenever and wherever it is feasible without unduly affecting the reasonable requirements of waterway transportation. One of the problems involved is the need for relatively high navigational clearances to permit vessels engaged in coastal trade to operate on inland waters with navigational lights that conform to the international rules of the road. The international rules necessitate the carrying of navigational lights at an elevation substantially higher than that required under the rules applicable on inland waters and navigational lights which conform to the international rules are in some cases permissible and in some cases required on seagoing vessels operating on inland waterways. On the other hand, navigational lights which conform to the rules generally applicable to inland waterways, do not meet the requirements of the international rules.

Studies of bridge costs indicate that substantial amounts of additional funds are required to construct bridges with vertical clearances sufficient to pass vessels equipped with the navigational lights required under international rules over that which is required to pass vessels equipped with the navigational lights required under the rules applicable on inland waters. The matter is also pertinent with respect to movable bridges. In many instances, vessels operating with navigational lights required under the rules applicable on inland waters can pass under existing movable bridges in closed position, but it is necessary to open these bridges for the same or similar vessels if they are equipped with navigational lights required under the international rules. This is particularly important in urban areas where the large volume of highway traffic delayed by the bridge opening results in a substantial economic loss to the community.

It is believed that the enactment of the proposed legislation would result in savings in bridge construction and operation costs which would benefit principally the Federal aid, State, and local highway programs. The proposed legislation, and the special rules that would be issued thereto, would provide official recognition for effective treatment of a rapidly growing problem in surface transportation relationships.

The enclosed draft bill is based upon section 4 of a draft bill submitted to the Congress on February 18, 1959, which, among other things, would amend section 502 of the General Bridge Act of 1946. S. 1126 and H.R. 7153, 86th Congress, 1st session, are identical to this earlier draft bill. It is now believed desirable and appropriate that the matters presented herein be considered as separate legislation.

The Department of Commerce recommends this proposed legislation for favorable consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP A. RAY,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES ACT OF 1960—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 10777) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961—AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am today submitting, for printing and appropriate reference, an amendment to the independent offices appropriations bill which would prevent Federal funds from being used to help construct airport terminals which will contain racially segregated facilities, including segregated waiting rooms, restaurant facilities and restrooms.

A 1955 regulation bans the use of funds under the Federal-aid airport program for "the development of separate facilities of space in airport buildings when such facilities or space are designed for use now or in the future for separate racial groups." However, I have learned that approximately $600,000 under this program has been spent on plant construction in five airports to contain segregated facilities located in Birmingham and Montgomery, Ala.; in Meridian and Natchez, Miss.; and Tallahassee, Fla. In each case, local authorities complied with the FAA requirement in using Federal Government money but local funds were used to construct the particular facilities which were segregated. Nearly half a million dollars in the pending Federal-aid airport appropriations request is earmarked, according to the Federal Aviation Agency, for terminal construction grants to the Birmingham and Tallahassee airports which currently maintain segregated facilities.

I was surprised to learn from an exchange of letters with the FAA that the Agency permits Federal funds to aid in the construction of airport administration buildings including passenger terminals which contain facilities constructed with local funds which are segregated—like waiting rooms, eating facilities and restrooms. The fact that local funds and not Federal funds are actually used to build such segregated facilities within the federally aided airport building is absolutely no reason for avoiding our national policy against segregation.

The very existence of such segregated public facilities has been ruled as illegal repeatedly by the U.S. courts on the grounds that they violate rights guaranteed under the 14th amendment of the Constitution. Therefore, allowing local authorities in Southern States to build what amounts to segregated "oases" inside buildings constructed with hundreds of thousands of dollars of Federal Government aid looks like tacit approval of a procedure we would not countenance directly. Surely to the average air traveler, the impression is created that the Federal Government has been a partner in the undertaking.

General Quesada states in his letter to me of April 15:

> The Federal Aviation Agency does not require any local airport owner or operator to placard or otherwise designate segregated facilities as having been built solely with local funds, or that the Federal Government does not support such indices of segregation.

I believe that the Federal Aviation Agency and General Quesada are just as opposed as I am to segregated facilities in airports, but I regret to say that to my mind whatever may be its construction of its mandate, there can be no such thing as the Agency's position that it is not responsible if local authorities choose to sidestep the Federal law; this position seems to me to contradict established policy and vigorous efforts of the Eisenhower administration to condemn and end segregation practices in

all programs in which the Federal Government is directly involved as I have described.

It was President Eisenhower who saw to it that previous Executive orders banning segregation in the armed services were fully implemented. He established both a Government Employment Policies Committee and a Committee on Government Contracts to help end discrimination in employment. He saw to it there was prompt compliance in the District of Columbia with the Supreme Court's order for desegregation of the public schools. And in 1957, the administration proposed broad-scale civil rights legislation which led to the enactment of the first major bill in that field in some 80 years and again this year, a voting rights bill was passed to strengthen the Attorney General's hand in cases brought under the 1957 act.

Also, in the FAA's own field, transportation, the Interstate Commerce Commission under this administration ended "Jim Crowism" in interstate bus and train travel, and has sought to end segregated facilities in passenger terminals despite the fact that no Federal funds were involved in their construction.

That stacks up as a good record and should be further buttressed with action to prevent segregated facilities in airline terminals.

It should be clearly understood that facilities or equipment which contribute to air safety are not involved; as they can be established separately from airport terminal construction. The funds which my amendment would affect pertain solely to administration buildings including passenger terminals, and there the expenditure of these funds should be authorized in such a way as to promote—not to tend to frustrate—national policy which clearly does not condone segregated facilities for use by interstate travelers. Commitments already made are a problem but I cannot see that we can avoid scrutiny of the whole matter on that account, if we did we might never catch up with the situation if appropriations succeeded instead of preceding commitments.

Hearings are scheduled to begin next Monday, May 16, before the Senate Appropriations Committee on the independent offices bill which contains the Federal aid airport program including the request for nearly $500,000 to help pay for the completion of terminal construction for the airports in Birmingham and Tallahassee which will contain segregated facilities. I hope that the committee will have an opportunity to delve thoroughly into this contemplated expenditure and look with favor on my amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed in the RECORD, together with my exchange of correspondence with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and a copy of the 1956 memorandum setting forth the airport building policy followed by the FAA in dealing with localities which desire to build segregated facilities within the federally aided airport buildings.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment, correspondence and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

On page 10, line 9, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following:

"*Provided*, That no payments shall be made out of appropriations for the liquidation of contract obligations entered into under such authority, which provide for the construction of airport terminal buildings containing racially segregated dining or other facilities, whether or not the portions of such buildings containing such segregated facilities have been constructed without Federal contributions."

The correspondence and memorandum presented by Mr. JAVITS are as follows:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1960.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: I am pleased to answer the questions you asked me in your letter of March 30, 1960, pertaining to the Montgomery, Ala., airport.

For your convenience, I shall restate your questions in the order in which you asked them.

1. Would the Agency have approved a project which omitted dining and restroom facilities completely if the State refused to permit the inclusion of desegregated facilities in an integral project?

The Federal Aviation Agency would approve a project which omitted dining and restroom facilities under such circumstances. The Federal Aviation Agency does not presently participate in the costs of constructing dining facilities. In numerous instances, we have approved projects which omitted dining facilities and we do so now. Because of the need of funds for high priority safety facilities such as runways, lighting, taxiways, proper approaches, etc., there are no allocations of funds in 1960 for terminal building construction. Additionally, our 1961 program contains only one allocation of funds for terminal construction and that building is on the Butte, Mont., airport. In almost all circumstances, we would require restrooms to be provided. However, if a sponsor proposed to provide such facilities on a segregated basis, we would deny to that sponsor any Federal funds for application to that purpose.

2. Is there any requirement of physical separation of the facilities paid for by local government and those in which the Federal Government shared other than the computation of costs for those areas (including allocated cost of shared foundations, heating facilities, and other common services) determined on a computed basis?

There is no requirement that such facilities be physically separated from those which are built in part with Federal funds.

3. Is there any indication to the public using these facilities, which I assume are commonly known as being federally assisted, to make clear to them that the Federal Government is not supporting these indices of segregation?

The Federal Aviation Agency does not require any local airport owner or operator to placard or otherwise designate segregated facilities as having been built solely with local funds, or that the Federal Government does not support such indices of segregation.

4. Is it a proper Federal policy to encourage, or even permit, any effort to circumvent the Federal Government's policy against discrimination in such facilities as clearly and repeatedly interpreted by the Supreme Court?

As we stated to Mr. LeFlore in our correspondence, a copy of which we sent to you, our policy does not, in our opinion, encourage segregation. In fact, our experience indicates that our policy has the opposite effect.

The Federal Airport Act has been amended numerous times by the Congress. It has always been informed as to the administration of the act and has not seen fit to require local sponsors of Federally aided airport projects to desegregate facilities constructed solely with local funds in order to obtain Federal funds for construction of needed facilities. The Federal Airport Act requires the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to consider projects which are necessary to provide a system of public airports adequate to anticipate and meet the needs of civil aeronautics. We believe our policy has served effectively to enable the Federal Aviation Agency to meet and carry out its responsibilities to promote needed airport development and, at the same time, to deny financial assistance for construction of facilities for use by separate racial groups.

If I can be of further service to you, please let me know.

Sincerely,

E. R. QUESADA,
Administrator.

MARCH 30, 1960.

Hon. E. R. QUESADA,
Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL QUESADA: I have read with great interest the letter to me of March 14 of Mr. Daggett H. Howard, General Counsel of the FAA respecting a situation which was called to my attention by citizens of Mobile, Ala., which involves a discrimination in facilities constructed through the use of Federal funds. I am seriously concerned that the expression of the FAA's policy in this letter permits the use of Federal funds for a facility while continuing racially discriminatory policies in violation of the 14th amendment. This apparent policy of permitting the use of Federal funds for the construction of all terminal facilities except some arbitrarily separated sections which the State wishes to segregate appears to be not only frustrating of a proper national policy, but also tends to encourage denial of the constitutional rights of American citizens.

For example, the file forwarded to me by Mr. Howard indicates that the terminal at Mobile, Ala., was financed in part by Federal funds, except that the restrooms, waiting rooms, dining rooms and kitchen areas, comprising 5,405 square feet of space, were paid for entirely by the locality apparently so that they could be segregated.

In view of this situation, I would very much appreciate your comments on the following questions:

1. Would the Agency have approved a project which omitted dining and restroom facilities completely if the State refused to permit the inclusion of desegregated facilities in an integral project?

2. Is there any requirement of physical separation of the facilities paid for by local government and those in which the Federal Government shared other than the computation of costs for those areas (including allocated cost of shared foundations, heating facilities, and other common services) determined on a computed basis?

3. Is there any indication to the public using these facilities, which I assume are commonly known as being Federally assisted, to make clear to them that the Federal

Government is not supporting these indices of segregation?

4. Is it a proper Federal policy to encourage, or even permit, any effort to circumvent the Federal Government's policy against discrimination in such facilities as clearly and repeatedly interpreted by the Supreme Court?

Your comments on this most disturbing matter will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1960.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Your memorandum of February 12, 1960, pertaining to Mr. LeFlore's letter of February 2, 1960, has been referred to this office for reply.

We have had several exchanges of correspondence with Mr. LeFlore relating to the terminal building at the Montgomery, Ala., airport. We are enclosing copies of Mr. LeFlore's letters to the Agency and the replies thereto.

We believe that our letters to Mr. LeFlore explain that no violation of the Agency policy in connection with construction of the terminal building in question has occurred.

We are also returning the copy of Mr. LeFlore's letter transmitted with your memorandum.

Sincerely yours,

DAGGETT H. HOWARD,
General Counsel.

JANUARY 22, 1960.

MR. J. L. LEFLORE,
Mobile, Ala.

DEAR MR. LEFLORE: We conclude from reading your letter of January 7, 1960, that you apparently have misinterpreted our letter to you dated December 4, 1959. We are glad to further explain our policy pertaining to segregation of the races at those public airports where Federal-aid airport funds have been expended.

Since the inception of our policy, which we quoted in our preceding letter, no Federal-aid airport funds have been expended for the development of facilities or space in the terminal building at Dannelly Field for use by separate racial groups. The terminal building in question was constructed in part with Federal funds. However, that portion of the terminal building intended for use by separate racial groups was financed wholly by the city of Montgomery. This portion includes the rest rooms, waiting rooms, dining rooms, and kitchen area comprising 5,405 square feet of space for which, in accordance with our policy, no Federal funds were spent.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. BOYLE,
(For Daggett H. Howard, General Counsel.)

THE CITIZENS' COMMITTEE,
Mobile, Ala., January 7, 1960.

MR. DAGGETT H. HOWARD,
General Counsel, Federal Aviation Agency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOWARD: This is to acknowledge your letter of December 4, 1959, with regard to segregation complaints made in certain communications of ours to the Federal Aviation Agency relative to separate waiting rooms at the Montgomery Airport and train and bus stations or depots at Biloxi, Miss., and Selma and Montgomery, Ala.

The opinion stated by you with regard to the Montgomery Airport waiting room segregation question has perturbed several competent attorneys who have studied the matter since your December 4 letter was received.

In connection with the Biloxi waiting room segregation policy, enforced by police power, the matter was brought to the attention of the Federal Aviation Agency in view of a suggestion offered in a letter from the Department of Justice. Biloxi is the location of the Keesler Air Force Base.

The Montgomery situation, where a new airport was constructed with the aid of Federal funds and where separate waiting rooms are maintained for white and colored Americans, with segregation enforced by the city, is confusing to us because of the opinion expressed by you which, we feel, negates the general policy of the Federal Aviation Agency on the racial proscription question.

You quoted the Aviation Agency's policy for administering the Federal aid airport program, Code of Federal Regulations, title 14, part 550.23, .24 and .25, subsection 24(i)(5), to read as follows:

"No Federal aid airport program funds will be made available for the development of separate facilities or space in an airport building when such facilities or space are designed for use now or in the future for separate racial groups."

Your assertion that this policy was complied with fully seeks to ignore the fact that segregation of the races is now being practiced at the Montgomery Airport which, in our opinion, stultifies the purposes of the said subsection 24(i)(5).

May we respectfully inquire of you as to whether the word "future" in the said subsection 24(i)(5) has any significance whatever relative to the present segregation policy at the Montgomery Airport?

With every good wish, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

J. L. LEFLORE,
Director, Civil Rights Casework.

DECEMBER 4, 1959.

MR. JOHN L. LEFLORE,
Mobile, Ala.

DEAR MR. LEFLORE: We have several letters from you, two dated November 9, 1959, and two others dated respectively November 14 and November 20, 1959, with reference to discrimination at the municipal airport in Montgomery and at railroad and bus stations serving airfields on military installations at Biloxi, Selma, and Montgomery.

This agency has no jurisdiction or authority to take action with reference to any military installations or any railroad or bus terminals.

Your letter of November 14 referred to the use of Federal funds in the construction of the Montgomery airport. The general policy of this agency for administering the Federal aid airport program is published in the Code of Federal Regulations, title 14, part 550.23, .24, and .25.

Subsection 24(i)(5) of the part contains the following statement:

"No Federal aid airport program funds will be made available for the development of separate facilities or space in an airport building when such facilities or space are designed for use now or in the future for separate racial groups."

This policy was complied with fully in the construction of the terminal at the Montgomery airport.

Apart from the stated policy, you realize, of course, that the Federal Government does not certificate airports and that the airport in Montgomery is owned and operated by the city of Montgomery and is subject to its sole control.

The authority of this Agency with reference to the matters described in your letters is confined to the administration of the grant program within the limitations of the approved policies referred to above.

Sincerely yours,

DAGGETT H. HOWARD,
General Counsel.

AIRPORTS POLICY AND PROCEDURE MEMORANDUM NO. 41

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1955.

To: All holders of the Office of Airports Field Operations Manual.

From: Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

Subject: Airport building policy—segregation.

Programing Standard G(3), as stated in the "Policies and Procedures" booklet, dated October 1, 1955, reads as follows:

"(3) No Federal-aid airport program funds will be made available for the development of separate facilities or space in an airport building when such facilities or space are designed for use now or in the future for separate racial groups."

The purpose and intent of the policy expressed in this programing standard is to prevent the use of Federal funds to further or to increase racial segregation in airport buildings. Under this policy, Federal-aid airport program funds will not be used in the construction or reconstruction of any areas of a building which are intended for use by separate racial groups.

It will, therefore, be required, prior to the issuance of a grant offer for any project involving a building, that the chief executive officer of the sponsor of each building project clearly state, in writing, whether or not it is the intent of the sponsor that all of the areas and facilities in the building will be available without regard to race, creed, or color, and are intended to be operated on a nonsegregated basis.

If not, it will be necessary that the written statement describe those areas and facilities within the building which are intended for segregated use.

If so, a simple written statement to this effect will suffice, unless the building will, upon completion, contain separate facilities, such as two or more waiting rooms, two or more dining areas, or two or more sets of sanitary facilities (a set consisting of one rest room for men and one rest room for women), etc. In this event, the sponsor's written statement shall, in addition, specifically point out the reason for providing such duplicate facilities and the intent of the sponsor in providing them.

If the written statement of the sponsor describes areas within the building that are intended for segregated use, such areas will not be eligible for, and will be excluded from, Federal-aid airport program participation. This will be accomplished by a special provision in the grant offer clearly specifying the ineligible space.

Where single facilities (one waiting room, one dining area or one set of sanitary facilities) are provided, from which it is intended that any person will be excluded on the basis of race, creed or color, such segregated areas will be excluded from the project.

Where duplicate facilities are provided, intended for segregated use, the areas involved in such duplicate facilities will be excluded from the project. For example:

(a) If separate waiting rooms for segregated use are provided, all waiting room areas will be excluded.

(b) If separate dining areas are provided for segregated use, all dining, kitchen and related areas will be excluded.

(c) If separate sanitary facilities are provided for segregated use, all areas involving sanitary facilities will be excluded.

This policy will apply to all types of building construction work, including the construction of new buildings, the construction of additions to existing buildings, and the remodeling, alteration or repair of existing buildings, and will apply whether the work

consists of the completion of a facility or its partial completion, such as the roughing-in of utilities.

The allowable costs of a building project, which include space and/or facilities excluded from Federal participation in the grant agreement, will be determined on the basis of an equitable distribution of the costs of the eligible and ineligible space and/or facilities. This, of course, should be taken into consideration in computing the maximum obligation of the Government as stated in the grant offer.

Any unusual cases which are not clearly covered by this policy will be presented to the Administrator for final determination.

C. J. LOWE.

AMENDMENT AND EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 3361, to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, introduced by me on April 14, 1960.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON GOVERNMENT PATENT POLICY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Standing Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce that the subcommittee has scheduled public hearings on Government patent policy, to commence on Tuesday, Mav 17, 1960.

The hearing is set for 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

The following is the general order for appearances of witnesses: U.S. Senators; the heads of the following departments and agencies: General Accounting Office; Health, Education, and Welfare; Veterans' Administration; General Services Administration; Post Office Department; Tennessee Valley Authority; National Science Foundation; Department of Agriculture, and the Department of the Treasury.

Anyone wishing to file a statement for the record should communicate immediately with the office of the Senate Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights Subcommittee, room 349A, Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D.C,, telephone Capitol 4–3121 or Government Code 180, extension 2268.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Address by him delivered before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce on May 4, 1960.

TRIBUTE TO VERNON L. TALBERTT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, today we are celebrating an anniversary which is of great sentimental value to all Members of the Senate. This is the 50th anniversary of the day that Vernon L. Talbertt entered on his long career of Senate employment.

I am sure every Senator knows and respects Vernon Talbertt. He is the Chief Messenger in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, and, Mr. President, he has already become part of the history of the Senate.

He has served for half a century, and under Secretaries going all the way back to Charles G. Bennett of New York.

History has been written before his eyes, and his calm approach and his always judicious temperament have made an important contribution to the smooth operation of the Senate. I believe that every Senator considers Vernon L. Talbertt to be a personal friend, and we want him to know that we wish him a very happy anniversary, with many more to come.

One of the fine things about service in this great deliberative body is the loyalty, the efficiency, the dedication of so many faithful employees. I doubt that there is any institution in this country that, over the years, has produced men and women who serve more faithfully, more competently, and more loyally than do the employees of the U.S. Senate; and Vernon Talbertt is one of the examples of those who possess those attributes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how well and true it was said long ago that they also serve who only stand and wait. In this connection I think of Vernon Talbertt, who for 50 years, with the exception of a short period of military service, has served the Senate and the office of the Secretary of the Senate under both Republican and Democrat administrations and has done it in such a gracious and efficient manner as to evoke the praise and the respect of all who came to know him.

When he came into the service of the Secretary of the Senate as a messenger on May 12, 1910, the 61st Congress was in session, and to me it is always interesting to go back and pick up the historical stitches to get a better idea of what is implied by 50 years of continuous service.

In the Senate of the United States when Vernon Talbertt first came to duty in the Secretary's office, the Senate roll, among others, included such history-making names as Oscar Underwood, of Alabama, William E. Borah, of Idaho, Shelby Cullom, of Illinois, and Albert Beveridge, of Indiana. It included Charles Curtis, of Kansas, who later became Vice President. It included Henry Cabot Lodge, and the celebrated wit, Chauncey Depew, of New York. It included Elihu Root, who became Secretary of State. It included Boies Penrose, of Pennsylvania, Robert M. La-Follette, of Wisconsin, Nelson Aldrich, of Rhode Island, whom we always remember in connection with the tariff. It included Benjamin R. Tillman, who, I think, was known as "Pitchfork Ben." It included Reed Smoot, of Utah. All these men made history, and their names became familiar to several generations of Americans. They were here when Vernon Talbertt entered service in the Senate.

In the House of Representatives, in the 61st Congress, was Joseph Knowland, of California, the father of my distinguished predecessor, the former minority leader, Senator Knowland.

The House roll also included James Mann, of Illinois, regarded as probably one of the outstanding parliamentarians who ever came to Congress. It included also Frank O. Lowden, of Illinois, who married the daughter of Mr. Pullman, of Pullman car fame, and who later became Governor of Illinois. It included the very colorful Joseph G. Cannon, the Speaker, of Danville, Ill. It included William Fordney, of tariff fame, from Michigan, and Cordell Hull, of Tennessee, who later came to the Senate, and then became a distinguished Secretary of State. It included James Tawney, of Minnesota, who became the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and whose son is a part of the staff of the minority leader. It included Andrew Volstead, whose name for generations was associated with all things dry and, shall I say, ultratemperate. It included George Norris, of Nebraska, who later came to the Senate, and also Nicholas Longworth, son-in-law of Theodore Roosevelt, who was to become the Speaker of the House. It included Carter Glass, of Virginia, who told me once he never made a speech in the House in 13 years, which indicates how guarded he was, and yet what distinguished service he rendered, not only in the House of Representatives, but in the Senate of the United States. It also included Frank Mondell, of Wyoming, who became the Republican leader in the House.

They were all here in the House and in the Senate when Vernon Talbertt began his services with the Secretary of the Senate on May 12, 1910, as a messenger; and when Vernon Talbertt entered Senate service, Alaska, Arizona, Hawaii, and New Mexico were all territories; they were not States. So he has seen four stars added to the flag in the time of his service in the Senate.

I think it makes a person conscious of the fact that the life of the Republic is just an endless stream and that this Republic is still young, for it takes less than four periods of service such as that of Vernon Talbertt to span the whole life of this Republic. It is not time that marches on, but it is men who march through time, and as they do, they make history, in one way or another.

So Vernon Talbertt, in his quiet and gentle and gracious way, has also made history by his outstanding service, and when I say outstanding service, I include humble service to others who have served here with him.

So today, after 50 years of service, I salute a kindly man, one with a kindly face. I have frequently said to Mr. Johnston, Secretary of the Senate, that I have never encountered a man upon whose countenance there was chiseled the grace and the sweetness that must be a reflection of the inner life of the man.

Today we salute Vernon Talbertt. I am delighted to have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join the leadership in their commendation of Vernon Talbertt, and their congratulations to him on the 50th anniversary of the start of his service in the Senate of the United States. I agree with everything which has already been said by both the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Vernon Talbertt has served eight Secretaries of the Senate, both Republican and Democrat. Possibly the figure should be nine, because of the fact that Leslie Biffle served in that office on two occasions.

Vernon's service to the Senate outdates the service of any Member of the Senate or of the House of Representatives. It has been a service of love on the part of Vernon Talbertt. It has been recognized with respect and affection by the membership of this body. In his way he is truly a great man. He is kind. He is gentle. He is understanding. While the contributions he has made may not go down in the history books of our Nation, nevertheless they will be remembered with affection and respect by all of us who have had the honor to know him, to call him friend, and to see him as the occasion demanded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to join with the leadership and my colleagues in the Senate in paying much deserved and I believe long overdue tribute to Vernon Talbertt, who is the invaluable aid to the Senate Secretary, and who has been the chief messenger of the Senate Secretary's office for these many years.

Vernon is more than a Senate aid. He is a neighbor. He is a friend. He is a companion. I for one wish to thank him for the many kindnesses he has extended to me personally. I thank him for the friendly and happy countenance which is always his, which gives Members of the Senate who, on occasion, become a little brittle, sometimes discouraged and sometimes even distressed, a note of encouragement and a feeling of happiness and contentment.

Vernon Talbertt has served the Senate of the United States for 50 years. The majority leader indicated to me a moment ago that Vernon Talbertt was here when the majority leader was less than 2 years old. Even with the great qualities our majority leader possesses he could hardly have been a Senate leader at that tender age, when Vernon Talbertt was helping U.S. Senators be better Senators and giving them comfort, guidance and helpfulness in those early days.

Vernon Talbertt was here when the senior Senator from Minnesota was yet unknown—unborn. He was here 1 year before my birth. It goes without saying that I should look to him for guidance, since he is my elder and has had so many more years of experience.

What I like best about this man are his genuine qualities of integrity, faithfulness, fidelity, and loyalty not only to his work but also to those with whom he associates.

I say, most respectfully, that certain officers of the Government could take from Vernon Talbertt a good lesson in what we call honorable public service. I suppose there is no man in the U.S. Government who has heard more of the intimacies and more of the problems of Government than has Vernon Talbertt. He listens to Senators talk among themselves, as we say, when they are "with their hair down," talking frankly and candidly. Never a word of what he so hears is ever revealed; never a word is ever spoken. The State Department could well exemplify some of these qualities. When I think of the number of leaks from Federal agencies which seem to find their way into newspaper columns, I suggest that the good qualities of trustworthiness and faithfulness which are exemplified by Vernon Talbertt should be the standard for all good public servants to follow.

I conclude, Mr. President, by saying to our good friend Vernon, he makes our experience in the Senate a little more enjoyable. He makes Senators who occasionally have a tendency to think they are public figures become human beings, simply men, simply people. He has a capacity for soothing the nerves and sort of cleansing the soul and enlightening the mind.

To Vernon Talbertt I express my profound gratitude and appreciation for his personal friendship, for his kindnesses, and for his constant courtesy each and every day.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this is a unique milestone in the life of a loyal and sweet-tempered American who now concludes a half century of service for the U.S. Senate. Vernon Talbertt began his labors in the year in which I was born, and in the swiftly passing intervening years he has seen history unfold in all her allure and her splendor as humankind has falteringly advanced, and, on too many occasions, has encountered her repeating tragedies.

During all that period of time Vernon has had literally a front seat on the center aisle in this free parliamentary body to see the events of the period from 1910 to now unfold. He has seen, on moving occasions, the Congress of our country declare war. He has seen, in equally thrilling moments, the Congress determine to pass legislation in the interest of our people and, if I may say so, in the interest of all mankind.

From time to time I have heard Vernon reminisce, as I have asked him to do so, and speak of some of our predecessors of whom so eloquently our minority leader spoke. I was interested in those who had the honor to represent my State in the days gone by. I have heard Vernon describe some of the outstanding Members of the Senate from California in bygone times. They have been thrilling recollections for me to listen to.

I join my friends on both sides of the aisle in wishing Vernon Talbertt godspeed for many years ahead, and many years of continuing happy service in the Senate, as one who each day has been of invaluable assistance to some of us in easing our way along our pathway in the Senate.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, it has not been my privilege to visit the office of the Secretary of the Senate in recent years as much as I would have liked, although in my first 2 years of service I did most enjoyably frequent that office. Why there has been this change in the last 6 years I suppose is best known to the voters, who have returned a Democratic majority to the Senate of the United States. Nevertheless, I am occasionally the guest of my good friend, the Secretary of the Senate, and it is always a pleasure then to refresh my friendship with and my original impressions of Vernon Talbertt formed in 1953 and 1954.

I remember the impression this very kindly man made upon me. In this day, when people are rather careless about their manners and conduct, I have the impression that Vernon Talbertt's conduct presents what I would call the ultimate in courtesy. He is a kindly and a gentle man in his relationships with all of us, and I presume with everybody. We lay great stress in this body upon senatorial courtesy, which I believe is a very fortunate practice. It makes for restraint. It makes for good feeling when bad feeling might prevail. But in this able friend who has now served 50 years in the Senate, we have one of the outstanding examples of senatorial courtesy, and it is most agreeable to have people work with us who have this concept of courtesy. By their example they inspire all of us perhaps to be more courteous in our relationships with others. So I am very happy to join today in congratulating Vernon Talbertt upon the splendid accomplishment of 50 years of service to the Senate.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I wish to join in the tributes which have been paid to 50 years of courteous, patient and wonderful service in the Senate by Vernon Talbertt. In a unique way he has reflected the dignity, the tradition and the history of the Senate. We compliment him upon a half century of faithful and wonderful service to the greatest legislative body in the world.

The Senate, perhaps foremost among governmental institutions, honors stability, continuity and tradition. It is especially fitting, therefore, that this tribute should be paid to Vernon Talbertt on the completion of a half century with the office of the Secretary of the Senate. I have had the personal opportunity since I came to the Senate to learn of Vernon Talbertt's efficiency, his constant good humor, and his devotion to duty; and it is an especially happy occasion for me to join in the congratulations on this golden anniversary and to wish Vernon many more years of happiness, good health and service to the Senate.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I desire to join the distinguished majority leader, the minority leader, and other Senators in paying justly deserved tribute to the long and faithful service of Vernon Talbertt as assistant to the Secretary of the Senate. Service in the

Senate for a period of 50 years is truly of historical significance. Vernon has seen through the eyes of the Senate, World War I, World War II, the Korean war, and now the extreme difficulties in which we are engaged in the cold war with the Communist world. I have found Vernon to be efficient, able, dedicated, courteous, polite, ever cooperative, faithful in all of his endeavors. I congratulate him on his long, honorable, and efficient service.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I should like to join my many colleagues in the Senate in honoring Vernon Talbertt on his 50th anniversary as a Senate employee. His long record of loyal service should be a source of great pride to him, as I am sure it is an inspiration to all of us who are dedicated to the Senate as an institution. I can well imagine what a deep sense of satisfaction it must be for him to reflect on the many historic moments he has witnessed during his half century of service.

To him go my heartiest congratulations for a job well done and many good wishes for the years to come.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCGEE

Today marks the 50th anniversary of service performed by Vernon Talbertt. Vernon, as he is affectionately known to us in the Senate, has served with dignity and distinction. He has been especially helpful to new Members and their staffs as they assume their duties in the Senate; and I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to this outstanding employee. I wish him well, and trust he will be able to serve the Senate for another 50 years.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it is hard for those of us who have recently come to the Senate to contemplate the full import of 50 years of service to this body. Vernon L. Talbertt, the Chief Messenger in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, who today celebrates his golden anniversary as a Senate employee, was going about his tasks before many of us were born.

There is little one can say that compensates for so many years of steady and devoted service. If his satisfaction in a job well done is half as great as that of the Senate, this should indeed be a gratifying day for him.

From the first time I met Vernon, and on every subsequent occasion, he has been pleasant, courteous, devoted, and efficient. I am sure the many men in public life whom he has served could say the same. We all wish him well.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I feel genuinely privileged to have the opportunity of joining with my colleagues today in honoring a man who has given unselfishly of his confidence, service, and ability to the Senate of the United States for half a century.

To me, Vernon Talbertt, the Chief Messenger of the office of the Secretary, a man who has served eight Secretaries of the Senate, typifies the high purpose and genuine loyalty that pervades this great institution and which motivates all of the employees and staff that serve in making our Government work.

His devotion to duty and quiet efficiency attracted my attention when I first came to the Senate, and the high opinion of this man that I formed then remains to this day.

I look forward to his continued employment in the Senate and hope he will be with us for many more years.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I was saddened to learn that my good friend, the senior Senator from Wyoming, has decided to retire. Having made a similar decision last month, I realize how difficult it is to weigh conflicting personal, family, and political desires. JOE O'MAHONEY has richly earned the right to lay aside the duties and demands of office, but the Senate will suffer a great loss from his absence.

JOE O'MAHONEY was one of four Members now in the Senate serving when I came here 26 years ago. Then already with years of prior experience on Capitol Hill as secretary to the late Senator Kendrick, JOE O'MAHONEY was highly trained in the technicalities of government; and his counsel to me and other incoming Senators was invaluable, as it has been through the years.

I recall with pleasure and was proud of my years of service with him when he was chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which accomplished so much for our country. Subsequently, I became chairman, and when JOE O'MAHONEY returned to the Senate I was pleased that he also returned to the Interior Committee, to which he contributed so much in wise counsel and sound judgment.

Mr. President, I wish to mention two great endeavors of Senator O'MAHONEY which illustrate the foresight that has characterized his legislative endeavors. He was coauthor of the O'Mahoney-Milliken amendment, which reserves to upper basin States the use of waters arising in those States prior to use for navigation. Rural electric cooperative leaders in the upper Missouri basin have an ever-deepening appreciation of this provision of law, enacted 16 years ago, and now being cited in protection of our rights.

Perhaps JOE O'MAHONEY's greatest contribution to this Nation was his brilliant leadership as chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee. I think it is fair to state that the TNEC study, conducted by JOE O'MAHONEY, was the first exhaustive, thorough and workmanlike evaluation of this Nation's economy. The TNEC study laid some of the groundwork for the Employment Act of 1946, and JOE O'MAHONEY properly served, with distinction, as first chairman of the Joint Committee established by the Employment Act of 1946.

I wish you good health, JOE, and many pleasant years of retirement for you and Mrs. O'Mahoney.

PROSPECTIVE RETIREMENT OF SENATOR O'MAHONEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, when I heard that my dear friend, Senator O'MAHONEY, had made up his mind not to be a candidate for reelection, that announcement brought back memories of my association with him, through the years, on subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee. At this same time, I should like to pay a brief tribute to this distinguished and outstanding Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, in the last 2 days several Members of this body have expressed their regrets because of the announcement of the very able senior Senator from Wyoming that he will not be a candidate for reelection. My good colleague from Texas, the majority leader, appropriately commented that few men who have served in this body have rendered more dedicated or more patriotic service than has the Senator from Wyoming, Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY.

The senior Senator from New York, who was acting minority leader during the Tuesday session, paid his tribute as a Republican to Senator O'MAHONEY and to his unusual abilities as a lawyer.

I should like to add a few comments relating to the dedicated work and accomplishments of Senator O'MAHONEY, with whom I have had the pleasure of serving in the U.S. Senate and on its committees for more than 20 years.

Senator O'MAHONEY has always been a fighter. He has fought for economic freedom, for the little man, and for American economic and political success. One of his basic beliefs is that "political liberty cannot exist without economic freedom."

In fact, from early childhood, Senator O'MAHONEY learned to be a fighter. After his father died, he studied at night, while he worked in the daytime for a publishing house. He held many odd jobs, and wrote many freelance articles. One of them was entitled "A Hundred Years Hence," and predicted television, nuclear science, and other modern-day marvels.

In 1916, Senator O'MAHONEY went to Cheyenne, Wyo., to make his permanent home there. Ever since, he has stood out as a vocal proponent of the American West. He first came to Washington as secretary to Senator John B. Kendrick, of Wyoming. Later, he served as First Assistant Postmaster General; and in 1934 he was appointed to fill the seat of Senator Kendrick, who died in office. Senator O'MAHONEY has held this seat ever since, with the exception of the years 1952–54.

Senator O'MAHONEY first served on the Judiciary Committee in 1936. When he was reelected to the Senate in 1954, he was again named to the Judiciary Committee; and since then he has played a very vigorous role on that committee and on its Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee—on both of which I have had the privilege of serving with him.

Senator O'MAHONEY has been known for his independence of thought. Although I have not always agreed with his political or his economic thinking, I have

always appreciated his candor, his forthrightness, and his courage.

In the retirement of Senator O'MAHONEY, the U.S. Senate and the American people will lose a devoted servant, a fighting representative, and a constitutional scholar. As a Republican, I naturally must hope that the one who will replace him will be a member of my own party. Yet, as an American, I certainly pray that the stature of the man who will replace him in this body will be equal to that of my dear friend, Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY.

THE SPY BUSINESS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the article in the Washington Post this morning by Mr. Walter Lippmann in which he discusses the present situation resulting from the flight of the U.S. U–2 airplane over the territory of Soviet Russia. As so often is the case, Mr. Lippmann hits the nail squarely on the head. He said:

> Our position now seems to be that because it is so difficult to collect information inside the Soviet Union, it will henceforth be our avowed policy to fly over Soviet territory, using the territory of our allies as bases.

He goes on:

> To avow that we intend to violate Soviet sovereignty is to put everybody on the spot. It makes it impossible for the Soviet Government to play down this particular incident, because now it is challenged openly in the face of the whole world. It is compelled to react because no nation can remain passive when it is the avowed policy of another nation to intrude upon its territory. The avowal of such a policy is an open invitation to the Soviet Government to take the case to the United Nations, where our best friends will be grievously embarrassed.

Mr. President, I was very unhappy and dubious about the announcement of this policy which seems to me to be insupportable throughout the world.

Mr. Lippmann goes on to say in analyzing the situation as to what should or should not have been done:

> The administration should have said that it was investigating the charge and would then take suitable action. We should then have maintained a cool silence.

I have heard it suggested that certain of the committees—the Armed Services Committees—investigate this untimely effort just before the summit conference to secure some information about the Soviet Union. I think it would be just as well to let that effort wait until it can be pursued without further embarrassment to our country and to our present position overseas. However, I suggest that the Foreign Relations Committee should, as quietly and as discreetly as possible, talk with our Secretary of State and see what can be done to get us out of the fix we are in. I am convinced Mr. Lippmann is right. We cannot stand on an avowed policy of violating Soviet airspace and sovereignty. World opinion, our allies, and the United Nations will repudiate that policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article by Mr. Lippmann be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SPY BUSINESS

(By Walter Lippmann)

In the whirl of incidents following the capture of the spy plane the administration has ventured, perhaps the right word for it would be stumbled, into an untenable policy which is entirely unprecedented in international affairs. Our position now seems to be that because it is so difficult to collect information inside the Soviet Union, it will henceforth be our avowed policy to fly over Soviet territory, using the territory of our allies as bases.

Although the intention here is to be candid and honest and also to make the best of a piece of very bad luck, the new policy—which seems to have been improvised between Saturday and Monday—is quite unworkable.

To avow that we intend to violate Soviet sovereignty is to put everybody on the spot. It makes it impossible for the Soviet Government to play down this particular incident because now it is challenged openly in the face of the whole world. It is compelled to react because no nation can remain passive when it is the avowed policy of another nation to intrude upon its territory. The avowal of such a policy is an open invitation to the Soviet Government to take the case to the United Nations, where our best friends will be grievously embarrassed. The avowal is also a challenge to the Soviet Union to put pressure on Pakistan, Turkey, Norway, Japan, and any other country which has usable bases. Our allies are put on the spot because they must either violate international law or disavow the United States.

Because the challenge has been made openly, it is almost impossible to deal with this particular incident by quiet diplomacy.

The reader will, I hope, have noticed that my criticism is that we have made these overflights an avowed policy. What is unprecedented about the avowal is not the spying as such but the claim that spying, when we do it, should be accepted by the world as righteous. This is an amateurish and naive view of the nature of spying.

Spying between nations is, of course, the universal practice. Everybody does it as best he can. But it is illegal in all countries, and the spy if caught is subject to the severest punishment. When the spying involves intrusion across frontiers by military aircraft, it is also against international law. Because spying is illegal, its methods are often immoral and criminal. Its methods include bribery, blackmail, perjury, forgery, murder, and suicide.

The spy business cannot be conducted without illegal, immoral, and criminal activities. But all great powers are engaged in the spy business, and as long as the world is as warlike as it has been in all recorded history there is no way of doing without spying.

All the powers know this and all have accepted the situation as one of the hard facts of life. Around this situation there has developed over many generations a code of behavior. The spying is never avowed and therefore the Government never acknowledges responsibility for its own clandestine activities. If its agent is caught, the agent is expected to kill himself. In any event, he is abandoned to the mercies of the government that he has spied upon.

The spying is never admitted. If it can be covered successfully by a lie, the lie is told.

All this is not a pretty business, and there is no way of prettifying it or transforming it into something highly moral and wonderful. The cardinal rule, which makes spying tolerable in international relations, is that it is never avowed. For that reason it is never defended, and therefore the aggrieved country makes only as much of a fuss about a particular incident as it can make or as it chooses to make.

We should have abided by that rule. When Mr. K. made his first announcement about the plane, no lies should have been told. The administration should have said that it was investigating the charge and would then take suitable action. We should then have maintained a cool silence.

This would have left us, of course, with the unpleasant fact that our spy plane had been caught. What really compounded our trouble, and was such a humiliation to us, is that before we knew how much Mr. K. knew we published the official lie about its being a weather plane. Then, finding ourselves trapped in this blatant and gratuitous lie, we have tried to extricate ourselves by rushing into the declaration of a new and unprecedented policy.

JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER, JR.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the morning newspapers contain news of the death of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. I had the very great privilege of his friendship since 1942, and I regard him as one of the greatest philanthropists and one of the most charitable and Christian gentlemen whom I have ever known. His record of philanthropic and charitable activities speaks for itself to a large extent.

In addition to the great contributions which he made to the church and to the Nation—such as the restoration at Williamsburg—he has done a great deal in private philanthropy and charitable giving which has been not only useful, but inspirational.

I have particularly in mind the occasion in 1942 when I became chairman of the national campaign organization to raise funds for the USO, which was then in its second year. We were given a goal of $32 million to raise for the USO for service to the Armed Forces at that time, shortly after Pearl Harbor. This seemed like a staggering sum to me, but Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., felt that the task was not insurmountable, and that, on the contrary, the amount was probably not nearly so much as we ought to be trying to raise.

I recall that in those days and all through the war he was the principal inspiration to the efforts of that great organization, the United Service Organization, in which the three faiths combined, through their six service organizations, to render assistance and to provide a home away from home to all the men in the Armed Forces.

I recall that as we were about to start our big drive, in the spring of 1942, going to the office of our organization one morning and finding a letter addressed to me from Mr. Rockefeller. I opened it, and out of it fell a check for $1 million. I had never seen anything like it before. I wanted to be sure that what I was seeing was actually so. Therefore I took the letter to my assistant in the next room and asked him if that is what he read too. He said, yes, Mr. Rockefeller had talked to him about it and had decided recently that that was the least he could do.

That is the kind of thing one actually never forgets. However, that was just

the first million dollars he gave to help servicemen during the days of World War II.

I remember calling on him, 2 or 3 years later, at his office, possibly in the late 1940's. I went up on the elevator in Rockefeller Center to the floor on which his offices were located. I said to the attendant who met me as I got off the elevator, "I would like to see Mr. Rockefeller."

He said, "You mean Mr. Junior?"

I said, "I presume so. I should like to see Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr."

He said, "Yes; we call him 'Mr. Junior.'"

Apparently this was a man, like our Vernon Talbertt here in the Senate, who had been in the service of the Rockefeller family for many years. Although Mr. John D. Rockefeller Jr., was then in his seventies, because of the earlier associations these associates of his referred to him as "Mr. Junior."

They always had a very warm affection and respect for him. That is what he inspired in other people.

So I am glad to pay tribute to this great American. Men like him do not come along very often, and when they go, unfortunately, there are no others who take their places.

THE ISSUE IS THE IRON CURTAIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the world is now waiting to see just how far Mr. Khrushchev will go in his political "propaganda tantrum" over the flight of the U–2 plane over Soviet territory.

Frankly, I believe Mr. Khrushchev's blasts are primarily for home consumption. His country's "economic pains" and the growing awareness of the intellectuals of his denial of their political freedom have required this diversionary tactic. The downing of the plane provided a launching pad for a blastoff into orbit, propagandawise. The world can only guess how far he will go.

The wild foray of Khrushchev's blasts and accusations—many of which, if carefully analyzed, are found to be reiterations of old themes—raise this question: Will he jeopardize the summit conference? Will he carry through his suggestion of calling off the President's visit to the Soviet Union? Will he create greater world tensions and furor?

These questions are unanswered in the world's mind.

In addition to a condition of "less than harmony" at home, I believe that Khrushchev's suggested efforts to withdraw the invitation to President Eisenhower to visit the Soviet Union may well be because of his fear of the impact such a visit might have upon the people of Russia.

At a summit conference—if held—we must recognize also that the goals of the East and the West may be at cross purposes. The West is striving to establish a firm foundation upon which to build a lasting peace.

As yet, it has not been possible to conclude that the Soviets want anything else except to finds way and means to further their still avowed goal of world domination. In effect, Khrushchev does not want peace. Rather, he wants to take the world, "piece by piece." His furor demonstrates that the issue of the Iron Curtain is one of the major causes of tension. Khrushchev will be lucky indeed if the furor he is creating does not backlash, by disclosure of the chain of spying, espionage, and subversion which the Communists are carrying out in countries all around the globe.

Wisely, President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Herter, are keeping their eyes on the fundamental goals.

The New York Times today published a constructive editorial entitled "The Issue Is the Iron Curtain." The editorial sheds new light upon this situation, now clouded by Soviet propaganda. Therefore, I request unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ISSUE IS THE IRON CURTAIN

In the face of Premier Khrushchev's campaign to heat up the cold war atmosphere over an incident in rival espionage, President Eisenhower is making a valiant effort to keep world attention focused on the real issues of the day so that the work of safeguarding peace may proceed. These issues, as he again outlined them in his press conference yesterday, are controlled disarmament, Germany and Berlin, and, as a problem suddenly most pressing, East-West relations, in which the Iron Curtain plays a decisive role.

To cope with these issues the President announced that he is going to the East-West summit meeting, beginning in Paris next Monday, and that he still plans to visit Soviet Russia, Japan and Korea. This dispels any doubts about his attendance at the summit. Moreover, far from shirking the issue of the downed American reconnaissance plane, the President proposes to use this very incident to challenge the Soviets to abolish the Iron Curtain as a major cause of suspicion and world tension.

To this end he will again propose his "open skies" plan, which would open up Soviet Russia to the same kind of aerial inspection which the West itself is willing to accept and thereby eliminate fear of a surprise attack. Until this is done, he warned, the United States will continue its intelligence work as a distasteful but essential work, both to safeguard this Nation against an atomic Pearl Harbor and to deter any Soviet attack on the free world.

Somewhat along the same line the President also announced that Soviet observers will be invited to attend the new underground explosions planned by the United States. These explosions are to be part of the joint research program to which the Soviets have agreed, in order to find adequate means of detecting underground tests.

Unfortunately, even as the President spoke, Foreign Minister Gromyko announced in Moscow that the Soviets will again reject the "open skies" plan, as they did in 1955, and that Soviet skies "will remain closed." Premier Khrushchev's latest contribution was to cast such doubt on the wisdom of President Eisenhower's visit to Moscow as in effect to qualify the invitation. As for the feigned Soviet indignation over the American plane, its real character is exposed by the American photographs of Soviet planes reconnoitering over Western bases and by the arrest as spies of two Soviet Embassy members in Switzerland.

COMMEMORATIVE STAMP IN RECOGNITION OF 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED STATES JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on June 21, the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce will hold its annual convention in St. Louis, Mo. That event will mark the 40th anniversary of the Jaycees.

Since its inception, the movement has grown to include 200,000 young men in 3,700 communities in the United States. Internationally, it is estimated that there are now 350,000 in 92 countries and territories.

As we know, the primary purpose of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce is to develop leadership and ability of its individual members. Under the slogan "Leadership Training Through Service to our Communities," the Jaycees have made a tremendous contribution to creating the high-quality leadership that is needed in these challenging times.

Dedicated to preservation of our free enterprise system and the American way of life, the Jaycees also have spearheaded efforts to further strengthen our system at local, State, and National levels.

In recognition of its 40th anniversary, a proposal for a special postage stamp has been submitted to the Postmaster General. As we know, special stamps are issued to depict our country's famous men and women, great events, outstanding organizations, industries, and natural wonders.

During its brief 40-year lifetime, the Jaycees have indeed become a significant organization in our civic, cultural, educational, and economic life.

I am aware, of course, that the decision on the issuance of such stamps is the responsibility of the Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee, which selects the subjects and advises the Post Office Department on their issuance.

Because of the significant role which the Jaycees are playing in the community life in all our States, I join the people of America in congratulating the organization upon its 40th anniversary.

In addition, I shall be happy to add my voice in support of the recommendations which the Post Office Department has already received for the issuance of a special stamp in recognition of the fine role which this organization is playing in American life.

MRS. MAY CRAIG

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I desire to pay special tribute to one of the great ladies of our time and a distinguished member of the Washington press corps, Mrs. May Craig.

After 35 years of covering the Washington scene, May Craig is a national figure. Her daily column, entitled "Inside in Washington," is eagerly read and discussed in thousands of Maine homes. Her warm human interest in people and her persistent drive to get to the heart of every important event are well-known and deeply appreciated by those who

read the Maine newspapers published by the Guy Gannett Publishing Co.

Interestingly enough, although Mrs. Craig is a Maine and, indeed, a New England institution, she was born in Coosaw, S.C., and has lived most of her life in the Nation's Capital. In addition to a brilliant career in the field of journalism, Mrs. Craig has two children. They both now have children of their own. Her friends all know of her justifiable pride in this fine family.

I am sure that I speak for all who have served in Congress from the State of Maine, during Mrs. Craig's long career in Washington, in saying that she is at once fair, straightforward, extremely conscientious, and an infallible judge of that which is most important in the news.

May Craig has performed an invaluable service over the years, in keeping the people of Maine informed on great national issues, and she is also, by her periodic travels on foreign continents, giving us a broader perspective of the vast problems now being faced by the peoples in other lands who are emerging from colonial rule.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to Mrs. Craig which was published in Good Housekeeping magazine for February 1958, and an article entitled "Meet May Craig," written by Patricia Schroth, for the August 1959 issue of Downeast magazine, which is published in Camden, Maine.

At a subsequent date, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of articles which Mrs. Craig wrote for her Maine newspapers in February, March, and April of this year, when she was visiting the African Continent and talked with the leaders and people in all walks of life, from Ethiopia to South Africa. This series constitutes responsible and accurate reporting at its best and should be of interest to many thoughtful Americans who may not ordinarily have access to Mrs. Craig's daily columns.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Good Housekeeping magazine, February 1958]

AS MAY GOES

"As May goes, so goes Maine" might not be an improbable paraphrase of an old saying, for May Craig's incisive "Inside Washington" column in a chain of Maine newspapers has been a must on the breakfast menu of myriad down-Easters for almost 30 years. And she is known to the Nation as an incandescent panelist on the television program "Meet the Press," where her charming smile usually precedes an acute verbal thrust. Southern-born, with bright, bituminous blue eyes, "Miss May" was an accredited war correspondent, and covered bombings in London, the Normandy invasion, the liberation of Paris, the German campaign and occupation, and the Korean war. She has been a Washington radio commentator, is a veteran of Presidential press conferences and campaigns. Famous among women for her 40 almost identical hats, she's also renowned among her male colleagues—for her journalistic prowess and for her suffragist success in such matters as a Senate appropriation for a ladies' restroom in the Press Gallery. Not impertinent, it seems, is a Senate page boy's recent remark to a fellow autograph hound: "I'll give you two Senators for one May Craig."

[From Downeast magazine, August 1959]

MEET MAY CRAIG: NEWS HEN EXTRAORDINARY

(By Patricia Schroth)

"Where * * * do you get the right to thwart the will of Congress?"

The scene was a crowded White House press conference. Congressional complaints about defense budget cuts were hot and heavy, and President Eisenhower's reaction to them was just about as steaming.

The unflinching questioner was May Craig, columnist for the Guy Gannett newspapers of Maine, and former president of the Women's National Press Club.

Called everything from "dynamite in a blue dress" to a "feminine Simon Legree," and, by Franklin D. Roosevelt, a "cheerful little Pollyanna," Mrs. Craig doesn't change her rules for mere Presidents or mere television shows. For one and all she devises questions she thinks are "escapeproof."

Many react to them as Adlai E. Stevenson once did before one "Meet the Press" television show, where she has been a panelist for 12 years. Stevenson wrote:

"DEAR MAY: I shudder at the prospect of facing you again. Please be merciful."

After 35 years of covering the Washington scene, her reputation is formidable for her blunt questions and competent reporting. She does her homework. She also has chalked up a tradition-shattering record on a corollary front: winning for women reporters the same rights as those enjoyed by men in the trade.

A suffragette marcher during Woodrow Wilson's administration, she states the case succinctly: "I believe women are people and, for God's sake, why not."

In one of her first assaults on the once all-male journalism wall, she demanded and got a hearing by the Senate Rules Committee on a petition for a ladies' room in the Senate Press Gallery. The hearing was jammed. Mrs. Craig and three colleagues who made up her "ladies comfort committee," testified. So did a string of opposing male reporters. The ladies won, and one of the mementos in her mountain of scrapbooks is an architect's blueprint of the ladies' room, signed by all members of the powerful Rules Committee.

Mrs. Craig followed that victory with a similar one after a fight before the House Appropriations Committee for a ladies' room in the Press Gallery on that side of the Capitol. As final proof that women were in the Capitol to stay, Mrs. Craig later was elected the first woman member of the standing committee of correspondents that governs the Press Gallery.

One battle which ended in temporary defeat came when she was the lone woman reporter accompanying President Harry S. Truman to a 1947 conference in Brazil. After flying down to Rio, the President and the White House press entourage that followed him were scheduled to return on the battleship *Missouri*—all of them, that is, but May. She was told there were no facilities for ladies on board, a claim that was especially irksome since Mrs. Truman and daughter Margaret were to be on board. Mrs. Craig was flown home instead, at White House expense.

But 2 years later she overcame Navy tradition when assigned as the first woman newspaper correspondent to live aboard a combat ship at sea to cover air-sea maneuvers on the aircraft carrier *Midway*.

Decorated by the War Department for her World War II correspondent stint, Mrs. Craig also covered such things as the V-bomb raids in London ("I was scared stiff"); the Normandy campaign; the liberation of Paris; the German campaign. Later she covered the Korean war by helicopter, jet plane, and jeep; the troubled Middle East and almost any other place in the world where news was happening, be it Venezuela just before Jiminez was ousted or Cuba just after Castro took over. She also was the only woman along on the first flight by reporters over the North Pole.

Hot "scoops" are not her forte, but that doesn't keep spice out of Mrs. Craig's column. Here's how one column began after she interviewed Cuban Prime Minister Fidel Castro: "Pistol-packin' Fidel Castro will have to lay that pistol down if he is going to do the administrative job that lies before him. He is apt to find being a statesman is more difficult than fighting * * *"

As White House Press Secretary James C. Hagerty sees it, "She's a feminist, God knows. But I would rank her equal to any reporter there is, man or woman." Hagerty frankly says some of her questions "may have needles." But, he says, "They're news questions and invariably elicit something that makes news." He said he has "great respect" for her and added that it was "pretty obvious" that his boss shared his opinion.

The bulk of Washington's news corps and officialdom also share the opinion. U.N. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge recently broke ranks at a formal White House social function to rush over, hand outstretched, to say hello to "Miss May."

Mrs. Craig, though she sounds like New England personified, was born in Coosaw, S.C., one of nine children of Alexander and Elisabeth Adams. When she was 12 years old, she came to Washington to live with an aunt, and, between travels, she's called the Capital home ever since. Mrs. Craig, who tries to keep her private life private, gives only minimum details about her life outside of the newspaper world—no birth date, or marriage date, for example. She does say she will be "50 until I die."

She became excited about writing in high school, where a piece for the school paper once caused her suspension for 3 days because it was termed disrespectful to the faculty. She did a variety of odd writing jobs after graduation before marrying Donald Alexander Craig, one-time crack Washington bureau chief for the New York Herald. As a young married woman she continued to find "quite a lucrative business floating around town" in writing feature stories for various papers. Her first paycheck, she recalls, came from a feature she wrote for the old New York World. She received $2.85 for a story no one else could get: how silent Cal Coolidge dictated to his secretary. ("He was awful—demanding and impatient.")

A member of the World's Washington Bureau, Buck Bryant, told her then: "You've got your foot in the door"; and she followed his advice to keep it in. She gratefully recalls that Bryant "really learned me." When the World folded, she and Bryant formed their own bureau, serving a group of small papers from Maine to Montana and from New York to North Carolina. "I covered the Capitol and he covered downtown."

Mrs. Craig had two children during those early writing days, Donald Alexander and Betty (Mrs. Albert A. Clagett). They both now have children of their own to make her a grandmother in fact as well as appearance. Her husband died in the 1930's.

After Bryant left newspapering, she decided that to cover Washington for all the bureau papers would be too much of a job to handle alone. She chose to stick with the Gannett chain for whose Portland papers she and her husband had written from time to time. By now its roster had grown to include the Portland Press Herald, the Evening Express, the Waterville Sentinel, the Kennebec Journal, as well as the radio station WGAN and WGAN–TV in Portland.

That svelte magazine, Vogue, once described Mrs. Craig, 5 feet 2 and compactly built, as quail-shaped. The description amuses her: "You know it's perfectly true."

Her day begins at 6:30 when she uncorks a thermos of coffee next to her bed, turns on a news broadcast and scans the daily papers. She shortly adjourns to the bookshelf-lined office near her bedroom and pounds out her 1,000-word, 7-day-a-week column, "Inside in Washington."

Inside in May Craig's house, a two-story red brick just seven blocks from the Capitol, everything is as pink and blue as are most of her 40 or more hats. She concedes that her hats have become almost a trademark, comments on them adding up to bundles of mail for the National Broadcasting Co. and "Meet the Press." But she "never meant to make a thing of wearing them." When Washington was just a village, she explains, "you never went anywhere without a hat." Most of hers are similar in size and shape—small-brimmed and close fitting.

By about 8:30, her column finished, Mrs. Craig is off for the day, either on foot to the Capitol or by cab to the White House or elsewhere downtown.

One friend maintains that she is a "Taft Republican and doesn't know it." But Mrs. Craig has never belonged to any political party and has never voted. She believes in the "Fourth Estate being the Fourth Estate." She admits she once said she was "75 percent New Deal" and also admits it comes back to haunt her from time to time misquoted as "75 percent Democratic." She insists the New Deal was a "long overdue" social movement.

Mrs. Craig hates to be thought of as a wisecracker. She says that she never asks a question for any purpose other than to bring out something important, and she maintains that a really shrewd person wants to get a tough question so that he can answer it.

As for the way her questions sound, Mrs. Craig says she doesn't like her voice over the air; but she had to learn to speak in a clipped way in order to be understood even if it sounds a bit harsh.

On Meet the Press she once asked her good friend in private life, James B. Carey, president of the Electrical Workers Union, "Don't you think it's un-American for a man to have to belong to a union to earn a living?" Carey afterwards sadly said he never thought she would ask him such a question. "Jim," she replied, "that's a question that needed asking."

After a certain touchy question once put to him, FDR asked her if she had stayed up all night thinking it up. Her answer, "I did." At another news conference when Roosevelt called columnists "an unnecessary excrescence on our civilization," Mrs. Craig spoke up to the delight of her writing colleagues and reminded him that he had one in his own family—his wife.

"I didn't mind being called an excrescence. After all, that's only a wart," she confided later. "But I did resent being called unnecessary. My goodness, what if my editor should get that idea too."

There apparently is no danger of that. A few years ago she asked her editor, the late Guy P. Gannett, to let her trim her output to less than a 7-day-a-week performance. His reply was that Maine readers had been having May Craig with their breakfast for 30 years and he wasn't about to stop the habit.

The debt Maine readers owe to her informed and dispassionate reporting is equal to the pride they take in her well-deserved reputation in Washington circles. In conferring a doctor of humane letters on May Craig in 1946 the University of Maine said in part in its citation: "Able journalist who has combined a successful career as a newspaperwoman with homemaking * * * known and admired by thousands of people in this State through her daily column * * * Inside in Washington; friend and trusted confidante of statesmen and military leaders; ardent defender of freedom of the press; accurate recorder of life in the Nation's Capital and in the crossroads of the world."

There are few who will disagree with this accolade—in Maine or anywhere else.

TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, there is increasing interest in Senate bill 2755, the so-called consumer credit labeling bill, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and 19 cosponsors, of whom I am one. There is also considerable misunderstanding concerning the purpose of the bill.

On this subject, the Senator from Illinois on Tuesday of this week delivered an address entitled "Truth in Lending" before the National League of Insured Savings Associations. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUTH IN LENDING

(Address by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS before the National League of Insured Savings Associations, Washington, D.C., May 10, 1960)

I welcome this opportunity to discuss with you today the subject of truth in lending.

Truth in lending is the objective of a consumer credit labeling bill (S. 2755) which I introduced in the Senate early this year on behalf of myself and 19 cosponsors.

The bill is basically a simple and moderate measure. It would require that anyone engaged in the business of extending credit at the retail level disclose the price of the credit to the customer, in writing, before the transaction is consummated.

The disclosure would contain two vital pieces of information for the American consumer:

1. The finance charge in dollars and cents; and

2. The finance charge as a simple annual rate on the unpaid, declining balance.

These are the two indispensable measures of the price of credit. The first tells you how much more you will have to pay for something if you buy it on credit rather than for cash. The second reduces the price of credit to a common denominator—a common standard or yardstick—in terms of an annual rate, which enables you to shop around and compare alternative offers of credit.

Extensive hearings were held by the Senate Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization, and an amended version of the original bill has been recommended to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Although time is running out on this session of the Congress, I am hopeful that the bill will be given a high enough priority for favorable action this year.

The work of our subcommittee was somewhat delayed and embarrassed by the fact that a number of organizations which are critical of the bill did not wish to come forward and testify publicly, but contented themselves with submitting a statement for publication. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, for example, which frequently purports to speak for the business community, flatly refused to discuss its statement in public hearings.

As subcommittee chairman, I personally requested and urged many associations to come in and discuss the issues—to give us their criticisms and suggestions. We received valuable help from opponents as well as proponents, and I think the bill has been improved as a result of their testimony.

I am a little baffled by the tactics of the opposition. I am certain they would agree that we conducted the hearings in a neutral and impartial manner. We leaned over backwards not to mention the name of any firm which may have been guilty of sharp practices. We did not pillory any individual. I refused to open our voluminous files to the Department of Justice, on the grounds that a legislative committee cannot legislate effectively if it serves as an arm of the prosecutor.

What we are trying to do is to clean up a situation which apparently has many abuses. We ask only for improvements in the future and are not concerned with apportioning blame about the present or the past.

Let me make it perfectly clear that I am not trying to indict the American business community. Undoubtedly, the overwhelming majority of lenders and sellers are honest and law abiding. But in pursuing the consumer at the retail level, businessmen have wandered into a competitive jungle, where they apparently believe—erroneously, in my judgment—that survival depends upon camouflaging the real price of credit.

CREDIT CAMOUFLAGE

Here are some typical examples of credit camouflage. As experienced lenders yourselves, you will recognize them as the prevailing rule in significant sectors of the finance industry—and not as exceptions to the rule.

1. The "easy terms" quotation. So much down, so much a month. The price of credit is not stated, either in dollars or as a rate. The true rate may vary up to 100 percent and more, but is never disclosed.

2. The price of credit is quoted as a percentage of the principal amount, rather than of the unpaid, declining balance. An extension of credit which is repaid on an installment basis gives the customer an average use of approximately one-half the principal amount over the life of the credit extension. Under this circumstance, the simple or true rate is roughly double the quoted "add-on" or "discount" rate. Thus, when a bank advertised: "We offer to finance your new car at a cost to you of 4 percent interest," the true rate was closer to 8 percent.

3. The price of credit is quoted as a monthly rate. This is typical of the small loan field and the relatively new field of revolving credit, in which the simple annual rate is 12 times the quoted monthly rate.

Most consumers first learn about rates early in grade school—in simple annual terms. As a saver in a bank or a savings and loan association, he is paid in simple annual terms. As a homeowner, he pays on his mortgage in simple annual terms. If he reads the financial pages, he sees that the price of credit extended to businesses such as sales finance companies, small loan companies, and merchants is invariably quoted in simple annual terms.

Only the installment borrower or buyer in the short-term credit market is denied a disclosure of the annual rate.

As mortgage lenders, you are accustomed to quoting the price of credit in simple annual terms. I have not heard of a 6-percent mortgage quoted in terms of a 3-percent add-on or one-half of 1 percent a month on the unpaid balance.

On the other hand, it may not be the universal practice for a mortgage lender to spell out the total interest charges over the life of the mortgage. I would think that a prospective home buyer would become a more rational manager of his family budget if he knew in advance, for example, that the interest charges on a $15,000 mortgage at 6 per-

cent would add up to a total of $17,400 over a 30-year period, compared with $10,812 for 20 years—a saving of $6,588, or more than a year's income for the average family. I was encouraged by testimony, during the hearings, that many mortgage lenders make such a dollar disclosure as a matter of routine business practice.

As I see it, there are at least three reasons why S. 2755 should be enacted. First, ethics; second, economic stabilization; and, third, competition. I would like to comment briefly on each of these.

THE ETHICAL OBJECTIVE

Because of the widespread use of misleading and deceptive methods of stating the price of credit, an ordinary citizen finds it difficult to understand and make sense out of business practices. In the current era of payola, there is a tendency to believe that the economic end of profit justifies unethical means of achieving it. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Is the American consumer entitled to the truth about credit rates and charges? The ethical question is basically as simple as that.

For example, the American Bankers Association has taken a significant step toward a higher ethical standard of rate advertising. In connection with the case I cited a few minutes ago, of a bank's "offer to finance your new car at a cost to you of 4 percent interest," which was presented to the association witnesses for comment during the hearing last week, the vice president of the association expressed the opinion that it was untruthful. Moreover, he indicated that he would instruct the chairman of their installment credit commission that a bulletin go out to all the advisory board members and that the banks in each State be canvassed and have called to their attention that "this is inadequate and improper disclosure of the rate being charged."

Another example of an ethical problem is the promotion of teenage credit. It is one of the unfortunate new developments in consumer credit. It is aimed at a youngster too old to spank, too young to garnishee, who should be learning the savings habit. In the forthright words of President Earl Schwulst of the Bowery Savings Bank, teenage credit "is something like teaching the young to use narcotics * * * ; merchants and merchants' associations ought to repudiate this sort of thing. * * * It is this kind of thing which gives the Russians ammunition against our private enterprise system, saying that all we are interested in is building up volume, and anything for the buck."

THE STABILIZATION OBJECTIVE

The declaration of purpose in the bill reads as follows: "The Congress finds and declares that economic stabilization is threatened when credit is used excessively for the acquisition of property and services. The excessive use of credit results frequently from a lack of awareness of the cost thereof to the user. It is the purpose of this act to assure a full disclosure of such cost with a view to preventing the uninformed use of credit to the detriment of the national economy."

At the end of 1959, personal debt reached the alltime high of $183 billion, divided between mortgage debt on nonfarm 1- to 4-family properties and consumer credit, as follows:

	Billion
Mortgages	$131
Consumer credit	52
Total	183

Since the end of World War II, mortgage debt has increased nearly 6 times—from $18.6 billion in 1945 to $131.2 billion in 1959; consumer credit has increased more than 8 times—from $5.7 billion in 1945 to $52 billion by the end of 1959.

During the 1950's alone, personal debt increased 160 percent.

By the end of this year, the American consumer will be entangled in a $200 billion web of debt.

At this rate, personal debt could exceed the Federal public debt in just a few years from now.

The increase in consumer debt held by commercial banks may be of particular interest in a tight-money period. Banks increased their total loans and investments about $2.7 billion from February 1959 to February 1960. They increased their residential mortgage holdings $1.8 billion, but their consumer credit outstanding increased by $2.5 billion in the same period.

The banks have followed the path of retail merchants in the devices by which they have increased consumer credit—a heavy use of advertising, and a notable development of revolving credit. Revolving credit has been described by one commercial banker as a "perpetual loan scheme." Another banker characterizes it as putting the borrower rather than the banker in control of the volume of credit; this same banker stated that revolving credit makes the customer much more able to yield to his impulses in buying, and that it allows him to continue to pile up debt even if his income should decline or stop.

Implicit in these developments are the possibilities that consumer credit will initiate and carry booms too far, and that retrenchment of purchasing will intensify future recessions.

The danger is greater because the cost of consumer debt is not advertised, and is quoted in various fashions, all of which are designed to understate the cost. The consumer-debtor is not flagged down by being told that the credit he uses will cost him 12 percent, 18 percent or more.

The Senate bill to require disclosure of the amount and rate of charge on consumer credit would give consumers information about the price of credit which would lead any rational family manager to control and stabilize buying and borrowing. When rates are increased in tight money periods, the increase would become apparent, and encourage consumer restraint. I firmly believe that the American consumer is his own best credit manager, if he has all the information about the costs involved.

It is important to remember that the sole product of the bill is information. It does not set a ceiling on finance charges. Nor does it control credit terms. Its immediate impact would stem from a change in the state of buyer knowledge, not in the price of installment credit.

There is a possibility that this effect might be very small, for most experts in the field agree that the volume of consumer demand for credit is quite unresponsive to changes in credit prices—especially in contrast to contract terms (downpayment and maturity) which have a relatively larger effect on the size of the monthly payment. On the other hand, this lack of response might be traced directly to the lack of information about the price of credit. Once the price of credit use becomes identifiable, it may become a much more important determinant of changes in the total volume of credit.

There is another reason why the immediate impact of a change in the statement of finance charges would not be very large. The use of consumer credit has had ever-widening acceptance and practice. Indeed, for many families, the increase in savings in institutionalized forms such as social security, insurance, and payroll savings bonds precludes additional private savings in advance of major purchases. Furthermore, a large part of credit buying is replacement purchasing or in the category of necessity, or whatever the family may decide to put in the category of necessity. Given the habits of our economy, then, there is probably a fairly high minimum level of installment purchases to be made as long as incomes are maintained. Finally, since monthly payments would not be changed at all, and since the bill would affect all installment lenders and sellers at the same time, the period of consumer adjustment should be very short.

CONSTITUTIONAL BASIS OF S. 2755

The question has been raised from time to time of the constitutional basis of S. 2755. The *Legal Tender Cases* (79 U.S. 457 (1870)) support the following propositions:

"1. The power conferred on Congress by article I, section 8 of the Constitution 'to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin * * *' does not limit by its terms the power of Congress with respect to the currency.

"2. This power, coupled with (i) the 'necessary and proper clause,' and (ii) the denial to the States (art. I, sec. 10) of any power to coin money, emit bills of credit, and to make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts, vests whatever power there is over the currency in Congress.

"3. For an act to be constitutional it is not necessary to show that it is indispensable in order to give effect to a specified power. Congress has the choice of means to a permissive end."

From these general propositions one may reasonably contend that the control or regulation by Congress of the use of credit is supported as an exercise of its power over the currency; such control or regulation having been determined by the Congress to be necessary in order to stabilize the economy and thereby protect the value of the currency.

The competitive reason for the Senate bill was stated very aptly by a witness at our hearings who described the annual rate disclosure as "* * * part and parcel of the purest of classical economics and the basic principle of the free enterprise system—the rational informed man buying in the free market place, with full knowledge of the prices, and making a decision which is best for him and, therefore, best for the entire economy."

The benefits of effective competition cannot be realized if the buyers (borrowers) do not have adequate knowledge of the alternatives available to them.

S. 2755 would invigorate competition in the consumer credit market by stimulating a return to price competition.

Extra-normal profits earned through the ability to mislead borrowers would be minimized.

FEDERAL MINIMUM STANDARDS

In the amended version of the Senate bill, we have spelled out a Federal-State relationship that I sincerely hope will place the burden of enforcement on the States, and avoid Federal preemption of State responsibilities.

This is accomplished by setting forth minimum standards for an acceptable system of State enforcement. Where these minimum standards are met, the States would run the program. Where they are not met, either because a State has no law or an inadequate law, the Federal Government would undertake to fill the gaps and require the appropriate disclosures.

Administration of the bill is placed in the Federal Reserve Board. The Board has unusual knowledge of financial institutions throughout the Nation, and the system which it governs provides a very large part of the total of consumer credit. The Board, however, desires to avoid substantial enforcement duties. The possible alternative administrative agency, the Federal Trade Commission, is experienced in enforcement problems arising from other Federal disclosure

legislation. However, by its own admission, the FTC is not acquainted with the practices of credit and financial institutions.

The problem of evidence of failure to comply with the requirements of S. 2755 is not serious; whether disclosure was or was not made in any transaction could be established readily.

I fully expect that the burden of enforcement will be assumed by the States in accordance with minimum Federal standards. I also expect the statute to be virtually self-enforcing, because local publicity, local legal aid societies, better business bureaus and chambers of commerce would uphold it in the interests of equity and fair competition. If I am correct in these assumptions, then the remaining tasks of definition and exemption are peculiarly appropriate subjects for the financial expertness of the Federal Reserve Board.

A pointed observation was made by the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia in the April 1960 issue of its Business Review. In a lead article entitled "$52 Billion on the Cuff," the Philadelphia bank states that a real burden for the economy "occurs because consumers often buy on time in an uninformed way without knowing the cost of the money they are borrowing. When they do this, they do not only hurt themselves, but they reduce the efficiency with which the economy provides goods and services in accordance with consumer tastes."

TRIBUTE TO RABBI HAROLD H. GORDON

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the New York Board of Rabbis is an organization with one of the most distinguished records in my State. Over the years it has rendered notable service in areas that required sympathy and understanding. Rabbi Harold H. Gordon has been at the helm of the New York Board of Rabbis for 13 of his 25 years in the rabbinate, as its executive vice president and director of chaplaincy services. A testimonial dinner was held in Rabbi Gordon's honor by his colleagues in New York on March 24 to mark his many years of high services which was attended by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller and many other civic and religious leaders.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller on this occasion:

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF REMARKS OF GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER, AT NEW YORK BOARD OF RABBIS' TESTIMONIAL DINNER IN HONOR OF RABBI HAROLD H. GORDON'S 25TH YEAR IN THE RABBINATE AND 13TH YEAR AS EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK BOARD OF RABBIS, NEW YORK, N.Y., MARCH 24, 1960

Rabbi Golovensky, Rabbi Gordon, Mr. Chairman, Louis Lefkowitz, Arthur Levitt, Mr. Levy, distinguished guests, distinguished rabbis, and friends, what a privilege it is for me to be here with this wonderful group this evening which is gathered to honor a great leader, a man who has dedicated his life to service, to those spiritual values which have brought this group together here this evening in the presence of so many spiritual leaders of our great community. It is an aspiration in the busy life which we all lead to have the opportunity of stopping and pausing to join together quietly in respect and reverence and gratitude to a man who has given so generously and so completely of himself, in his own community and throughout the world, in peace and in war. What an inspiration to each of us. What a wonderful thing to see his family here with him on this occasion from all over our great country.

Therefore, we join with you, Rabbi Gordon, on this occasion, each one of us more determined to live better lives ourselves, to reach out to our fellow men with more courage, with more integrity, with more love.

I will never forget attending a Brotherhood meeting in Boston where a young Rabbi asked the blessing. He said, "Oh God, give us the courage to love."

What a wonderfully penetrating and simple prayer.

And here this evening is a man who has had that courage to love, and who has lived a life of love. We are grateful to you for giving us this opportunity to be here this evening.

Rabbi Golovensky referred to the political side of life, and he said he was politically naive. So I am in the same class?

I will never forget going with Louis Lefkowitz during the campaign 2 years ago when he first took me down to Delancey Street. After we had been in Rattners for my first blintz and sour cream, we went out and were doing a little—excuse me, Bob (Wagner)—we were doing a little work on the sidewalk there, and a lady came up to me and said that she could not find a place to live that was within her means. Well, I was definitely concerned, and I had been studying the situation in the State and I knew of the two bond issues which were up for a vote and I explained to her about the $100 million for low-cost housing and the other $100 million for middle-income housing and for urban renewal, and I told her to get all her friends to vote so that we would have the money to get the construction started. She looked at me and said, "So I should live so long?"

Then we went into a little delicatessen. I had been set back a bit by this lady, but I was coming forward again and reaching out and there was a man there who was having a bite to eat and I said hello, and he picked up his food and walked away. Some of the boys from the press went up to him and asked him why he walked away, that the candidate had merely said hello. And he said, "You can put a hello in the bank?"

So you can see, Rabbi, I have been learning from the very beginning the hard way.

I will say it is hard enough to have a baby in the family and handle everything else, but I want to tell you, this business of what Bob and I are going through—two families trying to have a baby together, but we are almost there.

Now I should like to express to all of you my appreciation and admiration to the New York Board of Rabbis for the wonderful cooperation that they have given us, and I mean all of us in Albany, both parties of the legislature and the executive branch—that is, Arthur Levitt and myself. We appreciate tremendously the spirit with which you have dealt with the matters before the legislature, your consideration and understanding, your helpful service and counsel, and I should like also to express my appreciation before all of you to the New York Board of Rabbis in helping the selection of chaplains for the various institutions in the State. It has been a happy association indeed.

As one thinks of political life and the rough and tumble that goes with it, in fact all phases of the changing world in which we live, revolutions in science, revolutions in social and economic and political life throughout the world, it is clear that we are faced with change, and with change come uncertainty, and with uncertainty there is fear. So, probably as at no other time in history we in this country, and people throughout the world, are faced with this sense of movement and change.

In this we have to make decisions and we, who have the benefit of Judeo-Christian heritages, are indeed fortunate because in the confusing times, in sorting out the problems that are before us, in trying to make the decisions that are going to reflect the best interests, the hopes, the aspirations, not only of our own people, but of mankind, we in this room, and so many throughout the country, in fact most of our country, are indeed fortunate to have constant guidance in these spiritual values. And you distinguished rabbis, through your synagogues, are playing such an important role in instilling in the on-coming generation those basic forces that will give us the foundations on which to build for the future so that we can seek and find a world at peace, a world of opportunity, equal opportuniity. As Lincoln said, the unity of the Confederacy was based importantly on the common effort to lift the burdens from the shoulders of man.

Today we have that capacity to lift the burdens from the shoulders of man and let us use it. We will find that it will give us not only throughout the Confederacy alone, but throughout the world, the unity in achieving true brotherhood under the fatherhood of God.

Thank you very much.

THE TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF ESTABLISHMENT OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, yesterday—May 11—marked the 25th anniversary of the establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Ceremonies commemorating this historic occasion were conducted in my State at Franklin Roosevelt's beloved "Little White House" at Warm Springs, Ga., where the President signed the Executive order creating the original REA.

It was entirely fitting that the Silver Anniversary ceremonies of the REA should be conducted in my State, the adopted State of President Roosevelt. Georgia is also honored to be the home State of the current able president of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, the Honorable Walter Harrison. Mr. Harrison is doing an outstanding job in carrying forward the work of this great program.

It was my privilege to be a Member of this body when the original REA was created 25 years ago, and I am proud that I have had an opportunity to support this noteworthy program throughout the years.

At a time when I was a member of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I had the opportunity of serving as floor manager of the bill under which the REA now operates; and as chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee, I have had the honor throughout the years of handling the appropriations for the REA program. It is a matter of note that at no time have adequate funds failed to be available to provide for any worthy application for a loan by one of the cooperatives.

Mr. President, I am proud of my association with the REA program. It

has been one of the most successful programs ever undertaken by the Federal Government, both in terms of its operation and administration and in terms of its genuine service to the people of the country. Its contributions to the betterment and enrichment of the lives of our farm people have been immeasurable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial, published on May 11 in the Atlanta Constitution, commenting on the 25th anniversary of the REA and on the ceremonies conducted at Warm Springs, Ga.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REA CELEBRATION TO BE IN APPROPRIATE SETTING

It is most appropriate that the national celebration of the Rural Electrification Administration's 25th birthday Wednesday be held at Warm Springs.

It was, in the words of the late President Roosevelt, in "a little white cottage at Warm Springs, Ga.," that the REA was born.

Back in those days only 11 percent of America's farms had electricity. Those now without it are a rarity. Not only has REA made life on the farm more pleasant but it has played a significant role in increasing the efficiency of farm operations. In addition a new billion-dollar annual market in electrical appliances was created by the program.

Congress and the executive branch of Government will accord due recognition to the 25th anniversary of REA. But the real celebration will be at Warm Springs where a man with vision and compassion saw the need for rural electrification and then with the vigor that marked all his endeavors, turned on the lights for rural America.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 910) to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday, the time for debate during the further consideration of the bill (S. 910) is limited to 30 minutes on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table; and on the question of the passage of the bill debate is limited to 1 hour.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] identified as "5-11-60—A."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is the pending business. Five minutes are allotted to each side. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before the adjournment of the Senate last night, I stated the argument which I thought was appropriate in support of the amendment. It has already been printed in the RECORD. I do not like to burden the RECORD by restating it.

My understanding is that the sponsor of the bill, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is inclined to agree with me that the amendment is a proper one and should be adopted. That being the case, I am prepared to yield back my time on the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back my time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time on the amendment, on both sides, yielded back?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I believe the Senate is operating under a unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the minority leader yield time to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I yield 5 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall not require much time. I simply wish to say, speaking as one who comes from a rural section of the country, that while I do not know the parentage of the language of this provision, or how it got into the bill, the elimination of this provision would certainly make the bill even more unacceptable. If this type of payments in lieu of tax program is to be adopted a State such as mine certainly should receive such benefits as it would be entitled to obtain in order to offset the sharply increased taxes which the people of my State would be compelled to pay, following the adoption of this entirely new concept of Federal taxation. In that situation, some consideration should be given to the people who are definitely affected by the giant hydroelectric installations along the Missouri River.

In areas where such dams are constructed, if the Federal Government is to go into the business of making payments in lieu of taxes, I see no reason for excluding from the bill the provision the committee included, which deals with this type of Federal installation.

Although—as I tried to make clear on yesterday—I am not in favor of the concept of having the Federal Government pick up the tax check for its installations all over the country, until and unless some criteria have been established and until and unless some high-level study has been made, so we know whither we are bound, and so we know what amounts of money are involved, certainly I could not sit quietly by and accept the exclusion of the one provision whereby conceivably the people of a great many States such as South Dakota in which these hydroelectric installations have been made, could receive some benefits.

I agree that this is a highly speculative venture; and I agree that if the proposed board, to be established with such great powers—it would be an omnipotent oligarchy which would serve as a third Appropriations Committee and would determine what would be done with the money of the taxpayers—were to decide to make payments in lieu of taxes for these hydroelectric installations, the payments could conceivably be very large.

On the other hand, if this new fiscal policy is to be established, there is an element of justice in providing that when the Federal Government makes such installations in our communities, with the result that the people who live there are deprived of opportunities they formerly had, those who are seriously affected by the installations should receive some benefit by way of payments in lieu of taxes. That would be proper and just under the payments-in-lieu-of-taxes plan, because—quite to the contrary of what the Senator from Florida believes; he comes from a State where the land is flat—such installations are not unmitigated blessings. They are built in part to protect those who live downstream from temporary flood waters; and such installations result in the permanent flooding of thousands of acres of rich, valuable rural land; in our State, it is river-bottom land, and is highly productive, and is tax-producing. When that land is permanently covered by these waters, of course those who owned the land can no longer produce on them the grain crops and the cattle they formerly produced there. As a consequence of the action of the Federal Government, the living practices and the taxpaying practices of those areas have been vastly changed.

Therefore, Mr. President, if the Federal Government is to pick up the check generally, I see no reason to single out and to except from the great array of potential beneficiaries of such payments in lieu of taxes, this particular group.

It is true that hydroelectric power is of benefit to our area; but frequently it is forgotten that the same power is also available to Minnesota, Nebraska, and Iowa. Frequently it is also forgotten that one of the great purposes and results of the construction of these great multipurpose dams is the protection of the people who live in the large cities, such as Omaha, Kansas City, and other urban centers downstream from the installations, from the threat of devastating floods.

In these circumstances, our State has become the host State for a number of these great bodies of water, which are wonderful for recreational purposes; but from the standpoint of the farmers who have been dispossessed, and whose lands have been flooded, as well as the local tax collecting authorities, these installations are not unmitigated blessings.

Therefore, although I dispute the desirability and wisdom of passing out Federal funds without any check, without any limitation, without any possibility of a Presidential veto, and without congressional review, and although I oppose setting in motion such a financial apparatus, if it is, nevertheless, to be done, certainly I oppose doing it for all such areas except the rural areas which happen to have some problems as a result of the construction of great hydroelectric dams.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to state briefly that it seems to me the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], my good friend, is in an almost indefensible position when he objects to the bill and its principles, but insists on retaining in the bill probably the most indefensible position in it. That provision is that when the Federal Government, after the cutoff date established by the bill—a date 10 years ago—constructs a large dam, and uses the dam and the power installations added to it and the great lake which is created for the production of hydroelectric power for sale generally in that community, notwithstanding that fact, the local units of government—cities, school districts, counties, and the like—may have the right to receive from the Federal Government payments in lieu of local taxes.

Those are the very areas which are the beneficiaries of the investment and expenditure of Federal money. Those are the areas which get the benefit of small electrical power rates, due to the fact that it is a Federal installation and does not have to pay a profit to investors. It exists simply because Federal money has been spent there. Further, the representatives of those areas, or any such area, have been the ardent advocates of the location, construction, and operation of such developments in those areas.

The Senator from Florida has served on the Public Works Committee for a number of years, and for a good many years on the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. There is no other Senator who has been more diligent, and I compliment him for his diligence, than has the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] in urging the authorization, first, and later the appropriation, of funds for the construction of such developments in his own State. I compliment him on that. I think it was completely within his right. I think it was a part of his duty as a diligent representative of the people of his State and of the United States.

To follow that up with the assertion that people from a State where there are no possibilities of hydroelectric development, such as my own, must pay Federal taxes which must eventually go—in part at least—to pay the local units of government which are receiving the benefits and which have ardently sought these developments in their areas, it seems to me is carrying that matter clearly beyond any limit of defensibility.

The mere fact that the advocates of this bill, the distinguished Senator who is sponsoring it and has charge of it on the floor, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Alaska, who spoke out immediately yesterday when he realized what this involved, and said he wished my amendment to be adopted, and thought it was in the interest of fairplay, and other Senators whom I shall not mention, have taken that position, I say shows it is a fundamental defect, one of several, in the bill.

Before I conclude, I wish to say that I, as Governor of my State, initiated this effort a long time ago. I want the day to come when there shall be a fair method of offsetting tax losses to some communities which are very badly hurt because of the exemption from local taxation of Federal property.

But, Mr. President, here is a provision which I think is so indefensible that I could not possibly support it, just as was the provision, which was corrected yesterday by the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. I do not expect us to find all the defects and accept all the required amendments in this bill. What we are doing is a beginning. I think the principal purpose of the legislation is to have a longtime, wise study started, with a program which is effective.

I do not like that part of the bill which gives no community in the field of real estate taxation any right to come, as a matter of right, to the Federal Government, but, instead, puts it in the position of a supplicant, coming with a tincup in its hand, asking the Federal Board whether it is entitled to Federal funds. I do not like that provision; but this is a beginning, which will begin to take care of such inequities and inequities in special areas like Arlington, the State of Florida, and other areas which are so adversely affected.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yesterday the question was asked as to the meaning of the term "suburban." The response would be subject to a little interpretation. Of course, the prefix "sub" means below. So such an area would be below an urban area, but, presumably, it would not be a rural area.

Is it true that if a large hydroelectric plant in the West, in a rural area, were constructed, and then a small enterprise were brought into that area to use the electricity, a suburban area could be created, and the whole plant could be taxed for its support?

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, that is correct. The real accomplishment of the building of great powerplants is to create tremendous development of industry in the areas affected.

My recollection is that the definition of urban and suburban areas relates to that part of the bill which has to do with the payment of assessments for special construction and development, and not to the general right of property taxation.

Mr. President, I hope that we can get the bill in such shape that we can at least make a beginning in the solution of this important problem. So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he could not support the bill containing the provision to which his amendment is addressed; and he hopes, since the amendment has been accepted by the sponsors of the bill, it will be promptly adopted by the Senate, and that we can proceed to other matters.

Does the Senator from Minnesota wish any time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe the argument made by the Senator from Florida is a cogent argument. I certainly wish to associate myself with the desire of the Senator from Florida to make this correction in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Does the minority leader desire to yield further time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I merely point out that the Senator from Florida, with his usual capacity to discover errors in the philosophy of a bill of this type, in his argument in support of his amendment has emphasized one of the glaring weaknesses of the approach we are called upon to make. He has said it is utterly indefensible, from the standpoint of the Senator from Florida, to have the bill contain language which would provide for payments in lieu of taxes to an area like South Dakota, Nebraska, Nevada, or any other State where hydroelectric plants were located, because, he has said, and has said understandably, he could not go back to his people and say he has asked the people to make payments in lieu of taxes in an area far removed from Florida, because projects of this type cannot be built there.

It would seem to me very unjust to the people of Florida; but not a bit more unjust than to say to the people of South Dakota, a rural State, "Well, it is all right to exclude us," because this is one area where we might benefit and then vote for a payment in lieu of taxes to benefit big urban areas, since, just as big hydroelectric dams are not going to be built in Florida, big warehouses and defense industries are not often going to be constructed in rural areas. They are constructed where industry is concentrated and where defense plants are. While we have dispersal programs, rural areas have not often successfully been utilized. So the same philosophy which applies with respect to areas where large hydroelectric plants cannot be constructed applies, it seems to me, to areas which cannot benefit from the construction of large buildings and enterprises such as I have mentioned.

This underscores my belief that we ought to have a high-level study which considers the needs of the country as a whole, and a law which does not discriminate against rural people in favor of urban people, which this bill inevitably does, and does not discriminate against flat States in favor of mountain or rural States, as the Senator believes this bill does. What we require is an equitable overall solution to these problems and not one which creates new inequities.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator recognizes, of course, that the

Senator from Florida has eagerly, actively and gladly supported his efforts to get authorizations for such projects and to get appropriations for such projects.

Mr. MUNDT. I do. I am grateful to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator from South Dakota think the Senator from Florida would be naive enough to do that again, if this kind of a provision is written into law?

Mr. MUNDT. I am afraid that if this kind of a provision is written into law we will have many new cleavages between areas of the country which should be working together.

The Senator has been helpful, and we have appreciated his help. The Senator does not quite recognize the problems which also are created by these tremendous bodies of impounded waters insofar as the recipient county and the recipient State are concerned.

Our most valuable land, our most tax-productive land, in many instances, has been inundated. We accept that. That is part of the game. However, if we are to change the rules of the game and to say, "We are going to make payments in lieu of taxes to cover Government installations of every type except hydroelectric plants," I certainly do not see how the Senator from South Dakota could be expected to support that kind of amendment, which would increase the tax burden for his folks, and would exclude, by amendment, even consideration by this high and mighty Board of the problems and payments which might otherwise be brought before it for adjudication.

The Senator from Florida is correct; I consider this to be an indefensible approach to fiscal policy and an indefensible method of trying to rewrite the tax laws of America. However, the Senator from South Dakota opposes emphatically any amendment which would deny the right of the people of his State and of neighboring areas to present their problems in regard to inundated acres and hydroelectric installations. It is indefensible, if, in fact, we are going to go into this whole new approach to our national fiscal policy.

I shall continue to oppose the amendment of the Senator from Florida, and I shall vote against it. I shall certainly vote to recommit S. 910, if the opportunity is presented, or I shall vote against passage of the bill, in favor of a study being made which will make it possible to solve the existing problems in an equitable and in an enduring manner.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield time to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if I have any time remaining I will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the statement of the Senator from South Dakota that this subject matter is excluded from consideration by the study board is not accurate. The study board, under the provisions of S. 910, can study any part of the problem of payments in lieu of taxes. There is no restriction upon the jurisdiction of the board in terms of study. The board can study any and all phases of Federal-State-local fiscal relationships.

What the Senator from Florida seeks to do is to exclude, for the purpose of payment by the Board in the initial stage, the one area of the generation of electrical energy, other than those installations already covered under current law.

I will say that everything which is presently constructed is covered by some kind of Federal statute, with revenue-sharing, direct taxes, payment in lieu of taxes, or direct appropriations.

I have in my hand committee print No. 23, of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of the 83d Congress, which relates to taxes and other in-lieu payments in respect to Federal property, which was prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. There is in it an outline as to all of the many categories of Federal properties which are to be compensated for by some form of payment by the Federal Government.

I invite the Senator's attention to the reclamation properties of the Bureau of Reclamation. The language is:

> Incidental to these operations, there are facilities for the generation of hydroelectric power, drainage and flood control, improvement of navigation, etc. Up to June 30, 1953, the total cost of all plant, property, and equipment of all reclamation projects amounted to $2.4 billion. Including projects authorized, the total ultimate investments of Federal funds will approximate $6.7 billion.

The report goes on to point out the amount of land owned by the Bureau of Reclamation. I invite attention to page 77 of the report to which I referred, committee print 23 of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the 83d Congress, 2d session, which is the report prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress as to the payments made. It states:

> Generally the lands and property of the Bureau of Reclamation are exempt from taxation and no payments in lieu of taxation are made. One important exception is Boulder Dam. Under the act as presently written, Arizona and Nevada each receive $300,000 each year from the revenues derived from the operation of the Boulder Canyon project. As originally enacted, the statute called for payment of 37½ percent of its net income (after operating expenses, interest, and amortization payments) to be divided equally between the States.
>
> The Bureau of Reclamation has also been making some payments in lieu of taxes with respect to particular projects. Thus it is said that $10,000 a year transitional payments are being made for 10 years with respect to 8,350 acres of acquired lands on the Big Thompson project in Colorado. It is also noted that tax equivalent payments are being made pending the development of irrigation systems on 219,000 acres of land in Washington.
>
> Finally it may be noted that there have been and are instances in which the Federal Government has supplied and maintained school buildings or the contractor has been required to make suitable arrangements for the education of the children of Federal employees as well as those of the contractor. In other cases the law has provided that payments may be made to local school districts where an undue burden is imposed by reason of the attendance of children of employees working on the construction of Bureau of Reclamation projects.

The report goes on to point out that in the reclamation areas there are payments made either for the purpose of public services or for education, or there are outright payments made for land which may be acquired by the Bureau of Reclamation.

I say to the Senator from South Dakota that we have established a precedent already in existing public law for payments to these hydroelectric projects under the Bureau of Reclamation. There is nothing in the present bill which would deny the Board which is to be set up the right to examine the matter and to make whatever recommendations it desires with respect to projects other than those presently covered.

What the Senator from Florida seeks to do is to exclude for a brief period of time, for the 5-year period during which payments are to be made, the electrical generation facilities which are not currently covered by some other form of Federal statute. All of the major hydroelectric projects to date have been covered by some form of compensation; either under a revenue sharing plan or some form of special payment to the areas affected by the hydroelectric project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. All time for the proponents of the amendment and all time for the opponents of the amendment has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Government Operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUSH. Under the agreement, is this motion treated as an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state for the information of the Senator that it is a motion, and it is subject to the time limitation under the

unanimous-consent agreement, of 15 minutes on each side.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Bureau of the Budget is opposed to the bill. I say that with authority, because I talked with representatives of the Budget Bureau this morning. They reaffirm what they previously stated. There are many unresolved issues; and, in addition, the bill could cost the Treasury half a billion dollars a year.

So, speaking for the Bureau of the Budget and the Treasury—and I believe they make a good case—the very fact that amendments have been adopted the effect of which is unpredictable at the moment is the best reason I know of why the bill should go back to the committee.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that suggestion for a moment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] will take only 1 minute. Does the Senator from Illinois desire the yeas and nays on his motion?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I recognize that the present Director of the Bureau of the Budget is opposed to the bill. I also wish to state that the bill was drafted in 1956 by a task force composed of the senior Senator from Minnesota, a member of the professional staff of the Committee on Government Operations, a representative of the Legislative Counsel's office of the Senate, and technicians from the Bureau of the Budget, and the Department of Defense. We spent 3 months in negotiations and we trimmed the bill down to a very basic minimum. The bill has safeguards in it so that no local community can have a windfall. The bill has standards in it to guide the Federal Board. The bill will for the first time give some recognition by the Federal Government to local government fiscal problems, particularly, to revenues.

Almost every Senator is concerned about State rights and local government. The Presiding Officer [Mr. TALMADGE] is one of the most valiant champions of local government and State rights. The bill makes State rights a meaningful reality first, by providing for a study of the revenue needs of local government, and, second, a modest beginning in terms of a limited program dealing with a number of cases in which the Federal Government has a clear-cut responsibility to local government.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I agree with what the able Senator from Minnesota has said. This is a modest program. It has been all too long delayed. Seven years is a long time for a study of the means by which the Federal Government should live up to a responsibility which it has recognized by passing similar legislation. Twenty years is all too long. I hope the motion will be defeated, and that the Senate will stand up and recognize the need for this legislation, which has been fashioned by the Senator from Minnesota and all those who have stood with him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I support the bill, and I speak in opposition to the motion to recommit. I oppose the motion to recommit on the grounds which I stated yesterday. The bill is a positive recognition of the need to help communities upon which Federal installations, principally war plants, have imposed an unduly heavy burden.

I believe that the most significant sentence in the statement of Mr. Bernard F. Hillenbrand, executive director of the National Association of County Officials, is this:

> With the tremendous expansion of the National Government and with the complex industrial defense and commercial and business activities of the Federal Government, the traditional immunity of Federal property from local taxation must be modified to meet the realities of the situation.

Mr. President, we are already doing this in connection with education payments in lieu of taxes to communities, to support education, where a heavy overload has been created by Federal installations. I see no difference at all between making a grant-in-aid payment in lieu of taxes to a community for education and making such a contribution for the roads that lead to the schools and for police and fire protection with relation to these centers, and to take care of other needs of the community, proportionately, with respect to the property belonging to the Federal Government.

Finally, I observed that the assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. David A. Lindsay, as shown at page 37 of the committee report, supports S. 910.

For these reasons I hope the motion to recommit will be defeated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in response to what the Senator from Minnesota has said, let me say that it is correct that in 1956 the Bureau of the Budget did favor a limited program of this kind.

However, since then there has been a U.S. Supreme Court decision which has opened up the horizon of spending tremendously, and the Bureau of the Budget is now against the program in view of that Supreme Court decision.

The minority leader has pointed out that the Bureau of the Budget has stated that this budget-busting bill would cost the Government $500 million the first year. Then it will grow like Topsy. Once we start out on the trail of spending with a Presidentially appointed board, the cost will not only be $500 million, which is the cost for the first year. Nobody knows how much it will cost from then on. Then we can kiss goodby to any chance of ever again balancing the American budget.

I hope the motion to recommit for further study will be agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). All time for debate on the motion has expired. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea,"

and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 196]

YEAS—30

Aiken	Cotton	Long, La.
Allott	Curtis	McClellan
Bennett	Dirksen	Martin
Bridges	Dworshak	Mundt
Brunsdale	Ellender	Robertson
Butler	Fong	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Goldwater	Stennis
Capehart	Hayden	Thurmond
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Wiley
Case, S. Dak.	Lausche	Williams, Del.

NAYS—52

Bartlett	Hartke	O'Mahoney
Beall	Hill	Pastore
Bible	Holland	Prouty
Bush	Humphrey	Proxmire
Cannon	Jackson	Randolph
Carroll	Javits	Schoeppel
Case, N.J.	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Church	Johnston, S.C.	Smathers
Clark	Keating	Smith
Cooper	Kerr	Sparkman
Dodd	Kuchel	Symington
Engle	Lusk	Talmadge
Ervin	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Frear	Magnuson	Yarborough
Gore	Mansfield	Young, N. Dak.
Green	Morse	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Moss	
Hart	Muskie	

NOT VOTING—18

Anderson	Hennings	McGee
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	McNamara
Chavez	Jordan	Monroney
Douglas	Kefauver	Morton
Eastland	Kennedy	Murray
Fulbright	Long, Hawaii	Saltonstall

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the motion to recommit was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment: On page 32, in line 1, before the word "levied," insert "or tax"; and insert the same words in line 4, following the word "assessment."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy that the Senator from Ohio has submitted the amendment, because it is a technical one which must be included in order to make the bill comply with the amendment agreed to yesterday. In short, it is necessary that this technical amendment be included.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, in line 1, before the word "levied," it is proposed to insert "or tax"; and on the same page, in line 4, after the word "assessment," it is proposed to insert "or tax."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of the time available to me on my amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Today, the committee accepted the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], on page 23, in lines 15 and 16, to delete the words "the generation of electrical energy."

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Unfortunately, I could not be in the Chamber when the debate on that amendment was had. However, I realize that during the debate the purpose and effect of the amendment have been made clear.

I understand that the bill as thus amended will not in any way affect Federal projects which come under existing law, such as the Bonneville Power Administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is entirely correct; and section 11 makes that even more specific, in terms of the exemptions which already are taken care of under existing statutes.

To be precise, the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] in no way affects existing power projects and Federal statutes which relate to them, in terms of shared revenues, payments in lieu of taxes, or whatever consideration may be given to the States or local communities.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, on what basis does the Senator from Minnesota make his last statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. On the basis of section 11 of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I reserve to myself the remainder of the time available to me on my amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I have asked a question of the Senator from Minnesota. Is it not true that despite the amendment of the Senator from Florida, which has been added to the bill, it will be possible for publicly owned electrical generating facilities to pay taxes to local and State units?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Only by specific existing statutes, or by means of further statutes; or the Board may so recommend to the Congress—but it will be only a recommendation.

The Senator from Washington asked whether the Holland amendment would in any way affect the existing public projects or hydroelectric power-generating projects and any payments or shared revenues concerning them. My answer is that the Holland amendment will not do so. The Holland amendment merely provides that electrical generating facilities, under the term "industrial or commercial use", as that term appears in the bill, that are not covered by existing law, shall be excluded.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Most of them are not covered, anyway.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then they are excluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield 1 or 2 minutes to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Dakota 2 minutes of the time available in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I should like to direct the attention of the Senator from Minnesota to the fact that on page 22, in line 9, under the definitions, the term "State" is defined to mean "any State of the United States."

Will the Senator from Minnesota agree to accept an amendment to add the words "and the District of Columbia"?

In view of the compliment recently paid the Senator from Minnesota by the voters of the District of Columbia, I am sure he would not want to discriminate against them by excluding them from the benefits of this bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say this whole matter was given very careful consideration by the staff and by the committee some years ago and also in this 86th Congress. The reason why the District of Columbia was not included is simply that in the District of Columbia there is Federal sharing and obviously there are Federal appropriations.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But not on the basis of the taxes which normally would be levied on the property now owned by the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, if such property were privately owned. There is an authorization to pay up to $25 million, as a Federal contribution; but that is far less than the amount of taxes which would be paid on these Federal properties in the District of Columbia if they were privately owned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the Senator from South Dakota is asking, as regards the categories of special assessments and commercial and industrial properties covered by the bill, that when a special provision already is made, the District of Columbia be included. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to have the District of Columbia included in the definition of "State," so the whole bill will also apply to the District of Columbia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would have no objection to such an amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, may I offer that amendment at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If there is no objection, then I submit the following amendment: On page 22, in line 10, after the word "States," to include "and the District of Columbia."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order: Is not my amendment pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; but the Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the submission of the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] would not displace the amendment the Senator from Ohio has offered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I thought the amendment of the Senator from Ohio had been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not yet been agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the technical amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Ohio must be included in the bill, if it is to be in conformity with the action taken yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me on my amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 22, in line 10, after the word "States", to insert the words "and the District of Columbia."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 22, line 10, after the word "States", to add the words "and the District of Columbia."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment.

Do Senators yield back the time on the amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, my understanding is that the amendment is acceptable to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment, the question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, on page 23, in line 8, to strike from the bill the words "or other public improvement."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 23, in line 8, to strike out the words "or other public improvement."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on page 23, in subsection (k), there appears a definition of the words "public improvement", and that section reads:

> The term "public improvement" means any street, road, bridge, sewer, water-distribution system, drainage project, or other public improvement.

My amendment is to strike out the words "or other public improvement."

An attempt is made to define "public improvement," and that is done. Then, by including the words "or other public improvement," the whole subject is thrown wide open, without any limitation. I submit to my colleagues it is an open end coverage, and completely too broad to provide at this time. Stadiums, dance pavilions, and other such buildings might be constructed. I do not believe the citizens of Circleville, Greenville, Fairfield, and Greenfield, those who live in rural areas, and who will get no benefit out of such construction, should be paying taxes to build such public improvements in suburban or in urban areas. This is no method of definition. A public improvement is a public improvement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There was a discussion of the matter. We had extensive discussion with technicians of the executive branch about the provision. The Bureau of the Budget representatives thought it was important to have that provision in the bill. I do not think it is. I am perfectly willing, as one Senator, and as a sponsor of the bill, to to accept a much more restrictive definition of the words "public improvement." In light of the amendment to the bill relating to special assessments, I think the amendment is desirable.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I agree with the Senator that we should accept the amendment; and I hope it will induce the Senator from Ohio to support the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I simply cannot vote for a measure, the cost of which none can foretell, and I cannot vote for a measure which merely lays the groundwork for another attack on the problem 1 year from now, when the demand will be made to eliminate the date of June 30, 1950, and an attempt will probably be made to push the date back to 1945 or 1940.

Mr. President, I yield back whatever time I have remaining on the amendment.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to observe, if I may have a moment, as one who has sponsored this kind of legislation for the last 8 years, I certainly would not agree to change the date to an earlier date. I doubt that any sponsor of the legislation will be persuaded to push the date back beyond 1950. There is good reason for establishing that date. I could see no good reason for pushing it back.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from Connecticut read the remarks made yesterday by the distinguished Senator from California. He will find that there is a vision that all the Federal property in California will be taxed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, whom is the Senator talking about? Which California Senator? The Senator who is now on his feet?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am going to ask the Senator from Ohio to get yesterday's RECORD and get the comments the senior Senator from California made, and point out, if he can—and I deny that the Senator can and the RECORD will bear me out—anything that even by remote, speculative implication would form the basis of the statement the Senator from Ohio just made. I deny it, and I do not believe the RECORD will substantiate that comment. I say that to the Senator from Ohio with all sincerity.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I see. I thought I heard the Senator from California yesterday enumerate the many properties the Federal Government has within his State.

Mr. KUCHEL. Indeed the Senator from California did, but I deny that the Senator from Ohio can accurately or logically draw from that statement an implication that I want to use every single foot of Federal property located in the State of California, or elsewhere, as a basis on which in-lieu payments will be made. I come from a State half owned by the Government of the United States, and I wanted to demonstrate that fact to the Senate, but I say to the Senator from Ohio, sincerely, I had no such desire as stated when I spoke, and have none now, nor will I have in the future.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad to hear that. I am glad to correct my statement. I hope what the Senator from California said yesterday will prevail—that there has never been any contemplation of paying the local governments' tax structures on properties that are used solely for governmental functions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, such payments are excluded in the bill. The bill makes it absolutely, unqualifiedly, and unmistakably clear that where there is Federal property used exclusively for governmental functions, with the exception of special assessments, there will be no Federal payments in lieu of taxes.

Mr. KUCHEL. And there ought not to be.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Very well. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). All time on the amendment having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 19, in line 21, to strike out the numbers "1959" and insert in lieu thereof "1960."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and read the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, obviously the bill will pass. It is my sincere hope it will receive a Presidential veto; and it is my sincere hope we will not override the veto.

Mr. President, 6 years ago, as a freshman Member of this body, it was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Government Operations with and under the able leadership of my esteemed friend from Minnesota, whom I greatly admired for his work on that committee. My admiration continues.

A bill of this type then came before our committee. At the very moment it came before the committee, Mr. President, the local communities and the States in this Union were offering enticements for private industry to locate with in their borders. The States were offering tax exemptions for periods of years. The States and local communities were building and offering factories and plants.

I have no objetcion to that procedure. I admired it then, and I admire it now, as a demonstration of enterprise on the part of those people.

Mr. President, in the committee at that time, 6 years ago, the junior Senator from New Hampshire offered an amendment, which I am glad to say is still in the bill, providing that a State or community which is offering such tax inducements cannot avail itself of the privilege under the bill of getting payments in lieu of taxes from the Federal Government on manufacturing enterprises or similar industrial enterprises within the State.

Mr. President, the situation which then existed in a sense will always exist. There is an adage in the Bible which says:

> For whosoever hath, to him shall be given; and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he seemeth to have.

That, in a sense, is true. My heart cannot bleed too much for some of these great States which are filled to the brim with Federal enterprises which bring money into the States, bring employment into the States, bring business to the merchants, and lifeblood into the communities.

In most cases the representatives of these States have come to Washington, D.C., very naturally and laudably, to continue to ask for these Federal enterprises. But as soon as they get their feet into the tent, they turn around and ask the Federal Government to make payments in lieu of taxes.

Mr. President, I represent a State which is hungry for industry and hungry for more employment. I represent a State which will receive virtually none of the largess envisioned under the bill. I say to some of my friends who come from these States, who have spoken in the last few days, "If you do not want to build the highways, if you do not want to maintain the sewers, if you do not want to maintain the water systems for these plants, we will be very happy to have those plants move into our State, and we will give a written guarantee that we will never ask for a contribution of taxes from the Federal Government."

I served on the committee 6 years ago, and I learned one thing as a freshman Senator, that this is one of the most difficult and technical tasks which can ever be faced by the Senate.

In the last 2 days we have seen and reviewed all the corrections and the amendments and the safeguards and the provisions which have been placed in the bill and they have confirmed the thought that we are venturing into a field in which it is almost utterly impossible to legislate fairly, to legislate with safety, and to legislate without signing a blank check for years and years ahead.

With that knowledge, despite the respect I have for those who have supported the measure and helped it through this body, I venture the prediction that in the years ahead some of the Senators who now support the bill will decide it was a dangerous step and a very unsafe step to take. With all respect to those Senators, I voted to recommit the bill. I shall vote, whatever form the vote may take, against passage of the bill. I hope to have a chance to vote to sustain a Presidential veto. I think the bill, no matter what we may do to clean it up, is bound to be discriminatory, to be unfair, and to be expensive almost beyond our imagination.

Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. ALLOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Colorado wish to speak? I shall be glad to yield the Senator some time.

Mr. ALLOTT. I desire to speak on the bill. I will get some time from the acting minority leader. I wish to speak in opposition to the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall say only a few words in reference to the comments of the Senator from New Hampshire, for whom I have great personal affection, and high admiration.

Mr. President, I am pleased that there were no more amendments offered to the bill than were submitted. This is a complicated bill. We do not deny that. I honestly can say this is not the kind of measure which the Senator from Minnesota finds particularly politically attractive. It has none of what we call "political sex appeal."

This is a legislative proposal which offers simple justice. It is a beginning. The bill is couched in terms which will limit its application to a very small number of cases.

The difference between this bill and a mere study bill is that the pending bill provides not only that a Federal Board shall make a comprehensive study of the entire problem of Federal payments in lieu of taxes and all other fiscal relationships between the Federal Government and local governments, but will also authorize payments in three very limited categories. This will give the Board a chance to obtain some experience in deciding which of the applicants should be granted some relief.

We have been studying this matter from an academic point of view for many years. Universities have studied it. The Bureau of the Budget has made three studies of it. The Treasury Department has studied it. Committees of the Congress have studied it. I think there have been perhaps 15 studies over the last 20 years of the question of payments in lieu of taxes and the fiscal relationships of the Federal Government to local governments. In the meanwhile, the Federal Government moves ever more into what we might call the proprietary interests and ever more into the local government areas, acquiring property which is taken off the local tax rolls as the result of Federal acquisition.

Mr. President, an honest and sincere attempt has been made in S. 910. This is not the Humphrey bill. This is not the bill of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] or of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], even though these two esteemed Senators have contributed mightily to it. They have testified. They have worked. They have helped to refine the provisions in the bill. So have many other Senators.

This is the end product of a good deal of hard work by the staff, by the Bureau of the Budget, by the Presidential Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, by universities, by students in the field covered by the bill, and by many others.

I admit that undoubtedly there are some flaws in the bill. I hope when it goes to the House of Representatives it will be worked on and some improvements may be made in it. I assure the Senate that efforts were made to see to it that the bill did not have an open end, that it was not a handout, that it would not lead to fiscal irresponsibility or recklessness. What we tried to do was to get a system of casework, so to speak, before the Board, so that the Board could attempt to perfect some kind of system.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I will say, in reply to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, that what he has had to say I think has, I believe, confirmed everything I said a few minutes ago.

In the first place, I will testify from my experience in the years I worked on this type of bill in the committee with

the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, I agree 100 percent that the Senator's service in this field has not been from any political motivation. With the deepest of sincerity, with the greatest of skill, with unlimited industry and unflagging enthusiasm, the Senator from Minnesota has worked his level best to bring forth a fair, a reasonable, and a constructive measure. I honor the Senator for that.

The fact that the Senator has brought to the attention of the Senate the information that there have been 15 different studies of this matter by different groups, in an attempt to devise some way of achieving the effect desired without discrimination, without danger, and without extravagance, and that these groups have been unable to find the solution, confirms my opinion.

I honor the sincerity and the skill of the Senator. However, this proposal represents a step out into the darkness in an attempt to solve the problem, with the understanding that it is to be a trial-and-error method, and with a further realization that there is to be no limit as to how far we shall go.

There is one idea about which I would take issue with what the distinguished Senator has said; I must disagree with the statement of the Senator. It is not a fact that the safeguards and the landmarks which have been provided in the measure, with complete sincerity, will hold back the floodtide. I have served in the Congress of the United States, in both branches, for 14 years. Many Senators now in the Chamber are my seniors in service. I ask any one of them if there has ever been a time when we have embarked on a new program at Federal expense and have written into the bill safeguards so that the program will not grow, when those safeguards and those protections ever held back the tide.

We cannot say that will be done any more than we could say, when we started paying total disability payments under the Social Security Act to those who were over 50 years of age, that the provision would not be extended. Now people come in to say, "Why should we not pay disability payments to those who are under 50 years of age?" When we write the safeguards into the bill, they simply will not be sufficient.

I honor the Senator for his sincerity. I can testify to the very fine leadership he has given in this field.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this question is not new to a great many Senators. Some by reason of their long service in the Senate and on the committee from which the bill has come, and some by reason of their service as Governors of their respective States, are well acquainted with the problem. My own experience in this field took place when I was serving my State as its Governor.

I do not know whether every Senator knows, or whether the record shows, but under the rule of the national Governors' conference no action can be taken except by unanimous vote. I wonder how many actions we would have in the Senate if we had that requirement? By unanimous vote of the Governors at the national Governors' conference it was decided that one of the things which cried out for attention was the question of the loss of revenue in certain counties, districts, school districts, and the like, by reason of the Federal Government coming into such county or school district and taking over property and removing it from the tax rolls. By unanimous vote of the Governors a committee was created. I myself as Governor, and later the comptroller of our State, spent weeks in Washington trying to set something in motion which would take care of the problem.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that piecemeal we have been taking care of this problem in various ways. For example, we have taken care of the impact of defense establishments on schools by measures for the construction of school buildings and school operations. But there is no definite policy or program.

As late as last year our able President recommended that we not renew the law by which the plight of many school districts was recognized because of the impact of great defense installations. The Congress did not see fit to follow that recommendation. I have the greatest of respect for the Chief Executive. I am sure his recommendation was based upon his conviction. But I call attention to that fact as illustrative of the point that no permanent policy has been laid down in this important field.

I have jotted down a few of the temporary expedients which have been adopted since that time. One of them has to do with the sharing of minerals in States where minerals are produced from public lands. States in the West in particular receive quite a large amount of revenue yearly by participating in the income from minerals and from oil products.

In the case of forest products, the little county of Wakulla in my own State, without the revenue which comes from its participation in the sale of forest products from a national forest which practically covers all of that county would have difficulty in continuing to operate. I know there are many similar counties in the forested areas of the Nation.

Then there is the question of power installations, which has been mentioned already. If I correctly understood the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], there are approximately 55 dams and power units which are covered by contribution provisions which have been enacted by the Federal Government at one time or another going all the way from the sweeping declaration in the case of TVA to almost as sweeping declarations in the case of the whole Bonneville structure and others that are more applicable to independent and individual enterprises.

Likewise, in the field of grazing there is a sharing position.

The point I make is that the field calls out still, as it did then, for some kind of reasonable policy announcement to be engrafted on the law so that our local units of government, which have a legitimate interest in this problem, as a matter of right, may know what they can depend upon by way of Federal revenue. I dislike the part of this bill which puts the local units of government in the position, for the time being, of coming with a cup in their hand to a Federal agency to determine whether or not they are entitled to any payments in lieu of taxes.

The reason I support the bill, and the reason I opposed its recommittal after the two important amendments offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the Senator from Florida had been adopted, is that I think we must proceed to make a thorough study. The important part of this bill is the provision for setting up a board of capable, full-time members, whose nominations would be confirmed by the Senate, to study this very difficult and complex problem. It is becoming more complex with reference to such areas as the county of Arlington, across the Potomac River from the District of Columbia, and the new State of Alaska, and other areas which might be mentioned.

I think that study should move ahead. I vote with some reluctance for that part of the bill, which I regard as a temporary expedient. I would not have voted for it, but for the adoption of the two amendments which I have already mentioned. But I believe the whole field manifestly requires attention, and it is for that reason that I shall vote for the bill. This is not the last form of the bill. The House will still find some defects in it, as we have found in the Senate. We do not expect perfection on a first attempt in a debate on the floor of the Senate after many years of effort to solve this question, but I think we should get along with the solution of it.

Finally, the subject should be placed on a basis of right, so that the units of government which have to keep their schools open, which have to build roads, which have to do all the things which are implicit in local government, will know that when the Federal Government comes in and disturbs their tax structure unduly, there are some things upon which they can definitely depend. It is in the hope that that kind of result will be accomplished by the passage of the bill that I support it.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding 5 minutes to me.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have just listened to the very persuasive arguments by my friend from Florida, who is a brilliant lawyer. I must confess that he nearly persuades me, but each of us comes finally to rely upon those principles upon which he places most emphasis.

I shall vote against the bill, although I am a cosponsor of the original bill. I believe that most of us can discuss the bill without assuming to cast any re-

flection on any work which any Senator has done or any position which any Senator has taken upon the question. We can disagree with the positions, but I cannot see any justification for letting the personal element creep into the discussion, as has sometimes happened on the floor here in the past day or so.

What compels me primarily to vote against the bill is that in my opinion it delegates the work of the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and of the House to a board called a Federal Board for Payments to Local Governments without any opportunity for the Congress ever to review the actions of that board with respect to the payments it decides to make.

In this situation I realize that all that the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has said about the great number of years which have been spent on this problem is true. The problems he has mentioned are problems in my State, as they are in most other States. Nevertheless, I cannot bring myself to vote for a bill which I think is as dangerous as this bill could be.

I must say that it is hard to vote against the committee, which has taken so much time on the bill. Although the committee has spent a great deal of time on the subject, I still believe implicitly that the bill does not lay down, for the payments of money to the States or the local authorities, sufficient guidelines to protect the Government of the United States.

The committee does lay down guidelines generally upon the basis of businesses and upon the basis of special improvements or public improvements. The public improvements part, I believe, was stricken by the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, which was agreed to a few minutes ago.

Nevertheless, I do not find any criteria laid down in the bill anywhere which would govern the Board in the determination of how much should be awarded to any given authority or any given municipality or any given State in a given instance.

Then when we come to page 37, subparagraph (f), we read:

> (f) Each final order made by the Board under this Act for the payment of any award shall be final and conclusive upon all tax authorities and upon all Federal agencies, unless such order is modified or reversed by a court of competent jurisdiction or is adjudged invalid in whole or in part by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. President, I can interpret that language in only one way, and that is that the payment is final unless the General Accounting Office adjudges it invalid. Therefore we have placed in the General Accounting Office and in the Board the power to appropriate money for this purpose.

However, there is still another exception, and that is: "unless such order is modified or reversed by a court of competent jurisdiction."

Upon what standards would any court of competent jurisdiction reverse a finding made by the Board? I believe I can say without fear of contradiction that the only basis upon which a court could reverse such a finding would be upon a finding of malfeasance or misfeasance of members of the Board. I do not believe we need worry too much about that kind of situation arising.

The second ground would be—and I ask Senators to pay particular attention to this—a gross abuse of discretion. There is not a lawyer in the Senate who does not know how difficult it is to overturn an action of any administrative body on the basis of abuse of discretion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Therefore, Mr. President, with all due regard for the work which the committee has done—and I do not minimize the importance of the work the committee has done, and I do not minimize the time it has spent on this subject, and I do not minimize the difficulties of the problem—because I believe the bill actually amounts to a deprivation of the Appropriations Committees of Congress of their powers, I must vote, reluctantly, against the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I was one of the original sponsors of the bill. In fact, I introduced a bill on the subject in a previous Congress, several sessions ago.

I regretfully must vote against the passage of the pending bill, in spite of the fact that I believe the committee has done an excellent job in studying the problem, and has done all it could do in making the recommendation with which it has come forward to the Senate. I wish to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee which made this study. He certainly has been assiduous in applying himself to the task. Therefore I regret it is necessary for me to be against the bill, even though I favored it when it was in its original and simple form.

We must have a reason for backing off from a position previously taken. I am in complete sympathy with the philosophy of the Government paying moneys instead of taxes. However, I am not in sympathy with the broad and very general payments that this bill now encompasses. The original position I had taken was directed toward the ownership of Federal lands, mainly in the Western States, where great problems are confronting us as our populations grow.

For instance, in my own State of Arizona we can tax only 16.4 percent of the land in the State. That was all right when we had only a few people and a handful of Indians. However, now that the population of my State is increasing at the rate of 60 percent every 10 years, the 16.4 percent of taxable land is not enough to support the population.

It was with this in mind that I wrote the first bill that I introduced several years ago. It was with this in mind that I supported the original Humphrey proposal. I did so because I felt it would be minimum in its effect, and would apply only to areas such as public lands where Government industry or a Government contracted industry occupies tax-free land and where that industry impacts school districts or communities.

Such a program will not solve the problem. It is not even directed at it. However, we are confronted with a problem, and that problem caused my interest in the subject in the first place.

The Bureau of Land Management was created in 1945 under a presidential reorganization plan. One of the objects encompassed by the Bureau of Land Management Act was to get the land belonging to the Federal Government back to the States or back to the people. In 1955, in the Federal budget, the Bureau reported it was administering 737 million acres of public land in the United States and Alaska, in the interest of conserving forest, range, mineral, and water resources. One of the reasons the Bureau of Land Management gave for its existence was to get this land back into the hands of the State and into the hands of the people.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, they recognized that was one of the prime purposes of the act. Then let us look at the 1961 budget. We find that the Federal Government now has 833 million acres of land, an increase of 96 million acres in 6 years. That increase represents the combined area of England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, Denmark, Holland, and Belgium.

We in the West are very apprehensive of the Federal Government's growing ownership of land. It was to this ownership that the original bills were directed, in an effort to alleviate the growing responsibility of State governments in the West to the people who are moving into these sections. I was hopeful that the bill would encompass just those very narrow areas where the Federal Government, by insisting on owning land, which should belong to the people, would make these payments.

The argument has been made that the Federal Government pay the Western States for forest lands, and so forth. Mr. President, we get very little money for the forests in Arizona—and we have the largest stand of ponderosa pine in the world—and we cannot support our schools with those funds, even though that was the original intent.

We cannot build the necessary roads. It was to that end that I was interested in the original bill, so that the Federal Government would assume or could assume more of its rightful responsibility in this area.

Therefore it is with great regret that I must leave my good friend from Minnesota on the pending bill. I reiterate my compliments to him for having done an outstanding job, even though I cannot agree with his final result.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish highly to commend the tenacity and devotion which the chairman of the subcommittee, our dedicated friend, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], has shown in pursuing this

important subject—securing Federal payments in lieu of taxes—session after session—indeed he began working at it when he first came to the Senate over 11 years ago until he has finally brought it to the point where we can be hopeful of producing a bill, a modest bill, it is true, but one which moves in the right direction which at least makes a start, and that that bill will be enacted into law.

Likewise I wish to associate myself also with the excellent remarks made by the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who has brought new light and fresh impetus to this whole subject, as well as with the valuable contributions made on the floor yesterday by the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss].

I consider the pending bill important to Alaska, where 99 percent of the land is in Federal ownership. It is true that under the Statehood Act, in the next 25 years we will be allowed to select 27 percent of that land for the 49th State. That will still leave 73 percent of the land in Federal ownership.

On top of all that, Mr. President, there are vast reservations for special purposes. We have some national parks and monuments in Alaska, three of which are larger than some States. In addition, we have tremendous Federal withdrawals of all varieties and more are threatened. We have all kinds of military withdrawals, some actual, and others potential, which at any time can be made by the President if he thinks it necessary for defense purposes.

While these problems are not met by this bill, I cite these facts as an indication of how extensive has been the impact of Federal ownership in Alaska.

The bill is, as I have said, a modest one. It is limited in time and in scope. It expires in 5 years and applies to only certain types of Federal ownership. It is an exploratory operation, which will give us an opportunity to make a beginning in a matter that has been before Congress for decades. It certainly deserves support. It is obviously unjust that the Federal Government should move into communities and preempt large sections of revenue-producing land and other enterprises, removing these areas from the State and local tax rolls, and not make some requital.

In my judgment, the bill does not go far enough. But I am happy to support it in its limited form, because I believe it is better to begin in a small way and see how its works. At the end of 5 years, when the act will expire, we will be in a better position to judge what has been accomplished and what the next steps should be.

I hope the bill will be enacted shortly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the letter sent to the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], by David A. Lindsay, assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, under date of August 11, 1959. The letter appears on pages 37 and 38 of the committee report. It points out that the Treasury Department found the bill to be acceptable and it embodied principles which the Treasury Department regarded as sound for a temporary program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., August 11, 1959.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Government Operations, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the Department's views on S. 910, to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes.

The bill, S. 910, is identical with S. 4183 reported favorably by your committee during the 86th Congress and with S. 967 introduced in the 85th Congress. It would authorize a limited program of payments in lieu of taxes for a 5-year period beginning January 1, 1960, on industrial and commercial real property acquired by the Federal Government after June 30, 1950. These payments would be limited to jurisdictions which have suffered a demonstrable financial hardship as a result of the removal of the property from their tax rolls. The amount of such payments would be determined on the basis of the amount of local taxes which would have been payable if the property were privately owned, increased by any additional expenditures incurred by the local taxing jurisdiction in furnishing services to the Federal agency, and reduced by the value of local-type government services furnished by the Federal agency. Adjustment would also be made for any special tax benefits for which the Government's property would be eligible under State or local law if it were privately owned.

The bill would also authorize the payment of special assessments on Federal property in urban and suburban areas if levied also against real property owned by taxable persons and of taxes on the Federal Government's interest in real property leased or sold to private persons under conditional sales contracts.

The payments program authorized by the bill would be administered by a Federal Board for Payments to Local Governments composed of five members to be appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation. Said Board would be required, in addition, to conduct a comprehensive study of the problems arising out of Federal immunity from local real and personal property taxes, including the operation of existing payment programs, and within 2 years to submit recommendations for the future treatment of the Government's real and personal properties with respect to local tax laws.

The provisions of the bill generally accord with the program outlined to your committee by the Assistant to the Director, Bureau of the Budget, on April 19, 1956. On that occasion the administration recommended legislation "to provide the authority and mechanism for payments, during a period of 4 or 5 years, in cases of demonstrable hardship involving the recent removal of real estate from the tax rolls by reason of its acquisition by the National Government for industrial or commercial purposes, and including provision that during that period there should be detailed field studies of specific local situations."

Since the submission of these recommendations to your committee, the U.S. Supreme Court, in four separate decisions rendered last year, ruled that the Government's contractors and leaseholders are required to pay the local taxes on the possession or use of Federal real or personal property in their custody. In at least some of these situations, the economic burden of the local taxes is on the Federal Government.

The 1958 Court decisions have altered fundamentally the constitutional and fiscal relationships existing between the Federal Government and the States and may require congressional consideration of legislation defining the status of the Government's properties under State and local tax laws. The subject matter is currently under study by the Federal agencies concerned. Pending completion of this evaluation, it is not clear what additional legislation will be required. Nonetheless, since the bill, S. 910, embodies principles the Department regards sound for a temporary program of payments in lieu of taxes on real properties in the possession of the Government, and would provide machinery for the ultimate development of permanent legislation in an area of vital interest to local governments, the Department does not counsel that its enactment be further delayed. It therefore supports enactment of S. 910, reserving the right to recommend such additional legislation as is deemed necessary with respect to the tax status of the Government's properties in the hands of contractors and lessees.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID A. LINDSAY,
Assistant to the Secretary.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota answer a few questions I wish to ask?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. WILEY. My name appears on the bill because I think that, fundamentally, the idea of having the Government make a contribution when, in equity, it should do so is a good idea. However, I should like to ask some questions.

Suppose in my town a new post office were to be built, and the Federal Government acquired some land within the next year or two on which to build it. On what basis would the Federal Government pay taxes on that property?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would pay on that property only whatever special assessment might be required in terms of public improvements or, under the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], if there is a tax for a public improvement, as defined in the law—the language is now more restrictive, due to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio—then the Federal Government would have a responsibility for payment. But the payment must not be discriminatory. In other words, the local taxing authority cannot ask more from the Federal Government than it would ask from any other taxable person. Furthermore, the special assessment must be levied on all other taxable persons in the assessment district. It cannot be levied only on the Federal property.

Mr. WILEY. Would a tax be imposed on real estate on which a plant was built?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No.

Mr. WILEY. The tax would simply be on what are called special improvements?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. Very well. Suppose the Federal Government acquires 2,000 or 3,000 acres of land in a State for the purpose of constructing an airfield. After it had acquired the land, suppose the Government either used it or left it alone. Would any tax be imposed on the Federal Government for acquiring that property?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Only for public improvements, or if the land were converted to some private use, under which a taxable person would use the property. Then the portion which was used would be taxable.

Mr. WILEY. If the Federal Government built a plant for the use of a private business concern, but the property was owned by the Federal Government, although the business concern occupied it and utilized it, what would be the status of the tax on the real estate and the plant?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The personal property in the plant would not be subject to tax, but the payment in lieu of tax would be upon the real property.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Minnesota has clarified some thoughts I have had.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The bill is a limited bill.

Mr. WILEY. What is the purpose, then, of the further investigation? The bill contains a provision for a further investigation. What would be investigated—the method of assessment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. A continuing study would be made of all forms of Federal payments in lieu of taxes to the local governments. In other words, a continuing study would be made of the Federal-local fiscal relationships. Under the pending proposal, the studies and investigations would be directed toward presenting to the President and to the Congress within 2 years the results of the study, together with recommendations. The Board would make recommendations to Congress and to the President.

Mr. WILEY. I heard yesterday the statement that the measure is an open door which would permit the Federal Government to be taken, we might say, for a further tax ride. I am wondering if there is any truth in that statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not believe so. The Treasury Department does not think so, and is quite specific in its communication.

As the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has pointed out, the local government does not come here by right; it comes by reason of a grant to the local taxing authority to make its plea to justify its case. The burden of proof rests upon the local taxing authority. It does not have any right, per se, to come before the Federal Board; but it can be heard. In other words, the Federal Board, of 5 members, will consider the application and decide the request on the basis of the information which is presented, within the confines and limitations of the act.

Mr. WILEY. Why was the year 1950 designated?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was felt by the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget that this was the year in which an appreciable amount of commercial- and industrial-type property had been acquired or constructed by the Federal Government due to the Korean war. World War II properties had been pretty well either integrated within community life or disposed of by surplus sales to private industry. Nineteen hundred and fifty was felt to be the best base year. I can honestly say that there might be a better year, but it was necessary to draw the line at some place. Nineteen hundred and fifty excludes World War II properties, many of which were declared surplus and sold by the Federal Government. The 1950 base year takes in the expansion of the industrial plant for the rearmament program which began in 1950. Also, I think it places upon the agencies of Government which own Federal properties that are currently being put to an industrial- or commercial-type use an incentive to get rid of them and return them to the normal tax rolls, and not to continue to hold such properties for an indefinite period.

In this sense, the bill is an economy measure, because it will place upon the Federal agencies the responsibility to reexamine continuously the necessity of holding such properties. If there is no real need or long-term necessity for retaining them, the agencies should dispose of them and return them to private hands, so that the properties will become a part of the private economy, subject to normal taxation.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Minnesota has answered my next question, whether or not, in his judgment, if the bill should become law, it would constitute what so many persons have contended, a real reason for the disposition of Government-owned property which the Government does not need.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; and so the agencies of the Government testified in response to our inquiries.

Mr. WILEY. Has the Senator an estimate in his own mind as to what the program would cost the Federal Government over a term of years?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I made an estimate yesterday. It is only a guess, because one does not know, first of all, what properties will be brought to the attention of the Board.

We have a pretty good idea that in the category of special assessments the amount will be modest. As to commercial and industrial properties, with the restriction placed in the bill, the amount will be cut back substantially.

There will be very little adjudication of these matters in the first year. In 2 years we will have a complete study followed by a report to Congress.

What we seek to do is to have an opportunity to have a case-by-case study, so to speak, based on individual cases which will be brought before the board—so that we can really ascertain what the problem is rather than to discuss it from an academic point of view.

I believe the letter of the Treasury Department to the committee indicates that we are not too far off, in the light of even the recent court decisions, which some persons felt would have imposed an additional burden on the Government. The Treasury Department in its letter stated:

> Nonetheless, since the bill, S. 910, embodies principles the Department regards sound for a temporary program of payments in lieu of taxes on real properties in the possession of the Government, and would provide machinery for the ultimate development of permanent legislation in an area of vital interest to local governments, the Department does not counsel that its enactment be further delayed. It therefore supports the enactment of S. 910, reserving the right to recommend such additional legislation as is deemed necessary with respect to the tax status of the Government's properties, in the hands of contractors and lessees.

Subsequently, the Bureau of the Budget took a different view, and said it preferred that at this time there be only study legislation.

But the Treasury Department did advise the committee, after carefully examining this from a fiscal point of view, that it felt this measure was reasonably good, constructive legislation.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator made the point that, in his opinion, if the bill becomes law the Government will begin to liquidate its ownership of some of these properties.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my hope; yes.

Mr. WILEY. Is there any estimate in that connection? Some claim the Government owns billions of dollars' worth of such properties.

Mr. HUMPHREY. An inventory has been made; the Committee on Government Operations, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] has an inventory of federally owned properties, particularly the industrial and commercial properties. There is no doubt that the total runs into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

There is always a tendency of the Government agencies to hold on to these properties longer than I regard necessary. But if, as a result of the enactment of this bill, they must make payment in lieu of taxes, and must include the funds for such payments in their departmental budgets, then the Appropriations Committees will ask them, annually, "Why do not you dispose of this property at a fair rate, and return it to private hands, where it will be subject to taxes on a fair base?"

Mr. WILEY. Some claim the bill will unbalance the budget. Has the Senator given any thought to a possible increase of taxes anywhere along the line?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not believe the bill will have the effect which some persons predict it will. I cannot believe that the Treasury Department, which has great responsibility for the Federal revenues, would have recommended that the bill be passed, and would have regarded the bill as sound legislation, if the Department thought the bill would throw the Federal budget out of kilter.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, if sufficient time remains under my control.

Mr. President, how much time remains under my control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). Three minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then, Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield all that time to the Senator from Colorado, if he desires that I do so.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to ask one or two brief questions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Is the proposed board to be an arm of the Congress or an arm of the executive branch?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is to be appointed by the President, and confirmed by the Senate, as an independent board.

Mr. CARROLL. It is to be independent?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, it is to be independent.

Mr. CARROLL. Is the board to be given the power to make rules and regulations? In other words, will the board be under the Administrative Procedure Act?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; obviously it will fall under the Administrative Procedure Act.

Mr. CARROLL. Therefore, the Board itself will be able to issue and establish rules and regulations, because the authority to do so is provided under the Administrative Procedure Act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. In addition, section 5(d) specifically provides that the Board may make such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of the act, as may be necessary for the performance of its duties.

Mr. CARROLL. Let me ask a question of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who has spoken on this subject, and is an able lawyer: When the Board establishes rules and regulations and procedures, and when, thereafter, an application is filed, if the Board rules against the application, will the applicant have a vested right to appeal under due process?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Under this proposal, he will have a right to judicial review of the Board's decision. Therefore, on that basis, if, following a ruling by the Board, someone wishes to contest the ruling, he would be able to have a judicial review in court.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Minnesota has stated the matter exactly as I understand it, although I am not as familiar with the bill as he is. But I should like to point out that the bill contains an unusual provision, which I regard as salutary; namely, that the General Accounting Office, an arm of the Congress, will have veto power over the payment of any funds, if it believes the Board has proceeded irregularly. At times when the Congress was not in session, that provision would, as nearly as could be, result in some supervisory power and control.

Mr. CARROLL. I agree with the interpretation of the Senator from Minnesota; and I shall vote for the bill.

But we must remember that as regards each application upon which the Board passes, and as to which a record or history is established, this provision will serve as the administrative law which will be applicable.

In the event of an appeal, from what could the applicant appeal? Could he appeal on the basis that the action of the Board was arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. I think that under the Administrative Procedure Act there will be some guidelines which will serve to protect against a charge of fiscal irresponsibility. That is why I asked whether this point has been considered by the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. On pages 32, 33, and 34 we lay down specific guidelines to guide the Board as regards the making of payments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Fourteen minutes remain available to Senators who oppose the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall use only 1 minute.

I reassert what I have said on a number of occasions: On July 8, 1959, in a message from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, there appeared this sentence:

> However, in view of the numerous difficulties as yet unresolved by S. 910, we must oppose its enactment.

On occasion it has been said that the Treasury approves this bill. But I point out that on August 25, 1959, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, David A. Lindsay, said, in a letter addressed to the chairman:

> This will confirm the information given you this morning by telephone that the administration's position on S. 910 is reflected in the letter to you dated July 8, 1959, from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, rather than in my letter to you, dated August 11, 1959.

Mr. President, I add that this morning I talked to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. He has reaffirmed and reasserted the position he took in that letter to the chairman of the committee.

I believe this bill will be an open door. The estimates already run as high as $500 million; $128 million in estimated taxes by Federal contractors have already been presented, up to a year ago; and probably a good many more have been presented since that time.

I cannot reconcile the idea of a study bill with a provision for the making of temporary payments, allegedly because hardships are involved.

This road is so complicated that the Congress should not go down it, unless Congress is absolutely sure that it is a valid one.

For that reason, Mr. President, I oppose the bill.

I regret that the motion to recommit the bill, for further study, did not prevail. However, in view of that fact, which is on the RECORD, in connection with that vote, I shall not ask that a yea-and-nay vote be taken on the question of final passage of the bill. Instead, I shall let the yea-and-nay vote on the motion to recommit speak for itself.

However, I wished to be sure that the present viewpoint of the Federal agencies involved is made a part of the legislative record or history in connection with the bill.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to state that if a yea-and-nay vote were taken on the question of final passage of the bill, I would vote against passage of the bill. I should do so because I think a paradoxical situation exists, in which many communities are asking the Federal Government to construct post offices, Federal office buildings, and bring in commercial plants, and otherwise. While they beg for these improvements, an added burden is asked to be put upon the Federal Government of giving an additional premium to those communities which have the good fortune of having the manpower to be employed in offices located in their areas.

Under the bill, the Federal Government will have to pay the equivalent in taxes that would be levied against the property and against the building. It would not be paid in the form of taxes or special assessments, but in lieu of taxes and special assessments.

If it were contemplated providing that, to the extent the Federal Government had removed property from the tax revenues, the Federal Government would pay, there would be equity in such a law. But in the proposal before us, if a community asks for a $20 million office building, for example, which will result in employing thousands of people, the Federal Government will have to pay the equivalent of taxes not only on the land, but on the building, for all public improvements.

Public improvements are, of course, as defined in the bill, bridges, irrigation plants, roads, highways, sewage disposal plants, and water distribution plants. That is quite a burden to put on the Federal Government when it settles in a community in a State. Let us keep in mind also that the benefits will come only to the community in which the property is located. There may be a hundred other communities in the State which will have to pay taxes to benefit the community in which the job-giving structure was placed.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, all time on the bill has been exhausted; has it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the bill has been exhausted.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Ohio was allowed to express his opinion,

I should like to express mine, since there will be no record vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Colorado may speak for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, if I were permitted to record my vote on this bill, I would vote "Yea." I heard the argument of the Senator from Ohio, and I had in mind the points he made when I began a study of the bill. I know that certain benefits fall to a community when the Federal Government moves a project into it. I know the civic leaders and the fathers of communities want such projects brought into their communities. But I can, if necessary, give the Senate specific cases where the Federal Government has condemned land for such a project in a county adjacent to a big city, and the people of that county, under the taxing laws in existence have had to bear the cost through sharply increased real estate taxes, and presently there is no immediate relief given to the people of such areas. I can give the Senate examples where the Federal Government condemned land in World War II, and is now leasing that land to private corporations, and that land is paying no taxes to the communities.

That is the question which concerns me as I look at my own State and examine the situation which exists in some counties. I agree with the Senator from Ohio that if, for example, Denver wants a post office, Denver should not necessarily file an application under the bill. Why? The Board would require evidence showing demonstrable hardship. This means that every such community could not go, willy-nilly, before the Board and demand money. It would have to show a demonstrable hardship. It would have to be shown that the construction of a plant necessary for the war or defense effort, or an atomic plant, resulted in a need for pipes, gutters, and other such improvements; that the people of the county should not be required to pay for those improvements, unless there was enough real property on which taxes could be levied to pay for such improvements.

That illustration is one reason why I shall vote for the bill.

I should like to read from page 26 of the bill:

> The Board may make such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this act.

It was in view of that provision that I asked the Senator from Minnesota whether the Board would come under the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, to assure that the Board would not be turned loose to run free, raiding the U.S. Treasury. The Board is going to be bound by rules and regulations under law, under the Administrative Procedure Act. We know the Board will follow the intent of the bill, as indicated by the debate which has taken place on the floor of the Senate, and which I hope will take place to a greater degree on the floor of the House.

It was one of the reasons why I became convinced, as I began a study of the bill and heard the very intelligent speech of the able Senator from Minnesota. I intend to vote for the bill.

The bill is not going to open up any great holes in the present budget. Why? It will take a year for the Board to function. It will take almost a year before it drafts rules and regulations. The Board will start sifting matters slowly. It will be a year, too, before it really begins operating.

During this period of time reports should be coming to the Congress which should reveal the scope and extent of this legislative program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? [Putting the question.]

The bill (S. 910) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Payments to Local Governments Act of 1960".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) Although the United States is under no constitutional obligation to pay taxes, or to make financial contributions in lieu of taxes, to any State or any political subdivision or instrumentality thereof with respect to any property of the Federal Government, the Congress hereby declares that it is national policy to avoid demonstrable financial hardship upon such local governments caused by the exemption of Federal real property from taxation by local governments.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to provide for the conduct of a comprehensive study to ascertain (1) the nature and extent of any continuing need for Federal contributions to those governments to relieve such hardship, and (2) the ways and means whereby any such hardship may be alleviated most effectively and economically. It is further the purpose of this Act to make temporary provision for the relief of those governments from such hardship, pending the completion of that study, by authorizing the making of certain Federal contributions to local governments in lieu of the payment of—

(1) special assessments and taxes levied after the effective date of this Act upon real property situated in urban and suburban areas to defray the cost of local public improvements;

(2) taxes with respect to Federal real property in the custody or control of taxable persons under lease, contract, or permit arrangements, to the extent that taxes with respect to that property are not paid by such taxable persons; and

(3) taxes upon Federal real property acquired after June 30, 1950, which is in the custody or control of any Federal agency for industrial or commercial use.

(c) In consideration for the payments authorized by this Act, the Congress expects that the recipients thereof will make all public services normally provided by them available to and with respect to the Federal Government, its property, and its officers and employees and their families, upon the same terms and conditions as such services are made available to or with respect to other property and individuals.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Federal agency" means any department, agency, officer, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government of the United States, and any corporation now or hereafter subject to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 846);

(b) The term "Federal property" means any real property the legal title to which is held by the United States or any Federal agency;

(c) The term "real property" means any interest in land, and any improvement thereon, if such interest or improvement constitutes real property under law in effect within the State in which such property is situated;

(d) The term "controlling agency", when used in relation to any Federal property, means the Federal agency which is charged with the duty of administering such property;

(e) The term "Board" means the Federal Board for Payments to Local Governments established by this Act;

(f) The term "State" means any State of the United States and the District of Columbia;

(g) The term "tax authority" means any county, city, municipality, tax district, or other political subdivision or public entity of any State having authority under the law of such State to levy within its territorial jurisdiction any tax or special assessment upon real property;

(h) The term "tax" (except as otherwise specified) means any tax of general application levied according to value by any tax authority upon real property situated within its territorial jurisdiction, but does not include any tax levied upon the manufacture, purchase, sale, transfer, or use of any property or upon any income derived from any property;

(i) The term "taxable person" means any individual, partnership, private association, private corporation, or other nongovernmental legal entity;

(j) The term "special assessment" means any levy, other than a tax, imposed after the date of enactment of this Act by any tax authority directly upon real property situated within its territorial jurisdiction to defray the cost of any public improvement;

(k) The term "public improvement" means any street, road, bridge, sewer, water distribution system, drainage project undertaken by or on behalf of any tax authority for the benefit of residents of the geographical area over which such tax authority has jurisdiction; and

(l) The term "industrial or commercial use", when used in relation to any Federal property, includes any use made of such property for (1) the mining, manufacturing, fabrication, or repair of any article or commodity, (2) the transportation of individuals or property, (3) the sale or leasing of any property, commodity, or service, and (4) the storage of property incident to any of the uses heretofore enumerated, but does not include the use of any such property for (A) the housing of individuals for which rent is received, (B) the storage of any agricultural commodity, or (C) any purpose for which the property, if privately owned or used, would by reason of its use be exempt from tax under laws applicable within the tax authority of its situs.

FEDERAL BOARD FOR PAYMENTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established the Federal Board for Payments to Local Governments (referred to hereinafter as the "Board"), which shall be composed of five members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall serve at the pleasure of the President. Not more than three members of the Board may be members of the same political party. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Board.

(b) A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Board, and three members shall at all times constitute a quorum. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) Each member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Commissioners of the United States Court of Claims, and no member of the Board may engage in any other business, vocation, or employment while serving as such member.

(d) The Board shall cease to exist on December 31, 1966.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE BOARD

SEC. 5. (a) The Board shall exercise the powers conferred upon it, and perform the duties imposed upon it, by this Act.

(b) In the performance of its functions under section 6 of this Act, the Board in its discretion from time to time may consult with the Advisory Committee established under section 7 of this Act to receive its advice and recommendations with regard to problems encountered by the Board in the performance of those functions. The Board shall consult from time to time with representatives of tax authorities and State governments, and such other persons as it may deem appropriate, in carrying out the provisions of this Act. The Board is authorized to pay to such representatives and persons, while serving without compensation for purposes of consultation pursuant to this subsection, transportation, and per diem as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b–2).

(c) As soon as may be practicable after the end of each period of six calendar months, the Board shall submit to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, a report concerning its operations during such period. Each such report shall contain full and complete information concerning the applications received and the payments ordered by the Board during such period under section 8 of this Act, together with such other information as may be helpful to the Congress in evaluating the operation of this Act and all other provisions of law authorizing the payment of taxes, or the making of payments in lieu of taxes, to States and to tax authorities.

(d) The Board may make such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, as may be necessary for the performance of its duties, including such uniform rules, regulations, and forms as it shall prescribe for (1) the filing by tax authorities of applications for payments authorized by this Act, (2) the examination of such applications and the conduct of hearings thereon, and (3) the determination of action to be taken upon such applications.

(e) Subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, the Board may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

(f) The Board is hereby authorized to procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55(a)), at rates not exceeding $50 per day for the personal services of individuals.

(g) Subject to provisions of law and regulations relating to the classification of information in the interest of national security, the Board is authorized to secure from any Federal agency any information necessary to carry out its functions under this Act, and each Federal agency is authorized to furnish such information to the Board upon request made by the Chairman thereof.

SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS

SEC. 6. (a) The Board shall conduct a comprehensive comparative survey to determine the nature and effect of—

(1) provisions of law in effect within the several States relating to the taxation of real property by such States and by tax authorities thereof; and

(2) existing provisions of Federal law providing for—

(A) the payment to any State or to any tax authority thereof of any tax or special assessment with respect to any Federal property or any personal property of any Federal agency;

(B) the making of any payment to any such government or authority in lieu of the payment of any tax or special assessment with respect to any such property; or

(C) the rendition of assistance to any State or to any tax authority thereof through the making of grants-in-aid, the sharing of revenues derived from properties of the United States, or through the furnishing of services or facilities by any Federal agency.

(b) The Board shall conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the extent to which States and tax authorities thereof derive benefits directly or indirectly through payments made to them (1) under the provisions of law described in section 6(a)(2); (2) by persons residing or employed upon Federal property; and (3) for or in connection with any property, trade, business, occupation, or transaction situated or occurring upon Federal property.

(c) The Board shall conduct a comprehensive investigation to determine the extent, if any, to which there is need for additional legislation by the Congress to provide continuing financial assistance for States or tax authorities thereof to relieve hardship incident to the tax-exempt status of Federal property. Such investigation shall include inquiry to determine—

(1) the classes of Federal property, if any, with respect to which any such additional continuing assistance should be granted;

(2) the nature and extent of any such additional continuing assistance;

(3) the conditions, if any, under which such additional continuing assistance should be granted;

(4) the annual cost to the United States for providing such additional continuing financial assistance with respect to each such class of Federal property and with respect to all such classes of Federal property; and

(5) ways and means whereby States and tax authorities thereof may be accorded effective right to apply personal property taxes in effect within their several jurisdictions to industrial plant equipment, materials, supplies, and inventories owned by taxable persons and used by them for commercial purposes within plant facilities owned or controlled by departments and agencies of the United States Government.

(d) Within two years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Board shall submit to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, a comprehensive report containing—

(1) the text of all provisions of law referred to in subsection (a), together with an analysis of the purpose and effect of each such provision;

(2) the findings of the Board as to the facts disclosed by its studies and investigations made under subsections (b) and (c) of this section;

(3) its recommendations as to any additional legislation the need for which has been disclosed by its investigation under subsection (c) of this section;

(4) a detailed analysis of the relationship between any recommendations so made and the provisions of existing law referred to in paragraph (2) of subsection (a); and

(5) specific recommendations with respect to the future treatment of properties for which payments are temporarily authorized by title VII of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 7. (a) The President shall establish an advisory committee on Federal payments to local governments composed of twelve members appointed by the President, of whom six shall be officers or employees of Federal agencies, three shall be representatives of State governments, and three shall be representatives of tax authorities. One member shall be designated by the President to serve as chairman of the committee.

(b) It shall be the duty of the committee to—

(1) study the administration of this Act and all other Federal legislation authorizing the payment of taxes, or the making of payments in lieu of taxes, by Federal agencies to tax authorities, and problems arising in connection therewith;

(2) consult with the Board, upon its request, in an advisory capacity in the solution of such problems; and

(3) transmit from time to time to the Board and to the President for transmittal to the Congress a report containing a summary of the results of its studies, together with its recommendations for administrative or legislative changes which it may consider necessary or desirable for the efficient, economical, and equitable administration of such provisions of law.

(c) Members of the committee who are officers or employees of any Federal agency shall receive no additional compensation for service rendered under this Act. Other members may receive such compensation, not in excess of $50 for each day of service, as the President shall prescribe. All members shall be reimbursed for travel and other expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of their duties under this section in conformity with the provisions of section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b–2).

TEMPORARY AUTHORIZATION FOR PAYMENTS TO TAX AUTHORITIES

SEC. 8. (a) Subject to the provisions of sections 9 and 11 of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be paid to any tax authority, upon its application made in conformity with the provisions of section 9 of this Act, for any period such amount as the Board may determine to be equal to the sum of—

(1) the amount which would be payable to such tax authority, with respect to all Federal property situated in any urban or suburban area within the territorial jurisdiction of that tax authority, upon any special assessment or tax levied after the date of enactment of this Act to defray the cost of any public improvement, if such property were owned by a taxable person, except that no such sum shall be payable unless such special assessment or tax in fact was levied upon real property owned by taxable persons;

(2) the amount of the real property tax which would be payable to such tax authority, with respect to all Federal property situated within the territorial jurisdiction of that tax authority which is in the custody or control of a taxable person pursuant to a lease, contract, or permit executed by a Federal agency, if such property were owned by a taxable person, diminished by the amount of any real property or other tax measured by the value of such property which is payable by the taxable person having custody or control thereof to such tax authority for such period with respect to that property, or for or on account of the possession or use thereof; and

(3) such amount, if any, as the Board may determine to be payable in conformity with subsection (b) as to all Federal property situated within the territorial jurisdiction of such tax authority which (A) has been first acquired by any Federal agency after June 30, 1950, (B) is in the custody

or control of a Federal agency, and (C) is devoted to or held for predominantly industrial or commercial use.

(b) Subject to the provisions of subsection (c), the sum referred to in subsection (a)(3) shall be a sum equal to—

(1) the nominal Federal liability, which shall be the amount of the real property tax which such tax authority would have been entitled to receive for such period on account of such property if it had been owned by a taxable person; increased by

(2) the specific Federal liability, which shall be the aggregate amount of the expenditures necessarily incurred by such tax authority during such period in furnishing directly to or on behalf of such property any facilities or services of kinds not customarily furnished by such tax authority to or on behalf of other properties of like class; and diminished by

(3) the credit against Federal liability, which shall be the aggregate value of governmental services of kinds normally furnished by tax authorities which, during such period, were furnished within the territorial jurisdiction of such tax authority by Federal agencies controlling such property, computed upon the basis of the unit cost incurred by such tax authority in providing like services, or (in the absence of such data) the unit cost incurred therefor by comparable tax authorities in the same vicinity; and further diminished by

(4) any additional credit against Federal liability, which shall be such sum as the Board may determine to be required to assure equitable treatment of Federal property situated within the territorial jurisdiction of any tax authority which, under State or local law or public policy, grants any exemption or immunity from the payment of any tax of any kind, or any reduction in the rate or amount of any tax paid, with respect to real property of any taxable person as an inducement to such taxable person to engage in industrial or commercial activities within the territorial jurisdiction of such tax authority.

(c) No payment determined pursuant to subsection (b) to be payable with respect to any Federal property situated within the territorial jurisdiction of any tax authority shall exceed the amount which the Board finds to be equivalent to the tax which would be payable with respect to such property if it had been developed and used by a taxable person for a similar private industrial or commercial use within the territorial jurisdiction of such tax authority or in nearby comparable communities, as determined by the Board.

APPLICATIONS AND PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINATION AND PAYMENT

SEC. 9. (a) Each application made by one or more tax authorities for any payment under section 8 of this Act with respect to one or more parcels of Federal property situated within the territorial jurisdiction of such tax authorities shall specify (1) the Federal property or properties with respect to which claim is made for such payment, (2) the basis upon which such claim is made, and (3) the period of time for which such claim is made.

(b) Each application made by any tax authority for any payment under this Act shall be for a period not in excess of twelve months, beginning not earlier than January 1, 1960, and ending not later than December 31, 1964. No tax authority may file with the Board more than one application for any period with respect to the same Federal property. Each application for payment for any period must be filed within six months after the end of such period.

(c) Upon the filing of any application under this Act by one or more tax authorities for any such payment, the Board shall—

(1) examine such application to determine whether it states a probable basis for the making of any such payment;

(2) if such probable basis is found to exist, conduct a full and fair hearing upon such application;

(3) upon the basis of evidence received at such hearing, or obtained by such field investigation as the Board may determine to be appropriate, or both, prepare its report in which it shall set forth its findings of fact and its conclusions as to the merits of such application; and

(4) enter its order thereon, prescribing the amount, if any, awarded to each applicant who joined in such application, and the portion thereof to be paid under this Act by each controlling agency administering real property chargeable in whole or in part for such award.

(d) Upon the entry of the order of the Board upon any application for any payment under this Act, the Board shall give notice thereof to each tax authority which was a party to such application. Each such order shall become final upon the expiration of a period of sixty days after its entry, unless the Board during such period has granted a rehearing of such application upon request made by any applicant who joined therein. Not more than one rehearing shall be granted upon any application, and any order entered by the Board after a rehearing of any application shall become final upon its entry. A certified copy of each final order of the Board shall be transmitted (A) to such tax authority joining in the application upon which such order was entered, and (B) to each Federal agency charged thereby with the payment of any part of any award made thereby.

(e) Upon the certification by the Board to any Federal agency of any final order of the Board awarding to any tax authority any payment under this Act with respect to any Federal property controlled by such agency, such agency shall pay to such tax authority the amount specified in such order.

(f) Each final order made by the Board under this Act for the payment of any award shall be final and conclusive upon all tax authorities and upon all Federal agencies, unless such order is modified or reversed by a court of competent jurisdiction or is adjudged invalid in whole or in part by the General Accounting Office.

HEARINGS CONDUCTED BY THE BOARD

SEC. 10 (a) The Board (or any duly authorized member thereof or any examiner duly designated thereby) may conduct any hearing or investigation authorized by this Act; administer oaths and affirmations; examine witnesses and receive evidence at any place in the United States; and require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, relevant to the matter under inquiry. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such documentary evidence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing. Witnesses summoned shall be paid the same fees and mileage paid to witnesses in the district courts of the United States.

(b) In the case of any disobedience by any person to a subpena issued under subsection (a), the Board may invoke the aid of a district court of the United States in requiring the attendance and testimony of such person, or the production of documentary evidence by such person, or both. The district court of the United States for any judicial district within which any such inquiry is conducted may, in the case of the contumacy or refusal of any person to obey a subpena issued under subsection (a), issue an order requiring such person to appear (and to produce documentary evidence if so ordered) and to give evidence relating to the matter in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. For the purposes of this subsection, the order or process of the district court for any judicial district may be served and shall be effective within any other judicial district of the United States.

(c) Hearings conducted under subsection (a) shall be open to the public. In any such hearing upon any application made under section 9, each applicant shall have the right to present its case with the assistance of counsel; to offer oral or documentary evidence; to submit rebuttal evidence; and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. An accurate stenographic record shall be taken of the testimony of each witness in each hearing conducted by the Board, and a transcript of such testimony shall be filed in the office of the Board.

LIMITATIONS AND SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 11. (a) No payment may be made under this Act to any tax authority with respect to any parcel of Federal property for any period for which such tax authority is eligible to receive from any Federal agency any payment with respect to such property under (1) any other provision of law which authorizes any payment of real property tax or any payment in lieu of the payment of real property tax, or (2) any revenue-sharing arrangement.

(b) No payment may be made under this Act to any tax authority with respect to (1) any power property owned or controlled by the Tennessee Valley Authority, or (2) any portion of any multipurpose property owned or controlled by such Authority which is allocated to power purposes. With respect to those properties and parts of properties, such Authority shall continue to make payments to States and to tax authorities, as a charge against its power operations, in accordance with section 13 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 66, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 831L). With respect to other properties and parts of properties owned or controlled by the Tennessee Valley Authority, such Authority shall make payments in accordance with the provisions of this Act in addition to the payments required to be made under section 13 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933.

(c) Nothing contained in this Act shall bar the making of any payment under any provision of law or revenue-sharing arrangement referred to in subsection (a) or subsection (b).

(d) The failure of any Federal agency to make, or to make timely payment of, any payment authorized by this Act with respect to any Federal property shall not subject—

(1) any Federal agency, or any purchaser of such property from any Federal agency, to the payment of any tax, penalty, penalty interest, or other charge; or

(2) such property to any lien, attachment, foreclosure, or other proceeding not specifically authorized by this Act.

(e) Nothing contained in this Act shall limit or impair any power which any tax authority may have under any other provision or principle of law to levy upon or collect from any taxable person any tax upon any interest in Federal property possessed by such person, or with respect to the possession or use by such person of any Federal property.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Board, and to each Federal agency controlling any Federal property, such sums as may be required for the discharge of its duties and obligations under

this Act. Any sum determined by the Board to be payable under section 8 of this Act by any Federal agency shall be considered to be a necessary expense of such agency.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which Senate bill 910 was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MONITORS-TEAMSTERS CONTROVERSY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in 1957, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America held a convention during which a new international constitution was adopted. This was followed by an election of the union's officers.

In September of the same year, some members of the union filed an action to set aside the election on the ground that the convention and the election were "rigged." They also alleged "various breaches of fiduciary duties and responsibilities" by some union officials, and asked that a "temporary receivership be established for the limited purpose of assuring and supervising elections and a convention that would be conducted in strict compliance with the international constitution."

Evidently there was sufficient substance to those charges so that a trial was held.

After several days of trial, the parties to the dispute agreed on a compromise which was embodied in a consent decree entered on January 31, 1958, by Judge F. Dickinson Letts of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, who had presided over the trial.

The settlement provided, among other things, that a board of three monitors should be established to serve until the holding of a new convention for the election of officers; that election, which the union's general executive board was authorized to call, was to be held, as I recall, 1 year from the date the consent decree was promulgated; the union officials who were elected at the 1957 convention were to serve provisionally until the new election.

In accordance with the agreement, one member of the board was to be appointed by the union; one member, by the dissident members; and the other, by the court. The board of monitors has had membership troubles, one member of the board has been replaced for alleged ineffectiveness while another has refused to resign on invitation.

I am informed that the union's general executive board, pursuant to its authority under the consent decree, issued a call for a new convention and election for March 1959. However, the court having found that conditions for a new convention were not yet ripe after a year of operation under the consent decree, ordered, on February 9, 1959, slightly over a year ago, that the consent decree be modified to make the time for the new convention "subject to recommendation by the board of monitors to the general executive board of the international brotherhood, with the exact time of holding the convention being subject to the final approval of the court."

In the meantime, charges and countercharges have been hurled by both parties against each other.

The action of the monitors has been questioned; the action of the judge has been questioned; and there has been continuous questioning of the officers of the union itself.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose at this time to justify these charges or countercharges, one way or another. I am sure they have been extensively and exhaustively presented by the parties concerned through all the available media.

However, there are several questions which I think are of concern to Congress. One is the question of whether or not the workers are to be given the right to hold a free election under proper conditions.

It is a fact, I believe, that the holding of the union's election has been postponed for almost 2 years since the establishment of the monitorship under the consent decree.

If the problem is with the union, the election should be postponed. If the problem is with the monitors, it seems that that is a matter of concern to Congress. If the problem rests with the court, then the court itself should look to its own internal affairs.

The second question relates to whether or not the legislation passed by Congress last year is adequate to meet a problem of this kind, one with which the court, it appears now, is attempting to deal.

The third question really relates to the second one, and is the basic one of how much of an administrative burden is to be put upon courts or court-appointed monitors or trustees in other cases, not only in a case involving a labor union, but also in the case of industry or finance or any nongovernmental institution or activity in the United States.

It seems to me that there are enough questions with regard to this problem that the committees of the Senate and the House which are properly concerned in the matter—the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare or the Committee on the Judiciary—ought to give some attention to the problem.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. Is it not true that earlier this year we passed a labor bill, one of the provisions of which was to limit the time during which there could be a trusteeship of the parent labor union over a local union?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. We set a limit.

Mr. MOSS. Therefore, would it not follow that it would be considered improper or undesirable to have a period of monitorship or trusteeship or control from the outside over a labor union?

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe it is certainly true, whether it be a labor union or a steel corporation or any other nongovernmental institution or activity. Unless there are compelling reasons for court supervision, it should be terminated.

Mr. MOSS. As I understand the Senator's position, it is that some action should be taken at this time to resolve this impasse which has continued for 2 years, I believe the Senator said.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would hope that it might be resolved. At least we should get somewhat more complete information to Congress as to what the real difficulty may be.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the Senator for his remarks. I should like to concur in his general approach to the matter, without indicating to what extent I believe the matter ought ultimately to be resolved. However it seems to me that there has been a long period of stalemate and impasse, and certainly Congress should examine into the matter and find a way of concluding the matter.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree with the Senator. There is no question about interfering with the courts, since the main problem seems to be with respect to the court-appointed monitors who carry on a quasi-judicial but principally an executive function. That should be of concern to us, particularly because we have passed new legislation dealing with the problem of the internal conduct of labor unions, and we ought to look into the problem to see where justice lies and what course of action should be followed.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am reluctant to engage in this discussion today, and I have not done so on previous occasions, because I was counsel, with others, for the dissident group which instituted the proceedings that resulted in the appointment of the monitors.

I understand the attitude and view of my colleagues the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Utah, who as I understand them want to know more about the proceedings.

I intend, if necessary, to make a full and complete statement in the Senate, since the matter has come up here, and has come up in the other body as well. However, because I have had such active personal interest in it as a lawyer before I came to the Senate, I have been reluctant to do so.

The monitors were appointed, I might point out briefly, after the plaintiffs had

put in their case in the District Court for the District of Columbia. It was a settlement mutually acceptable to both sides.

It might be well at a later time to describe more in detail what took place. I wish to assure the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Utah that I shall be happy to shed light on the situation. Something perhaps should be said to clear up some of the confusion with regard to the appointment of the monitors. I cannot speak from personal experience about what has happened since the appointment of the monitors, because I have not been in the case for some time.

But I believe I know what happened when the monitors were appointed and why they were appointed and I have excellent facilities for getting the facts on what has happened since they were appointed.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Connecticut has made a valuable contribution to the discussion. As he has said, he has been identified with the matter from the beginning, when he was not a Member of Congress, and he is fully familiar with what I consider to be a continuing problem. I look forward to the time when the Senator from Connecticut will make a comprehensive statement on the problem. I yield the floor.

Mr. BARTLETT subsequently said: Mr. President, to the best of my knowledge, one union in the United States, and one union only, continues under the control of a monitorship. I refer, of course, to the Teamsters Union. I have little knowledge, personally, of the affairs of that union, and no acquaintance whatever with its top officials. However, it seems to me, since the Labor-Management Act of 1959 was enacted to provide, among other things, for free elections in all unions operating in the United States, that that right ought to be reinstated soon—at the very earliest possible moment—for the Teamsters Union.

One million, six hundred thousand members—good Americans—of this great labor craft have a right, it seems to me, to decide who their officers shall be. It has been said that the monitors are draining the resources of the union's treasury. That may be true, or it may not be true; I do not know. But it is certain that the monitorship arrangement requires the expenditure from the union's treasury of large sums of money. This is not a democratic system which ought to be continued ad infinitum. The time has come, it occurs to me, when the members of the Teamsters' Union ought to have the right to elect their national officers, and the choice should be theirs. It might be that the monitors would not agree with that choice, but that does not matter in a democratic country such as ours.

For example, over the years, many criticisms have been made of the union of which Harry Bridges is the president. Yet no effort has been made to take the control of that union from the officers elected by its members and to place such control in the hands of a board of monitors. I do not think that ought to be done indefinitely with respect to any union.

I am glad the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has introduced a bill on this subject, and I join several of my colleagues in expressing the hope that the bill will have early consideration. In making that statement, I do not wish to imply a personal belief that Congress should intervene in connection with matters now pending before the courts. In whatever way this is to be accomplished, I firmly believe that the members of the Teamsters Union should, at the earliest possible date, have the right to elect their own officers.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2778. An act to amend the act relating to the Commission of Fine Arts;

H.R. 1607. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anne Morgan; and

H.R. 10474. An act to authorize construction of modern naval vessels.

THE SUMMIT AND THE TEST BAN FALLACY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, this coming Monday the leaders of the free world and the supreme dictator of the Soviet world will come together in Geneva for still another summit conference.

There is an uneasiness in all of us, I believe, about the outcome of this conference. There is an uneasiness throughout the country, some of it articulate, most of it inarticulate. Despite our reassuring statements, there is still uneasiness among our allies. As for the so-called neutral nations, from the least of them to the greatest of them, from the most friendly to the most critical—they all know that their fate, too, ultimately depends on the hard reality of American power. And, though they cannot say so, they share the uneasiness of the rest of the free world.

This uneasiness has been fanned by the forcing down of the U–2 reconnaissance plane over Soviet territory last week, by Khrushchev's intemperate diatribes, by his threats to dispatch missiles against those airfields in our allies' countries from which U–2 planes might take off or at which they might land. The fear is now expressed in some quarters that East-West relations have deteriorated to the breaking point and that the issue of peace or war may very well hang on the outcome of the summit conference. I do not believe this is so. But I am sure that the Communists would like us to believe that it is so.

The purpose of any conference is somehow to amend the status quo. From the standpoint of the free world, the forthcoming conference can result in one of three things. The status quo minus, the status quo plus, or a deadlock. Since the Soviets are making all the demands, and we are making none, it is a foregone conclusion that the conference will not result in the status quo plus. A deadlock is the best that can be hoped for. But this is uncertain, even improbable, because we have so heavily committed ourselves to seek some kind of settlement of the crisis Khrushchev has created. There is, therefore, a very serious danger that we shall once again wind up with the status quo minus.

In my opinion, we have, over the past few years, retreated to the point where we now stand quite literally with our backs to the wall. I believe that the American people understand this, and there have been some encouraging evidences that the administration, too, is beginning to understand. Our policy on Berlin has again been firmed up. In this connection, I wish to pay my personal tribute to Under Secretary Dillon's magnificent presentation to the AFL–CIO Conference on World Affairs in New York on April 20. I can recall no more cogent analysis of the world situation or statement of American policy by a spokesman for the Department of State.

If we hew to the policy outlined by Under Secretary Dillon, there will, I am certain, be no surrender on the question of Berlin. But I cannot help fearing that, in the light of Khrushchev's recent tough talk and our own confusion and embarrassment over the recent plane incident, there may be some temptation on our side to purchase a deferment on Berlin by offering concessions in some other area.

Specifically, I fear that, because we do not understand the gravity of the issue, we will yield to the demand for a nuclear test ban covering not only detectable tests which contaminate the atmosphere, but nondetectable tests that do not result in contamination. And if such a treaty should not be signed at Geneva, I am just as worried that, out of deference to the possibility of such a treaty at some future date, we will consent to further prolong the 20-month old voluntary moratorium on weapons tests of all kinds.

It is to this subject, Mr. President, that I wish to direct my remarks.

I speak on this subject for the first time with some hesitation, knowing how much study the distinguished Senators who serve on the Foreign Relations Committee and on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have devoted to the problem. I could not have spoken on this subject 6 months ago because I stood in awe of those of my colleagues who could bandy about words like "thermonuclear" and "fissionable" and "neutron." If I venture to speak today on the question of the nuclear test ban, and if I now myself employ a few of the technical words that seemed awesome a few months ago, there are two reasons for this transformation.

Reason No. 1 was a gnawing conviction that the moratorium was wrong,

that the Communists were not abiding by it, that it increased the danger of war rather than diminished it, that it might ultimately cost us our freedom.

Reason No. 2 was my recent illness, which gave me some time for reading and reflection. The more I read, the more I thought about the problem, the more I discussed the matter, the more I was able to replace intuitive estimates with established facts—the stronger my fears and my convictions became.

I now believe that we stand in mortal peril, and that this peril is not many years removed.

The lack of understanding on the test ban issue cannot be explained in terms of its complexity. It is really not that complex. The scientific aspects of the problem can, I assure you, Mr. President, be understood by any intelligent layman. To achieve comprehension, the basic requirement is the kind of understanding of politics and of the nature of communism and of the realities of power relationships that I believe most of us in this Chamber possess.

Why, then, is there so little understanding? I can think of two reasons:

First, the facts have not been given to the public.

Second, our minds have been confused, our nerves dulled, our wills sapped, by what I consider the Kremlin's most spectacular triumph in the realm of propaganda and psychological conditioning.

Thanks to the occasional learned presentations by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and by the equally distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the present occupant of the chair, I believe that we in this body are beginning to have an awareness of the problem. The justification for my speech today is that I believe we must look at the problem both whole and in detail.

We start from the premise that the whole complex of nuclear problems—including such matters as the question of nuclear weapons technology, the strategic and tactical use of nuclear weapons, the test ban, the moratorium—must be viewed within the context of national purpose, as expressed by our foreign policy.

We have certain stated purposes on which there is broad bipartisan agreement. We are committed to the broad, moral purposes that are stated with enduring eloquence in our great historic documents. We are committed to the defense of our own freedoms, and of the free world at large against Communist aggression. We are committed—sincerely, if vaguely and ineffectually—to the extension of freedom to the peoples now enslaved by communism and to the principle of self-determination.

We are committed to the maintenance of peace—with justice, and without surrender. We do not believe in peace at any price. Benjamin Franklin once declared that those who believe they "can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." There is as much truth in this in the age of thermonuclear weapons as there was at the time it was written by Franklin.

On these attitudes and purposes we agree. But there have been times in recent years when I have had the impression that the conduct of our foreign policy had somehow been separated from any guiding principles, that we were simply responding on a fire department basis to emergencies and crises created by the Kremlin.

I am even more profoundly convinced that the entire critical relationship between nuclear weapons and foreign policy has not been understood. The nuclear capabilities we have developed are sadly out of balance and at certain points are in conflict with the principles we espouse. They are, I fear, inadequate to cope with the spectrum of dangers that confront us. Our guileless approach to the moratorium is, in my opinion, a reflection of the same disjunction between our nuclear thinking and our national commitments.

All the purposes I have enumerated are interrelated. In order to maintain peace, in order to defend the free world, in order to embark on a positive foreign policy, in order to extend the frontiers of freedom, in order to keep faith with our forebears and our children, in order to reduce the danger of thermonuclear war to a minimum, in order to create a stable basis for peace, there are two prior conditions that must be met.

The first requirement, on which there is no dispute, is that we maintain a superiority in strategic nuclear weapons—that is, large-yield weapons of devastating power—so that the Soviets will never be tempted to seek a settlement of the cold war by means of a thermonuclear Pearl Harbor. We are committed to the avoidance of preventive war. If the Kremlin should strike first, only a portion of our original strength would get off the ground, and only a portion of this, in turn, would reach enemy targets. General Powers has expressed the opinion that a surprise Soviet missile attack could reduce our ability to retaliate to near-zero. This viewpoint has been challenged by other competent officers; but even the most optimistic estimates concede that a surprise strike by the Soviets might immediately eliminate 50 percent or more of our bombers and ICBM's. To serve as an effective deterrent to a surprise attack, therefore, our superiority must be nothing short of overwhelming.

Today, I am inclined to agree with the President that our retaliatory capability is sufficient to deter such an attack. Technological superiority, however, is something that must be constantly renewed. If the Soviets ever achieve superiority or if they beat us to a major breakthrough in the field of nuclear weaponry—for example, the anti-missile missile—a preemptive strike might become a serious possibility. We cannot ignore this possibility, the more so since Soviet military thinkers—and I shall cite evidence of this—have given such serious consideration to the concept of a preemptive strike.

Corollaries of requirement No. 1 would be the development of an anti-missile defense, the invigoration of our civil defense, and a mandatory shelter construction program. The greater our ability to survive a surprise attack and to retaliate, the less likelihood there is that such an attack will ever take place.

But our strategic deterrent by itself is not enough. Indeed, by itself it may be highly dangerous. There is much to be said for Thomas Murray's argument that we have placed altogether too one-sided an emphasis on multimegaton weapons, that our very capacity "to wreak unlimited nuclear violence inhibits us from the use of limited force which may be politically necessary." I am, in fact, inclined to believe that, with our exclusive reliance on nuclear retaliation, we have succeeded in frightening ourselves and our allies far more than we have frightened the Kremlin.

Obviously, if the Kremlin drops thermonuclear warheads on American cities, we will retaliate in kind; we would have no alternative. But if it is simply a matter of a limited challenge at Berlin or in the Mideast or in the Far East, can we, will we, respond to this by destroying millions of men, women, and children in Soviet cities? This is a terrible decision for any President to have to make, especially when he knows that minutes later a comparable number of American civilians will have perished in the ashes of our own cities.

Requirement No. 2, therefore, is the development of a system of tactical nuclear weapons capable of being used with discrimination against military targets both on the battlefield and in the rear. The possession of such weapons would enable the forces of freedom, in Europe and in Asia, to confront the vastly superior Communist manpower with firepower of "unacceptable" superiority. Only in this way can we offer deterrence to the increasingly serious threat of limited aggression.

"We arm to parley," Winston Churchill once said. The peace of the world can be considered secure only when we have met these two basic requirements—only when we have established deterrence at both the strategic and limited levels. At that point we could go to the conference table with the initiative firmly in our grasp. At that point we could truly embark on a positive foreign policy.

If our weapons requirements should be determined with reference to our national purposes and commitments, our policy on the question of nuclear testing should, in turn, be determined in the light of our weapons requirements. Instead, our once sound policy on the question of the test ban has now degenerated into nothing better than a frightened, unthought-out reaction to the international hysteria which the Kremlin has so cleverly fostered and exploited.

What makes it so difficult to cope with this hysteria is that all of us, whether we recognize it or not, have been afflicted by it, some in smaller degree, some in greater. There can be no question that the overwhelming majority of the decent citizens who favor a test ban believe in freedom and abhor the tyranny of communism. There can also be no question that the agitation for a complete cessation of tests has been the central item on the agenda of the world Communist movement for several

years now. Of this there is ample documentary proof. Through the infinitely subtle propaganda apparatus which they command, through the thousands of channels of information to which they have access, the Communists have unquestionably succeeded in infiltrating this movement and in providing it with much of its guiding philosophy and stock of arguments.

There is nothing novel or really surprising about this situation. There has been a whole series of critical situations in which the Communists have succeeded in persuading the majority of the people in the non-Communist world to believe what the Kremlin wished them to believe. The widely held belief, for example, that the Chinese Communists were not really Communists, but simple agrarian reformers, helped to pave the way for the Communist takeover in China.

The Communists achieved a similar success in the realm of psychological conditioning at the time of the 1944 Communist insurrection in Greece. If you look back through the American newspapers of that time, you will find that a great majority of our editors, our public officials and public opinion molders in general, attacked Prime Minister Churchill for his courageous decision to put down the Communist insurrection. They did so because, in one way or another, they were led to believe that Churchill was intervening against the heroic Greek resistance fighters, and not against a Communist insurrection which had already gone to the point of mass executions of anti-Communist citizens. Today, of course, everyone agrees that Prime Minister Churchill did the right thing. In fact, he did the only thing. But very few people stopped to consider how it was that the Communists were able completely to befuddle our mental processes and destroy our sense of balance.

On the issue of the test ban, we are today the victims, at both governmental and private levels, of the same kind of befuddlement and psychological conditioning that led both public and Government to the wrong conclusions on the Chinese Communists and on the Greek insurrection.

I could list many more such experiences and I hope at a later date to remind the Senate of them.

The general argument in favor of the test ban can be broken down into eight basic propositions, to which I shall hereafter refer as the eight fallacies of the test ban.

FALLACY NO. 1

Fallacy No. 1 is that a test ban agreement would serve to "open up" the Soviet Union—that the stationing of international inspectors at a number of fixed points would at least create a first chink in the armor of secrecy.

Soviet spokesmen have hinted that they might be willing to consider the establishment of a few fixed stations on their territory and a few onsite inspections. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] pointed out, in his statement of March 2, that after 18 months of negotiations, the Soviets have yet to commit themselves to a single onsite inspection or to the establishment of a single station. All of our efforts to pin them down have failed.

On one occasion, as I have heard, Congressman HOLIFIELD cornered Mr. Semyon Tsarapkin, the chief Soviet delegate to the test ban conference, and demanded to know what quota of annual inspections the Kremlin was prepared to accept. Mr. Tsarapkin, according to the story, shrugged his shoulders and said: "A few." On another occasion Soviet Ambassador Zaroubin contemptuously said to Dr. Alvin Groves of Los Alamos, that the West could, if it wished, have all of its three inspections at the same time.

Personally, I consider it inconceivable that the Soviets will ever accede to the revised Bethe formula calling for 21 manned stations, 600 robot stations, and 300 onsite inspections per year. I consider it highly improbable that they will even accede to the original Geneva formula of 1958, which we now know to be absurdly inadequate, but which called for 21 manned stations on the territory of the Soviet Union, plus 20 to 30 onsite inspections. I am afraid that if they offer us anything remotely resembling the original Geneva formula—perhaps 50 percent of the formula, perhaps 25 percent—we will hail this as a great concession, sign a treaty on Soviet terms, and present this agreement as an assurance of "peace in our time."

It is utter nonsense to argue that such an arrangement would "open up" the Soviet Union. It can be taken for granted that the international inspectors would be confined to their stations and that most of these stations would be located in isolated areas. It can also be taken for granted that the inspectors would see nothing and would have minimal opportunities for contacts. If they engage in a handful of on-site inspections, they would do so in company of the Soviet members of their teams, who would exert themselves to the limit to frustrate their fellow inspectors, and would watch over them with eagle eyes.

I have the greatest doubt that 10,000 or 20,000 American tourists who will visit the Soviet Union next year will in any way help to "open it up." I would point out that the tourist traffic to the Soviet Union was just about as heavy in the mid-thirties, during the heyday of the Stalinist terror, as it is today. It opened up exactly nothing. The tourists saw what Stalin wanted them to see, and most them returned to this country convinced that the stories of Bolshevik terror were greatly exaggerated.

In his article, "Beware Tourists to Russia," in the Reader's Digest, Eugene Lyons described the manner in which the Kremlin bemuses and befuddles the tourist innocents. But these impressionable ordinary tourists, I am convinced, are far more plausible instruments for "opening up" the Soviet Union than a handful of nuclear test ban inspectors at fixed stations and under constant surveillance.

FALLACY NO. 2

Fallacy No. 2 is the argument that we are now far ahead of the Soviet Union in nuclear weapons technology, that if the race should continue indefinitely the Soviets would probably surpass us, that a freeze on weapons testing would therefore be to our advantage.

This argument is based on a whole series of assumptions which, as I shall demonstrate later, are, at the worst, demonstrably false; at the best, highly questionable. Among other things, it assumes the following:

That we will be able to conclude a test ban agreement with the Soviets providing for an adequate and enforceable system of inspection.

That, despite any initial inadequacy, the system of inspection will ultimately be improved to the point where weapons tests of any significant magnitude will be detectable.

That, once detection has been established, there will be no serious difficulty in establishing verification.

That, if there is a voluntary moratorium on tests of less than 20 kilotons magnitude, the Soviets will abide by this moratorium; that they will faithfully honor the provisions of the treaty and will not engage in clandestine tests, no matter how much the Kremlin may stand to gain from them.

Fallacy No. 2 has been advanced over and over again as a reason for entering into a formal test ban agreement. It is amazing to me that mature men could give serious consideration to an argument based on so flimsy a substructure of "ifs." Among other things, this argument, after assuming that the Soviets have the ability to surpass us technologically, even without cheating, does not consider what might happen to our technological lead if Khrushchev and company should cheat.

I believe we can take it as a maxim that, if there is something to be gained from it, the Communists will cheat. But let us be generous. Let us assume that there is a 50–50 possibility that Khrushchev and company would adhere to their word. Can the future security of the United States be based on a 50–50 possibility?

This argument also fails to consider what will happen to our technological lead if there should be no agreement, if, instead, the negotiations drag out year after year while, year after year, we continue to renew our voluntary moratorium on all tests in the hope that an agreement may be just around the corner.

At the time the Soviets exploded their first A-bomb, it was estimated that we had something like a 4 to 5 year lead in nuclear technology and weaponry. By the time we embarked on the present moratorium in October 1958, this lead had unquestionably been cut down—according to informed estimates, to a figure of 3 or 4 years at best. If the Soviets have not been observing the honor moratorium, then we have already dissipated almost 2 years of our lead. If the moratorium persists for another 2 years, then, even without an agreement, we shall have completely dissipated our lead in nuclear weapons technology.

FALLACY NO. 3

Fallacy No. 3 is the fallacy of the ultimate technological plateau.

According to this argument, there is little point to the further development

of our nuclear weapons because we already possess sufficient multimegaton weapons and weapons of other yields to destroy the Soviet Union several times over.

This argument ignores the fact that our stockpile of thermonuclear weapons leaves us helpless, unless we are prepared to resort to all-out nuclear war, to cope with some of the limited threats and challenges with which the Kremlin will confront us.

It ignores the fact that the NATO land forces can serve as an effective deterrent to such threats only if their manpower inferiority is offset by the possession of a broad and flexible system of tactical nuclear weapons.

It ignores the fact that research into the possibilities of antimissile defense is still in its infancy.

It ignores the fact that we require new multi-megaton missile systems to cope with hardened missile sites and for other defensive purposes.

that technology has no limits. There is

In short, it ignores the elementary fact no such thing as an ultimate technological plateau. On the contrary, with each new breakthrough, new and more fantastic developmental vistas seem to open up.

The hydrogen missiles we now possess and those that are scheduled for the next few years are not the ultimate weapons. Given a continuing developmental program, there will be a second and third and fourth generation of missiles and warheads.

The yield-to-weight and yield-to-diameter relationship will be improved so that the warheads can be miniaturized.

Missiles will be reduced in size and cost and greatly improved in accuracy. By enabling us to make many more missiles and much more effective and more mobile missiles at a greatly reduced cost, such a development would vastly strengthen our deterrence and would help to vindicate our peace policy.

The energy of fusion explosions will be tailored to produce a variety of effects which correspond to the nature of the intended targets.

Clean weapons of all yields will be produced, thus greatly increasing the utility of the atom for tactical, defensive, and strategic purposes.

Entire new weapons systems will come into being—weapons that seem as fantastic today as the atom bomb did in 1943 or the hydrogen bomb in 1945.

Such developments could have incalculable strategic consequences. If the Kremlin were to get there first on any major technological breakthrough in nuclear weaponry, my conviction is that we would, in short order, find ourselves confronted with a choice between annihilation or surrender. At the very least, this is a serious possibility.

I found Khrushchev's statement of January 14 ominous in terms of its emphasis on continuing technological progress. I am sure that this statement came to the attention of many of my colleagues, but I wish to recall it here nevertheless. In my opinion, it is a statement to be read—and reread—and pondered:

> Our armed forces have to a considerable extent been transferred over to missile-nuclear arms. These arms have been perfected and will continue to be perfected. The armament which we now have is formidable armament. The armament under development is even more perfect and more formidable. The armament which is being created and which is to be found in the folders of the scientists and designers is truly unbelievable armament.
>
> We state openly that in reducing the numbers of men in the armed forces we are not diminishing firepower. On the contrary, it has increased qualitatively several times.

Other Soviet spokesmen have gone further than Premier Khrushchev in stressing the importance of technological surprise and in hinting at the possibility of a preemptive attack. Marshal A. A. Grechko, in an article published in Red Star on February 23, emphasized the following points:

> (a) Suddenness (or surprise) is crucial to success in modern war.
>
> (b) Technological surprise may be equally crucial.
>
> (c) The initial phase of the war will be of decisive importance.
>
> (d) Soviet forces will employ nuclear weapons as their main armament.

Another Soviet marshal, Marshal Nedelin, I note parenthetically, was last week appointed "Marshal of Soviet Rocketry."

What is the "truly unbelievable" armament of which Khrushchev spoke? Let me outline some of the possibilities on the technological horizon—possibilities that can only be realized by the renewal of testing both in space and underground.

First of all there is the matter of tactical weapons. The so-called tactical rockets and cannon shells which we now possess are in reality medium-sized atomic bombs, with all the unpredictable danger of fallout. They are clumsy; they are potentially dangerous both to the user and to the civilian populace adjacent to the area of battle; they cannot be used with real discrimination. The military planners who have been working on the development of tactical nuclear weapons, have, as I understand it, been thinking of light, clean weapons with yields of from 1 to 100 tons—with a kiloton yield almost an outside figure. These weapons would be small enough to be fired from bazookas, from tanks, from weapons carriers, from light field guns, or in salvos from missile-launching trucks.

There is a limit beyond which weapons development cannot go without testing. Commenting on the semiannual AEC report, the Washington Post said on January 31, 1960:

> The AEC report said only that weapon research and development were continuing on weapons with greatly reduced fallout but special emphasis was being placed on small rugged weapons that could be assembled and made ready to fire in a matter of minutes. One already announced is the "Davy Crockett," a one-man bazooka-launched weapon. Although it is being produced for the Army, it has not been tested yet because of the moratorium. The Army is reported to be reluctant about ordering them in quantity before they have been proven.

The production of a clean, tactical, nuclear weapon would open the way to a whole series of technologically significant breakthroughs. By definition such a weapon would have to have a fusion warhead—that is, a heavy hydrogen or tritium warhead—which is not triggered by fissionable material or else triggered by only a minute quantity. Such an explosion would produce a small amount of carbon 14, but, compared to today's weapons, it would be 95 percent clean. The radioactive fallout would be negligible. This technique, once mastered, would be substantially applicable to warheads of all sizes, up to the multimegaton range.

It is the fissionable material in a thermonuclear bomb which makes it so extremely expensive to produce. The chemical components, chiefly heavy hydrogen and lithium, which are immediately responsible for the fusion explosion, are relatively cheap to manufacture. If a straight fusion weapon can be developed—and there is no doubt that it can—this would open up the way to the production of thermonuclear weapons of all yields in vastly increased quantities and at much smaller cost.

Then there is the matter of the neutron bomb, to which there has already been some reference in the press. Such a bomb can theoretically be produced by tailoring the energy of a fusion explosion so that, instead of heat and blast, its primary product is a burst of neutrons. Such a burst would do negligible physical damage, but it would immediately destroy all life in the target area. It would, in short, operate as a kind of death-ray.

I have heard that, in the light of present theoretical knowledge, the neutron bomb is no more questionable than the hydrogen bomb was 6 months before it was demonstrated that one could be built. Although there have been a few fragmentary references to the neutron bomb in the press, I was told, when I tried to obtain more information, that the matter was classified. When I pressed my physicist friend further, he threw up his hands in despair and said: "You must forgive me, I have never heard of a neutron."

I consider all the hush-hush that surrounds the neutron bomb to be a glaring instance of the official abuse of secrecy. To keep the facts of life on the nuclear age from the American people is foolish, and potentially disastrous. If there is a possibility that a neutron bomb can be built, if there appears to be any chance that the Soviets may succeed in building one before we do, then the American people have a right to the facts.

The current issue of Foreign Affairs contains a remarkable article on the question of the test ban by Dr. Freeman J. Dyson. Dr. Dyson quotes a paragraph from a report by the prominent Soviet physicist, L. L. Artsimovitch entitled "Research on Controlled Thermonuclear Reactions in the U.S.S.R.," printed in

December 1958. Let me read this paragraph, Senators, very slowly:

> It may also be possible to realize a pulsed thermonuclear reaction under conditions in which the high temperature is produced by a charge of conventional explosive (such as TNT or something more powerful) which surrounds a capsule containing heavy hydrogen. Without dwelling on the experimental details, we may note that conditions have been found under which the generation of neutrons in hydrogen reactions has been established reliably and reproducibly. In experiments carried out in 1952, there is no doubt that we have observed neutrons which are formed as a result of the heating of matter to extremely high temperatures.

From this, it is apparent that the Russians were experimenting with fission-free hydrogen devices as far back as 1952 and that, as a corollary of this, they have for years had some understanding of the possibilities of the neutron bomb.

Once upon a time there was no hydrogen bomb. But there were a few scientists, a tiny but brave minority, who said it could be made and who urged that we embark on a crash program of development, lest the Kremlin beat us to it. At that time we had a President, Harry Truman, who gave the facts to the people. Had he not done so, had he not enjoyed the public support that only comes from understanding, the production of the H-bomb might have been deferred beyond that fateful day in 1953 when the Soviets exploded their own first H-bomb.

I believe President Eisenhower owes a similar duty to the American people in the case of the neutron bomb. The President should tell the people what the scientists told him. Not to do so would be a dereliction that can only lead to the most dangerous kind of speculation.

Then there is the matter of the so-called Christofilos effect, first suggested by an amateur Greek physicist and subsequently confirmed in the Argus test shot. All we know at this moment is that after the Argus shot, there was a temporary blackout in radio communications in the area due to the release of neutrons and rays at high altitude. These effects conceivably could have a revolutionary impact on modern war. They might be used by either side to interfere with the communications of the opposing side. It is not even precluded that a massive release of neutrons at high altitudes could be used to prevent missile attacks. The fact is that we do not understand the military potentialities of the Christofilos effect. Our national security demands that we learn more about these phenomena. But without tests, this is impossible.

Then there is the antimissile missile. The development of the antimissile missile by either side would have strategic implications comparable to the development of the A-bomb or H-bomb. We cannot afford to let the Kremlin get there first.

There are competent scientists and engineers, I know, who believe that, for all his genius, man will never be able to devise a missile capable of knocking down an incoming missile traveling at a speed of 15,000 miles per hour. But I am impressed by the fact that the corps of equally competent scientists and engineers who have worked on the antimissile system for the U.S. Army are profoundly convinced that both the problem of guidance and the problem of a suitable warhead for the Nike-Zeus can be solved. Indeed, they believe that their project is far enough along to warrant the advance procurement of vital components. This, in my opinion, is sufficient reason to order full speed ahead and to provide the necessary funding without stint. Perhaps their judgment will be proved wrong. Perhaps it will be proved right. But there is so much to be gained if they are right that even at 10-to-1 odds, I would be in favor of risking the several hundred million dollars involved. Every day's delay may cost American lives if a showdown ever comes. It is not too much to suggest that delay in this area alone may cost us our freedom.

While we have been making considerable progress in the field of missile technology, we have been inclined to sit smugly on our stockpile of nuclear and thermonuclear warheads, apparently confident that, come what may, they are so fearsome that no aggressor dare challenge us. In the multimegation field, it is not much of an exaggeration to say that we have been standing still, or almost standing still. The Soviets, I am convinced, have not been standing still. Somewhere along the line, if they run hard enough and push their clandestine tests hard enough, they may achieve a technological superiority in both strategic and defensive weapons that would make a surprise thermonuclear attack on the United States a distinct possibility.

According to expert testimony, the Soviet ICBM's are far superior in thrust to our own. This means that they can carry a much bigger cargo, so that, even with inferior technology, they have been able to arm them with warheads of substantially greater yield. According to these estimates, the Soviet ICBM's carry warheads of 5 megaton yields against the 2 megaton warheads with which our Atlas missiles are equipped.

The missile gap we confront is, by common consent, a matter for concern even as expressed in numbers of ICBM's. It becomes a matter for much greater concern when expressed in megatons. Whether we find this pleasant or not, the hard, inescapable fact remains that megatons constitute the basic currency necessary to purchase deterrence and perhaps necessary to purchase survival.

The word "megaton" has come to have an evil connotation because it is generally associated with the mass devastation of cities. But I would point out, in defense of this word, that the multimegaton weapon will almost certainly become the chief instrument for defending our own cities and our own lives against enemy attack. If we are ever attacked, an effective antimissile system alone may require thousands of multimegaton warheads; and we would need more thousands of high-yield weapons to strike back at the hardened missile sites of the enemy.

General Powers has declared that the Soviets now have the capability to wipe out virtually all of our retaliatory capacity with several hundred missiles. In reply to this, it has been argued that it would require an average of three 5-megaton missiles to knock out the average SAC base and ten 5-megaton missiles to knock out hardened missile sites. The deduction from this is that the Soviets will never be able to afford the thousands of missiles required to reduce our retaliatory capacity to what the military people call "acceptable level."

Is it not conceivable, however, that as a result of technological improvements, the Soviets, within the next several years, will be able to develop a missile system capable of delivering a more powerful warhead with greatly increased precision? In that case, 2 missiles instead of 10 might do an adequate job of destruction on a hardened missile site or on a SAC base. If, finally, such weapons could be made compact and cheap, the arithmetic of deterrence would have to be completely rewritten.

I ask the Senators to imagine the consequences of a major technological breakthrough by the Kremlin in the fantastic, limitless horizon of nuclear weaponry. Suppose that at the next May Day parade in Moscow or at the opening of the next session of the Supreme Soviet, Prime Minister Khrushchev were to make the following statement:

> Comrades, a year ago the glorious scientists of the Soviet Union solved the problem which is still baffling the scientists of the capitalist world. They produced a missile capable of knocking down an ICBM in flight. Today all the major approaches to the Soviet Union are guarded by batteries of anti-missile missiles.

Suppose, on the heels of such a statement, Khrushchev were to renew his Berlin ultimatum. What, then, would be the reaction of the free world?

We can suppose a lot more things. Suppose at the next May Day parade a division of Soviet troops marches by the reviewing stand with gun carriers, tanks, rocket launchers, and bazookas of clearly nuclear design.

Suppose that, while we concentrate on producing improved missile systems, Khrushchev one day announces that the neutron bomb has for the past 6 months been in mass production in the Soviet Union.

If any one of these things happened, we would be in immediate jeopardy. If the Soviets could time their announcements so that they hit the free world simultaneously, or salvo fashion, with the news of two or more major technological breakthroughs, then the effect would very probably be disastrous.

FALLACY NO. 4

Fallacy No. 4 is the fallacy of the "*n*th nation."

According to this argument, the world will be placed in serious jeopardy at the point where nuclear weapons come into the possession of the so-called "*n*th nation," the point, in other words, where

control becomes impossible. It is therefore of overriding importance that we conclude an agreement—any kind of agreement—as rapidly as possible.

This argument is propounded in all earnestness by sincere pacifists, by the members of the Committee for Sane Nuclear Policy, by many other people of both liberal and conservative opinion, by the Department of State, and by the British Foreign Office.

It is also propounded, with altogether different motivations, by the international Communist apparatus. The Kremlin's purpose in brandishing the menace of the "*n*th nation" is obvious enough: it is part of its effort to create a climate which will make it impossible for us to provide our NATO allies with nuclear weapons.

The NATO alliance is the chief target and immediate victim of the "*n*th nation" fallacy.

If NATO is today a sick and purposeless organization, wracked by defeatism, this, in my opinion, is due to two things: First, our one-sided reliance on massive retaliation; and second, our failure to convince our allies that we are prepared, if necessary, to fight a land war in Europe.

President Eisenhower has been indiscreet enough to inform the world that it would be pointless to try to fight such a war. But even more destructive on morale than the President's indiscretion has been our obstinate refusal to provide our NATO allies with the modern nuclear weapons they must have to be able to deter or resist an aggressive strike by the Red army. Who can blame our NATO allies if, lacking confidence both in our intentions and in their own military capabilities, they have fallen far short of the 40 divisions originally prescribed as essential for the defense of Western Europe? At his press conference of February 3, President Eisenhower said that he favored arming our NATO allies with nuclear weapons. When the Kremlin protested, the White House recoiled and announced that we had no intention of distributing nuclear arms to our NATO allies at this juncture. But this is a measure which we put off at our peril. It is a measure for today and not for tomorrow. It would do as much as, perhaps even more than, an airborne alert to increase our deterrent power over the coming critical period.

Despite their bluster, the Soviets will not be able to emulate us, because there is nothing they fear more than nuclear arms in the hands of the satellite armies. Would the Kremlin have dared to intervene in Hungary if the Hungarian Army had possessed nuclear weapons?

Since the provision of nuclear weapons to our NATO allies would, if anything, stabilize the situation and make peace more secure, and since the chances that the Soviets will share their nuclear weapons with their satellites are decidedly remote, the hypothetical danger of the "*n*th nation" is, I am convinced, a chimera—a chimera in the literal sense of being a mythical monster. I do not say that the theory will have no validity at some remote date in the future. But I do say that in the context of the present, it has no significant validity, and that its only conceivable effect will be to keep NATO disarmed.

Somewhere along the line, Egypt or Israel or some other small nation may build a few nuclear weapons. We should certainly attempt to discourage this development, but I can see no ironclad way of preventing it, short of enforcing an "*n*th nation" ban on peaceful nuclear technology. But small nations will never become nuclear powers, and a word of caution from the only real nuclear powers would be more than enough to restrain them.

There remains the single question of Red China. In the case of China, the "*n*th nation" justification for accepting a test ban without adequate inspection, is doubly fallacious. It is the height of folly to believe that the conclusion of a treaty between the Big Four could persuade Peiping not to develop or test her own nuclear devices. No matter what we may do or say, Communist China, I am convinced, will explode some kind of device over the course of the next few years. It can be taken for granted that this will be the signal for an unprecedented campaign to bring Red China into the United Nations on the theory that this will make her more amenable to control. In fact, I think it is highly conceivable that the Kremlin, by arrangement with Peiping, will soon explode such a device on Chinese territory in order to accelerate the panic.

The second part of the fallacy of the "*n*th nation" thesis, as applied to Red China, is that the explosion of a nuclear test or two by Mao Tse-tung would place the free world in mortal jeopardy. Given her poverty, her still massive backwardness, the enormous industrial and agricultural requirements of her 5-year plans, and the fantastic cost of nuclear weapons, Red China would be accomplishing miracles if she achieved nuclear power status 20 or 25 years hence. There are two schools of thought as to whether the West or the Soviets will have the most to fear from this distant prospect. In either event, there is absolutely nothing we can do to prevent or impede this development other than pressing unremittingly for international inspection based on complete "openness."

In the age of nuclear technology, nuclear weapons are inevitable. No great power will forever forego the right to nuclear weapons and forever resign itself to second-class status simply because the nuclear powers who were first on the scene have entered into an agreement to limit their club to a total membership of three.

We must free ourselves from the tyranny of the chimera of the *n*th nation.

The sharing of nuclear arms with our NATO allies will decrease the danger of war by putting some modern military muscle into NATO, by making NATO meaningful, by giving our allies confidence in NATO and confidence in our own intentions. It would simultaneously provide us with greatly increased leverage in pressing for "openness" in our proposals on disarmament and the test ban.

FALLACY NO. 5

The fifth fallacy is the fallacy that underground tests and tests at high altitude and in space, are detectable and verifiable.

Even the most ardent test ban advocates admit that under the best of circumstances, many tests could go undetected, and that, after detection, there would still be a formidable job of establishing proof. They argue, however, that it would be adequate to have a 1 in 5 or even a 1 in 25 chance of verification. A significant possibility of detection, according to this point of view, would be sufficient to deter any government from attempting a sneak violation of a test ban treaty.

In an age that is already notorious for its political folly, there has been no concept more fallacious than that of the enforceable ban. The hearings held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy from April 19 to 23 have, in my opinion, reduced the entire concept to a rubble of nonsense.

I believe the free world owes a great debt to the distinguished Senators and Representatives who organized and participated in these hearings. I wholeheartedly agree with Arthur Krock's statement in the New York Times of Sunday, April 24:

> The hearings ordered by the Joint Committee was an act of statesmanship, as well as service to its high responsibility for national security in the nuclear field.

The four volumes of evidence are, unfortunately, still in transcript form. I hope it will not be too long before the Joint Committee can make available to Congress and to the general public its printed record of these historic hearings. I consider the wide distribution of this record so vital that I think it might be possible to get out a paper-back edition.

The committee brought before it as impressive an array of scientific brains as had ever appeared in a congressional committee room. There were those who favor a test ban treaty, while admitting that it contained many elements of uncertainty. And there were those who were convinced that no system of inspection could be devised that offered anything better than a marginal hope of detecting and verifying a concealed test shot.

None of the scientists questioned the "big hole" theory, which was originally developed by Dr. Albert Latter of the Rand Corp. While the higher mathematics that go into the theory are beyond most of us, in essence the theory constitutes the kind of scientific common sense that a nonscientific layman like myself can appreciate. Let me explain it in my own way: If one simply tamps an atomic charge into a hole in the ground and shoots it off, he will get a seismic signal that is roughly proportionate to the magnitude of the explosion. If, on the other hand, one explodes a test shot in the center of a large spherical cavity, the surrounding air muffles, or decouples, the explosion so that one gets a much smaller seismic signal. If the hole is made large enough, the seismic reading can be reduced by a factor of 300, which means that 300 tons would register as 1 ton.

By their joint calculations, Dr. Latter and Dr. Bethe have demonstrated that,

in a spherical cavity 500 feet in diameter a 20-kiloton device—that is, a device equal to 20,000 tons of TNT, which was the size of the Hiroshima bomb—would produce a seismic signal equal to that of 70 tons of TNT. Unless the seismograph were close in, this would produce no more than an imperceptible wriggle in a seismic reading.

The original Geneva agreement of 1958 had been based on the assumption that an international network of 180 stations, which would include 21 stations in the Soviet Union, would be adequate to detect tests to 5 kilotons. Later this was amended to read that the system would be adequate for detection of seismic readings of greater than 4.75. This would be, roughly, equivalent to the explosion of a 20-kiloton bomb.

I must say a 20-kiloton bomb could not have demolished the Geneva agreement more completely than did the "big hole" theory.

The debate that took place between the scientists representing the two points of view makes highly interesting reading.

Dr. Hans Bethe, Dr. Roberts, and some of the other scientists who favored compromise said that while the "big hole" theory was unchallengeable as theory, it was questionable whether it would ever be translated into practice. Apart from the general agreement on the "big hole" theory, their opinions were challenged at virtually every other point by Dr. Edward Teller, Dr. Latter, Dr. Brown, and some of the other scientists who testified.

The first group said that a hole of 500 feet in diameter could only be excavated by running water through an underground salt deposit; that such an operation would cost $50 million, which would make it prohibitive in price; that salt deposits of the necessary cubic volume and deep enough underground could be found only in a very limited number of places; that such a cavity could not be excavated without detection of the human activity in the area and of the increased salinity in the adjacent waters and soils.

The second group pointed out that one salt dome of 500 feet cubic diameter already does exist in the United States; that limestone deposits, which are very widely distributed, also lend themselves to the construction of big holes; that a 500-foot hole could probably be built for much less than the estimated $50 million, but even $50 million was not a prohibitive sum when equated against the cost of a nuclear-weapons program, and when it is assumed that the cavity could be used over and over again; that in a totalitarian state human activity was highly concealable; that any increase in salinity would dissipate rapidly.

Finally, they pointed out that the hole need not be 500 feet in diameter—this is the size of the hole needed to decouple a 20 kiloton explosion effectively. To take care of a 1 kiloton explosion—and at this level a considerable amount of really significant testing can be done—would require a big hole only one-twentieth the size. This would involve a very simple exercise in engineering and would reduce the cost to no more than several million dollars per hole.

They argued further that, at the 1 kiloton level, it would be possible to conduct tests inside a specially constructed container—perhaps disguised as a factory.

Having argued at every point in support of the feasibility of an adequate detection system. Dr. Bethe went on to agree that the discovery of the decoupling technique made a more extensive detection network imperative. As I have pointed out previously, he proposed a system involving 21 manned stations, 600 robot seismic stations, and 300 onsite inspections per annum.

Dr. Bethe said that the installation of his proposed grid of seismic stations at 125 mile intervals would provide a 300 times greater sensitivity than the original Geneva network, which would compensate for a potential decoupling factor of 300. With the proposed network, therefore, it would still be possible to detect explosions of greater than 20 kilotons magnitude.

The scientists on the other side of the table challenged this argument on two scores. First, they said, it was naive to believe that the Kremlin, which has not yet agreed to the installation of a single station, could be talked into accepting 600 stations. Secondly, they pointed out that while Dr. Bethe's network might take care of a decoupling factor of 300, the technology of decoupling and of cheating in general was still in its infancy. It was suggested, for example, that a greatly increased decoupling factor could be obtained by surrounding the nuclear charge with several tons of graphite. When the charge went off, the graphite would be vaporized and the great heat required to produce vaporization would sap much of the energy of the explosion and reduce its seismic impact.

Dr. Roberts and others argued that it was theoretically possible to distinguish the seismic signal of an earthquake from that of a nuclear explosion and that the technique of obtaining and reading seismic signals might be improved by a program of research. Dr. Harold Brown of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory stated that initially it had been believed that only a small percentage of the continental earthquakes which occur would produce seismic signals which did not clearly identify them as earthquakes.

On the basis of our experience in the Hardtack tests of 1958, however, Dr. Brown declared that, of the 5,000 or more continental earthquakes per year which produce seismic signals equivalent to a 1 kiloton explosion or greater, "only a few percent could be identified by the seismic signature method." This, he said, "left many thousands throughout the world which could then be suspected of being nuclear explosions of between 1 and 5 kilotons and about 100 which could be suspected of being nuclear explosions of 5 kilotons or more." Actually, I am told these statistics on earthquakes are conservative. There probably are tens of thousands. Even if we were to accept Dr. Bethe's estimate that 90 percent of the earthquakes could be identified by their seismographic signal, it would still leave many hundreds and perhaps thousands of seismic disturbances that could not clearly be identified as such.

Dr. Brown and others pointed out that the earth is a noisy medium, that it is extremely difficult to filter out background noises produced by trains or trucks or other man-made disturbances or by pressure changes in the atmosphere, or by waves beating on the shore. If the first upward motion on the seismograph, which might be expected from a nuclear exposion, is lost in the background noise, then the second motion on the chart, which is downward, would appear to be the first motion—and under these circumstances, the conclusion would be that the signal had been caused by an earthquake.

Dr. Brown pointed out that seismic signals could be confused or forged by simultaneously detonating large quantities of conventional explosives in some legitimate engineering enterprise which the Soviets might demonstratively open to public inspection.

Finally, the scientists pointed out that the Kremlin could achieve complete seismic concealment by setting up their test shots so that they would be triggered by seismic shocks of considerably greater magnitude. This would be an extremely simple arrangement, and there are enough natural earthquakes occurring each year to enable the Kremlin to run off such test shots to its heart's content. The debate went on and on and on, in this manner. I found the reading of the arguments on both sides fascinating. But I feel that the entire argument was rendered completely irrelevant by the two points on which the opposing sides agreed.

Point No. 1 is that even if the impossible did happen and the Kremlin agreed to 21 manned and 600 robot seismic stations plus 300 annual inspections, this would only provide us with the capability of detecting blasts of greater than 20 kilotons magnitude. Even with today's technology—and this technology will be improved—tests of far less than 20 kilotons magnitude could be extrapolated in designing improved weapons systems covering virtually the entire nuclear and thermonuclear spectrums.

Point No. 2 is that, even given the Bethe network, and even given the maximum conceivable improvement in methods of detection, there is a threshold below which no detection—let alone verification—would be possible. This threshold was estimated at approximately 1 kiloton. A kiloton blast, decoupled or reduced, by a factor of 300, becomes the equivalent of only 3 tons of TNT. What this signifies is that there will never be any method of detecting nuclear explosions in a range that covers virtually the entire projected spectrum of tactical nuclear weapons.

If these two points are true, what conceivable purpose is there to arguing about our ability to detect tests of greater than 20 kilotons magnitude?

It would be bad enough if this entire irrelevant argument had been confined to the hearing room of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. But it seems to me that the President and State Department have now bogged down in this

grotesque and utterly irrelevant argument. And, in doing so, they have, unwittingly, helped the Kremlin to befuddle Western public opinion completely.

Perhaps I am obtuse or just plain unscientific, but for the life of me I see no point to a detection system which would cost several billion dollars to install and probably another billion dollars per year to operate, and which would still leave the Communists free to sneak test any device up to the size of a Hiroshima-type bomb.

But we have not yet come to the end of the nonsense. Dr. Bethe's proposed enlargement of the system would not in any way take care of test shots released over remote ocean waters, perhaps in the proximity of the Antarctic. With the Soviet Union and the United States both building missile submarines with nuclear propulsion, the vast stretches of the world's oceans are to be "inspected" by only 10 ship stations. What way would there be of preventing a Soviet submarine from surfacing in a remote area, firing a test shot, taking its observations, and then submerging for a long underwater trip back to its home station? We might detect such a shot—but how could we possibly prove, in the absence of a corpus delicti or a captured submarine, that it had been fired by the Kremlin? If we wanted to police the seas on a scale that would make inspection meaningful, it would probably cost additional billions of dollars per year.

If the discussion on detection capabilities was irrelevant, the debate on verification was doubly irrelevant. Verification would require the production of material evidence in the form of a radioactive core of rock.

Again I may be obtuse or unscientific, but what conceivable point is there to discussing the pros and cons of verification if one cannot even detect a test shot of less than 20 kilotons magnitude? There may be a flicker of hope that with thousands of stations, signals might be obtained indicating a test ban violation above a threshold of, let us say, several kilotons. But it is one thing to suspect a violation, and another thing to prove in a legally valid form that a violation has occurred. And, as I see the matter, the proof would have to have legal validity before we could cancel the treaty or ask for sanctions against the violator.

I should like, nevertheless, to summarize some of the testimony on verification that was given to the Joint Committee, because it all helps to demonstrate what a monstrously fallacious thing the so-called enforceable test ban is.

Although the scientists varied in their estimates, all of them agreed that verification was an exceedingly complex problem and that the mathematical odds were in favor of a determined and enterprising cheater. Several of the scientists estimated the odds against verification at 100,000 to 1.

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee has pointed out that in the case of the Rainier test shot, even though we knew the exact underground point at which the shot had been exploded, it required 3 months of drilling to come up with a radioactive core. But let me summarize for your amusement some of the complexities of the problem of verification as described to the Joint Committee.

Let us assume the inspection system is set up and a station at point X receives a seismic signal which cannot clearly be identified as an earthquake. Depending on the spacing of the stations, it would be necessary to carry out a minute examination of some 100 square miles to 500 square miles of Soviet territory. The first surveys would be aerial surveys utilizing all types and sizes of aircraft, ranging from helicopters to multiengine, fixed-winged craft, and flying at survey altitudes ranging from 150 feet to 18,000 feet. The aerial reconnaissance would involve first, visual observation; second, photography; third, radiation, magnetic, electromagnetic, and infrared surveys.

Obviously, the first task of the aerial survey would be to determine whether or not the seismic event was an earthquake, or a nuclear explosion. A nuclear explosion might produce a fissure in the ground if it were not down deep enough—but this is a possibility we can rule out. There might be some metallic debris or other signs of human activity if the Communists were careless—but I believe that this is a possibility we can also rule out.

So, the aircraft flies over this suspected area. The inspectors find no signs of human activity, and their sensitive instruments pick up no surface evidence of an explosion. On the other hand, there is physical evidence that a genuine earthquake has occurred in this area. What do the inspectors do at this point? Do they call off the search and write off the seismic signal to a genuine earthquake? Or do they take the quite realistic stand that the earthquake may have been used as a shield for a test explosion? In the latter case, every suspicious seismic event would involve detailed inspection over a large area, by air, on the ground, underground, and under water.

According to the most optimistic estimates, it would be possible, by means of such techniques, to narrow the area of suspicion down to one-half of 1 square mile and ultimately to a radius of 500 feet. Then drilling would commence. The smaller the test shot, the greater the difficulty of location. According to Dr. C. E. Violet, of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, the probability of locating radioactive debris from a 1.7-kiloton explosion would be approximately 1 in 100,000. To make the probability 1, or equal to unity, he said, one would have to drill 100,000 holes. A far more optimistic estimate was presented by Dr. Richard M. Foose, of Stanford Research Institute. Let us examine this "optimistic" estimate.

If the area of suspicion could be cut down to 500 feet in radius, it would require only 63 drill holes, in triangular grid pattern, to insure 100 percent completeness of search. The tables presented in connection with this "optimistic" estimate are "enough to make a cow laugh"—to use a favorite expression of Comrade Khrushchev. The drilling of 63 holes would involve a total footage of 75,600 feet. This, I would point out, is the equivalent of three Mount Everests. At a cost of $5 per foot—exclusive of all mobilization costs—this would work out to $378,000. Working three shifts a day, it would require 1,008 man-days of drilling and this, mind you, simply to carry out one inspection of one undetermined seismic disturbance. If one were willing to settle for a 1-in-10 chance of verification, fewer holes would be necessary.

At this point, Representative DURHAM made the apt comment:

> If you had about 10 seismic disturbances and had to inspect them on the basis of what you told us here, you probably would have full employment in most of the country.

I am afraid that this employment would not be limited to our skilled and unskilled workers. To carry out 300 such onsite inspections per annum would probably require several entire graduating classes of seismologists, geologists, and of scientists and engineers in the critical field of nucleonics.

If the probability of detection is 1 in 1,000 and the probability of verification is 1 in 1,000—and these are far from being the most conservative estimates—then the combined probability of detection and verification is 1 in 1 million. If the combined probability figure were a thousand times smaller than this, it would still be preposterous. It would be bad enough if it were simply a matter of absurdity. But, as I have pointed out previously—and as I want to emphasize again—these estimates of probability become utterly irrelevant when you consider that they apply to tests of greater than 20 kilotons magnitude, that below this level, no detection would be possible.

How ridiculous can we get?

As for tests in the lower reaches of space or in outer space, all the evidence points to the conclusion that the Soviets would be able to conduct such tests with impunity even with devices of considerable size. As everyone knows, our Argus shot went completely undetected.

Let us assume that the Geneva network is installed in the Soviet Union and that a clandestine 100-kiloton test shot is fired at an altitude of several hundred miles somewhere in the northernmost reaches of Siberia on the fringe of the Arctic Ocean. Light-measuring instruments, if stationed close enough, might detect the explosion. But if the shot were fired against the background of a brilliant display of the aurora borealis, how could we ever prove that the transitory flicker registered by our light instruments was not actually caused by a sudden brilliant burst of the aurora? There might be electromagnetic disturbances similar to those which caused the temporary communications blackout after the Argus shot. But if the shot were fired at a period of considerable sunspot activity, how could we ever prove that the sunspots had really not been responsible? No matter how great

our suspicions might be, in the absence of radioactive debris there would be no way of clinching our case against the cheater.

It is time that we put an end to all this sorry exercise in futility and irrelevance.

It is high time—it is past time—that we presented the facts to the American people.

It is time that we woke up to the fact that these protracted negotiations are part of the conflict strategy of the Soviet rulers—that they have used these negotiations first, to impose a moratorium on nuclear weapons testing by the United States; second, to intensify the international propaganda in favor of a total test ban, without inspection or with inadequate inspection; third, to create a condition of international hysteria which would restrict or prevent the possibility of effective Western reaction to aggression.

It is time we realize that the extension of the moratorium is a deadly serious business—that a single, major, technological breakthrough by the Soviet scientists who have produced the A-bomb, the H-bomb, and the sputnik, may confront us with a choice between enslavement and annihilation.

On February 11, President Eisenhower submitted to the Soviet Government a four-point plan for ending the deadlock in the nuclear test ban negotiations. His proposal called for an immediate ban, under assured controls, of all nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere and in the ocean, of space tests up to altitudes where effective controls can function, and of underground tests above a seismic magnitude of 4.75.

It also called for a joint program of research and experimentation, and offered to extend the ban systematically to remaining areas underground as adequate control measures were devised.

I favor the proposal of an immediate, complete, and unconditional ban on the several categories of tests that result in atmospheric contamination. Such an agreement could have gone into effect without delay since such tests are easily monitored, whereas the detection of even very large underground tests, of tests in space, and of tests over remote ocean areas, requires the establishment of extensive monitoring facilities.

By and large, however, the President's plan was a good one. It was a simple, straightforward proposal on an issue of vital importance to the whole of mankind. I agree with the President that, had the Soviets accepted this proposal, it might ultimately have paved the way for a much broader agreement on disarmament.

But, instead of accepting our proposal, the Kremlin responded with a diplomatic ploy. It announced that it was prepared to "accept" the President's proposal to ban all major tests of nuclear weapons if the West would sign a pledge not to conduct any nuclear tests, big or small, for a number of years to be decided by negotiations. A period of 4 years was suggested. Among other things, it specifically "accepted" the President's proposal that during the period of the moratorium, a joint program of research would be carried out for the purpose of improving detection capabilities.

At the time it was made, the Soviet counterproposal was hailed as a concession to our point of view. For the life of me, I cannot understand why. In my opinion, their counterproposal constituted an act of international blackmail, and we should have called it this. It was as though the Kremlin were pointing a pistol at the head of mankind and saying to us: "We refuse not to contaminate the atmosphere—unless you agree to a moratorium on undetectable underground tests, which do not contaminate the atmosphere, but which might conceivably add to your defensive capabilities."

The Soviet counteroffer conceded nothing. It was merely a rehash of the old Soviet position, substituting the concept of a voluntary moratorium for that of a formal ban on small underground tests. But instead of exposing it for the fraud it was, the President suggested that the Soviet offer was indicative of a sincere desire to come to terms; and Ambassador Wadsworth issued a joint communique with the Soviet and British representatives which carried the strong implication that the Kremlin had accepted the American proposal with certain minor modifications.

The distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] deserves the thanks of all of us for immediately denouncing the Soviet offer as a "phony" and for the incisive analysis which he presented to the Senate on March 22. We are equally in the debt of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] for the dignified but forthright manner in which he raised the matter of the joint communique and explained to Ambassador Wadsworth that, in signing it, he had made an unwitting contribution to the Soviet propaganda campaign.

But Senator ANDERSON'S eloquent warning fell on deaf ears. On March 22, the very day on which he spoke in the Senate, there took place a meeting of the so-called Committee of Principals—Secretary of State Christian Herter, Allen Dulles, George E. Kistiakowsky, the President's science adviser, Atomic Energy Commissioner McCone, and Deputy Defense Secretary Douglas, sitting in for Secretary Gates. According to an article by Mr. Chalmers Roberts in the Reporter for April 27, the Committee of Principals, with only Commissioner McCone opposing, decided in favor of conditional acceptance of the Soviet counterproposal.

According to Mr. Roberts, the joint communique issued by President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillan on March 29 from Camp David was based largely on the agreement reached by the Committee of Principals on March 22. In the Camp David communique, the two heads of government said that they had agreed that, once remaining issues had been resolved and a treaty signed, "they would be ready to institute a voluntary moratorium of agreed duration on nuclear weapons tests below that threshold—4.75 on the seismic instruments—to be accomplished by unilateral declaration of each of the three powers."

This statement contained two vital concessions to the Soviet point of view. By implication, it extended the scope of the proposed test ban treaty to cover undetectable tests in space. In this respect, and in consenting to a moratorium on undetectable underground test shots we abandoned the cardinal principle of enforceable inspection which has thus far guided us in our negotiations on disarmament and the test ban. In my opinion, it constituted the single most catastrophic retreat since the inception of the test ban negotiations.

I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Arthur Krock's statement in the New York Times of March 31:

> The response of the President and the British Prime Minister to Soviet Russia's latest nuclear disarmament proposal gave Premier Khrushchev what he wanted.

Because of the softness and lack of understanding which the administration had displayed on the test ban issue, this has become the area of greatest danger at the forthcoming summit conference. But I feel that the hearings recently held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy provide the administration with every justification for reconsidering its position.

With all the earnestness at my command, I would urge the President and the Department of State to give the most serious consideration to the testimony of Dr. Bethe, Dr. Teller, Dr. Romney, and the other scientists who testified before the Joint Committee. In the light of this testimony, I consider it mandatory that we free our hands to resume tests that are not subject to detection and do not contaminate the atmosphere—at the very least to resume small underground tests.

I do not think the Administration need feel in the least embarrassed over revising its stand at this point. The original moratorium was based on the belief of competent scientific advisers that an adequate system of detection and verification could be devised. On the basis of the most recent scientific testimony, it is now apparent that the chances of developing such a system are exceedingly slim—certainly it is not something that can be counted on within the next decade.

In theory—despite our recent concessions—we still adhere to the position that any agreement on testing must be based on a truly enforcible system of inspection. We would be acting in consonance both with this principle and with recent scientific evidence if we now reverted to the President's eminently sensible proposal of February 11.

I believe that the fate of our country and the fate of the entire free world community may hinge upon our early resumption of underground nuclear testing. Every day of delay cuts down our nuclear technological lead over the Soviets. It is not inconceivable that, as a result of our voluntary 2-year moratorium, they have already caught up with us and surpassed us at a number

of points. Heaven knows what will happen if the moratorium is now extended for another year or 2 years—with or without a formal treaty.

FALLACY NO. 6

Fallacy No. 6 is that the cessation of nuclear tests will, ipso facto, result in a relaxation of the dangerous tensions that have grown up in the world. This fallacy we can dispose of in a few minutes because that is all it deserves.

The Conference of International Experts on Nuclear Test Detection took place in Geneva in the summer of 1958. While the conference was still in progress, and after it became apparent that the West was yielding and that a joint statement on agreed findings would be issued, the Quemoy-Matsu crisis erupted.

On October 31, 1958, the United States exploded its last nuclear test shot and announced to the world that it was embarking on a voluntary 1-year moratorium, while the possibilities of a test ban were being further explored with the Soviet Union. Simultaneously, the Soviet Government embarked—or announced that it was embarking—on a reciprocal moratorium.

Exactly 4 weeks later, on November 27, 1958, Khrushchev promulgated his famous Berlin ultimatum. The 18 months that have elapsed since the ultimatum was issued have witnessed a whole series of missile-rattling perorations by Mr. Khrushchev, the bloody riots in the Panama Canal Zone, the establishment of a quasi-Communist regime in Cuba, and stepped up activity by the Communist Parties throughout the free world.

This is the relaxation of tensions which we purchased with our voluntary moratorium on nuclear tests. I do not consider this sequence of events accidental. I am not surprised by them. It is only natural that the Communists should have been emboldened by their success in bludgeoning us into a nuclear test policy, the folly of which was eloquently described by both President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles in statements made as late as the end of 1957.

My prediction is that, if we now formalize the moratorium by entering into a test ban treaty with inadequate inspection, the Kremlin will again be emboldened, and will become more demanding, not less demanding.

FALLACY NO. 7

Fallacy No. 7 is the oft-repeated statement that in the course of the Geneva negotiations the Russians have conceded far more points than have the West, that they have shown a genuine desire to reach agreement, that the two sides have already arrived at an agreement on all but 4 or 5 of the 17 articles of the treaty—and that an agreement on an enforceable test ban is, in fact, just around the corner.

It is entirely true that the Soviets have made concessions on a number of points—even on many points. But these concessions have always been on points of secondary importance. On the really basic question like the number of onsite inspections per annum, they have shown themselves absolutely adamant.

Let me give one example of the great concessions the Soviets have made. When the "big hole" theory was first presented to them at Geneva by Dr. Bethe, the Soviet delegates denied its validity. The "big hole" theory, however, is something that can be demonstrated mathematically in a black-and-white manner and which has also been verified in recent tests conducted with conventional explosives. After a period of resistance, the Soviet delegation finally abandoned its opposition to the "big hole" theory, but without specifically accepting it. This was just as if they had agreed not to argue against the proposition that two plus two equals four—but without specifically agreeing that it does.

Dr. Bethe and some of our columnists hailed this as one of the most significant of the Russian concessions and as another indication of their genuine desire to compromise. I am not a scientist but I have had some experience with facts. Consequently, I find Dr. Bethe's logic here very difficult to follow.

Compared with the altogether minor concessions which the Soviets have made on a number of points, the West has made three concessions of fundamental importance.

Our first major concession, was our agreement—in violation of everything we had previously said—to consider the questions of nuclear testing in isolation from the general problem of disarmament.

The second major Western concession was our agreement to extend the test ban treaty to cover undetectable tests in outer space. This, again, constituted a violation of our fundamental position that there should be no disarmament of any kind without enforceable inspection.

Our third major concession, and in my opinion potentially the most disastrous, was our submission to the Russian demand that the conclusion of the treaty be accompanied by a voluntary moratorium or, to be exact, by the extension of the already existing voluntary moratorium on undetectable underground tests.

It is true, too, that agreement has been reached on some 12 or 13 articles of the 17-article treaty. But the articles on which no agreement has yet been reached constitute the heart of the treaty. Let me quote the comment of the Washington Post on April 20:

> In its present form, the incomplete treaty is like an automobile with a chassis, wheels, transmission, body, dual controls, upholstery, and trim. Missing from it is the engine, electrical system, and fuel.

Finally, it may also be true that a test ban treaty is just around the corner. But, if a test ban treaty does come into being, in the light of present attitudes and of the Camp David pronouncement I believe we can safely predict that it will not be the kind of test ban agreement about which we were talking 1 year ago. It will not, in short, be a test ban agreement in which our national interests are protected by a system of enforceable inspection.

FALLACY NO. 8

The eighth fallacy is the thesis, exceedingly popular after the first Geneva conference, that the question of a test ban can easily be resolved if we simply turn the problem over to the scientists on both sides.

According to this fallacy, the scientists at Geneva, who came together unencumbered by political prejudice, had no difficulty in arriving at a meeting of the minds. The conference was conducted in an atmosphere of openness and cordiality; and there emerged from it an honest agreement on the guiding scientific principles for a test ban agreement.

The true story of what happened at the Geneva conference is very far from the romantic idyll which was presented to the press of the world.

In checking through the documents pertaining to the conference, the first thing that strikes one is the almost indecent haste with which we rushed to get to Geneva. Here was a projected conference of extraordinary complexity, in a field where there was virtually no body of experience to serve as a guide. But the delegation to the conference, consisting of 3 senior scientists and some 20 technical advisers, was thrown together, briefed, and dispatched to Geneva all within a period of a few weeks.

The picture of idyllic apolitical relations which were supposed to have existed at the conference, was badly punctured by the recent testimony of the American scientists to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. Let me quote a few items from these hearings.

Dr. Wolfgang H. Panofsky, High Energy Physics Laboratory, Stanford University, told the committee:

> After the report of the 1958 conference of experts was filed with the governments of the three countries, all of them (including the United States) formally accepted the report. As a result, the U.S.S.R. delegations like to refer to the report as a formal agreement on technical facts rather than as a technical working paper. In so doing, they propose that the experts' report is an unchangeable point of departure for the political negotiators. On the other hand, the United Kingdom and United States delegations have assumed that the technical facts should be brought up to date to reflect changes in our knowledge.

Dr. Harold Brown, Deputy Director of the Livermore Weapons Laboratories, made this commentary on the behavior of the Soviet scientists.

> On a number of occasions, I have seen them [the Russian scientists] accept something in private scientifically, or at least appear to accept it scientifically, and then come back for the record with quite a different attitude. There is always a technical explanation. Sometimes it holds almost no water. Sometimes it is quite fallacious. Other times there is some basis to what they say.

Dr. Brown went on to say:

> No conference of experts' report can logically be criticized for not taking adequate account of the self-evident fact that a violator of a treaty or a moratorium on nuclear weapons tests must be expected to take full

advantage of whatever methods he can find to reduce the probability of detection.

One can say, looking back, that perhaps not enough attention was paid to them (the difficulties of detection) particularly in such items as the possibility of very large decoupling, the difficulties of on-site inspection, and the possibilities of shielding explosions in space.

I cannot conclude my comments on the fallacy of the scientific idyll at Geneva without some reference to Dr. Hans Bethe, the chief adviser on nuclear testing to the President's Scientific Advisory Committee.

Dr. Bethe is one of the greatest living theoretical physicists, and, as a man of science I have nothing but respect for him. He has the good and the bad qualities of the theoretical physicist. He is by reputation stubborn in his convictions, but willing to listen to demonstrable evidence when he is proven wrong. Unfortunately, Dr. Bethe's predictions in the field of science have frequently been wrong, and his predictions in the fields of technology, military science, and politics have fared even worse.

In the immediate postwar period he frequently declared that the Soviets would not get the atomic bomb for decades. Before the H-bomb, he took the stand that it could not be made and should not be made. And when we developed the hydrogen bomb, he was just as emphatic in his declaration that the Soviets would never discover the secret for themselves. Before the big hole theory was developed by Dr. Albert Latter, Dr. Bethe had declared that decoupling was impracticable. After Latter had developed his theory, Dr. Bethe was big enough to examine and confirm the validity of the theory. In the light of this new knowledge, Dr. Bethe was also realistic enough to propose a substantial enlargement of the original Geneva detection network. But, in proposing it, he came up with the proposition that it was possible to construct completely tamperproof instruments and communication lines for his network. Experts with whom I have discussed the matter tell me that to this date no such thing as a completely tamperproof mechanical device has yet been produced. Nor did Dr. Bethe offer any suggestions.

On the basis of such a record of error on vital matters, what value should we place on the political sagacity of Dr. Hans Bethe?

At this hour of peril, how much reliance can the Nation place on the ability of the President's chief test ban expert to accurately forecast the course of future events in science or in politics?

THE QUESTION OF FALLOUT

There is another argument that used to play a central role in the antitest-ban agitation: That is, the danger of fallout. I have not listed this as a fallacy because once upon a time this argument had some validity. According to the most recent findings, the danger is substantially less than was previously believed, but it is real, nevertheless. But fallout is no longer an issue. No one proposes the resumption of tests that contaminate the atmosphere. Such tests, in my opinion, will not be resumed by either side, even in the absence of a formal treaty. The only question at issue today is whether we should leave ourselves free to conduct tests that do not contaminate the atmosphere and that are essential to our national security.

OUR PRESENT POSITION, AND A PROPOSAL FOR ACTION

Now that I have examined the major fallacies of the proponents of the nuclear test ban, I should like, in closing my remarks, to reexamine our present situation and to suggest the outline of a positive plan of action.

I realize, of course, that it is not enough to point to dangers and to criticize. A purely negative approach on the question of nuclear testing could have disastrous propaganda consequences. But we do not have to be negative. I am convinced that, if we give the facts to the people of our own country and of the other free countries, we shall be able to carry the propaganda offensive to the Kremlin. Let me suggest the outline of such an approach.

First. We inform the Soviets that in the light of recent scientific testimony, an adequate inspection system for underground tests, based on fixed stations, would present virtually insuperable technological difficulties, would be prohibitively costly, would if installed, provide no means of detection for tests under 20 kilotons magnitude.

In the light of this testimony, it is obvious that there would be only one way of effectively policing an agreement banning all categories of tests. This would be the acceptance of the principle of complete openness by both sides. We, therefore, propose a test ban based on President Eisenhower's "open skies" proposal, plus unlimited right of ground inspection, and policed in each country by a stated number of aircraft and inspection teams enjoying complete freedom of movement.

Second. If the Soviets do not accept our proposal for a complete test ban based on "open skies" and unlimited rights of inspection, we propose, as an alternative, an immediate ban on all tests that contaminate the atmosphere. We point out that an agreement on this simple but basic proposal would respect the opinions of mankind, would be easily monitored, and would at the same time, pave the way for further and broader agreements.

Third. If the Soviets, in turn, reject our proposal for a worldwide ban on "dirty" tests, we announce that we ourselves will voluntarily observe a moratorium on such tests. We express the hope that the Soviets will also observe a voluntary moratorium in the absence of a formal agreement—but we warn that, if there is ever conclusive evidence that the Soviets have resumed such tests, then we shall have to reconsider our own position.

Fourth. We announce our willingness to extend the ban to other categories of tests, if, as, and when enforceable methods of inspection are developed.

Fifth. We leave ourselves free to resume tests in space and underground.

Sixth. We commit ourselves, with testing again possible, to an all-out program of nuclear weapons development, conceived on a scale that will not merely maintain our lead over the Soviets but will increase it from year to year. This program must be continuous. We must not again rest on our laurels—as we have done under both Democratic and Republican administrations—when we reach the next technological plateau.

Seventh. We declare our intention (a) to embark on a so-called "plowshare" program—that is a program of research on hydrological and geographic engineering and on other peaceful uses of nuclear explosions, (b) to appropriate $100 million for this program of research, (c) to use our underground weapons test program, insofar as this can be done, to further our "plowshare" program, (d) to disseminate freely all information resulting from this program.

Eighth. We commit ourselves publicly to announce all tests.

Ninth. We act immediately on the President's suggestion of February 3 that we arm our NATO allies with nuclear weapons. Nothing would do more to reinvigorate NATO or to persuade its member nations of the seriousness of our intentions.

Tenth. Recognizing the fact that nuclear physics is not an American monopoly, that Italian, Hungarian, German, Danish, and other scientists all played an important role in the development of the atom and hydrogen bombs, we call for and offer to participate in a joint NATO effort in nuclear weapons development. Such an enterprise would not be designed to replace our own facilities, but to cooperate competitively with them. Nothing would do more to tighten our alliance and to challenge the Russians. The existence of such NATO-wide research facility would also add to our leverage in pressing the Kremlin for "openness."

On May 7, the President stated that we will resume underground nuclear testing, presumably by the end of the year. This declaration was hailed by many as a welcome reversal of policy. But his statement leaves much unanswered and even more undone.

It commits us to limit the new test series to nonmilitary devices—when the crying need is for underground tests of new warheads and new devices designed to provide our land forces with tactical nuclear weapons and our defenses with antimissile capabilities.

It still leaves us committed to the offer made in the Camp David communique of May 29. This called for (1) a treaty banning not only detectable tests in the atmosphere, underwater, underground, and at high altitudes, but also banning undetectable tests in space; and (2) a moratorium on undetectable underground tests while a research program on improved methods of detection was carried forward.

It ignores the fact that with each new extension of the moratorium—no matter what we may say about our intentions at the end of the stated period—it becomes psychologically more difficult to renew testing.

In the war of propaganda, the Communists have used the test ban issue to place the West on the defensive, and to create a condition of international hysteria which would restrict or prevent the possibility of Western reaction to Communist aggression. They have been able to place us on the defensive for the simple reason that we have not given the facts to the American people and the people of the free world. The President's statement of May 7 still does nothing to give them the facts.

The President's statement still leaves us without a positive program that would enable us to carry the propaganda offensive to the Communists.

The President's offer of March 29 already conceded far more than should have been conceded. His statement of May 7 strongly suggests the conclusion that at the forthcoming summit conference it will be used as a bargaining device, and that our offer of March 29 may now be regarded only as an opening position which will be further compromised.

In the light of Khrushchev's recent conduct, in the light of the Berlin ultimatum, in the light of the situation in Cuba, and the many other evidences of aggression and subversion, what possible justification can there be for a continuation of the moratorium on underground tests—with or without a treaty banning tests in detectable media?

For my own part, as I have stated previously, I believe it can be taken as a virtual certainty that the Kremlin has not been observing a corresponding moratorium, and that it will not do so if a treaty is signed.

If the Administration does not accept this point of view, is it prepared to assure the American public that the Kremlin—its opposition to inspection notwithstanding—has honored the moratorium and will continue to do so? And if it cannot offer this assurance, on what grounds does it justify the extension of the moratorium?

By our exclusive reliance on the doctrine of massive retaliation; by our failure to concentrate on the development of clean tactical nuclear weapons as the chief means of offsetting the Communist superiority in manpower; by our failure to arm our NATO allies with the nuclear arms that are available; by our voluntary 2-year moratorium on tests—which, I am positive, have not been reciprocally observed by the Communists; by our failure to accord the antimissile missile the priority it deserves; by our failure to explore the potentialities of the neutron bomb and of the so-called Christofilos effect; by our failure to pursue the further development of nuclear weapons with all the energies at our command; by our recent abandonment of the principle that all disarmament measures, including a test ban, must be based on a system of enforceable inspection—by all these catastrophic errors in judgment, we have placed the free world in mortal peril.

That is why I am worried. That is why I have spoken at such length today.

The Pulitzer prize-winning novel, "Advise and Consent," pictures an America of a few years hence, an America in which demagogs can inflame huge gatherings and bring them to their feet cheering with the slogan, "I would rather crawl to Moscow on my hands and knees than be killed by an atomic bomb."

Is this to be the image of America tomorrow? God forbid it. For should this book prove prophetic, it will mean that our people have rejected the choice between liberty and death made by Patrick Henry and the Founding Fathers, the choice which drew the cheers of America and of free men everywhere from 1775 down to the recent past.

It would mean the victory of the apostles of nuclear surrender. It would signify our total moral and spiritual capitulation.

It would mean that free America has chosen a slavery which is worse than death.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that the conference report on the mutual security bill is ready. I ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] to submit it.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today, p. 10167, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a statement prepared by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], in connection with the conference report.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

This conference report, like all conference reports, represents a compromise. There are some things in it which I wish were not. There are some things not in it which I wish were. I am sure this is true of all the Senate conferees, but on the whole, we are reasonably well pleased with it and are glad to recommend it to the Senate.

The overall total authorized by the bill is $1,366,200,000, compared with $1,405,500,000 in the Senate bill and $1,318,400,000 in the House bill. The accompanying table and statement show the figures in detail, and explain other provisions of the bill.

It is becoming increasingly clear to me that this program cannot survive many more annual authorizations. Every year there is a steady accretion of new restrictions, new conditions which must be met, and new procedures which must be followed in the administration of the program. The cumulative result of these provisions is to make the program so slow and cumbersome as to reduce its effectiveness very greatly. When, under these handicaps, the program fails to perform as it should, its opponents seize on this as an excuse to add more handicaps.

Another mischievous result of annual authorizations is the inordinate amount of time they take in the Congress. Every year the Committee on Foreign Relations is virtually precluded from considering any other business, except the most routine kind, for a period of 6 weeks to 3 months. This year, for example, the committee began its hearings March 22, and here we are completing action the second week in May. In the meantime, we have neglected the International Development Association, the Chicago water diversion, the Antarctic treaty, a badly needed revision of passport legislation, the Japanese security treaty, and various other matters. I am not suggesting that all of these would have been disposed of in the absence of mutual security, but certainly many of them would have been given more consideration than they have so far received.

Neither am I suggesting that the mutual security program should be freed of all legislative oversight. But there comes a point at which legislative oversight is self-defeating, not only for the program overseen but also for the committee overseeing it. We frequently hear complaints, for example, that more information on the program should be made available to Congress. I am not against the Congress having information, but I am reminded of the story about the little girl who went to the library and asked for a book on penguins. She was given a large volume and after reading only part of it, returned it with the comment that "This is rather more than I care to know about penguins." I submit that Congress already has rather more information about the mutual security program than it can digest. The Committee on Foreign Relations has file cabinet on file cabinet of voluminous documents which are widely unread. If the committee were to undertake to scrutinize all these documents and to follow up all the questions they suggest, the whole New Senate Office Building would not be big enough for the staff the committee would need. It might be said that the committee should enlarge its staff, but this, too, would be self-defeating. No matter how many staff members we have, there are still only 17 Senators on the committee. Each of those Senators, as we all know only too well, has a great many other things to do and can absorb only so much about the mutual security program. The staff would work to no avail if it produced more than the committee could digest.

The function of a legislative body is not to second-guess every administrative action, but rather to concern itself with broad questions of policy. The more time and effort the Senate spends on administrative detail, the less time and effort it can spend on policymaking, which is its true role in this Government. In my judgment, we have already gone so far that we allow our policymaking function to suffer and at the same time we seriously handicap the administrators of the program. I think it is

significant that in the Senate debate and in the conference committee this year, the great preponderance of issues presented went not to the amounts of money but to administrative strings and conditions of one kind or another.

I hope that next year, not only for the sake of the program, but also for our own sake, steps can be taken to put more, perhaps all, of the program on a multiyear authorization. This would leave the way open for periodic review by Congress. Perhaps military assistance could be looked at one year, defense support the next, technical cooperation the next, and so on. My urgent plea to whoever moves into the White House next January is that he give this matter his close attention.

	Administration request	House bill	Senate bill	Conference agreement
Defense support	$724,000,000	$675,000,000	$700,000,000	$675,000,000
Bilateral technical cooperation	172,000,000	172,000,000	172,000,000	172,000,000
U.N. technical cooperation	33,000,000	33,000,000	33,000,000	33,000,000
OAS technical cooperation	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Special assistance	268,500,000	256,000,000	260,000,000	256,000,000
U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,100,000	1,300,000
Escapees	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
U.N. Children's Fund	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
Palestine refugees	[1] 18,500,000	[1] 18,500,000	[2] 22,000,000	[1] 16,500,000
Ocean freight	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
ICA administration	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000
Atoms for peace	3,400,000	3,400,000	3,400,000	3,400,000
Contingency fund	175,000,000	100,000,000	155,000,000	150,000,000
Total	1,454,900,000	1,318,400,000	1,405,500,000	1,366,200,000

[1] Plus unobligated balances of $6,500,000.
[2] Unobligated balances of $6,500,000 to revert to Treasury.

Military assistance to Latin America: The conferees agreed on the provisions of the Senate bill as reported by the Foreign Relations Committee. The amendment added on the Senate floor, dealing with reimbursement to the Defense Department, was eliminated as unnecessary and redundant.

Defense support information to be furnished Congress: The House bill contained a proviso making the authority for defense support contingent upon the furnishing, on request, to the General Accounting Office and congressional committees of all documents and other material relating to defense support. This was accepted by the conferees after it had been modified to provide that either the information must be furnished or the President must certify that he has forbidden it to be furnished and give his reasons. This was one of the most important points at issue, and it was resolved in a manner satisfactory to the Senate conferees. As finally agreed to, it allows the President to exercise his constitutional prerogatives without stopping the whole defense support program.

Development Loan Fund: The House accepted most of the Senate provisions designed to broaden the purposes of the Development Loan Fund and to give greater emphasis to social, as distinguished from strictly economic, activities. The purposes of the Fund, and the criteria it is to consider in passing on loans, are broadened to include the development of free economic institutions as well as economic resources and to make it clear that agricultural as well as industrial production is covered. The conferees retained the Senate language stating the sense of Congress that, consistent with the other purposes of the Fund, special consideration should be given to housing loans and guarantees, but the conferees deleted the section of the Senate bill relating to housing projects in Latin America. This latter action was taken largely on the grounds that in view of the new emphasis given to housing worldwide, special reference to Latin America was unnecessary and redundant. The conferees were agreed, however, that conditions are peculiarly favorable in Latin America, which is in an intermediate stage of economic development, for the kind of activities envisaged by the amendments; and the conferees expect that many of these activities will in fact be carried out in Latin America.

The House bill contained an amendment, for which there was no corresponding provision in the Senate bill, and one of the effects of which would have been to prohibit the Development Loan Fund from making advance commitments or allocations to support broad programs of economic development, except in special and limited circumstances. The amendment would have restricted the Fund instead to specific projects and would have surrounded them by so many stringent criteria that, in the opinion of the Senate conferees, the Fund would have had no chance of effective operation.

The Senate conferees resisted this amendment most strongly and were successful in securing a modification which, in their judgment, will give the Fund an acceptable degree of flexibility.

It seemed to the Senate conferees that the amendment was based upon a misconception of the purpose of Congress in creating the Fund. Implicit in the amendment was the concept that the Fund should operate as a hard-boiled bank, restricting itself to specific, bankable projects. In point of fact, the legislation creating the Fund specifically provides that "it shall be administered so as not to compete with private investment capital, the Export-Import Bank or the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development." Moreover, the amendment in question would have made the Fund's operations subject to even more severe restrictions than those applying to the Export-Import Bank which frequently extends line-of-credit loans without meeting the criteria for specific projects which the amendment would have applied to the Fund.

Finally, the amendment seemed to be based, at least in part, upon criticism of State Department dominance of the Fund and of the weight given political considerations in the Fund's operations. This is precisely what Congress intended, and the legislative history of the Fund's creation and early operations allows of no other interpretation. In 1958, for example, when the Fund was incorporated, the Committee on Foreign Relations report contained the following statement:

"The committee has acquiesced in the administration's desire to incorporate the Fund, because a Government corporation has many advantages of business management and stability. But the committee is emphatic that incorporation does not imply any greater degree of independence in the Fund's operations. The Fund is an instrument of American foreign policy, and is intended to be under the foreign policy direction of the Secretary of State, whether incorporated or unincorporated."

Under the language agreed to by the conferees, the Fund will continue to be free to support sound programs of economic development as well as specific development projects.

International Development Advisory Board: The House bill repealed section 308 of the act which provides for the International Development Advisory Board. Although this Board once performed a useful function, it has languished in recent years and the Senate conferees agreed it might as well be abolished.

Fifty-fifty shipping: Both the House and Senate bills authorized funds for the Indus Basin development to be used without regard to the 50–50 shipping requirement. The House bill, however, contained a proviso requiring compensating allowances to be made in other shipments to the same area. It seemed to the Senate conferees that this was too confining, and agreement was reached on a proviso requiring compensating allowances in other shipments to the same or other areas. This will enable the adjustment to be made worldwide instead of only in regard to south Asia.

Palestine refugees: This presented one of the most complicated issues before the conference. The House bill authorized $18.5 million for 1961 and repealed a proviso which earmarked 10 percent of the funds for repatriation or resettlement. This had the effect of freeing $6.25 million, which had accumulated under the proviso, for relief purposes. The House bill would have likewise authorized the continued availability of an additional $250,000 in other unobligated funds.

The Senate bill authorized $22 million for 1961 and also repealed the earmarking proviso. At the same time, however, it provided that the funds which had accumulated under the proviso, as well as the other unobligated funds, should revert to the Treasury.

On this point, the conferees agreed to an authorization of $16.5 million for 1961, to repeal of the proviso, and to continued availability of unobligated funds. The net result is to provide a total availability for 1961 of $23 million, or $2 million less than the House bill and $1 million more than the Senate.

The Senate bill contained two other substantive provisions not found in the House bill. One of these would have prohibited use of U.S. contributions after January 1, 1961, for programs of relief heretofore administered on the basis of ration cards except for refugees whose need and eligibility for relief have been certified after July 1, 1960. The other directed the President to include in his recommendations to Congress for the 1962 mutual security program specific recommendations for the progressive repatriation and resettlement of refugees and for reducing U.S. contributions to the UN Relief and Works Agency.

The House conferees felt strongly that the Senate provisions were too tightly written and that, in view of the conditions existing in Jordan, they would be impossible of administration and would interfere with achievement of U.S. objectives in the area. The Senate conferees agreed to a revised version which expresses the sense of Congress that "the earliest possible rectification should be made of the Palestine refugee rolls in order to assure that only bona fide refugees whose need and eligibility for relief have been certified shall receive aid from the Agency and that the President in determining whether or not to make U.S. contributions to the Agency should take into consideration the extent and success of efforts by the Agency and the host governments to rectify such relief rolls." The revised language further provides that the President is to report to Congress next year on the progress made toward rectifying the relief

rolls as well as toward repatriating and resettling the refugees.

President's special education and training fund: The House bill repealed section 412 of the act which earmarked $10 million a year of mutual security funds for each fiscal year of 1960 through 1964 for the President's special education and training fund. The Senate conferees acquiesced in view of the provision in the current appropriation act prohibiting use of funds for this purpose.

Loans to small farmers: The House bill contained a section stating the policy of the United States to provide agricultural assistance "particularly through loans of foreign currencies to associations of operators of small farms, formed for the purpose of joint action designed to increase or diversify agricultural productivity." The House bill limited unpaid balances of loans under this section to $10 million in the aggregate and to $25,000 for any association.

The conferees modified the section slightly to provide for foreign currency loans "for" rather than "to" associations of small farmers. This modification will make it plainer that lump sums can be made for this purpose to local institutions, such as agricultural banks, and that U.S. Government agencies need not directly administer small individual loans.

The activity contemplated by this section is one which is badly needed in many underdeveloped countries, and the Senate conferees were glad to agree to the House provision, as modified.

Congressional travel expenses: The Senate bill contained a provision, which was not in the House bill, modifying existing law regarding congressional use of foreign currencies. Existing law requires each congressional committee to make a consolidated report for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing its total itemized expenditures of foreign currencies for the preceding calendar year. The Senate bill expanded this requirement to include a report of dollar expenditures from appropriated funds and publication of the expenses of each member and employee of a committee.

The conferees agreed to retain the requirement for reporting dollar expenditures and to insert clarifying language which was suggested by the House and which makes it plain that the expenditures to be reported are those incurred as a result of the official activities of members and employees of committees. The new language follows existing law in not requiring publication of reports of individual members or employees.

Upper Nile cultural monuments: The House bill did not contain the Senate bill's provision respecting U.S. participation in an internationally financed program to preserve the cultural monuments of the upper Nile from flooding upon completion of the Aswan Dam. Instead of the rather elaborate Senate provision, which spelled out conditions for U.S. participation in some detail, the conferees agreed on a simple statement expressing the sense of Congress that prompt and careful consideration should be given to the proposal and asking the President to submit his recommendations in this respect to Congress on or before March 1, 1961.

Standards for land and water resource projects: The House bill contained a provision applying the domestic standards of the Budget Bureau to nonmilitary flood control, reclamation, and other water and related land resource projects financed abroad with nonmilitary mutual security funds. A comparable provision had been rejected when offered in the Senate, and the Senate conferees stood firm by this position, taking the view that domestic standards are inapplicable abroad and that the attempt to apply them would result in paralysis. The conferees agreed to a provision requiring that costs and benefits for these foreign projects be computed insofar as practicable in accordance with Budget Bureau domestic standards, but the new language does not make these domestic standards ironclad for foreign projects.

Pay of employees abroad in foreign currency: The Senate bill authorized the chief of a U.S. diplomatic mission in a country, whenever he determined that the achievement of U.S. foreign policy objectives required it, to issue regulations governing the extent to which Government employees and contractors in that country were to receive their pay and allowances in foreign currencies. The House conferees accepted this provision with only minor changes. Under the conference language, the determination is to be made by the President, who may then direct the chief of mission to issue the regulations. It was never contemplated that the chief of mission would act except upon instructions, or with the approval, of the Department of State and the President. It should be emphasized that the determination required by this section relates to the achievement of U.S. foreign policy objectives. Although it is not intended to work an undue hardship on anyone, the convenience of members of the Armed Forces or other affected employees is not to be taken into account. Other changes made in the Senate version simply clarify it as applying to enlisted men as well as officers and also as embracing employees of contractors.

Security clearance: The House bill substituted, for the employees security clearance requirements in the present law, a provision applying the standards and procedures of Executive Order 10450. This is the Executive order which covers security clearance for other Government employees, and the Senate conferees agreed to put mutual security employees on the same footing.

Duties of Inspector General and Comptroller: The House bill deleted the provisions of existing law making the Inspector General and Comptroller responsible for designing the form and prescribing the financial and statistical content of the annual mutual security program presentation to Congress The Senate conferees agreed to this provision.

Congressional presentation: The Senate bill contained an amendment, adopted on the floor, which prescribed in some detail the content of the annual program presentation to Congress for military assistance. The amendment also, however, deleted the requirements of existing law prescribing the content of program presentation for defense support. The House bill contained no new provision on this subject, and the Senate conferees agreed to leave the existing law as it is.

Assistance to Cuba: Senate conferees agreed to a provision of the House bill prohibiting assistance to Cuba "unless the President determines that such assistance is in the national and hemispheric interest of the United States." This applies to bilateral aid programs; it would obviously be impractical to try to apply it to multilateral programs of the Organization of American States and the United Nations and its agencies.

Use of Public Law 480 currencies for health and education: The Senate bill contained a highly technical amendment to section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (Public Law 480), the effect of which was to make available currencies accruing under title I of that act for health and education programs related to economic development, without appropriation, while continuing to require appropriation of such currencies for health and education programs of direct benefit to the United States and not related to economic development. This subject had not been considered by the House, and the Senate conferees agreed to delete the Senate provision, with the hope that further consideration can be given to the problem next year.

Use of title II of Public Law 480 for economic development: The House bill contained a provision, which was rejected on the Senate floor, authorizing the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities under authority of title II of Public Law 480 on a grant basis for purposes of economic development as well as for purposes of famine and other emergency relief. The Senate conferees agreed to this expanded authority for a period of 1 year, during which time Congress can review the matter on the basis of trial experience.

Payment of general average contributions: The House bill contained a rather complicated amendment relating to payment of ocean freight charges on relief goods shipped under title II of Public Law 480. The amendment was designed to meet a rare but embarrassing situation which arises when a portion of a ship or its cargo is damaged or destroyed in order to save the ship or the remaining cargo. In these circumstances, the owners of the ship and of the remaining cargo are liable, pro rata, for the damage. Although the United States pays the ocean freight on title II relief shipments, title to the commodities passes to the recipient country at the U.S. port. Thus when, as occurred in at least one instance, some other cargo on a ship is damaged, the recipient government becomes liable for claims against a gift of relief goods. The House amendment, which was agreed to by the Senate conferees, will enable the United States to pay these claims, which are known in admiralty law as general average contributions.

Food and Agriculture Organization: The Senate bill repealed the $3 million ceiling on U.S. annual contributions to the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization, leaving intact the ceiling of 33⅓ percent of total contributions. The House bill did not contain a similar provision, and the Senate conferees receded in view of the fact that the dollar ceiling will not become an acute limitation until next year and the matter can be further considered at that time.

Assistance to foreign students and teachers of foreign languages: The Senate conferees receded from provisions of the Senate bill authorizing assistance to universities for orientation programs for foreign students and assistance to American teachers of foreign languages for study abroad. This was done reluctantly and in the hope that these programs may be further considered in connection with other legislation.

In other respects, the bill agreed upon in conference is in substantially the same form as the bill which passed the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas is absent on official business today and is unable to be present, but he prepared a very comprehensive statement regarding the conference report before he left.

Mr. President, there were no great differences between the Senate version and the bill as it passed the House. There were some differences. There was a difference as to amount, and some of the amendments were in different wording. The conferees met in two or more sessions and were able to compromise their differences, and the report is a compromise of the differences between the two Houses.

There was no great difference between the amount of money. The amount was compromised by dividing the difference almost evenly. I believe from the standpoint of the Senate the Senate conferees did a very good job. There were some things which the Senate had written into the bill upon which the House conferees were absolutely adamant, but by

and large I believe the action of the Senate was more generally adopted than was the action of the House. I ask for a favorable vote on the conference report.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What did the conferees do in connection with the amendment which the Senate approved 68 to 0, the purpose of which was to require Members of Congress and congressional employees to render an accounting of their expenditures on trips abroad?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The point is covered in the statement prepared by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I read the language from his explanatory statement:

> Congressional travel expenses: The Senate bill contained a provision, which was not in the House bill, modifying existing law regarding congressional use of foreign currencies. Existing law requires each congressional committee to make a consolidated report for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing its total itemized expenditures for foreign currencies for the preceding calendar year. The Senate bill expanded this requirement to include a report of dollar expenditures from appropriated funds and publication of the expenses of each member and employee of a committee.
>
> The conferees agreed to retain the requirement for reporting dollar expenditures and to insert clarifying language which was suggested by the House and which makes it plain that the expenditures to be reported are those incurred as a result of the official activities of members and employees of committees. The new language follows existing law in not requiring publication of reports of individual members or employees.

This is one of the provisions with respect to which the House conferees were quite insistent. We succeeded in getting some modification, but I invite the attention of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the fact that the first provision which went into the bill dealing with this use of foreign currencies originated in the House of Representatives. The House feels a protective interest in connection with this particular provision, and the House conferees felt that what they insisted on was better than what the Senate had proposed. The House conferees were not willing to go beyond the modification we were able to get, as referred to in the statement of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator referred to the feeling on the part of the House conferees that they have a protective interest. What does the Senator mean by "protective interest"?

Mr. SPARKMAN. As the Senator knows, I mean that Members of the House feel it is more or less a project of the House since the measure originated there, and they probably feel they gave thought to the legislation before the Senate did. I am not willing to concede that, because the subject has been discussed here for a good many years, but the first language which went in, as I recall, came from that source.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I feel inclined to compliment Members of the House for feeling proud of what was perhaps their original "baby." However, I am wondering if the Senate conferees and the Senate should not likewise feel a great deal of pride in the fact that they approved this amendment unanimously, and I wonder if we should not insist on our amendment. I think the Senator from Alabama will agree with me that there is merit in the proposal that the American taxpayer should have an accounting of what we spend on any official trips. I say that as one who feels very strongly that official trips abroad have a constructive purpose and that when Members of Congress and members of the staff are on official business, expenses should be paid out of the Public Treasury. I support that principle entirely. But I likewise support the principle that when we come back from such official trips we should do just as we must do in private industry; namely, render an accounting for what we have spent of the taxpayer's money.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am in complete agreement with the Senator from Delaware. I have often said that one of the best things we ever did was to authorize the use of a very small percentage of counterpart funds in this way. Instead of condemning what are so often referred to as "junkets," I think we ought to encourage Members of Congress to travel and visit other countries on official business.

I do not mean so-called junketing, but working. I believe it is well to use these funds for this purpose. I agree also with the Senator from Delaware that there ought to be a complete accounting. There is absolutely no justification for some of the loose handling of funds I have heard of. I have done a good bit of traveling, and I have used counterpart funds, but I have never seen the loose type of handling of these funds that is sometimes referred to by various columnists and other writers. It may be possible, but not if the spirit of the law is observed.

I surely agree with the Senator from Delaware that there ought to be a complete accounting. The House conferees apparently felt that their method of accounting is superior to that provided in the Senate language. As I said a few minutes ago, it is my understanding that they were adamant on this point.

I was not present in this particular conference meeting. I had gone to Alabama for the election. I was present at the conference committee meeting at the last session of the conferees. However, I was not there when this matter was considered. It is my understanding that the House conferees absolutely insisted upon that langauge, and the most our conferees could get was the modified language to which I called the Senator's attention in the statement of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The provision is nothing more than a rewriting of the existing law except that it does include dollar expenditures.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It does include dollar expenditures.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree fully with the Senator from Alabama that with the amount of money our Government is spending throughout the world it is not only important but essential that Members of Congress on occasion take official trips to familiarize themselves with the expenditures. However, I believe it likewise is important that we provide adequate accounting. I am confident that the overwhelming majority of those who make these official trips spend money just as conservatively as if they were spending their own money. We would be blind, however, if we did not recognize that some will abuse the privilege. With the present cloak of secrecy thrown around it the instances of abuse are reflections on those who conduct themselves properly.

Any foreign traveler, whether he be a Member of Congress or anyone else, who abuses that privilege is not a good ambassador for our country. In fact, a lavish spender is the worst kind of ambassador we could have. I believe that if we required an accounting we would eliminate much of the criticism which is directed against these congressional trips. I am wondering whether the Senator from Alabama agrees with me. If so and if the Members of the Senate feel it is an important amendment and has much merit, does not the Senator feel that we should send the conference report back to the House and insist on the Senate position, and that if we did so the House members might look at the matter in a different light?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is my understanding it would be most difficult to get a further concession from the House conferees. I should dislike very much to see the conference report sent back to the House. I remind the Senator from Delaware that a Member of Congress, either of the House or the Senate, is not allowed to use counterpart funds unless he gets authorization from the chairman of his committee.

Furthermore, when he returns, he must make an accounting in detail to the committee that authorizes the expenditure. It is not published all over the country. Frankly, I do not know, but I have heard it said, that one reason why some Members of Congress do not want that information published is that one Senator might take a short trip, perhaps to Mexico—I am using that as an example—in which case only a few dollars would be spent, whereas another Member might visit 15 different countries. As that appears in the press, the only thing shown is the amount spent, not the extent to which the visitation was made. Therefore the publicity does not give a fair basis for comparison.

I will say to the Senator from Delaware that I was not present when his amendment was agreed to. Had I been here, I am sure I would have been one of those who voted for it, because I belive in strict, well-protected, accounting, I will say. I am told that the Senate conferees did their very best in the conference, but that the House was adamant on this particular provision.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I assure the Senator from Alabama that I certainly was not sponsoring this proposal with the thought of holding any Member up to ridicule.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I realize that, of course.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not believe that the press or the people back home would misinterpret these expenditures as referred to by the Senator. There is a difference, of course, between going to Mexico and going to several countries. The best example I know of to indicate that no misunderstanding would arise is that I believe six members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which the Senator and I are members, have upon their return rendered such an accounting to the people, and I have never seen any adverse comment in the press on their expenditures. On the contrary, several complimented them on the fact that these Members had made the trip and that they had rendered the accounting.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say to the Senator from Delaware that I have been on trips on two or three occasions, and that on those occasions the funds were handled by a staff member of the committee. I had nothing to do with the handling of funds at all. The staff member of the committee handled them, and a full accounting was made to the committee. There are ways by which that can be handled in a proper manner. I believe the majority of Members of Congress handle it that way.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I did not mean to imply otherwise. The only point I am making is that the money spent is money which belongs to the taxpayers and that the taxpayers are entitled to an accounting.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, I do not believe the Senator from Delaware can properly say that the taxpayers are not getting an accounting now. They are not getting it in the same detail the Senator from Delaware wishes. Each committee must give a report as to what that committee spends, and the committee can give as much other information as it desires to give—as to how many Members traveled and the extent to which they traveled. So far as the published account is concerned, it is a lump-sum accounting of the committee as a whole, showing what the committee spent.

The taxpayers are getting an accounting on the amount of counterpart funds spent. We now include the dollar expenditures also. I certainly hope that the Senator will not insist on disagreeing to the amendment, and that he will permit the conference report to be adopted, because I am assured that it represents the best that our conferees were able to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, when this bill, H.R. 11510, passed the Senate there was included by a vote of 68 to 0 an amendment the purpose of which would have required a public accounting by all Members of Congress of their expenditures, dollars or foreign currencies, which were made while they were traveling on official trips in foreign countries.

Sixty-eight Members of the Senate voted for this amendment, and of the 32 absentees 26 had their position stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as being in favor of the amendment; only 6 were not committed.

In the face of this unanimous approval on the part of the Senate of the principle that Members of Congress or committee employees should each render an accounting of expenditures in foreign countries, I cannot understand the reasoning of the Senate conferees in agreeing so readily to the elimination of this amendment.

It is true that in the bill as brought back by the conferees they did include a modification of the original amendment's language, but it is also true that this modification completely destroys the purpose of the original amendment as far as requiring any accounting from the individual Members of Congress is concerned.

I have checked with the Legislative Counsel, and it has been confirmed that the language as modified is, in effect, merely a rewritten version of the existing law and also that it will have the same practical effect as the present law.

In a memorandum prepared by Mr. Dwight Pinion, of the Legislative Counsel, he interpreted the conference amendment as follows:

> Since this change removes the language of the amendment which would have required that the consolidated reports show total itemized expenditures of individual Members and employees, it would appear that committee chairmen, in submitting these reports for publication, may continue to submit them in the same form as required by existing law.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum prepared by Mr. Pinion be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR WILLIAMS OF DELAWARE

This memorandum is submitted in response to your request for information concerning the effect of the action of the conference committee on the mutual security bill on the Senate amendments to section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954.

Under section 502(b), as contained in existing law, members and employees of a congressional committee are required to make itemized reports to the chairman of the committee of their expenditures of foreign currencies made available to the committee pursuant to such section. The chairman of the committee is required to prepare and submit annually for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a consolidated report showing the total itemized expenditures of the committee and each subcommittee.

The Senate amendment changed section 502(b) in two respects:

1. It imposed a requirement that the reports required by the section include not only foreign currency expenditures but also dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds in connection with foreign travel.

2. It required that the consolidated reports submitted by committee chairmen for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD disclose not only the total annual itemized expenditures of the committee and each subcommittee, but also the total annual itemized expenditures of each member and employee of the committee.

The committee of conference adopted the first amendment without change, so that hereafter both the individual and the consolidated reports must include, in addition to foreign currency expenditures, dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds in connection with foreign travel.

With respect to the second amendment, however, the conferees modified the language of the amendment which described the consolidated report, and which originally read: "a consolidated report showing the total itemized expenditures during the preceding calendar year of the committee and each subcommittee thereof, and of each member and employee of such committee or subcommittee," by deleting the underlined words and substituting the words "incurred as a result of the official activities of the members and employees." Since this change removes the language of the amendment which would have required that the consolidated reports show total itemized expenditures of individual members and employees, it would appear that committee chairmen, in submitting these reports for publication, may continue to submit them in the same form as required by existing law.

It must be pointed out that the above conclusion is based entirely upon an examination of the language of the amendment and of the changes made in such language by the conference agreement. Since the final interpretation of any statutory language must take into consideration its legislative history, an indication of a contrary intent by the conferees, in the debate on the conference report, would necessarily require a reexamination of this conclusion. I would think that this should be particularly true in the case of a provision such as this which deals with the internal procedures of the Senate and House, and the interpretation of which, in the final analysis, will rest with the chairmen of the respective congressional committees.

Respectfully submitted.

DWIGHT J. PINION,
Assistant Counsel.

MAY 9, 1960.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, we are advised by the Senate conferees that the House has refused the Senate amendment which would have required an accounting of our expenditures of all public funds—dollars or foreign currencies—which congressional Members or their staffs spend while on official trips in foreign countries.

However, the Senate cannot place all the responsibility for the rejection of this amendment on the House of Representatives. If we want this amendment, we can reject the conference report and insist upon another conference, and then the Senate can instruct its conferees not to yield on this particular point.

In the present parliamentary situation, the only manner in which the Senate could reinstruct its conferees to insist upon this amendment requiring public accounting of congressional expenditures would be first to reject the conference report and then to follow that rejection with a motion requesting a new conference.

As one Member of the Senate, I shall refuse to vote for the conference report, which eliminates this amendment requiring public accounting of our expenditures on foreign trips.

I cannot conceive of Congress placing itself in a position to tell the overburdened American taxpayers that they must pay the expenses of the various trips taken by the Members of Congress or congressional employees around the world, but yet thumb their noses at the same taxpayers when they ask for an ac-

counting as to how much the trips cost or for what the money was spent.

I hope the conference report will be rejected so that the Senate may then adopt a motion to insist upon its amendment and the conferees be so instructed. I wonder if the Senator from Alabama will agree to this suggestion and make at least one more attempt to have the House accept the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Delaware is aware, I believe, that the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is away from the city, on an official trip, at the present time. He was the chairman of the Senate conferees. I am acting today in his place. I hope the Senator from Delaware will not insist upon this procedure, because the Senator from Arkansas is away. Even if the conferees were sent back to another conference, we could not function until the Senator from Arkansas had returned. Considerable delay would be caused. I hope the Senator from Delaware will not insist upon his request, but will let the Senate agree to the conference report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the conference report.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

INCORPORATION OF FEDERAL MORTGAGE INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide additional financial facilities in the Federal National Mortgage Association, to provide for the incorporation of Federal mortgage investment companies, and for other purposes.

The bill is introduced by request, in order to provoke study and discussion. The idea of a central mortgage bank has been of great interest for a long time. As the present occupant of the chair, the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], who is a member of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, well knows, we have discussed the subject in committee many times. Considerable research has been done over the last few years, and now three of the great organizations interested in the matter—the National Association of Home Builders, the Mortgage Bankers Association, and the National Association of Real Estate Boards—have come forward with a suggested bill.

As I have said, I introduce the bill at their request at this time for the reason that hearings are now in progress in the Subcommittee on Housing concerning housing legislation for this year. The hearings have been running during this week, will resume on Monday, and will continue through next week.

Some persons will want to discuss this very kind of program in the course of the hearings, so I think it is well that a specific bill be before the Senate.

I have not had an opportunity to study the bill in all its details. I cannot say that I am familiar with all its features. I do endorse the central idea, and have done so for a long time.

I think it would mean much for the obtaining of needed credit and stabilization of the home mortgage market in this country if there were such an organization as the one which is proposed.

My introduction of the bill does not mean that I endorse every feature of it at all. I endorse the central thought, and hope that the bill may serve as a basis from which a satisfactory central mortgage program may be evolved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared concerning the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3541) to provide additional financial facilities in the Federal National Mortgage Association, to provide for the incorporation of Federal mortgage investment companies, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. SPARKMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN

I am introducing today, on request, a bill which should provide the basis upon which the Senate can begin to consider a proposal to which many of us have given long consideration and which has gained support in many quarters during recent years. It is a bill to provide additional financial facilities in the Federal National Mortgage Association, to provide for the incorporation of Federal mortgage investment companies, and thereby to establish by amendment of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act and other statutes the framework for a central mortgage reserve facility, which many in the past have called a central mortgage bank.

The subject of a central mortgage reserve facility has been widely discussed and considered in general terms by private industry and committees of the Congress over a period of several years. During the hearings before the Subcommittee on Housing in the last session on "A Study of Mortgage Credit Over the Next Decade," a number of witnesses presented papers and testimony pointing emphatically to the need for this legislation. The report of the subcommittee submitted under Senate Resolution 221 had this to say on the subject:

"The Federal National Mortgage Association, as presently constituted and administered, cannot be expected to supplement and stabilize the flow of mortgage credit to the extent that may be desirable. If this supplementation and stabilization are to be objectives of Federal policy during the 1960's, it will be necessary to (1) reconstitute the Federal National Mortgage Association, or (2) change its administrative policies, or (3) create new institutions, such as a central mortgage bank, to operate in lieu of or in conjunction with the FNMA, or (4) a combination of these actions."

Heretofore, however, most discussions on this subject have been on the desirability—in effect, the necessity—of supplementing and stabilizing the flow of mortgage credit. Differences among private groups upon detail in the method of accomplishing this have gradually disappeared.

I am now informed that during the past several months three representatives each of the National Association of Home Builders, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, and the Mortgage Bankers Association have held frequent meetings to solve differences in detail in their thinking on this subject and to develop a sound bill, aimed at constituting a true central mortgage reserve facility, to which the industry could agree. I am pleased to be able to inform the Senate that such agreement has been accomplished and is expressed in the bill I have introduced. I am informed that it has the support of the National Association of Home Builders and of the National Association of Real Estate Boards and that, although the board of directors of the Mortgage Bankers Association has not yet met to act officially, the president and other representatives of MBA who attended the meetings from which this bill developed have approved it and state that it is in accord with the general policies of that organization.

Possibly the bill can be further improved as the views of other organizations and individuals are obtained at committee hearings. However I have introduced the bill at this time in order to bring it to the attention of all of those sincerely interested in improving the residential mortgage credit system and so that it may be discussed at hearings of the Subcommittee on Housing, now under way.

It is my hope that other Senators on both sides of the aisle will join with me in sponsoring the bill. I shall in the next few days submit a section-by-section analysis and further explanation of the bill.

RESTORATION OF ANNUITY RIGHTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 173, H.R. 4601.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4601) to amend the act of September 1, 1954, in order to limit to cases involving the national security the prohibition on payment of annuities and retired pay to officers and employees of the United States, to clarify the application and operation of such act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, House bill 4601 is identical with Senate bill 91, presently on the calendar, and reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service a little more than a year ago. The bill has now been cleared for passage, which I hope will shortly be forthcoming.

The bill is a long one, but most of it is a reenactment of existing law.

The purpose of the bill is to amend an act passed in 1954, which prohibited the payment of annuities to Federal employees who had been convicted of a wide variety of specified offenses.

It is the view of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of the House of Representatives—as evidenced by its passage of the bill—of the Comptroller General, of the Attorney General, and of the Civil Service Commission that the 1954 law, which was enacted at the height of the witch-hunt atmosphere of that year, has had some unintended and unjust effects. The pending bill seeks to remedy the injustice.

No adverse testimony was heard by the committee, which held full public hearings. The committee was unanimous. The committee adopted amendments suggested by the Department of Justice and by the Civil Service Commission.

The bill would limit the application of the 1954 act to cases in which Federal Government employees have been convicted of offenses relating to the national security. I repeat that the bill deals with the payment of annuities to Federal employees.

The provisions of existing law against payment of Federal annuities or retired pay to Federal employees convicted of crimes involving the security of the United States would be continued in full force and effect and would be broadened by the terms of the pending bill.

Let me give the Senate a couple of examples of the harsh effects of the 1954 act which were entirely unforeseen by its original sponsors. Long-term Federal employees, entirely loyal to the country, as well as their innocent wives and children, have been denied substantial retirement benefits by virtue of minor offenses committed many years ago.

As of this date 189 persons have been denied Federal retirement benefits, worth more than $3 million, because of the 1954 act. Only 11 of those persons had been charged with or convicted of offenses which were related in any way to loyalty or security matters. The other 178 were denied Federal retirement benefits because of their involvement in postal infractions or similar nonsecurity offenses for which they had been punished previously according to law.

The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, in his letter to the committee, stated, and I read from page 5 of the report:

> In the more than 34 years between the effective date of the original Civil Service Retirement Act (August 1920) and enactment of Public Law 769 on September 1, 1954, the concept of the act was that an employee who met the requirements specified therein was entitled to annuity regardless of reason for separation or other consideration.
>
> In other words, the Government guaranteed to the individual as part of his employment contract a defined retirement benefit upon his completion of a stipulated service period, payment of the required contribution, and attainment of a specified age or becoming disabled. If he met these conditions, a discharge for cause regardless of the reason, the commission of a crime, the loss of U.S. citizenship, etc., did not defeat the right already earned. When survivorship provisions were placed in the law, the same concept operated as regards survivors of deceased employees or annuitants.

Section 1 of Public Law 769 of the act of 1954 changed all this and barred the payment of an annuity to an employee and his survivors, if convicted of any one of the Federal criminal offenses specified in the act, and there was a long, long list of offenses, including offenses which had nothing to do with the national security. Section 2 of the 1954 act barred retirement benefits for failure to appear, testify, or produce records, or for making false or fradulent statements involving matters many of which were outside the realm of national security.

I have before me a list of hardship cases which would be redressed by passage of the bill, but I shall not take the time of the Senate to read them all. I shall read merely one.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the Senator mind if I asked him a few questions?

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator mind if I first completed my initial statement, which will take only about 3 minutes?

This involves a U.S. naval employee who was convicted in 1946 of theft of Government property of minor value and sentenced to 1 hour in the custody of the U.S. marshall. Ten years later, after completion of 35 years and 4 months of otherwise honorable service, he retired. He would have had an annuity with an estimated value of $34,000, for which he had paid $5,438 during the course of his employment, had it not been for the act of 1954. As a result of that act he lost his entire annuity.

Mr. President, the bill, in my judgment, merely does simple justice by restoring the concept and philosophy which existed in our retirement laws prior to 1954, permitting Federal employees to get the annuities they bargained for, unless they are convicted of offenses involving the national security.

I believe that is all I care to say at the present time. I would ask that the committee amendments may be dealt with en bloc before yielding to the Senators from Delaware and New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I have no objection. I did not intend to oppose the bill. I merely wanted to ask some questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that there are no committee amendments to the bill before the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I regret that I made an error. We are dealing with the House bill, and not with the Senate bill.

I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, first I should like to say that this bill has incorrectly received the sobriquet "the Hiss bill." As a matter of fact, I understand from the Senator from Pennsylvania that the bill expressly excludes restoration of a pension to anybody like Hiss. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct. Mr. Hiss would not get his pension, because he was convicted of perjury in a trial involving questions related to the national security.

Mr. JAVITS. Would anyone else who had been convicted of an offense related to the national security be restored his pension?

Mr. CLARK. He would not.

Mr. JAVITS. I notice that the Comptroller General of the United States favors the bill, but I also notice that in the letter of the Civil Service Commission, which is found in the report at page 6, the statement is made:

> The Commission urges that S. 91, amended to incorporate the new language, be enacted into law.

Mr. CLARK. The new language was put in S. 91. It was also put into the bill which we are now considering, which is the House bill, H.R. 4601, and all the suggestions made in the communication from which the Senator from New York has read have been incorporated.

Mr. JAVITS. So it is fair to say that both the Civil Service Commission and the Comptroller General favor the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is entirely correct. Also the Department of Justice.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I had agreed to yield to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], but the two Senators can settle between themselves as to who should be recognized first.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am willing to let the Senator from Georgia proceed.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Delaware very kindly agrees that I may propound a question to the Senator.

I know that there are a great many hardship cases in this area that should be corrected, but I am very apprehensive this bill may go a little further than is necessary to take care of real, bona fide hardship cases. As a theoretical case, if some person employed by the Post Office Department were to steal $10,000 from the Government and be convicted of that offense, would it be necessary for him to make restitution before he could draw his retirement benefits?

Mr. CLARK. In the first place, such an employee is bonded. In the second place, the answer is "Yes."

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is sure that it would be necessary for deductions to be made from the retirement benefits equal to the amount for which the Government had not received restitution?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. I have in my hand a letter directed to me, under date of January 19, 1960, signed by Mr. Ruddock, of the Civil Service Commission, in response to an inquiry which I made.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter may appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
BUREAU OF RETIREMENT AND INSURANCE,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1960.

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senate

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: In response to your interest in H.R. 4601, a bill to amend Public Law 83-769, denying Federal annuities to persons convicted of certain offenses against the United States, we present the following explanation of the existing right to collect a debt due the United States from annuity payable under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

In a long line of consistent decisions, the Comptroller General holds that money due the United States may be recovered from funds otherwise due and payable to the debtor under the Retirement Act. The right of the Government to apply retirement money to satisfy Government indebtedness has been upheld by the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the 2d Circuit on February 4, 1941, in the case of *Edward E. Boerner* v. *United States* (117 Fed. 2d 387), by the U.S. District Court for the Southern Division of the Northern District of Alabama on June 24, 1943, in the case of *Bryan Watson* v. *United States*, and by the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York on May 18, 1944, in the case of *Emilio Marrero* v. *United States*.

The various agencies are kept aware of the availability of retirement benefits for offset. Procedure respecting the filing of Government claim against retirement moneys otherwise due and payable is outlined for the agencies in the Federal Personnel Manual. Pages R-5-75 and 76 of the Manual, covering this material, is enclosed for ready reference. Also enclosed is a copy of Standard Form 2805, the form specifically designed for requesting set-off against retirement money.

Sincerely yours,
ANDREW E. RUDDOCK,
Director.

Mr. CLARK. The letter states in part:

In a long line of consistent decisions, the Comptroller General holds that money due the United States may be recovered from funds otherwise due and payable to the debtor under the Retirement Act.

Not only would he have to make restitution, but also the Government could get the money from his retirement payments.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator will yield, I think the Senator will find the man would repay the Government with its own money, which he would get from retirement. He would not have to pay the money back himself.

Mr. CLARK. The net result is that the man would get less by way of retirement. I read the language to the Senator.

The right of the Government to apply retirement money to satisfy Government indebtedness has been upheld.

Then there is given a long series of cases, and it is stated:

The various agencies are kept aware of the availability of retirement benefits for offset. Procedure respecting the filing of Government claim against retirement moneys otherwise due and payable is outlined for the agencies in the Federal Personnel Manual.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am glad to get that statement. I was concerned about the matter.

I should like to ask the Senator a question about section 5. As I understand it, the language is somewhat technical.

Mr. CLARK. I cannot hear the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I refer to section 5, subsection (a). I have the Senate bill before me, but I assume the two bills are the same.

Mr. CLARK. I have the Senate bill before me, also.

Mr. RUSSELL. The reference is to a person who has been paid erroneously.

Mr. CLARK. It provides that he will have to refund the money to the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the money is paid erroneously?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. In other words, if it has not come to light that such a person has defrauded the Government, and the person receives the payment, he would be subject to a civil claim for the return of that money?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator has quoted Mr. Ruddock, chief of the Retirement Division. I also have some reports which were furnished by Mr. Ruddock which give some specific examples of some of the individuals who would benefit by passage of the bill.

First, I wish to say that it may be that the law goes too far in regard to certain hardship cases. If so we should correct it. That does not mean we should open the barn door wide.

I shall refer to one individual who would receive a benefit under the bill. I shall not refer to him by name but shall use the claim number. The Senator can check the accuracy by that. It is claim No. 390939.

This man was an internal revenue agent. He was under investigation in connection with charges of accepting bribes. He was charged with accepting bribes for fixing cases for taxpayers. He was subpenaed to appear before a Federal grand jury in the southern district of New York. He refused to answer questions in the case in regard to his Government service on the ground that it might involve matters of self-incrimination. In other words he "took the fifth amendment." Under the present law that man is not entitled to retirement benefits. If the bill is passed he will be.

Mr. CLARK. I am sorry, but I cannot hear my friend very well. Will the Senator speak more slowly? I am a little deaf.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will do the best I can, because I want the Senator to hear this.

Under this bill, if passed, this internal revenue agent, who was charged with accepting bribes and who "took the fifth amendment" rather than answer the charges when asked questions in connection with his having accepted bribes, was discharged from the Service and barred from retirement benefits. Under this bill he would be eligible to receive $292 a month for the rest of his life and would be eligible to receive a retroactive payment of $13,084. The retroactive payment was computed as of April 30 of last year, and this lump sum amount would be increased for the intervening months.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator repeat the amount involved?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The amount was $13,084 in retroactive payments and $292 per month, which could be paid to a revenue agent who "took the fifth amendment" rather than answer charges that he had been accepting bribes in connection with his official duties.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator makes a great hue and cry about the particular case. It sounds very good as the Senator points it out.

I wish to point out that this man to whom the Senator refers was never convicted of any offense against the national security. He served for 32 years and 3 months before the charges were brought against him. He exercised his constitutional right to "take the fifth amendment." I see no reason in the world why this man should not receive the money which he paid into the fund, and receive the benefits from it.

If the man had been convicted of a crime against the national security, I would agree with the Senator. Before the "witch-hunting" act of 1954 the man would have received the whole amount.

I disagree with my friend. I do not think that he has raised on the floor of the Senate a case about which we should get excited.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am sure the Senator disagrees. I suppose the Senator would likewise defend all of those labor leaders who "took the fifth amendment" before the McClellan committee.

Mr. CLARK. We are not talking about union labor leaders.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We are talking about this Internal Revenue agent and his right to "take the fifth amendment" and still get full retirement.

Mr. CLARK. I have the floor, and I have not yielded.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will wait until the Senator finishes.

Mr. CLARK. We are not talking about labor union leaders. We are not talking about Jimmy Hoffa. We are not talking about Walter Reuther. We are not talking about Sherman Adams. We are not talking about a lot of other men who would not get pensions under the bill.

We are talking about a man who would have received a pension before 1954, a man who served 32 years and 3 months for the Government. He would have received a pension after he "took the fifth amendment," which he had a constitutional right to do, except for the 1954 act.

If my friend does not like that procedure, I suggest that he should introduce a bill to repeal the fifth amendment. Then perhaps we can cover this matter and convict the man of a crime against the national security, so that he will not get a pension.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Has the Senator unwound?

Mr. CLARK. I will say also that the Civil Service Commission had full knowledge of this case before, speaking for the Eisenhower administration, it sent in its approval of the bill.

I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I seek the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. BARTLETT rose.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

RESALE OF CERTAIN SHIPS TO REPUBLIC OF CHINA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8042) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to resell four C1–SAY–1 type vessels to the Government of the Republic of China for use in Chinese trade in Far East and Near East waters exclusively. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today, p. 10205, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the conference agreed to the Senate amendment which would make the title consistent with the body of the bill.

The conference agreed to the Senate amendment authorizing an allowance to the purchaser of depreciation computed at the rate of 3½ percent per year from the date of default under the original contract to the time of repurchase under this legislation. Such depreciation, the conference agreed, would be computed on the statutory sales price before that statutory sales price is reduced by payments the purchaser has already made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am very grateful to the Senator from Pennsylvania for allowing me to interrupt.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

RESTORATION OF ANNUITY RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4601) to amend the act of September 1, 1954, in order to limit to cases involving the national security the prohibition on payment of annuities and retired pay to officers and employees of the United States, to clarify the application and operation of such act, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and suggest it would be proper to have a third reading of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to discuss a few more of these cases. The Senate should know that, while we may pass the bill in the name of helping only a few individual employees who may have been convicted of minor violations of law, with the exception of those individuals who have been charged with treason we will be putting back on the retirement rolls, at the expense of the American taxpayers, and giving retirement benefits to, all the crooks and scoundrels who have been convicted during the past 10 years.

We will be putting back on the retirement rolls every public official who in the last several years has been convicted of any wrongdoing, such as embezzlement, bribery, forgery, or any other crime, in connection with his official duties.

That is the purpose of the bill before us. It makes no exception whatever but for cases involving national security. For example, there is one official who had rather serious charges placed against him in connection with his official duties. He was working in Alaska. He was a high official in the Alaskan Railroad, a Government agency.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield in a moment. The Senator may sit down.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator give me the number? I can follow the presentation that way.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will tell the Senator about it. The Senator may sit and be patient. We have plenty of time.

This particular individual was charged with improper financial transactions in connection with his official duties. The man was indicted by a grand jury in Alaska. In order to escape prosecution, he did not "take the fifth amendment." What did he do? He "skipped the country." He went down into South America. Rather than come back to this country and stand trial for charges which were made against him, charges involving his official activities as an employee of the Government, he renounced his American citizenship. He was so determined not to come back and stand trial that he accepted citizenship in a South American country. This bill would restore the retirement benefits of a man who would renounce his American citizenship before he would stand trial to answer charges against him in connection with his official duty. I do not think we want to go that far. Certainly there is a higher code of ethics.

I recognize that when retirement benefits are taken from an individual, that in effect is an additional punishment. But do not forget that every one of these individuals who is convicted of a crime, whether it be bribery, embezzlement, or whatever it may be, gets back all of his contributions to the civil service retirement fund. Under existing law he gets back every dollar which has been taken from his pay envelope plus interest. He has all of his money back. All we said when we passed the 1954 law was that we would not put crooks on the retirement rolls of the taxpayers after they had violated their official trust.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am sure the Senator would not want to misinform the Senate on a matter of this importance, and I call his attention to section 3 of the bill, which reads:

> There shall not be paid to any person—
> (2) who wilfully remains outside the United States, its territorities and possessions, * * * for a period in excess of one year with knowledge of such indictment or charges, as the case may be * * * any annuity or retired pay—

And so forth. The man the Senator has been so excited about would not get his retirement because of the language I have just read.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. He can come back after the statute of limitations have expired, whereby he could not be prosecuted. I quote from a letter dated April 16, 1959, signed by Mr. Roger W. Jones, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. He quotes this gentleman's name, his service record, and so forth, and then he goes on—

> If he is so barred, this bar would be removed by enactment of S. 91 unless the conviction (or other circumstance) involved the national security.

He was not charged with violating the national security. Surely he would not receive his benefits if he stayed out of the country. But he could come back after the statute of limitations would run. So far as any prosecution or any chance to prosecute this man is concerned, it would be gone. The witnesses would be gone. Why was this man included under the provisions of the bill? The Civil Service Commission has said that if the bill were enacted and the charges did not involve the national security, he would be eligible for restoration of his retirement benefits.

Do not overlook the fact that this man even went so far as to renounce his American citizenship to avoid facing prosecution.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. How does the Senator explain the provisions of section 3 of the

bill which I just read, which quite clearly seems to exclude the individual to whom he refers?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Because he could come back. I directed a letter to the Civil Service Commission and referred to the individual by name. I have the letter here, if any Senator wishes to examine it. I can read the whole letter. This case is a matter of public record. I do not think this individual needs any particular protection. I will ask that the statement in connection with all the charges be put in the RECORD if the Senator wishes.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator be kind enough to give the Senate the number of the case?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not have the number of the case, but I have the man's name.

Mr. CLARK. All I can say as a lawyer is that I entirely disagree with the Senator in his interpretation of section 3 of the bill. I do not think the man whom he described is covered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is not the first time the Senator from Pennsylvania has disagreed with me or the Commission. I merely point out that the Commission said this individual could have his pension reinstated.

I shall read another case.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator give the name of the individual or the civil service case number in the case?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; I shall not give the name in this case. It is the case of a postmaster who was charged with falsification of records and embezzlement of postal funds. The man was suspended from office, and the date of his separation was January 6, 1955. The man was convicted, and given a 3-year suspended sentence. If this bill passes he will be eligible to receive retirement benefits of $120 a month. He would also receive a retroactive payment of $3,220.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator realizes that if he is unwilling to give either the name of the individual or the case number, we cannot follow his argument. We have voluminous records here which I think would answer each of these cases, and if the Senator will give us neither the name nor the case number, we cannot follow him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I respectfully suggest that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who is in charge of the bill, and other members of his committee who have checked these cases, should have given that information to the Senate. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator to permit him to tell of these cases himself and to describe the cases in his own language.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is aware that if he would give us the case number, we could ascertain all the facts.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Why does not the Senator from Pennsylvania, with the knowledge he has of these cases, insert them in the RECORD? Why do we have to pry the information loose?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Pennsylvania believes, though he may be wrong, that he has pretty effectively disposed of the two cases the Senator from Delaware has referred to so far, and if we had the benefit of knowing what the other cases were, we probably would have rebuttal of those, which would dispose of the matter. If the Senator is to read a mass of anonymous information and give us no opportunity to check our records, we shall have to remain silent. I am prepared to let the Senator from Delaware proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator thinks he has disposed of the cases mentioned, I shall go back to the first one he thinks he has disposed of and discuss it again. That was the case of the Internal Revenue agent. This Internal Revenue agent was charged by the Government with accepting bribes in his official duties, and he took refuge behind the fifth amendment. When he was asked to appear before a grand jury and answer questions in connection with having accepted bribes and refused to answer on the grounds of self-incrimination, certainly we have a right to accept the principle that there is some degree of guilt. If we do not, then Congress had better stop passing resolutions condemning or censuring various officials of the Teamsters Union who have plead the fifth amendment. After all, I thought we were laying down the principle that a man in holding a public office and spending public money had a duty to answer such charges. I say that any man—I do not care whether he be a Member of Congress or anyone else—charged with accepting a bribe in connection with his official duties has a responsibility to answer such charges.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] can talk about constitutional rights, but I wonder if he would not be well advised to give some attention to the rights of the American taxpayers who, if this bill passes, must pay to this revenue agent, who took refuge under a plea of the fifth amendment, $13,084 in back retirement, and put him on the retirement payroll for the rest of his life at $292 a month.

I will give the case of another gentleman here who the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] wants to restore to full retirement. This man was in the Quartermaster Corps, the procurement agency of the Department of the Army. This man was charged with the solicitation and acceptance of a bribe in violation of title 18, United States Code, section 202. He was removed from office. He was convicted and sentenced to 3 years in prison. Yet if we put this man back on the retirement rolls he would be eligible for retirement at $95 a month, and he would get a total of $1,457 in retroactive payment. These figures were computed as of April 30, 1959, and he would have another year's payment added to this figure for retroactive benefits. Remember, this man was convicted of solicitation and acceptance of a bribe in connection with his official duties.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Do I correctly understand from the distinguished Senator from Delaware that these are cases certified to the Senator from Delaware by the Civil Service Commission as individuals who would be entitled to these annuities under the bill in the form in which it is before the Senate today?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct, and the figures I have quoted were furnished by the Civil Service Commission under date of April 30, 1959. As the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] said, this bill has been on the calendar for a little more than a year, and I have not brought the figures up to date. Here are some of the retroactive amounts that will be paid under this bill. Here is one who would get $5,566; another would get $4,840; another $13,084; another $3,220; another $4,992; another $4,435; and another $10,274. Those are retroactive payments in addition to putting the individuals on a lifetime pension from here on out. That applies to every official who has been convicted of any charge or any irregularity in office, except crimes dealing with national security. I see nothing in the bill which provides that a man charged with embezzling $100,000 from the Government and who is serving time in the penitentiary cannot go back on the retirement rolls. There is nothing in the bill which provides that he must pay that $100,000 back except as it is deducted from his retirement checks. The Comptroller General only says he would rule that these payments could not be made until the individual concerned had paid back the amount which he had stolen from the Government.

The point I make is that a man who in his official capacity embezzles money of the Government or accepts a bribe does more than rob the Government of money. He takes from the Government certain prestige that cannot be restored. He destroys the confidence of the American people in their Government. That is the most serious result in a case like this.

I do not believe that our taxpayers will endorse the passing of this bill.

The Senator from Pennsylvania speaks about inequities. I call attention to the fact that if a GI in the military service goes a.w.o.l., or steals a few cigarettes, or is convicted of a minor charge, and gets a dishonorable discharge—and, incidentally, the pending bill does not touch this kind of situation—we take away from him all the retirement benefits he may have accumulated, and he loses all the benefits under the GI bill of rights. Furthermore, nothing is ever given back to him. That is what happens to the man in uniform even though he may have only been homesick and gone home. The pending bill does not correct that situation so far as any GI or any other person in the military service who has accumulated some retirement benefits is concerned.

A man in the military service may build up full retirement benefits, but if he gets in trouble, is court-marshalled, and receives a dishonorable discharge, he loses all those benefits. The pending bill would not restore those benefits to him.

Yet the bill before us proposes to restore these benefits to the civil service employees who are convicted of embezzlement, bribery, et cetera. This bill

would, in effect, say, "You can go to jail. You can take bribes. You can embezzle funds. However, after you have served your time in the penitentiary we will put you back on the retirement rolls for the rest of your life."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. As I understand, under existing law, a person who is barred, because of his misdeeds, from further employment in the Federal Government, gets back all the money he has paid into the retirement fund.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, yes. That is what the law provides now and properly so.

Mr. KEATING. In the case of Alger Hiss, that was true also; he got back the money he had paid into the retirement fund?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, even in the case of Alger Hiss. That is also true in the case of any other individual. He gets back all the money he has paid into the retirement fund, and he gets it back with interest. They are entitled to that. Congress included that provision in the bill because we said otherwise it would be confiscating their own money.

The existing law gives back to the individual all the money he has paid in. The only thing which the 1954 law took away was his claim against the U.S. Government for that part which the Government would contribute.

No one questions their right to a refund of their own contributions.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the Senator's analysis, and believe that that is the correct action to take in all these cases in respect to money which has been paid in by the persons involved.

When the Senator refers to the lump-sum payments, he means the amounts which, since they have left the service, they would have received from the Government up to that date, if their service had been honorable.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is right. That is up to the date when the list I have before me was computed—namely, April 30, 1959. To all these figures it would be necessary to add another full year's computation at the rates to which they would be entitled.

The point I make is, why should we restore these convicted embezzlers and bribe takers to the retirement rolls?

I cite another case: On May 1, 1957, there was subpenaed before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations a Government employee who was a clothing inspector in the Department of the Army. This gentleman refused to answer questions with respect to his service as a Government employee on the ground of self-incrimination. He took the fifth amendment.

If we pass this bill we shall glorify the action of this employee and give him a pension of $234 a month for the rest of his life. In addition, we would send him a check for $5,616 covering retroactive payments. This would be money taken out of the Federal Treasury.

Who says crime does not pay?

I cannot conceive that the Senator from Pennsylvania intended the provisions of the bill to go quite that far. I just cannot conceive that he would. Congress, by an overwhelming vote, stopped these payments in 1954.

I say again that there may be borderline cases, and I will cooperate in handling those cases, if there are some. However, the cases I have discussed are not borderline cases. They are cases involving officials and employees of the Government who failed to recognize that a public office is a public trust. Serious charges were brought against them, and they took the fifth amendment for fear that answering those charges would incriminate them. Then we have the case of a man charged with the embezzlement of funds from the mails. He was convicted. If the bill passes, we would give back to this man $2,121 in retroactive payments plus $94 per month. I do not know how much he embezzled, but embezzlement of funds from the mails is a serious crime.

Do we want to give this man a pension for the rest of his life? Remember he has already collected all his retirement fund contributions. There is no question about his being entitled to them. I support the principle that all the moneys he has paid into the retirement fund belong to him, but the part to which he is not entitled is the part the Federal Government has contributed to the fund. That is money paid by the taxpayers. We have no right to say to the taxpayers that they must continue to pay a person who betrayed their confidence as a public servant.

This bill being sponsored by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] singles out every fifth-amendment public official and restores them en bloc on the retirement rolls.

I have before me the case of another Internal Revenue agent. This one appeared likewise before the grand jury of the southern district of New York and refused to testify with respect to acts performed by him in his official capacity on the ground of self-incrimination. He was not convicted because he took the fifth amendment.

Does it make any sense to tell the American taxpayers that we are going to give a pension to a public official who comes before a congressional committee or a grand jury and refuses to testify by taking the fifth amendment?

We have criticized rather severely various officials of certain unions who appeared before congressional committees for taking the fifth amendment. The American people and Members of Congress and the press have been rather critical of men who, when they were brought before the McClellan subcommittee and asked questions in connection with the manner of their managing the funds of the union members practically thumbed their noses at the committee and took the fifth amendment.

We were all critical of and disgusted with those people. We said they had a responsibility to answer to the members of the union and to the public on how they had discharged their trust.

Do we, as public officials, have any less responsibility? I do not believe we do. Therefore, I think the bill before us today should be defeated. I think we have the votes to defeat the bill. And I will suggest that the bill be recommitted to the committee.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of all Members of the Senate. The Senator from Delaware desires to offer a motion to recommit. Has he offered it?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, but I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator from Delaware make his motion now?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I move that the bill be recommitted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on that motion, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, would the Senator from Delaware be willing to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement that we speak for 15 minutes on each side?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Oh, that is too long; the Senator from Delaware never speaks for more than 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall not take too much time, but I will not enter into an unanimous-consent agreement because I wish to place in the RECORD a statement of what is being sought to be done by the bill.

I think this is a very important bill from the standpoint of policy. I cannot conceive of the Senate wanting to pass a bill which provides retroactive retirement benefits to every convicted crook and scoundrel discovered in the U.S. Government, whether in a Republican administration or a Democratic administration. I cannot understand that.

Congress overwhelmingly passed a law about 6 or 7 years ago providing that a person who was convicted—not charged, but convicted—of accepting bribes in connection with his official duties of Government or of embezzlement of Government funds, would lose his retirement benefits. That law gave such a person the right to reclaim all the money which he had paid into the retirement fund plus all the accumulated interest, but it repealed his retirement rights. But why repeal that law and now give him retroactive benefits dating from 1954 or 1955? I have already called to the attention of the Senate some of the benefits such persons would receive and have a long list of other cases. I said that we had been rather critical of many labor leaders who took the fifth amendment before the McClellan committee, when they were asked proper questions concerning how they had managed union funds. We criticize such persons, and properly so.

Now it is proposed to give full retirement benefits to public officials who took the fifth amendment, and some Senators see nothing wrong in doing so.

In one fifth amendment case which I mentioned earlier an internal revenue agent was under investigation concerning his having accepted a bribe from a taxpayer for fixing a tax case. He was subpenaed before a Federal grand jury in the southern district of New York and refused to answer questions with respect to his Government service on the ground of self-incrimination.

If this bill were passed, that man would get $292 a month for the rest of his life and retroactively would receive $13,084 in retirement benefits. That retroactive figure is computed only as of last April, and if the payments subsequent to April 30, 1959, were added to those figures it would result in a retroactive payment of $16,000 or $18,000.

Mr. President, who says that crime does not pay?

We had another Government official appear before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations; and there he "took the fifth amendment" when he was asked questions about charges involving his official duties.

The bill would put that man back on the retirement rolls of the American taxpayers, at $234 a month; and, in addition, he would be given a check for $5,616 covering retroactive retirement benefits.

Another revenue agent in New York "took the fifth amendment," and this bill would put him back on the Federal retirement rolls.

Under this bill another convicted revenue agent would receive approximately $17,000 in retroactive payments. In just a moment I shall refer further to that case.

One man who was working for the United States Government executed, on standard form 84, an affidavit, at the request of his employer; and in the affidavit he concealed his past or his present membership in the Communist Party. Later he admitted he was a member of the Communist Party. He was removed from office. This bill would give him $7,715 in retroactive retirement benefits, and he would draw a monthly check of $153 for the rest of his life.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. If what the Senator from Delaware has said is true, I am amazed that the bill is now being considered at all by the Senate. But this afternoon I have been told that the Administration is supporting the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is what I have been told by the committee, but that does not make the bill right so far as I am concerned.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me say that I have no knowledge of these matters.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to ask a question of the Senator in charge of the bill, who is supporting it.

Mr. CLARK. The introduction of the bill was requested by the Civil Service Commission, in a letter to Vice President NIXON, who referred it to the Democratic-controlled Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which thought the Civil Service Commission, the Attorney General, the Vice President, and the House of Representatives, all of whom have approved this bill—and the House has passed the bill—were correct.

The bill was reported by the unanimous vote of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The first two cases my friend, the Senator from Delaware, raised, I was able to dispose of correctly, because I was able to obtain the names and numbers of the persons involved.

As for the other cases the Senator from Delaware has talked about, he has refused to give me the names and the numbers.

In the hour and one-half I have listened to him, I have heard nothing to make me believe that the Vice President, the Civil Service Commission, and the Attorney General were not correct.

Frankly, I have no personal interest in the bill, and neither do the other Democratic Members of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

This is an Eisenhower administration bill, which I reported.

Mr. PASTORE. Then I think the Senator should proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this may have been an Eisenhower administration bill or it may not, but it is still a bad bill. It was originally offered for the purpose of correcting certain inequitable treatment of a few Federal employees. But the bill as it is now before us would cover the waterfront, it would put back on the Federal retirement rolls every convicted Federal employee of the last several years, unless he had been convicted of treason.

For instance, one Treasury agent willfully made fraudulent statements in connection with a report he filed with the Department. He was convicted and sentenced to imprisonment for a year, and was fined $1,000. He received a suspended sentence. There is no question about his guilt. He was convicted of knowingly and willfully making false and fraudulent statements, but under this bill he would be eligible to $316 a month for the rest of his life and a retroactive payment of $17,822 from the Federal Treasury.

I do not think the American taxpayers want to give $17,822 to a convicted Treasury agent who knowingly and willfully filed false statements, and I do not think we want that done under the guise of correcting some little, minor inequity.

Certainly there are some marginal cases. I know of some of them, and I would go along with a measure to correct their inequities; but that is not the main objective of this bill. In supporting the bill the Senator from Pennsylvania called attention to one such case; it involved a minor charge against a man who had served a brief period in the custody of a marshal. In that case I do not think his widow should be penalized. We can correct such inequities, but in doing so let us not open the door so wide as to permit the putting back on the Federal payroll every former Federal official who defrauded the U.S. Government by embezzlement of public funds or of having accepted bribes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. In view of what the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has said—namely, that the bill has the backing of the President of the United States, the Vice President, and the Civil Service Commission—does not the Senator feel that instead of moving that the bill be recommitted, it would be in order to move that the bill be sent back to the White House?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is what the Senator from Pennsylvania wants to do—send it to the White House for the President's signature.

Mr. PASTORE. Well, I will support that motion——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But I do not think the bill as now reported to the Senate can be defended on such a basis. I do not care who may have been for the bill. I think it will ultimately be found that the administration only recommended the correction of certain minor inequities. However, as often happens, the bill was reported out in an entirely different form.

Frankly, I doubt that the administration will go along with the bill as it has been reported to the Senate. At least, if we return the bill to the committee, the committee can find out for sure what their position is.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The report on the bill indicates that the Bureau of the Budget, an arm of the executive, had no objection to sending up the bill. But that is not an endorsement by either that agency or by the President.

The Civil Service Commission did give the bill a recommendation.

Mr. CLARK. And so did the Vice President.

Mr. PASTORE. But there has been made here on the floor, this afternoon, an accusation that the bill would result in the making of payments of Federal funds to a galaxy of crooks and thieves. If that is true, I do not care how nicely or subtly we develop this very touchy and delicate issue.

Now it has been said this afternoon that the administration is behind the bill. But the Senator from Delaware has said the bill will be a handout to a list of thieves. If that is so, I want to know why the Civil Service Commission, an arm of the administration, is supporting the bill. Are they making it possible for us to provide a handout to a collection of crooks?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I do not care who has the floor; I have said what I had to say.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished minority leader whether he has read the report of the Civil Service Commission, in which, in the next to the last paragraph, the former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Harris Ellsworth—formerly a colleague of ours, I believe, in the House of Representatives—said:

The Commission recommends that the attached draft of legislation be reported to the Congress and enacted into law.

Is the Senator from Illinois familiar with that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, Mr. Ellsworth was chairman of the Civil Service Commission; and that language speaks for itself.

But speaking for myself, it was not longer than an hour ago that the bill was called up. I called it up, in the absence of the majority leader. But I had not seen the bill.

Eighteen thousand bills and resolutions have been introduced thus far in the 86th Congress. I do not pretend to keep abreast of all of them; that would be a physical impossibility. So I simply say that I did not read the report, and I am not familiar with it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from Illinois will read the report, I think he will find that the Commission recommends the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But I do not believe a recommendation by the Commission that the bill be enacted into law makes it existing law. I wish to examine the bill, myself.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I should like to say that I am not discussing at all who has recommended the bill or who has been opposed to the bill. I merely say that I think the bill is wrong. Frankly, I do not care who or which administration has endorsed it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware will yield, I wish to make a brief statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And then I shall yield the floor.

Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the able chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, has asked that I make the following statement for him:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The administration requested enactment of this measure to right a wrong done a number of years ago. Its enactment is supported by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, the Department of Justice, and the Comptroller General.

The House acted on the measure last year. Hearings were held in the Senate committee last year. There was no objection to the measure from any source.

I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for his devotion to duty in bringing the measure to a vote today. It is in his capacity as chairman of the Civil Service Subcommittee that he is acting. I am glad to support him at this time.

The distinguished chairman of the Civil Service Committee had to leave, and asked me to read that statement into the RECORD, and I have complied with the request.

Mr. PASTORE. I hope the majority leader will remain for one moment, so that I may make an observation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will, for a moment.

Mr. PASTORE. If I may ask a question of the majority leader through the Senator who has the floor, Is it not a fact that if the allegations or accusations which have been made this afternoon by the Senator from Delaware are true, this is a reflection on the integrity of the committee, because what the distinguished Senator from Delaware says the bill does is to shelter and give a handout to a list of persons who have been convicted of stealing money from the Government? If what the Senator from Delaware has said is true, is it not a reflection on the committee and the Commission?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And the Comptroller General.

Mr. PASTORE. And the President of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I emphasize one point; namely, I am not trying to cast any reflections on the integrity of the committee or on any member of the committee or on any one who favors this bill. I am merely saying what the bill does and stating why I think it should be sent back to the committee. If anyone made a recommendation that the bill be passed, it may have been done as so many recommendations are made on bills, without knowing exactly how far it went. The fact is that I have been furnished by the Civil Service Commission the reports I have used here today. I have all that information here and can incorporate it in the RECORD if necessary. I will now yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before using that information?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. I regret that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is not here——

Mr. PASTORE. I am here.

Mr. KEATING. Very well. I want to correct what the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island has implied from the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. PASTORE. Now wait a minute. There is no correction of any implication. I said if the accusations which are being made here this afternoon are true—that is what I said; if what the Senator from Delaware has said is true—this bill does cast a reflection on the integrity of this committee and a reflection on the integrity of every Senator who is supporting this particular bill—that is if what the Senator from Delaware has said is true.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I am sure, knowing the fairness of the Senator from Rhode Island, when the facts are brought to his attention he will not reach the conclusion which he has reached.

The Senator from Delaware, in his presentation here this afternoon, started his statement of listing these cases with the admission that there are probably inequities which have to be corrected and that legislation should be enacted to that end. He has pointed out a relatively few—I do not know how many there are in all—specific instances which, it is entirely possible, escaped the attention of the Commission when it referred the matter to us. In my judgment, if those instances are accurately stated—and I shall be happy to hear an explanation to the contrary—it makes it desirable for us to recommit the bill in order that it can be narrowed in its effect so as not to include those cases. It is no reflection on anyone either on the Civil Service Commission, or certainly on the committee, or any Senator supporting the bill now before us.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield in a moment. First I wish to make a comment, and then I will yield to the Senator from Rhode Island. I emphasize what the Senator from New York has said. I am not finding fault with this bill because it has had or has not had the endorsement of the administration or of the committee. The Senator from Pennsylvania in presenting the bill called attention to a case which he said was a hardship. I agree with him that it needed correction. I am sure there are other cases which need correction. But what I am also saying is that in correcting those cases we should not go too far. This bill goes too far.

And I want to emphasize that it is not a question of whether I am correct or not. I appreciate the right of the Senator to raise the question, but I advise him that I have here on my desk for his examination, reports and cases that have been furnished by the Commission. They are the complete records of the cases I have discussed on the bill. I cannot help but think this bill goes further than was intended by the committee. That is the reason why I asked the Senator from Pennsylvania if he would agree to sending the bill back to committee for further examination.

I call attention to one other case; and there are many. This particular gentleman was charged with forgery of U.S. Treasury checks in violation of title 18, section 495, of the United States Code. He was charged with forgery and convicted in court; he was sentenced to 1 year in the custody of the Attorney General. There seems to be no question of his guilt.

If this bill is passed he will be eligible for $169 a month in retirement benefits from here on out, and he will retroactively receive a payment of $5,833. Surely that was not intended by the Senate committee.

Here is the case of another man who was charged with embezzlement of funds. He hid behind the fifth amendment. This is the case of a Treasury agent.

There are serious charges against several other top officials of Government, all of whom would be restored to eligibil-

ity for retirement benefits under this bill. Why?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. Did not the Senator from Delaware cite an instance in which a Communist is going to be restored to his retirement benefits?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; I said that.

Mr. PASTORE. Now the Senator from Delaware seems to be softening up what he originally said.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There are those who think I am not.

Mr. PASTORE. When I came into the Chamber the Senator was stating that a Communist would be given a pension. The Senator from Delaware made a great point of that case. I said if the committee has approved that, it is either a deplorable mistake or a reflection on the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. You can make your own interpretation. I am not casting any reflection on anyone, but I am citing these particular cases wherein under this bill the convicted former public officials would be restored to full retirement benefits.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator give me the number?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I must leave the Chamber for another assignment. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have made a check of this. Hearings were held on the bill 14 months ago, consisting of 27 pages. There are general statements. To be sure, there had been Government witnesses before the committee. However, it seems to me they could have very well listed all the cases and the amounts involved in the hearings themselves. I am advised that information appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If it does, it has escaped my attention. However, the witnesses did not appear, in the very brief hearings on the bill, and give that information.

I think the wise procedure would be to send the bill back to the committee, and take another look at it. If it is a good bill, I am prepared to support it; but if there is merit in the point that the distinguished Senator from Delaware has made, I think it ought to be taken into account.

The other point I make is this: Is there any great urgency about this? Do we have to do it this afternoon? Should there not be an opportunity for a second look?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. This bill has been on the calendar now for 13 months, largely because of the objections of the Senator from Delaware. The committee has had a pretty careful look at it. I think the bill ought to be passed today. If the Senator from Delaware will permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum, I have a suggestion which might be acceptable to him, and which might resolve the issue. Would the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; I will yield in just a moment——

Mr. CLARK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Just a moment, before I yield for that purpose. In further reference to what the Senator from Rhode Island was saying, I wish to emphasize that I am not pulling these cases out of thin air. The complete documentation of each case is here for any Senator's examination. I have and will continue to withhold names.

Here again is the case of the man to whom I earlier referred as executing an affidavit on Standard Form 84 in which he concealed his past or present membership in the Communist Party. Such membership was later admitted. That is the description given me by the Civil Service Commission in this case.

If this bill is passed, based upon the report which I was given by the Civil Service Commission, he would be eligible for his pension.

One might ask, "Why did I not appear before the committee and testify?" I did not have the information before the bill was reported out of committee. This man who failed to state that he was a Communist but later admitted it, will get $7,715 retroactively and $153 a month from here on.

Mr. CLARK. I plead with my friend to give me the number. The Senator refers to these anonymous cases, and we cannot check them. I have at my desk a listing of every one of these cases, broken down in detail. This is the fifth time I have asked my friend to give me the number.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will give the Senator the number. When the Senator presented these cases, he pulled one or two cases out. He should have given us all these cases.

The number of this case is 386154. In addition, the Senator should tell us about the other cases in the records.

I will now yield to the Senator so that he may tell us about them if he wishes to, or if the Senator wishes to have me yield so that he may suggest the absence of a quorum while looking them up I will do so.

While the Senator is looking up that case, I will give him another one to look up.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, for an observation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I merely want to say to the distinguished Senator from Delaware, I find no fault with the recitation he is making this afternoon. I merely say that if the bill would permit what the Senator alleges it would permit, then I daresay the bill ought to go back to the committee and be reconsidered. That is my position precisely.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. On that point we are in agreement.

Mr. PASTORE. Somebody is wrong. Both cannot be right.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I have found the case.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I will ask my good friend from Rhode Island if he thinks the man involved in this case should not get a pension. If he does, perhaps we should not pass the bill.

These are the facts. This is case No. 386154. This man was an employee of the Post Office Department as a clerk. He had served for 25 years and 9 months. He executed in 1947 an affidavit on standard form 84 in which he concealed past or present membership in the Communist Party. Later on he admitted that he had once been a Communist. He was removed. The present value of his annuity is $17,000. The approximate refund due is $3,935.77.

I do not know what my friend from Rhode Island thinks. I think that fellow ought to get his pension back.

Mr. PASTORE. Well, I do not think so. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to say another thing before I sit down.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. This set of facts I have read is a very different set of facts from what my friend from Delaware attempted to persuade the Senate it was.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Well, now, Mr. President, I resent what my friend the Senator from Pennsylvania has said. If the Senator will go back to check the RECORD he will find what I said was that the man filed form 84 and denied membership in the Communist Party and then later admitted it. That is all I said. I repeat it. The Senator from Pennsylvania has admitted that. If the Senator wants to put this man back on the retirement rolls, as a Communist, OK.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, before the Senator goes further will he yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I am certain that the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island feels the same way I do about this matter. It seems to me in such a case as this, when the Government has refunded to the man every penny he put in the funds, that the Government has done, certainly, all that should be done with respect to some man who has acted as this man has acted.

Mr. PASTORE. That is precisely what was done in this case, and precisely what is permitted under existing law.

Mr. KEATING. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. That is about as far as we should go. That is all I am saying.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Rhode Island and I are in agreement. I helped to write into the law the provision that the man should get his money back.

We have another case in respect to a man who was charged with forgery of U.S. Treasury checks. He will get retroactive retirement benefits under this bill of $5,833. This man is a convicted

forger, a man convicted of forging Treasury checks. Surely, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] does not want to put such a man back on the Federal payroll. Surely it was never intended by the committee that we should do that.

Then we had the case of the clothing inspector who was in the Quartermaster Corps. That man was charged with solicitation and acceptance of bribes in violation of title 18 of the United States Code.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Will the Senator give me the number?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Number 501668.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. He was charged with solicitation and acceptance of bribes in violation of title 18, United States Code, section 202. This man was convicted in the courts. I am not saying this man was guilty, but the court said he was guilty. He was sentenced to serve 3 years in the Federal penitentiary.

What would we do under the provisions of the bill if it is passed? We would give this man $95 per month for the rest of his life, and $1,457 as a retroactive retirement benefit. The reason the amount is smaller in this case is that the man did not have quite as long a Government service.

I always thought that we were holding up a different code of conduct. This is the case of a Government official who was guilty of soliciting and accepting bribes. He was convicted by a court. He was dismissed. The Government gave him back all of the money he had ever paid into the retirement fund plus all of the interest to which he was entitled. He has had all of that back.

Surely we are not going to put that man back on the retirement rolls and say that nothing was wrong.

As I pointed out before, if a GI is a.w.o.l. for too long a period of time he may receive a dishonorable discharge and may lose all of his benefits under the GI bill of rights and all of his retirement benefits. This bill would not restore those. Yet we are asked to provide that the public officials, whether under a Democratic administration or a Republican administration, be given restoration of all their retirement benefits.

I am not one of those who thinks a man goes wrong based upon his political affiliations. I have seen these things happen time and time again. We have seen discredited public officials in both political parties.

If men have violated their positions of trust as public officials by embezzlement or by accepting bribes they are not entitled to any retirement benefits when they leave the Government service. They do get the money they have paid into the retirement fund, but the American taxpayers should not be required to pay them retirement benefits as well.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Do I correctly understand that the bill has the approval of the Civil Service Commission, of the Comptroller General, and of the President of the United States?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Pennsylvania has so stated. I have no reason to question that, because I have not asked. I do not support the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Have these cases which the Senator from Delaware has brought to the attention of the Senate this afternoon had consideration? Has the approval of these cases in this measure been given by the administration, in the persons of the Comptroller General, the Civil Service Commission, and the President of the United States?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not understand the Senator's question. Does the Senator ask whether I got the information from one of those agencies?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. Would those cases be included under the bill; and, if so, are they included under the bill with the approval of the administration?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not know whether they are in the bill with the approval of the administration or not, but they are in the bill. I do not question the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania that the administration requested legislation in this connection. I do not know. As I said before, I think there may be some cases where relief is needed but certainly not in the cases I have mentioned nor in the cases of the several others I have here.

Whether the administration or the committee knew of these specific cases being under the bill or not at the time the legislation was first recommended I do not know.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield in just a moment.

I cannot think the administration did. I cannot think the members of the committee knew about them. I cannot conceive that they would have recommended the bill if they did.

This was called to my attention after the bill had been reported and I began to check into the matter. I ran down all of these cases. It took me two or three months to get all the information. That is why I asked that the bill be held up last year. This information is all confirmed by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The cases I am giving and the dollar figures, the amounts of money, the charges, and so on, were all furnished by the department.

I was further told by the Civil Service Commission that if the bill is passed it will restore the retirement benefits for every public official who has been convicted of any crime in the last 10 years unless their crimes involved treason or the security of the country. Not many of them did.

I did not ask the Civil Service Commission whether they were for the bill or against the bill. I was simply getting the facts as to what the bill would do and made up my own mind.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I understand the situation, the Civil Service Commission has approved this particular measure. If I correctly understand the Senator's remarks, he is in favor of the general provision, because he recognizes there are inequities. However, the Senator is opposed to inclusion of certain specific cases, to which he has invited the attention of the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I said I thought there were cases in regard to which the law possibly goes too far, yes. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania cited one of those cases.

In checking the hearings, I found that some of the cases which were brought to the attention of the committee were cases on which I would favor having corrections. I do not think we want to put ourselves in the position of taking the last drop of blood from a man. But on the other hand, I do not want to vote a Government pension for every convicted crook, forger, embezzler, or bribe taker.

The bill before us would open the door wide. Surely, in an endeavor to correct a few cases we do not want to go all the way across the lot and restore to the retirement rolls, with retroactive retirement benefits, all of these various officials who have been guilty of such conduct as has been cited.

After all, Congress passed the law which restricted the payments. I think we were right in that action, and I do not want to see it reversed here today.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I do not know anything about the background of the bill. I think we have a responsibility, however. If the bill has been recommended to us as a result of a mistake by this administration, then whatever the reason is it seems to me that if the facts which the distinguished Senator from Delaware has presented to us are accurate—and they have not been challenged as yet—this is not the kind of legislation we should support. This bill needs further study in the committee and should be recommitted, in my judgment, unless this can be explained in some way.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may answer a question raised by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say to the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Rhode Island that I hold in my hand, as it used to be popular to say, 189 cases which are affected by this bill. This is the record sent to the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and sent also to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with a detailed

record of each case, by the Civil Service Commission, on Civil Service Commission stationery, with the recommendation that the bill be drafted exactly as it was drafted and exactly as it passed the House, with the approval of the administration. Since my friend from Delaware raised this question about his precious little Communist, I have called the Civil Service Commission and they have pointed out to me something which I should have known but did not, that under the terms of the bill that precious little Communist would not get his pension back, because on page 9 of the Senate bill, which is identical with the House bill, the following provision is contained:

(b) There shall not be paid to any person who, prior to, on, or after September 1, 1954, knowingly and willfully, has made or makes any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation, or who, prior to, on, or after such date, knowingly and willfully, has concealed or conceals any material fact, with respect to his—

(1) past or present membership in, affiliation or association with, or support of the Communist Party, or any chapter, branch, or subdivision thereof, in or outside the United States, or any other organization, party, or group advocating (A) the overthrow, by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means, of the Government of the United States, (B) the establishment, by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means, of a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in the United States, or (C) the right to strike against the Government of the United States.

I am pretty sure if the Senator from Delaware had given me the courtesy of discussing these cases one by one instead of suddenly appearing with great surprise on the floor with a paper which he has largely treated as anonymous—because only about 20 minutes ago I persuaded him to give me the number of this case—we would be in a far better position on this bill than we are now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I remind the Senator from Pennsylvania that the particular case in connection with which he said the individual involved would not receive any benefits only further emphasizes the need to recommit the bill. I gave him the number of that case. He finally confirmed the facts. He had it among his 184 cases, and he confirmed on the floor of the Senate that that case involved a Communist and thought he should get these payments.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is entirely incorrect. The Senator has misquoted me, I am sure inadvertently. I did not say these were cases that were covered by the bill. I said if I had my way that poor little Communist would get his pension back, but under this bill he would not.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I realize that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] would like to see this "poor little Communist" get his pension back.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] in a moment. I ask him not to get excited. We have plenty of time. After all, I have a feeling a lot of taxpayers are not in a hurry to put this Communist, nor these fifth amendment crooks, nor these embezzling public officials, nor those who have accepted bribes, back on the public retirement rolls. I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania not to get in a hurry. We have time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand there are 184 cases altogether.

Mr. CLARK. One hundred and eighty-nine.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Have all those cases received the approval of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Technically, no, some of them could be rejected, as I understand—and the Senator from Pennsylvania can correct me if I am wrong. The cases of those who could be eligible for restoration were furnished; and I am sure they are the same list of names the Senator from Pennsylvania has.

Mr. MANSFIELD. One hundred and eighty-nine?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Each case would be decided on its merits, but these are the ones expected to apply, and it is assumed they would be eligible.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is incorrect. May I correct the record? Each case was screened by the Civil Service Commission before it sent the material to the committee. There is a total of 189, of whom 11 would not be covered because their cases involve national security. The others would be, but every one of the other cases was considered by the Civil Service Commission and approved for coverage under the bill before the bill came to us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Including the other cases mentioned by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] this afternoon?

Mr. CLARK. If I could identify them I would be happy to do so.

In passing, let me say that the Senator from Delaware, I am sure inadvertently, has made a great to-do on the floor today about cases which are clearly not covered by the bill, and in doing so I am afraid he has again, inadvertently and in perfect good faith, permitted thoughts to enter the minds of some Senators with respect to the bill which are not entirely correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Delaware does not accept the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania. What I am doing is quoting the figures which were given to me by the Civil Service Commission, and if the Civil Service Commission does not know what it is talking about, it is time it should be checked. I am somewhat surprised to hear the Senator from Pennsylvania say that this list has been in his possession all these months and that he is still for the bill.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is still misquoting me. I ask him to retract. I said no such thing.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Do I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania does not have a list and he did not have it at the time?

Mr. CLARK. I said this list was in the hands of the committee; and my friend from Delaware very well knows that that is what I said. The Senator knows that often a Senator serving on a committee does not undertake to screen information which is given to the staff.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the information is in the hands of the staff and he did not examine it that is his fault. I will accept that statement, and I will concede the fact that the Senator from Pennsylvania had not seen it before if that is what he says. I will even accept the fact that he has not read the bill if he so insists. Frankly, I am inclined to think he does not know what is in the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a correction?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I ask the Senator not to be in a hurry. We have plenty of time. I do not wish to get him excited. We are not going to give this money away too fast.

Mr. CLARK. I want the RECORD to show my appreciation to the Senator from Delaware for conceding for the first time this afternoon that something was incorrect. He made the statement that the Senator from Pennsylvania had not read the bill. I state to the Senate that I have read the bill, although I do not purport to be the great expert on it that the Senator from Delaware is.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield for a question.

Mr. DODD. I ask the Senator from Delaware if he will permit me to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania to show us why the "precious little Communist" is not included in the bill. It does not appear to me.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator from Connecticut have before him the House bill or the Senate bill?

Mr. DODD. I have the House bill.

Mr. CLARK. I will point out the provision to my friend.

Mr. DODD. The Senator from Pennsylvania has been kind enough to point out to me paragraph (b) on page 9 of the Senate bill, which provides:

There shall not be paid to any person who prior to, on, or after September 1, 1954——

Mr. CLARK. "Prior to, on, or after." That is pretty comprehensive.

Mr. DODD. I think it does include such a case.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his question. I think it is important the Senate should have this information.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Lest there should be some misunderstanding, this particular individual had executed an affidavit on standard form 94, in which he concealed present or past membership in the Communist Party. Such membership was later admitted. He was removed from office. The serial number of the case is 386,154. I wrote a letter to the Civil Service Commission and asked it in connection with the cases listed what amounts would be paid in

retroactive benefits if approved under this bill. I have a letter signed by Andrew E. Ruddock dated April 13, 1959.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he reads the letter?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should like to complete my reading before I yield. This letter reads:

> We have compiled the additional information you requested in connection with S. 91, a bill to amend Public Law 769. The information appears in the attached report.

Turning to the attached report to the same serial number which is involved in this case, the Senator will observe No. 382,083. The man will get $164 per month, and his accrued annuity amounts to $10,798.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What was the last number? I thought the Senator was referring to the Communist case before and was going back to that case.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The last three digits were 154.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There are two cases. There is 386,154. This man was charged with executing an affidavit on Standard Form 84, in which he concealed past or present membership in the Communist Party. His membership was later admitted. In case 386,154 the retroactive annuity is given as being $7,715, and he will receive $153 a month.

I am not saying there may not be a mistake, but I am reading these figures correctly. Here they are. The Senator from Montana or the Senator from Pennsylvania can check them. I think this bill should go back to the committee.

In addition to these men there are ex-officials of the Treasury Department—and we had some former officials connected with executive agencies—who were convicted of accepting bribes in connection with their official activities, every one of them, with the exception of those who were convicted in connection with internal security, would go back on the retirement rolls retroactively.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The reason why I asked for that case was that I understood the Senator from Pennsylvania to say that under the bill that man would not be eligible for any benefits in any manner, shape, or form.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Pennsylvania said that. However, if that is so, why did the Civil Service Commission put that man on the list? I asked them for all the information in connection with these people who would be affected by these bills.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has not questioned the fact that the bill would put these convicted former public officials back on the retirement rolls. We will leave out of consideration for the moment the Communists. One of them was an admitted Communist, and the other was charged with being one. However, let us forget them for the moment. Let us consider those who took the fifth amendment, and those who made fraudulent statements to the Government. They were Treasury agents charged with accepting bribes in connection with the discharge of their official duties. They were called before the grand jury and took the fifth amendment. Under present law, we give them back all the money they paid into the fund, plus interest, but they were denied retirement benefits. This bill would give one of them $13,084 in retroactive payments, and another one more than $17,000. Is that what the Senate wants to do?

Mr. President, surely we do not want to do this. I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania again if he will not take the bill back to committee in order that it can be properly checked and examined. The bill should go back to committee. I do not believe that the Senate wants to put these crooked former officials back on the retirement rolls.

I am willing to vote. I believe the yeas and nays have been ordered; however, I would prefer, if the Senator would agree, that the bill go back to committee. It is not proper legislation.

There is the case of another man who was charged with embezzlement and with conduct prejudicial to good discipline in the Navy. He was one of the chief accountants of the Federal Public Housing Authority. The bill would give him $8,111 in retroactive retirement benefits. These are serious charges. The purpose of our retirement system is to protect the bona fide Government employees in their old age. It provides pensions to which they are entitled and of which they can be proud. Therefore, we do not want to reduce this system to the point where every crook will be drawing payments from the Government.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Would the Senator tell us how many there are of these cases, in toto, which are similar to the ones he has presented?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have a large number of them here, but I have not counted them. I accept the count of the Senator from Pennsylvania. Those mentioned are the most glaring cases that were called to my attention. The Senator from Pennsylvania said he had 184 cases before the committee. No doubt, some of them are meritorious cases, but there are several cases that cannot be justified.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield

Mr. CLARK. I wish to make a suggestion in all good faith to my friend from Delaware. He has stated certain facts with respect to certain cases. I have tended to controvert them. I wonder if the Senator from Delaware would be agreeable to a motion to set aside consideration of the bill until some day next week, so that the Civil Service Commission and the other members of the administration who support the legislation may have an opportunity to communicate through the committee with the Senate, so that we can bring this subject up for further consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The bill should go back to committee. Let these agencies testify in the usual manner. Then the committee can consider it. The committee can then report the bill back when it gets ready, and it can be motioned up at any time. I will go along with that suggestion.

Mr. CLARK. No; my proposal is——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not believe that we can start to amend the retirement law on the floor of the Senate. That is what I am fearful of. I believe that after the Senator has checked with the administration, they may want to come to the committee with technical changes in the bill. Those changes may be good; however, we cannot properly amend a retirement bill on the floor of the Senate. I do not believe it is fair to the other Members of the Senate to do it that way. The matter should be considered by the committee. Administration officials should come before the committee and testify how far they intended to go and what they want to do. This matter can be worked out in committee, but the bill as it is should not be passed.

Mr. CLARK. I do not want to see the bill go back to committee, because I have a good deal greater confidence in the Civil Service Commission than the Senator from Delaware has. I believe that when they answer the questions of the Senator from Delaware, who is an honest and openminded man, he will withdraw his objection. I will say this, too. If the Civil Service Commission recommends as much as one amendment to the bill, I will join my friend from Delaware in moving that the bill be recommitted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If they do not recommend some amendments, I will join somebody in trying to defeat it. I will not support any bill that does this sort of thing. I will insist that the bill go back to committee. The committee should take all these matters into consideration.

I do not believe the Senator from Pennsylvania understood me. These are not idle charges concerning some phantom cases. These are not all fifth amendment charges. For instance, I have before me the case of the clothing inspector, who was charged with solicitation and acceptance of bribes, in violation of title 18, United States Code, section 202. He was convicted in court and sentenced to pay a fine of $500 and to be confined for 3 years in a Federal penitentiary.

I repeat the charge—solicitation and acceptance of bribes.

This bill would put him back on the retirement rolls and put him in good standing along with other Federal employees. That should not be done. Surely that is not the purpose of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. This man was convicted of a serious charge. If the bill is passed, this man will collect $1,457 in retroactive retirement benefits. Then we have the case of the clothing inspector who had certain charges made against him. He appeared before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations and refused to testify; he took the fifth amend-

ment. Do you want to restore this man's retirement benefits?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. JAVITS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. While the discussion of the bill was taking place earlier this afternoon, I uttered the hope that since the passage of the bill was not particularly urgent, perhaps it could be sent back to committee, that the Civil Service Commission representatives could be called back, and that a proper inquiry could be made into the specific cases which have been recited by the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

There is now pending, I believe, a motion to recommit the bill; and I believe the yeas and nays have been ordered on the question of agreeing to that motion.

I would respectfully suggest that consent be given to withdraw the order for the yeas and nays, if the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] will undertake to agree that the bill go back to the committee, and that the committee take a further look at the matter, so the Senate will be fully advised with respect to all the facts.

Frankly, I am unclear in regard to the situation.

I was deeply impressed by the recital of some of these cases by the distinguished Senator from Delaware; and, notwithstanding the fact that the then chairman of the Civil Service Commission—that was in March 1959—asked that the bill be enacted into law, of course it is entirely possible that the Commission was not familiar with all the facts involved or to what extent the language of the bill, as it presently comes before the Senate—and I notice that there have been modifications—would carry us, and whether in trying to make provision for cases in which inequities seem to exist, the bill would also embrace those who should not be included in remedial legislation of this kind.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder whether the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Delaware will join in a request that the order for the yeas and nays be withdrawn.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. All I want, Mr. President, is that the bill go back to the committee because I am confident that the bill should not be enacted in its present form.

If the Senator from Pennsylvania is agreeable to having the bill go back to the committee, I have no desire to call the other Senators back to the floor for a yea-and-nay vote. All I want is that the bill go back to the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In order to achieve our objective, would it be best to return the House bill to the committee and to indefinitely postpone the further consideration of the Senate bill, or to return both the Senate bill and the House bill to the committee? Of course, the Senate bill could go back to the committee, anyway, if we removed it from the calendar.

In short, what would be the best course for us to follow in order to get the entire subject back to the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would suggest that the Senator from Delaware might wish to have both bills returned to the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; I believe that would be the best course. Then the committee would be able to study the entire matter.

So, Mr. President, I now modify the motion so as to move that both Calendar No. 173, House bill 4601, and Calendar No. 133, Senate bill 91—the two companion bills—be recommitted to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware withhold the motion, and be willing to trust to the good judgment of the Senator from Pennsylvania to make a request which may meet with the wishes of all concerned in this situation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The agreement we had with the Senator from Pennsylvania was that I would make this motion; and he was agreeable to it. I think the motion is a very proper one.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think there will be no need for the motion. The Senator from Delaware can always make the motion a little later, if he thinks that necessary.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have no yen to stand on protocol; and I do not care who makes this motion.

I am presently prepared to support the motion, not because I do not think this administration bill is still a good one, not because I do not think there are adequate answers to each of the cases which my friend, the Senator from Delaware, has raised—answers which, in my judgment, have been made here on the floor.

But, Mr. President, as I have said before, this bill is not a measure sponsored by Members on my side of the aisle. It is a bill introduced at the request of the Vice President of the United States, who was asked to do so by the Republican Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. The bill has been passed unanimously by the House. In hearings conducted before the committees of both bodies, there were no objections to the bill.

In my judgment the Senator from Delaware has raised, more or less unilaterally, some questions which I think the Civil Service Commission, whose bill this is, has an obligation to answer before the Senate legislates.

Therefore, I shall not oppose the motion to recommit either or both of these bills to the committee; and, as the member of the committee in charge of the bill, I have just now instructed the members of the committee staff to communicate as soon as may be done with the Civil Service Commission, send the Commission a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for today, ask the Commission to comment on the charges made by the Senator from Delaware, and advise our committee whether the Commission stands on the bill as drafted, or desires to propose some amendments, or desires that the bill be withdrawn.

Again I say this is a bill which, largely as a matter of courtesy, the majority members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service—believing the bill to be just, as did the House of Representatives—were happy to report at the request of the administration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am glad the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has acceded to the request that the bill go back to the committee.

But I ought to make the following statement a part of the legislative record: When the name of the Vice President is brought into the matter, I think it should be made abundantly clear that, so far as proposed legislation is concerned, he is only a transmittal officer. There is not a morning when I come to my desk that there are not a dozen communications from various agencies of the Government: "Be advised that we have this day sent to the Vice President" such and such bill—from the Treasury Department, from the Veterans' Administration, from the Civil Service Commission, from the regulatory agencies, from the Bureau of the Budget, and from every other agency of the Government. If the Vice President undertook to inform himself regarding every measure sent up here, obviously if he read 24 hours a day from now until doomsday he could not even begin to read all the proposed legislation.

A moment ago, I pointed out that up to the 1st of May, 14,000 bills and resolutions had been introduced in the House of Representatives, and a little more than 4,000 in the Senate. What a monumental horde of proposed legislation.

And how grateful the people of the country can be that, up to this good hour, only 453, including both private bills and public bills, have been engrossed and approved by the President of the United States and enacted into law. The people of the Nation can be everlastingly grateful that all this horde of measures has not found its way to the solemn statute books.

So I wish to say that the Vice President is a transmittal officer; that fact should be very definitely understood.

When the bill comes up with a recommendation from the Civil Service Commission, I do not apologize for the Commission, nor do I defend it, if I think it is wrong.

It remains to be seen whether the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has made a good case in connection with this matter. But since speedy action on this measure is not urgent, we can take some time, and we shall take a look.

I hope the committee will summon the present Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and others to testify before it; and I hope they will set out, in whatever hearings the committee holds, the names of those who would be the beneficiaries under the provisions of the bill, the payments they would receive by way of monthly annuities and retirement payments, why they were separated from the rolls, the nature of the violations, if any, whether they involve turpitude, and all the other facts to which I think the Senate is richly entitled.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there is a great deal of merit in what the distinguished minority leader has just said. I think it should be pointed out, though, that the bill was sent up to Congress at the request of the administration, was drafted by the Attorney General, as I understand, and was proposed and supported by the Civil Service Commission. There has been a change in the leadership of the Commission. I am delighted the present Commissioner will be a witness and will testify.

I was also interested in what the minority leader said the the effect that about 14,000 bills and resolutions have been introduced in the House and Senate this year, and his further statement that, of those, something in the neighborhood of 400 had been passed, and that the American people should be grateful to the Congress for the discrimination shown.

I want the RECORD to show I am pleased that the minority leader has such good words and high hopes on the accomplishments of this Congress; and I am sure what he has said this afternoon will be repeated up and down the country. It is nice to see a Democratic-controlled Congress have the wholehearted support of the Republican leader in the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. To show my distinguished friend from Montana how far I have gone in this matter, on Saturday and Sunday, on 15 television and 60 radio stations out in my part of the country, where I do a weekly program, I took as my text, "Little and Big; Much and Little," and I undertook to show the side of the so-called unglamorous work of the Congress.

Too often, in evaluating what the Congress has done, there are considered only major policy proposals; but there are many other matters that are a part of the congressional process. All those matters must be processed. All must be heard. Witnesses must be heard. Then the evaluation must begin.

So I have said what I stated not only on the Senate floor, and privately, but I have gone even to TV and radio stations to express my pride in that institution of Government of which I have been a part for more than 26 years.

I have sought to point out to my own people that when one talks about a "do-nothing Congress" or a "do-little Congress," or any other kind of a Congress, there are many matters that do not reach the headlines, but which are yet a part of our responsibilities.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. First I make one other comment. I think it was said this bill came with the support of the Attorney General. Certainly it was sent to the Congress by the Civil Service Commission. I read the letter and report indicating they urged the enactment of this measure. But, of course, Government agencies and the persons who speak for them can be fallible. Even Senators are fallible. Even Senators make mistakes. Not all the omniscience in the world is centered in the Senate Chamber. I freely and openly and in public confess what is in my soul, and admit my mistakes, because it makes it so much easier to deal with them when one is charged with them.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. There has been a little misunderstanding about the Civil Service Commission membership. It was the present Chairman of the Civil Service Commission who recommended this bill to our committee. I read very briefly two sentences from his testimony at a hearing over which I presided. Mr. Roger W. Jones, Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, said:

> May I conclude by reiterating the Commission's view that the amended S. 91—
>
> The bill we were considering today—
>
> would produce a result which is equitable and proper from the standpoint of the Government, as well as being fair to the employee and his survivors. I therefore urge upon Congress the desirability of early approval action.

That testimony was given over a year ago. Failure to have early approval was due to objections by the Senator from Delaware, which is entirely within his rights.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know if that estimate by Mr. Jones is reiterated. I know Mr. Jones. He is, in my judgment, one of the most capable and diligent employees in government. He may be right. He may be wrong. But that would be no reason for the Senate going down the wrong road when it has an opportunity to take a second look. If there were any urgency about passing the bill, if the world was about to topple, or if one of Mr. Khrushchev's rockets was going to burst in the Senate Chamber, it would be a different matter. But there is time; and time and restraint are the saving grace of free government.

I am reminded of the historian who said, "It is not what goes on the statute books that counts, but what comes off that is finally the salvation of a free society."

Mr. President, I think I had better give up the floor before I start to philosophize.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry, but before I do so, again I am struck by something which the distinguished minority leader has said, relating to the historian who said that the idea was not to pass legislation, but to withdraw legislation, or words to that effect.

It seems to me, and I am sure my friend, the Senator from Illinois, will recall this, because he served in the House at that time, and it was before my time, a certain Congressman was sent here from New York City, and one of his promises was that he would repeal a bill a day. I do not think he was very successful. He did not last too long. But he was a very good Congressman. At least he seemed to follow the historic precedent laid down. But that is something easier to talk about than to do, I may say to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Surely.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I remember that incident. I know the distinguished gentleman who adopted what I think is a very, very fine slogan. He did not get too far, unfortunately.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But he made a pretty good effort.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, it must be admitted that he tried. He introduced about a bill a day, trying to repeal something. I think he should get an "E" for effort.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. We will give him an "E" for effort.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion the first two paragraphs from a letter dated April 16, 1959, signed by Roger W. Jones, in which is stated his explanation in regard to the bill. I will omit the balance of his letter because it refers to specific cases by name, and I see nothing to be accomplished by using the names.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: There is before me your letter of March 27 regarding application of S. 91, if enacted, to certain specific cases.
>
> This bill is intended to and will amend the existing bar in Public Law 768, 83d Congress, against annuity awards by limiting its application to crimes or actions involving the national security. It will not affect the Civil Service Retirement Act in any other way. For those persons whose annuity payments are barred because of conviction for embezzlement of Government funds or having accepted bribes or kickbacks while in public

office, enactment of S. 91 will restore their annuity rights.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is there before the Senate a motion to recommit the bill now under consideration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is to refer the bill to committee. The Senate is dealing with a House bill. It is not a motion to recommit.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, that is correct, but my motion is intended to send both bills to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware.

The motion was agreed to.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S PROPOSED VISIT TO RUSSIA

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the press reported today that Nikita S. Khrushchev has expressed doubt whether President Eisenhower will be welcome in the Soviet Union next month. The press also stated that Mr. Khrushchev sidestepped the specific question of whether he would want President Eisenhower to postpone the visit. It is reported that he said:

> I would not like to comment. We can exchange views on that in Paris.

I should like to say that while the American people would like to see President Eisenhower welcomed in Russia, and I believe that he would be welcomed, as he has been in every country that he has visited, the "welcome," in my view, is not the essential purpose of his visit.

In my view there are two essential purposes of such a visit. They deal directly with the tensions, and with the issues which divide the United States and Russia, and which transcend any "welcome" by Russia as important as that may be.

One of the essential purposes of the trip is to afford the opportunity for President Eisenhower to continue his conversations with Mr. Khrushchev in the hope that they may find solutions of the fearful issues which threaten world security and peace.

A second purpose of the visit is to enable President Eisenhower to speak directly to the Russian people, as well as with Russian leaders—to tell them of the desire of the Government of the United States and its people for peace, their desire to settle issues, and their determination to maintain freedom. We gave Mr. Khrushchev this opportunity when he was in the United States. It may well be that Mr. Khrushchev does not want to give President Eisenhower the same free speech and the same opportunity of speaking directly to the people, or to give them the true facts about the United States-Soviet issues and the American position toward these issues.

The reported statement of Mr. Khrushchev is hypocritical. The American people felt no great warmth toward Mr. Khrushchev, either before he came, during his visit, or after the visit ended. Yet because there are grave issues, such as Berlin, Germany, disarmament, the cessation of nuclear tests accompanied by adequate inspection, which threaten security and peace, the President—large in mind and heart—invited Mr. Khrushchev to come to the United States to discuss these issues. The American people were generous enough to support the invitation. And, as I have said, Mr. Khrushchev spoke his piece about Soviet policy throughout the United States in public forums and through all our media of communication.

Let me say that this invitation was given to Mr. Khrushchev, his speeches were made, and discussions were held with the President and other members of our Government, and with Members of the Congress, even though the people of the United States had full knowledge of the Soviet record which has shocked free people every day since World War II. By inviting Mr. Khrushchev to the United States, the President and the American people did not approve the Soviet record. It is a record which includes the breach of its agreements with World War II allies—the United States, Great Britain, and France. We did not approve the breach of Russia's promise of self-determination for Poland, Hungary, and Bulgaria, or its seizure of Czechoslovakia. We did not approve its suppression and its murder of the people of Hungary, Poland, and East Germany, who sought to exercise the right of self-determination, which Soviet Russia, along with its allies, had promised. We did not approve Russia's flagrant breach of its promises of free elections for Germany, made during World War II, in postwar agreements, and again at the Summit Conference in 1955.

We did not approve Soviet Russia's support of Communist China, and North Korean aggression against South Korea and the United Nations itself. We did not approve its breach of promise to dissolve the Comintern and the Cominform, or its worldwide instruments of espionage and subversion, which it has used continuously in the United States and every free country. We did not approve Soviet Russia's imprisonment of the people who dared dissent against its policy, and particularly the imprisonment of great church leaders of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths. We did not approve its system which denies the existence of God and of human dignity. And we do not approve any of these things today.

Yet, with full knowledge of the Communists record of flagrant disregard of written promises, of principles of international law and order, and of the decencies of mankind, our Government and the American people accepted Mr. Khrushchev and gave him full opportunity to present his country's views, because we want a solution of the dangerous issues which might bring a nuclear holocaust, and set back the long strivings of mankind for freedom and for peace.

In the face of the Russian record, it comes with poor taste for Mr. Khrushchev to suggest that the Russian people would not welcome the President of the United States. The true issue is not whether the President would be received with tumultuous demonstrations, whether ordered by the Soviet dictator or whether genuinely responsive to President Eisenhower, by the Russian people. The true issue is whether Mr. Khrushchev is willing to open the Soviet Union to the President, so that conversations may go forward toward the solution of the fateful and awful issues which threaten the world, and whether he is willing to give to the President of the United States the same opportunity to speak directly to the Soviet people as was accorded him upon his visit to the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. First, I wish to associate myself fully with one of the most eloquent and intelligent statements I have ever heard on the subject of foreign policy in this or any other forum.

Second, I believe the Senator from Kentucky has rendered a real service, not only to the American people, but also to the whole free world, in saying what he has now said, and in putting the whole situation in focus, as he has.

We have talked about the Russian people and the American people. One must have faith in those people. The Senator from Kentucky has addressed an eloquent testimonial to the Russian people as to whether they really want peace—whether they want peace, not whether Khrushchev wants peace.

In my opinion, the President will be well received in the Soviet Union. I think such a visit by the President may afford one way for the people who cannot vote, and cannot speak, to show what they think about foreign policy and what they think about their love for peace.

I hope the President hears what the Senator from Kentucky has said, just as I hope the press will spread his statement to every corner of the free world, to the Soviet Union, too, and to all the countries of the Communist bloc.

I hope the President will make the trip.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from New York. I myself hope that the opportunity will come for the President to visit Russia. As I have said, I believe the real issue is not whether he receives a welcome, but simply whether Mr. Khrushchev is willing to give the United States the opportunity to continue negotiations toward a settlement of the issues, and whether he is willing to give the President of the United States the opportunity to speak directly to the Russian people.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FARM POLICY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it is distressing to see the Democratic Party's advisory committee on farm policy give up on America's farmers and the independent future of agriculture in this country.

The committee's report demonstrates a hopeless, negative attitude that bodes

no good for farmers. "Let us go back to programs that failed" seems to be their battle cry. The discredited multibillion-dollar Brannan plan is once more resurrected. How long can one beat a dead horse?

The advisory committee offers, as their only solution to the economic problems facing agriculture, a return to the old, discredited 90 percent of parity price support formula that destroyed markets at home and abroad, especially for cotton and tobacco, and built the present costly surpluses.

The committee offers even higher export subsidies that will lose us international friends in our great and continuing efforts for trade liberalization. America needs export markets.

Further, they want to reduce livestock production sharply by wrapping the control cloak around this great freedom-loving industry. All of this means reduced employment, less transportation, and less business.

In the final analysis, the advisory committee deals in generalities, neatly skirting if not ignoring such basic matters as the extent of the rigid controls that must be wrapped around this bureaucratic bauble.

The Congress, though tightly controlled by the Democrats for all but two of the last 27 years, has consistently refused to impose the tight and presumably effective controls on farmers envisioned by the advisory committee as a means of reducing production.

And to completely confuse the American farming public they conclude with an endorsement of the administration's conservation reserve program to take land out of production of crops in surplus—an endorsement that follows close on the heels of the Democratic-controlled House Appropriations and Senate Agriculture Committees' recommendation not to extend the soil bank program at all.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1373, H.R. 10777, so that the bill will be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10777) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 13, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 10: 9: *He that walketh uprightly, walketh securely.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, in the quiet of this noon hour, inspire us with one accord, to commune humbly and reverently with Thy spirit. May we surrender ourselves in glad and willing obedience to Thy light that has followed us all our way and to Thy love that will never let us go.

Forgive our sins and imperfections, the waywardness of our desires and the irresolution of our undisciplined wills, that we may know the strength of being clean and free.

Help us in these strange days of tension and pressures, when our minds and hearts are filled with anxieties and wistful longings, to lay hold of Thee with increasing tenacity of faith which alone will enable us to carry on faithfully and without fear.

Hear us in the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1974. An act to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2778. An act to amend the act relating to the Commission of Fine Arts.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Saturday to file a report on the bill S. 2611.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention today to a resolution of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N.Y., calling for the enactment of the Forand bill which provides medical care for the aged. Under unanimous consent I include this resolution at this point in the RECORD. The resolution follows:

RE LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Whereas there exists a real need for legislation to solve the problem of medical care for the aged; and

Whereas the high cost of medical care and hospitalization makes it difficult for our aged citizens to procure adequate medical care and attention after their earning capacity has greatly diminished or ceased; and

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States the Forand bill which would provide such benefits under the social security system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Buffalo express its approval of the provisions of the Forand bill in dealing with the problem of providing adequate medical care for our senior citizens; and further

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States, be requested to enact the Forand bill into law; and further

Resolved, That the city clerk be authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Clerks of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to each legislator representing any part of the city of Buffalo in Congress.

Adopted April 19, 1960.

A POLITICAL LOOK AHEAD

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, if the Democratic Party at their coming convention selects Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, for their presidential candidate and Senator KENNEDY for their vice-presidential candidate—and I predict that will be the team—they will have selected the strongest team they could select.

Senator JOHNSON would carry the Southern States with him and Senator KENNEDY would carry the large cities of the North—Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, and so forth. It would be a very difficult team to beat.

In order to stand a chance of defeating that team the Republican Party would have to team up NIXON and Rockefeller—the two most popular Republican leaders in the Nation—joining New York and California—the two most populous States of the Union. Both of these men are young, popular, glamorous, vote-getting campaigners who would give the Nation a fighting campaign such as we have not had for many a year.

What a campaign that would be—NIXON and Rockefeller versus JOHNSON and KENNEDY. I predict there will be few stay-at-home voters this fall if these two teams become the Republican and the Democratic battle leaders.

THE LATE ROBERT LEWIS RODGERS

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I announce to the House the passing of our former colleague, Robert Lewis Rodgers.

Lew, as he was affectionately known here during his 8-year tenure in Congress, was called by his Creator on Monday at his home, 1219 West 10th Street, Erie, Pa.

Mr. Rodgers was first elected to the 76th Congress in 1938. Of the new Members at that time from Pennsylvania there remains Congressman CORBETT, Congressman VAN ZANDT, and myself.

It was indeed a pleasure and privilege to serve with Lew Rodgers. He was ever thoughtful of all his colleagues, was conscientious in the performance of his duties, and above all was true to his oath of office in supporting the Constitution and protecting the interests of his Government and the country he loved so well.

While serving the best interests of his country first, Lew was always mindful and alert to the needs of his district and his constituents. He established a fine reputation in Washington, and his memory will long be cherished by countless friends in all walks of life.

Robert Lewis Rodgers was born in El Dorado, Kans., on June 2, 1875. Upon the death of his mother in 1878 he was reared by his grandparents on a farm in Greene Township near Jamestown, Mercer County, Pa. He attended district school and Fredonia Institute. Lew enlisted in Company K, 15th Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and saw service in the war with Spain. He taught in the district schools and engaged in farming.

On March 20, 1908, Mr. Rodgers married the former Madge E. Cathcart, of Adamsville, Pa., who survives together with one son, Thomas, also of Erie.

After having engaged in the insurance and real estate business on October 31, 1914, Mr. Rodgers met with considerable success in this field. In 1938 he was elected to the 76th Congress to represent the counties of Crawford, Erie, and Mercer in Pennsylvania. He served in the three succeeding Congresses, his tenure being terminated at the conclusion of the 79th Congress in 1946. He served with distinction on the former Rivers and Harbors Committee, and the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee. During the 79th Congress he was the energetic whip of the Pennsylvania Republican Delegation.

Mr. Rodgers was very active in fraternal circles being a 33d degree Scottish Rite Mason. Previous to his election to Congress, for 10 years he was recorder of Zem Zem Temple, Ancient Accepted Order Nobles of the Mystic Shrine. He was a past president and secretary of the Erie Rotary Club.

My sympathy is extended to Mrs. Rodgers, her son Thomas, and other loved ones. We know that God will give them fortitude to carry on in their hour of sorrow and the days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and character of Robert Lewis Rodgers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BOW. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1593)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Mutual Security Act of 1960'.

"STATEMENT OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which is a statement of policy, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(f) It is the sense of the Congress that inasmuch as—

"'(1) the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations; and

"'(2) the purposes of this Act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under this Act wage economic warfare against other nations assisted under this Act, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways;

assistance under this Act and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, shall be administered to give effect to these principles, and, in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this Act or arising under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, these principles shall be applied, as the President may determine, and he shall report on measures taken by the Administration to insure their application.'

"CHAPTER I—MILITARY ASSISTANCE

"Military assistance

"SEC. 101. Chapter I of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to military assistance, is amended as follows:

"(a) In section 103, which relates to authorizations, insert the following new subsection (d):

"'(d) The value of programs of equipment and materials for American Republics, pursuant to any authority contained in this chapter other than section 106, in any fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year 1961, shall not exceed $55,000,000. For the purposes of this subsection, the value of nonexcess equipment and materials shall be as defined in section 545(h) of this Act, and the value of excess equipment and materials (as excess is defined in section 545(e) of this Act) shall mean the acquisition cost to the Armed Forces of the United States of such equipment and materials.'

"(b) In section 105(b)(4), which relates to conditions applicable to military assistance, strike out the last sentence.

"CHAPTER II—ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

"Defense support

"SEC. 201. Title I of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to defense support, is amended as follows:

"(a) In the first sentence of section 131(a), which relates to the authority of the President to furnish defense support, insert immediately before the period at the end thereof the following proviso: ': *Provided*, That either all documents, papers, communications, audits, reviews, findings, recommendations, reports, and other material which relate to operations or activities under this title are furnished to the General Accounting Office and to any committee of the Congress, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, charged with considering legislation, appropriations, or expenditures under this title, upon request of the General Accounting Office or such committee or subcommittee as the case may be, or the President certifies that he has forbidden the information to be furnished pursuant to such request and gives his reasons for doing so'.

"(b) In section 131(b), which relates to general authority, strike out '1960' and '$751,000,000' and substitute '1961' and '$675,000,000', respectively.

"(c) In section 141, which relates to conditions of eligibility for assistance, strike out 'No such assistance' in the second sentence and substitute 'No defense support or military equipment and materials'.

"(d) In section 142(a), which relates to agreements, strike out 'No assistance' in the introductory clause and substitute 'No defense support or military equipment and materials'.

"Development loan fund

"SEC. 202. Title II of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to the Development Loan Fund, is amended as follows:

"(a) Amend section 201, which states the purposes of the Development Loan Fund, as follows:

"(1) In the last sentence, after 'to develop their economic resources' insert 'and free economic institutions', and after 'to increase their productive capabilities' insert 'in agriculture as well as in industry'.

"(2) At the end of the section, add the following new sentences: 'The Congress recognizes that the accomplishment of the purposes of this title in rapidly developing countries requires the development of free economic institutions and the stimulation of private investment, local as well as foreign, in the field of housing. It is the sense of the Congress that, consistent with the other purposes of this title, special consideration should be given to loans and guarantees to stimulate activities in this field.'

"(b) Amend section 202, which relates to general powers of the Development Loan Fund, as follows:

"(1) In clause (3) of the first sentence of subsection (b) insert 'or free economic institutions' after 'economic resources'.

"(2) At the end of the section, add the following new subsection:

"'(c) The Fund shall not allocate, reserve, earmark, commit, or otherwise set aside,

funds aggregating in excess of $50,000 for use in any country under this title unless (1) an application for such funds has been received for use in such country together with sufficient information and assurances to indicate reasonably that the funds will be used in an economically and technically sound manner, or (2) the President determines with respect to each such allocation, reservation, earmarking, commitment, or set-aside that it is in the national interest to use such funds pursuant to multilateral plans.'

"(c) In section 205(a), which relates to management, powers, and authorities, strike out 'Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs' in the first sentence and substitute 'Secretary of State'.

"Technical cooperation

"SEC. 203. Title III of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to technical cooperation, is amended as follows:

"(a) In section 304, which relates to authorization, strike out '$179,500,000' and '1960' and substitute '$172,000,000' and '1961', respectively.

"(b) Amend section 306, which relates to multilateral technical cooperation and related programs, as follows:

"(1) In subsection (a), which relates to contributions to the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance and related fund, strike out '$30,000,000' and '1960' and substitute '$33,000,000' and '1961', respectively.

"(2) In subsection (b), which relates to contributions to the technical cooperation program of the Organization of American States, strike out '1960' and substitute '1961'.

"(c) In section 307, which relates to advances and grants, insert '(a)' immediately after 'SEC. 307. ADVANCES AND GRANTS; CONTRACTS.—', and at the end thereof add the following:

"'(b) The President shall arrange for a nongovernmental research group, university, or foundation to study the advisability and practicability of a program, to be known as the Point Four Youth Corps, under which young United States citizens would be trained and serve abroad in programs of technical cooperation. Not to exceed $10,000 from funds made available pursuant to section 304 of this Act may be used to help defray the expenses of such a study.'

"(d) Repeal section 308, which relates to the International Development Advisory Board.

"Special assistance and other programs

"SEC. 204. Title IV of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to special assistance and other programs, is amended as follows:

"(a) In section 400(a), which relates to special assistance, strike out '1960' and '$247,500,000' and substitute '1961' and '$256,000,000', respectively.

"(b) In section 401, which relates to the United Nations Emergency Force, strike out '1960' in the second sentence and substitute '1961'.

"(c) In section 402, which relates to earmarking of funds, strike out '1960' in the first sentence and substitute '1961'.

"(d) In section 403, which relates to responsibilities in Germany, strike out '1960' and '$7,500,000' in the first sentence and substitute '1961' and '$6,750,000', respectively.

"(e) Insert after section 403 the following new section 404:

"'SEC. 404. INDUS BASIN DEVELOPMENT.—The Congress of the United States welcomes the progress made through the good offices of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development toward the development of the Indus Basin through a program of cooperation among south Asian and other nations of the free world in order to promote economic growth and political stability in south Asia, and affirms the willingness of the United States, pursuant to authorities contained in this and other Acts, to participate in this significant undertaking. In the event that funds appropriated pursuant to this Act are made available to be used by or under the supervision of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in furtherance of the foregoing purposes, such funds may be used in accordance with requirements, standards, or procedures established by the Bank concerning completion of plans and cost estimates and determination of feasibility, rather than with requirements, standards, or procedures concerning such matters set forth in this or other Acts; and such funds may also be used without regard to the provisions of section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1241), whenever the President determines that such positions cannot be fully satisfied without seriously impeding or preventing accomplishment of such purposes: *Provided,* That compensating allowances are made in the administration of other programs to the same or other areas to which the requirements of said section 901(b) are applicable.'

"(f) Amend section 405, which relates to migrants, refugees, and escapees, as follows:

"(1) In subsection (c), which relates to contributions to the program of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, strike out '1960' and '$1,100,000' and substitute '1961' and '$1,300,000', respectively.

"(2) In subsection (d), which relates to the continuation of activities undertaken for selected escapees, strike out '1960' and '$5,200,000' and substitute '1961' and '$3,500,000', respectively.

"(g) In section 406, which relates to children's welfare, strike out '1960' and substitute '1961'.

"(h) Amend section 407, which relates to Palestine refugees in the Near East, to read as follows:

"'SEC. 407. PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1961 not to exceed $16,500,000 to be used to make contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. In determining whether or not to continue furnishing assistance for Palestine refugees in the Near East, the President shall take into account whether Israel and the Arab host governments are taking steps toward the resettlement and repatriation of such refugees. It is the sense of the Congress that the earliest possible rectification should be made of the Palestine refugee rolls in order to assure that only bona fide refugees whose need and eligibility for relief have been certified shall receive aid from the Agency and that the President in determining whether or not to make United States contributions to the Agency should take into consideration the extent and success of efforts by the Agency and the host governments to rectify such relief rolls. The President shall include in his recommendations to the Congress for fiscal year 1962 programs under this Act a report concerning the progress made toward the rectification of the relief rolls as well as toward the repatriation and resettlement of the refugees by the governments directly concerned. Whenever the President shall determine that it would more effectively contribute to the relief, repatriation, and resettlement of Palestine refugees in the Near East he may expend any part of the funds made available pursuant to this section through any other agency he may designate.'

"(i) Section 409, which relates to ocean freight charges, is amended as follows:

"(1) In subsection (a), after 'such nations and areas' insert ', or, in the case of such nations and areas which are landlocked, transportation charges from the United States ports to designated points of entry in such nations and areas,'.

"(2) In subsection (c), strike out '1960' and '$2,300,000' and substitute '1961' and '$2,000,000', respectively.

"(j) Amend section 411, which relates to administrative and other expenses, as follows:

"(1) In subsection (b), which relates to certain expenses of administering nonmilitary assistance, strike out '1960' and '$39,500,000' and substitute '1961' and '$40,000,000', respectively.

"(2) In subsection (c), which relates to administrative and other expenses of the Department of State, strike out 'to' after 'appropriated' and substitute 'for expenses of'.

"(k) Section 412, which relates to the President's special education and training fund, is repealed.

"(l) In section 419(a), which relates to atoms for peace, strike out '1960' and '$6,500,000' and substitute '1961' and '$3,400,000', respectively.

"(m) Add the following new section after section 420:

"'SEC. 421. LOANS TO SMALL FARMERS.—It is the policy of the United States and the purpose of this section to strengthen the economies of underdeveloped nations, and in nations where the economy is essentially rural or based on small villages, to provide assistance designed to improve agricultural methods and techniques, to stimulate and encourage the development of local programs of self-help and mutual cooperation, particularly through loans of foreign currencies for associations of operators of small farms, formed for the purpose of joint action designed to increase or diversify agricultural productivity. The maximum unpaid balance of loans made to any association under this section may not exceed $25,000 at any one time; and the aggregate unpaid balance of all loans made under this section may not exceed $10,000,000' at any one time.

"CHAPTER III—CONTINGENCY FUND

"SEC. 301. Section 451(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to the President's special authority and contingency fund, is amended by striking out '1960' and '$155,000,000' in the first sentence and substituting '1961' and '$150,000,000', respectively.

"CHAPTER IV—GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"SEC. 401. Chapter IV of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to general and administrative provisions, is amended as follows:

"(a) Section 502, which relates to use of foreign currency, is amended as follows:

"(1) Subsection (b) is amended as follows:

"(i) Insert after the word 'expended' in the proviso the words 'and the amounts of dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds in connection with travel outside the United States'.

"(ii) Amend the second sentence to read as follows: 'Within the first sixty days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, the chairman of each such committee shall prepare a consolidated report showing the total itemized expenditures during the preceding calendar year of the committee and each subcommittee thereof, incurred as a result of the official activities of the members and employees of such committee or subcommittee, and shall forward such consolidated report to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives (if the committee be a committee of the House of Representatives or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Clerk of the House) or to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate (if the com-

mittee be a Senate committee or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate).'

"(2) At the end of the section, add the following new subsection:

"'(c) It is the sense of the Congress that prompt and careful consideration should be given to participation by the United States in an internationally financed program which would utilize foreign currencies available to the United States to preserve the great cultural monuments of the Upper Nile. Accordingly, the President is requested to submit to the Congress on or before March 1, 1961, his recommendations concerning such a program.'

"(b) Section 504(d), which relates to small machine tools and other industrial equipment, is repealed.

"(c) In section 505(a), which relates to loan assistance and sales, insert after the first sentence the following new sentence: 'Commodities, equipment, and materials transferred to the United States as repayment may be used for assistance authorized by this Act, other than title II of chapter II, in accordance with the provisions of this Act applicable to the furnishing of such assistance.'.

"(d) In section 513, which relates to notice to legislative committees, insert before ', and copies' in the the last sentence the following: 'and under the last clause of the second sentence of section 404'.

"(e) Amend section 517, which relates to completion of plans and cost estimates, as follows:

"(1) Insert '(a)' immediately after 'SEC. 517. COMPLETION OF PLANS AND COST ESTIMATES.—'.

"(2) Add the following at the end of such section:

"'(b) Plans required under this section for any water or related land resource construction project or program shall include a computation of benefits and costs made insofar as practicable in accordance with the procedures set forth in Circular A–47 of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to such computations.'

"(f) Amend section 523, which relates to coordination with foreign policy, by adding the following new subsection:

"'(d) Whenever the President determines that the achievement of United States foreign policy objectives in a given country requires it, he may direct the chief of the United States diplomatic mission there to issue regulations applicable to members of the Armed Forces and officers and employees of the United States Government, and to contractors with the United States Government and their employees, governing the extent to which their pay and allowances received and to be used in that country shall be paid in local currency. Notwithstanding any other law, United States Government agencies are authorized and directed to comply with such regulations.'

"(g) Amend section 527, which relates to employment of personnel, as follows:

"(1) In subsection (c), which relates to employment of personnel outside the United States, strike out 'Director' in the introductory clause and substitute 'President'; and insert before the period at the end of paragraph (2) the following new proviso: ': *Provided further*, That Foreign Service Reserve officers appointed or assigned pursuant to this paragraph shall receive in-class promotions in accordance with such regulations as the President may prescribe'.

"(2) In subsection (d), which relates to appointment of alien employees outside the United States, strike out ', at the request of the Director'.

"(h) Section 531, which relates to security clearance, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 531. SECURITY CLEARANCE.—The standards and procedures set forth in Executive Order Numbered 10450, as amended or supplemented, shall apply to the employment under this Act by any agency administering nonmilitary assistance of any citizen or resident of the United States.'

"(i) In subsection (c) of section 533A, relating to the Inspector General and Comptroller, strike out paragraph (9) and renumber paragraphs (10) and (11) as paragraphs (9) and (10), respectively.

"(j) In section 534(a), which relates to reports, strike out 'six months' in the first sentence and substitute 'fiscal year'.

"(k) In section 537(a), which relates to provisions on uses of funds, amend paragraph (3) to read as follows:

"'(3) contracting with individuals for personal services abroad: *Provided*, That such individuals shall not be regarded as employees of the United States for the purpose of any law administered by the Civil Service Commission;'.

"(l) In section 537(c), which relates to construction or acquisition of facilities abroad, strike out '$2,750,000' and substitute '$4,250,000'.

"(m) Add the following new section immediately after section 551:

"'SEC. 552. ASSISTANCE TO CUBA.—No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to Cuba after the date of enactment of the Mutual Security Act of 1960 unless the President determines that such assistance is in the national and hemispheric interest of the United States.'

"CHAPTER V—TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS REFLECTING NEW LIMITS OF UNITED STATES

"SEC. 501. The Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, is amended as follows:

"(a) In section 205(c), strike out 'continental' in the twelfth clause of the first sentence.

"(b) In section 411(d), strike out 'the continental limits of'.

"(c) In section 527(c), strike out 'the continental limits of' in the introductory clause.

"(d) In section 527(d), strike out 'the continental limits of'.

"(e) In section 530(a), strike out 'the continental limits of'.

"(f) In section 537(a), strike out 'continental' in the last proviso of paragraph (5) and in paragraphs (13) and (17); and strike out 'the continental limits of' in paragraph (10).

"CHAPTER VI—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

"SEC. 601. Title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1721 and the following), which relates to famine relief and other assistance, is amended as follows:

"(a)(1) In section 202, strike out 'The' at the beginning thereof and substitute the following: 'In order to facilitate the utilization of surplus agricultural commodities in meeting the requirements of needy peoples, and in order to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas in addition to that which can be accomplished under title I of this Act, the'.

"(2) The amendment made by this subsection shall expire June 30, 1961.

"(b) In section 203, which relates to delivery of relief supplies, in the third sentence after the words 'designated ports of entry abroad' insert ', or, in the case of landlocked countries, transportation from United States ports to designated points of entry abroad,', and before the period at the end of such sentence insert the following: ', and charges for general average contributions arising out of the ocean transport of commodities transferred pursuant hereto may be paid from such funds'.

"SEC. 602. Section 501(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 256), which relates to international cooperation in health, is repealed.

"SEC. 603. Section 3(a) of Public Law 403, Eightieth Congress, as amended (22 U.S.C. 280b), which relates to United States membership in the South Pacific Commission, is amended by striking out '$75,000' and substituting '$100,000'.

"SEC. 604. The President shall have a study made of the functions of, and the degree of coordination among, agencies engaged in foreign economic activities, including the Department of State, the International Cooperation Administration, the Development Loan Fund, the Export-Import Bank, and the Department of Agriculture, with a view to providing the most effective means for the formulation and implementation of United States foreign economic policies. The President shall include in his presentation to the Congress of the fiscal year 1962 mutual security program his findings and recommendations resulting from such study.

"CHAPTER VII—CENTER FOR CULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INTERCHANGE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST

"SEC. 701. This chapter may be cited as the 'Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West Act of 1960'.

"SEC. 702. The purpose of this chapter is to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific (hereinafter referred to as 'the East') through cooperative study, training, and research, by establishing in Hawaii a Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West where scholars and students in various fields from the nations of the East and West may study, give and receive training, exchange ideas and views, and conduct other activities primarily in support of the objectives of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, title III of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and other Acts promoting the international, educational, cultural, and related activities of the United States.

"SEC. 703. In order to carry out the purpose of this chapter the Secretary of State (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') shall provide for—

"(1) the establishment and operation in Hawaii of an educational institution to be known as the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, through arrangements with public, educational, or other nonprofit institutions;

"(2) grants, fellowships, and other payments to outstanding scholars and authorities from the nations of the East and West as may be necessary to attract such scholars and authorities to the Center;

"(3) grants, scholarships, and other payments to qualified students from the nations of the East and West as may be necessary to enable such students to engage in study or training at the Center; and

"(4) making the facilities of the Center available for study or training to other qualified persons.

"SEC. 704. (a) In carrying out the provisions of this chapter, the Secretary may utilize his authority under the provisions of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended.

"(b) The Secretary may, in administering the provisions of this chapter, accept from public and private sources money and property to be utilized in carrying out the purposes and functions of the Center. In utilizing any gifts, bequests, or devises accepted there shall be available to the Secretary the same authorities as are available to him in accepting and utilizing gifts, bequests, and devises to the Foreign Service Institute under the provisions of title X, part C of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended. For the purposes of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, any gift, devise, or bequest accepted by the Secretary

under the authority of this chapter shall be deemed to be a gift, devise, or bequest to or for the use of the United States.

"(c) The Secretary shall make an annual report to the Congress with respect to his activities under the provisions of this chapter, and such report shall include any recommendations for needed revisions in this chapter.

"SEC. 705. There are authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this chapter.

"CHAPTER VIII—HEMISPHERIC CENTER FOR CULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INTERCHANGE

"Statement of purpose

"SEC. 801. The purpose of this chapter is to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the other nations of the Western Hemisphere (hereinafter referred to as 'the Hemisphere') through cooperative study and research, by establishing in Puerto Rico a Hemispheric Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange, either as a branch of an existing institution of higher learning or as a separate institution, where scholars and students, in various fields from the nations of the the Hemisphere may meet, study, exchange ideas and views, and conduct other activities primarily in support of the objectives of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, and title III of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 and other Acts promoting the international educational, cultural, and related activities of the United States.

"Establishment of Center

"SEC. 802. In order to carry out the purposes of this chapter the Secretary of State (hereinafter referred to as 'Secretary'), after consultation with appropriate public and private authorities, may, on or before January 3, 1961, prepare and submit to the Congress a plan and program for—

"(1) the establishment and operation in Puerto Rico of an educational institution to be known as the Hemispheric Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange through arrangements to be made with public, educational, or other nonprofit institutions;

"(2) grants, fellowships, and other payments to outstanding scholars and authorities from the nations of the Hemisphere as may be necessary to attract such scholars and authorities to the Center;

"(3) grants, scholarships, and other payments to qualified candidates from the nations of the Hemisphere as may be necessary to enable such students to engage in study at the Center; and

"(4) making the facilities of the Center available for study to other qualified persons on reasonable basis."

And the Senate agree to the same.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD,
WALTER H. JUDD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference has agreed to a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. Except for clarifying, clerical, and necessary conforming changes, the differences are noted below:

INTRODUCTION

The House bill authorized an appropriation of $1,318,400,000 for fiscal year 1961. The Senate amendment authorized an appropriation of $1,405,500,000. The committee of conference adjusted the individual program amounts and agreed on a total authorization of $1,366,200,000 for fiscal year 1961. The authorization agreed upon is a reduction of $39,300,000 from the Senate amount and an increase of $47,800,000 over the House figure.

There were five amounts in the House bill from which the Senate amendment differed. On two of them the Senate receded—defense support, for a reduction from the Senate figure of $25 million; and special assistance, a reduction of $4 million. The two Houses split the $400,000 difference for the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees and agreed to a final figure of $1,300,000. On the amount for Palestine refugees, the Senate receded from its position cutting off unobligated funds, and the House managers reduced their figure by $2 million with the understanding that approximately $6,500,000 of unobligated funds would be made available. For the contingency fund the difference between the House bill and the Senate amendment was $55 million. On this the House increased its figure by $50 million and the Senate cut its figure by $5 million.

Fiscal analysis of mutual security program for fiscal year 1961

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	House bill (1)	Senate amendment (2)	Conference substitute (3)	Adjustment against House bill (4)	Adjustment against Senate amendment to House bill (5)
Chapter:					
I. Military assistance: Sec. 103(a): General authorization	[1]	[1]	[1]		
II. Economic assistance:					
Title I—Defense support: Sec. 131(b)	675,000	700,000	675,000		−25,000
Title II—Development Loan Fund: Sec. 203: Capitalization	[1]	[1]	[1]		
Title III—Technical cooperation:					
Sec. 304: General authorization	172,000	172,000	172,000		
Sec. 306: Multilateral technical cooperation and related programs:					
(a) U.N. technical assistance	33,000	33,000	33,000		
(b) Organization of American States	1,500	1,500	1,500		
Total, title III	206,500	206,500	206,500		
Title IV—Special assistance and other programs:					
Sec. 400(a): Special assistance	256,000	260,000	256,000		−4,000
Sec. 405: Migrants, refugees, and escapees:					
(a) Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration	[1]	[1]	[1]		
(c) U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees	1,500	1,100	1,300	−200	+200
(d) Escapee program	3,500	3,500	3,500		
Sec. 406: Children's welfare	12,000	12,000	12,000		
Sec. 407: Palestine refugees	18,500	[2] 22,000	[3] 16,500	−2,000	−5,500
Sec. 408(a): NATO science program	[1]	[1]	[1]		
Sec. 409(c): Ocean freight charges on voluntary relief shipments	2,000	2,000	2,000		
Sec. 410: Control Act expenses					
Sec. 411: Administrative and other expenses:					
(b) Administrative and other expenses (other than ch. I and title II of ch. II)	40,000	40,000	40,000		
(c) State Department administrative expenses	[1]	[1]	[1]		
Sec. 419(a): Atoms for peace	3,400	3,400	3,400		
Total, title IV	336,900	344,000	334,700		
Total, ch. II	1,218,400	1,250,500	1,216,200		
III. Contingency fund: Sec. 451(b)	100,000	155,000	150,000	+50,000	−5,000
Total	1,318,400	1,405,500	1,366,200	+47,800	−39,300

[1] Authorization contained in the Mutual Security Act.

[2] This total does not include unobligated balances of prior year appropriations requested to be continued available. Unobligated funds of approximately $6,500,000 which the administration proposal and House bill would have made available for use in 1961 are to revert to the Treasury. Although the Senate amendment authorizes a 1961 appropriation of $3,500,000 more than the House bill and the administration request, it will result in a total availability of $3,000,000 less.

[3] Does not include unobligated balances from prior year appropriations amounting to $6,500,000 which are authorized to be continued available.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO LATIN AMERICA (SEC. 101)

The House bill amended section 105(b)(4) to limit the aggregate amount of funds which might be obligated or reserved for military assistance to Latin America in fiscal year 1961 to the total for fiscal year 1960. The ceiling included training as well as materiel but did not apply to "excess" materiel or to reimbursable transactions under sections 103(c) and 106.

The Senate amendment added a new section 103(d) to limit the value of programs of military materiel beginning with fiscal year 1961 to $55 million. This ceiling included "excess" as well as nonexcess materiel and also applied to reimbursable transactions under section 103(c), which are financed with military assistance funds. It did not apply to training or to reimbursable transactions under section 106, which are not financed with military assistance funds. The Senate amendment also provided that in no case should any reimbursement to the Department of Defense and the military services for excess equipment exceed the usual value of excess equipment as determined under section 545(h).

The committee of conference was in agreement that U.S. assistance to the American Republics in the form of military materiel should be progressively reduced and that a ceiling should be imposed on the use of mutual security funds for this purpose. The managers on the part of the House accepted the language of the Senate amendment, except for the deletion of a provision relating to reimbursement for excess equipment which did not in any way alter the requirements already in effect under sections 522(c) and 545(h) of the Mutual Security Act.

The provision as agreed upon sets an annual limitation of $55 million beginning with the fiscal year 1961. This ceiling includes excess as well as nonexcess materiel and reimbursable transactions financed with military assistance funds. It does not apply to training or to reimbursable transactions under section 106.

SUBMISSION OF DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION TO THE CONGRESS (SEC. 201(a))

The House bill added a proviso to section 131(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, requiring that all documents relating to defense support operations be furnished upon request to the General Accounting Office or any authorized congressional committee. The Senate amendment did not contain a provision on this subject.

The Senate amendment, however, included a provision striking out the existing language of section 537(f) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which specifies the information to be submitted to Congress in connection with certain types of economic assistance and substituted for this provision a new requirement, outlining information to be submitted to the Congress in relation to military assistance.

The managers on the part of the House accepted a compromise according to which the provision of existing law relating to economic assistance, section 537(f), was retained while the new language contained in section 401(j) of the Senate amendment was deleted.

In addition, the provision in section 201(a) of the House bill was amended so as to require that if a request for any document or material is denied by the Executive, the President must certify that he has forbidden the furnishing of such document or material.

The Committee of Conference recognizes that the separation of powers under the Constitution makes it impossible for the Congress to infringe the prerogatives of the Executive by legislative action and that consequently this provision would serve to indicate the will of the Congress but that it could neither prescribe nor limit the constitutional powers of the Executive.

INCREASING DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND EMPHASIS ON DEVELOPMENT OF FREE ECONOMIC INSTITUTIONS AND ON ENCOURAGEMENT OF PRIVATE INVESTMENT IN HOUSING (SEC. 202 (a) AND (b))

The Senate amendment added to the purposes of the Development Loan Fund the development of free economic institutions and the development of agriculture as well as industry. It also required the Development Loan Fund to take into consideration the contribution of any proposed financing activity to the development of free economic institutions. The Senate amendment also expressed the sense of the Congress that the Development Loan Fund should give special consideration to loans and guarantees to stimulate the development of free economic institutions and private investment in the field of housing in rapidly developing countries.

In addition, the Senate amendment included an expression of the sense of Congress that the Development Loan Fund should assist in the development of self-liquidating pilot housing projects in the American Republics.

The House bill contained no similar provisions.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate provisions relating to the stimulation of private investment in housing on a worldwide basis and the other provisions broadening the purposes of the Development Loan Fund.

The Senate conferees, in accepting the deletion of the Senate provision relating to housing projects in Latin American countries, emphasized the fact that existing law already provides adequate authority for establishing or assisting in the establishment of savings and loan type institutions in foreign countries and for guaranteeing private U.S. capital for investment in private housing in Latin American countries.

The committee of conference was in agreement as to the desirability and the importance of encouraging the development of self-liquidating pilot housing projects in the American Republics and calls the attention of the Executive to the need for greater emphasis on this type of activity.

DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND SPECIAL ADVANCE COMMITMENTS (SEC. 202(b)(2))

The House bill added a new section 202(c) which prohibited the Development Loan Fund Board of Directors from formally allocating, committing, reserving, setting aside, or earmarking funds in excess of $50,000 for use in any country unless an application or applications in excess of the amount to be committed for loans in such country had been received, supported by engineering, financial, or other data, or unless the President personally determined it to be in the national interest to use such funds pursuant to multilateral plans.

The Senate amendment contained no provision on this subject.

The managers on the part of the House accepted an amendment to the House provision, which requires that before funds are allocated by the Development Loan Fund "sufficient information and assurances" must have been received "to indicate reasonably that the funds will be used in an economically and technically sound manner" in place of the more specific language contained in the House bill.

The committee of conference agreed that the limitation on advance allocations, reservations, earmarks, commitments, or setasides by the Fund definitely applies to any formal action by the Fund's Board of Directors which would either bind the Fund or constitute a basis for representing to the Congress that a given sum cannot be used for other purposes. It does not mean that the Fund's staff cannot, or should not, as prudent bankers, informally discuss priorities of various proposals with prospective borrowers, or internally prepare work programs and give special attention to applications from key countries. It should be noted here that just last year the Congress directed in section 202(b) of the Act that the Fund "in its operations shall recognize that development loan assistance will be most effective in those countries which show a responsiveness to the vital long-term economic, political, and social concerns of their people, demonstrate a clear willingness to take effective self-help measures." Obviously assistance to projects and programs in such countries are to be given priority.

Secondly, the information and assurances called for are those appropriate to forming a judgment that the allocation will result in economically and technically sound uses. These would include an appraisal of the competence and past performance of the entities submitting the applications and their understanding that loans be available only for projects and programs which meet the requirements of section 517. Depending on the development need involved, the Fund will continue to be available to finance such specific projects as dams, industrial enterprises, and development banks and loans for programs which may either be a group of related projects or portions of overall plans or programs for economic development.

POINT FOUR YOUTH CORPS (SEC. 203(c))

The House report accompanying the bill included an endorsement of the Point Four Youth Corps and expressed the committee's desire for a comprehensive survey of the possibilities of developing a program for using the services of American youth under the mutual security program. The Senate amendment to the House bill included a specific provision requiring the President to arrange for such a study by a nongovernmental group and authorized the use of not more than $10,000 from technical cooperation funds to help defray the expenses of the study. The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate language.

ARMAMENTS FOR THE NEAR EAST (SEC. 204(a))

The House bill amended section 400(a) of the act to express the sense of Congress that money made available for special assistance should not be used by any nation in the Near East to purchase armaments. The Senate amendment did not contain this language. While sympathetic to the overall objectives, the committee of conference decided that the implications of the language might make more difficult the achievement of our foreign policy objectives in that area.

INDUS BASIN—50–50 SHIPPING REQUIREMENT (SEC. 204(e))

The House bill added a proviso at the end of the second sentence of the new section 404 which authorizes the waiver of the 50–50 shipping requirement in connection with U.S. participation in the development of the Indus Basin. This proviso required that compensating allowances be made in the administration of other programs to the same area to which the 50–50 shipping requirement is applicable. The Senate amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The committee of conference considered the possibility that, since the Indus Basin development project involves a period presently estimated at 10 years, it might be impossible at some future date to make compensating allowances on shipments under other programs to the same area.

The managers on the part of the House, therefore, accepted an amendment which extends the scope of compensating allowances to include shipments not only to the

same area but to other areas. This broadening of the provision in the House bill should assure fulfillment of the objectives of the 50–50 shipping requirement on a worldwide basis.

PALESTINE REFUGEES (SEC. 204(h))

The House bill deleted the proviso in section 407, which earmarked a percentage of the funds for resettlement and repatriation, and amended section 407 to authorize an appropriation of $18.5 million for contribution to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA), which, together with the use of reappropriations, would permit a total contribution of $25 million.

The Senate amendment deleted the proviso in section 407 and amended section 407: (1) to authorize an appropriation of $22 million and to bar reappropriation of unobligated funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated under section 407; (2) to provide that after January 1, 1961, the U.S. contributions should not be used for relief programs except for refugees who had been certified as to need and eligibility after July 1, 1960; and (3) to require the President in the next fiscal year presentation to submit specific recommendations with respect to a program for the progressive repatriation and resettlement of refugees and for reducing the U.S. contribution to UNRWA.

The committee of conference agreed that the United States shall make progressive reductions of its annual contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, that there shall be a consistent effort to rectify the Palestine refugee rolls in order to assure that only bona fide refugees in need are included, and that a continued and vigorous effort shall be made toward the repatriation and resettlement of the refugees by the governments directly concerned.

The managers on the part of the House accepted a compromise which authorizes an appropriation of $16,500,000 for the fiscal year 1961. This amount, together with the $6,500,000 previously appropriated for resettlement but not used, would authorize for fiscal year 1961 a total of $23 million, which is $2 million below the total amount for this purpose in the House bill and $1 million above the total amount contained in the Senate amendment. It also expresses the sense of the Congress with respect to the rectification of the refugee rolls and directs the President to include in his recommendations to the Congress for fiscal year 1962 a report concerning the progress made toward rectification of the relief rolls and toward the repatriation and resettlement of the refugees.

TRANSPORTATION CHARGES TO LANDLOCKED COUNTRIES (SECS. 204(i) AND 601(b))

The committee of conference accepted a Senate amendment to section 409(a) which relates to ocean-freight charges to permit payment of transportation charges to points of entry in landlocked countries.

At present there is authority to use mutual security funds to pay ocean transportation for voluntary agency shipments to "ports of entry" in foreign countries. There is no authority, however, to pay overland transportation to points of entry in landlocked countries which do not have ports. The adoption of the Senate amendment will remove an inequity which a few countries suffer solely on account of geography.

The committee of conference accepted a similar amendment to section 203 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480). The new language will authorize the payment of overland transportation charges to landlocked countries on title II and title III shipments.

LOANS TO SMALL FARMERS (SEC. 204(m))

The House bill added a new section 421 which stated it to be the policy of the United States to strengthen the economies of underdeveloped nations and to provide assistance designed to improve agricultural methods and techniques and encourage programs of self-help, particularly through loans of foreign currencies to associations of small farm operators. The new section 421 also imposed certain monetary ceilings on loans made under that section.

The Senate amendment contained no provision on this subject.

The committee of conference accepted the provision of the House bill with an amendment to the first sentence in which the word "for" was substituted for the word "to" in reference to associations of operators of small farms. This amendment is intended to make clear that loans of foreign currencies for such associations are not expected to be made directly by agencies of the United States, but would instead be made through agencies or institutions of foreign governments.

CONGRESSIONAL TRAVEL ACCOUNTING (SEC. 401(a)(1))

The Senate bill amended section 502(b), which requires an itemized reporting of congressional travel expenditures in foreign currencies, in two particulars. The new Senate language broadened the provisions of existing law to require itemized reporting of "the amount of dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds in connection with travel outside the United States." The Senate amendment also provided that the reports on congressional travel, which are published annually in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, should include the names of each Member and employees incurring local currency or dollar travel expenses. The committee of conference accepted the Senate language with an amendment. The language agreed upon tightens the provisions of existing law and makes it clear that the funds to be reported include both local currencies or dollars from appropriated funds expended "as a result of the official activities of Members and employees of congressional committees or subcommittees," and that committee chairmen, in complying with the provisions of section 502, submit annually for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD consolidated reports which show the total itemized expenditures in appropriated dollars and local currencies of the Members and employees of their committees and subcommittees.

CULTURAL MONUMENTS OF UPPER NILE (SEC. 401(a)(2))

The Senate amendment added a new section 502(c) which provided that if the President found that U.S. participation in an internationally financed program to preserve the cultural monuments of the Upper Nile would promote U.S. foreign policy, he might, notwithstanding section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, and subject to congressional approval, contribute certain U.S.-owned foreign currencies for this purpose of a value not to exceed 33⅓ percent of the total cost of the program. It also provided that no such currencies might be used unless the President was satisfied the remaining cost would be borne by other nations.

The House bill contained no provision on this subject.

The managers on the part of the House accepted a substitute in the nature of a compromise, expressing the sense of the Congress that consideration should be given by the United States to participation in an internationally financed program which would utilize foreign currencies available to the United States to preserve the cultural monuments of the Upper Nile and requesting the President to submit to the Congress on or before March 1, 1961, his recommendations concerning such a program. The language agreed to does not commit the United States to any course of action nor does it authorize any use of foreign currencies.

WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS (SEC. 401(e))

The House bill added a new section 517(b) which required nonmilitary flood control, reclamation, and other water and related land resource programs or projects proposed for construction to be examined by qualified engineers financed under the Mutual Security Act in accordance with the general procedures prescribed in Circular A–47 of the Bureau of the Budget. The House language also called for a determination of the benefits and costs and the submission of a copy of the determination to the Congress and prohibited the undertaking of any such program or project on which the benefits do not exceed the costs and which does not otherwise meet the standards and criteria used in determining feasibility of similar domestic programs and projects in accordance with Circular A–47. The Senate amendment did not contain any provision on this subject.

The committee of conference agreed to the principle of using the procedures set forth in Circular A–47 with respect to the computation of benefits for any water or related land resource construction project or program that is hereafter planned pursuant to the requirements of section 517. The latter section already prohibits the makfng of an agreement that obligates more than $100,000 until technical, financial, and other plans have been worked out and a reasonably firm estimate of the cost to the United States has been made. The committee of conference recognized that the kind of statistics and cost-and-earning-potential data on hand in the United States necessary to make the computations required by Circular A–47 may not always be available in the underdeveloped countries. Hence the conferees agreed to the application of the standards "insofar as practicable" in order that foreign policy objectives of the United States would not be unduly impeded.

PAY OF EMPLOYEES IN LOCAL CURRENCY (SEC. 401(f))

The Senate amendment added a new section 523(d) which authorized Ambassadors to regulate the extent to which officers and employees of U.S. Government agencies and contractors abroad might receive their pay and allowances abroad in dollars or in local currency.

The House bill contained no provision on this subject.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate provision with a number of clarifying amendments in the belief that this authority might increase the ability of the United States to prevent blackmarket operations on the part of overseas personnel. The Committee of Conference agreed that, as the amendment relates to contractors and contract employees, it applies only with respect to future contracts.

The language of the provision is sufficiently flexible and permits discretion in its application so as to assure that no undue hardship will be imposed on American military and civilian personnel serving overseas.

EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONNEL

The House bill amended section 527(b) of the act which relates to employment of personnel, to increase by four the number of positions that may be compensated, up to and including grade 15, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949. The Senate

amendment did not contain any provision on this subject. The committee of conference accepted the Senate position that improved administration of the mutual security program can only be achieved through the employment of competent top-level managerial personnel.

PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (SEC. 601(a)(1))

The House bill amended section 202 of Public Law 480 to authorize the use of surplus agricultural commodities on a grant basis to meet the requirements of needy people and to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas.

The Senate amendment contained no provision on this subject.

The committee of conference accepted the House provision with an amendment limiting the authorization to the period of one year. The managers on the part of the House accepted this limitation in the belief that a trial period of a year would not impede the operation of the program and would provide an opportunity to evaluate whether a longer range authorization would be desirable.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION (SEC. 603)

The committee of conference accepted the language of the Senate amendment which amended section 3(a) of Public Law 403, 80th Congress. The new language raises the ceiling of $75,000 to $100,000 in appropriations authorized for our annual contribution to the South Pacific Commission.

The U.S. assessed contribution to the 1960 budget of the Commission will be about $70,000, or 12.5 percent of the total contribution. A majority of the member governments have expressed an interest in intensifying the work of the Commission, especially in the field of health. They are prepared to support an increase in the Commission's budget which would require the United States to exceed the present ceiling of $75,000. The adoption of the new language will permit the United States to support needed and well-planned increases in the budget of the Commission for the next several years and, at the same time, bear its share of the apportioned expenses at a relatively small additional cost. The peoples of three territories administered by the United States benefit from the activities of the Commission.

STUDY OF COORDINATION OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC OPERATIONS (SEC. 604)

The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate amendment, with an amendment, requiring the President to have a study made of the functions of, and the degree of coordination among, agencies engaged in foreign economic activities, including the Department of State, the ICA, the Development Loan Fund, the Export-Import Bank, and the Department of Agriculture. The purpose is to provide the most effective means for the formulation and implementation of U.S. foreign economic policies. The President is required to include his findings and recommendations resulting from the study in his presentation to the Congress of the mutual security program for fiscal year 1962.

During the last decade various departments and agencies have embarked upon economic assistance programs. While each of the programs, whether grants, loans, or sales, is directed toward the strengthening of our foreign policy, there is increasing concern that they are not sufficiently coordinated or integrated to provide the unity of purpose necessary to achieve their common objective. Some are operated within the Department of State; others are outside the Department. It is the expectation of the committee of conference that the study will result in a larger measure of coordination or integration within the executive branch in the formulation and implementation of our foreign policy.

CENTER FOR CULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INTERCHANGE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST (CH. VII)

The committee of conference agreed to the language in the Senate amendment providing for the authorization of an appropriation to establish a Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West. The activities to be carried out by the center are those that will support the objectives of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (the Smith-Mundt Act) and other acts promoting the international, educational, cultural, and related activities of the United States.

Last year the Congress directed the Secretary of State to submit to Congress before January 3, 1960, a plan and program for the establishment in Hawaii of an educational institution, for grants, fellowships, and other payments to outstanding scholars and to qualified students from the nations of the East and the West.

The Secretary of State filed a comprehensive report, as required. The language in the bill will permit the Secretary of State to carry out the recommendations contained in the report through any appropriate Federal or State agency or department. The establishment of such a center is in keeping with the objectives of the mutual security program and will constitute a significant contribution toward better understanding between the people of Asia and the Pacific area and of the United States.

HEMISPHERIC CENTER FOR CULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INTERCHANGE (CH. VIII)

The committee of conference agreed to the language in the Senate amendment designed to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and other nations of the Western Hemisphere by establishing in Puerto Rico a hemispheric center for cultural and technical interchange. The objectives of the center would be consonant with the objectives of our several international educational and cultural programs.

The new language authorizes, but does not require, the Secretary of State to make a study on all aspects of the proposed project and to submit a plan and program for the center and its activities and functions before January 3, 1961.

This section does not carry an authorization for an appropriation. The study will be financed from funds available to the executive branch.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD,
WALTER H. JUDD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 87]

Anderson, Mont.	Bonner	Canfield
Barden	Buckley	Cederberg
Blitch	Burdick	Celler
	Burke, Ky.	Chelf
Davis, Tenn.	Metcalf	Spence
Durham	Miller, George P.	Sullivan
Fogarty	Mitchell	Taylor
Holifield	Montoya	Thompson, Tex.
Jackson	Moorhead	Trimble
Johansen	Morris, N. Mex.	Vinson
Kelly	Porter	Walter
Kilburn	Powell	Williams
Landrum	Scherer	Willis
Lindsay	Scott	Withrow
McGovern	Shelley	Young
McMillan	Smith, Kans.	
Macdonald		

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 384 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the conference report on the ground that the conferees have gone beyond the range of the difference between the two Houses, particularly as it relates to section 407 of the bill. The conference report comes back, on the item of Palestine refugees, Near East, with a figure of $16,500,000. The figure in the House-passed bill was $18,500,000 and in the Senate-passed bill $22 million. My point of order is, Mr. Speaker, that the conferees have gone beyond the range of the difference between the two Houses.

The SPEAKER. The jurisdiction of conferees when they have before them an amendment in the nature of a substitute as we now have before us, is governed by clause 3, rule XXVIII, of the Rules of the House. This clause provides:

> Whenever a disagreement to an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been committed to a conference committee it shall be in order for the managers on the part of the House to propose a substitute which is a germane modification of the matter in disagreement, but their report shall not include matter not committed to the conference committee by either House.

The case before us, the House bill H.R. 11510, contained an authorization of $18,500,000 for contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Middle East. The Senate amendment in the nature of a substitute authorized $22 million for this same purpose. The language proposed by the committee of conference reduces the authorization to $16,500,000.

The Chair would like to point out that where a figure or sum is involved, the general rule is that the conferees are confined within the limits set by the figure included in the House bill and that in the Senate amendment. But this general rule is not applicable where the Senate has struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted an amendment in the nature of a substitute. In this case, clause 3 of rule 28 is applicable, and the conferees may report a germane modification of the matter in disagreement. The Chair thinks the conferees have reported a germane modification and, therefore, overrules the point of order.

The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that in his opinion the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, before the question was put, I was trying to get recognition to ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs if he would not yield to me some little time. I wonder if we could not return to that situation so that might be done.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is pretty late for that. The question has been put. At the proper time the gentleman from Pennsylvania had the right to yield time. He did not, and the Chair put the question.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I was trying to get recognition before the Chair put the question.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman addressed the Chair, the Chair did not hear him. The Chair doubts that the gentleman addressed the Chair. He might have been addressing the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HARDY. If the Speaker will permit, I most assuredly did address the Chair. I am sorry the Chair did not hear me.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already stated that the gentleman from Pennsylvania had control of the time. The Chair has nothing to do with the time.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet, and I fully intended to use the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the managers on the part of the House I present the conference report on the Mutual Security Act of 1960.

The bill which we submit is a compromise. There were 38 points of difference between the House bill and the Senate bill which were considered by the conference. With respect to these differences, the Senate receded on 13, the House receded on 10, and 15 were compromised by modifying the language of the House or Senate bills, or both.

The House conferees did not prevail in everything they tried to preserve in the House bill, but I firmly believe that they did not surrender on any vital provision.

There were five differences in the money authorizations in the two bills. On two of these, defense support and special assistance, the Senate receded and accepted the House figures. This was a total concession of $29 million on the part of the Senate.

In the case of the authorization for the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the conference split the difference. The House went down $200,000 and the Senate went up $200,000.

The authorization for Palestine refugees is rather complex because the carryover of certain unobligated funds is involved, but the net result of the conference is that the House went down $2 million and the Senate came up $1 million.

The House authorization for the contingency fund was $100 million and the Senate figure was $155 million. The House conferees finally agreed to a figure of $150 million for this item. That means that the House went up $50 million. The action of the managers on the part of the House in this matter was influenced by contemporary events. The short period which has elapsed since the mutual security bill was considered by the House has served to emphasize the fact that contingencies are one of the most important aspects of our foreign policy. During this short period we have seen the student revolution in Korea, the disturbances in Turkey, and the loss of a U.S. plane over the territory of the Soviet Union. Each of these situations undoubtedly will have an impact on our foreign policy, and it is very likely that significant adjustments in the mutual security program will result. It is the sincere judgment of the managers on the part of the House that this is not the time to make a drastic reduction in the contingency fund.

The net result is that the total authorization agreed to by the conference is $1,366,200,000 which is an increase above the total in the House bill of $47,800,000 and a decrease below the total in the Senate bill of $39,300,000.

The modifications made in the House bill are, as they inevitably must be, the result of give and take. The Senate bill, for instance, increased the authorizations for U.S. contributions to two international organizations—the South Pacific Commission and the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. The House accepted one of these increases, that for the South Pacific Commission, which involved increasing a $75,000 ceiling to a ceiling of $100,000, and refused to accept the increase in the ceiling for the Food and Agriculture Organization, which involved a figure of $3 million.

In several cases, the compromise language agreed to, in the judgment of the House conferees, actually improved the House bill. For instance, in the case of the 50–50 shipping requirement relating to the carrying of cargo financed under U.S. aid programs in U.S. vessels, the provision accepted by the conference gives greater protection to U.S. shipping than the language approved by the House. The bill as finally approved provides that compensating adjustments to assure the attainment of the objectives of the 50–50 shipping requirement are to be made in the administration of other programs not only to the same area but also to other areas. As a result, this permits necessary adjustments to be made on a worldwide basis.

In conclusion, let me state again that there were 38 points of difference between the House bill and the Senate bill, and that under our Constitution we have a legislature of 2 equal bodies. There is no way in which the House can impose its will on the Senate and no way in which the Senate can dictate to the House. It is necessary to compromise, and it is the sincere conviction of all of the managers on the part of the House that the best possible compromise has been agreed to.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the committee of conference on the mutual security bill—H.R. 11510—was confronted with 38 differences between the House and Senate bills. Many of these were on matters of far-reaching policy and to reach agreement presented a real problem. It is one thing to compromise differences in amounts but quite another to agree on fundamental principles in a program as complex as this one.

I wanted to congratulate and commend to the House the diligent work of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MORGAN, chairman of our committee, as well as Dr. JUDD, of Minnesota, and Mr. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, in upholding the House position. I know of no Member of the House or Senate who has greater knowledge of the details of this program than these gentlemen. Their outstanding work, I believe, resulted in bringing back to the House a bill which, in my judgment, is better than either the House or Senate version.

The authorization agreed upon reduced the Senate amount over $39 million and increased the House figure about $47 million.

The House had originally cut the contingency fund by $75 million and the conferees restored $50 million of this amount. I believe this was a wise move as we are all aware of the new tensions arising in Korea, Turkey, and the plane incident since the passage of the bill by the House.

The distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] had adopted in the bill two important amendments; one requiring the submission of documents and information to the Congress, and the other requiring certain conditions be met before obligating funds under the Development Loan provisions of the act. The substance of both of these amendments were retained. The committee of conference recognized in the first amendment the prerogatives of the Executive in withholding information. However, it is not within the province of your conferees to determine the constitutionality of this issue. The conferees modified language of the other amendment to allow a reasonable flexibility.

I believe the conferees' action limiting the military assistance to American republics is a step in the right direction as it was felt this form of aid should be progressively reduced.

I was glad the conferees on the part of the House adopted a Senate amendment providing for a study to develop the program for the Point 4 Youth Corps. Even the severist critics of mutual security who had personally investigated this particular program had only admiration for its work.

Numerous other provisions were adopted which, I believe, will improve the bill including the most difficult problem of Palestine refugees, fulfillment of the objective of 50–50 shipping requirements on a worldwide basis, transportation to landlocked countries, loans to small farmers, and so forth.

Wholly aside from humanitarian and altruistic motives the main purpose of the mutual security bill is through military and economic aid to maintain the security of the United States and the free world from communistic aggression and thereby maintain the peace. Equally important as maintaining this powerful deterrent against war is to guard against surprise attacks and to know what we would be confronted with in case of aggression.

Our defense and intelligence agencies are charged by law with knowing and advising what endangers our security, whether it is behind the Iron Curtain or elsewhere. In carrying out these responsibilities it may result in embarrassing situations such as the present one. But it would be extremely hazardous, if not fatal, if we did not know the dangers with which we are confronted. I fully approve of what is being done.

The mutual security bill provides outside of our own defensive forces the best means to maintain the peace.

On the whole, I believe this conference report is the best that could be obtained and I urge its adoption.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Was there in the House bill the establishment or first steps toward the establishment of a Point 4 Youth Corps?

Mr. MORGAN. No. I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa that the House report carried a recommendation that a study of the Point 4 Youth Corps should be made by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The Senate version of the bill carried a requirement for a study, as the gentleman knows, and authorized the use of $10,000 of technical assistance funds for this purpose. The House adopted the Senate amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman envisage that the establishment of this youth corps will blossom out into another multimillion-dollar enterprise?

Mr. MORGAN. No. All that is authorized is a study to be made by a non-Government foundation or a university. Programs similar to the point 4 youth program are now operating on a small scale in several of the countries in southeast Asia. I think the Pilcher committee mentioned it as one of the very good parts of the mutual security program.

Mr. GROSS. I note in the conference report provision for cultural monuments of the Upper Nile; a center for culture between the East and the West, and a hemispheric center for culture. What is all this culture going to cost; does the gentleman have any idea?

Mr. MORGAN. The item of the cultural monuments of the Upper Nile, of course, was in a Senate amendment. It is not going to cost a dime. There was an authorization to use foreign currencies in the Senate bill and the House conferees were successful in removing this authorization and changing the language to request the President to study the matter and submit recommendations.

Mr. GROSS. What about the rest of it—the East-West Cultural Center?

Mr. MORGAN. The East-West Cultural Center, as the gentleman knows, was included in the mutual security bill that passed last year. A study was authorized to be made. The study was made and reported back by the Secretary of State on January 1 of this year. This amendment is the result of the study made and the recommendation by the Secretary of State.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any idea what these things are going to cost, for example, the cultural center in Puerto Rico?

Mr. MORGAN. The cultural center in Puerto Rico is not going to require the use of any mutual security funds this year. This is just an authorization for a study and provides no authorization of an appropriation.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the Point Four Youth Corps question raised by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], I wish to commend the managers on the part of the House for adopting the language of the Senate. That language directs the President to arrange for a nongovernmental research group or foundation to study the advisability and practicability of a Point 4 Youth Corps, in which young Americans would have a chance voluntarily to serve their country abroad in technical assistance programs. I think that, if properly studied—and I may say there are at least three major American universities ready on request to make such a study—there is every indication that private foundations will fund that study, which means it will not cost the taxpayers anything if the study is made. And if the Congress at the next session chooses to adopt the recommendations of that study, a new and affirmative note in our foreign economic aid program can be struck. I commend the committee for giving the point four youth idea a chance to be born.

Mr. MORGAN. I recognize that the gentleman from Wisconsin has done a great deal of work on this Point 4 Youth Corps amendment. He introduced a bill on this subject which received very careful consideration by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. As a result of our inquiries the Executive also explored the matter and submitted recommendations. The committee has been very sympathetic to the idea and I assure the gentleman that we will await with interest the report when it is ready.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. There are several of us who have been much concerned about the business engineering standards on some of the public works projects in this foreign aid program. I am disturbed by the fact that the committee amendment which was brought out in the bill when it first passed the House on that point is considerably modified by the conference report, particularly by the fact that the conference language does not contain any provision that qualified engineers make a study, or that the benefit-cost determinations be supplied to the Speaker of the House and to the Senate; and, furthermore, it does not contain a prohibition against the project being built when that project does not meet the benefit-cost standards for projects in the United States.

Is it the intention of the committee to require that those standards be met on those projects, and to require that engineers make cost studies that we require in the United States?

Mr. MORGAN. This provision was incorporated in the House bill by the Foreign Affairs Committee. It was taken to conference in good faith, and the amendment adopted by the conference was the result of compromise after full discussion, during long sessions in the conference. I am sure that the amendment takes in all prescribed in Circular A–47 of the Bureau of the Budget except for adding the words "as far as practicable." It gives the President some flexibility in dealing with projects in the less developed countries.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the amendment as adopted represents progress, but I would like the gentleman to assure us, if he can, that the benefit-cost determinations will be available to the Congress on those projects in the future.

Mr. MORGAN. I can assure the gentleman as far as I am concerned that I will work to that end.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield.

Mr. ADAIR. Would the gentleman say, with respect to this exhaustive information to which reference was just made, that it was the intent of the conferees that the provisions of Circular A–47 should apply insofar as practical?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield.

Mr. BENTLEY. I would like to ask the chairman about this new section, which I understand has been inserted by the Senate, 523(d), on page 7 of the conference report. This section reads:

(d) Whenever the President determines that the achievement of U.S. foreign policy objectives in a given country requires it, he may direct the chief of the U.S. diplomatic mission there to issue regulations applicable to members of the Armed Forces and officers and employees of the U.S. Government, and to contractors with the U.S. Government and their employees, governing the extent to which their pay and allowances received and to be used in that country shall be paid in local currency. Notwithstanding any other law, U.S. Government agencies are authorized and directed to comply with such regulations.

I would like to ask whether the ambassador in any given country is authorized to issue regulations applicable to all members of all U.S. military forces.

Mr. MORGAN. Only when the President so determines and directs.

Mr. BENTLEY. In other words, our ambassador would be able to issue regulations governing the pay of Army officers throughout any foreign country?

Mr. MORGAN. Only under the direction of the President of the United States.

Mr. BENTLEY. The Ambassador could under direction of the President of the United States?

Mr. MORGAN. Under the direction of the President of the United States.

Mr. BENTLEY. But how would that be worked out?

Mr. MORGAN. The President would give directions.

This amendment was put in by the other body as a direct result of black-market operations which went on in Turkey in which a number of military personnel apparently were involved. The amendment is very flexible. It gives the President authority and flexibility so that I do not think the condition described by the gentleman can occur. This is simply an effort to try to correct the black-market practices such as went on in Turkey.

Mr. BENTLEY. In other words, if the financial situation in any country is such as to warrant it, he may by reason of this amendment have authority to direct all military contingents in that country in the matter of whether they be paid in dollars or local currency or a combination of both, depending upon the circumstances.

Mr. MORGAN. That is quite correct, but the President directs both the Pentagon and the State Department.

Mr. BENTLEY. I am just wondering if this were not an example of an encroachment of the State Department on the military, the State Department taking precedence of the military.

Mr. MORGAN. The President is still Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. I am sure he makes the decisions.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield.

Mr. VANIK. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, in the report, I note that the Senate amendment also expressed the sense of Congress that the Development Loan Fund should give special consideration to loans and guarantees to stimulate the development of free economic institutions and private investment in the field of housing in rapidly developing countries.

I also note in the current issue of the National Savings and Loan Journal that the Development Loan Fund has just made a $2 million housing loan to a privately owned savings and loan association in Lima, Peru, known as the Association Mutual de Creditos para Vivienda Peru which was founded by Pedro Beltran, Prime Minister and Minister of Finance of Peru.

Is it the sense of your committee that these loans for housing development should be made to banks or institutions owned by prime ministers or executives of Latin American states?

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, these loans should be properly administered; but this is a sense amendment. It gives the Development Loan Authority no new powers.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is this kind of administration of the law which makes it difficult for a Member of Congress to explain his vote and compels him to apologize for it.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me express my appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding this time to me in order that I may bring to the attention of the House certain language contained in the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

I refer to the passage, commencing on page 13 of the conference report, under the heading "Submission of Documents and Information to the Congress (Sec. 201(a))" which describes the action of the conferees with respect to my amendment, unanimously adopted by the House, which requires the executive branch to furnish complete and accurate information to the General Accounting Office and committees of Congress with respect to the expenditure of defense support funds.

The Senate version contained no such language, and the conferees compromised by accepting the language of my amendment with a proviso that the President might deny requests for documents or information by certifying "that he has forbidden the information to be furnished pursuant to such request and gives his reasons for doing so."

Mr. Speaker, the paragraph of the statement which disturbs me most appears at the top of page 14 and reads as follows:

> The committee of conference recognizes that the separation of powers under the Constitution makes it impossible for the Congress to infringe the prerogatives of the Executive by legislative action and that consequently this provision would serve to indicate the will of the Congress but that it could neither prescribe nor limit the constitutional powers of the Executive.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that what is particularly unfortunate about this language is that it refers to the "prerogatives of the Executive," but fails to mention the prerogatives of Congress. Article I, section 1 of the Constitution vests all legislative powers in the Congress.

It is clearly settled that the legislative power includes the power of inquiry—*McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U.S. 135 (1927)). Since the language to which I object makes no reference to the congressional power of inquiry, it appears to accept what has been advanced by many in the executive branch of the Government as the "doctrine of Executive privilege." There has been a great deal of loose thinking and loose talk by executive agents under the label "Executive privilege" to justify increasing truculence in the executive agencies in flouting legitimate requests of congressional committees, as well as the General Accounting Office, for information concerning the conduct of the public business.

Mr. Speaker, let me hasten to say that I do not believe it is within the power of the Congress, nor within the power of Congress itself, for that matter, to divest the Congress of any authority vested in it by the Constitution of the United States. That power is inalienable.

What disturbs me is that leaders of the Congress itself unwittingly or inadvertently should lend credence to unfounded executive claims of "privilege" by including this phraseology in a formal document which becomes a part of the legislative history of the Mutual Security Act. It seems to support a claim of Executive privilege advanced by officials in the executive branch which inures to the apparent enhancement of the power of the executive branch and the diminution of the power of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I wish there were some way to delete or amend the paragraph of the conference report which is objectionable. Upon inquiry, however, I am informed that the parliamentary situation is such that the only way this proposition could be repudiated is by rejection of the entire conference report itself. Since this remedy might be rather drastic to cure one defective paragraph of the statement of the managers when the other compromises of the conference committee by and large meet the approval of both Houses, there seems to be no action open to Members of the House except to attempt to clarify the ambiguity or possible misconstruction of this passage by contesting the erroneous implication in this discussion of the conference report and by issuing a caveat to future conference and other committees to exercise caution in accepting any representations from executive agents concerning limitations on the legislative power of inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this matter on a great number of occasions, and my remarks appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

March 10, 1958, remarks on Attorney General's testimony re Executive privilege, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, part 3, pages 3848 to 3854.

March 31, 1958, remarks on Executive privilege, including Meader-Rogers correspondence, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, part 5, pages 5857 to 5859.

April 16, 1958, remarks during debate on amending section 161, Revised Statutes, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, part 5, pages 6548 to 6573.

July 14, 1958, remarks on "Congressional Investigations," including Gerald D. Morgan's California Law Review article, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, part 10, pages 13744 to 13749.

June 18, 1959, remarks on Hardy amendment to Mutual Security Act, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 9, page 11307.

July 21, 1959, remarks on Foreign Operations Subcommittee activities, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 11, pages 13971 to 13925.

July 28, 1959, remarks on Hardy amendment to mutual security appropriations bill, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,

volume 105, part 11, pages 14531 and 14532.

September 7, 1959, remarks re Mollenhoff article on Executive privilege, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 14, page 18432.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Special Subcommittee on Government Information of the House Committee on Government Operations has made a study of secrecy in Government including the attempted withholding of information by executive agencies from committees of Congress and the General Accounting Office. The Government Operations Committee has repeatedly repudiated the so-called doctrine of Executive privilege to withhold information from Congress, and in its report issued January 25, 1960, in conclusion 6, on page 3 of that report, said the following:

> The refusal to furnish the General Accounting Office the MATS report it requested was based upon an assertion of "Executive privilege" claimed to arise from the separation of powers in the Constitution (pp. 45 to 47). The committee believes there is no foundation whatever for the alleged doctrine of "Executive privilege" to withhold information from the Congress or its agency, the General Accounting Office. Thus, there is a clear violation of section 313 of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 (pp. 49 and 52 to 55).

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to discuss this issue at length at this time, but I do think it is important to point out that all of us, particularly the leadership of both the House and the Senate, have a responsibility to be continually vigilant and jealous of the prerogatives and powers of the body of which we are a part and to arise and defend those powers when they are under attack by a coordinate branch of the Government.

I can understand the President, the Attorney General or any of the 2½ million employees of the executive branch of the Government attempting to expand executive powers and to limit congressional powers, particularly those powers whereby the Congress may scrutinize the stewardship and the discharge of their trust of Federal officials, their exercise of broad statutory powers, and their administration and expenditure of public funds. It is only natural that they should seek to be free from accounting to the Congress, to the General Accounting Office, or to the general public.

What I cannot condone, however, is indifference on the part of the Congress to executive flouting of congressional authority. The congressional power of inquiry is well established as an inherent part of the legislative power. To me it is fantastic to claim that the congressional investigative power is plenary when applied to private persons and the business community, but impotent when applied to public affairs, public officers, and the expenditure of public funds.

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his very lucid remarks which go right to the heart of the matter.

I note that the Senate version of the Mutual Security Act contained no such language as my amendment, and that the conferees compromised by accepting a proviso that the President might deny requests for documents or information by certifying "that he has forbidden the information to be furnished pursuant to such request and gives his reasons for doing so." I do not at this time oppose the compromise in the statutory language even though I consider it undesirable, but I sincerely hope that it was not the intention of the managers for the House, by their remarks at the top of page 14 of the conference report, to indicate support of the alleged doctrine of Executive privilege. Claims and denials of this doctrine have been made for many years and I feel sure that there was no intention to attempt to resolve the issue, at the expense of the powers of Congress, by a casual aside in a conference report.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] calling attention to certain phraseology in the statement of the managers that might be taken to imply congressional approval of the so-called doctrine of Executive privilege to withhold information from the Congress.

While I appreciate the possibility that the language may be so construed it was certainly not my intention, and I do not believe it was the intention of any of the other conferees, to pass judgment on this constitutional question. The conferees were simply trying to arrive at a compromise between House language which had no limitations on the requirements to provide information, and the absence of any language whatsoever on this subject in the Senate version.

What we determined was that, as a matter of policy, the Congress would not at this time insist upon requiring information in those cases, expected to be very few in number, where the President was personally convinced that the information should not be furnished and was willing publicly to state his reasons.

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman. I felt certain that that was the situation.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], for making it clear that the conference committee by the adoption of the language in section 201(a) did not desire or intend by legislative act to grant authority to the President or concede that he has constitutional authority to withhold information of this type from the Congress.

The conference report, commenting on section 201(a), states that the conferees recognize "that the separation of powers under the Constitution makes it impossible for the Congress to infringe the prerogatives of the Executive by legislative action." This is true; Congress cannot modify the President's constitutional powers. But the President is not the sole arbiter of his own powers. He derives his powers from the Constitution and the laws enacted by Congress. When he ignores the Constitution and the laws, he may be curbed by action of Congress or the courts. He swears to uphold the laws and is under special mandate of the Constitution to enforce the laws.

The "Executive privilege" to withhold information from Congress is administrative folklore, created by Presidents and Attorneys General, simply by repeated assertions. It appears nowhere in the Constitution. No court decision has ever recognized it. On the contrary, the courts frequently have used language similar to that of the recent Watkins case of 1957:

> The power of Congress to conduct investigations is inherent in the legislative process. That power is broad. It encompasses inquiries concerning the administration of existing laws as well as proposed or possibly needed statutes. It includes surveys of defects in our social, economic, or political system for the purpose of enabling the Congress to remedy them. It comprehends probes into departments of the Federal Government to expose corruption, inefficiency, or waste (354 U.S. 178).

Section 201(a) was amended by the House of Representatives on April 21, 1960, to provide for the right of access to reports and documents by both the General Accounting Office and appropriate committees of Congress. But the conference report appears to give the right to the President to refuse such requests. Left unclarified, this might have emasculated the right-of-access amendment which was offered by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] and unanimously adopted by the House.

It is a matter of simple logic. If the President has such an inherent constitutional power, it need not be spelled out by statute. If he does not have the power, it is clear that the Congress does not grant it to him in this specific instance.

The conference report says:

> This provision would serve to indicate the will of the Congress * * * that it could neither prescribe nor limit the constitutional powers of the Executive.

I am sure we do not wish to fritter away the constitutional right of the Congress to sit in constant watchfulness over the executive branch.

The Constitution provides that Congress shall do all things "necessary and proper" to carry out its powers "and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or officer thereof"—article I, section 8, clause 18.

Dean Wigmore, in his great work on evidence, condemned those who assert a broad "Executive privilege" to withhold information. He said:

> The lawful limits of the (Executive) privilege are extensible beyond any control, if its application is left to the determination of the very official whose interest it may be to shield a wrongdoing under the privilege. (8 Wigmore on Evidence, sec. 2378a.)

The adoption of the conference report amendment cannot create an "Executive privilege" but it may create the monster which has been conjured forth by a faulty interpretation of the Constitution. It is a pernicious doctrine, rooted in the theory of "the divine right of kings," and sooner or later, like that

ancient fraud on the people, it must finally be laid to rest.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the chairman of the committee for having the courage in this colloquy to make it absolutely clear as a matter of legislative intent that the conference committee by the adoption of the language in section 201(a) and by the remarks on this section appearing on pages 13 and 14 of the conference report on H.R. 11510, does not create or grant and does not intend to create or grant a privilege to the President of the United States to withhold any of the information required to be furnished under section 201(a) to the Congress, its committees and subcommittees, and the General Accounting Office; and further that such language in the bill and report does not admit, concede, or recognize, nor does it intend to admit, concede, or recognize, that the President in fact or in law has an alleged "Executive privilege" to withhold such information from the Congress, its committees, and the General Accounting Office.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the position of the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN]. In my remarks I said "it is not within the province of our conference to determine the constitutionality of this issue."

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, as one of the House conferees, I also want to concur in what has been said by the chairman. This is a constitutional question on which our committee of conference was not trying to pass judgment one way or the other. We were merely describing a situation that exists. We were trying to make it plain that we want the executive branch to make this information available to the Congress; but we do not in this act seek to compel it to do so.

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the clarification of the language of the conference report which has been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN]. No one disputes the constitutional separation of the powers of the executive and the legislative branches, but it is the capricious assertion of privilege of withholding pertinent documents on the part of the Executive that has concerned the Hardy committee and other committees of the Congress.

The investigative function of Congress is too important to be curtailed by ex parte bureaucratic decisions. Congress is not only entrusted, but is charged with overseeing the operations of Government agencies and it is important that no curtailment of the Congressional powers be acquiesced in, even by implication.

For that reason, I welcome the clarifying statement of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It will make clear that in accepting the language of the conference report, the House, in no way, surrenders its claim to adequately exercise its investigative powers and to require responsible production of pertinent documents by the Executive.

Mr. HARDY. I am grateful to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] for their comments on this important matter. Both of these gentlemen served on the conference and they speak with authority on what the conference intended.

I want to thank also the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] who is a valuable member of my subcommittee as well as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] who is so well informed about this subject.

I appreciate particularly the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN]. His position as always carries great weight with me. He has clarified the matter considerably, and I believe that, in light of his statement and the comments of our other colleagues, the House need have no concern that its rights have been infringed in this provision. With this explanation, I shall support the conference report.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was before the House, I congratulated the committee upon the inclusion of the language which appeared on page 11 of the House bill.

That language, conforming in large part to an amendment I had supported 2 years ago, required that all nonmilitary water development projects financed under the Mutual Security Act for foreign lands comply with the same benefits-costs requirements of economic feasibility which apply to domestic projects.

At that time I stated that if this language were to be deleted or materially weakened in conference, it would be my intention to oppose this bill on final passage.

For the reasons expressed by me at that time, and because of the serious weaknesses pointed out a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] in the section as finally approved in conference, I shall be compelled to vote against adoption of this conference committee report.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Dr. MORGAN, and the other House conferees on bringing back to the House a conference report for which all can vote with good conscience. I am especially happy that the statement of policy in regard to freedom of navigation in international waterways which originated in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs remains intact in the bill that will now go to the President for his signature. I think all of us followed with interest the attempt in the other body to delete or to render weak and meaningless this statement of policy in the House bill, and it was a source of great satisfaction to all who truly believe that international waterways should be open to the ships of all nations that the attempt in the other body to delete or to make meaningless the language of the House failed. As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs I wish especially to commend the very able and modest gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] for the outstanding contribution he made in assisting in the drafting of this statement of policy and in effectively championing it in our committee. I am sure I am speaking the sentiment of all the members of the committee when I say that no one on our committee is held in higher esteem than the gentleman from New York, and his modesty and his personal self-effacement, forgetting himself in his greater devotion to a cause in which he believes, are not the least of his virtues as appraised by his fellow members on the committee.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to propound a question to the managers on the part of the House. I would like to address it either to the gentleman from Pennsylvania or the gentleman from Minnesota. A number of members of the committee and of the House are concerned about the matter of advance commitments made in the Development Loan Fund. I share that concern. There was apparently a practice growing up among those in charge of that Fund of making allocations of money before specific worthwhile projects were presented by the requesting country. We felt that that was bad practice. We felt that it unduly tied up the funds that were available to the Development Loan Fund. Therefore I am asking either of the gentlemen what the action of the conferees was with respect to that practice.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the best statement I can give on that is to call attention to the third paragraph on page 15 of the statement by the House conferees. We worked on that language very carefully to clear up this very point. The Development Loan Fund is in a dilemma. Nobody wants it to go out, as the gentleman has well said, and tie up or allocate funds for projects that are still only in the dream stage. On the other hand, we ourselves last year and again this year directed the Development Loan Fund to give priority to certain types of projects in certain countries, because they are of greater importance to our own foreign policy. We did not want to put the Development Loan Fund in a straitjacket that would prevent it from doing properly what we have directed it to do. We wanted to give it authority to make informal working plans, and we expect it

to do so. The staff itself must be able to sit down and say, "Now, if we have $100 million, and that is all we have, where are the places and what are the projects in which the amount can be loaned to the greatest advantage for the foreign policy of the United States, if there are economically sound and carefully studied projects that will pay back the loans, if the country survives?" The staff and the managers of the Fund ought to make this sort of informal and tentative probings in making their own plans.

But under the amendment no action could be taken by the Board that would tie up or earmark or commit funds for projects until there are thoroughly worked out plans and sufficient data to show that the projects are economically sound, and such plans and data are available to the Fund as it considers definite applications from specific countries. Thus we hope we can avoid the former practice to which the gentleman objects, and at the same time not prevent the Development Loan Fund from doing properly what it ought to do.

Mr. ADAIR. In other words, the gentleman is saying that studies could be made, research could be undertaken, but no definite earmarking or allocating or setting aside of funds would be made until a worthwhile and justifiable project was presented?

Mr. JUDD. Yes. Let me read for the record two sentences from the statement of the managers on the part of the House:

> The limitation on advance allocations, reservations, earmarks, commitments, or set-asides by the Fund definitely applies to any formal action by the Fund's Board of Directors which would either bind the Fund or constitute a basis for representing to the Congress that a given sum cannot be used for other purposes. It does not mean that the Fund's staff cannot, or should not as prudent bankers, informally discuss priorities of various proposals with prospective borrowers, or internally prepare work programs and give special attention to applications from key countries.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the conferees have worked well and diligently within the framework of the bills that they had before them. I think, however, that the conference report now before us contains the same shortcomings, the same failures to which many of us objected before. Therefore, I feel that the vote upon this should be in the negative.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. No matter how thick or thin the slices, this foreign handout bill, calling for the spending of $1.366 billion is approximately $48 million more than the already rich bill that went out of the House not so long ago. It is not in keeping with the administration's professed position in behalf of austerity, frugality, and economy in Government.

Mr. ADAIR. It is higher by that amount than the bill that left the House.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. COFFIN].

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the chairman of the committee would be willing to tell the House what was the final version of the section to which we gave some attention on the House side, section 421, Loans to Small Farmers.

Mr. MORGAN. This amendment was adopted in the Committee on Foreign Affairs and in the conference was adopted intact except for the change of one word, the word "to" being changed to the word "for." It tightened up the amendment to make sure the money was not directly loaned by American Government officials, but was loaned through local agencies.

Mr. COFFIN. In the gentleman's opinion it in no way weakened the provision?

Mr. MORGAN. No, I think it strengthened it.

Mr. COFFIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ADAIR) there were—ayes 108, noes 60.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 240, nays 138, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—240

Addonizio	Conte	Glenn
Albert	Cooley	Goodell
Arends	Corbett	Granahan
Ashley	Cramer	Green, Oreg.
Aspinall	Curtin	Green, Pa.
Auchincloss	Curtis, Mass.	Griffin
Avery	Curtis, Mo.	Griffiths
Ayres	Daddario	Gubser
Baker	Dague	Hagen
Baldwin	Daniels	Halleck
Barrett	Dawson	Halpern
Barry	Delaney	Hardy
Bass, N.H.	Derounian	Hays
Bates	Diggs	Healey
Baumhart	Dingell	Herlong
Beckworth	Dixon	Hess
Bentley	Donohue	Hoeven
Blatnik	Dooley	Holifield
Boggs	Dorn, N.Y.	Holland
Boland	Downing	Holtzman
Bolling	Doyle	Horan
Bolton	Dwyer	Hosmer
Bowles	Elliott, Ala.	Huddleston
Boykin	Elliott, Pa.	Ikard
Brademas	Fallon	Inouye
Breeding	Farbstein	Irwin
Brewster	Fascell	Jarman
Brooks, Tex.	Feighan	Johnson, Calif.
Broomfield	Fenton	Johnson, Colo.
Broyhill	Fino	Johnson, Md.
Burke, Mass.	Flood	Johnson, Wis.
Byrne, Pa.	Foley	Jones, Ala.
Byrnes, Wis.	Forand	Jones, Mo.
Cahill	Ford	Judd
Cannon	Frelinghuysen	Karsten
Carnahan	Friedel	Karth
Chamberlain	Fulton	Kasem
Chenoweth	Gallagher	Kastenmeier
Chiperfield	Garmatz	Kearns
Clark	Gary	Kee
Coad	George	Keith
Coffin	Giaimo	Keogh
Cohelan	Gilbert	Kilday
King, Calif.	Nix	Saund
King, Utah	Norblad	Schenck
Kirwan	O'Brien, Ill.	Schneebeli
Kluczynski	O'Brien, N.Y.	Schwengel
Kowalski	O'Hara, Ill.	Selden
Kyl	O'Hara, Mich.	Sheppard
Lafore	O'Neill	Sisk
Lane	Osmers	Slack
Langen	Ostertag	Smith, Iowa
Lankford	Pelly	Smith, Miss.
Lesinski	Perkins	Springer
Libonati	Philbin	Staggers
Loser	Pillion	Stubblefield
McDowell	Pirnie	Taber
McFall	Price	Teague, Calif.
Machrowicz	Prokop	Teller
Madden	Pucinski	Thompson, N.J.
Magnuson	Quie	Thornberry
Mahon	Quigley	Toll
Mailliard	Rabaut	Tollefson
Marshall	Rains	Udall
Martin	Randall	Ullman
Matthews	Ray	Vanik
May	Reuss	Van Zandt
Meader	Rhodes, Pa.	Wainwright
Merrow	Riehlman	Wallhauser
Miller, Clem	Rivers, Alaska	Watts
Miller, N.Y.	Roberts	Weis
Milliken	Robison	Westland
Monagan	Rodino	Widnall
Morgan	Rogers, Colo.	Wier
Moss	Rogers, Mass.	Wilson
Multer	Rooney	Wolf
Mumma	Roosevelt	Yates
Murphy	Rostenkowski	Younger
Natcher	St. George	Zablocki
Nelsen	Santangelo	Zelenko

NAYS—138

Abbitt	Fisher	Moore
Abernethy	Flynt	Morris, Okla.
Adair	Forrester	Moulder
Alexander	Fountain	Murray
Alford	Gathings	Norrell
Alger	Gavin	O'Konski
Allen	Grant	Oliver
Andersen, Minn.	Gray	Passman
Andrews	Gross	Patman
Ashmore	Haley	Pfost
Bailey	Hargis	Pilcher
Barr	Harmon	Poage
Bass, Tenn.	Harris	Poff
Becker	Harrison	Preston
Belcher	Hechler	Reece, Tenn.
Bennett, Fla.	Hemphill	Rees, Kans.
Bennett, Mich.	Henderson	Rhodes, Ariz.
Berry	Hiestand	Riley
Betts	Hoffman, Ill.	Rivers, S.C.
Blitch	Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Fla.
Bosch	Hogan	Rogers, Tex.
Bow	Holt	Roush
Bray	Hull	Rutherford
Brock	Jennings	Saylor
Brooks, La.	Jensen	Shipley
Brown, Ga.	Jonas	Short
Brown, Mo.	Kilgore	Sikes
Brown, Ohio	Kitchin	Siler
Budge	Knox	Simpson
Burleson	Laird	Smith, Calif.
Casey	Landrum	Smith, Va.
Church	Latta	Steed
Collier	Lennon	Stratton
Colmer	Levering	Thomas
Cook	Lipscomb	Thomson, Wyo.
Cunningham	McCulloch	Tuck
Davis, Ga.	McDonough	Utt
Dent	McGinley	Van Pelt
Denton	McIntire	Wampler
Derwinski	McSween	Weaver
Devine	Mack	Wharton
Dorn, S.C.	Mason	Whitener
Dowdy	Meyer	Whitten
Dulski	Michel	Winstead
Edmondson	Mills	Wright
Everett	Minshall	
	Moeller	

NOT VOTING—54

Anderson, Mont.	Flynn	Mitchell
Anfuso	Fogarty	Montoya
Barden	Frazier	Moorhead
Baring	Hébert	Morris, N.Mex.
Bonner	Jackson	Morrison
Buckley	Johansen	Porter
Burdick	Kelly	Powell
Burke, Ky.	Kilburn	Scherer
Canfield	Lindsay	Scott
Cederberg	McCormack	Shelley
Celler	McGovern	Smith, Kans.
Chelf	McMillan	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	Macdonald	Sullivan
Durham	Metcalf	Taylor
Evins	Miller, George P.	Teague, Tex.
		Thompson, La.

Thompson, Tex.	Walter	Withrow
Trimble	Williams	Young
Vinson	Willis	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Williams against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Young against.
Mr. McCormack for, with Mr. Scott against.
Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Bonner against.
Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Morrison against.
Mr. Lindsay for, with Mr. Scherer against.
Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Johansen against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Withrow against.
Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Smith of Kansas against.
Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Barden against.
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Baring against.
Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.
Mr. George P. Miller for, with Mr. Willis against.
Mrs. Kelly for, with Mr. McMillan against.
Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Thompson of Texas against.
Mr. Trimble for, with Mr. Flynn against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Burdick with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. Jackson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a privileged report on two appropriation bills, military construction and legislative.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on both bills.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ACT OF 1960

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 520 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10495) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, after which I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 520 provides for the consideration of H.R. 10495, to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes. The resolution provides for an open rule, waiving points of order, with 2 hours of general debate.

H.R. 10495 is the usual biennial authorization for the fiscal years of 1962 and 1963 for the A–B–C Federal-aid highway program and for the several classes of Federal domain roads. It is deemed necessary to authorize funds for these fiscal years for both the Federal-aid primary and secondary highway systems and their extensions within urban areas so that the several States may prepare their plans, including the all-important financing arrangements required to match the Federal-aid funds, and to permit apportionment of such funds in accordance with law for future highway contruction.

The amount of the funds authorized in the bill for the A–B–C program for each of the fiscal years is identical with the amount authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961. The authorization for fiscal year 1961 provided for $925 million for the A–B–C program, and H.R. 10495 would provide the same amount for fiscal years 1962 and 1963.

The Committee on Public Works was convinced by the testimony it received that the amounts in this bill for the A–B–C program provide an adequate basis for the continuation of this vital program at or near the level contemplated at the time of enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. In order to be successful, this program must be continued on an orderly basis from year to year.

The A–B–C highways extend into every county of the United States. They include both primary and secondary roads, and their extensions within urban areas. The present extent of the primary system is 260,170 miles, including 237,117 miles in rural areas and 22,993 in urban areas. The secondary system, by far the larger of the two in terms of linear miles, consists of 570,399 miles, including 559,248 rural miles and 11,151 urban miles. At the present time the total A–B–C highways embrace approximately 790,000 miles and carry about 48 percent of the total of all highway traffic in this country, and traffic on these roads can be expected to increase over the next few years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 520.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10495) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10495, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House, H.R. 10495, is to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

Let me state at the outset that the effect of this legislation is to continue Federal policy without change, insofar as the so-called A–B–C highways are concerned. This is the biennial bill providing for the continuation of the long-established Federal-aid highway program for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963. In considering this legislation, the Committee on Public Works has taken the position that there should be no change in the present level of authorizations at this time, inasmuch as it is anticipated that the next Congress will deal in a comprehensive and detailed way with the entire Federal-aid highway program.

Since 1956, the Congress has followed the policy of increasing the amounts authorized for A–B–C highways—the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and the urban extensions—in annual increments of $25 million. This incremental increase was contemplated to be continued until A–B–C authorizations reached $1 billion annually. Such an increase is necessary to keep the program in balance. However, the present bill does not call for any incremental increases in the A–B–C program, but, in-

stead, authorizes an amount for each of the 2 fiscal years, 1962 and 1963, identical to the $925 million which was authorized for fiscal 1961.

The committee agreed to this departure from established policy with considerable reluctance, in view of the demonstrated need for the enlargement of the A–B–C construction program.

Two factors made it seem desirable to hold the A–B–C authorizations down to the current level:

First. The anticipated income of the highway trust fund is not sufficient to finance any increase in the A–B–C program without reducing the interstate program by an equivalent amount. Progress on the Interstate System has already been slowed down by the financial pinch, and it was felt that it would be unwise to force a further slowdown on Interstate work.

Second. In 1958, the Congress enacted legislation providing a $400 million emergency fund for use in the A–B–C highway construction as an antirecession measure. For this reason, the A–B–C program is somewhat ahead of the schedule contemplated in 1956, while the Interstate program is behind schedule.

The needs of the A–B–C system are urgent. It is by no means the intent of the present legislation to freeze the rate of progress on the A–B–C program to current levels. It is my hope, and I believe the hope of a majority of the members of the Committee on Public Works, that the A–B–C program will be accelerated at least until the $1 billion a year level is reached. The long-range needs of the A–B–C program should be considered in conjunction with the consideration of the needs of the Interstate System as a part of the legislative package which we hope to enact in 1961.

I do not believe that we can afford to stretch out our highway program. The price of land, the price of labor, and the price of many materials used in highway construction are all increasing. During the past three and a half years there has been practically no increase at all in the level of prices paid to highway contractors. However, it seems apparent that the cost of highways will never be less than it is now, and that the Federal investment in highways at current prices is a good buy.

It is true, also, that the Nation is paying a high price, in terms of economic waste and in terms of lives lost in highway accidents, as the price of inadequate roads. The proved safety record of modern roads, as contrasted with the record of obsolete roads, indicates that many lives could be saved by the timely construction of adequate highways.

The A–B–C system, extending into every county of the United States, must be developed along with the Interstate System if we are to have a complete, integrated network of modern highways and secondary roads in the country.

When the 1956 Highway Act was passed, our population was about 167 million, we owned 65 million motor vehicles, and we drove those vehicles about 623 billion miles. By 1976, our population will have increased to 234 million—an increase of 37 percent. But motor vehicle registrations will have increased to 114 million—up 74 percent—and annual travel will have increased to 1.2 trillion vehicle miles—up 93 percent.

The figures of $925 million authorized for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963 is the minimum figure that can be used at this time to keep the ABC program moving at a smooth pace.

Under H.R. 10495 there would be authorized $925 million for the fiscal year 1962 and $925 million for the fiscal year 1963 for the ABC highways, in the usual 45–30–25 ratios. This would make available the following sums each year:

Primary system	$416,250,000
Secondary system	277,500,000
Urban extensions	231,250,000

As introduced, H.R. 10495 also provided for 2-year authorizations for certain other highways at the same level as has been provided for fiscal 1961, as follows: For forest highways, $33 million; for forest development roads and trails, $30 million; for park roads and trails, $18 million; for parkways, $16 million; for Indian reservation roads and bridges, $12 million; and for public lands highways, $3 million.

The Committee on Public Works approved an amendment to the bill increasing the proposed authorization for forest development roads and trails to $35 million for fiscal 1962 and to $40 million for fiscal 1963.

Section 4 of the bill includes a total of five technical amendments to section 23, United States Code. These can best be described as "housekeeping" amendments, noncontroversial in nature, dealing with administrative procedures. The amendments are explained in detail in the report accompanying the bill.

Approximate apportionment of $925,000,000 of Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban highway funds for fiscal year 1962–63, pursuant to H.R. 10495

MARCH 3, 1960.

[Millions of dollars]

State	Primary ($416.3)	Secondary ($277.5)	Urban ($231.2)	Total ($925)
Alabama	8.4	6.5	3.0	17.9
Alaska	22.1	14.8	.1	37.0
Arizona	6.0	4.0	.9	10.9
Arkansas	6.4	5.2	1.3	12.9
California	19.0	9.8	20.5	49.3
Colorado	7.4	5.0	1.9	14.3
Connecticut	2.7	1.4	4.5	8.6
Delaware	2.1	1.4	.4	3.9
Florida	6.5	4.2	4.1	14.8
Georgia	9.7	7.5	3.4	20.6
Hawaii	2.1	1.4	.7	4.2
Idaho	4.7	3.3	.4	8.4
Illinois	15.5	8.4	16.1	40.0
Indiana	9.6	6.6	5.5	21.7
Iowa	9.3	6.9	2.8	19.0
Kansas	9.2	6.5	2.2	17.9
Kentucky	7.3	6.1	2.4	15.8
Louisiana	6.2	4.4	3.4	14.0
Maine	3.2	2.3	1.0	6.5
Maryland	3.7	2.3	3.9	9.9
Massachusetts	5.3	2.0	9.6	16.9
Michigan	12.4	7.6	10.7	30.7
Minnesota	10.4	7.3	3.8	21.5
Mississippi	6.9	5.9	1.3	14.1
Missouri	11.1	7.5	5.7	24.3
Montana	7.7	5.3	.5	13.5
Nebraska	7.6	5.4	1.3	14.3
Nevada	4.6	3.1	.2	7.9
New Hampshire	2.1	1.4	.6	4.1
New Jersey	5.5	1.9	10.1	17.5
New Mexico	6.5	4.5	.8	11.8
New York	19.3	7.6	30.8	57.7
North Carolina	9.9	8.6	3.0	21.5
North Dakota	5.4	3.9	.4	9.7
Ohio	14.1	8.5	13.3	35.9
Oklahoma	8.4	6.1	2.5	17.0
Oregon	6.6	4.6	1.8	13.0
Pennsylvania	16.5	9.9	17.4	43.8
Rhode Island	2.1	1.4	1.6	5.1
South Carolina	5.5	4.5	1.6	11.6
South Dakota	5.8	4.2	.4	10.4
Tennessee	8.5	6.7	3.4	18.6
Texas	25.0	16.7	11.1	52.8
Utah	4.7	3.0	1.0	8.7
Vermont	2.1	1.4	.3	3.8
Virginia	7.6	6.0	3.6	17.2
Washington	6.5	4.4	3.5	14.4
West Virginia	4.3	3.9	1.5	9.7
Wisconsin	9.3	6.5	4.5	20.3
Wyoming	5.0	3.3	.3	8.6
District of Columbia	2.1	1.3	2.0	5.4
Puerto Rico	2.2	2.3	1.9	6.4

Approximate apportionment of $925,000,000 of Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban highway funds for fiscal year 1962–63, pursuant to H.R. 10495—Continued

MARCH 3, 1960.

[Millions of dollars]

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Would the gentleman mind explaining to the committee why the large disparity between primary and secondary authorizations?

Mr. FALLON. It is done on a formula basis. It has not been changed. It is the same under this act today as all other legislation that was passed on highways.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman must realize that with the construction of our interstate highways we have a particular problem to connect up the secondary roads with the main highways, not only the primary but the interstate highways. There is every evidence that we will not have sufficient funds, and the majority of the people who would like to get to the modern highways would still be denied the right of access to those roads.

Mr. FALLON. I think the committee and the Congress recognized that problem in 1956 when they put into effect that the A-B-C roads, that is, the primary and secondary roads, would be increased each year until it reached a billion dollars.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman must know that we are pretty well along with our program of construction of primary roads. The interstate highways are going to eliminate the necessity for much of that primary work.

Mr. FALLON. That is correct.

Mr. BAILEY. But there is nothing available, apparently, for connecting up our ordinary farm-to-market, our secondary roads, with the primary and the Interstate System. I think consideration should be given to increasing that item for secondary roads.

Mr. FALLON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. It is not anticipated that the rate of construction authorized under this bill would require the levying of any additional taxes?

Mr. FALLON. No, there are no additional taxes required to finance the program for 1962 and 1963.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] for bringing in a very good bill, particularly the section increasing the amount of money for forest trails. I think it is a very wise increase and will be utilized to the best advantage all over the country. I have the honor of representing the district in southern Illinois that has the great Shawnee National Forest. We are increasing our timber activities each year and we hope to be able to make the forest yield more profits from the sale of timber because it not only puts more money in the Federal Treasury but 25 percent of the funds go to local counties in lieu of taxes. Many of the school districts near the Shawnee Forest are having a difficult time getting by because of the loss of tax money due to the large acreage taken from the tax base. The only means of supplementing is from the 25 percent share of revenues from the sale of timber.

The $15 million increase for 2 years in forest trail funds will give us and other national forests a chance to build new access roads in order to expand our timber operations through increased sales. Mr. Chairman, in closing I want to publicly state that it has been a great honor to serve on the Subcommittee on Roads under the distinguished chairmanship of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], and I appreciate his sincere interest and help in providing adequate authorizations for a sound highway program. Thank you.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Maryland for his very fine statement. As usual he is most competent in handling the road legislation. He knows a great deal about this project, and he works very hard on this problem. I might add that it is a great pleasure to work with him. I would like to say also that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], who is the ranking member of the Roads Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, is unable to be here today because of illness and wishes to express his regrets.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, this is a relatively noncontroversial bill with one possible exception, which I will mention in just a few moments.

I, too, want to join in the accolades being paid to our very fine Roads Subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], who has been the champion of this highway program and is the father of the Interstate and Defense Highway Act of 1956. He and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], as the ranking minority member, have done a magnificent job on this bill, acknowledging what the realities are. All of us, obviously, would like to bring before this committee a bill with the full authorization of $975 million, which was contemplated at least in the bill which passed the House in 1956—although that statement of policy was stricken out in conference before the bill was finally passed—that we could bring a bill before the House that would provide for an annual increase of $25 million per year until $1 billion is reached—for the fiscal year 1962 and again an increase of $25 million, meaning $975 million for 1963. But the realities of the situation must be acknowledged. What are those realities? The realities of the situation, and the reason why the authorization for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963 are pinpointed and retained at $925 million, which is the authorization for fiscal years 1960 and 1961, is that there is just not enough money in the trust fund to pay in full the authorizations for the A–B–C system and also for the Interstate System. Also, Congress has failed to provide new revenues to bolster the trust funds. The A–B–C system is calling under this bill for $925 million for 1962 and 1963.

I wish to point out to the committee a very important fact. If there were greater authorizations for the A–B–C system provided for 1962 and 1963, it would have to come out of Interstate System's moneys because the A–B–C system has the first call on the highway trust funds. Therefore, if this authorization had been increased above the $925 million suggested figure, then it would, obviously, have to come out of some other highway program, meaning the Interstate System, because it has second call on the trust fund. Therefore, acknowledging the Interstate System has already been cut back and will be cut back during 1962 and 1963 by about 20 percent as the result of lack of funds coming in and also the increased cost of construction, recognizing that that will be cut about 20 percent, it obviously would make little sense to increase that cut in the Interstate System further by increasing disproportionately above the $925 million the authorizations for the A–B–C system. So those are the facts of life. The administration recommended $900 million in these A–B–C authorizations. The committee ended up with what I thought was a reasonable compromise of $925 million. There were other bills introduced. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] introduced a bill for $975 million. All of us would like to have been able to go along with an authorization of that size, but as I say, the committee acted responsibly and acknowledged the facts of life by accepting a reasonable figure and thus not an unreasonable cut into the Interstate System money.

One reason why we are in this situation in addition to that is that in the 1958 "scare of recession" the Congress made available an additional $400 million for expenditures on the A–B–C system. That is another reason why the trust fund is short of money at the present time. This $400 million expended in 1958, incidentally, means the A–B–C system is actually ahead of the suggested $25 million annual increase schedule today.

Of course, the A–B–C is composed of primary and secondary and urban systems, which are naturally essential. If the Interstate System roads are to be useful, we have to have feeder highways leading to them.

Next year there will be two major significant reports made to the Public Works Committee. They are reports with regard to a safety and use study being made on certain Illinois highways at the present time. That will deal largely with construction. The second report deals with the question of long-range completion of this program, long-range cost and financing of it, and the proper and equitable allocation of costs to the different taxpayers who support this program.

So those two reports will be before the Public Works Committee next year, and at that time we will have another opportunity to take a look at the entire ABC system authorization.

Also, we will look at the Interstate System financing and authorizing problems, and at that time make determination on a long-range basis as to authorizations.

There are a couple of other matters I would like to discuss. The bill authorizes an appropriation of $33 million for 1962 and 1963 for various highways; $3 million for public land highways. The President has recommended that this should, instead of coming out of the general fund, properly come out of the trust fund, in that they are of the same purpose and usage as the primary and secondary road systems. There is no justification for their coming out of the general fund under these circumstances.

There is only one point in controversy in the bill, the question with regard to the committee putting into the bill an additional $5 million in 1962 and an additional $10 million in 1963 for the forest development roads and trails. That amendment, which appears on page 3 of the bill, was made in the full Public Works Committee. It was not approved by a subcommittee, but it was approved by only a two-vote majority in the full committee. The reason why the minority report that is filed, dissenting views, objected to increasing by $15 million the forest development roads and trails for 1962 and 1963 is that we found ourselves in the position of adding $15 million to expenditures, and to that extent budget-busting proposals—$5 million in 1962 and $10 million in 1963, which will mean $15 million expenditures, out of the general fund.

The significant thing is that this is one of the only substantial areas where there was any increase made in authorizations in this bill. The reason why the minority objected to an increase of $15 million is that obviously it comes out of the general fund and not from road user taxes or the trust fund and thus out of the taxpayers' pockets. Secondly, it makes little sense, if we are to have a cutback in the field of primary, secondary, and

urban, as well as interstate roads on the one hand, how can we justify increasing the forest development roads and trails at the same time?

Mr. Chairman, I suggest, then, that so far as this bill is concerned, with that one exception the minority is in wholehearted support of the bill. It is an absolutely essential bill to be passed at this time.

Some may ask why do we put through an authorization bill in 1960 for 1962 and 1963? The reason is that already allocations or allotments of funds are being considered and soon will be made to the States for 1962 so they can do their advance planning for the construction of these highways, for the money that will be available in 1963, and it is essential that the States know now what allocations or allotments will be available for those future years. It is the position of the subcommittee, certainly my position, that we cannot afford to have any holdup on cutback in the A–B–C program; and, as the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee said, this will continue authorizations at the present level, existing under present legislation.

Mr. Chairman, in further explanation, H.R. 10495 continues the division of authorization set forth in previous Federal-aid highway acts as follows: 45 percent for projects under the Federal-aid primary system; 30 percent for projects on the Federal-aid secondary system; 25 percent for projects on extensions of Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems with urban areas.

As usual the bill provides for authorizations for various classifications of Federal highways as follows:

For forest highways, $33 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and $33 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. Increase of $3 million each fiscal year.

For forest development roads and trails, $35 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and $40 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. Increase of $5 million fiscal year 1962; $10 million fiscal year 1963.

For park roads and trails, $18 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and $18 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. Same as fiscal years 1960 and 1961.

For parkways, $16 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and $16 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. Same as fiscal years 1960 and 1961.

For Indian reservation roads and bridges, $12 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and $12 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. Same as fiscal years 1960 and 1961.

For public lands highways, $3 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and $3 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. Same as fiscal years 1960 and 1961.

The attention of every Member of the House is called to the statement of supplemental views appearing in the committee's report, pages 10 to 12.

I trust the bill will be favorably acted upon.

Approximate apportionment of $925,000,000 of Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban highway funds for fiscal year 1963, pursuant to H.R. 10495

[Millions of dollars]

State	Primary ($416.3)	Secondary ($277.5)	Urban ($231.2)	Total ($925.0)
Alabama	8.4	6.5	3.0	17.9
Alaska	22.1	14.8	.1	37.0
Arizona	6.0	4.0	.9	10.9
Arkansas	6.4	5.2	1.3	12.9
California	19.0	9.8	20.5	49.3
Colorado	7.4	5.0	1.9	14.3
Connecticut	2.7	1.4	4.5	8.6
Delaware	2.1	1.4	.4	3.9
Florida	6.5	4.2	4.1	14.8
Georgia	9.7	7.5	3.4	20.6
Hawaii	2.1	1.4	.7	4.2
Idaho	4.7	3.3	.4	8.4
Illinois	15.5	8.4	16.1	40.0
Indiana	9.6	6.6	5.5	21.7
Iowa	9.3	6.9	2.8	19.0
Kansas	9.2	6.5	2.2	17.9
Kentucky	7.3	6.1	2.4	15.8
Louisiana	6.2	4.4	3.4	14.0
Maine	3.2	2.3	1.0	6.5
Maryland	3.7	2.3	3.9	9.9
Massachusetts	5.3	2.0	9.6	16.9
Michigan	12.4	7.6	10.7	30.7
Minnesota	10.4	7.3	3.8	21.5
Mississippi	6.9	5.9	1.3	14.1
Missouri	11.1	7.5	5.7	24.3
Montana	7.7	5.3	.5	13.5
Nebraska	7.6	5.4	1.3	14.3
Nevada	4.6	3.1	.2	7.9
New Hampshire	2.1	1.4	.6	4.1
New Jersey	5.5	1.9	10.1	17.5
New Mexico	6.5	4.5	.8	11.8
New York	19.3	7.6	30.8	57.7
North Carolina	9.9	8.6	3.0	21.5
North Dakota	5.4	3.9	.4	9.7
Ohio	14.1	8.5	13.3	35.9
Oklahoma	8.4	6.1	2.5	17.0
Oregon	6.6	4.6	1.8	13.0
Pennsylvania	16.5	9.9	17.4	43.8
Rhode Island	2.1	1.4	1.6	5.1
South Carolina	5.5	4.5	1.6	11.6
South Dakota	5.8	4.2	.4	10.4
Tennessee	8.5	6.7	3.4	18.6
Texas	25.0	16.7	11.1	52.8
Utah	4.7	3.0	1.0	8.7
Vermont	2.1	1.4	.3	3.8
Virginia	7.6	6.0	3.6	17.2
Washington	6.5	4.4	3.5	14.4
West Virginia	4.3	3.9	1.5	9.7
Wisconsin	9.3	6.5	4.5	20.3
Wyoming	5.0	3.3	.3	8.6
District of Columbia	2.1	1.3	2.0	5.4
Puerto Rico	2.2	2.3	1.9	6.4

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the highway construction authorization bill, H.R. 10495. This is the usual biennial fund authorization for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963 for the Federal-aid highway program and for several classes of Federal domain roads. It is a 2-year authorization and deals with primary and interurban roads. It is felt necessary to authorize funds for 2 fiscal years so that the States may make their plans, arrange for financing these projects, and to allow for the apportionment of these funds in accordance with law for future highway construction.

The authorization for fiscal year 1961 has been $925 million for this program. This authorization which we are now considering provides for identical amounts of $925 million for fiscal years 1962 and the same amount for 1963. Of this amount, 45 percent is available for projects under the Federal-aid primary system; 30 percent for projects under the Federal-aid secondary system, and 25 percent for projects on extensions of Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas.

Mr. Chairman, this A–B–C highway system extends into every county of the United States including both primary and secondary roads, and their extensions within urban areas. There are presently 260,170 miles in the primary system. This includes 237,117 miles in rural areas. The secondary system is by far the largest and consists of 570,399 miles of which over 559,000 are within rural areas. At the present time the total A–B–C highways embrace around 790,000 miles and carry about 48 percent of the total of all highway traffic in this country. With the normal increases in traffic over the next few years it is felt that the authorizations called for in this bill represent a minimum figure needed to keep the program moving at a smooth pace and to try and avoid any possible breakdown in this most vital operation. This pace is however not sufficient to adequately meet the demands of a fast increasing highway traffic.

For the State of Missouri this authorization means that over the next 2 fiscal years there will be allocated the following sums each year for the purposes noted: First, for its primary road system the State of Missouri is allocated the sum of $11.1 million in each of the next 2 fiscal years; second, for its secondary road system the State is allocated for each of the next 2 fiscal years the sum of $7.5 million; and third, for its urban connective road system the allocation for each of the next 2 fiscal years is $7.5 million.

The remainder of my remarks, Mr. Chairman, are directed to a subject close to the heart of those of us who live in the wonderful Ozark Water Wonderland which comprises most of my congressional district—the authorization for forest highways and forest development roads and trails. We who live in this water wonderland amid the great forests of the Ozarks are keenly aware of the vital importance that forest roads and trails play in the proper development and utilization of our forests. I endorse wholeheartedly the proposals in this bill which increase funds for the purpose of building access roads and trails and I congratulate my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Idaho, Congresswoman PFOST, and the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] for offering this amendment while the bill was in committee. Over the past few years funds for this needed project have been somewhat stabilized at a figure of around $30 million. The increases called for in this authorization bill are set at a figure of $5 million in 1962 and at $10 million in 1963. This is a modest sum for the expansion of such a vitally needed service.

It is these access roads, or the lack of them as the case may be, that makes it possible or impossible for our forests to be properly managed. Such important items as the marketing of timber, the distribution of these forest products, salvage cutting, protection from fire, insects and disease are vitally connected to the question of the adequacy of roads within these areas. There is yet an additional phase of this program which is

aided by the building of proper roads—the recreational use of our forest lands.

Mr. Chairman, the long-range objective of this provision in the bill is obvious—to have and maintain a system of roads and trails at a level adequate to make it possible to properly utilize the expected demands of these great forest areas within the Nation. This provision of the bill will indeed enhance the value of both the timber and other resources of our forests. I urge adoption of this bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], father of the interstate highway program, the greatest public works program in the history of the world. Through his leadership in sponsoring a better highway program thousands of lives will be saved, and millions of dollars in property damage.

Mr. Chairman, although I am from the Midwest, and, as you know there are no forests in the city of Chicago, I am familiar with this problem because of being a member of the Committee on Public Works and also a member of the Subcommittee on Roads. From testimony presented I am thoroughly convinced that the moneys we put into forest development roads is not an expenditure but is an investment which is repaid many times over in increased receipts to the Government from the sale of timber.

Again, Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to serve with a gentleman like Mr. FALLON of Maryland.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I yield.

Mr. McFALL. I would like to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his statement on forest roads. I know that he as a long-time member of this committee understands this problem from his long history of distinguished legislative experience. I wish again to commend his statement.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, it has been a privilege to serve during the past 6 years as a member of the Roads Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee under the very able leadership of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]. In my opinion, without any question, Mr. FALLON is the most authoritative highway expert in this body. Under his leadership the Congress of the United States has enacted into law the most important far-reaching interstate highway program that is now making possible a great speedup in the construction of highways throughout the United States in an effort to meet the needs of traffic and to decrease the loss of life. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] has made a great contribution to highway safety in this country and to the more rapid movement of people in suburban and urban areas, from the places where they live to the places where they work. The gentleman from Maryland deserves the commendation of this body and of the citizens of this country.

We have before us today the extension for 2 additional years of the so-called ABC road program which provides Federal aid to State primary and State secondary roads. This in the past has been a noncontroversial program. We are extending it at the same rate that has been previously authorized for the fiscal year 1961, that is, $925 million. This program, of course, requires matching by the States on a 50–50 basis. There has been some discussion of an amendment which was adopted in the committee to increase the funds for forest roads and trails.

Let me say that we have adequate justification for this increase in the testimony of representatives of the Forest Service who came before our committee. Of all the authorizations contained in this bill this is the one authorization upon which there is a specific monetary return to the U.S. Treasury.

During the last year for which statistics are available, the year 1959, the Forest Service testified that we have received from the forests of this country an amount of $122 million. These receipts will be enhanced by proper development of forest roads and trails.

Under the procedure followed by the Forest Service, if they have asked for bids on a national forest selective logging contract, and the bidders have to construct the roads to serve the area which will be logged, then the bidders reduce the amount of their bids by the amount of the cost of building the roads.

If, on the other hand, those roads are available, then the bids are increased by that amount. For that reason this amendment does not represent a net budgetary loss of $5 million in the fiscal year 1962 and $10 million in the fiscal year 1963 because we will have increased returns from those contracts to the Federal Government.

In addition to that, all of those who are familiar with our great national forests know that one of the greatest menaces to our national forests today is forest fires. Hundreds of thousands of acres are lost per year from that great danger. One of the biggest reasons why so many acres are lost is because we have inadequate access roads to get to the place where the fire is burning. Through this increased authorization it will make it possible for our firefighting units to get to those fires sooner and to attack them more rapidly with a greater chance to put them out more quickly, resulting in a great saving in the forests of this country.

I do not think anyone feels more discouraged than someone who goes through the great national forests and sees thousands of acres completely denuded because of the ravages of a forest fire. This will reduce those ravages.

I think the amendment is a desirable one. I supported it in committee, and I intend to support it here on the floor.

I urge approval of H.R. 10495.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Public Roads. I happen to be a member of the Public Works Committee. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] showed me every courtesy when I appeared before his subcommittee in support of the amendment that has just been referred to.

I want to speak briefly in support of the amendment adopted by the committee. In the United States we have 180 million acres of Forest Service land. It is a vast resource which is underdeveloped and not much used at this time. This is spread over approximately 41 States of the Union. In California we have approximately 25 million acres of Forest Service land. In order to bring about proper utilization of our lumber products it is very necessary that we allow adequate funds to provide for these access roads and trails, because there are many areas within our national forests that have not been cut over. It is virgin timber, and it is going to waste. The more we open these forests the more dollars are returned to the Federal Government and the greater this vast resource is protected.

I think the major item that the forest people have to consider is control of disease within the forests, which results in more damage each year than do the fires.

The gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] has pointed out that we have had serious losses due to fire in our national forests. Providing these access roads and providing these trails will give our Forest Service personnel an opportunity to control the diseases within our forests.

I might say also that these access roads are very important to our livestock people. They are very important to our mining people. And today we are trying to provide recreation areas within the national forests to provide for the care of approximately 90 million visitors a year. So I think you can all see that we do have a real job to do in opening up our forests with these access roads and trails.

Now, I think the Congress has been very kind in years past, long before my coming to the Congress, in allowing these necessary appropriations to be increased. During the years 1954, 1956, 1958, and again in 1960 we were and are very much concerned with this item, and we are very much in support of the increase allowed by the full committee. I think when that bill was passed by the full committee, with the amendments in it, there were only one or two objections to it going to the floor in that manner. I want to say that the $5 million authorized as an increase over what was recommended in the initial bill will be available in 1962; the $10 million that was authorized over the authorization will be available in 1963. I know that the Forest Service will do a very good job in presenting a case before the Committee on Appropriations to show that the Federal Government will reap a return upon this investment. I am very happy to say that this is one agency of our Government, under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, that is self-supporting.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. As I understand, the increase of these funds for the forest highways is to implement the sustained yield program in the national parks.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is quite true.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Have not past studies shown that this is only about 50 percent of what we could use in the way of funds to develop in a proper way the national program for national forests sent up from the Agriculture Department last year?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. To the best of my knowledge, I think the Secretary of Agriculture has asked for more than we have asked for here in these particular items.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. And these are very minimal requests for increased appropriations?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes. Based upon past experience, I think these increases are very nominal for the proper development of these great resources.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I will be happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. TABER. It appears to me that there is a general authorization here instead of an authorization for appropriations out of the trust fund which was created by the act of, I think, 1956. What does the gentleman think about that?

Mr. ROBISON. If the gentleman would permit me, I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that the title specifically provides—and I stand to be corrected by the chairman of our subcommittee if I am wrong—"for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code." I believe that incorporates the 1956 Highway Act. Of course, that would be the governing factor as to where the money comes from, and that 1956 act specifically provides that A–B–C moneys shall come from the trust fund. I ask the gentleman from Maryland if that is not correct.

Mr. FALLON. That is true. It specifically says in section 3 that the money that comes for the development of forest roads—that category of roads—comes from section 101, title 23 of the United States Code. And that comes out of the general fund.

Mr. CRAMER. And that is the same procedure that has been followed in the past?

Mr. FALLON. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. Those specific categories coming out of the general fund?

Mr. FALLON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, reserving my objections to the committee amendment that has already been discussed, I rise in support of H.R. 10495, and I commend the contents of the committee report and the supplemental views of certain minority members, in which I joined, to the study of my colleagues.

There is no need for me to take the further time of this committee in outlining again the problems we faced and the conclusions we reached. In arriving at the compromise that we have, our committee has again indicated its full awareness of the fact that this vast Federal-aid highway program, which got under way in 1956, is the single most important public works program not only in the history of this Nation but in the history of the world as well.

I was not a Member of this body in 1956, so I do not share with many of my senior colleagues on our committee in the responsibility for justifying the decision to undertake a program of this magnitude. However, I do fully share with them, and with you all, in the responsibility for doing all within our power to insure that the dream thus expressed is brought to its full fruition. If we are able to do so, all the objectivity, wisdom, and willingness to rise above petty politics we possess will be required of us. I hope we will not be found lacking, and the fact that there was this year the self-evident desire to search out the reasonable compromise that H.R. 10495 truly represents is a most encouraging sign.

Mention is made in the report, and has been made on the floor today, concerning the various reports that we will have for consideration next year. The arrival of these long-awaited studies presages long and exhaustive work on the part of our committee when the 87th Congress convenes. In the course of that work, I feel I must also say that I most sincerely hope that the question of reimbursement of those several States, like my native State of New York, that have contributed mileage built at their own expense to the Interstate System without just compensation therefor will be fully explored. I have introduced H.R. 7512 in this Congress, seeking to reestablish the equitable principle of eventually making such reimbursement. There are other bills before our committee presenting various other approaches to this same problem. I now know it is unlikely that there will be action on any of them this year, and in view of the broader base of information we will have before us next year to act upon, perhaps it is just as well. It is interesting to note, however, that in the early days of the program there was almost unanimous committee support for the principle of such reimbursement, and that it has only been as our basic financial problem has been steadily magnified that such support has dwindled away. Thus, I must say again, that I would hope we will not eventually permit the cost of doing equity to blind us to the principle of equity. I realize that there is ample room for dispute over the method of reimbursement as well as over the principle itself, but all that we ask and all we can expect, who believe we are right on this proposition, is to have our cause fairly presented and fully considered.

Before closing, I too, would like to say a word about our chairman of the Roads Subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON. It is not for me to intervene in any way in the decision to be reached by the people of his party in the district he so ably represents. However, I think it is proper for me to express my hope that they will afford him the opportunity of returning to office this year because, in my judgment, our committee has need of his experience, his fairness, his judgment, and his capabilities.

I have been a member of this committee for 3 years now, and I feel I would also be remiss if I did not express my appreciation of what a privilege that has been. I wish to also congratulate and commend the staff of our committee, including its able chief clerk, Mrs. Margaret E. Beiter; the chief counsel, Mr. Richard J. Sullivan; the diligent minority counsel, Mr. Robert F. McConnell; our splendid engineer-consultant, Mr. Joseph R. Brennan; and the members of our clerical staff. Without their help and assistance I am certain that the committee would not be able to function as well as it now does.

I urge the passage of H.R. 10495.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my colleagues in commending the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads, Mr. GEORGE FALLON, for the very excellent work he has performed in committee on the bill before us for consideration today. It has been my privilege to serve on the Public Works Committee for the past 2 years, and I have had an opportunity to work closely with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], the chairman of the subcommittee, and have personal knowledge of his dedicated service. He was extremely courteous to me when I appeared before his subcommittee in behalf of an increase in funds for forest roads and trails, and he has always been most helpful on other committee matters. He is a conscientious chairman and a very able member of the committee. I wish to compliment him at this time.

Mr. Chairman, there has long been a need in this country for a well-rounded road and trail development program for the approximately 181 million acres of forests managed by the Government.

The committee has been generous in the past by providing authorizations for increasing amounts, and today the bill before the House carries an amendment that would make additional funds available for such projects. The amendment would boost the funds from $30 to $35 million for fiscal 1962 and from $30 to $40 million for fiscal 1963. These funds represent a sound business investment for the Government. Receipts from timber

sales which would be made accessible by such roads would more than offset the additional funds provided for in the amendment.

My district—the First District of Idaho—until Alaska was admitted to statehood, contained more national forests than any other congressional district. It has long been recognized by Forest Service officials that the access road problem in the northern part of Idaho is very acute.

For many years, the harvesting of timber was limited to the most accessible and better stands. These were heavily cut. Since most of the lower elevation lands are not in the national forests, but rather are privately owned, they were not cut under sustained yield.

Today, as Members of Congress know, the demands for timber are steadily increasing. Science has given to wood and its byproducts hundreds of new uses in our everyday world. But lack of proper roads and trails has limited the timber harvest.

In north Idaho, there are 6.8 million acres of national forests with a sustained yield allowable cut of 600 million board feet annually. Last year only 370 million board feet were harvested, or only about 60 percent of the allowable cut.

The same story of—shall we call it—underproduction, also prevailed in the southern part of Idaho, which is in region 4 of the Forest Service. There are 13½ million acres with a sustained yield cut of 330 million board feet there. Last year, these forests marketed 240 million board feet of timber, or approximately two-thirds of the allowable cut.

Thus, I think that it can easily be seen that a substantial increase can be effected in the amount of timber marketed with the right kind of roads and trails. In Idaho, alone, Treasury revenues could be increased by more than $3 million annually by providing necessary access roads in the national forests.

I might give as another example Clearwater National Forest. This area has an allowable cut of 170 million board feet, of which only 60 percent was marketed last year. On this forest, the Government constructed only 5.4 miles of roads in 1959. This forest has 735 miles of roads in it, but to complete the road system a total of 6,900 miles will be required.

Only about 10 percent of the Clearwater Forest road needs have been met so far. At the present rate, I think that it will take decades to do the necessary road development work.

I might also mention, Mr. Chairman, that a recent survey showed that there is 25 million board feet of cull trees in our north Idaho forests. These old growth forests should be opened and, under sustained yield, converted to healthy forests. This same situation is true over most of Idaho.

Then, too, we should keep in mind that the new Government-built access roads would help smaller lumber companies to obtain timber contracts in competitive bidding with large corporations. At the present time, roadbuilding costs often prevent small companies from even submitting their bids.

This is the dollar-and-cents side of the ledger, and I think the figures are all in favor of carrying out the program as amended. There is also the other and, perhaps, equally important side of the picture, which must be kept in mind.

The new access roads, for example, would benefit farmers and ranchers in transporting their 6 million head of livestock to national forest ranges. They would greatly aid forest firefighters in putting out blazes which annually burn out more than 200,000 acres of valuable timber in the Nation.

And the new roads would open up tourist attractions in the wonderful mountain fastnesses for vacation-minded America to enjoy. The Forest Service tells me that some 81.5 million Americans use our national forests for recreation every year. And this figure is increasing from year to year.

I hope that Members of this body will approve the amendment. Keep in mind that the cost of the roads will be self-liquidating and thus there will be no real expense to the taxpayers. They represent a good, solid investment for Uncle Sam in the country's expanding future.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. PFOST. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. I want to congratulate the very able gentlewoman from Idaho on her fine statement. I also want to congratulate the committee and its chairman [Mr. FALLON] for coming before us with this excellent bill. I am particularly pleased with the increase in funds for roads and trails. In my opinion, this is an exercise in real statesmanship in the administration of our forest lands.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of the 22 Members for whom my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], spoke when he appeared earlier this year before the Public Works Committee and asked for the increased authorizations for forest roads and trails which it is now proposed to delete from the committee's bill. My interest in this problem is very real. There are more than 9 million acres of national forest in my district. I also think it is fair to say that I have a certain amount of experience with regard to the problems concerning forest roads and trails and of the need for a more adequate program in this regard.

We asked the committee to authorize $40 million for fiscal 1962 and $50 million for fiscal 1963. Even this, you will recognize, is short of the annual investment of $60 million which would be required for full implementation of the program for the national forests. We were pleased, naturally, when the committee recommended an increase, though it was somewhat smaller than we had asked. It is now proposed to eliminate even this increase. Let me furnish you with five solid reasons for keeping these funds in the bill.

First. Increased forest roads and trails are needed to make timber sales more efficient, more competitive, more democratic, and more profitable to the Government. Timber sales from the national forests are not up to desirable or programed levels and a major reason for this fact—which, I would point out, results in the wasting of these public resources—is the inadequacy of access road facilities. Furthermore, the result of increasing dependence on timber purchasers for construction of access roads is not to save the Government money, but to cost it money. Experience shows that only the largest purchasers can and will bid on combined road-and-timber proposals and this means that usually only one bid is received. The resulting lack of competition means more cost for the roads and less revenue from the timber sales. And most important, to my mind, is the fact that this practice tends to freeze out the smaller timber buyers—a tendency which is contrary to our established policy and tradition of giving small business a fair break.

Let me cite several examples from my own district. One sale of 97 million board feet was appraised for $1,768,000. Road costs were estimated at $824,000 or about half the value of the timber itself. It is not surprising to note that there was only one bidder at this sale and that it was sold under auction at the appraised price.

In another sale of 91 million board feet, the appraised price was $1,808,000. Road costs were $385,000 and again there was only one bidder with a sale at the appraised price.

A third sale involved 54 million board feet with an appraised price of $1,174,000. The road was estimated to cost $234,000. Needless to say, there was only one bidder.

These examples reflect a general situation. In sales running between 10 million and 25 million board feet, the average cost of roads was $93,000 compared to an average appraised price for the timber of $178,000. The average bid price of these sales was $272,000, or a 53 percent increase over the appraised price. In the next larger class with sales running between 25 million and 50 million board feet, the average cost of roads rose to $178,000 per sale. The average appraised price was $319,000. The average bid price was $444,000, or a 39 percent increase over the appraised price. In sales involving more than 50 million board feet, the difference between appraised and bid price narrows with extreme rapidity. At the same time, the number of bidders is generally reduced to one per sale.

These examples demonstrate a number of serious shortcomings in private purchaser construction of the more expensive type of access roads. All such roads require larger sales, but when such sales are made, competition is greatly lessened. The result is the loss to the Government of financial increments accruing through a possible higher price for timber and a possibly lower bid for the construction of the roads.

Another sale of 21 million board feet adequately demonstrates this conclusion. The timber was appraised at $468,000 while road construction costs were esti-

mated at only $27,000. On this sale, there were three bidders and the timber was sold for $525,000. In other words, the Government received $57,000 over the appraised price.

Thus, when sales are of such a size that actual bidding is possible, the price received represented the lowest price for road construction and the highest price for timber. But such sales can only be made if the Forest Service is allowed to build the more expensive roads.

Second. Increased forest roads and trails are necessary to keep the national forests on a basis of financial self-sufficiency. If use for nonreimbursable purposes continues to grow—as we know it will and as we want it to—increasing revenues from the sale of renewable resources will be essential to pay the cost. More adequate access facilities are needed to make possible the normal growth of those revenues and the increases recommended by the committee are a necessary step toward that goal.

Third. More adequate forest roads and trails means savings both in the cost of fighting forest fires and in reduction of timber losses which stem from such fires. It has been estimated that the total cost of forest fires on the national forests—in terms of damage and in terms of expenditures to fight them—amounted to about $70 million last year. Better access road systems cut the costs of fire-fighting and make the job more efficient, thus saving the Government money on both counts.

Fourth. Increasing recreational use of the national forests means greater needs in terms of access roads. Visits to these forests have more than doubled in the last 5 years, from 40 million persons in 1955 to an expected 81 million this year. This is an encouraging and wonderful thing. Recreation is one of the important uses of this public resource. But, obviously, this increased use requires increased access facilities and only if we provide the necessary roads and trails can the full benefit of our national forests be enjoyed by all of the people who want to do so. After all, Mr. Chairman, the national forests belong to the people and they should be available to the people.

Fifth. Finally, increased revenues from the renewable resources of the national forests will mean increased revenues flowing to local government and to meet such needs as those which are so pressing in education. Again, the basic fact is that expenditures on our national forests represent an investment and one of the best investments which we can make. This, as I have tried briefly to show, is particularly true of expenditures on forest roads and trails.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to a member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the bill H.R. 10495 and also to compliment our chairman on the effective way he has presented this bill to our committee, and also the members of the committee. I wish at the same time to state that the funds provided for forest roads and trails by the Public Roads Committee result from the effective factual presentation made by one of our colleagues, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

I need not detain you further with these remarks concerning a man whom we know and respect as a conservation leader in our Nation.

It was in early January before the Congress had even convened that LEE METCALF started to work on this vital element of the road bill. I say to my colleagues, LEE METCALF constantly stresses that these forest roads bring development to the forest areas in the 40 States that have national forests. LEE METCALF proved effectively that these forest roads are a key to helping private enterprise and small business to work together with our Government in the development of our natural resources.

Mr. Chairman, I wish at this time to put in the RECORD a telephone conversation I had with LEE METCALF stating he is supporting the highway bill. This was a telephone conversation to me from Montana this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STATEMENT OF HON. LEE METCALF ON H.R. 10495, FEDERAL HIGHWAY ACT OF 1960

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 10495, the Federal Highway Act of 1960, as reported. I was among those appearing before the Committee on Public Works urging an increase in the amounts authorized for forest roads and trails. As you know, the committee increased the authorization from $30 million a year to $35 million for fiscal 1962 and to $40 million for fiscal 1963.

This item will provide roads needed for timber management, fire and disease control, watershed development and management and recreation.

The budgets of the past few years have not permitted progress in timber sales. Montana national forests have an allowable cut of 825 million board feet. In the past few years, an average of less than 50 percent of the allowable cut has been sold. The major reason is the lack of access roads to this timber.

There are two ways to build these roads. One is by direct appropriation. The other is by the timber purchaser, who then deducts the estimated cost of road construction from the price paid for public timber.

When timber purchasers build these roads, public timber is sold in large blocks—too large for a small or medium-sized operator to handle. Then there is generally only one bid—at the appraised price, minus the estimated cost of the road.

The taxpayers stand to benefit, in cash on the timber, by having several bidders. They stand to benefit by having the main line road built under separate contract, bid upon by road builders, for experience shows that the road builders generally offer to do the job for 10 to 20 percent less than the engineers' estimated cost.

These large sales make it impossible for the smaller operators to secure timber. Since estimated cost of a road built by a timber operator is deducted from the price he pays for the timber, this means less return to the Public Treasury from a public resource and, in turn, less money for the rural school and road systems in the counties in which the forests are located. As you know, these counties share in the income from the national forests. In addition, road construction by timber purchasers is outside the control of Congress.

We lose all around when we don't appropriate the money for forest development roads. We lose millions of board feet of timber, deteriorating in inaccessible areas. We spend large sums, and risk the lives of parachuting firefighters, to control fires in these roadless areas. Smaller firms cannot buy timber if they are also burdened with expensive road construction, so they fold. The fewer the bidders, the lower the price the public gets for its timber. Road construction by the purchaser shuts out the road contractors and the union labor they employ.

The statement in the minority report on this bill that this increase is "primarily for the benefit of some big lumber companies" demonstrates abysmal ignorance of the integral part these roads play in the development, management, and use of our public forests. In fact, this program is opposed by the big timber companies because they oppose development and growth of small and medium-sized firms such as two recent new industries which have come to Montana—the new lodge pole mills at Phillipsburg and White Sulphur. These mills, operated by experienced small timbermen from Oregon, are in Montana because of our rich supply of timber, made available as a result of past actions by Democratic Congresses in increasing funds authorized for timber development.

I plead with the House to support its committee which stated: "Every cent invested in timber access roads * * * returns in full the investment made by the Federal Government."

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minues to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER].

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I can attest from my own professional experience as a forester that money put into road construction in the national forests will certainly bring back much more both in the form of forest products and in other uses of the forest than we would ever put into the course of construction. Therefore, to me this is fundamentally an investment in something worthwhile that will produce revenue for the Government and for the people in general.

In connection with the general road-building program, my State of Vermont is a State that has very few people, but a great number of miles of roads to build on a per capita basis. For that reason, our costs are high and we have a lot of trouble building those roads. I would like to ask the gentleman from Maryland about the percentage of contributions by the Federal Government for the primary and secondary system. I notice there is going to be a review of the program starting in January of next year. Does the gentleman from Maryland believe that the percentage paid by the Federal Government might be increased? I know that this would help a State such as mine very much. Starting in January of next year, does the gentleman from Maryland believe that consideration would be given to raising the percentage of contribution by the Federal Government for the primary and secondary systems because in States like mine we have a great deal of trouble raising our share of funds?

Mr. FALLON. It may well be brought out in the hearings and study that our committee will start in January of 1961.

But I cannot guarantee to the gentleman that there would be any change unless the hearings would justify such a change.

Mr. MEYER. I would like to ask the gentleman if, in the consideration of this in the future, some weight would be given to my remarks because I know it would help a State like Vermont a great deal if the percentage of the Federal contribution is raised.

Mr. FALLON. I can say to the gentleman from Vermont, when the hearings start, if the gentleman would apply to testify before the committee, we would be delighted to hear him as we have heard all other Members who have wanted to testify.

Mr. MEYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CLEM MILLER].

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues in support of this legislation, H.R. 10495, and particularly those sections providing for forest roads and trails. We are asking for a modest increase here. Ample studies have been conducted over the past years by this body and the other body, which indicate that the level of expenditures for forest roads should amount to approximately $60 million a year while we are only seeking $35 million here—and it should continue to rise within 5 years to approximately $90 million a year. All of this money would be more than repaid by the timber users. It has been emphasized that there is a benefit from the point of view of timber sales, fire and insect control. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] spoke so eloquently in behalf of this bill, it should be noted that there are benefits for the people of Illinois. The people of Illinois come to our forests and use them. These forest roads are not just for timber sales, insect and fire control. They are also available for recreational uses for the people of the entire United States. I can attest to the fact that the automobiles in my congressional district summer after summer from outside the State of California far outnumber the local automobiles. Therefore, the increase for forest roads is of tremendous importance to those in the urban areas as well as those who have national forests in our districts. This increase in the forest roads and trails should be supported by Congressmen representing urban districts as well as by those of us who represent districts containing national forests. They stand to gain just as much or more for their citizens as we do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I have in mind a proposal which would amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to federally assisted highway programs, to provide that we retain the concept of direct routes between principal metropolitan areas referred to in section 103(d) of that title, but at the same time would require that, wherever practicable, such federally assisted highways must preserve or increase to the maximum extent possible established historical, residential, and property values.

I have long been interested in this subject, having become concerned with the preservation of a number of historic sites and buildings in New Jersey, including Morristown National Historical Park and the Ford Mansion there which was Gen. George Washington's winter headquarters for his New York campaign.

The situation is so bad in Morristown, N.J., that at one point Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks directed the U.S. Commissioner of Public Roads to give his personal attention to the Route 202 issue in that lovely New Jersey city.

In a letter made public at the time by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], Secretary Weeks said he had discussed the present alinement across property of Washington's headquarters with the Bureau of Public Roads in an effort to secure an alinement, and I quote, "which will minimize property damage and, if possible, eliminate any encroachment on a national park."

The letter declared that the National Park Service was firmly opposed to the proposal of the New Jersey State Highway Department which would cut off two triangles from the Morristown National Historical Park.

The National Park Service proposed, instead, that the new highway be taken out of Morristown altogether.

The Director of the National Park Service, Conrad L. Wirth, wrote as follows:

> We oppose this plan on the basis of its justifiable distraction from historic park features that were associated with the very birth and recognition of this country as a Nation.
>
> We cannot concur in the present State plans and must disapprove the use of Federal lands under our jurisdiction for highway purposes.
>
> I am certain that in the long run the people of New Jersey and the country as a whole would be better served if the new highway could bypass entirely the historic town of Morristown.

National Park Director Conrad Wirth, according to reports published in the newspapers in New Jersey also urged that consideration be given to alternate routes completely removed from the site and features of Morristown National Historical Park as well as the historic town setting which surrounds them.

These reports have been published in newspapers in New Jersey such as the Morristown Daily Record which have been made available to me by Mayor J. Raymond Manahan of Morristown. Here I read from one of these reports:

> TRENTON.—State Highway Commissioner Dwight R. G. Palmer was skeptical when asked last night about the decision of the National Park Service not to allow the highway to touch the historical park.
>
> "How much of Washington's Headquarters is hallowed ground," he snapped. "Washington didn't sleep out on the lawn every night."
>
> Palmer, frankly critical of the Park Service's action, said he was confident our legislative representatives in Washington will defer to the judgment of the highway department and the bureau of roads in the alinement of FAI 104.
>
> He said the department would not ask for an act of Congress to get the road across the property but indicated there would be no barrier to taking (George Washington) school grounds.
>
> He said if the highway is placed outside of town, "We'll have to cut the heart out of the town with a feeder road."
>
> "I feel certain," he concluded, "that once this circus is over, the populace will commend us for our action."

Another newspaper story from the Morristown Daily Record is headlined "Route 202 Due To Go Through Town—Little Chance of Any Change in Line Seen," and it goes as follows:

> TRENTON—State Highway Commissioner Dwight R. G. Palmer and a top aid told 150 people from Morristown and vicinity yesterday that though the new FAI 104 (Route 202) was not yet finalized as going through Morristown, that is exactly where it will go in all probability.
>
> At a hearing on the new road, Palmer and Chief Engineer Otto Fritchie answered objections, principally from Morristownians, and indicated (1) the Federal Bureau of Roads requires that the highway go where traffic is the greatest; and (2) traffic is greatest in Morristown.
>
> Mayor J. Raymond Manahan, spokesman for the Morristown group, declared that local citizens are "fighting for their residential lives" and warned that if the route goes through town, "we will be a deserted village."
>
> Lawrence B. Howell, president of the board of trustees of the Washington Association, which operates Washington's Headquarters, Dr. Francis Ronalds, coordinating superintendent of the parks, and Harvey Cornell, of the National Park Service, which owns the land, all opposed the route.
>
> Dr. Ronalds said quietly: "To me, it's a horror."
>
> Former Mayor W. Parsons Todd called the alinement "extremely unfortunate."

I include here, as part of my remarks, a letter under date of May 3, 1960, from Mayor Manahan of Morristown transmitting the newspaper articles from which I have been quoting:

> TOWN OF MORRISTOWN, N.J.,
> *May 3, 1960.*
>
> Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
> *House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR FRANK: In reply to your communication of April 29, 1960, concerning Mr. Palmer's remarks in connection with the Morristown National Historical Park, I am forwarding to you a scrapbook which contains all of the press releases concerning the proposed new highway. I have specifically marked a page which carries the story of Mr. Palmer's remarks questioning the amount of land that could be termed "hallowed ground." I will forward additional information to you in the near future.
>
> When you have completed your research with the scrapbook, would you please arrange to have it returned to me.
>
> With kind personal regards, I am,
> Yours very truly,
> J. RAYMOND MANAHAN,
> *Mayor.*

In a recent newsletter of mine I praised New Jersey State Highway Commissioner Dwight R. G. Palmer, who is certainly one of the ablest men in New Jersey and, indeed, in the Nation. There has been no scandal in New Jersey's highway building program, and this program is certainly a model for other States. However, I felt constrained to point out that Commissioner Palmer has made very clear his utter lack of concern with the dwindling number of historic

sites and buildings in New Jersey, and his determination to encroach upon the Morristown National Historical Park.

The Newark Evening News of April 27, 1960, carried a story from United Press International which reported that Commissioner Palmer had said there was not a single example to back up my newsletter statement.

I have, therefore, read from these newspaper articles on the situation at Morristown and let the facts speak for themselves.

This lack of interest and concern in historic structures is shocking. A nation with no regard for its past will have little future worth remembering. The Reader's Digest in January 1959 warned that "studies indicate that at least 25 percent of the finest historic and architectural monuments that existed in the United States in 1941 have been destroyed."

The Reader's Digest article, which was authored by Blake Clark, one of its senior editors, reported that the concrete cloverleaf is fast becoming our national flower, and warned that "many communities may not attempt to save their historic places until it is too late." This magazine, which is to be commended for its interest in historic preservation, added that "In the next few years 41,000 miles of new highways will charge through some of our last surviving wilderness areas, through major cities, along historic old roadways."

It is my sincere belief that the Congress must deal with this problem now, before it is too late.

I now turn to a quite similar situation facing the people of the District of Columbia.

Here, by reason of pressures from the Federal Highway Administrator, controlling 90 percent of the funds that would be used, the District of Columbia is presently making surveys and other preparations for construction of an $111 million freeway on a routing generally known as the Wisconsin Avenue corridor between Pooks Hill in Maryland and the Inner Loop. This Northwest Freeway—to be designated route 70–S—has been declared undesirable by a majority of the District Commissioners and the Chief of the District Highway Department and is deemed unnecessary by the engineering consultant to the mass transportation survey. The Maryland State Roads Commissioner has also declared his opposition to this route. If actually constructed, this route would, according to the Nothwest Committee for Transportation Planning, of Washington, D.C. (a) cost the Government—Federal, District of Columbia, and Maryland—more money than the alternative route proposed by the District and Maryland highway departments; (b) permanently harm many premium residential areas of Northwest Washington, Chevy Chase, and Bethesda; (c) permanently harm many primary educational and charitable institutions, including Woodrow Wilson High School, Sidwell Friends School, the Washington Home for Incurables, Phoebe Hearst Elementary School, Dumbarton College, and Our Lady of Lourdes School; (d) deface the valuable park facitilities through which it will pass, including Fort Reno Park, Melvin C. Hazen Park, Glover-Archbold Park, and Rock Creek Park; and (e) increase the tax burden of residents of the District of Columbia by condemnation of a minimum of $22.4 million of property bearing an assessed valuation for tax purposes of at least $8 million.

At this point I would like to quote a paragraph or two from an April 29, 1960, survey of the Northwest Freeway controversy prepared by the Northwest Committee for Transportation Planning:

> The proposed link for Interstate Route 70–S is being pushed over the unanimous opposition of citizens' associations representing the residential areas through which it would pass, and in spite of the fact that the official engineering studies indicate that such a route is not needed. Expert opinion is agreed that the route will not solve traffic congestion problems in the Northwest. Most of the experts called by the Joint Senate and House Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems (Bible committee), which studied the mass transportation survey, testified that a rapid rail transit system such as that being proposed for Washington in the Bible bill (S. 3193) will make any such freeway unnecessary.
>
> The Northwest Freeway received its original impetus from the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council, Harland Bartholomew (NCPC) and Donald E. Gingery (NCRPC), who succeeded in having these bodies overrule the advice of their engineering consultants to the extent of including the freeway in the "Transportation Plan—National Capital Region" submitted by the President to Congress in July 1959. Public opposition to the freeway, expert testimony before the Bible committee in November 1959 against the "auto-dominant" features of the transportation plan, and the route's inherent engineering drawbacks persuaded the District of Columbia Commissioners to maintain their previously expressed opposition to the Northwest Freeway as the Route 70–S link. District Highway Director Harold Aitken therefore initiated cost studies for the route recommended by the engineering consultants to the NCPC. This route would bring Route 70–S to the Inner Loop via the B. & O. Railroad right-of-way and the area of Sixth Street NW. At this stage, however, Bertram D. Tallamy, the Federal Highway Administrator, intervened and announced that he would only approve a route down the Wisconsin Avenue corridor so that the District of Columbia Government is now placed in the dilemma of either submitting plans for a route it does not want or else forfeiting a multimillion-dollar grant from the highway trust fund.

Commenting publicly on the Wisconsin Avenue corridor, which is being forced on Washington because of what the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star calls "the dictatorial decision of the Bureau of Public Roads," Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, has publicly declared that—

> It seems to me that as far as possible the routing of a link of the Interstate System through a city—and particularly the Capital City—should cure a blight rather than create one. Offhand, it is my opinion that any overhead throughway similar to the Whitehurst Freeway, if run through a good residential section, would blight the property on both sides to a serious degree.
>
> On the other hand, it seems to me that if the route should go through an area which is marked for redevelopment or slum clearance, to the extent that the construction results in clearance and improvement, a second benefit will flow from the money expended.
>
> And, at the same time, an overhead freeway through a well-developed residential section would seem to be more costly than acquiring the right-of-way through an area marked for reconstruction.

And then the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who is ranking minority member of the Senate Public Works Committee, made the following statement which is the basis for the amendment which I have offered:

> I recognize that the Bureau of Public Roads in passing upon route proposals must operate within the directive of the laws relating to the Interstate System—in this instance, perhaps noting particularly that relating to a "direct route." However, if it should be demonstrated that greater benefits from the Federal dollar spent would result by deviating from the shortest line concept, it should not be too difficult to pass authorizing legislation where the Nation's Capital is concerned.
>
> We have to recognize that if the taxable valuations within Washington are reduced by elimination of or injury to well-developed areas, the pressure increases on Congress to make a larger annual payment to the District. So, it could be that although the cost to the highway trust fund might be less on the shortest route possible, the ultimate cost to the Federal Treasury might not be.

I have discussed my amendment with the Assistant General Counsel of the Bureau of Public Roads, R. L. May, who advised me that it is consistent with the general policy of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads. In addition, he called my attention to the last sentence of the last paragraph of subsection B, section 101, title 23—Public Law 85–767—which reads as follows:

> It being the intent that local needs to the extent practicable, suitable, and feasible shall be given equal consideration with the needs of interstate commerce.

It is high time that greater attention was given to this significant sentence by all public officials concerned with the Federal highway program and here I refer to the State highway officials as well as the officials in charge of the program at the national level.

In a number of highly important acts, the Congress has spelled out our Nation's policy of preserving and protecting historic American buildings and sites for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States.

State and Federal highway officials should take a cram course in these enactments.

America's history is of growing concern to our people, and unless the present course is altered, and altered drastically, we may soon find that there is none of it left standing in visible form.

Carl Sandburg, Lincoln scholar, poet, and philosopher, has summed it up brilliantly in these words in his book, "Remembrance Rock"—

> If America forgets where she came from, if the people lose sight of what brought them along, if she listens to the deniers and mockers, then will begin the rot and the dissolution.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the members of the submittee for the fine cooperation shown me in writing this bill. Particularly I would

like to compliment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], who is unable to be here today, for his fine cooperation and contribution to the legislation that comes out of our committee at all times.

I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Federal Highway Act of 1960".

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title 23 of the United States Code the following sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated:

(1) For the Federal-aid primary system and the Federal-aid secondary system and for their extension within urban areas, $925,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and $925,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. The sums authorized in this paragraph for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(A) 45 per centum for projects under the Federal-aid primary system;

(B) 30 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid secondary system;

(C) 25 per centum for projects on extensions of Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas.

(2) For forest highways, $33,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and $33,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963.

(3) For forest development road and trails, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963.

(4) For park roads and trails, $18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and $18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963.

(5) For parkways, $16,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and $16,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963.

(6) For Indian reservation roads and bridges, $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963.

(7) For public lands highways, $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purposes of section 2 of this Act each of the following terms shall have the same meaning as is given it in section 101 of title 23 of the United States Code:

(1) Forest development roads and trails;
(2) Forest highway;
(3) Indian reservation roads and bridges;
(4) Park roads and trails;
(5) Parkway;
(6) Public lands highways;
(7) Federal-aid primary system;
(8) Federal-aid secondary system;
(9) Urban area.

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 23

SEC. 4. (a) Subsection (c) of section 129 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "under prior Acts".

(b) The first sentence of section 203 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "Funds now authorized" and inserting in lieu thereof "Funds authorized".

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that committee amendments 1 and 2 be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read committee amendments 1 and 2, as follows:

Page 2, beginning on line 16, after the word "trails," strike out "$30,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$35,000,000".

Page 2, beginning on line 17, after the word "and" strike out "$30,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$40,000,000".

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to labor the point. I discussed it in general debate, but there is a difference of opinion with regard to the inclusion of an additional $5 million for forest development roads and trails for the fiscal year 1962, which is amendment number one, and $10 million increase, from $30 million to $40 million, both amendments being considered en bloc. That means an increased general fund expenditure in the amount of $15 million over a 2-year period.

Where does this money come from? This comes from the general fund; from the taxpayers' pockets. Let us not have any doubt about that fact, about these amendments, which will increase the 1962 budget by $5 million and the 1963 budget by $10 million. So we are talking about general funds authorization in the amount of $15 million.

Let me briefly mention the latest increases that have been made with regard to forest development roads and trails. Let me say at the outset there is no one who is more in favor of the proper and necessary development of forest highways and trails and who realizes better the benefits that come from them. But I pose this question: Are those benefits any greater than those flowing from the A–B–C system? Are they any greater than the benefits from the Interstate System, that will save 3,500 lives when completed? Of course, if we are going to appropriate an additional $15 million, then you go to the further question, if we are going to authorize that much more money, could we not justify just as well or better the spending of that amount on the A–B–C system or on the Interstate System, if we are going to spend more money out of the general fund?

So I think that question has to be answered; and my reply to it, so far as I am concerned, looking at the equities of the situation, looking at the financial problem and being dedicated to a balanced budget, and with regard to this forest highway problem, and recognizing the value of the arguments of those who proposed the amendment, that this is in effect a self-liquidating highway construction phase of the matter which, of course, to some extent may be true, but we still get back to the same result, that it means an increase of $15 million in appropriations.

It has been suggested that these highways have earned $122 million through the cutting of timber, and so forth, recreation, and what have you, $122 million last year. I do not know how much net that is; that, apparently, is the gross; I do not see any testimony in the hearings as to what the net earnings have been, or whether that has been taken into consideration.

Let me trace what the authorizations have been in the past years, what the increases have been, and then you can perhaps better decide whether or not this authorization as proposed by the subcommittee is warranted. The subcommittee did not make these increases. The subcommittee retained the funds of $30 million a year and did it because it was of necessity having to keep the A-B-C system on the present authorization of $925 million a year. As a matter of fact, of necessity, last year there was also a cutback of $400 million in the Interstate System from $2.2 billion to $1.8 billion. Recognizing realities, we went along with present authorizations, but the subcommittee did the same thing with regard to forest development roads and trails.

In 1954 and 1955 Congress authorized $22.5 million for these forest development roads and trails. In 1956–57 it went up to $24 million. In 1958–59 it went up to $27 million. In 1960–61 it went up to $30 million. So there has been an increase of one-third in this between 1954 and 1960.

Again, in 1958, in the so-called Recession Act there was an increase of an additional $5 million.

What is being proposed is an increase over and above that one-third increase over the last 6 years for an additional increase of $15 million: $5 million in 1962, and $10 million in 1963; or, in effect, nearly a 100-percent increase to $40 million in 1963 over $22.5 million in 1965.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. McFALL. Would not the gentleman agree, however, that the increase in the budget that he spoke of is an illusory one in view of the fact that every time the amount has been increased in this manner the money has come back to the Treasury through receipts from the timber that has been sold, sufficient money to cover the entire increase? And the gentleman, I think, would agree that that would be the case this time as well.

Mr. CRAMER. I say to the gentleman that probably there would be some increased money in return. There is nothing however, in 1961 to show what proportion of the additional expenditure would come back in net earnings to the Federal Government which incidentally go into the general fund.

The point is it actually means an increase in appropriation to the amount of $15 million, and at this time I do not think it is justified.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last

word and rise in support of the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that every dollar we are asking for here will be more than repaid to the Federal Government. I think the Federal Government at the present time is spending much more than we are asking in allowing these funds to come from the timber receipts, the actual sales of timber. They are setting aside so much of the funds today for the construction of these roads for the operator who is the successful bidder, and he himself constructs these roads.

The more we open up these forests with the funds we are requesting in the way of access roads, the more we provide in the way of multiple benefits to the forests themselves. I think we have only to look at one benefit, and that is the competition that takes place in connection with the bidding for this timber, because approximately 95 percent of the receipts of the Forest Service come from the sale of timber. If you will study the matter as I have and take into consideration the returns to the Federal Government you cannot help but support the amendments that were adopted by the committee. Therefore, I ask that the amendments be agreed to.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McFALL. Is it not true also that in this case this money comes out of a general fund and will be reimbursed through timber sales? It has no relation to a necessity for a cut in the trust fund, nor to the necessary cut in the ABC system because of the condition the trust fund will be in. In other words, there is no relation between those items?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is right. This is an amount that comes from the general fund. Every bit of this proposed appropriation comes from the general fund. It is not a part of the trust fund item.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to respond to a point made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] regarding the increases that have occurred from year to year in these forest road appropriations. He called attention to the increases from year to year and it looks like a frightening amount when you consider the matter in percentages, but when you come to dollars it is an insignificant amount. Even the percentage increases are readily explained if you consider that our national forests have not been developed for sustained yield at a very speedy rate. In the First District of California, the Six Rivers National Forest is only beginning to feel the effects of our road program. The cutting circles are only now reaching their sustained yield potential—a short time ago it was 35 percent, and right now it is only 75 percent. A greatly expanded road program is needed to reach our optimum cut. Even if there is a substantial increase from year to year in the road construction programs we are only now beginning to make a dent in the huge backlog of requirements. It is only in very recent times that we are beginning to cut in our national forests on a sustained yield basis. We have so far to go that percentage increases are no index of a proper spending level at all.

Last year the Department of Agriculture brought down to us the program for the national forests. It was astounding to me to see how the budget recommendations made by the administration to implement this program has fallen so far short of its goals. I believe, therefore, that the percentage increases give an incorrect picture of what is actually happening in the national forests and should not be regarded as an adequate index when we come to vote on these amendments. The amendments are necessary in order that the sustained yield operations recommended by the administration itself can be fulfilled.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, as a woman and one who manages our family's budget, there is no one more aware than I am of the urgent need for saving dollars when it comes to the taxpayers' money. I always have, and will continue to be 100 percent for slicing every possible bit of fat out of the budget.

But the amendments that have been made to the bill before us—which would increase the funds for forest roads and trails development during the next 2 fiscal years—would not in fact be adding to the overall cost of the budget. In the long run, they would more than pay for themselves. I think that Uncle Sam stands to make money on the deal and, to me, that sounds like good, solid business practice.

This does not come out of the trust fund. It must be justified again before the Appropriations Committee.

Building these new access roads and trails would be a genuine aid to economic development in those States which contain many thousands of Government-managed forests. In Idaho, for example, we have more than 20 million acres of national forests. Figures collected by the U.S. Forest Service show that we are harvesting just a little more than half of the timber potential in the State.

New access roads would greatly step up the timber yield and in turn the revenues to the industry, the State and the Federal Government would be considerably increased. The Government now shares in these timber proceeds. The miner's expression, "There's gold in them thar hills," can easily apply to the economic potential awaiting us in our national forests.

I also want to underline the point that modern logging methods and the careful supervision by Forest Service officials would prevent wasteful practices. Our experts report that it would help the overall health of many square miles of our national forests if the ripe timber were culled out, thus giving the young trees a chance to grow tall and straight.

I therefore urge adoption of the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the last committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 3, insert:

"(c) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 205 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'construction'.

"(d) Section 210 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(g) If the Secretary shall determine that it is necessary for the expeditious completion of any defense access road project he may advance to any State out of funds appropriated for defense access roads transferred and available to the Department of Commerce the Federal share of the cost of construction thereof to enable the State highway department to make prompt payments for acquisition of rights-of-way, and for the construction as it progresses. The sums so advanced shall be deposited in a special fund by the State official authorized by State law to receive such funds, to be disbursed solely upon vouchers approved by the State highway department for rights-of-way which have been or are being acquired and for construction which has been actually performed under this section. Upon determination by the Secretary that funds advanced to any State under the provisions of this subsection are no longer required, the amount of the advance which is determined to be in excess of requirements for the project shall be repaid upon his demand, and such repayments shall be returned to the credit of the appropriation from which the funds were advanced.'

"(e) Section 305 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'to carry out this title'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Alabama: On page 5, after line 7, insert the following:

"(f) Subsection (a) of section 114 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'On any project where actual construction is in progress and visible to highway users, the State highway department shall erect such informational sign or signs as prescribed by the Secretary, identifying the project and the respective amounts contributed therefor by the State and Federal Governments.'"

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been circularized among the committee and, as far as I know, has been agreed to by all the members of the subcommittee.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the minority, I accept the amendment. I think it is a very fine one. Actually, it is one that should have been in the bill before, providing for notification to the general public to the effect that Federal moneys are included in highway construction where road signs are erected by the State. And, I

congratulate the gentleman for his usually very learned fashion in suggesting such an amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How many of these signs is it proposed to erect, and how much will they cost?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Well, the cost of the signs that are erected on Federal highways under construction is not borne by the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. Who is going to pay for them if the Federal Government is not?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The State Highway Department pays for them entirely.

Mr. GROSS. This is authorizing the placing of the signs; is that all it does? It directs them to do it?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It prescribes the designation of the highway system, whether it is primary, secondary, or interstate, and how much Federal funds are available for the construction of the project.

Mr. GROSS. Is this going to be on a par with Civil Defense when that agency erected huge signs on many highways saying, "This road will be turned over in the event of an emergency?" Does anyone think a highway will not be taken over by the military if needed in an emergency?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It has nothing to do with civil defense.

Mr. GROSS. Will it be that kind of a boondoggle?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It is not going to involve the expenditure of Federal moneys.

Mr. GROSS. Well, somebody is going to pay for it. I would like to know who.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. Actually, at the present time signs are erected on each Federal interstate highway project, but they simply are general signs saying "Construction is in progress." And, a great number of people think it is a State construction program and they think the money is coming from the State. Since it is interstate, they are entitled to know that a portion of these funds is coming from the tax dollar.

Mr. GROSS. Would there be any way to put on those signs how many billions have been spent on the foreign handout program?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Well, I do not know whether the House would be ready to accept that kind of a proposition, in connection with the highway program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 2, line 2, after "areas" and before the comma, add "out of the highway trust fund."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I asked a question awhile back as to whether or not these appropriations could be out of the trust fund. Frankly, I am afraid there might be a construction that they would be not taken out of the highway trust fund. Therefore, I have offered this amendment which will unquestionably tie it in. That amendment relates only to the $925 million item which appears on lines 2 and 3.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I do believe that what the gentleman is trying to do with his amendment is in the basic law. However, I see no objection to spelling it out in this bill.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. What this does is refer specifically to the highway trust fund as it relates to subsection 1 of section 2, dealing only with the A–B–C system. Clarifying it in that manner I think is certainly in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10495) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 520, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RETIRED PAY RECOMPUTATION ACT OF 1960

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 506 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11318) to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the Act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the Act of May 20, 1958. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, after which I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 506 provides for the consideration of H.R. 11318, to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958. The resolution provides for an open rule, with 2 hours of general debate.

In May of 1958 the Congress enacted legislation based, in part, upon the recommendations of the Cordiner committee. This legislation resulted in very substantial increases in basic pay for the senior officers and the senior noncommissioned officers on active duty in the uniformed services.

The objective, of course, was to increase the attractiveness of a service career for young officers and thereby reduce the alarming turnover among outstanding junior officers who were leaving the armed services.

The 1958 Pay Act set up a substantially improved active career pattern for both officer and enlisted personnel; however, it departed from previous pay acts in its application to retired personnel.

In the past, retired personnel of the armed services have normally participated in pay advances or reductions granted to or levied against active duty personnel.

At the time the 1958 legislation was being considered, the Department of De-

fense recommended no increase for retired personnel.

The Committee on Armed Services felt that retired personnel should at least receive a cost-of-living increase. As a result, the committee recommended, and the Congress adopted, a 6-percent cost-of-living increase for all retired personnel regardless of the laws under which they were retired.

The 1958 act has accomplished many of its objectives. There has been, in both officer and enlisted categories, an increase in retention of specially skilled personnel. However, there has been a mounting concern from many quarters as to the wisdom and the eventual effect on the armed services of the departure from traditional retirement pay procedures that was embodied in the 1958 act.

Military personnel for many years have been considered lifetime members of the military service to which they belong. Even after they are retired from the service of which they are a member, they are subject to military discipline and, under certain circumstances, can be recalled to active duty voluntarily or involuntarily.

Their retirement pay is always based on basic pay, exclusive of allowances. The maximum retirement pay is 75 percent of basic pay, but a considerably lesser percentage of total active duty pay and allowances.

Authorized allowances for housing and subsistence are based upon the Government's obligation to provide quarters for a service member and, if otherwise qualified, for his dependents, or a cash substitute in lieu thereof. Subsistence is based upon the concept that the Government must either furnish food in kind or a cash allowance in lieu thereof. Allowances do not follow an individual into retirement—no retirement pay is based upon the allowances received by the individual while serving on active duty.

This proposed legislation in fiscal year 1961 will increase retirement costs from an estimated $775 million to $806 million. By 1965 the present projected retirement cost will exceed $1,175 million. By 1980, military retirement costs, without further pay increases, will exceed $3 billion.

It should be stated, however, that retirement costs reflect the size of the active duty forces. There is invariably a lag between the increase in size of the retired list.

Enactment of H.R. 11318 is recommended by the Department of the Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget interposes no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 506.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this bill came to the floor with the unanimous report of the Committee on Armed Services. I think, however, that the Congress should begin to examine some of these built-in expenditures that recur every year. Now we are placed in a position where the retired pay of the retired military is in the neighborhood of $1 billion per year, which must be provided by tax money. It is estimated that by the fiscal year 1970 that figure will be $3 billion per annum. That has nothing to do with this particular bill, but I think it is something Congress should keep in mind in enacting any future legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11318) to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11318, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is unanimously reported by the Committee on Armed Services. The title of the bill adequately expresses its purpose. I believe that it would be valuable to the membership to review briefly the history of the military retirement system because then I think it will be more easily understood why we feel it to be important that this bill be enacted.

At the time our Constitution was adopted we had previously had a military force operating under the Articles of Confederation. After our system of Government went into effect, the officers of the Military Establishment were, of course, nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. But, not being appointed for a definite period of time, they were appointed for a continuing period of time, so that it developed that there was no termination as to the appointment and they continued on indefinitely.

This became very important in 1861, at the outbreak of the Civil War. At that time we had on duty in the military establishment many superannuated officers, because there was no retirement system and no means by which officers could be required to leave active duty notwithstanding age or physical condition.

It is reported that at that time there were four regiments of artillery, for instance, and that the colonels in command of them were all incapacitated for field service, yet they remained in command. There were also a number of naval officers who had been confined to institutions, but were still carried on the active list.

The most significant example of all, of course, was Gen. Winfield Scott who in 1849 had been one of our two commanders in the Mexican War and who was still the commanding general of the U.S. Army. He was greatly advanced in age and suffering from dropsy and gout. In those days, of course, a general who could not mount a horse was under a severe handicap and General Scott could not mount a horse. So in 1861, in an attempt to revitalize the Federal Army, a retirement system was adopted. It provided for retirement of those persons with over 40 years of service upon their application and gave the President power to direct that officers of that length of service be retired. At that time the retired pay in the Military Establishment was related to the active duty pay and constantly since 1861, retired pay has been a percentage of the current military pay received by the military. We have done that in each pay bill from the beginning. That is, we have permitted those persons previously retired to recompute their retired pay on the new higher rate. With one exception, which I will refer to in a moment, that has been done. In the pay bill of 1958, the recommendation which came to us from the Department of Defense was that those previously retired receive no increase whatever. We were operating under a budgetary ceiling. However, because it was agreed that there had been a material increase in the cost of living there was another provision in the bill which granted a 6 percent cost-of-living increase to those already retired.

In other words, the Committee on Armed Services recommended, and the House passed and it became a law, that those previously retired would receive a 6-percent increase. That became the law, as I said, and has continued to be the situation since June 1, 1958. That is, those retired prior to June 1, 1958, received a 6-percent increase; those retired after June 1, 1958 compute their retired pay on the new rates. This has proven to be very upsetting to morale because of the traditional system under which retired personnel except for the period 1922–1926, have computed their retired pay on the current pay rates. It is obvious why those persons previously retired feel they have been deprived of a vary valuable and a traditional right. Those on active duty are also very deeply concerned about this situation. We all know what happens to a person on a fixed income because of inflation. The active duty personnel feel they have lost a most valuable and traditional right—real security for the future in that heretofore they had a retirement system which was geared to the existing pay scales so that they could look to their retirement with a feeling of security.

The President in his budget message this year used this language:

Traditionally, rates of pay for retired military personnel have been proportionate to

current rates of pay for active personnel. The 1958 Military Pay Act departed from this established formula by providing for a 6-percent increase rather than a proportionate increase for everyone retired prior to its effective date of June 1, 1958. I endorse pending legislation that will restore the traditional relationship between retired and active duty pay rates.

The President in his fiscal 1961 budget message requested that funds be made available to pay the additional amount so that it has been budgeted by the President.

The Department of Defense, after an investigation of the matter, stated to the committee that it "believes the net result would be of significant value by increasing the morale, efficiency, and effectiveness of our active duty career personnel as well as avoiding discrimination against retired personnel who served their country faithfully and well."

The Secretary of Defense informed the committee as follows:

Undoubtedly, there is merit in the assertion that morale in the active forces will be further enhanced by restoring the increase to those receiving retired pay under the same law but retired prior to June 1, 1958.

The Defense Department does not desire any discrimination to exist against our retired personnel and particularly those officers who bore the brunt of senior responsibility in command during wartime, many of whom did so with great distinction, patriotism, and heroism.

The bill will do exactly what I have stated. Of course the number of people to be affected by the bill is already established. Therefore the cost of the bill, while recurring, will recur at a lower amount each year, because as those retired members pass on no others will enter. It is only those persons who retired prior to June 1, 1958, and are paid under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who are affected. So that while the cost is material, about $33 million for fiscal 1961, it will reduce each year thereafter.

In all instances where pay scales are established within the body of the statute itself, it is most difficult so say what is going to happen to each individual. However, we have included in the report exactly what happens to the various pay scales, based upon typical years of service, and an analysis of average pay increases for those reasons with those years of service. I would request that for any specific determination of what would go to any particular individual, that you refer to the report, because it is set out in complete detail.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to ask the gentleman whether in any sense this will cause any change in the amount paid to the widows and minor children of officers after death.

Mr. KILDAY. The Survivors Benefits Act is based upon a percentage of the active duty pay. So, while this bill does not do that, it has been automatic. In other words, the wife and children of a deceased service member, or one who dies with service-connected disability, draws $112 per month, plus 12 percent of the base pay of the service member computed on the latest pay rate.

Mrs. CHURCH. I rose because of my interest in the surviving widow and minor children, since I understood the gentleman to say that the effect of the bill would taper off as each officer dies.

Mr. KILDAY. Well, it tapers off because the survivor does not draw the same amount as an active duty personnel, and the bill is applicable only to retired personnel.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such times as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to allow those who compute their retired pay under the rates set forth in the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and who retired before June 1, 1958, to recompute their retired pay in accordance with the rates contained in the Military Pay Act of 1958.

Since the establishment of the military retirement system in 1861 there has been, with one exception, a continuing and vital relationship between active duty pay and retired pay. This one exception took place in 1922 when pay increases were granted to all military personnel, except retired officers. Four years later, in the 1926 Pay Act, the Congress restored the normal relationship between the two types of pay for the officers affected by the earlier act.

During the economy period of the early 1930's, the pay cuts imposed upon active duty personnel were extended to retired personnel. This action and the 1926 action, together with the fact that retired persons are not only subject to trial by court-martial but also to recall, point up that retired personnel do indeed remain part of the Military Establishment.

I think we should also bear in mind that many persons on the retired list are not there by choice. Retired status has been imposed upon them, not because they are incompetent or unable to perform arduous duty, but because this country has to keep the military services young, dynamic and ready for any eventuality.

Their devotion and dedication during their careers was predicated upon the certainty that they would receive that percentage of the active duty pay of the grade and length of service which is prescribed by law. This has always been one of the strong points in selling a military career to either the recruit or the young officer.

Military pay rates have always been set so as to consider retired pay as earned pay, but payment is deferred until the individual has earned his right to apply for retirement.

I strongly urge passage of H.R. 11318 and believe it will have a marked effect on the morale of all service personnel, active and retired, and keep faith with those who served loyally and well and kept faith with our country in trying times.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, this bill received unanimous approval of our committee. It merely restores to retired personnel the rights and privileges which were exercised for many years, starting in 1861.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H.R. 11318 is to return to the traditional system of military retired pay from which we departed in the Pay Act of 1958.

Although the group involved is relatively limited and will grow smaller as death takes its toll over the years, it is important that we take this move as a reassurance and an incentive to the young men now in the service who we hope will make a career of the military profession. This was the basic purpose of the 1958 Pay Act and it is also the basic purpose of the bill now before us.

If our country is to be defended properly, we must have a force in being capable of instant action.

We can no longer depend on the time required for the mobilization of citizen armies; we must have armed services composed in good measure of career professional military personnel. It is important that we continue to provide the traditional incentives for that career.

Except for temporary departures, military retired pay has always been based on current active duty pay scales. This has provided the assurance that whatever the change in the cost of living, retired personnel need not fear that they will be forgotten with a retired pay which has lost its purchasing power.

This assurance is important for two reasons.

In the first place, military retired pay is not a pension. It is more in the nature of a retainer pay. Unlike retired people in other fields of endeavor, the retired military are not separated from their service. They are still members, although inactive, and have always so regarded themselves, as they are in fact in law. We must keep in mind that they are still subject to the regulations of their services and also to the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

In time of war or national emergency, retired personnel are subject to recall to active duty. These obligations are real and they are borne with pride by our devoted retired personnel.

Of equal importance as a reason for our system of military retired pay is the nature of the military profession itself. By far the greater number of combat personnel are not trained in skills which can be translated into civilian occupations.

It is essential that these officers and enlisted personnel go through their careers without having to worry about learning another occupation on the side in order that they may be able to support themselves and their families upon retirement.

I think we must face the fact that the military profession is a young man's game, especially for the senior commissioned officers, and we must necessarily place them on the retired list at a time when their family responsibilities are at their highest. If we are to demand and receive the complete dedication which our career military personnel should give their jobs we must see to it that any doubt as to their family's security after retirement does not arise.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, having introduced similar legislation myself, in H.R. 6357. The objective of my bill was to remove all inequities that resulted from the 1958 Career Compensation Act, and to remove all discrimination—a bill to restore the traditional relationship between active duty pay and retired pay for members of the uniformed services.

My bill, in general, provided that in order to eliminate discrimination, a member of a uniformed service retired before June 1, 1958, would have his retired pay computed on the same basis as those who retire in the future.

This is only fair, equitable and just—what we are accomplishing in this bill before the House today, H.R. 11318.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 11318. This bill simply corrects the inequity that developed as the result of the passage of the 1958 act and restores the original relationship between retired military personnel and active duty personnel.

This bill is important, I believe, because retired military personnel will feel assurance that they will continue in this traditional relationship. I am glad the Committee has brought this bill before us today and I hope it is adopted by unanimous vote.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, today the House will consider proposed legislation which will restore a tradition of basing retired pay for members of the Uniformed Services on the basis of existing pay scales—a tradition that was in effect, with only one exception, from 1861 to 1958. This will be accomplished through the enactment of H.R. 11318.

The best way to describe the purpose of this bill is to quote the title, which states that it is a bill "to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1948."

Retainer pay goes to fleet reservists who are, for practical purposes, retired, but have not yet completed a total of 30 years of service. Retired pay goes to retired personnel.

On May 20, 1958, the Congress enacted into law the Pay Act of 1958, to be effective June 1, 1958.

You will recall that this act was based, in part, upon the recommendations of the so-called Cordiner Committee.

In 1958 the Nation was aroused by the loss of skilled personnel from our Armed Forces.

Officers were not seeking regular commissions, and many officers with regular commissions were resigning long before reaching retirement age.

Enlisted personnel were reenlisting in specialties in which we had surplus numbers; but enlisted personnel who possessed specialties in short supply were reenlisting at an alarmingly low rate.

Thus, the Congress enacted into law the Pay Act of 1958.

Now that act provided very substantial pay increases for the senior officers in our armed services and for our senior noncommissioned officers. The objective was to increase the attractiveness of a service career.

In plain language, the law provided higher pay for the senior grades so that younger officers would have something to look forward to insofar as pay is concerned.

As a matter of fact, the Chiefs of Staff of the Army and Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps, for example, received a 46 percent increase in basic pay; lieutenant generals averaged a pay increase of 28 percent; major generals, 29 percent; brigadier generals, 31 percent; colonels, 20 percent; lieutenant colonels, 16 percent; majors, 11 percent; captains, 10 percent; first lieutenants, 6 percent; and even second lieutenants with over 2 years of service received a 6 percent increase.

Two new enlisted grades were created, E–8, or first sergeant, and E–9, or sergeant major, which provided pay increases of 21 percent and 41 percent respectively, above the pay which previously existed for an E–7, or sergeant first class. Other enlisted grades were also increased.

We were losing good men, and the new law was passed to keep them.

The proposal submitted to the Congress in 1958 by the Department of Defense recommended substantial increases in basic pay for certain personnel, but it contained no recommendation for any increase whatsoever for those men on the retired list.

The Defense Department proposal did recommend, however, a temporary 6-percent cost-of-living increase for certain active-duty personnel.

The Committee on Armed Services revised the proposals to a considerable extent, and, in addition, recommended to the House that all persons retired for any reason whatsoever, receive a 6-percent cost-of-living increase.

This proposal eventually became law.

As a result, we created two different categories of retired personnel who are paid under the same law.

Since the 1958 Pay Act merely changed the pay scales of the Career Compensation Act, but became effective on June 1, 1958, and was not applicable to anyone retired prior to June 1, 1958, we created a situation in which we had two categories of retired personnel retired for the same degree of disability, or with the same length of service, in the same grade or rank, but receiving substantial differences in retired pay.

Now, how is this possible?

Well, I stated that we increased the pay of a colonel, for example, by 20 percent, and we increased the pay of a sergeant first class by 11 percent.

A colonel retired with 30 years of service on May 1, 1958, now receives retirement pay in the amount of $644 a month. Before the Pay Act of 1958, he received $608 a month.

You will recall that we gave him a 6 percent cost-of-living increase.

Therefore, we increased his retired pay by 6 percent of $608. The net result was to give him retired pay in the amount of $644 a month.

But a colonel retired after June 1, 1958, the day the Pay Act became effective, because of the substantial increase of 20 percent in the basic pay scales of a colonel, receives $738 a month.

Thus, there is a difference of $94 a month—for the same rank and the same length of service.

An E–7, or sergeant first class, with 23 years of service, for example, retired prior to June 1, 1958, received $183 a month. The 1958 Pay Act gave him a 6-percent increase in retired pay, raising him to $194 a month. But the E–7, or sergeant first class, who retired after June 1, 1958, receives $201 a month. Thus, there is a difference of $7 a month—for the same rank, same length of service, and quite likely, the same responsibility.

You can see, therefore, that we have two types of personnel who are paid under the same law, served in the same grade, have the same length of service, may have assumed the same responsibility, and may have fought in the same wars, but who have substantial differences in retired pay because one retired prior to June 1, 1958, and the other after that date.

Now what the bill H.R. 11318 will do is to put all personnel who are paid under the same law in the same status insofar as entitlement is concerned.

In other words, all officer and enlisted retired personnel who are paid under the Career Compensation Act and who have the same grade and length of service or degree of disability, will receive the same retired pay except that those who received a cost of living increase in 1958, which may exceed the amount of the increase in the pay scales, will continue to receive the greater amount provided by the cost of living increase.

Now what are we talking about in terms of numbers?

Well, the bill applies to about 118,000 persons. There are 114,000 in the Armed Services, and about 4,000 in the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service.

I should mention here that the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, as well as the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, are all paid under the pay scales contained in the Career Compensation Act.

Insofar as the armed services are concerned, that is, the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, 49,884 officers will receive a pay increase under the proposed legislation, and 64,274 enlisted personnel.

However, the increased pay resulting from the enactment of the proposed legislation will vary considerably among officer grades and enlisted grades. The following breakdown indicates who among the retired personnel will get increases, as well as the average amounts they will receive in each grade and the number of people affected:

OFFICERS

Retired pay grade	Rank	Total personnel and additional average annual increase	Retired pay grade	Rank	Total personnel and additional average annual increase
	CS, CNO, CMS, and CJCS.	11 will get $4,586 more per year.	O–5	Lieutenant colonel	10,177 will get $526 more per year.
O–10	General	41 will get $3,191 more per year.	O–4	Major	11,036 will get $103 more per year.
O–9	Lieutenant general	126 will get $2,394 more per year.	O–3	Captain	2,556 will get $83 more per year.
O–8	Major general	817 will get $1,918 more per year.	O–2	1st lieutenant	2,143 will get $38 more per year.
O–7	Brigadier general	1,130 will get $1,416 more per year.	O–1	2d lieutenant	1 will get $25 more per year.
O–6	Colonel	12,933 will get $1,035 more per year.		Total officers (including warrant officers).	49,884.

ENLISTED

E–7	Sergeant, 1st class	50,186 will get $113 more per year.	E–1	Recruit	53 will bet $10 more per year.
E–6	Staff sergeant	7,141 will get $19 more per year.		Total enlisted	64,274.
E–5	Sergeant	3,169 will get $47 more per year.		Grand total (officers, enlisted, and warrant officers).	114,158.
E–4	Corporal	2,543 will get $22 more per year.			
E–3	Private, 1st class	516 will get $4 more per year.			
E–2	Private	666 will get $6 more per year.			

The proposed legislation will cost $33,600,000 in fiscal 1961.

We all know that military retirement costs are increasing at a substantial rate.

In fiscal 1961, without the proposed legislation, retirement costs for the Department of Defense will amount to $775 million, and with the proposed legislation will increase to $806 million.

This amount will increase each year as the total number of retired personnel increase.

The total number of retired personnel will increase, because we have maintained a force since World War II far in excess of that which existed prior to World War II. We expanded our military structure in 1939 and 1940, and after World War II maintained an average strength in excess of 2,500,000. We are now 20 years away from 1940, and retirement costs will begin to increase as the number of personnel on the retired list increases.

This is a deferred cost of national defense.

Now what is the justification for the proposed legislation from the viewpoint of morale, tradition, precedent, equity, and fairness?

Well, we adopted the first retirement system for our Armed Forces in 1861. And we geared the retirement pay to the active duty pay.

For many, many years the retirement pay of service personnel has been based upon the years of service that an individual contributes to the Nation, multiplied by 2½ percent times the basic pay of his grade. Let me explain that further.

Let us take the basic pay of a colonel with 26 years of service. His basic pay is $985 a month, but he receives a subsistence allowance and a quarters allowance which increases his total monthly pay to $1,169.

If he retires with 26 years of service, he will receive 26 years times 2½ percent, which amounts to 65 percent of his basic pay, that is 65 percent of $985.

This gives him $640 in retired pay per month.

In other words, he cannot include any of his allowances for the purpose of computing his retired pay.

Allowances do not follow an officer or enlisted man into retirement.

And for that matter, neither does flight pay, nor any other special pay such as proficiency pay or personal money allowances for the very senior officers.

Now this has been the system for many years.

For years people who have joined the Armed Services have felt that one of the advantages of being a member of the Armed Services is that their retired pay would always be multiplied against existing pay scales, regardless of what they were. If they went up, their pay went up; if the pay scales went down, their retired pay went down.

Thus, if the Congress increased basic pay, the man on the retired list felt that he would also receive the same increase in proportion to his years of service.

This system of wedding together retired pay to existing pay scales continued from 1861 to 1922, or 61 years.

In 1922, Congress enacted a general pay increase, and left out the officers then on the retired list. But the Congress corrected that situation 4 years later, in 1926.

In 1949 we did change the disability retirement system and this, of course, was justified in view of the evidence disclosed by the Committee on Armed Services with regard to the abuses that existed in the disability retirement system.

Prior to October 12, 1949, an officer could be retired for disability if he was found unfit for full duty.

It did not make any difference how disabled he was. If he was unfit for full field duty, he was retired for disability and received 75 percent of his basic pay, tax free, for the rest of his life.

After October 12, 1949, we made disability retirement applicable not only to officers, but also to all enlisted personnel; and in addition, we changed the system. We said that hereafter persons retired for disability would compute their retired pay based upon their degree of disability, or their years of service, whichever gave them a greater amount.

Degree of disability is determined by using Veterans' Administration standards.

The Veterans' Administration does not make the examinations, but the standards used by the Veterans' Administration determine the degree of disability.

Those who had been retired for disability prior to that date were given the choice of choosing to keep their old retired pay, which was 75 percent of the pay scales in existence prior to October 12, 1949, or qualifying for the new pay scales on the basis of the determination made as to their degree of disability or length of service under the Career Compensation Act.

We thus changed the system of disability retirement in 1949. But those previously retired for length of service, or 75 percent disability, were allowed to compute their retired pay under the new and increased active duty pay scales. This proposal, H.R. 11318, makes no attempt to change the disability retirement system by one iota. We think that system is sound and should not be changed.

But in 1958, because of the position of the Department of Defense, the Congress did not allow the existing pay scales to be made applicable to those on the retired list who were being paid under the same law. Congress limited retired personnel to a cost-of-living increase.

That is what the proposed legislation will correct.

The President stated in his budget message that he favors this legislation and indicated that funds will be requested for fiscal 1961 to cover the costs.

The Department of Defense now strongly endorses the proposed legislation, as do various veterans organizations, as well as the Reserve Officers Association, Retired Officers Association, and other organizations. Many State legislatures have adopted resolutions asking Congress to pass this bill.

This bill simply carries out the traditional policy established by the Government in 1861 of computing retired pay on the basis of the active duty pay scales, whatever they may be, and whether they go up or down.

In only one instance in the past, except for the change in the disability retirement system, has Congress departed from this concept.

In other words, from 1861 to 1958, except for a 4-year period from 1922 to 1926, the policy of the Government has been to compute retired military pay on the basis of existing active duty pay scales.

Let me remind the House that retired personnel are still members of the Armed Forces. They are subject to court-martial, and under certain conditions they may be called to active duty without their consent.

This bill is sound. It is only right and proper that these retired personnel should have their retired pay based on present active duty pay scales.

The bill has been unanimously approved by the Armed Services Committee and I urge its passage.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the bill and to point out that on January 22, 1959, I introduced a companion measure, H.R. 3164.

I believe this legislation is equitable and, therefore, support it.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCFALL].

Mr. MCFALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation. I feel it is equitable and necessary. I commend the committee for bringing it to the floor.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, some 65,000 retired enlisted men and some 50,000 retired officers in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force will receive retired pay equal to that of their fellows who retired after June 1, 1958, as a result of passage of the measure before the House today, H.R. 11318.

Basically this is an equalization measure which corrects an existing situation in which military personnel retired, for example, on May 30 or 31 of 1958 receive benefits substantially lower than those retired a few days later. The correction thus made reestablishes past procedure by which retired armed services personnel have participated in pay adjustments for active duty personnel. This past procedure was changed in 1958 when, at the time of the passage of the 1958 Pay Act, the Department of Defense recommended that increases not be extended to retired personnel. Now the Department of Defense has restudied its earlier position and, in the words of Secretary of Defense Gates, "after further consideration now believes it only equitable and fair to reestablish the traditional relationship between active-duty pay and retired pay."

I have introduced one of the more than 40 bills similar to H.R. 11318 because I have the honor to represent a considerable number of individuals who were affected by the inequity in the 1958 Pay Act and because, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have come to be aware of the importance of this and other commitments to both the efficiency and the economical operation of our armed services.

Faced with the necessity of maintaining vast military forces requiring more and more skilled personnel, our commitments of various kinds—and retirement benefits is one of the most important of these—are essential to our being able to compete for top manpower. The Federal Government's failure in 1958 to continue its past practice of improving retirement scales along with active-duty scales has had at least some undesirable effect in that it caused military personnel to take a cold look at this job advantage.

It is necessary that all understand that military retirement pay is somewhat different than other retirement benefits, in that retired military personnel are not really cut off. In our report on this measure—House Report No. 1513—the Armed Services Committee points out:

> Even after they are retired from the service of which they are a member, they are subject to military discipline and, under certain circumstances, can be recalled to active duty voluntarily or involuntarily.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said, I have introduced legislation similar to H.R. 11318. I urge that it be passed today.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. CLEM MILLER].

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation for which I introduced a companion measure.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced a similar bill. I support the present legislation. In view of the fact that there is no opposition to the bill I shall not impose upon the time of the membership by speaking at length in favor of it, but merely say I hope it will be supported by unanimous vote.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] may extend his remarks at this poiont in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to voice my support for this legislation which I feel is so necessary to correct the inequities involved in the present retirement pay system. I sponsored a similar measure to H.R. 11318 because I realize the injustices involved in the present system.

I believe the passage of this bill will provide more of an incentive for our young men and women who might be considering the military service as a career. Also, it seems to me that it is only right that we provide a more realistic and adequate retirement system for retired members of the uniform services who have devoted their skills and qualifications in protecting and defending America for so many years.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to add my voice in support of H.R. 11318.

Enactment of this proposal will eliminate an injustice that could seriously affect the morale of our Armed Forces.

With but one exception, previous laws pertaining to active-duty pay increases, as well as decreases, have followed the time-honored concept that retired pay shall be based on the existing active-duty pay scales.

Public Law 85–422, at the insistence of the Congress, authorized a 6-percent cost-of-living increase for persons on the retired list. This was better than had been recommended by the Department of Defense, but the new law departed from the basic principle that retired pay should be based on active-duty pay scales.

Enactment of H.R. 11318 will primarily affect those persons who were combat leaders in time of war. It will prevent a situation from continuing wherein many of those who retire in the future will not have assumed the responsibilities of those who served in combat positions in time of war, but will receive more retired pay.

H.R. 11318 is also a belated recognition of the fact that the Military Pay Act of 1958 was deficient in not extending to retired military personnel the pay scales established by that law.

This bill will restore the traditional relationship which, down through the years, has been maintained between the active-duty pay scales and the retired pay scales. The temporary deviation from this tradition which occurred in 1958 should be speedily remedied. This action will have two important effects:

First, it will treat our retired persons in the way they should have been treated in 1958; second and most important, it will reestablish the principle that future adjustments in active-duty pay scales will be accompanied by corresponding increases in retired pay.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, the Military Pay Act of 1958 had the unfortunate effect of denying its full benefits to many retired officers of the Armed Forces who served under fire in two great wars.

As I am sure all of us understand this resulted from severing the traditional relationship that had existed for many years between retired pay and active duty pay.

As sponsor of a companion bill to H.R. 11318, I take this opportunity to congratulate our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] and the other members of the Committee on Armed Services for their wise and painstaking solution of this problem.

This is a good bill, a fair bill, and one which I wholeheartedly support.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as there are no further requests for time I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law except section 6483 of title 10, United States Code, a person entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the rates of basic pay in effect under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 before June 1, 1958, is entitled to retired pay or retainer pay based on the rates in effect on the effective date of this Act or the retired pay or retainer pay to which he was entitled on the day before the effective date of this Act, whichever is greater.

SEC. 2. This Act becomes effective on the first day of the month following the month in which it is enacted.

SEC. 3. No person is entitled to any increase in retired pay or retainer pay because of the enactment of this Act for any period before the effective date of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 11318, to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958, pursuant to House Resolution 506, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include extraneous matter in the remarks I made on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8042) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to resell four C1–SAY–1 type vessels to the Government of the Republic of China for use in Chinese trade in Far East and Near East waters exclusively."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11510) entitled "An act to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes."

GRAND VALLEY FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT (COLORADO)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 5098) to provide for the application and disposition of net revenues from the power development on the Grand Valley Federal reclamation project, Colorado.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That upon the expiration of the contract between the United States, the Grand Valley Water Users' Association, and the Public Service Company of Colorado, dated June 19, 1931, as amended, the Grand Valley Water Users' Association, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for the sale or development of any power or power privileges in the Grand Valley Power Plant, Grand Valley reclamation project, Colorado. Any such contract shall provide, among other things, that annual net power revenues from the plant, minus the annual operation and maintenance cost of delivering the power water, will be applied in the following order: (a) On the aggregate of the annual sums due and payable by the association to the United States as provided in article 12, paragraphs (c), (d), and (e), of contract numbered Ilr–644 between the United States and the association, dated January 27, 1945, until such time as the obligation under said contract has been paid in full; (b) on all obligations incurred for the rehabilitation of the project works; (c) as the association may direct.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That upon the expiration of the contract between the United States, the Grand Valley Water Users' Association, and the Public Service Company of Colorado, dated July 2, 1959, the Grand Valley Water Users' Association, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for the sale or development of any power or power privileges in the Grand Valley Power Plant, Grand Valley reclamation project: *Provided,* That such sale or development of power or power privileges shall be without expenditure of funds by the United States. Any such contract shall provide, among other things, that annual net power revenues from the plant, minus the annual operation and maintenance cost of delivering the power water, will be applied in the following order and manner: (a) on the aggregate of the annual sums due and payable by the Association to the United States as provided in article 12, paragraphs (c), (d), and (e), and article 22, paragraph (a) (ii), of contract numbered Ilr–644 between the United States and the Association, dated January 27, 1945, until such time as the obligation under said contract has been paid in full; (b) in any year in which the net power revenues exceed the aggregate of the annual sums due and payable under said contract between the United States and the Association, and after the obligation under said contract has been paid in full, against the total obligations incurred for the rehabilitation of the project works under contracts between the United States and the Association now existing or hereafter entered into: *Provided,* That such application shall not reduce the annual sums payable by the Association under such rehabilitation contracts; and (c) as the Association may direct."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to permit the continued operation of the small existing powerplant of the Grand Valley Federal reclamation project in Colorado after the expiration of the present interim contract. This interim contract expires on December 31 of this year and, therefore, enactment of this legislation is necessary during this session of the Congress.

This small powerplant is a most unusual Federal powerplant in that it was constructed and is operated without any expenditure of Federal funds. This legislation provides that it would continue to be operated without the expenditure of Federal funds.

A little history showing how this powerplant happened to be built may be of interest to Members. The Grand Valley Federal reclamation project was one of the first projects initiated under the Federal Reclamation Act of 1902. It was authorized in 1912 and the first irrigation water was delivered by it in 1915. When the project was initially constructed the Grand Valley Water Users Association which operates the project requested the Bureau of Reclamation to include a powerplant to assist the project financially. The original plan for the project contemplated such a plant but the studies by the Bureau of Reclamation indicated that power development was infeasible and the plant was not constructed as a feature in the original project. Later, with the Orchard Mesa Irrigation District as a unit of the project, an opportunity arose for changing the location of the proposed powerplant and thereby increasing the power head and improving feasibility. The association went back to the Bureau of Reclamation with the revised plan and again asked for the power development. But the Bureau again turned down the request of the association for construction.

Having failed to get the Bureau of Reclamation to build a powerplant, the Grand Valley Water Users Association undertook to make its own arrangements for construction of the plant. It was

able to get legislation approved in 1931 authorizing the power development and successfully negotiated a contract with the Public Service Co., of Colorado for the operation of the plant. The contract entered into in June 1931, to which the United States was also a party, provided, first, for construction of the powerplant by the United States with funds advanced by the company; second, operation of the powerplant and disposal of the power by the company; and third, annual payments by the company to the association during the 25-year contract term with such payments to be applied to the irrigation construction obligation of the association to the United States. The company was also required to pay that portion of the irrigation project operation and maintenance expenses which was attributable to furnishing power water to the plant. The 1931 contract expired in 1959 and a short-term interim contract will be in effect only through December 31 of this year.

Now, a little more about what H.R. 5098 does. It authorizes the Grand Valley Water Users Association to enter into a contract or contracts for continued operation of the powerplant and disposal of the power after the present interim contract expires. It is expected that the association will continue to contract with the same company, the Public Service Co., of Colorado, under essentially the same arrangements that presently exist. The bill provides that the revenues which the association receives from the power operations shall be applied, first, to its irrigation construction obligation to the United States until such obligation has been paid in full; second, to the association's obligation to the United States for rehabilitation of project works under contracts now existing or hereafter entered into and, third, as the association may direct.

It appears that all revenues received by the association in the foreseeable future from the power operations will be needed in connection with the construction and rehabilitation obligations of the association to the United States.

The one point of disagreement between the water users and the Bureau of Reclamation related to whether the authority to contract should be limited. The Bureau recommended that it be limited to 25 years while the water users thought that the authority to contract should be without any time limitation, thereby giving them the benefit of the revenues from power operations so long as there were any revenues available. The committee went along with the water users in this matter and the bill before you today has no time limitation. It seemed to the committee that under the circumstances surrounding this development the association should have continued use of the net revenues to financially assist the irrigation project without any string attached. This determination of the committee is based upon the fact that this small powerplant was built strictly on the energy, plans, and financing arrangements by the water users themselves and has not cost the Federal Government one penny nor will it cost the Federal Government anything in the future.

While H.R. 5098 involves a relatively minor matter, its enactment at this time is urgent in order that the power operations of the small Grand Valley powerplant may continue and the water users receive some financial assistance therefrom.

HEADQUARTERS SITE FOR MOUNT RAINIER NATIONAL PARK

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1358) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Wash., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Idaho.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1358, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-six Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 89]

Anderson, Mont.	Fogarty	Montoya
Anfuso	Frazier	Moorhead
Auchincloss	Giaimo	Morris, N. Mex.
Barden	Gilbert	Pilcher
Baring	Green, Oreg.	Porter
Bass, Tenn.	Healey	Powell
Bolton	Jackson	Scherer
Bonner	Johansen	Scott
Bow	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Kans.
Boykin	Kelly	Spence
Brown, Mo.	Kilburn	Sullivan
Buckley	Lafore	Taylor
Burdick	Lindsay	Trimble
Burke, Ky.	McGovern	Vinson
Canfield	McMillan	Walter
Cederberg	Macdonald	Westland
Chelf	May	Williams
Davis, Tenn.	Metcalf	Willis
Durham	Miller, George P.	Withrow
Fino	Mitchell	Young
		Zelenko

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK, having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 1358, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Wash., and for other purposes, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 370 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, Mount Rainier National Park, in the State of Washington, which is the subject of this legislation, is one of the best known and most frequently visited of our great national parks. In 1959, more than 1,100,000 persons visited the park.

This legislation deals specifically with administrative facilities at the park rather than with the boundaries of the park itself. The existing headquarters facilities, located within the park boundaries, are inadequate and obsolete and there is insufficient suitable land at the existing location to permit proper development. Also, the winter snows at the present location are such that it has never been properly adapted as a site for living quarters of the park personnel and their families.

Because of these conditions, the new proposed site would be located at a lower elevation near the town of Ashford, some 6 miles from the park entrance. The legislation is necessary because of the location of the land outside the park boundaries.

Acquisition of real estate, under the measure, is limited to 300 acres of land. Negotiations are under way under which the desired real estate could be acquired without a financial payment, by means of an exchange for public lands not needed by the Government. It has been agreed with the committee by the National Park Service that a copy of the agreement, by which the exchange of lands would be consummated, will be filed with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs before it is executed. One of the advantages of this program is that the present headquarters site at Longmire, which is within park boundaries, will become available for public use to which it is more suited. As my colleagues know, Mission 66 is a program to improve public-use facilities in our national park system. Through enactment of this measure and provision of necessary funds, this development can take place in keeping with the increasing visitations that are expected at Mount Rainier National Park.

It is the judgment of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that the new park headquarters site should be authorized through the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. PFOST. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado, the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not true that the reason this legislation comes before the committee at this time is because of the necessity of authorizing the construction of certain facilities outside of the park area?

Mrs. PFOST. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. If these facilities are built within the park area and the site is not adequate to do the job, the Park Service can go ahead and request funds without further authorization?

Mrs. PFOST. That is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. This legislation has nothing to do with station facilities?

Mrs. PFOST. The gentlemen is correct. Testimony was given during the hearings that the site in Mount Rainier is at times flooded, and in the winter time the deep snow is a handicap to the park personnel and their families who reside there.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. PFOST. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Simply because the Park Service asks for funds does not mean that the Committee on Appropriations will necessarily give them the funds, is that not correct?

Mrs. PFOST. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. Even if Congress does approve it and the Executive approves it and the bill becomes law, that does not necessarily mean that the Committee on Appropriations will put out the funds immediately; it may wait until it sees fit to appropriate the funds, is that correct?

Mrs. PFOST. That is correct.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Idaho, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands, has fully explained the need for this legislation. This bill had the unanimous support of the Subcommittee on Public Lands and the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I know of no opposition to the bill. I think everyone is agreed that these new headquarters are necessary, and I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, this proposal comes down from the Department of the Interior. The bill was introduced by request. As has been explained very ably by the gentlewoman from Idaho, the situation is that the buildings which are several in number are old, dating back as far as 1910. They are all substandard, wooden buildings, and need to be rehabilitated.

It was the opinion of the Department of the Interior and, more particularly, the Park Service, that rather than spend the money rehabilitating these substandard buildings, new ones ought to be constructed, and if new ones were to be constructed, the Park Service felt that the new headquarters site should be outside of the park boundary rather than within the park boundary.

The present location of the existing facilities is about 6 miles inside the park entrance at a point near the Nisqually River. The bulk of the buildings, if not all of them, are constructed on land below the level of the river itself. The area has been flooded in the past and undoubtedly in the future will be flooded again. The only reason more floods have not occurred is on account of the dike, which is expensive to put in and maintain.

I may very frankly say to the committee that I was opposed to the legislation at the outset, not so much on the ground that new facilities were not needed, but simply because I felt if any money was to be spent in the park it should be spent first for a new inn up at Paradise Valley, which is within the park boundaries.

The inn up there—and I take this opportunity to acquaint the Members with the situation—is more than 40 years old and ought to be torn down because it is unsafe. For that reason I formerly objected to this proposal, feeling that the money should be spent on a new inn. However, instead of my taking a dog-in-the-manger attitude, I concede that new facilities are needed. Either we build them in the park or outside the park. Because of the lack of available area within the park, I do not think there is any doubt—there is none in my mind—that the new facilities ought to be outside where the severe winter weather does not affect them so much, and where the severe winter weather will make living conditions for some 27 families, Park Service employees, who live there more comfortable.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Of course, as I understand, this does not have anything to do with the repair or rehabilitation or the building of new facilities at Paradise Inn. That comes under the Park Service.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. It is true, however, that the present Longmire site will not take care of the new headquarters and also serve the visitors that are expected to go into that area.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. This is true. That is one of the reasons the Park Service has to have the new facilities placed outside the park entrance.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am trying to find a copy of the hearings on this bill. Were there no hearings?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Yes, there were hearings. I do not know why they are not here. I am sorry I cannot enlighten the gentleman on that. There were hearings.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. This is one of a group of several small bills or bills authorizing small projects. Hearings were held, of course. The hearings are available, if any Member of the Congress wishes to come to the committee and look them over. It is not the habit of the committee of which I am chairman to publish and put the Congress of the United States to the expense of publishing hearings on small bills. Usually these bills pass either by unanimous consent or they pass under suspension. The report is a true statement of the hearings held by the committee.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman for that comment.

I want to emphasize one point which I do not think I emphasized sufficiently. The average annual snowfall in the wintertime is about 4 or 5 feet. And, of course, it drifts in this area, and as a consequence the living conditions of the 27 families who live there throughout the winter—and this is more than a couple of months, I assure you—are very uncomfortable. There are no stores or school facilities or church facilities, and as a consequence the families must run down to the next nearest town and the children commute back and forth to the nearest school, which is some 16 miles away.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the committee will approve the bill.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to apply the present headquarters site in Mount Rainier National Park to public use for which it is more suitable and to provide an efficient operating base for the park, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to provide a park headquarters in the general vicinity of Ashford, Washington, and for such purpose to acquire in this vicinity, by such means as he may deem to be in the public interest, not more than three hundred acres of land, or interest therein.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to provide for the spending of $2,356,000 for a new headquarters in Mount Rainier National Park. The gentlewoman from Idaho was correct when she said that this is purely for buildings for administrative purposes. The Government already has a headquarters in Mount Rainier National Park and there is no showing that those buildings are not adequate.

It is stated in the report that there is some flooding; that there has been two so-called floods in 10 years. Let me say that floodwater drives some of the people off the Cedar River which runs through my district at least twice in 10 years. But I do not come in here crying for an appropriation of $2½ million simply because some people are inconvenienced once or twice in 10 years.

If the Federal Treasury were in a good position, if we were not faced with very serious financial problems, I would not be opposed to this kind of legislation. But so far as I am able to discover these headquarters are adequate as of now. If we are going to have any kind of financial sanity in this Government of ours, we have got to stop spending $2½ million for purposes of this kind.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The gentleman stated that there was no showing that the present facilities at Mount Rainier were inadequate. The statement of the Acting Secretary of the Interior, con-

tained in his letter which is included in this report, states:

The present headquarters development at Longmire is totally inadequate and obsolete.

This is his opinion, of course, but I should like to concur in that opinion. This area is within my congressional district. I have seen these facilities many times and I can assure the gentleman that they are obsolete and inadequate.

Mr. GROSS. I believe the gentleman from Washington said a moment ago that one of the reasons for new quarters is to make the employees more comfortable; did he not say that?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. With the headquarters site being moved out of the park, the employees also would be moved out of the park and will have the opportunity to rent their own facilities down at Ashford, where this would be located.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, they would be more comfortable.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is not the primary consideration. It is a contributing factor, but not the primary consideration. The primary consideration is the inadequacy and the obsolescence of the present headquarters facilities.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wonder from whom this piece of land would be purchased, on which it is proposed to erect these headquarters; how big it is, and what the lay of it is.

Mr. GROSS. I have not the slightest idea. I have seen no hearings; there are no hearings available.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman think those questions ought to be answered?

Mr. GROSS. I should be glad to yield for the purpose of someone answering the question.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Of course, when the gentlewoman from Idaho made her statement she said that the lands which would be secured for the headquarters site would be from public lands. It would be a matter of exchange of properties that may be necessary. In other words, the property on which the new headquarters is to be provided would not cost the Government, as such, any money, because it would simply be public land which at the present time is being used for other purposes.

The gentleman is throwing the matter of the need of these facilities into a situation which does not meet with very easy understanding. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN], one of the finest members we have had come to our committee, was very careful to ferret out as much information on such matters as he could. He asked the representative from the Park Service, Mr. Scoyen, as follows:

Do the present headquarters provide, in some manner, all of these buildings at the new site that you are contemplating?

Mr. Scoyen, of the Park Service, said:

Yes, but most of them are very old. Some are 30 and 40 years old and were somewhat of a temporary nature to start with.

As I pointed out, we cannot afford to put in additional investment because of the threat it will be flooded out at any time.

Mr. LANGEN. How old are the facilities in the present site?

Mr. SCOYEN. They vary a great deal, but I would say there has been nothing new put in there since, probably, about 1935 or 1936.

Mr. LANGEN. What will happen to those facilities? Is there any salvage there? Will they serve any other purpose or are they just to be abandoned?

Mr. SCOYEN. There are a few residences up on safe land above the stream we will maintain to house employees who will be operating the visitor's center and campground and other facilities there, but the rest of the buildings will be removed.

Mr. LANGEN. What has been the flooding period there? How often?

Mr. SCOYEN. I think three times in about the last 7 years we have had to evacuate our employees there under the threat of flood and the last time was just last December.

I can show you a photograph here which illustrates that situation if you would like to see it.

We had the photograph.

In other words, as stated here on the floor, it will be necessary to rebuild these headquarters facilities. The question is, when are they going to be rebuilt?

Mr. GROSS. At some future time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct, some future time. Even if we pass this authorizing legislation now it would not go into effect until after it had been considered by the Appropriations Committee.

May I say to my friends on the committee that when we have over a million people visiting an area such as this in the season, that is the summer and fall of the year, we must see to it that they are provided with the necessary administrative personnel. A million people; that is a number not to be laughed at.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any question as to whether there is a sufficient number of administrative personnel now?

Mr. ASPINALL. There is no question as to the sufficiency of the numbers at the present time. However, with the increase there will be necessity for more personnel. Not only that, there will be a necessity to provide a camping ground, and the only place you can provide a camping ground is the present site. It cannot take care of both operations.

Mr. GROSS. All I am asking is that this thing be deferred until we can show some signs of disposing of some of this $290 billion of debt. This can only be done by cutting out unnecessary expenditures, no matter how desirable, and I think this is a good place to begin.

Mr. ASPINALL. I can understand the gentleman's position, but when these matters come before the committee of which I am chairman we see to it that the case is disposed of expeditiously. We bring it to the floor of the House and the House is the final judge. I think we have made a case on this bill.

Mr. GROSS. With all due respect, I think some of these bills have been overly expedited, and I think this is one of them.

May I point out again that a great deal is made of the alleged flooding of the present headquarters, twice in the last 10 years, according to the report, neither of which apparently did much damage. In the report it is said,

The existing headquarters building which is not likely to be destroyed by flooding would be converted to a visitor's center.

So this flood danger is not apparently what some people would like to make it.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill because I do not think Congress ought to spend nearly $2,500,000 for this purpose at this time. I insist the present headquarters is adequate until the financial situation of this Government improves.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this method of taking the floor to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of this week and next week, if he can tell us about it at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. I intend to ask unanimous consent at the end of today's business to go over until Monday. After this bill there are a couple of other minor bills. If both of them get by, I would like it, or one of them, whatever the House wills on that; but it would help out, because I like to give Members having bills on which rules have been reported their day in court. I know that as we go along at this time some of these bills that are important to certain areas and to the Members representing those areas and which might not, perhaps, be of more general importance are liable to be caught in the squeeze of legislative business. But, of course, I want to be as fair to all Members as I can to give them their day in court.

So if the pending bill is disposed of, then another bill or both of them, namely H.R. 6851 and H.R. 8226, can come up. Either one of them or both of them, and I would like to get them out of the way although I would not be terribly disappointed if that was not the case.

As to the program for next week:

Monday, that is Consent Calendar day.

Then there are three bills to be taken up under suspension:

H.R. 11602, amending certain laws in relation to Hawaii.

H.R. 10500, the incentive pay bill relating to the Navy and to those brave officers and men on nuclear powered submarines—the kind of men who did this remarkable job, particularly on the *Triton*, which has made history and brought fame to the United States.

S. 2611, amending the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

Then there is the military construction appropriation bill for 1961.

On Tuesday, the Private Calendar will be called.

Then there is the legislative appropriation bill for 1961.

Following that the bill H.R. 7155, the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, which will be considered for general debate only.

There are primaries in Maryland and Oregon. The Maryland primary takes place on Tuesday and the Oregon primary on Friday. I realize that that presents some complications.

With reference to Calendar Wednesday, I am informed that the bill, H.R. 10128, will be called up by the Committee on Education and Labor under the Calendar Wednesday rule. That is the School Construction Assistance Act of 1960.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield at this point, am I correct in understanding that the Committee on Banking and Currency would still have another call on Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; it is my understanding that the Committee on Banking and Currency which was called last week will not be called on the coming Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. HALLECK. Then, of course, the next committee to be called is the Committee on the District of Columbia before the Committee on Education and Labor is called.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is right. The Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HALLECK. If my colleague will permit me, I do not mean to interrupt except to say that this matter has been definitely asserted here as to the probable action on Wednesday. It is my information that hearings have been scheduled before the Committee on Rules for next week on the school construction bill. Does this mean that the effort to obtain a rule will be abandoned in favor of the Calendar Wednesday operation?

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish my friend would address that question either to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] or to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] because they both have told me that they do not want Calendar Wednesday dispensed with, and under those conditions, of course, I would not ask unanimous consent to dispense with the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week.

Mr. HALLECK. It seems to me to be a little unusual, if not highly unusual, that in spite of the fact hearings have been scheduled by the Committee on Rules and publicly announced, that an attempt will be made to resort to Calendar Wednesday. It would seem to me to be in the best interest of legislative procedure to present the matter before the Committee on Rules in hearings and then see what action the Committee on Rules takes. If such a practice is not to be followed, then in my opinion we might as well abolish the Committee on Rules and forget about it. I see a few people applaud on the other side—and you may be enjoying this—but I just happen to believe that the Committee on Rules is a very important part of the House of Representatives and that it performs a useful function. So far as I can discover, it has not been too remiss in its operation so far this session.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I certainly agree, and I will concede that the Committee on Rules has not been, as the gentleman from Indiana says, "too remiss"—it has been slightly remiss. Our information is that as of the time that the Committee on Education and Labor met in regular session this morning, that there was contemplated, for an indefinite time, perhaps next week, a hearing.

The gentleman would seem to imply that Calendar Wednesday, which is provided for in the rules of the House, and is a perfectly ethical, moral, and valid rule, should be used. This bill has been before the Committee on Rules five times. The gentleman from West Virginia has made numerous personal requests. In the face of that we avail ourselves of the rules of this body instead of an indefinite announcement.

We would be delighted to have a rule on Tuesday and take it up under the rule; we prefer that. But hearings are not quite the same as a rule.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then, I take it that if a rule were granted the gentleman would not object to not taking it up for a week or two.

Mr. HALLECK. If I may interpose for a moment, I read in the papers this morning a report which I have every reason to believe is accurate, there had been a consultation between the Speaker and the chairman of the Rules Committee and that hearings were to be had on Tuesday of next week.

Let me say this to some of you who now seem to think the Calendar Wednesday is to be available for all of these occasions without regard to any Rules Committee action, I recall early in the session when the leadership was dispensing with Calendar Wednesday in respect to the civil rights bill, and a great drive was made and speeches made, hours long, that everybody should sign the discharge petition to bring the civil rights bill to the floor. In connection with that I said a rule would be granted, and a rule was granted, in the proper way; and with proper debate that took something over a week, and not one day, the civil rights bill of 1960 was enacted into law.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The fact is the gentleman could have objected.

Mr. HALLECK. That is the orderly procedure that ought to be followed, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. If the gentleman will yield, we have followed it, but the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from West Virginia, I believe, will be more than willing if a rule is granted before Wednesday to take it up under the rule; we prefer that.

Mr. HALLECK. The members of the Rules Committee may have some idea about that too.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. But failing that we are using Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know what is going to happen. It may be a real interesting time.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. As the gentleman knows, I am announcing the program for the information of the Members and being informed that Calendar Wednesday is going to be availed of, I naturally advise the Members that the Calendar Wednesday rule will be exercised next week and the School Construction and Assistance Act of 1960 will be brought up. What might happen between now and then I do not know. As far as I know, they want it brought up. Is that correct?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There are members of the Committee on Education and Labor here. What I would like to know is whether the Committee on Education and Labor instructed the chairman or the chairman of the subcommittee to bring the bill up. Under the rules of the House can anyone other than the chairman of the commitee call up a bill under the Calendar Wednesday rule?

Mr. McCORMACK. My understanding is that the chairman of the committee in the absence of instructions from the committee is the one to do it, but the committee may authorize and direct some other member to do it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does not the rule say that the chairman of the committee, when the calendar is called, and so forth?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a matter that would be passed upon at the time. I am not undertaking to make a ruling, but my understanding is that the committee can authorize and direct someone to call up the bill on Calendar Wednesday. That, however, is a matter that will have to be passed upon by whoever is presiding, if the question is raised.

Continuing, assuming Calendar Wednesday is exercised, then on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday there is H.R. 7155, the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project.

Then there is H.R. 5, the Foreign Investment Incentive Tax Act of 1959. A good part of the debate on that bill has already taken place. I understand that there are a couple of amendments to be offered.

Then there is H.R. 2331, national parks, involving the C. & O. Canal in Maryland that I had on the program today. I want the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY] to know that I had no knowledge that the bill was not going to be called up today. I want the RECORD to show that because when I give my word I try to keep it. I have no criticism to offer except I had no knowledge and I was surprised when I came in and found out that the bill was not going to be brought up.

That is the program for next week. There is the usual reservation that conference reports will be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

May I say to the gentleman from Indiana, not agreeing with everything the gentleman said about Calendar Wednesday but, nevertheless, recognizing that it is a rule that is advisable and necessary but to be resorted to only in extreme cases, I hope between now and Wednesday a situation will exist where the leadership may be satisfied that a rule will come out of the Rules Committee.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to make one observation in respect to the program next week. It is noted here that there are primaries in Oregon on Friday. It has also been called to my attention that a Wisconsin State convention is being held on that same day. I would express the hope that for the protection of the Members from both of those States we might arrange matters so that Friday of next week will be open.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I suggest to the gentleman, I do not want the RECORD to show that I can recognize conventions because, as a matter of fact, there is a convention next Thursday in one of our States. A Member on my side of the aisle came to me about it. It is pretty tough to arrange a legislative program. I am trying to do the best I can, having due regard for the necessities of all the Members. But it is hard in trying to get along with a program and to at the same time protect Members on rollcalls when there are primaries. But wherever there is a State convention I cannot commit myself that nothing will happen that day in connection with rollcalls. Certainly, I will make every effort to try and harmonize the proceedings of the House with the necessities of some Members in connection with State conventions.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, and I commend the gentleman. He has been fair. I want to assure him that as far as I am concerned I will cooperate in every way I can.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot make a promise to any Member that on Monday or Tuesday, in light of our recent experience, there will not be rollcalls. I shall try to protect them and will ask unanimous consent for them to go over. Whenever Calendar Wednesday is exercised, I want it understood they will go over until Thursday. Of course, I do not want to clutter up Wednesday with rollcalls. If any Member objects they will have to take place on the day when the bills come up.

The last time it happened, and I am not criticizing anyone, we did not expect the first rollcall, but the right was exercised by a Member. I am sorry. The second one we did not expect a rollcall on. If I had known there was going to be a rollcall on the second resolution I would have seen to it that it was not called up on that particular day. But as far as I can reasonably expect I do not expect a rollcall so far as next Tuesday is concerned.

In connection with primaries between now and the end of the session, I cannot make any promise there will not be rollcalls. I will do everything, however, to cooperate with the Members in having them postponed. But as far as next Monday and Tuesday are concerned, I want to frankly state I will have to ask that they go over until Thursday.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. As chairman of the subcommittee that handled this legislation, I made repeated requests of the Committee on Rules for a date for a hearing on the rule. No later than yesterday I called on the chairman of the Committee on Rules. I got no assurance that it would be held on Tuesday. There was a possibility that it might be held sometime next week. Some days ago I made a formal request on the Majority Floor Leader that he not move to dispense with Calendar Wednesday but keep it open. If Calendar Wednesday is kept open and if the Committee on Rules has met and granted a rule, we would prefer to proceed under the rule rather than use Calendar Wednesday. But, in the event there is no rule, we want Calendar Wednesday left open.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me inquire of the gentleman from West Virginia: As I understand, you have two school construction or Federal aid to education bills up before the Committee on Rules. Which one do you want a rule on? Which one do you want to call up? Will you call up the Metcalf $4 billion bill or the other?

Mr. BAILEY. H.R. 10128, which is the lesser in expenditure and spread over a greater period of time. It is partially the administration bill. It is a compromise bill, if the gentleman cares to know it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I am asking this for the benefit of the Members. Assuming a rule is reported out or a reasonable expectation that would satisfy the gentleman and the proponents of the bill and assuming that a rule is reported out before Wednesday, the gentleman does not mean that the rule has to be called up on Wednesday. Then the leadership can program the rule in the future. Of course, that would not be the remote future, you could rely on me, but, at least, that would mean that if the leadership did not want to bring it up until next week or the week after, that would be agreeable; is that correct?

Mr. BAILEY. If a rule is granted, you can have Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. HALLECK. I think I probably ought to say at this juncture, and with that I will desist, that I have served on the Committee on Rules for a great many years. I was proud to serve on that committee. I was here for a time when the Committee on Rules was pretty much stripped of its power and authority under certain new rules adopted by the House of Representatives. It was soon discovered that that rule was not in the public interest. Now, when I served on the Committee on Rules, I must say to the gentleman from West Virginia that as a member of the Committee on Rules, having understood that hearings would be initiated next week, I would have been just a little slow to rush in and report out a rule by Tuesday with no hearings being held under the circumstances that now exist.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Before I had been a Member of this House a period of 1 month, they invoked Calendar Wednesday procedure on me on legislation coming from the Committee on the Judiciary to suspend a decision of the United States Supreme Court. They convicted 184 of the major fire insurance companies of this country. They set it aside and gave them a moratorium of 18 months. Of course, I was not here long enough to know what Calendar Wednesday was, but I got 139 votes.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman is always persuasive, and we all recognize that. As I remember, the last Calendar Wednesday we had before was in 1950, when we had the FEPC bill. But, I have been here when Calendar Wednesday was invoked, and at the time it was invoked the House adjourned. I do not know what might happen again.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I might point out in the gentleman's reference earlier to a time when the Committee on Rules was rather stripped of its power, that this was not a rule respecting Calendar Wednesday, which has been a part of the procedure of this House since 1910. I might say I am at a bit of a loss to understand the gentleman's reluctance to consider a bill which the President recommended and which calls for $325 million less than the President recommended.

Mr. HALLECK. We will argue the merits or demerits of the bill when the time comes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has expired.

The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "an efficient operating base" and insert "a headquarters."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to try to get a little more information about this bill which calls for $2,356,000 which we are proposing to authorize for this park. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, if I may, does not this park produce some revenue either from admissions or concessions, or something like that?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me, it is my understanding that this particular facility follows the line that most national park facilities follow. They do charge an admission for entrance into the park area; that is correct. As far as concesssions are concerned, there is only one primary concessionaire in the park at this time.

That is the one that operates the Paradise Inn. The Paradise Inn has not been paying any money. The return from that concession is practically nil.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I have no objection to national parks. I think they are fine. But here is one where you are charging an admission, where you do have a concession, and where it seems there should be the possibility of a return at least to pay some of the expenses. I cannot see why some of these facilities should not be more self-sustaining.

Another question: The gentleman says they are going to move this headquarters near a town, as I understand it.

Mr. ASPINALL. That is correct, a small community just outside the park boundary.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman was not explicit in saying whether these 300 acres were already owned by the Government in some land-use facility. The gentleman left the impression the 300 acres were already owned by the Government.

Mr. ASPINALL. I did not intend to leave that impression. I intended to leave the thought for the gentleman that the 300 acres would be Government-exchanged land, if necessary.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. But the gentleman did not answer the gentleman from New York when he asked who owned the 300 acres of land.

Mr. ASPINALL. The present owner is the Weyerhauser Lumber Co. which has used this land for some time. But as I understand, the exchange will be made by the Department of the Interior for public lands elsewhere to the Weyerhauser company, and they in turn will give their title to these 300 acres to the Government.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. This is the Weyerhauser Lumber Co.?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is right.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is one of the big companies operating out west. And they are going to trade some land off for some timber up north?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. That is in the hearings.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It looks as though we are in for another skinning there.

Mr. ASPINALL. If the gentleman will yield, just how?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I have never seen the Government yet trade any land to a private individual and come out ahead. That is my point. I am just wondering how much the Weyerhauser Lumber Co. had to do with promoting this deal. I am just a little leery of it, combined with the fact that we have not had a chance to see these hearings and the fact that we are proposing to spend $2,356,000. I think we ought to go a little slow on it and I am glad that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] have pointed out some of these things. In these times I think it is well for us to spend our money for some of the more essential things, but if things can be postponed, let us wait until we get this national debt down a little bit.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman comes from an area where there is very little public land. The gentleman from Colorado, now speaking, comes from an area where Uncle Sam owns approximately 70 percent of all the land area. May the gentleman from Colorado advise his friend from Missouri that the gentleman from Colorado does not know of any instance where the Federal Government has come out on the short end when these transfers are made.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I had no intention of leaving any impression or making any intimation that I was inferring that any member of the committee or of the Congress was in on this at all. If there was any such inference assumed from what I said, I certainly want to state publicly that I had no such intention of casting any reflection on any Member of Congress. But I do know that some of the people representing the Government in these deals usually come out on the short end of the horn. I have observed that over a long period of years. I am just afraid that might happen here. I do not like this trading. I think we ought to find out what the value of this land is and, if we need it, buy it.

I would also add, that if, as statements of members of the committee indicate, none of the authorized funds would be used for purchase of land, it appears that $2,356,000 would be a rather substantial sum to spend for the building of facilities to be used as the headquarters for this park. The statement in the report that the expenditure necessary for building new facilities at the new location would be only slightly more than what would be necessary to rehabilitate existing facility would appear to be much more indefinite than I would like to consider on an authorization of this size.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am all for conservation and think the Government should buy more land, own more parks. I always have felt that way. But there is a time for everything.

This morning my mail was heavy with a demand that I support this bill that came out of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. An increase in the compensation of all Federal employees. So I got a copy of the bill. Did you see all those increases of pay therein?

Then there is the effort to bring up the Federal aid to education bill. That takes more money. Almost every teacher in my district is pounding me on the back to vote for that bill; and that calls for millions. What are we to do?

All the old folks want and many need more money to buy food or clothing or shelter or all three. Everyone wants more money and there is not enough to go around. What are we to do about it? Print it? Some say yes. But what will it buy if we do that?

If we give the money for parks, all right. Some group must take less, which one? I like parks. I like to hunt and fish. It is a personal matter with me. But I cannot vote to appropriate the same dollar two or three times. There is not money enough to pay all demands.

Then, we voted all this money the other day for foreign aid. We might well have saved some of it—for aid for our own folks.

That mountain or that land will still be there. There is no likelihood any private individual will want it. Is there any private organization after it? If not, then I think we should save our money now and vote for the things we must vote for rather than spend it on what might well be called a recreation area.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The gentleman said he approved of the Government's buying property for a park. This bill does not provide for the purchase of any land by the Federal Government. It provides for an exchange of land between the Bureau of Land Management and some private concern.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It calls for $2 million, does it not?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You give that $2 million to improve a park. We cannot then give it to the postal employees, we cannot give it to the schoolteachers, we cannot give it to the people that are hard up for something to eat, we cannot give it to people who are in need and will vote in November. I intend going to look after myself if I know how to, and I am in grave doubt about the wisdom of spending dollars needed now, by others, for a park which will still be around later.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I want to correct the impression the gentleman may have that the Government was going to purchase the property outside the park. That is not the case. It calls for an exchange of property, an exchange to be reviewed by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Which is now being criticized by the Moss subcommittee for exchanging land in Arizona. I am in favor of parks and all that, but not before November next. First, let us take care of present needs. We can take care of pleasures later and after necessities have been satisfied.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The headquarters site provided pursuant to this Act shall constitute a part of Mount Rainier National Park and be administered in accordance with the laws applicable thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Com-

mittee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1358) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Wash., and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 508, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment, adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 263, nays 83, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 90]

YEAS—263

Abernethy	Cunningham	Holifield
Adair	Curtis, Mass.	Holland
Addonizio	Curtis, Mo.	Holtzman
Albert	Daddario	Horan
Alford	Daniels	Hosmer
Andersen, Minn.	Dawson	Huddleston
	Delaney	Hull
Andrews	Dent	Ikard
Arends	Denton	Inouye
Ashley	Diggs	Irwin
Aspinall	Dingell	Jarman
Avery	Dixon	Jennings
Ayres	Donohue	Jensen
Bailey	Dooley	Johnson, Calif.
Baldwin	Dorn, N.Y.	Johnson, Colo.
Barr	Dulski	Johnson, Md.
Barry	Dwyer	Johnson, Wis.
Bass, N.H.	Elliott, Ala.	Jones, Ala.
Bates	Everett	Judd
Baumhart	Evins	Karsten
Beckworth	Farbstein	Karth
Bennett, Fla.	Fascell	Kasem
Bennett, Mich.	Fisher	Kee
Berry	Flood	Keith
Blatnik	Flynn	Kilday
Blitch	Foley	Kilgore
Boggs	Ford	King, Calif.
Boland	Fountain	King, Utah
Bolling	Frelinghuysen	Kluczynski
Bowles	Friedel	Kowalski
Brademas	Fulton	Kyl
Bray	Gallagher	Laird
Breeding	Garmatz	Lane
Brewster	Gary	Langen
Brock	Gathings	Lankford
Brooks, La.	George	Lesinski
Brooks, Tex.	Giaimo	Libonati
Brown, Ga.	Granahan	McCormack
Broyhill	Grant	McFall
Burke, Mass.	Gray	McGinley
Burleson	Green, Oreg.	McIntire
Byrne, Pa.	Green, Pa.	McSween
Cahill	Griffin	Machrowicz
Carnahan	Griffiths	Madden
Casey	Hagen	Magnuson
Chamberlain	Haley	Mahon
Chenoweth	Halleck	Mailliard
Church	Halpern	Marshall
Clark	Hardy	Matthews
Coad	Hargis	Meader
Coffin	Harmon	Merrow
Cohelan	Hays	Meyer
Collier	Hechler	Miller, Clem
Conte	Hemphill	Miller, George P.
Cook	Henderson	
Cooley	Herlong	
Cramer	Hogan	Miller, N.Y.
Mills	Rabaut	Smith, Iowa
Monagan	Rains	Smith, Miss.
Moore	Randall	Springer
Morgan	Reece, Tenn.	Staggers
Morris, Okla.	Rees, Kans.	Stubblefield
Moss	Reuss	Teague, Calif.
Moulder	Rhodes, Ariz.	Teague, Tex.
Multer	Rhodes, Pa.	Teller
Murphy	Riley	Thomas
Natcher	Rivers, Alaska	Thompson, N.J.
Nelsen	Rivers, S.C.	Thompson, Tex.
Norblad	Roberts	Thomson, Wyo.
Norrell	Rodino	Thornberry
O'Brien, Ill.	Rogers, Colo.	Toll
O'Brien, N.Y.	Rogers, Fla.	Tollefson
O'Hara, Ill.	Rogers, Mass.	Udall
O'Hara, Mich.	Rogers, Tex.	Ullman
O'Neill	Roosevelt	Vanik
Oliver	Rostenkowski	Wainwright
Osmers	Roush	Wallhauser
Passman	Rutherford	Wampler
Patman	Santangelo	Watts
Pelly	Saund	Weaver
Perkins	Saylor	Whitten
Pfost	Selden	Widnall
Poage	Sheppard	Wier
Preston	Shipley	Wolf
Price	Short	Wright
Prokop	Sikes	Yates
Pucinski	Simpson	Younger
Quie	Sisk	Zablocki
Quigley	Slack	

NAYS—83

Abbitt	Gross	Moeller
Alexander	Harris	Mumma
Allen	Harrison	Murray
Ashmore	Hiestand	O'Konski
Belcher	Hoeven	Ostertag
Betts	Hoffman, Ill.	Pillion
Broomfield	Hoffman, Mich.	Pirnie
Brown, Ohio	Holt	Poff
Byrnes, Wis.	Jonas	Ray
Cannon	Jones, Mo.	Riehlman
Chiperfield	Kastenmeier	Robison
Colmer	Kearns	Rooney
Corbett	Kirwan	St. George
Curtin	Kitchin	Schenck
Dague	Knox	Schneebeli
Davis, Ga.	Landrum	Schwengel
Derwinski	Latta	Siler
Devine	Lennon	Smith, Calif.
Dorn, S. C.	Levering	Stratton
Dowdy	Lipscomb	Taber
Elliott, Pa.	Loser	Tuck
Feighan	McCulloch	Utt
Fenton	McDonough	Van Pelt
Flynt	Mack	Van Zandt
Forrester	Martin	Weis
Frazier	Michel	Wharton
Gavin	Milliken	Winstead
Goodell	Minshall	

NOT VOTING—87

Alger	Doyle	Moorhead
Anderson, Mont.	Durham	Morris, N.Mex.
	Edmondson	Morrison
Anfuso	Fallon	Nix
Auchincloss	Fino	Philbin
Baker	Fogarty	Pilcher
Barden	Forand	Porter
Baring	Gilbert	Powell
Barrett	Glenn	Scherer
Bass, Tenn.	Gubser	Scott
Becker	Healey	Shelley
Bentley	Hébert	Smith, Kans.
Bolton	Hess	Smith, Va.
Bonner	Jackson	Spence
Bosch	Johansen	Steed
Bow	Kelly	Sullivan
Boykin	Keogh	Taylor
Brown, Mo.	Kilburn	Thompson, La.
Buckley	Lafore	Trimble
Budge	Lindsay	Vinson
Burdick	McDowell	Walter
Burke, Ky.	McGovern	Westland
Canfield	McMillan	Whitener
Cederberg	Macdonald	Williams
Celler	Mason	Willis
Chelf	May	Wilson
Davis, Tenn.	Metcalf	Withrow
Derounian	Mitchell	Young
Downing	Montoya	Zelenko

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Anderson of Montana with Mr. Budge.
Mr. Metcalf with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Williams with Mrs. May.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Alger.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Wainwright.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Nix with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Fino.
Mr. McGovern with Mr. Becker.
Mr. Burke of Kentucky with Mr. Derounian.
Mr. Burdick with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Jackson.
Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. Westland.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Bentley.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Johansen.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Lafore.
Mr. Porter with Mr. Bosch.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Withrow.

Mr. ROONEY, Mr. GAVIN, and Mr. KEARNS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF VESSELS TO REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8042) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to resell four C1–SAY–1 type vessels to the Government of the Republic of China for use in Chinese trade in Far East and Near East waters exclusively, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1600)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8042) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to resell four C1–SAY–1 type vessels to the Government of the Republic of China for use in Chinese trade in Far East and Near East waters exclusively, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
WILLIAM K. VAN PELT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
E. L. BARTLETT,
ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8042) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to resell four C1–SAY–1 type vessels to the Government of the Republic of China for use in Chinese trade in Far East and Near East waters exclusively, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House bill provided that the sales price of the two vessels authorized to be sold should be the statutory sales price less payments already made from 1948 to 1951 on account of the purchase of four vessels.

The Senate amendment provided that the sales price of the two vessels should be the statutory sales price less payments already made from 1948 to 1951 on account of the purchase of four vessels and less depreciation computed at the rate of 3½ per centum per annum from the date of default under the original contract to the date of sale under this Act.

The action of the conference would accept the method for determining the sales price provided in the Senate amendment.

The amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill was also accepted by the conference in order to make the title consistent with the body of the bill.

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
LEONOR K. (MRS. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
WILLIAM K. VAN PELT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 352) to authorize preliminary study and review in connection with proposed additional building for the Library of Congress, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert "That the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction and supervision of the Joint Committee on the Library, is authorized and directed to prepare preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional building for the Library of Congress.

"SEC. 2. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized, under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, to make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this resolution, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for such purpose the sum of $75,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I was present during the rollcall a few minutes ago but was in conference on an emergency matter, and I do not believe the RECORD shows my voting "aye," which I would have done if I had heard my name.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recorded.

Mr. DOYLE. I ask to be recorded, because I was in conference with the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] all through that rollcall, right in the seat where I usually sit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Did the gentleman vote?

Mr. DOYLE. I did not vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman did not vote, he cannot be recorded.

Mr. DOYLE. Then, Mr. Speaker, I should like the RECORD to show that had I voted I would have voted "aye."

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until May 16, 1960, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

POSTPONEMENT OF ROLLCALLS UNTIL THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any rollcalls, with the exception of quorum calls and rollcalls on rules or questions of consideration, or rollcalls on any previous question if it takes place on any of the votes, on any bills that may be brought up on Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday of next week, be postponed until Thursday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RULE OF LAW—THE ROAD TO PEACE

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the urgent message from the valiant citizens of Berlin, circulating last week in American newspapers and periodicals, should have brought home to all citizens of this country the great importance to the free world of Berlin, serving as a bright beacon of encouragement and hope amidst the dark sea of enslaved humanity trapped behind the Iron Curtain and so desperately longing for the light of freedom. The Berlin appeal served to emphasize the recommendation to the three Western heads of government of the NATO foreign ministers that the German people themselves be given the opportunity to decide by an internationally supervised plebiscite the question of reunification. This is a timely reminder that the right of a people to self-determination is a recognized principle and an established rule of international law. A brief glance at the new African and Asian members of our family of nations will make us aware of its overwhelming importance. Today, the right to self-determination can no longer be denied to any people on earth. We Americans may take special pride in the fact that it is a President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, who will always be known in history as the champion of this right and as the chief architect in bringing about its incorporation into the law of nations.

THE PROBLEM OF GERMANY, INCLUDING BERLIN

Many of us may approach the forthcoming summit conference with little expectation wondering whether, aside from a possible minor advance in the area of an arms agreement, much of anything will come of it. Nevertheless, this should not obscure the solemn warning uttered by Under Secretary Douglas Dillon in a major foreign policy statement on April 20:

The central issue confronting the Soviet Union and the Western nations at the summit is the problem of Germany, including Berlin. No issue on earth today is more critical. It involves the immediate fate of two and a quarter million West Berliners and the ultimate destiny of about 70 million Germans. It bears directly upon the future stability of central Europe and the possibility of a lasting European peace. The issue of Germany and Berlin, if it cannot be resolved through negotiation, may involve the gravest of all issues: the issue of peace or war.

Mr. Khrushchev has taken on a new twist: To see him posing with an air of self-righteousness as an innocent victim of American "spy aggression" is surely a sight to behold. After all, the Iron Curtain with its manifold devilish paraphernalia, with its watchtowers and playing searchlights, its barbed-wire obstacles and high-voltage traps, its evacuated and leveled "dead" zone, ghastly bare of life, except for hunter-killer patrols using bloodhounds to track down human beings that might dare to escape from the Communist "paradise"—all this is not of our making. But it creates suspicion, and free world apprehensiveness is caused not so much by what we know as by what we do not know about the Soviet octopus. If Khrushchev goes into a tantrum over a single plane on an intelligence flight, what about his trawlers and submarines prowling close to our coastal shores? What about the

permanent establishment on foreign territories of Kremlin-directed organizations of information and subversion?

It seems to be a standard preconference technique of the Soviets that the Kremlin, on the eve of an important meeting with Western leaders, springs a surprise motion, designed to cause confusion in the Western camp and force responsible Western statesmen to consult their foreign offices, perhaps their legislative leaders, and recheck positions with each other. By offering last-minute changes, such Soviet maneuvering invariably aims to split the Western Alliance. The spy aggression may have been a windfall for Khrushchev. What other surprise will be sprung is anybody's guess. That something of the sort is being kept in the wings of the stage, one may be reasonably sure.

Mr. Khrushchev has repeatedly called the Berlin situation abnormal and during a recent visit to Indonesia is quoted as having said:

> We are trying to secure peace, and we still have not eliminated all the vestiges of the last war. We are striving to do away with these leftovers and to convince our former allies of the necessity of concluding a peace treaty with Germany.

Of course, this is nothing original and will startle no one. Eleven years ago in a policy statement on Germany, Dean Acheson, then Secretary of State, raised the same question as to a permanent settlement of the German problem with these words:

> How long must we be satisfied with interim measures when the people of all countries desperately desire a genuine and lasting peace?

But he cautioned:

> There are certain principles, the observance of which is essential, in our view, to any satisfactory solution of the German problem and which we shall have to keep firmly in mind in whatever the future may bring.

Mr. Acheson listed among the principles the assurance to the German people that the U.S. Government will agree to no general solution for Germany into which the basic safeguards and benefits of freedom would not be absorbed.

The foreign policy of this Government has often been criticized as being too rigid. Bold and imaginative steps are demanded and more flexibility is advocated. But these are just glittering catchwords to attract the unsuspecting mind. Flexibility? Maybe. But no flexibility of principles; because their flexibility is just a cloak for disreputable appeasement, is shortsighted, dangerous, and leads straight down the road to catastrophe. Yet the question is being frequently asked: Can the West produce an idea not negative, but positive, a dynamic idea for peace which neither sacrifices justice nor provokes aggression?

OUR PEACE GOAL IS WRITTEN IN ATLANTIC CHARTER

I would say that such a dynamic idea for peace does exist. For instance, there is the Atlantic Charter, signed by the President of the United States and the British Prime Minister on August 14, 1941, wherein they solemnly and in the face of the world announced "certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries," among them: first, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other; second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned; third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. In spite of Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam, I think that this Government has lived up to the letter and spirit of the Atlantic Charter. It has repeatedly emphasized that it did not, and will not, seek "aggrandizement, territorial or other." In a radio and television address as recently as February 21, 1960, President Eisenhower declared:

> After the two world wars and the Korean war, the United States did not annex a single additional acre, and has sought no advantage of any kind at the expense of another. * * * Our desire is to work * * * in the building of a universal peace with justice.

SOVIET PEACE GOALS ARE BROKEN PROMISES

Now let us read about the Soviet peace goals and see what action followed. On November 6, 1941, Mr. Stalin announced:

> We have not nor can we have such war aims as the seizure of foreign territories or the conquest of other nations, irrespective of whether European peoples and territories or Asiatic peoples and territories * * * are concerned. * * * We have not nor can we have such war aims as the imposition of our will and our regime on the Slavic and other enslaved peoples of Europe. * * * Our aim is * * * to accord them the possibility of arranging their lives on their own land as they see fit, with absolute freedom.

You will observe in Mr. Stalin's language a similarity to the Atlantic Charter the text of which seems to have influenced it. It was not surprising, therefore, that, when the Atlantic Charter was incorporated into the United Nations Declaration, the Soviet Union joined 25 other nations, including Poland, in acceding to it and reaffirmed its principles by signing it at a solemn ceremony in Washington, D.C., on January 1, 1942.

But the Soviet Government did not stop there. Stalin reaffirmed these principles time and again. On February 23, 1942, he denounced as "a stupid lie and witless slander" any intention "to exterminate the German people and destroy the German state. Hitlers come and go, but the German people and the German state remain."

On May 1, 1942, Mr. Stalin again proclaimed the Soviet goal for a peace with these words:

> We do not set ourselves the aim of seizing foreign countries, of conquering foreign peoples. Our aim is clear and noble. * * * We want to liberate our brothers, the Ukrainians, Moldavians, Byelorussians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, and Karelians.

The Soviet Government even went to incorporate these aims in another international treaty, binding themselves and their pact partners solemnly to its terms. By the Anglo-Soviet treaty concluded for 20 years and signed on May 26, 1942, in London by the Soviet Foreign Commissar, Mr. Molotov, and the British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Eden, both parties agreed to act in the future in accordance with "the two principles of not seeking territorial aggrandizement for themselves and of noninterference in the internal affairs in other states."

Now, did the Soviet Government live up to the "clear and noble aim" which it so solemnly proclaimed? Or did Mr. Khrushchev, when he denounced his master—after the latter's corpse lay safely in a coffin—indict Stalin for not having lived up to it and has he perhaps since been making hasty amends? Quite to the contrary, the Soviet Government has pursued an unabashed policy of aggrandizement and has imposed its rule by force on more than 100 million people in a dozen countries that were free and independent in 1939.

Yet in his article in the October 1959 issue of Foreign Affairs Mr. Khrushchev, in the face of all evidence, continued to profess:

> Our desire for peace and peaceful coexistence * * * springs from the very nature of Socialist society. * * * The Soviet Union and the other Socialist countries * * * have * * * no need to pursue an expansionist policy of conquest. * * * Peaceful coexistence * * * signifies the repudiation of war as a means of solving controversial issues. * * * Apart from the commitment to nonaggression, it also presupposes an obligation on the part of all states to desist from violating each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty in any form and under any pretext whatsoever.

Lenin, the idol of all Communists, once advised, "if need be, to resort to all sorts of strategisms, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion, and subterfuge." He added:

> As long as capitalism remains we cannot live in peace. In the end one or the other will triumph—a funeral requiem will be sung over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism.

And his loyal disciple, Khrushchev, told an American TV audience on September 17, 1955:

> If anyone thinks that our smiles mean the abandonment of the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he is deceiving himself cruelly. Those who expect this to happen may just as well wait for a shrimp to learn how to whistle.

I do not question Mr. Khrushchev's assurance that he will continue to "tread the line" laid down by Lenin, including the latter's above quoted advice. The result is evident. During the years since the Communist regime began to rule over the people of Russia, three U.S. Presidents and seven U.S. Secretaries of State conducted more than 20 high-level talks with their opposite numbers in the Soviet Government. The conferences resulted in 40 agreements involving specific Soviet promises, 37 of which have been cynically violated. A fully-documented study of nearly 1,000 Soviet treaties, made public in 1955 by the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, revealed that the Soviet Union had broken its word to almost every country to which it ever gave a promise.

KHRUSHCHEV LEARNED POLITICS IN 1939–40—SEEKS WAR SPOILS

Khrushchev engineered the Berlin crisis, threatening the allied position, then hinted of a settlement on the terms that we should give up our rights while he would give up his threats—until he sees his next chance. What a striking similarity to Hitler's conduct leading up to the Munich conference, the results of which encouraged the Nazi dictator to believe that the democracies were weak and decadent. Could it be because Khrushchev won his spurs in the Kremlin hierarchy during the era of the Nazi-Soviet conspiracy? This conspiracy led to the fourth partition of Poland and to the rape of the three valiant Baltic nations.

For reasons of his own, Khrushchev is rather touchy on the subject; but this should not deter us from remembering that, in 1939, Poland fell victim to the avarice not of one, but of two dictators, Hitler and Stalin. Some time ago, when in an expansive mood, Khrushchev remarked that—

> Stalin had concluded the pact with Hitler for the sole reason to entangle the latter in war acts against the other capitalist states.

We have no reason to doubt it. Khrushchev was then eagerly listening to "his master's voice" and doing his bidding.

Today the world knows that less than 4 weeks after the signing in Moscow of the Nazi-Soviet nonaggression pact, and in accordance with an appended secret protocol, the Kremlin rulers had joined their Nazi allies in finishing off an already defeated nation and playing the ignoble role of the vulture that devours a prostrate body. The feeling of self-satisfaction among the ruling clique, including Khrushchev, in the Kremlin is vividly reflected in the gleeful account given on October 31, 1939, to the Supreme Soviet U.S.S.R. by Molotov:

> One well-aimed blow again Poland, first by the German and then by the Red Army, and already there wasn't anything left of this ugly offspring of the Versailles Treaty which had existed by oppressing non-Polish nationalities.

And a few months later, already eyeing the Baltic nations, Molotov declared:

> The so-called rights and interests of the little nations are just so much small change in the hands of the imperialists. Therefore, it is not only crazy but actually criminal to conduct a war to destroy Hitlerism and call it a fight for democracy.

The political archives of the Kremlin are not open to us. However, I have little doubt that Mr. Khrushchev's thoughts during those days coincided in sentiment, if not in words, with those of Molotov. In view of the record of Nazi-collaboration it may be puzzling that the Kremlin boss, dutifully echoed by Communist puppets in other places, time and again sounds off against the purported existence in West Germany of neo-Nazis and neo-militarist groups. The purpose of raising and manipulating the Kremlin-made bogy of German revanchism is obviously to bamboozle the United States and its Western allies into accepting the crude imperialist Soviet domination over half of the European Continent.

While the United States—and I might here include our wartime Western allies—did not annex a single additional acre, the Soviet Government has broken its promises and treaty obligations and, helped by its Communist accomplices, has illegally expanded in a Drang nach Westen and gobbled up peoples and territories. The goal of the present Soviet propaganda drive is to force the free nations of the West to acquiesce in the status quo behind the Iron Curtain. Since more than 2 years Khrushchev has been engaged in a desperate effort to blackmail the United States and its allies into recognizing as permanent the Soviet Russian cruel domination over all these once-free nations of central and eastern Europe.

The Soviets want to get away with their ill-gotten war spoils and this requires a considerable act of razzle-dazzle on the part of Khrushchev.

KARL MARX ON RUSSIAN TACTICS—SOVIETS KNOWN AS MAXIMALISTS

It seems as if we were constantly a little stunned and tongue-tied at Khrushchev's verbal assaults against the United States and the Western Alliance. A keen observer of the Russian scene once reported from London to a New York paper that, while the Russians are counting on the fears of the Western Powers, they exaggerate their demands as far as possible so that later they can show to be generous by being apparently reconciled with a less ambitious goal. This report did not come over the wires yesterday. It was written 104 years ago, in 1856, by the London correspondent of the New York Tribune, Dr. Karl Marx, otherwise known as the founder of communism. Present-day Russian Communists seem to be running true to the description given by their founder-father.

In the early days of the Soviet regime the Bolshevist Party used to be known as the Maximalists. This may have been an English mistranslation of the Russian "bolshoi" or "bolshevik." Nevertheless, it reveals the correct definition of Soviet strategy. The Kremlin always advances maximal demands. They are truly Maximalists and always have been. It has brought them handsome profits. Western irresoluteness, Western indecision, Western eagerness to get off dead center and make a fresh approach to the problem has frequently added up to meeting halfway the demands of the Maximalists, to buy appeasement for a short spell, only to be soon confronted with new demands of the Maximalists.

Mr. Khrushchev contended that the present situation of Berlin is abnormal.

Very well; have we forgotten the normal place of Berlin within Germany and Europe? Berlin has never been situated in East Germany, has never been surrounded by a flood of Russian communism and Soviet armed might. This is abnormal, indeed. Berlin has been the very center of Germany with from 300 to 400 miles of German soil extending to the southeast, respectively, to the northeast of that metropolis. This is the normal situation. The artificial separation from more than 2 million fellow citizens in West Berlin of 1 million East Berliners is abnormal. Their joint action to choose the form of government under which they will live would be normal.

BERLIN'S LEGAL SITUATION: INTERALLIED PROTOCOL OF 1944

And what is the legal situation? The Soviet claim of the Berlin metropolitan district being part of the Soviet zone of occupation is false and plain bluff. Our Department of State has recently pointed to the protocol between the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union, signed at London on September 12, 1944, which makes it clear beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Berlin area is not a part of the Eastern zone. The document had previously been published in the volume containing the minutes of the Yalta Conference.

The signature of the Soviet plenipotentiary, F. Gusev, on that document was not a concession of any sort; the exclusion from the Soviet Zone of Berlin had actually been proposed by him to the European Advisory Commission 7 months before when on February 18, 1944, he submitted a document paragraph (d) of article 15 of which provided for the establishment of a separate Berlin zone to be occupied jointly by the armed forces of the three powers.

The protocol of September 12, 1944, is of interest in more than one respect: It shows that East Berlin is definitely not a part of the Soviet Zone and that the Communist zonal regime with present headquarters in the Berlin suburb of Pankow is in fact squatting outside of the area over which it acts as puppet rulers. It also shows that the Eastern zone, then about to be occupied by the Soviet armed forces, comprises all of Germany east of the present zonal boundaries, excepting Greater Berlin, but including the whole of East Prussia, Pomerania, and Silesia. Those who advocate that the United States and its Western Allies acquiesce in the Polish annexation of the German provinces east of the Oder-Neisse line are unwittingly promoting the Soviet squeeze game. A recognition of the Oder-Neisse line as boundary would mean that the zonal boundaries of the protocol of September 12, 1944, have been superseded, which in turn would mean that Greater Berlin is no longer an area outside of the Soviet Zone, which in turn would expose the 2¼ million West Berliners to grave danger. I do not think that any responsible citizen of the United States is prepared to advocate this course.

BERLIN'S LEGAL SITUATION: LONDON PROTOCOL OF 1871 AND LEAGUE OF NATIONS COUNCIL RESOLUTION OF 1935

But what about the status of Berlin? Can one country unilaterally terminate its international agreement and step out from under, leaving the other partners to the agreement to hold the bag? I do not think so. This question has long been decided and has led to the establishment of an important principle of present-day international law. Accordingly the policy of this Government has been that "treaties can lawfully be modified or terminated only by processes prescribed or recognized or agreed upon by the parties to them." In fact, Russia had

something to do in bringing this recognized principle of international law about. In the 1860's, Russia attempted to repudiate certain sections of the Treaty of Paris which had ended the Crimean War. The representatives of the signatory powers, after meeting in London, signed the London protocol of January 17, 1871, which reads as follows:

> The plenipotentiaries of north Germany, of Austria-Hungary, of Great Britain, of Italy, of Russia, and of Turkey, assembled today in conference, recognize that it is an essential principle of the law of nations that no power can liberate itself from the engagements of a treaty, nor modify the stipulations thereof, unless with the consent of the contracting powers by means of an amicable arrangement.

France, another signatory to the Paris Treaty, acceded to the London protocol on March 13, 1871.

This principle of international law was reaffirmed in 1935. On March 16, 1935, the Nazi government of the German Reich promulgated a military law which violated its obligations under the Versailles Treaty. The Council of the League of Nations upholding "that it is an essential principle of the law of nations that no power can liberate itself from the engagements of a treaty nor modify the stipulation thereof unless with the consent of the other contracting parties," declared on April 17, 1935, "that Germany has failed in the duty which lies upon all members of the international community to respect the undertakings which they have contracted," and condemned "any unilateral repudiation of international obligations."

The Soviet Union was then a member of the League of Nations. It was since 1934, a member of the League Council and thus helped to invoke and reaffirm this essential principle of the law of nations. Therefore, Mr. Khrushchev cannot now unilaterally repudiate the international agreement on Berlin, unless he wishes to emulate Hitler of 1935. It has sometimes been stated that treaties are made upon the tacit assumption that a vital change of circumstances will justify the unilateral denunciation of a treaty; or in its Latin wording: conventio omnis intelligitur rebus sic stantibus. This maxim, actually a consideration of equity originating in medieval canon law has been brought into international law in the late 16th century by the Anglo-Italian jurist, Alberico Gentili. However, an exhaustive study of a Harvard research group came to the conclusion that, according to the preponderance of opinion among the publicists:

> One party to a treaty may not, under the rule of rebus sic stantibus, unilaterally declare its obligations thereunder to have ceased to be binding, whether or not a request has previously been made.

KHRUSHCHEV'S WAR "REMNANTS": POLAND, BALTIC NATIONS, EASTERN GERMANY

Mr. Khrushchev has also assured us that he is "striving to do away with the leftovers" of World War II. He will surely find us ready to cooperate with him in this task, though I have some doubt whether his auspicious words will be followed by actual deeds.

There are quite a number of remnants left in the wake of the Second World War. Let us start with the beginning, in 1939, and with Poland. The Soviet Union at that time illegally occupied and, since, has annexed the eastern part of Poland. If Mr. Khrushchev really wants to remove the vestiges of the last World War, I ask him to remove from eastern Poland the Soviet armed forces and political agents and withdraw behind the prewar Soviet Russian boundary. Justice demands that this area should first be restored to Poland. However, if thereafter a plebiscite under international, preferably United Nations, supervision should be held to decide the ultimate future of the area, that is, whether the people of the area wish to remain with Poland, may be a later problem. First must come its restoration to Poland. Of course, there still is a question to be faced. As was pointed out in this House on September 1, last year, by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], Khrushchev has been the military and administrative head of the Soviet occupation forces in the eastern part of Poland when it was seized almost simultaneously with Hitler's invasion of Poland in 1939. Quoting the gentleman from Illinois:

> It was under Khrushchev's direction that some 2 million Poles, mostly women and children, were deported to slave labor camps in Siberia. It was also under his administration in eastern Poland that 15,000 gallant Polish Army officers were taken to Katyn and massacred.

This question must be answered by Khrushchev and restitution must be made.

Another remnant of the last war, dating back to 1940, concerns the three valiant Baltic nations, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. They have been occupied by Soviet armed forces and illegally annexed. The restoration of their sovereignty which they enjoyed prior to invasion by the Soviets will remove another vestige of the last war. Of course, there are also some questions left that will have to be answered by Mr. Khrushchev. Tens of thousands of peaceful and law-abiding citizens of the three Baltic nations, men, women, and children, have been murdered, raped and/or deported. These crimes cannot be just swept under the rug. They demand restitution. The latest Soviet census figures dealing with the Baltic nations are being carefully scrutinized and the population figures given are being carefully checked against the last pre-Soviet figures so as to ascertain whether Mr. Khrushchev and his government has committed the crime of genocide and should be so charged and indicted.

I would like to point with pride to the policy of this Government which has steadfastly refused to acquiesce in the rape of these three small nations. I believe that not a single year has passed in which we have failed to renew our protest against the illegal annexation of the three nations and to repeat our pledge to these gallant peoples that they will not be forgotten and that we shall not rest until their freedom is restored. We continue to recognize the diplomatic and consular representatives of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as the official spokesmen of their nations. Furthermore, last year when the increasing volume of correspondence with the Soviet Government necessitated the setting up in our Department of State of an Office of Soviet Union Affairs, which had previously been a division of the Office of Eastern European Affairs, the desk dealing with the Baltic States was not transferred to the Soviet Union Affairs Office but remained under that of Eastern European Affairs.

Our protests and pledges may not yet have gained their intended result. Nevertheless, they make clear before the whole world and beyond the shadow of any doubt our legal position. At the same time they serve notice to all the young nations of Africa and Asia, struggling for their freedom and their sovereignty, that it is the declared policy of this Government, in contrast to the scheming of the Soviet Government, to insist and never cease to insist that the right, that is, the rule of law and not of force, shall at last prevail.

There are more vestiges left along the Russo-Finnish boundary, as Ingermanland and Petsamo, though the evacuation, a few years ago, of Porkkala indicated that the Soviet Government is able, if willing, to remove vestiges. Other remnants are left along the southwestern border of the Soviet Union, such as Carpatho-Ruthenia, Bukovina, and Bessarabia. Naturally, the Soviets should be reminded of various international pledges which they have given, for example, in the treaties concluded in 1947, to safeguard "human rights" and "the fundamental freedoms" the latter of which were enumerated in the text of the treaties.

I shall not go ticking off further vestiges of World War II but limit my discussion and, at the same time, point to the biggest remnant of that war, the present occupation by Soviet Russia and its Red satellite, Communist Poland, of the eastern part of Germany, that is, the länder of East Prussia, Pomerania, Mecklenburg, Brandenburg, Silesia, Saxony, and Thuringia. There should be no misapprehension. If Khrushchev means what he says and if he honestly wishes to remove the vestiges of World War II, he should by removing his troops and political agents restore Germany as well as Poland and as well as Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia within the boundaries recognized by international law. As President Eisenhower said in his message to the opening of the American exhibit at Moscow last summer:

> It is never too late to build a peace with honor and justice.

LESSON OF HISTORY: PEACE TREATIES OF WESTPHALIA AND VIENNA PROVIDED FOR RESTITUTION

Let us try to get historical perspective of the worldwide vicious war and destruction that actually began in 1914. There were, at least in Europe, two other widespread upheavals of a comparable kind: The Thirty Years' War and the wars of the Napoleonic period. It is no mere dabbling in historical philosophy when I here point out to you that the peace treaties ending the two aforementioned war cycles merit more than

passing notice. In fact they deserve our serious reflection. Each war cycle was preceded by an era which gave birth to new ideas and rising forces and each then culminated in ghastly bloodletting, tumults, and general disorder.

The Thirty Years' War involved almost every nation in Europe and, when it ended, in 1648, one-third of the population of that continent is said to have been killed as combatants or by famine and pestilence. To be sure, many clauses of the Peace Treaty of Westphalia—a double-feature treaty negotiated and signed at Osnabrück and Münster—were of the usual reactionary type; but the part dealing with the religious issue between the Protestants and Roman Catholics showed considerable perspicacity and laid the foundation for the religious liberty of our day.

On the victors' side of the conference table there was no clamor: "They have lost the war, they should pay for it." It was exactly this absence of any clauses aiming to punish the vanquished which made the Treaty of Westphalia far more lasting than, for example, that of Versailles in 1919. The clauses dealing with the crucial problem of reconciliation were, indeed, the most notable feature of the Treaty of Westphalia and I want to call them to the earnest attention of the peacemakers of 1960 as well as of their several advisers and advance publicists:

The negotiators at Osnabrück and Münster did not even think of accepting the status quo, as they found it at the end of the Thirty Years' War, and in this they surely proved to be right. Suppose they had sanctioned and ordained permanence of a status quo which, not long before, had struck every normal person as scandalously wrong? Suppose they had draped those acts of violence and of annexation of lands and property with the dignity of legalization, forcing all parties to the peace treaty duly to respect as enacted law the result of those evil deeds, would it not have outraged the very sense of justice of those who had been shocked by the wrong? And what about the people upon whom those acts of violence were perpetrated? Could they ever have looked at such new right in any other way than seeing in it the willful and malicious perpetuation of a wrong, nay, of a crime?

Mr. Speaker, the correct answer to this problem will always decide the issue of the permanence of such a peace. No more and no less.

In a conscientious effort to grapple with it, the peacemakers of 1648—the preliminary negotiations began 7 years before—agreed on a year to which the rule of status quo ante should then be applied and they chose New Year's day of 1624, except for the restitution of the territories of various German princes for which a status quo ante 1618 was agreed upon.

Non obstantibus sed annullatis quibuscumque interim in contrarium factis mutationibus—all changes that have taken place in the meantime shall not prevent it, and are declared null and void.

I am quoting this passage from the Osnabrück part of the treaty, article 4, paragraph 26, so as to give a concrete example of the manner in which a problem, similar to that which we are facing today, has been tackled and solved more than three centuries ago.

In much the same way were the treaties signed in 1815 at Vienna and Paris, and marking the end of the Napoleonic wars, conspicuously free of punitive clauses. The treaties put an end to 25 years of wars bred by the ideas emerging from the French Revolution and Napoleon's schemes of a Europe under French domination. Like Hitler and his German armies in our days, Napoleon and his French armies had invaded and subjugated country after country. He had brought untold misery to the suffering people of those nations. Four million men in Europe were lost in the wars caused by Napoleon's ambitions. The passing of a sesqui-century may have put softening pastel shades on the harsh features of the man and his rule. But he was hated as a monstrous and terrible being by those who had overthrown him and had put him away to die on a desolate island in the Atlantic.

Again, as in the Treaty of Westphalia, no attempt was made to punish the defeated. A senior member of the Vienna Congress, France fully participated in preparing the treaties of 1815. In spite of all misery that Napoleon had inflicted upon the nations which his armies overran, French sovereignty over its territory within the pre-Napoleonic boundaries was never even questioned. It was taken for granted and ascertained in the peace treaty accordingly. Not even Alsace which with its German-speaking inhabitants had been torn from the old Reich by Louis XIV was debated, though the argument over German rights in Alsace had continued until 1798 and might well have been reopened. However, since France was left untouched within its historic boundaries, and even beyond them, this treaty also proved to be far more lasting than that of Versailles in 1919.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize this point and call it to the attention of the peacemakers of 1960 as it might help them to get a better perspective of the gigantic task which they are facing.

It is my thesis that we can either have revenge or we can have peace. But we cannot have both. Analogous to the thoughts guiding the earlier peace settlements described a moment ago, I propose, therefore, that the Soviet Union withdraw its troops and political agents to the historic boundaries of August 1, 1939, thus restoring freedom and independence to the captive nations, while Germany be reunified within the borders recognized by international law which boundaries are in general those of the pre-Hitler Weimar Republic.

SILESIAN AND EAST PRUSSIAN BOUNDARIES UNCHANGED SINCE MIDDLE AGES: 1335 AND 1422

I might add here that the eastern boundary of Silesia and the southern and eastern boundaries of East Prussia, separating these provinces from Poland, respectively from Poland and Lithuania, are among the oldest and most respected boundaries in all of Europe. The former dates back to 1335, the latter to the treaty on Lake Melno in 1422, when the defeated German knights negotiated with the victorious Poles and Lithuanians a boundary settlement which could not have given undue advantage to German claims. The fact that these boundaries stood unchanged for more than five centuries clearly refutes any justification of that malicious phrase of a German Drang nach Osten. Few Americans have an intimate knowledge of geography and history of that part of Europe. The myth of Drang nach Osten thrives on exactly this supposition.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS ON SILESIA; MARSHAL PILSUDSKI ON EAST PRUSSIA

Testifying to the German character of Silesia, I can find no better witness than our sixth President, John Quincy Adams. When American minister at Berlin, he traveled in Silesia and wrote these remarks about the inhabitants:

Among them I found men of agreeable manners and of considerable information, but none of them spoke any other language than German. * * * The manners of the people in the towns have more of a republican than of a monarchical cast; and the general equality among the people give them a social turn, which I have seldom seen in other parts of Germany.

Where does that leave the claim of enforced Germanization of an originally Polish population during the later decades of the 19th century?

Regarding East Prussia, we have the impressive testimony of Marshal Josef Pilsudski, the soldier-statesman and first President of the Republic of Poland after World War I, who led the Polish Army to defeat the Soviet invaders in 1920. It was on his visit to Geneva in December 1927, when Pilsudski discussed with Gustav Stresemann, then Germany's Foreign Minister, a German complaint about Polish aggressive publicity against East Prussia, the southern part of which had almost unanimously reaffirmed its adherence to Germany in an internationally supervised plebiscite after Germany's defeat in World War I. Said Pilsudski to Stresemann:

When a child, I had often crossed the then Russian-German boundary from our Lithuanian home, accompanying my father on shopping trips to East Prussia, particularly before Christmas. The border did not only separate two countries, but two worlds. What a different picture neighboring East Prussia presented. There everything was German, even the Masurians who at that time, more than today, were still speaking their Slavic tongue. East Prussia was undoubtedly a German country. This has been my opinion since childhood, and with me it did not require a plebiscite to confirm it. You may tell this at a public meeting in Königsberg to your East Prussians, to ease their minds, and you have my permission to quote me, if you regard as politically opportune a statement which will surely delight my political opponents at home.

The statement of the Polish leader was never made public by Dr. Stresemann, but put into the records of the German Foreign Office.

AMERICAN RETREAT ON ODER-NEISSE QUESTION WOULD STRIKE FATAL BLOW TO NATO

Mr. Speaker, the suggestion has been made that this Government recognize as a legal German-Polish boundary the present administrative line of demarkation at the Oder-Neisse Rivers. It has

been argued that this would give the Poles external security by alleviating their fears of renewed German expansionism. Please note the footprints of Communist word distortion: the legitimate return to their native land, from which they were cruelly expelled, of the eight or more million Germans is here termed "expansionism" and, please, compare with this malicious phrase the testimony of John Quincy Adams and Josef Pilsudski.

It has also been claimed that such a step, as indicated above, would deprive Soviet Russia of her monopoly as guarantor of Poland's western territory, meaning thereby the historic eastern German provinces. All this, it is suggested, would be a most practical step toward a European settlement and, it is somewhat apologetically added, the British and French also seem to favor such a policy which then could be an item in the list of compromises to be offered to Khrushchev.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that an infamous deal of this kind would entail an avalanche of consequences of dangerous proportions. First of all, by canceling out the interallied agreement of September 12, 1944, concerning the zones of occupation, our retreat would jeopardize the legal basis for our presence in Berlin. Moreover, the deal would surely strike a fatal blow at the security and the very continuation of membership of our German NATO partner. As is generally known, the expellees and refugees from the other side of the Iron Curtain make up a substantial part of the people of West Germany. In addition to 8 million people from eastern German provinces, there are at least 5 million more from Sudetenland, the Soviet-occupied zone and other areas east of the Iron Curtain. Stalin and his cohorts wanted them to be the source of social unrest and candidates for communism. Instead, they have followed their leaders' counsel of patience and moderation and an unshakable belief that "the right shall at last prevail." But how do you think they would act if ever we should go to sell them down the river in order to buy from Khrushchev a brief spell of "peace in our time"? Khrushchev knows how to bide his time and this may be precisely what he is waiting for to deal a fatal blow to NATO.

Furthermore, how much trust, do you think, will our many friends among the captive nations continue to have in our solemn assurances, if we are bamboozled into a seemingly Red Polish, actually Soviet Russian aggrandizement? A retreat—and such it is—of even a legal position in the center bastion of NATO will also make its sure consequences felt on the southern and perhaps still more on the northern flank of NATO. And what about the many uncommitted and new nations that keep a close watch on us for any sign of strength as well as weakness?

No, I do not think that this can ever be the way to a solution. What Poland is entitled to is not the territory of other people; it is the independence, the freedom, and the dignity of her own soul to which she has an inalienable right.

In this connection I want to put on record the warning words of an outstanding member of the West German Bundestag who is also a member of the presiding committee of the association of expellees from East Prussia, now in West Germany, Reinhold Rehs. Addressing in the city hall of Duisburg, West Germany, the assemblymen of his home city of Königsberg, Mr. Rehs said:

> If the free world ever sanctions the fact that law can be brushed aside by force, would there still remain, in these days of Khrushchev-propagated coexistence, the will to resist the corroding spread of Communist ideology? The concept of law is imminent in the concept of freedom. He who abandons the rule of law surrenders freedom and this would cause the very basis of democracy to crumble.

ARGUMENTS FAVORING RED POLISH ANNEXATION OF GERMAN PROVINCES ARE ANSWERED

Mr. Speaker, it may not be necessary for me to elaborate again on all the economic, historical, legal, and political aspects involved in a presentation of the problem of the German provinces east of the Oder-Neisse line. Instead, it will suffice to refer to my statements on May 16, 1957, when I had the privilege of addressing this House on the aforementioned subject. However, sundry political and legal arguments to further Soviet and Communist Polish interests have since been advanced on which I would like to make a few comments.

First, it has been claimed that the "unconditional surrender of Germany" entitled the Big Three at Potsdam to sign away a part of Germany. Therefore, a peace treaty could only "formalize" or "finalize" the delimitation of the Oder-Neisse line. The answer is that the so-called unconditional surrender was not "of Germany," but by its express terms that of the German armed forces. The German military commanders would have violated the rules of international law had they arrogated unto themselves the authority to sign away German territory which, of course, they did not.

Another argument, referring to Cyprus in 1878 and other precedents in support of the claim that all international administrations have led to a transfer of sovereignty, seems to me misleading. I think it can rather be shown that international administrations have led, almost invariably, to a surge of demands for the right to self-determination of the people concerned.

Then, the argument has been made that the resumption or continuation by the Allied governments of diplomatic relations with Communist Poland implies the recognition of boundaries. This certainly is not so. The U.S. Government maintains diplomatic relations with the Soviet Government, yet does not recognize the Soviet annexation, in 1940, of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; and I might add that it has no intention whatever of compromising on this point of law and justice.

The compensation idea, maintained in some arguments, is, of course, untenable in law. If a Pole fell victim to a Russian pickpocket, he cannot then go and help himself by picking the pockets of his German neighbor. Some of the peace settlements of the 17th and 18th centuries, perhaps up to the Congress of Vienna, where balance of power played an important part, have included provisions for swapping territories. But the Versailles Peace Conference rejected such a plan. It may be remembered that Belgium, at that time, wanted the Netherlands to cede the Scheldt River area and proposed that the latter be compensated with German territory on the Ems River. This was rejected because it would have totally disregarded the principle of self-determination. It seems unlikely that a practice, rejected as outmoded in Versailles in 1919, would be adopted now.

The compensation idea is often connected with the penal thesis, that is, that annexation of the eastern part of Germany should be imposed as a punishment. This is but a thinly veiled return to the practice of "the spoils to the victor." However, it is untenable and surely a gross violation of the principle of English law:

> Par in parem imperium non habet—an equal has no dominium over an equal.

An individual nation has the right of self-defense but not of punishment against another nation. Only the total community of nations can arrive at punishment of an offending nation.

The so-called historical claims that have lately been advanced seem to me rather absurd. When the Poles now proceed to claim the area which Slavic—not even Polish—tribes held at a period of their biggest territorial inflation, it would logically lead other people to extraordinary demands. The German—Holy Roman—emperor was feudal overlord of the English king. Great Britain held for centuries large parts of France and, until 1800, His Britannic Majesty maintained also the title, King of France, the reality of the Bourbon dynasty notwithstanding. Historical claims have little meaning if based on legendary dynastic heritages. Modern democracy requires a plebiscite. The people are entitled to the right of self-determination.

Still another argument contends that the expulsion from the German provinces of the inhabitants—of more than 9 million Germans who were expelled every seventh man, woman, and child died in the process of what the Soviets and Polish Communists euphemistically call "transfer"—is evidence of the finality of the present administrative line. A glance at Germany's western boundaries will prove, however, that this is not so. There the Saar territory was placed under French, several smaller areas under Dutch administration. The French expelled many Germans from the Saar region and the Dutch acted likewise. But in both cases the expulsion measures could not prejudge the final decision as to the territories themselves.

Much is made by various apologists contending that delimitation of a boundary means, in general, verification and precludes major alteration. But U.S. policy statements leave no doubt that the question of Poland's western and northern boundaries is wide open. Secretary of State James F. Byrnes expressed the policy of this Government as

early as 1946 when he called attention to the fact that the eastern German provinces had been assigned "to Poland by Russia for administrative purposes" and that the heads of government, at the Potsdam meeting, had agreed that, pending the final determination of Poland's western frontier, the eastern German provinces should be under the administration of the Polish state and for such purposes should not be considered a part of the Soviet zone of occupation. Note the qualification "for such purposes." We should also remember that the protocol of the Potsdam Conference makes it clear the heads of government did not commit themselves to support at a future peace settlement the cession of the eastern German provinces. The policy of this Government has been further enunciated by Secretary of State George C. Marshall in 1947 when he declared that "a just settlement requires careful consideration to the needs of the populations which will be directly affected," and indicated that the United States would "avoid a decision" which would "violate the principles of the Atlantic Charter to which we have all agreed." As in the case of the illegal annexation by Soviet Russia of the three little Baltic countries, this Government has since then, on appropriate occasions, repeated that its policy concerning the eastern German provinces remains unchanged.

GERMANY NOT LEGALLY BOUND BY YALTA AND POTSDAM

Finally, we cannot deny that the agreements of Yalta and Potsdam, while they may have resulted in contractual obligations on the part of the wartime Allies, including Poland, do not, and cannot, bind Germany. Germany is not a partner to these agreements. Germany can only be bound by a peace treaty signed with the consent of the German people and by their authorized representatives. International law accepts as valid the dictum of the famed Roman jurist, Sextus Pomponius, written in the digests section of Justinian's Corpus Juris Civilis:

Id quod nostrum est, sine facto nostro ad alium tranferri non potest—what is ours, cannot be transferred to another person without action on our part.

The British rephrased it thus:

Nullus jus alienum forisfacere potest—no man can forfeit another's right.

This is the wording as it has come down to us from Fleta's Commentarius Juris Anglicani.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is of crucial importance to the future of the free world that this Government, at the forthcoming summit discussions, withstand all inveiglements of Khrushchev and his associates, and that it remain on the firm ground as indicated by the rule of law.

POINTING WAY TO SOLVE GERMAN-POLISH PROBLEM

But what, then, is the solution? I believe the way to a practical solution of the German-Polish problem is indicated by the mode in which similar problems have been solved along the western borders of Germany. In 1945, at the time of Germany's total defeat, France as well as the Benelux countries initiated steps toward annexation of German territory. But all four, realizing that they would not change the rules of international law, changed, instead, their policy. Mindful of the many advantages which their national economies would derive from long-range economic cooperation with their former enemy, they coupled the return of the areas, for example, the Saar territory, held under their administration with fruitful negotiations for just such an arrangement. The result has been altogether gratifying.

I understand that a similar plan, though on a vastly bigger scale, is being unofficially prepared for a German-Polish settlement. But here, too, questions have been asked and should be answered. Admitted that the return of the eastern German provinces is the logical restitution of a wrong, would it not be an act of injustice to the new Polish and Ukrainian settlers, obliging them to vacate and thus continue the vicious circle of imposing hardship and suffering upon people, and thereby breed more hatred and urge for revenge?

The evidence shows that no member of the Bonn government, not a single deputy of the Bundestag nor any spokesman of an expellee group has ever asked for the transfer of those Poles and Ukrainians who would wish to remain in the eastern German provinces. The spokesmen of the expellees are not paying mere lipservice, but are truly living up to the letter and spirit of the Charter of the Expellees of August 5, 1950, that great human document which solemnly renounced all thought of revenge and retaliation.

Instead, it has been intimated that, if the Polish and Ukrainian inhabitants remain or would wish to go to West Germany, they will be put on an equal footing with German citizens, will enjoy ethnic and cultural autonomy and, if they desire, will be eligible to apply for German citizenship in due course of time. Moreover, I understand that in case of a peaceful return into German administration of the eastern German provinces a comprehensive aid program has been unofficially envisaged for those non-German inhabitants who prefer to return to their old home regions of Poland. The program plans to provide: financial aid; furnishing and setting up prefabricated houses; erecting workshops and factories; and building roads, bridges, and community centers. All of it is to be done in cooperation with the proper authorities in Poland.

I think the plain facts of West German reconstruction and rehabilitation will leave little doubt in anybody's mind that the German economy is fully capable to assure any prospective German citizen of Polish origin of an appreciably higher standard of living than he has previously enjoyed and, moreover, to offer Poland such a comprehensive aid program for its returning citizens.

Far from causing new suffering, it will in all likelihood start a growth of the general prosperity area to reach from the Atlantic to the eastern boundaries of Poland. This promises to be a practical solution because it will work, at the same time, toward a genuine reconciliation of the two peoples whom God has ordained to be neighbors and the lesson of recent history should teach them to be good neighbors.

THE RULE OF LAW IS THE ROAD TO PEACE

Mr. Speaker, I refuse to be pessimistic about our ability of gaining ground toward a solution of the world's problems, if only we follow loyally and courageously the guiding lights which our Founding Fathers so wisely set when they deliberated about and agreed on our Constitution. It is the supremacy of the law which within our Nation has assured freedom to every citizen. If we project this upon the world scene and unflinchingly insist that in the relations between nations the rule of force shall likewise be replaced by the rule of law, it will give a mighty impulse toward peace with freedom and justice for all. I can properly quote here from my late friend, Senator Robert A. Taft, who said:

I do not see how we can hope to secure permanent peace in the world except by establishing law between nations and equal justice under law. It may be a long hard course, but I believe that the public opinion of the world can be led along that course, so that the time will come when that public opinion will support the decision of any reasonable impartial tribunal based on justice.

There may be skeptics and cynics who wonder whether, in a world of tension and power politics, there even is such a thing as a real law governing international affairs. But the world is run by ideas and, as Victor Hugo has aptly said:

An idea whose time has come is more powerful than an army.

While the people of the world speak many different languages and have many diverse forms of government, the rule of law is a universal idea and ideal which all men would like to have in common. I think the idea of the rule of law must strike all those people all over the globe who are desperately longing for peace with freedom and justice, as the Christian cross is said to have struck the Roman Emperor Constantine 16 centuries ago, when he saw the sign in the sky and heard the words:

In hoc signo vinces—in this sign thou shalt be victorious.

President Eisenhower has repeatedly pronounced this idea and has emphasized it on proper occasions. In his last state of the Union message on January 7, 1960, the President urged this Congress "to intensify our efforts to replace force with the rule of law among nations."

Vice President NIXON in a notable statement last year has declared:

I am convinced, and in this I reflect the steadfast purpose of the President, and the wholehearted support of the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, that the time has now come to take the initiative in the direction of establishment of the rule of law in the world to replace the rule of force.

I would think that it was not mere chance but had an urgent and solemn import, that the late Secretary of State Dulles devoted his very last public ad-

dress, before entering the hospital, to emphasize this idea. Speaking of "the broad strategy of our foreign policy," he stated:

> We seek peace * * * in what seems to us the only dependable way—the substitution of justice and law for force.

Mr. Dulles ended his address with this ringing appeal:

> To accomplish peace through law will take patience and perseverance. * * * There is no nobler mission that our Nation could perform. Upon its success may depend the very survival of the human race. We can, therefore, dedicate ourselves to this mission with supreme confidence that our Nation shall thus fulfill its highest destiny.

If we make this theme the kernel of U.S. foreign policy, we shall unfold a banner around which most nations of the world can unite. It is then that the words from the essay "On Eternal Peace" of the Königsberg philosopher, Immanuel Kant, will be realized:

> Nature irresistibly wills that the right shall at last prevail.

COST INFORMATION IN THE BUDGET PROCESS

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, in 1956 Public Law 84–863 was enacted by Congress and signed into law by the President. It was my privilege to be a cosponsor of this important measure.

Public Law 84–863 is to provide for accrual accounting and cost-based budgeting in all Federal agencies. Its purpose is not only to provide improved information for the Congress concerning the agencies' budgetary needs, but also to help create better management tools for the agencies themselves in the form of more detailed, accurate, and useful financial information concerning their operations.

I think it would be very worthwhile at this time to review briefly the events leading up to the enactment of this legislation and the reasons it was deemed necessary, the progress that has been made in putting it into effect, and the significance, now and in the future, of this legislation toward improving the fiscal management of Government.

In the Federal Government, the budget process serves as a tool of management, providing the legislative and executive branches with financial control over agency operations. For many years this process operated primarily on the basis of obligation and disbursement information. From the legal standpoint of observing appropriation limitations, this system was adequate; however, it did not always reach its full potential as a management tool because of a failure to develop in the agencies significant operating information of a financial nature.

With the rapid growth of Federal programs the last few decades, the need for better financial information became more and more evident. Agency management, under the leadership of the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the Treasury Department, began developmental work designed to produce financial data that would provide for improved disclosure and control of program operations. The first Hoover Commission recognized this need; it recommended the use of a performance budget, which would identify programs and the character of the work involved, and bring out the cost of performance of agency operations.

Performance budgeting was adopted in the Federal budget for fiscal year 1951. The first steps toward the ultimate objective of bringing out the cost of agency performance were taken in the budget presentation for the Atomic Energy Commission and the Bureau of the Mint in the Treasury Department. For these appropriation requests, the presentation brought out the cost of agency activities, the resources on hand for future use, and the obligating authority needed to finance the planned programs. While there were some transitional problems in the governmentwide conversion to performance budgeting, the House Appropriations Committee report on the general appropriation bill for 1951—No. 1797—contained these statements concerning the Atomic Energy Commission budget:

> The Commission's budget was presented for the first time on an accrued-cost basis. This method of presentation gave the committee a more realistic picture of estimated costs. Generally, the justifications presented by the Commission gave the committee a more accurate view of the 1951 program than has been provided in previous years.

The same House report identified the improvement work needed in other agencies to make the conversion process fully effective. Under the heading "The Performance Budget," the report stated:

> In its full fruition it is hoped and expected that the better presentation of data will enable the Congress to appropriate more intelligently and provide funds more nearly in line with actual requirements. This can be accomplished only if the budget data are so directly related to the accounting data available in the agencies as to make possible a close check on cost of operations.
>
> The Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Director of the Budget have undertaken a joint program to improve accounting processes in the Government. In this effort lies the success or failure of the performance-type budget. It was not expected that the 1951 budget would furnish cost data for the current and past years inasmuch as most agencies of the Government are operating antiquated accounting systems which do not produce the kind of cost information which is required. But if the new method is to succeed, immediate attention must be given to modernization and improvement of accounting systems, and the schedules presented in the budget must be so written as to provide a basis for proper accounting.

These statements indicated acceptance of the general principle that, in addition to obligation data, costs of operations were an important element of budget review and administration. Accordingly, financial management improvement efforts in the Federal Government were directed toward the development of agency accounting systems that would produce information on the costs of agency performance as well as the obligation data needed for compliance with appropriation restrictions. Under this effort, initial emphasis was placed on developmental work in agencies where there was an identified management need.

The second Hoover Commission in 1955 noted the evolutionary improvement work underway and recognized the advances made under the cooperative arrangements of the joint accounting improvement program. However, it urged more rapid progress, and recommended that all Federal agencies adopt accrual accounting and cost budgeting practices as soon as practicable. The President supported these proposals, which were adopted by the Congress in the passage of Public Law 84–863. In enacting this legislation, which gave effect to these as well as other Commission recommendations, the House Government Operations Committee stated in its report—No. 2734:

> The committee is * * * convinced that the enactment of this legislation will eliminate the confusion that has resulted from a difference between accounting and budget classifications and will require a realistic estimate of costs in support of budget requests. It will reaffirm the constitutional right of Congress to control over and knowledge of appropriated funds. No other justification of this legislation is necessary.

These actions and reactions over the earlier years of the past decade gave impetus to the program for modernization of agency budget and accounting systems. An organized Government-wide plan of action was begun in the latter part of 1956 and is still under way. The ultimate objective of this effort is the establishment in each agency of a financial management system that is adapted to the programs of the agency, and provides financial data for strengthened fund and management controls, and for improved disclosure of the cost of agency operations. This improvement program has made good progress—though much still remains to be done. The accomplishments to the end of the last fiscal year are shown in the annual report of the joint financial management improvement program for fiscal year 1959, which tabulated agency reports of the status of their improvement efforts in this field.

As an overall indicator of the results of this government-wide program, 353 accounts, covering appropriation requests of about $34 billion in the 1961 budget, are now presented on a cost basis. In terms of the original performance budget objective, this means that more than half of the appropriations have been converted to a presentation that discloses the costs of programs, the resources on hand, and the obligating authority required. According to the President's budget message, the remaining accounts will similarly be converted as soon as possible.

The appropriation requests now showing cost data in the budget document cover programs that range from complex construction activities to the administrative-type service operations conducted by many small Federal agencies. The significance of such a cost

presentation—in contrast with the traditional obligation presentation—varies according to the types of programs and the kinds of financial transactions involved. Where there are large inventories, or where there is long leadtime between the commitment of funds and the receipt of the goods and services purchased through such commitments, the differences are significant. However, where large inventories or long leadtime are not generally involved—as may be the case in an administrative-type agency—the difference between costs and obligations at a given time may be relatively small. A cost-based presentation for such an appropriation would therefore differ but slightly from an obligation presentation.

In view of the minor differences in such accounts, some questions have been raised concerning the value of changing over to the cost basis of budgeting. In answer to such questions, it should be recognized that much more is involved in this modernization and improvement effort than the difference in presentation that may be reflected in the budget document. In an effective conversion to financial management on an accrual accounting and cost budgeting basis, the agency budget document presentation is only the surface evidence of the significant change sought in the method of operation and control exercised by the agency. Furthermore, these techniques must be appropriately applied in all Federal agencies to permit the development of Government-wide information on program costs and the results of financial operations—another proposal of the Hoover Commission that has been supported in both the legislative and executive branches.

Probably one of the most significant features of Public Law 84–863 is the requirement that:

> For purposes of administration and operation, such cost-based budgets shall be used by all departments and establishments and their subordinate units. Administrative subdivisions of appropriations or funds shall be made on the basis of such cost-based budgets.

In terms of application to Federal agencies, this means the installation of a coordinated programing, budgeting, accounting, and reporting system that gives appropriate attention to costs of operations as well as obligations or fund control. It requires that the financial plans of operating units be constructed on the basis of the full cost of planned programs in relation to the available resources on hand; and that those plans give recognition to the timing of the obligation of appropriated funds, the receipt of goods and services, and the application of available goods and services to the planned programs. After approval of such plans by appropriate review authorities, internal cost-based budgeting involves the use of an accounting and reporting system that provides adequate fund control and measures actual operating results against the approved plan in such terms as unit, activity, and organizational costs. These kinds of data will furnish management at the various levels in the agency with a sound basis for meaningful program and operating decisions. From the standpoint of efficient and effective financial management, this type of system is as appropriate for the small administrative agency as it is for the large scale construction operation.

This goal, the effective management use of significant financial data in all agencies, is the all-important end objective of the modernization program now under way. The most important advantage to be gained is the effective conduct of agency affairs at a minimum cost. To do this, agency management must have available to it the costs of operations within a given time period, to permit comparisons of the performance of similar offices and functions during the same period, or of the performance of the same operating unit in different time periods. This approach, properly applied, contributes to the development of a cost consciousness among the operating managers in an agency. Practices such as these highlight the need for efficiency and place a premium on carrying out programs at less than the planned cost.

To summarize, the Federal agencies today are in the midst of a transition to a more modern, businesslike method of carrying out assigned functions. They are installing accrual accounting to provide more pertinent financial data on agency activities; they are adopting planning procedures that give more attention to costs and the effective use of available resources; they are developing related reporting practices that provide more significant operating and financial data for management use; and they are presenting these additional data in support of appropriation requests to furnish more complete disclosure of actual results and the planning factors used in developing such requests. These improvements can contribute greatly to more effective program, budgeting, and operating decisions.

In addition, such improvements can produce administrative savings to the agencies involved. This is borne out by the report issued in 1958 by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, following its study of manpower utilization in the financial management functions of the Federal Government. In this report—No. 2512—the committee found that:

> During the period 1950–57 * * * departments and agencies, exclusive of the Department of Defense, were able to achieve a reduction of 15.4 percent in personnel performing financial management functions. * * * It is significant that, in a number of instances, reductions were made in financial management personnel through more effective systems and procedures despite level or increased program activities of the departments and agencies. This information clearly indicates that (1) increased program activities and appropriations do not automatically mean an increase in financial management personnel is required and (2) real economies in the use of manpower are possible where effective effort is made to modernize and streamline agency financial management functions.

At the time of this report, comparable data were not available for the Department of Defense. However, the 15.4 percent reduction identified in the civilian agencies represented a decrease in personnel of over 6,000. These findings attest to the effectiveness of the improvement programs under way in the financial management field.

This modernization effort of the operating agencies is worthy of continued and strong congressional support. With such support and stimulation, it can pay important dividends in terms of more effective use of appropriated funds. Considering the size of our annual budget and the outstanding public debt, this is the kind of approach needed in the conduct of our financial affairs. It is therefore incumbent upon all elements of Congress to do all that can be done to promote and encourage these developments.

U–2 INCIDENT AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the lesson we should have learned from the experience of the U–2 is how quickly, in international relations, great powers can be brought to the brink of war, and, in truth, we should thank God that the world is not in ashes today. It would behoove those men who God and the people of the United States have trusted with their topmost leadership to spend a little time in serious meditation about the awful consequences of such obstructionist tactics in the question of nuclear control.

Yesterday's column by Marquis Childs had a tremendously sobering effect on me and, I believe, should be seriously studied by everyone. Marquis Childs is known for serious and analytic editorial opinion. Thus, the following quote must take on great significance:

> If a treaty fails to be agreed to because of what seem to be obstructionist tactics from the American side or if a treaty is rejected by the Senate, the Western alliance will be split apart and the United States put in the position of standing almost alone in the world.

His further comment is equally significant:

> Furthermore, the British here believe that it would have been possible to get a treaty with adequate guarantees any time during the past 9 months if it had not been for America's delaying tactics.

[From the Washington Post, May 11, 1960]

UNITED STATES ON THE SPOT IN GENEVA TALKS

(By Marquis Childs)

GENEVA.—The incidents of the past few days are readymade for those who want to continue the cold war and who have persistently by every means sought to prevent any meaningful negotiation with the Soviet Union. Here in Geneva, where a negotiation has been going on for 18 months, this is seen in the sharpest and most dramatic fashion.

The announcement from Gettysburg by President Eisenhower that the United States intends to resume nuclear explosions for research purposes fits the pattern. It was

made without any notice to the American delegation. More important, it came as the three powers—Great Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union—were trying to get agreement on a joint program of research into improved methods for detecting nuclear explosions.

What is little understood is the way in which the Soviets have made one concession after another, coming around time after time to the Western view. They began by saying they would not discuss any control system until after a treaty on general principles had been signed. After 4 months they agreed to talk about how a control system would function in the Soviet Union and the United States.

They came around to agreeing to a discussion by scientists from each country on the problem of underground identification. Having said they would never agree to a threshold and a moratorium outside a nuclear test treaty on explosions below that threshold, they finally accepted this position. They would never accept our criteria for detection which they called absurd, but they accepted them.

With literally dozens of concessions by the Soviets, the outline of a treaty has evolved. Major issues—the number of inspections in each country, the makeup of a control commission, the length of the moratorium—remain to be determined presumably by the heads of government when they meet in Paris.

The American negotiator through all these long, trying months has been James J. Wadsworth, who is deputy head of the American delegation to the United Nations. Wadsworth's Western colleagues say he has shown more skill, patience, and persistence in dealing with the Russians than any other American since the end of World War II.

What has made Wadsworth's position doubly difficult is that, while inching the Russians up little by little to the Western view, he has constantly been fighting a rear-guard action with those in Washington who have been determined to block any treaty. In this context, the Gettysburg announcement is seen as the latest attempt to sabotage the negotiation. While no one will say this officially, it is the view of observers close to the conference for many months.

No one would accuse President Eisenhower of such an intention. But since he has not followed at close range the complex negotiations, he must take his lead from one faction or another. And while the committee of principals dealing with this matter at the top level of Government in Washington is reportedly in favor of a test treaty with proper inspection and control by a majority of four to one, the minority in the Pentagon and the Atomic Energy Commission has shown great resourcefulness in blocking tactics.

There should be no illusions back home about the situation the United States confronts. If a treaty fails to be agreed to because of what seem to be obstructionist tactics from the American side, or if a treaty is rejected by the Senate, the Western alliance will be split apart and the United States put in the position of standing almost alone in the world. Here are the reasons why:

The Conservative Government in London has never wavered in the determination to get a treaty that would mean the beginning of inspection behind the Iron Curtain and perhaps the beginning of a pattern of disarmament. They concede the risk of some cheating under any control system, but they believe this is minimal and is heavily outweighed by the gain of a beginning at inspection and control.

Opinion in Britain is virtually unanimous on this score, as it is in the Scandinavian countries, West Germany, and most of Asia and Africa. Furthermore, the British here believe that it would have been possible to get a treaty with adequate guarantees anytime during the past 9 months if it had not been for America's delaying tactics.

CONSTRUCTION OF HELIPORT ON CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the construction of a heliport on the Capitol Grounds. This bill is identical to the bill introduced 2 years ago but which was not acted upon by the Congress. This bill would amend the Legislative Appropriation Act of 1956 so as to authorize the construction and operation of adequate facilities on the U.S. Capitol Grounds to permit the landing of helicopters and other heavier than air aircraft capable of vertical landing and ascent.

We are spending millions of dollars in this huge project and only a small sum would be required to develop adequate facilities for helicopters. The Pentagon and the White House have helicopter facilities and I see no reason why the U.S. Capitol should not have similar facilities. It is true that the facilities are not urgently needed now but a heliport would facilitate traffic between the Pentagon and the Capitol especially during rush hours. It will also be needed when the new Dulles Airport is completed.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE INCREASED COST OF LIVING

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ALEXANDER] may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been greatly concerned over the critical situation that has been brought about in the lives of thousands of our citizens who are drawing social security benefits by reason of our ever increasing cost of living.

During the past several years we have witnessed a steady increase in the cost of food, clothing, housing, and medical services. This increase has been felt by all of us, but certainly no class of our citizens has suffered more than those who are in receipt of social security benefits.

Mr. Speaker, under present law a person receiving social security benefits is allowed to earn as much as $1,200 a year from outside sources. In the face of our steady increase in the cost of living I feel that this limitation on the earning ability of social security annuitants is unrealistic and works a severe hardship on many deserving persons.

With a view to correcting some of this inequity I have, therefore, introduced a bill today which will raise the present $1,200 a year maximum on outside income for social security annuitants to $1,800. This increase, I feel sure, will do much to improve the living standards of the many thousands of our people who are finding it extremely difficult to meet the necessary expenses of daily living.

It is my hope that my colleagues in the House will support my measure and that it will receive favorable consideration at this session of Congress.

A FARM PROGRAM THAT WILL ELIMINATE SURPLUS AND BRING DOMESTIC PRODUCTION INTO BALANCE WITH DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION, THUS PERMITTING THE LAWS OF SUPPLY AND DEMAND TO FUNCTION NORMALLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FLYNN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, across the Nation, especially in rural areas, an expression often heard is, "What can be done to solve the farm problem?" It would appear, therefore, that it is almost universally accepted that we have a farm problem. Members of Congress have wrestled with this problem for many years, but commencing in 1952 the control of surplus farm commodities broke down, resulting in annual increases in the stored farm commodities each year since that time. This has tended to neutralize the laws of supply and demand. They have been replaced by artificial rules consisting of orders trying to limit future production in the form of acreage allotment price supports, and the like. Each of these measures has had the same effect that a mechanic experiences when he puts in a new set of spark plugs for a customer whose motor is in need of a complete motor overhauling. It may tend to keep the car running temporarily but the car will continue to sputter and operate in an inefficient and ineffective manner until the owner has the complete overhaul job done which is required. Agriculture, today, must have the complete overhaul job. A new set of spark plugs is not enough; by this I mean that we must have a new and a fresh look at the farm situation and determine basically the cause of the present farm ills, and then agree upon what measures can best solve these ills.

SURPLUS IS CAUSE OF FARM PROBLEM

I believe that all farm economists will agree that the cause of the entire farm problem is that we have in the past produced and are yearly producing more farm produce on American farms today, than the American population can consume annually. It is apparent, therefore, that we must bring domestic production of farm commodities into balance with domestic consumption of farm commodities. American agriculture, because of transportation costs, differences in the value of American and foreign moneys, and because of the complications of world trade and considering the

American standard of life in comparison with the European and Asian standard of living cannot successfully produce foods at a profit for a sale on the foreign market on a broad and general basis.

We, therefore, cannot look to foreign exports of farm produce to solve our problem; instead we must limit the produce of American foodstuffs to the normal annual needs of the American population. If we can keep production in balance with consumption, the economic laws of supply and demand will operate so that the urban dweller will be assured of an adequate supply of food at a reasonable price and the producer will be assured of a fair price. Operating in this type of a free and open market, he will receive an adequate price for the foods that he supplies to the market; a price that would give the producer his cost of production plus a fair return on his investment. Farming is a business, and in order to have successful agriculture, the American way of life must—in the marketplace and not with Government subsidy or dole—guarantee the American farmer the cost of production and a fair return on his investment. This can only be done in a market where the laws of supply and demand are operating and where supply remains consistent with domestic demand.

The automobile manufacturer can, because of the small number engaged in that business, quit making cars when production outruns demand.

Because of the large number of farmers producing for the market and because of the unknown elements of weather, it is difficult and I believe impossible for the farmers themselves to keep supply in balance with demand. This must be accomplished by the Government through studies and through a program that will annually keep in production enough acres to produce the food needed to feed the American public, but also keep out of production those acres of land which produce a surplus and thereby defeat the laws of supply and demand and create a national food problem, such as this country has been plagued with for the past 8 years.

This country can no longer continue to approach the problem in the way it has been approached in the past. The farm produce purchase and storage program is costing billions of dollars annually and the American taxpayer cannot be expected to continue paying on his tax dollar in these huge amounts on a farm program that does not work. Just yesterday we considered the agricultural appropriation bill for 1961. This bill is costing the American taxpayer close to $4 billion. The committee report on that bill is as follows:

> The records of the Department show that the Federal Government is now spending far more in the name of agriculture than ever before in history, and yet income from farming in 1959, including soil bank payments, was at the lowest level since before World War II. This is true, despite the fact that national income has increased consistently each year and per capita income for all segments of the population, other than agricultural producers, is at the highest level in the history of the country.

THE PERIOD 1932–52

The farm price support program was created in 1933 to preserve and maintain our soil resources, to give the farmers suitable purchasing power and to provide the consumers with an adequate supply of food and fiber. By 1952 some weaknesses began to become apparent in the laws which were enacted at that time. The Government had an investment of some $2½ billion in commodities in 1952 and was incurring some one-half billion dollars of cost per year. This came about because of overproduction.

Several factors contributed to this overproduction: (1) The increased knowledge and technical know-how of farmers who were able to materially increase their production by cultivating each acre; (2) lack of effective means of controlling production due to an antiquated system of acreage controls which was becoming ineffective.

Net farm income was $14.4 billion per year in 1952.

THE PERIOD 1953–60

Beginning in 1953, the Department of Agriculture, reflecting the views of some people, insisted that changes should be made in the program then in effect. Since that time, the following "cures" have been offered, tried, and from the record found wanting, so far as solving the problem is concerned:

1. Price support reductions averaging 20 percent were made under the "flexible price support plan."

2. A soil bank program was created to curtail production by paying farmers not to farm.

3. Public Law 480 was enacted to dispose of surpluses by virtually giving them away overseas.

4. Research and extension appropriations have been increased some 120 percent.

5. Department of Agriculture personnel has increased about 28 percent and appropriations have increased around 300 percent.

6. Production controls have been relaxed as price support levels have been lowered. For example, the removal of controls on corn production, beginning with the 1959 crop, has resulted in enormous increases in acreage harvested and volume of production.

THE RESULTS

Most of these so-called cures have been a heavy drain on the Treasury and have provided little to improve the deteriorating farm situation, which will grow worse if the present course is followed.

One serious result has been the impairment of purchasing power of rural America. Farm income has dropped from $14.4 billion in 1952 to $11 billion in 1959, a 24 percent reduction. The effect of reduced prices and increased costs on net farm income during this period has been disastrous.

The loss of this purchasing power has already affected not only those who depend on farming for a livelihood, but also those engaged in banking, merchandising, industrial production and other business activities, particularly in the smaller communities. Since those dependent on agricultural income, either directly or indirectly, represent an important market for goods produced in the urban areas of the Nation, this loss of farm income has not only affected the economic welfare of farm sections of the Nation, but if allowed to continue is bound to have serious effects on the whole Nation.

The importance of American agriculture as a market for the Nation's goods can be appreciated when it is realized that agriculture uses more finished steel in a year than is used for a year's output of passenger cars. It uses more petroleum products than any other industry. It uses more rubber each year than is required to produce tires for 6 million automobiles. It is one of the Nation's largest users of electrical power. Its inventory of machinery alone exceeds the assets of the American steel industry and is five times that of the automobile industry.

It has been reliably estimated that each dollar of farm income produces $7 of income throughout the rest of the economy. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that the loss of $3.4 billion of farm income in 1959, as compared to 1952, resulted in a loss of domestic markets worth some $24 billion to the industrial producers of the Nation in that one year.

Another unfortunate result of these so-called cures has been the production of huge surpluses of many agricultural commodities, which have served to depress markets generally for agricultural products and have been a great economic loss to the United States. Figures furnished by the Department, as set forth on page 68, part 1, 1961 hearings, indicate that total farm output has increased from the 1952 level of 108 percent of the base period 1947–49 to 125 percent in 1959. This increase in production of 17 percent, which has created the surplus problem, has to a considerable degree been due to efforts of farmers to offset reduced prices by increased output. This has placed an additional strain on the fertility of the Nation's soil. It is estimated by officials of the Department that this unneeded production has cost the grain farmers over $1 billion in extra annual production of grain alone.

All of this money has been spent and all of the disastrous effects of agriculture have been incurred without putting into effect any effective plan for limiting the production of agricultural producers.

PLAN THAT WILL WORK

The solution to this problem appears to be relatively simple. It is estimated that there is someplace in the neighborhood of 360 million acres of farmland in production. Farm economists have estimated that if from 50 to 80 million acres of this farmland were removed from production that the remaining acres would be adequate to produce the food that this Nation needed. I propose, therefore, to engage in a program where the Secretary of Agriculture will be authorized to remove from production an adequate number of acres to bring annual production into balance with annual consumption. The method and manner of removing these acres is not important and sound means of doing so have been suggested. All of the plans suggested are good; but in lieu of the fact that we do have in the Department of Agriculture an operating program known as the conservation reserve, which has already taken out of production approximately 28 million acres of land, I propose to increase at the rate of 12 million acres per year the number of acres of farmland to be taken out of production.

I propose to continue doing this until domestic production is brought into balance with domestic consumption, and I also authorize in the bill that the Secretary of Agriculture take out such acres that are needed until he reaches the maximum of 80 million acres.

I propose that this land, while remaining idle, be used for two conservation purposes and that, insofar as possible, we cooperate with conservation groups to permit maximum conservation practices on the land that is removed from production.

I believe, however, that the American farmer is, and should remain, a free

enterprise operator, that he should not be subject to directives that will control his every move and control his operation of the farm that he operates. The American farmer is revolting because of the number of bureaucrats that continually check his operation, issue orders to him and control his movements. The farmer should be able to declare his independence on bureaucratic orders by the agencies of Government.

I propose to keep the farmer free to choose whether he wants to come under the program and if so, I propose to give him election so that he can choose voluntarily which program he wishes to participate in.

I believe that farm operators, for the purpose of this program, should be divided into three classifications: First, the older farmer beyond 65 years of age whose responsibilities are over and whose family is raised; second, the middle-aged farmer of 50 or more who is relieved of some of his responsibilities and who would be willing to cut down his operation, if that were possible; and third, the younger farmer just starting out in life who would like to operate a large farm and who would like to produce the maximum amount possible.

Considering these three age groups and considering that our goal is to remove 80 million acres of land from production we, by my bill, can accomplish our goal and permit the farmer to participate or refuse to participate, as he so desires. I propose to have the Department of Agriculture rent whole farms excluding the living quarters and not to exceed 5 acres on which the buildings are located. I believe that the older farmer will be glad to rent his land to the conservation reserve and use the annual rental as an annuity policy upon which he can retire. He will live on the farm and maintain it.

I will permit the Department of Agriculture to rent partial farms and to permit the middle-aged farmers to cut down their operation by approximately 25 percent and thus have spare time left to engage in other activities such as running for town chairman of their particular township. I would pay this farmer a fair rental for the acres taken out of production and give him a payment in kind to make up his loss. I would then permit the young married man to rent additional farms and farm as much land as he desires. A cross section of these three age groups will show that by removing whole farms from those who want to retire, and partial farms from those who want to cut down the size of their operation, and leaving the young man free to increase his farming operation, that we will have taken out as much land from production that we would have taken out if we provided, by our bill, that all three groups had to continue farming but that each group had to farm 25 percent less land. Such a program makes it mandatory that the elder farmer continue farming 75 percent of his land and denies the young man the opportunity of increasing the size of his operation. Through the process of letting the farmer elect which program he would come under and through the use of the existing conservation reserve programs, the Department of Agriculture can retire at the rate of 12 additional million acres per year; enough acres from production to bring domestic production into balance with domestic consumption.

The cost of this program to the taxpayer would be less than one-half of the cost of the existing program. There would be no need for future storage programs. There would be no need for further increase in bureaucratic control of the farm. The farmer would be free to operate his farm as he desired. We would keep controls in effect for 3 years while we are eliminating the surplus and after this, price supports could be removed, because in the market where supply was in balance with demand, price supports would not be necessary. In the event future years indicated price supports were advisable, engaging in such a program would be far cheaper with the volume of farm produce reduced than it would by continuing to produce huge volumes of produce that are not needed for domestic consumption.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WOLF. I would like to bring to the attention of the gentleman and the membership, statistics resulting from a poll recently conducted in my district among more than 10,000 farmers. That many reported. Of this number, 87.9 percent of the folks in my district that answered this poll would accept farm legislation with controls. Ninety-five and nine-tenths percent would accept a food-for-peace program. I thought that statement might help the gentleman in making his case that the dirt farmers, the folks who are close to the soil, are in favor of Federal help in the field of agriculture and they will accept controls in order to get it.

I would like to say further that I agree with the gentleman in his remarks and recognize him as a leader in matters dealing with agriculture. I congratulate him for his statement.

Mr. FLYNN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Yes, the farmers will accept Federal control with regulation. I might say, however, that the farm people revolt at being socialized, if I may use the term. He resents being followed on his farm by an army of bureaucrats telling him how and what to do and what to plant and being told the manner and method in which he can operate.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. BERRY. I wonder if the gentleman has given any thought or consideration to the fact that it would not be necessary to take these acres out of production if we limit to a reasonable extent agricultural imports. I do not know whether the gentleman has paid any attention to imports or not, but last year we imported 2¼ million head of cattle. The Department of Agriculture tells me that they do not know the production of how many acres just the beef imports have supplanted. It takes 30 acres per beef per year. Nationwide I think it would require an average of about 20 acres to produce a beef, fatten it, and put it on the market. In other words, the 2¼ million head of beef that we imported last year supplanted the production of about 50 million acres. If we do not import this beef, the 50 million acres that the gentleman is talking about taking out of production would not need to come out of production. The same thing is true with sheep and lamb and mutton and hogs. The same thing is true with wool. The wool that we imported into this country last year is supplanting the production of 75 million acres. I wish that the grange and the Bureau and the Farmers Union would look to the cause of the agricultural difficulty, which is primarily foreign agricultural imports. We do not have to completely limit it. We do not have enough acres in America today to produce the food that we eat and the fiber that goes onto our backs. If the American farmer was only given the opportunity to produce a majority of what we eat and wear, it could be limited.

Mr. FLYNN. I thank the gentleman. I could not agree with anyone more wholeheartedly than I do with him. I point out, however, that the problem he has raised insofar as it applies to the farm economy is duplicated and multiplied in every other segment of our economy. Just today the Secretary of the Army authorized the Panama Canal authorities to sign a contract for something like $4 million for the construction of locomotives for the Panama Canal to be made by the Mitsubishi Co. in Japan. Now, this Buy-European program is so rampant today, we are taxing American industry to maintain the American standard of living and then refusing to buy from American industry and buying abroad with only a 6 percent differential in a country where the standard of living is so far below that which we are trying to maintain. That policy is all wrong.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in the statement which the gentleman from Wisconsin is making today. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn this today that the defense contract, involving some $4 million, to which the gentleman from Wisconsin has referred, was awarded to the Mitsubishi Co. of Japan to furnish 39 locomotives to the Panama Canal Zone for towing ships through the locks. This is not only a devastating blow to the welfare of a fine small business enterprise in my district, the Plymouth Locomotive Works, the only qualified domestic bidder on this contract, the kind of small business enterprise we like to see flourish in America; this decision on the part of the administration not only means the loss of jobs to the breadwinners of a great many families in the Plymouth area where we already have substantial unemployment, but in other areas as well where component parts are made.

Mr. Speaker, the award of this contract to a foreign bidder not only results in a loss to our Government of some $500,000 in revenue from taxes, but it raises in my mind a serious question as to whether or not we are risking national security by relying on a foreign firm to maintain service and furnish spare parts for a defense facility in the Canal Zone.

Mr. Speaker, this is another example of the overall policy of this administration to which the gentleman from Wisconsin has just referred, to take care of the many peoples in foreign countries but seemingly without the same regard for the welfare and the interests of our own people at home.

I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin and the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota will join me and many of our colleagues in this House who are very desirous of taking a whole new look at the concept of foreign aid, the principles involved in the Buy American Act, the Small Business Act, and our overall trade policy with a view to stemming this "anything but America" fad, realizing that if we are to meet the challenge laid down by Mr. Khrushchev when he said he would "bury us," we must remain strong economically as well as militarily.

I think this is one of the great issues before the Congress of the United States. I certainly hope that the gentleman will join me in this overall reexamination of these policies to which I have referred.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FLYNN. I yield.

Mr. BERRY. I should like to remind the gentleman that it is Congress that makes these laws. The Constitution provides that Congress shall levy the tariff. Congress has handed, if you please, its authority, or it has attempted to hand its authority, to the administrative branch. I do not believe the Congress had the authority to do it in the first place.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Wisconsin will yield further, I would remind the gentleman from South Dakota that under the Buy American Act prior to 1954 a foreign bidder was required to be 25 percent lower than a domestic bidder in order to qualify for a defense contract; but that by the Executive order of 1954 that 25 percent was lowered to 6 percent in most cases and to 10 percent in some cases, depending upon the tariff situation in a given case.

Mr. BERRY. Why do not we, as Congress, do something about it?

Mr. LEVERING. That is exactly what I was suggesting to the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. BERRY. It is we, it is the Congress that is to blame. And I say that we had better get busy pretty fast.

Mr. LEVERING. I certainly agree with the gentleman from South Dakota that the Congress should speak out, but what can the Congress do about the policies of the administration which suggest that we can afford to spend money for flood control projects in foreign lands, but that we cannot afford to do it in America?

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, we have just appropriated $40 billion for defense; that is not only the defense of America, but the defense of the free world. We are appropriating about $5 billion a year for foreign aid. That is about $45 billion, which is $875 per family in America. That $875 has to be added to the cost of everything that is produced in America, whether it is on the farm, in the factory, or wherever it is. That price has to be added. I say to you that if we are going to continue that, then we will have to do this: We are going to have to levy an assessment against these other countries that we are defending, and the only way we can collect it is to collect it when they import material into this country; but I am convinced that the only way we can hope to compete with them is on a competitive basis, and that is by levying a tax against them and collecting it as their product is imported into this country.

I thank the gentleman very much for giving me this opportunity.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FLYNN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEVERING. I do not want to give the Members of this House the impression that I think we should terminate all foreign trade. I think the gentleman would agree that we must have foreign trade.

Mr. BERRY. Surely, but on a reciprocal basis.

Mr. LEVERING. We must have a reciprocal trade program that is reciprocal and be sure that under such measures as the Buy American Act, we come up with a formula which will protect the domestic interests involved.

Mr. FLYNN. I thank the gentleman very much.

I may say in reference to the contract to which the gentleman alluded with reference to locomotives for the Panama Canal that it was the Panama Canal Company, not necessarily the administration, that was at fault. The Panama Canal Company let bids some few months ago. At that time a concern in my district, the Fairbanks, Morse Co., was the low bidder. The Plymouth Locomotive Co. of Ohio, also a very fine company, was second. Mitsubishi of Japan was No. 3.

For some reason that I think is totally unexplained all the contracts were rejected. On the second bid, No. 3, the Mitsubishi Co., was low, the Plymouth Locomotive Co. of Ohio was second, and the Fairbanks-Morse Co. of Beloit, Wis., was third. Both of the American companies are exceedingly fine companies, old companies, qualified to fulfill the contract but unable because of the Buy-American program to get the contract.

I might say that though they say "unable" there was no inability, because in a similar circumstance the Tennessee Valley Authority signed contracts where there was over a 20-percent differential, and the same authority existed for the Panama Canal Company to exceed the 6 percent that existed for the TVA to exceed the 6 percent.

I called this to the attention of the Panama Canal Company and took the matter up with everybody in authority, but finally after they went over the entire matter, with letters of protest going in and the gentleman's concern in Ohio protesting vigorously, and the Senators taking it up, they still signed the contract with the Japanese concern, costing America millions of dollars in loss of tax revenue, hundreds of thousands of man-hours of employment for men living in the industrial Midwest, where there is unemployment today, and costing the Government the taxes that would be paid by these men on the earnings they made. Also, they are getting these locomotives from a place where in time of war it would be extremely difficult to get the necessary spare parts.

That shows how industry is being treated by our Government, yet is being taxed to maintain our standard of living. The workingmen in those plants in order to compete with Japanese labor will have to reduce their standard of living, and their wage per hour will be reduced to a comparative basis with Japanese labor.

The laboring man and the industrialist do not yet realize what the effect might be, but the farmer well knows what it means, because the farmer has already had the price of his commodities reduced to a price which is far out of line with the standard of living maintained by the rest of the American people. Over the last 10 years, as the price of all other commodities rose, the price of farm commodities has decreased, so that any farmer attempting to live on a family farm has had to reduce his standard of living and do a greater share of the work himself or with his family in order merely to hold on. He knows and understands what it means to have this country engage in a Buy-European campaign, to buy millions of pounds of beef, pork, and other food produced outside this country in competition with the produce of his farm.

The farmer, however, is the last vestige of independence in the United States. He does not want to be collectivized, and this Congress cannot attempt to foist upon American farmers a bill that will socialize or collectivize the farmer and make him the victim or pawn of an army of bureaucrats who travel from farm to farm giving orders.

RECOMPUTATION OF MILITARY RETIREMENT PAY

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly favor the legislation presented so ably to the House of Representatives by my colleague and chairman, PAUL KILDAY, of Texas, to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services who were prejudiced at the time the Congress enacted the Military Pay Act of 1958.

The legislation reported by the Armed Services Committee is similar to H.R.

1997, a bill I introduced on January 9, 1959.

Favorable action on this bill will have a profound effect not only on those servicemen who have already retired, but on active duty personnel, as well as the young men who today may be contemplating a career in the military service of the United States. Passage of this legislation will restore the confidence of the serviceman that he also will be subject to traditional pay increases should they be put into effect in future years.

In my district of San Diego, Calif., we have perhaps one of the largest concentrations of retired servicemen who to a man have evidenced their concern to me about the departure from established tradition when the Congress enacted the 1958 act.

Correction of this inequity will mean a great deal not only to my community but to the country as well, for it will restore this confidence that was somewhat shaken in 1958.

Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates summed this matter up quite well in his report to our committee. His remarks follow:

The Department of Defense has restudied its earlier position on the recomputation of retired pay and after further consideration now believes it only equitable and fair to reestablish the traditional relationship between active duty pay and retired pay. The Department of Defense, therefore, recommends enactment of legislation to achieve these objectives * * * and believes the net result would be of significant value by increasing the morale, efficiency and effectiveness of our active duty career personnel as well as avoiding discrimination against retired personnel who served their country faithly and well.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

PRESENT FEDERAL OLD AGE MEDICAL PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the propaganda in behalf of a Federal program to assist people over 65 to meet their medical expenses has been based upon a gross innuendo that there is no present Federal program.

There is a substantial Federal program today which is geared into a substantial State, county, municipal, private charity, private enterprise, family, self, health care program. The question is not whether we at the Federal level are to do nothing—because we are doing considerable—the question is can we improve what we are doing.

It is foolhardy to make new proposals without reference to what is being done. We can damage with good intentions our present program which is the finest health program any society has ever had. This program is improving each year at a rapid pace due to the built-in factors permitting healthy growth.

The bold figures of what the Federal Government is presently spending in care for the aged, of which health care of course is a part, are as follows:

For the year 1960

	Billion
OASI (old age social insurance) payments to persons over 65	$9.2
OAA (old age assistance) Federal payments to persons over 65	1.74
Total	10.94

Additional benefits to people over 65 granted in Federal income tax—double Federal income tax exemption for people over 65—$600 times 15 million, equals $9 billion of exemption.

At 20 percent tax is $1.8 billion, adjusted by 40 percent, roughly those who utilize their exemption, $0.72 billion.

Three percent medical deduction allowance in Federal income tax—no figures available.

In addition, the Federal Government has extended FHA guarantee for private nursing homes, has in effect the Hill-Burton hospital construction program, National Health Institute programs and other programs.

RURAL LINES, U.S.A.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Electrification Administration, which celebrates its 25th anniversary today, has published two new booklets telling the history and purpose of its electric and telephone loan programs.

I would like to call these two publications to the attention of my colleagues, for they tell a fascinating story of a revolution in rural America that has not stopped yet.

In keeping with the nonpartisan character of REA, both books are nonpartisan publications. They are complete, accurate, and objective, and they are written so that high school students, as well as adults, can understand them. In addition, both books are profusely illustrated. As a former newspaperman who enjoys a good story, I heartily commend both publications to all of you.

I would like to quote several passages. Rural Lines, U. S. A., the story of REA's electric program, begins as follows:

Within the past quarter century 1,053 rural electric systems have been financed with funds borrowed from the Rural Electrification Administration, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. By 1960, more than half of all the electrified farms in the United States were receiving electric service from REA-financed utilities, along with a sizable number of other rural establishments.

Each of these electric systems, most of which are operated by farmer-owned cooperatives, is pledged to a principle called area coverage, by which it agrees to make a diligent effort to extend service to anyone within a given area who wants it, no matter how remote the farm or ranch. This principle has proved as practical as it is lofty, for during the 25 years since 1935, when REA was created, the percentage of electrified farms in the United States has climbed from a scant 11 percent to around 97 percent. A large number of the farms and ranches in the thinner areas of our Nation receive their electric service from these REA-financed systems. Furthermore, REA borrowers have proved good credit risks, with principal and interest payments to the Government passing the $1 billion mark by 1960.

Rural Lines, U. S. A. goes on to tell how farmers grew tired of waiting for commercial power companies to build lines to their farms, and how President Franklin D. Roosevelt created REA to help them get electricity on May 11, 1935.

The book describes the efforts of REA's first Administrator, the late Morris L. Cooke, to transform the agency from an unemployment relief program to a full-scale electrification loan program. It tells how the demands of farmers for the right to form their own rural electric cooperatives to borrow funds led to the approval of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, which was introduced in this Chamber by Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN.

As the REA program moved into high gear, REA helped develop a new kind of construction.

Rural Lines, U. S. A. recalls:

The cost of building rural lines before REA was between $1,500 and $2,000 per mile of line. In thickly settled areas, there were enough people per mile to pay for this expensive "battleship" construction. In rural areas, however, it was a different story. REA knew that costs would have to be cut if more U.S. farmers were to get electricity and to pay for it.

From the beginning, therefore, REA engineers concentrated on finding new and cheaper ways to build rural lines that were both simple and sturdy. They were enormously successful. By the end of 1936, the agency was able to announce that nine projects had been built in as many States at an average cost of only $941 per mile of line. By 1939, REA borrowers were building lines for an average of less than $825 per mile, including overhead.

The REA publication gives the biggest share of the credit for the success of its program to farm leaders in 45 States who unselfishly gave so much time and energy to organizing the hundreds of electric cooperatives.

The book points out that:

As with most new ventures, the hard work of organizing the rural electric cooperatives generally fell to a handful of local farm leaders. It must not be supposed that the co-op idea sold itself to farmers. As a rule the energetic few had to sell the idea to their neighbors.

The organizers faced many difficulties, even after the co-op was formed. Rural Lines, U. S. A. notes:

It seemed to the co-op organizers that they were always selling something. No sooner was the signup campaign complete than the easement campaign began.

At the outset of the electric program, REA had decided not to approve the use of loan funds to purchase rights-of-way from members, feeling that payment would be inconsistent with the idea of member-owned cooperatives. As a result, cooperatives had to collect thousands of easements across property, each one signed by the property owner. Some idea of the size of the task is indicated by the fact that co-ops had collected more than 1 million separate easements by 1941.

The job would have been difficult enough had all farmers been agreeable, but many were not. As in the signup drive, they had to be sold individually. A number of farmers still had the idea that in signing an easement, they were mortgaging their property to the U.S. Treasury. Others feared that a line of poles would hamper farming operations or attract lightning. Still others didn't like the idea of a pole in the front yard.

In most cases, opposition evaporated when everything was carefully explained. Once a landowner understood that a pole line interfered little if any with farming, that he was protected against damage by insurance carried by the co-op, and that he was not mortgaging his property, he signed. He was made to realize that his neighbors down the road could not have electric service unless he granted his right-of-way.

It goes on to recall the deep emotion with which farm families greeted their first electric lights:

That night—the night the lights came on—was forever after an important date in most farm families, ranking with marriages and births as an anniversary of importance. In countless homes, the lights remained on all night long, with people getting a good look at the rooms—and at each other.

In time, as rural people used more electricity and learned the business of running their cooperatives, it became apparent that the REA program and the co-ops it helped bring into being were going to write one of the biggest success stores of the 20th century.

As Rural Lines, U. S. A. puts it:

To many people, it appeared that the typical electric cooperative had more than three strikes against it from the start. For one thing, the first officers and directors were amateurs in the utility business. It wasn't only their lack of management experience; they had never even experienced electricity before. The first manager was likely to be short of training, too. Chances are he was a former lineman or a board member. Add to this the thinly populated area served by the typical co-op, and you have a textbook case of an outfit in serious trouble.

So much for the textbooks. While the typical cooperative had its bad days, it turned out in the long run to be an enormously successful organization. Behind that success was an intangible that doesn't show on the balance sheet—enthusiasm. The consumers, the directors, and the co-op employers were sold on electricity. They had waited a long time to get it, and they weren't going to give it up.

The book traces the enormous impact of rural electrification on such agricultural pursuits as dairy farming, poultry production, and stock feeding. It observes that in recent years electricity has attracted thousands of nonfarm people and new rural industries to the country.

Rural Lines, U. S. A. concludes:

During REA's first 25 years, the member-owned electric systems have proved themselves efficient and financially responsible organizations. They have proved themselves capable of distributing electric power on an area-wide basis to even the most thinly populated parts of our country. They have proved their right to serve. If all REA-financed systems continue to concentrate on service in the future as well as they have in the past, there appears to be no reason why they should not be a permanent part of the utility industry of the United States.

The other new REA publication is Rural Telephone Service, U. S. A. It tells the story of the agency's newer telephone loan program, which already boasts 686 borrowers and which has approved loans to finance new or improved telephone service for more than 1.2 million rural families.

If any of you have not read both REA histories, I suggest that you secure copies. When you do, I believe that you will take even greater pride in impressive achievements of REA and of the millions of rural people who have participated in its programs.

I commend the Administrator of REA, Mr. David Hamil, for the effective job he has been doing, for his dedication to the REA program and his steadfast adherence to the principles that bind representatives of rural America together in a service of so much benefit to our country. I commend Mr. Hamil and others, namely, Mr. William E. Spivey, Chief, of REA Information Division, and Mr. Robert W. Kelley, information specialist, who are responsible for the compilation of the two books I have discussed this afternoon. Mr. Spivey has directed, in my opinion, the publication of one of the finest, most interesting, and most informative public documents ever issued by a Government agency.

INTERNATIONAL PAYOLA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, when the House passed the conference report to accompany H.R. 11510, it included a Senate amendment which expressed the sense of the Congress that the Development Loan Fund should give special consideration to loans and guarantees to stimulate the development of free economic institutions and private investment in the field of housing in rapidly developing countries.

In general I am in sympathy with this amendment. The housing problem in many of these countries is deplorable and much worse than most Americans can fully comprehend.

In the current issue of the National Savings & Loan Journal I note that a $2 million loan was recently made by the Development Loan Fund to a privately owned savings and loan association in Lima, Peru. This loan is being made to the Association of Mutuel de Creditos para Vivienda Peru, which was founded by Pedro Beltran before he became Peru's Prime Minister and Minister of Finance.

It was certainly more than mere coincidence or accident that the first Development Loan Fund loaned for housing should be made to an institution founded and owned by the Prime Minister of Peru.

Earlier this afternoon I inquired of the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee whether it was the sense of that committee that these loans for housing development should be made to banks or institutions owned by prime ministers or government officials of the Latin American States. I was pleased to learn that this kind of lending was certainly not the intention of the committee. Therefore, it appears to me that those responsible for such lending should bear in mind that this type of international payola is not approved by the Congress.

It will also be interesting to learn the interest rate which will be assessed by this particular institution for residential home construction. Since this $2 million is being borrowed from the United States for a period of 10 years at an interest rate of 5¾ percent, the Association of Mutuel de Creditos para Vivienda Peru should enjoy a very handsome profit on the transaction and pay off the loan within 4 years. It is my understanding that residential loans in Peru are currently commanding an interest rate of 20 percent and higher.

Under these circumstances the borrowing institution in Peru should end up with a whopping big profit on the transaction. It is to be seen whether the victims of this kind of lending will develop any great affection for the Development Loan Fund and the American people who have made this kind of borrowing possible.

I hope that this type of good will interest in the Latin American Republics will not result in greater dislike for America.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for May 12 and 13, on account of personal reasons.

Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. PRICE (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), to address the House for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FALLON, to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and to include extraneous matter and tables on H.R. 10495.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), to revise and extend his remarks during debate on the bill H.R. 10495 and to include extraneous matter therein.

(At the request of Mr. MCCORMACK, the following Members were granted

permission to revise and extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. SANTANGELO.

(At the request of Mr. SMITH of California and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1607. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anne Morgan;

H.R. 10474. An act to authorize construction of modern naval vessels.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2778. An act to amend the act relating to the Commission of Fine Arts.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, May 16, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 525. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 4815, a bill to insure effective regulation of D.C. Transit System, Inc., and fair and equal competition between D.C. Transit System, Inc., and its competitors; without amendment (Rept. No. 1602). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 526. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7480, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with respect to label declaration of the use of pesticide chemicals on raw agricultural commodities which are the produce of the soil; without amendment (Rept. No. 1603). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 527. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 10572, a bill to authorize and direct that national forests be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1604). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 528. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 11761, a bill to simplify, consolidate, and improve the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to loans to farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1605). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12196. A bill to relieve hardship for displaced families and businesses by assisting in their relocation and by providing them with mortgage financing under a new low-rent private housing program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 12197. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Commerce from approving plans, specifications, and estimates for a portion of a route on the Interstate System in New York, known as the Lower Manhattan Expressway, and to prohibit further obligation or expenditure of Federal funds in connection with such route; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12198. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from income tax for certain nonprofit clubs organized and operated for the purpose of paying benefits to the members and their dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 12199. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on musical instruments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H.R. 12200. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize reduction in enlisted grade upon approval of certain court-martial sentences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McGINLEY:

H.R. 12201. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act to provide that land devoted to conserving uses after the expiration of a conservation reserve contract may continue to be counted in the determination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H.R. 12202. A bill to amend the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, to provide that the plan for the extension of the U.S. Capitol shall provide for a heliport on the Capitol Grounds; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 12203. A bill to relieve hardship for displaced families and businesses by assisting in their relocation and by providing them with mortgage financing under a new low-rent private housing program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 12204. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, to aid in protecting individuals, corporations, companies, and other organizations against defamatory or otherwise injurious statements made in interview or discussion programs purporting to be spontaneous and unrehearsed; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 12205. A bill to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 12206. A bill to relieve hardship for displaced families and businesses by assisting in their relocation and by providing them with mortgage financing under a new low-rent private housing program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 12207. A bill to stabilize cotton price support for the 1961 crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 12208. A bill to amend section 3568 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for reducing sentences of imprisonment imposed upon persons held in custody for want of bail while awaiting trial by the time so spent in custody; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R. 12209. A bill to amend sections 7323 and 7325 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to preclude forfeitures of certain property before a final decision in certain criminal proceedings instituted against the owner of such property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 12210. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $1,800 a year the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 12211. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease and desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 12212. A bill to provide that certain subcontracts may be entered into only in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 12213. A bill to amend title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12214. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to remove certain limitations on the aggregate amount of outstanding mortgage insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 12215. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939, with respect to the allocation of funds available under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAINS (by request):

H.R. 12216. A bill to provide additional financial facilities in the Federal National Mortgage Association, to provide for the incorporation of Federal mortgage investment companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.J. Res. 707. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an Annual Youth Appreciation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CONTE: Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing the compensation of postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FORAND: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to preserve the immunity of State and local governments from the payment of Federal income tax on bond interest and to continue in full

force and effect the exemption of such bond interest from Federal taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 12217. A bill for the relief of Harry L. Watson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWLES:

H.R. 12218. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo Leone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12219. A bill for the relief of Sydney Gruson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12220. A bill for the relief of Hans Erich Arthur Langhammer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 12221. A bill for the relief of Joan Discallar Beasely; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 12222. A bill for the relief of Marya Marek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12223. A bill for the relief of Helena Maria Michno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 12224. A bill for the relief of Alvin C. York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 12225. A bill for the relief of James L. Merrill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 12226. A bill for the relief of Adam and Edmund Wojtowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12227. A bill for the relief of Wladyslaw Figura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12228. A bill for the relief of Eugeniusz Kubicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 12229. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine the claims of Mollers' Suidah Shipbreakers, Ltd., Alpha Steamship Co., Ltd., and Lancashire Shipping Company, Ltd.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 12230. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chung-Huang Tang Kao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

462. By Mr. McCULLOCH: Petition of members of United Papermakers and Paperworkers Local No. 195 of the State of Ohio, District No. 4, for passage of the Forand bill, H.R. 4700; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

463. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Bertram Edises, Oakland, Calif., relative to *Edises, et al.* v. *Willis, et al.;* to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

School Safety Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, we have all noticed from time to time on our street corners, in the morning and afternoon hours when children make their way to and from school, a young boy or girl in the uniform, or wearing the shoulder strap, of the School Safety Patrol. Almost everyone, if they were asked what they thought of the Safety Patrol, would say that they think it is a good thing. The hard fact that the Safety Patrol averts many traffic accidents, and even probably saves many little lives, is not brought home to us until we read a newspaper account of some heroic act by a boy or girl in the Safety Patrol.

I was highly honored to have present in the House today Miss Beverly Jean Marsh, a constituent of mine from Cedar Rapids, Iowa, who today received the following citation from the Vice President of the United States:

BEVERLY JEAN MARSH, AGE 12, TAYLOR SCHOOL, CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA, CERTIFICATE CITATION

Samuel Fountain, age 5, and David Jones, age 10, returning to school after lunch on March 10, 1960, were about to cross Sixth Street at Fifth Avenue where Beverly was on School Safety Patrol duty. A truck driver, moving north on Sixth Street, kept driving at about 25 miles per hour despite a red traffic signal. The two boys, facing a signal in their favor, were not aware of the approaching truck. Alertly noting their danger, Beverly quickly pulled them back, thus preventing serious consequences.

Beverly is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Marsh, 820 Ninth Street SW., Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, we believe in the School Safety Patrol for this is the sort of activity which develops good leadership, and we hope that other young people will be encouraged to take seriously their responsibilities.

I have today sent to the Gazette and to radio station WMT, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, the following telegram:

Ceremonies have just been concluded in the office of the Vice President at the Capitol in which the lovely little safety patrol, Beverly Jean Marsh, of Taylor School, Cedar Rapids, was honored by a national citation from the Vice President of the United States for the courage which she showed in rescuing from a traffic accident two little boys on March 10. As the Congressman representing Cedar Rapids in the U.S. House of Representatives I take great pride that one of my constituents has been chosen as one of five people in all the Nation to be so honored this year. I commend Beverly Jean for her alertness, devotion to duty, and her courage. Let us hope that her example can encourage other young people to take seriously their responsibilities.

Jobs After 40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following excerpts from a talk on "Older Worker Placement" by Ewan Clague, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, U.S. Labor Department before the Older Worker Forum in Philadelphia on December 5, 1957, clearly illustrate why we must break the employment age barrier:

Middle-aged and older men and women today constitute a very considerable part of our manpower resources, and by 1965 they will constitute an even more important part. We expect a 10 million increase in labor force between 1955 and 1965, and half of the increase will be persons 45 years and over.

Only if we can make the best possible use of the skills, ability, and capacity for continuous work of all of these people, will we be able to produce the goods, both civilian and military, which are needed. * * *

By 1965 we expect our population in the United States to have reached 193.3 million persons. Our labor force is expected to increase from 68.9 million to 79.2 million in 1965. However, the age distribution will be different. We will have many more of the younger age groups (14–24) and a good many more of the older group (45 and over), but hardly any more in the middle age groups from 25–44, than now. * * *

These projections point up for us * * * the great importance of the worker over 45 in our factories and service industries of the future. If we practice or introduce the right hiring and personnel policies now, then the gradual change in the composition of our labor force will not produce the waste, shortages, or unemployment which might otherwise occur. Since we shall not have a large reservoir of just the preferred age groups, it is all the more important that we learn to make the best possible use of the manpower resources that will be available.

These figures given by Mr. Clague illustrate the fact that our economy needs to learn how to use the productive skills of our older workers. But there are human needs in addition to economic needs. What about the individual who wants to continue working; who needs to work in order to be happy? Studies show that a great many people want to work after they reach 65, even though they are eligible for old-age pensions.

Unless our society can develop methods by which persons can continue to work as long as they are able to work, we shall be faced with an ever-growing number of discontented and unproductive older persons, who will have to be supported by younger persons economically, emotionally, and spiritually.

The problem becomes more acute in periods of depression or recession when there is a labor surplus. Those who do the hiring are more apt to insist on rigid age barriers during such periods because it is easier to find workers with characteristics precisely of the type specified. This makes it even harder to place older workers than is usually the case. Moreover, the increased failure of businesses in depression and recession periods throws more older workers on the labor market. The economy comes out of the recession eventually, but many of the older workers never reach full productivity again.

For those mature people who are able to work, the greatest emotional need they have is to be able to work, to be able to support themselves, to be able to think of themselves as economically useful people.

There are also tremendous social costs in denying employment to older workers under 65. There is the cost of supporting such workers, either through public assistance benefits or private help. There is the loss in taxes which would be paid by such workers if they were employed. And finally there are the numberless social services which are often required when families suffer financial reverses.

It is plain that we cannot continue to lengthen man's lifespan and at the same time lower the age at which he is allowed to continue as a productive member of society. Sooner or later we will reach the point where the burden of supporting large numbers of older workers who are not fully productive will become too much for our economy to bear.

Therefore, there are at least three compelling reasons why all citizens of good will should work to break the age barrier to employment. One is economic—we must do it in order to keep our productivity high and our economy prosperous; a second is social—everyone in our society must help to bear the cost that arises when an individual is denied the opportunity to support himself and his family; a third is human—we must do it to keep our society stable.

Medical Care Now: America's Great Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, a nation's moral fibre is judged by the regard the government has toward its people, especially its senior citizens. The Forand bill, H.R. 4700, is a measure which demonstrates a concern for the health and care of our elders in the twilight period of their lives. I was happy to be a cosponsor of this humane and practical measure and introduced H.R. 7154.

Our problem is the care of over 15 million of our citizens, and I believe the Forand bill provides the best approach to the solution of this problem. The administration proposal is a cruel hoax upon the American people and the proposal by the American Medical Association is based upon the premise that only a small fraction of our senior citizens need health care and most of them can afford the cost of hospitalization and medical care.

The problem of medical and hospital care for our elderly citizens arises from the fact that medical science has made more progress in the last decades than ever before. Today some diseases such as malaria, smallpox and bubonic plague have been almost completely eradicated in America. Other diseases such as polio and osteomyelitis are on the way out, and we may hope that the recent progress in cancer and heart research may someday result in their eradication as well. Because of these strides, people are living longer than ever before. Man's life expectancy is now 70 years of age. There are now over 15 million Americans who have passed their 65th birthday. In 1975 there will be 20 million.

The increase of life span has not been an unmixed blessing. The aged today face a number of problems some of which they find very difficult to meet. One of the most pressing of these needs is adequate medical care. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has stated:

> Older persons have larger than average medical care needs. As a group they use about two and a half times as much general hospital care as the average for persons under age 65 and they have special need for long term institutional care.

It should always be kept in mind that the cost of this large amount of medical care must be paid for out of the same resources on which the older person depends for his food, clothing, and shelter. Unfortunately, millions of our senior citizens simply cannot meet all of these expenses out of their present slender means.

In 1958 half of the people over 65 had incomes of $870 or less. That amounts to 8 million people who must live and pay for their medical care out of $73 per month. The cost of medical care has risen far more steeply since 1949 than the cost of items like food. In November 1959 food cost 17 percent more than it did in the base period ending in 1949, while medical costs had increased by 53 percent. The cost of hospital care alone has nearly doubled. It is little wonder that older persons are often forced to forgo medical care they really should have, or that proper care is often delayed until the situation is serious.

As the American Hospital Association stated in hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on the Problems of the Aged and Aging:

> We are convinced by all the evidence we have seen that the problem of health care and its financing is one of the most serious facing the nonindigent aged, and one of the greatest threats to their economic security. * * * Various indications * * * suggest that a good many of the aged postpone or refrain from seeking hospital or other care which would be desirable.

It is also not surprising that a single illness can wipe out the savings of a lifetime and leave a person dependent on the public dole. These problems not only affect the aged persons themselves, but they can also be a tremendous shock to the children and other relatives who assume responsibility for the expenses.

The American Medical Association, which bitterly opposes the Forand bill seems to believe that there is no need for Federal legislation because of the longstanding policy of many doctors to render their services free of charge to those who are in need. You and I know of many excellent physicians who follow this policy. They deserve our respect, our love, and our affection. I know how much they do and how much they can do. I had a brother who was a medical doctor and surgeon who rendered much free services and practically operated a free clinic for the community during the thirties. These doctors are the men who have earned the great respect of society and undying gratitude of their patients. They contribute to the high regard in which the public holds the medical profession. Nevertheless, it seems to me that the evidence is conclusive that many people do not get the care they need despite the generous assistance and charitable work rendered by the followers of Hippocrates.

Even though physicians do take their patients' financial resources into account in fixing their own fees, a great part of the medical expense problem remains beyond their control. In days gone by a doctor could carry all the equipment he needed in a small bag and depended largely on his unaided senses to make his diagnoses. Modern research has ended those days forever. A doctor now requires a host of complicated instruments and highly skilled personnel to operate them. These require huge capital investments and someone must pay for all this modern apparatus.

The Forand bill would help meet the medical care needs of the aged in a way no other proposal yet developed can. It would make health benefits part of the social security system, and thus provide at least a minimum of protection to the nearly 11,300,000 persons over 65 who are now eligible to receive regular old age and survivors benefits. The health benefits would include 60 days' hospitalization per year, plus 60 days' nursing home care per year, and all surgery performed in a hospital. These benefits would be paid as a matter of right out of the social security trust fund created by the joint contributions of the workers and their employers. This, I think, is the most important thing about the Forand bill. The Government, Federal or State, makes no contribution. The taxpayer is not saddled with income taxes to finance the program. Older people would not be subjected to a humiliating "needs test"

or forced to take a pauper's oath. Benefits would not be charity doles, but the proceeds of insurance for which the worker had made payment during his working life. The fact that protection will be completely paid for by the time the worker reaches age 65 does not make medical care free any more than automobile, fire, or life insurance is free.

Most important of all, the worker would pay his share of the cost when he is most able to afford it—when he is working. When a worker retires he would have permanent insurance which would not require additional premium payments out of his meager retirement income.

From one point of view it is difficult to understand the opposition of some doctors to this proposal. As we have already noted many doctors assume a personal responsibility for providing medical care to those who cannot afford it. Even though physicians may be willing, even eager, to carry so much of the load, it is not fair that they should do so. This is after all a national social problem for which the Nation as a whole should bear responsibility.

One question which always arises and which must be answered is "How much will it cost?" The best estimates now available have been prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. According to these estimates the cost of the Forand bill could be defrayed by increasing the rate of social security tax by 0.40 percent of payroll each for employers and employees—0.60 percent for the self-employed. The small increase in the contribution rates seems to be more than justified by the great benefits it would provide.

Opponents of the Forand bill have a great many arguments, which I would like to discuss. First, some attack the cost estimates of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as too low, even though that Department, as part of the administration, is opposed to the bill. Representatives of the insurance industry and the medical profession have claimed that it will cost almost twice as much as the Department says it will. I am tempted to believe that the zealousness of these opponents has caused them to overestimate the costs. Similar predictions were made when we passed the disability benefit program in 1956. In fact, the Department's estimates proved entirely reliable, even somewhat conservative.

Part of the argument that the cost of the bill would be excessive rests upon assertions that hospitals and nursing homes would be flooded with malingerers who were not really ill. There will, of course, be an increase in the number of people going to hospitals. The bill would not serve its purpose if this did not happen and there would be no reason to pass it. The idea is to get people into hospitals who need treatment but are not getting it because they cannot presently afford it. As for the malingerers, no person would receive health benefits unless treatment were found to be medically necessary by a doctor. I cannot believe that the doctors of this country would deliberately abuse the program. I do believe they are too skillful to be misled by any great number of hypochondriacs.

I think a great deal of opposition to the proposal has come from people who do not want socialized medicine and who have been taken in by statements that the Forand bill would mean the socialization of medicine in this country. Of course, the Forand bill would do nothing of the kind. It provides that medical bills will be paid out of a trust fund to which the patient has contributed. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would have no more authority to control the practice of medicine by fixing fees and prescribing treatment than does the president of the Mutual Insurance Co., of Omaha, probably less. In fact, any such control by the Secretary is specifically prohibited by the bill. Every patient would have the right to be treated in the hospital of his choice so long as the hospital were willing to receive payment out of the trust fund. No hospital or doctor would be required to admit or treat a patient unless they thought it medically necessary. It seems to me that every conceivable safeguard has been built into the bill.

It has been said that the Forand bill is unnecessary because of the growth of private health insurance, and that passage of the bill would destroy the progress made by private insurers. The opponents cite figures to show that 40 percent of the aged now have some form of health insurance and they predict that the proportion will increase to 70 percent by 1965. The growth of private insurance is a wonderful thing and our Government has helped it grow. However, figures can be misleading because, even if true, they refer to those who are covered while they are employed and not after they retire.

Since World War II because of the wartime restrictions on wage increases, collective bargaining agreements gave impetus to fringe benefits and hospitalization plans. Private hospitalization plans developed on a scale so vast that 95 million American workers and dependents are presently covered by hospitalization programs while they are still working and have not retired. After retirement, only a small portion of the 19 million workers who have pension plans are covered for medical care and hospitalization. Retirement means the end of hospitalization and medical care for our Nation's workers and their dependents. The Forand bill is designed to take care of this need after retirement when because of age, most people need medical and hospitalization care desperately.

With each passing year, our senior citizens develop inexplicable pains and aches. Our senior citizens have arthritic and old bones. I, for one, know of those pains which come from nowhere and end just beyond where the doctor's fingers touch. They frequently defy location. I know of the pains which come with the night and disappear with the dawn. A prescribed pill or an appropriate injection, inexpensive but effective, determines whether our elders shall pass many hours of agony or a period of comparable comfort.

Many of the people who are included in the 40 percent have wholly inadequate coverage for which they must pay more than they can really afford. For instance, one insurance company charges $78 per year for benefits which are less than one quarter of those which would be provided by the Forand bill. If the insured failed to make a single deadline on his premium payments, the policy may lapse and perhaps cannot be reinstated. Many of the aged who have health insurance have this type.

It is not hard to understand why some private insurance companies must charge so much for so little. In some cases almost 60 cents out of every premium dollar is eaten up by overhead expenses, leaving about 40 cents for the actual payment of benefits. Under the Forand bill more than 96 cents out of every dollar collected would be paid out again in the form of benefits. The real problem with most of these private insurance contracts is that they must be paid for after retirement when the ability to pay is lowest and the premiums are highest. As for the predictions of their expansion to coverage of 70 percent of the aged, it seems unlikely to me that the 8 million aged with yearly incomes of $870 or less are going to buy very much insurance at $100 per year, or even $78 per year. The dire prediction that the Forand bill would result in the destruction of private insurance is also fallacious. The same type of argument was used in 1935 when opponents of the social security system claimed it would destroy the great progress which had already been made in private pension plans. Of course, the reverse has been true—private pension plans have burgeoned as they never did before 1935. I believe we could expect the same kind of results after passage of the Forand bill. The Forand bill, like the Social Security Act, is not designed to supplant, but to supplement, private initiative.

Within recent days in response to the great demand that some action be taken, the administration has finally come up with a proposal of its own. The general idea is to put the State governments in the insurance business, with part of their expenditures to be reimbursed by the Federal Government on a matching basis. The States would not, of course, be required to participate in the program. But if they do, they would sell health insurance to people over age 65 for premiums of $24 per year, provided he meets certain fine print qualifications. Benefits would be payable for almost every conceivable type of medical service. However, as in all something for nothing proposals, there is a catch to it. No beneficiary of the State insurance policies would get a penny in benefits until he had spent $250 per year on medical expenses out of his own pocket. Even then his policy would cover only 80 percent of the yearly expenses above $250. Any person who made more than $2,500

per year would not be eligible to buy a policy. However, once a person owned a policy he would not be deprived of coverage no matter how high his income, provided he were willing to pay an increased premium. This is hailed as a voluntary program. This program, I submit, would be neither voluntary, nor calculated to meet the needs of the aged.

Another point. As we have already noted, half of the people over 65 had incomes of $870 or less in 1958. Let us see how much protection such people would have under this program. First, a person in this income group must spend $274—$24 enrollment fee plus the $250 deductible amount—in a year before he will get a penny. That amounts to more than 30 percent of an annual income of $870. Even after he has spent this amount, he will receive benefits only if he is able to put up one more dollar for every $4 of benefits. This means that a person with a $700 medical bill would have to pay almost $360 of it himself. I cannot see how a person who has $870 to live on for a year can afford to spend 40 percent of his income for medical care. If I have only $10 to spend, I cannot buy a $50 suit of clothes even if the merchant offers to cut the price to $25.

The opponents of the Forand bill have called it socialistic. It is surprising that the administration should offer a proposal which is far more susceptible to such charges. The Forand bill would simply extend the well-established social security system to provide for the payment of medical bills. The administration proposal would actually put the State governments in the business of selling insurance to the public at large. Moreover, the State governments would be given control over such aspects of the practice of medicine as the fixing of doctors' fees.

The eligibility requirements of the administration proposal are arbitrary and would operate capriciously. A man who has an income of $2,500.01 would be ineligible to buy a policy. However, if he voluntarily brought his earnings below this level in 1 year he could buy a policy, and then boost his earnings to any level without losing his coverage. This would result in a situation where there are two persons, with exactly equal incomes, one of whom will be covered while the other is not.

It is said that more than 12 million people would be covered by this program. However, this assumes that all 50 States, some of whom are already in financial difficulties, are going to jump into a program which will cost the States $600 million per year. If a State decides to stay out of the program its citizens will not have an opportunity to receive the benefits of the program, even though they must continue to pay the Federal taxes which will be used to finance the program. No one has yet estimated what the administrative expenses of the proposal would be, but I am inclined to think they would be large.

For all of these reasons, I am, therefore, convinced that the administration—in spite of its exhaustive studies—has not come up with an acceptable alternative to the Forand bill. Pain cannot wait until 1970. I, therefore, urge support of the Forand bill now.

The Need for Effective and Meaningful Leadership in the State of Georgia and Elsewhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1960

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, by unwavering faith in the inherent greatness of the American character and in the passion for justice possessed by most Americans, has developed in me a reverential regard for those Americans who have come forth from time to time giving direction and leadership to the people of our country in times of tribulation and peril.

Today our Nation has come to its moment of judgment; men of all races and countries know of our might. In every corner of the globe the just, as well as the unjust, are aware of the circumstances of our birth as a Nation and of our heritage of equality, justice, and morality which flows from that event. Many sober-minded men and women of good will in our country know of our imminent peril but have maintained a troubled silence and wishfully hoped that our country would somehow choose to follow the high road to greatness. At the same time a vociferous minority misrepresents the thinking of the majority; distorts the meaning of democracy; creates a U.S. image of intolerance and arrogance; paves the road to our destruction and blithely seeks to lead us.

Mr. Speaker, to those millions of Americans, who in these times of tensions and difficulties have fervently hoped for constructive leadership, I am happy to say that in a prepared speech for delivery before the Seventh District Democratic Executive Committee at Rome, Ga., released Saturday, May 7, 1960, 11 a.m., one of our distinguished colleagues, Representative ERWIN MITCHELL, has drawn the blueprint for leadership and has charted the course for progress. It is particularly significant and encouraging to me and millions of other people in our country that the statement referred to above has come from a gentleman who is a citizen of the State of Georgia. It is a matter of the gravest importance to note that the speaker had the courage, the analytical ability, and the vision to call to task the present leadership of his party in his State and southern leadership in the Nation and to emphasize the fact that this type of leadership is not reflective of the true objectives of a democratic government.

Mr. Speaker, I share the hope of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia that the time is upon us when the citizens of that State must rise up and demand that those who are selected to lead and to express the will of the constituency, do so in terms reflective of the Constitution of the United States, decisions of the courts, as well as in terms which give assurance that the United States of America, in truth, believes in the dignity of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend that the thoughts expressed in Mr. MITCHELL'S speech are worthy of emulation by his colleagues from the State of Georgia and by men of high principle everywhere. Lastly, I suggest that the directors of the Voice of America program make available to the peoples of the uncommitted countries of the world this address delivered by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE ERWIN MITCHELL PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE SEVENTH DISTRICT DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AT ROME, GA.

We are gathered today to set the rules and regulations for the primary in which the next Democratic candidate for the U.S. Congress will be nominated. This is an exclusive meeting, this is a meeting of Democrats. By our very presence at this occasion, we put the world on notice that we are not Republican nor Dixiecrat in our political philosophy. Each of you by virtue of acceptance of appointment to this committee has thereby made himself an official voting representative of the Democratic Party of Georgia and the United States. This being so, I feel it timely that we talk about the importance of political parties, that we talk about the South's attitude toward the Democratic Party and that we discuss the caliber and attitude of political leadership that we in Georgia and the remainder of the South have today.

In America we have by our own free choice elected to operate under what is known as the two-party system. Every Member of the U.S. Congress is sent to that body under the label of Democrat or Republican. Is party affiliation important? To this I think we all would answer "yes" simply because at the State and national level it is imperative to have party affiliation in order to be elected. But the prime question is this, why is party affiliation important? There are many, many answers to this but most fundamental and most important is the fact that only by men and women of kindred thought joining together in a political organization can there be the unification and strength essential to the presentation and implementation of an effective course of governmental action. This is, of course, the legislative program and the platform which a party adopts and which it believes to be in the best interest of the Nation. Therefore, we who have voluntarily cast our lot with the Democratic Party have thereby manifested our general—not specific—but our general approval of the political philosophy of the Democratic Party of the United States. It is essential that if the course which our party has chartered for our country is to be effective that it have the support not only of you and me as officials of the party but the rank and file membership as well. Only in this way can the visions which emanate from collective thought become realities through legislative and executive action. The things I have said about the system of party are basic and require no further amplification, but it does emphasize that when any candidate seeks

to run as a nominee of his party he thereby signifies that that particular party's ideas and goals most closely approximate his own. This being so, it is a source of amazement that we constantly return to office as Democrats, elected officials who have established the practice of berating our party, its leadership and its principles. It is absolutely astounding that we permit these men and women to bear the Democratic badge when they at every opportunity, through voice and vote, join with the opposition party. I can say this because I believe in the Democratic Party. I can say this because I have not and will never be a part of the sham and hypocrisy that permeates the ranks of the Democratic Party in the South. And when I say this I am talking about political leadership both State and national throughout the South. May the day be forthcoming, and I say to you with the strongest conviction of which I am capable that this day will be forthcoming, when we Democrats will nominate and elect Democrats and will send scrambling those who use our party only as an expedient avenue to public office.

These wonderful 3 years that I have been permitted to represent you in the National Congress have taught me many things, and among the foremost is that the false, self-styled Democrats from the Southland do more harm to our region than any group of northern Democrats and Republicans could ever do. This small group of men and women, and thankfully it is small and will continue to grow smaller, is one of the major obstacles in the path toward unprecedented economic growth, development, and prosperity in our region. These are the people who through their hue and cry have with a great deal of success instilled in the minds of Georgians and other southerners the false belief that the remainder of the Nation literally hates us. These are the ones who constantly cry out that northerners seek to crucify us, to insult us, to make whipping boys of us. I have traveled throughout our great Nation and I have never found this to be so. I have many friends in the Congress from all over the United States and I know that not to be their sentiment but that on the contrary the prevailing sentiment is that the South is a part of the United States just as is the West, North, and East, and that our Nation is no stronger than its weakest section. These political leaders who deem themselves the preservers of our way of life might well be called the destroyers of our future. These people through their negative approach and with the help of a substantial portion of the southern press have sought to convey the impression that we in the South are the last bastion of freedom in our great Republic. This we know to be untrue. These same thought molders have developed the negative and defeatist attitude that the remainder of the Nation stands alined against the future growth and progress of the South. This we know to be untrue. Our fellow Americans regardless of where they come from stand ready to join with us for our mutual benefit if we would only let them. But the attitude of many of our political leaders closes the door to this prospect. They say we are suspicious of you, we don't trust you, and we will not cooperate with you. This pessimistic attitude has caused us suffering in many ways. Each year the influence of the South in Washington is being lessened. Southern opposition to the genuine needs of our metropolitan areas has lost support for the farm programs that are so vital to our economy. This same untenable attitude has led all public education in our State to the very brink of destruction. It warns of Federal domination, it shouts Federal encroachment and control, it says on the one hand "stay away Federal Government and let us operate our schools as we see fit" and then on the other hand it says to you and to me in the local school district that you cannot have the freedom of choice to determine locally what you desire done with your schools. This same leadership screams to the heavens shouting "States rights" when the Congress enacts legislation to insure the right of vote to every qualified American regardless of where he may live and at the same time is responsible for legislation that takes away from you the right to vote for the Democratic nominee for President. How many of you realize this? How many of you recognize the fact that when we go to the polls in November of this year to elect the President of the United States that here in the State of Georgia if you desire to vote for the Democratic nominee you will have no opportunity to do so? Our only opportunity will be to vote for a slate of unpledged electors who can cast the electoral vote of our State for whomever they may choose and without your and my concurrence, advice, or instruction. The same leadership that says there is no need for more legislation to insure the privilege of vote in Georgia is the very same leadership that is responsible for taking away from us the cherished right to cast our ballot for the specific Democrat we would like elevated to the Presidency.

Tradition is fine. No one is more proud of his heritage than I. No one loves Georgia and the Southland any more than I but I am afraid that by and large our leadership has been guilty of too much tradition and not enough vision. This is the age of rockets and nuclear power. What is our past we will continue to revere and will continue to be enriched by it, but we must come of age politically. We must elect men to office who have a full consciousness of America's great reservoir of progress that is awaiting to be tapped. While we should continue to treasure the past and gain experience from it, we should no longer live in it. We must have leaders who are living in the present and are looking to the tomorrow.

These are my words for today. These are some of the impressions I have gained as your Representative and I pass them on to you with the deep conviction that only through affirmative and realistic leadership will the State that you and I love so dearly ever achieve its full capability. It is my hope and prayer that the Democrat you and I send to Congress shall have these qualities.

Jobs After 40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, columnist Roscoe Drummond one time dispelled many of the myths which are responsible for the unwarranted discrimination by employers against hiring older workers. His excellent article reads as follows:

WASTING OUR WORKERS
(By Roscoe Drummond)

Is there any valid reason why industry should instinctively turn from employing older workers? The answer is to be found in a study by the Labor Department, which provides the first unbiased, comprehensive research into the skills, education, capabilities, performance, stability, adaptability, and health of workers 40 and over. Here are the principal findings:

Myth: The hiring of older workers unduly increases pension costs.

Fact: It is not true that employment of older workers unduly increases the costs of private pension plans. These pension plans are mostly based on a percentage of average earnings multiplied by the number of years of service. Under this system, a man hired when young automatically qualifies for a bigger pension because of longer service.

Myth: That older workers are unskilled.

Fact: The opposite is the truth. Of the workers sampled in seven cities, twice as many older jobseekers had held skilled jobs.

Myth: That older workers are not as flexible, won't accept change.

Fact: This is theory, not experience. Research shows that one in four older job applicants changed jobs in order to get work.

Myth: That they are unstable, or they wouldn't be unemployed that late in life.

Fact: This is misinformation. The fact is that more than one-half of the older jobseekers had held the same job for the previous 3 years, compared with one-third of the younger applicants.

Myth: That older workers are less productive than younger workers.

Fact: In eight clothing and shoe plants studied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, average output per man-hour of piece-rate workers remained stable through age 54.

Myth: Older workers are absent more often than younger workers.

Fact: There is no visible difference in regularity on the job.

Conclusion: Most of the unfavorable things we've heard so long about older workers simply have no basis in fact and experience. A healthy industry and an expanding economy urgently need their skills.

The Fraternal Order of Eagles has, for some time, conducted an effective national campaign to educate employers and eradicate the scourge of discrimination against older workers. Its campaign has brought much favorable comment from persons prominent in public life. Here are samples:

George M. Leader, Governor of Pennsylvania:

"I am more than happy to have this opportunity to participate in the Eagles jobs after 40 program. Countless men and women who are qualified are rejected for jobs simply because they have reached an arbitrary age limit that steadily becomes lower."

Charles E. Potter, U.S. Senator from Michigan:

"May I commend the Fraternal Order of Eagles for its vision in undertaking its jobs after 40 campaign looking toward ending job discrimination based on age. I consider arbitrary hiring-age barriers now put up by many employers in the United States as unwise and economically unsound."

Abraham Ribicoff, Governor of Connecticut:

"Concerning the jobs after 40 campaign of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Connecticut will make every effort to increase the employment opportunities for our older people so they can be productive and self-supporting."

Robert E. Smylie, Governor of Idaho:

"I wish to take this opportunity to commend the Fraternal Order of Eagles in their undertaking of the jobs after 40 campaign and to lend my wholehearted support to this worthwhile cause. It is work that gives life meaning. Work gives a sense of personal worth and status among fellow men. The denial of work pulls the pin out of living and the structure of living collapses in a heap."

JOHN SPARKMAN, U.S. Senator from Alabama:

"I am continually amazed that many employers throughout the Nation still tend to refuse to hire people who are over 40 years

old. I want to congratulate the Fraternal Order of Eagles on the order's jobs after 40 campaign. I hope and I pray that the publicity accompanying this program will help turn the tide of employer opinion toward taking advantage of those fruitful years after 40."

Joe Foss, Governor of South Dakota: "I certainly can heartily endorse the 'jobs after 40' campaign, which has been undertaken by the Fraternal Order of Eagles. The over-40 worker who is willing and able to learn should be given an opportunity to do so. Discrimination based on age is not sensible nor practical."

CHARLES RAPER JONAS, Member of Congress, 10th District, North Carolina:

"You are to be commended upon this worthwhile undertaking, the 'jobs after 40' campaign which the Eagles are undertaking as a project. I have a deep interest in this subject and feel very strongly about this work."

Lane Dwinell, Governor of New Hampshire:

"To summarize my attitude toward the Eagles 'jobs after 40' campaign to end job discrimination based on age, I heartily agree that the problem of providing useful employment on a nationwide basis for our older citizens is a most important one, deserving of our best efforts at the Federal, State, and local level."

GORDON H. SCHERER, Member of Congress, First District, Ohio:

"As a member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, I was pleased to learn of the Eagles 'jobs after 40' campaign. The Eagles are giving the cogent arguments in favor of this fine program."

G. Mennen Williams, Governor of Michigan:

"The Eagles are doing a great and needed work in getting behind the movement to provide jobs for older workers, and use their skills and experience to the utmost. The Nation needs the services of these experienced men and women, and it cannot be economically healthy as long as those over 40 suffer discrimination in finding jobs."

WINFIELD K. DENTON, Member of Congress, Eighth District, State of Indiana:

"It seems to me that we have reached a point where investigation and education about the value of older workers is not enough. For that reason, I introduced a bill to prohibit discrimination against older workers by employers who operate or produce goods in interstate commerce."

Address by Hon. Barry Goldwater, of Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 12, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech which I made before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce on May 4, 1960.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MAY 4, 1960

Disclosures before the McClellan committee which so clearly pointed up the results of the abusive use of power within the labor movement resulted in the passage last year of the Landrum-Griffin bill. While this measure is an infinitely better one than the do-nothing Kennedy bill which passed the Senate, Congress has still to come to grips with the real evil in the labor field. Graft and corruption are symptoms of the illness that besets the labor movement, not the cause of it. This cause is the enormous economic and political power now concentrated in the hands of union leaders.

Such power hurts the Nation's economy by forcing on employers contract terms that encourage inefficiency, lower production and high prices—all of which result in a lower standard of living for the American people.

It corrupts the Nation's political life by exerting undue influence on the selection of public officials.

It gravely compromises the freedom of millions of individual workers who are able to register a dissent against the practice of union leaders only at the risk of losing their jobs.

All of us have heard the charge that to thus criticize the power of big labor is to be antilabor and antiunion. This is an argument that serves the interest of union leaders, but it does not usually fit the facts, and it certainly does not do justice to my views. I believe that unionism, kept within its proper and natural bounds, accomplishes a positive good for the country. Unions can be an instrument for achieving economic justice for the workingman. Moreover, they are an alternative to, and thus discourage State socialism. Most important of all, they are an expression of freedom. Trade unions, properly conceived, are an expression of man's inalienable right to associate with other men for the achievement of legitimate objectives.

The natural function of a trade union and the one for which it was historically conceived is to represent those employees who want collective representation in bargaining with their employers over terms of employment. But note that this function is perverted the moment a union claims the right to represent employees who do not want representation, or conducts activities that have nothing to do with terms of employment (e.g., political activities), or tries to deal with an industry as a whole instead of with individual employers.

As America turned increasingly, in the latter half of the 19th century, from an agricultural nation into an industrial one, and as the size of business enterprises expanded, individual wage earners found themselves at a distinct disadvantage in dealing with their employers over terms of employment. The economic power of the large enterprises, as compared with that of the individual employee, was such that wages and conditions of employment were pretty much what the employer decided they would be. Under these conditions, as a means of increasing their economic power, many employees chose to band together and create a common agent for negotiating with their employers.

As time went on, we found that the workingman's right to bargain through a collective agent needed legal protection; accordingly Congress enacted laws—notably certain provisions of the Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act and the Wagner Act—to make sure that employees would be able to bargain collectively.

This is not the place to examine those laws in detail. It is clear, however, that they have overaccomplished their purpose. Thanks to some unwise provisions and to the absence of others that should have been included, the delicate balance of power we sought to achieve between labor and management has shifted, in avalanche proportions, to labor's advantage. Or, more correctly to the advantage of union leaders. This mammoth concentration of power in the hands of a few men is, I repeat, a grave threat to the Nation's economic stability, and to the Nation's political processes. More important, it has taken from the individual wage earner a large portion of his freedom.

The time has come, not to abolish unions or deprive them of deserved gains; but to redress the balance—to restore unions to their proper role in a free society.

We have seen that unions perform their natural function when three conditions are observed: association with the union is voluntary; the union confines its activities to collective bargaining; the bargaining is conducted with the employer of the workers concerned. Let us briefly treat with each of these conditions, noting the extent to which they are violated today, and the remedial action we are called upon to take.

FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION

Here the argument is so plain that I wonder why elaboration is necessary. What could be more fundamental than the freedom to associate with other men, or not to associate, as each man's conscience and reason dictates? Yet compulsory unionism is the rule rather than the exception today in the ranks of organized labor. Millions of laboring men are required to join the union that is the recognized bargaining agent at the place they work. Union shop agreements deny to these laboring men the right to decide for themselves what union they will join, or indeed, whether they will join at all. The exercise of freedom for many of these citizens, means the loss of their jobs.

Here is the kind of thing that can happen as the result of compulsory unionism. X, a family man in Pennsylvania had been a union member in good standing for over 20 years. When the United Electrical Workers became the recognized bargaining agent at his plant, he refused to join on the grounds the UEW was Communist dominated—a judgment that had been made by the CIO itself when it expelled the UEW in 1950. The result, since his employer had a union shop agreement with the UEW, was that X lost his job.

The remedy here is to give freedom of association legal protection. And that is why I strongly favor enactment of State right-to-work laws which forbid contracts that make union membership a condition of employment. These laws are aimed at removing a great blight on the contemporary American scene, and I am at a loss to understand why so many people who so often profess concern for civil rights and civil liberties are vehemently opposed to them. Freedom of association is one of the natural rights of man. Clearly, therefore, it should also be a civil right. Right-to-work laws derive from the natural law: they are simply an attempt to give freedom of association the added protection of civil law.

I am well aware of the "freeloader" argument, so often advanced by union leaders in defense of compulsory unionism. The contention is that a man ought not to enjoy the benefits of an organization's activities unless he contributes his fair share of their cost. I am unaware, however, of any other organization or institution that seeks to enforce this theory by compulsion. The Red Cross benefits all of us, directly or indirectly, but no one suggests that Red Cross donations be compulsory. It is one thing to say that a man should contribute to an association that is purportedly acting in his interest; it is quite another thing to say that he must do so. I believe that a man ought to join a union if it is a good union that is serving the interests of its members. I believe, moreover, that most men will give support to a union provided it is deserving of that support. There will always be some men, of

course, who will try to sponge off others; but let us not express our contempt for some men by denying freedom of choice to all men.

The union leaders' argument that right-to-work legislation is a "union-busting" device is simply not borne out by the facts. A recent survey disclosed that in all of the 19 States which have enacted right-to-work laws union membership increased after the right-to-work laws were passed. It is also well to remember that the union movement throughout the world has prospered when it has been put on a voluntary basis. Contrary to popular belief compulsory unionism is not typical of the labor movement in the free world. It prevails in the United States and England, but in the other countries of Western Europe and in Australia, union membership is generally on a voluntary basis. Indeed the greatest percentage of unionized workers are found in countries that prohibit compulsion by law. The unions in those countries operate on the principle that a union is stronger and better if its members give their adherence of their own free will.

Here, it seems to me, is the sensible way to combat graft and corruption in the labor movement. As long as union leaders can force workers to join their organization, they have no incentive to act responsibly. But if workers could choose to belong or not to belong depending on how the union performed, the pressure to stamp out malpractice would become irresistible. If unions had to earn the adherence of their members the result would be—not only more freedom for the workingman—but much less dishonesty and high handedness in the management of the union affairs.

POLITICAL FREEDOM

One way we exercise political freedom is to vote for the candidate of our choice. Another way is to use our money to try to persuade other voters to make a similar choice—that is, to contribute to our candidate's campaign. If either of these freedoms is violated, the consequences are very grave not only for the individual voter and contributor, but for the society whose free political processes depend on a wide distribution of political power.

It is in the second of these areas, that of political contributions, that labor unions seriously compromise American freedom. They do this by spending the money of union members without prior consultation for purposes the individual members may or may not approve of, purposes that are decided upon by a relatively small number of union leaders. Probably the greatest spender in the labor movement is the powerful AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education (COPE) which is supported in its "educational" work entirely by union general funds.

It is impossible to say just how much unions spend on political campaigns; certainly one can't tell from the amounts officially reported, which invariably present a grossly distorted picture. In 1956, for example, labor officially acknowledged expenditures of $941,271. According to that official report, $79,939 of the total was spent in the State of Michigan. However, a Senate investigating committee obtained evidence that in that year each of Michigan's 700,000 union members had been assessed $1.20 as a contribution to a "citizenship fund," and that this money was made available for political activities. This suggests that labor spent, from that one source alone, almost a million dollars in Michigan, instead of $79,000. By projecting the difference on a nationwide scale, we get a more realistic idea of the size of labor's political contributions.

Union political activity is not confined, of course, to direct financial contributions. In fact, this is one of its smallest endeavors. Unions provide manpower for election-day chores—for making phone calls, driving cars, manning the polls, and so on. Often the union members who perform these chores are reimbursed for their time off out of union funds. Unions also sponsor radio and television programs and distribute a huge volume of printed material designed to support the candidate of the union's choice. In short, they perform all the functions of a regular party organization.

Now, the evil here is twofold. For one thing, the union's decision whether to support candidate X or candidate Y—whether to help the Republican Party or the Democratic Party—is not reached by a poll of the union membership. It is made by a handful of top union officers. These few men are thus able to wield tremendous political power in virtue of their ability to spend other people's money. No one else in America is so privileged.

The other evil is more serious. Individual union members are denied the right to decide for themselves how to spend their money. Certainly a moral issue is at stake here. Is it morally permissible to take the money of a Republican union member, for example, and spend it on behalf of a Democrat? The travesty is deeper, of course, when the money takes the form of compulsory union dues. Under union-shop conditions, the only way an individual can avoid contributing to the political campaign of a candidate whom he may not approve is to give up his job.

The passage of right-to-work laws will help the situation. But putting unionism on a voluntary basis is only part of the answer. For even though a man can leave or refuse to join a union that spends money for purposes that he does not approve, there may be other factors that would dissuade him from doing so. In many communities strong economic and social pressures are exerted on behalf of joining a union—quite aside from the threat of loss of employment. As a result, a man may decide to join a union notwithstanding his disapproval of its political activities. The question remains, Should that man's union dues be used for political purposes? The answer is clearly "No." Unions exist presumably to confer economic advantages on their members, not to perform political services for them. Unions should, therefore, be forbidden to engage in any kind of political activity. I believe that the Federal Corrupt Practices Act does forbid such activity. That legislation has been circumvented by the "education" approach and other devices; and Congress and the courts, in effect, have looked the other way. The only remedy, it appears, is new legislation (Supreme Court, Looper case).

In order to achieve the widest possible distribution of political power, financial contributions to political campaigns should be made by individuals and individuals alone. I see no reason for labor unions—or corporations—to participate in politics. Both were created for economic purposes and their activities should be restricted accordingly.

ECONOMIC FREEDOM

Americans have been much disturbed in recent years by the apparent power of big labor to impose its will on the Nation's economic life whenever the impulse strikes. The recent steel controversy, and the terms of its settlement, are the latest illustration of labor's ability to get its way notwithstanding the cost to the rest of society. When the strike began, neutral observers—including Government economists normally friendly to the unions—agreed that the Steel Workers' wage demands were exorbitant and would inevitably cause further inflation; and that the steel companies were quite right in insisting that certain work rules promoted inefficiency and retarded production. Nevertheless, the steel companies were forced to accept a settlement that postponed indefinitely revision of work rules and granted a large portion of the union's wage demands.

The reason the union won is quite simple: It posed to the country the choice of tolerating stoppages in steel production that would imperil national security, or of consenting to an abandonment of the collective bargaining process. Since neither the steel companies nor the country at large wanted to resort to compulsory arbitration, the alternative was to give the unions what they asked. In this situation, the only power superior to union power was Government power, and the Government chose to yield.

One way to check the unions' power is for the Government to dictate through compulsory arbitration, the terms of employment throughout an entire industry. I am opposed to this course because it simply transfers economic power from the unions to the Government, and encourages State socialism. The other way is to disperse union power and thus extend freedom in labor-management relations.

Eighty years ago the Nation was faced with a comparable concentration of economic power. Large corporations, by gaining monopoly control over entire industries, had nullified the laws of competition that are conducive to freedom. We responded to that challenge by outlawing monopolies through the Sherman Act and other antitrust legislation. These laws, however, have never been applied to labor unions. And I am at a loss to understand why. If it is wrong for a single corporation to dictate prices throughout an entire industry, it is also wrong for a single union—or, as is the actual case, a small number of union leaders—to dictate wages and terms of employment throughout an entire industry.

The evil to be eliminated is the power of unions to enforce industrywide bargaining. Employees have a right, as we have seen, to select a common agent for bargaining with their employer but they do not have a right to select a national agent to bargain with all employers in the industry. If a union has the power to enforce uniform conditions of employment throughout the Nation its power is comparable to that of a Socialist government.

Employers are forbidden to act collusively for sound reasons. The same reasons apply to unions. Industrywide price fixing causes economic dislocations. So does industrywide wage fixing. A wage that is appropriate in one part of the country may not be in another area where economic conditions are very different. Corporate monopolies impair the operation of the free market, and thus injure the consuming public. So do union monopolies. When the United Automobile Workers demand a wage increase from the auto industry, a single monolith is pitted against a number of separate, competing companies. The contest is an unequal one, for the union is able to play off one company against another. The result is that individual companies are unable to resist excessive wage demands and must, in turn, raise their prices. The consumer ultimately suffers for he pays prices that are fixed not by free market competition—the law of supply and demand—but by the arbitrary decision of national union leaders. Far better if the employees of Ford were required to deal with Ford, and those of Chrysler with Chrysler, and so on. The collective bargaining process will work for the common good in all industries if it is confined to the employers and employees directly concerned.

Let us henceforth make war on all monopolies—whether corporate or union. The enemy of freedom is unrestrained power, and the champions of freedom will fight against the concentration of power wherever they find it.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 13, 1960

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who committeth to us the swift and solemn trust of life, so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.

Thou hast ordained that, not in cushioned seats of ease, but in danger and stern conflict shall we find our strength and our triumph in these days when all mankind stands in the valley of decision. As deadly perils threaten the birthright of our liberties, help us to close our national ranks in a new unity of the spirit.

In a time calling for greatness, deliver us from all that is petty and provincial. By Thy restraining grace, turning aside from the pull of conflicting opinions and the divisive rivalry of personal loyalties, empower us and sustain us as, with strength unequal to our tasks, we battle in Thy name the powers of darkness. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U. S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 13, 1960.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MANSFIELD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 12, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8042) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to resell four C1–SAY–1–type vessels to the Government of the Republic of China for use in Chinese trade in Far East and Near East waters exclusively.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 352) to authorize preliminary study and review in connection with proposed additional buildings for the Library of Congress.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1358) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Wash., and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5098. An act to provide for the application and disposition of net revenues from the power development on the Grand Valley Federal reclamation project, Colorado;

H.R. 10495. An act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11318. An act to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5098. An act to provide for the application and disposition of net revenues from the power development on the Grand Valley Federal reclamation project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10495. An act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 11318. An act to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make a few observations about an event which could determine the destiny of our country for many years to come. It is, of course, the summit conference which will take place next week.

The conference will take place against the most dramatic background in history. The world is changing before our very eyes. We must keep our heads cool and our hearts strong if we are to salvage the values which all Americans hold dear.

Mr. President, these are turbulent times. In Africa, men and women are awakening from the slumber of centuries. In Asia, the surging spirit of nationalism is sweeping away the bonds of the 19th century, in a desperate grasp by the people there for a place in the sun. In the Soviet Union, a political philosophy which openly challenges the concept that men are born free is thrusting communism into new spheres of worldwide influence. In Latin America, a restlessness grips the whole continent. In Europe, political tides are rising and falling, and men and women live on the precipice of danger and destruction.

Our President is going forth to deal with these challenging problems. At best, the situation will be very difficult to handle. But it can be complicated beyond recognition.

It can be complicated if throughout the world there is a feeling that our Nation is divided by its fears. It can be complicated if in other lands it is felt that ours is a Nation which has been split by suspicion.

Mr. President, at times there is an aspect of our political system which can create that impression. Frequently, it is difficult for other nations and other peoples to understand how we in the United States operate under our democratic system. An outsider can look at

our land and can come to the conclusion that the West fears the East, that the South distrusts the North, that the farmers fear the politicians, that labor fears management, and that Republicans and Democrats spend their time lambasting each other hammer and tongs.

Mr. President, if our system were carried to an extreme, that would be so. If we were incapable of admitting the concept that an adversary can be acting in good faith, then we could be destroyed. But, Mr. President, I believe our system has the vitality to survive.

We are approaching an important election which could easily be the dividing line of the 20th century. In that election, all the issues will be debated fully, frankly, at length, and, I am sure, heatedly. This is as it should be, and as it must be. But in this debate, I hope and believe that we shall close our ears to the hate mongers, that we shall debate the real issues with all the maturity and all the objectivity we can muster.

When our President is at the summit conference, I want him to feel the buoyancy of a united country. The President is a member of a political party with whose concepts I do not agree. But he is still our President, and he will continue to be our President until next January. He is the one who must speak for our Nation; and practically all of us are Americans before we are partisans.

I also want to feel that our next President, regardless of his party, will be backed by the same unity of purpose when he speaks for this country. The times are much too important for anything else.

Yes, Mr. President, there is a time for partisanship; that is when we present the issues; that is when we ask the American people to decide between the parties.

But, Mr. President, there is also a time for unity. That is when the decision has been made, and when our Government must act for all the people.

We cannot, and we must not, permit our Nation to be divided either by the clever use made by Nikita Khrushchev of the U–2 plane incident or by internal hatreds of race, of creed, of religions, of color, or sections, or of personalities. When our President goes to the summit conference, he can tell Premier Khrushchev in all confidence that this land, our own America, is united. We debate issues, and we debate them heatedly. But there is one issue that is beyond debate: that is our united determination to preserve our freedoms of discussion, of religion, of the right to disagree, and of the right to live in a land that is governed by law.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the majority leader merits the commendation and the congratulations and the thanks of the country for the observations he has made with respect to the necessity for restraint at a time when the summit conference is soon to take place in Paris, and the Chief Magistrate of this country will go there to represent our country.

When the President leaves this country tomorrow for Paris, he will go not only as President of all the people, but he will go as the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the country. It would certainly be amazing for the highest officer elected within the gift of the people to go abroad for a conference of such momentous importance and feel that the specter of doubt had to dog him as he went into that conference and into the interchanges between him and those who will be sitting around the conference table.

As the majority leader pointed out, this conference is important and momentous, because it involves the continuing peace of the world, and it involves the security and survival of our own country.

It would be amazing if a commander had to move into battle never quite sure whether he had to entertain some doubts as to whether all of them were with him at a time when great decisions had to be made.

This is, indeed, a time for unity and restraint. I saw a brief reference to an address which was made yesterday, which I shall not identify further than that, and I thought it was rather unfortunate because of some terms which were used.

I think the Congress in itself is to be congratulated on the restraint it has shown about this whole U–2 incident. We had a briefing session on Monday. It was attended by Members of both bodies of Congress, from both sides of the aisle. And when it was concluded, it was agreed that the Secretary of State should speak for everybody and make a formal statement; and, with the exception of a laudatory and commendatory statement made in another branch of the Congress, we carried out that agreement in full. I think it indicates the restraint the Congress manifests. Even though it is fair to assume that Members of Congress have access to confidential and secret data, they still showed restraint, whereas sometimes that restraint is not shown by others.

Mr. President, there is a place for this center aisle in our deliberations as we differ on domestic matters and sometimes on matters of foreign relations; but that time and that circumstance must be put aside when the Commander in Chief, when the President of the country, goes to the conference table, there to cross sabers, so to speak, on great issues. He must feel that his hand is being held up, and that we will support him, and that he speaks for a unified country.

I commend the majority leader for the statement he made this morning, because I think it will give the President great heart. I fully share and concur in those sentiments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I, too, on the eve of the President's departure for Paris tomorrow, to engage in a summit conference which may have momentous consequences, commend the majority leader for the statement he made earlier today, and also the minority leader for his endorsement of that statement. As always, the majority leader has performed a distinct service in behalf of the country as a whole.

What I have to say is not presented in collaboration with what the majority leader has already said, nor, as one can observe, were the remarks by the distinguished minority leader. However, I have been thinking on this subject, and thinking of the problems which will confront the President as he represents all of us in Paris.

Mr. President, the events of the past week should bring home to all—to the Russians, to Americans, and to peoples everywhere—a realization of how slender is the reed by which we cling to a civilized survival. That is the fact and it ought now to be visible to all. Yet this fact, this blazing fact, is in danger of being lost. National passions rise up on all sides to overwhelm it. The struggle of propaganda takes precedence over it. The incident is appraised not in terms of its deep implications for the present state of the world's tensions but in terms of whose equipment is better and the present level of skills on each side for penetration, defense, and counter-penetration, and even photography.

Let me say with all the seriousness that I possess, if this game goes on in its present vein—this game of propaganda-counter-propaganda, this game of probe and counterprobe—there will indeed be a wreckage to study, a monumental wreckage. But it will be for some other generation, not this one, to study it. For the wreckage will be not just a plane. It will be the charred remnants of the civilization which houses living mankind.

That is the grim and fundamental reality which confronts the chiefs of state on the eve of the summit conference. If their attention remains fixed upon it, there will be no room at that meeeting for displays of outraged indignation on anyone's part. There will be no room for propaganda-plays designed to bring to any nation the label of sole custodian of peace or the sole source of provocation to war.

At this critical juncture the four men who will meet are in every sense the principal guardians of humanity's highest hopes—perhaps of the human species itself. This may well be the decisive moment when the deadly game begins to end in the beginnings of a beginning of a durable peace, or drifts into the path of inevitable war. If they maintain that perspective these men will put aside and they will urge their peoples to put aside the dangerous provocations and the glib propaganda. They will see these provocations, this propaganda, for what they are, fragments embedded in the great wound which festers in mankind and threatens the very existence of civilization.

It is with this perspective that I hope Mr. Khrushchev will go to Paris. It is with this perspective that I feel sure Mr. Eisenhower will go to Paris.

Mr. Eisenhower will speak at the summit on behalf of all of us—Democrats and Republicans alike. That is the way under our constitutional system; there is no other. Anger, consternation, or even revulsion at the events of the past week do not alter that fact. As the President carries our common hopes for progress toward a more durable peace so, too, should he command our common support.

There will be a time to explore the grave questions which the events of the past week have raised in this Nation. Enough has already been said to make it clear that these questions must be examined thoroughly, relentlessly. But the need now is to provide the fullest support for the President so that he may proceed with this meeting in a fashion which advances the hopes of the people of this Nation for peace.

May God go with him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I came to the Chamber in time to hear the words of the assistant majority leader. I have read the statement of the majority leader. I wish to commend them both for joining in what I know is the feeling of all of us, that when President Eisenhower goes to Paris he will go with the united support of all of us behind him.

Over the years I have known the President I have heard him speak many, many times of his desire to get a more peaceful world. I am confident he is going to Paris to do his utmost to attain that goal and to solve some of the very difficult problems which face us today.

When the majority leader and the assistant majority leader speak for unity in our desire for the success of the President, it is mighty helpful to him, I know, and it coincides with the feeling of all of us who want and pray for a better and more peaceful world.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I, too, should like to join my majority leader and assistant majority leader in their remarks about the coming summit conference and their hopes and prayers in which all of us, as Democratic Senators, concur, that the President may have success at the summit conference.

There have been times when I have differed with the distinguished majority leader. This certainly is not one of them. I am enthusiastically in support of his position. The majority leader has set a fine example for us, perhaps in many ways an unprecedented example. Not often under similar cirmcumstances has the opposition party refrained from criticism.

The Democratic Party is sorely tempted, of course, in an election year, a few months before an election, to make political capital out of the tragic developments involving our plane's capture by Russia, 1,300 miles inside Russia on May 1. Thanks to the leadership of the Senator from Texas, I am sure the Democrats throughout the country will recognize, as he said so well, that this is much too important an occasion for Democrats to politically exploit any partisan differences. Freedom, peace, even survival may hang on these fateful summit deliberations.

Mr. President, I also welcome the assurance of our leader that the Senate and the Congress will quietly, thoroughly and carefully investigate this situation, and take whatever action Congress can take to attempt to secure correction, and to assure that this country will be prepared to prevent the recurrence of the misstatements and lack of responsibility that have been so tragically revealed by this incident.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, all of us fervently hope for the success of the summit conference. Our best wishes go with President Eisenhower, as he attends the conference overseas with the head of the Soviet Union. We sincerely hope that the summit conference may lessen some of the tensions, and relieve to some degree our justified fears of further aggressive acts and belligerent action on the part of Mr. Khrushchev, the dictator of the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, nuclear war is unthinkable. The nations of the world must disarm.

Ever since early man discovered that a club could convince his neighbor more easily than a conference, mankind has been embroiled in recurrent wars of ever-increasing ferocity and destruction.

All wars have been horrible, filled with agony and death and the aching of mothers' hearts. But never before has war threatened the total annihilation of mankind.

Today, war has lost all meaning as an instrument of policy. To all who remember the horror of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, it is clear that there must never be another war.

It is a fact, Mr. President, that man has outgrown war. He has made it both impossible and impractical. The wonders of science—in this case, questionable wonders— have made it worse than folly, worse than calamity, worse than tragedy. They have made it insanity.

Mankind now controls the power to eliminate himself and to erase the great achievements of his civilization. If there is sanity left in our species, this will never happen.

Mr. President, recently the United States and the Soviet Union embarked upon disarmament negotiations. Though negotiations now are in recess, there is great hope everywhere that when they resume after the summit conference genuine progress will be made.

These talks must not fail. The art of destruction has grown too refined to permit them to fail.

In the near future, lesser nations will develop atomic and hydrogen bombs and will themselves become threats to the future peace of our world.

Before this happens, sanity must prevail over insanity.

Disarmament is the only answer to this dilemma. The leapfrog game of the arms race—where first one nation is ahead, then another—certainly cannot be the answer indefinitely.

History of the 20th century to this good hour demonstrates that armaments races between nations led to World Wars I and II. We must end the armament race with the Soviet Union and Red China by definite agreements plus safeguards; else the most terrible of all world wars is likely to be precipitated.

Mr. President, my view is that the Soviet Union now recognizes that in any war there can be no victory, for the spoils of victory would be nothingness. My view is that the people of the Soviet Union seek peace and want disarmament and that they, as we, want to devote their energies and resources to improving the lot of their own people.

But to speak disarmament is easier than to achieve it. We must be prepared for long, tedious—often discouraging—negotiations. We must be prepared to compromise.

This has been the case with negotiations to permanently end nuclear weapons testing, and we are now near that essential goal.

Only an ostrich which has kept its head in the ground would say the negotiations, if they succeed, have not been worth it.

So it is with disarmament. Years of negotiations, if they achieve the goal, will repay us with relief, with security, with safety, and with the comforting assurance that mankind will endure and will not commit the final and irrevocable insanity of total self-destruction.

EXCUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal contributions program, for the quarter ended March 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE VIII OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

USE OF SURPLUS GRAIN FOR EMERGENCY USE IN FEEDING WILDLIFE

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the use of surplus grain by the States for emergency use in the feeding of resident game birds and other wildlife, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 507 OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO BASIC COMPENSATION IN DOWNGRADING ACTIONS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 507 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the preservation of basic compensation in downgrading actions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION INCREASING THE COMPENSATION OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States legislation, including H.R. 9883 and H.R. 9977, which would increase the compensation of postal employees; and

Whereas the Post Office Department requires adequate means for attracting and retaining efficient and well-qualified personnel in order to maintain the operations at a high level of service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that will increase the compensation of all postal employees; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

Adopted by the senate, April 25, 1960.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Adopted by the house of representatives in concurrence, April 27, 1960.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

Attest:

JOSEPH D. WARD,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 3074. A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Development Association (Rept. No. 1349).

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S. 1235. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences (Rept. No. 1348).

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. O'MAHONEY), from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 602. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May of 1960 in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week (Rept. No. 1350).

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 602.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 602) authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May of 1960 in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 602) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Malcolm M. Willey, of Minnesota, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation;

Harry P. Anastopulos, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service;

David Brand, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; and

Henry H. Kyle, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3543. A bill for the relief of Willia Niukkanen (also known as William Niukkanen, and William Albert Mackie); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3544. A bill to amend the Menominee Termination Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT):

S. 3545. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of January 21, 1929, 48 U.S.C. 354a (c), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. GRUENING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 3546. A bill to amend the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 3547. A bill relating to the recovery from liable third persons of the cost of medical care and treatment furnished by agencies and departments of the United States to persons authorized by law to receive such care and treatment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. BYRD of Virginia when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3548. A bill to amend the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the National Labor Relations Act, and the Railway Labor Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S.J. Res. 192. Joint resolution designating September 22 of each year as Emancipation Proclamation Day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

WILLIA NIUKKANEN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I speak with a rather sad heart for a very few moments about a cause célèbre in my State. This situation can be much misunderstood—and no one knows that better than I do—unless people are willing to study the record.

I speak of the famous Willia Niukkanen, or so-called William Albert Mackie, case. It involves the case of a house painter in my State who is the son of Finnish parents who came to the United States, gave birth to several children in the United States, and then returned to Finland for a short visit. While they were there, Willia Niukkanen was born—in Finland. As a babe, he spent 9 months in Finland, while his parents were visiting the country where they originated. Then he was brought back to the United States.

It is alleged that in 1937 to 1939 he attended Communist Party meetings in the State of Oregon. He denies it. He denies, at least—as is set forth in an affidavit to which I shall refer in a moment—that he knew he was attending a Communist meeting.

It is perfectly clear that this man is not well educated. He thought he was attending meetings which sought to find employment and be of economic help, during the depression, to people who were unemployed.

I am perfectly willing to argue the case from the standpoint that he, in fact, did attend Communist meetings; and I am willing to argue the case from the standpoint that from 1937 to 1939 he might have been duped into joining the Communist Party. But I wish to discuss this case from the standpoint of the great moral principle that in this Government we should not be a party to man's inhumanity to man.

In this case, several ex-Communists testified against Willia Niukkanen, and said he was a member of the Communist Party in 1937 and 1939, before World War II, a war in which thousands of American boys died at a time when Russia was supposed to have been an ally of our country, although during the war I said Russia was not an ally; she just happened to be a country with a common enemy.

But here is an uneducated, uninformed man who was tried by immigration officials. He did not have the benefit of a jury trial, because juries are not used in immigration proceedings of this kind. Our immigration officials decided that he had been a member of the Communist Party. They seek now to deport him to Finland. He is 51 years old. He has not been in Finland since he was a babe in arms.

Mr. President, this Capitol dome is not going to fall if this house painter in Portland, Oreg., remains in the United States. My State is highly aroused about it. The Finnish people of my State, and there are thousands of them, cannot understand the case.

The U.S. Supreme Court, by a decision of 5 to 4, handed down a decision against Willia. In a per curiam opinion, the

majority, without going into the facts at all, said they would have to sustain the finding of the immigration officials, although one cannot read the majority decision without realizing that the Court recognized the inhumaneness of its decision.

Mr. Justice Douglas issued a classic and historic dissenting opinion. Concurring in the dissent were the Chief Justice, Justice Black, and Justice Brennan.

This case involves a 51-year-old man, with a father who is 79 and depends on him for support. He owns his home and his automobile; he was a member of the Oregon State National Guard; he was drafted into the U.S. Army, and received an honorable discharge.

I want to say that the Congress ought to reverse the decision of the majority of the U.S. Supreme Court, which carries out a principle of man's inhumanity to man, and we ought to see to it that justice to an individual is done in this case. I am for keeping the man here. He could be kept under the strictest of surveillance, if anybody, after reading the record, really thinks he is of the slightest threat to the security of the country. But somebody ought to be willing, as I am today, to call the attention of the Congress to the inhumaneness of these acts before it is too late, because, as the court has pointed out, Congress is the last resort. It is up to the Congress now.

So, Mr. President, I am offering a bill today, and I ask for urgent and immediate consideration of the bill.

I now introduce the bill, and ask to have it appropriately referred, and printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3543) for the relief of Willia Niukkanen (also known as William Niukkanen, and William Albert Mackie), introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Unites States of America in Congress assembled, That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Willia Niukkanen (also known as William Niukkanen, and William Albert Mackie). From and after the date of enactment of this Act, the said Willia Niukkanen (also known as William Niukkanen, and William Albert Mackie) shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the New York Times of April 21 be printed in the RECORD at this point. The editorial makes the point I am making today, for the application of the principle of humanity, rather than inhumanity, to this case. I fail to understand what would be accomplished, in the name of decency, by sending this 51-year-old man to Finland, about which country he knows nothing, where he would be a perfect stranger, when we should keep him in this country; and I am willing to have him kept here under surveillance, if anyone thinks he is a dangerous character. But when one reads the record, he will realize that he is not dangerous, and that he was merely misguided from 1937 to 1939.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an affidavit be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the editorial and affidavit will be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial and affidavit presented by Mr. MORSE are as follows:

DEPORTATION CRUELTY

Willia Niukkanen is a 51-year-old house painter in Portland, Oreg., who was born in Finland but came to this country when less than a year old. Between 1937 and 1939 he was a member of the Communist Party in Portland. There is no evidence that he personally advocated revolution, and he is said to have had no intellectual interest in Marxist doctrine.

A law first enacted in 1940 and reenacted by Congress in 1950 and 1952 requires the deportation of every alien who has ever been a Communist Party member in the United States—no matter how long ago or for how short a time. Because Willia Niukkanen had never become a citizen, deportation proceeding were begun against him. This week the Supreme Court ruled, 5 to 4, that his party membership had been sufficiently proved and that he must go.

It is difficult to disagree with the dissenters' protest against "exile" of "a man who has lived here for every meaningful month of his life." But the onus for this cruel deportation lies more with Congress than with the Supreme Court. The Court years ago, perhaps regrettably, upheld the constitutionality of this statute. Now it is up to Congress to amend a law whose rigid condemnation of every alien who was ever a Communist, however briefly and however much his views have since changed, serves no valid purpose.

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF OREGON,
County of Multnomah, ss:

I, Willia Niukkanen, also known as William Niukkanen, also known as William Albert Mackie, being first duly sworn on oath, do depose and say:

That I am a resident of the city of Portland, Oreg., with my address at 4326 North Montana Street. That I have lived at this residence for 11 years, and prior to that time I lived at 3820 North Gantenbein Street, Portland, Oreg., for about 8 years. Before then I lived at 3921 North Gantenbein Street, Portland, Oreg. I have been a resident of the city of Portland since I was about aged 10. Before then I lived with my family in Duluth, Minn.; Minneapolis, Minn.; St. Paul, Minn.; Butte, Mont.; and in the State of Washington and State of California.

That I was born in Viipuri, Finland, on November 24, 1908.

I was born in Finland because at the time of my birth my parents were visiting that country. They had originally come to the United States in about 1902 but returned for a 2-year visit to Finland, where I was born.

I have two sisters living at this time. The first is named Eileen Van Beek, who is a native-born citizen and a resident of Portland, Oreg. The other sister is Lillian Mackie, also a native-born citizen, who resides with my father at 3820 North Gantenbein Street, Portland, Oreg. That I had two brothers, both of whom are now deceased. That an older brother, William, was born in the United States and died in Finland on the visit of my parents during which I was born. My other brother, Elmer Mackie, was lost at sea near Wake Island in 1941 or 1942, after the Japanese attack on that island. He was employed as a civil construction worker and was apparently lost at sea.

My father is named William T. Mackie and he is by trade a tailor and lives with my sister, Lillian, at 3820 North Gantenbein Street, Portland, Oreg.

My mother, Ida Mackie, died in 1956, while a resident of Portland, Oreg.

With respect to my education, I completed Jefferson High School in the city of Portland, Oreg., in about 1929.

With respect to my employment, I have been a painting contractor since 1947. Prior to that time I was employed in the Vancouver, Wash., and Swan Island, Portland, shipyards from 1942 to 1945 as a welder and leadman. Prior to that time I had various jobs, including employment with Libby, McNeil & Libby, in Portland, and the U.S. Army Engineers, doing road construction.

In June 1945 I married Irene Hodgdon, who had a son, Stuart, by a prior marriage. He is now approximately 15 years old. I was divorced by my wife about October 1957 without any contest on my part. I did not legally adopt Stuart and I am under no legal obligation for either child support or alimony.

With respect to military service, I enlisted in the National Guard at the age of 16 years and served for approximately 2 years. In 1940 I was drafted into the Army for about 3 months and then I was released because of age. In 1941, I was called back into service but remained on duty only about 3 days before I was rejected, for medical reasons I believe. I was given an honorable discharge.

I have applied for naturalization as a citizen three times. The first time was in 1937 or 1938, the second was in 1941, and the third was in 1944 or 1945. Each time I was rejected but I was not told why I was rejected.

The only criminal record which I have is for two minor offenses. The first one occurred in The Dalles, Oreg., in about 1928, where I was arrested for stealing a chicken and given a 30-day sentence. I was with another man and we were very hungry inasmuch as we hadn't eaten for some time and he actually stole the chicken. He escaped detection but I was caught. The other offense occurred in the State of Idaho during the time when that State had alcohol prohibition in force. I was convicted of possession of some beer and fined $30.

My father is aged 78 or 79 and is employed as a tailor part time in Portland. He is in poor health, having a heart condition. He expects to retire from work completely in the very near future as he is unable to continue his employment and is growing progressively weaker. When he retires, it will be up to the children to take care of him and provide for him. My sister Eileen is not financially able to help and my sister Lillian, while she is a practical nurse, is not financially able to support him. I will therefore have to contribute to his support.

I wish to state that I make this affidavit in support of my request that a private bill be introduced into Congress to permit me to stay in the United States. I believe that my deportation would be a very great hardship on my father and the rest of my family in Portland, and also an extreme hardship upon me, inasmuch as I was in Finland only less than a year, having come to

the United States in 1909. I know a little Finnish, because I have heard it spoken in my home and by friends who were born in Finland, but I do not have any connections, family, or other place to go in Finland should I be deported to that country.

I wish to further state that although I have been accused of being a member of the Communist Party of the United States, I have never been a member of that party and I do not advocate the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence. Neither do I advocate the principles of communism. I have always considered myself to be loyal to the United States and to the Constitution thereof. I have always been and am still willing to engage in military service on behalf of the United States against any foreign power that might become its enemy.

Further deponent sayeth not.

WILLIA NIUKKANEN.
WILLIAM NIUKKANEN.
WILLIAM ALBERT MACKIE.

(Willia Niukkanen, also known as William Niukkanen, also known as William Albert Mackie.)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 8th day of January 1958.

GERALD H. ROBINSON,
Notary Public for Oregon.

(My commission expires Mar. 3, 1961.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a legal analysis of this case by Mr. Nels Peterson be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 27, 1960.

Re deportation of Willia Niukkanen known throughout his life as William Albert Mackie.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a factual and legal background to merit introduction of a bill to permanently prevent deportation of the above named, herewith follows a brief outline of his life and the legal aspects of his deportation.

William Albert Mackie was born in Finland on November 24, 1908, at a time when his father and mother were visiting in Finland after having emigrated from Finland to the United States of America. On September 5, 1909, his mother carried him across the border of the United States at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., for permanent residence in the United States of America. His father was a tailor by trade and the Mackie family lived in California, Montana, Minnesota, and Washington before coming to Portland, Oreg., in 1919. Here, William Albert Mackie attended grade school and high school. He became a painter by trade. During the thirties, he was among the unemployed. He made application for citizenship in 1939 but apparently did not follow through in order to get his final citizenship papers and his application was dismissed, I believe, in 1946. In 1940 he served in the U.S. Army and was given an honorable discharge in 1944 or 1945. He had previously been in the Active Reserve for 4 or 5 years. In 1926 and 1927 he was in the Oregon National Guard. He married an American citizen who had a son.

On June 17, 1952, a warrant of arrest was issued by the U.S. Department of Justice for his deportation under the Internal Security Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 987). He was arrested pursuant to the warrant in September 1952 for deportation to Finland. The warrant of arrest charged that he was "an alien in the United States in violation of the immigration laws and subject to deportation * * * since his last entry on September 5, 1909, * * * and that after such entry into this country he became a member of the Communist Party of the United States."

A hearing was held upon this warrant of arrest in Portland, Oreg., on May 11, 1953, presided over by a special inquiry officer (a nonlawyer) and prosecuted by an examining officer (a nonlawyer). At this hearing, the first witness called was one Walter Robert Patrick Wilmot who then resided in New York City and who testified that he was the editor of the CIO newspaper known as the Labor New Dealer. This witness ascribed the Labor New Dealer as being Communist controlled. The witness testified that he had been expelled from the Communist Party at the Bridges hearing (July or August 1939). The witness testified that he had seen Mackie at Communist Party meetings and at dances, but testified that Mackie never held an office in the party; that he was never employed by the party nor was he ever a functionary in the sense of representing the party; that he attended a regional meeting at Aberdeen, Wash. This witness testified that the only things discussed at any of such meetings were unemployment and bread and butter topics. The period of time of his (Wilmot's) membership in the Communist Party was from sometime in 1937 until the summer of 1939. Mackie swore he had never seen this witness before to his knowledge in his lifetime. This witness (Wilmot) admitted that during the period of time in question he drank a great deal and he always drank to excess.

Another witness was called at this hearing on behalf of the Department of Justice, named Lee Arthur Knipe. This witness testified to Mackie's alleged attendance at Communist Party dances and at meetings, but that Mackie was never a functionary; that Mackie did not participate in any of the discussions in the "educational group"; that Mackie did not distribute literature and that bread and butter topics only were discussed. The witness Knipe denied conviction of any crimes but was recalled to testify that he had been convicted of the felony of forgery in the State of California.

Mackie did not take the stand to testify in his own behalf at this hearing and on the basis of the evidence received, he was ordered deported. An appeal was taken to the Board of Immigration Appeals in Washington where the order of deportation was affirmed.

Mackie had been released on bail following his arrest and arrangements were made to immediately banish him to Finland following affirmance by the Board of Immigration Appeals.

A suit was filed on his behalf by myself as his attorney for injunctive relief and for a writ of habeas corpus in the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon. We applied to the Immigration Department for the right to apply for suspension of deportation on the ground of personal hardship upon him and his family. A hearing was held upon this application at which time he testified and swore that he had never been a knowing member of the Communist Party. As an illustration, he was asked the question:

"Question. In the Finnish Hall, or anywhere else, did you attend Communist Party meetings?

"Answer. Well, if I say 'yes' and if I said 'no,' maybe I would not be telling the truth because I really could not tell one way or the other. I went to meetings there. Sometimes maybe they were Communist and maybe they wasn't. It could have been and maybe they wasn't."

He further testified that "any place I went to meetings was always more work and more food."

"Question. As far as you know, that was what the Communist Party stood for during that period?

"Answer. I don't know if they stood for that, but I never heard anything against it."

The suspension of deportation was denied, although hardship was found, on the ground that Mackie's answers were evasive and he did not name persons at a meeting of the Oregon Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born. In other words, he refused to be a stoolpigeon and involve other people at a meeting of a committee headed by Rev. Mark Chamberlain in Portland, Oreg., for the protection and preservation of the rights of the foreign born. A hearing was held before Judge Gus Solomon who affirmed the order of deportation and discharged the writ. An appeal was taken to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals which affirmed Judge Solomon. A petition for certiorari was applied for in 1957 and denied on December 16, 1957. Following the denial of certiorari by the Supreme Court of the United States in December 1957, a new proceeding for injunctive relief and for writ of habeas corpus was instituted in the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon, primarily to test the constitutionality of the Internal Security Act with particular reference to its being a "bill of attainder" and also upon the contention that no "meaningful association" was shown by the Government's evidence within the meaning of the case of *Rowoldt* v. *Perfetto* (355 U.S. 115 (decided December 8, 1957)). Again a hearing was held before Judge Solomon who did not pass upon the constitutional questions raised and held that *Rowoldt* v. *Perfetto* did not fit the Mackie case. An appeal was again taken to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals where Judge Solomon was affirmed. A petition for writ of certiorari was granted in October 1959 by the Supreme Court of the United States and the latter was argued by myself and Joseph Forer of the law firm of Forer & Rein, Washington, D.C., on March 21, 1960. On April 18, 1960, a per curiam decision of approximately a page and a half affirmed the order of deportation. A strong dissenting opinion was written by Mr. Justice Douglas, concurred in by the Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Black, and Mr. Justice Brennan. In the dissent, Mr. Justice Douglas stated that one who reads the whole of this record cannot put it down without feeling that here is a man, neither conspiratorial, dangerous, cunning, nor knowledgeable. Petitioner, a painter by trade, represents a microscopic element in the ranks of our labor forces who was caught up in a movement whose ideology he did not understand and whose leaders spoke in terms of bread for the hungry, and jobs for the unemployed." Mr. Justice Douglas further said, "The case is on all fours with *Rowoldt* v. *Perfetto* (355 U.S. 115). The 'solidity of proof' (id., at 120) required for the severe consequences of the deportation of a man who came here when he was less than 1 year old, whose only memory of life is in this land, and who has lived here over 50 years has not been met. The 'meaningful association' with the party which the Rowoldt case requires (id., at 120) simply has not been established here. In this case, as in Rowoldt, petitioner's association with the party was 'wholly devoid of any political implications.'" He further said, "A man who has lived here for every meaningful month of his entire life should not be sent to exile for acts which this record reveals were utterly devoid of any sinister implication."

The foregoing is a brief summary of the turbulent years that have faced William Albert Mackie since September 1952 where he has been tormented by the threat of banishment to a "foreign land" to him. He does not speak the Finnish language nor does he write it. He is able to understand a few Finnish words. His father, in his eighties, continues to live in Portland, Oreg., as do his many friends and acquaintances. His mar-

riage has ended in divorce since the deportation proceedings against him. He was seriously injured in an automobile accident in August 1959.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE LAW

A summary of the laws relating to immigration and nationality is found in "Laws Applicable to Immigration and Nationality," 1953 edition, compiled under the direction of Carl B. Hyatt, assistant commissioner, Citizenship Services and Instruction Division, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, by Edwina Austin Avery, Editor. (Available from Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.) A comprehensive review of most of the cases relating to immigration and the laws passed are included in "The Constitutional Status of the Lawfully Admitted Permanent Resident Alien" published in volume 68, No. 8, July 1959, and volume 69, No. 2, December 1959, Yale Law Journal by Siegfried Hesse.

The Internal Security Act of 1950 was passed over the veto of President Truman. The act provided that "any alien who is a member of any one of the following classes shall be excluded from admission into the United States: * * * (2) aliens who, at any time, shall be or shall have been members of any of the following classes: * * * C. Aliens who are members of or affiliated with * * * (i) the Communist Party of the United States." It is under this provision that Mackie was sought to be deported. This law is a very extensive act and most confusing to any lawyer who reads it for the first time.

In my opinion, the most important case decided by the Supreme Court of the United States on constitutional questions as they apply to aliens was the case of *Fong Yue Ting* v. *United States* (149 U.S. 698 (decided by a divided court on a Chinese ejection case in 1893)). Joseph Choate was the lawyer for Fong Yue Ting. In this opinion there is reviewed the constitutional powers of the Congress to pass laws affecting immigrants to this "land of immigrants."

I personally believe that the framers of the Constitution of the United States (mostly lawyers) in 1787 intended that the Constitution of the United States should apply to citizens and aliens alike. My belief is based upon article I, section 9 of the U.S. Constitution, which provides in part: "No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed." I believe the only rational theory of the power of Congress to enact laws relating to immigration can only relate to "regulation of foreign commerce" and if this construction of the U.S. Constitution could be adopted, then all constitutional safeguards would apply to citizens and aliens alike.

With respect to the bill of attainder aspect of Mackie's case and all other cases involving current laws, no decision of the U.S. Supreme Court has ever discussed it with the exception of the language of Mr. Justice Black in dissenting in *Galvin* v. *Press* (347 U.S. 522, at p. 533) where he said:

"Perhaps a legislative act penalizing political activities, legal when engaged in, is not a bill of attainder. But see *U.S.* v. *Lovett* (328 U.S. 303, 315, 316).

The leading cases in the United States on bills of attainder are: *Cooper* v. *Telfair* (4 Dall. 14 (1800)), *Ex parte Garland* (4 Wall. 333 (1867)), *Cummings* v. *Missouri* (4 Wall. 277 (1867)), and *U.S.* v. *Lovett, supra* (1943).

Bill of attainder is discussed in *American Communications Association, CIO* v. *Dowds* (339 U.S. 382 (1950)).

Turning to relatively recent cases, the first case of importance dealing with deportation is *Harisiades* v. *Shaughnessy* (342 U.S. 580 (1952)), wherein it was held that the Immigration Act of 1940 was a constitutional act even though having retroactive effect for past membership in an organization which advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence.

Galvin v. *Press* (347 U.S. 522 (1954)) declared that it was sufficient for deportation under the Internal Security Act of 1950 that "the alien joined the party, aware that he was joining an organization known as the Communist Party which operates as a distinct and active political organization, and that he did so of his own free will" (p. 528).

Rowoldt v. *Perfetto* (355 U.S. 115), was an opinion by Mr. Justice Frankfurter which held that Rowoldt, an elderly man who had spent most of his life in America, could not be deported under the evidence submitted by the Government consisting solely of his admission, years before his deportation, that he had belonged to the Communist Party and had worked in a Communist Party bookstore. Mr. Justice Frankfurter said that the solidity of proof required had not been met and that no meaningful association with the Communist Party had been shown. Rowoldt at his hearing for deportation refused to testify.

In each of the foregoing cases, the Court was sharply divided.

At the argument before the Supreme Court of the United States on March 21, 1960, the Assistant Solicitor General, Mr. Davis, who argued for the Government, stated that there were 16 cases in the United States pending decision on this subject of deportation and that there were 200 cases on deportation for past political activities in the administrative stage.

I believe it can be reliably estimated that the Internal Security Act of 1950 and its concomitant act of June 27, 1952 (66 Stat. 162), known as the Immigration and Nationality Act, affect 15 million persons, either aliens or naturalized citizens. Those of us having familiarity with the Constitution of the United States and its historical background know that the current laws relating to immigration, insofar as they deal with banishment of persons admitted for lawful residence and who have lived a good part, if not most of their lives in this country, are out of place in the long view of American democracy. I personally am convinced that they are a clear example of a bill of attainder so well known by the framers of the Constitution, as well as constituting an unconstitutional invasion of rights guaranteed under the first amendment as to freedom of speech, association, and assembly, and the due process clause of the fifth amendment which declares that "no person * * * shall * * * be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law."

I respectfully urge that all responsible legislators of good will reconsider the severities imposed by this barbaric act which imposes the cruelest punishment for past political activities, lawful when engaged in, and, where the courts have felt constrained not to grant relief, that the Congress enact special legislation, as they may and have done on many occasions in the past under this act to remedy a wrong.

The tragic story of William Albert Mackie portrays a classic example of man's inhumanity to man.

Congress can show its dedication to American democracy by continuing his presence in the only land which he knows, which he loves, and has demonstrated a willingness to fight and die for. Such legislative action would demonstrate to the world that American democracy still exemplifies justice and mercy. Such action would aid in restoring in the eyes of the world the position, once held, that our system of government affords a superior system over that of any other yet devised by man. Failure to do so will brand our Government as despotic and ruled by tyranny. Enactment of this legislation will give meaning to Emma Lazarus' inscription on the Statue of Liberty:

"Give me your tired, your poor
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me!
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Best regards.

Yours sincerely,

NELS PETERSON.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a detailed statement I have prepared on this case, which I shall not take the time to read, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

This is a bill for the relief of Willia Niukkanen, from a deportation order. They say that from 1937 to 1939 Willie was a member of the Communist Party and that he must therefore be sent to Finland. He has exhausted his administrative remedies. His appeals to the courts have failed. Now, Willie, and a whole host of his neighbors in Portland, Oreg., would like Congress to make it possible for him to stay in the United States and go on painting houses.

The Congress can do this. And what I've learned about the case of Willie Niukkanen makes me believe that Congress should and will do it.

Before I say anything about the Niukkanen case, though, let me tell you some things about Willie himself. Mr. and Mrs. Niukkanen, Willie's parents, came from Finland to the United States in 1902. Since that time the Niukkanens have had five children. Only four of them, however, were born in the United States. It was Willie's fate to be born in Finland while his parents were visiting the old country in 1908. In 1909 they returned to the United States bringing 10-month-old Willie with them. Though Willie was born in Finland, he has no memories of any land but the United States.

The Niukkanens moved about for a while. From Minnesota to Montana. From Washington to California. In about 1919, however, they settled in Portland, Oreg., and there they all have stayed. All that is except an older brother who died during the same visit to Finland on which Willie was born and a younger brother who was lost at sea near Wake Island after the Japanese attack in 1942.

Willie grew up in Portland and joined the National Guard when he was 16. He spent about 2 years in the Guard then finished high school in 1929. There is no need to remind you what happened in 1929. Portland was not much different from any place else in the United States. New York had no monopoly on stock brokers selling apples. And for the next 10 years we had our share of breadlines too. This was the decade in which Willie came to manhood. It was about this time, also, that Willie had two brushes with the law. In The Dalles, Oreg., Willie and another hungry lad decided to steal a chicken. Willie's friend got the chicken and also got away. Willie was caught and sentenced to 30 days. Another time he was fined $30 for having some beer in Idaho. Meanwhile Willie worked when he could, where he could. He was with a foodpacker in Portland, and did road construction with the Army Engineers.

Willie was drafted in 1940. He was a little older than most of his peacetime buddies and was honorably discharged "for the

convenience of the Government" because of illness, with an excellent character rating. He was recalled in 1942 but was turned down for medical reasons. Thereafter, he went to work in the Vancouver and Swan Island Shipyards as a welder and leadman. In 1947 he became a painting contractor in Portland. He bought a house for $3,100 which is now worth about $6,000 and he owns a car. His father is 78 years old and a part-time tailor. He is about to retire because of a heart condition and when he does Willie will have to contribute a large measure to his support. Willie's sisters can help care for their father but the financial burden will be largely Willie's. He has been making about $4,000 a year, lately. Does this sound like the life of a man who poses a threat to the national security?

Willie's immigration troubles started in 1952 when the Department of Justice issued a warrant for his arrest for deportation under the Internal Security Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 987). The warrant charged that he was an alien who entered the United States on September 5, 1909, and that after such entry "he became a member of the Communist Party of the United States."

The hearing on the warrant was presided over by a special inquiry officer who was not a lawyer. The officer who presented the case against Willie was not a lawyer, either. There were just two witnesses against Willie. One of them admitted that during this period 1937–39 he "drank a great deal" and "always drank to excess." The other denied conviction of any crimes, but was recalled to testify that he had been convicted of the felony of forgery in the State of California. Both witnesses had been Communists. Their testimony was never heard by a judge. Whether these witnesses were reliable or not is questionable. But let me summarize their testimony against Willie, not in my words, but in the language of the dissenting opinion concurred in by four Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court, including the Chief Justice:

"They testified that petitioner was a member of the Communist Party from 1937 to 1939 in Portland, Oreg. One of them testified that petitioner had assisted in the circulation of a paper, Labor New Dealer, which apparently was an organ of the party. There was evidence he paid dues to the party of 25 cents a month and that he attended both open and closed meetings of the party. But even these two ex-Communists who appeared against petitioner said that there was no discussion of ways and means to overthrow the Government at those meetings; that only problems such as labor conditions, relief, and the like, were discussed. One also swore that petitioner never advocated the overthrow of the Government. Petitioner's interest in the party, according to one of these hostile witnesses, was a result of 'the sufferings of the people in the depression,' and he was 'very sympathetic toward their welfare.' This witness agreed that petitioner was not an intellectual interested in 'theory' or 'political discussion.' His interests were 'in bread-and-butter topics of the day, what to do for unemployment and relief.' Nor had petitioner ever taught the Communist doctrine nor distributed its literature, except for the Labor New Dealer.

"These two ex-Communists testified that petitioner attended dances that the party arranged in Portland. But they said he never held an office in the party, nor was ever employed by the party, nor was ever a 'functionary' in the sense of representing the party. He attended a regional meeting at Aberdeen, Wash., where various speakers, according to one ex-Communist, gave 'glowing accounts' of their work for the party, 'more or less fabricating' their achievements."

So much for the testimony against Willie. Now let's turn to the record and hear what Willie had to say for himself:

"Question. In the Finnish Hall, or anywhere else, did you attend Communist Party meetings?

"Answer. Well, if I said yes, and if I said no, maybe I wouldn't be telling the truth, because I really couldn't tell one way or the other. I went to meetings there. Sometimes maybe they were Communist and maybe they wasn't. It could have been and maybe they wasn't.

* * * * *

"Question. Have you been a member of the Communist Party of the United States or any branch or affiliate or organization by that name or any similar name?

"Answer. Knowingly, I haven't; no.

* * * * *

"Question. Do you believe that membership in the Communist Party now is a lawful political purpose?

"Answer. No. I can't answer questions about that because I don't know. If Congress says it is unlawful, it is unlawful. If it isn't, it isn't. I don't know. If I got the question right, I don't know.

"Question. I am not trying to confuse you. * * * I am trying to find out your feelings toward communism.

"Answer. Naturally I don't—communism or socialism, I don't care what party it is here or any place else, if it has anything to do with overthrowing the Government by force and violence, I don't agree with it, no.

* * * * *

"Question. What was your impression of what the Communist Party was trying to do?

"Answer. Well, the only thing I heard in those days was more relief and more work, and I never heard anything else, no violent overthrow of the Government, or anything of that sort, but anyplace I went to meetings was always more work and more food.

"Question. As far as you know, that was what the Communist Party stood for during that period?

"Answer. I don't know if they stood for that, but I never heard anything against it."

With this evidence and this testimony in mind, is it any wonder that four Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court concurred in saying:

"One who reads the whole of this record cannot put it down without feeling that here is a man neither conspiratorial, dangerous, cunning, nor knowledgeable."

With a minority of the Court, and a majority of his neighbors who concur with us I say: Willie "represents a microscopic element in the ranks of our labor force who was caught up in a movement whose ideology he did not understand and whose leaders spoke in terms of bread for the hungry and jobs for the unemployed. * * * A man who has lived here for every meaningful month of his life should not be sent into exile for acts which this record reveals were utterly devoid of any sinister implications."

The technical legal question resolved by the Supreme Court in the Niukkanen case was whether the evidence against him made Willie subject to deportation under the rule of *Galvan* v. *Press* (347 U.S. 522 (1954)), or saved him from it under the rule of *Rowoldt* v. *Perfetto* (355 U.S. 115 (1957)). Under Galvan an alien can be deported if it is shown that he joined the party aware that he was joining an organization known as the Communist Party which operates as a distinct and active political organization, and that he did so of his own free will. Under Rowoldt it was held that the dominating impulse of that particular alien's affiliation with the party may well have been wholly devoid of any "political" implications and that the record was too insubstantial to establish that petitioner's membership was the kind of meaningful association with the party required by the law to support an order of deportation. In Niukkanen a bare majority of the Court in a very short per curiam opinion resolved this issue against Willie stating in part:

"The determination * * * turns on evaluation of the testimony before the district court. * * * An able judge found that petitioner in denying membership in the Communist Party, unlike Rowoldt who admitted membership but accounted for its innocence, 'perjured himself before, and I believe perjured himself today.' We cannot say that his findings, affirmed by the Court of Appeals, were clearly erroneous and do not support the conclusion of both the lower courts."

However, the four justices who dissented stated:

"The case is on all fours with *Rowoldt* v. *Perfetto* (355 U.S. 115). The 'solidity of proof' (id. at 120) required for the severe consequences of the deportation of a man who came here when he was less than 1 year old, whose only memory of life is in this land, and who has lived here over 50 years has not been met. The 'meaningful association' with the party which the Rewoldt case requires (id. at 120) simply has not been established here. In this case, as in Rowoldt, petitioner's association with the party was 'wholly devoid of any "political" implications' (id. at 120)."

Needless to say I am in complete agreement with the dissenting opinion. But I want to make it very clear to everyone that this bill for the relief of Willie Niukkanen is not going to have any effect whatever on future determinations by the Court nor will it in any way modify the law under which the deportation order was issued. I want to make it clear also that what the courts are doing in cases like this is determining whether or not a particular law written and passed by the Congress requires the deportation of a particular alien. As the judge of the district court said:

"The right to terminate hospitality to aliens and the grounds upon which such determination shall be based are matters solely for the responsibility of Congress and are wholly outside the power of the court to control. *Niukkanen* v. *Boyd* (148 F. Supp. 106, 107 (D.C. Oreg. 1956)) citing *Harisiades* v. *Shaughnessy* (342 U.S. 580, 587, 597 (1953))."

In determining that there is no need for the deportation of Willie Niukkanen I am convinced that the Congress will be acting in the spirit of a statement cited in a memorandum submitted to this body by Senator McCarran in 1951 when the question of the meaning of the words "members of or affiliated with" in the Internal Security Act was being considered by the Senate:

Congress could not have intended to authorize the wholesale deportation of aliens who, accidentally, artificially, or unconsciously in appearance only, are found to be members of or are affiliated with an organization of whose platform and purposes they have no real knowledge. *Colyer* v. *Skeffington* (265 F. 17 (D.C. Mass. 1920), cited at 97 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2373).

Mr. MORSE. Lastly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Supreme Court decision, which is not very lengthy, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the decision was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—No. 130—OCTOBER TERM, 1959—WILLIA NIUKKANEN, ETC., PETITIONER *v.* E. D. MCALEXANDER, ETC.—ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

April 18, 1960

Per curiam: The petitioner sought relief from an order directing his deportation on

the ground that as an alien he had become, after entering the United States, a member of the Communist Party within the meaning of the Act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950, 64 Stat. 987, 1006. The district court, after hearing, denied the petition, 148 F. Supp. 106, and the Court of Appeals affirmed (241 F. 2d 938). Invoking *Rowoldt* v. *Perfetto* (355 U.S. 115) decided after the order for his deportation, petitioner sought an administrative reconsideration of his status. Upon its denial by the Board of Immigration Appeals he began the judicial proceeding immediately before us for review. After a hearing, the district court again denied his petition for relief and the court of appeals affirmed the order of the district court (265 F. 2d 825). The ultimate question is whether petitioner is subject to deportation under *Galvan* v. *Press* (347 U.S. 522) or is saved from it under *Rowoldt* v. *Perfetto, supra.* The determination of this issue turns on evaluation of the testimony before the district court, in light of *Galvan* v. *Press, supra,* and *Rowoldt* v. *Perfetto, supra.* Such assessment largely depends on the credibility of the testimony on which the district judge based his judgment, particularly that of the petitioner himself, whom the judge saw and heard. An able judge found that petitioner in denying membership in the Communist Party, unlike Rowoldt who admitted membership, see 355 U.S., at 116–117, but accounted for its innocence, "perjured himself before, and I believe perjured himself today." We cannot say that his findings, affirmed by the court of appeals, were clearly erroneous and do not support the conclusion of both the lower courts.

Judgment affirmed.

MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS, WITH WHOM THE CHIEF JUSTICE, MR. JUSTICE BLACK, AND MR. JUSTICE BRENNAN CONCUR, DISSENTING

Petitioner was born in Finland in 1908; and came here when he was less than a year old and has resided here ever since. He is married to a native-born citizen; he served honorably in our Army; and he has no criminal record of any kind except for a petty offense, back in 1930.

The evidence against petitioner was given by two witnesses who had once been Communists, one of whom petitioner swore he never knew. They testified that petitioner was a member of the Communist Party from 1937 to 1939 in Portland, Oreg. One of them testified that petitioner had assisted in the circulation of a paper, Labor New Dealer, which apparently was an organ of the party. There was evidence he paid dues to the party of 25 cents a month and that he attended both open and closed meetings of the party. But even these two ex-Communists who appeared against petitioner said that there was no discussion of ways and means to overthrow the Government at those meetings, that only problems such as labor conditions, relief, and the like were discussed. One also swore that petitioner never advocated the overthrow of the Government. Petitioner's interest in the party, according to one of these hostile witnesses, was as a result of "the sufferings of the people in the depression;" and he was "very sympathetic toward their welfare." This witness agreed that petitioner was not an intellectual interested in "theory" or "political discussion." His interests were "in bread and butter topics of the day, what to do for unemployment and relief." Nor had petitioner ever taught the Communist doctrine nor distributed its literature, except for the Labor New Dealer.

These two ex-Communists testified that petitioner attended dances that the party arranged in Portland. But they said he never held an office in the party; nor was ever employed by the party; nor was ever a "functionary" in the sense of representing the party. He attended a regional meeting at Aberdeen, Wash., where various speakers, according to one ex-Communist, gave "glowing accounts" of their work for the party, "more or less fabricating" their achievements.

We know from petitioner's lips that he was not acquainted with the conventional Communist literature; and nothing came from the lips of his accusers that denied it. One who reads the whole of his record cannot put it down without feeling that here is a man neither conspiratorial, dangerous, cunning, nor knowledgeable. Petitioner—a painter by trade—represents a miscroscopic element in the ranks of our labor force who was caught up in a movement whose ideology he did not understand and whose leaders spoke in terms of bread for the hungry, and jobs for the unemployed. He has recently earned about $4,000 a year; he bought a home for $3,100 (which is now worth from $6,000 to $6,500 subject to a $2,500 mortgage); and he has personal property, including a car, worth $2,000.

This is the background against which the following testimony can be best understood.

"Question. In the Finnish Hall or anywhere else did you attend Communist Party meetings?

"Answer. Well, if I said yes and if I said no maybe I wouldn't be telling the truth, because I really couldn't tell one way or the other. I went to meetings there. Sometimes maybe they were Communist, and maybe they wasn't. It could have been and maybe they wasn't.

* * * * *

"Question. Have you been a member of the Communist Party of the United States or any branch of affiliate or organization by that name or any similar name?

"Answer. Knowingly, I haven't, no.

* * * * *

"Question. Do you believe that membership in the Communist Party now is a lawful political purpose?

"Answer. No. I can't answer questions about that because I don't know. If Congress says it is unlawful, it is unlawful. If it isn't, it isn't. I don't know. If I got the question right, I don't know.

"Question. I am not trying to confuse you, * * * I am trying to find out your feelings toward communism.

"Answer. Naturally I don't—communism or socialism, I don't care what party it is here or anyplace else, if it has anything to do with overthrowing the goverment by force and violence I don't agree with it, no.

* * * * *

"Question. What was your impression of what the Communist Party was trying to do?

"Answer. Well, the only thing I heard in those days was more relief and more work, and I never heard anything else; no violent overthrow of the Government, or anything of that sort, but anyplace I went to meetings was always more work and more food.

"Question. As far as you know, that was what the Communist Party stood for during that period?

"Answer. I don't know if they stood for that, but I never heard anything against it."

The case is on all fours with *Rowoldt* v. *Perfetto* (355 U.S. 115). The "solidity of proof" (id., at 120) required for the severe consequences of the deportation of a man who came here when he was less than 1 year old, whose only memory of life is in this land, and who has lived here over 50 years has not been met. The "meaningful association" with the party which the Rowoldt case requires (id., at 120) simply has not been established here. In this case, as in Rowoldt, petitioner's association with the party was "wholly devoid of any 'political' implications" (id. at 120).

The testimony of the two ex-Communists upon which petitioner is being banished has never been heard by a court. The only testimony taken by the district court was that of the petitioner and his character witnesses. The district judge believed the witnesses against Niukkanen by virtue of having read the same record that is now before this Court. His impression of their credibility can be no more reliable than our own. Certainly then his conclusion that petitioner "perjured himself before, and * * * perjured himself today" does not preclude this Court's review of the evidence against him. Apart from that, the evidence would be far too meager to establish the "meaningful association" which we required in the Rowoldt case.

The unanimity of all the finders of fact in the Rowoldt case (id., at 119) that Rowoldt was a "member" of the party and his refusal to answer when asked in the deportation proceedings whether he had ever been a member of the Communist Party, did not stop us from declaring that "the record before us is all too insubstantial to support the order of deportation" (id., at 121). The unanimity of the finders of fact in the present case should likewise be no barrier to our entry of a just decree. A man who has lived here for every meaningful month of his entire life should not be sent into exile for acts which this record reveals were utterly devoid of any sinister implication.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close my plea by saying I am satisfied if Members of the Congress will read the record of the case, they will agree with me that, although it is good politics to wave the flag in regard to such a case as this, I believe we ought to rise above our emotions in a matter such as this and see to it that we do justice to our country by not letting the world receive notice that we are going to be guilty of the kind of an inhumanity to man which, in my judgment, is proposed in regard to this particular individual.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAY INCREASE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday I submitted to the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service a statement in support of what I believe to be a completely meritorious pay increase for our Federal employees. I ask unanimous consent that my statement be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objections, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE IN SUPPORT OF FEDERAL PAY INCREASE LEGISLATION, MAY 12, 1960

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I come before you today to urge that you give earnest and favorable consideration to a Federal pay increase bill this session which will increase the compensation of postal and Federal employees by at least 9 percent.

There is nothing magic about 9 percent, it could be 10 percent or 12 percent or even more if justified by the facts of the matter. I am suggesting 9 percent to you as an interim figure only, which would be adjusted upon the completion of such necessary and overdue studies as the administration has indicated it is conducting. In my judgment, an objective study would show that the 9 percent figure is a low figure and that an equitable increase would be a higher percentage amount.

Parity of income for Federal employees, by which I mean a fair day's pay for an honest

day's work, corrected when necessary to reflect changes in the cost of living and increases in productivity, is a goal to which we should dedicate ourselves. Those of us who believe that the Government should be a model employer have a responsibility to vote for justified pay increase legislation when it comes before us. It is this parity of income based upon the 1939 standard which we should enact as a minimum.

Let us not forget that we are in a special relationship of trust to the people of the Nation whose best interests we are sworn to uphold, and to the men and women who, by freely entering into our postal and classified services, have dedicated themselves to a lifetime of service to their fellow citizens. By doing so, the scientists who work in the Bureau of Standards, the agricultural and veterinary specialists who guard our health, the indispensable agents who work in Internal Revenue and the postal employees who deliver our mail, to name but a few of the many important service functions performed for our citizens, have all surrendered the accepted rights of labor in private industry to improve economic status by work stoppage. They have done this because their service is vital to our national community and cannot be interrupted. They therefore have a just and continuing claim upon us as legislators for fair and equitable treatment.

I very much regret, from what I have observed in the press, that the administration does not recognize this elementary responsibility to our Federal employees. I have heard that representatives of the administration have even gone so far as to stigmatize the elected representatives of the people by inferring that the Congress is callously manipulating the Federal employee. I am reminded that once before, not too many years ago, a Cabinet rank appointee of the President, went so far in connection with a pay bill for which credit was later claimed by the administration, to say that Federal pay increase proposals of the Congress were a cruel hoax upon the Federal employee. Mr. Chairman, this type of scarecrow argument should be recognized for what it is—the substitution of semantics for needed action.

The administration wants to delay needed upward adjustment of pay schedules under the guise of a study completion. By acceding to this delaying tactic what really is accomplished? The saving of some money which should have been paid at an earlier date. It is the repudiation of a just debt. If the facts you have elicited warrant an increase at this time, then we should face up to the problem and vote the increase now.

Since 1939 there have been increases in productivity of postal and Federal employees which should be kept in mind. Since 1939 there has also been imposed upon the Federal employee the same burden of tax which is borne by all our citizens. Let us not forget that the traditionally lower wages for Federal workers were, in large part, once justified by the tax free nature of their income. But this justification died with the imposition of taxes, State and Federal, upon the Government worker two decades or more ago. Equal pay for equal work is the guide and principle which should determine our action. We should not expect the Federal employee, any more than we should expect the farmer, or the industrial worker to subsidize, by low pay, the balance of our economy. An argument to the contrary, an argument based upon a feared inflationary impact of a Federal pay raise, is an argument, in effect, for forced and uncompensated labor.

A remedy for the supposed inflationary situation which might develop, and I have yet to be convinced that it will develop, lies not in restricting arbitrarily the just reward for conscientiously performed work, it may lie rather in changes in our income tax structure. I note that the administration is not hesitant to inflate the cost of living by postal rate increases and increases in gasoline taxes.

It may be that there are a few grave inequities in our classification system in both postal and civil service. If so, these inequities should be rectified upon the basis of an objective and scientific study. But the study should not be used as a cloak for doing nothing about an immediate and pressing problem.

It is for these reasons that I ask the chairman and his distinguished committee to give careful heed to the just recommendations of the representatives of the employees who have appeared before you in support of an immediate pay raise, and in reporting a bill to do so without prejudice to any further upward adjustments which may later be found to be necessary.

AMENDMENT OF MENOMINEE INDIANS ACT, RELATING TO TERMINATION OF FEDERAL CONTROL OVER TRIBAL AFFAIRS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to enable the Secretary of Interior to determine whether or not the Menominee Indian Tribe may require additional time—beyond December 31, 1960—for termination of Federal control over tribal affairs.

As we all well appreciate, the termination of Federal control involves complex economic, legal, and social problems. Prior to enactment of Public Law 85–488, providing for termination of Federal control, I pointed out that I was opposed to a December 31, 1960, deadline.

Unfortunately, however, this was the best that could be obtained at the time.

In view of the complex problems involved, however, I am introducing legislation to enable the Secretary of Interior—intimately acquainted with tribal affairs—to determine whether or not additional time would be necessary.

As we know, the Secretary is charged, also, with the responsibility of approving a plan for control of tribal assets after termination of Federal control.

As of now, there is question as to whether or not the tribe will be able to meet the deadline—even though the State of Wisconsin—and the tribe itself—has taken extensive measures to deal with the involved problems. Consequently, I am proposing that the Secretary of Interior be provided with authority to extend the date of termination—if deemed advisable both in the interest of the tribe and the Nation. The purpose would be to enable the tribe to put its affairs in order so as to enable it to integrate properly into the economy of the State.

I believe this is a realistic and justified approach.

In view of the fact that this apparently will be a short session—and termination of control ends December 31, 1960—I would sincerely hope that the Interior Committee would find it possible to act expeditiously on this legislation. I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3544) to amend the Menominee Termination Act, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of June 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 252), as amended (25 U.S.C. 891), is hereby amended by adding a new section 13 as follows:

"SEC. 13. If the Secretary of the Interior determines that more time is needed before the transfer of property to the tribe or a tribal corporation on December 31, 1960, as provided in section 8 of this Act, and before a termination of Federal responsibility for furnishing supervision and services to the tribe on December 31, 1960, as provided in section 7 of this Act, he is authorized to postpone such transfer of property and termination of Federal responsibility to a date he determines is reasonable."

LEASING OF PUBLIC LANDS BY UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Alaska, and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the law under which the University of Alaska is authorized to lease public lands granted to it.

As the law is now worded, the university can lease this land only at public auction. Experience has indicated that higher prices for this land can be obtained through sealed competitive bids. This is the method utilized by the State in leasing its own lands. There seems no valid reason for the use of different methods by two instrumentalities of the same State. It is much too confusing for prospective lessees. The bill we are introducing, therefore, would permit the University of Alaska to utilize the same method, namely sealed competitive bidding, employed by the State itself in leasing public lands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3545) to amend section 4 of the act of January 21, 1929, 48 U.S.C. 354a(c), and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

THE NEED TO INCREASE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR THE REVOLVING FUND IN BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986).

One of the major issues before Congress which concerns many of us, and is discussed periodically, is what can be done to revitalize our Federal Indian policy. The predominant views can be divided into three categories.

First, there are those who believe that our Indians should be protected and sheltered as wards of the Federal Government for as long as the Indians themselves will accept it.

Second, there are those who would terminate Federal control over the Indian reservations as rapidly as possible, and I might add that the most obvious result of such a policy would be to turn over a welfare problem of the Federal Government to the individual States and counties.

Third, and this is a policy to which I subscribe, is that the Federal Government should see that these folks are properly educated and encouraged to help themselves in addition to seeing that the needy Indian is properly cared for; developing the Indian so that he will break the ties with Federal Government of his own accord.

I do not feel that the Indians want to be under the protective wing of the Federal Government forever, and I am sure that they would like to be treated as the rest of us are. But the majority of our Indian reservations, especially those in Montana, are not blessed with sufficient resources and income to enable them to do anything about improving their own living and economic conditions.

In Montana we have a reservation made up of Northern Cheyenne Indians. I have spoken of these people often. They are very fine people, but they live on a reservation which is blessed with fewer resources than most areas in the country. In fact, many of these people live under the worst kind of circumstances. I have done my utmost to assist them, and they have made a very honest effort to help improve their own situation.

Just recently the Northern Cheyenne Tribal Council submitted a very fine imaginative program for the development of their reservation. It was not a grandiose plan, but was one which they could handle themselves. The tribal council received encouragement from the Bureau of Indian Affairs officials and even submitted the plan to Washington. However, that is as far as the proposal has gone. In order to implement these economic development programs these folks need money. As the Members of the Senate know the tribal revolving credit fund is overcommitted. Without a loan these tribal groups cannot proceed with their land purchase programs which are essential to the development of their reservation. The increased amount of land sales is indeed disheartening and tends to dissipate the land area on their reservation.

I might point out here that I have felt for sometime that when termination does come it does not necessarily need to mean the end of the reservation unit. I see no reason why a reservation cannot continue to function in some corporate form after termination and the release of Federal control. But if many of the reservations are to progress to this state they are going to need financial assistance.

With regard to the land sale matter, I might point out that I recognize the right of an individual Indian to sell the land that is his own, but I also want to see that the tribal council is given the opportunity to exercise its own prerogative of meeting the highest bid. This certainly cannot be done if the tribal council does not have the necessary funds in their treasury.

I have joined my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MURRAY] in the introduction of proposed legislation today which would increase the authorization of the tribal revolving credit fund in the Bureau of Indian Affairs by an additional $15 million. This would enable many of the tribal organizations to have their loan applications processed and they could then proceed with their own individual programs. The Department of the Interior has given its blessing to such an increase in its report on heirship legislation. I feel that the present situation demands that the loan fund matter be handled separately because of the controversial nature and complexion of the various heirship proposals. The need for the loan fund is immediate.

I am pleased to advise the Senate that the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has reported a bill which includes this $15 million authorization. I might point out that this action was taken under the able leadership of Representative JAMES HALEY, whom we all know as the chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee in the House. The need to replenish the revolving credit fund is very serious and I do hope that the Senate will act favorably at an early date.

Under the leadership of the new chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], I know we will get the necessary action.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by my colleague [Mr. MURRAY], relating to the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3546) to amend the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986), introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. MANSFIELD is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague, Senator MANSFIELD, in sponsoring the bill to increase the Indian Bureau revolving credit fund authorization from $10 million to $25 million.

I will explain briefly the need for such legislation. The revolving credit fund is now overcommitted. This situation has prevailed for some time. Subsequently, deserving tribes which make reasonable proposals for loans are turned down. For example, here is what Assistant Secretary of the Interior Roger Ernst told me in a letter dated March 29, 1960:

"Unfortunately, funds are not available at present to make the Northern Cheyenne Tribe a loan of $550,000 as contemplated by its program. If the Congress authorizes and appropriates the $15 million increase in the revolving fund, recommended as an amendment to S. 51, we shall, of course, proceed to make funds available for land purchases. However, any land purchases made with revolving loan funds would have to be in accordance with a program agreed upon by the Northern Cheyenne Indians and the Bureau of Indian Affairs."

As of February 29, 1960, according to Mr. Ernst, that part of the fund which the loan would be made was overcommitted $1,353,797.

The remedy for this situation is, in my judgment, to increase the authorization promptly and appropriate a reasonable sum in the supplemental appropriations bill.

The revolving credit fund is presently useless to most tribes, some of which have proposed sound land acquisition and tribal enterprise programs which require additional funds.

I have a very high regard for the able, new chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, the junior Senator from Idaho. I hope that he will consider the proposal which Senator MANSFIELD and I have made. As chairman of the Interior Committee I shall be glad to cooperate in any way toward improvement of the revolving credit fund situation.

RECOVERY OF CERTAIN COSTS OF MEDICAL CARE FURNISHED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the recovery from liable third persons of the cost of medical care and treatment furnished by agencies and departments of the United States to persons authorized by law to receive such care and treatment. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement, prepared by me, in connection with the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3547) relating to the recovery from liable third persons of the cost of medical care and treatment furnished by agencies and departments of the United States to persons authorized by law to receive such care and treatment, introduced by Mr. BYRD of Virginia, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. BYRD of Virginia is as follows:

The bill relates to lack of authority in certain areas of the Government to recover the costs of hospital and medical services in "negligent third-party cases." It is based on official audit report by the Comptroller General of the United States. The language of the bill was drafted by the Senate Legislative Counsel and approved by the General Accounting Office.

The Comptroller General's report on this subject shows that, while provision is made for recovery of these costs in other areas, the law without apparent reason is silent or insufficient with respect to accident cases involving injury to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents, the Coast Guard, merchant seamen, and others for whom Government medical care is furnished.

The magnitude of these errors of omission is shown by the Comptroller General's examination of Department of Defense records which reveal that in the 30-month period ending June 30, 1959, there were 13,500 accidents involving privately owned automobiles in which military personnel were injured.

The Comptroller General estimated that costs of Federal medical and related services in these cases averaged $10.5 million a year, or some $26 million for the 30-month period; but lacking specific authority, and under a 1947 Supreme Court decision, the Defense Department made no effort to recover any of these costs.

The Comptroller General found so-called "third-party negligence" reasonable to assume in 5,400 of the 13,500 accident cases because the injured military personnel were passengers or pedestrians. The unrecovered costs of medical and hospital services in these cases were estimated at an average of $4.2 million a year.

The military personnel injured in the other 8,100 accident cases were drivers of vehicles involved, and the Comptroller General said that while incidence of "third party liability in these cases is not known, it is reasonable to assume that it was present in a significant number of instances."

In the same review the Comptroller General found that the U.S. Public Health Service does not recover from "negligent third parties" the costs incurred by the Government in the treatment of injured Coast Guard personnel, merchant seamen, and others who are entitled to care in PHS hospitals at Government expense.

He found further that the Veterans' Administration, while successful in proceedings under general provisions of the Veterans Benefits Act, also lacks specific authority to recover medical costs from negligent third parties for accident cases treated through VA facilities.

The review found in some cases injured personnel may recover from negligent parties, but the Government cannot recover from either party in the absence of specific legal authority. In other cases injured parties, having received medical care at Government expense, do not include such costs in their claims.

I concur in the Comptroller General's conclusions that Government medical care in these cases is not intended to relieve anyone of any accident liability, and that the right of recovery should be uniform throughout the Government, with no exceptions.

I am advised by the Senate Legislative Counsel that the bill authorizes the uniform right of recovery in these cases throughout the Government. The bill has been worked out with counsel for the General Accounting Office. And the Comptroller General's recommendation is concurred in by departments and agencies involved including the military departments.

I hope the bill may be enacted during this Congress.

EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION DAY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in 1962 we shall reach the 100th anniversary of one of the most significant documents in the history of the United States. I refer to the Emancipation Proclamation.

That proclamation set the tone of American protection for all citizens and rejection of second-class status for any citizen. In issuing it President Abraham Lincoln strengthened immeasurably the world position of our Nation. Lincoln set forth, for all to see, a policy of national dignity and respect for the God-given rights of the individual. It has stood, alongside such other documents as the Magna Carta, as a hallmark in man's never-ending fight for individual liberty.

In the century since, breathtaking changes have occurred, and yet we still must concern ourselves with the fundamental truths of our freedoms. There is not one of us here who would not champion the freedom of all men, although we may differ on details as to how we can insure that freedom.

As Abraham Lincoln told a group on April 6, 1859:

This is a world of compensations; and he who would be no slave must consent to have no slave. Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves; and, under a just God, cannot long retain it.

With this abiding faith, with his feeling that "this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free," Abraham Lincoln finally, on September 22, 1862, issued his Emancipation Proclamation. Let us once again recall those words:

That on the first day of January, in the year of our Lord 1863, all persons held as slaves within any State, or designated part of a State, the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free; and the Executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authority thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons, and will do no act or acts to repress such persons, or any of them in any efforts they may make for their actual freedom.

That the Executive will, on the first day of January aforesaid, by proclamation, designate the States and parts of States, if any in which people thereof, respectively, shall then be in rebellion against the United States, and the fact that any State, or the people thereof, shall on that day be in good faith represented in the Congress of the United States by Members chosen thereto, at elections wherein a majority of the qualified voters of such State shall have participated, shall, in the absence of strong countervailing testimony, be deemed conclusive evidence that such State, and the people thereof, are not then in rebellion against the United States.

Now, therefore I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, by virtue of the power in me vested as Commander in Chief, of the Army and Navy of the United States in time of actual armed rebellion against authority and Government of the United States, and as a fit and necessary war measure for suppressing said rebellion, do on this first day of January, in the year of our Lord 1863, and in accordance with my purpose so to do, publicly proclaimed for the full period of 100 days, from the day first above mentioned, order and designate as the States and parts of States wherein the people thereof respectively, are this day in rebellion against the United States, the following, to wit:

Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana (except the parishes of St. Bernard, Plaquemines, Jefferson, St. John, St. Charles, St. James, Ascension, Assumption, Terrebonne, Lafourche, St. Mary, St. Martin, and Orleans, including the city of New Orleans), Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia, (except the 48 counties designated as West Virginia and also the counties of Berkeley, Accomac, Northampton, Elizabeth City, York, Princess Ann, and Norfolk, including the cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth), and which excepted parts are for the present left precisely as if this proclamation were not issued.

And by virtue of the power and for the purpose aforesaid I do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within said designated States, and parts of States are and henceforward shall be free; and that the Executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of said persons.

And I hereby enjoin upon the people so declared to be free to abstain from all violence, unless in necessary self-defense; and I recommend to them that in all cases when allowed, they labor faithfully for reasonable wages.

And I further declare and make known, that such persons of suitable condition, will be received into the armed service of the United States to garrison forts, positions, stations and other places, and to man vessels of all sorts in said service.

And upon this act sincerely believed to be an act of justice, warranted by the Constitution upon military necessity, I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind, and the gracious favor of Almighty God.

By the President:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which proclaims September 22 of each year as "Emancipation Proclamation Day." It requests the President of the United States to issue a proclamation each year inviting observance by our people. The joint resolution further sets September 22, 1962, as the first such day of observance on the centennial of the issuance of the historic statement. It directs that this first observance be coordinated with the Civil War centennial already scheduled.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 192) designating September 22 of each year as Emancipation Proclamation Day, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas on September 22, 1862, the President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, issued the proclamation historically known as the Emancipation Proclamation; and

Whereas the one-hundredth anniversary of that great historical event will occur in 1962 during the Civil War centennial celebration; and

Whereas the issuance of that proclamation being one of the most significant events in the history of this country, it is fitting that special attention be accorded the anniversary of that event: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the 22d day of September of each year is hereby designated as "Emancipation Proclamation Day." The President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation each year inviting the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

(b) In the preparation of plans and programs under the Act of September 7, 1957 (Public Law 85-305; 71 Stat. 626), the Civil War Centennial Commission is authorized and directed to include plans for special ceremonies commemorating the Emancipation Proclamation issued on September 22, 1862.

REPORT ON JUSTIFICATION OF WILSON DAM AND RESERVOIR, SALINE RIVER, KANS. (S. DOC. NO. 96)

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated March 10, 1960, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, in accordance with Public Law 505, 84th Congress, demonstrating justification of Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Saline River, Kans.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KEATING:

Press release of Governor Rockefeller, of New York, including an exchange of letters between the President and the Governor on the subject of atomic energy regulation.

WHY WE SHOULD HALT ATOMIC TESTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the lead letter in this morning's New York Times is an expression by Harvard Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith who writes from Switzerland on the prime importance of stopping nuclear tests.

Professor Galbraith was director of the strategic bombing survey in 1945. He conceded that the abandonment of tests does indeed constitute a risk for this country, as the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut argued so brilliantly yesterday in his eloquent speech. But as Professor Galbraith so ably points out, the American people and our Government must manfully face up to the fact that there is no riskless course left in this world. Are we without risk if we resolutely refuse to consider inspection and control systems designed to end nuclear testing in the kind of technological world the junior Senator from Connecticut described yesterday, an age in which every passing day seems to bring a new and more terrible weapon of nuclear destruction, a world in which France now has broken into the nuclear club, and soon Red China, Germany, and even possibly Castro and Tito may follow?

Mr. President, this is not only a time to speak for peace and to pray for peace, but also a time to work for peace and—yes—to risk for peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Professor Galbraith be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HALTING ATOMIC TESTS—CHOICE OF LEAST PERILOUS COURSE BELIEVED TO BE NECESSARY

(The writer of the following letter, professor of economics at Harvard University, served as Director of the U.S. Strategic Bombing Survery in 1945:)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The recent hearings before the Joint Commission on Atomic Energy, like much earlier discussion, suggest the presence of a strikingly unrealistic attitude toward an agreement on halting atomic tests. I do not suggest that this attitude is universal, but it does seem sufficiently common to merit comment.

We must surely agree that our task is not to eliminate all risk from our lives—that is an impossible goal—but to find the course of policy that minimizes risk. This requires that we balance the dangers of different courses of action. In the present instance there is, on the one hand, the danger of illicit violation of any agreement to ban tests and that the violation will go undetected. On the other hand, there is the danger of continued explosions. We must choose the course which involves the least peril.

Almost everyone must agree—and most do agree—that the dangers inherent in continuing the tests are virtually total. The tempo of competitive development and testing will increase. The countries newly possessed of atomic weapons will claim their right to poison their just share of the atmosphere. Obviously those who are making tests themselves cannot deny them the privilege. All of these dangers are predictable and certain in the absence of agreement.

POSSIBLE BAD FAITH

Against this, as noted, we must reckon with the possibility of Soviet bad faith and that it will escape detection. Some of our estimate of the danger of bad faith, we must agree, will be the residue of the bad feeling of recent years. And bad faith that involves risk of discovery is not without disadvantage as a practical policy.

But it is not my purpose to argue that this course is riskless. Rather what is clear is that whatever its dangers, they must be less than the dangers of the first course, which are certain and total. Yet this is not the nature of much of the present calculation. It holds that the danger of violation must be totally eliminated or we will continue the tests. One is reminded of the man who insists on suicide unless he is fully protected against automobile accidents. Surely we are more logical than that.

Nor is it reassuring that many who advise against accepting the lesser risk believe that any test ban makes poor military sense. We have recently heard that our military security requires a new series of tests this summer or autumn. And a high official of the Defense Department has recently stressed the need to develop atomic weapons which, though they burn, blind, disintegrate, mutilate and otherwise commit to a disenchanting death, are nonetheless clean.

CONCEALED POSITION

The danger of illicit violation has thus become part of the case against the agreement as such. It has no part of this case. If we believe an agreement is unwise, we should say so. This position should not be concealed behind arguments over enforceability. We fool no one with such transparent devices.

But I have difficulty in imagining that responsible military opinion can face with equanimity a world of uncontrolled tests. In the annals of armies there have always been examples of excessive and myopic preoccupation with military goals. Yet thoughtful military leaders certainly agree that the purpose of the armed services is to protect the continuing life and civilization of the community. Armed services are but one means to this end and diplomacy and diplomatic agreements are among the others.

It is to see the whole problem that we have civilian control of the Armed Forces. This will on occasion require the overruling of too parochial a military view. The danger lies not in doing so, but in failing to do so.

JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH.

GSTAAD, SWITZERLAND, *April 27, 1960.*

ABYSMAL FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO WORK FOR PEACE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the saddest statistics I know about is that in this vast Government bureaucracy of ours, less than 25 persons are employed full time in working in research on nuclear testing control areas which cries out for understanding if we are to achieve peace. It can in this sense honestly be said that less than 25 people in our Government are working for peace.

The senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] have repeatedly pleaded for this research and have in fact introduced legislation to provide for it.

What an irony if this Nation and mankind should perish in a nuclear holocaust because our Congress and administration refused to hire the very few essential experts necessary to do the homework we must do if we are to go into an inspection and controls system knowing what we are doing.

I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article on this subject by Representative CHESTER BOWLES, of Connecticut, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE ARMAMENT MEETS DISARMAMENT—A VAST NEW RESEARCH PROGRAM IS REQUIRED TO DEVELOP POLICIES FOR BOTH SIMULTANEOUSLY

(By CHESTER BOWLES)

Few public policies have been subjected to more scrutiny and pressure in the last few years than the twin issues of arms and arms control. True, the attention given to arms has far exceeded that given to arms control, but our policies on both issues have been equally confused and the controversies surrounding them have refused to fall into any particular pattern. Yet the expectation is that if the May 16 summit meeting results in agreement on any subject, that subject is likely to have something to do with arms control.

Clearly, our defense debacle and our disarmament debacle are interrelated (although to a degree each has an inner logic of its own). They center around two fundamental truths: (1) Arms races throughout history have usually ended in war. (2) Unpreparedness and unilateral or unsafeguarded disarmament have usually ended in national

catastrophe. Many of our major difficulties stem from attempts to separate these two truths in our thinking.

A fresh approach to our dilemma demands the recognition of both propositions as parallel routes to disaster. Some who recognize this fact recoil from what they see and tell us that our only alternative is to leave the outcome to fate. But such defeatism, however understandable, is potentially catastrophic.

Viewed from the defense perspective on survival, our problem is how to keep up with the arms race. Viewed from the human perspective on survival, our problem is how to curtail it. These two perspectives seem destined to live or die together, an inseparable if unstable combination. Consequently, the central question facing us at the moment is how to pursue simultaneously the policies of rearmament and disarmament of arms and arms control.

There are critics who insist that the task is impossible. They regard the policies as inherently conflicting—economically at odds, politically unmanageable and psychologically frustrating. On specific issues these policies would seem to pull naturally in opposite directions; even their moods seem competitive. But it is high time that we faced these issues for what they are; two sides of the same coin.

The greatest current controversies in the nuclear field are excellent up-to-date examples. They concern nuclear tests and the transfer of nuclear weapons. A brief résumé of each might shed light on the problems we can continue to expect as we pursue rearmament and disarmament together.

Nuclear testing has never been a simple issue. It was not nearly as simple as Vice President RICHARD NIXON thought in October 1956, when he denounced Adlai Stevenson's test suspension proposal as "catastrophic nonsense." Nor was it as simple as NIXON indicated in November 1959, when he took the other side of the question and announced that anyone urging a resumption of nuclear tests was "ignorant of the facts" (a statement, incidentally, which throws a curious shadow over President Eisenhower's subsequent decision that pending any further moratorium or agreement we consider ourselves "free to resume testing").

Surely our patient negotiators, now in the 18th month of the three-power nuclear test talks in Geneva, do not regard the issue as a simple one. Since October 31, 1958, when these talks began, the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union have been painfully attempting to find an acceptable formula for inspection and control to allow the discontinuance of tests.

The latest Soviet proposal and the Eisenhower-Macmillan counterproposal have now brought within striking distance the possibility for a summit agreement on a nuclear test ban. Seventeen articles out of a proposed 22-article treaty have been agreed upon. In principle, the USSR has committed itself to accept a complex global monitoring and control system that will include foreign observers and inspectors operating inside Russia.

A treaty based on these propositions would be a tremendous step forward, even if it did not cover the presently undetectable small bomb tests conducted underground. It would set into motion the world's first trial international inspection system. It would initiate the process of international controls for which we have waited so long, and upon which the chances for all further progress directly depend.

Of course there is still a measurable gulf between the Soviet proposal and the British-American counterproposal. Critical differences remain over the number and kind of onsite and offsite inspections to be provided under the treaty. The duration of the moratorium on small bomb testing still has to be decided. The chances are that neither of these issues will be resolved prior to the summit meeting. Moreover, the pitfalls which could prevent final agreement are still very much with us.

Despite our latest official position in favor of a treaty coupled with a moratorium on small bomb tests, forces in the Pentagon and the Atomic Energy Commission remain vitally interested in resuming tests. Viewing matters from a defense perspective, they are eager to make cleaner bombs, test the proposed nuclear charges for the warheads of the Polaris and Minuteman missiles, improve the small warheads for the Nike-Zeus antimissile and develop small, tactical, battlefield weapons. Press reports indicate that preparations are under way for the resumption of certain nuclear tests within a matter of months if the talks in Geneva and Paris fail.

Yet Phillip Farley, the State Department expert on disarmament and atomic energy, recently told the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee that the United States would benefit more than any other nation from a test ban. And one highly important factor which lends an air of unreality to the argument about whether we should or should not resume tests is the feeling that we are not really able to resume them anyway.

Walter Lippmann has suggested that if we did "there would be an uproar around the world. Quite competent and cool observers believe that the uproar would bring about a special meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations to protest against our action, and that if the question were put to a vote, we should be lucky to get 10 votes out of 80." Lippmann may be exaggerating a little, but there can be no doubt that the damage to our moral position would be enormous if we resumed tests.

Thus we are facing another real dilemma. If current negotiations fail, we will still not be able to resume testing without bearing the full brunt of world opinion. If we allow the test ban negotiations to drag on, the Russians will get what they have wanted all along—an informal, de facto suspension of tests which leaves the rest of the world without any means to determine whether the U.S.S.R. is behaving.

No one who really hopes for the successful conclusion of the test negotiations will readily agree that nuclear tests, however small, should be resumed as long as there remains a chance, however small, that agreement will be reached. At the same time, we know that an indefinite suspension of tests without controls could damage our military capability. This is especially true when we have no way of assuring that the Soviet Union has refrained from secret tests.

This is why a 1-year moratorium on small bomb testing, as a quid pro quo for a treaty with a meaningful inspection system, would, I think, be a good bargain—providing it is carefully meshed with an effective joint research program conducted on a crash basis and designed to close the present gap in our ability to detect underground explosions.

The divergent perspectives of defense and disarmament converge on the inspection question. More reliable scientific preparation, in depth, might already have saved us much time, uncertainty, and embarrassment. To the degree that forces within the governments involved desire to test regardless of whether tests can be detected, a solution for the detection problem would not end this controversy. But it would end a source of tremendous confusion and obstruction which has hitherto vexed all of our arms control efforts, and it is the only way our defense planners can be assured that the technological prohibitions flowing from a complete test ban will apply against the Soviet Union too.

In a field in which progress on all sides is difficult, it would be prudent to concentrate on those areas where more accurate scientific information might tip the scales of policy. One obvious area for effort is to improve the scientific underpinning of the controversy over the detection of underground tests. Since we have not moved ahead with vigor to close this major technical gap in the past, it is essential that we do so now.

The controversy over the sharing of nuclear weapons is the second major current example of how the different perspectives of defense and disarmament converge in the scientific and technical context of controls. Our strategic planners are legitimately worried because the amount of available reaction time in case of attack is coming closer and closer to zero. They are concerned over how to speed the transfer of nuclear weapons for use if and when an attack occurs.

Our nuclear weapons now in Britain, for instance, are physically separated from the missiles which can carry them and which are under British control. The administration reportedly now wants to make atomic weapons available to Britain as warheads for IRBM's manned by British crews and for air-to-air missiles carried by British interceptors. Such a move could be a precedent for similar action in the case of other allies.

Reportedly, too, the administration wants to do this under the President's "inherent powers" as Commander in Chief. Leading members of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy have publicly challenged the legal propriety of such a move. At a press conference on February 3 the President himself, to the consternation of his advisers, undermined carefully presented Defense and State Department views by adopting the contrary approach that a change would be needed in the present atomic energy law which prohibits "transfers" of weapons from our "custody" and "control."

From the defense perspective, Gen. Lauris Norstad has been warning that the need for instantaneous defense action in case of attack now requires that nuclear warheads be made available to some of our allies on some new basis inside the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. In case of war, he stresses, there won't be time to negotiate a formal transfer. He has tentatively suggested that one solution might be an atomic-armed international fire brigade to operate under NATO colors, but the proposal is still an embryonic one and administration lawyers are desperately striving to prove that the custody of nuclear warheads would technically remain in American hands.

The constitutional, legal, and policy arguments which these developments have opened up are still gathering clouds on Capitol Hill.

First, there was the astonishing attempt to bottle up a constitutional debate by a classified presentation to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Second, the President's remarks suggested that signals had once more been seriously crossed between the White House and the departments concerned.

Third, there is a growing feeling that what were intended to be specific congressional restrictions on the custody and control of nuclear weapons have been greatly eased by administrative interpretation.

Fourth, the administration's eagerness to avoid a congressional debate on this subject has been especially disquieting. Only last July, many Senators and Congressmen expressed their misgivings over the substance and manner of the administration's handling of certain new agreements with seven NATO countries permitting the exchange of nuclear information.

Naturally, from the disarmament perspective, there has long been active concern over the spread of nuclear weapons. It has always been highly improbable that the

world's other 90 nations would be content to allow the United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union to preserve their nuclear monopoly in the absence of international controls.

In its helpful new pamphlet, "The *n*th Country Problem and Arms Control," the National Planning Association suggests that 11 more countries have the scientific and industrial capacity to follow France into the nuclear club with actual weapons over the next 5 years: Belgium, Canada, West Germany, India, Italy, Japan, Sweden, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, and Communist China. Just behind them are eight more countries with a similar prospect over a slightly longer period of time. All of this means that the nuclear club is the least exclusive club in the world, and new members can in no sense be vetoed at the whim of the self-conscious elite who now belong.

Once more there would seem to be surface evidence that the defense and disarmament perspective are not complementary. One view stresses the need for a wider sharing of nuclear weapons, arguing that denying our allies a capacity which our probable enemy already has is suicidal in an era of split-second strategy. The other view stresses the equally realistic danger that a further proliferation of weapons increases the likelihood that they will never be brought under control, and that the dangers of the accidental or deliberate triggering of a nuclear war will be correspondingly enhanced.

But these divergent perspectives, under closer examination, may not be unalterably opposed. Once more what chance there may be for reconciliation lies in the field of control systems. It is probably predicated on new procedural answers to this order of questions: What specific steps, if any, are consistent with both defense and disarmament requirements? What new arrangements inside NATO can be made to present simultaneously the steadiest deterrent and the least provocation to outside aggression? What system can maximize the dedication of nuclear technology to common purposes and minimize the sense of deprivation which now serves as an incentive for nonnuclear powers to become nuclear?

The answers are not likely to be found in the indiscriminate granting of nuclear weapons to just any ally, as some of the President's press conference remarks might be read to favor. Similarly, the answer is not likely to be found in the simple satisfaction of hoarding our own nuclear weapons while refusing to consider the very real prospect of the spread of nuclear weapons over our objection and without our help. Now that the French example is before them, the fifth to *n*th powers can confidently be expected to exert increasing pressure on us, the British, and the Russians to placate in one manner or another their desire for nuclear prestige.

Within NATO it may be timely and possible, under the urgency of these new pressures, to negotiate new arrangements for a recognized and equitable division of labor. Such arrangements might be based on accepting the proposition that there is no NATO equality of weapons, manpower, finances, or industrial production. It might be involve general acceptance throughout the alliance of assignments of roles and missions to avoid useless rivalries and duplication.

Internal NATO involvement of nonnuclear members in control, supervision, observation, and planning activities might help to divert the ambitions of some members to emulate France. Development of a credible, overall NATO nuclear deterrent strategy itself could reduce the provocations of separate nuclear deterrents and even reassure the Russians. Joint scientific research inside NATO could be of great potential value in the fields of both arms and arms control.

Outside NATO the threatened spread of nuclear weapons is bound to have equally profound effects. There can be little private gratification in the Kremlin, for instance, over the prospect of an independent nuclear capability in Communist China or in restless East Germany.

Out of mutual danger, too, may come new opportunities for agreements based on mutual interest. In its recent significant study on "The U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe," prepared for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Columbia-Harvard Research Group may have had this in mind when it said: "In the long run, we may come to regard the Russians as our most conservative and responsible adversary, as we explore the possibilities of common interest in limiting certain aspects of the arms race." This may appear extraordinary, but it is in no sense impossible.

Dangerous deficiencies in our military and strategic positions have accrued from our lingering preoccupation with the reckless single strategy of massive retaliation. The strategy itself was the normal outgrowth of our fixation on big bombs and balanced budgets. The continuing effectiveness of our deterrent strategy now depends on our ability to muster the skill, nerve, and wherewithal to equip ourselves with multiple strategies for defense. By the same token, our chances for a world of greater safety and freedom depend on our ability to develop multiple strategies for peace.

Our inadequacy in the field of arms control research is obviously one of our most glaring shortcomings. I have already discussed instances where advance technical preparation in depth might have spelled progress where we now have frustration and defeat. Additional examples keep occurring:

Why has so little been done to implement the report issued on March 16, 1959, by a panel of seismologists under the direction of Lloyd V. Berkner? It outlined a 3-year program of research and development which it thought would restore to full efficiency the inspection system for bomb tests agreed upon in 1958 at Geneva.

Many distinguished atomic scientists now feel that the addition to the detection network of a series of unmanned seismic stations which could pick up small earth shocks might get the Geneva test conference over its last hurdles. Why is the push not being made?

Time and again Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, chairman of the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee, which has done such outstanding and effective work in this field, has sought an appropriation of $400,000 which the State Department wants for its own use in procuring special foreign policy studies relating to disarmament, weapons control, and possible technical means for enforcement. Time and again the funds have been refused. Yet the costs and the risks of not moving ahead in these areas are mounting daily; $400,000 is one-thousandth of 1 percent of our annual defense budget.

And where is our system of values? If one asks his 10-year-old son today whether in his lifetime he thinks it might be possible to take a fishing trip to the moon, the boy is likely to answer unhesitatingly, "Yes." If he is asked whether he thinks it will ever be possible to get missiles under international control, he is likely to answer unhesitatingly, "No."

We are, I am afraid, living in a fool's paradise of complacency. What will end it short of catastrophe, I do not pretend to know. But I do know that we have a right to worry, and we have an obligation to propose those things which seem sensible.

One of the latter is Massachusetts Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY'S new proposal for an Arms Control Research Institute embodied in a bill he has introduced in the Senate, and in a companion bill which I have introduced in the House.

We propose to give this new agency the responsibility for a vast new research effort to fill those gaps which science and technology can fill in our preparation for peace and disarmament. The Arms Control Research Institute would conduct studies in the physical, natural, and social sciences relevant to specific disarmament issues. It would be an excellent center for coordinating our participation in the joint research activities which may be agreed upon with the Soviet Union.

The Institute could also be a clearinghouse for arms control proposals—deliberately organized to bring ideas and people together on a practical basis for peace. If the Institute operates as I hope it would operate, we will be able to say with more assurance than we can today that our efforts for arms control are a vital part of American policy.

WISCONSIN CONTINUES LEADERSHIP IN PUBLIC WELFARE FIELD UNDER GOV. GAYLORD NELSON

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Gaylord A. Nelson, in serving less than 2 years of his first term as Governor of Wisconsin, has convincingly demonstrated he will carry on and enhance Wisconsin's tradition of leading the Nation's State governments in recognizing and meeting their people's new problems with sound, progressive programs of action.

Probably the most important function of our State governments today is in the public welfare field. Most of us believe that the welfare needs of people should be fulfilled to the greatest extent possible at the State and local level. In Wisconsin we are tremendously proud that our State has led the Nation in developing many programs of aid to the unfortunates among its people, just as we have pioneered many governmental reforms in other fields.

Last week, Governor Nelson reviewed the public welfare advances Wisconsin has already made in the few months of his term of office in an address to the Wisconsin Public Welfare Association. These totaled up to 16 significant reforms which make Wisconsin's government even more responsive to the needs of our people. And he went on to describe the jobs that still face Wisconsin in the welfare field—the jobs he intends to carry through.

In this report, Governor Nelson put his finger on a very significant truth about the vital public welfare function of State governments. He said:

I don't know why, but the press will devote its front pages to story after story on regulation of water skiers or billboards, while burying or completely ignoring many of the programs I have described today.

Perhaps my old friend Wilbur Schmidt—whom we all recognize as one of the great public welfare leaders in the Nation—was right when he said to me the other day that welfare programs represent the failures of society and the society doesn't want to look at its failures.

But Governor Nelson concluded his talk by pointing out that we are overcoming this attitude.

Public welfare programs have come a long way from the days of the dole and mere custodial care. And as we direct our efforts more and more strongly toward the twin

goals of prevention and rehabilitation, I think the people will begin to respond, with sympathy, with understanding, and with hope.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this highly significant address by Gov. Gaylord Nelson be published at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY GOV. GAYLORD NELSON AT THE WISCONSIN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION CONVENTION, MASONIC TEMPLE, OSHKOSH, WIS.

Public welfare, in its broadest sense, determines everything we do in State government. This includes the conservation of our forests, soil, and water; the education of our children; the restrictions we place on the criminal or unscrupulous elements in our society; the location of our transportation routes; the rules we set for general health and safety. In each case, public welfare becomes the first and foremost consideration.

Today, however, I would like to talk about public welfare in your terms—in terms of the help we offer to the less fortunate members of our society, the disabled, the unemployed, the retarded, the delinquent, the sick, the mentally ill, the homeless, the aged, the orphaned. I think it's worth reviewing what we in State government have accomplished in the past 12 months, and I think it's important that we set some goals for the future.

It seems to me that the past year has been a heartening one to all of you who have devoted so much time and effort to helping those in our State who cannot help themselves.

First, we changed the State definition of "total disability" to conform with the Federal interpretation, thereby permitting almost four times as many Wisconsin residents to qualify for total disability payments. Today, over 180 people a month are being transferred from local relief rolls to total disability rolls. The average grant to those transferred has jumped from $64 to $107 a month, or 67 percent. By August, more than 2,000 citizens will be transferred to total disability rolls, or almost one out of every 10 receiving general relief at the time the new act went into effect. And an additional 1,100 people will be approved for total disability payments who were never on relief.

This means a substantial saving in local property taxes that go to pay for general relief. Far more important, however, it means that more than 3,000 disabled people will get anywhere from $30 to $100 more per month. Everyone here knows how often such increases can spell the difference between poor health and good health, between human misery and human dignity.

Second, we rewrote the State's unemployment compensation law, extending periods of coverage to 34 weeks and raising maximum benefits to 52½ percent of the statewide average weekly wage. As a result, 25,700 Wisconsin workers who became jobless through no fault of their own in the last half of 1959 received added protection worth an average of $233 per worker; and more than 4 out of every 10 workers who have applied for unemployment compensation since the start of 1960 have received weekly payments higher than the old $41 maximum, with 3 out of 10 getting the new maximum of $47.

Third, we completely recodified Wisconsin's family code, tightening up our marriage, divorce, and child support laws to promote greater stability in family life.

Fourth, we place top priority on construction of a forestry camp for delinquent teenage boys. This camp will relieve population pressures on the school for boys at Waukesha and the State boys school now under construction at Wales. Equally important, the forestry camp offers special advantages in handling the problems of teenage offenders since the boys will be working in a healthy outdoor atmosphere and will be able to find considerable satisfaction in the work they have done. I feel that this conservation approach to rehabilitation without institutionalization—although starting on a small scale—offers one of the bright new hopes in meeting the problem of juvenile delinquency.

Fifth, we authorized the State's joint committee on standards to develop minimum levels of the care and treatment for patients in Wisconsin's 38 county mental hospitals. This committee, which includes some of our most outstanding county welfare officials, is expected to submit its recommendations sometime this summer.

Sixth, we appointed a citizens' committee on county institutions to coordinate the future role of county institutions with other private, State, and county services available to the mentally ill, the physically infirm and the aged. This committee also includes leading county authorities, and it too is hard at work.

We created a State mental health advisory board to study all mental health activities in the State and recommend improvements. This committee, aided by a full-time executive secretary, is now preparing an inventory of Wisconsin's present and future mental health needs, concentrating first on the needs for trained personnel and the educational programs necessary to obtain them.

We provided funds for construction of an intensive treatment center for emotionally disturbed children. The center will accommodate about 30 children between the ages of 6 and 12. Its great promise is that intensive treatment may enable us to cure emotionally disturbed children at an early age. The research aspects of this project are equally important, considering how little we now know about effective treatment of these extreme cases.

We also provided a total of $396,000 for State aids to the 21 present community mental health clinics. This measure provides for State payment of 40 percent of local clinic costs, and already we have spent more than $33,000 and committed an additional $57,000. The community approach to mental health—providing early, outpatient treatment at the local level—is in line with the best modern psychiatric thinking, and again our hope is to provide cures for many before they become permanent wards of our society.

We passed a new State law prohibiting discrimination in employment because of age.

We provided the first operating funds for the new rehabilitation center at the University of Wisconsin. This center, cooperating with the university medical center and other State agencies, is embarking on a program of total rehabilitation for the victims of industrial and farm accidents and for the increasing numbers of children, adults, and aged who recover from the acute stages of lengthy diseases.

We made major changes in procedures at the University of Wisconsin hospital, promoting greater use by both patients and medical students. This was done by permitting the State to share costs for a broader category of public patients, by abolishing the quota system on county welfare patients, and by letting the State relieve counties and veterans of the excess burden in costly cases.

We launched an all-out effort to provide kitchen facilities to feed the 450 children who will occupy the Central Colony nursery building for retarded children. The nursery building will be completed this summer; and as a result of our efforts, the kitchen will be ready 6 months ahead of the original schedule.

In 1959, we also became the third State in the Nation to share health insurance costs with its State employees. A single State health insurance program was established to replace 239 piecemeal plans previously in effect and the same law provided for State payment of 50 percent of the monthly premiums up to a maximum of $6.

Finally, we placed Blue Cross, Blue Shield, and Surgical Care under regulation of the State insurance commission, and we eliminated the power of private companies to terminate individual health and accident policies at any time on 5 days' notice, limiting their termination rights to annual renewal dates, and then only after 30 days' notice.

I have listed some 16 steps we in State government have taken in the past year as we strive for better public welfare. They are important advances.

The last thing I want to do, however, is leave you with the impression that the State government has done all it can. The steps we have taken are important, but they are only a few yards down the long road that lies ahead of all of us.

For one thing, I think we have to work increasingly—at the State, county, and local levels—toward welfare programs that place the emphasis on cures rather than on costs, and on rehabilitation rather than mere custodial care.

For another, I think it's time we did something about the 1-year residence requirement for general relief. I'm sure no one here today would stand by idly while a family starved simply because it hadn't lived within our State borders long enough. I am not sure of the answer, but perhaps it lies along the lines recently suggested by the Lieutenant Governor of New York, who proposed that anyone residing in New York for less than a year be eligible for general relief only after producing a certificate from the State employment service stating that no work was available within his competence. I am also encouraged by recent proposals that the Federal Government assume some responsibility for relief payments to these so-called stateless people.

I also think we should give serious consideration to the proposal of the blue-ribbon tax revision committee that the State take over the general relief program. Under this proposal, the State would employ the same people now administering local relief programs, but the transfer of general relief to the State would provide $23 million in local property tax relief. In addition, the State could apply all its rehabilitation services to getting these general relief recipients back into productive occupations, including our vocational and adult education system to provide training and the State employment service to find proper jobs.

If we are to continue shifting the emphasis from custodial care to rehabilitation—as we should and as we must—we have no choice but to hire the additional caseworkers we need. Let me give you two examples of what I mean:

First, let's take the State's vocational rehabilitation program. The cost of keeping a handicapped person on public assistance is about $1,000 a year in Wisconsin. It costs us $700 to train this person for employment. But after training, his average earnings amount to more than $2,700 a year.

It only makes sense to train these handicapped people. But what are the facts? Last year, we approved 3,670 cases for vocational rehabilitation, but we trained and discharged only 1,440—or less than half. We simply lacked the personnel and the facilities to handle any more.

Let's take a second case: The average pardon and parole officer in Wisconsin costs the State $8,000 a year, including travel ex-

penses. But this worker handles an average of 40 cases a year. The cost of keeping these 40 people in prison for another year is about $80,000, or 10 times the cost of a caseworker. Yet public safety demands that we keep these people in prison unless we have the trained personnel to supervise their activities.

In the revised budget I submitted to the legislature last fall, I increased funds for vocational rehabilitation by $41,000, and recommended adding nine pardon and parole workers at a cost of $76,000.

Both these increases were killed when the State senate voted to defeat the revised budget. This, I think, is an example of the false economy we must constantly fight against. Because the senate killed the $41,000 increase for vocational rehabilitation, about 150 handicapped people this year will be denied the training that could enable them to earn an average of $2,700 a year; many will remain on public assistance rolls at a substantial relief cost. Because the senate defeated the $76,000 increase for 9 parole and pardon workers, as many as 360 convicts may remain in prison, at a cost of $720,000 a year. This is more than insufficient welfare work; it is terrible economy.

Finally, I want to repeat what I have said on many other occasions—that we must amend the State constitution to permit borrowing for capital construction. As you know, the Wisconsin constitution forbids State debt beyond $100,000. To get around this limitation, past State administrations have adopted the device of the dummy corporation, and I have reluctantly continued the practice while pleading for legal borrowing power. But the dummy corporation has been restricted to borrowing where it can assure repayment of loans out of the fees and rents collected on the buildings it constructs. Such fees and rents are notably lacking in our State welfare institutions. Not a single new State welfare building was authorized by the last State administration. And although we are doing better today, we will never have the modern welfare facilities we need until we can go out and borrow funds for construction, backed by the full faith and credit of the State. You have heard of "pay as we go." I suggest this is nothing more than "pay as we grow."

I have spent a good deal of time today outlining our achievements and our goals in public welfare. But I think such a detailed report is necessary, and perhaps overdue. I don't know why, but the press will devote its front pages to story after story on regulation of waterskiers or billboards, while burying or completely ignoring many of the programs I have described today.

Perhaps my old friend Wilbur Schmidt—whom we all recognize as one of the great public-welfare leaders in the Nation—was right when he said to me the other day that welfare programs represent the failures of society and society doesn't want to look at its failures.

I am convinced, however, that we are overcoming this attitude. Public-welfare programs have come a long way from the days of the dole and mere custodial care. And as we direct our efforts more and more strongly toward the twin goals of prevention and rehabilitation, I think the people will begin to respond—with sympathy, with understanding and with hope.

Thank you.

WHAT IS WRONG WITH OUR MULTI-BILLION-DOLLAR HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] have often spoken of the fiscal irresponsibility of some phases of our Federal road building program.

In view of our highway program's enormous cost, and what so often seems the formless, planless, dollar-happy, something-in-it-for-everyone-but-the-taxpayer chaos, I was very much impressed by a lucid, thoughtful critique on the subject that appeared recently in the Reporter. Because this constitutes an acute criticism of congressional action from which we can benefit, I ask unanimous consent that this article entitled "New Roads and Urban Chaos," by Daniel Moynihan, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ROADS AND URBAN CHAOS

(By Daniel P. Moynihan)

The Wall Street Journal does not commonly describe any undertaking of the Eisenhower administration as "A vast program thrown together, imperfectly conceived and grossly mismanaged, and in due course becoming a veritable playground for extravagance, waste, and corruption." It must, to the White House, seem notably unkind for the Journal to speak thus of an enterprise the administration has declared "the biggest public works program ever undertaken anywhere or at any time throughout the world." But even the President has conceded that all is not well with the $45 billion interstate and defense highway program.

The program provides for the construction of 41,000 miles of superhighway, connecting 90 percent of the nearly 300 cities of the continental United States with populations of 50,000 or more. When completed, the system will carry 20 percent of the Nation's traffic Up to 95 percent of the cost will be paid by the Federal Government. Half of it will be spent in the cities the system connects.

Washington abounds with administration task forces, congressional committees, and special interest groups—all investigating this program. Those in Congress who are looking for scandal will likely find no end of it. Those in the President's office looking for ways to cut back the program will have an even easier task, although they may encounter more difficulty getting their findings published during this election year. But very few seem to be asking whether, quite apart from corruption or extravagance, the program is bringing about changes for the worse in the efficiency of our transportation system and the character of our cities.

One of the best publicized resolves of the administration that took office in 1953 was to redress the balance of Federal-State relations by divesting the National Government of such usurpations of State sovereignty as vocational education and aid to the dependent blind. While almost nothing has come of this endeavor, an important change in Federal-State relations has in fact taken place during the Eisenhower years. The Federal Government, through the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, has assumed the direction of highway construction—one of the few areas of significant government activity in which the States still had the initiative after the New Deal.

Although the Federal Government has been providing some highway aid to the States since 1916, roadbuilding was almost entirely a State and local affair until 1956. The Federal Bureau of Public Roads was, as late as 1939, a small agency in the Department of Agriculture helping to "get the farmer out of the mud" by supplementing State highway budgets. The States spent the money pretty much as they pleased.

The system was permissive but not disorganized. Standards for highway construction, for example, and national routes (the familiar U.S. sign) were successfully established on a voluntary basis. For the most part, however, these roads followed trails that had originated far back in frontier history. With the coming of the automobile they were just surfaced, and widened and straightened somewhat. Our counterparts of the "rolling English drunkard" who laid out Chesterton's "rolling English road" were the Iroquois war party and the Conestoga wagon: More purposeful but not less circuitous as they sought out the passes and water-level routes north and south, and across the continent. The Roman roads Hilaire Belloc has written of, struck like a lash across the conquered provinces, were not reproduced in America until we too established a dominant central government.

The idea of a Federal system of superhighways arose during the First World War. It was revived by the Roosevelt administration as a public works project for building 14,000 miles of transcontinental routes. A study made by the Bureau of Public Roads, which the President commended to Congress in 1939, revealed that there was surprisingly little cross-country traffic and suggested that the concept be changed to a 26,700-mile intercity system. The idea was popularized by General Motors' Futurama exhibit at the New York World's Fair.

In 1944, after some further study, Congress authorized construction of a National Interstate Highway System on this basis. The size was increased to 40,000 miles. Thus, from the outset there has been more mileage authorized for the system than anyone knew exactly what to do with.

MORE ROADS FOR MORE CARS

Authorization is the first step in a Federal public works program. It more or less commits Congress to appropriate money at a future date and provides time for plans and other necessary arrangements to be made. Plans for the Interstate System went ahead. In 1947 the Federal Government and the States agreed on the location of 37,700 miles of the system, leaving the rest for additional urban connections. The roads were to be limited-access, multilane high-speed routes designed to the highest standards. But no special funds were appropriated to build them; only regular Federal highway-aid funds were made available, on the standard 50–50 matching basis. This required the States to take sizable amounts of money from regular projects to spend on interstate mileage.

The result was that the interstate mileage didn't get built. Highway construction expenditure multiplied by nearly eight times from 1945 to 1952, but the States just would not use their money on interstate highways. It had never, after all, been their idea. Special funds were thereupon appropriated and the Federal share increased to 60 percent, but still with little effect. By 1952, less than 1 percent of the system had been completed. Three years later President Eisenhower declared: "At the current rate of development, the interstate network would not reach even a reasonable level of extent and efficiency in half a century."

For the highway transportation industry this raised a serious question. Automobile registrations had almost doubled in the first decade after the war. By 1955 there was a motor vehicle for every 700 feet of lane in both directions on all the streets and roads of the Nation. It was expected that registrations would rise another 40 percent in the following decade, to a total of 81 million. Yet already the cities were "chockablock" with cars. Unless more room was made for

automobiles, the automobile industry itself might feel the pinch. "Either the roads must be made adequate for the traffic," stated the Engineering News-Record, "or the end of national expansion as we know it must be accepted."

Few pains were spared to popularize this notion. General Motors even went into the essay-sponsoring business, offering $25,000 for the best theme on "How To Build the Roads We Need." (The prize was won, naturally, by Robert Moses.)

But the Eisenhower administration needed little persuading. Highway transport had become, in the words of the Brookings Institution, "the greatest single combination of economic activities in men's history."

In July 1954, the President proposed a "grand plan" for a national highway system. His plan was to build the Interstate System Roosevelt had proposed and Congress had authorized. He next appointed a Committee composed of Gen. Lucius D. Clay and assorted men of substance, including Dave Beck, as was de rigueur in those days, to devise means for doing so. The Committee quickly reported that the system would cost only $27.5 billion, and could be built, with borrowed money, in 10 years. It proposed that the Federal Government pay 90 percent of the cost generally and up to 95 percent in States with extensive untaxed Federal landholdings. The President submitted this proposal to Congress in February 1955.

SOMETHING FOR EVERYBODY

Introducing a highway program in today's Congress is like letting a tariff bill loose in the old days—the figures go up and up and up. The economic interest in highways affects not only General Motors, but also countless numbers of garage owners, automobile dealers, road contractors, real-estate developers, and similar large and small businesses throughout the land. Conservatives think of roads as good for business. Liberals think of them as part of the litany of public investment they so love to chant: "Better schools, better hospitals, better roads * * *." Plain politicians think of roads as the indispensable means by which the owners of 70 million motor vehicles derive the benefits from what is for most of them the largest or second largest investment they ever make.

Highway construction is especially important to the professional politicians, since it provides the largest single supply of money available these days to support their activities. The alliance of the county leader and the contractor is ancient and by no means dishonorable. Public works represents the most beneficent outlet yet devised for the politician's need to make a living and, at the same time, please the public. If it occasionally takes the form of paving stream beds in Kansas City, it may also produce a New York State Thruway.

In most States a symbiotic relationship has been established between the contracting firms and the local political organizations which obviates the usual forms of corruption. The contractors pay an honest tithe to the parties' exchequers out of fair profits, which are large mostly because the sums involved are vast. It is a point of pride with many contractors to make all contributions by check and often, as it were, in public through advertisements in party yearbooks. To the extent that this system works, it provides an excellent, if informal, means of financing our parties out of tax funds—contractors are normally apolitical, asking only that there be just a little more than enough work to go around. The politicians usually do their best.

One special attraction of the interstate program was that these roads, for the most part, would be brandnew. Seventy-two percent of the mileage, both in urban and rural areas, would be on entirely new locations. Along most of these 30,000-odd miles, property values are destined to soar. This is sure to please the owners, whether the property has been in the family for years or, by good fortune, recently acquired. The redoubtable George Washington Plunkett, of Tammany Hall, was not the last American politician who could suggest as his epitaph, "He Seen His Opportunities, and He Took 'Em."

In a Democratic Congress, dominated by southern and western representatives, the program had the further advantage of providing a considerable subsidy to those parts of the country. Far the heaviest concentration of traffic and automobiles in the Nation is located in a parallelogram running from Boston to Milwaukee down to St. Louis over to Washington and back up to Boston. The area's 14 States and the District of Columbia had just under half the Nation's motor vehicles in 1955. However, only a quarter of the interstate mileage is located in these States. Mississippi, with one-third to a half as many automobiles as Massachusetts, is to get almost one and a half times the mileage. Texas, with five-sixths as many automobiles as New York, is to get almost three times as much mileage.

It was fortunate for the President that there were so many sound political reasons to support his program. There weren't many others. With the railroads running at 50 percent of capacity, a sudden, sharp increase in intercity transportation facilities represented, if anything, a threat to the economic stability of the entire transportation industry. Almost certainly the 40,000-mile figure was too large, it had no basis other than the enthusiasm of the wartime Congress for a peacetime program that might be years away. In 1944 Congress had little idea where this mileage was to be located, much less whether it would be needed. Ten years later the Clay Committee, appointed by President Eisenhower, found that only 8,500 miles of the system could expect enough traffic to pay for themselves as toll roads—and of these, all but 3,500 were already built or being built.

There was no question that city streets were jammed, and it was always understood that half the cost of the program would go to urban arterials. But this aspect of the program should have evoked the Malthusian specter raised by New York City's Deputy Administrator Lyle C. Fitch: the number of automobiles increases to fill all the space provided.

A few months after the program was adopted, Geoffrey Crowther, of the London Economist, returned from a trans-American tour, told a New York meeting of the Committee for Economic Development: "I have driven myself with my own hands over 12,000 miles. * * * I could tell you a great deal about the * * * fabulous development of the highways in the United States. I find myself puzzled by the statements—that are taken for granted in this country now—that your highways are obsolete. I think I can claim to know as much about them now as anybody in this room and I say it is not so. Your highway system is magnificent. It is overburdened in the immediate vicinity of the large cities; but get away from the large cities and your highways are empty.

"I wonder," said Crowther, speaking of the new interstate program, "if the matter has been investigated as thoroughly as it should be." It had been. Any number of Congressmen had wondered if it could not be made bigger. It was. The President's proposal was adopted with only one other important change. Ever alert to the call of patriotism, Congress lengthened the title to make it the interstate and defense highway program.

WHO PAYS THE BILL?

The urge to have the highways was not matched by an urge to pay for them. From the outset the financing of the program has been the object of much controversy and muddle.

The Clay Committee had proposed that the program be financed through an independent Federal highway corporation which would sell some $20 billion worth of bonds to raise money to build the highways in a 10-year period. The bonds would be retired over 30 years by the returns on the 2-cent Federal gasoline tax. This would have permitted an increase in Government borrowing and spending of billions of dollars each year, without any increase in the debt limit, the budget, or taxes.

The fiscal conservatives in Congress were upset by this proposal for deficit financing. The partisan Democrats were loath to let the President carry off such a political coup. The two groups combined to insist on what is substantially a pay-as-you-go program, matching increased expenditures with increased taxes. After some difficulty over which taxes would be increased, a bipartisan program passed the House in April 1956, by a vote of 388–19. The Senate approved its measure and the President promptly signed the conference bill.

The Highway Act of 1956 gave the President the $25 billion he had asked to construct the Interstate System (to be matched by $2.5 billion from the States) and provided a third more than he had asked for regular highway aid. The authorized mileage of the Interstate System was increased to 41,000. It was to be built over a 13-year period, at a rate of Federal expenditure rising to $2.2 billion per year.

To provide the money, the fuel tax was increased from 2 cents to 3 cents per gallon and the tax on new tires from 5 cents to 8 cents per pound. These increases, together with some smaller ones on other taxes, brought an increase of almost two-thirds in taxes on highway use. A highway trust fund was set up to receive these and some related taxes. The receipts of the trust fund would be used to pay for the highway program.

The device of the trust fund satisfied the administration's wish to keep the increased level of Government spending from showing up in the budget. The bulk of highway expenditure is now carried as a separate item, similar to social security payments. Thus in the budget for fiscal 1961, highway expenditures are shown as $3 million, although they will actually be something like $3 billion.

The program got under way on July 1, 1956, but it was in trouble even before it began. The financial plan provided for the highway trust fund to incur some deficits during the peak construction years. These would be balanced by surpluses obtained during the early period when the program was still on the drawing boards and during the latter years as it was tapering off. At the last minute, Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, supported by Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey, added an amendment that forbade the trust fund ever to incur a deficit. This meant the scheduled program would have to be cut back as soon as the small initial surplus was used up.

A deficit seemed imminent in March 1958, when the President asked Congress to permit the expenditure of an additional $600 million on the Interstate System as an antirecession measure. Congress eagerly responded with $800 million. The 1958 recession thus caused an increase in expenditures and at the same time a decrease in receipts because of lowered economic activity. In January 1959, the Secretary of Commerce reported to Congress that unless receipts were increased the fund would soon be exhausted. There would be no interstate funds apportioned for fiscal 1961 and only $500 million for 1962.

To prevent this the President asked that fuel taxes be increased from 3 cents to 4½ cents a gallon. This aroused opposition from the oil companies, and for a time it seemed that the program might be seriously interrupted, but at the last moment Congress enacted a 1-cent gas tax increase. The President asked for the other half cent in his recent budget message, but nothing will be done until after the election.

Something will have to be done soon, however, for the financial problems of the Interstate System have become more difficult than simply maintaining the level of expenditures envisioned in 1956. Since then the estimated cost of the system has almost doubled.

In January 1958, the Secretary of Commerce announced that revised estimates indicated that instead of $25 billion, the Federal share of the interstate cost would be nearly $34 billion. This was for only 38,548 miles, however, which, it turned out, was all the routes laid out in 1947 required. To build the remaining 1,452 of the 40,000 miles originally planned (never any question of just dispensing with them as a tribute to efficient management) and the extra thousand miles authorized in 1956 will require another $2.2 billion. Technically the revised estimate did not even cover all of the 38,548 miles, since it did not include the cost of reimbursing the States that had already built parts of the system with their own funds or as toll roads. This would add perhaps $4.3 billion. There is also the matter of some $1.5 billion for relocating railroad tracks, telephone lines, and other utilities disturbed by the new highways, as authorized by Congress. Also, another half billion dollars might be needed to provide the extra 1.5 percent of the cost to States that forbid billboards along the new routes, as authorized by Congress. This could bring the total Federal-State cost to something like $45 billion. The sole prospect of economy is that the States aren't taking up the no-billboard option.

WHO RUNS IT?

This is not the end of it: rising costs are built into the Interstate System. From the outset the program has been undermined by the administration's desire for big government achievements without big government. The Clay Committee envisioned the largest public works program in history being carried on with no increase in public personnel. "The Federal Highway Corporation should consist only of a board of directors with secretarial assistants"—a kind of bureaucratic fantasy in which almost everyone is a member of the board and there is no overhead. The Clay Committee proposed that the interstate program be operated through the Bureau of Public Roads as an ordinary Federal highway-aid program, with all the work of picking sites, drawing plans, letting contracts, and so forth, done by the States. For extra help the States, many of which were altogether incapable of doing such work anyway, would turn to the private engineering organizations capable of providing sound engineering in this field. All of this, in some way, would further the President's stated desire for "a cooperative alliance between Federal Government and the States so that government * * * will be the manager of its own area."

The President has had his desire. The Bureau of Public Roads, with only a handful of extra help, depends on the States, which depend on consulting engineers. The consulting engineers, normally paid by a percentage of cost of the projects they design, depend on the Rotary Club for forecasts of the traffic potential of whatever town they happen to be tearing up.

WHERE IS IT BUILT?

Many instances of almost incredible mismanagement have appeared in scathing reports by the Comptroller General, but there is nothing to be done about it. The interstate program is not a Federal enterprise; it is only a Federal expense. Washington is simply committed to keep supplying money until it is finished. But the States have no real freedom of action either. The basic decision to build the system has been made for them: The enormous bargain of the 90-to-10 money makes it politically impossible to do anything but take the money as fast as possible and try to match it. Since all contracts are closely scrutinized by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, the States hardly see it as their responsibility to control the costs of the program, as indeed it is not. But the Bureau, under equally heavy pressure to keep the program rolling and Congress happy, exercises little real control. It functions rather as a company comptroller who fusses over items on an expense account without ever daring to ask if the trip was necessary. In fairness, the Bureau could hardly do otherwise: in 1958 it had two investigators to cover the entire United States.

The Comptroller General's men recently came upon a 3-mile segment in a very sparsely settled area of Nevada on which three interchanges have been built at a cost of $384,000. They will handle a daily traffic load of 89 vehicles, serving, in the words of the General Accounting Office, "some old mines, a powerline, four or five small ranches, and a house of ill repute."

From Arkansas the State auditors reported: "On every hand among both employees and commissioners we encountered a strange and distressing apathy at any extravagant use of highway funds." In Indiana apathy was replaced by enthusiasm: The boys had organized a syndicate, with highway department employees to take all the risks out of speculating on capital gains from right-of-way condemnations. The Pennsylvania Highway Department, 100 percent patronage, was performing less than 10 percent of the preliminary engineering on interstate routes, while passing out contracts to consulting engineers at the rate of a $1 million a month. In West Virginia, "* * * only about 10 percent of the State's project engineers * * * were registered or graduate engineers."

With no strong direction of the program, there has been no way to resist the political pressures to build a little bit of interstate highway in every county along the 41,000-mile route. Limited access highways over new locations are more like bridges than ordinary roads. Until they make the complete crossing from one city to another they are relatively useless, starting, likely as not, at one of the cities and ending in a cornfield. A minimum of businesslike management would have arranged for the system to be built in complete segments, concentrating on the more important ones. Instead it is being built in fragments strewn across the continent. It will be years before these are connected into anything like a national system.

The repeated financial crises of the program have created a mistaken impression that it is slowing down. Apportionments of funds for the next 2 fiscal years will be down as much as $600 million, but this will no more than offset the increases provided in 1958. According to Federal Highway Administrator Bertram D. Tallamy, who built the New York State Thruway and is in charge of the interstate program, expenditures are running some 4 percent ahead of the schedule envisioned by the 1956 legislation. Fifteen thousand miles of the system are either in the contract stage or have actually been completed. Routes have been located and plans are in process for 95 percent of the remaining mileage.

True, unless more funds are made available, the program will stretch out. But there is much support for providing more funds. The President's recent budget message, which calls for cuts in housing, hospital, water pollution, and similar programs and makes clear that a serious education bill will be vetoed, nonetheless proposes more funds to permit the construction program for the Interstate System to proceed at a higher and more desirable level. Congress continues to share the President's unflagging interest in highways. Senator ALBERT GORE, who sponsored the 1956 legislation, was talking awhile back about adding another 7,000 miles.

A few legislators such as Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, have questioned whether this is the very best way to spend our money. Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, has asked whether the program wasn't merely hastening the day when "You'll be able to drive 80 miles an hour along superhighways from one polluted stream to another, from one urban slum to another, from one rundown college campus to another."

The only certain consequence of the rising costs of the program is that there is no longer much serious possibility of reimbursing the States that built sections of the system as toll roads. In the postwar years, after the outlines of the Interstate System had been established, a number of States did this. From the outset of the present program it has been recognized that justice entitled these States to be reimbursed so that they might either remove the tolls or build additional roads. Five years ago it seemed unthinkable that this would not be done. An administration spokesman told the House Committee on Public Works that not to reimburse these States would be like saying, "Boys, we are sorry, you took care of yourselves, so you do not get anything."

The 1956 legislation declared the intent of Congress to settle this matter, but as one financial crisis has followed another, the intention has grown weaker. It is now practically settled that those States which did not wait around for Uncle Sam to look after them will in fact get nothing. So much for the fate of the bird dogs in the Eisenhower years.

Not surprisingly, 70 percent of these toll roads are located in the States of the northeastern parallelogram, which as a result will get even less than a quarter of the interstate mileage.

This development only compounds the inequity of paying for the Interstate System with gasoline taxes. Drivers on the Massachusetts Turnpike, the Indiana Toll Road, the New York State Thruway, and similar highways will not only have to pay tolls to use their portion of the Interstate System, but they will be paying extra gasoline taxes to build the other portions.

WHO BENEFITS MOST?

Apart from any regional imbalance, the gasoline tax is still a highly questionable way of distributing the burden of paying for the Interstate System in terms of the benefits that will be derived from it. The fuel levy really amounts to a household tax—more than $15 a year on the average—on the 7 out of 10 American families that own an automobile. Most of these families will use the interstate from time to time, but hardly enough to get their money back.

By contrast the system will provide a great subsidy to industry in the form of cheap road transport. The nature of this subsidy has been obscured by the endless arguments concerning the precise share of highway costs that should be paid by trucks as against private automobiles. (The Federal Government and the States are currently spending $22 million running tractor trailers over a road near Ottawa, Ill., to determine just how much they damage the pavement.) Although it appears that truckers do not pay a fair portion of highway costs, this in itself is not the secret of their economic success. The truckers' main advantage is that railroads must pay all the cost of building and

maintaining their transportation system, while trucks pay only when they actually use the roads. Of each railroad revenue dollar, 20 cents goes to right-of-way costs. For trucks the figure is 4½ cents.

As a result of this advantage, in the words of the industry's trade association, "Within one generation, trucking has become the dominant form of transportation in the United States." This dominance will be confirmed by the completion of the Interstate System, at a presently estimated cost of some $45 billion. The net investment in our entire 220,000-mile railroad system is only $28 billion. Were it not for the trucking subsidy, the railroads would almost certainly be running at better than their current 50 percent of capacity.

Some of this imbalance could be righted if the Interstate Commerce Commission were authorized to take the road subsidy into account in fixing trucking rates. But actually only a third of the road transport is conducted by firms operating as common carriers in direct competition with railroads and under regulation by the ICC. Railroad analyst, A. Joseph Debe of Standard & Poor's estimates that two-thirds of it is conducted by or for private industries hauling their own products. It is these companies, spread across the entire range of American industry, that benefit most from the highway subsidy.

Because two-thirds of truck traffic is subject to no rate regulation, the only practical way to restore any economic balance in intercity transportation would be to impose a toll on the commercial users of the interstate System. A permit system would not send trucks to parallel routes; they gladly pay as much as 10 cents a mile to use a road like the New York State Thruway. (This may give some indication of the size of subsidy on free roads.)

The question of tolls must also be asked in connection with the problem of how the system is to be maintained by the States once it is built. Running a limited-access highway is a complex, exacting job requiring intensive, continuous supervision, much as does running a railroad. The great turnpikes are, in fact, very much like railroads; they are not public facilities nearly so much as they are public enterprises. Their headquarters are elaborate communications centers receiving information and dispatching orders, often of much urgency. The forces required to keep the routes open in winter, repair damage, keep up with maintenance, and generally look after things are far greater than those required on ordinary roads. The costs run as high as $10,000 per mile per year. Few States have this kind of money; fewer have the organization to spend it effectively. Only tolls can really be expected to provide either.

The problem will be vastly enlarged by the absence of any food or fuel facilities on the Interstate System. Limited-access highways are isolated travel corridors; it is essential that they be as self-contained as possible. Restaurants and service stations are automatically included in plans for any large toll road. Anyone who has used a turnpike knows how busy these facilities are. They produce income from concessionaire fees and provide indispensable services to motorists. But the Highway Act of 1956 specifically provided that there should be no service facilities on the system.

A motorist on the Interstate System who has car trouble or needs gas will have to leave the main road at an interchange to find a service station. At four in the afternoon he will almost certainly find one open. At four in the morning he will almost certainly find them all closed. The oil companies are thus free of any obligation to set up stations on interstate routes where their prices might be regulated, where they might have to share their profits with the State governments, and most particularly where they might have to stay open in the unprofitable hours of the early morning. And, of course, nothing will help real-estate values at those interchanges like a gas station and a honky-tonk or two. As far as the public is concerned, it means the interstate routes will almost certainly be poorly maintained and will be dangerous to drive on at night or at any time during the winter.

CHAOS IN CONCRETE

It is not true, as is sometimes alleged, that the sponsors of the interstate program ignored the consequences it would have in the cities. Nor did they simply acquiesce in them. They exulted in them. Thanks to highways, declared the Clay report, "we have been able to disperse our factories, our stores, our people; in short, to create a revolution in living habits. Our cities have spread into suburbs, dependent on the automobile for their existence. The automobile has restored a way of life in which the individual may live in a friendly neighborhood, it has brought city and country closer together, it has made us one country and a united people."

This rhapsody startled many of those who have been concerned with the future of the American city. To undertake a vast program of urban highway construction with no thought for other forms of transportation seemed lunatic.

The 1939 report that Roosevelt sent to Congress—prepared in the Department of Agriculture—took it as axiomatic that the new highways would be part of, and provide the occasion for, a "radical revision of the city plan," which would coordinate other urban programs such as slum clearance and provide for a "reintegration of facilities for the various forms of transportation." The 1944 legislation had much the same intent. But so far as the Highway Act of 1956 goes, there is no form of transportation but the automobile, and the act has no objective save providing more room for it.

It had always been understood that a large portion of the interstate funds would be spent in the metropolitan areas, but the 1956 legislation went further to declare that "local needs * * * shall be given equal consideration with the needs of intensive commerce," thus authorizing construction of arterial highways only by courtesy connected with the Interstate System.

It was clear at the time that locating the metropolitan portions of the Interstate System would constitute an unprecedented venture into national planning. It was estimated that the size of our metropolitan areas would double by 1975. For good or ill, the location of the interstate arterials would, more than any other factor, determine how this growth would take place. Yet no planning provisions of any kind were included.

In the absence of any other provisions, the planning would be done by highway engineers. Theirs, admittedly, is an unjustly maligned profession. Nothing in the training or education of most civil engineers prepares them to do anything more than build sound highways cheaply. In the course of doing this job they frequently produce works of startling beauty—compare the design of public highways with that of public housing. Yet, in the words of John T. Howard, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, "It does not belittle them to say that, just as war is too important to leave to the generals, so highways are too important to leave to the highway engineers."

Highways determine land use, which is another way of saying they settle the future of the areas in which they are built. It stands to reason that engineers should be required to conform their highway plans to metropolitan land-use plans designed in the context of more general economic and social objectives.

Yet in 1956 we had no metropolitan area plans, as we had no metropolitan area governments. The only one we have now is in Dade County (Miami), Fla., which is just getting started.

In this predicament, there was considerable sentiment for a moratorium on the urban interstate program until planning requirements could be imposed. Most of those concerned, however, as the distinguished Transportation Economist Wilfred Owen is frank to say, felt if the program went ahead it would precipitate such a crisis that something would have to be done at last about our metropolitan areas.

Across the Nation there seemed to be an increasing awareness among those who actually run the cities and suburbs that to do nothing more than build bigger highways only produced bigger traffic jams. There seemed a growing belief that a complex system of mass transit had to be preserved, or revived, or even indeed created—if only to make automobile transportation feasible.

The sorry results of carrying on a number of Federal urban-development programs completely independent of each other had become increasingly evident. Thus, the American Municipal Association formally requested legislation requiring that the urban renewal and highway program be coordinated.

The crisis has come. It has been impossible for the cities to resist the offer of unprecedented amounts of money, however futile they might know it will be to spend it on highways alone. In one metropolis after another the plans have been thrown together and the bulldozers set to work.

Here and there, as in Milwaukee, a vigorous and established city planning authority has been able to get intolerable plans redrawn. But in general the program is doing about what was to be expected: throwing up a Chinese wall across Wilmington, driving educational institutions out of downtown Louisville, plowing through the center of Reno. When the Interstate runs into a place like Newburgh, N.Y., the wreckage is something to see. Down the Hudson, Robert Moses is getting set to build the Canal Street Expressway, the first hundred-million-dollar mile.

The Bureau of Public Roads recently considered an edict requiring that some area plans be developed before interstate funds are allocated, but the idea was abandoned. Some felt it was too late anyway. As for relating the highway program to urban renewal, a recent policy statement of the American Institute of Planners said simply: "Except for the coordination which may be supplied at the local level * * * each one is apparently operating entirely independently of the other." The legislation asked by the Municipal Association was never introduced. It was with compassion that Paul Ylvisaker of the Ford Foundation recently addressed a meeting of city planners as the "beaten profession."

Just ahead for all of us, perhaps, is Los Angeles, in the words of Harrison Salisbury, "nestled under its blanket of smog girdled by bands of freeways, its core eviscerated by concrete strips and asphalt fields, its circulatory arteries pumping away without focus * * * the prototype of Gasopolis, the rubber-wheeled living region of the future."

MONEY TALKS

Yet we may be learning our lesson after all: Owen may be right. All across the country, area planners and highway engineers are discussing what they recognize as their common problems with a new sense of urgency. It is clear that if the areas in which Federal highways are to be built were required to work out adequate plans for the use of land and transportation before the money was handed over, the planning would almost certainly be done. The demand for 90–10 highway funds is so great that there is almost

nothing, however sensible, that local governments would not do to get their share.

It is true that metropolitan area planning will not be an easy matter to bring off. Dennis O'Harrow, director of the American Society of Planning Officials, says candidly: "There is a shortage of planners, a shortage of information, a shortage of money to support studies, and, more fundamentally, a shortage of information as to what should be done if you could do what you wished." But this is a normal condition of human affairs. Almost any effort to think a bit about what we are doing would help.

Simply by providing some flexibility in the program, we could produce great savings. If the cities were permitted to do what they thought best with, say, 50 percent of the more than $20 billion of interstate funds allotted to them, much of it would almost certainly go to mass transit and commuter facilities. This kind of money could reshape urban transportation in America: our total national investment in public transit is less than $4 billion, and a combined highway-mass transit-commuter program could almost certainly produce the same results at lower cost than a program dependent on highways alone.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that American government, both national, and local, can no longer ignore what is happening as the suburbs eat endlessly into the countryside. Since the spreading pollution of land follows the roads, those who build the roads must also recognize their responsibility for the consequences. There are a number of obvious steps that could be taken. Public authorities could, for example, buy up the development rights of open land in the suburbs—not the property itself, but only an easement to prevent it from being turned into a factory site or a housing development. This could be done, as it is in England, in accordance with an area land-use plan that fixes the perimeter of the metropolitan area, or alternates built-up sections with open spaces. What this really amounts to is effective zoning regulations.

How could the money be found to pay for the development rights? A practical solution would be the technique of "excess-taking" as proposed by President Roosevelt in his 1939 message to Congress. As he put it: "The Government, which puts up the cost of the highway, buys a strip on each side of the highway itself, uses it for the rental of concessions and sells it off over a period of years to homebuilders and others who wish to live near a main artery of travel. Thus the Government gets the unearned increment and reimburses itself in large part for the building of the road."

This unearned increment can be staggering; a 5,000-percent increase in land values is not uncommon. At a time when State and local governments are reaching a limit of the money they can get out of taxpayers, here is an opportunity to get money that doesn't belong to anyone; it doesn't exist, as it were, until the Government builds the highway. It represents a legitimate source of Government revenue of great potential. Used to shape the development that the highways make possible, it could transform the suburbs of the next half century.

All these possibilities are enlivened by the investigation of the interstate program now getting under way in Congress. So much thieving, mischief, and blunder will be uncovered (if not, it will be necessary to investigate the investigators) that the public should be prepared for a serious reappraisal of the program by the next administration, Democratic or Republican.

We may yet impart some sanity and public purpose to this vast enterprise. We may yet establish some equity in paying for the highways and restore some balance between them and other elements of our transportation system. We may even refute Belloc's dictum, "The general rule in history is that a city having reached its highest point of wealth becomes congested, refuses to accept its only remedy, and passes on from congestion to decay." But we shall not escape his rule that "the road moves and controls all history."

Roads can make or break a nation.

MONTANA SCHOOL OF MINES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, each city in my State, and I am sure each city in the country, is very proud of the schools it maintains, especially the colleges and universities. Many times these institutions of higher learning are taken for granted and people forget what they contribute to a community.

Colleges and universities are a stabilizing influence. They are in a sense an industry whose product is our Nation's greatest asset, an educated youth.

Montana has an exceedingly fine school of higher learning which is probably better known in parts of the United States and the world than it is in Montana. I speak of the Montana School of Mines, at Butte, one of the best of its kind in the world, if not the best. The school of mines is a unit of the university system in the State and is noted for its educational accomplishments, its outstanding graduates, and its contributions to the fields of mining and engineering. The school is playing an ever-increasingly important part in this age of advanced technical and scientific research.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a feature story from the April 27 issue of the Montana Standard, which discusses this fine school, printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINES SCHOOL: INSTITUTION DEFINITELY GREAT ASSET TO BUTTE

"To keep a town alive you must take care of what you already have before you attract something new."

This is an excerpt from a speech made by E. G. Booth, regional manager of the U.S. Department of Commerce, before a group of Butte civic leaders.

We were particularly attracted to this statement because Booth, as the saying goes, knows what he is talking about. It is said that his opinions on proposals for new industries are highly valued in Butte as well as in other communities throughout this area.

Now one might ask what we in Butte should take care of before we go out to get something new. Any number of industries come to mind.

One of them, we would say, is the Montana School of Mines whose campus looks down on the mining city from its western heights.

Some people might not think of the School of Mines as an industry. But it definitely is an asset to Butte. We would do well to take care of it. By taking care of it, we mean that the people of Butte should take more interest in the Montana School of Mines.

We should find out all about it and then tell other people.

Sometimes we think that the Montana School of Mines is better known outside Butte than it is in Butte.

It definitely has an international reputation, because its graduates over a period of more than half a century have penetrated to the four corners of the world. They have become known for their technical competence, their high character, their dependability and their devotion to duty.

Jobs always await Mines graduates. Even during the worst years of the depression of the 1930's Mines graduates stepped off the campus into jobs.

Many have contributed greatly to the advancement of the science of mining, mineralogy, geology, and engineering.

It is something of a novelty in these days and times for a school to become noted internationally for its exceptional educational accomplishments. The Montana School of Mines has achieved this status.

We think many more Butte young men and women could profitably spend a year or two as students at the Montana School of Mines before beginning to specialize in other schools.

The first year or two in college does not vary greatly in any institution of higher learning.

The cultural value of such an institution as the School of Mines to a community cannot be overestimated. The School of Mines faculty represents men and women of the highest ranking in their respective fields.

Dr. Edwin G. Koch, president of the institution, is a native of Butte. Before being chosen to head the school 2 years ago, Dr. Koch was head of the School of Mines chemistry department. Dr. Koch was awarded a doctorate in philosophy at the University of Illinois in 1932.

The School of Mines has an average of more than 300 students, many of them coming from out of the State and even from out of the United States. Many of them find jobs in Butte to assist them in getting through school.

We think the Montana School of Mines deserves a salute from the people of Butte for being a good citizen, an asset to the community and State and Nation and as a producer of a product which is of the highest quality and, consequently, is of universal demand.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE AND GREATER EFFICIENCY IN THE PENTAGON AND THROUGHOUT THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at a time when our national security requires maximum military strength consistent with dollar economy, it is particularly encouraging to note the steady progress the new Secretary of Defense, Mr. Thomas S. Gates, Jr., is making toward greater efficiency in the Pentagon and throughout the Armed Forces. The Congress has already noted, and I believe with satisfaction, the decisive fashion in which Mr. Gates has tackled the job of making decisions in defense matters, and the commendable manner in which the Secretary has entered into discussions of the problems which face them as custodians of the Nation's security forces. His policy of personally meeting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and quickly resolving matters in disagreement has revitalized the constitutional principle of civilian control, and reaffirmed the ageless adage that organizational and procedural problems in Government—in this case in the Pentagon—are readily resolved by officials such as Secretary Gates who know their responsibilities, willingly assume them, and make the decisions it is their duty to make.

As the able military writer of the New York Times, Hanson Baldwin, recently pointed out:

Secretary Thomas S. Gates has galvanized the decisionmaking process by the simple expedient of making decisions.

Today I would like to call your attention to another most important decision coming from the Secretary's office, which is the creation of a Defense Communications Agency and a Defense Communications System, both under his direction, authority, and control. The magnitude of the services' communications problem can be partially measured by the fact that the combined annual message traffic of the services is in excess of 63 million per year, and the systems which carry this traffic involve over 6 million channel miles of leased wires and nearly half a million high quality long-range voice channels. Under Mr. Gates' two directives, military long-line communications systems will be centralized under an officer of general or flag rank, with command responsibility direct to the Secretary of Defense through the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

When one stops to reflect that our continent is now only 30 minutes or less away from any place in the world, missile time, one begins to get some appreciation of the requirement for the fastest and most reliable communications that can be provided, organizationally as well as technically. We have been making tremendous strides in the technical area. The organizational aspects and control of this global complex have been under official scrutiny for some time, seeking further improvements and economics.

The Secretary's directives are the result of long and thoughtful studies, and promise not only improved command and control for the employment of our military forces, but also increased flexibility, a maximum return in communications capability for the dollars invested in the various systems, and increased responsiveness to the need of the Defense Establishment.

CONFERENCE ON AFRICAN RESOURCES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on May 2, 1960, I placed in the RECORD at pages 9009 to 9010 a brief statement about the Conference on African Resources which is scheduled to be held at New York University in September. That statement included a quote from the New York Times of April 29 that there had been speculation that the Union of South Africa had brought pressure to bear on certain corporate investors in this country to get them to shun the conference.

Ambassador du Plessis of the Union of South Africa has written to me that this newspaper speculation "has absolutely no basis in fact" and that his Government "has yet to arrive at a decision whether or not to participate in the conference."

On May 6 the New York Times carried a similar statement by the consul general of the Union in New York City and I ask unanimous consent that the article appear at this place in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH AFRICA DENIES HOSTILITY TO FAIR

A South African spokesman denied yesterday that his Government was seeking to destroy a proposed African trade conference here.

T. J. Endemann, consul general of the Union of South Africa, said he was "completely unaware" of any supposed hostility of his Government toward the Conference on African Resources, planned for September at New York University. He said the Union was in fact "still giving consideration" to an invitation to take part.

The consul branded as a fabrication rumors circulating in New York business circles that the Union Government had brought pressure to bear on companies to withdraw from sponsorship of the Conference. The aim of the meeting is to promote trade between the United States and the rising nations of Africa south of the Sahara.

The conference is a joint project of New York University and African Fair, Inc., a nonprofit organization set up in 1959 to promote a traveling African trade fair. A third of the original 24 sponsors have withdrawn for unexplained reasons.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, upon further investigation I am satisfied that there is no factual basis for the speculation referred to by the Times in its April 29 issue, and I would like to make this brief statement to express regret for having given currency to a newspaper report which contained unfounded implications adverse to the Union Government.

THE PRESIDENT'S APPOINTMENTS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list showing the President's appointments for Wednesday, May 11, 1960, as carried in the Washington Post, may appear at this point in my remarks. I call the attention of my colleagues to the noon appointment.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S APPOINTMENTS

President Eisenhower's schedule today:

7:45 a.m. (breakfast): A group of 17 Republican Senators headed by Senate Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN.

9 a.m.: Clarence Francis, consultant to the President on surplus foods, and Dr. C. G. King, executive director of the Nutrition Foundation, Inc., New York.

10:30 a.m.: News conference.

11:30 a.m.: Officers of the National League of Insured Savings Associations.

Noon: The President receives an award from Travel magazine.

PROVIDING A SENATE CLIMATE FOR THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE, THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN NEGOTIATIONS, AND THE DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, all of us in the Senate must be increasingly concerned by the recent events which have cast grave doubt on the success of the summit conference, the success of the nuclear test ban negotiations, and the success of the general disarmament negotiations in Geneva.

It has been my view that we in this body would be wise not to engage in partisan criticism of the activities of the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, or others in the administration. I adhere to that view.

However, I believe it important that a climate should be created in the Senate which will give encouragement to the administration to work for a relaxation of tensions, to work for an agreement at the disarmament conference, based on total and permanent disarmament under adequate supervision and control and enforced by the strength of the United Nations, protected by an international police force.

It has always been my hope that there would be created a climate in this body which would encourage meaningful agreements at the summit, and it is to help create that climate that I speak briefly today.

This morning, in the New York Times, there appears a penetrating article, written by Mr. James Reston, entitled "The Political Consequences Following the U–2."

I ask unanimous consent that the column may appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES FOLLOWING THE U–2

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, May 12.—There is one charge that cannot fairly be made against the administration in the U–2 spy case. It is not playing Presidential politics with the foreign policy of the United States. As a matter of fact, it may in the last week have lost the "peace issue," which was the best issue it had.

The best politics for the GOP this summer lay in creating an atmosphere of peace, an air of progress toward an accommodation with the Russians on Berlin, Germany, nuclear testing and disarmament.

Prime Minister Harold Macmillan of Britain demonstrated the possibilities of such an atmosphere in the British election of last year. This is not to say that his peace efforts were an insincere campaign maneuver—they obviously were not—but the fact remains that his patient and persistent negotiations in Moscow, Paris, and Washington helped his party win the election.

The same opportunity was open to President Eisenhower. He had agreed to go to the summit with Nikita Khrushchev. He had worked out the possibility of associating Vice President NIXON with the Paris talks. He had a date with Khrushchev in Moscow on June 10, followed by a dramatic flight into the Far East just before the nominating conventions.

All these events, combined with the nuclear testing talks and the disarmament negotiations in Geneva, gave the administration the chance to start a long process of negotiations; and this, in turn, put Mr. NIXON in a position to argue that he should be elected to keep the process going in the years ahead.

THE SUDDEN SWITCH

The U–2 case has not destroyed these political opportunities but it has certainly minimized them. Instead of a calm atmosphere the politcal weather is now stormy. Instead of the "spirit of Camp David" we

now have the "spirit of Sverdlovsk." Instead of President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev writing mash notes to each other about "peaceful coexistence," Khrushchev is now making like the unrequited lover whose trust was betrayed.

There is still just a chance to save things at Paris but not if the President continues on his present theme. He is insisting that he must continue crossing the Soviet frontiers. He is saying that the security of the United States demands it. He is saying all these things openly, and therefore Khrushchev cannot let them pass.

By demanding the right to intrude into the Soviet Union, the President has defied Khrushchev to stop him, put Khrushchev on the spot with the Stalinists who have always been against a détente, embarrassed the allies by making their bases a target of Khrushchev's anger, and even repudiated one of Washington's own favorite principles—namely, that each nation has the right to choose its own form of government.

Maybe the President has made the right choice in demanding the right to challenge the authority of the Soviet Government over its own territory; maybe this was essential to protect the United States against another Pearl Harbor. But the President cannot have it both ways: he cannot defy Khrushchev and have his cooperation too.

BAD POLITICS

Accordingly, much depends on whether Mr. Eisenhower goes to Paris in his present mood, blaming Soviet secrecy for U.S. aerial espionage. Asking the Russians to give up secrecy, as anybody who knows Russian history will tell you, is asking the Russians to stop being Russian. And if the President rests his case on this point, the summit will be highly volcanic. Instead of a "peace issue" the GOP may very well, in that case, face a "war issue."

In domestic political terms—to say nothing of international politics—this situation, created largely by accident, bad luck and bungling, will do the Republicans no good. And this is especially so since Vice President NIXON has known all about the aerial espionage and boasted about the wonderful photographs the U–2 brought back.

The fate of one political party in one country in one election is not, of course, the main consideration. The fate of much more is at stake in the present trend of events. But it is a factor. The GOP has, unwittingly, by bad administration, bad judgment and bad luck, stumbled into a course which is also bad politics.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Reston makes the point, with which I am in agreement, that there is still just a chance to save things at Paris, but not if the President continues on his present theme.

I do not intend to be unduly critical of the President, but I hope that he and his White House advisers will ponder long the comments made by Mr. Reston in that regard.

We are all aware of the fact that there is growing up in this country a strikingly unrealistic attitude toward an agreement on halting atomic tests. We are told about the dangers of Russia cheating on these tests. This danger is, of course, a real one. But we are told nothing about the danger to all of us if these tests are continued without any treaty.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in my remarks a very able letter written by Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith, of Harvard University, writing from Switzerland, entitled "Halting Atomic Tests. Choice of Least Perilous Course Believed To Be Necessary."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HALTING ATOMIC TESTS—CHOICE OF LEAST PERILOUS COURSE BELIEVED TO BE NECESSARY

(The writer of the following letter, professor of economics at Harvard University, served as Director of the U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey in 1945.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The recent hearings before the Joint Commission on Atomic Energy, like much earlier discussion, suggest the presence of a strikingly unrealistic attitude toward an agreement on halting atomic tests. I do not suggest that this attitude is universal, but it does seem sufficiently common to merit comment.

We must surely agree that our task is not to eliminate all risk from our lives, that is an impossible goal, but to find the course of policy that minimizes risk. This requires that we balance the dangers of different courses of action. In the present instance there is, on the one hand, the danger of illicit violation of any agreement to ban tests and that the violation will go undetected. On the other hand, there is the danger of continued explosions. We must choose the course which involves the least peril.

Almost everyone must agree—and most do agree—that the dangers inherent in continuing the tests are virtually total. The tempo of competitive development and testing will increase. The countries newly possessed of atomic weapons will claim their right to poison their just share of the atmosphere. Obviously those who are making tests themselves cannot deny them the privilege. All of these dangers are predictible and certain in the absence of agreement.

POSSIBLE BAD FAITH

Against this, as noted, we must reckon with the possibility of Soviet bad faith and that it will escape detection. Some of our estimate of the danger of bad faith, we must agree, will be the residue of the bad feeling of recent years. And bad faith that involves risk of discovery is not without disadvantage as a practical policy.

But it is not my purpose to argue that this course is riskless. Rather what is clear is that whatever its dangers, they must be less than the dangers of the first course, which are certain and total. Yet this is not the nature of much of the present calculation. It holds that the danger of violation must be totally eliminated or we will continue the tests. One is reminded of the man who insists on suicide unless he is fully protected against automobile accidents. Surely we are more logical than that.

Nor is it reassuring that many who advise against accepting the lesser risk believe that any test ban makes poor military sense. We have recently heard that our military security requires a new series of tests this summer or autumn. And a high official of the Defense Department has recently stressed the need to develop atomic weapons which, though they burn, blind, disintegrate, mutilate and otherwise commit to a disenchanting death, are nonetheless clean.

CONCEALED POSITION

The danger of illicit violation has thus become part of the case against the agreement as such. It has no part of this case. If we believe an agreement is unwise, we should say so. This position should not be concealed behind arguments over enforceability. We fool no one with such transparent devices.

But I have difficulty in imagining that responsible military opinion can face with equanimity a world of uncontrolled tests. In the annals of armies there have always been examples of excessive and myopic preoccupation with military goals. Yet thoughtful military leaders certainly agree that the purpose of the armed services is to protect the continuing life and civilization of the community. Armed services are but one means to this end and diplomacy and diplomatic agreements are among the others.

It is to see the problem whole that we have civilian control of the Armed Forces. This will on occasion require the overruling of too parochial a military view. The danger lies not in doing so, but in failing to do so.

JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Professor Galbraith points out that what is clear is that whatever the dangers of a test ban are, they must be less than the dangers of no test ban.

In this morning's Washington Post there appears another able column, written by the distinguished commentator Marquis Childs, entitled "Lack of Support Perils Arms Talk." I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Childs' column may appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LACK OF SUPPORT PERILS ARMS TALK
(By Marquis Childs)

GENEVA.—It was not alone the pilots of espionage airplanes who brave great dangers in the service of their country on oversea missions. Diplomats and negotiators confronting the Russians across the conference table, all too often find themselves perched precariously at the end of a forgotten limb.

A case in point is Ambassador James J. Wadsworth, who was sent here 18 months ago by Washington to negotiate a nuclear test agreement treaty with the British and the Russians. Close to success after long and painstaking effort, he finds that a massive propaganda attack is being launched against the treaty and, incidentally, against him. From the principal figures in the administration, who are supposedly behind his efforts, there comes scarcely a peep of support, not to mention encouragement.

The propaganda concentrates on the technical difficulties of perfecting a system of inspections that will be cheat proof, and these difficulties are considerable. But this stress entirely ignores the political advantages of a test treaty and by implication it greatly exaggerates the gains that might come from further testing.

A familiar experience of the American negotiator is to have an American Senator or Congressman pop in and out for a few days and then to presume on the basis of this brief experience of an enormously complicated subject that he knows more than the men around the conference table. Wadsworth has experienced this kind of harassment which has included inspired attacks on him in the familiar cliches of "soft" and "appeaser."

He comes of a family distinguished for public service in a tradition more familiar in Britain than in America. His father, the late James W. Wadsworth, served first in the Senate from his native New York and then in the House. Ambassador Wadsworth's grandfather was John Hay, who started his public career as secretary to Lincoln and then, as the climax to a series of diplomatic posts, became Secretary of State.

A big, shambling man with an easy, friendly manner, he has shown a monumental patience and persistence in bringing the Soviets around to the Western view on the major issues of control, inspection, and joint research. If he and—far more important—his work are to be shot down in flames, the disastrous effect on America's standing in the world can hardly be exaggerated.

America's position is rapidly deteriorating because the visible signs of leadership, the friendly grin to one side, are fewer and fewer. The tragedy of the U–2 illuminated this as with a lightning flash. The universal regret and sorrow in the European press, even in West Germany where there is a confused desire to cling to the concept of American infallibility, are expressed in terms of restraint that cloak dismay and indignation.

At the 10-nation disarmament conference, which met here for 7 weeks of polite futility, the chief of the American delegation was Frederick M. Eaton. A New York lawyer of standing and integrity, Eaton started from scratch with no knowledge of disarmament, of the Russians, or of negotiation. He proved himself a quick and resourceful learner who often puzzled the Soviets by the novel frankness of his approach.

But he was thrown in against a tough, hardened, experienced, professional Valerian Zorin, a deputy foreign minister and head of the Soviet delegation. Zorin held repeated press conferences at which the world press represented in Geneva was free to ask any and all questions. After repeated prodding, Eaton announced a press conference. He appeared with a written statement which he said he would read but no questions would be permitted. That was the last as well as the first Eaton press conference.

What is most damaging to America's prestige and standing is the wibble and wobble of American policy from one side of the road to the other. Nothing could illustrate this more forcefully than the backing and filling over the proposed nuclear test treaty; the impression so strongly reinforced in the U–2 case that the left hand and the right hand are operated by quite different sets of intellectual and emotional controls. The record on nuclear testing can be set straight only by strong affirmative words from the President and his Secretary of State.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, for a good many weeks now Mr. Childs has been among the leaders in the formulation of public opinion which has pointed out that the record on nuclear testing can be set straight only by strong affirmative words from the President and the Secretary of State.

I hope we will get those words soon, and also that those words will be followed up by deeds at the summit conference. Again I express the hope that we can create a climate in the Senate which will be favorably disposed to any meaningful agreement which may be brought back from Paris for ratification by the Senate.

Mr. President, this morning the Washington Post has published a full-page advertisement entitled "Time for Common Sense," signed by Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review. I ask unanimous consent that the advertisement may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME FOR COMMON SENSE

An uneasiness is settling over America. It goes deep down. There is a feeling that we are undergoing a moral shrinkage in the eyes of the world community.

The bigness of our history seems to have been interrupted. The large image of America created by our past seems less clear than it was only a short while ago. And we are sensing a mood of disconnection—disconnection between what we stand for and what we do; disconnection between ourselves as individuals and those who speak and act for us as a Nation.

It is natural for Americans to think of their country as a prime source of stability and responsibility in the world. We have traditionally interposed ourselves against hotheads and bullies in the international arena. We have denounced aggressors, instituted action to stamp out brush fires, and called for a code of responsible behavior for nations.

Only 3 years ago, in fact, the President dissociated the United States from the action of Great Britain and France in the attack on Suez. He properly declared that the United States could not observe a double standard in its foreign policy. We could not approve in our friends that which we denounced in our foes. World law meant obligations binding on all. This was the position we took when we went before the United Nations and supported the resolution against our friends.

Another question of right and wrong has now come up—but this time we ourselves are wrong.

We dispatched jet planes on military reconnaissance over Russian territory. In doing so we took appalling risks.

The main danger of nuclear war today comes not from a definite policy by any nation to launch such a war, but from an act of carelessness or a hideous miscalculation.

An alien military reconnaissance plane taking photographs over any country—whether the Soviet Union or the United States or Great Britain or Pakistan or India or whatever—is a specific and volatile act of provocation that could ignite the war fuses. Our Armed Forces are constantly monitoring their radar screens and are prepared immediately to send jet planes in the direction of the Soviet Union if we should see any possible hostile object. Thus, precisely the same violation we committed, if carried on against us, would trigger our swiftest retaliatory measures.

In any case, the plane incident is at the opposite end from the code of responsible international behavior and world law advocated by the President and the Secretary of State. It creates a strange atmosphere for a meeting of heads of government called for the purpose of reducing world tensions. It gives world communism its biggest propaganda boost in many years. It puts us in a harsh and damaging light before the world's peoples, whose good will and respect are more vital to our security than any reconnaissance photographs or even stockpiles of nuclear bombs.

Only a week ago the President sought to dramatize for the Nation the importance of maintaining a human fund of good will and respect, in connection with his proposals for economic aid. But we can't place a high value on world opinion about our economic policies and then disregard that same world opinion about our military policies.

Just as disturbing as the incident itself was the manner of our response. When it was announced that an American plane had been shot down, we made a false explanation that the plane had wandered off its course, and that the pilot had perhaps been in a daze. (If this statement had been true, consider its implications alongside the recent proposal by American military officials to keep hundreds of bombers in the air on a round-the-clock basis, fully loaded with nuclear explosives and within ready striking distance of the Soviet Union.)

Meanwhile, by way of compounding the damage, several Washington sources were quoted as saying that our only mistake was that we were caught. This is a curious definition of morality to come from a capital that only recently was making headlines with its investigation of rigged TV quiz shows.

An equally astounding comment was that, if only the pilot had chosen to go down with his ship, instead of bailing out, the United States might have been spared the embarrassment represented by the Soviet ability actually to produce the captain of the American plane. In other words, we are now calling on our soldiers to give their lives, not to serve our honor or our freedom, but to spare us the indignity of being caught in a lie.

In any event, the sense of fright and shock felt by the world over the incident was not allayed when it was demonstrated that the initial American explanation was untrue. In this connection, one thing is clear: the American people have not given leave to their government or any branch thereof to speak falsely in our name or make us look like fools.

Most serious of all is the later statement that the reconnaissance 1,000 miles inside the Soviet Union was carried out without knowledge of the White House or the State Department. What it means is that not all the major decisions having to do with war and peace are being made by those who are constitutionally entrusted with the responsibility. It means that the military has arrogated to itself powers intended for the President and the Congress.

No one doubts that the American military was attempting to serve the national security as it sees it. The location of our missile bases is a matter of common knowledge. We live in an open society. But very little is known about the Soviet bases. And there is the fear of surprise attack. It was for the purpose of reducing this danger, it is now officially stated, that the reconnaissance flights were authorized.

The danger, however, of a surprise attack against us may proceed more out of jitters caused by high-flying planes where they shouldn't be than by inadequate intelligence. Moreover, the best pictures in the world will not tell us whether the Soviet is about to spring a surprise attack—any more than Soviet pictures of American military sites can tell them when our bombers will go into operation. Only a knowledge of intentions can provide adequate information about lightning attack. The principal value of mapping is that it provides knowledge about what targets to hit. The Soviet knows this; we know this; other countries know this.

Meanwhile, the gravity of the situation has not produced in either Government an appropriately sober recognition of the perils involved. Mr. Khrushchev puts a nuclear chip on his shoulder and says the Soviet may bomb bases from which our planes took off. Not to be outdone, the United States says it may continue its provocative flights and come to the defense of countries in which we maintain bases. The distance between nuclear threats and nuclear horror grows shorter by the minute.

Ultimatums and counterultimatums will not have the peace, but common sense may. If we are really serious about wanting to reduce or eliminate the danger of a Soviet surprise attack, we should vigorously pursue the new Soviet offer to disarm. Instead of locating Soviet rocket sites, we ought to be locating the true nature of the Soviet intentions. At long last the Soviet claims it is now willing to accept inspection and controls as part of a comprehensive disarmament plan.

If we can get the Soviet to give up its capacity to wage surprise attacks, this will contribute much more to our security than a

gallery of photographs showing every military installation in the Soviet Union. And if the Soviet offer to submit to controls is just a propaganda maneuver, it will be easy enough for us to unmask it as such. We can make counterproposals to give the United Nations the specific machinery for carrying out a program of effective disarmament under enforcible safeguards.

Let's test the policies of the Russians and not their tempers.

Here we get to the heart of the matter. The Atomic Energy Commission and certain military officials have made it clear that they are opposed to any program of disarmament—even if we could get the Russians to agree to everything we asked. One thing is certain, however. We are not going to get others to submit to controls and turn in their hardware unless we are prepared to to do the same.

The result is an American policy of uncertainty and drift. The President speaks on a plane of important principle; but major parts of the Government go off in entirely different directions and act in violation of those principles.

Hence, the present feeling of uneasiness in the Nation, the feeling that things are going against the American grain. For when we lost ground in world opinion, we lose vital security. What does a nation do when it is wrong? The answer need not be obscure. We can admit it and face up to it. We can act promptly and resolutely to guard against a recurrence. And we can do the things that can restore both our pride and our station in the world.

We can identify ourselves mightily with the big ideas that are directed to the control of force in the world, and not with the exercise of force. Ideas calling for a United Nations with the responsible powers of world law. Ideas concerned with the development of the world's resources for a more productive and healthier human commonwealth. Ideas that serve freedom by dramatizing the moral imagination of freemen.

NORMAN COUSINS.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I particularly call the attention of Senators to the last paragraph of the advertisement which actually is an editorial that will appear in this week's Saturday Review, a splendid publication, which I know many of my colleagues read regularly. Mr. Cousins points out that it is our responsibility to identify ourselves with the big ideas which are directed to the control of force in the world, and not with the ideas which are connected with the exercise of force; that we must stand for a strong United Nations with the responsible powers of world law; and with ideas concerned with the development of the world's resources for a more productive and healthier human commonwealth. Those are the ideas we need in America today.

I hope the spirit and the philosophy of what I have said today and of the items which I have asked to have printed with my speech will be the prevailing spirit in the Senate as we face the days ahead.

POLICY FOR AGRICULTURE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on May 11, 1960, the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, delivered an address before the National Restaurant Association, in Chicago. The address is at once timely and fundamental. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON BEFORE NATIONAL RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 11, 1960

Seven years ago this month—shortly after I became Secretary of Agriculture—I had the privilege of addressing your convention. Many changes have taken place since that time, but at least one thing remains the same—the warmth of your hospitality.

It is a great honor to be singled out, as we five have been, as contributors in the field of food research. I'm sure I speak for the other recipients also when I say that I do not regard this as a personal tribute. In our day so many people play a part in whatever is achieved that the recognition given to one is rightfully shared by the many. All of us who have received these beautiful medallions, speaking for ourselves and for those who over the years have joined their fruitful labors to ours, thank you for these inspiring awards.

Actually, if it were possible to do so, there is one medal, above all, that should be given today. It is a medal to the American farmers.

Through their enterprise, initiative, and self-reliance, our American farmers have done much to lift the standard of living in this country higher than has ever been known before, in any land, at any time.

They have done marvels in producing abundance. Their productivity is growing more than twice as fast as the productivity of workers in industry.

Since 1950, output per man-hour in nonagricultural industry has risen 2 percent per year. In agriculture the increase has averaged 5 percent per year. A man-hour of farm labor now produces nearly three times what it did 20 years ago.

The ability of our farmers to produce abundance is one of the basic strengths of our Nation. We, who are concerned with food, should help see to it that every citizen realizes this fundamental truth.

The fact that you are presenting a scroll to the Department of Agriculture indicates your awareness of the role the USDA has played in the development of our great farming system, which in turn has been so fundamental to the development of this Nation. One hundred years ago one farmworker provided food and fiber for 4½ persons. By 1950, the figure had risen from 4½ to 14½. Now in 1960, we find one farmworker on the average providing food and fiber for some 25 persons. In short, we've made as much progress in this respect in the past 10 years as was made in the preceding 90 years. The work of the USDA, as well as that of the land-grant colleges and State experiment stations, has been an important factor in this technological revolution.

Over the years, agriculture and the entire food trade have made it possible for our people to buy their food for a smaller proportion of their incomes than is true in any other major nation. That is another fact which needs to be told.

Much of our eating today is done outside the home. The market value of all food served in restaurants and other away-from-home eating places last year is estimated at $15 billion—23 percent of the value of all food sold in the country. More and more of our people of every age are depending on restaurants for balanced, nutritious meals.

As one who has seen the way food is marketed in many parts of the world, I have no hesitation in saying that I believe our food supplies in the United States are the safest, cleanest, and most wholesome food anywhere on the face of the earth.

We have come to accept these achievements of agriculture and the entire food industry as something commonplace. But they are not commonplace. These conditions are unique in the world.

How other nations envy us our agriculture. One must go abroad to appreciate it.

Last fall I visited the Soviet Union and several other countries in Europe. In Russia some 50 million persons—more than 40 percent of the labor force—work in agriculture and forestry. This compares with from 7 to 7½ million persons in the United States, or about 10 percent of our labor force engaged in agriculture.

Compared with us, the Russians have relatively few farm machines. They use a great deal of hand labor, most of it provided by women. Three out of five, or possibly even three out of four persons engaged in agricultural production in Russia, are women.

They are putting up a bold front as regards their ability to catch up to us. I saw hundreds of posters in the U.S.S.R. urging farmers to surpass the United States in per capita production. I also saw many posters forecasting the ultimate victory of the Communist system.

But I feel sure that the Soviets will not equal, much less surpass, our productivity in our lifetime, if ever, under their system of agriculture. Why? Because they can never duplicate the levels of efficiency and productive ingenuity which are called forth in a free society.

Communism is an evil system. It is far more than an economic system. It is a total philosophy of life—atheistic and completely opposed to all that we hold dear.

We must constantly keep our guard up.

But if we dedicate our efforts to making our own free system of agriculture and industry even more efficient, we need have no fears of being overtaken in the foreseeable future.

I don't know how many of you have eaten in restaurants in the Soviet Union. As one who has, I can testify that you need not fear competition from that direction.

Our scientists and technologists are continually discovering new truths which give hope to the entire world in mankind's long struggle to conquer hunger.

And this progress, of course, is not confined to production. Years ago agricultural research may have been devoted almost entirely to helping farmers get higher yields—to make two potatoes grow where one grew before. But today it's far more than that. Today, we use research to grow a better potato at half the cost. We use research to learn more about the nutritive value of potatoes and other foods. We use research all the way through processing, marketing, and household or restaurant utilization.

We expect research to go on building better qualities into foods. Research developed the family-size turkey, the modern broiler, and the meat-type hog. Now we are seeking to develop beef cattle to produce more lean tender beef—and dairy cows to provide milk with more solids and less fat—and hens to lay eggs with longer lasting fresh qualities.

Progress is being made in breeding better fruits and vegetables. We are going to have potatoes with higher total solids and more vitamin C—and giant size, high-flavored blueberries—and fine textured strawberries that are easily capped—and tender snap beans that hold their moisture and crispness—and sweet corn with more sugar that will not turn to starch so quickly as present varieties.

Research continues to tell us more about food composition and about the nutritional needs of people at different ages and doing

different kinds of work. You use this information in planning and preparing your balanced menus. Consumers use it, too, in selecting their food.

So the problem of feeding America is not simply one of producing meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables. The problem is to help farmers produce the right foods of the right quality and in the right quantity—and to enable industry to process and market them in ways that will meet consumer demands for high quality and convenience.

How fortunate the food trade is to be able to get an abundance of high quality food at reasonable prices.

Because restaurants and other public eating places have become such a large and important outlet for food, we are striving to help you improve the efficiency of this part of the marketing system. It is vital that the cost spread between the farmer and consumer be kept within reasonable bounds. We appeal to you to make every effort to increase the marketing efficiency of the food industry so as to reduce this spread.

Aided by marketing research on improved warehouse layout and methods, wholesale grocers have been able to reduce their gross margins by 50 percent in the past 10 years. Labor productivity in their offices has increased by 25 to 50 percent.

We are planning a similar research program for institutional wholesalers. It should produce comparable reductions in their margins. Preliminary work with a few institutional wholesalers has shown that better plant layout, improved equipment and work methods, and more efficient office and delivery procedures can cut labor costs in half.

We plan to survey food service operators to find out just what services they need from wholesalers. This will help your wholesalers to give you better services at lower costs for food.

We have projects underway that apply even more directly to your operations. Following plans developed by marketing research, a large restaurant chain is installing and testing a revolving table for making salads. This one improvement could reduce costs in this food service department by 14 percent.

Your association asked us to develop more information on the quality of potatoes. Our biologists, working with our home economists, provided information that has resulted in better tasting potatoes with longer storage life.

We have provided similar research to protect the quality of lettuce, tomatoes, sweet corn, and other perishables.

Your association has also cooperated with us in developing recipes for preparing foods in large quantities. We have a mutual interest in putting on the tables of America food that not only tastes good but is good for our bodies.

Recently we have developed machines that quickly identify products of high quality. Such a machine is now helping make possible a constant, reliable supply of high quality eggs. It reduces the gamble for you when a customer orders "two sunnyside up." We are working with meat products to find out just how much marbling is necessary for maximum tenderness.

Such research benefits all our people—those in the food trade, our farmers and ranchers, and, of course, consumers in general. We are pleased with our progress in agricultural research.

But research alone is not sufficient to develop and maintain the kind of progress we seek in agriculture and the food industry. We need to pursue realistic programs all along the line:

Programs that build farm markets.

Programs that permit dynamic adjustments to the rapidly changing science of agriculture.

Programs that will strengthen our family farms as sound economic units.

Programs which will always dignify the individual farmer and his family in the free atmosphere of a vigorous and prosperous America.

In the past 7 years we have emphasized greater freedom for farmers to plant, to market, to compete, and to make their own decisions. In farmer polls and in the corn referendum of 1958, our farm people again and again have made it clear that they want more freedom and less Government interference.

We have stood for more emphasis on making farm products competitive in price and in quality.

We have emphasized aggressive promotion and marketing.

During our term of office we have seen farm exports rise to the highest level in U.S. history in 1957 and remain high ever since.

We have moved out of surplus and into use the astounding total of $17.5 billion worth of farm commodities.

Only last week we signed an agreement with India for the movement of the equivalent of over 1,500 shiploads of wheat and rice during the next 4 years.

We have seen the standard of living on farms rise higher than ever before, measured in terms of electrical appliances, automobiles, and other conveniences owned by farm families.

Yet our critics persist in trying to peddle the myth that our programs have been tried and found wanting. The truth is that some of the important programs we urged years ago are still wanting to be tried. The programs that have failed are the programs we inherited, the programs which Congress refused to bring sufficiently up-to-date. We are still trying to get action on wheat—after all these years and the repeated urgings of President Eisenhower. Yet Congress refuses to act.

Neither farmers nor this administration are to blame for the high costs of existing obsolete farm programs. Our farmers are living, producing, and marketing in the 1960's—but some of the farm programs under which they operate are geared to the 1940's and 1930's. We have protested—we have recommended—we have appealed—all to little avail.

In the light of all the circumstances, three conclusions seem to me to be forced upon any logical mind:

1. The only justification for paying farmers not to produce in 1960 is the fact that Congress has been unwilling to correct outmoded legislation. This has prevented needed adjustments by forestalling the play of economic forces in the market to direct production and consumption.

2. Only if Congress enacts the needed legislation, especially for wheat, should be recommended extending the conservation reserve.

3. Farmers overwhelmingly want to stand on their own feet in a market economy. We must use price support to facilitate orderly marketing, not to destroy outlets by pricing commodities out of the market. It is long past time we released farmers from the acreage control price-support straitjacket.

I speak to you in these terms because this is not only the farmers' battle for realistic farm programs. This is your battle—the battle of everyone who has any connection with any phase of agriculture—the battle, indeed, of every businessman, professional person, every taxpayer, every housewife, every consumer, every person interested in the future of this country.

The abundant blessings we have in this country came to us through an economic system which rests largely on three pillars:

1. Free enterprise—the right to venture—to choose.

2. Private property—the right to own.

3. A market economy—the right to exchange.

Let us never forget that the progress of the future must be built upon these same three pillars or it is not worth having—because in that case it will not be true progress at all but retrogression.

The basic issue is Government control versus freedom. We must keep our economy strong and free. This is your challenge and mine—a challenge to every American no matter who or what he may be. As Daniel Webster put it in an earlier day, "God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on the 10th of May, the Democratic Advisory Council, under the leadership of, I suppose, Gov. Herschel C. Loveless, issued a statement with respect to agricultural policy. Subsequent to the issuance of the statement, the Secretary of Agriculture made some comment. I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the Democratic Advisory Council and the statement by the Secretary of Agriculture, dated May 11, 1960, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY GOV. HERSCHEL C. LOVELESS, CHAIRMAN OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FARM POLICY OF THE DEMOCRATIC ADVISORY COUNCIL, MAY 10, 1960

The Advisory Committee on Farm Policy has been in session for the last 2 days for its first meeting.

The committee has reviewed practically all phases of agriculture. I have referred many subjects to subcommittees for further study and investigation, and to report at the next meeting of the committee.

The committee has unanimously agreed upon certain specific recommendations which it will make to the Democratic Advisory Council. Those recommendations are set forth in the following report of the Advisory Committee on Farm Policy:

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DEMOCRATIC ADVISORY COUNCIL BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FARM POLICY

The Advisory Committee on Farm Policy recommends to the Democratic Advisory Council for consideration in connection with their recommendations to the platform committee of the Democratic National Convention of 1960, as its first interim report, as follows:

1. When President Roosevelt assumed office in 1933 he found American agriculture prostrate—bankrupt. Under his matchless and fearless leadership this desperate situation was corrected. He established programs for building and maintaining the fertility of the soil—our most precious possession; for rural electrification, to provide our farm people with light, power, and modern conveniences; for support prices and production quotas for agricultural commodities; and numerous other programs which resulted in the restoration of agriculture to a sound and profitable basis.

For the next 20 years, in times of war and peace, under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, our farm people continued to produce in abundance at a fair return. Agriculture remained strong, vigorous, and prosperous until the present Republican administration assumed office. Since that hour the fate and welfare of agriculture has gone down and down, with every indication that another 4 years of Republican control will return our farm people to the bankrupt condition they faced at the end of 1932.

Yet agriculture is our basic industry. It provides a high percentage of the raw products for industry. It must continue to provide a plentiful supply of food and fiber for our people rapidly increasing in number and now estimated to reach 300 million by the turn of the century. Farmers offer a $40 billion market for American labor and industry. Their return to the conditions of 1932 would have a dangerous impact on the national economy. A vigorous and prosperous agriculture is just as important to the safety and security of the American people as is our Armed Forces. We cannot afford to leave agriculture in the hands of another Republican administration—the chance is too great, the consequences too terrible.

2. The economic welfare of the Nation demands positive Government action to raise farm prices to enable farmers to earn full parity of income with other groups in the economy. This means the immediate attainment of higher prices for the farm commodities produced by those farmers who will adopt effective production adjustments to bring supply into line with requirements for all national purposes.

Restoration of the full 100 percent of parity prices enjoyed by American farmers under Democratic administrations can be achieved through the fair and just application of production and marketing quotas, commodity loans at not less than 90 percent of parity, purchases, payments, marketing orders and agreements, orderly retirement of land and other effective methods. Such programs will provide production adequate for all national needs, at what price, including expanded domestic food programs and greatly increased use of food for peace, for exports, and for reserves, and can be brought about without substantially increasing the farm price of food to consumers and with annual savings to the U.S. Treasury of several billions of dollars. Such programs should lead as expeditiously as possible to a parity of income to the farmers; that is, that gross income from agriculture which will provide the farm operator and his family with a standard of living equivalent to those afforded to persons depending upon other gainful occupations.

3. The Secretary of Agriculture, and his administrative officials, must be persons who are thoroughly familiar with the financial situation now facing the farm people of the Nation, who are dedicated to the early restoration of farm prosperity, who will make constant use of farmers in the preparation and administration of all farm programs, and who will at all times be guided by the best interests of the farmers, consumers, and the national welfare and security.

4. Farmers have demonstrated, through their own marketing and purchasing cooperatives, that only through combined strength can they hope to match the bargaining power of those who process and market the products of the farm. We support the right of farmers to provide themselves with marketing services and farm production supplies through their own cooperative organizations so as to reduce costs, raise the value of their products and enhance their individual income. To this end, we will continue our long-established support of bona fide farmer cooperatives by protecting them from taxation of a punitive nature, or from any other action which will restrict their ability to effectively perform the services for which they were established.

5. We, of the Democratic Party, are pleased to join with the rural electric cooperatives and the rural people of this Nation in the observance in this year of 1960 of 25 years in the service of bringing electricity to rural America.

Our party has successfully blocked all attempts of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration to force its hard money policy upon this great free enterprise program of our farm people.

We believe that Congress should continue to depend upon the farm leadership of our rural electric cooperatives to bring adequate and abundant low-cost electric service to all rural communities on a complete area coverage basis, and that loans by the Government to effectuate this purpose should be available at the interest rate and for the term now provided by law.

6. The Democratic Party supports the use of our food abundance to feed our needy at home and expand the food consumption of our aged and unemployed. The legislation passed by the 86th Democratic Congress, authorizing a food stamp plan, should be immediately and fully implemented.

7. The Democratic Party originated and supports the food for peace idea, and seeks to put it on a permanent and expanded basis. The food bounty of the United States can be used to combat famine abroad, and finance and support economic development in countries greatly in need of such development. At the same time, food for peace programs can expand importantly the market for our farm products.

MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FARM POLICY OF THE DEMOCRATIC ADVISORY COUNCIL IN ATTENDANCE AND APPROVING THE PRECEDING STATEMENT

Hon. Herschel Loveless (chairman), Governor, State of Iowa, Des Moines, Iowa.

Hon. Robert G. Lewis (secretary), agricultural coordinator, executive office, Madison, Wis.

George Bader, McClure, Ill.

Palmer E. Beebe, chairman, Michigan Agricultural Commission, Route 2, Dowagiac, Mich.

Ralph S. Bradley, 200 East Jefferson Street, Springfield, Ill.

Hon. Charles F. Brannan, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

Hon. J. FLOYD BREEDING, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

L. C. Carpenter, director, public affairs, Missouri Farmers Association, Inc., Columbia, Mo.

Prof. Willard W. Cochrane, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.

Hon. D. S. Coltrane, department of administration, Raleigh, N.C.

Lloyd Godley, Osceola, Ark.

Charles J. Hearst, Maplehurst Farm, Cedar Falls, Iowa.

Emery E. Jocabs, 1510 Republic Building, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Hans O. Jensen, Aurora, Nebr.

Ken Kendrick, vice president, National Association of Wheat Growers, Stratford, Tex.

Arthur Jones, Britton, S. Dak.

William H. Morgan, cooperative consultant, Cortland, N.Y.

Howard Haines Murphy, Sr., 900 North Street, Walpole, Mass.

Ole L. Olson, Buxton, N. Dak.

Hon. Stephen Pace, Macon Road, Americus, Ga.

J. S. Watson, president, California State Board of Agriculture, 498 Pepper Road, Petaluma, Calif.

Hon. Claude R. Wickard, Fairacre Farms, Inc., Camden, Ind.

Dwight Wise, Route 1, Freeman, Ohio.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON, MAY 11, 1960

I have just seen press reports of the plan for agriculture drafted by the Democratic farm policy advisory committee.

It is a shocking commentary on the present confused thinking among some so-called experts that the best the Democrats can offer American farmers is a sellout to servitude and a return to what caused their problem in the first place.

It is tantamount to a doctor prescribing for his patient more of what caused the illness.

I had not thought much about what might have emerged from that meeting (of the advisory committee) but I never expected this, especially since other confused Democrats on Capitol Hill have been busily brewing a different but equally poisonous concoction for farmers commonly referred to as the Poage bill.

These fumblings are proof to me that some Democrats are groping desperately for a political panacea. It also shows they do not know the farmers' mind. Every responsible poll of farm operators that I know about is overwhelmingly opposed to Government meddling in agriculture.

Farmers want more freedom to manage their own affairs. If this is what farmers want, what are we waiting for? Why don't we give it to them?

The answer is we must have constructive legislation but Congress refuses to act. There are those in Congress who still seem to favor a Government-regimented and socialized agriculture. We have never had tightly effective control on agriculture production. I fear we really would have a farm revolt should such controls be legislated and enforced.

I believe, as I always have, that Congress would never enact, farmers would not accept and the Government could not enforce the controls necessary to throttle our dynamic agriculture.

I cannot conceive that farmers would sell their freedom for a Government-guaranteed price. If such should happen it would be a sad day for America.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think it is a little incredible that the Democratic advisory committee should recommend and indicate a desire to go back to rigid price fixing and attempted controls, because to do so would be a repetition of the very thing which has brought on all the ills and difficulties with which the country is confronted today in the agricultural domain. I regard the statement of policy as something incredible, and I let it speak for itself.

LABOR RELATIONS ON THE RAILROADS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, recently the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision in a case involving the Chicago & North Western Railroad and the Telegraphers Union. The railroad company, believing that in the interest of efficient carrier operation it should close quite a number of its way stations because, first, they did not pay their way, and, second, because those who manned those operations were putting in so little time in the course of the day, they felt it imperative, in the interest of efficient transportation, in the interest of the stockholders, and in the interest of management, that the stations be closed.

Subsequently there was a strike, and the company asked for an injunction. That matter was rejected by the Supreme Court of the United States by a 5-to-4 decision. The Court indicated that the remedy lay in Congress. The act to which the Supreme Court referred is the Norris-La Guardia Act.

The case was one in which the railroad, in attempting to solve its present financial problems, as we in the Senate have urged to the Senate to do, obtained permission from the proper authority to eliminate certain of the stations on its route, but offered to negotiate with the union about new jobs or severance pay for the workers. Some of the employees were drawing a full day's pay for as little as 15 to 30 minutes' work.

I point out particularly that in South Dakota the Public Utility Commission found that the employees affected in that State averaged 59 minutes of work a day, and that the maintenance of the railroad's full-time service to keep such stations open because of the lack of public need would constitute mismanagement.

However, the union threatened to strike unless the railroad gave it the contractual right to veto the abolition or discontinuance of any job then in existence. The Supreme Court held that Congress intended to give the union that power, saying:

> If the scope of the * * * act is to be cut down in order to prevent waste * * * Congress should be the body to do so.

This decision has broad implications, affecting all industrial improvement. If the Court had held that way 50 years ago, we would still have men making horse blinders. Unless we make it clear to the Supreme Court that we do not condone waste, the wonderful world which scientists and engineers predict for our future may never come into being, because we will have allowed the Supreme Court to freeze the state of our present industrial development by permitting the freezing of existing jobs.

I am therefore at this time introducing for appropriate reference a bill to make it abundantly clear the intent of Congress is that progress is our way of life. I want to emphasize, however, that this progress requires due regard for the welfare of those whose lives are dislocated by such progress and that the bill is not intended to change the law on bargaining as to rates of pay, rules, working conditions, severance pay, and other matters. All the bill does is to provide that the phrase "terms and conditions of employment" and related language in various acts do not include the creation or discontinuance of jobs.

I wish to note, too, that the decision of the Supreme Court was by a narrow 5 to 4 vote and has been condemned by editorials regardless of the political inclination of the newspaper.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an editorial entitled "Another Blow at the Railroads," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune, and an editorial entitled "Supreme Court Creates New, Bigger Featherbed," published in the Chicago Daily News of April 20, 1960.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the editorials will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3548) to amend the Norris-La Guardia Act, the National Labor Relations Act, and the Railway Labor Act, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The editorials presented by Mr. DIRKSEN are as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Apr. 20, 1960]

ANOTHER BLOW AT THE RAILROADS

No matter what the railroads do, some agency of the Government tells them it's wrong.

Two years ago a Senate committee bawled out the railroads for not doing enough to help themselves. Among the things specifically recommended by the committee was abandonment or consolidation of nonpaying branch and secondary lines. About the same time the Chicago & North Western Railway, which was in poor financial shape, sought to better itself by eliminating full time agents at several hundred little used stations. Permission to do so was obtained from the Public Utility Commissions of South Dakota, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

The railroad did not propose to throw out all the superfluous agents without notice and without compensation. It suggested to the telegraphers union several means of cushioning the effects. The agents no longer needed might be transferred to other jobs or granted severance pay, or have their jobs abolished only through death, retirement, or resignation. The union countered by threatening to strike unless the North Western promised that no job existing on December 3, 1957, would be abolished except by agreement between the railroad and union.

The North Western sued for an injunction to restrain the strike. The Federal district court in Chicago refused to issue an injunction, but the court of appeals reversed the lower court, holding that "this is an attempt by the union to arrogate to itself the prerogatives that have been traditionally and rightfully management's, while at the same time, assuming none of the corresponding burdens and responsibilities."

Now the U.S. Supreme Court, in a 5-to-4 decision, has reversed the court of appeals. The majority opinion, written by Mr. Justice Black, noted the railroad's contention that station abandonments were necessary but held that, under the circumstances, the courts were barred by the Norris-La Guardia Act from enjoining a strike.

"If the scope of the act is to be cut down in order to prevent 'waste' by the railroads, Congress is the body to do so, the Court held.

Mr. Justice Whittaker, who wrote the principal dissenting opinion, concluded that a lawful labor dispute was not involved and that, therefore, the Norris-La Guardia law was not applicable. Mr. Justice Clark, in a separate dissenting opinion, said he did not believe Congress intended to put the railroads in such a situation.

In view of the Court's decision, it is obviously the duty of Congress to clarify this matter without delay. On the one hand, Congress cannot berate the railroads for being inefficient while at the same time requiring them by law to be inefficient.

The question here goes far beyond the telegraphers on the North Western Railway. All the railroads and their employees are involved. The question is whether a railroad must get the consent of a union whenever it wishes to abolish a job made unnecessary by changing conditions or technological improvements. As Mr. Justice Clark said, "Everyone knows what the answer of the union will be."

If the unions are to have veto power over the abolishment of jobs, there is no chance for the railroads to help themselves.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Apr. 20, 1960]

SUPREME COURT CREATES NEW, BIGGER FEATHERBED

When the Chicago & North Western Railway decided in 1957 to close 123 little-used freight stations, the jobs of some telegraphers were threatened. Some of them had been drawing full pay for less than an hour's work a day.

The Telegraphers Union threatened a strike unless the railroad agreed to negotiate on a demand that none be dismissed unless the union consented. The U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals issued an injunction forbidding the strike.

In a decision of far-reaching importance, the U.S. Supreme Court has now held, 5 to 4, that the injunction was improper, being in conflict with the Norris-La Guardia Act forbidding court interference in labor disputes.

The significance of the decision is that a union demand for this form of job security is held to be a proper subject for negotiation. Other unions can be expected to press for a contract clause reading: "No position shall be abolished or discontinued except by agreement between the union and the employer."

Justice Clark, in his dissent, noted that a strike would be the death knell of the railroad. Therefore, he added, the Court was in effect telling the C. & N.W. that it must obtain union approval before severing the hundreds of employees no longer needed, and everyone knows what the answer of the union will be.

The majority opinion, written by Justice Black, struck down the railroad's contention that the union's demand represented an attempt to usurp legitimate managerial prerogative in the exercise of business judgment. He added that Congress passed the Norris-La Guardia Anti-Injunction Act knowing that it might sometimes increase the expense of railroad operations because of increased wages and better working conditions.

"If the scope of the Norris-La Guardia Act is to be cut down in order to prevent waste, Congress should be the body to do so," asserted Black.

Justice Whittaker, in a separate dissent, said he was fearful that the innovation and reach of the Court's conclusion will be destructive of congressional policy and to the public interest. He noted the unsatisfactory earnings of the North Western, and pointed out that the planned efficiencies were undertaken in an attempt to safeguard both service to the public and the jobs of 18,000 other employees.

This is really the nub of the matter: whether a business is to be operated for the benefit and convenience of those who manage once to get on its payroll, or whether it may revise its operations to insure its solvency—or to increase its profits.

Up to this point in our industrial progress, the Nation has cast the decision generally on the side of efficiency, in the conviction that if everyone produces the maximum possible, the result will be advantageous to all.

Now we are approaching a situation in which an employee can be sewed into a job requiring 12 minutes of his time a day. If featherbedding really does get accepted to this extent, our industrial supremacy will be a gone glory.

THE MALLORY CASE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a very illuminating letter written to me by Senator HALL S. LUSK of Oregon, and my reply concerning the Mallory case and S. 3411.

Senator LUSK has had a most distinguished career in the legal and judicial field and is one of our ablest authorities on the law.

It is with his approval that I ask consent to have his letter and my reply inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1960.

Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I listened with interest to your statement on the floor on April 25th regarding the Mallory case and S. 3411. I am in entire sympathy with the view that the rule of the Mallory case should be abrogated. I think, however, that one statement which you made, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is not supported by the facts. You said, "The so-called Mallory case has been applied to convictions in State courts all over the country."

As you no doubt are aware the Mallory decision stems from *McNabb* v. *United States* (318 U.S. 332), in which the Supreme Court first departed from the rule which had theretofore been uniformly applied in both the Federal and the State courts, that the only test of whether a confession of the accused in a criminal case is admissible in evidence is whether the confession was freely and voluntarily made and was not induced by coercion, threats, or promises. The McNabb case was decided in 1942 and has since then been discussed in many opinions of the State courts, but has never, to my knowledge, been followed.

I take the following statement from the 1959 Cumulative Supplement to volume 20 of "American Jurisprudence," page 79:

"A number of recent cases decided in the Supreme Court or lower Federal courts have held that an illegal delay in arraignment is sufficient to render inadmissible a confession procured during the period of delay. This rule has been qualified or limited in its application by some courts. Thus, where the delay in arraignment was not illegal, or was found to have been necessary and reasonable under the circumstances, the doctrine has found no application.

"Where no unlawful detention is found prior to the time when a confession is made, an illegal detention subsequent to the making of the confession does not operate retroactively so as to invalidate it.

"Confessions have been ruled inadmissible in a number of cases where a delay in arraignment has been only one of several factors which combined to create a coercive atmosphere which most of the courts have found to be violative of the "due process" clause of the Federal Constitution.

"Generally speaking, the State courts have continued to consider only the question of the voluntariness of a confession in determining its admissibility."

The recent cases that have been collected in 19 A.L.R. 2d, beginning at page 1331, bear out the following statement at page 1336:

"With few exceptions, the State courts have refused to apply the strict rule established by the McNabb case, although the decision has been discussed in the majority of subsequent cases involving the question of the admissibility of confessions obtained during a period of delay in arraignment."

Among the State decisions which have refused to accept the rule of the McNabb case are two by the Oregon Supreme Court, *State* v. *Folkes* (174 Oregon, 568) and *State* v. *Leland* (227 p. (2d) 785).

As a result of this adherence of the State courts to long established precedent, the impact of the Mallory rule upon the administration of criminal justice in this country has not been as serious as otherwise would have been the case. At the same time, this position of the State courts is strong reason for questioning the validity of the Mallory rule, for these judges deal with criminal cases not occasionally as does the Supreme Court of the United States but from day to day. They are fully aware not only of the need to protect the accused in his right to a fair trial, but also the right of the public to be protected against violators of the law. The Supreme Court has never held that to admit in evidence a voluntary confession obtained under the circumstances disclosed in the Mallory case is a violation of a prisoner's constitutional rights. The State courts have therefore felt free to apply their own rule. In doing so, they have harmed no one and have served the public good.

Sincerely yours,

HALL S. LUSK,
U.S. Senator.

MAY 12, 1960.

Hon. HALL S. LUSK,
U.S. Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I certainly appreciate your letter in regard to my talk on the Mallory bill.

Enclosed is a copy of my release, which referred to the lower courts, and in some way, the RECORD stated, State courts.

I received a very fine letter from Senator ERVIN regarding your letter, and I am much pleased that you have no objection to having it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which I am doing.

With appreciation and warm regards, I am,

Faithfully yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

VERNON TALBERTT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with other Senators in extending my congratulations and also my highest personal regard to Vernon L. Talbertt, Chief Messenger of the Office of Secretary of the Senate, upon the almost unprecedented occasion of his 50th anniversary as an employee of the U.S. Senate.

During the period of my acquaintance with him I have come to consider him a gentleman of the highest caliber. I have found him personable, intelligent, and most understanding and accommodating.

In addition to his services over these many years, under various Secretaries of the U.S. Senate, Vernon Talbertt served in the Armed Forces of his country as an enlisted man.

So I am glad to yield my deference and devotion to Vernon Talbertt, and to express the happiness I have experienced in knowing him personally. I consider him a fine, loyal American, and a conscientious and intelligent employee of the U.S. Senate. I join other Senators in wishing him many more happy anniversaries.

NATIONWIDE SUPPORT FOR NATIONAL VOTERS DAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, across the Nation we face a challenge of increasing voter participation in elections—local, State, and National.

The voting record by U.S. citizens is deplorably low—ranging from 24 percent in 1904 to 63 percent in 1952 in a national election.

By contrast, voting in other countries has reached such ranges as follows: Italy, 93 percent; Germany, 86 percent; Turkey, 87 percent; Denmark, 80 percent.

For 1960, the Nation should shoot for a minimum of 75 percent and, if possible, a 90–100 percent voting record in the election.

My colleagues will recall that recently I introduced a resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 186, in which I was joined by Senators KENNETH KEATING, of New York, and JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, as cosponsors—designed to designate a national voters day. The purpose would be to give direction to a much-needed national effort to increase voting.

The aim of the resolution—to designate the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of each year as National Voters Day—would also be to encourage not only national efforts, but Governors, mayors, industry, business, labor, fraternal, service, women's and other civicly oriented groups to support voter education campaigns.

The objective, of course, would not—as some have erroneously concluded—merely attempt to herd people to the polls, regardless of qualifications. To the contrary, the fundamental aim would be to carry on programs—beginning now—to educate people on the issues in a campaign; the candidates and their qualifications; mechanism of voting, such as marking ballots and using voting machines; informing eligible voters of—and encouraging them to meet—registration requirements; educating potential voters on the processes of government, and the value of citizen support, participation in—and, if deemed advisable, constructive opposition; finally, launching a counter-attack on the trend toward apathy—now among the major causes, keeping almost 50 percent of the eligible voters away from the polls.

Would the designation of a National Voters Day stimulate interest among voters? On a statewide basis the idea of a special Voters Day has already been tried and proved successful. In Connecticut, Governor Ribicoff, for example, reports that the designation of such a special day increased the percentage of voters casting ballots considerably higher than the national average—amounting to 93.4 percent in 1952, 81.3 percent in 1954, 90.8 percent in 1956, and 80.2 percent in 1958. By contrast, the national voting record in these respective years was, in 1952, 63 percent; 1954, 42.5 percent; 1956, 60 percent; and 1958, 44 percent.

GOVERNORS SUPPORT NATIONAL VOTERS DAY

Following the introduction of the resolution, a great many Governors across the country have enthusiastically endorsed the idea in a splendid, bipartisan way.

In addition a substantial number of veterans, fraternal, women's, and other organizations have wholeheartedly endorsed the idea of establishing a National Voters Day.

In view of this widespread support, I sincerely hope that our colleagues on the Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations Subcommittee—before which this resolution is now pending—will give it early and favorable consideration.

Overall, I believe it would—if enthusiastically supported by creative efforts at local and State levels—educate voters and encourage them to turn out at the polls—and so serve to strengthen the foundation of our free country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD letters from Governors across the country endorsing the concept of establishing a National Voters Day.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF VERMONT,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Montpelier, April 29, 1960.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I have read with keen interest your proposal for a National Voters Day and give this excellent idea my wholehearted support. Any step taken to encourage greater voter participation is good, and your proposal is certainly in the right direction.

I shall be most happy to cooperate here in Vermont by designating such a day.

Very truly yours,
ROBERT T. STAFFORD,
Governor.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Tallahassee, May 3, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator From Wisconsin,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for your letter of April 20, informing me of your proposal for the establishment of a National Voters Day.

I am very much concerned by the low percentages of eligible voters participating in our local, State, and national elections. I think your proposal has great merit and you can count on me to render any assistance I can.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely,
LEROY COLLINS,
Governor.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Sacramento, May 2, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I appreciate your recent letter and its suggestion to designate the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November, in each year, as National Voters Day.

I would like to join with you in the hope that such a movement will stimulate a greater voter participation, and that the observances held shall be regardless of race, color, religion, economic status, or partisanship. Such a movement for a better based participation in our national elections, and particularly in local and State elections, will have widespread acceptance and appeal.

I hope that you will go forward with this project and I wish you the greatest success in so doing.

Sincerely,
EDMUND G. BROWN, *Governor.*

STATE OF DELAWARE,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Dover, April 22, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for your good letter of April 20 with enclosure concerning your proposal for National Voters Day.

I would certainly welcome the opportunity to cooperate in every way possible to encourage greater registration by the citizenry and greater voter participation in local, State, and National elections. I believe that extensive attention directed to registration dates and election dates would indeed have the desired results. To that end a National Voters Day would, I am confident, stimulate greater participation in elections.

Thank you again for writing and with best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,
J. CALEB BOGGS, *Governor.*

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, April 28, 1960.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ALEX: Thank you for your letter of April 20 in connection with your resolution for a National Voters Day.

I fully concur in the importance of this program and appreciate your drawing it to my attention.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,
NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Governor.

STATE OF OHIO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Columbus, April 25, 1960.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you very much for your recent letter concerning the resolution for National Voters Day. I believe the idea is commendable and has great merit.

Certainly in a proposal such as yours, which would increase voter participation, is worthy of great consideration. One of the problems in my State is getting the voters to make themselves eligible for participation by registering prior to the actual election.

While your resolution does not strike at this particular problem, I am certain it would make the voters more aware of their responsibilities in an election.

Sincerely yours,
MICHAEL V. DISALLE,
Governor.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND
PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Providence, April 27, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The problem of greater voter participation in our elections is one which deserves the serious attention of all responsible groups and individuals if it is to be met successfully.

Fortunately, many civic groups in recent years have recognized this challenge to our democratic form of government and have attempted to stimulate more widespread interest in our elections. In many areas, these programs have met with significant success.

Your resolution seeks to focus further attention on this matter and I would be happy to cooperate in any way to insure the success of such a program.

I look forward to receiving any additional proposals you plan to make on this vital subject.

With best wishes.
Sincerely,
CHRISTOPHER DEL SESTO,
Governor.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Carson City, Nev., May 4, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have received and thank you for your letter of April 20 regarding the problem of stimulating greater voter participation in our local, State, and National elections. I certainly do agree with you that we should use every available opportunity to recommend and promote greater voter participation.

I realize, as you do, that merely designating a National Voters Day could not be expected to solve the problem; however, it may help to stimulate in the minds of many people the idea of exercising their citizenship franchise. I support this idea, and I feel that any progress made along this line would be extremely beneficial to all citizens of our Nation.

Cordially,
GRANT SAWYER,
Governor.

STATE OF IOWA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Des Moines, May 3, 1960.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I received your letter under date of April 20 in which you advise me of your deep interest in stimulating greater voter participation in local, State, and National elections. I note that you have introduced a resolution in Congress to designate a National Voters Day.

I am preparing a proclamation entitled "National Voters Day" as a result of your letter.

With kind personal regards, I am,
Cordially yours,
HERSCHEL C. LOVELESS,
Governor of Iowa.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Trenton, April 26, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for your letter of April 20. I agree with you that the low percentage of eligible voters participating in our general elections is deplorable.

In many talks I have made over the past years, I have stressed the necessity for greater citizen participation at the polls, in primaries as well as in general elections.

I think that your plan to designate a National Voters Day might help to stimulate a greater exercise of suffrage rights and you are assured of my help and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT B. MEYNER,
Governor.

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Little Rock, April 25, 1960.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This will acknowledge your letter of the 20th in reference to

National Voters Day, to be observed in November.

In accordance with your request, I will be happy to proclaim National Voters Day at the appropriate time. Certainly, it behooves all of us, as civic-minded citizens, to do our utmost to encourage greater interest in voting.

Please let me know whenever I can work with you in mutual service to our constituents.

Most sincerely,

ORVAL E. FAUBUS,
Governor.

STATE OF ALABAMA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Montgomery, April 27, 1960.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I wish to thank you for your letter of April 20, with enclosure, suggesting that a National Voters Day be observed nationwide each year. I appreciate your sending me a reprint of your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in explanation of your suggestion.

It appears to have much merit since voter participation in our national elections has never been very high. I am interested to know of your National Voters Day campaign, and I hope you will keep me posted on developments.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN PATTERSON,
Governor.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Annapolis, Md., April 28, 1960.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am grateful to you for your letter of April 20, and for the enclosure outlining your program to stimulate greater voter participation in local, State, and National elections.

I concur wholeheartedly in your statement that it is the duty of all of us to work toward the achievement of a broader participation by the people in our elections.

As you suggested in your statement, it is perhaps premature at this time to consider the establishment of a legal holiday for the Tuesday after the first Monday in November. In Maryland, for example, I would feel compelled to go to the general assembly for such action.

I shall be happy, however, to proclaim that day as National Voters Day and to support you in any other practicable way.

With best wishes and kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

J. MILLARD TAWES,
Governor.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Olympia, April 29, 1960.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: May I thank you for your suggestion that a National Voters Day be designated in the State of Washington.

At the present time we cooperate with both political parties in designating a Voters' Registration Month to stimulate greater participation in elections. Your idea may possibly be used to supplement this traditional effort.

Sincerely,

ALBERT D. ROSELLINI,
Governor.

STATE OF IDAHO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Boise, April 29, 1960.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I share with you, as do all chief executives in the 50 States, your concern in getting out eligible voters to exercise their rights in the elections coming up this fall.

We, in Idaho, have, through the efforts of many organizations and civic leaders, gained the enviable position of having led the Nation in the last general election. Seventy-some percent of the voters voted in that election. I sincerely hope we can improve this record.

I am quite certain that your resolution to designate a National Voters Day will receive widespread support.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. SMYLIE,
Governor.

WYOMING EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Cheyenne, April 26, 1960.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The problem which you have moved into with your resolution in Congress to designate a National Voters' Day is one which, of course, plagues us every election.

When the appropriate time comes, just prior to our next election, I shall be most happy to bring National Voters Day to the attention of the Wyoming people either by proclamation or statement to the press. I would appreciate it if you can advise me when the resolution is passed.

Sincerely yours,

J. J. "JOE" HICKEY,
Governor.

DEFENSE COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, yesterday the Defense Department made the announcement that Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., has established a single defense communications system. By this action Secretary Gates has pulled together into one consolidated system the vast and expensive worldwide communications networks of the various services.

I take this opportunity to commend Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., on his recent decision. The proposed defense communications system will furnish facilities for command and control functions, intelligence, weather, logistics, and administration. It represents a most important organizational step and, to quote the Secretary of Defense, it is "one which will result in better utilization of the communications equipment so essential to our modern military forces and weapons systems."

This action of the Secretary of Defense is one more example of his tireless efforts to give the American people a more efficient Defense Establishment. It reflects his determination to avoid rigidities in the organization of his Department, and to move in a forthright manner to integrate functions in the interests of efficiency.

Under this new agency the facilities of the services will be integrated for the first time into a single system responsive to the needs of the Department of Defense as a whole. The reorganization not only provides maximum communications for dollar outlay, but it also provides maximum flexibility, dispersion and alternate routing capability, and standardization of installations, operations, and maintenance. Unnecessary duplication in research and development in this important area will be prevented.

I believe that we can take additional encouragement from this action as evidence of what the present Secretary of Defense is doing to improve our Nation's military capability. This, together with his recent decision to meet personally with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, constitutes reassuring examples of how personal leadership, such as that possessed by Tom Gates, can result in both economy and strength.

In view of the great importance of this action, I ask unanimous consent that the press release and directives of the Secretary of Defense under date of May 12, 1960, announcing this new single communication system, be made a part of these remarks, and printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the release and directives were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SINGLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM SET UP IN DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

(News release from the Department of Defense)

A single communications system, pulling into one Agency all the long-haul requirements of the Department of Defense will be established under two directives, the Department of Defense announced today.

The documents, signed by Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., authorize a new type of Agency headed by an officer of general or flag rank with command responsibility direct from the Secretary of Defense through the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It resolves a problem that has been known to concern the Congress and the Pentagon for a long period.

The two directives, designed to increase the effective use of long-line communications by centralizing their control provide for a Defense Communications Agency and a Defense Communications System, both under the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense. General responsibility for the operational control and supervision of the system will be assigned to the Agency.

The Defense Communications System will furnish facilities for command and control functions, intelligence, weather, logistics, and administration. Communications requirements which have been met by the three military services in support of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will be furnished in the future by the Agency.

In commenting on this action, Secretary Gates said: "This method of handling long-line communications is the outcome of a most comprehensive study in which the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the military services, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense participated. We regard it as an important organizational step, and one which will result in better utilization of the communications equipment so essential to our modern military forces and weapons system."

Implementation of the plan, with the assumption of operational control and full supervision of the system by the new Agency will be accomplished on a phased basis without disrupting essential communications during the transition period. This is expected to

take about 9 months from the date when the Chief of the Agency is appointed.

The Defense Department believes the single communications system is essential for the following reasons:

(a) To provide maximum communications for the dollar investment;

(b) To provide support for the more advanced weapons systems of the future through a centralized control;

(c) To provide maximum flexibility;

(d) To assure adequate dispersion with alternate routing capability;

(e) To eliminate duplication in the research and development field; and

(f) To provide for standardization of installation, operation, and maintenance to assure overall system efficiency.

The system does not include: tactical communications which are self-contained within tactical organizations; self-contained information gathering, transmitting and/or processing facilities which are normally local in operation and use; weapons systems requirements which cannot be met through the facilities of the DCS; and land, ship, or airborne terminal facilities of broadcast, ship-to-ship, ship-to-shore, and ground-air-ground systems.

The communications net does encompass 79 major relay stations scattered throughout the world representing a plant investment of $2 billion.

The combined annual message traffic handled by the three military systems which are to be integrated into a single communications system, currently is in excess of 63 million messages per year. The systems of today involve 6.352 million channel miles of leased wires and 489,000 high quality long-range voice channels. To provide some idea of the magnitude of the traffic, the Air Force high frequency radio alone is 14 times greater than the RCA system, has three times as many people, and handles 20 times as much traffic.

The military departments' communications systems employ approximately 24,700 personnel. Personnel will be assigned to the Agency from existing resources of the military departments or other Department of Defense agencies to man the Communications Agency headquarters and traffic control centers.

The Chief of the Agency will be a military officer of general or flag rank who will be responsible for establishing a headquarters staff and such subordinate units, facilities, and activities (including communications control centers) as are required by the Agency.

The location of the Agency headquarters shall be determined when the organizational structure and staffing plans of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Chief of the Defense Communications Agency are submitted to the Secretary of Defense for approval.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DIRECTIVE NO. 5105.19, MAY 12, 1960—DEFENSE COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY

References: (a) Memorandum from Deputy Secretary of Defense to Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, subject as above, July 25, 1959; (b) DOD Directive 4600.2, "Defense Communications System"; (c) DOD Directive 4600.1, "Telecommunications Policy Objectives."

I. GENERAL

Pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of Defense and the provisions of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, including the Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1958, a Defense Communications Agency (DCA) is hereby established as an Agency of the Department of Defense under the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense.

II. ORGANIZATION AND COMMAND

A. The Defense Communications Agency shall consist of a military commander of suitable general or flag rank, a headquarters staff, and such subordinate units, facilities and activities (including communications control centers) as are specifically assigned to the Agency by the Secretary of Defense or by the Joint Chiefs of Staff by the authority and direction of the Secretary of Defense.

B. The chain of command shall run from the Secretary of Defense, through the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to the Chief, DCA. Orders, program approval and guidance to the Chief, DCA, shall be issued by the Secretary of Defense or by the Joint Chiefs of Staff by the authority and direction of the Secretary of Defense.

C. The DCA shall establish and operate communications control centers as necessary to implement responsibility assigned the DCA for operation control and supervision of the Defense Communications System (DCS). Operational responsibility for DCS communications control functions currently being performed by the military departments will be assumed by the communication control centers establishment by the DCA as soon as practicable after activation; no other control centers will be authorized to perform these functions after that time.

III. RESPONSIBILITIES

The DCA, under the direction and control of the Chief of the Agency, shall be responsible for the operational control and supervision of the DCS which includes all worldwide, long-haul, Government-owned and leased, point-to-point circuits, terminals, control facilities and tributaries required to provide communications:

A. From the President to and between the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other governmental agencies.

B. From the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to and between the military departments and the unified and specified commands.

C. From the military departments to and between their major commanders and subordinate fixed headquarters.

D. From the unified and specified commands to and between their component and subordinate commands.

IV. FUNCTIONS

Under the direction and control of the Chief, DCA, the Agency shall perform the following functions within its assigned field of responsibility:

A. Operations:

1. Based on approved requirements, allocate circuits and channels to the military departments, the unified and specified commands and other Department of Defense or governmental agencies.

2. Allocate standby communications facilities (installed and mobile) to meet approved requirements or emergency situations.

3. Supervise the restoration and allocation or reallocation of circuits and channels under emergency conditions.

4. Operate communications control centers; supervise "departmental facilities/technical control" elements; and maintain current information on status of circuits, channels, and resources of the DCS.

5. Prescribe maintenance standards and installation practices.

6. Conduct continuing traffic analysis and maintain necessary records to insure effective and efficient utilization of the DCS.

7. Supervise the operation of special purpose communications facilities, such as those required to support the Alternate Joint Communications Center, Joint War Rooms, and other similar activities as designated by the Secretary of Defense or the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

8. Conduct periodic operational exercises, inspections, and tests in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the DCS.

9. Maintain necessary radio frequency records and request the assignment or reassignment of radio freqencies required for the DCS.

10. Recommend to the Secretary of Defense, through the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the assignment to the military departments or other Department of Defense agencies the responsibility for:

(a) Providing and maintaining component facilities of the DCS.

(b) The leasing of authorized commercial circuits and facilities required to support the DCS.

(c) Providing and maintaining personnel, facilities, equipment, and other support required by the DCA to maintain and operate the communications control centers.

B. Plans and engineering:

1. Consolidate and analyze communications requirements proposed for the DCS, giving due consideration to planned and available system facilities, and submit report of analysis and evaluation to JCS together with recommendations for approval, modification, or disapproval.

2. Develop plans for meeting approved requirements that are beyond the capability of the DCS and submit such plans through the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the Secretary of Defense for approval.

3. Translate approved requirements into system plans for detailed engineering by the military departments.

4. Review detailed engineering plans prepared by the military departments for conformance with approved policies and programs and consistency with the concept and objectives of the DCS.

5. Initiate appropriate action to implement approved plans.

C. Programs:

1. Translate system engineering plans into program guidance, including the assignment of appropriate program priorities.

2. Recommend to the Secretary of Defense, through the Joint Chiefs of Staff, assignment of program implementation responsibility to the military departments.

3. Review status of programs and related facilities which support the DCS and recommend to the Secretary of Defense, through the Joint Chiefs of Staff, any corrective action or change necessary.

D. Research and development:

1. Coordinate communications research and development programs of the military departments which are applicable to the DCS to insure effective integration, standardization, and compatibility and to eliminate unnecessary duplication in research and development effort and expense.

2. Review current status of research and development efforts in support of the DCS.

3. Recommend to the Director of Defense, Research and Engineering, through the Joint Chiefs of Staff, research and development programs or projects required to insure progressive improvement of the system.

E. Perform such other functions as the Secretary of Defense or the Joint Chiefs of Staff assign.

V. RELATIONSHIPS

A. In the performance of its functions, the Agency shall:

1. Coordinate actions, as appropriate, with the military departments and other Department of Defense or governmental agencies having collateral or related functions in the field of its assigned responsibility.

2. Maintain active liaison for the exchange of information and advice with the military departments and other Department of Defense or governmental agences.

3. Make full use of established facilities in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the

military departments and other Department of Defense agencies rather than unnecessarily duplicating such facilities.

B. Officials of the military departments and other Department of Defense agencies shall provide support within their respective fields of responsibility to the Chief of DCA as may be necessary to carry out the assigned responsibilities of the Agency in accordance with approved requirements.

VI. AUTHORITIES

A. To carry out assigned responsibilities and functions of the Agency, the Chief of DCA is specifically delegated authority to:

1. Exercise operational control and supervision of communications activities and facilities comprising the DCS.

2. Issue instructions pertaining to the operation and maintenance of the DCS to the heads of the operating agencies of the military departments and other Department of Defense or governmental agencies, provided that task assignments and pertinent instructions may be issued directly to any operating element of the DCS that are within the capacity of such elements to accomplish.

3. Have direct access to and direct communication with any department or agency performing DCS functions over which the DCA exercises operational control and supervision.

4. Direct the consolidation or elimination of DCS facilities and operations in order to achieve maximum efficiency, economy and effectiveness.

5. Prescribe procedures, principles, standards and practices for activities under his operational control and supervision.

6. Prescribe or approve, as appropriate, security rules, regulations and instructions for DCS activities.

7. Obtain such reports and information from the military departments and other Department of Defense or governmental agencies as may be necessary to the performance of the Agency's assigned functions.

B. In providing direct DCS support to the military departments, other Department of Defense agencies and other governmental agencies, the Chief of DCA is authorized to redelegate operational control of specified DCS facilities and resources.

C. Other authorities specifically delegated by the Secretary of Defense to the Chief, DCA, in other directives or issuances will be referenced in an inclosure to this directive.

VII. ADMINISTRATION

A. The Chief, DCA, shall be designated by the Secretary of Defense, upon recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

B. Applicable Department of Defense policies, regulations and procedures shall govern the Agency's operations.

C. The Agency will be authorized such personnel, facilities, funds, and other administrative support as the Secretary of Defense deems necessary for the performance of its functions. The military departments will assign military personnel to the Agency in accordance with approved authorizations and applicable Department of Defense directives and instructions.

D. Personnel, facilities, equipment and other support required to maintain and operate specific segments of the DCS for which a military department or other Department of Defense agency has been assigned responsibility shall be provided from resources available to that department or agency.

E. Personnel, facilities, equipment and other support required to maintain and perform the operation of the DCS Communications Control Centers will be provided to the DCA by the military departments or other Department of Defense agency to which such responsibility is assigned.

VIII. DEFENSE COMMUNICATIONS POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A Defense Communications Policy Advisory Committee is hereby established to advise the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense on matters relating to the DCS. The membership of the committee shall consist of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (S. & L.), as chairman; the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, as vice chairman; a representative of each military department and the organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; the Chief of the DCA; and the Director of the National Security Agency.

IX. EFFECTIVE DATE

This directive is effective upon publication.

THOMAS S. GATES,
Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DIRECTIVE NO. 4600.2, MAY 12, 1960—DEFENSE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (DCS)

References: (a) Memorandum from Deputy Secretary of Defense to Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, subject as above, July 25, 1959; (b) DOD Directive 5105.19, "Defense Communications Agency"; (c) DOD Directive 4600.1, "Telecommunications Policy Objective."

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this directive is to establish a single Communications System within the Department of Defense under the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense, and assign general responsibility for its operation.

II. DEFINITIONS

A. The Defense Communications System (DCS) includes all worldwide, long-haul, Government-owned and leased, point-to-point circuits, terminals, control facilities and tributaries, required to provide communications from the President to and between the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other Government agencies; from the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to and between the military departments and the unified and specified commands; from the military departments to and between their major commanders and subordinate fixed headquarters; and from the unified and specified commands to and between their component and subordinate commands.

B. The DCS does not include: tactical communications which are self-contained within tactical organizations; self-contained information gathering, transmitting and/or processing facilities which are normally local in operation and use; weapons systems requirements which cannot be met through the facilities of the DCS; and land, ship or airborne terminal facilities of broadcasts, ship-to-shore, ship-to-ship, and ground-air-ground systems.

III. POLICY

A. There will be a single Defense Communications System (DCS) to provide facilities to meet all long-haul telecommunications (as defined in II.A. above) requirements of the Department of Defense. No other facilities will be authorized for this purpose.

B. Special purpose communications facilities, such as those required to support the Alternate Joint Communications Center (AJCC), Joint War Rooms and similar activities, as designated by the Secretary of Defense, will be included in the DCS.

C. The operational control and supervision of the system will be under the Defense Communications Agency (DCA) as prescribed in reference (b) above.

D. The system will be operated and maintained in accordance with Department of Defense policies, regulations and procedures and strategic and logistic guidance by the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS).

E. Unilateral tactical and special purpose communications (as defined in II.B. above) will be operated and maintained by the military departments and other Department of Defense agencies, as assigned.

F. Personnel, facilities, equipment and other support required to maintain and operate specific segments of the DCS for which a military department or other Department of Defense agency has been assigned responsibility shall be provided from resources available to that department or agency.

G. Personnel, facilities, equipment and other support required to maintain and perform the operation of the DCS Communications Control Centers will be provided to the DCA by the military departments or other Department of Defense agency to which such responsibility is assigned.

IV. OPERATION AND CONTROL

A. The requirements of the Department of Defense for efficient and economical long-haul communications will be met by an evolutionary conversion of the common communications facilities of the military departments into the DCS. The DCS will provide facilities for command and control, intelligence, weather, logistics, and administrative purposes. The component facilities of the DCS as assigned will be operated by the military departments and unified and specified commands under the operational control and supervision of the DCA. The communications control centers will be directly operated by the DCA.

B. The DCS will be designed to provide the flexibility and reliability necessary to maintain the quality and quantity of communications capabilities required for military operations. In addition, common-user services and allocated channels will be provided to other Government agencies, as required. The utilization of channels allocated to commanders will be under their control and will be considered an integral part of their command and control systems.

V. RESPONSIBILITIES

In addition to the normal staff functions assigned to the principal staff assistants to the Secretary of Defense, the following organizations of the Department of Defense are specifically responsible, as indicated below, for DCS functions:

A. The Director of Defense Research and Engineering in accordance with responsibilities and functions contained in DOD Directive 5129.1 and other pertinent issuances.

B. The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics) in accordance with responsibilities and functions contained in DOD Directive 5126.1 and other pertinent issuances.

C. The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) in accordance with responsibilities and functions contained in DOD Directive 5118.3 and other pertinent issuances.

D. The Defense Communications Policy Advisory Committee will provide advice to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense on matters relating to the DCS.

E. The Joint Chiefs of Staff in accordance with responsibilities and functions contained in DOD Directive 5100.1 and other pertinent issuances, as well as the following specific functions:

1. Review communications requirements submitted by the unified and specified commands, the military departments and other users of communications facilities to assure consistency with strategic and logistic plans and to determine validity of requirements.

2. Evaluate communications requirements peculiar to a special mission or weapons system to determine if the requirements can be

satisfied by the facilities of the DCS, and make recommendations to the Secretary of Defense.

3. Obtain advice and recommendations from the DCA during the review and evaluation of communications requirements.

4. Issue orders, program approval and guidance to the Chief, DCA, by authority and direction of the Secretary of Defense.

F. The unified and specified commands in accordance with responsibilities and functions contained in pertinent issuances, as well as the following specific functions:

1. Develop communications requirements and submit to the JCS for review and approval.

2. Operate and maintain assigned facilities of the DCS.

G. The military departments in accordance with responsibilities and functions contained in DOD Directive 5100.1 and other pertinent issuances, as well as the following specific functions:

1. Operate and maintain assigned facilities of the DCS.

2. Budget, fund and account for the support of the DCS (including those components assigned to the military departments) in accordance with instructions of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

3. Develop departmental communications requirements and submit for review.

4. Perform detailed engineering to meet approved requirements of assigned DCS responsibilities.

5. Implement approved plans for assigned DCS operation.

H. The Defense Communications Agency will perform the functions prescribed in reference (b) above.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION

1. Instructions implementing the provisions of this Directive will be issued in accordance with the attached schedule. Such instructions will be coordinated with the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics) prior to publication. The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics) will coordinate the instructions with appropriate officials of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

2. During the implementation period, provisions of existing directives and procedures pertaining to long-haul, point-to-point communications programs will remain in effect until superseded by the new implementing instructions.

VII. EFFECTIVE DATE

This Directive is effective upon publication, for planning and for systematic implementation, in accordance with the attached schedule.

THOMAS S. GATES,
Secretary of Defense.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

Action	Action agency	Action date
1. Recommend Chief, DCA	JCS	Within 15 days from date of issuance of this directive.
2. Appoint Chief, DCA	Secretary of Defense	No later than June 15, 1960.
3. Develop organizational and staffing plans and submit to Secretary of Defense for approval.	JCS and Chief, DCA	Within 30 days after date of appointment of Chief, DCA.
4. Establish the DCA headquarters	do	Items 4 through 8 will be completed within 9 months after date of appointment of Chief, DCA, in accordance with a schedule to be developed by the Chief, DCA in coordination with the JCS, D.D.R. & E., ASD (S. & L.) and the military departments.
5. Prepare plans for exercising his authority in accordance with functions and responsibilities set forth in DOD Directive 5105.19.	Chief, DCA	
6. Develop and submit to the Secretary of Defense for approval a plan which identifies each component of the DCS, assigns responsibility therefor, and fixes specific dates that each military department or other DOD agency will assume its assigned responsibilities.	Chief, DCA, in coordination with the JCS, ASD (S. & L.) and other appropriate DOD officials.	
7. Assume operation of communications control centers.	Chief, DCA	
8. Assume operational control and supervision of the DCS in accordance with plan.	Chief, DCA and staff	
9. Other actions necessary to accomplish effective implementation of the DCS as identified.	As appropriate	Continuing.

MOTHER'S DAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Anna Jarvis, of Grafton, W. Va., was the founder of Mother's Day. The day set aside each year for the honoring of our mothers is past, but to all mankind every day is mother's day. To those of us who have no memory of a loving mother, a man's greatest blessing, for which he should be most thankful, is a living mother on Mother's Day.

Tender and beautiful words have been written and spoken about the hand that rocks the cradle and rules the world. What could surpass the beauty and tenderness of the sentence which Thomas Gray wrote for the resting place of his *mother*? In the old churchyard at Stoke Poges, hard by the elm and yew beneath which Gray wrote the matchless "Elegy," we can read today these words:

In the same pious confidence, beside her friend and sister, here sleep the remains of Dorothy Gray, widow, the careful and tender mother of many children, one of whom alone had the misfortune to survive her.

When Alexander the Great entertained the kings and nobles at the court of Persia, he appeared wearing only those garments which had been woven for him by his mother, Olympias, who was the daughter of a chieftain, the wife of a king, and the mother of a conqueror. Long ago we discarded the garments that were made for us by a loving mother's hand; and yet, in a certain sense, as to life and character, we are all still wearing the garments that were woven for us by a mother.

Napoleon, whose mother, Madam Mere, was one of the strongest of women, said:

My opinion is that the future good or bad conduct of a child depends entirely on its mother.

When General Grant's mother died at Jersey City in 1883, he said to the minister who was to officiate at the funeral:

Make no reference to me. She owed nothing to me, to any post I have occupied or any honors that have been paid me. Speak of her just as she was, a pure-minded, simple-hearted, earnest Methodist Christian.

Said Henry Ward Beecher concerning the influence on him of the sorrows and sufferings of his mother:

Now you may put all the skeptical men that ever lived on the face of the earth on one side, and they may plead in my ears. And all the scientists may stand with them, and marshal all the facts of the universe to disprove the truth of Immanuel, God with us; and yet, let me see my mother, walking in a great sorrow, but from the surface of which sorrow reflecting the light of cheer and heavenly hope, patient, sweet, gentle, full of comfort for others—yea, and showing by her life as well as her lips that with the consolation wherewith she has been comforted, she is comforting others—and that single instance of suffering is more to me, as an evidence of the truth of Christianity, than all the arguments that the wisest men can possibly bring against it.

No one ever read Victor Hugo's "Notre Dame" without being moved and purified and cleansed in heart at the marvelous scene where the demented mother, who has been searching over all Europe for her child, long years before stolen by the gypsies, matches the shoe she carries with the shoe the maid has carried all the years about her neck, and discovers her long-lost child. The heavenliness of her joy, and the terribleness of her anger and grief when her daughter is again dragged from her, exhibit perhaps as well as anything that was ever written the strange and awful powers of human love.

Mr. President, the blessed thoughts of mother are probably best spoken by the poet, Elizabeth Akers Allen, in the beautiful lines of her poem "Rock Me to Sleep." These lines bring back the sweet memories of yesteryear, and bring sunshine where now is but night:

Backward, turn backward, O time, in your flight,
Make me a child again just for tonight!
Mother, come back from the echoless shore,
Take me again to your heart as of yore;
Kiss from my forehead the furrows of care,
Smooth the few silver threads out of my hair;
Over my slumbers your loving watch keep;
Rock me to sleep, mother, rock me to sleep!

Backward, flow backward, oh, tide of the years!
I am so weary of toil and of tears—
Toil without recompense, tears all in vain—
Take them, and give me my childhood again!

I have grown weary of dust and decay;
Weary of flinging my soul-wealth away;
Weary of sowing for others to reap;
Rock me to sleep, mother, rock me to sleep!

Tired of the hollow, the base, the untrue,
Mother, O mother, my heart calls for you!
Many a summer the grass has grown green,
Blossomed and faded, our faces between:
Yet, with strong yearning and passionate pain,
Long I tonight for your presence again.
Come from the silence so long and so deep;
Rock me to sleep, mother, rock me to sleep!

Over my heart, in the days that are flown,
No love like mother love ever has shone;
No other worship abides and endures—
Faithful, unselfish, and patient like yours;
None like a mother can charm away pain
From the sick soul and the world-weary brain.
Slumber's soft calms o'er my heavy lids creep;
Rock me to sleep, mother, rock me to sleep!

Come, let your brown hair, just lighted with gold,
Fall on your shoulders again as of old;
Let it drop over my forehead tonight,
Shading my faint eyes away from the light;
For with its sunny-edged shadows once more
Haply will throng the sweet visions of yore;
Lovingly, softly, its bright billows sweep;
Rock me to sleep, mother, rock me to sleep!

Mother, dear mother, the years have been long
Since I last listened your lullaby song;
Sing, then, and unto my soul it shall seem
Womanhood's years have been only a dream.
Clasped to your heart in a loving embrace,
With your light lashes just sweeping my face,
Never hereafter to wake or to weep;
Rock me to sleep, mother, rock me to sleep!

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further business in the morning hour? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10777) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Technical Services Facilities

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Training facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $6,221,000.

Benicia Arsenal, California: Utilities, $337,000.

Blue Grass Ordnance Depot, Kentucky: Utilities and ground improvements, $353,000.

Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey: Research, development, and test facilities, $850,000.

Pueblo Ordnance Depot, Colorado: Operational facilities, $369,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Community facilities and utilities, $1,000,000.

Umatilla Ordnance Depot, Oregon: Utilities and ground improvements, $319,000.

Watertown Arsenal, Massachusetts: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,849,000.

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico: Operational facilities and utilities, $1,233,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Fort Lee, Virginia: Utilities, $363,000.

Atlanta General Depot, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, $365,000.

New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, $89,000.

Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center, Massachusetts: Research, development, and test facilities, and troop housing, $3,628,000.

Richmond Quartermaster Depot, Virginia: Administrative facilities, $478,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Army Chemical Center, Maryland: Operational facilities and community facilities, $843,000.

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $334,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Research, development, and test facility, and utilities, $415,000.

Fort Monmouth, New Jersey: Research, development, and test facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, $8,803,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, utilities, and real estate, $1,838,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Brooklyn Army Terminal, New York: Utilities, $607,000.

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Administrative facilities, and troop housing, $833,000.

(Medical Corps)

Madigan General Hospital, Washington: Medical facilities, $73,000.

Walter Reed General Hospital, District of Columbia: Supply facilities, $788,000.

Field Forces Facilities

(First Army area)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Troop housing and utilities, $2,157,000.

(Second Army area)

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Research, development and test facilities, and troop housing, $6,649,000.

Fort Meade, Maryland: Operational facilities, $314,000.

(Third Army area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Medical facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, $1,956,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Training facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $1,092,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $609,000.

Fort McClellan, Alabama: Training facilities and supply facilities, $463,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $3,329,000.

(Fourth Army area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Maintenance facilities and troop housing, $1,880,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,955,000.

(Fifth Army area)

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,370,000.

Fort Riley, Kansas: Utilities, $1,332,000.

United States Army Support Center, Missouri: Administrative facilities, $2,188,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and medical facilities, $9,087,000.

(Sixth Army area)

Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $539,000.

Fort MacArthur, California: Operational facilities, $151,000.

Fort Ord, California: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $997,000.

Presidio of Monterey, California: Troop housing, $1,633,000.

Presidio of San Francisco, California: Utilities and ground improvements, $202,000.

West Coast Relay Transmitter Station, California: Operational facilities, and utilities, $1,231,000.

Yuma Test Station, Arizona: Research, development, and test facilities and community facilities, $137,000.

(Military District of Washington, District of Columbia)

Fort McNair, District of Columbia: Utilities, $263,000.

(United States Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Utilities, $350,000.

(Defense atomic support agency)

National Naval Medical Center, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,891,000.

Sandia Base, New Mexico: Hospital facilities and troop housing, $140,000.

(Alaska command area)

Fort Greely, Alaska: Family housing and community facilities, $2,649,000.

Outside the United States

(Pacific command area)

Fort Buckner, Okinawa: Operational facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $2,946,000.

Korea: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities and utilities, $4,892,000.

(Caribbean command area)

Salinas Training Area, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $208,000.

Fort Allen, Puerto Rico: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $295,000.

(European command area)

Italy: Utilities, $221,000.

(Army security agency)

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,964,000.

(Signal overseas stations)

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $806,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $45,598,000.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1961, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 104. In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments

of 1955 (69 Stat. 646) as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Inside the United States

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, 100 units.
Fort Meade, Maryland, 400 units.
Fort Ritchie, Maryland, 60 units.
Fort Campbell, Kentucky, 500 units.
Fort Rucker, Alabama, 498 units.
Fort Sill, Oklahoma, 350 units.
Fort Lewis, Washington, 500 units.
Fort Ord, California, 500 units.

Outside the United States

Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico, 100 units.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES", in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fifth Army Area)", with respect to Camp Carson, Colorado, strike out "$3,582,000" and insert in place thereof "$3,839,000".

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "$131,906,000" and "$238,870,000" and inserting in place thereof "$132,163,000" and "$239,127,000", respectively.

SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 102 "$203,331,000" and inserting in place thereof "$207,385,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 402 the amounts "$203,331,000" and "$339,601,000" and inserting in place thereof "$207,385,000" and "$343,655,000".

SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 85–241 as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Transportation Corps)", with respect to Fort Eustis, Virginia, strike out "$562,000" and insert in place thereof "$747,000".

(2) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (First Army Area)", with respect to Fort Devens, Massachusetts, strike out "$6,719,000" and insert in place thereof "$7,354,000".

(3) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fourth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas, strike out "$7,704,000" and insert in place thereof "$8,113,000".

(b) Public Law 85–241, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "$118,101,000" and "$295,580,000" and inserting in place thereof "$119,330,000" and "$296,809,000", respectively.

SEC. 108. (a) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Second Army Area)", with respect to Fort Meade, Maryland, strike out "$498,000" and insert in place thereof "$917,000".

(2) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Third Army Area)", with respect to Fort Bragg, North Carolina, strike out "$762,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,059,000"; and with respect to Fort Campbell, Kentucky, strike out "$847,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,200,000".

(b) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "$109,556,000" and "$309,466,000" and inserting in place thereof "$110,625,000" and "$310,535,000", respectively.

SEC. 109(a) Public Law 86–149 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Second Army Area)", with respect to Fort Meade, Maryland, strike out "$2,530,000" and insert in place thereof "$3,819,000".

(b) Public Law 86–149 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 402 the amounts "$72,363,100" and "$188,403,100" and inserting in place thereof "$73,652,100" and "$189,692,100", respectively.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Shipyard Facilities

David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland: Utilities, $206,000.

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $12,355,000.

Naval Facility, Fort Miles, Lewes, Delaware: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,293,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Operational facilities, and dental facilities, $738,000.

Navy Underwater Sound Laboratory, New London, Connecticut: Research, development and test facilities, $4,432,000.

Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, $2,790,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Training facilities, $509,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $6,829,000

Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, California: Utilities, $285,000.

Fleet Base Facilities

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina: Utilities, $56,000.

Naval Observatory, District of Columbia: Research, development and test facilities $250,000.

Naval Observatory, Flagstaff, Arizona: Research, development and test facilities, $1,900,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida: Utilities, $1,895,000.

Naval Station, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, $1,700,000.

Naval Weapons Facilities

(Training stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, ammunition supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $2,695,000.

(Fleet support stations)

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Operational facilities, $384,000.

Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $108,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $271,000.

Naval Degaussing Station, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, and real estate, $235,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational facilities, $178,000.

Naval Air Station, Lenmoore, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $10,568,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Maintenance facilities, $786,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California: Maintenance facilities, $244,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $965,000.

Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, $919,000.

(Marine Corps air stations)

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $272,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Operational facilities, and utilities, $1,611,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Utilities and ground improvements, $558,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $397,000.

(Special purpose stations)

Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pennsylvania: Research, development and test facilities, $1,334,000.

Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Utilities. $2,116,000.

Naval Missile Center, Point Mugu, California: Operational facilities, and on San Nicolas Island, utilities, $338,000.

Supply Facilities

Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, District of Columbia: Administrative facilities, $85,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Supply facilities, $151,000.

Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California: Utilities, $358,000.

Marine Corps Facilities

Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, $65,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Supply facilities, $82,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Troop housing, $433,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina: Troop housing, and community facilities, $1,455,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,973,000.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, $715,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California: Training facilities, $73,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twenty-nine Palms, California: Utilities, $215,000.

Service School Facilities

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Troop housing, $6,000,000.

Navy Supply Corps School, Athens, Georgia: Medical facilities, and real estate, $193,000.

Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia: Troop housing, $669,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Utilities and ground improvements, $125,000.

Fleet Sonar School, Key West, Florida: Training facilities, $1,002,000.

Communication Facilities

Naval Radio Station, Adak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $670,000.

Naval Radio Station, Annapolis, Maryland: Operational facilities, and utilities, $795,000.

Naval Radio Station, Cheltenham, Maryland: Operational facilities, $396,000.

Naval Radio Station, Dixon, California: Operational facilities, $2,474,000.

Naval Radio Station, Skaggs Island, California: Operational facilities, $1,579,000.

Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $357,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine: Operational facilities, $2,279,000.

Outside the United States

Shipyard Facilities

Naval Facility, Bermuda: Operational facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $908,000.

Naval Facility, Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, $200,000.

Fleet Base Facilities

Joint United States Military Mission, Golcuk, Turkey: Family housing, $675,000.

Naval Weapons Facilities

Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, $822,000.

Naval Station, Argentia, Newfoundland, Canada: Operational facilities, $462,000.

Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan: Operational facilities, and utilities, $416,000.

Marine Corps Air Facilities, Iwakuni, Japan: Operational facilities, $910,000.

Naval Air Facilities, Naha, Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands: Family housing, and troop housing, $5,943,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, $460,000.

Naval Station, Rota, Spain: Operational facilities, and family housing, $2,414,000.

Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Sicily, Italy: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $347,000.

Communication Facilities

Naval Radio Station, Barrigada, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, $68,000.

Naval Radio Station, Finegayen, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, $469,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Galeta Island, Canal Zone: Operational facilities, $1,750,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Karamursel, Turkey: Operational facilities, $84,000.

Naval Radio Station, Martin Pena, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, $72,000.

Naval Radio Facility, San Miguel, Luzon, Republic of the Philippines: Operational facilities and utilities, $383,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $18,208,000.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1961, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 204. In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California, nine hundred units.

Marine Corp Base, Camp Pendleton, California, four hundred units.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, five hundred units.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, two hundred and fifty units.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida, five hundred units.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, five hundred units.

Naval Post Graduate School, Monterey, California, two hundred and fifty units.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, forty units.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California, three hundred units.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, one hundred and fifty units.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Fleet Support Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida, strike out "$2,224,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,724,000".

(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$308,624,000" and "$578,801,300" and inserting in place thereof "$309,134,600", and "$579,301,300", respectively.

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Receiving Station, District of Columbia, strike out the amount "$650,000" and insert in place thereof "$850,000".

(2) Under the subheading "COMMUNICATION FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine, strike out the amount "$38,654,000" and insert in place thereof "$45,954,000".

(b) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202 the amount "$75,301,000" and inserting in place thereof "$93,101,000".

(c) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$216,809,000", "$75,-301,000", and "$325,994,000" and inserting in place thereof "$224,309,000", "$93,101,000", and "$351,294,000", respectively.

SEC. 207. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, upon such terms and conditions as he may determine to be in the public interest, to convey to the State of Oregon the lands, including acquired and public domain lands, comprising the Boardman Bombing Range in the State of Oregon, as delineated on a map designated as War Department-Office of the Division Engineer-North Pacific Division-Real Estate-Boardman Precision Bombing Range, approved February 17, 1947, drawing numbered O–31–52. The conveyance of such lands to the State of Oregon shall be made in exchange for a conveyance, without restriction as to use, to the United States of such lands of the State of Oregon as the Secretary of the Navy shall find suitable for use as a bombing range, and upon payment by the State of Oregon to the United States of such amount as the Secretary of the Navy determines to represent the total of (1) the difference, if any, between the fair market value of the property so conveyed by the Secretary of the Navy and the fair market value of the land accepted in exchange therefor, and (2) the cost to the Department of the Navy of providing a complete substitute facility on the State lands so acquired.

(b) The State of Oregon shall agree to be primarily liable and hold the United States harmless from any claims for personal injury or property damage resulting from the condition of the lands conveyed by the United States.

(3) Of the lands conveyed to the United States by the State of Oregon, 37,320.31 acres thereof, as agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Navy, shall become public domain lands of the United States subject to all the laws and regulations applicable thereto, but shall remain withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, and shall be reserved for use as a bombing range under the administration of the Department of the Navy until such withdrawal and reservation is revoked by order of the Secretary of the Interior with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Navy. The remaining acreage of the lands conveyed to the United States shall become a part of the lands comprising the substitute bombing range and shall be administered by the Department of the Navy.

(d) The money received by the Secretary of the Navy in connection with the exchange authorized by this Act shall be disbursed as follows: (1) the difference in the fair market value between the public domain lands conveyed by the United States and the lands designated as public domain lands under subsection (c) shall be distributed as a receipt from the sale of public domain lands; (2) the difference in the fair market value between the remaining lands exchanged shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt; and (3) the amount received to defray the cost of providing a complete substitute facility shall be available to the Department of the Navy for the construction and acquisition of such complete substitute facility.

(e) The Department of the Navy shall not be required to relinquish use of the Boardman Bombing Range until the complete substitute facility is available for use.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Air Defense Command

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Maintenance facilities and community facilities, $197,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $456,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $2,571,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Maintenance facilities and troop housing, $419,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $2,874,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and community facilities, $299,000.

Kincheloe Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, $3,382,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $854,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, $2,882,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $451,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and real estate, $732,000.

Paine Air Force Base, Everett, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,985,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $131,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,383,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Maintenance facilities and community facilities, $411,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,272,000.

Air Material Command

Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $400,000.

Gentile Air Force Station, Dayton, Ohio: Operational facilities, $422,000.

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,725,000.

Heath Maintenance Annex, Newark, Ohio: Maintenance facilities, $3,907,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $4,095,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $638,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,169,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California: Ground improvements, $169,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,478,000.

Stockbridge Test Annex, Rome, New York: Research development, and test facilities, $2,653,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $1,032,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $1,810,000.

Air Research and Development Command

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, $10,500,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development, and test facilities, and community facilities, $171,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $2,312,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Utilities, $424,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, utilities, and real estate, $3,596,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and real estate, $2,011,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $5,065,000.

Sacramento Peak Upper Air Research Site, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, $166,000.

Air Training Command

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,098,000.

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Troop housing, $734,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $670,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, $2,499,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $5,427,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Maintenance facilities and utilities, $1,256,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $2,709,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia; Training facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,389,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities, and real estate, $3,752,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Utilities, $182,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Training facilities, $268,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities and medical facilities, $928,000.

Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Operational facilities and medical facilities, $457,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $292,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $938,000.

Air University

Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Training facilities and troop housing, $548,000.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Operational facilities, hospital facilities, and troop housing, $4,757,000.

Alaskan Air Command

Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $5,178,000.

Galena Airport, Alaska: Operational facilities, $1,965,000.

King Salmon Airport, Alaska: Operational facilities, $973,000.

Various locations, Alaska: Operational facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,524,000.

Headquarters Command

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $3,109,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Aeronautical Chart and Information Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Administrative facilities, $3,200,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational facilities, $147,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities, $156,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Operational facilities and community facilities, $999,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Medical facilities, $41,000.

Pacific Air Forces

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $265,000.

Strategic Air Command

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Maintenance facilities, $109,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Operational facilities, $7,265,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,558,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $974,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,487,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $1,647,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational facilities, $170,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, and community facilities, $2,760,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,221,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, $2,921,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational facilities, $222,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities and real estate, $2,575,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational facilities, $776,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational facilities and community facilities, $5,951,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $635,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Operational facilities, $445,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, $3,541,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Operational facilities, $463,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, $734,000.

Larsen Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,282,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational facilities, $500,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $7,428,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational facilities, $786,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational facilities and administrative facilities, $695,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $3,458,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Operational facilities, $80,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,895,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Maintenance facilities and utilities, $1,284,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Operational facilities, $156,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $177,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Operational facilities, $561,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $2,400,000.

Tactical Air Command

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Operational facilities, $1,021,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $1,176,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Maintenance facilities, $50,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,645,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $222,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, $2,223,000.

Pope Air Force Base, Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Maintenance facilities, $200,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,672,000.

Aircraft Control and Warning System

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, $22,938,000.

Miscellaneous Facilities

Various locations: Family housing, $750,000.

Special Facilities

Various locations: Operational facilities and administrative facilities, $684,000.

Outside the United States

Military Air Transport Service

Various locations: Utilities, $140,000.

Pacific Air Forces

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $27,777,000.

Strategic Air Command

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Utilities, $850,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, $70,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $3,797,000.

United States Air Forces in Europe

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $33,362,000.

United States Air Force Security Service

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $8,758,000.

Special Facilities

Various locations: Operational facilities, $4,308,000.

Aircraft Control and Warning System

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $25,637,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for ballistic missiles by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $408,600,000.

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permament or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1961, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 304. In accordance with the provisions of Title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

Beale Air Force Base, California, two hundred and thirty units.

Brooks Air Force Base, Texas, one hundred and seventy units.

Griffiss Air Force Base, New York, one hundred and thirty-five units.

Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, one hundred units.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, five hundred units.

Turner Air Force Base, Georgia, four hundred and thirty units.

Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts, one hundred and eighty units.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND", with respect to Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon, strike out "$229,000" and insert in place thereof "$290,000".

(b) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended, by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$544,239,000" and "$954,493,000" and inserting in place thereof "$544,300,000" and "$954,554,000", respectively.

"SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 86–149, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "ALASKAN AIR COMMAND", with respect to Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, strike out "$1,150,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,409,000".

(2) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND", with respect to March Air Force Base, Riverside, California, strike out "$6,052,000" and insert in place thereof "and real estate, $8,271,000."

(3) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND", with respect to England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana, strike out "$2,468,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,669,000".

(b) Public Law 86–149 is amended by striking out in section 302 the amount "$417,541,000" and inserting in place thereof "$467,541,000".

(c) Public Law 86–149 is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the amounts of "$296,897,800", "$417,541,000", and "$797,496,800" and inserting in place thereof "$299,576,800", "$467,541,000" and "$850,175,800", respectively.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities required for advanced research projects and in connection therewith may acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in the total amount of $20,000,000.

SEC. 402. (a) Section 401 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 659), is amended by striking out "$50,000,000" and inserting in place thereof "$73,545,000".

(b) Section 502 of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 660), is amended by striking out in clause (4) "$50,000,000" and inserting in place thereof "$73,545,000".

SEC. 403. Section 7 of Public Law 85–325, dated February 12, 1958 (72 Stat. 13), as amended, is hereby repealed.

TITLE V

General provisions

SEC. 501. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529, 40 U.S.C. 259, 267), and sections 477(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use) by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $79,552,000; outside the United States, $12,332,000; section 102, $45,598,000; section 103, $10,000,000; or a total of $147,482,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $81,361,000; outside the United States, $16,383,000; section 202, $18,208,000; section 203, $10,000,000; or a total of $125,952,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $202,240,000; outside the United States, $104,699,000; section 302, $408,600,000; section 303, $10,000,000; or a total of $725,539,000.

(4) for title IV: $20,000,000.

SEC. 503. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska, if he determines in the case of any particular project that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost arising in connection with that project, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such project was submitted to the Congress. However, the total costs of all projects in each such title may

not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 504. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313(b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 505. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States and its possessions, under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 506. As of July 1, 1961, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before August 21, 1958, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1961, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guarantee for family housing in the amount of $100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

(4) notwithstanding the provisions of section 406 of the Act of August 10, 1959 (73 Stat. 302, 319), the authorization for—

(a) operational and training facilities in the amount of $1,246,000, maintenance facilities in the amount of $1,335,000, utilities and ground improvements in the amount of $275,000, all at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "Third Army Area" of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 533);

(b) administrative facilities in the amount of $350,000 at Fort Bliss, Texas, that is contained in title I, section 101 under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Fourth Army Area)" of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 992), as amended by title I, section 107(a) of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 536);

(c) maintenance facilities in the amount of $809,000 at Fort Ord, California, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Sixth Army Area)" of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 533);

(d) classified facilities in the amount of $3,664,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 534);

(e) clearance easements and land acquisition in the amount of $63,300 at Atlanta General Depot, Georgia, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Quartermaster Corps)" of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531);

(f) tactical air navigation facility in the amount of $39,000 at the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Saufley Field, Florida, that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Naval Air Training Stations)" of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 537);

(g) operational facilities in the amount of $8,479,000 at the Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Fleet Support Air Stations)" that is contained in title II, section 201, of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 538);

(h) operational facilities in the amount of $1,500,000 at the Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and the subheading "MARINE CORPS FACILITIES" that is contained in title II, section 201 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 538);

(i) utilities in the amount of $120,000 at the Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and the subheading "YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES" that is contained in title II, section 201 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 539);

(j) community facilities in the amount of $759,000 at the Naval Station, Adak, Alaska, under the heading "OUTSDE THE UNITED STATES" and the subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES" that is contained in title II, section 201, of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 539);

(k) operational facilities (guided missile support facilities) in the amount of $428,000 at the Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES" that is contained in title II, section 201 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 540);

(l) operational facilities in the amount of $5,619,000 at the Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES" that is contained in title II, section 201 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 540), and

(m) medical facilities in the amount of $4,136,000 for Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan, that is contained in title III, section 301 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 344) as amended.

(n) solar facilities in the amount of $4,401,000 for Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and the subheading "AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND" that is contained in title III, section 301 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 545), as amended.

SEC. 507. (a) Section 803(a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out in the last proviso the word "twenty" and inserting in place thereof the word "twenty-five".

(b) Section 406(a) of Public Law 85-241, as amended, is amended by inserting a comma after the word "activities" and adding the following "and no certificates with respect to any family housing units shall be issued by the Secretary of Defense or his designee under section 810 of the National Housing Act, as amended,".

(c) Paragraph (B) of section 803(b)(3) of such Act is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a colon and the following: *"And provided further,* That subject to the limitations of this paragraph no family unit included in any mortgaged property shall be contracted for after the date of enactment of the Military Construction Act of 1960 if the cost of such unit exceeds $19,800."

SEC. 508. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to issue certificates under section 810 of the National Housing Act, as amended, for family housing units at the following locations:

Crystal Springs Air Force Station, Mississippi, twenty-seven units;

Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, two hundred units;

Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, one hundred units;

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, one hundred units;

Naval Activities, New York, New York, five hundred units;

Naval Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana, one hundred and seventy-eight units;

Naval Base, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, four hundred units;

Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, two hundred units;

Syracuse Air Force Station, New York, two hundred and fifty units;

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, two hundred units.

SEC. 509. Section 407 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 557), as amended, is further amended by adding the following subsection:

"(g) The Secretaries of Defense and Health, Education, and Welfare, in order to insure as far as possible that family housing under their jurisdiction is adequate as public quarters and fully utilized, shall maintain such continual surveillance and conduct such periodic surveys of such quarters as they shall deem necessary for this purpose. Where either Secretary or his designee determines, on the basis of such surveys, that it is not in the best interest of the United States to improve, demolish, or otherwise dispose of any quarters which have been determined inadequate under this section, he may exempt such quarters from the requirements of subsection (e) of this section: *Provided,* That any quarters so exempted must be improved, demolished, or otherwise disposed of not later than July 1, 1963."

SEC. 510. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, may, with respect to any housing owned by the United States which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, and which has been constructed, as rental housing and is occupied by personnel of the Department of Defense on a rental basis, utilize the proceeds from the rental of such housing for maintenance, repairs, and rehabilitation thereof.

SEC. 511. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, at least 75 per centum of the total cost of any family housing project or community facility hereafter constructed or acquired in any foreign country by the Department of Defense or any military department shall be paid for from foreign currencies acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; except that the following projects authorized pursuant to this Act shall not be subject to this requirement:

Air Force activities, Japan, one hundred fifty units;

Cigli Air Base, Turkey, community facilities;

Clark Air Force Base, Philippine Islands, one hundred units;

Iraklion Air Station, Crete, community facilities;

Kirknewton RAF, United Kingdom, fifty units;

Naval Air Station, Naha, Okinawa, two hundred; and

Site I–5, Italy, one hundred units and community facilities.

SEC. 512. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project within the continental United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) $32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

(2) $6 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) $1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

(4) $8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

SEC. 513. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 2662 is amended to read:

"§ 2662. Real property transactions: Reports to the Armed Services Committees

"(a) The Secretary of a military department, or his designee, may not enter into any of the following listed transactions by or for the use of that department until after the expiration of 30 days from the date upon which a report of the facts concerning the proposed transaction is submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives:

"(1) An acquisition of fee title to any real property, if the estimated price is more than $50,000.

"(2) A lease of any real property to the United States, if the estimated annual rental is more than $50,000.

"(3) A lease of real property owned by the United States, if the estimated annual rental is more than $50,000.

"(4) A transfer of real property owned by the United States to another Federal agency or another military department or to a State, if the estimated value is more than $50,000.

"(5) A report of excess real property owned by the United States to a disposal agency, if the estimated value is more than $50,000.

If a transaction covered by clause (1) or (2) is part of a project, the report must include a summarization of the general plan for that project, including an estimate of the total cost of the lands to be acquired or leases to be made.

"(b) The Secretary of each military department shall report quarterly to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on transactions described in subsection (a) that involve an estimated value of more than $5,000 but not more than $50,000.

"(c) This section applies only to real property in the United States and Puerto Rico. It does not apply to real property for river and harbor projects or flood-control projects, or to leases of Government-owned real property for agricultural or grazing purposes.

"(d) A statement in an instrument of conveyance, including a lease, that the requirements of this section have been met, or that the conveyance is not subject to this section, is conclusive."

(2) Chapter 159 is amended by deleting the following item in the analysis:

"2662. Real property transactions: Agreement With Armed Services Committees; reports."

and inserting the following item in lieu thereof:

"2662. Real property transactions: Reports to the Armed Services Committees."

SEC. 514. Section 43 of the Act of August 10, 1956 (70A Stat. 636, 50 U.S.C. App. 2285), is amended to read:

"§ 43. Real property transactions

"(a) The Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, or his designee, may not enter into any of the following listed transactions by or for the use of that agency until after the expiration of thirty days from the date upon which a report of the facts concerning the proposed transaction is submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives:

"(1) An acquisition of fee title to any real property, if the estimated price is more than $50,000.

"(2) A lease of any real property to the United States, if the estimated annual rental is more than $50,000.

"(3) A lease of real property owned by the United States if, the estimated annual rental is more than $50,000.

"(4) A transfer of real property owned by the United States to another Federal agency or another military department, or to a State, if the estimated value is more than $50,000.

"(5) A report of excess real property owned by the United States to a disposal agency if the estimated value is more than $50,000.

If a transaction covered by clause (1) or (2) is part of a project, the report must include a summarization of the general plan for that project, including an estimate of the total cost of the lands to be acquired or leases to be made.

"(b) The Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization shall report quarterly to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on transactions described in subsection (a) that involve an estimated value of more than $5,000 but not more than $50,000.

"(c) This section applies only to real property in the United States and Puerto Rico. It does not apply to real property for river and harbor projects or flood-control projects, or to leases of Government-owned real property for agricultural or grazing purposes.

"(d) A statement in an instrument of conveyance, including a lease, that the requirements of this section have been met, or that the conveyance is not subject to this section, is conclusive."

SEC. 515. Titles I, II, III, IV, and V of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Act of 1960".

TITLE VI

Reserve Forces facilities

SEC. 601. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for reserve forces:

(1) For Department of the Army:

Army National Guard of the United States

(Armory)

Abbeville, Alabama: Training facilities, $71,000.

Aibonito, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $63,000.

Alexandria, Louisiana: Training facilities, $311,000.

Anaconda, Montana: Training facilities, $66,000.

Angleton, Texas: Training facilities, $85,000.

Barbourville, Kentucky: Training facilities, $138,000.

Bastrop, Louisiana: Training facilities, $131,000.

Beatrice, Nebraska: Training facilities, $165,000.

Bismarck, North Dakota: Training facilities, $265,000.

Bogalusa, Louisiana: Training facilities, $180,000.

Boston (Jamaica Plain), Massachusetts: Training facilities, $360,000.

Brockton, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $255,000.

Brooklyn (Eighth), New York: Training facilities, $75,000.

Brooklyn (Sumner), New York: Training facilities, $75,000.

Brownsville, Texas: Training facilities, $85,000.

Burlington, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $140,000.

Carmichael, California: Training facilities, $115,000.

Carson City, Nevada: Training facilities, $101,000.

Carthage, Mississippi: Training facilities, $63,000.

Carthage, Texas: Training facilities, $85,000.

Casa Grande, Arizona: Training facilities, $108,000.

Charleston, West Virginia: Training facilities, $250,000.

Claremont, New Hampshire: Training facilities, $139,000.

Clayton, New Mexico: Training facilities, $70,000.

Clear Lake, South Dakota: Training facilities, $63,000.

Columbus, Texas: Training facilities, $87,000.

Cortez, Colorado: Training facilities, $114,000.

Cranston, Rhode Island: Training facilities, $184,000.

Crete, Nebraska: Training facilities, $120,000.

Danville, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

De Kalb, Mississippi: Training facilities, $63,000.

Dover, New Hampshire: Training facilities, $139,000.

Dover, New Jersey: Training facilities, $190,000.

Driggs, Idaho: Training facilities, $80,000.

Dumas, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Elkins, West Virginia: Training facilities, $157,000.

Elko, Nevada: Training facilities, $97,000.

Escondido, California: Training facilities, $105,000.

Eupora, Mississippi: Training facilities, $63,000.

Forest, Mississippi: Training facilities, $64,000.

Georgianna, Alabama: Training facilities, $71,000.

Gurabo, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $130,000.

Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $104,000.

Hartwell, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Hawthorne, Nevada: Training facilities, $97,000.

Heber Springs, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Hettinger, North Dakota: Training facilities, $100,000.

Hinton, West Virginia: Training facilities, $157,000.

Honolulu, Hawaii: Training facilities, $102,000.

Hot Springs, South Dakota: Training facilities, $132,000.

Howell, Michigan: Training facilities, $250,000.

Islip, New York: Training facilities, $300,000.

Jackson, Mississippi: Training facilities, $232,000.

Jacksonville, Florida: Training facilities, $243,000.

Jasper, Indiana: Training facilities, $218,000.

Kings Mountain, North Carolina: Training facilities, $104,000.
Laredo, Texas: Training facilities, $87,000.
Las Vegas, New Mexico: Training facilities, $70,000.
Lavonia, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.
Lawrence, Kansas: Training facilities, $102,000.
Lawrenceville, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.
Lehighton, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $240,000.
Levelland, Texas: Training facilities, $85,000.
Lewiston, Montana: Training facilities, $66,000.
Lexington, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $255,000.
Logan, Ohio: Training facilities, $150,000.
Louisville, Kentucky: Training facilities, $285,000.
Marshall, Arkansas: Training facilities, $47,000.
Mendenhall, Mississippi: Training facilities, $63,000.
Montgomery, West Virginia: Training facilities, $189,000.
Mountain Home, Arkansas: Training facilities, $47,000.
Natchitoches, Louisiana: Training facilities, $161,000.
Newberry, South Carolina: Training facilities, $136,000.
Newport, Oregon: Training facilities, $120,000.
Northfield, Minnesota: Training facilities, $49,000.
Orofino, Idaho: Training facilities, $75,000.
Oshkosh, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $235,000.
Perryville, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.
Philip, South Dakota: Training facilities, $145,000.
Pittsfield, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $195,000.
Plymouth, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $185,000.
Portland, Oregon: Training facilities, $393,000.
Redding, California: Training facilities, $105,000.
Richlands, Virginia: Training facilities, $161,000.
Richmond, Indiana: Training facilities, $188,000.
Richmond, Missouri: Training facilities, $135,000.
Riverdal New Jersey: Training facilities, $171,000.
Rolla, Missouri: Training facilities, $150,000.
Sabana Grande, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $63,000.
Sacramento, California: Training facilities, $72,000.
Safford, Arizona: Training facilities, $113,000.
Schenectady, New York: Training facilities, $108,000.
Scottsburg, Indiana: Training facilities, $188,000.
Sheldon, Iowa: Training facilities, $113,000.
Sheridan, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.
Siloam Springs, Arkansas: Training facilities, $47,000.
Spartanburg, South Carolina: Training facilities, $134,000.
Spencer, West Virginia: Training facilities, $157,000.
Springfield, Illinois: Training facilities, $50,000.
Springfield, Missouri: Training facilities, $240,000.
Statesboro, Georgia: Training facilities, $120,000.
Stoughton, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $210,000.
Stratford (Bridgeport), Connecticut: Training facilities, $415,000.
Union City, Tennessee: Training facilities, $87,000.
Vergennes, Vermont: Training facilities, $135,000.
Weymouth, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $180,000.
Worland, Wyoming: Training facilities, $141,000.
Various locations: Training facilities minor conversions, $423,000.

Army National Guard of the United States

(Nonarmory)

Camp Murray, Washington: Supply facilities, $159,000.
Camp Ripley, Minnesota: Troop housing and utilities, $910,000.
Camp Shelby, Mississippi: Troop housing, $846,000.
Fort William H. Harrison, Montana: Troop housing, administrative facilities and supply facilities, $123,000.
Fort Stewart, Georgia: Troop housing, $846,000.
Salt Lake City, Utah: Administrative facilities and supply facilities, $266,000.

Army Reserve

Albany, New York: Training facilities addition, $61,000.
Alexandria, Virginia: Training facilities, $553,000.
Artesia, New Mexico: Training facilities, $173,000.
Ashtabula-Geneva, Ohio: Training facilities, $182,000.
Bluefield, West Virginia: Training facilities, $173,000.
Bogalusa, Louisiana: Training facilities, $183,000.
Boulder, Colorado: Training facilities, $350,000.
Clarksburg, West Virginia: Training facilities, $350,000.
Cleveland, Ohio: Training facilities, $746,000.
Columbus, Nebraska: Training facilities, $173,000.
Creston, Iowa: Training facilities, $173,000.
Dallas (Number 3), Texas: Training facilities, $525,000.
Elmira (Horseheads), New York: Training facilities addition, $61,000.
Eureka, California: Training facilities, $182,000.
Fort Thomas, Kentucky: Training facilities, $476,000.
High Point, North Carolina: Training facilities, $156,000.
Houma, Louisiana: Training facilities, $164,000.
Kalispell, Montana: Training facilities, $190,000.
Kingsport, Tennessee: Training facilities, $333,000.
Lafayette, Indiana: Training facilities addition, $58,000.
Lancaster-Logan, Ohio: Training facilities, $182,000.
Le Sueur, Minnesota: Training facilities, $190,000.
Lewiston-Auburn, Maine: Training facilities, $523,000.
Lincoln, Nebraska: Training facilities addition, $55,000.
Los Angeles (Number 2), California: Training facilities addition, $73,000.
Louisville, Kentucky: Training facilities addition, $55,000.
Lubbock, Texas: Training facilities expansion, $111,000.
Madisonville, Kentucky: Training facilities, $173,000.
Marion, Illinois: Training facilities, $182,000.
Miami (North), Florida: Training facilities, $498,000.
Mount Pleasant, Iowa: Training facilities, $173,000.
New Castle, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $182,000.
Norfolk, Nebraska: Training facilities, $173,000.
Oak Ridge, Tennessee: Training facilities, $164,000.
Palatka, Florida: Training facilities, $156,000.
Pasadena, California: Training facilities addition, $58,000.
Pasadena, Texas: Training facilities, $333,000.
Penn Yan, New York: Training facilities, $190,000.
Petersburg (Fort Lee), Virginia: Training facilities, $452,000.
Pittsburg, California: Training facilities, $366,000.
Rushville, Indiana: Training facilities, $182,000.
Shawnee, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $173,000.
State College, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $303,000.
Tampa (Drew Field), Florida: Training facilities, $428,000.
Tobyhanna, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $182,000.
Toledo, Ohio: Training facilities expansion, $77,000.
Troy, Ohio: Training facilities, $182,000.
Tupelo, Mississippi: Training facilities, $167,000.
Ventura, California: Training facilities, $366,000.
Wailuku-Maui, Hawaii: Training facilities, $225,000.
Willmar, Minnesota: Training facilities, $190,000.
Winston-Salem, North Carolina: Training facilities addition, $49,000.
Yoakum, Texas: Training facilities, $164,000.
Various locations: Training facilities minor additions, $179,000.
Land acquisition: Training facilities, $671,000.

(2) For Department of the Navy:

Naval Reserve

(Aviation)

Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Operational facilities, $130,000.
Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Operational facilities, $1,298,000.
Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Operational facilities, $150,000.
Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Supply facilities and utilities, $306,000.
Naval Air Station, Minneapolis, Minnesota: Operational facilities, $178,000.
Naval Air Station, New York, New York: Operational facilities, $471,000.
Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Operational facilities, $121,000.
Naval Air Station, Seattle, Washington: Operational facilities, $181,000.
Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $300,000.
Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $575,000.

Naval Reserve

(Surface)

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Appleton, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $47,000.
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Auburn, California: Training facilities, $75,000.
Naval Reserve Training Center, Fort McHenry, Baltimore, Maryland: Training facilities, $300,000.
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Boulder, Colorado: Training facilities, $56,000.
Naval Reserve Training Center, Brooklyn, New York: Training facilities, $75,000.
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Corvallis, Oregon: Training facilities, $56,000.
Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Eau Claire, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $55,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Fayetteville, Arkansas: Training facilities, $87,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Freeport, New York: Training facilities, $35,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Helena, Montana: Training facilities, $56,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Medford, Oregon: Training facilities, $56,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Paris, Texas: Training facilities and land acquisition, $90,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Phoenix, Arizona: Training facilities, $600,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Provo, Utah: Training facilities, $56,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Red Bluff, California: Training facilities, $80,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Redding, California: Training facilities $80,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Topeka, Kansas: Training facilities, $383,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Wenatchee, Washington: Training facilities, $65,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Yuba City, California: Training facilities, $75,000.

Marine Corps Reserve

(Ground)

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Acquisition of land and training facilities, $65,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Phoenix, Arizona: Training facilities, $225,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Topeka, Kansas: Training facilities, $123,000.

(3) For Department of the Air Force:

Air National Guard of the United States

Barnes Municipal Airport, Westfield, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $675,000.

Congaree Air Base, Columbia, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $432,000.

Fort Smith Municipal Airport, Fort Smith, Arkansas: Operational facilities, $164,000.

Foss Field, Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Operational facilities, $675,000.

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $604,000.

Hutchinson Naval Air Station, Hutchinson, Kansas: Operational facilities, $1,389,000.

Jackson Municipal Airport, Jackson, Mississippi: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $2,689,000.

Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon: Operational facilities, $314,000.

Springfield Municipal Airport, Springfield, Ohio: Operational facilities, $164,000.

Westchester County Municipal Airport, Westchester, New York: Operational facilities, $120,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $5,771,000.

Air Force Reserve

Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Indiana: Operational facilities, $237,000.

Bradley Field, Windsor Locks, Connecticut: Maintenance facilities and troop housing, $150,000.

Dallas Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $1,992,000.

Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, $1,268,000.

Ellington Air Force Base, Genoa, Texas: Operational facilities, $534,000.

General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $155,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Operational facilities, $161,000.

(4) For all reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility to be undertaken under this subsection.

SEC. 602. (a) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "ARMY RESERVE" in clause (3) of section 603 with respect to Galesburg, Illinois, by striking out "$157,000" and inserting in place thereof "$182,000".

(b) Public Law 85–685 is amended under the heading "ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)" in clause (3) of Section 603 as follows:

(1) With respect to Dallas number 5, Texas, strike out "$154,000" and insert in place thereof "$351,000".

(2) With respect to Jerome, Idaho, strike out "$52,000" and insert in place thereof "$72,000".

(3) Strike out the following:

"Boston, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $270,000."

"Juncos, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $38,000."

"Mayaguez, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $160,000."

"Oak Ridge, Tennessee: Training facilities, $142,000."

"Saugus, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $210,000."

"South Boston, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $360,000."

(c) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 606 "$27,079,000" and inserting in place thereof "$26,141,000".

(d) Public Law 86–149 is amended under the heading "ARMY RESERVE" in clause (1) of section 501 as follows:

(1) With respect to Aurora, Illinois, strike out "$302,000" and insert in place thereof "$366,000".

(2) With respect to Bloomington, Indiana, strike out "$302,000" and insert in place thereof "$366,000".

(3) With respect to Champaign, Illinois, strike out "$302,000" and insert in place thereof "$366,000".

(4) With respect to Duluth, Minnesota, strike out "$317,000" and insert in place thereof "$384,000".

(5) With respect to Jefferson City, Missouri, strike out "$288,000" and insert in place thereof "$349,000".

(6) With respect to Joliet, Illinois, strike out "$302,000" and insert in place thereof "$366,000".

(7) With respect to Mount Vernon, Ohio, strike out "$168,000" and insert in place thereof "$182,000".

(8) With respect to Odessa, Texas, strike out "$152,000" and insert in place thereof "$175,000".

(9) With respect to Savannah, Georgia, strike out "$259,000" and insert in place thereof "$315,000".

(10) With respect to Vallejo, California, strike out "$302,000" and insert in place thereof "$366,000".

(e) Public Law 86–149 is amended by striking out in clause (1)(a) of section 504 "$20,916,000" and inserting in place thereof "$21,457,000".

SEC. 603. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 604. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 601 for the respective reserve components of the Armed Forces may not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Army:

(a) Army National Guard of the United States, $18,093,000;

(b) Army Reserve, $13,089,000;

(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $6,450,000;

(3) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air National Guard of the United States, $12,997,000.

(b) Air Force Reserve, $4,497,000.

SEC. 605. Any of the amounts named in section 601 of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Army National Guard of the United States, the Army Reserve, the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Air Force Reserve, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses (1)(a), (1)(b), (2), (3)(a), and (3)(b) of section 604, respectively.

SEC. 606. As of July 1, 1961, all authorizations for specific facilities for reserve forces to be accomplished by the Secretary of Defense, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in the Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1958, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization, are repealed except the authorizations for facilities for the reserve forces as to which appropriated funds have been obligated in whole or in part before July 1, 1961, and authorizations for appropriations therefor.

SEC. 607. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1960."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has the unfinished business been laid before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which is a complete substitute for the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate provides construction and other related authority for the military departments within and outside the United States, including authority for the construction of facilities for the Reserve components. The total sum of the new authorizations contained in the bill is $1,074,099,000. The Army would be authorized $147 million; the Navy, $126 million; the Air Force, $726 million; the

Department of Defense, $20 million; and a total of $55 million for the various units of the Reserve forces.

In addition thereto, approval is granted for an increase of $110,766,000 in prior years authority for a total authorization of $1,184,865,000. I should like to call attention to the fact that the bill, as originally submitted to the Congress, and upon which the House acted, called for authorizations in the amount of $1,142,122,000. Subsequently, however, the Department of Defense requested numerous revisions, including major changes in the air defense program, resulting in a revised request of $1,219,555,000, which is $77,433,000 above the amount contained in the original bill. Thus, the Senate committee was called upon to pass upon many major items not considered by the House. The authorization granted is $34,690,000 below the amounts requested.

By way of review: In new authority, the Army is authorized $147.4 million; the Navy, $125.9 million; the Air Force, $725.5 million; the Department of Defense, $20 million; and $55 million for the Reserve components.

In addition, the bill also contains authority for the construction of 9,541 units for family housing, consisting of 653 units to be constructed from appropriated funds, 8,543 units under the Capehart Act, and 345 units overseas programed under the surplus commodity program. The Secretary of Defense is also given the authority to issue certificates, under section 810 of the National Housing Act, for 2,155 units of housing. Some of the latter units have previously been authorized under other programs; and the inclusion of this provision does not necessarily mean that these houses will be constructed, but simply permits the Secretary of Defense to explore the feasibility of the section 810 program. Later, I shall discuss further these housing provisions.

The basic policy of Defense Department planning continues to have, as principal elements, the following: first, possession of a powerful retaliatory capability, which is considered mandatory as a war deterrent; second, the responsibility to maintain a capability to apply military force promptly in various local conflict areas of the free world; and, third, continuation of a strong continental air defense and maintenance of open sea lanes. The items included in the bill support these policies.

The committee, during its examination of the project, took particular care to verify that all items included in this bill were needed to support the long-term future military plans, eliminating all items for which a compelling military necessity did not exist.

This bill contains, first, construction which is necessary in support of new weapons systems and new defense concepts; second, construction needed in the augmentation of existing bases to support changes in weapons and operating concepts which are due to advancing technological development; and, third, construction needed to modernize support facilities which, because of deferred maintenance, must be improved to assure adequate capability at a time of demand.

Now I should like to deal more specifically with certain areas of concern to the committee in considering the bill.

As mentioned earlier, the bill considered by the committee was a revised version of the one originally submitted to the Congress in early February of this year. The principal revision requested by the Defense Department related to a change in the air defense and ballistic missile programs. Several major items were deleted from the bill and others were added, the net effect being an increase in this area of over $73 million.

I wish to emphasize these few comments now, because I am speaking not only for myself, but, I think, for the entire subcommittee.

The committee's concern over the air defense picture has been made abundantly clear over the past several years. Emphasis has repeatedly been placed upon the need for prompt clear-cut decisions on the part of the Department of Defense to avoid costly duplications and waste in the air defense program and to assure a balance between our offensive and defensive forces. We have consistently taken such steps as were available to us to bring forth the desired decisions from the Defense Establishment.

During consideration of the military construction authorization bill last year, in response to the committee's suggestions, the Secretary of Defense submitted a revised plan for air defense. This plan particularly called for revisions in the ground-to-air missile program and in the electronic ground environment so necessary to the control of the weapons and the air battle. The committee received this revised plan with some reservations as to the premises and philosophy employed, and requested the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to again carefully review the proposed new program before proceeding with the construction of new ground-to-air missile sites.

By letter dated September 10, 1959, the Secretary of Defense then advised the committee that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had reviewed the plan in accordance with the directive of the committee and that all currently authorized surface-to-air missile sites were required by military necessity. He concurred in these recommendations. Again, as late as February 1960, certain questions were submitted to the Department of Defense with reference to the air defense problem designed to determine if there had been any significant changes in the planning since the Secretary of Defense appeared before the committee to present the revised air defense plan in June 1959.

Under date of February 9, 1960, a reply was received from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, which, in part, stated:

> With respect to the objectives of the June 1959 Department of Defense air defense plan, there has been no significant departure from the concepts enunciated therein, although some differences in detail have developed. * * * The force levels established for Bomarc, Nike-Hercules, and manned interceptors have not changed since the plan was originally presented.

The military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1961, as originally submitted to the Congress around the first of February, was apparently based on these contentions.

Prior to the time the committee could complete consideration of the bill, however, the Department of the Air Force again drastically revised its air defense planning, although no testimony had been presented to indicate any major change in the air defense threat since the submission of the revised plan in June 1959. The details of the most recent revised plan are, of course, classified; but, generally, the new plan consists of placing greater emphasis on the intercontinental ballistic missile program, a new concept for the electronic ground environment, and a 50-percent reduction in the number of Bomarc ground-to-air missile sites which the committee had earlier been led to believe were so necessary to our continental air defense.

The committee has not been able to reconcile the cancellation of these long-range, ground-to-air defense missile sites, located on the perimeter of our country, while continuing those of shorter range primarily designed for last-minute protection of our cities and military installations.

Mr. President, if I may emphasize that situation, no member of the subcommittee or of the full committee would set himself up as an expert in this field, but we wish to make clear to the Congress that, in the constant shifting of these plans, the committee has certainly tried to be diligent, within our limitations, in keeping up with this matter. Most of us felt all the time that too much money was being put into ground-to-air missiles, at the expense of the affirmative or purely offensive weapons.

We asked the Senate to authorize these sites and to approve the appropriation of the huge sums of money, which run into billions of dollars, on the direct representation that such steps were essential.

Last year we were much impressed by the need for revised thinking, so we left many of these items out of the bill. That forced the Department of Defense to revise its estimates. The Department came in with a changed plan, which they called the master plan. We recommended its adoption. The money was provided.

This year, after the budget was submitted and late in the legislative year, we were again approached, this time by the Air Force, to make a change which was really not concurred in by the North American Air Defense Command, or NORAD, as it is called. We come to the Senate now to reverse ourselves in a great measure, and to ask the Senate to shift the authorizations around, and, in effect, to abandon over $26 million worth of installations for Bomarc and almost $30 million worth of construction alone for the super Sage system which goes with it, for a total of over $58 million on

those two items alone. We ask for the shift of that money over to the two Titan squadrons, and Minuteman and other facilities, for a net increase in the amount of $73 million.

At least four of the perimeter defense missile sites discontinued have reached an advanced stage of completion. Granted that developments in the missile field have lessened the value of fixed defenses against bomber attacks, the bomber threat will continue for the next decade. The committee feels that further consideration should be given to the completion and utilization of at least two of these locations on the northern perimeter of the United States. As may be seen from the chart appearing on page 10 of the report before the Senate, the cost of completing these sites is nominal in comparison to the money already spent in developing these sites, and to be spent in settlement charges resulting from the cancellation of contracts.

Accordingly, the committee has requested that the revised air defense plan be again reviewed in detail by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense with due consideration of the recommendations of the commander in chief of the North American Air Defense Command, and his staff, who have the final responsibility for the air defense of this continent.

On the credit side of the ledger, additional emphasis has been placed on our offensive forces, and the revised program provides an additional $110 million for this purpose, making almost $409 million available for operational, testing, and training facilities for the Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missiles, as well as for the Samos and Midas satellites.

The Atlas missile facilities program is moving ahead at an accelerated rate, and the bill before us provides for facilities for three additional Atlas squadrons. Under present program objectives, this provides for the last phase of Atlas construction. Six additional Titan squadrons are provided for as well as the construction required for the first three operational squadrons of Minuteman. The bill also provides substantial contributions to our other retaliatory forces, including the powerful manned bomber units, the Polaris submarine with its capacity for concealment and mobility, and our intermediate range ballistic missiles being deployed at forward locations in Allied countries.

Mr. President, speaking only for myself on this point, because others can make their positions clearer than anyone else could, I am inclined to think this is a timely move and a sound move, to put the money more on the offensive weapons. At the same time, we are left with an amazing situation in regard to ground-to-air defense. There must be some, but we are canceling out the longer range weapons, like the Bomarc, and providing for the shorter range missiles, like the Hercules. In other words, the longer range part of the ground-to-air weapons is being stopped, whereas the shorter range part is to be left in operation. I do not think there is any logic or consistency behind this. It represents, to my way of thinking, more of a matter of letting each service use the money as it sees fit, not even complementing or supplementing another service in its operations, which still leaves us highly uncertain as to what we shall accept and believe in and suggest to the Senate be done.

I know there cannot be absolutely accurate planning and forecasting with reference to such a vast program. It is something to which the committee has given special attention. We have called before us the man in charge of the North American Air Defense Command, a very exceptional general, General Kuter. We find this was not done on his recommendation.

The committee is still very uncertain as to exactly what the present situation is; and certainly dissatisfied with the situation in its present state. However, we approve the idea of putting the money into these intercontinental ballistic missile programs, and that is the substance of our recommendation with reference to the funds left over from Bomarc and the additional money which is required.

We are requesting, though, that the revised Air Defense plan be again reviewed in detail by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense, with due consideration to the recommendations of the Commander in Chief of the North American Air Defense Command and his staff, who have final responsibility for the air defense of this continent.

Another area of the program the committee reviewed with a critical eye was the numerous requests for replacement items and additions to existing facilities, many of which were almost new. The impression was gained that perhaps such requirements were not as firm or as critical on items contained in the bill in past years. As a result, there were deleted shop facilities of various kinds in excess of $7.5 million and community facilities consisting of officers' clubs, commissaries, and post exchanges totaling $5.4 million. As indicated, in nearly every instance, these deletions were made in areas where there are now existing facilities which may be used. When no community facilities of the type described existed at all, the committee approved the requests of the services but at a reduced figure. On the other hand, approval was granted for five new hospitals, and I am happy to advise that we found the cost estimates consistent with action taken by the committee last year. Mr. President, Senators may recall that in the bill last year authority was requested for several hospitals at costs far in excess of known costs for Hill-Burton civilian hospitals. The committee found it necessary to delete all hospitals in an effort to secure from the military services more realistic estimates. When such estimates were not forthcoming, the committee made substantial reductions, approximating 20 percent or more, and reinserted these facilities in the bill. We now find that the services have been able to get along with the amounts granted and the office of the Secretary of Defense is to be commended for the very satisfactory efforts made this year in holding down the cost of the hospitals contained in the bill before us.

Mr. President, that is another amazing story. The committee, after proper testimony and surveys out in the field, was fully convinced the hospital costs were far too high. We called upon the services for revised estimates, and we were told the figures were as low as they could get them if the work was to be done. The services had no further suggestions to make with reference to those figures.

After some weeks of consideration, we wound up by reducing the figures approximately 20 percent, and the amount as to the other hospitals was sustained by the Appropriations Committee. We now find that the work is going on at the reduced figures, and that this year the request for further appropriations for hospitals is based upon the plan we adopted last year.

This simply shows, in respect to many avenues of military construction, that if some segment of the Congress simply takes out after the point and runs it down, finally maintains it and writes it into the law, cutting the figures accordingly, a savings is made. That is about the only way to do it.

The Department of the Navy presented rather elaborate plans for additional facilities at the Anacostia Naval Air Station in the District of Columbia to house and to supply their personnel in the Washington area and to accommodate various activities such as the music and photographic schools. This committee has long urged both the Navy and the Air Force to vacate the Bolling and Anacostia Air Fields and to return this valuable property to the tax rolls.

This is the area, the Senate will remember, that embraces the services moving out of Anacostia Naval Air Station and Bolling Air Force Base due to the congested air pattern over the city of Washington, D.C., particularly in close proximity to the National Airport.

The Senator from Mississippi happened to be a member of the subcommittee which considered for the Appropriations Committee the need for a second National Airport. We finally recommended, as the Senate will recall, the building of a new airport. We were going to move the service installations out. I have decided it would have been better to move the National Airport and to let the service installations remain where they were, because this process has already cost us some $58 million, which has already been spent to take the services over to Andrews Air Force Base, and more money will be required. The Navy has come in with a program to redo Anacostia Naval Air Station at a cost, according to its figures, of about $40 million, although that has been reduced somewhat by the Navy.

We understood the Air Force had an even more ambitious program for the old Bolling Air Force Base next year. It is located in an area in the Capital of

the Nation which cannot expand geographically. It is hemmed in by the boundary lines of the District of Columbia. It is an area which should be restored to civilian use and put back on the tax rolls. People who make their homes in the area should be permitted to develop it. I do not know that all of the area is suited for such purposes, but in view of the fact that it is located in the Capital of the Nation, and is hemmed in and cannot expand, the proposal should be given the utmost consideration.

Therefore, the item of $13.3 million, the first increment of the proposed renewal of construction at the Anacostia Naval Base, has been taken out of the bill.

The committee's position is set forth in greater detail on page 10 of the report before the Senate. The view is expressed that before proceeding further with this matter an impartial committee should make a study of all Army, Navy, and Air Force space in the Washington area.

The bill as it passed the House contained $15 million for a Polaris submarine drydock at the Charleston, S.C., shipyard. While the Navy does not propose to fund this item during the coming fiscal year, they did testify that the inclusion of some authorization in the bill would be most helpful for planning and design purposes, and they will ask for funding in fiscal year 1962. The committee is sympathetic to this important proposal but feels that $10 million in new authority is sufficient for the purpose. If any adjustments are necessary the Navy can let this be known when they are ready to proceed with construction.

Another area where a substantial reduction of $22.5 million was made is in the authority granted for emergency construction requirements arising during the year as a result of new developments or unforeseen circumstances. The Department of Defense requested an authorization for each military service of $17.5 million. Past experience demonstrates that this amount of authority is not necessary and we have provided for $10 million, the amount granted last year.

Now I should like to speak briefly concerning the Reserve portion of the bill. I want to emphasize the important role played by our Reserve forces in the overall defense picture and their outstanding performance in past conflicts in which the country has become engaged.

I do not believe I can overemphasize the importance of the role which the Reserves, including the National Guard, play in our national defense program. Particularly is it valuable, as the Senator from Mississippi sees it, in keeping trained and utilizing the talent of the men whom we have already trained. It also carries forward the concept of the civilian soldier, and it keeps the military program in close touch with the communities back home. I believe that that, more than anything else, makes our present military program understood. The Reserve programs have had appropriated for them comparatively little money over the past few years, and so we have incorporated additional projects in the National Guard program and also in the Reserve construction program, and a special one for the Air National Guard. About $90 million in Federal money would be required to match the local money which has already been made available by counties, States, and cities for the building of National Guard armories, and which is on hand for them to pay their part of the cost of armories, land, and all that goes with it. That in itself indicates how strong these programs are at the so-called back-home level. We adopted the amount suggested by the House, added a certain amount in the Senate committee, and then we inserted an overall total of $5.5 million additional for National Guard armories exclusive of the Air National Guard increase that I am coming to.

On the National Guard armories and other military installations the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] strongly urged the inclusion of projects in his State both from the standpoint of need and also the standpoint of employment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. May I express my appreciation as a Member of the Senate for the excellent report and excellent recommendation which the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Military Authorization for Military Construction has made to the Senate. I think we are fortunate to have a subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the ranking minority member, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

I would like to emphasize the importance of the Air National Guard and the Air National Guard Reserve. I am pleased to note the authorization program calls for an expenditure for the Air National Guard unit at Hutchinson, Kans., of some $1,389,000. This National Guard unit is located on a deactivated former naval base, and I think it is fine that the base is being used. It is in the interest of the Federal Government as well as the State government that this is being done, and if the distinguished Senator will permit again for just a moment, I wish to express my appreciation to the chairman and all members of the subcommittee and the full committee for including the authorization for a new bridge at Fort Riley, Kans. I know the evidence will prove that this bridge is badly needed, and its authorization will mean much to the future development of a post which is rapidly becoming, and is already, a part of a great defense program. I express my sincere thanks to the chairman.

Mr. STENNIS. We were very much impressed with the Senator's testimony with reference to the bridge. We think he rendered a service by presenting the facts and figures in this connection. We are glad we could include the project in the bill.

I likewise appreciate his remarks with reference to the Air National Guard, which has become an even more important part of our program with new duties assigned. The needs of the Reserve components must not be neglected.

Testimony before the committee indicated that there is a definite need for more flexibility in the Army National Guard program to permit the National Guard Bureau and the States to construct to the limit of annual obligation authority. The subcommittee was urged to incorporate additional project authorization in the bill to provide total authority more in consonance with the amount of the matching funds already on hand and held by the States for this program. This will permit substitutions of authorized line items on a basis of unforeseen contingencies. The subcommittee believes this argument has considerable merit and has increased the authorization granted by the House for the Army National Guard by approximately $5.4 million, to provide for a total of 99 armories, 26 expansions, and to accelerate the completion of 2 important Reserve training centers. An additional $5.7 million was given the Air National Guard to provide for essential maintenance and missile-storage facilities at various locations made necessary as the result of the accelerated conversion to century series aircraft.

Although there were many other adjustments necessary, the above-enumerated items account for the major money changes in the bill.

Finally, I should like to speak briefly on certain language changes in the general provisions which are of some importance.

Section 503 of the bill before you was rewritten to more specifically spell out the intent of the Congress in providing a 5-percent differential to take care of unforeseen cost increases. This should prevent such abuses of this provision as have occurred in the past.

Mr. President, in the new or revised defense program which I mentioned a while ago, which has really been formulated in the past few weeks, there is a transfer of duties and responsibilities in the interceptor and fighter field to the Air National Guard units. As a minimum requirement, $5.7 million would be needed to carry out those missions, which consist of relatively minor additions in many fields throughout the United States. As the committee understands, if the authorization is granted, the Air Force, having been relieved of certain responsibilities of its own, will recommend the transfer of a like amount of money from its budget for 1961. It will recommend that the Appropriations Committee transfer the appropriation to this program. We have, therefore, included all the items that have been agreed upon and spelled out for this additional construction program, which covers the entire United States.

Section 507(a) places a limitation on the number of Capehart housing units that may be contracted for by the Department of Defense after July 1, 1959. It will be recalled that a 20,000-unit limitation was placed in the bill last year to assure that of the 23,600 odd units authorized only those found to be absolutely essential would be built. This

year the Department of Defense has requested approval of in excess of 8,500 additional units and an increase to 30,000 the number of units to be contracted for. The committee has again applied the same criteria as last year and believes an increase in the limitation to 25,000 units is sufficient.

That means, Mr. President, that we did not authorize, in effect, the total number of new Capehart housing units requested, and puts a ceiling on the gross amount of the entire program over the years that can be built. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has an inquiry, I understand, and I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his courtesy. I should like to call his attention to page 42 of the committee report, which deals with the request by the Navy for 400 units of Capehart housing at the Naval Base in Philadelphia. I am not sure whether all members of the committee know the history of this request.

It is a problem with which the city of Philadelphia has been laboring ever since the days when I was mayor, in 1955. During the war some public housing was built in South Philadelphia near the navy yard. It is now occupied entirely by naval personnel. Under the housing law, that project is supposed to be operated by the Philadelphia Public Housing Authority as a public housing project. However, in point of fact it is occupied entirely by naval personnel, and therefore the city has been deprived of the use of that project for 400 public housing occupants.

I know that the Senator will agree with my comment that the applicants for that housing are stacked as high as the planes on a foggy day over Washington National Airport. We have been negotiating for years with the Navy Department to move these people, so that the city can get control of the project and move people in there who cannot find anything lse.

We have been trying to persuade the Navy to go in for Capehart housing, to be built on a site quite close to the naval hospital, adjacent to the navy yard. They have been resistant to that suggestion.

Finally, on the 10th of May, our prayers and protestations took effect. I have here a copy of a memorandum sent to Representative BARRETT by the Department of the Navy.

With the approval of the Senator from Mississippi I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1960.

Hon. WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BARRETT: This is in further reply to your letters of January 15, 1960, addressed to the Honorable Thomas S. Gates, Jr., and the Honorable William B. Franke. My letter of January 29, 1960, promised that you would be advised of the plans to cope with the housing problem for naval personnel in the Philadelphia area when such plans had been formulated.

Please be advised that a plan for the construction of a 400-unit Capehart housing project for enlisted personnel in Philadelphia has been approved by the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. It is proposed that the project will be built near the naval hospital on land to be acquired from private owners. This matter is now under consideration by the Congress.

If I can be of any further assistance to you in this matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,

F. A. BANTZ,
Under Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Navy has now persuaded both the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget—and I interpolate to say that must have been quite a job—to agree to the authorization of 400 units of Capehart housing on this land, which is just sitting there, ready to be used, next to the naval hospital.

As the Senator knows, I have been perhaps a little bit too aggressive in urging the committee to follow up this matter. I was therefore quite disappointed to find that even though the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense had finally been persuaded of the justness of the claim of the city of Philadelphia, of which the Navy Department was satisfied some time ago, these units were not authorized, and we were relegated to section 810 of the National Housing Act, as appears from the report on page 42. The reference to section 810 is on page 63.

I may say to the Senator from Mississippi, honestly, that we are not going to get the job done under section 810 in the foreseeable future, because the rents are not good enough to persuade private capital to go in there and build this housing. The naval people are actually squatters on the property which the city of Philadelphia ought to have.

I appreciate that this is a kind of last-minute request, and I actually hesitate to make it. However, I know how strongly my constituents in Philadelphia feel about it. If the Senator from Mississippi ever had the distinguished Mayor Dilworth of Philadelphia on his back, trying to get him to do something, he would know how strongly I feel about it. I wonder, therefore, if I could possibly persuade the Senator to accept an amendment on page 90, after line 25, to insert the 400 units for the naval base in Philadelphia. Before he answers, I should like to say to him that we really have made survey after survey to establish the fact that rental housing is not available, anywhere near where these naval personnel have to go to work, at rents which their naval pay will permit them to take care of.

I make this plea to the Senator and throw myself on his mercy.

Mr. STENNIS. I certainly appreciate the attitude of the Senator from Pennsylvania. He has a problem there, and undoubtedly the Navy has, too. This matter came in very late, and we were met, on the very threshold of our examination with the fact that we would have to spend, as we understood, $540,000 at the very outset for land upon which to build these Capehart houses. That is $18,000 per acre. It seemed to us that the Navy had the authority to buy the land, but had not requested it, that the Senator from Mississippi can recall, at least, within the last few years to take care of this situation.

We treated the situation in Brooklyn, N.Y., in the same way with reference to their requests for 500 units, and thought that perhaps under section 810 it might be taken care of. We thought it might be a better plan to try it out under section 810 and see whether it would work. These sums are running into enormous figures on the Capehart housing.

We hear talk about its being $16,500 a unit. That is just for the walls and the roof and the interior walls and floors, more or less. That does not include the land around the house. It does not include anything beyond the 5-foot line. Loose statements to the effect that the rental allowance made to these military men will pay for the housing are not true. They have no regard for the $60 or $70 a month for repair and maintenance and the upkeep cost which must be provided, and various items of that kind.

We are convinced that somebody will have to stop, look, and listen and make a new start with reference to the housing.

These requests came in late, and we put them in the program under section 810. We believe it will work out, although we are not sure it will. However, it ought to be tried, and very thoroughly gone into. It would certainly have a very high rating next year if something could not be done and we were satisfied that they tried.

Mr. CLARK. In the first place, I understand the very heavy responsibilities which the Senator from Mississippi must bear in this regard. Quite often he cannot do for his friends what he would like to do. Therefore, I understand fully what he has just said he has to do in accordance with his public duty.

On the other hand, I point out that there was before the committee a joint statement by my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and me, which begins on page 623 of the printed hearings and continues over to the middle of the next page.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Department of Defense has transmitted a letter to the Armed Services Committee requesting that the military construction bill be amended to provide 400 units of Capehart housing for the 4th Naval District, with headquarters in Philadelphia.

We wish to point out to the committee the urgent necessity of approval of this authorization at this time.

At the present time there are 663 families of Navy enlisted personnel living in a project in Philadelphia known as Passyunk Homes, which was constructed in 1941, and has been occupied by Navy personnel since that time.

Under the terms of the National Housing Act, Passyunk Homes automatically reverted to the Philadelphia Housing Authority for low-income public housing on January 1,

1960. In the 1959 session of Congress, because no Capehart housing had then been approved by Congress to provide for these Navy families the deadline for the reversion of Passyunk Homes was extended to February 1, 1962.

At that time the Senate and House Banking and Currency Committees made it clear to the Navy Department and Defense Department that the extension could not be renewed beyond 1962, and that the Defense Department would have to make other provisions for these families prior to February 1, 1962.

The Navy Department and Department of Defense have meanwhile explored other alternatives for providing housing for these families and has found none to be feasible. A thorough study of the possibility of using section 810 of the Housing Act of 1959 demonstrates that such housing would cost $30 per room per month, which is far beyond the income capacity of the Navy personnel presently occupying Passyunk Homes.

Other alternatives investigated but found to be unfeasible were the extension of the present authority to inlease housing for military personnel assigned to tactical installations, to nontactical installations, and the modification of existing authorities to permit institution of special station allowances in high-rent areas.

Surveys completed by the 4th Naval District, the Philadelphia Housing Authority, and the office of development coordinator of the city of Philadelphia, and later verified by special study teams of the Navy and Defense Departments, demonstrate that there is no rental housing in Philadelphia to meet Navy requirements.

At the present time the city of Philadelphia has a shortage of 5,000 public housing units for low-income families. The stepped-up pace of Federal highway construction and urban renewal will increase this gap considerably by 1962. The city of Philadelphia, therefore, cannot agree to any extension of the deadline for Passyunk Homes beyond the present date.

Because of the income limitation for public housing 625 of the 663 Navy families occupying Passyunk Homes will be required to vacate on February 1, 1962.

Unless the additional units of Capehart housing are authorized now these 625 Navy families face sure eviction by February 1, 1962, with no other form of housing within their income limits open to them.

During the fiscal year 1959 the Navy recruiting station in Philadelphia enlisted a total of 4,390 individuals for naval service. The effect on recruitment in Philadelphia and the serious damage to efficiency and morale to Navy personnel stationed in Philadelphia if adequate housing within their means is not provided is self-evident.

There is presently a site available within easy commuting distance of the Philadelphia Navy Yard in the development of which the city of Philadelphia is willing to cooperate by bringing it under its redevelopment program, thus providing it with adequate community services and sound city planning. This site cannot be withheld from subdivision for very much longer, however.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I think we make a pretty conclusive case that section 810 will not work. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, in all good humor, that, with some regret, in my judgment, this is what will happen: We will not get section 810 housing. The land which is now being sought avidly by speculative builders next to the naval hospital will be taken off the market, and housing far too expensive for the naval personnel to occupy will be built there. The city of Philadelphia will reluctantly have to kick the naval personnel out of there by February 1962, and the loser will not be the city of Philadelphia; it will be the U.S. Navy. This I deeply deplore. However, I believe the city of Philadelphia has exercised extraordinary patience in putting up with this situation so long as it has.

While I thoroughly understand the point of view of the Senator from Mississippi, I believe it is only appropriate, for the purpose of the RECORD, to advise him of what, in my opinion, will be the result of the unwillingness of the committee to accept this amendment.

Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bantz, writing to the secretary of the Committee on Armed Services on May 10, requested 400 units of Capehart housing. That letter was not printed in the hearings, but I have just placed it in the RECORD.

Mr. STENNIS. I think that is a valuable contribution. I assure the Senator from Pennsylvania that action of the committee was not hastily taken, as I am certain he knows. We have great concern for the problem in the city of Philadelphia, or the problem in any other city, for that matter. At the same time, the Federal Government is certainly confronted with a big problem as to whether it shall build expensive houses on expensive pieces of real estate in the large cities of the Nation. Many of those houses certainly will not be built until a real survey has been made as to the number required, a determination made as to whether they cannot be built in areas where real estate is not so expensive, and it can be ascertained whether provision cannot be made for even more than 400 units, if they are essential.

So the commmittee will take these matters into consideration when the question comes up again, as I am certain it will.

Mr. CLARK. I simply wish to say, in conclusion, that surveys of the situation have been made until they are running out of the wood. I believe the facts have been fully established. However, I know full well that if the Senator from Mississippi is unwilling to accept the amendment, there is no point in my offering it. I simply wish the RECORD to show that I had it here, ready to present it, if I had been able to persuade the Senator of the justice of our cause.

Mr. STENNIS. No cause is in better hands than when it is in the hands of the vigorous Senator from Pennsylvania, who always knows his facts, and is really helpful in getting at the very heart of a problem. We certainly will continue to give his problem—and it is a real one—our utmost attention, and will try to do something affirmative which will meet the situation. I especially thank the Senator for his attitude in the matter.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have a very few more remarks, which I think will cover the high points of the bill. I understand the Senator from Massachusetts is concerned about a matter in the bill and has compelling reasons for being off the floor later in the afternoon. If it is agreeable with other Senators, I hope we may consider his item next.

Section 507(a) places a limitation of $19,800 on the amount that may be spent for a single Capehart housing unit. The General Accounting Office reported that instances have been discovered by law for appropriated fund housing in building Capehart units for general officers. Since Capehart housing must be constructed for an average of $16,000 per unit—within the 5-foot line—it can be seen that these more expensive units can be built only by a sacrifice in the size of units for lower grade personnel. Therefore, the limit was put upon the top amount which could be spent for a single housing unit. If units which cost more than that amount are absolutely essential, the overflow beyond the $19,800 can be obtained by appropriated funds.

Section 510 will permit the Secretary of Defense to use rental proceeds from rental quarters under the jurisdiction of the military for the maintenance and repair of such housing. This particularly applies to certain Lanham Act housing which the military is inclined to destroy as maintenance costs are higher than would be on more modern type structures. It has come to the attention of the subcommittee, however, that some of this type housing is still useful and better than some that may be obtained on the economy. It is felt that this provision will act as an incentive to the military commanders to retain such housing rather than have it torn down and request new housing units.

I have attempted to analyze briefly the highlights of the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1961, and I shall be pleased to answer any questions any of the Members of the Senate may wish to ask.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield. First, I wish to thank and commend the Senator from South Dakota for the excellent service he has rendered in the preparation of this and all other bills. He renders, the year round, valuable service to the committee in this respect, as well as in other respects in the Senate. The Senator from South Dakota formerly served as chairman of this subcommittee, and his work was outstanding.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the words of the Senator from Mississippi are deeply appreciated.

I reciprocate by saying that it has been a pleasure to work under his leadership on this and other bills while he has been chairman of the subcommittee. I shall say more on this later. I rose at this time because I wanted particularly to give emphasis to the point which the Senator was making in respect to the limitation in the bill upon the Capehart housing units which would be designed for officers.

CAPEHART OFFICERS QUARTERS

I think it came as a surprise to members of the committee to realize that in the operation of the so-called Capehart

housing program, the armed services were using as an average figure per unit one which could mean considerably less than the average for lower grade officer and servicemen's units, and considerably more than the average for the higher grade officers. It is not that the higher grade officers are not entitled to housing which is larger and designed for entertaining, and in keeping with responsibilities, but the Capehart and Wherry housing programs were primarily intended to provide the maximum housing accommodations for the maximum number of people and yet stay within an average cost figure that would permit rentals the servicemen could pay.

It came as a surprise to me when I visited one base and saw the housing there called Capehart housing. It included some of the most exquisitely appointed officers' quarters I had ever visited. Yet it was Capehart housing. That was a surprise to me, because the Capehart housing I had visited before had a uniform quality, with the average cost limit used to benefit all the officers and personnel whose families it served.

The committee was told, as I recall, that some of the units now are costing as much as $35,000, $36,000, or $37,000 per unit, plus the utilities and the land which were provided in the project. This was not only above the average permitted but exceeded the limitation which would have been applicable had the housing been built directly as military housing. It seemed to the committee to be inconsistent with prior presentations on the purpose of these projects that certain units could be selected which would cost about twice as much as the average cost of units, and more than could have been expended if the houses had been provided by direct appropriation for standard military housing.

That is the reason why the committee placed a limitation of $19,800 upon any individual unit within Capehart projects. Of course, $19,800 is above the average permitted for Capehart units, but that amount will permit some leeway. If it is felt on any particular station that even better appointed quarters should be provided for general officers or post commanders the committee thinks that they should be justified and presented for building with appropriated funds.

The Senator from Mississippi was the one who really brought out the facts concerning this particular proposition. He is entitled to the credit for it. I have ventured to interrupt him at this point because I thought his efforts and the action taken deserve some emphasis.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from South Dakota very much, indeed.

We really found the practices outlined by the Senator from South Dakota to be evasive of the intent of the law; and such practices take a rather heavy toll of the confidence we can give to this program and to other programs. I hope there will be no repetition of such practices.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Washington, who is a very able member of our subcommittee, and makes excellent contributions to its work.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Those of us who serve on the subcommittee are very grateful to the distinguished chairman [Mr. STENNIS] for his very able leadership.

It is a fact that our decisions in each and every instance in connection with the pending bill—as has been true in the past—have, almost without exception, been unanimous ones; and great credit must go to the chairman for the way in which he has handled the bill.

I also wish to state that the ranking minority member, the former chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], has distinguished himself this year, as he has in the past, by his wide knowledge of the subject matter and by the fine way in which he has participated in the handling of the bill.

The same is true of the other members of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, it is not possible for a subcommittee or a committee to do a good job without able support by the staff technicians and staff members, who must be responsible for all the details. They have the further responsibility of pointing out the areas of special concern. Mr. President, without the invaluable counsel, advice, and assistance of the able staff members, we could not do a proper job.

Therefore, I wish to pay special tribute to Gordon Nease, the staff director for the subcommittee, who has been ably assisted by his assistant, Mrs. Edith Johnson. They have done a wonderful job, and we are grateful for the contributions they have made.

Mr. President, the report speaks in great detail about all the provisions of the bill. There is little that I can add, by way of any statement here on the floor, in further explanation of the provisions of the bill.

As has been true in the past, I believe the bill represents the muscle we need in order to maintain a firm military posture.

We have attempted to cut out the "fat," wherever we could find any.

The bill is a good one. It meets the overall objectives of the security position of our Government, as presented to us.

I can make only one concluding statement, Mr. President, and it relates to the subject of air defense. Air defense has been a subject of continuing concern to our subcommittee, over the past several years. I believe we have established a good record in this regard. Our main problem has been to obtain from the Defense Department some statements of long-range objectives in the area of air defense. In that regard, we have had great difficulty, because of constant changes which have been made.

This year we had the problem all over again; as we were about to approve an air-defense program, it was revised "in the middle of the stream," so to speak.

In this bill, and in the report, in particular, to which I invite the attention of the Members of the Senate, we have tried to point out the problem, the situation we must face, and the things which must be done if we are to provide an adequate air defense.

I wish to pay my highest respects to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], for the fine way in which he has handled this difficult matter. As he has done in other matters, he has approached this task with his unique judicial ability. He has been fair, objective, and understanding.

I believe we have before us a good bill chiefly because he has done an outstandingly fine job.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I especially thank the Senator from Washington for his remarks on the substance of the bill. He has had a great deal to do with it, and I am particularly apreciative of his kind remarks.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am more than happy to yield to other Senators, for statements on the bill.

In regard to the amendments, I understand that the Senator from Virginia has an amendment which can be presented in a brief time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President——

Mr. STENNIS. But, Mr. President, first, I should like to yield to the Senator from South Dakota, who is a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, perhaps I should speak in my own time; I desire to discuss the bill at some length.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, Mr. President, I expect the Senator from South Dakota to speak in his own time.

I understand that the Senator from Louisiana wishes to ask a question at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I should like to ask a question.

Mr. STENNIS. Very well; I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that the total amount authorized by the bill is $1,184,865,000. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will any counterpart funds be used for the construction of any facilities which now are being authorized?

Mr. STENNIS. This year there is a new policy in reference to the local currencies or the so-called counterpart funds. I imagine the Senator from Louisiana uses the term in an inclusive way.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. The new policy is that we authorize the funds to be used to buy that currency or to pay the Commodity Credit Corporation, or whatever agency may be involved, the dollars. But we nail it down, so that any dollars authorized cannot be spent if counterpart funds or other local funds are available.

Mr. ELLENDER. So this part of the funds will be purchased from the Treasury or from whoever owns them; is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then, Mr. President, I should like to ask about——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the Senator from Louisiana about to refer to another item?

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to ask about an item which was stricken from the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to refer to the item which has been under discussion.

Mr. STENNIS. On this point, I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I expected to mention the counterpart funds, insofar as housing overseas is concerned.

In view of the comment which already has been made, I wish to call attention to section 511 of the bill, on pages 122 and 123, reading as follows:

SEC. 511. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, at least 75 per centum of the total cost of any family housing project or community facility hereafter constructed or acquired in any foreign country by the Department of Defense or any military department shall be paid for from foreign currencies acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; except that the following projects authorized pursuant to this Act shall not be subject to this requirement.

Then there follow, in the next five or six lines, the few excepted housing projects. They are given an exception, because we were advised that adequate amounts of foreign currencies were not available in those particular countries.

But with the exception of the ones specifically excepted, at least 75 percent of the cost of any other housing project or community facility to be constructed will have to be paid through use of foreign currencies, the so-called counterpart funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. What I had in mind during our earlier discussion was to find out if these counterpart funds would be in addition to the amount authorized in the bill. Am I clear in understanding that, in the event counterpart funds are used in foreign countries for military construction, some of the amount authorized by this bill would be used to purchase these foreign currencies?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe the Senator is correct in his understanding. There is a requirement that on housing at least 75 percent must be met by counterpart funds except on a few indicated projects. It would mean at least that much of the authorization would be saved.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my hope that other agencies will follow this very good example. For example, only a few days ago we authorized foreign aid spending to the tune of $4,175 million. But, in addition to that, we have Public Law 480 funds that can be used for foreign aid functions that will aggregate some $540 million. Other funds can also be drawn under title II of the act. So, it is possible that instead of our Government spending $4,175 million for foreign aid—the amount authorized by the Congress—we could spend a great deal more. I wanted to make certain that in the case of military construction there would not be any extra funds for this purpose in addition to the actual money authorized.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Let me make one additional comment. The Senator from Mississippi recalls, of course, that it was back in 1954 when this particular subcommittee first wrote into legislation the possibility of using counterpart funds for the construction of military housing or military facilities overseas. We have sought to make that practice as effective as possible in the years that have followed.

With respect to the point which the Senator from Louisiana has brought up—and it is a very worthwhile point—I wish to say this committee is so eager to have the dollar signs reduced by the utilization of foreign currency funds that, during the hearings, we repeatedly brought to the attention of the representatives of the military services the possibility of using counterpart funds from a second or third country when counterpart funds were not available in the country where the installation was to be built. We pointed out that it might be possible to use counterpart funds of a third country in order to provide facilities in country A or country B. We tried, by the emphasis expressed in the hearings, by the language in the report, and by the references to which the Senator from Louisiana has already alluded, to maximize the utilization of counterpart funds in place of dollars, and at the same time not to increase the total dollar authorizations.

Mr. ELLENDER. That objective could be accomplished in the agreements that are made between us and the receiving countries of surplus commodities, for which purpose we are able to use some of the funds.

Mr. President, I should like to ask one more question of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I notice on page 67 of the House bill, on lines 11 to 12, there was a very small item of $58,000 for the New Orleans Naval Air Station at New Orleans, La., for operation facilities and supply facilities. That item was provided in the House bill. I notice the Senate committee, in its wisdom, deleted that item. I wonder if the Senator can tell me why the item was deleted.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Louisiana could be mistaken about the deletion.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope I am.

Mr. STENNIS. A memorandum is not available on that item at the moment. We shall check into it, if I may answer the Senator's question later.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Dakota seeks the floor now, I hope he may make such remarks as he wishes to. I will yield the floor at this time, with the hope of obtaining it later.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, first I wish to make a few comments on some specific features of the bill, and then to discuss the general aspects of the situations it applies to military construction.

BOMARCS IN AIR DEFENSE

First, with reference to some of the items already mentioned by the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Washington, I wish to invite the attention of Senators to the language in the report which starts on page 8, runs over to page 9, and onto the middle of page 10, relating to air defense.

I particularly invite the Senator's attention to the table at page 10, which gives the comparative figures for construction, obligation, percent completion, cancellation costs, and recoupments on four BOMARC sites. As the previous speakers have said, the air defense picture is changing. The Air Force revised its requests following the original submission, and there is some doubt as to whether or not the revisions are firm even as of today. This, however, seems necessarily to be expected under the changing concepts of weaponry.

When we were dealing with planes as the major offensive threat against which a defense should be conceived and planned, it seemed adequate to have a Distant Early Warning line, a mid-Canada line, a Pine Tree line, and then a SAGE system, which could take the intelligence gained by the early warning lines and use that information, in turn, to trigger off a rocket defense as the incoming planes might get within the area of the weapons.

Interceptor planes, of course, were the weapon of first response with the longest range an air-to-air system.

Behind them in the zones closer to targets we had two types of rockets—ground-to-air systems.

One, the Nike, with the Ajax and Hercules series, and then the Bomarc. The Nike defense was a point defense system. The Bomarc was an area defense system, with potential protection for a larger range.

In the revision of plans which has accompanied the recognition of a changing threat from bombers planes to intercontinental ballistic missiles, the Defense Department recommended the suspension of all of the Bomarc construction with the exception of that in the northeastern part of the United States.

I think I do not reveal classified information when I say that at the time, when Bomarc was expected to occupy a major role in the defense plan for the continental United States, some 32 Bomarc sites were once scheduled. By some preprograming, that initial number was reduced to 29, and, by later steps, to a lesser number. The final number of Bomarcs in the plan recommended by the Defense Department this year, was limited to those in the northeastern part of the United States, and largely for installations the construction of which was substantially completed.

The committee noted, in the cancellations proposed under this revised plan, that there were four sites, listed on page 10 of the report—Paine, Wash.; Adair, Oreg.; Travis, Calif.; and Vandenberg, Calif.—where a considerable obligation had already been made, and

where the percent of completion as of March 31 ranged from 25 percent complete to as much as 67 percent complete.

After we asked for figures as to the costs for cancellation of the contracts and the indemnity which the Government would be obligated to pay, and noted the possible recoupments, it occurred to members of the committee that it might be worthwhile to take another look at these Bomarc facilities. It was difficult for us to reconcile the proposed continuation of the point defense system afforded by Nike-Ajax and Nike-Hercules stations, with their more limited range, and the decision against completion of these Bomarc sites, where there could only be a relatively small recoupment if the construction were canceled at this stage.

That is the reason for the language which appears on page 8 and following, to which I have referred. It explains the reason why the table appears on page 10 of the report.

The committee has directed a letter to the Secretary of Defense, raising a question on the validity of the cancellation cost figures.

It will be noted, in the case of Adair, Oreg., that the cancellation cost figure is placed at $2,780,000, which is in excess of the obligation figure as of March 31, which is $2,673,000. The committee felt that if there were value in keeping some Nike sites operational it might be worthwhile, since these would be the only Bomarc sites in the Northwest part of the United States, to take another look at them and to ask for the recommendation of the commander in chief of the North American Air Defense Command, before abandonment of the projects.

That is, if it is sound to keep Nike stations operational, might it not be worthwhile to complete the Bomarc stations nearest completion where the costs of a cancellation come close to completion costs? At least, the matter warrants a second look the committee believes.

DEFERRAL OF SHOPS AND COMMISSARY ITEMS

Mr. President, I wish now to say a few words with respect to the policy which the committee followed in the elimination of some shop items, commissaries, and post exchanges.

The committee, to the best of its judgment, did deny requests for some shop items where it seemed clear that the denial would not interfere with operational capability of the facilities. The matter was given special study by a subcommittee headed by a new member of the committee, who, incidentally, is proving to be a very valuable member of the committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON]. It was the finding of the subcommittee that in each case where the deletion is recommended the operational requirements of the facility would not be interfered with by deferment of the requested item at this time.

Similarly, with respect to commissaries and post exchanges, the committee felt that in those instances where there was an operating commissary or post exchange, or where the dependents' housing was located near to an established marketing center, these items could be deferred without injury to the services. At a time when items of very great priority and importance to the national defense picture—and I mean the changing national defense picture—are being denied or limited, the committee felt we ought not to authorize the spending of money for projects which lack essential or critical priority. This should make some resources available for reprograming on items needed in the new military space picture. That explains why some of the commissary and shop items were deferred.

There is an additional aspect of the housing program which I wish to mention briefly. Under the Federal Housing Act there is a section known as section 810. In the statutory law today that section would authorize the building of some 5,000 units of housing where the Secretary of Defense gives a certification to the Federal Housing Administration which would permit insuring the building of houses which do not quite meet the criteria of economic soundness which are required for normal FHA housing.

The committee felt that some strings should be put on that authorization. We have previously established standards for housing built with appropriated funds. We have previously adopted the practice of line items in order to get control over the Capehart housing program. Accordingly, we felt it was in order to establish the line item principle for houses to be built under section 810. That is why the paragraphs appear in the bill as they do on page 120 of the bill, suspending in one instance the authority granted in the original section 810 and in the other instance providing specific line items of authorization for about 900 housing units under section 810.

CHANGING PICTURE OVERSEAS

Mr. President, I now propose to discuss some of the implications of the U–2 plane incident upon the military construction program. In venturing to say something about that subject, I do so because some parts of this bill before us is outdated by the events of the past 10 days.

First, however, let me repeat in essence what I have said in the Senate in previous brief statements on the U–2 plane incident.

The day after the plane was reported downed in mid-Russia, I placed in the RECORD an article written by Constantine Brown some weeks ago, in which he warned of the danger of war by accident or miscalculation. I thought the incident pointed up his warning.

The day after our State Department came forward with the admission that the plane was on a mission of espionage, I likened the situation to a baseball game, where the coaches on both sides seek to steal the signals of their opponents, by pointing out that this does not deter the managers of both teams from shaking hands and sitting down to work out ground rules to prevent the incidents from turning into knockdown and drag-out brawls.

I not only said that of course President Eisenhower should go to the summit conference, but also that he should proceed with a greater awareness on the part of everybody of the importance of arriving at understandings to lessen world tensions. I recalled De Gaulle's wise words that in the better climate of a détente, "objective solutions little by little would come into view."

Mr. President, I fervently believe that. In international matters as well as other relationships of life, we move step by step. We make progress by beginning with simple things. Cooperation begets cooperation.

Last summer, when Vice President NIXON went to Russia, I applauded his trip as one of the remarkable developments of our time, that a man of his ability in expression could speak by radio and television to the previously closed ears behind the Iron Curtain.

Similarly, I defended the invitation to Premier Khrushchev to visit this country and to see whatever he wanted to see. I wanted him to realize what America is really like.

I have supported in every way the proposed return visit by President Eisenhower to the Soviet Union. I still think President Eisenhower should visit Russia, and should do what he can to dispel the schooled propaganda notion of the Russians that the United States wants to fight Russia, and that Americans are dominated by a bloodthirsty, warmongering group.

The President can say effectively that we are not seeking conquest. Despite the propaganda made of the plane rubble and the presence of pilot Powers in Russia, he can say, in ways the Russian people can hear, that we do have open skies in this country, that here newspapers publish pictures of military installations and maps of their locations, and that although we have been visited by spies like Fuchs and Abel, our concern is to guard against surprise attacks, and our aim is to achieve security and freedom for all people everywhere.

Only the President can now tell our story to the Russians in ways that will reach them effectively.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Who is the Senator quoting?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I started by quoting from a previous statement I made; otherwise what I have been saying has been my present statement.

Mr. BRIDGES. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota speaks, as he always performs his work, ably and well.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

I turn to the implications of the present situation for the military construction bill which is found in the bill before us, and I do so, Mr. President, because I think a new picture has arisen.

There is carried in the bill something like $160 million of authorization for construction overseas. The necessity, the importance, and the relative priority of some of that construction will be affected by what has happened in the past week. It has made the bill to some extent out of date. Already revised in its

request since originally submitted, as we have previously said, it is now out of date by reason of recent events which are beyond the ability of anyone to assess and revise accurately at this time. If the committee today were asked to revise the bill to meet the changing picture, we would not have the information at this time to do it. This is so because our military posture has been built around certain deployments abroad, and because the present situation inevitably will affect the availability of some of the bases and fields that have been developed.

The impact of the disclosures in connection with the U–2 plan is considerable in our own country. We realize that there would be fairly vigorous remarks if a high-altitude reconnaissance Russian plane had taken off from a field in Cuba and had come down over Chicago.

Understandably the impact is considerable in Russia. The piling of the plane's pieces for exhibition in Gorki Park is not calculated to lessen the effect of the incident. On the contrary, it is intended to strengthen the hand, I suppose, of Mr. Khrushchev at the summit conference and possibly in positions at home.

And, certainly the incident is not without some effect in the countries around the world where we have spent military dollars and constructed airstrips, built control towers, stationed ships, and supplied troop housing.

News dispatches of the past few days have told of Labourite questions in the British Parliament, queries in Pakistan, disavowals in Norway, and reassurances by Foreign Minister Fujiyama of Japan. I note that early editions of the Washington Star today carry the statement that Norway has lodged a formal protest with our Ambassador against the claimed plan to have the U–2 plane land in Norway. I believe we should note that that claim has never been admitted to be an accurate one but, in any event, the allegations are such that the Government of Norway has felt it necessary to lodge a formal protest against any such use of its airfields.

And the Canadian authorities have felt obliged to state that the two U–2 planes based in Canada engage only in weather reconnaissance and are not authorized to engage in activities such as are alleged in the case of the U–2 plane found in Russia.

These references suggest the concern that is being felt in various countries of the world and indicate the nature of the problem that now confronts us.

The threat by Russia that any additional flights into or over Russia would be smashed to smithereens and that the bases from which they took off would be destroyed naturally brought a prompt rejoinder from the United States that our forces would go to the prompt defense of any of our friends.

But, Mr. President, it must be obvious to anyone who gives that suggestion a second thought that this declaration of readiness on the part of the United States to go to the defense of any of our friends or allies does not remove the fears that have been generated or quench political fires which can be fanned by elements in some of those countries adverse to the government in power.

The plain and simple fact is that no country wishes to become the first battleground in a nuclear war. In my humble opinion the possible availability or nonavailability of some of the fields overseas will not be enhanced by the mere declaration that this Government stands ready to come at once to the rescue of some country whose fields are being "smashed to smithereens" because no country wants to become the first battleground of a nuclear war.

So, some of the authorizations in the bill for military construction abroad cannot be considered as very firm today. It authorizes limited military housing for Japan. But if Japan begins to define what can be done with, on, or from the bases on her soil, naturally the question arises as to how much new construction should be undertaken there.

Is it sound for Congress to authorize the building of additional military housing in Japan if we are to be confronted with a statement by the Japanese Government that the use of the bases there which those housing units would support cannot be used for purposes which are determined upon by the Government or in accord with what we thought was understood at the time the base agreements were reached?

The tenure of the Japanese bases is involved in the ratification of the new treaty now pending in the Japanese Diet. It would be naive to assume that the debate on the ratification will escape questioning on the use of the bases. The values to Japan will be discussed pro and con. I believe that eventually the treaty will be ratified both there and here in the Senate, but there could be some clarification of its provisions before this happens and this might take a little time.

Debate in Japan will have its repercussions in Korea, in the Philippines, and in the Ryukyus group, including Okinawa. This all may be regrettable, but anything less than honest appraisal of the situation serves neither the cause of sound security planning, nor budgetary expenditure.

The involvement of Pakistan is probably more closely related to questions of appropriations for military support in the mutual security bill than construction authorizations. Yet the use of the airfield at Peshawar and its facilities establishes an interest in decisions that will be taken.

Around the Mediterranean the bill carries only limited construction authorizations, notably one facility on the island of Crete. That program, so far as I can see, should not be disturbed by anything in the current situation.

As for Morocco, the subcommittee handling the bill has had its reservations with respect to additional construction there since 1953, and in recent years there has been a realization that we were gradually phasing out deployment of our forces there. So no new construction is proposed in this bill for Morocco.

Moving into Europe, the situation is quite stable, and though there has been some lag in siting rocket stations for antiaircraft facilities in West Germany, the political situation is stable and construction authorizations in the bill are relatively small. It is my personal belief, however, I should remark in passing, that the United States should not have to spend a single dollar in military construction in West Germany. The West German economy is flourishing.

Physical facilities will remain there for German occupancy and use long after our troops have come home. The early installations were built by occupation deutsche marks; the new ones or additions and improvements should be financed by the Germans themselves. They had a favorable balance of trade last year thanks in large part to the $750 million poured into their economy by the 250,000 Americans there. The United States had a trade imbalance approaching $4 billion.

Let it not be forgotten that the favorable balance of trade of West Germany is in part due to the $750 million poured into their economy by the quarter million Americans, civilian and military, residing there.

The physical works in Germany authorized in the bill before us are not large, but if I had my way every dollar spent on them would be bought by deutsche marks.

In concluding, Mr. President, I suggest that the Senate understand that the Subcommittee on Military Construction and the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Defense Department be given some leeway in tentatively approving revisions in the programs and projects authorized in this bill if the Defense Department's continuing review of programs indicate that modifications should be made. I know of no way to write that into statutory form other than by the provisions for emergency funds and transfers that are already in the bill. But recognizing the nature of this year and the hope of everyone to avoid special sessions, I venture the opinion that the Congress in January will not be too critical if some of the authorizations carried in this bill are not exercised and if some appropriations based hereon may be reprogramed within the general purposes that have been justified.

Some flexibility is needed in the present situation.

I wish to repeat that, Mr. President, because I do not want to be misunderstood. I am not suggesting that we establish a precedent whereby the Defense Department could come in with new projects and claim they were authorized because the total dollar sign in the authorization was not exceeded. In fact, in this bill at one point we specifically provide that the total amount of the expenditures under a category shall not exceed the individual line items. We do that because it has come to the attention of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for these expenditures that in the past few months a theoretical 5 percent overrun on all projects, which it has been customary to allow on individual projects if needed, had been added together by the Defense Department and used as if that created

an authorization for an amount greater than the total amount originally carried in any bill.

My own opinion is that that is an unsound practice. When the matter came to the attention of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Defense Department, I suggested that the opinion of the General Accounting Office be asked on this matter as a guard against trouble in the future. And in this bill we have placed language to prevent such an interpretation on authorizations contained herein.

I am suggesting that if a review of the new world situation should indicate that some authorizations in the bill for proposed construction for the Defense Department or Air Force are for facilities which might not become available for their use, they should not regard this bill as a mandate or a directive to proceed to build them anyway. The services should not use authorizations in this bill unless the facilities when constructed are to be available for the purposes for which they were justified in the requests submitted.

On the other hand, if a needed facility can be provided by a slight change in location or some adaptation, Congress should be charitable in approving that flexibility.

In closing, Mr. President, may I repeat that we live in a fateful era. Events overtake policies. But man can still be master of his destiny, under God. We have been given the greatest means of communication the world has ever had.

There ought not to be misunderstandings among the peoples of the earth. We should be able to understand them and they should be able to understand us if somehow all could operate under the Golden Rule—that one should treat another as he would like to be treated. That is not a maxim exclusive to any one religion. It is a code of conduct that people of every background instinctively understand.

It is my earnest prayer that in the forthcoming summit conference of the heads of state of four great powers, Mr. President, that the common concern of all men for peace and security and the dignity of man may triumph over clouds of doubt and fear. If there is a will by all, there is a way.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi understands that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has completed two amendments which were not before the subcommittee and not before the full committee, except that they got in at the last minute without time for review. Since that time the committee has had a chance to examine them, and looks with favor on them. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Virginia for the purpose of discussing and offering the amendments, if he sees fit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I appreciate the kindness of the Senator from Mississippi. First I wish to join my other colleagues in paying tribute to the fine work the Senator from Mississippi has done with respect to this bill. He has been very diligent and conscientious. He is one of the ablest men in the Senate. This is one of the most difficult bills that any committee has to prepare, dealing, as it does, with military construction authorizations.

I wish also to say that I was very deeply impressed with the statement made by the ranking minority Member, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], with respect to the military situation throughout the world by reason of the recent U–2 incident in Russia, and perhaps the necessity of making changes in our military defense by reason of this occurrence and other things.

The amendment I desire to call up is identified as "5–12–60—B."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place insert the following new section:

SEC. . (a) The first sentence of section 303(c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (37 U.S.C. 253(c)) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "except that no transportation of any item of baggage or household effects of a member of any uniformed service may be made by commercial air carrier at a rate exceeding the cost of the transportation thereof by other means unless the Comptroller or the Deputy Comptroller of the military department concerned has certified that the military requirements of that uniformed service do not permit its transportation by any other means."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the second month beginning after the date of enactment of this section.

Renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What is the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to make a suggestion before it is adopted.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment before we vote on it?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the amendment relates to abuse in the use of commercial airfreight in the shipment overseas of the household effects of uniformed personnel in the armed services. It is based on an official audit report by the Comptroller General of the United States. The language of the amendment was drafted by the Senate legislative counsel, and approved by the General Accounting Office.

The Comptroller General's report covered an audit of 13 Army and Air Force cases in which it was found that commercial airline shipments cost five times as much as the charges would have been for available and adequate surface transportation. The cost of these 13 shipments ranged from $2,700 to $21,700 each.

The total cost in the 13 cases was $125,470 compared with surface transportation costs which would have totaled $22,984 if that means of transportation had been used. In one case the shipment by commercial airfreight from Texas to Pakistan cost $14,830, whereas surface transportation would have cost $1,750, and the shipment would have arrived a week earlier.

The number of such commercial airfreight shipments was found by the Comptroller General to be averaging between 250 and 300 a year. The greatest frequency was found in shipments for military officers ordered to and from military advisory group duty in foreign countries.

The Comptroller General's report points out that under military regulations and the Career Compensation Act of 1949, "household effects of members of the uniformed services may be shipped without regard to the comparative costs of various modes of transportation," and under present practice final determination is most often made by local transportation officers.

From these audits, the Comptroller General concluded that such shipments should be by less expensive surface transportation, including MATS, "unless there are cogent reasons which are fully documented, justifying commercial air shipment," and he recommended that commercial air shipments should require official approval at high level in the respective military departments.

The amendment I propose has the approval of the Comptroller General. It would simply require certification by the Comptroller or Deputy Comptroller of the respective military departments that such items shipped by commercial air freight, at costs higher than other means of transportation, are necessary to the military requirements of the service.

I think adoption of the amendment will result in the saving of a considerable sum of money. I am offering the amendment at the suggestion of the Comptroller General, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I had hoped the Senator would submit his amendment with the change of words in line 3, page 2, from "any other" to "less expensive." It seems to me that the way the language was drawn, it would not permit the shipment by commercial air carrier even if that were the cheapest method of carrying the commodities.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I agree with the Senator from South Dakota. I have discussed the matter with him, and I modify my amendment accordingly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator. Perhaps I should say that the amendment is very much in order. It is a needed guard against the payment of excess costs for a shipment which is not a necessary military requirement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the

amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I submit an amendment designated "5–12–60—C" and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. . No obligation shall be incurred by any military department under any cost-reimbursement type contract, as fee or otherwise, for payment to the contractor, as consideration for agreeing to accept reimbursement for any costs of performance after the time reasonably necessary for the submission of billings for and reimbursement of such costs, in excess of the return on comparable amounts for comparable periods, calculated on the basis of the average market yields of marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity of less than two years and current at the time such costs of performance were incurred.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, this amendment likewise was recommended by the Comptroller General. It relates to cost-plus-fee contracts by military departments. It is based on an official audit report by the Comptroller General of the United States. The language of the amendment was originated by the General Accounting Office, and it has been perfected by the Senate legislative counsel.

Under cost-plus-fee contracts, military departments reimburse the contractors for project costs incurred as the work progresses. The fee is added as profit. Until 2½ years ago these contractors were reimbursed for 100 percent of costs while the job was being done.

In 1957, when we were scrapping the statutory debt ceiling, the Air Force found itself $2 billion over the Defense Department expenditure limit. This led to an expensive practice which is now increasing, although it was originated—in DOD Directive 7800.6, dated November 1, 1957—as an expedient temporarily to defer cash expenditures.

Under this practice the Government holds up 20 percent of its current payments for costs until delivery of the end items. The contractor temporarily is required to finance this so-called 20-percent withholding pending delivery when he is reimbursed in full.

In the arrangement the contractor is given "additional fee," or profit, as compensation for this financing service to the Government. The payment is called "additional fee," instead of cost, to evade the armed services procurement regulation which prohibits interest as a cost item under these contracts.

The Comptroller General, in recent audits, has found one case in which the additional fee totaled 25 percent a year for the use of the money the contractor advanced; in another case it ran to 13 percent, and so on.

In 26 recently examined Air Force contracts additional fees totaled $17.6 million. The three military departments have entered into hundreds of these contracts involving billions of dollars. The Comptroller General believes, if the practice is continued, these nonessential expenditures will run to hundreds of millions of dollars.

Need for continuing the practice does not now exist. The auditors found that the Government is receiving no significan benefit. Whitley C. Collins, president, Northrop Corp., agrees. I think the practice should be stopped outright, now. But the amendment I am proposing does not go that far.

The amendment, which is approved by the Comptroller General, simply provides that the additional fees for this purpose shall not exceed the interest the Treasury would have to pay on the money if it borrowed it for the same period. There is ample precedent for such a provision, and information as to the Treasury rate is readily available.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I commend the Senator from Virginia for giving us the benefit of his extraordinary ability to ferret out leaks in Federal expenditures, and particularly for calling them to our attention at this time.

I was amazed to read a memorandum on this subject, and amazed at the figures which have been developed to indicate the amount of money which, apparently, the Federal Treasury has been called upon to pay as a sort of special interest charge on payments deferred, evidently, long beyond the need of the Government for the deferment of the final payment. It is understandable, and probably desirable, that the final payment should not be made on some projects until the projects have been fully tested and inspected, and the Government has been satisfied that it got what it wanted. However, deferments which have resulted in something akin to an interest charge amounting to 25 percent are unconscionable.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia is very much in order and should be accepted without opposition.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I desire to reiterate what the Senator from South Dakota has said. I was very much impressed—in fact, to a degree shocked—by the facts stated in the memorandum which supports the amendment. I heartily support each of the amendments, and wish also to commend the Senator from Virginia, who has been valuable to us heretofore, as he is now with reference to matters in this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to complete a matter in which the Senator from Louisiana is interested. I said I would answer his question within a few minutes.

The Senator inquired about a small item relating to a naval base in Louisiana, which appears to have been stricken from the bill. It really has not been rejected at all, and is not stricken from the bill, because upon inquiry we found that included in this small amount of $58,000 are two or three different small items, all of which can be covered, and, as the committee understands, will be paid for out of what are called minor construction funds. The authorizations and the money for that kind of items are picked up out of leftovers. So it has not been found necessary to include this matter as a line item.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the amount been authorized for this work?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; the amount, in effect, is authorized, and the project, in effect, is authorized. Perhaps the money is now available to do the work. A line item appropriation will not be required.

Mr. ELLENDER. The House has included the item in the bill. I hope that if in conference the House insists that it is necessary to have language in the bill to cover the item, the Senator from Mississippi will agree to it.

Mr. STENNIS. We assure the Senator from Louisiana that we will take care of the situation. The Department of Defense—not the committee—reported that this item could be taken care of, and would be taken care of, otherwise. So I think the matter is just as safe as if it were provided for in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I wish to ask the purpose of the item of $5,619,000 for the Naval Air Station at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Mr. STENNIS. The primary item in that connection is the waterworks system there, which has been a problem for some time. Without refreshing my recollection on this matter, I recall that this item is for the last so-called increment of a rather extensive improvement program which has been going on. At one time, consideration was given to building it into a major base in the Atlantic. The item also involves the taxiway and extension of the runway there, so as to take care of jetplanes. A 3,000-foot extension of the runway is included in this item.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the details are not satisfied, can the Senator from Mississippi tell us what are the line items for the $5,619,000?

Mr. STENNIS. This is for a continuation of a prior authorization which otherwise would lapse—and which, as I have said before, was for the building up of a major installation.

I shall read the Navy's comment on the item:

This covers the construction of a 3,000-foot extension to the runway and taxiway at the Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. This construction has been delayed because there were insufficient appropriations available to cover the entire fiscal year 1959 Navy construction program, and this item was not contained in the fiscal year 1960 funding program approved by the Congress.

To state the matter in a different way, this is an old authorization, which merely is being brought forward in order to avoid having it automatically lapse under general law. The matter was skipped in the 1959 appropriation bill. It was eligible for construction, but insufficient funds to take care of all of the item were appropriated. And it was omitted in the 1960 appropriation bill. This item will renew the authorization.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The point which concerns me—and perhaps others may also be concerned about it—is the lack of security for the United States in regard to that base, to begin with. We know that the Communists are strongly entrenched in the Cuban Government. Some persons think Fidel Castro himself is a Communist. I wonder whether we are justified in spending $5,619,000 in a land where, so far as we know, we are now being told to leave.

I suppose the Senator from Mississippi noted in today's newspapers that mobs are shouting that the U.S. forces should leave Cuba.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; and I am in sympathy with the feelings of the Senator from Lousiana in regard to this matter, and I am glad to discuss it. But I believe we should authorize this program, at least, so it will be available if the situation there clears up. It seems that the President has adopted an attitude of "wait and see." Sometimes we get a little impatient with that.

But I approve of the idea of renewing this old authorization; and I think we are safe in doing so.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think this illustrates what I was trying to say a little while ago; namely, that recent events are changing the picture somewhat. I think the situation to which the Senator from Louisiana has directed attention might well be included within that general description of the projects in regard to which I suggested that a degree of flexibility should be considered—in other words, that the Department should not consider these authorizations as mandatory projects, but should be expected to assess the situation and be sure we are going to be able to get our money's worth for what is authorized to be spent.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Of course, some of us feel that so long as the Government of Cuba is not demonstrating friendship for the United States, but, in fact, is demonstrating outright hostility for the United States, we might just be building the Communists a good base and runways which eventually could be used by unfriendly planes against the United States.

I know the Department usually prepares its budget about 1 year in advance, and then sends it to the Navy, and then it goes back to the Department of Defense, and then it goes to the Bureau of the Budget. So the chances are that this item was probably included by the Navy as long as 1 year ago at a time when the United States was getting along very well with Cuba.

I suggest to the Senator that a second reason why we should give second thought to this item for Guantanamo Bay is that to some degree it is a make-work project for the employment of a large number of unemployed workers who were displeased by Castro, by one means or another, by requiring American firms there to shut down.

Mr. STENNIS. I think the Senator's remarks are very timely. I did not mean to suggest that the program should be proceeded with. I understand it is not even included in the appropriation bill this year. This is just a matter of bringing forward an old authorization. So I agree with the Senator.

Mr. President, in the Army section of the bill there is an item which requires special explanation, I think, because it involves a change. I understand that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] will offer an amendment in connection with it.

It is a request by the Army for a construction fund of $3,314,000 for construction at Natick, Mass., of the facilities to house the Food and Container Institute; and $720,000 is going to be required for the movement of equipment and the making of minor modifications at the new location. That matter is included in the budget; and the Army's request was taken up, and a case for it was made by the Army; namely, to move this entire experiment and research installation and all the incidental activities in regard to the Food and Container Institute research program from what is called the Chicago Administration Center, in Chicago, Ill., to Natick, Mass. All of it is handled by the Quartermaster Research and Engineering Command, a unit of the Quartermaster Corps of the Army, which has been in operation for several years.

As I have said, the amount involved for the construction program is $3,314,000.

Their estimate was that it would reduce the annual operating cost of the Army by an estimated $1,297,000 annually, which at that rate would amortize the one-time cost of this operation in 3 9/10 years. They claim it would enhance the overall Army operational efficiency in connection with the work being carried on.

With all deference to the structure at Chicago, it seems that the large Chicago Administration Center building there is used for military activities. But it is impossible to carry on this activity there—so the Army says it has found—on the basis of efficiency, insofar as the proper use of funds, and so forth, is concerned.

We heard some very fine statements about the matter, and it was fully presented to the committee by gentlemen from Chicago who really knew the subject; and we also received testimony from the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and also an additional statement by him, as I recall.

The committee considered all those matters, but decided that a case in favor of the proposed change had been made.

Mr. President, I am not attempting to keep the floor; but I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], if he wishes to submit amendments, and then to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk, and ask to have read; and I also ask that the pages distribute copies of the amendments to the desks of all Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 72, beginning with line 3, to strike out all down through line 5.

On page 113, line 3, to strike out "$79-552,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$75,-924,000."

On page 113, line 6, to strike out "$147,482,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$143,854,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Mississippi for the courtesy which he showed in permitting the delegation from Chicago to state the facts in this matter, and I also want to say that I know in matters of this kind it is very hard for a senatorial committee to carry out an independent investigation, and that, almost of necessity, they are forced to rely upon the representations which are made to them by the military authorities. So I hope the Senator from Mississippi and the other members of the committee which heard this matter will not regard me as being unduly critical of them individually.

The purpose of my amendment is to strike from the bill the authorization of a transfer of the Food and Container Institute from Chicago to new buildings in Massachusetts.

The Quartermaster Corps has for a long time had designs upon this facility in Chicago, and has been determined to transfer the Food and Container Institute to this new center of theirs which they have been building in Natick, Mass.

As far back as 1952 we asked the Quartermaster Corps whether they had any designs to transfer the Food and Container Institute to Natick; and I shall submit for the RECORD statements by Defense Department officials and by the generals in the Quartermaster Corps disavowing any intent to make this transfer. But we have had the suspicion for a number of years that this was a design by the Quartermaster Corps and by the Army; and while, from year to year we were told that we were unduly suspicious, at last it has happened.

On the face of it, to transfer a food and container institute from the Middle West, which is the center of the food industry, both in the production and in the processing of food, and which is also the center of the container industry, to a peripheral area of the country, nonagricultural in nature, seems extremely foolish.

On the floor of the Senate the other day, I said that I thought a transfer of an institute for research into food and containers from Chicago to Massachusetts would be like transferring an institute for the study of arctic diseases to Puerto Rico. I say that analogy is

guarded, in language, and, if anything, is an understatement.

Mr. President, I shall develop this argument in some detail. Let me say that what the Quartermaster Corps is proposing to do is to break up the so-called administrative center in Chicago, which occupies 1,800,000 square feet of space, and which houses 26 separate Army functions, plus 8 non-Army activities. They propose to break it up, and scatter the units which are contained therein, most of them being moved to other regions in Chicago, but transferring the Food and Container Institute to Natick, Mass. From these moves they claim that large economies will result, and these are the asserted justification for the proposal.

The General Accounting Office has subjected the claims of the Army to a very stringent analysis; and while the Army attempted to reply, that reply is, in my judgment, wholly inadequate.

It is true that the present administrative center probably has much more space in it, and occupies a larger area, than is needed to carry on the 34 different functions. But it is perfectly obvious that economies could be effected even in the present buildings—there are really three connected buildings—by giving up one or two of the buildings, or giving up a floor or two in the buildings, thus shrinking the space for the present functions within the existing buildings. The space thus freed could be used for other Government services. That in itself would take care of most of the claimed economies for the move.

So I would suggest that what the Quartermaster Corps has been doing has been seeking to find excuses to justify a prearranged plan of constructing still support that contention in a statement shall submit more detailed evidence to support that contention in a statement which will later be included in the RECORD.

The Quartermaster Corps is intent on building a new structure, and it uses as justification the claimed economies to be achieved by constructing a new building in Natick and by moving most of the other functions to other locations in Chicago. I personally am very dubious as to whether any new structure is needed; but, if it is needed, we have produced evidence to indicate that it can be constructed for approximately the same cost in Chicago itself, and that there is no need for the transfer of the facility itself to Natick.

We have an extremely good institute of technology in Chicago, the Illinois Institute. It is one of the three or four best engineering and technical institutes in the country.

The Illinois Institute has offered to make available space upon its campus for a new structure and has had informal negotiations about the possibility and estimated cost of constructing a new building there for the Food and Container Institute. Their offer was turned down by the Quartermaster Corps under very extraordinary conditions.

The record will indicate that the representative of the Quartermaster Corps in the informal conversations with representatives of the Illinois Institute of Technology, told them he wanted somewhere between, roughly, 200,000 and 300,000 square feet of space. I believe the Quartermaster Corps representatives do not deny this impression which they gave to the Illinois Institute. And the Illinois Institute officials replied according to the Army that, in their judgment, to construct the desired new building would cost approximately $6 million.

The Quartermaster Corps then compared this estimate of $6 million with the estimate of $3,628,000 for the construction in Natick, and pointed to the $2,400,000 saving as an indication of the superiority of the Natick site.

The giveaway in this whole matter is that the Natick costs are for only 121,000 feet of space, whereas the Quartermaster Corps asked the Illinois Institute to submit an offer on from 200,000 to 300,000 feet of space. So the Quartermaster Corps was comparing horses and apples. Rather, either inadvertently or by design, the Quartermaster Corps has led the Illinois Institute down the garden path into a proposal based on about twice the footage that the Natick project was based upon. It took the public hearing and Illinois Institute's subsequent letter to "smoke that out" of the Quartermaster Corps.

We also asked the Illinois Institute to figure what the cost would be for a new building, and what the cost would be for moving, inside Chicago, for a building with 121,000 feet, the same area as planned at Natick. We got the information only the day before yesterday, on the very day the Armed Services Committee was marking up the military construction bill finally. We rushed the information over, with a covering letter, to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the chairman of the subcommittee. I assume that the decision probably had already been made. It is hard for the committee to reverse itself.

I also made the documents available in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the day before yesterday, so that the Members of the Senate could read them.

In brief, the Illinois Institute now says it could construct a building on or next to its campus in Chicago conforming to all of the standards, comprising a little over 121,000 square feet, for $3,690,000, and that this would include the moving costs from the present headquarters into the new building. This compares with an appropriation authorization at Natick of $3,628,000. In other words, the Chicago bid is only $62,000 more than the Natick bid.

I will say in passing that the General Accounting Office is very critical indeed of the estimate which the Quartermaster Corps put together for $3,628,000 at Natick. The General Accounting Office believes the cost will run well over $4 million—indeed, very much more than $4 million.

Mr. President, I do not blame the Subcommittee on Military Construction Appropriations for not being able fully to digest this information when it came to them at the last moment. It was not the fault of the Illinois Institute or of the Senator from Illinois that the information did not reach the subcommittee earlier. There was no delay, I assure the Senate.

However, I think the Senate should now consider this matter with all the facts before it. There is really no difference in the cost. If anything, the cost is less in Chicago, because the Quartermaster Corps estimates of cost are very dubious and understated, in the opinion of the General Accounting Office, and are not well founded.

I wish now to develop the question of the relative superiority of location for a moment. The Food and Container Institute has been in Chicago for almost 40 years. It has been in full force in Chicago for a quarter of a century. It works closely with the food and container industries, and with the universities, through exchanges of information, cooperation in application of new discoveries, discussion of procurement matters, and through research contracts. Over 100 of its 250 civilian employees are classified as scientific and technical. It has developed a highly skilled personnel.

The Chicago Association of Commerce & Industry submitted a table showing how the industrial concerns dealing with food are primarily based upon Chicago. That also is in the hearings. I wish to mention some of the items.

The Chicago Board of Trade is certainly the world's leading market in futures trading in grains.

The city is first among all metropolitan areas of the Nation in meat production. Despite the growing decentralization in the market, Chicago is still the national center of the sales market for meat.

Chicago is the center of distribution for the dairy industry.

Chicago is the center of the confectionery industry in the United States, producing about one-fourth of all candy manufactured in the country.

The Chicago Mercantile Exchange is the Nation's leading futures market in butter and eggs.

The major portion of America's fruit and vegetables funnel through Chicago. In fact, more fresh produce passes through Chicago than passes through any other similar center in the world.

Chicago handles enough grain to be known as the Nation's third largest granary. The value of crops harvested within a 500-mile radius of Chicago is 41 percent of the national total.

Among the large firms which are in Chicago engaged in baking are the Continental Baking Co., Schulze & Burch Biscuit Co., Ward Baking Co., Gordon Baking Co., Piper Baking Co., the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., United Biscuit Co., and so on and so forth.

The Chicago area manufactures more containers of all kinds than any other area in the Nation.

There are at least 12 important universities carrying on research and graduate work as to food and container technology within a radius of several hundred miles, many inside Chicago itself.

We have in Chicago the largest collection of libraries devoted to food products.

A very large number of industrial firms have signed a letter urging that the Food and Container Institute be kept in Chicago. The list includes:

Daniel F. Gerber, president, Gerber Baby Foods, Fremont, Mich.

William A. Beich, vice president, Paul F. Beich Co., Bloomington, Ill.

Russell D. L. Wirth, president, Red Star Yeast & Products Co., Milwaukee, Wis.

J. Clyde Loftis, president, Kraft Foods Co., Chicago, Ill.

Daniel J. Uhrig, president, American Bakeries, Co., Chicago, Ill.

R. G. Lucks, president, California Packing Corp., San Francisco, Calif.

K. W. Brighton, vice president and general manager, American Can Co., Barrington, Ill.

Roscoe G. Haynie, president, Wilson & Co., Inc., Chicago, Ill.

Herbert R. Stratford, executive vice president, Morton Salt Co., Chicago, Ill.

Dale W. Johnson, manager, Edible Protein Products, Central Soya Co., Inc., Chicago, Ill.

A. V. Williams, vice president, Lawry's Products, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.

G. F. Atkinson, general manager, Durkee Famous Foods Division, the Glidden Co., Chicago, Ill.

C. S. Bridges, president, Libby, McNeill & Libby, Chicago, Ill.

W. G. Mason, vice president, marketing, the Quaker Oats Co., Chicago, Ill.

P. K. Bates, Ph. D., general manager of research, Carnation Co., Van Nuys, Calif.

G. C. Scott, president, research, Green Giant Co., Le Sueur, Minn.

J. B. Pardieck, president, California Vegetable Concentrates, Inc., Huntington Park, Calif.

Douglas S. Steinberg, president, National Confectioners Association, Chicago, Ill.

John T. Walsh, director, American Dry Milk Institute, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

M. A. Peterson, general manager, Idaho Potato Growers, Inc., Idaho Falls, Idaho.

George L. Sternfield, executive vice president, Kitchen Art Foods, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

C. L. Griffith, president, the Griffith Laboratories, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

Robert W. Reneker, vice president, Swift & Co., Chicago, Ill.

Arthur T. O'Connor, secretary-treasurer, Dean Milk Co., Franklin Park, Ill.

Robert J. Greenebaum, president, Inland Steel Container Co., Chicago, Ill.

R. Bruce Holmgren, editor, Package Engineering, Chicago, Ill.

Harold M. Mayer, vice president, Oscar Mayer & Co., Chicago, Ill.

Dwight P. Joyce, chairman and president, the Glidden Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Philip N. Wrigley, president, Wm. Wrigley, Jr., Chicago, Ill.

H. L. Slaughter, vice president, Durkee Famous Foods Division, the Glidden Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

One could go on. It is interesting to note that the sole witness who could be brought before the committee to testify from the industry in favor of Natick was William Hampton, the director of research of the Ocean Spray Cranberry Co., of Duxbury, Mass.

I like cranberries. I suppose the Massachusetts cranberries are as good as any other cranberries, though we rather prefer those from Wisconsin. However, the sole witness from all of industry who testified in favor of transferring this Institute to Natick was the representative of the Ocean Spray Cranberry Co. This is a veluetio ad absurdum. I would like to say "horseradish." But I will say "cranberries."

I do not believe cranberries should weigh so heavily in the scale compared with all other products.

Mr. President, I think we should go slow on this matter. I think we should not authorize the appropriation, and that the committee should go into the question more thoroughly. We should not take so implicity as true the claims of the Quartermaster Corps. We have apparently had the cards stacked against us from the very start. I am confident that if a thorough investigation is made, it will be found, first, that merely by reducing the amount of space used in the present buildings, adequate economies can be effected without any physical relocation and, second, if a physical relocation is carried out, it can be done with greater effectiveness and at no greater cost with the new building on the grounds of the Illinois Institute of Technology in Chicago.

I ask unanimous consent that a more detailed statement which I have prepared on this subject be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I hope that when the Senate comes to a final decision, we shall not decide the question with only four or five Senators in the Chamber. I hope, therefore, that this item, which is an authorization, may be eliminated and that we may have a more thorough examination of the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the statement may be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

The item of $3,628,000 for research, development and test facilities, and troop housing at Natick, Mass., which my amendment would strike from the bill, would in effect authorize the transfer of the Quartermaster Corps Food and Container Institute away from Chicago where it has been located for many years to Massachusetts.

I believe this proposal is most unwise and should be deleted from the bill. It would remove this important research facility from the area that is the heart of the food and container industry. The proposal was put forward without adequate consideration of the alternative possibilities for new building in Chicago at the Illinois Institute of Technology for virtually the same cost. And the savings claimed by the Army for this move, as examined by the GAO, are greatly exaggerated, if not wholly dubious.

A brief examination of each of these points should make clear the desirability of removing this item from the bill.

1. FOOD AND CONTAINER INDUSTRY CENTER IS ONLY SENSIBLE LOCATION

Dating back in some of its functions to 1921, the Food and Container Institute was originally established in Chicago as the Subsistence Research Laboratory in 1936, grew rapidly in World War II to a function employing nearly 300 persons, and has performed vital services in all succeeding years with personnel now totaling about 250 civilian and 60 military employees.

Here it has performed basic research and development in food nutrition, stability, and acceptance; in military rations and food products for the Armed Forces; in containers; and in irradiation processes. The Institute has also carried on a standardization program for related research and engineering and has given technical services and engineering support to other military activities.

It works closely with the food and container industries and universities around the country through research contracts. Over 100 of its employees are classed as scientific or technical.

In the light of these functions, Mr. President, the only sensible location for this work is in Chicago, for the following reasons:

(a) The contacts with the food and container industries, with which the Quartermaster Corps spends large amounts of its money each year, are most easily maintained in Chicago, which is admittedly the center of the Nation's food and container industries. Chicago is in the heart of the country's richest agricultural area. It produces more meat products than any other city. It ranks second in grain mill products. It is a leading distribution center for dairy products, poultry and eggs, fruits, etc.

Similarly Chicago is the country's major producer of containers of all kinds. It leads in tin can production and is very high in paperboard container production.

Chicago is accordingly the most convenient location for the Army to secure the assistance of the industry technologists from industry advisory committees. There are 17 such committees, and in addition 29 task groups cooperating with the Institute.

There are more food and container trade associations located in Chicago than anywhere else, another important source of contacts.

It is no wonder that officials of such companies as the following have urged that this Institute not be moved away from Chicago:

Kraft Foods Co.; American Bakeries Co.; California Packing Corp.; American Can Co.; Wilson & Co.; Morton Salt Co.; Central Soya Co.; Libby, McNeill & Libby; Quaker Oats Co.; Carnation Co.; Green Giant Co.; California Vegetable Concentrates, Inc.; National Confectioners Association; American Dry Milk Institute, Inc.; Idaho Potato Growers, Inc.; Kitchen Art Foods, Inc.; Swift & Co.; Dean Milk Co.; Inland Steel Container Co.; Oscar Mayer & Co.; Wm. Wrigley, Jr., Co.; and Glidden Co.

Only an official of the Ocean Spray Cranberry Co. of Duxbury, Mass., out of all the food industries, appeared in favor of the Natick move.

(b) Because of the concentration of the industry in Chicago and the development of related research in nearby universities, the Chicago area presents unmatched private research facilities to cooperate with the Institute. Over 100 such industrial research laboratories are listed in the materials I inserted in the RECORD on Wednesday. Major scientific research facilities are also available at the University of Chicago, Northwestern University Technological Institute, Illinois Institute of Technology, Armour Research Foundation, American Meat Institute, the University of Illinois Medical Center, and Argonne National Laboratory. The technical libraries are also numerous, including the John Crerar Library, one of the greatest scientific libraries in the world.

(c) Chicago is the best center for recruiting technical personnel, both because of the abundance of industry research in the vicinity and because educational institutions doing graduate work in food technology are more numerous in the Midwest than in any other part of the country.

It seems to me that the Army has underestimated the importance of this factor also in recommending the move from Chicago to Natick. Mr. William G. Mason, who testified at the hearings in behalf of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, and is himself a vice president of the Quaker Oats Co., made it clear that the Institute has built up a very competent personnel, including many highly skilled individuals. He also expressed a doubt that many of them would go to Natick, if this change is made. Is it really worthwhile to tear this Institute out by its roots and break up the manpower group that has provided such excellent scientific and research services to the country?

(d) Retention of the Institute in Chicago would enable it to maintain its present close relationship with the Military Subsistence Supply Agency and the Army Subsistence Center, with which there are frequent conferences and contacts. I am told that the improvements and developments in relation to rations result in new and revised specifications which are used by the subsistence agencies for the procurement of subsistence supplies, and that a nearby location is therefore of great importance.

(e) Since by General Seeman's admission in the hearings, almost half of the Quartermaster Corps' research and development activities are contracted out, the proximity of the Institute to the institutions which receive these contracts is also of importance. The summary of these contracts prepared by the Chicago Association of Commerce indicates that in dollar volume over $1,900,000 of these contracts are in the Middle West and on the west coast, whereas only $422,000 of these contracts are in the East (including New York, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia). In terms of the number of contracts, nearly 72 percent are in the Middle West and West and only 22½ percent in the East.

In the light of the great advantages which the Chicago location offers, therefore, I believe it would be folly to transfer the Food and Container Institute from Chicago to Natick—and it appears that a preponderant segment of the related and cooperating industries agree.

As I said on Wednesday in the Senate, it would make about as much sense to locate a laboratory on Arctic diseases in Puerto Rico.

2. ALTERNATIVE CHICAGO POSSIBILITIES NOT FULLY EXPLORED

In its justification of the proposed move because of claimed economies, the Army reports that it conferred with officials of the Illinois Institute of Technology in Chicago about placing the new building on that campus if the present facility is vacated. But the Army memorandum submitted to the Armed Services Committee asserted that the Illinois Institute "offer" came to "approximately $6 million," as compared with the estimated cost of $3,628,000 at Natick.

It now appears from the letter I placed in the RECORD on Wednesday, however, that the conversations with the Illinois Institute officials were based on an assumed building area of 200,000 to 300,000 square feet. On the other hand, the new buildings at Natick are planned for 121,000 square feet at the most—and General Seeman's latest memo refers to only 112,000 square feet.

The Illinois Institute vice president, Mr. Raymond J. Spaeth, in his letter of May 9 to me has stated that on this reduced area of 121,000 square feet—as contrasted with the 200,000 to 300,000 square feet earlier discussed—they could erect the necessary laboratories so that, with moving costs (which are included in the $3,628,000 figure in the bill), the total cost in Chicago would come to $3,690,170.

This is only $62,000 more—or about 2 percent—than the figure submitted by the Army.

The GAO, which has made some sweeping criticisms of the Army claims of possible economies, pointed out that in July 1959: "Although the advantages of affiliation with the IIT were considerable, the cost factors, when compared to relocation at the Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center at Natick, were considered so unfavorable that the proposal was not further explored in detail" (p. 29).

But since they were comparing such unlike areas, it is no wonder the advantage was all with Natick.

I certainly think Congress should go slow to break up a highly efficient operation and scientific team in Chicago on the basis of alleged savings to the Government most of which vanish into thin air when the basis of comparison is a fair one. I cannot understand why the Army did not explore this move more fully last year. But at least now that we know the Quartermaster Corps did not ask the Illinois Institute to submit a proposal based on the same size facility as at Natick—which General Seeman admitted in response to Senator Cannon's questions at the hearing (p. 576)—and did not try to find out the costs of any comparable new facility in Chicago, I believe Congress should not accept the Army's recommendation on this item as adequately justified.

3. THE SAVINGS CLAIMED BY THE ARMY FOR THE TRANSFER TO NATICK ARE PROBABLY NONEXISTENT

The Army's plan in connection with the proposed move of the Food and Container Institute to Natick is primarily supported by the claim of operating economies made possible through vacating the present building where it is now located in Chicago, the so-called Chicago Administration Center.

This building—really three connected buildings—has 1.8 million square feet of space. It presently houses 26 different functions of the Quartermaster and Fifth Army, four other Defense Department activities, and various other functions of four other Government departments. All of these would have to be relocated or otherwise cared for. It is no simple operation.

The new plans for the Department of Army functions provide for the use of only 266,000 square feet as against the 1,071,000 square feet the Army is now using at the Chicago Administration Center. Over half of this space reduction (499,000 square feet) is accounted for by eliminating the space for administrative personnel—and the saving through reduction in that personnel (261 employees) is a further major part of the claimed savings.

But two things should be said. First, the savings from this large reduction in space and administrative personnel depends only in small part upon the move to Natick. Most of it can also be made by vacating the present building and moving the Food and Container Institute into new and smaller quarters in Chicago.

And secondly, the GAO points out that "most of the savings which may be realized are contingent upon the ability of the Army to perform the operations within the sharply reduced space requirements estimated by the Army for the relocation sites" (p. 7). (For instance they cut the Food and Container Institute space from 188,000 to 121,000 or 112,000 square feet, depending upon which figure of General Seeman's is used.) And the GAO further states: "It is, of course, quite possible that in any given case, or in all the moves proposed, the projected space needs will be found inadequate or the support costs at the relocation sites will be greater than estimated, or that both situations will occur" (p. 14).

The GAO also declares that it found the estimated support costs at the various relocation sites understated, the costs of relocating the other tenants understated, and the relocation costs of nonmilitary activities not considered at all.

Thus the claimed savings through inactivating the Chicago Administrative Center building are held by GAO to be exaggerated.

But the essential point is that most of them (the only exception being the saving from placing the Food and Container Institute under the administrative operation of the present Natick command) could also be secured from inactivating the Chicago Administration Center building and moving the Institute to a new location in Chicago.

Taking special note of the drastic space reductions planned by the Army for the functions now performed at the CAC, the study by the GAO also developed an estimate for possible future savings in the same CAC buildings, but with the present functions compressed into the proposed smaller space, and with other Government tenants making a full use of the whole CAC building space. Interestingly enough, these projections develop an ultimate annual savings of $1.3 million (p. 21), which is greater than the exaggerated claim of $1,297,000 annual savings by the Army—although the savings in the first 7 years when new equipment costs would be amortized is estimated below the Army figures.

It is also interesting to note that the Army is able to get cost figures which are apparently somewhat lower at Natick (although General Seeman concedes that unit construction costs are virtually the same) because the existing development building at Natick is a specially designed laboratory structure, the entire first floor of which is now devoted to office use. They plan to convert this to laboratory use (and extend the development building also) and relocate the present office personnel in a less costly new office facility. In other words, part of this costlier laboratory structure represents past Government expense.

Another interesting point in the GAO analysis is that the annual savings properly allocated to Natick alone in recurring costs resulting from the closing of the C.A.C. building in Chicago is only $281,285 (schedule A). At this rate it will take a lot longer than the claimed 3 years to amortize the cost of the new construction at Natick—which is $3,628,000 under this bill, but which GAO estimates will come with relocation costs to $4,542,000 (schedule B).

In any case, the study which GAO made left it in sufficient doubt about the claimed savings from inactivating the C.A.C. building and the possibilities of more economical use of it than at present, that GAO declared the "C.A.C. facility should be studied further * * * before a final decision is made regarding the ultimate use or disposal of this facility" (p. 22).

The case for economy in the proposed move, therefore, seems to fall apart, and I believe the Senate has before it a simple question of where this food and container research function can best be performed. For the reasons which I outlined at the start, I believe there can be only one answer to this question, Chicago. And I hope we shall not make the mistake of moving this vital Laboratory, breaking up the scientific group long assembled at the present site, damaging the performance of the Government's own work and making more difficult the essential cooperation with related industries and the recruitment of new personnel.

I hope, therefore, that my amendment may be approved.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS IS GOING BACK ON ASSURANCES AGAINST MOVE AWAY FROM CHICAGO

When the initial appropriation for the Natick research center was before the Senate in 1952, I specifically raised the possibility that that might be the opening move in a more extensive plan to transfer the Food and Container Institute from Chicago also.

In a letter from the Department of Defense placed in the RECORD by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], however, it was categorically stated, "The Quartermaster Corps Food and Container Institute will remain at its present location in Chicago, Ill." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 30, 1952, vol. 98, pt. 7, p. 8590). Previously the distinguished Representative from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], had stated in the House that the Natick facility would not house all the Quartermaster research, just that research concerned with protecting the soldier from all weather conditions where he may be called upon to fight. He added, "There is no provision to take care of the Food and Container Institute at Chicago." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 25, 1952, vol. 98, pt. 3, p. 2855.)

Similar assurances had been given in the hearings on the authorization bills in 1947:

"Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does this laboratory * * * contemplate research on foods?

"General DORIOT. No, sir. I should say not. Food technology, the application of the industrial side of it, the assay food as a military weapon, so to speak, is in Chicago, because that is where the industry is." (Hearings on H.R. 612, p. 3985.)

"General MIDDLESWART. We feel we can do a much better job if we put all of it, except for food, which we intend to leave in Chicago, into this consolidated laboratory" (p. 3988.)

And again in the hearings in 1948—

"Dr. HUNTER (technical director, Research and Development, Quartermaster Corps). The food work is in Chicago and does not become a part of this discussion here." (Hearings on S. 286, p. 25.)

Against the background of these repeated assurances, we surely cannot be blamed for feeling that we have been booby-trapped by the Quartermaster Corps. Regardless of that, however, the basic question is, where can this function be most efficiently and economically run. And the Army has not to my mind justified the move to Natick, and the proposed expenditure of $3,628,000 to start it in motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] wish his amendments to be considered en bloc?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; of necessity they must be so considered because the first part of the amendments strikes out the individual item, whereas the two latter paragraphs of the amendments deal with the reduction in totals which would be occasioned if the earlier item is eliminated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to defend for a moment the action of the subcommittee and the full committee of the Armed Services Committee in including this item for the Natick Research and Engineering Center in the military construction authorization bill.

I am opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, which would strike out the funds for the movement of the Food and Container Institute from Chicago and its construction at Natick, Mass. The Department of the Army, the Department of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, and the full committee of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate have approved this move, and the Comptroller General estimates it will save approximately a million dollars a year. The Army puts the savings at nearer $1,300,000 a year. The amount provided in the bill for the move is $3,628,000, which includes the new construction and equipment. It is an addition to the Natick Research Center, which is the headquarters of the Quartermaster Research and Engineering Command.

At Natick at the present time there are installations valued at approximately $11,800,000. This provision would add $3,628,000 to that amount, and would provide for new and converted space in the amount of 121,235 square feet.

Included in this amount would be an addition to and conversion of a development building, animal laboratory facilities, addition to an enlisted men's barracks, and a new office and laboratory building, all of which is included in the $3,628,000.

At the present time the center does the Quartermaster research work for the Armed Forces in clothing, in atmospheric conditions, and in all other investigations which contribute to better health of members of the Army. It is desired to put the food and container research there also, as it is all a part of the same undertaking.

I do not object to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] opposing this move because the laboratory in Chicago has been there, as he stated, for a number of years. But I do say that Massachusetts is just as good a food research center as is Illinois. I call attention to the facilities of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the University of Massachusetts, and the Arthur D. Little Research Laboratory, which are all working on the question of food research.

In addition I remind the Senator from Illinois that the products of the Birdseye Food Co., for example, were developed entirely in Massachusetts. That is a national product today. So we do know something about food.

I also point out that the geographic distribution of industrial food laboratories, as shown in a study prepared by the National Academy of Sciences as of 1956, shows that the great majority of food research laboratories are in the East rather than in the Chicago area.

Originally the Senator from Illinois wished to rehabilitate the warehouse where this laboratory is now located in Chicago. The Army calls it a white elephant. That proposal was dropped. The present proposal is to have new construction at the Illinois Institute of Technology. But one thing the proposal does not state is whether the Armed Forces will construct a building on land of the Illinois Institute of Technology or whether they will lease a building which would be built by the Illinois Institute itself.

The Senator states that the building would require about 121,000 square feet of space, and that the cost of such a structure in Illinois would be only slightly greater than the cost would be in Natick. I point out to him that if the structure were built in Illinois, there would have to be about 40,000 square feet additional—the Army only estimates that; without a detailed study it is not sure—for administrative purposes.

I also point out that this 40,000 square feet at $22 a square foot would add another $800,000 to the cost. That expenditure would not be necessary in Natick because of consolidation with present administrative services. Also if the project is built at Natick, there would be employed 220 technical people instead of the 252 now employed in Illinois.

So there are these reasons—fundamental financial reasons, economic reasons, and research reasons—why all of this research work for the Armed Forces should be concentrated at Natick. A subcommittee of the House is studying this subject. If the bill is in conference, the matter will be open when we get the report of the subcommittee of the House. If that report is adverse to Natick, of course, what I am saying to the Senate is of very much less value. If it is in favor of Natick, it makes even a stronger case than the Army, the Defense Department, and the Bureau of the Budget are now making.

As it was pointed out, this building will be paid for, in savings, in approximately 3 to 5 years. I say that advisedly, because if it is figured at $1,300,000, it will be paid for within that period. If the figure is less, it will take a little longer.

I would say that my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who is very busy at the present time, could not be in the Senate this afternoon, and he has authorized me to speak in his behalf on this subject; he is in accord with me regarding this transfer.

So I hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] will be defeated, and that the unanimous report of the Committee on Armed Services on this subject will be sustained, and that this matter will be taken to conference, where we can discuss it on its merits.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there are a few points which the Senator from Massachusetts made that I believe should be answered. One is his statement that if the facility remains in Chicago it would need 40,000 more square feet for administrative purposes, whereas that would not be needed in Natick.

This seems to me a figure which has been drawn out of the hat to justify a predetermined decision. The square footage needed for research purposes and the facilities connected with this food and container research come to 121,000 feet. To say that a third more is needed for administrative purposes is extraordinary and incredible.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I believe I can give the exact statement of the Army on that subject. Would he prefer not to yield at this time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In relation to this subject, to which the Senator is now addressing himself, the Army says:

It does not cover facilities for housing additional station overhead requirements which would be necessary to accommodate the necessary overhead if the F and CI were continued in Chicago at IIT. Provision of this additional space would invalidate IIT purported equivalent costs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to say, in reply, that some reasonable space for administrative personnel would be understandable, but not 40,000 square feet. Furthermore the General Accounting Office has pointed out that if we take in all of the probable costs, the costs at Natick would not be $3,628,000, but over $4 million. So that this is a very dubious advantage which the Senator mentions. It is clearly outweighed by the enormous advantages of locating this research work in the midwest, in Chicago.

I appreciate the fact that Massachusetts is a center of food consumption. I had never thought it was also a center of food production or processing. In spite of the high standing of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, I had never thought that much of its work was done in the field of foods. It is a great engineering institution, but not a food center. There are in the Chicago area no less than 100 industrial research laboratories dealing primarily with foods and containers. There are scientific research facilities in the field of foods available at the University of Chicago, Northwestern University, the Illinois Institute of Technology, the Armour Research Foundation, the American Meat Institute, the University of Illinois Medical Center, and the Argonne National Laboratory. The John Crerar Library, one of the greatest scientific libraries in the world is located in Chicago.

In addition, Chicago is the best center for the recruiting of technical personnel in the field of food technology.

I introduced for the RECORD on Wednesday the information about the geographical distribution of the Food and Container Institute's research contracts. By the admission of General Seeman himself, almost a half of the Quartermaster Corps research and development activities are contracted out. If we analyze these contracts, we find that by volume more than $1,900,000 are in the Middle West and on the West Coast, whereas only $422,000 of these contracts are in the East, including New York, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia. In terms of the number of contracts, nearly 72 percent are in the Middle West and West, and only 22 percent in the East.

So I submit it would make about as much sense to transfer the Food and Research Institute to Natick, Massachusetts, as it would be to locate a laboratory on Arctic diseases in Puerto Rico.

I believe we have now a sum total of perhaps six or seven Senators on the floor, and I would not like to have this issue decided at this time. Therefore I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that suggestion for a moment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I withhold it.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to talk very briefly on this subject, and I shall try to summarize it as I see it. What is involved here is the transfer of a function and a facility from the city of Chicago to the city of Natick, Mass. I can readily understand the desire of my distinguished friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, to have the transfer made. I am sure he understands our desire to retain the center in the city of Chicago, if we can.

We hope it will be left there. We believe that the arguments which have been adduced in behalf of the transfer are, first, that it would effectuate a consolidation of certain activities. Second, and I suppose this is to be conceded according to the report by the Comptroller General, that some savings might be effected.

I should point out, however, that the Comptroller General's report dealt entirely, as I understand, with the money savings, and gave no effect to a good many other factors.

In the first instance, I believe the Army overstated the economies, and perhaps the General Accounting Office did likewise, because they sent first one report to my office, and then a few days later they sent a revised report, indicating the economies were not quite as substantial as were first indicated by the Army or the Comptroller General.

I am concerned with the argument as to why this Institute ought to remain in the city of Chicago and in the State of Illinois. I will summarize the argument in this way. First, the economies were overstated and were concerned only with the dollars involved. Second, I believe the Comptroller General's report indicates that there would be circumscribed space at the Natick installation. In fact, Mr. Weitzel's letter to Representative YATES, dated April 27, 1960, has this statement in it:

> It is important to note, however, that most of the savings estimated by the Army and by us depend upon the ability of the Army to perform the operations within sharply reduced—by 75 percent—space requirements estimated by the Army for the relocation sites.

I think it is a very significant thing; and if that were taken into account, and if the matter were rationalized on a comparable area basis, doubtless no such savings could be established.

The third reason I would cite is that this center has been located in the city of Chicago, or its forerunner has been located there, since 1921. That means that some kind of function like this has been in the State of Illinois for 39 years, and I think there ought to be a preponderant argument before there is approval of the proposal to relocate this Container Institute.

Fourth, the facility was located in Chicago because of the proximity to the procurement agencies of the armed services. There are so many of them there, and I think that is the reason why the center was established there in the first instance. Those procurement and supply agencies are still there, or are in that general area. Hence, that is another valid reason why the proposal to move the center to Massachusetts should not be lightly undertaken.

Fifth, I submit that this function was located in Chicago because of the proximity of laboratories and libraries. One needs only to examine the hearings and note the long list of laboratories and other facilities to get some hint that actually that area is the center for that kind of function.

Beginning at page 562 of the hearings, there are listed, first, the industrial research laboratories in the Chicago area dealing with foods; second, the laboratories dealing with containers; and then the major Chicago trade associations in the food and container field. Nowhere else in the country are there facilities to match them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the lists of the various facilities.

There being no objection, the lists were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENCLOSURE 1. INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH LABORATORIES IN THE CHICAGO AREA

(Source: Industrial Research Laboratories of the United States (10th ed.) Publication 379, National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 1956.)

A. FOODS

American Bakeries Co., 919 North Michigan Avenue.

American Dry Milk Institute, Inc., 221 North La Salle Street.

American Institute of Baking, 400 East Ontario Street.

American Meat Institute Foundation, 939 East 57th Street.

American Research & Testing Laboratories, 32 North State Street.

Armour & Co. Research Division, Union Stock Yards.

Armour & Co. Auxiliaries Division, 1355 West 31st Street.

Beatrice Foods Co., 1526 South State Street.

Best Foods, Inc., The, 2816 South Kilbourn Avenue.

Chicago-Allis Manufacturing Co., 113–25 North Green Street.

Chicago Dairy & Food Laboratories, 6930 North Clark Street.

Chicago Pharmacal Co., 5547 North Ravenswood.

Columbus Laboratories, The, 31 North State Street.

Continental Can Co., Inc.—Metal Division, 76th and Loomis Boulevard.

Continental Coffee Co., 641 North Orleans Street.

Cook Chocolate Co., 4825 South Rockwell Street.

Dawes' Laboratories, Inc., 4800 South Richmond Street.

Dickinson Co., Albert, The, 2750 West 35th Street.

F. & F. Laboratories, Inc., 3501 West 48th Place.

Fermco Chemicals, Inc., 4941 South Racine Avenue.

Feuer & Associates, Bertram, 664 North Michigan Avenue.

Food Technology, Inc., 5903 Northwest Highway.

General Foods Corp.-Perkins Products Co., 7400 South Rockwell Street.

Glidden Co., The, Food Division (Durkee Famous Foods), 2670 North Elston Avenue and 3702 Iron Street.

Griffith Laboratories, Inc., The, 1415 West 37th Street.

Hales & Hunter Co., Red Comb Laboratory, 140th and Stewart Avenue.

Independent Biscuit Manufacturers' Co., 7002 North Clark Street.

Industrial Bio-Test Laboratories, Inc., 4122 South Union Avenue.

Institute of American Poultry Industries, I.A.P.I. Egg Products Laboratory, 110 North Franklin Street.

James Laboratories, The, 189 West Madison Street.

Johnson Products Co.—Keto Laboratory, 4603 South State Street.

Kitchen Art Foods, Inc., 2320 North Damen Avenue.
Kohnstamm & Co., Inc., H., 11 East Illinois Street.
Laboratory of Vitamin Technology, Inc., 7737 South Chicago Avenue.
Liquid Carbonic Corp., The, 3100 South Kedzie Avenue.
Long Co., W. E., 188 West Randolph Street.
Miner Laboratories, The, 9 South Clinton Street.
Morton Salt Co., Development Division, 1357 North Elston.
Peter Hand Foundation, 1632, North Sheffield Avenue.
Quaker Oats Co., The, 345 East 25th Street.
Reliable Packing Co., 1440 West 47th Street.
Scientific Oil Compounding Co., Inc., 1637 South Kilbourn.
Siebel Sons' Co., Inc., J. E., 4055 West Peterson Avenue.
Stange Co., William J., 342 North Western Avenue.
Swift & Co., Union Stock Yards.
Synthetical Laboratories, The, 5558 West Ardmore Avenue.
Vico Products Co., 2817 North Oakley Boulevard.
Vitamins, Inc., 809 West 58th Street.
Wahl-Henius Institute, 1135 Fullerton Avenue.
Wilson & Co., Inc., 4100 South Ashland Avenue.
Wrigley Co., Wm., Jr., 301 East Erie Street.
Corn Products Refining Co., Argo, Ill.
Jewel Tea Co., Inc., Barrington, Ill.
Wilson & Co., Inc., Calumet City, Ill.
Victor Chemical Works, Chicago Heights, Ill.
General American Transportation Corp., East Chicago, Ind.
Fearn Foods, Inc., Franklin Park, Ill.
Furst-McNess Co., Freeport, Ill.
National Dairy Products Corp., Kraft Foods Co., Glenview, Ill.
Grayslake Gelatin Co., Grayslake, Ill.
Pratt Food Co., Hammond, Ind.
Armour & Co., Kankakee, Ill.
Allied Mills, Inc., Libertyville, Ill.
American Can Co., Maywood, Ill.
United Biscuit Co. of America, Melrose Park, Ill.
American Maize-Products Co., Roby, Ind.
Dean Milk Co., Rockford, Ill.
California Packing Corp., Rochelle, Ill.
Julep Co., The, Sycamore, Ill.
Koller & Koller, Villa Park, Ill.
Wander Co., The, Villa Park, Ill.
Morton Salt Co., Woodstock, Ill.

B. CONTAINERS

Celotex Corp., The, 205 West Monroe Street.
Chicago Carton Co., 4200 South Pulaski Road.
Container Corp. of America, 10 North Clark Street.
Container Laboratories, Inc., 112 West Kinzie Street.
Continental Can Co., Inc., Central Research & Engineering Division, 7622 South Racine Avenue.
Continental Can Co., Inc., Millsplastic Laboratory, 2930 North Ashland Avenue.
Cracker Jack Co., The, 4800 West 66th Street.
Cromwell Paper Co., 4801 South Whipple Street.
Daubert Chemical Co., 4700 South Central Avenue.
Ekco Products Co., 1949 North Cicero Avenue.
Glidden Co., Protective Coating Division, 1856 North LeClaire Avenue.
Inland Steel Container Co., 6532 South Menard Avenue.
Liquid Carbonic Corp., The, 3100 South Kedzie Avenue.
Meyercord Co., 5323 West Lake Street.
Precision Scientific Co., 3737 West Cortland Street.
Rapid Roller Co., 2550 South Federal Street.
Stone Container Corp., 4200 West 42d Place.
Transparent Package Co., 3520 South Morgan Street.
Triangle Package Machinery Co., 6655 West Diversey Avenue.
Visking Corp., 6733 West 65th Street.
White Cap Co., 1819 North Major Avenue.
Apollo Metal Works, Bedford Park.
Dearborn Glass Co., Bedford Park.
Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., East Chicago, Ind.
Borg-Warner Corp., Marbon Chemical Division, Gary, Ind.
Glidden Co., the Chemical, Metal, and Pigment Division, Hammond, Ind.
Dearborn Chemical Co., Lake Zurich.
American Can Co., Maywood.
Atlas Powder Co., Zapon Finishes Laboratory, North Chicago.

ENCLOSURE 2. MAJOR CHICAGO TRADE ASSOCIATIONS IN THE FOOD AND CONTAINER FIELDS

A. FOODS

Chicago Candy Association, 306 North Union Avenue.
Independent Grocers' Alliance Distribution Co., 131 South Wabash Avenue.
Mayonnaise & Salad Dressing Manufacturers Association, 100 East Ohio Street.
National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue.
National Association of Retail Meal & Food Dealers, Inc., 500 North Dearborn.
National Cheese Institute, Inc., 100 North Franklin Street.
National Confectioners' Association of the United States, Inc., 36 South Wabash Avenue.
National Fruit & Syrup Manufacturers Association, 38 South Deaborn Street.
National Pickle Packers Association, 202 South Marion Street, Oak Park.
National Retail Tea & Coffee Merchants Association, 222 West North Bank Drive.
National Soup Mix Association, 125 East Church Street, Libertyville.
National Split Pea Association, 332 South Michigan Avenue.
Research & Development Associates, Food & Container Institute, Inc., 1849 West Pershing Road.
Salt Producers Association, 231 North La Salle Street.
American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street.
American Meat Institute Foundation, 939 East 57th Street.
National Livestock Producers Association, 139 North Clark Street.
National Livestock and Meat Board, 407 South Dearborn Street.
Packers & Sausage Manufacturers Association, 100 West Monroe Street.
American Corn Millers Federation, 140 South Dearborn Street.
Cereal Institute, Inc., 135 South La Salle Street.
Chicago Association of Stock Exchange Firms, 120 South La Salle Street.
Millers National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard.
Association of Vitamin Chemists, Inc., 7737 South Chicago Avenue.
American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin Street.
American Dairy Association, 20 North Wacker Drive.
American Dry Milk Institute, 221 North La Salle Street.
American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart.
Evaporated Milk Association, 228 North La Salle Street.
Illinois Dairy Products, Association, 309 West Jackson Boulevard.
Milk Foundation, Inc., 28 East Huron Street.
National Cheese Institute, Inc., 110 North Franklin Street.
National Dairy Council, 111 North Canal Street.
National Poultry, Butter & Egg Association, 110 North Franklin.
National Soybean Processors Association, 3818 Board of Trade Building.
Poultry and Egg National Board, 185 North Wabash Avenue.
Pure Milk Association, 343 South Dearborn Street.
American Bakers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive.
American Institute of Baking, 400 East Ontario Street.
American Society of Bakery Engineers, 121 West Wacker Drive.
Associated Food Retailers of Greater Chicago, Inc., 500 North Dearborn Street.
Bakers Club of Chicago, 112 West Randolph Street.
Canned Chop Suey Foods Industry, 332 South Michigan Avenue.

B. CONTAINERS

Chicago Paper Box Suppliers Association, 1210 Ridgewood Drive, Northbrook.
Fibre Box Association, 224 South Michigan Avenue.
Folding Paper Box Association of America, 222 West Adams Street.
Paraffined Carton Association, 111 West Washington Street.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Comptroller's Office, in dealing with money, does not take this into account. Yet I think it is one of the most important factors to be considered when we are dealing with research operations in the field of food and containers.

Next, I point out the impressive number of organizations which are opposed to the removal of this center. They are listed on page 544 of the hearings. I ask unanimous consent that this very impressive list, including packing companies and food processing companies of all kinds, may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Daniel F. Gerber, president, Gerber Baby Foods, Fremont, Mich.
William A. Beich, vice president, Paul E. Beich Co., Bloomington, Ill.
Roscoe G. Haynie, president, Wilson & Co., Inc., Chicago, Ill.
Herbert R. Stratford, executive vice president, Morton Salt Co., Chicago, Ill.
Russell D. L. Wirth, president, Red Star Yeast & Products Co., Milwaukee, Wis.
J. Clyde Loftis, president, Kraft Foods Co., Chicago, Ill.
Daniel J. Uhrig, president, American Bakeries Co., Chicago, Ill.
R. G. Lucks, president, California Packing Corp., San Francisco, Calif.
K. W. Brighton, vice president and general manager, American Can Co., Barrington, Ill.
Dale W. Johnson, manager, edible protein products, Central Soya Co., Inc., Chicago, Ill.
A. V. Williams, vice president, Lawry's Products, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.
G. F. Atkinson, general manager, Durkee Famous Foods Division, the Glidden Co., Chicago, Ill.
C. S. Bridges, president, Libby, McNeill & Libby, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, next I point out the close liaison which has been established between the food industry and the trade organizations, on the one hand, and the Container Institute, on the other. It seems to me that we would be fairly undoing the work of certainly more than a quarter of a century, and perhaps 40 years, if this removal were undertaken.

Next, I point out the availability of technical personnel. I doubt very much that if the center were removed to Massachusetts, technical personnel in the numbers which are available in the Chicago area, because of the concentration of laboratory work there, would ever become available. That is not the least of the attractions for maintaining this operation in Chicago. There are contacts with the food industry, with the packing plants, with the canners, with the bakers, with the confectionery groups.

One could continue to name almost every food group in the category. There is no other area, and certainly no other city, anywhere in the United States, which offers comparable contacts with which this work is concerned.

Then, of course, there is the question of central transportation, not only as it involves the transportation of commodities, but also the transportation of persons.

Then, too, an offer has come from the Illinois Institute of Technology, which on its own campus, in the near Southside in Chicago, could make quarters and facilities available for this purpose. There is precedent for that. The kind of function which has been identified with Duke University has been taking place for years. I can see no good reason, under the circumstances, why a similar contact and a similar contract could not be negotiated with the Illinois Institute of Technology.

I think the evidence is clear that there are no adequate facilities available at Natick for the moment—at least, I gathered that from such engineering evidence as I could find in the RECORD. It is pretty clear as to what will happen. It will mean that there will be subsequent requests for appropriations for facilities of one kind and another. Why undertake that, and why undertake the removal costs and the relocation costs at this time, when this function has been operating in a very satisfactory fashion?

I think other evidence also could be adduced to support the contention which my colleague [Mr. DOUGLAS] makes, and which I make, that the proposed removal should not be effected; and if the Army has an abiding interest in it, it certainly merits far more consideration.

I hope, therefore, that the pending amendments will prevail, and that another good, long look can be taken before the proposed transfer is undertaken.

The House of Representatives was persuaded on that point, and included no comparable provision in the bill. I do not believe, therefore, that the Senate ought to act until we have had another look at the matter and have had a more thorough investigation made. I hope, therefore, that the Senate will not approve the transfer, and will support the pending amendments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield, to permit me to reply to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The distinguished Senator from Illinois, the minority leader, has stated that the Comptroller General merely talks about the cost involved but does not consider the question of efficiency. I point out that the headquarters for the research work of the Army Quartermaster is now located at Natick, and that if the new building is constructed in Chicago, all reports from Chicago will have to go through Natick and then to Washington, in order to have the operation unified.

Furthermore, the present building is so inefficient that the proposed move has been stimulated. As I told the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Army today considers the building to be a white elephant. They cannot rent the parts of it which they are not using. So the building has become extremely inefficient.

The revised suggestions concerning Illinois are to erect new buildings on the grounds of the University of Illinois, rather than to try to rebuild the present quarters.

The reason why the research work was originally in Illinois is that other Army research was located there. But that has been moved out, now, except for the food research.

I also point out to the Senators from Illinois that it is not a question of the procurement of a large amount of food. The Army now, as I understand, procures food from various parts of the country for its research. The amount of food necessary for the research is very small. So there is no question about transportation.

The Senator from Illinois also pointed out that additional new facilities might be needed. The Army made it very clear that while they probably will, in the future, enlarge the Natick facilities, or request the enlargement of the Natick facilities for other purposes, the amount of $3,628,000 is all that will be needed for the movement of the food research laboratory to Natick, and construction of the other related facilities I mentioned earlier.

I should say also that this proposal is an initiation on the part of the Army, pure and simple. As a Senator from Massachussetts, who worked originally with Members of the House to establish research efforts for other purposes, I did not know about this matter until it was actually presented in this year's budget. It was proposed by the Army, the Department of Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget, to provide greater efficiency and savings.

I hope the amendments will not prevail.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the Chair will bear with me, I wish to make a brief reply.

Essentially, Mr. President, this installation is for a container-research operation. If research is to be done in that field, where should the operation be located, if not in the center of the country which has the greatest amount of container research and container facilities to be found in any place, not only in the United States, but, I venture to say, in the whole wide world.

As a youngster—in the rather mischievous days when probably my sense of right and wrong was not too fixed, and I was still in knee pants—when some of my friends proposed that we raid a farmer's apple orchard and purloin some apples, and when one suggested that we go to Farmer Miller's place, my answer usually was, "Let's go to Farmer Jones' place."

Then one of the group would ask, "Why?"

My reply would be, "Because there are apples on his trees."

Mr. President, in Chicago there are "apples on the trees." The container people and the food people and the laboratory people and the facilities and the technicians are there. So it seems to me that, by every rule of logic, that is the place for this kind of function to be established and maintained.

Therefore, Mr. President, on that basis I am willing to submit this question to the wisdom of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, an informal count shows only five Senators on the floor. I should not like to have the decision as to these amendments reached by so small a number of Senators. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments, en bloc, offered by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.] The ayes appear to have it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendments to the committee amendment were rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on agreeing——

Mr. STENNIS and Mr. HOLLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, under the agreement, I had the floor, but I now yield the floor.

CRITICISM BY PRESIDENT NASSER, OF UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC, OF RECENT ACTION OF U.S. SENATE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to say a word about a recent speech by President Nasser, of the United Arab Republic, in which he called the Senate of the United States some pretty harsh names, which I think is most unfortunate, and which related to the antiboycott amendment adopted by the Senate.

I call attention to this because the attack, made in a speech in Al-Mansurah on May 7, 1960, aside from its reference to propaganda matters, charges that the Senate of the United States, by its ex-

pression of opinion in the antiboycott amendment adopted to the mutual security bill, was not properly defending freedom. He said that Members of the Senate "pretend that freedom has touched their consciences and hearts." I quote further: "All the world exposes them because if they truly spoke of freedom, they would discuss the freedom of all peoples everywhere."

It seems to me this charge ought to be answered and put in focus. It is precisely because the Senate felt it was defending one of the most fundamental freedoms, namely, the freedom of navigation, in this instance through the Suez Canal, in compliance with international law and international agreements solemnly entered into by the Government of Egypt itself, agreements going back to 1881, which are indisputable elements of a peaceful world, that the Senate took the action it did.

Let it not be forgotten that the United States came to the rescue of Egypt in 1956, when she had closed the canal to world shipping—indeed, barred world shipping from the canal by making it unusable by sinking ships in it when the forces of the United Kingdom, France, and Israel went into action in an effort to keep the Suez Canal open. When the United States came to the rescue of Egypt and got it out of the predicament which could have caused its government to fall, President Nasser made certain commitments to the United Nations itself, which are being violated in this absolutely illegal fashion, and which the sense of the Senate has condemned.

Mr. President, I speak only because I think the Senate was absolutely right in acting as it did, because it held to high moral principles, and principles of freedom, and because it is those very principles of freedom which enable the people of Egypt to have an opportunity in a free world.

For myself, and I am sure every Member of the Senate feels the same way, I express the greatest feelings of friendship for the people of Egypt, the greatest desire to see progress made among them and the Arab world. But progress cannot be achieved—as a matter of fact, it can only be frustrated—by denying to any of the peoples of the world the fundamental freedom of the right of unobstructed passage through international waterways.

I hope very much the people of Egypt may see clearly that the Senate, in enacting the provision which it did, was defending the interests of the people living in a free world—the interests of the United States, and the interests of every other country, including Israel.

Mr. President, it is very easy to paint this action only as an element in the conflict between the Arab States and Israel. I have very strong feelings on this subject. I think it is shameful and not in the interest of world peace that we allow the state of ferment to continue as the result of the United Arab Republic's insistence on maintaining a state of war with Israel.

But the fact is not germane to this situation. In acting as it did with respect to the declaration on freedom of navigation, the Senate was acting in the interest of the peace of the world, in the interest of the freedom of access of shipping to international waterways, and in the interest of maintaining international law and international commitments.

Mr. President, one must speak of this whole situation more in sadness than in anger; and I believe the efforts of President Nasser to read into this action some deep, dark, and conspiratorial motives will fall of their own weight. It was the sense of the Senate to maintain freedom, whereas Egypt's action in boycotting certain shipping through the Suez Canal is a boycott of freedom; and it is very important we should here assure the people of Egypt that we desire very much to safeguard freedom.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation on this subject?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I merely wish to express again the hope that, in some way, something can be done to relieve the tensions which are responsible for the feeling, for the remarks, for the legislative riders, and so forth, which result in this situation. I think if the Senate or the United Nations could come forward with a real solution of the refugee problem, many of these situations could be eliminated. I hope that authority will be extended beyond June 30 to take care of the refugees. But, aside from that, I think it is time we have a cure for the sore that has been festering now for more than 12 years.

Mr. JAVITS. No one would more dearly desire an Arab-Israel peace settlement than I would. I think the United Nations is exactly the right forum to carry through such a reconciliation. I hope and pray for the day when it may be effected. As I have always been, I shall be again extremely anxious to see that there is a spirit of compromise and sacrifice by both parties, who I think have suffered under the dreadful situation.

I think it is fair to point out that, notwithstanding every effort of the free world to bring about peace, including resettlement of Arab refugees, and an opportunity to those who wish to do so to be repatriated to Israel, this whole effort has been constantly frustrated by the feeling, apparently, on the part of President Nasser and other leaders in the Arab world, that it was more advantageous to them to use the refugees as a political dagger at the throat of Israel than it was to take care of their kinsmen in an appropriate and humane way.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I would not want my failure at this time to say more on the subject to be interpreted to mean that I accept all of the characterization of the situation which has been given by the Senator from New York. I will say that I welcome the statement the Senator has made about hoping for and desiring a solution to the problem.

I think anyone who visits that area must be impressed by the fact that so long as the situation continues it is a reproach to the world, it is a reproach to the United Nations, and it is a reproach to humanity for children to be born into the world and to grow up in the conditions of these refugee camps.

I was at the camp at Jericho. I saw the children there, who were 8 or 9 or 10 or 12 years old, with no knowledge of the world other than what they obtained from the hovels in which they lived in the refugee camp. It suggests that something ought to be done. There ought to be a permanent solution, rather than continue to have the situation fester as it is.

Mr. JAVITS. I, too, have visited an Arab refugee camp on the Gaza Strip during the small moment of time it was possible for me to do that, in 1956.

I think the United Nations has done an outstanding job, I will say, considering the limitations which have been put upon it.

I do not wish my colleague to join me in the statement I am about to make, but I feel deeply that this is a reproach mainly to the Arab States, which have stood in the way of resettlement and of repatriation, or some combination of both.

I understand, I think, the feelings of my colleague, but a study of this matter and of its history indicates no reproach to the United Nations, which is more than anxious to do something about the problem. The same is true with respect to the civilized world.

We have had appropriations earmarked by the Congress lying in the bank, completely fallow, because it was not possible to use them due to the fact that the Arab States will do nothing about cooperating in an effort to bring about resettlement or repatriation of these people.

I repeat, I am not trying to induce my colleague to agree with me. I wish to make it very clear that we may have a disagreement on this point, but I would be less than truthful if I did not state my own views.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota always respects the right of every other Senator to make clear his own position in a statement.

Understandingly, Mr. President, I would not want to put words in the mouth of the Senator from New York, or to attempt to make a statement for him. Since the matter came up, it seemed to be an opportunity to emphasize the fact that some attention should be given to the problem. I certainly do not pretend to go into the merits of the problem, or its background or history. I could, if I were so disposed and time permitted, pay some tribute with respect to what has been accomplished in the reconstruction of Israel. I admire what has been accomplished there. At the same time, I cannot help feeling that some burden ought to lay pretty heavily upon the conscience of the world, which has been unable to find a solution which would prevent a continuation of the situation which does exist in these refugee camps.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator for yielding.

ADDRESS BY UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE DOUGLAS DILLON

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon, with whose name there is increasingly being associated the proposals for cooperation between the countries of the Western community and the United States, in an effort to help the less-developed areas to a greater extent even than is being done now and to cooperate in other respects in the fields of trade and aid, gave an address at the 12th annual New Jersey Business Conference, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J., on May 12, 1960, in which he eloquently set forth what the United States is trying to accomplish in this whole field in a very splendid way.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address by Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE DOUGLAS DILLON AT 12TH ANNUAL NEW JERSEY BUSINESS CONFERENCE, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J., MAY 12, 1960

It is always a pleasure to come home to New Jersey, and I am honored to participate in this important conference on the Rutgers campus. Your theme—"America's position in world commerce"—is directly related to the major issues of our day. Its choice and your attendance here are proof that New Jersey's business community is keenly aware of the problems of our times, and is dedicated to the search for workable solutions.

The times clearly call for strenuous efforts to maintain and reinforce our international economic position if we are to successfully meet the two major challenges which confront us today:

The first is the worldwide offensive mounted by the Soviet Union against our system of free institutions.

The second is the desperate struggle of more than a billion people in the free world's newly developing areas to escape their traditional poverty, sickness, and illiteracy, and to achieve dignity, independence, and material progress within a framework of meaningful freedom.

These two challenges are closely intertwined. For the Communist leaders are making a major effort—supported by a high rate of economic growth in the Soviet Union—to persuade the peoples of the newly developing areas that their best hope of achieving progress is by taking the Communist path.

At no time in history has our free way of life been under greater pressure. We must energetically demonstrate that freedom, rather than communism, can best meet man's universal aspirations for spiritual and material growth. The newly developing nations are watching to see which system can perform best—ours or the Communists. How well we perform will largely determine not just our own well-being, but the course of world events as well. The private American businessman has a vital role to play in this competition. For he is the very heart of the system which the Communists are striving to destroy.

If we are to succeed, we must constantly strengthen our economy, both at home and abroad. The goal of domestic growth is closely related to success in our efforts to help the newly developing areas. Growth at home makes it easier to marshal the resources so desperately needed to foster growth abroad. Equally important, growth at home provides confidence abroad in free enterprise and promotes faith in the United States as a nation worthy of emulation.

A high growth rate should be our goal even if communism simply didn't exist. But we cannot ignore the fact that industrial production in the Soviet Union is presently expanding at more than 8 percent annually, compared with our own rate of about 4½ percent. The Soviet Union continually uses this comparison to project its own Communist image to the newly developing countries as the ideal blueprint for economic progress. It would, of course, take the Soviets many years to make good their boast of catching up and surpassing us. But catch up they may—unless we bestir ourselves. We cannot afford to be complacent, especially when we reflect that with an annual gross national product only 45 percent of our own, the Soviets, by concentrating on areas which contribute most to industrial and military strength, are already able to fully match our military efforts.

The last 2 years have highlighted the importance of a substantial export surplus. Today, any businessman who works to sell American made products abroad should know that he is contributing directly and importantly to our national security.

In order to counter the Soviet threat, we have been forced to deploy strong military forces overseas. These forces, together with those of our allies, provide the security shield behind which the free world can live and work in peace. Our own defense expenditures abroad cost the United States between $2½ and $3 billion a year in foreign exchange. In the long run, we must look to our export surplus to provide this sum. A much smaller, but equally important, requirement for expenditure abroad comes from our foreign aid programs. The larger part of the expenditures under these programs are made in the United States—and, hence, have no effect upon our balance of payments. Nevertheless, the net dollar outflow for all forms of foreign aid—military and economic—amounts to a little over $700 million a year.

Both expenditures—to maintain substantial American military forces abroad, and to operate our foreign aid programs—are absolute necessities if security, stability and progress are to be maintained in the free world. Both are ultimately dependent upon a continued and substantial U.S. export surplus.

In the years immediately following the war, we had no export problems because we were the only large-scale producer. Our sales were limited only by the availability of dollars in other countries. To use the vernacular, our exporters "never had it so good." Today, however, the other industrialized free nations have recovered from the ravages of war. Our friends in Europe and Japan provide strong competition. In some areas, their costs of production are lower than ours. In many others, this is not the case. But they work night and day to increase their exports. This is the normal situation for an industrialized nation such as ours. The time has come when we Americans must give exports the same sort of priority and attention.

The Departments of State and Commerce are now embarked with other interested Government agencies on an intensified new program to stimulate greater interest in foreign trade in American business circles. We are moving energetically to provide better Government facilities, both at home and abroad, to assist American firms in selling their goods and services in foreign countries. But despite everything that we in Government can do, the promotion of exports remains essentially a task for private business. The basic drive must come from the business community.

Over the past 15 months, the Department of State has been seeking to persuade our friends and allies in Western Europe and Japan to eliminate discrimination against our exports which were originally invoked to protect meager foreign exchanges reserves during the postwar period of the so-called "dollar shortage." Fortunately, now that the financial problems that originally brought these discriminations about have been overcome, the need to do away with them has been recognized by our trading partners. Great progress has already been made. Our estimates indicate that Western European actions to remove discriminations last year increased our potential markets by roughly half a billion dollars a year. The momentum is being maintained and gives hope that by the end of this year, postwar discriminations against our exports will be virtually a thing of the past.

Our efforts to open markets long closed to American products are only a part of our drive to expand exports.

We are constantly seeking reductions of tariffs affecting our exports, and we are alert to forestall the erection of new barriers to American products.

With this in mind, we have been closely following developments in Western Europe, where one important regional economic group—the European Economic Community—has been established, and a second—the European Free Trade Association—will soon come into being.

The European Economic Community, often referred to as the Common Market or the "Six," represents a far-reaching effort on the part of France, Germany, Italy, and the three Benelux nations, to merge their economies into a single entity.

The Common Market Treaty calls for complete free trade inside the Community, with a uniform level of tariffs and a common commercial policy toward the rest of the world. The Treaty also provides for free movement of workers and capital, and for harmonized agricultural and financial policies—all overseen by common institutions.

The United States has long favored the goal of economic integration in Western Europe. We believe that a strong, single unit, closely allied with us and other Atlantic nations, is highly desirable for reasons of free world security, political cohesion, and economic growth and stability. We therefore support the objectives of the European Economic Community.

At the same time, we are urging the Community to adopt liberal trading policies and, in particular, to establish as low a common tariff as possible. For this reason, among others, we welcomed the proposal that the Common Market reduce its future common external tariff by 20 percent at the same time that it speeds up the creation of its customs union.

The second European regional grouping is the European Free Trade Association—also known as the "Seven." The EFTA, recently ratified by the parliaments of Austria, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom, provides for free trade in industrial goods among its members. Unlike the Common Market, which aims at a high degree of economic integration and very close political ties, the EFTA has no common tariff. It explicitly reserves to each member full control of its own external commercial and general economic policies. Its stated objectives are therefore not as far reaching as those of the Common Market.

You may have read reports that U.S. support for the European Economic Community in some way indicates opposition to the EFTA, or favoritism for the Six as against the Seven. I can assure you that this is not the case. There is no question of choosing sides. In indicating our support for the European Economic Community, based on political and security as well as on commercial policy considerations, we neither state

nor imply opposition to the European Free Trade Association.

We do not, however, share the belief of some of the Seven that the mere creation of the Common Market will inevitably cause such serious trade difficulties that Europe will be split in two. We favor negotiations between the Six and the Seven to work out individual commodity problems that are of particular importance to the countries concerned. We have always favored such negotiations. It is our considered opinion that if they are entered into in good faith and vigorously pursued, they can provide reasonable solutions to the complex problems of intra-European trade.

We have also pointed out to both European groupings the importance of their actions to the rest of the free world. We have stressed the fact that the most favored nation provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade require that such special tariff concessions on individual commodities as the members of the two groups may grant each other must be extended to all other members of the GATT—including, of course, the United States. I am happy to say that this principle has been widely and generally accepted by the members of both groupings. You can be certain that we shall continue to urge the European Common Market and the European Free Trade Association to pursue increasingly liberal trade policies toward the United States and the rest of the free world.

I have every reason to hope that our efforts will be successful. But I should like to emphasize that we must maintain our own liberal trade policy if we are to expect other countries to join with us in liberalizing and expanding trade. If nations are to buy from us, they must also be able to sell to us.

The preservation of freedom must be a cooperative effort. Our friends and allies recognize this truth. As their economic strength develops they are assuming a steadily increasing share of the common responsibility for safeguarding the free world. For example, the annual military expenditures of our NATO allies have increased more than a billion dollars in each of the past 2 years and further substantial increases are in sight this year.

Our newly prospering allies are also playing a stronger role in speeding the growth of the developing areas. They have not only accelerated their direct financial and technical assistance to needy regions, but they have joined with us in strengthening the free world's institutions of economic cooperation. These major steps include the proposed establishment of a billion dollar International Development Association to complement the operations of the World Bank, and creation of a Development Assistance Group, through which our allies and ourselves are seeking ways and means of increasing the flow of capital to development-hungry areas.

Finally, 18 European nations have joined Canada and the United States in preliminary steps to reconstitute the Organization for European Economic Cooperation into a major instrument for meeting the challenges we now face. Once the reconstituted OEEC is a reality, with full membership for Canada and the United States, more effective collaboration will be possible in promoting sound economic growth and in mobilizing the resources of its industrialized members to help the newly developing lands.

The increased help which other industrialized countries are extending to newly developing areas is a welcome and most important development. However, these increased contributions from others should not be regarded as a substitute for our own contributions, which must be continued at adequate levels through our mutual security program.

This includes military assistance and defense support grants to nations on the periphery of the Sino-Soviet empire whose economies are otherwise unable to sustain the defense establishments they must have to resist Communist military pressure. It includes loans for sound productive purposes through our Export-Import Bank and our Development Loan Fund. It also involves furnishing ideas and skills to the newly developing countries through technical, educational, and cultural programs.

We can go forward confident in the knowledge that other countries are working with us in the great struggle to preserve and expand freedom. We no longer stand alone but the basic American effort must come from private business which, after all, is freedom at work. Private business is the mainstay of our growth here at home. It is to private business that we must look for much of the investment capital and technical know-how so desperately needed in the newly developing countries. And it is to private business that we must look for our all-important export surplus. By accepting this challenge—each in your own way—you will be serving your own best interests at the same time as you serve the cause of freedom for all mankind.

ADDITIONAL JUDGESHIPS FOR NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a hard-hitting report published on the front page of this morning's Wall Street Journal on the clogged condition of Federal court calendars, where almost half of the civil cases get to trial after a delay of up to 4 years.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLOGGED COURTS—BACKLOGS REMAIN HIGH DESPITE STEPPED-UP EFFORTS TO CUT THEM—MANY FEDERAL CASES DELAYED UP TO 4 YEARS—CONGRESS STALLS ON NEW JUDGESHIPS—A MAJOR CULPRIT: THE AUTO

(By Lyle W. Denniston)

Eleven long years ago, before the Korean war, a small Nevada company called Sensytrol Corp. filed a court claim charging Radio Corp. of America with infringement of a patent on a basic radar technique. That claim is still awaiting trial, much to the plaintiff's distress.

Emil K. Ellis, New York lawyer fighting the case for Sensytrol, says the company "has been at a standstill because of its inability to do anything until this claim is settled; we've been the victim of years and years of delay." RCA attorneys, in turn, blame the plaintiff for part of the wait, saying the company failed to produce requested information on time. Anyway, the case is practically a life-and-death affair for Sensytrol, Mr. Ellis contends. "Its only asset is this claim to infringement."

This frustrated seeker of what it deems to be justice is one among a legion of businesses, public agencies and plain citizens caught in the toils of courthouse congestion and delay. These ailments are plaguing much of the U.S. legal process despite growing attempts at a cure.

The new lawsuits that go to court today face this prospect: At least two-thirds of them will still be there 6 months from now. A sizable number—nearly 50 percent of the civil cases that go into Federal courts—will have to wait from 1 to 4 years even to get to trial.

CHRONIC CONGESTION

Justice delayed, warn the highest authorities, can be justice denied. U.S. Chief Justice Earl Warren, who presides over the entire Federal judiciary, has complained that "choking congestion is so chronically prevalent that it is compromising the quantity and quality of justice available to the individual citizen." Clogging of courts, adds Supreme Court Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., "is a problem of such gravity at some places as to threaten an actual breakdown in the administration of justice itself."

At the end of December, latest reports show, a total of 65,962 civil cases were pending in Federal district courts. Add the 8,321 criminal cases, and the caseload is big enough to keep the district judges busy for a year even if no more cases were to go to court. The total backlog at the end of 1959 was 2,894 cases smaller than the year before, largely due to a mid-1958 law that trimmed Federal court jurisdiction slightly. However, the 1959 Labor Reform Act, with its controls on unions, is expected to produce almost enough cases to take up the slack.

State courts, too, are clogged; in some, it takes 5 to 6 years to get a case to trial.

WORK GROWS FASTER THAN MANPOWER

It would be easy to attribute this logjam to one simple fact: The courts' workload has increased faster than the juidcial manpower handling it. And that certainly is part of the story. Population and economic growth, along with the increasing complexity of modern life, breeds more and more legal combat.

Chief Judge Sylvester J. Ryan, of the southern district of New York cites the continuing swell of court business confronting the same number of judges, and asks rhetorically: "How long can you whip a willing horse?" His 18-judge court, the biggest and busiest of all Federal courts, disposed of 1,231 more civil cases in the 9 months ended March 31 than a year earlier, but the backlog only dropped by 430 cases. The reason: New cases came into court at a sharply increased pace.

But some of the blame for congestion must also be laid to lawyers' delaying tactics and outmoded court procedures. And there's an element harder to pinpoint: Many Federal judges are old, and some, court students suggest, are downright lazy or even incompetent. Not only do Federal judges average more than 60 years in age, but their jobs are guaranteed for life, a fact that tends to insulate them from criticism and pressure.

The most obvious remedy for court congestion—addition of more judges—has been proposed, but is not likely to be applied in Federal courts anytime soon. The Federal judiciary has asked Congress to create 46 new judgeships. So far the Senate Judiciary Committee has voted to create 22, while a House Judiciary Subcommittee wants to add 40. But there the matter lies.

AN INCENTIVE FOR CONGRESS

Trying to pry loose a bill for more judges, President Eisenhower told Congress in his special message last week it would be heartless to continue to neglect delayed justice. Furthermore, to entice the Democratic-controlled Congress to act, the administration has promised to name Democrats to half of any new judgeships created.

But even this is doing little to advance the judgeship bills. By delaying any action until next year, when they hope the White House will be in their hands, the Democrats see a chance to snare all new judgeships, not just half, for their party. With less than 2 months left in 1960's congressional session, judicial expansion seems all but dead for this year.

Any shortage of judicial manpower may not be entirely Congress' fault, however. At the moment, nine seats on the Federal district bench stand empty—one of them has been vacant for a year—and it's the President's responsibility, primarily, to fill them. One of these vacancies, it's true, has been open only a month, and for two of the others, nominations are pending. But part of

the delay in proposing nominees is the need for clearing them with Senators; sometimes the lawmakers can't agree among themselves or with the administration on the man.

Meantime, the pressure of congestion is bringing a tinkering with court procedures that may ultimately change much of the character of U.S. justice. In some instances, cases are being streamlined at pretrial conferences. Arbitration is being tried to decide lesser cases. For certain types of cases, the time-consuming use of juries is being reduced in favor of decision by a judge alone.

SOME PROGRESS MADE

Through such devices, some progress is being chalked up. Last year, in a 4-month experimental project, Chief Judge William F. Smith and 14 other Federal judges pounced on 1,170 cases on the docket in Brooklyn Federal court. When they had finished, 901 of the cases had been disposed of altogether. The object of the venture was to examine each pending case carefully at a pretrial conference, sharply pare the issues and the testimony to be relied upon at the trial, then promptly put it through a trial before a judge.

Even with the tinkering done so far, however, most civil cases still face long delays. "Human roulette, that's what we're playing," complains Philip F. Di Constanzo, a Brooklyn lawyer who handles hundreds of individuals' accident-injury cases. Not long ago, one of his clients, Italian immigrant Joseph Giuffre, collected $45,000 for fractures to both legs in a dock accident about 8 years earlier. The longshoreman couldn't work, Mr. Di Constanzo relates, but "still the case had to lie and wait its turn."

Consider the case of Charles Novak and Francis Savage, teenagers at the time, who were driving through South Boston on February 7, 1953. As their car moved into the crossing of A and West Third Streets, so did an Army truck. The streets were slippery, brakes didn't hold and the two vehicles crashed. Guardians for the boys took Uncle Sam to court, claiming the Army driver was at fault and asking $35,000 for injuries. That was 7 years ago. Still no settlement is in sight.

A CLASH OVER COPPER

Business and industry, of course, get on the judicial treadmill, too. Two years ago, Ferric Industries, Inc., a New York company, made a plea for a quick trial, "for reasons of hardship," of a damage suit that was already 3 years old. The trial is now set to start in Boston in June. Ferric and a German company, Klockner & Co., contend Bay State Smelting Co., Inc., of Somerville, Mass., didn't carry out 1954 and 1955 contracts to supply copper to Ferric for export to Klockner. Bay State argues it couldn't get an export license for copper because of a then-existing Government embargo, so the only way it could comply with the contract was by breaking the law. Ferric says Bay State only was obliged to deliver the copper, not export it. Ferric and Klockner say canceling of the contracts has caused them damage because "the price of copper has risen materially."

Docket congestion exists mostly in big-city areas. But that's where most of the cases are filed, so delay there has its widest impact. Thus, far more people are affected by the four-plus years it takes to get an average case to trial in Cook County superior court in Chicago than by the wait of only 4 months in Washoe County district court in Reno.

Among the courts that sit in metropolitan centers, delay and congestion are confined to the trial courts—the Federal district courts and their counterparts at the State level. These are the tribunals that get the cases first, and they dispose of most of them. At the Federal level, only about 5 percent of all cases are appealed.

PRIORITY FOR CRIMINAL CASES

Most stalled cases are civil ones. Criminal cases commonly get priority handling and they're relatively few in number, anyway. Among civil suits, the delayed ones most often fall into one of three categories: Personal injury cases charging negligence, as in the Giuffre case in Brooklyn; patent infringement complaints, such as Sensytrol Corp.'s case against RCA; or antitrust cases, such as the Government's still-pending attempt—begun in 1956—to break up the merger of Continental Can Co. and Hazel-Atlas Glass Co.

Personal injury suits dominate the backlog, simply because they pour in so fast; they make up roughly a third of all civil cases filed in Federal courts. Patent infringement and antitrust cases drag on because of the complex technical and economic issues they raise.

Federal appeals courts, including the one at the top—the U.S. Supreme Court—are practically abreast of their work. Together they consider only about 4,000 cases a year. The U.S. Courts of Appeals, on the level below the Supreme Court, "are disposing of their business in less than 7 months for the median case," according to U.S. Court Administrator Warren Olney. Though Justice Felix Frankfurter thinks the Supreme Court considers too many cases, Justice William O. Douglas just as stoutly insists it's a myth that the Court is overworked.

The congestion that does exist is blamed variously upon economic growth, the birth rate, the automobile, Congress, the judges, lawyers, and legal habit.

"The truth is," Chief Justice Warren has declared, "that for every inch we gain, the normal healthy economic and population growth of our country extends a yard—leaving in its wake a whole new volume of litigation for the courts."

"Perhaps the biggest culprit," Attorney General William Rogers has suggested, is the auto. Cases spawned by car accidents, he noted, make up nearly a fourth of all private civil suits taken into Federal courts. This had led to some vigorously challenged suggestions that auto cases be taken out of court and put before an administrative body.

SOME HELP FROM CONGRESS

Congress now and then helps the judiciary fight congestion with such laws as the 1958 act sharply curtailing the opportunity to get cases into a Federal court just because the people involved lived in different States. However, Congress has lately been unresponsive to what many consider the real need: More judges.

Ranking next to criticism of legislators for failure to help judges cure congestion is criticism of judges for failing to help themselves. Chief Judge Charles E. Clark of the second circuit court of appeals phrases it kindly: "The caliber of judges, particularly as judicial administrators, varies greatly." A high-level Government attorney is much less charitable: "Some of these men on the bench don't belong there."

INERTIA AND COMPLACENCY

Paul Cotter, Senate Appropriations Committee staff member, found in a 1959 survey of a score of Federal courts that "some of the judges are overworked while a minority of the judges appear to do little." He concluded: "In some courts, inertia and complacency predominate."

Whatever a judge's energies and talents, however, his output is also influenced by the procedure that surrounds his work. Mr. Cotter's report complained that some of the courts he visited "are hopelessly enmeshed in outmoded, inadequate, and, at times, amateurish and most unbusinesslike practices and procedures." Improved court procedures, Administrator Olney comments, are as necessary as adequate judgepower.

Almost as often as judges and their aids are blamed for delay, lawyers' tactics are found at fault. "Stalling tactics," Attorney General Rogers has complained, "are used too often by some lawyers without justification." After all, Judge Clark of the second circuit court declares. "We must recall that defense lawyers' primary responsibility is to win cases for their clients, not to improve law administration for the public. A pleading order delaying and worrying a plaintiff is but an obvious and a natural strategy."

Though some court reformers are willing to forgive some intentional delay as part of the game, they're less tolerant of delay that comes when too many cases are handled by too few lawyers. The Federal district court in the District of Columbia now has a rule that any lawyer who has more than 25 cases on the docket can't get a postponement of a case on grounds he's tied up in another court, unless it's the U.S. Supreme Court or the U.S. Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia. The object: Get the lawyer to drop some cases or hire more help.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, last session my colleague [Mr. KEATING] and I pressed repeatedly for action by the Senate Judiciary Committee on Federal judgeship nominations and stressed the urgent need for seven additional judges in three Federal courts in the New York area. Eventually, action on the nominations was forthcoming, and today there is only one vacancy on the Federal bench in New York. Also, the Judiciary Committee has reported a bill recommending the creation of 30 new judgeships, including 1 for the Second Circuit Court of Appeals and 3 in the southern district of New York. Meanwhile, the House Judiciary Committee is at work on a bill to create two new Federal judgeships in the second circuit—two judgeships in the eastern district and four more in the southern district, which is in close accord with the number called for in the bill I introduced with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] last year.

The need for new judgeships as contemplated by the House Judiciary Committee is a far more realistic number so far as New York is concerned. The judges in the southern district carry the heaviest caseload in the country, an average of 633 per judge as of March 31, 1960. Although the eastern district shows a caseload of 306 cases per judge, the pressure is also close to unbearable, for in both these districts the litigation is often of an unusually involved nature, and the time required on the average case is normally much greater than is the experience in other Federal districts, and delays in excess of 4 years are commonplace. On the Second Circuit Court of Appeals the judges are carrying the second highest caseload in the country.

In his recent legislative message, the President singled out the need for increasing Federal judgeships as an urgent national issue demanding "swift action" by Congress, since, he reported, "in certain districts injured people must wait over 4 years for justice or compromise their rights—a fact well known to New Yorkers. He reaffirmed the administration's support of the Judicial Conference's recommendation that approximately 40 new judgeships be created.

Here in the Senate, I urge the leadership to schedule action in the very near future on the judgeship bill reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee. We

all recognize that there is a traditional reluctance to move forward on such matters in a campaign year. But so long as the Congress does not act and an intolerable caseload burden continues to build up in so many areas of the Nation, then the Congress must share part of the responsibility whenever justice delayed because of the endless logjam of cases results in justice denied.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO PERSONNEL OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1410, H.R. 9449.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill to amend certain sections of title 14, United States Code, relating to personnel matters in the U.S. Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the bill has the approval of the majority leader. The bill was reported unanimously by the committee. I ask that the bill be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 9449) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10777) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator may have the floor in his own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, at noon today, at about the time the Senate convened, the administrative assistant of the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] got in touch with me quite hurriedly to say that the two Senators from Oklahoma were detained out of the city today by necessitous official duties and that a matter would come up in regard to the particular bill under discussion which was of great concern to both Senators, but especially of great concern to the junior Senator from Oklahoma. The administrative assistant brought me the papers in regard to the matter, one of which was a letter of May 13 to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] from Julian H. Zimmerman, Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration. There were also various briefs, and a proposed amendment to the pending measure in connection therewith.

Mr. President, I found, upon examining the papers, that the questions raised which concerned the Senators had to do with section 810 of the Federal Housing Act. The matter related to an amendment which was placed in the Housing Act last year, in the field of military housing construction for families, on the motion of the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. It appears that under said section 810 the Commissioner of the FHA can, in certain cases, move to provide family housing in the area of military bases for occupancy by military personnel, by families of military personnel, or by families of key civilian personnel, as the Senator from Florida understands.

The point made was that in the action by the other body upon this bill there was a provision enacted to the effect that, from the time of enactment of this bill, any item to appear under that section 810 must be a line item or specific provision in the authorization bill.

The Senator from Oklahoma, by request, transmitted this information to me. To the request was attached, as I have said, communications from the FHA. It has been stated there are certain projects which do not appear in the line items contained in the present bill, which the Senator from Oklahoma thinks could most advantageously be handled by making an exception of 1,500 family housing units from the new provision in the House bill, which, as I understand it, has been approved by the committee and incorporated in the pending measure today.

The time afforded me for investigation of the matter was not great, but I noticed at once that the reason why the matter was referred to me for handling was that one of the first items in the group of bases that were said to require this kind of handling was an item for 300 family units for the Canaveral guided missile base, which is generally referred to as the Patrick Air Force Base complex near Cocoa, Fla. I have never heretofore requested, and I do not now propose to request, of this subcommittee or of Congress any action affecting any such project at any base in my State upon any other basis than that it can be completely justified. In this instance it would have to be justified in conference, because I have no detailed information on the subject.

I immediately consulted the two Senators from Arizona, since Fort Huachuca, Ariz., was one of the bases mentioned to which this problem pertained and found they had been apprised of the need for 150 housing units of this kind there. I have endeavored to consult other Senators from States where bases were said to be affected but have been unable to do so. Since the matter had been called to my attention by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], I felt that I should check on an item alleged to affect his State. Upon checking with the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, who, I understand, is handling this matter for the Department of Defense, I found that in his opinion 150 units would be adequate to take care of the situation at the Oklahoma base.

The office of Assistant Secretary Bryant, who is handling this matter, stated that when they received word of the action of the House, they asked the three branches of the service—the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force—to contact their farflung bases and to advise them of items which they felt should appear as line items. They said they had not yet had an answer from any except the Navy, and the answer from the Navy came within the last few days covering three or four needs which I understood from them were incorporated in the present bill; and I have so understood on checking further today. The information from the Army and the Air Force has not yet been received.

In view of the announcement made to me by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and other members of the subcommittee, who think the items in this field should be handled henceforth as line items so that Congress can retain complete jurisdiction, I know of no method to attack this problem except by offering line items affecting the three or four needs which we have had time to check on, with the completely distinct understanding that unless they are justified in conference, I do not expect them to remain in the bill. I have never asked a member of this committee to include any such item for any base in my State, and if the base in my State that I have mentioned, at Canaveral, does not show a clear requirement for attention of this kind, I hope that the item will not be left in the bill.

Mr. President, I have drafted an amendment containing the two items—one for the Patrick Air Force Base providing for 300 family home units, and one, as a courtesy to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], for the Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base at Clinton, Okla., for 150 units, the same to appear after line 14 on page 121 of the bill, with the distinct understanding which I have just stated, and I hope that the committee in its judgment will feel that that is a fair way to approach this problem, to see whether or not there exists a case of real need for immediate construction of additional family housing under the program mentioned and in the two bases mentioned which determination may be made before the conference or during conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 121, after line 14, it is proposed to add the following:

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida, three hundred units; Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma, one hundred and fifty units.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I will make very few remarks now as a background for the consideration of the two amendments. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from

Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to these remarks. I have discussed this subject with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senators from New Mexico and Arizona, and on behalf of the committee, we expect to join in the request that the amendments under the conditions stated be adopted by the Senate. However, I do think a firm background statement ought to be made.

A year ago, in the regular housing bill passed by the Senate there was a section, about which the Subcommittee on Military Construction was not consulted, which provided that 5,000 units of housing could be constructed by the Federal Housing Administration for military use or for civilians employed by the military. There was no limitation. There was no line item requirement as to where the units would be located or anything like that. The first the Senator from Mississippi heard about it was when it was explained that this would be a fine new program, and that the military would not have to put up any money. They would not have to guarantee anything except to promise to rent the residences for the first 5 years of their useful life. That seemed to me to be a very attractive program. I thought well of it. As time rocked on, this program was authorized on a 5,000-level basis in another nonmilitary bill regulating military matters.

This is the program as of today:

The Federal Housing Administration said:

> We will build the houses, but if we find certain things connected with the program, the military will have to underwrite and guarantee the program. You do not have to promise to rent the housing, but you must promise to pay for it.

One hundred million dollars in principal amount, in round numbers, was authorized by the Congress under the conditions which I have briefly outlined.

The House of Representatives, alert, as it usually is, very promptly amended the bill with a provision that before the military could be liable for any of this money, there would have to be a line item authorization.

The provision commended itself to us very highly. It was passed, I think, on March 7, and nothing was said about it. No one appeared before our committee against the provision. I did not hear anything from the Housing Administration until the day the bill was to go before the full committee. There were requests of various kinds for amendments, but we did not adopt the amendments.

There has been no proof of need for any of these units at any of the military installations. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] said no agency except the Navy had reported any kind of need. By the way, we put the Navy's request in the bill, and on the floor of the Senate the Senator from the State in which the installation was to be placed asked that it be removed. That is the softness of this program. I say this with deference to all Senators.

In the past day or two, all of a sudden, presumably through the activities of the Federal Housing Administration, Senators have been consulted about an alleged need. Senators are not prepared to prove that there is need.

There is a certain amount of fairness involved here, which dictates that the requests of these Senators be not left out entirely; otherwise they would be excluded from the operation of the 5,000-unit law, which I believe is a bad provision. We agree to join the Senators in the amendments and take them to conference, with the understanding that the justification for these proposals and the need for them will have to be shown before we get to conference and before we can make an outright fight for these amendments.

I believe that fairly sums up the situation. I felt compelled to make this statement. It is partly, we feel, a matter of an agency of Government going after the business. We do not have any real proof and I am sure the Senators do not have any real proof or had any real proof given to them with respect to the actual need. Of course, we can call up a general, and naturally he will say that he feels some need, and will tell us about it. That is all right, too.

We carefully considered all of this Capehart matter and went through it and combed through it, and tried to bring out what we thought was fair. We do not think it is fair to exclude the wishes of these Senators. Therefore, I think what is proposed is the right thing to do.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall conclude in less than 30 seconds. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Mississippi. His action is eminently fair. If the actual need and the pressing need is not established, the Senator and his conferees can exclude these items, so far as I am concerned, and he is invited by me to do so if that proof is not produced. I know only of the tremendous congestion at Canaveral. I told the Senator that I had not been approached from that angle, that I was not able to tell him that I knew of the urgent need or the immediate need to go ahead with this matter, but I told him it exists, or the Senator from Oklahoma would not have told me so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 121, after line 14, it is proposed to insert:

> Army Electronic Proving Grounds, Fort Huachuca, Arizona, one hundred fifty units.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on what the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has said. I thank him for his understanding of this problem. I have not been contacted by the FHA. I have contacted them rather strongly to do something about the housing situation at Fort Huachuca. In my opinion, if the FHA were doing the job it should be doing in that area, it could supply the need for housing. However, they have been reluctant to operate in that area. It is a reluctance I do not believe is justified. They say that the community is not a permanent one. If spending $80 million for a military base does not mean that the community is a permanent one, I do not know what could.

As an Arizona businessman I should like to open a business in that community. I do not go into a place that I consider to be a bad business risk. This request, coming from Senators, as it does, is not the military urging the FHA, but others urging the FHA to do their job, so the military will not have to be bothered with this.

I wish again to thank the Senator from Mississippi for his willingness to take this problem to conference.

I could not prove this case if I stood here for 10 years. I do know that because one agency of the Government has been sitting on its hands we have the problem of providing housing, and this is our only means of trying to do something about it.

Mr. STENNIS. Huachuca is an installation which is relatively remote, and there are 100 units of Capehart housing in the present bill for Huachuca.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 21, after line 14, it is proposed to insert:

> White Sands Proving Grounds, White Sands, New Mexico, two hundred and fifty units.

Mr. ANDERSON. The able Senator from Mississippi understands the circumstances involved in this case. I have recently been in New Mexico, so I am aware of the fact that additional housing is required at the White Sands Proving Grounds. I know that approval was given at the proper levels for 299 units, but that this matter may have been brought up late. I have suggested to the Senator from Mississippi I should like to have him take the amendment to conference. I believe the need for the housing can be justified. At noon I talked again to Maj. Gen. W. E. Laidlaw, the Commanding General at White Sands, and he expressed to me again the need for this housing.

If the able Senator from Mississippi will take the amendment to conference, and there finds the facts as I understand them, very well. If not, I know what he will do with it there. I wish to present it in the same fashion that the able Senator from Florida presented his amendment with respect to this particular housing.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I am glad to join in the request that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have been listening to this debate with great interest, because I have heard from FHA, not from the Glasgow Air Force Base. I have asked one of my assistants to find out the number of units in question. I am at a loss as to what to do, because I have every faith and confidence in the diligence and fairness of the committee; however, if there is something which would rule out Glasgow Base. I should like the advice of the chairman as to what I should do.

Mr. STENNIS. Under the terms of the provisions in the housing bill the Senator would not be eligible unless an amendment were added to this bill. This is not the Capehart program. The Senator would not be eligible for the program the Senator from Florida and other Senators have discussed, unless an amendment for a line item at Glasgow Base is included in the bill.

I should like to yield to the Senator from California, a member of the subcommittee, and a very valuable member of it, who has worked on the bill with great interest and effectiveness. I should like to have him say something about the bill, if he would.

Mr. ENGLE. I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding to me. With reference to the bill, I believe the careful and excellent work demonstrated by its excellent presentation is largely due to the patience and courtesy and effort and broad knowledge and experience which the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has in this very complicated field. His detailed knowledge of the various military establishments throughout the Nation and the world is a tremendous asset, not only to our committee, but also to the entire country. He has handled the long and complicated hearings on the subject matter with great patience and great courtesy, not only to all the members of the subcommittee, but also with respect to all the witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee.

I am frank to say that I doubt very much if there is anyone in the executive department who has both the experience and knowledge with respect to this particular subject matter the Senator from Mississippi possesses. I believe it is a commentary upon the kind of government we have, that in the executive department we have one crew working, one crew coming, and one crew going. There is not the continuity of service in the Defense Department, as an illustration, which we have in this subcommittee, where over a number of years both the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, have dealt with this subject.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, began to deal with these subjects as a member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House and as a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House. He continues to add to that experience as a Member of the Senate.

I express my gratitude to the chairman of the subcommittee for the outstanding work he has done on this particular bill, and I express my appreciation also for the contributions which have been made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from California for his kind remarks.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not wish to let the opportunity pass without thanking the Senator from California for his very generous compliment. It was my privilege to serve for many years on the House Subcommittee on War Department Appropriations.

Earlier this afternoon I made some reference to the contribution made by some members of the subcommittee. The membership of the subcommittee was enlarged this year. Formerly there were three members; this year there were six. I have said on various occasions that I thought the additions to the subcommittee greatly strengthened it.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] all have made real contributions to the work of the subcommittee this year.

I believe the Members of the Senate know that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and I have found it easy to work together on a bill in which partisan questions seldom arise. They certainly have not arisen this year. Each of the new members of the subcommittee has brought special talents to the work of our group. They have attended faithfully the meetings of the subcommittee. As a result of the efficient work of the committee, including that of our efficient clerk, Gordon Nease, the bill, we really felt, when reported to the Senate represented as good a bill as could be presented, considering the perplexing problems which confront any committee which attempts to deal with these subjects.

I express my personal appreciation to the chairman for his unfailing courtesy and his diligence during the entire consideration of the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I have previously expressed my appreciation for his fine work on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from California, the Senator from South Dakota, and other Senators who have spoken so highly concerning the diligence and attention to duty on the part of this particular subcommittee. I have found all its members to be very cooperative. I have extremely high personal regard for the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Mississippi, and for all the other members of the subcommittee as well.

The chief counsel of the subcommittee, Mr. Gordon Nease, has been very helpful on the occasions when I have gone to him for assistance, and in trying to find my way out of various morasses in which I have become encumbered.

As insurance, and with the proviso that the chairman of the subcommittee will strike it out if I am in error, I ask that the amendment I have at the desk be read at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 21, after line 14, it is proposed to insert:

Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, one hundred units.

Mr. STENNIS. In accordance with the sentiments I have expressed with reference to similar amendments, I join in the request of the Senator from Montana that the Senate adopt the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, earlier in the day a number of relatively minor items, totaling about $5 million, were presented to the Senate. They are necessary to put various municipal airports and a few airbases in condition for the Air National Guard to assume its newly assigned duties under the revised North American air defense plan.

Because this matter was rushed considerably in the last few weeks, one item, which is on the borderline, was not included in the list of airports approved by the Air Force. It was presented by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. It is exactly on all fours with the description I have heretofore given. It adds the sum of $800,000 for the extension of the runways at McGee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tenn. The extension of the runways will be necessary if the F–104 planes are operated from that airport.

In order to afford the Air Force more time in which to consider this item, whether favorably or not, the Senate, I believe, should adopt the amendment and take it to conference, so as to fill out the pattern which has been presented, even though it does not quite meet the requirements which the other facilities meet. With that understanding, I offer the amendment and ask that it be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 140, after line 9, it is proposed to insert:

McGee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tennessee: Operational facilities, $800,000.

On page 145, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "$12,997,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$13,797,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I shall not object to the amendment, but I should like the RECORD to show that in not objecting to it, the Senator from South Dakota would not want to be regarded as putting any obligation on the members of the committee to hold the amendment in conference if we should fail to find complete justification for it.

On the other hand, since the end of this session of Congress is approaching,

and there may not be another opportunity to consider the item, I would not want the improvement to be deferred if the investigation showed it is important and essential. Therefore, I have no objection to taking the amendment to conference, with the understanding that we shall get further testimony before the conference ends.

Mr. STENNIS. For the information of the Senator from South Dakota, I expressly said in my remarks that the amendment would be accepted pending its justification by the Air Force before the final conference session. I had conferred briefly with the Senator from South Dakota before offering the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] raised a question about an item in the bill of something like $5 million for Guantanamo Bay. He was told that that was merely to bring forward a current authorization which would otherwise expire. I was not certain then what the situation was with reference to the appropriation for this year. However, there is no request for an appropriation this year for that project, so it is merely a matter of bringing it forward for consideration in future years.

Mr. President, all of us owe a special debt of gratitude to the very capable gentleman who is our clerk. Even though this is only the second year he has been with us, he has acquired an expert knowledge of all the matters reflected in the bill. It is a year-around problem to keep up with them. They are reflected in the vast number of items which reach around the world, even as the new submarine *Triton* has done. Sometimes we, too, have to travel under water.

On behalf of all members of the committee, I wish to thank him especially for the way he has mastered this subject, and for his very sincere and, at the same time, very modest approach to this far-reaching work.

Mr. Nease is assisted very ably by Mrs. Edna Johnson, who also, as one of the secretaries to the Committee on Armed Services, is becoming an expert on military installations.

Mr. President, so far as I know, there are no further amendments or matters to be taken up in connection with the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 10777) was passed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill as passed by the Senate be printed, so as to show the amendments adopted by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. SALTONSTALL the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I should like to join in the tributes which the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] have paid to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] for his outstanding work in connection with the military construction authorization bill.

I also wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] in paying tribute to the ranking minority member of the subcommittee which handled the bill, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The writing up of the bill took a great deal of time, much effort, and considerable knowledge and understanding of many difficult problems.

These members of the subcommittee have performed in a most admirable manner; and I am very happy to have had the privilage and the opportunity of serving on the subcommittee with them.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada for his very kind remarks. His assistance to us in the writing up of the bill was most valuable.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 8042. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to resell any two of four C1–SAY–1-type vessels to the Government of the Republic of China for use in China trade in Far East and Near East waters exclusively;

H.R. 9449. An act to amend certain sections of title 14, United States Code, relating to personnel matters in the U.S. Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11510. An act to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 352. Joint resolution to authorize preliminary study and review in connection with proposed additional building for the Library of Congress.

AUTHORIZATION FOR VICE PRESIDENT OR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS OR JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment following today's session, the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign enrolled bills or joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found to be truly enrolled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1267, Senate bill 2131, and that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2131) to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at this point I should like to ask the acting majority leader a question: In addition to the bill which just now has been made the pending business, what measures are likely to be called up on Monday or Tuesday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Offhand, without having much in the way of prior knowledge, I understand that earlier this week the majority leader informed the Senate that bills such as the community television antenna bill, which has to do with community antennas; the so-called Stella bill; and other measures then listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will be brought up at the appropriate times next week.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With respect to the so-called community antenna bill, I should like to say that a number of Senators will be out of town—necessarily absent—on Monday, but will be back in time for consideration of the bill on Tuesday. Therefore, I hope the bill will not be called up for action on Monday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I can assure the distinguished minority leader that the bill will not be called up on Monday.

DECISION OF SENATOR MURRAY NOT TO STAND FOR REELECTION

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the announcement of the senior Senator from

Montana [Mr. MURRAY] of his decision not to run for reelection to the Senate brought many expressions of sorrow at the announcement, and many expressions of praise of the distinguished senior Senator from Montana, by his colleagues. Similar expressions, of both sorrow and praise, have been made by the press in Montana and by the press throughout the Nation.

At this time, I wish to have some of those editorial and newspaper comments and commendations printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, the Montana Standard of May 1, 1960, in an editorial entitled "MURRAY's Action Has Many Repercussions," dealt with the long and distinguished record of the senior Senator from Montana, and made a number of statements in regard to his political activities in the State of Montana over a period of many years. I now read from that editorial:

After all, he won election to the Senate five times against some of the strongest opposition his own party and the Republicans could muster. And there were many who felt he would secure the nomination again this year had he remained in the race.

When first elected to fill out 2 years of Senator Walsh's term in 1934, he had a plurality of nearly 40,000 votes in polling almost 117,000. He beat Representative Scott Leavitt in that race.

In 1936 he beat Democratic Representative Joseph P. Monaghan of Butte in the primary by about 2,200 votes and then trounced GOP State Senator T. O. Larson of Choteau by 61,700 in the general election, even though Monaghan ran in that race as an Independent. That time MURRAY polled nearly 122,000 votes.

He defeated Monaghan again in the primary of 1942, by nearly 20,000 votes, but edged past Republican Wellington D. Rankin by only 1,212 votes in polling 63,700 in the general. That was his closest escape from defeat, as he won the primary by nearly 49,000 in 1946 and then trounced Tom J. Davis of Butte in the general by more than 30,000 in racking up a 125,000-vote total.

The Senator captured his party's primary by more than 60,000 in 1954, his last time out, and got nearly 115,000 votes in the general to defeat Representative Wesley A. D'Ewart by only 1,728 votes.

Mr. President, the editorial presents a remarkable chronicle of the political campaigning by one of the greatest Democratic Members we have had in the U.S. Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial, from which I have read an excerpt, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL EARTHQUAKE—MURRAY'S ACTION HAS MANY REPERCUSSIONS

The decision of Senator JAMES E. MURRAY to give up his seat in the U.S. Senate clarifies some of Montana's political air. It also results in widespread repercussions.

To some Democrats in the race it is a golden opportunity. Every candidate in that primary now can look upon himself as the chosen one who will represent Montana, along with MIKE MANSFIELD, in that exclusive "club of 100" which has so much to say about the lives and destinies of all of us.

To the Republican candidates, this also may appear as a bright spot in their political careers. Each of them, too, now must be certain in his own heart that this is the once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to win, not only the nomination, but also the grand prize as well.

Some of the latter, it appears may be a little bit miffed. Those are the candidates who were sure this was the year when JIM MURRAY was to be beaten, either because of his age or for other reasons. Their disappointment must be leavened by the realization that his decision not to run again removed from the field a man who even at age 84 was not to be taken lightly when it came to getting votes. After all, he won election to the Senate five times against some of the strongest opposition his own party and the Republicans could muster. And there were many who felt he would secure the nomination again this year had he remained in the race.

When first elected to fill out 2 years of Senator Walsh's term in 1934, he had a plurality of nearly 40,000 votes in polling almost 117,000. He beat Representative Scott Leavitt in that race.

In 1936 he beat Democratic Representative Joseph P. Monaghan of Butte in the primary by about 2,200 votes and then trounced GOP State Senator T. O. Larson of Choteau by 61,700 in the general election, even though Monaghan ran in that race as an Independent. That time Murray polled nearly 122,000 votes.

He defeated Monaghan again in the primary of 1942, by nearly 20,000 votes, but edged past Republican Wellington D. Rankin by only 1,212 votes in polling 83,700 in the general. That was his closest escape from defeat, as he won the primary by nearly 49,000 in 1948 and then trounced Tom J. Davis of Butte in the general by more than 30,000 in racking up a 125,000-vote total.

The Senator captured his party's primary by more than 60,000 in 1954, his last time out, and got nearly 115,000 votes in the general to defeat Representative Wesley A. D'Ewart by only 1,728 votes.

Now, aside from the impact his action will have on the other candidates this year, the Senator's retirement carries with it broader implications. This is particularly true because this is a presidential election year.

Certainly the full import of the decision will reflect throughout the Nation. Montana, many times considered not worth too much bother in a presidential race because of the limited population and the comparatively small number of electoral votes, may assume a place of more importance in the national election picture.

And, with this State playing host to the Nation's Governors at Glacier National Park late in June, Montana should surge to the forefront as a sounding board for national political interest.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the Daily Missoulian, of Friday, April 29, 1960, published an editorial entitled "Senator MURRAY Decides To Retire." The editorial makes the following comment, in part:

We admire Senator MURRAY for finally bowing to the inevitable. He has ample reason to take great pride in that the voters have kept him in the Senate longer than any other Montanan.

* * * * *

Senator MURRAY has more than earned the rewards of retirement. Montanans generally, irrespective of party, will wish him sufficient restoration of health for real enjoyment of the greater leisure that will be his upon the expiration of his term next January 3.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial, from which I have read excerpts, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Missoulian, Apr. 29, 1960]

SENATOR MURRAY DECIDES TO RETIRE

No one likes to admit, even to himself, that age has taken its toll to the extent that he isn't "up to par" and should therefore give way to a successor considerably nearer the prime of life.

That was the proposition JAMES E. MURRAY had forced upon him in reaching yesterday's decision to withdraw from the field of aspirants to the Senate seat he has occupied since November 7, 1934.

From the Senator's limited activities it is quite obvious that he hasn't the strength to make an all-out campaign for either renomination or reelection. General recognition of that fact is largely responsible for the large field of younger men in the primary Senatorial races of both the Democratic and Republican Parties.

Without question the Senator had hoped that deference to his record, age, and Senate seniority would allow him an easy field in his quest of a sixth consecutive election.

But younger men, of both parties, could not square that idea with either their personal or party ambitions. That's why, in whatever direction he looks, about all the Senator is able to see is younger men anxious to pull him out of and then sit in his Senate seat.

With understandable reluctance, Montana's senior Senator has decided to walk the plank voluntarily as he has seen many elderly colleagues do in his more than 25 years in Washington. Recent predecessors in that role were the highly respected Arthur Capper, Republican, of Kansas, and Walter F. George, Democrat, of Georgia.

We admire Senator MURRAY for finally bowing to the inevitable. He has ample reason to take great pride in that the voters have kept him in the Senate longer than any other Montanan. As he looks around in his final days in the Senate he sees only one man who is older, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Democrat, of Rhode Island. He also, by voluntarily retiring, is conceding that it would be better for his State to have a younger Senator. And throughout the Senate there are only three men who have been there longer than Mr. MURRAY: CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona, dean of the Congress, and the renowned HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, and RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia.

Senator MURRAY has more than earned the rewards of retirement. Montanans generally, irrespective of party, will wish him sufficient restoration of health for real enjoyment of the greater leisure that will be his upon the expiration of his term next January 3.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in the People's Voice, of April 29, 1960, appears an editorial entitled "MURRAY Has Served Montana Well." In addition to other statements, we find the following in the editorial:

MURRAY, during his more than a quarter of a century on Capitol Hill, has brought great honor and recognition to the constituents of his sparsely settled State. He has always been in the forefront of battle in behalf of legislation aimed at furthering the American dream of achieving the finest possible life for all its citizens.

Let me add, Mr. President, that that has been the foremost characteristic of Senator MURRAY's service in the Senate.

I read further from the editorial:

He has fought the good fight for better, more humane consideration of the problems of the aged, for better education for all our

children, for better health for all Americans, for a great dignity for the ordinary man whether he be in blue overalls, on Main Street or of the professions.

In recent years, the value of MURRAY's seniority became recognized throughout the Western States, as he chairmaned the important Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. In that capacity his has been a powerful voice for the development needs of the West, for resource conservation, for multiple-purpose projects, for building a solid base on which a flourishing economy would incubate and grow.

Mr. President, this editorial gives a fine, excellent, and eloquent summary of the great services rendered by Senator MURRAY, not only to his State, and not only to the Far West, but also to the entire Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, from which I have read excerpts, be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MURRAY HAS SERVED MONTANA WELL

Senator MURRAY's decision to retire at the end of his present term came as a mild but not entirely unexpected surprise. The weight of years and the exhausting duties of his office have taken their toll. He has justly earned the privilege of being Montana's "Senior Statesman."

MURRAY, during his more than a quarter of a century on Capitol Hill, has brought great honor and recognition to the constituents of his sparsely settled State. He has always been in the forefront of battle in behalf of legislation aimed at furthering the American dream of achieving the finest possible life for all its citizens.

He has fought the good fight for better, more humane consideration of the problems of the aged, for better education for all our children, for better health for all Americans, for a greater dignity for the ordinary man whether he be in blue overalls, on Main Street or of the professions.

In recent years, the value of MURRAY's seniority became recognized throughout the Western States, as he chairmaned the important Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. In that capacity his has been a powerful voice for the development needs of the West, for resource conservation, for multiple-purpose projects, for building a solid base on which a flourishing economy would incubate and grow.

Senator MURRAY, in the telegram announcing his decision to retire, said, "I shall always be proud of the confidence placed in me by the people of Montana * * *." Senator, I am sure that most Montanans join us in saying you richly earned that confidence which the people exhibited five different times in the polling places, beginning with 1934.—H.L.B.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on May 8, 1960, in the Washington Post, in the column, "The Washington Merry-Go-Round," by Drew Pearson, under the headline, "Senator MURRAY Will Be Watching," Mr. Pearson wrote the following, in part:

For a quarter of a century, MURRAY, a millionaire, has battled for the underdog. He worked for social security, public housing, public power, fair employment standards, health insurance. And he battled right up to the present. During the civil rights debate, he slept in his office and shuffled into the Senate Chamber for quorum calls while younger Senators were still in their beds.

Mr. Pearson went on to say:

But MURRAY is proudest of the Full Employment Act which he pushed through Congress in 1946 and which pundit Walter Lippmann described as the most important legislation in 50 years.

I would say that statement is certainly true, and it indicates the very broad scope of Senator MURRAY's attention and interest to the problems of our Nation. He dealt not only with those problems which were crucial to the State of Montana and the Far West, but he took a vital interest, in the early days of the Franklin Roosevelt administration, in the Wagner Act and other legislative proposals started during that era, and which are still a part of the law.

So it can properly be said that Senator MURRAY is proudest of the Full Employment Act of 1946, which, as Walter Lippmann said, was the most important legislation in 50 years, because it indicated the adoption of a new principle by the Federal Government; that is, the responsibility of the Federal Government itself for the employment of the people of this country, as well as in maintaining throughout this Nation a sound and growing and prosperous business economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, parts of which I have read, may be made a part of the RECORD in toto at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MURRAY WILL BE WATCHING

(By Drew Pearson)

A few days before his 84th birthday, Senator JIM MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, his shoulders stooped and his walk slowed to a shuffle, reluctantly agreed to give up the Senate seat he had held for 26 years.

But to those who persuaded him to retire, the old warhorse snorted: "If I don't like my successor, I'll be back 6 years from now running for the job again."

MURRAY's departure will mark the passing of an era. He is the last of the Senators who pioneered the social reforms of the Roosevelt New Deal.

For a quarter of a century, MURRAY, a millionaire, has battled for the underdog. He worked for social security, public housing, public power, fair employment standards, health insurance. And he battled right up to the present. During the civil-rights debate, he slept in his office and shuffled into the Senate Chamber for quorum calls while younger Senators were still in their beds.

When Representative LEROY ANDERSON, Democrat, of Montana, made MURRAY's age an issue in the Montana Democratic primary, the 84-year-old Senator showed that he had answered six times more quorum calls than the Congressman.

It was back in 1906 that MURRAY broke into politics as county attorney for Silver Bow County, Mont. He climbed the political ladder until he was elected to the Senate in 1934—the second year of the New Deal. Quickly he established himself as a fighting liberal, and when his retirement was announced, he was leading the Senate fight for Federal funds to build more schools and raise teachers' salaries.

A stanch Catholic, he stood for separation of church and state. He was also continuing a long, bitter struggle with the American Medical Association for Government health insurance to pay medical bills.

But MURRAY is proudest of the Full Employment Act which he pushed through Congress in 1946 and which Pundit Walter Lippmann described as the most important legislation in 50 years.

No wonder when MURRAY's retirement was announced it brought 3 hours of eulogies from both Democratic and Republican Senators. The old man sat through the speeches, head bowed, eyes misty.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in the publication Labor of May 7, 1960, under the title "Great Liberal Figure—MURRAY To Leave Senate After 25 Years' Service," that article has this to say about Senator MURRAY:

The son of an immigrant railroader, "JIM" MURRAY became a man of wealth. In politics, however, union observers recalled this week, Senator MURRAY has always fought for the underdog.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article, from which I have read an excerpt, be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREAT LIBERAL FIGURE—MURRAY TO LEAVE SENATE AFTER 25 YEARS' SERVICE

One of the Senate's great liberal figures, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, announced last week that he will not run for reelection next November. Now 83, and a Senator for over a quarter-century, MURRAY indicated he wants to "spend my remaining years in less arduous pursuits."

The son of an immigrant railroader, "JIM" MURRAY became a man of wealth. In politics, however, union observers recalled this week, Senator MURRAY has always fought for the underdog.

He's credited with a big role, back in the 1930's in passage of the Wagner Act guaranteeing collective bargaining, of the Social Security Act, of the Railroad Retirement Act, and many others. Perhaps his greatest triumph came in 1946 when Congress passed the Full Employment Act, which bears MURRAY's name as chief Senate sponsor.

As chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, MURRAY has also consistently championed conservation and development of natural resources, observers recalled. His successor next year in the Interior Committee is slated to be Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico.

In the words last week of Congressman LEE METCALF, Democrat, of Montana, "Senator MURRAY's fights in behalf of the poor, the sick, the oppressed, have changed the attitudes of the entire Nation." MURRAY's announcement also brought an outpouring of tributes from Senate colleagues of both parties.

In his election campaigns, the Montana Senator always had the warm endorsement of organized labor, including the railroad unions. Railway Labor's Political League had also endorsed MURRAY this year, after he indicated earlier in the year that he planned to run for reelection.

MURRAY's withdrawal left three announced candidates for the Democratic nomination to fill his seat. They are Montana's two Congressmen, Metcalf and LeRoy Anderson, plus John Majan, a Helena attorney. The Montana primary takes place June 7.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, during the recent tributes to Senator MURRAY

it became necessary for me to leave the floor before I could get recognition. In addition to my comments on the editorials which have just been made a part of the RECORD, I should like to add my personal regret that Senator MURRAY is to withdraw as a candidate for reelection to the Senate.

Senator MURRAY and I have been friends a long time. I worked very closely with him during the period of almost 16 years that I served in the House of Representatives. He and I had many mutual interests. The district I represented in the House comprised over 600 miles of the Sierra Nevada Mountains. It has many of the same problems as Montana—in the fields of mining, livestock, lumber, water conservation, recreation, and farming. I am deeply indebted to Senator MURRAY for his constant and effective cooperation in handling legislation affecting these vital interests. As chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I worked closely with Senator MURRAY in his capacity as chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. The great record made by the Senate Interior Committee under Senator MURRAY's chairmanship should not be lost sight of while we properly pay tribute to his leadership in other fields.

Senator MURRAY has been chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during a tremendous growth of western water development programs. Three-fourths of a billion dollars in water projects for California alone have been authorized. These include additions to the Central Valley project, which was started when Senator MURRAY first came to the Senate. Some of the better known ones are the Trinity River Project, the American River development, including the Folsom project, the Sacramento Valley canals, the Monticello project, and the Cachima and Santa Maria projects in Santa Barbara, and the Casitas project in Ventura County. But the whole West has gone forward during the time of Senator MURRAY's leadership of the Senate Interior Committee. The Upper Colorado Basin project, currently under construction, was authorized by his committee. This is probably the last very large irrigation, flood control, and power project in the Far West. The Hungry Horse Dam in Montana was built during his service. He has been a dedicated public servant in the field of water conservation and public power development.

Not to be overlooked is his contribution to the mining industry, which he knows so well. The stockpiling program initiated immediately after the Second World War had his blessing and his aid and the consistent support, not only of his committee, but of his very efficient committee staff. Senator MURRAY has done everything in his power to maintain a strong, vigorous, and prosperous domestic mining industry.

Not the least of the major legislation to Senator MURRAY's credit is the entry into the Union of our two new States—the State of Alaska and the State of Hawaii. These measures were handled by the Senate Interior Committee.

In the last few Congresses, the Senate and House Interior Committees handled approximately 20 percent of the public laws passed by the Congress and signed by the President. The high percentage of the public laws taken care of by the Senate Interior Committee is an index of the industry and the constructive legislation managed by that great committee under Senator MURRAY's chairmanship; and I am proud to have had the honor of serving as chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during 4 years of that time.

In all of this work in recent years, I have been the constant beneficiary of Senator MURRAY's friendship and his powerful assistance. The entire West loses by the retirement of Senator MURRAY from the U.S. Senate. The Nation, too, is the loser, because his interest and his influence have gone far beyond the regional achievements with which his name has been so intimately associated, and for which he will be long remembered in his home State and in the Far West.

Senator MURRAY can be justly proud of his leadership in legislation on labor, public welfare, and education. These are subjects of nationwide interest and impact. Senator MURRAY was one of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's leaders in the U.S. Senate when his great program was put together in the early years of the New Deal.

Senator MURRAY's interest and support of constructive liberal legislation has continued down through the years. He retires from the U.S. Senate with a remarkable record of achievement, to the sorrow and with the plaudits of his colleagues, and with the deep appreciation not only of the people of Montana, but of the whole Nation.

THE B–70 INTERCONTINENTAL BOMBER PROGRAM

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on January 11 of this year I expressed myself at length on the administration's folly in "gutting" the B–70 intercontinental bomber program. That was only a few weeks after the decision had been made. In the months since then, several congressional committees have heard a mass of testimony on this subject from defense officials and Air Force officers. In the main, this testimony fully confirms the judgment of those of us who have criticized the administration's decision.

I will not dwell on the transparent effort of defense officials to deny that the decision was budgetary. It was claimed that the choice was made on technical grounds. The B–70 was said to be in competition with other weapons systems, including the advanced B–58 and four ballistic missiles—the Atlas, Titan, Minuteman, and Polaris.

Since this particular testimony was given, an Air Force team of experts rejected the proposed advanced B–58 as technically inadequate to perform the mission that would have been required of it. As for the B–70's competition with ballistic missiles, I feel this argument is a prize sample of the administration's foggy defense thinking. If the B–70 is in competition with them, how much more are they in competition with one another? If one has five weapon systems—four ballistic missiles whose capabilities largely duplicate one another, and one manned bomber—does it make sense to eliminate the bomber and keep all four of the duplicative systems? Does this square with the Defense Department's repeated statements that a mixed force of manned and unmanned weapons offers the best defense?

I am not arguing for cancellation of any missile programs, which I believe to be absolutely essential to the Nation's security, but I am drawing attention to the pathetic logic used by administration apologists to justify the B–70 decision. I think it is an insult to the public intelligence to claim that, with Air Force leaders and even the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff arguing for the B–70, the decision to scrap it was a technical one. Can it be seriously maintained that the status of the B–70 would have come into question if there had been no pressure to slash the budget? I submit, Mr. President, that the administration's story about technical reasons for the decision was put forward in order to stave off far more embarrassing admissions. It would not do to acknowledge that our national defense is being shortchanged—that essential elements of our security are being sacrificed so that the President may go out of office with a balanced budget.

However, the most remarkable aspect of the B–70 testimony is not the double talk of the defense officials, but the unanimous agreement of professional Air Force men on the need for the B–70 intercontinental bomber. They told us frankly that it was essential for the Nation's defenses, that they had lost their battle for it, and that as good soldiers they have accepted the decision of their superiors. When I hear men speak with such forthright integrity, my pride in our country and my confidence in its fundamental strength are refreshed and recharged.

Let us for a moment review the basic thinking that went into the formulation of the B–70 program, and let us also note that these facts and beliefs are not controverted by the administration today.

It is axiomatic among military planners that a mixed force composed of weapons with various capabilities constitutes a surer defense than a force which depends on a single type of weapon, because it contains the inherent flexibility to probe for enemy weaknesses and to react skillfully to the enemy's varying tactics. It is safe to say that no war in history has been fought and won just as it was planned beforehand. In fact, wars have usually been won by the side best able to vary its attack to exploit the weaknesses of the other.

Translated into the structure of our present strategic retaliatory force, this principle means the use of both manned

and unmanned weapon systems. The unmanned systems, represented by the ICBM's and the submarine-launched Polaris missile, have obvious advantages. They are so swift—covering intercontinental distances in half an hour—that in a surprise attack they give the victim only a few minutes warning, at best. Moreover, this same speed is baffling to the designer of defensive counter weapons. Some observers have been so carried away with these advantages that they have called the ICBM the "ultimate weapon."

But the ballistic missile also has some clear disadvantages which require us to deploy another, completely different, type of weapon to give our defense structure the most elementary insurance. One of these disadvantages is that the weapon and its base are vulnerable to preemptive attack. That is, if one thinks an enemy has unleashed an attack, one cannot get the missile up in the air and let it cruise around while the attack is confirmed. The missile, once well launched, cannot be called back.

For this reason we must operate on the assumption that it will have to ride out the attack. To this end we plan hardened and mobile bases for our most advanced type missiles. But the principle still holds that we cannot cut the rope on our missile until we have been hit.

With only this weapon in our strategic arsenal, our survival depends on the degree of success of an enemy's initial surprise assault. The effectiveness of our defense becomes a function of the enemy's efficiency, not of our own. We have lost control of our own defense.

Secondly, the ballistic missile offers no means of reporting back to our command centers on the results of our counterattack. As a practical matter, once a nuclear war has begun we would have little or no intelligence about the enemy. We would not know where we have hit the enemy. We would not know where to hit him again. We would not know where his remaining shots are coming from. The only way we would know that he is still in business is by the punishment he would be delivering on us. This, I maintain, is a classic example of finding out the hard way. It could well mean that we would find out too late.

These are some of the reasons why our professional airmen insist upon manned weapons in our defense force. A manned bomber does not have to ride out an enemy attack. It can be up and away at the first warning, without waiting to find out whether the attack is the real thing, a feint, or an error. If the warning turns out to be false, the bomber can be recalled to its base.

Once the battle is joined, the bomber provides a means of firsthand observation over enemy targets. It can vary its attack to suit the situation. And it can report back on the remaining targets to be destroyed.

The value of these attributes of the manned bomber is not limited to actual warfare. Equally important to all of us is that they promise such a certain and accurate retaliation that an enemy would be deterred from attacking us in the first place. For this reason the universal mobility of the bomber is especially important. Because it can be exercised throughout the world, potential aggressors as well as uncommitted peoples can see it. It is its own powerful argument for peace. As Gen. Thomas White has pointed out, it is not enough for us to say to other nations, "Oh, you should see the submarines we have under the sea and the missiles we have in these holes all over the United States." With the manned bomber, seeing is believing.

Now, if the manned bomber is an essential part of our deterrent force, are we seeing to it that we continue to maintain this deterrent in the future? The B–70 intercontinental bomber was conceived for just this purpose. With its curtailment to prototype status, where does that leave us? Gen. Thomas Power has told us that as a general rule of thumb, a bomber is obsolete in 10 years. He further said that the B–52 even with the improved capabilities that will be provided for it, will become obsolete any time in the mid-1960's. That is, the performance of Soviet interceptors and surface-to-air missiles will by that time be such that the B–52 will no longer be a serious threat.

It happens that, through the foresight and initiative of Air Force planners, the B–70 was programed to come into operation at about the time that the B–52 would become obsolete. In comparison to the B–52, the B–70 has an astounding performance. It will have a speed of mach 3 or 2,000 miles per hour—more than three times faster than the B–52. In contrast to our experience with other supersonic aircraft, it can maintain this mach 3 speed throughout its entire mission, while also maintaining an intercontinental range.

This speed is above the speed of the fastest Soviet interceptors that are coming into operation. Moreover, due to certain aerodynamic and thermodynamic problems, at such speeds, it is not likely that the Soviets can build an interceptor that could make the B–70 obsolete within the immediate foreseeable future.

So far as altitude is concerned, the B–70 flies above 70,000 feet, which is higher than the utmost reach of Soviet defenses—either interceptors or surface-to-air missiles. Moreover, the B–70 has a substantial growth potential to still higher altitudes, so that in this dimension, as well, it promises to hold up strongly as a retaliatory threat for many, many years.

Thirdly, the B–70 would carry a full complement of the most advanced defensive countermeasures known, in order to confuse and divert enemy weapons. It also contains provision for substantial increase in electric power capacity, so that it can make use of new advances in the countermeasure state of the art.

As a result of its superior performance, the B–70 would obsolete the present Soviet defensive system. If the Soviets wanted to build a system that would be at least competitive with the B–70, they would have to spend a far greater amount than the cost to this country of the B–70 program.

In short, the B–70—as it was planned—offers assurance that it can get through to enemy targets in the period following the obsolescence of the B–52. As Gen. Nathan Twining has told us, it is the only manned weapon system that was programed for this role. There is no substitute. But since last December, the B–70 has been removed from the role.

There has been no denial on the part of the administration of the considerations that I have just discussed. Instead there has been only a vague and unsupported explanation that the B–70 is in competition with four ballistic missile programs. This explanation, Mr. President, is deliberately vague. It cannot get specific. If it does, it has to face up to the fact that our retaliatory force needs an effective manned intercontinental bomber, and that the only effective intercontinental bomber planned for the future is the B–70.

If we do not provide such a weapon, are we keeping faith with the brave crewmen who will have to fly our bombers in case of war? As Gen. Thomas Power has told us, "I think if men are going to have to go over there with the sophisticated defenses, this country owes it to them to give them a modern piece of equipment so it can survive."

Mr. President, I call for a reinstatement of the B–70 to its full weapon system program, and to this end, the provision of adequate funds in the 1961 budget.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 95)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the veto message by the President of the area redevelopment bill be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying bill, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed:

To the Senate of the United States:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 722, the area redevelopment bill.

For 5 consecutive years I have urged the Congress to enact sound area assistance legislation. On repeated occasions I have clearly outlined standards for the kind of program that is needed and that I would gladly approve.

In 1958 I vetoed a bill because it departed greatly from those standards. In 1959, despite my renewed urging, no area assistance bill was passed by the Congress.

Now in 1960, another election year, a new bill is before me that contains certain features which I find even more objectionable than those I found unacceptable in the 1958 bill.

The people of the relatively few communities of chronic unemployment—who want to share in the general prosperity—are, after 5 years, properly becoming increasingly impatient and are rightfully desirous of constructive action. The need is for truly sound and helpful legislation on which the Congress and the Executive can agree. There is still time, and I willingly pledge once again my wholehearted cooperation in obtaining such a law.

S. 722 is seriously defective in six major respects which are summarized immediately below and discussed in detail thereafter.

1. S. 722 would squander the Federal taxpayers' money where there is only temporary economic difficulty, curable without the special Federal assistance provided in the bill. In consequence, communities in genuine need would receive less Federal help for industrial development projects than under the administration's proposal.

2. Essential local, State, and private initiative would be materially inhibited by the excessive Federal participation that S. 722 would authorize.

3. Federal financing of plant machinery and equipment is unwise and unnecessary and therefore wasteful of money that otherwise could be of real help.

4. The Federal loan assistance which S. 722 would provide for the construction of sewers, water mains, access roads, and other public facilities is unnecessary because such assistance is already available under an existing Government program. Outright grants for such a purpose, a provision of S. 722, are wholly inappropriate.

5. The provisions for Federal loans for the construction of industrial buildings in rural areas are incongruous and unnecessary.

6. The creation of a new Federal agency is not needed and would actually delay initiation of the new program for many months.

I

The most striking defect of S. 722 is that it would make eligible for Federal assistance areas that don't need it—thus providing less help for communities in genuine need than would the administration's proposal. S. 722, as opposed to the administration bill, would more than double the number of eligible communities competing for Federal participation in loans for the construction or refurbishing of plants for industrial use—the main objective of both bills. Communities experiencing only temporary economic difficulty would accordingly be made eligible under S. 722 and the dissipation of Federal help among them would deprive communities afflicted with truly chronic unemployment of the full measure of assistance they so desperately desire and which the administration bill would give them.

II

Lasting solutions to the problems of chronic unemployment can only be forthcoming if local citizens—the people most immediately concerned—take the lead in planning and financing them. The principal objective is to develop new industry. The Federal Government can and should help, but the major role in the undertaking must be the local community's. Neither money alone, nor the Federal Government alone, can do the job. The States also must help, and many are, but in many instances and in many ways they could do much more.

Under S. 722, however, financing of industrial development projects by the Federal Government—limited to 35 percent under the administration's proposal—could go as high as 65 percent, local community participation could be as low as 10 percent, and private financing as little as 5 percent. Furthermore, although S. 722 conditions this assistance on approval by a local economic development organization, if no such organization exists one can be appointed from Washington.

III

S. 722 would authorize Federal loans for the acquisition of machinery and equipment to manufacturers locating in eligible areas. Loans for machinery and equipment are unnecessary, unwise, and costly. Much more money would be required and unnecessarily spent, much less money would find its way into truly helpful projects, and manufacturers would be subsidized unnecessarily vis-a-vis their competitors.

IV

S. 722 would authorize further unnecessary spending by providing both loans and grants—up to 100 percent of the cost—for the construction of access roads, sewers, water mains, and other local public facilities.

Grants for local public facilities far exceed any appropriate Federal responsibility. Even though relatively modest at the start, they would set predictably expensive and discriminatory precedents.

With regard to loans for such purposes, exemption from Federal income taxes makes it possible today for local communities in almost every case to borrow on reasonable terms from private sources. Whenever such financing is difficult to obtain, the need can be filled by the existing public facility loan program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency—a program which S. 722 would needlessly duplicate and for which an additional $100 million authorization has already been requested.

V

S. 722 would make a minimum of 600 rural counties eligible for Federal loans for the construction of industrial buildings in such areas. The rural development program and the Small Business Administration are already contributing greatly to the economic improvement of low income rural areas. Increasing the impact of these two activities, particularly the rural development program, is a preferable course.

VI

Finally, S. 722 would also create a new Federal agency and would, in consequence, mean many unnecessary additions to the Federal payroll and a considerable delay in the program before the new agency could be staffed and functioning effectively. None of this is necessary, for all that needs to be done can be done—much better and immediately—by the existing Department of Commerce.

Again, I strongly urge the Congress to enact new legislation at this session—but without those features of S. 722 that I find objectionable. I would, however, accept the eligibility criteria set forth in the bill that first passed the Senate even though these criteria are broader than those contained in the administration bill.

Moreover, during the process of developing a new bill, I would hope that in other areas of past differences solutions could be found satisfactory to both the Congress and the Executive.

My profound hope is that sound, new legislation will be promptly enacted. If it is, our communities of chronic unemployment will be only the immediate beneficiaries. A tone will have been set that would hold forth, for the remainder of the session, the hope of sound and rewarding legislation in other vital areas—mutual security, wheat, sugar, minimum wage, interest rates, revenue measures, medical care for the aged, and aid to education to mention but a few.

Only this result can truly serve the finest and best interests of all our people.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 13, 1960.*

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, one of the difficulties in our American political system is that the President is at once the ceremonial head of our Government and the Chief of State, and also the Chief Executive and the leader of his party. When one criticizes the President, therefore, one is always accused of belittling the ceremonial head of the Government or the Chief of State. Nevertheless, if the President, as party leader, writes a message which is ignorant, unduly unctuous, and hypocritical, the message cannot escape criticism because of the fact that the man who signed his name to it also happens to be the ceremonial Chief of State.

Of course, President Eisenhower, in all probability, did not write this message. This was written for him either by someone in the executive office, or, as is more probable, by someone in the Department of Commerce.

I have a real liking for the President. It is in no personal sense, therefore, that I repeat, this message betrays ignorance, it is unctuous and hypocritical, and it is greatly mistaken in its attitude toward what is happening in this country.

The President says that he is for area redevelopment. My reply is that one can only tell whether a person is for area redevelopment or not by his actions and not by his words.

I should like very briefly to summarize some of the things which have been happening in the last 4 or 5 years.

In 1955 I introduced a bill to provide for area redevelopment. The administration opposed that bill. We passed the bill through the Senate, in the concluding days of that Congress. The bill went to the House. Informal requests were

made that the House permit the matter to come before the House under unanimous consent, but the Republican leaders of the House refused to give the unanimous consent, so the bill died in the House.

In 1957 I introduced another area redevelopment bill. It passed the Senate. The RECORD shows that in the Senate the bill received only 15 Republican votes. The bill was opposed by the Republican leadership in the Senate. The bill went to the House. The distinguished present occupant of the chair, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], was then a Member of the House of Representatives. The Senator from West Virginia knows that the House Republican leadership opposed the measure. The bill was sent to the President, and the President vetoed it. Incidentally, that veto helped to defeat the former Senator from Maine, Mr. Payne, and helped to defeat the two former Republican Senators from West Virginia.

I introduced an area redevelopment bill again in 1959, and we got only four Republican votes in the Senate for it. The bill went to the House, and the House Banking and Currency Committee recommended a bill in substantially similar form to the Senate bill, but the Committee on Rules for approximately a year has refused to allow the bill to be submitted to the House for action.

It is well known that the Rules Committee of the House consists of 12 members, 4 of whom are northern Democrats, 4 Republicans, and 4 southern Democrats; and the coalition of 4 Republicans and 4 southern Democrats prevented that bill from being approved by the Rules Committee.

Finally, it was brought up this year on Calendar Wednesday and passed by the House. And by recent action the Senate accepted the House bill. This time we got five Republican votes, the remainder of the Republicans voting against the measure.

Mr. President, since I began to speak, I have been able to obtain the party votes in the House in 1958 and 1960. On the important vote to consider in 1958 the yeas were 216, and the nays 170.

Of the 216 Members who voted yea, 159 were Democrats, and only 57 were Republicans.

Of the 170 who voted nay, 57 were Democrats—almost all of them southern Democrats—and 113 were Republicans, showing that the Democrats voted 3 to 1 for the bill, and the Republicans voted, roughly, 2 to 1 against the bill.

On the vote on recommital, the vote against recommital and for the bill was: Democrats 139; Republicans 49.

For recommittal, against the bill, the Democrats were 54, and the Republicans 116.

Once again, the Democrats, in this case, voted approximately 2½ to 1 for the bill. The Republicans voted 2 to 1 against it.

This year, 179 Democrats voted for the passage of the bill and only 23 Republicans voted for it.

Sixty-nine Democrats voted against the bill, and 115 Republicans voted against it.

The Democrats in the House voted almost 3 to 1 for the bill; the Republicans voted precisely 5 to 1 against it.

Mr. President, I do not read these figures with any pleasure. It was the pick of the crop of the Republicans who voted with us. The five Republicans in the Senate who voted with us are splendid gentlemen. We hope to acquire a few more.

However, the President and his party leaders have made this a party issue. We tried to prevent it from becoming a party issue We took Senators Payne, Beall, and Cooper into full partnership, and played them up as coauthors, but the administration has now made it a party issue.

What is wrong in trying to provide employment in areas of high and persistent unemployment?

Now the President has vetoed this measure for a second time, and yet he has the nerve to say that he has always been for area development. The action of the President reminds of the nursery rhyme passage which we all know so well. The little girl asked:

> Mother, mother, may I go out to swim?

And the mother replied:

> Yes, my darling daughter. Hang your clothes on a hickory limb, but don't go near the water.

That is precisely like the action of this administration. They say they are for area redevelopment, but on every effective move we make to get area redevelopment they throw their full strength on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House to kill it; and then, when over all those obstacles we pass a bill, the President vetoes it.

In the ballad of Reading Gaol, Oscar Wilde wrote:

> For each man kills the thing he loves,
> By each let this be heard—
> Some do it with a bitter look
> Some with a flattering word.
> The coward does it with a kiss,
> The brave man with a sword.

I would much rather have area redevelopment put to death with the sword by an outright attack on it rather than have it kissed and embraced first and then put to death. Let there be no hyprocrisy in this matter. The administration is opposed to area redevelopment. It is opposed to helping the areas of this country with high and chronic unemployment. At the same time it is opposed to aiding these areas, it is demanding $4 billion for foreign aid.

When the House bill was under consideration I brought into the Senate Chamber a volume, which the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] had compiled, what listing I thought were all the projects which this administration had supported since 1955 only, in countries abroad. There were 104 countries listed, with every conceivable type of project under the sun. I announced that the document weighed 5 pounds, 7 ounces. I now find that the listing by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], which is the best we have had to date, covers only about one-half of all the projects the administration has favored abroad since 1955, and it does not include the projects under the Development Loan Fund.

I have before me a list of such projects for 1 year only. It probably weighs a half pound, and more is coming. All this is for abroad but there is nothing for the unemployed ones at home.

Mr. President, whoever wrote this message—and I suspect it was Frederick H. Mueller, the Secretary of Commerce—makes the President say:

> The people of the relatively few communities of chronic unemployment—who want to share in the general prosperity—are, after 5 years, properly becoming increasingly impatient and are rightfully desirous of constructive action.

He goes on to say that this bill would squander the Federal taxpayers' money where there is only temporary economic difficulty.

As of May of this year there are now 40 major areas which would qualify and 103 minor areas which would qualify under the terms of the bill which the President vetoed. I prefer the Senate formula for area participation to the formula which the House finally adopted.

However, the mere qualification of an area would not mean that the loan would have to be made; and we can assume that the Administrator would pick out the areas of greatest need and make loans to them.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of the regions which would be eligible under the bill as it went to the President be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENTATIVE LIST OF URBAN AREAS THAT MAY QUALIFY FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE AS AREAS WITH SUBSTANTIAL AND PERSISTENT UNEMPLOYMENT UNDER LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL [1]

MAJOR AREAS [2]

Area redevelopment bill as passed by Congress

Forty Major Areas

Connecticut: Bridgeport, New Britain.
Indiana: Evansville, Terre Haute.
Kentucky: Louisville.

[1] This listing is preliminary and tentative and is based largely on bimonthly or semiannual data compiled from area labor market reports prepared in connection with the Bureau of Employment Security's program for the classification of areas according to relative adequacy of labor supply. Data used cover a 2- to 5-year period, generally extending through March 1960. Later data, now becoming available for some areas, could result in several changes in the above listing. A more comprehensive review of area data on a monthly—rather than bimonthly or semiannual—basis, and in the light of whatever criteria may be included in the bill finally enacted, would be required to determine which areas are eligible for assistance as areas with substantial and persistent unemployment.

[2] Major areas are areas included in the Bureau of Employment Security's regular area labor market reporting and classification program. This program covers 149 of the country's leading employment centers. Unemployment and labor force data for these areas are generally available on a bimonthly basis.

Maine: Portland.
Massachusetts: Brockton, Fall River, Lawrence, Lowell, New Bedford, Springfield-Holyoke, Worcester.
Michigan: Detroit, Flint.
Minnesota: Duluth-Superior.
New Jersey: Atlantic City, Newark, Paterson, Trenton.
New York: Albany-Schenectady-Troy, Buffalo, Utica-Rome.
North Carolina: Durham.
Pennsylvania: Altoona, Erie, Johnstown, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, York.
Rhode Island: Providence.
Tennessee: Chattanooga.
Texas: Beaumont-Port Arthur, Corpus Christi.
Virginia: Roanoke.
West Virginia: Charleston, Huntington-Ashland, Wheeling.

SMALLER AREAS [3]

One Hundred and Three Smaller Areas

Alabama: Florence-Sheffield, Gadsden, Jasper, Talladega.
Alaska: Anchorage.
Connecticut: Ansonia, Bristol, Danielson, Meriden, Middletown, Norwich, Thompsonville, Torrington.
Illinois: Centralia, Harrisburg, Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort, Litchfield, Mount Carmel-Olney, Mount Vernon.
Indiana: Connersville, Vincennes.
Kansas: Coffeyville-Independence-Parsons, Pittsburg.
Kentucky: Corbin, Hazard, Madisonville, Morehead-Grayson, Owensboro, Paducah.
Maine: Biddeford-Sanford, Lewiston-Auburn.
Maryland: Cambridge, Cumberland.
Massachusetts: Newburyport, North Adams.
Michigan: Bay City, Iron Mountain, Marquette, Monroe, Port Huron.
Mississippi: Biloxi-Gulfport.
Missouri: Flat River, Joplin, Washington.
Montana: Butte, Kalispell.
New Jersey: Bridgeton, Long Branch.
New York: Amsterdam, Auburn, Elmira, Gloversville, Jamestown-Dunkirk, Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon, Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone, Plattsburgh, Wellsville.
North Carolina: Fayetteville, Hendersonville, Lumberton, Mount Airy.
Ohio: Portsmouth-Chillicothe.
Oklahoma: Ardmore, McAlester, Muskogee, Okmulgee-Henryetta.
Pennsylvania: Berwick-Bloomsburg, Butler, Clearfield-Du Bois, Indiana, Kittanning-Ford City, Lewistown, Meadville, New Castle, Oil City-Franklin-Titusville, Pottsville, Sayre-Athens-Towanda, St. Marys, Sunbury-Shamokin-Mt. Carmel, Uniontown-Connellsville, Williamsport.
Tennessee: La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell.
Texas: Laredo, Texarkana.
Virginia: Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, Richlands-Bluefield.
Washington: Aberdeen, Anacortes, Bellingham, Bremerton, Port Angeles.
West Virginia: Beckley, Bluefield, Clarksburg, Fairmont, Logan, Martinsburg, Morgantown, Parkersburg, Point Pleasant-Gallipolis, Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs. Welch.
Wisconsin: La Crosse.

[3] Smaller areas: Areas with a labor force of 15,000 or more which are officially classified as "smaller areas of substantial labor surplus" by the Bureau of Employment Security. Data for such areas are generally available on a semiannual basis. Information for smaller areas which are not classified, or for areas with a labor force of less than 15,000, is not available in Washington on a consistent basis.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would like to comment upon some of these places. For example, in the State of West Virginia, which the present occupant of the Chair [Mr. BYRD] so well represents, there has been high and persistent unemployment for at least 5 years, and in my judgment, possibly for 10 years, but our records do not go back of 1955. This is true of the major areas such as Charleston, Huntington, and Ashland, but also the coal-mining areas of southern West Virginia have been in that condition for a long time. I can testify that the coal-mining areas of southern Illinois have had high and persistent unemployment for at least 10 years; they are areas such as Centralia, Harrisburg, Herrin, West Frankfort, Litchfield, and Murphysboro. Other regions with high unemployment in southern Illinois are Mount Carmel, Olney, Mount Vernon, and Cairo.

We know well what has been happening in the textile centers of Massachusetts. Lowell, Lawrence, Fall River, and New Bedford, amongst the major areas, have had high unemployment for the past 5 years. Brockton, Springfield, the Holyoke region, and Worcester have had high unemployment for the past 2 years. I have personally visited North Adams and Adams, and I know that they are in dire straits and have been for several years.

Among the towns in Pennsylvania which are in trouble is the great railroad center of Altoona and the coal and steel cities of Johnstown, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, and Hazleton in the anthracite region, and more recently York, are all experiencing great economic difficulties.

Then there are a large number of other areas, such as the Clearfield bituminous region, Shamokin, and the Mt. Carmel region, Oil City, Franklin, Titusville.

This continuing high and long-continued unemployment is not confined to any area of the country. Evansville and Terre Haute have been in difficulties for the last 5 years. Biddeford and Sanford in Maine have been for several years. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has truthfully and eloquently spoken of the great privation in eastern Kentucky, in the coal mining regions of that State.

The textile towns of Connecticut and of those producing hardware are in difficulty. Chattanooga, Tenn.; Roanoke, Va.; Albany, Schenectady, and Troy, N.Y.; Utica and Rome, N.Y.; Duluth and Superior in Minnesota; Flint, Mich., and Louisville, Ky., are other cities which are in trouble.

This is a nationwide problem. It was created primarily by the fact that industries will decline, notably textile and coal mining, but also where the timber is cut off and a natural resource is exhausted, and where there are changes in technology such as the substitution of diesel engines for coal-burning locomotives. It has caused trouble in Altoona. Jobs disappear, and a large number of men and their families are stranded.

We are not proposing Federal handouts. We are proposing pump-priming loans to get these localities at least partially back on their feet.

The President makes much of the fact that a Federal loan might go up to 65 percent. Yes; it might. But it is not compelled to. That is merely the upper limit. He says the local participation could go as low as 10 percent, and private financing as little as 5 percent. That is theoretically possible.

However, a prudent administrator would, except in cases of great need, try to get the localities and individual industries to put up as much money as they could, and only use the Federal loans to stimulate local action.

There has been a difference of opinion as to whether the Federal loans should merely be for real estate and building, or whether they should include machinery and equipment. I may say that machinery and equipment were originally included in the bill at the suggestion of the then distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut, a Republican, who had a great deal of experience in the metal industries. He felt that a loan merely for plant and land would not be adequate.

The President is critical that we have a program for rural regions of this country as well as for the industrial regions. This shows ignorance. There is a great deal of unemployment and underemployment in the rural regions of America. Farm income has fallen by approximately $4 billion in the 7½ years that the Eisenhower administration has been in office. Last year the total farm income was only $11 billion; $3½ billion of this consisted of food grown on the farm and the rental value of the farm housing. So the net cash figure was only $7½ billion, to be shared among 4,600,000 farms, or an average of approximately $1,650 per farm, or $32 a week. That was the average. Of course far more than 50 percent received less than this amount.

We have a tremendous amount of rural poverty in this country and of unutilized farm time. One of the things which these areas need is to have factory employment brought to them so that the members of the family can work in the factories, and in the off seasons, when the farmers are not busy themselves, they can work there too.

The President does not like to have this measure provide loans to localities for public facilities, and says we already have a program. Well, we have checked up on that. We find that the present community facility loan program has funds for public facilities of only $25 million remaining of which $23 million has already been pledged. Furthermore, this is designed simply for sewers and other things. A locality, if it is to draw industry, must have, instead, industrial water. This requires small lakes, and, in some cases, not so small lakes, and industrial parks, whereby groups of industry can come in and subdivide buildings and they need access roads built to these industrial parks and electricity and

power facilities. These things cost money, and a locality will really need to have these facilities in order to attract industry. So that the bill provides for these loans at low rates of interest; and where a community is not able to fully make a pledge, small grants are provided as well.

The President is critical of our bill because it provides for retraining workers. That is extremely important. Workers in industry who have been unemployed need to be given new skills in order to find work in new industries which are brought in. So it is necessary to have a program of retraining. It is also necessary that during the period that the workers are learning, there should be a limited amount of subsistence payments to them. That is what we provide.

The veto is very disappointing, and it does not reflect credit upon whoever wrote it. I had hoped that the President would acquaint himself personally with the situation, which he evidently chose not to do. I know that probably it will be difficult to override the veto, in view of the almost solid Republican vote against the measure.

It is my personal belief, however, that it would be desirable to have one more lineup, so people may know on which side they stood, and also to give a chance to those who have fought this bill to come over at the last minute. I believe in deathbed repentances. I believe they have spiritual value. A chance should be given to the sinners to join the forces of the righteous. I do not want to condemn them permanently. I do say this, Mr. President, that the rollcalls on these bills will resound through the country during this next year.

Approximately 6⅓ million workers live in areas of chronic labor surplus. They represent, roughly, one-tenth of the total national civilian labor force, and they accounted, recently, for about 17 percent of the total national unemployment. On the average, more than 12 percent, at the time I compiled these figures last fall, of the labor force in those areas was unemployed. This is not short-time employment. These figures represent large numbers of people who in the main have been unemployed year after year after year.

It is very interesting to observe that the conservative Government of Great Britain, headed by Mr. Macmillan, a highly conservative Tory, has put into effect a law to provide aid for the distressed areas of Great Britain. Whether my bill was copied by the Tories or not, I do not know. I hope it was.

It is well known that Chancellor Adenauer used this method to absorb the refugees who swarmed into Germany to escape from the Russians. Chancellor Adenauer, I suppose, is about as conservative a person, economically, as can be found.

But in the United States, what seems to be acceptable to the British Tories and to the German Conservatives is rejected by the Republican Eisenhower administration. We did not ask for much money. We asked for only $251 million. Not much of that would have been spent in the first year. It was only an authorization. An appropriation bill would have been compelled to follow. Time would have been needed to create an administration to process applications, and so on. The bill was in no sense a budget-busting program. It was a constructive program. Now the President comes along and dashes the hopes of the people in these communities, and does so protesting that he is for area redevelopment.

Mr. President, I think that in the interest of restraint, I should stop at this point. We will let the country decide.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the present administration continues to play the part of Scrooge in this country; yet it plays the part of Santa Claus to the rest of the world.

Today's veto of Senate bill 722, the depressed areas legislation, unalterably stands as evidence of the seeming disconcern for the people of this country who are jobless.

The President wanted a depressed-areas bill providing $53 million. If the President were fully aware of the joblessness in this country, his signature would have been on the bill sent to him by this body.

The Senate had previously passed an area-redevelopment bill providing for $389 million, but it accepted a $138 million cut by the House of Representatives, cognizant of the urgent need for such legislation. The $251 million measure that was finally agreed upon and sent to the White House was reasonable legislation. We should keep in mind that $251 million is but one-sixteenth of the amount requested by the President for foreign aid this year.

It should not be unreasonable to assume that the first duty of the Federal Government should be to serve and provide for the welfare of the people of this country. But in the thinking of the present administration, it appears that this theory is unreasonable.

For many years the administration has claimed that it is aware of the need for area redevelopment legislation, but for the second time in 2 years the President has vetoed legislation provided by Congress.

In 1958 the President vetoed Senate bill 3683. That bill would have provided, generally, the same assistance to chronically depressed areas that the measure vetoed today provided.

Those who opposed the bill called it excessive, and said it would cost too much money. But, in the opinion of those of us who supported the legislation, the economic merits were quite evident. Moneys expended would have come back to the Federal Government with profits. In other words, money outlayed by the Federal Government would have been returned, with interest, in future years. The bill would have meant money repaid in American dollars whereas loans to foreign countries under the foreign aid program are repaid in foreign currencies.

The legislation would have induced productivity and would have injected new vitality into those areas of joblessness. Workers could have been retrained for different jobs; local communities would have had funds for industrial development; and loans for construction of public facilities could have been provided.

Today, as in 1958, thousands of workers across America are disappointed. Their hopes for employment in the near future have been dashed again.

The responsibility was squarely on the shoulders of the President. He has failed in this responsibility. Depressed areas legislation has, once again, been vetoed.

What plans have been made by the administration to aid the displaced worker? How will it answer the thousands of urgings by unemployed workers for an opportunity to work again?

Congress did its job. Legislation was passed. Concurrence was easily reached because of the need for such a law to aid chronically depressed areas.

Mr. President, I recall the words of the American clergyman, William Ellery Channing, when he spoke of example:

> Precept is instruction written in the sand. The tide flows over it, and the record is gone. Example is graven on the rock, and the lesson is not soon lost.

The veto of the area redevelopment bill is another example of callous indifference on the part of the present administration toward depressed communities and unemployed men and women. It is an example "graven on the rock, and the lesson is not soon lost."

Mr. KEATING obtained the floor.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. KEATING. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY: WYOMING'S GREAT SENATOR

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this week the distinguished and able senior Senator of Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the outstanding constitutional lawyer of the Senate, announced his retirement from this body at the end of this year. His clear, vibrant, resonant tones will leave this Chamber, but his opinions on constitutional law are recorded in the permanent archives of the Nation for the guidance of this and future generations.

Mr. President, like all those who have come to know and appreciate the dedicated and courageous work of Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, I want to associate myself with the many tributes which have been paid him for his wonderful service and to express sincere regret that time and circumstance have caused him to decide that he should not continue in the Senate past his current term.

It would require a book, perhaps several volumes, to properly record

the invaluable contribution Senator O'MAHONEY has made to the American way of life. Long before I came to the Senate, I admired his continuing and countless fights for the principles of freedom which have made our Nation great. Since coming to know him personally, I have learned to appreciate him even more.

It is remarkable how his magnificent stands for America and all Americans have bridged a span of time that connects the heroic past, which mirrors our proud heritage, to the shining future, which surely holds freemen's destiny.

Keeping the word "free" in our free-enterprise system is a requisite of life as we know and want it. Probably no man in the history of this body has worked harder and more persuasively for economic freedom. Unwaveringly he has fought for the public interest in business competition against giant special-interest trends toward monopolies and administered prices.

One of the foremost constitutional lawyers of our time, his sound opinions are usually heard when important questions of constitutional law come up for discussion in Senate committees or on the Senate floor.

But not only did he constantly work to preserve the idea of human liberty, as written into our Constitution, for all future generations; he also sought to preserve for those who will come later some of the vast expanses of natural beauty which all of us have inherited. He has worked for preservation of our great national parks and forests and for development of our Nation's natural resources for the benefit of all the people.

The most important, everlasting mark to his credit, I believe, is this: Not only did he stand for all of these things when first he came to the Senate, but he also held to his convictions and fought for these ideals throughout a long and glorious senatorial career.

We in Texas feel close to the people of Wyoming, and are proud of her history in the American West and in the westward expansion of the American people. Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY typifies the fierce spirit of independence and strong individual feeling for personal justice for every man, that typifies the American West.

The Texan love for Wyoming stems from our history. When the Civil War ended, Texas was bankrupt, but millions of wild Longhorn cattle roamed her reaches. The returned Confederates rounded them up and pointed them north. By 1868, these trail drivers with their longhorn steers and cowboys, were headed for the valleys and plains of Wyoming. Since the Republic and State of Texas, prior to the Compromise of 1850, had included a stretch of territory now a part of Wyoming, Texans, for decades, had looked at Texas maps that carried them up the east side of the Rockies. They drove their herds into a Wyoming of Indians—with only a few white mountain men and trappers in the Territory.

By 1870, there were only 9,118 people in Wyoming; but the herds of Longhorns furnished employment, and soon the ranges were filled.

One of the Texans who followed a herd of cattle from Texas to Wyoming was John Benjamin Kendrick, who was born and grew up in east Texas, in Cherokee County, about 20 miles from the area where I was reared. As a young man of 22, he drove cattle to Wyoming in 1879, and stayed there to become one of Wyoming's great triumvirate of Senators—Francis E. Warren, John B. Kendrick, and Joseph C. O'Mahoney.

During Senator Kendrick's senatorial service, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY became his executive assistant. When death called Senator Kendrick in 1933, the Governor of Wyoming appointed JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY to succeed him. Except for a 2-year interregnum, he has been Senator since that time.

While Senator O'MAHONEY's service as a Senator for all the American people gives permanent luster to the character and ability of Wyoming's representatives here, we in Texas have a special pride in our historical ties with Wyoming. For years I have watched Senator O'MAHONEY's great career; for years, as a judge and lawyer in my home State, I paid intellectual tribute to his brilliance in the field of American constitutional government.

Senator O'MAHONEY's retirement will mark the loss from this body of a man who always held to his goals, even in the face of tremendous pressure, and in the face, at times, of fabulously powerful opposition. JOE O'MAHONEY is a remarkable American, and this Government and all America will miss his service here. He carries our good wishes and our esteem with him wherever he goes.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me, so I could pay this tribute to Senator O'MAHONEY this week, during which he announced his prospective retirement.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have been happy to yield for that purpose, because earlier I also paid tribute to Senator O'MAHONEY. So I am glad that the tribute by the Senator from Texas will also appear in the RECORD.

THE FORTHCOMING SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, we stand today on the threshold of the summit conference. At this conference a small number of men will discuss problems that affect billions of people on the face of this earth. The word "summit" is, I feel, an appropriate term for this momentous gathering—not merely in the sense that it is to be a meeting of minds on the part of the leadership of East and West, but also in the sense that these men will sit and view the world from a point of vantage that commands a panorama of the entire world and its problems.

It would be heartlifting to all men to anticipate that such manifold problems, raised and debated in the assemblage of chiefs of state, will prove susceptible of solution, in whole or in part. However, the hard face of reality gives to us no smile of promise or hope in this regard. That is why we must steel ourselves against wishful thinking or illusory hopes as to positive and concrete achievements in the form of mutually agreed upon treaties. By the same token, however, it becomes sterile and defeatist to assume that no useful international purpose is served by gatherings such as the conference which will open in Paris on Monday.

It is unfortunate that the atmosphere of this meeting has been clouded by the recent plane incident. But that incident must not be considered the major deterrent to fruitful negotiations that it has been portrayed. Actually, the great shock wave that the incident induced has been followed by a wave of sanity. The emotional fireworks are burning out, as fireworks always do, for the world suddenly remembers that spying is as old as war is old, whether that war be hot or cold. By his habitually adroit technique, Khrushchev has gotten his propaganda mileage out of the incident; but he knows, as the world does, that the whole story of the incident began, not in the Government of the United States of America, not in the Office of the Chief of the CIA, not from an airstrip near the Soviet border, but in the very Kremlin, from which the loud cries of anguish and pain now emanate.

This fact must be remembered. It must be burned into the minds of those who speak of aggressive acts on the part of the United States. This world of nuclear force cannot abide a black shroud of secrecy. It is in the interest of peace, not of war; in the interest of humanity, not merely of the United States of America, that we have been obliged—as in our past history—to watch on the ramparts of freedom. Once the Kremlin rolls back its frontiers of darkness, once it gives up its weapon of secrecy, there will remain no need for us to send pilots aloft to seek the information on which our very survival may depend.

Actually, in the delicately balanced world of bloodless conflict in which we find ourselves today, it is imperative that we open all available doors to understanding, rather than to shut any one of them because of our conviction that that door leads nowhere. "Contact" and "discussion" are words we must keep alive if we are to keep alive our aspiration for the global harmony that is the true and God-given climate in which free men were destined to live.

The summit conference is not a secret meeting. The whole world is its audience. Nations and peoples will be apprised of declarations that are made, proposals that are advanced, positions that are defended. I believe sincerely that this open forum of international discussion represents a distinct advantage for our Nation. It will allow President Eisenhower to restate American ideals and American principles. It will

write indelibly into the minds of all peoples the role of our President as a peacemaker, rather than as the peace destroyer that the caricaturists of Soviet propaganda have painted him.

It is vain to suppose that the problems that confront the modern world are going to be solved in a matter of days by a meeting of world leaders. It is far more vain and futile to expect that they will be solved by hermetically sealing ourselves against these problems, by shutting the door on negotiations, and isolating ourselves in the ivory tower of unreality.

It is my belief that new avenues of hope may be opened up by the very fact of nuclear stalemate—that is, by the mutual realization that the awesome armaments of today leave man only the choice between annihilation and accommodation.

The alternative to an attempt to destroy each other is, perforce, the reconciliation to the idea of living with each other, with all the implications of detente and of flexibility that such a modus vivendi involves.

Indeed, the climate of detente is already perceptible, evoked by the hard fact of geopolitics that war cannot resolve a single one of the questions that plague the European family of nations, or, indeed, the world family. This atmosphere of détente is sought, as well, as a kind of long breathing spell—better, a respite from strife—that will allow the great powers to mind the manifold problems of an evolving world where new directions, new pressures, new challenges call imperiously for the attention and the energies of the leadership nations.

We are too prone to think largely in terms of the East-West struggle yet a multitude of the shaping forces of history lie outside this struggle, and constitute a concrete and immediate preoccupation. To these forces, to the problems they pose, to the challenges they present, each of the great powers must commit itself.

For our own part, we have legitimate and demanding preoccupations in our own hemisphere. An expanding population requires a concurrent expansion of our economy. The increased cost of providing more governmental aid and services to more people has to be equated with the financial demands of the total Defense Establishment. In addition, the searchlight of our own interest, which has been beamed to Europe during the past years, must be directed increasingly to the neglected areas of our own hemisphere.

England, too, has preoccupations that lie outside the context of East-West struggle. The recent Commonwealth Conference reminds us that England belongs to a family other than NATO, and that the Commonwealth family poses to England a unique problem she has never been called upon to face before. This is an integration problem on a massive international scale. In substance, it is the question of integrating politically the old-line white nations of the Commonwealth with the emerging, self-conscious, and racially sensitive new nations of Africa and south Asia.

More immediate and compelling, perhaps, is the need of France for a period of détente. With the problem of Algeria so immediate and so real, the problem of East-West relationships is an untimely intrusion. The heart of France's military power remains in Algeria, not in Europe. The drain of the war in Algeria seriously limits France's ability to play the effective role in NATO that has been assigned to her.

And, in the case of Russia, the iron fist that she shakes at the world must not be misconstrued as a symbol of total power, without flaw, without weakness. We know that the Soviet farm problem has been met by many answers, but not yet by the right one. We know of areas of unrest, not only in the captive nations, but also in the homeland of the U.S.S.R. And we know that Red China, bulging and brooding in the near distance, is a neighbor that, paradoxically, is the same uncomfortable enigma to Russia that Russia represents for us.

The great power preoccupations I have touched upon must be taken into account if we are to view the summit and its prospects in true perspective.

Our stand on the question of West Berlin has been made abundantly clear. We view it, not as mere geography, but as a symbol of where free men must take their stand if they are to breathe life and meaning into the principles they espouse. Soviet Russia may rattle its saber over this issue, but it knows full well that to unsheathe that saber would bring the holocaust it is not at all disposed to precipitate. We have two Germanies—East and West—as the summit conference opens. We shall have two Germanies when it closes; and this situation must persist so long as the concept of free elections remains unacceptable to the Kremlin.

No man, no nation, has anything to fear from peace with justice; and it will be precisely as advocates of peace with justice that President Eisenhower and Secretary Herter will sit down at the summit conference, next Monday, in Paris. Their mission is not to transform the world before our eyes, but to build hope in the hearts of men, to reaffirm our dedication to the principles by which we live, to state before the court of humanity, the historic cause of free men and free institutions.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 13, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2778) to amend the act relating to the Commission of Fine Arts.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 16, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 13, 1960:

In the Army

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. Williams Stevens Lawton, O14924, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Francis William Farrell, O12784, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Charles Edward Hart, O15788, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. George Windle Read, Jr., O12603, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Samuel Tankersley Williams, O8472, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. William Howard Arnold, O15558, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. David William Traub, O17110, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Robert Jefferson Wood, O18064, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. John Lawrence Ryan, Jr., O16451, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. William Peirce Ennis, Jr., O16436, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

In the Navy

Capt. William C. Mott, U.S. Navy, to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy for a term of 4 years with the rank of rear admiral.

Coast and Geodetic Survey

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointments to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Ray M. Sundean	Morton K. Meiers
Lawrence S. Brown	Robert M. Davidson
Karl R. Anderson	Ray E. Moses
George M. Poor	Pat T. Redden
James A. Ten Eyck	Douglas J. Wilcox
Gordon N. Orr	Frederick A. Ismond
Charles K. Townsend	Peter A. Martus
Ronald L. Newsom	Donald R. Tibbit
Donald W. Moncevicz	Charles G. Elliott
Doyle D. Harper	Gerald C. Saladin
Will Connell	Donald C. McIntosh
Richard L. Hess	Michael L. Olivier

To be ensigns

James Collins	William D. O'Neill
William A. Drohan	Archibald J. Patrick
Douglas O. Farrand	William G. Proffitt, Jr.
Richard Hull	E. Douglas Schwantes, Jr.
Bernard F. Karwisch	
Thomas E. Krakowski	Robert H. Seay
Henry A. Mathis, Jr.	Charles D. Strawman
George A. Maul	R. Lawrence Swanson
Park A. Nelson	

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

New York State Cooperation With the Federal Government in the Atomic Energy Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 13, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to invite attention today to the fine spirit of cooperation which exists between New York State and the Federal Government with regard to the framing and establishment of New York's atomic energy regulation program.

An amendment to the Atomic Energy Act which was enacted last year provides for the assumption of exclusive State regulatory control in the field of atomic energy. New York has been for several months endeavoring to work out a regulatory program which will be acceptable to the Atomic Energy Commission under this authority.

In accordance with a recent bill enacted by the legislature, the State is presently drafting its proposed agreement which will be submitted to the Atomic Energy Commission in the very near future.

Mr. President, these events represent a significant step. As the President has so clearly stated, it is important that we recognize "the need to increase the functions and responsibilities of the States as a safeguard against excessive centralization of governmental power in this country." I am hopeful that New York's efforts in this field will set an example which other States will follow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a press release from Governor Rockefeller, which includes an exchange of letters between the President and the Governor on the vitally important subject of atomic energy regulation.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany.

Governor Rockefeller today made public an exchange of correspondence between the President and the Governor, and between the Atomic Energy Commission and the Governor, on the subject of atomic energy regulation.

The correspondence disclosed that the Atomic Energy Commission has expressed the hope that the State of New York take the lead in reaching an agreement with the Commission on atomic energy regulatory control and thereby "serve as an example for other States to follow."

Authority for such an agreement was contained in an amendment to the Federal Atomic Energy Act, adopted last year, which would provide for the assumption by the State of exclusive regulatory control within the State of radioisotopes, natural uranium and thorium, and fissionable material in quantities of less than a critical mass.

In his response to the President, Governor Rockefeller said that "I am pleased to assure you that we shall make every effort to cooperate with the Commission in arriving at an agreement that will serve as a valuable precedent in safeguarding the public health and safety and in introducing into the regulatory control of atomic activity the competence and high regard for the public interest which exists among State authorities."

Legislation expressly authorizing the Governor to enter into such an agreement with the Commission was adopted by the New York State Legislature in its last session, and the State's office of atomic development was at the same time authorized to enter into related subsidiary agreements with the Commission on behalf of the State.

The regulatory authority that would be assumed by the State under the proposed agreement would primarily be administered by the State department of health, the State department of labor, and the New York City Department of Health, with the State office of atomic development functioning in a coordinating role.

The texts of the letters from President Eisenhower and the Atomic Energy Commission to Governor Rockefeller, and his responses, follow:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 11, 1960.

Hon. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Governor of New York,
Albany, N.Y.

DEAR NELSON: I have often stressed the need to increase the functions and responsibility of the States as a safeguard against excessive centralization of governmental power in this country. Public Law 86-373 was enacted in response to a recommendation by the Joint Federal-State Action Committee.

The law authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into agreements with the Governors of the States under which the States will assume responsibility for specified regulatory functions now performed by the Commission for the promotion and regulation of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Following consultations with representative State groups, the Commission has prepared proposed criteria to guide both parties in reaching agreement on the transfer of these functions.

I have asked the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission to send copies of the proposed criteria to you. Your views, and those of the other Governors, will be important in determining the actual criteria to be applied. I request that you give this matter your personal attention and ask that you send your views as soon as possible to Mr. John A. McCone, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Mr. McCone and his staff will welcome an opportunity to meet with you or your representatives to discuss the proposed criteria and other aspects of the program authorized under Public Law 86-373.

This legislation is a constructive step toward a better distribution of functions between the Federal Government and the States. I know that you share with me the hope that more such steps to expand State responsibility will be taken in the future.

With warm regard.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 12, 1960.

Hon. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Governor of New York,
Albany, N.Y.

DEAR GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER: Within the past few days, President Eisenhower wrote to you about the importance he attributes to the reapportionment of responsibilities between the States and the Federal Government and mentioned the authority granted by Public Law 86-373 to take such steps in the atomic energy field. Our first step in implementing this proposal is the development of criteria for use in the discontinuance of the Atomic Energy Commission's responsibilities over certain radioactive material and the assumption of those responsibilities by the States through agreements with the AEC.

Therefore, I am sending copies of our "Proposed Criteria for Guidance of States and the AEC in the Discontinuance of AEC Regulatory Authority Over Byproduct, Source, and Special Nuclear Materials in Less Than a Critical Mass and the Assumption Thereof by States Through Agreement." Also enclosed are the following background materials: Public Law 86-373; a summary of AEC policies and procedures of the regulation and licensing of source material, special nuclear material, and byproduct materials; and AEC regulations applicable to source, special nuclear materials, and byproduct material.

My fellow commissioners and I are looking forward to receiving your comments on the proposed criteria and to working with you to achieve the objectives of Public Law 86-373.

Because of the great interest of your State in atomic energy and of your many atomic energy activities, we hope that you would be willing to take the lead in this matter of reaching an agreement and to serve as an example for the other States to follow. If we or our staff can facilitate your consideration of this material, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. FLOBERG,
Acting Chairman.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, April 26, 1960.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you very much for your letter of the 11th and the related material which was sent to me by the Atomic Energy Commission on April 12th at your request. I share your view that the law authorizing Federal-State agreements in the atomic energy field constitutes a constructive step toward a better distribution of atomic functions between the Federal Government and the States, and wish to advise you that we are proceeding immediately to evaluate the Commission's proposed criteria with the objective of submitting our views to the Commission within the next few weeks.

We are gratified that the Commission, in recognition of our interest and activity in atomic energy, has expressed the hope that New York State would be willing to take the lead in reaching an agreement and to serve as an example for other States to follow. We are mindful of the responsibility that this imposes upon us, and I am pleased to assure you that we shall make every effort to cooperate with the Commission in arriving at

an agreement that will serve as a valuable precedent in safeguarding the public health and safety and in introducing into the regulatory control of atomic activities the competence and high regard for the public interest which exists among State authorities.

We look upon this new step as a milestone in the development and control of atomic energy, and we shall do all that we can to insure its success.

Sincerely,

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, Apr. 26, 1960.

Hon. JOHN A. MCCONE,
Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: I am inclosing a copy of a letter I have sent to the President advising that New York State will submit its comments on the Commission's criteria for proposed Federal-State atomic energy agreements to you within the next few weeks.

We deeply appreciate the confidence in New York State evidenced by the expression of the Commission's hope, contained in Acting Chairman Floberg's letter to me of April 12, that we take the lead in reaching an agreement with the Commission and thereby serve as an example for other States to follow. We shall make every effort to achieve this desirable objective.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 16, 1960

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, and our God, with this new week, our prayerful thoughts leap the sea to the summit consultations where the fate of the turbulent world may hang in the balance.

In all this meeting of minds, we would be vividly conscious of spiritual resources. We are grateful for the leaders of free men who are there with a faith that colors their outlook, that determines their objectives, that stretches out their horizons, and which is linked to the supremacy of things unseen.

Fortified by that faith, may Thy benediction rest upon the leaders of the free world, face to face with ideas of the earth, earthy doctrines, alien to the emancipating revelation which has lifted mankind from the cave to the cathedral.

At this altar of divine grace, we rejoice in the moral majesty of a creative creed whose fundamental belief is, not in material might, or in scientific achievement, but in the dignity of the individual made in the image of God and in the eternal laws of the Creator which for men and nations only are the paths to abundant life.

In spite of the formidable forces arrayed against us, grant to those who stand for us and speak for us before the bar of world opinion and judgment the triumphant assurance that they who are for us are more than those against us.

In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 13, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 13, 1960, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1062. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require Federal approval for mergers and consolidations of insured banks;

S. 1328. An act for the relief of Parker E. Dragoo;

S. 1408. An act for the relief of Ronald R. Dagon and Richard J. Hensel;

S. 1410. An act for the relief of Jay R. Melville and Peter E. K. Shepherd;

S. 1466. An act for the relief of Sofia W. Sarris;

S. 2173. An act for the relief of Mrs. John Slingsby, Lena Slingsby, Alice B. Slingsby, and Harry Slingsby;

S. 2234. An act for the relief of the estate of Hilma Claxton;

S. 2309. An act for the relief of Gim Bong Wong;

S. 2333. An act for the relief of the heirs of Caroline Henkel, William Henkel (now deceased), and George Henkel (presently residing at Babb, Mont.), and for other purposes;

S. 2430. An act for the relief of certain employees of the General Services Administration;

S. 2507. An act to relieve Joe Keller and H. E. Piper from 1958 wheat marketing penalties and loss of soil bank benefits; and

S. 2778. An act to amend the act relating to the Commission of Fine Arts.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MONUMENT COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am enclosing for the consideration of the Congress a report of the National Monument Commission submitted as directed by the act of August 31, 1954. I have requested the Secretary of the Interior to submit to the Congress a proposed bill embodying the Commission's recommendations.

The Commission's report recommends an approved design for the Freedom Monument, asks that the Commission be authorized to erect the monument, suggests that the number of private citizens serving on the Commission be increased from four to eight, asks the Congress to authorize the appropriation of $12 million as the Federal share of the cost of construction, and requests that the Commission be authorized to solicit private contributions for the remaining cost of the monument.

The act of August 31, 1954, created the National Monument Commission for the purpose of securing designs and plans for a useful monument to the Nation symbolizing to the United States and the world the ideals of our democracy as embodied in the five freedoms—speech, religion, press, assembly, and petition—sanctified by the Bill of Rights adopted by Congress in 1789 and later ratified by the States.

I believe it important that the story of the noble ideas which shaped our country's beginning, its course, its great moments, and the men who made it possible, be ever present in the minds of Americans. This purpose can be furthered in a variety of ways, but the simplest and most effective of all methods in my judgment is to present it impressively in visual form. The erection of the Freedom Monument would accomplish that objective. The National Capital area is adorned by a galaxy of memorials to individuals but nowhere in the Nation's Capital or this Nation can one find a memorial to the principles and ideals upon which our Government is based.

The Commission, since its creation, has placed the ideas I have mentioned on the drawing board. It is intimately acquainted with the problems involved in the erection of the Monument; it has advanced the memorial; and I recommend that the Commission be authorized to complete the task.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 14, 1960.*

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5(a) of Public Law 307, 73d Congress, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 14, 1960.*

REPORT OF U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ENTITLED "EMPLOYEE TRAINING FOR BETTER PUBLIC SERVICE"—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States,

which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Government Employees Training Act (Public Law 85–507) directs the Civil Service Commission to submit annually to the President for his approval and transmittal to the Congress a report with respect to the training of employees of the Government under the authority of the act. I am transmitting to you with this letter the Commission's report entitled "Employee Training for Better Public Service."

It is my firm conviction that training has long been essential for the successful operation of Federal agencies. Today's demands, however, bring a new urgency to training, especially for our career managers. I have, therefore, recently asked all agency heads to strengthen their programs for the selection, development, and training of these key officials. This directive is in addition to that issued in 1955 which supported all types of training.

The action of the Congress in broadening authority to train Federal employees was a healthy and progressive move. The Commission's report shows that Federal officials have made intelligent use of their authority under the act and that it has helped to meet an urgent need. I was particularly interested in the Commission's comments on "The Future," which point out two important areas needing improvement—planning, and budgeting and scheduling for training activities.

The Commission's report is encouraging and its suggestions to the agencies sound. A good beginning has been made under the authority granted by the Congress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 14, 1960.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3338) to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. Air Force aircraft at Little Rock, Ark.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10777) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. DURHAM, Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. GAVIN, and Mr. VAN ZANDT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 640) to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of General of the Armies John J. Pershing.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 602) authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May of 1960 in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works and the Communications Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

DEVELOPMENTS IN PARIS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, according to the news dispatches from Paris, Soviet Premier Khrushchev seems determined to destroy the summit conference even before it starts. This development has implications which must be considered with great care and calmness by all the freedom loving peoples of the world.

I doubt whether thoughtful people anticipated too much out of the summit conference under any circumstances. Nevertheless, the United States can never place itself in the position of refusing to negotiate in good faith whenever there is even a remote possibility of reducing world tensions and of setting the footsteps of humanity upon the road to peace.

However, several days ago it became apparent that Premier Khrushchev was in no mood for orderly negotiations. The manner in which he handled the U–2 plane incident was clearly an indication that he planned to make the summit conference either a shambles or a forum for Soviet propaganda. These indications were more than confirmed by the manner in which the Soviets have acted in the past 2 days.

Premier Khrushchev arrived in Paris with what every correspondent has described as a display of toughness.

A few hours ago he withdrew his invitation to President Eisenhower to visit the Soviet Union; and now we are informed that Mr. Khrushchev's price for negotiating at all is one that obviously is unacceptable to the United States. In other words, he is not going to discuss the issues upon which there might be some possibility of agreement, unless there are first discussed issues upon which there is no possibility of agreement.

This development is one which will disappoint the whole world. But the world has become accustomed to such disappointments.

Mr. President, this is not the first time the Soviets have deliberately broken up an international meeting, and probably it is not the last. The world would have a great deal more faith in Soviet intentions if these Communist leaders were capable of negotiating real issues, sometime, at some place, without a drum-fire propaganda campaign.

As the situation now stands, in the minds of men and women everywhere is the question of whether the Soviet Union actually wants a world of peace, or whether it prefers constant tensions which must end in disaster.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have had no opportunity to familiarize myself with the statements and the facts with respect to the summit conference which have appeared on the ticker. However, I am advised that, first, the invitation for President Eisenhower to visit the Soviet Union has been withdrawn. What the facts and circumstances are, I do not know. But it would appear to me, offhand, that this comes as something of a significant confession that evidently the Soviet leaders—meaning Mr. Khrushchev and all his associates—are quite alarmed about the effect the warm personality of the President of the United States would have on the Soviet Union and upon its people.

The second thing I glean from all this is that Mr. Khrushchev must be alarmed that a great country like the United States has penetrated Soviet security, notwithstanding all the boasts which have been made to the whole wide world and to the Soviet people. This certainly puts Mr. Khrushchev in a delicate position with respect to his own people. It is understandable, then, how irritation and an irksome attitude on his part would finally eventuate in a denunciation of the United States and a denunciation of the President of the United States.

I have been informed that the President was absolutely firm in his own attitude. I applaud him for it, and I am sure the people of this country will applaud him for it, because it is the only kind of attitude the Soviet leaders can well understand, as we learn when we look into history in retrospect.

The tragedy of it all is that all this could have been understood without the necessity of the President's making a trip to Paris in the first instance. The Soviet leaders must have known, before they arrived for the conference, that this

was going to be the "play," and they could just as well have uttered their intentions first, as last; and then we could have known, and on that basis could have absented ourselves from the conference, or else could have had a conference without the Soviet leaders.

A moment ago I was officially advised that very shortly the President will make a statement from Paris. I am confident it will be a firm statement from a man who is noted for his firmness in an hour of challenge and crisis.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the news from Paris is discouraging, but I would remind my colleagues and my countrymen that this is a time, not to give vent to our emotions, but to remain calm in the face of the danger which confronts us. I have said this before. I will say it again.

The events of the past week, accentuated by the reports of today's summit meeting, should bring home to all—to the Russians, to Americans, and to peoples everywhere—a realization of how slender is the reed by which we clinch to a civilized survival. That is the fact, and it ought now to be visible to all. Yet this blazing fact is in danger of being lost at Paris. National passions rise up on all sides to overwhelm it. The struggle of propaganda takes precedence over it. The incident is not being appraised in terms of its deep implications for the present state of the world's tensions.

Let me say with all the seriousness that I possess that if this game goes on in its present vein—this game of propaganda and counterpropaganda, this game of probe and counterprobe, this game of charge and countercharge, this game of invite or not to invite—there will, indeed, be a monumental wreckage to study. But it will be for some other generation, not this one, to study it. For the wreckage will be not just a plane. It will be the charred remnants of the civilization which houses living mankind.

That is the grim and fundamental reality which confronts the chiefs of state. There is no room at this meeting for displays of outraged indignation on anyone's part. There is no room for propaganda plays designed to bring to any nation the label of sole custodian of peace or the sole source of provocation to war.

At this critical juncture the four men who meet are in every sense the principal guardians of humanity's highest hopes—perhaps of the human species itself. This may well be the decisive moment when the deadly game begins to end in the beginnings of a beginning of a durable peace, or drift into the path of inevitable war. If they maintain that perspective, these men will put aside, and they will urge their peoples to put aside, the dangerous provocations and the glib propaganda. They will see these provocations, this propaganda, for what they are, fragments embedded in the great wound which festers in mankind and threatens the very existence of civilization.

I would express the hope that President Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev would meet privately, lay their differences on the table, talk them out, and then, along with their colleagues, Prime Minister Macmillan and President De Gaulle, recognize the danger which faces civilization—not just the United States and the U.S.S.R.—and do their utmost to bring a modicum of peace and stability to all mankind.

The hopes of mankind are wrapped up in the deliberations of these four men. Let us pray that these hopes will not be treated lightly, but with the profound gravity to which they are entitled. It is not a question of saving face; it is a question of saving civilization.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I applaud the statements of the majority leader and the minority leader and also the Senator from Montana. I believe what they have said would meet the approval and the enthusiastic backing of a large majority of the Senate, and it is fitting that these three leaders in the Senate should at this time speak out as they have so eloquently done this morning.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the feeling of resentment must be unanimous among the American people that the President has been insulted by Mr. Khrushchev. I agree with the junior Senator from Montana that it is a time when one must hold his emotions in rein. That is necessary, because the consequence of tragedy in Paris today could be grave, indeed. Unless the rift can be healed by statesmen of good will and noble purpose, one consequence—one regrettable consequence—might be an intensification of the armaments race, the easing of which the people of the world had earnestly hoped for.

I thought it was most appropriate that the Chaplain of the Senate prayed for careful, dispassionate, earnest consideration at the summit conference when the Senate convened a few moments ago.

I believe the American people can trust President Eisenhower to react as the gentleman that he is, as a military leader, as a man of honor, as an embodiment of the pride, of the hopes, and the aspirations of the American people for peace.

Mr. President, Senators will recall that I am one of those who have had misgivings about a haphazard approach to a conference among heads of state. Regrettably, the events of today demonstrate the unwisdom of substituting personalized diplomacy for the hard work and a careful step-by-step solution of international problems by painstaking negotiation through the customary courses of diplomacy. That, however, is beside the point just now. What does the future hold?

We must look to our strength. We must look to the strength of our resolution, to the strength of our dedication to the central pulse of our creation. We must look to the strength of our defense and that of the free world.

Mr. Khrushchev created the Berlin crisis. We have an agreement about Berlin. It was Mr. Khrushchev who created the current Berlin crisis, the problem, and then demanded that we settle it to his advantage. Peace is not promoted by such threats and tactics.

By "blowing up" the reconnaissance aircraft incident out of all proportion to its importance, the Russian dictator has undertaken to place the blame upon the United States for failure of the conference, while making it impossible for the conference to succeed other than through an acceptance by the Western Powers of the Khrushchev formula.

As it is reported now, Khrushchev is demanding an ignoble apology by the President of the United States of America as the price of further conferences. If true, our President will react honorably.

Events of the next decade, Mr. President, may well determine whether a free, unregimented society such as ours, through the processes of democracy and persuasion, can successfully cope with the challenge of a completely regimented society, a dictatorship which now engulfs one-third of the world and surges with the monolithic unity of totalitarianism.

To provide the answer, the United States must reassess its policies, must rededicate itself to its fundamental purpose—to the goal of greatness to which destiny beckons it.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the deliberate act of Khrushchev to scuttle the conference reflects once more the twisted, unreliable, tortuous line of Communist policy. I said "the deliberate act."

We saw Khrushchev get off the plane smiling. He had made some preliminary remarks before coming to the conference. Everyone thought there was to be a homecoming of nations, with a big purpose of arriving somewhere. Instead of that, Khrushchev "blew his top." The arrogant way in which he made the demand for the apology of the President of this country at the opening session of the conference is in itself most reprehensible and not in accordance with reasonable conduct of international affairs. What he did causes every person who has a thinking apparatus to ask why he did it. The answer must be that he did it for home consumption. Things are not going very well within the borders of Russia.

The history of the Soviet espionage and subversion—yes, outright aggression—the world knows. Every country in Europe knows of it. Then Khrushchev puts on a stage play. I do not think he has fooled very many people by it. He has, however, created another crisis—and it is a crisis.

Khrushchev knows that today we have Colonel Abel, a Soviet spy, in a U.S. prison. He knows also that Switzerland "kicked out" a couple of spies the other day.

What does Khrushchev think? Does he think that Europe and the rest of the world are simply children in evaluating

these conditions? What about these things, Mr. Khrushchev?

After long months of attempting to get an agreement for a summit conference, Khrushchev now throws the world hopes out the window and throws out the window the hoped-for agreement which might lessen world tensions. The world, I believe, will hold him accountable.

Of course, we know his motives. First, we let him come to this country. We treated him like a gentleman. By the usual trickery of Communist policies, he has now denied the equivalent right to our President, the right to meet the Russian people. Why is this? Is he fearful the salesmanship of the Chief Executive of this country is such, in relating the facts, that the Russian people might, indeed, say to Mr. Khrushchev, "We do not like your lies. We do not like the way you behave. We like the way the American Nation treats its people and the way the President of that Nation treats the people."

Of course, Khrushchev, as an international poker player, thought he had a trump card. As a matter of fact, it was only a deuce. He has already overplayed his hand.

Now we will all wait to see what the President will have to say. I am sure we will find he will call a spade a spade. He will not mince any words.

As I understand the situation, Khrushchev is proposing another adjournment of 8 months. Perhaps he hopes then there may be a new President whom he can handle.

He is going to be fooled. No candidate for the Presidency has any confidence in Khrushchev's methods or his promises. They know the history of Mr. Khrushchev and Stalin. I believe the American people should consider this food for thought when they select the next President of the United States.

Yes; these are challenging times, and it is up to all of us to realize, as has been suggested already, that we should not go off halfcocked ourselves, but think sanely. But, more than that, we should keep the Nation alert and adequate.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Mr. Khrushchev by his action this morning, in canceling President Eisenhower's visit to Russia, has again demonstrated to the world that he has no desire to live in the world as a neighbor with neighbors.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the majority leader, the minority leader, and the assistant majority leader, as well as others, on the floor of the Senate, in regard to the most delicate situation that is confronting this Nation and the world today at the summit meeting. I am pleased by the calm statements and carefully selected remarks which have been made this morning on the floor of the Senate. All who have spoken realize the seriousness of the situation.

I have a personal feeling with regard to this which I should like to state. Mr. Khrushchev, through his provocative remarks and propaganda during the last week, has let the world know that he did not dare have the President of the United States visit the Soviet Union, because of his position, because of his personal appeal, and because of his fine method of meeting folks in various countries, which has been demonstrated time and again. I regret it sincerely, because I believe it would have been a great thing for the Soviet nation—the rulers and the people of that nation—to have had an opportuntiy to come in contact with the President's thinking and his personality at a time when the world sorely needs that type of leadership.

I believe that on this occasion all of us should be proud of the fact that we treated Mr. Khrushchev as a ruler of a great country, and that we gave him every consideration when he was in the United States on his visit. Every courtesy was extended to him, and all doors were opened to him. Now he has demonstrated to the world that he does not care to live in a neighborly fashion with the rest of the world.

It is our duty now to remain calm and deliberate and take no hasty action, but realize that we are living in a very difficult time.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the statements made this morning by the distinguished majority leader, the very able assistant majority leader, the gentle minority leader, and other leading Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle regarding the latest developments in Paris. Certainly I wish to commend all of them for the interest which they have expressed at this critical hour.

I am sure all of them agree with me that while this is a time for sanity and self-control, it is, as well, a time for reflection, and also a time for all of us to wake up and recognize that we have been pursuing a course which has led this Nation perilously close to grave disaster.

A few months ago, just 7 months ago, I stood in my place here on the floor of the Senate and tried my best to warn my colleagues and my countrymen of what I thought was a great blunder: to bring to the United States of America, and indeed to its capital, this very citadel of freedom itself, to this Senate Chamber, one of the greatest tyrants in world history, and give him a cloak of respectability and acceptance by the forces of justice and decency in the world.

But that is past history, sad history, tragic history. Let us learn its lesson well.

Since then, it seems to me, we have moved step by step closer to what I described a few minutes ago as a grave disaster. For, Mr. President, unless we mend our ways disaster will visit us. There are several points that ought to be made this morning. One of them is that we should never have agreed to attend a so-called summit meeting without knowing in advance what is going to be talked about; that we should not go to such a meeting like country bumpkins.

That is what happened in 1955. I was a Member of the other body at the time, and I raised my voice then, and at that time I said I thought it was wrong to do so. But we went and accomplished nothing and suffered a setback. Some of us hoped we would learn a lesson then. But we kept right on from one mistake to another.

Now this has happened. It was all predictable, I say. I do not believe that Khrushchev ever intended to have President Eisenhower visit the Soviet Union, because he knew the President's visit would threaten his control over the people he holds in subjection under his tyranny. He knew it would threaten, as well, control over the millions of people he holds in confinement in the captive nations. He could never permit President Eisenhower, with his frankness and honesty and his captivating personality, the opportunity to talk to the Russian people who are held in thralldom by the evil dictatorship of the Soviet Union.

So I repeat it was predictable. The tragedy of it is that we welcomed Khrushchev to our own country and thereby increased his prestige and standing in the world and furthered his evil plans. While this is no time for violence and no time for recklessness, it is, however, a time for reflection, for prayerful reflection.

Right now I am sure Khrushchev is carrying on a massive propaganda effort to get us to permanently suspend all nuclear testing. Many well-intentioned people are being used by him. Insofar as my limited talents are concerned I tried to make this clear here in the Senate last Thursday. There are better informed persons in Congress on this subject than I, persons with more prestige and more experience in this field. I say they should speak up and tell the people the facts and what needs to be done. Senator ANDERSON has done so, so have other Senators, but much more should be said and done by the President.

We all want peace, but we want peace with honor and peace with justice. We cannot blunder our way to peace. We cannot beg our way to peace. We cannot wish our way to peace. We must work and pray our way to peace if we want to have it.

The effort by the Soviet Union to stymie us and cripple us and paralyze us with respect to nuclear testing is another massive move by this evil force in the world to destroy us and to destroy our allies who are with us in this fight for freedom. Let them not succeed. From this hour forward let us give up all self-deception and speak and act like free men who know the truth and are not afraid.

So I hope that we will wake up.

I say to the President that he need not feel embarrassed or deeply disturbed. He can come home to the American people and to his free friends in the world. We will receive him well. His only fault is that he trusted this evil man too much, but he did so with all good intentions for our country.

It has almost become something to be ashamed of for people to talk about freedom and patriotism and liberty, and about fighting and dying for the things that are right. A man is made to feel like a fool or knave when he speaks of these things. What must we do to awaken in our people the spirit of justice and freedom? What must we do to teach them not to be frightened into peace at any price?

That is the great lesson to be learned from this calamity. Let us be strong in our faith in freedom, and brave in the face of threat and bring to our side free men everywhere. Let us recall the days of our early founding, when only a handful of people on a strip along the Atlantic Ocean gained the respect of the world because these men were not afraid to stand up and fight for freedom.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I am personally very much thrilled at the sensible, courageous, and patriotic position taken by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. Whenever in this country we are confronted by a crisis, it is, in my judgment, important that voices such as that of the Senator from Connecticut be heard to summon the country to a unified recognition of the fact that America is not only the strongest nation in the world in its armament, in its resources, and in its physical attributes, but that there exists within us a moral strength and a pride in our national history which will resist the sharp tactics of a bully and a blusterer, and which support the President in the kind of situation which has developed today.

While I shall speak further on this subject later, in my own time, at this moment I wish particularly to congratulate the Senator from Connecticut, who is never wanting in the expression of the kind of patriotic and forthright views which make so clear the attitude of most Americans. Truly this is not a time in our country for sissies or pantywaists or timid apologists, because the need and the circumstances call for unified support of our country.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania. He understands this situation. He can help us all to better understand.

The sorriest spectacle of all, to me, is Khrushchev, of all people, lecturing President Eisenhower on morality. Certainly a new, all-time low has been hit in the world when a man of Khrushchev's record, having the blood of millions on his hands can lecture a man like Dwight Eisenhower about morality. Perhaps this incident will help to wake up the American people. Think of a man who has never kept his word, who is full of deceit, who has caused all kinds of trouble in the world, a bloody butcher, lecturing a fine human being like President Eisenhower, who every honest man and woman in the world recognizes to be such, on the subject of morality.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF VESSEL BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO THE AMERICAN LEGION, ELLSWORTH, MICH.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), reporting, pursuant to law, that the Department of the Navy proposes to transfer the vessel *Flamingo* (MSCO–11) to Jansen-Richardson Post No. 488 of the American Legion, Ellsworth, Mich.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROGRESS OF LIQUIDATION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE, WAR AND RECONVERSION ACTIVITIES OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the progress of the liquidation of the national defense, war and reconversion activities of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, during the quarter ended March 31, 1960; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO FORT HALL INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to supplement and amend the act of June 30, 1948, relating to the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, and to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior issued under the act of June 22, 1936 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON BUSINESS TRANSACTED BY BANKRUPTCY COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, tables of bankruptcy statistics, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Council of the City of New York, N.Y., relating to the submission by the President of the United States of a peace formula at next summit conference between the United States and Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS LIVESTOCK COMMISSION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, at the last session of the Kansas Legislature additional funds were voted for the expansion of the program of brucellosis eradication.

Under the new program there will be approximately 50 counties out of the 105 which have been certified, or which are in the process of being certified.

At a meeting of the Kansas Livestock Commission a resolution was adopted urging Congress, through the Department of Agriculture, Animal Disease Branch, to make available additional funds to assist the State in carrying out this program.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Kansas at its 1960 finance session has made State funds available for the brucellosis eradication program in Kansas for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, in the sum of $382,945, and reappropriated unused funds; and

Whereas the brucellosis eradication program in Kansas has been stepped up so that there is now approximately 50 counties out of the total of 105 which have been certified, or which are in the process of certification; and

Whereas it is the present administrative goal of the office of the livestock sanitary commissioner, working in cooperation with the Federal officials in this State to complete the brucellosis testing program in this State by the end of fiscal year 1962: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Livestock Commission of the State of Kansas, That the Congress of the United States through the Department of Agriculture, Animal Disease Branch, make available Federal funds for cooperative brucellosis eradication work in Kansas in an amount comparable to the Kansas appropriation, and in an amount adequate to meet the stepped-up program, and complete the State certification goal of 1962.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 2581. A bill to amend the act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281), to empower the Administrator of General Services to appoint nonuniformed special policemen (Rept. No. 1351);

H.R. 7681. An act to enact the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959 with certain amendments (Rept. No. 1353); and

H.R. 9983. An act to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments (Rept. No. 1352).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments:

S. 2583. A bill to authorize the head of any executive agency to reimburse owners and tenants of lands or interests in land acquired for projects or activities under his jurisdiction for their moving expenses, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1374).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 700. A bill for the relief of Mladen Carrara, Tonina Carrara, Ante Carrara, and Zvonko Carrara (Rept. No. 1356);

S. 993. A bill for the relief of Christos G. Diavatinos (Rept. No. 1357);

S. 2277. A bill for the relief of the Geo. D. Emery Co. (Rept. No. 1358);

S. 2740. A bill for the relief of Julia Sukkar (Rept. No. 1359);

S. 2942. A bill for the relief of Eugene Storme (Rept. No. 1360);

S. 3049. A bill for the relief of Oh Chun Soon (Rept. No. 1361);

H.R. 1402. An act for the relief of Leandro Pastor, Jr., and Pedro Pastor (Rept. No. 1364);

H.R. 1463. An act for the relief of Johan Karel Christoph Schlichter (Rept. No. 1365);

H.R. 1516. An act for the relief of Juan D. Quintos, Jaime Hernandez, Delfin Buencamino, Soledad Gomez, Nieves G. Argonza, Felididad G. Sarayba, Carmen Vda de Gomez, Perfecta B. Quintos, and Bienvenida San Agustin (Rept. No. 1366);

H.R. 1519. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Edward Peter Callas, a minor (Rept. No. 1367);

H.R. 3253. An act for the relief of Ida Magyar (Rept. No. 1368);

H.R. 3827. An act for the relief of Jan P. Wilczynski (Rept. No. 1369);

H.R. 4763. An act for the relief of Josette A. M. Stanton (Rept. No. 1370);

H.R. 8798. An act for the relief of Romeo Gasparini (Rept. No. 1371); and

H.R. 11190. An act for the relief of Cora V. March (Rept. No. 1372).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 3032. A bill for the relief of Samuel Pisar (Rept No. 1362).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 3130. A bill for the relief of Anne Marie Stehlin (Rept. No. 1363); and

H.R. 1542. An act for the relief of Biagio D'Agata (Rept. No. 1373).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 3366. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency and to authorize their protection by the Secret Service (Rept. No. 1354).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2744. A bill to extend the term of design patent No. 21,053, dated September 22, 1891, for a badge, granted to George Brown Goode and assigned to the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution (Rept. No. 1355).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Lyle F. Milligan, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Wisconsin, for the term of 4 years.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 3549. A bill to amend the act of September 14, 1959, with respect to sales and use taxes imposed by States on sales and other business activities in interstate commerce, and authorizing studies by congressional committees of this type of taxation; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 3550. A bill to establish a national policy for the acquisition and disposition of patents upon inventions made chiefly through the expenditure of public funds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. O'MAHONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 3551. A bill for the relief of Kay Addis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 3552. A bill for the relief of Arsene Kavoukdjian (Arsene Kavookjian); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3553. A bill to amend section 304 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the payment of certain American claims arising out of the war with Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 3554. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land to the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. HARTKE, and Mr. MCGEE);

S. 3555. A bill relating to the training and utilization of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FONG (for himself and Mr. LONG of Hawaii):

S. 3556. A bill to compensate the State of Hawaii for not having been treated on the basis of equality with the other States in regard to payments made pursuant to titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. FONG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON):

S. 3557. A bill to expand and extend the saline water conversion program under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior to provide for accelerated research, development, demonstration, and application of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

LIMITATION OF IMPOSITION OF STATE USE TAXES ON OUT-OF-STATE CONCERNS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to limit the imposition of use taxes by States on sales and other business activities in interstate commerce, and authorizing studies by congressional committees of this type of taxation. A companion bill is being introduced in the House by Representative EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, of Connecticut's First District.

Mr. President, businessmen and manufacturers in my own State of Connecticut, as well as in other States, have been alarmed by the predicament in which they have been placed by the U.S. Supreme Court decision in the Scripto, Inc., against Carson case, decided March 21, 1960. This decision would permit any State having a use-tax law to compel an out-of-State seller "at retail" to act as tax collector and file periodic tax returns, even though the only connection of the seller with the taxing State is that orders are solicited there by an independent representative who acts for other firms as well.

An equally troublesome situation has existed for some years as a result of the Supreme Court decision in the *General Trading Company* case (322 U.S. 335), which permits States to impose the same responsibilities on out-of-State sellers who send traveling salesmen to solicit business in the taxing State.

The unfortunate result of these two decisions is that manufacturers, large and small, are faced with the prospect of learning the details of the sales- and use-tax laws of every State in which they do business, collecting use taxes from their customers and filing periodic tax returns. This imposes an impossible burden, particularly on small business, and is a serious interference with interstate commerce.

A similar problem arose last year in connection with State taxation of net income derived from interstate commerce. As a result, Congress enacted Public Law 86–272, limiting such taxation and authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House and the Committee on Finance of the Senate to make full studies leading to uniform standards to be observed by the States.

The bill I have introduced would amend Public Law 86–272 to include sales and use taxes within the scope of the studies to be conducted by the two committees, and to limit the imposition of use taxes by the States on activities in interstate commerce. I hope it will receive prompt consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3549) to amend the act of September 14, 1959, with respect to sales and use taxes imposed by States on sales and other business activities in interstate commerce, and authorizing studies by congressional committees of this type of taxation, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act relating to the power of the States to impose net income taxes on income derived from interstate commerce, and authorizing studies by congressional committees of matters pertaining thereto", approved September 14, 1959 (Public Law 86–272), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new titles:

"TITLE III—SALES AND USE TAX MINIMUM STANDARD

"SEC. 301. (a) No State, or political subdivision thereof, shall have power to impose, after the date of the enactment of this title, a use tax assessment upon any person with respect to sales in interstate commerce if the only business activities within such State by or on behalf of such person during

the period for which such assessment is imposed were or are either, or both, of the following:

"(1) the solicitation of orders by such person, or his representatives, in such State for sales of tangible personal property, which orders are sent outside the State for approval or rejection, and, if approved, are filled by shipment or delivery from a point outside the State; and

"(2) the solicitation of orders by such person, or his representative, in such State in the name of or for the benefit of a prospective customer of such person, if orders by such customer to such person to enable such customer to fill orders resulting from such solicitation are orders described in paragraph (1).

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply to the imposition of a use tax assessment by any State, or political subdivision thereof, with respect to—

"(1) any corporation which is incorporated under the laws of such State; or

"(2) any individual who, under the laws of such State, is domiciled in, or a resident of, such State.

"(c) For purposes of subsection (a), a person shall not be considered to have engaged in business activities within a State merely by reason of sales in such State, or the solicitation of orders for sales in such State, of tangible personal property on behalf of such person by one or more independent contractors, or by reason of the maintenance of an office in such State by one or more independent contractors whose activities on behalf of such person in such State consist solely of making sales, or soliciting orders for sales, of tangible personal property.

"(d) For purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'independent contractor' means a commission agent, broker, or other independent contractor who is engaged in selling, or soliciting orders for the sale of, tangible personal property for more than one principal and who holds himself out as such in the regular course of his business activities;

"(2) the term 'representative' does not include an independent contractor; and

"(3) the term 'use tax assessment' means any assessment, fine, or penalty imposed or levied under the provisions of the retail sales and use tax law of any State because of the failure or refusal of a seller either to: (A) register as a seller or dealer; (B) collect a use tax from a purchaser; (C) file a use tax return; or (D) remit the use tax to such State.

"(e) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not be construed to prohibit the collection, after the date of the enactment of this title, of any use tax assessment which was assessed on or before such date for a period ending on or before such date.

"SEC. 302. If any provision of this title or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this title or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

"TITLE IV—STUDY AND REPORT BY CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

"SEC. 401. The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate, acting separately or jointly, or both, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall make full and complete studies of all matters pertaining to the imposition of sales and use taxes by the State on sales and other business activities which are exclusively in furtherance of interstate commerce, or which are a part of interstate commerce, for the purpose of recommending to Congress proposed legislation providing uniform standards to be observed by the States in imposing sales and use taxes on such sales and business activities.

"SEC. 402. The committees shall report to their respective Houses the results of the studies authorized by this title together with their proposals for legislation on or before July 1, 1962."

NATIONAL POLICY FOR ACQUISITION AND DISPOSITION OF PATENTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Standing Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee on Patents I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a national policy for the acquisition and disposition of patents upon inventions made chiefly through the expenditure of public funds.

Though the Congress of the United States has the sole power under the Constitution to legislate for the issuance of patents and although in the past 20 years, according to the figures of the National Science Foundation, the taxpayers of this country have expended almost $36 billion for scientific research and development, some of the agencies of our Government have actually, without statutory authority, authorized some of their employees to apply for patents resulting from work accomplished by the expenditure of money and the use of facilities of the Government. Congress has passed no general law dealing with this problem, and there is such a diversity of policy among the agencies that it amounts to little less than a scandal.

PURPOSE OF PATENT AUTHORITY IS TO PROMOTE SCIENCE

It should be understood by all that the issuance of a patent by the United States to an inventor is the grant of a limited monopoly, just as a copyright is to an author. The authority extended to Congress by the framers of the Constitution was for the promotion of "the progress of science and useful arts," to use the language of our fundamental law.

Knowing that they were dealing with monopoly and that their purpose was for the general welfare, not for the concentration of economic power, the framers of the Constitution were careful and precise in the words which they used to grant this power to Congress. They are to be found in section 8 of the first article of the Constitution, section 8 being the section which defines the legislative powers that the Congress has. The clause reads as follows:

> The Congress shall have power * * * to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.

BUSINESS WOULD USE PATENTS TO PROMOTE MONOPOLY

In modern times various types of organized business have made every effort to convert the exclusive rights for limited times to monopolies of greater extent and more permanent life than was contemplated by the brainy men who drafted our Constitution of political liberty and economic freedom. As a consequence, patent law has become a complex matter with which few people, and even comparatively few lawyers, are familiar.

It is not surprising, therefore, that instead of preserving a method of promoting the progress of science and the useful arts many organizations and individuals have made attempts to use patents for the purpose of concentrating control of science and the useful arts in the hands of those who would use them for the purpose of hampering free enterprise and promoting monopolistic control.

Such is the case now in the field of Government research and development which is pursued by way of expenditure of the taxpayers' funds for contracts or grants.

LARGE SUMS SPENT BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES ON RESEARCH

An examination of the last 10 years reveals that five Government agencies have each spent more than $1 billion on scientific research. In every case this money has been appropriated in order that the United States would have the advantage of publicly subsidized research in the field of science so that it might more effectively defend its people. These agencies in the order of their approximate expenditures are as follows: The Air Force, $11 billion; the Navy, $7 billion; the Army, $5 billion; the Atomic Energy Commission, $2 billion; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, $1 billion.

GREATEST BENEFIT GOES TO CONTRACTORS AND EMPLOYEES

Several other agencies are involved in these research and development contracts, as well as financial grants to non-Government institutions to engage in scientific study for the promotion of the general welfare, for it has long been recognized that this Nation is deeply involved in an international arms race. In the cases of only two agencies, the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, has the Congress by law specified that title to the inventions discovered by reason of the subsidized programs should remain in the United States. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has freely made available to the public, by dedication or by Government ownership of patent titles, most of the inventions produced under its jurisdiction. On the other hand, most of the inventions produced by the $23 billion spent by the three Armed Forces have been privately patented with the Government receiving only a royalty-free license to use them for governmental purposes.

This was not done by law, but by contract, and the provision for a royalty-free license to the Government under the contracts is only a device to make it appear that the contractors and their employees were somehow entitled to receive the patents.

Under our theory of a free enterprise system a royalty-free license to the Gov-

ernment is of no purpose, for it means that the Government would use the patents for industry, trade, and commerce in competition with the people of the country. It is not the objective of our system to have the Government in competition with its citizens.

As a result of this method devised for the contracts the real beneficiaries of the patents are not the people, not the Government, but the contractors and their employees, who are thus able to exclude small business enterprises completely from the field of science entered as a direct result of the Government subsidy.

STATUTE IS INADEQUATE

One reason for what thus appears to be a shocking failure of the Government to provide adequate patent protection for its people, itself, and the fundamental system of free competition to which we are devoted appears to be the failure of Congress to have been specific about the disposition of patent rights when it passed the National Science Foundation Act in 1950. Congress enacted that law to promote basic scientific research, because it recognized that there was no agency in existence to see that the research needed for promotion of the general welfare was carried out in such a way as to insure maximum benefits to the people. The weakness of this statute resides in the fact that it provides only that scientific research contracts should contain provisions covering the disposition of invention "in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract or other arrangement is executed" (sec. 12(a)). No attempt was made in the statute to define such equities, clearly a statutory power.

That the Congress had no real intent of delegating away its legislative power was indicated by section 3(8)(c) which provides for an annual report by the Foundation giving to the Congress "information as to the acquisition and disposition by the Foundation of any patents and patent rights." Despite this clause, the Foundation has never acquired any patents at all.

Not only is that true, but Congress later in the enactment of the Space Act and in the extension of the Atomic Energy Commission patent policy in 1957 has specifically declared that title should be taken by the United States.

It seems to be obvious in the circumstances that the Congress should now make an opportunity to resolve this dilemma.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3550) to establish a national policy for the acquisition and disposition of patents upon inventions made chiefly through the expenditure of public funds, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MANPOWER ACT OF 1960

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, at this time I wish to proceed for a total of 8 minutes, despite the limitation of time applicable to the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which we have entitled the "Manpower Act of 1960."

This bill carries out another of the recommendations of the recent report of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems, on which my three cosponsors and I had the privilege to serve.

Our committee concluded that—

> The Federal Government should maintain a continuing concern for the Nation's overall manpower resources, requirements, and utilization, including the problem of underemployment. Both the legislative and executive branches should be concerned with prospective manpower dislocations resulting from automation and technological change and with the manpower needs which must be determined as a basis for training and counseling programs.

The committee recommended that a permanent subcommittee be established within the appropriate Senate committee to concern itself with manpower resources, requirements, and utilization, and that either a new or an existing agency of the executive branch be charged with corresponding responsibility.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the respected senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], has taken steps to create the subcommittee which we recommended. He has designated the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] to be the chairman, and I have the honor to be among the members, along with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BRUNSDALE].

This bill would carry out the other half of the recommendation of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems, by establishing in the Executive Office of the President a Council of Manpower Advisers.

This measure follows the pattern of the Employment Act of 1946 and establishes a corresponding mechanism.

It declares a policy that—

> It is the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to assist in development of policies and programs for the adequate training and useful utilization of the manpower resources of the Nation in pursuit of our national goals.

It calls for an annual manpower report of the President. The Council of Manpower Advisers would assist the President in the preparation of this report, as the Council of Economic Advisers assists him in the preparation of the economic report. On a continuing basis, the Council would conduct studies, appraise Government programs, and make such other reports and recommendations as the Council or the President might consider necessary.

Mr. President, those of us who served on the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems were deeply impressed with the extent of manpower wastage in the United States.

The waste which we observed is of two kinds:

First, far too many people—3,660,000 at last count—are doing nothing at all. This is the problem of unemployment.

Second, far too many people are doing far less than they are capable of doing. This is the problem of underemployment and of undertraining and undereducation.

And to these I would add a third kind of waste: Too many people are doing the wrong things, when viewed from the standpoint of our national goals.

The tragedy of this immense waste becomes clear when we consider our policies in contrast to those of the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc as a whole.

In Communist countries, unemployment is not tolerated.

In those countries, capable students are kept in school and paid handsome stipends to continue in specialized and professional education to the limits of their capabilities.

In those countries, manpower is assigned to whatever jobs are considered most valuable in the service of the state.

Now, I do not propose that we in this country use the Soviet methods of compulsion. Indeed, I would oppose any suggestion to that end. But I wonder whether we do not have to find ways of achieving, through various voluntary methods of inducement, guidance, and counseling the same ends which the Soviet Union achieves through compulsion.

I wonder whether we can compete with a mobilized and dedicated Communist opponent when we permit our basic resource—the brains, skills, and talents of our men and women—to be only partly utilized and often in the wrong places in terms of our national objective.

Mr. President, my colleagues on the special committee and I came to the conclusion that it is time for the Government of the United States to take a hard and continuing look at the waste and misutilization of manpower resources. To express it more positively, it is time to take a hard and continuing look at how we can train, develop, and utilize the manpower resources of our Nation to the fullest possible extent to best serve the purposes of our free society and discharge our responsibilities for leadership of the free world.

The problem, as I have expressed it before, is nothing less than the problem of staffing freedom. We are trying now

to staff freedom without benefit of a national personnel policy, a national personnel plan, or even a national personnel agency.

This bill would create such an agency. The Council of Manpower Advisers would look into the future and project the needs of our country for manpower at all levels. It would concern itself with the shortages or prospective shortages of highly trained people, such as teachers, doctors, natural and social scientists, engineers, and persons trained to represent our country in working with other peoples abroad. It would also concern itself with the adequacy of the supply of subprofessional and skilled and semiskilled workers.

It would consider whether the inducement for men and women to go into fields where they are needed are insufficient, and, if they are insufficient, what might be done about it. It would concern itself with the ability of our training and educational institutions to prepare the number and kinds of people which the projections show will be required. It would review our guidance, counseling, and placement services, including those of our schools and of the U.S. Employment Service.

It would concern itself with the manifold barriers that prevent so large a share of our young men and women from continuing in school until they have developed their potential skills, talents, and abilities to the full, and what might be done to remove those barriers. In our hearings in many parts of the country, our special committee was much impressed with the number of people—particularly young people—who were idle and looking for work, at the same time that jobs in those same communities needed to be filled. But the young people, many of them school dropouts, did not have the training necessary to enable them to fill the jobs that were available.

Much of our unemployment is thus the consequence of a lack of matching up of the skills of the persons who are available with the skills required by the jobs to be filled. It seemed clear to us that vocational, specialized, and professional training of all kinds must be better planned, based on the best available knowledge of job requirements now and in the future. This problem is heightened by the headlong pace of technological change and automation, which displace and dislocate workers and create new requirements.

A related problem is the failure to utilize fully the skills and talents of older workers, of women, and of minority groups because of prejudice and discrimination against the members of these groups.

The bill specifically directs the new Council to coordinate its activities with those of the Council of Economic Advisers in order to promote maximum employment.

Mr. President, I do not mean to derogate the excellent work being done on specific aspects of the manpower problem within various departments of the Government, particularly the Department of Labor. But I am convinced that the absence of concern for this problem at the highest levels of policymaking renders the experts and their work far less effective than they should be. The Council of Manpower Advisers and the annual Manpower Report of the President would focus attention on manpower problems and lead to the development of recommendations for action that the Congress does not now receive.

I hope, Mr. President, that hearings can be held on this bill in order to enable us to illuminate this problem further. I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section summary of the bill may be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the section-by-section summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3555) relating to the training and utilization of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. HARTKE, and Mr. MCGEE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The section-by-section summary presented by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

SUMMARY OF MANPOWER ACT OF 1960

Section 1 is the short title of the bill.

Section 2 is a declaration of policy that it is the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to assist in development of policies and programs for the adequate training and useful utilization of the manpower resources of the Nation in pursuit of our national goals.

Section 3 establishes a Manpower Report of the President. The report shall be submitted within 60 days after the beginning of each regular session of the Congress and shall set forth—

Anticipated future requirements for various occupational groups and categories of trained manpower;

An analysis of current manpower resources and utilization, with special emphasis on unemployment and shortages of trained personnel;

Techniques used by employers and by labor for transition of employees from obsolete jobs, upgrading of the work force, and other matters; and

Recommended policies and programs for the more effective training and utilization of manpower resources in the light of projected requirements.

Section 4 established a Council of Manpower Advisers in the Executive Office of the President. The Council will consist of three members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The Council, with the assistance of specialists including representatives from education, labor, industry, and the general public, shall assist and advise the President in the preparation of the Manpower Report and make recommendations with respect to the achievement of the policy set forth in this act. It will conduct studies, appraise Government programs, and make such other reports in the field of manpower and advise the President as may be necessary.

COMPENSATION TO STATE OF HAWAII, RELATING TO CERTAIN TITLES OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would equalize Hawaii's treatment under titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act, which provide respectively for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

My bill would compensate the State of Hawaii for sums she should have received over what she has received since the Social Security Act Amendments of 1958 were enacted. Prior to that time all of the States and Territories received funds on the same basis under the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act. The Federal Government paid four-fifths of the first $30—$24—and matched the States on a 50–50 basis for payments over that amount up to a combined Federal-State maximum of $65.

The 1958 amendments, however, introduced a new concept into these titles by providing increased funds for those States with average per capita incomes lower than the national average. Under the formula adopted at that time the Federal Government continues to pay four-fifths of the first $30 but above this base a higher amount is paid to States whose per capita income is below the national average while the 50 percent matching is continued for those States whose per capita income is equal to or above the national average.

The 1958 amendments provided that Hawaii should also continue to receive only the 50 percent matching rather than come under the per capita income provision. This legislative fiat was clearly unfair to Hawaii. Not only did Hawaii have per capita income figures fully as adequate and reliable as those of the various States, but these figures were used in the same 1958 amendments in connection with the child welfare program. These figures have also been used by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare since 1956 to determine Hawaii's allocation under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control Amendments Act.

As a result of this inequity, Hawaii has lost approximately $20,000 per month since October 1958, for a total of approximately $360,000 up to March 31, 1960. Although this sum is not large, it is an important and substantial matter to the State of Hawaii.

The bill calls for an appropriation of the amount Hawaii would have received had it been given equitable treatment. I would like to point out that there is precedent for reimbursing Hawaii when it has been treated in such manner:

The provisions of the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916—39 Stat. 355—were extended to Hawaii by an act of Congress—43 Stat. 17—approved March 10, 1924, and Hawaii received its

initial Federal-aid highway allocation of $365,625 for the 1925 fiscal year. The Congress by an act approved February 23, 1931—46 Stat. 1415—appropriated $880,000 for Federal-aid highways in Hawaii which was the amount Hawaii would have received from 1917 to 1925 if it had been included in the original act.

I urge that early consideration be given this measure so that payment may be made to Hawaii to correct the inequity resulting from the 1958 amendments to the Social Security Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3556) to compensate the State of Hawaii for not having been treated on the basis of equality with the other States in regard to payments made pursuant to titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act, introduced by Mr. FONG (for himself and Mr. LONG of Hawaii), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXPANSION AND EXTENSION OF SALINE WATER CONVERSION PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, by 1975 America will face a severe and possibly disastrous shortage of water unless we take steps now to avoid it.

This is a cruel fact, Mr. President, and it concerns not only arid sections of our country where water shortages occur daily, but also the traditionally water-rich regions where spot shortages are appearing. Our water problem is not regional. It is nationwide.

We have the resources to meet this problem, in the sea water around us and in the underground reservoirs of brackish water beneath us, but our present efforts to convert these vast reservoirs of saline water into usable form are inadequate to meet the national demand for water in the decades ahead. These efforts, though they have made progress, are small compared to the technical difficulties standing in the way of economical saline conversion. These difficulties give no promise of any dramatic breakthroughs. Rather, they require sustained research and development on a great number of engineering questions so that, as we find answers, we may gradually reduce the cost of conversion.

We are in a race against time. For the sake of our homes, our cities and towns, our industry and agriculture, we cannot afford to delay.

I am therefore introducing a bill to provide for an accelerated program of research and development to find economical means of converting saline water. The bill will remove present restrictions of time and money on saline development and will offer loans to communities wishing to build developmental conversion plants. I believe it will put us in a position to meet our coming water crisis.

THE PROBLEM OF SUPPLY—TODAY AND TOMORROW

The dimensions of this crisis, as they can be seen today and reasonably estimated for the future, may come as a surprise. Here are some statistics which indicate the gravity of the situation for our entire Nation:

The U.S. Geological Survey reports that the total national supply of readily available water is about 515 billion gallons daily. With our current population of about 180 million, our daily water requirements are about 312 billion gallons, or about 60 percent of the available supply. And already severe shortages face parts of the Nation.

By 1975, however, our population will reach 235 million and our daily water requirements will be 453 billion gallons. Since there is no reason to expect that we will have expanded our natural supply of water much above the present 515 billion gallons, we will then be using nearly 90 percent of our available supply. Since we have shortages today when we use only 60 percent of the supply, it is not difficult to imagine the severity of the shortages which will confront us when we consume 90 percent.

As an indication of how water use grows, U.S. daily water consumption in 1900 was an estimated 40 billion gallons. By 1940, it had grown to 135 billion gallons; today it is 312 billion.

Population growth is only one reason for the steep increase in our water consumption. Our rapid industrial growth and the increasingly complex production techniques that accompany it call for progressively more water. Today, industry uses 40 percent of all the water we consume and this proportion is growing rapidly.

Consider this: It takes 60,000 gallons of water to make a ton of steel; 240,000 gallons to make a ton of newsprint or a ton of acetate, and 660,000 gallons to make a ton of synthetic rubber. All major industries are heavy users of water; they expand only where local water supplies can support expansion.

Mr. President, we need not look into the future for signs of water shortage; the distress flags are flying in many communities across the Nation today. According to Geological Survey, there are 1,000 communities in 47 States which were forced by shortages to restrict water use in 1957. In my own State of Texas that year, residents of Dallas lined up to buy water at 50 cents a gallon—double the price of gasoline.

In some gulf and Atlantic coast States, overtaxed and underground reservoirs and streams have been depleted to the extent that contaminating salt water is seeping in with harsh consequences for the communities involved.

As a result of actual or prospective situations of this sort, many communities have put in requests for experimental saline conversion plants provided under Public Law 85–883. More than 200 communities offered building sites to the Office of Saline Water—although this act provided only $10 million to build plants—and this number included many in the East. Official interest was shown by New York, Rhode Island, New Jersey, North and South Carolina, Florida—indeed by every State on the coastal perimeter of the United States.

Complicating the problem of local water supplies is the fact that many municipal water plants were built 20, 40, or even more years ago. They tapped the most readily available and cheapest water sources, and now these communities are finding that it is too expensive to go further afield to get new fresh water supplies. Californians will soon be asked to approve a $1.75 billion bond issue so that water for southern California can be brought from the north 400 miles away, across a 4,000-foot mountain range.

A special master of the U.S. Supreme Court just handed down a decision concerning the diversion of water from the Lower Colorado River. Arizona, California, Nevada, and New Mexico were all eager to use this water. A shrinking supply, coupled with increasing demand for water, led to the competition between the States for its use, according to the Court's master.

It is plain that the water crisis is already widespread and severe in some areas. It is also plain that this crisis can only get worse unless we act.

THE AVAILABILITY OF SALINE WATER

We can, of course, conserve water in many ways and I urge that we do it. We can save water with new dams and reservoirs, by improving pollution control, by better industrial reuse of water, and sewage disposal. We can do all these things, but they can only make our available natural water supply go a little further; they cannot increase that supply.

To do this, we must turn to our inexhaustible sources of saline water. We are well situated to do so: 55 percent of our population, and 65 percent of our industry, are in States bordering the ocean. Some of our States literally float on submerged salt water seas; others have extensive underground deposits of brackish water. The water is there; it is up to us to find ways to tap it in time.

CONGRESSIONAL BACKGROUND

The problems of which I have spoken, Mr. President, are not new to Congress. The Senate just last year appointed a select committee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] to make a complete study of the Nation's water resources and find ways to conserve and develop them. This committee has been hard at work, and I am told we will have its report next year.

The history of congressional interest in saline conversion goes back at least to 1952, when Congress, at the request of President Truman, authorized a 10-year research program to search for economical conversion methods. This led to the creation of the Office of Saline Water in the Department of Interior, but with an average annual budget of less than $1 million.

Again, in 1958, Congress authorized the construction of at least five saline conversion plants over a 7-year period, but with a total program cost of no more than $10 million. Construction is due to start soon on three plants, and design is under way on two more.

It is obvious that these two temporary programs, for all they have accomplished, are too small and hamstrung by legislative restrictions to meet the growing water crisis our Nation faces. It is senseless that these programs should be temporary, due to end before they have found concrete solutions to the problems that face us.

Considering the nature of these programs, I think the Office of Saline Water has done an admirable job with the facilities and funds at its disposal.

The Office operates through research grants to public and private institutions, as well as other agencies of the Federal Government. But it has never had its own laboratory or test facilities, and its small technical staff is confined to directing and coordinating the activities it contracts for.

Furthermore, its research work has been restricted as more conversion pilot plants have gone into operation—the OSW now has 11 of these working—and research work will likely be cut back further as more funds are needed to run pilot plants. In fiscal 1960, the Office is operating on a budget of $1,755,000, plus $1,850,000 for plant construction. For fiscal 1961, the administration has asked for $1,355,000, plus $2,040,000 for demonstration plant construction.

These amounts are most inadequate for the Office of Saline Water to do the job it must do—and which we so desperately need to have done.

PROGRESS SO FAR; DIFFICULTIES AHEAD

In the nearly 8 years since we established a research program to find cheap ways to convert saline water, we have turned up much promise of succeeding. But it is clear that we must broaden and strengthen our efforts.

Already, the cost of converting saline water has come down sharply. Ten years ago, the cheapest we could make usable water from sea water was about $4 a thousand gallons. Now, some plants can do the job for $1.75 a thousand, and a plant under construction in Freeport, Tex., is expected to cut this even more, to $1 a thousand.

But this is not enough when you consider that most municipal water in the United States costs in the neighborhood of 30 cents per thousand gallons.

There is every reason to believe intelligent research will bring costs down to an economical point. Indeed, already it is cheaper for some communities to convert water.

Coalinga, Calif., for example, was hauling in water at a cost of $9.35 per thousand gallons. Now, residents are drinking fresh converted water which costs $1.45 per thousand.

But scientists and technicians tell me there is still no assurance that they have even hit on the proper way to convert salt water economically.

Research currently centers around five main areas. They are:

First. Distillation—an age-old process brought up to date. Great cost-cutting progress has been made in the conservation of heat and scale and corrosion control.

Second. Solar distillation—using heat from the sun.

Third. Membrane conversion—using a combination of thin membranes and electric currents to screen out dissolved salts.

Fourth. Freezing—an experimental method. Frozen water crystals separate themselves from salt crystals, and researchers are trying to find ways to remove the salt from the ice.

Fifth. Other chemical and electrical methods—using gas hydrates, controlled absorption, and other experimental means.

Researchers feel there is little chance of a revolutionary advance in saline water conversion. Instead, they believe that only continuous and more intensive research can bring the answer to a host of engineering questions. These questions are minor in themselves but, if solved, they can produce gradual cost reductions with the cumulative effect of a major breakthrough.

I believe we have reached a crucial point in the development of saline conversion. We must remove the present restricted limits of time and finances from the program and establish it as a continuing project subject to annual appropriations. We must begin also to translate research programs into operating plants. I have included this provision under title II of the bill, which authorizes loans to communities and other public bodies to build saline conversion plants and to have one-quarter of their loans canceled if the Office of Saline Water uses these facilities for research and demonstration of conversion processes.

Title II of the bill is similar to bills which have been introduced in the House by Representatives ASPINALL, RHODES, SAYLOR, WAINWRIGHT, UDALL, and WILSON and in the Senate by Senator ALLOTT, on behalf of himself and Senators CASE of South Dakota, CHAVEZ, KUCHEL, ENGEL, GOLDWATER, FONG, and LONG of Hawaii.

SUMMARY OF BILL

Here is a summary of what this bill calls for:

First, research. Funds available to the Office of Saline Water for research contracts averaged only $36,000 a year from 1953 to 1958. This is insufficient. Research should be stepped up on small conversion units, on extraction and use of byproducts, on the nature of heat exchangers and compressors, the use of atomic energy, and many other technical problems. Unallocated funds should also be available to take advantage of new ideas that come along from sources outside the Government. We should have $2 million available for this whole area of general and fundamental research in fiscal 1961.

Second, process development. Processes resulting from research must be tested in large-scale pilot plants to be demonstrated on a practical scale. Pilot plants are expensive, but the Office of Saline Water had an average of only $200,000 a year available for their construction from 1953 to 1958. A reasonable figure for process development in fiscal 1961 would be $2.6 million.

Third, demonstration plants. The test methods proven to have potential in pilot plants need to be tested full scale. Often "bugs" are discovered in full-scale plants which did not show up in pilot plants, and they serve as practical training grounds for operating converters.

Most technicians and scientists agree that the five plants being built under the 1958 law will be only a start, since varying conditions in different sections of the country require different processes. The use of gas hydrates in conversion, for example, is rapidly nearing the stage of development where it will be ready for demonstration. Of the five plants in the works, none use this process.

The entire demonstration program could be speeded greatly by appropriating for fiscal 1961 the rest of the original authorization of $10 million, or $8,150,000.

Fourth, a test site and laboratory. The entire program of saline conversion research has been hampered by the lack of a central test site and laboratory. The Office of Saline Water does not even have a central staff. Right now, OSW research is carried on at widely dispersed places under unsatisfactory conditions. What's more, the entire OSW staff numbers just 25, only 10 of whom are scientists and engineers who direct and coordinate research by the Government and private contractors.

A central laboratory, located near both sea and brackish water, would give the program a good boost. It would not reduce the number of contracts for outside research, but rather would likely increase private work because of more research ideas which would come up.

Fifth, coordination of research at home and abroad. There is a great deal of scientific interest in saline conversion in other nations, as well as in the United States. OSW would profit if it could keep up with this work by having available both domestic and foreign scientific literature and issuing its own periodical information; by inspecting conversion sites at home and abroad; by taking part in conferences relating to saline conversion, and by correlating all this information for easy use.

About $500,000 a year would provide for this.

Sixth, economic studies. One of the greatest unknowns about saline conversion is its cost. Without accurate cost studies, communities cannot intelligently decide whether they should install saline conversion facilities, and as current water supplies diminish, this factor will become increasingly important.

Continuous economic studies and water market surveys could be made for about $500,000 a year.

The second part of the bill contains the important provision for aiding construction of conversion plants. Right now, commercial conversion of saline water would probably be cheaper for many communities than obtaining water from natural sources. But these communities understandably hesitate to put money into plants which may, in later years, turn out to be high-cost operations.

Federal assistance, in the form of loans, is necessary to bridge for a few years the gap between experimental plant operation and practical application of conversion plants. Such a program would also help get new plants built and operating, and would add to the stock of technical and cost information and speed the entire program.

The appropriations suggested in this bill would amount to about $17.5 million for fiscal 1961. A part of this would be nonrecurring—the amounts for construction and plant site acquisitions, for example. Loans under title II would be automatically appropriated as the loans are made.

This expenditure is one of the best our country could make in its future. There is no question that it would hasten the day when we can assure adequate water supplies, not only to our own cities and towns, but also to other parched communities throughout the world through the dissemination of what we learn. We are in a good position to meet a coming crisis right now.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill and ask that it be printed, and I ask unanimous consent that it may lie on the desk for the remainder of the week, to enable other Senators who may wish to do so to add their names as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the request of the Senator from Texas is granted, and the bill will lie on the table until May 21.

The bill (S. 3557) to expand and extend the saline water conversion program under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior to provide for accelerated research, development, demonstration, and application of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE SYSTEMS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 9, 1960, the names of Senators HART and BARTLETT were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3505) to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself and other Senators) on May 9, 1960.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Address delivered by him before State Society of West Virginia, May 1-4, 1960, upon the designation of Senator RANDOLPH as West Virginia's Son of the Year.

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from address delivered by him over Wisconsin radio stations, relating to legislative program.

By Mr. ENGLE:

Editorial entitled "A Congressman Reports," published in the Sacramento Union of May 2, 1960.

PRESIDENT'S VETO OF SENATE BILL 722, THE AREA RELEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I deeply regret that the Democratic majorities in control of this Congress sent to the President of the United States an area redevelopment bill, S. 722, which he was compelled to veto.

I conclude, reluctantly, that the majority party, with cynical disregard of the genuine needs of so-called depressed areas, attempts to create an issue for the approaching presidential campaign. The President's opponents have callously chosen this course, instead of cooperating with him to enact sound legislation which could give genuine, not illusory, help to areas of the country where chronic employment exists.

Senate bill 722 was sent to President Eisenhower in the expectation, nay in the hope, that he would veto it. The bill deliberately invited a veto in an obvious attempt to reap political capital from human misery.

Before it is too late, I hope that the majority will have sober second thoughts about the wisdom of this political cynicism and will accept the President's conciliatory offer to cooperate in obtaining sound legislation, an offer expressed in the following paragraph of his veto message:

> The people of the relatively few communities of chronic unemployment—who want to share in the general prosperity—are, after 5 years, properly becoming increasingly impatient and are rightfully desirous of constructive action. The need is for truly sound and helpful legislation on which the Congress and the Executive can agree. There is still time and I willingly pledge once again my wholehearted cooperation in obtaining such a law.

My conclusion that politics was the motive behind sending this bill to the President in its present form is strongly reinforced by the strange and silent reversal of position by its supporters on the runaway shop or industry-pirating problem.

I invite the attention of my friends from the South to the fact that the antipirating provisions of the bill have been strengthened very considerably by House amendments which have not been discussed before in the Senate. I wonder if these amendments will diminish their expectations about benefits to be derived from the bill.

I recall that in opposing my own attempts to have effective anti-pirating language inserted in the bill, its author, the able senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] stated very candidly that one of his reasons was his fear of loss of southern support.

When S. 722 was before the Senate last year, I offered amendments to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the purpose of relocating a business establishment from one area to another.

The bill as presented to the Senate proposed to permit such a relocation if it did not result "in substantial detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment."

The danger of such a weasel-worded, vague standard to the heavily industrialized States of the North and Northeast was clearly brought out in a colloquy between the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and myself, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 4, page 4942, as follows:

> Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in my understanding that under the language of the bill Congress would say to one area, "You can get Federal money for the purpose of damaging a community in Ohio and benefiting yourself"?
>
> Mr. BUSH. That is correct.
>
> Mr. LAUSCHE. "Unless it is shown that you propose to damage it substantially, that money will be available to you."
>
> Mr. BUSH. That is correct. But who is to determine what is "substantial detriment"? The poor administrator? I submit to the Senator from Ohio that he would have an impossible assignment.
>
> Mr. LAUSCHE. In my opinion, that provision, in effect, would serve notice upon communities, "Come to the Federal Government and receive Ohio taxpayers' money, and with that money draw away from Ohio those industries and businesses which it has developed through good government and good service, and locate them in other communities."

Despite this clear inequity and injustice, the sponsors of the bill refused to tighten up the language. Their reasons were clearly disclosed by the able senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] when he said:

> The Bush amendment would cause many of our southern friends to oppose the bill in the belief it would finance businesses in staying where they are and not creating new employment opportunities in the South.

The Senate sent the bill to the House with the objectionable "substantial detriment" language in it, and the House Committee on Banking and Currency resisted all attempts within committee to have effective anti-pirating safeguards inserted.

Just before final passage in the House, however, anti-pirating amend-

ments were accepted with little discussion and no debate. Offered by the Honorable SEYMOUR HALPERN, Republican, of New York, these amendments modified the declaration of purpose of the bill, and section 6, concerning loans and participations.

In the declaration of purpose, the language was changed to provide that—

New employment opportunities should be created by developing and expanding new and existing facilities and resources rather than by merely transferring employment opportunities from one area of the United States to another.

The original language had stated that such opportunities should be created "without substantially reducing employment in other areas of the United States."

In section 6, the "substantial detriment" language was stricken from the bill, and language inserted to prohibit relocation assistance "when such assistance will result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location."

Although I find the amendments adopted by the House not as effective in preventing industry pirating as those I had proposed last year, they represent a marked improvement over the original language of the bill.

The Halpern amendments make the bill less objectionable, but it still contains highly objectionable features, which are summarized in the President's message as follows:

1. S. 722 would squander the Federal taxpayers' money where there is only temporary economic difficulty, curable without the special Federal assistance provided in the bill. In consequence, communities in genuine need would receive less Federal help for industrial development projects than under the administration's proposal.

2. Essential local, State, and private initiative would be materially inhibited by the excessive Federal participation that S. 722 would authorize.

3. Federal financing of plant machinery and equipment is unwise and unnecessary and therefore wasteful of money that otherwise could be of real help.

4. The Federal loan assistance which S. 722 would provide for the construction of sewers, water mains, access roads, and other public facilities is unnecessary because such assistance is already available under an existing Government program. Outright grants for such a purpose, a provision of S. 722, are wholly inappropriate.

5. The provisions for Federal loans for the construction of industrial buildings in rural areas are incongruous and unnecessary.

6. The creation of a new Federal agency is not needed and would actually delay initiation of the new program for many months.

Because I agree with the objections to S. 722 which have been stated by the President, and because I resent the efforts which have been made to play politics with human misery, I shall vote to sustain the veto.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following these remarks a brief comparison of the administration's area assistance bill (S. 1064 and H.R. 4278) with the area redevelopment bill (S. 722).

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

BRIEF COMPARISON OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S AREA ASSISTANCE BILL (S. 1064 AND H.R. 4278) WITH THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL (S. 722)

ADMINISTRATION BILL	S. 722
Title: Area Assistance Act of 1959.	Area Redevelopment Act.
Purpose: To assist areas to develop and maintain suitable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes.	To establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas.
Organization: President appoints an Area Assistance Administrator who reports to the Secretary of Commerce.	Establishes the Area Redevelopment Administration as an independent agency.
Criteria for area eligibility: a. Labor market areas where the nontemporary unemployment meets three conditions:	a. Industrial redevelopment areas with unemployment of:
1. Rate is currently 6 percent, and	1. At least 6 percent at time of application, and
2. Rate has averaged at least 6 percent:	2. Twelve percent for 12 months, or
(a) For 4 out of preceding 5 years and has been 50 percent or more above national average, or	
(b) For 3 out of preceding 4 years and has been 75 percent or more above national average, or	
(c) For 2 out of preceding 3 years and has been 100 percent or more above national average, and	3. Nine percent for 15 out of 18 months, or
3. Nonagricultural employment has declined, or has increased less than in the country as a whole, during preceding 5 years.	4. Six percent for 18 out of 24 months, or
	5. Fifteen percent for 6 months if causes are not temporary.
(Eligible for loans and technical assistance grants.)	(NOTE.—The term "redevelopment area" may include one or more counties, or one or more municipalities, or a part of a county or municipality.)
b. One-industry towns, small towns in rural areas, and rural low-income areas.	b. Rural redevelopment areas with the largest number and percentage of low-income families and having a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment. Includes 500 counties ranking lowest in level-of-living index or in production for sale.
(Eligible for technical assistance grants.)	
Loans: (a) $50 million for eligible labor market areas.	(a) $75 million for industrial redevelopment areas.
(b) None provided.	(b) $75 million for rural redevelopment areas.
(c) See housing amendments below.	(c) $50 million for public facilities.
NOTE.—Area assistance fund to be financed by congressional appropriation.	NOTE.—Area redevelopment fund to be financed by congressional appropriation.
Terms for industrial loans: (a) Up to 35 percent of project cost for 25 years at rate of interest to be determined; at least 15 percent funds from State or local sources.	(a) Up to 65 percent of project cost for 30 years with interest at Treasury cost plus one-half of 1 percent; minimum of 10 percent State or local and 5 percent private funds.
(b) Loans for land and buildings only.	(b) Loans for land, construction and machinery.
(c) Loans must be approved by State development agency.	(c) Loans must be approved by the official State or local development agency. If none exists, the administrator appoints a local redevelopment committee.
(d) Project must be consistent with an overall economic development program.	(d) Project must be consistent with an overall economic development program.
Grants: (a) No grants for community facilities. See housing amendments below.	(a) Authorizes $35 million for community facilities grants.
(b) Authorizes $3 million annually for technical assistance grants. Of this amount, $1.5 million is available for "one-industry" towns, small towns in rural areas, and low-income areas not otherwise eligible.	(b) Authorizes $4.5 million annually for economic studies and technical assistance grants.
Technical assistance: Technical advice and consultation on economic development problems available to all areas.	Information, advice, and technical assistance limited to redevelopment areas.
Housing amendments: (a) Amends title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, to permit the rehabilitation of blighted industrial and commercial areas.	(a) Amends title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, to permit the rehabilitation of blighted industrial and commercial areas. Limited to 10 percent of funds authorized for capital grants after January 1, 1959.
(b) Amends section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, to extend urban planning assistance grants to cities, other municipalities, and counties of 25,000 or more located within areas of substantial and persistent unemployment.	(b) Amends section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, to extend urban planning assistance grants to cities, other municipalities, and counties of 25,000 or more located within industrial redevelopment areas.

BRIEF COMPARISON OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S AREA ASSISTANCE BILL (S. 1064 AND H.R. 4278) WITH THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL (S. 722)—Continued

ADMINISTRATION BILL	S. 722
(c) Amends title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 to give first priority to applications for community facilities loans from areas of substantial and persistent unemployment.	(c) See above under Grants. (Authorization for $35 million.)
Vocational training: The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare assist in vocational training or retraining.	The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare assist in vocational training or retraining. One and one-half million dollars provided for assistance to State boards for vocational education.
Retraining payments: None provided.	Secretary of Labor makes retraining subsistence payments for up to 13 weeks for those undergoing vocational training or retraining.
Total costs: $53 million in loans and technical assistance grants. (Other costs not specified.)	Two hundred and fifty-one million dollars in loans and grants, including $10 million for retraining subsistence payments and $1.5 million for vocational training. (Other costs not specified.)

Summary costs of the administration bill and S. 722

	Administration bill	S. 722
Loans:		
Industrial areas	$50,000,000	$75,000,000
Rural areas		75,000,000
Public facilities		50,000,000
	[1] 50,000,000	[1] 200,000,000
Grants:		
Public facilities		35,000,000
Technical assistance (annually)	3,000,000	4,500,000
	3,000,000	39,500,000
Retraining subsistence training payments to States	None	10,000,000
Total, loans and grants	53,000,000	249,500,000
Administration	[2]	[2]
Vocational training (annually)	[2]	1,500,000

[1] Financed by congressional appropriation.
[2] Not specified.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF BUREAUCRATIC WASTE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I wish to call the attention of the Senate to another example of bureaucratic waste.

The Air Force has just bought 272,710 screws at $1 each from a contractor who even prior to the completion of the negotiations had purchased these same screws for 5½ cents each.

The pricing to the Government under this negotiated contract of the 272,710 screws at $1 each represented a profit on this one item alone of $257,810, or nearly 2,000 percent.

Under date of May 10, 1960, the Comptroller General forwarded to the Congress a report calling attention to this inexcusable extravagance of the Department of the Air Force under negotiated contract No. AF 01(601)-20268 with Thompson Ramo Wooldridge, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio. The total amount of this contract was $2,103,685 for fuel booster pump repair kits.

Thompson was awarded two production orders under contract -20268 calling for a total of 54,542 fuel booster pump repair kits. Based on the formula, a total price of $2,103,685, which included profit of 10 percent of estimated costs, was negotiated for the 54,542 repair kits.

The Comptroller General's review indicated that the contractor experienced costs under these two production orders totaling $980,796, and as a result the negotiated prices exceeded experienced cost by $1,122,889, or 114 percent.

The Cleveland Air Procurement District, Cleveland, Ohio, administered this contract, and the Auditor General, U.S. Air Force, has responsibility for the audit of contracts at Thompson's Cleveland plant.

The explanation of how the company and the Air Force arrived at the $1 figure for the screws included in these repair kits is even more fantastic.

The price was based on the overall cost of an emergency purchase of 116 screws which were shipped to Cleveland from New York by air special delivery. This special handling ran the cost of the 116 screws up to the $1 figure, and it was then used as a base for the pricing of the entire contract.

This is another typical example of the indefensible carelessness with which the Air Force has been negotiating contracts and wasting the taxpayers' money.

If the Air Force would conduct its purchasing program under the same commonsense arrangement as used by private industry by requiring competitive bids, the American taxpayers would get at least 25 percent more defense for the tax dollars now being spent.

Any buyer in private industry who through stupidity or gullibility agreed to such extravagant cost-pricing arrangements would be fired by his company. I most respectfully suggest that the Air Force start using the same procedure.

The time is long overdue when Congress should pass a law requiring that every agency of the Government use competitive bidding practices on all contracts wherever feasible.

I compliment the Comptroller General on the remarkable work being done by his auditors.

AMERICA PROVIDES EISENHOWER WITH "SECRET WEAPON" AT SUMMIT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a release I have prepared regarding the summit conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American people can feel justifiable pride that they have provided President Eisenhower with a "secret weapon" to take with him to the summit meeting which starts in Paris today.

He and our allies enter negotiations with Russian Premier Khrushchev just as the U.S. economy has passed the annual rate of a half-a-trillion-dollar gross national product.

This is "secret" only in the sense that more explosive international developments of the past few days tended to obscure President Eisenhower's announcement last Wednesday that the annual rate for the gross national product was $500.2 billion for the first quarter of this year.

This is a "weapon" in the sense that it helps our people to wage peace, even as it would help our Nation to wage war. A half-a-trillion-dollar economy means that our Nation's production is big and growing bigger, that it is productive of more jobs, more homes, and an improved way of life for all our people. It describes in dramatic terms the great stake the American people have in a peaceful, productive world. But it also signifies the immense resources we have at our disposal in the event that an aggressor should be foolhardy enough to force us into war.

A figure of a half a trillion dollars is so astronomical that it needs some further defining and examples.

Half a trillion one-dollar bills would fill 1,000 standard size three-bedroom houses from basement to attic.

If we divide this half trillion dollars among every man, woman, and child in the United States today, every one of us would receive $2,778. A half a trillion dollars is more than the Federal Government spent from 1789 through the end of World War II in 1945.

It is nearly twice the national debt, and more than six times the annual expenditures of the Government today.

The gross national product represents the sum total of the market value of all production of goods and services by the Nation's economy. In terms of the disposition of this output, the half-a-trillion-dollar gross national product can be divided approximately

into the following basic categories of goods and services:

[In billions of dollars]

Personal consumption expenditures	328
Residential construction	22
Business investment in plant and equipment	47
Increase in business inventories	3
Federal Government purchases	55
State and local government purchases	45
Total	500

What does this huge gross national product mean to us, then, as American citizens? It means civilian employment of more than 66 million and unemployment at about 3.6 million. It means, in addition, supporting armed services of about 2.5 million men. It means payments of wages and salaries totalling some $290 billion a year. It means corporate profits before taxes of about $50 billion a year. It means farm proprietors' income of $12 billion, and business and professional income of $36 billion dollars annually.

A gross national product of half a trillion dollars involves the production of some 2.7 million net tons of steel ingots per week, up from about 1.8 million net tons a week in 1950. It means distribution of some 14.5 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity per week, compared to less than half that much, 6.2 billion kilowatt-hours in 1950. It means in general industrial production about 50 percent higher than 10 years ago, in 1950.

This high level of gross national product has made possible a standard of living far higher than that enjoyed by any other peoples in any other time and place. It is reflected in the fact that of the total of 86 million passenger automobiles in operation in the world, 57 million or 66 percent are in the United States. Of 25 million trucks operating in the world today, nearly 11 million are in the United States. As a matter of fact, by now over 15 percent of all American families own two or more cars. The United States has almost 64 million telephones in use, or 54 percent of the world's total of 118 million.

The high level of American output is reflected further in the fact that over 60 percent of all dwelling units are occupied by their owners. It means that almost all houses with electricity have refrigerators, 93 percent have electric washers, 90 percent have television sets, 73 percent have vacuum cleaners, 22 percent have freezers, 18 percent have electric or gas clothes dryers, and 13 percent have air conditioners.

It has made possible the fact that the average family now has $9,300 worth of life insurance, up from $4,300 10 years ago. It is related to the fact that there are now over twelve and a half million owners of shares of stock in American corporations.

Never before in the entire history of civilization has a gross national product of a half a trillion dollars been approached. And today the United States is the only nation which has reached this astounding level of output.

No other nation has achieved even half this level. The Soviet Union's gross national product is estimated at only $214 billion (in 1959).

The level of America's gross national product of itself puts the United States in a position of overwhelming influence in the world today. It makes it possible for us to spend $46 billion (in fiscal year 1961) on major national security needs while still permitting a continuing increase in consumer purchasing power and in the standard of living of the American people.

It makes it possible for the United States to be an effective leader of the free world, a rallying point in the long struggle against the tyranny of communism. We have been able to share some of our bountiful production with other peoples of the world, to alleviate suffering, to help people in underdeveloped parts of the world raise their standard of living, and to strengthen the bulwarks against Communist penetration in many areas of the globe.

A gross national product of half a trillion dollars thus thrusts great opportunities but also great responsibilities into the hands of our people.

We have not reached the level of a half-trillion dollars gross national product overnight nor has it been achieved without a great deal of hard work, ingenuity, and capital. The growth of our national output has nonetheless been phenomenal.

Even measured in constant dollars, as recently as 20 years ago, in 1940, the gross national product was less than half of what it is today. In 1935 it was a third of the present level. A quick indication of the growth of the Nation's gross national product since 1929 is shown in the following table, measured in both actual and constant (1959) dollars.

Gross national product, 1929–59

[In billions of dollars]

	In actual dollars		In constant 1959 dollars	
	Amount	Percent charge over previous year shown	Amount	Percent charge over previous year shown
1929	104.4		203.6	
1934	65.0	−37.7	155.1	−23.8
1939	91.1	+40.2	211.5	+36.4
1944	211.4	+132.1	366.3	+73.2
1949	258.1	+22.1	328.2	−10.4
1954	363.1	+40.7	408.8	+24.6
1959	478.8	+31.8	478.8	+17.1

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce. In "Economic Report of the President, January 1960," pp. 155, 156.

This increase is not due alone to the growth of the labor force. It is due much more to the incessant drive toward greater productivity through new inventions, new techniques of production and management, development of greater skills, and applications of large amounts of capital.

We can take great pride in having, as a Nation, achieved the point where our gross national product has reached a level of half a trillion dollars. This achievement is in reality a tribute to the industry, the imagination, and the ambitions of the American people. It is a demonstration to the world of what a free people can accomplish in building a Nation rich and powerful beyond the dreams of most of the world's inhabitants.

It is finally a challenge to us as a Nation to use our productive capacity and our native abilities in such a way that our children and our children's children will be able to live in a world of peace, able to develop their own capabilities to the utmost of their potentialities, and able to use the material blessings of our land in the service of the high and cherished ideals of our people.

All these facts—some spoken, some unspoken—will enter into the summit negotiations. They can be summed up by one final statistic.

Our President arrives in Paris as the leader of a Nation which produces more goods and services than that of the Soviet Union and Western Europe combined.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it is my judgment that Mr. Khrushchev has overplayed his hand. Evidently he has considerable fear, concern, and possibly fright over the attitude of the people in his own country, in view of his recent agitations before he went to Paris.

Mr. President, it is quite obvious to me that Mr. Khrushchev has decided that the most damaging rebuttal which could be given to his posturings and his violent outcries at home would be the appearance in Russia of President Eisenhower, and that Khrushchev fears most of all the wide popularity of President Eisenhower and the tremendous enthusiasm which undoubtedly would greet him, which he apprehends would serve to wipe out Khrushchev's recent utterances regarding one of our planes. It appears to me that Khrushchev has, for those reasons, deliberately sabotaged the summit meeting because it is necessary for him to fall back and regroup with as much bluster as possible.

The fact that he suggests a period of about 8 months before another meeting be called would also indicate that he fears the influence among his own people of President Eisenhower, and is willing to take his chances on what may occur in some future year.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. DODD. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania agree with me when I say that it seems to me that at the time last September when we were talking about Mr. Khrushchev's proposed visit to the United States, one of the most sensible arguments offered in defense of his proposed visit here was that after Khrushchev's visit to us, our President would have an opportunity to go inside Russia and tell the truth there through personal appearances there.

As the Senator from Pennsylvania knows, I did not think much of the whole business. I admitted privately, and, I hope I did publicly. I do not recall, that, while a poor one, it was a reason in favor of the proposed visit by Mr. Khrushchev, although I was afraid the many grave disadvantages would outweigh that one advantage.

But is it not a great tragedy that we went so far as to allow Khrushchev to come here and build himself up, and now the excuse and apology and reason we offered for this blunder last September has been destroyed today?

Mr. SCOTT. I agree with the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. Khrushchev is a great one for using proverbs and sayings. I am not aware that he reads the Bible; but surely he must somewhere have heard the saying of St. Paul—

Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make ye free.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, no one can condone the activities of Mr. Khrushchev at Paris, today. All patriotic Americans must rally behind the President of the United States, and must resent the insults which have been tendered to him and, through him, to our country.

I also hope that all Members of the Senate and all the American people will remember that the search for peace in our time is the most important issue which confronts the entire world—civilized, free, and slave—and that we must continue to search unremittingly for peace in our time, although the road ahead will apparently be much more difficult, at least for some months.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, along with a number of my colleagues, I am grievously disappointed at the President's veto of the area redevelopment bill. Chronic and persistent unemployment, fortunately, is confined to relatively few areas throughout the United States. There, it is real and deep, and results in great suffering.

Each of the six reasons given by the President for vetoing the bill is without merit. One can only conclude that the President is looking for a political issue with which to beat the Democrats over the head.

First, he says the bill would squander the taxpayers' money where there is only temporary economic difficulty. The bill does not call for the expenditure of 1 cent. It is only an authorization bill. Moreover, communities whose economic difficulties are truly temporary will cease to be eligible once their unemployment rates drop below 6 percent. If the administration's own rosy economic forecasts are borne out, we should shortly emerge from the recession which began in 1958. Accordingly, it is simply not true that communities in genuine need would receive less help than under the administration's proposal.

Second, he says that local, State, and private initiative would be materially inhibited by excessive participation that the bill would authorize. But the Administrator could limit the Federal participation to any amount he saw fit. Any Administrator who permitted excessive Federal participation should, and probably would, be fired. Those of us who know at first hand about conditions in the depressed areas realize that many a community has been bled so white in its efforts to pull itself up by its bootstraps that substantial Federal participation, as authorized but not required by the bill, would be needed to rehabilitate the community.

Third, the President says that the Federal financing of machinery and equipment is unwise and unnecessary. Again, the bill merely authorizes, but does not require, such financing. No Administrator is ever expected to take actions which are unwise and unnecessary. If the President is right, the authority would never be used. But those of us familiar with these hard-pressed communities believe there might be occasions when the only way a sound new industry could be brought into a distressed community would be to provide financing for plant and machinery as well as land and buildings.

Fourth, the President complains that Federal loan assistance for public facilities is unnecessary because such assistance is already available under an existing Government program. But the fact is that money available under the existing public facility loan program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency is virtually exhausted. While the President has asked for it, it is not now there. Moreover, why not consolidate all the facilities for assisting chronically depressed areas under one agency, instead of dividing them between executive agencies, thus requiring additional coordination?

The President's suggestion that outright grants for public facilities are wholly inappropriate flies in the face of facts established not only in the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, but also in the voluminous testimony taken by the Special Senate Committee on Unemployment Problems. Many a community is entirely unable to finance its facilities on a loan basis.

Fifth, the President complains that the provisions for Federal loans for creating industrial jobs in rural areas are unnecessary. Again the President appears unaware of the facts established by a wealth of testimony.

There are hundreds of rural counties as badly in need of economic rehabilitation as many of the distressed industrial areas. It would be grossly unfair to confine the relief to urban centers, when the need exists, to a like extent, in many rural areas.

Sixth, the President complains of the creation of a new Federal agency, but he should know that the reason why the Congress did not put this agency in the Department of Commerce is that his appointees in that Department have demonstrated their lack of sympathy with the program. The creation of a new agency would not mean the addition of any more personnel than would have to be added in the Department, because the workload would be the same. By simply transferring existing personnel in the Department of Commerce to be the nucleus of the new agency, he could eliminate any delay in getting the program started.

In short, the six reasons given for the veto are so hollow that it is clear this is merely a political veto.

It seems clear that the President, having promised to veto some Democratic bills, felt it necessary to make good on his promise.

The "cold war of partisan politics," which the President once predicted, he has apparently now initiated—and at the expense of thousands of men, women, and children to whom this bill held out the promise of jobs and bread.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Edward K. Mills, Jr., to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold C. Patterson, of Virginia, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HOUSING COMMISSIONER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Bruce Savaage, of Indiana, to be Public Housing Commissioner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, Corps of Engineers, to be member and president of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 37) (33 U.S.C. 642).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. John A. Morrison, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507) (33 U.S.C. 661).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Francis Adams Cherry, of Arkansas, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for a term of 5 years expiring March 4, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of U.S. attorneys.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of U.S. attorneys be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Oliver H. Metcalf, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Farm Credit Administration will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for appointment in the Regular Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Malcolm M. Willey, of Minnesota, to be a member of the National Science Board for the remainder of the term expiring May 10, 1964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

NOMINATIONS FAVORABLY REPORTED AND PLACED ON THE VICE PRESIDENT'S DESK WITHOUT PRINTING

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Regular Army and in the Regular Air Force, favorably reported and placed on the Vice President's desk without printing.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the acting majority leader what he foresees by way of the program for the remainder of today and for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that no controversial measures will be brought up today. There will be a number of printing resolutions and related legislation, reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

I wish to announce to the Senate that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the morning hour, the Senate will resume the consideration of Calendar No. 950, Senate bill 2653, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish jurisdiction in the Federal Communications Commission over community antenna systems.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION TOMORROW OF THE COMMUNITY ANTENNA SYSTEMS BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in that connection I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business today, Calendar No. 950, Senate bill 2653, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish jurisdiction in the Federal Communications Commission over community antenna systems, be laid down as the pending business; and that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the morning hour, the Senate resume the consideration of that measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPRESENTATIVE DAVID M. HALL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, David McKee Hall, the late Representative from the 12th North Carolina District, was born on May 16, 1918, in Sylva, the county seat of Jackson County, which is situated among North Carolina's beautiful "mountains with hills at their knees."

He was descended on both sides from God-fearing and hardy folk who fought for independence in the American Revolution, planted the first settlements in the scenic section of North Carolina west of Asheville, and made contributions of much consequence to the business, the educational, the professional, the political, and the religious life of the State.

David Hall was the namesake of his father, who followed agricultural and mercantile pursuits in Jackson County, and died at a comparatively early age.

The immediate family of his mother, who was born Edith Enloe Moore, has been especially noted for its legal ability, three of its members, namely, her father, Judge Frederick Moore, her uncle, Judge Walter E. Moore, and her brother, Judge Dan K. Moore, having served the State with great distinction as superior court judges. Mrs. Edith Moore Hall is now assistant dean of women at Western Carolina College in Cullowhee.

David Hall attended the public schools of Jackson County and Sylva. While participating in an athletic contest at the age of 12, he suffered a leg injury, which produced osteomyelitis and marked the beginning of recurring sojourns in hospitals and repeated surgical operations. Three years later this bone infection culminated in paraplegia, which confined him to a wheel chair the remainder of his life.

This tragic misfortune would have daunted a less heroic soul. But it served to refine and enrich the character of David Hall, who was steeled by it to meet in surpassing and unforgettable fashion the greatest test of courage on the earth, which is the capacity to bear disaster without cursing fate and losing heart.

Despite his crippling physical disability, David Hall asked of life no quarter. He had compensating gifts, some inherited and some acquired. He used them to the full. His handsome countenance, alert mind, gracious and sympathetic personality, and courageous and persevering spirit enabled him to emulate Tennyson's poetic character Ulysses and "drink life to the lees."

His recurring confinement to hospitals made his attendance at high school rather intermittent, and prevented his graduation. But it did not deter him from obtaining a thorough education in many fields. This is true because he read and remembered everything which came to hand.

Since he was unable to qualify for admission as a high school graduate, David Hall was enrolled as a special student when he entered the University of

North Carolina at Chapel Hill. While a student there, he took various subjects in the arts and sciences, and completed the regular course in the school of law.

His popularity among his instructors and college mates equaled that which he enjoyed in after years among the people. For this reason, he was called to many student offices. He served as magister of Vance Inn of Phi Delta Phi legal fraternity, secretary and treasurer of the university law association, dormitory president, interdormitory council president, member of the board of directors of Graham Memorial, member of the campus cabinet, and member of the advisory board of the dean of men. Moreover, he was granted the Phi Delta Phi award for outstanding achievement.

As a consequence of his excellence in legal scholarship, the faculty of the school of law took an unprecedented action in his behalf. It waived his lack of prescribed educational prerequisites, and permitted him to graduate at the commencement in June 1948 with the degree of bachelor of laws.

Having passed the North Carolina bar examination the preceding year, David Hall forthwith opened an office in Sylva and began the practice of law. His outstanding ability and tireless industry brought him a highly satisfactory clientele. The constantly increasing demands of his profession soon made it advisable for him to form a legal partnership with Lacy H. Thornburg as junior partner.

After his return to Sylva from Chapel Hill, David Hall maintained his residence at the ancestral home of the Halls, which stands upon a farm abutting the Tuckasiegee River near Webster and affords picturesque views of the surrounding countryside.

Notwithstanding the exacting demands of his personal affairs, David Hall participated in large measure in the activities of the various bar associations and the civic and religious undertakings of Sylva and Jackson County.

He was an Elk and a Rotarian, and held memberships in the American Bar Association, the North Carolina State Bar, and the Jackson County Bar Association.

He served as a member of the board and the chairman of the finance committee of the First Methodist Church of Sylva, president of the Jackson County Chamber of Commerce, member of the Jackson County Committee on Employ the Physically Handicapped, member of the Jackson County Committee on Morehead Scholarships, president of Jackson County Industries, secretary-treasurer of the Jackson County Savings & Loan Association, director of the Jackson County United Fund, and regional fund chairman of the American Red Cross. He was also a member of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

Both inclination and personality made it inevitable that David Hall should be deeply concerned with politics and public affairs. He described himself with accuracy as a Democrat "by heritage and choice," and a conservative by political philosophy. By the last term he signified his adherence to the old and tried against the new and untried.

He was exceedingly active in behalf of his party, serving at various times as president of the Jackson County Young Democratic Club, senior party liaison officer and member of the executive committee of the North Carolina Young Democratic Clubs, vice chairman of the Jackson County Democratic Executive Committee, and member of the Democratic Committee for the 20th Judicial District.

David Hall attained his first public office on November 2, 1954, when he was chosen by the people of Haywood, Henderson, Jackson, Polk, and Transylvania Counties to represent the 32d senatorial district in the North Carolina General Assembly of 1955. As State senator, he distinguished himself for his devotion to duty and sound judgment. Before the expiration of his senatorial term, he was appointed a member of the North Carolina Board of Water Resources by Gov. Luther H. Hodges.

Subsequent to the May 1958 primary, George A. Shuford, the Democratic nominee in the 12th North Carolina Congressional District for the 86th Congress, was compelled by illness to relinquish the nomination. Upon that occurrence, the Democratic committee for the district conferred the nomination on David Hall, who conducted a vigorous campaign throughout the 10 counties of the district and triumphed over his Republican opponent by a vote of 52,609 to 31,524. After qualifying as a member of the 86th Congress, he was assigned to the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and rendered services of great worth to his district, State, and country until his last illness overtook him.

David Hall was singularly fortunate in his choice of a wife. While he was a patient in Duke Hospital at Durham, N.C., he met, wooed, and won his nurse, Sarah McCollum, of Bradenton, Fla., a girl of unusual charm, whose brave heart matched his own. Their marriage took place on July 14, 1944, and was blessed by three winsome daughters, Sarah Anne Hall, Edith Allison Hall, and Hannah McKee Hall.

David Hall died at the C. J. Harris Community Hospital in Sylva, January 29, 1960. Two days later impressive funeral services in keeping with his simple faith were conducted for him by his pastor, the Reverend Asmond L. Maxwell, assisted by the Reverend Robert G. Tuttle, in the First Methodist Church of Sylva, and his body was laid to rest in a cemetery near Webster in the presence of a multitude of sorrowing friends and in sight of the beautiful "mountains with hills at their knees," which he loved with such intensity.

Despite his broken body, David Hall created a great character and lived a great life. At an earlier point in my remarks, I recounted the remarkable gifts, inherited and acquired, which I believe made this miracle possible. No one can assert with absolute assurance, however, that even these gifts would have sufficed had not two good women, one his mother and the other his wife, stood beside him with comfort and encouragement during the many dark hours when his body, racked with pain, tested his courageous heart to the uttermost.

Be that as it may, those of us who were privileged to know David Hall can say one thing with certainty. It is this: We have never known a more gallant soul. His courage was like that of the King's son in Edward Rowland Sill's inspiring poem "Opportunity":

This I beheld, or dreamed it in a dream;
There spread a cloud of dust along a plain;
And underneath the cloud, or in it, raged
A furious battle, and men yelled, and swords
Shocked upon swords and shields. A prince's banner
Wavered, then staggered backward, hemmed by foes.
A craven hung along the battle's edge,
And thought, "Had I a sword of keener steel—
That blue blade that the king's son bears—but this
Blunt thing!" he snapped and flung it from his hand,
And lowering crept away and left the field.
Then came the king's son, wounded, sore bestead,
And weaponless, and saw the broken sword,
Hilt-buried in the dry and trodden sand,
And ran and snatched it, and with battle-shout
Lifted afresh he hewed his enemy down,
And saved a great cause that heroic day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, these items:

An outline of the remarks made by Representative David M. Hall's pastor, the Reverend Asmond L. Maxwell, at the funeral service held for him in the First Methodist Church of Sylva, in Sylva, N.C., on the afternoon of Sunday, January 31, 1960.

A resolution concerning Representative David M. Hall adopted by the Board of Commissioners of Buncombe County, N.C., on February 1, 1960.

Some 29 articles and editorials relating to Representative David M. Hall gleaned from various newspapers and magazines.

There being no objection, the outline, resolution, articles, and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTLINE OF REMARKS OF THE REVEREND MR. ASMOND L. MAXWELL AT CONGRESSMAN HALL'S FUNERAL SERVICE

The spirit of man is given by his Creator.

It is the unique quality in man. "God is a spirit" and "God created man in His own image."

It is a questing, a hungry, a restless spirit.

It is indomitable, invincible, unconquerable.

David Hall was richly blessed here. He had a double portion.

His indomitable courage is known to all.

His strong will to live in a large world.

His drive, control, discipline of his natural abilities.

His desire to grow, to learn, to achieve.

His faith in himself, his boundless energy, his unceasing hope.

His sense of duty, of mission, though he knew he lived on "borrowed time."

His impatience with any obstacle in his way.

All of these things were a reflection of God's spirit within.

But the spirit of man needs a Master. William Henley's "Invictus"—this is an arrogant, pagan philosophy:

"Out of the night that covers me,
Black as the pit from pole to pole,
I thank whatever gods may be
For my unconquerable soul.

"It matters not how strait the gate,
How charged with punishments the scroll,
I am the master of my fate;
I am the captain of my soul."

For the spirit of man must be conquered. His will must be subjected. His pride must be bent. His spirit must acknowledge its Master.

And David Hall knew this.

In all the battles he fought against insuperable odds—and won. There was one he could not afford to win. God, his Creator, must be acknowledged supreme.

One who was close to him, closer than I ever was, remarked that David's spirit became gentle, strong, yet tamed to the hand of his Master.

David loved life. He lived it fully, accepted it without resentment. He drank deeply at its springs. But I believe he had learned to live it in submission to the One who gave it, and at last, to surrender it back willingly. "The Lord hath given; the Lord hath taken away; Blessed be the name of the Lord" (Job).

Another who loved life was Robert Louis Stevenson. He wrote his own epitaph, "Requiem":

"Under the wide and starry sky
Dig the grave and let me lie,
Glad did I live and gladly die,
And I laid me down with a will.

"This be the verse you grave for me:
'Here he lies where he longed to be;
Home is the sailor, home from the sea,
And the hunter home from the hill.'"

PRAYER AND BENEDICTION

O Lord, support us all the day long of this troublous life until the shadows lengthen and the evening comes; and the busy world is hushed; and the fever of life is over, and our work is done.

Then, of Thy great mercy, grant us a safe lodging and a holy rest and peace at the last, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

DAVID M. HALL, A MAN OF COURAGE

Resolution of Board of Commissioners of Buncombe County, N.C., concerning Congressman Hall

Be it resolved, That the highest possible tribute be paid to David M. Hall, Congressman of the 12th Congressional District.

In spite of a physical handicap which confined him to a wheelchair, Mr. Hall lived a full, active, productive and useful life, dedicating himself to governmental service, to the State as a member of the State senate, to his home county as attorney for Jackson County and to his country as Congressman of the 12th Congressional District.

His determination to carry on this record of public service in spite of serious illness is an inspiration to all people in public life.

Congressman Hall's undaunted courage, his concern for other people, his scholarly mind, faith and optimism earned for him the admiration and respect of the people of North Carolina; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be placed upon the minutes of this board, that a copy be furnished the press, and that a copy be sent to Mrs. Hall.

Approved as to form:

ROY A. TAYLOR,
County Attorney.
COKE CANDLER,
Chairman.
J. C. VANCE,
Member.
HARRY P. MITCHELL,
Member.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Times, Aug. 2, 1958]

SYLVA LAWYER ABLE LEADER FOR WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA DEMOCRATIC FORCES—DAVID M. HALL FINE CHOICE AS CONGRESSIONAL NOMINEE

The choice of David M. Hall, of Sylva, as the 12th District's Democratic nominee for Congress, is a most admirable one. In making this emergency decision Thursday the district's Democratic congressional executive committee acted with political wisdom and a keen sense of responsibility to all western North Carolina in selecting such an excellent and popular replacement for Representative George A. Shuford.

For serious health reasons Mr. Shuford, now serving his third term, had to withdraw as his party's candidate after winning the nomination in the May primary. His record in Congress has been marked by dedicated and highly effective service not only to his district but to his State and Nation as well.

The true story to date of Mr. Hall, age 40, would fascinate and inspire anybody anywhere who loves to learn about physically handicapped persons who overcome all manner of tragic difficulties and push ahead to great achievements.

Mr. Hall is an outstanding Jackson County lawyer, civic, church, and political leader, a successful cattle raiser and enjoys a happy family life at his farm home. He is a former State senator and since 1955 has been a member of the State board of water commissioners. He accepted the congressional nomination from a wheelchair in which he has moved about skillfully much of the time since he was stricken with a rare bone disease as a boy of 12.

If Mr. Hall is elected to Congress in November, as he is virtually certain to be in this overwhelmingly Democratic district, he will be remarkable for other significant things too. He will be the first North Carolina Congressman to come from west of the Balsams since before the War Between the States and the first Congressman ever to come from Jackson County. Not in 50 years has this district's Congressman lived outside Buncombe or Henderson County.

Many thousands of citizens in the other eight counties of this district are mighty happy about this new situation. The Asheville Times is also delighted by it. We consider this a thoroughly wholesome and desirable development—good for western North Carolina and the Democratic Party therein. Mr. Hall possesses all the qualifications, in his fine mountain background and place of residence as well as in his splendid character and abilities, to represent western North Carolina in Congress.

If there are any political jealousies among the Democratic political leaders in the 10 counties of this district harmful to regional solidarity, in promoting the best interests of all western North Carolina, then we know of no better man than David M. Hall, of Jackson County, to break the spell and launch a new era of enlightened teamwork.

The job of a Congressman is to represent his district—every part of it—in the National Legislature with courage, intelligence, and devotion. He must know his district intimately, its needs and aspirations. He must be well grounded in State and National Government. He must understand politics and be a good politician himself. He must be a sound party man—in this case a Democrat—because to get good results in Washington a Congressman must function efficiently as a member of his party's legislative team.

The Times is convinced Mr. Hall has all these qualifications and is otherwise exceptionally well equipped to win in November and then represent the 12th District ably and faithfully in Congress. We cordially congratulate Mr. Hall and the district's Democratic executive committee for making him the party's nominee.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen Aug. 2, 1958]

IT'S TIME FOR DEMOCRATS TO UNITE

The action of the Democratic executive committee in naming David McKee Hall of Sylva as the party's nominee for Congress in the 12th District brought to a happy conclusion a period of political tension and turmoil.

It is hoped, with all earnestness, that the Democrats in the 10 counties of the district, from Cherokee to Buncombe, will now unite in support of the nominee as he faces Republican opposition in the general election in the fall.

The liveliness of the interest shown in the selection of a nominee to succeed the able and ailing Representative George A. Shuford, of Asheville, who withdrew, speaks well for the concern the people have in their representation in Congress. Other able men were considered for the nomination; each should feel honored.

Mr. Hall, an attorney and former State senator, fought his way to success over the handicap of a major body infirmity. At the age of 12 he suffered from osteomyelitis and 3 years later it resulted in paraplegia, making it necessary that he go about in a wheelchair.

His conquest of this disability demonstrated his patience and determination, his faith and courage. At the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, where he made an excellent scholastic record, he earned part of his way by reading to blind students and preparing law briefs.

After receiving his bachelor of law degree in 1948 and being admitted to the bar, he engaged in a rehabilitation work in New York, aiding H. A. Littledale in preparing the book, "Mastering Your Disability."

But the law had a great appeal and he returned to Sylva to practice, serving as attorney for Jackson County and for the towns of Sylva and Dillsboro.

His public service has had a wide range, including work with organizations devoted to the promotion of business, industry and tourism and membership in the State senate in 1955. He resigned his senate seat later that year to become a member of the State board of water commissioners.

The personable Mr. Hall, whose attractive and appealing qualities have won for him many friends, is 40 years old. He makes his home with his family on a farm near Webster.

Not only does he know the needs and interests of his home county, but he is familiar with the desires and aspirations of the entire district. A political conservative in his thinking, he has pledged, if elected, to work in behalf of the entire district.

During the four decades of his life he has been steeped in a family tradition of public service, a heritage that has given impetus to his own desire to serve.

His family has been prominent for generations in business, the legal profession and in politics.

The son of David McKee Hall and Edith Enloe (Moore) Hall, he is a grandson of Judge Fred Moore, a grand-nephew of Judge Walter E. Moore and a nephew of Judge Dan K. Moore, who but recently left the superior court bench to accept a post with the Champion Paper & Fiber Co. He is also a grand-nephew of the late E. L. McKee, of Sylva, whose wife, Mrs. Gertrude Dills McKee, served in the State senate.

In selecting a congressional nominee, the Democratic committee reached into a central

county of the district and tapped a man who, by heritage, training, and character, is equipped to be an excellent representative of the Democracy of this rugged mountain country. He should be elected.

[From the Sylva (N.C.) Herald, Aug. 4, 1958]

DAVID HALL AND JACKSON COUNTY HONORED

Following his nomination to succeed George A. Shuford as Representative in Congress from the 12th North Carolina District, David McKee Hall, 40, Sylva attorney, who won the vote of the 20-member congressional committee, said, "I accept the nomination with a great deal of humility. I pledge to expend every effort toward victory this fall for all the Democrats—in district, State, and Nation, and I will work untiringly for not part, but all, of the 12th District."

Knowing the game and fighting young Jackson native, who uses a wheelchair to propel himself about, we know he will do just that. And he is wasting no time in getting started to mend the fences in the Democratic ranks in the district as he starts out next week to make the rounds of visiting all of the counties in the district.

The citizens of Jackson County received the word of Hall's nomination with great enthusiasm and are proud to be represented in Congress for the first time by a man of his experience and ability. Having served his district as State senator, as member of the State water conservation committee, and in dozens of other fields of activity, politically and otherwise, has provided the young Democratic nominee with a wealth of knowledge that will fit him for the big job in Washington.

Mr. Hall, if elected this fall and there is little doubt but what he will win the election, will be assuming a position which will carry with it great opportunities and grave responsibilities. He will have an opportunity, as the first man to represent western North Carolina west of the Balsams, to prove to the district that a man west of the French Broad can do as much, if not more, for the entire district as many have in the past east of the French Broad. In serving in the U.S. Congress he will not only be serving the 10 counties of the 12th North Carolina District and North Carolina but the entire Nation as well.

The citizens of Jackson are quite sure that "Bud" Hall, as he is known by his friends, will serve his county, his State and his Nation with distinction, bringing honor to himself and to his native State and county. He will go to Washington with the best wishes of all the citizens of the district.

The congressional committee is to be recommended for having made a wise selection in the candidate to succeed George Shuford.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen, Aug. 4, 1958]

DAVE HALL: A FIGHTER WITH UNCONQUERABLE GRIT

(By John Parris)

WEBSTER.—To name a man to match my mountains is to name a fighter of unconquerable grit.

Such a man is David McKee Hall, a native-born, briar-sharp, 40-year-old mountain lawyer, who confounded the experts last week by being selected to run for Democrat George A. Shuford's seat in the U.S. House of Representatives in November. He's been a fighter all his life.

At 15, a bone infection called osteomyelitis cut his spinal cord and paralyzed him from the waist down.

That put him on his back, but not out of circulation.

Even then, it was still touch and go.

The doctors said it would either kill him or leave him helpless for the rest of his days.

But they didn't know Dave Hall.

He stubbornly refused to die or submit to a life of invalid despair.

He fought the disease—8 years in various hospitals and some surgical operations—fought it when everybody else said he didn't have a chance.

In the darkest days of his illness he kept on encouraging his doctors, his mother, and father, his friends, who found it hard to hold out even a little bit of encouragement for him.

They watched him suffer and they suffered, too.

And there was one man, closer to him than all the rest, who said, tearfully: "It's too much to bear. I couldn't blame him if he took a gun and ended it."

And, yet, this man knew nothing ever would cause this boy to take the easy way out. And the man was proud. More proud than that, if he could live to see him on his way to Congress, which he couldn't.

But while the others despaired, Dave Hall grinned through the pain and planned his future in a world where he expected to ask for no quarter.

In the hospital, and at home between operations, he read everything he could lay his hands on. He read dictionaries and encyclopedias, books on philosophy and economics, history, and geography, absorbed textbooks, newspapers, and news magazines.

He got through high school—he didn't graduate—and the University of North Carolina in a wheelchair, went on to law school, and at 26 married his nurse.

He entered the University of North Carolina as a special student. He aimed to be a doctor. He went into premedical school and the school officials and faculty members figured he wouldn't get through the first year.

But like a heap of others, they didn't know Dave Hall.

It wasn't that they didn't think he had the brains. They just didn't believe he would live long enough.

Dave set 'em back on their collective heels.

Strangely enough, he was a self-help student. He earned part of his educational expenses by reading to blind students, later, when he shifted from premed to law, by preparing law briefs.

His family background included a line of famous lawyers and jurists on his mother's side, and after a year of premed, although he was tops in his class, he shifted to law school.

As a matter of fact, he didn't have the academic requirements to permit him to enter the university's school of law. But again, the officials didn't expect him to finish the course and reckoned there was no reason to worry about what they would do if he did.

When Dave made the dean's list with an A average, they still didn't become concerned too much with the outcome, albeit they had to admit he was a very unusual young man. To be exact, quite a rare young man.

Through it all, Dave Hall kept going back to the hospital now and then, seeking to lick the malady that had struck him down once and for all.

In 1946, he heard about Manhattan's Institute for the Crippled and Disabled in New York.

He showed up in New York in July and announced firmly that he meant to walk by summer's end. Said the institute's medical director, George Deaver, "Certainly."

Dave could not dress himself or put on braces without help.

But after 6 weeks of pushups and other exercises to strengthen arms, shoulders, and abdominal muscles, he was ready to begin crutch work.

The goal at the institute is to become almost completely independent, to be able to go anywhere under your own power if you are paralyzed from the waist down, as Dave Hall was.

Par scores at the institute were:

Fifteen minutes to dress, 7½ to put on braces, 1 to get out of bed or rise from a chair, 30 seconds to open and close a door.

To graduate, institute patients had to be able to go up and down three steps in 1 minute, enter a bus in 10 seconds, cross a 48-foot street in 20 seconds (before the traffic light changed).

Dave Hall bettered par on every course.

He became the institute's pride and joy.

It's tough enough going for a man with all his facilities to negotiate across town in New York from the east side to the west side, especially hustling, bustling, dog-eat-dog, 42d Street and Times Square.

I know. I've been there. Many times. And I'll take a cab.

Dave Hall made it look easy.

He negotiated that mad, wild cross-town couple of miles like he was going from the living room to the kitchen. Swapped buses five times, hopped over curbs, thumbed his nose at Times Square traffic and crossed the no-man's land untouched, unharmed and without causing a single cabdriver to slam on his brakes or dent a fender.

He was so good, the institute got him to put on a show when the Congress of Physical Medicine came to New York early in September 1946, for its convention.

He hopped briskly onto a platform 18 inches high, dropped to the floor, and, by strategic use of his crutches, got up again in less than 30 seconds.

My wife was there. She witnessed the amazing demonstration.

Dave told the doctors that anybody with good arms and shoulders could learn to walk.

They didn't argue with him. They had seen, and they knew it was a fact.

Dave taught the folks at the institute things they didn't know were possible with crutches.

As a matter of fact, he opened up a whole, wonderful new life for folks doomed to a wheelchair.

Dr. Deaver offered him the Sun and Moon and stars to stay in New York. He was offered a post at New York University along with a place at the institute and an affiliation with an insurance company which would have assured him an income of a hundred thousand dollars a year.

It was hard to turn down. But Dave Hall was first of all a mountain boy. He loved the mountains, the mountain people. That's where his rootholds were, and that's where he wanted to settle down.

Besides, he had a couple more years in law school.

So he turned down the gold of New York, headed back for Chapel Hill to become the first special student to graduate from the University of North Carolina Law School and the first special student to receive an LL. B. degree.

To get his degree, he had to make up a lot of academic courses he had bypassed.

The hourly load to stay in school at the university is 12 and the maximum permitted is 18. Dave took twice the normal load. The professors had got wise to him and knew he could. So they let him take what he wanted, and he took 33 hours a quarter, studying high finance, advanced economics, banking, instead of knocking off the minor, crip courses which would have qualified him for his degree.

And then he headed for home to hang out his shingle.

Behind him was a record they wouldn't soon forget down at Chapel Hill. A record by a young fellow in a wheelchair with unconquerable grit.

The year he graduated from law school he was selected as one of the 12 outstanding law students in America.

While he was there he was a member of Vance Inn of the national honorary legal fraternity of Phi Delta Phi, serving as president, secretary and treasurer, as well as being elected exchecquer. He also was treasurer and secretary pro tempore of the University Law Association.

Add to these honors a host of others that shout: "Don't ever underestimate a man in a wheelchair."

He was dormitory president, interdormitory council president, a member of the board of directors of Graham Memorial, a member of the campus cabinet, on the advisory board to the dean of men, vice chairman and then president of the dormitory council of presidents.

For 1946–47 he was named Phi Delta Phi Law Student of the Year.

By the time he headed for the mountains and Sylva to hang out his shingle he had licked the malady that had struck him down in his 'teens but couldn't keep him down.

Ahead lay his future. He knew what he wanted. And he knew he would get it. He was a man now. A man of unconquerable grit.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen, Aug. 5, 1958]

DON'T UNDERESTIMATE THE MAN IN THE WHEELCHAIR

(By John Parris)

WEBSTER.—Don't let the wheelchair fool you, and don't underestimate the man in it.

You'll get your ears pinned back, if you do.

For David McKee Hall, albeit paralyzed from the waist down, is almost completely independent, able to go just about anywhere under his own power.

His capacity for work and for doing things is incredible. His stamina like his courage, is a wonder to behold.

He hunts, he fishes, and he swims.

He drives a car—averages some 30,000 miles a year—and mows his own lawn, which is the size of a country acre, if it's a foot.

He never has considered himself as an invalid, which he really isn't, and though he can't walk as other men walk, he doesn't consider that a handicap either.

"Never," he says, "never have I thought of myself as being other than normal. Physically, that is.

"As far as material things are concerned, I have as much or more than most people.

"The fact that I was confined to a wheelchair at 15 apparently didn't affect my ability to earn or to participate in civic, church and political affairs."

His philosophy might be summed up in something my grandfather, another mountain man, once said:

"It's up to you to whittle what you can with what you've got."

And Dave Hall's got a lot.

His mind is sharp as a meat ax.

He doesn't scare worth a darn.

He's tough when he has to be tough. But he's soft, too, and sentimental.

There's a bit of Lincoln about him. Something of Will Rogers.

He is quite as stubborn as Lincoln in supporting the people he trusts through thick and thin.

But don't cross him, brother, don't cross him.

He is deeply ambitious, the skilled man, utterly sure of his own skill and taking no nonsense about it from the unskilled.

He has taken great burdens and he has borne them well.

Folks will tell you he is a good father, a loving husband, and a considerate friend.

He does not seek intimates, yet draws men to him.

He knows his own value without pomp or jealousy.

He listens and talks with every sort of man.

He is a man who can reason, but he is a fighter.

His brain is as big as his heart and his heart is as big as Dave Hall.

He is a big man—broad shoulders, big hands, strong arms, a deep, infectious laugh, and a smile as big as all getout.

"Life," he says, "it is good. I've always had a good time."

His pet hobbies are fishing, boating, and swimming.

He likes to fish best of all. And he doesn't sit on the dock to do his fishing, either. He's a trout fisherman and he fishes the mountain streams.

He learned to swim, and well, before osteomyelitis cut his spinal cord and paralyzed him from the waist down at 15.

"For long-distance swimming," he explains, "I swim on my back. Can't kick but use a modified crawl without the kick when I swim on my stomach."

Last fall he went on a bear hunt to Mount Mitchell.

"I didn't get a shot," he said, "but we brought back a bear."

He isn't one for sitting back and letting somebody else do the work. Not even on a hunting or fishing trip. He's right handy with a skillet and likes to cook for the whole party, whether it's two or a dozen.

He lives here on the old home place which his great-grandfather gave to his grandfather Coleman Hall nearly a hundred years ago.

It passed out of the Hall family back in the early forties. But Dave bought it in 1950 and restored it to its onetime elegance.

Here, among other things, he raises cattle. horned Herefords. And his pride and joy is a prize bull from the Milky Way Farms named Larry Domino, who's worth a fortune.

Dave was born May 16, 1918. He attended Sylva High School from 1931 to 1933 and intermittently through the spring of 1938 without graduating.

It was February 1931 that he got sick, contracting osteomyelitis at the age of 12. And this resulted in paraplegia at the age of 15. He spent 8 years in various hospitals and had approximately 200 surgical operations before he licked the disease, albeit he was doomed to a future in a wheelchair.

He got a certificate of law from the University of North Carolina Law School in 1947, and an L.L.B. degree in 1948.

And then he returned to his home in Sylva to practice law and become a dynamo in a wheelchair.

He didn't sit in his office and let people come to him. He didn't let somebody else handle his cases when they came to trial.

From the beginning, Dave Hall was as busy as a bee. Folks from all over sought him out, brought him more work than he could handle, albeit he burned the midnight oil, which he still does, and forced him to expand his firm until it now is the largest in the county.

No man in his home town or county has taken a more active part in civic, church, and political affairs.

He has been attorney for the town of Dillsboro since 1948, for the county of Jackson since 1952, and has been regional fund chairman of the American Red Cross of the counties west of Buncombe for the past 3 years.

He was attorney for the town of Sylva for 1948 and 1949; president of the Jackson County Young Democratic Club from 1952 to 1954, and vice chairman of the Jackson County Democratic executive committee from 1948 until 1954.

He served in the senate of the 1955 North Carolina General Assembly, occupying seat No. 46.

In 1952 he was appointed to the 20th Judicial District Committee, and is now senior party liaison officer and member of the executive committee of the North Carolina Young Democratic Clubs.

Presently he is a member of the North Carolina Water Resources Commission.

He has served on the board of the Sylva Methodist Church, as well as being a trustee, and chairman of the church's finance committee.

He started the Jackson County Savings & Loan Association, of which he is secretary, and was instrumental in organizing Jackson County Industries, Inc., serving as its president from the beginning in 1953.

He has served on the board of the Jackson County Chamber of Commerce, is still a member of the chamber's industrial commission, and is a member of the Sylva Rotary Club.

His great-great-grandfather was Capt. William Moore, American Revolution, first white settler west of the French Broad in Hominy Valley near Asheville, and patriarch of the Moore clan in western North Carolina.

His uncle is Dan K. Moore, former judge of the superior court and now an executive of Champion Paper & Fiber Co. in Canton.

Dave is married to the former Miss Sarah McCollum, of Bradenton, Fla., who was his nurse at Duke University Hospital. They have three young daughters, Anne, who is 9, Allison, who is 8, and Hannah McKee, who is 3.

His father was the late David M. Hall, a prominent merchant and landowner. His mother is Edith Moore Hall, assistant dean of women at Western Carolina College.

He has two sisters, Mrs. Joe Dowdle, of Franklin, and Miss Lela Moore Hall, superintendent of public welfare for Harnett County. His brother, Robert, is an executive with the Bank of Asheville.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen, Nov. 5, 1958]

SWIRL OF ACTIVITY AHEAD FOR HALL

Representative-elect David M. Hall steps into a swirl of activity following his victory Tuesday over Republican W. Harold Sams.

In the next few weeks, he will name an administrative assistant and begin selecting a staff to man his Washington and district offices.

His choice for No. 1 assistant will be a key to the selection of other staff members. He may choose his top aid from a list of names he carries—names submitted by political leaders from throughout the district. Hall's had such a list for some time.

Or, Hall may look beyond designated favorites. He says he will "want to look over the field carefully." Holding that he owes no commitments to anyone, he says he would like to see some more names: "I haven't got all the names I'd like to see."

Hall has made one exception to his no-commitments boast: he has promised some people in a small county west of Jackson that he would, if elected, give a staff job of some sort to someone from that county. The post wouldn't necessarily be in Washington.

Clay, Graham, Cherokee, and Swain Counties lie to the west of Hall's native Jackson. He received powerful backing at the grassroots level from all four in his successful bid for the Democratic nomination. So, after his checkup, Hall hopes to spend the rest of next week in the Florida sun.

He'll return to his Sylva law office the following week—about November 17—and get

down to the business of collecting a staff and packing up for the big trip to Washington where he'll take his seat in Congress 4 months shy of 41 years of age.

Beyond his 2-year term, if there's a question mark over the 1960 Democratic choice, it doesn't appear to be worrying Dave Hall.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen, Nov. 5, 1958]

DAVE HALL'S VICTORY OVER SAMS REALLY A POLITICAL ANTICLIMAX

David Hall's conquest of GOP contender W. Harold Sams at the polls Tuesday was a political anticlimax.

Despite considerable Republican campaign activity, most knowledgeable observers—and nearly everyone else—would have conceded the chances of a Sams' upset very slim.

Hall's real victory came last summer in the 12th District's seething Democratic cauldron.

He came out on top of all these boiling developments.

Representative George A. Shuford, winding up 6 years in Congress, was the favored candidate for the party's renomination.

But wealthy Waynesville industrialist Heinz W. Rollman, who had actually been campaigning a year in advance came out openly against Shuford and began a free-spending blitz on the nomination.

Three other candidates dropped in their hats. Hall wasn't among them and no one even thought of him as a candidate at the time.

Shuford, who had already had two operations for cataracts, entered an Asheville hospital the week of the May 31 primary. After 3 days, his admission became known, but few details could be established beyond that he had entered for minor surgery and a checkup.

In the primary vote, Shuford bested the field of our opponents, although Rollman rounded up nearly 19,000 votes. Then, as losers' tempers flared, it developed that Shuford's illness was more serious, had resulted in strokelike complications, including some paralysis. He transferred to Bethesda Naval Hospital for treatment. While back at home Rollman and others began charging the voters had been deceived—that they would have voted otherwise if Shuford's condition had been known.

Denials or explanations generally were brushed aside. The political squabble spilled into print and downstate press reports began building up a picture of alleged conspiracies of silence.

Shuford eventually decided against a general election campaign because of his health.

This tossed the nomination into the lap of the almost unknown district executive committee—two representatives from each of the area's 10 counties.

Rollman cried that the nomination was his by rights of runnerup. The strong Buncombe political organization booster City Manager J. Weldon Weir of Asheville, Henderson hopeful advanced a familiar name—Monroe Redden, Jr.—son of a former district Congressman.

Only the far western area hailed the name of Hall.

Into a hot upper story chamber of the Swain County courthouse the day of the decision, delegates from all over the district were packed for the executive committee's meeting. Speeches were public, but the selection was to be private.

Nevertheless, after the first 20 minutes, it became obivous that if the committee had any idea of fulfilling the wishes of the people who'd turned out, it could scarcely help selecting the man in the wheelchair on the front row—David McKee Hall, paralyzed but powerful.

Rollman's name was never nominated in committee. The other major contenders lost where they needed to win. Hall and his uncle, influential Superior Court Judge Dan K. Moore, who'd just resigned from the bench to go into private industry, had done their work well.

The little counties carried the day. And that was the day that David picked off both Goliath and the GOP with smooth pebbles.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen Nov. 5, 1958]

HALL KEEPS ONLY PROMISE: ONE MADE TO HIS DAUGHTERS

(By John Parris)

WEBSTER.—Dave Hall grinned. "Yep," he said, "They say I'm going to Congress."

This was his reaction as the voters of the 12th Congressional District gave him a resounding victory Tuesday over his Republican opponent, W. Harold Sams of Asheville.

Hall, 40-year-old lawyer and native of Jackson County, welcomed the news of his election at his farm home here in Webster.

As the returns made it evident that Hall had chalked up one of the largest majorities in a 12th District congressional race, his first act as newly elected Congressman was to carry out the only promise he had made during the campaign.

That promise was to his three small daughters.

He had kissed them goodnight at 8 p.m. with the promise he would wake them when he learned of the outcome of the election.

And at 10:25 p.m. he roused them gently. They came wide awake. Their eyes sparkled through the sleep from which they had awakened. But they knew as only a child's faith knows.

"Daddy," said Anne, who is 10, "You beat him. I know you did."

Dave Hall grinned and kissed her.

And then Allison, who is 8, and Hannah, who is 4, hugged their daddy and set up a happy screaming, jumping up and down in their beds.

It was a happy, homey scene.

Nightlong, Dave Hall had sat in his wheelchair near the telephone at his home, with his family about him, listening to the returns as they came in.

And nightlong, his telephone had rung constantly, bringing the voices of friends calling to tell him how he was running in the various counties. And when the results were in and it was assured that he was the next Congressman from the 12th District, David Hall made his first public statement as the newly elected Representative from the 12th District.

He said:

"This is a great, heartfelt moment in my life.

"It is with a feeling of great pride and a sense of sincere responsibility that I accept this, the most important office that you, the voters of the 12th Congressional District of North Carolina can bestow.

"I pledge that I will dedicate myself and my office to true representation of all the people of this great district.

"And I wish especially to express my appreciation to my devoted wife and family and to my friends who have made it possible for me to attain this high position.

"I assure each and every one of you that this acceptance is with the deepest humility. And I trust that I can in my work merit the confidence you have placed in me."

[From the Waynesville (N.C.) Mountaineer, Nov. 10, 1958]

CONGRESSMAN HALL SETS SEVERAL RECORDS

For the first time in 47 years, a North Carolina Congressman has been elected west of the French Broad River.

The election of David M. Hall, of Sylva, on Tuesday set up a number of records—first he gathered more votes by several thousands than many political observers had predicted; he became the first man west of Asheville to get elected to Congress, and he is one of the youngest men of the district to ever sit in Congress.

Hall's hometown newspaper, the Sylva Herald said editorially:

"People of Jackson County have good reareason to be proud of David Hall, who on Tuesday was elected to serve the 12th District in Congress. He is believed to be the first man west of Haywood County to be named Congressman. And it has been 49 years since a Congressman came from the area outside Buncombe and Henderson Counties. The last one west of the French Broad was the late W. T. Crawford of Waynesville, who served in 1911."

Even though there has been a drought in having a Congressman from 6 of the 10 counties in the district, when Hall takes office in January he will carry with him experience gained while a State senator. And we do not expect other legislators in Washington to be "pulling the wool over his eyes." Hall knows politicians. How they work. And he understands their legal language, which often is designed to gain public opinion but has tricky phrases.

A native of Jackson, the 40-year-old Congressman received a certificate of law from the University of North Carolina Law School in 1947 and was named Phi Delta Phi Student of the Year. He was the first special student to graduate from UNC Law School with an LL. B. degree.

By showing that he could overcome a physical disability, having been confined to a wheelchair since he was 15, Hall knows which rows are hard ones to hoe better than the average person.

Knowing the game and fighting young Sylva attorney, who succeeds Congressman George Shuford of Asheville, we know Hall has a wealth of knowledge that will fit him for the big job in Washington. In addition to being State senator, he has served as a member of the State Water Conservation Committee and in dozens of other fields of activity, politically and otherwise.

His new job carries great opportunities and still graver responsibilities. The citizens of Jackson are quite sure that "Bud" Hall, as he is known by his friends, will serve his county, his district, his State and his Nation with distinction. He goes to Washington with the best wishes of all the citizens of the district.

[From the Asheville, N.C. Citizen, Jan. 8, 1959]

PROUD DAUGHTERS LOOK ON AS REPRESENTATIVE HALL TAKES OFFICE

(By Margaret Kernodle)

WASHINGTON.—It took a former President, Harry S. Truman, to attract the attention of three little North Carolina girls away from their father, Representative David M. Hall, Democrat, of North Carolina, in the House Wednesday.

Anne, 10, Allison, 8, and Hannah, 4, kept their eyes on their father from the time he entered the House in his wheelchair until Truman appeared in the gallery. Hall was crippled by a disease in childhood.

"President Truman sat just two seats away from me," Allison exclaimed.

She was a little reluctant to tell her father how impressed she was with the former President, as if she didn't really mean to take away any glory from daddy when he took his oath of office as a Congressman.

Hannah and Allison admitted they waved proudly at their father, but Anne said she was a little too grown-up to do that, though

she admitted she watched him almost constantly as the opening session of the 86th Congress got under way.

Hannah fought off a virus infection to make the ceremony and sat on her mother's lap.

Hall returned to his suite in the Old House Office Building for a reception for his family and close friends who came to Washington for the ceremony.

Also very proud of him was his mother, stately gray-haired Mrs. Edith Moore Hall, stunning in a navy blue outfit, who presided at the coffee table.

Here also were his sisters, Mrs. C. N. Dowdle, of Franklin, N.C., and Miss Lela Moore Hall, of Lillington, N.C.; his brother, Robert Hall, of Asheville, and his uncle, Dan Moore, former North Carolina superior court judge, of Asheville.

Hall succeeds Representative George A. Shuford, Democrat, of North Carolina, who retired at the end of the 85th Congress.

The Halls have a house in nearby Arlington, and the older daughters have entered public school there, three blocks away. But the Halls arrived ahead of their furniture. To the delight of the Hall daughters, furniture in the new house has consisted so far of only mattresses, a sofa and an army cot.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen, Feb. 9, 1959]

REPRESENTATIVE HALL AND OUTER SPACE

When committee assignment time came in the House in Washington, Representative David M. Hall, of Sylva, got exactly the opposite of what he had requested.

He wanted to start off on solid ground, asked to be put on the Interior Committee.

Instead, he was assigned to outer space, the first permanent new committee of both Houses of Congress since 1892.

The 12th district Democrat, a congressional freshman, married 15 years, admits his contact with the moon is remote. But he is modest in saying that. A mountain man, he has lived closer to the moon and the stars than his lowland colleagues.

Mr. Hall has accepted his assignment as offering a challenging opportunity for service.

The importance of the work of the Space Committee is spelled out in some points made by Representative OVERTON BROOKS, Democrat, of Louisiana, chairman of the new committee. He told Congressional Quarterly:

"Missiles will begin to replace manned aircraft by 1963.

"The defense budget soon will be divided into two parts—one for brush-fire wars and the other for all-out atomic missile wars.

"Interservice competition over control of missile development will grow more intense. The program should be unified under one department.

"Ultimately the United Nations or some other international agency will have to spell out outer space law.

"The national security aspects of space vehicles should be stressed now. Development of satellites will benefit later from this."

Mr. Hall, as a member of the Space Committee, is thus in a position to engage in pioneering legislative work in connection with the space race with the Soviet Union. For instance, there will be many problems dealing with international aspects of space and space law.

"We have no time to lose," added Representative BROOKS. "There is no doubt the Russians are ahead of us in some particulars," notably the thrust of their engines in their missiles. "I will not be satisfied until we have closed the gap in the missile and space race."

All of this leads to the fact that Representative Hall does face a challenging field of work, one that is vital to the future of America. He may have wanted Interior, but he is now in a position to serve the Nation on a legislative frontier that has no boundary and is fraught with meaning to the American people and the entire human race.

[From Reach, a bimonthly publication of the North Carolina division of vocational rehabilitation, Raleigh, N.C., of January–February 1960]

DAVID HALL, THIS IS YOUR LIFE

"Handicap," as defined by Webster, means to put at a disadvantage or to hinder; but had you been present on January 3, 1959, when David McKee Hall, paraplegic, quietly rolled his wheelchair into the Nation's Capitol to take the oath of office as a Member of the 86th Congress, representing the 12th Congressional District of North Carolina, you might have said, "Hall has revised Webster." And indeed you would have been quite correct, because his journey to Washington had been made over a long and toilsome road strewn with boulders of pain and suffering, blocked at intervals by detours of long, lingering months in hospital beds—all of which would have made a person of less fortitude, determination, and driving ambition turn back and thus confirm Webster's definition that a handicap is truly a hindrance. But because of his relentless drive, his complete unwillingness to admit defeat, his all-consuming ambition, the journey had been accomplished. And in so doing, he had lent inspiration and encouragement to others—both handicapped and physically fit—to complete the task at hand, to achieve that goal out yonder and to do it without complaining.

At the age of 12, David was a round, pudgy, pink-cheeked lad who had more than the normal boy's interest in fishing, hunting, scouting, football, and the like. That is, until the day that osteomyelitis destroyed the participation, even though it could not lessen the interest which remains intact to this day some 28 years later. And thus began the years of suffering, of excruciating pain, and of long, long months in Piedmont Hospital, Atlanta—years which deprived him of a secondary education because of the some 200 surgical operations he was required to undergo, and the repeated close brushes with death. At the age of 15, the infection affected his spinal cord to the extent that he was permanently paralyzed from the waist down and thereafter confined to a wheelchair life.

Throughout the 28 years his family physicians and close friends were constantly amazed at the indomitable courage he manifested at all times, never discouraged if his plans and activities were brought to an end by another painful hospital experience but always ready to begin a new project or complete the old one when given brief respites at home.

Then, with the discovery of the sulfa antibiotics, his hospital stays became less frequent and so he determined to enter the University of North Carolina; and like all his plans and ambitions, he carried this to a successful, brilliant conclusion by his graduation in 1948, thus becoming the first special student to graduate from the law school with an LL.B. degree. Thereafter, he passed the State bar examination and opened a law office in Sylva where he has been practicing law since that time. During the time he was in college, he was not only studying law himself, but was helping blind students by reading to them.

His subsequent achievements and accomplishments came as no surprise to those who know him best, for at last they were convinced that when David Hall said, "I will," it meant that he would and could. Because of his attitude and demeanor concerning his handicap, one forgets that he cannot stand up tall and straight or that he is denied the simple art of walking into a room. He has never sought concessions or privileges because of physical limitations, rather he prefers to take his turn always with the physically normal.

Too much cannot be said for his mental approach to his handicap. Gov. Luther H. Hodges said at the recent Young Democratic Club convention in Asheville that David Hall had exhibited more courage than any man he had ever known. The distinguished Senator SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., in introducing him at the 12th Congressional District rally in Bryson City, likened his courage and achievements to those of the knight described in the poem "The Broken Sword."

More important than these encomiums is the widespread influence he has had on other handicapped people by his inspiring example and the tangible things he has done for their benefit. Perhaps one of his most noteworthy contributions was in 1946, at Manhattan Institute for the Crippled and Disabled in New York. (See Time magazine, Sept. 16, 1946.)

Through his understanding and sincere appreciation of the vocational rehabilitation program, he has encouraged many handicapped people, especially other paraplegics, to develop their limited abilities. Searching out those in need of help and working in close cooperation with the vocational rehabilitation counselor, he has frequently made his office available for conferences and interviews between these individuals and the counselor which resulted in their receiving training and/or other rehabilitation services through which they gained a new lease on life.

For many years David Hall has devoted considerable time and effort in working with the local Committee on Employing the Physically Handicapped; he was instrumental in getting a survey made by the employment service on the county's labor supply which later led to the location of a new industrial plant in the community, thereby creating additional job opportunities for the unemployed. He has helped many handicapped people to secure gainful employment and thus become useful citizens who experience the satisfaction that comes with finding one's place in life.

He has served his district well in the House of Representatives and has been accorded recognition unusual for a freshman Representative. He was honored by being appointed to the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, the first permanent standing committee to be created by the Congress since 1892. As a member of this committee, he participated in an 11,000-mile factfinding inspection tour of the major research and development centers of Western Europe's NATO countries.

He served in the senate of the 1955 North Carolina General Assembly, has been a member of numerous boards and commissions, is active in the Methodist Church, and in local civic organizations.

The mountains, streams, and waterfalls of western North Carolina are dear to his heart. He enjoys swimming, hunting, and fishing. He lives on a farm adjacent to the Tuckasseegee River, in the beautiful restored old home of his ancestors at Webster, N.C., with his lovely wife, Sarah McCullom Hall, and their three daughters, Anne, Allison, and Hannah, ages 12, 10, and 5 years. Their happy homelife has been well described in many feature stories which have appeared in the Asheville Citizen.

Since this article on David Hall was started, his doctors have told him that he has cancer.

And like all the other obstacles which have confronted him, he has accepted this with the same calm, courageous attitude—not one of resignation, but one of continued determination which finds him now as a patient in Memorial Hospital, Sloan-Kettering Institute, New York, from where he radiates hope and confidence of recovery from the favorable report of his doctors there.

David Hall looks to the future and a continuing career of service.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen, Jan. 30, 1960]

DAVID HALL, 41, DIES AFTER LONG ILLNESS

SYLVA.—Twelfth District Congressman David M. Hall, stricken by cancer last November, died here at 5:45 p.m. Friday in C. J. Harris Hospital.

The 41-year-old Congressman was a native of Sylva. He was elected to represent the 10-county congressional district in the November 1958 general election. He had been expected to seek reelection this year.

Victim of a crippling bone infection at the age of 12, Hall underwent surgery December 10 in a New York hospital for removal of a cancerous growth on his bladder. He died of complications of the operation, including a kidney blockage.

RETURNED JANUARY 12

Specialists who performed the operation reported to Hall afterward that the cancer had been completely eliminated. Hall was returned to the hospital here January 12 to continue convalescence.

A paraplegic who had been confined to a wheelchair since the age of 15, Hall was an attorney by profession but had devoted some attention to farming.

Hall styled himself a political conservative in Democratic ranks. Before election to Congress, he had served in the North Carolina Senate and later, as a member of the North Carolina Board of Water Commissioners.

PICKED BY COMMITTEE

The Democratic district executive committee on July 31, 1958, chose Hall to run in place of Representative George A. Shuford, of Asheville, who had withdrawn as the Democratic nominee for reasons of health.

Recognized as an active Jackson County civic and political leader. Hall won the district committee's nomination from a field of five aspirants. In the general election, Hall overwhelmed his Republican opponent, W. Harold Sams, an Asheville attorney.

Thus, for the first time in more than two generations, the 12th District's Democratic Representative was a man from west of the Balsams.

A month after his election, Hall announced the opening of a full-time district office in Waynesville, the first time a congressional office had been established west of Asheville.

The district office functioned as a clearing house for citizens with problems needing congressional attention. As a convenience to constituents, a representative of the office followed a schedule of regular appearances in many western North Carolina towns and cities.

Hall was sworn into the U.S. House of Representatives on January 7, 1959.

Less than 2 months later, on February 23, he underwent surgery in Bethesda naval hospital in Washington for drainage of his right kidney after proper natural expulsion had failed. Physicians announced the following month that a second kidney operation might become necessary.

This operation, for the removal of scar tissue resulting from the kidney surgery, was performed November 10 in St. Joseph's Hospital in Asheville.

Three days later, physicians who performed the operation announced the finding of a malignancy in miscroscopic studies of the scar tissue. Hall went to New York soon afterward to begin a series of X-ray treatments preparing him for the December 10 operation for removal of the cancerous growth.

As a Member of Congress, Hall asked for Interior when committee assignments came around. He got Outer Space.

Commenting on the assignment Hall stated: "Except for the contacts with the Interior Department in my district, I am very happy with it."

Hall became top-ranking freshman Democrat on the space committee, the first permanent new committee of both Houses since 1892.

During the month he was sworn in, the Sylva Representative was elected treasurer of the 86th Congressional Club. The club, chiefly social, was composed of 63 freshmen Democratic House Members elected to the 86th Congress.

Hall was a strong supporter of timber management and development plans. He frequently called attention to western North Carolina's vast timber resources.

In September 1959 Hall went to London for a series of conferences in connection with the International Astronomical Federation Conference.

Born May 16, 1918 at Sylva, Hall was the son of Mrs. Edith Moore Hall of Sylva and the late David McKee Hall.

Despite his physical disability, Hall received a certificate of law from the University of North Carolina Law School in 1947 and an LL.B. degree in June 1948. Admitted to the bar in August 1947, he began active practice in Sylva in the fall of 1948.

His record at the university was outstanding, both in academic and extracurricular activities. He headed a number of important campus organizations including Vance Inn of Phi Delta Phi. He was the first special student to graduate from the University of North Carolina Law School with an LL.B. degree since the school's establishment.

In the summer of 1947, he appeared before the Congress of Physical Medicine in New York and gave a demonstration of new mobility methods being taught paraplegics. Although he seldom used them, Hall had mastered the ability to walk on crutches.

Among organizations in which he participated or held office were the Jackson County Chamber of Commerce, the Jackson County Industrial Committee, and Jackson County Industries, the Sylva Rotary Club and Sylva Methodist Church, Jackson chapter of the American Red Cross, and Morehead Scholarship Committee of Jackson County. He served as county attorney for 2 years and was town attorney for Sylva from 1948 until 1951. He had also served as attorney for the town of Dillsboro.

Hall had been active in county and district Democratic circles for more than 20 years. He had served as president of the Jackson County Young Democratic Club and as a member and officer in the Jackson County Democratic Executive Committee.

He was a grandson of the late Superior Court Judge Frederick Moore, grandnephew of Superior Court Judge Walter E. Moore, and grandnephew of the late E. L. McKee, and State Senator Gertrude Dills McKee, his wife.

He was a nephew of Superior Court Judge Dan K. Moore, of Sylva, now associated with Champion Paper and Fibre Co.

Survivors include his widow, the former Miss Sarah McCollum, of Bradenton, Fla., to whom he was married in 1944, and three daughters: Sarah Anne, 10, Edith Allison, 9, and Hannah McKee, 4; a brother, Robert C. Hall, of Asheville, and two sisters: Miss Lela Moore Hall and Mrs. Margaret Hall Dowdle, both of Franklin.

Services will be at 3 p.m. Sunday in Sylva Methodist Church. The Rev. Asmond G. Maxwell, pastor, and the Rev. Robert G. Tuttle, of Asheville, district superintendent of the Asheville District Methodist Church, will be in charge. Burial will be in the family plot in Webster Cemetery.

Pallbearers will be Ernest Burch, Andrew Wilson, Joseph T. Wilson, Lacey Thornberg, Malcolm Brown, Fred D. Cooper, E. L. McKee, and W. D. McKee.

Before his death, Representative Hall requested that in lieu of flowers, donations be made toward establishment of a David McKee Hall Scholarship Fund at Western Carolina College.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Times, Jan. 31, 1960]

FUNERAL FOR HALL AT 3 P.M. TODAY

SYLVA.—Representative David M. Hall, the paraplegic freshman Congressman who died Friday of complications from cancer surgery, will be buried Sunday in the family plot at Webster.

Funeral services will be conducted at 3 p.m. in the Sylva Methodist Church by the Reverend Asmond G. Maxwell, pastor, and the Reverend Robert G. Tuttle, superintendent of the Asheville district of the Methodist Church.

The 41-year-old Hall had requested that in the event of his death flowers be omitted and expressions of sympathy be in the form of donations to a scholarship fund at Western Carolina College, where his mother is assistant dean of women.

Members of the North Carolina Congressional Delegation planned to come from Washington by train for the funeral. Representative GEORGE MILLER, Democrat, of California, was named to represent the House Space Committee, of which Hall was a member, at the services. Also accompanying the North Carolina delegation was Zeake W. Johnson Jr., House Sergeant at Arms.

(In respect to Hall, the House of Representatives has tentatively postponed its Monday program.)

A special primary and election will be necessary to fill the remainder of Hall's term, which expires next January. Roy A. Taylor, former State representative from Black Mountain, announced last week as a candidate for Hall's seat in the May Democratic primaries. Others being mentioned include State Senator William Medford of Waynesville and former Solicitor Thad Bryson, of Bryson City and Franklin, but neither has announced.

Hall won his congressional seat in 1958, after the Democratic nominee, Representative George A. Shuford of Asheville, withdrew because of ill health. Hall, the pick of the district Democratic committee, soundly defeated the Republican candidate, W. Harold Sams of Asheville.

He was sworn in last January, but 2 months later had to undergo surgery for drainage of his right kidney. During another operation, a month later, to remove scar tissue from the preceding surgery a malignant growth was discovered.

On December 10 the malignancy was removed in an operation at Sloan-Kettering Institute in New York. Hall returned home to recuperate, but his health began to decline and he entered the hospital here, where he died.

Surviving are the widow, the former Sarah McCollum of Bradenton, Fla., three young daughters; his mother, Mrs. Edith M. Hall, of Cullowhee; a brother, Robert C. Hall, of Asheville; and two sisters, Miss Lela Hall and Mrs. Margaret Hall Dowdle, both of Franklin.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen-Times, Jan. 31, 1960]

REPRESENTATIVE DAVID MCKEE HALL

Representative David McKee Hall's death has brought a deep sense of loss and of regret.

The freshman Congressman from the 12th North Carolina District died of complications following a cancer operation performed last December 10.

The gentleman from the valley of the Tuckasegee west of the Balsams was but 41 years of age.

In the prime of his maturity, death brought a close to what promised to be a distinguished career in the lower House of Congress. He was a member of the Space Committee.

He had intended to seek renomination in the May Democratic primary. He had many friends and wide support.

Illness was no new experience for Dave Hall. Crippled by a bone infection in his youth, he was a paraplegic. Since the age of 15 he had been confined to a wheelchair.

This physical handicap did not deter Mr. Hall from living a full and active life.

He was known for his faith and courage, his optimism in the face of adversity.

The quality of his mind and character led him to enter the field of public service. After studying at the University of North Carolina, where his record was outstanding, he practiced law in his native town of Sylva in Jackson County. He was not only proficient in his profession (he farmed also), but developed into a constructive civic leader.

For more than 20 years he was active in Democratic Party circles and he served in a number of official capacities, including membership in the State senate and on the North Carolina Board of Water Commissioners.

Representative Hall was a member of a prominent mountain family, many of whose members have won distinction in business, in the professions and in public life.

It is men like Dave Hall who have lasting contributions to the growth and development of this mountain region. He was deeply interested in serving the region and his fellow man and he did serve well and faithfully in all the posts to which he was called in civic and political life.

We have reason to remember Dave Hall, not the least by far being the record of courage which shone through his entire life. It becomes a legacy of his family and an inspiration to all who had the privilege of knowing him.

[From the Waynesville (N.C.) Mountaineer, Feb. 1, 1960]

LARGE CROWDS ATTEND LAST RITES OF REPRESENTATIVE D. M. HALL

A large number of Haywood County citizens were among the estimated 600 persons who attended funeral services for 12th District Congressman David M. Hall, Sunday afternoon in the Sylva Methodist Church.

The small church, with seats for only 200, was filled to capacity with many standing. An estimated 400 friends waited outside.

The service, conducted by the Reverend Asmond L. Maxwell, pastor, and the Reverend Robert G. Tuttle, superintendent of the Asheville district of the Methodist Church, was simple and impressive.

The active pallbearers were Ernest Burch, Andrew Wilson, Joseph T. Wilson, Lacey Thornberg, Malcolm Brown, Fred D. Cooper, E. L. McKee, and W. D. McKee.

A delegation of U.S. Congressmen and Senators included North Carolina's two Senators, SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., of Morganton, and B. EVERETT JORDAN, of Saxapaw, and HUGH Q. ALEXANDER, of Kannapolis, L. H. FOUNTAIN, of Tarboro, CHARLES R. JONAS, of Lincolnton, A. PAUL KITCHIN, of Wadesboro, ALTON LENNON, of Wilmington, RALPH J. SCOTT, of Danbury, and BASIL L. WHITENER, of Gastonia.

Representative GEORGE P. MILLER, Democrat, of California, attended as a representative of the House Space Committee of which Hall was a member. Zeake W. Johnson, Jr., House Sergeant at Arms, also was present.

Hall was buried in the family cemetery at Webster.

Representative Hall died Friday at 5:45 p.m. in the C. J. Harris Hospital in Sylva. A paraplegic, who had been confined to a wheelchair since the age of 15, he underwent surgery December 10 in a New York hospital for removal of a cancerous growth.

The 41-year-old Congressman was a native of Sylva. He was elected to represent the 10-county congressional district in November 1958.

He became top-ranking freshman Democrat on the Space Committee, the first permanent new committee of both Houses since 1892. He was a strong supporter of timber management and development plans. He frequently called attention to western North Carolina's vast timber resources.

In September 1959, Hall went to London for a series of conferences in connection with the International Astronomical Federation Conference.

Hall was the son of Mrs. Edith Moore Hall, of Sylva, and the late David McKee Hall. He was a grandson of the late Superior Court Judge Frederick Moore and a nephew of Superior Court Judge Dan K. Moore of Canton, now associated with Champion Paper & Fiber Co.

Despite his physical disability, he received a certificate of law from the University of North Carolina Law School in 1947 and the LL.B. degree in June 1948. He began his law practice in Sylva in the fall of 1948.

In the summer of 1947, Hall appeared before the Congress of Physical Medicine in New York and gave a demonstration of new mobility methods being taught paraplegics.

He participated and held office in the Jackson County Chamber of Commerce, the Jackson County Industrial Committee and Jackson County Industries, the Sylva Rotary Club, the Sylva Methodist Church, Jackson chapter of the American Red Cross, and the Morehead Scholarship Committee. He served as county attorney for 2 years and was town attorney for Sylva from 1948 until 1951. He had also served as attorney for the town of Dillsboro.

Active in county and district Democratic circles for 20 years, he had served as president of the Jackson County Young Democratic Club and as an officer in the Jackson County Democratic executive committee.

Surviving is his wife, the former Miss Sarah McCollum, of Bradenton, Fla.; three daughters, Sarah Anne, 10, Edith Allison, 9, and Hannah McKee, 4; a brother, Robert C. Hall, of Asheville; and two sisters, Miss Lela Moore Hall and Mrs. Margaret Hall Dowdle, both of Franklin.

[From the Waynesville (N.C.) Mountaineer, Feb. 1, 1960]

REPRESENTATIVE HALL WAS A MAN OF GREAT COURAGE

Representative David McKee Hall was a symbol of courage and determination.

Having suffered from a physical handicap for some 25 years, he never sought sympathy—never indulged in self-pity. He was, in turn, concerned over the welfare of others and made many valuable contributions to the civic, religious, business, and cultural life of his community and district.

An indication of his concern for his fellowman was one of his last requests—that a scholarship fund be established at Western Carolina College in lieu of floral offerings.

Representative Hall was an inspiration to people of all ages in all walks of life. He won out many, many times over great odds as he underwent numerous operations in an effort to regain his health.

He was a consistent fighter and never knew what it was to give up. The greater the odds, the harder he fought.

The adult life of Representative Hall was truly one of courage and determination—an inspiration to those who are prone to give up this side of success.

(From the Ashville (N.C.) Citizen, Feb. 1, 1960)

SIX HUNDRED FRIENDS AND NOTABLES ATTEND FUNERAL FOR HALL

SYLVA.—More than 600 persons attended funeral services here Sunday afternoon for Representative David M. Hall, 12th District Congressman who died Friday of complications from cancer surgery.

The small Sylva Methodist Church, with seats for only 200, was filled to capacity with many standing. An estimated 400 additional persons waited outside.

The service was simple and impressive. The Reverend Asmond L. Maxwell, pastor, described the 41-year-old Hall as a man with "indomitable courage known to all." Of Hall, the minister said:

"He had a strong will to live in a large world. He had drive, control, and discipline of his natural abilities. He had a desire to grow, to learn, to accomplish.

"He had faith in himself, boundless energy, unceasing hope, a sense of duty and mission although he knew he lived 'on borrowed time'."

Stricken by a crippling bone disease at the age of 12, Hall had lived most of his life in a wheelchair. During his life, he underwent more than 100 operations.

The last was performed December 10 in New York City for removal of a cancerous growth of the bladder. The Congressman's death resulted from complications of the operation, including a kidney stoppage.

Hall's casket was cloaked in white carnations. Organ music filled the church as the coffin was rolled to the front of the altar.

In addition to the minister, who was assisted by the Reverend Robert G. Tuttle of Asheville, superintendent of the Asheville district of the Methodist Church, the solemn procession into the church included the pallbearers, members of the family, and a delegation of U.S. Congressmen and Senators who came from Washington for Hall's last rites.

Included in the group were North Carolina's two Senators, SAM J. ERVIN of Morganton and B. EVERETT JORDAN of Saxapahaw and North Carolina Congressmen HUGH Q. ALEXANDER of Kannapolis, L. H. FOUNTAIN of Tarboro, CHARLES R. JONAS of Lincolnton, A. PAUL KITCHIN of Wadesboro, ALTON LENNON of Wilmington, RALPH J. SCOTT of Danbury, and BASIL L. WHITENER of Gastonia.

Representative GEORGE P. MILLER, Democrat, California, attended as a representative of the House Space Committee, of which Hall was a member. Zeake W. Johnson, Jr., House Sergeant at Arms, also was present.

Hall was buried in the family cemetery at Webster, a few miles south of Sylva. He was buried in the same plot with his father, David McKee Hall, who died in 1938.

The little cemetery is at the crest of a hill. Stretching for miles beyond the Cowee Mountains and at the foot of the hill the Tuckasegee River winds its way through the valley.

The cemetery is a short distance from the Hall homeplace, a stately home built by Hall's grandfather on the banks of the Tuckasegee.

At least 200 persons attended the burial services. The grave was thickly covered

with flowers even though Hall had requested that in the event of his death, flowers be omitted and expressions of sympathy be in the form of contributions to a scholarship fund at Western Carolina College.

Telegrams of sympathy were received by Hall's widow from dozens of congressional Members, other nationally known persons, and notables with whom Hall had been closely associated.

Governor Hodges wired: "Mrs. Hodges joins me in expressing to you our love and sympathy in your great loss."

Senator ERVIN's telegram read: "We sorrow with you and the other members of his family in Dave's passing. We have never known a more gallant person."

A telegram from Senator JORDAN stated: "Katherine and I deeply grieved to learn of the passing of our good friend Dave. He will be greatly missed by his host of friends throughout North Carolina and by his colleagues in the Congress. Dave will long be remembered for the great contribution he made to his community, State, and Nation and for his indomitable courage. Our deepest sympathy to you and the family."

Most of Hall's close 12th district friends were present for the funeral. Among them were Mrs. Edith P. Alley of Waynesville, who was in charge of his district office in Waynesville.

Hall's survivors include the widow, the former Sarah McCollum of Bradenton, Fla.; three small daughters; his mother, Mrs. Edith M. Hall of Cullowhee; a brother, Robert C. Hall of Asheville; and two sisters, Miss Lela Hall and Mrs. Margaret Hall Dowdle, both of Franklin.

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal, Feb. 1, 1960]

DAVID M. HALL

In late August 1958—hardly 3 weeks after the 12th District's Democratic executive committee had named him as the party's nominee for Congress—David M. Hall was in Washington more or less looking around. Asked by a Journal reporter if he was certain of victory in the November election, he grinned.

"It isn't a question of whether I'm coming (to Washington) or not," he said. "It's just a question of how long I'll stay."

As it turned out, the reply was more prophetic than it was intended. Mr. Hall died Friday afternoon—having filled only half the term to which he had indeed been elected that following November.

He was not in Congress long enough to build up much of a legislative record, to bring his name to public attention outside his own district and State, or even to shed fully the label of the freshman. But, while they had not come to know his public side, there are those in Congress—as there are many in other sections of his own State—who readily admired his personal courage. For Mr. Hall had entered Congress, as he had gone into most of the undertakings of his life, in a wheelchair. And his ambition, his obviously unflagging optimism, his desire for public service, in spite of his handicap, earned him highest regard.

On that count alone, Representative Hall achieved something which some men with the ability to walk and the opportunity to stay in Washington longer never have reached.

[From the Shelby (N.C.) Daily Star, Feb. 1, 1960]

THE MARK OF A MAN

One must review with a mixture of respect, awe, and admiration the life of David M. Hall.

The man spent most of his 41 years confined to a wheelchair, but he was never one to whimper.

He survived countless operations, endured unbelievable pain and fought back every time. He insisted upon being his own man.

His courage, determination, and public-spirited law career led to his election to Congress from North Carolina's 12th District in 1958.

It looked for awhile that David Hall would win the fight against his most recent assailant—cancer. But the ravages of the disease finally broke the resistance of a body that had previously fought and won over seemingly insurmountable odds.

When Hall was elected to Congress we wrote that here was an example for the youth of our land prone to whine about the adversities of their lives where material things are concerned.

Here was a man, even though confined to a wheelchair, who insisted upon standing upon his own two feet.

And we'll wager he never stood taller than he does now.

[From the Durham (N.C.) Morning Herald, Feb. 2, 1960]

HEROIC COURAGE

Representative David Hall's life was short—he was only 41 when he died Friday—but it will long be cited in North Carolina as an example of heroic courage.

From the age of 15 Dave Hall had been confined to a wheelchair, a paraplegic. But the handicap which chained his body did not curb his mind and his confidence. He earned a law degree at the University of North Carolina, returned home to practice, and earned the respect and confidence of his neighbors. They sent him to the State senate. Then, when Representative Shuford declined the Democratic nomination in the 12th District after the 1958 primary, Hall was the choice of the district Democratic committee for nominee.

Ill health had plagued him during the little more than a year he had served in Congress. He was much in hospitals. Finally came the dread diagnosis, cancer. Characteristically, Dave Hall joined battle with this most formidable of foes. The courage, the confidence, and the will which had carried him so far were his to the end. And in his passing, Dave Hall has left an example which shines among the many shining pages of the records of those who refused to let physical handicap keep them from the high destiny they believed was theirs.

[From a Morristown, Tenn., newspaper]

Perhaps the greatest endowment to any child is the will to do.

Far greater than an inheritance of wealth or brains is that indefinable something lit early in a young person's mind and heart that inspires him with a determination to make the most of the gifts with which God has endowed him.

In the majority of instances, such a person does not have a super-abundance of gray matter; but he has something much better, commonsense and a tiny power motor somewhere in his makeup that keeps saying, over and over, to him: "I think I can; I think I can; I think I can."

Whatever the limitations of opportunity, and sometimes these opportunities are so limited as to appear practically nil, such a boy or girl has the drive to pick up straws and to keep using those straws until they have erected a house of brick and stone.

Such are the lessons of success which have painted such marvelous panoramas in the business history of the United States.

Although now in this country those who are unwilling to work and who feel that Uncle Sam owes them a living are embarked upon a governmental program to force the workers to more than divide with the drones, around us all the time are patterns of success positively amazing.

Such a pattern is the life of Congressman David M. Hall, freshman Democratic Representative from the State of North Carolina, who last week died in Sylva, N.C., at the early age of 41 years.

Direct cause of death was attributed to cancer, that dread disease that seems to be constantly increasing as a menace, not only to the old but to the young as well.

David Hall had been an invalid all of his life. Most boys would have given up from the very first, would have folded their hands, carried along with a grimace on their faces, been depressed, miserable, a happiness deterrent to themselves and all those around them.

Although a paraplegic confined to a wheelchair for 30 of his 41 years, Mr. Hall succeeded in obtaining his degree in law from the University of North Carolina, entered into all sorts of business ventures, as well as practicing his profession, married and became the father of three lovely little girls.

Greatly interested in civic affairs, Mr. Hall was also interested in the welfare of his State and of the Nation. He had made a name for himself in Washington where he was regarded as an able and patriotic Representative.

Last rites for young Hall were held the past Sunday in a small Methodist mountain church in his home city where his death had followed recent surgery for removal of cancer.

Among the 500 persons attending the services was the entire North Carolina congressional delegation, as well as many other notables of Washington who came to pay final tribute to a man whom all considered marvelous.

Rev. A. S. Maxwell, in speaking of the deceased, said:

"Hall was richly blessed here," said the Rev. A. S. Maxwell. "His indomitable courage is known to all.

"He knew he lived on borrowed time," Maxwell told the group which overflowed the small red brick church.

He recalled the Representative's "strong will to live in a large world * * * his drive, control, and discipline of his natural abilities * * * his desire to grow, to learn, to achieve * * * his faith in himself * * * his boundless energy * * * his unceasing hope * * * his sense of duty, of mission through life * * *."

As Maxwell spoke of the young Representative's traits, his widow and three small girls sat in a front pew, weeping softly.

Behind them sat Senators SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., and B. EVERETT JORDAN; the 11 North Carolina House Members; Representative GEORGE P. MILLER, Democrat, of California, of the House Space Committee on which Hall served; and Zeake Johnson, Sergeant at Arms of the House.

The 41-year-old Hall had requested that in the event of his death, flowers be omitted and expressions of sympathy be in the form of donations to a scholarship fund at Western Carolina College, where his mother is assistant dean of women.

A special election will be necessary to fill the remainder of Hall's term, which expires next January. Roy A. Taylor, former State representative from Black Mountain, announced last week as a candidate for Hall's seat in the May Democratic primaries.

[From the Sylva (N.C.) Herald, Feb. 4, 1960]

SCHOLARSHIP FUNDS SHOULD BE MAILED TO WCC PRESIDENT

Before his death, Congressman David M. Hall requested that in lieu of flowers, donations be made toward establishment of a

David McKee Hall Scholarship Fund at Western Carolina College.

Some who desire to contribute to this scholarship fund have raised a question as to procedure. The procedure is as follows:

Mail contributions to the scholarship fund to the President, Western Carolina College, Cullowhee, N.C. Checks should be made payable to the David McKee Hall Scholarship Fund.

The president's office will acknowledge the gifts and will notify the family of those who contribute to the scholarship fund.

[From the Sylva (N.C.) Herald, Feb. 4, 1960]

DAVID M. HALL, 41, DIES; FUNERAL SERVICES ARE HELD IN SYLVA SUNDAY AFTERNOON—CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION AMONG 600 WHO ATTEND

Twelfth District Congressman David M. Hall, 41, of Sylva, stricken by cancer last November, died from complications of cancer surgery at 5:35 p.m., Friday, in C. J. Harris Community Hospital.

Funeral services were held at 3 p.m. Sunday at Sylva Methodist Church. The Reverend Asmond Maxwell, pastor, assisted by the Reverend Robert G. Tuttle, superintendent of the Asheville district of the Methodist Church, officiated. Burial was in the family cemetery at Webster.

Survivors include the widow, the former Sarah McCollum of Bradenton, Fla.; three daughters, Sarah Anne, 11, Edith Allison, 9, and Hannah McKee, 5; his mother, Mrs. Edith M. Hall, of Cullowhee; a brother, Robert C. Hall, of Asheville; and two sisters, Miss Lela Moore Hall, of Lillington, and Mrs. Margaret Hall Dowdle, of Franklin.

Pallbearers were Ernest Burch, Andrew Wilson, Joseph T. Wilson, Lacy Thornburg, Malcolm Brown, Fred D. Hooper, E. L. McKee, and W. D. McKee.

Victim of a crippling bone infection at the age of 12, Hall underwent surgery December 10 in a New York hospital for removal of a cancerous growth on his bladder. He died of complications of the operation, including a kidney blockage.

Specialists who performed the operation reported to Hall afterward that the cancer had been completely eliminated. Hall was returned to C. J. Harris Hospital January 12 to continue convalesence.

A paraplegic who had been confined to a wheelchair since the age of 15, Hall was an attorney by profession but had devoted some attention to farming.

On July 31, 1958, the 10-member Democratic district executive committee selected Hall over five other Democratic nominee aspirants for the post left open when Representative George A. Shuford, of Asheville, withdrew because of his health.

Hall won over his Republican opponent, W. Harold Sams, Asheville attorney, in the general election to become 12th District Congressman.

Hall's election marked the first time in 49 years that the 10-county area had had a Congressman outside Buncombe or Henderson Counties.

A month after his election, Hall announced the opening of a full-time district office in Waynesville, the first time a congressional office had been established west of Asheville.

Hall was sworn into the U.S. House of Representatives on January 7, 1959.

Less than 2 months later, on February 23, he underwent surgery in Bethesda Naval Hospital in Washington for drainage of his right kidney after proper natural expulsion had failed. Physicians announced the following month that a second kidney operation might become necessary.

This operation, for the removal of scar tissue resulting from the kidney surgery, was performed November 10 in St. Joseph's Hospital in Asheville.

Three days later, physicians who performed the operation announced the finding of malignancy in microscopic studies of the scar tissue. Hall went to New York soon afterward to begin a series of X-ray treatments preparing him for the December 10 operation for removal of the cancerous growth.

As a Member of the Congress, Hall became the top-ranking freshman member on the Outer Space Committee, the first permanent new committee of both Houses since 1892. In September, he went to London for a series of conferences in connection with the International Astronomical Federation Conference.

He received a certificate of law from the University of North Carolina Law School in June 1947 and an LL.B. degree in June 1948. He was admitted to the bar in August 1947.

Among organizations in which he participated or held office were the Jackson County Chamber of Commerce, the Jackson County Industrial Committee and Jackson County Industries, the Sylva Rotary Club and Sylva Methodist Church, Jackson County Chapter of the American Red Cross and Morehead Scholarship Committee of Jackson County. He served as county attorney for 2 years and was town attorney for Sylva from 1948 to 1951. He had also served as attorney for the town of Dillsboro.

Hall had been active in county and district Democratic circles for more than 20 years. He had served as president of the Jackson County Young Democratic Club and as a member and officer in the Jackson County Democratic executive committee.

Born May 16, 1918, at Sylva, Hall was the son of Mrs. Edith Moore Hall, of Sylva, and the late David McKee Hall.

He was a grandson of the late Superior Court Judge Fredrick Moore, grandnephew of Superior Court Judge Walter E. Moore, and the grandnephew of the late E. L. McKee and State Senator Gertrude Dills McKee, his wife.

Among the more than 600 persons attending the funeral services Sunday was a delegation of U.S. Congressmen and Senators who came from Washington.

Included in the group were North Carolina's two Senators, SAM J. ERVIN, of Morganton, and B. EVERETT JORDAN, of Saxapahaw, and Congressmen HUGH Q. ALEXANDER, of Kannapolis; L. H. FOUNTAIN, of Tarboro; CHARLES R. JONAS, of Lincolnton; A. PAUL KITCHIN, of Wadesboro; ALTON LENNON, of Wilmington; RALPH J. SCOTT, of Danbury; and BASIL L. WHITENER, of Gastonia.

Representative GEORGE P. MILLER, Democratic Congressman from California, attended as a representative of the House Space Committee. Zeake W. Johnson, Jr., House Sergeant at Arms, was also present.

Telegrams of sympathy were received by Hall's widow from dozens of congressional Members, other nationally known persons, and notables with whom Hall had been closely associated.

Moody Funeral Home was in charge of arrangements.

[From the Smoky Mountain Times, Bryson City, N.C., Feb. 4, 1960]

CONGRESSMAN HALL DIES; FUNERAL AT SYLVA SUNDAY

Representative David M. Hall, Democrat, of North Carolina, a paraplegic whose career carried him to Congress despite almost a lifetime of pain and suffering, was buried near Sylva Sunday.

Members of the U.S. Senate and House were among the mourners who crowded the small Sylva Methodist Church and thronged outside at services for the 41-year-old Hall, who suffered a bone disease at 12 and from 15 lived in a wheelchair.

"He had a strong will to live in a large world. He had drive, control, and discipline of his natural abilities. He had a desire to grow, to learn, to accomplish," said the Reverend Asmond L. Maxwell, the church pastor.

"He had faith in himself, boundless energy, unceasing hope, a sense of duty and mission, although he knew he lived on borrowed time."

Hall, a lawyer prominent in civic and Democratic Party affairs, was elected to Congress in 1958.

Those attending the funeral included North Carolina's two Democratic Senators, SAM J. ERVIN, of Morganton, and B. EVERETT JORDAN, of Saxapahaw, and seven of the State's Congressmen.

The House Space Committee, of which Hall was a member, was represented by Representative GEORGE P. MILLER, Democrat, of California. Zeake W. Johnson, Jr., Sergeant at Arms of the House, also attended.

The church was filled to its 200-person capacity and many stood in the sanctuary. An estimated 400 others stood outside.

Mr. Maxwell was assisted in the service by the Reverend Robert G. Tuttle of the Asheville district of the Methodist Church.

Congressman Hall was buried in the family cemetery at Webster, a few miles south of Sylva and a short distance from the Hall homeplace. At least 200 persons attended the graveside services.

Attending Hall's funeral, in addition to North Carolina's two Senators; Johnson and Representative Miller, were North Carolina Congressmen Hugh Q. Alexander of Kannapolis, L. H. Fountain of Tarboro, Charles R. Jonas of Lincolnton, A. Paul Kitchin of Wadesboro, Alton A. Lennon of Wilmington, Ralph J. Scott of Danbury, and Basil L. Whitener of Gastonia.

Telegrams of sympathy were received by Mrs. Hall from Governor Hodges, Members of Congress, and other notables with whom her husband had been associated.

[From the Smoky Mountain Times, Bryson City, N.C., Feb. 4, 1960]

DAVID M. HALL

David Hall proved that a person can become successful in spite of handicaps if he has the courage and if he has the will.

Crippled at the age of 12 and confined to a wheelchair since the age of 15, with determination and courage he forged himself a place as a leader in western North Carolina civic and political circles.

He had served in the North Carolina Senate and as a member of the North Carolina Board of Water Commissioners before being selected to serve in Congress by the Democratic executive committee in 1958.

This was the first time in more than two generations that a 12th District Democratic Representative from west of the Balsams was in Congress.

He became ill less than 2 months after being sworn in as a Member of the House of Representatives, thus never getting the opportunity to do all he wanted for his district. But in spite of his serious illness, he kept in touch with affairs of the 12th. His interest in the proposed Federal building in Bryson City is an example of his continuing work.

After his last major operation (he had 100 operations during his lifetime) he announced that he was coming home to recuperate and run for reelection.

This was typical of Dave Hall who never admitted defeat against physical handicaps which would have overwhelmed a man of smaller stature.

It was with deep regret and sense of loss that the 12th District and North Carolina learned of his death.

He has made a high mark in his life as a gentleman, family man and man of courage. We salute Dave Hall, every inch a man.

[From the Sylva (N.C.) Herald, Feb. 4, 1960]

DAVID HALL WAS A SYMBOL OF COURAGE AND DETERMINATION

Jackson County has reason to long remember and honor the life and courage of David McKee Hall, cut down so young in life, and who lived and achieved great success under trying physical handicap and suffering from his public school days, through his college training and professional career.

David Hall, confined to a wheelchair since his teenage days, packed more living, business, and public service into his 41 years than the majority of us achieve in a long lifetime.

Endowed with a keen mind and indomitable courage and a determination to achieve success in anything he undertook, David Hall achieved professional and political success and rendered outstanding service to his county, State, and Nation.

Following his graduation from the university law school and on being granted his license to practice he wasted no time in opening an office in his hometown and was soon recognized as an attorney of ability and gained a wide practice, particularly in the civil courts. He served as attorney for Jackson County, represented the 32d senatorial district in the State senate, where he sponsored much constructive legislation on the local, district and State level. When the new and very important water resources commission was established to study and report on the State's water use and resources, he was appointed as a member of that body by Governor Hodges. It was while serving in the senate that he proposed an income tax withholding law for North Carolina. He lived long enough to see that law passed and put into operation, although it was by a money-hunting legislature 2 years later.

The young attorney spent many hours working for industry, schools, roads, the new hospital and other things for the betterment of Jackson County. During all of this time few people, other than his immediate family, fully realized the tremendous handicap under which he labored, and at times, with much pain and physical discomfort.

The crowning success of his political career came with the nomination as Democratic candidate to Congress and the winning of the 12th congressional seat in the November election in 1958. The few months he was able to serve in Congress he exhibited the kind of leadership and wisdom that this Nation needs in its national representatives. Had his health and strength prevailed there is little doubt of his having made a remarkable record of service to his district and the Nation as U.S. Congressman.

Of the many editorials written about Representative Hall since his death, the predominating theme of most of them has been his "spirit of courage and determination." Quoting the Waynesville Mountaineer, "Representative Hall was an inspiration to people of all ages in all walks of life. He won out many, many times over great odds as he underwent numerous operations in an effort to regain his health. David Hall was a symbol of courage and determination."

Although his county, State, and the Nation have suffered a great loss it is his family who will feel his passing most keenly.

An indication of his concern for his fellow man was one of his last requests—that a scholarship fund be established at Western Carolina College in lieu of floral offerings.

[From the Sylva (N.C.) Herald, Feb. 4, 1960]

THE DAVID MCKEE HALL SCHOLARSHIP FUND

The many, many friends of the late David M. Hall, throughout North Carolina have an opportunity to honor his memory and at the same time aid many deserving young men and women of this mountain region in pursuing higher education at Western Carolina College.

One of the last requests made by Representative Hall was that in lieu of flowers at his funeral contributions be made to a scholarship fund at Western Carolina College to aid deserving young men and women in securing a higher education at this college. Having struggled through college himself, under great physical handicap, he realized the need for more scholarships at Western Carolina College. His friends have suggested that the scholarship fund be known as the David McKee Hall Scholarship.

Many people here in Sylva, Jackson County, and elsewhere have said that this is one of the finest opportunities to honor the late Congressman and are already sending in their contributions. Machinery for handling the fund has been set up at the college and checks may be drawn in the name of the fund and mailed directly to President Paul A. Reid at Cullowhee.

This can well be the source of funds for one of the largest scholarships at Western Carolina College as hundreds of friends of the young attorney and civic leader will wish to remember his life and service to his State in this way.

Our fast growing Western Carolina College does not have a wealthy alumni and therefore scholarships, memorial and otherwise, are not available for those who could qualify for them. The David McKee Hall Fund offers an opportunity for many people to join hands in providing for this much needed part of our college.

[From Highlands (N.C.) Highlander, Feb. 5, 1960]

CONGRESSMAN DAVID M. HALL

The untimely passing of Representative David M. Hall is mourned by everyone in this entire area. His death has brought a deep sense of loss to the 12th North Carolina District which he served as Congressman. He will be missed by everyone, and our hearts go out in sympathy to his family.

David Hall's life has been a shining example of courage comparable to the life of the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Assuredly no man ever came to the end of his life who had done more to rise above his infirmities in order to unselfishly serve his fellow man than these two men. In spite of the crippling disease since the age of 15, which confined David Hall to a wheelchair, and made him a paraplegic, this handicap did not deter him from acknowledging that it was what he could do for others, and nothing else, that satisfied him, and he fulfilled his destiny of having responsibility, and the burden of other people's business laid upon his shoulders.

His loving and spontaneous service to others will be long remembered. His courage and faith in spite of his adversities will bring hope and faith to many others in the same set of circumstances. His calm, gentle spirit will live on in the lives of everyone in the Nation who was privileged to know him personally, or know of him through his service to his country and his fellow man.

[From the Sylva (N.C.) Sylvan, Feb. 1960]

JACKSON COUNTY LOST ONE OF ITS ABLEST CITIZENS IN THE DEATH OF DAVID M. HALL

A grievous loss has been suffered by Jackson County, N.C., and the Nation in the recent passing of Congressman David M. Hall, one of the ablest and most highly respected citizens of our day.

Seldom has one in so short a time been able to build such a record of achievement. The disabilities which confined him to a wheelchair during most of his life seemed to instill within him that burning ambition and courage that recognized no limitation.

At a time when lesser men would have accepted their fate, David Hall undauntedly pursued his education and graduated with honors from the Law School of the University of North Carolina. He established practice in his home town of Sylva and demonstrated a legal talent that soon brought him clients beyond his ability to serve without assistance. He represented the Mead Corp. in many important legal matters. He was an honorary member of the Mead Foreman's Club and the November meeting honoring Raymond Sutton, which he attended, marked what was perhaps his last public appearance.

His list of official duties includes those of attorney for Jackson County, State senator, and a member of the State water resources commission. In 1958 he was elected Congressman of the 12th District in which honored position he was ably serving when overtaken by the illness from which he failed to recover.

Despite the demands upon his time by legal and official duties, he rendered a full measure of service in civic, church, social, and community activities. With it all he seemed never lacking in time for a congenial chat with his many friends.

His accomplishments in 41 short years is seldom matched in the threescore and ten allotted to many and truly proves that it is not how long one lives but how well.

[From the Waynesville (N.C.) Mountaineer, Apr. 18, 1960]

AWARD MADE TO LATE REPRESENTATIVE HALL

"I know in my heart that David is as proud of the award as I am."

With these words, the saddened wife of the late Congressman David M. Hall, of Sylva, accepted a posthumous award Friday given to her husband for being chosen the outstanding handicapped North Carolinian for 1959.

"He was one of the most courageous men I have ever known," Governor Hodges declared in presenting the award. "I can't think of a finer tribute than for the State * * * to give this award to Mrs. Hall and her children."

Mrs. Hall's three daughters—Hannah, 5, Allison, 9, and Anne, 11—watched the presentation in the Governor's conference room.

Hall, confined to a wheelchair for many years, died January 29 of cancer. He was stricken by osteomyelitis during his childhood. At the age of 15, the infection affected his spinal cord, paralyzing him from the waist down. He underwent scores of surgical operations.

Despite his handicap, Hall became the first special student to be graduated from the University of North Carolina Law School with an LL.B. degree. He practiced law for some time in Sylva.

A district committee nominated the late Mr. Hall for the award. Serving on the district committee were Miss Debrayda Fisher, and Mrs. Edith P. Alley.

The following was published in a booklet, "Reach," about Mr. Hall:

"Handicap," as defined by Webster, means to put at a disadvantage or to hinder, but had you been present on January 3, 1959, when David McKee Hall, paraplegic, quietly rolled his wheelchair into the Nation's Capitol to take the oath of office as a Member of the 86th Congress, representing the 12th Congressional District of North Carolina, you might have said "Hall has revised Webster." And indeed you would have been quite correct, because his journey to Washington had been made over a long and toilsome road strewn with boulders of pain and suffering, blocked at intervals by detours of long, lingering months in hospital beds—all of which would have made a person of less fortitude, determination, and driving ambition turn back and thus confirm Webster's definition

that a handicap is truly a hindrance. But because of his relentless drive, his complete unwillingness to admit defeat, his all-consuming ambition, the journey had been accomplished. And in so doing, he had lent inspiration and encouragement to others, both handicapped and physically fit, to complete the task at hand, to achieve that goal out yonder, and to do it without complaining.

At the age of 12, David was a round, pudgy, pink-cheeked lad who had more than the normal boy's interest in fishing, hunting, scouting, football and the like. That is, until the day that osteomyelitis destroyed the participation, even though it could not lessen the interest which remained intact for some 28 years later. And thus began the years of suffering, of excruciating pain and of long, long months in Piedmont Hospital, Atlanta—years which deprived him of a secondary education because of the some 200 surgical operations he was required to undergo and the repeated close brushes with death. At the age of 15, the infection affected his spinal cord to the extent that he was permanently paralyzed from the waist down and thereafter confined to a wheelchair life.

Throughout the 28 years his family, physicians, and close friends were constantly amazed at the indomitable courage he manifested at all times, never discouraged if his plans and activities were brought to an end by another painful hospital experience, but always ready to begin a new project or complete the old one when given brief respites at home.

Then, with the discovery of the sulfa antibiotics, his hospital stays became less frequent, and so he determined to enter the University of North Carolina and like all his plans and ambitions, he carried this to a successful, brilliant conclusion by his graduation in 1948, thus becoming the first special student to graduate from the law school with an LL.B. degree. Thereafter, he passed the State bar examination and opened a law office in Sylva where he practiced law since that time. During the time he was in college, he was not only studying law himself, but was helping blind students by reading to them.

His subsequent achievements and accomplishments came as no surprise to those who knew him best, for at last they were convinced that when David Hall said, "I will," it meant that he would and could. Because of his attitude and demeanor concerning his handicap, one forgets that he cannot stand up tall and straight or that he is denied the simple art of walking into a room. He has never sought concessions or privileges, because of physical limitations; rather, he preferred to take his turn always with the physically normal.

Too much cannot be said for his mental approach to his handicap. Gov. Luther H. Hodges said at the recent Young Democratic Club convention in Asheville that David Hall had exhibited more courage than any man he had ever known. The distinguished Senator SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., in introducing him at the 12th Congressional District rally in Bryson City, likened his courage and achievements to those of the knight described in the poem "The Broken Sword."

More important than these encomiums is the widespread influence he has had on other handicapped people by his inspiring example and the tangible things he had done for their benefit. Perhaps one of his most noteworthy contributions was in 1946, at Manhattan Institute for the Crippled and Disabled in New York.

Through his understanding and sincere appreciation of the vocational rehabilitation program, he has encouraged many handicapped people, especially other paraplegics, to develop their limited abilities. Searching out those in need of help and working in close cooperation with the vocational rehabilitation counselor, he has frequently made his office available for conferences and interviews between these individuals and counselors which resulted in their receiving training and/or other rehabilitation services through which they gained a new lease on life.

For many years David Hall devoted considerable time and effort in working with the local committee on employ the physically handicapped; he was instrumental in getting a survey made by the employment service on the county's labor supply which later led to the location of a new industrial plant in the community, thereby creating additional job opportunities for the unemployed. He has helped many handicapped people to secure gainful employment and thus become useful citizens who experience the satisfaction that comes with finding one's place in life.

He has served his district well in the House of Representatives and has been accorded recognition unusual for a freshman representative. He was honored by being appointed to the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, the first permanent standing committee to be created by the Congress since 1892. As a member of this committee, he participated in an 11,000-mile fact-finding inspection tour of the major research and development centers of Western Europe's NATO countries.

He served in the Senate of the 1955 North Carolina General Assembly, has been a member of numerous boards and commissions, was active in the Methodist Church, and in local civic organizations.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen, Apr. 18, 1960]

IN MEMORY

The late Representative David M. Hall of Sylva lived in memory in Raleigh last Friday when he was honored as the outstanding handicapped North Carolinian for 1959.

The posthumous award, presented by Governor Hodges, was accepted by the widow, who expressed her pride in the honor and in the memory of her husband.

Representative Hall, who died last January 29 of cancer, had been confined largely to a wheelchair since he was a youngster.

His affliction did not bar him from a university education, his law license, and a successful career in professional, civic, and public life.

To those who knew him, his life and courage were inspiring.

EXTENSION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in 1958 the National Defense Education Act established a program of federally financed loans to enable prospective college students to get their education now and repay the loans on exceedingly easy terms at a later date.

This act has made a good beginning toward strengthening our system of higher education, but the full amount authorized by Congress for the student loans has never been made available and as we study the operation of this act, we see ways to enlarge its scope and improve its effectiveness.

I have joined with others in cosponsoring a bill introduced by the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], S. 3481, which would make the student loans under the act available to teachers attending summer sessions. Repayment would not be due for several years and half of the loan is forgiven to those in the teaching profession. I feel that this amendment would be widely utilized and that it would be extremely helpful to teachers in financing courses pursued for higher degrees and refresher courses that would improve their earning power and their professional competence.

There is growing national awareness of the injustice to our teachers and the danger to our educational system posed by our failure to pay teachers adequate salaries. I have supported legislation to increase those salaries through Federal aid, but we can help our teachers and our educational system in other, smaller ways. This amendment would help thousands of teachers carrying heavy financial burdens by making it possible for them to advance in their profession through attending summer sessions. And the whole country would be the beneficiary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

FISHTRAPS IN ALASKA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alaska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, one of the most flagrant cases of attempted Federal executive usurpation is inherent in the action of the Secretary of the Interior in attempting to establish fishtraps in several Alaskan communities. If successful, it will constitute a wholly unwarranted and unjustified interference in the affairs of the recently admitted State of Alaska. If successful, it will be a nullification of the rights of the 49th State. If successful, it will be an overruling by a Federal executive agency of the repeatedly declared wishes of the people of Alaska.

The issue strikes at the very heart of Alaskan sovereignty. Ever since the passage of the Organic Act of 1912, which unjustly denied the people of Alaska the right to manage their own fisheries, the people of Alaska have pleaded for the right to manage and control that vast resource. An essential part of that plea was for the abolition of fishtraps. The fishtrap is a costly device which takes large quantities of fish economically as they are on their way to spawning beds, but also takes them destructively.

For 47 years, from 1912 until the passage of the Alaskan Statehood Act, the people of Alaska sought through ever-repeated memorials of the Alaska Territorial Legislature, and through the introduction of bills in every session of Congress by Alaska's voteless delegates, to secure the abolition of fishtraps.

But the Interior Department's opposition, combined with that of the absentee canned salmon interests, proved to be too strong. They were never abolished until statehood was at hand.

In the meantime, because of the fishtraps, this once greatest national fishery resource, and Alaska's greatest resource—the Pacific salmon—was tragically depleted. Year after year the catch became smaller. From a pack of over 8 million cases in 1936, it dropped to 1,600,000 cases last year.

In 1959, the last year of Federal control, the pack reached the lowest point in 60 years. A tragically wrecked, depleted resource was turned over to the infant State.

There was hope, however, that with statehood, with the people of Alaska at long last assuming control of its fishery, by their abolition of the fishtraps provided both by the Alaska constitution and action by the State legislature, by the application of and by the action of effective conservation measures, by the patience and restraint of the Alaska fishermen this once great, and now almost vanished fish resource might eventually be restored. That is the objective of the people of Alaska.

But, alas, Alaskans did not reckon with the self-perpetuating determination of the Federal bureaucracy.

Secretary Seaton insists that he can and will authorize fishtraps in Indian communities. Those communities have themselves gone on record in a statewide referendum by overwhelming majorities against fishtraps.

Now, the tragic aspects of Secretary Seaton's intrusion into the affairs of Alaska is that racial friction and antagonism will be aroused in a State where it has been virtually nonexistent.

Secretary Seaton claims the right to order the erection and operation of fishtraps in certain Indian villages. The situation he will create, if he succeeds, is that fishing villages inhabited by whites will be denied the right to fishtraps in conformity with their own oft reiterated wishes, in conformity with the expressions of all the Alaskan people, by the legislature, and by the Territorial Delegates of Alaska for nearly half a century, but that Indian communities and Indian villages only, which always in the past have voted against fishtraps, will by action of the Secretary of the Interior henceforth operate them.

Only last summer the Alaska Native Brotherhood representing the Indian communities of southeastern Alaska where Secretary Seaton is determined to install fishtraps, adopted a resolution at its annual convention condemning the restoration of fishtraps. Racial antagonism and racial friction, previously nonexistent, are almost certain to follow if Secretary Seaton has his way.

Mr. President, years ago there was a certain amount of prejudice and discrimination in a few places in Alaska against the so-called native people, as the Indians and Eskimos are called there. It did exist in occasional instances, but vanished completely a decade and a half ago after the 1945 Territorial legislature passed an antidiscrimination act, penalizing any discrimination on the basis of race, creed, or color. That action responded to a wide sentiment. Since then there has been only harmony and friendship between the aboriginal races and the later white comers. Natives thereafter began to be elected to our Territorial legislature. They served well. They helped make our laws. They served on executive boards.

In the first State legislature a year ago the contest for the presidency of the senate lay between an Indian, who had formerly served as president of the Territorial senate, and an Eskimo, who had served for years in the legislature. Both were admirably qualified. The Eskimo was elected on a basis of longer service in the legislature. He acquitted himself of this responsibility admirably in the first two sessions of the first legislature to date, the second of which has just been concluded.

Mr. President, the action of the Secretary of Interior will tend to destroy this admirable relationship between the races in Alaska. It will establish by Federal action racial discrimination. It will also tend to nullify the desire and hope of the people of Alaska to restore their fishery.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that earlier in this session, on April 19, my distinguished and able colleague [Mr. BARTLETT] discussed this subject for six pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I supplemented what he had to say on April 29. These statements constitute a complete summary of the tragic and wholly unwarranted and unjustifiable action which the Department of the Interior proposed to take. I hope it will not succeed.

I now ask unanimous consent that there be included at the conclusion of my remarks an article entitled "Fishtrap Battle," written by Jerry Bowkett, and published in the Anchorage Times, which gives a résumé of the situation to date.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISHTRAP BATTLE

(By Jerry Bowkett)

Next week the State of Alaska is going to argue before the U.S. Supreme Court that it is entitled to full control of its fisheries and that Interior Secretary Seaton has no right to continue to meddle in such affairs.

And Interior Department attorneys are going to declare before the High Court that Seaton can do anything he wants to do when it comes to Indian fishing rights in Alaska.

Seaton will be hard pressed for sustaining arguments. The constitution of Alaska, approved by Congress, declares that no fishtraps shall be allowed in the State and no special group shall enjoy exclusive privilege in the fishery.

And the Statehood Act itself states that Alaska will gain control of its fisheries after the Interior Secretary has certified it has made adequate provision for the administration, management, and conservation of the resources. Seaton made such certification last year and the State theoretically gained full control of the fisheries last January 1.

Seaton declared he is obligated to protect Alaska natives—under authority of the Bureau of Indian Affairs—when he issued certain fishing regulations last month which, among other things, could perpetuate 11 southeast Alaska fishtraps and closed the Karluk fishery off Kodiak Island to many Kodiak fishermen.

Senator E. L. BARTLETT protested the new Federal fishing rules on the floor of the Senate. And Gov. William Egan and the Alaska Board of Fish and Game added their voices to his protest.

It was not too long ago that the battle for statehood came to an end, and Alaskans can still come up with strong arguments why they should manage their own resources and the Interior Department should be sent packing.

The fish and game board in a letter to Seaton said his new fishing regulations "will make a giant stride in introducing flagrant segregation in a presently well-integrated State. Not only do the regulations set off Indians differently from whites, but they even separate villages of natives."

The board expressed fear it would not be able to manage the fishery properly. The board said:

"The native of Alaska probably composes about one-half of the total resident fishing effort. In order to effectively manage any fishery, only one agency can have the responsibility. This and the other proposed regulations will have the effect of maintaining two fisheries in Alaska, one for natives and one for other groups * * *. All that can result is complete chaos."

Some 400 to 500 fishermen each year fish at Karluk, the board pointed out to Seaton. There are only about 25 Karluk villagers who use the fishery.

Seaton declared in his new regulation that only natives of the village of Karluk may use the fishery this year.

Seaton is getting little support from the natives themselves in his attempt to extend Federal authority over Alaska fishing. The Alaska Native Brotherhood, meeting at Yakutat last November, passed a resolution calling for the abolition of all fishtraps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2131) to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, as amended.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

NOMINATION OF ARTHUR V. WATKINS TO BE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF THE INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a nomination and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Arthur V. Watkins to be Chief Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Arthur V. Watkins to be Chief Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I can think of no more gracious or fitting tribute which the Senate could pay to one of its former Members than to accept a nomination of that Member to an office in the administrative branch of the Government, offer it, and approve it on the floor, without referring it to committee. This is a mark of respect, of appreciation, and of confidence. I am certain that our former colleague, Senator Watkins, deserves that respect. I am sure he will very effectively carry out the responsibilities of the new office to which he has been appointed and his nomination has been confirmed.

For some time, former Senator Watkins has been serving as a member of the Indian Claims Commission. By the President's nomination, and the confirmation by the Senate of the nomination, he now becomes the Chief Commissioner of that Commission.

Before he came to Congress, Senator Watkins presided with honor and success as a judge in my State of Utah. His work as the chairman of the special subcommittee committee which considered the censure of Senator McCarthy demonstrated to the Senate his judicial ability and temperament.

During his service in the Senate as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and of its Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, Senator Watkins demonstrated his interest in and his basic fitness for the kind of assignment which he now holds, a position which involves him deeply in the problems of the American Indians and their claims against the Government. So I am very happy that the Senate, under the leadership of our distinguished acting majority leader, took a short cut and honored my colleague in this rather unusual way.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, our former colleague, Arthur V. Watkins, has performed an invaluable service to the country in his membership on the Commission, and I feel sure that in his new responsibilities that type of service will continue in the future. I congratulate the President on his nomination.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I should like to join in the remarks the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] have made on the nomination of former Senator Arthur Watkins. He served with great distinction and devotion in this body. I think this is an excellent appointment, and I think he will be a most useful public servant in a field in which he is well acquainted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] in what they had to say about our former colleague, Arthur Watkins. He was a truly great Senator, who made many contributions to the welfare and betterment of this country and also of the Senate. Our confidence in him and our appreciation and affection for him are indicated by the fact that his nomination was not referred to a committee, but was considered immediately, by the Senate and confirmed unanimously.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

AMENDMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2131) to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, as amended.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

REDUCTION OF FIGHTER PLANE STRENGTH IN ALASKA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to serve notice that tomorrow, if we can obtain the time, my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT] and I will address ourselves to the utterly amazing reduction, by nearly 50 percent, of the Air Force fighter strength in Alaska.

The Air Force has informed us that its purpose is to abolish the entire fighter squadron of 25 F–89 planes at Ladd Field, the northernmost air base under the American flag, and the U.S. air base nearest Russia. It is an almost unbelievable piece of folly; and we shall attempt to secure its reversal in the interest of the national security. To cut almost in half our fighter strength in that area would be sheer idiocy; and we intend to explore the matter fully.

In that connection, let me say that I am delighted to see in the Chair at this time my colleague from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]; and I am also very happy to see on the floor at this moment the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who is fully aware of the importance of maintaining the strength of our Air Force. I am likewise very happy to see in the Chamber at this time the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who has conscientiously devoted himself to the maintenance of our strength in the interest of our security and is fully aware of the strategic importance of Alaska to national defense.

I now give notice that we intend to do our utmost to have this very much mistaken order reversed.

THE EISENHOWER-NIXON DOUBLE STANDARD OF AREA REDEVELOPMENT FOR THE PEOPLE OF EUROPE, ASIA, AFRICA, AND SOUTH AMERICA BUT NOT FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last Friday the President returned to the Congress, without his approval, S. 722, the area redevelopment bill.

Thus, the Eisenhower-Nixon administration, by veto—or threat of veto—marches on.

Thus, the Eisenhower-Nixon "double standard"—everything for the people of foreign countries, little or nothing for our own people—is once more, for the *n*th time, reaffirmed.

Shortly after the receipt of the President's 161st veto message last Friday, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] presented on the floor of the Senate a masterful analysis of the President's reasons for vetoing S. 722. Of this message, Senator DOUGLAS said:

> This message betrays ignorance, it is unctuous and hypocritical, and it is greatly mistaken in its attitude toward what is happening in this country.

Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the analysis made by the able senior Senator from Illinois in his characterization of the President's message.

Senator DOUGLAS was joined in his analysis of the President's actions by the able and distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], with whose remarks I also wish to associate myself.

I also wish to thank the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for referring to my 5 pounds and 7 ounces book setting forth some—only some—of the many, many projects under the mutual security program. Our efforts are not yet con-

cluded, so I cannot at this time say with certainty how many volumes will ultimately be filled or how many pounds those volumes will weigh.

But this much I can say at this point: Contained in this one volume are example after example of items for which Federal dollars have been spent for projects of exactly the same type as those which this administration bitterly opposes at home.

The President's veto of the area redevelopment bill is, for me, just one more example of the double standard, doubletalking, and doubledealing of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration.

We have seen many similar actions in the past.

Mr. President, I think that relieving want and unemployment and economic distress, wherever they may be found in the United States, should not be made a political football. But that is exactly what the President is making of the problem of relieving those areas—some 40 major areas and 103 minor areas—which are suffering from economic dislocation. That was the purpose of S. 722, the area redevelopment bill vetoed by President Eisenhower.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Friday, May 13, 1960, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] detailed on pages 10303–10304 the incontrovertible proof that the Republican Party is only paying lipservice to the problem of relieving the economic distress of the 143 areas in the United States which, as of May of this year, needed help.

The Senator from Illinois recounted very well the long and rocky road followed by this legislation. Today, I shall not take the time of the Senate to recount in detail the proof offered by my colleague from Illinois of continued Republican opposition to the area-redevelopment legislation. It is written clearly in the votes in both Houses of the Congress.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Alaska yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator recall that about a year ago, when I offered an amendment—and the Senator from Alaska voted for it—to increase welfare payments, not 10 Republican Senators voted for adoption of the amendment, although the amendment was adopted because the overwhelming majority of the Democratic Senators voted for it.

Now, in an election year, the Republicans say they think they are in favor of some improvement of social security which is pretty much in line with the type of assistance and the type of philosophy for which many of us voted. The difficulty which some of us experience, however, is that we are accused of favoring the enactment of such measures in election years. However, the fact is that we vote for them year in and year out; but it seems that some of the Republicans want to vote for them only in election years, when they can explain to the chambers of commerce that that was necessary in order to be reelected, although they did not really believe in it.

Mr. GRUENING. And, Mr. President, it was interesting to note, the other day, that Senators on the other side of the aisle made fine speeches in favor of area redevelopment; but the next day, following the breakfast at the White House, the same Senators voted to recommit the bill. Perhaps such reversal is not difficult to understand.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They were in favor of it, except when the time for decision came.

Mr. GRUENING. That is correct.

An area redevelopment bill was originally introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] 5 years ago—in 1955. It passed the Senate; but the Republican leaders in the House refused to give unanimous consent for its consideration by that body, so it died.

In 1957 the able and distinguished senior Senator from Illinois introduced another bill for area redevelopment. Only 15 Republicans voted for it when it passed the Senate. Over the opposition of the Republican leaders in the House, the bill was passed and sent to the President, only to be met by the customary veto.

In 1959 a similar bill passed the Senate, with only four Republican Senators voting for it. For approximately a year it was held up in the House by the Rules Committee. I shall not dwell at this time on the composition of the Rules Committee in the House or how the combination of votes there makes delay possible. Finally it passed the House on Calendar Wednesday, again in the face of stiff Republican opposition.

And now, for a second time, the President has vetoed the area redevelopment bill.

Twice before, area redevelopment has been defeated by the administration. It simply does not want a program for our own American depressed areas.

But my purpose today, Mr. President, is to consider one particular facet of the President's message and to show the extent of the double standard of this administration.

In his veto message, the President said:

> Under S. 722, however, financing of industrial development projects by the Federal Government—limited to 35 percent under the administration's proposal—could go as high as 65 percent, local community participation could be as low as 5 percent.
>
> S. 722 would authorize Federal loans for the acquisition of machinery and equipment to manufacturers locating in eligible areas. Loans for machinery and equipment are unnecessary, unwise, and costly.

The Eisenhower-Nixon administration, therefore, Mr. President, seems to be saying that in making grants for industrial development, the localities should put up at least 65 percent of the total, and that loans for machinery and equipment are in all events "unnecessary, unwise, and costly."

Does the Eisenhower-Nixon administration apply the same high-sounding standards to its foreign-aid program, for which we were asked, this year—under threat of a special session if we do not comply—to authorize the appropriation of over $4 billion, and that $4 billion only a part of the foreign-aid request?

No, Mr. President, what is sauce for the goose is not sauce for the gander under this administration.

There is not even the semblance of equal treatment.

The sky is the limit on our foreign-aid standards. Things which the Eisenhower-Nixon administration calls unnecessary, unwise, and costly when Federal dollars are to be spent on them at home, are deemed urgent, essential, and for an unassailable purpose when the Federal dollars are to be used for the same types of things abroad.

Consider the loans made by the Development Loan Fund.

I ask that there be printed at this point in my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list furnished me by the Development Loan Fund, at my request, showing the cumulative status of loans and commitments.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Amount (thousands)	
I. Total loan and guarantee agreements signed Apr. 13, 1960 (from attached report)		$872,806
II. Other loans approved, not yet signed:		
Letters of advice issued:		
Borrowers and project:		
Government of Yugoslavia, diesel locomotives (2d stage)	$14,800	
Government of India, Chandrapura electric power	30,000	
Government of India, Sharavathi hydroelectric power	8,400	
Industrial Finance Corp. of India, industrial finance corporation	10,000	
Tec Pan Industrial Corp. (Korea), Tec Pan	1,100	
Peru Savings & Loan Association, savings and loan association	1,000	
Societe National des Chemins de Fer Tunisiens (Tunisia), National railways	+350	
Taiwan Telecommunications Administration, telecommunications	2,000	
Liberia: Bank of Monrovia, Bank of Monrovia	250	
Government of Vietnam, Saigon-Cholon water distribution	19,500	
N. V. Indonesia Service Co., N. V. Indonesian service	2,600	
Central Sucriere Nord-Haiti, SA, sugar mill	3,000	
Government of Peru, Aguaytia-Pucallpa Highway	3,500	
Industrial Development Bank of Israel, development bank	5,000	
Government of Paraguay, telecommunications	1,000	
Vinylex Plastics, Ltd., plastics, carbide plant	6,100	
Koruma Tarima Ilaclari, production of chemicals	2,800	
Government of Pakistan, dredging facilities	2,000	
Banque de Credit Agricole Industriel et Foncier (Lebanon), development bank	5,000	
		118,400
Letters of advice pending		70,500
III. Other project commitments		18,150
Total loans approved, Apr. 30, 1960		1,079,856

Development Loan Fund—Cumulative status of approved loans as of Apr. 13, 1960

Region and country	Borrower	Purpose	Amount (thousands)	Date agreement signed
A. Loans and guarantee agreements signed (obligations):				
Africa:				
Ethiopia	Sviluppo Agricolo Industriale Dell'Eritrea S.A.	Cotton textile mill	$500	Aug. 6, 1959
Liberia	Liberian-American Agricultural and Industrial Corp.	Sawmill	190	Dec. 16, 1958
	Republic of Liberia	Telecommunications	3,000	Jan. 30, 1959
Libya	Government of Libya	Electric powerplant	5,000	June 25, 1959
Morocco	Kingdom of Morocco	Irrigation	23,000	Mar. 16, 1960
Nigeria	Nigerian Ports Authority	Construction of warehouse	800	Dec. 30, 1959
Somalia	Credito Somalo	Agricultural and industrial development.	2,000	Mar. 31, 1959
Sudan	Sudan-American Textile Industry	Textile mill	10,000	May 21, 1959
Tunisia	Societe Nationale des Chemins de Fer Tunisiens	National railways	2,400	May 27, 1959
	Societe Nationale Tunisienne de Cellulose	Pulp factory	6,250	May 13, 1959
Subtotal, Africa			53,140	
Europe:				
Netherlands	Government of Netherlands	Emigrant resettlement	3,000	Jan. 21, 1959
Spain	Instituto Nacionale de Colonizacion	Irrigation (equipment)	7,700	June 5, 1959
	Spanish National Railways	Railway rehabilitation	14,900	Do.
	Union Electrica Madrilena	Hydroelectric plant	3,900	Mar. 23, 1960
Yugoslavia	Government of Yugoslavia	Fertilizer plant	22,500	Jan. 8, 1959
	do	Diesel locomotives	5,000	June 12, 1959
	do	Electric power	9,000	Nov. 25, 1959
	do	Hydroelectric plant	15,000	Dec. 17, 1959
Subtotal, Europe			81,000	
Far East:				
Indonesia	Republic of Indonesia	Railway rehabilitation	3,000	June 26, 1959
	do	Harbor development	6,000	Do.
Korea	Tongyang Cement Manufacturing Co.	Cement plant	2,140	Jan. 20, 1959
	Republic of Korea	Telecommunications	3,500	Apr. 8, 1959
	Korea Electric Power Co.	Chung Ju hydroelectric	1,500	May 26, 1959
	Oriental Chemical Industries Co.	Soda ash plant	5,600	Dec. 14, 1959
	Korea Reconstruction Bank	Reconstruction bank	5,000	Apr. 12, 1960
Malaya	Federation of Malaya	Wharfage accommodations	10,000	Mar. 18, 1959
	do	Roads and bridges	10,000	Do.
Philippines	Central Bank of Philippines	Small industry fund	5,000	May 6, 1959
	Republic of Philippines	Roads and bridges rehabilitation	18,750	June 29, 1959
	Bataan Pulp and Paper Mill	Pulp and paper mill	5,300	July 10, 1959
	Mindanao Portland Cement Co.	Construction of cement plant	3,700	Oct. 22, 1959
	Bago Pulp and Paper Co., Inc.	Pulp and paper mill	5,300	Dec. 29, 1959
Taiwan	Asia Cement Corporation	Cement plant	3,000	July 25, 1958
	Republic of China	Multipurpose dam	21,500	Nov. 10, 1958
	do	Railways	3,200	Nov. 12, 1958
	do	Railways (second)	5,900	Feb. 18, 1960
	Land Bank	Improvement of fishing industry	686	Mar. 18, 1959
	First Commercial Bank of Taiwan, Chang Hwa Commercial Bank, Hua Nan Commercial Bank, Ltd., and Central Trust of China.	Small industry fund	2,500	Dec. 15, 1959
	Ingalls-Taiwan Shipbuilding Co.	Expansion of shipyard	2,000	Jan. 22, 1959
	Pioneer Chemical Corp.	Coke oven	1,000	Feb. 19, 1959
	Taiwan Aluminum Corp.	Production of aluminum	1,350	June 25, 1959
	China Development Corp.	Development bank	10,000	Mar. 24, 1960
Thailand	MEA (Metropolitan Elective Authority)	Electric power expansion	20,000	Mar. 6, 1959
	Government of Thailand	Dredge facilities	1,750	Feb. 10, 1959
	Livestock Trading Corp.	Meat processing plant	750	July 16, 1959
Subtotal, Far East			158,426	
Latin America:				
Argentina	Government of Argentina	Economic development	24,750	Mar. 18, 1959
Bolivia	Gasser y Cía Industrias La Belgica	Sugar mill	2,500	Feb. 5, 1959
	Government of Bolivia	Construction of runway	1,500	Oct. 22, 1959
Brazil	Cooperative Agro-Pecuaria Batavo Limitada & Sociedade Cooperativa Castrolanda Ltd.	Resettlement project	240	Mar. 4, 1959
Chile	Government of Chile	Airport design	300	May 20, 1959
Costa Rica	Societa Italiana de Colizzazione Agricola	Resettlement project	300	Jan. 13, 1959
Equador	Government of Ecuador	Highway construction	4,700	Mar. 19, 1959
	do	do	5,300	Nov. 5, 1959
Guatemala	Banco de Guatemala	Rubber production	5,000	Aug. 17, 1959
	Productos de Kenaf	Kenaf bag factory	400	June 3, 1959
Haiti	Government of Haiti	Irrigation	4,300	May 28, 1959
	do	Highway (engineering)	300	Jan. 21, 1960
Honduras	Government of Honduras	Highway development	5,000	May 10, 1958
Nicaragua	Municipality of Matagalpa	Public utilities	600	May 7, 1959
Paraguay	Corporacion de Obras Sanitarias de Asuncion	Water supply system	1,000	Sept. 5, 1958
	Government of Paraguay	Road improvement	2,500	Oct. 29, 1958
	International Products Corp.	Modernization of operatives	2,600	Nov. 6, 1958
Uruguay	Administracion General de las Uninas Electricas y los Telefonos del Estado (UTE).	Telephone expansion	8,800	Sept. 3, 1959
Subtotal, Latin America			70,090	
Near East:				
Greece	Government of Greece	Fertilizer plant	12,000	Jan. 28, 1959
	Public Power Corp.	Hydroelectric plant	31,000	Jan. 29, 1960
Iran	Plan Organization	Economic development project	47,500	Jan. 7, 1959
	Industrial and Mining Development Bank of Iran	Development bank	5,200	Nov. 19, 1959
	Plan Organization	Highway construction	25,000	Oct. 7, 1959
Israel	Government of Israel	Development projects	15,000	June 25, 1958
	Industrial Development Bank of Israel	do	5,000	Apr. 12, 1959
Jordan	Transjordan Electric Power Co.	Electric power	1,200	June 25, 1959
	Jordan Phosphate Mines Co.	Phosphate mine expansion	1,500	Oct. 26, 1959
Turkey	Industrial Development Bank	Development bank	10,000	Sept. 12, 1958
	Maden Tetkik Ve Arma Enstitud	Aerial mineral survey	900	Apr. 30, 1959
	Turkiye Komur Isletmeliri Kurumu	Coal mining facilities	14,500	Do.
	ETIBANK	Electric power distribution	7,000	Jan. 21, 1960
Lebanon	Societe d'Electricite de'El Bared	Powerplant	500	Feb. 9, 1960
Syria	Modern Industries Corp.	Textile mill	700	Nov. 10, 1959
Subtotal, Near East			177,000	

Development Loan Fund—Cumulative status of approved loans as of Apr. 13, 1960—Continued

Region and country	Borrower	Purpose	Amount (thousands)	Date agreement signed
A. Loans and guarantee agreements signed (obligations)—Continued				
South Asia:				
Ceylon	Government of Ceylon	Irrigation and land development	$1,600	June 24, 1958
	do	Highway development	900	July 28, 1958
	do	Rehabilitation of railroads	750	Sept. 3, 1958
India	Government of India	Railway modernization	40,000	June 23, 1958
	do	Roads, cement, jute	35,000	Do.
	do	Railway modernization	35,000	Dec. 24, 1958
	do	Steel imports, public development	18,000	Do.
	do	Steel imports, private development	22,000	Do.
	do	Public power development	10,000	Do.
	do	Capital equipment, private industry	15,000	Do.
	do	Steel imports	20,000	July 27, 1959
Pakistan	Government of Pakistan	Water, sewage, and disposal	5,500	June 30, 1958
	PICIC [1]	Industrial development loans	4,200	Feb. 4, 1958
	Government of Pakistan	Railroad rehabilitation	9,100	Feb. 18, 1959
	do	Multipurpose dam	17,500	Do.
	West Pakistan Water and Power Development Authority	Land reclamation	15,200	Do.
	do	Power transmission lines	14,700	Do.
	Government of Pakistan	Dredging facilities	2,000	July 10, 1959
	Sui Gas Transmission Co	Expansion gas treating plant	2,000	Feb. 19, 1960
	Government of Pakistan	Construction power substation	23,000	June 29, 1959
	do	Improve inland waterways	1,750	Sept. 12, 1959
	do	Construction jet runway	4,800	Nov. 3, 1959
	PICIC [1]	Industrial development loans	10,000	Jan. 14, 1960
	Government of Pakistan	Railroad rehabilitation	22,000	Jan. 16, 1960
Subtotal, South Asia			330,000	
Subtotal, direct loans			869,656	
Guaranteed loans:				
Taiwan	Ingalls-Taiwan Shipbuilding Co		3,150	
Total, loan and guarantee agreements signed.			872,806	
B. Other loans and guarantees approved but not yet signed.			170,900	
Total loans and guarantees			1,043,706	

[1] Pakistan Industrial Credit and Investment Corporation.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is rather striking that the first item is for diesel locomotives to the Government of Yugoslavia, in the amount of $14,800,000.

The second one is a loan to the Government of India for the Chandrapura electric power, in the amount of $30 million.

There is no partnership there as in the administration's hydro policy at home; the Government does it all. There is a second loan to the Government of India for the Sharavathi hydroelectric power, amounting to $8,400,000.

There is another one to Industrial Finance Corporation of India for $10 million.

There are others, as this list in the RECORD will show.

Let us consider one or two of these projects in the light of the President's own standards.

One of the loans is to India—and I am not critical of the project as such. I know no more about it than the information furnished me by the Development Loan Fund. But in looking through this information, I find that a loan has been made to India in the amount of $5 million, repayable in 15 years in Indian rupees.

What is the loan for?

Five million dollars to purchase equipment for use in the modernization and expansion of India's privately owned jute industry. Equipment to be procured includes looms, spindles, and spare parts. The proceeds of the loan will be made available by the Government of India to private companies through a national jute trust composed of representatives of the industry and government officials.

But the Eisenhower-Nixon administration just told us on Friday, in the veto message, that loans to American communities—even when they are to be repaid in good, hard American dollars—and not in soft currency, in rupees—are unnecessary, unwise, and costly.

Obviously, a different standard is to be applied when the loans are made abroad and are to be repaid in soft currencies—much of which we cannot even take out of the foreign countries and much of which today poses a serious problem of inflation in some of these foreign countries—which we are then asked to remedy by further contributions, either as grants or loans, and cheerfully do so.

Consider another example, Mr. President.

Consider, Mr. President, the loan of $1,350,000 for the Taiwan Aluminum Corp. repayable in 5 years in new Taiwan dollars.

What is this loan to be used for?

According to the Development Loan Fund, it is to be used as follows:

The proceeds of this loan will assist in financing the costs of acquiring equipment, materials, supplies and services required for modernization and expansion of the corporation's facilities for producing aluminum and aluminum ingot at Kaohsiung, Taiwan.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure to my able and distinguished colleague from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I wish to say to the Senator from Alaska that I think, in the speech which he is making today, and which I have had the privilege of following as I sat here, he is again contributing, as he has so often in the past, to a clear understanding of just what the American people are up against in this administration which is so concerned about big private business, and so little concerned about small people and their needs. There is no more dramatic example of that fact than in this whole business of aid to depressed areas.

I received only this morning a communication from a very good Republican friend of mine in my own State. I have his letter on my desk, but I do not have his permission to read it into the RECORD. I think it is fair to say that he is a very prominent member of his party. He says, among other things, "I am writing to you because I read in the press that Ike will veto the $251 million depressed areas bill." Then he asks me if I will send him the figures of the staggering amounts we are sending to foreign countries as subsidies. "I am still a Republican," he says, "but I am critically wondering just how I can go on being so with this attitude in the White House." Little wonder that he is worried.

Before I go any further, I wish to say to the Senator from Alaska, I think he is doing a great thing in helping our people

to understand just what this question is really all about.

As the Senator from Alaska knows, I have been very strongly in favor of foreign aid. When I was in the other body and a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I worked and voted for foreign aid. I have voted for it while I have been a Member of the Senate. I think we must continue the program. I deeply believe there is a need for it, and I know the Senator from Alaska feels likewise. But, on another occasion, I said there is such a thing as being so broadminded that we get flatheaded; and I am wondering if we have not reached that point on foreign aid in this country. We are so concerned about the poor and the unfortunate and the needy abroad—which we should be, and properly so, that we go to the extent of neglecting our own. That is the point the Senator from Alaska is so ably making. I am glad he is doing so, because it needs to be done.

Mr. GRUENING. As the Senator has noticed, in the last year we have been borrowing money from our own people to be able to spend abroad as the $12 billion deficit in 1959 reveals and, under the policies of this administration, which wishes to raise interest rates, our people will have to pay still more to raise the money to give and lend to foreign nations, whereas, loans made to foreign countries are really not true loans at all, since they are repayable in soft currencies, which makes them virtually gifts, masquerading as loans.

Mr. DODD. Of course, they are. I do not want to delay the Senator further. I wish to hear what else he has to say. However, I should like to say that his complaint is not that we are carrying on a foreign aid program, but, rather, that we are not carrying it out properly, that we are not doing the job as it should be done, and that we are not taking care of our own people as they should be taken care of and, in my own judgment, as a priority matter. It is getting so that it is considered bad for an American to stand up and say that America should be given a priority in anything. In some quarters it is considered wrong to do that. It has got so that if one raises his voice so he can be heard in this Chamber, he is characterized as a demagog. We are led to believe that we must whisper; we must speak softly, in double terms and then only in certain places. It is high time that our leaders, as the Senator from Alaska is doing, speak up so they can be heard, and give the people the facts they need, so we can move ahead at home and abroad.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank my able colleague from Connecticut. I shall not delay the Senate much further, but I think when the people read in today's RECORD, what some of these foreign projects are, they will have a better understanding of the Eisenhower-Nixon double standard. Let me refer to the list of projects.

Here is one item for $10 million for a textile mill in the Sudan.

Here is one for $2 million for agricultural and industrial development in Somalia.

Here is one for $800,000 for construction of a warehouse in Nigeria.

Here is one for $23 million for an irrigation project for the Kingdom of Morocco.

Here is one for $5 million for an electric power plant for the Government of Libya.

Here is one for a pulp factory in Tunisia; and so on—projects which in this country our Government would denounce as socialistic and all the other adverse things that it says about any projects for the American people.

What makes these foreign aid projects sacrosanct? Yet projects costing much lesser amounts, projects which have been carefully worked out, that have passed both bodies of Congress, which are aimed at relieving distress, whether for area redevelopment, education, housing, resource development or to end water pollution, needs that exist in this country, are labeled as "unnecessary, unwise, and costly"?

Perhaps there is some allergy on the part of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration to loans repaid in American dollars and that when the loan is to be paid in new Taiwan dollars, rupees, or other soft currencies, the loan no longer is "unnecessary, unwise, and costly"?

Mr. President, I confess that I cannot understand such double talk.

But I can understand this, Mr. President: Our gross national product has now reached the sum of one-half a trillion dollars annually. What we were seeking to do in enacting S. 722 was to devote a sum approximately equivalent to what could be produced by our national effort in 4 hours to relieving the economic distress of our fellow citizens here at home in areas needing economic redevelopment.

It is my sincere opinion that the devotion of that small fraction of our gross national product to such a worthy purpose at home has at least as much merit as devoting many times that much to similar projects abroad.

The time will come—and I hope it will be not too long distant—when the Eisenhower-Nixon administration will rue the day that it forsook the interests of the people here at home in favor of the people in 104 foreign countries, and adopted its double dealing, double talking, double standard, making it the first administration in American history which by its actions shows that it prefers the interests of the people of foreign lands to the interests of the people of our own.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMUNITY ANTENNA SYSTEMS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, unless there is further business, it is the intention to adjourn the Senate shortly.

Mr. President, as I understand the situation, when the Senate adjourns this afternoon until 12 o'clock tomorrow, the pending business will be Calendar No. 950, S. 2653, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish jurisdiction in the Federal Communications Commission over community antenna systems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the bill, S. 2653, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2653) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish jurisdiction in the Federal Communications Commission over community antenna systems.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I announce to the Senate that this measure will not be considered today, but will be taken up for consideration at the conclusion of morning business tomorrow. I believe unanimous consent has been granted that if morning business should conclude before 2 o'clock, the bill, S. 2653, will be laid before the Senate and will be open for consideration and debate by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this is a sad day in this melancholy world. What mankind had fondly hoped might conceivably result in forward progress toward the cause of peace with honor apparently in advance has been doomed to failure.

Today in Paris the Soviet Premier has done a tragic and frightening disservice by his announcement calculated to scuttle a summit meeting which he himself originally sought.

For years the Soviets have maintained a far-flung system of espionage all around the globe. Other states, including our own, have done likewise, though none on the same scale, I believe, as Russia. We have apprehended and convicted many Soviet secret agents who were plying their trade in our own country. Now Russia, in regard to the U–2 plane incident, has announced that an American reconnaissance plane pilot will be held for trial on charges of espionage behind the Iron Curtain. Meanwhile, they announce the orbiting in outer space of a mechanism which, when perfected, perhaps could supply a worldwide reconnaissance capability to them.

This morning the Soviet Premier used the U–2 incident as a basis for effectively preventing the meeting from being held. What is it, Mr. President, which the Soviets apparently, at all costs, desire to have remain secret behind their own borders? Is it progress in the fields of peaceful pursuits, or is it something else?

We deal here with the perpetuation of American liberty, and equally, with the cause of mankind's freedom. What new, or different arrangements may now be necessary, here and elsewhere, to assure our freedom, our Government will be prepared to make, and it will make them with the unstinting approval of all the American people and, I feel sure, with the approval of free governments and free peoples everywhere.

I have just read the text of the statement which our President made today in Paris at the conference of the heads of state. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement appear at this point in my comments.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Having been informed yesterday by General de Gaulle and Prime Minister Macmillan of the position which Mr. Khrushchev has taken in regard to this Conference during his calls yesterday morning on them, I gave most careful thought as to how this matter should best be handled. Having in mind the great importance of this Conference and the hopes that the peoples of all the world have reposed in this meeting, it concluded that in the circumstances it was best to see if, at today's private meeting, any possibility existed through the exercise of reason and restraint to dispose of this matter of the overflights which would have permitted the Conference to go forward.

I was under no illusion as to the probability of success of any such approach but I felt that in view of the great responsibility resting on me as President of the United States this effort should be made.

In this I received the strongest support of my colleagues, President de Gaulle and Prime Minister Macmillan. Accordingly, at this morning's private session, despite the violence and inaccuracy of Mr. Khrushchev's statement, I replied to him on the following terms:

"I had previously been informed on the sense of the statement just read by Premier Khrushchev.

"In my statement of May 11 and in the statement of Secretary Herter of May 9, the position of the United States was made clear with respect to the distasteful necessity of espionage activities in a world where nations distrust each other's intentions. We pointed that these activities had no aggressive intent but rather were to assure the safety of the United States and the free world against surprise attack by a power which boasts of its ability to devastate the United States and other countries by missiles armed with atomic warheads. As is well known, not only the United States but most other countries are constantly the targets of elaborate and persistent espionage of the Soviet Union.

"There is in the Soviet statement an evident misapprehension on one key point. It alleges that the United States has, through official statements, threatened continued overflights. The importance of this alleged threat was emphasized and repeated by Mr. Khrushchev. The United States has made no such threat. Neither I nor my Government has intended any. The actual statements go no further than to say that the United States will not shirk its responsibility to safeguard against surprise attack.

"In point of fact, these flights were suspended after the recent incident and are not to be resumed. Accordingly, this cannot be the issue.

"I have come to Paris to seek agreements with the Soviet Union which would eliminate the necessity for all forms of espionage, including overflights. I see no reason to use this incident to disrupt the conference.

"Should it prove impossible, because of the Soviet attitude, to come to grips here in Paris with this problem and the other vital issues threatening world peace, I am planning in the near future to submit to the United Nations a proposal for the creation of a United Nations aerial surveillance to detect preparations for attack. This plan I had intended to place before this conference. This surveillance system would operate in the territories of all nations prepared to accept such inspection. For its part, the United States is prepared not only to accept the United Nations aerial surveillance, but to do everything in its power to contribute to the rapid organization and successful operation of such international surveillance.

"We of the United States are here to consider in good faith the important problems before this conference. We are prepared either to carry this point no further, nor undertake bilateral conversations between the United States and the U.S.S.R. while the main conference proceeds."

My words were seconded and supported by my Western colleagues who also urge Mr. Khrushchev to pursue the path of reason and commonsense, and to forget propaganda, Such an attitude would have permitted the conference to proceed. Mr. Khrushchev was left in no doubt by me that this ultimatum would never be acceptable to the United States.

Mr. Khrushchev brushed aside all arguments of reason, and not only insisted upon this ultimatum, but also insisted that he was going to publish his statement in full at the time of his own choosing.

It was thus made apparent that he was determined to wreck the Paris conference.

In fact, the only conclusion that can be drawn from his behavior this morning was that he came all the way from Moscow to Paris with the sole intention of sabotaging this meeting on which so much of the hopes of the world have rested.

In spite of this serious and adverse development, I have no intention whatsoever to diminish my continuing efforts to promote progress toward a peace with justice. This applies to the remainder of my stay in Paris as well as thereafter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 17, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 16, 1960:

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Edward C. Sweeney, of Illinois, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 9, 1960, vice R. Lockwood Jones, resigned.

Edward C. Sweeney, of Illinois, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for a term of 5 years expiring August 9, 1965. (Reappointment.)

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Roy L. Stephenson, of Iowa, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Iowa, vice Edwin R. Hicklin, retired.

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah, to be Chief Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission, vice Edgar E. Witt, resigned.

T. Harold Scott, of Colorado, to be an Associate Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission, vice Arthur V. Watkins.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Loren Keith Olson, of Maryland, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1962, vice John Forrest Floberg, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 16, 1960:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Harold C. Patterson, of Virginia, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1965.

PUBLIC HOUSING COMMISSIONER

Bruce Savage, of Indiana, to be Public Housing Commissioner.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, Corps of Engineers, to be a member and president of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 37) (33 U.S.C. 642).

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. John A. Morrison, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507) (33 U.S.C. 661).

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Francis Adams Cherry, of Arkansas, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for a term of 5 years expiring March 4, 1965.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Ralph Kennamer, of Alabama, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Alabama, term of 4 years.

William L. Longshore, of Alabama, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Alabama, term of 4 years.

Joseph S. Bambacus, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Virginia, term of 4 years.

U.S. MARSHAL

Oliver H. Metcalf, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years (now serving under an appointment which expired March 1, 1960).

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Lester Clyde Carter, of Arkansas, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration for a term expiring March 31, 1966.

Robert T. Lister, of Oregon, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring March 31, 1966.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Malcolm M. Willey, of Minnesota, to be a member of the National Science Board for the remainder of the term expiring May 10, 1964.

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah, to be Chief Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission.

IN THE U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be appointed to the rank indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be commanders

Richard H. Puckett
Arthur C. Hoene, Jr.
James W. Conway
Arthur A. Atkinson, Jr.
Thomas F. Dunham, Jr.
James M. Winn

To be lieutenants

David F. Bosomworth
Paul F. Bade
George H. Garbe

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Robert Burke
John W. Kime
Richard J. Green
Thomas D. Combs, Jr.
Paul T. Kaufmann
Louis K. Bragaw, Jr.
Charles S. Niederman
Ronald A. McClellan
David R. Markey
William C. Parish, Jr.
Frederick C. Bruner
Henry J. Harris, Jr.
Keith D. Ripley
Harold E. Fallen, Jr.
Arnold B. Beran
Donald M. Morrison, Jr.
Ronald G. Malone
Tommy G. Woodworth
Robert L. DeMichiell
John I. Maloney, Jr.
Russell C. Bishop, Jr.
Terrill H. Oloege
Thomas T. Matteson
Ralph N. Fennacchini
Thomas W. Pinnegan
John P. Flaherty, Jr.
John R. Mitchell
John B. Lynn
Harland D. Hanson
Davlid J. Heskell, Jr.
James E. Brown, Jr.
George D. Passmore, Jr.
Richard J. Collins
George P. Vance
John C. Wirtz
Robert A. Johnson
Richard W. Michaels
Douglas B. Thurnher
James C. Osborn
John M. Cece
Richard "D" Thompson
Robert J. Cardinal
Donald B. Davis
Thomas P. Nolan
Peter J. Rots
Matthew J. Ahearn
Everett L. Crowell
Ralph Z. DelGiorno
John R. Erickson
William R. Babineau
Richard Buell
Ernest J. Bader
Carol E. Conry
Richard J. Marcott
Albert D. Super
Andrew R. Rippel

To be ensigns

Leonard Francis Alcantara
Rudolph George Anderson
Leon Elwood Beaudin
Daniel Francis Bobeck
Carl Melvin Brothers
Robert Allen Burt
Richard Oliver Buttrick
Frederick Michael Casciano
Robert James Cheney, Jr.
Gerald Francis Corcoran
Robert Austin Creighton
Ian Stuart Cruickshank
Kenneth Charles Cutler
Randolph DeKroney
Michael Bernard Dunn
William Joseph Ecker
John Norman Faigle
Jerome Patrick Foley
Bailey Mozo Geeslin
Robert Alan Ginn
Donald Charles Greenman
William Henry Hall, Jr.
John Richard Hay
Neal Frederick Herbert
Eugene Joseph Hickey, Jr.
John Heaton Hill
Douglas Anthony Hlousek
Ronald Paul Hunter
George Forsyth Ireland
Robert Edward Isherwood
Michael Richard Johnson
Frederick Paul Karres
Eugene Martin Kelly
Charles Harold King, Jr.
Richard Robert Kuhn
Thomas Youlden Lawrence, Jr.
Walter Ted Leland
Paul Robert Lewis
Jan Darryl Long
Merrill Conrad Louks
Terry Luther Lucas
James Edwin Margeson, Jr.
Paul Anthony Joseph Martino
John Eugene McCarty
Angus McKinnon
George Henry Moritz III
Martin James Moynihan
Jerome Marvin Myers
William Edgar Neal
Harry Elis Obedin
James Harold Parent
David Loren Parr
George Henry Peck III
Keith Palmer Pensom
Theodore Hugh Purcell
Kenneth Monfort Rappolt
Rupert Blue Reynolds, Jr.
Paul Dennis Russell
John Allan Schmidt
Robert Allen Schwartz
Joseph Kenneth Shartiag, Jr.
Clifford Gerard Spelman, Jr.
Thomas Norman Sullivan
William Robert Allen
Robert Stanley Bates
Joseph Snowball Blackett, Jr.
Gary Joe Boyle
Lloyd Cornell Burger
James Franklin Butler
William Joseph Campbell
Donald Robert Casey
David Emil Ciancaglini
Charles William Craycoft
Gary Fred Crosby
David Frederick Cunningham
Wesley Gwynne Davis, Jr.
Michael Alan Duke
William Earl Ecker, Jr.
Roderick Yerkes Edwards, Jr.
Robert James Finan
David Herman Freese, Jr.
Ralph Edward Giffin
Joseph Bramble Goodwin III
Richard Earl Haas
James William Haugen
William Hugh Hayes, Jr.
Jack Buran Hewes
Frederick Andrew Hill
Paul Kenneth Hinkley
Gerald Francis Hotchkiss
Robert Austin Ingalls
Thomas Bone Irish, Jr.
Donald Frederick Jenkins
Manuel Josephs, Jr.
Charles Lee Keller
Lawrence Allen Kidd
Leroy George Krumm
Carl Eugene Kunkel, Jr.
James Theodore Leigh
Jack Walter Lewis
Lloyd Ralph Lomer
Richard Wayne Long
William Henry Low, Jr.
Fred Ernst Maiser
Joseph Marotta
Michael Paul Maurice
John Thomas McKean
Alan Francis Miller
Frank Clay Morgret III
Michael Paul Munkasey
Donald Anthony Naples
Merlin Gerald Nygren
John Francis Otranto, Jr.
William C. Park III
James David Partin
Gregory Alden Penington
Ronald Chester Pickup
Joel Graydon Rainwater
Wayne Elmer Rentfro
Edwin John Roland, Jr.
James Vincent Sayers
Leo Nicholas Schowengerdt, Jr.
Kyle Arnold Shaw
David Stewart Smith
John Robert Sproat
Allen John Taylor
William Thomas Troutman
Alfred David Utara
William James Walsh
James Garfield Williams
John Knox Witherspoon, Jr.
Richard Walter Zins
James Lea Turman
Jefferson James Wash IV
Hugh Daniel Williams
Robert Gray Williams
Robert Milton Wood

To be chief warrant officers, W–2

Warren O. Nilsson
William H. Bellow
John H. Olsen
John H. Coppens
Raymond W. Gifford
Frank A. Coleman
Fred Permenter
Albert Debrase
Karl M. Ashby
Paul R. Cornell
Eugene K. Kindschi
John Rekuc
Leonard L. Bouler
Robert L. Wilson
Clifton Cuthrell
James D. Toler
William A. Shaffer, Jr.
Kirven L. Dunn
Joseph F. Baranowski
Lester H. H. Oneil
Richard R. Anthony
Charles F. Potter, Jr.
George R. Brower
Wasey S. Hayes
Clark A. Johnson
James E. Butler
Dorris L. Steele
Ivan J. Anderson
Peter Lindquist
Joseph C. Waldrop
Jack G. Smith
Mortimer Jeffords
Robert E. Penny
Carl A. Carlson
Melvin G. McCoy
Harlan Montgomery
Edward T. Rollins
Charles H. Buckley
Merle L. Cochran
Earnest C. Justis
Harold G. Trupp
Douglas E. Walker
Harry C. Strother, Jr.
John J. Lencmeyer
Charles E. Bunkley
Leslie M. Furst
Robert C. Bainbridge
Eugene E. Moore
Richard M. Burdick
William E. Miller
George E. Rongner
Andrew Pietrykowski
Elmer E. Johnson
Howard R. Tarr, Jr.
Harold E. Gavin
Eric G. Bragg
Edward L. Muller
James B. Gill
Cleo Hack, Jr.
Donald O. Davey
Roy M. Schwanekamp
Darrel B. Sinift
Edmund A. Novak
Jerome R. Morton
Jack W. McDonald
William W. Muessel
Asa M. Jones
Euclid L. Wade
Eugene W. Darcy
Joseph F. Cody
Eugene R. Lockhart
Richard A. Krueger
Wallace N. Anderson
Floyd J. Mulheran
Charles W. Oldham
Robert Jiudice
Frederick H. Muesse
Jack K. Halbert
Richard J. Zwally
Roland A. Woodward
Morgan C. Hutto, Jr.
James A. Winslow
Roger G. Stanton
Thor B. Olson
Slavko Stokich
Donald W. McNaughton
Raymond B. Pote
Donald L. Janse
Robert G. Cameron
Olos F. Marshall
Everett J. Matteson
Russell A. Scruggs, Jr.
Arno J. Bowden
William B. Miner
William A. Vasquez
Grover C. Newberry
Edwin H. Cornell
Andrew Yackovetsky
Richard J. Laflin
Donald R. Myers
Clark W. Straus
Frank P. Huotte
Charles J. J. McGrath
Anton J. Foydl, Jr.
Paul L. Tomardy
Melvin Midgett
Russell H. Stockfieth
Bruce M. Buchanan
Paul G. Patrinos
David C. Adkins
Hollis L. Beard
Andrew J. Brovey
Lewie F. Trawick
James F. Jones
John C. Revels
Arthur B. Meyer
Keith R. McClinton
Clarence A. Long
Richard K. Mitchell
James V. Eigo
Harold I. Baker
Stanley J. Aymond
Myron E. Chesley
John A. Ritter
John T. Hartman
Charles A. Hatfield
Alfred L. Hunt
Alvadore C. Grant
Herbert W. Conger
Edward F. Mattingly
Edward L. Wyman
Keith R. Bruhl
Wallace P. Stembler
Joseph J. Glynn
Harlan F. Smith
Harry G. Lee
Joseph S. Moulton, Jr.
Eldred Bolinger
Carl S. Kaiser
George W. Tate
Orval K. Halsey
Donald C. Ebert
Milton M. Midgette
Karl C. Teater
Edward F. Barber
Leon D. Shea
William L. Patterson
Lyle G. Tilden
Donald S. Grisham
Louis E. K. Pall
William T. King
Ralph E. St. John
William M. Price, Jr.
Foster C. Spruill
Wilbert D. B. Williams
Bruce L. Sifford
Earl J. Wesner
John H. Liedke
Thomas D. Galliher
John F. Minster
Robert C. McClanahan
Stephen J. Flees
James Szokolay

Morris M. Spector
Richard P. McMullen
Frederick R. Nickerson
George G. Bannan
Walter W. Hake
William T. Morrisson, Jr.
Herman H. Keith
Charles R. Fowler
Clyde S. Delanoy
Robert B. Collins
Wilbur E. Lincoln
Cyril L. Fennelly
Donald W. Olson
John W. Laine
Robert W. Conway
Wilfred C. Bullis
Robert A. McCarten
Raymond E. Masker
Donald B. Fish
William H. Westin
John E. Kenny
William W. Watkins
Raymond C. Herrington
Paul C. Carman
John W. Forster
Ray Johnston
Ernest B. Roark
Michael H. Bower
Eugene H. Kelly
Harold E. Stone
Norman A. Whitney
Elliott J. Echols
Fay K. Thompson
John D. Green
John W. McMinn
James L. Reynolds
Maurice K. Nelson
Fred Pilatsky
Robert J. W. Collins
Marion K. Reynolds
Ludvig Slavich, Jr.
Robert A. Kemmett
Leroy P. Phelps
Zigmond Golaszewski
William B. Eichler, Jr.
John Sabath
Theodore L. Turgeon
James C. Bond
Harry A. Benson
Alan H. J. Dowd
Joseph W. Dunhour
Wilbur J. Davis
Robert R. Harber, Jr.
Walter A. Evans
Porter F. Ammerman
Gordon L. Sims
Charles T. Buckner
Robert L. Sellers
Frederick Jones
Edward H. Askew, Jr.
Frank H. Buzzee, Jr.
Nelvin H. Bateman
Baker W. Herbert
Paul H. Johannes
George M. Bruner
Herman Schmidt
Jesse B. Lowe
Lee R. Green
Lester M. H. Roehr
Raymond J. Moen
Kenneth C. Oliver
George A. Saunders
Lee O. Madden, Jr.
Edward A. Liles
Marion O. Simmons
Calvin W. Pratt
Thomas E. Bockman
Phillip E. Thompson
Joe D. Wright, Jr.
William K. Bailey
James P. McBride
Herbert L. Shuey
Lavern G. Ketcherside
George V. Stauffer
Charles E. Shook
James R. Comerford
Don E. McDonald
John C. Lippincott
Norval E. Cosby
Earl J. Potter
Benjamin R. Teal
Charles H. Dyer, Jr.
Norman F. Muench
Edmund J. Smenner
Jesse H. Burgess
Robert B. Paris
Lester E. Howe, Jr.
George A. Menge
Ralph E. Ford
Hubert A. Anderson
Reckner B. Moe
Charles W. Price
Robert H. McGinnis, Jr.
George C. Hickman
Arnold M. Deshaw
Curtis W. Chamberlain
Robert E. Calimer
Thomas H. Renfree
John W. Hammack
Wilfred J. Sellers

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for appointment or permanent promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service to the offices indicated, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by laws and regulations:

FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior surgeons

David Brand
Louis S. Gerber

To be senior assistant surgeon

George W. Douglas, Jr.

To be senior sanitary engineer

Edwin L. Ruppert

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

Leo Weaver

To be senior scientists

Alfred S. Lazarus
Olaf Mickelsen

To be scientists

Herbert T. Dalmat
John E. Porter

To be veterinary officer

James Lieberman

To be nurse officer

Marie H. Van Son

To be health service officer

Claudia B. Galiher

FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be senior assistant surgeons

John W. Dickson
S. Paul Ehrlich, Jr.

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

Delbert A. Larson
Thomas N. Hushower

To be assistant sanitary engineer

Joseph H. Meier

To be senior assistant pharmacist

Donald B. Hare

To be senior assistant nurse officer

Marie Herold

FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior surgeons

Henry H. Kyle

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Robert J. Lucas
Joe T. Hillsman
Samuel J. Wycoff
Francis O. Webb

To be assistant dental surgeons

Charles C. Swoope, Jr.
Gerald W. Gaston
William E. Dorrill
Richard L. Christiansen
George N. Newton
Wellesley H. Wright
Jim D. Webb
William L. Knudson
Richard K. Fred
David A. Dutton
Franz P. Helm
Buckner S. Burch
Manuel H. Marks
Orlen N. Johnson
Gresham T. Farrar, Jr.
Donald R. Swatman

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

Ian K. Burgess

To be senior assistant nurse officers

Laurette M. Beck
Patricia P. Grimaila

To be assistant nurse officer

Juanita M. Barkley

To be junior assistant nurse officer

Ray Cameron

To be senior assistant surgeons

Harry P. Anastopulos
Robert B. Balderson
Richard F. Barbee
Robert N. Barnes
Frank C. Bigler
Aaron B. Brill
Ray A. Brinker
Willard L. Brown
Willard R. Brown
Gerald E. Caplan
Leo J. Castiglioni
Ruth Coffin
John F. Dotter
Arvo B. Ederma
Richard W. Emmons
Earl R. Feringa
James P. Fields
Paul J. Fry, Jr.
George G. Glenner
John E. Glennon
Leon I. Goldberg
Betty E. Hathaway
Lowell R. Hughes
Robert A. Jordan
Karl M. Johnson
Marion E. Kintner
Charles E. Koch, Jr.
Frederick L. Lang
William C. Larsen
Dale Lindholm
Robert P. Locey
William R. Martin
Samuel Milham, Jr.
Barry Miller
John P. Nasou
Alvin H. Novack
John A. Oates, Jr.
William M. O'Brien
Gerald H. Payne
Paul G. Pechous
Darwin J. Prockop
H. McDonald Rimple
Marcus N. Rogers
Saul W. Rosen
William B. Sheldon
Richard A. Smith
Roland W. Sonntag
Richard A. Stamm
Barron H. Stillman
Michio Takahashi
John B. Titmarsh, Jr.
Fred E. Tosh
Robert C. Vander Wagen
Cecil C. Vaughn, Jr.
Richard D. Wasson
Charles L. Whetstone
Harold W. Wylie, Jr.

To be assistant surgeons

William J. Atkinson
John R. Baugh
Frederick V. C. Featherstone
George T. Harding, Jr.
Otto L. Loehden
Robert J. Warren

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

George L. Crocker
Raymond D. Haslam
Phillip K. Humphreys
Donald P. Jelinek
Karl K. Kreth
Richard B. McDowell
James J. McMahon
Joseph P. Moffa, Jr.
James M. Power
Gunnar E. Sydow

To be assistant dental surgeons

Robert W. Baumann
Lawrence I. Carnes
George R. McGuire
John R. Stolpe

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

John M. Rademacher
Leo A. St. Michel

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Eugene J. Donovan, Jr.
John A. Eckert
Robert L. Elder
Edwin L. Johnson
Jack W. Keeley
Donald S. Licking
Paul J. Traina

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

R. Frank Grossman
Alfred W. Hoadley

To be senior assistant pharmacists

Lowell F. Miller
Billy G. Wells

To be assistant pharmacists

Robert P. Chandler
James R. Gates
Jacob H. Hendershot
Luis Hernandez
Philip R. Hugill
Samuel Merrill
James E. Norris
Joseph F. Toomey
John R. Wiseman

To be junior assistant pharmacists

Ray D. Crossley II
Jerome A. Halperin
Joe M. Holman
Harley A. Mills

To be senior assistant scientist

Jay D. Mann

To be assistant scientists

John C. Feeley III
Sheldon D. Murphy

To be senior assistant veterinary officer

Robert K. Sikes

To be assistant veterinary officers

Garland D. Lindsey
Roger E. Wilsnack

To be senior assistant nurse officers

Lawrence A. Levine
Majory E. Lewis

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The nominations of Edward L. Abercrombie et al., for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 27, 1960, and appear in full in the executive proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption of "Nominations," beginning with the name of Edward L. Abercrombie, which appears on page 8758.

IN THE AIR FORCE

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force to the grades indicated, under the provisions of chapter 835, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Robert B. Landry, 635A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert E. L. Eaton, 594A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Richard M. Montgomery, 1025A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Harvey T. Alness, 1085A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Russell L. Waldron, 1164A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Romulus W. Puryear, 637A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas S. Moorman, Jr., 644A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Benjamin J. Webster, 974A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Leighton I. Davis, 1111A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James H. Walsh, 1120A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas C. Musgrave, Jr., 1129A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William T. Hudnell, 1171A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Howell M. Estes, Jr., 1211A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Joseph J. Nazzaro, 1241A (brigadier General, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Bruce K. Holloway, 1336A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Maurice A. Preston, 1337A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John D. Ryan, 1418A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William H. Blanchard, 1445A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James Ferguson, 1530A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. David Wade, 1582A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas P. Gerrity, 1613A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Donald L. Hardy, 618A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles H. Pottenger, 661A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert J. Goewey, 910A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Harry C. Porter, 976A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James C. Jensen, 1042A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Joseph D. C. Caldara, 1048A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Dale O. Smith, 1074A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Perry B. Griffith, 1075A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Elvin S. Ligon, Jr., 1077A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert M. Stillman, 1114A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Daniel E. Hooks, 1166A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis, Jr., 1206A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Albert P. Clark, 1218A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Turner C. Rogers, 1232A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Von R. Shores, 1236A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Lewis L. Mundell, 1286A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John M. Reynolds, 1299A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Sam W. Agee, 1346A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Kenneth O. Sanborn, 1363A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Don R. Ostrander, 1343A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert J. Friedman, 1397A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert A. Breitweiser, 1406A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Prescott M. Spicer, 1413A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Fred M. Dean, 1450A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Waymond A. Davis, 1470A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Marcus F. Cooper, 1543A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Cecil H. Childre, 1551A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Sam Maddux, Jr., 1561A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Frank E. Rouse, 1595A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Hewitt T. Wheless, 1609A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Glen R. Birchard, 1623A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Henry R. Sullivan, Jr., 1655A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William K. Martin, 1697A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Henry Viccellio, 1728A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Osmond J. Ritland, 1731A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Don Coupland, 1766A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Beverly H. Warren, 1768A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Keith K. Compton, 1849A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John K. Hester, 1870A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph R. Holzapple, 1897A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. David A. Burchinal, 1936A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James F. Whisenand, 1945A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Glen W. Martin, 1955A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles M. Eisenhart, 1957A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William W. Momyer, 1964A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph J. Preston, 1966A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Harold H. Twitchell, 19034A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Major S. White, 19056A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard L. Bohannon, 19067A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John K. Cullen, 19068A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force to the grade indicated, under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10, of the United States Code:

Major generals

Brig. Gen. Donald P. Graul, 455A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Donald L. Hardy, 618A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles H. Pottenger, 661A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Perry B. Griffith, 1075A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Major S. White, 19056A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John K. Cullen, 19068A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Kenneth O. Sanborn, 1363A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Prescott M. Spicer, 1413A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Glen R. Birchard, 1623A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Henry R. Sullivan, Jr., 1655A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John K. Hester, 1870A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph R. Holzapple, 1897A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles M. Eisenhart, 1957A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph J. Preston, 1966A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William C. Kingsburg, 923A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jermain F. Rodenhauser, 933A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas J. Gent, Jr., 1130A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles B. Root, 1258A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Frederic H. Miller, 1273A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Chester W. Cecil, Jr., 1298A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William B. Keese, 1531A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Arthur C. Agan, Jr., 1759A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James W. Wilson, 1711A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The nominations of Arthur C. Aho et al., for promotions in the Regular Air Force, which were confirmed on May 16, 1960, were received by the Senate on April 25, 1960, and may be found in full in the executive proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, beginning with the name of Arthur C. Aho, which is shown on page 8641.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 16, 1960:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Edward K. Mills, Jr., of New Jersey to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1954, vice John C. Doerfer, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 16, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Joshua 24: 24: *The Lord our God will we serve, and His voice will we obey.*

O Thou who art the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, in these days of world crisis and confusion, may we never allow our faith in Thy divine sovereignty to become extinguished and our vision of universal peace to become eclipsed.

We earnestly implore Thee that the leaders of nations, now attending the summit conference, may be united in a sincere desire and determination to achieve for broken and bruised humanity the blessings of a nobler and more excellent way of life.

Grant that our President and those assembled with him in the council chamber may be conscious of the unmistakable guidance of Thy spirit, bestowing upon them wisdom and skill in finding the right approach and solution to the many complex international problems.

May our citizens encourage the hearts and strengthen the hands of our chosen representatives by giving them the clear and convincing assurance that they are willing and ready to make every sacrifice in the struggle to preserve the sanctity and security of our beloved country and the freedom of all mankind.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 12, 1960, was read and approved.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 602. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May of 1960 in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10777. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 910. An act to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

MAY 13, 1960.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on May 12, 1960, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following message:

That the Senate passed the bill (H.R. 9449) entitled "An act to amend certain sections of title 14, United States Code, relating to personnel matters in the U.S. Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION ENROLLED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had, on May 13, 1960, examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8042. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to resell any two of four C1–SAY–1 type vessels to the Government of the Republic of China for use in China trade in Far East and Near East waters exclusively;

H.R. 9449. An act to amend certain sections of title 14, United States Code, relating to personnel matters in the U.S. Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11510. An act to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 352. Joint resolution to authorize preliminary study and review in connection with proposed additional building for the Library of Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the authority granted him on Thursday, May 12, 1960, he did on May 13, 1960, sign the following enrolled bills and joint resolution of the House:

H.R. 8042. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to resell any two of four C1–SAY–1 type vessels to the Government of the Republic of China for use in China trade in Far East and Near East waters exclusively;

H.R. 9449. An act to amend certain sections of title 14, United States Code, relating to personnel matters in the U.S. Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11510. An act to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 352. Joint resolution to authorize preliminary study and review in connection with proposed additional building for the Library of Congress.

CENTENNIAL OF THE BIRTH OF GENERAL OF THE ARMIES JOHN J. PERSHING

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 640 to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of General of the Armies John J. Pershing, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 1, strike out all after "Pershing." down to and including "Government" in line 5 and insert "The Secretary of Defense will be responsible for coordination between such civic and patriotic organizations and the departments and agencies of the Government".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the approval of House Joint Resolution 640 I would like to advise my colleagues that the sole amendment which we are called to act upon is very minor. It merely substitutes the Secretary of Defense for the Secretary of the Army as the official to be responsible for coordination between civic and patriotic organizations and departments and agencies of the Government in the honoring of the late General of the Armies John J. Pershing on the 100th anniversary of his birth.

The brief statement contained in Senate Report No. 1304 giving vital data as to the life, works, and honors of the great American, General Pershing, strikes me as worthy of being made available to the general public. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, this statement is attached for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATEMENT

September 13, 1960, is the 100th anniversary of the birth of General of the Armies John J. Pershing.

In view of the significant contribution which General Pershing made to the American victory in World War I, in organizing the American Expeditionary Forces in 1917 and their subsequent participation in the battles in France, and in view of the fact that he symbolizes the men of the AEF who fought under him, this resolution would authorize and request the President to proclaim September 13, 1960, as a day upon which all Americans should pay honor and respect to General Pershing and the men who served under him.

This resolution authorizes departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate with civic and patriotic organizations in ceremonies commemorating General Pershing's birth. In addition, the resolution, as amended, designates the Secretary of Defense as the responsible officer for the coordination between civic and patriotic organizations and the departments and agencies of the Government.

The 100th anniversary of the birth of General Pershing will occur on September 13, 1960. The anniversary will afford a convenient and appropriate time for the American people to pay honor to General Pershing and the unique American military system of which he was a product and exemplar. It will also furnish an appropriate occasion to recall the achievements of the men and women who served in the AEF, whose ranks grow thinner with each passing year.

Accordingly, the committee recommends the favorable consideration of House Joint Resolution 640, as amended.

Following is a statement of General Pershing's military history and accomplishments.

John J. Pershing was born near Laclede, Mo., on September 13, 1860. He was appointed to the U.S. Military Academy from his native State on July 1, 1882, and upon graduation on July 1, 1886, was commissioned a second lieutenant of cavalry. He was promoted to first lieutenant on October 20, 1892; and to major (temporary) on August 18, 1898; to captain (permanent) on February 2, 1901. On June 30, 1901, he reverted to the permanent rank of captain; and was promoted to brigadier general, Regular Army, on September 20, 1906; to major

general on September 25, 1916; and to general on October 6, 1917. He became general of the armies on September 3, 1919.

General Pershing joined the 6th Cavalry on September 30, 1886, and served with it at Fort Bayard, Fort Wingate, and Fort Stanton, N. Mex., until December 1, 1890. He served in the field in campaigns against the Apache Indians; and being transferred to South Dakota, he participated in campaigns against the Sioux Indians, and commanded Indian Scouts at Pine Ridge Agency, S. Dak.

From September 25, 1891, to October 1, 1895, General Pershing was professor of military science and tactics at the University of Nebraska, and upon completion of that duty joined the 19th Cavalry at Fort Assiniboine, Mont. During the following summer he participated in a roundup of Cree Indians in the northwestern States and their return to Canada. On December 20, 1896, he was assigned to duty on the staff of Gen. Nelson B. Miles, at Headquarters of the Army in Washington, and on May 1, 1897, returned to his regiment at Fort Assinniboine where he remained to June 1, 1897.

He then served as assistant instructor of tactics at the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y., to May 5, 1898, when he joined, at his own request, his regiment, the 10th Cavalry, at Chicamauga Park, Ga., sailing with it to Cuba, where he served with distinction in the Santiago campaign. Upon his return to the United States he was on duty at Headquarters of the Army, Washington, D.C., to December 20, 1898, and in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of War in connection with insular affairs until his appointment, upon the organization of the Division of Customs and Insular Affairs, as its first Chief.

In September 1899, he requested active service in the Philippines where he served in various official capacities in the Department of Mindanao, until October 11, 1901, when he returned to the line in command at Iligan, in charge of Moro affairs at Camp Vicars, and in command of Vicars, participating in many operations against the Moros. He returned to the United States in July 1903, and after serving until January 1904, with the War Department General Staff in Washington, D.C., was assigned to duty as Assistant to Chief of Staff, and as Acting Chief of Staff, Southwestern Division, Oklahoma City, Okla., to October 24, 1904. He attended the Army War College, Washington, to January 1905.

He served as military attache in Japan, beginning in February 1905, and during the Russian-Japanese War he was an accredited observer with the Japanese Army and accompanied General Nuroki's army in later stages of the Manchurian campaign. His duties brought him back to the United States, then to Europe under special instructions pending result of situation in the Balkans, as an observer should open hostilities ensue. In December 1908 he returned to the United States, serving for a short time in the Office of Chief of Staff, in Washington, D.C. He returned to the Philippines in October 1909, where he assumed command of the Department of Mindanao. Upon his return to the United States in January 1914 he commanded the 8th Brigade to April 1914; served on the Mexican border to March 15, 1916, when he entered Mexico in command of the Punitive Expedition, remaining there until February 1917. Upon his return to the United States, he commanded the District of El Paso, Tex., to February 21, 1917, and the Southern Department to May 1917.

He was designated by the President on May 26, 1917, to lead the American forces in the World War, and sailed for France on May 28, 1917. He returned to the States on September 8, 1919, at which time he was assigned to duty at General Headquarters, American Expeditionary Forces, Washington, to August 31, 1920; and at Headquarters, General of the Army, Washington, to July 1, 1921. On that date he was appointed Chief of Staff of the Army, in which capacity he served until his retirement, for age, on September 13, 1924.

In 1923, General Pershing became Chairman of the American Battle Monuments Commission, which was created by Congress for the purpose of commemorating the services of the American forces in Europe during the World War. In November 1924 he was designated by President Coolidge as Ambassador to represent the United States in Peru during the centennial of the battle which marked the end of Spanish domination in South America. He returned the following year to South America, where he served as head of the Tacna-Arica Plebiscitary Commission. On June 24, 1936, he was appointed by the President as a member of a commission to prepare plans for the erection of a memorial within the Panama Canal Zone to Gen. George W. Goethals, builder of the Panama Canal.

On June 27, 1936, he took his seat in the French Institute, having been elected a member (foreign associate) of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences.

In 1937 he was appointed by President Roosevelt as a member of a special delegation to represent him at the Coronation of His Majesty King George VI, and attended the ceremonies in London.

General Pershing received many honorary degrees, which are shown below. His military decorations and awards were numerous, and follow in detail.

HONORARY DEGREES

LL.B. and LL.D., University of Nebraska.
D.C.L., Oxford University.
LL.D., Cambridge University.
LL.D., University of St. Andrews, Scotland.
LL.D., University of Arizona.
LL.D., University of Missouri.
LL.D., George Washington University.
LL.D., Columbia University.
LL.D., Williams College.
LL.D., Yale University.
LL.D., Harvard University.
D. of M.S., Pennsylvania Military College.
LL.D., University of Pennsylvania.
LL.D., McGill University, Canada.
LL.D., University of Maryland.
LL.D., Princeton University.
D. of M.S., New York University.
LL.D., the College of William and Mary, the University of Wyoming.

MILITARY DECORATIONS AND AWARDS

Decorations

Distinguished Service Cross.
Distinguished Service Medal.
Silver Star.

Service medals

Indian Campaign Medal
Spanish Campaign Medal.
Philippine Campaign Medal.
Mexican Service Medal.
Army of Cuban Occupation Medal.
World War I Victory Medal with Battle Clasps for Cambrai, Somme Defensive, Lys, Aisne, Montdidier-Noyon, Champaigne-Marne, Aisne-Marne, Somme Offensive, Oise-Aisne, Ypres-Lys, St. Mihiel, Meuse-Argonne, Vittorio-Veneto and Defensive Sector.

Badges

Silver Medal, rifle competition, 1889 Arizona Revolver Team.
Bronze and Silver Medals, 1891 Platte Revolver Team.

Foreign decorations

Belgian: Order of Leopold (Grand Croix); Croix de Guerre.
British: Order of the Bath (Knight Grand Cross).
Chinese: Grand Cordon of the Order of the Precious Light of the Chia Ho (Golden Grain) (first class).
Czechoslovakian: Croix de Guerre; Order of the White Lion (first class) with Sword.
France: Legion of Honor (Grand Cross); Medaille Militaire; Croix de Guerre with Palm.
Greek: Order of the Redeemer (Grand Cross).
Italian: Military Order of Savoy (Grand Cross); Order of St. Maurice and St. Lazarus (Grand Croix).
Japanese: Order of the Rising Sun (Grand Cordon of the Paulownia).
Montenegrin: Medaille Obilitch; Order of Prince Danilo Ier (Grand Croix).
Panamanian: Medal of La Solidaridad (first class).
Peruvian: Grand Cross of the Order of the Sun; Medal Commemorative of the First Centenary of the Battle of Ava Chuchoo.
Polish: Order of "Virtutit Militari."
Rumanian: Order of Mihail the Brave (first class).
Serbian: Order of the Star of Kare-Georges with Swords (first class).
Venezuelan: Grand Cordon of the Order of the Liberator.

SPECIAL AWARDS

State medals

Missouri: Distinguished Service Medal.
Virginia: Distinguished Service Medal.
New Mexico: Medal of Honor.

Tendered thanks of Congress

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled*, That the thanks of the American people and the Congress of the United States are due, and are hereby tendered, to Gen. John J. Pershing for his highly distinguished services as commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Forces in Europe and to the officers and men under his command for their unwavering devotion and heroic valor throughout the war." (Joint resolution of Congress Sept. 18, 1919, approved Sept. 29, 1919.)

Special gold medal

"In recognition of his peerless leadership, heroic achievement, and great military victories, as Commander in Chief of the American Expeditionary Forces in Europe in World War I, and for his gallant and unselfish devotion to the service of his country, in his contribution to the preparation for, and the prosecution of World War II." (Awarded by act of Congress, Aug. 7, 1946.)

Special medal

A commemorative medal from Dr. Adofe Magica, president of the Committee of the City of Buenos Aires, "Sir, in the name of the committee in charge of the festivities with which the city of Buenos Aires celebrated joyously the advent of peace, consummated by the Treaty of Versailles, I have the honor to convey to you a commemorative medal which has been especially dedicated to you. Receive it, sir, with a testimony of the profound admiration and respect with which we hold your great services to the cause of justice and civilization."

Resolution of a foreign city

Letter of February 3, 1920, of resolution passed at a public meeting by the citizens of Wanganui, New Zealand, as an expression of their appreciation of the value of General Pershing's services in the World War.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include an article which appeared in the Saturday, May 14, 1960, edition of the Washington Post, as follows:

WORTH TRYING AGAIN

To no one's astonishment President Eisenhower has vetoed the so-called area redevelopment bill, charging that it would spread Federal aid too thin, extend some aid that is unnecessary and inhibit local initiative by excessive Federal intervention. There is some merit in all of these objections although the complaint that the bill would duplicate assistance now provided under other programs is not valid enough to justify a veto, in our view.

Mr. Eisenhower does not contend that there is no need for various kinds of economic help for chronically depressed areas; indeed, he calls again for enactment of his own somewhat more modest program. If the need is real, as it certainly seems to be in States like Pennsylvania, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Massachusetts, would it not have been better to accept some program with which to make a start on redevelopment in these areas?

By the same reasoning, however, it may now be asked whether Congress ought not to meet the President half way and pass another bill that eliminates the major sources of objection. Mr. Eisenhower has indicated he would accept some broadening of the criteria in his proposal. If legislation, not mere campaign talk, is the objective, a workable and useful program ought still to be within reach.

I also feel that the Congress and the administration can reach a compromise on this legislation, and sincerely hope that we can get a bill through the legislative processes in a short time.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the call of the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AGRICULTURAL ATTACHÉ ROTATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8074) to amend section 602 of the Agricultural Act of 1954.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of another Member, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE AT BENT'S OLD FORT, COLO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6851) authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Bent's Old Fort near La Junta, Colo.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

USE OF PESTICIDE CHEMICALS ON AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7480) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with respect to label declaration of the use of pesticide chemicals on raw agricultural commodities which are the produce of the soil.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 343) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of paragraph (k) thereof the following sentence: "The provisions of this paragraph with respect to chemical preservatives shall not apply to a pesticide chemical when used in or on a raw agricultural commodity which is the produce of the soil.";

(2) by adding at the end of such section the following new paragraph:

"(l) If it is a raw agricultural commodity which is the produce of the soil, bearing or containing a pesticide chemical applied after harvest, unless the shipping container of such commodity bears labeling which declares the presence of such chemical in or on such commodity and the common or usual name and the function of such chemical: *Provided, however,* That no such declaration shall be required while such commodity, having been removed from the shipping container, is being held or displayed for sale at retail out of such container in accordance with the custom of the trade."

SEC. 2. Nothing in the amendments made by the first section of this Act shall affect any requirement of the laws of any State or Territory.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 526 was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL PAY FOR MANAGERS OF VA INSTALLATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9792) to amend section 4111 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of managers of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4111(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after the first sentence thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the per annum rate of salary of each individual serving as a manager of a hospital, domiciliary, or center shall not be less than (1) the rate of salary of the highest paid employee of the Veterans' Administration (other than himself) assigned to or employed at such hospital, domiciliary, or center, increased by (2) $500 per annum."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out "section" and insert "the first sentence of subsection".

On page 1, beginning on line 4, strike out "by adding immediately after the first sentence thereof the following" and insert "to read as follows".

On page 1, line 8, strike out "not".

On page 1, beginning on line 8, strike out "less than (1) the rate of salary of the highest paid employee of the Veterans' Administration (other than himself) assigned to or employed at such hospital, domiciliary, or center, increased by (2) $500 per annum" and insert in lieu thereof "$16,500; and that of each individual serving as a director of professional services at a hospital, domiciliary, or center shall be $16,250".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read: "A bill to amend section 411 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of managers and directors of professional services of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NATIONAL MONUMENT, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8226) to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of another Member, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

INCENTIVE PAY FOR PERSONNEL OF NUCLEAR SUBMARINES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10500) to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 with respect to incentive pay for certain submarine service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That subsection 204(a)(2) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 235(a)(2)), be amended to read, "(2) duty on board a submarine, including, in the case of nuclear-powered submarines, periods of training and rehabilitation after assignment thereto as determined by the Secretary concerned, and including submarines under construction from the time builders' trials commence;".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SETTLEMENT OF AIRCRAFT CRASH AT LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11644) to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. Air Force aircraft at Little Rock, Ark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the $5,000 limitation contained in section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to claims arising out of the crash of a United States Air Force aircraft at Little Rock, Arkansas, on March 31, 1960.

SEC. 2. With respect to claims filed as a result of an aircraft crash described in the first section of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall, within thirty months after the date of the enactment of this Act, report to Congress on—

(1) each claim settled and paid by him under this Act with a brief statement concerning the character and equity of each such claim, the amount claimed, and the amount approved and paid; and

(2) each claim submitted under this Act which has not been settled, with supporting papers and a statement of findings of facts and recommendations with respect to each such claim.

SEC. 3. No part of the amounts awarded under this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 3338 be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the $5,000 limitation contained in section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to claims arising out of the crash of a United States Air Force aircraft at Little Rock, Arkansas, on March 31, 1960.

SEC. 2. With respect to claims filed as a result of an aircraft crash described in the first section of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall, within 30 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, report to Congress on—

(1) each claim settled and paid by him under this Act with a brief statement concerning the character and equity of each such claim, the amount claimed, and the amount approved and paid; and

(2) each claim submitted under this Act which has not been settled, with supporting papers and a statement of findings of facts and recommendations with respect to each such claim.

SEC. 3. Payments made pursuant to this Act for death, personal injury, and property loss claims, shall not be subject to insurance subrogation claims in any respect. No payments made pursuant to this Act shall include any amount for reimbursement to any insurance company or compensation insurance fund for loss payments made by such company or fund.

SEC. 4. No part of the amounts awarded under this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings by which H.R. 11644 was passed were vacated, and that bill was laid on the table.

CLAIMS OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE ALASKA RAILROAD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4084) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the amounts due and owing and render judgment upon the claims of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad for overtime work performed.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11985) to make American nationals eligible for scholarships and fellowships authorized by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 10 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 149, 152; 42 U.S.C., sec. 1869) is amended by adding the words "or nationals" after the word "citizens".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTEND TIME FOR FINAL PROOF UNDER DESERT LAND LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11706) to authorize an extension of time for final proof under the desert land laws under certain conditions.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, without regard to and in addition to extensions authorized or granted under the provisions of the Acts of March 28, 1908 (35 Stat. 52; 43 U.S.C. 333), April 30, 1912 (37 Stat. 106; 43 U.S.C. 334), March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1161; 43 U.S.C. 335), and February 25, 1925 (43 Stat. 982; 43 U.S.C. 336), or other provision of law existing prior to the date of the approval of this Act, to grant to any entryman of the class provided in section 2 of this Act, one extension of not more than three years within which to make final proof, but one additional extension of three years under this Act may be granted to any entryman upon a showing satisfactory to the Secretary that the entryman possesses adequate financing for completion facilities during the requested extension period.

SEC. 2. The benefits of this Act shall be limited to entrymen who, on the date of the approval of this Act, held an uncanceled entry under the desert land laws of the United States to reclaim public lands of the United States located on the Lower Palo Verde Mesa in the Palo Verde Irrigation District in Riverside County, California, who, with ninety days after approval of this Act, or prior to the cancellation of their entry for failure to submit satisfactory final proof, whichever is later, submit to the satisfaction of the Secretary, a showing that because of unavoidable delay in the construction of the irrigation works intended to convey water to the land embraced in their entry, they are, without fault on their part, unable to make final proof within the time limited therefor, and that the proposed irrigation works is feasible from a financial and engineering standpoint and can be developed within three years after the termination of the cause of the unavoidable delay. Within the meaning of this section 2 "unavoidable delay" shall include delay occasioned by litigation involving rights to water for the proposed irrigation works.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to accept as annual proofwork required prior to the date of approval of this Act sums of money expended for engineering or legal expenses incurred in obtaining, attempting to obtain, or perfecting water rights or irrigation works for entrymen included in section 2. For purposes of this section 3, sums paid in advance to an organization of entrymen for such expenses shall be considered so expended within the year of payment by the entrymen.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3 after the word "of" insert "not more than".

Page 2, line 5, after the word "completion" insert "of the necessary irrigation facilities".

Page 2, line 12, after the word "California," insert "and".

Page 2, lines 22 and 23, strike out the words "developed within three years after the termination of the cause of the unavoidable delay." and insert in lieu thereof: "financed within one extension period of not more than three years and can be completed either during such extension period or thereafter in one additional extension period of not more than three years."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, my bill—H.R. 11706—is designed to permit the completion of certain worthwhile irrigation developments on lands situated within my congressional district.

Under the bill, authority would be given to the Secretary of the Interior, under certain conditions set forth in the bill, to extend by not more than 3 years the time within which holders of desert land entries on public lands in the Lower Palo Verde Mesa, Riverside County, Calif., may complete the reclamation and cultivation of their entries as required by the Desert Land Act. A further extension of up to 3 years is also authorized if the entryman can show before the end of the first extension that he has adequate financing to complete his project during the additional period and if other requirements are met.

In addition, section 3 of the bill permits the acceptance of expenditures for engineering or legal expenses, including sums paid for these purposes to an organization of entrymen, as proof of the past annual expenditures for benefit of the entries required under the Desert Land Act. The minimum amount required for proof work is $1 per acre per year.

H.R. 11706 is designed to afford relief to approximately 60 holders of desert land entries in the area described above. The entrymen are attempting to develop their lands for irrigation through the Palo Verde Irrigation District. The district's project to develop irrigation water from the Colorado River has been delayed by lack of financing. Financing could not be had because, at least in part, of uncertainty arising out of pending litigation between Arizona and California concerning rights to the use of Colorado River water. In the meanwhile, the time has expired or is expiring within which final proof of development must be made under the Desert Land Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill worthy of the support of all of the Members of the House.

VALIDATING CERTAIN SALARY OVERPAYMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4271) to validate the salary overpayments made to certain officers and employees incident to the salary adjustment provisions of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AMENDING CERTAIN LAWS CONCERNING STATE OF HAWAII

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11602) to amend certain laws of the United States in light of the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Hawaii Omnibus Act".

PRINTING OUTSIDE UNITED STATES

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 890), is amended by striking out the words "the continental United States" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "the States of the United States and the District of Columbia".

SOIL BANK ACT

SEC. 3. Section 113 of the Soil Bank Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "This subtitle B shall apply to the several States and, if the Secretary determines it to be in the national interest, to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; and as used in this subtitle B, the term 'State' includes Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands."

ARMED FORCES

SEC. 4. (a) Title 10, United States Code, section 101(2), is amended by striking out the words "Hawaii or".

(b) Title 10, United States Code, sections 802(11) and 802(12), are each amended by striking out the words "the main group of the Hawaiian Islands,".

(c) Title 10, United States Code, section 2662(c), is amended by striking out the word ", Hawaii,".

(d) Title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out clause (6) of section 4744; by renumbering clauses (7) through (9) as clauses (6) through (8); by amending redesignated clause (8) to read as follows: "The families of persons described in clauses (1), (2), (4), (5), and (7)."; and by striking out the words "clause (8) or (9)" in the last sentence of such section and inserting in lieu thereof the words "clause (7) or (8)".

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

SEC. 5. (a) Paragraph (3) of section 2 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "the Virgin Islands of the United States, and the Territory of Hawaii" and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "and the Virgin Islands of the United States".

(b) Section 7 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "Territory of Hawaii" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "State of Hawaii".

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

SEC. 6. The National Housing Act is amended by striking out the word "Hawaii," in sections 9, 201(d), 207(a)(7), 601(d), 713(q), and 801(g).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) Paragraph (6) of section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is further amended by striking out the word "Hawaii,".

(b) Paragraph (16) of section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, is further amended by striking out the word "Hawaii,".

(c) Paragraph (37) of section 2(a) and paragraph (1) of section 6(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, are each amended by striking out the word "Hawaii,".

(d) Paragraph (18) of section 202(a) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is further amended by striking out the word "Hawaii,".

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT

SEC. 8. Paragraph (4) of section 103 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended by striking out the words "the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii,".

SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

SEC. 9. (a) Section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "in the continental United States, except in Alaska," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "in the States of the Union, except Alaska,".

(b) Section 17(a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is further amended to read as follows: "This Act shall apply to the States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and, as used in this Act, the term 'State' includes Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands."

WATER STORAGE AND UTILIZATION

SEC. 10. Section 1 of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 869), as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "the United States, including the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "the States of the United States and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands".

WILDLIFE RESTORATION

SEC. 11. Section 2 of the Act of September 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 917), as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "; and the term 'State' shall be construed to mean and include the several States and the Territory of Hawaii".

FISHERY RESOURCES

SEC. 12. The Act of August 4, 1947 (61 Stat. 726), is amended—

(a) by striking out the words "the Territories and island possessions of the United States" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "the United States and its island possessions" in sections 1 and 2;

(b) by striking out the words "Territory of Hawaii and" in section 1;

(c) by striking out the word "Territorial" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "State" in section 3; and

(d) by striking out the words "Hawaiian Islands" and "Territory of Hawaii" and inserting in lieu thereof, in both cases, the words "State of Hawaii" in section 4.

FISH RESTORATION

SEC. 13. Section 2(d) of the Act of August 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 431), as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "; and the term 'State' shall be construed to mean and include the several States and the Territory of Hawaii".

CRIMINAL CODE

SEC. 14. (a) Title 18, United States Code, section 1401, is amended by striking out the

words "the Territory of Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii,".

(b) Title 18, United States Code, section 5024, is amended by striking out the words preceding the first comma and inserting in lieu thereof the words "This chapter shall apply in the States of the United States".

(c) Section 6 of Public Law 85–752, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words preceding the first comma and inserting in lieu thereof the word "Sections 3 and 4 of this Act shall apply in the States of the United States".

EDUCATION

National Defense Education Act

SEC. 15. (a)(1) Subsection (a) of section 103 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, relating to definition of State, is amended by striking out "Hawaii," each time it appears therein.

(2)(A) Paragraph (2), and subparagraph (C) of paragraph (3), of subsection (a) of section 302 of such Act, relating to allotments for science, mathematics, and foreign language instruction equipment, are each amended by striking out "continental United States" each time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "United States".

(B) Effective in the case of promulgations of allotment ratios made, under section 302 of such Act, after enactment of this Act and before satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce for a full year on the per capita income of Alaska, subparagraph (B) of such paragraph (3) is amended to read:

"(B) The term 'United States' means the continental United States (excluding Alaska) and Hawaii."

(C) Effective in the case of promulgations of allotment ratios made under such section 302 after such data for a full year are available from the Department of Commerce, subparagraph (B) of such paragraph (3) is amended to read:

"(B) The term 'United States' means the fifty States and the District of Columbia."

Promulgations of allotment ratios made under such section 302 after such data for a full year are available from the Department of Commerce, but before such data are available therefrom for a full three-year period, shall be based on such data for such one full year or, when such data are available for a two-year period, for such two years.

(3) Section 1008 of such Act, relating to allotments to territories, is amended by striking out "Hawaii,".

Vocational education

(b)(1) Section 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (43 Stat. 18), extending the benefits of the Smith-Hughes vocational education law to Hawaii, is repealed.

(2) The last sentence of section 2 of the Act of February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 930), relating to allotments for salaries of teachers of agricultural subjects, is amended by striking out "$27,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$28,500". The last sentence of section 4 of such Act, as amended, relating to allotments for teacher training, is amended by striking out "$98,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$105,200".

(3) Paragraph (1) of section 2 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, relating to definition of States and Territories, is amended by striking out "the Territory of Hawaii,".

(4) Subsection (e) of secton 210 and subsection (a) of section 307 of such Act, relating to definition of State, are each amended by striking out "Hawaii,".

School construction assistance in federally affected areas

(1) Paragraph (13) of section 15 of the Act of September 23, 1950 (64 Stat. 967), as amended, relating to definition of State, is amended by striking out "Hawaii,".

School operation assistance in federally affected areas

(d)(1) The material in the parentheses in the first sentence of subsection (d) of section 3 of the Act of September 30, 1960, as amended, relating to determination of local contribution rate, is amended to read: "(other than a local educational agency in Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, or in a State in which a substantial proportion of the land is in unorganized territory for which a State agency is the local educational agency, or in a State in which there is only one local educational agency)".

(2) The fourth sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out "in the continental United States (including Alaska)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(other than Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, or the Virgin Islands)" and by striking out "continental United States" in clause (ii) of such sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "United States (which for purposes of this sentence and the next sentence means the fifty States and the District of Columbia)". The fifth sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out "continental" before "United States" each time it appears therein and by striking out "(including Alaska)".

(3) The last sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out "Hawaii," and by inserting after "for which a State agency is the local educational agency," the following: "or in any State in which there is only one local educational agency,".

(4) Paragraph (8) of section 9 of such Act, relating to definition of State, is amended by striking out "Hawaii,".

Land-grant college aid

(e) Notwithstanding the last sentence of subsection (b) of section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union", approved March 18, 1959 (73 Stat. 4; Public Law 86–3), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the State of Hawaii the sum of $6,000,000. Amounts appropriated under this subsection shall be held and considered to be granted to such State subject to those provisions of the Act entitled "An Act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts", approved July 2, 1862 (7 U.S.C. 301–308), applicable to the proceeds from the sale of land or land scrip.

IMPORTATION OF MILK AND CREAM

SEC. 16. Subsection (b) of section 9 of the Act of February 15, 1927 (44 Stat. 1103), as amended, is amended to read:

"(b) The term 'United States' means the fifty States and the District of Columbia."

OPIUM POPPY CONTROL

SEC. 17. Section 12 of the Opium Poppy Control Act of 1942, as amended, is further amended by deleting therefrom the words "the Territory of Hawaii,".

HIGHWAYS

SEC. 18. (a) The definition of the term "State" in title 23, United States Code, section 101(a), is amended to read as follows:

"The term 'State' means any one of the fifty States, the District of Columbia, or Puerto Rico."

(b) Sections 103(g) and 105(e) of title 23, United States Code, are repealed.

(c) Section 103(d) of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Interstate System shall be designated within the United States, including the District of Columbia, and it shall not exceed forty-one thousand miles in total extent. It shall be so located as to connect by routes, as direct as practicable, the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense and, to the greatest extent possible, to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico. The routes of this system, to the greatest extent possible, shall be selected by joint action of the State highway departments of each State and the adjoining States, subject to the approval by the Secretary as provided in subsection (e) of this section. All highways or routes included in the Interstate System as finally approved, if not already coincident with the primary system, shall be added to said system without regard to the mileage limitation set forth in subsection (b) of this section. This system may be located both in rural and urban areas."

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, or improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the Interstate System, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with section 103(d) of title 23, United States Code, as amended by section 1 of this Act, the sum of $12,375,000 shall be apportioned to the State of Hawaii out of the sum authorized to be appropriated for the Interstate System for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, under the provisions of section 108(b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 374), as amended by section 7(a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 89), such apportionment to be made at the same time such funds are apportioned to other States. The total sum to be apportioned under section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, among the States other than Hawaii, shall be reduced by said sum apportioned to the State of Hawaii under this section. The Secretary of Commerce shall apportion funds to the State of Hawaii for the Interstate System for the fiscal year 1963 and subsequent fiscal years pursuant to the provisions of said section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code, and, in preparing the estimates required by that section, he shall take into account the apportionment made to the State of Hawaii under this section.

(e) Section 127 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "With respect to the State of Hawaii, laws or regulations in effect on February 1, 1960, shall be applicable for the purposes of this section in lieu of those in effect on July 1, 1956."

INTERNAL REVENUE

SEC. 19. (a) Section 4262(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the definition of "continental United States" for purposes of the tax on transportation of persons) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES.—The term 'continental United States' means the District of Columbia and the States other than Alaska and Hawaii."

(b) Section 2202 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to missionaries in foreign service) is amended by striking out "the State, the District of Columbia, or Hawaii" and inserting in lieu thereof "the State or the District of Columbia".

(c) Section 3121(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to a special definition of "State") is amended by striking out "Hawaii,".

(d) Sections 3306(j) and 4233(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (each relating to a special definition of "State") are amended by striking out "Hawaii, and".

(e) Section 4221(d)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to a special definition of "State or local government") is amended to read as follows:

"(4) STATE OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term 'State or local government' means any State, any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia."

(f) Section 4502(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of "United States") is amended by striking out "the Territory of Hawaii,".

(g) Section 4774 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to territorial extent of law) is amended by striking out "the Territory of Hawaii,".

(h) Section 7653(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to shipments from the United States) is amended by striking out ", its possessions or the Territory of Hawaii" and inserting in lieu thereof "or its possessions".

(i) Section 7701(a)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of "United States") is amended by striking out ", the Territory of Hawaii,".

(j) Section 7701(a)(10) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of "State") is amended by striking out "the Territory of Hawaii and".

(k) The amendments contained in subsections (a) through (j) of this section shall be effective as of August 21, 1959.

JUDICIARY

SEC. 20. Title 28, United States Code, section 91, and the Act of June 15, 1960 (64 Stat. 217), as amended, are each amended by striking out the words "Kure Island,".

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

SEC. 21. (a) Subsection (g) of section 11 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, relating to definition of "State", is amended by striking out "Hawaii,".

(b)(1) Subsections (h) and (i) of such section, relating to definition of allotment percentages and Federal shares for purposes of allotment and matching for vocational rehabilitation services grants, are each amended by striking out "continental United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "United States" and by striking out "(including Alaska)".

(2) Paragraph (1) of such subsection (h) is further amended by striking out "the allotment percentage for Hawaii shall be 50 per centum, and" in clause (B).

(3) Subsection (h) of such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(3) Promulgations of allotment percentages and computations of Federal shares made before satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce for a full year on the per capita income of Alaska shall prescribe for Alaska an allotment percentage of 75 per centum and a Federal share of 60 per centum and, for purposes of such promulgations and computations, Alaska shall not be included as part of the 'United States'. Promulgations and computations made thereafter but before per capita income data for Alaska for a full three-year period are available from the Department of Commerce shall be based on satisfactory data available therefrom for Alaska for such one full year or, when such data are available for a two-year period, for such two years.

"(4) The term 'United States' means (but only for purposes of this subsection and subsection (i)) the fifty States and the District of Columbia."

(4) Subsection (i) of such section is further amended by striking out "the Federal share for Hawaii shall be 60 per centum, and" in clause (B).

LABOR

SEC. 22. (a) Section 3(b) of the Act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 114), as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "Hawaii, Alaska,".

(b) Section 13(f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "Alaska; Hawaii;".

(c) Section 17 of the Fair Labor Standards Act, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "the District Court for the Territory of Alaska,".

(d) Section 3(a)(9) of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act is amended by striking out the word "Hawaii,".

NATIONAL GUARD

SEC. 23. Title 32, United States Code, section 101(1), is amended by striking out the words "Hawaii or".

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

SEC. 24. (a)(1) Subsection (h) of section 5 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, relating to Federal share for purposes of program operation grants, is amended by striking out "continental United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "United States", by striking out "(including Alaska)", and by striking out, in clause (B) of paragraph (1), "for Hawaii shall be 50 per centum, and".

(2) Such subsection is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(3) As used in this subsection, the term 'United States' means the fifty States and the District of Columbia.

"(4) Promulgations made before satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce for a full year on the per capita income of Alaska shall prescribe a Federal share for Alaska of 50 per centum and, for purposes of such promulgations, Alaska shall not be included as part of the 'United States'. Promulgations made thereafter but before per capita income data for Alaska for a full three-year period are available for the Department of Commerce shall be based on satisfactory data available therefrom for Alaska for such one full year or, when such data are available for a two-year period, for such two years."

(b) Subsection (d) of section 11 of such Act, relating to definition of "State", is amended by striking out "Hawaii,".

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

SEC. 25. The first sentence of section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 988), is amended by striking out the words "the several States" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "the States of the continental United States, excluding Alaska".

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 26. (a) Title 38, United States Code, section 624(a), is amended by striking out the words "outside the continental limits of the United States, or a Territory, Commonwealth, or possession of the United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "outside any State".

(b) The first sentence of title 38, United States Code, section 903(b), is amended to read as follows: "In addition to the foregoing, when such a death occurs in the continental United States or Hawaii, the Administrator shall transport the body to the place of burial in the continental United States or Hawaii."

(c) Title 38, United States Code, section 2007(c), is amended by striking out the word "Hawaii,".

DAVIS-BACON ACT

SEC. 27. Section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1494), as amended, is further amended by striking out the words ", the Territory of Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii," and the words ", or the Territory of Alaska, or the Territory of Hawaii".

FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT

SEC. 28. The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended by—

(a) striking out the words "continental United States (including Alaska), Hawaii," in section 3(f) and inserting in lieu thereof the words "States of the Union, the District of Columbia,";

(b) striking out the words "continental United States, its Territories, and possessions" in section 211(j) and inserting in lieu thereof the words "States of the Union, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the possessions of the United States";

(c) striking out the words "continental limits of the United States" in section 404(c) and inserting in lieu thereof the words "States of the Union and the District of Columbia"; and

(d) striking out the words "and the Territory of Hawaii" in section 702(a).

BUY AMERICAN ACT

SEC. 29. Section 1(b) of title III of the Act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1520), as amended, is amended by striking out the word "Hawaii,".

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

SEC. 30. (a) Subsection (f) of section 2 of the Public Health Service Act, relating to definition of State, is amended by striking out "Hawaii,".

(b) The first sentence of section 331 of such Act, relating to receipt and treatment of lepers, is amended by striking out ", Territory, or the District of Columbia". The fifth sentence of such section is amended by striking out "the Territory of Hawaii" and inserting in lieu thereof "Hawaii".

(c) Subsection (c) of section 361 of such Act, relating to regulations governing apprehension and detention of persons to prevent the spread of a communicable disease, is amended by striking out ", the Territory of Hawaii,".

(d)(1) Clause (2) of subsection (a) of section 631 of such Act, relating to definition of allotment percentage for purposes of allotments for construction of hospitals and other medical service facilities, is amended by striking out "the allotment percentage for Hawaii shall be 50 per centum, and".

(2) Such subsection is further amended by striking out "continental United States (including Alaska)" and inserting in lieu thereof "United States".

(3) Subsection (b) of such section, relating to promulgation of allotment percentages, is amended by striking out "continental United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "United States". Such subsection is further amended by inserting "(1)" after "(b)" and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(2) The term 'United States' means (but only for purposes of this subsection and subsection (a)) the fifty States and the District of Columbia;

"(3) Promulgations made before satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce for a full year on the per capita income of Alaska shall prescribe an allotment percentage for Alaska of 50 per centum and, for purposes of such promulgation, Alaska shall not be included as part of the 'United States'. Promulgations made thereafter but before per capita income data for Alaska for a full three-year period are available from the Department of Commerce shall be based on satisfactory data available therefrom for Alaska for such one full year or, when such data are available for a two-year period, for such two years;".

(4) Subsection (d) of such section, relating to definition of State, is further amended by striking out "Hawaii,".

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

SEC. 31. (a)(1) Paragraph (8) of subsection (a) of section 1101 of the Social Security Act, relating to definition of Federal percentage for purposes of matching for public assistance grants, is amended by striking out "continental United States (including Alaska)" and inserting in lieu thereof "United States".

(2) Subparagraph (A) of such paragraph is further amended by striking out "(i)" and by striking out ", and (ii) the Federal percentage shall be 50 per centum for Hawaii".

(3) Such paragraph is further amended by adding after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraphs:

"(C) The term 'United States' means (but only for purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of this paragraph) the fifty States and the District of Columbia.

"(D) Promulgations made before satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce for a full year on the per capita income of Alaska shall prescribe a Federal percentage for Alaska of 50 per centum and, for purposes of such promulgations, Alaska shall not be included as part of the 'United States'. Promulgations made thereafter but before per capita income data for Alaska for a full three-year period are available from the Department of Commerce shall be based on satisfactory data available therefrom for Alaska for such one full year or, when such data are available for a two-year period, for such two years."

(b)(1) Subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 524 of such Act, relating to the definition of allotment percentages and Federal shares for purposes of allotment and matching for child welfare services grants, are each amended by striking out "continental United States (including Alaska)" and inserting in lieu thereof "United States".

(2) Such section is further amended by adding after subsection (c) the following new subsections:

"(d) For purposes of this section, the term 'United States' means the fifty States and the District of Columbia.

"(e) Promulgations made before satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce for a full year on the per capita income of Alaska shall prescribe a Federal share for Alaska of 50 per centum and, for purposes of such promulgations, Alaska shall not be included as part of the 'United States'. Promulgations made thereafter but before per capita income data for Alaska for a full three-year period are available from the Department of Commerce shall be based on satisfactory data available therefrom for Alaska for such one full year or, when such data are available for a two-year period, for such two years."

(c)(1) The last sentence of subsection (i) of section 202 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "forty-nine" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifty".

(2) Subsections (h) and (i) of section 210 of such Act relating to definitions of State and United States for purposes of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, are each amended by striking out "Hawaii,". Such subsection (h) is further amended by striking out the comma after "District of Columbia".

(d) (1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 1101 of such Act, relating to definition of State, is amended by striking out "Hawaii and".

(2) Paragraph (2) of such subsection, as amended, relating to definition of "United States", is amended by striking out ", Hawaii,".

(e) Subparagraph (C) and (G) of paragraph (6) of subsection (d) of section 218 of the Social Security Act, as amended, are each further amended by striking out "the Territory of" and "or Territory" each time they appear therein.

(f) Subsection (p) of such section is amended by striking out "Territory of".

(g) The last sentence of subsection (a) of section 1501 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "Alaska, Hawaii,".

SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS

SEC. 32. The Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1044), as heretofore and hereafter amended, shall apply to the State of Hawaii.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SEC. 33. Section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 617), as amended, is further amended by striking out the word "Hawaii,".

FEDERAL REGISTER

SEC. 34. Section 8 of the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 502), as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "continental United States (including Alaska)" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "States of the Union and the District of Columbia".

HOME PORTS OF VESSELS

SEC. 35. Section 1 of the Act of February 16, 1925 (43 Stat. 947), as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "Alaska, Hawaii, and".

MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

SEC. 36. (a) Subsection (a) of section 505 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'continental limits of the United States' includes the States of Alaska and Hawaii."

(b) Section 606 of such Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For the purposes of this section, the term 'continental limits of the United States' includes the States of Alaska and Hawaii."

(c) Section 702 of such Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For the purposes of this section, the term 'continental United States' includes the States of Alaska and Hawaii."

COMMUNICATIONS ACT

SEC. 37. Section 222(a)(10) of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by striking out the words "the several States and the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "the District of Columbia and the States of the Union, except Hawaii".

AIRCRAFT LOAN GUARANTEES

SEC. 38. Section 3 of the Act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 629), as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "Territory of Hawaii" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "State of Hawaii".

REAL PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 39. Section 43(c) of the Act of August 10, 1956 (70A Stat. 636), as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "United States, Hawaii," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "States of the Union, the District of Columbia,".

SELECTIVE SERVICE

SEC. 40. Section 16(b) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is further amended by striking out the word "Hawaii,".

REPORTS ON FEDERAL LAND USE

SEC. 41. The President shall prescribe procedures to assure that the reports to be submitted to him by Federal agencies pursuant to section 5(e) of the Act of March 18, 1959 (73 Stat. 6), providing for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, shall be prepared in accordance with uniform policies and coordinated within the executive branch.

HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION LANDS

SEC. 42. Section 5(b) of the Act of March 18, 1959 (73 Stat. 5), is amended by inserting, immediately following the words "public property" the words ", and to all lands defined as 'available lands' by section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended,".

LEASE BY UNITED STATES OF PUBLIC PROPERTY OF HAWAII

SEC. 43. Until August 21, 1964, there shall be covered into the treasury of the State of Hawaii the rentals or consideration received by the United States with respect to public property taken for the uses and purposes of the United States under section 91 of the Hawaii Organic Act and thereafter by the United States leased, rented, or granted upon revocable permits to private parties.

TRANSFER OF RECORDS

SEC. 44. (a) There are hereby transferred to the State of Hawaii all records and other papers that were made or received by any Federal or territorial agency, or any predecessor thereof, in connection with the performance of functions assumed in whole or in substantial part by the State of Hawaii. There are hereby also transferred to the State of Hawaii all records and other papers in the custody of the Public Archives of Hawaii that were made or received by any Federal agency.

(b) There are also hereby transferred to the State of Hawaii all books, publications, and legal reference materials which are owned by the United States and which were, prior to the admission of Hawaii to the Union, placed in the custody of courts, libraries, or territorial agencies in Hawaii in order to facilitate the performance of functions conferred on such courts or agencies by Federal law.

USE OF G.S.A. SERVICES OR FACILITIES

SEC. 45. The Administrator of General Services is authorized to make available to the State of Hawaii such services or facilities as are determined by the Administrator to be necessary for an interim period, pending provision of such services or facilities by the State of Hawaii. Such interim period shall not extend beyond August 21, 1964. Payment shall be made to the General Services Administration by the State of Hawaii for the cost of such services or facilities to the Federal Government, as determined by the Administrator.

PURCHASES OF TYPEWRITERS

SEC. 46. Title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1960, is amended by striking out the words "for the purchase within the continental limits of the United States of any typewriting machines" and inserting in lieu thereof "for the purchase within the States of the Union and the District of Columbia of any typewriting machines".

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

SEC. 47. Section 18(a) of the Act of March 18, 1959 (73 Stat. 12), providing for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, is amended by striking out the words "or is conferring" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "or as conferring".

TARIFF ACT OF 1930

SEC. 48. Section 309(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1309(a)), is amended by inserting "or between Hawaii and any other part of the United States or

between Alaska and any other part of the United States" immediately after "possessions" wherever it appears.

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 49. (a) The amendments made by section 15(a)(2)(A), by section 24(a), by paragraphs (1), (2), and 3 of section 30(d), by subsection (b), and paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (a), of section 31, and, except as provided in subsection (g) of this section, by section 21(b) shall be applicable in the case of promulgations or computations of Federal shares, allotment percentages, allotment ratios, and Federal percentages, as the case may be, made after August 21, 1959.

(b) The amendments made by paragraph (2) of section 31(a) shall be effective with the beginning of the calendar quarter in which this Act is enacted. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, as soon as possible after enactment of this Act, promulgate a Federal percentage for Hawaii determined in accordance with the provisions of subparagraph (B) of section 1101(a)(8) of the Social Security Act, such promulgation to be effective for the period beginning with the beginning of the calendar quarter in which this Act is enacted and ending with the close of June 30, 1961.

(c) The amendment made by paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) and paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (d) of section 15 shall be applicable in the case of fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1960.

(d) The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (3) of section 15(a) shall be applicable, in the case of allotments under section 302(b) or 502 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1960, and, in the case of allotments under section 302(a) of such Act, for fiscal years beginning after allotment ratios, to which the amendment made by paragraph (2) of section 15(a) is applicable, are promulgated under such section 302(a).

(e) The amendment made by section 31(c)(1) shall be applicable in the case of deaths occurring on or after August 21, 1959.

(f) The amendments made by subsection (c), paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (b), and paragraph (4) of subsection (d) of section 15, by section 21(a), by section 24(b), by subsections (a), (b), and (c), and paragraph (4) of subsection (d), of section 30, and by subsection (d), and paragraph (2) of subsection (c), of section 31 shall become effective on August 21, 1959.

(g)(1) The allotment percentage determined for Alaska under section 11(h) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended by this Act, for the first, second, third, and fourth years for which such percentage is based on the per capita income data for Alaska shall be increased by 76 per centum, 64 per centum, 52 per centum, and 28 per centum, respectively, of the difference between such allotment percentage for the year involved and 75 per centum.

(2) The Federal share for Alaska determined under section 11(i) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended by this Act, for the first year for which such Federal share is based on per capita income data for Alaska shall be increased by 70 per centum of the difference between such Federal share for such year and 60 per centum.

(3) If such first year for which such Federal share is based on per capita income data for Alaska is any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1962, the adjusted Federal share for Alaska for such year for purposes of section 2(b) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act shall, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (3)(A) of such section 2(b), be the Federal share determined pursuant to paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(4) Section 47(c) of the Alaska Omnibus Act (Public Law 86-70) is repealed.

(h) The amendment made by section 48 shall apply only with respect to articles withdrawn as provided in section 309(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

ADMINISTRATION OF PALMYRA, MIDWAY, AND WAKE

SEC. 50. Until Congress shall provide for the government of Palmyra Island, Midway Island, and Wake Island, all executive and legislative authority necessary for the civil administration of Palmyra Island, Midway Island, and Wake Island, and all judicial authority other than that contained in the Act of June 15, 1950 (64 Stat. 217), as amended, shall continue to be vested in such person or persons and shall be exercised in such manner and through such agency or agencies as the President of the United States may direct or authorize. In the case of Palmyra Island, such person or persons may confer upon the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii such jurisdiction (in addition to that contained in such Act of June 15, 1950), and such judicial functions and duties as he or they may deem appropriate for the civil administration of such island.

OTHER SUBJECTS

SEC. 51. The amendment by this Act of certain statutes by deleting therefrom specific references to Hawaii or such phrases as "Territory of Hawaii" shall not be construed to affect the applicability or inapplicability in or to Hawaii or other statutes not so amended.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 52. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second is considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 11602, might be accurately described as an epilog to statehood. Until 2 years ago the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs handled a great many bills dealing with the then Territories of Hawaii and Alaska. Congress, in its wisdom, in these last 2 years has voted to bring those Territories into the Union as States.

A year ago as a result of the granting of statehood to Alaska we approved here the so-called Alaska omnibus bill. Now we come before the House with the Hawaii omnibus bill.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is necessary because of the numerous changes which must occur when an area passes from Territorial status to that of statehood. The basic purpose of this bill is to accomplish those changes in Federal laws which have become necessary and desirable because of Hawaii's admission into the Union on an equal footing with the other States in all respects whatsoever.

The President noted in his 1961 budget message to Congress that, "As in the case of Alaska, comprehensive legislation will be necessary to enable Hawaii to take its place as the equal of the other 49 States."

Mr. Speaker, this is a bulky bill but many of the sections are technical and merely change the status of Hawaii to that of any other State under existing law.

I think the committee, which conducted full hearings and which reported this bill out unanimously, has prepared and submitted to the House a conservative and reasonable bill which will do the job and which will enable Hawaii to take its full place as the 50th State in the Union.

The cost of the omnibus bill is slightly in excess of $6 million, compared with the $10 million cost of the Alaska omnibus bill. The principal item of cost in this measure is $6 million in lieu of land grants. As we know, when each of the other States came into the Union they were given land in place of land scrip, and the moneys evolved from those grants were used to support their land-grant colleges, agricultural colleges.

Hawaii comes before Congress in a rather unusual position. We do not have the vast land holdings which were in being at the time the other States were admitted.

The land which does exist in Hawaii is owned in large measure by private enterprise or by the Federal Government. It would be impossible to devise a bill under which we could give to Hawaii the kind of land grant that we gave to Alaska and to the other States which came into the Union. The very zealous and hard-working, capable Representative from Hawaii, Congressman INOUYE, came before the committee and proposed that we follow a formula. He suggested that in the past we have given to each new State the equivalent of 30,000 acres for each Representative in Congress. That would spell out to 90,000 acres in the present instance. Well, we do not have the acres—so he took the 90,000 acres and multiplied that by the fair valuation of land in Hawaii and came up with a figure of $36 million. The committee considered his request, and then decided unanimously to reduce that sum to one-sixth or $6 million. I would like to point out that of all of the 50 States in the Union, Hawaii is the only State that has not been granted any land in place or in script for the specific purpose of establishing a college for the teaching of the agricultural and mechanical arts. May I say, Mr. Speaker, in that connection, the establishment of such a college and the development of such a college in Hawaii would be of tremendous benefit not only to the rest of the Nation but to the friendly peoples in the Pacific, many of whose young people study at the University of Hawaii. They would be able to acquire agricultural and mechanical skills which could be used, in my opinion, much more effectively than some of the moneys that we have granted to countries under the heading of Foreign Aid or Mutual Aid. I believe that this $6 million would be a splendid investment. I believe it is a fair compromise

in view of the fact that we have given other States land in place of script.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, would my colleague from New York yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I think it should be understood that the State of Hawaii does not get an outright grant, but that the money is placed in trust and the investment interest of the money is at the discretion of the State of Hawaii for this particular project; is that not correct?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. The gentleman is very correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate my distinguished friend and coworker on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for the fine work he has done in this field. In his operations and labors in the Congress, he has been indefatigable. His decisions have been worthy of commendation, effective, and constructive. I wish also to join in the fine compliment he has paid to our new Congressman from Hawaii, Mr. INOUYE.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I thank the gentleman. I would restate what the chairman of the full committee has said, that this money is not an outright grant. It must be placed in trust and only the income can be used for the purposes of an agricultural college.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other matters in this legislation, but I assure the House that virtually all of them are changes which must be made in connection with the transformation from Territorial to statehood status. There is no great degree of controversy that I know of about the other provisions of the bill.

M.. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE].

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, on August 23, 1959, I stood before you in this well to take the oath of office as the first U.S. Representative from the new and sovereign State of Hawaii. At that moment I was extremely tempted to address this distinguished body to express the deep and warm gratitude of the people of Hawaii for your action in granting statehood to Hawaii. Although belated, may I now take this opportunity to express to you, in behalf of the people of Hawaii, our "mahalo" and warm "aloha." "Mahalo" means thank you, and "aloha" means many things—it means a friendly hello, a fond farewell, but above all, it means warm love and friendship.

Today, this body is considering H.R. 11602, a bill to amend certain laws of the United States in light of the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, and for other purposes. The distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Honorable LEO W. O'BRIEN, has most adequately explained the provisions of this bill. This bill is a supplement to the action taken by this body in granting statehood to Hawaii.

It provides for certain benefits long denied us because of our Territorial status, and also because of our geographic separation from the continental United States. Furthermore, it provides for the restoration of certain benefits which we enjoyed as a Territory, but subsequently denied us upon the granting of statehood.

The initial drafting of this measure was done by the Budget Bureau under the supervision of Dr. Harold Seidman. I wish to, at this time, express my gratitude to Dr. Seidman and his staff for carrying on the monumental project of preparing this Hawaii omnibus bill.

I would also like to express the gratitude of the people of Hawaii to the very distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the distinguished gentleman from Colorado, the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL; to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable LEO W. O'BRIEN; and to the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR; and to all of the members of the distinguished committee. The people of Hawaii will be forever indebted to the distinguished members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for their compassion and understanding in advocating greater self-government and self-determination to the proud people of Hawaii.

I have looked forward to this day for a long time. The several months I have spent with you have been most enjoyable and encouraging. I shall never forget your many courtesies and your kindnesses. I am indeed very proud to be one of your colleagues.

Thank you.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. INOUYE. I shall be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I would like to ask the gentleman if I correctly understand the purpose of this $6 million proposition. That is, that you get certain lands, like other States have gotten, for educational purposes.

Mr. INOUYE. Under the Morrill Act of 1860, every State was given 30,000 acres of land for each Representative in Congress. Because of the land situation in Hawaii, I have asked the committee to grant the State of Hawaii money in the sum of $6 million—in lieu of a land grant. But as the chairman stated, we will not receive this grant of $6 million but we will receive the interest on it.

Mr. COLMER. In other words, instead of getting the land you are getting money in the form of a revolving fund?

Mr. INOUYE. That is correct.

Mr. COLMER. I wondered why you could not get land. Can you give us some light on that subject?

Mr. INOUYE. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] stated, we have no public domain where we can have 90,000 acres of land available for such purpose. Most of the Federal lands are used for military purposes.

Mr. COLMER. I just wanted to get that straight in my own mind. Of course, as one who opposed the admission of Hawaii as a State, I still think that having been admitted as a State, it is entitled to the same treatment that all other States of the Union received.

May I say in this connection that I am also very happy the gentleman who is now addressing the Chamber is and has the great honor of being the first Representative from Hawaii. I happen to know that the gentleman is quite a war hero, if I may say that without embarrassment to him. I knew about him long before he came to Congress. He trained in my State of Mississippi and rendered valiant service to the cause of our great common country of which he is now a part. I welcome him to this Chamber and congratulate the people of Hawaii on their wisdom in selecting him to be their first Congressman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. INOUYE. I shall be very happy to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] on the able presentation he has made here on this bill which means so much to the State and the people of Hawaii.

The gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] has made an outstanding record already in this body and enjoys the confidence and respect of his colleagues. He serves his people in a manner which reflects the greatest credit upon them. They are justified in feeling proud of the gentleman and the character of public service he renders.

Mr. INOUYE. I thank my leader for his compliments.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. INOUYE. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Alaska.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11602, known as the Hawaiian omnibus bill, introduced by our distinguished colleague, DANIEL INOUYE, of Hawaii. At the outset I wish to compliment the gentleman from Hawaii upon the fine job he is doing for our 50th State, and to express my pleasure in his friendship and in serving with him in this great legislative body.

My work last year in behalf of the Alaska omnibus bill, in association first with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, the able and dedicated gentleman from New York, LEO O'BRIEN, and then with the chairman of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the distinguished gentleman from Colorado, WAYNE ASPINALL, and the other fine members of the committee, highlighted the need of an omnibus bill for a new State. The very fact of a grant of Statehood to an erstwhile Territory compels provisions for an orderly transition from Territorial status to full-fledged State operations. Also required are amendments to numerous Federal statutes making them applicable to the new

State on an equal footing with the other States, and many technical amendments to the United States Code deleting inappropriate references and otherwise bringing the United States Code in conformance with the new situation.

This bill, first drafted by the Bureau of the Budget along the lines set forth in the Alaska omnibus bill enacted a year ago, has been painstakingly considered by the subcommittee and the full committee of which I am a member, and is, in my opinion, admirably suited to meet the need, and constitutes legislation which I unqualifiedly recommend to this House for passage.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the action we are taking today might be called the windup of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. During the 85th Congress and the 1st session of the 86th Congress, the House and the Senate in their wisdom overwhelmingly admitted into the sisterhood of States these two great Territories.

Last year the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee brought to the floor for consideration and adoption a bill which would wipe out all the inequities and inconsistencies in existing laws affecting the new State of Alaska. This year there has been introduced and there is presented now for your consideration a bill which will do the same thing for the new State of Hawaii. If you will examine carefully the report which came to our committee from the Bureau of the Budget you will be surprised to find that the bill was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The Speaker and Parliamentarian could have assigned this bill to any one of a number of committees, Banking and Currency, Education and Labor; in fact, he could have assigned it to every committee of the House except the Committee on Rules, and I think they might even have found a rule to allow it to go to the Rules Committee, because this bill covers some phase of jurisdiction of each one of those committees. But under the procedure adopted by the Speaker it was referred to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] because, even though this was referred to our committee he directed a letter to the chairman of each of the other committees of the House calling their particular attention to the section of the bill affecting their jurisdiction and asked them for any comments or changes they wanted to make in this legislation.

It shows the manner in which this great House operates, because the Chairman and the staffs of the respective committees all cooperated with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make this bill possible.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I commended the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] and the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], and I wish to commend also the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] for his cooperative approach and effective aid in the consideration of legislation leading to the approval of the status of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, and the necessary legislation needed to bring these two States in a full relationship with the other States. I extend a like commendation to my friend and colleague from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND].

At this time I would like to advise the House that Mr. SISK, Mr. MCGINLEY, Mr. WESTLAND, Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, and Mr. INOUYE traveled extensively throughout the Pacific area last fall on a committee assignment from my committee, paying attention to the problems treated in this particular legislation as well as those in the Pacific area described as the American Samoan Islands, the Island of Guam, and the trust territory over which our Government presently has jurisdiction. They rendered a difficult and valuable service for the Federal Congress and the citizens of the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 91]

Alexander	Farbstein	Meader
Alford	Fino	Merrow
Anderson, Mont.	Flynn	Mitchell
	Fogarty	Montoya
Anfuso	Forand	Moorhead
Ashley	Frazier	Morris, Okla.
Ayres	Garmatz	Nix
Barden	Giaimo	Osmers
Barry	Gilbert	Pilcher
Bass, N.H.	Glenn	Pillion
Bentley	Granahan	Porter
Blatnik	Gray	Powell
Bolling	Green, Oreg.	Quigley
Bonner	Griffin	Rogers, Tex.
Bow	Griffiths	Roosevelt
Brewster	Halpern	Rostenkowski
Brown, Mo.	Hays	Santangelo
Buckley	Healey	Scott
Cahill	Hébert	Short
Canfield	Hemphill	Smith, Kans.
Cederberg	Holland	Staggers
Chelf	Irwin	Steed
Coffin	Jackson	Stratton
Corbett	Johnson, Colo.	Stubblefield
Curtis, Mass.	Kearns	Sullivan
Curtis, Mo.	Keogh	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Kilburn	Teller
Dent, Pa.	Kilday	Thompson, N.J.
Devine	Kluczynski	Van Pelt
Diggs	Lafore	Walter
Dingell	Landrum	Williams
Dorn, N.Y.	Lesinski	Wilson
Dulski	McDowell	Wolf
Durham	McGovern	Zelenko
Fallon	Macdonald	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 327 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AMENDING CERTAIN LAWS CONCERNING STATE OF HAWAII

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question or two with reference to section 48 of the bill, amending section 309(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930. There is a justifiable concern with regard to this on the west coast and in the Rocky Mountain area, due to soft market conditions in the petroleum and petroleum-products industry in these regions and the possibility of this amendment aggravating that situation. Am I correct in my understanding that there is an amendment under consideration with reference to this section to exclude petroleum products from the operation of the amendment?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. It was called to our attention, and the reason this amendment was placed in it was to make sure that the carriers have the same privilege with regard to the tax on cigarettes, liquor, and playing cards that their competitors have in the same trips with ships which would leave either the east-coast ports or the gulf-coast ports and go to Hawaii. It was never intended to go as far, apparently, as the amendment does. It is one of the things that was called to the attention of the other body, and I am sure it will be corrected when it gets there.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. At the present time, as the gentleman has indicated, it is impossible under the rules and procedures of the House to amend the bill, but the other body does have it under consideration. With the understanding that an amendment has been offered in the other body to exclude petroleum products and that it will be supported by the House conferees, I am not going to oppose this legislation at this time. Unless such action is taken, though, I would oppose it as it comes from conference.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Legislative Oversight Committee may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1960

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2611) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes, with amendments.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Small Business Investment Act Amendments of 1960".

SEC. 2. As used in this Act, unless otherwise indicated, references to "the Act" are to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as approved August 21, 1958 (72 Stat. 689).

SEC. 3. Section 103 of the Act is amended by deleting the paragraph numbered (4) and inserting, in lieu thereof, the following: "the term 'State' includes the several States, the Territories and possessions of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia."

SEC. 4. Subsection 301(d) of the Act is amended by deleting the paragraph thereof numbered (9); and by respectively redesignating the paragraphs thereof numbered (10) and (11) as (9) and (10).

SEC. 5. Subsection 302(b) of the Act is amended by deleting the first word and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6(a)(1) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, shares".

SEC. 6. Section 304 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"PROVISION OF EQUITY CAPITAL FOR SMALL-BUSINESS CONCERNS

"SEC. 304. (a) It shall be a function of each small business investment company to provide a source of equity capital for incorporated small-business concerns, in such manner and under such terms as the small business investment company may fix in accordance with the regulations of the Administration.

"(b) Before any capital is provided to a small-business concern under this section—

"(1) the company may require such concern to refinance any or all of its outstanding indebtedness so that the company is the only holder of any evidence of indebtedness of such concern; and

"(2) except as provided in regulations issued by the Administration, such concern shall agree that it will not thereafter incur any indebtedness without first securing the approval of the company and giving the company the first opportunity to finance such indebtedness.

"(c) Whenever a company provides capital to a small-business concern under this section, such concern shall have the right, exercisable in whole or in such part as such concern may elect, to become a stockholder-proprietor by investing in the capital stock of the company 5 per centum of the amount of the capital so provided, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator."

SEC. 7. Title 26, chapter 6, section 26-610 of the District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition, is amended by inserting after the word "associations" the following: ", small business investment companies licensed and operating under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

A second was considered as ordered.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. It makes two substantial changes. It provides that the small business investment organization may make direct purchases of stock from the borrowing corporation. It authorizes small business investment companies to purchase stock in small business concerns and relieves the small buiness concern from compulsory purchasing of stock in the investment company.

I think that will encourage the investment of equity capital in small businesses. They are in need of equity capital and long-term loans. We hope that this will stimulate small business. Small business is essential to the economy of our Nation. Without small business we could not have the free competitive enterprise system. If we destroy small business our economy will be controlled by a few great corporations. It would be a concentration of power that would be disastrous to the welfare of our people and the prosperity of our country.

I hope that this bill will be passed. It came out of the committee without a dissenting vote, and I am sure there can be no opposition to the bill in the House.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have no proposed amendments. Neither do I have any serious objection to this bill. This is a proposal by the House Banking and Currency Committee to expand and increase the facilities of small business in all parts of the Nation. One of the things that I think is extremely beneficial in this proposal to expand small business is that it will supplement and provide a means for employment. This should be a vehicle where depressed areas can be improved by this small business organization expanding manufacturing facilities and retail facilities and service organizations in areas where employment may be low at the present time, and do it on a free enterprise basis, without the type of legislation that was passed in the House recently.

We are not opposing the bill, but I wanted to make this point while we were debating it.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will use the entire 5 minutes. I merely wanted to comment in passing that the amendments to the Small Business Investment Act being considered today were almost identical to the recommendations that flowed from the Subcommittee No. 1 of the Select Committee on Small Business.

Rather extensive hearings were held under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], who is on the floor; and we are glad indeed the Banking and Currency Committee saw fit to agree to the recommendations of Subcommittee No. 1 of the Small Business Committee. We support the amendments and urge the passage of this bill.

The amendments to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 as incorporated in the bill presently under consideration—S. 2611—are consistent with the steady progress and improvement which has characterized Executive and congressional action on the Small Business Act since its inception.

May I mention the fact that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], who also serves on Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Small Business Committee, introduced on June 11, 1959, the original bill—H.R. 7691—which contained amendments recommended to our subcommittee by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration at the subcommittee hearings held in May 1959. The bill before us is substantially in keeping with Mr. MOORE'S bill and the recommendations of the administration. Mr. MOORE and I also had the pleasure of supporting this legislation before Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Banking and Currency Committee, which subcommittee is presided over by the chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who I understand will speak in support of the bill later this afternoon.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, this act to amend the Small Business Investment Act is another one of many alleged Federal aids to the small businessman, in this instance to help secure equity capital for investment. Does this act, and do any of the other Federal aids, actually provide the basic help needed? Is a tax cut not what the small businessman really needs? Suppose, for example, the small businessman could keep the money he earns that he now pays out in taxes. Would this not provide the additional equity capital needed for business expansion? Now, suppose, on the other hand, we build the Federal bureaucracy through various alleged Federal aids for the small businessman, all of which machinery and personnel costs more money, that is more taxation. So we tax the small businessman more to pay for these services offered him. Are we not actually hurting him, not helping him, by imposing a greater tax-load?

It is my firm conviction that the way to help the small businessman is not to increase the Federal bureaucracy but cut back Government spending and, as quickly as we can, cut down the taxation of all our citizens, including the small businessman. This would be the greatest thing we could do for a small businessman.

From another standpoint, this bill is questionable. Small businessmen know where and how to get loans without Federal aid.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1958 the Congress enacted the Small Business Investment Act to encourage the establishment of privately owned small business investment companies. This legislation was enacted in recognition of the

fact that existing financial institutions such as commercial banks were not prepared or designed to satisfy the needs of small business for equity capital and long-term loans. The act authorized the Small Business Administration to assist the proposed new Small Business Investment Companies to get started. We have now had about 20 months of experience operating under the 1958 act and 95 of these investment companies have been licensed. While this is a start, there is general agreement that some amendments to the 1958 act are needed if this new program is to meet the needs of small business properly. S. 2611 would make some changes in the 1958 act which I hope will make this program operate more effectively.

The first change the bill would make would be to open up new ways in which small business investment companies may furnish equity capital to small business concerns. Under the 1958 act as it stands today the only way this can be done is for the small business investment company to buy debentures of the small business concern which are convertible at the option of the investment company into the small business concern's stock. S. 2611 would provide instead that the small business investment company may furnish this capital in other forms to be authorized by the Small Business Administration regulations—such as by directly buying stock in the small business concern, or by buying debentures with detachable stock rights.

S. 2611 would also repeal the requirement of the 1958 act that a small business concern must purchase stock in any small business investment company from which it gets equity capital. This requirement has proved objectionable to the small business concerns who look upon it as an additional expense of obtaining equity funds. S. 2611, as reported by the committee, would repeal this mandatory requirement but preserve for the small business concern the option of buying stock in the investment company up to 5 percent of the amount of capital furnished.

The bill would also make certain other changes in the law again designed to increase the effectiveness of this new program. Further experience under the program may reveal additional changes which should be made but I am hopeful that the bill will prove a big step forward in providing small businesses with the equity capital that they need so sorely if they are to play their proper role in our expanding economy.

The report of our committee is inserted herewith:

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1960

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2611) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "1959" and insert "1960" in lieu thereof.

Page 2, strike out all of lines 12 through 19 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 6. Section 304 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'PROVISION OF EQUITY CAPITAL FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS

" 'SEC. 304. (a) It shall be a function of each small business investment company to provide a source of equity capital for incorporated small-business concerns, in such manner and under such terms as the small business investment company may fix in accordance with the regulations of the Administration.

" '(b) Before any capital is provided to a small-business concern under this section—

" '(1) The company may require such concern to refinance any or all of its outstanding indebtedness so that the company is the only holder of any evidence of indebtedness of such concern; and

" '(2) except as provided in regulations issued by the administration, such concern shall agree that it will not thereafter incur any indebtedness without first securing the approval of the company and giving the company the first opportunity to finance such indebtedness.

" '(c) Whenever a company provides capital to a small-business concern under this section, such concern shall have the right, exercisable in whole or in such part as such concern may elect, to become a stockholder-proprietor by investing in the capital stock of the company 5 per centum of the amount of the capital so provided, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator.' "

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The primary purpose of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is to make equity-type capital and long-term credit more readily available for small business concerns, through encouraging the establishment of privately owned small business investment companies (referred to in this report as SBIC's). S. 2611 would amend this 1958 act in order to remove certain obstacles which have impeded the realization of this goal. The bill was ordered reported by unanimous vote of your committee, and it has the support of the Small Business Administration.

Under the 1958 act, each SBIC must have a minimum initial paid-in capital and surplus of $300,000, of which $150,000 may be supplied by the Small Business Administration through purchase of subordinated debentures of the SBIC. SBA may also make loans to any SBIC, up to 50 percent of its capital and surplus. Today an SBIC can supply funds to a small business concern in two ways: (1) By having the small business concern's unsecured debentures, convertible into stock in the concern, at sound book value as determined at the time the debentures are issued; or (2) by making term loans (not involving equity interest) of 5 to 20 years.

S. 2611 would open up new methods by which SBIC's may furnish equity capital to small businesses. Under the 1958 act, as indicated above, this can be done only by purchasing convertible debentures. S. 2611 would allow SBIC's to furnish capital in other forms to be authorized by regulation of the Small Business Administration (such as by directly buying stock in small business concerns, or by buying debentures with severable or detachable stock rights).

S. 2611 would also repeal the requirement that a small business concern must purchase stock in any SBIC from which it gets equity capital. Instead, the bill as reported would grant the small business concern an option (exercisable in whole or in part) to buy stock in the SBIC equal to 5 percent of the capital supplied. Other provisions of S. 2611 would authorize a bank that is a subsidiary of a holding company to invest up to 1 percent of its capital and surplus in any SBIC (this is now prohibited where the SBIC is a subsidiary of the same holding company); would extend the act to possessions of the United States, such as Guam; would exempt SBIC's in the District of Columbia from the District of Columbia small loan law; and would make certain other technical amendments, explained below in the section-by-section summary of the bill.

BACKGROUND OF THE BILL

In the 20 months that have passed since Congress enacted the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, the Small Business Administration has licensed 95 SBIC's. While this represents a hopeful beginning, it falls short of SBA's own expectations, and there is general agreement that some changes in the act are needed to remove restrictions that have deterred formation of SBIC's.

The following is a more detailed summary of the status of SBA actions on SBIC applications as of May 6, 1960:

Total proposals (preliminary applications received in Washington office)	189
Total initial capital and surplus	[1] $78,360,504
Federal funds requested through purchase of subordinated debentures under sec. 302 of the act	$20,280,550
Notices to proceed (conditional approval)	54
Amendments or additional information requested	10
Under current active review	19
Notice of insufficiency or withdrawn	11
Licenses issued (final SBA approval)	95
Having a total initial capital	$33,895,681
With subordinated debentures (included above)	$9,540,050
Total actual capital (including proceeds from additional stock sold after licensing)	$51,535,168
Total actual capital, plus amounts of public offerings in progress or contemplated in registration statements filed with SEC	[1] $81,715,168
Total capital plus public offerings (as above) and potential sec. 303 loans giving effect thereto	[1] $122,572,752

[1] These figures do not take into account an additional proposed public offering of $10,000,000 of securities by firm commitment with underwriters, for which registration statement has been filed at SEC by company not yet licensed.

(Based on their present capital, licensees are eligible to borrow maximum of $25,768,000 from SBA under sec. 303 of the act but have actually borrowed only $550,000. Upon completion of public offerings in progress or in registration at SEC, the loan potential will increase by $15,090,000.)

Names, locations, and capital structure of licensed SBIC's, as of May 6, are shown below, together with financial participation in them by SBA. SBA's participation may take the form of initial contributions to capital, through purchase of subordinated debentures of the SBIC's, as shown in the third column. It may also be in the form of loans to SBIC's on their securities (under sec. 303 of the 1958 act) as shown in the fourth column.

Licensed small business investment companies as of May 6, 1960

Name of licensee	Total initial capital and surplus	Subordinated debentures		303 loans	
		Committed	Disbursed	Committed	Disbursed
Business Assistance Corp., Boston, Mass	$301,000	$150,000			
First Small Business Investment Corp. of New England, Boston, Mass	325,000				
Industrial Small Business Investment Corp., Boston, Mass	301,500	150,000	$150,000		
Massachusetts Small Business Investment Co., Inc., Boston, Mass	414,000				
Narragansett Small Business Investment Co., Providence, R.I	301,000	150,000			
Prudential Small Business Investment Co., Inc., Boston, Mass	300,600	150,000	150,000		
The Small Business Investment Corp. of Western Massachusetts, Worcester, Mass	301,500	150,000			
Business Equity Corp., New York, N.Y	330,000				
Eastern Small Business Fund, Inc., New York, N.Y	307,575	150,000			
Empire Small Business Investment Co., Inc., New York, N.Y	2,500,000				
The First Connecticut Small Business Investment Co., Bridgeport, Conn	310,000	150,000			
Franklin Small Business Investment Corp., Franklin Square, New York, N.Y	305,000				
Louisiana Equity Corp., New York, N.Y	310,000				
Royal Small Business Funds, Inc., New York, N.Y	305,000				
Small Business Capital Corp., New York, N.Y	310,000	150,000	150,000		
Upstate Small Business Investment Co., Inc., Ithaca, N.Y	301,000	147,000	125,000		
Frankford Grocery Small Business Investment Co., Inc., Philadelphia, Pa	301,700	149,700			
Keystone Small Business Investment Co., Scranton, Pa	367,500				
The Small Business Investment Co. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa	301,050	150,000			
Watkins Investment Co., Philadelphia, Pa	302,295	150,000			
Allied Small Business Investment Corp., Washington, D.C	302,000	137,000	137,000		
Avionics Investing Corp., Washington, D.C	305,000	145,000			
Baltimore Business Investment Co., Baltimore, Md	305,000	145,000	145,000		
Charles Small Business Investment Corp., Baltimore, Md	301,000	150,000	25,000		
Citizens Small Business Investment Corp., Washington, D.C	305,000	150,000			
General Business Investment Corp., Washington, D.C	304,510	150,000			
Greater Washington Industrial Investments, Inc., Washington, D.C	332,571				
Hanover Small Business Investment Co., Charlotte, N.C	304,000	150,000	67,500		
Inter-State Business Investment Co., Baltimore, Md	303,500	148,500			
Merchants Investment Corp., Charleston Heights, S.C	305,000	150,000	150,000		
Mid-Atlantic Small Business Investment Co., Baltimore, Md	500,000				
Small Business Investment Corp. of Virginia, Richmond, Va	348,750				
Southern Growth Industries, Inc., Greenville, S.C	305,250	150,000			
United Small Business Investment Corp., Baltimore, Md	501,585				
West Virginia First Small Business Investment Co., Huntington, W. Va	310,000	150,000			
Central Small Business Investment Co., Miami, Fla	305,000	150,000			
The Citizens & Southern Small Business Investment Co., Atlanta, Ga	325,000				
First Miami Small Business Investment Co., Miami Beach, Fla	301,000	150,000	150,000		
First Small Business Investment Co. of Tampa, Inc., Tampa, Fla	305,000	147,500	147,500		
First Southern Investment Co., Inc., North Miami Beach, Fla	400,000				
Florida Capital Corp., West Palm Beach, Fla	302,000	150,000	150,000	$150,000	$50,000
Lincoln Small Business Investment Co., Inc., Miami Beach, Fla	301,000	150,000			
Standard Small Business Investment Co., Inc., Nashville, Tenn	305,000	150,000			
Tennessee Investors, Inc., Nashville, Tenn	333,500				
The Third's Small Business Investment Co., Nashville, Tenn	305,000	145,000	50,000		
Cleveland Small Business Investment Co., Cleveland, Ohio	302,500	145,000			
Ohio Security & Small Business Investment Co., Inc., Cleveland, Ohio	303,500	148,500			
The Small Business Investment Co. of Ohio, Cleveland, Ohio	$307,500	$140,000	$140,000		
Techno-Fund, Inc., Columbus, Ohio	303,000	150,000	150,000		
Badger Small Business Investment Corp., Milwaukee, Wis	302,100	150,000			
Bloomington Small Business Investment Co., Bloomington, Ill	301,000	150,000	150,000		
Businessmen's Small Business Investment Co., Chicago, Ill	301,100	149,850	90,000		
Evansville Small Business Investment Corp., Evansville, Ind	300,000				
First Chicago Small Business Investment Corp., Skokie, Ill	300,000	150,000	150,000		
First Milwaukee Small Business Investment Corp., Milwaukee, Wis	302,000	142,000			
First Wisconsin Investment Corp., Milwaukee, Wis	300,000				
General Equity Investment Corp., Fort Wayne, Ind	304,000	150,000			
Great Lakes Small Business Investment Corp., Tipton, Ind	301,000	150,000	150,000		
Marine Business Investment Corp., Milwaukee, Wis	301,000	150,000			
Morris Plan Business Investment Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa	302,000	150,000			
Thorp Small Business Investment Corp., Thorp, Wis	301,000	150,000			
Wisconsin Capital Corp., Milwaukee, Wis	303,500	150,000			
Fidelity Small Business Investment Co., Minneapolis, Minn	305,000			$250,000	
First Bancstock Small Business Investment Co., Minneapolis, Minn	300,000				
First Midwest Small Business Investment Co., Minneapolis, Minn	315,000				
Northwest Equity Corp., Minneapolis, Minn	300,000				
ComTrusCo Investment Co., Kansas City, Mo	300,000				
Alliance Business Investment Co., Tulsa, Okla	303,000	150,000	60,000		
Bankers Small Business Investment Corp., Dallas, Tex	997,044				
Dallas Small Business Investment Co., Inc., Dallas, Tex	300,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	$150,000
First Business Investment Corp., Dallas, Tex	301,500	150,000			
First Small Business Investment Co. of New Orleans, Inc., New Orleans, La	303,000	150,000	150,000		
First Texas Investment Co., Sulphur Springs, Tex	301,500	150,000			
Fort Worth Capital Corp., Fort Worth, Tex	300,450	150,000			
First United Capital Corp., Houston, Tex	306,000	150,000			
Small Business Investment Co. of the Southwest, Dallas, Tex	408,000				
Small Business Investment Co. of Tulsa, Tulsa, Okla	329,400				
So-Tex Investment Corp., Alice, Tex	300,000	150,000	75,000		
The First Small Business Investment Co. of Louisiana, Inc., New Orleans, La	310,000	150,000	50,000		
Texas Capital Corp., Austin, Tex	307,000				
Texas Continental Investment Co., Inc., Dallas, Tex	300,000	150,000	150,000		
Agri-Supply Finance Co., Lathrop, Calif	301,000	150,000			
Continental Capital Corp., San Francisco, Calif	303,000	150,000	150,000		
Equity Capital Corp., Palo Alto, Calif	301,950	150,000			
Northern California Small Business Investment Co., Palo Alto, Calif	305,000	150,000			
Small Business Enterprises, San Francisco, Calif	1,500,000				
Western Small Business Investment Co., San Rafael, Calif	300,000	150,000	150,000		
Columbia Small Business Investment Co., Portland, Oreg	305,000				
Small Business Improvement Co., Billings, Mont	303,000	150,000			
Capital for Small Business, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif	303,000				
Electronics Capital Corp., San Diego, Calif	318,501				
First Small Business Investment Co. of California, Los Angeles, Calif	315,000				
South East Small Business Investment Co., South Gate, Calif	300,000	150,000			
Regional Building Investment Corp., Detroit, Mich	303,000	150,000	150,000		
Central Investment Corp. of Denver, Denver, Colo	303,750	150,000			
Total	33,895,681	9,540,050	3,512,000	550,000	200,000

S. 2611 passed the Senate late in the last session of this Congress. In March of this year, Subcommittee No. 3 (Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman) of the House Committee on Banking and Currency held hearings on the Senate-passed bill and other proposals for increasing the effectiveness of this program, including amendments proposed by Hon. JOE EVINS, on behalf of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, and Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN, chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate. At the conclusion of these hearings, Subcommittee No. 3 agreed upon certain amendments to S. 2611, and reported the bill favorably to the full Banking and Currency Committee, with these amendments, on April 20. The full committee agreed with the recommendations of Subcommittee No. 3, and ordered the bill, as so amended, reported to the House, by a unanimous vote.

FLEXIBILITY IN TYPES OF EQUITY INVESTMENT

Under existing law small business investment companies may provide equity-type capital to small business concerns through the purchase of convertible debentures. Such debentures, which are unsecured promises to repay, are callable at par upon any interest payment date upon 3 months' notice by the issuing company. The debentures are convertible at the option of the SBIC, or a holder in due course, up to and including any call date, into stock of the small business concern at the sound book value of such stock at the time of issuance of the debentures.

Most witnesses who appeared during the hearings expressed the belief there should be more flexibility in types of equity investment that SBIC's could make in small business concerns. The SBA reports that it likewise has been told by people potentially interested in forming SBIC's that greater latitude in the form such investment could take would stimulate the flow of funds to small business concerns. It was pointed out, for instance, that SBIC's could tailor securities to meet the eligibility requirements of trust funds, endowment funds, pension funds, and insurance companies and thus enhance the ability of the investment companies to either borrow money against securities held or permit the sale of such securities to these private secondary markets.

Your committee believes it would be desirable to provide greater flexibility in the types of equity investment that SBIC's may make in small business concerns. Accordingly, section 6 of the bill would broaden equity investment authority granted so that the investment company and the business concerned can arrive at the form the investment should take so long as the financing is in accordance with regulations of the Administrator. In other words, within the limits of publicly known acceptable procedures and subject to SBA regulations, the investment company and the small business concern through open negotiations can decide the type or types of equity investment that would be most desirable for the particular case.

The bill as it came to the committee contained a provision permitting even greater latitude in choice of type of equity investment in that the approval by SBA could be "by regulation or otherwise." Your committee was of the opinion the words "or otherwise" granted too broad and indefinite approval authority and accordingly deleted these words. SBA's regulations will provide definite, ascertainable limits permitting all parties at interest to know in advance what can and what cannot be done in their negotiations as to choice of the investment type or types to be used. At the same time, SBA will have authority through its regulations to protect the interests of small businesses in these negotiations; for example, as SBA indicated during the hearings, it plans to draw its regulations so as to preclude the use of certain types of equity financing which might be patently unfair to small concerns.

In considering this amendment granting wider flexibility, your committee was concerned over the possibility of abuses of this flexibility by some SBIC's which might seek to use it to take control of promising small business concerns. This is a difficult problem to deal with, because absolute prohibitions against SBIC's obtaining control of small business concerns may unduly restrict legitimate operations in some situations where it could be necessary for an SBIC to take a control position. But your committee is pleased to note the testimony of the SBA Administrator that he will not license an SBIC which has as its objective taking control positions in small business concerns, and that SBA will exercise care to prevent abuses. Your committee expects SBA to continue to watch this situation carefully.

SBIC's may also assist small business concerns by making long-term loans not involving equity rights, under section 305 of the 1958 act. This loan authority is not affected by the revisions the bill would make in section 304.

ELIMINATING MANDATORY STOCK PURCHASE REQUIREMENT

The bill eliminates the present requirement that small businesses which receive capital from an SBIC under section 304 must purchase stock of the SBIC in an amount equal to 2 to 5 percent of the capital provided. All witnesses agreed that this mandatory requirement is unpopular both with the SBIC's and the small businesses concerned. The SBIC's do not welcome the prospect of gradual dilution of their ownership, and the small business concerns look upon this requirement as an unnecessary loading charge that deprives them of the full amount of capital furnished. Your committee agrees that this mandatory requirement may create a major obstacle to the program, and that it should be repealed.

Your committee agrees with the House Select Committee on Small Business, however, that the small business should have the option to buy stock if it wishes to do so. We feel that the small businesses themselves should have an interest in SBIC's and in their operation. Accordingly, your committee adopted an amendment to the Senate-passed bill to give the small business concern the option, exercisable in whole or in part, to buy stock in the SBIC in an amount equal to 5 percent of the amount of capital supplied.

BANK HOLDING COMPANY SUBSIDIARIES

Under existing law, a bank holding company may invest up to 1 percent of its capital and surplus in an SBIC, but none of its subsidiary banks may invest in an SBIC that is a subsidiary of the same bank holding company. This restriction has prevented banks affiliated with holding companies from participating fully in this new program. The bill would remove this restriction, so as to permit such an affiliated bank to invest up to 1 percent of its capital and surplus in an affiliated SBIC. Your committee concluded that this limited participation would not conflict with the essential purposes of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, and would stimulate investment in small business through the new program.

OTHER PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Section 3 of the bill eliminates obsolete references to the "Territories" of Alaska and Hawaii, and extends the operation of the act to possessions of the United States, such as Guam. The speaker of the legislature of Guam, Hon. A. B. Won Pat, testified during the hearings on this bill that the extension of the act to Guam "will not only serve the crying needs of small businesses but will enhance the general economy of the territory of Guam."

Section 4 of the bill repeals a provision that now authorizes SBIC's to act as depositories or fiscal agents for the Government when designated by the Secretary of the Treasury. This provision serves no purpose and has caused difficulties in establishing SBIC's in some States.

Section 7 of the bill exempts SBIC's operating in the District of Columbia from the District of Columbia small loans law (D.C. Code. sec. 26–601 et seq.). This act prohibits any company subject to it from making a loan of over $200. Although it was obviously not intended to apply to SBIC's, it does apply to them literally and constitutes an obstacle to effective operations of SBIC's in the District of Columbia. The bill grants the same exemption for SBIC's that is now written into the law for commercial banks, savings banks, savings and loan associations, and real estate brokers.

HOW THE REPORTED BILL DIFFERS FROM THE SENATE BILL

As explained above, the Senate bill authorizes SBIC's to make such equity investments as SBA shall approve "by regulation or otherwise." The bill reported by your committee requires that this be handled by regulation only.

The Senate bill omits from existing law certain provisions restricting additional borrowing by small business concerns to which an SBIC has supplied capital under section 304. None of the witnesses who appeared during the hearings expressed any complaint about the way these provisions are working today, and many letters were received indicating that their omission from the revised section 304 would be misunderstood. To the extent that the SBIC's investment under section 304 takes the form of a debt instrument, it should have some control over additional debt incurred by the borrower. Your committee concluded, therefore, that it would be best to leave these provisions as they are in existing law. They appear as subsection (b) of section 304 of the 1958 act, as it would be rewritten by the reported bill.

The Senate bill repeals the existing requirement that small business concerns purchase stock in SBIC's which supply them with equity-type capital. The reported bill also repeals this mandatory requirement, but it replaces it with an option, exercisable in whole or in part by the small business concern, to buy stock in the SBIC equal to 5 percent of the capital supplied.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

The first section of the bill provides that the act may be cited by its short title (the Small Business Investment Act Amendments of 1960).

Section 2 provides that references within the bill to the act are to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

Section 3 eliminates obsolete references to the "Territories" of Alaska and Hawaii, and extends the operation of the act to possessions of the United States, such as Guam.

Section 4 repeals a provision that now authorizes small business investment companies to act as depositories or fiscal agents for the Government when designated by the Secretary of the Treasury. This provision serves no purpose and has caused difficulty in establishing SBIC's in some States, because it has raised questions whether they must comply with the State banking laws.

Section 5 relates to bank holding companies and grows out of an interpretation of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 by the Federal Reserve Board. The Board interprets that act, in combination with the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as permitting

a bank holding company to invest up to 1 percent of its capital and surplus in an SBIC. At the same time, it ruled that a bank holding company's subsidiary bank cannot invest in an SBIC, where the SBIC is or will become a subsidiary of the bank holding company. The bill would allow a bank that is a holding company subsidiary to invest up to 1 percent of its capital and surplus in any SBIC even though the SBIC is a subsidiary of the same holding company.

Section 6 does away with a number of restrictions now in section 304 of the 1958 act, relating to SBIC's providing equity capital for small business concerns. Section 6 amends section 304 to provide that SBIC's may furnish equity capital to incorporated small business concerns "in such manner and under such terms as the small business investment company may fix in accordance with the regulations of the (Small Business) Administration." Thus, the following changes are made in existing law:

(1) Equity capital may now be furnished only in the form of convertible debentures, callable by the borrower on 3 months' notice. The bill would allow SBIC's to furnish capital in other forms to be authorized by SBA regulation (such as by directly buying stock in the small business, or by buying debentures with severable or "detachable" stock rights).

(2) Section 304 now says it "shall be a primary function" of each SBIC to provide equity capital for small business. The bill strikes out "primary." This will confirm SBA's present practice of allowing SBIC's to engage solely in the business of making long-term loans, without actually offering equity capital in any form, so long as their charters contain authority for engaging in, and they are thus available for, both types of operation.

(3) The act now requires a small business concern to purchase stock in any SBIC from which it gets equity capital. The bill eliminates this requirement, but grants the small business concern an option (exercisable in whole or in part) to buy stock in the SBIC equal to 5 percent of the capital supplied to it.

Section 7 exempts SBIC's from the District of Columbia small loan law (D.C. Code, sec. 26–601 et seq.). Commercial banks, savings banks, savings and loan associations, and real estate brokers are now exempt from this act.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Subcommittee No. 3 of the Banking and Currency Committee of which I have the privilege of being chairman, held hearings on this bill and made a report to the full committee. The full committee adopted the report of Subcommittee No. 3. Subcommittee No. 3 in conducting the hearings relied heavily upon an investigation that had been made by a subcommittee of the Small Business Committee of which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] was the chairman.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I merely want to supplement what he said as chairman of the Subcommittee on Banking and Currency. He has brought forth recommendations for needed amendments to the Small Business Investment Act. As the gentleman has indicated, this bill was passed in 1958. At that time there was hope and great expectation as to what the bill might do to aid the small business economy of the Nation. Several months later the very first hearing on the operation of the act was held by my Subcommittee No. 1 of the Select Committee on Small Business.

At that time there were only one or two small business investment companies which had been chartered. During the course of that hearing some five or six more were chartered. Since the hearings and the streamlining of the procedure, following the hearings and also talks with Mr. Duncan Read of the Investment Division of the Small Business Administration, there have been some 97 companies chartered throughout the United States. The report of the Committee on Banking and Currency contains a list of these companies. I think the membership would be interested in knowing their location.

Mr. PATMAN. For the gentleman's information, I am inserting in connection with my remarks the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency which includes the information the gentleman has just referred to.

Mr. EVINS. I thank the gentleman. Certainly the committee is to be commended for bringing this legislation out, because it is needed and necessary. All the witnesses who testified before our committee, and incidentally we were unanimous in our report, stated that the amendments were needed if the act was to be made effective to implement the full purposes of the Congress. The committee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has wanted this legislation to work, and these amendments will provide the necessary convertibility of credit and loans that are needed. I merely want to support what the gentleman has said and urge passage of the legislation at this time. It was unanimous in our committee, and I understand unanimous in the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Banking and Currency, held extensive hearings on the bill during March of this year. As all of you know, Mr. PATMAN is also chairman of the House Small Business Committee. Also, our colleague Congressman MULTER, of New York, is a member of both the House Small Business Committee and the House Banking and Currency Committee. These capable gentlemen who down through the years have shown their dedication to the welfare of the small business economy of the Nation, have done an excellent job in bringing this bill to the House for our consideration. They are fully capable of carrying the ball in this matter. However, as chairman of Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Select Committee on Small Business, which has jurisdiction and oversight of the operations of the Small Business Administration, I want to address myself very briefly to the bill.

During May and August of last year, my subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee—Subcommittee No. 1—held extensive hearings into the organization and operation of the Small Business Administration and gave particular emphasis to the work of the Investment Division of the SBA. Up until that time the spotlight of congressional inquiry had not been focused on the implementation of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. Our subcommittee paid special attention at these hearings to this act.

Based upon these hearings and subsequent investigations by the subcommittee's staff, Subcommittee No. 1 filed a report—House Report No. 1252, 86th Congress—which was submitted to the Speaker on February 8, 1960. In this report it was pointed out that the program was not progressing as expeditiously as had been expected. At the time the proposed hearings were announced on March 7, 1959, only two small business investment companies had been licensed by the SBA. This was approximately 7 months after the act was passed. When the hearings began on May 11, the SBA announced that seven companies had been licensed. When the hearings closed on August 6, nearly a year after the act was passed, 24 small business investment companies had been licensed. On January 15, 1960, nearly 17 months after the act was passed, only 67 companies had been licensed under the act. The total capitalization of these companies to January 15, 1960, was $41,868,000.

Today, after a call to Mr. Duncan Read, Deputy Administrator for the Investment Division of the SBA, I am pleased to advise that 97 small business investment companies have been licensed to date. It is very possible that before the end of this week there will be more than 100 investment companies licensed throughout the United States for the purpose of providing equity capital and long-term loans to small businesses. It is our hope that the work of our subcommittee may have been helpful in assisting the SBA in eliminating red-tape and clarifying the procedures under this new act.

Although the program has been slow getting off the ground, the full purpose of the act may yet be effectively achieved. Great hope still exists for this important act to be of real service to our economy.

The hearings before our subcommittee indicated that certain amendments would be proper and in order and these amendments are recommended in the report of Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Small Business Committee. In fact, most of the amendments incorporated in the Senate bill—S. 2611—were recommended in principle in our report. On last July 6, I introduced a bill—H.R. 8096—which contained similar amendments. The amendments recommended in our report were unanimously approved. These amendments are reasonable and should assist in effectuating the originating purposes of the act. The SBA says they need these amendments. The small business investment companies say they need these amendments. In principle they are good. It may be that some other amendments in time might be necessary. However, the Banking and Currency Committees of both bodies have done an excellent job and the amendments here proposed are now necessary and they should be approved.

It is hoped that the bill will be expeditiously passed and that the minor changes from the Senate version will be approved by the Senate in order to put the tools in the hands of the SBA and the small business investment companies which each say they desire to make the act more workable and effective.

It is hoped that the SBA will accelerate its program in order that more capital will be made available to the small business firms of the Nation in the public interest. The original purpose of this act was good and is still good. But it is also realized that changes are sometimes desired and necessary. I feel that the changes proposed in S. 2611 are reasonable and proper.

ANALYSIS OF THE PROVISIONS OF S. 2611

Sections 1 and 2 are technical and introductory.

Section 3 would define the word "State" to permit possessions such as Guam to come under the provisions of the act and delete obsolete references to the territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

Section 4 would delete subsection 301(d)(9) of the act which gives the small business investment companies power to act as depositories and fiscal agents of the United States. This power is not needed, and has, in some States, given rise to suggestions that SBIC's must be chartered under the banking laws.

Section 5 would amend subsection 302(b) of the act by freeing bank purchases of an SBIC's securities authorized in this section from the provisions of subsection 6(a)(1) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. This amendment would enable a bank which is a subsidiary of a bank holding company to invest the full 1 percent of its capital and surplus in an SBIC, without regard to whether or not such SBIC is, or would become, a subsidiary of the parent company.

Section 6 would rewrite section 304 of the act to eliminate the restriction in the act that equity capital can be furnished a small business concern by an SBIC only through the medium of convertible debentures. This amendment is designed to give more flexibility to the forms of securities and the terms covering their issue. This flexibility would aid the SBIC in finding a secondary market for these securities. This amendment would also eliminate the statement that it is the primary purpose of an SBIC to furnish equity capital to small businesses. This places long-term loans and equity capital on an equal footing.

Another very important amendment in section 6 is one that eliminates the requirement that when equity capital is furnished to a small business concern such concern will purchase from 2 to 5 percent of such amount of stock in the SBIC, and makes this optional rather than mandatory.

Section 7 would amend title 26, chapter 6, section 26–610 of the District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition. This act imposes licensing requirements and other restrictions on persons engaged in lending money in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5(a) of Public Law 307, 73d Congress, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 14, 1960.*

EMPLOYEE TRAINING FOR BETTER PUBLIC SERVICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Government Employees Training Act (Public Law 85–507) directs the Civil Service Commission to submit annually to the President for his approval and transmittal to the Congress a report with respect to the training of employees of the Government under the authority of the act. I am transmitting to you with this letter the Commission's report entitled "Employee Training for Better Public Service."

It is my firm conviction that training has long been essential for the successful operation of Federal agencies. Today's demands, however, bring a new urgency to training, especially for our career managers. I have, therefore, recently asked all agency heads to strengthen their programs for the selection, development, and training of these key officials. This directive is in addition to that issued in 1955 which supported all types of training.

The action of the Congress in broadening authority to train Federal employees was a healthy and progressive move. The Commission's report shows that Federal officials have made intelligent use of their authority under the act and that it has helped to meet an urgent need. I was particularly interested in the Commission's comments on "The Future," which point out two important areas needing improvement—planning, and budgeting and scheduling for training activities.

The Commission's report is encouraging and its suggestions to the agencies sound. A good beginning has been made under the authority granted by the Congress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 14, 1960.*

NATIONAL MONUMENT COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am enclosing for the consideration of the Congress a report of the National Monument Commission submitted as directed by the act of August 31, 1954. I have requested the Secretary of the Interior to submit to the Congress a proposed bill embodying the Commission's recommendations.

The Commission's report recommends an approved design for the Freedom Monument, asks that the Commission be authorized to erect the Monument, suggests that the number of private citizens serving on the Commission be increased from four to eight, asks the Congress to authorize the appropriation of $12 million as the Federal share of the cost of construction, and requests that the Commission be authorized to solicit private contributions for the remaining cost of the Monument.

The act of August 31, 1954, created the National Monument Commission for the purpose of securing designs and plans for a useful monument to the Nation symbolizing to the United States and the world the ideals of our democracy as embodied in the five freedoms—speech, religion, press, assembly, and petition—sanctified by the Bill of Rights adopted by Congress in 1789 and later ratified by the States.

I believe it important that the story of the noble ideas which shaped our country's beginning, its course, its great moments, and the men who made it possible, be ever present in the minds of Americans. This purpose can be furthered in a variety of ways, but the simplest and most effective of all methods in my judgment is to present it impressively in visual form. The erection of the Freedom Monument would accomplish that objective. The National Capital area is adorned by a galaxy of memorials to individuals but nowhere in the Nation's Capital or this Nation can one find a memorial to the principles

and ideals upon which our Government is based.

The Commission, since its creation, has placed the ideas I have mentioned on the drawing board. It is intimately acquainted with the problems involved in the erection of the Monument; it has advanced the memorial; and I recommend that the Commission be authorized to complete the task.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 14, 1960.*

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 390)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H.R. 7947 entitled "An act relating to the income tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association."

When a financial institution sells a mortgage to the Federal National Mortgage Association, the institution is required to purchase shares of Association common stock at par value in an amount equal to 2 percent of the unpaid principal of the mortgage. The market price for this common stock has been appreciably lower than its par value. H.R. 7947 would permit the financial institution to deduct as a business expense the difference between par value and market value when it sells the common stock it was required to purchase.

I am sympathetic with the objectives of the bill. But it provides for the retroactive application of the proposed amendment in a highly discriminatory manner. This is a defect which is sufficiently serious to require my disapproval. Generally, changes in the tax laws should only apply prospectively, for retroactive amendments result in substantial administrative problems. Wholly apart from this, however, the particular provision for retroactivity in H.R. 7947 would benefit only those taxpayers who previously claimed the deduction contrary to the announced position of the Internal Revenue Service; the bill would not permit refund or credit to those taxpayers who accepted the position of the Internal Revenue Service and paid their taxes. I cannot approve such discrimination.

In view of this defect, I withhold my approval from H.R. 7947.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 14, 1960.*

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10777) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON, KILDAY, DURHAM, RIVERS of South Carolina, ARENDS, GAVIN, and VAN ZANDT.

UNIVERSAL TRADES, INC.—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 389)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H.R. 1456, a bill for the relief of Universal Trades, Inc.

The Renegotiation Board, in 1955, ordered Universal Trades, Inc., to refund to the Government $50,000 in excessive profits subject to applicable Federal tax credits. The law provides a 90-day period, after the conclusion of the Renegotiation Board proceeding, in which to apply for a review of the case by the Tax Court of the United States. Universal Trades did not file such a petition.

Under H.R. 1456 jurisdiction would now be conferred on the Tax Court—some 5 years after the expiration of the 90-day period.

Universal Trades claims that income of $92,481.54 was improperly included in its 1952 renegotiation proceeding. A change in the company's accounting method did move this income from 1952 to 1953 for income tax purposes, but for renegotiation purposes no such transfer was made. This treatment was equitable, appropriate for renegotiation purposes, and in accordance with the Renegotiation Act.

Finally, no valid justification appears for the corporation's failure to file a petition with the Tax Court within the prescribed 90-day period. At all times before and after issuance of the Board's order, Universal Trades was in full possession of the facts pertaining to the accounting method used by the Board.

Under the circumstances, therefore, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 14, 1960.*

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

POSTPONEMENT OF ROLLCALLS UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on May 12 I submitted a unanimous-consent request, which the House graciously granted, that any rollcalls on Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday be postponed until Thursday. It was my intention that any rollcalls asked for today or tomorrow would go over until Thursday. If Calendar Wednesday is exercised, it would not apply to that particular day because there would be no necessity of it. My purpose in asking that rollcalls go over until Thursday was that if Calendar Wednesday is exercised there would be freedom on the part of those exercising their rights under the Calendar Wednesday rule. So, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous-consent that so much of my unanimous-consent request as applied to Wednesday be withdrawn. I have discussed this matter with the distinguished minority leader.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that means that if there are rollcalls on Calendar Wednesday, they will be had on that day.

Mr. McCORMACK. On the legislation that day, yes; but rollcalls that might be ordered today or tomorrow will go over until the following Thursday.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, further legislation for today was the military construction appropriation bill for 1961. At the time that was programed it was overlooked that the authorization bill has not yet been enacted into law. Therefore that bill cannot very well come up today. I just wanted the Members of the House to understand that that bill will not be brought up today and cannot be brought up until the authorization bill comes out of conference, is passed, and, I assume, signed. In any event, it will not come up until a later date.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Then what is the business for the remainder of the day?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no further business. I scheduled certain bills for the latter part of the week, but I do not feel justified in bringing them for-

ward. I made up a program which at the time justified my action, but I note, in looking over what I said with reference to the program, that I left myself no flexibility. So I am bound by the program that I announced the other day.

MORE DISCRETION IN SPENDING

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from three communications received in my mail this morning.

A Connecticut Yankee writes:

You have been quoted as saying, "I don't like the idea of spending a million dollars" for a memorial to Teddy Roosevelt. To that I am sure T. R. would say, "Bully." A lot of taxpayers, facing mounting costs for everything, feel Congress is altogether too free with our money, that in fact some Congressmen have lost the perspective of the dollar, tossing millions hither and yon. I'm quite sure T.R. would be happy with his place in history as it is, without further cluttering up Washington with memorials which should have been stopped with Washington and Lincoln.

A lady in Canton, Ohio, writes:

I ask the question because I am trying to understand. What possible justification can there be for spending around $1 million for a memorial of that sort?—

Referring to the proposed memorial to the late President Theodore Roosevelt—

Why not put that money to use for the living where there is greater need? Perhaps scholarships for students of government, donation to research in diseases, aid to colleges and universities and give in his name? By the way, where does that money come from?

And, finally, a letter from the 10th District in Missouri, which I am privileged to represent:

I am writing you as you seem to be one of the few in Washington who would like to keep the Government from going completely wild in spending. According to the papers the white collar Government workers are about to get another 10 percent raise. If they do we will have still another big shot of inflation. Doctors and hospitals and all other necessary services and goods will of course go up again, and the farmers and businessmen will take it on the chin again and pay the bills. In my own case I've taken it on the chin about all I can. I own and operate about 300 acres of land and a small hardware store. I work about 70 hours a week and I still don't clear any more actual money than some of these Government boys who put in 40 hours with paid vacations, hospitalization, and other benefits including retirement pensions. In my opinion what the Government is actually doing is taking what some of us have saved over the years and giving it to this group who do very little work and give very little thought and concern to what is happening to this country.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will give some thought to the opinions expressed by these people, and begin to exercise just a little more discretion in how we spend the taxpayers' money. Let us spend a little more time in figuring out how we can save a dollar here and there.

MASSACHUSETTS FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, some of the severest northeast storms, with consequent tidal flood problems, strike at the Nahant, Winthrop, and Revere coastal areas in Massachusetts.

A beach-erosion control project was authorized for Lynn-Nahant Beach by the River and Harbor Act of September 3, 1954. Construction of the project is awaiting action by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Any work done on the authorized Federal project will be eligible for Federal aid equal to one-third the first cost of construction, contingent upon appropriation of funds by Congress. Reimbursement on projects of this type is generally made after the construction is completed and funds have been appropriated by Congress.

Specific Federal aid for this project was authorized for the purpose of "protecting the shores of publicly owned property." Safety improvements were not mentioned in this authority or under subsequent public laws.

However, Public Law 71, 84th Congress, the hurricane survey authority, gives broader coverage, including protection of lives, for long-range coastal protection based on the disaster element of great hurricanes. Where the hurricane problem is present, tidal flood damages caused by storms like that of December 29, 1959, can also be taken into account, according to the division engineer, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, Waltham, Mass.

Furthermore, if protection is found to be economically feasible, for specific localities, projects could be recommended that would protect against hurricanes and other severe storms. If the hurricane threat is not severe, there is some question as to whether the Corps of Engineers has the authority to study and recommend projects for protection against storm damage and flooding. Northeast storms are likely to be more severe than hurricanes in many areas on the New England coast.

The purpose of my bill is to remove that doubt from the language of the law, and to make this exposed coastal area of Massachusetts eligible for projects for protection against storm damage and flooding.

We do have our share of hurricanes, but northeast storms are a chronic fact of life that we must contend with along the New England coast. They are frequently more damaging than hurricanes. But as Public Law 71, 84th Congress, gives broader coverage based on the disaster element of hurricanes, but neglects to provide for those areas that suffer similar damage from northeast storms, it is my purpose to correct that oversight.

My bill will "authorize the Secretary of the Army to make surveys with respect to floods aggravated by intense and unusual storms in the areas of Winthrop, Nahant, and Revere, Mass." This will include floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I notice in the whip notice that the school construction bill will be up under Calendar Wednesday rules this week.

This brought to my mind an article that appeared in the Harrisburg Patriot on March 17. This article announced that a vast education study was launched to discover the State's 10-year needs. This was a statement from the office of the Governor of Pennsylvania in which he said this commission of 63 would be formed as a bipartisan group. They are going to make an exhaustive study of the education situation from all angles and will report back to the Governor on January 31, 1961. A copy of the article will appear at the end of my remarks and you will note, under school construction, they are quite up in the air as to what may be done. Personally, in my district, the various school boards, in connection with the general State authority, have built well and much. In fact, in the city of Harrisburg, by a population readjustment, I understand that our schools are not crowded.

There is another point that is quite interesting. I have made sort of a sketchy survey and checked with bond salesmen in my community and they agreed with me in this statement that the general State authority of Pennsylvania and its communities can at this time borrow money cheaper than the Federal Government.

There is another item that I think should be considered seriously as they are doing in Miami, Fla., and that is making fuller use out of schoolrooms. At the present time they say the facilities are only being used 75 percent of the time. Our Harrisburg Patriot also commented editorially on this situation on March 18, 1960.

Another point is the most current report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, supplied to Senator MCNAMARA. The classroom shortage in Pennsylvania really only averages about eight per county and I know personally in my district many more than this are now being built.

In summation, I do not feel in good conscience I could vote for the present bill in light of the situation in my own district. I will be interested in seeing

what the Governor's committee reports and how the debate on this matter turns out.

The article follows:

VAST EDUCATION STUDY LAUNCHED TO DISCOVER STATE 10-YEAR NEEDS—LT. GOV. JOHN DAVIS HEADS WIDE OPEN REVIEW OF PROGRAM

(By John H. Baer)

A sweeping review of Pennsylvania's billion-dollar-a-year education program in the light of today's needs projected through the next 10 years was launched Wednesday by Governor Lawrence.

The Governor appointed Lt. Gov. John Morgan Davis to head a 35-members special Committee on Education and named 28 others to the bipartisan group. The State council of education has allocated $300,000 from the school fund to finance the committee's work.

Six more appointments will be made later, the Governor explained. Some of those he wants to serve are out of the country at present and could not be reached for confirmations.

TO COVER ALL PHASES

The Governor told a special press conference the study is wide open. It is expected to cover everything from kindergarten to college, and include the question of public junior colleges, senatorial scholarships, and school financing.

A committee report is due next January 31, along with legislative proposals where law changes are needed to put the recommendations of the study into effect.

Leaders in the fields of business, labor, the professions and government were included in the committee. But the Governor said he especially avoided naming school administrators, such as the presidents of colleges to the panel. The group will convene here during the first week of April.

DR. CHRISTIE NAMED

Dr. Robert A. Christie, on leave as director of methods and planning in the office of administration, has been assigned by the Governor as executive director for the committee, which will have its headquarters in the State education building.

George Mohlenhoff, former educational director of the American Friends Service committee, and an aid in the office of administration, will serve as chief assistant to Dr. Christie. He also will be on leave for the duration of the special project.

In naming the committee, the Governor said:

"For many years we have recognized that Pennsylvania's educational program has not measured up fully to our community or national needs, or for that matter, to the capacity of the young people it serves.

"We have tried to meet our shortcomings on a hit-or-miss basis attacking specific problems without relating them to the program as a whole," the Governor added.

Noting that a special session of the legislature had been suggested as one means of attacking the education problem, the Governor said it was decided that the study would be a better approach toward legislation.

KEY MATTERS LISTED

Among specific subjects to be probed by the group are curriculum, school district organization, teacher training and relations, school administration, counseling and guidance, school construction, and higher education.

Past policies and procedures in Pennsylvania will be compared to practices in other sections of the country and related to the aims and goal "which we can legitimately establish to give Pennsylvania the best possible education program," Governor Lawrence declared.

Eight research and administrative subcommittees known as task forces will be assigned. Much of the research in the project will be supplied by public service organizations with a strong interest in education.

The eight task forces and their chiefs of staff, all selected so far from the department of public instruction, are:

Curriculum: To deal with matters such as pupil grouping, course content, and length of the school day and year. Dr. Richard A. Gibboney, director of curriculum development.

School district organization: To determine what is the most desirable and efficient size of school districts, to weigh the advantages of various degrees of district consolidation, and to decide how the State may encourage the best type of organization. Dr. Clarence E. Ackley, director of special school audit.

School construction: To examine and make findings on new school building needs, the types of school buildings needed, their cost, the best means of financing them, and to what extent they can be standardized. Dr. James S. Tresslar, director of school buildings.

Teacher education and relations: To set forth the best means of educating and certifying teachers including types of courses they need; hiring and advancing teachers; salary scales including retirement benefits, and coordination between teachers and school administrators and school boards. Dr. Catherine Coleman, director of teacher education.

ADMINISTRATION STUDY

School administration: To suggest how schools can be administered best at every level, including studies of office, professional personnel, and pupil administrative techniques. Dr. Robert A. Mellman, director of curriculum administration.

Guidance and counseling: To suggest the best way to identify and train various pupil talents to assure that pupils receive a full and proper education. Dr. Kathryn Dice, director of special pupil services.

Higher education: To study and make recommendations on the proper and fair means of maintaining adequate facilities, including new types of schools, and to look into public and private financing. Dr. Richard F. Schier, deputy superintendent for higher education.

School finance: To survey the cost to the State, its localities and to the average taxpayer of the present system; to decide whether or not we make the most efficient use of education money and to determine if the present State subsidy system is actually working. Gage the cost of recommendations of the other task forces for 1961 and the next revenues needed for the overall program. A task force chief will be selected from an outside agency.

Superintendent of public instruction, Dr. Charles H. Boehm, said the cost of education in Pennsylvania is now edging the billion-a-year mark, with the State currently paying about 56 percent of the tab in subsidies.

ISRAEL

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on May 16, the first legislative day following May 14, to express here once more my congratulations to the State of Israel on a record of unparalleled achievement and my own faith in the continued economic, political, and spiritual growth of that strong new country. Such knowledge of achievement, such appreciation of future potential is based on three personal visits which I have made to Israel, in 1955, 1957, and 1959. The progress witnessed on the successive visits bespeaks, indeed, the purpose and vitality on the part of Israel, for which the free world may well be grateful.

On May 14, 1948, in Tel-Aviv, the Provisional State Council proclaimed the establishment of the State of Israel in Palestine, following the United Nations sanction of the establishment of a Jewish State, an Arab State, and an International Zone of Jerusalem on November 29, 1947.

The doors of Israel were quickly opened to the persecuted and homeless Jewish people of the world, hundreds of thousands who came from 70 different nations to find sanctuary and fulfillment of their lives. Within 10 years the population of Israel trebled.

The development, growth, and progress of this small State, about the size of Massachusetts, is indeed phenomenal. The desert land, which provides few natural resources, has been reclaimed; an expanding economy has been developed; and social and cultural institutions have been successfully established.

When the new state was put into being, almost 75 percent of its agricultural needs had to be imported; today, 80 percent of those needs are supplied by Israel itself. The cultivated area has increased from less than 400,000 acres to over 1 million acres. Agricultural exports have more than trebled.

Nineteen hundred and forty-seven found little organized industry in the State of Israel. Today, an essentially agrarian community has been transformed into an intensive industrialized economy. The increase in productive capacity underlies the miraculous absorption of the newcomers. New industries have been established, many of them using local raw materials to a great extent and some using them exclusively. A tremendous housing program has been instituted, through Government and private effort. Over 1,000 miles of roads have been added, railroad mileage has been increased, and merchant shipping expanded. Exports have increased considerably in the small span of 12 years.

The expansion of Israel's educational system was the direct consequence of the Education Act of 1949, which provided that all children between the ages of 5 and 14 must have free elementary education. Six institutions of higher learning are also included.

Great strides have been made in health services, particularly in the field of child welfare. Among the many agencies so engaged, I would mention in particular the work of the Hadassah Medical Service, which has been dramatic. With the increasing demands of an expanding population, Hadassah is meeting the challenge by providing needed hospital facilities, establishing added health centers in various communities, and developing teaching functions and medical research. Hadassah is also a partner in

child rescue work, rehabilitation, land rebuilding, and other humanitarian endeavors.

The efforts of Israel to provide education, employment, housing, and social services for her growing population have been accompanied by cultural efforts to build and strengthen a united nation.

The State of Israel, in a critical frontier area, is carrying the message of democracy to new nations of Asia and Africa, with which it has entered into economic and cultural exchange. The survival and further development of this new state, dedicated to the cause of freedom and peace, is an essential component of the strength of the Middle East and, indeed, of the world.

WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS OFFICERS HONOR LT. COL. MARY ALICE HALLAREN ON THE 18TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, May 14, 1960, marks the 18th anniversary of the establishment of the Women's Army Corps of our U.S. Army. I feel a special interest and pride in this splendid organization, for it was I who, on May 28, 1941, introduced a bill in the House of Representatives to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States.

There were two basic reasons why I—together with many others—was so vitally interested in the establishment of a women's service in our Army. The first was to alleviate the acute shortage of manpower. The second was to answer an undeniable demand from American women that they be permitted to serve their country, together with the men of America, to protect and defend their cherished freedoms and democratic principles and ideals.

During the past 18 years, the thousands of women who have served and who are now serving in the Women's Army Corps have more than justified the creation of that organization. Their outstanding performance of duty during World War II resulted in the passage by Congress in June 1948 of legislation making the Women's Army Corps a permanent and integrated part of the Regular Army and of the Army Reserve.

Their primary mission is to constitute a nucleus of trained military women upon which expansion of the corps would be based in time of national emergency. They also contribute voluntarily the womanpower needed to help meet military manpower requirements.

During the Korean war, they accomplished their primary mission in a superior manner. Many WAC reservists were called to active duty and served with distinction. Enlistments of women were increased, and the increased training requirement was efficiently met.

Now, in peacetime, a well-trained nucleus is being maintained. Present strength of the corps is more than 9,000. These women are contributing to the Army each day their voluntary services in the occupational skills required in the modern army. They are adding to the splendid record of dedicated and loyal service which began 18 years ago.

I am proud of the Women's Army Corps. I am proud of the part I played in bringing it into existence.

On Saturday evening, May 14, in the Crystal Room, Patton Hall, Fort Myer, the WAC officers held a reception in honor of the 18th anniversary of the Women's Army Corps and in honor of their former Director, Lt. Col. Mary Agnes Hallaren on the occasion of her retirement. Colonel Hallaren and lovely mother are beloved and respected friends of mine. She was one of the most beloved teachers that Lowell, Mass., has ever had. We are very proud of each one of her many accomplishments and of every honor paid to her. She has been a tower of strength to the Women's Army Corps and to the Army. Her duty often took a great deal of courage. She was in dangerous zones during the war. No task was too great for her to perform. I am pleased to include here an outline of her impressive record of service in the U.S. Army:

LT. COL. MARY A. HALLAREN, U.S. ARMY

ASSIGNMENTS

Officer Candidate School, WAC Training Center, Fort Des Moines, Iowa, July 7, 1942.
Recruiting, Baltimore, Md., September 15, 1942.
Commandant, First WAC Separate Battalion, Fort Des Moines, Iowa, and Daytona Beach, Fla., October 1, 1942.
Army Air Corps WAC Staff Adviser, England and France, July 15, 1943.
WAC Staff Adviser, European Theater of Operations, Germany, July 16, 1945.
Chief, Civilian Employee Relations, Headquarters, U.S. Forces, European Theater, March 23, 1946.
Deputy Director, Women's Army Corps, Washington, D.C., June 20, 1946.
Director, Women's Army Corps, Washington, D.C., May 7, 1947.
J-1, Headquarters U.S. European Command, May 6, 1953.
Office of Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Personnel, and Reserve), Washington, D.C., May 1957.

AWARDS

Croix de Guerre avec l'Etoile de Vermeil, August 17, 1945.
Legion of Merit, June 29, 1945.
Oak Leaf Cluster to Legion of Merit, April 20, 1946.
Bronze Star Medal, November 14, 1944.
European-African-Middle Eastern Theater (EAME) Campaign Ribbon, July 20, 1943.
Women's Army Corps Service Medal, July 29, 1943.
Commendation Medal, May 31, 1946.
Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant (Oak Leaf Cluster), April 19, 1957.

PROMOTIONS

Second lieutenant, August 29, 1942.
Captain, December 23, 1942.
Major, January 1, 1944.
Lieutenant colonel, March 8, 1945.
Colonel, May 7, 1947.

CIVILIAN EXPERIENCE

Born in Lowell, Mass.
Taught school for 15 years.
Traveled summers in Europe, Near East, Latin countries, South America, Alaska, and the United States (for 16 summers).

IMPOSITION OF STATE USE TAXES ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to limit the imposition of State use taxes on sales and other business activities in interstate commerce and to authorize a study by appropriate committees looking toward definitive regulation of this problem. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH is introducing a companion bill in the Senate.

This bill is prompted by the recent Scripto, Inc., against Carson decision of the Supreme Court—1960, 361 U.S. Manufacturers and businessmen in Connecticut have brought to my attention some of the repercussions this decision is likely to have in the growth and conduct of interstate commerce.

This new problem is similar to that posed by the Stockham Valves and Fittings, Inc., decision of a year ago. That case concerned the constitutionality of State net income taxes levied on foreign corporations. As a result, Congress, in its first session, enacted Public Law 86-272 halting such taxation and authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House and the Committee on Finance of the Senate to make full studies leading to uniform Federal standards to be observed by the States.

My bill would amend this public law to bring the subject of sales and use taxes within the definition of such studies and to halt further imposition and collection of such use taxes until the studies are made.

I think we are all aware of the problems at all governmental levels in paying for the wide range of services and activities expected by their citizens. This need is growing with the population. The rapid growth in population, plus general increases in prices and living standards make it unlikely that the pressure for revenues will decrease. This pressure has already pushed State debt levels to new and sometimes record highs.

As a result, States have been casting about for new sources of revenues. The general property tax has long been inadequate to meet the major share of local expenditures. Today, few sources of revenue at the local level have been left untouched. The present principal sources of State tax revenues include sales, motor fuels, income, motor vehicle, liquor and tobacco taxes. And the States are still looking.

It was inevitable that they should come to activities conducted within their borders, but by out-of-State concerns. Like the popularity of tariff and customs duties, these revenues afford a source of income without the painful necessity of taxing residents, and if the ultimate cost

is borne by the consumer, it is not quite so obvious as a direct tax.

This does violence to the unity of the Nation, and to the concept under which our forefathers made this one free-trade territory, with no State barriers. We have, in recent decades, urged this course upon other nations, convinced that the larger the market, and the more freedom to develop it, the greater the benefits. We are seeing some fruitful results from this policy.

Yet we are doing damage to it at home as the States and other subdivisions, in their admitted need for revenue, approach interstate commerce. It could well be, as Mr. Justice Frankfurter warned, that all States of the Union would hasten to follow the policies of Minnesota and Georgia with respect to the imposition of State income taxes on out-of-State corporations, unless some minimum Federal standard is adopted. And the imposition of sales and use taxes on out-of-State sellers also offers new possibilities to harrass such commerce.

It is well within the power of Congress to relieve sellers who maintain no fixed establishment within a taxing State from the obligation of collecting use taxes imposed upon consumer residents from whom the sellers have solicited and filled orders. I believe such relief is justified.

For one thing, thousands of relatively small or moderate sized corporations doing exclusively interstate business spread over several States may be subject to such a tax. They could be required to keep books, make returns, store records, and engage legal counsel, all to meet the diverse and various tax laws of thousands of city and State taxing authorities. The problem is already tremendous, with many such authorities levying quarterly tax requirements, and is growing constantly.

For another, the Congress has been occupied over the years with many difficult and intricate problems affecting economic fields such as railroads, communications, and power which overlap State lines. Trying to devise formulas has proven a difficult and wearing task. The problem of the Scripto decision suggests that this could well spread to many other types of businesses if a Federal study is not now authorized. To quote from the dissent of Mr. Justice Frankfurter:

> The problem calls for solution by devising a congressional policy. Congress alone can provide for a full and thorough canvassing of the multitudinous and intricate factors which compose the problem of the taxing freedom of the States and the needed limits on such State taxing power (*Williams* v. *Stockham Valves & Fittings, Inc.* (358 U.S. 450)).

To me, the arguments of the Stockham case apply with equal pertinence to the Scripto case. Most likely to suffer under the Scripto dictum are the hundreds of thousands of small businesses, the smaller companies without the staff to process the required bookkeeping.

When this matter first came to my attention, at least five States were contemplating extended use of the sales tax field: Kentucky, Virginia, Colorado, Vermont, and Massachusetts. I fully appreciate the feeling at the State level that greater exploitation of tax sources is necessary. I believe, however, that we must sharply define now the limits of such taxation if we are to adhere to the constitutional concept of interstate commerce.

My bill would not prevent States from levying use taxes on resident consumers. It would free business from harassment, from paperwork, and from rigged formulas intended to favor local manufacturers against other Americans. It would meet the long standing judicial interpretation of the commerce clause that—

> The States * * * are not allowed "one single tax worth of direct interference with the flow of commerce."

I believe it is necessary legislation, preliminary to the establishment of a firm congressional policy on the limits of taxation.

SUPPORT LEVELS FOR MANUFACTURING MILK

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to increase the support levels for manufacturing milk to $3.25 per hundredweight and to 60 cents per pound for butterfat. This modest increase would help assure an adequate supply of dairy products for our own domestic needs and for the very important job of feeding hungry people in nations abroad. While I would like to see dairy price supports returned to the 90 percent of parity level and feel that dairy farmers are entitled to this support price, I do not think it realistic to press for a higher figure at this time.

It is true that milk and butterfat have been selling above the present support price of $3.06 for milk and 56.6 cents for butterfat. However, with dairying going into the flush season, the price trend is again heading downward. In February of this year, farmers were receiving $3.26 for milk and 59.2 cents for butterfat. April figures show farmers receiving $3.17 for milk and 58.7 cents for butterfat.

For several years, the dairy industry has been faced with increasingly severe price and supply problems. Production has moved to new high levels, and domestic consumption has fallen off.

Mr. Speaker, income of dairy farmers has declined each year for the past 8 years, while farm operating costs have risen steadily, setting new records year by year. Under the regime of Secretary Benson and President Eisenhower, the support price for dairy products has been slashed from 90 percent to 77 percent of parity. During this same period, the prices received by farmers for their milk have dropped almost 25 percent, while the cost of family living items has gone up 6 percent. The result has been a devastating cost-price squeeze which has forced many hundreds of thousands of dairy farmers out of business. In some of the major dairy-producing areas, farm families have been putting in as much as 3,300 hours of labor a year and an investment of some $32,000 in plant and equipment to earn an hourly wage rate of 56 cents an hour.

The dairy industry is made up of some 1,200,000 farmers and over 10,200 creameries, milk-drying plants, condenseries, and other processing and distributing firms. These dairy plants are vital industries in their home communities, employing more than 250,000 workers and carrying an annual payroll of more than $500 million. They all make an important contribution to our national economy and deserve a fair return on their labor and investment.

Mr. Speaker, in these days of ever-increasing world tensions, we have a powerful instrument for good will in the products of our dairy farms. The children's milk program has been most successful in bringing nutritious milk to children in our own schools. But we have not licked the problem of the hungry and ill-fed people in our own country, and we have made only a beginning in sharing our food with the underprivileged peoples abroad.

The familiar CARE packages have brought nutrition and comfort to countless peoples in the free world. Schoolchildren in many foreign countries are learning what milk is through the school milk program operated under Public Law 480. We all remember too well the concern last November when the Department of Agriculture ran out of nonfat dry milk for oversea relief right at the height of the Christmas season of good will and giving to the needy.

I sincerely believe that the modest increase in support levels called for in this legislation would not only help provide a greater degree of economic stability to our dairy farmers, but would also help assure an adequate supply of healthful dairy products for schoolchildren and needy in both our country and overseas.

SACRILEGE BEHIND THE CLOAK OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, on or about April 13, past, one of my constituents, incensed by a recent humanities class assignment at the State University College on Long Island, at Oyster Bay, N.Y., gave me a copy of the poem that was the subject of the assignment by the instructor, Merrill G. Rodin.

Profoundly disturbed by the poem, I wired the Governor of the State of New York, the New York State Board of

Regents, the New York State Commissioner of Education, and the dean of the State University College on Long Island, asking an immediate investigation. The poem and my action are related in the following release from my office:

DEROUNIAN BLASTS BEATNIK SACRILEGE

Representative STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, Republican, of New York, "shocked and greatly disturbed" that "under the guise of teaching the humanities" there was distributed to a class of the State University College on Long Island, at Oyster Bay, N.Y., a "cheap, tawdry, and insolent beatnik poem ridiculing and deriding the most solemn and sacred event in Christian belief—the crucifixion of Christ," has wired Governor Rockefeller, the New York State Board of Regents, the New York State Commissioner of Education, and the dean of the State University College of Long Island, asking an immediate investigation.

"Is such blasphemy part of the education the taxpayers are paying for?" the legislator asked.

"This is the kind of class assignment I would expect in a university in the Kremlin where it is taught that belief in God is an 'opiate.'" Congressman DEROUNIAN said. "All our efforts, everything we strive to accomplish in the United States is for one purpose—to build a better world for our children. Of what value are our labors if mandatory assignments in public schools arrogantly belittle and degrade Christianity? I resent this outrageous episode, as should every Christian."

"If there is a concentrated and planned effort to try to destroy Christian belief, under the guise of education, we should know it," DEROUNIAN stated, "so immediate corrective action can be taken."

The excerpt from "A Coney Island of the Mind: No. 5," distributed to the class in humanities, on or about April 5, for analysis and discussion on April 7, follows:

"A CONEY ISLAND OF THE MIND: No. 5

(By Lawrence Ferlinghetti)

"Sometime during eternity
Some guys show up
And one of them
Who shows up real late
Is a kind of carpenter
From some square-type place
Like Galilee
And He starts wailing
And claiming He is hep
To who made heaven
And earth
And that the cat
Who really laid it on us is his Dad.
And moreover
He adds
It's all writ down
On some scroll-type parchments
Which some henchmen
Leave lying around the Dead Sea somewhere
A long time ago
And which you won't even find
For a couple thousand years or so
Or at least for
Nineteen hundred and forty-seven
Of them
To be exact
And even then
Nobody really believes them
Or me
For that matter.
You're hot
They tell Him
And they cool Him.
They stretch Him on the Tree to cool
And everybody after that
Is always making models
Of this Tree
With Him hung up
And always crooning His name
And calling Him to come down
And sit in
On their combo
As if He is the king cat
Who's got to blow
Or they can't quite make it
Only He don't come down
From His Tree
Him just hang there
On His Tree
Looking real petered out
And real cool
And also
According to a roundup
Of late world news
From the usual reliable sources
Real dead."

Dean Leonard K. Olsen, State University College on Long Island, replied, and I wrote him further:

APRIL 19, 1960.

The Honorable STEPHEN B. DEROUNIAN,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DEROUNIAN: Your telegrams and statements concerning the content of a poem discussed in one of our humanities classes recently have prompted us to make an inquiry into the facts so that the circumstances can be made clear.

I am sure that you did not mean to infer that our college is antireligious, but I regret that we did not have an earlier opportunity to explain this matter and avoid any misunderstandings. It certainly was not the intention of any member of our instructional staff to offend any student or to deride his religious beliefs.

Perhaps we can best understand the event which occurred if we review the purpose of the humanities course at our college which is similar to basic humanities courses in other institutions.

The primary focus of the course is upon works which have won an established and recognized place in the tradition of great literature. These represent values set forth from a wide variety of points of view and modes of expression. Among authors studied for example are St. Thomas Aquinas, Lincoln, Shakespeare, Donne, Milton, Father Hopkins, Yeats, Plato, etc. The students have read such works as "God's Grandeur," by Father Gerard Manley Hopkins, Wordsworth's "Ode on Intimations of Immortality," and St. Thomas Aquinas' "Proofs for the Existence of God."

These works are not studied for themselves, simply, but also for the purpose of developing in the student the disciplined ability to understand and appreciate other comparable works which he will encounter elsewhere in college and in adult life. It is inevitable and desirable that many students will encounter positions with which they cannot agree, but it is the obligation of a university to inquire into and to examine impartially and broadly rather than protect students from views other than their own.

In following the purposes of a humanities course, the program in literature is not antireligious or partisan. The poem to which you refer is not included in the regular program, but was discussed in response to requests from students. In permitting discussion of the poem by an author whose works are not considered antireligious, the instructors assumed both the freedom and the responsibility which traditionally belong to a member of a university faculty. Students were afforded an opportunity to use their newly acquired skills of literary analysis on something considered modern and unconventional and to agree or disagree as they saw fit.

We appreciate your interest in the program and teaching at our college and will be glad to discuss them with you in detail at your convenience.

Sincerely,

LEONARD K. OLSEN,
Dean, State University, College on Long Island.

APRIL 26, 1960.

Dean LEONARD K. OLSEN,
State University,
College on Long Island,
Oyster Bay, Long Island, N.Y.

DEAR DEAN OLSEN: I appreciate your letter of April 19, which arrived while I was in California on committee business.

You have missed my point completely.

Apparently you do not agree with me that a faculty member of a tax-supported college should have, also, the attributes of common sense and judgment, in teaching his students.

I have no objections to the study of beatnik poetry but I do feel very strongly that a captive student audience should not be subjected to perverted proselytizing of the most sacred belief of Christianity. You have been quoted as saying that the poem in question is "deeply religious"; you must know that in the beatnik vocabulary words like "square" and "dead" are words of absolute derision.

Following your line of thought, pornography would be regarded as a respected art and worthy of discussion, in this light, by a class of freshmen students, because the teacher in charge so assigned it.

Sincerely yours,

STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN,
Member of Congress.

Newspapers reported that both the dean and instructor thought the poem "deeply religious," and the author was quoted in the April 19 issue of Newsday, as follows:

What the poem is saying is that the way the world acts, you'd think that Christ is dead and that's what it says. As far as I'm concerned, it is not blasphemous and does not have any blasphemous intent. I used hip language, sure, but I'm not making a parody of the Crucifixion just for the hell of it. All I'm saying is how the spirit of Christ ain't with us no more.

The voice of the people is expressed in this editorial, which appeared in the April 15 issue of the New York World-Telegram and the Sun:

SICK SACRILEGE

If the so-called beatniks of our time (in another day they'd have been called just bums) want to trudge through life unbathed, looking like unmade beds, mumbling their drab jargon and committing it to verse for their mutual commiseration, we suppose that's their business. The Nation has survived worse.

And if they choose to parody religious history with flip irreverence, we suppose that's also to be expected—and endured, and ignored.

But when an English teacher at the State university college at Oyster Bay devotes classroom time to a discussion—and apparently an admiring discussion—of a beatnik Crucifixion poem by an upper echelon San Francisco beatnik, that's just about too much. Christ, in this blank-minded verse, is described as "kind of a carpenter from some square-type place like Galilee." It gets progressively worse, such as "Him just hang there on His tree looking real petered out and real cool."

That's enough. To quote further from this sick sacrilege would be inappropriate on Good Friday.

A girl in one of the classes complained to her parents about this. Word reached her

Congressman, then Albany, and an investigation was on.

We say that any faculty member who provides a forum for sacrilegious trash is unfit for his post.

And what an ironic counterpoint to the barring of even a nondenominational prayer in a public-supported school.

His Excellency, Walter P. Kellenberg, D.D., bishop of Rockville Centre, a distinguished leader of Christianity, has written me:

MAY 11, 1960.

The Honorable STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DEROUNIAN: Thank you for your very cordial letter of April 26, 1960, enclosing an excerpt from "A Coney Island of the Mind: No. 5," together with a copy of your comments and evaluation of it.

May I state unequivocally that I concur fully with your reaction to this blasphemous mockery and your request for immediate corrective action.

I have invited the comments of five members of my faculty of St. Pius X Preparatory Seminary and I quote the consensus of opinion: "Whatever the intentions of the author might have been, the work he produced lacks both reverence and good taste.

"Religious truths can be conveyed even to children's minds provided that the teacher presents this sacred doctrine with the reverence it merits. This author presented a sublime truth irreverently.

"No one here thought the work had any literary merit. It seems that the author was trying to make up for lack of insight by originality of language. The result achieved shows confusion of ideas and forced artificiality of expression.

"It is extremely blasphemous and certainly most insulting to the sacred religious belief of millions of God-fearing and God-loving Christians throughout the world."

May I commend you for the action you have taken in this regard.

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER P. KELLENBERG, D.D.,
Bishop of Rockville Centre.

An investigation by the State University of New York is continuing, despite efforts to sweep under the rug of "academic freedom" this disgraceful episode in education, as indicated in Dean Olsen's letter.

It should be increasingly clear to all thoughtful and fair-minded educators that if we are to preserve our Nation and our way of life, we need above all harmony among our citizens and the respect of each for the rights and beliefs of others and to attain the same we must train our young people in such respect for such rights and such beliefs. I am forcibly reminded of Judge Learned Hand's words:

A society in which men recognize no check upon their freedom soon becomes a society where freedom is the possession of only a savage few, as we have learned to our sorrow.

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I aks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, on May 10 I introduced H.R. 12153, which provides, among other things, for several amendments to the Federal National Mortgage Insurance Association, designed to permit that agency to serve more effectively its statutory objectives. This bill will be the subject of public hearings before the Subcommittee on Housing beginning May 16.

On Friday, I introduced, by request, another bill on the subject, which also relates to the Federal National Mortgage Association. This bill represents the study and efforts of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the National Association of Home Builders, and the Mortgage Bankers' Association. Representatives of these three trade associations have held several meetings, and there appears to be general agreement that the changes proposed in this legislation will provide additional sources of mortgage money.

I introduced this bill in order that the subcommittee, representatives of these three associations, Housing Agency officials, and others may direct testimony toward its provisions.

While I have introduced legislation relating to the Federal National Mortgage Association, I am, of course, not wedded to specific amendments. Certainly the combined efforts of these three associations are deserving of serious study by the Subcommittee on Housing.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE ENDORSES "HIGHLY IMPORTANT" CHEMICAL PESTICIDES BILL, H.R. 11502, INTRODUCED BY REPRESENTATIVE LEONARD G. WOLF, OF IOWA

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in its editorial of May 10 the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune called the chemical pesticides coordination bill, H.R. 11502, introduced by Representative LEN WOLF, of Iowa, "little noticed but highly important." This bill was recently considered by the Fish and Wildlife Subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, of which I am a member.

His sponsorship of this desperately needed legislation is an excellent example of the keen mind of LEN WOLF and his constant delving deep below the surface to discover ways in which he can protect and fight for the public interest.

The chemical pesticides bill is just one of many fine examples of the splendid contribution which LEN WOLF is making in the Congress of the United States in the interest of all of the people.

I met LEN WOLF on his first day in Congress and since that day have always been impressed by his dynamic fighting spirit which has so greatly influenced so much of the significant legislation before Congress.

Few freshmen in the history of Congress have made as great an impact on the legislative activity of this great body. Few freshmen are better known, better liked, or more respected by their colleagues. Let us hope that LEN WOLF will be returned to Congress again and again to continue his hard work and leadership on behalf of the people, and his great contribution to Government.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the body of the RECORD at this point the Chicago Tribune editorial referred to:

TOO MUCH POISON

The House Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation has just concluded hearings on a little noticed but highly important bill introduced by Representative LEONARD G. WOLF of Iowa. His proposal, called the Chemical Pesticides Coordination Act, is a moderate and sensible move to impose some restraint upon the enthusiastic pesticide spreaders of the Department of Agriculture.

WOLF'S bill provides that no Federal agency shall embark on chemical biological controls without first consulting with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the corresponding State agencies in the areas involved. Exceptions may be made by the Secretary of the Interior for projects of demonstrably little danger to wildlife. The Fish and Wildlife Service is authorized to report to Congress if its advice is disregarded.

The most striking example of the need for such legislation has been the fire-ant control program in the Southeastern States. Here 10 to 12 million dollars, most of it Federal money, has been spent to kill an imported insect which the National Wildlife Federation has called "a nuisance, but nothing more." Yet the Plant Pest Control Division of the Department of Agriculture dosed tens of thousands of acres with 2 pounds per acre of heptachlor or dieldrin. The dosage was so destructive of wildlife that the pest control sprayers retreated to two applications of one-fourth pound per acre, spaced 3 or 4 months apart.

The fire-ant poison campaign was so potent that residents in affected areas were advised to keep children off the ground for days, to cover their gardens, and to keep milk cows out of pasture for a month. In one area in Texas, bird populations were reduced 85 percent. In 9,900 acres in Alabama, the quail population was down 88 percent.

On Long Island, prominent citizens including Robert Cushman Murphy, the ornithologist, and Archibald B. Roosevelt sought an injunction against Department of Agriculture spraying against the gypsy moth. While their suit was pending, the contested spraying was done. Because the Government said it did not intend to repeat the dosage at that place, the court of appeals held the question moot. There is no existing legal barrier to keep a demonstrably irresponsible agency from dumping any amount of poison it pleases into anyone's backyard.

Dr. George J. Wallace of the Michigan State University faculty, who has seen robins eliminated from his campus after tree spraying, has stated, "The current widespread and ever-expanding pesticide program

poses the greatest threat that animal life in North America has ever faced—worse than deforestation, worse than market hunting and illegal shooting, worse than drainage, drought, or oil pollution, and possibly worse than all of these decimating factors combined."

Since human beings are bigger and hardier than birds and fish, the toxic effects of pesticides on man are less evident. Robins get the tremors and keel over dead in areas where people are not visibly affected. But even small amounts of poison are not good for the health. The Pure Food and Drug Administration has declared a zero tolerance in human foods for heptachlor, used in the fire-ant program. The National Cancer Institute has listed DDT and other pesticides as carcinogens, and has incriminated some of the petroleum products in which the pesticides are often dissolved.

Certainly chemical poisons are dangerous materials to spread about wholesale. Ill considered applications of these poisons have been made before now, and will be made again and again unless measures are taken to prevent it.

A MATTER OF PRECEDENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week the House will have before it a modest proposal from the Committee on Education and Labor to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance to the States for classroom construction.

During the debate we shall hear the tired old argument that such a program does violence to our traditional concept of educational finance; that the Federal Government has no responsibility to public education.

Mr. Speaker, this argument is not only tired and trite, it is completely invalid, as a look at the record will indicate. The record is documented in detail in a study on Federal educational policies, programs, and proposals, prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, by Charles A. Quattlebaum, and published as a committee print by the Committee on Education and Labor. My remarks from this point forward rely largely upon extractions from this study.

The Federal Government's interest in, and financial responsibility for, public education predates the Constitution. In 1785 an ordinance, adopted by the Congress of the Confederation for the disposal of public lands in the Western Territory, reserved one section of every township for the endowment of schools within that township. Two years later, in the Ordinance of 1787 providing for the government of the Northwest Territory, the Congress made the clear declaration of policy that "religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

Federal responsibility to public education has been assumed since the beginning of our present Government under the Constitution.

President George Washington, in his first annual address to Congress said:

> There is nothing more deserving your patronage than the promotion of science and literature. * * *
>
> Whether this desirable object will be best promoted by affording aids to seminaries of learning already established, by the installation of a national university, or by any other expedients will be well worthy of a place in the deliberations of the Legislature.

Alexander Hamilton, a patron saint of today's conservatives, held that whatever concerned the general interests of learning was within the Federal jurisdiction "as far as regards an application of money."

The great Thomas Jefferson, a patron saint of today's liberals, held that Congress could appropriate public lands for the support of education, and in 1806 he proposed to use import duties for education, among other public improvements.

Most new States admitted to the Union subsequent to 1789 were first organized as Territories by the Congress. In so doing, Congress established a school system which was taken over by the new State upon its admission. Thus, the Federal Government itself is responsible for the very existence of public school systems of a large number of States.

During the administration of President Andrew Jackson, in 1836, and nobody will deny that he was one of the patron saints of the liberals, the Government found itself with a surplus of $47 million in the Treasury. Congress passed a law allocating this money to the 38 States that were then members of the Union to use that money for the purpose of constructing school buildings. All of the 38 States accepted the Government appropriation and used the money to build school buildings. I make the point, therefore, that we are not setting a precedent by proposing that the Government spend money for school classroom construction. That precedent was set as early as 1836.

This grant was not an isolated case. During the first part of the last century, Congress made many monetary grants, principally from the sale of public lands, which were frequently used to support education. In most instances the land and monetary grants were for education in general. It has been pointed out that funds from such grants were the sources of the first stable support for free schools in more than half of the States.

During the depression years, the Federal Government spent many hundreds of millions of dollars on educational projects, ranging from literacy classes, nursery schools, to building construction grants and loans.

President Herbert Hoover appointed the National Advisory Committee on Education in 1929. Its mission, as stated by President Hoover on December 3, 1929, in his message to Congress, was to "investigate and present recommendations" relative to Federal policy with respect to education.

This committee made its report in 1931. It said it found in the Constitution 14 warrants for Federal activities in education.

It is significant that none of these provisions authorizes the Federal Government to exercise any control over State and local school systems. Neither H.R. 10128, nor any other bill which I have endorsed, or ever will, authorizes any such control. This finding by President Hoover's handpicked committee makes more valid our contention that the Federal Government may provide financial support to public education without imposition of Federal controls. It is within the pattern suggested by Alexander Hamilton.

In fact, if anything might be construed as unconstitutional, it would be Federal control, but certainly not Federal assistance.

It is interesting to note that this earlier Hoover Commission found that there are national responsibilities for education which only the Federal Government can adequately meet. The American people, the report said, are justified in using their Federal tax system to give financial aid to education in the States.

It is extremely significant, in view of the position taken today by General Eisenhower, that this committee appointed by an earlier Republican President found that to require the matching of Federal money grants with State or local funds is an undesirable policy in the field of education.

In 1936, President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed an Advisory Committee on Education to consider the whole matter of Federal-State-local relationships in education.

In essence, this committee found that past Federal participation in education has been required by the fact that locally supported programs of education have never been adequate to accomplish all vital national purposes. Their relative inadequacy is increasing, not because the local programs do not improve but because they do not improve rapidly enough to meet increasing needs.

The ability of the States and local communities to provide education has always been unequal. That inequality has been magnified, however, by the recent great changes that have taken place in social and economic conditions. At the same time, education has become increasingly important.

In providing funds to more nearly equalize educational opportunity, the more efficient taxes are the Federal taxes on incomes and estates. These taxes are collected chiefly in the richer areas, where the resources available to local taxation are more than adequate for the support of schools. There are definite limits on the extent to which any individual State can use taxes based upon ability to pay, such as the income and estate taxes. These are the taxes which, above all others, should be used to provide funds for equalization purposes. They can be applied effectively on a large scale only by the Federal Government.

This committee recommended a broad program of Federal assistance, including

general aid to elementary and secondary education.

The Congress, in an act dated June 7, 1939, established the National Resources Planning Board. Part I of its report for 1943, entitled "Postwar Plan and Program" recommended that equal access to elementary and high school education be made available to all children and youth. The NRPB also recommended that most of the increases in expenditures for education in the postwar period must be financed principally, if not entirely, by Federal funds.

The first Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, appointed by President Harry S. Truman in accordance with an act of Congress, was concerned primarily with administrative procedures. The Task Force on Public Welfare, however, observed that past aid programs had been beneficial, that the argument that Federal aid would lead to Federal control was only a screen to make other reasons for opposing Federal aid, and that Federal financial assistance and leadership of a noncoercive nature, while leaving basic control of and responsibility for education as a State and local function, is desirable.

These observations were made in connection with recommendations to coordinate all programs within the Office of Education.

The second Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, appointed by President Eisenhower, had a stated primary purpose to seek reductions in expenditures. Its recommendations were concerned only with then existing programs.

Meanwhile, President Eisenhower also appointed a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, headed first by Clarence E. Manion and later by Meyer Kestnbaum. This Commission suggested shrinking existing programs, and opposed further Federal activity. No criticism was made on the grounds of Federal control.

President Eisenhower called a White House Conference on Education, which was concluded during late November 1955. This conference agreed that the Federal Government should increase its financial participation in public education.

Most recently there was a White House Conference on Youth, called by President Eisenhower. This conference, by resolution, also called for Federal financial assistance for public education.

Mr. Speaker, the record is quite clear; the Federal Government has been concerned with public education since before the Constitution; and has supported education with grants of money and land since its beginning.

Two early day leaders—Hamilton and Washington—who were members of the Constitutional Convention, recognized a Federal responsibility to education and proposed financial support.

Jefferson, the strict constructionist, who was responsible for the first 10 amendments proposed Federal financial assistance to the States. It might be well to remind Members that the 10th amendment is the one most quoted by those who oppose adequate financial support for public education; yet its author, Jefferson, favored programs of Federal financial assistance to education.

Such conservatives as Hamilton and the late Senator Robert A. Taft have favored the proposition. A bill passed by the other body had Senator Taft's cosponsorship.

Committees and commissions appointed by Presidents Hoover, Roosevelt, and Truman, and conferences called by President Eisenhower have not only recommended programs of Federal financial assistance, but one committee found 14 warrants in the Constitution to support the proposition.

The Federal Government is itself responsible for the establishment of public school systems in the majority of the 37 States admitted to the Union after the original 13. Grants of land and money gave first stability to the financial foundation of public schools in more than half of the States.

The record shows that Federal financial assistance to public education is traditional, constitutional, and without Federal control.

This makes the issue clear cut. When we vote on a school bill, we either vote for our boys and girls or we vote against them.

We either want good education, or we do not.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the aid-to-education bill to which my distinguished colleague [Mr. BAILEY] has just referred is, to my mind, the most important piece of legislation to come before this session of Congress. Our strength as a nation, both now and in the future, rests on a well-educated populace. There once was a time when education was necessary to make democracy work, to strengthen our economy, and to guarantee that America maintained her forward surge of progress. I say that today all of these things are just as essential, but today the very survival of our Nation rests on expanding our educational system.

I am gratified that my beloved colleague, the indomitable dean of our West Virginia delegation, has made this statement today. He has effectively demolished the opposition arguments against aid to education. He has stated the positive benefits which will accrue from the bill which will be considered on Wednesday. I pay tribute to CLEVE BAILEY, who has fought so hard and so courageously down through the years so that America's most precious resource—her children—receive the education they deserve, and from which the Nation will profit.

I hope and trust that when this body convenes on Wednesday the Members will consider their solemn obligation to the future and, within the dictates of their conscience, will support this compromise bill which will play a major role in our survival as a free nation.

MIAMI-JACOBS BUSINESS COLLEGE, DAYTON, OHIO

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to share with you and my fellow Members of the House of Representatives the pride we in the Third Congressional District of Ohio feel in a college that is this year rounding out a century of educating young men and women for business pursuits. It is the Miami-Jacobs Business College, founded in Dayton, Ohio, in 1860, a year when the now heavily populated industrial metropolis boasted of a total of 20,000 residents. Our city, even then, was showing signs of rapid growth in the field of invention, manufacturing, and commercial enterprises of all kinds and it was in this atmosphere that Edwin D. Babbitt opened his one-room Miami Commercial School. Higher education at the university level was a privilege enjoyed by a select few from the wealthier families and many ambitious youths were glad to take advantage of this type of training for the office jobs arising in the community.

We have come a long way from the days when a commercial school prepared its students to write a good hand and keep the books. In 1865, one of the school's more successful students, A. D. Wilt, took over as its president and for 52 years he dedicated himself to developing a new type of business education, replacing the old emphasis on the mere mechanics of office routine and accounting with good, basic business principles, methods, and management.

Throughout the years of its existence since 1860, this college has shown a steady and remarkable growth. It merged with another excellent business school in the city, headed by a man from Pennsylvania, H. L. Jacobs, and it was then that it became known as the Miami-Jacobs Business College. From 1916 to 1954 the college flourished under the presidency of William E. Harbottle, and became one of the leading schools of its kind in the country. The curriculum has gradually broadened in scope; the school now has its own fine building in the heart of the downtown business district of the city; it is fully equipped with the most modern machines and facilities; and its teachers are competent, dedicated individuals eager to give their students the most comprehensive education possible during the 2 years required for obtaining a junior college degree. It is one

of 24 such colleges recognized by the U.S. Office of Education as an approved, accredited agency for this type of higher education. Charles Harbottle succeeded his father to the presidency in 1954 and he has continued to maintain the school's high ideals and its reputation as one of the most progressive educational institutions for business training in the country.

One of the most vital and necessary bulwarks of our country's defense in these critical times is economic productivity. Another is, of course, the education of our youth in all areas of learning. Miami-Jacobs is meeting both these needs by furnishing the industries of the area with the finest type of employees drawn from the ranks of its graduates. At this point in the school's long and remarkable history, its 100th anniversary, I congratulate its administrators, its teaching staff, and all its students and alumni fortunate enough to have had the advantage of its influence and training in good business techniques and administration.

A BILL PROVIDING DOLLARS FOR EDUCATION WITHOUT ANY FEDERAL DIRECTION OR CONTROL

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, according to the announced schedule, H.R. 10128, the so-called Thompson bill for school construction, will be called up this week under the Calendar Wednesday rule.

I oppose any legislation for an expanded program of aid to education which could involve control and eventual domination of our public school system by the Federal Government. But my interest in providing quality education is second to none. In this latter connection, many competent witnesses have testified that the Federal Government must assume a greater share of the financial support of schools.

There may be an emergency, but first things should come first, and the more important decision at this time is not with regard to the Nation's classroom shortage nor the adequacy of teachers' salaries. Our first job, as I see it, is to establish a method which would absolutely assure that if financial assistance is rendered it would entail no Federal controls or any opening wedge which could lead to diminishing of local responsibility and authority for the administration and type of education available to the children of America. Any system of aid must be foolproof. Priority should be given the question of how to help, not how much to help.

Can anyone who has studied the history of our Government and has witnessed the expansion of our Federal bureaucracy not recognize that under a program of general Federal aid to schools local control would inevitably be relinquished? Can anyone study education in Japan, Germany, and Italy prior to World War II and not find that centralized control of education is dangerous? The Soviet Union today uses its school system to mold its youth to Communist Party doctrine and control. So it could be here in America.

Therefore, I have taken the firm position that if assistance is necessary it should be in the form of encouragement to the individual States without any strings.

The legislatures and local school authorities must retain the basic right to finance and control its own educational system without any Federal direction or dictation.

The current effort to secure from the Congress funds for public education includes H.R. 22, the so-called Murray-Metcalf bill for school construction and teachers' salaries. It would provide $1.1 billion for fiscal 1960 and each of 3 succeeding years. There will be an attempt, as I understand, during House consideration of the Thompson school construction bill under the Calendar Wednesday rule to substitute the Murray-Metcalf provisions so as to include teachers' salaries.

To me this bill has nose under the tent Federal controls and besides, of course, any such move is a disservice to education because if such a bill went to the President, most certainly it would be vetoed and that would not help the schools.

Another school measure is S. 8, a construction and teachers' salaries bill, which passed the Senate and would provide $916 million the first year. That bill contains the same implications as H.R. 22 and if passed would meet the same fate because both of these bills are opposed by the administration and besides, as I said, contain provisions which could lead to diminished local responsibility.

Another likely supposition is that an attempt will be made to substitute the provisions of what is called the administration's proposal. Under this legislation the Federal Government would pay half of the debt service charges, the principal and interest, on school bond issues in needy districts to provide the cost of new school buildings.

Such a program would be easy on the budget momentarily but my preference would be for a plan which would be free from any threat whatsoever of toe-in-the-door approaches and keeping the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare completely out of the situation.

I have introduced just such legislation. Unfortunately, there is a question as to whether it would be germane and as such, as a substitute for the Thompson school construction bill, on a point of order I may be prevented from offering it as an amendment.

My proposal nevertheless has great merit because it embraces, in my opinion, the one system of assisting schools in which danger of Federal control is completely absent. My bill contains the one method, and possibly the only one, which could draw support from certain Members of Congress from States which under other bills would contribute to the cost but receive little or no benefit and thereby my bill could represent the only legislation of all the bills which could be enacted into law.

My bill would return to the respective States for education three-quarters of the Federal cigarette tax collected by the Federal Government. There would be no Federal agency, or employees, or red-tape involved. There would be only 50 checks each year to 50 States from the Treasurer of the United States to the respective State treasurers. The total disbursement would be approximately $1 billion, and the distribution to each State would be in the same ratio to the total as each State's school-age population bears to the total school-age population of all the States.

My bill then would strengthen State finances so each State itself would be better able to provide an adequate education to every child residing in that State.

The bill clearly declares that responsibility for and over education as set forth by the 10th amendment of the Constitution is reserved to the States. However, in accordance with the Ordinance of 1787 adopted by the Confederation Congress, the bill reaffirms that education shall forever be encouraged.

That is the spirit and essence of H.R. 12093, which I would like to substitute for the Thompson bill. I hope it will not be ruled out on a point of order. But if I am prevented from offering it as an amendment, and if the other measures fail, then I hope consideration will be given to my bill.

Meanwhile, for the information of interested friends of the public schools and those who desire to assure a quality education to every child, I include the text of my bill, and following that I offer a tabulation showing the estimated amount of funds which would be returned to each State.

H.R. 12093

A bill to strengthen State governments, to provide financial assistance to States for educational purposes by returning a portion of the Federal taxes collected therein, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Congress hereby finds and declares that responsibility for and control over education is one of the powers not delegated to the United States but reserved to the States or to the people under the tenth amendment to the Constitution.

(b) The Congress hereby reaffirms and reenacts a portion of article III of the Ordinance of 1787, adopted by the Confederation Congress, July 13, 1787, as follows: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

(c) The Congress further finds that continued encouragement of the means of education requires the strengthening of State governments.

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the

Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, and for each fiscal year thereafter, to each State, to be used by such State for any current expenditure for elementary or secondary school purposes for which educational revenues derived from State or local sources may legally and constitutionally be expended in such State, an amount equal to 75 per centum of the Federal tax on cigarettes (computed as provided in this Act).

(b) For the purposes of this section the term "State" includes the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury shall allot for each fiscal year to each State, from the total amount appropriated for such year pursuant to section 2, an amount which bears the same ratio to such total as such State's school-age population bears to the total school-age population of all the States.

Number of pupils enrolled in full-time public elementary and secondary schools, together with estimated Federal allotments for educational purposes to individual States under H.R. 12093

	Total	Elementary	Secondary	Allotments
Total, United States (50 States and District of Columbia)	35,286,177	24,034,381	11,251,796	$1,058,585,310
North Atlantic	8,263,670	5,246,610	3,017,060	250,910,100
Connecticut	460,311	331,015	129,296	13,809,330
Delaware	77,761	45,399	32,362	2,332,830
Maine	197,035	150,239	46,796	5,911,050
Maryland	583,015	349,121	233,894	17,490,450
Massachusetts	829,327	555,278	274,049	24,879,810
New Hampshire	102,421	71,157	31,264	3,072,630
New Jersey	1,012,000	766,000	246,000	30,360,000
New York	2,735,000	1,616,000	1,119,000	82,050,000
Pennsylvania	1,948,985	1,156,749	792,236	58,469,550
Rhode Island	128,406	75,727	52,679	3,852,180
Vermont	72,822	52,108	20,714	2,184,660
District of Columbia	116,587	77,817	38,770	3,497,610
Great Lakes and Plains	9,835,913	6,782,097	3,053,816	295,077,390
Illinois	1,663,001	1,258,431	404,570	49,890,030
Indiana	940,000	573,400	366,600	28,000,000
Iowa	567,253	376,340	190,913	17,017,590
Kansas	458,000	345,000	113,000	13,740,000
Michigan	1,641,167	1,050,336	590,831	49,235,010
Minnesota	676,800	413,800	263,000	20,304,000
Missouri	805,000	610,200	194,800	24,150,000
Nebraska	274,262	194,977	79,285	8,227,860
North Dakota	130,173	96,954	33,219	3,905,191
Ohio	1,832,479	1,249,673	582,806	54,974,370
South Dakota	147,778	110,986	36,792	4,433,340
Wisconsin	700,000	502,000	198,000	21,000,000
Southeast	8,635,355	6,011,393	2,623,962	259,060,650
Alabama	775,981	474,777	301,204	23,279,430
Arkansas	422,060	240,146	181,914	12,661,800
Florida	919,491	548,155	371,336	$27,584,730
Georgia	930,624	655,272	275,352	27,918,720
Kentucky	610,992	441,252	169,740	18,329,760
Louisiana	701,000	545,000	156,000	21,030,000
Mississippi	560,000	447,000	113,000	16,800,000
North Carolina	1,089,742	828,006	261,736	32,692,260
South Carolina	573,084	376,135	196,949	17,192,520
Tennessee	779,928	596,489	183,439	23,397,840
Virginia	820,578	576,081	244,497	24,617,340
West Virginia	451,875	283,080	168,795	13,556,250
West and Southwest	8,371,299	5,877,502	2,493,797	251,138,970
Arizona	280,369	220,318	60,051	8,411,070
California	3,230,000	2,200,000	1,030,000	96,900,000
Colorado	378,000	238,000	140,000	11,340,000
Idaho	155,890	92,443	63,447	4,676,700
Montana	142,850	96,313	46,537	4,285,500
Nevada	60,279	40,494	19,785	1,808,370
New Mexico	211,334	127,137	84,197	6,340,020
Oklahoma	535,000	322,000	213,000	16,050,000
Oregon	379,699	267,078	112,621	11,390,970
Texas	2,084,540	1,631,095	453,445	62,536,200
Utah	228,826	138,332	90,494	6,864,780
Washington	609,024	454,989	154,035	18,270,720
Wyoming	75,488	49,303	26,185	2,264,640
Alaska	39,449	32,465	6,984	1,183,470
Hawaii	140,491	84,314	56,177	4,214,730
Outlying parts:				
American Samoa	5,720	3,691	2,029	171,600
Canal Zone	10,893	6,266	4,627	326,790
Guam	13,595	10,580	3,015	407,850
Puerto Rico	567,162	390,330	176,832	17,014,860
Virgin Islands	6,318	4,298	2,020	189,540

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF REA

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, we had an unusual anniversary on Wednesday last—the 25th anniversary of the establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration on May 11, 1935.

The bare statistics of the achievements of the REA are impressive. If we try to list them, they turn out to be lengthy. Even in summary form they reveal what can be done through the active and informed operations of a Government agency working intelligently with the people to help meet the needs of people.

When the REA was started a quarter of a century ago, fewer than 10 percent of America's farmers enjoyed the blessings of electricity. Today, more than 96 percent of the farms are electrified.

This means higher production. A farmer with modern machinery can handle his cattle, his dairy herds, his silage, his feeding and cleaning problems more cheaply and more efficiently.

Electrification also means comfort and leisure. A farm wife in the pioneer days may be a romantic figure as we look back through the lens of fiction, but her life was hard and rigorous. When the day came that she could buy soap instead of making her own, she still had to get her meals and clean her house by drudgery. The daily chores were a grinding burden on her family.

There is electricity in the homes of the farm wives today, and they have vacuum cleaners and food freezers and electric stoves. Most of the back-breaking chores are performed by power-driven mechanisms. There is television and radio. There is a different light on the land.

What has been responsible for this vast change? It has been, very plainly, the result of a decision made to create the REA and to use Federal Government money to furnish the capital needed to take electricity to the farm.

This Government money, let it be remembered, has been furnished in the form of loans—not gifts. The farmers got access to a system whereby they were encouraged to organize cooperatives and let the co-ops borrow Federal money to create electric systems and then repay the Government, with interest, out of the earnings.

The system has worked. It has been one of history's most remarkable achievements.

As a Member of this House, it is a matter of pride to me to realize that the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration was underwritten by Congress and given statutory sanction.

The REA was created by Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1935, in an Executive order based upon an emergency relief law. Many of our people today cannot recall what the depression was like—what mass joblessness was and what daring steps were needed to help overcome the depression and lay the foundations for a better society.

After President Roosevelt set up the REA, it was given a permanent status by act of Congress. It has become an institution in our land.

I confess I do not understand the attitude of mind that has placed the REA under attack in the last several years by those who would rather quibble about alleged flaws than recognize the solid accomplishment. It is sufficient to observe that the attack has occurred—that REA interest rates, for example, are called "too low" by doctrinaires who cannot bring themselves to acknowledge good in what the Federal Government did when it was infused with an active desire to serve the general welfare.

The attacks have been beaten back, and I am sure they will be beaten back as often as necessary in the future.

I salute the REA. It has spread good across the land, and we pay our tribute to those who built well before us when we celebrate the anniversary of the great work they set in motion.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. GEORGE), for today, May 16, on account of official business.

Mr. SHORT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for week of May 16, on account of death in his family.

Mr. DURHAM (at the request of Mr. FOUNTAIN), for 10 days, on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DEROUNIAN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BAILEY, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DORN of South Carolina and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASPINALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALLEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RABAUT.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. PUCINSKI in three instances.

(At the request of Mr. MCCORMACK, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

(At the request of Mr. ROBISON, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. ARENDS.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 910. An act to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 602. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May of 1960 in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 14, 1960, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1607. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anne Morgan;

H.R. 8042. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to resell any two of four C1–SAY–1 type vessels to the Government of the Republic of China for use in China trade in Far East and Near East waters exclusively;

H.R. 9449. An act to amend certain sections of title 14, United States Code, relating to personnel matters in the U.S. Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10474. An act to authorize construction of modern naval vessels;

H.R. 11510. An act to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 352. Joint resolution to authorize preliminary study and review in connection with proposed additional building for the Library of Congress.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 17, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2146. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1961 involving an increase in the amount of $32,500,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission (H. Doc. No. 387); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2147. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 11, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a survey of Gleason Creek, Robinson watershed, at and in the vicinity of Ely, White Pine County, Nev., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved May 17, 1950 (H. Doc. 388); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

2148. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material) relative to a proposal by the Department of the Navy to transfer *Flamingo* (MSCO–11), to Jansen-Richardson Post No. 488 of the American Legion, Ellsworth, Mich., pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2149. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the use of surplus grain by the States for emergency use in the feeding of resident game birds and other wildlife, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2150. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on the progress of the liquidation of the national defense, war and reconversion activities of Reconstruction Finance Corp., to comply with the provisions of the RFC Liquidation Act (Public Law 163, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 230, 231), as amended, and with Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2151. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to supplement and amend the act of June 30, 1948, relating to the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, and to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior issued under the act of June 22, 1936"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2152. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting a report of statistical tables reflecting the business transacted by the bankruptcy courts and other pertinent data for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, pursuant to section 53 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 81); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2153. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 507 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the preservation of basic compensation in downgrading actions"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2154. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 10, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on the economic justification of Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Saline River, Kans., in response to an item in Public Law 505, 84th Congress, 2d session, approved May 2, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1960, the following bills were reported on May 13, 1960:

Mr. SHEPPARD: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 12231. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1606). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. NORRELL: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 12232. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1607). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1960, the following bill was reported on May 14, 1960:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2611. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1608). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted May 16, 1960*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1214. An act to amend the act of March 11, 1948 (62 Stat. 78), relating to the establishment of the De Soto National Memorial, in the State of Florida; with amendment (Rept. No. 1609). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1960, the following bills were introduced May 13, 1960:

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 12231. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H.R. 12232. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

[*Introduced and referred May 16, 1960*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 12233. A bill relating to the recovery from liable third persons of the cost of medical care and treatment furnished by agencies and departments of the United States to persons authorized by law to receive such care and treatment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 12234. A bill to amend section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, so as to eliminate authority for the payment of subsidies for domestic trunk air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 12235. A bill to amend the act of September 14, 1959, with respect to sales and use taxes imposed by States in sales and other business activities in interstate commerce, and authorizing studies by congressional committees of this type of taxation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 12236. A bill to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 12237. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make surveys with respect to floods aggravated by intense and unusual storms in the areas of Winthrop, Nahant, and Revere, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 12238. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to the level of price support for milk for manufacturing purposes and for butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 12239. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease-and-desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 12240. A bill to amend sections 4504, 4511, 4520, and 4549 of the Revised Statutes, related to shipping articles; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 12241. A bill to amend section 376 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 12242. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of 1958 with respect to certain reservoir projects in Texas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. Res. 529. Resolution to name and dedicate the three House Office Buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to request the U.S. Treasury Department to mint a sufficient number of half dollars commemorating Old Ninety Six Star Fort; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing the compensation of postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 12243. A bill for the relief of Incoronata Raffa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 12244. A bill for the relief of Joe Ho Kwong and Alverne Joe (Goon) Kwong, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H.R. 12245. A bill to admit the oil screw tugs *Barbara, Ivalee, Lydia,* and *Alice*; and the barges *Florida, DB 8, No. 220,* and *No. 235* to American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade while they are owned by Standard Dredging Corp., a New Jersey corporation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 12246. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Woman's Party, Inc., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 12247. A bill for the relief of Keith K. Hoover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

464. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the chief clerk, the Council of the City of New York, New York, N.Y., relative to requesting passage of House Concurrent Resolution No. 39, with respect to the submission of a peace formula by the President of the United States during the next summit conference between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

We Shall Beat Them With Ingenuity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently I had occasion to discuss the present world situation, particularly the increasing pressure that America is experiencing from foreign imports, with one of the Nation's most successful businessmen, who got his start in my district and continues to have his central store in my district.

I was most encouraged to hear Mr. Sol Polk, whose merchandising techniques have attracted nationwide attention and who is now celebrating his 25th anniversary as a retailer, assure me that America will find an answer to the problems which now confront us.

"We shall beat them with ingenuity," was Mr. Polk's confident rejoinder.

I think this is a powerful slogan which we Americans ought to adopt throughout our Nation.

There are few people I know who are more qualified to make this statement with such confidence than Sol Polk. From a very humble beginning, Sol Polk and his family have been able to build a highly impressive retailing institution. I think we all know how thoroughly competitive is the retailing field. Yet, by using the full scope of ingenuity, initiative, and dedication to the highest principles of retailing, Sol Polk today stands out as one of the Nation's most successful businessmen.

I am very concerned that so many Americans look to the future with grave fear and apprehension. The spirit of confidence and dedication, which exemplifies Sol Polk, is too frequently being replaced in many people by an attitude of despair and lethargy.

If all of us, as Americans, will recognize the full depth of the statement—"We shall beat them with ingenuity"—I feel that we can recapture that precious attribute which has distinguished us as free Americans from all other social orders.

It is true that the world is growing ever smaller. We are now engaged in a great race for conquest of outer space. As a Nation, we are also confronted with a world that is experiencing an industrial revolution. Many areas of the world, which for centuries have remained dark and totally undeveloped, are today seeing the magic of light. Nations which for centuries have relied on primitive methods of production and satisfied themselves with only an agrarian economy, today are becoming bastions of industrial development.

Many nations whose industrial potential was totally destroyed during World War II, are today again competing for world markets. It should come then as no surprise that competition in our country from foreign imports will mount in an ever increasing degree.

I find comfort in Sol Polk's confident prediction that "We shall beat them with ingenuity," because I believe we can, if we exercise our traditional American initiative.

The aura of fear and uncertainty in this country must be replaced with confidence that we have the ability to solve our problems with ingenuity. It was this ingenuity which has helped make the United States the greatest Nation in the world today. It was this ingenuity which has given our Nation the highest standard of living anywhere in the world today. It was this ingenuity which has given us a productive capacity that has inspired the imagination of people throughout the world.

There are many problems confronting America today, but I am confident that, in the words of Sol Polk, "we will solve them with ingenuity."

Yes, Mr. Speaker, to those who would predict the collapse of America; to those who would have the world believe we are a decadent Nation; to those who would want to cast doubts about our ability to defend freedom, to those who fear other ideologies will destroy us, I should just like to send this admonition: "We shall beat them with ingenuity."

I feel confident we shall meet the challenge of the sixties not by lowering our own standard of living, but rather by inspiring the rest of the world to raise its own standard; not by surrendering our own liberties but by bringing freedom to others; not by going backward but, instead, by proceeding forward—and all of this we shall do with traditional American ingenuity.

Senator Randolph, West Virginia's Son of the Year—Address by Senator Mansfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 16, 1960

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 14, I met with members of the State Society of West Virginia for the purpose of designating our distinguished colleague, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], as West Virginia's Son of the Year.

Mr. President, in meeting with these people of West Virginia, I felt both honored and humble. Their State had just been subject to much disgraceful malignment and to many irresponsible charges of bigotry and backwardness.

West Virginians have now given an answer to those who fostered this malignment, to those who made these charges. They have given an example to the rest of us of a political maturity in which such false issues as religion and sectionalism are put aside and political judgments are made on the basis of records and platforms. I sincerely hope the rest of us, particularly the pollsters and commentators, will take this example to heart.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks in designating Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH as West Virginia's Son of the Year, delivered before the State Society of West Virginia, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENTATION TO SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH AS WEST VIRGINIA'S SON OF THE YEAR, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, MAY 14, 1960

(Address by Senator MANSFIELD)

I hope that West Virginia has room for many sons. In view of the warmth and friendliness of your welcome to me I am going to apply for adoption. I have no sense of being an outsider here tonight and perhaps that is understandable. For my meeting with you, topographically speaking, is a kind of meeting of the mountains. What West Virginia is to the East in that respect, Montana is to the West. Each State gives character and spine to its respective sector of the country.

I've heard somewhere that West Virginia is a wonderful State in which to work because if you get tired all you have to do is stop and lean on it. Montana is something like that except that there we can lean on it even when we are working.

Even as West Virginia and Montana share a common heritage of mountains, the two States also share a common heritage of great natural resources and for that reason they are sometimes called Treasure States. For those of us of these States, however, the real treasure is not copper or coal but fine, generous and friendly people.

We share another heritage—West Virginia and Montana—a less pleasant heritage—the heritage of grave economic problems which grow out of a heavy dependence on a single industry. This is not the occasion to detail these problems. I mention them only by way of noting that we are close not only in the sense of common joys but also common sorrows.

For, tonight, then I hope you will act favorably on my petition for adoption as a son of West Virginia. I file it because it takes an ordinary son like myself to recognize an outstanding son. And to recognize and to honor an outstanding son of West Virginia is half of the reason why we are gathered here tonight.

The man whom we honor as West Virginia's son of the year began a long time ago the work which was to merit him this great distinction. The work began as soon as he had learned enough at Salem College to teach his younger brothers and sisters. And for 7 years, as a newspaperman and educator he taught and taught well.

But that was only prelude to his coming to the House of Representatives in 1933. From his seat there which he held for a long time—I found him enthroned as a senior when I arrived as a freshman in 1943—from his seat there he carried on his work in education. Only this time he was not educating West Virginia about the rest of the country but rather the rest of the country about West Virginians. He did much, too, I may add, during his service in the House to make the District of Columbia the 56th county of West Virginia. So strenuous was his—if I may coin a word—his Westvirginianism that we in the House of Representatives in 1946 voted him the man who was doing most for his constituents.

There is one achievement to his everlasting credit which dates from his days of service in the House: Few people know of it because it is in keeping with his modest nature not to publicize it. Yet, I believe tonight is the time to bring it to light. Back in 1936, he authored the act which established blind citizens as the operators of newsstands and snack bars in all Federal buildings. Out of his sensitive awareness of the needs of his fellow men this concept has grown until now more than 2,000 blind persons are running these small, successful businesses. Each year they do over $35 million of business and last year they earned more than $5 million for themselves. That is the kind of imaginative approach to public welfare in which the entire Nation can share a deep sense of achievement. We, West Virginians, can take special pride in the fact that it was our son of the year who provided the inspiration and the legislative drive in the House of Representatives which made the achievement possible.

Yet his long service in the House was also prelude, prelude to his coming to the Senate. In that body, in his work on the Labor and Public Welfare and Public Works Committees, in his work on the whole range of the questions which come before the Senate, in close partnership with your other dedicated Senator, BOB BYRD, he has pursued a diligent course of service which blends the interests of West Virginia with those of the Nation in a most responsible and helpful fashion.

West Virginia's son of the year is well chosen. It is a distinction and a privilege to make this year's presentation to Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH whose service to the State and to the Nation has extended over many years and yet is just at its beginning.

To a good, decent, honorable, and devout man it is a personal privilege to have the honor to present this citation. It is more than deserved.

Sound Leadership Manifested by Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1960

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the recent decision on Defense Department communications announced by the Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates, Jr., on May 12, is in the pattern of conduct he has established since he took office some 6 months ago. In this period Mr. Gates has left no doubt that he not only recognizes the responsibilities of the Secretary of Defense in the law and under the Constitution, but he has made it clear beyond doubt that he will meet these responsibilities head on, with timely, honest decisions. There is no question that he has sought out the problem areas, brought their issues to the surface, and moved with forceful purpose to their resolution.

The 1960 defense picture is one which opens a new era of tremendous weapons, fantastic speeds, global ranges, and technological sophistications unbelievable a few years ago. The essence of such military operations is control, and the fundamental tool of control is communications. Without communications the most modern of Armed Forces would be practically useless. The volume and

cost of long-range communications within our defense system is, thus, of great magnitude. Efficiency and economy require that we do not support unnecessary duplications in the vast and extremely expensive worldwide military communications networks. Mr. Gates' recent decision has wisely recognized this requirement and has given us a solution. His action will give us one efficiently integrated system. Wisely, it will eliminate any uncoordinated systems which might exist, and head off the future creation of any such unnecessary facilities.

Dollars, resources, and time are all vital to this Nation, and the system created by Mr. Gates will insure that we get the most out of each of these. Research and development will be pointed toward the actual requirement of our defense system, without duplication and waste. The system itself will be based only on our total needs, with no other consideration. This is truly a step in the right direction.

This action by Mr. Gates will save money, conserve our resources, and provide us with more efficient communications system—in a word, it will improve the defense and security of this Nation. It will result in dollar and materiel economy and at the same time provide enhanced military efficiency.

It is a constructive step.

It is thoroughly in keeping with the kind of sound, responsible, and exemplary leadership which has been so consistently manifested by the present Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates, Jr.

Wiley Reviews Accomplishments of Congress—Outlines Major Legislative Action Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 16, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as Congress hits the homestretch, we all recognize that there is a lot of work still to be done.

Recently, I was privileged to review over Wisconsin radio stations, some of the legislation not only of interest to the Nation, but of special significance to my home State. Reflecting on a part of the big job ahead, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY REVIEWS ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF CONGRESS—SAYS: "HARD WORK AHEAD"—OUTLINES MAJOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION NEEDED

(Excerpts of address prepared for delivery by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, over Wisconsin radio stations)

Friends, at this time, I would like to report to you on the progress of legislation in Congress.

According to current plans, this will be a short session. Why? Well, the Democratic and Republican conventions, as you know, are coming up in July. The purpose of early adjournment would be to avoid an entanglement of our legislative work with the politicking of the conventions. Even there are many efforts to play politics with issues of significance to the country.

Despite the fact that this is an election year, however, I believe Congress should stay in session as long as necessary to get its work done.

As of now, the Senate has been in session 73 days, passed 246 measures and reported about 350 measures from the committees.

OUTLOOK FOR FARM LEGISLATION

Question. Senator WILEY, what is the outlook for farm legislation?

Answer. Frankly, the prospects for any large-scale farm bill are extremely dim.

Question. Why?

Answer. For many reasons. Fundamentally, however, there has been real difficulty in reaching agreement—even among farmers and farm organizations—as to what should be done.

Over the years, exhaustive efforts have been made to find legislative remedies for the complex problems in agriculture. Unfortunately perhaps, because these are sometimes "politically motivated" these "patent political medicines" have not succeeded in curing the patient—that is the farm economy.

As in the past, I again stress that legislative action can only provide a temporary palliative. The basic problem must be solved in accordance with sound economic principles—that is, adopting a realistic method for creating a relative supply-demand balance for dairy and other farm products.

Question. If the outlook is dim for a so-called omnibus farm bill, what legislation has a realistic chance for enactment?

Answer. First, the conservation reserve of the soil bank will in all likelihood be extended and somewhat expanded. However, the program, I believe, should be aimed—as directly as possible—at curbing production of the major farm products in surplus, that is, wheat and corn.

In addition to attempting to deal with the surplus problem, the conservation reserve, of course, benefits the country in other ways. These include: Creating a soil bank of land of enriched fertility for the future; expanding our forest reserve by tree plantings; attempting to improve the agricultural economy by reducing surpluses at less cost than the price support program has been to the taxpayer; providing an opportunity for expanding not only soil and forest resources but also carrying on watershed projects, improving habitats for wildlife and other such purposes.

Question. What is the outlook for change in price support levels, for example, for dairy products?

Answer. Earlier this session, I joined other Senators in sponsoring legislation which would increase the price support level.

Question. Annually, there is considerable pressure for modifying the tax laws relating to co-ops as well as increasing interest rates for REA and co-op loans. How does it stand at this time?

Answer. The Ways and Means Committee—the taxwriting body of Congress—has held extensive hearings on these controversial issues. As yet, however, the views are so wide apart that such legislation—which constitutionally must originate in the House of Representatives—has not yet been forthcoming; nor does it look like it will.

Question. Are there any other legislative proposals to be considered in the farm picture?

Answer. Yes. Legislation (along the lines of a bill I introduced earlier) for extending and expanding the school milk program has been approved by Congress and signed by the President.

Currently, also, there is pending before the Senate a bill, S. 690, to expand research for utilization of farm commodities for industrial purposes. I would hope that expeditious approval be given this measure providing new use through industry utilization, which may well be one of the answers to our production-exceeding problem.

Incidentally, I am continuing to urge action on my bill for establishing a much needed dairy research laboratory at Madison, Wis., to find better ways of processing, distributing, and utilizing dairy products.

I would hope, also, that the bill I proposed for establishing a Country Life Commission would be enacted. As you may know, the purpose would be to make a long-range evaluation of the social, economic, and technological revolution in agriculture, and propose recommendations to enable the farmer to better adjust to these changes.

Question. What about the recent warnings—almost "public scares"—by the Food and Drug Administration relating to utilizing chemicals, antibiotics, and other products for animal health and crop protection?

Answer. Over the years, the American farmer has—in good faith—attempted to provide the consuming public an abundant supply of good, healthful foods. In this effort, chemicals and other products have been utilized.

According to recent investigations, however, it now appears that use of some of these may be questionable. Naturally, our first obligation is to protect the public health. However, I do not believe that the Food and Drug Administration should engage in sensationalism.

Instead, the American farmer deserves a fair break. I have contacted the FDA to stress the need for working out reasonable, effective ways to assure utilization of only safe products that will serve the purposes of our farmers; at the same time, adequately protect the public health.

OTHER ISSUES OF INTEREST TO WISCONSIN

Question. Now, turning to other fronts, what's the outlook for legislation in other fronts of particular interest to Wisconsin?

Answer. Well, that's a big order. Briefly, however, I'd like to review with you a few of the major issues. These include: First, authorization of a realistic rivers and harbors bill to carry forward work on flood control projects as well as deepening and improving our port and harbor facilities.

As you will recall, President Eisenhower vetoed a measure last year because he considered it too much of a "pork barrel" nature. The task now is to get enactment of a realistic piece of legislation—one that will fulfill our development needs but at the same time can avoid a Presidential veto.

In view of the real need for carrying forward such projects—many of which are now under way in our port cities, I believe that Congress should act expeditiously. Currently, the appropriations bill, H.R. 7634, is pending before the Senate Appropriations Committee. Included in this measure are authorizations of funds for work on the following projects: Menominee Harbor and River; Kewaunee Harbor; Superior-Duluth Harbor; Ashland Harbor; and Washburn Harbor.

In the 1961 budget, also, maintenance funds would be provided for the following projects: Green Bay; Manitowoc; Milwaukee; Port Washington; Racine; Sheboygan; Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan; Ship Canal; Two Rivers; and others.

Secondly, there is a need to keep close watch on the efforts to enact the so-called

water steal bill that would threaten to divert dangerously large volumes of water from Lake Michigan and thus lower the water levels of the lake.

As you may know, I have voted against the enactment of this legislation. Currently, the matter is still pending before the Foreign Relations Committee.

Question. Are there any new developments?

Answer. Yes, the "pushers" of this water-diversion legislation are now trying an end run, so to speak. Under the guise of proposing a $12 million antipollution program for the Great Lakes generally, an effort is being made to earmark specific funds for dealing with the pollution at Chicago and in the Illinois Waterway—the same objective as contained in the water-diversion bill itself, H.R. 1.

Now I want to say this: I am fully in favor of carrying out any necessary and effective antipollution study needed in the Great Lakes. However, let's not be fooled by this ruse for attempting to increase diversion of water from the Great Lakes.

Currently, this issue is before the Senate Appropriations Committee. As a result, the pushers of the water diversion bill now have measures before two Senate committees to accomplish their objectives.

Consequently, you can well understand the need for staying "on the alert" to head off such forthright, and round-about, efforts to divert more and more water from the Great Lakes—dangerous to commerce for Wisconsin and the rest of the Lake States.

OTHER PROGRAMS AHEAD

Now, what is some of the other "unfinished business" of Congress?

As President Eisenhower recently urged, we should also: (1) remove—or at least "adjust"—the ceiling on U.S. Treasury bonds to enable the Treasurer to better carry on the financing for meeting the obligations of the Federal Government; and (2) we also need to strengthen our judicial system by creating about 40 new judgeships. Regrettably, Congress, for political reasons, has, for too long, been "sitting on" this proposal. In a splendid bipartisan action, however, President Eisenhower has offered to fill such judgeships with an equal number of Democrats and Republicans. Today, our Federal courts are logjammed with thousands of cases requiring up to years for consideration. The Congress, I believe, should act immediately.

NEEDED: PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING OF UNCLE SAM'S BUDGET PROBLEMS

In considering legislation—particularly spending programs—we, of course, need to adopt wise, realistic policies. Not only Congress—but each of you, as citizens, need to be aware of Uncle Sam's budgetary problems.

Often, in the vast volume of mail flowing into my office—amounting to hundreds of letters daily—I receive strangely contradictory letters: Some say: "I want this program for myself"; others say, "I want that program"; still others say, "I want this, but don't do anything for the other fellow."

However, Uncle Sam is not a fountainhead from which flows an increasing stream of gifts, handouts, and Federal support. To the contrary, every penny spent on grants or assistance programs comes out of the taxpayers' pockets—and that means you and me.

CONCLUSION

This, then, is a brief review of only a small part of the workload ahead of us in Congress.

As these, or other issues, in which you are particularly interested, come up for consideration, I shall, as always, be glad to hear from you to get your suggestions and recommendations on problems of significance to our State and Nation.

Thank you for listening.

This Is Our Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1960

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the Michigan congressional delegation wishes to call attention to the book "This Is Our Michigan," copies of which have been mailed to all Members of the Congress in connection with the 1960 observance of Michigan Week, being celebrated this week.

We commend this book for your reading, for it tells the story of our water wonderland State in a way which makes clear why we do have the honor of serving it in this Congress are so tremendously proud of our State.

"This Is Our Michigan," is an easy-to-read narrative of a sturdy people who have pioneered, persevered, and prospered. It is the story of people whose productive genius in World War II made Michigan known and respected as the arsenal of democracy, and in whom the spirit of American democracy burns today with unceasing fervor.

The book is an authoritative recital of the attributes, resources, and achievements of a richly endowed and energetic State which a century ago produced the lumber to build many of America's cities and the iron ore to build its railroads, and whose automobile factories in a later era put the Nation on wheels.

It is also the story of a State whose scientific research and whose inventive and productive talents have helped prepare this Nation of the conquest of space.

The author of "This Is Our Michigan" is Willard Baird, an experienced newspaperman in our State capital at Lansing and chief of the State capital bureau for Federated Publication, Inc., which publishes the State Journal in Lansing and the Enquirer and News in Battle Creek. His years of painstaking research and compilation of data for this project culminated in a series of 59 articles written for those two daily newspapers early this year.

So great was the interest in the articles elsewhere in Michigan that Federated Publications, Inc., made the material available as a public service to all other Michigan dailies and weeklies. Altogether, it was published by more than 150 Michigan newspapers.

Now, as an additional public service endeavor, Federated Publications, Inc., has published the entire series in an attractive book which will be widely used as a reference work by the schools and libraries of our own State and, we hope, by similar institutions in other States.

In it you will find, briefly yet clearly narrated, the history of Michigan from Indian days through the French and British colonial periods, territorial times, and early statehood to the present day. You will find in it also the story of Michigan's tremendous natural resources, its industrial eminence, its impressive records in agriculture, its fame as a tourist and resort State, and its many cultural achievements.

It is a story we in Michigan are pleased to share with the rest of the Nation, and one we hope you will enjoy reading.

THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, First District.
GEORGE MEADER, Second District.
AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, Third District.
CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Fourth District.
GERALD R. FORD, JR., Fifth District.
CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, Sixth District.
JAMES G. O'HARA, Seventh District.
ALVIN M. BENTLEY, Eighth District.
ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Ninth District.
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, 10th District.
VICTOR A. KNOX, 11th District.
JOHN B. BENNETT, 12th District.
CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., 13th District.
LOUIS CHARLES RABAUT, 14th District.
JOHN D. DINGELL, 15th District.
JOHN LESINSKI, 16th District.
MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, 17th District.
WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, 18th District.

The Summit Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the action of the Soviets in scuttling the summit conference and withdrawing the invitation for President Eisenhower to visit the Soviet Union next month, while sensational, is not particularly surprising.

It was also most disappointing to many people who felt the conference might possibly help to ease current tensions and promote peace.

The Marxist formula, being followed by the Soviet, does not desire the easing of tensions or the establishment of peaceful conditions. It is compounded of diplomatic strategy and propaganda tactics designed to encourage and arouse as much agitation, turmoil, and disorder in the world as possible.

We are presently witnessing a large number of incidents, some of them in our own hemisphere and Nation, which indicate the widespread influence of the world Marxist movement.

It is unfortunate that some way cannot be found, through dispassionate discussion and exchange of views, to eliminate some of the basic causes of friction, but so long as the Soviets are intent upon using Marxist tactics and pursuing Marxist goals, we are not likely to develop in diplomatic councils that good faith and that sincerity of purpose which always must be indispensable ingredients of any successful worthwhile diplomatic conference.

Perhaps the breaking up of the conference at this time, if it is broken up as reported, may bring some good results. It would at least avoid a woeful waste of

time and energy on the part of our representatives and negotiators and would remove a most important source of communistic propaganda activity leveled against the free world, and particularly against the United States.

It is a real pity that the nations cannot sit down together in an earnest effort to hammer out an agreement for disarmament, control of nuclear energy through inspection safeguards, and the liberation of subject and enslaved peoples.

Until these great questions are resolved, there can be no lasting peace in the world. And Mr. Khrushchev will have to take the grave responsibility for this unhappy and dangerous situation.

There are other encouraging aspects, namely, our great military and economic power and our unwillingness to knuckle under Communist threats.

Barring constructive agreements, this power and strength will continue to be the real deterrent to large-scale war and, I hope, to small-scale ones as well.

I hope that the President will speak out strongly for freedom and let Mr. Khrushchev and the world know, by unequivocal language, that we intend to protect our security and our liberties, and we are willing to talk with any nation that honestly and sincerely wants to talk peace and justice.

Airlift Modernization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an interview with Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina, chairman of a Special Subcommittee on the National Military Airlift, as it appeared in the Christian Science Monitor:

AIRLIFT MODERNIZATION—A CAPITAL INTERVIEW WITH REPRESENTATIVE RIVERS

(By Courtney Sheldon)

WASHINGTON.—Representative L. MENDELL RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina, veteran member of the House Armed Services Committee, with airplanes a special personal interest, and chairman of an influential Special Subcommittee on the National Military Airlift, says: "Everybody has been going hog wild on pushbutton warfare and forgetting what the Army has been saying. * * * Everybody else has overlooked the possibility of a limited war."

He estimates "It will take a billion dollars" to modernize the Military Air Transport Service.

Question. Sir, in your report you state that "within the first 20 days of either a general war without warning or limited war under any current assumptions for planning purposes, strategic airlift capabilities are seriously inadequate." Could you elaborate on what you mean by "seriously inadequate"?

Answer. The source of this information is classified. I'll just have to say it is inadequate for the reason that we would have terrific difficulty in getting people of highest priority to the right place at the right time. Those people would have to be carried in military aircraft because of the classified nature of their positions and of the equipment that they would have to operate. Transportation of them would tax every single thing that MATS now has. And there would be a deficiency.

Question. What has happened to MATS's capability?

Answer. They have only 31 airplanes that are modern out of 400-odd planes. I don't want to minimize what MATS is doing with their inventories. They have done a monumental job. Their exercise Big Slam-Puerto Pine was fantastic for the inventories they have. Most of their planes are from 7 to 10 years old; yet they carried out that operation without one serious casualty.

I just don't understand why we spend $42 billion a year for defense and only possess second-class planes to do a first-class job.

Question. Well, how did we arrive at this situation of such obsolescence?

Answer. I think that everybody has been going hog-wild on push-button warfare and forgetting what the Army has been saying. The Army has been like a voice crying in the wilderness. Everybody else has overlooked the possibility of a limited war, and they have all thought that airplanes would phase out and missiles would take their place. This is the situation in a nutshell.

Question. In respect to the Army needs you just mentioned, you said in your report that STRAC (Strategic Army Corps) is one of a very few major commands in all the services that has not acquired its own airlift. Do you feel that they should have one or that some part of MATS should be predesignated for Army airlift?

Answer. Our report says it should be MATS on equal priority with the other services. Now we have recommended that MATS' name be changed to MAC—Military Air Command. People have been shooting at MATS so long MATS has become anathema to certain ones. MATS is a command. It is part of a weapons system. People have been sniping at MATS as a competing airline. It is ridiculous. MATS is no airline.

Question. You are talking now about the complaints of the civilian aviation transport industry that MATS is unfair competition?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Now can Congress order the Pentagon to predesignate MATS planes for Army airlift?

Answer. The Joint Chiefs of the Armed Services can do it.

Question. There is no way you can force them to?

Answer. Well, I feel confident that the Joint Chiefs will do this. Our hearings were held for the purpose of helping. This is the first time the subject of airlift has ever been heard in Congress. And the information we have obtained has been helpful to the military. The Joint Chiefs are fine men. We are all in the same business—survival.

Question. In regard to your recommendations for funds for modernizing MATS, is Congress going to support you?

Answer. The House Appropriations Committee made available $300 million for immediate off-the-shelf procurement of planes of the type the Army has requested, the 130–B with extended range. That plane is already in production. The House has approved and the bill has gone to the Senate.

Question. What was the administration's request concerning airlift modernization?

Answer. The administration requested only $50 million to begin development of an uncompromised cargo plane. It recommended nothing to modernize MATS at this time. This would only be the beginning of a development.

We, too, have recommended development of the plane. It takes from 4 to 5 years to develop a plane. We need planes now. It will take many more hundreds of millions to bring MATS up to what it should be. I would venture the assertion that it would take a billion dollars to do the job.

Question. Has there been any significant opposition within Congress itself or without Congress to your recommendations so far?

Answer. I haven't found a single opponent in the Congress, not a single one. It has been remarkable how people who have been fighting MATS have joined with us and sponsored our program. I know people who have been fighting MATS terrifically, called it an airline, now they have joined us and it demonstrates a bigness of men in Congress after the facts have been obtained.

American Mining Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the American Mining Congress held its convention in Pittsburgh, Pa., at the Pittsburgh-Hilton Hotel during the week of May 9.

One of the outstanding addresses delivered to that convention was made by the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior.

Secretary Seaton's speech points out many of the items which are of grave importance, not only to the coal industry, but to the Nation during the coming years. I wish to include this address, as a part of my remarks, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FRED A. SEATON, AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS COAL CONVENTION, PITTSBURGH, PA., MAY 9, 1960

The energy market, like our economy as a whole, is a highly dynamic phenomenon. Viewing its development over the last century, two characteristics stand out with particular clarity.

1. There has been a steady and very substantial rate of overall growth.

2. Within the expanding energy market, a complicated interplay of economic forces has produced an unusually high degree of fluctuation in the demand for different fuels.

The high ratio of demand for coal came in 1901, up to 90 percent of the market, before the curve turned downward under the impact of competition from oil and gas.

It is true that today, oil provides two-fifths of the energy used; coal and natural gas, about one-fourth each; with hydropower and natural gas liquids providing the remainder.

It is also true that while your industry's production in 1901 was about 293 million tons, today it is over 430 million tons.

The congressional panel on the Impact of the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy forecasts that overall energy consumption in the United States will reach 75,000 trillion British thermal units by 1975. Other authoritative estimates are in substantial agreement.

Thus, the professional consensus is that the United States in 15 years will be using 85 percent again as much energy as 5 years ago.

For coal this could mean an increase of some 75 percent over 1955, with estimated production levels ranging up to about 750 million tons annually.

Some believe you will do even better than hold the portion of the market you now supply. This optimism is based on the assump-

tion that increased demand for fuel in the United States will be mainly for electrical energy, a field in which coal is at its best as a competitive fuel.

For the competition which is to come, you of the coal industry have already set powerful forces in motion to work in your behalf.

You have mechanized to an astonishing degree. Preliminary estimates for 1959 put the overall average output at more than 12 tons per man per day. By comparison, very few other countries have been able to reach an output level of 2 tons per man per day. Parenthetically, these few exceptions do not include Russia.

It is highly significant that at a time when your industry has progressed to the highest efficiency level in the world, you also enjoy the best record for health and safety.

The high plane of sound labor-management relations in your industry has provided a dependable supply of coal at competitive prices. It has also fostered cooperation in your industrial operations, marketing, and public relations.

Through such cooperation, notwithstanding significant increases in the cost of labor, equipment, supplies, and the general effects of inflation, the average price of coal f.o.b. the mine has been less than $5 a ton throughout the past decade.

On the industrywide organizational front, you have made it clear that you will continue to attack your problems in an aggressive manner. Indicative of that is the work of such organizations as the American Mining Congress, which is our host today.

Important as these achievements are, the master keys to what you have been able to do, in my opinion, have been the varied and imaginative scientific and technologic research in which you have engaged, and the individual initiative you have displayed. It is obvious that without research, the degree of mechanization you now have would still be a dream, not a reality. Without mechanization it would have been absolutely impossible to hold the cost line. Without initiative and the willingness to accept change, you would now be trying to compete in a 20th century market while using the 19th century mining methods.

For an industry in a field as competitive as yours, a continuation, even an acceleration, of research activity is an absolute necessity. I assure you that the Department of the Interior wants to be both helpful and effective in your endeavors.

That pledge isn't mere talk. We mean it and our actions prove we do. The Department now has under way comprehensive analyses of coal production, distribution, and marketing methods, as well as projects ranging from geologic mapping to the development of new uses for coal.

At this afternoon's meeting, Bureau of Mines' personnel will present a film, showing preliminary work done last fall on hydraulic mining of coal. It will indicate that given certain conditions, coal can be effectively mined by the use of high-pressure, high-velocity water jets.

Recently, Bituminous Coal Research, Inc., made available to us the coal-fired gas turbine with which it had been conducting studies at Dunkirk, N.Y. The Bureau of Mines is working to adapt this equipment to stationary powerplants. If its performance lives up to our expectations, it will greatly increase powerplant efficiency and should prove to be particularly valuable in those arid regions of the West where water is in short supply.

Much as we are doing in coal research, we want to do much more. That is why I have repeatedly urged enactment of H.R. 3375, a bill now pending in the Congress to provide the Secretary of the Interior with much-needed authority to contract for coal research.

It is my firm belief that research programs of an immediate and applied nature can be carried out most efficiently through contracts with appropriate public and private organizations.

We sincerely hope this legislation is approved in this session. I have already announced that once we have the authority, a special office of coal research will immediately be established to serve as our contracting agent.

Greater activity in the field of applied research would complete the research spectrum from the long-medium range to those of the short range, of immediate benefit to the coal industry. Such a three-pronged approach would make possible a united attack of science and technology on many of the problems of the coal industry. You and I will agree that is exactly what we must have, and the sooner, the better.

In developing this new program, the Office of Coal Research will utilize fully the guidance received from advisory committees which would include representation from all segments of your industry. Our experience in this kind of activity with the Office of Saline Water has been highly successful, and we are sure that a similar operation for coal will produce equally significant results.

As you are all aware, the Department of the Interior and the coal industry share other common interests and problems.

In March of 1959, President Eisenhower ordered the imposition of a system of mandatory controls on imports of crude oil and of its principal products, including residual fuel oil. The President made it clear that the purpose of the oil import program was to insure a healthy domestic oil industry capable of exploring for and developing new oil reserves to replace those being depleted.

Understandably, your testimony has a high degree of interest in the level of residual oil imports. One obvious reason is that many industrial installations, particularly electric utilities on the east coast, are able to switch quickly from coal to residual oil to natural gas, depending upon the price and availability of these competing fuels.

I would prefer to believe that we would all agree that the program, as it applies to residual fuel oil, cannot be administered in a manner so as to cause real shortages or result in real hardships to consumers. That would be morally indefensible, even if legally possible.

In April of this year we necessarily made an upward adjustment in the level of allocations for residual imports for the period ending June 30, in order to avert a serious shortage of residual on the east coast, however, that shortage may have been caused. That adjustment, together with the unimported portion of the original allocation for the first half of the year, made the total amount available for import in the second quarter of this year almost identical to actual imports in the second quarter of 1957, the base year for the residual part of the mandatory program.

We are engaged in an import control program, and importers and consumers alike should recognize it as just that. In establishing allocation levels we have no intention of creating a set of conditions under which unlimited quantities of residual fuel oil can be imported and sold at distress prices. Nor do we have any intention of allowing the creation of an artificial set of circumstances to accomplish the same end result.

To further strengthen the administration of the program we have, as you know, recently announced a revision in the allocation period from a semiannual to a quarterly basis.

Coal has been and is now an essential element in the fuel supply picture in the United States, and it will continue to be so in the foreseeable future. No one should forget that your industry provided the principal energy base upon which our Nation's great industrial economy was founded. No one should forget that in the face of many obstacles, you satisfied unprecedented demands for energy during two terrible and prolonged World Wars.

To me, a pound of coal means much more than a mere 16 ounces of a hard and black substance which we remove from the earth. In hundreds and thousands of ways it is important in the lives of human beings.

Coal means for those engaged in the industry, a source of livelihood for themselves and their families.

For the consumer, it means everything from heat for the home to electric power for iron lungs or television.

For those who have a role in developing our industrial might, it means a comparatively inexpensive yet reliable source of fuel for everything from chemical plants to steel mills.

For the Nation as a whole, it is one of the keystones which secures our economic system and our national defense.

No one can believe more fervently than do I that for reasons of future national security, if for no other, it is of vital importance that we work together to maintain a healthy and thriving coal industry.

There is something else I believe. At the overall rate of development and growth of this Nation, it is clear to me that we are going to need in the future all the fuel energy we can get, from whatever source.

There are obvious and clearly defined limits to the amount of hydroelectricity we can produce. There are also limits on the use of oil and gas for many purposes. And there are limits, economic and otherwise, on production and use of coal.

A thriving industry in each case is certainly desirable from a national standpoint, and I believe it is a proper function of Government to help maintain an economic environment within which efficient business enterprises may prosper and contribute to national economic strength.

But it is not, in my opinion, a proper role of government to restrict unnecessarily the right of free economic choice by American consumers of the fuels, or anything else they want to purchase and use. Any other policy can only tend to throw our private enterprise economic system out of gear, and continued in the long run, destroy it altogether.

Aside from the demands of national defense, the consumption of fuels should properly continue to be determined by such factors as relative costs at specific locations, efficiency of use, dependability of supply—in short, a combination of consumer preference and the cost per British thermal unit, delivered at the burner.

Our governmental system is one which gives equal opportunity to every citizen, according to his ability and effort. If we are to have equal opportunity, with freedom, then we cannot have an enforced or guaranteed equality without regard to ability or effort. The one is unalterably antagonistic to the other.

To me, this principle also applies to our economic system. To bind it into a straitjacket where the strings would be pulled from Washington could at best only serve to stifle initiative and progress. The logical result would inevitably be to destroy the very flexibility which is so essential if individual initiative is to be encouraged to make its impact felt.

Admittedly, your industry has some very real problems. Nevertheless coal, as a fuel and as a source material for many other uses, has a perhaps unlimited horizon of opportunities in the future. In the best tradition of economic competition, I am sure you recognize that fact and will seize those opportunities. And again, I assure you of the

Department of Interior's sympathetic and helpful interest in your present and future economic health.

A Firm Position at the Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, following is a letter which I sent to the President of the United States regarding the summit meeting. I believe the letter is self-explanatory.

I am happy to include a reply which I received today from the White House regarding my original correspondence. They are as follows:

MAY 12, 1960.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Since it is quite apparent to many of us here in Congress that you are going to the summit meeting under most difficult conditions in the light of Soviet Premier Khrushchev's activities during the past few days, I thought you would like to see the results of a survey which I have just concluded in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois.

My congressional district, I believe, reflects to a great extent the thinking of most Americans. It is a representative district of the United States, and I am sending you these results with the hope that you will find comfort and strength in the knowledge that the American people support a firm position by the United States in our dealings with the Soviet Union.

Two of the questions from my survey which deal with the summit meeting, together with the replies, follow:

1. Should the United States yield to Soviet Russia's demand that we abandon our position in West Berlin? Yes, 6 percent; no, 90 percent; undecided, 4 percent.

2. Do you believe the United States should base its dealings with the Soviet Union on a firm and decisive demand that the captive nations of Europe be given the right to free elections? Yes, 85 percent; no, 9 percent; undecided, 6 percent.

Regarding question No. 2, you will recall that the House of Representatives unanimously adopted a resolution urging that the subject of free elections for the captive nations be raised by you at the summit meeting.

I am happy to advise you that out of approximately 60,000 lengthy questionnaires mailed to my constituents, about 14 percent took the trouble to respond. This response includes a much larger cross section of my constituency than many professional surveys.

May I wish you Godspeed in your difficult journey? I join with my constituents in expressing a sincere hope that your mission will be successful.

Respectfully yours,
ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., May 13, 1960.

The Honorable ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PUCINSKI: The President has asked me to acknowledge with thanks your May 12 letter and to say that he found the responses of your constituency to the questions on your survey relating to the summit meeting very heartening and helpful. Your thought in bringing this information to his attention and your good wishes for the success of his endeavors in Paris are warmly appreciated by the President.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,
JACK Z. ANDERSON,
Administrative Assistant to the President.

Voyage of the "Triton"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1960

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, the accomplishment of Capt. Edward L. Beach, the officers and men of the *Triton* will always stand out as one of the greatest Naval expeditions in history—in keeping with the highest traditions of the U.S. Navy.

President Eisenhower hailed the unprecedented feat in a special White House ceremony, at which time he conferred the Legion of Merit on Capt. Edward L. Beach.

The White House proudly announced the journey, which began, February 16 and closely followed Magellan's course of 441 years ago.

This achievement gave me great personal satisfaction because it was my privilege and honor to have appointed, Lt. Comdr. Robert W. Bulmer of Sterling, Ill., to the U.S. Naval Academy. Lieutenant Commander Bulmer served as the operations officer on the nuclear submarine *Triton* on this historic voyage.

When I appointed Robert Bulmer to the Academy in 1945, I was convinced that he would not only be a credit to himself, but also a credit to the U.S. Navy. He has always justified the confidence I placed in him.

Representative Bizz Johnson and the 1960 Winter Olympics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 16, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I was delighted to read an editorial recently in the Sacramento Union commending California's able Representative from the Second District—HAROLD T. "BIZZ" JOHNSON. BIZZ JOHNSON played a very significant role in getting the 1960 Winter Olympics held in California, and the editorial commends him for not lagging in his interest in winter sports once the games were over. It makes the important point that BIZZ JOHNSON does not regard the Winter Olympics as a fait accompli, but rather as a logical step toward popularizing the great California winter sports industry.

I take pleasure in bringing the editorial to the attention of my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CONGRESSMAN REPORTS

Congressman HAROLD T. (BIZZ) JOHNSON of the Second District doesn't regard the winter Olympics at Squaw Valley as a fait accompli, but rather as a logical step toward popularizing the great California winter sports industry. In this viewpoint JOHNSON is to be commended.

"More than a million persons visited Squaw Valley before, during, and after the winter Olympics," declares JOHNSON, "but more impressive to me is that more than a million persons visited other snow sports areas of the State as well. I took a survey of California's national forests and parks to see what was happening in this recreation field. Everywhere officials reported the business of going down hill on skis and sleds is zooming."

Isn't this what California bargained for in underwriting the rather expensive spectacle of the winter Olympics? But here is a State investment, seemingly, which is paying off. Let JOHNSON continue:

"Many mountain areas, which once lived on summer economies, are finding the snow enthusiasts bring welcome new business. Millions of dollars have been spent in snow sports and lodge developments. And the potential still is tremendous.

"Tahoe National Forest, with the Olympics of course, led the field and Henry E. Branagh, forest supervisor, advised me that skiing was itself up 60 percent over last season with 116,500 people on the slopes. Nearly 14,000 people have used the ice rink, not counting the thousands upon thousands of spectators.

"An old standby in the winter sports field is Yosemite's Badger Pass. Superintendent John Preston writes that there have been 126,718 visitors by early April and they still were coming. An average of 500 persons use the facilities on a weekday and 1,800 to 2,600 on a typical Saturday or Sunday. This does not include 6,232 visitors who ice skated on the valley floor. Badger Pass opened in 1933 and the use has been growing constantly.

"Stanley R. Zeger, acting supervisor at Eldorado National Forest, says the year there was substandard as far as snow conditions were concerned, but that did not slow down the skiing enthusiasts. About 95 percent of the approximately 106,000 people using the Highway 50 and South Tahoe snowfields are skiers. The use was up about 7 percent. 'The last two snow seasons have been poor,' says Supervisor Zeger, 'but the trend is steadily increasing.'

"The people on the east side of the mountains are sharing in this activity and Mammoth Mountain of the Inyo National Forest is one of the fastest growing snow regions in California. Supervisor Joe Radel reports a 32 percent gain with more than 100,000 snow visits to the Inyo.

"Although skiing is a major sport at Lassen National Forest and Volcanic Park, Forest Supervisor V. A. Parker and Park Superintendent Edward Freeland say heavy family fun use attracts groups from all over northern California, including the San Francisco Bay region.

"About 22,000 traveled to Lassen Forest, half of them going just to romp in the snow with the rest doing the skiing. Another 15,000 toured Lassen Park's snowfields.

"There is a tremendous potential for future development in both the Lassen and Inyo regions as well as some of the lesser used forest lands.

"Plumas National Forest's La Porte was one of the first ski areas to develop in northern California many, many winters ago. With that facility and the new Johnsville State Park coming in, the potential winter sports development is considerable.

"I look for development of the Plumas, Cedar Pass, Union Valley, and many other regions similar to Mount Shasta's Ski Bowl in the Shasta-Trinity National Forest. Observing its second year of winter sports, Forest Supervisor Paul Stathem says Shasta Bowl use is up 25 to 50 percent this year over the initial season there and Snowman's Hill continues to provide an excellent community place to play in the snow, which means most of the increase consists of visitors from outside the immediate region.

"The reputation was spread this year to the benefit of all the Sierra Nevada, and everyone concerned must continue to work together to provide the facilities to meet this demand. The investment will be repaid many times."

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 14, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, May 14, 1960)

The Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, just enacted, presented the contradictory though not too unusual spectacle of Congressmen debating and agreeing to the expenditure of public money for a program that practically everyone, for varying reasons, thought wrong, yet the bill passed handily without a record vote. The bill called for approximately $4 billion in various agriculture subsidies. The Appropriation Committee's own report on the bill highlights the inconsistencies. Here are some quotes: "The Federal Government is now spending far more in the name of agriculture than ever before in history * * * yet farm income in 1959 was at the lowest level since World War II. * * * Since 1953 the following 'cures' have been offered, tried, and from the record found wanting, so far as solving the problem is concerned." Then are listed reduced price supports (lower assured prices), soil bank (to pay farmers for acreage left untilled), Public Law 480 (to give surpluses away at home and abroad), Agriculture Department personnel increase of 28 percent, appropriations increase of 300 percent, and production controls lowered (reduced acreage control). And still the problem remains unsolved. "The cost to the Federal Treasury since 1952 now totals $25.8 billion. * * * Farmers tend to increase their production as farm prices are reduced."

The soil bank failed, according to the report, because we paid farmers for land that already lay idle; further; that if 56 percent of all farms were retired at $10 per acre per year, costing us $2.75 billion, we would cut production only 9 percent. The problem, as the report states, "will never be solved until Congress attacks the problem at its base, which is overproduction." The report then shows that the $13.5 billion in food given away at home and abroad under Public Law 480 since 1954 has not eliminated the surpluses, but rather "has contributed to a constantly deteriorating situation for American agriculture by getting these huge surpluses out of sight abroad and thereby postponing action to prevent the increase in the surplus problem." Also, the report states that Public Law 480 "should be considered a foreign aid program and should be paid for in the mutual security bill." Speaking of acreage controls, the report states, "while efforts to control production through acreage controls have not been effective, it appears unwise to eliminate them." Under the heading, "Corrective Action Urgently Needed", we find, "the situation becomes progressively worse. * * * It is imperative the present approaches to this problem be reversed if the agricultural industry of this country is to survive and if we are to prevent a bankrupt agriculture from pulling down the rest of our economy." Yet the bill passed perpetuates the present programs.

The forthright report stopped just short of the truth. The truth is that Federal subsidy (Federal money and Federal control) will kill private enterprise ultimately. True, to a degree, industry can live on, through accumulated productive strength, against the debilitating Federal regulation, much as a ship moves despite barnacles. True, taxpayers can survive economically despite the weight of taxation much as a strong man can carry a heavy burden and still do other tasks. But in either case or in combination of the two, subsidy and taxation, free enterprise, private initiative, and individual freedom go down the drain. We are now witnessing the struggle of a dying, free industry, originally a free industry—agriculture—because of the Federal Government. The solution? Get the Federal Government out entirely. Only then can normal market supply and demand react and result in the right prices, which in turn will result in a good income to the farmer, balanced against the costs of other commodities. So the effort of Congress should be directed toward freeing the farmer, not regulating and subsidizing him deeper into trouble. The bill passed without a record vote. I voted against it and desire to be so recorded. I predict that if Congress will not take the statesmanlike position, then the people will force action, just as happened in the labor reform bill, passed despite House leadership opposition. It would be better, and hurt the farmers less, it seems to me, if the Congress and the farm industry effected the changes voluntarily than to have it forced on them.

Russia's propagandistic blustering concerning the American "spy" was answered forthrightly by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in a floor speech. Mr. CANNON pointed out our failure to anticipate the Communists' Korean attack which cost our own unready troops dearly. So it is that for 4 years CIA (Central Intelligence Agency) by design has been sending planes over Russia to observe in order to protect ourselves, so far as possible, against buildups for surprise attacks. He likened the appropriation of funds for this work to the secret atomic work at Oak Ridge which preceded the atom bomb, unknown to all but a few of the Members of Congress. Espionage is a part of modern warfare and survival. Ours is hardly comparable to Russia's infiltration and subversive efforts. It was a refreshing statement. Russia needs to be told once and for all that we are deadly serious in our intention to protect freedom-loving nations, and if they don't like it, that's just too bad. Tough and direct action is all that blusterers understand. Only as we are strong, tough-minded, and toughtalking, will we prevent war and strengthen and attract the only kind of allies we want, specifically those equally dedicated to preserving freedom for mankind against the godless, slave-state alternative of communism.

Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following is a brief résumé of a talk I made to the Clinton (S.C.) Kiwanis Club's annual farmers night program, April 14, 1960:

FARM PROGRAM

(Address of Congressman WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN at Kiwanis Club's annual farmers night, April 14, at Clinton, S.C.)

The most serious domestic problem facing the people of the United States is the farm situation. Farm population in the United States has dropped to 11 percent of the total, the lowest percentage in the history of the United States and the lowest of any major world power in the history of the world. This is a dangerously low percentage.

The United States was founded by men with a rural philosophy. The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights were largely written by rural men. Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe were all outstanding farmers. The fact that Washington and Jefferson were great farmers made them good Presidents. Nearly all of the Presidents in the history of the United States were born and reared on a farm or associated with a farm. The membership of the Congress for 130 years was overwhelmingly rural. Farmers have initiative. They are independent. They think for themselves. They cannot be herded or coerced to the polls by goons and ward bosses. It is difficult to get up a mob or overthrow the Government with busy, contented landowning farmers. A man who is busy milking cows and tilling the soil is not going to lead a march on the Nation's Capitol to overthrow representative government.

We do not find Communists and Socialists engaged in the pursuit of agriculture. Our rural areas are no breeding ground for juvenile delinquency. Rural people go to church and support good schools. The rural home is the bedrock of a democratic society.

Under the price-support and acreage-control programs, the American family-size farmer has been reduced to a state of peonage. One-half of the burley-tobacco growers in the United States, under this Government program, are permitted only one-half acre or less—in a nation that originated the culture of tobacco. Under these Government programs, cotton acreage has fallen off in the United States 60 percent since 1930. We have lost cotton markets at home and abroad. One-third of the cotton farmers in the United States grow 5 acres or less. The percentage is even greater in the Southeast. It is impossible for a farmer to clothe, support, and send his children to college with less than 5 acres of cotton or one-half acre of tobacco.

What opportunity is there for a young man with an ambition to be a farmer? He cannot possibly become a farmer unless he inherits a farm or marries into one with allotted acres. Farming is the only business in this

so-called free nation that a young man cannot go into—he is not permitted to do so by a government of free people. Under these Government programs, the situation gets worse and worse. Surpluses mount and the rural population decreases, with more and more people on the welfare rolls and more looking to Washington paternalism.

These farm programs could not have served Russia's purpose more if they had been written by the Kremlin's planners of world conquest. America's population is being concentrated in the great cities, easy to annihilate with the atomic bomb, easy to herd into political machines, and easily subjected to propaganda and agitation. In fact, the first farm program inaugurated in the United States was written by questionable characters—one of whom has since served a term in the penitentiary. The farm program was written by Alger Hiss, Nathan Witt, Frank Shea, Rex Tugwell, Lee Pressman, Henry A. Wallace, and Felix Frankfurter, presently a Justice of this notorious U.S. Supreme Court. These were principally bright young attorneys, most of whom knew nothing whatever about agriculture.

Under the programs these men inaugurated, we grow less and less, our farm population shrinks, while Russia grows more and more and every nation in the world increases her farm acreage. Soviet Russia since 1955 has added over 100 million new acres to agricultural production. Rhodesia exempts her farmers from land taxes to grow more and more. Turkey exempts her farmers from income taxes to grow more and more. In this country we passed a soil bank to get our farmers to grow less and less. Incidentally, the average farmer in Rhodesia plants 65 acres of tobacco; in Canada, 30 acres; and in the United States, may I repeat, half of the tobacco farmers are permitted to plant only one-half acre or less. The same is true with cotton and wheat. Foreign nations grow more, with American foreign aid, while we grow less. We send them marketing experts, fertilizer experts, and the net result is to put our own people out of business.

Under the cotton price-support loan program, in the year 1958 358 farmers in the State of California received $50,000 or more; Arizona, 194; Mississippi, 237; South Carolina, 1; Georgia, none; North Carolina, 2; Alabama, none. Here in the Southeast we are not only being forced and tricked off the land, but we are paying the bill for others to become bigger and bigger. The atmosphere is being carefully created so that someday a campaign of land reform will explode in the United States along the lines of China's and Cuba's agrarian reform. The only segments of our farm economy holding its own, growing, free, and with hope, are those outside of Government control and price supports—for example, livestock, pine trees, citrus fruits, and vegetables.

On my farm I grow beef, pine trees, and grass, because I can do so without Government regulation.

The pressure was put on Congress to put price supports on livestock, but I am so glad today we resisted these pressure groups. The beef surplus simply vanished through increased consumption. Livestock today accounts for 54 percent of the farm income.

Yes, we need a farm program, a new farm program, a positive program, one that looks to the future, one that will offer hope to the youth of this country, one that will beckon to the teeming millions in the crowded cities, one that can assure us food and part-time employment for the unemployed during times of depression.

1. The No. 1 plank in this farm program should be gradual elimination of price supports and all acreage controls. Our free Nation cannot long survive as long as its farm population is regimented, controlled, and paid to do less and become weaker.

2. The Government subsidizes certain business operations to stay in business, to expand, grow, and to employ more people. On the other hand, we subsidize the farmer to plant less and less, to employ fewer people and to buy less fertilizer, machinery, and supplies. We are simply paying him directly to go out of business. It would be much better for the Nation if we paid the farmer to grow more, not less, and if we paid him directly to stay on the farm instead of moving toward the overcrowded cities.

3. Get rid of the surplus by promoting markets abroad and expanding our markets at home.

4. Develop new crops and new uses through expanded research and advertising. Dr. Herty kept thousands of farmers in business by research on the pine tree.

5. Expand the rural development program.

6. Give the farmer more Federal tax advantages so he can compete with the tax exempt farmers of foreign nations. Give him a break with local taxes by making him pay less for improved rural property. The policy now is to tax a farmer if he paints his house and improves the appearance of his farm. The local taxes of many farmers have doubled since improving his place by sheer initiative and effort.

7. Imports—the farm problem could be solved in one stroke by prohibiting imports of livestock, cotton goods, and other farm commodities we already have in surplus. Over 100 million new acres could be used in the United States to produce the beef, wool, sugar, cotton, tobacco, grain, and other farm commodities now imported from foreign countries.

South Carolina needs new industry, but more than anything else we need to save our old industry which consumes cotton from our farms. We need new industry, but we also need a South Carolina Planning and Development Board for Agriculture. South Carolina's agriculture development must keep pace with its industrial development. It will be tragic for the future political and social welfare of our State if we become all industrial. We must have a balanced economy. We must preserve our South Carolina rural heritage, traditions, and philosophy.

We have a great agricultural college at Clemson. Clemson's agricultural program needs the full support and backing of all of our citizens, both urban and rural.

Through research and planning, South Carolina was able to switch from indigo to rice, to cotton, and now to livestock and pine trees. South Carolina must and can continue to be largely agricultural.

A Good Example To Follow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the pleasure of attending what I believe was a historic meeting of Local 1031, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Union, in Chicago, whose president is Mr. Frank Darling.

So far as I know, local 1031 is the first union in America to provide for its retired members hospital and surgical insurance, which they otherwise could not afford and which will be paid for out of union dues.

Much has been said in the recent past about the lack of democracy in unions. On the basis of my own personal observations, no such charge could be lodged against local 1031, which used 29 voting machines to conduct a secret election on a proposal to raise the union's dues 50 cents a month with which to provide this insurance for its retired members.

The proposal was approved by an overwhelming vote of approximately 6 to 1, and it is indeed encouraging to see the members of a union show such humane concern for their retired members, who otherwise would be denied surgical and hospital care in their older years.

The membership of this union is fully aware that Congress is now studying various proposals to provide surgical and hospital care for our senior citizens. I think it can be an inspiration to all of us to see that this organization did not wait for the Federal Government to act, but rather until such time as a Federal program is agreed upon, it has undertaken the responsibility of providing for the care of its retired members through its own resources.

In discussing the proposal, Mr. Darling made it eminently clear that many small unions throughout the country are not financially capable of taking similar action and that the action of his own union was in no way intended to serve as a deterrent to the responsibility which rests with Congress to provide a plan for our Nation's senior citizens. But it is refreshing to see this union recognize its responsibility to its older members without waiting for Federal action.

I recall the many assaults against decent unions that were voiced here in this Chamber last year during the debate on the labor-management reform bill. I wish that every Member of Congress could have seen democracy at work at this meeting of local 1031, when each member's individual right to express himself in a secret ballot on this proposal was respected by the union's leadership.

I believe Mr. Darling is to be congratulated for initiating this action in his union. It was obvious to me in observing the voting on this proposal that the large turnout of members who participated in this meeting reflects the high regard the members of local 1031 have for Mr. Darling and the rest of the officers of his local.

Those who have been so severe in their criticism of the labor movement and who have repeatedly refused to acknowledge the fact that the abuses of the few in no way reflect the decent conduct of the overwhelming majority of unions in this country, could learn a great deal by observing the conduct of local 1031.

Together with my remarks I should like to include an excerpt from a bulletin put out by Harry C. Herman, of New York, entitled "Executive's Labor Report" which is published weekly for the Nation's top industrial executives. This publication caters primarily to the Nation's largest industries and could hardly be called a prolabor publication. Significantly, in this bulletin of May 2, the "Executive's Labor Report" describes Frank Darling as "one of labor's most original innovators."

Here is how this particular publication described the action of Mr. Darling's union regarding surgical and medical care for its senior citizens:

The Darling plan, which is the first to our knowledge in America for a major industrial union, provides hospitalization and medical care upon retirement for the rest of the members' lives. It starts in 1960.

But this is not the astonishing part.

Here is the big twist:

The entire and complete cost of this program will be borne by the union. No dues during this time or any other costs are required.

In order to qualify to receive such hospitalization and medical care, a member must have a total membership period of 10 years or more, be employed in any local 1031 shop after reaching the age of 60, be 65 years old or more, and retire at 65 or more.

The proposed insurance coverage is to be $15 per day hospital expense, up to $300 surgical expense, up to $150 for medicines, X-rays, ambulance, etc., and doctor visits of $5 for each visit a doctor makes to either the member's home or a hospital, and $3 for each visit the member makes to a doctor's office starting with the third such visit and with a maximum of 50 visits in any illness.

The plan will apply to any member who has paid dues to local 1031 for 10 years or more, regardless of the number of companies any such member may have worked for during that period.

It further provides that local 1031 will give any member who otherwise qualifies and retired during 1959, who was 65 or more, such an insurance policy at no cost to the retired member even though the plan does not formally go into effect until 1960.

When checking around the country for the effects of such a plan among labor leaders and industrialists, it was interesting to this observer that reaction was unanimously enthusiastic by both.

The bulletin quite appropriately includes a salute to Frank Darling, "Chicago's most unusual labor man—we need more like him."

This action taken by local 1031, I believe, will undoubtedly inspire other unions to take similar action until such time as Congress recognizes its responsibility and provides an adequate program to care for the Nation's senior citizens.

I should like to add my own warm congratulations to Frank Darling and to his membership, which showed such good judgment in solving a serious problem for its senior members. I feel confident that the action taken by local 1031 will provide a stimulus for other organizations to follow suit.

Continental Fuels Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1960

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, last week the American Mining Congress at its coal convention in Pittsburgh featured a panel discussion on a national fuels policy. My observation is that the series of presentations provided emphatic evidence of the urgent necessity for a study to determine whether a national fuels policy is needed. If the answer is yes, then it must also be determined whether legislation is needed to adopt or implement a policy.

As one of the participants in the discussion, I was especially interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], who suggested that the possibility of a continental fuels policy should be considered. With the development of Canada's rich mineral resources, and with increasing fuels traffic between the Dominion and the United States, I feel that the point raised by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs should receive careful attention.

From a selfish position, I might be inclined to stand pat on my resolution to confine the study to this Nation's energy resources, supplies, and requirements. Although already more than half a billion tons of bituminous coal have been extracted from Colorado's mines, at least 49 billion tons of minable reserves remain within our borders—enough to supply the entire Nation for more than a century at present rates of production. We have enough oil shale to provide through synthesis all the liquid and gaseous fuels that America could use in many, many years. Petroleum, natural gas, water power, and atomic energy are well represented in Colorado's soil.

Canada, and Mexico as well, have important fuel reserves. They are our good neighbors and we all want to encourage commerce among these great nations to whatever extent is mutually beneficial. I am interested in the idea of a continental fuels policy. I believe that it should be explored assiduously. I ask that Congressman SAYLOR's remarks to the American Mining Congress be inserted at this point:

AN ADDRESS TO THE AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS, MAY 9, 1960, BY HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

At the start I should like to congratulate Mr. Julian Conover and the American Mining Congress for making this forum possible. Discussions of this kind can go a long way toward developing a public awareness to the need for a fuels policy. Perhaps the idea will also appeal to the oil and gas industries when they hold association meetings. When all considerations—pro and con—have been thoroughly threshed out, maybe we will find that we have a common meeting ground on this issue.

I will say at the start that I have no particular pride of authorship with respect to the fuels policy study that I have introduced in the House. If someone has a better approach to the problem—be he a Democrat or Republican—from Texas, Louisiana, West Virginia, or anywhere else—you may be sure that I will go along with it. Just keep religion out of it—that's all anyone can ask.

The first mention of a national fuels policy study produced tumultuous repercussions. I was reminded of the minister describing the Day of Judgment.

"Thunder will boom," he boomed. "Lightning will strike. Rivers will overflow. Flames will shoot down from the heavens. There will be storms, floods, earthquakes."

A little girl looked up eagerly at her parent.

"Mommy," she whispered, "will we get out of school?"

A representative of a competing fuels industry rushed up to my office protesting violently the idea of a fuels policy study. "We already have a fuels policy," he insisted. When I asked him if there was anything wrong in studying existing Government programs, he hesitated, then merely said that there was no necessity for it.

Acknowledging that we have a semblance of a fuels policy in the form of the various laws and agencies that effect energy production and supply, it appears that opposition to a study would come exclusively from industries, companies, or individuals fearful that the results of an investigation might serve to discomfort their own particular interests. There are three sound reasons why the proposed study should be undertaken as soon as possible. Any one of the reasons is enough to justify the project; in the aggregate they make it a mandatory undertaking. Let us examine them, although the order in which they are listed does not necessarily indicate their degree of importance.

(1) Conservation: As an admirer of Teddy Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot for many years, I have devoted considerable time in Congress to the matter of proper use of all natural resources. God was very generous in filling our cupboards with ample supplies of the raw materials that a people must have in order to make the most of human resources, inventiveness, and ambition. To use our natural resources extravagantly without considering the needs of the generations to follow is immoral.

Is America exercising proper frugality in the production and utilization of energy deposits? I think it is time that we find out. Eight years ago the President's Material Policy Commission, known as the Paley Commission, warned against extravagant use of natural gas. I have repeated this warning numerous times, because I believe that it would be unfair for us to deprive unnecessarily our children and their children of a supply of this special fuel.

Natural gas spokesmen raise a hue and cry when the suggestion is made that the principles of conservation should be applied to their relatively scarce product—natural gas. However, the Federal Government has already taken legislative steps to conserve the extremely scarce and valuable product, helium, and this has been done without any implication of undue imposition of Federal controls * * * and without any allegations of damage to the free enterprise system. Natural gas is disappearing and should not be wasted. It is valuable and the same principles of conservation will eventually—why not now—have to be applied. It is my view that conservation should be exercised now, to use a metaphor, rather than in the future attempt to lock the distribution door when the natural gas horse has already been stolen.

(2) National security: Last Tuesday morning newspapers contained an item, "Dateline Tokyo," stating that Russia has 100 submarines operating in the Pacific. On many occasions we have been alerted to the fact that Red underwater craft infest Atlantic waters. Naval experts have warned us that major ports on both coasts could be demolished through coordinate enemy submarine action in the event of a major war. For that matter, oceangoing tankers would have little need for port facilities in an age when Russia has 400 submarines. Germany started World War II with only 60, yet was able to disrupt completely tanker traffic in the Gulf of Mexico as well as along the Atlantic seaboard.

So, in an emergency we could not depend upon foreign oil to help our domestic mobilization activities. To what extent the country can lean upon foreign fuel in peacetime merits close study. A Cabinet Committee looked into this phase of the defense structure and recommended the import restrictions that were the basis for the mandatory control program established by the

President last year. This control order could be regarded as a phase of a national fuels policy. I see no reason why it should remain apart from the general study which we propose.

(3) The general economy: The Natural Gas Act, another of the many Federal laws affecting the oil and gas industries, was adopted 22 years ago when the Nation was using just 20 percent of the amount of natural gas that is being consumed at the present time. Quite a few of us in Congress have asked repeatedly that this obsolete legislation be updated. From what has been appearing in the newspapers of late, a growing number of Americans agree that the Natural Gas Act should be revised to meet present day requirements.

The natural gas industry is protected by public utility status. Under present conditions, a gas transmission line may make its product available to industrial consumers at less than half the cost that residential patrons are charged. Pittsburghers are complaining about constantly increasing rates. I have some figures here which may be of interest. The last available tables are for 1958, but they are sufficiently recent to spotlight a despicable situation. The average cost of natural gas to homeowners in Pennsylvania was a little more than $1 per thousand cubic feet in 1958. In the same year the same product was being sold to electric utilities in Pennsylvania for 31.2 cents—or less than one-third of what householders had to pay for it. Mainline industrial users were charged a little more * * * they paid 47.1 cent per thousand cubic feet, but still less than half of what we the people were charged.

This discrimination is reprehensible. I think that a national fuels study could result in its elimination.

Needless to say, the practice of dumping gas into industrial markets at whatever price is necessary to undersell coal is costing the bituminous coal industry many millions of tons per year. Although we have enough coal in America to last for more than 1,000 years, at present rates of production, and though the natural gas life index is set at less than a quarter of a century, this valuable product is flowing freely into whatever industrial and utility markets will take it. As a consequence, many mines are closed, mineworkers are idled, railroaders who depend upon coal traffic for a livelihood are laid off, and economic stagnation extends in communities up and down the line. Certainly we need a fuels study.

Gentlemen, I could cite 101 cases to support my proposal for a fuels study. I assure you that I shall continue to exert every effort to induce Congress to undertake this work. I repeat that I will not stand by my own resolution if a more logical one is advanced.

As a matter of fact, I have been giving serious thought to the possibility of recommending that the fuels study be extended so that it will be continental in scope rather than limited to our own boundary. For a number of years I protested the proposal to import natural gas from Canada into the Midwest. Among other reasons, I feel that it would place our consumers at the mercy of international gas interests. Within the past several months both the Canadian Energy Board and the U.S. Federal Power Commission have issued the necessary certificates for the line from the Dominion into and through Minnesota. I noticed about 10 days ago that the National Coal Association has asked that the case be reopened, so as yet the final decision must be considered uncertain.

Unless Congress or the tariffmaking authorities in the State Department do an abrupt about-face, any gas entering this country from Canada would be duty free. In contrast, Canada imposes a 50-cent-per-ton tariff on all U.S. coal that moves northward across the border.

If there is any reciprocity in this arrangement, I do not detect it. Perhaps a continental fuels policy could also bring about a solution to this inequity.

Michigan—Your Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1960

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the title I have given my remarks today—"Michigan—Your Opportunity"—is also the slogan for Michigan Week, 1960. The seventh annual observation of Michigan Week commenced yesterday, May 15, and will run through the remainder of this week. In general, the purpose of Michigan Week is to promote the great State of Michigan throughout the Nation. More specifically, the purposes of Michigan Week are three: First, to advance the economic and social progress of Michigan; second, to promote among Michigan residents and the people of the United States a better understanding of the advantages Michigan offers as a place for living, working, enjoying recreation and doing business; and, third to get all Michigan residents working together to make the State an even better place in which to live, work, and enjoy life. As a native and life-long resident of Michigan, I am happy to take part in this Michigan Week effort and to assist in advancing these fine purposes which I have just enumerated.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it is comparatively easy for me to do this because the State of Michigan is replete with such a wealth of natural resources, commercial opportunities, and other advantages that I could go on virtually ad infinitum in extolling them.

Michigan is the largest State east of the Mississippi. The Upper Peninsula alone is equal in size to Connecticut, Delaware, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts combined. Both the Upper and Lower Peninsulas have been richly endowed by nature. Indeed the State motto: "If you seek a pleasant peninsula, look about you" is well justified. The economy of Michigan rests firmly upon the three main pillars of industry, agriculture, and the tourist trade. During World War II, the magnificent performance of Michigan's automotive industry earned for our State the title "Arsenal of Democracy." Our State continues today to be one of the foremost producers of military vehicular equipment and is also in the forefront of the vast new development and rapid expansion in the manufacture of ballistic missiles—awesome and terrible weapons of the new space age.

The automotive industry, however, is only one among many in which Michigan is a leader. On the basis of value added by manufacture, Michigan also ranks first in boatbuilding, output of internal combustion engines, mobile homes, steel springs, hardware, industrial patterns, special dies and tools, and conveyors. Michigan is also known far and wide as an outstanding producer of furniture, breakfast foods, drugs and chemicals, sporting and athletic goods, steel, chemicals, salt, and paper products.

Michigan boasts of many new and up-and-coming fields. One of these is the production of chemicals. The value added by manufacture in the chemical industry is even now in the neighborhood of $600 million. The wealth of raw materials available within the State gives every prospect of boosting Michigan to one of the Nation's top producers of chemicals. In general, overall diversification of industry has proceeded at such a rapid pace that of the 453 industries classified by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, Michigan has 369—or 81 percent of the total.

What is more, industry is continuing to flock to Michigan in droves. For the 6-month period ending last month, April 1960, Michigan led all other States in industrial growth. During that time 94 new industrial facilities came to Michigan. This is far more than the second ranked State. Of these 94 new facilities, 74 were in the Detroit metropolitan area, including Ann Arbor. This means that this single metropolitan area acquired more new industrial facilities than any other single State. And it should be duly noted that these figures do not even include companies which leased or expanded into existing industrial facilities. These figures represent new facilities only. In short, during the 6 months ending April 1960, building permits were issued for 94 new industrial projects costing a total of $111,121,209. Of this total more than $62 million was in the city of Detroit and eight suburban communities. This Detroit figure does not include some $20 million for expansion of 214 industrial plants and 87 industrial warehouse facilities during the same 6-month period. Nor do any of these figures include any of the approximately $150 million in new facilities announced or started in the previous 6-month period. It is easily seen, Mr. Speaker, that Michigan's tremendous attractiveness to industry has not diminished at all. To the contrary, it is on the upswing.

One of the main reasons for this attractiveness, of course, is the tremendous treasury of raw materials of which the State of Michigan can so justly boast. It is said that "whatever a manufacturer may need in the way of materials, it is probable that he will find them in Michigan." A study of a resources map of the State readily bears out this great abundance of nature's bounty.

Starting with Upper Peninsula, which is part of the greatest iron ore producing region of the world—the Lake Superior District, we find very extensive iron ore deposits—Michigan's most valuable mineral resource. These deposits place Michigan second among all iron ore producing States. Since 1854, Michigan mines have shipped a tonnage of ore equal to the total excavation of the Panama Canal. Between 1860 and 1890 Michigan led the Nation in the production of lumber. Michigan lumber helped

to build 19th century America. Although the forests have been largely cut over, Michigan is still a major lumbering State. In all, the State of Michigan boasts 19 million acres of forests, yielding about 1 million cords annually. It is expected that Michigan's lumber harvest will be considerably increased as the second stand of timber grows in, for the lumbermen of the State are applying their knowledge of modern conservation methods to insure a continuing supply of wood. The hardwoods are basic to our furniture industry, while the softwoods underwrite Michigan's well-known paper and pulp industry.

Michigan is well endowed with many other natural resources. She is noted for her limestone. She is first in the production of salt in the Nation, furnishing about 20 percent of the Nation's supply. Of all the States, Michigan has easiest and greatest access to the bountiful supply of fresh water in the Great Lakes, by far the largest reservoir of fresh water in the world. Michigan annually ranks fourth in production of cement. She ranks high in the annual production of oil—over 10 million barrels per year. She is always very high, usually sixth, in the production of copper. Michigan has the world's largest limestone quarries and deposits of gypsum. Nationally Michigan is first in gypsum production and second in all stone production, including limestone. Michigan is second in the production of iron ore, supplying about 13 percent of the Nation's need.

Michigan's Lower Peninsula has extensive quantities of sand and gravel. Michigan's fine highways are built of her own native materials. The mention of highways brings to mind Michigan's wonderful traffic safety record. Although Michigan is high up among the States with the highest traffic volume, yet she has the second lowest number of traffic fatalities per 100 million miles traveled. In addition to industry, Michigan is a top notch agricultural State. The value of her agricultural products exceeds $730 million each year. For example, Michigan annually produces: 42 million pounds of strawberries with a value of $6.1 million; 65 thousand gallons of maple syrup worth $350,000; 6,000 acres of peppermint worth $800,000; 3,000 acres of spearmint, a crop worth $600,000. The Lower Peninsula of Michigan produces some 97 percent of the Nation's crop of navy beans. Beans may be baked in Boston, but they are raised in Michigan. The State also leads in the production of tomatoes, cucumbers, and cultivated blueberries. She is third in the production of apples, fifth in peaches, fourth in pears. In addition, Michigan is the largest producer of red tart cherries and is third in the production of sweet cherries. Celery and corn are also large crops. In all, 44 different fruit and vegetable crops are grown commercially in Michigan.

Recreation is also an important "product" for Michigan. The lakes, streams, and woodlands of the State combine to provide the perfect setting for vacationers. Ten million tourists annually roam the beauty spots in Michigan. The State's tourist and resort industry which caters to these millions accounts for a yearly revenue of some $700 million. This great influx of visitors makes Michigan the fourth most popular vacation spot in the Nation, accounting for some 6 percent of the domestic tourist trade.

With all of these assets bestowed by nature, with the tremendous diversity of commercial activity and opportunity and with this great magnetism for tourist, it is readily obvious that the great State of Michigan is richly deserving of an eminent place among her sister States. I feel sure that she has been accorded such a position and I am equally sure that she will continue to earn and deserve the pride of the Nation and the respect of her sister States. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and all other Members of this House to join me in saluting the great State of Michigan during this—Michigan Week, 1960.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 17, 1960

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, Thou only art the fountain of our being; Thou art the light of all our seeing. Our puny mortal strength alone is unequal to the tests and tasks of the terrific times which are upon us. We dare not trust our own devices and councils.

To those who through the treacherous seas of this violent era pilot the Nation's course, give, we pray Thee, a revealing and steadying remembrance of the altars dedicated to spiritual verities at which the Founding Fathers knelt, and the moral standards to which they were committed.

For the radiant dream which we call America, hear our vow as we pledge our all as security for freedom's greatest venture against freedom's deadly foes now loose on the earth.

We ask it in the name above every name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1960.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MANSFIELD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 16, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2611) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7480. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with respect to label declaration of the use of pesticide chemicals on raw agricultural commodities which are the produce of the soil;

H.R. 9792. An act to amend section 4111 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of managers and directors of professional services of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers;

H.R. 10500. An act to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 with respect to incentive pay for certain submarine service;

H.R. 11602. An act to amend certain laws of the United States in light of the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union; and for other purposes;

H.R. 11706. An act to authorize an extension of time for final proof under the desert land laws under certain conditions; and

H.R. 11985. An act to make American nationals eligible for scholarships and fellowships authorized by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 7480. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with respect to label declaration of the use of pesticide chemicals on raw agricultural commodities which are the produce of the soil; and

H.R. 11985. An act to make American nationals eligible for scholarships and fellowships authorized by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 9792. An act to amend section 4111 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of managers and directors of professional services of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10500. An act to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 with respect to incentive pay for certain submarine service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 11602. An act to amend certain laws of the United States in light of the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11706. An act to authorize an extension of time for final proof under the desert land laws under certain conditions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the

usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigation of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; the Subcommittee on Flood Control—Rivers and Harbors, of the Committee on Public Works; the Communications Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and the Subcommittee on Patents of the Committee on the Judiciary, were authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nomination on the calendar will be stated.

U.S. MARSHAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lyle F. Milligan, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE NEWS FROM PARIS ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the news from Paris will cause a wave of regret and disappointment all over the world. Apparently the prospects of any kind of a successful conference at the summit are virtually dead.

At no time were the prospects of great accomplishment from the summit conference better than 50–50. But the abrupt manner in which they seem to be coming to an end foreshadows a period of greater tensions and greater agony for a war-weary world.

Inspired stories from Communist sources seem to be indicating already that the world may be plunged into a crisis over Berlin. For whatever reason, the Communist leaders seem bent on forcing issues, rather than seeking to resolve them.

It is evident that the determination and the unity of the American people are going to be tested as never before in our history. The so-called cold war puts a heavy strain on the nerves and the hearts of people everywhere in the world.

This is definitely a time for Americans to unite, because something very precious is at stake—freedom in this world.

If there have been mistakes, responsibility will be assessed coolly and objectively. But one mistake that we cannot afford to make is to weaken the free world by division within our own ranks.

America should try to keep open every channel of communication, because it is always better to talk than to fight. But keeping open every channel of communication in good faith does not mean that we should relax our determination to maintain freedom as a way of life.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to join in the statement which has been made by the distinguished majority leader. His statement exhibits his well-known pattern of statesmanship and responsibility, and especially so in the grave crisis which confronts all of us at the present time.

CONVICTION OF RUDOLF IVANOVICH ABEL—OPINION OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed an earlier action in the case of one Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, who was indicted and tried in New York. He was convicted; and the court of appeals affirmed the conviction on July 11, 1958. The Supreme Court affirmed the conviction on March 28, 1960; and the Supreme Court on May 16, 1960, refused further review.

Rudolf Ivanovich Abel on August 7, 1957, was indicted on three counts charging him with having conspired from about 1948 to the date of the indictment, first, to communicate and transmit to the Soviet Union information relating to the national defense of the United States—conspiracy to violate 18 United States Code 794(a)—second, to obtain documents and other materials connected with the national defense of the United States for the purpose of transmitting such documents to the Soviet Union—conspiracy to violate 18 United States Code 793—and third, to act in the United States as an agent of the Soviet Union without prior notification to the Secretary of State—conspiracy to violate 18 United States Code 951.

The petitioner was convicted and sentenced to a total of 30 years and to pay a fine of $3,000. The conviction was affirmed by the court of appeals, and then was appealed to the Supreme Court.

On October 13, 1958, the Supreme Court granted certiorari. Briefs were filed, and the case was argued on February 17 and 18, 1959. The questions presented to the Court were first, whether the fourth and fifth amendments to the Constitution are violated by a search and the seizure of evidence without a search warrant, after an alien suspected and officially accused of espionage has been taken into custody for deportation, pursuant to an administrative Immigration Service warrant, but has not been arrested for the commission of a crime; and second, whether the fourth and fifth amendments are violative when articles so seized are unrelated to the Immigration Service warrant and, together with other articles obtained from such leads, are introduced as evidence in a prosecution for espionage.

Mr. President, in this connection, I should like to include in my remarks a complete copy of the indictment. If there is anything that stands at this moment as eloquent evidence of the kind of espionage carried on in this country by agents of the Soviet Union, this is it. After going through all the courts of the land, and twice to the highest court, the conviction has been affirmed; and the defendant will go to the Federal penitentiary for a period of 30 years, where he rightly belongs.

I should like to have both the Congress and the country know—since such items in text form do not always come to the attention of those who read the press and the magazines—just what is involved in this case. Therefore, I wish to have a copy of the complete indictment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so the people generally can see whether espionage by agents of the Soviet Union is taking place in the United States.

There being no objection, the indictment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT, EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *v.* RUDOLF IVANOVICH ABEL, ALSO KNOWN AS "MARK" AND ALSO KNOWN AS MARTIN COLLINS AND EMIL R. GOLDFUS, DEFENDANT

The grand jury charges:

COUNT ONE

1. That from in or about 1948 and continuously thereafter up to and including the date of the filing of this indictment, in the eastern district of New York; in Moscow, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and elsewhere, Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Martin Collins and Emil R. Goldfus, the defendant herein, unlawfully, willfully and knowingly did conspire and agree with Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic"; Mikhail Svirin; Vitali G. Pavlov; and Aleksandr Mikhallovich Korotkov, coconspirators but not defendants herein, and with divers other persons to the grand jury unknown, to violate subsection (a) of section 794, title 18, United States Code, in that they did unlawfully, willfully and knowingly conspire and agree to communicate, deliver and transmit to a foreign government, to wit, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and representatives and agents thereof, directly and indirectly, documents, writings, photographs, photographic negatives, plans, maps, models, notes, instruments, appliances and information relating to the national defense of the United States of America, and

particularly information relating to arms, equipment and disposition of U.S. Armed Forces, and information relating to the atomic energy program of the United States, with intent and reason to believe that the said documents, writings, photographs, photographic negatives, plans, maps, models, notes, instruments, appliances and information would be used to the advantage of a foreign nation, to wit, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

2. It was a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and his coconspirators would collect and obtain, and attempt to collect and obtain and would aid and induce divers other persons to the grand jury unknown, to collect and obtain information relating to the national defense of the United States of America, with intent and reason to believe that the said information would be used to the advantage of the said foreign nation, to wit, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

3. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and certain of the coconspirators, including Aleksandr Mikhailovich Korotkov and Mikhail Svirin, being representatives, agents and employees of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, would by personal contact, communications and other means to the grand jury unknown, both directly and indirectly, employ, supervise, pay and maintain the defendant and other coconspirators for the purpose of communicating, delivering and transmitting information relating to the national defense of the United States to the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

4. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and certain of his coconspirators would activate and attempt to activate as agents within the United States certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces who were in a position to acquire information relating to the national defense of the United States, and would communicate, deliver, and transmit, and would aid and induce each other and divers other persons to the grand jury unknown, to communicate, deliver, and transmit information relating to the national defense of the United States to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

5. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and certain of his coconspirators would use shortwave radios to receive instructions issued by said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to send information to the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

6. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and certain of his coconspirators would fashion containers from bolts, nails, coins, batteries, pencils, cuff links, earrings and the like, by hollowing out concealed chambers in such devices suitable to secrete therein microfilm, microdot and other secret messages.

7. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the said defendant and his coconspirators would communicate with each other by enclosing messages in said containers and depositing said containers in prearranged drop points in Prospect Park in Brooklyn, N.Y., in Fort Tryon Park in New York City, and at other places in the eastern district of New York and elsewhere.

8. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the said defendant and certain of his coconspirators would receive from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its agents, officers and employees large sums of money with which to carry on their illegal activities within the United States, some of which money would thereupon be stored for future use by burying it in the ground in certain places in the eastern district of New York and elsewhere.

9. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and certain of his coconspirators, including Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," would assume, on instruction of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the identities of certain U.S. citizens, both living and deceased, and would use birth certificates and passports in the name of such U.S. citizens, and would communicate with each other and other agents, officers and employees of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics through the use of numerical and other types of secret codes, and would adopt other and further means to conceal the existence and purpose of said conspiracy.

10. It was further a part of said conspiracy that defendant and certain of his coconspirators would, in the event of war between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, set up clandestine radio transmitting and receiving posts for the purpose of continuing to furnish the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with information relating to the national defense of the United States, and would engage in acts of sabotage against the United States.

In pursuance and furtherance of said conspiracy and to effect the object thereof the defendant and his coconspirators did commit, among others, in the eastern district of New York and elsewhere, the following:

Overt acts

1. In or about the year 1948 Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Emil R. Goldfus and Martin Collins, the defendant herein, did enter the United States at an unknown point along the Canadian-United States border.

2. In or about the summer of 1952 at the headquarters of the Committee of Information (known as the KI) in Moscow, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did meet with Vitali G. Pavlov, a coconspirator herein.

3. In or about the summer of 1952 at the headquarters of the Committee of Information (known as the KI) in Moscow, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did meet with Mikhail Svirin, a coconspirator herein.

4. On or about October 21, 1952, in New York City, Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did disembark from the liner "Queen Mary."

5. In or about October 1952, Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did go to Central Park in Manhattan, New York City, and did leave a signal in the vicinity of the restaurant known as the Tavern-on-the-Green.

6. In or about 1952, Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did go to the vicinity of Prospect Park in Brooklyn within the eastern district of New York.

7. In or about November 1952, Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did go to Fort Tryon Park in New York City and did leave a message.

8. In or about December 1952, Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did meet and confer with Mikhail Svirin, a coconspirator herein, in the vicinity of Prospect Park in Brooklyn within the eastern district of New York.

9. In or about the summer of 1953, Mikhail Svirin, a coconspirator herein, did meet and confer with Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, in the vicinity of Prospect Park in Brooklyn, within the eastern district of New York, and did give to Hayhanen a package of soft film.

10. On or about December 17, 1953, the defendant Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Emil R. Goldfus and Martin Collins, did rent a studio consisting of one room on the fifth floor of the building located at 252 Fulton Street, Brooklyn, within the eastern district of New York.

11. In or about August or September 1954, the defendant Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Emil R. Goldfus and Martin Collins, did meet with Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, in the vicinity of the Keith's RKO Theater, Flushing, Long Island, within the eastern district of New York.

12. In or about the summer of 1954 the defendant Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Emil R. Goldfus and Martin Collins, and Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did go by automobile to the vicinity of New Hyde Park, Long Island, within the eastern district of New York.

13. In or about March or April 1955, the defendant Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Emil R. Goldfus and Martin Collins, and Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did proceed by automobile from New York City to Atlantic City, N.J.

14. In or about the spring of 1955, Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did proceed by automobile from New York City to the vicinity of Quincy, Mass., at the direction of defendant Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Emil R. Goldfus and Martin Collins.

15. In or about December 1954 or January 1955, Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did proceed by rail transportation from New York to Salida, Colo., at the direction of the defendant Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Emil Goldfus and Martin Collins.

16. In or about the spring of 1955, the defendant Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Emil R. Goldfus and Martin Collins, and Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, did proceed from New York City to the vicinity of Poughkeepsie, N.Y., for the purpose of locating a suitable site for a shortwave radio.

17. In or about the spring of 1955, the defendant Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Emil R. Goldfus and Martin Collins, in the vicinity of 252 Fulton Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., within the eastern district of New York, did give a shortwave radio to Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein.

18. In or about 1955 the defendant Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Emil R. Goldfus and Martin Collins, did bring a coded message to Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, and did request him to decipher said message.

19. In or about February 1957, the defendant Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark," and also known as Emil R. Goldfus and Martin Collins, did meet and confer with Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," a coconspirator herein, in the vicinity of Prospect Park, Brooklyn, within the eastern district of New York, and did then and there give to Hayhanen a birth certificate and $200 in U.S. currency. (In violation of 18 U.S.C. 794(c).)

COUNT TWO

The grand jury further charges:

1. That from in or about 1948 and continuously thereafter and up to and including the date of the filing of this indictment, in the eastern district of New York, in Moscow, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and elsewhere, Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark," and also known as Martin Collins and Emil R. Goldfus, the defendant herein, unlawfully, willfully, and knowingly did conspire and agree with Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic"; Mikhail Svirin; Vitali G.

Pavlov; and Aleksandr Mikhailovich Korotkov, coconspirators but not defendants herein, and with divers other persons to the grand jury unknown, to violate subsection (c) of section 793, title 18, United States Code, in the manner and by the means hereinafter set forth.

2. It was a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and his coconspirators would, for the purpose of obtaining information respecting the national defense of the United States of America, receive and obtain and attempt to receive and obtain documents, writings, photographs, photographic negatives, plans, maps, models, instruments, appliances, and notes, of things connected with the national defense of the United States, knowing and having reason to believe at the time of said agreement to receive and obtain said documents, writings, photographs, photographic negatives, plans, maps, models, instruments, appliances, and notes of things connected with the national defense, that said material would be obtained, taken, made, and disposed of contrary to the provisions of chapter 37, title 18, United States Code, in that they would be delivered and transmitted, directly and indirectly, to a foreign government, to wit, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to representatives, officers, agents, and employees of the said Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the said defendant intending and having reason to believe that the said documents, writings, photographs, photographic negatives, plans, maps, models, instruments, appliances, and notes of things relating to the national defense of the United States of America, would be used to the advantage of a foreign nation, to wit, the said Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

3. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the said defendant and his coconspirators would make contact with persons to the grand jury unknown, who were resident in the United States, and at places to the grand jury unknown, and who, by reason of their employment, position or otherwise, were acquainted and familiar with and were in possession of or had access to information relating to the national defense of the United States of America.

4. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and certain of his coconspirators would activate and attempt to activate as agents within the United States certain members of the United States Armed Forces who were in a position to acquire information relating to the national defense of the United States, and would communicate, deliver and transmit, and would aid and induce each other and divers other persons to the grand jury unknown, to communicate, deliver, and transmit information relating to the national defense of the United States to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

5. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and certain of his coconspirators would use short-wave radios to receive instructions issued by said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to send information to the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

6. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and certain of his coconspirators would fashion containers from bolts, nails, coins, batteries, pencils, cuff links, earrings, and the like, by hollowing out concealed chambers in such devices suitable to secret therein microfilm, microdot, and other secret messages.

7. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the said defendant and his coconspirators would communicate with each other by enclosing messages in said containers and depositing said containers in prearranged drop points in Prospect Park in Brooklyn, N.Y., in Fort Tryon Park in New York City, and at other places in the eastern district of New York and elsewhere.

8. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the said defendant and certain of his coconspirators would receive from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its agents, officers, and employees large sums of money with which to carry on their illegal activities within the United States, some of which money would thereupon be stored for future use by burying it in the ground in certain places in the eastern district of New York and elsewhere.

9. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and certain of his coconspirators, including Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," would assume, on instruction of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the identities of certain U.S. citizens, both living and deceased, and would use birth certificates and passports in the name of such U.S. citizens, and would communicate with each other and other agents, officers, and employees of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics through the use of numerical and other types of secret codes, and would adopt other and further means to conceal the existence of said conspiracy.

10. It was further a part of said conspiracy that defendant and certain of his coconspirators would, in the event of war between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, set up clandestine radio transmitting and receiving posts for the purpose of continuing to furnish the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with information relating to the national defense of the United States, and would engage in acts of sabotage against the United States.

Overt acts

In pursuance and furtherance of said conspiracy and to effect the object thereof, the defendant and his coconspirators did commit, among others, within the eastern district of New York and elsewhere, the overt acts as alleged and set forth under count one of this indictment, all of which overt acts are hereby realleged by the grand jury (section 793, title 18, United States Code).

COUNT THREE

The grand jury further charges:

1. That throughout the entire period from in or about 1948 and up to and including the date of the filing of this indictment, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, through its representatives, agents, and employees, maintained within the United States and other parts of the world a system and organization for the purpose of obtaining, collecting, and receiving information and material from the United States of a military, commercial, industrial, and political nature, and in connection therewith recruited, induced, engaged, and maintained the defendants and coconspirators hereinafter named and divers other persons to the grand jury unknown as agents, representatives, and employees to obtain, collect, and receive such information and material for the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

2. That from in or about 1948 and continuously thereafter up to and including the date of the filing of this indictment in the eastern district of New York; in Moscow, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and elsewhere, Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, also known as "Mark" and also known as Martin Collins and Emil R. Goldfus, the defendant herein, unlawfully, willfully, and knowingly did conspire and agree with the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and with agents, officers, and employees of the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, including Aleksandr Mikhailovich Korotkov, Vitali G. Pavlov, Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," coconspirators but not defendants herein, and with divers other persons to the grand jury unknown, to commit an offense against the United States of America, to wit, to violate section 951, title 18, United States Code, in the manner and by the means hereinafter set forth.

3. It was a part of said conspiracy that the defendant and Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," and other coconspirators to the grand jury unknown, none of whom were included among the accredited diplomatic or consular officers or attachés of the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or of any foreign government, would, within the United States, and without prior notification to the Secretary of State, act as agents of the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and would, as such agents, obtain, collect, and receive information and material of a military, industrial and political nature, and as such agents would communicate and deliver said information and material to other coconspirators for transmission to the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It was also a part of the said conspiracy that coconspirators residing outside the United States would direct, aid and assist the defendant and certain coconspirators as aforesaid to act as such agents within the United States and would receive and transmit the said information and material to the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

4. It was further a part of the said conspiracy that the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its officers, agents and employees would employ, supervise and maintain the defendant and Reino Hayhanen, also known as "Vic," within the United States as such agents of the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the purpose of obtaining, collecting, receiving, transmitting and communicating information and material of a military, commercial, industrial and political nature.

5. It was further a part of the said conspiracy that the defendant and certain of his coconspirators would receive sums of money and other valuable considerations from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, its officers, agents and employees, in return for acting as said agents of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics within the United States for the purpose of obtaining, collecting, receiving, transmitting and communicating information, material, messages and instructions on behalf and for the use and advantage of the said Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

6. It was further a part of said conspiracy that the said defendant and his coconspirators would use false and fictitious names, coded communications, and would resort to other means to the grand jury unknown to conceal the existence and purpose of said conspiracy.

Overt acts

In pursuance and furtherance of said conspiracy and to effect the object thereof, the defendant and his coconspirators did commit, among others, within the eastern district of New York and elsewhere, the overt acts as alleged and set forth under count I of this indictment, all of which overt acts are hereby realleged by the grand jury. (In violation of sec. 371, title 18, United States Code.)

WILLIAM F. TOMPKINS,
Assistant Attorney General.
LEONARD P. MOORE,
U.S. Attorney.

THE NEEDS AT THE PARIS CONFERENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this point it appears unlikely that the summit meeting will continue. The need to save face may well prevail over

the need to save civilization. There is still a possibility, however, that Mr. Macmillan and President de Gaulle will be able to impress upon Mr. Khrushchev the need for these meetings to go on to the end that a greater measure of stability may be brought about in the international situation, before the little stability that is left disappears entirely.

The problem at Paris is not the U–2 incident; it is world peace. The blunders involved in that incident and—let us use the correct word in all honesty; let us call a spade a spade—the blunders in that incident and its handling are for this Nation to face. Responsibility for dealing with them rests, not with Mr. Khrushchev, but with the politically responsible President, with the politically responsible Congress, and with the American people who hold both accountable.

At the proper time, we shall trace the chain of command, or lack of it, which set in motion the U–2 flight, which has undercut the deep-seated desire of the people and policies of the United States for peace.

At the proper time, we shall find out what lies beneath the confusing zigzags of official pronouncements of the past fortnight. We shall find out why, on one day, the Congress and the people of the United States are told by the Secretary of State that, in effect, it is the policy of the United States to sanction the continuance of reconnaisance flights across the borders of another nation and why the Vice President, on a TV appearance last Sunday, confirmed this policy. We shall find out why this happens at one time, and then, subsequently, in Paris, the President tells Mr. Khrushchev and the world that such flights had already been halted last Thursday by his order and are not to be resumed. Why these conflicting statements? Why the delay in making clear that in official policy the United States sustains international law, and that this policy is established by the President, and the President alone speaks for this Nation?

These are grave questions, for they suggest that there is not one administration, but two, not one official policy but two, with the stature and safety of the Nation and the continuance of peace torn between them.

I repeat: At the appropriate time, these questions and others will be asked. They must be asked. The people of the United States will demand that they be asked and answered, for they go to the heart of our system of responsible popular Government. They go to the heart of the question of our survival as a free Nation. But, I repeat: It is for us, not for Mr. Khrushchev, to ask and answer them.

It is for Mr. Khrushchev and the other participants at Paris to get down to negotiation, to serious negotiation, on the critical differences which divide mankind.

It is to be hoped that President de Gaulle will assume leadership in bringing about these negotiations. He stands outside the immediate crisis between the United States and the Soviet Union. As host to the conference, as a man with a profound depth of understanding of the great need for peace in an anxious Europe and a troubled world, he may yet bring a measure of sanity, a measure of reason to this conference which is otherwise destined to be stillborn.

May I say, further, that it is to be hoped that if these talks do go on, the administration will seriously consider inviting the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to Paris to join the American delegation. We are all in this together, Democrats and Republicans. We are all bound by a common responsibility for what may transpire at this critical moment. I would respectfully suggest, in this connection, that the able and distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT] who is now in the Middle East, be summoned forthwith to serve in an advisory capacity to the President in Paris.

Mr. President, I recognize that responsibility for the conduct of foreign policy rests with the President of the United States. In making these remarks, I do not speak for any other Member of this body on either side of the aisle. I speak only as a Senator from Montana, responsible to the people of Montana, to the Nation, and to my own conscience.

I make these remarks with the greatest reluctance and in full realization that the hour is desperately late. I make them because I do not believe it is simply a game of renewed cold war which will ensue if this conference fails. It is more likely, in my opinion, to be the beginning of a deepening of the crisis in Germany and elsewhere which sooner or later must bring this Nation, the Soviet Union, all peoples to the edge of catastrophe. That may be inevitable and if it is we must all face it together. But I would not be keeping faith with my State, with the Nation, and with my conscience if I did not now state my feelings as plainly and bluntly as I am able, if I did not urge the four statesmen in Paris once more to recognize, before the long night begins to close in upon us, that they are in every sense the principal guardians of humanity's highest hopes, perhaps of the human species itself and to act in accord with that sacred trust.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Although I join with the Senator from Montana in expressing our deep regret at the apparent failure of the summit conference in Paris, I would, however, be willing to leave it to history and future revelation to fix the responsibility for this failure. At some time perhaps we may get to the bottom of some of the mysteries that have surrounded the circumstances of the last 2 weeks.

I join the Senator from Montana in expressing the hope that General de Gaulle, President of France, and host to the conference, will be able to exert enough leadership to pull the Western allies back into unanimity, if there is a lack of such unanimity at the present time, and also to get the summit conference under way again, so that we may salvage some results from the great effort which has already been put into preparation for this conference.

Mr. Khrushchev has apparently made compliance with some impossible conditions a condition to the resumption of the conference in Paris. I would not expect the President of the United States to apologize to Russia for the U–2 incident unless Mr. Khrushchev is willing to apologize to the world, to every other country in the world, for maintaining tho most elaborate espionage system the world has ever known.

There is a question in our minds—perhaps not so much of a question—as to whether Mr. Khrushchev ever desired the Paris conference to produce any degree of satisfactory results; but what I think we ought to make clear at the present time, and make clear to the people of Russia, the people of Western Europe, and the people of all the world, is that the people of the United States are still very earnestly desirous of making such agreements on an international scale as will lessen the danger of a terrible conflict such as could conceivably result, although I would not agree that it is imminent; and we ought to continue our efforts toward securing agreements on disarmament, as well as on other matters which relate to the relationships between the different countries of the world.

We must have world peace, and we must let the people of the world know of our desire for world peace.

There is some question now as to whether the people of Russia are fully informed by their own Government as to what the situation is. It is believed that whatever they are told, they are given in a prejudicial manner, and one which would reflect against the people of the Western World.

I join with the Senator from Montana in expressing the opinion that we should not give up hope, and that President de Gaulle and his associates will exert every effort possible to secure a renewal of the Paris conference, or the summit conference, as it is called.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional minute, so that I may comment on what the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont has said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as always the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] shows the hallmarks of statesmanship and common sense. I agree with every word he has said.

The Senator from Vermont has mentioned the resumption of the Disarmament Conference at Geneva. I should like to see it resumed, as well as the Conference on Nuclear Testing and also the Conference on Surprise Attack, which I understand is technically still in existence even though no meetings have been held, if my understanding is correct, since December of 1958.

I will say to the Senator also that if the summit meeting at Paris fails, we

will all know whom to blame for the debacle, and we will know how to pinpoint it, because of events up to the present time.

I sincerely hope, in the interest of mankind as a whole, that these statesmen on whom the world depends will forget anything which might affect them personally, will think of the people all over the world, and will do what they can to bring about a degree of stabilization and, if at all possible, a modicum of peace as well.

I thank the Senator from Vermont, who has said in fewer words than I what the present situation is, what our hopes are, and what we devoutly pray will be accomplished.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to place in the RECORD at this point a bit of information which Drew Pearson got the other day from Mr. Adenauer, when he was in Bonn. Mr. Pearson spoke to Chancellor Adenauer about the situation, and I quote from what he has said:

> I asked the vigorous Chancellor of West Germany if the so-called spy incident hadn't played into Khrushchev's hands and got the summit conference off to a bad start. He brushed it aside with, "It isn't remotely comparable to the spying Russia has been doing against the West. Russian planes fly over Germany all the time. The Communist bloc countries have 1,000 agents in Germany alone. Khrushchev has exaggerated the incident out of all proportion."

I should like to make a comment in relation to that matter. I think Chancellor Adenauer has really brought to the summit what we might call the factual situation facts. Khrushchev never intended to have this meeting. Why? Because he needed to "shoot off" his mouth for the benefit of home consumption.

Those are not my words, but those are substantially the words of an American commentator in the Near East, who is acquainted with the conditions as they exist.

In other words, this was a diversionary tactic on the part of Mr. Khrushchev. Of course, if he can call a conference later on, when conditions at home have been smoothed over, and probably when the people in Russia who are feeling the ferment all over the world for a better standard of living have been put to sleep in one way or another, he may think it will be more opportune to hold a conference then. Then, if the conference is held, will we permit him, by his ways and means, to give us a sleeping pill?

I think the particular issue right now in America is that we be alert, be adequate, and put ourselves in a position where we will know what is going on.

In the article to which I have referred the point is brought out that Khrushchev has known what has been going on, but because the Russians happened to shoot down this young American, Khrushchev had a chance to blow up the incident and to scuttle the summit meeting.

I am not one of those who thinks war is "right around the corner," so long as we are adequate and so long as we are prepared for any emergency, of which fact Khrushchev will be made aware. He, of course, is the prime actor on the world stage. He can pull most any stunt and get the publicity he desires.

I agree with the commentators of last evening. The general consensus was that Khrushchev is not getting by with this, that the common people in the various countries recognize him for what he is.

THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the same subject on which the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] just spoke, and to one or two different points.

One thing which stands out from what is occurring in Paris now with its serious impact upon the peace of the world is that Chairman Khrushchev seemingly has made a completely wrong estimate of the spirit of the American people. It has been reported that when he visited the United States he went away with the feeling that we were soft. This is a dangerous and unwarranted assumption. I do not believe it is shared by the Russian people; and if there is a public opinion in the Soviet Union, Chairman Khrushchev has by now driven matters so far that even it might assert itself.

What is important to us is that Chairman Khrushchev's bid to determine the result of our 1960 elections by outbursts or intransigeance in Paris or Moscow—or by saying, in effect, he wants to negotiate with a new President—will inevitably fail. The American people, as they have already shown, close ranks in the face of any such obvious maneuver. Not only must we close ranks at home, as has already been demonstrated in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, but we must not put all our eggs in the summit basket, which is the mistake our country could make, one which, perhaps notwithstanding the recent tragic events, we may have been saved from making. We cannot put all our eggs in the summit basket. That much is clear.

What is really the issue for us "the morning after" is the renewed effort to integrate the free world itself and to create a rule of law in the world in which the United Nations must be a prime mover. Right now we have much to be desired on both counts.

Mr. President, I join with the sentiment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I compliment him in expressing the hope which we all express that, everyone having had a chance to sleep over what occurred yesterday, we shall continue the negotiations in Paris, and that President de Gaulle may be the happy instrument for bringing that about. Certainly we all devoutly wish it.

We cannot in the meantime waste our lives in frustration, whatever Chairman Khrushchev's propaganda may bring, or whatever direction it may take.

So I suggest two things as well worthy of our attention. I urge upon the President right now at Paris, and thereafter, in order to utilize our time to the full: First, the integration of the free world in problems of trade, aid, immigration, refugee resettlement and travel with respect to which we face serious failures of cooperation. An example of that is the European trade conflict which was threatened, and now seems to be lessened in intensity, between the Inner Six and the Outer Seven. We have enormous difficulties right now in the growing sentiment for increased tariff protection against imports in the United States. Also there is the danger of impending meat ax cuts in the mutual security program in the Congress, and the difficulty of getting other nations to carry their share of the cost or burden of the common defense, and additional difficulties in liquidating archaic colonialist positions.

The free world needs to make a massive effort to aid less developed areas; to improve technical, professional, educational, cultural, athletic and other exchanges; to deal with extreme fluctuations in primary commodity prices, and to develop broader and more prosperous internal markets through establishing further common market and free trade areas.

The free world need not and should not exclude the Communist bloc, but it should utilize this opportunity of a probable interregnum in the effort to come to closer accord with the Communist bloc to more effectively unite its elements, and marshal its own resources for the peace struggle. Whatever may be the storm of the moment, observers believe that it will gradually subside and that something resembling competitive coexistence may develop, but this time we hope with far fewer illusions about the desirability of a relaxation in tensions as an end in itself, and with better understanding of the fact that "competitive coexistence" means the most intensive kind of struggle on every level short of nuclear war.

The United Nations has an important role to play in this situation. It is not yet standing up to its opportunity as the agency demanding a rule of law in the world. Its diplomacy still requires "playing it safe." This is the real significance of Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold's mild statement on boycotts and blockades of the Suez Canal by President Nasser, notwithstanding violations of international treaty commitments, international law, and President Nasser's explicit promises of 1956 made directly to the United Nations itself.

Mr. President, the Secretary General is doing the best he can, and his attitude is very understandable. His attitude is the natural result of a fear that the necessary two-thirds of the nations will not back a strong moral and legal position, and therefore of thinking of the United Nations more as a trade association to be held together at any cost than as an agency to secure justice in world affairs.

The real difficulty appears to be that Chairman Khrushchev and his associates have the idea that they are about to leapfrog the whole world in terms of basic productive strength and capability. The free world needs to make a bound forward to restore the perspective of the Soviet leaders. This can most effectively

be done by major means to unite the free world and integrate its resources, and by strengthening the machinery for undertaking the rule of law in the United Nations. It is for this reason that President Eisenhower's proposal for aerial surveillance will become so important. Let us utilize our time now to advantage, not in useless recriminations of the what-might-have-been.

Mr. President, I address this request to our President. Let him in Paris now—even if Mr. Khrushchev will not participate—continue the summit conference for the purpose of uniting and strengthening the free world. This will in the ultimate prove to be far more potent than endeavoring to continue negotiations with a man who refuses to negotiate for whatever reasons he may have. This means no derogation of our love for peace and no derogation of our respect for the Russian people. It means only that we move to strengthen the free world at a time when its strength will determine whether or not there shall really be peaceful coexistence, or whether the Communists will so completely overestimate their own situation as to bring us to the brink of some holocaust. Chairman Khrushchev shows that negotiations with the Communist bloc are likely to prove fruitful only when we have proved the economic superiority of our system. In the meantime we should talk and negotiate at every opportunity but without illusions.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the very fine remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and others with regard to the episode which the world witnessed yesterday, and commend them for the views they expressed.

Certainly, for all-around arrogance, it would be extremely difficult to outdo yesterday's performance by the world's highest ranking blusterer, Mr. Khrushchev. It was not enough that he had already received assurance that American reconnaissance flights over the Soviet Union had been suspended since the U–2 incident and would not be resumed, but he wanted more. He wanted a public humiliation of the President of the United States. He wanted apologies, punishments, and guarantees as his price for remaining in Paris, and as an added insult, he withdrew his invitation to President Eisenhower to visit the Soviet Union.

The height of his insult was reached in his effort to interfere with the electoral processes in the United States, in the statement that a new administration might have a different method of dealing with him. Then he threw into it, for good measure, some very insulting remarks about the President of the United States.

I do not believe that Mr. Khrushchev will be successful in influencing the people of this country with respect to their selection of candidates for high office. I rather anticipate also that Mr. Khrushchev will learn before he is through that the people of this country are very well united in their method of dealing with him. Certainly this effort on his part to interfere with our electoral process was a gratuitous insult of the first order.

He had the consummate gall to demand American punishment for all those concerned with the U–2 flight. He failed to tell us what punishment, if any, has been meted out by the Soviet Union to the spies, both Russian and American, who have left this country and disappeared behind the Iron Curtain in Russia, some of them now holding high positions in that country. I know of no case in which anyone has been punished in Russia for his acts in syping on our country.

I suppose Khrushchev expects Congress to impeach the President of the United States and sentence Allen Dulles to 20 years at hard labor. In that connection, Mr. Khrushchev had better think twice.

Millions and millions of people in this country and all over the world prayed that the summit conference would resolve issues or, at least, take an important step in that direction. It is still the hope of many, including myself, that the summit talks will continue, although certainly a heavy cloud has been cast over that hope.

What can possibly be the motives of a man who deliberately seeks to wreck the conference on its very first day? Clearly this is not something that was thought out on the moment. It was preconceived in Moscow. The reaction of thinking people in the free world can only be one of utter disgust. It is obvious that Mr. Khrushchev wants the cold war to continue. The world now knows that his pious pleas for peace were as phony as an aluminum half dollar.

As for his crude withdrawal of his invitation to the President, this is one of the rare cases in history when inhospitality has been used as a weapon. Khrushchev apparently is disposed to feel that he cannot run the risk, not of hostile demonstrations, as he has indicated, but friendly demonstrations toward our President by the Russian people. In the light of President Eisenhower's triumphal visits to India and Pakistan and South America, this is perhaps understandable.

The militarily realistic Soviet people cannot be sold the idea that spying is the act of the Devil, as Khrushchev has put it, because spying is an accepted policy of the Soviet Government. Fundamentally this is not a positive move on Khrushchev's part; it is a negative move, and a move of retreat. The thin armor plate of moral indignation he has assumed does not become this man whose past does not bear complete unveiling. While his colonies of spies range all over the world, and not only go unpunished, but are honored, we are asked to make a public show of penitence because one of our intelligence agents was apprehended by the Soviets.

Mr. President, the world knows that President Eisenhower is a truly dedicated man of peace, more dedicated to the maintenance and preservation and furtherance of peace in this world than any other individual, and that he has done as much as he honorably can do to hold the summit together. If the summit disintegrates, the responsibility will rest squarely upon Nikita Khrushchev.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for yielding to me. Does not the Senator agree with me that Mr. Khrushchev is fighting a certain intangible which he cannot beat, and which he can never hope to beat? I refer to the fact that he has indicated he does not want President Eisenhower to appear in Russia. A statement given out by his aides strongly indicates that his purpose is to take a chance on the next election, and thereby hope that under those circumstances a future President might come to Russia under conditions which he thinks would be more favorable to him; whereas the next President of the United States, no matter who he is, will go not only as President, if he goes to Russia, but also as the symbol of something that Mr. Khrushchev cannot lick, and that is the symbol of freedom. If he goes, he will be cheered. If he goes, the hearts of the Russian people will go out to him, as the people of the satellite countries gave their hearts to the leaders of America, and as the peoples of the world gave their hearts to Eisenhower. They stand and cheer and they stand and weep, because they see before them the symbol of the free peoples of the earth.

Does not the Senator agree with me that what Mr. Khrushchev is hoping for is that someone will get him off the hook, from which he cannot extricate himself because he is the head of a slave system?

Mr. KEATING. What the Senator says is true. Khrushchev will be fooled. In the first place, the most insulting move I have ever heard of is the attempt to tell the American people whom they should name or what party they should name to control the destinies of this country.

Secondly, I do not believe it will be of any effect in this country, because our Nation stands united, no matter who our President is. If the President ever went to Russia, he would go with the backing of the American people. Certainly we do not propose to let Mr. Khrushchev be successful in indicating who he thinks that President should be.

He may not like the present administration, and may not, as he has indicated very clearly, like the President or the Vice President personally. However, he will find, I anticipate, that whoever is the President, he will stand four-square for the things we believe in.

Mr. SCOTT. Exactly. My point is that whether the President is a Democrat or a Republican, Mr. Khrushchev has nothing to hope for in that direction, if he seeks to divide us or to smother the symbol of freedom and equality and courageous defense of those fundamental principles which our next President, whoever he may be, will surely exemplify.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure that is so. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1961, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE (S. DOC. NO. 97)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1961, involving an increase in the amount of $20,138,000, for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Finance:

"CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO ENACT LEGISLATION PROVIDING HOSPITAL, SURGICAL, AND NURSING HOME BENEFITS TO OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE RECIPIENTS

"Whereas 500,000 New Jersey men and women, having passed the age of 65, require more than 2½ times as much hospitalization as the general population; and

"Whereas more than half of the aged population have incomes of less than $1,000 per year; and

"Whereas access to the highest quality health care should be the right of the elderly under circumstances which promote self-respect and encourage independence; be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey (the Senate concurring):

"1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact amendments to the Social Security Act so that old-age and survivors insurance recipients will receive hospital, surgical, and nursing home benefits as a benefit right;

"2. An authenticated copy of this resolution be forwarded to the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives;

"3. Copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and to the Members of Congress elected from New Jersey.

"MAURICE A. BRADY,
"Speaker of the General Assembly.

"Attest:

"MAURICE F. KARP,
"Clerk of the General Assembly.

"GEORGE HARPER,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"HENRY A. PATTERSON,
"Secretary of the Senate."

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], I send to the desk a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of South Carolina memorializing the Congress to request the U.S. Treasury Department to mint a sufficient number of half dollars commemorating Old Ninety Six Star Fort.

I ask that this concurrent resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO MEMORIALIZE CONGRESS TO REQUEST THE U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT TO MINT A SUFFICIENT NUMBER OF HALF DOLLARS COMMEMORATING OLD NINETY SIX STAR FORT

Whereas the general assembly is cognizant of the historical importance of Old Ninety Six as an Indian trading post on the Cherokee Path in the 17th century, the farthest English settlement from the coast, the site of a fort for the protection of settlers in the Cherokee war, and the seat of justice for huge Ninety Six District, comprising the later districts of Abbeville, Edgefield, Newberry, Laurens, Spartanburg, and Union; and

Whereas in the American Revolution, renown was added to Ninety Six as the scene of two outstanding military events, and the village was also a focal point of violent patriot-Tory strife which rent the up country with bitterness, destruction, and sorrow through the war years; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that historical sites in South Carolina should be preserved reverently as evidence of our way of life in the past, and should be passed on to posterity with a distinct feeling of pride in the great advancement and achievements of our State; and

Whereas the general assembly desires that an investigation be made with a view to restoring the town and Star Fort and such other historical ruins as may be practical to something of their former likenesses and preserving them as historical shrines by erecting suitable markers thereon and by providing for adequate protection to insure their preservation for the future; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that such investigation should include a conference with the present owners of the site with a view toward the acquisition and restoration of the fort; and

Whereas funds may be raised from the sale of a commemorative issue of half dollars, all of which issue would be purchased from the U.S. Government by the Greenwood County Historical Society as a means of financing such acquisition and restoration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That Congress be memorialized to request the U.S. Treasury Department to have minted a sufficient number of half dollars commemorating Old Ninety Six Star Fort and that the special issue be sold to the Greenwood County Historical Society to be used for the purpose of acquisition and restoration of Old Ninety Six Star Fort; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the clerk of the U.S. Senate, the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each member of the South Carolina congressional delegation.

RESOLUTION OF RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE OF CITY COURT OF BUFFALO, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the resolutions committee of the city court of the city of Buffalo, N.Y.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE OF THE CITY COURT OF BUFFALO, BUFFALO, N.Y.

At the annual observance commemorating the adoption of the Polish Constitution of the 3d of May, held at Dom Polski Hall, 1081 Broadway, in the city of Buffalo, N.Y., on May 8, 1960, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the year 1960 marks the 169th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, which documented for all time the respect of the Polish people for the dignity of the individual and their lofty aspirations for freedom; and

"Whereas today the desire of all people, regardless of color or national origin, the world over, is to breath the air of freedom and to possess the right to decide for themselves a government of their liking which shall conduct their internal affairs; and

"Whereas a summit meeting is scheduled between our President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Premier Nikita Khrushchev, commencing May 16, 1960, and which will be attended by the leaders of the Western Powers; and

"Whereas we feel that a lack of a positive and affirmative position on the part of our American State Department and support for the retention of Poland's western boundaries at the Oder and Niese Rivers places the people of Poland in the position of reliance upon the Soviet bloc as the sole guarantor of its western boundaries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That as Americans dedicated to the cause of freedom for all nations, we feel dutybound in the name of international justice and morality to appeal to our State Department to be firm in the forthcoming summit meeting of world powers in order to preserve world peace; and be it further

"Resolved, That we appeal to the State Department for a declaration that the U.S. Government is in favor of retention of Poland's boundaries at the Oder and Niese Rivers; and be it further

"Resolved, That we commend our great President Dwight D. Eisenhower on his actions, personally undertaken by him, to resolve many of the crises that have arisen on the international forum, for his dedication to the cause of a just world peace, for his efforts to create good will for the United States throughout the world; and be it further

"Resolved, That we Americans who are of Polish ancestry, assembled at this observance, pledge our allegiance and our loyalty to our great and beloved country, and that we voice these appeals in regard to the land of our forefathers, Poland, as good Americans, reflecting the opinion of our fellow Americans who believe in the dignity of man; that Poland, historically our ally at all times of our country's need, should be afforded better treatment in view of the great sacrifice made by her people; and be it finally

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Secretary of State Christian A. Herter, our New York State Senators, Hon. Jacob Javits and Hon. Kenneth Keating, and our Representative in Congress, Hon. Thaddeus Dulski."

MICHAEL E. ZIMMER.
JOHN F. WOWOH.
WALTER J. LOHR.
ROSE BIEDRON.
DR. BOLLDAN F. POWLOWICZ.

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, YONKERS, N.Y.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I want to call attention this morning to a resolution of the board of education of Yonkers, N.Y., concerning the excise tax on general telephone service. The resolution provides for the levying of this tax at the State level for educational purposes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas on April 8, 1960, Governor Rockefeller signed into law chapter 418 of the Laws of 1960; and

Whereas this chapter authorizes the imposition of a tax for school purposes on general telephone services on a countywide basis; and

Whereas additional funds are urgently needed by the board of education of the city of Yonkers to provide more adequately for the educational program in the public schools, and

Whereas the city of Yonkers is presently within $10,326.14 of its constitutional tax limit of 2 percent, and is thereby restricted in providing additional funds for the educational program, and

Whereas the board of education of the city of Yonkers, in order to serve more adequately the educational needs of the more than 25,300 pupils enrolled in the Yonkers public schools, wishes to utilize the revenues from this source beginning September 1, 1960, in the event that the Federal Government does not reimpose this tax: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of education of the city of Yonkers, pursuant to chapter 418 of the Laws of 1960, hereby requests the imposition of a local tax for school purposes on general telephone services as specified in article 24 of the tax law, a public hearing having been held on the imposition of said tax on the 5th day of May 1960; and be it further

Resolved, That the said board of education hereby requests that the said tax become effective during the calendar year 1960; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be filed with the commissioner of education of the State of New York, the mayor, the city manager, the members of the common council, the comptroller and city clerk of the city of Yonkers, the county clerk of Westchester County, the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING, the Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS, and the Honorable ROBERT R. BARRY.

Resolution sponsored by:

ANITA F. WOLFE,
Member, Board of Education.

Recommended by:

STANLEY S. WYNSTRA,
Superintendent of Schools.

RESOLUTION OF DISTRICT 500, ROTARY INTERNATIONAL

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, district 500 of the Rotary International has forwarded to me a resolution adopted unanimously by the Rotary District 500 Conference in support of the establishment of an International Center at the University of Hawaii. Richard E. Mawson, district governor, requested that I bring the resolution to the attention of the Members of the Senate. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE ROTARY DISTRICT 500 CONFERENCE TO SUPPORT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INTERNATIONAL CENTER AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

Whereas Hawaii has had a long history of interracial harmony, cooperation, and friendship among those who live here; and

Whereas Hawaii possesses outstanding resources to bridge the gap between the East and the West; and

Whereas thousands of foreign visitors from all over the world who have been in Hawaii have already been highly impressed by Hawaii, its governmental services, its technological know-how, its cultures, heritage, and its spirit of aloha: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That district 500, Rotary International, through its conference, assembled on the Island of Maui, April 22–23, 1960, go on record as favoring the establishment of an International Center at the University of Hawaii for the interchange of cultural and technical ideas between the East and the West; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the U.S. congressional sponsors of the bill for the establishment of such a center, to the U.S. Secretary of State, to the Governor of the State of Hawaii, and to the president of the University of Hawaii; and be it further

Resolved, That the district governor of Rotary district 500, Rotary International, be empowered to give this resolution and the accompanying conference action the widest possible publicity.

K. C. LEEBRICK,
Resolutions Committee Chairman.
E. MARION SEXTON,
Conference Secretary.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1454. A bill for the relief of Keitha L. Baker (Rept. No. 1375);

S. 2113. A bill for the relief of George K. Caldwell (Rept. No. 1376);

H.R. 1600. An act for the relief of Francis M. Haischer (Rept. No. 1377);

H.R. 3107. An act for the relief of Richard L. Nuth (Rept. No. 1378);

H.R. 7036. An act for the relief of William J. Barbiero (Rept. No. 1379);

H.R. 8217. An act for the relief of Orville J. Henke (Rept. No. 1380);

H.R. 8806. An act for the relief of the Philadelphia General Hospital (Rept. No. 1381);

H.R. 9470. An act for the relief of E. W. Cornett, Sr., and E. W. Cornett, Jr. (Rept. No. 1382);

H.R. 9752. An act for the relief of K. J. McIver (Rept. No. 1383); and

H.R. 10947. An act for the relief of Aladar Szoboszlay (Rept. No. 1384).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 817. A bill for the relief of Freda Feller (Rept. No. 1386); and

H.R. 6081. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Emery C. Jones (Rept. No. 1385).

PROTECTION OF CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original bill (S. 3560) to amend section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to further protect the internal security of the United States by providing penalties for malicious damage to certain communications facilities, and submitted a report (No. 1387) thereon; which bill was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 3558. A bill to authorize and direct the transfer of certain Federal property to the Government of American Samoa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Hawaii when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3559. A bill to amend section 201 of the act of September 21, 1959 (73 Stat. 610), to provide for the nutritional enrichment of rice distributed under certain programs; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3560. A bill to amend section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to further protect the internal security of the United States by providing penalties for malicious damage to certain communications facilities; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to above bill when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S.J. Res. 193. Joint resolution to authorize the construction of a hotel and related facilities in Mount Rainier National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S.J. Res. 194. Joint resolution to authorize the use of surplus grain by the States for emergency use in the feeding of resident game birds and other wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO GOVERNMENT OF AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize and direct the transfer of certain Federal property to the Government of American Samoa. The purpose of the bill is to transfer to Samoa land, buildings, and equipment held by the U.S. Navy in Samoa prior to 1951, when the Navy's responsibility for the administration of Samoa ended. Since that time this property has actually been used by the Government of American Samoa.

The property involved consists of some 215 acres of land, plus the buildings and docks on the land. This proposed legislation is required to transfer title, since existing law does not permit such transfer without reimbursement.

Since the property has not been used or needed by the United States for 9 years, and since it is essential to the conduct of the Government of American Samoa, I urge passage of the bill. Such action is recommended by the Department of the Interior and not objected to by the Bureau of the Budget.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3558) to authorize and direct the transfer of certain Federal property to the Government of American Samoa, introduced by Mr. LONG, of Hawaii, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

NUTRITIONAL ENRICHMENT OF CERTAIN RICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, last year the Congress enacted legislation providing for the enrichment of cornmeal, corn grits, and flour so as to meet the regulations promulgated under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. These food commodities, which are distributed to school lunch cafeterias over the entire Nation, have contributed much to the welfare and well-being of the Nation's schoolchildren. Before last year these foods were not enriched before they were sent to the schools. The legislation last year has very capably caused these foods to meet minimum standards before they reached the children. However, rice, one of the very basic food commodities in practically every State, was not included.

Practically every State has laws requiring the enrichment of rice but the Federal Government has, since the inception of the School Lunch Act, distributed unenriched rice to the schoolchildren.

I introduce, for appropriate reference, proposed legislation which would provide for the nutritional enrichment of rice distributed by the Federal Government. The cost will be very small compared to the value received. I hope the Senate will see fit to pass this proposal at an early date.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3559) to amend section 201 of the act of September 21, 1959 (73 Stat. 610), to provide for the nutritional enrichment of rice distributed under certain programs, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES IN MOUNT RAINIER NATIONAL PARK

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished senior colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the construction of a hotel and related facilities in Mount Rainier National Park jointly by the Federal Government, the State of Washington, and philanthropic interests.

At the outset, I wish to point out that there have been overnight accommodations inside Mount Rainier National Park since 1884. But present facilities are in an advanced state of deterioration and will be abandoned soon.

The National Park Service, in its mission 66 program, has determined that all future overnight accommodations be located at the lower elevations of the park, just inside or just outside the park boundaries.

The Senators from Washington and hundreds of organizations and individuals who testified before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on this question feel that to abandon overnight facilities in the heart of the park is detrimental to the park, to the region, and to hundreds of thousands of Americans who have come from all parts of the United States to vacation there.

At the request of the Senators from Washington, the National Park Service and Jackson Hole Preserve, Inc., the Rockefeller family's philanthropical organization which has made substantial investments in our Nation's national parks, undertook studies of replacement facilities.

The Park Service study concluded only that an overnight facility in the heart of the park could not be operated at a break-even point at reasonable rates if interest and depreciation on the initial investment are taken into consideration.

The Jackson Hole Preserve, Inc., study substantiated this finding but—very importantly—reached these additional conclusions:

First. Existing accommodations inside and outside the park are inadequate to tourist needs.

Second. If new and more adequate hotel accommodations are provided, tour agencies could book many more people into the park.

Third. The fullest enjoyment of this scenic area can best be accomplished by providing a variety of use facilities, including a hotel with comfortable, first-class accommodations.

Fourth. The most spectacular displays of beauty within the park occur during the early morning and late evening hours, and can be enjoyed only by those who stay overnight in the park.

Fifth. The most desirable site for such a hotel is in the Paradise area, where existing deteriorating facilities are about to be abandoned.

Sixth. The lower level accommodations suggested in the mission 66 report would have little appeal to the visitor.

Seventh. An adequate hotel and related facilities could be constructed at a cost of $6,878,000.

Eighth. Such a hotel could produce an operating profit, at reasonable rates, sufficient to maintain the property, provide for necessary replacements of furniture, furnishings, and equipment, but would produce little or nothing to meet repayment of the investment in fixed assets or interest thereon.

Mr. President, our joint resolution provides for a cooperative venture in Mount Rainier National Park. It specifies that the Federal share of the hotel and related facilities shall not exceed 50 percent. The balance is to come from the State of Washington and from philanthropical funds which may be committed to this worthwhile purpose.

Already the Governor of the State of Washington, the Honorable Albert D. Rosellini, has indicated his desire to participate in such a joint venture. The attorney general of the State of Washington, the Honorable John O'Connell, has rendered a legal opinion stating that the State legislature may authorize and appropriate funds for such a purpose.

Ownership of the facility, of course, would be vested in the United States, and operation would be in accordance with well-established National Park Service policies and regulations.

This is admittedly a new approach to fuller development of our national parks for the benefit of all our people. We urge its adoption for two purposes: first, to get on with a necessary job; and, second, to serve as a model which may have application elsewhere in our Nation in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 193) to authorize the construction of a hotel and related facilities in Mount Rainier National Park, introduced by Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the national parks have been established to provide for the enjoyment and inspiration of the American people; and

Whereas Mount Rainier National Park is one of our Nation's most scenic attractions, visited by more than one million persons annually; and

Whereas there have been overnight accommodations inside the park since 1884; and

Whereas existing overnight accommodations inside the park are in an advanced state of deterioration and due soon to be abandoned; and

Whereas the National Park Service has determined that replacement facilities in Mount Rainier National Park cannot be operated on a profitable basis if interest and depreciation on the initial investment are taken into consideration; and

Whereas the National Park Service, in its Mission 66 plan, envisages moving all overnight accommodations to lower elevations outside the park or just inside the park boundaries; and

Whereas the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has conducted hearings both in Washington, D.C., and in Washington State which establish the desire of a genuine cross section of individuals and groups for continued overnight accommodations inside the park; and

Whereas an independent study of the problem has been made by Jackson Hole Preserve, Inc., which has issued a Report on Survey of Need for and Economic Feasibility of Hotel Facilities in Mount Rainier National Park; and

Whereas said report finds existing accommodations inside and adjacent to the park inadequate to tourist needs; and

Whereas said report finds that the fullest enjoyment of this scenic area by the public can best be accomplished by providing a variety of use facilities, one of which should be a hotel with comfortable, first-class accommodations; and

Whereas said report finds that the most spectacular displays of beauty within Mount Rainier National Park occur during the early morning and late evening hours and can be enjoyed only by those who stay overnight in the park; and

Whereas said report finds that if new and more adequate hotel accommodations than now exist were provided in the park, tour agencies could readily book many more people in the park; and

Whereas said report finds the most desirable site for such hotel to be in the Paradise area, and that the lower level locations suggested for overnight accommodations in the Mission 66 report would have little appeal to the visitor; and

Whereas said report finds there is genuine need for hotel accommodations and recommends a sizable hotel of from 250 to 300 rooms with related facilities, integrated with day-use facilities at the same general location, with all operations controlled by one concessionnaire; and

Whereas such hotel would cost an estimated $6,878,000; and

Whereas such hotel could operate most successfully, economically, during a season of 90 days in the summer, with potential for future winter operation; and

Whereas said report concludes that the operation of a 250-room hotel in the Paradise Valley area will produce an operating profit sufficient adequately to maintain the property, provide for necessary replacements of furniture, furnishings and equipment, but will produce virtually nothing to meet repayment of the investment in fixed assets or interest thereon; and

Whereas no private or public body has indicated a willingness to undertake the necessary capital investment unilaterally but various elected officials of the State of Washington, including the Governor have indicated a willingness to consider such State's participation in a joint undertaking; and

Whereas it is evident that the much-needed facilities will not be built inside the park unless the necessary capital is provided by a source or sources which do not require repayment of the capital investment; and

Whereas it is possible that the necessary capital investment could be acquired in part each from a number of sources, public and private: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, subject to the provisions of section 2 of this joint resolution, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, in the Paradise area of Mount Rainier National Park, a hotel and other related facilities for the care and accommodation of visitors to the park.

SEC. 2. (a) The cost of constructing the building and related facilities authorized by the first section of this joint resolution shall be paid for one-half by the United States and one-half by donated funds. The Secretary of the Interior may take action with respect to the construction authorized by the first section of this joint resolution when commitments satisfactory to him have been made to assure that donated funds are available for purposes of paying one-half of the cost of such construction.

(b) Any hotel and related facilities constructed pursuant to the first section of this joint resolution shall be constructed substantially in accordance with the standards set forth in the report made by the Jackson Hole Preserve, Incorporated, referred to as the Report on Survey of Need for and Economic Feasibility of Hotel Facilities in Mount Rainier National Park. All right, title and interest in any such hotel and facilities shall be vested exclusively in the United States.

SEC. 3. The National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized (1) to enter into a contract, consistent with the laws relating to the National Park Service and the established practices and regulations of such Service, with one or more concessionaires to operate any hotel and related facilities constructed pursuant to this joint resolution in accordance with such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the National Park Service; and (2) to accept donations or commitments from public or private sources and to expend such donations for the purposes of this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. Any hotel and other related facilities constructed pursuant to this joint resolution shall be administered by the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, in accordance with the provisions of this joint resolution and the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535).

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. JACKSON] concerning our joint resolution to authorize the construction of a hotel and related facilities in Mount Rainier National Park.

Mr. President, more than 1 million tourists a year are now visiting Mount Rainier National Park. This is considerably in excess of the projected estimates of visitors under the mission 66 program. These visitors deserve an opportunity to enjoy the park to the fullest, from the best vantage point, and with the minimum of inconvenience. Only a hotel facility in the heart of the park will make this possible.

My colleague has explained how the Jackson Hole Preserve, Inc., study shows that Mount Rainier can be enjoyed fully only during the early morning and the late evening hours, and because of distances can be so enjoyed only by those who stay overnight inside the park.

This fact has been recognized since 1884 when the first overnight facilities went into the park. I am convinced, and my conviction is supported by substantial testimony before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, that we must continue to provide overnight lodging in the heart of the park if its function is to be fully and properly executed.

We accept the findings of both the Park Service and the Jackson Hole studies that such accommodations cannot be operated at reasonable rates except at a loss, if interest and depreciation on the initial investment are taken into consideration. What we are attempting to do is to capitalize on the avowed interest of the State of Washington, expressed by the Honorable Albert D. Rosellini, in financial cooperation which will ease the impact on the Federal Government of providing a necessary public service. Our resolution also opens the door for contributions, for philanthropic individuals or organizations to participate, also.

Mr. President, I consider this a sound approach to a difficult problem. I urge its acceptance by the Congress, for I believe that thousands upon thousands of Americans in every State in the Union will reap the benefits of this proposed legislation for years and years ahead.

STATE USE OF SURPLUS GRAIN FOR EMERGENCY FEEDING OF RESIDENT GAME BIRDS AND OTHER WILDLIFE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of the Interior, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the use of surplus grain by the States for emergency use in the feeding of resident game birds and other wildlife, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary of the Interior, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 194) to authorize the use of surplus grain by the States for emergency use in the feeding of resident game birds and other wildlife, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., May 12, 1960.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith is a draft of a proposed joint resolution to authorize the use of surplus grain by the States for emergency use in the feeding of resident game birds and other wildlife, and for other purposes.

We recommend that this proposal be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and that it be enacted.

This proposed legislation is designed to provide a means whereby the States would be enabled to use surplus grain to provide feed to wildlife that is threatened by starvation. By the terms of this proposal, upon a finding by the Secretary of the Interior that any area of the United States is threatened with serious damage or loss to wildlife from starvation, the particular State involved would be authorized to request from the Commodity Credit Corporation grain acquired by that Corporation through price support operations. The State would be required to pay the cost of transportation and packaging of the grain.

We have become increasingly aware in recent years of the interest of certain State fish and game agencies and other local

organizations in providing a method whereby surplus grain could be used to feed resident game birds and other wildlife that at certain times of the year may be in danger of starvation as a result of adverse weather conditions. These State agencies are particularly concerned with the welfare of resident game in time of emergencies, such as severe ice and snow conditions, or drought. They wish to provide supplemental food when natural food is considered to be in short supply. This proposal contains a safeguard which would require the Secretary of the Interior to determine that conditions exist which would warrant this kind of emergency feeding. While our experience has been that there are relatively few emergency situations where local or regional game populations are in jeopardy of starvation, we believe that standby authority of this kind may prove valuable in certain circumstances. We believe the mechanics of any grain feeding program of this kind, once a decision has been reached that such a program is called for, should be one for the particular State fish and game department to work out with the assistance of the Commodity Credit Corporation along procedural lines indicated in this proposal.

While no precise estimate can be given concerning the value of the grain that may be required to carry out the purposes of this proposal, we believe it is unlikely that the value of the grain that may be required for an average year would exceed $100,000.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO COMMUNITY ANTENNA SYSTEMS—AMENDMENT

Mr. ALLOTT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2653) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish jurisdiction in the Federal Communications Commission over community antenna systems, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INDIAN LONG-TERM LEASING ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on March 14, 1960, I introduced for myself and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] Senate bill 3198, to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act. The distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] wishes to be associated with the proposed legislation.

I am delighted to have the Senator join with us on this bill and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that when S. 3198 is next printed the name of the senior Senator from Nevada may be included as a cosponsor of it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to announce that public hearings have been scheduled on the following nominations, for 10:30 a.m., Tuesday, May 24, 1960, in room 2228, New Senate Office Building:

Oren R. Lewis, of Virginia, to be U.S. district judge, eastern district of Virginia, vice Sterling Hutcheson, retired; and

Roy L. Stephenson, of Iowa, to be U.S. district judge, southern district of Iowa, vice Edwin R. Hicklin, retired.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in these nominations may make such representations as are pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

Letter addressed to Mr. Robert Lovett, New York, N.Y., written by Senator MUNDT, and reply thereto, relating to testimony of Mr. Lovett, before the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery of the U.S. Senate; and article entitled "How To Make a Shoe Fit Any Foot," written by Arthur Krock, published in the New York Times of April 14, 1960.

THE TRAGEDY AT PARIS—INTERPRETATIONS BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Walter Lippmann thinks. Thin are the ranks of those who do. But Walter Lippmann has other strengths besides—a rare combination of courage which gives him a fierce independence, and integrity which impels him to state the facts as he sees them, regardless of how unpleasant, unpopular, or unpolitic they may be. These attributes have made him the giant of American journalism.

Walter Lippmann's interpretations of the reasons for the tragedy at Paris are, characteristically, quite different from the commonplace excuses now being widely circulated in the press. But when historians search for the hard truth concerning the debacle at the summit meeting in Paris, they are more likely to find it in two articles he has written during the past week, than in all the rest of the explanations offered from all other sources.

I ask unanimous consent that these two articles, published in the Washington Post on May 12, 1960, and May 17, 1960, may be printed in proper sequence at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 12, 1960]

THE SPY BUSINESS

(By Walter Lippmann)

In the whirl of incidents following the capture of the spy plane the administration has ventured, perhaps the right word for it would be stumbled, into an untenable policy which is entirely unprecedented in international affairs. Our position now seems to be that because it is so difficult to collect information inside the Soviet Union, it will henceforth be our avowed policy to fly over Soviet territory, using the territory of our allies as bases.

Although the intention here is to be candid and honest and also to make the best of a piece of very bad luck, the new policy—which seems to have been improvised between Saturday and Monday—is quite unworkable.

To avow that we intend to violate Soviet sovereignty is to put everybody on the spot. It makes it impossible for the Soviet Government to play down this particular incident because now it is challenged openly in the face of the whole world. It is compelled to react because no nation can remain passive when it is the avowed policy of another nation to intrude upon its territory. The avowal of such a policy is an open invitation to the Soviet Government to take the case to the United Nations, where our best friends will be grievously embarrassed. The avowal is also a challenge to the Soviet Union to put pressure on Pakistan, Turkey, Norway, Japan, and any other country which has usable bases. Our allies are put on the spot because they must either violate international law or disavow the United States.

Because the challenge has been made openly, it is almost impossible to deal with this particular incident by quiet diplomacy.

The reader will, I hope, have noticed that my criticism is that we have made these overflights in avowed policy. What is unprecedented about the avowal is not the spying as such but the claim that spying, when we do it, should be accepted by the world as righteous. This is an amateurish and naive view of the nature of spying.

Spying between nations is, of course, the universal practice. Everybody does it as best he can. But it is illegal in all countries, and the spy if caught is subject to the severest punishment. When the spying involves intrusion across frontiers by military aircraft, it is also against international law. Because spying is illegal, its methods are often immoral and criminal. Its methods include bribery, blackmail, perjury, forgery, murder, and suicide.

The spy business cannot be conducted without illegal, immoral, and criminal activities. But all great powers are engaged in the spy business, and as long as the world is as warlike as it has been in all recorded history there is no way of doing without spying.

All the powers know this and all have accepted the situation as one of the hard facts of life. Around this situation there has developed over many generations a code of behavior. The spying is never avowed and therefore the Government never acknowledges responsibility for its own clandestine activities. If its agent is caught, the agent is expected to kill himself. In any event, he is abandoned to the mercies of the government that he has spied upon.

The spying is never admitted. If it can be covered successfully by a lie, the lie is told.

All this is not a pretty business, and there is no way of prettifying it or transforming it into something highly moral and wonderful. The cardinal rule, which makes spying tolerable in international relations, is that it is never avowed. For that reason it is never defended, and therefore the aggrieved country makes only as much of a fuss about a particular incident as it can make or as it chooses to make.

We should have abided by that rule. When Mr. K. made his first announcement about the plane, no lies should have been told. The administration should have said that it was investigating the charge and would then take suitable action. We should then have maintained a cool silence.

This would have left us, of course, with the unpleasant fact that our spy plane had been caught. What really compounded our trouble, and was such a humiliation to us, is that before we knew how much Mr. K. knew we published the official lie about its being a weather plane. Then, finding ourselves trapped in this blatant and gratuitous lie, we have tried to extricate ourselves by rushing into the declaration of a new and unprecedented policy.

[From the Washington Post, May 17, 1960]

THE U–2 IN PARIS

(By Walter Lippmann)

As of Monday afternoon, eastern time, there is only the faintest chance that the summit meeting will not break up. It is certain that the President will not go to Russia, the invitation having been withdrawn. Thus, the attempt to arrive at a truce in the cold war, and to relax the tensions has, unless there is a diplomatic miracle, ended in a tragic fiasco.

The issue on which the conference has been disrupted is the flight of the U–2, or more precisely the position taken by the President and his administration. We must remember that when the plane was captured, Mr. Khrushchev opened the door to the President for a diplomatic exit from his quandary: He did not believe, said Mr. K., that Mr. Eisenhower was responsible for ordering the flight.

Undoubtedly Mr. K. knew that Mr. Eisenhower must have authorized the general plan of the flights but he preferred to let the President say what in fact was a sorry kind of truth, that he did not authorize this particular flight. The diplomatic answer would have been to say nothing at the time or at the most to promise an adequate investigation of the whole affair. Instead, Mr. Eisenhower replied that he was responsible, that such flights were necessary, and then he let the world think even if he did not say so in exact words that the flights would continue. This locked the door which Mr. Khrushchev had opened. It transformed the embarrassment of being caught in a spying operation into a direct challenge to the sovereignty of the Soviet Union.

This avowal, this refusal to use the convention of diplomacy was a fatal mistake. For it made it impossible for Mr. Khrushchev to bypass the affair. Had he done that, he would have been in a position of acknowledging to the world, to the Soviet people, to his critics within the Soviet Union, and to his Communist allies, that he had surrendered to the United States the right to violate Soviet territory. No statesman can live in any country after making such an admission.

The news from Paris on Monday shows that Mr. Eisenhower had already realized that his making an avowed policy of the flights was a crucial mistake which had to be corrected. On Saturday there was, it appears, a briefing of the correspondents to tell them that we had never meant to say that the flights would continue. On Sunday in a broadcast in this country Mr. George V. Allen said the same thing. And on Monday the President told Mr. Khrushchev that the flights over Russia have been suspended "and are not to be resumed." A week ago this might have sufficed to quiet down the affair.

The withdrawal was, however, late, and it may prove to have been too little. For during the past week the flight and the way it was handled have given the Soviet Government a rich opportunity to weaken the ring of America's allies around Russia. Those who say that Mr. K. has seized upon the opportunity solely in order to make propaganda have not, I think, realized the gravity of the disaster which has befallen us. For the Soviet Union there is in this much more than propaganda. There is an instrument for disturbing if not disrupting the encircling alliance.

It would be wishful thinking to suppose that the Soviet Government will not seize this opportunity to push countries like Norway, Iran, Pakistan, Turkey, and Japan into pledges and into measures which in some considerable degree neutralize them as American airbases. Morally and legally these allies of ours are defenseless against these Soviet demands.

The Soviet Government is at least as interested in neutralizing our allies around her borders as she is in neutralizing West Berlin. We dare not hope that the Soviet Government will not make the most of the opportunity which has so unexpectedly and so unnecessarily been opened up to her.

Before the affair of the plane there had been, as Mr. Reston wrote on Monday from Paris, a strong indication that Mr. Khrushchev was very uneasy about the prospects of the summit meeting. I myself was one of those who talked to his personal emissary, Mr. Zhukov, when he came to Washington in April. The burden of Mr. Zhukov's complaint was that about March 15 American policy had suddenly hardened against a negotiation about the status of West Berlin, and that this was a reversal of the understanding given to Mr. K. by the President at Camp David.

Almost certainly, therefore, the affair of the plane offered Mr. K. an opportunity to make a diplomatic gain against the small encircling allies from Norway to Japan. If he was stymied in Berlin, he had the chance to recoup elsewhere. We have not heard the last of the troubles of the encircling allies.

There is not much comfort for us in this. For our own blunders provided Mr. K. with his opportunity.

At this writing it is still conceivable that a way will be found to carry on in Paris. Let us hope so.

ALA LOTO ALOFA—THE ROAD OF THE LOVING HEART

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in Samoa, one of the far-off south sea islands, any native or traveler may read on a tablet on a mountainside this inscription:

Remembering the great love
Of His Highness Tusitala
And his great love
When we were in prison
And sore distressed,
We have prepared him an enduring present—
This road, which we have dug forever.

Tusitala in the Samoan tongue means "teller of tales."

Years ago a man came from Scotland, weary, sick, and distressed, hoping that in the south sea islands he might find health or a quiet place to die. On the island of Samoa he bought 400 acres on a mountain to which he gave the name of Vailima, meaning "five rivers." There he built a house, where his mother came from old Scotland to live with him and his wife, and where he welcomed the natives in most friendly hospitality. The natives also came in great numbers to him for counsel, and he became their hero and friend.

One time he heard of chiefs who had been imprisoned unjustly, and visited them, bringing them comfort and cheer. As he was good and kind to all, the natives wished to thank him. They built for him a road from the harbor up to his home on the side of Mount Vaea, laboring for long days in the torrid heat of that land. When at last it was finished they presented it to him. He called it Ala Loto Alofa, or "the road of the loving heart."

Not long after, Tusitala, the "teller of tales," their white chief, died.

At his funeral one chief said, "The day is no longer than his kindness." Then the chiefs carried him to the top of the hill that he had loved so well, and kneeling down with bared heads and uplifted faces they softly said, "We place him here that he may be forever in the sunlight."

Who was this man for whom "the road of the loving heart" was made? He was Robert Louis Stevenson. His verses, gathered together in his "Child's Garden of Verses," are loved by all. Upon the monument at the end of "the road of the loving heart" are carved in English these words, which he composed a dozen years before his death, December 3, 1894:

Under the wide and starry sky,
Dig the grave and let me lie;
Glad did I live and gladly die,
And I laid me down with a will.
This be the verse you grave for me;
Here he lies where he longed to be;
Home is the sailor, home from the sea,
And the hunter home from the hill.

ELIMINATION OF POTOMAC RIVER POLLUTION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the attainment of some sound, workable program to clean up the pollution of the Potomac River is essential to the millions of people living in the broad expanse of the Potomac River Valley. Pollution abatement is of particular concern to those residing in the Washington Metropolitan area, as this is the section primarily responsible for the pollution of the river, as well as that which would be primarily benefited by an effective pollution abatement program.

In 1957, a group of private citizens representing widely divergent interests and backgrounds, but with one common interest, the development of the Potomac River Basin in a manner best suited to serve the needs of the people affected, as well as the Nation as a whole, established a coordinating committee on the Potomac River Valley. In the months and years subsequent to the establishment of this committee, a thorough study of the Potomac has been made and the committee is now in the process of publishing a report on its findings, together with appropriate recommendations. This report reflects the time and money which the private citizens' committee members have expended in an effort to further the interests of those living in the Potomac Valley. It is my hope that appropriate governmental officials, State and local, as well as Federal, will give immediate attention to the coordinating committee's report in our efforts to determine a sound, realistic program to save the Potomac River.

Mr. President, in connection with my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD an outline of the coordinating committee's report,

entitled "Potomac Prospect," which is to be made public in its entirety in the near future.

There being no objection, the outline of the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVIEW OF "POTOMAC PROSPECT"

(A study and report with recommendations for action concerning water supply, water needs, pollution, flood moderation, recreational areas, and the preservation of the natural environment of the Potomac River waterways prepared by the Coordinating Committee on the Potomac River Valley)

The Potomac River rises in the Appalachian Mountains and flows for 383 miles in a northeasterly to easterly direction and then southeasterly to the Chesapeake Bay. Divided by nature into two distinct portions—a fast-flowing upper river, frequently narrow and rocky with precipitous tributaries, becomes a broad, sedate waterway as it meanders past Washington and gently laps the corn and tobacco fields of tidewater Virginia and Maryland—the Potomac River basin embraces over 14,500 square miles of land.

As American rivers go, the Potomac is relatively small. In comparison with western and midwestern rivers, it might be classed as merely a large tributary. But, considered in relation to the other rivers of the North Atlantic slope, it is second in size, exceeded only by the Susquehanna.

Throughout most of its length, the Potomac is open to the general public—the canoeist, the hiker, the angler, the hunter, the summer cottager, and the year-round homeowner. It is one of the few rivers not harnessed and hobbled to industrial use. It winds through pleasant valleys and hills steeped in the history of our country from the earliest days.

Capt. John Smith explored the tidal reaches of the Potomac up to Little Falls in 1608. Towering forests lined the banks, he reported. Perch, alewives, and black bass abounded in the crystal-clear depths. The fish about his boat were "lying so thicke with the heads above the water" that his men amused themselves by dipping them out.

Into the Potomac in 1634 sail the *Ark* and the *Dove*, bearing Leonard Calvert and his brother "with near 20 other gentlemen of very good fashion and 300 laboring men well provided in all things." Among the passengers was a Jesuit missionary, Father Andrew White, who called the Potomac "the sweetest and greatest river I have ever seene."

But 300 years have passed, and the Potomac has suffered at the hands of man—from siltation as erosion from farm and pasture swept away topsoil and subsoil, from industrial and mine wastes, from sewage of urban populations.

Today the Potomac, as it flows past Washington, is an open cesspool. In places the river bottom is covered with solid sewage 10 feet deep. As a District health officer recently described it: "It is sick unto death, for it carries, as it courses along, all the man-made filth that he is able to bestow * * * a sickly portrait of a noble river." Enough raw and partially treated sewage is dumped into the Potomac and its tributaries each year to fill 150 Pentagon buildings.

Visitors to Washington, the capital of the world, might reasonably expect to find a recreational mecca with fine bathing beaches, neat marinas, and wholesome fishing grounds. They find instead a natural sewage lagoon.

Visitors to European capitals, particularly in Scandinavia, are impressed by the contrast between the present condition of the Potomac and the dramatic development of other waterfront capitals, where the cleanliness of the water is a matter of national pride and the waterfront regarded as a showcase.

The Potomac could be Washington's greatest recreational asset, as valuable as Seattle's Lake Washington or Miami's gold coast. Instead it gets dirtier with each passing day. But though the river is sick, the illness is not hopeless. The causes of the malady are known. With the right approach, a great and sweet Potomac can be found again. The first and most essential measure is an end to pollution.

Piecemeal solutions have been tried in the past, but the solutions have never caught up with the growing problem. The asset of a clean stream would be shared by all. The problem of a dirty stream is shared by all. The solution must be shared by all.

The Coordinating Committee on the Potomac River Valley, composed of private citizens representing widely divergent interests and backgrounds, has just completed a 3-year study of the problem Potomac. Members of this civic-minded group, working without remuneration, interviewed 50 experts in related fields and logged thousands of man-hours in research and study before issuing their report, "Potomac Prospect."

Committee members share one common bond: Guiding the development of the Potomac River basin in a fashion best suited to serve the needs of those directly affected and the needs of our Nation as a whole.

The committee's plan is essentially a "clean river plan." It is based on the premise that the Potomac, the Patuxent, and all their tributaries, into the most remote headwaters, must be made clean and kept clean. The plan would achieve five objectives:

1. The gradual elimination of all pollution—and at no additional net cost per capita for sewage treatment than present costs for the general standard of 80 percent effectiveness.

2. The conservation of water—our most vital natural resource.

3. An adequate and safe supply of water without the necessity for any dams and at any increase per capita over present costs.

4. The preservation of large areas of our natural environment.

5. Waterways throughout the basin safe for swimming, all forms of water sports, waterfowl, and fish life.

The elimination of pollution would be accomplished progressively over a period of 40 years by the attainment of the following four-point program:

1. No raw sewage from any source shall be discharged into the waterways of the Potomac or Patuxent basins after the year 1975.

2. All sewage treated by sewage plants in the Potomac or Patuxent basins shall be given complete treatment (primary, secondary, and chlorination of the effluent) by methods which will remove at least 90 percent of all contamination by the year 1975, at least 95 percent by the year 1990, and 100 percent by the year 2000.

3. No industrial wastes or water used in industrial processes which contain any contamination shall be discharged into the waterways of the Potomac or Patuxent basins.

4. All farming, urban development, and timbering within the Potomac and Patuxent basins shall comply with modern soil conservation techniques and reforestation practices by the year 1970.

The above goals are politically realistic and economically feasible to attain. Achievement should be based on State legislation and municipal ordinances preceded and followed up by educational and promotional campaigns.

The committee is aware that while increased efficiency of present sewage treatment methods results in the reduction of contaminating elements in the effluent, it does not appreciably reduce the quantity of dissolved mineral salts. Up to the present, the volume of water needed to flush pollution past Washington has been adequate to provide a sufficient dilution of the mineral salts and to prevent the undue growth of algae in the upper estuary. But it is impossible to tell with certainty at just what point the natural flow of the river might be inadequate to provide the necessary dilution of these mineral salts.

Therefore, to assure proper dilution, the committee's plan provides for the possible construction of few impoundment reservoirs in the headwater areas which would provide a supplemental flow of water sufficient to assure adequate dilution. These dams would be built progressively, if and when the need for supplemental water for dilution purposes were definitely indicated.

The committee holds that by the year 2000 domestic sewage will be treated by evaporation-distillation techniques, such as are now being perfected for the economic distillation of fresh water from salt water, and that industrial wastes will be treated by this technique or some other effective method. This would result in a 100 percent pure sewage effluent—one that would contain no organic or inorganic materials—no bacterial, chemical or radioactive contamination. Hence, there no longer would be even the problem of adequate dilution. Actually, the addition of evaporation-distillation facilities to sewage treatment plants would have commenced well before the year 2000 under the committee's plan, and the requirement for water to dilute the mineral salts in the effluents from conventional sewage plants would have been steadily diminishing.

Once pollution is thus completely eliminated, there will be adequate water for all reasonable purposes without the necessity for constructing huge impoundments and destroying the natural environments of our waterways.

The quantity of water in the streams and rivers of the Potomac basin depends upon the amount of rainfall over the area. During the past 88 years, since accurate records have been kept, the average long-term precipitation has been more or less constant in amount, the average annual precipitation for the last 22 years being approximately equal to the average for the past 88 years.

This is reflected by the flow of the Potomac which shows that, for the past 65 years, during which accurate records have been kept, the flow has been relatively uniform, on a cyclic basis.

Thus, there is good evidence that a water crisis from progressively diminishing rainfall is not in prospect for the future. If the daily river flows of the Potomac, Patuxent and Occoquan equaled at all times their average daily flow of 7.5 billion gallons, such flows would be adequate to supply the requirements of the Potomac basin for all foreseeable time. But such is not the way of rivers. During drought conditions, the flow of the Potomac drops to less than a billion gallons per day in the Washington area.

At any of the above times, the water that would be needed by Metropolitan Washington in excess of the river's natural flow would be available in the upper estuary—75 billion gallons of it—as by such time, under the committee's plan, it would be virtually free of contamination. All that would be required would be an adaptation for pumping out the tidewater side of the diversion dam below Little Falls as well as for pumping the natural flow from the upriver side of the dam.

The solution advanced by the Corps of Engineers is to flush pollution past Washington. To assure water for this purpose in

progressively increasing quantities to be released in periods of low river flow, the corps proposes the impoundment of billions of gallons of supplemental water by means of a series of large dams and reservoirs above Washington.

For the record, the corps has no official plan as yet, as it is still in the throes of studying the problem. It commenced its latest study about 2 years ago and has received appropriations for it of nearly $1 million to date. Another half million has been requested for the corps to carry on and complete its study and to come up with official recommendations.

But from time to time representatives of the Corps of Engineers have strongly advocated the flushing theory and the building of huge dams and impoundments, at a cost of many millions. Their schemes are so unimaginative as to be unworthy of the atomic and space age.

Damming the Potomac would be an economic folly, a human tragedy. Damming the river would mean destroying the scenic Potomac Gorge above Great Falls. It would mean flooding thousands of acres of good farmland on the tributaries. It would mean inundating many miles of the historic C. & O. Canal and other areas rich in wildlife, rich in the diversified flora of mountain, piedmont, and coastal plain.

No dams are needed to convert tidewater Potomac at Washington into a mecca for aquatic enthusiasts. In the early 1920's bathers lolled on a sandy beach and swam in the tidal basin not far from where the Jefferson Memorial now stands.

Let the river be cleaned of pollution, and the Potomac, from its source to the Chesapeake, will extend an invitation surpassing anything to be found behind dams.

Frankly, it is incomprehensible how any enlightened citizen of our country can, in this day and age, contend that untreated sewage, contaminated sewage effluent, polluted industrial wastes, and the valuable topsoils of our farmlands should continue to be dumped or washed into the waterways of our Nation, especially in the historic and scenic river flowing through the very heart of the Nation's Capital City. As highly civilized and as wealthy as is this Nation, these practices are both barbaric and intolerable.

Only recently a U.S. Senator stated: "From the back porch of the White House one can see the Potomac River flowing only a few hundred yards away. It is one of our most famous, most scenic, most important rivers. It is in addition the most polluted river west of the Nile, one of the most neglected."

However, should the residents of the basin choose to live with polluted waterways as the Corps of Engineers' plan would have them do, then the coordinating committee offers as an alternative to the corps' plan a plan based upon a limited number of impoundments located exclusively in the headwater areas. Under such a plan an annual supplement of 144 billion gallons of water would be provided to meet the demand as of the year 2000 should there be a recurrence of the low record flows of 1930 at such time. This can be accomplished by 10 possible impoundments, all in the headwater areas.

The conclusion of the committee is that the costs of full treatment under its plan—the elimination of pollution—will be infinitely less than the costs of the dams. One hundred percent treatment has the merit of solving the problem. Flushing from dams would merely mitigate it, and poorly. Funds would be spent on a half-way measure, and the real problem would have been evaded.

The final comparison between the plans should be made on a dollar-and-cents basis. It shows dramatically that if this were the only criterion, the clean river plan would be the winner—way out in front.

The coordinating committee's clean river plan, when compared with the "dirty river plan" of the Corps of Engineers, will save taxpayers $165.6 million in costs to the year 2000 and $298.6 million if projected to the year 2100.

With all pollution eliminated and the waterways virtually pure, there would be water for all reasonable purposes for the residents of the Potomac basin—whatever their number might be—for all time to come.

The goal is clear—a clean river and a healthy land. The remedial measures at hand leave only the need for a will to act.

Copies of the coordinating committee's full report are available at room 709, Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D.C.

Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, chairman; Stanley N. Brown, Arthur B. Hanson, Rear Adm. Neill Phillips, U.S. Navy (retired), Anthony Wayne Smith, vice chairmen; Mrs. Andrew Parker, Treasurer; Charles J. Durham, secretary.

The officers and the following committee members constitute the executive committee: Elting Arnold, Washington I. Cleveland, Grant Conway, William J. Cox, William E. Davies, W. W. Rapley, Vice Adm. Ralph S. Riggs, U.S. Navy (retired), Waverly Taylor.

PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BRIDGES

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the senior Republican Member of the U.S. Senate—the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]—delivered an address on May 14, 1960, at the Kittery-Portsmouth Navy Yard which merits the attention of all Americans. It was the kind of address that is needed very much these days.

I say this because in it the senior Senator from New Hampshire put the accent where it should be put—he put the accent on the positive instead of putting it on the negative. For too long now there have been far too many utterances that put the accent on the negative when speaking of the status of the national defense of our country.

It was indeed refreshing to listen to a Senator, who knows what he is talking about from his service as past chairman and as ranking Republican on the Senate Appropriations Committee, and as the senior Republican member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and ranking Republican on the Senate Space Committee, speak in confident tones about the security of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH

(Address by U.S. Senator STYLES BRIDGES at the launching of the nuclear Polaris submarine, the *Abraham Lincoln*, Portsmouth, N.H., May 14, 1960)

As a U.S. Senator and a member of the Senate Committees on Armed Services, Space Sciences, Appropriations, and the Preparedness Subcommittee, I participated in the legislative program necessary in the development of this mighty weapon of defense. So, for me, as for the Navy, and especially for the shipbuilding men of the Portsmouth-Kittery Naval Shipyard, this is a day of fulfillment.

I refer deliberately to this great defense installation as the Portsmouth-Kittery Yard, because, as you know, we are privileged to have with us today my distinguished colleague, the Honorable MARGARET CHASE SMITH, senior U.S. Senator from the State of Maine. Senator SMITH and I enjoy a friendly rivalry as to whether this historic naval base belongs to New Hampshire or Maine. Today, at least, I would like to think of it as belonging to both—in recognition of the many significant contributions which Senator SMITH has made to the defense of our country. Indeed, she has been a good and stalwart friend to this yard.

The realization of the dual concept of a nuclear powered submarine armed with long-range missiles might very well be reckoned the outstanding naval achievement of our time. I know Senator SMITH agrees with me that this ceremony today is another tribute to the skill and craftsmanship of New England's shipbuilders.

The *Abraham Lincoln* represents many great technological advances. She is a far cry from the tiny L–8, which in 1914 started this shipyard in the field of submarine building. Many of the features of the *Abraham Lincoln* would have seemed like fantastic dreams to the men who sailed the L–8 nearly 50 years ago.

WILL CARRY LINCOLN'S NAME TO THE SEVEN SEAS

This great ship is named for a man who is known the world over as a humanitarian. Yet he had a duty to lead his Nation through its bloodiest war to preserve freedom and his country. He belongs to all men, and to the ages. This new submarine will carry his name to the seven seas. True to the name she bears, her mission is one of peace, not war.

THE CONCEPT OF PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH

Peace through strength is one of nature's immutable laws. The elephant, the mightiest animal in the jungle, is the most peaceful for the simple reason that no other animal dares attack him.

Even in plantlife, the weak flower or tree succumbs to insect or blight. The strong survives to grow in strength and beauty; to glorify God and man.

It is both strange and tragic that man, supposedly the most intelligent form of life, often ignores the lessons of nature.

The American Republic has learned the meaning of peace through strength by hard experience. We learned at Pearl Harbor and we got another lesson when the Communists invaded South Korea.

The *Abraham Lincoln* is evidence for the world to see, that we have learned and shall never forget: The key to lasting peace is overwhelming strength.

ONE OF GREATEST ADVANCEMENTS

This submarine is one of the most advanced machines ever built by man. Her nuclear powerplant makes her a real undersea craft, almost completely independent of surface operations. Her ability to move freely beneath the waters was demonstrated when our submarines sailed from the Pacific to the Atlantic under the polar icecap. With this ability, there is no place on the face of the earth that is beyond reach of her power. She will be constantly moving, and, submerged, she cannot be "zeroed in" by enemy missiles.

The Polaris missile system itself is a great advance in the development of weapons. Propelled by a solid fuel, they will be instantly ready, safe to handle, and quick to fire if they are ever needed.

The *Abraham Lincoln* has 16 missile launching tubes. A single salvo would launch greater destructive power than all the bombs dropped by both sides during World War II.

This ship was built by a nation that loves peace enough to build the strength to prevent war. Her primary purpose is to deter

the threatened aggression of dictators. The *Abraham Lincoln*, along with her sister ships, should help convince our potential enemies that our freedom is not to be trifled with.

THE RECORD OF SOVIET DISHONOR

We are living in a time of peril. The international Communist conspiracy directed from Moscow poses the threat of world domination by force.

By word and deed, they have proved their readiness to destroy freedom when and if they are able.

We are about to engage in summit conferences. Our President will sit at the bargaining table with other world leaders representing both East and West.

Our earnest desire is that differences will be resolved and peace assured. We hope that Khrushchev and his satellite leaders are similarly sincere. But, regardless of the immediate outcome of the conferences, we cannot forget that the Russians have violated practically every international agreement to which they have been party over a period of 30 years.

Now they want to talk disarmament. But let us at the onset resolve not to be disarmed by words.

If they agree to lay down one weapon, let us agree to lay down one weapon of similar capability, but only if the agreement calls for adequate inspection. Otherwise, we disarm at our peril, for we have no proof that they would honor the compact.

Until such time as disarmament can be carried out with foolproof inspection, our best insurance for peace is strength.

UNITED STATES NEEDS VARIETY FOR DEFENSE

We need balanced forces in order to keep the potential enemy off balance. With limited strategy and only a few types of weapons, our enemy could concentrate his energy and resources. We need a broad range of defense capability.

The *Abraham Lincoln* is further evidence that the United States will not be placed in the position of relying on one or even a few weapons. To do so would be fatal.

We need land-based mobile missiles. We need modern bombers and fighter planes. We need Polaris submarines. We need modern aircraft carriers and a capable and well-equipped Army and Marine Corps. Each contributes its competence and experience to our overall Defense Establishment.

Submarines are by nature creatures of cunning. They are hidden beneath the surface and can be scattered over the vast oceans of the world. It is no easy task to find a single submarine at sea. It's virtually impossible to find all of them.

THE FIFTH POLARIS SUB

When the *Abraham Lincoln* loads her Polaris missiles, she will be the fifth of her type to join this Nation's seagoing deterrent. Her 16 missiles—immediately ready for action—will bring the total of weapons of destruction around the nerve center of the enemy's homeland to 80. This will mean a total of 80 targets that an aggressor must be prepared to see destroyed if he should decide to attack. This number will steadily increase as additional sister ships are completed.

This is why this ship is so essential and why this work here in Portsmouth is so important to every citizen of the United States. My sincere congratulations to all of you who have played a part in the construction of this fine ship.

I wish success to those who are to man this ship as she moves through the seven seas in the performance of her assigned mission. The officers who will soon command this magnificent warship might bear in mind one of Lincoln's observations: "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it." With this guidance—still so meaningful after almost a century—for the men who man her, a new *Abraham Lincoln* can soon go forth on the seas to support the principles of freedom and liberty which this Nation holds so dear.

MINNESOTA HIGH SCHOOL RESIDENTIAL SEMINAR

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the Minnesota High School Residential Seminar on Latin America recently issued their final report on their discussion of the problems of Latin American countries and of the policies which the United States might usefully adopt with respect to these countries.

These students from the high schools of Minnesota should be commended for their interest in foreign policy, particularly in our relations with our Latin American neighbors, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINAL REPORT, MINNESOTA HIGH SCHOOL RESIDENTIAL SEMINAR ON LATIN AMERICA, APRIL 7, 8, AND 9, 1960

The members of the seminar have spent 2 days in stimulating discussion of problems of Latin American countries and of policies which the United States might usefully adopt with respect to them. The resolutions which follow express the general consensus of the group. They do not imply that complete agreement was reached; occasionally there were minority dissenting opinions.

The seminar was organized under the sponsorship of the Center for Continuation Study, University of Minnesota, and the Minnesota World Affairs Center, with the support of the Hill Family Foundation, St. Paul, and the Winton Fund, Minneapolis. The members wish to express their appreciation for the opportunity these organizations have given them to conduct their discussions under especially favorable conditions. The careful selection of participants, the able guidance of a distinguished faculty, and the efficient organization and congenial atmosphere of the conference, have all contributed to this.

I. THE PRESENT SITUATION

1. The policy of the United States with respect to Latin American problems must be considered in the light of the evolution of an American community of which this country is one member. The objectives of this community have been to assure peace by a hemispheric security system and to promote the development of free and prosperous societies in all American States. The attainment of these objectives is a matter of mutual interest and benefit for all Americans. It should be pursued as a common effort involving joint planning and cooperative programs. The United States, as well as every other American State, has a great deal to gain from the success of such efforts. Failure to secure the peace and prosperity of any part of the Americas would be potentially dangerous to us. In view of these community objectives it should be a matter of concern to the United States that the feeling of hemispheric solidarity which prevailed during and immediately after the Second World War has sensibly diminished during the past decade. This has been due to the fact that preoccupation of the United States with military and economic assistance programs and development programs designed to counter Communist expansion in Europe and Asia has not been matched by an equal attention to problems of development in the Latin American States. The people of these states have felt with some reason that problems of the American community deserve an equal emphasis in the policy of the United States.

II. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

2. Objectives: Stability in Latin American countries requires a closing of the gap which exists in most of them between classes—on the one hand a wealthy class of metropolitan entrepreneurs and semifeudal rural proprietors who control the economy and the Government, on the other hand a large class of uneducated and impoverished agricultural laborers and unskilled city workers. The development of a middle class is linked with (a) the expansion and diversification of economies and (b) the development of education, communications, and social services. We must therefore consider what steps the United States can take to help in these directions.

3. Economic development:

(a) Raw material production:

(1) Diversification: Many Latin American countries have been overly dependent upon market fluctuations and economic conditions in other countries because of failure to diversify production. This has also made it difficult for them to develop a skilled labor force or business group and hence to develop a middle class. Many of these countries could expand their economies greatly and secure stability by introducing new products and seeking new markets for them. For a time the transition might cause loss of income and dislocation of labor. The United States, in cooperation with Pan American organizations, could make a useful contribution by assistance in planning complementary diversification, providing training for enterpreneurs and labor, and extending loans to cover initial losses. For example, such diversification can be encouraged by continuation and expansion of the point 4 program.

(2) Marketing: The United States could assist in stabilizing markets for Latin American products by removing arbitrary tariff protection for U.S. products which can readily compete with corresponding products of Latin American countries, and in some cases by import quotas. The United States should avoid dumping of its excess produce on the world market at prices far below the market price or as gifts except in cases where this may be a necessary measure of relief in a disaster situation. Because producers of non-American countries may also enter the market, control by production quotas or price fixing should ordinarily be undertaken in the form of international commodity agreements involving all producing countries. Common market agreements among American States are possible in some cases and may prove increasingly useful as more diversified raw material and industrial production develops.

(b) Industrialization:

The capacity of Latin American countries for industrialization (which depends upon sources of power, raw materials, labor supply, transport, and markets) varies widely. Brazil and Mexico are already developing heavy industry and are able to move forward rapidly. Considerable potential exists in Venezuela and Chile. Most countries could develop light industries. In doing this there is great need for investment capital and technical assistance. The provision of capital for specific projects should be primarily a function of private investment. There are many projects which will be not only economically sound but likely to yield attractive profits within a reasonable period. Where projects require very large or long-term investment before reasonable profits can be anticipated, there may be need for occasional public loans. It is also true that in a few industries, e.g. petroleum, Latin American

countries may consider a raw material asset so essential to the development of the whole economy that the national interest will not permit private development. Where there is evidence that this is not a rationalization of a scheme of personal control and self-enrichment of political leaders, it seems wise to accept this view and not to try to impress private enterprise upon them.

(1) Conditions of private investment: The conditions of investment should be framed in a cooperative spirit. Corporations formed in the United States for operations in Latin American countries should expect as a condition of permission to do business that they must assume a position approximating that of Latin-American corporations. They should be willing to give assurances that they will employ and train a substantial Latin-American labor force, giving opportunity for advancement to higher posts; submit to the jurisdiction of local courts without invoking diplomatic interventions or claims by the United States on their behalf except where general standards of justice are violated; accept a fair share of responsibility for support of community and national services; engage in fair competition. The United States could encourage its companies to initiate or expand enterprises in Latin American countries in a manner consistent with these principles by developing a plan of Government insurance of such companies against losses resulting from expropriation or revolution, restricting such benefits to companies which undertook to improve production, compete equitably, benefit the local economy, and conduct their business in a manner compatible with the business and cultural traditions of the countries in which they operated.

(2) Conditions of Government assistance: Most public support of industrialization ought to be in the form of technical assistance programs whereby expert personnel for planning of projects or training of personnel is provided. In the few cases where long-term, low-interest Government loans are required for industrial development it would be preferable to channel these through regional development organizations which can provide some supervision and review of expenditures without arousing fear of economic imperialism. Loans should be made only for specific projects, carefully defined by agreement between the governments.

4. Social services: Capital and technical assistance are also required for programs of education, public health, housing, land reform programs, roads and transport, and other social services. Without this a trained labor force and a politically alert middle class cannot develop. Financing must necessarily be by long-term low-interest loans, which can be provided preferably by inter-American development banks or funds, or directly by the United States. Appropriations for such purposes should be substantially increased. To assure effective planning and utilization of funds it is desirable that surveys and planning by regional or international agencies be undertaken and that periodic reports upon progress be made by them. Facilities for this might well be provided by the Organization of American States. Consideration might also be given by it to inclusive long-term planning of such programs, so that resources can be efficiently allocated. An expanded technical assistance program will be necessary to provide expert guidance and training in such programs.

5. Political obstacles to development programs:

(a) Dictatorship: It is certainly desirable to avoid the funneling of money lent for development purposes into the pockets of local dictators. However, it would not solve the problem to try to draw a simple distinction between dictatorial and democratic governments, refusing aid to the former. Political control is far more confined to a small governing class in most Latin American countries than in the United States. Although in some cases it will be difficult to assure the cooperation of the group in control, the best approach appears to be through careful earmarking of loans for specific projects, substantial publicity to the aid programs, and regular review of progress. Such a review could best be undertaken by a regional agency. Continued misuse of funds might then become a ground for refusal to make further loans. Care should also be taken to avoid loans for projects to which a dictator might point as evidence of U.S. support of his regime.

(b) Nationalism. Nationalism is a natural sentiment which need not prevent an intelligent common effort on a regional basis. There is an exaggerated form of economic nationalism which demands artificial creation of uneconomic industries. The object is to free the country from dependence upon other states, a reaction against unscrupulous exploitation. The United States was not free from fault in this. The best way to overcome the bad effects of such nationalism in Latin American states is to pursue consistently over a long period a shared program of development along the lines suggested herein.

6. Education: The development of cultural relations through student and faculty exchanges, improvement of communications and press coverage, supervised travel, and general education can also do much to increase sympathetic appreciation of the institutions and problems of other American countries. Such exchanges must be a two-way street. Americans, both North and South, need more knowledge of each other.

III. COMMUNISM

7. Character: We need to be cautious about attributing to leftist movements in Latin America all the characteristics of Russian or Chinese communism. In countries where there is a pressing need for social and economic reform, opposition to government policy may be a sign of intelligent desire for social democracy rather than of communism. These movements, although they may be labeled communistic, may be national movements neither stimulated by nor associated with international communism. A predisposition to find communism in social reform movements or even in palace revolutions has led us into serious mistakes in estimating past situations, e.g., the Guatemalan revolution of 1954. Careful, independent reporting by well-trained career officers, and attention to their reports by the Department of State, are essential in determining the facts.

8. Extent: There appears to be little immediate threat of control of Latin American countries by international communism. Russian and Communist Chinese policy has been directed primarily toward driving a wedge between Latin America and the United States by creating in the former a distorted image of U.S. imperialist exploitation and opposition to social reform. However, some beginnings of economic penetration are also apparent. Although not an immediate danger, international communism is certainly a potential danger in any countries where sharp social and economic stratification continues. If it can gain control of social reform movements, communism may twist them to its own patterns. It is therefore essential that we try to avoid this by removing the causes of social and economic unrest through a common American program.

9. Remedies: Where there is not clear evidence of international Communist control there should be no interference in social revolutionary movements in American states. In such situations great patience and forbearance need to be shown even when economic interests of the United States or its citizens are injured. Sympathetic consideration should be given to assisting programs of social reform. Limited trade relations between American governments and Communist states should not cause great concern. We commend the restraint thus far shown by the United States in dealing with the Castro government.

If there is evidence of danger from international communism this should never be taken to justify unilateral intervention by the United States. Investigation to develop the facts should be undertaken by the Organization of American States, and any program to protect American security should be jointly developed and executed.

The most effective way to counter communism will be the support of positive programs of economic development and social reform, to which reference has already been made.

IV. SECURITY

10. Disarmament; regional police: Common action of American States in the preservation of hemispheric security is an accepted principle for which consultative apparatus is provided in the Organization of American States. This principle must command the continued support of all American States. However, it would be consistent with this to take steps which would partially relieve the pressure upon national budgets of maintaining the present military establishments of Latin American States. If these states wish to initiate a program of national disarmament and demilitarization of national forces, substituting an adequate regional police force under the Organization of American States to maintain order in Latin America, the United States ought to give full and prompt support to such a proposal. This would not seriously affect defense of the hemisphere against external attack, for the principle of solidarity does not imply the necessity of large forces from Latin American countries. The burden of meeting an attack by great non-American powers must necessarily fall very heavily upon the United States. Such an arrangement would also relieve this country from the burden of military assistance to Latin American States and from the danger which now exists that such assistance might strengthen political regimes which we do not care to support.

11. Panama Canal: It would be an evidence of wholehearted acceptance of the principle of common action likely to be deeply appreciated by other American States if the United States would consent to regional administration of the Panama Canal. The genuine community of interest of all American States in the security of the Canal would assure that such administration would be responsibly undertaken.

V. SOCIAL PROBLEMS

12. Reference has been made to the existence in many American states of social and economic stratification which perpetuates the poverty, illiteracy, and dependency of large segments of the population. There is urgent need for land reform which will distribute independent holdings more widely and reduce peonage, for large programs of public education especially in rural areas, for public health and sanitary services, for training in improved agricultural methods, for building of better systems of communication and transport, for more equitable tax structures, for diversification of production and introduction of industries. The security and welfare of all American countries is involved in the success of such undertakings.

VI. PRINCIPLES OF COOPERATIVE ACTION

13. In urging that the United States give increased support to such programs we wish to make clear that we appreciate the need for certain limitations upon our action.

There must be no intervention or pressure by the United States alone even to secure good ends. This can best be avoided by common planning and common execution of plans. The use of the servicio de cooperación ténica suggests that institutions can be developed which will permit joint action without inefficiency and perpetual negotiation. Reliance upon regional institutions in planning, supervision, and review may often avoid misunderstanding of motives. Especially we should help to develop and expand the services of the Organization of American States for these purposes. It is in a position to formulate authoritatively regional standards upon such matters as expropriation, protection of the interests of nonnationals, international claims, and compensation; and to coordinate and give effective direction to the common efforts of American states to improve economic and social conditions. The creation of standing financial institutions or funds for development loans which function outside political channels will prove helpful. Continued effort to make clear the cooperative spirit in which we wish to participate in development programs is needed. In particular we must attempt to understand specific development problems not in terms of our tradition but of the tradition which produced them, and must use ingenuity and flexibility in planning reforms. If we fully accept for ourselves the principle of common effort as members of a community we can expect that we will come to be identified with progressive tendencies in government and economics and that our assistance will be sought.

YOUTH APPRECIATION WEEK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on March 30 of this year I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 181, to designate the second week in November as Youth Appreciation Week. I was joined by five of my colleagues in proposing this significant salute to our young people.

Strong backing for this idea has come from Optimists International, that fine organization which is dedicated to carrying out its motto: "Friend of the Boy." The Optimists have been leaders in observances of Youth Appreciation Week all over the country, and this November the organization will be sponsoring its fourth annual program. In 1959 more than 1,400 of 1,800 Optimist Clubs actively participated in the program.

I recently had the pleasure of conferring with officials of Optimist International, including President Nicholas C. Mueller, about the wonderful work being done in this field. They pledged full support for Senate Joint Resolution 181.

In viewing the importance of giving congressional support to Youth Appreciation Week, it is vital to consider the outstanding work which has already been done during observances of this week all across the Nation.

Meeting the ever-present problem of juvenile delinquency with a positive approach has led Optimists to give more than 17,200,000 youth of North America a pat on the back during the Youth Appreciation Week program.

The idea of lauding youth for their desire to become good citizens was conceived 5 years ago by a North Carolina businessman. With the aid of his Optimist Club members and the State's Governor, Youth Appreciation Week became a reality for the youth of the Tarheel State, and within 2 years this dream became a pilot project with Optimist International. In 1957 the first international Youth Appreciation Week program was conducted. This past year the program has increased tremendously in size and scope. Here is how Optimists have given youths a pat on the back.

Executive proclamations were issued in almost every State, province, and city in which an Optimist Club operates.

Billboard companies, newspapers, radio and TV stations, eager to commend the good works of our younger generation, joined in the program wholeheartedly, contributing many hundreds of column inches and hours of broadcasting time to the effort. Their generosity and sympathy with the program have helped youngsters realize that they do not have to be bad to be noticed.

Eminent speakers, such as Dr. George W. Crane, joined the ranks of those who believe that praise is more valuable than punishment in the raising of good citizens. And law enforcement agencies throughout North America agreed with the Optimist theory that this program, if continued and expanded, would help reduce future advances in delinquency.

Optimists, realizing the growing need for advanced education, set up scholarships during Youth Appreciation Week at various colleges and universities.

Youth in Government Day, observed during the week, was a huge success everywhere. The program has been especially designed to show youngsters the problems they will face when they become the voting citizens of the community. It is further arranged to demonstrate how the various city offices are conducted. Those fortunate enough to live in the vicinity of New York City visited the United Nations and watched world government in action.

Courtesy driver awards were made in many communities, several clubs using Youth Appreciation Week to sponsor and promote the activities of youth driving clubs. And other machines were brought into play, too. Numerous clubs conducted sewing contests for the girls of the community.

Sports and food—two of youth's biggest interests—provided many clubs with the highlight activity of their Youth Appreciation Week. Luncheons, dinners, barbeques, hot dog roasts, formal banquets, and old-fashioned family picnics marked this special week. Sporting events of every variety were held, indoor and outdoor, depending upon the locale and the temperature.

Knowing full well that the development of mind and body are of equal importance for the future of our country, clubs presented playgrounds with new equipment and high school science laboratories with experimental facilities.

And youth, eager to demonstrate to their elders their appreciation for this recognition, participated in numerous activities of charity and devotion. Throughout the land, ministerial and lay students were in charge of church services on Youth in Church Day.

Art displays and hobby shows seemed to sprout up everywhere, and in several communities youth, finding hobbies in common, joined together to form new Junior Optimist Clubs.

Young people themselves banded together to give recognition to their fellow youth who have worked unrewarded and unknown for months and years at hospitals for the physically and mentally ill.

Another group, realizing one of the community's biggest problems was a lack of street lights, stenciled numbers in phosphorescent paint on the curbs of every home in the community as a measure of safety and convenience.

And in one school, the youth picked up the theme of appreciation and turned the tables on the faculty. Knowing that their teachers were responsible in great part for their future, they produced a program of teacher appreciation.

Mr. President, the fine work which has already been done by Optimists International clubs all over America augurs well for the success of a congressionally sanctioned Youth Appreciation Week. I am extremely hopeful action will be forthcoming soon on this proposal, so that all of us can join in a salute to our young people.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 684. An act for the relief of Gerald Degnan, William C. Williams, Harry Eakon, Jacob Beebe, Thorvald Ohnstad, Evan S. Henry, Henry Pitmatalik, D. LeRoy Kotila, Bernard Rock, Bud J. Carlson, Charles F. Curtis, and A. N. Dake;

S. 2317. An act for the relief of Mary Alice Clements;

S. 2523. An act for the relief of Harry L. Arkin;

S. 2779. An act relating to the election under section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by the Augusta Furniture Co., Inc., of Staunton, Va.; and

S.J. Res. 166. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary and permanent construction work on the Capitol Grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 3338. An act to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of

the Air Force from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. Air Force aircraft at Little Rock, Ark.; and

H.J. Res. 640. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of General of the Armies John J. Pershing.

EXTENSION OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, a robust library system is just as fundamental to America as a strong highway or educational system. For this reason I deemed it a privilege to join in cosponsoring the measure introduced by the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] to extend for 5 years the Library Services Act of 1956.

It is impossible to estimate the number of people throughout the country who have been drawn into the wonderful world of books by the library services program. Traveling bookmobiles and the addition of library books to permanent and newly established libraries have helped millions of Americans to learn more, to be challenged and entertained, and to be carried off on the high road of adventure. The program has made more libraries possible, and has established loan and reference programs, workshops, and moving picture film services. Its benefits have flowed into rural America in all sections of the country.

My State of Utah entered the program on July 10, 1957, and by December had both temporary quarters and a State director, Mr. Russell L. Davis. During the 2 years and 5 months the program has been in operation it has proved of genuine grassroots value.

Four bookmobiles have been purchased, and three, including an exhibitmobile, are in operation. The exhibitmobile has been in all but three of Utah's counties, and in practically every town of the State. The three counties include Salt Lake County, which has several bookmobiles of its own. A station wagon to deliver books completes the State library fleet.

A staff of 14 is operating from State library headquarters, completed in August 1958. Headquarters consists of 7,200 feet of floor space and 2,900 running feet of shelving. Forty-one thousand two hundred and twelve books were cataloged and ready for use by the beginning of this year. The staff has conducted many public meetings in every county in the State.

As a result of these activities, Mr. Davis reports the following accomplishments:

San Juan County, which encompasses a large and remote area bordering on Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona, has created a county library and has purchased a bookmobile and 6,000 books, which the State library cataloged. The entire county now has library service and is planning two library buildings.

Kane, Garfield, Piute, Sevier, and Duchesne Counties have established county library boards to contract with each other or with the State library to maintain continuing library service.

Iron, Wayne, Rich, Tooele, and Weber Counties are participating in bookmobile demonstrations operated from the State library and have not made final decisions on their programs as yet.

Many books have been loaned to small libraries throughout the State, bringing new or improved service to almost 100,000 people in Utah.

There is still much to be done, according to Mr. Davis. Fourteen other counties in Utah need help to start providing adequate service to all residents of the county.

Of the 10 counties now being served by the State library, 8 will need continuing aid to bring them up to minimum standards of service.

To provide complete library coverage of the State, Utah should have between 20 and 22 bookmobiles. Salt Lake City has ordered 2 new bookmobiles, which will bring the total in the State up to 11—Salt Lake County 4, Salt Lake City 2, San Juan County 1, State library 4.

Mr. Davis reports that the people of Utah are so "book hungry" that the present State library book stock is exhausted, and that more books could be used to great advantage. Additional funds are also needed for bookmobiles so that additional counties can be reached.

Mr. President, the Library Services Act has proved its worth many times over. Surely it is as noncontroversial as legislation can be. The bill has now been reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I hope it will be quickly passed by the Senate.

COMMUNITY ANTENNA SYSTEMS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah will state it.

Mr. MOSS. Has the morning hour been concluded?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2653) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish jurisdiction in the Federal Communications Commission over community antenna systems.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I desire to express——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Would the Senator from Utah accept a suggestion from the Chair to the effect that the Senator suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED REDUCTION OF AIR STRENGTH IN ALASKA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, some weeks ago, the Department of the Air Force informed me and my colleague, the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], that the 449th Fighter Interceptor Squadron at Ladd Air Force Base was to exchange its F–89 aircraft for F–101B's. The information was that a superior, more modern, faster, and more effective type of aircraft, in harmony with the presumed steady improvement of our defense equipment and our defense needs, would replace the F–89 fighters at this base near Fairbanks, Alaska. On May 10, after hearing rumors of a different plan, which contemplated reduction, instead of either maintenance or improvement of our armed strength, in what is our Nation's northernmost air base on this continent, in company with my able colleague and Alaska's Representative in the House, the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, I visited the Pentagon. Our Alaska delegation considered the reports so alarming and so unbelievable that we wanted to get the fullest information at firsthand. We met in the Office of the Under Secretary of the Air Force, Dr. Joseph V. Charyk. Present were also Gen. Curtis LeMay, Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Maj. Gen. Thomas C. Musgrave, Director of Legislative Liaison of the Air Force, and several colonels.

We were informed that, far from substituting superior planes for the existing ones, it was planned to phase out the entire 449th Fighter Interceptor Squadron, and that it would cease to exist by August of 1960. This meant the abolition of 25 planes and the reduction of the force of 500 men, pilots, mechanics, and other personnel.

Mr. President, this is a shocking abandonment of a vital sector of our first line of defense in an area of maximum strategic importance. I would be more than remiss if I did not voice most vigorously, and with all the emphasis at my command, the protest which I feel is more than justified, to a proposal I deem to be the height of folly.

For all intents and purposes, Ladd Field is to be abandoned as an airbase. We were told that the only Air Force facility scheduled to remain there would be the Arctic Aero Medical Laboratory. We were given some indication that an attempt to cover this area from Elmendorf Field, 300 miles to the south, or Eielson Field, 29 miles to the east, would be made, but that actually Alaska could be protected by planes flying from the older 48 States in the event of an emergency. That might be to prepare us for the removal of the 32 fighters now at Elmendorf, leaving Alaska wholly without fighter planes.

We were likewise told that conversations were in progress between the Air Force and the Army in Alaska, with a view to seeing whether some of the living quarters at Ladd might not be utilized

by the Army. But there is to be no increase in Army strength or personnel. So it is clear that, whatever the allegations and attempted justification, this announced action represents a sharp reduction in our defensive strength on our northernmost and westernmost fronts. In short, it is a budgetary cut, and similar to those in our national defense which the administration is making elsewhere.

Instead of cutting some of the fat out of the defense expenditures, instead of stopping the utterly inexcusable triplication of purchasing that takes place in the three armed services, instead of eliminating the waste which reaches shocking proportions in the conduct of the armed services, the Eisenhower administration, which was once hopefully looked to as the one which might achieve a true unification of the armed services, which might obviate waste, and which might strengthen the national defense, is, instead, cutting at the vitals of our national security.

Recently, that excellent daily, the Wall Street Journal, published an article "Military Managers," with a subheading, "They Waste $2 Billion or More Every Year," with a further subhead telling how desk job airmen get flight pay, whereas actual flyers in Alaska are being grounded. It does not begin to tell the whole story of military waste. If that were told, the total would be nearer $5 billion than $2 billion.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, telling of the needless waste of billions of dollars in our armed services, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY MANAGERS—THEY WASTE $2 BILLION OR MORE EVERY YEAR, CIVILIAN CRITICS SAY—MORE DESK-JOB AIRMEN GET FLIGHT PAY; NEW HOSPITALS ADD TO A SURPLUS OF BEDS—SAGA OF 30,017 FOOTLOCKERS

(By Alan L. Otten)

WASHINGTON.—The Army is resisting all attempts to make it sell 72 acres of Hawaii's lovely Waikiki Beach. It maintains that GI's need the tract, valued at $40 million, for swimming and sunbathing.

The cost of operating planes for desk-bound airmen who put in a few hours a month of practice flying time to collect bonus flight pay has risen so high that the administration is considering awarding the men the extra pay without requiring the flying. There's hardly a thought of cutting out this bonus; it has become so ingrained in military pay scales that removal would bring an uproar that military men wouldn't like to face.

The San Francisco area already has four miltary hospitals with total capacity of 5,235 beds, of which less than 2,850 are in use, and there's an inactive 775-bed hospital nearby. Yet the Army and Navy are proposing to build new hospitals to replace two of the four.

Civilians who have worked for years on the military budget—in the executive branch, in Congress, in private life—produce these examples of what's wrong with management of the Nation's defense effort. Any top-notch impartial management expert, they say, would agree on the need for reform. Such practices, they maintain, flout widely accepted principles of efficiency and economy. And they involve no hotly controversial issues of defense policy, such as emphasis on missiles versus manned aircraft or preparedness for big or limited war.

MOST REFORMS ARE BLOCKED

Yet most of the reforms proposed by management experts are blocked by pressure—pressures from empire-building officers within the services, pressures from Congressmen and local businessmen intent on keeping military payrolls in their districts, pressures from patriotic and veterans' organizations who see some broad national defense issue in the simplest procedural changes.

"Good management changes, on which any right-minded man should be able to agree, can save $2 billion to $3 billion a year in the military budget, and produce a better defense effort," asserts one top Government official who has labored for many years to hold down service outlays. Military spending now runs about $41 billion annually, over half the total Federal budget.

Most of the critics of military management agree the fairly new Defense Secretary, Thomas Gates, is the kind of man needed to bring some order out of chaos; he has worked in the Pentagon for 7 years and knows the political maneuvers of the services in and out. But they say even a man like Mr. Gates needs time to build up a loyal and knowledgeable staff and to bring a change in the atmosphere. And with this administration nearing a close, time is what Mr. Gates doesn't have.

"Talk to people who don't live with it every day and they refuse to believe what you tell them," declares one observer of the defense setup. "It's the most complex organization ever developed, and you can't change it overnight. Change must come slowly. But it must come if we are to support this huge Military Establishment for much longer without breaking the country."

BUILT-IN RESISTANCE

"Resistance is built into the system," declares another critic of Pentagon ways. "You don't get promoted for being a good manager or efficient spender, but for the job you hold and the time you put in and the number of people under you. The Defense Department is one of the finest collections of individuals you can find anywhere, but the system just doesn't let them function. No lieutenant colonel is going to tell his superior what's wrong or go over his head. No Air Force officer temporarily assigned to the staff of the Secretary of Defense is going to be too rough on the Air Force so long as he must get his promotions in the Air Force and go back there some day."

But, the critics agree, changes can be made to improve the situation immediately and pave the way for more basic overhaul later on. The changes would involve disposing of valuable real estate the services don't need, eliminating duplication in supply and servicing, keeping better track of what's on hand, doing a better job of placing new orders and getting rid of surpluses, overhauling sacred cow fringe benefits, and making dozens of other big and little alterations.

Air Force flight pay, many experts believe, is coming close to scandal proportions, as the Air Force switches increasingly to missiles and more and more fliers descend to ground jobs. About 110,000 Air Force pilots, navigators, flight surgeons and other airmen now get some $200 million a year in bonus flight pay. Provided originally as compensation for hazardous combat flights, the pay can now be earned for flying as little as 4 hours a month and 100 hours a year. Most flight personnel, even if desk-bound, make sure they log that much time. Many are taking special jet training so they can continue to get flight pay when few nonjet planes remain. None of these is ever likely to fly jets as a main job. Meantime, there's a mounting outlay to provide, maintain, service and repair the planes these men use for their minimum flying activity.

Smaller matters prove equally sticky. The Army, Air Force, and most civilian Government agencies pay their employees every 2 weeks. Navy blue-collar workers, however, have long been paid every week—and despite the clear prospect of a $2 million-a-year saving in bookkeeping costs, the Navy refuses to change.

THE FOOTLOCKER STORY

Supply distribution, management experts say, betrays Pentagon muddling at its worst. Witness the "horror story" of an order for 300 footlockers by the Air Force base at Bitberg, Germany. As received at the Quartermaster Depot at Philadelphia, the order had somehow grown to 30,017 footlockers. Without questioning the need for more than 30,000 footlockers at a base of 400 men, the depot had the trunks shipped from Texas and Tennessee supply points. While they were on the high seas, the error was discovered—too late to save some $100,000 in excess shipping costs.

That's not all. When the footlockers did arrive, the base obligingly took 702, more than double its original order. The rest went to the Army supply depot at Giessen, Germany; it already had on hand several thousand footlockers, from which the Bitberg order could have been filled in the first place.

An area where the greatest economy progress could be most painlessly made, the critics say, is in the disposal of unneeded military real estate. The services now have land, factories, and other buildings that cost $33 billion to acquire or build, and recently they've been adding about $1.5 billion to $2 billion a year and getting rid of practically nothing. The maintenance cost creeps up. "It's eating us out of house and home, leaving us less and less for strictly military spending," one official complains. Some experts figure the Pentagon could easily take in $1 billion from sale of unneeded real estate and save some $200 to $300 million a year on upkeep.

Consider these unrealized possibilities for savings:

The Presidio, 1,343 acres of prime San Francisco real estate overlooking the Golden Gate, serves as the sprawling headquarters of the 6th Army. The headquarters, critics say, could operate far more economically and efficiently in one compact office building.

Fort Hamilton in Brooklyn is now used chiefly to process dependents of service families going overseas or returning to the States. The processing, economizers agree, could easily be done at other military installations around New York, and higherups in the Pentagon and White House have pressed the Army to yield this land to civilian use. But the Army refuses. Recently, when the New York Triborough Bridge Authority needed a strip of the fort for the approach to the new Narrows Bridge, the Army gave up a small piece of land—on condition the Authority replace the land at another point and also replace the building which had been on the ceded land.

The services not only refuse to yield real estate but persistently try to do more with what they have. The Army recently proposed reactivating its nearly idle Cleveland and Lima, Ohio, ordnance plants and its Detroit arsenal. The Cleveland plant was to be used to produce lightweight combat vehicles, and the Detroit and Lima plants to produce medium-weight combat vehicles—all satisfactorily produced by private firms. The Army argued its plants could produce the vehicles more cheaply and better. Top Pentagon officials vetoed this plan as too sweeping, but expect the Army to come back shortly with a more modest proposal.

When the services do get ready to dispose of installations, they frequently run into stormy opposition. Local merchants like the military payrolls. Southern Wisconsin took months to quiet down not long ago when the

Air Force decided to discontinue construction of the new Bong Airbase and dispose of the land. Right now Maryland and Virginia Congressmen of both parties are teaming up again, as in past years, to pressure the Navy into revising plans to cut back Washington's naval weapons plant with its 5,500 employees. The plant makes a variety of missile control devices, antisub gear and other items which management specialists agree could be better produced elsewhere.

PROBLEM OF DUPLICATION

Elimination of military duplication is considered another huge area of potential savings, and here too there is marked resistance to change within each service. Each has its own medical, communications, supply, contracting, auditing, and weather forecasting systems—and each aims to keep them as long as it can.

A congressional staff study recently estimated Armed Forces medical costs at over $400 million a year, with some 185 hospitals in the United States and 90 overseas. The hospitals have a total capacity of about 105,000 beds and average occupancy of less than 40 percent. They employ about 145,000 people, about 75 percent military and 25 percent civilian.

"It is difficult to conceive," the report said, "of an area that would more readily lend itself to consolidation than medical care. The conditions which require medical service, the facilities for treatment, and the professional standards for medical personnel are virtually indistinguishable among the services."

At Denver, a 350-bed hospital at Lowry Air Force Base keeps only 100 beds in use to care for an average load of 51 patients. Six miles away, Fitzsimons Army Hospital, with 2,078 beds, operates about 900 of them to care for an average of 684 patients.

At Langley Air Force Base in Virginia, a 217-bed hospital keeps 100 beds in use to care for 62 patients, on the average. Six miles away, at the Army's Fort Monroe, there is a 141-bed hospital, in which 35 beds are maintained to care for an average 20-patient load.

DEPOTS DO SAME JOB

Supply distribution is an area of rampant duplication, experts say. In the Southeastern United States, one congressional investigation has found, the Army's Atlanta and Memphis depots, the Air Force's mobile depot, the Marine Corps supply center in Albany, Ga., and four Navy stock points are all supplying their respective services with the same supplies. Army supply operates through seven different technical services—Ordnance, Chemical, and the like—each with specific types of material assigned it. This results in no less than 24 separate Army supply control points in the continental United States—several for each of the 7 services—when 5 to 8 could handle the job nicely, according to one management expert.

Military overbuying, lack of standardization, bad inventorying, and slow and costly surplus disposal habits long have been favorite congressional targets. Some progress has been made, budget scanners say, but much remains to be done.

This year the Navy has begun buying extra plane engines on the basis of having a 150-day supply in the pipeline; previously, it insisted on a 210-day supply. Though the shorter cycle would save millions, it took the General Accounting Office, Congress' spending guardian, two long battles to get the Navy to change.

Attempts to standardize military footwear have so far eliminated 752 different types and finishes, but 339 types remain. Pentagon experts recently attempted to prescribe a black low men's shoe as standard for all services. The Marine Corps insisted on keeping its mahogany shoe because it matched the bill on the Marine caps, and the Navy insisted on keeping a brown shoe for its fliers because it has been traditional—ever since late in World War II.

MANY ITEMS DIFFER ONLY SLIGHTLY

Over 1.3 million common supply items, according to congressional investigators, differ among the services in such relatively minor respects as color, finish, or even just names. Defense officials estimate they could save about $1 million a year in management expenses alone—not counting procurement savings from placing larger consolidated orders—for every 1,000 items eliminated from the supply system.

The Defense Department has been ballyhooing its single manager system as the answer to many of its buying problems. Under this system, one service buys all supplies of one kind for all the services; the Navy does all the fuel purchasing, for instance. But management experts say it's only a step in the right direction.

For one thing, the Pentagon is installing the system very slowly; seven supply categories were put under single managers in 1955 and 1956, but only two more minor categories have been added since then. More important, though, the single manager has authority only to consolidate and place the orders he's given. He has no power to standardize equipment, redistribute excess stocks, or cut back orders.

"If we can extend its use, and raise it to a higher level of command where it can really accomplish more, the single manager system might some day pave the way for a separate single supply service," one would-be reformer wistfully asserts.

FRINGE BENEFITS

Perhaps one of the touchiest areas of theoretical saving in the entire military establishment is the vast number of "fringe" benefits which military personnel now enjoy. Many have grown out of all proportion to the original intent, and now seem beyond uprooting.

Commissaries are a prime example. These food supermarkets were supposed to be set up where there were no private facilities selling at reasonable prices convenient to the post. Now there are over 250 commissaries in the continental United States, many in cities such as Washington and New York.

The right to buy there is now extended not only to people living on the posts, but to military families off the post, reserve and retired personnel, and Public Health officials. Less than 20 percent of the people holding permits to buy at U.S. commissaries now live on the base where the store is located. In Washington, customers at the Walter Reed Army Hospital commissary include such off-base types as a National Institutes of Health neurologist and a World War II Navy nurse, now a reservist, who is the mother of seven children and extremely unlikely ever to return to active duty.

The Government not only employs 9,000 people to man the commissaries, but supplies the buildings, equipment, light, heat and other services. The customers pay only the original cost of the food, plus transportation charges, and a highly inadequate 3 percent markup to cover all else. Military experts figure the annual running subsidy is $75 million, not counting depreciation on the buildings and equipment.

The Government also provides medical care and hospitalization for military men and their dependents, including veterinary care for pets; a retirement plan completely Government-financed; quarters, often including all or much of the furniture; in many areas, free libraries and even bus service to public schools; in many cases, subsidized laundry service; free personal travel on military planes and ships if space is available; and burial in Government-owned cemeteries, including plots for pets.

"The military life," comments one administration official, "is marked by growing socialism and paternalism, literally from the cradle to the grave."

Mr. GRUENING. It is difficult to understand the performance of this administration. Two years ago, it insisted that the strategic and military importance of Alaska was so great that virtually the northern half of Alaska—the entire area north of the Yukon and Porcupine Rivers, and some to the south of it, including most of the Alaska Peninsula and the 900 miles of Aleutian Islands—had to be set aside as an area which could be withdrawn wholly or in part for defense purposes. This is an area of over 225,000 square miles, an area larger than California, and almost as large as California and Oregon combined.

I have here in the Chamber a map which I borrowed from the office of my able colleague [Mr. BARTLETT], which shows the Eisenhower line dividing Alaska practically in half. All that area above the red line is the area which the President insisted must be withdrawn for defense purposes, and that unless such a provision were included in the statehood bill he could not approve the bill. I call the attention of my colleagues to the tremendous extent of that area.

Alaskans, and the Alaska delegation, saw no justification for this proposal, but were told officially that this would be a prerequisite to getting Presidential approval of the Alaska statehood bill. So we agreed, and section 10 and subsections A, B, C, D, and E thereof of the statehood act provided for the drawing of a so-called Eisenhower line, ostensibly in the interest of national security, in this strategic area. There has been nothing like it in previous American history. The constitutionality of this provision was challenged during the Senate debate on the statehood bill. But these objections were overborne by the assumption that such a huge potential excision from the 49th State was deemed indispensable for the future security of our Nation by the Commander in Chief. Now, in effect, the offensive and defensive strength of northern Alaska is to be largely withdrawn.

How can these two contradictory actions of the Eisenhower administration be reconciled? Let us not delude ourselves that Alaska is now adequately defended. It is not. It can become another Pearl Harbor. A few months ago, our excellent theater commander in chief of the Alaskan command, Lt. Gen. Frank Armstrong, called attention to the total lack of missile bases in Alaska. He felt so strongly on the subject that he expressed this view publicly. But his warning and plea were ignored by the administration. The Pentagon informed us the other day that he was not even consulted about this latest proposed slash in Alaska's fighter strength.

Mr. President, since the discovery by the Russians of our observation plane on its espionage mission, and the announcement by the administration that we intend to continue to send planes into Russia on spying missions—a statement made by the Vice President over the weekend, but later countermanded by the President—there is no reason to assume that the Russians will not do likewise.

As a matter of realism the administration might reverse its stand again. Why should they not if they can get away with it? And why should they not add this form of spying to the other forms they practice, since the United States has done it and proposes to continue to do it? However, when Russian planes come into northern Alaska on spying missions, the fighter strength to bring them down will have been abolished. Nor are there any missile installations there to protect us against such espionage from the air or the offensive sorties which may follow.

Twenty-five years ago a great and courageous Army officer, a pioneer flyer, the late William "Billy" Mitchell, testified before a House Committee on Military Affairs:

> Alaska is the most central place in the world for aircraft and that is true either of Europe, Asia, or North America. I believe in the future he who holds Alaska will hold the world, and I think it is the most important strategic place in the world.

Billy Mitchell's great wisdom about the importance of aircraft in war was scorned at the time by the high military commands of both the Army and Navy. Indeed Billy Mitchell, for his vision, for his courage, and his unflinching determination to safeguard the military strength of our country, was crucified on what we might call a cross of brass. He was, in fact, cashiered and driven out of the Army. But after his death, his vision about the importance of the airplane as an instrument of combat came to be appreciated. The high command of that day was proved wrong. It was wrong, however, at a time when the consequences of its shortsightedness and its wrongness were not as they are and could be now. We did not then face a ruthless, determined, and unprecedentedly powerful totalitarian enemy which makes no secret of its purpose to conquer the free world and to substitute its Communist way of life for ours. Our relations with Russia, which have never justified the slightest letdown of our guard, are moreover further strained by the recent U–2 episode and what has since developed in Paris.

Nor was Billy Mitchell's wisdom about the strategic value of Alaska appreciated, despite the pleas of Alaskans, notably those of our late Delegate in the House, Anthony J. Dimond, and, consequently, Alaska's defenselessness caused it to be the only area in North America during World War II that was invaded and for a time held in part by the enemy. There was some subsequent improvement thereafter in Alaska's defenses, notably because of Alaskans' protests, including the protests of our succeeding delegate in the Congress, my present colleague [Mr. BARTLETT], but for a long time the inadequacy of Alaskan defenses continued, and they have never been adequate. As General "Hap" Arnold wrote in his book, "Global Mission":

> Through to this day, Alaska has never received the attention in national defense planning that it deserves.

And further:

> Alaska had always been and no matter what happened in any theater of war, always remained, to me privately, a high priority. But we were never able to get the money or allocations for the air force that we really needed there to give us the kind of bases we required then—and need more than ever now.

Those words, although written 11 years ago, are certainly no less and possibly more true today.

Mr. President, there was, as I have said, for a time an improvement in the defenses of Alaska, but they have never been sufficient. At the same time, we have been spending billions of dollars on bases all over the world. Many of these are, figuratively speaking, built on quicksand. Some of them we hold at the dubious pleasure of dictators. And even in the free world, our tenure of some bases, which have cost billions of dollars, is most uncertain. I do not wish to embarrass the administration by citing these examples specifically, as I could, or going into detail about some of the strategems and the expenditures—if we can use that polite euphemism—which have had to be employed to persuade other governments to permit us to keep our bases within their borders. By contrast what we build in Alaska, on American soil, is not built on political quicksand, not amid peoples of doubtful sympathy with our cause, not in areas subject to the dangers of subversion and sabotage, not in countries whose tolerance of our presence must be ever reconfirmed and rebought, but instead is built on the solid rock of American terrain, amid an American population militantly loyal, patriotic, and alert. So we have just another example of this Administration's double standard, which I have pointed out repeatedly in other aspects of the so-called mutual security program. While we spend lavishly abroad on establishments of dubious validity and permanence, we are jeopardizing security within our own borders, to the detriment of our safety and of our economy, by a budgetary policy that is the height of folly.

To return to the latest blow at our actual defensive strength in Alaska, there are some strange contradictions and anomalies in the Air Force's action.

Testifying before the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Senate Armed Services Committee as recently as April 13 last, less than 1 month after which we were told of the liquidation of the entire fighter force at Ladd Air Force Base, Under Secretary Charyk testified that subsequent to the Air Force submission of its fiscal 1961 construction program, major changes in the previously programed air defense system were approved, and he named three necessary revisions. They were, first, a more timely completion of an improved defense against air-breathing enemy weapons; second, an acceleration of systems designed to provide ballistic missile warning; and, third—and kindly note this, Mr. President—an improved deterrent posture.

Just how is our deterrent posture, which Under Secretary Charyk says is one of the Air Force's objectives, improved by the elimination of the entire fighter force north of the Alaska Range, and nearly 50 percent of our total fighter force in Alaska—for at Elmendorf Field, 300 miles to the south, is the balance of our Alaska fighter force consisting of 33 fighters?

And even more amazing—in view of the Air Force's proposed action—is the statement, a few sentences later, by Under Secretary Charyk, to be found on page 319 of the printed hearings:

> To complete the picture, we also plan a revised and improved fighter-interceptor force.

Just how is the total elimination of our fighter force at our northernmost airbase and nearly half of Alaska's present total fighter force, a revised and improved fighter-interceptor force?

Either Under Secretary Charyk had adopted "Newspeak," in which words mean the opposite of what they say, or a fundamental change in Air Force program and policy had again occurred in the less than 30 days between Under Secretary Charyk's appearance before the committee and our delegation's visit to the Pentagon on May 10. The Nation is entitled to an explanation of a defense policy that is so radically changed within a few weeks that it is changed once after the submission of the 1961 construction authorization program and changed again after that program is testified to before the Senate committee.

Moreover, later that same day, April 13, just a little over a month ago, Colonel Parkhill, presented by General Curtin as the Air Force spokesman for the line items, testified as follows:

> The Alaskan Air Command is responsible for providing early warning in the Alaskan area in case of attack against the United States. It is also responsible for the air defense of Alaska, and furnished operational and certain logistical support for the Strategic Air Command, the Military Air Transport Service, the Command of the Alaskan Sea Frontier, and the U.S. Army. To provide for the accomplishment of these missions, the command supports three major operational bases, Eielson, Elmendorf, and Ladd.

So, less than a month earlier, Ladd Field was referred to as one of the three operational Air Force bases in Alaska, but now it is reduced to an aero medical laboratory, a hospital, and some housing which it is hoped the Army in Alaska may be induced to occupy, although its forces are not to be increased by a single soldier.

Mr. President, even before the world-shaking events that have come to us from Paris, even before the prospects of improvement in international tension had been rudely shattered at the summit, the discussion on the floor of the Senate last Friday, in connection with the adoption of the military construction bill, shows how little justification there was for these rapid changes by the Air Force. Let me point out that in the new authorization for the military construction program totaling $1,074 million, the Air Force received well over half—some $726 million—far more than the Army, Navy, and other parts of the Defense Establishment received.

The able junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], chairman of the

subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, who is in charge of the bill, stated:

Prior to the time the committee could complete consideration of the bill * * * the Department of the Air Force again drastically revised its air defense planning, although no testimony had been presented to indicate any major change in the air defense threat since the submission of the revised plan in June 1959.

And Senator STENNIS added:

The committee has not been able to reconcile the cancellation of these long-range ground-to-air defense missile sites located on the perimeter of our country while continuing those of shorter range primarily designed for last-minute protection of our cities and military installations.

And he says further:

Most of us felt all the time that too much money was being put in ground-to-air missiles at the expense of the affirmative or purely offensive weapons.

In view of all this, and much else that I will not bother to repeat, for it can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Friday, Senator STENNIS reported that the committee has requested that the revised air defense plan be again reviewed in detail by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense.

And finally, Senator STENNIS said—and this was last Friday:

The committee is still very uncertain as to exactly what the present situation is and certainly dissatisfied with the situation in its present state.

I do not wonder that it is dissatisfied. The entire Congress and the American people should be dissatisfied.

Still later in the discussion, our distinguished colleague from the State of South Dakota, FRANCIS CASE, a member of the committee, gave his view that the bill—to quote his words—is "to some extent, out of date"; and he stated that this was the case "because our military posture has been built around certain deployments abroad and because the present situation inevitably will affect the availability of some of the bases and fields that have been developed."

Senator CASE was referring to the consequences of the discovery of the U–2 mission over Russia. But his comment took place before Nikita Khrushchev had virtually ruptured his relations with the President and with the summit meeting.

If the military situation in regard to the Air Force was cause for dissatisfaction on the part of the members of the Armed Services Committee last Friday, there is infinitely more cause for even greater dissatisfaction and for immediate revision, and revision upward, now.

Mr. President, we do not, to date, know what foreign bases the United States will be allowed to retain by the government of the countries in which they are located. We do not know whether our bases ringing Russia from which our spying missions have originated will be permitted to continue. But the one thing that we can be certain of is that whatever bases, whatever offensive or defensive strength we have in Alaska, will continue, if only our military have the vision and understanding to reverse their incredible latest decision. Indeed, they should not merely carry out the plan of a month ago of replacing the 25 F–89 fighters at Ladd with more modern fighters, but actually by adding to the present fighter strength additional fighter planes.

I call upon the Armed Services Committees of both Houses and the Appropriations Committee immediately to look into this situation and to insist that the Air Force, at the very least, reverse its position and restore the fighter squadron to the northernmost American air base and the American air base nearest to Russia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, the story of our meeting at the Pentagon with the Air Force officials, as published in the Anchorage Daily Times, and written by Mr. A. Robert Smith, its Washington correspondent, as well as two editorials from the Fairbanks News-Miner, from the issues of May 12 and May 13, respectively, entitled "Is Now the Time To Reduce Our Defenses?" and "Are We Expendable?" a letter from Gov. William A. Egan to the Secretary of Defense dated May 14, 1960, and the first page of a newsletter by Mary Lee Council, administrative assistant to my colleague, which summarizes the situation as he saw it coming from the Pentagon.

There being no objection, the articles, editorials, and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily Times, May 11, 1960]

ALASKAN DEFENSES CUT; STATE SAID "NO LONGER KEY OUTPOST"—25 FIGHTERS AT LADD TO LEAVE; SOLONS SHOCKED

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Air Force officials have bluntly told the Alaska congressional delegation they no longer regard Alaska as a key defense outpost of the free world.

This was revealed today at a press conference held jointly by Senators BARTLETT, GRUENING and Representative RIVERS to disclose the outcome of a lengthy meeting they had late yesterday at the Pentagon. They disclosed that:

1. The 25 fighter-interceptor aircraft of the 449th Squadron at Ladd Air Force Base will all be removed from Alaska, starting in August and ending by January 1.

2. The Army may take over use of Ladd, but this will not mean any increase in Army strength in Alaska, only some shifting.

3. There is no plan for the Defense Department to build offensive or defensive missile bases in Alaska as was urgently recommended last year by Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, the Alaska commander.

4. The upshot of these developments is that Alaska's defensive strength will be reduced 25 percent, according to Gen. Curtis LeMay, deputy chief of staff.

But BARTLETT contended it means a reduction of nearly 50 percent, inasmuch as the cut of 25 fighters at Ladd leaves only 33 fighters in Alaska, all based at Elmendorf Air Force Base.

5. When asked by GRUENING whether he didn't agree with Gen. Billy Mitchell's estimate of the strategic importance of Alaska for defense, LeMay replied: "Frankly, no."

BARTLETT termed these disclosures "dreadfully shocking" considering the state of world affairs.

"Peace hasn't been established with Russia," he added.

GRUENING and his colleagues vowed to oppose these plans by attempting to arouse public and congressional sentiment against them, but they indicated little hope of success in overturning this military decision. The verdict has been made, the military officials said.

"This is obviously an economy move," observed GRUENING, "directed by the Bureau of the Budget." When he asked why they didn't cut out fat and waste instead of reducing strength, LeMay said he "didn't think the American people wanted to cut out fat."

In support of its supposition that this was an economy move, the delegation noted that not long ago the Air Force announced it would substitute a superior, faster aircraft, the VooDoo, for F–89 fighters at Ladd which are becoming obsolete.

This indicated to the Alaskans that up until recently it was thought militarily wise to give Alaska improved interceptors, but that now it is no longer necessary to have them at all.

This unexplained shift was thought by the delegation to have been forced by budgetary limitations which caused the Air Force to take its choice rather than to deploy as much strength as it might have wished.

LeMay said the Air Force constantly bucks up against resistance to reducing its operations by congressional pressure such as the Alaskans put on, reported Gruening, inferring the General presumed they were interested only in the effect of the cut on the economy of Fairbanks.

"It isn't just the money, it's that those people are awfully close to Siberia and they are bound to get uneasy," said BARTLETT.

Withdrawing the squadron will reduce the military personnel by 500 officers and men, plus supporting civilian employees. The delegation said it would have hurt the Alaska economy and the morale of all Alaska.

BARTLETT reported the Army is still studying the possibility of using Ladd, but no decision is expected until July 15. The Air Force plans to continue using some of the housing at the base for personnel at Eielson Air Base, 26 miles away, because Ladd's facilities are superior. The Arctic Aero Medical Lab at Ladd will not be affected.

The Alaskans were visibly incredulous at the news they were bluntly handed by the Pentagon, and particularly by the expressed attitude of LeMay, the tough, cigar-smoking former commander of the Strategic Air Command.

RIVERS said he pointed out Armstrong had feared the threat of 27 missile bases Russia had built in nearby Siberia. LeMay, he reported, said he didn't think Russia is doing much there. Asked what they thought LeMay meant, BARTLETT blurted out:

"God knows what he meant by anything he said."

BARTLETT recalled Armstrong's plea for missiles and more defense for Alaska. He said LeMay brushed it off as just the desires of a theater commander who had been overruled.

Was Armstrong consulted about the wisdom of the elimination of 25 fighters?

"Probably not," BARTLETT quoted LeMay as answering.

How will the mission of the 449th Squadron be handled after its removal?

"We can operate from the U.S. west coast with long-range airplanes just as well as from Alaska," BARTLETT quoted LeMay as saying.

LeMay was asked what he thought would happen if Soviet bombers came over Alaska, as Armstrong envisioned in a public speech last year in which he said the Russians could knock out Alaska and move on to hit deep into the interior of the other States.

LeMay was reported to have replied he didn't think Soviet attacking aircraft would strike the United States via Alaska. He said that would be foolish because they would risk earlier detection on that route, presumably by the DEW line radar network.

BARTLETT said LeMay stated he thinks Eielson, the base from which SAC bombers are ready to strike back if necessary, is now of subordinate importance if Alaska is not of great importance any longer in the defense strategy of the United States.

GRUENING observed with irony that the White House just a few years ago thought Alaska so important for defense that it insisted that the whole northern section be set aside for possible military use as a condition for granting statehood.

BARTLETT observed, "This process of whittling down Alaska's defenses" has been underway for several years, bit by bit.

GRUENING also questioned the wisdom of cutting back on domestic bases while depending upon bases in foreign lands where America may have only a tenuous hold. He said LeMay brushed this off by saying that foreign bases were important.

LeMay also told the delegation he thought conditions were unfavorable in Alaska for military operations because the weather goes down to 60° below zero and the transportation costs are unusually high.

GRUENING scoffed at both contentions. He noted that when Alaska Steamship Co. recently announced increased freight rates, Alaskans were unable to get the armed services to join them in protesting this increase.

BARTLETT, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, was particularly disturbed by these developments. Last fall he toured military bases along the Pacific rim from Alaska to Japan and returned convinced that U.S. defenses needed boosting rather than reducing. His pleas to that effect have fallen on deaf ears here.

[From the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner, May 12, 1960]

IS NOW THE TIME TO REDUCE OUR DEFENSES?

Yesterday's News-Miner had two front page headlines: "Military Cuts Strength Here," followed by "Khrushchev May Not Want Visit From Ike."

The first headline preceded an announcement by Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Vice Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, that one of the two fighter squadrons stationed in Alaska would be eliminated within the next few months; that before the year is out, the 449th Fighter Group, manning America's and Alaska's farthest north defense post, will move south.

The fighter base closest to Russia will be abandoned as a fighter base. America's first line of defense will retreat southward several hundred miles.

Ladd Air Force Base, home of the 449th, and Ladd's host city of Fairbanks will no longer be the first line of defense.

Result of this action, in plain language, is that Ladd and Fairbanks will be left as sitting ducks out in the middle of no man's land, between the Soviet armed forces concentrated in strength a relative few miles north and west, and America's shrunken farthest north defense post at Elmendorf Air Force Base to the south.

It is ironical that on the very day announcement is made of America's first-line defense post is to be wiped out, Soviet Premier Khrushchev baldly indicates a worsening relationship with the United States with a clearcut insult to President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Taking into account Premier Khrushchev's current statements, circumstances would seem to indicate strengthening of our defense posts closest to Russia as the Soviets maintain their belligerent status.

Public announcement America is cutting defensive strength of Alaska's formidable air patrol in the far North hardly seems the most effective way to soften Russia's present hard-nosed belligerency. Why should the bully slow his blustering when his proposed opponent is running away? Is blustering Khrushchev going to be intimidated when he sees our air defense retreating several hundred miles? We think not.

In yesterday's announcement, General LeMay, longtime plain-talking boss of SAC, Air Force offensive arm, took a position diametrically opposed to many other able top Air Force commanders. From the time of Gen. Billy Mitchell to today's Alaska top commander, Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, Alaska has been given top priority in world air strategy.

General LeMay's present position appears to be a casual writeoff of Alaska's strategic importance in defense of the United States.

We disagree with General LeMay.

We particularly disagree when results of his decision will not only reduce defensive strength of America's first line of defense by approximately 50 percent, but will in the process leave Fairbanks and Ladd Air Force Base sitting out in the middle of no man's land like ducks in a shooting gallery.

[From the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner, May 13, 1960]

ARE WE EXPENDABLE?

Gen. Curtis LeMay, Deputy Chief of Staff of the Air Force, would have us believe that, militarily, Alaska is expendable.

He is quoted as saying that Alaska is no longer of great importance in the defense strategy of the United States. This statement was given to Alaska's congressional delegation in justification of the Air Force's plans to cut the strength of Ladd Air Force Base by withdrawing the 449th Fighter Interceptor Squadron.

The action comes at a most inopportune time—a time when world tensions have reached a high peak—a time when every facet of defense needs strengthening instead of weakening.

It is hard to believe that General LeMay's dogmatic view on Alaska's strategic importance is shared widely in military circles.

Starting with Gen. Billy Mitchell's evaluation of the importance of Alaska as key to the continent's defense to similar views expressed more recently by Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, Alaska's present military commander, Alaska's vital role in the military picture has never been minimized.

On March 17, 1958, Franklin L. Orth, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army told the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce he considers Alaska "the keystone in the arch of our defensive system."

Orth added: "Alaska has now become the strongest defensive link in our outpost of freedom."

Lt. Gen. J. H. Atkinson, formerly commander in chief of the Alaskan command, told the Alaska Chamber of Commerce: "As we all know, Alaska is an outpost of our continental defense, and I cannot overemphasize its importance in the strategic picture. It is a shoulder of the Polar Basin, that most critical area which separates us from Siberia and from the heartland of Russia itself."

In a later speech, General Atkinson declared: "It is logical to assume that if Alaska is a desirable location strategically from which to fly manned aircraft against enemy targets, it will be an equally desirable strategic location from which to launch unmanned aircraft—namely, missiles."

General Atkinson based his remarks on the contention that range will always be an important factor in that it is cheaper to send an aircraft or missile 500 miles than 5,000 miles.

It is even more surprising and shocking as Senator BARTLETT says—that after all these views on Alaska's value to American defense from responsible military leaders we are told that Alaska is expendable.

It is even more surprising and shocking for taxpayers in Alaska and elsewhere to be told that the millions of dollars spent to construct strong military outposts in Alaska are now construed to be in vain and useless.

We are not military men, nor have we made a thorough study of military concepts and strategy. Yet we cannot see the wisdom of weakening and neutralizing the one American State which is closest to America's greatest potential enemy.

We cannot see the wisdom of deciding that more than 200,000 Americans in America's largest State are expendable and apparently to be left without adequate defenses.

We wonder if the Russians would apply the same sort of thinking to the vast reaches of Siberia, the Kamchatka Peninsula or other key points in their defense system?

We still believe—and we are convinced our view would have firm support in military circles—that Alaska is a highly important segment of our national military picture. We believe that from a standpoint of continental defense, our Government should retain Alaskan defenses at a high level. We believe that instead of stripping Alaska of her defenses, these changes should be augmented with both missiles and aircraft.

America's national security should not be sold down the river so casually.

To weaken Alaska now would be to create an inviting "Pearl Harbor" which would prove extremely tempting to our potential enemies, and harmful to our national security.

Is Alaska expendable? We must disagree most emphatically with those who feel it is. Alaska is not only not expendable—it is America's most important shield against an aggressor.

Loss of Alaska could prove a crippling blow to the entire defense of America.

STATE OF ALASKA,
Juneau, May 14, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS S. GATES, Jr.,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is to protest, in feelings stronger than words can convey, the recently disclosed decision of the Air Force to deactivate the 449th Fighter Interceptor Squadron at the Ladd Air Force Base.

I do so because of my deep concern with the effect of this reduction, predicated, apparently, solely on budgetary considerations, upon the Nation's defenses.

It is my understanding that the 449th represents more than 40 percent of the existing fighter strength in Alaska. With its departure, Alaska—the first line of resistance in event of attack—would be left with a defending force of 33 fighter planes.

For many months it has been public knowledge that the Russians have more than two dozen bases along the coast, which could easily be reached by medium-range ballistic missiles. Military officials familiar with the situation have implored that offensive ballistic missile sites be constructed in Alaska.

Instead of strengthening Alaska's already inadequate defenses, however, the military has followed a policy of steady retreat. First Nome, then the Aleutian Islands have been abandoned, ostensibly in line with the so-called heartland concept. Now, apparently, this concept, too, has been abandoned, and the few thousand military personnel remaining in Alaska, not to mention the residents of an integral part of the Nation, are to be considered expendable.

There is to my mind a glaring lack of evidence that either the United States or Russia is now prepared, or will be prepared for some period of time, to conduct a push-button war.

To contend that the role of the Air Force can be conducted as well from the west coast as from Alaska—a theory attributed in news reports to Gen. Curtis LeMay, Air Force Vice Chief of Staff—is contrary to all reason.

Millions of dollars have been spent in Alaska and across northern Canada in the construction of warning systems premised on the knowledge that additional minutes would be gained to prepare for an aggressor. Now, in this latest reversal of form, the Air Force would cut back by more than 40 percent the very interceptor units that could gain additional precious minutes for preparation.

Is it a far-fetched interpretation of General LeMay's theory to suggest that the American people should now prepare themselves for word that the United States is withdrawing its forces from West Germany because they are too close to East Germany? Under this premise, could not the aerial strength stationed throughout Europe operate just as well from the east coast of the United States?

I do not intend to dwell on the fact that this announced reduction in deterrent strength comes at a time when Premier Khrushchev is daily giving forth with ever more menacing threats of attack against nations whose bases are used by the United States in spy missions which the President has stated publicly will continue. Are these statements a mere bluff, or do they reflect intent? I would not presume to know the answer. I know only that it would appear to be a most illogical time to slash the strength of the defensive forces closest to the probable line of attack.

Nor have I dwelt upon the undeniably crippling effect which such a drastic curtailment will have on the economy of the nearby city of Fairbanks, although it will be extreme.

I know I speak for the majority of Alaskans when I say we are appalled at the apparent disregard reflected by this decision not only for the safety of Alaska but of the United States. In the light of the present condition of those defenses, as well as world tensions, such a course of action appears foolhardy, if not irresponsible.

This then is to strongly request your early action either to revoke the Air Force decision in event it has not come before you, or to reconsider that action in the light of its dangerous and demoralizing implications.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor.

LADD AIR FORCE BASE

(Washington news letter by Mary Lee Council, administrative assistant to Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, May 13, 1960)

In a week which had President Eisenhower stating that the secrecy policy of the Soviet Union makes it essential that we watch that country every way we can and that in Russia a large-scale surprise attack could be launched and we must guard against this in every feasible way, the Alaska congressional delegation was told by Air Force officials that the only fighter-interceptor squadron north of the Alaska range would go out of existence in August of this year.

In a meeting with Under Secretary of the Air Force Joseph V. Charyk, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Vice Chief of Staff, and other officers, Senator GRUENING, Representative RIVERS, and Senator BARTLETT were advised that rumors which had been gathering strength recently that the 449th Fighter-Interceptor Squadron at Ladd Air Force Base was pulling out were true. This means that some 500 military personnel will depart, leaving as Ladd's Air Force mission a hospital, an air medical laboratory, and a weather reconnaissance squadron.

The action, which the Air Force has taken, is based, the Alaska delegation was told, on factors involving high transportation costs, bad conditions making it difficult to operate in low temperatures, and other expenses of operation.

The strategic position of Alaska was downgraded by General LeMay in responding, "Frankly, no," when Senator GRUENING asked him if he didn't agree with Gen. Billy Mitchell's estimate that Alaska's geographical position was of high strategic importance. General LeMay also said he thought Eielson Air Force Base was now of subordinate importance.

Senator BARTLETT recalled unsuccessful efforts made several months ago to place missiles in Alaska when Alaska's commander in chief of the Alaskan Command, Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, Jr., urged their installation in pointing out that some 27 Russian bases exist in Siberia. At that time, General LeMay stated that the Strategic Air Command could operate from the west coast with long range airplanes just as well as from Alaska, a statement which he repeated in the meeting this week. This is the attitude taken, the Alaska delegation pointed out, despite the fact that such flights could take several hours while fighter-interceptor planes based in Alaska could be in the air in minutes. The Alaska delegation asked General LeMay what would happen if Russian bombers came over Alaska aimed at the other States and received the reply that the Russians would be foolish to come over Alaska.

Senator BARTLETT recalled testimony given in January of this year by Gen. Thomas D. White, Air Force Chief of Staff, before the House Appropriations Committee that "the Soviet Air Force is the U.S.S.R.'s most dangerous weapon. Approximately 10 percent of its aircraft strength is in its long range air force of about 1,200 modern heavy and medium bombers." General White added that the Soviet has a "rapidly growing intermediate and intercontinental range ballistic missile force." Assuming that the threat of Soviet missiles is a growing threat, Senator BARTLETT pointed out, it is clear that the major immediate threat is that of Soviet manned aircraft and contended that reductions of the strength at Ladd would diminish this country's capabilities to deter attacks by manned aircraft.

In stating they will do everything they possibly can to ward off the action at Ladd, the Alaska delegation pointed out that no one person, civilian or military, has the answer on any possible Soviet plans and that the announced Ladd decision to diminish the military strength in Alaska because of economic reasons could be dangerous to the military security of the United States. "The decision announced this week is especially perplexing," Senator BARTLETT stated, "in view of the fact that in March we were told that 18 F–101B jets would be assigned to Ladd in April. Now we are advised they are not needed and that small groups of fighters from Elmendorf will be assigned to Ladd on a rotational basis. What this really means is that the fighter-interceptor strength of Alaska has been cut almost in half."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the apprehension and even the alarm which has been expressed by my colleague from Alaska is fully shared by me. A concern has been expressed from all sections of Alaska over the announced cut in the Alaska air defenses, and I hope that when the story has been told the entire Nation will react, because whatever weakens air defenses in the 49th State weakens the entire defense structure of the United States.

My colleague has in his informed address given an excellent statement of what has occurred. It is accurate. It reflects exactly what we were told at the Pentagon on May 10. As he states, it seems incredible even yet, because it was only last March 22 that we were informed of the Air Force decision to augment the fighter strength at Ladd Air Force Base near Fairbanks by substituting F–101B aircraft for the less modern fighters which had been stationed there. What could have happened in the interim to cause that decision to be completely reversed? Is it that our relations with Soviet Russia have taken such a decided turn for the better? There is no evidence of such improvement. In fact, there is massive evidence to the contrary.

What is happening in Alaska? Over the period of the past several years, in respect to defense, what has transpired is highly discouraging and dangerous for the security of our country. Those defenses have been whittled away piece by piece, man by man, plane by plane, until little is left.

We have a unified command in Alaska, with an Air Force officer in command of Air Force, Army, and Navy components. At the same time under the existing arrangement, that commander is not much more than a glorified housekeeper, because he does not have command over the operational situation, and is merely there, it would seem, to house and feed the men on the several bases.

As my colleague has stated, we were informed at the Pentagon a week ago today of the proposed inactivation of the 449th Fighter Interceptor Squadron, and on May 11, subsequent to our meeting at the Pentagon, a letter was delivered to each of us—to Representative RALPH J. RIVERS, Senator GRUENING, and me—announcing the decision to remove this squadron from this highly strategic Air Force base. No reason for this abrupt change was given to us, and no real reason has been given yet by anyone to anyone.

Only in January, or at least in the forepart of this winter, General White, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, testified before the House Appropriations Committee. He was queried by Chairman MAHON in these words:

> You have told us that the U.S.S.R. air power is the most dangerous weapon confronting us. Is that true as of January 1960?
>
> General WHITE. In my opinion, it is.

So the highest officer in the United States Air Force is reported as testifying before the House Appropriations Committee that Soviet air power is the most dangerous weapon confronting us.

In the face of this, the Air Force decides to reduce drastically, radically, and dangerously, the strength of the air fighter defenses in Alaska. With one exception, every high officer of the United States Armed Forces has said now and in the years gone by that Alaska is a strategic area of paramount importance and consequence in the defense of the United States.

What ought to be done—and nothing should be permitted to stand in the

way—is the building up of our defenses of all kinds. In this connection I must refer to a charge made against Senator GRUENING, Representative RIVERS, and me by a candidate for political office in Alaska, who was quoted in a front-page story appearing in the Anchorage Daily Times for May 12 as having charged us with "release of classified information by revealing the number of fighter aircraft in Alaska."

That is a most serious charge. It is most serious to charge anyone with a breach of security. I feel it is only proper that I should read into the RECORD at this point a letter from General Kingsley, deputy director, legislative liaison, U.S. Air Force, dated today:

In response to an inquiry, this is to advise you that the information which had been given you relative to the scheduled deactivation of the 449th Fighter Interceptor Squadron at Ladd Air Force Base became unclassified information as of May 10, 1960. Consequently there appears to be no security violation in your notifying the press that 25 aircraft would be withdrawn from Alaska, but that the augmented squadron of 33 planes would remain at Elmendorf Air Force Base.

In the summer of 1959 a determined effort was made by Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, commanding general of the Alaskan Command—that is the unified command—to have intermediate missiles stationed in Alaska. He made urgent recommendations, as I understand, upon that point. Those recommendations were rejected by higher authority here. Among other things, it was said that General Armstrong merely wanted to do that which is described as the ambition of every local commander, to augment his own strength and his own authority. He was accused of being almost parochial in this. General Armstrong is a distinguished officer of the U.S. Air Force. He has an outstanding record in war and in peace. I assert here that his recommendations for intermediate range missiles, for IRBM's, were made out of his sincerest conviction that this was essential, not so much for the protection of Alaska, but for the protection of the entire Nation, which he has a part in guarding.

Some very interesting statements relating to General Armstrong's desire to have missiles placed in Alaska were made in the magazine Flying for December 1959. The article to which I now refer asks this question:

Is Alaska expendable? Are Alaska's defenses adequate for its survival in case of sudden attack from across the Bering Strait? The startling reply to these vital questions came from none other than the commander of Alaska's joint services defense force, Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, Jr.

The veteran airman and air strategist spoke forcefully thus: "As things now stand, it would take only two enemy bombers to put Alaskan bases out of action. If these attacks were followed up with paratroop landings, Alaska would be lost.

"With Russians in the Fairbanks and Anchorage areas, President Eisenhower would have to decide quickly whether to bomb Alaska or leave the rest of the country open to close range attack from Red troops along the Yukon."

He followed with this dire prediction: "If Alaska doesn't get IRBM (intermediate range ballistic missiles) soon, we're going to be in one hell of a fix."

Further in the article, Mr. President, General Armstrong is quoted as follows:

As it stands today, our mission is to alarm the United States, not to defend it.

The article continues:

According to the best military analysts, the threat to this top of the world area, the growing strength of Red bases in neighboring Siberia, is such that the Red forces can well choose their own good time and method of attack. They can literally push the United States off this strategic and sensitive polar position at will, leaving its northward flank exposed and defenseless. Alaska is strategic because of its commanding location. Changing military strategy being brought about by the advent of missiles, satellites and jet transports, makes it imperative that this factor be given proper importance in Defense Department development of our pattern for security.

At the moment there are 26 bases in Siberia armed with aircraft missiles that are capable of striking at the heart of the United States from the top of the world. They are reportedly growing in strength every day.

In the event of a surprise attack, these same experts estimate that our own Strategic Air Command bomber force would be able to immobilize only eight of these Red bases leaving the rest to launch second wave destruction upon the United States.

I continue to quote from the article entitled "Is Alaska Expendable?" published in the magazine Flying for December 1959:

Again the military men estimate that the first provocation or hot war action would trigger retaliatory strikes upon all Siberian bases within 20 minutes. They say the firing of U.S.-based missiles and launching of manned nuclear bombers would require 3 to 4 hours to reach the targets—much too long to stop second- and third-wave missile or bomber assaults upon U.S. industrial centers.

Mr. President, that is why General Armstrong urged—although unsuccessfully—that IRBM's be located in Alaska. He did not want the inevitable time lag to occur in the event of war, which would occur if missiles were not available, and bombers had to fly from distant points.

I continue to read from the article:

Although the Air Force's Armstrong asks only for IRBM's and one-man bombers, others carry his appeal further by calling for intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's) such as the SAC-manned Atlas and the forthcoming USAF Minuteman.

The article concludes with a searching question, the question which needs to be asked today more than ever. That question is:

Is Alaska expendable?

It may be, if the decision to deactivate the 449th Fighter Interceptor Squadron is imminent. It ought not to be. That decision should be reversed forthwith. This is more important than dollars.

A few minutes ago, I alluded to the contention made by a politician in Anchorage, Alaska, that the members of the Alaska congressional delegation had violated security. I rebutted that contention by reading a letter from Brigadier General Kingsley, which stated that the material we of Alaska's congressional delegation had given to the press last week in this connection was not classified. Additionally, the very article from which I have been quoting gave the number of fighter squadrons in Alaska; and within reasonably close limits, any spy would know the number of airplanes in a squadron. So this material was published, in effect, long since.

During our conversation at the Pentagon, my colleague from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] referred to the Wall Street Journal article about Defense Department waste, which he mentioned in the illuminating speech he delivered only a few minutes ago. We were told by one of the participants in that meeting that actually the country does not want this waste to be stopped. It was hinted to us—or more than hinted, I should say—that our presence in the Pentagon on the mission which had taken us there was proof of this, because, it was implied, we were there chiefly—or perhaps altogether—to prevent damage being done to the economy of Fairbanks, the community nearest Ladd Air Force Base.

I resented that implication, and I resent it still. I imagine the State of Alaska will survive economically even without the presence of the comparatively few men who comprise the interceptor squadron. But it could have been, and it was, a more important, a more patriotic, and a more meaningful motive which took us from Capitol Hill to the Pentagon to seek to reverse this decision. We had in mind almost altogether the need for shoring up Alaska's defenses, instead of sitting supinely by while they were being reduced. We entertained then, and we entertain now, the opinion that our action was not only in the best interest of Alaska, but of the whole Nation, as well.

Alaska is the northern shield. If it should be taken, havoc could be wrought upon the other States by manned bombers. I submit that the Air Force decision to deactivate the 449th Interceptor Fighter Squadron is a faulty judgment, a wrong judgment, and a risky judgment. It is a judgment that should be corrected without delay.

Mr. President, it was less than a year ago that General Armstrong called for intermediate range missiles in Alaska. But now, in the spring of 1960, we discover that those recommendations have been rejected almost out of hand, it would seem; and we also discover—lamentably—that the conventional defenses shielding us from the multiplicity of Soviet bases in Siberia, which are so close to Alaska, have been diminished.

Mr. President, I hope and pray that an aroused public will demand that Alaska's defenses be strengthened, instead of being cut further.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Were not we told by one of the Air Force experts at the conference that, actually, Alaska could be adequately defended, in case of attack or other emergency, by planes coming from the west coast or from some of the other 48 States?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is true; we were told that defense would be easier, simpler, and perhaps better if done in that fashion. But we were not given an explanation in regard to how fighter aircraft, with their limited range, would get there.

We were also told by one participant in the conference that Billy Mitchell, Hap Arnold, and all the other high strategists in the Air Force through the years were wrong, and that Alaska is really of subordinate strategic importance.

Mr. GRUENING. If that premise of the contemporary Pentagonians were logical, there would be no reason even to keep the 33 remaining fighter planes at Elmendorf Field, near Anchorage, would there?

Mr. BARTLETT. I could not agree more fully with my colleague. If Alaska has no strategic importance, as a shield or otherwise, there would be no reason to have any military personnel or military equipment in Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Does my colleague believe that we would be justified in accepting the claim, as made by some of those now in the Pentagon, that Air Force bases in Alaska are of little strategic value? In other words, if it is true—as claimed by some of those in the Pentagon—that Alaska has little usefulness for either offensive or defensive bases, and that the same purpose can be adequately served by using planes dispatched from the mainland of the United States, can my colleague state why our administration has found it necessary to have military bases all over the world—in Turkey, in Morocco, in Spain, in Pakistan, in Saudi Arabia, in Iceland, in Britain, in Japan, and elsewhere—if all that might need to be done can be done from bases located in the 48 States? If that is true, what justification is there for our tremendously expensive around-the-world system of airbases?

Mr. BARTLETT. I cannot answer that question, because I departed from the Pentagon in a very high state of confusion, and I have not as yet been able to adjust myself entirely, because I kept dwelling on the fact that on March 22 we were told that new and more modern fighter airplanes were to be sent to Alaska; and we had a right to assume, and we did assume, that that was because they were needed there for the defense of Alaska and for the defense of the entire United States. But now, less than 2 months later, orders to remove the entire squadron have been issued. I cannot understand it.

Mr. GRUENING. Does my colleague believe the relationship of the United States with Russia has improved greatly since the time—30 days ago—of the decision to base those better and faster fighter planes in Alaska, and the decision, last week, not to have any of our fighter planes at all based there?

Mr. BARTLETT. Most regretfully I say that every bit of evidence which has accumulated during that period is to the contrary. Indeed, the evidence of the last 48 hours in this regard is as tragic as it is disconcerting.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank my colleague.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to notify the Senate that there will be at least one yea-and-nay vote today, and there may be others. So I express the hope that the attachés of the Senate will notify Senators on both sides of the aisle accordingly.

RIOTS AT SAN FRANCISCO HEARINGS OF HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 14, I was in San Francisco, Calif., where a sorry and distressing spectacle occurred. A subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities was holding hearings in San Francisco, as a part of its continuing effort to document the activities of Communists and subversives in our country. During the course of the hearings on Friday, there was a riot; and strenuous efforts by the police were required, in order to subdue the riot. Sixty-four persons were arrested.

The persons who participated in that riot were, for the most part, students. Undoubtedly, the riot was inspired and incited by Communists or fellow travelers. That display was a sad commentary on the lack of self-discipline and moral training of the young people involved. It also illustrated the degree to which enemies of our Government, whether they be Communists or fellow travelers, are distorting American concepts and are twisting and warping the minds of many of the young people in the United States.

Mr. President, that incident should serve to impress on our minds the fact that Communist efforts to misdirect and mislead the formative minds of the youth of the United States are every bit as dangerous, if not more so, than Communist spying and espionage activities in this country. We should spare no effort to rid our educational institutions and our whole society of those who exert such un-American influences, and to counter—by our own examples and teachings of patriotism and moral stamina—such subversive efforts.

In this regard, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an excellent editorial about this incident. The editorial is entitled "Storm Trooper Tactics"; and it appeared in the May 16, 1960, issue of the News and Courier, of Charleston, S.C.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, May 16, 1960]

STORM TROOPER TACTICS

Storming of a House Un-American Activities subcommittee hearing in San Francisco by a jeering mob of 200 demonstrators is an outrage and a challenge to the authority of the U.S. Government.

We are sure that the good people of California are shocked that this Communist-style protest was directed against a subcommittee of the Congress. Who incited and organized the demonstration should be the first objective of police agencies, which should include California officials and the FBI. For years, the House Un-American Activities Committee has been a target of Communist abuse. Because this committee exposes Soviet agents and fellow-travelers, the Communist conspiracy in this country long has had abolition of the committee as one of its primary targets.

In considering the ugly attack on the subcommittee, which might have resulted in physical harm to Members of Congress, Californians should bear in mind the recent abuse heaped on the committee by U.S. Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California. He is to some degree responsible for the climate of opinion that made possible the storming of the subcommittee hearing.

Fortunately, San Francisco authorities were prompt in sending policemen to protect the congressional subcommittee, which represents the American people. But the presence of youthful stormtroopers in this great American city is a shame that distresses all patriotic citizens.

FREEZING OF ASSETS OF LOCAL 371 BY INTERNATIONAL TEXTILE WORKERS' UNION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, last year Congress passed a bill in the labor-management field, for the purpose, at least in part, of insuring more democracy in labor unions. Despite the difference which existed in the Congress over the specific provisions which should be written into the act, Congress was almost unanimous in recognizing the need and desirability for individual labor union members to have more power and authority in the conduct of the affairs of their own labor organizations. It should now be obvious to all of us, as it was to some of us last year, that our legislative effort was inadequate, at best.

In today's issue of the Washington Post there appears a news article which reports that Local 371 of the AFL–CIO Textile Workers is facing expulsion from the parent union. Already the international union has taken control of the local, and has frozen the assets of the local union.

The action of the international against local 371 does not stem from any difference between the local and the international on matters affecting collective bargaining. The difference between the local and the international, on the contrary, arises from a basic difference in philosophy between the members of local 371 and the officers of the international union, with respect to the question of school segregation. The members of local 371 live in Front Royal, Va., and have expressed themselves clearly in favor of private segregated schools, rather than to submit to integrated public schools under court order. As an indication of their preference, the members of local 371 of Front Royal, Va., contributed $48,000 during the 1958–59 school year to help pay the cost of a private high school when the Supreme Court of the United States ordered the races to be integrated in the public high school.

The International Union of the AFL–CIO Textile Workers, on the other hand, is a militantly liberal organization that

has backed strongly the school desegregation decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. The international has been one of the leading advocates of immediate integration of the races in the public schools, and it has backed its advocacy both vocally and financially.

It seems to me an intolerable situation that would allow the international union under these circumstances to seize control of the local union and take over the assets accumulated by the members of local 371. I congratulate the members of local 371 of Front Royal, Va., for remaining stanch in support of their views and for their continuing support of the ideas in which they believe, despite the pressures which can be brought against them by the bosses of the international union. I sincerely hope that the local will be able to regain control of the assets of the union through court action, if necessary, and I urge the Congress to take the necessary legislative action to remove the weapon of economic control over a local by the bosses of the international union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Post of Tuesday, May 17, entitled "Front Royal Union Faces Ouster Vote," be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRONT ROYAL UNION FACES OUSTER VOTE

Members of a defiant Textile Workers local in Front Royal, Va., may soon discover that they have been spinning themselves out of their international union.

For 2 years the local and the international have been in bitter disagreement over the local's support of segregated public schools.

A showdown between Local 371 of the AFL–CIO Textile Workers and the officers of the parent union may come on Thursday in Front Royal.

If the showdown does not materialize then, it surely will develop at the union's convention which begins next week in Chicago.

On Sunday it was disclosed that the international had taken over the control of the local and frozen its assets. The local sought to use $8,000 of its funds to purchase bonds being sold by a private high school, set up following the desegregation of the Warren County High School in 1958.

The international charged the local with using union funds for a nonunion purpose in violation of the Textile Workers constitution.

The Textile Workers, a former CIO union, is a militantly liberal organization that has backed strongly the school desegregation decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Local 371, which represents 2,000 workers at the American Viscose Corp. plant in Front Royal, is militantly segregationist.

When the Supreme Court ordered the desegregation of the Warren County High School in Front Royal 2 years ago, the local immediately became one of the leaders in the community's efforts to set up a private high school.

During the 1958–59 school year the members of the local contributed $48,000 to help pay the cost of a private high school which hurriedly established classrooms in five private buildings throughout Front Royal.

This year the Warren County Educational Foundation has been operating a high school in the Virginia Gentleman Restaurant and Club.

About 435 students are attending the Virginia Gentleman classes. Another 420 students are going to the desegregated Warren County High School.

Most of the cost of operating the private school is being met through State tuition grants given to students who attend private, nonsectarian institutions.

The $8,000 in school bonds which the local tried to buy would be used to help pay for the construction of a building for the private school.

The projected John A. Mosby Academy would cost $225,000. H. H. Marlow, president of Front Royal Academy, Inc., said that $85,000 in bonds already have been sold to local residents and businessmen.

Officials of neither the international nor the local union would comment yesterday on what is likely to be the outcome of the hearing on Thursday or any action that might be taken at the union's convention in Chicago.

But one distinct possibility is that the local may find itself—voluntarily or involuntarily—segregated from its international.

COMMUNITY ANTENNA SYSTEMS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill pending before the Senate is Senate bill 2653, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish jurisdiction in the Federal Communications Commission over community antenna systems.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Chair.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2653) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish jurisdiction in the Federal Communications Commission over community antenna systems.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, Senate bill 2653, as proposed to be amended, places community antenna television systems—CATV's—under the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission and empowers the Commission to issue requisite certificates of public convenience and necessity for the construction and operation of a CATV. In order to avoid any misunderstanding, the bill specifically declares community antennas not to be common carriers. Only the appropriate sections of title III of the Communications Act affecting regular broadcasters are specifically made to apply to the CATV's. Where it is suitable, the same provisions of the Communications Act that apply to broadcasters are made applicable to CATV's.

Generally the bill provides as follows:

First. The first subsection is an amendment to the definition section of the Communications Act defining a community antenna television system as a facility for performing the service of receiving and amplifying the signals transmitting programs broadcast by one or more television stations and redistributing such programs, by wire, to the subscribing members of the public.

Second. Section 3(h) of the Communications Act is amended by the second subsection by specifically declaring that a community antenna system is not a common carrier.

Third. Title III of the Communications Act is amended by inserting a new section 330 that is entitled "Community Antenna Television Systems."

(a) Subsection (a) of this new section specifically provides no person shall operate a community antenna television system except under and in accordance with a license granted by the Federal Communications Commission, but permits the CATV which is in operation on the date of the enactment of this bill to continue in operation until the Federal Communications Commission issues a license. The bill requires such a CATV system to file its application not later than 120 days after the bill is enacted.

(b) Under subsection (b), the bill designates the specific provisions of the Communications Act that shall apply to the community antenna system regulation. It is to be noted that section 325(a), which presently requires any broadcasting station rebroadcasting the program or any part thereof of another broadcasting station without the express authority of the originating station, does not apply.

(c) Subsection (c) is the so-called grandfather provision. It holds that the community antenna system operating on the date of the enactment of this bill shall be deemed to be operating in the public interest, and therefore entitled to a license subject to such conditions as the Commission may impose under subsection (d).

(d) Under subsection (d), a local television station assigned to a community in which a community antenna television system serves subscribers and is granted a grandfather license has 30 days within which, after the grant of a license or renewal thereof, to file a petition with the Commission requesting that the license of the CATV contain such conditions on the CATV's operation as will significantly facilitate the continued operation of a television station which is providing—and I wish to have Members of the Senate note this—the only available locally originating broadcasting program service. It should be noted that the filing of the request for imposing conditions is limited to the licensee of the television station who is concerned about the continued operation of his television station which is providing the only available locally originating television broadcast service. Procedures are established so that the community antenna system is afforded an opportunity to file a response to such petition, and that the Commission then shall determine whether, with due regard to services rendered by the community antenna television service and by the television station, the public interest, convenience, or necessity would be served by the adoption of the proposed operating conditions. If the television station or community antenna system requests public evidentiary hearings, the Commission is required to grant such a request, and, in addition, may order hearings on its own motion.

(e) This subsection would authorize the local television broadcast station to file an application requesting the community antenna television system to carry the programs of such local broadcast station which is assigned to a community in which a community antenna system operates if the Commission finds that this would be in the public interest. This subsection authorizes the FCC to promulgate rules and regulations so as to assure that reception of such programs as redistributed by community antenna television systems would be reasonably comparable in technical quality to other programs redistributed by the community antenna television system.

(f) This subsection would require the FCC to prevent, by appropriate regulations, duplication by a community antenna television system of programs of a television station assigned to a community served by the community antenna system.

Mr. President, I want Senators to remember that we are talking about community antenna systems and the only available local TV station. Those are the two standards in this proposed legislation.

This is not an important issue in my own State of Rhode Island. It makes very little difference to my State whether this proposed legislation is enacted or not. However, because I am privileged to be the chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and because this task was assigned by my subcommittee, we held protracted hearings in order to afford an opportunity to be heard to all people concerned with the problems, with the hope of reaching some practical and reasonable solution.

I visited the various States which are affected by this situation. I want the Members of the Senate to know that this indeed, insofar as the junior Senator from Rhode Island is concerned, in fact soon became a labor of love.

Many, many parts of our country, because of topography—because of hills, valleys, mountains, and other features—contain communities which are very hard to service.

This bill is not directed in any way toward injuring CATV as such. We seek merely to place CATV systems under regulation in order to protect their rights, and also to protect the rights of the only available broadcasting station, which may perish and go out of existence unless proper reforms are taken now of a very moderate nature.

In this country there are many sparsely inhabited areas. In a valley there may be four or five farmers who live within a radius of 5 or 10 miles. These people have no opportunity to receive a direct television signal. What happens? They build a little "kitchen" booster on top of a hill. Through that medium they take the signal from the nearest local broadcasting station, which may be located miles away and rebroadcast it. That is the only opportunity they have to receive and see one signal.

What is happening now? CATV is rendering a noble service. CATV came into existence at the time of the freeze. What does that system do? It builds a large antenna and takes out of the air three or four signals, which originate miles and miles and miles away. After these signals have been captured from the air, then by a process of amplification and microwaves, the signal is moved on, finally, to a cable system which runs along a street, on a wire on the street poles, then to be brought to the individual home.

Initially a fee is required in order to install the service, and thereafter a monthly rate is charged for the use of the equipment.

This bill in no way seeks to supervise or to affect the fees which are charged. If those fees are exorbitant, if they are moderate, if they are reasonable, or if they are too low, this bill would not affect them at all. We have no interest, under the terms of the bill, of watching over the profits of the CATV systems. That is the reason why we have said expressly in the bill that this CATV system shall not be considered a common carrier, so that the system will not fall within the formula of a public utility company. That is the first point.

Point No. 2 is that we are granting grandfather rights to these systems and they shall continue to operate pending the disposition of any request for the imposition of conditions. They must serve the public interest, the public convenience, and the public necessity.

There is a case now pending in court. I want all those who are opposed to the bill to pay close attention. There is a serious question today as to whether the people who are capturing this program out of the air have a right to do so without paying for the programs. There is a serious question in that regard, and there is litigation now pending in the courts.

When the bill was originally introduced there was a provision in the bill, as there is a provision in the Communications Act, to the effect that once these systems were licensed they would have to get the permission of the people who are originating the signal. Now, that would have been quite unfair. That would actually be saying to these people, "Go back and pay for something you have not been paying for up to now." Naturally, the broadcaster who would have to be approached for permission would say, "If you are obliged to come to me to get my permission, then I have a right to charge a fee." The broadcaster could charge $1,000, or could charge $1 million if he wanted to, depending upon whether to put the CATV system out of business or to keep the system in business.

I will tell Senators how fair the subcommittee was. We thought that was an unreasonable provision at the time we considered it, so we made an exception. We eliminated it from the bill. We have said that insofar as CATV is concerned, we will not disturb the present practice. However, there is a case pending in court.

Let us assume, for instance, that these systems are not put under regulation. Let us assume that the Senate defeats the bill today. What will happen if the Supreme Court should decide that these systems have to get the permission of the broadcasting station before they can take the program out of the air? Do Senators know what will happen? There will be chaos. We will deprive a lot of people of CATV service, because the fees may be prohibitive and there will be no authority which can say, "Look, these people are operating in the public interest, in the public convenience, and in the public necessity, and you have to be reasonable as to what you charge them; otherwise you will put them out of business."

I say that is most important. When Senators begin to think of voting against the bill, I think they should consider the matter very seriously. Let me tell the Senators what has happened.

In Montana this situation became so serious that there was introduced a bill putting CATV under local statutory authority. That bill passed the house, and it passed the senate, but the Governor vetoed it.

Let me tell Senators what was done in Utah. In Utah the situation became so bad that the legislature passed a law authorizing each municipality to borrow money to set up its own television service, so that the people could get the picture free, and have the charge put on the tax bill under "Recreation."

That illustrates what is happening throughout the country. I am saying that unless something is done promptly, many of those interested people in the galleries today will be surprised. These people have barraged the Senate with telegrams. They have been coming to town in large numbers. They have been walking up and down the corridors of the Old Senate Office Building and the New Senate Office Building. They have been saying that the bill is aimed at the little fellow.

I will say this: This is a bill to protect and to help the little family, which has no opportunity to view television free.

The CATV systems are claiming they are being made the underdog in this fight. That is not true at all. We have drawn up a moderate bill. We have taken everything into account.

Let me recount how far we have gone. We asked the attorney for this association to come before our committee, and we quizzed him point by point. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] will subscribe to this. Finally I said, "All right; what do you want us to do with this?" I took that man through the bill point by point by point. Finally, we agreed on practically everything he wanted.

Well, these men are in the corridors today and they are saying, "We do not agree with our lawyer."

I do not like to be personal about this matter, but this problem has been pending since 1958. So far as the junior Senator from Rhode Island is concerned, the proposal does not make any difference to him or to my State. It does mean much to the little people all over the country who can get only one signal. Those are the people we are trying to protect.

What are we saying? Take a situation where there is CATV in a locality and the community is being serviced by one local broadcasting station—if there are two, the criteria about the only local live television station does not apply—that one station might go out of business if this situation is not handled correctly. When the broadcaster applies to the FCC and can show that there is a contract with the broadcasting network with an obligation to show a picture—let us say it is "I Love Lucy" or "Gunsmoke" or any picture which is desired—on a Monday night, because it is being placed on a film, if the CATV system is taking this picture out of the air on Sunday night for broadcast on Sunday, we simply say this is unfair competition and the question of duplication is then raised.

This duplication should be avoided. There are two other channels available. Let them have three signals. In that case, why not wait until Monday night to show a picture which is going to be shown by the local station on Monday night? If the viewers do not like it, they can still turn off that channel and turn on either of the other two channels. That is all we are asking them to do. Yet these people are walking through the corridors of the two Senate Office Buildings trying to tell us we are attempting to put them out of business. What the bill does is to save that only existing local originating broadcasting station. It does not go much beyond that.

I have talked with many CATV owners. They come in to me and say, "We want to be under Federal regulation," but when the matter is investigated, we discover they do not want to be regulated. After all, if they are to be regulated, certain rules must be followed. This, I repeat, is a very modest, a very moderate, and what I consider to be a very fair bill.

I repeat that it makes no difference to the State of Rhode Island, but it makes a big difference to the State of Colorado. It makes a big difference to Arizona.

Let me state what will happen in Arizona. There are four commercial broadcasting stations in Phoenix, which is more than a hundred miles from Yuma. Yuma has one local broadcasting station. There is an hour's differential in time between Phoenix and Yuma. I ask the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] if that is correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. The local Yuma TV station must get its program from California and pay for it, but it gets the program an hour later than does Phoenix.

Unless these two systems are brought together on the one program which is to be shown at Yuma before the CATV program is brought in, the local broadcasting station will be showing yesterday's news. Who wants to see "Gunsmoke" on Monday night if he can see it on Saturday night? That is what it amounts to. All we are saying in that particular instance is that through the rules of the FCC—and everything is to be done through the order of the FCC—duplication must be avoided of the local picture, if it is in the public interest. This is necessary so that the local station will not vanish, and so that these little people will still have their one little signal, and will not have to throw their television sets into discard.

That is all we are doing. I submit to the Senate that we could not be any fairer than we are, and any attempt to defeat this legislation at this time would do irreparable harm to many little people, none in Rhode Island, but located throughout the Midwest.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Montana

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to ask some questions, but before I do so I should like to state that I was engaged in a colloquy with the distinguished minority leader last Friday, at which time he asked me what the schedule for this week would be. I told him I thought we would bring up the CATV bill, the Stella bill, and another bill which the majority leader had previously announced would be considered shortly. The minority leader asked that the CATV bill not be brought up on Monday. I replied, "Fine, we will bring it up as soon thereafter as possible."

On Saturday I received many telegrams from the State of Montana, 12 of which I have here, all identically worded, from my hometown of Missoula, Mont. I almost put them in the RECORD, but I do not believe I shall do so, because I do not wish to embarrass anyone in my home State. But I have 12 telegrams, identically worded, from the same town.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator whether he received any telegrams from the little people in Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not know exactly in what stratum these people are, but altogether I must have received 60 telegrams, and I was visited by 4 representatives from my State. They had a right to visit me. They were interested in cable TV. I told them that if they would give me a list of the questions they wished to ask, I would try to get the answers in black and white. But before I get to their questions, I should like to ask some questions of my own.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it possible to yield when I have been yielded to?

Mr. PASTORE. With my permission it is possible.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I should like to state that in connection with the point just made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], I have in my hand a telegram which reads as follows:

SALINAS, CALIF., *May 16, 1960.*

Mr. HARRY BUTCHER,
DuPont Plaza Hotel,
Washington, D.C.:

Our attention has been called to a flood of telegrams from Carmel, Calif., in opposition to S. 2653 regulating CATV systems. Upon checking we find all telegrams identical, with different signatures sent by one man and billed to one man. Upon further checking we find two of the signatures knew nothing about the telegrams and doubt that others did either. It seems the telegraphic attempt to persuade Senate not to pass this bill is a hoax. On legislation so vital to the future orderly growth of TV it is regrettable that the proponents of an unregulated CATV system should resort to such doubtful tactics.

JOHN C. COHAN,
President, KSBW TV, Salinas, Calif.

On the same point, if it bears on the issue the Senator from Colorado was raising here, I have in my hand a message——

Mr. PASTORE. From where?

Mr. McGEE. From Rhode Island. Excuse me. When there are two such distinguished Senators on the floor at the same time, the junior Senator from Wyoming can be pardoned for being confused.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Wyoming does not have to look as far to see me as he does to see the Senator from Colorado. I cannot understand why he made that mistake.

Mr. McGEE. I have a pair of bifocals which it may be in order to use.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a set of instructions described "Legislative program in regard to S. 2653." These instructions have apparently been given to a host of individuals who have come to visit us in Washington over this weekend. I think the instructions bear out very much of what the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] was alluding to in his comment to the chairman of the committee. The instructions read in part as follows:

No. 1. Please make a personal visit to the office of the two Senators from your State on Monday, May 16. Senators are very busy and your visits should be brief but to the point.

I believe that is a commendable instruction. It recognizes how busy Senators are.

No. 2. When talking with your Senator, ask him to take action for you. Ask him first to oppose the bill. If he cannot agree to oppose the bill and vote against it, ask him to vote to send the bill back to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Reasons why the Senators should do this are prepared for you on another sheet that is in your kit.

I have heard the expression "kit and caboodle." They have left out the "caboodle" side of their instructions, but the kit is there.

They finally say, "Tell your Senator that you intend to watch the proceedings from the gallery while you are in town."

May I suggest to my chairman, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], that I have the feeling that not only are we being watched, but we are surrounded, and I think that fact ought to be called to the attention of this body. This is not the first time this has happened in the Senate, nor will it be the last, but I think what has been indulged in here ought to be made a matter of public record.

If it is permissible, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point the full content of these marching orders.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM RE S. 2653

BACKGROUND

The CATV bill, known technically as S. 2653, is scheduled for action Tuesday, May 17, and probably will be voted upon on that date.

A motion may be made to resubmit the bill to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for further study.

ACTION

(1) Please make a personal visit to the office of the two Senators from your State on Monday, May 16. Senators are very busy and your visit should be brief but to the point * * * they will appreciate it. Arrange your visit in advance by telephone, if possible, starting as early in the morning as 8 a.m. * * * Senators are available until 6 p.m., or later, and don't stop until you have talked with them both.

(2) When talking with your Senator, ask him to take action for you. Ask him first to oppose the bill. If he cannot agree to oppose the bill and vote against it, second, ask him to vote to send the bill back to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Reasons why the Senators should do this are prepared for you on another sheet that is in your kit.

(3) Ask the Senator to arrange for a visitor's gallery pass; tell him that you intend to watch the proceedings while you are in town.

(4) Offer your help in obtaining any additional information or facts the Senator or his office may want.

(5) Report back to NCTA legislative headquarters. Give the legislative committee representative on duty in the Concord Room a brief verbal report of your visits not later than 10 p.m., Monday, May 16. For telephone contact with the headquarters, the Mayflower Hotel's telephone number is DI 7-3000; the hotel operator will know the extension.

(6) Be present in the Senate gallery on Tuesday morning, May 17, to watch developments on your bill. Your presence will be effective, and noticed by your Senators.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am quite certain the delegation from Montana is in the gallery, as I invited them to attend, and listening to every single word I say. As I mentioned earlier, I did ask them, if they so desired, to raise some questions which I should like later in the proceedings to call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, the chairman of the subcommittee which held the hearings on the bill.

What is the name of the lawyers who represent this association in Washington?

Mr. PASTORE. I believe the name of the lawyer is Mr. Smith.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Stratford Smith?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes. He is a very nice young man, very courteous, and an attorney well qualified.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On page 3783 of the television inquiry hearings held in May and July of 1958, Mr. Smith states that—

The community antenna television industry born in the so-called freeze imposed by the Federal Communications Commission on the licensing of television stations on order issued in September 1948, and the industry grew since that time but was "more or less ignored" by the Commission until the "freeze" was lifted.

Is it correct that the Federal Communications Commission has failed to bring about proper regulations to give stability to the television industry as a whole, so that all forms of television can exist properly?

Mr. PASTORE. Well, that is a very difficult question to answer. I have been very critical of the FCC at times. Of course, if we are to go off on tangents, in trying to determine whether the FCC has done its work properly in giving us a competitive system throughout the Nation, that will lead us into many detours, and it will lead us into many arguments that can be made on both sides.

I have been critical of the FCC. The following is not in criticism of CATV. It is true that CATV came into existence at the time of the so-called freeze. They have done a good job. There is no criticism of the people in CATV, as such. They have a right to live and to do business. I say that sincerely, Mr. President. I have told them so. I told them so when they appeared before the subcommittee.

What they do is to take three or four signals out of the air and bring them home to a community which may not have had any TV. Where there is only one signal, they can bring in that signal. They charge for this service, of course. They have a right to make a charge. They charge a fixed fee, too, for installation.

Some people think that they charge too much. Some think that they have become quite wealthy at it. Well, after all, even Henry Ford, after he created his automobile, became a very wealthy man—and deserved to be wealthy. This is not a bill to circumvent anyone's business activity. These people have a difficult, important, and useful job to do.

I have been to Helena, and held hearings there, in order to see what the problem was in Montana, and I have visited locations where there are probably only a half dozen people involved. I remember one case of a man in Idaho, I believe, who lived on the other side of a mountain. A half dozen farmers got together and they put up a series of boosters to get a picture brought to them. They can get only one picture. They depend completely on the continuation of the TV station that supplies that signal. If anything happens to that only local TV station, we put their sets into complete darkness. We are trying to protect them. We are trying to give these people a chance to enjoy the TV station that needs a chance to live.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Has not the Senator stated on a number of occasions that he felt that this country could have all kinds of television if the business were properly regulated, and that this responsibility should be under the Federal Communications Commission?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct. That is why I believe CATV ought to be put under the Federal Communications Commission. After all, this is television we are talking about. Television is now under the control of the FCC, under existing law. The Federal Communications Commission has a right to grant licenses for microwaves. However, they do not go into questions the effect such grants will have on the other operations authorized by the Commission—the public interest.

Inasmuch as we are dealing with television, inasmuch as there is somewhat of a conflict here, inasmuch as they have a situation which in time might result in people being placed in total darkness, I am saying that now is the time to put CATV under supervision. There is nothing in the bill that does CATV any harm. There is nothing in the bill that does CATV the slightest injury. I say that, no matter what the protestations may be.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator feel that the committee has taken all due care in the preparation of this bill; that is, does he feel that the committee has done a thorough job in considering all the factors involved?

Mr. PASTORE. I not only feel that, but I say we have visited locations involved, and have sat one afternoon in Senator FULBRIGHT'S office going over amendments. I have talked to CATV representatives in the corridor, at the behest of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and I have explained the situation to them. I have talked with everyone who wanted to explain his position with regard to this proposed legislation. I do not believe that any bill ever came before the Senate that had been studied as exhaustively as has this bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not correct to say that the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission and other Commissioners have requested authority on numerous occasions within the last 2 or 3 years to conduct on-the-site investigations?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It has been rumored that this bill is geared to put television cable operators out of business. Is that true?

Mr. PASTORE. No; that is not true. I have already said that the Federal Communications Commission was rather lukewarm with regard to whether they should assume the responsibility of implementing the bill. They appeared before us and they said so. They published one or two directives to that effect. Finally, at the urging of our committee, they sent a man out into the field to investigate the situation. Let me disclose what the Commission submitted to the House committee yesterday. May I have the Senator's indulgence to read the testimony into the RECORD at this point? I believe it will in part answer his question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. PASTORE. I read:

Thereafter, the Commission initiated a field inquiry into the general subject of TV repeater services and particularly into the problems encountered by local stations in communities served by a CATV system. This inquiry was made by a member of the Commission and staff officials during August 1959 in the States of Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Washington, and Wyoming, and the views of various organizations and individuals who reflected all sides of the local station-CATV controversy were obtained. As a result of its further consideration of this problem in the light of the information obtained since the issuance of its report and order in Docket No. 12443, the Commission is in accord with the approach taken in subsection (g) of the proposed legislation as it looks to the prevention of the duplication of local station programs by a CATV system. It would appear that the ability of CATV systems, operating without any Federal statutory restrictions, to intercept first run programs broadcast by stations in large metropolitan areas and to redistribute them to subscribers in a small community in advance of the broadcast of that same program by the local station, gives rise to an inequitable competitive disadvantage which the local station is unable to overcome by any reasonable means within its control.

Can anything be clearer than that? The FCC, after being lukewarm on this subject, sent a Commissioner and a staff member out into the field. They talked to every interested individual possible. They made an inspection on the subject of the location of these antennas and of these CATV systems, and they came back and said that we ought to have some Federal control. They said that without some Federal control we would put the local broadcasting stations at a disadvantage, which they could not meet through any reasonable means at their disposal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator will recall that in 1958, after the other members of the Montana delegation and I had received thousands of communications concerning free television, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], as chairman of the full Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, granted our request to conduct hearings. The Senator will further recall that on May 28, when I personally appeared before the committee, I introduced the people from my State who represented television stations, and television cable operators, and requested at that time that everyone be given an opportunity to state his case. As a result of those hearings, the committee made four recommendations to the Federal Communications Commission. As a result of these recommendations, FCC asked Congress for legislation to carry them out.

Is S. 2653, which is now before the Senate, one of the bills introduced as the result of the request from FCC for legislation?

Mr. PASTORE. Well, it is a bill which was fashioned after we listened to the various witnesses and studied all the pending bills. Is the Senator asking whether the Commission itself suggested this particular bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Was it one of the recommendations that a bill of this nature be drawn up?

Mr. PASTORE. The FCC's original bill was limited to the consent provision. I daresay, from what I have read to the Members of the Senate, it would take many of our proposals today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. When I appeared before the committee on the bill in 1958, I mentioned that it was my understanding that Stratford Smith, an attorney, would present the views of the television cable operators, and I believe he did. Is Stratford Smith one of the individuals with whom the Senator from Rhode Island or the committee members have met to discuss the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. On several occasions he appeared before our committee, and we went over the bill point by point. I asked him what, specifically, was bothering him, and what suggestions he had to make. I think we debated practically all of them. But, as it is with human nature, after they changed some things, they now think it is better strategy to attempt to defeat the proposed legislation completely.

That is a natural reaction. However, after all, it is our responsibility to meet the public needs. We not only have CATV to be concerned about; we have the little people to think about and to protect as well. Somewhere in between we must do something about the matter. If we turn our backs completely on the question, it will deteriorate completely into chaos.

I know the Senator from Arizona is concerned about it. The Senator from Utah, the Senator from Colorado, the Senator from Idaho, and the Senator from Montana—Republicans and Democrats alike—are concerned about it. The Senator from Kansas is waiting to give his views. This is not a question which is separated by the middle aisle. It has to do with people. People want to look at a little signal. We do not attempt to say to the CATV, "We want to put you out of business." No; we want to keep them in business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Can the Senator from Rhode Island state whether Stratford Smith is one of the individuals who advised him, through the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], that if Senate bill 2653 were amended, the cable operators would accept the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. I would not like to answer that question. I think it would be improper for me to do so. I do not remember that he did. I do not believe he put his statement in that form. I think he is too smart a lawyer to have made such a statement. I myself think that after he got through agreeing to take what the Senate offered, he would fight it in the House, that would be quite natural. But I do not believe we ought to be guided by Mr. Smith's or his colleagues' judgment, one way or the other.

I simply say—and I challenge anyone to refute my statement—that we went over the bill with Mr. Smith in committee, step by step. We sat in the office of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and went over it step by step. When we left that office, it was agreed that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] would offer certain amendments and that I would consider them.

After they were worked out the first thing I knew, we were told that they were no longer going to push the amendments. I understand that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is no longer interested in sponsoring the amendments.

I know that somewhere along the line someone became a little displeased with the tactics being employed.

Frankly, I am a little bit irritated about the way we were treated, but I do not desire to vent that feeling or that emotion upon the proposed legislation. I am still predicating my argument upon the substance of the legislation and the need for it in this country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Last August, when S. 1886, affecting TV boosters, was before the Senate and passed, S. 2653 was called up, but at the request of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], it was passed over. Is not that a correct statement?

Mr. PASTORE. I believe it is correct. I know it was passed over, but I do not know at whose request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator from Rhode Island recall whether the request of the Senator from Arkansas was that the Senate delay action so that representatives of the National Community TV Association, Inc., could submit amendments?

Mr. PASTORE. That seems to be correct. That is precisely what happened in the office of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did not the Senator from Rhode Island, who now has the floor, agree to the request, which other Senators and I made, that he personally conduct hearings in States like Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Idaho, and Utah?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Those hearings were conducted, and the Senator heard individuals representing the cable operators, did he not?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did the Senator from Rhode Island hear the testimony of TV boosters, and TV station representatives, as well as of television viewers?

Mr. PASTORE. We heard the testimony of many of them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it correct to state that since that time the Senator from Rhode Island has met with such persons on a number of occasions to try to agree on these amendments to the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator from Rhode Island say that this is the first time a chairman of a subcommittee has ever reconsidered amendments to a bill which had already been

voted upon in committee and has been pending on the calendar since last August?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know whether this proposal is unprecedented. But that is precisely what I have done. I understand a motion will be made this afternoon to recommit the bill. I do not know how far an individual should go in carrying out the functions and responsibilities of a subcommittee.

I made public declarations that if there were any amendments which might be proposed, I would be perfectly willing to look at them and consider them. I made that statement yesterday. I was asked with whom they should get in touch. I said they should get in touch with Mr. Zapple of our staff who would show them to me. I have received no proposed amendments.

The difficulty is that the bill is not wanted. The desire now is to have the bill recommitted, to be refined further. It cannot be refined further.

As a matter of fact, I said we would consider any amendment that might be proposed; I went so far as to say that they should be brought to the floor, and I would consider them on the floor. But the fact is that the bill is not wanted. The desire is to have the bill sent back to committee. Why? To let it die.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island further yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is my understanding correct that the bill was reported unanimously by the committee?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know. There was a great amount of discussion. I would not go so far as to say that it was reported unanimously. I assume that Senators like the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who is a member of the committee, never agreed with it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is my understanding correct that after the amendments were agreed upon, and notice was given that the bill would be called up, the Senator from Rhode Island learned, only on Thursday or Friday of last week, that it was the intention of the representatives of the cable operators to oppose the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. It is my impression that they are going to oppose it. I do not think that is decisive.

Mr. MANSFIELD. My next question has been answered by the Senator from Wyoming. Does the Senator from Rhode Island know of a communication instructing the people in the States to send telegrams of such protest? I refer again to the 12 identical telegrams sent to me from Missoula, Mont. Each one of the senders seems to have the idea that I support S. 2653. I have never made a public statement about the bill, but each one of the telegrams states: "I oppose your support of S. 2653." How they got information that I support the bill, I do not know, because I have not made any statement about it, public, private, or otherwise, which would convey that fact. Nevertheless, it is interesting to receive telegrams of this kind, each having the same words, and coming from the same city.

Mr. PASTORE. I hope Senators will attend to my statement. This has been a blitz campaign. I ask Senators who perhaps are not too familiar with the bill, How many of them were approached by these CATV people months and months ago? The bill has been on the calendar for almost a year. The Senate has been considering the measure for almost 2 years. How many people who now say they are opposed to it have appeared before the committee? I daresay not many. But now, at the 11th hour, when the bill has been called up for action on the floor of the Senate, we are subjected to a blitz in the form of telegrams and of personal appearances in an attempt to make Senators believe that the bill will destroy—yes, destroy—their business. That is not true.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I met yesterday with four citizens of my State and suggested to them that if they had any questions concerning the bill I would appreciate having them and would try to get the answers to them, so that they would have them in black and white. Here are the questions they gave me:

Am I correct in my understanding that one of the effects of the bill would be to prevent CATV systems from receiving stations which broadcast programs scheduled by local stations located in the same community as the CATV system?

Mr. PASTORE. Only if it is done by edict of the Federal Communications Commission; if the practice would be more or less "getting a jump," for lack of a better word, on the program to be shown later by the local television station, and where it is thought that such a practice might jeopardize the existence of a local television station. Then the Federal Communications Commission could make rules and regulations to the effect that the CATV system would have to show that particular program at the same time, or the CATV would have to show the program along with the local television station, including several others it was already showing.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is there anything in the proposed legislation which would exempt community antennas from this particular requirement if the same programs that are being duplicated by the CATV system are also available in the community by means of off-the-air television reception from television stations in other communities?

Mr. PASTORE. That is a loaded question. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Montana gave me a copy of his questions an hour ago. Every question is a loaded question. They are like the old question asked around court houses: When did you stop beating your wife? Whether the answer is yes or no, the person who answers is in trouble. They all lead to the same thing; they all aim in the same direction. Take a situation where there is one available television broadcasting station in a community, and in the same community a CATV system operates, which has the advantage of showing three, four, or five signals, the TV broadcaster petitions the Federal Communications Commission and shows that unless its particular program is shown also on the CATV, as one of the three it shows, at the same time when the TV station shows it, that will be a disadvantage to the TV station inasmuch as the TV station lives on advertising, and inasmuch as the CATV serves only the congested areas, because it does not pay it to extend its lines to sparsely settled areas, unless something is done, the TV station will have to close, and then will lose its license, and then will have to close up shop permanently. That is the situation. Senators can ask me a thousand times; but if I have said it once to the members of the CATV organization, I have said it 100 times, and they understand the situation.

However, they say they will do it by agreement. If they are willing to do it by agreement, what is wrong with doing it under the supervision of the Federal Communications Commission? That is all the bill does.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield further to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator from Rhode Island call me up short if I get out of bounds? I ask him to remember that the questions I am submitting are not my questions but questions which I have asked the CATV people from Montana to prepare for me.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am not saying the Senator from Montana is out of bounds. But all these questions are drawn in such a way that if I answer them by saying categorically "yes" or "no," someone can get into an argument about my answers. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield further to me?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would any provision of the bill require the Federal Communications Commission to impose the same regulations against VHF boosters and UHF translators bringing programs into the same community in which a local station and a community antenna system are operating side by side?

Mr. PASTORE. There, again, I cannot imagine that the Federal Communications Commission would operate in a way that would be inimical to the public interest. But if it did, we should get rid of the Commission members. After all, all of the activities under the bill are to be placed under the aegis and the supervision of the Federal Communications Commission. Have we lost faith in the Commission? Do we think it is bent on putting anyone out of business? I do not think it is.

Does this bill apply to a community in which there are two broadcasting stations? No, it does not.

Does the bill apply to a television station which has less than 50 service subscribers? No, it does not.

Does the bill apply to anyone who puts an antenna on top of an apartment house, and serves all the tenants of the apartment house? No, it does not.

So we have taken care of practically every situation; and if there are any which we have not taken care of, I ask

Senators please to submit amendments in regard to them, and we shall take care of them, too.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield further to me?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Has the Senate passed, or is there being considered, any other legislation which would require the Federal Communications Commission to treat translators, boosters, and CATV systems on the same basis, insofar as avoidance of duplication of programs is concerned?

Mr. PASTORE. I thought that was the previous question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. All right.

Will the Senator from Rhode Island yield for another question?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not possible, then, that under this legislation, CATV systems might be prohibited from duplicating programs scheduled by local stations, whereas other auxiliary television reception devices in the same community could duplicate them?

Mr. PASTORE. I could answer that question in the same way. The word "duplication" runs all through these questions. I have explained what we mean by "duplication." You see, in many parts of the country there are no live television programs. For instance, if a program originates in New York, and if it is shown in Arizona, because of the difference in time, if it is on a direct line the program can come live or by tape by means of what is called kinescope. For instance, if live television were shown in Phoenix, let us say, and if the CATV were able, through microwave or a good antenna, to capture the picture coming from Phoenix, then the CATV would catch the picture while it was still "live"; and in that event, a poor fellow in Yuma who was waiting to get the program on Wednesday night would be at an insurmountable disadvantage, because by means of CATV many of the people in that community—including those who watched television in taverns or other public places—would be able to see the program on Tuesday night. In that event, the station which scheduled the program for Wednesday night would not be able to obtain advertisers. The prospective advertisers would feel that by Wednesday night any impact of the program would have been lost, and thus to advertise on the program on Wednesday night would be like trying to sell last Sunday's newspaper today. Who would buy it?

So this should be synchronized in such a way that if a local broadcasting station which can show only one signal is in conflict with CATV, there must be a plan, under the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission, to have the picture shown in that community, and at a time which will be convenient and satisfactory as the Commission will find to be appropriate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield further to me?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to state my next question, although it will not require an answer, because it, likewise, has to do with duplication. The question is this: Under this legislation, is it not possible, then, that if the Commission is required to require CATV to avoid duplicating programs where there is a local station, CATV could be destroyed by its inability to provide the public with the same services that boosters, translators, or out-of-town stations can provide?

My next question is as follows: If this is so, is there not a serious possibility that under the provisions of the bill there is a constitutional discrimination which, in the last analysis, might make it impossible for the Federal Communications Commission to enforce the provisions of the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. Well, Mr. President, when we talk about constitutionality, it works both ways. That is what the broadcasters are invoking against the CATV people. They say, "We go to great expense to show a program, and we have to charge our affiliates who show it. But those who use CATV can erect an antenna and can take the picture out of the air, and do not pay for it. Then they transmit it to others, and charge those others for the privilege of seeing the picture which we originate."

After all, constitutionality works both ways.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Am I correct in my understanding that, under the provisions of the bill, the Federal Communications Commission can require community antenna systems to receive the signals of a local television station in the same community if the local station wishes to be received?

Mr. PASTORE. If the public interest is to be served, of course.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield further?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Federal Communications Commission have authority to require a community antenna system in the same town as two local stations to receive both local stations upon application of both local stations?

Mr. PASTORE. The proposed bill should not apply. In any event this is a detail that is left to the FCC under f(1).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield further?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If, in fact, it is intended that a CATV system be required to carry only one local station, would not the carriage by CATV of the first local station work discrimination and undue hardship on the second or third local station which might not be received on the CATV system?

Mr. PASTORE. Only if the Federal Communications Commission were asleep and were not doing its job.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield further to me?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would not it be better to make it clear that whenever a second station comes into a community which is served by a CATV system, none of the provisions of the bill will apply?

Mr. PASTORE. I think that is abundantly clear, by means of the provisions already in the bill. But we can state, as a matter of history, that it is not the intent of the Congress to have the criteria apply. But I do not think we have to write in such a provision; I think we have made that abundantly clear. The hearings indicate it, and the report indicates it, and the bill indicates it.

So I think that is a rather specious argument; and I do not believe it has any place here.

But if some think there is any substance to such an argument, let me say here, unequivocally, that in that particular case the bill would not apply, because in the bill we use the words "the only available facility."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for his patience and his courtesy; and I express the hope that in asking these questions I have not worn out the patience of my colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island how much I appreciate the service he has rendered to the States of the West which are faced with this general problem.

At my request, the Senator will recall, he came to Idaho during the past recess, and he conducted a very fine and much appreciated hearing at Idaho Falls. It seems to me it is clearly in the interest of CATV to be licensed, and the provision in the pending bill which would require the CATV system to include in the local broadcasting station is, I think, something which neither they nor, indeed, anyone else can fairly object. But I do have some questions about the final provision of the bill which I would appreciate having clarified.

As the Senator knows, in my State there are community antenna television systems in Lewiston, in Soda Springs, and in places that are within reach of larger cities like Salt Lake City in Utah and Spokane in Washington. In Lewiston, for example, we have one available local television station. I am wholly in accord with the principle that the law should provide proper safeguards to preserve the local television stations; but there are about 3,000 families in the Lewiston area who are anxious to obtain programs broadcast by the Spokane stations, and they are paying customers of the local community antenna television system. One reason why they are willing to pay the fees is that they have the variety the local station cannot furnish, but another reason, it seems to me, may be the inducement that some programs they want to see at the time the event occurs can be purchased through this service, but cannot be seen at the time of occurrence, on the local broadcasting station.

Take, for example, the world's series. Let us assume that these many people in

Lewiston are anxious to see the world's series, and, through their connection with the community antenna television system, they can see the world's series as the games occur.

As I read the provisions of the pending bill, under subsection (g), there is to be found the following language:

> The commission shall prescribe appropriate rules and regulations in order to avoid the duplication of programs broadcast or scheduled to be broadcast by a television station * * * which is assigned to a community in which a community antenna television system serves—

Reading that far, it would appear to me that the effect of this provision would be to prohibit the community antenna system from broadcasting the world series, as it occurs, to the people of the Lewiston area, if the local station intends to obtain a kinescope of the games and play it back a day or two later.

Am I correct in my interpretation of this provision?

Mr. PASTORE. No; the Senator is not correct. In the first place, let me say this. I cannot imagine a situation in which, for example, a world series game played on Sunday is shown on the Tuesday following, when it has been read about and heard on the radio. That situation was given as a hypothetical question, I understand; but let me say this. The original bill which was introduced provided specifically that, at the request of a broadcaster, they had to show the broadcaster's signal. I thought that right should not be left up to the broadcaster; I thought it should be within the province of the Federal Communications Commission The committee agreed with me. That section reads in part:

> The Commission shall prescribe appropriate rules—

I am telling the Senator, very frankly, if that situation arose and the Federal Communications Commission had a regulation which blacked out the program, it either ought to repeal the regulation or be called before our committee to explain why it had adopted such a rule.

I suppose, under any given situation, one could imagine a condition which would be unwise, and sometimes even ridiculous. That is one reason why we are leaving this regulation within the province of the Federal Communications Commission. I would hope the Commission would make reasonable rules.

Mr. CHURCH. So it is the opinion of the Senator from Rhode Island that the FCC, in implementing this provision, will take into account the fact that some programs should be broadcast at the time the event occurs, and will not prohibit the community antenna station from so doing. Is that correct?

Mr. PASTORE. Either that or they will be blind to the facts of life.

Mr. CHURCH. Very well. I think this legislative history ought to be made clear.

I have one further question, if the Senator will yield. What administrative problem will be involved here for community antenna TV systems if they are prohibited not only from duplicating a program that is being simultaneously carried by the local station, but also prohibited from carrying a program which may later be scheduled to be broadcast by the local station? Is this practicable, or will it involve an administrative problem clearly beyond the ability of many CATV systems to comply with the regulation?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not think so. The distinguished Senator from Vermont and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire are present. I do not think they are much concerned with that problem. Some localities have a scarcity of local broadcasting. Some of them did not have one station, and that has now been corrected. There is one station in Vermont on the borderline of two States where that problem was involved. There are other sections of the country where that happens. In situations of that kind, I think the procedure would be rather perfunctory.

When we consider an area such as that of the State of the Senator from Idaho, there is a serious situation in some of the valleys behind high mountains. I recall that when I came to the lovely State of the Senator from Idaho, and we met at Idaho Falls, many people came to the hearing. The courtroom was crowded. Many farmers and their children and wives wanted to have a television broadcasting system so they could have a signal. The situation would be serious in such a case. I think the FCC is sensible enough to take such a situation into account in making the rules, so that they can deal with all these different situations, and equity can be done. There are some situations, I will say very frankly to the Senator from Idaho, where all that the procedure would amount to would be the filing of an application, the granting of a license, and that would be the end of it, because there would be no interference or contest.

I was told by a Senator from one of the northern New England States that they are not interested in anything like that, that there is no such problem involved. But there are localities in the United States where some of these local stations have shut down. I cannot put my finger on it just now to prove it, but the allegation is made that the cause of it was the coming of the CATV.

The CATV says, "Prove it." It is like asking someone to prove which bullet caused the death of a man who had two fatal wounds. I do not know. There are many factors which go into the shutting down of a station. But the fact of the matter is that there is a strong suspicion that the coming in of CATV has caused it. A staff man of the Federal Communications Commission has made an investigation of the matter. I will tell the Senator very frankly that is the impression I received. If that is so, it will be taken care of very quickly; but, in the meantime, I do not think anybody's toes are going to be stepped on too hard.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a clarifying question?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would the bill require a license for only the CATV systems which the Senator has described, which the Senator alleges in several cases are in conflict with a single local TV station, or would the bill impose Federal licensing on all 760 CATV systems, most of which pose no threat to and are in no conflict with the single local TV station?

Mr. PASTORE. The bill would impose licensing upon all of them for a very obvious reason. How do we know when the Federal Communications Commission is going to grant a broadcasting license? Are we not trying to promote a competitive system? Are we not trying to insure a free system? Do we want to say that once CATV is provided, the local people will have to forget about regular TV?

Of course, this will all be under Federal control. All I say is that the parts of the bill about which there is complaint will not have any effect in those localities which have been mentioned. In those localities, coming under supervision would be a very perfunctory thing.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The bill will require these men to go before the Federal Communications Commission. They will need a counsel to represent them. Obtaining one of these licenses involves the same complex provisions and rules and regulations which apply to the granting of TV licenses. These licenses would have to be renewed every 3 years.

This is the "guts" of what these men are afraid of. It involves the recurring expense of coming back again, after all of the trouble of getting the little business organized. Many of these systems were built by these men with their own hands, yet these men are to be subjected to relicensing every 3 years and the expense and trouble of appearing before the Federal Communications Commission at any hearings which may have to be held to justify the license.

Mr. PASTORE. Well, that is not entirely so. It is true that perhaps some of these fellows built these systems with their own hands. We know of several systems which have been sold for high sums.

In the case of getting a license for the microwave, it is necessary to appear before the same Commission, or otherwise these men cannot get the microwave authority. These men have to do business with the telephone company, or otherwise they cannot get the right to use the telephone poles, and so on. These men have to deal with the municipalities, in order to get a franchise to put up the cables.

After all, this is much the same as is true in other instances. When there is no objection, the application could be sent in. Why would it be necessary to get an attorney if nobody objected to the proposal? Why would it be necessary to do that? It would operate much the same as the Consent Calendar call in the Senate. We pass a great many bills, simply because nobody objects to the passage of the bills.

Sometimes we pass a couple of hundred bills in an afternoon. However, when some Senator objects, as is the case with regard to the bill we are now considering, we are here all afternoon.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL and Mr. KERR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator from Oklahoma does not mind, I should like to yield first to the Senator from Kansas, for he has been on his feet a long time.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Rhode Island that as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I appreciate what the Senator from Rhode Island has done while acting as chairman of the subcommittee. It has not been an easy task for the Senator. He has made a painstaking effort over a long period of time to go into all phases of the subject of the bill as they came up, and his actions have been most commendable.

I was one who voted to bring the bill from the committee to the Senate. I, like some of my distinguished colleagues in the Senate, have received within the last few days some objections, which I had never heretofore thought existed, and about which I had never heretofore heard. I had been informed by those in a responsible position, those who knew of the activities of the subcommittee and of the study which has gone into the whole matter, that most of the problems in this regard had been resolved.

I know that with respect to some proposed legislation we make a history on the floor of the Senate, as to the interpretations and a few things like that, of all of which, of course, the distinguished Senator is well aware.

Some of these matters may have been covered in part, but, as the distinguished Senator knows, I submitted to him this afternoon a series of questions which I desired to address to him. If some of the questions appear to be a duplication I shall avoid asking them. For instance, I think question No. 3 has already been answered.

If the Senator will yield for this purpose, I should like to ask him the first question.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Is there any authority in the bill under which the Federal Communications Commission could exempt some of the smaller community antenna systems from burdensome regulation?

Mr. PASTORE. First of all, let me say that the bill specifically provides that it shall not apply to cases where there are less than 50 subscribers. I think under the general power of classifying, that could be taken even further in the public interest. As a matter of fact, we refer to that particular matter under subsection (b) on page 3, where it is said, "The provisions of sections 303"—

If the Senator will read the Communications Act, he will find that the Commission has some latitude and flexibility in promulgating rules and classifications. I think in the public interest possibly we could go further than that, but so far as the bill is concerned, there is an exemption up to 50.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Question No. 2: Some of the communications to my office indicate a belief that S. 2653 would require a community antenna company to obtain permission from the television broadcaster before he could distribute the television signals. It is my understanding that no such provision appears in the bill. Will the Senator comment on this point?

Mr. PASTORE. Positively. That is one of the things I have emphasized.

I will say to the Senator, that even I would not vote for passage of the bill if that were required, because I think it would be an invitation to destroy the CATV industry. I am not bent on destroying the industry.

I repeat, this group has done a wonderful service. They have brought three or four channels to people who never had them to view. Even today, those people would not have the channels were it not for this service. We are saying to them, "Keep it up. Keep doing the fine job you have been doing, but at the same time let the other fellow live."

That is all that is at issue. These men have done a fine job. This is no criticism of them. If it had not been for them and their work, there would be many people in darkness today, so far as television is concerned. However, where the people cannot receive more than one signal, in certain localities, the CATV's have come in. Through this fee system, with a moderate installation charge in some instances for hooking the service up, they have made it possible for the people to see a fine picture and a clear picture on three or four channels. I think that is a wonderful job they are doing. I find no fault with that.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am in complete agreement with the Senator on that.

Question No. 4 is: S. 2653 is criticized on the ground that it is designed to protect the interests of a local television broadcaster rather than the interests of the public at large. How would the Senator answer this criticism?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not think that is so. I do not think we would write that kind of a bill, to begin with.

In the second place, the Federal Communications Commission is charged with protecting the public interest. We have to remember that all through this discussion.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PASTORE. The criterion we must use is the public interest, the public convenience, and the public necessity. That is woven all through this proposed legislation, as it is woven all through the Communications Act.

I do not think there is any doubt about the matter. I will say unequivocally that this service must be in the public interest. This is not to be done to satisfy the financial interests of either party. Naturally, of course, we believe the business must be protected, so that the man can continue to make a profit and so that he can continue to operate the service in the public interest.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. If the Senator will yield further, question No. 5 is: If the natural forces of competition are left to work without Government regulation, and if, as a consequence, a local television station should go out of business, would local CATV be able to supply service to surrounding rural areas?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not think so, because it would not be profitable. That is the point.

I asked the question, "Why do you not extend your lines, especially in a State like Idaho?" That cannot be done. It would be necessary to go over the mountains and all sorts of rough and rugged terrain. These men simply cannot do that, for it would not be profitable. They have to use the microwaves. They have to tap in with the wires. They have to run the cables. Usually the cables are attached to the same poles to which the telephone wires are attached. Naturally, it is necessary to concentrate on the congested areas.

Really, these operations siphon off the cream. I am not finding fault with them, but, let us say, these men come into a town of perhaps 10,000 inhabitants, where there might be a few people—two or three thousand people—way out on the outskirts. These men hook up the congested area. That is permissible. I find no fault with that. What happens then? The minute the people are satisfied with that kind of reception the man who is operating the local TV station, who caters only to the little farmers and to the people on the outskirts, cannot make enough money from his advertising, unless he can sell to the corner grocer and to the milk man and to all the others. After all, that is what sustains the television broadcasting station. The advertising is absolutely necessary. The minute the cream is siphoned off we will find the broadcaster in trouble. Unless we do something to permit the broadcaster to keep the facilities he has, the few remaining stations will be put out of business. Therefore, we have to do something to put both parties under supervision. That is all we propose to do. We want to keep both of them alive.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. One final question. Should a distinction be made in this legislation between CATVS that simply overcome terrain difficulties and others that have microwave relays to bring signals from hundreds of miles away? Should we make that distinction?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know what the Senator means by the question. Does he mean, Can we draw a bill which would control CATV only in instances in which the people must depend upon a "kitchen" booster in order to get the signal?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. That is the point which was raised by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. That cannot be done. They must all be put under regulation. So far as procedural matters are concerned, where there is no contest or problem, issuance of a license is perfunctory. But where there is a problem, there must be a hearing at which evidence is taken and both sides

heard. That is the natural procedure. I assume that in many cases the application would be filed and that would be the end of it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. First, I thank the distinguished Senator for his long efforts in a difficult area. I have given very limited study to S. 2653. It appears to me that the proposed legislation places the community antenna systems under the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission. To that extent there is a delegation of authority to them. Does the bill directly prohibit or outlaw any act that the community antenna systems are doing now?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not think so, aside from the fact that now they are at liberty to take a picture from a broadcasting station in Phoenix and show it in Yuma, for example. It may be earlier than the picture would be shown on the local broadcasting station in Yuma, and if the broadcasting station at Yuma made an application to the FCC, it could bring that to a stop. That would be a deprivation of some activity. That is about as far as it would go.

Mr. CURTIS. The bill grants to the Commission the right to look into that situation?

Mr. PASTORE. And to make rules and regulations.

Mr. CURTIS. To make rules and regulations.

But in the absence of action by the Commission, is there anything in the bill which prohibits what the community antenna systems can do?

Mr. PASTORE. I would not say so, unless the Senator sees something in the bill to the contrary.

Mr. CURTIS. I am not raising a particular point.

Mr. PASTORE. I would not say so. The bill involves no deprivation of rights. It merely puts the operation under the control of the Federal Communications Commission, for the specific reasons which we have enunciated in the bill. I do not think there is any deprivation of rights. We do not declare any.

Frankly there was a question about whether we should use the word "signal" or the word "program."

The lawyers suggested that we should use the word "signal," and I told them we would accept the word "signal," provided it was explained in the history of the bill on the floor of the Senate that we were using the word "signal" as synonymous with "program," as it was written in the bill as reported from the committee. I believe the reason for the request was that there is a case pending in court, and it might turn on whether or not it is a signal or a program which is involved. I believe the lawyers were trying to protect the interests of their clients. A question like that might have an effect one way or the other, and we have not tried to do anything other than I have indicated. In other words, there is nothing slippery in the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the intent of the proponents of the bill to grant authority to the Commission to regulate community antennas and the competition which arises between them and a single television station?

Mr. PASTORE. Let us assume the operators want to extend their lines, or let us assume they want to go to a neighboring city and questions of that kind arise. They would have to file an application and go through the procedures which are required by the Federal Communications Act. If they must be placed under control, they should be under control.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of the Senator from Rhode Island. When he was talking about the little people in such an eloquent, plaintive, and effective manner, the Senator from Oklahoma sat down and wept, since the Senator from Oklahoma is allergic when little people are mistreated.

Then the thought came to me that I was weeping for somebody who was either anonymous or unknown. I now wish to ask the Senator to identify the little people about whom he was so eloquent that he had the Senator from Oklahoma in tears.

Mr. PASTORE. These little people are farmers who live in the little valleys in Idaho, farmers who have five or six children who have to walk miles and miles to go to school, who come home from school tired, but still must study. Their fathers work in the fields all day and their wives work side by side with them tilling and cultivating the soil.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Oklahoma asked me a question, which I should like to have an opportunity to answer. Wives work side by side with them, and when nightfall comes they want to see, "I Love Lucy." Those are the little people I am talking about.

Mr. KERR. I am delighted to see the Senator's newly found interest in the farmer, but the ones I know do not spend their nights looking at "I Love Lucy," unless that happens to be the wife's name, though that is not often the case.

Mr. PASTORE. There are many "Lucys" out there.

Mr. KERR. How is that farm family with the children in that little valley—was it in Idaho?

Mr. PASTORE. Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming.

Mr. KERR. How are they protected under the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. They are protected in this way. I will repeat.

The local station, which is the only available TV station, has made the allegation that it subsists on advertising revenue in a community, which is rather small. Ordinarily the local broadcasting station in such a community uses spot announcements——

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator mean the local TV station?

Mr. PASTORE. The local TV station. The TV station subsists naturally on the advertising it gets. Sometimes the income is high, sometimes it is moderate, and sometimes it is fair. I am not going into that. Then CATV comes in. CATV can operate in very congested areas by means of cable lines. It cannot go too far out because as the distances increase, the expense becomes greater and the installation charge is higher than many people can afford to pay, and they cannot afford to pay the fee.

Even if they were in a section where CATV operates, some people cannot afford the installation charge, because it runs in some cases to $150 per installation, and in some cases the people must pay $9 a month for the privilege of viewing the station. Many farmers cannot afford that expense.

Mr. KERR. It is not compulsory upon them, is it?

Mr. PASTORE. No; but let me finish the premise I am developing. The point is that there is nothing wrong with CATV coming in and installing wires, but this is what happens. The minute a CATV station comes in with three signals, and the people can see the programs, because the CATV goes to the originating point, which is a large city—for example, in Montana they would go as far as Spokane, or if the station were in Arizona, I suppose they could go as far as Phoenix—they have the opportunity, for a fee, to see a program which takes place simultaneously at the time it is being performed or broadcast in the originating station or network.

The poor little fellow who has a small broadcasting station, and who has contracted as an affiliate of a network, has an agreement with the network to show that particular program but not on the night it originates and is shown in the large areas. He can show it only in the middle of the next week. After "Gunsmoke" has been shown on Saturday or Sunday night, whenever it appears live, there is not going to be too much attraction for the viewers and advertisers to have that same program on the following Wednesday night.

In order to cure that situation, we are asking CATV, which has three or four signals, to make a sacrifice and reduce the number to only one where the FCC, on petition of the station and decision by them, finds it is in the public interest, in order to sustain the local broadcasting station, or by such duplication is avoided. When there is a particular program which the TV operator is privileged to show on Wednesday night and can show only on Wednesday night, rather than show Gunsmoke on Sunday night, the CATV operator could be required to get something else for that channel Sunday night and wait to show his "Gunsmoke" later. That is not hard or unfair; is it? That is all we are doing.

Mr. KERR. Is that all the Senator proposes?

Mr. PASTORE. That is about all we seek to do.

Mr. KERR. I was asking the Senator from Rhode Island for whom we wept, and he told me it was the little family in the valley in Idaho and the little TV station in that area.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. Is this bill limited to only those CATV's who serve in and are served by only one TV broadcasting station?

Mr. PASTORE. Because it is impossible to write a bill that way.

Mr. KERR. I did not ask the Senator that.

Mr. PASTORE. It covers all the CATV's.

Mr. KERR. Why put 760 under control in order to protect a dozen or two dozen or 100?

Mr. PASTORE. Because one never knows——

Mr. KERR. May I finish my question?

Mr. PASTORE. Certainly.

Mr. KERR. Why do that in order to protect a dozen or 100 who are in the category the Senator has described and for whom he had me weeping on the floor of the Senate, without knowing who they were?

Mr. PASTORE. I am sorry. I did not mean to have the Senator weep for anyone. I do not want him to cry on the floor of the Senate. I want him to be patient and listen to what I have to say. It might be a more practical procedure if it were possible to limit the bill to certain specific situations. However, under our philosophy, under which we wish to extend free television as far as we can go, that cannot be done. Every day the Commission is granting licenses. We are talking about free television, of course. If the Senator wishes to develop a nationwide system of pay television, we will do what the Senator suggests.

Mr. KERR. No, I do not want to develop pay television.

Mr. PASTORE. Then it is necessary to put these people under regulation, so that as new licenses are granted the Federal Communications Commission will have jurisdiction. The FCC then will be in a position to develop an orderly system of TV. However—and this must be borne in mind—insofar as harassment is concerned, or so far as a burden may be incurred, because of the duties that are imposed upon a CATV organization where there is no problem, I would assume the action of the Federal Communications Commission would be nothing more than perfunctory.

Mr. KERR. Why put a burden on one who is not guilty and make him pay all the costs of sustaining that burden to protect someone for whose benefit the legislation is enacted, but in order to protect whom the Senator would affect 760 persons who started in business, and who had a right to start in business, and for whom the Senator would sound the death knell unless they could come to Washington to hire lawyers to appear for them before the Federal Communications Commission to sustain their businesses?

The Senator said before that the bill had been refined to the extent that it could not be refined further. I must say that the Senator does not have as much confidence in his ability as I do. I believe that if he wanted to write a bill which would protect a TV station in a community where there was only one station, he could do it a little easier than he could by the pages and pages that he brings to the Senate in the pending bill, and which, I charge, no one but a lawyer fully understands.

I see the Senator from Illinois on the floor. He should have been here and heard the plea for the little people.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did hear it.

Mr. KERR. Then why is not the Senator from Illinois weeping?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Oklahoma has not given me a chance to weep.

Mr. KERR. Why did he not weep with me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am waiting to weep.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if this weeping is going to continue, I hope I will be given a chance to go home to get my rubbers, because I do not want to get my feet wet.

Mr. KERR. When the Senator gets his rubbers, I hope he will get me an umbrella.

Mr. PASTORE. Over the years we have been developing a competitive free television system. We have been assured by the Commission from time to time, even though at moments we have been discouraged and frustrated, that they are trying desperately to promote a free television system throughout the Nation. There are many sites and many areas where there are four channels. Some areas have five channels. Large cities were in on the original grants. New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Washington, and many cities of that size have many channels. There are a great many other places where the people do not have one little television station, where the Commission is trying to work them in. There are other areas where the FCC is trying to drop them in as much as it can. This is true not only in Rhode Island but also in Oklahoma.

This whole problem of TV service and the type of service is knitted together. I know the argument the Senator is making. That argument was made in committee. I know a great deal can be made about that argument here on the floor of the Senate. One can get quite dramatic and even glamorous in the discussion. The fact is, however, that these things must be argued in proportion to their reality.

The committee has been studying them for a long time. It is not possible to separate these elements the way the Senator would like to separate them. The best we can do under the circumstances is to make legislative history to the effect that where the situation we are discussing does not exist, these people should be brought under the umbrella of this supervision, and not harass them.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Why is it necessary to bring in those the Senator does not wish to regulate and who he says should not be regulated, and then attempt to make legislative history on the floor of the Senate which would say that they are not affected by the proposed act, whereas the fact is that they would be required to come here every 3 years and ask for a renewal of their license? They would have to hire lawyers to defend them here.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct; that would be protection to them, as well.

Mr. KERR. Did it ever occur to the Senator from Rhode Island that there are hundreds and thousands of American businesses in operation who are praying unto the Lord and their Government to protect them by keeping them free of regulation, rather than imposing it on them and then having them depend upon a legislative record made on the floor of the Senate which, if someone downtown whose identity we do not know, is controlled by it, will let them loose after they have paid a bunch of lawyers in Washington to come down to get them loose?

The Senator says he cannot write a bill to protect these people. Apparently the Senator does not know his own ability.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator heed for a moment?

Mr. KERR. I will heed for the rest of the afternoon.

Mr. PASTORE. There was not one representative of a CATV who appeared before our committee who did not say that he wanted to be regulated. I call as my chief witness the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who is going to make the motion to recommit the bill. As a matter of fact, Senator MONRONEY introduced a bill himself to regulate the entire industry. However, that bill is only a shell. It does put them under regulation, but it does not regulate.

Mr. KERR. Next to not being under it, that is the best shape one can be in.

Mr. PASTORE. May I finish?

Mr. KERR. Certainly.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know of a witness who appeared before our committee who did not say that he desired to go under regulation. The man who is resisting the bill and is the chief spokesman for the industry introduced a bill to put them under regulation. Why? Because he recognized the fact that it is not possible to separate these situations. As we develop this nationwide TV competitive system, from time to time we must drop in these TV stations. The only wise and businesslike way of doing it is the way it is suggested in the bill. I realize that the Senator is fighting the bill, but even if we were to rewrite it, the Senator would still be opposed to it.

Mr. KERR. No; not at all. If the Senator will rewrite it to protect the people he is talking about, I will help to pass it.

Mr. PASTORE. I have not been flattered by the Senator's statement with regard to my capacity to do what the Senator has suggested. I vouch for the fact that the bill was given very careful consideration. We drew this bill in committee. It was decided by the subcommittee and by the full committee that this is the way the law should be framed.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. If I am correct in my understanding, the point about the timing is this. If there is town A in Idaho or Montana, and station ABY, a television station operating in that town, and there is an important program, and station ABY has a contract with one of the networks, the enactment of the bill would result in deferring the telecasting of a play perhaps for 24 hours, so that station ABY will not be at a disadvantage in delivering a late show or late news item.

What about national events or international events, such as the wedding of Princess Margaret, or the Kentucky Derby, or the World Series, or the inauguration of the President of the United States? How would such events be handled? Would those news events, which the people have been reading about and have been looking forward to seeing, be laid over for 24 hours?

Mr. PASTORE. No; they would not be laid over. First of all, that matter comes under the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission for the making of rules and regulations. As a practical proposition, let us assume that the local television station has a contract with ABC, NBC, or CBS. If it is one station, it might have a contract with all three networks. A conflict would not arise too often, because the other station has, perhaps, three or four signals to show. Let us assume a newsworthy picture had been made, or a spectacular public event. In that case, I assume, the FCC would make rules which would be sensible.

Mr. BUSH. If we assume that the Senator is correct in his original point, concerning the layover——

Mr. PASTORE. Under the bill, the FCC is obliged to write appropriate rules. I do not know what construction the FCC will put on "appropriate"; but to me "appropriate" means proper or reasonable. I do not know what an appropriate rule is, unless it takes care of a situation.

Mr. BUSH. In a case like that, it seems appropriate that any important news event should not be withheld from the people for 24 hours.

Mr. PASTORE. I cannot imagine that the Federal Communications Commission would ever do any such thing. I should suppose there are many hypothetical situations which we could conjure in our minds which might prove the point. After all, this matter is being placed under the supervision of a Federal agency which has jurisdiction of such matters. It understands the business. It should know the business. I assume they would have given consideration to the word "appropriate," which would mean reasonable or fair. If we have lost all faith in the FCC, then I do not think we ought to have that regulatory body at all.

Mr. BUSH. What does the Senator think about the hypothetical case I raised? After all, it is important to television viewers.

Mr. PASTORE. I should say that in a case that might be of immediate import—for instance, Khrushchev's withdrawal of his invitation to President Eisenhower. He made that statement on Saturday night. I do not believe anybody should wait until Wednesday of next week to see such an event.

Mr. BUSH. What about current news events televised every evening?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not believe there would be any conflict concerning that.

Mr. BUSH. In other words, the Senator does not believe there would be any interference which would prevent the people in the areas concerned from getting the news of the day on that day?

Mr. PASTORE. No, because the local TV broadcasting station has only one signal. The other CATV station may have three.

Let us assume the local broadcasting station is showing the NBC news——

Mr. BUSH. Yes; but it would not get it until 24 hours later.

Mr. PASTORE. Why could not the CATV be televising CBS news with another commentator explaining it in a different way? There would still be two other channels.

Mr. BUSH. If I may say so, I do not believe the Senator from Rhode Island has given me much comfort on this question.

Mr. PASTORE. Why not? I will explain it again. The CATV has three or four signals to show. It shows different signals at different times over different channels. The local broadcasting station has only one channel. I should suppose that when it came to news, they would show such programs, and the duplication provision would not apply.

Mr. BUSH. In any newscast?

Mr. PASTORE. In any newscast. I do not know how it would be handled. It may have to be studied further. I hope it will be studied, and studied properly, because everyone knows that news items are of importance at the moment they occur, and may be rather stale tomorrow.

Mr. BUSH. What about sporting events?

Mr. PASTORE. The same would be true of sporting events.

Mr. BUSH. The world's series, and the Kentucky Derby.

Mr. PASTORE. There is no need to see the Kentucky Derby a week later, when the result has already been made known.

Mr. BUSH. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. It would not be included.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the acting majority leader whether or not it is intended to have the debate continue until late in the evening, or whether we may agree on a time for its disposition tomorrow. I understand there is no other proposed legislation crowding the Senate, and I know that a number of Senators have evening engagements. I thought perhaps we might agree on a tentative time for a recess or adjournment this evening, and then have the Senate go over until tomorrow.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senate, while I propose a unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow, 2 hours be allocated to the motion to recommit; 1 hour be allocated to the passage of the bill; and one-half hour to any motion or amendment pertaining to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That effective on May 18, 1960, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 2653) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish jurisdiction in the Federal Communications Commission over community antenna systems, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to one-half hour, and except a motion to recommit, on which there shall be 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill, debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. It is my understanding that until 2 weeks ago the Federal Communications Commission was opposed to the proposal, and that it changed its mind. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. PASTORE. I would not say the Commission was exactly opposed to it. They were rather lukewarm, I should say, but they have modified their position.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It was my understanding that after they had made a serious study of the bill they indicated their opposition, but subsequently changed their mind.

Mr. PASTORE. I read a portion of the FCC position into the RECORD.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thought it was rather singular that there were no minority views submitted with the report. I discovered afterward, in the course of conversation with members of the committee, that evidently this was an agreed-upon measure, and that the association representing the so-called antenna group had more or less agreed to the proposal. I understand now, however, that there has been a change of heart, and that along with it they have presented, not formalized particularly, some amendments which had not been considered by

the subcommittee. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. PASTORE. Not precisely that. I would not say they agreed to the proposal. They appeared to me to be satisfied. I do not believe they would ever go on record as saying, "We are agreed on it"; but we sat with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in the office of Senator MAGNUSON, where certain amendments were proposed, and we agreed to accept some of them.

It was left that way. It was understood that when the bill came to the floor the Senator from Arkansas would offer the amendments and I would accept them. Then I understand that some members of the association became displeased with the whole matter. I was told that they were dissatisfied with the way the attorney had handled the matter, and that they planned to resist the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was given further to understand that they adopted some kind of policy at a meeting in Chicago, that they had a special meeting in Chicago, and that then the so-called community group had some discussion or controversy about an interpretation of their own policy. In pursuance of that, amendments were suggested which had not been considered by the subcommittee. The association acts on the theory that the amendments are necessary to make the bill workable from their standpoint.

I thought that if there were such amendments, that certainly would be an argument for recommitting the bill, in the hope that those amendments would be considered. I am not a member of the committee. I never saw such confusion about a bill. I talked with the chairman of the committee about it. I talked with other members of the committee about it. I find an amazing division of opinion on both sides of the aisle. I confess to my own confusion about it now.

If the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] continues longer, I shall weep about it. As I understand, the FCC was opposed to the bill until about 2 weeks ago. Now they have changed their mind. The association seemed to be agreed on the bill; now it has disagreed. Frankly, I do not know quite where we stand on the measure. I am disposed to do the right thing.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize how easy it is to say that at the 11th hour. There is nothing that cannot always be reconsidered a little more, no matter what it is, even very important matters.

This bill means very little to me. As a matter of fact, much time has been devoted to consideration of the bill. It began in 1958. We have had protracted hearings. I have visited the various States involved. I have gone through all of this measure. I have had private conversations with these people. I even suggested that they submit amendments. I sat down with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], when the amendments were submitted to me; and studied the amendments. We agreed to submit them.

Now the Senator from Illinois says there are new amendments—which we have not seen.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They are not new.

Mr. PASTORE. Were they submitted?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. To whom were they submitted?

Mr. DIRKSEN. To me. Some told me there were amendments which had not been considered. I asked where they were. They said they had not been formalized.

Mr. PASTORE. But we do not consider amendments until they are submitted; and this measure has been on the calendar since 1959.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The amendments as such were not actually formalized. The suggestion was made to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, and that is as far as the matter went.

I have no idea what the amendments are. But this measure involves many people and many television viewers.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Illinois has said he has no idea what the amendments are. Neither have I. But certainly if this measure is sent back to the committee, the bill will be killed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; and perhaps it should be; I would not know.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. As a member of both the full committee and the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Rhode Island—which considered the bill—I wish to state that I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Rhode Island in yielding to me.

First, I should like to say that I think the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island is justified in being a little vehement this afternoon, because—even though I am not satisfied with the bill, and have not been satisfied with it—I happen to have worked with the Senator from Rhode Island, and I know that he exercised the greatest patience and the greatest care throughout the consideration of the bill.

He says nothing "slippery" is in the bill; and I am here to state that anyone who knows the Senator from Rhode Island knows there never will be anything "slippery" in any bill he presents—at least, not to his knowledge.

The CATV people, for whom I shall speak before this debate is over—or, at least, the CATV people in New Hampshire—were misled, and some of us on the committee were misled, into agreeing to certain provisions. But the Senator from Rhode Island was not to blame for that. He was leaning over backward in his efforts to be fair; and I want that distinctly understood before I ask some questions.

I wish to refer now to section 330, subsection (d)(1), on page 4 of the bill. It reads as follows:

> Either prior to or within thirty days after the grant of an application for a license or a renewal thereof for a community antenna television system which was in operation on the date of the enactment of this section—

And, Mr. President, if I correctly understand the English language, those words cover a situation which exists in many sections of my State where there is no local station, and where the only means by which many persons can receive television is the community antenna—

> the licensee of a television station assigned to a community—

It does not have to be a television station that is in being. One who, under this bill, would be permitted to make a protest would not even have to have ever built a station. But in my State there are communities where a channel has been assigned. Such a station would never pay, never be economically sound, and no one now in that community will live long enough to see a local station built. Nevertheless, at the expiration of 3 years, someone who has had that privilege assigned to him, in a community—

> in which such community antenna television system serves subscribers may petition the Commission to include in such license such conditions on the community antenna television system's operation as will significantly facilitate the continued operation of a television station which is providing the only available locally originated television broadcast program service.

The last words of that provision are ambiguous. They may save the bill from being a hobble, for the CATV people in a community in which they are the only ones who are bringing this service to the people of the community. But if I read the bill correctly, it is very dangerous, because every 3 years almost anyone who had the privilege of building such a station whenever he might wish to build it could put the CATV "over the jumps"; and that would not be beneficial to the people of my State who are receiving piped-in television.

Furthermore—and after I ask this question, I shall be glad to listen to what the Senator from Rhode Island will very ably say in reply, I am sure—in such instances the bill means that the CATV people will not extend their service to the surrounding communities which do not now have adequate reception. Why not? Because the CATV people will not invest their money in the gamble of moving further into other sections, when hanging over their heads will be the threat of having someone else at the end of 3 years prevent them from getting a renewal, or impose on them a series of crippling restrictions.

Let me say that I was deceived, along with the rest. They said, "I guess it is all all right, and our lawyers tell us it is all right." I say very frankly that I was deceived, along with the rest; but I share the solicitude which has been expressed by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. I state frankly that in New Hampshire there is not a single case in which there is a local station and a CATV; but, nevertheless, I am afraid that subsection (d) of the bill will adversely affect all installations of that sort.

I have received many communications in connection with this matter. The communications I received are not worded exactly alike. The people of my State

began to be apprehensive about the situation a very long time ago, not just last week. That is why I am apprehensive about the bill.

I cannot help but believe that the bill can be drafted or redrafted so as to avoid any such situation.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will be patient, and will follow my reading of this part of the bill.

Mr. COTTON. I shall do my best.

Mr. PASTORE. I shall read this provision word by word; I refer now to subsection (d) (1), on page 4:

(d) (1) Either prior to or within thirty days after the grant of an application for a license or a renewal thereof for a community antenna television system which was in operation on the date of the enactment of this section, the licensee of a television station assigned to a community in which such community antenna television system serves subscribers may petition the Commission to include in such license such conditions on the community antenna television system's operation—

And, Mr. President, next come the important words—

as will significantly facilitate—

Facilitate what?—

the continued operation—

That means it has to be in existence, in order to be able to continue. So at this point we find the words—

as will significantly facilitate the continued operation of a television station which is providing—

Not "which may provide" or "which will provide," but "which is providing." How could any words more present in their tense than those be used?

Mr. COTTON. On page 4, the bill refers to a licensee of a local television station that is in operation. But on one page the bill refers to someone who has been assigned the privilege, and on the next page the bill uses the word "continued." I am aware of the interpretation which has been made by the staff of the committee.

Mr. PASTORE. The word "assigned" is in the past tense, and means the event has already taken place. The word "continued" means it must already be in existence. Something which is not in being cannot be continued; first it must be in existence.

In addition, the bill uses the words "which is providing"; and those words are in the present tense.

I say frankly that if Senators wish to begin to tear apart the words used in the bill, any kind of argument can be made.

But for the benefit of the Senate, I say it is quite clear that the bill is written in the present tense. It uses the words "the continued operation" and the words "is providing."

Mr. COTTON. Yes; but I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island to yield briefly again, and then I shall not bother him further.

First, I can name a situation in my own State. I refer to page 4 of the bill. And I am still just a simple enough country lawyer so that the language to me means what it says. On page 4 it says a licensee of a television station assigned to a community. I can name examples in my State where, for several years now, there has been a channel assigned to a community. No one has as yet constructed a station. No one has produced the capital for constructing one. I do not think there should be left in this bill a provision which states that someone may have the privilege, in trying to guard his own future, should he or should his heirs or assignees sometime get the money to build the station, cannot do it.

Mr. PASTORE. I will make the Senator from New Hampshire a fair offer. If he will agree to vote for the bill, I will agree to change the word "assigned" to "operating."

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from Rhode Island has already said he is distrustful of how we can legislate to protect those who need protection. I am distrustful of any kind of measure which we bring onto the floor and then try to legislate here. And it is not the committee's fault, may I say.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from New Hampshire misunderstands me. I have made the history for this proposal. I am not apologizing for the word "assigned." I am not apologizing for the paragraph. With all due modesty, I believe it is beautifully written. But I do not think it is going to impress the Senator from New Hampshire. No matter how I change it, he is going to vote against the bill.

Mr. COTTON. I know the Senator from Rhode Island finds it to be a very beautiful expression; but if he will turn to page 3, he will find on that page a provision which reads:

The provisions of sections 303, 304, 307, 308, 310, 311, 312, 313, 315, and 316 relating to stations, radio stations, broadcasting stations, licenses therefor, licensees thereof, and station operators shall apply also to community antenna television systems.

Then if the Senator will turn to page 36 of the Communications Act of 1934 and read page after page of all kinds of restrictions that are going to be put on the CATV operators by the provisions of the bill, he will realize that, though it may be beautifully written, it will be a "beautiful job" done on some people. And I am not thinking of the Federal Communications Commission, but of the people.

There is nothing slippery in it, but earnestly, sincerely, and beautifully, we put something in this bill that will put an end to free enterprise. If a local station is built that is good for anything, and if there are community programs that are good for anything, nobody in his right mind is going to pay for something which he can get free. That is a part of free enterprise.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator from New Hampshire answer a question? The Senator knows, having a CATV in his community, that these operators are taking a signal out of the air which originates in a rather large city; I think in this particular case possibly Boston. There is a case pending at the present time which raises the question as to whether or not a CATV can take a signal out of the air and not pay the man who goes through the expense of originating it. That case is now pending. I do not know how the case is going to be decided. But let us assume it is decided that the CATV has no right to use that signal, that he cannot take that signal without permission, and unless he gets permission, he cannot use it and redistribute the signal to the viewing public who are his clients. In a case of that kind, who does the Senator think is going to hear from the people who have gone to the expense of installing a CATV system in their homes, and of paying for a television set? Who is going to protect those people who have installed the CATV system? Are they not going to come running to the Senator to have the Federal Government umpire the unreasonable charges that might be made, that might be confiscatory of their property? What are we going to do then? I just hope the junior Senator from Rhode Island is a Member of the Senate when that happens.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator asked a question. May I answer it?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator. If the courts, including the Supreme Court of the United States, in another of a long line of remarkable decisions, decides to throttle this industry, put it out of business, and choke it to death, then let them do it, and we will meet the situation when it comes. There is no need of our doing it first. I doubt if it will be done.

Mr. PASTORE. But there is a serious question pending in the courts. I am only hoping that what is feared will not happen. But I have told representatives of CATV systems that one of the essential benefits of this legislation was to have them come under an umbrella of regulation. They were told that if the broadcasters who originate the signals try to charge exorbitant fees in order for them to get permission to use those signals, they will always have the FCC in a position to act as a wise umpire, and they can look to the FCC. They were much impressed when I said that. They may have changed their minds when they got out in the corridors, but they were impressed when I told them that.

Mr. COTTON. They can do it with the bill as it is.

Mr. PASTORE. No, because the consent was left out of the bill. May I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Did the Senator from Rhode Island say the Federal Communications Commission, which has control of the station whose signal is being picked up, could not control them without this act?

Mr. PASTORE. I did not say that.

Mr. KERR. That is what the Senator did say.

Mr. PASTORE. I said the CATV would not have any right to go before the FCC.

Mr. KERR. Who says they would not?

Mr. PASTORE. I say so.

Mr. KERR. Who prescribes that?

Mr. PASTORE. Because the Senator says they should be put under the CATV. That is just the point.

Mr. KERR. Cannot a person go into court and ask for justice, without being set aside by the court?

Mr. PASTORE. The FCC is not a court. It is a regulatory body. We are trying to put the parties under this body with appropriate procedures.

Mr. KERR. The Senator wants to make them slaves, without provision for protection of their lives. How silly can one get?

Mr. PASTORE. I am not silly. I am talking about jurisdiction.

Mr. KERR. So am I.

Mr. PASTORE. I am talking about jurisdiction, and there is nothing silly in it.

Mr. KERR. The Federal Communications Commission does not have to be given regulatory control over any citizens to enable those citizens to go before that Federal Communications Commission and file a petition.

Mr. PASTORE. A petition to do what?

Mr. KERR. To enforce any right that an American citizen has with reference to that Commission's jurisdiction.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator could not be more wrong than he is.

Mr. KERR. Well, the Senator has proved that one Senator can be wrong.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know about that. I have not proved any such thing. I am merely saying to the Senator that the purpose of this bill is to put the CATV's under supervision of the FCC so they can file petitions and FCC can take appropriate action.

Mr. KERR. And I am saying they do not have to be put under the FCC.

Mr. PASTORE. And I am saying the Senator is wrong.

Mr. KERR. And I am saying the Senator does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. PASTORE. So we are at a stalemate.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I intend this to be a dampening interlude. I refer to a situation the distinguished and able and forthright Senator from Rhode Island and I last discussed several months ago, about three television stations in Alaska which originate their own signals by means of regular station television equipment.

The signal is then fed into a coaxial system and distributed to homes and subscribers who pay a monthly fee for the service. These stations do not receive or amplify signals originated by a television station. The programs provided are on film, except for certain local programs originated by the station.

I wish to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, would such stations be included in the definition of a community antenna television system, which the bill would regulate?

Mr. PASTORE. No. This bill would not apply, for the simple reason that those stations originate their own programs and are exempted from the provisions of the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. Would the Senator have any objection to my asking unanimous consent at this time to have printed in the RECORD a very useful and explanatory letter which the Senator wrote to me on this very point on January 6, 1960?

Mr. PASTORE. I have no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
January 6, 1960.

Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 29, 1959, in which you refer to S. 2653, a bill which would amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish jurisdiction in the Federal Communications Commission over community antenna systems.

In your letter you refer to three operations which distribute television programs by wire in Sitka, Ketchikan, and Nome, Alaska. These systems, as you indicate, do not receive or amplify signals that are originated by a television station. They merely provide film programs which are transmitted over wires in a closed circuit fashion for subscribers.

In your letter you state it is clear from a reading of S. 2653, and the report accompanying it, that the bill does not intend to cover situations such as those operating in Sitka, Ketchikan, and Nome. The definition of a community television system that is intended to be regulated under the provisions of S. 2653 is as follows:

"(hh) 'Community antenna television system' means any facility performing the service of receiving and amplifying the signals transmitting programs broadcast by one or more television stations and redistributing such programs, by wire, to subscribing members of the public, but such term shall not include * * * (3) any such facility used only for the distribution, by wire, of programs for which a charge is imposed generally on all subscribers wherever located, and which are not in the first instance broadcast for reception wthout charge by all members of the public within the direct range of television broadcast stations."

You will note that it is very specific in defining a community antenna system as a "facility performing the service of receiving and amplifying the signals transmitting programs broadcast by one or more broadcast stations and redistributing such programs by wire to subscribing members of the public."

In addition, on page 12 of the committee report, the following statement with reference to the definition of a community antenna television system appears:

"This section defines the term 'CATV system' as a facility performing the service of receiving and amplifying the signals transmitting programs broadcast by one or more television stations and redistributing such programs by wire to subscribing members of the public. However, it does not include (1) any such facility which serves fewer than 50 subscribers; (2) any such facility which serves only the residents of one or more apartment dwellings under common ownership, control, or management, and commercial establishments located on the premises; or (3) any such facility used only for the distribution, by wire, of programs for which a charge is imposed generally on all subscribers wherever located, and which are not in the first instance broadcast for reception without charge by all members of the public within the direct range of television broadcast stations."

Therefore, your understanding of the legislation is correct. As you know, the bill is presently pending on the Senate Calendar and probably will be taken up soon after the session begins.

If I can be of any further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN O. PASTORE.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. McGEE addressed the Chair.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. My only reason for asking the Senator to yield at this time is that reference was made by the Senator a few moments ago to the fact that I introduced a regulatory bil.

Last year the committee had already scheduled hearings on S. 1739, S. 1741, S. 1801, and S. 1886. I then introduced S. 2303. I mention this sequence merely to show that there were four bills pending which would have done great violence to the CATV industry.

In order to have before the committee the industry's position as to the nature of the regulation, should any be required, I introduced my bill.

I will say to the Senator from Rhode Island that during the hearings the distinguished Senator did a great service for the CATV industry, by excluding from the reported bill the provision which would have permitted the original broadcaster to control the programs, as many of the bills provided. The Senator would not accept that as a part of the bill. Many other features of several of the bills would have been detrimental to the CATV industry.

After the hearings, when I was home in the late summer, I conferred with the members of this great industry in my home State. I was informed that they had considered what advantages they might receive from regulation and what disadvantages it would impose. Their position at that time was that they did not seek to be regulated and to be given licenses, even though they might be given "grandfather" licenses. At that time these men asked me to oppose the bill.

The day the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island reported the bill from the committee I filed an objection against consideration on the Consent Calendar. I am not a "Johnny come lately" who is suddenly disturbed about being "lobbied" by a few TV station owners. My objection to the bill was known to the committee and was filed on the day the bill was reported.

I think it is quite important, Mr. President, that we realize these men represent a very small industry, portions of which are operating in widely divergent areas. They felt they were led astray a bit by following the advice of some Washington lawyers, who do not think that regulation and licensing every 3 years is a very bad idea. Certainly, I do not think the average industry or the average business wishes to be licensed.

If the Senator will yield a little further, I should like to make one more thing clear.

The latest expression from the Federal Communications Commission was filed yesterday in regard to the House bill, H.R. 11041, which is exactly the same as the bill, S. 2653.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the comments of the Federal Communications Commission on H.R. 11041.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION ON H.R. 11041, "A BILL TO AMEND THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 TO ESTABLISH JURISDICTION IN THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OVER COMMUNITY ANTENNA SYSTEMS," IDENTICAL TO S. 2653

H.R. 11041 would create a broad Federal regulatory authority over community antenna television systems by applying to them a prohibition against operation without a license from the Federal Communications Commisison, comparable to that now described in section 301 of the Communications Act with respect to radio transmission apparatus.

The bill defines a "community antenna television system" in the same manner as the Commission has suggested in legislative recommendations made in the spring of 1959 and which are now embodied in H.R. 6748. It would also except community antenna television systems from the definition of "common carrier" in section 3(h) of the Communications Act and thereby make clear that the bill does not authorize the regulation of such systems as "common carriers" under title II of the Communications Act—an objective in which the Commission fully concurs. The remainder of the bill would include in one new section of the act section 330, the text of the new provisions and a reference to those existing provisions of the Communications Act of 1934 which are to be brought into play under the proposed regulatory scheme. It is noted, however, that the bill would not apply section 325(a) to CATV so as to require them to obtain the consent of originating television stations to CATV redistribution of their signals. The application of this requirement to CATV was included in the Commission's legislative proposals so as to place community antenna television systems on the same footing as other television repeater services in this regard.

The bill includes a statutory determination that the licensing of present program services of existing community antenna television systems would be in the public interest. While this provision would "grandfather in" existing systems, their licensing would still be subject to the prohibition of section 310 against alien ownership, and licenses so granted would still be subject to the revocation and antitrust provisions in sections 312 and 313 of the present statute. The bill would permit local stations to request the Commission to subject licenses issued under this "grandfather" provision, to conditions as to CATV operations which would significantly facilitate the continued operation of the station if it is providing the only locally originated television broadcast service in the community. It would appear that the impact of these provisions is to permit the imposition on existing CATV's of appropriate operating conditions, such as a limitation on the number or source of the signals redistributed by it but not to authorize a complete denial of a license application for an existing CATV system. The bill would apply a public interest standard for the grant of licenses to new CATV systems and of modification of licenses of existing systems—that is, that findings as to the public interest and necessity of the grant shall be made with due regard for the desirability of facilitating the continued operation of a television station which is providing the only available locally originated broadcast service. However, as distinct from its effect upon existing systems, the application of this standard to requests for new systems or the addition of new program services by existing systems would authorize the complete denial of such a request. Another distinction in the bill as between existing and new systems—procedural in character but of substantive effect—would establish new hearing procedures and rights with respect to the licenses of existing systems but would make the issuance of licenses for new systems or modifications of existing ones subject to the protest procedures set forth in section 309 of the Communications Act.

The new section 330(f) which is proposed by H.R. 11041 follows the Commission's legislative proposal to require CATV's to carry the programs of a local television station upon the latter's request and would permit the promulgation of rules by the Commission to assure that reception of such programs via the CATV systems would be reasonably comparable in technical quality to other programs redistributed by the CATV.

The bill would require the Commission to promulgate rules and regulations so as to preclude the duplication of programs of a local station by the CATV system serving subscribers in the same community. In promulgating such rules under the authority, the Commission is again called upon to give due regard to the desirability of facilitating the continued operation of a television station which is providing the only available locally originating television service.

The Commission's continuing study of the CATV local station problem leads it to favor what it understands to be the basic underlying objectives of the proposed legislation. The bill would encourage local television broadcast station operation by extending some protection against inequitable competition by unlicensed television services and, at the same time, recognizes the public benefit in the provision of multiple program services by CATV systems. It may be noted that these objectives form the basis of two of the priorities set forth by the Commission in its sixth report and order for the assignment of television channels.

The Commission's earlier examination of the CATV local station problem and its views with respect thereto are reflected in its report and order in docket No. 12443, which was adopted on April 13, 1959. In that document the Commission set forth the reasons for its view that an all-encompassing jurisdiction over CATV systems, through mandatory licensing requirements under the Communications Act, was neither necessary nor desirable in the public interest. However, in an attempt to reach some of the objectives reflected in H.R. 11041, the instant bill, and to permit some adjustment of the unfair competitive situation of TV stations as against CATV systems, the Commission did recommend the enactment of legislation which would (a) require that CATV's obtain permission of stations whose broadcast signals they redistribute; (b) require that, upon request by any local TV station, the CATV system carry the program broadcast by the local station; and (c) authorize the Commission to promulgate rules to assure that in broadcasting local station programs the CATV system will take reasonable measures to provide a picture of reasonable technical quality. These recommendations were submitted to the Congress and are now embodied in H.R. 6748 and S. 1801.

Thereafter, the Commission initiated a field inquiry into the general subject of TV repeater services and particularly into the problems encountered by local stations in communities served by a CATV system. This inquiry was made by a member of the Commission and staff officials during August 1959 in the States of Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Washington, and Wyoming, and the views of various organizations and individuals who reflected all sides of the local station-CATV controversy were obtained. As a result of its further consideration of this problem in the light of the information obtained since the issuance of its Report and Order in Docket No. 12443, the Commission is in accord with the approach taken in subsection (g) of the proposed legislation as it looks to the prevention of the duplication of local station programs by a CATV system. It would appear that the ability of CATV systems, operating without any Federal statutory restrictions, to intercept first-run programs broadcast by stations in large metropolitan areas and to redistribute them to subscribers in a small community in advance of the broadcast of that same program by the local station, gives rise to an inequitable competitive disadvantage which the local station is unable to overcome by any reasonable means within its control. Although this disadvantage may not be precisely measurable, there is ample recognition of the differing commercial values of TV program transmission, based on factors of time and area, in the long established practices of the motion picture distribution and exhibition field as well as in the broadcast industry itself. Also to be considered is the fact that under a national policy which looks to the provision of as many radio services as possible to as many people as possible, the duplication within a reasonable period of time of a program broadcast or about to be broadcast to all the people of a community by a local station would appear not to be in the public interest.

While in accord with the general objectives of H.R. 11041, the Commission is of the view that broadscale legislation establishing a mandatory licensing scheme for all CATV systems may work a result far beyond its apparent purposes. The bill may well have the effect of requiring that a substantial, if not complete preference be given to a local television station against any new CATV system or any enlargement of an existing one, without adequate regard to the multiple program services which would thereby be provided. More importantly the Commission is of the view that the objectives of this bill would best be achieved; that ample protection would be afforded local stations; and that inequitable competitive disadvantages would be largely eliminated, if the Congress were to adopt legislation to—

1. Amend section 325(a) of the Communications Act so as to make it applicable to CATV systems.

2. Require that upon request by any local TV station, a CATV system shall carry the programs broadcast by the local station.

3. Authorize the Commission, by rule or order, to prescribe standards to assure that the reception of local programs via a CATV system shall be reasonably comparable in technical quality to other programs redistributed by the CATV.

4. Authorize the Commission to prescribe appropriate rules and regulations to prevent the duplication of local station programs by a CATV system.

The Commission must also note that H.R. 11041 would require the licensing and regulation not only of CATV systems which may be established in the future but also of the some 500 to 700 systems which are already in existence. CATV systems already exceed in number all the local TV broadcast stations and it's obvious that a proper administration of the licensing system established in

the bill would require substantially more personnel and appropriations. It would therefore be vital that the enactment of such broad legislation by the Congress be accompanied by supplemental appropriations sufficient to enable the Commission to handle the substantially increased tasks that would be imposed upon it. However, even were the necessary funds and staff made available, the Commission does not believe that a licensing system for CATV's could, in practice, serve the underlying objectives of the bill any more effectively than is possible, at far less cost, through enactment of the regulatory provisions listed in the preceding paragraph.

SEPARATE VIEWS OF COMMISSIONER JOHN S. CROSS

I concur with the preceding views of my colleagues with the exception of the full paragraph in the center of page 3 and with recommendation "4" on page 4.

Subsection (g) of H.R. 11041 would prevent the duplication of local television station programs by CATV systems. It would not, however, prevent similar duplication by other TV repeater services (satellites, translators, and boosters) which provide signals to the areas served by local TV stations. In my judgment, effective nonduplication of local station signals cannot be accomplished by such halfway measures; if CATV systems must not duplicate the programs of local TV stations, then all other TV repeaters should be required to protect local stations from duplication. In sum, this means simply that either all or none should be confronted with such an obligation.

Moreover, even if all TV repeaters were required to avoid duplicating local station programs, I am not convinced that compliance with such a mandate would prove practicable and workable. After an exhaustive study of this overall problem, this Commission considered the public interest would best be served by carrying out the finding and conclusions reached in its report and order of April 13, 1959, in docket 12443. I voted for the adoption of docket 12443 and nothing has occurred in the interim to persuade me that the public interest would be served by changing it. Docket 12443 has this to say on the subject (FCC 59–292, pp. 40–41):

"95. Another suggestion made by various broadcasters is that there be a rule against the CATV duplicating programs carried by the local station; sometimes this request is confined to programs being presented simultaneously, but other broadcasters request that the CATV not be allowed to present ('live' or 'first run') programs to be presented later by the local station. There are further requests that the local station be given the first refusal, as against presentation on the CATV system, of all programs of its network, and that indeed the CATV not be permitted to present any of that network's programs.

"96. We cannot agree to adopt or support any of these suggestions. Certainly, with respect to anything more than the barring of simultaneous duplication, we believe this to be an unwarranted invasion of viewers' rights to get 'live' programing if they are willing to pay for it. The suggested rules restricting presentation of the programs of the local station's network would appear to be cumbersome, if not completely unworkable, especially considering that many stations in small markets, including some of those covered in the record, present programs of two or even three networks. As to the prevention of simultaneous duplication, it is true that this would involve no loss of program service to the community; but it would appear to present substantial inconvenience, not only to viewers (who would have to keep switching channels to follow a particular network) but to the auxiliary services (presumably translators would have to be treated the same way), who would have to keep turning their installations on and off."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I shall read a portion of the comments on the House bill.

The Commission must also note that H.R. 11041 would require the licensing and regulation not only of CATV systems which may be established in the future but also of the some 500 to 700 systems which are already in existence. CATV systems already exceed in number all the local TV broadcast stations and it is obvious that a proper administration of the licensing system established in the bill would require substantially more personnel and appropriations. It would therefore be vital that the enactment of such broad legislation by the Congress be accompanied by supplemental appropriations sufficient to enable the Commission to handle the substantially increased tasks that would be imposed upon it. However, even were the necessary funds and staff made available, the Commission does not believe that a licensing system for CATV's could, in practice, serve the underlying objectives of the bill any more effectively than is possible, at far less cost, through enactment of the regulatory provisions listed in the preceding paragraph.

Three of the purposes of the bill before us are endorsed by the Commission.

The Commission agrees that it would be desirable, upon request by a local TV station, to have a CATV system carry the programs broadcast by the local station in a one-station area. That is almost universally done, without any law requiring it.

Secondly, the Commission believes it should be authorized to prescribe standards to insure that the reception of local programs under a CATV system is reasonably comparable in technical quality to other programs redistributed by the CATV system. The technical quality of the signal of the local station over these systems is usually identical with the network station being picked up.

A third position is recommended, which these men feel they cannot follow, which has been debated at length. Perhaps a moment more will help to straighten us out on that matter.

The Commission recommends, with one Commissioner dissenting, that the Commission be authorized to prescribe appropriate rules and regulations to prevent the duplication of local station programs by a CATV system.

Why do these men object to that? It is simply that these are small businesses. The average is perhaps 400 or 500 subscribers to a system. To do as requested would require the manning of some sort of monitoring arrangement by an engineer in order to cut duplicating programs off. The man would have to have in front of him a list of programs which might be duplicating with regard to the local station.

For that reason these men feel that this would entail substantial expense for additional employees on the payroll. In the smaller type of operation this would be a considerable burden, and it would represent a large portion of the profit for many CATV systems.

The Commission believes it does not need the bill. The Commission does not wish to license every CATV, but recommends these three things, two of which are being done almost universally, without legislation.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, to come back to the point of beginning, I wish to say that to my State passage of this bill means little or nothing. Handling the bill was my responsibility, and I have performed it to the best of my ability. We gave the subject long hours of consideration. We gave it intense, deep study. We came forth with a bill which met with the approval of the subcommittee and of the full committee.

I have visited the State of my friend from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. I have visited the State of my friend from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. I have visited in Montana. I went to the States which have the problem. There are CATV systems in those States. I visited the State of my friend from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. There are local broadcast stations, as well.

I have said all that I care to say. I have tried to be as persuasive as I can be. If it is the intent and the purpose of the Senate to kill the bill, that is entirely up to the Senate.

As of this moment, I think those who have the problem ought to rise and speak. I hope they will speak eloquently enough so that whatever we do we shall not affect anyone unduly. I hope we will take care of the band of little people who have only one available station, who hope that they can see one little program one little evening on some weekday in their little bailiwicks out in the Midwest.

That was the only purpose of the Senator from Rhode Island. It is the only objective of the bill. If Senators want to send the bill back to slumber forever, that is entirely the responsibility of the Senate.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I think I have said all I care to say.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Why does the Senator not present such a bill and let us pass it? Why bring before the Senate a bill which would regulate 100 little people who do not want the bill, in order to protect 1 group of little people who, if they are entitled to protection, will have it without a voice in the Senate being raised in opposition?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Rhode Island has explained that. I have explained it as completely as I can. That is the way it stands. That is the way it is.

Mr. KERR. Take it or leave it?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not think we can agree to the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. It has been a joy to debate this issue with the Senator this afternoon. It is always a pleasure to do so. I have always enjoyed debating with the Senator, not only today but also in the past.

I have stated how the matter stands. This is the bill approved by the committee. From now on we shall hear from the men who have problems in their own States. Then we will calmly come to a vote. Whatever is the vote of the Senate, I shall accept it with good grace. I sincerely hope that the bill will be passed.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. As a spokesman for one of the States very deeply involved in connection with the bill, I should like to say, first, that if ever an individual operated above and beyond the call of duty, it has been the chairman of the subcommittee. It was my strong impression everywhere he went in that part of the world where he ordinarily had no business to be that the fairness with which he conducted the hearings and the depths to which he probed the problems involved arouse admiration on all sides. I personally can report that the people who now stand in opposition came away singing the praises of the fairness of the subcommittee's conduct. This was the on-the-spot reaction before the great mobilization began. I wish the chairman to know that those of us in the mountain West shall be forever grateful for his great scholarship, fairness, and skill in handling a difficult question ordinarily so foreign to the chairman, in the interest of our section of the country.

Never do I recall, in the 15 months which I have been a Member of the Senate, one man standing alone so eloquently and so effectively against so many. I think this demonstration will go down as one of the most effective performances in the history of the Senate. In the closing minutes of the assault a number of questions have been raised which I think ought to be set straight for the RECORD.

The distinguished minority leader asked, "Where are the amendments? What has happened to them?" I ask the Senator from Rhode Island if on every desk there is not a copy of the amendments at stake and also if each of the amendments is not printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 10?

This is not a sneak attack. This measure has been advertised, the amendments have been submitted, and accepted by the subcommittee. Is that not the case?

Mr. PASTORE. The junior Senator from Rhode Island is not impressed by a last-minute assertion that there are certain amendments which have not been stated. Anyone who has followed the history of the bill, anyone who has attended the hearings, anyone who has attended the conference, anyone who has talked to the people on both sides of the issue, well knows that everything pertinent has been considered. We studied the amendments suggested. We had a meeting. I believe the distinguished Senator from Wyoming attended that meeting and will recall the personal unfortunate incident which caused me to return to Rhode Island. I had to leave the meeting rather early. But we met for the purpose of considering the amendments. We agreed we would accept the amendments. We said so in the office of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

At the last minute it is said that we did not consider the amendments. That is said by Senators who are going to vote against the bill anyway. No matter how I agree to amend the bill, Senators who are opposed to it will still be opposed to the bill. We recognize that these are only arguments made on the floor, and we are not carried off by them.

I repeat: This is the bill we have presented. The bill will not be sent back to be improved. The bill, if sent back to committee, will be sent back to die. We know that. If the opponents of the measure do not want CATV to come under the supervision of the FCC, that is satisfactory to me. But I think the public interest demands it. I think for their own sake CATV would be better off if they did come under FCC. Surely in those areas of the country which are represented by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming we need this kind of measure if we are to have free television for those who cannot afford to pay the fee, who cannot afford to have to pay for television. In many instances those people live in places where, even if they could afford it, they could not get it anyway. That is a situation the bill takes care of.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire raised a point of interpretation of the bill itself. Is is not true that the point he raised was included and encompassed in the amendments to which we had agreed, and which are printed in the RECORD? This question is raised only as a factor tending to confuse rather than to spell out honest differences on the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Rhode Island is a great admirer of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and certainly I would not wish to say anything which could be construed as being in derogation of him. But the fact remains that the Senator from Rhode Island knows the Senator from New Hampshire is opposed to the bill. No matter how I might agree to amend the bill, I know he would still oppose it. Some questions were raised. I think the issue is abundantly clear. Representatives of the industry suggested a change here and there. We said, "If it will make you happy, we will accept the change, but not a change of the meaning." We were ready to make history to that effect. As a matter of fact, we were so agreeable that I think they became a little ambitious.

Mr. McGEE. At least they became a little overconfident, or maybe properly confident, as appears.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. Is there not another aspect of the continuance of local broadcasting stations beyond the service that a single station renders in itself? Does that not stem from the interest of the booster population; that is, the group in the mountain West which must depend upon booster TV reception as their only signal?

Mr. PASTORE. That is true.

Mr. McGEE. The booster extends the range of the broadcaster's own live signal?

Mr. PASTORE. That is true. I visited a town which had a population of no more than 400 or 500 people. On top of a hill a booster had been installed. The people of the town had contributed to pay for the installation. It was a nonprofit venture. It was a kitchen-type booster. But they installed the booster at their own expense. That is how far people will go to get a signal. Those are the people who are trying to have the bill enacted. They have the booster. They amplify the signal and send it to a town of 400 or 500 people who have no other television. That is the only television they have. They have only the one signal. Those are the people we are trying to protect.

Some industry representatives are saying, "We are the little people." They are the little people who are running around in air-conditioned Cadillacs.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a final question?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. Is it not true that there are large centers of the West which under no circumstances can receive a TV signal? I think at once of a community in the State of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who is now standing and waiting to address the Senate. I refer to the community of Grand Junction, a city of 40,000, with one live TV station. Through boosters it serves an additional 55,000 people, nearly 100,000, all told.

Without that service, with only community antenna television, the 40,000 might be serviced, but the 55,000 are left out without service. I think of the Saratoga Valley in my own State, a community of 700, where the community antenna people refused to go in because they could not make it pay, and the people would get it in no other way than by boosters. I think of the ranching area which the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] represents. This area would be turned down by the community antenna people because they could not afford to give them TV. I say the citizens in my State and in the State of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and, indeed, all the people of the West, have a right to be first-class TV viewers and citizens and not second or third class.

This is the great and noble cause to which the Senator from Rhode Island, who comes from the "down East" country, has labored so courageously, and I want him to know our deep appreciation.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I served for many years with the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] when he was Governor of his

State, and during his service in Congress, and I have been greatly impressed by his presentation this afternoon of a bill that is of concern to me and to many others. I may be the only Member of the Senate who lives in a community where we have CATV piped into our own stations. There has been a great deal of discussion about the effect of the bill in communities where there is a local TV station. We live in an area where we are proud to receive and, in fact, delighted to get, CATV. As a matter of fact, until we secured it in our hometown, we could not get Kansas weather reports except through the State of Nebraska. I do not think it is unfair to state that we are paying $7 a month for it. We wish we did not have to pay, but we are delighted to pay that sum.

That is the group of people about whom I am concerned.

I have been very diligent on the floor this afternoon. I sincerely hope that nothing will be done which will interfere with the antenna TV systems, because it is only through these systems that the people can get programs in many great areas of the country.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I say with all the honesty and sincerity at my command that the bill may present a little inconvenience—because these people will have to file for licenses, but that will be perfunctory in most cases—even if the Supreme Court rules that the broadcasters have no proprietary right in the signal which they originate, insofar as the particular locality from which the distinguished Senator from Kansas comes, that locality might not be affected, even if the bill fails. The fact is that if the Supreme Court should rule that they are capturing a signal out of the air and commercializing that signal, over which the broadcasters have a proprietary right, then serious trouble can ensue. The best thing that could happen to these people, in such a situation, would be for the bill to be passed. If the bill were passed, they would be placed under the control of the Commission which not only has supervisory authority over the broadcasters, but would have authority and responsibility over CATV as well. I know that if the Supreme Court decision goes against them, they will come rushing to the Senator and to me, but then it may be too late. I hope the representatives of CATV in the galleries will listen attentively to what I am saying. I pointed this out to the representatives of CATV, and they seemed to listen attentively. I received the impression that they understood precisely what I was trying to say.

I hope the Supreme Court will not disturb the present practice. However, if the Supreme Court should rule that since the broadcasters put out the picture at tremendous cost, it is not right to take that picure without permission and commercialize it. Other people cannot take the signal of a baseball game, for example, and commercialize it without paying for it. Therefore I say that the passing of the bill could be the best thing that could happen to them.

These CATV people claim that they stick up an antenna and take the program out of the air and thereby create a business. They say that they are free to do it, and it is nobody's business what they do. That is all well and good if they are right. If they are wrong, however, then the passing of this bill, as I have said, is the best thing that can happen to them.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to state that the Senator from Rhode Island has completed an outstanding task this afternoon in presenting this subject to the Senate. It is a matter of great concern to many of us.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. I appreciate the outstanding work which has been done by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island as chairman of the subcommittee. He came to our State of Utah and conducted hearings there. We have communities in Utah which cannot receive a signal even though they have boosters. I do not see how it can be said that with respect to an industry which is regulated by the Federal Communications Commission, so far as television stations are concerned, when the Senate has already passed a bill regulating boosters and translators, the community antenna systems should not be regulated at all. I believe all of them should come under the same Commission. They are in the same general business of distributing signals to people. Therefore I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island if he does not believe that the only way we can get a continuity of a system in this whole field is to bring all the mediums under the regulation of the Federal Communications Commission, which has the obligation of regulating in the public interest?

Mr. PASTORE. I hope the industry people in the galleries are listening. They too are using franchises, and poles, and stringing wires, and using the air. They could very well be classified as common carriers in their States. They could come under the public utilities commissions. They have already started to do that in Montana, and I believe also in Utah.

Mr. MOSS. We have passed a law in Utah.

Mr. PASTORE. They are doing it in Colorado, I understand. That is all right with me. I would be agreeable, if the bill does not pass, to adopting a resolution to the effect that it is the sense of Congress that this is a responsibility of the States; the States should take control.

However, because I think that there are many captive customers—people who have bought their television sets. They are charged so much a month for CATV service. I believe they should be protected. We must remember that after the system is installed, there is nothing to prevent the fee from going up to $15. These are people at the end of the line, like natural gas customers, and more or less like all utility customers. I do not say the situations are strictly analogous. The question is, Shall we put CATV operators under Federal regulation, because they are connected with the television industry, or do we wait until they are put under State regulation?

Some change is inevitable. The present condition will not exist much longer. There is the kind of situation that has been brought out with respect to Kansas. Certain localities cannot get any kind of television reception unless the people buy TV. That is pay TV. They are paying for the privilege of receiving it, just as a charge is made when a gas main is installed and a person has to pay a certain amount each month. Perhaps while business is good and the CATV operators supplying the need are satisfied with a fair return on their money, the fee may be moderate, but that fee could go up.

We took care of CATV operators in the bill. We said we will not consider them common carriers and put them under the utility formula. We placed them under the Communications Act, title III. In a large measure I think that is protection for CATV.

We have heard a great deal of talk about little people who are engaged in this business. That is largely fancy. There are those that have 40 or 50 customers, but we know of cases where a system has been sold for over a million dollars. I am not making a point of that.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, before starting my remarks on the pending bill, I must say, as others have said before this afternoon, how much I admire the very outstanding work the Senator from Rhode Island has done on the floor of the Senate with the bill.

I had the opportunity to be with the Senator from Rhode Island in Colorado at the time he held hearings in that State. The subject of the bill is one charged with great emotionalism. I believe there is far more emotionalism in it than is justified by the circumstances. I sat with the Senator in the hearings. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] also was present, I believe. I listened to the testimony which was given at that time. I also expressed my views. If anyone says that there is some idea which has not been considered by the committee, I would ask him to pick up the hearings which were held by the subcommittee presided over by the Senator from Rhode Island. Very few ideas and concepts, indeed, relating to this subject exist which were not discussed and considered in the hearings. Therefore, I shall confine my remarks today primarily to two aspects of the measure. One is the aspect of a reasonable approach to the question; the other is the aspect of no approach at all.

I can see no reason for anyone being against CATV per se. It is only in the areas where it becomes unfair competitively with those who are already in the area by license that the question arises. This is the first problem which must be recognized.

The first problem, linked to the second, is that of survival for the original broadcaster. I refer here to the television stations in smaller communities

which have rendered a great public service since their inception. These smaller TV stations were constructed at great risk by farsighted broadcasters who were willing to take a chance on their own future in order to enhance the future of their neighbors.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not true that broadcasters are under contract and must pay for the pictures they show?

Mr. ALLOTT. That is entirely correct. I intended to bring that out, but since the Senator has been so kind as to raise the question, I may say that not only have these people been entrepreneurs in the best sense of that word in seeking to establish new service for their community, but they have already subjected themselves to licensing by the Federal Communications Commission; and they have paid and must continue to pay for the services which they give to their neighbors.

How do they pay? They have to sell advertising in their own community in order to pay for it.

No more thorough investigation of this problem has been made than that which has recently been concluded by the subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. They made the same kind of investigation into the booster situation, and last year the Senate passed the bill on that subject.

I do not know how anyone to whom a piece of proposed legislation means less personally than this bill means to the junior Senator from Rhode Island could possibly have devoted himself so assiduously and so objectively, and with such great fighting spirit, I may say, as the junior Senator from Rhode Island has done. For this he deserves, and will always have, the respect and the thanks of all of us who must deal with this problem.

I was privileged to make some observations when the committee was in Denver during the past fall as a part of extensive hearings. I desire to pay special recognition to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, whose fair and impartial approach to this complex and sometimes emotional problem has won him the respect of the broadcasting industry.

Mr. President, no more accurate description of the chasm facing these smaller broadcasters can be found than that on page 4 of Senate Report 923. The paragraph to which I refer is as follows:

> The costs of wiring a community are such that only the densely populated areas can be economically served by CATV systems. The result is that generally suburban and rural areas receive no service from such systems.

Mr. President, one point ought to be made clear. CATV systems, by the very nature of their construction and operation, cannot generally serve suburban areas, nor can they ever serve rural areas.

In essence, uncontrolled CATV would rip the heart from the market area upon which these smaller stations depend for their very existence. If these small stations fold, then a concurrent TV blackout occurs in the booster areas which these stations support. For example, in my own State of Colorado, such a local situation exists in Grand Junction. The man who owns that station installed one of the first radio stations in Colorado at a time when people said it could not be made to pay. He also installed a television station in the western portion of Colorado at a time when everyone said a TV station could not be made to pay. But he has made them pay. The TV station at Grand Junction provides news and entertainment, together with selected educational programs, not only to the city itself, but also to more than 36 boosters covering other parts of western and central Colorado and eastern Utah.

Let us see what will happen if CATV is permitted to go into Grand Junction, for example, unlimited or unproscribed by any rules of the Federal Communications Commission, without any limitation on its powers or anything else.

The Grand Junction station is able to carry the signals of three or four stations. If a CATV is permitted to enter the area unregulated, it can soon drive the local TV operator out of business. The CATV service will serve the community or the particular town or city, but on the outskirts of the community, and even in the suburban areas, there will be a blackout, because the people no longer will have any local TV station to which they can tune. That is true not only on the outskirts of the city, but as one goes into the country there are 36 booster stations which have been set up by the TV operators to pick up the signals of the particular TV station. Those booster stations are in eastern Utah and western Colorado. They are placed there to pick up the signals of the particular station in the city, but the station will be driven out of business. Therefore, all the money that has been spent on the boosters—approximately $5,000 for each of them—will have been wasted. The people will be in complete darkness, and will remain in complete darkness for any foreseeable time in the future.

To extend further the example of this station, let me describe what would happen if CATV were permitted to skim the cream from its programing without realistic consideration for the station's survival. CATV has already laid the groundwork to operate in Grand Junction with the announced intention of obtaining programing from existing Denver stations. By airing these selected programs in advance of KREX–TV, and without regard for the property rights of the Denver stations involved, a matter which I shall discuss in a moment—the CATV operator is pushing KREX–TV, together with its news and local programing, toward the edge of the chasm.

Mr. President, I readily recognize the effort made by the committee in trying to offset any such contingency. Subsection (d) of the bill provides for petition from both broadcaster and CATV operator alike so that the FCC may make some decision based upon the convenience and necessity of the general public.

Some broadcasters have evidenced alarm, however, at the provisions of subsection (c), the so-called grandfather clause. They fear that existing CATV operations could, in fact, obtain blanket approval and license and thus destroy the effect of the bill before the Senate.

Mr. President, I point out to them, and to my colleagues, the language contained in the subsection which refers to the provisions immediately following subsection (d), and to the regulations and guidelines clearly established in subsection (d) itself.

Here is the essence of protection for the broadcaster which the bill provides. The Federal Communications Commission, although permitted to grant application for existing CATV operations, must nevertheless review and consider these operations in the light of their effect upon the local broadcaster if the local broadcaster can show any significant damage from uncontrolled CATV. In other words, existing systems would be subject, and properly so, to the same criteria as future CATV applicants.

What type of people depend upon boosters and upon this type of operation? Last fall I had a unique experience. In traveling around my State, I visited a small town, one of the smaller towns in the State, and had lunch with a group of citizens. They had conceived the idea that perhaps they could do something for themselves in the television field, and they did. They had gone to the general store of the town and purchased dynamite. With their own picks, shovels, and jeeps, they had built a road to the top of a mountain, 12,000 feet high. This was a small community, having a population of not more than 200. This group had built a road to the mountaintop with their own muscles, and there they built a booster.

Mr. President, are we going to permit the CATV to blackout people of that kind? I say no. With 36 boosters operating, all dependent on one station, I say we must consider the interests of all people. That does not preclude CATV from coming into the area upon a free and equal basis with anyone else and under such regulations as the FCC may prescribe.

Mr. President, earlier I referred to the question of property rights. This is the second problem, and one which the bill overlooks. Briefly, among the broadcasters there is grave concern regarding the apparent freedom granted CATV to pluck from the air, free of charge, a signal placed there at great expense. Indeed, the same concern was shared by those who created the original act, which we seek to amend. They, therefore, included a section protecting those property rights. I refer to section 325(a) of the Communications Act of 1934. So that my colleagues may have a basis upon which to make their decision, I now read that section of the act:

> SEC. 325. (a) No person within the jurisdiction of the United States shall knowingly utter or transmit, or cause to be uttered or transmitted, any false or fraudulent signal of distress, or communication relating thereto, nor shall any broadcasting station rebroadcast the program or any part thereof of

another broadcasting station without the express authority of the originating station.

I call attention to the words—

Nor shall any broadcasting station rebroadcast the program or any part thereof of another broadcasting station without the express authority of the originating station.

Those are the concluding words of section 325(a).

The junior Senator from Rhode Island has already stated most eloquently what might happen if the Supreme Court were to rule that this clause is applicable to the present CATV situation. I predict that if the Supreme Court did so rule, the representatives of CATV would be down here as thick as locusts, requesting the enactment of legislation to free them from the burdens imposed on them by this measure.

Mr. President, at this time I send to the desk an amendment which I shall call up later in the proceedings. I ask that the amendment lie on the table and be printed, to be available tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUSK in the chair). The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the amendment makes amply clear that, in placing CATV within the bounds of the regulatory control of the Federal Communications Commission, CATV is not to be regarded as a common carrier. Neither are broadcasters, either radio or television. The fact is that the CATV signal is wire-carried. Notwithstanding, in the truest meaning of the operation, CATV is an integral part of the broadcasting operation. Why, then, should we not include section 325(a) as one of those applying to this new entry in the field of broadcasting?

The argument has been raised that broadcasters would price CATV out of business. I disagree, Mr. President, as do many responsible members of the broadcast industry and, I firmly believe, many responsible CATV operators, as well. I should like to emphasize that this section in no way precludes the original broadcaster from granting his consent for use of the signal free of charge. The basic issue here is that he be accorded the right of consent.

The essential point here, Mr. President, is one of moral and legal rights which this body is entrusted to protect. It is my intention, therefore, to offer at the appropriate time the amendment which I have sent to the desk, to make applicable to the operation of CATV the provisions of section 325(a) of the Communications Act. Again, I emphasize that the intent here is not to penalize CATV, but to protect the established property rights of broadcasters whose signals are being resold without having recourse.

Mr. President, it is argued that the bill, if enacted, will hold up the CATV group, or something of that sort. I point out that we cannot forget that those who today have these broadcasting facilities have constructed them, expanded them, maintained them, and operated them at great expense, and now continue to operate them. We must not forget that they broadcast, at very great expense to themselves, these signals, which they have picked up, also at great expense to themselves.

The situation would be different if only certain individual persons or small groups were concerned. But in this situation, one group proceeds, at great expense, to place a signal in the air; and another group takes the signal from the air and puts it to work for itself, without making any payment to the originator of the signal or without even obtaining the consent of the originator of the signal.

Mr. President, this measure is a very, very important one. Unless this bill is enacted into law, we shall cause widespread blackouts in areas which now receive television.

I see in the Chamber the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. There will be such blackouts in his State, and also in Idaho and, I believe, in part of Utah; and I believe there will be widespread blackouts in Colorado.

Some Senators assume that the persons chiefly affected are those who live in cities. However, I wish to say that we must protect the property rights of all persons affected—and even if the property rights of only one person were affected.

I point out that unless a measure of this sort is enacted into law, not only will those who live in remote areas be blacked out, insofar as the reception of television is concerned, but the same situation also will apply to those who live in the fringe areas of cities.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. Does the Senator from Colorado have any figures in regard to the areas of his State which may be dependent on single stations or on boosters? Has that information been made available?

Mr. ALLOTT. I have it here, and I can supply it for the RECORD. I know in this one area 36 stations are dependent on this one signal. In other towns in the State, there are 50-odd boosters which pick up the signal on one channel and put it out to others in those areas.

Mr. McGEE. Will the Senator from Colorado agree that it is especially difficult for those of us who represent the mountain-region States to convey to Senators from other parts of the country the fact that in our areas TV is still in the frontier stage. The people there do not have a wide choice of programs or an unlimited number of channels from which to choose.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is true. I suppose that people who live in the heavily populated East find it hard to realize how much the signals from the repeaters or the boosters mean to those who live in the sparsely populated areas of the West. The list which I hold in my hand includes the names of towns such as Coaldale, De Beque, Dolores, Eagle, Fleming, and many, many others. The significance of this matter to such areas cannot be overestimated, in my opinion.

Mr. McGEE. Is it not true that in ranching areas the people are almost entirely dependent on only one signal? Many are unable to attend the movies, or even the drive-ins; in some of these areas such facilities are not readily available. So if the one television signal which the people of those areas now receive were not to be available, they could not readily find an alternative form of entertainment or recreation.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is well aware that in his State, as in mine, in the mountainous areas, particularly in the winter—in fact, almost in the winter entirely—we have great amounts of time when it is very difficult to get from one point to another. As a result, these single signal stations are of great significance to those people who have no other way or other means of getting those signals.

One of the Senators who has spoken eloquently on the other side of the question said to me yesterday there was no need for boosters in Colorado because Colorado had a CATV. He said that statement particularly applied to eastern Colorado. Well, the Senator is simply unaware of what he is saying, because eastern Colorado is pretty well filled up with boosters, according to the list I have.

Mr. McGEE. The burden of the Senator's suggestion is not that anybody should be put out of business, but that we should try to extend the coverage of this utility to as many people as possible. Is that correct?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S VETO OF THE DEPRESSED AREAS BILL, S. 722

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Friday last President Eisenhower returned, without his approval, S. 722, the so-called depressed areas bill. I applaud such action by the President; and it is my hope that in the event there is an attempt to override this judicious veto, it will be soundly defeated.

Mr. President, there are many problems which confront our Nation from time to time, both domestic and foreign. It has been recognized, since the adoption of the Constitution and the establishment of our form of government, that the Federal Government was sovereign in the conduct of foreign affairs and the State governments possessed little, if any, responsibility in this area. On the other hand, in some areas of domestic affairs, the States enjoy complete sovereignty, and other areas are occupied jointly by both State and Federal Governments. It was with the apparent intention of operating within the area which is jointly occupied that the Senate enacted S. 722 during the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

Mr. President, there is a great difference between the principle that the Federal Government has a definite responsibility in promoting the fullest possible employment and legislation which seeks to substitute a federally assisted planned economy for the free enterprise system.

S. 722 is an effort by the Congress to substitute its judgment for that of the industries which had either chosen not to locate in areas in which it was found uneconomical to operate, reduced their operations in such areas, or removed their plants to areas where a more favorable economic climate existed. However, there is no substitute for the three primary and initial prerequisites for a favorable industrial atmosphere; namely, capital, business judgment, and a market for the product produced. Any attempt by Government to substitute taxpayers' funds for the lack of conditions which would insure the ability of industry to be efficient and competitive would result in an extremely unfortunate situation. True, employment may be temporarily boosted, but as soon as the competitive advantages created by the subsidy have been exhausted, those initial factors which left the community without employment in the first place will reassert themselves. The alternative will then have to be faced of either continuing the subsidy or leaving the community where it was, but for the additional burden of a staggering addition to the public debt.

An additional reason for my opposition to this legislation is the fact that it will create a new Federal agency and add an undetermined number of additions to the already awesome army of Federal bureaucrats. Those who support this measure as a temporary means of alleviating unemployment in certain areas are obviously outstandingly naive. The history of our Republic has demonstrated that "temporary" in relation to Government agencies is not contained in the Federal lexicon.

Lasting solutions to those problems which now face so-called depressed areas can be forthcoming only through the efforts of local citizens. Local participation and private financing under this bill would be held to a minimum, and the major role of the undertaking would be assumed by a newly created independent agency within the executive branch of the Government. Financing of industrial development projects by the Federal Government could go as high as 65 percent, local community participation could be as low as 10 percent, and private financing as little as 5 percent.

Mr. President, it is my firm conviction that S. 722 represents a step in the wrong direction in solving the problems of areas which are presently beset by economic difficulty. Thousands of development boards have been created by States, cities, and communities, and most, if not all of them, have diligently set about creating the conditions conducive to industrial efficiency, so that industry, recognizing these assets, would locate and thrive in the community. This local initiative would be materially inhibited by the Federal assistance provided in S. 722, and the artificial economic climate created will ultimately compound the difficulties which are sought to be glossed over by this legislation.

U.S. SAVINGS BONDS REDEMPTIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have just received from the Treasury Department a monthly report on sales and redemptions of series E and H savings bonds, which I have requested be sent to me regularly, and am again deeply concerned by the continuing trend of redemptions exceeding sales. This situation has been reflected by the statistics without pause since July 1958, and with only one interruption since March of that year. During the 24-month period ending April 30, 1960, the excess of E- and H-bond redemptions over sales has totaled $2,324 million; even the increase in interest rates from 3.26 percent to 3.75 percent, which was put into effect in September 1959 following congressional action to lift the interest ceiling on these bonds, failed to stop this trend, with an excess of redemptions over sales during those 7 months of $565 million, though it did result in a slowing down of the excess of redemption.

For some time, I have been advocating that steps be taken by the Treasury Department to stop further attrition of individual holdings of these anti-inflationary bonds, which represent an important portion of the national debt, and signify the interest of every citizen in his country's fiscal situation.

At the present time of world crisis, where our Nation's economy is the frontline of the East-West struggle, it seems particularly important to take action in this field. I again urge that the Treasury avail itself of the authority granted last year by the Congress to raise interest rates on E- and H-bonds beyond the present 3.75-percent level. It should undertake a massive patriotic drive to sell to the public what we now call savings bonds, but which should be renamed "Peace Bonds"—perhaps featuring a special $25-billion issue which would seem to attract millions of new investors in a significant shift of the national debt into these securities. Irrespective of congressional action on long-term marketable bond interest rates at this session, this would reflect a shift of the debt into the longer term securities which is sought to be achieved by the administration. The suggestion of my colleague, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], for an immediate rise in the savings bond interest rate to the 4.25-percent ceiling, is a most commendable plan for the achievement of this goal. Together with my colleague from Delaware, with whom I have been working in this field constantly, I urge this course upon the administration.

I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Treasury Department may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The E- and H-bond picture

[In millions of dollars]

	Sales [1]				Redemptions [1]				Net			Exchanges of E for H	Outstanding in 1959	
	1958	1959	Change		1958	1959	Change		1958	1959	Change		End of period	Change during period
			Amount	Percent			Amount	Percent						
LAST YEAR														
April	398	350	−48	−12	412	452	+40	+10	−14	−103	−89		42,762	−23
May	368	338	−30	−8	383	433	+50	+13	−15	−95	−80		42,749	−13
June	376	323	−53	−14	411	470	+59	+14	−35	−147	−112		42,716	33
Fiscal year	4,670	4,506	−164	−4	5,187	5,107	−80	−2	−517	−601	−84		42,716	+574
July	418	350	−68	−16	417	507	+90	+21	+1	−156	−157		42,679	−37
August	369	309	−60	−16	380	454	+74	+19	−11	−145	−134		42,619	−60
September	352	300	−52	−15	397	469	+73	+18	−45	−169	−125		42,540	−79
October	378	358	−20	−5	407	495	+88	+22	−29	−137	−108		42,486	−54
November	324	332	+7	+2	342	390	+48	+14	−17	−58	−41		42,517	+31
December	370	377	+7	+2	414	454	+40	+10	−43	−77	−34		42,559	+42
Calendar year	4,689	4,320	−369	−8	4,856	5,519	+664	+14	−167	−1,199	−1,032		42,559	−30
THIS YEAR														
January	486	421	−65	−13	526	562	+37	+7	−40	−142	−102	41	42,539	−20
February	383	438	+55	+14	410	457	+47	+12	−26	−19	+7	73	42,613	+74
March	414	393	−21	−5	460	437	−23	−5	−46	−44	+2	32	42,662	+49
April	350	340	−10	−3	452	427	−25	−5	−103	−88	+15	22	42,664	+2

[1] Sales and redemptions beginning January 1960 include exchanges of minor amounts of series F- and J-bonds for H-bonds but exclude exchanges of E-bonds for H-bonds.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Debt Analysis Staff, May 5, 1960.

THE BOMARC MISSILE: AN INTEGRAL ELEMENT IN AMERICA'S DEFENSE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have just received word that a completely successful test of the Bomarc B missile was conducted this morning at Eglin Air Force Base. To those of us who have been following the development of this important missile, this comes as extremely good news. It is particularly significant at this time because tomorrow the Senate Appropriations Committee will begin hearings on the cuts made in the defense appropriation bill, and one of the items drastically cut by the House was the Bomarc program.

Probably the main reason why the House voted to eliminate the Bomarc program was because of the partial failures during the early tests of the Bomarc B. But since the House acted, there have now been two tests, both completely successful, which make it apparent that the Air Force's confidence in the missile is justified.

BACKGROUND OF PROBLEM

We have now invested about $600 million in the Bomarc B missile, and are now right on the brink of beginning full-scale production. The Marquardt plant in Ogden, Utah, which produces the ramjet engine for the missile, is 90 percent tooled up, and production has already begun.

On March 24 the Air Force announced its decision to reduce the number of Bomarcs previously programed in order to provide a better balance of air defense weapons within the limitations imposed by the budget.

Let me emphasize that I have no quarrel with the Air Force's decision, despite the adverse economic impact on Utah. I felt that the overruling consideration was to get the maximum amount of defense for every dollar spent, and if this involved cutting back the Bomarc program, I was willing to go along with that, as were the other members of the Utah delegation, and, I believe, most of the people of Utah.

But there is a big difference between reducing the number of Bomarc missiles to be produced and eliminating them entirely. The March 24 reduction was part of a carefully prepared plan, drawn up by military experts, intended to provide a better overall mix of defensive weapons. The House action, in contrast, was not the result of any carefully prepared plan; it was an arbitrary and, in my opinion, precipitate decision, and one which should be overruled by the Senate.

THE NEED FOR BOMARC

We have heard much during the last 2 years about our susceptibility to Russian attack between now and 1965, when our missile capability will be far greater than it is today. During this extremely critical period, the years of the so-called missile gap, the Bomarc is one of the most important defense weapons we have. It is incredible that those who claim there is a missile gap should oppose the construction of the weapons we need to guarantee safety from attack during the crucial period they are talking about.

It has been said that the Bomarc will be obsolete in several years, when Russia will have a larger force of intercontinental ballistic missiles. There are two answers to this:

First, the Bomarc is not likely to be obsolete in the foreseeable future, because even with the existence of the ICBM, the bomber threat and its associated air-to-surface missile capability will still exist, and to provide defense only against intercontinental missiles, and not against air-breathing missiles and planes, would be an open invitation to attack. Second, even though the need for the Bomarc may decrease several years hence, it is an absolute necessity at this time. There is no other weapon in existence or under development which can do the job the Bomarc is designed to do. Here again, to eliminate the Bomarc entirely is, as the Air Force has indicated, an invitation to attack.

There are three points I should like to emphasize today. The first is that the cut is wasteful. It cannot be justified from an economic standpoint, because it would leave a gap in our air defense which would have to be filled by production of additional fighter aircraft at a much greater cost.

Second, the Bomarc missile would give much better defense than would the number of F–106 fighter planes required to replace the missiles.

Third, the House action would delay the day when we will have adequate defense against attack by manned aircraft.

COST CONSIDERATIONS

With respect to the cost, Gen. H. M. Estes, Jr., Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff of the Air Force, has testified that the procurement of interceptors as an alternative to Bomarc, including operation and maintenance for 1 year, would cost $677.6 million. The Bomarc procurement costs, including operation and maintenance for 1 year, would be $466.6 million. Thus, there would be a saving of $211 million during a single year by approval of the Bomarc instead of procurement of a comparable number of fighter interceptor planes.

Maj. Gen. R. J. Friedman, Director of Budget, Comptroller of the Air Force, estimates that the cost of the Bomarc missiles will be $3.2 million each, and that the cost of the F–106 would be $4.4 million each. He has testified that it would cost about $1 billion to provide the number of fighter planes needed to replace the canceled Bomarcs. He emphasizes that replacement would have to be on a one-for-one basis.

So unless the Air Force is completely wrong in its cost estimates, it would require more money to provide the needed air defense with aircraft rather than Bomarc missiles. Now, let us consider the question of whether the two systems are really comparable.

LIMITATIONS OF FIGHTER PLANES

The North American Air Defense Command has studied the potentialities of the two systems in light of the defense mission it is assigned, and has recommended that the Bomarc program be continued for the simple reason that the Bomarc can do the job better than can fighter planes.

Obviously, a fighter plane has some advantages. It has the advantage of being under the personal control of a pilot, and it might be used more than once. And NORAD has indicated that it needs some fighter planes. It also needs, however, a goodly number of Bomarcs to give a "mix" of weapons which will provide the necessary flexibility. NORAD must be prepared to meet various tactics—mass raids, sneak raids, and low- and high-altitude attacks. Without the Bomarc, our capability to meet these varied threats is substantially diminished.

Incidentally, with respect to the advantage of control by a pilot, it should be emphasized that during the actual attack, the pilot does not control the plane. Human reflexes and human vision are too limited to permit a pilot to attack an incoming supersonic missile or plane. The plane is controlled electronically by SAGE, the same system as is used to control Bomarc, and, in fact, uses a missile to effect a kill.

REACTION TIME

The Bomarc has a much more rapid reaction time than does a fighter plane. It is in a continual state of readiness, and its reaction time of only 30 seconds is far beyond the capability of a plane.

And once in the air, the Bomarc can proceed to its target much more rapidly than the fighter plane—in fact, about twice as fast. Of course, our fighter planes, such as the F–101 and the F–106, are capable of supersonic speeds, but not in extended range operations. If they fly at these high speeds all the way to their target, they quickly run out of fuel, and if they are over the ocean, they have no chance of getting back to their base. Their range at top speed is only a fraction that of the Bomarc.

General Estes, discussing the advantages of the Bomarc, said:

> In the low-altitute regime, the Bomarc B has been specifically designed to attack targets at low altitudes. A high launching rate of missiles per base makes available an unequaled concentration of firepower that permits the defense system to cope with massed attacks or simultaneous attacks from all directions. The high launch rate, long-range and rapid reaction capabilities of Bomarc B combine to permit early engagement of bombers and thus remove the nuclear air battle from the vicinity of the targets being defended.

In response to a question about the difference between the missiles and fighters, General Estes said:

> One is altitude, sir. One is the competence that you can build into a missile system that you cannot in a fighter. For example, it is extremely difficult to put a large nuclear warhead into a fighter because you cannot escape from your own nuclear blast from your own missile. Bomarc, once it blasts, doesn't care. There is no human in it. So you have the capability of putting much larger warheads on your missile in

order to vaporize the bombs and the bomber. Therefore, it is the intention of North American Air Defense Command to use a mixed force of weapons, each of which has capabilities which are not directly attainable in the other type of weapon, to take on any attack.

It seems to me that there can be no question about the relative effectiveness of the "mix" recommended by the Air Force and a force made up only of fighter planes and short-range missiles.

BOMARC READY SOONER

But beyond all this there is another consideration, and perhaps this may be the most important of all. Even if the F–106's were completely effective, even if we could double their speed and increase their range, and provide them with more powerful warheads, all this would be academic. The fact is, we simply cannot build the additional F–106's by the time when we will need them.

Now, it is true that the F–106 has been in production for some time. But production of an airplane cannot merely be turned on or off like a faucet. Even though we have the assembly line in operation, no orders have been placed for the tens of thousands of additional parts which would be required to extend production, as recommended by the House committee. That is why the Air Force estimates that it would take about a year longer to produce the number of fighter planes needed than it would to produce the Bomarc B, which is already beginning production, and for which parts have already been ordered. And this is the time lag for the version of the F–106 now in production. An improved version would not be available until about 3 years after the Bomarc.

BOMARC TEST RECORD

Now, let me return to the Bomarc test record, which, as I indicated earlier, was a major factor in influencing the House decision.

The success of two Bomarc A missiles in firings against a supersonic missile and a drone May 12 at Eglin Air Force Base was a convincing demonstration of the effectiveness of the Bomarc. The first test of a complete Bomarc B missile on April 13 was 100 percent successful. The simulated target was intercepted. The missile was destroyed by the range safety officer at 150 nautical miles, the limit of the gulf test range. The ramjet problems which had been experienced in the early flights at Cape Canaveral have been overcome. Likewise, today's test was a complete success, with every part of the missile functioning perfectly. The missile traveled 270 miles, diving from an extremely high altitude to intercept a simulated target.

Interestingly enough, even the earlier tests of components of the Bomarc B, which were reported in the press as failures, actually were partial successes, and as a matter of fact, contributed much to the development of the missile. At this point, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a table showing what these flights were designed to test, and the number of successes and failures on each attempt.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Test record of Bomarc B

Objectives	Test number								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Solid rocket boost	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
Ramjets	F	F	F	F	F	OK	OK	OK	OK
Flight controls	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	F	F	OK	OK
Airframe	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
Performance	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
Accessory power unit	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	OK	OK
Range	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	OK	OK

F = Failure.
* = Not scheduled.

NOTE.—Tests Nos. 1 through 7 were conducted at Patrick Air Force Base. Nos. 8 and 9 were at Eglin Air Force Base.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, certainly, in view of the remarkable success of the Bomarc in its recent firings, and of the above analysis of the earlier attempts, it appears that the Air Force is justified in its optimism about the Bomarc, and its willingness to rely on the Bomarc as a key element in our defense against aerial attack.

THE CANADIAN POSITION

A decision such as whether or not to build a particular weapon must, of course, be based primarily upon technical considerations and military needs. And it is upon such considerations that the Bomarc is justified. But perhaps it would be appropriate to invite attention to one other aspect—the attitude of our Canadian allies, who have worked with us on the Bomarc, who are helping to supply parts and bases for it, and who have the same stake as we have in effective defense of the North American Continent.

In this connection, the Honorable G. R. Pearkes, Minister of National Defense of Canada, said in the House of Commons on April 29, in discussing the House committee's action:

> This is a recommendation, of course, by the Appropriations Committee which has yet to receive the approval of the Senate and the administration. If this recommendation is approved and made final then it will not be in keeping with the arrangements which were made over a year ago between our two countries for the air defense of this continent.

I think it is apparent that the Canadians recognize the value of the Bomarc, and it is equally apparent they desire that the program be continued as recommended by the Air Force, in keeping with the agreement made between Canada and the United States.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, on the basis of the facts available at the time the House committee acted, I am sure that I would have voted to continue the Bomarc B program, as recommended by the Air Force. But if there had been any doubts in my mind, I am sure they would have been erased by the results of the tests made since the House acted. I believe that anyone who is concerned with a sound defense for the United States during the next several years will concur in the recommendation of the Air Force and will agree that the funds needed for the Bomarc B missile should be restored.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO SUBMIT CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the filing of reports pursuant to Senate Resolutions 54, 56, and 61, of the 86th Congress, be extended to June 15, 1960. This request concerns annual reports of certain subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 17, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 3338) to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. Air Force aircraft at Little Rock, Ark.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 18, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 17, 1960:

U.S. MARSHAL

Lyle F. Milligan, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years. (Now serving under an appointment which expired March 1, 1960.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 17, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 31: 1: *In Thee, O Lord, do I put my trust.*

Most merciful and gracious God, may we now hallow Thy name and receive Thy help to gain the mastery in all the bitter conflicts and precarious situations of these days when we are tempted to yield to a sense of failure and futility.

We earnestly beseech Thee to gird us with moral sagacity and noble strategy as we contend with the forces of lawless violence and brutal tyranny and may it never be true that the sons of this world, in their generation, are wiser than the sons of light.

Help us to believe that we can take the fear and restlessness out of our human life by putting our trust in Thee and by reminding ourselves that Thou art our refuge and strength.

Show us how we may learn to achieve a finer skill in the art of brotherly living and attain unto the wisdom and peace of seeking one another's welfare.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE SUMMIT MEETING

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, the situation in Paris calls for cool heads. I urge that we close ranks in support of the President and leave the settlement of the affair to him and his advisers. This is no time for second guessing. The President and his advisers have the information and background to deal with this crisis and I hope and pray they will handle it capably. It will be of tremendous help to them to know that we, back home, are united behind them.

This whole affair points up more clearly than ever before the need for the Freedom Academy which I proposed in my bill, H.R. 3880, introduced in the previous session. The Freedom Academy would turn out trained, dedicated men and women of the free world to work to counteract the activities of the Communist conspirators who are all about us, both here and abroad. We need a more effective method of operation in the battle to win men's minds to the peaceful ideals of the free world.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency may have permission to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL TO PERMIT CERTAIN TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT CONSTRUCTION WORK ON THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 166 authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary and permanent construction work on the Capitol Grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to permit (1) the performance within the United States Capitol Grounds of excavation, temporary construction, or other work that may be necessary for the construction of a national headquarters building and other related facilities for the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America on the property immediately northwest of the intersection of Constitution Avenue Northwest, and Louisiana Avenue Northwest, in the District of Columbia; and (2) the use of Capitol Grounds property located west of the street curb on Louisiana Avenue Northwest, between Constitution Avenue Northwest and First Street Northwest, for purposes of ingress and egress to and from the building site during such construction. No permanent construction shall extend within the United States Capitol Grounds except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this joint resolution.

(b) The Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to permit the following improvements of a permanent nature to be made on Capitol Grounds property located west of the street curb on Louisiana Avenue Northwest, between Constitution Avenue Northwest and First Street Northwest:

(1) The removal of the existing driveway which provided access to a gasoline station which formerly occupied such site; the patching of the existing curb; and the regrading and sodding of the area comprising such driveway;

(2) The extension of existing sewers and the building of new manholes under the sidewalk along Louisiana Avenue Northwest, between Constitution Avenue Northwest and First Street Northwest, to accommodate service laterals from the proposed new building, and the installation of necessary laterals;

(3) The installation of service laterals from existing gas and water mains located on Capitol Grounds property located at Louisiana Avenue Northwest, between Constitution Avenue Northwest and First Street Northwest;

(4) The removal and replacement of existing sidewalks located on Capitol Grounds property at Louisiana Avenue Northwest, between Constitution Avenue Northwest and First Street Northwest;

(5) The planting of seven additional trees between street curb and new sidewalk along Louisiana Avenue Northwest, between Constitution Avenue Northwest and First Street Northwest, such trees to be selected by the Architect of the Capitol;

(6) The regrading and resodding of the remaining area; and

(7) The plugging and filling of a portion of the abandoned brick arch sewer located at the northeast corner of the proposed new building.

SEC. 2. The United States shall not incur any expense or liability whatsoever, under or by reason of this joint resolution, or be liable under any claim of any nature or kind that may arise from anything that may be connected with or grow out of this joint resolution.

SEC. 3. No work shall be performed within the Capitol Grounds pursuant to this joint resolution until the Architect of the Capitol shall have been furnished with such assurances as he may deem necessary that all areas within such grounds, disturbed by reason of such construction, shall, except as otherwise provided in this joint resolution, be restored to their original condition without expense to the United States; and all work within the Capitol Grounds herein authorized shall be performed under conditions satisfactory to the Architect of the Capitol.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed as conveying to the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America any right, title, or interest in or to any of the temporary or permanent improvements made by it within the Capitol Grounds pursuant to this joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

RELIGIOSA LUIGIA FRIZZO ET AL.

The Clerk called the first bill on the calendar (H.R. 3805) for the relief of Religiosa Luigia Frizzo, Religiosa Vittoria Garzoni, Religiosa Maria Ramus, Religiosa Ines Ferrario, and Religiosa Roberta Ciccone.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. JAMES H. McMURRAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1433) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James H. McMurray.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

HENRY AND EDNA ROBINSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1721) for the relief of Henry and Edna Robinson.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. MOSES GLIKOWSKY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1766) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Moses Glikowsky.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

GERALD DEGNAN ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 684) for the relief of Gerald Degnan, William C. Williams, Harry Eakon, Jacob Beebe, Thorvald Ohnstad, Evan S. Henry, Henry Pitmatalik, D. LeRoy Kotila, Bernard Rock, Bud J. Carlson, Charles F. Curtis, and A. N. Dake.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the persons enumerated below the sums specified, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States as reimbursement for personal effects destroyed as a result of the fire which occurred on October 2, 1958, at Sherman, Alaska, when the claimants were employed by The Alaska Railroad: Gerald Degnan, $286.83; William C. Williams, $755.92; Harry Eakon, $342,49; Jacob Beebe, $743.85; Thorwald Ohnstad, $1,556.32; Evan S. Henry, $199.68; Henry Pitmatalik, $472.22; D. LeRoy Kotila, $217.70; Bernard Rock, $729.79; Bud J. Carlson, $313.05; Charles F. Curtis, $1,111.69; and A. N. Dake, $93.40.

SEC. 2. No part of the amounts appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERRY LEE GORMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1720) for the relief of Perry Lee Gorman.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

MARY ALICE CLEMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2317) for the relief of Mary Alice Clements.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, limiting the period of time within which claims may be filed thereunder, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States shall have jurisdiction to receive and to determine the validity and amount of the claim of Mary Alice Clements, of Washington, District of Columbia, for civilian detention benefits under subsections (a) through (e) of section 5 of such Act, and shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund any award made thereunder. The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay, out of such Fund, to the said Mary Alice Clements the amount of any such award so certified by the Commission.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN B. MANTHEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2330) for the relief of John B. Manthey.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

HARRY L. ARKIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2523) for the relief of Harry L. Arkin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry L. Arkin of Denver, Colorado, the sum of $270.90. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Harry L. Arkin against the United States for (1) reimbursement for expenses, including insurance costs, incurred by him in having his automobile transported from Germany to the United States upon termination of his duty overseas with the Air Force, the said Harry L. Arkin having been denied shipment of his automobile at Government expense because of a change in Air Force policy which occurred after approval had been given by the transportation officer of the Seventeenth Air Force for the shipment of his automobile by such means, and (2) per diem allowance for the period (March 1 to March 6, 1959) he was permitted to remain in Germany, beyond his scheduled departure date, to await an official decision with regard to the shipment of his automobile: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUGUSTA FURNITURE CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2779) relating to the election under section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by the Augusta Furniture Co., Inc., of Staunton, Va.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the election under the provisions of section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 made by the Augusta Furniture Company, Incorporated, of Staunton, Virginia, and mailed to the District Director of Internal Revenue, Richmond, Virginia, on December 2, 1958, shall be deemed to have been filed with such District Director on December 1, 1958.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

F. P. TOWER ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1526) for the relief of F. P. Tower, Lillie B. Lewis, Manuel Branco, John Santos Carinhas, Joaquin Gomez Carinhas, and Manuel Jesus Carinhas.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MRS. CORNELIA FALES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6215) for the relief of Mrs. Cornelia Fales.

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Cornelia Fales, of Metropolitan State Hospital, Waltham, Massachusetts, the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all the claims of the said Mrs. Cornelia Fales against the United States for payment of the proceeds of the national service life insurance issued to her brother, the late Sam E. Seager (Veterans' Administration claim numbered XC 3466187), effective October 24, 1942. At the time of the transfer of the said Sam E. Seager to the Enlisted Reserve Corps and subsequent thereto, he indicated his intention of retaining such insurance but at the time of his death on February 10, 1944, such insurance was not in effect because an official communication from the Army, written in response to his inquiry, misinformed him about his rights with respect to such insurance: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and

the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "XC 3466187" and insert "XC–3466817".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISS HEDWIG DORA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6338) for the relief of Miss Hedwig Dora.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

WILLIAM J. HUNTSMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9406) for the relief of William J. Huntsman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That William J. Huntsman is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $116.42, representing overpayments of pay and allowances received by him during his service in the United States Army for the period from September 10, 1948, to November 22, 1949, and from April 25, 1956, to November 2, 1957.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT L. STOERMER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9711) for the relief of Robert L. Stoermer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 15 through 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby waived in favor of Robert L. Stoermer, Hudgins, Virginia, and his claim for compensation and disability benefits arising out of an injury to his back alleged to have been sustained by him on May 17, 1951, while employed at Fort Eustis, Virginia, shall be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such Act if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, within the six-month period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act. No benefits, other than medical and hospital expenses, shall accrue to the said Robert L. Stoermer by reason of the enactment of this Act for any period before the date of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOREN W. WILLIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11826) for the relief of Loren W. Willis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Loren W. Willis, 240 Montgomery Street, Annandale, Virginia, the sum of $1,068.51, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss sustained by the said Loren W. Willis as the result of damage to and destruction of his personal property and household goods in the warehouse of the Global Van Lines, Inc., in Orleans, France, by a fire which occurred on July 22, 1959, *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. HOWARD L. CLARK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11827) for the relief of Maj. Howard L. Clark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Major Howard L. Clark, O40928, United States Army, the sum of $277.94, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss sustained by the said Major Howard L. Clark as the result of damage to and destruction of his personal property in the warehouse of Allen Moving and Storage Company, 861 Estabrook Street, San Leandro, California, by a fire which occurred on February 23, 1959: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KATHERINE O. CONOVER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8606) for the relief of Katherine O. Conover.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Katherine O. Conover, Arlington, Virginia, the sum of $13,403.57. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Katherine O. Conover against the United States for compensation for the loss of salary, annual leave, and personal property sustained by her, and for reimbursement of certain hospital charges involuntarily incurred while serving as a civilian employee of the Department of the Air Force on Okinawa. Claims for losses such as sustained are not cognizable under the provisions of law referred to as the Federal Tort Claims Act, because such claims resulted from actions initiated in a foreign country. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$13,403.57" and insert "$5,632.02".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12232) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 12232, with Mr. TRIMBLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we bring you today the legislative branch appropriation bill for 1961. As usual, the bill has been written not by me, but by the members of the committee and particularly of the subcommittee, composed of Messrs. KIRWAN and STEED on the Democratic side and Messrs. HORAN and BOW on the Republican side with the able assistance of the chairman, Mr. CANNON, of Missouri, and the ranking minority member, Mr. TABER.

Mr. Chairman, a summary of the amounts involved in the bill is on page 2 of the committee report. The itemized tabulation by appropriation paragraphs begins on page 12 of the report.

The bill for 1961, as reported, carries a total of $100,317,660. Following the custom of the past, the bill omits appropriations for the Senate and also omits certain items under the supervision of the Architect which pertain solely to that body. Items will be added when the bill reaches the other body.

The bill is below both the budget request and appropriations to date for fiscal year 1960. Specifically, the committee recommends a total which is $3,754,360 below budget requests of $104,072,020, and $781,280 below appropriations to date for comparable items of $101,098,940.

It is not practicable, as Members know, to make large reductions in this bill which is the legislative housekeeping bill. Most of the provisions are statutory and cover necessary expenses of running the legislative establishment and maintaining its physical plant and do not fluctuate widely from year to year. As a practical matter, the committee is powerless to realistically reduce certain items such as, for example, statutory salaries, congressional printing, expenses of investigating committees, and things of that sort.

By way of summary, $42,492,485 is included for items under the House of Representatives; $3,483,875 for certain joint offices and items; $23,009,800 for items under the Architect of the Capitol, excluding, as I indicated, items pertaining solely to the Senate; $352,300 for the Botanic Garden; $15,230,000 for the Library of Congress, not including three items for the Library under the jurisdiction of the Architect; and $15,749,200 for congressional printing and binding and for the Office of the Superintendent of Documents.

As appropriation bills go, Mr. Chairman, the legislative bill is not a big bill and, as I say, it is not feasible to make large economies in the requests because much of it is irreducible if the legislative establishment is to be properly operated and maintained as authorized. We have followed the practice of the past in making reductions wherever we thought we could and still make reasonable provision for efficient functioning and services.

The largest item of decrease below the estimates is in the Library of Congress, where they asked for a new item in the amount of $2,811,400, mostly to purchase from the Treasury foreign currencies now owned by the Treasury to be used in several countries to acquire, catalog, and distribute library materials of those countries. The materials would be sent to a large number of research libraries here in the United States. The committee decided, after rather lengthy consideration, not to allow that item. It is rather fully covered in the committee hearings.

Several other decreases were made in the amounts requested and they are covered in the committee report.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman, the committee recommends a total of $42,492,485 for all items under the House of Representatives section of the bill. We have reduced these items by $331,160 below comparable budget estimates. In total, the amount recommended is also below 1960 appropriations by $643,780. The reductions made below the requests will not, I am certain, in anywise interfere with the efficient functioning of the activities of the House. In two or three cases, it is a matter of placing the judgment of the committee as to the requirements against that represented by the budget estimates.

We can call attention, as we have done in recent years, to the fact that the number of clerks on the rolls of the Members is well below the total permitted by law; currently the number is approximately 950 less than the maximum number permitted by law. Also, as we have noted in other years, the staffs of the committees are at a level somewhat below the total number authorized by law.

In respect to official allowances for Members of one kind or another, we do not propose any change from the present allowances. That, of course, is not within our jurisdiction. There are one or two individual changes.

I might call attention to the fact that the amount to cover the operating losses of the House restaurants is materially less than heretofore. They are doing better, especially with the new cafeteria in operation. The amount is now down to $35,000 whereas the original budget estimate was for $73,000.

JOINT ITEMS

For the various joint offices and items, as set out in the report, a total of $3,483,875, is recommended. Based on later information, we were able to scale down the request for reimbursing the postal account for penalty mail costs but it is also that same item which accounts for the increase above 1960. That is all explained in the hearings.

We have adjusted the salary language in one of the joint items, namely, that dealing with the two detectives detailed to the Capitol from the Metropolitan Police Department in order to equalize the salaries. Presently, one of the two men is receiving somewhat more than the other and we have brought them to a parity. We felt that was justified as a matter of simple equity.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

For all items covering the Architect of the Capitol in this bill, we recommend a total of $23,009,800. This is below both the budget requests and below the current year appropriation level. It was possible to delete a few items requested by the Architect without in anywise being detrimental to the necessary services performed.

The committee report on pages 5, 6, and 7 cover the highlights of this section of the bill. The printed hearings contain progress reports and financial summaries on the extension of the east front project and on the third House office building project. There is no money in the bill for the east front project, but there is $13 million included for the third office building to pay obligations accruing under contracts entered into under the basic law.

As usual, and as is necessary, we have allowed a number of mandatory cost items which come along every year, and, for the purpose of keeping the physical plant in reasonably good order—and that includes the library buildings—we have allowed various repair and improvement increases. We must keep the Capitol of the United States and its supporting buildings in good order. I am certain no one would quarrel with that.

The Architect asked for only six additional positions and we have allowed those. There is one item that I should call attention to. We have included a new item of $75,000 to enable the Architect to prepare preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional building for the Library of Congress. They badly need it. They have been overcrowded in the two buildings for many years. Each year, actually each month, the situation becomes worse. The Library does not stand still. It continues to grow. Our Library of Congress is the world's largest and richest in resources. The main building was constructed in 1897. The annex was built in 1938. They are using space originally designed for books and other materials for office space. In fact, the space situation is such that as a temporary but only partial measure, the Committee is recommending, under the Library section of the bill, an interim request to rent suitable space to house some of the activities that do not need to be close to the collections. We can dispense with this rental arrangement once the third building is available which, under favorable conditions, will not be before 6 or 7 years from now. The $75,000 to which I referred has been authorized by the House and the Senate in the passage of House Joint Resolution 352. We have inserted the money in order to save a year's time. We believe it to be fully justified.

BOTANIC GARDEN

There is nothing unusual about the request for the Botanic Garden. We have allowed the budget estimate of $352,300. The small increase is due solely to mandatory costs. A good many people visit the Botanic Garden each year as shown by the statistical tabulation in the printed hearings.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated, we have a great Library across the street. It is the world's largest. It is a very important institution and we ought not to neglect it. Its collections grow and grow each year and the demands on it

continue to grow. It has been for many years an invaluable institution to the defense agencies who have been allocating millions of dollars over there for special research and analytical projects.

In this bill, we have been inclined, as we have for the last few years, to make reasonable provision for the Library. We have allowed some additional personnel, although not as many as they wanted. We recommended $15,230,000 under this section of the bill as compared to budget estimates of $18,115,200, a reduction of $2,885,200, but $927,210 above 1960 appropriations. As I indicated earlier, the largest reduction below the estimates is in the special foreign currency program where they wanted $2,811,400 and we have not gone along with it. Some of the increase over 1960 is to meet mandatory costs, price increases, and the like in order to maintain present levels of services. Also, in the Legislative Reference Service, there has been an almost phenomenal increase in the demands on that important service and we have allowed some additional personnel to try to cope with it.

In addition, under the European Law Service, as we point out in the report, we have made somewhat larger provision than recommended in the budget for that work.

For the Copyright Office, we recommend enough to maintain the current level. They did not ask for any additional personnel.

In the program for selling catalog cards, we are pleased to note that for the first time in the current year, and this is projected for the coming year, not only will the full expenditure be recovered to the Treasury through sales of catalog cards but there will be a small profit in addition. Sales volume is increasing every year. This is a very important service to libraries all over the United States.

Continuing the position taken in the past several years, we have approved some expansion in the very worthwhile books for the blind program. That is covered in some detail in the hearings.

In the past, there has been some abuse of the privilege of occupancy of the so-called study rooms in the Library. As the hearings will disclose, that situation has now been cleared up and we shall try to see that there are no similar recurrences.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

There are two items under the Government Printing Office heading, one for congressional printing and binding and the other for the Superintendent of Documents.

For printing and binding, we have recommended the budget estimate of $11,900,000 which is somewhat above the 1960 amount but part of it, as explained in the report, is to replace amounts borrowed from prior appropriations, under authority carried in the bill, to pay for additional printing requirements for the years involved. No one can accurately judge the requirements in advance and we must supply whatever is necessary.

For the Office of the Superintendent of Documents, we have allowed the full budget estimate which is a rather substantial increase of $328,850 over 1960. We have allowed them 25 additional jobs they wanted, but, Mr. Chairman, we are pleased to report that this operation is completely self-supporting and the revenues from sales of Government publications return a small profit to the Treasury—that is, they cover not only the expenses of the sales program, but they also more than cover the cost of all of the other activities of the Office which do not produce revenue. We have these hundreds of Government publications being printed and it is our view that we should spare no reasonable expense to make them available to the public when it is willing to pay for them.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to touch on some of the highlights of the bill, although, as I have said before, there is not really too much involved in the bill this year. In conclusion, I might summarize by saying that generally speaking the bill provides for things to run along about like they have been for the last year or two. But, of course, there are usually, in any particular bill, a few changes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill and I hope it will be satisfactory.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I think the chairman has presented this bill very well. He has called your attention to the fact that it is under last year's appropriation and some $3 million plus under the budget this year. We think it is a clean bill. We have held extensive hearings on it, and we believe this bill is entirely in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 92]

Alexander	Farbstein	Lesinski
Alford	Flynn	Libonati
Anderson, Mont.	Fogarty	Loser
Arends	Forand	McGovern
Barden	Gilbert	Mitchell
Baring	Granahan	Moulder
Barry	Green, Oreg.	Multer
Blatnik	Griffiths	Nix
Blitch	Hays	Powell
Boykin	Healey	Riehlman
Brewster	Hébert	Rogers, Mass.
Brown, Mo.	Hogan	Rogers, Tex.
Buckley	Holt	Scott
Cahill	Jackson	Sheppard
Canfield	Jensen	Short
Cederberg	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Kans.
Chelf	Johnson, Md.	Taber
Coffin	Kearns	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Kilburn	Teller
Devine	Kluczynski	Thompson, N.J.
Diggs	Lafore	Walter
Dingell	Landrum	Williams
Durham	Lankford	Zelenko

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, H.R. 12232, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called when 362 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] had been recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, as we are today considering the appropriation bill which calls for a little over $42 million for the operation of the House of Representatives, this should be an opportune time to remind the Members of how this amount might be reduced in future years if we were to adopt some legislation which would regulate and restrict some of the printing that costs several million dollars each year.

I have always felt that the House of Representatives should set an example to the other agencies or departments of government. As long as we are extravagant and apparently take little recognition of the opportunity for saving some money ourselves, we cannot very well be too critical of other agencies.

Mr. Chairman, I have introduced two bills. One is House Resolution 307. That resolution, if adopted by this House, would provide that before printing any bill or resolution the clerk would compare the copy introduced with similar bills or resolutions introduced during the same Congress, and in lieu of printing identical bills or resolutions the title of the bill or the resolution and the name of the Member introducing the same would be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD together with a reference to the original bill or resolution introduced.

I would call to your attention and remind you that each session we have seen introduced hundreds of bills that are printed 5, 6, 7, 10, 50, and 100 times as separate pieces of legislation that go through all of the machinery and add to the cost. If we could do away with the printing of those identical bills, which are absolutely a waste of money, we could save millions of dollars.

The other piece of legislation that I have introduced is **H.R. 7676**, which would put a restriction upon the printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. During the 11 years that I have been here I have seen the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD grow to a place where it is absolutely nonsensical. We have certain rules here in the House, but all of us know that we do not abide by our own rules. We avail ourselves of the opportunity here in the well of the House to ask unanimous consent that we may extend our remarks in either the body of the RECORD or in the Appendix of the RECORD in an unlimited fashion. We have a rule which says that if the printing exceeds a certain amount, we have to go to the Public Printer and get an estimate of the cost and then come down here and ask unanimous consent again to have it inserted. Never in the 11 years that I have been here have I ever heard of any request being objected to.

Mr. Chairman, I am not saying this critically, but I am just calling your attention to try to consider how we could make a legitimate saving. I think that

we have abused many of the privileges that come to us. At the close of a legislative day we have seen men standing on each side of the aisle asking for unanimous consent that such and such a Member may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter, which sometimes runs many pages. They are asking permission for some Members not here; not even interested enough to be on the floor to make his own request. I realize that I could make an objection or you could make an objection and we could keep it out, but I am appealing to the Members of this House to join with me in these two pieces of legislation which would at least restore some semblance of reason, some realistic approach to this problem. I want to say this conservatively, that if H.R. 7676 is adopted, it would not affect 5 percent of the Members of this body and it would save anywhere from $3 million to $5 million during the 2 years of each Congress. I think that is a figure that we should keep in mind. In other words, if the legislation I have suggested were adopted, at the next session, when we consider this legislative appropriation bill with which this committee does such a fine job, we would be able to cut the request down by at least 10 percent. We would certainly save some money.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a few questions concerning this bill. I would like to start with the $13 million appropriation for the New-New House Office Building. Will someone on the committee tell me how much has been spent and what this $13 million will bring the spending for that new-new office building up to.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I think the record will show that up to this point on the actual building itself and the grounds immediately surrounding the additional House Office Building, it will be somewhere around $74 million. For the completion of the program which is necessary because of the additional House Office Building, the purchase of land and buildings on the House side, which takes in the Congressional Hotel and the old George Washington Inn and the other properties, the anticipated development will amount to about $105 million.

Mr. GROSS. So it is now up to about $74 million.

Mr BOW. For the additional building itself.

Mr. GROSS. And that will not equip the building, or will it equip the building?

Mr. BOW. I understand that will not take care of the furniture; that is for the building itself.

Mr. GROSS. That is just the building without any equipment at all in it?

Mr. BOW. A completed building.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Who authorized this new building?

Mr. GROSS. The Congress authorized it.

Mr HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know, but on what was the authorization based?

Mr. GROSS. That I could not say. The gentleman from Iowa tried to strike out the first $7,500,000 that went into it. I think the gentleman from Michigan opposed it as did the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did; and I never could find out who authorized it.

Mr. GROSS. Congress authorized it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I could not find out what the authorization was based on, why it was needed; there were no hearings.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot enlighten the gentleman on that.

Now, we maintain quite a fleet of Cadillacs for certain Members of the other body and the House of Representatives. Are there any new air-conditioned Cadillacs to be purchased under this bill?

Mr. NORRELL. So far as I know, there is nothing for that contemplated in the pending bill.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear that. I hope those available will be driven for several more years.

When will we know what the other body is going to get by way of running its operation? Is the bill for the other body to be tied onto this, and when will we know what the other body is going to spend, or are we not supposed to know?

Mr. HORAN. If the gentleman will yield, we will not know until the other body acts on their portion of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. When this bill goes over there, they tie their bill onto this bill, and then it comes back and is acted on in conference, if there is a conference. Do we know what they are asking?

Mr. HORAN. We know the total amount, yes.

Mr. GROSS. But that is about all we will know?

Mr. HORAN. Oh, no; we will have a breakdown.

Mr. GROSS. That leads me to ask this question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman just said that we will have a breakdown. Does the gentleman mean a national breakdown; does he mean that we will have a bankruptcy, or what?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I note on page 5 of the hearings an item for a physical therapist for the other body, for the new Senate Office Building. How many physical therapists are there in this bill?

Mr. NORRELL. There is no money at all in this bill so far as the other body is concerned. That will have to be included on the other side.

Mr. GROSS. This is under the title of "Senate Office Buildings." It says "One GS–7 physical therapist." How many do they have in the other body, does anybody know?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. One apiece.

Mr. NORRELL. I do not know what the other body will do.

Mr. MASON. That is in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Illinois states it is in this bill.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. It has been the custom for this bill, when it first comes to the House, to exclude items pertaining solely to operation of the other body. It has always been the custom for each body to recognize the prerogative of the other to set its own expenditures.

Mr. GROSS. We are all spending the taxpayers' money, is that not correct? We are responsible for spending it. The gentleman will agree with me that the other body knows when it gets this bill what the House of Representatives is spending?

Mr. STEED. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Then should not the House of Representatives know what they are spending?

Mr. STEED. When the conference report is filed we will have the same information about what they propose.

Mr. GROSS. We will get at the best one hour to discuss it if we feel like discussing it. The gentleman knows that the conference report is not in the nature of a bill where it is laid out in this fashion. I would like to know in detail what the other body does.

There is one other item of $6,345 for a secretary for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentarians' Conference.

Mr. NORRELL. That goes only through this session of Congress.

Mr. GROSS. For the remainder of the calendar year or the remainder of the fiscal year?

Mr. NORRELL. The remainder of the calendar year; to the end of the present Congress only.

Mr. GROSS. Then this junketing outfit must come back to the Congress to get another appropriation for a secretary for the junketeers?

Mr. NORRELL. This year we have not allowed any money for this item beyond the end of the present Congress. This item is authorized by House resolution which currently would expire with the expiration of the present Congress.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate that.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. May I point out to the gentleman that the request for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentarians' Conference for this year was $11,710, which would have been for the entire fiscal year. However, inasmuch as the resolution expires with the Congress, the committee has allowed $6,345 for this calendar year. The legislation upon which this is based has not been made a permanent part of this bill. Therefore, if there are additional funds authorized it will have to be by new resolution.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman's explanation, and I hope no further money will be appropriated for this purpose.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, his last editorial will soon pass on review. On May 19, 1960, he will cover his typewriter, gather his personal mementoes, and leave behind the weekly newspaper where he started in as a service officer in 1934.

During that period he saw the Civil War veterans fade away into history; the men of the Spanish American War reach their sunset years; the World War I veterans attain middle age; and millions of younger Americans qualify as veterans by their service in World War II and in Korea.

Jim Sheehan knew of their proud memories and their problems, for he met them every day of his 26 years as service officer, associate editor, acting editor, and finally as editor of the National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes.

This is the weekly that for 84 consecutive years has been "the voice of the veterans." Under its masthead it runs the quote from Abraham Lincoln: "To care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan."

To Jim Sheehan this was both a duty and a privilege. He gave his heart to the veterans as if they were his own sons and daughters.

A familiar feature that I always enjoyed reading was the front-page editorial which bore the imprint of his intelligence and his compassion.

He brought the gift of language to the service of the needy and ailing veterans and never let the conscience of the Nation forget its obligations to them.

He wrote the truth with kindness and courtesy that won the respect of those who opposed his views. He was honored by the many cccasions on which his editorials were reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or were quoted by Members of Congress in support of legislation beneficial to veterans.

Every man or woman who served in the Armed Forces of the United States owes much to the sincerity and devotion of Jim Sheehan.

His work in their behalf has undermined his health. Failing eyesight requiring surgery has forced him to resign from his position as editor of the National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes.

In appreciation of our good friend, I urge Members of Congress and individual veterans throughout the Nation to write messages of thanks and of good cheer to James A. Sheehan. He and Mrs. Sheehan will continue to make their home at the Woodner, 3636 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to ask one question of some member of the committee, if I may. In view of the embarrassing circumstances that the other body found themselves in when certain excessive costs in the furnishing of their new office building took place; is there any attempt being made in the House to see that the taxpayers will be spared and protected from the possibility of there being a charge levied upon us in the years to come for excessive spending in our new building? Or, to rephrase the question, are we forewarned, as a result of the unfortunate experience in connection with the furnishing of the new office building for the other body, that we, as Members of the House of Representatives will not be embarrassed by abuses here?

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. This work is progressing under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol. The work is also supervised by a special committee composed of three Members of the House on the House Office Building Commission. If the gentleman would go to the Office of the Architect of the Capitol and examine the plans and the details there, he will find what I believe to be true, that they are doing a very fine job in trying to anticipate everything that they possibly can. He will find also that some very substantial savings have been made. It is my impression from what familiarity I have with it that we are getting a very fine job.

For instance, in buying the steel for the building last year, by taking advantage of the market situation, we got the superstructure of steel at a cost which comes to about $1.6 million less than if it were bought today. Of course, when you are trying to build quarters for a lot of individuals like Members of Congress, it is pretty difficult to find a perfect norm that will suit them all. But, I do believe we are getting a very good job, and I urge every Member of the House who is interested to go to the Office of the Architect and study for himself the details of this building. I think the Members would find information there that would make them very pleased with the job that is being done.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Then the gentlemen and the committee feel there will be utmost practicality used so that we, as House Members, will not be embarrassed at a later date by some revelations in this respect?

Mr. STEED. I am confident of it, and I am sure you will find the members of the Building Committee and the Architect's Office glad to give any individual any information they have.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman expresses my own feelings about the matter.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

WE SHOULD SHOW THE WAY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this morning there came to my desk, and I assume to the desks of other Members, several letters calling attention to the fact that tomorrow is Calendar Wednesday, insisting that I support the bill for Federal aid to education.

We all know that recently there has been first one pressure group and then another here in Washington. There were the schoolteachers who wanted more money for themselves and school construction.

There were the postal employees who, when they came to my office had a list of questions and they tried to insist upon a yes-or-no answer to each. First, "Will you vote to sustain the President's veto if he vetoes our bill?"

I am getting a little weary of this never-ending pressure when there just is not enough money to satisfy all. I told them I would at least have to see the bill in its final form to learn what was in it before I promised to vote for it. That is the position I am taking, because I recall very distinctly when that bill went through for a new New House Office Building—the third one that is going up—I raised the point of order that it was legislation on an appropriation bill, and the ruling came down after I was on my feet and I remained on my feet, that I was too early. When I called the attention of the Presiding Officer to the fact that I was on my feet and that I stayed on my feet, objecting, he said, "You are too late." [1] I would like to know when the proper time comes to make objection

[1] The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (vol. 101, pt. 3, 84th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 3204–3205) shows that Mr. RAYBURN offered an amendment to an appropriation bill, authorizing construction of the new New House Office Building. Mr. CANNON, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, accepted the amendment and approved the expenditure. I made the point of order. The RECORD is as follows:

"Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

"The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

"Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

"Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order comes too late.

"The CHAIRMAN. The point of order does come too late.

"Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How does it come too late when I was on my feet seeking recognition before the gentleman was recognized?

"The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman, as chairman of the committee, was recognized first.

"Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is to say the rule that requires recognition of the chairman of a committee would deprive another Member from making a point of order?

"The CHAIRMAN. No. Did the gentleman address the Chair?

"Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did address the Chair before the clerk finished reading.

"The CHAIRMAN. That was not the proper time.

to spending millions of dollars that has never been approved. How can Members with success make objection to that kind of procedure and get a vote on it? Whoever heard that a point of order of that kind came both too early and too late, or that the point of order was not in order? Nonsense, as everyone who heard the ruling, knew.

Many of the Members will have to do one of two things: We will have to increase the national debt several billion dollars and leave it to future generations to make payment of that debt, or we will have to tell these various pressure groups that we cannot go along with them.

The bill now before us provides for our own expenditures and disbursements. If we ourselves take a substantial cut, as I am now proposing, we will have ample justification for logically refusing to go along with desirable but unneeded expenditures until we are once more, as a Nation, on a sound financial basis.

I have a suspicion of what we are going to do. We are going to appropriate more money than we can either collect or borrow. We are going to appropriate more money, some paid by additional taxes and some by borrowing, and increase the national debt. We—that means you and I—are not going to pay one single dollar of that debt. We are just going to pass it along for future generations to pay.

Let us show our sincerity by cutting our own disbursements. This bill, H.R. 12232, concerns us all personally and as a group. If there must be economy and a lessening of appropriations—and there must be—this bill presents an opportunity to cut our own appropriations, show our good faith.

Are we not proud of ourselves? Should we not be? Spend the money, enjoy ourselves, pat ourselves on the back as liberals, and pass the debt on. We know we cannot pay it. We do not have the slightest intention of paying the debts we create. I would like to find some way of going back and facing the people, and the younger folks at home, who are all for this progress, as they call it, without being embarrassed by what I have done down here, and I wish somebody would tell me how to do it. We sure have adopted the policy of Hopkins' "Spend and spend; don't think of where it comes from and never or paying."

Here is an item that I want to ask the committee about. I know there is no use trying to amend the bill. We are all a part of this thing. At least, we have not the courage to vote against it here today. I just want to know about page 6, line 7, from some member of the committee, $2,450,000 to pay the special committees; does that include the special committees created, for example, by the Committee on Government Operations, or does it not? Or does it just mean committees authorized by the House?

Mr. HORAN. It does.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is all?

Mr. HORAN. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was wondering, because just a few days ago we gave the Committee on Government Operations $400,000 additional to what the committee got out of appropriations and to what the contingent funds provide for that committee. That is right, is it not? That is all extra? I assume they did. The Committee on House Administration came up with $400,000. That is an addition to that item, is it not? Well, the language is in the bill. I am just asking to get information.

Mr. STEED. It comes out of the current 1960 appropriation for this purpose if it is a special or select committee study or investigation.

Mr. NORRELL. This item is for committees of the House. The Appropriations Committee cannot, of course, veto what some of the other committees may do. We have the item here in the House.

I would like to make one statement, if I may.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman will give me more time.

Mr. NORRELL. I will yield the gentleman additional time.

I have been in Congress the same length of time the gentleman from Michigan has. I am serving now my 22d year. I will put my record in Congress up with that of anybody.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am not finding any fault with your record. I lived over in the same building with you for many years. You and your wife were working all the time, day and night. I am not finding any fault with the gentleman.

Mr. NORRELL. I appreciate that, and thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. We are all in this mess. What I want to know is how I am going to square myself with these pressure groups.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman wish additional time?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not need any more time; everybody knows what the situation is. We spend far beyond our means. We continue to increase the public debt, impose additional burdens upon our people and then have the nerve to ask them to reelect us. I will vote against this bill.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side.

The Clerk read as follows:

ATTENDING PHYSICIAN'S OFFICE

For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency room and for the attending physician and his assistants, including an allowance of $1,500 to be paid to the attending physician in equal monthly installments as authorized by the Act approved June 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 629), and, in addition, an allowance of $1,500 payable to the attending physician in equal monthly installments, and including an allowance of $75 per month each to five assistants as provided by the House resolutions adopted July 1, 1930, January 20, 1932, November 18, 1940, and May 21, 1959, and Public Law 242, Eighty-fourth Congress, $16,545.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language beginning in line 11, after the comma following the parenthesis, and all of line 12, on the ground that it is not authorized by law.

Mr. NORRELL. Distasteful as it is to do it, reluctantly I must say I think the point of order is well taken. It is rather disagreeable to have to make that concession, but I will admit it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman concedes the point of order.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this item has been in the bill for some 20 years. Admiral Calver does attend meetings around the country and it is the feeling of the Speaker and others who have studied this item that travel and other expenses having increased, the Admiral is entitled to this amount.

I trust that the House will authorize this amount of money so that the attending physician to the House of Representatives may be in attendance at these necessary meetings that he goes to around the country.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, was the point of order I made conceded?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was conceded and sustained.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was hoping there would be no particular discussion of this subject, but since the issue has been raised the House should know what is at stake here. I might say to the gentleman from Washington, this is not going to deprive the House physician of a tax-free expense allowance of $1,500.

The language I struck out would have increased the allowance to $3,000 a year, tax free. That would be more than the expense allowance provided the majority leader or the minority leader or anyone else I know of with the exception of the Speaker.

If anyone can justify a $3,000 expense allowance to the House physician, who is a rear admiral in the Navy, who probably can get transportation through the Navy to those conferences the gentleman from Washington talks about, and probably does get his transportation that way, I would like to hear more about it.

Since the issue has been raised, I am going to add a few more details.

Military pay and allowances: The House physician's base pay as a rear admiral, upper half, is $16,200 a year. The special pay for physicians, dentists, and so forth, is $3,000; subsistence allowance, $574.56, and quarters allowance, $2,052. This is all annual income.

Legislative emoluments: An expense allowance of $1,500, for total gross pay

---

"Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was on my feet and addressed the Chair before the clerk finished and as soon as he finished. Now, if I have to shout louder, I can do that.

"The CHAIRMAN. The Chair could not recognize the gentleman until the clerk had finished reading."

This third office building for the House was the child of the Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN.

and allowances of $23,326.56. The pending increase would have added to that $1,500 a year, resulting in a total of $24,826.56, or more than any ordinary Member of Congress receives.

If the gentleman from Washington can justify that, if he still insists that the House authorize an additional $1,500 for the House physician, I will be glad to meet you and argue the case when he gets an authorization bill on the floor.

Mr. Chairman, let me add that the House physician also has a seven-passenger, air-conditioned Cadillac and chauffeur at his disposal. This has been provided by the legislative branch. He also has a Chrysler Imperial which I understand is supplied by the Navy.

As a naval officer he also has free medical care; a free retirement plan, and an added fringe benefit is reduced rates for personal purchase—PX commissary—if he cares to avail himself of that service.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come to scrutinize all these expenditures with the utmost care, and that I propose to do in the future.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee has just finished consideration of the legislative appropriation bill, which of course covers the Office of the Parliamentarian; and I just want to express this thought. Our parliamentarian has been indisposed and is in the hospital. Lew Deschler has the respect of all of us. We are all very fond of him, and I just want to use this minute to express my regret at his illness and hope that he will soon be back with us. I know all Members join me in wishing Lew well and extending best wishes.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12232) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that in his opinion the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings on this matter go over until Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan withdraw his point of order?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No. I am advised that I cannot withdraw it.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, further proceedings on this bill have been postponed until Thursday.

Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 93]

Alexander	Friedel	Magnuson
Alford	Garmatz	Mitchell
Anderson, Mont.	Gilbert	Morris, Okla.
Arends	Goodell	Moulder
Auchincloss	Granahan	Multer
Ayres	Green, Oreg.	Nix
Barden	Green, Pa.	Powell
Baring	Griffiths	Riehlman
Barry	Hargis	Rogers, Mass.
Baumhart	Hébert	Rogers, Tex.
Blatnik	Herlong	Scott
Bonner	Hogan	Sheppard
Brewster	Holtzman	Short
Brown, Mo.	Jackson	Smith, Kans.
Buckley	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Miss.
Canfield	Johnson, Md.	Spence
Celler	Jones, Ala.	Taber
Chelf	Kearns	Taylor
Coffin	Kilburn	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Kirwan	Teller
Devine	Kluczynski	Thompson, La.
Diggs	Lafore	Walter
Durham	Landrum	Widnall
Edmondson	Lankford	Williams
Farbstein	Libonati	Willis
Flynn	McCulloch	Withrow
Fogarty	McDowell	Zelenko
Forand	McGovern	
	Madden	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 341 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SAN LUIS UNIT OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 514 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7155) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE], and yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is a rule providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7155) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes. It is an open rule providing for 3 hours of general debate.

The bill has been before the Rules Committee on several occasions. Frankly, I have serious doubts about the bill myself. There is this feature about it which is very complicated: It is a joint project between the State of California and the Federal Government, for this project is an integral part of the Federal project known as the Central Valley project.

This bill will cost the Federal Government something like $250 million and a figure of that size always scares me. However, from a thorough investigation I made outside of the testimony before the Rules Committee I ascertained that the State of California had already proceeded on the project, had made certain binding arrangements with the Federal Government, and was so deeply involved in it that there was no question in my mind that the matter would work out all in good faith by both the State of California and the Federal Government; and I hope this rule will be adopted.

There is one controversial matter in the bill and I think the House ought to know about it, because I think all of us will want to consider it. There is a clause in the bill, a saving clause, known as section 7, which provides that the fact the State of California enters its project along with the Federal project does not bind the State under certain provisions of the National Reclamation Act. In other words, it is a States' rights question and California desires to reserve its rights. It hinges around that provision in the Reclamation Act regarding the 160-acre limitation to one individual. I would hope that the House would sustain the committee on this provision and leave section 7 in the bill. But I mention it because I think it involves a controversial matter.

Mr. Speaker, this is all I have to say on the subject. I hope the rule will be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no demand for time on this side, and I shall not take any time myself except to say that I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia; I hope that the rule will be adopted and that the bill with section 7 may pass.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7155) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7155) with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 14 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs brings to the Committee at this time one of the finest reclamation projects that we have endorsed and recommended for many years. We have so scheduled our time that it is my opinion we shall be able to present the arguments for the legislation logically, and I am sure that those who are in opposition will also have time to voice their position. Also the one section which is in dispute will be argued by the proponents and opponents, so that all Members may understand what is involved.

Due to the fact that this is an important piece of legislation and the only really large reclamation project that will be brought before the 86th Congress, I shall speak from manuscript and as soon as I finish reading the manuscript I shall try to answer any questions if there are any.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7155, the legislation now before the Committee, has for its purpose the authorizing of the construction and operation and maintenance of the San Luis irrigation unit of the Central Valley project of the State of California. This is a multipurpose facility with 99.97 percent of the cost allocated to irrigation, which means for all practical purposes the entire cost of construction of this project shall be repaid in full. The project has the unqualified approval of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget. It also has unanimous support in California.

The San Luis unit is the next logical addition to the Central Valley project which was initially authorized in 1937. The American River division was added in 1949, the Sacramento Canals division in 1950, and the Trinity River division in 1955. The San Luis unit has been under study since 1943.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the best irrigation projects that has been recommended by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for many years. To my friends who usually support these programs, may I say to you that this legislation is in line with established principles and policies approved and followed over the years. To my friends who are critical of such Federal activities, may I say to you that this legislation meets most of the objections which you have voiced here on the floor in the past. As we present our case, we shall appreciate it very much if you will give us your close attention so that if your questions are not answered by our direct presentation then we may have the opportunity and privilege of attempting to answer to your satisfaction any questions that remain.

The San Luis project, which would be authorized by this bill, meets the three all-important requisites necessary in such matters:

(a) It possesses engineering feasibility, that is, the facilities which are contemplated can be built to do the job required of them.

(b) It possesses economic feasibility, that is, the benefits to the State and Nation which will flow from the project far outweigh the costs of the project.

(c) It possesses financial feasibility, that is, the costs which are reimbursable will be repaid to the Federal Government within the regularly established and accepted payout period of 50 years.

Other speakers will go into these matters in more detail.

Mr. Chairman, for many years now, the membership of your House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with me as their spokesman in such matters, have endeavored to support and champion an orderly and constructive irrigation and reclamation construction program. It has been our thinking that this is the responsibility of Congress and not of the agencies in the executive branch. To such purpose, I have met annually with the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Public Works. I have consistently presented what I considered to a reasonable and orderly program for the Bureau of Reclamation. At times this has meant asking for new starts. At other times, as this year, it has meant supporting the recommendations coming up to us from downtown.

The legislative record of reclamation and irrigation authorizations, together with amounts appropriated for construction of such programs since 1947, Congress by Congress, is as follows:

[In millions]

	Authorizations	Construction appropriations
80th Cong. (1947–48)	$40.5	$375.9
81st Cong. (1949–50)	479.1	579.0
82d Cong. (1951–52)	16.1	385.5
83d Cong. (1953–54)	130.3	247.7
84th Cong. (1955–56)	1,162.8	303.0
85th Cong. (1957–58)	71.2	361.6
Total	1,900.0	2,252.7
Average per Congress	317.0	375.0

Authorizations for the 1st session of the 86th Congress total about $14.4 million while appropriations amounted to $207 million.

It can be seen from these figures that the average authorization per Congress since 1947 has been in the amount of $317 million and the average appropriations for each Congress has been $375 million.

A large portion of the appropriations during this 12-year period has been used for construction of projects authorized prior to this period such as the initial units of the Missouri Basin and Central Valley projects and the Columbia Basin project and, of course, a large portion of the work on the larger projects authorized during this period remains to be done, but this comparison does illustrate the point that I want to make and that is that over a long period the authorizations must support the construction program.

The civil works construction program of the Corps of Engineers has received an average of over $1.13 billion per Congress during the same 12-year period compared with the $375 million for the reclamation program, or three times as much. The civil works program is fully justified and I support it. I make this comparison only to show that the reclamation program has not kept pace with the civil works program in our expanding economy.

It is my belief, and I have so recommended to the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Public Works, that the national economy can stand, in fact, would be enhanced by, an annual irrigation and reclamation construction program of around $300 million, give or take a few million as each year presented itself.

This now brings me to the amount in dollars that is involved in the legislation that is before us, and the relationship of this amount to our program of authorizations for the 86th Congress.

The San Luis bill would authorize the appropriation of $290 million for construction of the San Luis unit. In addition to the basic project, distribution, and drainage systems, costing about $192 million will be needed. These systems could be built by the local districts or they could be built by the Federal Government. Those that are built by the Federal Government must be paid for in 40 years under separate repayment contracts. I would like to point out that agreement with the State with respect to joint construction, and I do not believe there is any question but that there will be such agreement, would result in a reduction in the Federal cost of about $50 million. This is simply a matter of sharing the cost of works built to capacity to serve both the San Luis unit and State service areas. Additional amounts may be saved if a satisfactory agreement can be reached with the local power company for power transmission.

While the amount involved in this bill is a rather large single item, it must be considered in the light of the expected overall program for reclamation authorizations in the 86th Congress. In the first session, three small projects were authorized involving a total amount of only $14 million and the addition of the

San Luis project would result in authorizations totaling only a little over $300 million, plus whatever amount is required for the San Luis distribution systems. The point I am making is that this one project constitutes practically the entire authorizations program for the 86th Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss very briefly section 7 of the bill, which appears to be the only controversial matter involved in this legislation. Section 7 provides that the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to water deliveries by the State of California from the jointly used San Luis facilities to lands outside the Federal San Luis unit service area. Now, it is my position and the position of the majority of my committee that it makes no difference whether this section is in the bill or out. We do not believe that reclamation law would be applicable to State-served lands even if this section is removed. The basis for this position is discussed in detail in the committee's report. The section was included in the bill at the request of the State of California as a means of bringing into unanimous agreement the many diverse interests and points of view in the State.

It is only by chance that there is any connection between the Federal and State projects. If two reservoir sites had existed, each government would probably have used one of them on its own terms, and the excess-lands problem, as applied to State lands, would not have arisen. But the physical situation is such that there is only one adequate reservoir site in the area to serve both projects. The State of California will have paid its entire share of the cost of constructing the joint-use facilities prior to its utilization of them for storage and delivery of water.

The majority of my committee feel that, insofar as there is a problem of large ownerships in the State-served area, this is a matter for the State of California to resolve. It is my understanding that the Governor of California is now in the process of formulating a State policy with respect to large ownerships served by State projects and that his recommendations will be submitted to the State legislature.

Because there has been so much misunderstanding and misinformation on this matter of excess lands, I want to make one point unmistakably clear. The legislation we are considering here requires the operation of the Federal San Luis unit under the provisions of Federal reclamation law, including the excess-land provisions thereof, and there is no way that large landowners in the Federal San Luis area can avoid compliance with such provisions.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a brief statement on reclamation development in general. In my opinion, the continued development of supplemental water supplies for existing irrigated areas is entirely consistent with sound long-term agricultural objectives. It provides the most important basic element to a successful regional economy, a stable diversified agriculture; it complements and enhances our overall agricultural economy, tending to alleviate, rather than add to, the existing imbalances or surpluses; and it helps to insure adequate future food and fiber for our rapidly growing population.

The objective of expanding the economy of the West is of prime importance to the whole Nation. The Federal reclamation program has been one of the important tools by which the underdeveloped arid and semiarid regions of the West have been made into a habitable and productive part of the Nation by promoting westward movement of population, business, and agriculture and providing a solid base for investment and employment where little existed previously. The reclamation program still has these positive influences today.

With respect to my statement that reclamation tends to alleviate the existing imbalances in agriculture, I have this to say. It is not widely understood that irrigation farming in the West enjoys a complementary, rather than competitive, relationship with the whole of the country's agriculture. Of the major crops in surplus, those that constitute more than four-fifths of the holdings and loan commitments of the Commodity Credit Corporation, reclamation farms grew only three of these crops and the 1958 contribution from reclamation farms amounted to only 1.8 percent of the holdings. The reason why this proportion is so small when the total importance of reclamation in the economy of the West is so great is that the irrigation farmer has been able to shift production from surplus crops to those that are in current demand. The nonirrigated land is largely tied to a one-crop economy and cannot diversify in response to changing demand patterns. Reclamation has played a large role in facilitating these adjustments and in enhancing the efficiency of the agriculture of the West as a whole. The misapprehension that any extension of irrigation will compound the Nation's agricultural difficulties is not borne out by the facts, either past or present.

In addition, we are advised by agricultural authorities that our present crop imbalances are merely temporary and that continued efforts are needed in research and the conservation and development of soil and water resources. They emphasize that the capacity to meet the food and fiber needs of the expanding population does not just happen automatically. Because major irrigation projects do not reach a fully developed stage until 15 to 25 years after the start of authorization, it is essential that reclamation needs be viewed in future perspective.

The Nation's population is increasing at about 8,600 additional persons per day while the acreage of good cropland diminishes at a rate of 3,000 acres per day due to conversion to roads, airports, and cities. Just how soon our agricultural abundance will give way to shortages depends on what positive steps are taken to overcome the effects of these incursions.

To accommodate the tremendous population surge toward the West the base for economic development has to be provided via water resource development for farms and cities. The material demands of these new westerners come back to the eastern industrial centers in the form of orders for new equipment, new cars, new appliances, additional fuel, chemicals, clothing, and capital.

Our reclamation authorization program for the 86th Congress, to a large extent, is included in this one bill to authorize the San Luis project. I urge my colleagues to give their approval to this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I want to pay a tribute to the gentleman from California. He and I came to the Congress at the same time, and we have sat alongside each other in committee for 6 years. This represents, I think, a notable day, a red letter day, for him because when he came to the Congress, his main aim as a Congressman was to get the San Luis project authorized. I have sat by him over the years and I know the work he has put into the planning of this project. Today, we have the culmination of his efforts and the efforts of his colleagues on the committee. I think this project is soundly conceived. I think it is a project which is in the national interest. Every Member of this body can conscientiously support it. I just want to compliment my colleague for the conscientious and hard work that he has put in over the past 6 years on this project, and I am delighted to be here on the floor today to support him and his project.

Mr. SISK. I certainly thank my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona, for his kind remarks. I am also deeply grateful to him for the assistance he has been in what amounted to a major endeavor to get this project thus far along the road.

Mr. Chairman, I would like first to call the attention of the Members to these charts, which we have here in front of you at the present time.

I want to call your attention to the map here to my left which shows the existing Central Valley project of California, the portion which has heretofore been constructed. That is the portion which is shown in green, starting in the north end of the State, up on the Sacramento River, showing the Shasta Dam and powerplant and the Keswick Dam and powerplant.

This portion, under construction at the present time, is the Trinity project. Then, coming on down the river, there is the Folsom Dam, Nimbus, and Sly Park. Then in the San Joaquin Valley is the Friant-Kern Canal which takes the water from Fresno County south, and the Madera Canal, together with the Delta-Mendota Canal into this area along the San Joaquin River. Also, the existing Tracy pumping plant.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will you explain the direction of the flow of the water in that particular area?

Mr. SISK. I will be glad to. I appreciate the gentleman calling my attention to this. I realize that some of these things are confusing. Actually, the Sacramento is flowing down here south into San Francisco Bay, and into the Pacific Ocean through the delta area. The San Joaquin River is flowing north from the lower end of the valley, and then into the delta area, where the water also empties through the bay and into the Pacific Ocean. As a result it can be confusing, when we have rivers flowing actually in opposite directions, and these rivers are fed by a series of streams, such as the Kern, Kings, the Fresno, Merced, and so forth. In the north they are fed by the Feather River, the Yuba, and many others. But the two rivers that converge in this delta area cause the surplus water to be dumped into the Pacific Ocean.

The project we have under consideration at this time, the San Luis project, is shown in red on this map, and it proposes to use existing facilities and add new ones. At the time that the Central Valley projects was constructed in this area and Friant Dam was built and the water diverted north and south from the San Joaquin, it was necessary to replace the water taken out of the river for these people who had water rights on the San Joaquin. So at that time there was a pumping plant built at Tracy.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I think, in order to clarify the matter so that it will be better understood, we should point out there is a surplus of water in the Sacramento watershed to the north, whereas the amount of water that is collected and falls into the San Joaquin Valley and runs north, is in short supply and cannot irrigate all of the available land in the lower San Joaquin Valley.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution, because that is exactly the situation. That is an area of deficient water. That is the reason why it is necessary to have these various water projects.

Continuing this explanation, this is the reason why it is necessary to take water out of the delta and bring it down into the Central Valley to irrigate this area of land. At the present time the Tracy pumping plant is used only in the summer or during the irrigation season, since there is no storage in this area. Those facilities are idle during the winter months when there is a great deal of rain occurring in those mountains, and millions of acre-feet of water pour out into the Pacific as waste water.

The San Luis project proposes to use these existing facilities during the months of December, January, and February to bring the water down through existing facilities and pump it into the San Luis Dam Reservoir at this point.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. JONAS. Will you tell the committee whether the cotton acreage in the project is in the green-colored area or in the brown-colored area?

Mr. SISK. At the present time, so far as existing cotton acreage in the valley area is concerned, it would be scattered over the valley, including this particular area here.

Mr. JONAS. That is the brown-colored area.

Mr. SISK. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. And there is no irrigation in that area?

Mr. SISK. Yes, there is. That is what I wanted to proceed to as quickly as I outline this, and I have just about completed my outline.

This is an area which is at present under irrigation. At present it is being farmed; but we have a situation where our water table is going down and down. There was a time when this area could be irrigated with pumping from reasonable depths. At the present time that water has to be pumped from a depth of hundreds of feet. The water table has gone down and down until today the wells that are being put down in this area are over 2,000 feet deep, and some run to 3,000 feet. We are lifting water with 300-horsepower pumps in an attempt to keep this agricultural area alive. So actually we are not putting any land under cultivation by this legislation; we are simply seeking to keep land in cultivation. I want to go back to my notes for a moment. Then if any Member has a question regarding these charts I will be glad to hear them. I want to show the State overlay for just a few moments in order to get back to the physical conditions.

We are pumping to keep 440,000 acres in this area under cultivation. We are not proposing to bring in new land. This land has been farmed for a great many years.

The situation then is this: It costs about $75,000 to put down a deep well. This means that the small operator is precluded from operating in this area until such time as we can get a surface supply of water which will permit him to move in and farm his own land, whether it be 160 acres, 320 acres, or whatever it may be. The present cost is from $60,000 to $100,000 to construct and sink a well. This, as I said, requires a large operator to carry on such an operation, and the small farmer is of necessity forced to lease his land or rent his land to larger operators.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. What is the average cotton yield per acre?

Mr. SISK. The average cotton yield per acre in this area would run about 3 bales. That has been the average yield. It would run from 2½ to 4 bales to the acre.

Mr. JONAS. Do you estimate that the cotton land will increase through additional irrigation?

Mr. SISK. No; I do not anticipate any increase in yield. In fact, all of our figures show that acreage would substantially decrease. I am not saying that the amount of cotton per acre will decrease. I would not anticipate any basic change in production per acre on this project, because at the present time it is irrigated; and it, of course, would continue to be irrigated.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SISK. Yes; I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. JONAS. According to the committee report, page 6, 132,000 of the 400,000 acres are devoted to cotton; and the statement is made that there will be no reduction in cotton acreage. Is that correct?

Mr. SISK. No, that is not correct. It is not correct that the report says specifically there will be no reduction. Let me get a copy of the report.

Here is the situation that exists as far as cotton acreage is concerned: The deep well pumps are bringing up so much boron in the water at the present time that the trees have become sterile in this area, the trees and the vines. This is in a semitropical area. The east side of my district is practically all devoted to vineyards, fruits, and vegetables. The boron in the water has brought about a condition in this area where the trees are sterile and will not produce. Therefore we are completely forced to row crops, cotton, and grain. That is about the only thing we can depend on in the area. However, if we are able to get a supply of surface water we will be able once again to go to the development of vineyards, groves of nuts, groves of figs, and other things that can be supported in this area with fresh surface water.

Very frankly, there is a great deal more profit in growing this kind of commodities and we do not have surplus problems.

Mr. JONAS. May I quote this sentence appearing in the third line of page 6 of the report:

> While there probably will be little change in the cotton acreage, it is expected that the acreage in irrigated grain will be drastically reduced.

It was on the basis of that sentence that I asked the gentleman if he expected there would be any reduction in the 132,000 acres of cotton now under production in that section.

Mr. SISK. I am sure those figures are taken from the Bureau of Reclamation report. Of course, I think that the amount of cotton that will continue to be grown will depend to a large extent on the economy of the cotton industry. If prices remain high there might be continued to be produced a rather substantial quantity. On the other hand, there is no comparison between the financial results of cotton and of row crops and citrus. There is lots of citrus on the east side of my district, as well as other commodities that produce high returns and would be a great deal more enhancing financially. Certainly, there is not any question in our mind but that this area will go into groves, into orchards, into vines, as rapidly as water is available, and it can be made to pay financially. For example, I might state that the Boston Land Co. a number of years ago went into this area and sunk about $3 million in an attempt to create

orchards. They had some big, beautiful trees but absolutely no fruit, since this boron situation existed, and it is my understanding they lost some $4 million or $5 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I would like to fortify the gentleman's point by bringing out the fact that there is a definite tendency for sugar-beet production to move into the San Luis service area. One of the great limitations on sugar-beet production happens to be water quality. With improved water quality that would come from surface distribution I think it would be safe to predict that thousands of acres of sugar beets would be planted to replace acreage which is currently devoted to cotton.

Mr. SISK. There is no question but that if we can get this water in here and we get a quota on sugar beets, we would be growing sugar beets, because this is a very fine sugar-beet producing area. What is going to happen on the domestic sugar deal, I do not know.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. As I understand it now, there is no limitation at the present time of any kind as to the crops that can be grown on these acres, is that true?

Mr. SISK. As to the kind of crop?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. SISK. No. If we had a good supply of the right kind of water, that is, a water free of minerals, we can grow any kind of fruits, vegetables, and nuts known to man in this area.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. At the present time basic commodities can be raised on those acres?

Mr. SISK. At the present time basic commodities can be grown. The one basic commodity, cotton, is being grown in this area.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. In the Senate bill there is an amendment that restricts the growing of additional crops on these acres if water is put into this area?

Mr. SISK. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If that amendment were adopted in this bill we would be extending the conservation reserve to new acres, that is, to 500,000 fertile acres?

Mr. SISK. I think the gentleman well states that. I know, of course, that an amendment is going to be offered to put this section which he refers to in the Senate bill into the House bill. I expect to agree to accept that amendment as far as I am personally concerned. I would not anticipate any particular objection to it.

I might briefly read that amendment:

(b) No water provided by the Federal San Luis unit shall be delivered in the Federal San Luis service area to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. And with the adoption of that amendment we would then be reducing by 500,000 acres the acreage in the United States that can be used for growing these surplus crops; is that correct?

Mr. SISK. That is correct in ultimate result. It would prohibit new cotton acreage and would make possible the growing of nonsurplus crops on land now growing cotton. I appreciate the gentleman's comment.

I would like to quickly proceed to the overlay showing the connection between the State and the Federal projects.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I wonder if the gentleman would enlighten me as to whether all of the works depicted on this basic map are Federal works and subject to the 160-acre limitation in the reclamation law.

Mr. SISK. All the works depicted in green, and also the cross-hatched, are Federal projects and are subject to the 160-acre limitation.

Mr. COHELAN. Would it be fair to say that under the actual situation in the State of California as far as reclamation projects are concerned they are pretty much entirely Federal?

Mr. SISK. No; I would not say that, either. I could cite to the gentleman many, many projects all through this area: the Merced works in here, the Don Pedro Dam, Modesto Irrigation District, Fresno Irrigation District, all publicly owned and operated districts in the State that are not Federal. The fact of the business is that percentagewise you have a great portion of your acreage under either public water or public irrigation districts that are not under Federal reclamation.

Mr. COHELAN. Would the gentleman be willing to give me a figure of what percentage of the total it would be so that we can get a comparison between the Federal facilities and the other agencies?

Mr. SISK. I can get that figure. I do not have it at hand now. I would say that the Federal facilities would be less than 50 percent of the total.

This is an overlay indicating the proposed State project in California, a project which has been authorized by the legislature of the State of California. They passed a bond issue which will be on the ballot this year for $1.75 billion for a State project. They have already spent about $172 million on this. They have a substantial appropriation that they are working on at the present time. This is the portion in red, starting with the Oroville Dam, and over here North Bay and South Bay aqueducts.

I want to quickly point out, because I am running out of time, how their project fit into the Federal project and how they enhance each other and reduce the cost to both agencies. This San Luis site happens to be the only substantial reservoir site on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley. The State proposes to bring water from the delta area, take it down through the valley, take it over the mountains and into the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Bernardino area. They need storage for water en route, and therefore they need this storage here in this area, since this is the only real good site. They need approximately 1 million acre-feet of storage. The Federal project, which has been on the drawing boards for the last 20 years and which we are discussing today, the San Luis project, needs approximately 1 million acre-feet of storage to take care of this San Luis area in here. Therefore, by joining together and using the same site but simply building a dam a little bit higher, we are able to reduce the cost both to the Federal Government and to the State and at the same time tie the two projects together at this point. I want to make it completely clear that outside of this point, the State will have its own canal system, its own pumping plants, just as the Federal Government already has in the existing canal to get this water into the Federal San Luis area. The State will not serve water in the Federal area and the Federal Government will not serve water in the State area. They are completely separate and apart. So, for all practical purposes, they are two entirely separate projects except that they are using a common site or, as if they were operating two entirely separate businesses out of the same building.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GUBSER. I think the gentleman should state that the area upon which this reservoir will be situated is currently owned by the State of California; is that correct?

Mr. SISK. That is correct. And this, of course, goes to the point that our colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, mentioned awhile ago with reference to the commitments of the State to go through with it; the State of California has already proceeded to purchase lands on this reservoir site. I do not think they are all acquired, most of the site has already been acquired and is now in the hands of the State.

Mr. Chairman, this piece of legislation in essence authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement with the State of California for a joint-use development which will reduce the cost of the Federal project by about $55 million; and at the same time will do the job that is needed to be done in this area where water is so desperately needed. At the same time it will help the State to construct and operate its own project in the transportation of water from the water surplus areas of the north to the water-deficient areas of the south.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. I do not know whether I have clearly in mind the gentleman's thought, but there is an item that I should like to inquire about from the appropriations standpoint. On page 12, in section 8, there is the figure of $290,430,000. Then I find on line 19 on the same page the language—

> There are also authorized to be appropriated in addition thereto, such amounts as are required (a) for construction of such distribution systems and drains as are not constructed by local interests—

Can the gentleman advise us or give us any idea as to what that open-end authorization would amount to? We have $290 million and here is an authorization for appropriation without any limiting amount set out.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the question the gentleman asks and I certainly want to be truthful in answering it. This is the identical language, so far as I know, used in every reclamation project. This is to provide that if the people in the area—in the Westlands Water District, or in other districts—if they desire, they may contract in seperate contracts for funds to construct the irrigation distribution system to carry water to individual farms, or they can do it through their own facilities, or they can do it through some other method. There are a number of ways. Many of these irrigation districts handle their own financing in other ways. But this provides that if the irrigation districts desire and if an equitable agreement can be worked out between the Bureau of Reclamation and the irrigation districts, the money can be borrowed to construct their irrigation facilities.

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will yield further, I note on page 6 of the report the statement that—

> The distribution and drainage systems which, as previously stated, could be constructed by the Federal Government or by the water users are estimated to cost $192,650,000.

So that what we are in effect doing here is authorizing $290,430,000, plus the $192,650,000; and I note further that there is an open end appropriation for operation and maintenance costs. So operation and maintenance also could be included in addition to the $290,430,000 and the $192,650,000.

Mr. SISK. Any contract which the Bureau would enter into would require the payment of O. & M. costs year-by-year by the district, so that does not become a call upon the Federal Government for O. & M.

As I said, the proposed irrigation distribution system would serve approximately 440,000 acres, and this runs in the neighborhood of $200 million, $192 million, whatever figure the gentleman used. In these reclamation projects we use this language here which would permit a district if it desires to build a system through the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Will the gentleman from California tell the committee, will the Government recover any interest on these advancements?

Mr. SISK. The only interest that will be paid on these funds will be for municipal water deliveries. In this area there are several small towns. There is one fair-sized city, the city of Coalinga, which recently was paying about $2,150 per acre-foot for its drinking water. They have a deplorable water situation. This project provides for a water system for the city of Coalinga. Of course, interest will be paid on their portion; other than that it is for irrigation purposes only. This is a regular project fitting into the reclamation law, which provides for these projects to be paid for without interest. It will be only municipal water on which there will be interest paid.

Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to have an opportunity to answer as best I can any questions Members may have on this project. In the time I have left I want to refer to this other map. When I spent so much time on this one, I never got to this. This is identically the same project, but blown up in that specific area which is to be served by the San Luis project. It does not show the extreme north end of the State as this map does. It shows the way the State project would fit into the Federal project.

I want to add one thing in summation, that this overall San Luis State and Federal project is approximately a $500-million project, with a total cost to the Federal Government, provided this agreement can be arrived at which is authorized by this legislation, of about $234 million, and with the cost to the State about $266 million, for this part of the State's project.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Is the project as to San Luis more Federal or more State? I am not clear on the hybrid character of it. It seems to me this is a very important point, because whether or not it is more Federal than State or more State than Federal has a great deal to do with whether the reclamation law applies. Will the gentleman comment on that?

Mr. SISK. The reclamation law will apply 100 percent to the entire Federal area. There is no State water to be delivered in this area at all. The only thing the State does is that through its own canals it brings water down here, puts it into a reservoir which they have paid cash for, their portion of it, then out through their own State canals down into the southern end of the San Joaquin Valley, Kern County, and over the Tehachapis into Los Angeles County. The State of California will deliver the waters for State purposes into this area.

Mr. COHELAN. Is it not true they are using Federal facilities to deliver the water?

Mr. SISK. No; they are not.

Mr. COHELAN. What is that, then?

Mr. SISK. Does the gentleman see the green canal?

Mr. COHELAN. Yes.

Mr. SISK. That is existing Federal facilities; that is, the facilities in which the Federal water will flow down here and go through Federal pumps, out to Federal facilities. And the water will go out through a Federal canal into a Federal service area. The State of California, separate and apart from the Federal Government, through its own pumps will pump water into its own canal and bring that water down to this reservoir, the construction costs of which they share in and pay their full share in cash before it is used. Then from there, in their own canals again, they will bring the water on down into the southern San Joaquin and Los Angeles area. This is completely and totally through a State project.

Mr. COHELAN. But they could not do that without the Federal-supported facility; is that correct?

Mr. SISK. I do not see any particular dependence in that respect. The only thing I want to say to my colleague here is, if we had two reservoir sites—if we had one here and another one here—then the Federal Government could build it in one place and the State could move over and build it in another place, but the thing is that the cost would probably run $50 million to $100 million more if that were done. But neither is dependent upon the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I happen to be chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that appropriates for these projects that are reported out by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I want to congratulate them for reporting out a piece of legislation such as this. It has been my privilege during the time that I have been a Member of the House of Representatives to visit every major project in the United States, starting with the Grand Coulee Dam when it was first being built and then the Hoover Dam and all the rest of them, right on down to the present day. I have seen them all. I have gone over that land, as I did years ago, when the land around Grand Coulee Dam was dry, when the dust from an automobile would be flying up through the air for miles. I remember when I was a youngster working in California, trying to take water down to the city of Los Angeles. That was back in 1910. And that was not water for industrial purposes, but just for drinking purposes. There was just a little village there, and the house that I used to board in had a picket fence around it. That was in downtown Los Angeles. Just think of what Hoover Dam has done for Los Angeles and all the southern counties in the southern part of California. Millions of people left the East and went out there. I have been over those projects. I went there

6 or 7 years ago and I tell you, when I look at the value those dams have given to America, it is amazing. This is the kind of project that builds America and gives a return to the Government and to the people. There may not be much interest in it in dollars and cents, but that interest comes back 100-fold—yes, many, many times to benefit America.

I have stated many times on the floor of the Congress that any dollar that is invested in a sound investment in America, and I am speaking now of Federal investments in such projects as this, will come back 100-fold. When you see all the land out there that this is going to irrigate, you will realize the difference that it is going to make. The difference is the difference between human slaves trying to raise something on the land as it is today, and sitting back and putting the water down to irrigate the land. That is the big difference. You will be stopping Americans from slaving out there. You will be putting the water in that section of the country to work—water that is now being wasted and going down to the Pacific Ocean. That is the difference. Think of the benefits that will come back to every one of us. The head of the Reclamation Department told me that there has been only one dam or one project in the United States that has failed to pay out. What a record that is. That is the best record I ever heard tell of in any business. You hear people talking about big business and small business, but in this reclamation project business, only one project has failed since the day that Theodore Roosevelt, that great President, put the reclamation law into effect back in 1902. I mean that sincerely. I know the day will come when the people who will go out there, even if it is only for a visit, will see one of the greatest sights not only in all of America, but one of the greatest sights on earth where this project will irrigate 400,000 acres of land, which today is all sand and dry.

I am asking you today if you ever cast a vote for a project, cast it for this one, and tell your colleagues that this is one of the best that will ever be built in this country.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], I have been a member of the committee that has appropriated for every bill that has been brought out by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and authorized by Congress for the past 18 years. I have been quite liberal as a conservative in voting for and supporting most similar irrigation projects as this one. I took the position long ago, after visiting all the big projects in America, in the 17 Western States, with all the dust and waste that was going on there because of the lack of water, that I would do my best to see to it that not one drop of this precious water, called "liquid gold" would be wasted away to the sea if it could be properly and beneficially used. Of course I have had some misgivings about some of these projects. I could support this project, which I am going to, with a clearer conscience, had it not been for the fact that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted last year to have the Government build the Trinity River powerplant at a cost of $60 million of all the taxpayers money. Had the Pacific Gas & Light Co. built that powerplant, which they were ready, willing, and able to do, and to furnish power at a reasonable rate, which we all know that they do, they would have paid into the Federal Treasury in the next 50 years over $100 million in Federal taxes from power revenues from that Trinity powerplant alone. Thus over $160 million would have been saved to the taxpayers of America. That would have gone a long way in paying for this San Luis project.

There was another thing that I did not appreciate a bit. About the last thing Secretary Chapman did before he left office was to sign a contract with the city of Sacramento which provided that they should get about three-fifths of the power from the Shasta Dam at postage stamp rates, taking that power away from the farmers and other people in the valley who had just as much claim to that cheap power as did the city of Sacramento, just to mention a couple of the things that are distasteful to me and many others in this big program.

It is things like that that we members of the Appropriations Committee must take into consideration when we appropriate these vast sums of money for these irrigation and multipurpose projects.

I know the San Luis project will bring great benefits to that area. I also know that over a period of years the revenues which will come into the local, State, and Federal Governments are going to be enormous, because of the increased prosperity in that area.

But, as I said before, I do not like the idea that we build powerplants with the money of American taxpayers instead of permitting private industry to build those plants wherever it is proper and feasible for that to be done and to pay great sums into the Federal Treasury from which we can appropriate to build our schools, take care of the veterans, the old people, and the thousand other things we have to do. These private utilities pay into the Federal Treasury every year over $1 billion in Federal revenues, and in addition they pay over $1 billion in State and local taxes annually. Let us not kick them in the teeth; let us give them the fair treatment they and all free private taxpaying industry deserve, which includes every farmer in America. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is one of the best, most honest, privately owned corporations in America. No one has ever accused them of overcharging their customers.

I have been all over the San Luis project; I have zigzagged back and forth the full length of the Central Valley, in the State of California, and in all the Western States. I apologize to no one for the position I have taken and for the support I have given to those great projects which have done so much for the western people and are paying out and we must thank the American people who have loaned the money without too much complaint to develop that great desert area of the West.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will pardon my taking a moment to direct a comment to the Chairman of the Interior Committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]. I am the youngest member of his committee, coming here in midsession; and I want to thank this gentleman, on the record, for the help and assistance he has given to me as he always gives full consideration and help to all members of the committee. He even helped me resist the temptation to avoid the daily sessions of the committee. Mr. Chairman, I thank you and congratulate you.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the San Luis project. I wish to commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and the author of the bill, my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] for their fine and clear presentations on this project. Perhaps at the risk of trying to gild the lily, I shall attempt to explain it in my own manner by using a little different approach.

Let us assume for a moment that the Republican National Committee and the Democratic National Committee both wish to build new headquarters close to the Capitol here in Washington, D.C. It is estimated that each needs two floors, but there is only one available site close to the Capitol. So the Republican Committee and the Democratic Committee get together and say: "It is foolish to seek out two expensive sites; let us build a four-story building on this one lot and then two floors of it will go to the Democratic Committee and two floors to the Republican Committee and we will make our own rules about how we will use our own two floors. We will each get water from a common reservoir maintained by the city of Washington, but we will each be on a meter that measures the water consumed and we will pay for this water. However, we will use it as we see fit."

Mr. Chairman, that simile may seem farfetched, but that is exactly what the proposition is. There is only one lot or one reservoir site available, and that is the San Luis site.

We are proposing that the State of California build a capacity of 1 million acre-feet with its money and the Federal Government build its capacity of 1 million acre-feet with its money. Then we will each make our own rules and regulations about what we do with the water stored with our own money. It is not at all unlike having one barrel in which two people store water. The water in the barrel is intermingled and you cannot identify each separate atom.

But water is water. If you put in 5 gallons you take out 5 gallons. It is just that simple.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. As the gentleman knows, I strongly support this project, but I have some question about certain details that will emerge as time goes on. Title 43, United States Code, section 523, reads:

> Water impounded, stored or carried in Federal reclamation facilities shall be subject to Federal reclamation law.

Would the gentleman like to comment on this code section?

Mr. GUBSER. May I point out to the gentleman that the law he reads concerns Federal reclamation facilities which are built 100 percent by the Federal Government. This is a joint facility and not built 100 percent by the Federal Government.

Mr. COHELAN. May I ask the gentleman, Does the Federal reclamation law contain any language at all excluding any part of such waters because a State shares in some part or in the construction of a Federal reclamation project?

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman should present that question some time later to the experts on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I am quite confident that at no time has it ever been held that the law of one government must apply to a portion of a project which is built with funds of a State or local government.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I think the simple answer to the gentleman's question is that this is two separate projects coexisting in the same identical space.

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman is right.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. The question that my colleague raises is the reason why section 7 must remain in the bill.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out one other advantage of this project which I do not think has been mentioned and probably will not be mentioned. Once the San Luis project is completed, we are not restricted to serving only the area which has been described here today as the San Luis project, because we will have an investment with which we can extend the service to other areas of California which are badly in need of water. I refer specifically to what is called the central coast area. This area includes Santa Clara County, the sixth ranking county in the Nation as far as agricultural production is concerned. It includes San Benito County, it includes Santa Cruz County, and Monterey County—all rich agricultural areas.

This Congress has already appropriated $220,000 to match $220,000 of local funds to determine the feasibility of pushing a tunnel through the mountains at the back of the proposed San Luis Reservoir in order to serve this area.

Mr. Chairman, this is an area which has conserved every drop of water natural to the area by its own initiative. This is an area which, in certain parts, has taxed itself $3.80 per $100 of assessed valuation to conserve water. It is an area which grows apricots, prunes, row crops, berries, and various other specialty crops. This is an area which is cut off from the main source of water by a mountain range. It must have supplemental water if it is to survive. The construction of this project will bring Federal water 100 miles closer at an elevation 100 feet higher, making it feasible to extend service to this great water-deficient area.

Mr. Chairman, we in California are very grateful to this Congress because you have helped us in solving a terrific problem. We have a fabulous increase in population. We have a peculiar topographical situation where the water is at one end and the people at the other. We are grateful to you for all you have done in solving our problem and in absorbing that fabulous increase in population. We ask you once more to help us by passing this San Luis bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN].

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, let me state at the outset that the San Luis project is a good project and that I support its authorization. The need for San Luis has been clearly demonstrated and its feasibility has been substantiated. The bill before us is the result of extended negotiations and is based on our committee's consideration of the problem over a period of not just weeks or months, but of years. This proposal is a sound compromise stemming from the earlier differing approaches to the situation. It provides for an agreement between the Federal Government and the State for joint use as a first alternative, but provides at the same time that the project shall proceed on an all-Federal basis in the event that agreement on joint-use cannot be reached within a specified time.

In short, Mr. Chairman, except for one section this is an excellent bill. That one exception is section 7, which I believe is unnecessary, unwise and unsound and which I strongly urge be eliminated from the bill. At the appropriate time I will offer an amendment to accomplish that purpose.

Why must we delete section 7? The answer to that question must be seen in the context of four aspects of the San Luis proposal before us.

First, the bill authorizes a joint-venture of State and Federal Government. This is made necessary by the fact that the San Luis reservoir site is the only adequate and feasible storage site in the area. For this reason the proposal is to construct, either initially or by subsequent enlargement, facilities sufficient to serve both the recognized Federal needs and those additional needs which the State proposed to meet.

Second, as a part of this joint-venture aspect, there will be a commingling of project facilities and storage supplies. This gives the project a character which is, I believe, unique and which represents a new approach to reclamation development. Third, and of utmost importance, is the fact that the details of joint-use arrangements are not spelled out in the bill before us. They are, of necessity, left to negotiation. The fact that we are moving here into a new area of approach to reclamation problems and that the details of the probable arrangement are to be worked out later in negotiations should alert all of us to the imperative need to move with extreme care—care that we do not in any way undermine Federal interests or the basic concepts of Federal reclamation law.

This concern is given a specific character when we consider the fourth aspect of the situation—the challenge to the traditional 160-acre limitation in Federal reclamation law. The 1956 data show that, of the 1.4 million acres in the San Luis Valley, including the proposed Federal service area and surrounding areas, over 64 percent of the land is held by owners with more than 1,000 acres each. The largest of these, the Southern Pacific Railroad, accounts for 10 percent of the total and the second-largest owner, the Standard Oil Co., accounts for another 7 percent. A similar pattern is to be found in Kern County including possible areas of irrigation service south of the Federal service area. Here, of 1.1 million acres of land, we again find that 64 percent is accounted for by owners of more than 1,000 acres each. The largest owner, the Kern County Land Co., accounts for 16 percent of the total and the various oil companies with large holdings account for another 15 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I do not need to belabor the point. The basic question is whether or not the 160-acre limitation and other such Federal guideposts of reclamation law shall follow Federal investment. This being the basic question, I think all of us would agree that it should be answered either by the courts or by the Congress considering it on its own merits. I submit that section 7 adheres to neither of these approaches, and that for this reason it must be deleted. It does not consider the question on its merits, as is abundantly clear both from the report of the committee on the bill and from the arguments of those who support its retention. But, at the same time, it clearly implies an answer to the question which may be regarded as binding by the courts. This is not the proper way of either changing fundamental reclamation law or of expressing our opinion as to the intent of such fundamental law.

Section 7 may not in any way alter reclamation law as some suggest. The majority of the committee takes the position that this is the case. Then it is redundancy and should be eliminated.

On the other hand, because of the indefinite nature of Federal-State relations contemplated by this bill—which, as I have pointed out, represents a new approach to reclamation—section 7, if

left in the bill, may very well alter directly fundamental reclamation law and abrogate the 160-acre limitation in its legal application. Because of that very distinct and dangerous possibility, this section must be deleted from the bill.

Section 7 is not necessary to the bill. The measure is complete without it.

I ask the opponents of my amendment this question: Is the retention of section 7 necessary to insure that Federal reclamation law will not extend to the so-called State service area? If they answer "No," then they are saying, as some of them do say, that existing law already provides this assurance and they can have no objection to deletion of this admittedly unnecessary action. If they answer "Yes," then they are saying, in effect, "we are not sure whether or not existing law would extend to the State service area and we want to insure that it doesn't." If that is their answer, they are clearly asking that we take a position on a question of fundamental Federal reclamation law—a position either expressing our intent as to its interpretation or altering it—and I repeat that such an action by this body should only be carried out through a specific measure in its own right, with all the due consideration and hearings that such a measure must receive.

I ask the Members of this body to protect the 160-acre limitation by supporting my amendment, then to support this project which will add so greatly to the conservation and use of the water resources of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the very able gentleman from California for his untiring efforts on behalf of the San Luis project. And, I want to say here that that is a very excellent example of the type of development that has built America, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has so ably told us a few minutes ago. This is a feasible project. It is a good project. It has been beset with many difficulties over a number of years because of the fact that involved here is not only Federal reclamation but a State water plan. So, we have had a compromise solution worked out in this bill before us today.

Generally speaking, it is a good solution. We are launching out in some respects in a new direction, an untried direction, but I think it is a sound one and the American way to get the job done.

I am concerned about one section of this bill, as many of my colleagues are, and at the proper time I plan to offer an amendment. It will be a very simple amendment to strike out section 7 of the bill. Section 7 is a very short section. It reads:

> The provision of the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to water deliveries or to the use of drainage facilities serving lands under contract with the State to receive a water supply, outside of the Federal San Luis unit service area described in the report of the Department of the Interior entitled "San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project," dated December 17, 1956.

The reason that I oppose this section so strongly—and I do strongly oppose it, as do many of my colleagues to the extent that if section 7 is left in the bill we may have to vote against the project. I urge all of you who are sincere believers in this great development to join in eliminating this section.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. If, as the chairman of the committee states, it makes no difference whether section 7 is in or out, why, if it is left in, would you vote against the bill?

Mr. ULLMAN. Of course, there is a difference of opinion on this point. The committee takes the position that it makes no difference. Therefore I say why not take it out? Under those circumstances it is completely redundant. There were days of debate over in the other body on this same issue. You can read the RECORD. The other body took out this section. The feeling is so strong over there that if you really want a bill, you will be wise to accept the amendment.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if it is redundant and you are in favor of the bill, why would you vote against the bill with something that is redundant in it?

Mr. ULLMAN. The proponents of section 7 take that position. I do not happen to agree. My position is that it does make a difference, that if section 7 remains in the bill, there is every likelihood that what we are doing is changing our basic reclamation law. What I am talking about is the 160-acre limitation. I think you all believe in this principle of spreading benefits to the small landowners and keeping the large operators from getting undue enrichment from our Federal investment. This is basic. I think most of my colleagues acknowledge that the taxpayers, who have through the years supported reclamation, depend upon us to make sure that this basic principle is safeguarded.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. On this question of whether it does or does not make any difference, and with all due respect to those who contend otherwise, I am wondering if the gentleman is aware that the Feather River Association on February 12 of this year passed a resolution demanding that if the Congress declined to delete section 7, the State of California should be asked to build San Luis in order to avoid the 160-acre limitation. Somebody obviously feels that this is important. In other words the position is taken just the other way around. The bill is threatened if section 7 does not remain in. This makes me very suspicious, and I am sure the gentleman will agree with me.

Mr. ULLMAN. This is true; a great issue has been made over this section 7. There are many people who cannot support the project if section 7 remains. I say delete section 7. What we seek is to have basic reclamation law apply. We want Federal benefits to follow our Federal investment.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAGEN. This may be a privileged matter; I think it occurred in the committee at the time of executive consideration of the bill and if the gentleman does not feel it is privileged I should appreciate his answer. Is it not true that in the committee the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] offered an amendment which would have spelled out the fact that Federal reclamation law did apply to the State project under these circumstances? As I understand, the gentleman was opposed to that amendment; I would like to know why.

Mr. ULLMAN. This is true. In other words, there are some who take the position that all of the water in this joint facility should be under the 160-acre limitation. I take the position that that portion of the water that comes from the Federal investment should be definitely under the 160-acre limitation. What I want to do is to preserve that basic principle. I believe that basic principle will be abrogated with section 7 in the bill and that there is a good likelihood that the benefits from this Federal project will go onto lands without the proper 160-acre limitation.

Mr. HAGEN. One more question, if I may. It is the gentleman's position, then, in offering his amendment, which he will do tomorrow, I assume, to strike section 7; and it is not his intention that water produced with State funds, let us say, shall be subject to the Federal reclamation law?

Mr. ULLMAN. My intention is that existing Federal reclamation law should apply to that portion of the water resulting from Federal investment. On that basis I feel sure that the Members of the House can and will support the amendment. It is certainly a reasonable position. It is a sound position. It is one that I know the taxpayers of America would support because they do not want to take the chance that part of their investment would go to provide water to unduly enrich large landholders beyond the 160-acre limitation principle.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in 1542 Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo put into San Diego Bay, went ashore and found the San Diego River which he wanted to use to wash his beard in, but he could find no water in it. California has been having water problems ever since that time.

The people who came out to California in the early days before Federal reclamation was ever heard of got busy and built many of their own projects; and as the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] indicated, over half of the State's farmlands are supplied by local private projects or public non-Federal projects. Then there came along the developments and increasing State population of the 20th century. San Francisco had to go all the way over to Hetch-Hetchy, which is somewhere in the vicinity of Yosemite Valley, in this portion of the State of California, all that distance, for its water. They have put a pipe across, and

take it from there to San Francisco many, many miles away.

The great city of Los Angeles, had to go up in the hills to another location, many miles away, and install a vastly imaginative water project the like of which the world had never before seen. It brought water down to supply that portion of the State's growing population and industry and turn this essentially desert property into the oasis it is today.

Further down in the State we had to augment the water supply for the coastal plain around San Diego and for the great Imperial Valley by the works along the Colorado River, Hoover Dam, Parker Dam, and so forth.

It is a magnificent tribute to the imagination of the men who conceived these projects and the ability of the men who executed them, and financed them, incidentally, that this great State exists as it does today.

I brought this different map, a molded relief map, out here because it shows the actual mountain ranges that hinder the movement of the water in this State. It illustrates why this San Luis project is needed.

In the southern part of the State the problem is chiefly the lack of water. In the far northern part of the State the problem is a superabundance of water and flooding. In the central portion of the State by San Francisco and below Sacramento, the so-called delta area, the water problem is the contamination of the water by boron and things like that. The gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] is going to introduce an amendment, which I think nobody objects to, to protect the water purity in that area. He is always zealous in the protection of the interests of his constituency.

In the Santa Clara Valley area, which is ably represented by the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] who spoke a moment ago, there is a water problem. Essentially what he wants is to take this same San Luis Reservoir and dig a hole in the back of it, the Pacheco Tunnel, to get some water down to his vital area, too. So you can see that all up and down the State we have problems. They are not the same problems at all. They are at variance, and their solution essentially, to some extent, involves an invasion of what the other man wants to do. That is, give and take is necessary.

In short, the problem of water in California is like a can of worms. It has been even more complicated by a recent recommendation of a master in the suit between Arizona and California that a good deal more water go to Arizona than had previously been anticipated. It is a problem that has placed upon the people of California for generations an awareness of the necessity and the will and the compelling reasons to do something about it.

The vast projects I have mentioned are only the beginning. If the State is to be able to progress and be able to live in the future, more and additional water projects are necessary.

I want to make sure this is understood: The San Luis project the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] is talking about is a project that will irrigate some half million acres in roughly the portion of the San Joaquin Valley around Fresno. As he explains, the San Joaquin River runs north, the Sacramento River runs south; they meet in the delta area. Other rivers come down off the hills to join them along their courses. The coastal mountains separate the valley from the coastal area. The project of which the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] speaks is in the middle of the San Joaquin Valley. If the State itself is going to solve its water problems in a cooperative way by taking the excess water from the north and taking it south, it has to follow some route that roughly traverses the length of this San Joaquin Valley.

Now you cannot go down the middle of the valley, naturally, because the flow is in the wrong direction. You have to move it in canals along these hills here after you pump water up from the Delta area at the Tracy Pumping Station. Since the water from the north is produced in the winter, it has to be stored so that the arid south can use it in the summer. That is where the San Luis Reservoir site comes in, so far as the State of California north-to-south water plan is concerned. It is something related to, but not the project that the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] wants to use to irrigate this half million acres. That San Luis reservoir site happens to be, according to the geographical facts of life in California, the only site where a reservoir can be built. So you see we have two different forces here wanting to use this reservoir site. We have the State of California with its north-to-south water plan and then we have the people who want this Federal San Luis project to irrigate these acres around Fresno in the San Joaquin Valley. Of course, the only sensible thing to do is to get together. Well, we tried a lot of different ways to get together. This project has many years of history behind it, and with all these various groups fighting back and forth there, it was a very, very difficult thing to get them together. In the beginning, most of the groups in California insisted that the Federal Government was not going to have anything to do with this reservoir here. The southern group said: "Gee, when you get the Bureau of Reclamation mixed up in this thing, the first thing you know some bureaucrat hidden in Washington will turn the valves and you will not get any water at all. Not only that, in the first place you have to go down to Washington and beg the Congress to give you some money for a project. We ought to do it at home, take care of it ourselves and keep the Federal Government out of this."

But, some second thoughts occurred which were: "Poor Mr. SISK over there—if you keep the Federal Government out, altogether, he is not going to have his people taken care of. After all, it is one State and why do we not all get together on it?"

Well, the first attempt at getting together was the idea to have the State to build this project, have the Federal Government put up some of the money and work out mutual cooperation that way, to let Mr. SISK get his water from the San Luis area and have the rest of it move to Kern County and further south in an all State project. Then, the State will keep control of it and we will not have the Bureau of Reclamation back in Washington chopping off the water. Finally, we got around to where we said, "Well, that is probably not the way to do it or to go about it. They want to do some integrating of the Federal San Luis project with this Federal Central Valley project and there are a lot of other factors that might make it better if the Federal Government did it jointly with the State." Out of that came the bill before you today.

In other words, we have one reservoir site here and two people wanting to use it. We settled and got together on building a joint reservoir. Mr. SISK's project, the San Luis project has need for about 1 million acre-feet of storage capacity and in order to handle the State north-to-south water plan, it needs roughly another 1,100,000 more acre-feet of storage capacity. So we said, let us build a dam that will store 2,100,000 acre-feet and we can both use it and we will share our costs. Now the State will pump its water in there when it can get it during the rainy season, store it, and then it will pump its water out in the dry season when it is needed. The Federal Government will take its water and pump it in there in the wet season and it will take the Federal Government water up and pump it down into Mr. SISK's project when it is needed there. Well, that is reasonable. The only thing is you cannot take every drop of water and say—this is water that the Federal people put in and this is water that the State people put in, and that you have to take that same exact drop of water out. That is foolishness. Of course, we have in the law a doctrine known as the doctrine of fungible goods.

These great grain storage places all over the Middle West are full of many people's grain. They store it in there, but they do not get the same grain out that they put in. They get a chit that says, "You have so many bushels of grain here, and when you come in you can get that same amount of that same kind of grain out, but we are not going to mark all of this grain with your name on it."

The same is true with water. As a consequence, a few moments ago I made the remark that this is essentially two separate projects, coexisting at one and the same place. Because of the unidentifiable nature of each and every molecule of water, what I say is borne out.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. What does the State do with the water it is bringing down from the north?

Mr. HOSMER. It is not bringing any down now. This is a project on which the State is voting on issuing bonds at the present time.

Mr. JONAS. It is not using the canal so far?

Mr. HOSMER. No. There is a Federal canal in here already.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. All we are trying to do at this time is to insure necessary right-of-way along the river.

Mr. HOSMER. Yes. As a matter of fact, the State has been spending several million dollars to acquire right-of-way for the San Luis Reservoir site itself. That money is being put up by the State as part of its share of the joint project. I have tried to make that clear but I see some of the Members have a rather quizzical look on their faces. Let me reiterate: These are two separate projects. There is a State project and there is a Federal project. What the bill does is to put up the money for the Federal project and authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a contract with the State of California for the joint enjoyment of this reservoir space and certain other necessary accouterments so that it can be used by both, with the costs being shared equitably by each.

This brings me down to section 7 about which we have a certain amount of argument. Generally, I am in favor of the 160-acre limitation. My heart does not bleed any time anybody criticizes it, but I think it has been a generally good thing for the country. I also recognize that where you have a State project, that is something else, and that you cannot and should not attempt to impose a Federal law on a State project that just because it is occupying the same space with the Federal project. By no stretch of the imagination is there any reason why it should, just because as independent projects, they happen to be occupying the same space for which they have both paid their separate independent amounts of money. There is no reason for it, in my mind.

I fully agree with the report of this committee, which says that section 7 is surplusage, that without it you could take a case to court and get a decision that says, "Of course, Federal reclamation law does not apply to the State project." The 160-acre limitation cannot apply to this project by any type of legal gymnastics even without section 7.

Then, why am I up here saying that I want to keep section 7 in? For this reason: This State project is going to require better than a billion dollars for just this San Luis phase including distribution systems. The entire Statewide water plan is going to require $5 billion out of the taxpayers of the State of California before it is through. What section 7 does and why it is necessary is illustrated take for instance the argument between the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN], and the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER]. It removes the possibility of such arguments by clean and distinct language. It assures the matter stay out of litigation which could last for 20 years. Why spell it out now and keep it out of court? While the cases are in court you cannot go out and get a bonding house to float bonds. They cannot float them while litigation is pending. In California we cannot wait 20 years for the water while this thing is in court. Section 7 makes sure to begin with it never goes to court and allows us to proceed with our vitally needed State water project. We in the State of California are only asking to be kept free of litigation so we can proceed to spend our own money on the State North-South project needed to take care of our own people. That is all we want to do.

Another thing in reference to my people down here in southern California: this water from San Luis has to come down a long canal and over what we call the Tehachapi Ridge. It has to go up a long way over the mountains and come down a long way to get to Los Angeles and the Long Beach area, and on down the plain to San Diego and the rest of these places. It is going to be costly to put the works in to do this.

A little south is another area in south end of the San Joaquin that also wants some of this water. That is Kern County, an area represented by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN]. Those people want to take part in the water plan but they do not want any part of the 160-acre limitation; they do not want to be faced with lawsuits, do not want to have to fool around with a lot of nonsense from the Federal Government but they are willing to submit to such limitations and control as may be imposed by the State of California. In fact, Governor Brown said he was going to put some kind of acreage limitation on them. But, from Sacramento, the State capital, the place where it should be done as regards to the State's project which it pays for itself.

What about this hassle over section 7 in connection with Mr. HAGEN's people? If that is out of the bill they will do just as they have done for a hundred years, keep pumping water and just tell everybody else to go take a walk. What does that mean to my people in Los Angeles? It simply means that the size of the water conduits along the valley and over the mountains from the San Luis Reservoir to Los Angeles will need to be only half as big, but it will still cost 90 percent of what it would to build it of sufficient size also to supply Mr. HAGEN's people. Thus the cost of this water to my people would be greatly increased if the Kern County people take a walk on the project. It would cost my people almost twice as much as it would to get water in cooperation with Kern County projects. That is what these opponents of section 7 are going to do to us if they succeed in taking this section out of the bill. It is going to make it difficult, and probably impossible, to float bonds; it is going to make it more costly to get water to my people; it is going to delay unmercifully getting the water to them.

Incidentally, let me assure anybody from the agricultural States that what it is proposed to do here for my area by the State project will not bring any vast new areas into agricultural production. In practical effect, what water we used on flora would not be much more than for a few good-sized window boxes containing flowers. It is going to supply our factories with the water that is needed; it is going to go to supply the California workers' homes with the water they need; and unless we can get it down there at a not unreasonable cost, what an imposition that is going to be on 7 million American citizens who happen to live in southern California. That is the reason why we want this section kept in the bill. Take section 7 out and it is not going to impose a 160-acre limitation on Congressman HAGEN's people. The only thing it is going to do is to cause my people to spend a lot more money to get this water, go through a lot of lawsuits to get it, and go thirsty for a long while waiting for it. Keep section 7 in the bill. That is all we are asking you to do; it is just that simple. It is direct, I think it is understandable. I am not going to try to persuade you about the merits of Mr. SISK's agricultural phase of the project. I will merely say that this is probably one of the best reclamation projects Congress has ever had a chance to vote on. Some of you are for reclamation, some of you are against reclamation. The President would like to have this bill; the Vice President would like to have the bill; and the people of California would. And, I am speaking about the bill as now written, without deletions. It has been explained that the cost will eventually be paid back and return a good dividend to the country overall. I am not going to try to persuade you about that. All I am pleading with you to do is after we have contended with this can of worms in California, after years and years of labor and finally gone out and got all these diverse water districts and groups together on a bill they could finally agree upon after all these years, please do not louse it up here, because we have problems enough without anything like that happening.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. I thank the gentleman. First, does the gentleman think he can get this bill through the other body if he keeps in the bill this controversial section 7?

Mr. HOSMER. Let me say this, I do not think this body which is an independent part of the legislative branch of the Government, should grovel itself around to try to figure out what the other body might do. Let us face this problem when it comes up, and if there is any giving to be done I think it is about time that the giving was done on the other side of the Capitol instead of this.

Mr. ULLMAN. The gentleman said it was surplusage. It seems to me if it is surplusage it would be little to give in return for getting a bill through this House and through the other body and making sure that you have a project.

Mr. HOSMER. It is surplusage insofar as this bill is concerned, but it is not surplusage insofar as its actual, practical effect upon my part of the country is concerned and in the financing, the operation and the speed with which we can carry out our State project.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. It appears to me from reading this very excellent report by the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs that that committee gave this subject a great deal of thought and by their thinking about this and working on it they decided to put section 7 in the bill.

Mr. HOSMER. That is right. Lots of thought was given to the matter, years of thought, and this is the way we were finally able to come out with the people involved behind the project.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. I may say that I rise as a friend of the project, but I, too, am concerned about section 7. Is it correct to state that the gentleman does not desire by this legislation to amend the basic reclamation law?

Mr. HOSMER. No. There is no intent, there is no desire, there is no possible way to do it. Read section 7 as the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] did a little while ago. At that time I thought, in my own mind, how can this gentleman possibly have in his mind that this is any attempt to alter general reclamation law? All it says is that the State portion of the project is not going to be subject to anything but State law, and the other portions of the bill say the Federal parts of the project are going to be subject to Federal law, which is as it should be. Does the gentleman disagree with that States rights proposition?

That is a part of the traditional way we set up our Constitution.

Mr. BURDICK. One more question.

Mr. HOSMER. I have one, too, but it is not answered.

Mr. BURDICK. On page 3, lines 1 to 4, it specifically defines that this project should be under the application of the Federal reclamation law. In the report on page 15 it is stated:

> Its deletion from the bill would have no substantive effect on the law applicable to the San Luis undertaking.

I submit to the gentleman that by adding section 7, rather than getting away from legal difficulties you will have conflicting legal difficulties.

Mr. HOSMER. I doubt that very much. The gentleman must not have heard my answer to the gentleman from Oregon a moment ago. I explained it fully. I was talking about legal difficulties in California with respect to floating bonds, for instance, that would result from this action to delete. If we do not settle it on the floor of Congress the State may have to take 20 years to settle it in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that section 7 is probably in direct conflict right now with a recent ruling of the supreme court of California?

Mr. HOSMER. I am not aware of that, and I do not believe it is true.

Mr. COHELAN. If I might proceed, the State supreme court, I would remind the gentleman, in a decision dated April 29 of this year, stated that the 160-acre limitation is in fact State policy as well as Federal law by action of the State legislature. It goes on to point out:

> The Federal Congress by the passage of section 5 of the Reclamation Act has determined, lawfully, that the 160-acre limitation is a basic part of Federal policy. The State legislature has adopted this concept as State policy by specifically authorizing irrigation projects to enter into contracts for project waters that contain the 160-acre limitation.

That is water code—section 23195—53 AC 718.

Mr. HOSMER. That is dandy, because the gentleman has just made my point for me. Since he is interested in the 160-acre limitation, and since the State has accomplished it on State projects already, why does he not just quietly say nothing about taking section 7 out, and rely on the State law and the State supreme court decision, which he has just referred to? Everything is taken care of, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SMITH of California. I would like to commend the gentleman from California for the tremendous amount of time and effort he has devoted to this project over the years and on the very fine statement he has made here today. May I take this opportunity to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman. For the purpose of the legislative record and history I have obtained permission to include here the following portions of the committee report which deal with applicability of Federal law to the Federal project and section 7 to the State project:

OPERATION UNDER FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAW

Judged in accordance with Federal reclamation law, about 325,000 acres of the 480,000 acres in the Federal San Luis service area—that is, the area within the Westlands, Panoche and San Luis Water Districts—are in large ownerships that will have to be divided into smaller ownerships. The owners of these large holdings are fully aware of the requirements of the antispeculation and excess land provisions of reclamation law, and the committee was advised that, with the exception of the Southern Pacific Co., they are willing to sign recordable contracts, in compliance with reclamation law, agreeing to dispose of their excess acreage. The Panoche and San Luis districts have already signed contracts with the Department calling for compliance with the excess land provisions. The Southern Pacific Co. owns about 58,000 acres within the San Luis service area as defined above, all of which is in the Westlands Water District. A representative of the Southern Pacific Co., appearing before the committee, stated that the company was not interested in selling its lands. At the same time, he stated that in the event of operation of the San Luis project under reclamation law the company would be willing to sit down with the district and the Bureau of Reclamation and explore the possibilities of obtaining water for company lands. The committee understands that the feasibility of the project does not depend upon furnishing water to the Southern Pacific Co. lands, and that the Westlands district will take all the water it can get regardless of whether it serves the company lands. If the company lands are not served, it would enable the district to pump less from underground. The district has the power to tax the company lands even if they take no project water.

The committee certainly recognizes the problems raised by the land ownership situation in the San Luis service area. During the committee's consideration of this legislation, concern was expressed by many individuals and groups lest the large landowners in the San Luis service area might, in some way, be exempt from the land limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation laws. For instance, the committee received this expression from the California Labor Federation:

"This language of the San Luis bills opens the door to unjust enrichment, to monopoly of water resources, and to subsidized giantism in agriculture. * * * We hope that the Congress of the United States will not breach long-established national policy."

The committee gave careful consideration to all the views and comments it received along this line and amended the bill in several respects.

The committee wants to make it unmistakably clear that the legislation it is hereby reporting requires the operation of the Federal San Luis unit under Federal reclamation law, including the excess land provisions thereof, and that there is no way the large landowners in the Federal San Luis service area can avoid compliance with such provisions.

Section 1 of the bill provides that, "In constructing, operating, and maintaining the San Luis unit, the Secretary shall be governed by Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto)." An additional phrase—"except so far as the provisions thereof are inconsistent with this act"—which was formerly appended to this sentence was deleted by the committee. While this phrase obviously related only to provisions set out in the bill and could not be interpreted as exempting the project from other unmentioned provisions of reclamation law, the committee nevertheless removed it in order to allay the fears of those objecting to it and on the basis that the provisions in the bill will speak for themselves and that such deletion will do no harm. The following colloquy illustrates the careful consideration the committee gave to this particular matter, including its consideration of a substitute phrase reading "except as otherwise provided in this act":

"Mr. ROGERS. For a question of counsel: What is referred to by the language 'except as otherwise provided in that act'? In other words, what does the 'otherwise' mean?

"Mr. WITMER. As you will recall, Mr. Chairman, during the hearing substantially the same question was asked of witness after witness. Each one had in mind those things which were particularly pertinent to him * * *. None of the witnesses covered the field fully, however. It seems to me that 'except as herein otherwise provided in this act' covers virtually everything in the bill that follows those words.

"Now, let me illustrate, if I may, sir. If this were authorized in the usual manner to be constructed, operated, and maintained under the Federal reclamation laws, the Secretary could forthwith send up a request for appropriations and, having gotten the appropriations, begin to construct. But the bill, immediately following the words you are considering, lays conditions on such construction.

"One condition: The Secretary has to negotiate with the State. Another condition: Until January 1, 1962, arrives, he cannot proceed without an agreement. Another condition: He must have made some arrangement for drainage works. Another condition: He must specifically have gotten necessary water rights to carry out the purposes of the project. And so on throughout the bill.

"In other words, it seems to me that every provision of the bill from there on is an exception to the general authorization which precedes. If you wanted to go into it more specifically, you could mention, as one of the witnesses did, the authorization for recreation facilities, which are not provided for in general reclamation law. You could mention, as the chairman of the full committee has just mentioned, the provision for joint operation and joint control with the State. If you wanted to be still more specific, you could mention the provision which authorizes the Secretary to turn over the operation and maintenance of the project to the State, for which there is no provision in general reclamation law. And so on.

"Mr. ROGERS. In that particular situation, is it your opinion that the authority of the Secretary to turn over joint use facilities to the State for operation would open the door for exempting the project from the application of the 160-acre limitation?

"Mr. WITMER. My answer, sir, to that is a clear and unequivocal 'No.'

* * * * *

"Mr. ULLMAN. May I ask just one additional question: What is your interpretation of the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [to strike the language 'except so far as the provisions thereof are inconsistent with this Act'] as against that offered by the gentleman from Colorado [to substitute 'except as otherwise provided in this Act'], for instance, in connection with the operation of the dam? Would the language in the two instances make any difference?

"Mr. WITMER. I think the language will make no difference. The effect of the language will be no different. In other words, may I put it this way, I think the exceptions will speak for themselves as being exceptions."

To avoid any possible misinterpretation on the matter of operation of the Federal San Luis unit service area under Federal reclamation law and in order that there could be no question as to the committee's position that the State should not be allowed to serve lands within the Federal service area the committee adopted several clarifying amendments. It amended section 3(h) of the bill to read as follows:

"(h) notwithstanding transfer of the care, operation and maintenance of any works to the State, as hereinbefore provided, any organization which has theretofore entered into a contract with the United States under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and amendments thereto, for a water supply through the works of the San Luis unit, including joint-use facilities, shall continue [to be subject to the same limitations and obligations and] to have and to enjoy the same rights which it would have had under its contract with the United States and the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 1 of the act of July 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 483, 43 U.S.C. 485h–1), in the absence of such transfer, and its enjoyment of such rights shall be without added cost or other detriment arising from such transfer."

Attention is called to the language in black brackets added by the committee.

The committee also (1) added language in section 2 which provides that the additional capacity in the joint-use facilities for State use shall be limited to service outside of the Federal San Luis unit service area and (2) added a subsection to section 3 stating that the State shall not serve any lands in the Federal San Luis service area except as required in connection with its acceptance of the care, operation, and maintenance of the joint-use facilities. In this connection, it is quite clear that if the State takes over the operation and maintenance of the joint-use facilities it will be acting as an agent of the Federal Government under reclamation law, so far as its service to the Federal San Luis service area is concerned. The situation would be no different from that in the many instances in which irrigation districts take over the operation and maintenance of the works serving such districts. The districts are still bound by all the provisions of Federal reclamation law. A portion of the committee's discussion on this particular matter follows:

"Mr. ROGERS. * * * Your answer would indicate, Mr. Witmer, that in the event the Secretary did, under the authority of this act, turn over the operation and maintenance of this project to the State authority, the State authority would then be bound by the 160-acre limitation?

"Mr. WITMER. The State authority would in my judgment, be operating in effect as an agent of the United States, under the laws of the United States. And there would be no waiver of any provisions.

"Mr. ROGERS. And as this bill is written, there is no place in it, in your opinion, where the Secretary himself, if he continued to operate it, would have the power or the authority to waive the 160-acre limitation?

"Mr. WITMER. No, sir.

* * * * *

"Mr. ULLMAN. I would like to ask counsel a question.

"I am rather intrigued by this last statement of yours—that the State of California would be acting as an agent of the Federal Government under the reclamation law. Is that correct?

"Mr. WITMER. In effect, yes.

"Let me give you an analogy. The general reclamation laws provide for turning over operation and maintenance of projects to irrigation districts. That is done every year. In fact, Congress encourages their being taken over. But the districts are still operating for the United States. They are still subject to the control of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior. They are still bound by the excess land laws, by the requirement that water be not delivered if there is nonpayment, etc. You can run down the whole list of requirements. What you are doing is substituting the districts for the Secretary in the operation only. In the case of San Luis it would be the State substituting for the Secretary instead of an irrigation district."

RECLAMATION LAW NOT APPLICABLE TO STATE SERVICE AREAS

Section 7 of the bill provides that the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to areas served by the State of California. Objection was raised in committee to this provision on the ground that it will "exempt" the State-served lands from the acreage limitation provisions of the Federal laws. In accepting section 7, a majority of the committee points out that there is nothing in the reclamation laws which, in the absence of a provision in the bill affirmatively making the land-limitation provisions applicable in the State-served area, would forbid the State from serving whatever lands it chooses on whatever terms it chooses. In other words, mere deletion of section 7 would not accomplish the purpose of those who advocate requiring owners of the State-served lands to observe the limitations which are imposed on those served by the Federal Government. It is, furthermore, the view of the majority that there is no justification for writing an affirmative provision into the bill which would require such observance. Its reasons for this conclusion are these:

(1) It is only by chance that there is any connection between the Federal and State projects. That connection arises from the physical fact that there is one and only one adequate reservoir site in the area and that both the Federal and State Governments need to use this site. If two sites existed, each government would be free to use one of them on its own terms, and the excess lands question as applied to State-served lands would not even have arisen.

Speaking, during committee debate, to the matter of applying Federal law to the State's service area, Mr. HOSMER one of the authors of the legislation, clarified the matter this way:

"So, I ask you gentleman to realize that this particular project we are talking about which the Federal Government would build and the project the State wants to build, are two separate and entirely different projects.

"Of necessity they must occupy the same particular space. But just because in an office building there are several law firms and one of the law firms is representing the plaintiff in a case and another law firm is representing the defendant does not mean they have a conflict of interest because they are operating out of the same building. They are separate enterprises and this is exactly what is occurring here."

(2) The water supply for the State's project will be derived from sources independent of the Federal project's water supply and, except for the joint works, will be handled through an entirely different system of reservoirs, canals, and other works. The Federal impoundment and transportation systems in the Central Valley will, with the construction of the Federal San Luis project, be fully utilized and could not, even if there were inclination to do so, be used to supply the State service area.

(3) The State will, under the terms of the bill, have paid its entire share of the cost of constructing the joint facilities prior to its utilization of them for storage and delivery of water. Even if the State were a customer of the United States—a water right applicant or an irrigation district, for instance—it would not be bound by the acreage limitation provisions under existing law in these circumstances. The committee sees no reason for treating the State, in its capacity as a partner in a joint venture rather than a customer, more onerously than it would a private citizen or an irrigation district.

(4) Insofar as there is a problem of large ownerships in the State-served area, the committee is confident that the Legislature of the State of California can and will enact legislation expressing the public policy of the State and representing the will of the majority of the people of the State. There would be no more justification for the United States, in other words, to decline to enter into this joint venture with the State unless the State makes its land-ownership policy conform to that of the United States than there would be for the State to refuse to enter into the arrangement unless the United States modified its policy to suit that of the State.

In order to make clear the present state of the law and the committee's reasons for believing that no exemption is provided by section 7, the following more complete explanation is offered.

Section 3 of the act of August 9, 1912 (37 Stat. 266, 43 U.S.C. 544) provides, in pertinent part, that "no person shall at any one time or in any manner * * * acquire, own, or hold irrigable land for which entry or water right application shall have been made under the said reclamation act of June 17, 1902, and acts supplementary thereto and amendatory thereof, before final payment in full of all installments of build-

ing and betterment charges shall have been made on account of such land in excess of one farm unit as fixed by the Secretary of the Interior as the limit of area per entry of public land or per single ownership of private land for which a water right may be purchased respectively, nor in any case in excess of one hundred and sixty acres, nor shall water be furnished under said Acts nor a water right sold or recognized for such excess."

During the period when irrigation water contracts were entered into with individuals rather than organized districts, it is thus clear that the law forbade delivery of water to more than one farm unit held by an individual only so long as the entire construction cost allocated to the excess unit had not been fully paid. That the law was so read and applied by the Interior Department is shown in detail in the Bureau of Reclamation's printed publication entitled "Landownership Survey on Federal Reclamation Projects" (1946) and the Interior Department's two-volume document prepared for the Subcommittee on Public Works and Resources of the House Committee on Government Operations entitled "Excess Land Provisions of the Federal Reclamation Laws and the Payment of Charges" (1956).

The same rule has been held to be applicable to irrigation district contracts. Speaking of the relation between the 1912 act and the excess-land provisions of the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 649, 43 U.S.C. 423e), the Associate Solicitor of the Interior Department advised the Commissioner of Reclamation on October 22, 1947, as follows:

"The specific question is whether the release of the limitation by section 3 of the 1912 act upon 'final payment in full of all installments of building and betterment charges' on account of 'irrigable land for which entry or water-right application shall have been made' can be held to apply to the payment in full of the joint obligation assumed by an irrigation district under a contract entered into as required by section 46 of the 1926 act.

"In construing an ambiguous enactment, it is held proper to consider acts passed at prior and subsequent sessions to which the act does not refer. * * * It seems clear that the various excess-land enactments were intended by Congress to provide a uniform and comprehensive procedure for the implementation of its land-limitation policy.

"Section 46 of the 1926 act, supra, sets out the substance of the provisions required to be incorporated in joint-liability repayment contracts with irrigation districts. That section does not purport to contain all the excess-land provisions applicable to lands affected by such contracts. * * * Since joint-liability repayment contracts were not in general use when the act of August 9, 1912, was adopted, the language used in those acts was not specifically directed at situations arising under contracts of that type. Congress apparently intended that the land-limitation provisions, in effect when the act of May 15, 1922 (42 Stat. 541), the act of May 25, 1926, and other acts covering the use of irrigation district contracts were adopted, would be applicable thereto, as nearly as practicable. Otherwise, substantially different acreage restrictions might result from the discontinuance of water-right applications and the adoption of the joint-liability repayment contract procedures.

"When all construction costs due under a joint liability repayment contract have been paid in full, there is no apparent reason why the lands receiving water under such contract should not be deemed relieved of the excess-land restrictions in the same manner as paidup water right application lands. The fact that Congress did not, in connection with the various acts authorizing or requiring joint liability repayment contracts, enact complete excess-land provisions couched in language adapted to joint-liability contracts does not in itself deny a congressional intention that the principles of its excess-land policy, as previously expressed with reference to water-right applications, should apply to such contracts. The enactment of new excess-land provisions, relative to the phases not specifically covered by the said acts, was undoubtedly deemed unnecessary because these acts became a part of the reclamation laws for all purposes and would be interpreted on that basis. The existing excess-land provisions would, therefore, become applicable.

"In the light of the foregoing, it is my view that upon full payment of construction obligation under a joint-liability repayment contract, the lands receiving water under such contract are, under the provisions contained in section 3 of the act of August 9, 1912, relieved of the statutory excess-land restrictions."

In accordance with this conclusion, a large number of repayment contracts which the Bureau of Reclamation entered into during the years 1949–54 with irrigation districts in Oregon, Idaho, Washington, California, and Montana have had written into them the following provision or its substantive equivalent:

"Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws, water made available hereunder shall not be delivered to more than 160 irrigable acres in the ownership of any one person * * *. The limitations stated in this subarticle shall cease to operate when the construction charge provided in this contract has been paid in full."

Many of these contracts were approved by Congress.

The present Secretary of the Interior has, in effect, announced his concurrence in this view of the law. On July 12, 1957, he said that he was unwilling to enter into a contract with the Kings River Conservation District, California, which would permit individual water users within the district to pay off their proportionate share of the construction costs to be paid by the district and thus come out, as individuals, from under the acreage limitations. But he also said—

"The Department continues to recognize and support the basic concept of reclamation law that full and final payment of the obligation of a district to the Federal Government ends the applicability of the acreage limitations."

"So long as the present acreage limitations remain in the basic reclamation law, they should be complied with, until the district has fully discharged its obligations to the Federal Government."

It is true that the provisions of the 1912 act and their relation to district obligations under the 1926 act have not been construed in any reported judicial decision, but the administrative history is such that the committee has little doubt that the payout rule could and would be properly applied in the present instance even if the State were to be thought of not as a partner but as a customer of the Federal Government. Whatever may be the merits or demerits of continuing to apply the prevailing construction of the 1912 and 1926 acts to irrigation districts in situations in which, although final payment is made only after a period of years during which they have received the benefits of interest-free Federal money and, in many cases, assistance from power revenues, it remains true that (1) the administrative practice of doing so is now so well fortified by history that it can probably be successfully attacked by no one except Congress and (2) that there is no legislation now pending before Congress, nor has any ever been introduced, which would overrule the departmental interpretation of these acts or provide other standards to guide it. The committee cannot, in this circumstance, apply to the special case of the State of California a rule which is not applicable to others.

The Warren Act (36 Stat. 925, 43 U.S.C. 523, 524) adds no substance to the claim of those who see section 7 of the bill as a breach in the Federal Government's land limitation policy. In the first place, that act, limited as its cooperative provisions are to "irrigation districts, water users' associations, corporations, entrymen, or water users," is clearly not applicable to the Federal-State venture proposed in H.R. 7155. In the second place, the Warren Act was enacted before the act of August 9, 1912, cited above and thus, as the Associate Solicitor of the Interior Department in the opinion which has already been quoted in part said, must be regarded as qualified by the payout provisions of the later act.

The whole matter is aptly summed up in the following message from Gov. Edmund G. Brown of California to Senator ENGLE which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 7, 1959 (p. 6890):

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *May 7, 1959.*

Senator CLAIR ENGLE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Having seen many statements in the press regarding the application of the Federal reclamation laws to the San Luis project, I wish to reiterate what I have said in the past regarding this matter. Upon the basis of my own legal analysis and that of all my legal advisers I am convinced that the Federal reclamation laws do and will apply to all Federal facilities and service areas of the San Luis project. In addition, with or without the language contained in section 6(a) under S. 44, the Federal reclamation laws do not and, in my view, should not apply to the State facilities and State service areas of the project. I am, and I believe that the California Legislature also is, opposed to any unjust enrichment or monopolization of benefits by owners of large landholdings as a result of either Federal or State operation.

However, I feel that the handling of this matter, insofar as State activities are concerned in relation to this project or other State construction, should come as a result of State legislation. I intend, at an appropriate time and before contracts are executed, to take this matter up with the California Legislature in order to preclude the undesirable results which I have described, but I firmly believe that this matter should not delay either Federal or State authorization or construction.

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor.

The worst that can be said about section 7, then, is that it is surplusage. Its deletion from the bill would have no substantive effect on the law applicable to the San Luis undertaking. Only an amendment affirmatively requiring adherence to the Federal acreage limitations notwithstanding the State's full payment of its share of the construction cost of the project would accomplish that which those who seek to delete section 7 mistakenly believe would be the effect of doing so.

The committee recognizes that the inclusions of surplusage is usually undesirable in a bill, but it also recognizes that the author of a bill, particularly when he is dealing with a subject that has involved bringing together as many diverse interests and points of view in his State and district as the San Luis project involves, should be given considerable latitude in the way he expresses the position that is arrived at, more latitude than the committee might give itself if it were to start drafting a bill ab initio.

The committee concludes that section 7 of the bill in nowise changes established principles of reclamation law. It can well understand the possibility, however, that there

might be difficulties in securing both statewide agreement and financing for the State project if there were doubt in anyone's mind concerning the relationship and the applicable laws under which each project would be constructed and operated. The committee therefore concludes that inclusion of section 7 in the bill will contribute to clarity and advance construction of the projects. The inclusion of this section—to put the matter otherwise, it is not to be interpreted as indicative of a belief on the committee's part that without it the excess land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws would be applicable to the State-served lands.

It was in the light of such considerations as those that have just been set forth that the committee rejected, by rollcall votes, amendments which would, in one case, have deleted section 7 from the bill and, in the other, replaced it with language requiring the State to agree not to serve lands which would be ineligible to receive water if they were being served by the Bureau of Reclamation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to rise in support of this legislation, a bill authorizing the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project in California. Coming from a reclamation State like Colorado I am always anxious to support the reclamation program. I take great pride in the fact that I have voted for all reclamation projects since I have been a Member of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, my colleague the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], for the skillful manner in which he has handled this legislation. I have been a member of the House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation which has had this project under consideration for a number of years. You have just heard the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], tell you something about the difficulties which this project has encountered and of the division in California on this proposal. I was happy to see the water users of California agree on this project. The gentleman from Colorado deserves great credit for the fact that he is able to bring this bill to the floor here today, with all parties in agreement I also want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], the author of the bill, for his perseverance and diligence in sponsoring and promoting this project over the years. He has done a splendid job.

Mr. Chairman, I had the pleasure of visiting the site of this project in California as a member of the subcommittee several years ago. I saw the need for this project in that great agricultural area and why this project is necessary. I was very favorably impressed with the need for this project. While in Fresno I met some very fine residents of California, and I want to mention just one, Mr. Jack O'Neil. I think Jack O'Neil deserves a great deal of credit also for this legislation being before the House today. He has worked with great zeal and enthusiasm for this project and has made numerous trips to Washington in support of the same. So, I want to commend Mr. O'Neil and his group for their interest in this project, because without their support I doubt if this bill would be before us today.

I have been very pleased this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, to listen to the debate on this bill. It certainly has been heartening to those of us who believe in reclamation, and who recognize that reclamation has been a great success, and that the reclamation program has made a most valuable contribution to the economy of this country. We had on the Democratic side the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling funds for all reclamation projects. Ohio is not a reclamation State. There is no reclamation in Ohio. But the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] took the floor this afternoon and called attention to the fact that he has supported these projects and cited the San Luis as an outstanding project. He urged the Members of the House to support the same. All of us are grateful to Mr. KIRWAN for his interest and support. On the Republican side we had the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the ranking Republican member of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations, of which Mr. KIRWAN is chairman, tell us of his support of reclamation over the years. I want to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] for the help he has given the reclamation program, and the projects I have sponsored in Colorado. His support has been most effective and helpful, and I know that I speak for many in the State of Colorado when I tell him that we are truly grateful. He has been a real friend of reclamation.

He knows what reclamation has accomplished for this country, and as long as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and the gentleman from Iowa give reclamation projects their full support, we are in good hands. I might state that without such support there would be no reclamation projects. There are not enough of us in the western reclamation States to produce the votes on the floor of the House to pass bills of this magnitude. Here is a bill calling for over $290 million. So, it has been our purpose to sell reclamation to the Representatives from the other States who are not as familiar with the reclamation program as we are. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to mention one other matter. I refer to the speech made by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], on the floor this afternoon in support of this project, calling attention to the fact that our agricultural surpluses are not being built up by products which are produced on irrigated land. It is true that some of the basic commodities are produced on irrigated land. However, I believe he said that just a little over 1 percent of the present surplus of agricultural commodities was produced on irrigated land. I think that is something we ought to keep in mind, and to emphasize that western reclamation projects are not responsible for our present surplus.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this bill will receive the support of the House and that it will be passed.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not appear here gratuitously. I have constituents who are interested in receiving water deliveries from the Federal San Luis project and I have more constituents who are interested in the integrity of the State Feather River project. I wish to commend everyone who has expressed an interest in these two projects. I particularly wish to commend the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] for opening up a discussion on the floor here today of the so-called section 7 of the bill. The gentleman from Oregon indicated that he would offer an amendment on Thursday, May 19, to strike that section. With respect to this possible amendment, I earnestly solicit your support of the viewpoint which I hereinafter express with respect to section 7. The section has been read into the RECORD by the gentleman from Oregon. However, certain background information is vital to an understanding of this section.

I first want to refer to the effort of California to build its own water project by a State bond issue. In 1951 the California Legislature, after extensive preliminary planning, approved a huge water project to be State financed and State operated, known as the Feather River project. The current cost of this project, or at least the features of it that were described here today, is estimated to be about $1¾ billion. The money will be derived from a State bond issue to be voted upon in California this fall. To date, as I understand, the State has spent in excess of $80 million pursuant to establishing a State Feather River project and has obligated itself, or has authorized itself to spend another $80 million in the immediate future for the same purpose, a total of $160 million.

Let us discuss the relationship of the Feather River project to the Federal San Luis project. Engineering studies disclosed that the State project would require the use of a dam site on San Luis Creek in Merced County for interim storage of water brought there by works to be wholly paid for by California and this same site is deemed necessary for the Federal San Luis project which you will approve or disapprove on Thursday.

What was the resolution of this conflict for a site? It was determined that both the State project and the Federal project had merit, and that the site conflict could be resolved by permitting both to build on the same damsite through the use of common structures thereon and directly appurtenant thereto to which both agencies would contribute their full share of the cost.

The common structures involved would be a main dam, a forebay and an afterbay, common pumps and a main line egress canal. The Federal Government would be the designated construction agent, and at completion, the operating agent of the common structures which would handle the commingled waters

brought there by completely independent water delivery structures.

Actually, the State financial contributions to the cost of construction and operation and maintenance of these common structures will be larger than that of the Federal Government. However, the State yielded to the Federal Government the role of construction and operating agent on the basis that its rights would be protected by a negotiated contract, the essential minimum features of which would be spelled out in a Federal authorizing statute. This brings me to the section 7 problem.

Inasmuch as the State would make the largest contribution to the cost of building and operating the common structures, which are not the whole of either the State or Federal projects, I might add, it was felt necessary to spell out the fact that the joint venture construction without subsidy to the State and the necessary operational commingling of quantities of water would not subject the wholly State financed project to the Federal reclamation law, including but not limited to the acreage limitation phase of the Federal law. Such statutory protection was deemed necessary in spite of the fact that prevailing interpretations of reclamation laws support the same proposition. The necessity arises from these facts:

First. No one can absolutely predict future court decisions.

Second. The State project hinges upon approval and sale of a State bond issue. The lack of explicit protection of the management integrity of the State project might affect the vote on the bond issue, and further, if the bond issue were successful in spite of that adverse effect, could affect the terms of sale and even the general salability of the State bonds. Bond issue lawyers and bond purchasers are notoriously cautious.

Third. The lack of such protection could block State-Federal agreement on a mutually advantageous construction operation.

Fourth. Statutory prohibitive language such as we seek in section 7 would tend to discourage essentially frivolous but costly lawsuits.

Thus section 7 was inserted in the Sisk bill by the author and approved by the House Interior Committee for entirely valid reasons.

Unfortunately, the opposition to this section has come from two sources, and I do not speak ill of them, I merely identify them. Those who feel that the Federal acreage limitation principle should be a part of all water projects and who also feel that all irrigation projects should have a large measure of public subsidy. Their position is implemented in three ways, in order of preference:

First. Securing Federal construction of all large water projects.

Second. Changing State laws to secure absolute conformity to the Federal law.

Third. In the case of the San Luis-Feather River projects, the imposition of Federal law to State water deliveries merely by reason of an arm's length sharing of a common site and common works at that site. This violates all logic and is typical of the attitude that the end justifies the means.

The second group are those who mistakenly feel that section 7 changes the Federal reclamation law. This is not the intent nor the effect of section 7 of the Sisk bill which specifically spells out the fact that the reclamation law applies to all water deliveries financed out of Federal funds. As a matter of fact section 7 itself does this by defining specifically a single class of water deliveries to which Federal law does not apply. Some of these objectors stipulate that the current state of Federal law is identical with the safeguards of section 7, but inexplicably do not want the Congress to state the law. They would abdicate our responsibility and thrust it on some court. Other of these objectors maintain that the current state of the law would subject the State project to the Federal law under the set of facts that we are considering. They view section 7 as an attempt to change the reclamation law. They lack the courage to test their interpretation by offering an amendment spelling their interpretation out in this bill in order that a clear-cut resolution of the justice and strength of their position can be secured in the Congress.

I say let there be light on this issue since the joint features of the Federal San Luis project and the State Feather River project represent a new departure in water cooperation with indicated great savings in cost to the Federal Government. Equity demands that the legislation meet the test of clarity on the issue of whether or not the Federal law applies to a purely State-financed project merely because of a conjunction of construction and use of some features jointly paid for by both. It is my position that section 7 should be retained substantially as it stands. If it needs clarification, let the opponents offer amendments to clarify it. Those opponents of section 7 who feel the Federal law should be applied to the State Feather River project should offer amendments to make such application clear. That would be an act of good faith. Absence of such action is merely an invitation to costly and harassing lawsuits and threats to a California bond issue which in the foreseeable future will greatly reduce demands on our Federal Treasury for California water development.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I commend the gentleman for his statement, and would like to ask him if he would enlarge on the point he has just mentioned, that the salability of the bonds for the State water project would be endangered or certainly be placed in jeopardy by the removal of section 7.

Mr. HAGEN. These bonds are only valuable to the extent that the State can find participants in its State project. A large group of these potential participants are in my district in Kern County and they would not buy any program from the State that involved application of the Federal reclamation law. I understand the same opinion holds in Los Angeles. We must remember that there is more to the Federal reclamation law than merely the acreage limitation. I am certain the city of Los Angeles with respect to its share of the State project do not want the Bureau of Reclamation telling them how to run it.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Is not the gentleman overlooking the fact that the whole purpose of the project is to benefit people and not to benefit the land? I ask the gentleman if he remembers the Ivanhoe case, an identical case in which it was stated by the Supreme Court:

> It is a reasonable classification to limit the amount of project water available to each individual in order that benefits may be distributed in accordance with the greatest good to the greatest number of individuals.
>
> The limitation insures that this enormous expenditure will not go in disproportionate share to a few individuals with large land holdings.

Mr. HAGEN. May I answer in this way. I have supported the principle of acreage limitation and as a consequence some of these large landowners who are my constituents have never supported me. But it is a separate proposition to say that Federal law should apply to waters that are financed purely at the expense of the State of California and its citizens. This is an entirely separate proposition.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I, too, want to commend the gentleman for the statement he has made. I know of the work he has done in this area and I know the gentleman does have an interest in the individual.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Does the gentleman know whether or not the State legislature in the State of California at the present time is exploring the possibility of applying the 160-acre limitation to the State portion of the project, and would the gentleman agree that if they are that that is their prerogative and, certainly, is not the prerogative of the Congress to be the all-seeing eye and to be dictating the laws of each of the several States?

Mr. HAGEN. That is absolutely right. Unless we adopt a philosophy that we are for limitation "come hell or high water," and that the end justifies the means. We legislate for a Federal project, not for the State of California, I hope.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield.

Mr. ULLMAN. Is it not true that if this is redundancy and if, as the gentleman says, this does not change the reclamation law, what is all of the concern about on the part of the landholders?

The gentleman does have large landholders in this area. What is the concern about if it does not change the reclamation law?

Mr. HAGEN. First I want to commend the gentleman from Oregon for his interest in this bill. If you and I were to sit down and write a contract, we would want to cover everything that we felt we needed language on rather than relying on a body of case law which is sometimes hard to find and often ambiguous.

For example if I were leasing your barn I would want to specifically cover the contingency of fire even though perhaps the common law would cover it, but as long as we are writing a contract, why not put it in there. It avoids the possibility of some lawsuit on the basis of the absence of that clause in the contract. Similarly legislators frequently codify an accumulation of legal interpretations in the interests of clarity and avoidance of controversy.

Mr. ULLMAN. Would that not be decided by the Court?

Mr. HAGEN. We should not wait upon that. The Members of this body are not legislating for the State of California with respect to their internal management of water projects and that fact should be clearly stated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] has expired.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the San Luis project, which is being discussed today, is unusual in many respects. First it is unusual in that for the first time in the history of reclamation, which began 58 years ago, a State in the Nation, which is recognized as a reclamation State, has come forward and asked to participate in the project. Up until this time, every time a reclamation project has been presented, every project has been a complete Federal project. Many of these reclamation projects since 1902 have been built in areas where the Federal Government owned all of the land. That brings me to the second point that makes this an unusual project. There is only one area in this section of California where a dam can be built, which will enable not only the area which is known as the Federal area but also the area which has been called a State area, to store water from the northern part of California so that it can be used in this area, and from this area transported south to the area of Los Angeles, through the Tehachapi Mountains to the west coast, and used in the towns in that area of California.

If the State of California, as a result of a bond issue which will be voted upon by the people of that State in this fall's election decides to go ahead, then we find ourselves in the situation that the Federal Government will have absolutely no place to store water and supply much needed water to a Federal area that is entitled by every standard that has been laid down by the Congress since 1902, to have water supplied in a reclamation district.

I want you to notice section 2 of this bill which is unusual, because it contains the provisions directing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the negotiations with the State of California that are necessary before we can proceed with the building of the San Luis project. Section 2 states:

The Secretary—

Meaning the Secretary of the Interior—

is authorized, on behalf of the United States, to negotiate and enter into an agreement with the State of California providing for coordinated operation of the San Luis unit, including the joint-use facilities, in order that the State may, without cost to the United States, deliver water in service areas outside the Federal San Luis unit service area as described in the report of the Department of the Interior, entitled "San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project," dated December 17, 1956. Said agreement shall recite that the liability of the United States thereunder is contingent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out its obligations under the same.

And, mark this well, because if this bill is passed, this is not the last time you will review the San Luis project, because once the agreement is entered into section 2 further provides:

No funds shall be appropriated to commence construction of the San Luis unit under any such agreement, except for the preparation of designs and specifications and other preliminary work, prior to ninety calendar days (which ninety days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) after it has been submitted to the Congress, and then only if neither the House nor the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has disapproved it by committee resolution within said ninety days.

So, if this bill is passed and an agreeable contract is entered into between the Federal Government and the State of California, then it must be brought back to the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for their approval before the Appropriations Committee can authorize any money under this bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my chairman.

Mr. ASPINALL. I want to commend my colleague for bringing this provision to the attention of the Committee. This is an important provision, and as usual, my colleague from Pennsylvania always has a keen insight into important provisions of legislation. I thank him again for bringing this provision to the attention of the Committee.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. GUBSER. I wish the gentleman would correct me if I am wrong in this statement: Is it not true that the gentleman from Pennsylvania now in the well of the House offered an amendment in the committee which stated that Federal reclamation law should apply to the State portion of the project?

Mr. SAYLOR. I did.

Mr. GUBSER. And is it not true that the amendment was rejected by the committee?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. GUBSER. And is it not true that apparently the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs decided that the reclamation law shall not apply to the State portion of the project based upon that vote?

Mr. SAYLOR. Based upon the vote, at least the 160-acre provision should not apply.

To come to the conclusion which the gentleman has done from my one amendment that was defeated I do not see is a justifiable deduction.

Mr. GUBSER. Was I incorrect and should I revise my statement to the extent that the gentleman tried to insert an amendment which would make the 160-acre limitation apply?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. That I did.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. And in addition, the feeling of the majority of the committee was to the effect that Federal law should not be applied to State projects?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAGEN. I have admired the gentleman from Pennsylvania for some time for his knowledge of reclamation law and reclamation projects. I would like to ask the gentleman, is not the worst possible position that could be assumed on this issue a mere striking of section 7? Is it not much more preferable to have the present section in the bill or the section which the gentleman offered in committee?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is a matter of opinion. I would have liked to have seen my amendment in the bill or I would not have offered it.

Mr. Chairman, I have had a number of questions asked me by colleagues on both sides of the aisle as to why I support this project, why I support this project at a time when the amount of money involved is so much and, according to some people, there has not been shown a need for any project, let alone another huge one in California.

Let me give you some good reasons why this bill should be enacted and why this project should be approved.

This is a true reclamation project. Ninety-eight percent of the cost of this project goes to irrigation, and is reimbursable which was the basic purpose of the original act of 1902. No bill covering any reclamation project in the 6 terms I have been a Member of Congress has had such a high proportion of its cost go into the reclamation of land. In view of the fact that some of this land which would be irrigated by the project is already under irrigation, I was interested in finding out what would be the effect of placing this new irrigation

water upon this land, supplementing the pumping that is going on in that area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, every witness who appeared, both from the Department and from the area, testified that the sweet water that comes down from the northern part of California and which will be stored in this dam will if allowed to flow onto the land to be irrigated, instead of raising many of the crops which are now in surplus, it will be possible in this area to convert this territory into a place where it will grow crops and foodstuffs which are in short supply. I think this alone will be a tremendous benefit not only to the State of California but it will be a tremendous benefit to the United States.

Another important feature of what this bill actually does, is extend to the south side of the Central Valley the same benefits which Congress in its wisdom extended to the east side of the Central Valley of California, and to enable the people who live in the south side of the Central Valley area to receive the same benefits that the people who live on the east side of the valley have already received.

The land in this area is just as good and will produce the same kind of crops that are being produced over on the east side of the valley.

It is also interesting to note that the cost-benefit ratio in this project is unusually high. Most of the projects which the Bureau of Reclamation has brought to us in recent years have averaged less than 1.5 to 1.

This project has a better than 2½ to 1 benefit cost ratio. That is one of the highest ratios that this Congress has had presented to it in the last 12 years.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. One of the great challenges, as I see it, confronting our people in the years that lie ahead is the availability of water for drinking and sanitation purposes. Does the gentleman agree that that opinion of mine has substance?

Mr. SAYLOR. It certainly does.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think we have a great challenge within the immediate years ahead; is that not right?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is right. And, I might say to the majority leader that the water problem that confronts the American people is confined not just to the western reclamation States, but it also affects his State and mine here in the East. It is a national problem.

Mr. McCORMACK. Everywhere; it is a national problem. And, I understand, in addition to the other benefits that will flow from this project, that it also covers the field of water available to the communities out there, towns, cities, and so forth, in connection with their future water demands, from the angle of drinking and sanitation and so forth.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. It will make available to the southern part of the State a great supply of fresh water which is now running to waste in the San Francisco Bay.

One of the important things about this bill is that after all of the controversy that has existed over the years, the State and all of the parties to it have gotten together and agreed unanimously upon this bill with the exception of section 7. That is a matter on which the House will have to work its will when the bill is read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

There is another provision in the bill that I would like to call attention to, and that deals with section 8. Section 8 places a limitation upon the amount of money that can be expended for this project. This follows the policy which the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs insisted be placed in each reclamation bill which comes out of that committee. It does, however, have one sentence in it which I am going to offer an amendment to delete, when we get to that stage, and that appears on page 12, lines 19 to 23, which is an open end appropriation for the construction of distribution systems and drains and for operation and maintenance. It is my belief that these features of the bill should be included in a closed contract just as the others are.

Mr. Chairman, I might say that after all of these nice things I have had to say about the project, some may wonder if there is not something that you can complain about. And, I would like to point out to my friends from California that while this is a good project and it is going to cost a lot of money, the Congress has given away or has placed itself in such a position that the Federal Government and the people in that area will have to pay for it completely out of their own pockets. If the committee would have accepted some years ago a provision which would have sold falling water from the Trinity project, which is also a part of the Central Valley, to one of the private utilities that made an offer for it, from that income alone there would have been more than sufficient funds to pay for this project. That was not the will of the members of the committee, and so this is one of the things that Congress will have to face up to in this bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of the legislation now before us, I would like to rise in support of H.R. 7155. First of all, however, I would like to commend my colleague from Colorado, Mr. WAYNE ASPINALL, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and my colleague from Texas, Mr. WALTER ROGERS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, which considered the bill.

The committee examined this bill extensively. It studied the project in the record and on the ground and came up with a sound recommendation for the San Luis project. The wonderful work of the committee members did much toward resolving the many problems so that with one exception, which I personally believe of minor importance, we have a bill we can give our united support.

I thank Chairman ASPINALL and Chairman ROGERS for their fine work.

Looking at the bill itself, Mr. Chairman, we find H.R. 7155 would authorize construction of an outstanding reclamation project. This project would irrigate 480,000 acres of high productive land in the San Joaquin Valley. Much of this land now is irrigated from ground supplies, but the underground pools are being depleted at an extremely rapid pace. Five times more water is being drawn from the ground than is being replaced each year. One city of 6,000 people has become so desperate that it is hauling its domestic water by tank car.

If this goes on much longer, the fine farms of the area will return to dust. The desert will reclaim the land. Certainly in this day when an expanding population demands more and more foodstuffs we do not want that type of reclamation.

The San Luis project will permit proper reclamation, development of the fruit, vegetable and dairy commodities for which there is a substantial demand in the immediate region.

The Bureau of Reclamation predicts that of the 480,000 acres to receive the benefits of this project, 88,000 acres will be in truck crops, 22,000 acres in deciduous fruit and grapes, 66,000 acres in miscellaneous field crops, 88,000 acres in alfalfa, 44,000 acres in irrigated pasture, 132,000 acres in cotton and only 44,000 acres in irrigated grain and grain hay. A substantial amount of the 400,000 acres now under cultivation is in wheat production. The transformation created by the availability of an increased stable supply of good water thus will have an effect on our national wheat surplus problem.

The transformation from wheat and cotton to fruit and similar commodities will mean a gross increase of agricultural production of $35 million a year. All of this will be added to our gross national product for the benefit of the entire Nation. This $35 million will be money not otherwise in circulation and will be spent for automobiles, refrigerators and other appliances, furniture, shoes, clothing, frozen and canned goods from throughout the Nation, homes, and in that way provide more jobs for people throughout the Nation. The transition from the large holdings to the smaller, family type farm also will provide more jobs and more homeowners in the immediate area. This, of course, will bolster and stabilize the economy to the benefit of the entire Nation.

The committee has found the benefit-cost ratio to be feasible economically with a benefit of 2½ to 1.

The project is unique in one way. It is the first Federal reclamation facility constructed in cooperation with a State government. In developing independent water plans, the State and Federal Governments settled on the San Luis site as the only feasible location for a major storage installation. From this came the logical decision that the project should

be developed and used jointly, although each agency would have its own basic collection and distribution system. The Federal Government has developed projects with local agencies for many years in all parts of the Nation.

There is no reason why the Federal Government and States cannot work together, especially when the scope of the projects far exceed the jurisdiction of any single local agency.

There are many flood control, reclamation, and other types of projects involving large areas, even more than one State. These projects could be developed most successfully on a cooperative State-Federal basis.

The San Luis project is a pilot plan for all these developments. I believe the Congress should try this pilot program, especially when committee and bureau feasibility reports indicate it will be so successful.

State participation in this project would save the Federal Government $50 million.

This is another benefit for all the people of the Nation.

Reclamation programs were developed as a program of the people. Here we have a reclamation project which will benefit the people in many ways:

By raising the standard of living of the immediate area, which will have its effect throughout the Nation.

By providing the needed farm commodities for a growing nation.

By adding $35 million a year to our national economy, which means more products and more jobs.

All of this can be achieved at relatively low cost to the people of the Nation, since all of the distribution system costs will be repaid and almost all of the basic project costs will be repaid. The annual benefit-cost ratio is 2½ to 1.

Mr. Chairman, our fine committee has given this matter long and thorough study over the years and in summary had this to say:

On the basis of its extensive consideration and examination of the San Luis project over the past several years, the committee finds that the Federal San Luis unit is physically and economically feasible and a desirable and logical addition to the Federal Central Valley project.

The committee finds that water service to this area is urgently needed to prevent most of the area from returning to desert, and the committee believes that the San Luis unit should be authorized and construction undertaken at the earliest possible date.

The legislation here reported provides a sound basis for joint Federal-State development and use of the San Luis Reservoir site and for an agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and the State with respect to such development. At the same time the legislation provides the means whereby the project can be constructed as an all-Federal development in the event an agreement between the Department and the State is not reached.

I urge you to approve this project. Thank you.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. McFALL].

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7155, the Sisk bill to authorize the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project and to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to its construction and operation.

This proposal represents, in my opinion, the best possible example of Federal-State action in water resources development.

The operation of the Federal San Luis unit would conserve and regulate surplus wintertime water that now wastes into the Pacific Ocean and make it usable, along with additional CVP water from storage, in the water-deficient San Joaquin Valley to the south.

The water made available would provide a supplemental water supply for the irrigation of about 480,000 acres of highly productive land on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley. The unit would also provide some domestic and municipal water as well as important benefits to recreation and to the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife.

At the same time, construction of this Federal unit will allow the development of a State project to serve additional thousands of acres of land badly needing irrigation and will serve as the basis for the transportation of water from north California to south California as is contemplated in the State water plan.

This Federal-State cooperative pattern might well also provide solutions to other water problems throughout the Nation, with resulting savings to the States involved and to the Federal Government.

The joint-use plant of the San Luis Reservoir site, apparently the only adequate and feasible storage site in the area, is the outcome of a situation in which the Federal Government and the State of California found themselves proposing key projects utilizing the same reservoir site. The State's Feather River project plan calls for storage at the San Luis location, as does the Bureau of Reclamation unit of the great Central Valley project.

In spite of the manifest difficulties in drawing up workable legislation to accomplish this joint purpose, the House Interior Committee, through the persistent and knowledgeable leadership of Congressman SISK over the past 4 years, has drawn a bill that can and will do the job.

The San Luis project directly fits the purposes and objectives of our national reclamation policy, and the Secretary of Interior, after full study, has described the project as economically feasible and with a very favorable benefit to cost ratio of 2½ to 1.

The project would be operated under Federal reclamation law, and I would support amendment of the measure under consideration to delete the section 7 provision in this regard, which has been the subject of some considerable discussion and misunderstanding.

The committee report makes it clear that this section is not necessary to carry out the purposes of the bill. Some people feel that the section would alter or modify existing provisions of Federal reclamation law, including the 160-acre limitation. I feel that under these circumstances it is better to leave the Federal law as it is and remove section 7 from this bill. We in California are not seeking any exemptions or favors that are not now available to all other States under general reclamation law. The 160-acre limitation has long since proved its worth in the development of our West.

Because of the lack of a firm water supply, the area to be served by San Luis does not now lend itself to the development of family-sized farms. With a firm supply of good quality water it is expected there will be a big change in the crop pattern and this, together with application of the acreage limitations, will cause the large holdings to be broken up into family-sized farms in the best tradition of American agriculture.

Also it is important to note that the pattern of family size farming in California is toward the nonbasic crops, the speciality crops such as fruits, nuts, and vegetables, which are not a part of our great national agriculture surplus problem. It is estimated that without this project, lands remaining under irrigation from ground units would be devoted to grain and cotton, which you will recognize as two of our problem crops.

The action we take today on this legislation will set the pattern for water and agriculture development in California for the next decade or longer and it may well show the way to other States with similar problems. Our State and our Nation need this project. I earnestly solicit your support of this measure.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McGINLEY].

Mr. McGINLEY. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and as a member of the Nebraska delegation, I am in support of this legislation. As an important addition to the development of the Central Valley project in California, the San Luis portion is unique in many ways. Its arrival here, in bill form, on the floor of the House today is the culmination of many years of discussion, planning, negotiating, and resolving of many diverse and conflicting interests in the State of California, all of which have a legitimate stake in the final agreement that is represented in this legislation.

To me, as a resident of the Platte Valley of Nebraska, one of the most interesting beneficial features of the San Luis project is the anticipated recharge of the underground water supply that will result. The gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] has explained the critical depletion of ground water in the San Joaquin Valley which has been drawn upon for pump irrigation. He says that whereas it once was possible to have efficient wells of the depth of 200 feet, that it is now necessary to install wells having a depth of 1,000 and 2,000 feet. It is unnecessary to elaborate on the obvious cost of the farming operation that must resort to such massive investments in deep-well facilities.

Of course, each of us from our own regions encounter different problems in

the goal of using our water resources to the fullest advantage and efficiency. But I am most interested in this aspect of reclamation project benefits—that of recharging the diminishing groundwater levels in established agricultural areas. Although it is one of the most real benefits, it is unfortunately one of the least measurable from the standpoint of methods used in arriving at a benefit-to-cost ratio.

Maintenance of a stable groundwater reserve is becoming more and more important in farming areas where farmers have made heavy capital expenditures in pump irrigation works. We have recognized this in the Platte Valley of central Nebraska, a rich farming and livestock feeding area, where the Bureau of Reclamation has presented the mid-State project as a means to alleviate the threatening decline in our natural water table.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege as a first-term member of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee to have had a small part in the formulation of this legislation. I congratulate my colleague, Mr. SISK, and the other Members from California who have labored so long to bring the San Luis project closer to reality.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN], I share the general feelings which have been so well expressed that the San Luis project is a good project and should be passed. While I favor the project and urge its passage, I also strongly urge the adoption of an amendment which will be introduced at the appropriate time by the gentleman from Oregon to delete section 7 from the bill.

The basic question, then, Mr. Chairman, is how Federal reclamation law, and specifically the historic and traditional 160-acre limitation, shall apply to a reclamation project, like the proposed San Luis Reservoir, in the construction of which the Federal Government is joined in some part by a State.

Generally, the San Luis bill provides for construction of a major central reservoir just about in the center of our State to store waters gathered in the northern and eastern mountain ranges. From this vital storage basin, water would then be distributed to parched lands in the central, southern, and coastal areas of California.

In the two major valleys in the interior of California, the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, we already have a vast Federal reclamation project—the Central Valley project. Some of the San Luis waters would be used to enlarge the Central Valley project to include valuable acreage now served by deep wells which are drying up. Other San Luis waters would be distributed to southern and coastal areas of the State.

According to the plan envisioned in the San Luis Reservoir bill, H.R. 7155, the Federal Government will build canals to take part of the San Luis water to the new Central Valley project land. The State will build separate canals to carry water to the southern and coastal areas. Now this is the heart of the matter: Those who support section 7 of this bill and argue for its retention propose that the question of how Federal reclamation law shall apply shall be simply solved on the basis that water carried through State-constructed canals is "State project" water and shall not be controlled by Federal reclamation law. Of course, it is all right, they say, for the water distributed from the San Luis Reservoir through Federally constructed canals to be termed "Federal project" water and distributed under the 160-acre limitation and other Federal reclamation law. In short, this bill applies Federal reclamation law simply on the basis of whether the State or the Federal Government distributes the water after it leaves the San Luis Reservoir.

Mr. Chairman, this is a gross oversimplification which blithely overlooks the vast Federal expenditure in the many and extensive dams, powerhouses, canals, and other facilities which will be used in gathering the water which will be stored in the San Luis Reservoir, and fails completely to take into account the vast Federal expenditure which would go into the construction of the San Luis Reservoir itself.

Let us take a closer look. The flow of water into the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, the natural pool from which the San Luis Reservoir would be directly filled, is regulated and controlled by the Shasta Dam, the Keswick Dam, the Nimbus Dam, the Folsom Dam, and others. These are all projects which were constructed with Federal funds. Furthermore, waters en route to San Luis Reservoir would pass through the delta cross-channel, a project constructed with Federal funds. These same waters would be pumped up out of the delta en route to San Luis through the Tracy pumping plant, a project constructed with Federal funds. Finally, San Luis pumping facilities will be activated by power from federally constructed powerplants in the Central Valley project.

Now we get to the San Luis project itself. The immense substructure of the San Luis Reservoir, the deep foundations, and the first story of the dam would be constructed and financed by the Federal Government. On top of this, it is proposed that the State of California build a second story so that it will be possible to store more water. The basic unit would be a Federal project and without this primary Federal investment there would be no reservoir for the State to later expand.

These are the facts: First, Federal structures regulate and control the water which will be gathered at San Luis, and, second, Federal investment will make the San Luis Reservoir possible.

These are the facts which we are asked to ignore when it comes to the question of how Federal reclamation law shall apply. Section 7 of H.R. 7155 would have us ignore the Federal interest in the structures by which water is brought to, and stored at, San Luis and simply divide the water after that point on the basis of whether it is then distributed by the State works or by Federal works and apply Federal reclamation law accordingly.

Federal reclamation law, specifically the Warren Act, bases the application of Federal reclamation law on the question of what facilities the water passes through, not just at one point along the way, but throughout the whole project—not just on the canal through which the water passes from a particular reservoir, but on the dams and canals and reservoirs through which it passes from point of origin to point of use.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment to delete section 7 from H.R. 7155 is intended to do only one thing, namely, remove that section of this bill which predetermines that Federal reclamation law shall be applied on the basis of who carries water from the San Luis Reservoir, the section which completely ignores the extensive Federal interest in San Luis itself and in the vast facilities which will bring that water to the San Luis pool.

Congress cannot ignore that Federal interest. Indeed, the sole job of the Congress in this matter is to jealously protect the Federal interest.

Mr. Chairman, deletion of section 7 of this bill will accomplish two things. Not only will it protect the traditional Federal reclamation law, but it will also assure the passage of this legislation which is so important to the State of California. The other body last year passed the San Luis bill after deleting this same language, and, in doing so, made it clear that a House bill which includes this controversial section will not be acceptable.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Ullman amendment to protect Federal reclamation principles and to assure the passage of this legislation which will create a vital, worthwhile reclamation project much needed in California.

The following letter from Dr. Paul Taylor, professor of economics and chairman of the Institute of International Studies at the University of California in Berkeley, Calif.—a distinguished economist long regarded as an expert on water and land policy—is well worth the careful attention of our colleagues. It is a summary statement of Professor Taylor's views on the San Luis project.

APRIL 6, 1960.

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COHELAN: A proposal is before the House to abandon this Nation's historic policy of distributing the benefits of water widely, rather than reserving them for the few.

Specifically, section 7 of H.R. 7155 (San Luis) proposes to grant waters destined for delivery to a so-called State service area the special privilege of using Federal facilities without observing the Federal excess land law. It has been a practice to defend some past proposals for similar exemption on the ground that few large landholdings were involved in the area, perhaps on an unspoken theory that a violation of public policy is not really a violation if it is small enough. Even that specious plea cannot be made to Congress at San Luis.

The proposal of H.R. 7155 is to exempt, not a handful of large landowners, but an area of perhaps the greatest concentration of landownership of an irrigable area in the United States. In 1947, 34 individuals or corporations, according to reports of the Bureau of Reclamation to Congress, owned close to three-quarters of a million acres "in probable present and future San Joaquin Valley service areas" of water development. None of them owned less than 5,000 acres each. (Senate Public Lands Subcommittee hearings on S. 912, 80th Cong. 1st sess., p. 864.)

In face of this frontal attack on national policy, we need to remind the public that the 160-acre limitation is exceedingly generous to large landowners. If it disappoints them, it is not because reclamation law is not lavish in the benefits it bestows, but because the law places a ceiling on the benefits one individual can receive. The excess land law takes nothing from its beneficiaries except hopes and expectations of gain that Congress has decided are beyond what they can appropriately be permitted to receive. A few simple arithmetic calculations of subsidies on a project adjacent to San Luis can be used to suggest the ceiling, and leave to anyone's judgment whether it is unreasonably low, and a just ground for complaint. In 1957 California Congressmen (ENGLE, MILLER, MOSS, HAGEN, SISK, MCFALL) estimated that the per acre subsidy on Federal Central Valley project, adjacent to San Luis, is $577, or $92,320 for 160 acres; or $184,640 for 320 acres of water allowed to man and wife by current interpretation of the excess land limitation. These estimates are exclusive of flood control subsidies, and exclusive of the privilege accorded to excess landowners of operating their entire acreages, no matter how extensive, with a subsidized water supply for about 10 years prior to sale of the excess holdings. The financial magnitude of this operating privilege has been acknowledged to Congress by a witness unfriendly to any protective limitation whatsoever on the amount of public subsidy to individuals:

"Let us lay the cards on the table with respect to [a particular, named], large landowner. I will give you my own opinion of his willingness to sign the 160-acre limitation. He thinks if he gets water for 10 years on there without having to sell it, he can make enough out of it so he can afford to sell the land at any old price." (Testimony of Harry W. Horton, chief counsel, Imperial Irrigation District, California, hearings before Senate Subcommittee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 85th Cong., 2d sess., on S. 1425, S. 2541, and S. 3448, pp. 87, 88.)

To approve section 7 would be to say that subsidies and gains from public expenditures of these large, not to say vast magnitudes, are too small.

So far as I know, no one has offered any reason why this great concentration of landownership in a California "State service area" should be freed from the compliance with law expected of other landowners. The author of the National Reclamation Act, and other original sponsors of reclamation said they had this very concentration of large holdings in mind when Congress passed the 160-acre water limitation in the first place.

Instead of pointing out characteristics, if any, of this extreme concentration of landownership in the San Luis area, that might support a plea for special treatment, the specious reason is advanced that State law should govern a State-served area. This, of course, is misleading; section 7 is unnecessary to assure that waters delivered to State service areas will be governed by State law. The fact is that Federal law applies at San Luis because these waters use Federal facilities, as the very language of section 7 acknowledges. There is no evidence at all that the owners of vast landholdings in the State service area want State law to apply; on the contrary, they want no acreage limitation law at all, neither Federal nor State.

California has a State law which it adopted, viz, Federal acreage limitation for Federal projects in the State, but a gap in State law leaves the so-called State service area uncovered by the State's policy. Large California landholders seek, not to extend State law in accord with State policy, but to preserve the gap. A recent decision of the California supreme court, on February 29, 1960, declares this identity of Federal and State policy and law on Federal projects in the State. The court said there is no "basic conflict between Federal policy and law on one hand, and State policy and law on the other. * * * The Federal Congress by the passage of section 5 of the Reclamation Act, has determined, lawfully, that the 160-acre limitation, is a basic part of Federal policy. The State legislature has adopted this concept as State policy by specifically authorizing irrigation districts to enter into contracts for project water that contain the 160-acre limitation (Wat. Code, sec. 23195)." (*Ivanhoe Irr. Dist.* v. *All parties* (53 Advance Cal. 718).)

California policy adverse to large landholdings is even older than Federal-State reclamation legislation. The State constitution contains a 320-acre limitation on grants of State lands (art. XVII, secs. 2 and 3); and the convention debates show that article XVII was adopted largely in protest against concentration of landownership in the very State service area for which section 7 now seeks an exemption from Federal law. Interpreting article XVII, the California Supreme Court has said:

"It must be manifest that all lands within this State should, so far as governmental action could accomplish it without violating private rights, be held in small tracts and constitute homes for its owners" (*Fulton* v. *Brannan* (88 Cal. 454, 455)).

There is no evidence, however, that the California Legislature intends to close the gap in State law in order to achieve State policy on the San Luis "State service area." On the contrary, the legislature has defeated attempts to close the gap in 1957 and again in 1959. There is no evidence that the legislature will do differently in the future. On the contrary, a leading association in California with spokesmen for very large landholdings on its directorate appears confident that the legislature can be relied upon not to bring State law into line with State policy. As recently as February 12, 1960, the Feather River Project Association opposed Federal construction of San Luis joint-use facilities if Congress rejects the exemption proposed by section 7, and proposes turning construction over to the State. Of course, the people of the State may not approve this proposal to help large landholders escape from public policy.

The Feather River Project Association joins others who have been saying to Congress, "It is essential to the State water development program that State laws apply to its water service areas" (FRPA Newsletter, Feb. 29, 1960). There is no State law, and most of those who insist on section 7 do not want any State law. The appeal to demolish existing Federal law in order to make way for an alleged State law appears to resemble an invitation to Congress to permit itself to be led by the hand into a dark cellar at midnight, searching for a black cat that isn't there.

At this time no one can even be certain how much of a State water project there will be. California voters will not decide prior to November 1960 whether they approve a general obligation bond issue in the amount of $1.75 billion to start financing a program. Opposition to these bonds is strong, and for many reasons. The California Federation of Labor, in the absence of policy protection at least equal in strength to the Federal 160-acre limitation, is among the organizations that oppose the issue.

If California should decide to put up money for a State program, is even that a reason why Congress should scrap a good Federal policy? The 160-acre protection was written for the benefit of the many in every State, including California, and not for the few. Congress has rejected proposals to sell policy in exchange for money before this. The 57th Congress, facing this question, said "No." It specifically repudiated "commutation" of policy for money in framing the original act of 1902 because it knew how seriously cash purchases of land had damaged the policy of the homestead law (sec. 3, 38 Stat. 389; Paul W. Gates, "Homestead Law in an Incongruous Land System," 41 Am. Hist. Rev. 655, 656).

You will appreciate, surely, that I am not speaking of conscious purposes of congressional sponsors of section 7, H.R. 7155, but rather of the natural and probable damage to policy that would result if Congress should take the action they propose. The damage was described as intentional on the part of excess-land owners as long ago as 1944, before the present sponsors were Members of the Congress, when a national magazine forecast that large landowners in Central Valley would seek to make use of the State of California as a means of escape from acreage limitation. "Another proposal," it wrote, "said to have originated among the big landowners of Fresno County, is for the State of California to take over the Central Valley project, paying the entire bill." (Business Week, May 13, 1944, p. 24.) Section 7 of H.R. 7155 and the resolution of the Feather River Project Association on February 12, 1960, appear to harmonize with this forecast.

The 160-acre limitation of 1902 was an expression in reclamation law of a principle embodied even earlier in homestead and preemption land laws, favoring widespread ownership of property rather than concentration. Widespread ownership was believed to be favorable, if not necessary to government by the people. Speaking in 1820 at the bicentennial of the landing of the Pilgrims, Daniel Webster said:

"Their situation demanded a parceling out and division of the lands; and it may be said fairly that this necessary act fixed the future frame and form of their Government. The character of their political institutions was determined by the fundamental laws respecting property. * * * The consequence of all these causes has been a great subdivision of the soil, and a great equality of condition; the true basis most certainly of popular government." (Webster, discourse delivered at Plymouth, Dec. 22, 1820. In commemoration of the first settlement in New England 53–54 (3d ed. 1825).)

Is widespread ownership of land by families outmoded? No American political party has said so yet. No studies of agricultural production indicate that family farms of sizes permitted by acreage limitation are inefficient. During the recent visit to this country of Mr. Khrushchev, the name of a distinguished Member of the House was appended to a vigorous letter published in the Washington Post, saying:

"I would inform Mr. Khrushchev, if he does not now know it, that the independent family farm was the foundation upon which America's free enterprise economy was constructed" (Sept. 18, 1959, p. A12).

Section 7 is an attack on the family farm, and on small business, too. Some years ago, about the time when Congress was rejecting proposals similar to section 7, made by former Congressman Alfred Elliott and by former Senators Sheridan Downey and William Knowland (H.R. 3961, sec. 4, 78th Cong.; S. 912, 80th Cong.), a study was made com-

paring the effect of family-size and large-scale farming, respectively, on small business in Central Valley, Calif. The Senate Small Business Committee published the results in 1946 under the title "Small Business and the Community: A Study in Central Valley of California on Effects of Scale of Farm Operations." (Report of the Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business, U.S. Senate, 79th Cong., pursuant to S. Res. 28, committee print No. 13, Dec. 23, 1946.) On page 5 that report says:

"Certain conclusions are particularly significant to the small businessman, and to an understanding of the importance of his place in a community. Not only does the small farm itself constitute small business, but it supports flourishing small commercial business.

"Analysis of the business conditions in the communities of Arvin and Dinuba shows that—

"(1) The small farm community supported 62 separate business establishments, to but 35 in the large-farm community; a ratio in favor of the small-farm community of nearly 2:1.

"(2) The volume of retail trade in the small-farm community during the 12-month period analyzed was $4,383,000 as against only $2,535,000 in the large-farm community. Retail trade in the small-farm community was greater by 61 percent. (See figure and table, pp. 83 and 84.)

"(3) The expenditure for household supplies and building equipment was over three times as great in the small-farm community as it was in the large-farm community.

"The investigation disclosed other vast differences in the economic and social life of the two communities, and affords strong support for the belief that small farms provide the basis for a richer community life and a greater sum of those values for which America stands, than do industrialized farms of the usual type."

Introducing the Arvin-Dinuba study, the chairman of the Senate committee said:

"The bearing on the American way of life which is all-important to all of us who seek to see the virility of this Nation go on unimpaired, is at once apparent. I submit this study to the Senate Small Business Committee, to the United States Senate, and the citizens of this country, feeling that it further indicates the importance of independent small-scale business as the cornerstone of our American economic system of free enterprise."

It is surprising that the attempt to escape from a policy so fundamental, while accepting benefits from generous public appropriations, could have advanced so far. Last May, a Senator described the Senate measure companion to section 7 of H.R. 7155 as a proposal for "one of the greatest land steals in the history of this Nation." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 6, p. 7849.)

If Daniel Webster knew the dangers of concentrated landownership in 1820, and Abraham Lincoln knew them in 1862 when he signed the Homestead Act, Theodore Roosevelt knew them also when he inspired the 160-acre limitation in the Reclamation Act he signed in 1902. A few years afterwards, when in San Francisco, he told the Commonwealth Club of California:

"Now I have struck the crux of my appeal [for the excess land law]. I wish to save the very wealthy men of this country and their advocates and upholders from the ruin that they would bring upon themselves if they were permitted to have their way. It is because I am against revolution; it is because I am against the doctrines of the extremists, of the Socialists; it is because I wish to see this country of ours continued as a genuine democracy; it is because I distrust violence and disbelieve in it; it is because I wish to secure this country against ever seeing a time when the 'have-nots' shall rise against the 'haves'; it is because I wish to secure for our children and our grandchildren and for their children's children the same freedom of opportunity, the same peace and order and justice that we have had in the past." (7 Transactions of the Commonwealth Club 108 (1912–13).)

Today, more even than a domestic issue of internal stability is raised by section 7. At stake, also, is the image of ourselves as a Nation that we wish to project to the world. Eight years ago Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, wrote to a Secretary of the Interior:

"The great landowners of the Kings River and Tulare Lake area apparently have not hesitated to seek public appropriations for their own benefit while deferring and possibly defying compliance with a law they should be proud to support. The President, on the other hand, has wisely declared maintenance of the family farm to be our national policy at home and abroad. Land reform has become one of our main instruments for stopping the spread of international communism and maintaining our national security. * * * Whatever we do on Kings River, therefore, will be subjected to the most searching examination of all who realize that our policy must now meet the test in our own country as well as in foreign lands." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 98, pt. 7, p. 9181.)

Why should Congress allow itself to be persuaded now at San Luis, Calif., to nullify the policy and law it enacted for the benefit of the entire Nation, including California?

Sincerely yours,

PAUL S. TAYLOR.

I also wish to add one further insertion, Mr. Chairman, which is a detailed statement explaining the views on this legislation of the California State Labor Federation, AFL–CIO:

STATEMENT BY CALIFORNIA STATE LABOR FEDERATION, AFL–CIO

The California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO, is deeply concerned by what appears to be a three-pronged attack in Sacramento and Washington to thwart the aims of Federal water policy and allow future irrigation projects in California to fall under the control of the the few corporate absentee owners who hold huge tracts of land in the San Joaquin Valley.

This three-pronged attack is manifested in the following:

1. The San Luis legislation now being considered by the House Rules Committee.

2. The irrigation repayment contract which Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton has recently offered to districts in the Pine Flat service area.

3. Water legislation passed by the California State Legislature.

These three drives are not necessarily coordinated, but, significantly, each of them would serve the same end: Monopolization of irrigation water furnished by public moneys.

SAN LUIS LEGISLATION

On April 24, 1959, this organization mailed to all Members of Congress an analysis (enclosed) of the San Luis bills. Since that time, one of the bills, S. 44, has been passed by the Senate with one of the key amendments suggested in our earlier statement (deletion of section 6a). Meanwhile, H.R. 7155 has cleared the House Interior Committee, and is now in the Rules Committee. H.R. 7155 is virtually the same bill as H.R. 5687 which is analyzed in our enclosed statement. The most objectionable feature which appeared as section 6 in H.R. 5687 shows up in H.R. 7155 as section 7.

We were pleased to discover that some of the objectionable language in section 3h has been removed, but that sections 3f and 3g have not been improved.

Without repeating the substance of our previous statement, we would like to emphasize that none of the language to which we have objected is necessary in this bill. The bill is complete without it, the legal framework for a cooperative State-Federal project already exists in present Federal reclamation law and, finally, the inclusion of this language can only serve to confuse and confound existing law to the sole advantage of the larger landowners, some of whom right now are on the verge of evading the aims of reclamation law in Pine Flat service area.

PINE FLAT SERVICE AREA

Secretary of Interior Fred Seaton has recently offered to the local districts receiving irrigation water from Pine Flat Dam repayment contracts which would allow them to sidestep compliance with the so-called 160-acre limitation (actually the 320-acre plus limitation) by prepaying the charges allocated for irrigation, but not, of course, all the charges involved.

In offering to exchange policy for cash by this prepayment doctrine, Secretary Seaton relies on an obtuse interpretation of reclamation law. But he fails to recognize that:

1. This interpretation runs counter to the strongly expressed legislative intent of the law. The framers of reclamation law planned to erect a permanent barrier against water monopoly. One that is not for sale.

2. On two occasions (in 1950 and 1951) legislation was introduced to permit the type of Pine Flat contracts Seaton is now proposing. Congress did not pass on either bill, so Secretary Seaton in 1959 is acting without legislative authority and in contradiction to the intent of the law which is supposedly designed to insure widespread distribution of the economic benefits of public financed water projects.

About 25 percent of the 1 million acres in the Pine Flat service area is excess land—land which should not receive water from Pine Flat unless the owners agree to abide by the acreage limitation. Incidentally, the dam has been completed for 5 years, and for 5 years the irrigation water furnished therefrom has been distributed with total disregard for the so-called 160-acre limitation. All the while, the large landowners have bickered over contract terms.

The pattern of land holdings in this area breaks down like this: Some 5,900 owners hold no excess land (no more than 160 acres per owner) while a mere 52 farmers own 196,466 excess acres.

In the Federal service area of the San Luis project, 66 owners hold about 70 percent of the project's 450,000 acres.

The Pine Flat and San Luis situations are closely related for two reasons:

1. The interpretation of the law which Seaton falls back on at Pine Flat is the same as one of the arguments which supporters of the San Luis legislation are using to buttress their claim that the Federal law cannot be applied to the alleged State part of the project. They say the State will be paying its share of the project as construction proceeds, therefore, the prepayment doctrine, which would free water from regulation once allocated charges are paid, in this case would free State water from regulation.

Supporters of H.R. 7155 also argue that the alleged State part of the project is a separate venture. Of course, if this were strictly true, the Federal law could not apply. But the very fact that these advocates find it necessary to include special exemptions in their bill and the fact that they rely so heavily on Seaton's unsubstantiated interpretation (see House report, pp. 11–16) seems to indicate that even they have some grave doubts about the existence of any separate State project.

This conclusion seems inescapable: The special language in San Luis legislation and

Seaton's ruling on Pine Flat are desired by certain interests to evade application of Federal reclamation law as concerns Federal facilities. We appreciate the fact that some of those supporting H.R. 7155 have accepted the questionable language as the price they must pay to gain support from certain interests in California. We do not doubt the sincerity of these men, but we cannot accept their assurances, and we do not believe that the whole framework of future California water development should be lashed to their political commitments.

2. The Pine Flat and San Luis situations are also closely related because many of the same corporate interests who hold huge acreages in the Pine Flat service area also have giant holdings in both the State and Federal service areas of the San Luis project which is right next door. If these interests will negotiate and stall on Pine Flat to avoid the law—as they successfully have—we certainly can expect they will resort to the same tactics on San Luis. The language of the San Luis legislation should be direct and minimal, not devious and rambling. It should be such that all reasonable men who understand reclamation law are not at odds as to just what every sentence means.

STATE WATER LEGISLATION

Some supporters of H.R. 7155 are taking a "let George do it" attitude in regard to antimonopoly and antispeculation controls. Rather than assert Federal authority, they apparently maintain the fiction of an independent State project, succumb to the lure of States rights, and design language which limits, and in part repeals Federal authority.

We are told that the provisions in the San Luis bill for State participation relate to an entirely independent project, and that the Federal Government cannot enforce its regulations. We do not know of any lateral barrier being planned in the San Luis Dam that will separate Federal water from State water, and prevent the latter from touching Federal concrete. On the contrary, it is our understanding that water for Federal deliveries is to be pumped to the San Luis Dam in the winter, and that as this water is used for irrigation in the summer, the State would have direct planned use of the federally financed portion of the dam. Again we note that the supporters of H.R. 7155, who hold to the States rights point of view, find that to maintain this position, they must write special provisions into the Federal bill to make sure the Federal law will not apply to a State project.

The full significance of this argument is revealed by the action—or more accurately the inaction—of the California Legislature.

The history of the California Legislature is consistent in efforts of the body to evade the application of Federal reclamation law to California projects. This history dates back to the period when the Federal Government assumed the responsibility for construction of the Central Valley project, and specifically to 1944, when the legislature adopted a resolution memorializing Congress to adopt the Elliott rider to the Rivers and Harbors Act, designed to remove the application of the excess lands law to the Central Valley project (SJR 1, filed with the secretary of state, June 15, 1944, ch. 24, statutes of California, 4th extra session of the 55th legislature.)

In the failure of the California Legislature to secure exemptions for monopoly landholders in Federal law, it has nevertheless left the door open for these monopoly forces to use the State as a vehicle for undoing Federal reclamation law.

This year several important water measures were passed by the California Legislature. None of them, however, contained any type of acreage limitation or public power preference. The most important measure was the passage of S. 1106, the Governor's $1.75 billion bond issue program, which will be submitted to the voters next fall. Unsuccessful efforts were made in both houses of the California Legislature to incorporate antimonopoly protections. The amendments were not supported by the State administration or the sponsors of the bill. During debates, claims were made that this was not the time to consider protections against enrichment and monopolization of benefits. A later date was suggested—some vague later date before water delivery. Those of us familiar with the evasions at Pine Flat Dam and the history of the Central Valley project generally, find it difficult to be convinced by such vague assurances.

Further, we are not unmindful of the decision of the California Supreme Court which upheld the efforts of monopolists in this State to undo reclamation law. While the U.S. Supreme Court reversed the State court decision in the application of the 160-acre limitation in the Central Valley project, there is no assurance that anything short of a State constitutional amendment, requiring two-thirds vote in the legislature, would prevent the invalidation of a State acreage limitation.

In summary, therefore, when we add up the questionable language in H.R. 1755, the machinations at Pine Flat Dam and the aloofness of the State legislature, we see a major threat to Federal water policy, dire consequences for working people, small farmers and small businessmen, and an erosion of independent economic political action in the great Central Valley of California.

We are taking this opportunity, therefore, to respectfully urge Congress to (1) amend H.R. 7155 along the lines suggested by the enclosed statement previously submitted to Congress, and (2) protest Secretary of Interior Seaton's proposed contracts for evasion of reclamation law in the service area of Pine Flat Dam.

California is truly at the crossroads in the development of its water and power resources. The decisions immediately before Congress will give direction to the future growth of California for years to come. We in California labor place our trust in the men of vision and integrity who are our elected representatives, to make the decisions which will insure the development of California's water and power resources in a manner consistent with the widest possible distribution of the benefits of such development.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7155 as reported by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The San Luis Dam is a vital link in the California water plan and I deem it of vital importance that the bill be speedily enacted into law.

I am in agreement with the committee action in setting forth, in section 7, that Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to an area served by a State water facility.

Section 7 does not change the Federal reclamation laws. It merely attempts to state in clear, unmistakable language that just because there would be joint Federal-State use of a common water storing facility, that such a situation for no reason gives rise to a right to impose Federal law on the State part of such facility.

The Congress in my view would not be fulfilling its duty if it failed to provide this expression of policy for the guidance of the Federal Government, the State of California, the courts, and others, in any future decision that may be given or negotiations that will take place concerning this unique joint facility.

To fail to do so on the part of the Congress could cause unreasonable and unnecessary delay and confusion in putting this facility into use and in any decisions that may need to be made concerning the relative rights in regard to the project.

I wish to again strongly urge the House of Representatives to approve H.R. 7155 as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, in supporting H.R. 7155, as introduced by Congressman SISK, I should like to stress that the San Luis Dam and Reservoir is not just another worthwhile project in my State; it is central and necessary to the sound development of California's vast water program which stretches from the Siskiyou Mountains on the north to the Mexican border on the south.

As I am sure you all appreciate, California's water problems have become more complicated and critical as its population has skyrocketed. The State's population now is more than 15 million and that figure is being increased daily by thousands. In something like 8 or 9 years, California, beyond doubt, will be the most populous State of the Union.

Time, therefore, is an increasingly important factor in our water situation.

As some of you know, the big difficulty waterwise in my State is that about two-thirds of its water resources are in the northern half of the State, where only one-third of the arable land lies, and about two-thirds of the arable land lies in the southern half of the State, which enjoys only one-third of the water resources.

The operation of the Federal San Luis unit would conserve and regulate surplus wintertime water now wasting away down the Sacramento River to the Pacific Ocean and make it usable, along with additional Central Valley project water from storage, in the water-deficient San Joaquin Valley to the south.

Water thus made available would provide a supplemental supply for the irrigation of about 480,000 acres of fabulously rich land on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley. It would also give some sorely needed domestic and municipal water to towns in this area, as well as providing important benefits to recreation and to the propagation of fish and wildlife.

As far as they serve the Federal San Luis service area, this project's works would be integrated physically and financially with other features of the

great Central Valley project to help move the rain from north to south in California.

By any rule the San Luis project, with a benefit cost ratio of 2.5 to 1 is an outstanding reclamation project. Not only will it save more than 400,000 acres of land from reverting to desert, but it will contribute many millions of dollars annually in net crop earnings to the Nation's economy, with which to buy the goods, services and products of other States.

In this connection, I might point out that the total gross farm income from the San Luis area is $75 million annually. Thus, it seems obvious that construction of San Luis would mean more markets and more jobs for many more people than are presently employed in this area. On the other hand, failure to build it would result in a large annual loss to the Nation's economy.

For several years, preparation of satisfactory San Luis legislation has been complicated by the fact that the development involves joint use by the Federal Government and the State of California of the proposed San Luis Reservoir and certain other project facilities. The joint use plan, provided for in Mr. SISK's bill, is the outcome of a situation in which both the Federal Government and the State found themselves proposing projects utilizing the same reservoir site. That is to say, California's $1.75 billion Feather River project calls for storage at the San Luis site and so does the Bureau of Reclamation's plan for the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project. The engineers seem to be in agreement on the fact that the San Luis Reservoir site appears to be the only adequate and feasible storage site in the area.

H.R. 7155 provides a new concept for Federal-State cooperation in water conservation. It is not hard to understand, therefore, the concern that has been expressed by some individuals and groups lest the large land owners in the San Luis service area might in some way be exempt from the land limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation laws.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House gave careful consideration to all the views and comments it received along this line and amended the bill in several respects. The committee has announced that it wishes to make it unmistakably clear that the Sisk bill as reported requires the operation of the Federal San Luis unit under Federal reclamation law, including the excess land provisions thereof, and that there is no way the large landowners in the Federal San Luis service area can avoid compliance with such provisions.

Section 7 of this bill provides that the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to areas served by the State of California. It is my conviction that section 7 should never have been put into the bill inasmuch as it does not in any way change the law as it is presently written, and only raises issues which tend to cloud the more important aspects of the legislation.

Since I view the section as unnecessary and without point, I support the San Luis legislation without section 7.

If, however, a move to strike section 7 is defeated, I shall support the measure with the section included.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER].

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the principal purpose of furnishing water for the irrigation of approximately five hundred thousand acres of land in Merced, Fresno, and Kings Counties, California, hereinafter referred to as the Federal San Luis unit service area, and as incidents thereto of furnishing water for municipal and domestic use and providing recreation and fish and wildlife benefits, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the San Luis unit as an integral part of the Central Valley project. The principal engineering features of said unit shall be a dam and reservoir at or near the San Luis site, a forebay and afterbay, the San Luis Canal, the Pleasant Valley Canal, and necessary pumping plants, distribution systems, drains, channels, levees, flood works, and related facilities, but no facilities shall be constructed for electric transmission or distribution service which the Secretary determines, on the basis of an offer of a firm fifty-year contract from a local public or private agency, can through such contract be obtained at less cost to the Federal Government than by construction and operation of government facilities. The works (hereinafter referred to as joint-use facilities) for joint use with the State of California (hereinafter referred to as the State) shall be the dam and reservoir at or near the San Luis site, forebay and afterbay, pumping plants, and the San Luis Canal. The joint-use facilities consisting of the dam and reservoir shall be constructed, and other joint-use facilities may be constructed, so as to permit future expansion; or the joint-use facilities shall be constructed initially to the capacities necessary to serve both the Federal San Luis unit service area and the State's service area, as hereinafter provided. In constructing, operating, and maintaining the San Luis unit, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto). Construction of the San Luis unit shall not be commenced until the Secretary has (1) secured, or has satisfactory assurance of his ability to secure, all rights to the use of water which are necessary to carry out the purposes of the unit and the terms and conditions of this Act, and (2) received satisfactory assurance from the State of California that it will make provision for a master drainage outlet and disposal channel for the San Joaquin Valley, as generally outlined in the California water plan, Bulletin Numbered 3, of the California Department of Water Resources, which will adequately serve, by connection therewith, the drainage system for the San Luis unit or has made provision for constructing the San Luis interceptor drain to the delta designed to meet the drainage requirements of the San Luis unit as generally outlined in the report of the Department of the Interior, entitled "San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project," dated December 17, 1956.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7155) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, along with a number of colleagues I was not present for the session on Monday, May 2, 1960, because of the assurances that many of us had received that, due to the Indiana primary on May 3, there would be no RECORD votes.

Because of circumstances with which we are all now familiar, there were RECORD votes on May 2 and many Members, including myself, were not present.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to announce that, had I been present on May 2, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 62, on the passage of H.R. 10596, legislation to change the method of payment of Federal aid to State or territorial homes for disabled veterans of the United States. This bill was passed by a vote of 265 to 0, with 165 Members not voting.

I should also like to announce that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 63, on the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 633, a resolution expressing the hope of Congress that the President "pursue energetically" at the summit conference the restoration of fundamental freedoms and basic rights to the people of the captive nations of Eastern and Central Europe. This resolution was passed by a vote of 276 to 0, with 154 Members not voting.

NATIONAL MILK SANITATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have been working for the past 4 years on ways of eliminating the

use of sanitary regulations as trade barriers against the free flow of high quality milk from State to State.

During the 85th Congress, I introduced a bill aimed at this objective. Hearings were held on this measure in 1958 by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and the testimony at those hearings proved very useful in pointing out some of the weak spots in the proposed legislation. Before submitting my new national milk sanitation bill, H.R. 3840, I consulted with public health officials to iron out those difficulties.

H.R. 3840, which is identical to S. 988, follows the recommendations of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers. As the name implies, this association is composed of the chief health officials in each State and territory. In 1957, the association set up a committee to study the matter of Federal milk sanitation legislation, and, a year later, issued an official report titled "Need and Recommended Principles for Federal Milk Sanitation Legislation."

This report states:

> The association believes that there is need to strongly reaffirm that the sanitary control of fluid milk and fluid milk products is a public health matter which is primarily the responsibility of State and local governments, except where interstate commerce is involved.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3840 and S. 988 are in full agreement with the principle set forth by the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers. This legislation seeks only to provide unrestricted interstate markets for milk of the highest sanitary quality by eliminating the use of capricious and arbitrary pseudo-health regulations to keep high quality milk out of monopolized local markets.

Being a public health and general welfare measure, national milk sanitation legislation has drawn bipartisan support. In the House, 9 other Democrats and 10 Republicans have joined me in introducing the bill. On the Senate side, the measure is being sponsored by Senators HUMPHREY and MCCARTHY of Minnesota and Senators PROXMIRE and WILEY of my home State of Wisconsin.

Under the provisions of the proposed milk sanitation legislation, a Federal Milk Sanitation Code which would be at least the equivalent of the U.S. Public Health Service's proven milk ordinance and code would become the quality yardstick for milk shipped in interstate trade. Fluid milk and fluid milk products meeting the standards of this Federal milk code could not be kept out of interstate trade because of varying local health rules.

Mr. Speaker, the measure would provide an effective means of eliminating barriers to the interstate shipment of high-quality milk resulting from unduly restrictive sanitation regulations and differing inspection requirements. This would be accomplished without displacing the existing local systems. The force of Federal law would be applied only where health regulations or enforcement practices are being used to unnecessarily obstruct the interstate marketing of wholesome milk of high sanitary quality.

At the same time, the States and municipalities would retain the right to inspect the interstate milk upon arrival to make sure it had not deteriorated in transit. From there on, the handling, processing and sale of the interstate milk would have to meet the requirements applied to milk entering the market from sources inside the State. Since the bill does not contain an "affects interstate commerce" clause, the measure would not deprive States and local communities of the right to exercise full sanitary control over their intrastate milk supplies.

National milk sanitation legislation would utilize, subject to U.S. Public Health Service checks, the existing system of State and local milk sanitation services for supervision, inspection, laboratory control, rating, and certification of interstate milk supplies. A minimum of Federal expenditure would be required to monitor certifications made by the States and to support certain other services such as training, research, and development of standards.

Mr. Speaker, some critics of national milk sanitation legislation have advanced the theory that it would be detrimental to the quality of the milk sold in their markets. These critics reason that the Federal standards to be established under the bill might not be adequate to protect the health of their citizens.

The bill provides that the Federal standards shall be at least the equivalent of the high health standards now contained in the Milk Ordinance and Code recommended by the U.S. Public Health Service—which is the watchdog of our public health. At the present time, 36 States and some 1,900 local jurisdictions have voluntarily adopted this model milk code or one based on its provisions. Some 75 million people drink milk produced under conditions spelled out by the U.S. Milk Code. In addition, it is used as the quality standard for milk purchased by our Armed Forces. Surely a body of health regulations in such general use cannot be notably deficient in providing for adequate health protection of our citizens.

On April 26, 27, and 28, the Health and Science Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held hearings on my H.R. 3840 and the milk sanitation bills introduced by 19 of my colleagues. We received favorable support from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Department of Commerce; the Bureau of the Budget; the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers; the National Consumers League; the General Federation of Women's Clubs; the Connecticut Milk Consumers Association; State boards of health; dairy equipment manufacturers; and many farm and dairy groups.

Mr. Speaker, in contrast to the wide range of persons and groups who appeared in support of the measure, the opposition was limited mainly to representatives of eastern fluid milk producer groups, farm groups from the same area, and a few State departments of agriculture. In going over their testimony, I found that 16 objections to the legislation are mentioned most frequently. I have gone over these 16 objections with experts in the general field of milk sanitation, and at this time, I would like to answer the objections point by point. They are as follows:

Objection 1: There is not enough evidence to show that health regulations have been unduly restrictive.

Answer: Considerable evidence indicates that on numerous occasions the sanitation or health requirements of a local milkshed have been used to keep out milk from another area. The U.S. Public Health Service has compiled such evidence, as has the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The experience of numerous milk cooperatives and milk plants shows that health regulations in truth have been, and are being used as trade barriers. This usually occurs during the time of the year when a surplus of milk exists in the locality. At times when there is a shortage of milk in the same locality, no questions are raised about the quality of milk shipped in from another State.

Frequently these out-of-State milk supplies are prevented from entering a local market by verbal interpretation of existing laws or regulations. This makes it difficult for out-of-State firms to appeal such a decision through the courts.

Objection 2: Such a law would lower the milk sanitation standards in receiving areas.

Answer: A comparison was recently made between the Milk Ordinance and Code recommended by the U.S. Public Health Service and the milk sanitation laws and regulations of some of the States which do not follow the Public Health Service's regulations. This comparison of milk sanitation standards revealed that these States either failed to cover many sanitation items of significant public health importance, or else referred to these items in general terms rather than in specific terms contained in the Public Health Service's Milk Ordinance and Code.

This code has been tried and proven over the years throughout the United States. A 90 percent compliance with the provisions of the code, as is required by this bill, would produce the highest quality milk, the safety of which would be above question.

Objection 3: The provisions of this bill would deprive States and municipalities of their police powers over milk sanitation and so would violate States' rights.

Answer: The Federal Government has the right to control interstate commerce, and this bill deals only with the interstate shipment of milk. The measure does not deprive the receiving State or municipality of the right to exercise its police power, inasmuch as section 808(b)(1) of the bill gives the receiving jurisdiction the right to subject the milk upon arrival to laboratory or screening tests. If the milk fails to comply with bacterial counts, temperature, and composition standards and other criteria of the Federal Milk Code, the receiving jurisdiction retains the power to reject the milk.

Objection 4: The Federal Government would force States and municipalities to accept milk inspected by other States and municipalities.

Answer: As I have pointed out in the answer to objection 3, the receiving States or municipality would still have the right to reject milk from another area if such milk, when checked upon arrival, did not meet the prescribed standards. I can see no public health reason why one State would object to receiving milk from another State if the milk was of the same or higher quality than that produced in the receiving area. If the State does object to receiving high quality milk from another State, then the objecting State is obviously misusing its health regulations as trade barriers.

Objection 5: The bill would provide for no uniformity of rating.

Answer: The measure authorizes the Surgeon General to establish regulations for the purpose of rating, certification and listing of interstate milk shippers. He would also approve a State plan to provide for reliable ratings; train State and local personnel; and cooperate with State milk sanitation authorities in the development of improved programs for the control of the sanitary quality of milk.

Under this authorization, frequent spot checks would be made of listed shippers; in-service training programs would be conducted for State milk sanitation rating officers; and field observations would be made of State program activities. All of this will enable the Public Health Service to attain a high degree of uniformity among the various State personnel making milk sanitation ratings.

Objection 6: National milk sanitation legislation would nullify the effect of Federal milk marketing orders.

Answer: H.R. 3840 and S. 988 would have no effect on the Federal milk marketing orders issued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, as these bills are not designed to affect or control or adjust the prices paid for milk.

Objection 7: The bill would require Federal inspection which would duplicate work already being carried out by local authorities.

Answer: This measure clearly states that routine inspection of milk supplies would be made by local authorities, and that the rating of these supplies would be made by the State rating survey officials. This same arrangement is now being successfully carried out under the voluntary interstate milk shippers program. Thus, there would be no duplication of inspection efforts. However, spot checks would be made by the Surgeon General for the purpose of checking on the quality of the local inspection services and the adequacy of the State certifying methods and rating officials.

Objection 8: In reality, this bill is an economic one traveling under the guise of a health bill.

Answer: Actually, the shoe is on the other foot. The States and municipalities which refuse to accept high-quality milk from other areas are utilizing health regulations to achieve the economic advantage of a monopoly on the milk market. The purpose of this bill is to prevent the unwarranted use of sanitary regulations for economic gain. Health rules should be used only to protect the public health, not for the protection of local monopolies.

Objection 9: If a plant were being discriminated against by a local health authority, the plant would be able to get relief through the courts under the present rules and regulations without the need of a National Milk Sanitation Act.

Answer: It is true that many milk plants have won court cases against restrictive local rules and regulations hindering the movement of milk in interstate commerce. However, taking a case of this kind to court is time consuming and expensive. Therefore, many plants prefer to seek a market elsewhere rather than put up with the long delays and expense involved in fighting a local restrictive ordinance. This bill would provide relief for many of these areas and permit the sale of high-quality milk wherever there is a need for additional milk.

Objection 10: The bill would give a State the power of determining whether or not its own milk supply is fit for shipment and consumption in interstate commerce.

Answer: While the State of origin would make the rating of the milk, the State inspectors would have to apply the Federal Milk Code in doing the rating. Before the milk for interstate shipment could be certified, it would have to achieve a 90-percent compliance with the provisions of that code. The entire program would be under the watchful eye of the Surgeon General. He would insure the integrity and reliability of the program through approval of the State rating plans; training and certification of State rating officers; spot checks of the plants and their milk supply to verify the compliance ratings; and exclusions or removal of a plant from the list of certified shippers if he finds the plant is not entitled to certification.

Objection 11: Such a measure would create a new Federal bureaucracy at high cost with no good purpose.

Answer: This legislation does not propose to create any new Federal bureaus. It would utilize the existing program and personnel in the Public Health Service, which is now carrying on a voluntary interstate milk shipment program at a very nominal cost.

Objection 12: Local inspectors would have no concern of milk to be shipped to another State.

Answer: Since many plants depend upon the shipment of milk to out-of-State areas, the plant operators are very anxious to obtain certification and approval of these supplies. They would be very much interested in obtaining approval of these sources through their State rating authorities.

Furthermore, if the entire milkshed met the minimum sanitation requirements under the proposed act, and this plant was listed and certified as an approved shipper for interstate commerce, any or all of the milk being produced by this plant could be shipped in interstate commerce. Since the plant operator would never know when he would receive a request for a shipment of milk, he would want to keep his supply on a continuous approval status for shipment in interstate trade.

Experience in the voluntary interstate milk shipment program has shown that the local inspectors are very anxious to maintain high standards for the milk shipped out of a State. The integrity of the inspectors as well as the integrity of the milk supply is involved in this.

Objection 13: Milk transported over long distances must be older than nearby milk, and milk does not improve with age.

Answer: When making this statement, the opponents of milk sanitation legislation are talking about the horse and buggy days, not 1960, with its modern transportation and refrigeration methods. Many tests have proved that milk properly produced and refrigerated at 35 to 40 degrees can be held for long periods of time without deterioration or loss of quality. When milk is handled under these conditions, it is impossible to tell the difference between milk that is a day old and milk which is a week old.

Objection 14: Supporters of the bill are interested in only one objective, which is to sell surplus milk from their own areas in other markets.

Answer: Of course we want to be able to sell our high-quality milk in interstate trade. Is there any reason why top-quality milk should not be shipped from one State to another? The supporters of this bill feel most strongly that trade barriers should not be disguised as health regulations.

Objection 15: This bill would lower the standards so that midwestern producers could sell milk in other markets without meeting established health requirements.

Answer: This statement is incorrect because a large portion of the midwestern areas are now using the Public Health Service's Milk Ordinance and Code as the standard for their milk laws and regulations.

Objection 16: Under this bill, the inspection of milk to be approved for interstate commerce is left up to the State and localities. Ratings on which the Surgeon General's approval is based are carried out by these agencies, although he cannot check on their activities. It appears odd that a man would rate his own work.

Answer: It is true the bill provides that inspection and supervision will be performed by the milk sanitation personnel of the States in which the milk supply is located. However, for a supply to be eligible for certification, the supervision and inspection, as well as the laboratory control, must be performed in accordance with the high standards of the Federal Milk Sanitation Code. State and local codes would not be used.

In addition, the Surgeon General would have the authority to check on the activities of the State and local health departments. The bill contains numerous provisions which the Surgeon General must carry out in order to assure the integrity and reliability of the system.

In regard to the charge that an inspector would rate his own work, this would not be the case. Ratings for certification would be made only by the State milk sanitation rating officers, who would have no responsibility for supervisory activity.

Mr. Speaker, this concludes my review of the 16 principal objections brought up by the opponents of national milk sanitation legislation. As I have pointed out, these objections do not hold water when compared with the facts in the case.

LEGISLATION IN THE SAVINGS AND LOAN FIELD

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to make permanent the existing law restricting holding companies in the savings and loan field. Legislation enacted last year was of a temporary nature, expiring May 31, 1961.

My bill to strike the termination date and make the law permanent has the support of the United States Savings and Loan League, the National League of Insured Savings Associations, and the California Savings and Loan League—the State in which most of the holding companies operate. I have been advised that the holding companies themselves have discussed my proposal and have agreed to support it—without amendment. Thus, all of the interested elements in the savings and loan business are in favor of this legislation. The bill also has the approval of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Government agency involved, and the Federal Savings and Loan Advisory Council, created by statute as an advisory agency for the Federal home loan bank system.

Legislation to prohibit holding companies from acquiring control of savings and loan associations was first introduced in 1957. This bill, H.R. 4135, which I introduced, was passed by the House unanimously. Similar legislation was included in S. 1451, the Financial Institutions Act of 1957, and passed by the Senate. However, the latter bill was not passed by the House and hence the savings and loan holding company legislation was not enacted.

Last year identical legislation was again passed unanimously by the House. The bill reached the Senate late in the session and some concern was expressed there that it might cause hardship on some of the savings and loan associations in California. As a result, an amendment was added to the bill in the Senate providing for an expiration date of May 31, 1961, and requiring the Board to submit a report to Congress concerning savings and loan holding company operations. The purpose of this amendment was to give an opportunity to review the actual impact and operation of the law.

We now know that the law is accomplishing the desired objective and has prevented the spread of holding companies. The fact that a permanent extension of the law has the support of the savings and loan business, including the holding companies, is good evidence that the law has not caused hardship or inequity to any group. The purpose of my bill is to make this legislation permanent so that all persons involved may plan their operations with greater certainty than is the case with temporary legislation. The bill would also repeal the requirement for a report by the Board, which would serve no useful purpose at this time.

The savings and loan associations of our Nation have rendered a tremendous service in promoting thrift and home ownership. They are the largest single source of housing credit, making 40 percent of all the home loans in the country. They are typically local institutions, managed and operated by men and women living in the community and deeply interested in the community's welfare. It would change the character of these institutions were holding companies to become an important or dominant feature of the savings and loan business. The legislation enacted last year prevents holding companies from acquiring more than 10 percent of the stock of more than one insured association. My bill would make this important law permanent and I hope the Congress will enact it speedily.

DISCHARGE PETITION ON NATIONAL FAIR TRADE BILL—H.R. 1253

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have filed today with the Clerk of the House a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from the further consideration of House Resolution 521, a resolution providing for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1253, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, so as to equalize rights in the distribution of merchandise identified by a trademark, brand, or trade name.

H.R. 1253 was reported to the House by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by a vote of 20 to 9 and the report was filed on June 9, 1959. I immediately requested the Committee on Rules to arrange for a hearing on this bill and a brief hearing was held on August 3, 1959. On April 19, 1960, the Committee on Rules tabled our request for a rule on this legislation.

H.R. 1253 would make it lawful for a manufacturer to establish and control, by notice to his distributors, stipulated or minimum resale prices for his trademarked or brand-named merchandise, if such merchandise is in interstate commerce, or is held for sale after shipment in interstate commerce, and is in free and open competition with merchandise of the same general class produced by others.

The bill would make it unlawful for a distributor with notice of applicable stipulated or minimum resale price on such merchandise to sell, offer to sell, or advertise such merchandise in interstate commerce at a different, or lower price, as the case may be. Any person suffering, or reasonably anticipating, damage by reason of violation of this legislation may sue in any State or Federal court of competent jurisdiction for damages and injunctive relief and be entitled to recover the cost of the suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

This bill is for the purpose of aiding small business from the onslaught of unrestrained, cutthroat competition of large chainstores, department stores, and discount houses which have been flourishing as a result of a breakdown of effective State fair trade laws.

I urge the Members of the House to sign this discharge petition.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader concerning the program for tomorrow according to his present expectations.

Mr. McCORMACK. I suggest that the committee that is handling the bill presently under consideration be available for a continuation of that bill under the 5-minute rule. I cannot state definitely the program, but I suggest that the committee stand ready.

AIRLIFT SCHEME

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, recently a Member of the other body made a statement supporting the proposed airlift scheme of the Post Office Department. This proposal would have a severely adverse effect upon the Nation's railroads which are so vital to our economy. This proposal would divert 4-cent letter mail which belongs to the railroads to aircraft and the costs of moving this mail would be greater if this should ever be done.

The Post Office Department does not have legislative authority to expand the airlift of 4-cent letter mail. I have introduced legislation to stop this practice

and to require that all mail moving by air carry the 7-cent postage rate as required by law.

I do not, of course, agree with the position taken by the Member of the other body and I am pleased to insert here a letter written by the president of the American Association of Railroads in answer to the statements which the gentleman has made. The letter which follows very effectively outlines a few of the objections many of us have to the proposed airlift scheme:

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS,
Washington, D.C., May 12, 1960.

The Honorable A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONRONEY: The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 10, 1960, records your statement in connection with plans of the Post Office Department to divert first-class mail from rail to air transportation.

I am astonished at your charge that the railroads have subjected Members of Congress to an unbelievable barrage of misinformation. I know that the railroad witnesses in public testimony before committees of Congress have correctly stated the effect on railroad passenger train service and revenue of the proposal for flying first-class and other preferential mail.

We have seen the flying of surface mail start in 1953 between Chicago, New York, and Washington; early in 1954, Jacksonville, Miami, and Tampa were added; later in 1954 it was extended along the west coast; this year it has been expanded to include Atlanta, Detroit, Cleveland, and Pittsburgh; and it is now proposed to extend this to all major cities throughout the United States. These cities are among those where the best train service is still available.

In addition to concern over the effect on railroad passenger revenues and service, as a result of eliminating railway postal cars on trains serving these cities, Congress should be concerned about mail service to the more than 11,000 communities and post offices in the United States which are served by rail and not served by air. There are only about 800 air stops in the country. Further, this program will eventually remove the distinction between 7-cent airmail service for those who want to pay for it and the 4-cent regular service for those who have no need for the more costly service. The public then would be deprived of their freedom to choose the more economical mail service provided by rail transportation.

In this connection House of Representatives Report No. 1281, dated February 19, 1960, on page 18, says:

"Any action which would further impair the condition of the railroads as an important element of our national economy would concern every citizen.

"Proposals affecting airlift and surface transportation of the mails involve major considerations of policy and major impacts on the railroads, the airlines, their employees, and the public. These policy questions should be formulated in legislative proposals for separate resolution; they are not a matter for inclusion in an appropriation bill nor for exclusive administrative determination."

In view of the wide interest in this matter, copies of this letter are being sent to Members of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, Post Office and Civil Service, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as well as to all the Members of Congress who have introduced legislation to prohibit, with certain proper exceptions, any flying of surface mail.

Very truly yours,

DANIEL P. LOOMIS.

NATIONAL POSTAL TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and as a lifelong active worker in the railway brotherhoods, I have an unusually strong interest in postal and railway problems.

Accordingly, I have been very much interested in statements emanating from the Post Office Department indicating that railway post office service valued at $2,684,221 annually is to be withdrawn to finance an expansion of the airlift of ordinary first-class mail.

Persons most directly affected by the withdrawal of railway post office service are those employed by the Post Office Department who perform distribution in railway post office cars. Those postal employees are represented by the National Postal Transport Association, formerly known as the Railway Mail Association.

A founder of the old Railway Mail Association is commemorated in my own hometown of La Crosse, Wis., where the local branch of the National Postal Transport Association once was called the Bill Fry branch, and where a Bill Fry banquet is held annually.

Just a few miles away from La Crosse, at Winona, Minn., the remains of one of the Railway Mail Association founders, Bill Fry, have been laid to rest.

The membership cards of each person belonging to the National Postal Transport Association to this day are embossed with the name Bill Fry on the side of the RPO car which is reproduced on the membership card and which serves to identify this loyal group of public servants.

Because of these sentimental reasons and because I have been closely interested in both the Railway Mail Association and now the National Postal Transport Association, I have a very grave concern over the postal service changes either threatened or already under way.

In addition to the Bill Fry heritage, I have had close contacts with the present leader of the National Postal Transport Association, Mr. Paul A. Nagle, and with one other president, Mr. William M. Thomas.

Mr. Thomas headed the National Postal Transport Association from 1949 to 1956. He was a person whom I knew very well and admired greatly.

The tensions associated with the initial activation of the airlifting of first-class mail in 1953 contributed greatly to the untimely death of Mr. Thomas almost immediately after he turned over the reins of office to the person whom he had groomed to succeed him, Mr. Paul A. Nagle, the same person who now heads the National Postal Transport Association with a vigor and determination of which Mr. Thomas will be proud.

Mr. Nagle has faced with quiet courage a systematic program of postal reorganization. To my certain knowledge, he has worked carefully to enlist the aid of friendly congressional people in an effort to stem the tide of needless reorganization. A measure of the progress he has attained is the fact that recently the House Post Office Committee of which formerly I was a member, has scheduled action on the airlift to be taken and hearings to be started on June 14. Now a subcommittee has been assigned to handle the problem and even earlier action may be anticipated.

One of the more tragic overtones of the trend away from railway post office service is that instead of being progressive, the post office in its thirst for change is instead turning the clock back 100 years to the period, ending in 1864, during which mail was concentrated in huge transportation centers.

Railway post office service was inaugurated in 1864. This new service was described in February 1959 in the Postal Service News, official publication of the Post Office Department, as "the answer to a bottleneck in postal service experienced by the Nation in its earlier history."

Until that time, the postal paper reported:

> Mail usually was not sorted until arrival at its post office of destination or a distribution post office along the route, resulting in huge accumulations of mail at such points and in numerous delays.

The Post Office Department is now going back to its earlier bottleneck structure. The nationwide integrated postal service plan, the newest innovation, will set up 62 transportation centers in the 50 States when it is fully in effect.

The final clock-reversing fact is presented in the official announcement of the new plan in which the Department has said:

> Distribution of mail en route would not be a basic requirement of the plan.

The 100-year-old service is still essential.

The railway post office service was only 15 years old when Bill Fry took up his first assignment from Winona to St. Peter in 1869.

Almost immediately Bill Fry was the center of controversy as he qualified for membership card number 10 in the Railway Mail Association and took up the cudgels for reform in the same way that Paul Nagle is doing today.

In the January 1957 issue of the Postal Transport Journal, official organ of the National Postal Transport Association, Mr. Fry is quoted by an ardent admirer, Mr. Lloyd Wilsey, of La Crosse, Wis., as having said of a then current problem:

> That is all a matter of detail which we can settle afterward. The big thing is to get the job done.

The spirit of getting the job done prevails today in the National Postal Transport Association. Paul A. Nagle and his

associates are fighting in true pioneer fashion to protect the Bill Fry heritage in the National Postal Transport Association. The changes of the times have flung some mighty challenges at Bill Fry's successors. With true adaptability they have moved from the railway post office car to the highway post office bus to carry on their fight to deliver the mail in the face of fleeting time.

With calm courage they have reckoned the cost of new ways of working, of fresh affiliations, of reshaped postal unions and have concluded again that "the big thing is to get the job done."

The men of the National Postal Transport Association are the unsung heroes of the postal service. All America owes them a debt of gratitude and I am proud to count them as my friends.

RELATIVE TAXES IN VARIOUS STATES

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, with the possibility of the Calendar Wednesday procedure being invoked tomorrow for consideration of the House Federal aid to education bill, H.R. 10128, I think my colleagues would appreciate having some pertinent information I have compiled on relative taxes in the various States. I have taken as an example a man and wife with two children and a total family income of $5,000 a year. The family automobile is driven 10,000 miles a year and gets 15 miles on a gallon of gas. The husband and wife together smoke a pack of cigarettes a day. They own a house, the actual market value of which is $10,000. They spend $800 a year on items which are subject to a sales tax if there is a State sales tax. They own $1,000 worth of tangible personal property for tax purposes.

The above figures are as close to the average as I could find for a family with a $5,000 income. It is interesting to see how that family would fare if they lived in Meridian, Miss.; Selma, Ala.; Cordele, Ga.; Jamestown, N.Y.; or Bloomfield, N.J. The following table is a partial breakdown by State, of the State and local taxes which such a family would pay. These figures are estimates based upon the rate of taxation which the most recent records available to me reveal. It is impossible to be precise, but I believe these estimates are generally accurate and fair. Following is my own compilation for the guidance of Members in this respect:

State and local taxes of a person with a $5,000 annual income in various States

	State sales tax	State tobacco tax	State gasoline tax	Local and State tangible property tax	State income tax	Local real property tax	Total taxes, State and local
Alabama	$24.00	$21.90	$46.62	$6.50	$27.00	$162.00	$288.52
Arkansas	24.00	21.90	43.29	----------	17.00	70.70	176.89
California	24.00	10.95	39.96	----------	8.00	149.70	232.61
Delaware	----------	10.95	33.30	----------	53.00	72.80	170.05
Florida	24.00	18.25	46.62	----------	----------	123.80	212.67
Georgia	24.00	18.25	43.29	2.50	----------	137.20	225.24
Kentucky	----------	10.95	46.62	----------	38.00	116.30	211.87
Louisiana	16.00	29.20	46.62	5.75	----------	91.20	188.77
Maryland	24.00	10.95	39.96	1.34	54.00	153.10	283.95
Michigan	24.00	18.25	39.96	----------	----------	196.00	278.21
Minnesota	----------	20.07	33.30	----------	114.50	223.50	391.37
Mississippi	24.00	21.90	46.62	----------	----------	117.70	209.22
New Jersey	----------	18.25	33.30	----------	----------	256.80	308.35
New York	----------	18.25	39.96	----------	88.00	278.70	422.91
North Carolina	24.00	----------	46.62	----------	76.00	102.40	249.02
Ohio	24.00	18.25	46.62	.60	17.00	142.40	248.77
Pennsylvania	32.00	21.90	33.30	----------	----------	154.40	231.60

I obtained the figures upon which the above estimates were made from table No. 5 of HEW's Circular No. 605 for October 1959 entitled "Preliminary Statistics for State School Systems, 1957–58"; from the biennial survey of education in the United States by HEW and from the information obtained in the hearings before the Senate and House committees.

APOLOGIES FOR CERTAIN POLITICALLY INSPIRED REMARKS

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the people of California I wish to offer apologies to the Congress and this Nation for the politically inspired remarks of our Governor, Edmund Brown, concerning President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, and the summit meeting in Paris.

I am chagrined to find that the Governor of my State of California has taken the moment of crisis in international affairs to launch an attack against the Vice President of the United States. Press reports indicate that Governor Brown has said he believes the summit dispute has undermined the prestige of the President and will result in the defeat of the Vice President at the Republican National Convention.

For some time it has been apparent to those of us from California that Governor Brown has slipped badly in public esteem. I feel that this below-the-belt effort, which can only have the effect of giving comfort to our enemies, will result in further revulsion against Governor Brown by the clear-thinking people of California.

I deplore such remarks, Mr. Speaker, and assure you and the Nation that such remarks do not truly represent the sentiments of the vast majority of loyal Californians.

GREEN ACRES FARM PROGRAM

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, on May 10 it was my privilege to discuss the details of my bill, H.R. 12000, which I introduced on May 2 to authorize a green acres farm program in behalf of our farm economy.

My office has received so many inquiries regarding the proposed legislation that I have arranged to have printed at my own expense copies of the May 10 debate which I plan to send to interested people in my own congressional district. I am asking them to study this proposal very carefully and see for themselves what it would be worth to them.

As pointed out in my earlier speeches on the subject, my bill will take nothing whatsoever away from any farmer which he now has under present law other than the one requirement of the green acres provision. In other words, I have scrupulously protected all of the commodity programs now in effect and, in addition, propose higher levels of price supports which the market will sustain in view of the orderly liquidation of present price-depressing surpluses.

At the time this bill was drafted we did not have available the 1959 Agriculture Census data. Although this information was still not available when I discussed the proposal on the floor, I now have the census data for a few of my counties and would like to briefly explain how the green acres program would work in one particular county.

This county has about 1,150 farms with a total of 232,000 acres of cropland. In 1959, almost 221,000 acres of cropland were harvested and only 224 farms reported a total of 6,300 acres of pasture. Only 80 farms reported 1,700 acres in cover crops. About 95 percent of the cropland in this county produced harvested crops in 1959.

More than 1,100 of these 1,150 farms produced corn, reporting 114,000 acres in corn in 1959 compared with less than 91,000 acres in 1954. This county produced 360,000 bushels more corn in 1959 than in 1954.

In 1960 that county will probably produce at least 3½ million bushels of corn, more than one-half of which will be put on the market for sale with a substantial portion to be delivered to the Government under the price support program.

At best that corn will be worth no more than a dollar a bushel or about $3,500,000.

However, if the principles of my bill are adopted, the results in 1961 will be quite different. Since that county has only 5 percent of its cropland under cover crops, pasture, and so forth, the green acres provision would immediately take at least 15 percent of the cropland—or 34,800 acres—out of crop production. Since one-half of the county's cropland is now producing corn, we can assume one-half of the green acres would come out of corn production and that would represent one-half million bushels less corn to be produced in that county.

Then, with the 80 percent of average yield payment-in-kind offered to farmers taking additional land completely out of production, we might assume an additional 15 percent of total acreage would be retired for a reduction in production of another million bushels of corn.

Note that the application of very conservative estimates to the corn production of this county proves conclusively that present surplus production would be eliminated and a strong market would be provided for the remaining production together with the payment-in-kind commodities.

Now, look at the economic impact of this type of program. Assuming a corn crop in 1960 under the present program worth, at most $3,500,000, compare that with the corn-crop income in 1961 under the green acres program which would be in the neighborhood of $3,800,000 with a considerable drop in the costs of production. In addition, the other grain crops would be worth proportionately more for a total increase in crop value of at least one-half million dollars or a total increase in net income of about $1 million in view of reduced production costs.

With a firm price on feed grains and no surpluses on the market it can also be assumed that excessive production of livestock products would be reduced to the point that we would also have relatively good livestock markets. In 1959 this county sold more than 100,000 hogs compared with 65,000 in 1954 when we did not have such an abundance of cheap feed. Those hogs in 1959 brought about $30 apiece or a total gross income of about $3 million. But, in 1961 with the green acres program in operation and $1.30 for corn you would not see all those hogs produced and, instead, you would have perhaps 75,000 hogs worth about $40 apiece. Gross income would be about the same—$3 million—but the cost of production would be down about 25 percent or $500,000 which would mean an increase in net income on hogs of about $500,000.

When all of the crop and livestock production is taken into account in that particular county, Mr. Speaker, the statistics show an increased net income of about $2 million the first year of operation under the green acres program and that all-important net income for farm people should increase another $500,000 a year for each of the next 5 years.

Think what this increase in net or spendable income would mean to the farm families in the 19 counties of my congressional district and you can readily see what it would mean to the whole Nation. The county I have described is not one of my bigger producing counties; it is actually a bit below average for the whole 19. Therefore, in my district, the first year of operation under the green acres program I have proposed in H.R. 12000, we would have an increase in net farm income of about $40 million. That increased income would be wonderful for our farm families and for the main street businessmen in every one of the towns, villages, and cities in my district not to mention the factories and mills all over the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, if I proposed a $40-million payroll to be added to all congressional districts like mine at little or no expense to the Government, I daresay there would not be a vote against it on the part of either the Congressmen from agricultural districts or those from the industrial areas looking for markets for manufactured goods.

I hope every farmer, every businessman, and every citizen of my district will study this proposal thoroughly and see firsthand what it could actually mean to him or her in dollars and cents income. I hope, also, that my colleagues from all over the Nation will weigh this matter very carefully in the hope that action may be taken on the measure before we adjourn less than 2 months from now.

We have been in session about 4½ months and have seen no constructive action taken by the Congress on this most urgent farm problem. I personally consider this our number one domestic problem and urge our colleagues to set aside their differences and proceed to the active consideration of some proposal such as I have advanced which will give our farm people and rural businessmen some hope for their economic future.

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF NORWEGIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay tribute today to the people of Norway on the occasion of the 146th anniversary of their independence day.

I have been lucky to have had for years many close friends who are Americans of Norwegian birth or descent. They have played an important part in the enrichment of our lives by their culture, their industry, and their strong religious and moral convictions. They are imbued with a great love for American ideals and our democratic form of government. Many have been notable and successful leaders in our Government and in our public life.

The Norwegian people have every reason for taking justly deserved pride in celebrating the day on which their country first adopted their constitution. In April of 1814 a constitutional assembly gathered at their capitol for the purpose of drawing up a constitution that would be based upon the sovereign will of the people. Within a few weeks after the first meeting of this assembly, a new constitution was adopted and a new Storting (legislature) elected. This constitution of 1814 was fully based on the firm principles of civil liberties and human rights.

Only 20 years ago the people of Norway were brutally assaulted by Hitler and his Nazi gang. Those were dark and seemingly hopeless days for them. But few nations in the world have shown a more indomitable spirit of courage and fortitude than the Norwegian people did during the grim hours of Nazi occupation. We shall always remember their courageous stand and their unrelenting underground struggle in the years that followed.

Since that time the Norwegians have strenuously defied Communist Russia even though a huge Red army is stationed in close proximity to them. They have been a staunch and loyal ally of our country, and we should feel fortunate in having them among our friends.

LAKE McALISTER

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill proposing to name and designate the reservoir at McGee Bend as "Lake McAlister."

The late Honorable Ralph McAlister was an attorney at Nacogdoches, Tex. He departed this life the morning of April 8, 1960.

Mr. McAlister had long been vitally interested in water conservation, and was one of the founders, a director, and one-time president of the organization which through the years has had as its principal objective the construction of McGee Bend Dam and Reservoir on the Angelina River, in east Texas.

With the passing of Ralph McAlister, who was my friend of many years, water conservation lost as persistent a supporter as it ever had. He was one of the first in our section of the Nation to devote his time to it. No other man did so much to bring McGee Bend Dam into being. He kept the project alive during its lean years. McGee Bend Dam and the reservoir created thereby will be a continuing memorial to Ralph McAlister, whether it bears his name, or not. I feel we can do no less than rename the reservoir "Lake McAlister" in his memory.

NO SUBSIDY FOR FAILURE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1960, Capital Airlines filed an application with the Civil Aeronautics

Board asking for $12,949,000 in annual subsidy payments. The subsidy would be in addition to the $2,300,000 paid Capital yearly by the Postmaster General for the carriage of mail.

The filing of this application was a momentous event, Mr. Speaker. No other domestic trunkline air carrier has requested subsidy payments and none of the domestic trunk airlines—with some minor exceptions—have received subsidy for the past 8 years—CAB Order No. E–15088, page 2. Capital itself has been off subsidy since October 1, 1951.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that subsidy was justified during the developmental stages of American aviation. I am also convinced that certain sectors of the airline industry such as the feeders and the helicopter companies are still in the developmental stages and require subsidy. But, Mr. Speaker, the domestic trunkline carriers have been self-sufficient for nearly a decade; they are or should be a mature industry no longer dependent on subsidy. Therefore this application for subsidy by a long self-sufficient member of the trunkline industry raises several important questions.

First. To what extent does continuing eligibility to receive subsidy encourage improvident decisions and economically reckless conduct among the domestic trunkline carriers

Second. What will be the consequences to the airline industry if one or more of the heretofore self-sufficient trunkline carriers succeeds in obtaining subsidy payments?

Finally, to what extent does Congress have control of the subsidy situation? For example, does the present law permit the accrual of trunkline subsidy claims that encroach upon appropriations Congress intended for local service carriers or other parts of the industry we are trying to develop?

Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is clear. The net effect of permitting subsidy eligibility to continue in an industry that no longer requires it is that some operators will take advantage of the insurance against bankruptcy which subsidy eligibility provides to take gambles and make decisions which a normal businessman would not risk. In other words, it breeds recklessness and irresponsibility.

The record of Capital Airlines headlong career of expansionitis is the best example of this principle at work. In 1950, Capital operated 798 million available seat miles. By 1955 it had nearly doubled its operation and was offering 1,363,912,000 available seat miles and in 1959, the last full year of operations available for comparison, Capital had more than doubled the 1955 level and was operating 2,759,941,000 available seat miles.

To achieve this phenomenal expansion Capital naturally had to expand its fleet extensively, and the results of this are being witnessed today in the Vickers Aircraft foreclosure on Capital's entire fleet.

I cannot believe that Capital would have expanded so recklessly and taken all the risks if they had not felt they could fall back on subsidy if their gamble failed.

Mr. Speaker, this leads me to my second question. What happens if we bail Capital out and subsidize their operation? The answer is simple. Capital's route system competes with several other trunkline carriers in the eastern half of the United States, all of whom are operating on a self-sufficient basis. Payment of subsidy to Capital would be no more and no less than Federal competition against these free enterprise subsidy-free companies. The consequences of such a policy are obvious. The weakest of Capital's competitors would soon be compelled to apply for subsidy to withstand the impact of federally subsidized competition. It would only be a matter of time before all of Capital's competitors would become infected, and they, in turn, once they were subsidized, would infect their competitors elsewhere in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached the point where the subsidy which was essential to nourish the domestic trunkline industry during its developmental period will, if it is continued, poison the industry and ruin its chances of survival as a strong, self-sufficent transportation facility. Continued subsidy eligibility can result in only one thing—nationalization of the industry.

Finally, I address myself to the question of the extent to which Congress has control of this vital economic problem under existing law and whether a change in the law is necessary. As of now the Civil Aeronautics Board has denied two requests by Capital for immediate interim subsidy grants and the Board has not requested any appropriation by Congress for any such subsidy. A prehearing conference has been set for May 16 and thereafter formal consideration will be given to Capital's subsidy application.

Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of existing law it is clear that Capital Airlines, or any other trunkline applicant, could be paid subsidy despite the fact that Congress had not appropriated money to be used for that specific purpose.

This is true because the Civil Aeronautics Board has statutory power to determine subsidy mail rates for an air carrier without regard to whether there are sufficient appropriations available to cover the amounts which may become due under those rates. The Comptroller General has said "that the existence or nonexistence of appropriations does not in any way restrict or interfere with the ratemaking duties of the Board," and that the Board's statutory authority to fix and determine the rates for subsidy payments "is disassociated not only from the Board's function of payment but even from the incurrence of obligations"—letter of the Comptroller General to the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, October 6, 1954.

Thus, if the Board were to grant Capital Airlines present request for subsidy, a valid legal obligation would be incurred. That obligation could be met by the Board out of appropriations for subsidy already available, and if the Board refused to make such payment, the legal obligation could be enforced in one of two ways.

First. The carrier could seek, in a district court of the United States, a mandatory injunction requiring the Board to authorize payment. This forum is made available under section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act and section 1337 of title 28 of the United States Code.

Second. A second approach would be a suit against the United States in the Court of Claims under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code. If successful, the complaining carrier would obtain a money judgment. If this judgment was not in excess of $100,000—title 31, United States Code, section 724a—it would be satisfied by the Government Accounting Office upon presentation of the certified copy of the judgment—title 28, United States Code, section 2517. If the amount of the judgment, however, was in excess of $100,000—as would almost certainly be the case—the amount of the judgment would be certified to Congress by the Court of Claims for an appropriation. Thereafter satisfaction would be purely a matter for Congress—*Hetfield* v. *United States* (78 Ct. Cl. 419 (1933)); *Citizens Bank & Trust Co.* v. *United States* (100 App. D.C. 2, 240 F. 2d 863 (1957)).

However, as a practical matter, Congress each year appropriates many millions of dollars for subsidy payments to the local service carriers, helicopter operators, and others. In fiscal year 1961 alone the Board requested $68,984,000 for these payments. The House Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations reported a bill proposing $60 million.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that such appropriations were intended for other activities, the trunkline carrier could, by the methods I have indicated, crowd out other subsidized interests. Such a diversion of appropriated funds might well seriously interfere with the program of the local service or other developmental industry.

Moreover, even if the Civil Aeronautics Board refused to consider an application for subsidy, a trunkline applicant can sue in the U.S. district court under section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act and title 28, United States Code, section 1337, for a mandatory injunction ordering the Board to process the application. Should differences arise between the trunkline and the Civil Aeronautics Board as to the amount of subsidy, the reasonableness and adequacy of the administrative findings are reviewable under section 1006 of the Federal Aviation Act by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, under present law a carrier can compel a hearing on its subsidy application, can compel the fair exercise of statutory subsidy criteria by the Civil Aeronautics Board in evaluating its claim and, regardless of whether Congress appropriated money for that purpose, if a subsidy payment is found needed, can compel the Civil Aeronautics Board to authorize payment out of funds appropriated by Congress for other carrier payments.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this law must be changed. On May 9, 1960, I in-

troduced H.R. 12122, which is identical in wording to that introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK]. I believe this legislation is necessary not only to preserve the trunkline industry from financial ruin and eventual nationalization but also to preclude any diversion of appropriated funds from the developmental purposes for which they are intended.

THE RIGHT OF THE CONGRESS TO BE INFORMED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that our rights as Members of this House have been and are infringed upon.

As an aftermath of the U–2 plane incident over Soviet Russia we heard the following on this floor:

> Although the Members of the House have not generally been informed on the subject the mission was one of a series and part of an established program with which the subcommittee in charge of the program was familiar, and of which it had been fully apprised during this and previous sessions.

However, earlier in the other body one Member stated that neither he nor any other member of the Select Appropriations Subcommittee which has for 13 years passed on the Central Intelligence Agency budget had ever heard that it operated planes.

When I subscribed to the following oath of office—

> I, WILLIAM H. MEYER, do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God—

I obligated myself to fulfill it and to fulfill it regardless of what others might do that might interfere with my obligation. I say that the previous statements in both bodies leave me confused as to what actually has happened in secret. Nevertheless and regardless, I claim that my sincere attempt to fulfill my oath of office is being obstructed and that this is harmful to my country. I wish to quote these excerpts from our Constitution that relate to my claim.

To begin with, we are charged with the following duties at various points in the Constitution of the United States:

> 1. * * * Raising revenue.
> 2. Lay and collect taxes * * * and provide for the common defense.
> 3. To declare war.
> 4. To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.
> 5. To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.
> 6. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

I would like also to quote the following excerpts from the Constitution:

> 7. No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.
> 8. The President, Vice President, and all civil officers of the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

Then I want to repeat the sentence contained in an amendment to the Constitution:

> 9. The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

I say that as a Representative to Congress I must know what is going on if I am to fulfill my duties. I and the vast majority of Congressmen cannot do this if either the House or Senate statements previously mentioned by me reflect the conditions we operate under. There can be no first-class and second-class separation of Congressmen. We all must have equal access to those facts without which we cannot fulfill our oath of office and our constitutional duties.

No man can tell me that I have any greater duty than to safeguard the rights of Congress and our people when the threat of actions leading to war are so ominous. War must be prevented, and at the very least it must not come while our people and Congress are purposefully kept in the dark as to facts and acts that are by law supposed to be available to them and under their control. No one has the right to arrogate special powers to himself especially when they belong equally to others and particularly when the life and future of our people and country are at stake as the clouds of a war of unknown destructiveness gather in the sky.

I ask that the appropriate committees and Members of the House investigate this matter and prepare the proper reports leading to remedial action.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with these items from the Constitution which I have quoted, I would like to add a little bit that has been in the papers and elsewhere. For instance, it seems to me, under the constitutional provisions relating to the common defense and declaration of war we could consider this one:

> Green Hackworth's authoritative work on "International Law as Interpreted and Applied by the United States" has much documentation on the international law concerning violation of national jurisdiction over air space which leaves no doubt of the illegality of the present practice.

Even our own Government forbids commercial planes of other countries to enter our airspace without a permit from the Civil Aeronautics Authority; and, certainly, if this is the case, it is obvious that the intrusion of espionage and military planes would certainly be prohibited and that they would not be permitted to invade our air space.

Furthermore, I would say under raising revenue and also laying and collecting taxes and providing for the common defense and declaring war: Is there no responsible control over the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency? That these spy flights, with all their inherent danger of precipitating war, have been going on for 4 years is alarming enough. But that such a flight should have been sent out at this moment just before the summit meeting indicates either incredible stupidity or a positive desire to sabotage this meeting of heads of state from which the whole world had hoped for an easing of tensions, a test ban treaty, and some insurance of human survival through disarmament.

Second. If unarmed, and possibly armed flights of this illegal kind are common practice, is it not true that the power to plunge us into war now rests with any one of hundreds, many of whom may be willing to gamble their lives, and perhaps the lives of all humanity for the high pay involved, or because they think they are performing a service? And also under the points I previously mentioned from the Constitution and many others, I would ask, thirdly: What of the superior morality claimed by the Government which lies and, when caught, justifies the act which it tried to hide by claiming that it was no worse than acts done by a totalitarian Communist Government, whose immorality it consistently condemns?

Mr. Speaker, one Member of the other body has said that the United States was an aggressor in sending a U–2 spy plane deep into Russia. I might not go that far, but I would at least say that we certainly could be under suspicion of that, and that many of our allies and friends throughout the world have been adversely affected by this news.

Furthermore, this same person said it was a risk that could lead to nuclear war if continued; and he added that there is no justification for getting military intelligence through aggression. Whether this is described as aggression or not I would say that it could be so interpreted; and I would agree that whereas we need military information and many other forms of intelligence we should not allow ourselves to be placed in a position where it could be interpreted as aggression, not if we want to stand before the world as the country that we really claim to be and which we really are.

I am not going to say too much more about what another gentleman said, but he did say that he was in favor of getting military intelligence, but in ways that we can reconcile with international comity. I think that is a sensible statement.

Another thing I would like to call to the attention of this body, Mr. Speaker—and these are not my words, but the words of another—we speak of our free society. It is not free if the people are committed to actions which

conflict with our stated diplomatic aims, though having no knowledge of these actions, no control over them, and no way of knowing who is to blame when mistakes are made. This is the way totalitarian societies work. This same type of thinking is part of the reason I am speaking now today. I feel that we must consider these matters if we are to maintain our traditional position, if we are to maintain those things which we stand for, and if we are to resolve the problems that are before the world.

Furthermore, I would like to quote from a column by Marquis Childs in the Washington Post for May 14.

He is over in Geneva now. He states:

America's position is rapidly deteriorating because the visible signs of leadership, the friendly grin to one side, are fewer and fewer. The tragedy of the U–2 illuminated this as with a lightning flash. The universal regret and sorrow in the European press, even in West Germany where there is a confused desire to cling to the concept of American infallibility, are expressed in terms of restraint that cloak dismay and indignation.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on for a long time with many other quotes and many other references to the Constitution and the traditions of our country in the past.

I do not want to be in the position in which I am playing what would be called partisan politics. That does not enter into the picture at all. But neither can we afford to be bipartisan. There is a difference. We can be nonpartisan, and when the national interest of the United States is at stake I, for myself, prefer to be nonpartisan rather than bipartisan. I believe that someone must speak out and correct this tragic comedy of errors. The people who are at fault must in some way be told to change some of the acts, some of the thinking that is leading them to do these things. Somehow or other we must find a better way.

I have just learned from the news wire what Mr. Khrushchev has said. He has demanded an abject apology from our President, he is demanding that we admit that we are aggressors. I feel in this case he has gone much too far if he is a sincere man who really wants to negotiate. His language is offensive. It is not conducive to the best negotiations which we must have.

However, I feel that we as Americans, that we as Members of Congress, have as our first duty to correct that which is within us which may be wrong, and at the same time help to correct that which is wrong elsewhere in the world, and that only in this way can we achieve the fine and noble goals which we as Americans all desire.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it was rather difficult to definitely state what the program would be on tomorrow or to state with any degree of definiteness until a few minutes ago. I am glad the gentleman from Indiana made the inquiry.

It is the intention to call Calendar Wednesday business on tomorrow and when the Committee on the District of Columbia is reached, if that committee calls up no bills, I shall undertake to take the necessary steps to dispense with further proceedings under Calendar Wednesday, which means that the school construction bill will not come up. It will enable the Committee on Education and Labor to be the No. 1 committee in connection with next week's Calendar Wednesday business. In the meanwhile, the Rules Committee is holding a hearing on Thursday with reference to the school construction bill. We will have another week's opportunity as to whether or not the committee takes a vote on reporting a rule.

If the House dispenses with further proceedings under the call it is intended that we proceed with the bill under consideration today, H.R. 7155, the San Luis project bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Then proceed with the bills as listed heretofore?

Mr. McCORMACK. Then we will proceed with the consideration of the other bills. Of course, when I announced the program last week we expected Calendar Wednesday to be utilized. If Calendar Wednesday business is dispensed with, it is implied that we would continue with the bills as listed heretofore. We want to proceed legislatively tomorrow and those bills will be taken up in the order noted.

THE SOIL BANK TRAGEDY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, when the House considers farm legislation this year, one problem must take precedence over all others: the so-called whole farm concept—most serious flaw in that unfortunate, jerry-built structure known as the soil bank program. This whole farm provision is systematically destroying the fabric of North Dakota's small community life.

What has happened is this: Hundreds of farmers are abandoning the land they have tilled, picking up their soil bank checks and moving to cities to disrupt the urban economy and, in many cases, deserting the State entirely.

Farmers who ordinarily would be placing a portion of their acreage into the soil bank but still continue to keep up their farms as live, productive, operating units, find it easier to retire all of their crop land and move into town. This convenient means of renting land to the Government is attractive and easy. The farmer sees a way to continue his income from his land without any of the headaches of active farming or private renting; he is left free to go elsewhere and find employment. While it is all perfectly honest and legal for him to do so, he is setting a pattern that is extremely unappealing to nonfarmers to say nothing of the whole rural population which continues to farm actively and always will.

We cannot place too much blame upon those who are joining the exodus away from the farm. They are not discouraged from the whole farm practice; it is to their economic advantage to go and it can even be construed to be patriotic. They are taking land out of production and believe they are doing their part to cut the surplus.

Under these circumstances, it is easy to see what is happening to the small towns and once thriving communities, which for the most part make up the State of North Dakota.

As people leave their farms and sell their machinery and personal property, the community loses tax money, the small town loses consumers, machinery and implement dealers are left without customers and the entire community gradually declines.

Being primarily an agricultural State, North Dakota does not have adequate industry to employ and support the people who bank their land. Thus, these North Dakotans leave the State to seek employment elsewhere, and they are leaving with alarming speed.

I was not sent to Congress to legislate the depopulation of the State of North Dakota. I cannot sit by and watch it happen and I implore all of you to try to understand the seriousness of this problem.

About a month ago, the 1960 soil bank contracts went into effect. The unofficial figures are frightening. A good many more than half of all the farmers participating in the soil bank program in North Dakota—and North Dakota is one of the most heavily contracted States in the Nation—have placed their entire farms in the bank. North Dakota now has a total of 12,375 soil bank contracts and 7,804 or 63 percent of them are whole farm retirements. Last year whole farms represented 52.2 percent of the total contracts.

In one North Dakota county alone 532 whole farms have been banked. Farmers in another have placed 475 entire farms in reserve. The impact on the communities involved is tremendous.

And what good is it doing? The program is so costly in terms of both money and the serious effect on community life that to justify it at all we would have to be sure that benefits at least balance the drawbacks.

Let me emphasize here that I realize the necessity for a land retirement program to control our surplus. It should be a program properly constituted under the banner of conservation which places responsibility on the individual farmer to participate on a cost-sharing basis at the greatest possible saving to the Government. Such a program can be worked out, I believe, along with full parity for crops raised under bushel quotas and is contained in the Poage-McGovern-Burdick farm bill.

But the present program is not decreasing our surplus and I, for one, see no hope that it will do so in the near

future. In fact, surpluses have continued to mount under the program.

First of all, the maximum amount which can be paid to a single farm operator is $5,000. This has had little or no effect on the wheat acreages in my State or elsewhere. Department of Agriculture people say that the present soil bank program should be expanded so that a dent can be made in our wheat surplus and, they argue, the fairest, fastest way to do it is to get whole farms out of production. I see little possibility that Congress will now, or for a long time to come, approve any program requiring such huge outlays to a single unit or operator for banking his land as would be necessary to have a real effect on our surplus.

So, who is really benefiting? The operating farmer today is beset with new problems which result from his neighbor's departure from his land. Weeds and pests are not being controlled on soil banked acreage. This is a dreadful hazard for farmers and they resent it deeply.

Furthermore, the tax burden on these people is being increased because the original number of farmers in a community with taxable personal property has decreased.

And they certainly are not pleased at the deterioration of community life. Their towns, churches, schools, roads, and all civic enterprises are hurt. The ultimate effect of banking whole farms is just the reverse of the intent of the program—to force people to do something they do not want to do—to force the farmers who want to be farmers, and who know nothing else, to look about them and decide they cannot make a go of it.

Does the large operator benefit by the program? Only very slightly, under the present limitations. Besides, when the large operator's quota is increased, what happens to production? He naturally will place his poorest eligible acreage in the soil bank and continue, with all his modern know-how and equipment, to get the greatest possible yield out of his best soil.

I believe there must be serious revision of the entire farm program and that such a revision is the only thing which can even begin to solve the problem. It cannot be attacked with halfway measures. Right now, however, we are facing an emergency. Before any more damage is done, we have got to stop this wholesale abandonment of farms with ownership still residing in the persons who have abandoned them and the Government paying the bill.

Aside from the unwanted results of this whole farm provision among farmers and on the farm economy itself, there are the demoralizing side effects which must be considered with equal gravity.

The farm implement dealer who no longer can maintain a profitable business is a common figure on the North Dakota scene today. The need for machines, fuel oil and service dwindles and, correspondingly, so do the employment opportunities with these businesses. Other Main Street merchants feel the pinch next, as the number of consumers in the community drops. And finally, the social institutions supported by tax money begin to suffer. Schools, churches, hospitals, municipal water and sewer systems, township and country roads—all begin to deteriorate.

The situation is ideally suited to the land speculator who comes in with ready cash and is able and willing to make a grand slam investment for the future—his future or those of the interests he represents.

Still another serious problem arising as a result of the whole farm retirement is the increased competition evident in urban labor markets. Farmers who have soil banked their land go into towns and cities seeking employment. Idle, and with soil bank income providing a cushion of support, they are willing to work for lower than average wages. The laboring men in our cities and towns are saying the farmers are taking jobs away from them—the only jobs by which the town worker can make a living.

The farmer cannot be blamed too much; his outlook for a satisfactory place in today's world is pretty discouraging. But the solution is not in the soil bank as we know it.

It should be remembered, however, that when the soil bank program is brought to an end, existing contracts will be honored as legitimate and valid obligations of the Government which cannot be repudiated. These contracts create obligations which are as binding as a bond or any other Government obligation.

When we see the results of the whole farm plan—results that have all the earmarks of permanence—can we afford to continue the program? I do not think so. Farmers, laboringmen, small businessmen, and community leaders all are protesting. They say whole farm abandonment has got to be stopped. We now are responsible to see that the whole farm concept of the soil bank is not renewed.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. VANIK, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BAILEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEYER, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BURDICK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. SISK), for 30 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mr. GUBSER, for 15 minutes, on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BOGGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KEE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FISHER and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRADEMAS.

Mr. HOSMER, his remarks in Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COHELAN, his remarks in Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. ROBISON, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. MUMMA.

Mr. BRAY.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. WILSON.

(At the request of Mr. SISK, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. DELANEY.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 640. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of General of the Armies John J. Pershing.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3338. An act to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. Air Force aircraft at Little Rock, Ark.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 16, 1960, deliver to the White House for presentation to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the following title:

H.J. Res. 602. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May of 1960 in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 18, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2155. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to reporting that

an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the East Bench unit, Three Forks division, Missouri River Basin project, Montana, has been completed as a part of the investigations required in the formulation of a definite plan for project development, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2156. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2157. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend section 15(b) of the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended, to revise the interest rate formula of special obligations purchased for the railroad retirement account, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2158. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the Annual Report of the U.S. Soldiers' Home for the fiscal year 1959, and the Report of the Annual Inspection of the Home, 1959, pursuant to the act of Congress approved March 3, 1883, as amended (24 U.S.C.A. 59 and 60); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 9702. A bill to amend section 2771 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office; with amendment (Rept. No. 1610). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 11812. A bill to provide uniform computation of retired pay for enlisted members retired prior to June 1, 1958, under section 4 of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945, as amended by section 6(a) of the act of August 10, 1946 (60 Stat. 995); without amendment (Rept. No. 1611). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1411. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 898); without amendment (Rept. No. 1612). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 12248. A bill to provide for a review and an analysis of the positions held by military personnel in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and in the Office of each of the Secretaries of the Armed Forces, for the purpose of effecting certain economies as well as of restoring the offices of the Secretaries to civilian control; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 12249. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease and desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12250. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose an import quota on iron ore; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 12251. A bill to provide additional funds for use in the several States without Federal direction, control, or interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12252. A bill to strengthen State governments, to provide financial assistance to States for educational purposes by returning a portion of the Federal taxes collected therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 12253. A bill to designate the reservoir to be constructed on the Angelina River near Jasper, Tex., as "Lake McAlister"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 12254. A bill to change the name of the bridge in DeKalb County, Tenn., now known as Hurricane Bridge, to the P. C. Crowley Memorial Bridge; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 12255. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, home nursing service, and diagnostic outpatient hospital services for persons eligible for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 12256. A bill to amend section 1361 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the election of certain partnerships and proprietorships as to taxable status; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 12257. A bill to amend section 601 of title 38, United States Code, to restore to certain veterans in Alaska or Hawaii the right to receive hospital care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 12258. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands to the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 12259. A bill to authorize a 5-year program of assistance to financially needy school districts in paying the principal and interest annually falling due on loans for construction of urgently needed elementary or secondary public school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 12260. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide for the payment of incentive pay to members of the Armed Forces performing duty as operators of submersibles; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 12261. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to market adjustment and price support programs for wheat and feed grains, to provide a high-protein food distribution program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 12262. A bill to amend section 353(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H.R. 12263. A bill to authorize the conclusion of an agreement for the joint construction by the United States and Mexico of a major international storage dam on the Rio Grande in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of February 3, 1944, with Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 12264. A bill to amend section 408 of the National Housing Act so as to repeal its expiration date, thereby making permanent law its provisions for regulating savings and loan holding companies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 12265. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize certain persons to administer oaths and to perform notarial acts for persons serving with, employed by, or accompanying the Armed Forces outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 12266. A bill to provide that if the Republic of the Philippines prohibits the export of rattan poles the full statutory rate of duty of 60 percent ad valorem shall apply to furniture wholly or in chief value of rattan which was manufactured in, or comes into the United States from, the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 12267. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act by excluding express companies from the provisions of the fourth section; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 12268. A bill to provide for the assessment and collection of fees to cover the cost of operation of certain regulatory agencies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 12269. A bill to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 12270. A bill to amend certain laws relating to the conservation and improvement of private housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 12271. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that lawful expenditures for legislative purposes shall be allowed as deductions from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 12272. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into agreements with each of the States, Commonwealths, territories, and the District of Columbia to provide for a private voluntary medical care insurance program for certain persons over the age of 65, and to authorize payments by the Secretary to States to cover part of the cost of such insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 12273. A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 12274. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of January 21, 1929 (48 U.S.C. 354a (c)), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H.J. Res. 708. Joint resolution providing for the issuance of a special postage stamp in recognition of the efforts of both labor and management in bringing to the attention of the American public the value of the

apprenticeship system to our national economy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Con. Res. 691. Concurrent resolution authorizing the disposal of certain publications now stored in the folding room of the House of Representatives and the warehouse of the Senate; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 530. Resolution to amend House Resolution 27, 86th Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 12275. A bill for the relief of Fotios Sakelaropoulos Kaplan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 12276. A bill for the relief of Domenico Natale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 12277. A bill for the relief of Stanley Hayman & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12278. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Louisa Caparrini Guasti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12279. A bill for the relief of Silvio A. Guasti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Kentucky:

H.R. 12280. A bill for the relief of Hans Peter Franz Schlobach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H.R. 12281. A bill for the relief of Kaino Knuuttila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12282. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Caroline Perry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 12283. A bill for the relief of Jan Michal Dien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 12284. A bill for the relief of David C. Thomas, Robert W. Barber, Milton A. Chace and Richard F. Turner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12285. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stamata Vergyri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

465. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of the Croatian Fraternal Union of America memorializing the Congress of the United States with respect to the Forand bill (H.R. 4700) which would amend the social security law so as to provide against the high costs of hospitals, nursing homes, medical and surgical care for persons eligible for old-age and survivors' insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

466. By Mr. McCULLOCH: Petition of 90 members of the Mercer County, Ohio, Teachers Association indicating support of H.R. 22 and S. 8 relating to Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Depressed Areas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania is one of the States suffering most from pockets of chronic industrial unemployment. There is general agreement that five of the major labor market areas are so-called depressed areas. These are the Altoona, Erie, Johnstown, Scranton, and Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton areas. As of March 1960, unemployment in these five major areas totaled 57,500 persons. In addition there are six smaller industrial areas on which there is general agreement that conditions of chronic unemployment exist. These are the Berwick-Bloomsburg, Clearfield-Du Bois, New Castle, Pottsville, Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel, and Uniontown-Connellsville areas. Unemployment in those six smaller areas totaled 40,850 persons on the basis of most recently available surveys. All 11 of these areas would have been recognized as areas of chronic unemployment under both the administration's and the Senate passed depressed areas bills. Aside from the addition of one smaller industrial area, namely Butler with an unemployed total of 3,100 persons, the bill as it passed the Senate and the administration's bill were in complete agreement that these were the areas of chronic unemployment in Pennsylvania. The unemployed total for these 12 areas totals 101,450 persons.

Now let us see what would happen under the House version of the bill, as amended, which was accepted by the Senate, and sent to the President and vetoed. It would have been mandatory that the administrator designate 23 areas in Pennsylvania as eligible for assistance with an unemployed total of 320,850 or over three times that for the commonly recognized chronic areas. In other words, chronic areas would get only one-third of the assistance intended for them. Other areas, including Philadelphia with 119,300 unemployed and Pittsburgh with 75,700 unemployed would get $2 of every $3 of assistance intended for the chronic areas in Pennsylvania.

No wonder the President found it necessary to veto the unfair and unsound depressed areas bill which the Congress sent to him. Failure of this Congress to get busy and pass a good bill at this session can mean only one thing, and that is, that the majority party of this Congress is more interested in a potential political issue than it is in enacting constructive legislation to lessen suffering in hard-hit areas of chronic unemployment.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of my newsletter released May 16, 1960:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

Dominating all discussion in Washington is the shooting down of an American plane while on a flight over Russia. This incident has raised serious international questions and its effect could be reflected in the summit conference scheduled for this week, and President Eisenhower's proposed subsequent visit to Russia.

There is no doubt that this country lost considerable prestige abroad over the manner in which the incident was handled. Yet, because Democrats have closed ranks behind the President, the possibility that the incident will be as costly as first feared has been lessened.

Chairman CLARENCE CANNON of the House Appropriations Committee, a Democrat and one of the three or four most powerful men in the House, took the floor in a dramatic speech to defend this Nation's practice of flying photographic planes over Russia at high altitudes. He was followed by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, the majority leader in the Senate, who called upon the Nation to close ranks at a time of crisis.

Mr. Khrushchev is enjoying a propaganda holiday as a result of the incident. He is going to do all he can to keep the issue alive and at times it seems he is intent upon forcing the President to cancel his planned visit to Russia.

If we had shown a tendency to argue among ourselves at home over this matter, the damage abroad could have been incalculable. Our allies undoubtedly would have been frightened, possibly to the point of denying to us the further use of bases.

As things worked out, the country is united behind the President, even though no one is particularly happy that we were caught in such embarrassing circumstances. We can at least through a show of unity minimize the damage from the incident.

REA 25 YEARS OLD

Last week marked the 25th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration. This is the Federal agency which loans funds to locally owned cooperatives to build and operate electric systems serving rural areas.

The program has been a tremendous success. About 95 percent of all farms are now electrified, enabling farmers to install modern conveniences and laborsaving devices. The life of farm families has been considerably enriched by this program.

REA is universally accepted as a part of the American system. It is an example of what can be accomplished when the Federal Government works with local groups instead of trying to run a program from Washington.

WEST VIRGINIA SPEAKS OUT

The people of West Virginia have demonstrated once more that they make up their own minds about people and issues. The national press devoted several weeks to telling the Nation that our State was composed of people whose judgment would be swayed by blind prejudice. Now the people have spoken. As usual, the people of West Virginia acted in accordance with the dictates of their own conscience. They refused to live up to the picture painted by visiting journalists. They listened to the arguments, they weighed them and then voted as they believed best.

Norwegian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we honor today a milestone in Norway's more-than-thousand-year-old history. Norway's Constitution Day dates from but a century and a half ago—May 17, 1814.

The Norsemen, however, were recognized as a separate nation as early as the 9th century. Political unification of this ancient country is identified with the Viking era; as is, indeed, the first connection with North America. For the intrepid Norsemen were famous for their voyages, reaching as far as Greenland and the coast of the North American Continent. This day May 17, 1814, marks the reemergence of the nation of Norway.

During the intervening centuries the political independence of Norway had more than once been submerged; but the spirit of freedom was unconquerable. It reasserted itself most vigorously after the Napoleonic Wars. The people refused to be dominated either from without or within.

On May 17, 1814, Norway, through a national assembly, was declared independent. The constitution then adopted was based on the ideas which had inspired the American and the French Revolutions, on the principles of Montesquieu and John Locke's doctrine of the sovereignty of the people.

The spirit of independence in Norway was, however, long linked with a spirit of cooperation. During the 19th century Norway was linked with Sweden in a union. Theoretically each country was to preserve its complete, sovereign independence. In fact, however, Sweden became dominant, particularly in the conduct of foreign affairs; and in 1905 the union was dissolved. Norway became an entirely independent nation.

Significantly, the democratic spirit of a people was never more clearly demonstrated than in their election of a king. When, in 1905, King Haakon VII commenced his long reign as a much-loved "First Citizen," he was the first man ever to be elected king by modern democratic processes.

Together with their love of democracy and independence the Norwegians have maintained their willingness to cooperate. Clear evidence of this spirit exists today in the part that Norway plays in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Emphasizing the fact that the principal aim of this collective system is to prevent war, Norway has placed great weight on NATO's activities to promote conditions of peace.

Norway has sought to strengthen political contacts between member countries for consultative activity on political problems. Such measures are not only valuable for cooperative purposes—and Norway places emphasis on the nonmilitary field—but also contributes to the relaxing of tensions. Such a policy is typical of Norway's traditional avoidance of international conflict.

We in the United States are proud to feel a kinship with Norway—this country of demonstrated faith in the principles of democracy, cooperation, and the promotion of world peace—one which has sent so many of her sons and daughters to our own shores.

Tribute to the Eagle Rock Sentinel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the 24th Congressional District of California, which it is my privilege to represent in Congress, possesses a number of top quality local newspapers which make an important contribution to the district in reporting news of special interest to the community, expressing area views on matters affecting it, undertaking crusades in behalf of the community where its interest is concerned, and generally performing many other valuable services in behalf of the residents of the community. The 24th District is very fortunate to have these public-spirited institutions.

One of the fine community newspapers serving the 24th District, the Eagle Rock Sentinel, is celebrating its 50th anniversary this year. The Sentinel is a source of pride to the district and I wish to add my heartiest congratulations on this important occasion.

There was no doubt as to what kind of newspaper the Sentinel was to be from the very beginning. When it first appeared, in March 1910, the Sentinel announced that it would defy the then existing trend toward journalistic sensationalism and that it would report community news in a conservative, straightforward manner.

In the intervening 50 years, the Eagle Rock Sentinel has maintained its original position with admirable determination. Throughout a brilliant career the Sentinel has kept to its original purpose and resisted temptations to gain in circulation through sacrifice of its ideals. It has earned a deserved reputation as a leader in its field.

Much credit for the success of the Eagle Rock Sentinel and the position it occupies today is due Mr. Harry Lawson, for many years the owner, and still publisher, of the Sentinel, and Mr. Oran Asa, who purchased the Sentinel several years ago. I am confident that under these extremely capable hands the Sentinel will continue to contribute to the best interests of the community of Eagle Rock for many years to come and I wish it every success in the future.

Federal Subsidies Inflate School Costs (H.R. 10128)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, in considering the question of Federal aid for education, we need to take a close, hard look at the facts. Is such Federal aid actually needed? Is it good business to send a tax dollar to Washington and get back a smaller dollar in the form of so-called Federal aid for school construction? Should we risk a degree of Federal control over education by undertaking a mammoth $975 million grant and aid program for school construction?

On the question of need, the U.S. Office of Education states that the peak need for new classroom construction has been passed. From that source it can also be assumed that the anticipated annual classroom construction rate, without Federal aid, will more than meet future requirements—even as estimated by the bill's proponents.

That same office, after a recent survey, reports that only 237 school districts in 45 States (embracing 35,000 districts) have exhausted all sources of borrowing for classroom construction. The total classroom need in these 237 "borrowed-up" districts was less than 3,100; and 45 percent of the districts had fewer than 600 pupils enrolled.

It is also significant that almost 50 percent of all classrooms used in 1959 have been built since World War II.

Moreover, it is estimated that on a national average property values for school tax purposes are assessed at 30 percent of real values.

It would seem self-evident, therefore, that in the face of available information the facts do not support the need for this form of Federal aid as proposed.

Second, is it good business from a taxpayer's standpoint to send a tax dollar to Washington and get back only a portion of it, to help build classrooms? Or, on the other hand, would it not be better, from the taxpayer's standpoint, to retain that tax dollar at its source, avoid the shrinking effect of sending it to Washington and then back to its source, and

be able to get the full benefit of that tax dollar in the construction of classrooms, and with no strings attached in the use that is made of it?

On this subject of costs, it is necessary for local interests to take into consideration section 8 of the pending bill, H.R. 10128, which provides:

SEC. 8. (a) The State educational agency of each State which receives funds under this Act shall give adequate assurance to the Commissioner that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on school construction projects financed in whole or in part under this Act will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Davis-Bacon Act.

A difficulty often encountered in the application of the Davis-Bacon Act is that wage rates set by the Secretary of Labor in a given community may reflect prevailing wages in a locality, but not those that prevail in a particular community.

Let me cite one example to illustrate that fact. Two schools were recently built simultaneously in Selma, Ala.—the Edgewood Grade School, upon which no Federal funds were used, and the New Knox Elementary School upon which Federal funds were used.

Here are the wage rates applied to the two construction jobs:

[Per hour]

Job category	Edgewood School (no Federal funds)	Knox School (Federal funds)
Common labor	$0.75	$1.15
Carpenter	1.75	2.25
Concrete finisher	1.75	2.85
Concrete mixer and traveling machine operator	1.50	2.75

It can be seen that the federally set wages ranged from 40 cents to $1.25 more per hour than local wages for the same kind of work. It appears from this example that the wage rates set by the Secretary of Labor in that particular community were substantially higher than the prevailing wage that existed there, although it may have reflected the prevailing rates in a locality that perhaps included a metropolitan area.

I have pointed out that the tax dollar that is sent to Washington and comes back later in the form of Federal aid, is a smaller dollar when it returns to its place of origin. I do not know just how much of its true value is lost in this form of Federal aid. In the field of Federal aid for slum clearance, for example, it is said that some 22½ cents of each dollar is consumed by the Federal overhead expense of making the dollar available and returned to its original source. And in the case of public housing, the brokerage fee paid to the Government on each tax dollar spent amounts to 39.9 cents.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I think most people agree with the warning so often given by the late Senator Robert Taft when he said: "Federal aid means Federal control. There is no middle ground."

A study of the history of Federal aid programs reveals that as a general rule such aid entails conditions and terms under which it is to be spent. We begin with it here by the application of the Davis-Bacon Act right at the inception, with Uncle Sam dictating to the local community how much they must pay the laborers who do the work, without regard to the local labor market and the wage rates that may actually prevail in a particular community.

It becomes evident, therefore, that if the taxpayers' money is to be sent to Washington, then returned for local use, it will come back with strings attached. That is one of the elements in the price that the people must pay if they choose to make use of Federal aid on local projects of this nature.

Therefore, while certain Federal aid programs have become accepted in this country, it would seem wise to take a close, hard look at the new ones that are proposed. Unless there are compelling reasons to justify such activities, it would seem the better part of wisdom to allow local communities which can do so to assume this responsibility on a local level, and keep Uncle Sam out of it.

Jobs After 40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Fraternal Order of Eagles has for some time conducted a fine campaign to educate employers to the advantages of hiring older workers. Remarks on the subject a couple of years ago by former Senator Frank A. Barrett were commented upon editorially by the Wyoming Tribune, Apirl 30, 1958, as follows:

JOB HUNTING AFTER 40

A lot of people will indeed applaud Senator Frank A. Barrett for questioning, in his newsletter, the callousness of the crack that "Life Begins at 40."

He pointed to the growing and grave concern with the trend among employers to bypass the fellow who has seen 40 summers.

"It is becoming increasingly difficult for men of that age to find jobs," he observed. "Thousands of skilled and experienced workers are unable to earn a living because of this discrimination in employment."

He praised the nationwide drive of the Eagles, which got off to a rousing start at Cheyenne largely through the efforts of W. F. O'Toole.

Legislation is pending before the Senate Labor Committee which would prohibit contractors on a Federal project from discriminating against individuals solely because of age.

"A good many of our citizens find themselves unemployed after working 20 years or more for one employer," the Senator said. "Even though they are in good physical condition and in the prime of life, they cannot find jobs. And yet these people are entirely too young to retire, and most without means to retire.

"They are caught betwixt and between. In my book, it 'ain't' fair and I don't mind saying so."

The seriousness of the situation was pronounced even when the economy was booming. It has become tragic in many respects with the onset of the depression.

The Federal Government, at least, doesn't have to go along with the matter. And States might also take a cue.

Other favorable comments on the Eagles' campaign have been made by many public figures. Here are samples:

Vice President: "The Fraternal Order of Eagles deserves the gratitude of every American for their 'Jobs After 40' campaign. The all too prevalent practice of discriminating against middle-aged workers is a twofold tragedy. It causes hardship to many of our finest citizens, and it deprives the Nation of skills which it so badly needs these critical days"—RICHARD NIXON, Vice President of the United States.

Governor: "It is gratifying to learn that the Fraternal Order of Eagles, of which I am a member, is conducting this active campaign to end job discrimination based on age. I have been very much opposed to practice of shunting aside older folks"—Ernest W. McFarland, Governor of Arizona.

U.S. Senator: "In what should be their 'golden years,' altogether too many, now, are shunted more and more to an insecure, dependent, and hopeless position in our society, through deprivation, because of their age, of their opportunity for gainful work"—WARREN G. MAGNUSON, U.S. Senator from Washington.

Governor: "The Eagles certainly have my support in their efforts to take better advantage of the skills now being neglected in the increasing group of older men and women. I do support the Eagles 'Jobs After 40' campaign"—Albert D. Rosellini, Governor of the State of Washington.

Congressman: "Both public and private employers would be benefited by giving our older workers greater job opportunities, and I should like to commend the Eagles for their efforts in this important field"—GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Jr., Member of Congress, Ninth District, Alabama.

Governor: "I subscribe wholeheartedly to the objectives of the Eagles 'Jobs After 40' campaign. I will be happy to take steps to evaluate the problem in Maine with a view to developing solutions"—EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Governor of Maine.

Congressman: "The Fraternal Order of Eagles program for 'Jobs After 40' is a highly meritorious one and it certainly has my full support. Congratulations on this worthwhile enterprise"—Lawrence H. Smith, Member of Congress, First District, Wisconsin.

Governor: "I am sure that your organization can do a great deal to assist persons over 40 years of age find employment, and I have long been understanding of the problems faced by the middle aged"—Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of Maryland.

Congressman: "Today too many competent, able-bodied, trained, and experienced workers are being told they are 'too old, even at age 40.' That is why I have pledged my full support to the Fraternal Order of Eagles campaign against age discrimination"—HENRY S. REUSS, Member of Congress, Fifth District, Wisconsin.

Governor: "To the Fraternal Order of Eagles: It has been my experience that people after the age of 40 years have very much to offer in being placed on jobs. Their accumulated experience is valuable, and I find that very often they are more inclined to take an interest in the work and stay on the job longer than younger people"—Charles H. Russell, Governor of Nevada.

U.S. Senator: "The loss of production, as well as of a skilled work force sufficient to meet our national defense needs, require that older workers be given equal status in the competitive job market. The Eagles 'Jobs After 40' campaign is a most commendable and worthy project, and one which deserves wholehearted support. You certainly can count on mine"—HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, U.S. Senator from Minnesota.

Pennsylvania Dutch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, just recently I sent to each Member of the House of Representatives, a 76-page booklet that contained just about that many traditional Pennsylvania Dutch recipes. Along with each copy, I sent a covering letter, written in the Pennsylvania Dutch dialect which is written and spoken in my district. One of the daily papers in my district, the Lebanon Daily News, each day has a column written in that dialect. Not to keep the Members confounded, I also sent along an English translation of my covering letter, mentioning this wonderful area in Pennsylvania, which, from the response I received from the Members, is borne out in their letters to me.

I am grateful to receive the many nice comments from the membership for my effort to impart to them some information about customs of the Pennsylvania Dutch community and particularly their delightful food preparations and combination of Dutch dishes.

I want to include at the end of my remarks typical letters received that reflect the literary effort evoked by the cookbook and its covering letters, and should you be passing through that lovely Pennsylvania country with its well-kept farms, the colorful "hex" signs, and so forth, and overhear expressions like: "Jake is spritzing the grass," "It's just for nice," or "It wonders me," then you will know you are among the nice, hospitable Pennsylvania Dutch.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1960.

MIE GUDER FRIEND: Ich hob kaird es sawa uft muhls—"Fer wos sella mir Deutsch sie, wun du bisht net dumm." Our, Ich bin recht shure wun do glicklich genunk waersht fuh dirich des land, du daetsch ous finna aus sell net war is.

De shanne un gute-kolta boweri mit schier gute in pharab un mit "hexa" tzana—un de ushtso gute-kolta heiser sin arrick gross un so be-kund.

Ains fum de unner digna fah wos si bekund sin is erie kucha. Si sin grosse esser. Dirich des land sin wotsheiser wu si specializea (in des essa wos unser gross- modder gamacht hut).

Ich hob gamaint du daitsch glicha bruvera fum des essa in die hamit. Well, mie guder friend, Jack Wolfe, fum der Meggs Kumpany fum Harrisbaerick, aire is gross in de bizness un macht por sodda fum de Pennsylfania Deutscha noodla, aire hut en resada buch mit feel resada fa gude essa, un du kunsht dale fum de bicher greea.

Ich was os du hummerich washt usht fum de resada laesa. Froke die familia ains bruvera. Mie besht resade is "Schnitz un Knepp" uf page 29.

Der Biles Horst, Secretary Benson's congressional liaison mun, aire is awe fum des land un connet usht des schwetza aire con des ouse acta.

Huff du gleischt das buch un awe dale fum des kucha.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER M. MUMMA,
Member of Congress.

[Translation]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1960.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have heard the expression many times—"What's the use of being Dutch if you are not dumb." Nevertheless, I am quite sure if you have been fortunate enough to get up through this country, you would realize the untruth of that statement.

The beautiful and well-kept farms with barns well painted and with "hex" signs—and the equally well kept houses are really terrific and so characteristic.

One of the other things for which they are famous is their cooking. They are stout eaters. Throughout the territory there are hotels where they specialize in these traditional dishes.

I thought you would like to even try such meals in your home. Well, my good friend, Jack Wolfe of the Meggs Company of Harrisburg, who specializes in manufacturing several varieties of the Pennsylvania Dutch noodles, has a recipe book for many such dishes, and has made some of these available for you.

I know you will get hungry just reading these recipes. Have your folks try one. My favorite is "Schnitz un Gnepp" on page 29.

Miles Horst, Secretary Benson's congressional liaison man, is also from this country and cannot only talk it but act it out.

Hope you will enjoy the book and also some of the cooking.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER M. MUMMA,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

WALTER: When the flags go by the train is all! Jacob! Get up! Mamas et herself, papas et hisself, and I have et myself!

Thanks for the noodles!

WALT.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1960.

Representative WALTER M. MUMMA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WALTER: Mine Gott, if your recipe book I take home an elephant mine wife makes me.

That's goot * * * I take home!

Thanks so much,

CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN.

MEIN LIEBE HERR MUMMA: Ich been gescribblin deser noten to mein Congressenman to asken vass is loss mitten der mailen und envelopen. Mein yungin Erhardt iss mit der trainen gewoerken mit mailen. He vass commenzin mit der grosse hufen puffer mit coal geskupen und now mit der lowdish getooten and stinken dieseler. Ich been ein aulten mann und been not understandern alles. Auber Erhardt is dinken he vill be das job withouten iffen das mailen and envelopin mit desen grosse zoomer boomers is gefiyian. He vants I shuld mine Congressenman gescribblin to tellen vas a goodische mann is Herr CUNNINGHAM who kompt fun Omaha.

Also ich been vorryin mit das zoomer boomer vas is gerpeepin mit kameran in das backyarden fun diese Kremlin. Varoom he is gettin gecaughten?

Leben zie so viele yahren as da fuchs um schwantz hadt haaren.

Zinserely,

WALTER WIENERWURST.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1960.

Howdy.

I has just contracted yore cook book and Ise powerful greatful.

Some of the vittles talked of shore sound scrumptus but it is quite a contrasatory to the grub fed in our Ozarks. We'uns air attached to the beans, tatters, maters, pork, cornbread, poke greens, and 'lassus we'uns been fetched up on, but bein' of the sportin' kind—I'll have Ma stew up a batch and try it on tha youngens!

Yourn,

His mark (X)
A. S. J. CARNAHAN.

P.S.—Translated from Ozark into English: "We wish to acknowledge receipt of your recipe book and sincerely thank you."

A. S. J. CARNAHAN.

Statement of Hon. Robert Lovett to National Policy Machinery Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, earlier in this session, Robert A. Lovett testified before the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, of which Senator JACKSON is chairman, and of which I have the honor to be a member. This testimony attracted widespread interest and comment when it was subsequently released, but a number of articles published subsequently interpreted certain comments of Mr. Lovett as being critical of President Eisenhower. In order to make clear that Mr. Lovett's testimony was both in word and intent directed at the institution of the Presidency and not at President Eisenhower personally, Senator MUNDT, ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, wrote Mr. Lovett and received a reply making this intent completely clear.

I ask unanimous consent that the exchange of correspondence between Senator MUNDT and Mr. Lovett, and an article on the subject by Arthur Krock printed in the New York Times of April 14, 1960, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 30, 1960.

Mr. ROBERT LOVETT,
Brown Bros., Harriman & Co.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. LOVETT: During March you graciously appeared as the leadoff witness before the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, of which I am a member. At the close of your appearance, the subcommittee went into executive session to receive your comments on the operations of the National Security Council.

Throughout your discussion of the NSC you referred to "the President." At the time, it was my impression that you were analyzing the position of President. Subsequent published articles have been based on the assumption that you described the activities of the present incumbent of the Presidency, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

One of these articles was a column by Mr. Walter Lippmann on March 1. Several days later I attempted to clarify the matter through a statement for the RECORD. Attached is a copy.

Unfortunately my clarification statement seems to have clarified nothing. Your testimony still is be interpreted as applying to President Eisenhower. I would appreciate very much having a short note from you as to the meaning you intended to give the phrase "the President" in your executive testimony. I hope to insert it in the committee record.

Again may I say that your basic statement before our subcommittee was most interesting and pertinent. With kindest regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senator.

ROBERT A. LOVETT,
New York, N.Y., April 4, 1960.

Senator KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: On my return to the office today from the Pacific coast, I found awaiting me your letter of March 31 requesting clarification of the meaning of certain language in my comments on the National Security Council given in executive session before the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery.

You are correct in your understanding that my use of the expression "the President" meant "a President," or "any President," and not specifically the present incumbent. I have made this same answer to Gordon Gray, special assistant to the President, who made the same inquiry of me by telephone while I was in California.

You will recall that, in my opening statement, I said (last sentence, p. 12, of the subcommittee printed record, pt. 1) that "It should be clear, therefore, that none of these observations is intended to be critical of any individuals or of operational decisions." The few paragraphs I had written dealing with NSC were excised from my public statement and were given in executive session in accordance, I am informed, with the terms of an understanding reached at the request of the White House regarding the handling in executive session of questions on NSC matters. The sentence quoted above naturally applies, as you rightly understood, to all my testimony in both open and executive sessions.

In view of the public interest shown in the subcommittee's hearings, it is not surprising to find some agencies or individuals who feel that the shoe might fit. I know of no way to keep them from trying it on for size.

With my thanks for your kind letter and cordial personal regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT.

HOW TO MAKE A SHOE FIT ANY FOOT

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, April 13.—Since Robert A. Lovett testified before Senator JACKSON'S subcommittee several weeks ago, the impression has been growing that he definitely subscribed to some of the harshest criticisms of President Eisenhower and the National Security Council in their mutual relationship. Some news dispatches and analyses of Lovett's testimony, and a Senate speech by Senator FULBRIGHT, are important sources of this public understanding.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee concluded that the former Secretary of Defense "indicated that the President (meaning Eisenhower) leads a dangerously sheltered life as Chief Executive." Also, that Lovett "said * * * the NSC protects Mr. Eisenhower from the debates that precede policy decisions."

The transcript of Lovett's testimony, both in open and executive session, does not establish either of these conclusions, or the assumptions in the press that when Lovett referred to "the" President, he always meant Eisenhower. What the transcript does establish is this:

1. At the outset of his testimony Lovett stated a caveat. It was that his remarks would be "based for the most part on notes made" during the Truman administration, and that he intended "no direct reference to any individuals or specific decisions."

2. But he did not regularly repeat this caveat. Therefore, when he answered, and agreed with, questions about "NSC procedures" and "the President," so phrased they could have been taken to apply to the Eisenhower tenure, it was possible to assume that the witness replied in kind.

3. But close inspection of the transcript shows that the former Secretary of Defense conceived he was discussing "a" President and the National Security Council as an institution, and he has since said as much. Apparently he relied on his opening caveat to prevent hypothetical exchanges in executive session from being interpreted as applying specifically to Eisenhower and the current procedures of the National Security Council.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following are such exchanges:

Mr. JACKSON. Do you think the Security Council can operate effectively, as it was designed originally, if you have a large number of participants?

Mr. LOVETT. I would have very great doubts about its ability to operate in a mass atmosphere. I think it would inhibit fair discussion * * * [and] be an embarassment as regards the vigor with which a man might want to defend his position. I think it would limit the quality of the debate which the President ought to hear.

Mr. JACKSON. You do not necessarily lighten the load of the President by bringing to him agreed-upon papers where no decision is involved, other than to say, "We will go ahead with this." Don't you think there is confusion on the point that there is a tendency to help the President, to lighten his load, by trying to do his constitutional work for him?

Mr. LOVETT. I think the President in his own protection must insist on being informed and not merely protected by his aids, [it being] a tendency of younger assistant * * * to try to keep the bothersome problems away from the senior's desk.

Probably it was because the witness did not steadily invoke his caveat, like takers of the fifth amendment before racket inquiries, that many concluded Lovett had conceded the points of criticism involved as currently applicable. But if he fears that President Eisenhower's temperament, his military preference for having issues intensely screened for him, and his awesome renown, inevitably have diluted the essential concept and function of the National Security Council in this administration, Lovett neither "said" nor "indicated" this. And the National Security Council's statistical record—of the President in the chair at 90 percent of the National Security Council meetings, sharp debates in his presence over fundamental differences in policy papers—refutes many assumptions on which major criticisms are founded.

H.R. 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House have been advised that H.R. 5, the Foreign Investment Tax Act, will be brought up on Thursday of this week so that the House can complete consideration of the bill. Members will recall the debate on H.R. 5 began on March 8 under a closed rule providing for 3 hours of debate. Two and one-half hours of debate were consumed on that day and debate was suspended until a later date. Thus, when consideration of H.R. 5 is resumed on Thursday, there will only remain 30 minutes of debate, 22 minutes of which are reserved to the minority.

The limited amount of time available for debate on Thursday will not permit a full discussion of a number of points which deserve to be brought to the attention of the House for its consideration in connection with the vote on the bill.

I refer particularly to the fact that the Committee on Ways and Means has adopted two amendments to the bill which it proposes to offer to the House as committee amendments, as provided for by the rule. On April 28 I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of three amendments and the text of the press release of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, in explanation of the committee amendments.

I want to take this occasion to explain briefly the committee amendments and to commend them and the bill to the House. These amendments were adopted in the light of the debate which took place on March 8 on the bill and are designed to perfect the bill by removing some of the features which evidently gave concern to a number of the Members of the House. I feel confident that the committee amendments successfully accomplish this purpose and that no Member of the House need entertain any reservations about voting for H.R. 5 this Thursday.

I also propose to discuss some of the matters raised by the Members involving general policy questions surrounding H.R. 5. I refer particularly to two matters: First, the question of the impact of H.R. 5 on the U.S. balance of payments and, second, the effect of the bill on American jobs. After giving very careful thought to these questions, I am absolutely convinced that there need not be any concern about H.R. 5 on these two counts.

BASIC PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The basic purpose of H.R. 5 is to permit the deferral—postponement—of the U.S. corporate income tax on income earned abroad by a new type of domestic corporation to be known as the Foreign Business Corporation. The Foreign

Business Corporation will be a corporation that earns virtually all of its income outside of the United States and meets a number of very rigorous tests. Under one of the committee amendments, which I will discuss in greater detail below, the Foreign Business Corporation must earn and reinvest its income in the less-developed countries of the world.

Today, under existing law, a great number of American business firms can enjoy tax deferral by setting up foreign corporations and particularly what are known as "foreign base companies." The Foreign Business Corporation would be a domestic base company. As I have indicated, in order to qualify as a Foreign Business Corporation and to enjoy tax deferral on the income earned, a company would have to meet very rigorous tests, more rigorous than those involved in foreign incorporation. In addition, as I have also pointed out, the Foreign Business Corporation would have to earn its income in the less-developed countries in order to enjoy tax deferral whereas existing foreign base companies can earn their income anywhere in the world.

The modest character of H.R. 5 is, I think, quite evident. Nevertheless the bill is important. A number of American firms, particularly small business firms, are either not able or not willing to incorporate abroad in order to get tax deferral. Foreign incorporation is generally regarded as a cumbersome and expensive business and often does not lead to rational management of business operations. H.R. 5 would make it possible for these American firms to enjoy parity with other American firms that have been able and willing to go abroad—at least so far as operating in the less-developed countries is concerned. H.R. 5 would also—and this is most important—improve the competitive position of American firms abroad relative to the position of their foreign competitors. The United States stands virtually alone among the major countries of the world in not providing the kind of tax treatment involved in H.R. 5. Finally, H.R. 5 would serve as an incentive to American private investment in the less developed countries and would serve, therefore, to advance our foreign policy objectives which are being met through Government aid. It is only through expanding private investment that the prospect of reducing Government aid to the less developed countries can be realized.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 5

The two amendments to H.R. 5 that will be offered to the House would accomplish three purposes. They would:

First, limit the provisions of H.R. 5 to income earned and reinvested in the less developed countries;

Second, eliminate the so-called gross-up with respect to the dividend income received by the foreign business corporation; and

Third, make a corporation ineligible as a foreign business corporation if it has been operating abroad under substandard labor conditions.

Limiting H.R. 5 to investment in the less developed countries means that the provisions of the bill would act as incentives to investment in the less developed countries only. It is in these areas of the world that private investment is most desperately needed and where the development of private enterprise is essential for long-term economic growth and political stability.

The elimination of gross-up is a highly technical matter. A number of the minority members of the committee, in the floor debate of March 8, objected to the inclusion of this provision in H.R. 5 on the grounds that it discriminated against the Foreign Business Corporation provided for in H.R. 5. Since that time, the Committee on Ways and Means has held public hearings on gross-up legislation which, if enacted, would apply to all domestic corporations including the Foreign Business Corporation. It was felt that, in view of this pending bill, it was not necessary or desirable to have a separate gross-up provision in H.R. 5.

The committee also adopted an amendment providing that a corporation would be ineligible for the benefits of H.R. 5 for any taxable year in which it was found to be operating abroad under substandard labor conditions. The wage standards involved would be those of the foreign country in which it was operating. The committee felt that, since the expansion of U.S. private investment was essential to the effectuation of important goals of national policy, the positive results of such an investment should not be endangered by a corporation operating in a less developed country under labor standard conditions that were below the minimum standards of the country concerned and still be able to enjoy the advantages of H.R. 5. This provision of the bill will not be administered in a harsh and punitive manner. It is expected that adequate opportunity will be given a corporation to raise its standards in order to conform with the required standards.

REVENUE EFFECTS

The Treasury Department has estimated that, with the amendment limiting H.R. 5 to less developed countries, the revenue effect of the bill will range between $30 to $40 million a year. This is a reduction of over 50 percent and, indeed, more like a two-thirds reduction, in the revenue effect that was estimated for the bill as originally reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

It is important to emphasize that this revenue effect does not involve an ultimate revenue loss for the Treasury. H.R. 5 does not provide for tax reduction; it only provides for the postponement of tax. When the earnings from foreign investments are returned to the United States, as they ultimately must, the full U.S. tax will be paid. Moreover, by promoting investments, H.R. 5 also promotes the future flow of income from investments and hence increases the revenue from such income which the Treasury will collect. I firmly believe that tax deferral should be regarded as a short-term investment by our Government in American private enterprise abroad that will yield good returns to the U.S. Government, to the Treasury Department and to American business in the years ahead.

ADMINISTRATION SUPPORTS H.R. 5

The administration has indicated its support for H.R. 5, as amended, because it gives effect to the President's recommendation, contained in his budget message this year, for the enactment of tax deferral legislation limited to income earned and reinvested in the less developed countries of the world. In a letter from the Treasury Department to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee it is pointed out that the administration has urged that further steps be taken to encourage private investment in the less developed countries abroad and that H.R. 5 is in accord with this specific recommendation of the President.

I also understand that the committee amendments to the bill have satisfactorily met the reservations that a number of groups have had to the enactment of H.R. 5. The AFL–CIO, which indicated its opposition to H.R. 5 when the bill was first brought up, has now urged the passage of H.R. 5, as amended.

H.R. 5 AND THE U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

There has been some concern expressed about the question of promoting private investment abroad at a time when the U.S. balance of payments has manifested a deficit. It is, therefore, worth while to examine briefly the relationship between private investment and the U.S. balance of payments and the effect of H.R. 5 thereon. Before doing so it is useful to take a look at the recent developments in the U.S. balance of payments to see what has been happening and particularly to note whether our balance of payments problem is as serious today as it was a year or two ago.

The evidence is very encouraging. In the Foreign Commerce Weekly, for May 9, 1960, a publication of the U.S. Department of Commerce, there is a detailed discussion of the remarkable improvement in U.S. exports. I quote the lead paragraph in this article:

> Sales of U.S. goods abroad displayed considerably increased vigor in the first 3 months of this year, following their rebounds in the second half of 1959. Nonmilitary shipments, totaling $18.4 billion at a seasonally adjusted annual rate in January–March, as compared with $15.4 billion a year earlier, showed the greatest strength apparent in more than 2 years.

The improvement in our exports reflected a 20-percent increase over the same period in 1959 and March exports were larger than in any month since June of 1957 when exports were inflated by the post-Suez situation. The gain in exports this year was shared by all major categories of U.S. exports.

It is interesting to note that exports to Western Europe—a prime target for American investors in recent years—rose 40 percent in January and February 1960 above the corresponding months of 1959. Exports to Japan were also higher by 40 percent than for the same period in 1959.

With the improvement in our balance of payments the gold outflow that was of so much concern in 1958 and 1959 has slowed down to a trickle. I understand that there was a smaller gold outflow in the whole first quarter of 1960 than was recorded on the average for any month in 1959.

Not only has our balance of payments situation shown very encouraging signs of improvement so that we need be less concerned about our balance of payments, but it is also very important to recognize that U.S. direct private investment abroad has not been a factor in our balance of payments troubles. There is one fact about investment and our balance of payments that is not well known and deserves wide attention. It is that year in and year out since the end of World War II, and even before, the income that we have earned from our direct investments abroad has exceeded the outflow of new direct investment.

Every year we have been taking in more in income than we have been sending out in new investment. This has been an important plus factor in our balance of payments—almost as important in 1959 as our export surplus. Thus, over the last 5 years, 1955–59, the excess of our direct investment income over our direct investment outgo has totaled $3.5 billion. Thus, direct investment transactions have on balance supported our balance of payments to the tune of $3.5 billion over the past 5 years. In 1958 and 1959, the excesses of income over outgo on direct investment account equaled $1.1 billion and $0.9 billion respectively.

Nor can it be argued that direct investment outflows helped cause our balance of payments problems in 1958 and 1959. The fact of the matter is that direct investment outflows were lower in 1958 and 1959 than in 1957 which was a year of balance of payments surplus for the United States.

Actually we can look forward to income from our direct investments offering an important support for our balance of payments in the years ahead. Direct investments abroad also help U.S. exports as can be seen in the record of exports to Western Europe this year which I cited earlier.

The "Staff Report on Employment, Growth, and Price Levels" prepared by the staff of the Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress and published on December 24, 1959, confirms these observations. The following quotation is taken from this report:

> Taken by itself, the net contribution of private capital investments abroad cannot reasonably be accused of causing balance of payments problems. To say this, however, requires the setting against one another of private foreign investment outflows and private earnings on foreign investment. If, at this period, U.S. business stopped investing abroad, the balance of payments deficit would be reduced to a negligible amount However, if the fruits of past private foreign investment were also eliminated, this proposition would be vitiated. It seems a more reasonable approach to take the net of these two flows, which gives private foreign investments to date a pretty clear bill of health.

A recent interim report by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the U.S. Senate, prepared in connection with its special study of U.S. foreign commerce and dated April 25, 1960 had this to say in connection with the subject of private foreign investment and our balance of payments:

> Reducing the flow of private investment abroad would contradict a major thesis of our economic assistance policy, hobble the competitive power of U.S. industry in world commerce and, in the longer run, diminish the returns from foreign investment which are an important entry on the income side of our international ledger.

JOBS, EXPORTS, AND FOREIGN INVESTMENT

It has been contended that private investment abroad reduces U.S. exports and hence takes away American jobs. What truth is there to this contention? I think the evidence shows that far from reducing American exports and taking away American jobs, private investment abroad creates markets for American exports and hence helps create American jobs.

First, let me say that H.R. 5 would not take away investment money that would otherwise be invested in the United States and induce American corporations to invest that capital abroad. H.R. 5 provides the deferral of U.S. tax on income earned abroad. It, therefore, operates as an incentive to reinvestment abroad of incomes earned abroad. To put it briefly, it promotes the plowing-back of foreign earnings. Once the foreign earnings come back to the United States and enter the domestic capital market they will be subject to the full U.S. tax. Thus, H.R. 5 will not take capital away from investment in the United States and from the creation of jobs in the United States. As a matter of fact, if an American corporation has decided to invest abroad, H.R. 5 would make it possible for that corporation to finance more of the investment out of its foreign earnings and correspondingly less of the investment out of its domestic capital.

Neither would the bill result in a reduction of U.S. exports and the production abroad of goods that were formerly exported from the United States. As we all know, there has been a sizable amount of U.S. investment abroad particularly in Canada and Western Europe in the last few years. Has this investment resulted in a decline of the U.S. exports? Let us take Western Europe for example. There has been a substantial amount of investment by U.S. corporations in the six countries that make up the common market. Yet, despite this fact, our exports to the common market countries have actually increased. In the first 2 months of this year U.S. exports to the common market amounted to almost $550 million. This was 52 percent above our exports for the same period in 1959 and 36 percent above our exports for the same period in 1956, a year which we tend to regard as a high export year.

Another test of whether U.S. investment has impaired our exports can be made by examining the decline in our exports that took place in 1958 and 1959 to see whether these declines in exports were attributable to American investments abroad. Our exports declined in such categories as raw cotton, iron and steel mill products, nonferrous metals, civilian aircraft and petroleum. In no case did our exports decline because the exports markets for these products were being supplied from overseas sources by American companies.

Even in the case of imports into the United States, the increase that we have experienced over the past few years is not attributable to goods produced by American investment abroad. As you know, H.R. 5 contains a provision that would make a corporation ineligible for the benefits of H.R. 5 if it reexported to the United States, directly or indirectly, goods that had been produced by it abroad. The provision in the bill says specifically that a corporation will be ineligible for the benefits of H.R. 5 if more than 10 percent of its gross income is derived from the sale of goods in the United States that were produced abroad.

I think it should be appreciated that the less developed countries of the world are not good markets for U.S. exports for the simple and basic reason that these countries are poor. Investment abroad, as investment at home, creates wealth and income. It is only through investment that production can expand, standards of living rise and markets be developed. Investment by private U.S. companies will produce goods that these countries cannot afford to buy today from the United States. But in the process these countries will become markets for U.S. exports and this will create jobs in the United States.

This is surely the lesson of American history. We export the most to those countries with the highest standards of living and in which American enterprise has the greatest investment. The following table shows this clearly:

	Income per capita	*Per capita purchases from U.S.*
Canada	$1,436	$234.0
Great Britain	958	21.0
France	846	13.0
Germany	742	18.0
Italy	404	14.0
Japan	254	13.0
Egypt	109	1.5
India	61	1.1
Pakistan	52	1.3

I therefore do not think that there is a basis for concern about the effect of H.R. 5 either in terms of what it might do to exports and jobs at home or in terms of the effect that it might have on the balance of payments. On the contrary, it seems to me that through offering this modest, but important, incentive to private investment in the less developed countries we will help these countries to develop and to become good customers. Beyond that we would be advancing important objectives of national policy through the utilization of private enterprise which is our secret weapon in the cold war with the Sino-Soviet bloc.

In Answer to Soviets: Congressman Curtis of Missouri Urges New Weapons To Fight an Economic War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, during past weeks, the Nation's press has been subject to considerable criticism and analysis. Many news media are, however, doing a thoughtful, careful and constructive reporting job in the public interest. A good example of this is an interview by Sid Goldberg, news editor, NANA, with my colleague, TOM CURTIS. Mr. Goldberg, who is an executive of NANA, seldom personally covers news breaks and does interviews because he is in charge of the gathering and transmission of news. However, as an experienced and skilled reporter, occasionally he does do a story of national significance and importance. His thoughtful analysis of the points raised by Congressman CURTIS in discussing that peace can be maintained both through a strong military defense but also sound economic policies, both at home and abroad, has been very favorably received by the Nation's press. This interview has already been printed in the editorial sections of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Atlanta Constitution, Louisville Times, New Haven Register, among others.

I am familiar with the work of NANA because one of my hometown papers, the San Diego Union, carries this service. In days when there is a tendency to publicize the spectacular, I wish to commend Mr. Goldberg, Mr. CURTIS, and NANA in presenting to the public a forward looking analysis of economic steps that can and should be taken in our relations with countries overseas and, at the same time, protect the jobs of American workers:

IN ANSWER TO SOVIETS, LAWMAKER URGES NEW WEAPONS TO FIGHT AN "ECONOMIC WAR"

(By Sid Goldberg, North American Newspaper Alliance)

NEW YORK, April 16.—A key Congressman, in response to Premier Khrushchev's declaration of economic war, proposes strong countermeasures to Soviet "dumping," a complete revamping of the U.S. tariff system, and creation of a secretary of foreign economics as a full Cabinet member.

"Khrushchev has challenged us to economic war, but our arsenal is empty of effective weapons in this field," says Representative TOM CURTIS of St. Louis, Mo. "We've got the bombs and missiles to stand up to Russia in a military showdown, but in a battle between economies—the kind we're now being forced into—the United States is almost defenseless."

CURTIS, the only Missouri Republican holding high elective office, is the ranking minority Member of the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee and fourth-ranking Republican in the House Ways and Means Committee.

Now completing his fifth term in the House, the 48-year-old Congressman has been mentioned in the press as a running mate for either Vice President NIXON or, should he be drafted, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York.

PROPOSALS NOTED

The first of CURTIS' unorthodox proposals is the establishment of a U.S. Trading Corpotion (USTC), capitalized by the Government at $1 billion with a potential of up to $4 billion. Purpose of the corporation would be to enable U.S. firms to compete with the artificially low prices set by Soviet state trading monopolies. Payments from the corporation would assure a U.S. firm of a fair profit margin if it were forced to drastically lower its prices to meet the monopoly prices of Russia.

"Right now Russia is engaged in the same kind of unscrupulous business practices that were outlawed by our antitrust legislation in the last century," CURTIS explained in an interview during a visit here.

"The U.S. exporter, in competing with Soviet monopolies, often is up against the type of unfair competition that many small businessmen faced in American before the Sherman Antitrust Act," he said.

The St. Louis Congressman stresses that the Corporation would be designed as a defense only against totalitarian economies such as Russia's, and would go into action only when U.S. firms could prove they were up against unscrupulous foreign competition.

"There must be built-in safeguards against U.S. firms taking advantage of the Corporation," he continued. "Some firms inevitably would try to blackmail the Corporation into helping them underbid foreign competitors. But payments would be made only when the competition could be shown blatantly unfair."

TOM CURTIS cites several examples of how Russia cuts corners in its economic war with the West. Two years ago it tried to create anarchy in the world aluminum market by dumping vast quantities of the metal at below-cost prices. At the same time it outbid the United States for Icelandic fish, trying to tie the island's entire foreign trade to Kremlin purchases.

RETALIATION THREAT

He also points out that Poland recently agreed to supply Cuba with textile machinery; yet for several months Poland was negotiating to buy textile machinery from the United States, claiming a serious shortage at home.

"This kind of trade deal often is expensive economically to the Soviet bloc, and is entered only when an outstanding political goal can be achieved," CURTIS said. "Perhaps the mere threat of U.S. retaliation through the trading Corporation would be enough to dissuade the Russians from these practices.

"Just as the possession of the hydrogen bomb works as a deterrent to military aggression, existence of the trading Corporation could work as a deterrent to economic forms of aggression," he suggested.

CURTIS hopes that the Corporation, if set up, some day could be internationalized, growing into an "economic court of justice" that would eliminate the cutthroat practices that still persist in international trade.

Regarding U.S. tariffs, CURTIS believes the whole system is outdated. "It regulates but it doesn't stimulate," he said. "The tariff should be an economic wedge that we could use to force an increase in the standard of living around the world."

He believes this could be done by automatically lowering the tariff by a set percentage every time a foreign wage scale goes up. For example, if Japanese textile workers received an increase in pay, the tariff on Japanese textiles would be lowered proportionately. Similarly, when a foreign wage rate goes down, the U.S. tariff would go up.

CURTIS says it is inconceivable that we can have healthy trade relations with countries where workers are paid a 10th or a 20th of the U.S. scale. He cites the Peruvian miner, who earns 8 cents an hour—compared to the $1.50 an hour earned by his American counterpart.

EMPLOYERS COULD PAY MORE

"Our miners may be 10 times more efficient than Peru's, or even 15 times; but I refuse to believe they are 20 times better," he said. "Although employers in underdeveloped countries naturally can't pay U.S.-scale wages, they certainly can afford to pay more than they are. One way to encourage them is through a carrot-and-stick tariff policy."

CURTIS says the United States need have no guilty conscience about "meddling" in the wage policies of foreign countries. "If you call this 'interference,' then I'm all for more 'interference' of this kind," he says. "People will eat better."

The Congressman is not dispirited that neither the trading corporation nor the new tariff system has majority support in Congress. He has tried twice without success to push through the necessary legislation. But he believes that, as the Soviet economic threat intensifies, and as the needs and demands of underdeveloped countries continue growing, pressure for a new approach to foreign economic policy will become compelling.

"The problems already have become so vast that the State Department no longer can handle them," he said. "What is needed is a new Cabinet position, a Secretary of Foreign Economics, devoted entirely to the questions of export-import, tariffs, the Soviet economic challenge, and our aid and trade agreements. Several European Governments have had such cabinet posts for many years, and it is time we got around to having one ourselves."

Herbert J. Pascoe Educational Scholarship Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include a statement which I made at the seventh anniversary dinner of the Herbert J. Pascoe Educational Scholarship Foundation, which was held on Sunday, May 15, in Newark, N.J. The foundation was set up to encourage young people to enter the field of education by awarding scholarships to aspiring young teachers. This year, scholarships were awarded to two outstanding students; Joyce Tuzzolo, of Bloomfield, N.J., and Rosalie Notto, of Phillipsburg. Both of these young women were selected because they demonstrated their superior academic ability and excellent potential for the profession which they have chosen for themselves.

The statement follows:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN PETER W. RODINO, JR., AT THE HERBERT J. PASCOE EDUCATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION SEVENTH ANNUAL DINNER

It is a great pleasure to greet you once again at this commemoration of 7 years of fruitful activity by the Herbert J. Pascoe Educational Scholarship Foundation.

There could be no more fitting memorial to Herbert J. Pascoe, who himself made a

great contribution to education in this State, than the dedicated work of the Foundation.

The lives of boys and girls throughout the State of New Jersey are already being affected and enriched by the leadership of Herbert J. Pascoe scholars who have now graduated and joined the dedicated ranks of their chosen profession.

Through your efforts many young people have become teachers who otherwise might have been attracted elsewhere, and many have attended college who might otherwise not have been able to do so.

The broad problem of higher education has come into sharp focus in recent years as we realize how essential is a college-trained and college-educated citizenry to our very survival.

The complex problems of living in this nuclear age makes bare literacy hardly sufficient. And the challenge of keeping pace with the technological advance of the Soviet Union—a challenge we must meet—further underlines the importance of higher education.

Unfortunately, the recognition of these basic truths has not yet spurred us on to adequate action.

While the Soviet Union is graduating more teachers, more scientists and more engineers than ever before, we complacently permit an appalling wastage of our human resources. It has been estimated that over half, and possibly three-quarters, of our qualified and capable students, with demonstrated academic ability, fail to go on to college.

Perhaps a major reason why so many of these young people do not go to college is because of a lack of adequate personal funds to finance their education. Part of this gap is being filled by the efforts of this foundation, and by similar private groups throughout the country. Another part of this gap is being filled by the National Defense Education Act, which in the 2 years since its passage has enabled many young people to go to college.

But I do not think I shall offend this organization, nor shall I offend the Federal Government, when I say that all of these efforts are only a drop in the bucket. The dimensions of the need are simply too great and too overwhelming.

And the problem is not alone that of finances. As graduation time approaches I receive dozens of letters every week from high school seniors who plead with me for help in getting into college. It is tragic, but true, that students with A or B averages, with well-rounded and impressive records, are being turned away every day by our colleges and universities. The schools have 5, 10 or even 15 applications for every opening. As a result, even those who could pay their own way are forced to forego their lifetime ambitions.

The problem is becoming more and more acute in New Jersey, which has always exported the majority of its high school graduates to out-of-State institutions. I understand from the press that other State universities have already given notice that the increasing pressures of their local applicants will require them to give less and less consideration to the New Jersey student in the future.

We cannot continue to permit our potential human resources to lie fallow. It is not my purpose, in this brief statement, to suggest the details of a solution. I merely wish to stress that the solution requires the concerted and dedicated efforts of all our citizens on all fronts and on all levels. It requires a program of national scope and with national support. Above all, it requires our united conviction that the need is too urgent to be set aside or ignored.

We in this country, have indeed, bet all our chips on the enlightenment of our people. We have placed all our faith, all our hope, upon the education, the intelligence and the understanding of our body politic. We have said that ours is a Government conducted by its citizens, and from this it follows that our Government can only be properly conducted if our citizens are well educated.

The manner in which we accept the challenge to provide those citizens with educational opportunities may well determine the future course of our destiny.

The Fallacy of High Interest Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, attempts to raise the interest rate on long-term U.S. bonds, will have an adverse impact upon our economy. The tight-money policy saddles this Nation with one of the most fantastic economic theories ever advanced.

Since 1953, the Eisenhower administration has persistently sought to effectuate higher and higher interest rates. As I have stated before, the rise in interest rates has been nothing less than scandalous. Hiking of interest rates has only one function, to create spirals of increasing costs on every item, transaction, and commodity, sold or purchased in our economy. These increased interest rates must be borne by the borrower, while the lender reaps tremendous additional profits for no good reason whatsoever.

The action of the Republican Party, self-professed disciples of the balanced budget, in straight-facedly urging a higher interest rate—which will among other things increase the cost of Government indebtedness—while at the same time, accusing the Democratic leadership of wild, inflationary spending, would be indeed comical if it were not so vicious.

The tight-money policy is dangerous because it tends to restrict our Nation's economic growth. Topflight economists have been quick to point out that pursuit of a policy such as this at a time when our economic growth is already retarded, as evidenced by the high unemployment statistics, serves only to further curb our productive capacity. Unfortunately, inflation is not retarded by increased interest rates. High interest rates accomplish higher costs with no corresponding increase in output. For example: the increased cost to the taxpayer of a quarter of 1 percent rise in interest on $1 billion worth of Government bonds is $2.5 million a year. Yet none of this increased cost gives the taxpayers a dime's worth of additional services; rather, it further raises the cost of all the other money borrowed, since this increase is passed along in other loans, mortgages, and financing plans. For instance, such a proposed interest raise would increase the cost of buying a home, and this would make homeownership more difficult.

Recently, Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE illustrated how increased interest rates have raised the cost of each typical elementary school by $150,000. The results of the tight-money policy in the school program alone have cost the Government an additional $675 million each year. This increased burden on school construction and education in the United States is directly attributable to the Republican administration's tight-money policy. The additional money did not go toward increased construction costs, or for the wages of workingmen, or even to the building contractors. Instead, this money went to the moneylenders, the financiers and investment corporations, and banks. It was sweated from the hides of our citizens.

The effect of tight money on private housing is already observable. Despite the continued pressing need for decent housing, it is estimated that there will be some 200,000 less homes built this year as compared with the year 1959, in which only 1.3 million new homes were built. The main reasons for fewer new homes; lack of mortgage money and the high interest rates, both the natural result of the Republican tight-money policy.

The more carefully the tight-money policy is analyzed, the more fantastic it becomes. Inflation can be successfully curbed, according to the administration, if the runaway boom in this country is nipped by making money more difficult to obtain. Money can be made more difficult to obtain by making those seeking it pay more interest when they attempt to borrow it. But how can this theory possibly work when the increased interest rate will only affect those who have need of the money markets; namely, the consumer and small business. It is they who must pay the increased interest rate oftentimes for commodities that are necessary to them and vital to our economy. Thus bankers prosper while the consumer staggers under an increased cost for borrowing money or mortgages, while the big corporations go unscathed. Yet it is the huge corporations who can, and do, swell their profits by continuous price hikes, thereby directly contributing to an inflated economy.

Not only has tight money failed to curb inflation, it has directly and unmistakably promoted it. The cost of living has increased in spite of this misguided act of clamping down on the little man. Billions of dollars have been lost as a result of only partial economic productivity. With at least 3½ million unemployed, and no reduction in sight, there is nothing to justify the currently high interest rates or an increase in them. Certainly we must scrap all economic theories which prevent the economy from developing in a manner that will permit it to support full employment. In Detroit, there are absolutely no signs whatsoever that point to a boom. Indeed, the opposite is true. Unemployment is still a serious problem, small business is in bad shape by any standard of measurement, and taxes and revenue from all branches of government are falling off. This then, is obviously no time to be raising interest rates. Already the number of second land contracts, second mortgages, and other

shaky security devices grow more numerous; and at the same time, there has been a drastic increase in the number of foreclosures. These are the results of this artificial scarcity of money that the administration seems determined to accomplish at any cost to the national economy. The tremendous costs of these already high interest rates that have been heaped upon millions of wage earners as well as small businessmen and home buyers, permitting moneylenders to reap a tremendous profit without providing any additional service whatsoever is disgraceful. To surrender to the moneylenders of this country by indulging them in this selfish desire, is unnecessary.

May I point out that since World War I, through the booms, depressions, and crises, this country has successfully met its fiscal needs without the necessity to exceed the 4½-percent interest rate ceiling on long-term U.S. bonds. I believe these bonds can attract buyers as they always have without the necessity of raising the interest rate. Whatever shortage of loanable funds that may arise from time to time, is, at most, a temporary situation.

I further charge the Republican administration with promoting a scare campaign about inflation, which besides being an irresponsible act in itself, operates to discourage investors in long-term bonds of any kind, but rather encourages them to buy stocks. Republicans from the President down have engaged in this inflation scare to justify various policies and results of the present administration. Why should the interest rates on long-term U.S. bonds be increased at a time when these rates are now at an alltime 35-year high? It would only add billions to the tax bill of working Americans, and to make it worse, would operate to further inflate all other interest rates as well.

Ever since Mr. Eisenhower's first Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, boosted interest rates, interest rates in all fields have been steadily increasing. Surely the tight-money policy should prove to its Republican supporters that the inflationary atmosphere created by the gigantic corporations in this Nation cannot be deterred by the tight-money policy, primarily because they have no necessity to go to the moneylenders. The giant industries of steel, oil, automobiles, and drugs, can and do administer their prices upward, without any regard whatever for a tight-money policy that is supposed to curb inflation.

Millions of average American families have been hit hard by tight money. For example, over the last few years, higher interest rates on FHA mortgages have added thousands of dollars to the cost of buying a home.

In the final analysis, high interest rates increase all prices; they inflate the cost of raising a family, of buying a home, car, or appliances, and of raising small business capital. Thus, high interest costs are a major factor in the spiraling prices.

Are not two recessions since the Republican-sponsored tight-money policy sufficient proof of its ineffectiveness?

In my view, the President's recent request for a higher interest rate on U.S. bonds is more than just bad economic judgment. It reflects concern for the bankers and the money lenders in preference to the welfare of the entire Nation. Such callous indifference to the economic necessities of the day are inexcusable. It is my intention to bring the facts to the American people for it is they who must know who in Government would make them economic pawns of the vested interests of this country.

Funds for the Building of Schools and Paying of Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there has been much said in our country about the need for good, sound education for American youth. I believe that all of us will agree that we do want such education provided for them. I believe that the State of Indiana has been trying to provide such education.

The building of schools, their maintenance, and the employment of an adequate number of capable teachers are very expensive and such costs will increase as time goes on. The taxes to support this educational system are falling heavily on property owners, especially the owners of homes, farms, and small businesses. In some school districts, especially those where the children live and go to school in one district and their parents are employed in another, the property taxes for the building and maintenance of schools have pushed the local property tax levy to seven, eight, and even as much as nine and ten dollars per hundred dollars of taxable property.

In order to alleviate this burden, taxpayers are considering many alternatives. For years it has been suggested that the Federal Government contribute heavily to the support of our schools, but that, too, entails several problems. One is that the Federal Government is, as we know, heavily in debt, and in the end the taxpayer is also paying for all of the Federal money, plus the expense of Federal bureaucracy. If Federal money is to be used, a problem also arises about the formula for allocating the money among the various States and school districts. Some say that Federal assistance should be according to the need of the respective States. This could lead to a great unfairness, as a State which has refused to tax its citizens to build and maintain its schools, and frankly there are such States, naturally has needs greater than those States which have taxed themselves to give their children a proper education. School districts in Indiana have been leaders in building and maintaining adequate educational systems. Any Federal criteria for either school construction or teachers' salaries that bases that allocation on need would give great advantage to those States which refuse to pay adequate taxes for education. This practice would condone those States which have failed to collect taxes to properly construct and operate their schools, and would encourage these States to rely on the money other States pay into the Federal treasury.

Certain States have encouraged industry to move from Indiana. The State of Indiana has lost considerable industry to these States by giving an exemption on property taxes. That brings about an interesting situation. Several States give industries 10 years freedom from taxes if they will move their factories from Indiana to their State. This industry, which has paid taxes to maintain Indiana schools, goes to another State and pays no taxes. Taxpayers in Indiana employed in that industry lose their jobs and the Indiana school system loses the taxes this industry paid. The industry pays no taxes in its new location so that State has a greater need for the Federal money. If legislation is passed which allocates Federal aid on the basis of need, Indiana would pay taxes to the Federal Government to build schools in these States that take industry away fom Indiana. This situation could go on and on.

However, we must admit that there is a great need to find additional revenue sources to build and support our schools without creating a greater burden on the local property owner.

In addition to these problems arising from proposals for Federal assistance in education, we also have a national fear, and I think a just one, that the Government might dominate our schools and would not exert the same care in spending our tax dollars as the individual States do. It is, fortunately, a problem to which there is a solution.

The Federal Government, through income and excise taxes, has been taking a tremendous tax bite out of our national economy. The Federal Government has, throughout the years, exploited new taxes in an aggressive manner and now dominates the excise, corporation, and personal income tax field. What I propose is that the Federal Government earmark a certain part of the taxes it takes from the citizens of each State to return to that State for educational purposes. The Federal Government would have no claim on this money; there would be no part of it remaining in Washington. The relationship of the Federal Government to this money would be the same as that of the county treasurer in each of the 92 counties in the State of Indiana. If the treasurer is to collect a $3 levy for schools in a certain township or district, all of it, not just part of it is sent to that district.

I have introduced legislation whereby the Federal Government shall return to each State one-half of the tax it collects on cigarettes sold in that State. The State would be obliged to use this money for teachers' salaries or the construction of school buildings, whichever it determines is most needed. This would not encourage a State to cut down on its property taxes in order to get Fed-

eral aid. Each State would get back a certain portion of that which its taxpayers had paid.

I mentioned the possibility of the cigarette tax to an educator friend of mine. He said that it wouldn't be enough. I pointed out to him that if the Federal Government returned to Indiana just one-half of the cigarette tax, that is, 4 cents of every 8 cents tax per pack, it would amount to $24 million per year, which is three times the amount Indiana would receive under proposed legislation. He readily agreed that this legislation would meet their needs. It would be a simple matter to determine how much each State would receive, for all States except three have imposed State cigarette taxes, which require that accurate sales records are kept.

For more than a decade we have heard many voices raised to provide Federal financial assistance to our schools to relieve the burden on State and local revenue sources. These proposals have varied widely but have inevitably become mired down, owing to the problems stemming from the Federal association with the program. If we really want to provide additional money for school purposes here is a way to do it and leave the authority with the States and communities. This will offset much of the criticism of the other proposals and avoid some of the problems which have prevented enactment of other suggestions.

Furthermore, the several alternative plans for Federal aid which have been before the Congress this year are all temporary "stopgap" measures, or so we are told. A rebate of excise tax collections could provide a steady and permanent source of additional revenue for school purposes. There would be no need for congressional wrangles about the distribution of such funds, for each State would receive what it would be entitled to, based on its own consumption.

This approach need not be limited to one-half of the cigarette tax. It could be a greater or lesser proportion of that tax or it could be related to some similar Federal excise tax or a percentage of a personal income tax paid by each State which would provide adequate funds. It does provide an opportunity for persons concerned about this growing financial problem to meet the need for additional school funds and avoid many of the pitfalls of other Federal school-aid suggestions.

Do We Value Our Free Civilization?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the Freedom Institute of St. John's University, Jamaica, N.Y., is designed to inform students at the graduate level of the nature and evils of communism as contrasted to the priceless gift of freedom.

In view of the developments at Paris, the following eloquent address given by Senator THOMAS J. DODD at the convocation of the Freedom Institute on May 14, 1960, is particularly timely, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD AT THE CONVOCATION OF THE FREEDOM INSTITUTE OF ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY, JAMAICA, N.Y., MAY 14, 1960

On Thursday of this week, during debate on the Senate floor, I had occasion to refer to the Pulitzer Prize-winning novel "Advise and Consent," which pictures an America of a few years hence, an America in which demagogs can inflame huge gatherings and bring them to their feet cheering with the slogan, "I would rather crawl to Moscow on my hands and knees than be killed by an atomic bomb."

Should this book prove prophetic, it will mean that our people have rejected the choice between liberty and death made by Patrick Henry and the Founding Fathers, the choice which drew the cheers of America from 1775 down to the recent past.

The fundamental question before the United States and our free world allies in the coming decade is this: Do we value our free civilization enough to run all the risks and meet all the challenges which the Communists will force upon us in the years ahead? It is in the context of this question that I would like to discuss the subject that has been assigned to me today—"Political freedom under a representative government and in a totalitarian state."

I do not think it likely that an ignoble surrender policy will ever be publicly proclaimed by high American officials as their political platform.

Men and nations have frequently betrayed their best interests through fear but they have generally rationalized and disguised their cowardice and not publicly proclaimed it. Surrender, if it comes, will probably come in more subtle ways, but the end result will be the same. We need not look, therefore, for base pronouncements. We must seek out the trend in less obvious signs and guises. And such signs are not wanting.

When the preservation of freedom in West Berlin appeared to run serious risk of war a year ago, there was no dearth of advocates, at home and abroad, for a policy of concession and retreat that would temporarily avoid risk of war at the probable cost of freedom for West Berlin.

There is today a rapidly growing movement, well organized, well represented in the press, movies and TV, in the scientific community and in government, people so fearful of the risks of the cold war, that they are willing to accept nuclear disarmament on almost any terms, with or without an adequate system of detection and enforcement.

These people are not concerned that this could condemn the United States to a military inferiority which would make our eventual surrender or destruction inevitable. They are concerned only with their fears of the present.

And then we have the school of British intellectuals now openly advocating what our own "softies" have heretofore kept below the surface. This group, headed by Lord Bertrand Russell and Philip Toynbee, believes that we must give up nuclear weapons now to assure that they will never be used against us, that we should seek the best terms from the Soviets we can get; but if they should be totally intransigent we should give up nuclear weapons anyway, and submit to Communist control as a preferable alternative to carrying on the present struggle that might lead to nuclear war.

Toynbee states the basic philosophy of this group in the following sentence:

"In the terrible context of nuclear war, even the vital differences between communism and Western freedom become almost unimportant."

Almost unimportant.

This is the neutralist intellectual's equivalent of "I would rather crawl to Moscow on my hands and knees than be killed by an atomic bomb."

It does not matter to these people that by building our strength we maintain a good chance of preserving both our lives and our freedom. It does not matter that the blood bath which historically follows every Communist seizure might take more lives than the A-bomb. It does not matter that the existence they purchased by surrender would be only the exploited existence of a Communist slave.

It matters only that the element of risk is large, and that, to them, any considerable risk to existence is a greater evil than the loss of Christian civilization. They are so overwhelmed at the horror of nuclear destruction that all other values are for them already destroyed and are rendered relatively meaningless.

Whether this neutralist philosophy will remain an isolated view held by an insignificant group, manifesting itself infrequently in test ban rallies or in occasional picketing of Downing Street and the White House; or whether this poisonous creed will seep into the marrow of our national bone structure and paralyze us, will depend upon whether our people really understand, or can be brought to understand, what the loss of national freedom and subjection to Communist tyranny would mean.

There are two basic replies to the neutralist position. The first is that we can avoid both catastrophies, nuclear war and enslavement, by remaining militarily strong and standing firm against aggression. This is a potent argument. It is a tangible argument. It is a demonstrable argument that has thus far worked. It is the basis of our national policy. It has been exhaustively debated, its tenets are widely known, and I therefore forego discussion of it today in favor of the second argument against neutralism, which is less understood and little discussed.

This argument maintains that the political destruction of Western civilization and its system of free institutions constitutes a death for its people and its nations just as violent, just as hideous, just as final as nuclear destruction itself, that there is little to choose between nuclear physical destruction and Communist political destruction.

The detailed knowledge of communism in all its aspects is available; indeed it is abundant. But the evil of communism is so alien, so appalling, so far removed from anything in our own experience, that our intellectuals and our people ignore the evidence.

By and large, men believe what they are prepared to believe, what is familiar to them, what jibes with their own experience. We ignore the clear signs in order to retain our familiar conceptions. We shield our eyes from the reality of communism or we lack the intellectual curiosity to inquire into it.

On the supernatural level, we have read in the lives of the saints of occasions when they were granted visions of human evil as God sees it, and the sight of this evil in its true light was so loathsome, so horrible that they felt they would die were the visions not instantly withdrawn. And ever after they would die rather than commit evil.

So on the natural level, a true picture of atheistic communism would so repel the freedom-loving peoples of the world could they but see it, that they would risk all that they have to defend themselves and their posterity against it. Our task is to bring this true picture before them in every way we can.

Communism can win only in darkness, deceit, error, and falsehood. Freedom can win only in light, candor, logic, and truth. This struggle must be fought on the intellectual front. Once we have won the intellectual struggle for men's minds, the other battles will be easily won and communism will be remembered in history as just another mental plague and torment that cost men dearly.

Your Freedom Institute is a great and early arsenal of truth and freedom. I congratulate St. John's University for exerting leadership in this field as it has throughout its distinguished history in so many fields of learning.

I hope that the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate will favorably recommend, within the next few weeks, the establishment of a National Freedom Academy, an academy which aims to do on the national level what the Freedom Institute is doing here at St. John's University.

It is a relatively easy thing to imagine the horrors of physical destruction brought on by a nuclear attack. It seems a difficult thing for people to understand the meaning of the political, moral, and social destruction that is involved in the communization of the civilized world. We cannot even grasp the full extent of it by looking at what the Communists have done already in the areas they control. For they have been unable to completely work their will on their subject peoples.

The existence of a great and powerful free community exercises a restraint upon them. The public remembrance of the old order still limits them. The need to concede some things to the wishes of their subjects still restrains them. Should they conquer the world, and thus gain complete security, they could work their terrible will unrestrained and put into total practice their dialectic which is as yet only half realized.

Prof. Gerhart Neimeyer of Notre Dame University, has described the meaning of Communist rule in a brilliant essay, a classic, recently appearing in Modern Age.

Dr. Neimeyer says at one point:

"Communism is destructive with a novel quality, not mere injustice or mere unfreedom, but the ravaging of the reality of human life by the spirit of dogmatized unreality. Western intellectuals understand the danger of material destruction, which is, after all, simple and obvious. The quality of communism's destructiveness has so far escaped their grasp. To understand it, one must get oneself to enter a mental world of distortion, reason perverted with the aid of force, half-truth set up as dogma, deceit espoused as norm."

If the Communists sought only to rule the world, then the danger could be judged in the same light as that of previous aggressive tyrannies. But they want more than to rule the world. They want to destroy it and remake it in the image of their insane dogma.

To the Communist, everything that we hold to be true is false. Our ideals, values, customs, loyalties are to him parts of an ugly system he is determined to destroy. Our concepts of God, the individual, the family, truth, love, freedom, justice are to him objects of hatred and derision.

But our world haunts him. He cannot be content just to deride us and wait for our demise. If our truths are real, then his life is a senseless nightmare. He must banish our values to vindicate his own.

In the long run, therefore, our death becomes essential to his life. He is locked tight in an irrational system which admits of no truth or standard of measurement outside its own dialectic.

To the extent that he is a Communist, he abhors the non-Communist world and is compelled to work for its destruction. To the extent that he is a Communist, he can know no peace. He is driven on by a desperate inner compulsion toward the destruction of the existing world order.

The only priority ahead of the destruction of our system is the building and preservation of his own. The only restraints upon his designs against us are his fears for the safety of his own system.

The threat of Communist subjugation, therefore, differs from the threat of all previous attempts to conquer the world. Here is no tyranny which seeks domination only for the sake of power, or spoils, or exploitation, or even the gratification of limitless ambition. Here is a depraved Samson which seeks to pull down the pillars of the present world and raise in its place a structure such as man has never seen. How would our lives be changed should the Communists achieve world domination? What would Communist rule mean in America?

The revealed truths of religion would be thoroughly and systematically stamped out. Religious instruction and services, the Sacraments, the means of grace which we hold to be essential for the salvation of the human soul, would be made as unavailable as perverted man can make them. Knowledge of the true goal of our existence, eternal life, would be erased insofar as it is possible for it to be erased.

The concept of private property, around which so much of our daily life revolves, would be swept away. The fabric of free choice, through which we shape our lives by thousands of our own decisions, would be unraveled. Family life as we know it would disappear. Our free associations would be gone.

Pride of country, respect for law, satisfaction with our basic political and social order, all of which so much conditions our habitual attitudes, our character, our personality—all this would vanish.

Every aspect of our lives, from the sublime to the ridiculous, would be swept away and in its place erected the insane, irrational, antihuman regimentation of every phase of life, which requires not mere submission to evil but active participation in it.

Again to quote Dr. Neimeyer:

"Their rule is 'not of this world,' not of the world of present reality, but of the unreality of speculative fiction. That is why their hostility to the present-day world is so unrelenting. That is why they impose their party line not merely to secure their power, but to combat the expressions of the present-day world in art, poetry, music, philosophy, and religion. That is why they are never contented with mere compliance under their rule, but always seek to break their victim's mind from the world of common humanity, to attach it to the cause of the dialectic future, to bring about its inner transformation by means of self-criticism or public confession. That is why they cannot stop lecturing even to their life-long enemies in the inhuman setting of the prison camps. That is why there can be for them no truth, ethics, wisdom, save in the party's will, why every act of the party's power is to them hallowed through its service to the dialectic of history. And that is why Communists, in their relations with men and women of the present-day world can never achieve peace, no matter how strong a structure of power they erect."

For the existence that we have known, Communist rule would mean a death as final as the grave. And our despair would be magnified by the sight of our children and grandchildren born into and growing up in a world alien to everything once cherished—a world of darkness, a world without faith, a world dead to either temporal or eternal realities.

This is the fate which the avant-garde of the neutralists is willing to accept now if they can thereby purchase the guarantee that there will be no war; death of the soul, death of the spirit, death of the heart, if only the body is permitted to live.

Failure to understand the evil of communism is only half of our problem. The other half is that so many free people do not understand the meaning of Government in their lives, nor the significance of freedom.

They tend to downgrade the importance of our political structure. They tend to think that we work out our destiny, our happiness in the private sphere of life and that the public sphere provides only utilities, peripheral benefits, law, order, safety.

They think that a change of government, or a new system of government, might cause some distress, some inconvenience but it would not reach the heart of our existence, it need not intrude upon the inner sanctum of our lives.

Many of our people regard government as a nuisance, a game of spoils for politicians, a butt for jokes. Many think that whatever degree of contentment and happiness they have achieved has come about independently of, or in spite of our political institutions rather than in large measure because of them.

These assumptions are tragically erroneous. The extent to which our lives are influenced by public institutions is difficult to exaggerate. Our education, our development, our ideas, goals, hopes, are all heavily influenced by a variety of public institutions. These institutions reflect the basic ideas of our people about God, about the nature of life, the destiny of mankind, the way that life should be lived.

Our public institutions determine whether our home is our refuge or a mere extension of the state; whether we live with our neighbors comfortably as with friends, or fearfully as with spies; whether we raise our children according to our lights, or surrender them to the state; whether we are free to work out a private life of our own making, or have no private life, but only a public existence ordered to serve the all-consuming demands of the state.

If our public institutions reflect our religious, ethical, and social ideals, our personal growth can take place with a certain harmony. If they do not, we are at best dogged with doubt and confusion and, at worst, reduced to hopeless frustration and neurotic helplessness.

If there are no religious or ethical convictions reflected in public institutions, but only a ruthless program to exterminate them and replace them with false gods and distorted truth, then the purpose of human life is so frustrated, the goal of life is so obscured, that it is really dehumanized.

And so the uprooting of public order, the destruction of this system of free institutions and its replacement with an order which is totally alien would wholly destroy our mode of existence as we have known it. This is a death as real as physical death itself.

And as the public framework is pulled down, as the churches are destroyed, as our ideals are uprooted, as human knowledge of God and His revelation is blotted out, as all the moral refinements and elevations of human nature wrought by thousands of years of our Judaic-Christian heritage are eroded away, our descendants may be condemned to a death infinitely more final than physical death, for we leave to them a world without the instruction, the aids, the instruments of grace which are necessary to man's eternal salvation.

That is the argument that I would make to the neutralist intellectual. But I would make it with scant hope of success, for in many ways he is little better than the Communist.

He is the lukewarm, for whom Christ reserved perhaps the most severe condemnation of the New Testament.

Convinced that there are no moral absolutes, he can wholly commit himself to nothing and he finds nothing worth suffering

greatly for or giving his life for. Convinced that there is no life beyond the grave, animal survival is to him the ultimate reality.

Fear blinds him to his own best interests; pettiness robs him of the magnanimous courage to risk all for the sake of posterity; pride compels him to cloak his fear and pettiness in the mantle of high, noble motives. All he can offer the civilization which has given him life and growth is the whimpering counsel of despair and abandonment.

Only history can tell how much of our intellectual community deserves this description. We may fervently hope the portion is small.

Any philosophy or political program which aims at the avoidance of death or destruction is foredoomed to failure.

Death, in the end, comes to all men and destruction comes upon all material things. In the century-old words of Cardinal Newman:

"The world passes, the lofty palace crumbles, the busy city is mute, the ships of Tarshish are sped away; death comes upon the heart and the flesh. The veil is breaking."

It is not the circumstance of death, but the moral quality of life that has eternal significance.

Let us help our countrymen to react to the risk of nuclear death not with a craven terror that prompts the betrayal of all we value in return for the wormlike existence of Communist slaves for ourselves and our descendants. Let us help them to regard death as the time of judgment, the time of entry into immortality.

Let our people live, and if need be die, in defense of our faith, our freedom and our country, confident that our individual destiny and the survival of our race is yet in the hands of Divine Providence, a Providence which, if we but act our part with courage and loyalty, may yet ordain for us and our children a full, natural life in a world in which the peace of a just political and moral order is extended to all peoples.

Addresses of Congressman John Brademas, of Indiana, and Martin McKneally, National Commander of the American Legion, at Dedication of New Post Home of James Lowell Corey Post 68, American Legion, Argos, Ind., May 15, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 15, in Argos, Ind., members of the James Lowell Corey Post 68 of the American Legion took part in ceremonies marking the dedication of a new post home to replace one that burned in 1958.

Among the persons participating in this event were the distinguished former Governor of the State of Indiana, the Honorable Henry F. Schricker; the Indiana department commander of the American Legion, Donald Hynes; and the commander of the James Lowell Corey Post, Bruce Van Der Weele.

Of particular interest to the Legionnaires and their families was the moving address of the national commander of the American Legion, Martin B. McKneally, of New York, who dedicated the new post home.

CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS PRESENTS AMERICAN FLAG

It was my honor on this occasion to to present to the members of the James Lowell Corey Post a 49-star flag which had flown over the Capitol of the United States on July 4, 1959, the day when the 49-star flag became the official flag of our country. I was also pleased to present the post with four pencil drawings of the "Four Fortresses of Freedom," the White House, the Capitol, the Supreme Court, and the Declaration of Independence.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include my own remarks on this occasion and those of National American Legion Commander McKneally:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS ON MAY 15, 1960, ARGOS, IND.

Governor Schricker, Commander McKneally, Commander Hynes, Commander Van Der Weele, fellow Legionnaires and friends, today is a great day not only for members of the James Lowell Corey Post of the American Legion but for all Hoosier Legionnaires. Not often do we have an opportunity to have our distinguished national commander, Martin McKneally, in our midst and we welcome him here today.

I want to congratulate Commander Van Der Weele and all the members of James Lowel Corey Post 68 of Argos for their dedicated efforts which have made possible the construction of this fine new home.

ARMED FORCES WEEK SLOGAN: POWER FOR PEACE

It is fitting and proper that we should dedicate this new home on the eve of Armed Forces Week, which begins tomorrow and runs through May 22. Commander McKneally has asked all Legionnaires to support the 11th observance of this week and Commander Hynes has been named by the Governor of Indiana to serve as Indiana State chairman of the observance.

The recognition of Armed Forces Week is therefore a splendid symbol of the continuing devotion of the American Legion to the security and defense of our country and to the cause of freedom.

The slogan of Armed Forces Week is "Power for Peace." All Americans want peace. Democrats want peace. Republicans want peace. You want peace and I want peace. Yet you and I know that today the world is standing on a tightrope, with peace depending in large measure on the capacity of a divided world to maintain its balance and not fall into the volcano of nuclear war.

REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS DISCUSS ARMS CONTROL

It is encouraging to see that political leaders of both our great political parties are now discussing the problem of arms control more seriously than it has ever been discussed before. For as Secretary of State Christian Herter made clear in February in his famous speech to the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., the only sure longrun way to defend ourselves in this troubled world is to work out an effective disarmament agreement with our adversaries in the Soviet Union, an agreement which, I hasten to add, will of course require effective inspection guarantees.

WE MUST BE MILITARILY STRONG IN ORDER TO DISCUSS DISARMAMENT

But I am sure Commander McKneally would agree with me that we in America must be strong militarily if we are to have bargaining power in dealing with the Soviet Union, even on the subject of disarmament.

We cannot lead effectively from a position of military weakness.

That is the meaning of the slogan, "Power for Peace."

We must be strong not only militarily but economically and diplomatically as well, for our Communist adversaries do not fight the cold war on one front alone. We have already seen, for example, how Khrushchev has been exploiting the unhappy blunder of the U–2 incident for all the anti-American propaganda he can make of it.

I have no wish to exploit this matter for partisan gain for we want our President to enjoy the united support of the American people as he goes into talks at the summit which may directly affect the destiny and peace of the entire world. We nonetheless must recognize how our Government has been placed on the defensive by this incident and by the way in which Khrushchev has been using it.

AMERICA FACED WITH POWERFUL CHALLENGE IN SOVIET UNION

We must realize more than ever by the events of recent days and by the trip which Khrushchev made across our country last year that in him and in the Soviet people whom he leads we are confronted with the most powerful challenge to our survival as a free society in all the history of the American Republic. We must be prepared to understand the nature of the challenge we face.

We believe in a free society. The Communists believe in a slave society.

We believe in an open society. The Communists believe in a closed society.

If we are effectively to meet the challenge of the Communist world, we must be prepared to sacrifice. We must understand why we must be strong if we are to continue to be free.

WE MUST HAVE POWER IF WE ARE TO HAVE PEACE

Better than most organizations in our country, the American Legion understands the dangers of the Communist challenge to freedom, understands why we must have power if we are to have peace.

I therefore deem it a high honor and a privilege, as your Representative in Congress, in the presence of our national and State commanders and of Commander Van Der Weele and all my fellow Legionnaires to present to the members of the James Lowell Corey Post 68 of the American Legion this American flag which was flown over the Capitol of the United States on July 4, 1959, the day the 49-star flag became the official flag of our country.

I have another gift which I am pleased at this time to present to you, four pencil drawings of the Four Fortresses of American Freedom: The White House, the Capitol, the Supreme Court Building and the Declaration of Independence.

May these drawings and may this flag serve as an ever constant reminder to all members of the American Legion of the greatness of our country and the freedom which is the birthright of the American people.

REMARKS OF NATIONAL COMMANDER MARTIN B. MCKNEALLY, THE AMERICAN LEGION, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW HOME OF THE JAMES LOWELL COREY POST, ARGOS, IND., MAY 15, 1960

I am delighted to be in Argos and to assist in the dedication of this beautiful new building wherein will be housed not only the men and women of James Lowell Corey Post but their ideals as well. This new post home is a fulfillment of the hopes and labors of the men and women of Argos for 40 years. It is a monument and at once a milestone of progress in the history of the American Legion.

The American Legion stands solely as the architect of the rehabilitation program with its network of hospitals across the land which is monument enough for any group of founders, but what of the millions of hours spent in hospital visitations? What of the millions of dollars spent in child welfare? What of the original thinking that chartered the course of the country in ways of preparedness or national security? What of the GI bill, written by the American Legion and sponsored over the protest of professional educators? What of the development of a strong, authentic voice in the field of Americanism? What of the multifarious arts of charity that have become a legend in the land? What a heritage—what a perfect description of this heritage of charity was written by the immortal Shakespeare when he penned the lines which read: "How far that little candle throws its beams, so shines a good deed in a naughty world."

THE PURPOSE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

I have said on previous occasions that the American Legion purpose in our day was the sustaining of the doctrine of belief upon which this Nation was founded and without which it must perish, and that is the belief in the existence of God and in the dignity of human personality. I need not point out to you that today it is those twin beliefs which are under the most relentless and the most powerful attack in the history of mankind.

CALLS FOR CONTINUED ATTENTION TO U.S. GRAVES ABROAD

The American Legion holds in high esteem the profession and the office of the soldier. If it were not for the soldier there would be no America and there would be no hope for men who love freedom. In man's ceaseless struggle to be free, he must be willing to pay the enormous costs of war. It is the melancholy record of fallen man, that his motivations conflict and collide. His will to do evil and his baseness must be reckoned with and the reckoning sometimes enslaves and it very frequently kills. I commend to your most reverent attention the thousands of graves abroad in cemeteries cared for by the American Government and I direct you to the fact that five new cemeteries are to be dedicated this year. Hardly a word is written, a picture published concerning this subject and I am informed that this is so because the present-day rationale of the American people is not to be reminded of the ugliness of the cost of freedom. Freedom and the cause of America we say to you, must never be computed in the terms of dollars and cents. The only item to be considered is the cost of men's lives. Reminiscence and reminders of this fact must be the No. 1 item on the agenda of our daily lives, depression, and sadness to the contrary notwithstanding.

"WE ARE EITHER FOR FREEDOM OR WE ARE AGAINST IT"

For we have an enemy, an enemy that opposes everything that we hold dear and that enemy makes our age one of tremendous risks. And in this age there is no neutrality, we are either for freedom or we are against it. Fear of atomic destruction does not provide us with the solution of the dilemma. There is a considerable body of intellectuals whom the fear of atomic war has obsessed. They have made their objective in life only the preserving of existence. One reads of their thinking with a certain horrifying fascination. Phillip Toynbee states as follows: "In the terrible contest of nuclear war even the vital differences between communism and western freedom become almost unimportant."

The West he declares should, "negotiate at once with the Russians and get the best terms that are available." Since Russia in his estimation is now and will continue to remain stronger there is nothing to do for the West "but to negotiate from comparative weakness." He admits that this may well set up the total domination of the world by Russia in a few years. The Soviets would impose on us a regime which most of us detest but this is better than allowing the human race to destroy itself. And one of Toynbee's confreres observes, "I might not much mind living under Soviet domination."

These men are not Communists but they have lost their will; they have lost it to fear and to despair, in the pursuit of existence. They have lost sight of the truth which is simple enough and that is that we in our day are faced with two destructive forces of incredible dimensions. The bomb represents material devastation, the Communist party political destruction.

THE SOLEMN DILEMMA OF OUR TIME

This is the solemn dilemma of our time and this is the foremost consideration of our people this afternoon. The administration in Washington has chosen by its continuation of nuclear testing, by the flight of the U–2 over the secret territory of the Soviets to pursue the ideal of political freedom. What kind of a nation with the holy mission of preserving its sovereignty, its people, and its freedom, would do less in the face of the gigantic dilemma? To sit by knowing what we know, facing what we face, and do nothing, would make the cemeteries of Europe where our honored dead are entombed, and the whole history of this Republic a gargantuan jest. The administration is charged through its intelligence service with the responsibility of providing for the safety of its people; its duty is plain and it is to gather the facts with which it may discharge that duty. Must we act as if its duty were less? Must we act as if the obtaining of information necessary to our own defense against a secretive and threatening power was to commit a sin? Are we to assume the abasing role of the boy caught with his hand in the cooky jar when we know the food there obtained is the only means of sustaining freedom and hope? I for one American, suffer no embarrassment and highly praise all those in authority who see clearly the bitter dilemma of these days. We of the American Legion do not seek to impose our views but we do propose to all that there is no flight from the serious business of our days and that is the survival of free man.

MEN OF COURAGE, FAITH, IDEALS NEEDED

The late Albert Camus tells us, "with every dawn an assassin slips into some cell, murder is the question before us." This is the solemn keynote of our time, the murder of men and the murder of ideals. As Americans, let us conduct ourselves as men. Men of courage, men of faith, and men of ideals. There is no other way open to us, for Americans may not be craven, they may not be pacifistic, they may not be men of despair.

In the world there is but one city in which we can dwell, it is the city of the halt, the blind, the maimed, but it is the city of charity, and it is the city of courage, the city of freedom. It is the City of God. Outside it is the night.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 1960

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God Omnipotent, Thou only art the help and hope of our distracted world in all the disasters in human relationships the wrath of men brings upon it.

Though people imagine a vain thing, Thou still art God, and Thy mercy endureth forever, in spite of all human denials and betrayals.

Make plain to our understanding that our legislative enactments and our economic adjustments in the realm of trade and commerce in themselves cannot bring social salvation, except as they clear the way for the spiritual undergirding without which we labor in vain and all our endeavors are as futile props against a decaying house that the Lord hath not made.

We ask it in the name of the One whose truth shall make us free. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 17, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. BARTLETT, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 6215. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cornelia Fales;

H.R. 8606. An act for the relief of Katherine O. Conover;

H.R. 9406. An act for the relief of William J. Huntsman;

H.R. 9711. An act for the relief of Robert L. Stoermer;

H.R. 11826. An act for the relief of Loren W. Willis; and

H.R. 11827. An act for the relief of Maj. Howard L. Clark.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 684. An act for the relief of Gerald Degnan, William C. Williams, Harry Eakon, Jacob Beebe, Thorvald Ohnstad, Evan S. Henry, Henry Pitmatalik, D. LeRoy Kotila, Bernard Rock, Bud J. Carlson, Charles F. Curtis, and A. N. Dake;

S. 2317. An act for the relief of Mary Alice Clements;

S. 2523. An act for the relief of Harry L. Arkin;

S. 2779. An act relating to the election under section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by the Augusta Furniture Co., Inc., of Staunton, Va.; and

S. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary and permanent construction work on the Capitol Grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H.R. 6215. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cornelia Fales;

H.R. 8606. An act for the relief of Katherine O. Conover;

H.R. 9406. An act for the relief of William J. Huntsman;

H.R. 9711. An act for the relief of Robert L. Stoermer;

H.R. 11826. An act for the relief of Loren W. Willis; and

H.R. 11827. An act for the relief of Maj. Howard L. Clark.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Judiciary Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Flood Control, Rivers, and Harbors Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

THE UNITED STATES AND FREE WORLD UNITY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the summit conference has collapsed, leaving in its wake confusion, discord, and a feeling of dismay in many quarters.

The fact that the conference accomplished nothing is not, in and of itself, the overriding factor which has left the people of the world with a deep feeling of anxiety. What is important is the manner in which an effort to negotiate was smashed before it had even started.

It is apparent that whatever the facts which were used to prevent discussion, there was a determination to prevent discussion. The spirit of Camp David has been replaced by a spirit of discord, and an uneasy world is groping its way into a future which, Mr. President, no one can see very clearly.

It goes without saying that the United States and the free world are going to have to reassess their position.

I do not believe there is any doubt as to the essential unity of this country. By that, I do not mean a generalized unity which covers everything, and therefore means nothing. I do mean unity on the specific points upon which all Americans—Republicans and Democrats alike—are in agreement. We earnestly hope that those who have openly proclaimed their opposition to freedom as a way of life now realize how deep that unity is.

The American people are determined to do whatever is necessary to preserve their freedom. They are not going to be panicked; they are not going to be divided; they are not going to be blackmailed.

The American people, I believe, are determined to maintain the strength that is necessary in order to survive in a world where a major power has set as its basic standard of right the issue of might.

The American people are determined that free men shall not be surrendered to the untender mercies of dictators. I hope no one will be deceived into premature actions on the assumption that America lacks the will or the determination to resist.

Mr. President, there is another point of that unity which I think should be made very clear. It is that unity does not imply that we ignore mistakes or that we smother differences. What it does imply is that we shall treat errors as mistakes to be corrected, not as leverage to separate our Nation. It also implies that whatever may be our differences, we are united on the fundamental necessity of preserving our way of life, and of opposing tyranny over the minds and souls of men and women.

Mr. President, there will, of course—as I stated yesterday—be a cool and objective assessment of whatever mistakes have been made. That assessment will take place under conditions and circumstances which will contribute to the information of the American people and to the strengthening of our country. Under our system, Congress is a body which has great responsibilities; and I am convinced that the Members of Congress will continue to discharge their responsibility.

We shall have to determine whether there are changed conditions which affect the adequacy of our defenses. We shall have to determine whether we have provided adequately for the integrity of our executive agencies. We shall have to determine whether we have provided adequately for the coordination of our vast governmental structure.

There is no need to search for scapegoats, because we do not have time to indulge in partisanship. All of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, must be conscious of the fact that the only time we can afford is that whose utilization will contribute to the strength, the determination, and the prestige of these United States of America and the free world.

Mr. President, we are not going to be panicked by threats over Berlin or threats against our allies.

We are going to continue to operate through our established institutions, recognizing fully that only one man can speak for our country, and that he must have behind him the united strength of a determined people.

Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD a cablegram which late yesterday afternoon was dispatched to President Dwight D. Eisenhower. The cablegram was signed by the illustrious Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. Rayburn; the majority leader of the Senate, Mr. Johnson of Texas; the Democratic presidential nominee in 1956, the titular head of the Democratic Party, the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, former Governor of Illinois; and the very able and distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. Fulbright. The cablegram reads as follows:

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
Embassy of the United States of America,
Paris, France:

As leaders of the Democratic Party of the United States we earnestly urge you to convey to Premier Khrushchev the views of the opposition party in your country that he reconsider his suggestion for postponement of the summit meeting until after the national elections in this country.

We feel that total failure of the conference and increasing mistrust on both sides will be serious and deeply disturbing to the whole world.

All of the American people earnestly desire peace, an end to the arms race, and ever better relations between our countries. We ask you, as the leader of this Nation, to see that these views are conveyed to Mr. Khrushchev.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished majority leader for the speech he has just made, and also for his part in the sending, on yesterday, of the cablegram signed by himself, Speaker Rayburn, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, and Senator J. William Fulbright, before the summit conference collapsed. I look upon it as an answer to the time proposal made by Mr. Khrushchev, to the effect that he would be willing to consider another summit meeting 6 or 8 months hence. As these leaders of the opposition party—that is to say, the party in opposition to the present administration—made abundantly clear, in this country there will be no division based on what has happened at the summit; but there will be unity, because it is needed and because it is voluntarily given and asserted.

Mr. President, speaking of the summit meeting, the breakdown of the meeting at Paris calls for a reassessment in the field of diplomacy. Perhaps what has happened at Paris is, in a sense a blessing in disguise.

It may well bring about an end to summit meetings, which are mostly ceremonial, and have a tendency to provide a propaganda field day for the press, the radio, TV, and even for some of the countries concerned. It would be far better if we returned to quiet diplomacy based on conferences in private, good faith on the part of the negotiators, and real authority vested in our accredited Ambassadors by those constitutionally responsible. In this way the hard, dogged, and determined work which must be shown on any question leading up to a solution can be performed by those most knowledgeable in the affairs of the country or countries concerned. It can be done on a mutual basis, a give-and-take basis, and perhaps in this way marginal differences in the beginning can be accommodated, and, as time goes on, even larger problems discussed, and perhaps settled.

Summit meetings at best are too short on diplomacy, too long on pageantry, and too limited in time. If they are to be

held, they should be held for the purpose of allowing the chiefs of state to put their final stamp of approval on agreements which had already been reached at lower levels; and certainly not, as in this most recent summit meeting, for the purpose of downgrading and humiliating the chiefs of staff of the Western Powers, and most especially President Eisenhower.

Mr. President, the invitation to visit the Soviet Union extended by Mr. Khrushchev to the President of the United States has been withdrawn. I understand from the press, though, that President Eisenhower intends to visit Japan and Korea. I would hope that, in addition to those two countries, at that time he will find it possible to visit the Republic of the Philippines and the Republic of South Vietnam as well.

I would hope also that what has happened at the summit, the breakdown, will not be duplicated at Geneva, because there at the present time there are at least technically three conferences in being: first, a conference on banning nuclear tests; second, a conference on disarmament; and third, a conference on surprise attack, which I understand has been in suspension since December 1958.

I would hope devoutly that these three conferences would continue to the end that at least in these fields a modicum of peace and stability could be achieved for the people of the world.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for the last few days I have given particular attention to the headlines and to the captions on the various columns expressing individual opinions as to what has been taking place in Paris. It constitutes something of a fantasy when one writes them all in a column, taking a good many pages, to see what a myriad viewpoint is expressed.

The comment of the majority leader comes as a refreshing note indeed in all this confusing complex, because it reasserts from the opposition party the unity of this country and its determination to stand behind the man who is endowed by the Constitution and charged by the Constitution with the conduct of our foreign policy. As he goes abroad to diplomatic battle, it may be a cheering happenstance that the ancient alphabet makers put the letter "U" ahead of the letter "V." I have always thought that "U" for unity must necessarily come ahead of "V" for victory, whether it be in battle or in diplomatic interchange. And so this note of unity is the kind of thing that energizes a national leader when he is thousands of miles from home, and it makes him feel that all of his troops, regardless of their political affiliations, are behind him; and I think I can say, for the President, to the majority leader and his associates, "Thanks for a refreshing message."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, that is a splendid thing for the minority leader to say, and it was also fine for the majority leader and for the assistant majority leader to have said what they did.

What has happened in Paris is no real disaster for our beloved country. It has perhaps more than ever knit more closely together the people of the United States. We do not intend to lose our liberty. We will continue to work for a just peace. I think, too, it is fair to say that Khrushchev's imprecations have knit together more closely the peoples of the free world.

What has been said here today has been echoed in parliaments all around the globe. I read with the greatest of interest the moving comments of the Prime Minister of the Flemish people to the Holland Parliament, in which he went on to say that so long as free people stand together, freedom can well be secured.

I congratulate my colleague on the other side of the aisle, and my Republican leader, as well.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ERIE COUNTY, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, N.Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide medical care for elderly citizens.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the agricultural productivity of America has resulted in an abundance of healthful and nutritious foods; and

Whereas medical science has made tremendous progress in the development of surgical methods and drugs which strengthen and prolong life; and

Whereas as a result we can all look forward to a healthier and longer life; and

Whereas since life expectancy has increased, we have in our midst a large number of senior citizens without whose efforts our recent situation would not be possible; and

Whereas the cost and frequency of medical care increases as a person reaches the age of 65 which is the mandatory retirement age for most persons; and

Whereas medical aid to senior citizens could be financed in a manner similar to or in conjunction with social security by spreading the cost over the productive years in which a person is gainfully employed; and

Whereas the benefits of medical aid to senior citizens would far outweigh the very small cost to each individual: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this honorable board go on record as strongly in favor of medical aid to senior citizens.

Attest:

LEON J. HINKLEY,
Deputy Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 2770. A bill for the relief of Borinquen Home Corporation (Rept. No. 1388).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S. 3429. A bill to amend section 216(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to permit the appointment of U.S. nationals to the Merchant Marine Academy (Rept. No. 1391).

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 3018. A bill to authorize the Maritime Administration to make advances on Government insured ship mortgages (Rept. No. 1389).

REPORT ENTITLED "TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT"—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1390)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, pursuant to Senate Resolution 56, as extended, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I submit a report entitled "Trading with the Enemy Act," together with individual views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with the individual views, be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Ray M. Sundean, and sundry other persons, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 3561. A bill to permit the Secretary of the Interior to revoke in whole or in part the school and agency farm reserve on the Lac du Flambeau Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 3562. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America," approved March 2, 1907, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 3563. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to give the Civil Aeronautics Board certain review authority over the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; and

S. 3564. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 with respect to the authority of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency over airmen's certificates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. ENGLE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3565. A bill for the relief of Alpo Fransila Crane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 3566. A bill for the relief of Yun Fun Cheng Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 3567. A bill providing for the disposition of judgment funds of the Omaha Tribe

of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 3568. A bill to establish a program of financial and technical assistance designed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in economically depressed areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BEALL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MORTON, and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 3569. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. MCNAMARA, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 3570. A bill to provide for the humane treatment of animals used in experiment and tests by recipients of grants from the United States and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. COOPER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S.J. Res. 195. Joint resolution providing for the designation of 1960 as Sinclair Lewis Year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

TREATMENT OF LICENSED PILOTS BY FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I continue to be distressed at what I feel to be arbitrary actions by the Federal Aviation Agency in the matter of treatment of licensed civil pilots under the authority granted to the FAA Administrator by the Congress in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. Senators may recall the tragic series of midair collisions that prompted a review of the then existing Civil Air Regulations and resulted in enactment by the 85th Congress of the Federal Aviation Act, which placed extraordinary powers in the hands of a single man—the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. At that time, I expressed concern with regard to the vast power that would be lodged in one individual, but the act was passed most expeditiously in the overall interests of safety. It may be recalled that testimony before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee indicated the desire of the aviation industry to cooperate in the legislative overhaul of our Civil Air Regulations. Misgivings were voiced by aviation leaders concerning certain aspects of the appeal provisions of the Federal Aviation Act and the thought was expressed that recourse to the Congress would be utilized if a reasonable period of operation indicated that some modification or amendment of the act was required.

When the act of 1958 was put in final form and passed by the Congress, a provision was included in section 609 for appeal to the Civil Aeronautics Board with regard to rulings by the FAA Administrator concerning airman and aircraft certificates. Time and experience now have indicated that this provision does not provide for an adequate review of decisions of the Administrator. Under the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act, the Civil Aeronautics Board has the authority to hear an appeal from a civil airman with respect to whether or not the action against the individual was correct and proper under the terms of the rule established by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. The Civil Aeronautics Board does not have the authority to take any decisive action with regard to correction of a faulty or unsound rule.

In practical operation, we have discovered that the rights of an individual pilot receive less consideration under the administration of the Federal Aviation Act than would be accorded the most common criminal in a court of law. Substantial and upright citizens of this country, who are active civil pilots, 380,000 by the last official count of the Federal Aviation Agency, are subject to being charged with a violation of the regulations under the present enforcement program of the Agency and thereafter stand guilty until they can prove their innocence. If a civil penalty compromise is offered by the Administrator when the pilot is accused, his only appeal is to the same Administrator who has made the charge against him. Thus, we find that the FAA Administrator who made the rule and who charged the pilot with violating the rule also acts as the judge, jury, and prosecutor. Under these proceedings, the pilot stands guilty until he can prove his innocence. These proceedings violate every basic concept of Anglo-Saxon law and justice. The only alternative open to a pilot in these cases is to take his case to the Federal courts, wherein the legal costs may well exceed more than 10 times the cost of the compromise penalty offered by the FAA. Usually, the pilot will accept the charge of guilty for economic reasons, if no other. There is no assurance that even the Federal courts can afford the individual pilot relief, regardless of the costs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator be given 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENGLE. Judicial determinations to date indicate that the courts rely upon the expertise of the Administrator and their findings are based upon whether or not this Administrator, who has been given the power to make the rule and then act as judge, jury, and prosecutor—has acted within the law—Aviation Act of 1958—and the Administrative Procedure Act.

The pilot does have an avenue of appeal in cases where the FAA Administrator suspends or revokes his pilot's certificate. This appeal may be made to the Civil Aeronautics Board in accordance with the present act. However, we have found that this appeal, which was granted by the Congress to protect the rights of individuals, can be circumvented by the FAA Administrator by the simple expedient of revising or amending any rule under which the Agency may receive adverse rulings from the Civil Aeronautics Board on actions against individual pilot certificates. The CAB is helpless in such cases.

The Federal Aviation Agency has been in existence for about a year and a half and in that time the Administrator has promulgated numerous rulings regulating flying and the conduct of pilots in the air. Some of these regulations have deprived pilots of their livelihood, even though the pilots may have had many years of experience and a good safety record. These regulations have been passed over a multitude of objections, with little factual evidence that they would contribute to safety in the air, and in the main, without a public hearing.

I do not believe that it was the intent of the Congress to authorize or encourage the Administrator to act in such an arbitrary manner, and I share the alarm of my colleagues who have had this matter brought to their attention by their constituents in the aviation industry. I have no quarrel with the need for immediate action by the Administrator of FAA on matters wherein there is a clear-cut and factual need for corrective action in the interest of safety in the air and to protect the public, but unfortunately, many of the arbitrary rulings that have been handed down by the Administrator under this power that we have given him, are not in areas where there is factual or clear-cut evidence to support his action in the interest of safety. In fact, there is very little evidence to indicate that many of his so-called safety rulings would have prevented any of the unfortunate accidents that have occurred in the past, or will make any significant contribution to safety in the future.

It is quite clear to me that the Administrator must be required to hold hearings on proposed rulings which do not require emergency exercise of his authority in the interest of safety. Only by following such procedure and obtaining full information from all of the valuable sources both within and outside of Government, can the Administrator arrive at reasonable and just rules which are necessary in the public interest. Failure to obtain full information through the medium of public hearings has resulted in actions by the Administrator which I consider arbitrary and unwarranted, and which have resulted in grave injustices whereby many capable and experienced pilots have been deprived of their flying privileges and their livelihood.

Aviation has become one of the great industries of the United States and I feel strongly that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency must exercise his responsibilities in this great and growing industry in a reasonable and just manner. To do otherwise would be contrary to the declaration of policy stated in section 103 of the act wherein

the Administrator was charged by the Congress with "the promotion, encouragement, and development of civil aeronautics." Unless this matter is corrected and the Administrator discharges these responsibilities in a reasonable and just manner, we will see our very valuable national asset—our aviation industry—wither on the vine under the burden of Government oppression. We have heard on many occasions that the Federal Aviation Agency program is being carried on with utmost vigor in the interest of public safety. I wish to commend the Agency for its forthright interest in safety, but I also wish to remark that the individual who is most concerned with the safety of an aircraft is the pilot who is in the front of that aircraft and may pay with his life for any major violation of basic safety concepts. These pilots are vitally interested in flight safety and have contributed much to develop this great national asset. Unfortunately, these people are operating under a severe handicap in the form of procedures imposed upon them by the Administrator of FAA and grave injustice is being done in many cases wherein the individual is denied the same due process of law that is the very foundation of our American way of life.

No one human being is infallible, yet we have vested in one man this vast authority over an entire industry. In a field so vital, progressive, and complex as the aviation industry, a safeguard must be provided to insure reasonable and proper exercise of this all-powerful authority. For this reason, I consider it of utmost importance that the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 be amended so as to grant the Civil Aeronautics Board certain review authority over the actions of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. It is quite clear now that we have placed too much power in the hands of a single individual and that a safeguard must be provided by the Congress to protect the rights of our citizens in this vital business. Without this safeguard, many grave injustices will be imposed upon law abiding and upright citizens and this dynamic economic resource will not continue to develop as it should with the proper encouragement of the Federal Government.

So, Mr. President, I offer for introduction and appropriate reference two bills, first a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to give the Civil Aeronautics Board certain review authority over the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and second, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 with respect to the authority of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency over airmen's certificates.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these bills—and they are short—be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. ENGLE, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3563. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to give the Civil Aeronautics Board certain review authority over the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 601 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. sec. 1421) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) The Board, by its own act or upon the application of any affected person, may review any rule, regulation, standard, or order issued or made by the Administrator under this title. The Board, insofar as practicable, shall give such review priority over other proceedings under this Act. Upon such review the Board shall have authority in the public interest to revoke or modify any such rule, regulation, standard, or order. Pending such review and determination thereon, the Board, by its own act, or upon the application of any interested person for good cause shown, may suspend the effect or operation of any such rule, regulation, standard, or order. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as amending, modifying, or repealing any portion of the Administrative Procedures Act."

S. 3564. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 with respect to the authority of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency over airmen's certificates.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 313(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. sec. 1354(a)) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the Administrator to promulgate or make any rule, regulation, standard, or order which shall have the effect of amending, modifying, suspending, limiting, or revoking airmen's certificates or an airman's certificate, or of depriving or limiting any airman in the use of such certificate or of disqualifying any airman from operation pursuant to such certificate, except after a hearing and compliance with the procedures provided under section 609 of this Act."

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that hearings have been announced by the Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with respect to some of these problems for the early part of June, and I hope the proposed legislation can be considered by the committee at that time.

AREA ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1960

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in his disapproval message on the area redevelopment bill, the President, among other things, said:

Again, I strongly urge the Congress to enact new legislation at this session—but without those features of S. 722 that I find objectionable. I would, however, accept the eligibility criteria set forth in the bill that first passed the Senate even though these criteria are broader than those contained in the Administration bill.

Moreover, during the process of developing a new bill, I would hope that in other areas of past differences solutions could be found satisfactory to both the Congress and the Executive.

My profound hope is that sound, new legislation will be promptly enacted. If it is, our communities of chronic unemployment will be only the immediate beneficiaries. A tone will have been set that would hold forth, for the remainder of the session, the hope of sound and rewarding legislation in other vital areas—mutual security, wheat, sugar, minimum wage, interest rates, revenue measures, medical care for the aged, and aid to education to mention but a few.

Only this result can truly serve the finest and best interests of all our people.

Consonant with that request and that entreaty by the President, I am introducing another bill dealing with the matter of area redevelopment. As a part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an outline of the bill.

I introduce the bill for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the outline will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3569) to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The outline presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

OUTLINE OF THE NEW AREA ASSISTANCE BILL

1. Incorporates eligibility criteria from first Senate bill.

(a) President, in veto message, said he would accept these criteria.

(b) Includes 1 more major area and 11 more smaller areas than would criteria in original administration bill.

2. Authorizes $75 million in loan assistance for the construction or refurbishing of industrial plants.

(a) The vetoed bill also provided $75 million for this purpose.

(b) No such loan authority is provided for rural areas.

3. Limits Federal loan assistance to 35 percent of aggregate cost, as in original administration bill.

(a) State or local participation must not be less than 15 percent, as in original administration bill.

4. Doubles existing HHFA public facilities loan authorization from $100 million to $200 million.

(a) This additional authorization had already been requested.

5. Requires HHFA to give a first priority to applications for public facilities that will directly serve an industrial plant construction or refurbishing project authorized by the act.

(a) Requires HHFA to accord next and equal priority to applications from (1) areas of substantial and persistent unemployment designated under the act and (2) smaller municipalities (which hold the only priority under existing law).

6. Authorizes $1.5 million annually for vocational education assistance in areas eligible under the act.

(a) Original administration bill contained no specific dollar authorization.

7. Authorizes $1.5 million annually for technical assistance, including studies of economic growth potential, to areas eligible under the act.

8. Authorizes $2 million annually for technical assistance to low-income rural areas and one-industry small towns to help them develop manufacturing activities and to diversify so that their economic vulnerability may be reduced.

NOTE.—7 and 8 in the original administration bill carried authorizations totaling $3 million for both; the vetoed bill authorized $4.5 million for these purposes.

NOTE.—Not included in this bill is the provision in the vetoed bill for retraining subsistence payments ($10 million annually was authorized) to unemployment persons, in eligible areas, not receiving unemployment compensation (because exhausted or not covered) and who are undergoing vocational training authorized by the bill—such payments to continue for not more than 13 weeks.

9. Provides for presidential appointment and Senate confirmation of an Area Assistance Administrator in the Department of Commerce.

Other provisions of the bill are of minor significance and are drawn mainly from the original administration bill.

The total of the authorization provided in the new bill is $180 million.

HUMANE TREATMENT FOR CERTAIN ANIMALS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators MANSFIELD, BARTLETT, BYRD of West Virginia, KEFAUVER, MORSE, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, GRUENING, MCNAMARA, and CLARK, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would provide for the humane treatment of animals used in experiments by recipients of grants from the United States, and by departments and agencies of the Government.

I am aware that there are those who have raised objection to this proposal. Yet it seems to me that the objectives of the bill are such that they are entitled to be considered by the appropriate committees of the Congress. I do not say that the language is perfect or that every approach is necessarily the proper one. Certainly, the objectives of the bill are worth while, and it merits earnest attention.

I am informed that this bill would not inhibit or prevent experimental research. Nor is it my intention or that of the cosponsors of this bill to do so. Its basic goal is to insure that in experiments requiring the use of animals, precautions will be taken and every effort will be made to conduct such experiments in a manner that is as humane as possible.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for 5 days so that other Senators who wish to join in sponsoring the bill may have the opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Kentucky.

The bill (S. 3570) to provide for the humane treatment of animals used in experiments and tests by recipients of grants from the United States and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. Government, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DESIGNATION OF 1960 AS SINCLAIR LEWIS YEAR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, our great Middle West has always contributed vigorously and distinctively to the mainstream of intellectual life in our Nation.

Novelist Sinclair Lewis who immortalized the Main Streets of America in his novel of "Main Street," Sauk Centre, Minn., is an excellent example of the spirit of free inquiry and honest self-criticism which has marked the thought of America's heartland.

Sinclair Lewis is being honored in 1960 in Sauk Centre and in Minnesota because this is the 75th anniversary of the birth of Sinclair Lewis, the 40th anniversary of the publication of "Main Street," and the 30th anniversary of the author's acceptance of the Nobel Prize for literature.

The Governor of our State has proclaimed 1960 as Sinclair Lewis Main Street Year in Minnesota, and civic and cultural observances are being planned in the State and in Sauk Centre throughout the year.

Sinclair Lewis was a focus of controversy in his time because he sought to hold a mirror up to his own society and to reflect not only its good points but its faults and vices. It is this spirit of free and honest self-criticism and self-evaluation that Sinclair Lewis practiced that we must strive to preserve so that our Nation will not allow itself to be lulled into a mood of self-satisfaction.

We cannot do better than we did yesterday and we certainly cannot do our best unless we are willing to admit honestly to ourselves that we are not perfect and that there is more that we must do.

Because of Sinclair Lewis' contribution to American literature and his effective social commentary, as well as the fact that he was the first American author to be honored with a Nobel Prize for literature, I urge prompt favorable action on my proposal to designate 1960 as Sinclair Lewis Year.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be appropriately referred, and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 195) providing for the designation of 1960 as Sinclair Lewis Year, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Sinclair Lewis in 1930 was the first American to be honored with the Nobel Prize for literature; and

Whereas this native son of Sauk Centre in the State of Minnesota, location of the Main Street he immortalized, was devoted to the ideal of an American literature reflecting fully and honestly human dignity, freedom and individual talents; and

Whereas he encouraged younger authors in pursuit of this ideal to reflect not only America's "mountains and endless prairies, enormous cities, farm cabins, billions of money and tons of faith" of her past but also her intellectual and spiritual achievements in meeting new opportunities and challenges; and

Whereas he opposed in American literature "a doctrine of death" and "escape from complexities and angers of living * * * in a land where one would expect only boldness and intellectual adventure"; and

Whereas with novels such as "Main Street" and "Babbitt," Sinclair Lewis demanded of America a spirit of objective self-evaluation and criticism to match her past achievements and the demands of a swiftly changing world; and

Whereas 1960 is the 75th anniversary of the birth of Sinclair Lewis, the 40th anniversary of the publication of "Main Street" and the 30th anniversary of Sinclair Lewis' acceptance of the Nobel Prize for literature: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) 1960 is hereby designated as Sinclair Lewis Year in recognition of the contributions of this great novelist of the Midwest to American life.

(b) The President is authorized and required to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe this year with suitable ceremonies.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. SCOTT:

Speech by Senator KENNETH B. KEATING delivered before the Americans for the Competitive Enterprise System, Inc., at Philadelphia, Pa., on May 13, 1960.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address entitled "The Quest for Safeguarded Disarmament Must Be at the Heart of the U.S. Foreign Policy," delivered by him in Washington, D.C., April 27, 1960.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I was in Wisconsin all last fall while the Senate was out of session, and, again and again, in cities, towns, and villages, our senior citizens, men and women in their late sixties and older, came to me with one insistent need—some way to take care of the enormous increase in the cost of medical care. This is not a synthetic, political, election-year issue. There is a deep, urgent, very widespread need.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter typical of those I receive from elder residents of Wisconsin describing their plight.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: I am one of the oldsters, age 69 and drawing social security. I retired in 1957 and am not, of course, drawing the maximum benefit.

I have a health and accident policy which I have carried for about 8 years. It gave me good coverage then. Today it will cover only about 50 percent to 75 percent of present doctor fees.

I wrote to the insurance company about this, and they offered to attach a rider for hospital benefits only. The two contracts would give me a credit of $13 per day and the new premium cost would be increased over 100 percent and my income will not allow for this.

A prolonged sickness or surgical confinement for either my wife or myself would be impossible to meet.

I believe the bill H.R. 4700, if passed, would give us much needed security, and respectfully ask that you give it earnest consideration.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

PROPOSED NATIONAL MILK SANITATION ACT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday I appeared before the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in support of a bill, of which I am a cosponsor, S. 988, to provide for a National Milk Sanitation Act.

At the present time there is a real anachronism in this country; a series of State and local sanitation provisions which prevent the transportation of milk from areas which produce it most efficiently and inexpensively into other areas of the country which urgently need it. The consumer therefore has to pay higher prices, and the Wisconsin farmers who produce far more milk than those of any other State have lower incomes because of the restriction. And Mr. President, the facts are very clear. These sanitation provisions are, to be blunt, phony. They do not protect consumer health at all.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my testimony, together with a table I received from the Department of Agriculture, setting forth in detail exactly how Wisconsin milk does flow into other States, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the testimony and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE, A MEMBER OF THE U.S. SENATE FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Senator PROXMIRE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you very much for this opportunity to appear.

As a cosponsor of S. 988, I appreciate this opportunity to testify in favor of a National Milk Sanitation Act. Such legislation would benefit consumers, farmers, and processors, and in my firm opinion is long overdue.

Let me take this opportunity to thank the subcommittee for holding these hearings. You are providing the means by which the attention of Congress and the general public can be focused on an important and much misunderstood problem. I feel certain that the testimony which you are hearing from the many competent witnesses appearing before you will help clear up this situation of doubt and confusion. By making this possible, you are performing a signal public service.

Enactment of a national milk sanitation law would have many beneficial consequences. At present so-called sanitation regulations are used as economic trade barriers, as Senator HUMPHREY so eloquently said. They exclude milk as effectively as a skyscraping tariff or a zero import quota in international trade. They distort trade patterns in the same way that a maze of national regulations made a patchwork quilt of European trade in the 1930's, and have helped create a similar "balkanization" of milk markets in the United States, thus violating the principle of free interstate commerce.

This fragmentization of markets came about because large quantities of milk were desired in each major metropolitan area, at a time when the technology of portable refrigeration had not advanced to its present high level. Until quite recently moving fresh whole milk more than a few miles was virtually impossible; it was difficult enough for the rural dairy farmer to rush his milk, in individual containers, to a nearby town, in time to be pasteurized and sold before it began to sour. The sight of a small pickup truck bouncing along a country road with milk cans jiggling behind is a familiar memory to many.

But it is no more than that, a memory. Today, fresh milk moves through pipes, hoses, and tanks, to a gleaming glass-lined ice-cold hermatically sealed tank on a refrigerated truck, which rolls smoothly from farm to city, and from city to city. The milk can be delivered a thousand and more miles from its source with absolutely no impairment of quality or purity.

The sanitation codes of many localities date from the time in the past when efficient refrigerated conveyance of milk was unknown. Today the codes remain as monuments to the obsolete requirements of a vanished era, anachronisms in a new world of reliable refrigeration and rapid transportation.

Though historic in origin, the problems caused by fragmented milk markets are very current in their effects. The American marketplace for milk as for nearly every product is potentially national in character. The benefits of free trade which accrue to all parties in a transaction, and to all citizens of a country, are well known. In the present case, the consumer in particular would gain if trade in milk could follow the road map delineated by the forces of supply and demand, undistorted by a proliferation of obsolete sanitation and inspection requirements.

I would like to state some facts about our dairy economy which may not be known to the committee. My State of Wisconsin produces about one-seventh of the total national milk output. Receipts from the sale of milk count for about one-half of Wisconsin's total annual farm income. In 1959, more than a third of the State's milk qualified as the top grade specified by the U.S. Public Health Service code.

However, only half of this top quality grade A milk was marketed for class I, fluid use. The rest was used to make cheese, butter, and milk powder, much less remunerative outlets. Besides the large portion which is grade A, a very substantial share of the milk which gets labeled grade B in Wisconsin is in fact practically equal to the top grade. Many Wisconsin dairymen could easily qualify their milk as grade A if they thought there was a market for it as fresh whole milk. But as it is, all this high quality grade B must go for manufacturing purposes, where it brings a significantly lower return.

I have asked the Department of Agriculture to prepare a table which I would like to send up to the desk for the chairman to see. I only have one copy of it unfortunately, but I have references to it in my text.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Senator PROXMIRE, do you desire this be filed and printed in the record of the hearings?

Senator PROXMIRE. I would appreciate that very much, Mr. Chairman, if it could be put in the hearings.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Or do you want this printed in the record?

Senator PROXMIRE. I appreciate if it could be printed in the record after my statement.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Fine. Do you need it there to refer to?

Senator PROXMIRE. I do not need it at the present time.

Senator YARBOROUGH. Fine, thank you. This table will be ordered printed in the record immediately following Senator PROXMIRE's statement.

Senator PROXMIRE. I am going to refer to this table, Mr. Chairman. The first column of it shows the total receipts of milk from pool plants. The second column shows the gross sales of grade A, fluid milk, in each Federal order market. This figure is usually somewhat lower than the total receipts, because in most Federal order markets some milk is surplus and moves into manufacturing purposes.

The third column shows the number of pounds of milk (or milk equivalent of cream) received from Wisconsin handlers in each Federal order market. The last two columns show the milk received from Wisconsin as a percent of column 1, the total receipts of each market, and as a percent of column 2, the gross sales of fluid milk in each market.

Overall, the table shows that 40 out of the 77 Federal order markets took in no milk at all from Wisconsin in 1959. In another 18 the Wisconsin share of total receipts or gross class I sales was less than 1 percent. Only 10 markets, all of them in the Midwest, accepted more than 5 percent of their total receipts of class I sales from Wisconsin.

The costs of transportation play a large role in causing milk from the country's most efficient dairy producing area not to move into some markets. But in a number of markets, the price for class I milk is significantly above the Wisconsin price even when transportation costs are added on.

Arbitrary and superfluous sanitation requirements help prevent Wisconsin milk from moving according to the promptings of supply and demand. For example, some municipalities require a 2-inch outlet valve on bulk milk coolers. Elsewhere the 1½ inch is standard. Some areas require that milk-handling machinery be sterilized by steam and heat, while others demand chemical sterilization. The poor dairyman is caught in a crossfire of conflicting regulations. With the best will in the world, he is unable to satisfy flatly contradictory requirements.

In the crazy quilt of milk regulations which blankets the country, inspection requirements are among the most whimsical and discriminatory in their effect. Many cities insist on sending their own public health officials to inspect any dairy facility which handles milk consumed in their area. This may entail a trip of several hundred miles each way, frequently at the expense of the dairy farmer. Obviously when a dairy farmer in Wisconsin has to pay the expenses of an inspector coming from a State several hundred miles away, it simply makes it impossible for him to compete. If he ships to several areas, he may be inspected as often as 100 times each year, as the sanitation officials from various communities fulfill their varying requirements. This puts an unnecessary and irritating burden on the dairyman, and because the inspections are redundant they do not in any way heighten the sanitary level of the final product.

Capricious administration of local codes is another way to discriminate against and exclude out-of-State milk. A municipality may waive its discriminatory health ordinance from time to time, when it needs Wisconsin milk. When it has enough, it clamps the restrictions back on, with no warning, forcing the trucker to sell the milk at the class II price or cart the milk back home again.

As other witnesses have pointed out or will point out, we already have a fine model U.S. Public Health Service milk code. Thus the present bill would not require a study of the dairy industry to determine standards of quality and purity. There is no need for prolonged technical arguments about what constitutes a permissible bacteria count, or how to measure butterfat content. These questions have already been examined and settled by Government scientists.

Local sanitary codes could continue to contain standards and provisions which differ from the national code. This bill will not force a municipality to bring its own milk purity standards in line with the Federal level. If a particular municipality wishes to allow milk which does not conform to the Federal code, it may continue to do so.

However, and this is the crux of the matter, the municipality may not exclude milk which meets the U.S. standards of purity and wholesomeness. Passage of this bill would prevent the misuse of sanitation regulations as barriers against free trade.

At the same time it would establish in law a very useful quality code. Inspection and grading is a service to consumer and producer alike, which is well handled by the Federal Government. Uniform standards are the bedrock of quality and purity and they should not vary from place to place.

Because the sanitation standards enunciated by the proposed law are high, it is plain that a defense of the existing system must be a defense of trade barriers, actual or potential. These barriers restrain interstate trade, and thus give effect to a practice which article 8 of our Constitution was intended to prohibit.

Legal action has been one method by which such trade barriers have been broken down.

Mr. Chairman, in the concluding comments, I would like to point out what I think is a very dramatic demonstration of how it has taken action by the courts because we face up to this situation. It is a very tough political problem in some areas and it can be blown up into a much tougher political problem than what it really should be. I think what happens in my own State of Wisconsin demonstrates this quite well.

One of the best known cases stems from an action in my own State of Wisconsin. It is not many years since an ordinance of the city of Madison still prohibited the sale of milk not pasteurized within 5 miles of the city. When that ordinance was first enacted, the 5-mile designation was not important because it was not possible for dairies in other cities to ship milk into Madison and maintain its quality. When because of technological developments, it became feasible to ship milk from hundreds of miles away to Madison, the interest of the local dairies in preserving the local market for themselves, was so strong that it was politically impossible to secure a repeal of this ordinance. I well recall the fight we had in Madison.

Senator YARBOROUGH. That was an intrastate matter?

Senator PROXMIRE. That is absolutely correct, Mr. Chairman.

Thus, a part of a health ordinance became an economic barrier, an intrastate barrier, as the chairman pointed out, and it took a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court to clear it away. That was the *Dean Milk Company* v. *City of Madison* ((1931) 340 U.S. 349).

However, the high cost of court action and the small size of many markets frequently make it impractical to bring such suits. It would be economically wise and simpler to enact a specific statute defining the legality of restrictive sanitation ordinances. Such a standard would settle the question clearly, once and for all, eliminating the need for prolonged and expensive litigation.

It seems plain to me, Mr. Chairman, that the bill currently before the committee must strike any unprejudiced observer as an eminently sane and desirable piece of legislation. I think, therefore, that it may clarify the subject if we face up to the fact that the opposition to this bill is mainly motivated by a fear that milk from the most efficient producing areas, like Wisconsin, will flood markets, depress prices, and take established business away from local dairy farmers. An examination of the facts shows that this is not a sound prediction. The high cost of transportation, which averages $2.18 per hundredweight per 1,000 miles (based on Wisconsin experience) will permanently give local producers an enormous cost advantage. Because they are already established near the ultimate consumer, they will continue to be able to provide milk to their traditional market.

The main benefit that will accrue to the Nation and to the dairy industry from the passage of this bill lies in the future development of new markets. We don't expect to break into the old markets and we would not. This will enable us to open up some of the new markets as they develop. The present pattern of marketing areas satisfies the milk needs of our present population, as presently distributed. Some sections, particularly in the West and Far West, are spurting ahead. Western cities are mushrooming, and whole new metropolitan centers are being created.

It would be silly if these new population centers of the jet age enacted sanitation and inspection codes suited to a model T generation. Passage of national milk sanitation legislation would give these communities the assurance that their milk is pure and wholesome, while sparing them the need to create and administer codes of their own. There would be no excuse for building up a high-cost, inefficient dairy industry, on lands far better suited to truck farming, citrus fruits, livestock, and timber. It is in the national interest that the section of our country which has a comparative advantage in dairying should provide milk to these new markets.

My own State of Wisconsin recently passed a grade A law which accomplished on a State basis what passage of a National Milk Sanitation Act would achieve nationally. This statewide quality and sanitation law has cut redtape, helped the dairy farmer, and assured reliable and unvarying top-quality milk to all consumers, including those not protected by any previous local regulations. Passage of a National Milk Sanitation Act would bring similar benefits to the entire country.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you very much for permitting me to appear and for accommodating us from Minnesota and Wisconsin, who feel very deeply and strongly about this legislation.

We feel it is not only in the interest of our own State but we feel—and I say this with complete sincerity—it is in the very great interest of all Americans everywhere.

Senator YARBOROUGH. That is a very forceful statement, Senator PROXMIRE.

Receipts from producers, gross class I and milk receipts from Wisconsin in specified Federal milk markets, 1959

	Producer receipts [1]	Gross class I [2]	Milk received from Wisconsin plants and producers [3]	Milk received from Wisconsin as percent of—	
				Producer receipts	Gross class I
NEW ENGLAND	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Pounds*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Boston	1,883,924	1,161,240			
Springfield	208,160	166,744			
Worcester	151,719	139,384			
Southeastern New England	584,540	485,367			
Connecticut [4]	719,977	611,458			
MIDDLE ATLANTIC					
New York-New Jersey	10,082,333	[5] 5,558,577			
Philadelphia	1,587,695	1,184,396	22,855,340	1.44	1.93
SOUTH ATLANTIC					
Wilmington	90,530	94,976			
Upper Chesapeake Bay [6]					
Washington, D.C. [4]	433,050	316,502			
Wheeling	159,624	143,627			
Clarksburg	69,499	59,021			
Tri-State	235,357	212,915	2,604,850	1.11	1.22
Bluefield	51,552	48,087			
Appalachian	150,383	136,617	2,849,100	1.89	2.10
Southeastern Florida	438,151	387,610	108,370	.02	.03
EAST NORTH CENTRAL					
Eastern group					
Upstate Michigan	125,012	98,506			
Muskegon	99,606	80,547			
Southern Michigan	2,044,421	1,303,065			
Toledo	294,287	253,652	5,334,789	1.81	2.10
Northeastern Ohio	1,558,267	1,110,480	178,750	.01	.02
North Central Ohio	221,964	195,424			
Columbus	315,491	262,847	108,300	.03	.04
Dayton-Springfield	380,117	306,713			
Cincinnati	495,513	344,249			
Western group	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Pounds*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Michigan Upper Peninsula [7]	132,661	88,861	37,150,012	28.00	41.81
Northeastern Wisconsin [7]	369,899	285,005	418,178,000	113.05	146.73
Milwaukee [7]	592,424	470,691	605,637,000	102.23	128.67
Rockford-Freeport	53,350	48,857	2,981,279	5.59	6.10
Chicago [8]	5,254,107	2,402,557	3,635,743,000	69.20	151.33
South Bend-La Porte-Elkhart	258,854	199,434	40,980	.02	.02
Fort Wayne	104,739	76,704	135,900	.13	.18
Ohio Valley [6]					
WEST NORTH CENTRAL					
Northern group					
Duluth-Superior [7]	176,410	84,663	89,889,000	50.95	106.17
Minneapolis-St Paul	851,908	585,922	240,683,524	28.30	41.10
Eastern South Dakota	40,026	29,241			
Sioux Falls-Mitchell	99,621	67,053			
Black Hills	42,653	33,848			
North Central Iowa	211,648	188,815			
Dubuque	49,989	29,250	10,398,992	20.80	35.55
Cedar Rapids-Iowa City	189,457	160,067	20,156,736	10.64	12.59
Quad Cities	193,851	116,258	12,861,790	6.63	11.06
Des Moines	271,064	226,391	18,920	(9)	(9)
Sioux City	63,284	53,727	1,198,340	1.89	2.23
Omaha-Lincoln-Council Bluffs	294,284	272,670	643,460	.22	.24
Platte Valley	88,566	60,366			
Southern group					
St. Louis	692,729	573,158	8,659,483	1.55	1.51
Ozarks	180,004	130,308			
Kansas City	634,961	460,404	86,800	.01	.02
Neosho Valley	141,350	99,542	31,200	.02	.03
Wichita	231,988	159,954	127,400	.05	.08
Southwest Kansas	59,516	45,317			

See footnotes at end of table.

Receipts from producers, gross class I and milk receipts from Wisconsin in specified Federal milk markets, 1959—Continued

	Producer receipts [1]	Gross class I [2]	Milk received from Wisconsin plants and producers [3]	Milk received from Wisconsin as percent of—	
				Producer receipts	Gross class I
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Pounds*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Louisville	380,352	281,434	808,760	0.21	0.29
Paducah	52,273	52,135	1,179,705	2.26	2.26
Nashville	251,049	205,884	73,700	.03	.04
Memphis	197,468	177,965	281,320	.14	.16
Knoxville	176,268	150,618			
Chattanooga	149,781	121,578			
Mississippi Delta	83,275	70,871	507,719	.61	.72
Central Mississippi	185,056	145,589	219,690	.12	.15
Mississippi gulf coast	61,575	54,419	38,530	.06	.07
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL					
Northern group					
Central Arkansas	200,371	176,045			
Fort Smith	45,740	36,688			
Oklahoma Metropolitan	500,786	370,013	261,300	.05	.07
Red River Valley	154,322	141,633			
Texas Panhandle	136,731	125,677			
Southern group					
Northern Louisiana	149,048	146,460			
New Orleans	353,743	260,502			
North Texas	898,221	691,172	5,984,850	0.67	0.87
Central West Texas	179,965	155,420			
Austin-Waco	136,866	131,162			
San Antonio	226,795	238,515	115,000	.05	.05
Corpus Christi	155,007	149,292			
MOUNTAIN					
Great Basin [4]	64,814	42,433	113,400	.17	.27
Western Colorado	36,279	32,312			
Colorado Springs-Pueblo [4]	101,232	85,351			
Central Arizona	430,324	335,284			
PACIFIC					
Puget Sound	1,014,582	549,876			
Inland Empire	161,165	116,674			

[1] Receipts from producers at pool plants.
[2] Includes sales by regulated and partially regulated handlers, sales by other order handlers, and sales by unregulated handlers.
[3] Includes receipts of milk and milk equivalent of cream which originated from Wisconsin plants or producers and receipts from Order 41 (Chicago) all, or most of which, originated in Wisconsin.
[4] Order in effect only part of 1959.
[5] Producer class I sales only.
[6] Not in effect in 1959.
[7] All or part of marketing area and supply area is in the State of Wisconsin.
[8] All or substantial portion of supply area is located in Wisconsin.
[9] Less than 0.01 percent.

CONTRACT OF UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING IN AFGHANISTAN

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from the president of the University of Wyoming. The letter deals with the question of the university's participation in some of our foreign programs in other parts of the world.

The University of Wyoming has had a very active foreign contract under the ICA involving the Government of Afghanistan. Afghanistan, as we well know, is one of the critical frontier fringe areas in the cold war.

In view of the participation by the University of Wyoming in that critical area, we have reason to believe useful, helpful and constructive inroads have been made in that area in favor of the free world.

The battle is by no means won; but in Washington, D.C., at the present time, hearings are being held on this phase of our oversea program. There have been those who have called into question the role of universities in the oversea undertakings. Because of that I should like to have printed in the RECORD this morning the record of the University of Wyoming in this program.

The university's participation has been on four fronts; in vocational agriculture, in the Afghan Institute of Technology, in agricultural research, and in the faculty of agriculture and engineering.

Mr. President, when I was touring in that part of the world last fall, although I was not able to go into Afghanistan myself, because that was not my particular assignment, I learned in the surrounding countries, particularly Iran and Pakistan, of the very notable service being rendered by my colleagues of the University of Wyoming, who have offered their services in order to help the cause in this very remote part of the world, a portion of the world which borders directly on the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the President of the University of Wyoming, Mr. G. D. Humphrey, to me, summarizing what has been done, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING,
Laramie, Wyo., May 16, 1960.

Senator GALE W. McGEE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR McGEE: It has come to my attention that hearings of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations are presently in process and that the practice of using U.S. institutions of higher learning in the educational activities of ICA has been seriously questioned.

As you are no doubt aware, the University of Wyoming has had an active foreign contract under ICA and predecessor agencies since September 1952, and we do not consider it either unreasonable or wasteful, as the subcommittee has suggested.

I should like to point out that our contract is a nonprofit type, with the only questionable revenue being a provisional overhead charge used to defray administrative and logistic costs on our campus involved solely in the prosecution of this work. Following is a brief résumé of our contract program, presented as a matter of information for you.

This contract is in the country of Afghanistan, and during the course of years since its inception it has been enlarged until it now consists of four separate, though related, fields of endeavor working in conjunction with the Royal Afghan Ministries of Agriculture and Education. These four specific projects are:

1. Vocational agriculture: This is high school level training, preparing students for either college work or terminal training, enabling them to act as aids for agricultural technicians.

2. Afghan Institute of Technology: This is high school level training in trades, again with the option of terminal or college preparatory curriculums.

3. Agricultural research: This project is an attempt to gain sufficient information in order that firm recommendations may be given to the Afghan farmers, enabling them to increase their production by various means.

4. Faculty of agriculture and engineering: This is college level training in the two listed fields, with the project being run in conjunction with Kabul University. Graduates from this faculty ordinarily go into Government service or, in some instances, are sent abroad for advanced technological education.

In all cases, Afghan personnel work side by side with their American counterparts, and it is hoped that in due course these projects may be phased out in their present form and turned over to the Afghans completely without loss of effectiveness to the project.

Over the years of this operation approximately 75 staff members have been assigned to this project, of whom about 40 percent have been directly from our campus. During this same period of time, approximately 80 Afghan participants have come to the United States for higher learning, most of them having matriculated at the University of Wyoming.

It is our concerted opinion that we, as an institution of higher learning, are aiding materially in the cold war fight against communism by virtue of our participation in this type of program. Further, we feel that we are assisting the country of Afghanistan in upgrading its agricultural and engineering techniques. I would be remiss not to men-

tion that, in so doing, our own institution is benefiting by foreign experience of our staff. Again I should like to mention that, in our opinion, this program has been neither unreasonable nor wasteful in its execution.

Sincerely yours,

G. D. HUMPHREY,
President.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, one of the most significant hearings of the year was held this morning before a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee. I am referring to the appearance of the Defense Department to present its appeals from House action on the Department's bill.

There is no thought in my mind of discussing the specific items. These will be handled adequately by the committee under the able and experienced chairmanship of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. But I think that there is one general point which is worthy of comment. It is the clear indication that budgetary ceilings rather than military needs are still controlling the Department's affairs.

The facts are simple:

First. The original budget request for the Defense Department—aside from military construction—amounted to $39,335,000,000.

Second. On April 6, the Secretary of Defense endorsed a series of changes in the budget which amounted to a net decrease of $119,100,000, but for some reason these changes have never been formally transmitted to Congress.

Third. In this connection, the Air Force Chief of Staff has testified that program adjustments the Air Force was permitted to submit were limited by the requirement to stay within the spending levels of the President's budget, and additional amounts for programs could not be requested officially.

Fourth. The House made a number of changes in individual programs totaling almost $4 billion, but the changes offset each other and the net effect was a $3 million increase in the total appropriation.

Fifth. The Defense Department now asks the Senate to appropriate exactly $39,334,500,000—$500,000, or one-thousandth of 1 percent, below the original budget request.

The inference is clear. Once a budget amount is set, no one in the executive branch is permitted to present military needs that may call for budget increases. The whole world situation may be changed by the summit conference and the events of the next few weeks—but the preparedness program is still held to a magic ceiling established by the Budget Director.

The Senate Appropriations Committee is in a position to get the facts. I hope that the Defense Department representatives will testify as to their real military requirements.

I know that the Senate, once it has the facts, will rise to the occasion, and I am confident will be supported by the American people.

BIRTHDAY OF SENATOR JAVITS AND SENATOR KEATING

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed that today is the birthday of both distinguished Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING]. I have served for many years in the Senate with these fine gentlemen with great pleasure. I was associated with both of them in the House of Representatives, and now we are all in the Senate. I know them to be diligent public servants and very competent advocates. I am pleased to call them my personal friends.

It is somewhat unusual for a State to have two Republican Senators in this body, but I am speaking this morning of two unusual men. I am not surprised that they have been able to convince the people of New York of their outstanding effectiveness and their great ability. I wish them many happy returns of the day, and again express to them my friendship and my willingness to join with them on any matter of moment which is in the national interest.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to express my very deep gratitude to the distinguished majority leader both on my own behalf and on behalf of my colleague [Mr. JAVITS], who is absent from the Chamber at the moment. It is a great pleasure for us to work in the Senate under the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

I know my colleague shares my view when I say that the distinguished majority leader has at all times been helpful to us and most courteous and kind in his treatment of us. We, of course, have differences of opinion with the majority leader on legislation from time to time, but perhaps less frequently than some throughout the country might think. Here in the Senate, as we all know, we often see eye to eye with entire disregard of the center aisle separating the Members of the two parties.

I deeply appreciate what the distinguished majority leader has said. The statement coming from him means a great deal to me, and I know it will to my colleague.

I do want to pay a special tribute to Senator JAVITS, who is my senior in this body and who has been most helpful and cooperative to me as I learned the whys and wherefores of the Senate. He has been a tower of strength in a great many fields, in behalf of our State and our Nation, and I am delighted to be associated with him both in serving the Empire State and in observing our common natal day.

We have labored together so often in common causes that there is, perhaps, a certain poetic justice in our sharing, as well, the one date in history most significant to us both.

Mr. President, I have reached the point in life when I am not entirely happy about having attention called to the event, although I am very happy to say that 100 years ago today Abraham Lincoln was nominated for President of the United States. Since, therefore, the majority leader has called attention to our republicanism, I am very happy that we happen to have our birthday on such a momentous anniversary as the centennial of Abraham Lincoln's nomination.

NATIONAL REPRESENTATION FOR CITIZENS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the House Committee on the Judiciary yesterday ordered favorably reported to the House a drastically amended version of Senate Joint Resolution 39.

Under the committee's amendments, the provisions of the Senate resolution dealing with the abolition of the poll tax and the appointment of members to the House of Representatives in the event of a disaster were completely eliminated. The remaining provision, with regard to national representation for the citizens of the District of Columbia, was restricted beyond anything justifiable.

About the only affirmative significance of the House committee's action is that it served to move the resolution out of committee.

The committee has gone entirely too far in cutting the voters of the District down to size. They have said the voter here shall enjoy two-thirds or three-fifths as much voice as voters anywhere else in the United States.

This is a new concept of fractional citizenship. They propose to lift the citizens of the District out of second-class citizenship, but not to elevate them to first-class citizenship. So we shall have to coin a new phrase. Shall we call it "first-class citizenship once removed," or "second-class citizenship once removed"?

I hope that the committee's recommendations will not be presented on a take it or leave it basis.

Every effort should be made to bring the House resolution more in line with the Senate resolution during its consideration in the House and in conference. There certainly should be no inclination on the part of the Senate to accept House language which scuttles two-thirds of the Senate resolution and emasculates the remaining third.

There is some disposition to regard the District of Columbia amendment as a matter of local interest only. This is not the fact. There have been editorials in newspapers all over the country criticizing Congress' failure to restore democracy to the Nation's Capital and I have heard from many New York residents on this subject. It does not do our Nation any good in world councils either to retain this blot on representative government at home.

I recognize that compromise sometimes is necessary to get results. But the Senate resolution was itself a compromise and nothing was presented at the House hearings on the District of Columbia vote amendment which remotely suggested that it should be further watered down.

QUALITY OF GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL—STATEMENT BY MARION B. FOLSOM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of America's most distinguished public servants, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Marion B. Folsom, recently presented most thought-provoking testimony to the Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery. Drawing on his extensive experience in Government service as well as his knowledge of business and personnel problems, he presented a series of important proposals to help attract topnotch people into Federal work.

Among his suggestions is the creation of a central bureau in the White House which would maintain lists of openings in Federal positions, recruit qualified people, and take charge of instructing new officials in the unique features of Government administration, and pertinent rules and regulations.

I noted with particular interest Mr. Folsom's support for the conflict of interest proposals embodied in S. 3080, which I am cosponsoring in the Senate. This bill grew out of recommendations of a special committee of the Bar Association of the City of New York, and they represent an monumental effort to codify and clarify the present statutes on this vital subject.

Mr. President, I hope Mr. Folsom's thoughtful ideas and constructive proposals will receive the careful attention of all who are concerned about the quality of Federal personnel and the performance of our Federal Government. It is vital that we leave no stone unturned in our quest for the best qualified people to help run the world's most important Government.

In order that this significant testimony may receive wide attention, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MARION B. FOLSOM BEFORE THE U.S. SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL POLICY MACHINERY, MAY 12, 1960

My name is Marion B. Folsom. I am a director and management adviser of the Eastman Kodak Co. in the fields of finance, public relations, and employee benefits. I joined Eastman Kodak in 1914 and became treasurer in 1935 and a director in 1947. I resigned these positions in 1953 to become Under Secretary of the Treasury of the United States. At that time I also resigned as chairman of the Committee for Economic Development and as a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. In 1955 I became Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I resigned from that office in 1958 and rejoined Kodak a month later in my present capacity.

Prior to 1953 I served the Federal Government in a number of different capacities. I was a member of the President's Advisory Council on Economic Security, which assisted in the development of the Social Security System in 1934–35, and I served on the several subsequent councils. Since 1936 I have been a member of the Business Advisory Council for the Department of Commerce. In 1944–46 I served as staff director of the House of Representatives Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning and in 1940–41 as a division executive of the National Defense Advisory Commission. I have also served as vice chairman of the President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine in 1947–48 and as a member of the National Advisory Board on Mobilization Policy in 1951–52.

I fully realize the importance of attracting able people into Government service and am pleased to present my views on the problem.

As far as my own experience is concerned, I found it satisfactory—in the administrative positions, in working for the congressional committee, and in the various advisory committees. I know many other businessmen who have also found Government service satisfying and rewarding. I do not feel that the difficulties faced by businessmen in the Government are as serious as often depicted. The situation has been exaggerated by the headlines arising from a few specific cases. Nevertheless, the fact that this impression exists among business people does create a problem in regard to recruiting men for these executive positions.

I have found that the factors involved in attracting men into Government positions vary widely, not only as to individuals but as to occupational groups. I will discuss four main categories: (1) businessmen; (2) lawyers; (3) college professors; and (4) miscellaneous professional men and State and local governmental officials.

BUSINESSMEN

It is true that businessmen will find working for the Government different in many respects from their experience in business. Much of the difficulty is due to the lack of appreciation of the fact that officials must operate in public view, and that Congress and the public have a right to know what is going on.

It is also hard for businessmen to become adjusted to the unique processes of governmental administration as compared with business administration. For instance, civil service rules make it difficult to reward good service of employees by prompt promotions and pay increases and to remove inefficient workers. Unless a person has had previous experience in government, it generally takes some months for him to adjust to the different surroundings and conditions, and the limitations of the numerous laws which reduce the flexibility of administration.

It is unfortunate that in most cases the business executive stays in Government positions less than 2 years. He generally leaves just about the time he reaches the peak of his usefulness. A study recently made by the Harvard Business School showed that in the past 16 years, of the businessmen who had been in Government service and left, 48 percent served only 1 year or less and only 33 percent served over 2 years.

DIFFICULTIES IN RECRUITING

While my experience was satisfactory to me personally, I did have difficulty in recruiting businessmen for top administrative positions, both in the Treasury and in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Recruiting was especially difficult for such positions as Under Secretary, Assistant Secretary, and Assistants—the appointive positions between the top civil service and the Secretary. I know also that other departments have had the same difficulty, not only in this administration but in previous ones.

Businessmen with experience in handling people in large organizations are uniquely fitted for many executive positions in government. I have found that businessmen are available in two groups—the older men who are recently retired or who are approaching retirement age, and the very young men. Some very able men have been recruited from the older group in this and previous administrations and many of them have done outstanding jobs. It is often difficult, however, for one who has had a top position in industry to accept a secondary position as an assistant. Furthermore, the men in this age group often cannot stand the pressure and the long hours required in most of these positions. It is also more difficult for them to adjust to the differences between Government and business. The businessmen in the younger group who are available have generally not had adequate experience, although there are some outstanding exceptions.

The persons really needed for many of these positions are men in their late 30's or 40's, with 10 or 15 years of business experience and with several years in important administrative positions, especially in large organizations. Great difficulty is experienced in obtaining businessmen in this category.

The difference in salary is a factor, but I found this was not the main reason. The able men in this age group would benefit considerably from the Government experience. They would have a number of years after their return to business to make up for any monetary losses which might have been experienced during their stay in Government.

Difficulty is also experienced in regard to pensions and other employee benefits, stock options, etc., but these difficulties generally can be ironed out. Family reasons, such as the maintenance of two homes, change in schools for the children, and the difficulties in moving, also are factors.

FEAR OF MISSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION

What I found as the principal reason, however, was the fear on the part of the younger executive that, regardless of promises by the company, he would find upon his return that he might have lost an opportunity for advancement. While I would contend that the executive should benefit from the experience and thus might be able to advance faster, my arguments were not generally convincing. Because of this factor, it probably will be necessary in many cases to agree to a service of 2 years. An able person with the right experience can make a real contribution during that period, although it would be much better if he would stay longer.

All of the factors I've mentioned tend to make it difficult to attract the able executive, but I feel that good progress could be made in overcoming some of them if certain measures were taken by Government and industry.

While, as I've said, I do not think the climate for business executives in Government is as bad as it's generally depicted, it would help if congressional leaders would find occasion to say that they consider it important that businessmen be obtained for some of these key administrative positions. It would also help if congressional leaders could find occasion from time to time to praise the work of businessmen who have performed an outstanding service. The press naturally plays up the cases where businessmen are criticized. A better climate would result if Senators and Congressmen were a little more careful in criticizing officials, and if—when they did criticize certain individuals—they were more careful not to give the impression that they were criticizing businessmen in general.

I found that the top officials of the large business organizations were quite favorably inclined to let their young executives do a tour of duty in Government, but the difficulty arises with the attitude of the young executive in question. He quite often has the wrong opinion about the position of the businessman in Government.

COMPANY BENEFIT PLANS

Of course, there are steps which industry could take to make Government service more attractive.

Employee benefit plans now are an important part of an employee's remuneration and many businessmen would naturally hesitate to accept a Government position if it should adversely affect their rights to group insurance, group health, or company pension plans. A company should continue the employee in the group life and group health plans while he is in Government service, with the employee being considered as away on a leave-of-absence basis, and with the same premiums being paid by the company and employee as when he was with the company.

Ordinarily the status of the executive as to pension rights would be frozen as of the date of his leaving the company, with no credit being given for service while in the Government. The company should also give credit to the employee when he returns to the company for the time served in the Government. This practice was frequently followed for men returning from military service.

The Government can help in the situation by making it clear in the regulations regarding employment of businessmen that such arrangements regarding benefit plans are permissible to men on leave of absence from their company.

It should also be understood that it would be permissible for a company to make a reasonable grant to the executive at the time of leaving, as was done in the case of those leaving for military service.

If arrangements of this type can be made, several of the obstacles can be overcome. The company should also make it clear to the executive that a position will be available to him when he returns and that every effort will be made to locate him in a position at least as good as the one he previously had. The company also should agree that in case a general salary increase were made during his absence, his salary upon return would reflect such increases.

Of course, a company in most cases cannot promise to hold an exact position open and the executive will have to take that chance.

I feel quite confident that if measures along the lines I have suggested and will suggest later are adopted, there will be enough men who are willing to devote 2 or 3 years of their career to Government service. A capable man at the age I was talking about—35 to 45—would gain considerable benefit from this experience and should actually increase his earning power. But he should not go into the service with this in view.

The businessman who will probably succeed in Government work is one who not only has ability as demonstrated by his progress with his company, but has shown an interest in Government policies. He should have been active in affairs in his local community and his local, State, and National trade organizations, and thus become familiar with problems faced by Government. It would also be very helpful if he has had some previous experience with the Federal Government, either in service on advisory committees or parttime work.

LAWYERS

Lawyers with corporate law experience are well fitted by training and experience for many of these appointive positions, not just as general counsels in the departments, but also as assistants and under secretaries. This is especially true for the positions which call for contacts with Members of Congress and the preparation and analysis of bills. Lawyers also are very helpful in planning programs and analyzing problems. Due to the nature of their experience, they are accustomed to adapting themselves to new situations. While not many lawyers have had much experience in administrative or executive positions, this is not always necessary. On the other hand, some of these young lawyers have turned out to be very able executives.

It is generally easier to obtain able young lawyers than businessmen. Their income, in most cases, has not reached the point where the salary of a Government position would mean much monetary sacrifice. There seldom is any problem of employee benefits. The experience gained, moreover, in many cases would be more in line with their career.

There is one handicap in the rule that lawyers or their firms cannot participate in any case in which the lawyer was involved in his Government work until 2 years after he has left the Government. While such a rule is reasonable for lawyers in the Department of Justice, Internal Revenue, and certain other positions, it would seem that there should be more liberal interpretation in the usual appointive position. A clarification of this rule would make it easier to obtain able young men.

EDUCATORS

For many of these positions college professors, especially those in the fields of political science, economics, and business administration, are good prospects. Most of them have had little executive experience and desire advisory positions rather than administrative positions. They can be valuable additions for most departments, and are especially helpful in formulating programs. There is little difficulty experienced in professors' obtaining leaves of absence for a reasonable time and, as a rule, the Government salaries are higher than in the educational institution. Educators in administrative positions in their institutions are particularly good prospects, but they are not so readily available.

OTHER PROFESSIONS AND GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Good men are available also in other professions, such as hospital, health, and welfare administrators, and men with experience in State and local governments. These government officials, however, would probably prefer civil service positions so that they would not be subject to loss of position when administrations change.

A CENTRAL RECRUITING AGENCY NEEDED

With so many able men available, the problem resolves itself into one of recruitment and proper placement. At present there is no central agency in Government service for recruiting these men. This is left up to each individual department. It would seem highly desirable to have a central recruiting office established in the White House which would maintain a list of the various positions to be filled by political appointees and the qualifications required for the positions. One reason the service of so many businessmen is short is that they were not properly placed in the first place. The present system is too much hit or miss. The Secretary or agency head generally is limited to suggestions received from friends or acquaintances and there is little system to it.

Such an office, comparable to executive personnel offices in large companies, could obtain lists of qualified men from various trade associations, management consulting firms, and executive employment agencies, and let it be known that key businessmen interested in Government service should contact this office. Similar lists could be obtained for the other groups.

Such an office could also conduct a training program for the new executive, mainly to cover such things as conflict-of-interest rules, the mechanism of civil service, and the differences between Government and business. The attitude with which the executive approaches a Government job is most important, and such a training course should be very helpful in developing the right attitudes and approaches in dealing with other executive departments and with Congress.

A start has recently been made in giving the new executives a course of indoctrination but it is not uniform throughout the departments and the present program can be considerably enlarged. Such an office, to which the executive could come for help and advice, might help to increase the length of time which the businessman spends in Government.

It would be very helpful if more promising young businessmen or men from other professions at an early age could obtain experience in Government at a level below the level of Presidential appointments. A promising plan is now being tried out on a pilot basis in a program recently organized by Brookings Institution called the public affairs fellowship program. This plan calls for a number of Government agencies' taking promising businessmen into their organizations for periods of 6 to 9 months. A number of businesses have indicated interest in this procedure and it is hoped that the institution can demonstrate through this pilot program the feasibility of such an arrangement and encourage it to develop on a much broader scale. It may be necessary for the Government to authorize a special category of training positions in the intermediate class usually made by appointment, without regard to civil service, for periods up to 2 years.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Questions regarding conflict of interest undoubtedly prevent many executives from serving in Government positions. The publicity given to a few outstanding cases has greatly exaggerated the actual situation, however, as far as the effect on businessmen is concerned.

In the great majority of cases there is no conflict of interest, as the executive would not be dealing with his former company and there is no need for him to divest himself of his savings. Except in the case of men in the very top positions, if a case should arise where the executive would be dealing with his former company, he could arrange to turn this specific job over to an associate. In the few positions where a conflict of interest can be foreseen, the executive should not be forced to sell his assets, but should be given the option of turning them over to a trustee who would have complete control as to investment, voting rights, etc. Such an arrangement could be worked out with the assistance of the Department of Justice and with the approval of the Senate committee which confirms the appointment.

This whole question of conflict of interest is in a great state of confusion and complexity due to the large number of statutes relating to various phases of the problem. Some of these statutes go back many years, when conditions were quite different than they are now. The situation would be alleviated to a great extent if these statutes could be consolidated and a reasonable statute adopted to meet present conditions.

Fortunately, a committee of very able lawyers from the New York City Bar Association has recently completed an exhaustive study of this whole problem of conflict of interest. Their report contains specific recommendations regarding divestment, employee benefit plans, payment for outside services, gifts, post-Government employment activities, etc. Their report also makes recommendations about what phases of the problem should be covered by statute and which by regulations, and includes the draft of a proposed consolidated statute. I understand that the chairman of the committee, Roswell B. Perkins (a very able lawyer, who formerly served with me as Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare) will present the report to your committee.

I have read the summary and the recommendations, and they seem to me to be very reasonable and provide adequate protection for the public interest. The enactment of

a consolidated statute and the adoption of other recommendations along the lines recommended by this committee would, in my opinion, greatly improve the present situation.

The conflict of interest statutes and regulations now cover part-time employment, as well as full time. Government departments find it quite helpful to bring in, from time to time, consultants or experts to help in specific problems, generally for short periods of time. These people are now often considered as Government employees, the same as full-time employees. This sometimes prevents these experts from serving. I recall a case where a person declined to serve on one of the advisory councils of the National Institutes of Health because of this provision. It would seem to me that the usual rules should not apply in the case of these part-time temporary consultants, and that they should also be permitted to maintain their usual connections and income. The New York City Bar Committee also covers this point in its recommendations.

Most of the business executives who come into Government service have only a vague idea regarding the conflict of interest statutes and regulations, and there is very little systematic effort to acquaint them with these rules. I would strongly endorse the recommendation of this New York City Bar Committee that a member of the White House staff be designated to see that uniform regulations are adopted in all the departments and agencies, and that instructions developed by the Department of Justice be given to each businessman when he enters Government service. Such an official could be associated with the recruiting office recommended earlier.

SALARY REVISIONS FOR APPOINTED POSITIONS

In regard to the salary level of executive positions in Government, the fact that it is lower than in industry undoubtedly discourages business executives from accepting positions in Government. As far as the top positions are concerned, such as Cabinet Secretaries and agency heads, I doubt if any increase in salary which would be practicable would make much difference. The people generally considered for these positions are in most cases earning salaries considerably above the Government level and a small increase would have little effect. These men know that a sacrifice in income is necessary and accept only because of an overriding desire to serve the Government.

On the other hand, an increase in the salaries in the second-line positions—that is, Under Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries, assistants to the Secretary, and assistant agency heads—would make a considerable difference in my opinion. It is more difficult for the younger men being considered for these positions to make the sacrifice in income.

A careful study which preceded the latest salary adjustments about 3 years ago recommended increasing salaries of Cabinet officers to $35,000, Under Secretaries to $30,000, Assistant Secretaries to $25,000. This schedule was revised downward, however, by Congress and the salaries fixed between $20,000 and $25,000. The schedule, as recommended, would have an appreciable effect in obtaining able men and the cost would be very little as altogether only about 300 positions would be affected.

CIVIL SERVICE SALARY REVISIONS

If the salary level of these political appointees were raised, it would also be highly desirable to raise the maximum salaries in the top grades of civil service employees. I feel that these maximum salaries are now distinctly out of line with comparable positions in industry, and the Government is losing too many of those who reach the top grades.

The salaries of Government employees in the lower and medium grades now compare favorably with those for similar work in industry. With the liberal sickness leave, vacation, pension, and now the group life and group health benefit plans which the Government employees have, the employee benefits in Government also compare quite favorably with those of progressive companies in industry.

A change, such as that suggested in the top Civil Service grades, could be made without much cost because there are relatively few employees in these grades (approximately 1,500 in the three top grades). I know of no one thing that would be as effective in improving Government administration as an increase in the maximum salary for these key workers. Not only would more of the able employees be kept in Government service, but the Government could attract abler young people in the first place.

During the 1930's, governmental careers and salaries were attractive enough that Government received its full share of able college graduates. In the postwar years this has not been the case. It has become increasingly difficult to compete with industry and the professions. It is important that steps be taken to make these careers more attractive.

Higher maximum salaries in the top grades would help. The Government should also do more in introducing executive and management development programs as is done in many industries today. In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we started a program a few years ago under which the entire Department is screened periodically to identify the young people with the greatest potentials for development. These people, along with some directly from college, are given a series of rotating assignments which will insure a breadth of experience and opportunities for growth. I understand that the program is working very well and also that the White House is encouraging a program of identifying key individuals throughout the Government for such development. This is an important step for preparing individuals for these top civil service positions to replace the older persons who retire or leave.

SUMMARY

It is clear that Presidential appointees and the top-grade civil service employees determine to a very large extent the efficiency and effectiveness of Government operations. It is important, therefore, that every effort be exerted to obtain able men for these positions.

For these appointive positions men well fitted by experience in business, law, education, and other fields are available for service in Government. The following measures would help to attract able men to these positions and hold them for longer periods:

1. A central agency in the White House should maintain lists of positions and the necessary qualifications, recruit people, place them properly, and instruct them in the unique features of Government administration.

2. Certain obstacles could be overcome if the various conflict-of-interest statutes were consolidated and a reasonable statute adopted to meet present conditions.

3. Business concerns could make it easier for executives to serve in Government for 2 years or more if they would grant leaves of absence and continue coverage under group life, group health, and other employee benefit plans. The company also should assure the executive of at least a comparable position when he returns and should assure him that recognition will be given for his Government service. In addition, credit should be given him under the pension plan for his service in Government as was done for those going into military service.

4. The status of lawyers as to clients during the first 2 years out of Government service should be clarified.

5. Salaries should be increased moderately to reduce the monetary sacrifice often involved for those taking these positions.

6. A program for giving young men work in Government for a period of 6 to 9 months would be helpful in stimulating interest in Government service and in equipping young men for positions in Government later.

7. The maximum salaries of the three top grades of civil service should be increased. This would serve to hold more able civil service employees and to attract more young men into Government service.

8. A more extensive management development program should be adopted throughout Government to identify and develop the most promising younger people.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY—A GREAT SENATOR'S RECORD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was not in Washington on the day the distinguished senior Senator from Montana announced that he would not run for reelection to the Senate.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY has written a record of achievement in the Senate without peer in its dedication to the public good. He combined a genuine concern for the good of every American with a deep loyalty to the West—responsible regionalism at its best.

Senator MURRAY knew that the West had much to give to this Nation in the past two decades and in the future but he know that there were two major needs for assistance for fullest development in the West—water resources and public power. To both these causes Senator MURRAY gave imaginative and tenacious leadership.

This great Montanan and great American steered through the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which he so ably chaired the extension of our Western frontiers to Hawaii and Alaska.

The same bold planning and constant prodding he devoted to measures designed to maintain a strong mining industry essential to our national security.

Expanding both our geographic and our resource frontiers in the great West, Senator MURRAY served all of us in every corner of the Nation.

But beside his leadership in resources development, Senator MURRAY 25 years ago came to the Senate intent on writing a legislative record in the full sense of a new deal for all.

He wrote that record in education, welfare, and labor relations legislation. In the record are his votes and leadership for aid to education and higher teachers' salaries, improved and expanded social security coverage, civil rights, fair employment, health insurance and public housing. It is a record which exemplifies his faith that good government is concerned with the public good, the good which means the best possible life for all our citizens, not just a privileged few.

The senior Senator from Montana is himself a millionaire—the son of an immigrant railroad man. But he has recognized, as his record proves, the responsibility of the Federal Government for a

fully prosperous and continually growing national economy. To this end, he led the fight for the Wagner Act—American labor's charter of justice—in the early days of the Franklin Roosevelt administration, and in 1946 led the fight for the achievement of which he is said to be proudest—the Full Employment Act.

Senator MURRAY has earned his retirement, but we will surely miss his strong and enlightened leadership. It will not be so great a loss to us here and to the Nation as a whole if after his extraordinary Senate career comes to a close he will continue to share his vision, imagination, and devotion to our Nation's good with his fellow Americans.

I have considered it a rare privilege and a precious gift to share in the friendship of this remarkable man, who represents with such dignity and such forcefulness, and yet with such basic integrity and honor, the highest ideals of this Nation and faith in the future of the American Republic.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota in what he said about my colleague the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial which appeared in the Great Falls Tribune of Thursday, May 12, 1960, entitled "As JIM MURRAY Retires."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS JIM MURRAY RETIRES

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY'S retirement as senior Senator from Montana sparked spontaneous laudatory comment from those who knew him and his works best, his colleagues in the United States Senate. This fulsome praise went beyond the perfunctory, provided clear evidence of the solid respect and warm affection in which he is held by the critical top echelon of the Nation's lawmakers.

Out of their chairs to voice tribute rose the Senate leaders and whips of both parties. Perhaps our own Senator MIKE MANSFIELD summed sentiment best in saying: "He will leave the Senate with the dignity, prestige, and humanity which have been his hallmarks in his 25 years of outstanding service to the people of Montana, the United States, and the free world."

All this is highly gratifying to many thousands of Montanans who in five consecutive elections have voted their confidence in MURRAY as their choice to represent them in Washington. They, too, knew him well, and liked what they saw. Oldtimers knew him when he was a struggling, impecunious lawyer in rough-and-tumble Butte in the early years of the century, raising a flourishing brood of six sons with appetites to put a crimp in any family budget.

For, contrary to latter-day public misconceptions, JIM wasn't born with any silver spoon in his mouth. It was considerably later before he became possessed of means to afford entry into politics without economic strain.

As JIM MURRAY relinquishes the Senate seat he has filled so well, he takes high place among those distinguished Senators who have represented our Land of the Shining Mountains in its nearly three-quarters of a century of statehood. His successors will have large shoes to fill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the passing scene of American life always carries with it moments of joy or sadness, and I am sure that all of us look for joy. But there are occasions when sadness hits us, and one of these periods came recently with the announcement by our distinguished colleague from Montana, the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, that he will retire from public life upon completion of his present term.

There are those among us who feel the sadness deeper than others because certain Members of this body have served with him for many years. I am one of those Members and I dislike to think of JIM MURRAY leaving our midst.

Much has been said in recent years of the ability and influence of Senator MURRAY, and I have been pleased to note it in the public press and in the pages of our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

JIM MURRAY has had tremendous influence on the American scene during his more than 25 years of service as a U.S. Senator. This is as it should be, because JIM MURRAY is a man of great wisdom. He has gained during his public life a vast knowledge of our national and international problems, and he has applied his knowledge effectively in reaching solutions for the betterment of our American way of life.

When I came to the Senate 24 years ago, JIM MURRAY had been on the scene only a brief period, but he was helpful in many matters affecting the Nation. He has benefited many other Members of this body during the succeeding years, and he has been a highly respected and beloved Member.

The people of Montana and the rest of our Nation will sorely miss his services. His devotion to his State and Nation has been of the highest degree, and he will leave for others in future generations a record for them to attempt to attain.

Although Senator MURRAY and I are of different political faiths, I am happy to say that we have been friends through the years and I have constantly enjoyed the privilege of working with him.

HEALTH PROBLEMS OF THE AGED

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my honor and my privilege to join the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] in sponsoring the Retired Persons Medical Insurance Act, S. 3503, and I hope my colleagues will give this important legislation very careful and sympathetic attention.

In today's New York Times appears a letter to the editor from Senator MCNAMARA about this bill. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH PROBLEMS OF AGED—SPONSOR OF SENATE BILL DISCUSSES OBJECTIVES OF PROPOSAL

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your editorial of May 10 on "Health Aid for the Elderly" is to be highly commended for its positive outlook and succinct definition of the issue involved—namely, the use of the social security mechanism versus Federal-State subsidies. Quite correctly, the argument in behalf of the former mechanism is overwhelming. Equally correct is the claim that the administration's solution is no less compulsory than those proposals made by various Democratic legislators, including myself.

Concerning the administration's proposal, it is only on the surface that substantially more benefits are offered. The practical effect of the administration's proposal (it is not yet a bill as of this date), when applied to typical illness experiences of the aged, such as carcinoma, heart failure, arthritis, fractures, etc., would be such as to cost the individual more than under S. 3503, the retired persons medical insurance bill, introduced on May 6 by myself and cosponsored by 19 Senators. This advantage also applies to catastrophic illnesses.

In addition, the retired persons medical insurance bill covers the approximately 4 million retired aged not included in the Forand bill, thus meeting the criticism expressed in your editorial.

Finally, and ultimately more significant, S. 3503 is based on first dollar medical costs and would thus encourage the practice of preventive medical philosophy and low-cost restorative medicine through outpatient diagnostic services, home health programs, etc.

The retired persons medical insurance bill was prepared on the basis of over a year's study, consultation and analysis by the staff and members of the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging. It represents the best thought and advice of practical authorities in the fields of health services and medical economics. Therefore, I believe that ample time does remain in the present session of Congress to work out a solution to meet the need and the public demand for effective action.

PAT MCNAMARA,
U.S. Senator.

WASHINGTON, *May 12, 1960.*

FEDERAL PROGRAMS OF MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution adopted at the 43d annual meeting of Central Cooperatives, Inc., held in Superior, Wis., on March 28 and 29, 1960.

At the meeting, delegates representing 75,000 cooperative members in Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, North Dakota, and South Dakota reaffirmed their support of the Forand bill and Federal programs of medical care for the aged.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 6—THE FORAND BILL

Whereas there is a lack of medical and hospital care provided for the aging through existing agencies of insurance; and

Whereas life expectancy and longevity is rapidly increasing each year and it is generally agreed that the problem of providing medical care for people on social security is an ever increasing one; and

Whereas there is no apparent hope of progress without national action: Be it

Resolved, That the delegates assembled at this 43d annual meeting of Central Cooperatives, Inc., go on record reaffirming our support of H.R. 4700, known as the Forand bill, representing to us either Federal action, or forcing suitable action by such existing agencies of insurance.

STUDENT LOYALTY OATHS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Community Council of Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn. It was once my privilege to be a member of the faculty of that college.

The resolution adopted by the community council relates to the National Defense Education Act, and protests as discriminatory and as an infringement upon freedom of thought the loyalty oath and the disclaimer affidavit provisions of the act.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas section 1001(F) of the National Defense Education Act of 1959 constitutes an infringement upon freedom of thought; and

"Whereas the above-named section manifests a discriminatory treatment toward higher education: Be it

"Resolved, That the Community Council of Macalester College for 1960–61 hereby condemn the imposition of the above-named section upon institutions of higher learning and earnestly request its repeal."

The council feels strongly that forcing upon students who are not financially in a position to resist the discriminatory loyalty oath and affidavit is not in keeping with the respect which higher education deserves from the U.S. Congress. We respectfully urge you to work and vote for the deletion of clause 1001(F) of the National Defense Education Act.

DEATH OF DR. VICTOR E. LAWSON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of Minnesota's great men passed away last month. He was Dr. Victor E. Lawson, founder and publisher of the West Central Daily Tribune in Willmar, Minn. Nothing that I could say about Dr. Lawson would be more eloquent than the tributes that poured into Willmar upon the news of his passing on March 19.

In testimony, therefore, to a wonderful man, a man who gave me valuable guidance and counsel during my service as mayor of the city of Minneapolis and as a U.S. Senator, I ask unanimous consent that a series of articles and editorials published in the West Central Daily Tribune, Willmar, Minn., and including a tribute delivered by Dr. Edgar Carlson, president of Gustavus Adolphus College, at the funeral services for Dr. Lawson, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles, editorials, and tribute were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the West Central Daily Tribune, Willmar, Minn.]

STATESMAN, HISTORIAN, JOURNALIST, CHURCHMAN—UNUSUAL LIFE COMES TO A PEACEFUL CLOSE ON EVE OF 89TH BIRTHDAY—FUNERAL WEDNESDAY—EDITOR AT 17, HIS LIFE WAS ONE OF GREAT PUBLIC SERVICE

Dr. Victor E. Lawson, founder and publisher of the West Central Daily Tribune, passed away quietly Saturday evening at his home in Willmar, after a lingering illness from maladies attendant to old age. He would have observed his 89th birthday on Thursday of this week, March 24.

With his passing has gone an outstanding citizen of Willmar who in 1958—Minnesota's centennial year—was honored as being one of the leading personalities in our State's history. Statesman-journalist-historian and churchman, his life's work and influence touched many fields and made their great contributions. The story of his days almost read like Alger tales of having done so much with so modest beginnings.

Out of an humble carpenter's home with a rural school education, so paltry in those days of a few early grades, he became educated through his own sheer efforts so that a great college, Gustavus Adolphus College, conferred upon him the degree of doctor of humane letters. Of Swedish ancestry, he was recognized as a leading Swedish-American of our country when the late King Gustaf of Sweden decorated him as a Knight of the Order of Vasa. A founder of political parties and a State senator from this legislative district for a long number of years and at one time candidate for Governor of Minnesota. In the field of his chosen vocation—journalism—he was at one time president of the Associated Press of Minnesota and prominent in editorial associations. In his passing has gone the last of the pioneer editors of the Seventh Congressional District.

In his church he was a president of the Augustana Church Brotherhood of Minnesota and served on the board of directors of the Augustana book concern at Rock Island, Ill. In education, president of the Willmar Board of Education and a member of the board of directors of Gustavus Adolphus College. In history—the author of the Illustrated History of Kandiyohi County, a volume rated as the top county history in Minnesota, a work which led him to a presidency and life membership in the Minnesota Historical Society.

In his home community he served several terms as mayor and his influence felt in this community throughout his lifetime when as a public-spirited citizen and as an editor he championed and fought for worthwhile causes for community and civil betterment. As a self-educated man, the Victor Lawson Library now found on the second floor of the Tribune building testifies to the inexhaustible thirst for knowledge which was his.

Such in brief is the history of the man who will be laid to rest at services to be held on Wednesday of this week. Services will be held at 2 p.m. at the Bethel Lutheran Church in Willmar with the Reverend Robert N. Pearson officiating. Following this service the remains will be taken to the Lebanon Lutheran Church at New London where another service will be held at 3:15 with the Reverend Carl H. Gronquist officiating. Interment will be made in the Lebanon churchyard where the remains will be laid to rest with those of other members of the Lawson family who have preceded him.

Friends may call at the Harvey Anderson funeral home in Willmar until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday.

Victor Lawson was the last member of the C. M. Lawson family. In addition to the parents who both passed away at New London, the sisters and brothers who preceded him in death were Carrie (Mrs. W. O. Swanson), Esther, Theodora, Thomas Lawson and Eben E. Lawson.

Immediate nephews and nieces who survive are Enock Swenson of New London, Lawrence Swenson of Olympia, Wash., Mrs. Frank Burns of New London, Verson Lawson of Helena, Mont.; Louis Lawson of Atwater, Mrs. A. D. Hall of St. Cloud, and through kin of Mr. Lawson's wife—Oscar B., Ann, and Gordon Augustson of Willmar, and Rudolph Augustson of Detroit, Mich.

VICTOR E. LAWSON, COUNTRY EDITOR, 1871–1960—"30"

"Thirty" is a symbol used in journalism to denote the end of a story written by a reporter. It also has become a mark symbolizing the end of a newspaperman's life and career. Truly that "30" personifies Victor E. Lawson whose hobby as a boy was printing, who became an editor at the age of only 17 years, and who was active for a period of over 60 years as a printer, editor and publisher. In his passing, journalism and the fourth estate has lost one of its greatest sons, one of honest and fearless conviction and one who also lived a life of great service to his community, his State, his church, and his fellow men. Peace to the memory of this unusual personality—statesman, journalist, historian, churchman—the founder of this newspaper and its beloved publisher over its life span thus far of 65 years.

LIFE SKETCH

Dr. Victor E. Lawson was born on March 24, 1871, at Paxton, Ill. He was the son of Carl Magnus Lawson and Maria Lindstrom Lawrence, devout Christian parents whose hospitable home in the very cradle of the Augustana Lutheran Church was thrown open to many of the early leaders and founders of the church.

When he was a mere lad the family moved to New London, Minn., in 1880 where the father continued as a carpenter, built churches just as he helped build the original Augustana College.

As a boy on the home farm his hobby was printing. No surprise then that at the age of 17 years he became editor of the New London Times and some years later was the founder of the Willmar Tribune, the forerunner of the present West Central Daily Tribune. As an editor he was the champion of the common man, was of liberal political philosophy, was a crusader for temperance and good morals, and an unholder of the Christian faith.

With a meager country schooling of a few early years he, through self-study and his personal library which today is monumental, was some years ago recognized by a great college when Gustavus Adolphus College bestowed upon him the degree of doctor of humane letters.

As an American of Swedish extraction, his contribution to the culture of both nations was notably recognized when the late King Gustaf of Sweden conferred upon him knighthood in the Order of Vasa.

Educationally he rose to places of eminence as president of the Willmar Board of Education and a member of the board of directors of Gustavus Adolphus College.

He served his home city of Willmar as mayor for several terms and many of the forward-looking programs of a civic nature were credited to him.

In the political realm he was one of the builders of the liberal movement in Minnesota, served as State senator from 1927 to 1939, was a candidate for Governor and the choice of the late Gov. Floyd B. Olson for U.S. Senator.

Great he was also as a churchman. In the Bethel Lutheran congregation he held positions as deacon and trustee, was president of the Minnesota brotherhood, served on the board of directors of the Augustana Book Concern. To his own bethel and in memory of his wife he gave a complete installation of carillon bells.

As a journalist he became president of the Associated Press of Minnesota and was the last of the pioneer editors of this West Central area.

A born historian he was. Note his authorship of the Illustrated History of Kandiyohi County, the outstanding county history in Minnesota, his presidency and life membership in the Minnesota Historical Society and the one credited with acquiring the State Society Building at the capital.

He was a great lover of nature and the outdoors. Note his leadership in acquiring Sibley State Park, Monson Lake State Park, Robbins Island and the establishment of

his own Ekeberg Conservation Foundation, 22 acres of which he finally gave to his church as the site of the present Shores of St. Andrew Bible Camp.

The above are merely the highlights of his public service and efforts in behalf of his community, his State and his church.

Mr. Lawson wedded Minnie Nelson of New London in 1894 but the young wife passed away 7 years later. In 1908 he married Julia Shellstrom who was his great helpmate until her demise in 1947. There were no children by either marriage.

He retired as head of the Tribune in 1947, assuming the position of the chairman of the board of the Tribune Co. but continuing his interest in the affairs of the newspaper he founded 65 years ago. Ill health came to him during the past decade but such maladies never dimmed the latent interests that were always his.

He passed away quietly at his home in Willmar Saturday evening March 19, 1960, on practically the eve of his 89th birthday.

Victor Lawson was the last member of the C. M. Lawson family. In addition to the parents who both passed away at New London, the sisters and brothers who preceded him in death were Carrie (Mrs. F. O. Swanson), Esther, Theodora, Thomas Lawson, and Eben E. Lawson.

Immediate nephews and nieces who survive are Enock Swenson, of New London; Lawrence Swenson, of Olympia, Wash.; Mrs. Frank Burns, of New London; Vernon Lawson, of Helena, Mont.; Louis Lawson, of Atwater; Mrs. A. D. Hall, of St. Cloud; and through kin of Mr. Lawson's wife—Oscar B., Ann and Gordon Augustson, of Willmar; and Rudolph Augustson, of Detroit, Mich.

[From the West Central Daily Tribune, Willmar, Minn.]

ALONG THE WAY
(By O. B. A.)

For just today we would revert back to our very personal column of some years past.

For during the decades of that column the writer took occasion to pay tribute to good and worthy people he had learned to know and esteem.

Today gives us the one and greater occasion to again pay honor—if we can find the words—to properly express our thoughts.

Pay deeply felt tribute to a great man who will be laid to rest tomorrow.

They say a truly great man is also great to his valet—he who is so close to the life of a man. In such a situation we found ourself during these past 44 years.

And we would seek to say so much that is on our hearts and call him great, not just because he was our employer, not because he was near of kin, not because he was our benefactor.

No—all those things aside, we pay deepest honor to the man—Victor E. Lawson himself—as we learned to know and almost worship him.

It was said of the Royal Air Force of Britain when they turned back the Luftwaffe these words by Churchill—"They did so much with so little."

How true that was of Victor Lawson—one who accomplished so much with so little, from such humble beginnings. Rose to such heights that he was termed illustrious as a statesman, historian, journalist, and a churchman.

As a country boy with a few grades of a rural school he became a doctor of humane letters. As a village newspaperman to become an editor of State and National stature.

As an historian whose work won him widespread fame, a legislator and political champion who stood so high in the halls of government, a churchman, who made such great contributions to the faith.

These are merely broad brackets of his life of achievements and service, service so unselfish, little thoughts of reward—the good done was his goals.

How can one but stand in awe and profound admiration—most especially we who were so close to observe it all.

Yet despite his gifts and the honors he attained, he was always the commoner, the one militant for those needing help, the crusader for causes, the upholder of noble principle and conviction cost what they would.

What more can one say in mere words found to be so futile in an hour like this?

And how best can one close this earnest comment but with the blessed benediction which we feel he will so well merit—"Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Peace to the memory of Victor Emmanuel Lawson—seldom in our estimation do such personalities flash across the horizon of time or walk the terrestrial stage.

Great and yet humble, one for whom service was an ideal, one who was strong as a lion and yet with the abiding faith of a child—faith in his God and in his fellowmen.

Farewell Victor E. Lawson, our lives and the bit of world which surrounds us was made better by your having been in our midst.

We would live on in the aura and glow of inspiration which enveloped your days of sojourn here on earth.

DESK, THOUGH VACANT, THE SPIRIT LIVES

Yesterday's editorial comment was material that had been written previous to the recent bereavement which befell this newspaper. It was run as a fill-in. Today we resume the editorial pen. And we cannot write without notice of the one vacant desk in our editorial room which was graced so long by his presence. Yes, it is vacant but we will ever sense his presence, his spirit—for he will continue to live here in an atmosphere made up of memories of this man, his personality, and his principles. As this newspaper was founded and grew under his guidance so may we continue to carry on through the inspiration he bequeathed to us all. Victor Lawson has departed to far happier climes but we who remain cannot but be dedicated to the ideals which he personified throughout his life. Victor Lawson founded this newspaper as an independent voice and under his leadership it has so remained. Look back, ye who do know, and recall with us the causes that he championed and at times when it was both costly and grievous to himself. But he was an editor—every inch of him—born as such. For him the principles he defended with his pen were more precious than the peace or the purse. To him journalism was a calling, a consecrated profession, something which had nothing to do with material gain—it was a thing of the spirit—convictions held stanchly when others about him may have faltered—beliefs that could not be swayed or bought. We who follow, know his life and how he lived up to his role as the humble country editor, yes humble but fearless, having at heart at all times what he thought was for the best and good for his fellowmen. Journalism and the fourth estate has lost one of its greatest sons—one of its pioneers—one who laid foundation stones of what journalism should be if it is to be deemed worthy of being called a profession.

The present editor who has inherited his mantle and has stood by his side all these years to both observe and learn could write both an impressive and interesting narrative of the editorial side of this man Lawson, a side just as illustrous as the roles he achieved as a historian, statesman, and churchman. Perhaps the future may give occasion to do this.

But now we must close this editorial tribute—it could say no more if it were thrice its length. But, as we gaze at his vacant desk we will always have indelibly imprinted on our very souls the editorial gospel and creed which shone through his life and which words we often heard him express—"Be true to your convictions." And this he was, so gloriously that he won the admiration and esteem of even his severest critics in public and political life.

His editorial desk is vacant but the spirit of Victor E. Lawson lives on.

COMMUNITY, CHURCH, STATE PAID TRIBUTE AT VICTOR E. LAWSON RITES—CHURCH AUDIENCE THRILLS AT VICTORY OF FAITH SERVICE

In a thronged church auditorium, in the assemblage of a community which came to do him last honors, in the presence of distinguished representatives of church, State, the Fourth Estate, and of recorded history, last rites were held Wednesday afternoon for the late Dr. Victor E. Lawson, beloved founder and publisher of the West Central Daily Tribune. It was not a moment of only mourning, it was not an occasion of only bereavement and loss—it proved to be a service of triumph and victory as a man of the faith returned to his Maker. This was all revealed in the tributes paid by the representatives mentioned, by the hymns that spoke of that faith, by the stirring message from the pulpit, all closing with the dramatic rendition, by the choir, of "The Hallelujah Chorus" from "The Messiah" as the audience stood and shared the inspiration. Such were the rites at the Bethel Lutheran Church for the man who from such humble origin had attained distinctions but bore with so much modesty, as a statesman, historian, journalist, and churchman.

Seated in the audience were various groups in reserved pews including some 21 honorary pallbearers, men who had been close to the career of this departed citizen and friend in so many public, business, and personal walks of life. These were Dr. R. E. Anderson, Willmar; M. W. Blomquist, Willmar; Judge Harold Baker, Renville; A. W. Chalberg, Kandiyohi; Carl Dahlheim, Willmar; W. J. DeVries, Raymond; Edward M. Elkjer, Willmar; H. C. Feig, Willmar; C. J. Freeberg, Willmar; Dr. C. E. Gerretson, Willmar; O. N. Gravgaard, Hawick; Judge Sam Gandrud, Litchfield; Charles Hedlund, Willmar; Harry Hallberg, Kandiyohi; Dr. J. C. Jacobs, Willmar; Martin Leaf, Willmar; C. J. Nelson, Kandiyohi; Victor Olson, Benson; Paul E. Peterson, Willmar; J. Albert Peterson, Willmar; Senator H. L. Wahlstrand, Willmar.

The active pallbearers were associates and employees of the Tribune—R. C. Bengtson, Ernest Strom, Anton Okerman, Emil Aspaas, Sigurd Pederson, Lowell Lundquist, Stanley Haldorson, and Olaf Hovseth. Other Tribune employees and their families were seated as a group.

The processional was led by Rev. Robert N. Pearson, of Bethel Lutheran, Willmar; Rev. Carl Gronquist, of Lebanon Lutheran, New London; Rev. Carl Sandgren, of Minneapolis; Rev. Thomas Wersell, Minneapolis; and the distinguished representatives.

After the opening hymn "He Leadeth Me," there was the order of service and reading of the Scripture and prayer. Then followed the tributes by the distinguished representatives from the area of church, state, press, and historical.

Dr. Edgar Carlson, president of Gustavus Adolphus College, paid an eloquent tribute to Dr. Lawson in which he called attention to the many years the deceased had served on the board of directors of the college and his interest in education. His highest tribute came when he noted that though the departed had only a few grades of a rural schooling he rose to such eminence as a scholar that Gustavus conferred upon him the degree of doctor of humane letters.

"Without the benefit of higher education" said Dr. Carlson, "he became a recognized scholar, to whom the best trained scholars were proud and happy to pay tribute."

Representing Gov. Orville Freeman was his personal secretary, Thomas Hughes, who spoke of the years when Senator Lawson served in the State legislature and the contributions he had made as a statesman of Minnesota. Ralph Keller, Secretary of the Minnesota Newspaper Association cited Dr. Lawson as a journalist of the highest order—"one who held high his profession as an editor without fear or favor. Though one may have disagreed with his views you never doubted his honesty and integrity" said Mr. Keller. Arch Grahn of the Minnesota Historical Society pointed out the contributions which Dr. Lawson had made to both local and State history and informed that the acquiring of the historical building at the capitol was largely through his leadership. Rev. Thomas Wersell of Minneapolis represented Dr. Leonard Kendall, president of the Lutheran Minnesota Conference of the Augustana Church whose statement cited Dr. Lawson's services to the church, his gift of the Bible camp site and generally his Christian life and labors.

The second hymn sung was "Faith of Our Fathers" after which the Rev. Robert N. Pearson delivered a very impressive sermon. He informed the audience that for years Dr. Lawson had a motto on his desk. It read "Prepare to meet thy God." This quotation is from the book of Amos and was made the basis for the fine Pearson sermon. He declared that a true Christian always lives with the thought of being prepared to meet his God. And this is realized said Reverend Pearson through humility, through honesty, and through harmony with God. This done, said the pastor, death has no sorrow—it is an occasion for triumph and victory and he applied it all to the passing of Dr. Lawson. It was at this point that the entire audience arose as the choir, directed by Julian Framstad rendered "The Hallelujah Chorus" from "The Messiah"—a thrill to everyone who was in the edifice at that moment.

The benediction was pronounced and the recessional began while hymns were played on the carillon bells in the church tower, the gift of Dr. Lawson. The organist at the service was Mrs. Harold Dale. The bells were also played during the processional. Pastor Pearson acknowledged the many floral tributes and likewise many in memoriam gifts for such causes as benevolences, the Bible camp, the chapel at Gustavus, etc.

The funeral cortege now set off for New London where brief services were held at the Lebanon Lutheran church, the old family church of the Lawsons. Here the Reverend Carl Gronquist officiated and delivered an effective sermon stressing the truth that our entire Christian faith is based on the Resurrected Christ and because He lives, we too, shall live. Special music at this service was a duet, "Children of the Heavenly Father" sung in the Swedish by Mrs. Herbert Holm and Mrs. Harry Dokkesven. The organist was Mrs. Harold Olson.

With the two services now having been completed the remains were borne to the Lebanon churchyard where they were laid to rest in the family plot. Here both Rev. Pearson and Rev. Gronquist officiated at the rites.

The thronged Bethel church reflected friends from throughout this part of the State and from a distance. They had come to pay their last respects to a man whom they had learned to both love and admire—a country lad who had risen to prominence but never lost his common touch and humility.

Among those from a distance, the following have come to our attention: State Treasurer Val Bjornson, former State Senator Simonson of Litchfield, the Honorable Odean Enestvedt of Renville, former Representative H. W. Rundquist of Dawson, former Willmar school superintendent, George O. Brohaugh of St. Cloud, former Governor Elmer Benson of Appleton Lud Roe of St. Paul and former publisher at Montevideo, Russell Fridley, secretary, Minnesota Historical Society, Hon. O. G. Nordlie of Litchfield, former State Senator Ansgar Almen of St. Peter, William Macklin, managing editor of the New Ulm Daily Journal.

After the Bethel service and the Lebanon services groups of ladies in both congregations served refreshments. The choir, which in Bethel church sang the Hallelujah Chorus was made up largely from singers in the Messiah Chorus which will render this famous oratorio in Willmar on Palm Sunday. The Lawson Library in the Tribune Building was open to visitors after the church service.

TRIBUTE TO DR. LAWSON DELIVERED BY DR. EDGAR CARLSON, PRESIDENT, GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS COLLEGE

"Dr. Victor Lawson was one of those rare persons who can be accounted for only by their unusual inner resources. Many people are shaped by the circumstances of their lives and reflect the communities in which they live and labor and the influences that have acted upon them. About Victor Lawson one has to say that the community reflects him to an even larger degree than he reflected the community. He was one of the major influences in the life of this city and of this State, of this congregation, and of the whole church.

"Without the benefit of higher education he became a recognized scholar, to whom the best trained scholars were proud and happy to pay tribute. I recall that when Gustavus Adolphus College conferred upon him the honorary degree, doctor of humane letters, in 1945, no less a historical scholar than Dean Theodore C. Blegen, dean of the Graduate School at the University of Minnesota, expressed his personal appreciation to the institution for this deserved recognition that had been given to one of Minnesota's great historical scholars.

"There was in him a remarkable combination of kindliness and humility on the one hand, and a sure confidence and almost regal bearing on the other. There was an independence of thought and action which was sure of its ground, while always inquiring and curious about new fields and new points of view. There was devotion to the old, the desire to conserve the best in the tradition, and an alertness to the new situation and new conditions which made him everyone's contemporary, and especially the contemporary of the young.

"Indeed, his interest in the young must be regarded as one of his outstanding qualities. For 25 years, from 1914 to 1939, he served as a member of the board of Gustavus Adolphus College. I am sure that the board has never had a more devoted or interested member than he, nor one who more fully embodied the best in its educational heritage. Always he knew what was going on at the college and was eager to learn more about it. In these recent years he gave concrete and dramatic evidence of his concern for youth and his faith in them by giving his beloved Ekeberg Farm to the youth of the church as a site for the Bible Camp, 'The Shores of St. Andrew.'

"In behalf of Gustavus Adolphus College, its board of trustees, faculty and staff and student body, and countless students and teachers of other years who owed a debt beyond that which they may have known to Dr. Lawson, I wish to pay him tribute and give public acknowledgment of our indebtedness to him. To those who stood closest to him by ties of blood and continuous association, we extend our deepest sympathies and assure you that we also stand in that community of gratitude and grief to which all who knew him now belong.

"The passing of another of these 'giants in the earth' makes us realize again how great is our debt to these men of vision and of faith, of whom there seem to have been so many in an earlier generation. They believed greatly in the God we have known in Jesus Christ, in America and its great possibilities, in the men and women with whom they associated, and most especially in the young. We may well pause to wonder whether they are being replaced by others in our generation. We honor men like Dr. Victor Lawson most by dedicating ourselves in what often appears to be the diminishing tribute of the great servants of mankind."

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, although I neither expressed nor experienced any joy when the able senior Senator from Minnesota laid aside his sword in another endeavor, I feel, and wish now to express, joy at seeing him back in harness on the floor of the Senate, where we need his intellect, his vision, his pleasant personality, and his articulate voice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for those words. I should like to share with him an intimate personal thought. I have never been happier in my life. I love the U.S. Senate. Having had the opportunity to experience some of the other delights of public life, I have come back home, and I hope to be able to remain here for some time.

I shall endeavor in the next few months to renew my contract, if the people of Minnesota are willing to be so gracious as to consider it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have already made known my feelings about the return of the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota to the Senate, and how happy and glad I am for personal reasons.

I simply wish to say that, now that HUBERT HUMPHREY has returned, the sun is shining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Montana.

THE DANGER OF SUSPENSION OF NUCLEAR TESTS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, for many years our policymakers have paid lip service to the idea of disarmament. This seems to be one of the ways, in modern diplomacy, of proving one's virtue. Recently, however, under strong Communist propaganda pressure, we have acted as though we mean this talk to be taken seriously. I cite our Government's momentous decision to suspend nuclear tests.

To the impending physical parity in nuclear weapons must be added a psychological factor assiduously cultivated by Communist propaganda. The horrors of all-out warfare are said so be so great that no nation would consider resorting to nuclear weapons unless under direct

attack by those same weapons. Now the moment our leaders really accept this, strategic nuclear weapons will be neutralized and Communist armies will be able to launch limited wars without fear of retaliation by our Strategic Air Command. I fear they are coming to accept it, and thus that a military and psychological situation is fast developing in which aggressive Communist forces will be free to maneuver under the umbrella of nuclear terror.

It is in this context that we must view the Communist propaganda drive for a permanent ban on the testing of nuclear weapons, and the inclination of our own leaders to go along with the proposal. There are two preliminary reasons why such proposals ought to be firmly rejected. First, there is no reliable means of preventing the Communists from secretly breaking such an agreement. Our most recent tests demonstrated that underground atomic explosions can be set off without detection. Secondly, we cannot hope to maintain even an effective strategic deterrent unless we keep our present nuclear arsenal up to date; this requires testing.

The moratorium on testing of nuclear devices prevents the exploitation of the full theoretical potential of some of our planned ballistic missile systems. Concurrently with the development of new missile systems, scientists had planned to develop new warheads for which the weight involved would have given vastly greater explosive forces than those now available in the relatively lightweight warheads used by missiles. Each day the moratorium continues will further delay the development, fabrication, and testing of warheads which would have significantly increased the striking power of new missile systems. Hence, Mr. President, we may be confronted with utilizing weapons far less potent than those originally contemplated or, as an alternative, equipping them with untested warheads. In manned bombers, however, weapon weight is not such a restrictive factor; and they are, and will continue to be, able to carry the very large yield by the comparatively heavy fully tested weapons now available.

This fact serves to highlight the danger of relying on any one particular system as an ultimate weapon. We must continue to develop our manned aircraft, to assure our continued capability to place adequate warheads on appropriate targets.

Scientists have a rightful place in our planning; but it is wrong, in my opinion, to depend entirely upon them for the development of military weapons for military strategy. I recall, Mr. President, that during World War II a scientific study showed that the B–17 would not survive in Europe. This decision came out after the B–17 had not only survived, but had enabled us to deliver such a strategic attack on Germany that we won the war.

What we must constantly remember is that we are the dominant country in the world today in air transportation; and, holding that dominance, we should utilize it, as England did her mastery of the seas, to maintain a situation without world wars for 200 years. If we are to be able to utilize that power, it cannot be tied up with red buttons. In other words, if we place all of our strategic and offensive hopes in missiles, once the red button is pushed the offensive strength is on its way and cannot be recalled. On the other hand, if our strategic forces are made up of the combination of missiles and manned bombers, then we shall have the flexibility and the maneuverability to show to the world our air power, as England did her sea power.

Nothing would delight Russia more than to have us agree to a disarmament program which would include the abandoning of our manned aircraft, for then she would, in effect, have taken from us the one weapon which we have to keep her from bullying the world as she desires.

Continued modernization of our manned force will be required, in order to maintain effectiveness. Both the growing obsolescence of the force and the significant increases being made in Soviet air defenses contribute to this requirement.

The mach 3 B–70 is the weapon system which best fulfills the vital requirement for a manned follow-on aircraft to the B–52.

It is the only manned aircraft system now under development by the Air Force. Its introduction into the strategic bomber force is essential to the continued effectiveness of the manned bomber force.

An effective offensive strategic capability requires a flexible force using manned aircraft and missiles.

Properly employed, manned aircraft and missiles can complement each other, by attacking the targets for which, individually, they are best suited. Both are essential, and neither can completely replace the other. The ratio of bombers to missiles may decrease, but we cannot abandon the manned bomber.

In addition, a diversified attack forces the enemy to dilute his defenses, so as to try to cover all speeds and altitudes.

Manned systems possess certain unique capabilities, not characteristic of missiles, which are considered mandatory to the strategic posture.

One is the capability which allows launching on less than certain information, because an airplane can be recalled. Launched in this situation, the manned system could be recalled or could proceed on to enemy targets; and, being airborne, it would be safe from the attack.

Also, manned aircraft can be used over and over on repeated strikes, whereas a missile cannot be used a second time.

In addition, the manned system fulfills the important role of obtaining intelligence and damage assessment information vital to planning subsequent strikes. It also provides a means of bringing mobile targets under attack.

Another unique capability of the manned system, now and for some time to come, is the ability to carry larger and greater yield weapons, as well as multiple weapons; whereas in the present state of the art, the ICBM can carry but one warhead, and it is of relatively small yield when compared with the yield of what the bomber can carry.

This capability enables the airplane to bring large-yield weapons to bear against such hardened targets as military and government control centers, or to attack several targets on the same mission.

We should also note that this large and variable load-carrying capability takes on additional significance when we consider the possibility that nuclear weapons conceivably would be banned at some time in the future, and only TNT weapons could be used.

In such a situation, missiles become a very expensive means of delivering TNT against the enemy, when compared to the cost of the bomber, with its capability of carrying many conventional bombs, and returning to carry more.

Furthermore, there exists the possibility that the moratorium on nuclear weapons tests will continue for at least the immediate future. If so, we shall be denied the means to develop and improve the ratio of warhead yield to weight, a factor of great importance when related to missiles. Consequently, reliable missile warhead yield growth, without testing, and within reasonable weight limitations, becomes most doubtful. Reliable, extremely large yield nuclear bombs are now in the inventory. When considered in conjunction with possible cessation of further flight testing of long-range missiles, this factor lends weight to the continued need for the manned bomber.

The manned aircraft can seek out, discriminate, and attack targets, with no sacrifice in accuracy and effectiveness. In short, it can achieve high accuracy using less accurate target data.

Moreover, the manned aircraft offer a much greater range of flexibility in choice of tactics. For example, they could use auy portion of the enemy perimeter to pentrate, with variance in both altitudes and speeds.

The man in the aircraft provides distinct advantages. He can use his judgment when confronted with unexpected conditions. He can disregard targets already destroyed, and can use his weapons on alternate targets. He has the ability to observe, think, and make unrehearsed decisions.

Of great significance is the increasing emphasis on arms control. Although complete and general disarmament is probably not attainable within the prevailing or foreseeable political environment, partial arms control is conceivable, and may eventually include space weapons, ICBM's, IRBM's, and nuclear weapons. Assuming this possibility, the future security of the Nation will, as today, be primarily dependent on the manned bomber force. The continuation of this force must be planned for and programed now. It cannot be a stop-and-go proposition, since many years are needed to develop and produce modern bombers and train personnel to use and maintain them.

Finally, manned systems offer cold-war application, not visualized in connection with large missiles.

In this regard, the flexibility of manned systems eases the decisionmaking process by providing an instrument

which may be employed on a graduated scale without an irrevocable commitment to combat.

The options provided the decisionmakers may vary from an increased ground alert posture to launching of the force subject to recall.

For instance, in times of stress it is difficult to let the world know, particularly potential enemies, that the readiness of the ballistic missile force has been stepped up. Nothing happens that anyone can see, whereas stepping up the readiness of the manned aircraft force on alert or initiation of an airborne alert is visible to friend and foe alike.

Furthermore, to display response in a tense situation, manned vehicles could be sent to where they would be seen by allies, or even picked up on radar screens of an enemy.

The aging B–47's are planned to be phased out of the Air Force inventory by the midsixties. Also, during the midsixties the earlier model B–52's will begin to be phased out.

This condition, coupled with an ever increasing Soviet defensive posture, requires modernization of our manned strategic capability.

An analysis of payload, range, speed, and penetration capabilities shows the B–70 to be the weapon system best suited to fulfill that requirement.

The B–70 would provide the Air Force with the most advanced, manned strategic system that the state of art now permits. It is unique, in that it has been designed expressly for continued operation in the supersonic environment.

It will travel the entire distance of its very great range at Mach 3, which is roughly 2,100 miles an hour. This represents a major aeronautical breakthrough, since it transcends the heat barrier, and conceivably opens the door to much greater speeds and further major advances in aeronautical science.

The principal technical factor which now permits attainment of a supersonic transport is the radical improvement in flight efficiency, which results in adequate range at acceptable fuel costs. Flight efficiency is the product of aerodynamic efficiency and propulsive efficiency. In considering aerodynamic efficiency, we find that a drastic decrease in lift-to-drag ratio occurs when sonic speed is reached and passed. However, recent developments and design refinements, such as the compression-lift principle, have substantially raised lift-drag ratios in the Mach 3 region. In compression-lift design, the aircraft wing is positioned on the supersonic shock wave, so that it derives additional lift from the increased air pressure behind the wave. It may be said that, in effect, the airplane "rides" its own shock wave. Thus, we see that by proper design we can translate increased speed into improved aerodynamic efficiency.

Furthermore, the attainable propulsive efficiency increases with increasing flight speed. The combination of the two factors produces flight efficiencies approaching those of present-day, high-subsonic aircraft. Still further improvement is anticipated in this area.

This speed means, for example, that in times of stress, if B–70's were on alert over the polar regions, and it was decided to attack, they would be over Moscow before an ICBM launched from this country could reach Moscow.

Penetration studies show that the B–70 will have excellent penetration capabilities. This capability is derived primarily from the airplane's speed and altitude; and this capability would be further enhanced by countermeasures, decoys, and air-to-surface missiles—all used under the monitorship of a human brain.

The B–70 is designed to carry a variable internal payload. It can carry several large bombs or a great many very small ones.

One of the problems in space research and military space work is the boost required to propel payloads through the lower dense atmosphere into space. It may be possible to realize substantial savings by launching space vehicles from the B–70 using it as a recoverable, first-stage booster instead of launching from the ground.

Of growing importance is the possible need for a defense against satellites. In this regard, the maneuvering ability, speed, and large load-carrying capacity of the B–70 offers great potential as an antisatellite weapons carrier, and possibly as a long-range platform for air defense missiles.

Additionally, the B–70's design, with the crew far removed from the engines, may be, with certain types of nuclear reactors, adaptable for nuclear propulsion.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am speaking on limited time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, may I have 6 more minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arizona may have 10 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not expect to use the 10 minutes, but now I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, is the Senator from Arizona at liberty to disclose the planned cruising altitude of the B–70?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The planned cruising altitude is 70,000 feet, but I believe it will be higher than that.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the utilization of the B–70 necessitate the remaking of airports or airfields?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No.

Mr. AIKEN. What length of strips would be required for takeoff or landing?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The lengths and thicknesses of present runways for B–52's would suffice for the B–70's. In the construction of new runways, it would be desirable to make them longer, but it is not necessary.

Mr. AIKEN. A 10,000-foot runway would accommodate a B–70, then?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, the weight would depend on whether the plane was loaded or not, and the required ballast of the runway would depend on the weight of the plane.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that, in my opinion, any modern B–52 or B–47 runway would handle a B–70.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the B–70 offers the potential for assuming the role of rapid strategic airlift or paving the way for mach 3 transport aircraft.

Just as the B–52/KC–135 developments paved the way for jet transportation, so the B–70 would initiate mach 3 transportation, freight, and passenger.

Under conditions of total weapons control a mach 3 transport utilizing the B–70 design features would provide the United States the flexibility of rapidly transitioning from transport aircraft to weapon system should such a need arise.

The recent disclosure by the CIA and the State Department and the President on a successful penetration of Russia's heartland by the U–2 should be added reason for quickly going ahead with full development of the B–70 program. The reason that the U–2 was able to operate, and is still able to operate with immunity in the skies over Russia, is that it can fly at an altitude higher than any of Russia's interceptors can reach and higher than the effective range of any of its ground-to-air missiles. Russia abandoned her supersonic program in aircraft, and for that reason she has not developed a fighter capable of effectively reaching the altitudes at which this reconnaissance plane flies. If a reconnaissance version of the B–70 could come off the lines in a short time from now, we would have started an arm of our Air Force that could revolutionize the entire field of reconnaissance. This craft flying at mach 3, at altitudes above 80,000 feet, could with immunity give surveillance to any part of the world and keep us constantly posted on the actions and progress of any potential enemy, wherever he might be.

A manned airplane is required as an essential and integral element of the strategic posture.

The B–70 is the weapon system which best fulfills the requirement for a manned follow-on aircraft to the B–52.

The B–70 offers the potential of additional required roles, including nuclear-powered airplanes, first-stage boosters to space launchings, and mach 3 transportation.

The B–70 offers a reconnaissance type aircraft that could fly above the effective range of any enemy aircraft or missile, and at speeds over three times of any known enemy interceptor.

Our Government could then go to the United Nations with a statement that it was clearly obvious that to help insure the peace of the world, a constant surveillance should be made of the entire globe and that this surveillance would

be, so to speak, "posted on the bulletin board" for every member of the United Nations to see. Daily, yes, even hourly, observations of all the world from these altitudes could result in information which could certainly prevent any massive surprise attack being launched by one nation against another. Now, the United Nations would probably turn this down so we would then go to NATO and make the same proposal that we, with our B–70's, would provide a flying watchdog for the world, and that gathered information would be the property of the world. It is reasonable to expect that NATO would reject this, so then, as a last resort, the United States could say to the world that we know if the world could be kept posted as to the activities of all nations on a real basis, the dangers of any overt attack could be virtually removed, and that, desiring peace as strongly as we do, we would provide this surveillance at our own expense.

If an enemy power is bent on conquering a nation, and proposes to turn all of its resources to that end, that power is at war with the nation; and the latter—unless it contemplates surrender—is at war with him.

"These are the times that try men's souls," said Thomas Paine when we were struggling through the war that brought us independence. If he were alive today, he could well repeat that, or say, "Now is the time that tries men's courage."

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF REA

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, rural electrification has been one of the most important developments in the progress of America and of American agriculture. It has revolutionized the workload on the farm and it has immensely benefited the family farm. Beyond this, it has enabled farm families to enjoy cultural values and a standard of living previously not possible. Perhaps no group can express more appreciative thanks than the farm wives of America who have seen the values brought to their homes and their families by rural electrification.

This great change has been accomplished in the past 25 years, and largely through the processes set in motion by President Franklin Roosevelt. The Rural Electrification Administration began with his Executive order in May 1935. Since then the percentage of farms in the United States with electricity has increased from less than 11 percent to more than 96 percent. In Minnesota only 6.8 percent of the farms were electrified in 1935, as compared to 98.6 percent today.

On the 25th anniversary of the establishment of REA, it is appropriate to commend the foresight of President Roosevelt and of the congressional leaders who supported and expanded the program. At the same time, the success of the rural electrification program is also the achievement of rural citizens. Rural electrification has been accomplished, not by government ownership or operation, but essentially as a private venture. The role of Government has been to provide funds for loans, just as it did for industry under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Although several forms of private enterprise were eligible to borrow for rural electrical expansion, most of the initiative came from rural cooperatives formed for this purpose. Of the 1,085 firms which have borrowed through REA, 984 have been rural co-ops. Special recognition is due on this occasion to the thousands of farm leaders who had both the determination and the skill to create their own institutions.

Nearly 16 million rural people are now served by locally owned and managed rural electric systems. and more than half of the Nation's farms get their electricity through an REA borrower. Over 83 percent of the Minnesota farms are served by REA. Only North and South Dakota have a higher percentage of farmers belonging to REA. The unusual success of REA co-ops in Minnesota is a reflection of the long and successful experience of Minnesota farmers with cooperatives. Given a means to finance their own electrification system, Minnesota farmers went ahead with confidence and skill to serve all the farmers of the State. Over 80,000 miles of powerlines have been constructed under REA in Minnesota, giving the State the third highest REA mileage of any State in the Nation.

The record of REA borrowers is not only one of success in giving service to the entire community. It has also been one of fiscal success. Approximately $3.5 billion has been loaned by REA in the past 25 years, and over $1 billion has been repaid by borrowers in principal and interest. The REA loans in Minnesota have totaled about $156 million, of which $37 million has been repaid on the principal, and another $20 million in interest. Repayments on loans are far ahead of schedule.

Today, the great majority of Members of Congress and citizens nationally agree on the value of the REA. It is an example of how Government can be used to extend freedom and independence for people.

Rural electrification was inevitable in the United States. Once started, it was simply a question of how fast it would come, of what form it would take, and of how many farmers would benefit. The Nation made its choice in democratic fashion and along lines consistent with democratic principles.

HE WHO WOULD BE SECURE AT HOME MUST BE SUPREME AT SEA

Mr. BUTLER. Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, has repeatedly and emphatically defined seapower in this way:

> Seapower is not just men-of-war. It includes freighters, tramp steamers, passenger liners, tankers, and the many other ships which make up the merchant marine.
>
> But seapower is even more than this. It is the sum total of weapons, ships, shipbuilding capacity, and geography which enable a nation to use the sea advantageously during peace and war.

The free world desperately needs the sea. The free world will not long remain free unless it controls the sea. The community of free nations, who together compose a mighty strength, draws power from the sea, and is tied together by the arteries of the sea. Obviously, seapower will play a major, if not a predominant, role in any future emergency which can now be visualized.

Yet, it is increasingly remarkable that the United States—the cornerstone of the free world—would permit elements of its seapower to be deficient from a qualitative or quantitative standpoint. But that is exactly what is happening in terms of our merchant marine.

My colleagues, I am sure, will be alarmed, as I have been, by a recent appraisal of our ocean shipping resources and capabilities to support the defense of the United States, which has been prepared by the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a letter, and attachments, dated March 11, 1960, received from Vice Adm. Ralph E. Wilson, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations—Logistics.

There being no objection, the letter and attachments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF
OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1960.

Hon. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: In your letter of February 17, 1960, you expressed interest in receiving a current appraisal of our maritime needs along the lines of the document dated February 21, 1959, and entitled "Ocean Shipping to Support the Defense of the United States." This paper has been revised to the present date, and a copy is enclosed for your information.

There has been little change in the substance of this appraisal since its last revision in February 1959. The bulk of our sea transportation resources have undergone another year's depreciation, and little has been accomplished in the way of either modernization or renewal.

The subsidized segment of the U.S.-flag merchant fleet remains at a few over 300 ships. The number of subsidized voyages authorized in the past year was a few more than in the year previous. There are a number of applications for subsidy pending. Although most of the subsidized shipping companies have entered into long-range ship replacement contracts, funding shortages have prevented actual replacement construction from being adequate. The rate of progress in the replacement of subsidized shipping depends on the future of construction differential subsidies. Our domestic shipbuilding industry is also largely dependent on this subsidy. In addition, the construction of the two superliner passenger ships authorized by the 85th Congress has not started due to financing difficulties.

Unsubsidized operators currently have about 700 ships active under U.S. flag. About 70 percent of this tonnage is in ships of World War II design or older. These ships will come to roughly the end of their competitive economic lifespans over the next few years. There is no orderly or comprehensive plan for their replacement, and the present state of the shipping market provides little incentive to the nonsubsidized owners to initiate replacement programs.

Our coastwise and intercoastal fleets which prior to World War II comprised the largest segment of the merchant marine, have declined nearly to extinction. The disappearance of this deepwater domestic fleet would be a more significant loss to our defense shipping capability than the small amount of tonnage involved would indicate. In their operations, these ships are never far from major U.S. ports and, as a group, are the most readily available for emergency usage of all ships under U.S. control.

The National Defense Reserve Fleet has undergone a decrease in numbers due to the scrapping of about 200 Liberty type vessels. Five hundred such vessels have been approved for scrapping. Some ships have been traded into the Reserve Fleet as partial payment on new construction to be financed through the Maritime Administration. In general, it may be said that the National Defense Reserve Fleet is gradually deteriorating, both in size and in qualitative usefulness.

Over the past few years, the American-owned merchant fleet registered under "flags of convenience" has come to be more and more important to defense logistic planning. Modern war concepts put a high premium on the active and operating ship, over the ship in reserve. The American-owned foreign flag merchant vessels under effective U.S. control constitute an active operating fleet of roughly 500 ships. About half the tonnage of this fleet was built in the last 5 years, and consists in great part of very large tankers. Half of the tanker capacity available to the United States is under flags of convenience. Thus from the standpoint of national defense we would be well justified in referring to these ships as the flag of necessity fleet.

The operation of these ships by American owners under flags of convenience has for some time been the target, along with our subsidy policies, of strong opposition by European governments and shipping owners who resent effective American competition in the carriage of ocean trade. More recently, opposition by maritime labor groups has increased to the point that operation under the usual flags of convenience (Liberia, Panama, and Honduras) is becoming increasingly untenable for some ship operators, principally those who deal mainly in presenting ships for charter (as contrasted to ships operated as proprietary carriers for oil or metal companies). These shipowners are attempting to escape this pressure by moving their ships to registry under the traditional maritime flags of Europe. Under present policies and conditions, such transfer results in the loss of effective control of these ships for emergency purposes.

The American owners of flag-of-convenience ships contend that they cannot pay American wage scales and operate in competition with European shipping without governmental subsidy.

American maritime labor contends that if the United States considers a strong merchant marine necessary to our position as a maritime power, then the Nation should be willing to pay the wage scales obtainable by American unions.

To bring the American-owned flag-of-convenience fleet of about 500 ships under U.S. flag with operating subsidies would entail large and continuing expenditures.

It would not be appropriate for either the Navy or the Department of Defense to become involved in a dispute between maritime labor and management. Our interest in the matter relates to the impact of this problem in our defense posture. It is imperative that U.S. control of this shipping be retained.

Your position and your interest in our maritime industry make it particularly important that you be fully informed on the above matters. I am, of course, at your service for any additional information that you may desire.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH E. WILSON,
Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Logistics).

OCEAN SHIPPING TO SUPPORT THE DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

INTRODUCTION

The United States must be prepared today—and throughout the foreseeable future—to deal immediately and effectively with any emergency that may be forced upon us. We must be ready at all times to fight a limited war, or a general war, or to support our foreign policies under tense conditions short of actual conflict.

The prosecution of war utilizes all the resources of our Nation. Our entire industrial potential is intermeshed into our overall national defense posture. To project our military power overseas and support sustained combat operations, our Armed Forces must rely heavily upon American industry—and our maritime industry, as in the past, must play a key role.

The prosecution of war utilizes all the reportation in wartime dictates that the United States must have effective control over sufficient active merchant type, shipping to promptly meet our initial emergency requirements—for the redevelopment of military forces and the rapid transportation of noncombatant evacuees from danger areas.

Several years ago we possessed a marginal, but gradually deteriorating capability to carry out the transportation task outlined above. More recently the Department of Defense has observed with concern the continued slow rate of progress made in the replacement of aging vessels. Greater emphasis must be placed on the need for orderly shipbuilding programs.

We cannot rely on NATO pooling to solve our merchant shipping problems, as it appears most probable that the combined requirements of all NATO nations will exceed the total capabilities of the pool. Moreover, considerable delay in the implementation of NATO pooling procedures is anticipated. Our global interests require that the United States be prepared for emergencies other than a NATO war.

BACKGROUND

At the outbreak of World War I, shipping available for charter to American interests suddenly became extremely scarce. Charter rates skyrocketed. We were forced to hastily improvise a shipbuilding program which was both costly and inefficient. Peak production was reached after the war ended. We learned in World War I that the law of supply and demand is real. We were subjected to the same lesson again in World War II.

The primary mission of the American merchant marine is the normal task of transporting our domestic waterborne commerce and a substantial portion of our foreign export and import ocean trade. The health of our industrial economy is dependent on sea transportation for the import and export of numerous raw materials and finished products. No other type of transportation can meet this requirement. It is imperative that the world's foremost trader control sufficient merchant shipping to transport what we need when we need it.

A collateral and extremely important mission of the American merchant marine is the maintenance of a posture of strength and readiness that will contribute the maximum to our national security. In the event of war we will require the services of a large number of merchant-type ships to meet our military, industrial, and civilian demands.

It is important that our anticipated wartime needs be insured to the maximum practicable degree in peacetime by the ready availability of privately owned merchant ships employed in gainful ocean commerce. The magnitude and quality of active commercial tonnage under U.S. control in peacetime will determine, in the event of a future war, whether or not we will be required to initiate a crash building program.

REQUIREMENTS AND AVAILABILITIES

Periodic evaluations of merchant shipping requirements and availabilities are made jointly by the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. A similar joint appraisal is made annually by the Maritime Administration and the Navy Department.

The determinations of merchant shipping requirements are based on approved mobilization plans for general war. Civilian and military requirements are combined to represent our total minimum shipping needs for the early phases of a general war.

Our joint evaluations of shipping availabilities consistently show that the United States does not have sufficient active U.S.-owned and controlled shipping to meet our initial wartime needs. Consequently, our estimated total capabilities must include planned early activations from the national defense reserve fleet—under optimum assumed conditions which make no allowances for possible damage to shore facilities. Some allowance is made for cumulative losses of shipping from enemy action.

The latest joint review of merchant shipping requirements and availabilities made by the Maritime Administration and the Navy Department indicates that during the initial phases of a general war:

(a) There would be a numerical deficit in excess of 200 dry-cargo ships equivalent to the C–2 class, approximately 30 refrigerated cargo ships equivalent to the Rs–S–BV1 class, and 4 heavy lift ships (150 tons booms) equivalent to the converted C–4 class.

(b) There would be small deficits in tanker availabilities.

(c) The small initial numerical deficits in passenger transport capacity are considered manageable. It is strongly emphasized, however, that there are serious qualitative deficiencies, particularly as to speed, in the available transports.

Our sea transportation resources for limited war are presently considered to be quantitatively adequate. However, the degree of promptness with which sealift responds in an emergency will have an important impact on the eventual outcome. A limited war crisis could well become a race against time to evacuate nationals, to redeploy troops and equipment, or to augment and resupply existing forces overseas. To be prepared for such situations, we must rely on the ready availability of active modern merchant ships of all types.

PRESENT CAPABILITIES

Existing inventories of sealift resources under U.S. control, as of January 1, 1960, are summarized below:

(a) Dry cargo ships

	Number	Deadweight tonnage
Operational	915	10,563,200
Reserve fleet	[1] 1,493	15,274,600
Total	2,408	25,837,800

(b) Tankers

	Number	Deadweight tonnage
Operational	677	14,903,500
Reserve fleet	80	1,094,800
Total	757	15,998,300

(c) *Passenger ships/transports*

	Number	Passengers (emergency capacity)
Operational, active, total	58	102,001
Reserve fleet	101	236,423
Total	159	338,424

[1] Includes about a thousand Liberty ships of little or no wartime value, recommended for scrapping.

The active U.S.-controlled sealift capability is comprised of merchant ships under U.S. flag, certain foreign registered merchant ships under effective U.S. control, and merchant-type ships operated by the Military Sea Transportation Service (MSTS).

The term "effective U.S. control," applies to selected American-owned ships which have been registered by their owners under the so-called flags of convenience (Panama, Liberia, and Honduras), in order to reduce operating costs. In such cases, the Maritime Administration has effected agreements with the present shipping companies in the United States to make these ships available to the U.S. Government in the event of a national emergency. These agreements can be fulfilled without restraint, because the laws of Panama, Liberia, and Honduras do not impose restrictions on the control of merchant ships that fly their flags. These countries have little or no shipping requirements of their own. In view of these circumstances, the Department of Defense and the Maritime Administration consider such ships to be under effective U.S. control.

The vast proportion of our U.S.-flag merchant tonnage was constructed during the years 1942 to 1945. These ships were mass produced for specific wartime purposes. Many of their design features were matters of expediency rather than choice. Ships built during World War II are now 15 to 18 years old and have long been outmoded from the standpoint of modern design.

The capabilities shown as comprising the national defense reserve fleet may be misleading. It should be pointed out that about 1,000 of the dry cargo ships are slow-speed Liberty types of extremely limited usefulness. Over 200 Libertys have already been scrapped under previous approvals to select and scrap 500 of the poorest quality ships. Their marginal value did not warrant the cost of further preservation efforts. Of the 102 transport-passenger ships, 51 are 17-knot C–4 austerity transports and 23 are 15.5-knot Victory troopships.

We can look forward to further depreciation of the overall potential of the reserve fleet—from the standpoints of both quantity and quality. Consequently, there is an obvious need that the reserve fleet be purified on a cyclic basis by the trade-in of aging ships under orderly replacement programs. This requirement goes hand in hand with the need to modernize our active merchant fleet.

DRY CARGO SHIPS

The only fully modern dry cargo ships in commercial operation today under U.S. flag are the Mariner class ships, that were built by the U.S. Government, plus a few modern container ship conversions. The 20-knot C–4 Mariners, which can do 23 knots if required, represent an impressive step forward in cargo ship design. Their performance has been highly praised by several private operators, to whom 29 of the ships were sold. Three of these ships have been converted into passenger ships.

With regard to future construction of dry cargo ships, the Department of Defense recommends that the design characteristics listed below be incorporated to the maximum degree that is commercially practicable.

(a) Speed: When built under construction-differential subsidy contracts and certified as being suitable for economical and speedy conversion into naval auxiliaries, dry cargo ships should have a sustained sea speed of 20 knots or better. Dry cargo ships certified as otherwise suitable for the use of the U.S. Government in time of war or national emergency, should have the maximum sustained sea speed possible consistent with the commercial utilization of the ship. Where construction subsidies and/or national defense allowances are not involved, the owners are encouraged to build into the ships, the highest commercially economical speeds.

(b) Other characteristics: The most practical and useful types of general-cargo vessels, from a military point of view, appear to be those having the capacity and characteristics of the C–3's and C–4's (particularly Mariners), of Maritime Administration design. However, much is to be desired in the matter of modernization with respect to cargo handling equipment and methods. Cargo vessels should be designed and equipped to load and discharge, using their own gear, in one-half the time now required by the existing C–3's and C–4's.

At least one hatch of each vessel should be served by a "jumbo" boom of 60 tons capacity and all hatches should be equipped with 10-ton booms. There is a definite need for a limited number of heavy lift ships equipped with oversized hatches and cargo booms capable of lifting up to 150 tons.

(c) Special type cargo ships: Roll-on/roll-off ships on the order of the USNS *Comet* as well as ships with partial roll-on/roll-off capability offer advantages in meeting requirements for the overseas movement of mobile military equipment such as wheeled and tracked vehicles. Additionally, we encourage the continued development of container cargo ships, which are designed to carry containerized and prepalletized cargoes. Further construction of such ships in peacetime would increase active capabilities and afford operating experience. U.S. shipyards would also gain construction experience which would enable them to commence early production under an emergency situation.

TANKERS

American shipowners have built a good number of modern tankers in the past few years—some constructed in the United States for registry under U.S. flag but most built abroad for registry under foreign flag. These new ships range in speed from 16 to 18 knots. Consequently, the overall quality of our total tanker capability is much better than the dry cargo category. This improvement has been due to various incentives directly related to the law of supply and demand.

The tanker building program should continue in order to provide orderly replacement of aging ships. It is recommended that future tanker construction incorporate design features as indicated below:

(a) Speed: Where national defense allowances are made, and the ships are certified as suitable for speedy and economical conversion into naval auxiliaries, tankers should be capable of a sustained speed of 20 knots or more. Where no certification by the Secretary of the Navy is sought, then the maximum commercially economical speed is acceptable.

(b) Other characteristics: Although tankers of large deadweight tons capacity can be utilized to a limited extent, the recommended general characteristics of commercial tankers most suitable for military purposes are 25,000/38,000 deadweight tons, capable of carrying several types of petroleum products. At the same time, there is still a requirement for small tankers of about 17,000 deadweight tons to handle products to and from limited facilities.

PASSENGER SHIPS/TRANSPORTS

Seven new passenger ships have been built since World War II and three have been converted from Mariner class cargo ships. The seven new ships are the 25-knot *Constitution* and *Independence*, the 33-knot *United States*, the 20-knot *Santa Paula* and *Santa Rosa*, and the 21-knot *Brasil* and *Argentina*. The Mariner conversions are the 20-knot *Mariposa*, *Monterey*, and *Atlantic*. These ships have contributed significantly to our maritime prestige and to our defense readiness.

Additionally, the 19-knot *President Cleveland* and *President Wilson* were converted from troopships. These ships, however, are basically World War II types. They form a part of the older and major segment of our total trooplift capability, which is not fully suitable for possible future emergencies. The majority of our ships are old, deficient in speed, and lacking in other features that are important in minimizing the hazards of moving troops by sea.

There is an urgent need to improve the quality of our trooplift potential. For ships that will be employed in wartime to transport personnel through areas in which hostile modern submarines may be operating, it is necessary to set much higher standards of performance and safety than would be required for ships carrying dry cargo and fuel.

(a) Speed: Speed is the best defense that merchant ships can employ against an enemy. The faster the target, the more difficult it is to hit with submarine torpedoes—or to pinpoint with missiles. Fast ships can be operated independently over more devious routes than is possible in convoy operations. This complicates the search and attack problems of enemy aircraft and submarines. Recent studies confirm that vulnerability to submarine attack is significantly and progressively reduced as speeds of 25 knots and greater are attained.

Troopships constructed in the future, and passenger ships suitable for conversion into troopships, should be capable of a sustained speed of 25 knots or greater. In no case should their maximum sustained speed be less than 20 knots.

The Department of Defense has consistently urged that all new merchant-type shipbuilding incorporate the maximum speed that is economically practicable. In this regard, it is important that our merchant ships be commercially successful. To be of immediate use to the Department of Defense in an emergency, they must be operating commercially at the time they are first needed.

(b) Other features: Emphasis on added speed should not obscure the significance of other national defense features which can be built into a merchant ship. High standards of compartmentation reduce vulnerability to enemy hazards by localizing damage. Various preventive measures increase a ship's resistance to the spread of fire. Special mountings minimize breakdowns of essential machinery under shock.

Endurance adequate for round-trip voyages at maximum sustained speed is a vital factor in wartime. Additional fuel capacity, the size of distilling plants, the storage space for provisions, and many other design aspects have an important bearing on endurance. Many of the foregoing factors, aside from improving the wartime utility of a ship, also assure safer, more versatile, and reliable performance in peacetime commercial operations.

FUTURE OUTLOOK

The subsidized segment of the U.S.-flag merchant fleet amounts to 310 berth line ships. They operate over essential trade routes under mandatory voyage scheduling procedures dictated by the Maritime Administration. Several unsubsidized shipping companies have applied for governmental subsidy. Their applications are still pending.

The rate of replacement of subsidized ships is much slower than that considered necessary to avoid future obsolescence "in block."

Most of the subsidized shipping companies have entered into long-range contracts with the Maritime Administration for the orderly replacement of their aging ships. However, curtailment of construction funds have prevented actual building from being started on schedule for most of the ships.

The 85th Congress authorized but did not appropriate funds for the construction of two large high-speed passenger ships—one of 33 knots and one of 30 knots speed. Financing difficulties have so far prevented their construction from being started. Construction of these two ships would significantly improve our trooplift potential. They would almost double our capability in the important speed range of 25 knots and above.

The rate of progress of the building programs will depend on actions taken in the future with respect to construction-differential subsidies. It is hoped that it will be practicable for future governmental subsidy funding to keep pace with the contractual schedules for replacement.

Our unsubsidized shipping companies operate approximately 700 ships under U.S. flag. Further, they own and operate about 500 additional ships under flags of convenience which are subject to effective U.S. control. While they have built considerable tonnage in recent years, few unsubsidized operators, if any, have either a comprehensive or a long-range plan for the replacement of aging ships on an orderly time schedule. Their planning is influenced from day to day by various incentives or discouragements. Their enthusiasm for shipbuilding has been dampened recently by renewed attacks against flags of convenience.

Over the past several months, increasing pressure has been exerted against flags of convenience by foreign shipping interests, maritime labor organizations and Western European governments. Combined opposition from these sources threatens to make it economically impracticable for American owners to operate their ships under flags of convenience. This raises the immediate question as to what steps should be taken to insure the continued availability of these ships for purposes of national defense. It is important to note that well over half of the U.S.-controlled tanker tonnage is registered under the flags of Liberia and Panama.

Prior to the outbreak of World War II, the part of our shipping that was engaged in the coastal and intercoastal trade was the largest segment of the U.S. merchant marine. At that time nearly 700 ships took part in the carriage of our deepwater domestic trade. Shortly after our entry into the war, practically the entire coastal and intercoastal merchant fleet, which at that time represented about 60 percent of our total ocean-carrying capability, was put into service, usually transocean, directly supporting the war.

With the domestic deepwater fleet engaged, worldwide, in supplying the Allied Armed Forces, the domestic trade which they formerly carried was absorbed by other modes of transportation. The domestic deepwater carriers have never regained this trade.

Ships engaged in coastal and intercoastal trade occupy a particularly significant position relative to the emergency use of transportation. Ships in the coastwise trades are the most readily available for emergency usage of any ships in the U.S. merchant fleet. In their normal operations they are always close to U.S. ports, ready immediately to handle such high-priority movements as may be necessary. Of course, to be available for immediate use, these ships must be active and operating commercially at the time they are first needed.

At the onset of a major, nuclear war, the domestic deepwater fleet would be uniquely fitted to act as a link between our coastal cities during the period of likely disruption of systems of land transportation. A large percentage of the ships in domestic trade would be at sea at any given time and would therefore be most likely to escape damage. Their ability to provide communications and transportation between coastal cities during the period just after an attack could be highly important. Systems of land transportation in the United States are especially vulnerable at many focal points. The ability of the domestic deepwater fleet to provide essential coastal and intercoastal movements of priority material might well be crucial. A number of the ships of this fleet are especially adapted for rapid cargo handling, giving them an increased value at such a critical time.

EMERGENCY EXPANSION

One basic factor to be considered in the development of specific construction programs is the necessity for the maintenance of a sufficient number of private shipyards in operation to form the base for expansion in time of war to meet mass-ship construction programs. The Department of Defense desires to emphasize that the existence of these active privately owned shipyards, together with the skills of the shipyard workers and the capabilities of the tools, equipment, and facilities, is essential to the national defense.

SUMMARY

Under the most optimistic assumptions, and on a quantitative basis only, the United States still possesses a marginal capability to carry out the sea transportation tasks of a general war.

There are serious qualitative deficiencies in our overall sealift capability, particularly in the dry cargo ship and the transport-passenger ship categories. The further aging of outmoded ships will aggravate this situation.

The present rate of new shipbuilding will not offset the rapidly approaching block obsolescence of the vast proportion of U.S.-controlled merchant-type tonnage—both active and reserve. There is an urgent need for increased emphasis on orderly ship construction.

The continued depreciation of ships in the national defense reserve fleet without cyclic purification will soon generate serious quantitative deficiencies in our total sealift capability.

Crash building programs in wartime can only be avoided by maintaining a modern and adequate maritime posture in peacetime.

CONCLUSION

In order for the United States to maintain adequate merchant shipping to meet our initial wartime needs, it is important that the ships of both subsidized and nonsubsidized operators be periodically replaced under orderly and progressive programs. In so doing, every advantage should be taken of recent and future technological developments. Cargo handling equipment and propulsion plants should be further improved—with a view to reducing the transit and turnaround times of commercial shipping.

Our shipbuilding programs should be farsighted in order that ships contracted for in coming years will be actually competitive throughout their economic lifespan. Further, ships built with foresight will be more readily adaptable to speedy and economical conversion into naval auxiliaries, or otherwise suitable for naval use in the event of war.

U.S. SENATE,
February 17, 1960.

Vice Adm. RALPH E. WILSON,
Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ADMIRAL WILSON: On February 21, 1959, you provided me with an excellent document entitled "Ocean Shipping To Support the Defense of the United States," reflecting the views of the Department of Defense with respect to the American merchant marine.

I wonder whether or not the Department has made a current appraisal of our maritime needs along similar lines and will appreciate any comments you might be able to share with me.

With all good wishes and kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
U.S. Senator.

AFTERMATH OF PARIS MEETING

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the so-called summit—which was not really a conference at all—is now ended.

Prior to the meeting, there had been no great hopes for panacea-type solutions of East-West differences. Perhaps the maximum accomplishments could have been a reaffirmation among the four great powers of a continuation of a willingness to meet, discuss, and attempt to resolve—on a reasonable, rational basis—the East-West difficulties as well as perhaps establishing a pattern for successive meetings with the same objectives.

At the minimum, the world and the involved nations had a right to expect of their representatives at the Paris meeting reasonable standards of conduct and common courtesy.

The leaders of the Western Powers, I believe, acquitted themselves most commendably, in view of the circumstances.

Particularly President Eisenhower, I believe, recognizing the conditions that existed, conducted himself in accordance with the high esteem, good sense, adherence to principle which we have come to expect from the lifetime of service to our country of our great President.

Particularly, his composure, reasoned, patient and constructive conduct, in the face of irresponsible, flagrant, unmannerly insults by the representative of the Soviet Union merit commendation. In effect, the splendid way in which the President handled the situation resulted in Khrushchev's propaganda blast boomeranging upon himself and communism.

After the anticlimatic end of the session of the conference, which never really started, the world is now asking itself, "Where do we go from here?"

Realistically, world hopes have been jarred somewhat. Even though no overall solution was expected from the conference, there was some feeling that a continuation of the willingness of East and West to speak rationally to each other would be a contribution to lessening of tensions.

At this time, people are also asking, "Does this mean war?" Frankly, I do not think so. Generally, I believe it does represent, however, a toughening of the Communist line in dealing with Western Powers.

At the Paris meeting, sabotaged by Mr. Khrushchev, however, we witnessed a renewal of the hard Communist brinkmanship that, since 1946, has imperiled peace on the globe.

In the light of these factors, it becomes increasingly important that we stay alert, on guard, and adequate—econom-

ically, militarily, and spiritually. Despite the scope of the challenge, however, I am not a painter of doom and gloom. It is true, we face serious problems in the world. But what civilization has not? And think for a moment of the so wonderful tools we have to fight the battle with—

The greatest economy in world history;

A mighty arsenal of jet planes, nuclear bombs, and an ever-growing arsenal of missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads;

A dedicated, devoted, ingenious people—selflessly dedicated to preserve freedom;

A mightly chain of free world nations supplemented by millions of people, vast resources, and thousands of additional military weapons to augment our own arsenal of peace;

And above all, we have freedom—for which all men yearn—the allies, in the uncommitted countries and, yes, even those under Communist tyranny.

Never before in history has a nation been so well equipped, blessed by a great people, and such a rich reservoir of resources, to carry out a role of world leadership, as well as support to carry forward programs in the interest of its own citizens.

We must, of course, be realists. The Communists are strong, tough, and dedicated—fanatically so—to their cause. Consequently, the battle will not be easy.

In the face of such a rugged enemy, obviously still intent upon world conquest, we will need to first, further shore up our defenses, as needed; second, assure maintenance of a strong alliance with the other free nations; and third, encourage bipartisan support of the programs and policies essential to provide for national security.

In effect, the free world now finds itself in the position that it was in long before the planned conference—that is, faced with the task of continuing to deal as effectively as possible with a powerful Communist bloc, dedicated to objectives of world conquest.

IN THE BEGINNING GOD

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in 1798 Napoleon set out on his expedition to Egypt. Much to the disgust of his soldiers and officers, he took with him a considerable company of scientists and philosophers. On a warm summer night these men were gathered together on the deck of the flagship. The heavens were brilliant, and these scientists were discussing whether or not the planets were inhabited. Some thought they were, and others that they were not. Then they began to discuss the origin of the universe, most of them taking the position that natural law and phenomena were sufficient to account for the origin of the world without a divine creator. Then Napoleon, who had been standing near them and silently listening to their conversation, introduced himself into the debate and, pointing with his hand to the brilliant host of the stars in the heavens, said, "Gentlemen, who made these?" A simple question, and one which went to the very heart of the matter.

Who made the world? The world is a great effect, and common sense tells us it must have a sufficiently great cause. The world is not only a great effect but it is also an intelligent effect, and it must have had a sufficiently intelligent cause. Back of all nebular hypotheses, primordial germs, and stardust, there lies some great secret; and the only key to it is the opening word of the Bible: "In the beginning God."

All things bright and beautiful,
All creatures great and small,
All things wise and wonderful,
Lord, God made them all.

Each little flower that opens,
Each little bird that sings,
He made their glowing colors,
He made their tiny wings.

The rich man in his castle,
The poor man at his gate,
God made them, high or lowly,
And ordered their estate.

The purple-headed mountain,
The river running by;
The morning and the sunset
That lighteth up the sky.

The cold wind in the winter,
The pleasant summer sun,
The ripe fruits in the garden,
He made them every one.

The tall trees in the greenwood,
The meadows where we play,
The rushes by the water,
We gather every day.

He gave us eyes to see them,
And lips that we might tell
How great is God Almighty,
Who hath made all things well.

LIBERTY IN LAW

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a wonderful article, written by our Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, entitled "Liberty in Law," which was published in last Sunday's Washington Star, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

It is one of the most challenging statements that I have ever read. I am certain we can all be proud that we have a chaplain of the quality and leadership which this article portrays.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBERTY IN LAW

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

In the midst of his great ministry, one of the most outstanding preachers of the 20th century made a significant discovery and confession. The Nation was then passing through what was being called by responsible citizens "an orgy of lawlessness." This nationally known preacher who was listened to eagerly by great crowds, in examining his own message, said: "I could not recall ever having preached a sermon on obedience; I could not recall ever having heard a sermon on obedience. I have searched volume after volume of modern addresses and sermons and I have not run upon any that dealt with respect for and obedience to authority. There were plenty on freedom, on the emancipation of the individual, on the outgrowing of old restraints, but few, if any, upon the necessity and glory of being mastered by what rightfully masters us."

Immediately after having been made conscious of that gap in the message to his generation, this prophet of God stood in the pulpit, which was his throne, and preached a sermon on "Obedience."

Certainly now, years later, the pulpits of the land need to thunder the same message. One does not have to be an alarmist or a pessimist to declare that one of the ominous symptoms, as we enter this decade of destiny, is that authority has broken down in the State, in the family, in the individual.

In the movies and television, upon which the eyes of millions are glued for hours every day, obedience to law is taken lightly. The representatives of the law are habitually at a disadvantage on the silver screen. The judge, the detective, the policeman, usually comes off badly in the plot, and the mere husband is often in ill repute with the audience. Those who are thus entertained are regaled with the story of attractive murderers, high-minded robbers, and noble crooks. Even in cases of heinousness involving law we witness often a veritable debauch of public sentimentality expressing itself in specious explanations of why a criminal does what he does. It is all a silly exaltation of crime.

In May, by Presidential decree, the Nation observes Law Day. In such an emphasis there is lifted before the gaze of all our people the fundamental conception on which all else in a democracy rests. Law Day floodlights the vital truth engraved on the facade of the noble edifice of the U.S. Supreme Court—equal justice under law—and of that sentence inscribed over the portal of the courthouse in Worcester, Mass.—"Obedience to Law Is Liberty."

Democracy is the faith that laws should be made and enforced, not by an all-powerful monarch or by a dictator whose rule is tyranny, but by the whole body of "We, the people," and that laws thus made should be gladly obeyed by all the people.

Any willful violation of law thus enacted is a blow at liberty itself. In just laws there is registered the conscience of God-fearing people.

Much is being said and written these perilous days about freedom and emancipation from compulsion. More, much more, needs to be said about discipline and law. The demand "don't fence me in" must be interpreted, if life is to be worth while and reach its highest possibilities, in the light of the larger truth mirrored in a great hymn—"Make Me a Captive, Lord, and Then I Shall Be Free." Says a U.S. Senator, as with deep anxiety he sees what so many of his contemporaries are doing with their boasted "liberty": "Unless discipline and obedience can be brought back to America we are on our way to the junk heap."

There is no way by which the democratic experiment can be saved if mad insistence on individual freedom to do as one pleases crowds out sober recognition of social obligations.

Often we hear of a "back to God movement." It is true that we need to get back to a conception of a God who is not, as some moderns have pictured Him, very amiable, even maternal, but to a God who stands for moral order—God who is all love, but also all law.

Too often we have confined our ideas of the Christ who revealed such a God as the "gentle Jesus." We think of the Man of Galilee only in terms of pity and compassion and kindness. But in these qualities we do not really touch the fundamental thing in His character. It was the thing that sent Him to the cross—"Thy will be done, as in heaven so on earth"—"Not my will, but Thine be done"—"Whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, my sister, my mother." To follow that Christ means to heed the injunction—"Confirm thy soul in self-control, thy liberty in law."

TRIBUTE TO JAMES W. MURPHY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to pay tribute to the late James W. Murphy, the senior Official Reporter of Debates, who at the time of his death was in his 64th year of service to the U.S. Senate.

The Bible reminds us that a man diligent in his business "shall stand before kings." Certainly James Murphy excelled in the virtue of diligence.

He began reporting back in 1896; served 32 Congresses, and at the time of his death was still devoting meticulous attention and long, long hours to the complex and arduous task of recording this body's debates.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we must remember, demands the utmost in accuracy so that it will be a fully reliable historical record. The calm of our friend, James Murphy, in the fire of vigorous, emotional debate assured this accuracy.

But James Murphy's service was not just to the archives of U.S. history, it was to each of us in this body, who prized his friendship.

How can any of us really measure the value of James Murphy's careful editing which on more than one occasion saved us from a dangling participle, split infinitive, or misplaced literary allusion?

Our friend, James Murphy, and the capable staff with whom he worked, were always cooperative and generous with their skills and time. He was always ready with a kind word and a smile for each member of this body.

In honoring our late associate and friend, James W. Murphy, for his diligence, competence, and devotion to duty, we are actually honoring the entire Murphy clan for their tradition of service to the U.S. Senate. In 1848, his uncle, Dennis F. Murphy, was the first Murphy to come from Philadelphia to the Senate, by appointment of Senator John C. Calhoun. For 112 years the Murphys gave uninterrupted service as Senate reporters as a second uncle, James J., our dear friend James W.'s father, Edward V., Sr., and his brother, Edward V., Jr., and finally our late friend James W. himself, carried on the Murphy family tradition.

COMMUNITY ANTENNA SYSTEMS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that the unfinished business comes before the Senate automatically at the conclusion of morning business. The time limitation is in effect.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2653) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish jurisdiction in the Federal Communications Commission over community antenna systems.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is under controlled time. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent that the time consumed in the quorum call not be charged to either side?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time necessary for the call of the roll not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "in order" and insert in lieu thereof "as may be required in the public interest".

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in the course of the debate yesterday on the bill I had occasion to express my own misgivings concerning paragraph (g), and several other Senators also questioned the scope and application of this particular provision.

The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] at the time made clear, in response to the inquiries put to him, the language was not intended to operate to preclude community antenna television systems from broadcasting programs which partake of the nature of a newscast or a sportscast which is of interest only if it is broadcast at the time the event occurs. Nevertheless, despite the reassurances which have been given us by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, it seems to me that the language in the bill is not sufficiently precise; and so the purpose of the amendment, which was originally drafted by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who I understand is absent and will not be able to offer the amendment, is to make it perfectly clear that the Commission, in carrying out the provisions of the act, shall prescribe appropriate rules and regulations—and then my amendment would strike out the words "in order" and insert in lieu thereof the words "as may be required in the public interest"—to avoid duplication of programs.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Senators will recall that yesterday I mentioned the conference held with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] which was attended by me, by the chairman of the full committee, by members of the staff, by representatives of the CATV association and their attorneys and legislative counsel. We went over several amendments. As a matter of fact, we agreed at that time that they would propose four amendments requested by CATV representatives.

The Senator has had stated two of the four amendments to which I referred. This particular amendment I say is superfluous, and I say that as kindly as I can. I believe the language of the section as written is absolutely clear. But, as I said at the meeting to which I referred, and as I shall repeat now on the floor of the Senate, if the section needs clarification in the minds of some, I am willing to accept the amendment on the basis of the explanation, for the advancement of the proposal of the particular amendment.

Amendment No. 5, which is the amendment before the Senate, would modify section 330(g) on page 7, line 11, by inserting after the words "regulations" the following: "as may be required in the public interest," and delete the words "in order." Section 330(g) is the so-called duplicating section. As presently written it requires the FCC to prescribe appropriate rules and regulations to avoid the duplication of programs broadcast or scheduled to be broadcast by a TV station which is assigned to a community in which the licensed community antenna serves subscribers. This is a very important section of the bill.

It is my understanding that all Commission rules are required to be made consistent with the public interest. It was my belief that the language as presently contained in section (g) authorized the FCC to adopt appropriate rules and regulations and had included therein the requirement that such appropriate rules would be reasonable and in the public interest. However, to eliminate any misunderstanding that might be in the mind of any Senator, I am willing to accept the amendment. I suggest it is only a clarifying amendment and therefore the explanation contained in the report remains intact, because it should remain intact.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I am perfectly willing to yield back the remainder of my time if the Senator from Idaho is willing to do likewise.

Mr. CHURCH. I wish to make only one further remark. I believe the adoption of the amendment would make perfectly clear as a matter of law that certain types of duplication which the Commission finds to be in the public interest would not be subject to the application of this provision in the bill. I therefore hope that the Senate will concur in the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. I also urge the Senate to adopt the amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 19, before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That the Commission may by rule waive the application of any section or subsection where it shall find that the public interest, convenience, and necessity will be served thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment which I have submitted is very simple. If the Senate will turn its attention to subsection (b) of section 330 on page 3 of the pending bill, beginning at line 14, it will be seen that it provides:

(b) (1) The provisions of sections 303, 304, 307, 308, 310, 311, 312, 313, 315, and 316 relating to stations, radio stations, broadcasting stations, licenses therefor, licensees thereof, and station operators shall apply also to community antenna television systems, licenses therefor, licensees thereof and operators thereof.

It is my understanding that some of the provisions of law to be found in these sections would not be suitable for or properly applicable to the kind of business conducted by a community antenna television system. Therefore, in order to make it perfectly clear that the section does not make it mandatory upon the Commission to apply all of these provisions to the community antenna television system, my amendment would add the following proviso:

Provided, That the Commission may by rule waive the application of any section or subsection where it shall find that the public interest, convenience, and necessity will be served thereby.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. This is the second of the four amendments which were discussed with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I repeat that the objective of this amendment is inherent in the tone and meaning of the section as it is now written, because obviously sections cannot be added which do not apply, and only those portions of sections which would apply to this particular situation would be applicable to the cause and would be useful in the determination of the meaning of the section.

If there is any belief in the mind of anyone that the amendment might be necessary for clarification, I shall accept it on that premise, for that reason I said to the group when we were in the office that we would be perfectly willing to accept such an amendment if it was intended to clarify the section. Again I repeat, however, that we do not have to change the report, because the meaning is clear. The objective the amendment desires to accomplish is the objective we sought to accomplish when we reported the bill from the committee.

Section 330(b)(1) of the bill is intended to make certain provisions of the Communications Act applicable to CATV operations. The specific sections enumerated in the bill were prepared after full and complete consideration and consultation with the FCC staff to take into account the present and potential developments as currently foreseen in the community antenna business. It has been suggested that a rigid application of some of these provisions to CATV operations might be impracticable or work hardships in certain cases. Generally speaking the Commission has sufficient discretion so as to avoid arbitrary action and it would be fair to assume that the Commission in applying any of these provisions would act in a practical manner. However, in order to remove any doubt and to assure the Commission adequate flexibility, the following amendment would provide the Commission with the discretion to waive any of the sections where it finds that the public interest, convenience, and necessity will be served thereby. For that reason I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I shall not oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho. I am sure it is offered in an attempt to improve the bill, but I wish to make it crystal clear that so far as the Senator from New Hampshire is concerned, he objects to legislation which encourages litigation, which unnecessarily burdens an administrative agency, and which compels operators to come in and justify themselves when it is unnecessary. In the opinion of the Senator from New Hampshire, the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Idaho does not in any way cure any defect, but it does not make the bill any worse, and therefore the Senator from New Hampshire will not oppose it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I do not wish to labor this subject, because I do not think it merits laboring, but to clarify the point let me say to the Senator from New Hampshire that after all we are inserting in title III of the Communications Act a new category for supervision. Naturally there are many sections in the Communications Act to which reference must be made in the proposed legislation which would be applicable to programs which would come over the air through CATV.

Let me explain that this particular amendment has been brought up for this reason. In our conference, the question was raised what would be done under section 315, which is the equal-time section of the Communications Act. Let us assume that these people take a signal out of the air and then transmit it to their subscribers, and let us assume that there is a candidate for public office who makes a speech in Spokane, where he is a candidate for U.S. Senate or for the Presidency of the United States, and that picture comes over. Let us assume, then, that there is a political candidate who has had time assigned to him. Naturally, the CATV has nothing to do with the origination of the broadcast, because they merely take the signal out of the air.

In this particular case, we are saying that only that part of section 315 shall apply that would be practical and reasonable to carry out the intent of the act. If the opponent of that candidate went before the FCC, which obliges the originating broadcasting station to give equal time to the opponent, under section 315, then, if the opponent talked, it would be obligatory upon CATV to show the opponent as well as the original speaker.

If we do not do that, we are permitting an exemption so far as section 315 is concerned with respect to equal time, and we are dealing here in a way which is inimical to the intent of Congress, because Congress wants equal time given to opposing candidates.

That is the only reason for the amendment. It is inherent in the law. There will be no question about it, as it is presently written in the bill—if the bill shall be passed. All we are doing is clarifying it by saying that should the Spokane station, whose signal is being taken out of the air by a CATV in Helena, Mont., show a speech being made, let us assume, by Mr. NIXON, who has a qualified opponent against him, and if the Spokane station were obliged—not CATV, but the Spokane station—to show Mr. NIXON'S opponent, then the CATV in Helena would be obliged, under this bill, if enacted into law, to also show Mr. NIXON'S opponent, as the CATV had shown Mr. NIXON originally.

In the event that anything arises which makes it impractical or infeasible, because CATV is not a programing system, then it would not apply. That is all it means. It applies where "public necessity and convenience" are involved. Those are the important words.

I repeat that insofar as the contention of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire is concerned, we have always by reference referred to the pertinent sections of the law that would apply. To do otherwise, I might say—and I say this considerately—would be a demonstration of inepitude in legislative craftsmanship.

Mr. COTTON. In view of the fact that I did not use my 2 minutes, may I have one-half minute more?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield time to the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. I shall be glad to yield the Senator 5 minutes if he wishes.

Mr. COTTON. I merely wish a half minute. I do not need 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASTORE. I will yield all the time the Senator from New Hampshire desires to use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. COTTON. I wish to have only half a minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will yield half a minute to the Senator on the bill.

Mr. COTTON. I wish to say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee—and I do not do so flippantly—that his statement so well and so eloquently points up all the difficulties of the regulations and the complexities of this proposed legislation that if before he made that statement I had been moved to vote for the bill, I could not vote for it now, because I never heard so clearly and eloquently exposed the maze of difficulties which we would be walking into if we were to enact this bill extending FCC regulation over this entire field, with all of its applications.

Mr. PASTORE. I shall not labor the point. I merely wish to repeat that the committee has been working on this bill for 2 years with the lawyers of CATV, who are expensive lawyers, and very well-paid lawyers. The provisions now being considered are what were finally agreed upon after days and weeks of work. I say frankly that the amendments we are working on now are the agreements that were then reached. Those agreements, insofar as I am concerned, will be kept. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island has already pointed out, this amendment was originally submitted by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who is not presently available. He should have full credit for it. I am grateful to the Senator from Rhode Island for his remarks, and for the fact that he is willing to accept the amendment. I believe that the acceptance of the amendment will definitely improve the bill, in that it will make expressly clear the fact that none of the provisions of the present law which would constitute an undue harassment of the community antenna system should apply, and that the Commission may waive the application of any section or subsection when it shall believe that the public interest and convenience will be served thereby. That is the intent of Congress. This merely writes it expressly into the law. I hope the Senate will approve the amendment. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, by inadvertence, when the official copy of S. 2653 was printed, after being reported by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the following phrase "The Commission may require that" was omitted from subsection (f) (1) appearing on page 6, line 20, following the words "local subscribers."

In fact, the bill which is printed in full in the committee report that accompanied S. 2653 contains this phrase.

I therefore move that S. 2653, page 6, line 20, following the words "local subscriber," be amended so as to include the following: "The Commission may require that".

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish to say, in behalf of those of us who oppose any legislation in this field, that the adoption of these committee amendments and other amendments which will be offered does not put the bill in the condition where we could possibly support it. This should be understood. We are not opposing the adoption of these amendments, but we do not believe that the bill, even by the adoption of the amendments, can be made acceptable to the CATV industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and I invite the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, line 2, after the period, insert the following:

> Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize any such condition requiring any delay in redistributing any news, current event, or other program where any such delay would be contrary to the public interest.

Mr. BUSH. I yield myself 5 minutes. I offer the amendment as a result of the colloquy had between myself and the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], in which he agreed, I think in general, to the purposes of my amendment. I think it is necessary that amendment be adopted in order to make it very clear that such broadcasts as regular newscasts, or current events, or special news bulletins on any current events, and events of international and national importance, like Princess Margaret's wedding or the summit conference—if we can mention those events in the same breath—or the Kentucky Derby, or the World's Series, or other events of national interest, would be excluded, as provided in the amendment if the bill were enacted into law.

I desire to have this explanation of the amendment appear in the RECORD as a part of the legislative history of the bill, in case the bill shall be passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. It is true that we had a colloquy on this subject yesterday afternoon. I reiterate now what I said then. There is no question in my mind that this practice is permissible, and is provided for within the context of the section already referred to. But if it is felt that it must be enumerated specifically, that is perfectly agreeable to me.

I merely say that this is a clarifying amendment. Some Senators may feel that this activity should be provided for in the language of the bill. Therefore, I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment.

I think the amendment is redundant; but even redundancy is pardonable if we can capture a vote for the bill.

Mr. BUSH. I think the issue concerning this matter is so important that redundancy is worthwhile.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from Connecticut. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BUSH. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is at the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "assigned to" and insert in lieu thereof "operating in."

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

In the colloquy which took place on the floor yesterday afternoon, I called attention to an apparent inconsistency between the words in subsection (1) (d), at the bottom of page 4, and the words which follow, beginning on line 25 and continuing at the top of page 5.

In the first instance, the indication is that anyone who has been assigned a channel or the privilege of erecting and installing a local TV station may petition the Federal Communications Commission to restrict the operations of the CATV.

The words which follow a few lines later seem to indicate that the language was intended to refer only to communities in which a local TV station was already operating.

I must in honesty add that the Senator from Rhode Island should not believe that he will be capturing a vote if the amendment shall be agreed to, because I do not promise that I shall vote for the bill if the amendment is adopted.

To clarify the matter, I simply propose that the words "assigned to" be changed to "operating in," so as to make it clear that the reference is to stations in being, and not simply to stations for which, perhaps, many years ago a license or a channel was assigned.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, merely as further proof of solicitude on the part of the subcommittee and a desire to meet all reasonable objections, even though sometimes we might consider them to be without added value, and even though it again involves redundancy, I am willing to accept the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

I am not so optimistic of a gain for the bill in this case, as I was in the case of the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], because I know it is hard for me to capture the vote of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, whose position on the bill I understand.

Again, I believe the amendment is superfluous. I think the language of the bill is clear. I made an explanation of this language in my discussion of the bill yesterday. I said as emphatically as I knew how that it applies to an existing station which is providing service, and is intended to enable it to continue to operate its facilities.

I believe the section is well written. However, if it will make the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire happy to have adopted the language he proposes, I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment. I hope that it will clarify any misunderstanding on that point, and even will cause him to support the bill.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island. He is characteristically considerate. However, if the Senator from New Hampshire is guilty of redundancy, he is not the first Senator in the history of this body who has been redundant.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COTTON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, there are two other amendments which were agreed upon in the conference which was held. One had to do with the leaving of the word "continued" in section (d), to which the Senator from New Hampshire has just referred. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire, because he is the one who raised the issue on this particular section.

I feel certain that the amendment would in fact weaken the case of the CATV. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will agree to that, because I would not want to press any amendment which would put CATV at a disadvantage because of any agreement they might make.

If the Senator from New Hampshire agrees with me, I want it clearly understood that that is the only reason why the subcommittee is not sponsoring that particular amendment. I think it would weaken the case of the CATV's rather than strengthen it.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from New Hampshire is in complete agreement with the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is not here, and I have not heard of anyone else offering the remaining amendment; but we gave our word to the representatives of CATV, and discussed the matter with them. After they had studied the proposed legislation for weeks upon weeks, they objected to the use of the word "programs" and wanted the word "signals" substituted. I do not know why. There was an impression on the part of some of us that because litigation was pending, it might be somewhat of a commitment of the legislative function to insist on certain words.

We are perfectly willing to accept the word "signals" in place of the word "programs," but with the explanation that this is not being done to prejudge any pending litigation. We are accepting it only as a characterization of a system, and are using "signals" in place of "programs" only to clarify the section because the nomenclature may have been misunderstood by the representatives of CATV.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island wish to submit the amendment at this time?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes. I offer the amendment, which is designated as "5-10-60—A," and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On the first page, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "programs" and insert in lieu thereof "signals".

On the first page, line 9, strike out "programs" and insert in lieu thereof "signals".

On page 4, line 12, strike out "program services" and insert in lieu thereof "signals".

On page 6, line 20, strike out "programs" and insert in lieu thereof "signals".

On page 6, line 21, strike out "programs" and insert in lieu thereof "signals".

On page 6, line 25, strike out "programs" and insert in lieu thereof "signals".

On page 7, line 3, strike out "programs" and insert in lieu thereof "signals".

On page 7, line 8, strike out "programs" and insert in lieu thereof "signals".

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of this amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 1

Page 1, line 8, change "programs" to "signals."

STATEMENT

With reference to the amendment which would substitute the word "signals" for the word "programs", it should be pointed out that the definition of a community antenna television system with the use of the word "program" was originally prepared and submitted by the FCC as its definition of a community television system and was contained in one of the bills considered by the committee when the community antenna problem was being heard by the Subcommittee on Communications. The committee adopted this definition as an accurate description of community antenna operations. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas would substitute the word "signals" for "programs" in the definition and wherever the word "program" appears in the legislation. Such an amendment of itself does not appear to be significant because as I construe the word, it means the same thing. That is, the transmission and reception of the intelligence which becomes the picture on the television set in the home of the viewer.

I want to make it perfectly clear that in accepting the amendment which would substitute the word "signals" for "programs" that such a change is merely for clarification and that the committee's attitude with regard to the property rights, and possible copyrights, that may be involved in litigation now or later is not being affected by this legislation. In fact, in order to avoid any possible misunderstanding, I want to repeat once again the language of the committee's report as follows:

"One basic issue between the community antenna operators and the broadcasters and their program suppliers has never been resolved, and that is the question whether the former are appropriating the latter's programs in violation of their property rights therein. The community antenna industry insists that the broadcasters have released their programs for the enjoyment of the public, whether within or without the service areas of the originating stations. Since an individual viewer could erect a high and expensive antenna to receive the signal at a point where reception is not possible by ordinary means, it is argued that this can be done for the benefit of an entire community through the master antenna of a CATV system. There are a number of private lawsuits pending on this question.

"Your committee desires, therefore, to make it crystal clear that in recommending this legislation it is not affecting in any way the private rights which may have existed prior to the enactment of this bill. No such inference should be drawn because of the failure to apply section 325(a) which would require the community antenna system to obtain the consent of the originating station nor should any such inference be drawn which may have an effect on any private lawsuit by the inclusion or exclusion of any language in this legislation."

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Does not the Senator understand that the purpose of the amendment, whether it be necessary or justified or not, was the desire not to have the CATV operators involved in the question of copyright royalties in the reproducing of signals?

Mr. PASTORE. That is the argument they made; but the subcommittee does not believe the argument really is relevant to the provisions of the bill as written. However, and again for the purpose of clarification, if there is any misunderstanding, we are perfectly willing to accept the amendment. It is a matter of fact that the reason why I sponsored it was so that no one could say we had not carried out our agreement to the full.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to make an inquiry. I have not been able to keep up with all the debate on the bill. Do the words "significantly facilitate" still appear in the bill, on page 4, in line 25; or have they been stricken out of the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. Those words are still in the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is that also true of the word "facilitating" on page 6, in line 11, and also on page 7, in line 20?

Mr. PASTORE. That is true.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What is the significance of the word "facilitating," as thus used in the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. We discussed that point with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. McCLELLAN. But at that time I was not present.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that. I wish to say that I am perfectly willing to accept, as an amendment, the striking out of the word "significantly." I do not think it would add very much, one way or the other. The phrase "significantly facilitate" means facilitate. In fact, I think there is a little bit of redundancy there; it is like saying "no smoking, and positively no smoking." What is the difference?

The word "significantly" was used in the bill and was agreed upon by the staff of Federal Communications Commission when the bill was drafted. My opinion is that it makes little difference whether the word "significantly" is left in the bill at that point or is deleted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I simply asked whether it remains in the bill. We are trying to make some legislative history here. As I read the language, I am trying to ascertain whether there must be a showing, or whether the Communications Commission must find, that the operation of the community antenna system is calculated to facilitate the continued operation of a local station. If that is one of the conditions required before a license will be issued to an antenna system, then the bill will put out of business practically all the antenna systems. I think there should be some explanation as to that portion of the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. No. We discussed this in great detail. This part of the bill means that in granting a license to a CATV, the Commission must make sure that the granting of the license will in no way hamper the facilitation of these operations. That is what that part of the bill is intended to mean, and I think that is what it says.

I wish to say to the Senator from Arkansas that if he feels that the word "significantly" should be deleted, I am perfectly willing to accept such an amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But that language will have to be read in connection with some other language in the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island some questions.

Does he feel that he has kept faith with the representatives of the CATV systems, on the basis of the negotiations conducted over the past 2 years, by means of the bill which was reported by the committee and by means of the acceptance of the Fulbright amendments?

Mr. PASTORE. Of course I do. As a matter of fact, let me now read a letter addressed to me, and dated February 19:

> DEAR JOHN: I thought I would see you today on the floor, but failed to do so.
>
> I enclose the proposed amendments to S. 2653. I assume it will take a little time to look them over, but I am sending them to you because I will be away for part of next week, and I want you to have them as early as possible.

And these are the amendments he sent, and the amendments we talked about and agreed upon and voted on today, with the exception of the one mentioned by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], which I am perfectly willing to accept if any Senator sponsors it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was not offering an amendment. I asked about the meaning of the words "significantly facilitate." I am not so much concerned about the word "significantly" as I am about the word "facilitate." Will that be a condition with which a CATV applicant must comply in order to be granted a license, if the local station petitions for consideration as to whether that will facilitate its business? Must that be one of the conditions precedent to the issuing of a license to the CATV? That is the way those words read to me.

Mr. PASTORE. But the whole section must be read in that connection. As regards an application for a license for a community antenna television system—

> The licensee of a television station assigned to a community in which such community antenna television system serves subscribers may petition the Commission to include in such license such conditions on the community antenna television system's operation as will significantly facilitate the continued operation of a television station which is providing the only available locally originated television broadcast program service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes on the bill, for I think this point is of importance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, nothing in the bill is intended to guarantee the economic security of any station. That was not the purpose of the committee in reporting the bill.

We are trying to facilitate the continued operation of a station which is the only available facility that is providing free television to people who will lose it if that station goes out of business. That is the concern of the Commission—the public interest.

The question here is whether the activities of the CATV will bring darkness to the free viewers who have only one station in the locality. That is where the public interest is involved.

But whether the station makes $1 million a year or 20 cents a year will be of no concern to the Commission. If there is bad management of the station, the Commission will take that into consideration.

But if there is an inequity in competition which will destroy the only existing station which is providing the only free television in a community, and this free service will be lost to viewers who cannot afford to buy the service of the CATV, the Commission must take that into account when it grants a license to the CATV.

Otherwise, if that were allowed to happen, free television would be changed to paid television. We are trying to guarantee an opportunity to the viewers—and that is where the public interest is involved—not guarantee the economic welfare of any station. That is our position, and I hope it is the position of the entire Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me ask a question, please. If in a locality a CATV is in operation, and if it applies for a license—as it must do, following the enactment of this measure—could the local station petition the Commission to take into consideration this situation? In such a situation, only one could survive; and the question would be which one would survive?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not think that is the question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is the question. The bill says it must facilitate the local station.

Mr. PASTORE. If the local station is under good management and is providing free television, then, in the situation to which we have referred, the issuance of a license to a CATV would mean that those viewers of free television would be deprived of their opportunity to view free television. In that situation, I will say that, in my humble opinion, as between the two, I think the Commission would have to favor the free viewers, not the paying viewers.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But I think this language of the bill will do exactly what the Senator says the Commission would have to do; and I think it should be clarified.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, if the matter ever came that close. In that event, I would say the philosophy of the Communications Act is that we must preserve free television, as opposed to paid television. So if that question arises, that is the law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is that what the bill means?

Mr. PASTORE. If it gets that close, that would have to be the decision.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I simply want that point clarified.

Mr. PASTORE. But let us assume that the owner of a station embezzled $50,000, and therefore the station became insolvent and would have to go off the air. Such a situation would not be a reason for the Federal Communications Commission to do anything, or everything, to hurt the CATV—merely in order to keep that station going. The bill only means that where the type of competition which siphons off the cream of the locality, through the process of paid television, leaves the free television viewers in a position where they might

lose their opportunity to see the one free signal, then the Commission must take that into account, in order to guarantee the opportunity of free TV to operate. The matter is as simple as that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator from Rhode Island has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me 3 minutes on the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, Mr. President; I yield 3 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish only to make a statement on the bill, because I think there has been a great deal of misunderstanding. There was some confusion on yesterday, I understand, regarding the position of the Federal Communications Commission. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island has tried to clarify the matter; but I wish to add whatever I can.

The latest report from the Federal Communications Commission appears on page 10431 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, from which I shall read one paragraph:

> The Commission's continuing study of the CATV local station problem leads it to favor what it understands to be the basic underlying objectives of the proposed legislation. The bill would encourage local television broadcast station operation by extending some protection against inequitable competition by unlicensed television services and, at the same time, recognizes the public benefit in the provision of multiple program services by CATV systems. It may be noted that these objectives form the basis of two of the priorities set forth by the Commission in its sixth report and order for the assignment of television channels.

Thus, we see that the Federal Communications Commission—as is true of all the commissions with which I have had to do in the committee—favors the principles incorporated in the bill. I wanted to mention this because I understand there was some confusion yesterday on that point.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate briefly to the record and the history of this legislation. This matter has been before the committee for a long time. The committee has discussed the bill pro and con, and when the bill was reported no minority views were filed. No minority views have been suggested, although much time has elapsed since the bill was reported, and any Senator who wished to do so had the opportunity.

I wish to call attention to the fact that the bill was scheduled for action last August. At the request of the National CATV Association, we held it over until January, in order to give an opportunity to have worked out a proposal which would be agreeable to everyone. I personally asked the minority leader, the assistant majority leader, and the majority leader that it be made the pending order of business when we recessed. If the record will be examined, that statement will be found to be accurate. All this time has elapsed since then.

Late in January representatives of the national association, who I assume they were the ones who came before the Senator from Rhode Island, myself, and my seat mate, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who had some concern about this matter, said their board was meeting some time in February and wondered if we could postpone action a little longer, so an effort could be made to further reconcile some differences in points of view. We agreed to such a postponement, and consideration of the bill was postponed. Finally, in a meeting in my office in late March or early April——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes, and yield to the Senator from Washington such time as he may require.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In late March or early April, the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from Rhode Island, and representatives of the National CATV Association, met for a long time, for 2 or 3 hours, in our office, and we reached an agreement, I thought, on what procedure would be followed.

The Senator from Rhode Island has letters confirming this understanding. I assume they have been referred to in the debate. To this hour we have had no official communication whatsoever from the National CATV Association reversing their stand.

It was mentioned yesterday that there are certain persons going around to the offices of different Senators, talking about the bill, which they have a right to do, making statements to the effect that some of the association officials—probably those who met with us; or who else they were, I do not know—do not properly represent their point of view.

I say to the Senate that all we can go by, and all we could go by, is what the association, after official action by its board, transmitted to us by what I thought were its official representatives at that meeting.

Several of these TV facilities exist out in my part of the country. Some of the people are here from Montana and other places in the Pacific Northwest. There is also involved in our part of the country a booster problem, because of the terrain.

I am authorized to say for these people that they recognize what the FCC recognizes, and what the Senator from Rhode Island recognizes, and what everybody else interested in this question recognizes, that some type of regulation is called for. They say, and I say, the question is: Shall this matter be under the jurisdiction of a series of State public service commissions, or under Federal regulation?

All of these people are here, and every communication, or contact, or meeting, or testimony we have had has been to the effect that not only do they prefer Federal regulation of some kind, but that Federal regulation is dictated under the circumstances. The FCC has told me the same thing. They have told me, as late as this morning, they prefer Federal regulation. I do not mean to imply that everybody is satisfied with every part of the bill, but they recognize that the legislative process is such that some of the rough corners in the bill probably can be taken care of in House hearings.

In light of all these facts, I think the Senate should proceed to act on the bill, and Senators should perhaps proceed by suggesting amendments to be adopted in the House committee.

I wish to say to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who is a member of our committee, I think the Senator from Rhode Island has been more than patient, fair, and equitable in this matter.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think so, too.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the Senator from Rhode Island has gone out of his way to try to resolve some of the differences which have arisen. I think I have, too, in a small way. We are trying to get free television throughout the country, to the greatest extent possible. We appreciate that these CATV systems are also important and belong in the communications system of the United States. However, they can serve only those places where there are enough subscribers to make such facilities economically feasible. I think in some places free television is particularly limited, especially in areas west of the Mississippi. The people there are willing to pay, where there are enough customers and where a CATV system is adaptable. I do not think this bill will hurt any of those people.

I think in the last few days there has been an attempt to build a few strawmen to be knocked down. The attempt is made to let us believe that the FCC is going completely out of its way to hurt the community antenna systems, which I know the FCC does not want to do. Those systems serve a purpose in the spread of this great medium of communication. There are many farm people who have only one signal available. I am sure the Federal Communications Commission will not hamper those people at all when merely an application for a license is made.

I feel as the Senator from Rhode Island feels. We have other things to do than merely to consider this bill. If these people want State regulation, they ought to say so. If they think it is better for the whole communications system, then they ought to go along with what they agreed to accept. We are going to be fair and helpful—and the Senator from Rhode Island has been—and be willing to have amendments adopted to clarify the whole matter as best we know how. That is our intention.

I hope the Senate will not agree to send the bill back to the committee, which has spent much time and effort on it. I do not know of a bill on which the committee has spent more time in trying to resolve differences, and some of the bills before the committee have been quite important. We have tried our best. The matter has been fully heard before the committee, and the subcommittee of the Senator from Rhode Island, whose patience could have

been sorely tried, but he has labored long and patiently in his effort to frame a bill which the Senate could consider and pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the bill.

May I ask who is in control of the time in opposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is in control of the time in opposition. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is the acting minority leader.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Senator yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. COTTON. I yield the Senator such time as he may need.

Mr. MONRONEY. After the very eloquent and informative statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee [Mr. MAGNUSON] and my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Communications Subcommittee [Mr. PASTORE], I wonder if I could clear the air just a bit.

I know of no one who sat through the hearings or who has been present at any meeting at which the bill was being considered who has had anything but praise for the job which has been done by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and by the distinguished chairman of the full committee. Every view was received graciously and given serious consideration.

I attended practically all of the hearings which were held in 1959, some of which, in order to take care of witnesses from all over the country, continued as late as 7:30 at night. The distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island did likewise. I have no complaint to make with regard to the patience of the Senators or the fairness of hearings.

If a license is to be required of every member of this industry, if we are to regulate so many in order to benefit so few, then the Senator from Rhode Island has done the very best possible job.

I introduced a bill as a working draft, for the benefit of the committee, so that if regulation had to come it could come in a manner which would not be crippling to the CATV units, of which there are so many.

After we had heard all the testimony, I had serious doubts as to the necessity for such broad regulation. Certainly there were doubts in the minds of dozens of CATV operators in Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, and many other places, in regard to their being asked to give up so much freedom to obtain so little, under licensing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 more minutes?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield 3 more minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma. I do not want to yield too much time to the Senator, until the minority leader returns to the Chamber. The time is being taken from the time on the bill. There is no amendment pending. That is why I do not want to yield too much of the time of the minority leader.

I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma at this time.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator. I will be careful with the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, so far as I could tell during the time I was supporting a bill to regulate this industry, in the belief that it was needed for its protection, I had the greatest help and service from the Washington representatives for the association.

The minute my own local operators, who I believe knew their business, told me they would rather not have any regulation, and that they felt they could survive and continue their operations without damaging anyone in our State, I never heard from or saw these representatives again.

Who has been bargaining? Who has been talking? Who has been taking up the time of the committee? I did not take part in these negotiations, and I do not know who purported to represent the 768 members of the CATV industry. The results did not represent the views of the members in Oklahoma. The results did not represent the views of dozens with whom I have talked, who have been in this city. Certainly I think it was high time that these men came to the Congress in person to tell the story to the Congress, particularly if the story was different from the position taken by their representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator please yield me 1 more minute?

Mr. COTTON. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MONRONEY. Certainly the people who oppose licensing have not been heard in the councils which were considering amendments to the bill. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, that is the issue before us today. It is not a question of how the industry will be licensed, but whether licensing is necessary.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island yield 2 minutes to me, during which time I may propound to the Senator some questions, in order to clarify the provisions in the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator defer a minute?

Mr. President, how much time do the proponents of the bill have remaining on the bill itself?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eight minutes remain for the proponents on the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Eight minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eight minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. And we shall have 1 hour on the motion to recomit. I understand that motion has not been made yet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If and when the motion to recommit is made, the Senator from Rhode Island will have 1 hour on the motion.

Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator wait a minute?

How much time does the opposition have remaining on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opposition has 23 minutes remaining on the bill. How much time does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. PASTORE. Two minutes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the purpose in asking the Senator from Rhode Island to yield is that I may clarify the provisions of the bill.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Texas from the time in opposition, so as not to use the remaining few minutes of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for yielding 2 minutes to me.

Mr. President, I address these questions for the purpose of clarification.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Texas may proceed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. My State has more of these community antenna television systems than any other State in the Union, and I can state that they play a very important part in the lives of tens of thousands of people. Due to the geographical extent of the systems and the population base, it is quite likely, therefore, that Texas will have more community antenna television systems than any other State in the Union for a long time to come. It is a very fast growing industry in our State. Many people have homes in what are known as fringe areas, and can receive television programs only over the community antenna television systems.

We did not hear answers to these questions before the committee, simply because nobody was objecting, though the bill has been pending for a couple of years. Questions have been raised. I know the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island can answer them. I think, Mr. President and distinguished Senators, these matters ought to be clarified in the RECORD before we vote.

First, where there is a local television broadcaster competing with a community antenna television system, what control, if any, would the bill give to the broadcaster over the community antenna television system?

Mr. PASTORE. The bill would not give the broadcaster any control at all, outside of the fact that he could file a petition with the Federal Communica-

tions Commission, and attempt to prove that unless the picture is shown as one of the three or four signals being serviced by the community antenna television system, in all probability it would cause him economic distress, which might lead to a closing down of the station.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 more minutes? This is for the purpose of clarification of the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, so that we may avoid all of this seesaw of time, yielding a minute or a minute and a half to different Senators, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 25, it is proposed to strike out "significantly facilitate the continued" and insert in lieu thereof "facilitate the".

On page 5, line 7, strike out "continued".

On page 6, line 11, strike out "continued".

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask these questions of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, since the questions have been raised and I think the matter can be clarified in a very few minutes.

Under the provisions of the bill could there possibly be a limitation on the variety of programs received by community antenna television subscribers?

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator repeat the question?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Could there possibly be a limitation on the variety of programs received by community antenna television subscribers under the provisions of the bill?

The charge has been made, Mr. President, that the people will not be able to get TV reception over the community antenna systems if the bill is passed.

Mr. PASTORE. In order to answer the question of my distinguished friend from Texas, I think we should get this matter in a proper context.

First of all, Senators must understand that the community antenna television system operates with some three or four or five signals.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I understand.

Mr. PASTORE. The one of the impositions upon the communuity antenna system, which might affect it in some way, is the fact that the local broadcasting station, which has a contract, let us say, with the network, to show "I Love Lucy" or "Gunsmoke" in the middle of the week, might, if the community antenna system is taking that same program from some large city on a Sunday night, and broadcasting it before the showing by the local broadcasting station, let us say, anticipating it by three or four nights, protest to the FCC. If the local broadcasting station can show that is being done and can show it will injure the station financially, in such a way that if the action continues it might be necessary to go off the air, the FCC could take appropriate action. That is about the only encumbrance upon the CATV systems.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. In other words, if there were no local broadcasting station broadcasting in the same town or city in which the community antenna system operated, then there would be no possible limitation on the variety of programs of the community antenna television system?

Mr. PASTORE. Practically none at all aside from the fact that they would have to apply for a license and, as I said yesterday, if there were no objections—and in this case there would be no objections because there is no local station—it would be a perfunctory procedure and the license would be granted.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Is there a provision in the bill which would allow broadcasting stations to charge the community antenna television system for the use of the broadcasting station signals or change the present legal relationship between the broadcaster and the community antenna television system?

Mr. PASTORE. Such a provision was contained in the legislation originally proposed. It is contained in the recommendation of the Federal Communications Commission, but we deleted it because we considered it unfair.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It is not in the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. It is not in this bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It has been so charged. My statement is intended to clear the air of many of the charges in regard to the bill. I hope the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, who is chairman of the Communications Subcommittee and knows more about this subject than any other Senator, will be patient with me for a minute until we clear up some of these points on the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. I welcome the opportunity to do so.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Would the bill increase the overall cost of the community antenna television system operation and subscription in any appreciable amount, and increase the cost to the subscriber who pays so much per month?

Mr. PASTORE. I would not say so. We heard the argument today that no one in Oklahoma was consulted about the proposed legislation. The CATV people of Oklahoma certainly knew of this measure. A prominent CATV operator, Mr. Griffing, of Oklahoma testified at the hearing a year ago. He must be fully aware of the progress of the bill and so, too, the CATV industry of Oklahoma.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Is there any validity to the contention that under the provisions of section (d), page 4, beginning at line 17, the licensee of a television station assigned to a community in which there was a community antenna system could prescribe what the community antenna system carried, and how it operated, other than that the community antenna television system would have to carry the local broadcaster's signal also? Is that the only modification?

Mr. PASTORE. And to avoid duplication; that is correct. That is about all.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. There would be no other control whatsoever?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not see what other control there would be.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I refer to the language beginning on page 4, line 20:

> The licensee of a television station assigned to a community in which such community antenna television system serves subscribers may petition the Commission to include in such license such conditions on the community antenna television system's operation as will significantly facilitate the continued operation of a television station which is providing the only available locally originated television broadcast program service.

It is contended that such provision would give the local broadcaster the power to require such a downgrading of programs of the community antenna system as not to take too many customers away from the broadcaster himself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

That is precisely the point that was raised by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. Let me give a graphic example of how this operation would work.

Suppose in a community like Helena, Mont., there were a local broadcasting station which was the only facility providing service in that community. At the same time CATV was also servicing people in Helena, Mont. Suppose the local station should apply to the FCC and spell out the fact that there was unfair competition and that it felt that the CATV should show the signal that was being shown by the Helena broadcasting station, and at the same time included it with the other signals. Next let us assume that the Federal Communications Commission should grant that petition. Let us assume again that after the petition is granted and the CATV does show the signal of the local station at the same time and without duplication, and other action the FCC may take, but in spite of all that, the local station is in a bad financial position and is likely to go out of business, then that TV station is simply out of luck.

The implication was left here that in order to save the local station CATV would have to be wiped out. That is not true at all. If after this grant was made to the local station it still could not make headway that would be its misfortune, and it would have to close shop. But CATV would not be closed down because, after all, it is not CATV that put the local station out of business. They were both there at the same time. There is a limitation as to how far CATV can go to help the local stations. But once it has exercised equity, that is the end of the road. Beyond that is an abyss.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. In conclusion, is the grandfather clause of S. 2653 broad enough to assure absolutely that each existing community antenna system will get a permit or a certificate to continue operations under the grandfather clause?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, except, of course, it might wish to expand its facilities or bring in more signals. It would then have to appear before the FCC, and in that case the FCC would decide the case in the public interest.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Then as to the overwhelming majority of the CATV stations, where there is no local broadcaster, is their broadcasting affected in any way whatsoever other than in the matter of getting its license?

Mr. PASTORE. No, of course not, aside from the fact that it would have to come under regulation. Every time that subject is mentioned we are told that expensive lawyers must be hired. Everybody who has been reading the front pages of the newspapers for the past 2 weeks has observed that impressive argument: "Everyone has to hire a big lawyer in Washington." Most of these CATV operators are represented by attorneys. They know that. We are told about little people being in this business. They are small businessmen, but they are not destitute. Some of them operate million-dollar systems, and I find no fault with that. The fact is that when they have to submit an application and have it considered by the FCC, it will be granted if there is no objection. It is said that every small operator will have to hire a big lawyer and pay him big fees. It sounds like a good argument to make here, but it is not true.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for his clarification of the points that have been raised with me by many of the operators of community antenna systems in my State. Texas is the largest State in the Union, and it has more of these systems.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I believe the implication was left that the grandfather clause gives these operators the right to continue. I know the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island did not mean to leave the implication that they would be covered by grandfather clauses from now on. He knows, as we know, that a license is good for only 3 years, and then if the license covered by the grandfather clause is renewed, it is good for an additional 3 years; but it is a 3-cycle, is it not?

Mr. PASTORE. Of course. The FCC does not issue a license for longer than 3 years.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is the issue. The FCC would license them for 3 years, and they would then return with another application. Is it necessary to require this of little business in order to protect the very few who would be affected by the bill, and who are in the so-called minority?

Mr. PASTORE. The operator of the little broadcasting station——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield myself 5 minutes additional.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield myself the 5 minutes. A small broadcaster in the town of Helena or in some little town in Colorado must apply every 3 years for renewal of his license. What does he have to do? He cannot take a picture out of the air and sell it to someone else, as some other operators are doing. He must pay for it. He must go to NBC, CBS, or ABC, and put the money on the line for everything he wishes to obtain. He is a small-business man, too. He must employ a lawyer. He must file an application. He must get a license every 3 years. Why does the Senator want preferential treatment for certain operators? All those operators are doing is taking a picture out of the air which belongs to someone else, which someone else paid to put on the air. They take it without compensation, and they sell it for a price. That is what the Senator is talking about, and he is saying that these people are being unfair to the few who are getting a little picture in their homes free.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Did the Senator say that the little station in Montana or Colorado which transmitted an NBC, CBS, or ABC broadcast had to pay for it?

Mr. PASTORE. It must pay for the privilege of showing the broadcast.

Mr. KERR. I thought it received pay from the network for showing it.

Mr. PASTORE. It must pay for the program. They have to pay for the privilege of showing the picture.

Mr. KERR. The Senator ought to review the facts.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator has reviewed them, and he extends the same invitation to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. I hope the Senator from Oklahoma has read the Communications Act. I make that statement unequivocally.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma makes the statement that when a television station is operating with one of the national networks, CBS, NBC, or ABC, the network pays the local TV station for the time that is consumed in broadcasting a network program. I say to my good friend, who knows more, he thinks, than anybody else on earth, that if he will read a little, or find out a little, he will know more even than he now thinks he knows.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator through?

Mr. KERR. I do not know whether I am.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator harken for a moment?

Mr. KERR. I do not know what that means.

Mr. PASTORE. It means to listen.

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. When we listen, we learn.

Mr. KERR. I do not know about both of us.

Mr. PASTORE. I know listening helps me. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that through the arrangement with the network the local station gets 30 percent of its rate card and what amounts to 70 percent is retained by the network. There is a difference between local rates and national rates. If that is not paying, I do not know what is paying.

Mr. KERR. The Senator does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator said that yesterday. I do know what I am talking about. The difficulty with the Senator from Oklahoma is whenever he cannot run anyone into the ground he gets a little intemperate. I have read the Communications Act, and I know it. I challenge the Senator from Oklahoma to do the same.

Mr. KERR. The Senator believes, in other words, that the Communications Act governs the contractual relationship between the broadcasting network and the local affiliate?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes. The contracts are filed with the FCC. If the Senator does not believe it, he can call up on the telephone and check it.

Mr. KERR. I do not have to do that.

Mr. PASTORE. That is the trouble with the Senator. He does not have to do anything. He knows everything.

Mr. KERR. No, no; but I know that much.

Mr. PASTORE. I withdraw my amendment. We have exhausted the time—I hope intelligently.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated. It is identified as "5–17–60—A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

(b) (4) Effective after ninety days following the effective date of this section the provisions of subsection (a) of section 325 relating to rebroadcasting by broadcasting stations shall apply to community antenna television systems as if they were broadcasting stations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield myself 5 minutes. The amendment I have offered gets down to the nub of this situation. I do not care how the facts are distorted here. The plain fact is that the bill is not going to hurt anyone except those who compete unfairly with other people.

Section 325(a) of the Communications Act provides:

No person within the jurisdiction of the United States shall knowingly utter or transmit or cause to be uttered or transmitted any false or fraudulent signal of distress or communication relating thereto—

Now I come to the pertinent part—

nor shall any broadcasting station rebroadcast a program or any part thereof of another broadcasting station without express authority of the originating station.

The amendment which I have offered provides that, effective after 90 days following the date of this section, the provisions of subsection (a) of section 325, which is the one I have read, relating to broadcasting by broadcasting stations, shall apply to community antenna television systems as if they were broadcasting stations. That provision would be inserted on page 4, between lines 9 and 10.

I am not unmindful of what the committee has said on this particular point. I should like to read it. On page 11 of the report the committee says:

> One basic issue between the community antenna operators and the broadcasters and their program suppliers has never been resolved, and that is the question whether the former are appropriating the latter's programs in violation of their property rights therein. The community antenna industry insists that the broadcasters have released their programs for the enjoyment of the public, whether within or without the service areas of the originating stations. Since an individual viewer could erect a high and expensive antenna to receive the signal at a point where reception is not possible by ordinary means, it is argued that this can be done for the benefit of an entire community through the master antenna of a CATV system. There are a number of private lawsuits pending on this question.
>
> Your committee desires, therefore, to make it crystal clear that in recommending this legislation it is not affecting in any way the private rights which may have existed prior to the enactment of this bill. No such inference should be drawn because of the failure to apply section 325(a) which would require the community antenna system to obtain the consent of the originating station nor should any such inference be drawn which may have an effect on any private lawsuit by the inclusion or exclusion of any language in this legislation.

Yesterday afternoon I tried to explain to the Senate in my own words the effect which I believe the uninhibited growth of CATV is going to have on many States, particularly upon my State. Unless CATV is brought within some regulatory control, it is going to run out the small TV stations in my State, particularly one that I have in mind at this time. That particular station, in Grand Junction, serves a great area of some 55,000 or perhaps 60,000 people in western Colorado and eastern Utah. If CATV comes into Grand Junction and competes, not upon a fair, but an unfair basis, CATV can pick programs from the three main broadcasters out of the air and distribute them in Grand Junction in unfair competition with the local station.

The whole matter of what has been unfair has been gone into fully by the chairman of the subcommittee. I paid my respects to him yesterday afternoon, and I do it again today.

Here we have the situation of people taking a free signal out of the air. It is true that I have the right to pick it out of the air, but I do not have the right to pick it out of the air for a profit. Yet this is what these people want to do. They want to pick the signal out of the air without the consent of the person who puts it on the air, and they want to put it into the local community and convert it to a profit, and eventually bring in two or three networks, and then run the small one signal TV station out of business.

How will this work? In this particular instance, they will serve one little town. They cannot serve the suburbs because the expense of installation is too great. They cannot serve all the surrounding area, because the expense of installation is too great.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield myself another 5 minutes.

There are now in this area 36 booster stations. They serve the people of western Colorado and eastern Utah, which are tuned in on this one station. If we do not by this bill bring in those people; if we do not provide some kind of regulation; there will be light in the communities, but there will be darkness in the suburbs and darkness throughout all of western Colorado and a part of eastern Utah.

I do not think anyone has the right to say that he can pluck a free signal out of the air, convert it to his own use and his own business, and make a profit from it, while he darkens the skies to the people who have an opportunity to get a free service.

I desire to make perfectly clear what I am trying to do by this amendment. There is nothing tricky about it. There is nothing new about it. The language has been in the Communications Act for a long time. It simply takes a part of the Communications Act, which is now in effect—section 325—and applies it within 90 days to the CATV system, so that CATV, like any other person, would have to get the consent of the person who broadcasts the signal before CATV could broadcast it.

There are cases which are now pending in the courts, but they have not yet been decided. Nevertheless, it is my opinion that this language should be a part of the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I must admit and concede that the Senator from Colorado has made a very powerful argument. As a matter of fact, many persons, particularly those who have been damaged by this condition, feel that they are compelled to get permission before they can rebroadcast a signal. However, everyone else who uses the signal for profit should do likewise. This is provided for in the Communications Act, section 325. That is the section which the Senator from Colorado would like to incorporate in the bill by his amendment.

I realize that the FCC, which was rather lukewarm to the proposed legislation, but is now supporting most of its provisions, has gone the full distance and is itself advocating that Congress compel consent to be obtained before CATV can take a signal and then sell it by the use of its cables.

I realize the reason for the Senator's position. I realize how he feels about this matter, because he is living with the problem. He lives among people who are enjoying both CATV and free television through one existing television station in a particular locality, as he has already explained. But the Senator from Colorado must realize that if his amendment is adopted today, irreparable harm will be done to the bill itself.

I am afraid we may be getting ourselves into a situation which may be rather delicate and serious. So, as seriously as I can say it, even though I am a proponent of the bill, and even though I realize that the Senator's amendment rubs pretty hard and roughly those who are opposed to the bill, I hope he might see it within his heart and in his good, fair mind to withdraw the amendment, and not press it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has 6 minutes remaining on the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. COTTON. I asked for this time.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. COTTON. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yielded myself 5 minutes initially and then asked for 5 additional minutes subsequently. The Chair has advised me that I have 6 minutes remaining.

The arguments and the discourse of the Senator from Rhode Island are very persuasive. I cannot help thinking that more dead cats have been dragged to the Senate floor in the last 24 hours than I have ever seen in a similar period. I have seen more misinformation scattered in connection with this bill than I have seen in a long, long time.

I cannot accept the theory that the bill will place a great burden on these people. It does not put a great burden on the CATV operators. It does not put a burden on them which the small broadcasters—the small TV broadcasters—do not have to carry all the time. They manage to handle the situation, though; and in most instances, I believe, they do it without the employment of attorneys.

The question is whether we shall give one group an opportunity to compete with and run out of business another group who are supplying free broadcasting, and do it with free signals which they pluck out of the air.

I offered the amendment in all sincerity, as I am certain the Senator from Rhode Island believes—he did not imply otherwise—because I do not think anyone should have a right to pluck a signal out of the air and then make somebody else pay him a profit in order to get the signal and utilize it.

Nevertheless, I cannot help realizing that if the amendment were adopted, it would perhaps make it more difficult, even, to pass the bill, about which we have heard so much static and misinformation. For that reason, and that reason alone, and not because I believe

for a moment that the principle I have espoused is not the correct principle, I intend in a moment to withdraw the amendment.

But I say to the visitors who are sitting in the galleries, and are breathing so hotly down the necks of the Senate today, that if the Supreme Court decides one of the pending cases against CATV, it will be you who will be coming here on your knees, begging and praying for the kind of legislation which we are trying to give you this afternoon.

Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I had hoped the Senator from Colorado would not take us off our feet after he had offered the amendment, by withdrawing it. That is why I asked for 3 minutes in opposition to it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I presume I have the right to do as I please concerning my use of it.

Mr. COTTON. Certainly.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator from New Hampshire wishes to question me on the amendment, I shall be happy to yield to him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado wishes to withdraw his amendment, he has the right to do so.

Mr. COTTON. He certainly has.

Mr. President, will the distinguished minority leader yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Before we cease discussing the amendment which was offered by the distinguished Senator from Colorado, and which he then withdrew, I should like to say for the benefit of the Senate and also for those outside the Senate that some of us who oppose the bill do not oppose it, as has been intimated, because we are carrying the flag for CATV.

I happen to come from a section of the country, and from a city—a county seat town—in the mountains; from a location where the people would never get TV unless they got it by this medium. My interest, and I am confident it is the interest of a good many other Senators, is for the consumer, the viewing public. I, for one, rather resent all the talk about pressure, telegrams, and all the rest. I am interested, as I think other Senators are interested, in protecting the means by which we who live in mountainous areas can get good TV service.

Furthermore, if the Supreme Court of the United States should suddenly decide, in its infinite wisdom, that CATV cannot take the signals from TV stations without the permission of those stations, I should like to have someone tell me, a simple country lawyer, how the FCC would be able to overcome the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. It is a new theory for me to believe that a Government agency could do that.

If such a principle should become the law of the land by a decision of the highest tribunal of the Nation, the FCC would have no power to change it. The only way it could be altered would be to have Congress enact new legislation, a practice which is always frowned upon.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COTTON. If time permits, I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Supreme Court should decide that a proprietary right exists, and that the privilege of using property which belongs to someone else must be paid for—I hope it would not do so—the fact that both mediums would be under the aegis of the FCC would certainly mean that the FCC could say that the rates charged must be reasonable, and that one segment of the population, such as the good people of New Hampshire, should not be deprived of the service. That would all depend on the FCC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator has expired.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, may I have 2 minutes more?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am absolutely sure that neither my good friend, the Senator from Colorado, nor my esteemed friend, the Senator from Rhode Island, nor any other Member of the Senate has any real idea that the courts are going to deprive the people who are receiving television shows by this means. I question it very much.

Mr. PASTORE. A court case is pending, and it could be decided one way or the other.

Mr. COTTON. I know a case is pending in court, and of course no one knows what the court will decide.

But let us remember some of the fundamental ethics and basic principles that are involved in this case. One thing is certain, namely, that every one in this country wants to have the privilege of receiving television programs. But because of the problems caused by technical difficulties in TV the economics of the broadcast industry, and the limited number of TV channel assignments there are many persons in parts of the country who could not get any TV reception or who, at best, could get only a single channel.

It is one of the glories of American ingenuity that when difficulties like these develop, ways to overcome them are soon found. As a result, we have booster stations, translators, satellites, and CATV's all contributing to the TV reception of the American people. Some of my friends from the West are interested in boosters; and as a member of the subcommittee, I want to help them.

I do not want to see any group in any valley in the country—whether in Wyoming or in New Hampshire, and whether receiving such programs by CATV or by booster or by some other means—not to have a full and fair chance to receive television.

Many of the parts of the pending bill are good.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time yielded to the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, may I have 1 more minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 1 more minute.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, many of the parts of the pending bill are good. In any city or town where a struggling local TV station is endeavoring to survive, I am perfectly willing to see the CATV there come under some regulation.

But I object to the pending bill, in that it would bring under regulation by far the largest proportion of CATV stations which are not in any way in competition with any local station.

The bill goes too far; it provides too much regulation. The bill would encourage litigation. The bill would cause expense and harassment. That is why I shall vote to recommit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time yielded to the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I assume that the Senator from Oklahoma has in mind a motion to recommit.

Mr. MONRONEY. I desire to call up my motion to recommit. But I shall be happy to withhold that, if the Senator from Montana wishes to speak. We have 1 hour on each side, and I hope we shall not use too great a proportion of it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But it will have to be used on the motion to recommit.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has suggested that he would like to offer an amendment.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], I offer the following amendment: On page 7 of the bill, strike out the last sentence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana wish to ask unanimous consent that the time required for the quorum call not be charged to the time available to either side?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, Mr. President; I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The absence of a quorum has been suggested; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the pending amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment, submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, it is proposed to strike out the last sentence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Let me say that the purpose of the amendment is to enable me to ask some questions of my friend, the Senator from Rhode Island.

I may say that I have not recently read the Communications Act, but I read it last year when we considered the equal-time provision.

Mr. PASTORE. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Florida and I have read section 15 of the Communications Act a number of times.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

I wish to make clear that I am not an expert in this field; and therefore I shall have to rely largely on the replies I receive from the Senator from Rhode Island in response to my questions in regard to a matter which disturbs me.

I note that the bill is largely for the protection of what are termed local television stations.

Mr. PASTORE. No, just one.

Mr. HOLLAND. A single station?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, it must be a single station; otherwise, the bill will really have no effect.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

That brings me to the following point: As Senators know, in the State of Florida the terrain is rather flat. The question of whether there is a single station generally depends on the height of the receiving tower at the point of reception.

For instance, in the city of Tallahassee, which until recent years has had very poor reception—though it is our capital city—there was located, several years ago, a so-called local station, and a good one, between Tallahassee and Thomasville, which I am sure would be termed a local station; but before and since that time, by putting up a higher tower, there may be received various stations in Jacksonville, which are about 150 or 160 miles away, a station in Panama City, which is only 100 miles away, and a station in Dothan, Ala., which is perhaps the same distance.

In the opinion of the Senator from Rhode Island, what is the standard as to what constitutes a single local station available for reception in a community?

Mr. PASTORE. It would be governed by the rule of reason, as I look at it. After all, the Commission is presumed to be proficient in this particular field. One could not say that a station in Providence does not go into Pawtucket or East Providence. It is difficult to state exactly; but I would say, within the area described by the FCC in granting a license to a station as to how far it can go, that would more or less control the matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. Looking at the bill, I notice several partial descriptions in this field, none of which, it seems to me, make it clear as to just how this question should be resolved. For instance, on line 21, page 4, of the bill, a local station is described as "a television station assigned to a community."

In lines 1 to 3, at the top of the next page, it is described as "a television station which is providing the only available locally originated television broadcast program service."

On lines 11 to 13 of page 6, it is described in the same words just read by me, "a television station which is providing the only available locally originating television broadcast program service."

Then four lines below that, on lines 16 to 18, it is described as "a television broadcast station which is assigned to a community."

Then a little bit later, in line 22, it is simply referred to as "local television broadcast station."

Similarly, on page 7, in lines 12 to 14, it is described again as "a television station which is assigned to a community."

There is yet a third concept that may or may not be applicable, which is shown on lines 9 and 10 of page 2, where appear these words "within the direct range of television broadcast stations."

All of those, at least to the Senator from Florida, do not add up to give a clear description of the area of application of this bill to stations which are to be considered as local stations. I am disturbed by that fact. I therefore ask for the clarification by my distinguished friend from Rhode Island. Also, I think the RECORD should be clear on this, because this is not wholly an engineering fact. This has to do with economic questions of great importance, not only to the so-called local stations, but also to the local customers or viewers, and to the communities generally. So I would appreciate any clarification of this question which the distinguished Senator might give.

Mr. PASTORE. In order to give a perfect explanation, of course, the language must be read in context, as we go from sentence to sentence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. There are certain standards by which the FCC operates, and it has adopted what more or less are termed trade terms as to the kind of facility to which they are granting a license. The Commission might say it is an A service or a B service, for this city or that city.

The intent of the bill, and the way we have interchanged these words, is always with the understanding that where there is an imposition of a duty to public authority is actually provided in the bill, it is intended to protect the only existing TV station giving the only available service in a particular community on a free basis.

If the Senator wants to take up the wording of the bill step by step, I think we can get along much better. For instance, I think the Senator pointed out the first example of the language on page 4. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. I think the Senator referred to the language which reads:

> The licensee of a television station assigned to a community in which such community antenna television system serves subscribers may petition the Commission to include in such license such conditions on the community antenna television system's operation as will significantly facilitate the continued operation of a television station which is providing the only available locally originated television broadcast program service.

May I ask this question, as respectfully as I can? What is bothering the Senator about that, so I can answer the question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I referred to the station in Tallahassee. It is a local station, and it is an excellent station. It is owned by splendid, civic-minded people. I would like to do anything that is proper to protect them, along with their interested viewers. But before that station was there and since, as I have just stated, broadcasts or telecasts from other stations, with a little extra expense, were receivable, and viewed by many people, from the Jacksonville, Dothan, and Panama City stations.

My question is directed to that situation, and to a similar situation in Fort Myers, which has a single locally originating station, but which is in comparable distance from other stations as Tallahassee is from the outlying stations there. It is a similar distance from Tampa, St. Petersburg, Miami, and West Palm Beach. I have viewed telecasts from some of the stations in these other locations while in the Fort Myers area. Yet I notice at Naples, which is only 40 miles from Fort Myers, they have spent $350,000 of local money to put in a 700-foot tower back of that town, about 7 miles, which will open next week and receive for distribution the pictures from the three Miami stations and from the one station in Fort Myers.

Mr. PASTORE. May I ask a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator certainly may.

Mr. PASTORE. This is how the bill would operate in the particular instance of Florida. There is already a CATV system installed. Then a station comes in and, at the time the bill is passed, they are both operating. Let us assume the CATV has siphoned off the viewers in the congested areas; and stops there because it would be uneconomical to extend their lines to the outskirts because the cost would be prohibitive. Then let us assume that section began to build up and more people entered the CATV system. In other words, if the CATV system filed a petition to extend their facilities, a question might arise as to whether a public convenience and necessity were being served. It might well be the television broadcasting station would have to depend upon those people for free television viewers——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. I have 15 minutes. I think we can share the time together.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. PASTORE. About the only thing that the broadcaster can do is to object to a further expansion and to rules which might interfere with his operation and might compel him to go off the air. Otherwise he could only say, "I petition to have my signal shown." That is the signal which is shown at a different time.

I do not think there would be that problem as much in Florida as there might be in the Midwest, because there is not the differential in time from the point where the large broadcasting station is sending out the signal which is captured by the CATV system, as against the broadcasting station which has an arrangement with the affiliate. Where one does not have that time differential element or bringing the programs in from a distant point, I do not think one would have the question of duplication, running more or less simultaneously.

In that particular case the local broadcasting station could as one step petition the FCC and ask for an order that the CATV system show, among the multiple signals to be provided, the signal which emanates from the local broadcasting station, which lives upon advertising in that locality. Unless the local station can service those people, the local station may lose its advertising, and if it loses its advertising the station may have to go out of business.

In that particular case, if the station would show cause, the Commission could order the CATV system to duplicate the signal of the local broadcasting station on one of the various signals which are provided.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would it be necessary to pay for that?

Mr. PASTORE. No.

Mr. HOLLAND. In other words, the CATV system in question would receive the signal from the so-called local station free, and would simply have to include it among the three or four or five signals handled through its wires?

Mr. PASTORE. This is local government at its best, because actually it would say, "I am taking nothing away from you. Let the people who pipe into you and who have four stations see this program."

If the people want to turn the programs off they can do so, because they can turn to three more programs. If the people want to see that program, they must pay for it.

There has been a big argument this afternoon as to whether it is necessary for a TV station to pay for its programs or not. The Senator knows how this works. The network sells time. For the local broadcasting station the local rate or the national rate may be $100 an hour. If someone is going a carry a network program, the local station generally has an arrangement where he gets 30 percent and the network retains 70 percent of the rate. It would be a payment to the network of 70 percent of the cost for the 1 hour of time of television. That is what I mean by the local station paying for it. We know in contracts of the affiliates that arrangements are made for so many free hours which are given to the networks.

In this particular case all of this would be done on a voluntary basis between the two parties, the local TV and the CATV, or it would be ordered to be done by the Commission, and there would be no charge insofar as this bill is concerned. The property rights in a program is something between the two parties.

Mr. HOLLAND. The order of the Commission would have to include as one term that there would be no charge, no cost for the displaying of the picture.

Mr. PASTORE. They would not even mention it, because the other party would be coming in and begging that the CATV system use the picture.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have two more instances to cite. I shall try to cover them in the time I have remaining.

In the case of Naples, I think we understand the situation. I will say that I have had no complaint from the so-called local station at Fort Myers. Apparently that station is not adversely affected. Apparently the Naples people intend to have the local program shown along with the three programs from Miami.

The next instance relates to the Fort Pierce, Eau Gallie, Vero Beach, Melbourne group. By the investment of citizens there an amount of $280,000 has been provided. A franchise has been obtained from the four cities affected, and the organization is now putting in the wiring distribution system.

As I read the letter, this group is not as far advanced as is the group at Naples, and they do not have, so far as I know, any local station. I believe the closest station would probably be at Orlando in one direction and perhaps at West Palm Beach in another direction.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

If there is no local station, there is no problem. There would simply be the filing of a petition for a license, and this group would come under the umbrella of supervision and protection by the Federal Communications Commission.

This action would preclude, in some instances, having the States move in with the chance of characterizing these groups as common carriers. To a certain extent there is a certain amount of protection even for the CATV people.

In the case the Senator cites and illustrates, I would say definitely that would be my clear understanding, from the provisions of the bill, from the hearings and from the history we developed. It is our understanding with the members of the Commission who appeared before the committee that in a situation of that kind this procedure would be a perfunctory procedure.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is probably referring, as I was in my question, to a local station as one located in the immediate community.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I doubt if that is the correct description, from all of the things we have heard, and those appearing in the text. I think the description more likely would be any station the signal of which can be received by viewers with clarity and with sufficient convenience to be available at practically all times. It would not have to be in the local town.

In fact, the station I referred to at Tallahassee is out on the line between Florida and Georgia, lying between the cities of Thomasville, Ga., and Tallahassee, Fla., and not actually located within the city of Tallahassee.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator will permit, I shall read from the report, for I think this is rather pertinent.

It should be pointed out that under this subsection the local television station has the burden of setting forth the operating conditions desired and of establishing that the imposition of such conditions would significantly facilitate its continued operation. Further, the necessity for making such determination would be limited to a comparable small number of situations wherein existing community antenna television systems serve subscribers in a community to which a local station has been assigned.

In other words, this is not punitive on the CATV systems. The whole burden of proof will be on the local station. The local station will have to be the moving party.

At best, what could the TV station win? It would simply be permitted to have its picture shown on CATV, together with other signals.

We are making it abundantly clear that there is no attempt to put the CATV systems out of business. No one wants to do that.

It has been said this afternoon, with dramatic force, great fervor and emotion that the only service for people in some of the localities, such as there are in the State of Kansas, comes from the CATV systems. I am not criticizing the CATV systems. As I said yesterday, they have rendered a noble service.

There are many localities in this country in which the people would not have an opportunity to view three or four signals, unless there were CATV systems.

I do not want to leave any impression with anybody that we are trying to oppress these people or trying to put these people under supervision, in order to find out what their profits are. I did not ask one CATV representative who came before our committee, "How much money are you making? What is your return on your investment?" I was not interested in financial arrangements. I do not want to do anything to hurt these people. We realize that this whole industry must be placed under the aegis of the FCC, if the FCC is to carry out its mandate, that it must, under the spirit of the law, bring free television to as many viewers of this country as possible, under a competitive system. That is the purpose, and it carries out the philosophy, of the law. If we cannot trust the Federal Communications Commission to assume that responsibility and to make sure that in some instances we protect those free viewers, who may be in

complete darkness unless something such as this mild bill is passed, we will be remiss in our obligation.

The argument is made, "Why should these people be put under regulation?" The answer is that this is the only way we can do this equitably. Why are the broadcasters put under regulation? These people are dealing in television.

Their argument is, "I am no different from the person who puts an antenna on his roof and takes the picture out of the air. The fact that I take the picture and sell it to somebody else for $9 a month is nobody's business but my own."

Can the Senator follow that reasoning? I cannot. I cannot follow that logic.

Mr. HOLLAND. I can follow it.

Mr. PASTORE. These people are in the television business.

Mr. HOLLAND. I can follow it at least to a certain extent. It seems to me this presents a question as to whether the State or the Federal Government ought to come into the picture as the regulating agency.

Mr. PASTORE. I shall say something further to the Senator in that regard.

Mr. HOLLAND. The distributing facilities are wholly within the control of the State public utilities commission.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. All of this is on a wire, on the telephone circuit.

Mr. PASTORE. There is a serious question in this area.

Let me tell the Senator what happened in one of the States. In Montana the legislature passed a bill, which was vetoed by the Governor, under which they would have put these CATV systems under State control, under the public utilities commissioner. I suppose that would have made them common carriers, and they would have been limited to a 6-percent return on their investment.

These people fought that. They do not want that. As a matter of fact, if the Senate desires to pass a resolution that it is the sense of the Congress we should put this responsibility under the sovereignty of each individual State, and that it is not a matter for Federal control or Federal concern, I tell the Senator very frankly that I think that the representatives of the CATV systems who are in the galleries now will fall out of the galleries.

They do not want that. If the State of Florida wishes to take the operation over, if the State of Montana wishes to take it over, or if the State of Oklahoma wishes to take it over, that is satisfactory to me. I do not think they wish to do that, and I do not think we should require that of them, for the simple reason that this picture does come through the ether. The ether has no bounds, and the picture perhaps could emanate from the State of Washington. Perhaps it traverses Oregon. It happens to go to Montana in some form or other, and they have a system of antennas. They have a system of amplification of microwaves. Then they put it on a cable which rests on a pole, and the cable enters a man's house, and he sits in his home and looks at television. It is wonderful. I still think the system should be under Federal control and I believe it should be controlled in the modest way proposed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator think the system should be under Federal control even in the many cases where the signal had to originate in the same State where it was received—as, for example, in the case of Key West?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator raises a nice legal question. I would assume in a case of that kind that while it may be a favor to the State to allow the system to come under the aegis of the Federal Communications Commission, I still think the State could control it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. The State could control it.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is one additional point I wish to raise with respect to the operation of the service in Key West, a city with which the Senator is familiar.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, I am familiar with it. As a matter of fact, I went to Key West to look at the operation.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is a receiving tower on one of the islands within easy receiving distance of the Miami stations, and the programs are piped by wire or otherwise 100 miles, or whatever the distance between those two points is, from the receiving station to Key West, along the Keys, and they are shown to the people on the Keys and in the city of Key West.

The city of Key West is perhaps the only place in Florida—certainly the only one I know about—which is far enough away from any transmitting station to cause great difficulty in receiving signals directly through the ether—even through the balmy Florida ether—signals from the station which originated the broadcast. So in that area there could not be a local station either?

Mr. PASTORE. No, because there are three television stations in Miami and I believe there is none in Key West.

Mr. HOLLAND. And they are all beyond the distance for direct service to Key West.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct. The provision would not apply. I assume the people who own this particular station would make their application. There would be nothing to it. I do not see that a hardship would arise. Much has been said about expensive lawyers which would have to be hired. I do not see the necessity of that exorbitant expense at all.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is another comment I should like to make and then I should like to ask a question.

I have not received any communication from any so-called local television station in Florida. Perhaps there is none such in Florida because of the facts which we have recited heretofore. Am I to understand from the arguments that have been made by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island and others that there are local stations elsewhere throughout the Nation which are requesting this legislation?

Mr. PASTORE. As a matter of fact, the stations have presented their requests in such a way as to make it appear to be a matter of life and death. That is how serious the situation is. In States such as Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana, because of the nature of the terrain, it is almost impossible for a local station to exist unless it operates in a congested area. What happens? It is put in a congested area, and the operators feel that is their security. It is their bread and butter. The advertising supports the station. Then the CATV comes in. It may take its signals from Spokane. Perhaps it brings in three signals instead of one.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does it refuse to take the signal of the local station?

Mr. PASTORE. In many instances that has occurred.

Mr. HOLLAND. If that is so, I see ground for complaint, but if it did take the signal of the local station, as has been indicated——

Mr. PASTORE. Had that happened in the beginning we would not be here now. That is the point. That is all we are dealing with. When the bill was first introduced we were asked to write a bill which would compel the CATV to show the signal of the local broadcasting station upon request.

I said, "That is unfair. There must be an umpire. You must show reasons. What we will do is to allow you to file a petition, but the decision must be made by the FCC. We cannot allow you at your request to impose upon someone else's privileges and prerogatives. If the CATV people are brought under control and they petition the Federal Communications Commission, if it is decided that it is in the public interest, convenience, and necessity that your picture be shown, that will be ordered."

We could not be any fairer than we have been. As a matter of fact, the bill appeared to be absolutely acceptable. We sat down, as I said yesterday, and agreed that certain amendments should be made. The proposal to recommit is a last-minute move.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator means it was acceptable to the people with whom he was dealing.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Unfortunately the industry is spread out so broadly that he could not have heard from everyone or have them all in the committee room.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that, and I hope I did not leave the impression that I talked to every one of the 700 operators. However, the operators of these stations have an organization through which they deal with the Government on such questions as we have before us. Some have problems different from others. I suppose the CATV operators in the State of Florida would not be as excited about this measure as perhaps the CATV operators in a State where there is a real problem, such as the States of Wyoming and Idaho.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator means the Mountain States.

Mr. PASTORE. The Mountain States.

Mr. HOLLAND. And the sparsely settled States.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct. It is fair to assume that when one speaks with the president of an organization

or with members of its board of directors or its executive director or its lawyers, they more or less speak on behalf of the members of the organization, although I know they do not commit each and every one of them. I realize that. It would be impossible for me to talk to them all. However, many delegations have visited me in the intervening days, and whenever I could do so, I have talked with them. I have sat and talked with many CATV people. I have made it clear that we do not want to hurt any one, or put him out of business. This is a step in the right direction for all.

A measure of the kind before us must finally be passed—whether it be next month or the month after. It is inevitable. It must come because somewhere along the line someone will become indignant and say, "Such stations should be classified as common carriers."

We have provided specifically in the bill that such stations shall not be common carriers. Others think as does the Senator from Colorado, that they should get consent before taking a picture out of the air and selling it to someone else. We have provided specifically in the bill that that consent must not be required. We have taken care of that contingency in those situations.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me ask two questions to bring into the RECORD what I believe is a résumé of this question. Do I correctly understand that where there is no single local station, and only one which can be viewed with facility and with relative ease from a certain locality, this question does not apply as to any station's being in a position to file an application and to be given an order requiring its signal to be carried?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct. Anyone could object to anything, but I do not think such an objector would be entitled to an order.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that when there is no local station in the sense that there is no station which can be heard directly or viewed directly from the receiving area, the criterion likewise cannot apply in an injurious way?

Mr. PASTORE. This criterion does not apply.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment and I yield back such time as I may have remaining. I trust the Senator from Rhode Island will do likewise.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield whatever time I have, if I have any. If the amendment is withdrawn, all time is withdrawn.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and myself, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, but I do so with the condition that the Senator from Oklahoma does not lose his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island request that the time for the quorum call not come out of the time of either side?

Mr. PASTORE. I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I rise to support the motion of my colleague from Oklahoma and myself to recommit the bill S. 2653 to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish jurisdiction in the Federal Communications Commission over community antenna systems. The bill would extend the long arm of Federal regulation to all the community antenna systems which exist throughout the country and which have been responsible for expanding television service to about 2 million people who otherwise would not have it.

I believe Senators would be interested to know that out of the 768 CATV systems which are listed, the average system has 530 subscribers. We are talking about what I consider to be little business. We are talking about organizations which were founded by free enterprise, many by TV repairmen or dealers in television sets at the local level, or sometimes by an electrician. Many of the systems were built and many of the lines strung by the men who founded them.

It is interesting to note also, as the effort is made to extend Federal control to these systems, that CATV was born during the television freeze which existed from September 1948, until July 1952. It was because of the failure and inability of FCC to act and allocate any new television stations that CATV was born. It was born as a result of the initiative of the free enterprise system. It has grown as a part of the free enterprise system. It is television which serves more than 2 million people throughout the gray or snow areas, or areas where no television could be received.

We talk about people in the mountain areas. A few people may be hurt, it is true, by the existence of the competitive CATV system, but certainly let us not forget about the 2 million who have been served without Federal regulation by systems which will continue to expand and perhaps eventually serve as many as 4 million people.

This certainly seems to me to be a poor time, in the closing days of the session, for Congress to try to regulate this industry. I wish to make it absolutely clear to all Senators that I do not believe it would be possible for the committee to take further action on the bill if it were recommitted to the committee. In that regard, I concur with what the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Rhode Island, has said. However, I wish Senators to know that this is not a matter of urgency. To the contrary, I believe it is a matter of sufficient importance that we cannot afford to act without knowing what we are doing.

The very adoption of half a dozen amendments on the floor of the Senate, changing in many respects the action of the subcommittee, certainly should be convincing evidence that it is not a perfect bill, and that the last words on it have not been said with respect to the desirability of Federal regulation of this industry.

The opposition of the Senators who are fighting the bill and are moving to recommit it is not the result of any lobbying by any great high-pressure lobbyist. I believe I can speak for those who oppose the bill when I say that we rather like to have our constituents come to Washington when legislation of vital interest affecting them is being debated in Congress, and to go to work themselves in support of their position on it without paying huge sums of money to Washington lobbyists to get the job done for them. Certainly I compliment them on paying their way to Washington and working in their own behalf and letting Congress know what effect a bill like this will have on their industry. That is important.

Certainly I do not feel that the confusion which has resulted from some misdirected or misguided or misinformed efforts of attorneys to get them under Federal regulation, and who continue to urge them to accept Federal regulation, is to the benefit of the national association or meets with the approval of the majority of the members of the association. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has said that this is a widely dispersed association of little businessmen. Many of the presidents must repair their own lines. Certainly many of them must collect their own bills. They have little time to read and understand the intricate problems of legislation that might affect them, or to worry about whether they would be destroyed by booster bills or repeater bills or translator bills, or all these other things that are being brought up. They are trying to keep the service going, because most of them are two- or three-man operations.

Regardless of any question about all the amendments which were agreed to, the fact is that most of them were presented by the Washington attorney for the association. Many members of the association were telling me as long ago as last July, when I filed objections to the bill when it was reported, that the people in my State did not want it, that they thought it was destructive of this little business.

I have before me a letter from the president of the National Community Television Association, Inc., which I shall read into the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COMMUNITY TELEVISION ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1960.

The Honorable A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONRONEY: We have been asked to advise you of the official position of National Community Television Association, Inc., with respect to S. 2653. The NCTA does not support, and has not supported, S.

2653, as reported by the Communications Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Amendments which have been discussed, in our opinion, do not make the bill acceptable to the CATV indusrty, nor do we believe it to be in the public interest.

Respectfully,

A.J. MALIN, *President.*

Mr. President, I believe that ought to put at rest the question whether the position taken by its Washington representatives, who seem to have been so determined to impose Federal regulation on this little group of people, represents the present view of the industry.

I hope Senators will realize that the only proper way to handle the bill is to recommit it; that the amendments will not do it any good, because the broad issue presented to us is the question whether we must extend the long arm of Federal regulation, with all the expense involved, to require licensing of 768 small businesses in order to protect a very few who could be adversely affected by the existence of the CATV system.

What does the bill do? The bill requires licenses from the Federal Communications Commission to construct or operate a community antenna system. Today it is possible to construct a community antenna system wherever one wants to construct it, where he can find a need for it and where he can find people who are willing to put up the money to get some television service. It is necessary to sell them on the need. A contract must be written for the service. Many of these contracts must run for as long as 3 years in order to help pay for the building of the lines or the extension of the service.

If the bill shall be passed, whether there is a single television station in a community or not, the man cannot begin to solicit anybody to be subscribers to the line unless he first hires a Washington lawyer and comes up and sees if he can get a construction permit; and even then it is not quite clear. He does not know whether he will get a certificate of convenience and necessity to operate it.

So the first thing we do is require Federal licensing for the construction and extension of television service to the dark areas, because whether the cases affect a local station or not—and most of them do not—it is not possible to build a new CATV without the Federal Government giving the say-so. That is what the bill does first. It is necessary to have a license from the Federal Communications Commission to construct and operate.

Second, the bill gives the Federal Communications Commission the same authority over the community antenna system as it has in respect to the licensing of a radio or television broadcasting system.

Granted, it does grandfather in a station now operating. For how long? Three years. It is a kind of short-lived grandfather. Then the station must go through all the evidentiary hearings, and meet any protests, both from the licensee of the local TV station and anybody else, and prove to the Federal Communications Commission that it is entitled to a 3-year extension of its right to serve.

Let us assume the parties have built their line. They have put their money in it. Seven hundred and sixty-eight systems have been built with their own money. The bill puts in jeopardy their right to continue in business after 3 years. They are at the mercy of the Federal Communications Commission.

I do not think that is what we want to do with free enterprise, which starts with its own money, and then have the Government say, when it is highly successful, and is bringing television to hundreds of thousands who could not otherwise see it, that "You are dead in 3 years unless the FCC says you can go ahead and perform the service you have been willing to perform."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Does the Senator seriously believe that the Federal Communications Commission would kill off the CATV stations.

Mr. MONRONEY. We do not know. I do know that they are in jeopardy. I do know that when they go to the little banks, as most of them have to do, to borrow money for line extensions, as they like to do, the bankers will wonder whether they will be alive 3 years from then. It will have a very adverse effect on their effort to finance themselves.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is it the general policy of the Federal Communications Commission to kill off free enterprise, or does the Commission try to permit it to continue?

Mr. MONRONEY. I know they are in jeopardy, and I know the people fear the adverse effect of the bill on the operation of their service. After 3 years, they will have to return to Washington and have an evidentiary hearing and go through all the rate and licensing aspects. They cannot do that without employing distinguished Washington counsel. That will necessitate very great expense for one-, two-, or three-man operations.

I do not think a case has been proved, by any means, that it is worth doing so much to do something for the benefit of so few.

Mr. HAYDEN. It seems to me that when the Federal Communications Commission decides one case of this kind, a pattern will have been set for all such cases.

Mr. MONRONEY. I submit that we do not know what will happen. Certainly the record of the Federal Communications Commission, which is discussed very often in the committee of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, has not been one to which we point with the greatest of pride, when we think of the speeding up or the settling of cases. The record has been quite the reverse.

So 768 new clients will be coming to Washington every 3 years to justify what I think can be proved to be an almost negligible number of stations which will be adversely affected, and which can be taken care of in the industry.

Mr. HAYDEN. There happens to be one in my State. The owners have spent their own money. They have built it up to a paying business. I refer to a station KIVA–TV in Yuma, Ariz. It serves that community and the surrounding area. If the new type of television facility is provided, and takes the cream of that station's business—takes its advertising away from it, what will it mean? It will mean that the people living in the city of Yuma can, by hooking up to a wire, get the CATV programs. But farmers living in other parts of Yuma County will be completely blacked out if station KIVA–TV cannot make money enough to enable it to remain in operation in Yuma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad the Senator mentioned Yuma, because it has been mentioned so often on the floor. Many Senators might have believed that a CATV facility existed in Yuma. There is no such facility in Yuma. The radio and television station does not have any adverse effect, because there is no CATV system there.

Mr. Butcher, who owns the station, and who is a great friend of Mr. Eisenhower, has established national headquarters in an effort to fight for the passage of the bill and to prevent a CATV station from ever threatening the competition of bringing Los Angeles stations to the good people of Yuma or to the people living in other parts of Arizona, so that they might have the choice, not of one station, but of three or more stations. I do not believe that is wrong, under the American system. I do not think we are here to expand the Federal Communications Act. It never was intended to guarantee economic protection.

The only test for the granting of a license for a television or a radio station, in the long history of the Federal Communications Act, has been, Is there a frequency available which will not interfere with the frequency assigned to someone else? A hundred television stations could be established if frequencies were available for them. If there is a radio station in Yuma, six stations could be put in if frequencies could be found for them. But we have never contemplated granting economic protection to licensees until this bill was introduced. We are breaking entirely new ground, which will extend in the future to such a point that other people will want to install television in an area, and it will be necessary to provide economic protection for the local single station. I do not think such a policy has ever been established.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not true that in the whole history of the Federal Communications Commission the Commission has never refused to renew a license for either radio or television?

Mr. MONRONEY. I suppose that is probably correct. But it does not help with the bankers for a small CATV station, or those who may wish to buy stock in it, or the owner who wishes to expand and take into his range a thousand new

people on the edge of town. This is a fact of life. It is a pioneering effort.

It does not help to say they have never done so, so that we can put them in this license position, and expect that the Federal Communications Commission will automatically rubberstamp it through.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not true that in a great number of cases the operator of a television station is protected from competition because not more than one or two stations can be licensed in any area? On the other hand, does not the bill undertake to provide that except under certain conditions not even an aerial can be erected to pick up the signals which are all around the area?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Louisiana is correct. The bill is rather discriminating, in a way.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course it does not do that. There is nothing discriminatory in the bill. I challenge any Senator to point to any language which holds that an aerial cannot be erected. Of course an aerial can be erected.

Mr. MONRONEY. Not if there are more than 50 connections.

Mr. PASTORE. No. Anyone who erects an aerial, picks a signal from the air, and transmits it a long distance, moves into a locality, and through the instrument of wires and cables into someone's house, and charges a fee for the service, should be under Federal control.

Mr. MONRONEY. Why?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Suppose the owner of an apartment house having 500 apartments erects an aerial and lets every tenant connect to the aerial. Then suppose some other person erects an aerial of a similar height and connects it to 50 homes. What is the difference?

Mr. MONRONEY. The man who erects a master antenna on a huge apartment house is exempt, while the man who seeks to bring television out into the country by means of a central antenna system to more than 50 subscribers, at a fee of $1 or $2 a month for the master antenna system, which will bring in 3 or 4 stations, must obtain a license.

But the country people may be worse off. It may be necessary to have a microwave to get the signal through to them. In order to transmit a signal to them, it is then necessary for the operator to be licensed by the FCC, because his system broadcasts a radio signal. But these people do not put out a signal. They put nothing in the air.

Again, the bill would stretch the application of the Federal Communications Act far beyond anything to which it has ever been interpreted as applying.

It is said that a CATV is not a common carrier; and I thank the chairman for his consideration of this group, by writing that provision into the bill.

The only others who are regulated are the television and the radio broadcasting stations. But they are putting signals into the air.

All that the CATV people do is stick a pole high into the air, take out of the air a signal that is in it, amplify the signal, and pipe it through cables to people who are willing to pay $5 or $6 a month to have the benefit of receiving the signals of a number of television stations.

Where a local television station is already in existence, no certificate of convenience and necessity will be issued, because consideration will have to be given, under the bill, to facilitating the operation of the local station. The area might be a good one. Perhaps most of those who would be prepared to operate a television station would be smart enough not to establish one in an area which had a small population. But if a television station were established in a city with a population of 300,000, and if that were the only station there, I doubt very seriously whether, under the pending bill, it would be possible for a CATV to obtain a license to bring in the signals of the other networks.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the bill violate the principle that the airways are free and are available to everyone?

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not think it does. But it violates the principle of not having Federal regulation of cable transmission.

Let me state the best illustration: All of us know that the mightiest force in television, which controls 90 percent of all television programs received by viewers in the United States, are the networks. They are not subject to regulation, and very few Members of Congress would want them to be regulated. Why? Because the concept of the Federal Communications Act is that the networks themselves are not putting anything on the air. They use cables to carry the signals to the local stations. So they are not regulated.

So we do not regulate—and I do not think we should—the mighty giant of television which supplies the television diet of 50 million television sets by carrying the television program signals by cable to the viewers.

But if the quite similar CATV systems are to be regulated by means of this bill, we shall be establishing a precedent; and in that event I do not see how we can properly regulate the smallest midget in the industry, but fail to give some consideration to regulating the mighty networks which are carrying signals by means of a similar system, and also without using the airways.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the bill provide that a community antenna system cannot carry the same program that is being carried over a local station at the same time?

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to discuss that point.

Fifty-two CATV systems are today operating in cities in which there is a local television station. By means of this bill, those CATV people will be required not to duplicate a program which will be run later. In that event, all 52 of those CATV's will have to employ administrative personnel, who will have to compare schedules, and the CATV's will have to hire engineers, so they can switch back and forth, to be sure they are not putting out on this Friday a signal that will be put out by the local station next Friday. So those 52 CATV's will have to more than double their personnel, in order to protect the local stations.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not know too much about how these antennas operate. But presently is it necessary for someone to stay there, to control the antenna all the time?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am reliably informed that most of them are completely automatic. They are beamed to a certain group of stations which they can reach; and they amplify the signals. They do not have to be attended. Their concern is only with possible line breaks. They do not have to turn on or turn off any signals or stations, because they do not originate anything and they do not add anything.

From the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, I have learned that in some cases the CATV's are sufficiently manned to be able to monitor, as a public-relations service, so they will not duplicate a program which later on will be shown by the local television station.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. A pending case involves both the city of Casper and the city of Rawlins. The CATV can bring in four channels from Denver, but it releases in the community only three. That gives the CATV a choice of the programs it will release; and under the system that is used, an engineer of the CATV has the opportunity to make that decision. The CATV carried three of the Denver stations, but did not carry the fourth one, KSPR; and it went out of business.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thought it was a UHF.

Mr. McGEE. No; it was a live TV station—Station KSPR. So it went out of business. The testimony was that they could not get the signal on the local cable, but they could get the signals of the stations that remained in business. That point became a bone of contention. The CATV already had sufficient engineering staff to choose the signals for its pattern. I think that raises a question of how much additional overhead there will have to be, and I think this probably will be the pattern for most of the CATV's.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think it can be worked out. I think there is a desire on the part of most of CATV systems to cooperate, and I do not think it is necessary to have Federal regulation in order to take care of the very few stations which are affected.

Mr. McGEE. I merely was attempting to refer to the question of overhead.

Mr. MONRONEY. The problem of additional overhead will affect 52 of them, if they are required not to produce a program which will be produced later on by the local station.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Then is it correct to state that in a great many cases the operating costs will be substantially increased, if the proposed regulations go into effect?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; for the 52 stations.

Furthermore, now we have to consider a new amendment; under the bill, as now amended, when people wish to receive by television the world's series games on the days when they are played, or wish to receive by television the Oklahoma-Notre Dame football game or the wedding of Princess Margaret, if the intention is to receive those programs as news items, the CATV must be sure to handle those events on the days when they occur. But in the case of the "I Love Lucy" program or the "Gunsmoke" program, the CATV must not duplicate a later television showing by the local station; that will be required by this bill. Therefore, there will also have to be monitoring of the program, in order to decide what is current news, according to the interpretation given by the Senator from Connecticut, and what is an entertainment program.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So, first of all, the bill will increase the operating costs of many of the CATV's; second, the bill will to a certain degree impede their operation; and, third, the bill will require the CATV's to hire Washington lawyers and pay them substantial legal fees, although presently the CATV's do not have to pay such fees?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. In fact, I think the pending bill is a full-employment bill for the members of the Washington bar who are in the television field.

In fact, I do not believe the bill will be of any particular advantage to even the small stations, except that it will prevent the expansion of CATV's. Many a man living in a small community might be inclined to establish a CATV. But if this bill were enacted into law, he would say, "Oh, all this Federal regulation is too complicated. So to heck with it. It would be easier to build my own antenna system, rather than take the time to go to see all those Washington officials, and fill out all the required papers, and abide by all those regulations."

But the point is that we want more CATV's, not less. Yet this bill would throttle the existing systems and stations.

On yesterday, I asked why the bill is not made to apply, to only the communities in which are located the 52 stations which are affected.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. A while ago the Senator referred to the possibility of establishing a precedent for more or less assuring or guaranteeing financial success in connection with the operation—as I understood the Senator from Oklahoma—of the local television stations.

Did I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to have the Senator give his interpretation of three provisions of the bill which are all related and which refer to the same subject matter. We begin with subsection (d) on page 4, wherein it states:

Either prior to or within thirty days after the grant of an application for a license or a renewal thereof for a community antenna television system which was in operation on the date of the enactment of this section, the licensee of a television station assigned to a community in which such community antenna television system serves subscribers may—

This is what the television station operator may do within 30 days after the grant of an application for a license—

petition the Commission to include in such license such conditions—

This is the local TV operator or owner. It is stated that if a license is granted to this community antenna television system, certain conditions are going to be imposed. Conditions for what?—

such conditions on the community antenna television system's operation as will significantly facilitate the continued operation of a television system which is providing the only available locally originated television broadcast program service.

If that is true, and if such a petition were made, would the Commission be able to grant, or could it grant, a license to operate under conditions that would not facilitate the continued operation of the station?

Mr. MONRONEY. An economic test is imposed. The whole matter is put in jeopardy, because if the Senator has been through, as I am sure the Senator has, ratemaking cases and procedures of that kind, he knows the local television operator would be able to bring in his books. He can plead he is going to be damaged, such as Mr. Butcher is pleading in Yuma. The people that have TV stations can raise as much of a cry as Mr. Butcher is raising with reference to getting this bill passed to avoid future competition. I do not think the Commission will get through with the granting of a single grandfather license if such extreme language is put in the law as "will significantly facilitate the continued operation of a television station."

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, if the licensing of an antenna system would detract from profits being made by a television station operator, would that not be a significant situation that might facilitate against the continuation of the station?

Mr. MONRONEY. As a matter of fact, CBS, which knows a lot about the market necessary to support a television station, will not take an affiliate in a town of less than 50,000. NBC declined to connect with a station on the basis that the market was too small. In other words, the stations that are in trouble are going to be in trouble regardless of what is done, because most of them serve areas so small that there is no advertising market for the network to seek it out, and they have to operate without network revenues and without very much local advertising. I do not think there is a single one of those stations that could not come before the Commission and say, "We cannot exist, because we are already in trouble, and this will make it worse."

Mr. McCLELLAN. The meaning of the word "facilitate," as I understand it, is to make easy or less difficult; to free from difficulty or impediment. In other words, it is to facilitate the execution of a task; to lessen the labor of; to assist; aid.

In other words, the station owner could petition the Federal Communications Commission to impose conditions that will facilitate, that will aid, that will remove any difficulty, that will remove any encumbrance or hindrance to the continued operation of that station.

Mr. MONRONEY. Which would mean limiting competition, which this bill is designed to do, from newly constructed CATV's.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not saying for the moment it is not a good thing. I am trying to find out what the bill does do.

Further on, if I had a station I could petition the Federal Communications Commission to impose conditions which would significantly facilitate my continuing to operate my television station. I assume the Commission is supposed to grant it, if there is such a petition, because in subsection (e), on page 6, it provides:

Findings by the Commission as to the effect upon the public interest, convenience, and necessity of the grant of an application or renewal * * * shall be made with due regard for the desirability—

Set out in the preceding section—

of facilitating the continued operation of a television station.

In other words, that is the paramount consideration the Commission must give in the granting of every license. Is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let us turn to subsection (g) on the following page, and I read the concluding sentence in that subsection:

In promulgating such rules and regulations the Commission shall be guided by the standards set forth in subsection (e)—

To which I have referred; that is, the Commission must take that into consideration, and must do it on the condition that it will facilitate the continuation of a local TV station.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, the rules the Commission promulgates must be promulgated to achieve that purpose. That is the proposed law we are considering. I am not saying it is not a good thing, but I think we ought to know what it does. This provision sets up a TV station in a position of preferred consideration, and in a position of preferred consideration in competition with another station.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator.

With all this trouble, let us get this one thing clearly in mind. On page 1090 of part 2 of the hearings, copies of which are on each Senator's desk, there is a table listing 43 communities where community antenna systems and television stations are co-located.

As of that date, 11 of those community antenna systems out of the 43, in localities which would be affected by the bill, did not carry local stations. I am advised that 9 of those 11 do so now. Since the date of the information nine more CATV systems have been installed in communities with local stations. I am advised all of them now carry the local stations. So here is this gigantic problem which demands Federal regulation. Thus, out of 52 CATV systems, only 2 CATV systems do not carry the local broadcasts.

Mr. CLARK and Mr. McGEE addressed the Chair.

Mr. MONRONEY. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, but I would prefer that he be brief.

Mr. McGEE. Would the Senator prefer to wait until he has completed his statement?

Mr. MONRONEY. No; I shall be happy to yield; but I would prefer that the Senator be brief. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] spoke to me previously.

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to defer to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Just so I may ask whether Wilkes-Barre, Pa., is not one of the two. I refer to page 1090 of part II of the hearings. I understand the Wilkes-Barre CATV did not receive the local station signals, and it does not yet. I wonder if the Senator knows.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not have the modern list. This was checked only last night by those who are most familiar with it. I am advised that it does now receive it.

Mr. CLARK. It does now, or does not?

Mr. MONRONEY. It does now receive it.

Mr. CLARK. My information is to the contrary.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield to my distinguished colleague and friend the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE].

Mr. McGEE. First I should like to ask the Senator a question about the number of CATV systems. How many of those systems are beyond the application of this particular bill?

Mr. MONRONEY. All of the systems which I have described would be under the bill. One hundred sixteen systems have 300 or less subscribers; 452 systems have between 300 and 1,000 subscribers; 200 systems have over 1,000 subscribers. They all would come under the bill. Only those systems having 50 or less subscribers are not covered. Those are usually more or less the cooperative stations, where a small community works out the problem. It would be hard for a system to exist on fewer than 50 subscribers.

Mr. McGEE. I raised the question because I had some confusion in my own mind. In our hearings, as the Senator will recall, an attorney for the association, who now stands in rather bad light in the Senator's cause, testified that in his judgment perhaps 200 or more of the systems would fall in the 50 or less class.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sure there are a lot more. We have always admitted that there are some we do not even know about. There are a number of such systems in San Diego and Beverly Hills, Calif., and Seattle, Wash., which are purely bigtown, neighborhood services, where the terrain makes it impossible to get good TV reception.

Mr. McGEE. Does the Senator know whether any of those happen to be apartment house operations?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would not believe that these would include any such operations. The apartment houses would be exempt, as the Senator knows, even though they might have 1,000 outlets and might be charging $2 or $3 a month for the master antenna service. The apartment houses are exempted completely and totally by the provisions of the bill.

Mr. McGEE. I was speaking in terms of those systems the Senator was explaining.

Mr. MONRONEY. These are the community antenna systems. The apartment house systems are not classified in the same group.

Mr. McGEE. I have one other question, on a point which has been raised. The question involves the effect of the proposed legislation on the future plans of CATV systems. Is the Senator aware of any effect this may have had upon the booster systems. The Senator joined me and our colleagues in passing booster station legislation a few months ago, which legislation required licensing by the FCC.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think those stations were already operating and that we gave them a certain amount of time in which they could continue to operate without a license, until they could meet the technical standards of emanating a proper signal which would not interfere with other broadcasts. I do not think there was a certificate of convenience and necessity involved, but I think it was a matter of putting a proper signal in the air waves.

These are two different things. I supported the Senator in that regard. A lot of this trouble, as the Senator well knows, in regard to complaints by small television stations, originated on the booster situation. The CATV group was kind of a "Johnny come lately" as a whipping boy.

I think there was a problem. I think the legislation we passed was good legislation, providing for standards, so that a wave going into the air would not "mess up" all the other waves or would not interfere with aerial navigation, and things such as that. Since those stations emanate a signal, certainly they are entitled to be held to some kind of a Federal standard. CATV does not emanate any signal. It puts nothing in the air. The CATV systems merely pull out of the air what is going through the air and put it on a cable and run it into a man's home, if he is willing to buy it.

Mr. McGEE. Part of the point is the fact that the booster people welcome regulation. They welcome licensing. So far as we have been able to observe, at least in our area, this has not discouraged any of these men at the present time, for they are still petitioning for the right to be licensed and to go into business. I question that this action will restrain the CATV people.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sure it will, particularly in regard to new CATV systems.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will yield to the Senator from Louisiana. I want to yield some time to my distinguished colleagues, and I want to reserve some time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Referring to this section the distinguished Senator from Arkansas pointed out, Does the Senator from Oklahoma know of any other situation in United States law where the requirement is made that a person in business must operate his business in such a way as to facilitate the success of his competitor?

Mr. MONRONEY. No. That certainly has never been true under the Federal Communications Commission in history. A person could put 10 radio stations in a community of 1,000 people, if somebody were crazy enough to do it. The FCC does not care a bit about that, because there is no economic test for broadcast stations or television stations. However, it is sought to put an economic restriction in the bill, to provide that one must facilitate the operation of TV stations.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is there anything in the bill to assure that the television stations will continue to operate in such a way as to facilitate the continued existence of the community antenna systems?

Mr. MONRONEY. Indeed not.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would it not seem that what is sauce for the goose ought to be sauce for the gander? If we are going to do it one way for one fellow, the other fellow ought to get the same consideration.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Louisiana has made a very good point. As the Senator said earlier, it is like passing a law——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. To protect garfish from the white trout.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. President, I will yield the floor and reserve some time for myself.

Mr. KEATING rose.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York, and I will yield more time if he wishes to have more time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, 2 minutes will be sufficient.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this is a measure which is of considerable interest to a great many New Yorkers who are today beneficiaries of various community antenna television systems. They are concerned that the provisions of the bill before us would stifle a young and growing industry which is providing a unique and valuable service to thousands of people in New York State.

Mr. President, some remarks were made a few minutes ago about this not being of any interest in New York City.

I think perhaps that is true, but there is a very large area of New York State which serves "country people," as the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has called them. These are the people who receive the benefit from these stations.

There are at least 35 community antenna systems now operating in my State. They serve some 36,000 subscribers who, as I understand it, would not otherwise receive any television programs. It is, therefore, vital that any step which might impair this valuable service be very carefully considered.

The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has worked hard and is to be commended for the very fine manner in which he has handled the bill and conducted the extensive hearings. However, on the basis of the correspondence I have received, and my meetings with various delegations concerned with this problem, I have grave doubts that S. 2653 represents sound legislation in this field. I am gratified to learn that community-TV operators are willing to be licensed by the Federal Communications Commission. That is only proper, since they are an integral part of the television industry in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 more minute?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for an additional minute.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I agree with those who have contacted me that the bill before us is drafted in a manner which may cause undue harm to this industry. I regret that no amendments appear in sight which might make this proposed legislation acceptable.

I therefore shall support the motion of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma to recommit the bill for further study, in the light of these objections which have been raised. I think regulatory legislation is justified and needed and should be welcomed by all parties. However, this bill is not the proper vehicle, and I therefore oppose it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional minute yielded to the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me a half minute more?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 1 more minute.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, an impressive array of telegrams and letters have indicated clearly to me the views of many of my constituents on this bill. I have received a great many from people in the community TV industry, from chambers of commerce, from mayors and other community officials, and from interested citizens. I ask unanimous consent that the texts of seven of these telegrams in opposition to the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HORNELL, N.Y., *May 14, 1960.*
Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As mayor of the city of Hornell I strongly urge the defeat of the provision to amend the Communication Act, S. 2653. Certain provisions of S. 2653 make this bill discriminatory in that it protects the large TV station industry at the expense of the smaller CATV industry. First: By making the CATV obtain permission from the TV stations to carry their programs. If the TV stations have property rights in their programs, then they have access to the courts in this matter and do not need the bill. If they do not, then this bill will impose an unwarranted hardship on the CATV industry. Secondly: The bill makes the FCC the judge and jury on the economic impact the CATV systems have on the local (if any) TV stations and could cause the CATV systems to delete certain conflicting or repeated programs from their systems if carried by the local station. This is almost impossible to do mechanically except at great expense to the CATV system, which would have to be passed on to the viewing public. Also, this would be in direct opposition of free enterprise. The CATV industry agrees that certain regulations contained in the bill are feasible and workable. They have stated that they would welcome FCC control and have tried to amend this bill to make it workable. But the bill in its present form would cause a great many CATV systems to close up, causing the subscribers and investors in the SE systems to lose their investment and their right to receive more than one channel or network (Hornell now gives 7 channels). Cable systems in our neighboring towns of Bath, Addison, Canisteo, Avoca, Andover, Wellsville, Dansville, Whitesville, Alfred, Arkport, and many others would probably have to give up doing business.

FRANK F. WOLFANGER,
Mayor.

CANISTEO, N.Y., *May 13, 1960.*
Hon. KENNETH KEATING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As a representative of the people of this village I am very much opposed to the CATV bill, S. 2653, now before the Senate. I feel that this bill in the present form will seriously jeopardize television reception in this valley. I am definitely against the part that requires our system to secure permission from TV stations before their programs can be carried. Please vote against this bill. I feel it favors the large networks at the expense of the public now being served by cable systems.

ERNEST G. MATTHEWS,
Mayor.

LAKE PLACID, N.Y., *May 14, 1960.*
Senator KENNETH B. KEATING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Sincerely recommend defeat of S. 2653, which represents an effort to create monopolistic control of retransmission of television signals and is directly contrary to our traditional concept of free enterprise.

R. J. PEACOCK,
Mayor.

SARANAC LAKE, N.Y., *May 14, 1960.*
Senator KENNETH B. KEATING,
Washington, D.C.:

We can only see that the type of regulation as provided in Senate bill 2653 will cause nothing but additional and wholly unnecessary costs to both the Government and the public and will not do a thing to improve television reception.

FRANCIS RATIGAN,
Mayor.

LAKE PLACID, N.Y., *May 16, 1960.*
Senator KENNETH KEATING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please vote against bill S. 2653 as I feel it could deprive a community of better television reception and broader television coverage.

VERNON LAMB, Jr.,
President, Lake Placid Chamber of Commerce.

CANISTEO, N.Y., *May 13, 1960.*
Hon. KENNETH KEATING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We understand there was a bill introduced May 11, 1960, namely, CATV S. 2653, which is to be voted on the first of the week. As the people in our community depend solely upon a master antenna system for television reception we are definitely opposed to the passage of this bill. Please vote no on this proposition.

FRED SCHNURLE,
President, Canisteo Chamber of Commerce.

HORNELL, N.Y., *May 13, 1960.*
Hon. KENNETH KEATING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

National Community Television Association has notified this association that Senator MONRONEY will move adoption of resolution to resubmit Senate bill 2653 to committee for reconsideration. New York Community TV Association consisting of 35 companies representing an investment in this State of several million dollars and serving 36,000 subscribers in 42 communities of this State strongly urges you on behalf of over 150,000 viewers to approve Senator MONRONEY's resolution, or, if the bill is presented, the complete defeat of Senate bill 2653.

JACK E. PRYOR,
President, New York State Television Association.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am grateful to my friend from Oklahoma for yielding the time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I understand that the opponents of the motion to recommit are prepared to use some of their time. We would like to reserve the remainder of our time until they have discussed it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma may reserve the remainder of his time.

Mr. McGEE obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Wyoming desire?

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming is very uncertain as to his expectations. It depends upon whether he is carried away with himself. I think perhaps 15 or 20 minutes would be adequate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How much time does the Senator from Wyoming wish?

Mr. McGEE. The Senator is very reluctant to make a commitment unless it has an open end.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield at least 20 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, we have been receiving a liberal education in human relations and personalities in the past few days, and rather than recount at this very late hour of these long debates what has transpired, and rather than try to pull together all of the loose ends, I should like to address myself to what I consider has emerged as the central question on this bill. It is the question which was raised by both of the Senators from Oklahoma. One of them asked, "Why regulate so many people to benefit so few?" The other asked, "Why do we interfere with so many in order to try to correct the grievance of but a handful?"

For that reason I believe it is important that we bear in mind what it is we are talking about in the industry.

The communications industry, as it pertains to the airways, has become a matter of deep concern for all of us because of its tremendous potential, power, and control. Because of that power, we enacted the Communications Act of 1934, which reserved to the people of the United States control of the airways. This was public property that was in turn to be licensed to those who were willing to use it responsibly under certain conditions. First, radio was brought under regulation, then TV, and as the TV industry developed and perfected its techniques, along came TV boosters, as they are called. TV boosters posed new problems which had not been anticipated before, but legislation was enacted last year which placed TV boosters under the jurisdiction of FCC.

In the meantime, there have developed the community antenna television systems, or the cable systems, as it is more properly described. This is as integral a part of this phase of the industry as the others in terms of the service it renders.

I am mindful of the technical differences between picking a signal out of the air and originating one, but the impact is the same, and this is an inseparable part of the TV projection and power in our country at the present time. Yet this is the one segment which remains outside the regulatory powers of the State. The purpose of this committee, I think in all fairness, ought to be made clear.

We simply seek an orderly and constructive development of the television industry in this country in the public interest. That is our only concern. The report again and again shows that we did not design to help someone to make a different profit from someone else, and that we were not trying to interfere with the free enterprise system per se. Our primary concern was with the public interest, and it is the public interest that becomes the first criterion in the calculation or the values which we place on the elements involved in this debate at this moment.

What has happened? With one segment of the industry still not under the same rules that apply to the others, we find arising a set of circumstances which produce confusion and, in some instances, has even produced violence and threats of violence.

Let me spell that out. Not only does the industry regulate its total picture except for the community antenna system, but also it has produced in the West—and I suppose it is appropriate that it has happened in the West—a series of frontier brawls that would do credit to any of the high-powered shows on TV today.

I think for a moment of the city of Sheridan, Wyo., where because of the open conflict between the TV business and the cable interests in Sheridan there was window peeping, there were spies, and there were attempts to tap information up the stairways of radio stations. The situation had cloak and dagger aspects that Los Angeles and New York have never thought to invent on the Saturday night late shows. Yet this was because we were dealing with a segment of the industry that had some semblance of regulation or was willing to go under regulation, and another part which has sought to remain outside the category of regulation.

In the city of Riverton, in the State of Wyoming, there were detecting devices which located large instruments on or about the projection tower of the booster station which jammed the station. We had another spy drama that completely distorted the community life in terms of prejudice, bias, heated arguments, and the passions which go along with the kind of heat generated on a local basis.

In the city of Thermopolis we had the story of high-powered rifles being employed to control the activities of one group which came under the jurisdiction of the FCC at the expense of the other group, which was not willing to come under that jurisdiction.

Finally, perhaps most recently I submit this story, and I suggest that while the setting is appropriately in the West and perhaps smacking a bit of the old frontier, it is not confined to the Far West, at least.

I have in my hand a letter which describes a similar kind of incident which did not occur in the Western United States. I wish the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] were present to listen to this fascinating story from his own State. This comes appropriately from the city of West Lebanon. I suppose that city is in the western part of New Hampshire. The paragraph I read is from a local broadcaster:

> Some time ago I built a small booster station which operates on channel 12 creating no interference whatsoever, which is very popular with the TV viewers. As of two weeks ago this little station has been consistently jammed. I think the FCC should legalize booster operations immediately and jamming should be outlawed. I believe that I could provide a better TV service to the viewers in this area by the use of a booster station operation with power of 1 watt, free of charge to the viewers, than they are now paying for to get by CATV.

He goes on to explain that he has evidence to submit that the jamming was contributed by the local cable company.

Mr. President, do not misinterpret what I have said. I do not believe that practice represents the policy of all cable operators. I do not think this is the accepted tactic of CATV operators. I say only that when we consider a business which is as highly competitive as this industry has become, in which the economic stakes are so great that open lawlessness and near violence are invited, in an attempt to capture a TV market, there is greater reason for the inclusion of all segments of the industry under the same rules, with the same referee, in the interest of stability and the growth of the industry.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe the Senator is describing cases which are mostly booster cases, and some rivalry between CATV systems and booster stations. I believe it should be made clear to the Senate that this bill does nothing to protect or guarantee booster stations in any way. Legislation which the Senate has already passed does that.

Mr. McGEE. Yes. My point is that the booster is a projection of a live broadcast, and in the competition for a market there has been the temptation to resort to these devices. It is petty to listen to, but it does suggest the kind of confusion and chaos which comes out of this if part of the industry is left to play under one set of rules—which means no rules—and the other part is restrained by another set of rules under regulation by the FCC.

In the interest of community stability and law and order in the competition for this kind of market, it seems to me that the rules ought to apply to all those concerned with the same market.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator explain to me how he believes requiring CATV groups to be licensed by the FCC would eliminate the conditions which he has been describing?

Mr. McGEE. In the first place, the FCC, as I understand, would regulate conditions under which they would operate if a booster were locally adopted. That booster station itself would then be subject to FCC jurisdiction, because of the authority to test and to act in defense of the booster. They are not under regulation. Legislation is pending which we in the Senate have authorized for licensing them. If we placed the CATV under the same regulation we would have the same referee calling the tune on the same participants, or competitors for the same market.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield further.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator believe that the local conditions of disorder which he has described would be effectively curbed by the FCC in Washington as a result of licensing, or does he believe that registration would elim-

inate the economic conflict and therefore it would automatically take place?

Mr. McGEE. The FCC, it seems to me, would be in the position to regulate it. This would depend on the FCC. Between radio stations, where this kind of thing has arisen, the FCC has moved in.

Mr. CLARK. I have received from my State some complaints against the bill, indicating that it would impose very difficult screening duties on CATV in order to eliminate duplication which might come from several different stations. I wonder whether the Senator would care to comment on that point.

Mr. McGEE. Yes. The answer is self-evident. We have as cases in point two stations in my own State, one in Rawlins and the other in Casper, in which cable systems now have the capacity to select channels, which they are already doing. They are carrying one channel at Casper and refuse to carry the other. They have the power to make the selection from channels broadcast through Denver, in this instance.

Mr. CLARK. Therefore, the Senator believes the passage of the bill would legitimately require CATV to hire whatever personnel is necessary to assure that there should be no duplication in connection with the programs of a local station in one place and perhaps the programs of a network in another place?

Mr. McGEE. In those cases where it should be ruled by the FCC in the public interest, convenience, and necessity that this be done in specific cases. This would not be the rule. This would be a particular case. I wished particularly to call attention to the kind of situation that results from a half regulated and half unregulated industry, with both trying to operate side by side.

I have suggested two things. First, that the industry should be guided by the same set of rules. All of it is, except this important segment, the cable system. Secondly, I have pointed out that, because of the competition for this market, there is a considerable state of confusion and some near violence.

I should like to proceed now to a third consideration, to try to keep this picture in its total value. In addition, we have heard referred to on the floor of the Senate again and again the cases of second-class TV citizens in these mountain areas. The basic purpose in our calculations for providing public interest, convenience, and necessity is to make sure that every American has the privilege of choosing free TV. He should also have the privilege of paying for pay TV. There are many things to be said for the multiplicity of channels which the cable systems make available. However, no citizen ought to be forced to go without TV because of the existence of a cable system that already jeopardizes the economic role of selected stations that has been referred to in this discussion. That is the third aspect of the overall effect and for the need, it seems to me, for uniform regulatory power on the part of the FCC.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator, who has distinguished relatives in my State.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, if the bill is to pass, why would it not be desirable to approach this regulation on the basis of providing that the operation of the community antenna system should not be in such a manner that would substantially impede or hazard the continuous operation of a TV station, rather than approach it on the basis of conditions that would be imposed under which it would significantly facilitate the continued operation of the local TV station? As long as the community antenna system provides no substantial hardship on the local station, the local station should not be in a position of demanding more. It seems to me it is demanding too much to demand that it should facilitate the operation of this business. It seems to me that what I have suggested would be enough.

Mr. McGEE. The FCC would use that as one of the standards for weighing the relationship between the two. In the colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee a little earlier this afternoon, he pointed out that the initiative would still have to come from the broadcaster, who would have to initiate the complaint, and that would be referred to the Commission. Therefore, in the few instances where this would represent a case of a clash of interest, the initiative would come from the broadcaster, and still would not place any undue burden on the system.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am referring to page 4 of the bill, at line 21, where it provides:

> A television station * * * may petition the Commission to include in such license such conditions on the community antenna television system's operation as will significantly facilitate the continued operation of a television station which is providing the only available locally originated television broadcast program service.

The thought that occurs to me is that it would seem to go far enough to say that the community antenna system should not impose any undue injury or hardship on the television station. However, to say that it could be required to operate in a manner to facilitate the continued operation of the competitor and system in his business, is too much to ask.

Mr. McGEE. I see the Senator's point. If I remember the legislative background, it was to insure that it did not in the first place indulge in pettiness. The "significantly" referred to the economic survival of the station in a one-station community which depended on this station to surround the area through dependence on boosters. I think it encompasses the complete position of the committee on that one point.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As the law stands today there is nothing in the law by which the FCC can prevent one television station from driving another one out of business. I have seen that happen in my State, where a VHF station came into a community which had a UHF station, by providing a better signal and better programs.

Mr. McGEE. That is a little different. I should like to read the language which the Commission itself uses, when it says that this situation gives rise to an "inequitable competitive disadvantage which the local station is unable to overcome by any reasonable means within its control." That is what they are trying to guard against.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator made the point that in his State an antenna system would not carry the program of a local station. It seems to me, on those facts, that the system should be required to carry the program.

Mr. McGEE. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But to go beyond this and say that they would have to operate the facility in such fashion as to help their competitor, rather than injure him——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 10 additional minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. I think the explanation of that, I may say to the Senator from Louisiana, is that the way in which they are competing, in which they pull a signal out of the air, a signal for which they pay nothing, and which they sell, is an unfair attribute, competitively, in connection with the live station, which has a limited market to begin with, and has to sell advertising in the community. In most cases, the community has only one signal, and that signal is in competition with a multisignal device which has no overhead expense so far as the maintenance of its system is concerned.

It is to enable the making of that system more competitive for economic purposes, rather than to try to assist what we have called the little people of the West, the valley people and the mountain people, which is one of the very basic reasons for the proposed legislation, but it is only one.

In an industry as vital to the public interest, convenience, and necessity as television, it seems completely wrong to lift this significant segment outside the rules of the game because of competitive factors and the discrepancy in those factors, which were discussed with the Senator from Louisiana.

I should like, for a moment, to address myself to the kind of burdens which it is claimed will rest on the community antenna television system. In the first place, CATV systems will be put to virtually no expense except in the cases where they will be required to carry the local signal. This theoretically will cut down the one extra channel they might have offered.

Second, it will require that they file applications for licensing purposes. I am not very much impressed with the suggestion that CATV people will be broken by the burdens of the cost of counsel.

I can recall vividly, and even better can the chairman of my subcommittee recall, that during the compilation of the thousands of pages of hearings, every single CATV witness, at the sessions I attended, was accompanied by counsel. In fact, in my State of Wyoming, in Casper, every lawyer who appeared happened to be a fine Democratic lawyer. I did not know there were that many Democratic lawyers in the State of Wyoming. But every one who testified for a free CATV system in the State was a Democrat. I do not know whether that was a coincidence, because I happened to be presiding at the time, but the CATV operators had counsel. Furthermore, they had counsel in Washington. In fact, they have had so much counseling that I am inclined to believe they are not certain as to what they believe themselves. They have not been without counsel. That has produced their confusion.

I fail to believe that the requirement of counsel before the Federal Communications Commission will break any of the CATV people or put them out of business on that basis.

Let us consider the other group in our State. That is the group which depends upon booster systems. They came before our committee. They came all the way to Washington without counsel. Cowboys, miners, and ranchers testified before the committee. They described how they climbed up the mountainsides on their hands and knees to put up boosters. They did not have the expert counsel of lawyers or engineers. They received no pay. They charge nothing for the signal they deliver. Yet they are willing to come under the regulation of the FCC. They believe the purpose of the bill is desirable, and that they will not go out of business. They do not believe they will be bankrupted.

Therefore, I believe the whole argument of the cost of employing counsel in Washington for the CATV system is a completely spurious one. I think it has no real bearing on the issue, as I see it, at this time.

Finally, I believe the central question concerns the type of proper and effective legislation which will permit regulation in the public interest. It is the public interest which must come first. It is only fair that there be one set of rules in the single game in which several groups are participating, and that there be, preferably, one referee to judge whether the rules are being adhered to honorably.

If there are any tough-seated CATV spokesmen in the galleries, after these 2 long days of debate, let me say to them that they have made a real contribution in my State. I think they have helped to advance the TV industry specifically. But I think they have also opened a Pandora box, because the day is in sight when any group with enough money to get hold of enough CATV systems can concentrate the whole industry in New York, Los Angeles, or Chicago, and can feed the whole country. There is nothing which exists at the present time to prevent that.

This is what started in radio; this is what got underway in TV at one time. It was found to be wise to restrict the number of radio stations which any single economic group could own. I think the number is seven. It was found to be desirable to restrict the number of TV stations which anyone could own. I think the number is five.

Yet the CATV's comprise a completely unregulated, unrestricted group having tremendous vigor and great economic power.

When the committee met in Casper, Wyo., it took the testimony of one of the former presidents of the CATV Association, a man by the name of Bill Daniels, who said it would be a more effective industry if it could be placed in his hands. Mr. Daniels already owns 23 systems. Although he is the head of the Wyoming TV system, he does not live in Wyoming. He lives somewhere else. He owns systems in seven or eight States of the Union.

It is the encroachment upon the realm of economic freedom which enters the picture. It is a tremendous power potential to enable those who are willing to provide this economic capacity to seize control of it. That is why it is fair, in the public interest, that we bring this group, too, under Government regulation.

I am impressed by the fact that so many fine representatives of the CATV have come all the way to Washington to tell Senators how they feel about the matter. That is what makes democracy work. I think it is one of the most impressive demonstrations I can ever recall. But I ask Senators, What about the tens of thousands who cannot afford to come to Washington? Who is looking after their interests? They have a stake in this matter. This activity involves the public interest. That is why the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from Montana, and the Senator from Illinois, and the Senator from Wyoming were sent here—to protect the public interest of the people of the United States. In my judgment, that is the guts of the proposed legislation. To look after the public interest is the obligation of the Members of the Senate; it is the No. 1 priority in the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much time remains on my side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I support S. 2653. I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], who has delivered a very telling argument for the bill.

Last year I introduced and the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] cosponsored, S. 1886, which represented a comprehensive treatment of the pressing problems of television booster and community antenna television systems. Acute and pressing problems involving both types of television repeater devices were facing the people of my State. It was my hope that comprehensive legislation which would provide the Federal Communications Commission with the authority it felt it needed to license boosters, and would also provide the Commission with authority to regulate CATV's, would be quickly enacted. Such legislation is imperative to preserve and protect the widespread dissemination of free television service to the many citizens of my State and other States who are not so fortunate as to live in areas where direct television reception is feasible and also to enable local TV stations to exist.

Extensive hearings were held under the able and incisive leadership of the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island and the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming. As a result of these hearings it was decided to present two bills, one concerning boosters and one concerning CATV's. S. 1886, which in its amended form dealt only with the booster problem, was passed at the end of the last session and awaits action in the House. It is my understanding that such action will not be forthcoming until the Senate takes action on the bill now before us. Since the present session is rapidly nearing the end, I am glad that we will complete action on the bill today.

S. 2653 is a committee bill which has been worked out with painstaking consideration of the legitimate interests of all concerned—the public, the community antenna television system operators, and the licensing of free television broadcasting stations. The bill received the unanimous approval of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Perhaps there are in the committee bill provisions which, ideally, might be strengthened; but I am persuaded that the bill represents sound and constructive legislation.

In the past few days the CATV industry has renewed criticisms and arguments against passage of the bill. They are "scare-type" objections, to be expected from a wholly unregulated industry, when it is proposed to be brought under regulation.

Mr. President, the work of the committee has clearly shown that the overwhelming public interest in this matter demands that cable operators be subjected to regulation. I should like to point out some of the arguments being advanced by the spokesmen of cable operators and comment briefly upon them.

It is said that the bill is aimed at putting CATV's out of business. This could not be farther from the truth. No doubt some CATV operators sincerely feel that to be compelled to comply with public interest requirements would complicate their business and would affect it adversely. Many broadcasters felt the same way when the Radio Act of 1927 was adopted; but today the industry is thriving. No provision of the bill has been shown to be onerous or unfair to the CATV's.

It is said that the standard of licensing of new CATV's—namely, "due regard for the desirability of facilitating the con-

tinued operation of a television station which is providing the only available locally originating television broadcast program service"—which is found in section 330(e) in section 3 of the bill, is unfair to the CATV's.

This objection goes to the heart of the CATV problem. It would be technically feasible to have 10 television stations in New York City and have their signals blanket the Nation over satellites, boosters, and CATV's. But if the Commission were to permit such a system, the death knell of local television would be sounded, and the Congress would immediately pass legislation to restore it. CATV's, unregulated, can accomplish much in this direction on a piecemeal basis. The whole purpose of this bill is to protect the public interest. And it is essential for Congress to reaffirm the traditional American concept favoring local service.

Once again it must be emphasized that this standard will rarely, if ever, result in an outright denial of a CATV authorization. But it will assure that all such authorizations are conditioned so that they will not destroy or cripple local service.

It is said that it is unfair to make CATV's carry the signals of local stations. The bill does not impose such a blanket requirement, but leaves disposition of a request therefor to the judgment of the Commission. The need for the requirement lies in the fact that once the CATV system is connected to a television set, that set will frequently no longer be able to receive the local station directly.

It is said that the antiduplication provision will require CATV's to maintain expensive switching mechanism and to increase their expenses of operation. In this connection it must be remembered that, today, CATV's normally get their program material free, that they charge for their service, and that they have none of the public-service responsibilities or technical responsibilities of regular stations. The antiduplication rules will place upon CATV's a relatively small burden of regulation, as compared to the heavy burden of regulation that is placed upon their competitors.

The Senate has completed only one-half of the legislative job with respect to repeater stations. On September 9, 1959, it passed S. 1886, which gives the Federal Communications Commission the power it thought it needed to license VHF booster stations in the areas where those stations are needed. That bill was important, because it is necessary to assure the maintenance of free television service in areas which otherwise would be unserved. The pending bill is equally important, because it, too, is necessary, in order to assure continuing television service to rural areas, and for the additional reason that it is essential to maintain and encourage local service.

I should like to call attention to one aspect of the proposed legislation. This bill would bring CATV's under regulation essentially paralleling the regulation to which broadcasting stations are subject. The bill would not treat the CATV's as common carriers. It would not make their services, rates, and charges subject to common-carrier regulation, although the CATV's render a type of service which lends itself to monopoly. And, unlike broadcasting stations, the CATV's impose on the public a direct charge for installation and for service.

I am hopeful that if this bill is promptly enacted and is administered wisely and vigorously by the Federal Communications Commission, no resort to common-carrier legislation will become necessary. On the other hand, if we do not enact this bill at this time, and if the CATV situation is allowed to continue to drift in its present unregulated pattern, I believe the result will inevitably be common-carrier legislation—whether at the Federal level, the State level, or both.

I urge, Mr. President, that the Senate pass Senate bill 2653.

I point out that the broadcasting industry is now being regulated, insofar as the stations themselves are concerned, by means of the enactment of the bill which dealt with repeater and translator systems. Therefore, the only segment of the industry not now subject to regulation is that which relays pictures to the people of the Nation; I refer to the CATV's.

It seems to me to be common sense to have all elements of the industry come under the jurisdiction of the same regulatory commission and under the same general pattern of regulation, so as to assure the people of America of access to free television, and to assure that local communities may support local television stations.

We have not said a great deal about the importance of having local television outlets for community affairs, for political speeches, and for cultural activities which are peculiar to a particular region or city or area. If the local television stations wither and die, or if they are unable to grow and expand, then many areas of the country will be deprived of that opportunity, which should exist for all parts of the United States.

Mr. President, I believe the Senate should pass the pending bill; and I believe that this bill and its companion measure, the booster bill, should then become the law of the land.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much time is left to those on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-one minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield back 16 minutes of that time, and hold the remaining 5 minutes for the Senator from Arizona and other Senators who wish to speak against the motion to recommit.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who wishes to ask some questions.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I merely wish to ask some questions of the Senator from Oklahoma or of another Member of the Senate.

It seems to me that a rather complicated legal situation could arise in this instance. As I understand, a CATV station merely takes something out of the air, and does not put anything into the air.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. After it takes something out of the air—just like using the air we breathe—it then wires it, by means of a physical operation, into a house, where it is hooked up to a television set.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What justification is there for having the Federal Government move into that regulatory field? Can it be called interstate commerce? If so, can the Federal Government then regulate my radio set in my house because I take the signal out of the air by means of an aerial erected on top of my house?

Mr. MONRONEY. This presents a problem, because many think this is exclusively in the field of intrastate commerce. Of course, the ether waves are interstate. But when the signal is taken out of the air and is transmitted to the Senator's house by cable, that is purely intrastate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then can the Federal Government, under the theory of this proposed regulation, regulate a farmer's well because the farmer takes air out of the wind that is moving past his farm, and thereby runs his windmill, and because that air happens to blow across the Mississippi River, from Illinois to Iowa, for instance? Does that make it interstate commerce, so the Federal Government can regulate the operation of that farmer's farm or can determine how he shall run his well?

Mr. MONRONEY. Of course, there are many strange constructions of interstate commerce.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I realize that.

Mr. MONRONEY. This does not seem to fit into the more normal categories. Neither does it fit into normal channels of communications, which deal with the regulation of signals or communications. This matter is strictly on the receiving, and not the originating, side.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I could understand some persuasive arguments that could be made if the CATV stations put something into the air. Being put into the air, as it is said, it flies we know not where, and they could not control it after it got into the air. It is out in the ether, and it would be interstate. But let us consider a station where, unless the cables or wires go across State lines, a CATV station is doing nothing in interstate commerce that I can see at all. It would seem to me if the Supreme Court would say that is a proper field for regulation by a Federal commission, when the station is operating strictly within the State, the Federal Government could regulate me when I turn on my radio because I pick up the signal by an aerial at the top of my house and it is piped down to my living room.

I am merely asking a question. I do not know whether this is a sound argument.

Mr. MONRONEY. Many lawyers doubt the constitutionality of the provision. I am not a lawyer, but it is

apparent that 99 percent of the operations would be intrastate in character.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I assume each of these CATV stations would be an individual unit operation.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct, in a community.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is no interlocking arrangement between a CATV station in, for example, the western part of a State, and the eastern part, unless there might be common stock ownership; but these CATV stations are individual unit operations. The CATV is a station which takes something out of the air that is already in the air, and uses a physical facility to transfer it to a community television station.

Mr. MONRONEY. One antenna serves 50 or more people.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Where does the line of regulation begin? Does it begin with two or three sets, or with one set? If so, the operator of one television set which brings in a signal from the aerial at the top of his house could be regulated.

Mr. MONRONEY. The bill states 50 or more sets, or an aerial in a central location of a building that could serve 200.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is the basic reason why the Federal Communications Commission asserts jurisdiction over this matter that concerns me.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator for raising the question.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I do not want to let the debate close without expressing my views on the bill. I think I have been most diligent in my attendance on the debate on this bill. I did so for two reasons. One reason is that I was not a member of the committee that heard much testimony and devoted much time to the consideration of the bill, the members of which, therefore, are very familiar with it. I expressed my appreciation to the chairman yesterday for his service in this field, as is true as to any bill he undertakes to bring before the Senate.

Second, I am fearful that if the proposed legislation is approved and becomes the Federal law of this land, it will have a limiting effect on the expansion of television in areas where it is needed. I have heard the arguments made that if community antenna systems are not put in, some local stations will come into the areas and establish television stations. That argument sounds reasonable, but it is not a practical one. There is not a person who is served by a community antenna television system who would not like to secure free television; but when one cannot get it, he is willing to pay for television programs. Some of these operations are quite expensive, but they do perform a service for people who otherwise could not secure it in sparsely settled areas.

So I am compelled, based on the debate I have heard in the past 2 days, to vote to recommit the bill.

I was hopeful the bill would be in such shape that I could support it. I hope it will be eventually, because I firmly believe we must have some regulation. However, I do not believe enough study has been given to the bill and enough time spent on it to protect the people who need the service.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, how much time remains to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 4 minutes remain to the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] yield me sufficient time so the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] can present his argument?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how much time remains on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes remain to the Senator from Illinois on the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I understand, the Chair stated I have only 4 minutes remaining. I yielded only 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Iowa and 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Kansas. I did not hear the gavel fall. That would leave us 8 minutes. Another 5 minutes would be sufficient.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, do I correctly understand we now have 13 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes remain on the amendment; and 15 minutes to the Senator from Illinois on the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I ask my colleague if he could take 10 minutes.

Mr. KERR. I defer to my colleague.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, would the Senator yield for the purpose of my suggesting the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the time would not be taken out of the time remaining to either side, so that we could have more Senators present before the vote?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose, without expressing too much hope in the success of the efforts of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without the time being taken out of the time allocated to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I rise in support of the motion to recommit the bill. I do it for the simple reason that I think it is an absolute necessity to protect the well-being and the opportunity for existence of over 760 small businesses.

Mr. President, I say to my good friend from Rhode Island that if anything I said on the floor in this debate was offensive to him personally I wish to apologize. I acknowledge to him that I am not an expert on Federal communications legislation, and I know he is.

There are many things, Mr. President, I do not know, but I will tell Senators that what I do know I know as well as anybody.

I know the effect of a Supreme Court decision. I know that if the Supreme Court says a CATV system cannot capture from the air a sound wave set in motion by a TV station and reconvey it by a channel to homes, if my good friend from Rhode Island thinks the Federal Communications Commission can change the situation so that it can be done by an order of the Federal Communications Commission, he ought to read about the experiences of countless thousands of people in this country who have found out the hard way they cannot get around a Supreme Court decision that easily.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. KERR. I will yield on the Senator's own time.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not have any time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes from the time on the bill to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. I merely say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that I never said what he is suggesting I said, and the distinguished Senator knows I never meant that.

Mr. KERR. I have apologized to the Senator for saying what he does not know and what he does know.

Mr. PASTORE. May I finish?

Mr. KERR. If we are going to do this, let us do it.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator want to do it his way, or no way at all?

Mr. KERR. No. Let us presume that the Senator from Rhode Island is sincere and that I am sincere. I know that is a violent presumption for either one of us, but let us do it for once.

Mr. PASTORE. How do we want to do it? May I proceed?

Mr. KERR. The Senator said the Senator from Oklahoma knew that what the Senator from Oklahoma said was not so.

Mr. PASTORE. No, I did not say that. I said that I did not say what the Senator asserted I did say.

Mr. KERR. And that I knew the Senator did not say it; that is what the Senator said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. PASTORE. I said this: Should these two factions come under the aegis of the Federal Communications Com-

mission and should the Supreme Court decide that the CATV system have no proprietary right to capture the picture or the signal and to show it at a cost, since both of them would be under the aegis of the Federal Communications Commission, if the broadcaster should impose an unreasonable or a confiscatory fee upon the CATV system in order to obtain permission to show the signal, the fact that both of the groups were under the umbrella of the Federal Communications Commission would mean that reason would be used and justice would be meted out to both sides by the FCC. That is all I said. Now, if the Senator from Oklahoma finds any fault with it, I am sorry, but that is all I said.

Mr. KERR. That is all I said the Senator said.

Mr. PASTORE. No.

Mr. KERR. That is all I said the Senator said.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator did not say that. If the Senator will further yield——

Mr. KERR. I will yield on the Senator's time. Mr. President, I do not want to yield on any of the 6 minutes I have, because that is all the time I have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 2 minutes yielded to the Senator from Rhode Island have expired.

Mr. KERR. I say again, Mr. President, that if the Supreme Court says that cannot be done then the Federal Communications Commission cannot say it can be done. That is point No. 1.

Another thing which I know as well as anybody relates to whether the network pays the local broadcasting company for broadcasting the network programs. I am about that like Sam Jones was about how he got religion. Sam Jones was asked about how he knew he got religion and he said, "I was there when it happened." [Laughter.] I know that the national network does not require the local TV station to pay the national network for the privilege of broadcasting the national network programs. The national network sells the advertisement for a certain amount of money, and then pays the local broadcasting station a certain percentage of that fee to broadcast it for them. I know that, Mr. President.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. KERR. I will yield on the Senator's time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, how many minutes do I have?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. PASTORE. The fact of the matter is that the rate is set per hour or per quarter hour by the local broadcasting station. I do not know if the Senator from Oklahoma is affiliated with or associated with any broadcasting station——

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma is, and it is a matter of public record.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct. The network by arrangement may pay 30 percent of the rate to the station. Therefore, it is necessary the network retain 70 percent of the cost of rate time, for programs of the national network. The Senator knows that that is the fee. That is what I meant about the fee for using the program which emanates from the network.

Mr. KERR. Not at all, Mr. President.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course, it is.

Mr. KERR. The national network fixes the fee.

Mr. PASTORE. By arrangement with the station, but the payment by the local TV station can be 70 percent of the rate.

Mr. KERR. The national network fixes the fee, and gives a certain percentage of it to the local station for the broadcasting of the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. KERR. I do not know all of the provisions in the communications law, but I know what is in a contract between a national broadcasting system and an affiliate, a local station.

Mr. President, my good friend from Rhode Island—and I say that sincerely—talked about the little people yesterday, yet he has brought to the Senate a bill which he says is for the benefit of some 52 of the 760-some local community antenna systems, and he wants to put all 760 of the systems under regulation of the Federal Communications Commission, simply to protect local broadcasting stations against 52 of them.

I submit to Senators, is that a reasonable proposition? If the Senator is interested in those 52 instances, considering how able the Senator is, he could bring a bill to the Senate for the benefit of those persons, or could amend the bill to limit it to them. Then the argument would be over.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. KERR. I will yield to the Senator in just a minute. That is not what the Senator has done. He has brought to the Senate a bill to regulate 760 systems, although he makes his whole case on what is being done in regard to some 50 community TV broadcasting systems.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield on the Senator's own time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Oklahoma is glorifying, perhaps even inadvertently, the Senator from Rhode Island. The Senator from Oklahoma keeps using the third person designation, saying, "He does this," and "He does that."

The Senator from Rhode Island is representing the committee. We had a subcommittee, which included the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. The matter was heard by the subcommittee. We went before the full committee. We explained the bill before the full committee.

I am the Senator in charge of the bill on behalf of the committee. The Senator keeps saying, "The Senator from Rhode Island wants to do this," or "He wants to do that," or "He does not want to do that."

I appreciate the glorification, but I am acting on behalf of the subcommittee and the committee. This was a committee action, not the action of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I still maintain that if the Senator from Rhode Island wishes to take care of 52 stations he can amend this bill on his own initiative on the floor. This bill has for its purpose subjecting to regulation 760 small private-enterprise businesses which had the ingenuity to go out and get started, and if this bill is passed, it will be the death knell to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in Arizona there are a number of CATV stations, and they serve a very useful purpose by conveying television programs to mining camps and to isolated parts of the State. We are very glad to have them render that service. But in one instance, at Yuma, about 200 miles from the center of population, there is an entirely different situation. The local station, KIVA–TV, serves an area with a radius of about 60 miles. That television station exists on the advertising which comes to it from businesses in the town of Yuma. If CATV comes to Yuma, its operators propose to charge $90 to make a connection over telephone lines in the city and then charge $6 a month to supply the programs, which originate in Phoenix. I do not doubt that a majority of the citizens in Yuma would be glad to pay those charges for that kind of service.

But what else does it do? It blacks out a large area in southern Yuma County.

For about 40 miles up the Gila River from Yuma there is an irrigated section which supports a farming population. South of Yuma, toward the Mexican border for nearly 20 miles there is another irrigated farming section. The people living in those sections cannot afford to have wires strung to each of their farms. They will receive absolutely no service if the station in Yuma is put out of business. This bill, as I understand it, provides protection for the Yuma television station.

All I plead for is the enactment of legislation which will not allow television service to be brought in which would put out of business a local community station, and from which no one could obtain service except those living in the town where the local station is now located.

The citizens living in the surrounding areas who now own television sets could turn them on and get nothing. That is no way to treat good people.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. There is an identical situation in Grand Junction, Colo., where there is a local station. I was privileged to be seated with the subcommittee when it came to Denver. This local station is picked up by TV boosters which go to five or six counties. If they put in CATV, the testimony was that it will drive the station to the wall because it will take away the advertising.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, may I ask if there is any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has 4 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the bill comes before us in an effort to protect some very few television stations. I am aware of that. I am aware of the situation at Grand Junction, which would not be able to furnish a signal that would supply the booster stations which take the signals over the mountains. I am aware of the problems which it is alleged will exist in Yuma if it finally gets a CATV station. Many people who wish more service, and who wish to see network programs other than those supplied by the local station, are willing to pay the required fee to see it so someone builds a CATV system in this area.

I think the figures are very important. The bill would cause the licensing of 768 CATV stations, because in some 52 cities there is a 1-television station situation which might be damaged.

Why put over 700 under complicated licensing system, almost as demanding as that required to obtain a television station license, with renewal every 3 years, and require a vast expenditure on the part of the small businesses to maintain Washington, D.C., counsel for that purpose simply because there are 52 locations where there might be difficulty?

The bill will not help the 52 locations very much, because in all but two of the places where CATV is in competition, CATV now carries the program of the local station. In most cases there is no conflict between the CATV and the local station. They work together. Some are jointly owned. As I saw only yesterday, at Brazos, Tex., the local station was going on the air jointly with CATV to celebrate the birthday of the new station.

There is no need to pass a bill which would throttle the expansion of CATV to millions of people in the flat areas of the country. The CATV operators would have to get a license for the construction of the stations. If the operators have to do all the things which are prescribed by the bill before they build the lines and install the wires, millions who are now in the "snow areas," the gray areas or the black areas in the flat country will be deprived of the service. Regulation will stump the little businessmen who build the lines. It will stump the men who must borrow the money, because the best they can look forward to is a 3-year license on an investment which may involve $100,000 or $200,000.

We are not asking that the bill be killed. We say, let us take a look at it next year. I believe we can come up with a much better bill, if we wish legislation, and certainly a measure which will do some good for the citizens the Senator is talking about, and for whom this bill will do no good.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks a telegram from Vance L. Eckersley, vice president, WDAU–TV, to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], dated May 17, 1960.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCRANTON, PA., *May 17, 1960.*

Senator JOSEPH CLARK,
Washington, D.C.:

Several of the 65 CATV systems which carry the channel 22 signal of WDAU–TV to more than 90,000 homes, have requested that we indicate to you that some broadcasters have serious doubts as to the wisdom of some of the provisions of S. 2653.

WDAU–TV works harmoniously with almost all of the cable systems within its coverage area. This cooperation brings local television service to a wide area which otherwise might have no television.

It is thought that S. 2653 will end such unpleasant situations as exist in Hazleton, where the cable system does not carry the signals of the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre stations and, in fact, microwaves the signal of channel 2, WCBS–TV, New York City, to Hazleton, where it is carried on cable to 4,000 homes to compete with the local CBS affiliate.

Unfortunately, the bill accomplishes these worthwhile objectives by requiring the elimination of all duplication of programs carried by local stations. In many situations this is a practical impossibility. For example, a cable system in Sunbury carrying the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre ABC, CBS, and NBC affiliated stations and also carries the Lancaster station would find the Lancaster station duplicating some of the CBS programs and some of the NBC programs. Also, a cable system in Williamsport carrying the three Scranton-Wilkes-Barre stations together with the Altoona station would find the latter duplicating some of the CBS programs and some of the ABC programs. To prevent such duplication would require constant switching.

VANCE L. ECKERSLEY,
Vice President, WDAU–TV.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to myself the time I have remaining on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Oklahoma has suggested that we recommit the bill and consider it next year. In making that statement he suggests there is a need for a bill. I wish to take this means to compliment, as highly and as sincerely as I can, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] for the fair, impartial, and unbiased job he has done in bringing this legislation before the Senate. So far as he is concerned this legislation does not mean anything one way or the other. One could not ask for a fairer man to look after the interests of both elements of this industry or all segments of the industry.

I asked him, in behalf of my distinguished senior colleague from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and our colleagues in the House, to hold hearings back here so that interested people from my State both in TV and in CATV could come here and have their case laid on the table. I am happy to state that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the chairman of the full committee, and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] agreed to do so. I also asked the Senator from Rhode Island if he would go to Montana at the request of the Montana delegation and there hold hearings in the field. He did so in the State capitol at Helena. Both sides were heard. Everyone who had anything to say had a chance to say it. He came back to Washington. He met with representatives of the industry. He spent hours with their attorneys. He met with Senators who are interested in preserving the CATV industry, as he is and as I am. His committee reported a bill after a long time; and what happened? The things which had been agreed to are disagreed to by representatives of the CATV industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for 1 minute on the bill.

If the Senate wishes to act on the basis of an unbiased man's judgment, if it wishes well-thought-out and careful legislation, if it wishes legislation which will preserve and save CATV and keep it from some other alternative, then I say that the Senate ought to uphold the hand of the Senator from Rhode Island and his committee and vote against recommitting the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate on the motion has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I observe the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I understand, the vote will be on the motion to recommit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to recommit, offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. TALMADGE. On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from

Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. McCARTHY. On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BRUNSDALE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of death in his immediate family.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BRUNSDALE] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 38, as follows:

[No. 197]

YEAS—39

Aiken	Fong	Monroney
Bridges	Gore	Morton
Bush	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Byrd, Va.	Hill	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Prouty
Carlson	Javits	Robertson
Clark	Johnston, S.C.	Russell
Cooper	Keating	Saltonstall
Cotton	Kerr	Scott
Dirksen	Long, La.	Smith
Dworshak	Lusk	Sparkman
Eastland	McClellan	Stennis
Ellender	Martin	Wiley

NAYS—38

Allott	Douglas	Magnuson
Bartlett	Engle	Mansfield
Beall	Goldwater	McGee
Bible	Gruening	Moss
Butler	Hart	Murray
Cannon	Hartke	Pastore
Carroll	Hayden	Proxmire
Case, N.J.	Hruska	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Humphrey	Thurmond
Chavez	Jackson	Williams, Del.
Church	Kuchel	Young, N. Dak.
Curtis	Lausche	Young, Ohio
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	

NOT VOTING—23

Anderson	Hennings	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Johnson, Tex.	Randolph
Brunsdale	Jordan	Smathers
Capehart	Kefauver	Symington
Ervin	Kennedy	Talmadge
Frear	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	McNamara	Yarborough
Green	Morse	

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the motion to recommit was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Chair please restate the announcement of the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question, 39 Senators voted in the affirmative, and 38 Senators voted in the negative, so the motion to recommit is agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the motion to recommit was agreed to.

Mr. KERR. I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on that question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Chair state the motion which is now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to reconsider the vote by which the motion to recommit was agreed to. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Do I correctly understand that a vote "yea" is a vote to table the motion to reconsider?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And that a vote "nay" is a vote to leave open the motion to reconsider?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a live pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If the Senator from West Virginia were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. TALMADGE (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a live pair with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If the Senator from Wyoming were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN and Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senators from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BRUNSDALE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of death in his immediate family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BRUNSDALE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 36, as follows:

[No. 198]

YEAS—38

Aiken	Cooper	Gore
Bridges	Cotton	Hickenlooper
Bush	Dirksen	Hill
Byrd, Va.	Dworshak	Holland
Byrd, W. Va.	Eastland	Javits
Carlson	Ellender	Johnston, S.C.
Clark	Fong	Keating

Kerr	Morton	Saltonstall
Long, La.	Mundt	Scott
Lusk	Muskie	Smith
McClellan	Prouty	Sparkman
Martin	Robertson	Stennis
Monroney	Russell	

NAYS—36

Allott	Douglas	Long, Hawaii
Bartlett	Engle	McGee
Beall	Goldwater	Magnuson
Bible	Gruening	Mansfield
Cannon	Hart	Moss
Carroll	Hartke	Murray
Case, N.J.	Hayden	Pastore
Case, S. Dak.	Hruska	Proxmire
Chavez	Humphrey	Thurmond
Church	Jackson	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Kuchel	Young, N. Dak.
Dodd	Lausche	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—26

Anderson	Hennings	Randolph
Bennett	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Brunsdale	Jordan	Smathers
Butler	Kefauver	Symington
Capehart	Kennedy	Talmadge
Ervin	McCarthy	Wiley
Frear	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	Morse	Yarborough
Green	O'Mahoney	

So the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire, first, of the acting majority leader, about the program for tomorrow and also for the remainder of the week, insofar as it is possible for him to inform the Senate now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question asked by the distinguished minority leader, I must admit that I do not have too much information available. But, as of now, it is the intention to have the Senate meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, so that at about 12 o'clock it will be possible for Senators who desire to do so to make speeches on the retirement of our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

It is anticipated that we shall then bring up some printing resolutions and minor money resolutions out of the Committee on Rules and Administration. If possible, we may get to the Stella bill, a bill of some renown. If we do not get to it tomorrow, we should get to it within the next several days.

I hope within the next 10 minutes or so to have a more complete schedule to announce and to inform Senators whether we shall meet Friday or go over from Thursday until Monday.

SUPPLEMENTAL AIR CARRIERS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I am concerned today about the fate of the supplemental air carriers industry in this country. After years of hearings the Civil Aeronautics Board, in January 1959, certificated and authorized supplemental air carriers, recognizing this unique and essential service as a necessary segment of the Nation's air transportation structure. Today the supplemental air carriers have a record of proven contribution in the framework of air travel, serving civilian passengers and cargo and as military carriers.

These airlines are unique in that they have never been nor are they now subsidized by the Federal Government. In addition to efficient, alert, and dependable day-to-day service supplied to the military, supplemental airlines were authorized to fly regular scheduled flights—10 flights per month—between any 2 cities within the United States. Currently cities such as New York, Chicago, Miami, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Honolulu, Detroit, and Dallas are served with civilian business and tourist air travelers who have come to depend on the unique transportation need filled by the supplemental airlines.

It should also be noted, Mr. President, that much of the credit for holding the line on air transportation costs belongs to the pioneers of the supplemental air carrier industry who have contributed greatly to low-fare, air coach travel.

During a visit to the Supplemental Air Carrier Conference, a national trade association, I saw the system and facilities utilized to respond to the demands of the Defense Department for troop movement on an around-the-clock basis day after day. The services proved themselves able and responsible when activated by the armed services. Most important, perhaps, is the system of the supplemental air carrier industry in doing business with the military in such a fashion that it provides airlift ready to take on a military mission in a matter of hours if a national emergency should arise. We have had altogether too many illustrations of the deficiencies in our airlift potential and I am sure that the committees concerned with this legislation will bear me out in this statement. This is a time when we should be doing everything we can to increase our airlift capabilities rather than to harass and place obstacles before an industry which serves so useful and necessary functions for both civilians and military.

I am sure that Congress and friends of aviation everywhere were distressed at the news last month that the appellate court had upset the Civil Aeronautics Board's certification of these small pioneering airlines which have contributed so much toward our national defense and as a convenience for the traveling public.

I know, Mr. President, that the court held that the Civil Aeronautics Board had no legal means by which these carriers' important services could be certificated under the Federal Aviation Act, as the statute is now in effect, and the court pointed out that the problem is one which invites congressional action. In fact, it is my interpretation that the Congress would be remiss in its historic duty to further the cause of safe and dependable air travel if we failed to act on this problem. It may perhaps be only a technical change that is required in the law, which can be remedied by the Congress, but our failure to act will have a most serious and perhaps disastrous effect on peacetime air transportation and national security.

I hope, Mr. President, that my colleagues will recognize the necessity for coming to the immediate rescue of the supplemental airlines and enact legislation during this session which will preserve the certificates granted to the individual carriers of the industry during this critical time in our national defense airlift. I believe that after some 12 years of proven ability the very least that Congress can do is to make permanent that which the governing agency—the Civil Aeronautics Board—has found to be so vitally in the public interest and in the interest of our national defense. I urge Members of the Senate, and particularly members of the committees directly affected in the study of this problem to give their most earnest and painstaking study to a problem that merits immediate attention.

REPORTED CASES OF SOVIET ESPIONAGE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this week in Paris Mr. Khrushchev engaged in a global blasphemy by raising his right hand and swearing before the God in whom he does not believe that his hands were clean from the standpoint of international espionage.

To a man who started his services on the House Un-American Activities Committee back in the days when Martin Dies, of Texas, was its chairman, that event struck a familiar note with me, and I have obtained from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress a list of over 65 Russian spy cases, documented in the history of the United States, beginning on May 1, 1946.

They include such famous cases as the Allan Nunn May case, that of a British scientist who was convicted for espionage, involving people in Canada.

The list includes the Judith Coplon case. She was convicted of taking Justice Department secrets and using them to aid Russia.

It includes the case of Alger Hiss, who was found guilty of lying to a grand jury in connection with his theft of State Department documents.

The list includes the case of Valetin A. Gubitchev, a United Nations employee who was found guilty as Judith Coplon's codefendant, and who was caught redhanded transferring American money for spy secrets to be delivered to the Russian Government, for whom he was then working.

The list includes the case of Harry Gold.

The list includes the case of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, about whom nothing further need be said.

It includes the Morton Sobell case.

It includes the David Greenglass case.

It includes the case of William Remington, who was found guilty of perjuring himself at his first trial in 1951, when he said he never gave any secret material of the War Production Board to Russia.

It includes the case of Yuri Novikov, secretary of the Soviet Embassy, named as a coconspirator in the Verber-Ponger indictment.

It includes the case of Igor A. Amosov, assistant naval attaché at the Soviet Embassy in Washington.

The list goes on and on for more than 65 specific cases of spies serving Mr. Khrushchev, his predecessor, Mr. Stalin, and the Government of Russia, all having occurred within the territorial limitations of the United States.

I think the RECORD should show those cases, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the entire list of the documented cases of spying by Communist agents on American soil.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET ESPIONAGE—A SELECTED LIST OF REPORTED CASES OF SOVIET ESPIONAGE IN THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER WESTERN ALINED NATIONS

(NOTE.—Those instances involving diplomatic personnel are indicated by "diplomatic.")

May 1, 1946: Allan Nunn May, a British scientist who worked on atomic energy in Canada, was sentenced to 10 years in prison by a British court. May was part of the Soviet espionage ring in Canada which was exposed by Igor Gouzenko, a code clerk in the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa, who broke with the Russians and sought political asylum. Seventeen Soviet Embassy officials charged with espionage have been expelled from Canada. Eight Canadian citizens, including a member of Parliament, were convicted of espionage and given various jail sentences.

June 30, 1949: Judith Coplon was convicted of taking Justice Department secrets and using them to aid Russia. She was sentenced to from 40 months to 10 years in prison. On January 28, 1952, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that she was entitled to a new trial because the Government used illegal wiretap evidence. She was never retried on this charge.

October 31, 1949 (diplomatic): Dr. Erwin Munk and a clerk named Horvat of the Czech Embassy in Washington were declared persona non grata.

January 25, 1950: Alger Hiss found guilty of lying to a grand jury in 1948 when he declared that he had never given any secret State Department documents to Whittaker Chambers, who then passed them on to the Soviet Union. He was sentenced to 5 years in prison.

March 1, 1950: Klaus Fuchs was sentenced by a British court to 14 years imprisonment after pleading guilty to giving atomic secrets to Russia.

March 9, 1950: Judith Coplon, in her second trial, was found guilty of conspiracy to commit espionage and was sentenced to 15 years in prison. On December 5, 1950, the U.S. Court of Appeals reversed the conviction on the grounds of illegal arrest and use of illegal wiretap evidence. The Supreme Court refused to review the case on January 28, 1952.

March 9. 1950 (diplomatic): Valetin A. Gubitchev, a United Nations employee, was found guilty as Judith Coplon's codefendant. He was sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment but the sentence was suspended on condition he leave the United States. Gubitchev sailed for Poland on March 20th.

April 15, 1950: Air Force Cpl. Gustav Mueller was convicted of attempting to give U.S. military secrets to Russia. He was sentenced to 5 years at hard labor.

September 22, 1950: Alfred D. Slack pleaded guilty to giving samples of a secret explosive to Harry Gold and was sentenced to 15 years in prison.

November 22, 1950: Abraham Brothman was convicted of conspiring to mislead a grand jury (which was investigating espionage) and of influencing Harry Gold to give false statements to the jury. He was sentenced to 7 years' imprisonment and fined $15,000. In July 1951, the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the 2-year sentence and $10,000 fine for misleading a grand jury, but reversed the 5-year sentence and $5,000 fine for influencing Gold.

November 22, 1950: Miriam Moskowitz was convicted (together with A. Brothman) of conspiring to mislead a grand jury and was sentenced to 2 years in prison and fined $10,000.

December 9, 1950: Harry Gold pleaded guilty to transmitting atomic secrets to the Russians and received a 30-year prison sentence.

April 5, 1951: Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were sentenced to death for procuring and transmitting atom bomb secrets to Russia during and after the Second World War. They were both executed on June 19, 1953.

April 5, 1951: Morton Sobell was sentenced to 30 years in prison for giving nonatomic defense secrets to the Fuchs-Gold spy ring.

April 6, 1951: David Greenglass admitted to giving atomic data to the Fuchs-Gold ring while working as an Army technician at Los Alamos, N. Mex., and was sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment.

September 26, 1951 (diplomatic): Nicholai P. Orlov, the assistant naval secretary of the Soviet Embassy in Stockholm, was ordered to leave Sweden immediately in connection with the Andersson espionage case.

November 14, 1951: Ernest Hilding Andersson, a petty officer in the Swedish Navy, was sentenced to life imprisonment after being found guilty of gross espionage for the Soviet Union. Andersson admitted supplying the Russians with secret data on the Swedish Navy, coastal defense installations, and suitable invasion areas along the coast of northern Sweden. He named N. P. Orlov, Konstantin Vinogradov, a Soviet Embassy secretary, and Tass correspondent Victor Anissimov as his accomplices.

October 1952: Nikolai Skvartsov, a political officer in the U.N. Department of Security Council Affairs, was discharged after the State Department notified the U.N. that he had violated a U.S. law.

February 4, 1953: William Remington was found guilty of perjuring himself at his first trial in 1951 when he said he never gave any secret material of the War Production Board to Elizabeth Bentley, a self-styled Communist spy. He was sentenced to 3 years in prison.

February 25, 1953: Lev C. Pissarev, Tass correspondent, was deported from the Netherlands for spying after being arrested on December 23 in the act of receiving secret documents from a Dutch official who was cooperating with the police.

May 30, 1953 (diplomatic): Christache Zambeti, first secretary of the Rumanian Legation in Washington, was declared persona non grata for attempting to blackmail a U.S. citizen into espionage acts.

June 5, 1953: William Perl was sentenced to 5 years in prison for perjury for having told a grand jury in 1950 that he did not know atom spies Julius Rosenberg and Morton Sobell.

June 8, 1953: Air Force Staff Sgt. Giuseppe Cascio was convicted by court martial in Taegu, Korea, of conspiracy to give jet plane secrets to the Communists. He was given a 20-year jail sentence and a dishonorable discharge.

June 8, 1953: Kurt Ponger and Otto Verber were convicted of conspiracy to procure and transmit Army, Air Force, and aircraft plant data to the Soviet Union. They were sentenced to 5 to 15 years and 3⅓ to 10 years in prison, respectively.

June 8, 1953 (diplomatic): Yuri Novikov, second secretary of the Soviet Embassy, was named as a coconspirator in the Verber-Ponger indictment. He was then declared persona non grata by the U.S. Government and returned to the Soviet Union.

October 31, 1953: Pvt. Robert W. Dorey was sentenced to 15 years in prison after pleading guilty to fleeing to East Germany, then twice returning to the U.S. Zone with Soviet agents whom he guided around U.S. military installations.

February 3, 1954 (diplomatic): Igor A. Amosov, assistant naval attaché at the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata and expelled for engaging in espionage.

February 3, 1954 (diplomatic): Alexander P. Kovalev, second secretary to the Soviet delegation to the United Nations was declared persona non grata and expelled for espionage activities.

May 29, 1954 (diplomatic): Leonid E. Pivnev, assistant air attaché in the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata and expelled for engaging in espionage.

August 28, 1954: Nobuniori Higurashi, a Japanese Foreign Office official, committed suicide after he had confessed to giving secret information to a Soviet spy ring. The central figure in the ring was Yuri A. Rastvorov, former member of the Soviet mission in Tokyo, who has been granted political asylum in the United States. Two other Foreign Office officials have also been implicated.

December 22, 1954 (diplomatic): Maj. Ludvik Sochor, Czech military attaché in Geneva, and two of his assistants were expelled from Switzerland for espionage.

September 14, 1955: An Australian Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage released its report. The commission, created after Vladimir Petrov, third secretary of the Soviet Embassy, sought asylum from the Russians on April 13, 1954, declared that two Soviet spy "apparatuses" had been functioning in Australia since 1943. At least 120 Australians, all of whom were Communists, assisted the Soviet spy rings but because of the Australian law on espionage and the admissibility of evidence no prosecutions were undertaken.

March 1, 1956 (diplomatic): Maj. Anatoli Kuznetsov, assistant military attaché of the Soviet Embassy in Teheran was expelled from Iran after being arrested with Iranian Air Force Warrant Officer Hussein Rejaei Tehrani who confessed to espionage.

June 14, 1956 (diplomatic): Col. Ivan A. Bubchikov, assistant military attaché of the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata for "activities incompatible to his continued presence in this country."

July 13, 1956 (diplomatic): Gennadi Popov, the Soviet second secretary, was expelled from Canada for spying.

August 24, 1956 (diplomatic): Victor I. Petrov, a translator in the languages section on the U.N. Secretariat, was discharged from the United Nations after the U.S. delegation issued a statement saying that Petrov had sought to get "information vital to the security and defense of the United States."

August 29, 1956 (diplomatic): Rostislav Shapovalov, second secretary of the Soviet mission to the U.N., was requested to leave the United States after it was discovered that he exerted pressure on a Russian refugee in the United States to become a Soviet agent.

September 5, 1956 (diplomatic): Sweden expelled Peter Mirosnikov for receiving secret data from Anatole Ericson and sent a formal protest to Moscow about its spy activities in that country.

October 5, 1956: Anatole Ericson, a radar instrument maker, was convicted of giving military secrets to Russia by a Swedish court and sentenced to 12 years at hard labor.

October 5, 1956: Jean Joseph Philip, a code clerk at the Budapest Legation in Paris, and Roger Dubois, Legation press attaché, were convicted in France of spying for the Hungarian Secret Service and were sentenced to imprisonment.

December 18, 1956 (diplomatic): Mate Vegh, former Hungarian second secretary, was expelled from Switzerland for spying.

January 14, 1957 (diplomatic): Maj. Yuri P. Krylov, assistant military attaché of the

Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata for purchasing classified electronic equipment and attempting to purchase secret military information.

January 28, 1957 (diplomatic): Vassili M. Molev, a clerk attached to the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata by the State Department. He was later named as a coconspirator in the indictment of the Sobles' spy ring.

February 27, 1957 (diplomatic): The Danish Government expelled Soviet Lt. Comdr. Mikhail Ruditchev, assistant naval attaché of the Soviet Embassy, on the grounds that he was attempting to obtain secret military information.

March 12, 1957: A Swedish court sentenced Bedros Zartaryan, a Turkish engineer employed by a firm which was building Swedish naval and air bases, to 10 years at hard labor for grand espionage for the Soviet Union.

March 16, 1957 (diplomatic): Jiri Stejskal, third secretary of the Czechoslovak Legation in Vienna, was expelled from Austria for attempting to bribe a police official to carry out espionage work.

April 24, 1957: Robert Folke Damstedt, assistant secretary of the Swedish Atomic Energy Commission, was convicted of stealing secret papers, and was sentenced to 5 years in prison.

May 7, 1957: Three men were sentenced to death in Greece after being convicted of treason and espionage for the Soviet Union. Another man was given a life sentence, and five other persons were given lesser terms.

July 23, 1957: West German security officials broke a Communist spy ring headquartered in a Bonn hotel.

August 9, 1957: Myra Soble, wife of Jack Soble, was sentenced to 5½ years in prison after pleading guilty to charges of espionage.

August 9, 1957: Jacob Albam was sentenced to 5½ years in prison after pleading guilty to espionage in behalf of the Soviet Union as a member of the Soble spy ring.

September 5, 1957: A former Japanese Foreign Office official was fined and sentenced to prison for selling secrets to a Soviet agent.

September 20, 1957: U.S. Air Force Capt. George French was convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment for attempting to sell military secrets to the Soviet Union.

September 25, 1957: An Austrian customs service official was arrested for espionage and confessed that he turned information over to Czech Communist agents.

October 8, 1957: Jack Soble was sentenced to 7 years in prison after pleading guilty to heading a spy ring for the Soviet Union.

November 1957: German officials reveal that a former first lieutenant in the West German Air Force has been convicted of espionage.

November 15, 1957: Col. Rudolf I. Abel, a Soviet intelligence officer, was sentenced to 30 years in prison and fined $3,000 for passing U.S. defense and atomic secrets to Russia.

February 21, 1958: M. Sgt. Roy A. Rhodes was convicted by a U.S. Army court martial of conspiring to deliver U.S. secrets to the Soviet Union and was sentenced to 5 years imprisonment at hard labor and was dishonorably discharged.

May 19, 1958 (diplomatic): Aleksandr Solovyev, assistant military attaché of the Soviet Embassy in Rome, after being detained on charges of espionage was asked to leave Italy.

June 7, 1958 (diplomatic): Nikolai I. Kurochkin, third secretary of the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata for the improper procurement of U.S. Army manuals and other materials.

July 18, 1958: Brian Linney, an engineer, was sentenced to 14 years imprisonment by a British court for selling secret information to Col. Oldrich Pribyl, a former Czech military attaché in England.

November 20, 1958: Mark Zborowski was convicted of perjury in denying to a Federal grand jury investigating espionage that he had known Jack Soble. He was sentenced to 5 years in prison.

November 20, 1958: Lt. Hans Berli was sentenced by a Swiss military court to 4 years hard labor for giving classified military secrets to Czech agents.

February 21, 1959: Einar Bleckinberg, a former Danish diplomat, was sentenced in Copenhagen to 8 years in prison for spying on behalf of Communist Poland.

January 30, 1960: Horst Ludwig and Fritz Briesemeister were sentenced by a West German court to 4 and 5 years at hard labor, respectively, for treason. Two other defendants, Werner Jaeger and his wife Hanni, were sentenced to 3 years and 18 months.

April 1, 1960: Anthony M. Wraight, a former Royal Air Force officer, was found guilty in London of having given military information to Russia and was sentenced to 3 years in prison.

May 11, 1960 (diplomatic): The Swiss Government arrested and expelled two Soviet Embassy officials for attempting to collect secret information on Swiss army installations and U.S. rocket bases in West Germany.

May 23, 1960: U.S. News & World Report (p. 54) described Communist espionage in West Germany as follows:

"Last year, in West Germany alone, 2,787 Communist spies were caught. * * * East Germany sent most of them * * * but 264 were from Russia, 114 from Poland, 63 from Czechoslovakia, 11 from Rumania, 8 from Hungary and 2 from Bulgaria.

"During the first 4 months of this year, 820 more Communist agents were arrested, including 691 from East Germany, 72 from Russia. Yet only a fraction of all spies sent from the Soviet bloc to West Germany are caught.

"The current estimate is that 17,000 Communist spies are operating in West Germany. * * * Red agents also make West Berlin the kidnaping center of the world. Since the war they have tried 340 kidnapings, succeeded in 255.

"West German estimates of 17,000 active agents do not include either the silent group (Polish, Czech and Rumanian spies posing as refugees) or the 35,000 members of the outlawed West German Communist Party.

"Over the years, more than 15,000 Red agents have been arrested in West Germany. Of these, fewer than 2,000 have been convicted. Many were let off because they confessed, voluntarily, not long after they entered West Germany. Others showed they were coerced into spying by Red threats to their families."

Sources: Facts of File; New York Times; U.S. Congress, House Un-American Activities Committee, "Patterns of Communist Espionage," 86th Cong., 1st sess., H. Doc. No. 119, January 1959, 81 pp.; U.S. Department of State; Washington Post and Times Herald.

ANNIVERSARY OF NOMINATION OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN TO BE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not want this day to pass without observing that 100 years ago today Abraham Lincoln was nominated, in a great structure in Chicago known as the Wigwam, as the Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States.

I have read a good many accounts as to what happened at that convention, and particularly those of a New York reporter named Murat Halstead. I think it is one of the most fascinating bits of reporting I have ever seen.

Abraham Lincoln was 51 years old when he was nominated on May 18, 100 years ago today.

I think it was one of the statesmen from New York, Mr. William M. Evarts, who made a seconding speech, who used a phrase or two which were not only interesting, but very applicable. He spoke about, "for the suffrages of the whole country." That is an interesting phrase. It has been echoed by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], when they have spoken of unity. Unity means speaking for the whole country. That becomes an interesting echo from over a century of time.

Also in the speech Mr. Evarts used the phrase, in presenting the name of Mr. Lincoln, that he was nominating him to be "the Chief Magistrate of the American Union." There is a rounded sound about the expression, "Chief Magistrate of the American Union." This is a Union. It is American. There is a Chief Magistrate. His name is Dwight David Eisenhower. I glory in how he has spoken for the American Union under difficult and challenging circumstances.

I wish to add one squib from the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, because he had a dedication of spirit to the cause of peace precisely like that of the present President of the United States. On one occasion Lincoln said:

> The man does not live who is more devoted to peace than I am. None who would do more to preserve it. But it may be necessary to put the foot down firmly.

So our President is equally dedicated to the cause of peace, and with that same devotion and that same firmness of spirit he has put his foot down, and in so doing merited the applause of our people.

I think I am at liberty to say that the President will return to the Nation's Capital in midafternoon of Friday of this week. I hope that all the citizenry who are available and so disposed will be able to journey to Andrews Field and to greet the President as he returns to his own country.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. In regard to the reference to what took place 100 years ago in the Republican convention, history has certainly recorded that the Republican Party made a wonderful choice in its nominating Abraham Lincoln for President, but I invite attention to the fact that at that time there was also a magnificent second choice whom the Republicans did not choose to call upon. That was William Henry Seward, who led in the balloting for two ballots and was overtaken by Lincoln on the third, but who lived on to be one of the great Secretaries of State in both Lincoln's and Johnson's Cabinets, and to consummate the purchase of Alaska, thus making a further great contribution to our Nation, even greater than those he had previously made as the Governor of New York State and as a Member of this body.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to round out the historical aspects of the

matter, the President-elect wisely chose as his running mate, if it was within his choice, a very redoubtable citizen, a great scholar, I suppose one of the greatest Latin scholars who ever came to the Congress. He came from Maine, and his name was Hannibal Hamlin. He was really a great citizen.

BIRTHDAYS OF SENATOR JAVITS AND SENATOR KEATING, OF NEW YORK

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would like to have my friend the Senator from New York listen when I say that speaking of anniversaries, I would not let this day go by without observing that this is the anniversary of the birthday of the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. Interestingly enough, it is also the anniversary of the birthday of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. Probably, never in the history of the Senate have there been two Senators from the same State who have had the same natal day. And so I offer my felicitations to my distinguished friends, Senator JAVITS and Senator KEATING.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep gratitude to my own leader. I understand the majority leader, when I was not in the Chamber earlier today, paid a tribute, on our birthday, to my colleague, Mr. KEATING, and to me. Mr. President, this is unusual, but it is a source of deep gratification to me. My colleague is not only a colleague, but also is a friend. We represent the most populous, and, in financial and industrial terms, the most powerful State in the Union. I should like to express to him my congratulations to him on his birthday, and to affirm our friendship and the gratification which I have in serving with a colleague in such close harness in the interests of so great a State.

Mr. President, it is a strange and fortuitous circumstance that Abraham Lincoln should have been nominated to be President on this day 100 years ago. This only enhances the joys of the day for me, and I know it does also for my colleague, Mr. KEATING.

I have one other thought which I wish to share with my colleague from Illinois. We have had a bad international blow in the last day. I have thought about it a great deal today. One does think about things on one's birthday. Perhaps this is a day to gain strength for what must be the integration of the free world and its greater devotion to freedom. I wish to state to my own leader the gratification which I have in being able to stand in the U.S. Senate and to fight for the causes which are conducive to that objective.

I am very grateful to my colleague for his affection and the warmth of his greeting.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished minority leader in extending congratulations to New York's two famous sons. I believe both the Senator from Illinois and I served with them in the House of Representatives, and got to know them and to recognize their value at that time.

It is, of course, a sad occasion, as we get older to note each passing birthday. There is nothing we can do about it.

It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to join with the distinguished Senator from Illinois in honoring two great members of his party, who have made many contributions to the betterment and to the welfare of our country in both Houses of the Congress.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I, too, desire to extend my most heartfelt congratulations to both the able Senators from New York. We have had occasion to listen to eloquence from the heart of our colleague, the senior Senator [Mr. JAVITS] but it is far more than his eloquence; it is, in addition, his ability and leadership in so many public causes in the Senate, which mellow the hearts of the rest of us on this occasion—it is his own friendship for his friends.

I should like to say to JACK, and in absentia to his colleague, KEN, that all of us in the Senate join in the congratulations of which our leader on the Republican side so eloquently spoke and of which earlier today the leader of the Democratic side spoke. If I may be pardoned for saying so, Mr. President, I am glad both these stalwart Senators sit on this side of the aisle.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I also join with my colleagues in extending congratulations and good wishes to our colleagues from New York, the distinguished senior Senator [Mr. JAVITS] and the distinguished junior Senator [Mr. KEATING].

We know that both of these men are men of fine intelligence, with wonderful abilities and great capacities. We know also that they are men of great integrity, humane spirit and heart. They are splendid representatives of a great State.

I know that all of us have treasured—as I have particularly treasured—our associations and friendship with these two colleagues.

Mr. President, I wish to join also with the minority leader, the Senator from New York, and others, in noting that this is the 100th anniversary of the nomination of Abraham Lincoln to be President of the United States. One hundred years ago our country faced a great problem, the problem of whether this country would remain united. We survived a great war, a tragic war. That war, bad as it was, bound our country together.

I do not wish to draw any analogies which may not be quite correct, but I think it can be said that today we are in a very difficult situation. Our country faces great problems as we look ahead. One of the factors which has been happy and helpful in the last few days has been the support given to the President of the United States at the summit.

I hope and believe that that support will continue and that our country will be unified as we look ahead.

The summit was a test of the intentions of the Soviet Union and Mr. Khrushchev. It may be also a test of the determination of the people of the United States to take whatever measures are necessary to defend our security and their determination to pursue whatever measures may be necessary toward the solution of the issues which have brought about the differences between the United States and the Soviet Union, and also our determination to pursue disarmament continuously. All of those things may eventually and ultimately bring peace to our country and to the world. But I do wish to say that there is some similarity between the conditions we face today and those faced by the country 100 years ago.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, may I add to the words of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] my sincere congratulations to both Senators from New York on this very unusual and happy occasion of their birthdays. The junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] a while ago spoke almost in a sad tone about the passing of the years and the addition of years to his age. I take from my own memory a quotation which might serve to hearten him. I believe it was Tennyson who said:

> Yet I doubt not through the ages one increasing purpose runs,
> And the thoughts of men are widen'd by the process of the suns.

So in achieving age, as we all come to our birthdays each year, we may feel the weight of years, but I am sure my friends will find heart in the words of Tennyson.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, as a native of New York State I am happy to join in the tributes initiated by the distinguished minority leader in behalf of the two Senators from New York who are celebrating their birthdays today. I had a very happy contact and experience with them before I became a Member of the Senate, which was several years ago when, as a so-called "Tennessee plan" Senator, I was elected by the people of Alaska to come to Washington to promote the cause of Alaskan statehood. The argument was advanced by some Members of the Senate and some Members of the House of Representatives at that time that they did not see how it was possible to justify and could not vote for admitting Alaska with only a little more than 200,000 people, when the great State of New York with 15 million people had only two Senators. But those arguments were not made by the two Senators from New York, one of whom, Senator JAVITS, was in the Senate and the other Senator KEATING, in the House at that time. Both of them voted for statehood, thus showing that they took a broad national view which extended their interest from the East coast far into the Pacific to America's farthest western and northern terrain. In doing so they demonstrated that they fully appreciated the great value to our entire Nation of the admission of the 49th State. They saw the great value in extending the frontiers of democracy to within naked-eye view of the Soviet police state. They rose above the purely parochial argument based upon the disparity in population, between New York State and Alaska, understanding fully, as some other Members of Congress did not, that had the policy been followed from the very beginning to admit no new State

whose population was smaller than those which were already in the Union, we would still be a nation of 13 States strung along the Atlantic seaboard. I am happy to join in congratulations and best wishes to my colleagues from the Empire State and to applaud their statemanship on the Alaska and Hawaii statehood issue and on other issues of national importance since that time.

SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I think that one of the striking events which has occurred in this country in the last few days is the heart-warming support of the President evinced by his countrymen. The insertion in the RECORD a few moments ago by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] of the record of spying in this country by Russian spies, Stalin spies and Khrushchev spies, should make every American aware that we are not living in a world of fantasy. We are living in a world of realism, and we also have to engage in a program of realism if we are to protect ourselves.

Mr. President, I hope that every Member of the Senate, as well as other Members of the Congress, who can possibly do so, will be present to welcome the President when he reaches home and to express the unity behind the President which the leaders of the Senate on both sides of the aisle have so well expressed. This is a serious time, but I believe the unity of the people of the United States has never come closer to being a oneness than it has today. I hope it will continue.

AMENDMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2131), Calendar No. 1267.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2131) to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, as amended.

THE B–70 WEAPONS SYSTEM

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, within recent days we have seen the hopes of the world for peace dashed by the impetuous and irresponsible tirades of Mr. Khrushchev at the Paris summit conference.

Instead of moving in the direction of disarmament and an easing of the tensions, we find to the distress and disappointment of the free world that we and the Russians are entering a period of even greater intensified cold war maneuvers in which the gravest consequences may be anticipated.

The question that seriously concerns me in that connection is, again, the adequacy and confidence that we can place in our Defense Establishment.

This body has heard prolonged and able debate by the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and others concerning the attributes and superiority of the B–70 bomber.

The Senate, Mr. President, has also heard that our danger point in our military security will occur in the next few years during which we are attempting desperately to close the missile gap.

I find it indefensible for the administration to have cut the $365 million B–70 budget approved by Congress last year to a figure of only $150 million this year. And I note with grave concern that the administration advocates an expenditure of only $75 million for fiscal 1961, when the amount for the B–70 should have been $463 million for fiscal 1961.

Where does this type of fiscal juggling of our military defenses place this country?

To me, it means that by the middle of this decade, we will have not a fleet of some 60 or more B–70 bombers capable of almost instantaneous arrival at a troubled area and capable of penetrating any known defense the Russians now have. But what we will have will be a mere prototype, an experimental model, which will not assure us that we can do what has to be done.

This will not, Mr. President, accomplish what many of our outstanding military leaders and congressional experts claim we should have at that critical time.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues in the Senate and Americans everywhere who are concerned with national defense to reexamine our vulnerability, to reexamine the scuttling of the B–70 program, and I am sure they will come to the conclusion that this country cannot afford to risk placing all of our confidence in the B–47's and B–52's of the Strategic Air Command and fixed, above-ground ICBM bases, together with Polaris, which may, in fact, be inadequate to a task which may come to them within the next few years.

Without the B–70 in our free world arsenal, our security would be doubtful. We could not, for example, place utmost confidence in our ICBM's, and we could not forever rely on the Strategic Air Command's present inventory.

This airplane, if we provide for its production now, would be the only recallable weapon that would be in our inventory even after all of our missiles are in place. Flying overhead even as a diplomatic weapon, it could be incalculable visible evidence of the military strength of this country.

It offers for us a weapon which could be directed toward the Soviet Union within minutes, and would require the U.S.S.R. to divert untold resources in manpower and treasure in seeking to provide a defense against the B–70. It is the one weapon that I feel would be exclusive to our inventory and which the Russians would not be capable of matching for some time.

The B–70 program, in my opinion, should be speeded up and placed on a crash program basis if that is what it will take to deliver these excellent airplanes at the earliest possible moment. To my mind, it represents an insurance policy which this country cannot afford to take lightly.

I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will weigh the evidence that has been presented in favor of the B–70 weapons system, and reexamine the contribution this system is ready to make to our defenses before unthinkingly subscribing to the administration policy that it is something we can do without.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 18, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 684. An act for the relief of Gerald Degnan, William C. Williams, Harry Eakon, Jacob Beebe, Thorvald Ohnstad, Evan S. Henry, Henry Pitmatalik, D. LeRoy Kotila, Bernark Rock, Bud J. Carlson, Charles F. Curtis, and A. N. Dake;

S. 2317. An act for the relief of Mary Alice Clements;

S. 2523. An act for the relief of Harry L. Arkin;

S. 2779. An act relating to the election under section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by the Augusta Furniture Company, Inc., of Staunton, Va.;

S.J. Res. 166. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary and permanent construction work on the Capitol grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately-owned property adjacent thereto.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 19, 1960, at 11 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Timothy 4: 17: *The Lord stood with me, and strengthened me.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, who alone can make us equal to every untoward circumstance and every bitter calamity, wilt Thou give us a sense of security and strength as we walk a dim and shadowy way whose meaning our finite minds cannot comprehend.

Grant unto us the chivalry and courage of a strong faith which is confident that our anchor will hold no matter how fiercely the storms of adversity may rage and that out of the welter of world tragedy there will emerge a new and nobler era for all mankind.

Hear us as we daily pray that the nations of the earth may be drawn into a closer and deeper fellowship with one another, possessing the same passionate

strivings after peace and righteousness and inspired with the same earnest longings to be comrades in the doing of Thy will.

In the name of our blessed Lord we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

Mr. McCORMACK (after the Committee on the District of Columbia was called). Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Committee on the District of Columbia was called. The next committee in order today or any future day when action is taken under Calendar Wednesday would be the Committee on Education and Labor.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the call of Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the Committee on the District of Columbia been called and passed?

The SPEAKER. The committee has passed.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

HIGHWAY INVESTIGATION

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, the May 21 issue of Labor, a periodical put out by the railway labor organizations, devotes an article to the current highway investigation of the Roads Investigating Subcommittee.

It uses the words "shocking, biggest scandals, fantastic," and so forth, and borders on the overly enthusiastic use of the spectacular. The writer of that article further professes agony and attempts to malign all the railroaders against new highways despite the fact they might use them in their daily travels to and from work or just for the fun of Sunday driving.

However, for myself, speaking as a member of that subcommittee, I think the writer could not have been present at the hearings and heard all the testimony. I have been in the supply and materials and contracting business and feel qualified to pass on this subject. You know, the parallel that comes to my mind about this situation in Oklahoma is something like a bank clerk being in collusion with the vice president of a bank—how long does it take the president or board of directors to find out something improper had been going on—perhaps until the Federal bank examiner comes around and uncovers the mess, if he is lucky and the bank clerk and board of directors do not attempt to conceal the dereliction from the examiner, which is the sort of thing which happened in the Oklahoma case.

To attribute the program as being full of corruption because of the Oklahoma incident is gross injustice to the rest of the highway construction program and untrue.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SAN LUIS UNIT OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 7155) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 94]

Alexander	Durham	Murray
Allen	Forand	Pillion
Baring	Gavin	Powell
Blitch	Gilbert	Preston
Bonner	Green, Oreg.	Roberts
Brown, Mo.	Hébert	Rogers, Tex.
Buckley	Jackson	Santangelo
Cannon	Johnson, Colo.	Scott
Celler	Kilburn	Short
Chelf	Landrum	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	Mitchell	Taylor
Dawson	Morris, Okla.	Walter
Diggs	Moulder	Williams

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 393 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SAN LUIS UNIT OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 7155, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read through section 1, ending on line 21, page 3 of the bill.

If there are no amendments to this section, the Clerk will read.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEMPHILL: On page 3 at end of line 21 insert new paragraph to be known as paragraph (b) to read as follows:

"No water provided by the Federal San Luis unit shall be delivered in the Federal San Luis service area to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed and which will be in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security."

Then renumber the first paragraph as section 1(a) and renumber other sections accordingly.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to keep within some reason this particular authorization bill. This is similar to the language which is contained in the Senate bill, although not identical. The language contained in the Senate bill, we find here, had some technicalities as to what marketing year would be involved. All this does is to say that we are not going to here authorize the use of water to promote further surpluses, and we take the basic crops, which are cotton, wheat, tobacco, rice—I believe corn has been included on a different formula—and say that the irrigation districts or the water districts cannot contract for the use of this water on this new land, if there is any new land irrigated—and I assume there will be—to provide more surplus crops.

Now, I might say to the gentleman from California, if he will give me his attention, that I would like for him to answer for me at this time a question about the cotton acreage production in this particular area. As I understood the gentleman from California yesterday in reply to the gentleman from North Carolina, the gentleman from California

assured the gentleman from North Carolina that despite the fact that the committee report said that there were 132,000 acres of cotton, the result of this particular legislation, if enacted, would be to reduce the cotton acreage.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. In answer to the question yesterday, I stated that rather than increasing any acreage in cotton, it definitely would reduce the acreage. Of course, I am basing that on actual, practical knowledge of the area and what will happen once we develop and get some sweet water, pure water, that will grow fruits and many other things that the present water will not grow due to the chemicals within that water. The particular material referred to in the report was taken from the original Bureau of Reclamation report, and apparently the assumption was there that certainly the acreage would not increase. It is my opinion, and it was testified before our committee at length by a great many people farming in the area, that cotton acreage would go down substantially and grain acreage, as such probably would disappear, because it is much more feasible economically to produce vines—that is, grapes and fruits of various types—nuts and many of the other specialty crops in this semitropical area than it is to produce things like grain or cotton which we are forced to do now because of the chemicals in the water which we are pumping from the deep wells.

If the gentleman will yield further, let me say this: So far as I am concerned, I am happy to accept his amendment. I realize that many times people in some of the areas would prefer not to have this language, feeling that it might cause some problem. However, I am in complete agreement with him; under no circumstances do I want to see, and I believe no one in California wants to see any increase in production of crops that are in surplus. It is my firm conviction, as I think it is that of the people of California, that what we would be permitted to do here under diversification is to reduce production substantially. On that basis I am happy to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman from California. I might say to the gentleman that it does not make sense to us to pay people to take cotton land out of production in one part of the country and then legislate to put land into cotton production in another part of the country. It does not make reason, although I recognize that in our agricultural approach in this country the rule of reason is not the rule of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. I should like to say the amendment the gentleman has offered has materially strengthened this bill; it has improved it. I want to commend him for offering this amendment.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] has expired.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOEVEN. I think the gentleman's amendment makes a lot of sense and I certainly shall support it.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman. I might say to the gentleman that the junior Senator from California made the statement in the other body on the 12th day of May that the effect on the basic crops that would be affected in this area would be to reduce production and acreage. They want the land for the production of vegetables and other crops of that kind. I appreciate the support given me in protecting the growers of our basic crops. They are limited now by acreage allotments. My amendment provides that this bill shall not jeopardize those allotments and the water will not be used to increase surplus crops.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized, on behalf of the United States, to negotiate and enter into an agreement with the State of California providing for coordinated operation of the San Luis unit, including the joint-use facilities, in order that the State may, without cost to the United States, deliver water in service areas outside the Federal San Luis unit service area as described in the report of the Department of the Interior, entitled "San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project", dated December 17, 1956. Said agreement shall recite that the liability of the United States thereunder is contingent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out its obligations under the same. No funds shall be appropriated to commence construction of the San Luis unit under any such agreement, except for the preparation of design and specifications and other preliminary work, prior to ninety calendar days (which ninety days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) after it has been submitted to the Congress, and then only if neither the House nor the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has disapproved it by committee resolution within said ninety days. If such an agreement has not been executed by January 1, 1962, and if, after consultation with the Governor of the State, the Secretary determines that the prospects of reaching accord on the terms thereof are not reasonably firm, he may proceed to construct and operate the San Luis unit in accordance with section 1 of this Act: *Provided*, That, if the Secretary so determines, he shall report thereon to the Congress and shall not commence construction for ninety calendar days from the date of his report (which ninety days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days). In considering the prospects of reaching accord on the terms of the agreement the Secretary shall give substantial weight to any relevant affirmative action theretofore taken by the State, including the enactment of State legislation authorizing the State to acquire and convey to the United States title to lands to be used for the San Luis unit or assistance given by it in financing Federal design and construction of the unit. The authority conferred upon the Secretary by the first sentence of this section shall not, except as is otherwise provided in this section, be construed as a limitation upon the exercise by him of the authority conferred in section 1 of this Act, but if the State shall agree that, if it later enlarges the joint-use facilities, or any of them, it will pay an equitable share of the cost to the United States of those facilities as initially constructed before utilizing them for the storage or delivery of water and will bear the entire cost of enlarging the same and if, as a part of said equitable share, it makes available to the Secretary sufficient funds to pay the additional cost of designing and constructing the joint-use facilities so as to permit enlargement, it shall have an irrevocable right to enlarge or modify such facilities at any time in the future, and a perpetual right to the use of such additional capacity: *Provided*, That the performance of such work by the State, after approval of its plans by the Secretary, shall be so carried on as not to interfere unduly with the operation of the project for the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act and the use of the additional capacity for water service shall be limited to service outside of the Federal San Luis unit service area: *And provided further*, That this right may be relinquished by the State at any time at its option.

SEC. 3. The agreement between the United States and the State referred to in section 2 of this Act shall provide, among other things, that—

(a) the joint-use facilities to be constructed by the Secretary shall be so designed and constructed to such capacities and in such manner as to permit either (i) immediate integration and coordinated operation with the State's water projects by providing, among other things, a capacity in San Luis Reservoir of approximately two million one hundred thousand acre-feet and corresponding capacities in the other joint-use facilities or (ii) such subsequent enlargement or other modification as may be required for integration and coordinated operation therewith;

(b) the State shall make available to the Secretary during the construction period sufficient funds to pay an equitable share of the construction costs of any facilities designed and constructed as provided in paragraph (a) above. The State contribution shall be made in annual installments, each of which bears approximately the same ratio to total expenditures during that year as the total of the State's share bears to the total cost of the facilities; the State may make advances to the United States in order to maintain a timely construction schedule of the joint-use facilities and the works of the San Luis unit to be used by the State and the United States;

(c) the State may at any time after approval of its plans by the Secretary and at its own expense enlarge or modify San Luis Dam and Reservoir and other facilities to be used jointly by the State and the United States, but the performance of such work shall be so carried on as not to interfere unduly with the operation of the San Luis unit for the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act;

(d) the United States and the State shall each pay annually an equitable share of the

operation, maintenance, and replacement costs of the joint-use facilities;

(e) promptly after execution of this agreement between the Secretary and the State, and for the purpose of said agreement, the State shall convey to the United States title to any lands, easements, and rights-of-way which it then owns and which are required for the joint-use facilities. The State shall be given credit for the costs of these lands, easements, and rights-of-way toward its share of the construction cost of the joint-use facilities. The State shall likewise be given credit for any funds advanced by it to the Secretary for preparation of designs and specifications or for any other work in connection with the joint-use facilities;

(f) the rights to the use of capacities of the joint-use facilities of the San Luis unit shall be allocated to the United States and the State, respectively, in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon. The United States shall not be restricted in the exercise of its right so allocated, which shall be sufficient to carry out the purposes of section 1 of this Act and which shall extend throughout the repayment period and so long thereafter as title to the works remains in the United States. The State shall not be restricted in the exercise of its allocated right to the use of the capacities of the joint-use facilities for water service outside the Federal San Luis unit service area;

(g) the Secretary may turn over to the State the care, operation, and maintenance of any works of the San Luis unit which are used jointly by the United States and the State at such time and under such conditions as shall be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State;

(h) notwithstanding transfer of the care, operation, and maintenance of any works to the State, as hereinbefore provided, any organization which has theretofore entered into a contract with the United States under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and amendments thereto, for a water supply through the works of the San Luis unit, including joint-use facilities, shall continue to be subject to the same limitations and obligations and to have and to enjoy the same rights which it would have had under its contract with the United States and the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 1 of the Act of July 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 483, 43 U.S.C. 485h–1) in the absence of such transfer, and its enjoyment of such rights shall be without added cost or other detriment arising from such transfer;

(i) if a nonreimbursable allocation to the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife has been made as provided in section 2 of the Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080, 16 U.S.C. 662), as amended, the features of the unit to which such allocations is attributable shall, notwithstanding transfer of the care, operation, and maintenance to the State, be operated and maintained in such wise as to retain the bases upon which such allocation is premised and, upon failure so to operate and maintain those features, the amount allocated thereto shall become a reimbursable cost to be paid by the State;

(j) the State shall not serve any lands within the Federal San Luis unit service area except as such service is required as a consequence of its acceptance of the care, operation, and maintenance of works under paragraph (g) of this section.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BALDWIN: On page 10, following line 10, insert following new section: section 4:

"If the Secretary proceeds to construct, operate, and maintain the San Luis works under the terms of section 1 of this Act solely as a Federal project, the operation shall be subject to the following restriction:

"Whenever the chlorides in the water at the head of the Delta-Mendota Canal exceed 150 parts per million during the months of July, August, or September, the mean daily diversion from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to San Luis unit via Tracy pumping plant and Delta-Mendota Canal as measured at the San Luis pumping plant shall not exceed the mean daily import to the Sacramento Valley from the Trinity project."

Renumber the remaining sections of the bill.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to protect the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta from undue infiltration of salt water during the summer months. This amendment provides that in the event the chlorides in the water at the head of the Delta-Mendota Canal exceed 150 parts per million during the months of July, August, or September, the mean daily diversion from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to the San Luis unit via Tracy pumping plant and Delta-Mendota Canal as measured at the San Luis pumping plant shall not exceed the mean daily import to the Sacramento Valley from the Trinity River project, which shall be defined as the mean daily release from Whiskeytown Reservoir. The effect of this amendment would be to bar any pumping of water from sources which are natural to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta in the event chlorides exceed 150 parts per million at the head of the Delta-Mendota Canal. Since the Trinity River project will introduce additional water into the Sacramento River channel which is not natural to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, the residents of the delta would have no riparian rights as to the Trinity River water and, therefore, they would have no legal right to endeavor to bar the use of this Trinity River water in the San Luis project, even during the summer months of July, August, or September. However, this amendment would recognize the right of these residents of the delta to bar pumping in the San Luis project of waters which are natural to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta such as the water from the Shasta Dam, Folsom Dam, Monticello Dam, and other similar dams on tributaries of the Sacramento and San Joaquin River, whenever the chlorides exceed 150 parts per million at the head of the Delta-Mendota Canal. This amendment will give protection to the residents of the delta from undue salinity infiltration.

Since it has been stated both in the committee report on H.R. 7155 and in the floor debate that the primary period during which water will be pumped into the San Luis project will be during the winter months, this amendment should have no adverse effect whatsoever on the operation of the San Luis project.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate very much the problem the gentleman has in the area he represents, and I am fully cognizant of the problem he seeks to solve to be sure it does not recur. I am completely in accord with the position he takes. Therefore, I personally am very happy to accept the amendment the gentleman is offering.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to accept the amendment. It will relieve a situation which is worrying the people in the area the gentleman represents.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. In constructing, operating, and maintaining a drainage system for the San Luis unit, the Secretary is authorized to permit the use thereof by other parties under contracts the terms of which are as nearly similar as is practicable to those required by the Federal reclamation laws in the case of irrigation repayment or service contracts and is further authorized to enter into agreements and participate in construction and operation of drainage facilities designed to serve the general area of which the lands to be served by the San Luis unit are a part, to the extent the works authorized in section 1 of this Act contribute to drainage requirements of said area. The Secretary is also authorized to permit the use of the irrigation facilities of the San Luis unit, including its facilities for supplying pumping energy, under contracts entered into pursuant to section 1 of the Act of February 21, 1911 (36 Stat. 925; 43 U.S.C. 523).

SEC. 5. The Secretary is directed to plan the works authorized in this Act in such a manner as to contemplate and make possible the future provision of Central Valley project service, by way of the Pacheco Tunnel route, to lands and municipalities in Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, and Monterey Counties heretofore anticipated as a possibility by the Acts of December 14, 1949 (63 Stat. 852) and August 27, 1958 (72 Stat. 937). Construction of additional works to provide such service shall not be undertaken until a report demonstrating their physical and economic feasibility has been completed, reviewed by the State, and approved by the Secretary, and the works have been authorized by Act of Congress.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 11, line 9, strike out "December" and insert "October".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. The Secretary is authorized, in connection with the San Luis unit, to construct minimum basic public recreational facilities and to arrange for the operation and maintenance of the same by the State or an appropriate local agency or organization. The cost of such facilities shall be nonreturnable and nonreimbursable under the Federal reclamation laws.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: On page 11, line 20, strike "suih" and insert "such".

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. The provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to water deliveries or to the use of drainage facilities serving lands under contract with the State to receive a water supply, outside of the Federal San Luis unit service area described in the report of the Department of the Interior, entitled "San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project", dated December 17, 1956.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ULLMAN: On page 11, after line 22, strike out lines 23 and 24, and on page 12 strike out lines 1 through 5.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment to strike out section 7 of the bill. I want to state at the outset, I am in favor of this project. It is an excellent project. It is one that is very greatly needed to develop fully the limited water resources of this area. But I want to explain something about this project. This is a joint undertaking, an undertaking between the Federal Government and the State of California. It has taken many months and many years of negotiations between the two groups in order to find some area of agreement in which they can go forward and develop these water resources. In this bill which is before you, they have arrived at partial agreement, an agreement only to this limited extent, it provides that at some time in the future, an arrangement shall be worked out between the State of California and the Federal Government as to the joint construction and operation of the San Luis project.

Mr. Chairman, I am willing to go along with this concept because I think this is probably the only way we can proceed in order to get the water resources properly developed. But I am very much interested as I know my colleagues are in protecting the basic reclamation law, the practices and the safeguards governing reclamation that we have built up over these many years. I am particularly concerned about preserving the 160-acre limitation in this project. When the Federal Government spends money, the money of all the people of the Nation, to develop a reclamation project, the benefits should be spread as broadly and as widely as possible and we should be particularly careful that no large landowners or special interest gain special enrichment. That, in effect, is what this amendment says. Now this is a sound provision. It is one that the people of America have insisted upon all through these years. Section 7 would, in effect, say that the portion of the project that is beyond the Federal service area should not be subject to this limitation. Due to the vagueness of the Federal-State relationship and due to the fact that no agreement has been worked out, this, in effect, becomes a Trojan horse section—it opens wide doors to special privilege. There are tremendous landholders here who are very much interested in getting all the benefits they can from this project. If we leave this section in the doors are open to circumvent the basic reclamation laws and the 160-acre limitation. The issue is this: Shall Federal benefits and Federal safeguards follow Federal investment? I am not here to tell you that we should try to superimpose upon the State all of our Federal requirements. All I say is that Federal benefits should follow Federal investments. If we leave out section 7, you have a complete bill. This provision was not included in the original legislation. Our committee experts say the section is surplusage. The only reason I can determine why it was put in the bill is because there are large landholders in the area who want to gain special privileges.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Does not the gentleman from Oregon remember the discussion that took place in committee, to the effect that this was a part of the agreement between the northern and southern interests in California, and that they were supposed to be in agreement? This section 7 came before our committee and was treated by our committee as a part of the understanding between the interets in the State of California. The gentleman also understands, I think, that the committee on which he serves, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is not desirous of having these intrastate quarrels thrashed out on the floor of the Congress of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon may be permitted to proceed for another 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. So it does follow that this language is in this bill for a purpose; that is, to show that wherever there is a State interest involved, if the State facility is paid for entirely by State funds, then the Federal law should not be applicable to that particular project or part of a project.

Mr. ULLMAN. Certainly what the gentleman has said is true. But this particular provision is one on which landholders and interests in the southern California area were particularly insistent. It has been said repeatedly on the floor that this section is redundant, that you do not need this language in the bill in order to carry forward the purposes of the act. It has been said repeatedly that this does not change the reclamation law. If it does not change the reclamation law, then why is it in the bill? I have grave fear, and many others join me in that fear that this section will be the vehicle to circumvent the 160-acre limitation. Why would there be this great fight over this section unless somebody had a great deal to gain?

The proponents of the section have said: "We do not want it to get into the courts." I say: What do you have to fear from the courts if you are not changing reclamation law? If it does change the reclamation law, then we should analyze that change on its own merits. This the committee has not done. If it does not change the reclamation law, it has no business in this bill. It is surplusage. There is no question of States rights here. On page 8, it says:

The State shall not be restricted in the exercise of its allocated right to the use of the capacities of the joint-use facilities for water service outside the Federal San Luis unit service area.

We are not attempting to foist anything upon the State. All we want to do is to safeguard our Federal investment; make sure we maintain the safeguards on the Federal investment.

I hope my colleagues will concur in this amendment. The other body took several days to debate this issue. They finally struck this section out, and I am sure those who want this bill will vote to strike this section and allow the bill to become law.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I want to congratulate the gentleman. Fourteen or fifteen years ago this was a hot issue. It defeated a Democratic Senator for reelection from our State. The very associations and groups who are now advocating the repeal of the land limitation clause of the reclamation law are the same ones who were advocating its repeal then. You can tell me all you want to that there is not something to be gained by keeping section 7 in the bill. I do not believe it. The ones who are trying to retain it are the prototype of those who have been against the 160-acre limitation clause for the past 30 years.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I, too, want to congratulate the gentleman on his statement, and particularly because I come from southern California. I want to say, very frankly, I believe that if there was not something that some very special groups could see to their advantage from retaining this provision in the bill, I do not think it would be in. I can see no harm in taking it out. I do not believe in any way it will jeopardize the sale of bonds on the California project. I earnestly support the gentleman in what he is saying.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the best that can be said of the arguments thus far made in favor of the pending amendment is that they are in error. What we have here is not one project, but two separate projects: One project to serve roughly half a million acres in Mr. SISK'S area, the

central Joaquin Valley, California, out of the Federal project; and in addition to the project to serve Mr. SISK's area we have a separate State water project.

Both of these projects, because of the geographical facts of life in California, have to occupy the same reservoir site in order to store their water; so we got together on building a dam at the San Luis site, which is the only available site that will hold both State water and Federal water. They are each going to put their own water into it; they are each going to take their own water out of it. There is a sharing of the costs; the State is paying its fair share and the Federal Government is paying its share to construct this reservoir. I do not see why any Federal law should be imposed upon the water produced by the State any more than there is any reason why State law should be imposed on the Federal project. If anybody reads the Constitution and believes we have State governments and a Federal Government he should realize that this is a matter of States rights, and there should be no interference from the Federal Government.

Why do the people from southern California want this section 7 left in if the report says it is surplusage? Insofar as our committee and the Congress is concerned it is surplusage, but from the California State standpoint it is not surplusage. They look at it from the standpoint of removing the possibility of long litigious lawsuits over the next 20 years which will delay the project while those lawsuits are being carried through the various courts, and which would keep this arid and thirsty area from getting the water it needs for many years. I ask that it be kept in for that reason, and I ask that it be kept in for the additional reason that it will make it impossible for certain areas in Kern County to join in with the State-financed plan; and, as a consequence, the people further south who must take this water and use it in their factories, their homes, and their industries will have, by themselves alone, to build the conduit to carry this water up over the mountains and down into the valleys, a very, very expensive job. It will increase the cost to our workers and to our industries and to our homes unmercifully if we have to do this. So that is the second reason we wish to have this in.

The third reason, of course, is to avoid the delay in getting the bond issue, because you cannot issue State water bonds and get a financial house to float them while there is litigation pending. This particular section 7 spells out here once and for all what is a fact, that the Federal reclamation law does not interfere with the State project, and removes the possibility of carrying this thing up through the courts of the land through the course of some 20 years, with the consequent delay of getting water service to our people.

The most zealous protector of the 160-acre limitation that we know of in this land, the National Reclamation Association, under date of yesterday advised each and every one of the Members of this body that it recommends retention of section 7. Of course, its recommendation is based on the very reasons I have given.

In closing its memorandum to the Congress, the National Reclamation Association said this:

> The San Luis project is urgently needed. Your support for the bill, H.R. 7155, with section 7 included, would be very greatly appreciated.

That comes from the most zealous protector of the 160-acre limitation in the country. They know and they understand this situation, and they recommend that the amendment before you be defeated. They recommend it in the interest of the maximum use of water in this water-short land of ours, they recommend it in the interest of the progress of the West and thereby in the interest of the progress of the rest of the Nation. They realize that the arguments upon which the amendment before you is based are fallacious. They have analyzed the matter and they say to the Congress of the United States: "Act sensibly, keep section 7 in there, permit the project to go ahead as it should go ahead on a sound basis, recognizing the difference in jurisdiction between the State and Federal Government and if a 160-acre limitation is proper in the State area, let the State impose it."

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I speak in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] to delete section 7 from the San Luis bill.

Debate yesterday and today has opened up the question with which this amendment is concerned, namely, the question of how Federal reclamation law shall apply to a project of this unique nature which involves joint Federal and State investment. Let me reiterate that this is a unique problem because it is a joint Federal-State project that we are planning at San Luis.

Normally, Federal reclamation law would apply to a federally constructed reclamation project. Normally, it would not apply to a State-constructed project. But this is a joint Federal-State project and the entirely honest and legitimate question of how reclamation law shall apply here arises.

The bill in the original form proposes to answer this question simply by stating that water taken from the San Luis Reservoir to be used in the Federal Central Valley project shall be subject to Federal reclamation law and that water taken from the reservoir for all other purposes shall be specifically freed from Federal reclamation law. It is section 7 which states this latter provision.

This formula is unacceptable. It ignores the all-important fact that Federal reclamation law has traditionally been stated not in terms of where water is used, but in terms of the facilities through which it is developed. There can be no question about it. Title 43 of the United States Code, section 523, reads:

> Water impounded, stored, or carried in Federal reclamation facilities shall be subject to Federal reclamation law.

Because this formula is unacceptable—the formula set forth in the present bill in its section 7—we should delete it as proposed in the Ullman amendment.

The fact is that waters to be accumulated in the San Luis Reservoir will have been developed elsewhere in the various mountainous regions of the State of California and will have been regulated and controlled by such facilities as Shasta Dam, Keswick Dam, Nimbus Dam, Folsom Dam, and others—all projects constructed with Federal funds. Then, on top of that, at San Luis itself, these waters shall have been stored in another facility dependent upon Federal funds. Let us not forget that the San Luis Reservoir substructure will be entirely a Federal project. If the State of California does, in the final instance, participate to make the San Luis Reservoir a joint Federal-State project—if it does, it will add to the basic Federal substructure.

Now, it is not my contention that the Federal reclamation law should apply to waters developed entirely by the State of California. What I am saying is that the definition of so-called State waters included in this legislation in its section 7 is simply not correct. In direct conflict with Federal reclamation law, the language of this section would set as a basis for the application of the law the standard of where it is to be used. Instead, the law traditionally applies on the basis of what facilities are used to develop and accumulate the water.

Clearly, then, section 7 of this measure is a device to bypass and confuse existing Federal reclamation law. It should, therefore, be removed.

I take issue with my good friend and colleague from the 14th District of California [Mr. HAGEN] who yesterday suggested that those of us who oppose the formula provided in section 7 should themselves offer clarifying language.

On the contrary, it is plain enough on the face of it that those who propose to bypass Federal reclamation law by putting forth this kind of formula, when their proposals are called to light and criticized, must then themselves suggest an alternative—presumably one more in line with traditional reclamation principles. Furthermore, if they cannot offer an acceptable alternative, I believe we have no choice but to strike section 7 from this measure and leave a final determination of the question to the courts.

I think it remains only to be pointed out once again that the result of passing this bill without cleaning up the matter of Federal reclamation law can only be unjust enrichment of the various large land owners who will benefit by receiving water from facilities built in some substantial degree with Federal tax revenues.

I urge strongly that our colleagues support the Ullman amendment, because, in doing so, we will be preventing the bypassing of Federal reclamation law. Then, with this question answered, we can join in supporting the San Luis project which is so vital to the State of California and which, in its large purposes, has my full support.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to state at the outset that I was not in Congress at the time when my colleague from California waged his fight, and I am one of those who wants to retain section 7, and I was not a part of that fight. Nor does this San Luis project deliver any water to our particular section.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of retaining section 7 for three fundamental reasons; three. In the first place, this is the first joint reclamation project that we have had. Every time we have something in which the State participates it is a question: If the Federal Government puts some money in it, are they going to control? I think we ought to make clear so as to encourage other States to participate in reclamation that if they do participate with the Federal Government, there is no intention on the part of the Federal Government because they put some money in it to control the water that comes out of a joint project. And, you can only do that by keeping section 7 in so that the intent of Congress is known.

Second, this fear of the 160-acre limitation certainly ought to have no bearing here, because the organization that represents that group, the National Reclamation Association, is for retention of section 7. I am sure that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] believes in the National Reclamation Association; is that not true?

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ULLMAN. I would say to the gentleman that the National Reclamation Association generally represents large landowners. The National Grange, the National Farmers Union, and the labor organizations represent a great many taxpayers. Those organizations are all against section 7 and are supporting my amendment.

Mr. YOUNGER. I am very happy that the gentleman brought that up, the tax question, because it brings me to the third part—to my mind, the important part of this proposal—and that is the payer. Who is going to pay for this project? In my opinion, the people who are going to pay for this project are the ones whose attitude and whose recommendation we should pay some attention to. I have here a letter which I think most Members have received from the Feather River Project Association. Let me read from this the names of the associations which are joined here and want to keep section 7 in:

Partial list of California counties, agencies, organizations, and associations which have officially declared their support of the provisions of section 7 of H.R. 7155 (Sisk), a bill to authorize the Federal San Luis unit, Central Valley project, California: Irrigation Districts Association of California (represents 190 water districts in California), Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Basin Association, Eastern Municipal Water District, Riverside County Water Association, Santa Ana River Water Association, San Bernardino County Supplemental Water Association, Chino Basin Municipal Water District, Mojave River County Water District, Mojave Water Agency, Mojave Desert Soil Conservation District, San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, California Farm Bureau Federation, Kern County Farm Bureau, San Bernardino County Farm Bureau, Imperial County Farm Bureau, Kern County Board of Supervisors, San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors, League of Women Voters, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce, and Feather River Project Association.

Southern California Water Coordinating Conference, which includes members representing the following: San Antonio Water Co., Southern California Water Co., Santa Fe Irrigation District, Calleguas Municipal Water District, Eastern Municipal Water District, Southern California Water Works Association, Western Municipal Water District, Metropolitan Water District, Orange County Water District, Bueno Colorado Municipal Water District, California Water & Telephone Co., Central Basin Municipal Water Association, Orange County Municipal Water District, Compton Municipal Water District, San Diego County Water Authority, Orange County Municipal Water Authority, Palm Springs Water Co., San Bernardino Valley Municipal, Municipal Water District, United Water Conservation District, Ventura River Municipal Water District, Chino Basin Mutual Water District, Fallbrook Public Utility District, Riverside County Water Advisory Commission, Inglewood Water Department, Long Beach Water Department, Coachella Valley County Water District, and Oceanside Water Department.

I think if we pay attention to the people who are paying the bill, we will leave in section 7.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it pains me to disagree with my good friends, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN], for whose motivation I have the highest regard. I just think they are wrong in this instance and I hope that Members listening will vote for or against this amendment on the basis of fact and logic rather than on the basis of emotion or the identity of persons on one side or the other of this question.

Section 7 in the bill was worked out very carefully with the author of the bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], and representatives of the Governor's office in California, and at no time was it ever stated that there was any intention to change Federal reclamation law. I am certain if that were the case the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] would not have included it in his bill, because he has stated repeatedly that he supports Federal reclamation law.

Therefore, there is a disagreement only over the question of whether or not section 7 accomplishes more than we seek to accomplish, to wit, a clear statement of the presently prevailing interpretation of reclamation law applied to the facts of the San Luis project. If we want to label this section 7 which we seek to retain in the bill, it might be described as the antibarratry section, the States rights section, the prevention of litigation section, the clarity and equity section; any one of these phrases would fit it. It merely states what we consider the prevailing opinion to be with respect to current Federal law as applied to the facts which will be represented in the joint undertaking of the San Luis and the Feather River projects. The Congress has often codified and stated existing law in the interest of clarity and the interest of convenience. That is all we are asking you to do in the case of section 7. We agree that the state of the law is exactly as would be obtained under section 7, but we can foresee, perhaps, that some court 10 years from now might disagree with our interpretation unless the Congress says that this is the law.

Further, there is a very practical matter concerned. The viability of the Feather River project of the State of California, which is only indirectly connected with the San Luis project, is tied up in the fate of a $1¾ million bond issue. That bond issue can be passed and sold only if it is evident to bonding house attorneys and purchasers and even potential customers of the State project that the State project, which is financed and paid for by the State, is not going to be subject to Federal management by the decision of some court 10 years hence. So this is a very practical caveat in the bill in the interest of clarity.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. As a matter of fact, the Federal investment in its service area is being reduced by reason of the fact that it is cooperating with the State in the financing of the dam.

Mr. HAGEN. That is correct.

I also want to point out that the State's contribution to the so-called joint structures is in excess of the Federal contribution in every instance; in other words, the State is going to pay exactly for what it gets and pay more than the Federal Government of the cost of these common structures.

You may ask why this should be of interest to someone from New York, Kansas, or some other State. This is an unique venture in partnership in that a State undertakes to make a major contribution to its own water development. Should this partnership venture fail for any reason, you will see the State of California back here several years hence asking for the Federal Government to build this total State project, and you will discourage the development of cooperative plans in other States, so that the potential Federal cost, created by the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon, in my opinion, poses a real threat of large increases in Federal expenditures in the future. That is one of the reasons why we ask that you sustain our position on section 7. The savings that will be immediately achieved by this joint Federal-State project have been indicated. The State of California will pay for the total benefit of the State project from these joint structures. As a matter of fact this characteristic of separate identity is stipulated in several sections of H.R. 7155 in addition to said section 7. For

example subsection (f) of section 3 stated on page 8 of the bill before us declares:

> The State shall not be restricted in the exercise of its allocated right to the use of the capacities of the joint-use facilities for water service outside the Federal San Luis unit service area.

Except as it adds reference to drainage facilities specifically this language is an exact statement of the intent of, and the import and effect of, section 7. Simply stated said subsection (f) declares that State water deliveries shall not be subject to any Federal statutory or administrative regulation insofar as water deliveries are concerned and it is my belief that this language is also broad enough to cover the use of drainage facilities although section 7 is more explicit on this point.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER] was speaking, I am quite sure that he did not intend to imply that every person who was in favor of retaining section 7 in this bill was in opposition to the philosophy and the principle of the 160-acre limitation. I am sure he spoke generally and not specifically, because in my own case I am wholeheartedly in favor of the 160-acre limitation. I will go so far as to say that if I were once again a member of the California Legislature and this proposal were before the legislature to limit the benefits of the State water project to 160 acres, I would vote for such a limitation. But my opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon is not based upon the philosophy of the 160-acre limitation. It is based purely upon the philosophy of States rights. I thought the gentleman from Oregon put his finger squarely upon the issue which is here involved when he said, shall Federal benefits follow Federal investment? I presume the gentleman from Oregon believes they should and Federal regulation should follow benefits. I might say I agree with the gentleman. Is that a correct statement of the gentleman's point of view?

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. That is basically true. We have here a Federal-State project where an arrangement has not been worked out. We have no agreement and I have no way of knowing and no one has any way of knowing where the benefits will flow at this time. I only want Federal benefits to follow where Federal investment is made.

Mr. GUBSER. Then I have stated the gentleman's issue correctly: Shall Federal benefits, Federal regulation, follow Federal investment—and we both agree they should. The point I would like to make here is that Federal regulations do follow Federal investment in this case because Federal investment is for the San Luis service area which is a Federal service area. Because we are building this jointly the Federal investment is $60 million less than it would otherwise have been. All we are asking here today is for the State legislature to have the right to determine the rules and regulations which apply to the service area which is served by investment made by the State.

I think we should remember this. The State of California owns this land upon which this reservoir will be built and if this bill does not pass, that the State of California will build the San Luis reservoir. But, if the State of California builds the reservoir on land that it now owns, then the opportunity to use that site will be taken away from the Federal Government and we will never be able to finish the Central Valley project. The people in the Federal San Luis service area of the Central Valley project, mostly in the district of our colleague, the gentleman from Califorina [Mr. SISK], will not have the chance to receive Federal water because the State has already built a reservoir on the only site available. Let us remember this; we are not giving anything to the State of California for the non-Federal service area. We are asking the State for the right to build our portion of this dam on top of the one that the State is going to build anyway. So why under the point of view is it justifiable for us, because we are being taken along as a partner, to tell the State of California that for your part of the project which you pay for, you must follow the same rules and regulations that we follow for our part?

I was asked before I concluded my remarks to remind the House that this is not a power project and public power is not involved in any way. In fact, the San Luis project is a consumer of power rather than a producer. Since I was asked by a Member on our side to bring that point out, I am so doing at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close at 1:30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there has been quite a little comment on this particular section of the bill. This is a controversial section which has created a great deal of fire. I want to state my position clearly because this was a part of some six or seven amendments which a group of us agreed to attempt to keep in this piece of legislation on behalf of some of our friends in southern California. These amendments were written into the bill which I introduced at that time. I carried on a consistent fight for all of those provisions. All of the provisions were written into the bill up until this point. I think my colleague from California [Mr. HOSMER], will agree that our joint efforts in the committee did manage to retain this section. However, since that time a controversy has developed over the meaning of this language. If anything happens with this section in the bill that would not happen with it out of the bill, then we are amending the reclamation law. This is simply a legal practicality. The facts are that the people in my area are not particularly concerned, because our area is 100 percent under the reclamation law, but I simply wanted to make sure that the Federal project will be able to operate successfully under the reclamation law. At the same time I want to make sure that the State project can operate successfully under the State law. That is my position. That is what I think will happen under this bill, whether this section is in or out.

Unfortunately a situation has developed where a few people are apparently reading something into this section which we in the committee do not read into it; that is, that it might offer a loophole through which water could be secured which could not be secured without it.

With reference to a legal proceeding in court, it is my opinion that when the Congress speaks that will be it. There will be no more litigation with this section out than with it in. That was my position from the beginning, that I would do the best I could to get it to the floor and then abide by the decision of my colleagues. The other body saw fit to strike this section, as I say. In view of the controversy that has arisen, in view of the fact that we all agree that we do not want to amend the reclamation law, it is my opinion at the present time that the legislation would be less controversial if the section is stricken from the legislation.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN. It is true that you have stated many times that you support the Federal reclamation law, including the acreage limitations, as applied to traditional federally subsidized projects.

Mr. SISK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HAGEN. Has anyone ever pointed out to you how this particular section 7 attempts to change the Federal reclamation law?

Mr. SISK. No. That is the point I wished to make. On the other hand, I have an idea that it has not been pointed out specifically that it would not amend it. Apparently it is the interpretation that various people have placed upon it, which has created the controversy.

Mr. HAGEN. It is your understanding that the present state of the law is that the Federal reclamation law would not apply to a wholly State-owned, State-financed project?

Mr. SISK. That is exactly right. It is my opinion, and it certainly is the intent of our committee and it is very accurately spelled out in the report accompanying this bill, that Federal law shall govern the Federal project and State law shall govern the State project; I believe that when the Congress

speaks that will be the intent; that Federal law governs the Federal project and State law the State project.

Mr. HAGEN. Is it not, therefore, fair to say that all section 7 does is to restate in the legislation what is already provided by current law?

Mr. SISK. That covers it precisely. The gentleman sat in the room at the time the agreement was made. This simply was inserted for purposes of clarification.

We intended and I believe that section 7 is merely a statement of existing Federal reclamation law and that, with or without section 7 in the legislation, the courts would hold that the sharing of a site and joint financing, construction and use of structures placed thereon as proposed in the San Luis legislation would not subject State water deliveries to Federal reclamation law. Further, it is my opinion that, acting pursuant to the legislation, with or without section 7, the Secretary of the Interior would have full legal authority to enter into a contract with the State of California spelling out the safeguard stated in section 7.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired, all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ULLMAN) there were—ayes 81, noes 84.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. ULLMAN and Mr. HOSMER.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 139, noes 122.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the works of the San Luis unit, including joint-use facilities, authorized by this Act, other than distribution systems and drains, the sum of $290,430,000, plus such additional amount, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in costs of construction of the types involved in the San Luis unit as shown by engineering indexes. Said base sum of $290,430,000 shall, however, be diminished to the extent that the State makes funds or lands or interests in land available to the Secretary pursuant to sections 2 or 3 of this Act which decrease the costs which would be incurred if the works authorized in section 1 of this Act (including provision for their subsequent expansion) were constructed solely as a Federal project. There are also authorized to be appropriated, in addition thereto, such amounts as are required (a) for construction of such distribution systems and drains as are not constructed by local interests, and (b) for operation and maintenance of the unit. All moneys received by the Secretary from the State under this Act shall be covered into the same accounts as moneys appropriated hereunder and shall be available, without further appropriation, to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 12, line 9, after "the sum of" insert "not to exceed," and on line 9 strike out the word "plus" and strike out lines 10, 11, and line 12 through the period following the word "indexes."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would limit the authorization to $290,430,000. As the bill is now written, it authorizes the sum of $290,430,000 "plus such additional amount, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in costs of construction of the types involved in the San Luis unit as shown by engineering indexes."

Mr. Chairman, I raise this question so that we may have a limitation and so that we may know the amount that is authorized under this bill. As the language now reads, you would depend upon some engineering indexes to determine the amount of the authorization. You would have your $290,430,000, and then it says "plus such additional amount as shown by engineering indexes." Now, whose engineering indexes? What engineering indexes? Let us say you had three or four engineering indexes, one showing an increase, one showing a decrease, and perhaps one showing the level to be as it is. What index are you going to take? I do not believe that the House should legislate in this manner. If it is going to run considerably over the $290 million in the authorization during the period of construction, that will be known. There will be plenty of time to come back to the House and ask for this additional authorization, but it seems to me rather irresponsible to say that we are going to depend upon some engineering indexes when we do not know what engineering index is going to be used.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be adopted so that we will not exceed the $290,430,000. If later on it becomes necessary to come back to the House and show why this additional amount is needed—as we have done in the past in the Central Valley project where there has been a later estimate—the funds will be provided. But, I do not believe we should have this kind of loose language in a bill when we have legislation in the future.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. Would the gentleman tell me, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and familiar with authorizations generally, is this open end proposal common in authorizations for construction work?

Mr. BOW. I understand in the Central Valley, in some areas, that it has been done in the past, but if we made mistakes in the past and the estimates have been low many times, I think we should correct that now and say it shall not exceed a certain amount, and perhaps they will be more careful in the manner the money is spent rather than saying it will be $290 million plus some engineering indexes later on. I think it is a rather reckless way of appropriating.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for his amendment and say only this: Simply because these open end bills have been passed before is no reason why we should not put an end to it, and this is a very good time to start.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman and I hope the Committee will go along with this amendment that we shall not exceed the amount; $290 million is a great deal of money and an open end authorization saying that somebody's index later on will make it possible to spend a lot more is a little dangerous, I should say.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to oppose this amendment because very frankly I am anxious to see that this construction, as well as any other construction, be done as economically as possible. I agree to some extent with the comment of the gentleman from Iowa that just because this has been in other bills is not necessarily a reason to leave it in this bill. I will say, however, that so far as I know, for the last 50 years, throughout the history of reclamation projects, this is the language that has been used.

The position taken by the departments downtown, including the Bureau of the Budget, as I understand their position, the Department of the Interior, the Corps of Engineers and others whose work is involved in this, is that this could save money; and, of course, there is some possibility that it might increase the cost. That is, they should be given the flexibility of following the construction indexes. This is a single index. There is not a multitude of these prepared. Actually the construction industry each month submits figures to a central filing section where they prepare what is called the construction index for that period of time. That has been followed by all agencies as the construction index. It is my hope that that index will show a reduction in cost of construction rather than an increase, although we have been faced with increases during the past 10 years; there is no question about that.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to my chairman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is there any possibility that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio can make any saving to the Federal Government in the construction of this facility?

Mr. SISK. There is no possible saving that I can see because what you would be doing, of course, would be giving them an authorization to go ahead and construct. Then you get to the point where you have spent all the money and you have a project that lacks a couple of million dollars of being completed. Certainly we are not going to let it stand uncompleted and unusable.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is there any possibility that it might lead to agreement of contracts that would be any more economical in the interest of the district or the Federal Government?

Mr. SISK. Based on my knowledge and understanding of the Department's

position and that of the construction people, I would say no. What it actually does is to place these people in a straitjacket, to a certain extent. It might tend to cause them to go up in their costs. In other words, in this case, the ceiling would become the floor. That is something we always run into. I think this project, so far as the Federal Government is concerned, is going to be constructed for substantially less than this amount. I expect that it will be constructed for somewhere in the neighborhood of $230-odd million. But I do feel that this amendment would place the Department and the construction agencies in a straitjacket which might tend to increase costs rather than decrease them.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MEADER. Would it not have this effect, that those undertaking this construction work would realize that if they had to have a larger authorization they would have to come back to Congress for further legislation which would involve some time and some difficulty; and that would tend to make them more careful than if they had the leeway which the language in the bill would afford?

Mr. SISK. Of course that is possible, as the gentleman states it. However, as I say, it is my firm opinion that the people who are guarding the dollars down there are going to see to it that the contracts go according to these construction indexes as they have existed from year to year. That is my only reason for opposing the amendment. I appreciate what the gentleman is trying to do. I am sympathetic with his position. I do believe that to give them the flexibility which they have under the normal language here is advisable. After all, the appropriation committee still has to appropriate the money and they can stop these appropriations whenever they desire. So there is certainly no desire on my part, or on the part of the committee, to take anything away from the appropriating power of the Congress, because I think it is essential not only to this project but to the carrying on of any other kind of construction carried on by the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: On page 12, line 19, after "Federal project" strike out the balance of line 19 and all of lines 20, 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the figure that has been included in this bill as the cost of the San Luis project is $290 million. By the language of my amendment, I just strike out $192 million more, because the cost of this project is actually in excess of $482 million. If there was ever an open-end proposition presented to this Congress, it occurs on page 12 in section 8, lines 19 to 23. The distribution and drainage systems should be constructed by the Federal Government or by the water users at an estimated cost of $192,650,000. If this language stays in the bill, instead of authorizing a project for $290,430,000 plus, up or down, according to the indices, you are authorizing a project in excess of $483 million. The Federal Government can build the distribution and drainage system, and there is absolutely no requirement to come back and ask this Congress or anyone else for the approval to build these features.

If anybody from California wants to stand up and tell me that that information is not correct, here is his opportunity to do it. This amendment just saves the taxpayers money and makes them come back to the Congress to get the approval for this $192 million.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Here again the gentleman knows this is the normal language that is used in all these projects. Is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. No. This is a different situation. This is a joint State-Federal project. This is the first one that they ever had. In every bill that we have ever had before, the cost of the distribution system has always been included in the amount that has been authorized. This is the first time we have ever had a bill presented that does not have that amount included. This $290 million does not take care of the distribution system. What my amendment does is just to say to the people of California that we will approve your project and if the State will enter in good faith into the type of contract which has been authorized, then there will be no responsibility on the part of the Federal Government to build the distribution system. If there is not a contract entered into and it becomes a full Federal project, before they can go ahead, they have to come back and ask the Federal Government for approval of $192 million more.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman in his amendment.

I should like to add my voice to those advocating the passage of the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project. This project has much merit and has been already delayed too long.

For many years, the State of California has desired to cooperate with the Federal Government in the joint development of the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project.

In the first place, construction of this urgently needed water storage project would have a double-barreled impact upon the State economically. Secondly, the Federal portion of the San Luis unit would make a most important resource contribution by furnishing much needed additional water to an area of almost 500,000 acres of highly productive farm lands on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley. In addition, the San Luis storage unit would be an important link in the State's far-reaching plan for moving water from surplus areas in the north to water deficient areas in the southern part of the State.

The lands in the proposed Federal service area are desperately in need of an additional water supply. Overpumping within the last decade has lowered the ground water table in excess of 400 feet, which has had the effect of skyrocketing pumping costs and forcing good acreage out of production.

Unfortunately, this agricultural economic tragedy is still in progress. Of the 500,000 acres in the service area, about 400,000 were developed for irrigation in 1950. A good percentage of these lands are now dry and unproductive because of the high pump lifts resulting from the falling water table. Prospects are that unless an additional water supply is brought into the area—such as would occur with construction of the Federal San Luis unit—the existing ground water supply is adequate to sustain somewhat less than 150,000 acres in irrigation. Without San Luis, therefore, two-thirds of a rich agricultural area will be an almost complete economic loss to the State.

The constantly lowering ground water table effects a sort of "creeping paralysis" in the once lush western San Joaquin Valley. This agricultural decline, moreover, is taking place in the face of California's continuing population growth, which is expected to make it the most populous State in the Union. In a rapidly growing State, where good farmland is limited by the available water supply, more land, not less, must be irrigated to keep up with growing State needs for food, fiber, and job opportunities.

The Federal San Luis unit, therefore, must be considered as a rescue-type development, vital to the continued economic development of the San Joaquin Valley and to the State of California and to the Nation as a whole. Everyone benefits if valuable natural resources can be developed and sustained.

The State of California has long recognized its upward population trend and the urgent requirement to develop its soil and water resources to meet its growing needs. A forward-looking State water plan developed in the 1920's laid the groundwork for the great Central Valley project. A complete restudy of that far-reaching early planning resulted in the California water plan, recently completed, one of the most ambitious State water programs ever advanced.

The first step in this new plan is the Feather River project and several features of the San Luis unit, such as the San Luis Reservoir, are a part of this project. Such joint facilities will play an important part in the State's scheme to carry water to its service area in the southern part of the San Joaquin Basin and across the Tehachapi Mountains to provide the growing metropolitan complex in the Los Angeles-San Diego area with an adequate water supply.

Furthermore, by constructing the San Luis unit on a partnership basis—with Federal-State cooperation—it is estimated that the Federal cost on this project would be some $56 million lower than it would be if only the Federal unit were constructed.

In accordance with the proposed legislation, the facilities of the San Luis unit which are common to both the Federal and State plans would be jointly developed. Such cooperation is a necessity if the needs for water in the burgeoning Golden State are to be met in the future.

During congressional consideration in the other body of the San Luis unit legislation there was considerable discussion of the various facets of the excess land provision of the reclamation laws. Involved in the discussion were the lands to be irrigated in the Federal service area and, through joint development of some of the facilities of the unit with the State of California, the lands in the service area of the State's Feather River project.

There is no question that the owners of lands within the proposed Federal service area should comply with the 160-acre limitation in existing law. Before any water from the project could be furnished legally to these people, each prospective water user would have to enter into the customary recordable contract with the Federal Government to dispose of his lands in excess of 160 acres in a single ownership. This procedure would apply to all, including large landowners such as the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., which holds some 120,000 acres in the San Luis area.

The Senate was informed that the railroad company had stated it was not interested in selling its excess lands, but indicated it would be willing to pay interest on water supplied for its excess lands. Other landowners in the Federal service area have indicated they will comply with the acreage limitation, and it is true that the unit would be a feasible undertaking even if the Southern Pacific Railroad lands were excluded from project water service.

The question of whether the acreage limitation provision would apply to the lands in the State's service area has caused confusion and misunderstanding. It is understood the administration's view is, that since the State would fully pay for its share of the construction of the joint facilities prior to its use of them for the delivery of water, the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws, and thus the excess acreage limitation, would not apply to the State's service area. This would be true whether the legislation specifically exempts the State's service area from application of the Federal Reclamation laws, as does section 7 of H.R. 7155, or is silent on the matter as is S. 44, in the form it passed the Senate. There seems to be no precedent for application of the Federal Reclamation laws to the service area of a State-constructed storage facility.

Surplus crops will not be a particular problem so far as the San Luis unit is concerned. Consider these factors: The land is of high quality—more than 85 percent is classified in class 1 and 2. The growing season is long—over 250 days. Farms in the Federal service area will be of reduced size, as required by reclamation law. More and better quality of water will be provided by the new storage. Because of all these factors, crops will be grown which are generally not surplus to the Nation's needs. Also, these same basic conditions will make this an extremely versatile agricultural area, responsive to shifts in demand for agricultural products. Should some particular crop encounter marketing difficulties, it would be easy for the San Luis area farmers to shift to a more profitable crop which is not in surplus.

The expected crops from the San Luis project area include: Truck crops 88,000 acres; deciduous fruits and grapes, 22,000 acres; miscellaneous field crops, 66,000 acres; alfalfa, 88,000 acres; irrigated pasture, 44,000 acres; long staple cotton, 132,000 acres, and grain and hay, 44,000 acres. With the project development, there would be a drastic reduction in the 162,000 acres of grain and hay now grown in the area.

When the question of surplus crops is raised, an accusing finger is generally pointed at the cotton which would be grown in the San Luis unit area. In this regard, however, it should be remembered that California-grown cotton is of the long-staple variety. This is high quality cotton and there is a demand for it in this country. Thus, it does not contribute to the surplus problem in short-staple cotton. Furthermore, efficient production methods and irrigation enable the farmers in California to grow this better quality cotton at a low cost per acre. Considering the competition that cotton is meeting from imports and man-made fibers, the welfare of the domestic cotton industry depends on lowering the cost of cotton by increasing quality and instituting more efficient methods of production, such as you would have in the San Luis area.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Actually, the facilities authorized by the language which the gentleman proposes to strike out here has absolutely nothing to do with the State project. There is not any part of the State project involved in this distribution system. This is a distribution system for a Federal project, and whether or not the people decide to contract with the Bureau of Reclamation under the normal procedure to construct the distribution system or decide under a bond issue or by some other method to construct, it is still part of the Federal project. Of course, it is covered by the reclamation law and has no part of the State project and no application to anything at all that has to do with the State project. I believe my colleague will agree with me on that.

Mr. SAYLOR. Let me ask my colleague, the author of the bill, then if that is the case—are you willing to go back to section 8 and strike out the words "other than distribution system" and insert the sum of $482 million, because that is what it becomes?

Mr. SISK. So far as I know, the statement by the gentleman that the distribution facilities have always been included in the total amount of money authorized, that is not my understanding. The gentleman may be right. It is my understanding that the normal language in these various projects which we have authorized—and the gentleman has been on the committee, of course, longer than I have—but it is my understanding that is the normal language we have always used in projects authorized in the 6 years that I have been on the committee.

Mr. SAYLOR. And the Central Valley project and the Central Valley distribution system have all, or almost all, been built by the Federal Government. In this case, this language which is in the bill authorizes $192 million more. What my amendment does is to tell the people of the area that if they want the Federal Government to build a distribution system, then they have to come back here again and get a further authorization.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield further to my colleague from California.

Mr. SISK. Let me say there are a good many of the systems which were not built on money furnished by the Federal Government, but were built on their own. On the other hand, many have been built under the terms of this type of language.

Mr. SAYLOR. And a great deal of the trouble in the Central Valley has grown out of the distribution system that the Federal Government built.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: On page 12, line 23, after the word "interests", insert "but not to exceed in total cost the sum of $192,650,000".

And on page 12, line 23, change period (.) to colon (:) and add "*Provided*, That no funds shall be appropriated for construction of distribution systems and drains prior to ninety calendar days (which ninety days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) after a contract has been submitted to the Congress calling for complete repayment of the costs of such distribution systems and drains within a period of forty years from the date such works are placed in service."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I, too, have been somewhat alarmed because of the fact that we did not come out and expressly state in this legislation the amount that should be authorized as the cost of the possible drainage and distribution installations. My amendment states that any contracts for this contemplated construction shall be placed with the Congress so that they can be reviewed so that they will conform to the procedures that we usually follow in such matters. The reason for this provision is, that all authorizations for reclamation projects do not carry this provision. Some projects do not necessitate the building of drainage and distribution facilities. In California it

so happens that a large part of the drainage and distribution facilities have been built by the local irrigation districts themselves. It is contemplated that such facilities will be constructed by the local districts in this particular project.

We have on certain occasions authorized separately certain distribution systems for California projects. However, in the planning and distribution of such projects at the San Luis project it is so much more practical, so much more feasible, so much more economical to plan for all the different construction facilities which are necessary. If it is found at the time of the primary construction that the drainage and distribution facilities, which mean so much to the success of the project, cannot be constructed by the local interests, then those facilities should be a part of the whole project and should be built by the Federal Government and the cost thereof should be returned by the users to the Federal Government. That is what my amendment provides. I think that it is a perfectly feasible way to take care of the situation. My amendment shows what the possible cost of this project may be. Remember that 99.99 percent of this project is repayable to the Federal Government. This does not provide for a 10-year development period for these distribution and drainage facilities. This provides that as soon as they are in shape to be put into operation the payments shall start.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. BOW. I think the gentleman's amendment is a good one and brings it out where we can see what these costs actually will be.

Would the gentleman explain why the operation and maintenance is in this bill when, in answer to an inquiry which I made yesterday of the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] he said no operation and maintenance money would be used.

Mr. ASPINALL. Well, the operation and maintenance funds are provided annually by the great Committee on Appropriations. These funds are payable annually. Sometimes they are paid before the start of the irrigation system. At other times they may be delayed until later in the season. But in order to keep these authorizations from coming back to Congress from time to time we have used this language. It permits the great Committee on Appropriations to continue its control and authority over this portion of the reclamation program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] has expired.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to join the chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in support of his substitute amendment, because this actually places in the bill the actual cost of the project, $482 million. I think the Members of the House who are going to vote on this project ought to know the total amount in the project. I think the manner in which it is now placed is a safeguard and that the committee should go along with the amendment.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, once again I say it is a great pleasure to work with my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and take this opportunity to rise in support of the bill in its present shape, and congratulate the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, both Democrats and Republicans, for the very careful and excellent manner in which the committee has always, during my years in this body, considered and screened legislation coming before the committee. The illustration of leadership on both sides, the chairman of the committee, my friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], shows the manner in which they approach consideration of legislation that comes before this excellent committee. It shows the teamwork, it shows the understanding. The gentleman from Pennsylvania made a profound speech. It was logical. Some of us might disagree to his amendment, but not to the logic of his reasoning behind his amendment. The chairman of the committee offers an amendment in the nature of a substitute, but an amendment by reason of the parliamentary situation. The gentleman from Pennsylvania accepts the amendment. That is the kind of teamwork in committee which produces the most constructive results.

This project is a great one that means much to the State and people of California. As far as I am concerned, coming from Boston, I am interested in projects all over the country. I do not feel because I come from Boston I should vote against a project that is going to marshal the natural resources of any section of our country in the service of the people of that section and indirectly the people of the entire country simply because it involves appropriations where other sections of the country might primarily benefit. I have voted for all these projects over the years. This is another project. It is in the best interests of our country. It is going to mean a great deal to the people of California, and I am supporting the bill, but I particularly wanted to take the floor to call to the attention of the House this fine teamwork and understanding that exists in the committee and to congratulate both the Democratic and Republican members of the committee for the manner in which they have approached the consideration of this bill in committee and on the floor, and the manner in which they approach the consideration of all bills referred to their committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASPINALL. Does not the vote recur on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania? Or will he withdraw his amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Colorado being in the nature of a perfecting amendment, the motion to strike out the paragraph falls.

If there are no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7155) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 514, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Ullman amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 11, line 22, strike out lines 23 and 24, and on page 12 strike out lines 1 through 5.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 215, nays 179, answered "present" 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—215

Abernethy	Burke, Ky.	Fascell
Addonizio	Burke, Mass.	Feighan
Albert	Burleson	Fisher
Alford	Byrne, Pa.	Flood
Anderson, Mont.	Carnahan	Flynn
	Casey	Flynt
Anfuso	Celler	Fogarty
Ashley	Clark	Foley
Bailey	Coad	Friedel
Barr	Coffin	Garmatz
Barrett	Cohelan	George
Bass, Tenn.	Cook	Giaimo
Beckworth	Cooley	Granahan
Bennett, Fla.	Daddario	Gray
Blatnik	Daniels	Green, Pa.
Boggs	Dawson	Griffiths
Boland	Delaney	Gross
Bolling	Dent	Halpern
Bowles	Denton	Hargis
Boykin	Dingell	Harmon
Brademas	Donohue	Harris
Breeding	Doyle	Hays
Brock	Dulski	Healey
Brooks, La.	Edmondson	Hechler
Brooks, Tex.	Everett	Herlong
Brown, Ga.	Evins	Hogan
Brown, Mo.	Fallon	Holifield
Burdick	Farbstein	Holland

Holtzman	Miller, Clem	Rivers, Alaska
Huddleston	Miller, George, P.	Roberts
Hull	Mills	Rodino
Ikard	Mitchell	Rogers, Colo.
Inouye	Moeller	Rogers, Fla.
Irwin	Monagan	Rooney
Jarman	Montoya	Roosevelt
Jennings	Moorhead	Rostenkowski
Johnson, Calif.	Morgan	Roush
Johnson, Wis.	Morris, N. Mex.	Rutherford
Jones, Ala.	Morrison	Saund
Karsten	Moss	Selden
Karth	Moulder	Shelley
Kasem	Multer	Shipley
Kastenmeier	Murphy	Sisk
Kee	Natcher	Slack
Kelly	Nix	Smith, Iowa
Keogh	O'Brien, Ill.	Smith, Miss.
Kilday	O'Brien. N.Y.	Spence
Kilgore	O'Hara, Ill.	Staggers
King, Calif.	O'Hara, Mich.	Steed
King, Utah	O'Konski	Stratton
Kirwan	O'Neill	Stubblefield
Kluczynski	Oliver	Sullivan
Kowalski	Passman	Teller
Lane	Patman	Thompson, N.J.
Lesinski	Perkins	Thompson, Tex.
Levering	Pfost	Thornberry
Libonati	Philbin	Toll
McCormack	Pilcher	Trimble
McDowell	Poage	Udall
McFall	Porter	Ullman
McGinley	Powell	Vanik
McGovern	Preston	Vinson
Macdonald	Price	Wampler
Machrowicz	Prokop	Watts
Mack	Pucinski	Wier
Madden	Quigley	Willis
Magnuson	Rabaut	Wolf
Mahon	Rains	Wright
Marshall	Randall	Yates
Matthews	Reuss	Young
Metcalf	Rhodes, Pa.	Zablocki
Meyer		Zelenko

NAYS—179

Abbitt	Dwyer	Meader
Adair	Elliott, Pa.	Merrow
Alger	Fenton	Michel
Andersen, Minn.	Fino	Miller, N.Y.
Andrews	Ford	Milliken
Arends	Forrester	Minshall
Ashmore	Fountain	Moore
Auchincloss	Frazier	Mumma
Avery	Frelinghuysen	Murray
Ayres	Fulton	Nelsen
Baker	Gary	Norblad
Baldwin	Gathings	Norrell
Barry	Gavin	Osmers
Bass, N.H.	Glenn	Ostertag
Bates	Goodell	Pelly
Baumhart	Grant	Pirnie
Becker	Griffin	Poff
Belcher	Gubser	Quie
Bennett, Mich.	Hagen	Ray
Bentley	Haley	Reece, Tenn.
Berry	Halleck	Rees, Kans.
Betts	Hardy	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolton	Harrison	Riehlman
Bosch	Hemphill	Riley
Bow	Henderson	Rivers, S.C.
Bray	Hess	Robison
Broomfield	Hiestand	Rogers, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Hoeven	St. George
Broyhill	Hoffman, Ill.	Saylor
Budge	Hoffman, Mich.	Schenck
Byrnes, Wis.	Holt	Scherer
Cahill	Horan	Schneebeli
Canfield	Hosmer	Schwengel
Cannon	Jensen	Sheppard
Cederberg	Johansen	Siler
Chamberlain	Johnson, Md.	Simpson
Chenoweth	Jonas	Smith, Calif.
Chiperfield	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Va.
Church	Judd	Springer
Collier	Kearns	Taber
Colmer	Keith	Teague, Calif.
Conte	Kitchin	Teague, Tex.
Corbett	Knox	Thomson, Wyo.
Cramer	Kyl	Tollefson
Cunningham	Lafore	Tuck
Curtin	Laird	Utt
Curtis, Mass.	Langen	Van Pelt
Curtis, Mo.	Latta	Van Zandt
Dague	Lennon	Wallhauser
Davis, Ga.	Lindsay	Weaver
Derounian	Lipscomb	Weis
Derwinski	Loser	Westland
Devine	McCulloch	Wharton
Dixon	McDonough	Whitener
Dooley	McIntire	Whitten
Dorn, N.Y.	McSween	Widnall
Dorn, S.C.	Mailliard	Wilson
Dowdy	Martin	Winstead
Downing	Mason	Withrow
	May	Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Aspinall

NOT VOTING—38

Alexander	Forand	Rogers, Tex.
Allen	Gallagher	Santangelo
Barden	Gilbert	Scott
Baring	Green, Oreg.	Short
Blitch	Hébert	Sikes
Bonner	Jackson	Smith, Kans.
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Taylor
Buckley	Kilburn	Thomas
Chelf	Landrum	Thompson, La.
Davis, Tenn.	Lankford	Wainwright
Diggs	McMillan	Walter
Durham	Morris, Okla.	Williams
Elliott, Ala.	Pillion	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Johnson of Colorado for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Allen against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Rogers of Texas for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Pillion against.

Mr. Santangelo for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Brewster for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Mr. Gilbert for, with Mr. Smith of Kansas against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Wainwright against.

Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Williams against.

Mrs. Green of Oregon for, with Mr. Barden against.

Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Baring for, with Mr. Alexander against.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. McMillan against.

Mr. JONES of Missouri changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, on the rollcall I voted "no." I have a live pair with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I, therefore, ask to be recorded as voting "present."

Mr. WILSON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MERROW changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit which is at the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. UTT. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. UTT moves to recommit the bill, H.R 7155, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 44) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes, which is a bill similar to the one just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Senate bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. (a) That for the principal purpose of furnishing water for the irrigation of approximately five hundred thousand acres of land in Merced, Fresno, and Kings Counties, California, hereinafter referred to as the Federal San Luis unit service area, and as incidents thereto of furnishing water for municipal and domestic use and providing recreation and fish and wildlife benefits, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the San Luis unit as an integral part of the Central Valley project. The principal engineering features of said unit shall be a dam and reservoir at or near the San Luis site, a forebay and afterbay, the San Luis Canal, the Pleasant Valley Canal, and necessary pumping plants, distribution systems, drains, channels, levees, flood works, and related facilities. The works of the San Luis unit (hereinafter referred to as joint-use facilities) for joint use with the State of California (hereinafter referred to as the State) shall be the dam and reservoir at or near the San Luis site, forebay and afterbay, pumping plants, and the San Luis Canal. The joint-use facilities consisting of the dam and reservoir shall be constructed, and other joint-use facilities may be constructed so as to permit future expansion; or the joint-use facilities shall be constructed initially to the capacities necessary to serve both the Federal San Luis unit service area and the State's service area as hereinafter provided. In constructing, operating, and maintaining the San Luis unit, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto). Construction of the San Luis unit shall not be commenced until the Secretary has (1) secured, or has satisfactory assurance of his ability to secure all rights to the use of water which are necessary to carry out the purposes of the unit and the terms and conditions of this Act, and (2) received satisfactory assurance from the State of California that it will make provision for a master drainage outlet and disposal channel for the San Joaquin Valley, as generally outlined in the California water plan, Bulletin Numbered 3, of the California Department of Water Resources, which will adequately serve, by connection therewith, the drainage system for the San Luis unit or has made provision for constructing the San Luis interceptor drain to the delta designed to meet the drainage requirements of the San Luis unit as generally outlined in San Luis project report by the Bureau of Reclamation of May 1955, as transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior, December 17, 1956.

(b) No water provided by the Federal San Luis unit shall be delivered in the Federal San Luis service area to any water user for

the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized, on behalf of the United States, to negotiate and enter into an agreement with the State of California providing for coordinated operation of the San Luis unit, including the joint-use facilities, in order that the State may, without cost to the United States, deliver water in service areas outside the Federal San Luis unit service area as described in the report of the Department of the Interior, entitled "San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project," dated December 17, 1956. The Secretary shall not commence construction of the San Luis unit, except for the preparation of designs and specifications and other preliminary work, until the execution of such an agreement between the United States and the State, but if such an agreement has not been executed by January 1, 1962, and if, after consultation with the Governor of the State, the Secretary determines that the prospects of reaching accord on the terms thereof are not reasonably firm, he may proceed to construct and operate the San Luis unit in accordance with section 1 of this Act: *Provided*, That, if the Secretary so determines, he shall report thereon to the Congress and shall not commence construction for ninety calendar days from the date of his report (which ninety days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days). In considering the prospects of reaching accord on the terms of the agreement the Secretary shall give substantial weight to any relevant affirmative action theretofore taken by the State, including the enactment of State legislation authorizing the State to acquire and convey to the United States title to lands to be used for the San Luis unit or assistance given by it in financing Federal design and construction of the unit. The authority conferred upon the Secretary by the first sentence of this section shall not, except as is otherwise provided in this section, be construed as a limitation upon the exercise by him of the authority conferred in section 1 of this Act, but if the State shall agree equitably to share the total cost of constructing the joint-use facilities and as a part of its share to make available to the Secretary sufficient funds to pay the additional cost of designing and constructing the joint-use facilities so as to permit enlargement, it shall have an irrevocable right to enlarge or modify such facilities at any time in the future, and a perpetual right to the use of such additional capacity: *Provided*, That the performance of such work by the State, after approval of its plans by the Secretary, shall be so carried on as not to interfere unduly with the operation of the project for the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act: *And provided further*, That this right may be relinquished by the State at any time at its option.

SEC. 3. The agreement between the United States and the State referred to in section 2 of this Act shall provide, among other things, that—

(a) the joint use facilities to be constructed by the Secretary shall be so designed and constructed to such capacities and in such manner as to permit either (i) immediate integration and coordinated operation with the State's water projects by providing, among other things, a capacity in San Luis Reservoir of approximately two million one hundred thousand acre-feet and corresponding capacities in the other joint-use facilities or (ii) such subsequent enlargement or other modification as may be required for integration and coordinated operation therewith;

(b) the State shall make available to the Secretary during the construction period sufficient funds to pay an equitable share of the construction costs of any facilities designed and constructed as provided in paragraph (a) above. The State contribution shall be made in annual installments, each of which bears approximately the same ratio to total expenditures during that year as the total of the State's share bears to the total cost of the facilities; the State may make advances to the United States in order to maintain a timely construction schedule of the joint-use facilities and the works of the San Luis unit to be used by the State and the United States;

(c) the State may at any time after approval of its plans by the Secretary and at its own expense enlarge or modify San Luis Dam and Reservoir and other facilities to be used jointly by the State and the United States, but the performance of such work shall be so carried on as not to interfere unduly with the operation of the San Luis unit for the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act;

(d) the United States and the State shall each pay annually an equitable share of the operation, maintenance, and replacement costs of the joint-use facilities;

(e) promptly after execution of this agreement between the Secretary and the State, and for the purpose of said agreement, the State shall convey to the United States title to any lands, easements, and rights-of-way which it then owns and which are required for the joint-use facilities. The State shall be given credit for the costs of these lands, easements, and rights-of-way toward its share of the construction costs of the joint-use facilities. The State shall likewise be given credit for any funds advanced by it to the Secretary for preparation of designs and specifications or for any other work in connection with the joint-use facilities;

(f) the rights to the use of capacities of the joint-use facilities of the San Luis unit shall be allocated to the United States and the State, respectively, in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon. The United States shall not be restricted in the exercise of its right so allocated, which shall be sufficient to carry out the purposes of section 1 of this Act and which shall extend throughout the repayment period and so long thereafter as title to the works remains in the United States. The State shall not be restricted in the exercise of its allocated right to the use of the capacities of the joint-use facilities for water service outside the Federal San Luis unit service area;

(g) the Secretary may turn over to the State the care, operation, and maintenance of any works of the San Luis unit which are used jointly by the United States and the State at such time and under such conditions as shall be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State;

(h) notwithstanding transfer of title or of the care, operation, and maintenance of any works to the State, as hereinbefore provided, any organization which has theretofore entered into a contract with the United States under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 for a water supply through the works of the San Luis unit, including joint-use facilities, shall continue to have and to enjoy the same rights which it would have had under its contract with the United States and the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 1 of the Act of July 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 483; 43 U.S.C. 485h–1), in the absence of such transfer, and its enjoyment of such rights shall be without added cost or other detriment arising from such transfer;

(i) if a nonreimbursable allocation to the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife has been made as provided in section 2 of the Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080; 16 U.S.C. 662), as amended, the features of the unit to which such allocation is attributable shall, notwithstanding transfer of title or of the care, operation, and maintenance to the State, be operated and maintained in such wise as to retain the bases upon which such allocation is premised and, upon failure so to operate and maintain those features, the amount allocated thereto shall become a reimbursable cost to be paid by the State.

SEC. 4. In constructing, operating, and maintaining a drainage system for the San Luis unit, the Secretary is authorized to permit the use thereof by other parties under contract conforming generally to the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws with respect to irrigation repayment or service contracts and is further authorized to enter into agreements and participate in construction and operation of drainage facilities designed to serve the general area of which the lands to be served by the San Luis unit are a part, to the extent the works authorized in section 1 of this Act contribute to drainage requirements of said area. The Secretary is also authorized to permit the use of the irrigation facilities of the San Luis unit, including its facilities for supplying pumping energy, under contracts entered into pursuant to section 1 of the Act of February 21, 1911 (36 Stat. 925, 43 U.S.C. 523).

SEC. 5. The Secretary is authorized, in connection with the San Luis unit, to construct minimum basic public recreational facilities and to arrange for the operation and maintenance of the same by the State or an appropriate local agency or organization. The cost of such facilities shall be nonreturnable and nonreimbursable under the Federal reclamation laws.

SEC. 6. The Secretary is authorized to provide Central Valley project service, by way of the Pacheco Tunnel route, to lands and municipalities in Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, and Monterey Counties: *Provided*, That construction of the works to provide such service shall not be undertaken until a report demonstrating their physical and economic feasibility has been completed, reviewed by the State, and approved by the Secretary and by the Congress, and in no event prior to July 1, 1964, unless, in the meantime, the Governor of the State of California shall have notified the Secretary that the State approves the construction of such works by the United States.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the works of the San Luis unit, including joint use facilities, authorized by this Act, other than distribution systems and drains, the sum of $290,430,000, plus such additional amount, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in costs of construction of the types involved in the San Luis unit as shown by engineering indexes. There are also authorized to be appropriated, in addition thereto, such amounts as are required (a) for construction of such distribution systems and drains as are not constructed by local interests, and (b) for operation and maintenance of the unit. All moneys received by the Secretary from the State under this Act shall be covered into the same accounts as moneys appropriated hereunder and shall be available, without further appropriation, to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 44, and substitute therefor the language in the bill H.R. 7155 as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the Senate bill, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 7155, was laid on the table.

AMENDING HOUSE RESOLUTION 27, 86TH CONGRESS

Mr. BOLLING (on behalf of Mr. SMITH of Virginia), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (H. Res. 530, Rept. No. 1613) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That H. Res. 27, Eighty-sixth Congress, is amended by striking out the period at the end of clause (7) on page 2 and inserting "; and" and by inserting after clause (7) on page 2 the following clause: "(8) involving the activities and operations of interstate compacts;".

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN RYUKYU ISLANDS

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (H. Res. 533, Rept. No. 1616) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1157) to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AUTHORIZING A PAYMENT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF JAPAN

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (H. Res. 532, Rept. No. 1615) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2130) to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PROVIDING FOR COMPREHENSIVE OPERATION OF HYDROELECTRIC POWER RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BOLLING (on behalf of Mr. COLMER), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (H. Res. 531, Rept. No. 1614) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7201) to provide for the comprehensive operation of hydroelectric power resources of the United States, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT INCENTIVE TAX ACT OF 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage private investment abroad and thereby promote American industry and reduce Government expenditures for foreign economic assistance.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 5, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Tuesday, March 8, 1960, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] had 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] had 22 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois would reserve 5 minutes, just in case we need it for purpose of explanation.

Mr. MASON. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I reserve all of my 20 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we began debate on this measure some weeks ago. At that time certain objections were raised to the proposed legislation, and in view of the fact that we were debating the bill under a closed rule as reported by the Rules Committee, it was felt that the best way to handle the objections was to reconsider the bill in the Committee on Ways and Means and adopt, if possible, committee amendments which would meet the objections.

There were three fundamental objections: One was that the administration and the Treasury Department took the position that this proposed legislation should be limited to the so-called underdeveloped countries.

The second was that we had written in the committee a so-called gross-up provision, which is a very technical tax matter quite difficult to explain, but nevertheless we had written it into this bill and had written it in other legislation pending before the committee.

The third had to do with labor standard conditions in the other countries of the world.

I think the Ways and Means Committee has met all of these objections. On yesterday I incorporated in the RECORD a comprehensive statement setting forth these committee amendments, setting forth the objections that had been raised some weeks ago, and our effort to correct these objections.

In the limited time available I do not propose to go into these matters in great detail, but as soon as general debate is over, which apparently will be in a few minutes, I will offer the committee amendments, which we are allowed to do under the rule and then will go into a general explanation.

One of the problems we had in the committee on so-called underdeveloped areas was the problem of defining these areas. This was finally worked out by the Treasury Department working in conjunction with the State Department and actually writing into the proposed law the so-called developed countries. I might read these to you: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and any of the countries within the Sino-Soviet bloc. That means that the other nations of the world, including the nations of Latin America, are eligible to participate in the tax-preferral provision of this proposed legislation.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. BAKER. All Western Hemisphere nations are eligible with the exception of Canada.

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct.

I might say that with the adoption of this amendment the Treasury Department and the administration approve the bill as written. I might also say that further objections to the so-called de-

veloped countries were raised by other groups, such as the AFL–CIO, and with the adoption of this amendment they too have directed a communication to the committee approving the legislation as drafted.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to corroborate the gentleman's statement in respect to the position of the Treasury Department. As I understand it, in the communication to the chairman of the committee they state:

> While the labor standards amendment and import restrictions which are already in the bill would create serious administrative problems, the Treasury Department nevertheless would support the bill as amended.

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct, and I thank the gentleman. The Treasury Department worked very closely with the staff of the Ways and Means Committee in drafting these amendments to the bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. For my information and for the information of other Members of the House, would the gentleman be so kind as to briefly explain to the Members of the House what advantages would be obtained by possibly choosing to come under the provision, if it should become law, as contrasted with the existing foreign subsidiary provisions?

Mr. BOGGS. The only advantage that I know of would be that these companies could operate under the American flag. The present device that American business uses, of course, has to do with what the gentleman mentioned a minute ago, namely, the use of foreign-based corporations. Under this proposal, with the exception of developed countries which I read a moment ago, an American company could use the American flag in these so-called undeveloped countries. Of course, there is some question as to how much capital will be generated in these countries but it is something that we should do. We should at least give it a trial.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Would the gentleman attach any significance to the requirement under the foreign subsidiary act that the taxpayer is required to establish tax avoidance as not being one of the purposes of the creation of this subsidiary, and does the fact we do not have a similar provision in H.R. 5 make any difference?

Mr. BOGGS. H.R. 5 is much more restrictive than any foreign subsidiary operations. As a matter of fact, in the case of the foreign subsidiary mere declaration is conclusive. But we have no way that we can look into a corporation organized in Great Britain, Mexico, Canada, or in the Philippine Islands. Under this arrangement the American Treasury Department has complete availability of the documents and the records of the American corporation, so that under the arrangement proposed here there is the same control that the Treasury Department has over all other domestic corporations. Under the foreign subsidiary there is none of that.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. Is it not true that under existing law there is no limitation upon the exports back into this country or imports of manufactured articles abroad, but under H.R. 5 to remain qualified it cannot exceed 10 percent, which is a great advantage from the standpoint of foreign competition.

Mr. BOGGS. That is true. The gentleman knows that is true because it is his amendment which created that limitation. That is another restriction that does not apply to the foreign subsidiary which the gentleman from Michigan referred to.

Mr. BAKER. On that very point, that was the main source of our opposition here, as I got it, when the bill was before the House previously.

Mr. BOGGS. I think that is correct.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I think this legislation has been improved since we considered it recently, but in reference to the section relating to the activities of American banks and their branch banking activities in these countries, do those branch activities continue to be exempt or entitled to deferred taxation?

Mr. BOGGS. The answer is, again, that this is tax deferral; not tax forgiveness. And, we do not try to limit it to any particular type of corporation that qualifies under the very restrictive provisions of the language in the Act, so that if a branch bank qualifies, then it is still in the legislation.

Mr. VANIK. Well, as the legislation now stands, the activities of branch banking by American banks in these countries would still be subject to this deferral privilege under this bill.

Mr. BOGGS. If they qualify under the other provisions of the bill, that is correct.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I wonder if the gentleman would inform me whether Cuba is included as one of the underdeveloped countries.

Mr. BOGGS. Yes, it is; that is correct. I might say to the gentleman, however, that there is very little prospect of any investment there.

Mr. PELLY. I do not think there are any profits there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the author of the bill please tell me whether one of the purposes of the bill is to give American industry a better opportunity to compete with foreign countries?

Mr. BOGGS. Precisely.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, will the bill, if we adopt it, tend to lessen the number of jobs for our local employees?

Mr. BOGGS. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Are you sure?

Mr. BOGGS. Well, only as sure as anybody can be about anything, I will say to the gentleman. It is our feeling and the feeling of the people who have studied this legislation that we will actually increase the number of American jobs.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Here at home?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear from the gentleman from Louisiana how this bill is going to increase jobs in this country. He has just made that statement and I would like to hear his answer.

Mr. BOGGS. If the gentleman will refer to the statement which I incorporated in the RECORD today, as a matter of fact, the gentleman will note it on page A4203. The gentleman will note the areas where we sell the most and, of course, the things that we sell are the things that are made in this country, the areas where we have the most investment, you will note that the greatest one is Canada.

Mr. GROSS. What kind of investment is the gentleman talking about? Is he talking about private investment or the investments to the tune of billions of dollars that the taxpayers have in foreign aid all over the world?

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman from Louisiana is talking exclusively about private investment. Canada, as far as I know—and I may be wrong. I see the gentleman from Maine [Mr. COFFIN] here, who has made quite a study of Canada, and he can correct me—Canada, as far as I know, has never received any foreign aid from the United States. Will somebody correct me on that? I do not think so. Canada is our best customer.

Mr. GROSS. It is the only one that has been passed over if it has not gotten some of the foreign handouts.

Mr. BOGGS. So I say to the gentleman that the best evidence I can give in answer to his question is that if past experience means anything, then it means that the areas where we use our private funds, not taxpayers funds, are the places where the most American products will be purchased. I will give you another example. Mexico is a good one. Mexico is fast becoming one of our best customers on the basis of the investments we have there.

Mr. GROSS. I am lost as far as this bill is concerned. You have backed and filled so often on this bill since it was

before the House in March. Is it planned to dispose of this bill today or put it over for another 2 months?

Mr. BOGGS. I would invite the gentleman to support the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Are you going to walk up the hill and down again, back and fill some more? How many amendments will be offered to this bill this afternoon that only a handful of Members have ever seen?

Mr. BOGGS. Two committee amendments.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman got trapped in his own closed rule; is that right?

Mr. BOGGS. I do not believe that I got trapped, no.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Louisiana had to go back to his committee in order to get some amendments to this bill, to make it palatable enough to sell to the Members of the House. He was hanging on the ropes when the bill was before the House previously, so he went back to the committee to get this monstrosity sweetened up and sugar-coated.

Mr. BOGGS. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], my good friend, said the other day, he who fights and runs away may live to fight another day. Perhaps the gentleman has described it accurately, I do not know. I admire the gentleman and I hope the gentleman will support the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Are the insurance guarantees put out by the ICA applicable to Americans who take their money and go abroad under the terms of the bill?

Mr. BOGGS. That is an entirely different law. The insurance guarantees come under the mutual security program.

Mr. GROSS. I know; but are the beneficiaries of this legislation entitled to those guarantees?

Mr. BOGGS. My answer would be yes, I should think so.

Mr. GROSS. So they get the benefit of this cheap insurance as to convertibility, as to expropriation and as to war-risk damage in some cases; and then also under the terms of this bill they get a tax deferral, or preferential tax treatment?

Mr. BOGGS. As far as I know—and I cannot really tell whether the gentleman is being completely serious or not—the insurance program was inaugurated to try to encourage private funds instead of Government funds to go into these areas. There are certainly some places on earth where they could be used. I do not know whether they have been used or not. We have seen the fantastic beating that the American investor has taken lately in Cuba. Whether or not the insurance program has been of help there or not, I do not know.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. When they get this insurance they pay a fee, a premium, just the same as anybody else does when he buys insurance.

Mr. GROSS. Sure, they do. But the gentleman is not trying to tell me that Lloyds of London would offer this insurance at the premium rate the ICA charges. He does not mean to tell me that Lloyds of London would insure against war risk damage in some of these countries where ICA is insuring?

Mr. JUDD. There are two answers. The first is that ICA has not had any losses. So obviously the insurance was not too bad.

Mr. GROSS. What does the gentleman mean by not too bad?

Mr. JUDD. The risks were not too bad, if they have had no losses. Maybe Lloyds has been unwise in not getting in on this.

Mr. GROSS. They do not miss many bets.

Mr. JUDD. The other reason, the big reason for such Government insurance, is that these investment guarantees and insurance are given for investment in projects which are economically sound, but which are in countries where there are unusual political risks. You cannot expect private funds to invest in a project which, however attractive it may be, is in a country whose political future is uncertain. Yet it is to our advantage to have investments in that particular country—and we will need to put in Government funds, if private funds are not invested.

Mr. GROSS. Give some of these countries a little time and stop giving them millions of dollars through the foreign handout program and it will be demonstrated how good they are as risks. This country has handed out neary $100 billion in foreign aid since the end of World War II and yet the climate for American investors in some of these countries, including Britain and France, is still so poor that these investors take out insurance with the ICA to protect themselves as to convertibility and the seizure of their investments. Now you want to give the corporations of this country preferential tax treatment on their investments. I hope none of those who vote for this bill will try to cry on my shoulder when they seek funds from the U.S. Treasury for their depressed areas when one of the contributing factors to unemployment and idle industry is because special tax treatment is given to those who take their money abroad and benefit from the cheap foreign labor that is to be found all over the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to address one specific question to the chairman of the subcommittee. I notice from the insertion that he put yesterday into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that a third amendment will be prosposed, seeking to make a corporation ineligible as a foreign business corporation if it has been operating abroad under substandard labor conditions. I should certainly approve the amendment; but I wonder if the gentleman could describe or define just what is meant by substandard labor conditions; according to U.S. standards or the undeveloped country's standards—or what?

Mr. BOGGS. The gentlewoman asks a very pertinent question; the standards prevailing in the country involved.

Mrs. CHURCH. Without any attempt being made in any case to elevate such standards to meet our own standards of labor?

Mr. BOGGS. Our experience is that the American investor generally maintains labor standards that are not only comparable to that in the host country, but in most cases higher than those in the host country. I think the tendency definitely will be to elevate those standards to be comparable to ours. That is what we hope will happen.

Mrs. CHURCH. Then it is the hope of the gentleman that eventually standards abroad might be raised in order to lessen competition with our own workmen at home?

Mr. BOGGS. Exactly.

Mrs. CHURCH. I had hoped that such might be the case.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to speak on these two committee amendments proposed by the chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] because I did not know about them until about 10 minutes ago; there are no printed copies on the floor nor is there a committee report. But I do believe that before we vote on this matter we ought to study the path this legislation has followed from its beginning.

Last year the bill was introduced. I do not know what they called it then, perhaps the Foreign Investment Incentive Act of 1959. But let us see what the intent of this legislation is. At the time the bill was introduced, under certain conditions, it gave the industry that would manufacture goods abroad, the promise to pay only 38-percent corporation tax instead of 52 percent. That is a differential of 14 percent, which is an enormous amount.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I do not want to take exception to the gentleman, but the gentleman is referring to one specific type of operation, namely, the Western Hemisphere corporation, which was passed during the war. This is the only type of corporation which gets this type of exemption. It applies only in that specific situation.

Mr. BRAY. I am aware of that.

Mr. BOGGS. It specifically does not apply to this legislation.

Mr. BRAY. I well realize that, because you did not get by with that. I spoke against that bill last year. I pointed out how, if passed, it was going to injure American labor and American manufacturers. Then the bill was changed by the committee, because the proponents could not get by with that 14 percent less taxes.

The American corporations pay 52 percent and these would pay 38 percent. In addition to that, they would not have to pay the taxes until they brought the money back to the United States.

Then, when the bill was brought to the floor here a month or so ago, the 38-percent corporation tax was eliminated, but they were allowed to leave their money abroad without paying taxes until the money was returned to the United States.

Then after debating it over a day, the proponents saw that they were not going to get by with that, so now they come to us with the two amendments changing it, whereby they put a sugar coating on this legislation so that this is to help depressed countries. Imagine trying to set up American labor standards in Pakistan or India.

The real object of this bill is as it states, the Foreign Investment Incentive Act of 1960. I do not know how much more incentive is going to be necessary to get American corporations to manufacture their goods abroad instead of in the United States. They are doing very well on that subject. Three thousand American concerns are now manufacturing goods abroad. I discussed this matter on the floor in detail when this bill was before the House last March.

Within the last month I have had conferences with labor in four different industries in my district as to the great damage that is being done them by goods brought into America from abroad, and in two of the industries, unless something changes within 2 years, are simply going to be out of business.

America has been helping all countries and peoples of the world, but I do believe we might spend just a little time and interest in trying to look after American interests and American workingmen. Thirty billion dollars has already been spent by American money on factories abroad.

But let us get back to the intent of this bill. Once they get their foot in the door the supposed safeguards in this bill will be changed. Why do you have to give any more incentive to get American business to manufacture abroad? They are certainly doing a wonderful job doing their manufacturing abroad now.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, in response to the last statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, I would again call to the attention of the membership that under existing law there is no limitation on imports back into this country which are manufactured abroad. Under H.R. 5, we have limited that to 10 percent. I just cannot see for the life of me why, whatever your objection might be to any other provision of the bill, that is not in the interest of the American economy.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Is it not true under this bill imports back to this country are limited to 10 percent of dollar volume of business of the foreign corporation, and 10 percent of their total volume might amount to 100 percent of the production of any particular industry in the United States.

Mr. BAKER. That is not the case.

Mr. DENT. That is the law, as I read it, and I beg the gentleman's pardon if it is not.

Mr. BAKER. If you manufacture say $1 million worth of windows in a foreign country, you could only send back to this country 10 percent of that million dollars worth of windows which, if my arithmetic is correct, would amount to $100,000 worth.

Mr. DENT. That is in dollar volume; is that not correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the pending bill. Our free enterprise system is, in my view, the most potent and versatile weapon in the arsenal of the free world. We can best meet the challenge of the Communist bloc in the underdeveloped areas of the world by providing incentives to induce private American capital to go abroad and take with it the imagination, the skill and the vitality that has made our economic system the strongest that the world has known. This bill would provide such incentives.

Regrettably, the rules provided by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 respecting the taxation of income derived from abroad and the administrative regulations and rulings thereunder are predicated upon the form of business organization and transaction rather than upon substantive effect and business need. The tax consequences of operating abroad thus vary greatly depending upon whether or not the particular business is in a position to utilize a branch organization, a domestic corporation or a foreign subsidiary. At the present time the branch form of organization is at a decided disadvantage and businesses which are forced, for either legal or practical reasons, to utilize this form of doing business find themselves at a competitive disadvantage respecting businesses with more freedom of choice. American banks and American insurance companies doing business abroad are required by both practical and legal reasons to operate as branches abroad. In the case of banks, foreign depositors expect and rely upon the security of the entire capital funds of the U.S. bank and this capital strength cannot be translated into subsidiaries for the banking laws do not ordinarily permit the guarantee of the liabilities of a banking subsidiary. For this and other reasons found in the laws which regulate banking, had not the Committee on Ways and Means taken steps with respect to the provisions of H.R. 5 to permit U.S. banks to treat their foreign branches as though they were foreign business corporations, they would have continued at a competitive disadvantage in relationship to the banks of other countries.

The action taken by your committee to prevent the continuation of this discrimination against United States banks is incorporated in the new section 957 which H.R. 5 would add to the Internal Revenue Code. This section would permit banks to treat their foreign branches for tax purposes as if they were separate foreign business corporations. For the foreign branches of an United States bank to be treated as foreign business corporations under the bill, they must elect such treatment and meet the qualifications for business in general, that is, they must derive 90 percent or more of their gross income from sources without the United States and derive 90 percent or more of their gross income from the active conduct of a trade or business. For this purpose, commissions and interests and income from gains on loans and investments which are ordinary and necessary in carrying on the trade or business of banking are to be considered as being derived from the active conduct of a trade or business.

Under the bill the foreign branches of United States banks are to be treated, under regulations to be issued by the Treasury Department, in the same manner as if they were separate corporate entities except that under subchapter C the rules relating to contributions of property and to distributions are not to apply. However, distributions received by the United States parent bank from a foreign branch will be treated as dividends with respect to which a 100 percent dividends received deduction is allowed.

The bill also provides that a United States parent bank may in its first election with respect to its branches elect to treat a branch as if it were a separate foreign business corporation or combine it with branches in other countries as a foreign business corporation. The latitude provided by this election will provide the flexibility of business decision necessary to best cope with local conditions.

It will be noted that the treatment provided by the bill in the case of the foreign branches of U.S. banks does not become available until taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1963. In my view, this is unfortunate. However, the Treasury Department has informed your committee that it does not have the personnel to issue the necessary regulations to permit the implementation of section 957 before January 1, 1963. I have been informed by the U.S. banks doing business abroad that they stand willing and able to cooperate with the Treasury Department in the task of issuing the necessary regulations. In my view the joint efforts of the Treasury Department and the banking industry would result in the issuance of the necessary regulations long before January 1, 1963, and I express the hope that it will be possible for the Treasury Department to reconsider its view of this matter when the bill is before the other body.

U.S. insurance companies operating abroad are also required in many cases to utilize the branch form. In most respects their case is similar to that of U.S. banks and I regret that the treatment provided for the foreign branches of U.S.

banks is not also provided for the foreign branches of U.S. insurance companies. However, subchapter L of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which provides for the income taxation of life insurance companies is a most complicated provision. As stated by House Report No. 1282 accompanying the bill, a special situation exists in the case of life insurance companies and they have been included in the ineligible category of corporations under the bill only because of the difficulty in working out the interrelationship of the bill's provisions and the life insurance company tax treatment provided by subchapter L of the Internal Revenue Code. Accordingly, they were made ineligible corporations for the present, without prejudice as to ultimate revision of this treatment until an opportunity has been presented for further study. It is my hope that the study will be completed before the bill comes up for consideration in the other body.

The life insurance industry stands willing and eager to cooperate in this study, and is, at the present time, engaged in working out the necessary technical provisions to implement a provision which would allow them to come within the provisions of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this bill by the House. I do not need to remind the Members of this body that economic subversion is an important tool of the Soviet bloc. Unless affirmative steps are taken to place American business in a position to compete with the Communist economic policies abroad, we face the possibility that we will find ourselves excluded from the markets of the world.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment, and the amendment in the nature of a substitute now in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

No amendments are in order except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means and such amendments shall not be subject to amendment.

The committee substitute is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE, ETC.

"(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the 'Foreign Investment Incentive Tax Act of 1960'.

"(b) AMENDMENT OF 1954 CODE.—Whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as otherwise provided, the amendments made by this Act shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960.

"SEC. 2. FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS

"(a) TAX ON FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS.—Part III of subchapter N of chapter 1 (relating to income from sources without the United States) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subpart:

"'SUBPART F—FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS

"'Sec. 951. Definition of foreign business corporation.
"'Sec. 952. Gross, taxable, and reinvested foreign income of foreign business corporations.
"'Sec. 953. Reinvested foreign income account.
"'Sec. 954. Distributions, etc., from reinvested foreign income account.
"'Sec. 955. Foreign taxes.
"'Sec. 956. Special rules.
"'Sec. 957. Elected foreign branches of banks taxed as foreign business corporations.

"'SEC. 951. DEFINITION OF FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATION.

"'(a) FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATION DEFINED.—For purposes of this title, the term "foreign business corporation" means a domestic corporation which has elected the treatment provided by this subject and which for the taxable year satisfies each of the following requirements:

"'(1) It derives 90 percent or more of its gross income from sources without the United States.

"'(2) It derives 90 percent or more of its gross income from—

"'(A) the active conduct of a trade or business,

"'(B) dividends from a qualified payor corporation (as defined in subsection (c)) which are out of earnings and profits of any taxable year for which such corporation was a qualified payor corporation (or would have been such a corporation but for the 10 percent stock ownership requirement of subsection (c)(1)(A)),

"'(C) income (other than dividends) from a qualified payor corporation, and

"'(D) compensation (other than compensation to which subparagraph (A) or (C) applies)—

"'(i) for the rendition, without the United States, of technical, managerial, engineering, construction, scientific, or like services; and

"'(ii) for the use of, or for the privilege of using, without the United States, patents, copyrights, secret processes and formulas, good will, trademarks, trade brands, franchises, and other like properties (but this clause shall apply only to the extent that the compensation described in this clause does not exceed 25 percent of the corporation's gross income).

"'(3) It derives not more than 10 percent of its gross income from the sale of articles which are sold by it for ultimate use, consumption, or disposition in the United States.

"'(4) It is not an ineligible corporation (as defined in subsection (d)).

"'(5) It furnishes for the taxable year, and for prior taxable years affecting (or affected by) an election under this subpart, such information with respect to such corporation as the Secretary or his delegate has prescribed by forms or regulations as necessary to carry out the provisions of the income tax laws.

"'(b) ELECTION.—

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—An election under this subpart may be made for any taxable year to which this subpart applies and for which (after making the election) the taxpayer is a foreign business corporation. An election, once effective, shall continue in effect for all subsequent taxable years of the corporation making the election up to and including—

"'(A) the taxable year for which the election is revoked by the filing of a notice of revocation, or

"'(B) the taxable year for which the election is terminated by reason of the fact that (i) such corporation was not a foreign business corporation for both such taxable year and the preceding taxable year, or (ii) such taxable year is the last taxable year of the corporation.

"'(2) WHEN ELECTION MUST BE MADE, ETC.—An election under this subpart may be made by a corporation for any taxable year at any time during the first month of such taxable year or at any time during the month preceding such first month. Such election shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe.

"'(3) NOTICE OF REVOCATION.—A notice of revocation (with respect to any taxable year) of an election under this subpart may be made only in such manner, and before such time, as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe.

"'(c) QUALIFIED PAYOR CORPORATION DEFINED.—

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, a domestic or foreign corporation shall be treated, with respect to another corporation, as a qualified payor corporation for any of its taxable years (including taxable years beginning before January 1, 1961) with respect to which—

"'(A) at least 10 percent of its voting stock is owned by such other corporation,

"'(B) it satisfies the requirements described in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (a), and

"'(C) it derives 50 percent or more of its gross income from sources without the United States from the active conduct of a trade or business.

For purposes of determining the tax of the taxpayer, no corporation shall be treated as a qualified payor corporation, with respect to the taxpayer or any other corporation, unless the taxpayer furnishes such information with respect to such corporation as the Secretary or his delegate has prescribed by forms or regulations as necessary to carry out the provisions of this subpart.

"'(2) DISQUALIFICATION FOR INSUFFICIENT FOREIGN INVESTMENT AND PAYROLL.—A corporation shall not be a qualified payor corporation for any taxable year if, on determining a percentage under section 954(b) with respect to such corporation (whether or not such corporation is a foreign business corporation), such percentage exceeds 20 percent. For purposes of the preceding sentence, a corporation shall be treated as engaged in only one trade or business.

"'(3) OTHER SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of determining under paragraph (1) of this subsection whether a corporation is a qualified payor corporation—

"'(A) income from another corporation shall be treated as from a qualified payor corporation if such other corporation satisfies the requirements of paragraph (1) (without regard to subparagraph (C) thereof), and

"'(B) a foreign corporation shall be treated as an ineligible corporation if it is a foreign personal holding company.

"'(d) INELIGIBLE CORPORATION.—For purposes of subsection (a)(4), each of the following (as determined without regard to this subpart) is an ineligible corporation:

"'(1) A corporation exempt from taxation under subchapter F.

"'(2) A corporation organized under the China Trade Act, 1922.

"'(3) A regulated investment company subject to tax under subchapter M.

"'(4) A personal holding company (as defined in section 542).

"'(5) A life insurance company (as defined in section 801).

"'(6) An unincorporated business enterprise subject to tax as a corporation under section 1361.

"'(7) An electing small business corporation (as defined in section 1371(b)).

"'SEC. 952. GROSS, TAXABLE, AND REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME OF FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS.

"'(a) GROSS INCOME AND TAXABLE INCOME OF FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATION.—For purposes of this title (other than section 170,

relating to charitable contributions or gifts, subchapter G of this chapter, relating to corporations used to avoid income tax on shareholders, subpart C of this part, relating to Western Hemisphere trade corporations, and section 951)—

"'(1) The gross income of a foreign business corporation shall be the sum of—

"'(A) the gross income from sources within the United States, and

"'(B) the amount (which shall be treated as an item of income derived from sources without the United States during the taxable year) subtracted from its reinvested foreign income account for the taxable year, as determined under section 953.

"'(2) The taxable income of a foreign business corporation shall be the amount determined under paragraph (1), minus the sum of the deductions allowed by this chapter to the extent deductible under part I of this subchapter (relating to determination of sources of income), as modified by this subpart, in determining taxable income from sources within the United States.

"'(b) REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME DEFINED.—

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, the term "reinvested foreign income" means the taxable income from sources without the United States (as determined under part I of this subchapter, with the modifications provided by this subpart).

"'(2) SPECIAL RULES.—In determining the reinvested foreign income for any taxable year—

"'(A) No deduction shall be allowed for income, war profits, and excess profits taxes paid or accrued to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States.

"'(B) There shall be included, as an item of income derived from sources without the United States during the taxable year, an amount equal to the taxes which (on applying section 955(c)) are deemed paid under section 902.

"'(C) If the net long-term capital gain from sources without the United States exceeds the net short-term capital loss from such sources, then the reinvested foreign income for such taxable year shall be the sum of—

"'(i) the reinvested foreign income (computed without regard to this subparagraph) reduced (but not below zero) by the amount of such excess, and

"'(ii) the amount ascertained by multiplying the amount of such excess by the percentage obtained by subtracting from 100 percent the sum of the normal and surtax rates applicable to such taxable year.

This subparagraph shall apply only if the amount of reinvested foreign income determined under this subparagraph is less than the amount determined without regard to this subparagraph.

"'SEC. 953. REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME ACCOUNT.

"'(a) IN GENERAL.—Each corporation making an election under this subpart shall, for purposes of this subpart, establish and maintain a reinvested foreign income account. The amount in such account as of the first day of the first taxable year to which the election applies shall be zero.

"'(b) ADDITIONS TO ACCOUNT.—The amount added to the reinvested foreign income account for any taxable year for which the corporation is a foreign business corporation shall be an amount equal to the reinvested foreign income for such taxable year.

"'(c) SUBTRACTIONS FROM ACCOUNT.—

"'(1) ORDER OF SUBTRACTION.—Any amount subtracted from the reinvested foreign income account of a corporation for any taxable year shall be treated as made first out of the addition to such account for such year, to the extent thereof, and thereafter out of the most recently added amounts which have not previously been subtracted.

"'(2) AMOUNT OF SUBTRACTION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), the amount of the subtraction from the reinvested foreign income account of a corporation for any taxable year shall be the sum of—

"'(A) the amount which is treated under this subpart as distributed from such account for such year, plus

"'(B) whichever of the following amounts is the larger:

"'(i) the amount by which the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year is increased by section 952(a)(1)(B) or 956(b), or

"'(ii) the ratable portion of the income, war profits, and excess profits taxes paid or accrued to foreign countries and possessions of the United States during the taxable year of the addition out of which the subtraction is made.

If a subtraction from the reinvested foreign income account for any taxable year is out of more than one addition to such account, subparagraph (B) shall be applied separately with respect to each taxable year of addition out of which the subtraction is made.

"'(3) ENTIRE AMOUNT SUBTRACTED IN CASE OF REVOCATION OF TERMINATION.—Except as provided in section 381(c)(23), if an election under this subpart is revoked or terminated, the entire amount in the reinvested foreign income account shall be subtracted from the account for the last taxable year for which such election was in effect.

"'(4) ACCOUNT NOT TO BE REDUCED BELOW ZERO.—Amounts subtracted under this subsection shall not reduce the reinvested foreign income account below zero.

"'SEC. 954. DISTRIBUTIONS, ETC., FROM REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME ACCOUNT.

"'(a) GENERAL RULE.—For purposes of this subpart, the amount of any distribution to shareholders shall be treated as made out of the reinvested foreign income account. For purposes of this subsection—

"'(1) the term "distribution" includes any distribution in redemption of stock or in partial or complete liquidation of the corporation, but does not include any distribution made by the corporation in its stock or in rights to acquire its stock; and

"'(2) the amount of any distribution shall be the fair market value of the property distributed.

"'(b) DISTRIBUTION BY REASON OF UNITED STATES INVESTMENT AND PAYROLL.—

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, there shall be treated as distributed to shareholders for the taxable year, out of the reinvested foreign income account, one-half of the amount determined by multiplying the portion of the reinvested foreign income for the taxable year which is attributable to the active conduct of a trade or business by the percentage determined by dividing—

"'(A) the sum of (i) the adjusted basis of the taxpayer's property within the United States, and (ii) an amount 2 times the amount paid or accrued during the taxable year for labor and personal services performed within the United States, by

"'(B) the sum of (i) the adjusted basis of the taxpayer's property wherever located, and (ii) an amount 2 times the amount paid or accrued during the taxable year for all labor and personal services.

For purposes of the preceding sentence, only real property and tangible personal property (other than property described in section 1221(1)), and labor and personal services, which are ordinary and necessary for carrying on the trade or business shall be taken into account. In the case of a taxpayer engaged in two or more separate and distinct trades or businesses, separate computations shall be made under this subsection with respect to each such trade or business.

"'(2) PARAGRAPH (1) INAPPLICABLE WHERE PERCENTAGE IS LESS THAN 10 PERCENT.—If the percentage determined under paragraph (1) with respect to any trade or business for any taxable year is less than 10 percent, paragraph (1) shall not apply to such trade or business for such taxable year.

"'(c) HOLDING OF PROHIBITED PROPERTY TREATED AS DISTRIBUTION.—

"'(1) PROPERTY HELD BY FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATION.—If the taxpayer holds prohibited property at any time during the taxable year, it shall be treated as having made a distribution to shareholders out of its reinvested foreign income account for such taxable year.

"'(2) PROPERTY HELD BY CERTAIN OTHER CORPORATIONS.—If the taxpayer owns (directly or through one or more other corporations) 10 percent or more of the voting stock of another corporation, it shall be treated for purposes of paragraph (1) as holding a corresponding percentage of the property held by such other corporation which would be prohibited property if such other corporation were a foreign business corporation.

"'(3) AMOUNT OF DISTRIBUTION.—

"'(A) MAXIMUM AMOUNT TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—This subsection shall be applied, with respect to the taxpayer, at that time during its taxable year when it results in the maximum amount of prohibited property.

"'(B) AMOUNT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT WITH RESPECT TO PARTICULAR PROPERTIES.—For purposes of this subsection, the amount taken into account with respect to any property shall be the adjusted basis of such property, reduced by the sum of—

"'(i) any liability to which such property is subject, and

"'(ii) the aggregate amount treated as distributions for prior taxable years by reason of such corporation's holding such property. For purposes of clause (ii), a distribution for a prior taxable year shall be treated as attributable first to the properties constituting prohibited property which were held at the close of such taxable year.

"'(4) PROHIBITED PROPERTY DEFINED.—

"'(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term "prohibited property" means any property other than—

"'(i) tangible or intangible property which is ordinary and necessary for carrying on a trade or business of the taxpayer (but only if for the taxable year or for the preceding taxable year 90 percent or more of the gross income of such trade or business is derived from sources without the United States),

"'(ii) securities of another corporation which is a qualified payor corporation (or a corporation, at least 10 percent of the voting stock of which is owned by the taxpayer, with respect to which an election under this subpart is in effect) for its taxable year ending with or within the taxpayer's taxable year or for the immediately preceding taxable year of such other corporation.

"'(iii) obligations of foreign governments, but only to the extent that the aggregate adjusted basis of all such obligations does not exceed 15 percent of the taxpayer's earnings and profits accumulated after December 31, 1960 (determined as of the beginning of the taxable year),

"'(iv) obligations of the United States, money, and deposits with persons carrying on the banking business, and

"'(v) any loan to which subsection (d) applies.

"'(B) SECURITY DEFINED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term "security" means any share of stock in any corporation, certificate of stock or interest in any corporation, note, bond, debenture, or evidence of indebtedness, or any evidence of an interest in or right to subscribe to or purchase any of the foregoing.

"'(5) SPECIAL RULES FOR APPLICATION OF PARAGRAPH (2).—

"'(A) NO ATTRIBUTION THROUGH A FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATION.—Paragraph (2) shall not apply to—

"'(i) stock held in a corporation with respect to which an election under this subpart is in effect, and

"'(ii) stock and other property which (but for this clause) would be treated as held by the taxpayer solely by reason of holding stock described in clause (i).

"'(B) NO DUPLICATION IN ATTRIBUTION THROUGH ANOTHER CORPORATION.—If (but for this subparagraph) any corporation would be treated under paragraph (2) as holding prohibited property by reason of—

"'(i) stock in another corporation, and

"'(ii) stock or other property held by such other corporation,

there shall be taken into account under such paragraph only the amount determined with respect to clause (i) or clause (ii), whichever is the greater.

"'(C) FAIR MARKET VALUE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT WHERE INFORMATION IS NOT FURNISHED.—For purposes of this subsection, the amount taken into account for any taxable year by the taxpayer with respect to any other corporation described in paragraph (2) shall be the fair market value of its direct or indirect stock holdings in such corporation, unless the taxpayer furnishes such information with respect to such corporation as the Secretary or his delegate has prescribed by forms or regulations as necessary to carry out the provisions of this subpart.

"'(d) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN LOANS.—

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, if any corporation makes a loan to another corporation which owns (directly or through one or more other corporations) 10 percent or more of the voting stock of the lending corporation, then—

"'(A) If the lending corporation is a foreign business corporation (or a corporation with respect to which an election under this subpart is in effect), it shall be treated as having made a distribution to shareholders, in an amount equal to the loan, out of its reinvested foreign income account for such taxable year.

"'(B) If the borrowing corporation is a foreign business corporation, an amount equal to the loan shall be treated, for purposes of determining reinvested foreign income, as an item of gross income received at the time the loan was received.

For purposes of applying this paragraph, each corporation in a chain of ownership (other than the lending and the borrowing corporations) shall be treated as having received, and in turn distributed, an amount equal to such loan.

"'(2) OUTSTANDING LOANS WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN TREATED AS DISTRIBUTIONS.—If any loan described in paragraph (1) remains outstanding in any taxable year of the ending corporation after the taxable year in which made, such loan shall be treated (for purposes of paragraph (1)) as made in such succeeding taxable year in an amount equal to the amount so outstanding, but the amount taken into account with respect to any corporation shall be reduced by the amount treated as distributions by such corporation for prior taxable years by reason of such loan.

"'(3) CERTAIN OPEN ACCOUNTS AND OTHER COMMERCIAL LOANS EXCEPTED.—This subsection shall not apply in the case of any loan arising in connection with the sale of property, if the amount of such loan outstanding at no time during the taxable year exceeds the amount which would be ordinary and necessary to carry on the trade or business of both the lending corporation and the borrowing corporation had the sale been made between unrelated corporations.

"'(e) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT TREATED AS DISTRIBUTED BY REASON OF PROHIBITED PROPERTY AND LOANS.—The amount treated as distributed under subsections (c) and (d) for any taxable year shall not exceed the amount of a distribution to shareholders which (after the application of subsections (a) and (b)) would reduce the amount in the reinvested foreign income account to zero.

"'SEC. 955. FOREIGN TAXES.

"'(a) YEAR FOREIGN TAXES TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this chapter (other than this subpart)—

"'(A) any income, war profits, and excess profits taxes paid or accrued during any taxable year to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States by a foreign business corporation shall not (except as otherwise provided by this subsection) be taken into account for such taxable year, and

"'(B) where an amount is subtracted from the reinvested foreign income account of any corporation, a ratable portion of such taxes paid or accrued to foreign countries and possessions of the United States during the taxable year of the addition out of which the subtraction is made shall, for purposes of subpart A and section 164, be treated as paid or accrued during the taxable year for which the subtraction is made.

"'(2) YEAR FOR WHICH NO REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME.—Paragraph (1)(A) shall not apply to a foreign business corporation for any taxable year for which no amount is added to the reinvested foreign income account.

"'(b) FOREIGN TAX CREDIT—OVERALL LIMIT TO APPLY.—In the case of a corporation to which an election under this subpart applies—

"'(1) section 904(a) shall not apply,

"'(2) the total amount of the credit in respect of taxes paid or accrued to all countries and possessions shall not exceed the same proportion of the tax against which such credit is taken which the taxpayer's taxable income from sources without the United States (but not in excess of the taxpayer's entire taxable income) bears to its entire taxable income for the same taxable year, and

"'(3) the reference in section 904(c) to subsection (a) of section 904 shall be treated as a reference to paragraph (2) of this subsection.

In applying section 904(c), no amount paid or accrued for a taxable year to which an election under this subpart applied shall (except for purposes of determining the number of taxable years which have elapsed) be deemed paid or accrued under section 904(c) in any year for which an election under this subpart does not apply.

"'(c) TREATMENT OF DEEMED TAXES.—For purposes of this subpart—

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—If any amount is added to the reinvested foreign income account of any foreign business corporation for any taxable year, the amount of taxes deemed paid by such corporation for such taxable year under section 902 (relating to dividends received from certain foreign corporations), by reason of taxes paid (or deemed paid) by any foreign corporation, shall be determined without reduction by reason of the ratio which the accumulated profits of the payor foreign corporation bear to its total profits.

"'(2) FOREIGN TAXES INCLUDE DEEMED TAXES.—Any reference to income, war profits, and excess profits taxes paid or accrued to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States shall be treated as including such taxes deemed paid under section 902, as modified by paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"'SEC. 956. SPECIAL RULES.

"'(a) SURTAX EXEMPTIONS.—In the case of a corporation to which an election under this subpart applies, the surtax under section 11(c) for the taxable year shall be determined by substituting for "exceeds $25,000" the following: "exceeds $25,000 (or, if smaller, the taxable income computed without regard to the amount subtracted from the taxpayer's reinvested foreign income account)".

"'(b) GROSS INCOME FOR TAXABLE YEAR FOR WHICH CORPORATION IS NOT A FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATION.—For purposes of this title (other than section 170, relating to charitable contributions or gifts, subchapter G of this chapter, relating to corporations used to avoid income tax on shareholders, subpart C of this part, relating to Western Hemisphere trade corporations, and section 951), if an election under this subpart is in effect with respect to any corporation for any taxable year for which such corporation is not a foreign business corporation, the gross income of such corporation shall include (as an item of income derived from sources without the United States during the taxable year) the amount subtracted from its reinvested foreign income account for the taxable year.

"'(c) APPLICATION OF SECTIONS 172 AND 1212.—

"'(1) COMPUTATION OF REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME.—In computing reinvested foreign income for any taxable year—

"'(A) no net operating loss carryover or carryback, and

"'(B) no capital loss carryover,

shall be allowed from a taxable year for which the corporation was not a foreign business corporation.

"'(2) LIMITATION ON YEARS TO WHICH FOREIGN SOURCES MAY BE CARRIED.—Except as provided in paragraph (3)—

"'(A) no net operating loss carryover or carryback, and

"'(B) no capital loss carryover,

which is from a taxable year for which the corporation was a foreign business corporation, and which is attributable to sources without the United States, shall be allowed for any taxable year for which the corporation is not a foreign business corporation.

"'(3) ADJUSTMENT IN CARRYOVERS ON REVOCATION OR TERMINATION OF ELECTION.—If an election under this subpart is revoked or terminated for any taxable year, then—

"'(A) the net operating loss carryover from any taxable year for which the corporation was a foreign business corporation (hereinafter in this subparagraph referred to as "loss year") to taxable years succeeding the last taxable year for which the election was in effect shall include the net operating loss carryover (reduced as provided by section 172(b)) from the loss year from sources without the United States, and

"'(B) in determining the short-term capital loss provided by section 1212 for taxable years succeeding the last taxable year for which the election was in effect, a rule similiar to the rule provided by subparagraph (A) shall be applied.

"'(d) LIMITATION ON INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE FURNISHED.—No information shall be required to be furnished with respect to any corporation under section 951(a)(5), 951(c)(1), or 954(c)(5)(C), for any of its taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960, unless such information is of a character which was required to be furnished under the forms or regulations in effect on the first day of such taxable year.

"'SEC. 957. ELECTED FOREIGN BRANCHES OF BANKS TAXED AS FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS.

"'(a) GENERAL RULE.—Subject to the qualifications in subsection (b), an election may be made by a bank (as defined in section 581) which during the taxable year operates a branch in a foreign country, permitting such branch to be subject to taxation as a foreign business corporation for such year and subsequent years as provided in subsection (e). Such election shall be made in accordance with regulations pre-

scribed by the Secretary or his delegate. Each branch with respect to which such electing bank has made an election under this subsection shall be an "elected branch" for purposes of this section.

"'(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—The election described in subsection (a) may not be made with respect to a foreign branch unless such branch—

"'(1) derives 90 percent or more of its gross income from sources without the United States; and

"'(2) derives 90 percent or more of its gross income from the active conduct of a trade or business, which for purposes of this paragraph shall include commissions and interest and all income and gains from loans and investments ordinary and necessary for the carrying on of such trade or business.

"'(c) CORPORATE PROVISIONS APPLICABLE.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, an elected branch shall, except as provided in subsection (g), be considered a corporation for purposes of this subtitle with respect to operation, distributions, and any other purpose; and the electing bank shall be considered the sole shareholder thereof.

"'(d) DURATION OF ELECTION.—The election under subsection (a) may be made for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1962, and shall continue in effect for all subsequent years until terminated, either by notice of revocation filed by the taxpayer, or by failure of the elected branch for two successive taxable years to qualify under this section.

"'(e) IMPOSITION OF TAXES.—An elected branch shall be treated as a corporation with respect to which an election under this subpart is in effect.

"'(f) COMPUTATION OF TAXABLE INCOME.—In computing the taxable income of an elected branch, there shall be allowed only such deductions and credits as are properly allocable to the operation of the business of such branch.

"'(g) PROVISION INAPPLICABLE.—An elected branch shall not be considered a corporation, nor shall the electing bank be considered a shareholder, for purposes of subchapter C, except with respect to—

"'(1) contributions of property, constituting either paid-in surplus or contributions to capital; and

"'(2) part I thereof (relating to distributions).

"'(h) MULTIPLE BRANCHES.—

"'(1) COMBINING BRANCHES IN 2 OR MORE COUNTRIES.—If, at the time of making its first election under this section, a bank makes such election with respect to branches in more than one foreign country, it may (for purposes of this section) elect to make one or more combinations of such branches and to treat each such combination as a single elected branch. If, thereafter, a branch becomes an elected branch for the first time, such branch may be combined with any other elected branch (whether separate or combined).

"'(2) BRANCHES IN SAME COUNTRY MUST BE COMBINED.—For purposes of this section, each branch in any one foreign country shall be treated as included within any election made under this section with respect to any other branch in such country.

"'(3) TREATMENT TO BE CONTINUED.—If a bank for any taxable year elects to treat its branch in any foreign country separately or in a specified combination, such treatment shall (except as provided in the last sentence of paragraph (1)) be continued for all subsequent taxable years, unless the Secretary or his delegate consents to a different treatment.

"'(i) DIVIDENDS RECEIVED OUT OF REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME ACCOUNT.—In the case of an electing bank which receives a dividend from an elected branch out of its reinvested foreign income account, there shall be allowed as a deduction an amount equal to 100 percent of the amount received as a dividend.'

"(b) CERTAIN DIVIDENDS RECEIVED OUT OF REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME ACCOUNT.—

"(1) Section 243 (relating to dividends received by corporations) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"'(c) DIVIDENDS RECEIVED OUT OF REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME ACCOUNT.—If—

"'(1) a domestic corporation receives a dividend from another corporation out of such other corporation's reinvested foreign income account (within the meaning of section 953), and

"'(2) the recipient corporation, or another domestic corporation, is in control (within the meaning of section 368(c)) of the payor corporation,

then there shall be allowed as a deduction an amount equal to 100 percent of the amount received as a dividend.'

"(2) Section 243(a) is amended by striking out 'In the case of a corporation (other than a small business investment company operating under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958)' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), in the case of a corporation'.

"(c) CARRYOVERS.—Section 381(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items of distributor or transferor corporations taken into account) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(23) SUCCESSOR FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATION.—If the acquiring corporation is a foreign business corporation (as defined in section 951), there shall be taken into account (to the extent proper to carry out the purposes of this section and subpart F of part III of subchapter N, and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) the reinvested foreign income account, and the items related thereto (including income, war profits, and excess profits taxes paid or accrued to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States), of the distributor or transferor corporation.'

"(d) PERSONAL HOLDING COMPANY INCOME.—Section 543 (relating to personal holding company income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) DIVIDENDS, ETC., RECEIVED BY FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS.—

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to dividends, interest, or royalties (other than mineral, oil, or gas royalties) received or accrued by a corporation which (on applying this subsection) is a foreign business corporation for the taxable year if—

"'(A) during its entire taxable year more than 50 percent in value of its outstanding stock is owned by a domestic parent corporation;

"'(B) such domestic parent corporation, for its taxable year which ends with (or within which ends) the taxable year of the foreign business corporation—

"'(i) is not a personal holding company; and

"'(ii) would not be a personal holding company if such domestic parent corporation itself had derived its proportionate share of each item of gross income derived by each subsidiary for the taxable year of such subsidiary which ends with or within the taxable year of the domestic parent corporation; and

"'(C) the dividends, interest, and royalties referred to in subsection (a)(1) are received or accrued by the foreign business corporation from another corporation—

"'(i) in which the foreign business corporation owns, directly or indirectly, more than 50 percent in value of the outstanding stock (or such lesser percentage as is the maximum percentage which the foreign business corporation may own under the law applicable to it or to such other corporation), and

"'(ii) which, for its taxable year which ends with or within the taxable year of the foreign business corporation and for its two preceding taxable years (or for such part thereof as it was in existence), has derived 70 percent or more of its gross income from sources without the United States and from the active conduct of a trade or business.

"'(2) SPECIAL RULES FOR APPLICATION OF SUBSECTION.—

"'(A) For purposes of this subsection, the term "foreign business corporation" includes a corporation with respect to which an election under section 951 is in effect.

"'(B) For purposes of paragraph (1)(B), a corporation is a subsidiary of the domestic parent corporation if it is a domestic corporation and if (at any time during the subsidiary's taxable year referred to in paragraph (1)(B)) the domestic parent corporation held more than 50 percent in value of its outstanding stock; and the proportionate share with respect to any item of gross income of such a subsidiary is that percentage which equals the percentage of stock ownership at that time (during the subsidiary's taxable year referred to in paragraph (1)(B)) when such ownership by the domestic parent corporation was the greatest.

"'(C) For purposes of paragraph (1)(C), if the trade or business referred to in clause (ii) thereof is of the same or similar or related character as the trade or business conducted by the domestic parent corporation, the percentage in clause (i) thereof shall be 25 percent in lieu of 50 percent.'

"(e) FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS NOT INCLUDIBLE CORPORATIONS IN AFFILIATED GROUPS.—Section 1504(b) (relating to definition of includible corporations for purposes of consolidated returns) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(8) A corporation with respect to which an election under subpart F of part III of subchapter N (relating to foreign business corporations) is in effect.'

"(f) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

"(1) The table of subparts for part III of subchapter N of chapter 1 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'Subpart F. Foreign business corporations.'

"(2) Section 901(d) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(4) For special rules relating to foreign business corporations, see section 955.'

"(3) Section 903 (relating to credit for taxes in lieu of income, etc., taxes) is amended by striking out 'For purposes of this subpart and of section 164(b),' and inserting in lieu thereof 'For purposes of this subpart, subpart F, and section 164(b),'.

"SEC. 3. CERTAIN TRANSFERS TO FOREIGN CORPORATIONS AND TO FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS.

"(a) AMENDMENT OF SECTION 367.—Section 367 (relating to foreign corporations) is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'In determining' and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(a) GENERAL RULE.—In determining'; and

"(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(b) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS TO FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of any exchange referred to in subsection (a) if such exchange arises out of, or in connection with, a transfer (whether or not in liquidation) of substantially all of the properties of a foreign corporation to a foreign business corporation (as defined in section 951(a)). In

the case of such an exchange, the accumulated earnings and profits, if any, of the foreign corporation shall be treated (except for purposes of section 951) as having been distributed immediately before the exchange or liquidation to the foreign business corporation as a dividend.

"'(c) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS BY FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS.—

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of any exchange referred to in subsection (a) if such exchange arises out of, or in connection with, a transfer of foreign business property by a foreign business corporation (as defined in section 951(a)) to a foreign corporation in exchange for stock of such foreign corporation, if for its first taxable year beginning after such exchange such foreign corporation—

"'(A) is controlled (as defined in section 368(c)) by one or more foreign business corporations, and

"'(B) is a qualified payor corporation (as defined in section 951(c) with respect to each such corporation.

"'(2) FOREIGN BUSINESS PROPERTY DEFINED.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term "foreign business property" means any property which is transferred for use, and within 6 months after the transfer is in use, by the transferee in the active conduct of a trade or business; except that such term does not include—

"'(A) property described in section 1221 (1),

"'(B) stock in a domestic corporation, and

"'(C) stock in a foreign corporation, unless such stock is voting stock in a qualified payor corporation as to the foreign business corporation for its last 3 taxable years ending before the exchange and, for its first taxable year beginning after the exchange (i) is a qualified payor corporation as to the foreign corporation, and (ii) derives 50 percent or more of its gross income from sources without the United States from the active conduct of a trade or business.

For purposes of this paragraph, stock which qualifies as property under subparagraph (C) shall be deemed property used in the active conduct of a trade or business.'

"(b) AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1492.—Section 1492 (relating to nontaxable transfers) is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 1492. NONTAXABLE TRANSFERS.

"'The tax imposed by section 1491 shall not apply—

"'(1) if the transferee is an organization exempt from income tax under part I of subchapter F of chapter 1 (other than an organization described in section 401(a));

"'(2) if the stock transferred is "foreign business property" as defined in section 367(c) (relating to certain transfers by foreign business corporations); or

"'(3) if before the transfer it has been established to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate that such transfer is not in pursuance of a plan having as one of its principal purposes the avoidance of Federal income taxes.'

"(c) TRANSFER OF INVENTORY TO FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS AND FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.—

"(1) Part II of subchapter B of chapter 1 (relating to items specifically included in gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 78. TRANSFER OF INVENTORY TO FOREIGN BUSINESS COPORATIONS AND FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.

"'(a) GENERAL RULE.—If any person transfers property which, in his hands, is property described in section 1221(1)—

"'(1) to a corporation for which an election is in effect under subpart F (relating to foreign business corporations) of part III of subchapter N, or

"'(2) to a foreign corporation,

in exchange for stock or securities in such corporation or as a contribution to the capital of such corporation, then such person shall be treated as having exchanged such property for stock in such corporation having a fair market value equal to the fair market value of the property so transferred.

"'(b) NONAPPLICATION OF SECTION 351.—Section 351 shall not apply to any transfer of property described in subsection (a).'

"(2) The table of sections for such part II is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'SEC. 78. Transfer of inventory to foreign business corporations and foreign corporations."

"(3) Subsection (d) of section 351 (relating to transfer to corporation controlled by transferor) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(5) For nonapplication of this section in the case of inventory transferred to a foreign business corporation or a foreign corporation, see section 78(b).'"

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, the bill now being considered, of course, is a committee amendment to the whole bill; so this amendment is offered, I presume, in the form of an amendment to the substitute amendment; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOGGS to the committee substitute: Page 23, strike out the period at the end of the first line after line 17 and insert ", etc."

Page 24, strike out the period at the end of line 1 and insert, ", ETC."

Page 24, strike out lines 7 and 8 and insert:

"'(1) It derives 90 percent or more of its gross income from sources within less developed countries (within the meaning of subsection (e))."

Page 24, lines 23 and 24, strike out "without the United States" and insert "within less developed countries".

Page 25, line 2, strike out "without the United States" and insert "within less developed countries".

Page 27, line 13, strike out "without the United States" and insert "within less developed countries".

Page 27, lines 22 and 23, strike out "FOREIGN" and insert "LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES".

Page 29, after line 8, insert:

"'(e) LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRY DEFINED; ALLOCATION OF ITEMS TO SOURCES WITHIN OR WITHOUT LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES.—For purposes of this subpart—

"'(1) LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRY DEFINED.—A less developed country is any foreign country (other than an area within the Sino-Soviet bloc) or any possession of the United States with respect to which, on the first day of the taxable year, there is in effect an Executive order by the President of the United States designating such country or possession as an economically less developed country for purposes of this subpart. For purposes of the preceding sentence, an overseas territory, department, province, or possession may be treated as a separate country.

"'(2) CERTAIN COUNTRIES EXCLUDED.—No designation shall be made under paragraph (1) with respect to Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

"'(3) SOURCE RULES.—Items of gross income, expenses, losses, and deductions shall be allocated to sources within or without less developed countries under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. Such regulations shall, to the extent of the Secretary or his delegate finds practicable, be consistent with the principles of part I of this subchapter (relating to determination of sources of income)."

Page 29, strike out lines 20 and 21 and insert:

"'(A) the gross income from sources without less developed countries, and".

Page 30, strike out line 3 and all that follows through line 4 on page 31, and insert:

"'(2) The taxable income of a foreign business corporation shall be the amount determined under paragraph (1), minus the sum of the deductions allowed by this chapter which are allocable to sources without less developed countries.

"'(b) REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME DEFINED.—

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, the term "reinvested foreign income" means the taxable income from sources within less developed countries.

"'(2) SPECIAL RULES.—In determining the reinvested foreign income for any taxable year—

"'(A) No deduction shall be allowed for income, war profits, and excess profits, and excess profits taxes which are allocable to sources within less developed countries and which are paid or accrued to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States.

"'(B) If the net long-term capital gain from sources within less developed countries exceeds the net'.

Page 33, strike out lines 4 through 8, and insert:

"'(ii) the ratable portion of the income, war profits, and excess profits taxes which are allocable to sources within less developed countries and which are paid or accrued to foreign countries and possessions of the United States during the taxable year of the addition out of which the subtraction is made."

Page 34, strike out lines 14 and 15, and insert:

"'(b) DISTRIBUTION BY REASON OF INVESTMENT AND PAYROLL WITHOUT LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES.—'"

Page 34, line 25, strike out "within the United States" and insert "without less developed countries".

Page 35, line 3, strike out "within the United States" and insert "without less developed countries".

Page 37, line 20, strike out "without the United States" and insert "within less developed countries".

Page 42, strike out lines 16 through 22, and insert:

"'(A) any income, war profits, and excess profits taxes which are allocable to sources within less developed countries and which are paid or accrued during any taxable year to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States by a foreign business corporation shall not (except as otherwise provided by this subsection) be taken into account for such taxable year, and' ".

Page 43, beginning in line 1, strike out "such taxes paid or accrued to foreign countries and possession of the United States" and insert "such taxes so allocable and so paid or accrued".

Page 44, after line 3, insert: "For purposes of paragraph (2), the taxable income from sources without the United States shall be determined by including the amount sub-

tracted from the reinvested foreign income account for the taxable year and, if the corporation is a foreign business corporation for the taxable year, by excluding the items referred to in section 952(b) (relating to definition of reinvested foreign income)."

Page 44, strike out line 10 and all that follows through line 2 on page 45, and insert:

"'(c) FOREIGN TAXES INCLUDE DEEMED TAXES.—For purposes of this subpart, any reference to income, war profits, and excess profits taxes paid or accrued to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States shall be treated as including such taxes deemed paid under section 902."

Page 46, line 17, strike out "without the United States" and insert "within less developed countries".

Page 47, lines 6 and 7, strike out "without the United States" and insert "within less developed countries".

Page 48, line 1, strike out "a foreign country" and insert "a less developed country".

Page 48, line 13, strike out "without the United States" and insert "within less developed countries".

Page 50, strike out "foreign" in lines 5, 14, and 19, and insert "less developed".

Page 52, line 15, strike out "paid" and insert "which are allocable to sources within less developed countries and which are paid".

Page 54, lines 12 and 13, strike out "without the United States" and insert "within less developed countries (within the meaning of section 951(e))".

Page 58, line 19, strike out "without the United States" and insert "within less developed countries (within the meaning of section 951(e))".

Mr. BOGGS (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chairman. Would the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana be subject to a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to inform the gentleman from Iowa that under the resolution which we are considering this bill, House Resolution 468, committee amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has just been offered does two things. First, it eliminates the so-called gross up on dividend income. When that was last referred to on the floor of this body, someone thought it referred to our friend, the gentleman from Iowa, but, of course, our good friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] knows that it does not. This provision was written into this proposed legislation having to do with the technical matter of computing the foreign tax credit on income earned abroad. Since that time, we have held hearings before the full Committee on Ways and Means to look into the question of whether or not this formula should be changed. The committee has come to no resolution on that proposed legislation, and it was our feeling that whatever is done should apply across the board, and as I think the gentleman from New York made the point here in the original debate, if we kept this language as to the gross up in the bill H.R. 5 and did not incorporate it into any other legislation, then rather than equalizing the position of American investors abroad as compared with foreign investors competing abroad, we would actually penalize American investors to a greater extent than is now the case under existing law.

Mr. BOSCH. I might say the gentleman has put the proposition correctly.

Mr. BOGGS. The second proposition has to do with the so-called underdeveloped countries. In the debate a moment ago I read a list of the countries which are defined by the executive branch of the Government as developed countries. I might say that as far as I was concerned, again the gentleman from Iowa talks about being on the ropes and so forth. That may be true. I may still be. The only thing I am seeking to do is to pass a constructive piece of legislation which will be helpful to American business and competing abroad and not competing at home for American jobs.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. DENT. Is there any restriction in this legislation on a corporation that builds its plant in a so-called underdeveloped country and expands it under the new amendment you are adding and then ships its products to the developed country in competition with its product it is now shipping to those developed countries all over the world from its U.S. production facilities.

Mr. BOGGS. I would say there are a number of kinds of restrictions over which we have no control; the so-called developed countries have their own tariff regulations and their own import restrictions and quotas and so on. I cannot answer the gentleman's question categorically. It has been the effort of our Government and governments all over the world, working through a General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, to reduce as much as possible restrictions on trade.

Mr. DENT. One of the main weaknesses of this legislation is that it gives to a corporation the right to go into an undeveloped country and build a plant and produce without restriction and ship to a developed country that we are now selling to. It does so under free tariff rules that you are talking about, because certain countries do not have any restrictions and no tariff laws against them. We can ship into any of the so-called undeveloped countries.

Mr. BOGGS. I would say to the gentleman that he does not correctly define the situation. In order to qualify as a corporation the American company must meet a whole list of qualifications. An American corporation engaged in the practice outlined by the gentleman would not be able to enjoy tax deferral on such income.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. BRAY. Has this amendment been printed? I have not been able to get a copy of it.

Mr. BOGGS. The amendments were put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 28. I have a copy of them here.

Mr. BRAY. Have there been any committee reports on this amendment?

Mr. BOGGS. No, because the committee report was previous to these amendments.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and take this time to inquire a little more deeply into the question which has just been raised under the provision of this particular bill relative to an American corporation locating in a foreign country, to determine where in the bill it prohibits this corporation from shipping manufactured goods from that particular plant into any other foreign country.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. Let me try to answer the question first.

Under the so-called area of investment provision of H.R. 5 if there is a sale of these products to any third country it would constitute what is called distribution and that would disqualify the corporation for the income preferral. It is set out very specifically.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOX. I yield.

Mr. BAKER. If the gentleman from Michigan will yield, I offered an amendment in the committee which was adopted adding the word "ultimate". The section now reads with that amendment in the bill: The third test which must be met by a domestic corporation if it is to be classified as a foreign business corporation is that it derives not more than 10 percent of its gross income from the sale of any articles for ultimate use, consumption, or disposition in the United States. The word "ultimate" certainly would not permit the shipping of goods to a third country and back to the United States. This is found on page 4 of the report.

Mr. KNOX. I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee, it certainly would not permit the corporation to export to another foreign country and then that foreign country export to the United States. What I am concerned about, however, is the fact that this foreign corporation could start to absorb our export market that we had in other foreign countries by the goods manufactured in this one country being shipped to another country to which we ordinarily export from the United States. I have some reservations about this legislation, and I expounded on it when the bill was before the House some 4 or 5 weeks ago. One of them is the export of dollars and the export of jobs. Just recently by the medium of the press we were informed that the United States is still $3 billion short in dollar payments. This is a matter of chief concern as far as I am concerned.

I think we may have some problem in taking care of some of our own depressed areas, and possibly we should look after them before we start to look after the underdeveloped areas of the world.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOX. I yield.

Mr. HIESTAND. One other point which I think the gentleman has just touched upon, as I understand, the bill provides a limitation of imports to 10 percent of the American manufacture. There is, as I understand, no limitation for a competing Japanese, German, or South American manufacturer; they can ship in all they want to, but we are limiting the American over there. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOX. They can ship in as much as they may desire and meet the tariff imposed by the United States.

Mr. HIESTAND. But the American cannot.

Mr. KNOX. Under the provisions of this bill the American corporation will be limited to 10 percent of the goods manufactured in a foreign country and shipped directly or indirectly into the United States.

Mr. HIESTAND. That is, 10 percent of his production?

Mr. KNOX. Ten percent of that production.

Mr. HIESTAND. There is no limit on the foreign producer?

Mr. KNOX. The foreign producer is involved in the payment of tariff. They have to pay our tariffs in order to ship their goods into this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 29, after line 8, insert:

"'(f) DISQUALIFICATION FOR SUBSTANDARD LABOR CONDITIONS.—

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, a corporation referred to in subsection (a) or (c) shall be treated as an ineligible corporation within the meaning of subsection (d) for any taxable year during which it operates in any less developed country under substandard labor conditions. Any determination that this paragraph applies to any corporation for any taxable year shall be made by the Secretary of Labor. Any such determination shall be final, except that it shall be subject to review by the courts (including the Tax Court of the United States) in a proceeding for the recovery of income tax or for a redetermination of a deficiency in respect of income tax.

"'(2) SUBSTANDARD LABOR CONDITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term "substandard labor conditions" means aggregate remuneration (including remuneration other than in money) for employment which is—

"'(A) below the minimum standards required under the laws of the country concerned, or

"'(B) if there are no such minimum standards—

"'(i) below the average standards prevailing for other employers in the same industry in such country or (if there are no other employers in the same industry) for other employers in similar industries in such country, or

"'(ii) where there are no average standards referred to in clause (1), substantially below the standards generally prevailing in the industries of such country.

"'(3) DETERMINATION AND CERTIFICATION BY SECRETARY OF LABOR.—

"'(A) INVESTIGATIONS.—On application of any affected domestic party (if the Secretary of Labor has reason to believe that the conditions described in this subparagraph exist), or on his own initiative, the Secretary of Labor shall make an investigation to determine whether any corporation referred to in subsection (a) or (c) has operated in any less developed country under substandard labor conditions.

"'(B) ATTENDANCE OF WITNESSES; PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS.—For the purpose of any investigation under subparagraph (A), the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C., secs. 49 and 50), are hereby made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Labor or any officers designated by him.

"'(C) CERTIFICATION.—If, pursuant to any investigation under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of Labor determines that a corporation has operated in any less developed country under substandard labor conditions during any taxable year, he shall promptly certify such determination to the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate.

"'(D) ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT INAPPLICABLE.—The Administrative Procedure Act shall not apply with respect to investigations and determinations by the Secretary of Labor under this subsection.

"'(E) TAXABLE YEARS AFFECTED.—No determination shall be made by the Secretary of Labor with respect to any corporation for any taxable year unless, during such taxable year, the taxpayer has been notified that an investigation under subparagraph (A) has begun, or is continuing, with respect to such corporation for such year.

"'(F) REGULATIONS—The Secretary of Labor may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to the performance of his functions under this subsection.

"'(4) CROSS REFERENCES.—

"'For provisions relating to the authority of the Secretary or his delegate to require the taxpayer to furnish information, see subsection (a)(5) and the last sentence of subsection (c)(1)."

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. As the gentleman from Louisiana knows, it was my privilege to cosponsor the original bill which he introduced, and I want to state that I think the amendments he has proposed to it, and which the committee has approved, will strengthen the bill. I would further like to say that I am surprised at the tenor of the discussion here today. We are having a review of practically all our general trade policies. I think the real issue at stake—and I would like to ask my colleague from Louisiana if he agrees with me—is whether, in encouraging economic development of the underdeveloped areas, that narrowing the scope of the legislation was a very wise move by the committee. The real issue confronting us is whether the genius of American private enterprise, which we all boast about, will be given an opportunity toward helping the underdeveloped areas, and that is what we are concerned with here today. Our commerce today leaps over State lines; it goes abroad. American capital is already abroad. There is some competition, but when the balance sheet is totaled up at the end of the year we come out ahead of the game. But this legislation does not concern American foreign-trade policy. This legislation concerns putting private funds to work in helping the underdeveloped countries. Is that not a fact?

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman could not be more accurate, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I oppose the legislation in general.

Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BAILEY. On what ground may I get recognition for the purpose of opposing the legislation?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] for 5 minutes in support of the committee amendment, so the gentleman from Louisiana would have to yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. At the expiration of the 5 minutes allowed the gentleman from Louisiana, may I be recognized to discuss the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. If no other member of the committee rises in opposition to the amendment, the Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the chairman.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, just one brief explanation of this amendment. This amendment simply puts into the law another condition in order to qualify for deferral. What it says in essence is that any American firm that goes abroad, to another country, should faithfully execute and uphold the labor standards of that country. I think from the point of view of the reputation of our country that it is wise that our people who operate in these countries should at least conform to the standards existing in those countries. There is no punitive intent involved in this proposed amendment at all.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. While I have serious doubts about the bill, I think the gentleman's amendments have most certainly strengthened it in many ways. I am not quite clear, and I wish the gentleman would elaborate for a moment, what the Secretary of Labor does to ascertain in a country what the minimum wages in that country are. Assume that the country has no minimum wage.

Mr. BOGGS. Of course, in that case he has to look to the standards prevailing in the industry.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Average wage scales and so forth.

Mr. BOGGS. I might say to the gentleman under the procedures adopted some time ago by the President, the Labor Department has the responsibility for determining wage standards in other countries. This applies in the preparation of lists for trade agreement negotiations and so forth. So, the machinery is already in existence in the Department of Labor working through the labor attachés connected with our embassies.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I ask the gentleman whether the amendment he has submitted is acceptable to the organized labor movement?

Mr. BOGGS. It is; very much so.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PELLY moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with its enacting clause stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. NATCHER). The Chair desires to inform the gentleman that his motion is not in order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves that the Committee now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the opinion of the gentleman from Iowa; I should like to ask him whether he does not agree with me that perhaps this is a case when we should ask for the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill so that some of us may have the opportunity to study these amendments. Under the conditions that exist at the moment, there is a limitation on amendments and we cannot inform ourselves properly on what is in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I think the best procedure, let me say to the gentleman from Washington, would be to adopt the motion to strike out the enacting clause. Failing in that, I think the next best course would be to recommit the bill to the Ways and Means Committee for this session of Congress. What the proponents of this bill want is to get the well-known tail in the crack in the door. That is all they want. They would accept anything; even down to the enacting clause, take it over to the other body, get what they want, and then bring it back here under the semigag rule of a conference report.

We have heard this amendment read. There has been almost no explanation, and there has been no opportunity to study it. There are not a dozen Members on the floor of the House who know what this amendment means, much less the one preceding it.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. For the information of the gentleman, this amendment is strictly a face-saving amendment. There is not anything in it enforcible. There is not any law you can point to that would guarantee anything. If it does guarantee anything, all it guarantees is that any American who invests money in Hong Kong can pay 9 cents an hour and be perfectly all right under the law. All it guarantees in any instance is a repetition of this very thing that is happening now.

Here is a letter that just came in against the minimum wage law in these United States. And what does it say? It comes from the Maidenform company. I think some of the ladies would know what I am talking about, perhaps the men do not. But the letter says that the corset and brassiere industry now is losing 17 percent of its industry to the Hong Kong market. There is nothing in this bill, there is nothing in this amendment that will protect an American worker.

Three years ago we imported 3 million cases of glass into the United States. In the past year we imported 8 million cases of glass. I want to say that if you continue to buy retail and sell wholesale you will not have to worry about being in business.

Mr. GROSS. Keep right on talking; I want to hear more. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is providing facts that all Members ought to know.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia who has been trying to get time under this virtual gag rule and has not succeeded.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the gentleman, I have been desirous of speaking on this legislation to say that it is not in the interest of our national security. Russia claims she has 75 crack divisions ready to take the field at an hour's notice. We have 21 divisions operative in NATO, including our own divisions. Within 30 days after the outbreak of hostilities those 75 Russian divisions would overrun the continent of Europe and seize all of the modern American plants that we have sent over there. They would not destroy them, but they would use them against us for the duration of the war.

This is the most silly, vicious legislation that has been proposed in Congress in the 14 years that I have been a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I think it would be interesting to know what companies already in existence would be the beneficiaries of this legislation. I think if we learn that, we would have a sad story.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to have a lot of information about this bill and what it purports to do. Practically nobody here today knows.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLLIER. As a practical matter, let us assume we had a firm here doing $800,000 worth of business a year at the present time. Let us assume further that they are exporting $400,000.

Under this bill, would it not be possible for them to cut their production in half and establish a foreign plant and produce the goods over there, and ship it from a foreign nation, and thereby reduce by half the employment in the industry established in this country?

Mr. GROSS. I have no doubt the gentleman is correct. I make no profession of knowing what is in this bill now since it has been loaded with committee amendments that were never considered when there was general debate last March. I say again, I doubt if there are a dozen Members of the House who know what is now in this bill. This is a sad and sorry way to legislate. The bill is being written on the floor of the House and that is an irresponsible way to handle important legislation.

The enacting clause ought to be stricken and this proposal considered under full and free debate at some future time, if ever.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation has been before the House of Representatives all of this session. I will say to my good friend from Washington, who complained about not having an opportunity to study the language of the bill or any amendments, that these amendments were printed in full on April 28 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with a full explanation of them.

In addition, and this is something I seldom do, I circulated all of the Members of our body attempting as best I could to explain what is involved in these amendments. Believe me, there is no intention here, no effort, and no desire to do anything that is not completely, totally above board, that anyone cannot examine under any conditions.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I know the gentleman has not tried to limit discussion, but many things have been brought up here which have brought questions from me. Under the manner in which this bill is being considered we cannot offer the usual pro forma amendments and then ask questions.

Mr. BOGGS. I have done the best I could to yield and to explain the legislation as best I could.

Let me say this: We live in difficult times. I would be the last person on earth to advocate exporting American jobs.

How do we judge so many of these matters? This is a piece of legislation which has the following support in the business community. It has the support of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. It has the support of the National Association of Manufacturers.

And in the farm community it has the support of the farm groups, the Farm Bureau Federation and so on.

It has the support of all the labor organizations. I read you a letter which I have in my hand dated May 4, 1960, signed by Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, director of the department of legislation, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. He says among other things,

Several days ago the House Ways and Means Committee adopted two amendments which it proposes to offer to H.R. 5 when the House resumes consideration of the bill. The first of these amendments is designed to restrict the benefits of the measure to foreign investment in "less-developed" countries so designated by the President. This change will hopefully increase capital investment by American business in underdeveloped nations.

The second amendment is the one we are talking about now.

He says:

This amendment will hopefully assure adequate minimum labor standards.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, does not the letter to which the gentleman refers close with a statement of approval?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes, it does. It closes with this statement:

The AFL–CIO urges you to support these amendments and upon their adoption to vote for H.R. 5.

I say to my colleagues, it is very difficult for us to comprehend some of the problems involved here. But the idea that this is some device or some scheme to deprive people of work in our country is just wrong. What this really means is that the genius of American business, as the gentleman from Arizona so beautifully stated a moment ago, can be employed in this cold war with the Soviets. The gentleman from West Virginia talks about the defense implications.

Well, anyone who thinks that the cold war is over just has to read the press and see what is happening at this very moment in Paris. I say to you, we must use every device we have at our command.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. May I ask the gentleman from Louisiana if this bill is designed to funnel these investments to the less-developed countries in the world, if the gentleman does not recognize that in many industries and the glove industry, for example, jobs are being taken away from people in this country precisely into these less-developed countries because of the fact that there is a great differential between the wages paid in those areas and the wages paid here in America and, therefore, this bill would, in fact, continue to take jobs away from this country?

Mr. BOGGS. No; that is not the purpose of the bill and I do not think it would have such a result.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must inform the gentleman that is not in order at this time.

The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 101, noes 93.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BOGGS and Mr. GROSS.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported there were—ayes 107, noes 101.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage private investment abroad and thereby promote American industry and reduce Government expenditures for foreign economic assistance, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the enacting clause be stricken out?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 160, nays 232, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—160

Abbitt	Fallon	Lane
Abernethy	Feighan	Langen
Adair	Fenton	Latta
Alger	Flood	Lennon
Andersen, Minn.	Flynt	Lesinski
Andrews	Fogarty	Levering
Ashmore	Forrester	Lipscomb
Bailey	Garmatz	McCulloch
Baldwin	Gavin	McDonough
Bates	George	McGinley
Baumhart	Glenn	McIntire
Becker	Gray	Macdonald
Belcher	Griffiths	Marshall
Bennett, Mich.	Gross	Martin
Berry	Gubser	Mason
Blatnik	Haley	May
Bosch	Hargis	Meyer
Bow	Harmon	Michel
Bray	Hays	Miller, Clem
Brock	Hechler	Moeller
Broomfield	Hemphill	Moore
Brown, Ga.	Henderson	Morris, N. Mex.
Brown, Ohio	Hess	Moulder
Budge	Hiestand	Mumma
Burke, Mass.	Hoeven	Nelsen
Canfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Norblad
Chenoweth	Holland	Norrell
Collier	Huddleston	O'Hara, Mich.
Cunningham	Jennings	O'Konski
Curtin	Jensen	Oliver
Daniels	Johansen	Ostertag
Davis, Ga.	Johnson, Calif.	Pfost
Delaney	Jonas	Philbin
Dent	Kastenmeier	Pilcher
Derounian	Kearns	Pirnie
Devine	Kee	Prokop
Diggs	Kelly	Rabaut
Dingell	King, Utah	Rains
Dixon	Kirwan	Ray
Donohue	Kitchin	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dorn, S.C.	Knox	Riehlman
Dowdy	Kowalski	Riley
	Kyl	Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Mass.	Slack	Vanik
Rooney	Smith, Calif.	Van Pelt
Roush	Staggers	Van Zandt
St. George	Stratton	Weaver
Saylor	Sullivan	Whitener
Schenck	Taber	Whitten
Scherer	Teague, Calif.	Wier
Selden	Thomson, Wyo.	Winstead
Shipley	Tollefson	Withrow
Siler	Trimble	Younger
Simpson	Utt	

NAYS—232

Addonizio	Fisher	Monagan
Albert	Flynn	Montoya
Alford	Foley	Moorhead
Anderson, Mont.	Ford	Morgan
Anfuso	Fountain	Moss
Arends	Frazier	Multer
Ashley	Frelinghuysen	Murphy
Aspinall	Friedel	Murray
Auchincloss	Fulton	Natcher
Avery	Gallagher	Nix
Ayres	Gary	O'Brien, Ill.
Baker	Gathings	O'Brien, N.Y.
Barr	Giaimo	O'Hara, Ill.
Barrett	Goodell	O'Neill
Barry	Granahan	Osmers
Bass, N.H.	Grant	Passman
Bass, Tenn.	Green, Pa.	Pelly
Beckworth	Griffin	Perkins
Bennett, Fla.	Hagen	Poage
Bentley	Halleck	Poff
Betts	Halpern	Porter
Boggs	Hardy	Powell
Boland	Harris	Preston
Bolling	Harrison	Price
Bolton	Healey	Pucinski
Bowles	Herlong	Quie
Boykin	Hoffman, Mich.	Quigley
Brademas	Hogan	Randall
Breeding	Holifield	Reece, Tenn.
Brooks, La.	Holt	Rees, Kans.
Brooks, Tex.	Holtzman	Reuss
Brown, Mo.	Horan	Rhodes, Pa.
Broyhill	Hosmer	Rivers, Alaska
Burdick	Hull	Rivers, S.C.
Burke, Ky.	Ikard	Roberts
Burleson	Inouye	Robison
Byrne, Pa.	Irwin	Rodino
Byrnes, Wis.	Jarman	Rogers, Fla.
Cahill	Johnson, Md.	Roosevelt
Cannon	Johnson, Wis.	Rostenkowski
Carnahan	Jones, Ala.	Rutherford
Casey	Jones, Mo.	Saund
Cederberg	Judd	Schneebeli
Celler	Karsten	Schwengel
Chamberlain	Karth	Sikes
Chiperfield	Kasem	Sisk
Church	Keith	Smith, Iowa
Clark	Keogh	Smith, Miss.
Coad	Kilday	Smith, Va.
Coffin	Kilgore	Spence
Cohelan	King, Calif.	Springer
Colmer	Kluczynski	Steed
Conte	Lafore	Stubblefield
Cook	Laird	Teague, Tex.
Cooley	Libonati	Teller
Corbett	Lindsay	Thompson, N.J.
Cramer	Loser	Thompson, Tex.
Curtis, Mass.	McCormack	Thornberry
Curtis, Mo.	McFall	Toll
Daddario	McGovern	Tuck
Dague	McSween	Udall
Dawson	Machrowicz	Ullman
Denton	Mack, Ill.	Vinson
Derwinski	Madden	Wainwright
Dooley	Magnuson	Wallhauser
Dorn, N.Y.	Mahon	Wampler
Downing	Mailliard	Watts
Doyle	Matthews	Weis
Dulski	Meader	Westland
Dwyer	Merrow	Wharton
Edmondson	Metcalf	Widnall
Elliott, Pa.	Miller, George P.	Wilson
Everett	Miller, N.Y.	Wolf
Evins	Milliken	Wright
Farbstein	Mills	Yates
Fascell	Minshall	Young
Fino	Mitchell	Zablocki
		Zelenko

NOT VOTING—40

Alexander	Green, Oreg.	Santangelo
Allen	Hébert	Scott
Barden	Jackson	Shelley
Baring	Johnson, Colo.	Sheppard
Blitch	Kilburn	Short
Bonner	Landrum	Smith, Kans.
Brewster	Lankford	Taylor
Buckley	McDowell	Thomas
Chelf	McMillan	Thompson, La.
Davis, Tenn.	Morris, Okla.	Walter
Durham	Morrison	Williams
Elliott, Ala.	Patman	Willis
Forand	Pillion	
Gilbert	Rogers, Tex.	

So the enacting clause was not stricken out.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Baring for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Morrison against.
Mr. Alexander for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.
Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Johnson of Colorado against.
Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Elliott against.
Mr. Williams for, with Mr. Santangelo against.
Mr. Barden for, with Mr. Gilbert against.
Mr. Durham for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. McMillan for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Allen.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Short.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Brewster with Mr. Smith of Kansas.

Mrs. GRANAHAN, Mr. LOSER, and Mr. FRIEDEL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WITHROW changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 5.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, there was pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] to the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] had consumed 5 minutes in support of the amendment.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, is it permissible for someone to speak for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOGGS. First, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this not be taken out of the gentleman's time, but at the conclusion of the 5 minutes granted to the gentleman from Michigan, it is my understanding that all debate will have expired and that we will vote on the committee amendment and then return to the House; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The vote will be on the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute and then on the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I sought this time for the purpose of speaking briefly on the amendment, and also for the purpose of expressing my support of the legislation as a whole.

The amendment, as I understand it, simply requires that American foreign business corporations pay the going rate of wages abroad, which does not mean a great deal. I do not think the amendment is necessary to the bill at all.

I commend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] for having pressed for this legislation because it seems to me this is a practical step to enlist American private capital in the job of developing the underdeveloped countries of the world. That is a theme that I have been preaching ever since I came to the Congress 10 years ago.

It seems to me that economic development and the promotion of economic and political stability in the underdeveloped areas of the world and for the peoples who are emerging from colonialism and seeking to establish themselves in the world community, that that job of economic development, pursuant to our American traditions, belongs primarily to the private business community. This legislation, Mr. Chairman, would foster, encourage and stimulate private capital investment for the economic development of the underdeveloped areas of the world. It should be the role of government merely to support, encourage, and facilitate this natural economic process.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DENT. Did the gentleman from Michigan get up and ask for time to speak in opposition and would that include any of us who are opposed to the bill, since he is speaking in favor of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, no one else can be recognized.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants me to yield to him to make a statement, I will be glad to do so.

Mr. DENT. I do not think that is it. I just want to know if the rules of the House allow the time to be usurped by those in favor of the bill when some time is supposed, under the rules of the House, to be allocated to those who are opposed to the billl.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to inform the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the gentleman from Michigan stated that he rose in opposition to the amendment, and the Chair recognized the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is there any rule that permits any Member of the House to shape your argument?

Mr. MEADER. I think I am capable of making my own argument.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, regardless of what anyone says, this bill does one thing.

It reduces taxes for somebody; American business abroad.

The only issue is whether that somebody deserves this priority of treatment.

I think not. If we are to consider a reduction of taxes, there are other areas of more justifiable need.

My principal objections to this bill as amended are the provisions under which the tax deferral privilege is extended to the income of branch banking activities of American banks in foreign countries. There is no reason why the tremendous profits of these banking operations in these countries should escape normal taxation.

These banking investments are made under considerable protection of the American flag and are frequently interwoven with loans made by the Development Loan Fund, the Export-Import Bank, and the World Bank. The high risk portion of these loans are usually assumed by these other institutions which are supported by the American taxpayer.

The interest rates under which these American funds multiply in foreign lands are scandalous. They range as high as 20 percent in Peru, 24 percent in Chile, 36 percent to 40 percent in Argentina, and as much as 48 percent in Brazil.

If American capital is participating in the extortion of such exorbitant rates of interest in the underdeveloped areas of the world, the profits of such investment should certainly be subject to normal taxation, since these practices are incurring a tremendous injustice which the American people will have to correct in other ways at a cost many times the taxes involved.

I just want to say to the gentleman in respect to the amendment, I do not think the amendment improves the legislation enough to warrant its adoption because, regardless of what anyone says, this bill does one thing—it reduces taxes for somebody.

One issue is whether that somebody deserves this priority treatment. I think not. I think we have a great many other areas to think about first. It is for this reason that I oppose this legislation.

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. Does this not just defer taxes?

Mr. MEADER. This simply defers taxes, but it does stimulate money going into these countries.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. DENT. Is it not true under this bill that any profits made by an American investor in a foreign country can be used for planned expansion and for plant construction in another undeveloped country without paying taxes in the United States on any profit whatsoever?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], continues to make these statements that have no foundation in fact. The answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania is "No." He would not qualify under the provisions of the act.

Mr. DENT. Will you show me in this legislation where you prohibit, instead of encourage, development of underdeveloped countries, by taking the profits made by an investment company? I can read the bill.

Mr. BOGGS. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], has made this argument all afternoon. There is a formula set out in the bill called payroll and investment, and unless you qualify under that formula and other equally restrictive provisions, you cannot get tax deferment. As the gentleman stated, this is not a tax reduction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] has expired.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I just listened to the gentleman from Michigan rise to oppose the second amendment offered by the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS]. In the course of opposing the amendment, which according to the chairman of the subcommittee, was designed to greatly improve the bill, the gentleman from Michigan then proceeded to support the bill. This, Mr. Chairman, is what has happened to this bill from the first day it came on the floor about 6 weeks ago.

At that time, this bill, H.R. 5, was debated for many hours and then, because of the great opposition with no chance of passage, in the form the bill was offered, the Committee rose and the bill was set aside for future discussion. Now, today, the bill, H.R. 5, comes before the House, but we are told it is no longer that bill; that the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana, is offering two lengthy amendments that changes a great part of the bill. Under the rule today, each amendment has had 5 minutes of so-called explanation. Many Members protested that this explanation was certainly nowhere sufficient to clarify the many important issues involved.

Therefore, I feel that, when I am asked to vote on legislation of this magnitude and with a completely new concept, I cannot vote for it with any degree of understanding or intelligence, I am constrained to vote against this bill. When the original H.R. 5 was debated, there was no question in my mind that this would not only save taxes for certain industries, but would also jeopardize, to the greatest degree, employment in our country. This I cannot tolerate.

Perhaps if there had been sufficient time to debate and study the amendments that we were told would clarify this view, a more intelligent understanding might have taken place.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point for the purpose of including an explanation of these amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. This analysis is as follows:

The Committee on Ways and Means adopted two amendments to H.R. 5.

The first amendment deals with two subjects: First, it limits the provisions of H.R. 5 to income earned and reinvested in the less developed countries; second, it eliminates the so-called gross-up with respect to the dividend income received by foreign business corporations.

Limiting the provisions of H.R. 5 to the less developed countries conforms the bill to the suggestions of the Treasury Department and of the President in his budget message to the Congress this year. Under the bill as reported by the committee, the tax deferral privilege is available where the foreign business corporation derives most of its income from sources outside of the United States. Under the committee's amendment, this privilege is available only where most of the income is derived from the less developed countries. The foreign business corporation must earn at least 90 percent of its gross income within less developed countries and its subsidiaries must meet the same test in order for these subsidiaries to be qualified payor corporations.

The committee amendment limiting the provisions of the bill to less-developed countries also provides that the distribution rule relating to investment and payroll situated outside of the United States and also the rule relating to prohibited investments in the United States are to be amended to refer to investment and payroll situated in the less-developed countries and to prohibited investments outside of the less-developed countries. As a result the foreign business corporation will have the privilege of tax deferral with respect to its income from the active conduct of a trade or business only to the extent determined in relation to the ratio of its payroll and assets situated in the less-developed countries to its worldwide payroll and assets. Similarly a distribution will result if certain property situated outside of the less-developed countries is acquired by the corporation. The committee amendment does not affect, however, the provision presently in the bill which provides that not more than 10 percent of a foreign business corporation's income may be from the sale of articles which are sold by it for ultimate use, consumption, or disposition in the United States.

Under the committee's amendment the President of the United States is empowered to designate which foreign countries and which possessions of the United States shall be regarded as less-developed countries except that he may not designate any area within the Sino-Soviet bloc. An overseas department, province or possession of a country may be designated as a less-developed country even though the mother country would not be so designated. The committee amendment also specifies certain countries, in view of the fact that they are considered to be economically developed, which may not be designated as less-developed countries by the President for the purpose of this bill. These are: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain, and Northern Ireland. This does not necessarily mean, however, that all countries other than the ones mentioned will be designated by the President as less-developed countries. This is a matter left to the discretion of the President.

The second part of the first amendment as I previously indicated eliminates the so-called gross-up with respect to the dividend income received by foreign business corporations. The committee has held hearings on the possibility of extending the gross-up concept to all dividend income received by American corporations from subsidiaries. This is now under consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means. In view of this it was concluded that it would be desirable to withdraw the gross-up provision in the present bill and apply the same rule in the case of foreign business corporations as is applied generally with respect to the gross-up for dividend income received from foreign subsidiaries. As a result, income on which the tax is deferred and which is placed in the reinvested foreign income account will not be increased by the amount of the foreign taxes paid with respect to this income. Also, the taxes which will be deemed paid with respect to this income will be only the portion of the taxes attributable to the income after the foreign tax. In other words, the concept laid down in the American Chicle Corp. case will continue to apply.

The second amendment relates to substandard labor conditions. A corporation will not be eligible to be treated as a foreign business corporation, or as a qualified payor corporation, for any taxable year if the Secretary of Labor determines, and certifies to the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate, that such

corporation has during the taxable year operated in any less developed country under substandard labor conditions.

Procedures: The determination of the Secretary of Labor shall be final as to whether a corporation is ineligible by reason of operation in any less developed country under substandard labor conditions except that it will be subject to review by the courts—including the Tax Court of the United States—in a proceeding for the recovery of income tax or for a redetermination of the deficiency in respect of income tax.

An investigation may be undertaken by the Secretary of Labor, on his own initiative, or upon the application of any affected domestic party if the Secretary has reason to believe that a corporation has been operating in any less developed country under substandard labor conditions. It is not contemplated that the Secretary of Labor will undertake investigations unless he has sufficient information to warrant an investigation. Furthermore, in order for a domestic party to file an application for an investigation it must demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Labor, that it is affected by, and has an economic interest in, the question of whether the foreign business corporation—or the qualified payor corporation—is operating in any less developed country under substandard labor conditions. For this purpose an economic interest, for example, might involve the loss of sales, production, or employment due to the fact that a foreign business corporation or a qualified payor corporation is operating under substandard conditions.

It is not the intention of your committee that this provision be administered in a punitive fashion. Rather, it is anticipated that this provision will serve to make corporations that may have been operating under substandard labor conditions conform their labor standards to the required standards. Thus, in interpreting the language "for any taxable year for which" it is expected that the Secretary of Labor will wish to be satisfied that there is a pattern of operation under substandard labor conditions before making any determination.

The Secretary of Labor is also proscribed from making a determination with respect to any corporation for any taxable year unless the taxpayer has been notified during such taxable year that an investigation is underway. Should an investigation continue into the succeeding taxable year, the Secretary of Labor must notify the taxpayer that the investigation is continuing during such succeeding taxable year and is applicable for such taxable year as well. It is also anticipated that the Secretary of Labor will expedite the completion of investigations that he has undertaken and, insofar as possible, limit the course of the investigation to the taxable year under consideration.

Standards: The term "substandard labor conditions" is defined by comparing the aggregate remuneration for employment paid by a corporation against minimum standards obtaining in the less-developed country in which the corporation is operating. If such aggregate remuneration is below such standards, then substandard labor conditions are deemed to exist. It should be noted that the aggregate remuneration for employment includes all payments to or on behalf of employees, whether in money, services, goods, and so forth. This term comprehends not only direct wages but also fringe benefits and other payments for employment. The amendment provides a number of standards against which the aggregate remuneration is to be compared. The first standards are the minimum standards required under the laws of the country concerned. The standards required under the laws of the country are those that are applicable and generally in effect with respect to employers under the laws of the country concerned.

If there are no minimum standards required under the laws of the country, then the standards to be employed will be the average standards prevailing for other employers in the same industry in such country. If there are no other employers in the same industry because the corporation in question is the sole employer in this industry, then the standards shall be the average standards prevailing for other employers in similar industries in such country.

If the standards referred to above are not available for use, then the standards to be employed shall be the standards generally prevailing in the industries of the country concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the great Ways and Means Committee on which Illinois is so outstandingly represented by our beloved dean, Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, and I would not presume to speak on the pending bill were it not for the fact that this is in a field of legislation in which I have some understanding from service on other committees and a great interest running back to the 81st Congress and the first year of the Truman administration.

Perhaps I should explain. President Truman had electrified the Nation with his point 4 program. The concept of that program appealed to the common sense of the American people.

In the development of that plan it was not intended that peoples in other and foreign lands could be helped by giving them doles. The concept was, and this is what appealed to the common sense of the American people, that they best could be helped by helping them to help themselves.

We thought, and I think soundly, that the best job could be done by encouraging private American capital to make investments in these undeveloped areas much as private capital in the developed areas of our own country earlier had made investments in the less developed areas. We thought that this would open the doors of opportunity and give challenge to the ambition of these peoples in undeveloped areas exactly as in an earlier period they had done to the peoples in our own then undeveloped areas.

But because of the risk of governments that might not be too stable and of currency problems a plan was devised of an insurance program guaranteeing American investors from these unusual risks. The jurisdiction then was in the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I was a new member. The present Secretary of State, the Honorable Christian A. Herter, then a Member of the House, was among the witnesses that appeared before our committee during the public hearings on a bill to establish a program of insurance for private American capital invested in these then undeveloped areas. Although a new Member of the Congress and of the committee, through the graciousness of Chairman Spence and Ranking Minority Member Jesse Wolcott, who in my appraisal constituted a team of statesmen of superlative quality, I was permitted to participate in the hearings and in the discussions in the measure of my great interest in the subject. I was enthusiastically for the program, but I did not wish it to operate without consideration of the necessity of protection for labor. That is, then as now, I could see the danger to the labor of our own country if, in the development of other countries, we were not concerned that the wages of the workers should be brought, as prosperity came to those regions, to something of our own scale.

Mr. Chairman, I think that my colleagues would find it informative and illuminating to read the public hearings of the Banking and Currency Committee when first this genuine type of legislation was before the Congress.

When I became a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I was no stranger to the foreign investment insurance program, jurisdiction over which had been transferred from the Banking and Currency Committee, where it had originated, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The program had worked well. It had not only paid its own way but it had made a profit and there were substantial reserves. I would say that its record pretty well compares with that of the Export-Import Bank, which itself at the outset had been controversial but which now is acclaimed by everyone. Mind you, this is insurance, not given away, but fully paid for by the premiums.

But last year the administration of the program, overconfident because of past successes when policies were sound, was reaching out for new and perilous worlds to conquer. It proposed to increase its coverage, without adequate additional premiums, to an extent that would have spelled complete ruin. When I presented the matter to the attention of the House in its consideration of the mutual security bill of last year I was very happy that my colleagues by an overwhelming vote struck out the provision that would have wrecked the entire program. I say happy, Mr. Chairman, not in a personal sense, but in a sense that this program seemed to me

so important if we were to work out a program of helping undeveloped areas to help themselves we could not permit the instrumentality of our effort to be destroyed by reckless administrative ambitions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, why were we interested in attracting private investments and private American businesses to these undeveloped areas? The answer is so simple that it should easily be understood by a child. We want a happy and a prosperous world. Wherever there is poverty there is unrest and there is danger. If we have goods to sell we can find no market for them in a country where there is only poverty. American ingenuity and American know-how can do so much wherever they are given a chance, and what it does in regions now undeveloped will bring back to us the blessings of a widened market and a spiritual lift of friendship.

H.R. 5, as I vision it, and strengthened by the amendments offered today, is just another forward step in the program that electrified the American people in the first year of the Truman administration. It gives American private capital a better chance to do the job. I urge its passage.

We cannot, with due respect for our taxpayers and the menace that lies in a constantly and alarmingly growing national debt, continue indefinitely to invest the public funds in helping undeveloped countries.

The money that we have put to such use, it has always seemed to me, is as water put in to prime the pump. Now that the pump is getting fairly started on the way to being primed we should not hesitate about helping the primed pump to function. I fail to see how my colleagues who have been loudest in crying out against our expenditures in our mutual security program in its economic phase can find consistency in opposing this bill which looks forward to the end of the necessity of such mutual security expenditures.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that the general purpose of H.R. 5 is well understood in the city of Chicago. Some months ago, and I think by arrangement of our beloved dean, TOM O'BRIEN, the author of the bill, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] addressed a tremendous audience of the leaders of Chicago, giving in detail the contents of his bill. It was a most representative audience. The exporters and the importers and the manufacturers and the leaders of labor, and the experts of Chicago in foreign trade and other fields were there. In the week following Congressman BOGGS' address in Chicago I received 63 letters urging my support of this bill.

I am happy that the gentleman from Louisiana and the full membership of the Ways and Means Committee have seen fit to present amendments that meet the objections of those who have given it thoughtful study. I am especially happy that the gentleman from Louisiana has accepted an amendment protective of labor and that the bill as amended now carries the endorsement of organized labor as well as the organizations of manufacturers and other groups of our citizenry. It is essential to the well-being of our own people, as well as those in the undeveloped areas, that we keep vigilantly in mind that no permanent good will comes to them or to us unless a broadening prosperity in those areas is reflected in the wages and working conditions of the workers, more and more approaching our own.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment to the amendment.

The committee amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage private investment abroad and thereby promote American industry and reduce Government expenditures for foreign economic assistance, pursuant to House Resolution 468, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MASON. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MASON moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5 to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask whether or not I can clear the record by reading from the bill one line where I was questioned as to veracity?

The SPEAKER. All debate on the bill has expired.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 196, nays 192, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—196

Addonizio	Fino	Moorhead
Albert	Flynn	Morrison
Anderson, Mont.	Foley	Multer
Anfuso	Ford	Murphy
Arends	Frazier	Natcher
Ashley	Frelinghuysen	Nix
Aspinall	Fulton	O'Brien, Ill.
Auchincloss	Gallagher	O'Brien, N.Y.
Avery	Gary	O'Hara, Ill.
Ayres	Gathings	O'Neill
Baker	Giaimo	Osmers
Barr	Goodell	Ostertag
Barrett	Granahan	Pelly
Barry	Grant	Poage
Bass, N.H.	Green, Pa.	Poff
Bass, Tenn.	Griffin	Porter
Beckworth	Hagen	Preston
Bennett, Fla.	Halleck	Price
Bentley	Halpern	Pucinski
Betts	Hardy	Quie
Boggs	Harris	Quigley
Boland	Harrison	Randall
Bolling	Healey	Reece, Tenn.
Bolton	Herlong	Rees, Kans.
Bowles	Hoffman, Mich.	Reuss
Boykin	Holt	Rhodes, Pa.
Brademas	Holtzman	Rivers, Alaska
Breeding	Hosmer	Rivers, S.C.
Brooks, La.	Hull	Roberts
Brown, Mo.	Ikard	Robison
Burke, Ky.	Inouye	Rodino
Byrne, Pa.	Irwin	Rogers, Fla.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jarman	Roosevelt
Cahill	Johnson, Md.	Rostenkowski
Cannon	Jones, Mo.	Rutherford
Carnahan	Karsten	Saund
Casey	Karth	Schneebeli
Cederberg	Kasem	Schwengel
Celler	Keogh	Sisk
Chamberlain	Kilday	Smith, Miss.
Chiperfield	King, Calif.	Smith, Va.
Church	Kluczynski	Spence
Clark	Lafore	Springer
Coffin	Laird	Stubblefield
Cohelan	Libonati	Teller
Conte	Lindsay	Thompson, N.J.
Corbett	McCormack	Thompson, Tex.
Cramer	McGovern	Thornberry
Curtis, Mass.	McSween	Toll
Curtis, Mo.	Machrowicz	Tuck
Daddario	Mack	Udall
Dague	Madden	Ullman
Dawson	Magnuson	Wainwright
Derwinski	Mahon	Wallhauser
Dixon	Mailliard	Watts
Dooley	Matthews	Weis
Dorn, N.Y.	Meader	Westland
Downing	Merrow	Wharton
Doyle	Miller, George P.	Widnall
Dulski	Miller, N.Y.	Wilson
Dwyer	Milliken	Wolf
Elliott, Pa.	Mills	Wright
Everett	Minshall	Yates
Farbstein	Mitchell	Young
Fascell	Monagan	Zablocki
		Zelenko

NAYS—192

Abbitt	Cook	Gross
Abernethy	Cooley	Gubser
Adair	Cunningham	Haley
Alford	Curtin	Hargis
Alger	Daniels	Harmon
Andersen, Minn.	Davis, Ga.	Hays
Andrews	Delaney	Hechler
Ashmore	Dent	Hemphill
Bailey	Denton	Henderson
Baldwin	Derounian	Hess
Bates	Devine	Hiestand
Becker	Diggs	Hoeven
Belcher	Dingell	Hoffman, Ill.
Berry	Donohue	Hogan
Blatnik	Dorn, S.C.	Holifield
Bosch	Dowdy	Holland
Bow	Edmondson	Horan
Bray	Evins	Huddleston
Brock	Fallon	Jennings
Brooks, Tex.	Feighan	Jensen
Broomfield	Fenton	Johansen
Brown, Ga.	Fisher	Johnson, Calif.
Brown, Ohio	Flood	Johnson, Wis.
Broyhill	Flynt	Jonas
Budge	Fogarty	Jones, Ala.
Burdick	Forrester	Kastenmeier
Burke, Mass.	Fountain	Kearns
Burleson	Friedel	Kee
Canfield	Garmatz	Keith
Chenoweth	Gavin	Kelly
Coad	George	Kilgore
Collier	Glenn	King, Utah
Colmer	Gray	Kirwan
	Griffiths	Kitchin

Knox	Moss	Selden
Kowalski	Moulder	Shipley
Kyl	Mumma	Sikes
Lane	Murray	Siler
Langen	Nelsen	Simpson
Latta	Norblad	Slack
Lennon	Norrell	Smith, Calif.
Lesinski	O'Hara, Mich.	Smith, Iowa
Levering	O'Konski	Staggers
Lipscomb	Oliver	Steed
Loser	Perkins	Stratton
McCulloch	Pfost	Sullivan
McDonough	Philbin	Taber
McFall	Pilcher	Teague, Calif.
McGinley	Pirnie	Thomson, Wyo.
McIntire	Powell	Tollefson
McMillan	Prokop	Trimble
Macdonald	Rabaut	Utt
Marshall	Rains	Vanik
Martin	Ray	Van Pelt
Mason	Rhodes, Ariz.	Van Zandt
May	Riehlman	Wampler
Metcalf	Riley	Weaver
Meyer	Rogers, Colo.	Whitener
Michel	Rogers, Mass.	Whitten
Miller, Clem	Rooney	Wier
Moeller	Roush	Winstead
Montoya	St. George	Withrow
Moore	Saylor	Younger
Morgan	Schenck	
Morris, N. Mex.	Scherer	

NOT VOTING—44

Alexander	Gilbert	Santangelo
Allen	Green, Oreg.	Scott
Barden	Hébert	Shelley
Baring	Jackson	Sheppard
Baumhart	Johnson, Colo.	Short
Bennett, Mich.	Judd	Smith, Kans.
Blitch	Kilburn	Taylor
Bonner	Landrum	Teague, Tex.
Brewster	Lankford	Thomas
Buckley	McDowell	Thompson, La.
Chelf	Morris, Okla.	Vinson
Davis, Tenn.	Passman	Walter
Durham	Patman	Williams
Elliott, Ala.	Pillion	Willis
Forand	Rogers, Tex.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Elliott for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Santangelo for, with Mr. Alexander against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Mr. Gilbert for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. Johnson of Colorado for, with Mr. Barden against.

Mr. Brewster for, with Mr. Williams against.

Mrs. Green of Oregon for, with Mr. Durham against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Smith of Kansas against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Allen.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Baumhart.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Short.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Morris of Oklahoma with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Pillion.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF INCORPORATION OF CITY OF MARLBORO, MASS.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution (H. Res. 535), which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the year 1960 marks the three hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of the city of Marlboro, Massachusetts, as a town on May 31, 1660; and

Whereas from the time of its first settlement in 1657 the people of Marlboro have figured conspicuously in the founding, growth, and defense of this Nation; and

Whereas the observance of the tercentenary anniversary of Marlboro will be celebrated June 10 through June 19, 1960, with impressive community ceremonies, large public gatherings, and widespread participation of Massachusetts citizens and visitors from other States and places; and

Whereas Marlboro is a beautiful community rich in historic interest, well known for its patriotic contributions, noted for its many famous sons and daughters who distinguished themselves in many fields of endeavor and many facets of American civilization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its greetings and felicitations to the people of Marlboro, Massachusetts, on the occasion of the three hundredth anniversary of this community and the House of Representatives further expresses its appreciation for the splendid services rendered to the Nation by the citizens of Marlboro during the past three hundred years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not expect to object, I have reserved the right to object to find out if we are going to have any more legislative business today.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no further legislative business today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This will be the final legislative action?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARLBORO TERCENTENARY

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, May 31 of this year marks the 300th anniversary of the incorporation as a town of the city of Marlboro, Mass., in my district, and I am truly gratified that the House is making note of this outstanding event by extending its congratulations to the people of this historic Massachusetts community.

Actually, the history of Marlboro goes further back in time than the 300 years of progress which will be celebrated with impressive exercises from June 10 through 19. Marlboro is located in an area of Massachusetts which was settled by pioneer colonists in the very earliest days of American history.

Courageous bands of early settlers as early as 1657 carved out Marlboro from the wilderness and today many descendants of these pioneers still reside in the community. These brave settlers helped to establish a civilization, a tradition, a way of life, and a history which live to this very day in the heritage which is so fortunately ours.

These early settlers of Marlboro helped to establish for all America the basic institutions of democratic government. They helped to forge a record of magnificent achievement that lives to this day.

It is therefore fitting, Mr. Speaker, that the House should make note of the struggles and bitter sacrifices of the pioneer people of Marlboro so that we and our posterity may benefit from the remarkable legacy of accomplishment these early settlers have left us. In recognition of the incorporation of Marlboro as a town, Mr. Speaker, the House today pays profoundly felt tribute to this community and its people by the adoption of my resolution, which reads as follows:

Whereas the year 1960 marks the three hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of the city of Marlboro, Massachusetts, as a town on May 31, 1660; and

Whereas from the time of its first settlement in 1657 the people of Marlboro have figured conspicuously in the founding, growth and defense of this Nation; and

Whereas the observance of the tercentenary anniversary of Marlboro will be celebrated June 10 through June 19, 1960, with impressive community ceremonies, large public gatherings and widespread participation of Massachusetts citizens and visitors from other States and places; and

Whereas Marlboro is a beautiful community rich in historic interest, well known for its patriotic contributions, noted for its many famous sons and daughters who distinguished themselves in many fields of endeavor and many facets of American civilization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its greetings and felicitations to the people of Marlboro, Massachusetts, on the occasion of the three hundredth anniversary of this community and the House of Representatives further expresses its appreciation for the splendid services rendered to the Nation by the citizens of Marlboro during the past three hundred years.

It is not possible for me in these brief remarks to recite in full the glorious history of Marlboro, but I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues some of the highlights of this progressive community which I have the great honor to represent in the Congress.

Marlboro was incorporated as a town in 1660 by the Massachusetts General Court on petition from pioneer settlers from nearby Sudbury which was settled as early as 1639. It took its name after Marlboro town in Wilts County, England.

Marlboro, which became a city in 1890, now comprises about 21 square miles. The 1960 census gives Marlboro 18,759 residents, an increase of 3,003 over the 1950 count.

Like famed Rome, Marlboro is located on seven hills. It overlooks the gentle rolling valley of the Assabet in the central Massachusetts area. It is said that on a clear day landmarks some 40 miles away can be discerned in every direction from Sligo Hill since local claims have it that the city is the highest elevation 30 miles inland along the entire eastern

Atlantic seaboard. Few, if any, other communities have disputed this claim since Marlboro is 400 feet above sea level and is known as the Highland City.

Marlboro is known throughout the Nation for its famous shoe industry which dates back to 1836. By 1917, Marlboro was the world's eighth largest shoe manufacturing city, some 20,000 pairs being made daily. A few years later, it became the fifth largest shoe center in the United States, a remarkable achievement in comparison to the much larger cities manufacturing shoes. Shoe manufacturing is still one of the city's basic industries, but diversification has taken place in recent years, so much so that Marlboro now makes automobile batteries, metal stampings and dies, set-up paper and jewelry boxes, wire products, miners' lamps, industrial scale models, metal polishing plates, and industrial chemicals.

Mr. Speaker, in observance of its 300th anniversary, Marlboro has planned an elaborate program of events beginning June 10 and extending through June 19. Among the highlights of the observance will be a historical pageant with a large local cast to depict the growth and development of Marlboro from the time of its early settlement, the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, the industrial expansion, through to the World Wars I and II and Korean conflict of the present century.

In addition, a huge parade will take place on June 12 with participating units from the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Present plans call for one of the largest parades ever to be conducted in the central Massachusetts area.

At the request of the general chairman of the Marlboro Tercentenary Committee, Mr. Louis F. Ghiloni, I was privileged to extend invitations to the Marlboro celebration to the armed services and it has been gratifying indeed to obtain such splendid cooperation from the various branches of the service.

Maj. Gen. William J. Verbeck, commanding general of Fort Devens, will be reviewing officer at the parade, to which he has assigned the Fort Devens band, a platoon of troops, and color guard. In addition, Maj. Gen. J. F. R. Seitz, chief of staff, Headquarters 1st U.S. Army, Governors Island, N.Y., has requested a U.S. Army exhibit unit for display during the Marlboro celebration.

Rear Adm. Carl F. Espe, commandant of the 1st Naval District, Boston, is making available the Boston Naval Base band, a color guard, and Navy marching unit.

Col. William C. Lewis, commander, Westover Air Force Base, is insuring Westover participation in the Marlboro event. Rear Adm. Edwin J. Roland, commander, 1st U.S. Coast Guard District, Boston, is endeavoring to work out Coast Guard participation.

In addition, plans are being made for a flyover of C–119G type aircraft over Marlboro in the early evening of June 10, opening day of the tercentenary observance, through the cooperation of Lt. Col. Gardner W. Mills, Air Force Reserve, commander, 732d Troop Carrier Squadron, Medium—Reserve, Grenier Field, Manchester, N.H.

Marlboro is a city of beautiful homes and honest, industrious, hardworking people comprised of numerous, different racial backgrounds who work together with unity and loyalty to further the welfare of their beautiful city.

It is its people throughout the many generations which have transpired since its establishment who have made Marlboro the great city that it is, and is to these people, from the beginning to the present, that we pay our tribute today for what they have done in each succeeding generation down to this very hour to make this fine Massachusetts city stand out so brightly in the firmament of American communities. Godspeed to them all.

I would like to express my deep personal thanks to my good friend and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, whose great interest and effective help have made possible the passage of this resolution.

I am also most grateful to Minority Leader CHARLES HALLECK; the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Judiciary Committee; and the ranking minority member of this committee, the Honorable WILLIAM MCCULLOCH; and also the distinguished members of the Rules Committee, Chairman HOWARD SMITH; and ranking minority member, the Honorable LEO ALLEN, without whose kind assistance the necessary action on this resolution could not have been taken at this time.

I am especially thankful to you, Mr. Speaker, for permitting the House to depart from today's heavy schedule so that the good wishes and felicitations of this Chamber might be conveyed to the city of Marlboro on the occasion of its 300th anniversary.

NATIONAL FUELS POLICY

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 666, which is designed to insure that America's fuels industries will be able to meet successfully the challenge of the future, in either peace or war.

The proposal will, when approved by the House and the Senate, establish a joint congressional committee to study the energy industries of the United States and make recommendations to the Congress for a national fuels policy. Such a policy would establish guidelines for the future conduct of America's basic energy industries—oil, coal, natural gas, and atomic power.

The Nation now has many separate policies affecting the fuels industries, but these policies are a crazy quilt of overlaps, conflicts, and loopholes administered by many different agencies. The consequent confusion is a detriment to the national security of the United States and threatens its capacity for the expansion necessary to keep pace with its growing population and ever-rising standard of living.

What is needed is a single, integrated policy covering America's vital fuels industries and this would be the end result of my resolution.

Immediate action on the national fuels policy resolution is necessary because the situation of all three domestic fuels industries is rapidly becoming critical. The petroleum industry is suffering from a huge oversupply of oil and prices have been declining for the past 3 years. The ills of the coal industry are well known, and the natural gas industry is the victim of artificially depressed prices. Unless these trends are stopped, and stopped soon, the future of this vital segment of the American economy appears exceedingly gloomy.

The following four reasons dictate the formulation and adoption of a national fuels policy without delay:

This step has been proposed by every independent commission or study group to investigate the problem of American energy resources.

This step will enable the United States to maintain a sound domestic economy capable of the expansion demanded by the dynamic years ahead.

This step will be invaluable aid in the current economic cold war with the Soviet Union.

This step is vital to provide a strong, stable energy base to meet the needs of a possible future national emergency.

This resolution is particularly important to the State of Illinois. In 1958, the last year for which figures are available, the value of fuel production in my State was nearly half a billion dollars. Consequently the health of the energy industries is vital to Illinois' economy.

I am hopeful this resolution will find speedy approval on the floor of the House and feel a similar proposal in the Senate should also be approved during the present session of Congress.

DEDICATION OF THE HORACE HARDY LESTER REACTOR FOR MATERIALS RESEARCH

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following address made by me at the dedication of the Horace Hardy Lester Reactor for Materials Research, Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, Mass., May 17, 1960:

Brigadier General Rust, Major General Schomburg, Mrs. Horace Hardy Lester, the Rev. Raymond Calkins, distinguished visitors, ladies and gentlemen.

It is not unusual for me to visit the Watertown Arsenal. I have been coming out here and working with the commanding general of the arsenal for many years. Together we

have worked out many problems not only of interest to the arsenal and the people of Watertown and the surrounding communities, but also of great importance to the defense of the United States. So it is not uncommon for this Member of Congress to visit the arsenal for various considerations and for various occasions.

Today, however, the situation is different. Today this is a great occasion. At this time we are here to mark a great milestone in scientific production here at the Watertown Arsenal. For me to have a part in this great occasion is not only a deeply felt honor but I believe it is somewhat a recognition of the labors that have been devoted to the work of this great arsenal operating in the defense of the Nation.

Today we are dedicating something new. In doing this it is my desire to pay tribute to those responsible for this work. As it always has been, as it is now, and as it will be in the future, the creation of something new requires the cooperation of many minds and many hands all the way from the dreams to the final reality.

The blazing of a new trail always requires complete cooperation of many people. There are those who plan it, those who get the operations under way, those who engineer and invent the processes and elements that must be developed, and finally, those who must do the work. A tremendous amount of time is required before this atomic reactor is actually ready to be constructed. Many persons have had a part. It is to all these people, the planners and the workers here at the Watertown Arsenal, we must give our thanks and appreciation for their interest, their loyalty, and their workmanship. I am sure that everyone here will agree with me that at the Watertown Arsenal is to be found some of the finest employees and loyal workers in the entire United States. Dedicated to their work, and dedicated to their country, they strive to do a perfect job. For this, not only the United States Army, but the people of this country, are grateful. Employees of this caliber and of this quality are invaluable in the defense of our country.

In the directing of our attention toward those largely responsible for this dedication today, we must give notice to the outstanding contributions and labors of the distinguished commanding general, of the Watertown Arsenal, Brig. Gen. C. E. Rust. The work he has accomplished, the contributions he has made, the problems he has surmounted, are worthy of the highest commendation. In one year, General Rust has done an outstanding and a most remarkable job at the Watertown Arsenal. It is men of his quality and ability that provide this Nation with a sense of security and confidence in their military forces. I am proud and pleased to have had the opportunity, as brief as it has been, to work with General Rust and to know him and his charming and capable wife. I wish them every success in their future undertakings.

In this dedication today it is our purpose to show our appreciation as a Nation and to honor the late Dr. Horace Hardy Lester, who lived to observe and indeed to participate in the early phases of one of the greatest scientific revolutions people of this earth have ever experienced. We are gathered here at the site of this nuclear reactor, evidence in itself of what has been happening so fast to our way of life—nuclear energy for economical power production is near and perhaps we'll see the harnessing of the energy of the sun tomorrow.

Here with us today, participating in this dedication, is Mrs. Horace Hardy Lester, the able and charming wife of Dr. Lester. All through the years of scientific research Dr. Lester was indeed fortunate to have constantly at his side the encouragement and the inspiration of his wonderful wife. Just as he did, she too has lived to observe and to experience at first hand some of these great scientific developments which mean so much to people all over the world. Just as many of you are, I am extremely pleased to meet Mrs. Lester and to have her here with us today.

Dr. Lester saw all of this nuclear development in his day. It was not until 1896 that Wilhelm Conrad Roentgen discovered X-rays and 1903 saw the discovery of radioactivity. A nuclear reaction consumes the fuel of this reactor and releases radiation in the form of neutrons for research yet the neutron was not discovered until 1932, less than 30 years ago.

Radiation from this reactor will enable your scientists here to study, understand, and repair fundamental defects in the materials used for the production of weapons of the future. The same studies will be applicable to the needs of all of us in our daily life. Materials Research is receiving much attention and emphasis by the Department of Defense and the scientific groups of the Nation. Our military requirements in particular are extremely demanding in this age of space. The very best equipment designed by the experts is limited by the quality of available materials from which the hardware must be manufactured. This limitation is one of extreme importance to the national defense. Progress must be made in this area—we must go forward and produce more basic knowledge to apply in this area. We must do this with optimism and confidence. Your record here at Watertown warrants such optimism.

It is indeed commendable that your Materials Research Office here at Watertown employs a scientific staff of such competence that the Atomic Energy Commission has awarded license to build and operate a nuclear reactor. I know how severe the requirements of this agency must be and I am pleased, but not surprised, to find such a basic scientific capability at the Watertown Arsenal.

It is estimated that new knowledge available for adaptation to the needs of man now doubles about every 10 years. New knowledge derives directly from basic research. Dr. Lester was a strong promoter of basic research and a recognized pioneer in industrial radiography. Early in his career at Princeton he worked with the great Thomas A. Edison. Any Army officer who knew him will say that he begged willingly, prodded, and argued incessantly for better laboratories and equipment here at Watertown Arsenal. As your representative I was not spared and spent much time here and in Washington obtaining support for work inspired by people like Dr. Lester.

Dr. Lester wanted to keep this arsenal, our arsenal, in the front lines of progress and we have, with the help of such dedicated men, accomplished much. In 1948 the American Society for Metals, the largest metal society of the Nation, credited Watertown Arsenal with eight milestones of progress from 1900 to 1950, more firsts than any other single contributor. These included the first large alloy steel weldments for gun carriages, and centrifugally cast cannon tubes in the 1920's. In 1922 Dr. Lester was personally responsible for the development of radiography for foundry control. Later the spectrograph was developed for routine chemical analysis. Molybdenum high-speed steel was a Watertown Arsenal first as were cast armor plate and carbide cored ammunition. In the 1950's inspired by Dr. Lester this arsenal led the way in the development of the new metal titanium.

Now in 1960 we have here the first Army research reactor. Research must precede development and production and throughout the years it has been this capability to do high-quality research which has given us much of our workload in the shops. The welded gun carriage of 1929 helped to keep us active in depression days—the centrifugally cast cannon tube made possible an increase in our production capability in World War II of many hundreds of percent. We are now in the missile business.

It is important that the arsenals keep an "in house" capability to advise the Chief of Ordnance, prepare technical specifications for procurement of weapons and inspect the items purchased. These responsibilities cannot be delegated. To keep such a capability you must do some of the research, development, and production yourselves. Only by practicing your professions and trades can you remain capable and progressive. You are a vital part of the science-industry-ordnance team which is so important to the defense of our country. To this extent our capability for preparedness depends upon you.

You are indeed fortunate to live here in one of the most important centers of technical knowledge in the world. Within a 50-mile radius of Watertown Arsenal are 45 educational, 26 electronic, and 28 research, development, and engineering organizations. Your position offers mutual opportunity for important exchange of technical views between universities, the industry, and the Army, a rare opportunity indeed to cross the communication barrier and tell the Army's story, its needs, and its problems to the scientific community.

My message to you today is this: Continue through the efforts of dedicated people like Dr. Lester to demonstrate new and progressive ability and I assure you that I will continue as I have these many years to fight for your cause here, and in Washington in the Halls of Congress.

AREA ASSISTANCE BILL

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am offering for consideration a new administration area assistance bill, H.R. 12286. This proposal incorporates eligibility criteria that the President in his veto message of May 13, 1960, stated he would accept. You will recall at the time the depressed areas bill was debated by the House, I pointed out that for 5 years the administration had been endeavoring to obtain passage of sound legislation that would be helpful to the chronically blighted and depressed areas. At that time, I offered as a substitute the administration bill that had been introduced by the gentleman from New York, Representative CLARENCE E. KILBURN. As the President said:

> The people of the relatively few communities of chronic unemployment—who want to share in the general prosperity—are, after 5 years, properly becoming increasingly impatient and are rightfully desirous of constructive action. The need is for truly sound and helpful legislation on which the Congress and the Executive can agree. There is still time and I willingly pledge once again my wholehearted cooperation in obtaining such a law.

If there is a genuine desire to be helpful to these chronic areas certainly there

is sufficient time for Congress to act. I would like to point out at this time the major items in the new bill:

First. The new eligibility criteria includes 1 more major area and 11 smaller areas than would the criteria in the original administration bill. In a spirit of compromise these criteria are those contained in the bill as it originally passed the Senate.

Second. The bill authorizes $75 million in loan assistance for the construction or refurbishing of industrial plants. It should be pointed out that the vetoed bill also provided $75 million for this purpose.

Third. Federal loan assistance is limited to 35 percent of the aggregate cost as in the original Administration bill and State or local participation must not be less than 15 percent. The balance of the funds would come from private sources and certainly a 50 percent participation can be expected for any project that offers promise of lasting benefits to the community.

Fourth. Housing and Home Finance Agency public facilities loan authorization would be doubled from $100 million to $200 million. The Agency would be required to give a first priority to applications for public facilities that will truly serve an industrial plant construction or refurbishing project authorized by the act. It also requires HHFA to accord next an equal priority to applications from (a) areas of substantial and persistent unemployment designated under the act, (b) small municipalities—which hold the only priority under existing law.

Fifth. A new section authorizes $1.5 million annually for vocational education assistance in areas eligible under the act. The original administration bill contained no specific dollar authorization.

Sixth. An authorization of $1.5 million annually for technical assistance includes studies of economic growth potential to eligible areas.

Seventh. Two million dollars is authorized annually for technical assistance to low-income rural areas and one-industry small towns to help them develop manufacturing activities and to diversify so that their economic vulnerability may be reduced.

Eighth. The bill provides Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation of an Area Assistance Administrator in the Department of Commerce. The President pointed out in his veto message that—

> S. 722 would have created a new Federal agency and would in consequence mean many unnecessary additions to the Federal payroll and a considerable delay in the program before the new agency could be staffed and functioning effectively.

Mr. Speaker, the people in these truly critical areas have a right to expect speedy action on the part of the Congress. As outlined by the President in his veto message, this is a bill that can become law.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 7155 under consideration earlier today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE LIMESTONE INDUSTRY

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the wave of destiny demands a strong America. To have a strong America, we must have strong agricultural production. We are being threatened by too many sources in the world today, and this means that we must remain stronger at home.

With agriculture holding the responsibility of keeping the "breadbasket" of the United States and the world filled, I would like to point out the following as recommended reading for each and every Member of the Congress today:

WE NEED THE LIMESTONE INDUSTRY ON OUR TEAM

(Talk by George H. Enfield, Extension Agronomist, U.S. Department of Agriculture, before the 15th annual convention of the National Limestone Institute, Inc., Washington, D.C., on January 19, 1960)

Bob Koch called me this last spring and he said, "How would you like to appear on the Limestone Institute Convention program?" You know, I was delighted. Back when I first started in agriculture after graduating at Purdue, my first job was to go into the laboratory and make tests on limestone for neutralizing value and fineness. So I thought it would be nice if I could come here and talk about your industry—the industry which makes the farmer a profit. Then I thought that I would like to come and give you an idea of what Extension really is. I thought, too, that it would be nice to come and see if there was not a possibility in making some changes. You see, we can always get crazy ideas and unless you get an idea now and then, there is no chance for change. You may think that some of these things are actually crazy. It doesn't make much difference to me though.

Now, really what is Extension? Extension is getting the agricultural and home economic information in usable form and out to the people. It is to furnish them with facts so they can make wise decisions and try to get farmers to change. Now we have been trying to get them to do something about agricultural limestone but it seems like an uphill proposition. Recently the Extension Service looked over their job and said—what is the major field of our endeavor—where should we put the emphasis?

Efficiency in agriculture was first. Further progress in the direction of improved efficiency in agricultural production is not only necessary, but mandatory. That was mandatory from the laws in the beginning. Limestone has long been recognized as one of the first steps in developing an efficient crop production program. To accomplish efficiency in all fields of agriculture, Extension has tried to cooperate with industry and other governmental agencies to hasten the adoption of proven practices and to get them universally accepted by all. As production technology increases there is a need for changes in farming practices. Those who accept change have a real opportunity to not only help themselves but to help the community and the Nation as well. Research results help us to achieve higher standards of living only if we actually get these new practices put into effect.

Efficiency in marketing and distribution is second. In this field we hope to accomplish several things. We hope to reduce the cost of marketing farm products, we are trying to expand the market, and we are trying to help people understand the marketing system. If we are able to develop a better atmosphere for the limestone salesmen to operate in, we believe we will have accomplished one of the things which we set out to do. If your salesman is the right kind of a man and we are able to keep the right kind of a frame of mind in the farmer, it should make it possible for your products to be moved more easily into the market and the farmer will be as happy to pass the time of day with your salesman as he was with the merchants in the old time grocery store.

Next is conservation, development, and use of natural resources. The close-knit interdependency of soil, water, minerals, plants, animals, and man constitutes a seamless web of life, and it defies the efforts to deal with one of these resources effectively while ignoring the other. The pressures on our resources are growing year to year. We hope to encourage the development of these resources and help plan for their wise use. This is emphasized in our efforts to use limestone products on the soil for the purpose of establishing adequate conservation crops or covers for our land.

Proper management on the farm and in the home is important. The decisions to be made on the farm today are probably as numerous and more varied in subject than in any area of industry. The alternatives are many and unless all the factors are carefully considered, the choice may not result in a greater achievement or a greater satisfaction to the family. Extension tries to make the facts available to farmers so that he and his family might make decisions that are more than satisfying to the whole family.

In family living Extension's duty is not only to make more money for the farmer but its ultimate goal is to develop a citizen that is more cognizant of his obligation to his community and the Nation. Much of the work of this area is done in the field of home economics. Our efforts are with the idea of making the home life more meaningful to all.

Youth development is another of Extension's objectives. The rapid increase in the number of youths calls for a specially oriented program. It may be a surprise to some that the ultimate goal in 4-H clubs and older youth groups is not as it was in the past—which was to make its members better farmers for tomorrow. Today we try to better equip youth for the challenge of tomorrow, whatever his field of endeavor might be. It is significant, I think, that 9 out of every 10 boys on the farm today will need to find some other livelihood than on the farm if he is going to have a job by 1975. 4-H aims to help the young people acquire knowledge and skills, enjoy useful work, develop talent, appreciate values, recognize the importance of science in agriculture and home economics, explore career opportunities, appreciate nature, cultivate principles of healthful living, strengthen personal standards, and gain abilities and understanding to work cooperatively with others.

Leadership development is one of Extension's major contributions that will be so necessary in the future. The interdependence of the farmer on the other segments of society makes it imperative that the lead-

ership be developed to act as a catalyst for the group action and the betterment of society itself and to his community.

In the Extension Service there are countless opportunities for leaders to gain stature and at the same time perform a great service to others. Leaders are not born, they are developed. In this respect Extension has not only afforded the opportunity but tries to help, encourage, and train.

Community improvement and resource development need assistance. Extension has the responsibility of developing and organizing programs that have benefited both the farmer and nonfarmer resident. Community improvement ideally should involve all the people within the area. It must be developed to achieve the greatest rewards to society as a whole and geared to the speed of change acceptable to those affected. These efforts should result in the achievements that are satisfying and mutually beneficial. In short, it should make living more worth while.

We also believe Extension has a part to play in public affairs. The complexity of public problems has brought Government intervention in many fields. People traditionally desire freedom from such actions. Extension has been looked to for a long time for help—not for the decision—on how people should think, but for the facts and all the facts so they can make a better appraisal of the situation themselves. This is really a new field, but it must be given attention if the farm people are going to be able to make the kind of decisions they will need to produce their greatest satisfaction for them.

Now let's look a little at the aglime situation. But, first, our clientele. Our clientele are farm families primarily, but it may include urbia, suburbia, and it includes farm organizations. It includes all organizations that are interested in the farm and the farm people. It includes the handlers of farm products and suppliers. This is the limestone producer, the trucker, the railroad man, and it also includes institutes like the NLI that try to help make liming meaningful to the American farm. What is the situation about lime in this country? Sure there's a need for lime. Here are two examples: New York and Tennessee. In New York from about 28,000 soil samples they find that about 70 percent of their agricultural lands are acid enough to need lime. Go to Tennessee—with twice as many soil samples tested—and you get the same kind of a picture. There is a need for more agricultural lime. Why isn't this need noticed? Why do people fail to recognize this need? Is there no profit in it? Let's look at the results from one State—Pennsylvania. This is not just a 1-year trial, but the average of 28 years. This soil is not extremely acid; it's only medium acid, a pH of 5.5. You Hoosiers know that there are many soils in your State with pH even below 4.0. Now, as a result for applying aglime there is a large increase from 64 bushels up to 80 bushels of corn. Oats are not affected much. However, the hay was increased greatly. The gross yearly return per acre, $39 compared to a $7 cost. Almost $31.50 per acre per year more than the unlimed land. Now I'm certain that even up in Vermont, where they package agricultural limestone in beautiful bags and spread it with some of the best equipment that I know of, you don't charge delivered and spread on land as much as $125 a ton. Now that's what that limestone is actually worth—7 tons spread over a 6-year period and it returned back to the farmer a little over $880. It's a dandy product that you have. Limestone—how much do we recommend and how much do we use? I didn't bring any figures because it varies from time to time, and who makes the recommendations? The recommendation, you may say, is 80 million tons annually. Some others may say 50 million tons annually. How much do we use? Sixteen to twenty-two to twenty-five million tons. But really what does that mean? It means that if you would do the job for 10 years in a row, you would just barely have the job completed. Our land needs more than 80 million tons. You need to get the job done now, not 10 years from now. Ten years from now you've got to do the job all over again.

Let's get down to farm size. I picked a 240-acre farm. And what do we see on this farm? They started out to make an estimate of how much limestone it really needed. Forty acres does not need any limestone at all. Twenty acres need 3 tons to the acre. And it looks like another 80 acres needs 4 tons to the acre; and another 100 acres needs about 2 tons to the acre. Can you see the reason for soil tests in a situation like that, and this is not exaggerated. In fact, it should be chopped up more than that. Actually, you will probably find that much difference in any one field rather than that one farm. If you put limestone on according to what you find in one field, or what the average is for the farm we would need about 3 tons per acre. Put 3 tons on fields that need two tons or less—what do you get? Too much investment and the farmer doesn't get the returns on the investments he really expects. You put 3 tons down when you need 4 tons and then what happens? You think that your darned old limestone is no good. You put 3 tons on where you don't need any at all and then what do you say? Limestone is worthless. That's the reason we recommend that you have a soil test—in order to get satisfied customers from the good product that you people are producing and selling. I have here an example now as to what we are doing. I want to show you what it's costing this farmer. Let's say he starts buying limestone like he normally does at the present time. He gets about one-tenth as much as he needs. That's about what he buys each year. Now it doesn't cost him very much over the period of time if he just keeps adding on a little bit of limestone and provided we have someone to pay for about 50 percent of the cost of the limestone delivered and spread for him. This is based on limestone normally selling for $5 a ton. I use $5 because that's about the average in the United States. Then I had someone pay for 50 percent of it. So actually our product only costs the farmer $2.50 a ton but he put on about one-tenth of what he needs to complete the job in 1960. By 1975, where will he be? This man would have about $25,000 more money to handle it but you see it is not how much do you handle, it's how much profit do you make. The profit line looks just about the same. Limestone costs a little bit; the returns are great. You say that $31.50 is too high. I didn't use that figure. I cut it less than half. It was only $15 an acre that I used in calculating these results. How much does a man really make? He has a little over $22,000 profit by 1975, enough to buy him a brandnew home or a new car every 5 years from the use of the product which you men are now producing. Now that's the way we have been trying to sell limestone in this country. Let's take a look at another situation. Now I'm going to say to Mr. X, "The sale's off. You don't buy limestone any longer for $2.50 a ton out of your pocket and $2.50 a ton paid by someone else. I'm going to charge you $6 a ton." You see, that's a dollar above the average. All right, what does it really cost? "Oh," he says, "I don't have the money." "Well, go down to the bank and borrow it. It costs you 7 percent if you go down to the bank and borrow money for limestone, that's if you can borrow it and I think you should." So if there's a little increase in the cost down here, it should cost you roughly $3,000 to get this farm limed all at one time. Now, what did he do? He bought 540 tons for 180 acres and slapped it all on according to need as indicated by the soil test. Now that's in the year 1960. Then about 8 years later he came along and put on 2 tons more on the land. You need that much for maintenance. So he put on another investment. How about his returns? His income goes up $35,000. Now let's just say the costs are high compared with the first example where the farmer never got his farm limed. Let's look at the profits if you wish. The profit situation in the first 3 years looks a little bad. You don't make money out of limestone the first year you put it on. You hardly make anything the second year. You've got to grow the crops and then harvest them and feed them to the livestock to get the return. But, after that he's $6,000 better off.

Are you limestone merchants trying to do the best job for your farmer customers and for yourselves? Why not tell him the whole benefit? Why try to clip the dog's tail off as fast as the hair grows out? The way we've been trying to sell limestone is to get the farmer to use enough limestone to correct the acidity found each year. You have been advertising limestone sales—50 percent off. Now that's what the man really hears before he opens his eyes and you haven't taken that sign down for the last 10 years. He says, "How much does it cost?" You see, he's not caring whether there's 50 percent off or not. But he finally reads the sign—limestone $5 a ton—cost now $2.50. But then let's look at what he really sees when he looks at the whole story. All sales limited to about one-tenth of the farmers' needs—see that's the way we've been trying to correct soil acidity in this country. You limit the quantity he can get. You've fenced him in.

Limestone is about the only product sold on the basis first ton one-half price—the remainder full price. What do we find in Kansas? This is a very recent survey too. One out of six farmers say at the end of the survey their neighbors are not using enough limestone. Why, they don't know very much about their neighbors—that's the only thing that that tells us. We know very well that the neighbors need more lime than that. They're very modest about what they think their neighbors need.

Three out of four people say they have never seen an ad for limestone for agricultural purposes. That is promotion work. Thirty-eight percent say they have seen demonstrations. We believe that Extension is doing as well as industry. You're getting 25 percent of the people—we're getting about 38 to 40 percent of them. Now, four out of five say they have used some limestone in the last 5 years—so they recognize the need for it. I'd ask you to remember two words—need and want. If they recognize the need, and that's something that Extension should do, want is created by a salesman. here's what we really need in this country today. Four thousand full-time limestone salesmen that are able to sell ten trainloads of limestone a year. You say that's just outrageous and no one can do it. All he needs is to sell 40 customers, on the examples I showed you, 500 tons each and he's got the job done. If you will put that many salesmen on the road—you notice I charged a dollar more for your product than the $5 average selling price. You ought to have the faith in your product and the ability of a good salesman. You need this extra dollar. This salesman ought to be an $8,000-a-year man and you may want to get on the road yourself. And then you should followup with another $2,000 expense account so he can operate like a real salesman. And then you'll need another $2,000 for promotional materials. You need another $1,000 for some research to keep your program before the people, even if it's no more than public relations. The trucker needs $2,000 extra money so he too has an incentive to do a good job when he spreads the limestone. Add another

$1,000 to the secretaries' salary so she will answer that telephone with a cheerful voice when those orders come rolling in. This will leave $2,000 for the stockholder and an extra $2,000 for the business manager.

This is our story. This is our suggestion. Let's see what industry has done. Fertilizer companies, I know, recognize the need for lime. More nitrogen is being pushed on our farmland year by year and every time they sell nitrogen they feel the need for a little more lime. If I were to go out today and try to sell limestone, I believe I would sell nitrogen because sooner or later I know they would have to come to come to me and buy lime. The more nitrogen we use the more acid our soil gets but this is no reason to stop using nitrogen. See how you create a customer? That's the way to do it—sell the other man's product and they'll come and buy yours. This is the situation I think for today. The fertilizer industry would like to have you on their team; Extension would like to have you on their team; but we need 4,000 players from your field. That's what we really need from the industry to make a success.

Gentlemen, it's been a pleasure for me. I hope it has given you some thoughts you can use.

COLLAPSE OF THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to call the attention of this body to today's substantial gains of defense industry stocks with the collapse of the summit conference.

It is indeed a strange paradox that bad news for the world should be such good news for the stock market. The defense group of stocks, aircrafts, missiles, and electronics, as well as steels, took a sharp rise in the trading which was the heaviest in more than a year, as the ticker tape ran considerably behind floor transactions.

If prosperity in America depends on expanded defense production, it is time that we find a more suitable alternative.

BIRTHDAY GREETINGS TO SENATOR JAVITS AND SENATOR KEATING

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to call to the attention of the House the fact that today, May 18, is the birthday of our two distinguished Senators from New York, JACOB JAVITS and KENNETH KEATING. I believe that it is a unique situation that both Senators from the same State will cut a birthday cake on the same day.

We in New York are intensely proud of our two Senators both of whom were former Members of this House. Their able representation of the people of the Empire State has earned them a richly merited acclaim.

I am proud to count JACK and KEN among my good friends and I want to express my heartiest congratulations and every best wish to them on this their doubleheader birthday.

In so doing, Mr. Speaker, I am certain that every Member of this House shares the warm feeling, high regard, and deep affection for both of these fine gentlemen and great legislators, and join in this sincere wish for many, many happy returns of this significant day.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF NOMINATION OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I know of nothing that the people of our country need more than an intelligent and understanding patriotism.

I believe that the study of history can be not only a most effective teacher of patriotism but maybe the only teacher of real patriotism. Our early forefathers understood this. Their successors endorsed this idea when they, in various ways, demonstrated their belief in the importance of history, including required study of American history in our public schools. They knew, as we should, that the more we know about the struggles of our Nation, the great men who initiated great ideas and led it and the better we understand the principles which sustain its people in periods of crises the deeper will be our feeling for our country.

We need to understand, too, Mr. Speaker, that our idea about patriotism can and maybe should change; ours, I believe, has changed. It has broadened since the time of Andrew Jackson and even since the Civil War period. The age we are privileged to live in may require a further extension of our idea of patriotism.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, and because it is historically significant, with your consent and with consent of this House, I have chosen to speak today on a subject of great moment.

THE POLITICAL COVENTIONS OF 1860, OTHER THAN THE REPUBLICAN

On February 2, 1860, Jefferson Davis introduced into the Senate of the United States a set of resolutions which were intended as a final statement of the terms on which the South would consent to remain in the Union. They were as follows: First, the Northern States must repeal their Personal Liberty Acts; second, the fugitive slave law must henceforth be rigorously enforced; third, Congress must assume and discharge absolute responsibility for the protection of slavery in every territory of the United States; and fourth, the freeport doctrine, as enunciated by Stephen A. Douglas in his debates with Abraham Lincoln in the summer of 1858, must be finally and formally repudiated.

The Democratic conventions of the spring and summer of 1860 began with the meeting at Charleston, S.C., on April 23. Although the committee on the platform approved the Davis resolutions of the preceding winter, the majority of the delegates—as opposed to the party machinery—rallied to the support of Douglas, who, without a single dissenting vote was the choice of the northern Democrats. Thereupon the Alabama delegation, headed by the fiery William L. Yancey, haughtily arose and marched out of the hall, followed by the majority of equally wrathful delegations from South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas. This left Douglas with less than the two-thirds support traditionally necessary for nomination by a Democratic convention; the remaining members accordingly adjourned, to meet at Baltimore on June 18.

Soon after the Charleston convention adjourned, to reassemble in Baltimore, the Constitutional Union Party held its first and only general convention, at Baltimore, on the 9th of May. Most of the States were represented, though not in all cases by delegates duly elected in primary meetings and conventions. Young as it was, the party was divided into two wings. The southerners, mostly representatives of the still surviving native American sentiment, desired to nominate Gen. Sam Houston, of Texas. The old Whigs of the North did not relish such a candidacy. They were adjured not to pay too much attention to gentility, but to take a candidate who, rough as he might be, would carry many of the Southern States.

Two votes only were necessary to effect a nomination, and on the second ballot John Bell, of Tennessee, secured the nomination as President and Edward Everett, of Massachusetts, was the unanimous choice for second place on the ticket.

The following month in Baltimore the Democratic regulars split, the majority reaffirming their support of Douglas, and the bolters naming John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky. Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia, one of the ablest statesmen of the South, destined himself to be the Vice President of the Confederacy, an ardent foe of secession, declared that "within a 12-month of the disruption of the Democratic Convention at Charleston the Nation would be engaged in a bloody civil war." So it proved, and meanwhile Mr. Lincoln's prediction, when his friends remonstrated against what they thought his reckless "House Divided" speech in accepting the Republican senatorial nomination in 1858, declared:

> Gentlemen, I am out for bigger game. If Douglas answers this question [Can the people of a U.S. territory lawfully exclude slavery prior to the adoption of a State constitution?] he can never be President, and the battle of 1860 is worth a hundred of this.

LINCOLN'S NOMINATION—100 YEARS AFTER

On this 18th day of May in 1860—100 years ago—the Republican Party's national convention in a place called the

Wigwam in Chicago, nominated Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, for the presidency of the United States.

Today and at the outset I want to give my thanks very personally to you, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, in particular, and to the leadership on both sides of the aisle, Republican and Democratic alike, for the help and encouragement you gave my idea for commemorating the 150th anniversary of Lincoln's birth and now this historic nomination by some commentary in this hour here on the floor of the House of Representatives which I hope will be appropriate and which will be shared with my colleagues on both sides of this aisle.

For nothing is more significant about the immortality of Abraham Lincoln than the profoundly accepted fact that while he was given to the political world by the Republicans, he belongs almost as much to the other party and that he transcends them both. He has become our most American American and he emerges in his unique greatness as the undying embodiment of democracy itself under the republican form of government.

Lincoln is now the symbol of a political credo for all mankind.

The Lincoln symbol is the credo of integrity and decency, executive strength extraordinary, and benevolence and compassion in government.

His symbol is the credo of freedom for men everywhere.

No individual in the whole of recorded history, without exception, has done what Lincoln has done in the concrete to give to politics and government, to terms like liberty and equality, such depth and the moving coloration of a compelling religious spirituality to the body politic. This divine union of an abstract idea, with action and the living reality, and the prophetic and kindly fire that touched his utterances, have placed him—and consequently the American tradition—in the very forefront of man's march to freedom everywhere on this earth.

Today we take this hour or so to do honor to his memory and to the Republican convention that launched him on the world stage and among the greatest immortals of all time.

The focus of this commemoration—I repeat—is the single fact in the life of Lincoln that this day a century ago saw him nominated on the Republican ticket to the Presidency. The reason I took it upon myself, Mr. Speaker, to ask that a special note be taken of this event and the work of this convention is because it has seemed to me that its enormous strategic importance for the destiny of our country and mankind has somehow been overlooked in the total impact of Lincoln's life and the immense tragedy of his death. For we have to remember that the logical Republican candidate in 1860 was the redoubtable William H. Seward, of New York.

There were, besides him, some other formidable personalities also seeking the Republican nomination. They were such great men as Salmon P. Chase, of Ohio; Simon Cameron, of Pennsylvania; Edward Bates, of Missouri, and John McLean of Ohio.

Lincoln, it is true, had made a remarkable impression upon those who would become the delegates to this convention and to the people in his debates with Stephen A. Douglas and in his Cooper Union speech. But he was hardly to be compared as a public figure of national significance with the eminence—as of then—of so distinguished and so well known a personality as Seward: the Seward who had been Governor of New York; the Seward who had been a Senator since 1848, the Seward who was known everywhere as the leader of the Republican Party and as an outstanding fighter for the containment of slavery and against its extension. Of course it was held against Seward that he was too radical in his views on slavery. He had frightened some of his supporters with his prophecy of an "irrepressible conflict" and shocked others with his avowal, as he put it, "of a law higher than the Constitution."

This was presumed to alienate several States from his support.

As for the other seekers-after-the-presidency it was held against Chase that he was even more radical in his opposition to slavery than Seward although he, too, had had gubernatorial experience—two terms as Governor of Ohio, and had served one term in the Senate. Bates, of Missouri, did not fit with the strong German element in the Republican Party. McLean, a member of the Supreme Court, enjoyed the following of the conservatives but was regarded as too old. Lincoln's assets were the weaknesses of his opponents, and, in part, the limited knowledge the country had of his views. Thus he was free of any labels for either extremism or conservatism. Not having held national office, except for one term in Congress, he had no record upon which political agitators could seize for anti-Lincoln ammunition. That he came from Illinois—a doubtful State—proved another asset. The fact that he was a real moderate—not an extremist on the slavery question—a man if elected who would be safe was also a very important factor in his nomination. In addition he had the rustic and the humble background that would endear him to tens of thousands of voters. Warm and affectionate slogans that attached themselves to his name such as "railsplitter" and "Honest Abe" were not only effective but they were wholly true. Yet the overall fact remains that the nomination of Lincoln is one of the greatest phenomena in the history of American politics. Lord Charnwood, among the greatest of the Lincoln biographers, writing from the objectivity and the perspective of an Englishman, says of it:

> This was the most surprising nomination ever made in America.

Perhaps one of the greatest motivating forces for the nomination of Lincoln was the basic feeling in that convention that this was the man to beat Stephen A. Douglas, the Democratic nominee.

What actually happened in that 3-day Chicago convention was as real, as true, as indigenous a demonstration of the process of representative government—good and bad—as the history of political conventions records in the annals of political life on this continent. There were some clever off-beat political shenanigans. There were rough and tumble maneuvers. There were intensely emotional doings inside and outside that $7,000 especially built cavernous barn called the Wigwam.

But, accepting all that, I am still very partial to a more contemplative and a more penetrating judgment. It is, it seems to me, that in the last analysis either an incredible and almost impossible combination of events vaguely described by some people as luck, or, as I believe, more simply and appropriately, the finger of God, determined the results of this convention. In spite of the fact that it was in the midst of so much shouting, in the tumult and the difficult confusion in that great wooden tabernacle in Chicago the right decisions prevailed. I know of few decisions in the life of man so pregnant for the good of our country and the fate of mankind as the decision by those that nominated—and therefore elected—Abraham Lincoln President of the United States in that dread, awful eve-year of the Civil War a century ago.

After the fact—and especially 100 years after the fact, it seems easy to reduce the complexities of the event down to simple analysis. Today we have whole shelves of books with detail and minutia, diagrams and diaries on the event. There is a whole library of commentary. But even now there are facets of that nomination about which, to the end of time, we can guess and speculate. But we know definitely and for certain this: Men who are free and men who are yearning to be free will everlastingly thank God for the decision by those voluntary and free citizens at that convention that vital May 18, 1860.

The Wigwam was an immense wooden box anchored against a brick wall. A hundred feet on one side and 180 feet on the other, it had excellent acoustics for an age before loudspeakers and given to stentorian oratory. It could hold 10,000 people. Perhaps four times that many sought admission. The political leaders, the delegates, the people, the roisterers and the bullies, represented the boiling point of a democratic ferment that extolled the great aims of the newly created Republican Party.

That Republican Convention represented in its composition, in its aims and in its platform the rich and the humble. It represented the vast wealth and sophistication of the East. It represented the burgeoning expansion of the West. It was industrial and agricultural and frontier. The spectacle of the country in 1860—4 score and 4 years after that great document for freedom, the Declaration of Independence—would have amazed and excited the interest and strained to the limit the capacity for wonderment of the Founding Fathers who, through implementing the spirit of that statement, set the stage for the immense growth and progress of this Nation.

For America now had the steamboat.

It had the photograph.

It had the telegraph.

It had the greatest wonder drug of its day—ether as an anesthesia.

There were farm implements within average reach.

There was the new marvel of the home and the factory; the sewing machine.

There were tools for carpentry beyond the wildest dreams of the colonial frontier: nails, spikes, screws, axes.

American firearms were being used by the royal bodyguards in China. They were preferred by the combatants in the Crimean War above all others.

There was the impact of the railroad integrating the Nation.

There was the engineering genius in the building of bridges that startled the world.

Boston had come up with an improved printing press unequaled in its day.

Many of the new things were widely available and relatively cheap.

Clocks cost little.

Steamers were fast.

Implements of all kinds saved human muscle and did much more in far less time.

That Wigwam in Chicago in 1860 reflected the immense and explosive energies for the common good released by the forces of freedom. It was the end product of free government under a Constitution the infinite decency of which—as we sit here today—is still the last great hope of mankind.

This was America.

But outside the Wigwam rumbled the impending peril of civil war. Here was the brink of war that very well might spell the doom of all that man and God had wrought on this soil in those incredible 4 score and 4 years during which America had grown from 3½ million to over 31½ million. And inside the Wigwam were men who had effected the passage a week before this National Republican Convention, of a resolution by the Illinois State Republican convention. This Illinois State resolution declared that:

> Abraham Lincoln is the choice of the Republican Party of Illinois for the Presidency.

The resolution instructed the delegates "to use all honorable means to secure his nomination by the Chicago Convention, and to vote as a unit for him." When the young Republican Party gathered for its national convention, the second in its history, on Wednesday, May 16, 1860, there was a resolute and alert, and grimly determined and dedicated group of Lincoln leaders and strategists. For example, there were at the so-called Lincoln headquarters in the Tremont House, volunteers for the Lincoln candidacy: O. H. Browning, Judge David Davis, R. J. Oglesby, Leonard Swett, Jesse K. Dubois, Charles Ray and Norman B. Judd, who was to nominate Lincoln.

There also were William H. Herndon, Gen. John M. Palmer, Ozias M. Hatch, Stephen T. Logan, Gustavus Koerner, Ward Hill Lamon and Jesse Fell. In the hands of these men—and especially of Judge David Davis—rested a mission for posterity they successfully accomplished under circumstances of the great doubt and in a crisis not fully appreciated until later. There were, to be sure, internal problems in the Lincoln strategic command—while the candidate throughout the convention was in Springfield—and there were some basic differences on procedure with the candidate himself. But the voluminous record shows that loyalty and integrity held fast within the moral context of the time. History shows that an enormous victory of immense meaning for the ages—greater than these men could possibly know—was won the fatefully consequential day.

There is a strong temptation to read the story of the Wigwam and Chicago in 1860 and imagine—out of proportion—the extent of the boisterousness and the consumption of liquor. Of course there was a good deal of that. But it could hardly be said that it was that kind of a convention. The soberest judgments and the most careful decisions were being made. Men worked at a cruel pace and afterwards—like Judge Davis—they wept almost as if they could peer down the corridors of time and envisage the greatness of their victory. That convention—that Republican Convention—dealt with many problems of its time and not alone with slavery.

The platform proper, or the discussions at the convention, or both, dealt with the issues and the ideals and principles of the time head on. While slavery was the shadow that clung like a cloud over the deliberations, yet that convention—for all its great concern with the slavery issues—had a wider and a deeper scope. Pertinent to the slavery issue finally was the reaffirmation in the platform of the thunder from the Declaration of Independence. "That all men are created equal"—giving that quotation in full. It proclaimed itself against disunion declaring the concept, I quote, "abhorrent."

The platform clamored for economy in the Federal Government asking for a return to, I quote, "rigid economy and accountability."

The platform demanded duties upon imports because, said the platform:

> Sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imports as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country.
>
> We recommend—

Said the platform—

> that policy of national exchanges, which secures to the workingmen liberal wages, to agriculture remunerative prices, to mechanics and manufacturers any adequate reward for their skill, labor and enterprise, and to the Nation's commercial prosperity and independence.

The platform favored the, I quote, "complete and satisfactory homestead measure," which at the time of the announcement of the platform had already passed the House. The platform stood against any proposed restrictions to the rights of the newly naturalized foreigners and to any changes—impairing their rights in the naturalization laws.

The platform favored appropriations by Congress for river and harbor improvements "of a national character."

The convention in this platform declared a railroad to the Pacific Ocean "imperatively demanded by the interests of the whole country."

This was a young Republican Party that looked brilliantly to the future with hope and with optimism, with action and with enthusiasm.

There was without a doubt a certain foreboding over the meaning of the monumental stakes that confronted the country. This played its part in the doubtful techniques that today engage the criticism as well as the fascination of the scholar. This manipulation of episodes on the lower level of events, and the generally rugged, frontier atmosphere of the 1860's lend themselves too invitingly to overemphasis by the journalistic approach. This is the approach that seeks more to be interesting than to be objective.

Representative government on this continent was young; it was tough; it was brazen, and it was brassy. It laved in its enthusiasms and its amazement with its own prowess. For the United States this republican form of government—by any standards—was, even then, the greatest success since Rome. If the Republican convention of 1860 proved anything it proved that what was here demonstrated, with all its tumult, its political guile, its uninhibited devices, was that government by consent of the governed—for all its imperfections—had basic soundness and was tough and flexible.

A catastrophic, bloody and dreadful test was in the offing.

But the words "conceived in liberty," and the words "dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal"—soon to be magnificently reaffirmed—were real words, as actual and as demonstrable as life itself.

Those rock-ribbed Republicans, whether Seward men or Lincoln men, or supporters of any of the other candidates, mirrored pretty genuinely the genius of the America of that day. That Republican Convention was a nucleus of the United States in 1860: Industry, agriculture, finance, law, politics, journalism, culture—and just people. There were many examples of the so-called common man jammed inside and outside the great Wigwam. There were also so-called forgotten men, I am sure they were there, too, and in force.

Even if we had never heard of the phrase "smoke-filled room" in the political conventions of our own times, I think an excellent case could be made proving that nominating conventions, Republican and Democratic, have on the whole neither deteriorated nor improved since the convention that named Lincoln. They were basically sound and honest then, and they are basically sound and honest today, the superficial imperfections altered only by changes in habits, not changes in morals.

What were some of the episodes in 1860 moralists might frown upon?

The Seward camp appeared to have a more ear-splitting claque than the Lincoln camp was at first able to muster. They pressed close, shoulder to shoulder and fore and aft, in the rear and the galleries, and they created a vast volume of pro-Seward noise, in that hot and steaming assemblage. The Lincoln board of strategy under the generalship in this case of Ward Hill Lamon and Jesse Fell, circumvented this imbalance by the surreptitious use of a hastily acquired printing press. By this process hard-bitten Lincoln men gained admission to the Wigwam with counterfeit tickets and simulated official signatures. By being on the job earlier they took up space in the Wigwam that crowded out the Seward men who struggled to get in later.

Another incident was the mechanism of delay to achieve the defeat of Seward.

This had to do with the actual or the pretended difficulty of counting the presidential ballots because of the declared absence at that instant of the needed tally sheets. The platform had at long last been adopted. The Seward men were anxious for the balloting for candidates at once. It was a practical certainty at the time that were a vote taken immediately the atmosphere of the convention was such that Seward would be nominated.

For precisely that reason the opposition to Seward—the Lincoln group and the others—sought delay.

The circumstance of the tally sheets provided a motive. The problem was communicated, amidst the hubbub, to the Chair by the secretary, and to the assembly by the Chair. Thus the Chair announced that while the presidential tally sheets were in fact prepared—they were not yet at hand, "but will be in a few minutes."

In the confusion came the motion to adjourn "until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning." There are questions about just how the vote to adjourn happened to carry. It was reported that there was, I quote, "very little voting being done either way." Nevertheless, the Chair announced that the adjournment motion had carried. And maybe it had. That delay may have meant the difference between Lincoln and Seward as the 16th President of the United States.

William Baringer in his book, "Lincoln's Rise to Power," writes:

> Fortunate indeed for Abraham Lincoln that some Sewardites just then cared more for supper than for Seward.

Upon such sensitive and uncertain details hung what I like to think is one of the greatest decisions in the history of man.

Other incidents may be mentioned such as the seemingly reckless bartering of Cabinet posts for delegate support. They reveal the political acumen or—if you like—the human failings concentrated in a climate of great contest and explosive emotions. This is inherent in masses of people struggling under diverse leadership for great goals. But none of these incidents, nor all of them together, can, from the vantage point of a whole century mar the essential grandeur, the essential integrity, the powerful conviction, that marked the Republican Convention in the Wigwam in Chicago in 1860. And all of it expressed itself with a granite honesty, and with force and meaning, in the personality of Abraham Lincoln.

Much can be said from today's perspective of the platform. More may be said on the detailed maneuvers that ended with victory for Lincoln.

I find, for instance, electrifying the debate that ended finally by the inclusion of some eloquent passages from the Declaration of Independence into the platform. I find moving the words of a German immigrant, a citizen and a delegate named Hassaureck, of Ohio. He captured the imagination of the convention with his eloquent appeal that the platform contain the words of Jefferson on "inalienable rights" and "the pursuit of happiness." And he won.

I marvel as all Americans must, how certain seemed the nomination of Seward. Reluctantly Horace Greeley, a resident of New York but a delegate from Oregon, wired his New York Tribune after a thorough canvass—we call them polls today. I quote:

> My conclusion, from all that I can gather tonight, is, that the opposition to Governor Seward cannot concentrate on any candidate, and that he will be nominated.

Young Murat Halstead, to whose writings I am much indebted for part of the materials in this address, telegraphed to the Cincinnati Commercial:

> Every one of the 40,000 men in attendance upon the Chicago convention will testify that at midnight of Thursday-Friday night, the universal impression was that Seward's success was certain.

The same guesses were made by James Watson Webb of the New York Courier and Enquirer, and by Henry Raymond of the New York Times, and they so wrote their respective newspapers.

There is some moody and interesting comment by Lincoln himself on this relation to his candidacy for the Presidency. In 1858, 2 years before the convention we commemorate today, he observed wistfully:

> Just think of such a sucker as me as President.

On another occasion he put his lurking ambition in these words. He said:

> The taste is in my mouth a little.

As for the convention proper, his position is stated best in his own words. They include his formula for victory. He wrote:

> If I have any chance, it consists mainly in the fact that the whole opposition would vote for me, if nominated.

Lincoln added here:

> I don't mean to include the proslavery opposition of the South, of course.

Then Lincoln goes on:

> My name is new in the field, and I suppose I am not the first choice of a very great many. Our policy, then, is to give no offense to others; leave them in a mood to come to us if they shall be compelled to give up their first love. This, too, is dealing justly with all, and leaving us in a mood to support heartily whoever shall be nominated.

It is to this statement of Lincoln's more directly that I referred when I spoke of his granite honesty and the basic integrity that governed the convention.

Lincoln's political captains at the convention paid no attention to sleep—only to victory.

The story of that third and climactic day is thrilling. The meeting opened with a prayer by the Reverend Mr. Green, of Chicago. Sensing the need of his country, the feeling of so many people at the grassroots, the great responsibility that rested on the delegates at this convention, thinking probably that he may be praying for Seward, who would have to carry out the decisions of the convention, but no doubt hoping it would be Lincoln, he gave to the convention delegates a spiritual uplift and to Americans a wonderful heritage with the following prayer:

> O, we entreat Thee, that at some future but not distant day, the evils which now invest the body politic shall not only have been arrested in its progress, but wholly eradicated from the system. And may the pen of the historian trace an intimate connection between that glorious consummation and the transaction of this convention.

To catch some of the spirit of the Wigwam, I lift the following from Murat Halstead's excellent report:

> The New Yorkers were exultant. Their bands were playing, and the champagne flowing at their headquarters as after a victory.
>
> But there was much done after midnight and before the convention assembled on Friday morning. There were hundreds of Pennsylvanians, Indianians, and Illinoisans, who never closed their eyes that night. I saw Henry S. Lane at 1 o'clock, pale and haggard, with cane under his arm, walking as if for a wager, from one caucus room to another, at the Tremont House. He had been toiling with desperation to bring the Indiana delegation to go as a unit for Lincoln. And then in connection with others, he had been operating to bring the Vermonters and Virginians to the point of deserting Seward. Vermont would certainly cast her electoral vote for any candidate who could be nominated, and Virginia as certainly against any candidate. The object was to bring the delegates of those States to consider success rather than Seward, and join with the battleground States—as Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Indiana, and Illinois insisted upon calling themselves. This was finally done, the fatal break in Seward's strength having been made in Vermont, and Virginia, destroying at once, when it appeared, his power in the New England and the slave State delegations. But the work was not yet done. The Pennsylvanians had been fed upon meat, such that they presented themselves at Chicago with the presumption that they had only to say what they wished, and receive the endorsement of the convention. And they were for Cameron. He was the only man, they a thousand times said, who would certainly carry Pennsylvania. They were astonished, alarmed, and maddened to find public opinion settling down upon Seward and Lincoln, and that one or the other must be nominated. They saw that Lincoln was understood to be the only man to defeat Seward, and thinking themselves capable of

holding that balance of power, so much depended upon, and so deceptive on those occasions, stood out against the Lincoln combination. Upon some of the delegation, Seward operations had been performed with perceptible effect. The Seward men had stated that the talk of not carrying Pennsylvania was all nonsense. Seward had a good tariff record, and his friends would spend money enough in the State to carry it against any Democratic candidate who was a possibility. The flood of Seward money promised for Pennsylvania was not without efficacy. The phrase used was, that Seward's friends "would spend oceans of money."

After the preliminaries of the opening session everybody was more impatient to begin the work.

I continue quoting from Murat Halstead's report:

Everybody was now impatient to begin the work. Mr. Evarts, of New York, nominated Mr. Seward, Mr. Judd, of Illinois, nominated Mr. Lincoln. Mr. Dudley, of New Jersey, nominated Mr. Dayton. Mr. Reeder, of Pennsylvania, nominated Simon Cameron. Mr. Cartter, of Ohio, nominated Salmon P. Chase. Mr. Caleb Smith, of Indiana, seconded the nomination of Lincoln. Mr. Blair, of Missouri, nominated Edward Bates. Mr. Blair, of Michigan, seconded the nomination of William H. Seward. Mr. Corwin, of Ohio, nominated John McLean, Mr. Schurz, of Wisconsin, seconded the nomination of Seward. Mr. Delano, of Ohio, seconded the nomination of Lincoln. The only names that produced "tremendous applause" were those of Seward and Lincoln.

Everybody felt that the fight was between them and yelled approvingly.

The applause, when Mr. Evarts named Seward, was enthusiastic. When Mr. Judd named Lincoln, the response was prodigious, loud, and raging far beyond the Seward shriek. Presently, upon Caleb Smith seconding the nomination of Lincoln, the response was absolutely terrific. It now became the Seward men to make another offensive when Blair, of Michigan, seconded his nomination:

"At once there rose so wild a yell,
Within that dark and narrow dell;
As all the fiends from Heaven that fell
Had pealed the banner cry of hell."

The effect was startling. Hundreds of persons stopped their ears in pain. The shouting was absolutely frantic, shrill, and wild. No Comanches, no panthers ever struck a higher note, or gave screams with more infernal intensity.

Now the Lincoln men had to try it again, and as Mr. Delano, of Ohio, on behalf "of a portion of the delegation of that State," seconded the nomination of Lincoln, the uproar was beyond description. Imagine all the hogs ever slaughtered in Cincinnati giving their death squeals together, a score of big steam whistles going (steam at 160 pounds per inch), and you conceive something of the same nature. I thought the Seward yell could not be surpassed; but the Lincoln boys were clearly ahead, and feeling their victory, as there was a lull in the storm, took deep breaths all 'round, and gave a concentrated shriek that was positively awful, and accompanied it with stamping that made every plank and pillar in the building quiver.

The result is history.

Two hundred and thirty-three votes were needed to nominate.

Seward got 173½ on the first ballot. Lincoln got only 102.

Pennsylvania wavered, then moved from Cameron to Lincoln.

The second rollcall showed 184½ votes for Seward and 181 for Lincoln.

After the third balloting Lincoln was nominated. As everybody now knows a switch of four Ohio votes from Chase to Lincoln did it. A New Yorker named Evarts rose to regret the failure to nominate Seward but nevertheless moved that the nomination be made unanimous. However, there is no evidence that the motion was ever put before the convention. Browning of Illinois made a speech for Lincoln.

Drama, good sportsmanship, and statesmanship was never better displayed than when Austin Blair, of Michigan, made the speech of the hour by telling the convention:

Michigan, from first to last, has cast her vote for the great statesman of New York. She has nothing to take back. She has not sent me forward to worship the rising sun, but she has put me forward to say that, at your behests here today, she lays down her first, best loved candidate to take up yours, with some beating of the heart, with some quivering in the veins (much applause); but she does not fear that the fame of Seward will suffer, for she knows that his fame is a portion of the history of the American Union; it will be written, and read and beloved long after the temporary excitement of this day has passed away, and when Presidents themselves are forgotten in the oblivion which comes over all temporal things. We stand by him still. We have followed him with an eye single and with unwavering faith in times past. We martial now behind him in the grand column which shall go out to battle for Lincoln.

The spirit of the Lincoln men was dramatically described by Halstead with the following quote:

A Lincoln man who could hardly believe that the "Old Abe" of his adoration was really the Republican nominee for the Presidency, took a chair at the dinner table at the Tremont House, and began talking to those around him, with none of whom he was acquainted, of the greatness of the events of the day. One of his expressions was, "Talk of your money and bring on your bullies with you—the immortal principles of the everlasting people are with Abe Lincoln, of the people, by —." "Able Lincoln has no money and no bullies, but he has the people by —." A servant approached the eloquent patriot and asked what he would have to eat. Being thus recalled to temporal things he glared scornfully at the servant and roared out, "Go to the devil—what do I want to eat for? Abe Lincoln is nominated, G— d— it; and I'm going to live on air—the air of Liberty by —." But in a moment he inquired for the bill of fare, and then ordered "a great deal of everything"—saying if he must eat he might as well eat "the whole bill." He swore he felt as if he could "devour and digest an Illinois prairie." And this was one of thousands.

The job was done.

In Springfield during the day where Lincoln waited, a hundred guns were fired. In the evening there was a mass meeting. When someone suggested a book on Lincoln's life, Lincoln replied:

There is not much in my past life about which to write a book, as it seems to me.

Later, with a glance toward his home, he said:

Well, gentlemen, there is a little short woman at our house who is probably more interested in this dispatch (announcing his victory) than I am; and, if you will excuse me, I will take it up and let her see it.

Mr. Speaker, this National Republican Convention which I have so sketchily described is what we commemorate here on the floor of the House of Representatives today. It was undoubtedly true that, as Seward prophesied, the War Between the States was as he said "irrepressible" and inevitable. It may very well be that in any event the Union would have been preserved under Seward as under Lincoln. But the record shows that Seward, as Lincoln's Secretary of State, was a man of considerable stature but hardly of the stature of Lincoln. This we know: Had Lincoln failed of nomination much of the greatest and the most treasured wealth of the American tradition would have been lost to us and to mankind. We would have had no second inaugural. We would have had no Gettysburg Address. The Emancipation Proclamation would undoubtedly have been different. We would have lacked the enormous weight of Lincoln's thinking. The name Lincoln has touched all the world with fire and moved men seeking freedom to prodigious effort. Russia's Tolstoy, China's Sun Yat-sen, India's Nehru find inspiration in this greatest of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it is good to ask ourselves—and I mean especially and particularly the Republican Party of today—it is decisive and pertinent to ask ourselves what can we take from this convention 100 years ago to guide us in this hour. I believe that the Republican Party can take some of the toughness and the ruggedness, the honesty and the decision as an inspiration to guide it in this hour. I believe that the Republican Party can take some of the progressive outlook of that day and make it applicable now. It was not a convention of special interests, and not a convention that sought to poise industry against labor, or labor against industry. It was not a party wedded to the past. The Republican convention of 1860 sought the good of the railroads, of agriculture, of labor, of business in general, of home products, and of the good and welfare of all the people. The monumental and inescapable evidence of what I say is the result of the fight for the nomination itself. When, I ask, when, in the history of any people, was a choice for leadership made more emblematic of a whole people, than the nomination of Abraham Lincoln? As we reflect on our own glorious history, let us note the rich heritage that is ours. May the spirit of unselfish sacrifice for the great ideal of freedom by those people we respectfully call our forefathers—especially that of Lincoln—have full sway in our political life. This will kindle our desire, inspire our faith, and make strong our judgment. Having done this, the attainment of a trinity of true greatness that Lincoln had and we need—courage, wisdom, and goodness—will be realized. Goodness to have the right; wisdom to know the right; and courage to do the right.

Probably the statesmen and all people who have influence on the world scene would do well to study the life of this great man.

The Republican Party of 1860, Mr. Speaker, did a service for humanity that will live through the ages and it is good that this distinguished body takes this occasion to commemorate the event.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the distinguished gentleman from Iowa in calling the attention of the Members of the House to this very historic occasion.

Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago today Abraham Lincoln was nominated by the Republican Party at a national convention in Chicago to be the party's candidate for the President of the United States. At the same national convention Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, was also nominated for the office of the Vice Presidency.

That Hannibal Hamlin was truly a great man there can be no question, for history and authentic records reveal that he moved in a multitude of ways to preserve the well-being of our Nation and to advance the dignity of the American citizenry.

BORN IN PARIS, MAINE, AUGUST 27, 1809

A citizen of Hampden, Maine, Hannibal Hamlin dedicated the major part of his adult life to public service, serving in high offices at both the Federal and State levels of government.

His political career had its inception when he was elected to represent his hometown of Hampden in the State legislature. Serving with distinction, he was elected speaker of this body, acting in that capacity for three terms.

In 1842 Hamlin was elected to the House of Representatives where, in the course of his service, he became recognized as an authority on parliamentary law and custom.

The early years of his congressional service were marked by his firm stand on slavery, and he asserted his opposition to slavery well in advance of the time when the major political parties of the time took a party position thereon. "Freedom," he said, "is national, and slavery is sectional." He branded slavery as a curse and a moral wrong, something to be endured only so far as the Constitution required it to be maintained.

Hanibal Hamlin typified the noblest type of American manhood, having a striking appearance that glowed brightly against a background of many personal attainments. He was a tall and graceful figure, having black and piercing eyes, a skin almost olive-colored, hair smooth and thick, and a manner that was always courteous and affable. He was a human claypot into which providence had poured generous portions of talent and personality.

Being a man steady of purpose, he was fixed with strong convictions. Possessed of a soul of peace and strength of character, he clung tenaciously to his ideals and values, thereby keeping himself free from the storms of uncertainties and doubts. So constituted, he was always firmly fixed on the object of his views, always able to concentrate all of his energies in devising ways and means to make his hopes and plans materialize.

We find his steadfast nature evidenced at a time when the effort was advanced to repeal the Missouri Compromise. As a reward for his support of this repeal, he was promised liberal offers of patronage and other special forms of benefits from fellow legislators. However, believing as he did that slavery was an insidious institution, he could not be moved to enhance his personal fortunes through a sacrifice of his ideals, and he forthrightly turned these offers aside. He was a man who could not sell his soul for pieces of silver.

Hanibal Hamlin was elected Governor of the State of Maine in 1854, leaving this office after only a brief term of service when he was elected to a seat in the Senate of the United States.

His career in the Senate was no less spectacular than his previous service in other public offices, and he continued to gain high respect for his arduous application to official duties. Although a convincing speaker, he took the Senate floor infrequently, for he preferred, as he many times stated, to be "a working rather than a talking Member" of the U.S. Senate.

That he was held in high esteem by his colleagues in the Senate is indeed a rich compliment for this man, because he served in company with legislators who were remarkably astute and able. Among them were profound lawyers, eloquent orators, keen debaters, skillful parliamentarians, highly educated and scholarly men, and men whose strong native powers compensated for the lack of polish of formal education. Hamlin and his fellow Republicans were a minority in the Senate, only 20 in number. But what men they were, for the roster boasted the names of Sumner and Wilson, Foster and Dixon, Hale and Bell, Collamer and Foot, Seward and King, Simmons and Fessenden; also Simon Cameron, Ben Wade, Zach Chandler, Durkee and Doolittle, Lyman Trumbull, and James Harlan.

The crowning point of Hannibal Hamlin's colorful political life was his nomination and subsequent election to the high office of Vice President of the United States. The nomination proceedings during which Abraham Lincoln and Hannibal Hamlin were selected to represent the Republican Party as candidates for these high offices pose as one of the most exciting events in the annals of early political history.

Before the Chicago convention of 1860 the nomination of Seward was considered a foregone conclusion, but Hannibal Hamlin had determined that the man to cope with the troubled times was the great son of the West—Abraham Lincoln.

He realized that the advancement of Abe Lincoln as the Republican Party's candidate for the Presidency represented a herculean task, for the sentiment of his own State of Maine was strongly disposed toward Seward. Further compounding the complexity was the fact that Hamlin was himself a very good friend and ardent admirer of Seward.

Nonetheless, Hamlin did not feel that Seward was the man of the hour, being convinced that he was neither a strong enough candidate to win the election nor an individual possessed of the qualities required of a President for those turmoiled days. Thus subordinating his personal feelings to a deeper cause, Hamlin worked to advance the nomination of Abraham Lincoln.

A total of 203 votes was essential to a choice on the ballot, and the first ballot saw Seward, Lincoln, Bates, and Cameron fall far short of a vote necessary to nomination. And all the while the balloting was being conducted Hamlin busied himself advertising the merits of his candidate from the West, striving to convince refractory delegates that Lincoln was not only politically potent but admirably equipped to cope with the pressures of the Presidency.

That he was making progress in his efforts was reflected in the second ballot, with Lincoln claiming a percentage gain in votes substantially larger than Seward's. The second ballot had, in fact, brought Lincoln essentially abreast of his nearest rival.

Hamlin persisted in his efforts, endeavoring to pierce the armor of resistant delegates not with the hammer of harangue but with the lance of persuasion. His labors finally bore rich fruit when he succeeded in striking home with the delegates of the pivotal states of Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Indiana.

On a call of the third ballot, a general stampede took place in favor of Lincoln, the force of which swept the rail splitter into the nomination. On this ballot Seward gathered only 181 votes, while Lincoln harvested 228, this being 25 votes more than the 203 essential to the nomination.

Then, on the second ballot, Hamlin was selected as the Republican Party's candidate for the Vice Presidency.

There was a remarkable resemblance in these two men who were subsequently elected to occupy the highest offices of the land. Each was self-educated, each had sought after and practiced the law, and each had the quality of remaining firmly fixed in convictions derived from deep ponderings and critical examination.

Perhaps it was a dictate of destiny that these two men possessed of flintlike natures would stand at the wheel to steer our ship of state through the then turbulent waters of domestic and world uncertainty, each serving to bolster the other in the gigantic task of preserving the Union.

During their administration the shadow of civil war fell upon the land, and it is recorded that Lincoln frequently turned to Hamlin for encouragement, advice, and inspiration during those dark days. And Hamlin, himself possessed of soldierly instincts, enlisted in Company A of the Maine State Guards early in the Civil War, serving in the ranks several weeks when this company was ordered to duty.

It was a quirk of fate that prevented Hannibal Hamlin from becoming President of the United States, for had he continued in the Vice Presidential office during Lincoln's second term, he would have, with Lincoln's assassination, been elevated to that high office.

That Hamlin did not succeed to the Vice Presidency during Lincoln's second term was in no way owing to any act of Abraham Lincoln. In fact, when Lincoln was approached as to his choice of

candidate for that office, he made it abundantly clear that it was his private and personal belief that a renomination of the old ticket would best serve the interests of the Nation. However, political forces operating far beyond the reach of either one of these two men catapulted Andrew Johnson into the office of Vice President of the United States.

That Hannibal Hamlin harbored no resentment over the selection of Johnson to succeed him is evidenced by his conduct during the political campaign of that period. Stumping throughout the Nation, Hamlin lauded the Vice Presidential candidate, proclaiming him to be a man of real virtue and one deserving of trust.

After leaving the office of Vice President, Hannibal Hamlin was appointed collector of customs at the port of Boston in 1865. A year later he resigned that office, occupying himself with building the Piscataquis Railroad and in preparing for a senatorial contest in 1869. Successful in that election, he once again found himself in the Senate, and exercising the diligence that marked his previous legislative career, he was reelected with insignificant opposition at the end of his Senate term.

At the age of 72, after a long and varied career in public service, Hannibal Hamlin voluntarily retired from the Senate of the United States. Remarkably alert and seasoned with years of valuable legislative experience, he was urged by friends to continue in public service. He reasoned, however, that it was best that he depart the public scene at a time when his people wanted him to stay, rather than lingering on until they wanted him to go.

He retired to his quiet home on the Penobscot, submerging himself in his community where respect, honor, and love followed him wherever he walked. He emerged from retirement briefly to accept an appointment as Minister to Spain, an appointment tendered him by President Garfield. After serving a year in this capacity, he once again returned to Maine to renew his association with the friends he loved so well.

His last public effort was directed toward having Abraham Lincoln's birthday declared a national holiday, and it is reported that his powers of persuasion attained rare heights as he pleaded for this Nation to extend to Lincoln this tribute of remembrance and gratitude.

He died in 1891, on July 4, departing this earth on the birthday anniversary of this Nation, as did Jefferson and Adams. The memories of these founders of the Republic and of those, like Hamlin, who strived so hard to save it, these memories connected with the national holiday serve to deepen and heighten the day's significance as a sanction of the imperishable nature of the Union.

Great men have appeared on our national scene, being remembered by Americans because they gave of themselves something that enriched our Nation and ennobled human nature. There must be counted among these such a man as Hannibal Hamlin of Maine.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and also that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to commend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] for a very eloquent and provocative address on a truly great American, Abraham Lincoln. I requested this time to comment on the role which the New Jersey delegation played at the historic Chicago convention.

Compared to some of the more populous States, New Jersey sent relatively few delegates to the Chicago convention. At a meeting in Trenton on March 8, 28 delegates had been chosen, each with half a vote. There had been considerable interest, both in and outside of the State, regarding the choice of delegates. It was generally recognized that New Jersey, together with Pennsylvania, would have an unusual amount of influence at Chicago, especially if their delegations were uncommitted.

The State convention at Trenton was referred to as the "Opposition" or "Black Republican" convention. Among those chosen were Marcus L. Ward, later Governor of New Jersey, and John Insley Blair, of Warren County, the railroad magnate who played a key role in the development of the Delaware Lackawanna and other railroads. Blair kept a diary at this time which, along with other papers, is now in the possession of the New Jersey Historical Society.

One of three delegates at large was my great-grandfather, Frederick T. Frelinghuysen, at the time a 43-year-old lawyer from Newark. He later served as a U.S. Senator from New Jersey, and as Secretary of State under President Chester Arthur. According to one newspaper account, some extremists criticized the selection of Frelinghuysen, despite his "high political character," because he had cooperated at a union meeting. If I may be excused a personal reference, my twin brother, Harry O. H. Frelinghuysen, has been selected to go out to Chicago this year as an alternate delegate from New Jersey.

In any event efforts were made at Trenton to instruct the delegation to support William Lewis Dayton, former U.S. Senator from New Jersey and in 1856 Republican candidate for Vice President. The effort failed, apparently, because it was generally felt that the delegation should be unpledged and unprejudiced toward any candidate. After agreeing that hearty support should be given whoever was nominated at Chicago, the meeting broke up with cheers for New Jersey's two favorite sons, William Dayton and William Pennington, then serving as Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives. Perhaps significantly, the only public figures of truly national significance who were also cheered were William Seward and Abraham Lincoln.

The scene now turns to Chicago as delegates gather to help choose the next President. The New Jersey delegation had its headquarters, including a handsome parlor for conferences, at Richmond House, where the followers of William Seward also gathered. Plans had been made for New Jerseyans living in Chicago to offer the visitors a warm reception, but since some delegates arrived as early as Friday, May 11, and others not until the 15th, this proved difficult to arrange.

On May 15, however, after most of the New Jersey delegates had arrived at Richmond House, they were formally welcomed to the city. Responding for the delegates, Frelinghuysen gave what was described as "an impromptu but exceedingly well-expressed speech." The visitors were then escorted on a tour of the city.

Making plans for the transportation of some 40,000 visitors to Chicago must have required real thought. Every effort was made to make the trip attractive. One newspaper advertised a $35 rate from Newark, N.J., to Chicago and return. A correspondent for the Newark Advertiser has left us an account of the special train which transported many of the New Jersey delegation, others from New York, and the delegates from Boston who brought their own band. The passengers, generally of a high order of intelligence and standing, were apparently soon able to overcome the usual taciturnity of strangers because of the common cause which brought them together.

After a rendezvous in Buffalo at the invitation of the mayor, a special train, properly decorated, with special accommodations for the delegates, left for Chicago at 6 a.m. on Monday, May 14. Crossing the suspension bridge wrapped in mists from Niagara Falls, the train was soon speeding along through the verdant, virtually untouched Canadian countryside. After taking the ferry at Windsor, the passengers continued the journey on the Michigan Central road. Every effort seems to have been made to insure a speedy trip. On two occasions engines were changed simply by disconnecting the exhausted engine and switching it off the track, with the train itself picking up the fresh engine under its own momentum. En route the inhabitants of villages and farms greeted the train with cannon, music, and cheers. At the occasional stopping places, not surprisingly perhaps, time was found for short speeches by the traveling dignitaries.

On the evening of the 15th the New Jersey delegation held its first caucus. By this time, of course, the political maneuvering was in full swing. As the leading contender, Seward naturally had many supporters active on his behalf. One evening Seward's headquarters at Richmond House was the scene of an elaborate champagne supper in the gentlemen's parlor, with everybody cordially welcome. General Nye of New York, ac-

companied by the well-known pugilist Tom Hyer, was reported to have invaded the headquarters of other hopefuls, "swinging $500 in his hands" and offering even bets on Seward. There was only one taker. Tom Hyer, incidentally, had come out on the special train. He was evidently sufficiently well known to attract the attention of the local residents, who crowded around to seek a glimpse of his "finely developed frame."

The New Jersey delegates agreed informally to support their favorite son, William Dayton, on the first ballot. Thereafter they were to be "governed by circumstances." An informal poll showed that there were six votes for Seward with eight opposed to the New Yorker. As far as the New Jersey delegation was concerned, Lincoln's name was not directly involved at this stage. According to the New York Times, the New Jersey delegates were divided in sentiment. Nonetheless they were reported to have joined with Pennsylvania and Illinois delegates in a formal call on the Massachusetts delegation to point out Seward's unpopularity.

When the balloting began, New Jersey, represented by Thomas H. Dudley, who was serving on the Committee on Resolutions, offered the name of William Dayton. All 14 New Jersey votes went to their favorite son. In that count Dayton stood fifth, with Seward first and Lincoln second.

The swing to Lincoln began on the second ballot. When the tally was made, Seward and Lincoln were almost in a dead heat. New Jersey split its votes, with 10 still voting for Dayton and 4 voting for Seward. On the crucial third ballot, the New Jersey delegation gave eight votes to Lincoln, five to Seward, with one vote holding to Dayton.

As Blair put it in his diary, and with his own spelling:

> Politicians had but little Influence. The delegates appeared animated with but one Mind. That was to Take no Trading Politicians. Lincoln & Hamlin are Such Men Taken from the People.

The Jersey delegation seems to have been animated more by a desire to "stop Seward" than to support Lincoln, about whom little was known in the East. Seward was weak in New Jersey because of his extreme views on the slavery issue. Lincoln's relative moderation on the question seems to have made him more acceptable to many members of the delegation. At any rate, the nomination was satisfactory to the rank and file of the opposition party and he was endorsed by most of the party's newspapers following the nomination.

The May 19 editorial in the Newark Evening Journal indicates why Lincoln was a generally popular choice:

> Mr. Lincoln deserves and will have the support of the common people, for he is one of them. Born and lived in poverty, he had no time for the education of the schools. What he possesses, he has got by hard knocks, as he has his position in society by untiring self-cultivation, industry and effort. * * * His personal history and rise are so extraordinary and even romantic as must touch the hearts of the great mass of the people. * * * Then he is a conservative and safe man. Whatever he does is judicious and marked with sterling common sense—a staunch friend of our institutions, the Constitution and the Union. * * *

The nomination of this eloquent and popular man has taken politicians by surprise. It crossed the wishes and efforts and contradicted the predictions of some of the most managing and skillful in such things. The people may be said to have made it themselves, and will therefore take care to make his election sure. Wherever the news was received it was celebrated with real enthusiasm. This city was a scene of tumultuous jubilation.

Meanwhile, a committee of delegates from the various States represented at the Chicago convention was selected to go to Springfield and officially notify Lincoln that he had been chosen. Ephraim Marsh, of Jersey City, and John I. Blair were among the members of this group. Blair described the incident in his diary:

> We * * * called over to see the President and lady. We spent about 1 hour. * * * We found him quite a plain man, very intelligent and cautious. His lady was quite talkative and sociable. We left with the impression that they each could fill their stations with credit to the Nation. Mr. Lincoln is not to be called handsome; says he is 6 feet 3½ inches, spare and bony, indicates a hard-working man. His lady is short, full face. I told him and her when I left that I expected to call on them at Washington when they got in the White House, but I should ask for no office. I found he was very temperate—they gave us cold water, nothing else. He neither drinks rum, chews, or smokes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] has been very modest in his comments about his ancestors. I should like to say that I discovered, in reading history, that the name "Frelinghuysen" is about as great and as common in the early history of our country as the name Adams. I have prepared some remarks dealing with the history and the lives of these people a little more in detail than the gentleman has, and I ask unanimous consent that they be placed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

(The document reads as follows:)

GREAT-GREAT UNCLE OF PETER FRELINGHUYSEN

Theodore Frelinghuysen, son of Frederick Frelinghuysen. He was a Senator from New Jersey; born in Millstone, N.J., March 28, 1787; pursued classical studies and was graduated from Princeton College in 1804; studied law; was admitted to the bar in 1808 and commenced practice in Newark, N.J.; served as captain of volunteer militia in the War of 1812; attorney general of New Jersey from 1817 to 1829, when he resigned; declined the office of Justice of the Supreme Court in 1826; elected as an Adams Democrat in the U.S. Senate and served from March 4, 1829, to March 3, 1835; resumed the practice of law in Newark, N.J.; mayor of Newark in 1837 and 1838; chancellor of New York University, 1839–50; president of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, 1941–57; president of the American Tract Society, 1842–48; vice president of the American Colonization Society; unsuccessful Whig candidate for Vice President on the ticket with Henry Clay in 1944; president of the American Bible Society, 1846–61; president of Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N.J., from 1850 until his death in New Brunswick, N.J., April 12, 1862; interment in First Reformed Church Cemetery.

GREAT-GREAT-GREAT GRANDFATHER OF PETER FRELINGHUYSEN

Frederick Frelinghuysen, father of Theodore Frelinghuysen. He was a delegate and a Senator from New Jersey; born near Somerville, Somerset County, N.J., April 13, 1753; was graduated from Princeton College in 1770; studied law; was admitted to the bar in 1774 and commenced practice in Somerset County, N.J.; member of the Provincial Congress of New Jersey in 1775 and 1776; served in the Revolutionary War; was commissioned first major in the Minutemen, February 15, 1776; captain of the Eastern Company of Artillery, New Jersey State Troops, March 1, 1776; colonel of the 1st Battalion, Somerset County Militia, February 28, 1777; served as aide-de-camp to Brig. Gen. Philimon Dickinson; Member of the Continental Congress in 1778, 1779, 1782, and 1783; clerk of the common pleas court, Somerset County, from 1781 to 1789, when he resigned; member of the State general assembly in 1784 and 1800–04; member of the New Jersey convention that ratified the Federal Constitution in 1787; member of the State council, 1790–92; appointed by President Washington brigadier general in 1790 in the campaign against the western Indians; elected as a Federalist to the U.S. Senate and served from March 4, 1793, to November 12, 1796, when he resigned; commissioned major general in 1794 during the Whisky Insurrection; trustee of Princeton College, 1802–04; died in Millstone, N.J., April 13, 1804; interment in the Old Cemetery, Manville, N.J.

NEPHEW OF PETER FRELINGHUYSEN'S GREAT GRANDFATHER—NOT A DIRECT RELATION TO PETER BUT A MEMBER OF THE FAMILY

Joseph Sherman Frelinghuysen, cousin of Frederick Theodore Frelinghuysen. He was a Senator from New Jersey; born in Raritan, Somerset County, N.J., March 12, 1869; attended the public schools; interested in insurance companies; served in the Spanish-American War in 1898 as second lieutenant, first lieutenant, and ordnance officer; chairman of the Somerset County Republican executive committee, 1902–05; member of the State senate, 1906–12; president of the senate in 1909 and 1910 and acting Governor of New Jersey ad interim; member of the Republican State committee, 1914–16; member of the New York Chamber of Commerce, 1912–26 and of the New Jersey Chamber of Commerce, 1914–25; president of the State board of agriculture, 1912–25; president of the State board of education, 1915–19; elected as a Republican to the U.S. Senate and served from March 4, 1917, to March 3, 1923; unsuccessful Republican candidate for reelection to the U.S. Senate in 1922; trustee of Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N.J., 1918–28; delegate to the Republican National Conventions in 1916, 1924, 1936, and 1944; reengaged in the insurance business until his death in Tucson, Ariz., where he had gone for his health, February 8, 1948; interment in St. Bernard's Cemetery, Bernardsville, N.J.

Frederick Frelinghuysen, great-great-great-grandfather of Peter, his son was Theodore Frelinghuysen, great-great-grandfather of Peter, his nephew and adopted son was Frederick Theodore Frelinghuysen, this man is the great-grandfather of Peter, his nephew was Joseph Sherman Frelinghuysen.

GREAT-GRANDFATHER OF PETER FRELINGHUYSEN

Frederick Theodore Frelinghuysen, great-grandfather of the present distinguished Member of the House, PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, also of New Jersey, was the nephew and adopted son of Theodore Frelinghuysen and cousin of Joseph Sherman Frelinghuysen.

He was a Senator from New Jersey; born in Millstone, N.J., August 4, 1817; was graduated from Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N.J., in 1836; studied law; was admitted to the bar in 1839 and commenced practice in Newark, N.J.; city attorney in 1849; member of the city council in 1850; trustee of Rutgers, 1851–85; member of the peace convention of 1861 held in Washington, D.C., in an effort to devise means to prevent the impending war; appointed attorney general of New Jersey in 1861; reappointed in 1866 and resigned the same year; appointed and subsequently elected as a Republican to the U.S. Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the death of William Wright and served from November 12, 1866, to March 3, 1869; unsuccessful candidate for reelection in 1868; appointed U.S. Minister to England by President Grant in July 1870; confirmed after considerable opposition from Senators Sumner and Wilson, but declined the appointment; again elected to the U.S. Senate and served from March 4, 1871, to March 3, 1877; appointed a member of the Electoral Commission created by act of Congress approved January 29, 1877, to decide the contests in various States in the presidential election of 1876; unsuccessful candidate for reelection; resumed the practice of law in Newark, N.J.; appointed Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President Arthur and served from December 19, 1881, to March 6, 1885; president of the American Bible Society in 1884 and 1885; died in Newark, N.J., May 20, 1885; interment in Mount Pleasant Cemetery.

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the Democratic side simply that we may join in tribute to the man Abraham Lincoln, to whom the gentleman has paid tribute today and that we may, oddly, extend our thanks and gratitude to that convention that nominated Abraham Lincoln to the Presidency.

We admire Abraham Lincoln for many qualities. We admire him for his vision when he, as the minority leader of the Illinois Legislature, worked hard toward the improvement of the natural resources of Illinois at a time when a primitive State was growing and needed to make investments in its roadways and harbors along the rivers.

We admire him because of his great compassion and his firm conviction on the equal dignity of every human being.

We admire him for his courage when as the President of the United States it became his responsibility and he stepped out and made a firm decision in the Emancipation Proclamation which forever ended one of the most shameful institutions in our history.

We admire him for his intellectualism; he was a deep and a profound man, and all of his statements and writings reflect that.

We admire him for his great articulateness. I, for one, have always felt that Abraham Lincoln has never received appropriate recognition in the field of writing. I think he was one of the greatest American prose artists. Also I feel that this rises out of the basic solid quality and genuineness of the man.

As the gentleman has so well said, his greatness transcends party and we like to claim him with the Republican Party as a great American institution.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join in complimenting the gentleman from Iowa for his thorough research on this very, very important episode in history, the 100th anniversary of this nomination which we celebrate today. I think the gentleman has very well recaptured the spirit of the Wigwam. I think he has demonstrated that he is one of the really great Lincoln scholars in this body. I believe that in unfolding this account he has made it live in a very dramatic way.

I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment a little on some of the sources he used in the preparation of this excellent material. The gentleman has referred to Rear Admiral Halsted. I wonder of the gentleman would care to add anything as to some of the excellent sources which he used.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Much of the material used has come from my own collection. I have in my office a list of books that I used as reference and there were newspapers that were used as sources. I think the New York papers are very good; the Cincinnati papers and, of course, the Chicago papers. I have quite a file of those. Most of my material was gathered from those sources. There is a new book written recently by a young man by the name of Don Johnson of the University of Iowa, which is fine source material also. It is a book on "Political Conventions in American History." The Library of Congress has been very helpful—a Mr. William Coblenz helped prepare most of the material in its final form. David Mearns and Lloyd Dunlap checked the manuscript for accuracy.

Mr. HECHLER. I think the gentleman has done an outstanding job in bringing to us not only the account of the convention but also its current meaning today. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield very gladly to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include as part of my remarks the text of three papers, the first one being a paper entitled "The Michigan Delegation at the Republican National Convention of 1860," prepared for me by Mr. George S. May, research archivist of the Michigan Historical Commmission; second, an address given before a joint convention of the Michigan legislature on February 13, 1958, by Mr. Arthur M. Smith, of Dearborn, president of the Abraham Lincoln Civil War Roundtable of Michigan; and third, a paper dated April 1960 entitled "Michigan and the Republican Convention of 1860," prepared by Mr. Lloyd C. Nyman, of Grosse Point Woods, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak very briefly about Michigan's part in this famous 1860 convention. It is a particular pleasure for me to do so at this time because this week happens to be Michigan Week and it is indeed appropriate that I should mention briefly the part played by the distinguished Michigan delegation at the Wigwam in Chicago 100 years ago.

Our delegation was headed by Austin Blair of Jackson, Jackson being, of course, the place where the Republican Party had been formed under The Oaks only 6 years earlier, and who subsequently became our war Governor of the State of Michigan.

The Michigan delegation was instructed to support the presidential nomination and candidacy of William H. Seward of New York, and adhered to that position throughout the three ballots which were taken at Chicago. As has been pointed out, of course, by the gentleman from Iowa and other speakers, a switch of four Ohio votes on the third ballot gave the nomination to Mr. Lincoln.

Austin Blair, who had been one of the strongest of Mr. Seward's supporters, having made for him the seconding speech, then arose and, with what the gentleman from Iowa has termed correctly good sportsmanship, made one of the outstanding addresses of the convention, a portion of which I should like to read at this time. I quote from Austin Blair's remarks following the nomination of Abraham Lincoln in Chicago 100 years ago:

> Like my friend who has just taken his seat, the State of Michigan, from first to last, has cast her vote for the great statesman of New York. She has nothing to take back. She has not sent me forward to worship the rising sun, but she has put me forward to say that, at your behests here today, she lays down her first, best loved candidate to take up yours, with some beating of the heart, with some quivering in the veins; but she does not fear that the fame of Seward will suffer, for she knows that his name is a portion of the history of the American Union; it will be written, and read, and beloved long after the temporary excitement of this day has passed away, and when Presidents themselves are forgotten in the oblivion which comes over all temporal things. We stand by him still. We have followed him with a single eye and with unwavering faith in times past. We marshal now behind him in the grand column which shall go out to battle for Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois.
>
> Mark you, what has obtained today will obtain in November. Lincoln will be elected by the people. We say of our candidate, God bless his magnanimous soul. I promise you that in the State of Michigan, which I have the honor to represent, where the Republican Party from the days of its organization to this hour, never suffered a single defeat, we will give you for the gallant son of Illinois, the glorious standard bearer of the West, a round 25,000 majority.

It so happens, Mr. Speaker, that in spite of an obvious feeling of disappointment and perhaps an early lack of enthusiasm in Michigan for Mr. Lincoln, nevertheless in the election of that year in November, Michigan gave Lincoln a margin of 23,413 votes over Mr. Douglas, the candidate of the Democratic

Party, which was almost the 25,000 majority promised by Governor Blair in his famous speech in Chicago.

It is a pleasure to speak here on this occasion. I want to commend our distinguished friend from Iowa for his having prepared this time and made these very moving remarks about the convention. I certainly express my appreciation to him for permitting all of us on both sides of the aisle to join this afternoon in calling attention to this historic centennial. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his appropriate remarks. I am sure the address he referred to by the great Governor of Michigan at that time was a real mark of statesmanship, one of our great heritages, of which we ought to be very proud.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the matters which I earlier secured permission to include with my remarks are as follows:

THE MICHIGAN DELEGATION AT THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION OF 1860

Michigan was represented at the Chicago convention of the Republican Party of 1860 by the following delegates: Austin Blair, Jackson; Walton W. Murphy, Jonesville; Thomas White Ferry, Grand Haven; and J.J. St. Clair, Marquette, were delegates at large. Delegates from the State's four districts included J. G. Peterson, Detroit; Alex D. Crane, Dexter; Jesse G. Beeson, Dowagiac; William L. Stoughton, Sturgis; Francis Quinn, Niles; Erastus Hussey, Battle Creek; D. C. Buckland, Pontiac, and Michael T. C. Plessner, Saginaw.

Ferry was chosen vice president of the convention to represent Michigan. Stoughton was chosen secretary to represent the State. Murphy was appointed to the Committee on Permanent Organization, Quinn to the Credentials Committee, and Blair to the Resolutions Committee.

Austin Blair, who was chairman of the Michigan delegation, was shortly nominated by the Republicans as their candidate for Governor. He was elected, serving two terms from 1861 through 1864, and, because he was Michigan's "war Governor," he is one of the State's most famous Governors. Several of the other members of the delegation also had distinguished careers as public servants. Ferry was later a Congressman and a U.S. Senator from Michigan, and was acting Vice President in 1876–77. Stoughton rose to the rank of brigadier general during the Civil War and afterwards served two terms in the U.S. House of Representatives. Hussey had been president of the famous Jackson convention of 1854 where the Republican Party was formed "under the oaks," and he held numerous public offices on the State and local level.

Michigan's delegation was pledged to support William H. Seward of New York for the Republican Presidential nomination. This pledge reflected the personal preferences of most of the members of the delegation and apparently also reflected the feelings of most Michigan Republicans. There are several reasons for Seward's popularity in Michigan. He was well known in the State, having visited and spoken in Michigan on numerous occasions. He was a New Yorker, which brought him close to the thousands of Michiganites who had been born and raised in that State. Finally, before the Republican Party had been formed in 1854, Seward, as a leading Whig, had enunciated most forcefully the antislavery principles which became such an important part of the Republican platform. Lincoln, on the other hand, had spoken only once in Michigan, at Kalamazoo in 1856 on behalf of John C. Fremont.

Before and during the convention of 1860 strong efforts were made to get Seward supporters to drop him in favor of one of the other candidates. The main argument used against Seward was that although he was strong in the so-called safe States (such as Michigan) he could not carry the doubtful States. Particularly, it was said he could not carry Pennsylvania and Indiana. Both States held their elections in October, and it was said that Fremont's poor showing in these States in October 1856 caused serious defects among his supporters which led to his defeat nationally in the November elections in the other States. However, the Michigan delegation remained steadfast in its support of Seward.

William W. Evarts placed Seward's name in nomination, and his speech was received enthusiastically. Lincoln followers then greeted the nomination of Lincoln by N. B. Judd with what the official record described as "immense applause." The Seward and Lincoln forces then engaged in a duel to see which one could arouse the most enthusiasm for their candidate. Blair seconded Seward in what one member of the convention many years later still remembered as "one of the outstanding speeches of the convention." The Seward supporters followed Blair's speech with a tremendous demonstration. "No Comanches, no panthers ever struck a higher note, or gave screams with more infernal intensity," a convention observer declared. But then Lincoln's nomination was seconded and the demonstration that followed outdid the best the Seward forces could muster. "New York, Michigan, and Wisconsin delegates sat together and were in this tempest very quiet," the same observer reported. "Many of their faces whitened as the Lincoln yawp swelled into a wild hozanna of victory."

On the third ballot, on May 18, a switch of four votes in the Ohio delegation gave Lincoln the required number to win the nomination. Evarts, speaking for the Seward forces, arose and moved that Lincoln's nomination be made unanimous. Blair then arose, and spoke for the Michigan delegation which had cast its 12 votes for Seward on each of the three ballots. The eminent historian, William Hesseltine, has called the speech Blair now made "the speech of the hour." It showed "evidence of real sincerity" in pledging Michigan's support of Lincoln.

Blair said to the members of the convention:

"Like my friend who has just taken his seat, the State of Michigan, from first to last, has cast her vote for the great statesman of New York. She has nothing to take back. She has not sent me forward to worship the rising sun, but she has put me forward to say that, at your behests here today, she lays down her first, best loved candidate to take up yours, with some beating of the heart, with some quivering in the veins [much applause]; but she does not fear that the fame of Seward will suffer, for she knows that his name is a portion of the history of the American Union; it will be written, and read, and beloved long after the temporary excitement of this day has passed away, and when Presidents themselves are forgotten in the oblivion which comes over all temporal things. We stand by him still. We have followed him with a single eye and with unwavering faith in times past. We marshal now behind him in the grand column which shall go out to battle for Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois.

"Mark you, what has obtained today will obtain in November next. Lincoln will be elected by the people. We say of our candidate, God bless his magnanimous soul. [Tremendous applause.] I promise you that in the State of Michigan, which I have the honor to represent, where the Republican Party from the days of its organization to this hour, never suffered a single defeat, we will give you for the gallant son of Illinois, and glorious standard bearer of the West, a round 25,000 majority."

So hectic was the convention proceedings that it appears uncertain whether Evarts' motion was ever properly put and acted upon. Despite what Blair said, it appears that the Michigan delegation and the hundreds of Michiganites who were at the convention were sorely disappointed at Seward's defeat. The Michigan delegation returned home by railroad and tried to work up enthusiasm for Lincoln. One who accompanied the train recalled later: "We started out in a train trimmed with Lincoln banners, but in spite of the banners and in spite of Blair's earnest speeches, we did not get a cheer for Lincoln all the way from Niles to Detroit." In November, however, Michigan gave Lincoln a margin of 23,413 votes over the Democrat Douglas, almost the 25,000 majority promised by Blair at Chicago.

LINCOLN AND MICHIGAN

(Address by Mr. Arthur M. Smith, of Dearborn, president, Abraham Lincoln Civil War Round Table of Michigan, before joint convention of the Michigan Legislature, February 13, 1958)

(Foreword, by Hon. Louis C. Cramton, State representative from Lapeer County: "Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, members of the Senate and House of Representatives of Michigan: Abraham Lincoln was born on the 12th day of February, 149 years ago in a frontier cabin with one window and a dirt floor, and through this joint session of its legislative bodies, the State of Michigan today pays tribute to this preeminent world figure ever to be revered as democracy's exemplar. We are fortunate to have with us a notable Michigan authority on Lincoln, Mr. Arthur M. Smith, of Dearborn, president of the Abraham Lincoln Civil War Round Table of Michigan, who will address us on the subject 'Lincoln and Michigan.' ")

Mr. Cramton, Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, members of the senate and house and friends, Abraham Lincoln was born 149 years ago yesterday. He lived but 56 short years. For 21 years of this time he was at home, the dutiful son of what today we call an underprivileged family. In the remaining 35 years of his life he was to become the symbol of America in the hearts of millions here and abroad. Today we pause in a troubled world to pay homage to his memory. It is altogether proper that we should do so, for Abraham Lincoln symbolizes as does no other historical figure the triumph of a man and his ideals over his environment and the partisan struggles of his time.

The Legislature of Michigan is to be especially commended on this splendid custom of meeting in joint convention to commemorate the anniversary of his birth. I am very honored, indeed, to have been asked to address you today on the subject, "Lincoln and Michigan."

The able speakers on like occasions in previous years have given you inspired word pictures of Abraham Lincoln the man. These addresses, supported by scholarly research have been executed with admirable skill. Today I shall not attempt to duplicate these efforts. Instead, I shall speak to you about Abraham Lincoln the inventor and Abraham Lincoln the statesman—because in both capacities he was so closely associated with Michigan backgrounds.

As an inventor Abraham Lincoln made it his lifelong habit to inquire into the nature of things. He exhibited what he called the habit of invention; the habit of observation and reflection. As a statesman

he relied upon these observations and reflections as he formulated those policies which preserved the Union in his time and which can save the world in our time.

Today the world needs leaders who like Lincoln are both inventors and statesmen. As inventors they can observe and reflect upon the technology which has given us jet planes, radio, radar, and television. They can see more than destruction in the release of atomic energy. Space to them is more than a tactical weapon in an unrelenting war of ideologies. Probing the world about them, inventors specialize in doing the impossible. They have vision. They have a will to do. They have initiative.

When the knowledge and skills of the inventor are combined with the attributes of statesmanship, realistic political policies will emerge—policies which the world must have very soon if mankind is to survive.

Abraham Lincoln blended the mind of the inventor with the skills of the statesman in such perfect proportions that he stands today as the one great American to whom we can turn for timely inspiration, counsel and guidance.

Here is the secret for the growth of the so-called "Lincoln Cult." There are many students and collectors of Lincolniana in Michigan who, in common with other members of this cult, share the sentiment recently expressed by the eminent director of the Lincoln National Life Foundation of Fort Wayne, Ind., Dr. R. Gerald McMurtry.

"Abraham Lincoln," says Dr. McMurtry, "seems to take hold of people as no other historical character does. He is someone they can tie themselves to. He possessed a true nobility of character, yet he was like the rest of us in so many human ways. We feel that we really know him. Yet Abraham Lincoln remains a paradox." [1]

Michigan met Abraham Lincoln as an inventor in 1848 when he looked upon our beautiful peninsula from the deck of the lake steamer *Globe*. Michigan met Abraham Lincoln the statesman when he addressed the Kalamazoo rally of Young Republicans for Fremont in 1856. This combination of inventor and statesman is indeed a paradox.

Rumor and speculation has it that Lincoln in his lifetime also appeared at Bay City, Pontiac, and Detroit. These visits have not been verified by acceptable proofs. In common with every Lincoln student in Michigan, I would like to see these visits verified. As of today, however, we know nothing about the reasons for such alleged visits nor do we know anything about Lincoln's part in them.

Despite the fact that other States were more fortunate in their contacts with Abraham Lincoln during his lifetime, Michigan today possesses a rich store of Lincoln materials and has made significant contributions to recent Lincoln studies. Thomas I. Starr found the long lost Kalamazoo speech and made it available to Lincoln students. He also published his historical researches on Lincoln and the Detroit River. Bruce Catton, noted author on Lincoln and Civil War themes is a native son of Petoskey. Carl Sandburg wrote his masterful "War Years" while living at Harbert. Valuable collections of Lincolniana are located at the Clements Library in Ann Arbor, in the Burton historical collections at Detroit, and in the Dwight B. Waldo collection at Western Michigan University of Kalamazoo. There are, in addition, a number of privately owned collections of Lincoln materials in Michigan, several of which are nationally known.

One of the best publicized bits of Lincolniana in Michigan is the Logan County Courthouse in Greenfield Village. Henry Ford, born 2 years before the death of Abraham Lincoln, was, like Lincoln, both an inventor and a statesman. We know him best as an inventor but I am sure history will also know him as a statesman. The careful restoration of the Logan County Courthouse and the choice Lincoln items collected by Henry Ford reveal the close philosophical kinship which existed between these two inventor-statesmen.

There is a strong urge to tell you more about these fascinating aspects of Lincoln and Michigan but they are a part of another story. Let us then return to the two episodes previously mentioned—Lincoln's visit to Michigan as an inventor in 1848, and his visit to Kalamazoo as a statesman in 1856.

In Kalamazoo in 1856 Lincoln said the key to the greatness of America was that "Every man can make himself." Here is the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln, the self-reliant inventor. But at the same time Abraham Lincoln, the statesman, added the qualification that such a man must be free; free that is from both physical and mental shackles and must be living in a nation, such as America, in which the government assures him the freedoms which he must have if he is to "make himself."

This blending of the philosophic inventor with the practical statesman in Abraham Lincoln provided the leadership which was extolled by Woodrow Wilson in his Chicago address at the centennial celebration of Lincoln's birth. Then as now we can join in Wilson's fervent plea, "God send us such men again." [2]

The balanced combination of inventor and statesman in Abraham Lincoln is not unique in American history. Before his time it had been possessed by Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, and Thomas Jefferson. Possessing it, each had blended an inventor's vision with practical statesmanship to leave to this Nation the political philosophy and the structure of government so revered by Abraham Lincoln.

I have told you that Michigan first met Abraham Lincoln as an inventor. As a first-term Congressman from Illinois, Lincoln returned from Washington to Springfield by way of the New England States and the Great Lakes. In the early fall of 1848 he visited Niagara Falls and embarked at Port Buffalo as a passenger on the lake steamer *Globe*. The *Globe* reported at Detroit on September 29, 1848.[3] A story in the Detroit Free Press the next day recounts that the steamship *Canada* in going down the river on Thursday night had run ashore on Fighting Island and was there when the *Globe* came up.

Here then was the spectacle—two great steamers in a great river—one passing safely to its destination, the other aground on a shoal. What visions this must have conjured in Lincoln's memory. What reflections this observation must have inspired. Here was a need. Here was a problem. Lincoln had had a personal, firsthand contact with the problems of river navigation. He had once floated a flatboat stuck on the Rutledge Dam in New Salem by the simple expedient of securing an auger from the shore and drilling a hole in the end of the boat which extended over the dam. This had allowed the water to drain out of the boat, and so increased its buoyancy that it floated over the dam after which the hole was plugged, and the boat continued on its trip to New Orleans.

Obviously, such an expedient was not possible with a Great Lake steamer trapped on the shoals off Fighting Island. There was no place to transport the cargo or passengers. There was no way to lighten the load. Lincoln must have closely observed the activities of the crew of the *Canada* in wedging under the sides of the gunwales, empty casks, barrels, and even bales of straw to increase the buoyancy of the ship and float her off the shoals.

Lincoln reflected on this problem and decided to do something about it. When he returned to Springfield, he described these events to his partner "Billy" Herndon who in after years was to write [4] that Lincoln, continued to think about this problem of riverboat navigation. As a result, he suggested attaching a kind of bellows on each side of the hull of the craft just below the waterline.[5] By a system of ropes and pulleys, whenever the keel grated on the sand these bellows were to be lowered to the water and inflated and thus buoyed up the vessel was expected to float clear of the shoal.

When Lincoln reached home, Herndon tells us that, "he at once set to work to demonstrate the feasibility of his plan. Walter Davis, a mechanic having a shop near our office, granted him the use of his tools, and likewise assisted him in making the model of a miniature vessel of the arrangement as above described. Lincoln manifested ardent interest in it. Occasionally, he would bring the model in the office and while whittling on it would descant on its merits and the revolution it was destined to work in steamboat navigation." [6] This model is now preserved and can be seen in Washington at the Smithsonian Institution.

Gains Paddock, an old resident of Springfield, remembered that when the boat model was completed, Lincoln, to prove his assertion that the Sangamon River was navigable, demonstrated his boat in one of the public watering troughs in the public square at Springfield.[7]

This invention was no passing fancy with Lincoln. When he returned to Washington early in 1849, he took the model with him and secured the services of a Washington patent attorney, Zenos C. Robbins. The model was filed, an application for patent was made, and on May 22, 1849, Abraham Lincoln was granted U.S. Patent No. 6,469.

Many Lincoln scholars have ignored these events, or have treated this invention as something of a curiosity. This I am unwilling to do. From an intimate professional association with inventors for nearly 32 years, I know that an inventor will not carry an idea as far as did Abraham Lincoln unless he is sustained by some broader vision. In all cases, the invention patented is but a means to an end—a mechanism, if you please, to give reality to a vision.

I am certain that Lincoln must have had a broader vision which caused him shortly after the war-threatened first inaugural, to think about his boat model and to have one of the Patent Office employees find it for him.[8]

What, then, can we say now, nearly 110 years later, motivated Abraham Lincoln, the inventor, to make this invention? Part of the answer to this question is found in the

---

[1] Saturday Evening Post, p. 92, "The Lincoln Cult" by Charles W. White.

[2] Centennial address of Dr. Woodrow Wilson, Chicago, Ill., Feb. 12, 1909, as quoted in "Lincoln Lore No. 659," Nov. 24, 1941.

[3] "The Detroit River and Abraham Lincoln," Thomas I. Starr. Bulletin of the Detroit Historical Society, vol. III, Nov. 5, February 1947.

[4] Herndon incorrectly tells the story as involving the "ship Lincoln was on." There is no record of the *Globe* having been involved in this episode except as passing the stranded *Canada*.

[5] This is also incorrect. Both the model and the patent show the bellows to be above the waterline.

[6] Abraham Lincoln, Herndon & Weik—2 vol. ed., D. Appleton & Co. 1926. Vol. I, pp. 298–299.

[7] Lincoln Lore No. 843, June 4, 1945 "Congressman Lincoln's Patent."

[8] "Sights and Secrets of the National Capital," by Dr. John B. Ellis, published Jones, Jenkin & Co., Chicago, Ill.—1869, p. 348.

platform upon which he waged his first campaign for the State legislature. Even at that time he had promised to work for improvement of the rivers. Lincoln was first of all a riverman who knew rivers from years of firsthand contact with them. He knew what rivers had meant to him. He knew them as nature's right-of-way to places where man wished to go. He knew the shallow streams which led to the greater rivers. He knew these great rivers as they joined the cities, villages, and peoples of the separate States and territories into one great and united Nation. He knew the need for transportation to the West. I believe he saw in the western rivers and in his little boat a ready answer to the problem of western exploration and western expansion.

Certainly to a riverman of Lincoln's experience, vision, and ability, the Detroit River with a great steamship fast on a shoal presented a challenge to his inventive mind. That his solution may have been impractical is beside the point. He had demonstrated what he was later to call the habit of invention; that is, the habit of "observation and reflection." [9]

The riverboat is but one example of Lincoln's scientific abilities. In the Lincoln Museum in Washington, D.C., there is a model of a small wagon which is attributed to Abraham Lincoln as the inventor. To date his inventorship has not been documented. If it can be established, then Abraham Lincoln was fully 20 years ahead of the art in his development of the type of vehicle steering which is common in the automobiles of today and in which each front wheel turns about its own spindle.

Many who knew him said he was a man of decided scientific bent of mind. Dr. Joseph Henry, one of America's greatest scientists, came to know Lincoln well by serving as his "scientific adviser" during the Civil War, and said that he "marveled at the President's grasp of scientific matters." [10]

Recently, I was privileged to examined the original longhand statement of Dr. John Allen which is now preserved as a part of the Robert Todd Lincoln collection in the Library of Congress. I was interested to note that this longtime friend of Abraham Lincoln had written in 1860, that Lincoln's mind was of a "metaphysical and philosophical order," and that Lincoln had made geology and other sciences a special study. Dr. Allen also comments on the fact that Lincoln "has an inventive faculty—is always studying into the nature of things." [11]

"Behind the solemn, furrowed countenance of Abraham Lincoln was an inquisitive mind," writes Benjamin P. Thomas in his foreword to the recent book "Lincoln and the Tools of War." "It ranged" writes Thomas, "over the abstract and the infinite, the absolute and the immediate. It was philosophical, and at the same time was intensely practical."

"On the practical level," Thomas continues, "Lincoln's curiosity directed itself, among other things, to mechanical devices." Thomas quotes a fellow lawyer of Lincoln's who remembered that whenever Lincoln encountered a new piece of farm machinery on his rounds of the old eighth circuit, "he would carefully examine it all over, first generally and then critically; he would sight it to determine if it was straight or warped; and if he could make a practical test of it, he would do that; he would turn it over or around and stoop down or lie down, if necessary, to look under it; he would examine it closely, and then stand off and examine it at a little distance; he would shake it, lift it, roll it about, upend it, overset it, and thus ascertain every quality and utility which inhered in it, so far as acute and patient investigation could do it."

"Living on the periphery of the machine age in America," Thomas observes, Lincoln "was keenly aware of the technological advances that were taking place about him. He pondered on the impact of those advances on mankind." [12]

After reviewing Lincoln's interest in the mechanical arts to provide superior arms for the north, Thomas writes: "That many of these devices failed does not mean that Lincoln was naive or absurdly a visionary. In many instances he was on the right track but simply ahead of his time." [13]

In today's frenzied race to train "scientists," let us remember that crash programs in scientific education may give us technicians but they cannot give us inventors or statesmen. For this we must train students in the fine art of observation and allow them the time necessary for reflection. While necessary to inventors, both are essential for statesman.[14]

Lincoln's abilities as an inventor become of added significance when they are blended with his skills as a statesman. The inventor's habit of observation and reflection gave a special quality to the statesmanship of Abraham Lincoln which the distinguished historian, Allan Nevins, comments on in "The Statesmanship of the Civil War". "The special quality of Lincoln's statemanship", says Allan Nevins, "was its extraordinary realism or practicality." Dr. Nevins then points out that what set Lincoln apart from other statesmen of his time was "his grasp of what was practicable at any given moment".[15]

It was as such a statesman that Abraham Lincoln paid a visit to Kalamazoo, Mich., on August 27, 1856. There, on that day, Lincoln delivered his address "Against Extending Slavery" and demonstrated how much he had observed and how much he had reflected upon the problems of that time. Here he was playing the role of a statesman. Standing before a large gathering, billed as a "foreign" speaker, he was to be "tested" as he faced an audience made up mainly of the more enthusiastic and radical elements of the new Republican Party.

As we now read his Kalamazoo speech, we see how patiently and how skillfully Lincoln there developed those fundamental positions which he was to state more fully and more eloquently 2 years later in 1858 in his "House Divided" speech at Springfield, Ill., and still again 2 years later in 1860 in his Cooper Institute speech at New York City.

What he observed at Kalamazoo must have been the subject of much reflection by Abraham Lincoln, the statesman.

To many in the crowd at Kalamazoo, Abraham Lincoln was nothing but a name—they had come to hear the Battle Creek Glee Club and bands from Detroit, Ann Arbor, Jackson, and elsewhere. They had come to hear their idol "Zack" Chandler declare, "Let Kansas come in as a slave State and the North will make it a desert".[16] The majority of the crowd echoed the sentiments of George C. Bates who declared that day, "Sooner than see another foot of slave territory added to the Union," he would "dash it to atoms". "Sooner", said he, "than to have the ship of state carry a crew of slaveholders, let her go down with all aboard".[17]

The crowd at Kalamazoo, as the crowds later were to do at Gettysburg and at the second inaugural, listened but did not comprehend the message of Abraham Lincoln, the statesman.

In his Kalamazoo address, Lincoln, the statesman, recognized the problems then before the people. He saw the dividing lines formed between the slave States and the free States; between the North and the South; between the abolitionists and the supporters of slavery. He knew this division threatened the Union.

Recognizing these things in his speech at Kalamazoo; sensing that he was not speaking the sentiments of the crowd; Lincoln, the statesman, urged the crowd to forget these differences and join him in the most important issue of all; the preservation of the Union. Lincoln, the statesman, saw this as the only course if this Nation was to achieve the destiny which he was certain a divine providence had planned for it.

In his speech in Kalamazoo, Lincoln urged all to come forward, and help to maintain the Constitution "for," said Lincoln, "it is the only safeguard of our liberties."

Lincoln then concluded, "Come, and keep coming. Strike, and strike again." "So sure as God lives," he said, "the victory shall be yours." [18]

The Kalamazoo Gazette reported that "Mr. Lincoln * * * made a very fair and argumentative address, but was far too conservative and Union-loving in his sentiments to suit his audience." [19]

Lincoln, at Kalamazoo, had not yet attained the stature of a national spokesman on these issues. This was yet to come in the "House Divided" speech, the Lincoln-Douglas debates, and finally in the acclaim with which the audience received his speech at Cooper Institute. In Kalamazoo, Abraham Lincoln was, at best, a successful lawyer and something of a local politician from a neighboring State. He was just beginning to be noticed as a national figure. There were those in the audience at Kalamazoo who remembered him as the politician whose devastating attack in 1848 on the venerable Lewis Cass [20] had been a deciding factor in defeating Michigan's only bid to place one of its sons in the White House.

There also were those in the audience who, like "Zack" Chandler, were offended by Lincoln's conservative views, and who were to become so openly hostile to Lincoln that 4 years later they were to hold the Michigan delegation for Seward when Lincoln was nominated for the Presidency.

I doubt if many in the crowd in Kalamazoo appreciated that they were observing the early flowering of Lincoln as a statesman. Yet, it was truly a statesman who proclaimed to the crowd:

"We are a great empire. We are 80 years old. We stand at once the wonder and admiration of the whole world, and we must inquire what it is that has given us so much prosperity, and we shall understand that to give up that one thing, would be to give up all future prosperity. This cause is that every man can make himself." [21]

---

[9] Lecture on "Discoveries & Invention"—The Collected Works of Lincoln. Roy P. Basler—Rutgers University Press, 1953, vol. III, p. 356.

[10] Quoted by Benjamin P. Thomas in the foreword to "Lincoln and the Tools of War" by Robert V. Bruce; Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1956, p. X.

[11] Robert Todd Lincoln Papers, vol. I, p. 10. Library of Congress.

[12] "Lincoln and The Tools of War", supra, pp. VII–VIII.

[13] Ibid., p. IX.

[14] See, "Man Is Not Primarily a Fact," Dr. Glenn Olds, Saturday Review, Feb. 15, 1958, p. 18.

[15] The Statesmanship of the Civil War, Allan Nevins, the Macmillan Co., 1953, p. 60.

[16] Kalamazoo Gazette, Aug. 29, 1956, as quoted in Starr-Lincoln's Kalamazoo address against extending slavery, p. 31.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Starr—Lincoln's Kalamazoo Address, pp. 45–46.

[19] Ibid., p. 42.

[20] Lincoln's remarks on Cass may be found in Clifton M. Nichols "Life of Abraham Lincoln," Most, Crowell & Kirkpatrick (1896), p. 107 et seq.

[21] Starr, supra, p. 39.

Lincoln, the statesman, also spoke of our deep and abiding interest in keeping the territories open for homes of free people. "There is another thing," said Lincoln, "and that is the mature knowledge we have—the greatest interest of all. It is the doctrine, that the people are to be driven from the maxims of our free Government * * *."[22]

The vision, the thoughts and sentiments of Lincoln, the statesman, at Kalamazoo find further expression in his "House Divided" speech. Remembering the problem of so expressing them as to reach his audience in Kalamazoo, we find Lincoln, the inventor, suggesting certain technical analogies and arguments based thereon which lie at the very heart of the "House Divided" speech.

It is Lincoln as a technician, an inventor if you please, who suggests the analogy of the sand casting mold and the frame timbers[23] to support so effectively the conclusions of Lincoln the statesman, in the "House Divided" speech that the combination of the Nebraska doctrine and the Dred Scott decision was an effective machine for the extension of slavery.

The close-knit fusion of the inventor and the statesman in Lincoln is seen also in his lecture on "Discoveries and Inventions" given before the Phi Alpha Society, of Illinois College in Jacksonville, Ill., on February 11, 1859.[24]

If time permitted, I should like to take you through this entire lecture for I believe it has a great deal of significance in the Lincoln story. One noted Lincoln scholar told me a few days ago, "That is the speech of a well educated man" Coming as it does between the "House Divided" speech and the "Cooper Institute" speech it shows the scope of Lincoln's interests and the intellectual growth which was to become so apparent in the "Cooper Institute" speech.

Let us turn our attention to some of the significant portions of this speech which reveal Lincoln as an inventor and as a statesman.

"I have already intimated my opinion," said Lincoln, in this lecture, "that in the world's history, certain inventions and discoveries occurred of particular value, on account of their great efficiency in facilitating all other inventions and discoveries." These included among others the discovery of America, and the introduction of patent laws.[25]

After considering the problems in the inventing of writing, Lincoln saw it as a means of recording and preserving important observations, thus possibly leading "to an important invention, years and even centuries" later. "In one world," said Lincoln, "by means of writing, the seeds of invention were more permanently preserved, and more widely sown."[26]

Lincoln was concerned about the inequality felt by uneducated people; about how such people looked upon the educated few as superior beings. "To emancipate the mind from this false and underestimate of itself," said Lincoln, "is a great task which printing came into the world to perform."

He then speaks of how difficult it is "for us, now and here to conceive how long it took to break its shackles" in order, as he put it, "to get a habit of freedom of thought, established." "It is," said Lincoln, "a curious fact that a new country is most favorable—almost necessary—the emancipation of thought, and the consequent advancement of civilization and the arts."[27]

After reviewing the course of invention through Asia and the older countries, this lecture continues on a very modern theme. "* * * we here in America," said Lincoln, "think we discover, and invent, and improve, faster than any of them. They may think this is arrogance; but they cannot deny that Russia has called upon us to show her how to build steamboats and railroads."[28]

To Lincoln, the discovery of America was "an event greatly favoring and facilitating useful discoveries and inventions."[29]

The "strong slavery of the mind" which concerned Lincoln in this speech, had to be broken before "freedom of thought" could be established. America was the new country so necessary to this "emancipation of thought."

This, then, brings us back to Kalamazoo and to the great empire whose cause he there stated as being "that every man can make himself."

Lincoln's message at Kalamazoo, and his lecture at Jacksonville, Ill., have particular applicability to the dilemma of free men in our troubled world today. Last November, Howard Fast, after leaving the Communist Party, wrote an article, in which he stated:

"Whatever the Communist Party once was, today it is a prison for man's best and boldest dreams. Tomorrow belongs to those who break down the prison walls that enclose the minds of man, not to those who support such walls. For mankind, the promise of tomorrow always has been and always will be the widening of intellect and horizon—in ever greater vistas of individual freedom."[30]

The mental slavery as well as the physical slavery demanded by communism was abhorrent to the mind of Lincoln. The Communist ideology can exist only so long as it can forge and hold its subject peoples in the shackles of mental and physical slavery. Lincoln's concern about extending slavery into free territories as he expressed it at Kalamazoo, was "that the people are to be driven from the maxims of our free Government." Today, I am certain his concern would be directed toward communism—and this for the same reason—that it drives people from the "maxims of our free Government."

The voice which spoke through Abraham Lincoln in stating this issue at Kalamazoo still speaks to us today, but we must listen closely if we are to hear it above the noise and clash of ideologies and the shoutings of rabid partisans seeking to separate man from man and nation from nation.

The voice today, as it did in the time of Abraham Lincoln comes from the soul of a great man who is a scientist, dedicated to serving "God's lowliest creatures," and living today in primitive surroundings, beside a river which he knows well. He speaks to us today against a frontier background. With a belief in God, and a devotion to the cause of all mankind Albert Schweitzer has given us a philosophy for today and tomorrow in his "Reverence for Life," and last year in his "Declaration of Conscience." In these writings I hear not the voice of Albert Schweitzer—nor the voice of Abraham Lincoln—but the voice of a Divine Providence again speaking patiently to us, to caution, to direct and to inspire us in the never ending search for a solution to our problems of survival, in a world terrified by what yesterday were but scientific curiosities discovered in its course of man's unrelenting search for knowledge.

I believe it is symbolic of our times that today replicas of the sculptured busts of Abraham Lincoln and Albert Schweitzer sit side by side in a showcase in the Smithsonian Institution at Washington.

We need to understand the great principles and the idealism of these great thinkers if we are to profit from their example.

Turn your ears to Lambarene in equatorial South Africa, or to Gunsbach in Alsace-Lorraine when Albert Schweitzer is there. Listen as he speaks. You, too, can hear the voice. It is the voice we heard speaking through Lincoln at Jacksonville and at Kalamazoo but the words are Albert Schweitzer's:

"A man's ability to be a pioneer of progress," says Schweitzer, "that is, to understand what civilization is and to work for it, depends on his being a thinker and on his being free.

"Material and spiritual freedom are closely bound up with one another," Schweitzer asserts and then says, "Civilization presupposes free men, for only by free men can it be thought out and brought to realization."[31]

Lincoln the inventor—Lincoln the statesman—gave us the vision, gave us the courage and gave us the leadership which enabled this Nation to survive the tragedy of the Civil War and to become a world power dedicated to the principle that people are not to be driven away from "the maxims of our free Government." As an inventor, Abraham Lincoln supported other inventors in developing the war-born technology of the Civil War from which has grown the awesome technology of today whose imperative voice demands that we firmly establish here and now the principle stated by Lincoln speaking as a statesman in Kalamazoo; that peoples shall not be driven from "the maxims of our free Government."

John Wilkes Booth cut short the life of Abraham Lincoln just 41 days after the second inaugural. It is one of the ironies of history that Abraham Lincoln, the inventor and statesman, could not have lived to see and to have directed the conversion of the many war-born inventions into devices for the peacetime uses of all mankind. Lincoln, the inventor, and Lincoln, the statesman, would have seen in this a vision come true—a nation strong and united; a nation dedicated to the principles of freedom.

In his writings, Abraham Lincoln, the statesman, fixed a course of freedom for this Nation and for all "other nations so conceived and so dedicated."

Denied in life the opportunity to see the Nation strong and physically united, Abraham Lincoln, the inventor, still had one last role to play.

The crowds which viewed his funeral car; the throngs which saw the train bearing the body of the beloved leader from Washington to Springfield, Ill., viewed all that was mortal of Lincoln in a setting new and strange to them. The car which carried the body of Abraham Lincoln on this last journey was the "Pioneer," the first luxury sleeping car built by George M. Pullman.[32] Appropriately, this car was drawn by a locomotive named the "Union."[33]

Lincoln, the inventor, would have been pleased to know that the railroads along the funeral route, in order to accommodate this new car, had to lay many miles of standard gage track, widen their bridges, and cut down their station platforms. This sad last journey supplied the impetus necessary to force standardization of tracks and equipment on the railroads of America.

---

[22] Starr, supra, p. 39.

[23] Quoted from p. 165, "The Life of Abraham Lincoln" by J. G. Holland; published by Gurdon Bill, Springfield, Mass., 1866.

[24] "The Collected Works of Lincoln"—Roy P. Basler—Rutgers University Press, 1953, New Brunswick, N.J., vol. III, p. 356.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid.

[30] "On Leaving the Communist Party," by Howard Fast, Saturday Review, Nov. 16, 1957, p. 15.

[31] Albert Schweitzer, "Decay," p. 16, reprinted p. 5. Albert Schweitzer, an Anthology, the Beacon Press, 1947.

[32] S. Giedion, Mechanization Takes Command—Oxford University Press, New York 1948, p. 453.

[33] Holland, supra, p. 530.

Thus, even in death, Abraham Lincoln, inventor, dreamer, prophet, and statesman, played an important part in achieving his vision of a Nation closely knit together.

Yes, the persistence of Lincoln, the inventor, has been rewarded. His beloved United States of America became united with the rails supplementing the rivers to join all of its parts into one great and indivisible Union. The little river boat of 1849 had been Lincoln's dream of one means to achieve this end. But the inventor of the boat became a prophet of the rails.

The eminent Lincoln scholar, the late James G. Randall, in "Mr. Lincoln," published last year, supports the picture of Abraham Lincoln as an inventor-statesman.

"Abraham Lincoln of Illinois," Randall says, "made it his business in the period preceding his presidential nomination to emphasize the peacetime pursuits of his country and to recover for his own day some of the Nation building stimulus of the fathers." "He was concerned with problems of slavery," Randall continues, "and with such a handling of those problems as would allay strife, as he hoped, but this was not all. He turned his thoughts also to discoveries and inventions, to the 'iron horse,' to 'hot-water power' harnessed to help mankind, to the '70 or 80 thousand words' of the English language to influences that tend to 'bring us together' and 'make us better acquainted,' to the harvest machine and the 'steam plow,' to the problem of 50 bushels of wheat to the acre."[34]

In passing, may I here express the hope that as the forthcoming Civil War Centennial is observed in Michigan, the Planning Commission proposed in pending Senate bill 1111 will focus public attention on these peacetime pursuits of Lincoln's day and emphasize the way in which the citizens of Michigan worked with the citizens of the other States to recover the Nation building stimulus of the fathers as the swords of the Civil War were beaten into plowshares of the peace which followed.

Today our science and technology, also born of a great war, have forced upon us new dimensions of time and space and wholly new concepts of energy. There were no sputniks in Lincoln's time; there were no intercontinental ballistic missiles; there were no atom bombs; there were no H-bombs. There were, however, grapeshot and shrapnel; explosives; gases and fire. The rifles of the Civil War had neither the range nor the awful destruction of a modern rifle. The cannons of that war had neither the range nor the frightfully destructive powers of a guided missile. The observation balloons and the crude electromagnetic telegraph of the Civil War were a far cry from the jet bombers, the space platforms, the radar, and the radio of the present age. Yet, as in all wars, all these things had this in common: they are used to kill young men; they are used to maim young men, and their use in war will solve no problems.

Today, we have the power, not only to kill and maim our enemies, but we can inflict our wrath on generations yet unborn. Upon all the generations of mankind yet to come we can inflict the terrible burdens of genes permanently damaged by the lethal rays of our atomic bombs. The inventors of the world have given us this power. With such power comes responsibility—the responsibility of world leadership.

If we are to learn but one lesson from our past history, it is that the gracious hand of an all-knowing providence has guided and directed the affairs of this great Nation through devoted and dedicated leaders, such as Abraham Lincoln, divinely inspired to accomplish, in the darkest moments of despair and gloom, the task of keeping faith in America and in keeping faith in those ideals which have made this country great.

Abraham Lincoln, the inventor; Abraham Lincoln, the statesman, has given us the pattern for such a leader. Michigan is proud today that Abraham Lincoln found here the inspiration for his invention of the river boat; the birthplace of the party which elected him to the Presidency; and the platform that day over 100 years ago, in Kalamazoo, from which emerged Abraham Lincoln, the statesman.

"God send us such men again."

Michigan and the Republican Convention of 1860

(By Lloyd C. Nyman)

The Republican convention of 1860 has found its place in the pages of history as a part of the written record of the life of Abraham Lincoln. As it was significant as a momentous event in his life, so it is significant in the history of our Nation. It was an important link in the dramatic events that preceded the Civil War. There is no doubt that the results of the convention added fuel to the flames that were smouldering in the South. It also marked the dedication of a young and powerful political party to a platform and a candidate opposed to the extension of slavery.

The role of the Michigan delegation in the Chicago convention became a minor one due to the simple fact that they had backed the wrong man. From the first they had supported William A. Seward of New York, and shared with their neighbor delegation from Wisconsin the distinction of unwavering loyalty to his cause until the last vote of the convention was cast.

The published historical events of the convention have been gathered by many authors from the Chicago newspaper files of that day, and it is doubtful if much more can be found to add to that part of the story. But, for the events relating to the Michigan Republicans, history and biography tell us little, and we must rely on the Michigan newspapers for the story of their activities. For the pungent editorials and colorful descriptions of the reporters of 100 years ago, we express our gratitude and our admiration.

A review of the editorials reveals the sharp political differences among the newspapers, and presumably, their readers. The Detroit Free Press, the Democratic paper, was solidly behind Stephen A. Douglas, the leading candidate for the Democratic nomination. The Detroit Tribune and the Detroit Daily Advertiser were pro-Seward, pro-Republican, and strongly antislavery. The Advertiser was also anti-Horace Greeley.

While it is not the intention of the writer to determine the "why" of the strong Seward sentiment in this State, mention should be made of contributing causes.

William A. Seward of New York was a popular political figure, commanding the respect of a large segment of the Republican voters. He had been Governor of New York, and was then serving in the Senate as an able statesman and adversary of the advocates of slavery. He was a leader of the "radical" antislavery group of Republicans, although he had alienated the more moderate Members by his statement that "there is a higher law than the Constitution." His campaign was in the hands of a clever political manipulator, Thurlow Weed, whose efforts to secure preconvention delegate commitments seemed to have brought Seward to the threshold of the nomination weeks before the convention.

In addition, it is pointed out by Thomas I. Starr that Zachariah Chandler was a strong factor in holding "Michigan in the Seward column at the Chicago convention of 1860, despite every influence that could be brought to bear upon its delegates by other western groups."

Chandler had spoken in Kalamazoo in 1856 when Lincoln had made his only appearance in the State, speaking in behalf of Fremont for President. "Particularly did Lincoln trample on the toes of Zachariah Chandler. * * * From that day onward Chandler never could speak or think of Lincoln except contemptuously."

Although Chandler's biographer reveals that he had cast one of the four Michigan votes for Lincoln for Vice President in 1856, Chandler, a powerful political force, apparently changed his mind, and his enmity of Lincoln may have been the strongest reason for the Seward strength in Michigan.

Abraham Lincoln was just emerging as a national figure. He was well-known in Illinois as a State legislator, a one term Congressman, and a skillful lawyer and public speaker. He had achieved prominence only 2 years before in the senatorial battle with Douglas. The celebrated "debates" were carried in newspapers across the land. Although Lincoln lost the election in the legislature (as was the procedure then), he carried the majority of the popular vote, and more importantly, brought his name before the country as the champion of the principle that slavery should not be extended to the new States and Territories.

If he nursed further political ambitions, he remained discreetly quiet. In November of 1859 he wrote in a letter, "I have enlisted for the permanent success of the Republican cause; and, for this object, I shall labor faithfully in the ranks, unless, as I think not probable, the judgment of the party shall assign me a different position."

In February of 1860, he traveled to New York and delivered the famous address at Cooper Union in which he established himself as a leader of the Republican Party, and gave the eastern politicians the impression of a man to be reckoned with.

Although his Illinois friends were urging him to declare himself on the nomination, and despite the clamor of the friendly newspapers in Illinois, he would not commit himself. He received two offers to manage his candidacy, but he replied to one offer—"Even my friends, so far as I know, have yet reached a point of staking any money on my chances of success."

But less than a month before the Chicago Convention he wrote to Senator Trumbull: "As you request, I will be perfectly frank. The taste is in my mouth a little."

The Republican State convention in Illinois named him as their unanimous choice as the "rail-splitter candidate," but even then he was cautious. He would admit only that "the Illinois delegation will be for me from the start, and no other delegation will."

But in Michigan Lincoln was not mentioned in the newspapers until a day or two before the convention. On May 2, 1860, the Republican State convention met in Detroit at 11 a.m. at Merrill Hall, situated at the northeast corner of Woodward and Jefferson, now the site of the City-County Building, and placed its faith in William H. Seward. The platform adopted that day read in part:

"ARTICLE 9

"*Resolved*, That William H. Seward, the tried and lifelong supporter of the Republican principles; the statesman of his time; eminently conservative and national in his views; commanding in private and in public life the men of all parties, North and South, is our first choice as a candidate for the Presidency; and under his leadership we shall enter the contest with an unvarying hope that a glorious triumph awaits us over the broken and unorganized factions of the Democracy.

"ARTICLE 10

"*Resolved*, That our delegates are hereby instructed to cast the vote of Michigan for

---

[34] Mr. Lincoln—James G. Randall edited by Richard N. Current, Dodd, Mead & Co. New York, 1957, p. 3.

him as a unit, and use all honorable means to secure his nomination."

The following delegates were selected to meet in Chicago:

First District: Delegate at large, Hon. Austin Blair, of Jackson; alternate, G. W. Lee, of Livingston. District delegates: J. G. Peterson, of Wayne; H. T. Backus, of Wayne; A. D. Crane, of Washtenaw; D. Cramer, alternate.

Second District: Delegate at large, W. W. Murphy, of Hillsdale; alternate, W. B. Montgomery. District delegates: Jesse J. Beeson, Cass; alternates, D. Larbelere; Wm. S. Stoughton, St. Joseph; alternate, N. D. Sheets, Branch.

Third District: Delegate at large, J. W. Ferry, of Ottawa; alternate, J. H. Andrews, of Van Buren. District delegate: Francis Quinn, of Berrien; alternates, A. H. Cary, Erastus Hussey, of Calhoun; Seth Sprague, Montcalm.

Fourth District: Delegate at large, J. J. St. Clair, Marquette; alternate, Morgan Bates, Traverse City. District delegates: D. C. Buckland, Oakland; A. T. Grossman, Geneseo; alternates, Michael T. C. Pressner, Saginaw; C. P. Parkhill, Shiawassee.

The platform commended the growth and vigor of the party, condemned the reckless expenditures of the administration in Washington, attacked the corruptness of the opposition, and significantly denounced the treachery involved in the admission of Kansas as a State.

A communication dated April 30 was read from the Sons of Michigan in Chicago, former residents of Michigan, advising that they had "secured for the use and accommodation of your delegates during the session of said convention, very desirable apartments in the Adams House of this city, one of our finest hotels * * * and tender to our Michigan friends who may be in attendance at that convention, their individual hospitality and personal service."

Advertisements in the Detroit papers announced that half-fare rates on the railroads be extended to those going to the Chicago convention. An item in the Detroit Daily Tribune of May 11 stated:

"A special train on the Grand Trunk Railroad will arrive in Detroit on Saturday morning with about 300 ladies and gentlemen, from the northern New England States, including the delegates to the convention. A special train over the Great Western Railway Monday noon will bring the remaining New England and New York delegation. A portion of the Michigan delegation will join them here.

"Mr. Thurlow Weed and ladies have engaged rooms at the Russell House for this Friday night. Persons going to Chicago from the interior will be accommodated by taking trains at 4:30 and 8 p.m. leaving Detroit."

On May 14 the Tribune noted:

"A special train over the Great Western Railway, which left Suspension Bridge (at Niagara Falls) at 6:05 this morning arrived at Windsor at 12:30. Portions of the distance were run at the rate of a mile a minute. Portions of the New York, California, Vermont, Connecticut, and Massachusetts delegations—and the whole accompanied by Gilmore's Band of Boston."

Among the delegates listed were Wm. Evarts, chairman of the New York delegation, the notorious Tom Hyer, ex-Governor King, ex-Governor Fish, and General Nye.

"The Detroit Light Guard Band played 'Hail Columbia' as the passengers passed from train to the ferryboat *Union* and the large body of Republicans who were on hand from this side of the river made the welkin ring with cheers of welcome. The passengers, while eating the splendid dinner prepared for them on the *Union* * * * were entertained by the Light Guard Band, and as soon as the steamer * * * under the command of Capt. Henry Abbot, neared the Michigan Central docks, the guns boomed and cheer after cheer went up for Wm. H. Seward and the delegations. As soon as the boat reached the dock, a rush was made for the Central train, composed of six large coaches, and all hands were seated. About two-thirds of the delegates wore Seward badges and a large silk banner, bearing upon its face a portrait of the New York statesman, was borne aloft by the accompanying New York delegation. The sight of the banner caused much enthusiasm. The feeling for Seward is very strong in all delegations. There being a few minutes to spare in the Michigan Central Depot, the Boston band played some national airs and Gen. Nye said a few words expressing the hope that he would on his return be able to stop at Detroit, and assist in ratifying the nomination of Seward. The train moved off at about 1 o'clock. The time to be made in about 8¼ hours."

The newspaper accounts of the next 2 days told of the excursion trains moving across Michigan at 40 miles an hour with demonstrations "at every stopping place." One train left Detroit with six coaches "densely crowded" and arrived in Chicago with twelve coaches. Several trains embarked from Detroit with four to six coaches. We can imagine the gay scenes as the trains, loaded with delegates and visitors, banners and flags festooning the engine and cars. "Cannons and banners met the train at all principal stations." Jackson, the birthplace of the Republican Party, must have put on a real show, with Austin Blair, chairman of the State delegation, and soon to become Governor, making a speech at the station.

"On the line of the road, the greatest excitement prevailed. In the cities, in the villages, in the hamlets, in the fields, and on the road, whether the train waited at a station or glided like a mete on by, waving handkerchiefs, swinging "tiles" (high silk hats) and shouting throats gave evidence of the deep sympathy universally felt in the cause and a Godspeed to the mission which it was bound. Those expressions were always responded to by the delegation."

From the Kalamazoo Telegraph a dispatch to the Tribune gave this interesting sidelight:

"Master Mechanic Sweet rode all the way to Marshall on the cowcatcher * * * and invited others to ride but no one accepted. * * * The train made five stops—Ann Arbor, Jackson, Kalamazoo, Niles and Calumet (Indiana). At Marshall the train changed engines at full speed. The Challenge raced ahead * * * the Racer started on * * * the train in pursuit of the new locomotive and without slacking speed the two were united without jar or confusion way to the west of Marshall. The same feat was also performed at Michigan City. * * * Tom Hyer raised $75.89 as a purse for the four engineers among the passengers."

The Detroit Daily Advertiser reported that the delegation from Hillsdale brought a curiosity made by J. D. Meers of that city, "a chair made from 24 different kinds of wood—one kind to represent each State represented in the Convention, and to be presented to the successful candidate for President."

The Niles Republican of May 19 related:

"The delegates from the New England States to the Chicago convention passed through this place on Monday en route to the Chicago Black Republican Convention. Speeches were made and cannon were fired. Massachusetts delegates were there full of treason abroad as at home. * * * The New York delegation wore Seward badges. Tom Hyer, the bully, accompanied the delegation to protect them. One of them got left by the cars and he had an opportunity to cool off in a strong anti-Seward city."

From further remarks, it can be deduced that the Niles Republican, despite its name, was a strong Democratic paper.

But the Detroit Tribune paused in its description of the gaiety to sound a sober note. "The common bond of the party is opposition to the extension of slavery in the Territories of the Union. * * * With five new Territories now awaiting organization and five more organized and still maintaining a territorial form of government, these are the strongest reasons presented why the Republican Party should be specially true to its early policy in relation to the exclusion of slavery from the Territories and the Union."

One of the rarities uncovered from the files of the Detroit Tribune was a Seward song, "On the excursion from Portland to Chicago by the Grand Trunk and Michigan Central Rail Roads" to the tune of the "Star Spangled Banner."

"The Great Bridge is finished, 'Victoria' its name,
So wood up the tender and let loose the brakes,
The engine is ready we start with the train,
From the gem of the sea to the queen of the lakes,
To Chicago we dash with the speed of the wind,
More swift than the bird with the dark raven wing,
Leaving ocean, and city, and mountain behind,
For the prairies that bloom in the verdure of spring.

"Then gather in strength then ye men of the North,
Light the watch fires of freedom from seashore to mountain,
From East, South, and West, go gallantly forth,
Up the Father of Waters, from outlet to fountain,
In liberty's voice shall the Nation rejoice,
As the sons follow right in their father's first choice,
And the white flag of freedom waves proudly and free,
From the queen of the lakes to the gem of the sea.

"The heart of the Nation beats full, free, and strong,
For freedom and justice let all men unite,
While the Empire State speaks in defiance of wrong,
And the Keystone stands firm in defense of the right.
No slavedriver's whip shall subdue the Northwest,
Or taskmaster's footsteps pollute the fresh sod,
For New England is ready to join with the West
In devotion to duty, to freedom, and God.

"If Seward or westward we following chase
Or Fremont or Fessenden lead in the race,
We pledge to the cause our thought and our days,
And follow our leader and honor the man.
Our triumph shall cease when New York's finest son,
The ablest of statesmen, the purest of men,
Shall proclaim to the Nation our victory won,
And peace and content must resume their mild reign.

"So harness the steam horse and fill up the car,
We sweep to Chicago, we annihilate space,
By the river of Erie, the distance so far,
Is spanned in 2 days of this wonderful race.
The sea and the West are united in one,
So fill up the firebox and lower the brakes,
We sweep to the West with the speed of the sun,
From the gem of the sea, to the queen of the lakes."

Whether this song was actually sung is doubtful, but certainly we can be sure that Seward's name was on every lip, and his name must have found its way into more than one melody of the day.

Thus did these trains and others bring 3,000 delegates and visitors from Michigan to Chicago—"all of the finest, and truest, and most earnest kind, and all Seward Republicans, from the crown of their heads to the soles of their feet, first, last and all the time."

Chicago was then a city of only 100,000 inhabitants, and a very young city at that. When Lincoln came to Illinois only 30 years before, the State was but sparsely inhabited, and Chicago but a village. Even in 1860 the State was just emerging from a pioneer prairie wilderness, and much of its land was still to be cultivated.

As the delegations arrived at the 12th Street depot in Chicago, they were greeted with a rousing reception. A Chicago paper reported that the "depots beat like great hearts with their living tides * * * a brilliant festival * * * an army with banners."

The accounts go on, "Michigan Avenue was finely illuminated, and as the train neared the 12th Street depot, a brilliant rocket announced it to the crowd. Another rocket streamed from Jackson Street; a cannon boomed across the basin; the bands struck up, and hearty cheers from the thousands of throats welcomed the train now nearing the depot. And the Wide Awakes (the Republican marching societies of young men) with gleaming torches, as well as the crowd, took up their line of march."

The delegates were escorted to the Adams House by the Seward men with torches blazing and bands beating a martial air. If there was any travel weariness in the bones of the delegates, it was soon washed away in the tide of the joyous welcome.

The 42 hotels and innumerable boarding houses in Chicago were jammed with upward of 30,000 visitors. One account stated that the population of the city doubled. The more than 1,000 saloons and grog shops did a land-office business, although one reporter claimed seriously, "We have yet to meet the first individual with any appearance of intoxication." Men slept in hotel lobbies, on pool tables, and wherever they might lay their weary heads.

The eve of the convention found Seward leading all the straw votes. Reports of polls taken on the trains indicated he was far ahead. Even the Democratic Detroit Free Press advised its readers that in the forthcoming "Black Republican Convention" "Seward will lead, Bates will come next, Mr. Chase will run third, Mr. Cameron next, and then Mr. Lincoln." But the possibility of Seward's nomination caused many to tremble, and the Detroit Tribune of May 17 editorialized that "the fact that a majority of the convention is in favor of Seward no one denies, but it is also certain that a majority of the convention look fearfully to the election in case he is nominated."

This was the crux of the situation. They must nominate a man who could carry the "doubtful" States—solidify the East with the Midwest—and satisfy the overwhelming ambitions of the various candidates and their powerful backers. But, interestingly enough, in the same paper in which the Tribune announced the nomination of Lincoln, it carried an item from its correspondent in Chicago that "Seward will receive 200 votes on the first ballot, and I do not think it possible to beat him, and yet there may be such a combination to do it."

The convention was held in the Wigwam, an auditorium expressly built for the purpose by a group of Chicago citizens and decorated by a committee of local ladies. It was a wooden structure, two stories high, and measured 100 by 160 feet. By our modern standards, this would be a small building, but for that day it was huge. But large or small, it was able to hold more than 10,000 people. The Detroit Daily Advertiser cites a very careful account of the number inside the building on the day of the nomination.

In the galleries	3,550
On the stand	980
Under the galleries	5,870
On the stairs	650
Within the railing	1,100
Total	12,150

And "outside the building stood an earnest impatient excited crowd of 12,000 men, making the whole number of persons in the Wigwam and around it nearly 24,000."

The building was designed to take advantage of a slope in the land by providing a series of landings on which the spectators stood "jammed in so tightly that they could scarcely move." At the rear of the hall was a wide platform on which were seated over 500 delegates and newsmen. Running around three sides of the building was a gallery so pitched that "from every part a perfect view of the stage could be had." Here sat the ladies with their gentlemen who had accompanied them, and although designed to seat 1,200, the preceding report indicates that it was extremely crowded. One reporter counted 5,800 in this section.

There were amusing tales of men bribing women to take them into the gallery to meet the rule that men were allowed only in the company of the ladies.

There was the story of the Irish washerwoman who, seeing the gentleman to his seat, retired with her bundle and her fee. However, when an Indian squaw who was selling moccasins outside was pressed into service, it was more than the doorkeepers could stand. They decided that she was no lady.

The committee of Chicago ladies decorated the interior of the Wigwam with wreaths of evergreen and other festoons. It is said that some of the evergreens were brought by one of Charles Mear's ships from his logging camp on the west coast of Michigan. Colossal statuary paintings on arched panels decorated the back of the stage. On the sides of the pillars supporting the roof were pictures of famous and distinguished men. The auditorium was lighted with gas which made it "brilliant in the extreme."

Telegraph was used for the first time at a national convention, and wires were extended into the building so that reports of the convention could be sent by an operator who was seated among the reporters on the stage.

On the opening day of the convention, the Advertiser reported that "20,000 people assembled around the Wigwam waiting for it to open and when it was thrown open the rush for the inside was like the breaking loose of a mighty river. In 3 minutes after the main entrances were thrown open, not less than five thousand people entered the hall, running and leaping like men fleeing from some great danger."

The Detroit Free Press stated that "the morning opens with much excitement. The streets are crowded, and several processions have been formed, headed by bands of music. By invitation of the Michigan delegation, the New York delegates and visitors gathered at the Adams House to march together to the Wigwam. The procession was a striking reature of the morning. They marched in sections of four, consisting of two New Yorkers and two Michigan men, numbering between 3,000 and 4,000, all wearing badges inscribed 'New York Republican Association,' 'Michigan Republican Association,' and with the name of Seward for President, a banner with Seward's likeness being carried at the head."

The proceedings of the first day, May 16, were typical of political conventions. Little transpired of interest unless it was the long debate concerning whether the convention should accept the invitation of the Chicago Board of Trade to entertain the delegates with an excursion ride on the lake, an event which would have interfered with the evening session.

The morning session of the second day, May 17, was taken up with the familiar reports of standing committees and the arguments pertaining to the seating of delegates. The slave-holding States were very nearly unseated, and the redoubtable Cassius Clay led the fight to see the border delegates take their place in the balloting. In the afternoon, the convention was aroused by the report of the platform committee which failed to include a reference to the Declaration of Independence. Battle-scarred old Joshua Giddings, of Ohio, a veteran of the antislavery fight, "took a walk" after an impassioned oration demanding that it be included. Then Delegate Curtis of New York made an eloquent speech that resulted in the insertion of the phrase "that all men are endowed with certain inalienable rights, etc.," and "venerable Giddings returned to the convention amid a great ovation."

When the platform was adopted there was a wild demonstration for about 10 or 15 minutes. When this had subsided, a motion was made to nominate a candidate for the presidency.

This, it is claimed, was the crucial point of the convention. If the nominations had proceeded, Seward would likely have been nominated on the first ballot. But, it was announced from the rostrum that the tallies necessary for recording the vote were not ready and that there would be a slight delay. At this point, a "voice" from somewhere was heard "moving that this convention adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning."

Thus was Abraham Lincoln saved for the great victory.

All that night the State delegations met in caucus. Judge David Davis, of Illinois, Lincoln's manager, strove with his coworkers to mend their political fences. Despite Lincoln's refusal to be bound by any deals, Senator Cameron, of Pennsylvania, was promised a Cabinet post. Other promises were made, and the doubtful States were one by one brought into the Lincoln camp. Horace Greeley, the famous New York publisher, shunned by the New York delegation and seated as a delegate by proxy from Oregon, of all places, worked among the Eastern States to defeat Seward. Many began to see now that Seward could not win the election without the support of the powerful Northern States. The cocksure attitude of the Seward crowd was becoming a deterrent. The fact that it had appeared that he had the nomination "sewed up" was working against him. Thurlow Weed and his cronies had done their work too well.

That night Ward Hill Lamon and Jesse Fell, of Illinois, arranged for the printing of a large number of additional tickets and distributed them to the Lincoln men. The next morning, May 18, they lined up early and entered the Wigwam and filled the visitors seats. When the Seward crowd marched gaily to the doors, they found that they could not get in. If Illinois could not outvote Seward, they were determined to outshout him. "A Chicagoan reputedly able to shout across Lake Michigan was enlisted to take a strategic position in the hall and to bellow lustily whenever he received the signal. Another man, equally endowed, was placed in another part of the hall."

The conventions of that day were saved the long and dreary nominating speeches that must be endured today. Following Seward's nomination, Mr. Judd of Illinois said simply, "I desire, on behalf of the delegation from Illinois to put in nomination as a candidate for President of the United States,

Abraham Lincoln of Illinois." The other candidates were duly nominated and equally brief seconding speeches made, including that of Austin Blair of Michigan in behalf of Seward.

But the short speeches did not limit the demonstrations. The applause grew into cheers, then prodigious shrieks, and then pandemonium. Murat Halstead reports it thus: "Hundreds of persons stopped their ears in pain. The shouting was absolutely frantic, shrill, and wild. No Commanches or panthers ever struck a higher note or gave a scream of more infernal intensity. Thousands of hats flew over the hall * * * when Lincoln's nomination was seconded, the uproar was beyond description. Imagine all the hogs ever slaughtered in Cincinnati giving their death squeals together, and a score of big steam whistles going together, and you conceive something of the same nature. The Lincoln boys * * * took deep breaths all around and gave a concentrated shriek that was positively awful, and accompanied it with stamping that made every plank and pillar in the building quiver."

Then came the rollcall—233 votes out of a possible 465 were necessary for a choice. Seward received 173½, Lincoln 102, Cameron of Pennsylvania 50½, Chase 49, and "others scattering." Michigan cast its 12 votes for Seward.

Proceeding to the second ballot, Cameron withdrew. Seward polled 184½, a gain of 11 votes, but Lincoln tallied 181, a gain of 79.

As the third ballot began, the crowd became silent, and many watched their own tally sheets as the voting progressed. When every vote was counted, Seward had 180, but Lincoln polled 231½, only one and a half votes shy of nomination.

Joseph Medill of Chicago who had seated himself in the Ohio delegation, leaned over to whisper to David Cartter, chairman of the Ohioans: "If you can throw the Ohio delegation to Lincoln, Chase can have anything he wants." Cartter, a stammerer, bounded up excitedly: "I I a-arise, Mr. Chairman, to a-announce the ch-change of f-four votes from Mr. Ch-Chase to Mr. L-L-Lincoln."

The Chicago Tribune reported: "Deafening roar of stentorian applause arose from the immense multitude such as had never been equalled on the American Continent nor since the day that the walls of Jericho were blown down." A signal was given to the men on the roof, and the news was given to the crowd outside. A cannon fired a salute, and the crowd of 20,000 on the street greeted the news with a roar that could be heard above the din inside.

The Lincoln men were jubilant. The Seward adherants were crushed. But as the States, one by one, rushed to join the winning side, Mr. Evarts of New York moved that the nomination be made unanimous. Carl Schurz of Wisconsin and Austin Blair of Michigan joined in seconding the motion, and Blair made a "touching and effective speech."

"Like my friend who has just taken his seat (Schurz) the State of Michigan from first to last, has cast her vote for the great statesman of New York. She has nothing to take back. She has not sent me forward to worship the rising sun, but she has put me forward to say that, at your behest here today, she lays down her first, best beloved candidate to take up yours, with some beating of the heart, with some quivering in the veins (much applause) but she does not fear that the fame of Seward will suffer, for she knows that his fame is a portion of the history of the American Nation; it will be written and read, and beloved long after the temporary excitement of this day has passed away. We stand by him still. We have followed him with a single eye and with unwavering faith in times past. We marshal now behind him in the grand column which shall go out to battle of Abram (sic) Lincoln of Illinois. Mark you, what has obtained today will obtain in November next.

Lincoln will be elected by the people. We say of our candidate, God bless his magnanimous soul. [Tremendous applause.] I promise you that in the State of Michigan, which I have the honor to represent, where the Republican Party from the days of its organization to this hour never suffered a single defeat, we will give you for the gallant son of Illinois, and glorious standard bearer of the West, a round 25,000 majority."

In Detroit the Democratic Free Press commented that all the black Republicans were down in the mouth at the nomination of a man who was beaten by Douglas and "whose reputation as a beaten candidate would not desert him for years."

The Republican Detroit Daily Advertiser stated "that it took by surprise the majority of citizens * * * who had confidently expected the nomination of Seward." But it added that "the wisdom of the choice was readily seen and acknowledged. As soon as the nomination of Mr. Lincoln was confirmed by subsequent dispatches, without waiting for a choice for candidate for the Vice President, extensive preparations were made for celebrating the event in an appropriate manner."

"In less than a half an hour after the reception of the news, the two brass guns of the Frontier Guards had been rolled out on the Campus Martius, and each had been furnished with 50 full cartridges. Later in the evening the whole front of the Advertiser office was brilliantly illuminated and from a central window hung a banner with the words 'Lincoln and Hamlin' in large poster type, inscribed on it. A bonfire was started in the street, just in front of the office. The whole proceedings last night were terminated with one tremendous hurrah for Lincoln and Hamlin."

Around the State there were celebrations and mixed emotions. Owosso fired 100 guns, Kalamazoo 50 guns, and Pontiac, presumably less enchanted or short of powder, fired 33 salutes.

The returning delegations from Michigan met with mixed receptions. The Niles Republican cites the reception of Delegate Francis Quinn:

"Longer faces were never seen on Main Street. 'Abominable,' said one. 'Seward has been beaten by some contemptible trick,' said another. Finally after the elapse of a day or two, Quinn arrived from Chicago. He endeavored to rally the disappointed. He went around to get a subscription of powder. Some of them refused to give a cent. But enough was raised to make about 5 small charges, and handbills appeared announcing there would be a grand ratification meeting on Main Street in front of the Inquirer office. Saturday evening came. A large number of Democrats assembled, as it was in front of where they were to hold a meeting to nominate delegates to the county convention, and several Republicans and numerous boys. There being so few present, it was resolved that they adjourn to Kellogg's Hall. Up they went some one hundred and fifty to hear what excuse Mr. Quinn had to give for the defeat of Seward."

Thos. Starr notes: "So bitter was the anti-Lincoln feeling in Michigan, sponsored by Chandler, that the special train of the Massachusetts delegation to that convention, whose leader, John A. Andrew, won the Wigwam delegates to Lincoln on the third ballot, was all but mobbed at Detroit on its return trip over the Michigan Central Railroad."

In the South, the drums of war were heard more clearly. The gauntlet had been thrown down. The "house was now dividing," and the issue would soon be drawn whether it would be "all one thing or all the other."

In Springfield, Abe Lincoln had walked from home the morning of the nomination to the public square. He visited the office of a friend just returned from the convention and listened to his account of the early proceedings. Later, with one of his friends from the Illinois Journal, he tried to pass the time away at the bowling alley, but the alleys were all busy. They tried to play billiards, but the tables were all engaged. They then went to the newspaper office to hear the reports of the balloting. Shortly before noon, the wire came announcing a great victory. "We did it, glory to God," wired Delegate Knapp. Lincoln shook hands all around and then said:

"There's a little woman over yonder on Eighth Street who is deeply interested in the news. I will carry it to her."

And he might have pondered on the prophetic words of the invocation on that historic day of the convention:

"O, we entreat Thee, that at some future but not distant day, the evils which now invest the body politic, shall not only have been arrested in its progress, but wholly eradicated from the system."

And we might well ponder the concluding sentence: "And may the pen of the historian trace an intimate connection between that glorious consummation and the transaction of the convention."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Roy P. Basler, editor, "The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln."

William E. Barton, "The Life of Abraham Lincoln," volume 1, Indianapolis, 1925, pages 425–435.

Murat Halstead, "Caucuses of 1860," Columbus, Ohio, 1860.

Ward Hill Lamon, "The Life of Abraham Lincoln," Boston, 1872, pages 447–453.

John G. Nicolay, "A Short Life of Abraham Lincoln," New York, 1911, pages 144–151.

John G. Nicolay, and John Hay, "Abraham Lincoln, a History," New York, 1890, volume 2, chapter 15, pages 255–278.

Addison G. Proctor, "Lincoln and the Convention of 1860," the Chicago Historical Society, 1918.

P. Orman Ray, "The Convention That Nominated Lincoln," the Chicago Historical Society, 1916.

Carl Sandburg, "Abraham Lincoln, the Prairie Years," New York, 1926, volume 2, pages 339–352.

Carl Schurz, "The Reminiscences of Carl Schurz, volume 2, New York, 1907, pages 173–188.

Thomas I. Starr, "Lincoln's Kalamazoo Address," Detroit, 1941, pages 30–31.

Benjamin Thomas, "Abraham Lincoln," New York, 1952, pages 210–213.

NEWSPAPERS

Detroit Free Press, 1860.

Detroit Daily Advertiser, 1860.

Detroit Tribune, 1860.

The above found in the files of the Burton Historical Collections, Detroit, Mich. Dr. James Babcock, chief.

Kalamazoo Telegraph, 1860, from the files of the Kalamazoo Public Museum, Alevis A. Praus, director.

Niles Republican, 1860, from the files of the Niles Public Library, courtesy of Mrs. Janet H. Evart, curator, Fort St. Joseph Museum.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. I want to take just a moment to congratulate and commend all who have taken part in this commemoration. I particularly wish to pay my respects to my friend from Iowa, who has rendered this tribute, for his part in presenting such a beautiful and moving

tribute to Abraham Lincoln, a great Republican and a great American.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the best accounts I have read of Lincoln's nomination in 1860 is the article which Philip Van Doren Stern has written for the NEA Service and which appeared in the Iowa City (Iowa) Press Citizen recently.

Under permission granted to me, Mr. Speaker, I include the article:

CANNONS FIRED IN JOY AS LINCOLN NOMINATED 100 YEARS AGO

(By Philip Van Doren Stern)

When the Democratic National Convention met at Charleston, S.C., in the spring of 1860, the party was so strong that anyone it nominated for the Presidency was automatically elected.

Lincoln's lifelong rival, Stephen A. Douglas, was the obvious favorite. Most people, including Lincoln, thought Douglas would surely be the next Preseident. But Douglas had lost the support of the South, and the Buchanan administration opposed him. The whole political picture changed overnight when the Democratic convention, after dragging on for nearly 2 weeks, adjourned without agreeing upon a nomination.

The historically impregnable party split into dissident groups to hold three separate conventions to nominate three different candidates, making it difficult for any one of them to be elected. The new Republican Party, which had entered the national scene only 4 years before, now had a good chance to elect a President.

The obvious Republican candidate was William H. Seward, former Governor of New York, U.S. Senator, and distinguished member of the bar. There were other possibilities—Chase, of Ohio, Bates, of Missouri, Cameron, of Pennsylvania, and many more. Lincoln was among them, but despite the name he had made for himself with Cooper Union speech and the tour of New England that followed, he was far down on the list although he did admit to a friend that "the taste (for the presidency) is in my mouth a little." When he wrote those words, he knew the Democrats were in trouble.

Something happened then that caught the imagination of the public. Richard James Oglesby, who was to become a Civil War general and the Governor of Illinois, knew John Hanks, cousin of Lincoln's dead mother, Nancy Hanks. John Hanks had seen Lincoln grow up in Indiana and had helped him cut fence rails when the family moved to Illinois in 1830. Oglesby sought him out, and the two men made a trip to a clearing near Decatur to get a few rails from the 30-year-old fence.

On May 9, at the Republican State convention in Decatur, John Hanks, a lifelong Democrat—made a sensation by carrying two of the original Lincoln rails into the hall. Lincoln was there, and he immediately became the "rail-splitter" candidate. The name stuck and became popular.

Being nominated by the Illinois State Republican convention helped, but a long, hard struggle was to be expected at the Chicago national convention on May 16—Seward's 59th birthday.

A huge wooden structure, holding 10,000 people and called the Wigwam, had been built for the convention. To it streamed thousands of visitors, most of whom were unable to get inside the building.

It was a colorful occasion, even more colorful than a presidential convention is today. And since everyone knew that the man chosen might very well become the first Republican President, there was a tense air of expectancy.

The convention was quickly organized; then a platform denying the right to extend slavery to the territories was adopted. On the third day, May 18, the real business of picking a candidate began.

That morning a thousand of Seward's followers marched to the Wigwam led by a swaggering military band. In the big hall Evarts of New York presented Seward's name; Judd of Illinois named Lincoln; other States followed with their favorite sons.

Only Seward and Lincoln got loud applause. When their names were seconded, the applause and cheering rose to a tremendous crescendo. People threw hats and handkerchiefs into the air as the rival backers tried to outshout each other. Then, according to an eyewitness, a Lincoln supporter, "Henry Lane of Indiana leaped upon a table, and, swinging hat and cane, performed like an acrobat." He shouted, too, but his voice could not be heard in that mighty uproar.

After that wild outburst, the convention settled down to voting. The first poll gave Seward 173½ votes; Lincoln 102; with the others trailing. Needed for the nomination: 233 out of 465 votes.

A second ballot was taken. Lincoln gained New Hampshire and Vermont, then Pennsylvania. These gave him 181 votes against Seward's 184.

On the third and final ballot Lincoln ran up to 231½ with only 1½ needed to win. Cartter of Ohio rose to cast four of his State's votes, and the crowd suddenly became quiet. Cartter was known for his stutter, and he stuttered as he spoke:

"I rise—Mr. Chairman—to announce the change of four votes of Ohio from Mr. Chase—to—Mr. Lincoln."

The silence held for a brief moment, then the crowd roared out. Someone signaled to a man stationed on the roof with a signal cannon, yelling to him:

"Fire the salute. Abe Lincoln is nominated."

The cannon told thousands of people outside what had happened, and the Wigwam was suddenly surrounded by a sea of noise. The roar of the crowd was punctuated by the resounding boom of exploding gunpowder as the cannon was fired, reloaded, and fired again and again.

The smell of gunpowder drifted down to the people outside; it came in through the open doors of the Wigwam, and hung heavily in the spring air.

The acrid odor was soon to become familiar to many of the young men who were shouting their heads off in Chicago that day. And they would hear the sound of cannon again. Sumter was less than a year away.

Mr. Speaker, adding to the significance of this event is an address on Abraham Lincoln which was made last year by Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, president of Howard University. The address was made before the Michigan Legislature as part of the sesquicentennial observance of Lincoln's birth and it certainly has a place among the words which have been spoken today. Under unanimous consent I include it in the RECORD as a part of these proceedings, as follows:

AN ADDRESS ON ABRAHAM LINCOLN BY DR. MORDECAI W. JOHNSON, PRESIDENT OF HOWARD UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D.C., BEFORE JOINT CONVENTION OF THE MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE, FEBRUARY 12, 1959

(Foreword by Hon. Louis C. Cramton, Representative from Lapeer County: Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, distinguished guests, members of the senate and house of representatives of Michigan, through this joint session of the senate and house of representatives of the State of Michigan, which in 1861–65 gave such loyal and heroic support to Abraham Lincoln in his wise and courageous leadership in our Nation's greatest crisis, in his demonstration of the capacity of this Nation to rule itself, joins with the Nation and the wide world today in paying tribute to him as the exponent of real democracy, the worldwide symbol for human freedom. It was 150 years ago today that this great leader was born. On this great occasion we are highly privileged to have with us to voice the day's message, Dr. Mordecai Johnson, president of Howard University, Washington, D.C., a great institution, with worldwide influence; himself a splendid example of the rich heritage of human capacity and vision his race has brought to the world since Abraham Lincoln's leadership made this Nation actually a nation of free men. It is my privilege to present to you my very generous friend, Dr. Mordecai Johnson, who will give to us today's address.)

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cramton, distinguished members of the Senate and House of the great State of Michigan, I am deeply grateful to you for the privilege which you give me today of joining you in meditative appreciation of our great leader, Abraham Lincoln—the man whose name is the greatest of all names connected with popular government in the history of the world. I have come to you today, bearing in my heart a deep sense of personal indebtedness to this man, for I am a child of slaves. My father was a slave and my mother was born a slave. Both of them were set free by Abraham Lincoln. Along with the deep sense of debt which I bear in my heart toward him is another which is akin to it, namely, the sense of debt which I bear toward you and for your kindred in this State who, under the leadership of Abraham Lincoln, made so very large an investment of devotion and suffering in that cause which made it possible for us to be free. I know that if that humble minority to which I belong could be aware that I am here today they would want me to tell you that they will never forget these things. They will remember the name of Abraham Lincoln and the citizens of these free States as long as they live, and they will cherish these revered memories and hand them down to their children and their children's children until the end of time.

I want to thank the members of this senate and house because your interest in this minority is still vibrantly alive. In recent years you have responded in a wonderful manner to the leadership of the Honorable Louis C. Cramton in the house, by crossing all party lines to establish a Fair Employment Practices Act in this State, which undertakes to provide an open door of economic opportunity for every citizen, regardless of his race, creed, color, or national origin. Several years ago I had the privilege of coming here to attend a banquet which was given in honor of Mr. Cramton, at which time outstanding Members of this body and your distinguished Governor heaped honors upon him for his diligent and unwearying devotion to the passage of this Fair Employment Practices Act and for the outstanding character of his devotion to the public good. My heart throbbed with joy at this banquet, for I have known and loved Mr. Cramton for 32 years. He is the best living example of Abraham Lincoln whom I know of in this world.

In undertaking to talk with you about Abraham Lincoln today I must approach him from that angle of his life which interests me most deeply. I am a teacher of young men and women. Among my graduates who give me greatest pride are a few who have become distinguished servants of humanity in the field of the public life. I am always searching for those qualities in men of distinction which have proved effective in the public life, hoping to be able to speak with my students about those qualities in such wise as to cause them to

study and to reflect upon them, with the purpose of making these qualities a part of the basic ingredients of their lives. Of all the men in the public life of the world who have deeply impressed me in this respect, Abraham Lincoln is one who grows on my affections year by year. The qualities of his heart and mind are remarkable, beyond measure, in their fitness and power to sustain and to transform the institutions of the democratic public life. Now if you will remember that this is a school teacher and a child of slaves talking with you, having perhaps a bigger message in his heart than he is able fully to articulate, you will try to think with me as I speak. In this way your own intuitions will supplement what I have to say and may turn an otherwise stumbling effort into a matter of power.

For the purposes of our mediation I want to divide the life of Abraham Lincoln into three periods. The first period, from 1809 to 1854, I would call the period of preparation during which his great personal powers were in the making. The second period, from 1854 to 1860, I would call the period of political creation, in which, under great difficulties, he nourished and brought to leadership in the Nation a political vehicle of decisive power. The third period, from 1861 to 1865, the period of victorious achievement, during which, under the pressure of violence, suffering, and death he obtained the great political ends for which the world reveres him—the emancipation of the slaves and the preservation of the Union.

THE FIRST PERIOD OF LINCOLN'S LIFE 1809–54

The great work of emancipating the slaves and the preservation of the Union, for which Abraham Lincoln will be remembered throughout the ages, was done in the last of the three periods from 1861–65, and the decisive political events preceding this great work were brought to pass in the period from 1854 to 1860. It has been customary to pass over this first period of 45 years in a cursory manner as if it were really of very little importance. It appears that Abraham Lincoln himself rather thought of it in this way. He was a man who spent very little time thinking about the days of his boyhood and early manhood. When people tried to make a great deal of it, he said, "Why, it is a great folly to attempt to make anything out of me or my early life. It can all be condensed into a single sentence, and that sentence you will find in Gray's Elegy: "The short and simple annals of the poor." When an effort was made, just before he became President of the United States, to have him speak about this period at great length, he did consent one time to sum it up in 500 words. He wrote these words as though his real life had begun in 1854. He spoke of the limited heritage which he received from his parents. His father and mother were poor. He was born in a log cabin and lived under very crude conditions in frontier communities of Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois where there were many animals and few men. His father was a man of little learning, and in his own boyhood he had little chance for schooling. There was only a very simple three-R school with very poor teachers available, and he was able to get only about 12 months of schooling in that. He confessed that when he was about 21 years of age he did not know very much, and that thereafter he never had a chance to learn, except by his own efforts. He reviewed the two or three little jobs he had. He mentions with some pride and joy his experience as a captain in the Black Hawk War. He calls very brief attention to his three terms in the State legislature and his one term in Congress, speaking of them as if these terms of office had yielded very little satisfaction, because he left them both for the practice of law in the small towns and country circuits, not presenting himself again for either State or national office. He described himself modestly as a man 6 feet 4 inches tall, but he did not tell you that he was also a gangling, loose-jointed, long-legged man, with long arms and big hands, a great big head, with serious lines in his face, deep and melancholy. He probably wore his clothes as if his trousers were unpressed and coat hanging loose, as long as he lived. He was just an ordinary man. One of those who knew him well says, lately, that the father of his wife spoke of him with derogation as being a man of "the poor white trash" whom he did not want his daughter to marry. In fact, that is the way he would have been classified if he had lived in Virginia whence his father and mother came.

But there was a whole lot more to the life of Abraham Lincoln in those first 45 years than he himself took time to mention. For in those 45 years this man developed by his own efforts one of the most powerful groups of qualifications for political leadership ever to be found in history. These are the qualities which made him the power that he was from 1854 to 1861, when he became President of the United States, and which led him in the years 1861 to 1865 to become the Emancipator of the slaves and the preserver of the Union.

A VIVID AND POWERFUL ETHICAL DISPOSITION

Now what are those qualities? First of all, Abraham Lincoln developed in those early years a vivid and powerful ethical disposition which he made radically applicable to every human being whom he touched—whatever his race, color, creed, sex, or national origin—and he extended it even to animals. He was especially sensitive in the presence of cruelty, either to men or animals, and often found it impossible to pass by an animal in distress.

This was no quality merely given to him. Maybe the greatest part—the instinctive part—was given to him, but he cultivated the rest of it deliberately and thoughtfully. He had the same experience that most of us have when we pass by a man or an animal suffering from cruelty or distress. He got a message from his heart which told him: "This is your kinsman and he is hurt. Are you going to help him?" Again and again in his life he tried to pass by, but again and again he would come back deliberately, thoughtfully, and help that man or help that animal. He kept this up constantly until it became an habitual disposition of his life, and it never weakened until the day he died. He was never able to look on cruelty complacently. He was never able to look at men and women who suffered from any unjust cause without feeling identified with them. This is where he got his great conviction that slavery was wrong, that the cruelty connected with slavery was wrong, that a cruel thing like this had no business to exist on this earth, and that somehow or other it ought to be done away with. There is no place on record where he ever said anything different from that. He said it over and over again, because it was a considered judgment, arising from the heart, confirmed by the reflections of deliberate intelligence and nourished as a part of his life.

A THOROUGH ACCEPTANCE OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

In the second place, Abraham Lincoln was a man who had a thorough grasp of the meaning of the Declaration of Independence, and he accepted the radically transitive universal ethics of that Declaration of Independence with all his heart. I do not mean merely that he accepted it intellectually. He accepted it as a part of his very being. Abraham Lincoln had one of the most precious habits that a man can have in this world—the habit of prolonged aloneness in meditation and in thought. Being impressed by the language of the Declaration of Independence, for example, he would go off with it by himself, or he would sit alone by the fire when there was no one at home but himself or when other people were sleeping. Then, wrapping his long legs around the chair and putting his arms on the back of the chair, he would read the words alone, asking himself, "Now, just what was it that these men had in mind when they wrote these words?" Of all the politically significant words written on paper, these were the most precious to him:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter it or to abolish it, and to institute a new government."

These words he turned over and over in his mind until the spirit of them possessed him through and through, and until he felt the electric possibilities of them in all the aspects of his being—intellectual, moral, and spiritual. Of these words he said, "I have never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but I hope to the world, for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weight would be lifted from the shoulders of all men."

Whenever you hear him speak about "the Union" this is what he is talking about. He is never talking merely about the physical union of men in the physical territory of the United States. He is talking about that Union "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal"—the most hopeful community of life, the most powerful community of life, the most creative community of life in the world. And when he said that, above all things, he wished to preserve the Union, this is what he meant. He felt that these words of the Declaration of Independence were the electric cord sweeping through the entire Declaration of Independence, the foundation and inspiration of the Constitution of the United States, and that there was no cruelty, no evil, no neglect of human rights or human welfare that could long endure in the presence of their moving and cleansing power.

A MASTERFUL POWER OF COMMUNICATION

In the third place, Abraham Lincoln acquired in early life a masterful power of communication. In all the history of public political speech there is no man in this country who ever had a greater power than Abraham Lincoln. It was an intellectual power, because he was a thoughtful man who gathered his facts and arranged his arguments with great care. He carefully studied grammar. He studied the language of the Bible and pondered it and absorbed it in his system. He studied mathematics, not in order that he might become a mathematician, but that he might reason precisely, consecutively, and with a clear and powerful relatedness. But there was something more than intellectual power in his speaking. There was a moral power and often persuasive moral beauty in what he said. He respected and loved the people to whom he was speaking. He believed in the capacity of the most ordinary man to understand the most profound ethical and political truths, if he needed them for his life. And when he spoke to such men he was not making an oration of words. He was speaking what he deeply believed. He was speaking directly and simply as if the fate of the World were depending upon his being understood.

Sometimes when he spoke his rugged, melancholy face would light up like a lamp and throw a glow of persuasive beauty to the very ends of the auditorium. People loved him, believed in him, flocked to him, because he bought their allegiance with the gold of sincerity and clarity that came to them from a pure heart.

HABITUALLY SIMPLE AND TRUTHFUL IN INDIVIDUAL RELATIONS

Another of his great qualities—the fourth—was his habituation of himself in his actions to simple and truthful relationships with individual human beings. You can see this nowhere better than in his practice of the law. If a client had a crooked or an unjust case, he would not take it if he knew it beforehand. If he took the case and found out afterwards that the cause was crooked or unjust, he would do everything consistent with the law to get out of it. He was helpless to use his best powers in the presence of the necessity to defend cruelty or crookedness. But if you had an honest case, very often the first thing he would try to do was to see whether he could adjust it without going into court, and especially if the case involved cruelty and injustice, he would put his whole life and soul into that case. He would address himself to the jury in simple, direct, and unadorned speech, and when he came to the cruelty involved, his language would sometimes burn with a fire of indignation as if to scorch the very ground on which he stood. And when he had finished, what did he charge you? Just about what it would take to buy the groceries and to take care of the most ordinary expenses of living. He did not take your case for the accumulation of money. He took it for the joy of setting things right, for the privilege of being vehicular toward the establishment of justice.

A SENSE OF HAVING GREAT UNSPENT POWER

Along toward the end of this preparatory period of his life, the fifth quality developed within him, which is remarkable to think about: he developed a sense of having great unspent power and a sense of melancholy distress because that power in him had never had a chance to be used up fully in some great cause. He walked about conscious of that power and with the feeling that some day the occasion would arise when he would use it for everything that he had in him. He respected that occasion and looked toward it, afar off, with melancholy hope, and because he respected that far off occasion, he never would sell his powers cheaply. He would not sell them for money. He was a poor man and the powers he had could have made him a great corporation lawyer and could have gotten him riches quickly, if he had gone to the big city; but he knew that what he had was too precious for money and he would not sell it so. He would not sell it either in order to cheat people out of their votes. In the first election in which he ever sought office, he said simply, "I am humble Abraham Lincoln. I have been solicited by my friends to become a candidate for the legislature. My politics are short and sweet. I am in favor of a national bank. I am in favor of the internal improvement system and a high protective tariff. These are my sentiments. If elected, I shall be thankful, if not it will be the same." And although he went to the State capital three times and to Congress once, as the elected representative of the people, he quit them both with very great dissatisfaction of heart, because he was occupying political power and moving about among men who accepted political power without having any great cause at stake. For him to be in political office with no great cause to use up his powers, was too cheap an occupation. He did not like it. He did not want it. He stayed at home, nourishing his powers, waiting for a great and worthy day to come.

Now I want to suggest that here in this preparatory period of his life Abraham Lincoln developed five of the greatest possible human qualities: (1) A vivid and powerful ethical disposition, livingly applied to every type of human being, urging him to respect them, to deal truthfully with them and to allow his compassion to go out to them whenever they were cruelly treated or left alone with struggles that they could not endure; (2) a wholehearted devotion to the Declaration of Independence, so that the city of justice which he saw when he read it lived in his mind's eye like a city built by God. He longed to be of great use to that city, and would rather have died than to have betrayed it; (3) remarkable powers of communication: simple and direct speech to people whom he loved, unadorned and never mixed with deceit; the marshaling of facts accurately and honorably, the drawing of conclusions with inexorable logic; reverent of truth, and at times throbbing with a passionate devotion to justice which caused his face to radiate with hope and expectancy; (4) a sustained habit of simplicity and truthfulness in his everyday actions affecting ordinary people. When he practiced law in a circuit of 14 different counties, he met and served a multitude of men whose names were without celebrity of any kind. He saluted them with courtesy, served them truthfully and honorably, loved them and enjoyed their trust. They called him "Honest Abe" and knew that he was a man who was utterly reliable, who when he gave his word meant what he said and would do it, whatever it cost him in time or effort or money; (5) a great sense of power residing in him—intellectual power, moral power, spiritual power locked up with an immense energy of devotion—but power waiting for a great and worthy occasion of use, not to be sold cheaply, not to be used for the heaping up of money, nor merely to buy high office. There was only one piece of goods he wanted most eagerly to buy—a great cause that would consume his powers as a great fire consumes wood. That cause came to him in 1854 when the Missouri Compromise was repealed. The whole country was shocked with a sense of crises that swept like wildfire into every State of the North and it swept into the heart of Abraham Lincoln. He knew that his hour had come. At once he laid aside everything and straightway went where he could place himself at the disposal of a powerful inward necessity to strengthen the people in this crisis, for the life and death struggle between slavery and the Union which he loved.

SECOND PERIOD OF LINCOLN'S LIFE—1854–60

One who reads the history of the second period of Abraham Lincoln's life, from 1854 to 1860 will find him giving an unparalleled devotion to political action. First of all, he made a decisive change in party allegiance. He was a Whig, but he saw that the struggle with slavery required something better than the split allegiance of Whiggism. He looked at the Democrat Party and saw that it had kneeled beyond recovery to the slave system. He looked at the possibility of coalition across the Whig and Democrat lines, and he saw the weakest, the most flabby, the most untrustworthy combinations of men on the basis of self-interest, and his heart repudiated what he saw. He looked around again and saw a new party, with only 120,000 votes over the entire Nation, but it had a program. It said in effect: "Our program has just two parts. One: slavery is wrong; two: we are going to stop it. We are going to leave it in the States where it is already established, because the Constitution provides that it has a right to be there, but we are going to shut the door to all the western territories, and not a step in that direction will it be allowed to advance." Abraham Lincoln liked that program. It was simple. It was unequivocal. It corresponded to the way he felt about slavery, corresponded to what he thought about the preservation of the Union. It constituted a cause to which he could devote all his powers. And this he unreservedly did.

SINGLE-MINDED AND IMMEASURABLE POLITICAL DEVOTION

Lincoln was not blind. He knew that it would normally take over two million votes to bring a party to national power in this country, but the difference between 120,000 votes and 2 million votes was not big enough to overawe him. He felt and knew that he was a man of power and that with the help of God he and his earnest associates, with single-mindedness devotion, could make up that difference. This capacity for single-minded and immeasurable devotion Abraham Lincoln most certainly had. In the history of parties in this country there is nowhere a record of devotion superior to that which this man Lincoln put into the building of the Republican Party between the years 1854 and 1860. In this undertaking he subordinated entirely his personal ambition to hold political office. He saw with clear eyes that unless a party devoting its whole life unequivocally to the restriction of the growth of the slave system and the deliverance of the Union from the danger of dominance by that system, could be brought to effective power, no office would be fit to have. And so when public office was set before him again and again he would not take it. "I have a duty to perform," he thought, "I must do everything in my power to put this party into shape to come to power. This is the power that alone can be decisive". Three times in 2 years he sacrificed his own personal ambition to put somebody else ahead of him because he believed it to be good for the party.

UTMOST USE OF HIS POWERS OF COMMUNICATION

He put all of his remarkable powers of communication at the disposal of his cause. He sought out and obtained direct confrontation with Douglas, the greatest proponent of slavery, and conducted a series of debates with him, which turned out to be one of the most determinative debates ever carried on in the world. He took the program of the Republican Party and expounded it from every helpful angle that deep moral conviction and logic could conceive; he defended it from every angle that sincerity and logic could command, until by his convictions and his thought he had established it in an impregnable and persuasive position.

When he began this series of debates and speeches in the Illinois senatorial campaign in 1858 he was scarcely known outside of Illinois. When he had completed them, the most intelligent and resourceful men on the eastern seaboard sent for this man of the one-horse towns and crowded Cooper Union in New York to hear him. If ever there were any of us who felt contemptuous toward a man of no university education—toward a poor man of no cultural family background and no university education—let us read again this speech produced by one who was called "the poor white trash." Let us read again his powerful putting together of historic facts; let us read again the masterful analysis of the arguments of the supporters of the slave system; let us observe again the intellectual power and moral sagacity with which he reduced the whole thesis of the slave masters to a demand that slavery henceforth be considered not only lawful but right. Then let us behold this gangling awkward son of the frontier, ignited from the depths of his being by moral conviction about the wrongness of slavery and its fateful danger to the Union,

and with his rude melancholy face glowing with persuasive light, holding this great audience of intelligent and resourceful New Yorkers and easterners in all but breathless silence, as he commandingly called them to put aside everything and support this Republican movement with all their hearts to halt the onward march of this wrong and evil thing and to put it in a place where it could no longer imperil the life of the Union. Here indeed, once again from the humblest depths of life, there had come a man of intellectual, moral, and spiritual power of the highest significance for all mankind.

AN UNCANNY SENSE OF STRATEGY

There is just one more quality appearing in this second period of Abraham Lincoln's life which I wish to comment upon. The man acquired an uncanny sense of strategy. In the Illinois senatorial elections of 1858, he daringly followed this sense of strategy against the advice of all his friends, in a manner which was decisive in securing the national political victory of his cause.

This remarkable sense of strategy grew out of a quality in his life which only appears in the lives of men who have an unusual faith in the operative power of moral sincerity. There is an opposite but corollary conviction which they have. It is the conviction that evil is incapable of perfect organization. This means that the supporters of righteous causes are not always obliged to overcome evil by the possession of overwhelming power to break it down and drag it out. There is always operating among the supporters of evil causes a tendency toward internal disintegration and self defeat. If they can be steadily confronted with the vigilant and sustained cohesion of men of righteous purpose, who give evidence of growing power, the supporters of the forces of evil will tend somewhere to crack internally and to facilitate their own defeat. There came a time when Lincoln saw this possibility at work in the proslavery forces.

He saw it in the initial and growing opposition of pro-slavery extremists, to one of the most honorable qualities in Stephen Douglas, the greatest leader of the proslavery forces; namely, against his disposition to affirm that the doctrine of "squatter" or popular sovereignty, in which he believed, admitted the possibility that a particular territory might, by its own vote, keep slavery out of its own boundaries. Douglas had honestly affirmed this opinion in the congressional debates on the Kansas constitution, and in doing so he had greatly angered the extreme pro-slavery forces in the South. Lincoln saw that if Douglas were skillfully questioned in the senatorial debates in Illinois, he would be led by his ambition to be reelected to the Senate, to reaffirm this belief in the right of a particular territory to exclude slavery, in spite of the language of the recent Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, which held that there was no lawful way in which a territory could do this. Lincoln saw that in so doing, Douglas this time would anger the extreme proslavery forces in the South. Lincoln saw that if Douglas were skillbeing unendurably angered, the extreme proslavery forces would split the Democrat Party rather than to support Douglas for the presidency in 1860, and that this split would open the way whereby in the national elections of 1860 victory would be possible for the Republican cause opposed to the extension of slavery. Lincoln meditated long upon a strategem to produce these results.

Lincoln's friends opposed such stratagem on the grounds that it would make it quite possible for Lincoln and the Republican Party to be defeated by Douglas in the Illinois senatorial elections. Lincoln admitted this possibility, but counting up the cost to himself and to his party he concluded that even such a loss would be worth enduring in order to bring the Republican Party and its cause to national victory in 1860. So, at Freeport, Ill., on August 27, 1858, in the second debate with Douglas, he proposed the determinative question. Just as he foresaw, Douglas answered honestly and unequivocally: "In my opinion the people of a territory can, by lawful means, exclude slavery from their limits prior to the formation of a State constitution. * * * It matters not what the Supreme Court may hereafter decide as to the abstract question whether slavery may or may not go into a territory under the Constitution, the people have the lawful means to introduce it or exclude it as they please."

This was the answer which Lincoln sought and foresaw. It came to be the most important question and answer in the entire series of debates, for it probably determined the destiny of the Nation in relation to slavery. In Illinois, the results turned out to be just what Lincoln's friends had feared. Even some Republicans in Illinois joined with the Democrats in elated support of Douglas, and Lincoln was defeated for the Illinois Senate.

But the national results which Lincoln foresaw came swiftly to pass. When the National Democratic Convention nominated Douglas for the Presidency on a platform in support of popular (squatter) sovereignty, the hard core of extreme proslavery forces in the South were so embittered that they walked out of the convention. They were not going to endure the folly of agreeing with any condition under which slavery could be shut out of any State or territory. This exodus split the Democrat Party. Thereafter, Breckenridge was nominated to represent the hard core of proslavery extremists, and two Democrat Parties went into the national election against the Republicans who had now nominated Abraham Lincoln for the Presidency. The election was further complicated by the entry of a four-splinter party.

The Republican Party, with its declared purpose of halting the extension of slavery had been so nurtured in solidarity—so strongly cohesive—that it came out of the election with 1,860,000 votes—almost 16 times the voters polled in 1852 and 40 percent more votes than they polled in 1856. And although the combined opposition of three parties polled an overwhelmingly larger volume of 2,810,000 votes, the split in the Democrat Party proved to be decisive. No one of the three opposition parties reached a higher vote than the 1,370,000 votes which went to Douglas. The Republican Party with 1,860,000 popular votes and 180 electoral votes had won the election. The cause dedicated to the halting of slavery was chosen to control the Nation.

Abraham Lincoln awoke one morning to find that in less than 6 years he had nurtured the Republican forces opposed to the extension of slavery into full maturity and had projected them into the control of the Nation. He stood there trembling like a boy—a man whose only previous experience in public administration had been the post office job of a one-horse town, where he could carry all the daily mail in his hat, had been elected to the Presidency of the United States. By one of the most remarkable rises to power in history, he now had come to the place where he had the power to do the one thing of all he most desired—to halt the westward march of the slave system and to place it back where it could no longer threaten the destiny of the Union which he loved.

COMPASSION FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE SOUTH

Now I come to the third and last period in the life of Abraham Lincoln. In this period I wish to concentrate attention entirely upon a quality which first appeared in the early days of his conflict with the slave system, but which reached its greatest development only in this third period; namely his compassion toward the people of the South.

In the earliest days of Abraham Lincoln's fight against slavery he learned how to do what is almost impossible; how to fight an evil cause without entertaining malice and enmity toward the men who support that evil cause. He hated slavery but he never hated the slaveowners or the people of the South as a group. When he agreed, as he did agree, that the Constitution required him to leave slavery alone in the Southern States, he did not agree to this merely for the sake of taking a political position. He agreed to it because he believed in the righteousness of this position and because he intended to be loyal to it. Abraham Lincoln did not feel that the people of the South were different in any fundamental respect from the people of the North. He did not feel that they supported the slave system, because there was some peculiar element in their human makeup which inevitably required them to do this. He knew that the people of the South had not hatched the slave system. The people of the North were just as much responsible for the development of the slave system as the people of the South. Moreover, he knew that there were hundreds of thousands and even millions of white people in the South who held no slaves, and would like to get rid of the slave system, but now that the slave system had come to be the only working economic system in the South, they did not know how to get rid of it. He was not sure that he himself would know how to get rid of the slave system if he were then so situated in the South. Instead of hating the southerners, therefore, his compassion went out to them with a loving heart. He knew that the slave system was injurious to them as well as to the Nation, and he wanted to bring it about some day that they would be in a position to put the slave system aside, and to unite freely in their hearts with their brethren of the North in support of the Union. He wanted to keep them in the Union so that a Union committed by majority leadership to the proposition that all men are created free and equal could be decisively helpful to them in working out a way to overcome the slave system and to establish complete freedom from it in their institutions and in their hearts.

One of the most beautiful things about Abraham Lincoln's thinking during this period of his life was this: that although he was obliged to approve the taking of arms, and to justify and to carry through the killing of men in battle, never did he, under any circumstances, allow the actualities of war to alter his compassion for the people of the South or to harden him into hating them or into despising them. When, on the one hand, some of his advisers urged him to despise them and to let them go their evil ways into secession, and when, on the other hand, some of his advisers urged him to take advantage of the secession, to break his personal and his party pledges and vindictively to free the slaves in spite of the Constitution to the contrary, his answer was always substantially the same, "I will not do it. They are still members of the Union. It is my purpose that they shall remain so. If we keep faith with them and do our full duty in bringing the expansion of slavery to an end, we can eventually find a way to do away with slavery in their midst, with their consent and cooperation. In all these matters I am the one who is responsible, and I must have some principle of my own to act upon. It is my duty to do this and I will do it."

Not only did he persist in his compassion, he reached out his hand in loving solicitude, endeavoring to persuade them. "Brothers," he said in effect, "you have made a great mistake. You have seceded from the Union, which is precious to us all. You have taken

up arms against your country in order to advance a cause which will destroy the Union. You would not have done this but for the evil influence of the system of slavery on your institutions and in your hearts. Come now, give up the slaves. I will have the Government of the United States compensate you with money in full for every slave that you give up." This was the length to which compassion took him and held him until the day when he met the Captain of Eternity in a decisive way.

There came a time when the Union's cause had lost so many battles that it looked as if victory was going to be impossible. He saw, instead, that the proslavery armies, with the help of 4½ million slaves, could possibly win the war, destroy the Union, and set up slavery permanently. A greater disaster was not conceivable to his mind. Down on his knees, he came to recognize that the hand controlling this war was not his own. The living God Himself was now in charge of events and through these events He was speaking to him, saying "Abe, I am vetoing your plan to leave slavery alone in the South. I want the slaves set free now. As Commander in Chief of the Armies of the Union you have the right to do it, and you have the power to do it. It will bless the slaves for you to do it. It will bless the South for you to do it, and it will save and bless the Union for you to do it. I want you, Abe, to do it now." And on his knees Abraham Lincoln heard the Captain of Eternity and rose with a reverent determination to do it. On a day thereafter when he took his pen in hand to sign the Emancipation Proclamation which could, supported by the 13th amendment, free all the slaves, and free the body and the soul of the South and of the Union from the curse of slavery, he found that his hand was trembling. "Wait, a moment," he is reported to have said to the man who was near him, "I am about to sign the most important paper that any man can sign in the world and my whole soul is in it. Let no trembling of my hand appear in this signature."

And so it came about that he who in all humility had seen no honorable way to deal with slavery except to halt its western progress while leaving it alone in the South—no doubt for years and years to come—now saw that God had given him the privilege to wipe it out entirely. And he did it with a heart full of gratitude and of trembling joy.

The suffering of Lincoln and of the Nation did not cease after the Emancipation Proclamation. The northern armies lost in battle, again and again. The number of the dead piled up and up. The monetary resources in the banks were giving out. The enormous cost of the war in men was so great that riots began happening in the Northern States and some men refused to register to go into the Army. Abraham Lincoln was about to lose the election, in the midst of divided counsel and for want of face. But just a few days before the election, Sherman marched into Atlanta. Grant and his men laid hold on some victories. The people, moved by these things, flew back to Lincoln because they trusted and loved him, and reelected him President by an overwhelming vote. With the armies moving toward victory and the people once again united, what did he do, when he came to his second inaugural address? What would you have done? What would Napoleon have done? What would any conqueror in the history of the world have done, that you know about? In all probability, he would have given his heart to the hardening process of war and would have stood up at the inaugural and said to the people of the South, "You can see all the suffering that you have brought upon yourselves and your country. You can see now that your cause is becoming hopeless. You can see that we are justified in the most ruthless dealings with you in order to bring this war to an end. You are not fit candidates for merciful dealings in any way." But he did not do this. No, his compassion for the people of the South was, by this time, too great for such thinking. He did not want them to be defeated in that way. He did not want them groveling in humiliation before his feet. What did he say?

"The Almighty has His own purposes. Woe unto the world because of offenses—for it must needs be that offenses come; but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh. If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offenses, which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove and that He gives both the North and South this terrible war, as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him? Fondly do we hope—fervently do we pray—that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid with another drawn with the sword as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said, 'The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.'"

What then did he do? His compassion was so deep and so thoughtful that instead of scorning and branding his brethren, instead of threatening and humiliating them, he put his arm around them in suffering and said, "This suffering that we are enduring together, we together have brought upon ourselves from the hands of a just God who is displeased with what both of us have done about slavery." The fact is that his compassion had deepened more than ever, for just a few days before the inaugural address he had once more sought to have his Cabinet promote a joint resolution in both Houses of Congress offering the Southern States $400 million in U.S. bonds, to be allotted among them in proportion to the property in slaves which each had lost. He saw the greatness of their suffering and his heart went out to them in their need. He wanted with all his heart to hasten their recovery, and to hasten their return to the Union.

When the war was over and the victory was won, and when his advisers wanted to know, "Whom shall we seek to hang; upon whom shall we lay the retribution of death?" "Nobody" was the answer of his compassionate heart. "These are our brothers. Tell them the gate is open. Let them come home and let us work together for the rebuilding of the Union."

An assassin killed him. But what more could it mean to him to be physically shot down? For 4 long years he had been killed all the day long by the continuing obligation to carry on a war against his brothers. For him to die was nothing. He knew all along that he was expendable and might have been killed at any time. Some men looked at him lying in death and said, "Well, at last he is dead. He ought to be dead. He should have been dead long ago. Blessed be the man who killed him." But today we all know that the Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all, that with his stripes we all were healed, and that with the 4 years of his dying and at length by his physical death, God redeemed this Union from slavery and purified her soul.

How beautiful upon the mountain are the feet of them that bear the glad tidings of emancipation, glad tidings of Union, but, above all, the glad tidings of a man inwardly driven by universal respect for all mankind, a man wholly committed to that Union which was "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," a man masterful in sincere and simple communication of the truth, a man pure in his heart toward every individual human being with whom he came in contact, neglecting none, a man reverent of all his powers and using them up in a great cause as if they were but wax under a lamp, a man unequivocal in his beliefs, diligent in his purposes to restrict and to overcome evil, but filled with a compassion so deep and beautiful that he always loved his very enemies.

Do you tell me that the history of the United States says that slavery was abolished and the Union was preserved by the victory of the Civil War? I tell you it is not so. There was one place in America where the slave was always free; there was one place in America where the Union was never broken—there in the heart of Abraham Lincoln. That is why we love him, black and white, North and South. That is why they love him in every nation in the world. That is why they will love him a thousand years from today. For he was liberty. He was union. He was freedom.

"O, God, what can we ask Thee?
That in every legislature in the land,
In every Governor's chair, and in
The White House itself,
Again and again we may have
One more man like Abraham Lincoln."

Mr. Speaker, the following is an address by Dr. Allan Nevins:

LINCOLN AND DEMOCRACY

(Text of an address by Dr. Allan Nevins, annual Lincoln dinner, Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., February 11, 1960, sponsored by the Lincoln group of the District of Columbia in cooperation with the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission)

With those people who think we make too much of the Lincoln anniversaries, it is difficult for a reflective man to feel any patience. As the ancient Roman household found inspiration in annually celebrating the natal day of its most illustrious ancestor, our American household finds refreshment each year in reverting to the example of its greatest exponent of democracy. For it is as the essential hero of democracy that we recall Lincoln. Any just definition of democracy would note the fact that it has a different meaning in America—we hope a richer meaning—than in other lands. Politically, it signifies a form of government in which the machinery is controlled as directly as possible by a majority of all the people.

In a broader sense, democracy represents a certain general condition of society rooted in our Anglo-American origins, shaped by circumstances in which the frontier and free immigration have been prominent, and involving not only the political tenet of popular sovereignty but a related group of corresponding tendencies covering the whole field of moral, social, and even spiritual life.

In either the narrow or broad sense, democracy denotes a revolutionary movement in human affairs, which has a set of determined opponents ranging from Sir Henry Maine to William Graham Sumner, and a body of ardent champions ranging from John Stuart Mill to Woodrow Wilson. Not for Americans alone, the name of Lincoln best typifies both political and social democracy.

Lincoln's life offers a panorama of contrasts as remarkable as any in history, and the author of a recent book, "The Lincoln That Nobody Knows," indeed calls it a study in contrasts. Among the facts of his life which conflict with preconceived notions of what is probable, one paradox holds a central place. It is this:

That a man who knew democracy so intimately, in a period when it was full of violence, crudity, and corruption, should have been so completely untouched by cynicism as to the system; nay, more, that a man too clearsighted ever to be fooled by surface pretensions, too realistic and honest to conceal his convictions, should have said so little in criticism of democracy and nothing in essential derogation of it.

More caustic statements on democracy as a form of government can be found in a paragraph of John Adams than in all Lincoln's speeches; more faultfinding with democracy as a social system in a page of H. L. Mencken than in all Lincoln's works. Yet Lincoln knew far more expertly than these men the seamy side of democracy.

Lincoln's faith in the people was so simple, spontaneous, and warmhearted that we tend to accept it as inborn and unchangeable. He himself—though actually it was changeable—gave it that interpretation with reiterated emphasis.

"This is essentially a people's war," he told Congress when it first met after Sumter. It was a contest, he went on, to preserve that form of government which would elevate the condition of all men, and he was "most happy to believe that the plain people understand and appreciate this." Throughout the war, even more than before it, the people were foremost in his thoughts. He declared at one point that he could never betray "so vast and so sacred a trust as these free people have confided to me."

In his policies, he was anxious to keep the mass of fairminded people with him, taking a position neither too conservative nor too radical. "I hope," he informed Zack Chandler, "to stand firm enough not to go backward, and yet not go forward fast enough to wreck the country's cause." In keeping the masses with him, he relied upon the persuasive logic exhibited in his State papers and letters. His evident object was not to make smart hits, or win rhetorical triumphs, but to reason with and convince commonsense folk. "If ever there could be a proper time for mere catch arguments," he wrote in his December message in 1862, "that time is surely not now. In times like the present, men should utter nothing for which they would not willingly be responsible through time and eternity."

As he stated in his letter to Greeley on saving the Union with or without slavery, he would correct errors when shown to be errors, and adopt new views so fast as they should appear true views; and when he did so, he would inform the people. Down to Appomattox, he clung to the maxim he had enunciated in Chicago in 1850: "Wisdom and patriotism, in a public office, under institutions like ours, are wholly inefficient and worthless, unless they are sustained by the confidence * * * of the people."

Men may believe fervently in liberty but reject democracy; Lincoln's position was a pole apart from that of such thinkers as Burke, a passionate libertarian but no democrat. Burke wrote that he never addressed himself to the vulgar nor to that which alone governs the vulgar, their passions. Lincoln pointedly addressed himself to the vulgar and to their reason. He never abused an honest opponent. He was so anxious not to repress honest discussion that he thought posterity would more likely criticize him for excessive leniency with copperheads and traitors than for excessive severity.

He was proud that the war neither postponed nor muted a single political campaign. "We cannot have free government without elections," he declared. Pitt was said to love England as an Athenian loved the city of the Violet Crown and a Roman the city of the Seven Hills; so it was that Lincoln loved the American democracy. His mind had not bent toward abstract thinking, and we look in vain in his writings for any body of generalizations on government. We meet rather an instinctive conviction, which experience never corroded.

Yet this man who so completely accepted his identification with the common people had taken laborious pains, from an early age, to raise himself above their level mentally and morally. When Herbert Croly remarked that the youthful Lincoln was as different from the ordinary Sangamon Valley citizen of his day as St. Francis of Assisi was from the ordinary Benedictine monk of the 13th century, he offered no explanation of the fact. The people about young Lincoln, busy with pioneer tasks, were hostile to intellectual effort; young men preferred the tavern or grocery to books, and boisterous sport to study. Dueling, Indian fighting and hunting made heroes, and the admired leader was the Davy Crockett type who distained personal restraint.

One illustration will exhibit the turbulent side of frontier manners. Andrew Jackson, when in the White House, told a friend how a Tennessee bully had once tried to pick a quarrel with him by treading thrice on his foot. "As quick as a flash," said President Jackson, "I snatched a small rail from the top of a fence, and gave him the pint of it full in his stomach. It doubled him up. He fell at my feet and I stomped on him. * * * If any villain assaults you, give him the pint in the belly." This was the spirit of too many backwoodsmen who reared log cabins on Congress land, fought Indians with long rifles, and subdued the wilderness with axe, sidemeat, whisky, and calomel.

Lincoln completely transcended this environment. Where others proved their manhood by intemperate speech and acts, he trained himself in kindliness, moderation, and generosity. We need not recall the hundred examples of his magnanimity; he always followed the principle which he finally summed up in his statement that he had never willingly planted a thorn in another man's pillow, and in his letter advising a young man against a quarrel, for quarreling befogged in the mind.

Meanwhile, among a rude folk at best indifferent to intellectual effort, he found means of systematic mental discipline. "Anybody who gives me a book," he said, "is my best friend," and his instinct for books useful in maturing his powers was unerring. He trained himself to think by Abel Flint's "System of Geometry and Triginometry" as well as Robert Gibson's "Theory and Practice of Surveying"; later, he said, he nearly mastered six books of Euclid. He nourished his imagination by "The Pilgrim's Progress," "Robinson Crusoe," and "Aesop's Fables," three volumes owned by his stepmother. He corrected his English by Kirkham's "English Grammar," for which Mentor Graham said he walked 8 miles—the very copy is now in the Library of Congress—Bailey's "Etymological Dictionary," and "The Kentucky Preceptor," with its classic selections. He improved his style and cadence, and enriched his mind, not only by the Bible, but by Shakespeare and Burns, to whom Jack Kelso introduced him. From Blackstone he drew a faculty of exact statement and something of the spirit of English history as well as a knowledge of legal principles.

Altogether, he could well admonish a student later in life that any youth can read as profitably in primitive communities as in cities: "The books, and your capacity for understanding them, are the same in all places." How wide his reading actually was in New Salem days, no one can say. F. Lauriston Bullard, a veteran student of Lincoln, hazarded the statement that in these years he probably gained as much in intellectural development as Henry Adams gained at Harvard; and at any rate, he never said that his New Salem years had been wasted, as Adams said of his Harvard sojourn.

The important fact is that he trained himself to reflect, and to express his well-pondered conclusions with precision. He had a deliberate but retentive mind; like a piece of steel, as he put it, "very hard to scratch anything on it, and almost impossible after you got it there to rub it out." According to a clergyman who rode on a Connecticut train with him just after the Cooper Union address, he remarked: "I am never easy now, when I am handling a thought, until I have bounded it north and bounded it south, and bounded it east and bounded it west". If he did say this, the Cooper Union speech perfectly illustrated the assertion.

Actually, no real mystery lies behind the ascension of Francis of Assisi or Lincoln above their fellow men. As Carl Sandburg shows us, the explanation lies in native bent and inherent genius. Lincoln resembled the Robert Burns he so much admired in his inborn capacity to distill from meager materials whatever strengthened the mind and ennobled the spirit. The Scottish plowboy poring over Pope's "Homer" and Allan Ramsay's poems at his Ayrshire fireside, and the Illinois railsplitter with his Blackstone and Shakespeare, were satisfying much the same thirst.

This kindling of an adolescent flame is happily no uncommon phenomenon. We meet it in the career of the Massachusetts Senator with whom Lincoln worked closely during the war, Henry Wilson. Bound out at 10 to a farmer who put him at drudgery, Wilson managed, before he gained his freedom at 21, to read a thousand books; he counted them. We find the same natural idealism and desire to excel intellectually and morally in a multitude of other poor lads. Some came to take Lincoln for a model; David Lloyd George, for example, the orphan whose cobbler uncle sent him to a penny school in Wales until he could educate himself by reading Cassell's "Popular Educator" and a host of other works, among them "The Life of Lincoln".

What is remarkable in Lincoln—what does defy easy explanation—is that he manifested so little consciousness of the superiority he had attained. Among rude, aggressive, selfish men, he became urbane, moderate, and generous. Among unlettered, impulsive, and unthinking people he was cultivated, restrained, and deeply reflective. Joseph H. Choate has told us how he and other New Yorkers went in 1860 to hear Lincoln at Cooper Union, expecting to be assailed by stump humor, special pleading, and frontier rhetoric, and how they were impressed instead by the sinewy strength of his plain argument. "It was marvelous to see how this untutored man, by mere self-discipline and the chastening of his own spirit, had outgrown all meretricious arts, and found his own way to the grandeur and strength of absolute simplicity." Yet of condescension to the vulgar, he never showed a trace. The humblest fellow townsman he treated as equal.

In one respect, to be sure, he did assert his superiority to his opponents: in perception of truth. He was scornful of Douglas' sophistries, of Pierce's casuistry, of Buchanan's evasions and cowardices. In every other respect, he took men on his own level. Miss Octavia Roberts of Springfield, gathering material for her book on "Lincoln in Illinois," talked with a Portuguese woman who had been a servant in the old Globe Hotel when the Lincoln family once stayed there. This woman recalled how quickly Mrs. Lincoln resented what she thought saucy talk. But there is a world of meaning in her comment on Lincoln: "He was common, like someone that is poor."

In social life sheer good nature might explain much of Lincoln's outlook; but in

politics he was far from good natured—he was savagely in earnest. The political paradox in his life is all the more remarkable. He believed firmly in political democracy, but just what was it in his time? In Illinois Gov. Thomas Ford, whom he knew, wrote a remarkable State History portraying democracy in repellent hues. Ford flayed such predecessors as Thomas Reynolds with a merciless scalpel; he showed that little men were leaders in the first generation of statehood, how mean their motives, how sordid some of their acts. Nor were the people exempt from acid criticism.

The Illinoisans had cruelly maltreated Black Hawk and his Sauk and Fox Indians; they had murdered Joseph Smith and his brother, and driven the Mormons across the Mississippi at the point of the musket; they had indulged in wild financial excesses during the internal improvement era, and had wavered on the brink of debt-repudiation later. The shabby side of political morals was lighted up by the conduct of Gov. Joel A. Matteson, one of the few men Lincoln despised, who, after nearly gaining that Senate seat that Lincoln sought was proved guilty of theft from the State treasury, and compelled to restore nearly a quarter of a million dollars. The Alton riots and murder of Elijah P. Lovejoy gave the Illinois Shield a sorry blotch.

In the Nation, political democracy had equally inedifying aspects. From Lincoln's point of view the Mexican War was impossible to defend. Slavery undermined the political integrity of the Government, and a succession of weak Presidents—the commonplace Fillmore, the forcible-feeble Pierce, the timid Buchanan—had no policy but one of dodge and delay.

Thaddeus Stevens said that the House of Representatives, when he entered it, was a place of Bowie knives, revolvers, and howling demons. It was a sad light that was cast on democracy by Bleeding Kansas, the assault of Brooks on Sumner, the eclipse of civil liberties throughout the South, the territorial greed embodied in the Ostend Manifesto, and the bloody raids of filibusters in Central America. For that matter, how the Civil War itself would have shocked the Fathers of the Nation as a negation of all their hopes. Punch published an apt cartoon which depicted the shade of George III poking the shade of Washington in the ribs against a background of fighting troops, and ejaculating: "What d'ye think of your fine Republic now? Eh? Eh?"

Lincoln of course had a large firsthand experience of the demagogic, log-rolling, planless side of democracy. As a young legislator, he had played his part in the craze which fastened an almost hopeless debt on the young State for a system of public works vote without surveys, estimates, or careful discussion; he had been one of the adroit lobbyists who had removed the capital from Vandalia to Springfield. He had seen all the vicious features of the spoils system in the Jacksonian Era, and the bad results of a blind party adherence to a military hero. As he expressed it, the Democrats were a horde of hungry ticks who stuck to the tail of the Hermitage Lion until after his death. He thought the acts and policies of the proslavery administrations just before the war disgraceful. "Our Republican Robe," he said, in his Peoria speech of 1854, "is soiled and trailed in the dust."

Nor should we forget that in his wartime dealings with democracy, Lincoln experienced three painful failures. His passionate desire during his first 5 weeks in office was to avert war, an end toward which he strove at any cost, save the sacrifice of principle; he was thwarted when the hotheaded southerners fired on Sumter. In the next 17 months, his principal effort, next to the prosecution of the war, was to persuade the Border States to accept his plan of gradual compensated emancipation. He put the utmost intensity of feeling into this effort. "Oh," he said to Isaac Arnold and Owen Lovejoy on July 13, 1862, "how I wish the Border States would accept my proposition. Then you, Lovejoy, and you, Arnold, and all of us, would not have lived in vain." He believed that acceptance would lead to an early termination of the war. But the very day after his conversation with Arnold, the border Congressmen said, "No."

Maryland, Delaware, Kentucky, and Missouri rejected his plan. In the ensuing 18 months his principal aim, next to conquering the South, was to persuade the majority in Congress to adopt a moderate scheme of reconstruction. Again, he failed, and in 1864 had to veto the vindictive Wade-David bill. The policies on which he most set his heart, in short, broke down.

Meanwhile, he might well have complained of public impatience, of the failure of the people to keep the armies sufficiently filled to avert a draft, of the widespread profiteering, cheating, and skulking, and of the mischievous effort of the Senate to dictate a new Cabinet after Fredericksburg.

He never complained except of individual men, and never lost faith. His best trusted associate, Secretary Seward, did sometimes grow utterly discouraged. We who bear the responsibility in Washington, Seward wrote his wife in 1862, see the war as a sad, painful, fearful reality. "To the public, who are not directly engaged in it, it is a novel, a play. * * * They weary and grow restive if the action of the war drags, or loses its intensity. They pronounce the piece a failure, and propose to drive the manager out of the theater. Who could believe that nations could be made or saved in civil war, when the people act like this?"

After the elections that year, Seward honestly feared that partisanship might effect the national ruin. On another occasion he wrote his wife that nothing preserved his faith in American democracy but reading history. "Selfishness crops out in everything, everywhere. It offends and alarms us constantly; but we learn from history that selfishness always existed, and always was more flagrant than now."

Gideon Welles likewise lost faith. When he watched the defeatist antics of Fernando Wood, he concluded: "But the whole city of New York is alike leprous and rotten." In such vicious communities, he thought, free suffrage was debased, and some outside control was needed. In his youth, he had believed that the popular voice was right, "but alas, experience has shaken the confidence I once had." In short, he doubted that democracy could succeed among "the strange materials that compose a majority of the population in our large cities," for demagogs would obtain the mastery.

Thaddeus Stevens felt a deeper mistrust. Called the Great Commoner, he was supposed to cherish a special feeling for democracy. Yet during and after the war, he came to a sardonic belief that misgovernment was chronic, and when near his end he sadly commented: "With all this great struggle of years in Washington, and the fearful sacrifice of life and treasure, I see little hope for the Republic."

These were men whose belief in democracy was shaken by the stormy time; many others never had a real faith in democracy. The planter statesmen of the South in the era of Jefferson Davis, Howell Cobb, Robert Toombs, and Judah P. Benjamin were like Calhoun in being natural antidemocrats. Representing a minority even in the cotton kingdom, they had to guard a great special interest, and so combated every theory of government and society which weakened their position.

By 1860, many of them openly repudiated the ideas of Jefferson. When Alexander H. Stephens, defending the Union before the Georgia Legislature in 1860, asked what form of government could be preferred to America's, Robert L. Toombs interjected: "England."

Of a different type were some of the Northern radicals, humanitarians and egalitarians, but not true believers in democracy. Of Charles Sumner, for example, it was truly said that he had unbounded sympathy for the poor Negro, but none to spare for the poor white man.

And in a still different category fall those who, reared in Lincoln's generation, turned against democracy as postwar materialism engulfed the land. Henry Adams, writing a novel entitled "Democracy," saw little hope for it. Ambrose Bierce, an Indianian sprung from the plain people, decided that popular government was one vast fraud. In "The Devil's Dictionary," he suggested his creed. "Politics: The conduct of public affairs for private advantage." "Deliberation: The act of examining one's bread to see which side it is buttered on." "Pocket: The cradle of motive, and the grave of conscience."

Mark Twain's disillusionment became so abysmal that in his last years, seeing war, greed, and cruelty rampant, he used to speak of "the damned human race." Doubtless he should not be judged by words he wrote after a long series of private misfortunes and bereavements had deepened his bitterness. But even when fairly young, he was cynical about democracy, as his novel, "The Gilded Age," shows. His approach to pioneer communities, to legislatures, to lobbyists, to business, to Mississippi steamboating and California mining, was primarily satiric. In "Life on the Mississippi," he wrote a paragraph on the frontier which Lincoln would have thought but wryly amusing:

"How solemn and beautiful is the thought that the earliest pioneer of civilization * * * is never the steamboat, never the railroad, never the newspapers, never the Sabbath school, never the missionary—but always whisky. Such is the case. Look history over; you will see. The missionary comes after the whisky—I mean, he arrives after the whisky has arrived; next comes the poor immigrant with ax and hoe and rifle; next, the trader; next the miscellaneous rush; next the gambler, the desperado, the highwayman, and all their kindred in sin of both sexes; and next, the smart chap who has bought up an old grant that covers all the land; this brings in the lawyer tribe; the vigilance committee brings the undertaker. All these interests bring the newspaper; the newspaper starts up politics and a railroad; all hands turn to and build a church and a jail—and behold, civilization is established forever in the land."

Of this cynicism, this disillusionment, we find not the slightest touch in all of Lincoln's writings. When he saw our Republican robe soiled and trailed in the dust, he blamed false leaders, not the people. We must purify the robe, he said, and as soon as he became Chief Magistrate, he set himself to the task. While he never defined his concept of democratic government in detail, it was undoubtedly that which John Stuart Mill had enunciated in 1835. "If the bulk of any nation possesses a fair share of * * * wisdom," wrote Mill, "the argument for universal suffrage is * * * irresistible; for the experience of ages, and especially of all great national emergencies, bears out the assertion that, whenever the multitude are really alive to the necessity of superior intellect, they rarely fail to distinguish those who possess it." They so distinguished in 1860; they chose even better than they knew. They elected a leader whose type of democratic leadership meant a happy blend of Jefferson's profound if rather uncritical faith in the people, and Hamilton's sense of the importance of a constructive plan.

It would be as hard for us to conceive of Lincoln writing sourly and satirically of the people and popular government as of Walt Whitman so writing. Whitman held that the entire Nation shared the guilt of slavery; he pictured the ugly, debasing side of war in contract-hungry cities, in Washington, and on the battle field with relentless pen. But he felt certain the people would emerge from their bloody ordeal with a truer bond of comradeship. With a perceptible degree of purification, Lincoln also felt that. He felt it much more strongly than Whitman, because he had a better understanding of the historic roots of democracy; for as a lawyer and politician, he had given careful study to the basic documents which between 1170 and 1790 established the American system. From the time he first read them in an appendix to the volume of the Statutes of Indiana which he early acquired, he had steeped himself in these writings of the founders of the Nation. To him, they were sacred. Of the Constitution, he said in Congress in 1848, that it should not lightly be touched: "It can scarcely be made better than it is." For the Declaration of Independence he felt a still deeper reverence, and when its spirit warred with the letter of the Constitution, he stood by the Declaration. Every nation, he said in Chicago in 1856, needs a central idea. "The central idea in our political public opinion was, and until recently continued to be, the equality of men."

It is not enough, therefore, to say that Lincoln's spontaneous, optimistic belief in democracy was founded on the same rock as Whitman's, a sympathetic appreciation of the virtues of the common man. In part it was. He was a citizen, as Lord Charnwood says, of that far country where aristocrat and democrat are judged by simple worth alone; and like Whitman, like Burns, he had a profound sense of the greatness which is often found in men of low as of high station. Mere rank meant little to him, as he showed when he once offended Secretaries Stanton and Welles by sending them a document with the endorsement: "Referred to Mars and Neptune."

But an important part of the foundation rock of Lincoln's conviction was his thorough study of the theory and early development of democratic government. How well he appropriated what is valuable in the teachings of Washington and Adams, of Jefferson, Hamilton, and Madison is evident in the Cooper Union Address and First Inaugural. Compared with Whitman, he was an expert political scientist. He also had, what Whitman lacked, a powerful sense of ideological world mission of democracy. He knew that democracy might not be so efficient in a brief crisis as a dictatorship, of which men like General Hooker spoke longingly during the war. But he also knew that in the long run, government of the people has greater endurance and stability, and a larger power to call forth and educate talent, than any other; and at Gettysburg he expressed his long-held confidence that its example would ultimately convert and conquer other peoples.

But the largest reason, I think, for Lincoln's fervent belief in democracy reached a little deeper than the considerations just named: it lay in his increasing conviction, from 1848 onward, that the masses of the North were becoming possessed by a great moral idea, which would ultimately regenerate the country. They were rising to meet the demands of a cause larger than any they had known since 1789.

Other men caught glimpses of this ocean-heave of American democracy. Carl Schurz, for example, wrote a German relative just after the election of 1856:

"The last weeks were a time when public matters made much more demands than ordinarily upon the American system. You over there in your decrepit Europe can hardly imagine how a great idea can stir up the masses of the people to their depths, and how an enthusiastic struggle for principle can thrust aside for a certain time all other interests, even the materialistic ones. * * * A general struggle of opinions among a free people has in it something unbelievably imposing; and you never see with greater clearness what a far-reaching influence political freedom exercises upon the development of the masses."

This German Forty-eighter knew inspiration when he saw it. Just the same view was expressed by the illustrious English liberal, Richard Cobden, who toured the United States in 1859. He found the North in the grip of stirring emotions. They were a sign, he saw, of vigorous health. "The concentrated earnestness with which political parties were at work in the United States," he wrote later, "inspired me with full faith that the people of the country would, in spite of the difficulties and dangers of their political issues, work out their salvation."

Lincoln felt the popular pulse begin to beat with new energy when the Wilmot Proviso almost passed Congress. He felt the movement grow in urgency and strength as Mrs. Stowe published "Uncle Tom's Cabin," as the Underground Railroad gave defiance to the Fugitive Slave Act, as millions of Northerners rose in wrath against what they deemed Douglas' betrayal of freedom in the Kansas-Nebraska Act, as the new Republican Party swiftly became a giant of crusading idealism. This popular espousal of a new moral idea gave Lincoln's house-divided speech and his debates with Douglas a grip on the attention of the whole Nation. The North was presenting the impressive spectacle which gave the French liberal, Elie Gasparin, his title for the powerful book he published early in the war, "The Uprising of a Great People."

The war brought the upheaval to its climax. It was no surprise to Lincoln that depressing as was the amount of confusion, selfishness, and limpness revealed by the conflict, far greater was the display of heroism, devotion, and generosity.

The plain people rose to save the Union and vindicate the type of government which would elevate the condition of all men. Countless soldiers proved ready to give the last measure of dedication. Countless mothers were proud to lay their costliest sacrifice on the national altar. Proud was the word the mother of Robert Gould Shaw used when she was told that Governor Andrew had offered him the command of the Negro regiment, the 54th Massachusetts: She said, "I would be nearly as proud to hear that he had been shot." Later she heard that too.

There were countless fathers like Commodore Smith, who, said Hawthorne, uttered the finest short speech of the war. His son commanded the frigate *Congress* in Hampton Roads when the *Merrimac* began battering her to pieces, and the old commodore knew that his boy would die before he hauled down the colors. When informed that the *Congress* had surrendered he said, "Then Jo's dead"—and Jo was dead.

There were countless public officers as devoted as the much-tried Stanton, whom an aid once surprised with his head bowed on his desk, weeping and exclaiming over and over, "God help me to do my duty." In the face of a nation giving so much to a sacred cause, Lincoln would have felt it treason to humanity to utter a word that would be construed as disheartened or cynical.

When the war ended, the historian John Lothrop Motley wrote from Austria to a Boston friend to say how glad he was that the nightmare of fire and blood had ended. "Believing in no government but that of the people, respecting no institutions but democratic institutions," he felt sure "that the future of the whole world is in our hands if we are true to ourselves." He paid tribute to Grant as a master of the art of war: "What could be more heroic than his stupendous bashfulness?" Of Lincoln he wrote that he was afraid to speak for fear of overenthusiasm. "But I am sure that through all future ages, there will be a halo around that swarthy face, and a glory about that long, lean uncouth figure such as history only accords to its saints and sages."

We may be certain that Lincoln would have shrunk from this as overenthusiasm indeed. But the President would heartily have endorsed the statement which Motley sent at the same time to the author of "Tom Brown at Rugby":

"MY DEAR HUGHES," it ran, "the true hero of the whole war—the one I respect and admire even beyond Lincoln and Grant (although I have not yet found anyone who is willing to go quite as far as I do in regard to both these men)—is the American people."

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in closing may I close with words on this subject that were used in this Hall by that great historian-poet, Carl Sandburg, incidentally, the only private citizen who never held high office who has ever addressed a joint session of the Congress. The speech he made on that occasion has now been translated in over 34 languages at the request of that many foreign countries to be used in their educational institutions and in their public libraries.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall at the close of that great speech he asked:

And how did Lincoln say he would like to be remembered? Something of it is in this present occasion—in the atmosphere of this room. His beloved friend, Owen Lovejoy, had died in April of 1864. Friends wrote Lincoln and he replied that the pressure of duties kept him from joining them in efforts for a marble monument to Lovejoy, the last sentence of his letter reading:

"Let him have the marble monument along with a well assured and more enduring one in the hearts of those who love liberty unselfishly for all men."

Today we may say, perhaps, that the well assured and most enduring memorial to Lincoln is invisibly there—today, tomorrow, and for a long, long time yet to come. It is there in the hearts of lovers of liberty—men and women—this country has always had them in a crisis—men and women who understand that wherever there is freedom there have been those who fought, toiled, and sacrificed for it.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include various newspaper articles, and speeches.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln has for a century been the most popular subject in America.

I will not belabor this afternoon's memorial to him with more than a few

words. But to me they are significant. They concern Mr. Lincoln's connections with an enterprise of great importance to the largest market area in my southwestern Iowa congressional district.

And in a collateral sense it is important to the whole Nation, because it involves the vital railroad industry.

Lincoln made an important contribution to the history of railroading in Iowa and America when, as President of the United States, he was confronted with the problem of locating the eastern terminus of the Union Pacific.

While stopping at Council Bluffs in 1859, he had met Gen. Grenville M. Dodge, who had just completed extensive railroad surveys west of the Missouri for the Rock Island Railroad. Lincoln recalled this visit when Congress passed the act providing for a transcontinental railroad and promptly called General Dodge to the White House for a conference.

These two meetings with Grenville M. Dodge, now of revered memory in Council Bluffs, more than perhaps anything else, fixed Council Bluffs, Iowa, as the eastern terminus of the Union Pacific.

A memorial to Lincoln has been erected on the bluff at Council Bluffs overlooking the Missouri River, where he and his Iowa friends stood in 1859 and looked westward across Nebraska.

A painting of the historic conference between Lincoln and Dodge occupies the most prominent place in my personal office. I am never more than a few moments distant from a thought of Lincoln. I consider that his unrivaled spot in human history is due to the fact that he belongs to everyone. We Republicans regard him as our patron saint, but we can share him with the whole world. He was truly America's right man at the right time.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, we, in Indiana, are especially proud of Abraham Lincoln because it was in the rolling hills of southern Indiana where Lincoln grew up and developed his great character which is now revered throughout the world.

We are also proud of the part that our State played in the Republican National Convention that nominated Abraham Lincoln for President in the "Wigwam" in Chicago a hundred years ago today.

From a very early age I have heard Hoosiers talk of Indiana's part in the nomination of Lincoln. A few days ago I had the opportunity to discuss Indiana's activities at that national convention with Mr. Hubert Hawkins, secretary of the Indiana Historical Society, which organization, incidentally, is 130 years old. Mr. Hawkins gave me a brief account of Indiana's part in that important convention. This account was documented by Kenneth M. Stampp's "Indiana Politics During the Civil War," published by the Indiana Historical Bureau, 1949; an article by Charles Roll, "Indiana's Part in the Nomination of Abraham Lincoln for President in 1860," published in Indiana Magazine of History, March 1929; and Reinhard H. Luthin's "The First Lincoln Campaign," 1944.

Moderation on the slavery issue and the sectional conflict typified the Indiana Republican Party in 1860. The failure of John C. Fremont in 1856 to carry the State was remembered as an evidence of the weakness of the extreme antislavery position with Hoosier voters. Consequently, the candidacy of William Seward of New York evoked little enthusiasm in Indiana. Friendly consideration was, however, given to Edward Bates of Missouri, Abraham Lincoln of Illinois and Judge John McLean of Ohio. Schuyler Colfax of South Bend led a strong group of Hoosier editors in supporting the Missourian and he enjoyed the influential backing of Horace Greeley. Bates' prospects for Hoosier support were weakened by the sturdy opposition of the German element in the Indiana Republican Party led by Theodore Hielscher, editor of the Indianapolis Freie Presse, who refused to forget his cooperation with the Know Nothings, a nativistic movement. Consequently, the Indiana delegation to the Chicago Convention was uninstructed.

With an electoral vote of 13 and 26 votes in the Republican convention Indiana constituted a prize worth any candidates seeking. With the same number of electoral votes as Massachusetts, Indiana ranked fifth in the Nation and only Ohio had a stronger political voice in the Old Northwest. Hoosier support was all the more sought after because of Indiana's status as a doubtful State. Lincoln recognized this point in a letter to Caleb Smith:

> We might succeed in the general results without Indiana, but with it failure is scarcely possible.

Lincoln's adherents in Indiana worked hard in his behalf between the mass convention at Indianapolis and the Chicago convention. Cyrus M. Allen, Henry S. Lane, and Caleb B. Smith spearheaded the Lincoln drive.

The Indiana delegation reached Chicago on May 12. Representatives of Bates, Lincoln, and other candidates assiduously wooed the Hoosiers. An informal poll on May 15 indicated that Lincoln was in the lead. The final decision was made on the morning of May 17. A Bates supporter, John Defrees explained:

> We Bates men of Indiana concluded that the only way to beat Seward was to go for Lincoln as a unit.

After the 17th, the Indiana delegation was solidly behind Lincoln.

Once committed the Hoosiers did yeoman service in rallying additional support of the Illinoisan. Henry S. Lane, Republican candidate for Governor of Indiana and chairman of the Philadelphia convention, was one of those who spent the night of the 17th seeking votes from undecided delegations. One witness saw Lane "at 1 o'clock, pale and haggard, with cane under his arm, walking from one caucus room to another, at the Trement House." Lane told the delegates that Seward's nomination would insure his defeat in Indiana. A report was widely circulated that the Republican candidates for Governor in Indiana, Illinois, and Pennsylvania would give up their candidacies if Seward were nominated. Being well aware of the Hoosiers natural love of politics, I can picture in my mind the great zest and love of political battle with which that Hoosier delegation entered into that great drama that would influence world history, the nomination of Abraham Lincoln. I envy those Hoosiers of a century ago.

On Friday the 18th Lincoln's nomination was seconded by Caleb Smith and Henry Lane led the Hoosiers into the wild demonstration. When the balloting began, Indiana's 26 votes were cast for Lincoln. This vote was pivotal. Only one other State, Illinois, demonstrated such unanimity in support of Lincoln on the first ballot and it undoubtedly had an important psychological impact.

Indiana never wavered in the subsequent balloting and Lincoln was nominated on the third ballot. The Hoosiers returned home with the jubilant consciousness that they had contributed decisively to the nomination of Abraham Lincoln, a candidate who had spent 14 important years of his life in Indiana. They were even more elated by the conviction that they had secured a nominee who could carry Indiana in November.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] has called the attention of the House and the country to the 100th anniversary of the nomination of Abraham Lincoln as the Republican candidate for the Presidency. As it has been pointed out, Ohio had a great deal to do with Lincoln's nomination. Realizing this, I asked the Canton Repository, one of Ohio's outstanding newspapers, in my congressional district, to check on the editions of their paper of a hundred years ago to determine what part, if any, our congressional district might have had in this nomination. It turned up some very interesting facts.

Abraham Lincoln's nomination 100 years ago today as the Republican candidate for the Presidency was assured by the dramatic announcement of an influential man from Massillon, Ohio, in my congressional district.

He was David K. Cartter, chairman of the Ohio delegation to the Republican national convention in Chicago's huge wigwam.

The wooden wigwam, which could hold 10,000 persons, was constructed especially for the 1860 Republican convention.

U.S. Senator William H. Seward, the preconvention favorite, led Lincoln on the first two ballots.

Seward's margin on the second ballot was three votes—184 to 181—with 233 of 465 votes needed for the nomination.

The third ballot began. New York switched its vote from Seward to Lincoln, whose total rose to 231½, only 1½ votes away from the nomination.

Mr. Cartter commanded the attention of the packed convention hall as he rose. He possessed a booming voice and he stuttered.

What he then was to say would start the tall, unhandsome man from Illinois on the way to the White House.

"I rise, Mr. Chairman," began Mr. Cartter, "to announce the change of four votes of Ohio from Mr. Chase, of Ohio, to Mr. Lincoln."

The nomination was assured. A cannon was fired on the Wigwam's roof to tell the world that "Honest Abe" was going to represent the young Republican Party at the election the next November.

After the delegates made Lincoln's nomination unanimous, Mr. Cartter submitted the name of Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, for nomination as Vice President.

Hamlin was nominated on the second ballot, according to the account in the May 22, 1860, edition of the weekly Ohio Repository.

Lincoln remembered Mr. Cartter after he got into the White House as the Nation's Civil War President. He appointed the Massillon man as Minister to Bolivia and as chief justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

According to an account in E. T. Heald's "The Stark County Story," Mr. Cartter was active in a move to bring the railroad through Massillon.

The charter under which the Ohio Legislature granted construction rights to the Ohio & Pennsylvania Railroad was the result of a meeting in Massillon in November 1847.

The meeting was called after Mr. Cartter headed a committee which in a meeting at Pittsburgh in 1846 failed to convince officials of Pittsburgh and Allegheny, Pa., that a railroad should be constructed through Massillon from Pittsburgh to Chicago.

Dr. Isaac Steese, a prominent Massillon banker and landowner, attended the convention with Mr. Cartter as a delegate. Dr. Steese's vote likely was one of those which Mr. Cartter switched over to Lincoln.

Dr. Steese and others organized the First National Bank of Massillon during the decade before the memorial convention in the Wigwam. He was president of the bank—then Stark County's largest—until his death in 1874.

"It was said that not 20 men in the Nation were better informed on politics in the large sense of the word," wrote Mr. Heald of Dr. Steese. He also was interested in farming and other business undertakings.

Dr. Steese's daughter, Annie, married Frank L. Baldwin. She later donated her home and grounds for the Massillon Public Library and Museum.

Another Stark Countian who attended the 1860 convention was Thomas W. Saxton, junior editor of the Repository. He was the son of John Saxton, founder of that newspaper.

I am indebted, indeed, to the Canton Repository for the research which made the facts I have cited here available to me.

I think it is most interesting to know that my congressional district, which gave the Nation William McKinley, was also responsible for the nomination of Abraham Lincoln, and that the same man who cast the votes to assure the nomination of Lincoln placed in nomination Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, as Lincoln's running mate.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, in the sequence of events preceding the War Between the States, few had such profound significance as the nomination of Abraham Lincoln for President of the United States. Today we celebrate the centennial of that nomination.

One of the finest contemporary newspaper reports of the Republican Convention of 1860 was published by the Washington Evening Star. This account has been reprinted in the Sunday, May 15, edition of that newspaper with an excellent commentary by Staff Writer John W. Stepp. This article accurately depicts the drama and excitement surrounding the convention, and inclusion in the RECORD will assure proper preservation of this succinct account of one of the most momentous events in America's rich political heritage:

THE STAR STORY OF THE EVENTS LEADING UP TO THE CIVIL WAR—THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION OF 1860

(By John W. Stepp)

The Republicans were confident of prevailing in the 1860 presidential election, regardless of their choice of a candidate. After all, the northern and southern factions of the Democratic Party had split—hopelessly, it seemed—on the slavery issue in their convention 2 weeks earlier in Charleston, S.C.

As the Republicans convened on May 16, the man who seemed most likely to become their standard-bearer was William H. Seward, Senator and former Governor of New York, who was resolutely antislavery in his views.

Abraham Lincoln's celebrity, such as it was, stemmed chiefly from his debates with Stephen A. Douglas, the Illinois Democrat, in the 1858 senatorial campaign, and from his address in February 1860 in New York's Cooper Union.

Missouri Judge Edward Bates' appeal was to the conservative wing of the party.

[From the Evening Star, Wednesday, May 16, 1860, p. 3, col. 6]

THE LATEST NEWS—TELEGRAPHIC—THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION—SPECULATION AS TO CANDIDATES

CHICAGO, May 15.—Nothing is of course determined as to the candidates. The friends of the different men proposed are all confident of the success of their favorites.

Lincoln is urged by the delegates from Illinois, but his alleged want of administrative ability is the objection raised against him. After a complimentary vote for him, Illinois will likely go for Bates.

[From the Evening Star, Thursday, May 17, 1860, p. 3, col. 6]

THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION

CHICAGO, May 16.—Long before the hour for the meeting of the Republican Convention today, the vicinity of the wigwam was thronged with thousands eager to gain admittance to its spacious enclosure. It is estimated that 30,000 strangers are in the city. Within the scene was very exciting.

As soon as the doors were opened the body of the wigwam was solidly packed with men, whilst the seats in the galleries were packed with ladies. The interior was handsomely decorated with evergreens, statuary and flowers. It was estimated that 10,000 people were within the building.

[From the Evening Star, Friday, May 18, 1860, p. 3, col. 5]

THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION, SECOND DAY

CHICAGO, May 17.—The platform, as reported, resolves as follows:

"Congratulates the country that no Republican Congressman has countenanced threats of disunion and denounces these threats as an avowal of contemplated treason.

"That the new dogma, that the Constitution carries slavery into the territories, is a dangerous political heresy.

"The reopening of the slave trade is denounced."

[From the Evening Star, Saturday, May 19, 1860, p. 3, col. 6]

THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION, THIRD DAY

CHICAGO, May 18.—The convention now proceeded to ballot for a candidate for President. The first ballot resulted as follows: Seward 173, Lincoln 102, Bates 51, [Simon] Cameron 50.

There being no choice, a second ballot was had, as follows: Seward 184½, Lincoln 181½, scattering 38. Whole number of votes 404; necessary to a choice, 203.

The third ballot then took place, and a general stampede of all the forces opposed to Seward took place in favor of Lincoln. It resulted as follows: Lincoln 228, Seward 181.

Mr. Lincoln was therefore declared the nominee. The result is said to have been brought about by the Pennsylvania friends of Mr. Cameron. [Mr. Cameron was a political boss of the Keystone State.]

During the preliminary proceedings, Lincoln's friends exerted their lungs to the utmost, and showed a noisy predominance over Seward's forces.

. . . On motion . . . the nomination of Mr. Lincoln was made unanimous.

. . . On the second ballot Senator [Hannibal] Hamlin [of Maine] was nominated [for Vice President].

HOW THE NOMINATION WAS RECEIVED

The intelligence of the nomination, when conveyed to the people outside the wigwam, created a scene of the wildest excitement which beggars description. Cheer upon cheer rent the air, while cannon sent forth their roar after roar. At least thirty thousand people participated in the excitement.

SKETCH OF MR. LINCOLN

The Hon. Abram [sic] Lincoln, of Illinois, who has so unexpectedly become the nominee of the Republican party for the Presidency of the United States, is known to a very limited extent, never having exhibited any ability as a statesman, or particularly distinguished himself in any other way. He was born in Hardin County, Ky., February 12, 1809; received a limited education; adopted the profession of the law; was a captain of volunteers in the Black Hawk war; at one time a postmaster of a small village; four times elected to the Illinois Legislature; and a representative in Congress from Illinois, from 1847 to 1849. A couple of years ago he was the Republican candidate for U.S. Senator, in opposition to Mr. Douglas. Both gentlemen stumped the State, and their discussions excited much attention throughout the country, as they were marked by great ability. The contest resulted finally in the return of a Democratic Legislature, and the reelection of Mr. Douglas to the U.S. Senate. Since that time, Mr. Lincoln has been prominent as a politician and traveling stump orator in behalf of republicanism, having within a few months past delivered several political lectures in various cities and towns at the North. He is a speaker of considerable ability.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, there is more than sentiment for Abraham Lincoln in our thoughts as we observe today

the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's nomination as Republican candidate for President of the United States. There is, more importantly, the recognition that many of the great advances that have resulted in the United States becoming the foremost power in the world today—economically, culturally, militarily—can be attributed to sound principles as set down and adopted at that second Republican Convention in Chicago, May 16, 17, and 18, 1860.

Today, 100 years after Lincoln's nomination as Republican candidate for President and subsequent election, this Nation celebrates a century of progress—continual advancement for a better and more purposeful life.

Lincoln, one of the most quoted of all Americans, is popularly known for his many immortal phrases on moral issues. Among the sagest of all his counsel was the following statement that is so timely and carries such import for us today:

"That the people justly view with alarm the reckless extravagance which pervades every department of the Federal Government; that a return to rigid economy and accountability is indispensable to arrest the systematic plunder of the public Treasury by favored partisans."

Mr. Speaker, a sound fiscal policy is today as much a part of the Republican Party's philosophy as it was 100 years ago, and we who are privileged to be affiliated with that party are as dedicated to its principles as were the first Republican leaders. Last year, in what unquestionably was the greatest expression of public opinion directed at Congress in my 11 years on Capitol Hill, Mr. and Mrs. America, with singleness of voice and purpose, demanded that their duly elected Representatives in both Houses of Congress live within the Nation's collective means. The public insisted that wasteful, deficit spending be halted and that the Federal Government demonstrate fiscal responsibility.

There are a number of vital items of legislation that this Congress must enact if it is to discharge its responsibilities and keep faith with its citizens. I urge my colleagues to be guided by these principles in the relatively few weeks remaining of the 86th Congress, and that all sincere effort be made to pass such legislation as we can reasonably expect will meet with the approval of the President. I am sure, in this connection, that his demands relating to the key bills before Congress are most reasonable.

Representative FRED SCHWENGEL is to be commended for taking this time so that we can all pay tribute to one of our Nation's most courageous leaders.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, if I could be permitted to repeat everything said by my distinguished colleagues, who have spoken so inspiringly and informatively of Abraham Lincoln on this 100th anniversary of his nomination for the Presidency of the United States, I would feel I would not be saying a bit too much about Abraham Lincoln and his influence on the life and destiny of our Nation; yes, Mr. Speaker, on the life and destiny of the whole world. In several nations where I have traveled officially as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I could observe very attractive statues, lifesize, of this illustrious Civil War President.

For many years prior to my first coming to this great legislative body 14 years ago, I had the great privilege of being president of the Abraham Lincoln Club at Long Beach, Calif. I am sure that there are many thousands of Californians who are appreciative of his place in history for understanding between people of the human race which was the policy and practice of President Lincoln—both in and out of office.

One of the paragraphs in his message to Congress in 1861 which I always remember and emphasize as very, very appropriate always, is as follows:

> The prudent, penniless beginner in the world labors for wages awhile, saves a surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, and at length hires another new beginner to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system which opens the way to all—gives hope to all, and consequent energy and progress and improvement of condition to all.

I love to read and reread this statement by him during the debates with Stephen Douglas in 1858:

> When I was a boy, I spent considerable time along the Sangamon River. An old steamboat plied on the river, the boiler of which was so small that when they blew the whistle, there wasn't enough steam to turn the paddlewheel. When the paddlewheel went around, they couldn't blow the whistle. My friend Douglas reminds me of that old steamboat, for it is evident when he talks he can't think, and when he thinks, he can't talk.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Senator Douglas is of worldwide renown. All the anxious politicians of his party have been looking upon him as certainly at no distant day to be President of the United States. They have seen in his round, jolly, fruitful face post offices, land offices, marshalships and Cabinet appointments, chargeships and foreign missions, bursting and sprouting out in wonderful exuberance ready to be laid hold of by their greedy hands. And as they have been gazing upon this attractive picture so long, they cannot bring themselves to give up the charming hope. On the contrary, nobody has ever expected me to be President. In my poor, lean, lank face, nobody has ever seen that any cabbages were sprouting out. These are disadvantages all taken together, that the Republicans labor under. We have to fight this battle upon principle, and principle alone.

I recall the following quotations of his:

> With malice toward none; with charity for all;
> With firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right,
> Let us strive on to finish the work we are in;
> To bind up the Nation's wounds;
> To care for him who shall have borne the battle,
> And for his widow and orphan—
> To do all which may achieve and cherish,
> A just and lasting peace among ourselves
> And with all nations.

> Stand with anyone that stands right. Stand with him while he is right and part with him when he goes wrong.

Mr. Speaker, lastly, we Members of this great legislative body should not be remiss in remembering that Abraham Lincoln was a duly elected Member of the House of Representatives in his day and was a member of the Illinois delegation in the House from March 4, 1847, until March 4, 1849; and while he and his wife were here in Washington during that period they lived at Mrs. Spriggs boarding house here on the Hill where the Library of Congress now stands. In checking through my reference file about him, I find that on Tuesday, April 26, 1949, I made remarks in the House of Representatives entitled "Lincoln, Martyred Friend of the South." Every year since that it has been an inspiration to me to participate in doing something to remember him.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in this discussion led by my able friend and colleague from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] and relate to you something about Lincoln in New Hampshire.

We owe our chief knowledge of this subject to Judge Elwin L. Page's book, "Lincoln in New Hampshire," published in 1929. The author in his preface states that upon reading Dr. William E. Barton's "Life of Lincoln" he was struck by Barton's emphasizing the failure hitherto of Lincoln biographers giving adequate consideration to the effect of Lincoln's speeches during the latter's visit to New England in February and March, 1860.

In the winter of 1860 Lincoln delivered his famous speech at Cooper Union—the speech that first brought him seriously to the attention of the East; that predisposed the anti-Seward faction in Lincoln's favor, and which consequently brought about the latter's nomination the following May in Chicago.

Lincoln spoke at Cooper Union on the evening of February 27, 1860. The following evening he spoke before a large audience in Railroad Hall, Providence. The next day, February 29, he was on his way to what must have seemed to him a far northern country indeed—the State of New Hampshire. On Thursday, March 1, he spoke at Concord in the afternoon, and at Manchester in the evening. At Concord he was introduced by Gov. Frederick Smith, who presented him to his audience as "the next President of the United States." As Dr. Barton remarks, "Such an introduction was exceptional," and the author adds ironically that at Norwich, Conn., where Lincoln spoke later, the speaker who preceded Lincoln "went the full length of the general imagination and suggested Lincoln might be the next Vice President."

On Friday, March 2, Lincoln spoke at Dover, and finally, the next evening, at Exeter, spending Sunday with his son Robert, who was attending the famous preparatory school in the town. This speech in the little town on Saturday evening, March 3, 1860, marked the final appearance of Mr. Lincoln in the State.

In all, Lincoln spoke 11 times in New England. As Barton says, biographers of Lincoln have not considered adequately the effect of these New England speeches. Several of these biographers, for example, state that Robert Lincoln was at Harvard at the time of his father's tour of New England. On the

contrary, having failed to pass his entrance examinations for that institution, he was at Phillips Exeter Academy, "boning up." Robert did not enter Harvard until 7 months later; one of his father's reasons for coming East was to look into his son's situation; had Robert been safely matriculated at Harvard in the winter of 1860 his father might not have delivered the Cooper Union speech, and the New England tour might not have been made.

Barton describes the situation in the following words—his book was published in 1925, the year before Robert Todd Lincoln's death:

Robert T. Lincoln is a very reticent man, and for the most part declines to speak for publication concerning his father; but one thing he modestly affirms, which is that he made his father President. In the autumn of 1859, Robert went to Cambridge expecting to enter Harvard. He was required to submit to an entrance examination covering 16 subjects, and he failed in 15 of them. The Lincoln family wrote him not to return home, but to enter Phillips Academy at Exeter, N.H., and complete his preparation. This he did, and at the end of a year was able to enter Harvard and complete a regular course. But Mr. Lincoln was somewhat anxious about Robert's studies, and one of his reasons for being ready to visit New York and speak at Cooper Institute was to visit Robert and see how he was getting on at Exeter. Robert T. Lincoln believes that if he had failed in less than 15 studies his father might have been less solicitous, and might not have delivered the Cooper Union speech, or having delivered it, might have returned from New York direct to Springfield. As it was, he determined to visit Robert and make a few speeches in New England.

As to the Lincoln speeches themselves in New Hampshire, there are, alas, only two summaries in reportorial fashion—that is, in the third person. They, however appear to be fairly adequate, considering the lack of press facilities in little New England towns 100 years ago, and the probable lack of shorthand skill on the part of the reporters. The two summaries which have come down to us appear in the Manchester Daily American for March 2, 1860, and the Dover Inquirer for March 8.

The concluding portion of the Dover report is most certainly reliable, for it is, almost word for word, a literal transcription of the final exordium of the great Cooper Union address: indeed, it is quite possible that Lincoln read from proofs, or the morning issue of one of the several New York papers of February 28, which contained the full text of the address from the original manuscript Mr. Lincoln turned over to Horace Greeley's New York Tribune. Mr. Lincoln's last recorded words in New Hampshire, via the Dover Inquirer, were as follows:

To satisfy them [the slaveholding States] said Mr. Lincoln, is no easy task. We must not only cease to call slavery wrong, but we must join with them in calling it right. Silence will not be tolerated. Douglas' new sedition law must be enacted and enforced. We must arrest and return their fugitive slaves with greedy pleasure. We must pull down our free State constitutions. The whole atmosphere must be disinfected from the taint of opposition to slavery, before they will cease to believe that all their troubles proceed from us. Wrong as we believe slavery to be, we should let [it] alone in the States where it exists, because its extirpation would occasion greater wrongs, but we should not, while our votes can prevent it, allow it to spread over the national territories and overrun us in the free States. Neither should we be diverted by trick or stratagem, by a senseless clamor about "popular sovereignty," by any contrivances for groping for some middle ground between the right and the wrong—the "don't care" policy of Douglas—or Union appeals to true Union men to yield to the threats of dis-Unionists, which was reversing the divine rule, and calling, not the sinners but the righteous to repentance—none of these things should move or intimidate us; but having faith that right makes might, let us to the end, dare to do our duty.

To Judge Page's delightful and exceedingly valuable book "Abraham Lincoln in New Hampshire," which has rescued and preserved Lincoln's New England tour from obscurity, we owe the following charming account of Mr. Lincoln's last day in New Hampshire:

On that Sabbath just 1 year before his first inaugural, Abraham Lincoln shuffled off the thought of politics and gave himself to rest. Early in the morning he walked out Front Street and along the muddy road toward Kingston. Arriving at a fork some 2 miles out, he took the right hand, leaving Kingston road, and wandered on another mile. Then he heard the pleasant roar of a river a bit to the left. Following the sound, he bore off on a crossroad and came upon Pickpocket Bridge. There he found young William H. Belknap, an Exeter printer, hanging over the rail and watching the swollen stream tumble down the falls. Lincoln joined the youth in gazing at the fascinating spectacle. As seems usually to have been his custom when other human beings were near, he engaged the youth in conversation. What was said was of little moment and was soon forgotten, but that chat with Abraham Lincoln was a lifelong satisfaction to the future townclerk of Exeter. The story that during his Exeter stay Lincoln saw a small boy fishing for eels near the Great Bridge and borrowed his crude alder pole to try his luck may be untrue, but is in keeping with the simple manner of Lincoln's casual contacts with the townspeople.

Lincoln worshiped that Sunday in the Second Church of the New Parish. The meetinghouse stood in the corner of the Academy yard near the present site of the public library on Front Street. The edifice was removed years after Lincoln's visit, and the parish has ceased to exist. The pew in which he sat has been preserved with great care and is now in the First Church. It was the property of Commodore John Collins Long and Mary Olivia Long, true representatives of the Exeter aristocracy of the day. The minister of the church at the time was the Reverend Orpheus T. Lanphear.

After the service Lincoln walked with Robert to the boy's lodgings in the Clarke (or Simeon Folsom) house on Hemlock Square, at the corner of High and Pleasant Streets, just over the Great Bridge. In their crossings of the river, however, the two usually took the rather shorter way over the lower bridge at the island and thence out Pleasant Street. In the portion of the house fronting on this street, in the left-hand, second-story room, the Lincolns had their Sunday dinner.

During his days in Exeter, Lincoln was seen much in Robert's company. That is one point upon which the evidence is clear and full. The father entered with real zest into the boy's interests and his companionships with the other students. This was the prime object of his trip into New England, and in spite of political calls he accomplished it. For these purely private pursuits he had Wednesday evening, Saturday afternoon, and all of Sunday afternoon and evening.

Lincoln appears in these contacts with the boys and with the townspeople he ran across to have been ever simple and sociable, a man thoroughly enjoying his brief snatches of holiday. A story was told by Albert Blair of a little gathering of academy boys in Bob's room on Sunday evening. Into the chatter Lincoln entered with true boy-like spirit. Bob remarked that one of the party, Henry Cluskey, played the banjo. "Does he?" said Lincoln in his high-pitched voice. "Where is the banjo?" "In my room," replied Cluskey. "Can't you get it?" "Oh, I don't think you would care for it, Mr. Lincoln." "Oh, yes. Go get it." And so the owner of the banjo went and fetched it from his room several blocks away, and played upon it. Lincoln listened with unaffected pleasure. "Robert," he said, "you ought to have one." What the youngsters chiefly remembered about their friend's father was that when he talked with Bob, or the boys gathered around, the deep seams of his face broke into a series of twinkling lines. Every boy was at once drawn to him, as he was to them.

The holiday—

Writes Judge Page—

was all too short. At a few minutes before 7 on Monday morning, March 5, 1860, Lincoln boarded the train at Exeter for Hartford, where he was to deliver a major address. Never again would he breathe the bracing air wafted down from the White Mountains, to meet and mingle with that from the caves of the misty Atlantic.

And thus—

Concludes Judge Page—

Abraham Lincoln passed from the sight of New Hampshire, but not from her memory.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, all of us in Illinois, as throughout the Nation, Democrat and Republican alike, revere the memory of Abraham Lincoln.

It is fitting, therefore, that, although a Democrat, I feel privileged to join in this tribute to Lincoln on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of his nomination by the Republican Party of 1860 as its candidate for President of the United States.

However, I cannot let this occasion pass without paying tribute to another great American, another stalwart son of Illinois, that great leader of the Democratic Party, Stephen Douglas.

If, as many historians say, Lincoln's debates with Douglas gained him national stature and led to the presidential nomination, it was because Douglas already had risen to preeminence in the political life of this country.

It was the mark of the man that Douglas, once Lincoln became Chief Executive amid the flames of civil war, forsook partisanship and loyally supported his Commander in Chief.

An interesting account of this final episode in the stirring life of Illinois' "Little Giant" is given in the following account prepared at my request by Mr. John T. Rodgers, editorial specialist with the history and government division of the legislative reference service of the Library of Congress:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN: STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS

The great political battle, formally opened by the ominous "House divided" speech at Springfield, Ill., on June 16, 1858, was at last

decided—insofar as it could lawfully be decided—by the returns as they filtered through from the North on the evening of November 6, 1860.

And the defeated—but still indubitably great opponent of that most fateful political field? I cannot, I feel, do better than to quote from Miss Tarbell's "Life of Lincoln," which, after three score and 5 years, still casts an indefinable charm. Speaking of the inaugural ceremonies on that foreboding March 4, 1861, Miss Tarbell writes:

"A few moments' delay, and the movement from the Senate toward the east front began, the Justices of the Supreme Court, in cap and gown, heading the procession. As soon as the large company was seated on the platform erected on the east portico of the Capitol, Mr. Lincoln arose and advanced to the front, where he was introduced by his friend, Senator Baker, of Oregon. He carried a cane and a little roll—the manuscript of his inaugural address. There was a moment's pause after the introduction, as he vainly looked for a spot where he might place his high silk hat. Stephen A. Douglas, the political antagonist of his whole public life, the man who had pressed his hardest in the campaign of 1860, was seated just behind him. Douglas stepped forward quickly, and took the hat which Mr. Lincoln held helplessly in his hand. 'If I can't be President,' he whispered smilingly to Mrs. Brown, a cousin of Mrs. Lincoln and a member of the President's party, 'I at least can hold his hat.'

" 'Douglas' conduct cannot be overpraised,' wrote the 'Public Man' in his 'Diary.' 'I saw him for a moment in the morning, when he told me that he meant to put himself as prominently forward in the ceremonies as he properly could, and to leave no doubt on any one's mind of his determination to stand by the new administration in the performance of its first great duty to maintain the Union.' "

"Immediately after the firing on Fort Sumter, Douglas accompanied George Ashmun to the White House, at the latter's suggestion, to assure the President of his support. He was cordially received and heard the President read a draft of the proclamation calling for 75,000 volunteers to suppress rebellion. His only criticism was: 'I would make it 200,000.' Otherwise their accord was complete. In the columns of the newspapers next morning Democrats read the President's proclamation and a dispatch (written by Douglas) announcing the determination of Senator Douglas fully to sustain the President in the exercise of all his constitutional functions to preserve the Union. From this time on Douglas was in frequent conference with the President. It was on Lincoln's advice that he left the Capital to rouse the people of the Northwest to the seriousness of the crisis. He spoke twice on the way, both times with obvious emotion, deprecating secession and pleading for the support of the Government at Washington. On April 25, he made a remarkable speech to his own people in the capitol at Springfield. Fifty years later, men who had been his political opponents could not speak of it without emotion. 'I do not think it is possible,' wrote Horace White, 'for a human being to produce a more prodigious effect with spoken words' (Herndon-Weik, Lincoln II, 126–27). His great sonorous voice reverberated through the chamber until it seemed to shake the building, stirring men and women to a frenzy of excitement. In a few weeks that great voice was still. Stricken soon after with typhoid fever, he battled resolutely as ever with this last foe, but succumbed on June 3, 1861, his last words a message to his two boys bidding them to obey the laws and support the Constitution."

Thus did not the least of the sons of Illinois pass over the Great Divide, his last thought—his very last breath—in support of the Union he so dearly and zealously loved.

LINCOLN AND WISCONSIN

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa has done a real service to take the leadership in commemorating the anniversary of President Lincoln's nomination as the first Republican President on May 18, 1860. I would like to add some Wisconsin Lincoln history to our proceedings today.

1. LINCOLN IN THE BLACK HAWK WAR

Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1832, Black Hawk and his band of Sauk Indians crossed the Mississippi River from Iowa into northern Illinois, angry at the treatment his people had received and intending to start an Indian uprising if he could.

Upon news of the invasion, Gov. John Reynolds, of Illinois, called for volunteers. Abraham Lincoln, then 23 years old and living in New Salem, responded promptly to the appeal, and while serving in the campaign spent some 11 days in southern Wisconsin.

Telling later about his experiences, Lincoln said he served nearly 3 months in the war, met the ordinary hardships of such an expedition, but was in no battle, although he "had a good many bloody struggles with the mosquitoes."

On April 21, 1832, the recruits from New Salem met on a farm 9 miles from the village and formed a company of mounted volunteers with Lincoln as captain. A week later they were mustered into the State service, becoming a part of the 4th Illinois Regiment of Mounted Volunteers. After an excursion into northwestern Illinois, the company was sent to Ottawa on the Illinois River. There on May 26 Lincoln reenlisted for 20 days as a private and a day later transferred to still another company, the Independent Rangers, which company was mustered out on June 16.

Lincoln at once reenlisted for another 30 days in the Independent Spy Corps. On June 22 this company left for northwestern Illinois and began a march up the Rock River in pursuit of Black Hawk's main force.

On July 1, 1832, the army crossed Rock River at Turtle Village—today Beloit, Wis.—the soldiers sleeping on their arms behind log breastworks that night, to be ready for surprise attack. On July 6 the army marched up the east bank of Lake Koshkonong and made camp 4 miles above the mouth of the White Water River. There at General Atkinson's headquarters Lincoln and his comrades in the company were honorably discharged "with the special thanks" of the general on July 10.

Lincoln and a companion returned by horseback and canoe to New Salem, reaching the village soon after July 17.

Numerous stories of Lincoln in the war have been told, most of them without documentation. One is that while captain of the company the men reached a narrow gate. Unable to remember the command for single file, Lincoln ordered them to fall out for 2 minutes and reform on the other side. Another is that when asked if he was afraid of Black Hawk, Lincoln said, "Well, I guess not. I'm no chicken."

The experience did teach Lincoln to appreciate how fighting men thought and felt. In the war he faced danger, often expecting Indian attack at night. He learned what war meant to the common man, and perhaps carried his sympathy for the private soldier into the Civil War.

2. LINCOLN'S SECOND VISIT TO WISCONSIN, SEPTEMBER 30–OCTOBER 2, 1859

Mr. Speaker, on September 30, 1859, Lincoln delivered the annual State fair address in Milwaukee. The State fairgrounds then were located near what is now 13th Street near Wells.

The Milwaukee speech stands as Lincoln's only formal address on the subject of agriculture. It was carefully prepared, as though he fully appreciated its importance in a commanding agricultural State. It reveals Lincoln as one of clear vision on the future of farming; in fact, some of his prophecies now seem amazingly accurate in the light of present technical developments for scientific and less burdensome farming.

The speaker evaluated boldly the respective rights of labor and of capital as he saw them. He was outspoken also in advocating a broad educational policy for his fellow citizens, having particular reference to the need for a blending of schooling and occupational training for workers.

That evening Lincoln spoke extemporaneously at the Newhall House in Milwaukee and the next day, October 1, delivered two antislavery speeches in Rock County—one at Beloit in the afternoon and one at Janesville in the evening. The two local newspapers reported the speeches in the form of editorial reviews, with scarcely a direct quotation from the speaker.

The Beloit Journal—weekly—October 5, 1859, reported that a large crowd and a band met Mr. Lincoln at the station. At 2 o'clock a packed hall heard him introduced by Mr. Bannister, president of the Republican club.

"Then 'Old Abe' commenced the clearest and most conclusive vindication of Republican principles, as well as the most unanswerable demonstration of the fallacy and utter absurdity of the Douglas doctrines, which we ever listened to."

The Beloit address was heard by several prominent Republican leaders of nearby Janesville, including an ardent abolitionist, William H. Tallman, who persuaded Lincoln to ride with him in his carriage to Janesville and deliver an address that evening. Lincoln consented, and after the speech that—Saturday, October 1—night, spent the night, the next day, and the following night at Tallman's house.

The Janesville speech was reported in the Janesville Morning Gazette, October 4:

When Mr. Lincoln made his appearance he was greeted with cheers, and was introduced to the people by Dr. Treat, the president of the Republican club. * * * When he came to make his points tell, and to

drive home his logical conclusions, the evidence of his profound thought was apparent, while his powers of satire and wit flashed out brilliantly, and rather startling the audience by their unexpectedness.

The Tallman house, the only identifiable house in which Lincoln is known to have slept while in Wisconsin, is now a public museum, the headquarters of the Rock County Historical Society.

3. BIRTH OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party was born in 1854. There is no dispute as to the year of its formal organization, although debate still goes on as to the exact birthplace. Most historians accept Ripon's claim as the birthplace of Lincoln's party.

The first recorded meeting of "Republicans" was held by a number of Whigs, Free Soilers, and Democrats in the Congregational Church at Ripon on February 28, 1854, at the call of Maj. Alvan E. Bovay, a prominent Whig. A resolution was adopted providing that, if the Kansas-Nebraska bill passed, the existing Ripon party organizations should be abandoned and a new party, to be called the Republican, should be formed.

When the bill did pass the Senate, Major Bovay called a second meeting, which was held on March 20 in the Ripon schoolhouse. By a house-to-house and shop-to-shop canvass, he obtained attendance of 53 voters, out of not more than 100 eligible in the town. The meeting voted to dissolve the local Whig and Free Soil organizations, and a committee of five was appointed to form the new Republican Party.

Many years later Major Bovay said of the schoolhouse meeting:

> We went into the little meeting, Whigs, Free Soilers, and Democrats. We came out of it Republicans, and we were the first Republicans in the Union.

The spring and summer of 1854 saw many other meetings, held under one banner or another, that brought Republican organizations into being in Michigan, Ohio, Iowa, and Maine.

The most notable meeting—notable because it was a formal convention that adopted a platform and nominated a full State ticket—was held "under the oaks" at Jackson, Mich., on July 6, 1854. The convention resolved "that we will cooperate and be known as Republicans until the contest be terminated."

The movement begun in the Ripon church and "under the oaks" at Jackson had changed the political face of the Nation.

The little Ripon schoolhouse, still standing, is labeled "Birthplace of the Republican Party."

4. THE CONVENTION AND ELECTION OF 1860

Mr. Speaker, at the Republican National Convention held in Chicago May 16–18, 1860, the Wisconsin delegation consistently cast its entire 10 votes for William H. Seward on each ballot.

Carl Schurz, one of the delegates and chairman of the Wisconsin delegation, seconded the nomination of Seward and after the nomination of Lincoln by the convention made a brief speech in response to a motion by Mr. Evarts, of New York, that the nomination of Lincoln be made unanimous.

Schurz said, in part:

> The delegates of Wisconsin were instructed to cast their votes unanimously for William H. Seward. * * * We stood by Mr. Seward to the last, and I tell you we stand by him yet, in support of Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois. * * * Again, do we stand by Mr. Seward as we did before, for we know that he will be at the head of our column, joining in the battle cry that unites us now, "Lincoln and victory."

5. CARL SCHURZ AND THE CAMPAIGN OF 1860

Mr. Speaker, from the close of the Wisconsin State convention, March 1, until after the November 6 election, Schurz was almost constantly busied with work for the national cause. On May 30 at the Milwaukee ratification meeting he delivered one of the best of his short speeches, pointing out how the convention had refused to compromise Republican principles. He paid a high tribute to Seward. Then he spoke of Lincoln, using language which must have introduced him most favorably to the millions, especially in the East, who had been taught to look upon the Illinois lawyer as a second- or third-rate man.

After lecturing throughout the country in the summer and fall, Schurz returned to Wisconsin for the last 2 weeks of the campaign. He made numerous speeches in the city and county of Milwaukee and covered, by team, a large share of the great German community near Lake Michigan. The results in Wisconsin, as well as in Indiana, Ohio, St. Louis, and Pennsylvania, spoke of his almost superhuman effort to swing the German vote for Lincoln.

In the election of 1860, Wisconsin cast 86,113 votes—56.6 percent—for Lincoln, 65,021 votes—42.7 percent—for Douglas.

Mr. Speaker, the information I have used today has been collected by the Wisconsin State Historical Society from the following sources: Edward P. Alexander's "Lincoln Comes to Wisconsin;" Publications of the Lincoln Fellowship of Wisconsin, 1943 and 1949; Joseph Schafer's "Carl Schurz."

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago today the Republican Party made one of the wisest decisions in its history. It chose as its presidential nominee a tall, somewhat ungainly man who represented Illinois in our own House of Representatives. We pause in our legislative duties today to pay tribute to the nomination of Abraham Lincoln.

Can words ever describe our feeling for this humble giant of a man? I think they can, Mr. Speaker, for it was Lincoln himself who showed us how powerful, how effective, how moving simple words could be. Of course, it is presumptuous of us to suppose we could say anything to match the classic words of Lincoln; we can only find consolation in the thought that Lincoln was but a man, and his example showed us the heights of wisdom man can attain.

Recall that Lincoln lived before the development of mass communications, that such a thing as a "TV personality" was undreamed of. Yet he was able to bring tears to the eyes of grown men when he spoke, affect an audience so deeply that it could not applaud, unite a Nation divided. He has been called the Shakespeare of politics, and this is entirely fitting.

That his words guide Republicans today is testimony to the enduring quality of his prose. We still hold that "the legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people, whatever they need to have done, but cannot do, at all, or cannot, so well do, for themselves—in their separate and individual capacities."

For the last 20 years I have been privileged to represent in the House of Representatives more than 350,000 fellow residents of New Jersey. They will never know the daily feeling of honor and pride that I have experienced in the knowledge that they have chosen me to speak their will in the same body that once knew Abraham Lincoln as a Member. Yes, the Republicans chose well at their second national convention on May 18, 1860, and Americans everywhere will always applaud their action.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the gentleman from Iowa in this observance of the 100th anniversary of the nomination of Abraham Lincoln to the Presidency.

Mr. Speaker, Nebraska was a territory in 1860 when Abraham Lincoln was nominated for President by the Republican Party. Nebraska was allotted six votes at the Chicago convention. A. S. Paddock, of Fort Calhoun, Nebr., acted as vice president of the convention, each State and Territory having a vice president and secretary. H. P. Hitchcock, of Omaha, acted as secretary from the Nebraska Territory.

Other members of the Nebraska delegation to the convention included O. H. Irish, Nebraska City, a member of the committee on permanent organization; John R. Meredith, Omaha, committee on credentials; Samuel H. Elbert, Plattsmouth, committee on business; A. Sidney Gardner, committee on resolutions, Phineas W. Hitchcock and E. D. Webster, both of Omaha.

Paddock later served as Senator from the State of Nebraska from 1875 through 1881. Members of the Hitchcock family also served the State in high office in later years, Phineas W. Hitchcock being elected a delegate to Congress from the territory to the 39th Congress and serving as Senator from 1871 to 1877. His son, Gilbert M. Hitchcock, was a Representative in Congress in the 58th, 60th and 61st Congresses and served as Senator from Nebraska from 1911 through 1923. He also established the Omaha Evening Herald and purchased the Omaha Morning World, which now exist as the Omaha World-Herald, Omaha's only daily paper. Mr. Hitchcock's widow is now a resident of Washington, D.C.

On this occasion I wish it were possible for me to say that Nebraska's six votes in the 1860 convention were solidly for Lincoln, but that was not the case. In fact only one of Nebraska's votes was cast for Lincoln on the first ballot, with two for Seward, two for Chase, and one for Cameron.

On the third ballot, when Lincoln was nominated, our Nebraska delegates still cast only one vote for Honest Abe. But of course the nomination was made unanimous a few minutes later, after Nebraska and many other delegations had switched their entire vote to Lincoln.

Although Nebraska is the only State to honor Lincoln by naming its capital city after him, he apparently never set foot in our State. In 1859 he came as close as Council Bluffs, Iowa, across the Missouri River from Omaha, and made a speech there. Willian J. Petersen in his book "Lincoln and Iowa" reports:

It attracted a good crowd, even though it was unscheduled, and it elicited conflicting reactions from the Republican and Democratic editors of Council Bluffs. The friendly Nonpareil praised his "masterly and unanswerable speech" and the "dexterity with which he applied the political scalpel to the Democratic carcass." The Weekly Bugle spoke in a derisive vein of Lincoln's effort, but admitted that his defeat by Senator Douglas had "magnified him into quite a lion" at Council Bluffs. Lincoln stayed at the Pacific House on this occasion and made his speech in Concert Hall.

Since this is also the 100th anniversary of the founding of the pony express, it is interesting to note that the pony express carried President Lincoln's first inaugural address across Nebraska. The distance from St. Joseph, Mo., to Denver, Colo., 665 miles, was covered on this historic trip in 69 hours.

Nebraska has long been proud of the fact that it is one of the major railway centers of the continental United States. Without a doubt, it is due to Nebraska's vast railway system that it is now the No. 1 stock market in the world and that it is attracting new industry every day. It was in 1863 that Peter Day, chief engineer of the Union Pacific Railroad, received a telegram in Omaha which announced that President Lincoln had fixed the initial point of the railroad on the "western boundary of the State of Iowa, opposite Omaha."

What is said to be the last signature of President Lincoln appears on the commission reappointing Alvin Saunders of Iowa to be Governor of the Territory of Nebraska. The commission is dated April 13, 1865. Governor Saunders states in a note written in his own hand at the bottom of the document:

The signature of President Lincoln attached to this commission was evidently the last official signature made by him—he signed it before leaving for the theater where he was assassinated, and left the commission on his desk without stopping to fold it, and where it was found when the room was opened after his death. These facts were communicated to me by one of the clerks.

In 1867, shortly after the admission of Nebraska to the Union as a State, it was decided that the capital would not remain in Omaha. Senator J. D. H. Patrick of Omaha moved that the new capital should be named after President Lincoln. The name was promptly approved, and the capital of Nebraska is still named Lincoln in fond memory of that famous President.

The Lincoln Monument stands on the west side of the Nebraska Capitol lawn as an additional tribute to that famous American. It was designed by Daniel Chester French and was completed in 1912. The following description of the statue is found in "Nebraska, a Guide to the Cornhusker State":

Abraham Lincoln is portrayed standing in a meditative pose, with head bowed and hands clasped, before a large granite tablet on which the Gettysburg Address is engraved.

The original model of the statue is in the Lincoln Tomb in Springfield, Ill., while a replica of the statue is to be found in the Chicago Museum of Art.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the historic Wigwam Convention, which nominated Abraham Lincoln for the Presidency, assembled in Chicago 100 years ago, May 16, 1860.

Mr. Lawrence Sullivan, coordinator of information for the House of Representatives, has reconstructed that convention from the rich Lincoln Archives in the Library of Congress.

Because that event "opened a new era in our national history," I include Mr. Sullivan's summary of the convention in the proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with two brief quotations from Abraham Lincoln in the years 1860 and 1861, expressing his great humility as he left Springfield, Ill., for Washington.

The article and quotations are as follows:

CHICAGO'S FIRST NATIONAL CONVENTION—ABE LINCOLN'S NOMINATION IN THE HISTORIC WIGWAM 100 YEARS AGO THIS WEEK, OPENED A NEW ERA IN HUMAN HISTORY

(By Lawrence Sullivan, Coordinator of Information, U.S. House of Representatives)

The convention which picked Abraham Lincoln as its presidential candidate assembled in Chicago 100 years ago this week. The Republican Party was only 6 years old.

Few participants in that historic convention suspected that their deliberations would lead to the abolition of human slavery in the United States, in less than 4 years.

The convention assembled in the newly constructed Wigwam on Wednesday, May 16, and Lincoln was nominated on Friday, May 18.

Years later the distinguished British historian, Lord Charnwood, described the convention's choice as the "most surprising nomination ever made in America."

The Wigwam, completed only a month before, accommodated almost 10,000 persons. Constructed entirely of rough lumber the magnificant edifice had cost $7,000. The city of Chicago, then less than 30 years old, had reared the Wigwam in a bold bid against mighty New York and stately Philadelphia for its first national political convention. The rugged, blustering West was emerging as the new power center of U.S. politics.

Lincoln did not go to Chicago for the convention, but remained at home in Springfield, close to his family and intimate friends. He had confided to young reporter Henry Villard months earlier that his wife, in 1859, had predicted his election some day to the Presidency of the United States.

"Just think of such a sucker as me as President," Lincoln said laughingly to Villard.

Like many other convention winners through the years, Abe Lincoln never publicly announced himself a candidate for the Presidency. But he did move about the country freely after the celebrated Lincoln-Douglas debates of 1858; and early in 1860 he ventured as far as New England, and to the historic Cooper Union in New York City, for speaking engagements.

Upon his return to Springfield, early in March, he began writing personal letters to prospective convention delegates in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Kansas, and Kentucky. On May 12, 4 days before the convention assembled in the Wigwam, two trusted political intimates from Illinois, Jesse K. Dubois and Judge David Davis, were in Chicago "ready" in Lincoln's words, "to confer with friends from other States."

To another friend Lincoln wrote in confidence a few months before the convention, "The taste is in my mouth a little." And to a Chicago banker who had invited him to bed and board during the convention, Lincoln wrote a few days before May 16: "I am a little too much a candidate to stay home and not quite enough a candidate to go."

Murat Halstead, telegraphed to the Cincinnati Commercial May 16, that 25,000 visitors were in Chicago for the convention. The current of the universal twaddle as the convention opened, he added, was "that Old Abe will be the nominee."

Halstead remarked his journalist roommates had been irrepressible to a late hour, and he had caught them playing cards early next morning to determine who would pay for a round of gin cocktails before breakfast.

Horace Greeley, the distinguished New York abolitionist editor, and himself an aspiring darkhorse before convention, was a striking figure in the crowded hubbub of Tremont House, the Republican headquarters hotel.

Lincoln's friends won their first victory in the platform committee, where they were successful in defeating the abolitionists' demand for a total denunciation of slavery. The Lincoln moderates carried the day with a plank ignoring slavery in the original States, but forbidding any extension of slavery into new territories as they might be organized. The platform also called for a railroad to the Pacific Ocean, to be assisted by Federal grants.

The first rollcall for President gave William H. Seward, New York, 173½; Lincoln 102; Edward Bates of Missouri 48; Cameron of Pennsylvania 50½; and Salmon P. Chase of Ohio 49. The total vote was 465, with 233 necessary to nominate.

As the second rollcall began the rumor spread that Pennsylvania's votes for Cameron would swing to Lincoln. The final tally on this rollcall showed Seward 184½; Lincoln 181.

The Seward forces realized they were defeated. They saw now that Lincoln's personal preconvention canvass of the delegates by mail already assured him a vast majority of the 100 scattered votes still to swing to make a nomination.

Early in the third rollcall, word spread through the Wigwam that Lincoln was the man. About midway in the call, Ohio interrupted to switch 4 votes from Chase to Lincoln—sufficient to make the required majority of 233 for Abe. At this juncture, Halstead noted, "there were thousands cheering with the energy of insanity."

New York then moved to make the nomination unanimous.

Lincoln's political genius had found succinct expression in a preconvention letter to an Ohio delegate: "Our policy, then, is to give no offense to others—leave them in a good mood to come to us if they shall be compelled to give up their first love. This, too, is dealing justly with all, and leaving us in a mood to support heartily whoever shall be nominated."

This firm policy of peaceful coexistence with all the "favorite son" candidates at length paid off when Seward, the uncompromising firebrand abolitionist, failed to command a majority on the second ballot.

The 1860 Wigwam convention, in short, demonstrated the prescient wisdom of Lincoln's original position in the 1858 debates with Douglas. "I did not at any time say I was in favor of Negro suffrage. . . . I declared against it." He had frankly admitted a total lack of Federal authority to abolish slavery in the original States, and was inclined personally not to "disturb" existing slave areas, but only to limit the spread of slavery to new territories. In the convention, this proved to be the political middle-ground which finally won the majority from the hardshell abolitionist, Seward.

Carl Sandburg emphasizes that Lincoln and Douglas were so close together in their fear of political sectionalism that several prominent Republicans had suggested Douglas, the Illinois Democratic Senator, reelected in 1858, might make a better Republican presidential nominee than Abe Lincoln in 1860.

In their great debates, both men, in Illinois, had sought to subordinate any question which tended to draw a sharp political line between the North and South. To this end, Lincoln was at pains to make clear he did not insist that Missouri should emancipate her slaves. Questions touching racial equality, intermarriage and such, he dismissed as "false issues."

Douglas likewise ignored all arguments for complete abolition, and agreed with Lincoln on the exclusion of slavery in all new territories. Lincoln demanded this exclusion by congressional enactment, while Douglas would leave the question to popular vote in the new areas as they approached statehood.

Lincoln was in the telegraph office in Springfield when news of the second ballot flashed from Chicago.

"I've got him," he exclaimed as he read the tally showing his own gain of 79 votes, against a gain of only 11 for Seward.

Then Lincoln and his friends moved over to the Journal office to await the third ballot. Soon Mr. Zane, the editor, rushed into the room with the Wigwam decision, calling for three cheers for the next President. Bedlam broke in all Springfield.

When a friend suggested a biography in book form, Lincoln replied, "There is not much in my past life about which to write a book."

After shaking hands all around, Lincoln joined the street crowds outside the Journal, saluting and greeting all who approached him. At length, glancing toward his house he said, "Well, gentlemen, there is a little short woman at our house who is probably more interested in this dispatch than I am; and if you will excuse me, I will take it up and let her see it."

About 6 weeks later, on July 4, Lincoln wrote his old Springfield friend, Dr. A. G. Henry, now in Oregon, to the effect "* * * today it looks as if the Chicago ticket will be elected."

November 6 again confirmed Lincoln's X-ray political judgment. The popular vote stood: Lincoln 1,866,452, Douglas 1,375,157, Breckinridge 847,953, Bell 589,581.

The electoral vote: Lincoln 180 (18 States), Breckinridge 72 (11 States), Bell 39 (3 States), Douglas 12 (1 State).

Had the Lincoln opposition got together on a fusion ticket, the results would have been different only in New Jersey, California, and Oregon, for a total of 11 electoral votes. Lincoln still would have won with 169, a clear majority in his own right.

That's how things went a hundred summers ago.

LINCOLN'S POSITION ON SLAVERY

Wrong as we think slavery is, we can yet afford to let it alone where it is, because that much is due to the necessity arising from its actual presence in the Nation; but can we, while our votes will prevent it, allow it to spread into the national territories, and to overrun us here in these free States? (Cooper Union, N.Y., February 27, 1860.)

LINCOLN'S FAREWELL TO SPRINGFIELD FRIENDS, FEBRUARY 11, 1861, AT THE RAILROAD STATION AS HE LEFT FOR WASHINGTON

My friends: No one, not in my situation, can appreciate my feelings of sadness at this parting. To this place, and the kindness of these people, I owe everything. Here I have lived a quarter of a century, and have passed from a young to an old man. Here my children have been born, and one is buried. I now leave, not knowing when or whether ever I may return, with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington. Without the assistance of that Divine Being who ever attended him, I cannot succeed. With that assistance, I cannot fail. Trusting in Him who can go with me, and remain with you, and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all yet will be well. To His care commending you, as I hope in your prayers you will commend me, I bid you an affectionate farewell.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow this anniversary day to pass without my boasting of the fact that Abraham Lincoln was nominated to the Presidency in Chicago, Ill., as the son of my home State of Illinois.

To be sure, Kentucky has its claim. That is where he was born. And Indiana has its claim. That is where he was raised as a boy. But it was in Illinois that he rose to greatness.

It is with pride that we make these special claims. At the same time, we recognize that Lincoln does not belong to any one State. He belongs to all Americans. He belongs to the ages.

Chicago was impressed with its responsibilities as the host for the nomination convention in May of 1860. They erected a special building for the occasion at the southeast corner of Lake and Market Streets. It was called the Wigwam. It was characteristized at that time as a "gigantic structure, the largest audience room in the United States."

An advertisement in the Chicago Tribune urged citizens to donate all the chairs they could spare for the gallery. It is an interesting fact that to get into this gallery for the convention gentlemen had to be accompanied by ladies.

The Chicago Tribune reported that this rule for gallery admission led to many curious bargains. Schoolgirls were urged to accept a quarter or half dollar to escort a gentleman to the gallery. Some of the enterprising girls found they could make considerable pocket money by entering different doors with different gentlemen.

Although women did not have a vote in those days, they demonstrated their party loyalty by tastefully decorating the convention hall. And so, from the very day of the foundation of our Republican Party women have played a part in our party's activities. Today they play a part beyond measure.

All this is Americana, never to be forgotten. In reviewing the life of Abraham Lincoln we are constantly inspired. His words and deeds show us the way in our efforts to serve our beloved country.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, many Kansans are aware of the effect Lincoln had on the controversy over whether Kansas should come into the Union as a Free or Slave State.

The Kansas-Nebraska bill was the basis of the famous Douglas-Lincoln debates in their campaign for Senator from Illinois. Douglas, the Democrat, won. Douglas became the leader of the northern Democrats in the Senate. The chief political issues that were fomenting in the 14 years period just prior to the Civil War was an attempt on the part of the Old Whigs and northern Democrats to chart their course through the political seas so as to avoid the rocks of discord caused by the slavery question. The alinements of some of the political leaders in various States were constantly shifting from Whig to Democrat and from Democrat to Whig.

Both of these parties took no positive stand on the slavery question. Lincoln, in his debates with Douglas, strongly indicated the necessity for a positive position on slavery when he said:

> This Nation cannot survive half slave and half free.

This statement was the harbinger of a new party.

Throughout the New England States the tide was rising for a more positive stand on the question of slavery. The start was made at Ripon, Wis., in 1854, to organize a new party which would take a definite stand on slavery. This new party—Republican—strongly offered the Kansas-Nebraska Act, which would leave it to the settlers whether Kansas and Nebraska would be slave or free. In 1856, Lincoln supported John C. Fremont, Republican candidate for President, making some 56 speeches in his behalf. Buchanan, the Democrat, was elected. Lincoln returned to his law practice in Springfield, Ill.

The Republican Party was kept alive over the question of slavery. The moneyed and illustrious-named American key people needed to keep the new party functioning were to be found in the eastern part of the United States. Chief among them were William K. Seward, of New York. Seward became the chief spokesman for this newly organized party. He and his friends, during the years of 1858–59, were constantly on the alert and formulated plans to name the Republican nominee for 1860.

Lincoln—at the insistence of his midwestern friends—was also active. It is common knowledge that Lincoln came to Kansas in 1859 at the insistence of his Kansas friends, in order to build him up to be the Republican nominee. Lincoln was received enthusiastically wherever he stopped and spoke. He was promised by his warm admirers the Kansas votes at the coming Republican Convention in Chicago.

But then, as now, there is many a slip between "cup and lip."

Herewith is a letter from the Ewing collection manuscripts from the Kansas State Historical Society. This letter was written by Thomas Ewing, Jr. It explains the feeling that existed in

Kansas. They wanted positive action and Seward seemed to have the qualifications demanded.

Here is the letter:

LEAVENWORTH, KANS., *May 6, 1860.*

Hon. ABRAHAM LINCOLN,
Springfield, Wis.

DEAR SIR: You will probably have observed that the Kansas delegation to Chicago were instructed by the convention by which they were selected to cast their votes (if they should have any) for Mr. Seward, and that Mr. Wilder, who is for Mr. Seward from choice, was chosen as the delegate from Leavenworth, over Colonel Delahay who was understood to be strongly in favor of your nomination. I have desired that you should know how both those things happened—and as I cannot be at Chicago, where I had expected to talk the matters over with you or with some of your personal friends, I shall take the liberty explaining them to you directly by letter.

Here as nearly everywhere in the North, Mr. Seward has more ardent, zealous and earnest admirers than any other candidate—and they are in the radical wing of the party which has possession of nearly all the presses, and controls all the minor conventions and less important movements of the party. As it was by no means certain that the Kansas delegates would be accorded seats in the national convention, or the right to vote, the great majority of the party took no interest in the movement, and the meetings called to appoint delegates to the Territorial convention were scarcely attended at all except by the managers. In that convention no interest was taken in any subjects except in selecting the delegates, three of whom are first for Mr. Seward from choice, but all of whom regard you as a highly acceptable and available candidate. The convention selected men who had done good service for the party and received no honor or reward and who well merited the compliment of an appointment, none of whom were selected with reference to their preferences among the gentlemen named for the Chicago nomination.

In the apportionment Leavenworth was accorded but one delegate, Wilder, who has done a great deal of hard work for the party here, had announced himself as a candidate for the place more than a year ago, and the place had been accorded to him without dissent, until the time for selecting delegates to the Territorial convention was near at hand. Colonel Delahay then, feeling assured that the great majority of the Republicans of Leavenworth favored your nomination, became a candidate in opposition to Wilder. The colonel was on all hands regarded as one of our best men and as representing truly the preferences of the majority of our Republicans, but he had just had one of the best offices of our poor Territory. Wilder had worked as hard, had held no office, and had all along been accorded this place, and as he had a big start, and the most money, the colonel could not make the race against him.

Our delegation at Chicago will, in perseverance of instructions, if given a vote, cast it for Mr. Seward. Three of them will adhere to him pretty tenaciously. Mr. Seward and Chase dropped, I think you would be the next choice of every man in the delegation.

Yours very truly,

THOMAS EWING, Jr.

In the three ballots necessary to nominate Lincoln Kansas regularly cast its six votes for Seward. Kansas Republicans joined the Lincoln parade too late to do much good except to have their final votes recast with the winner.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Iowa in commemorating this 100th anniversary of the nomination of Abraham Lincoln to the Presidency of the United States, and include herewith material abstracted from "Caucuses of 1860: A History of the National Political Conventions of the Current Presidential Campaign," by M. Halstead:

THE CHICAGO CONVENTION, MAY 15

The crowd is this evening becoming prodigious. The Tremont House is so crammed that it is with much difficulty people get about in it from one room to another. Near 1,500 people will sleep in it tonight.

The Bates movement, the McLean movement, the Cameron movement, the Banks movement, are all nowhere. They have gone down like lead in the mighty waters. "Old Abe" and "Old Ben" are in the field against Seward. Abe and Ben are representatives of the conservatism, the respectability, the availability, and all that sort of thing.

First day—Official roll of the convention

Kentucky, 12 votes:

At large: Geo. D. Blakey, Russellville; A. A. Burton, Lancaster; Wm. D. Gallagher, Pewee Valley; Charles Hendley, Newport.

Districts:

1. Abner Williams, Covington; H. G. Otis, Louisville.

2. Fred Frische, Louisville; E. H. Harrison, McKee.

3. Joseph Glazebrook, Glasgow; Jos. W. Calvert, Bowling Green.

4. John J. Hawes, Louisville.

5. H. D. Hawes, Louisville; Lewis M. Dembitz, Louisville.

6. Curtis Knight, Kingston; Joseph Rawlings, White Hall.

7. A. H. Meriwether, Louisville; Henry D. Hawes, Louisville.

8. H. B. Groaddus, Ashland; L. Marston, Millersburg.

9. Edgard Needham, Louisville; J. S. Davis.

10. Jas. R. Whittemore, Newport; Hamilton Cummings, Covington.

A Committee on Permanent Organization was constituted as follows: [List given.] Kentucky, Allen J. Bristow.

A DELEGATE FROM KENTUCKY. Mr. President, I would suggest that the name of all the States be called. [Applause.]

The CHAIR. Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi [great laughter], Louisiana, Alabama [laughter and hissing], Georgia, South Carolina [laughter], North Carolina [feeble hisses and much laughter]. I believe that includes the names of all the States.

The Committee on Credentials was made up as follows: [List given.] Kentucky, Charles Hendley.

The committee on business was constituted as follows: [List given], Kentucky, Louis M. Dembitz.

The convention had proceeded thus far with its business, when a communication, inviting the convention to take an excursion on the lake, was received and accepted, and then indefinitely debated, much time being frittered away.

The committee on resolutions was appointed: [List given], Kentucky, George D. Blakey.

The favorite word in the convention is "solemn." Everything is solemn. In Charleston the favorite was "crisis." Here there is something every 10 minutes found to be solemn.

A new ticket is talked of here tonight, and an informal meeting held in this house since I have been writing this letter, has given it an impetus. It is "Lincoln and Hickman." This is now the ticket as against Seward and "Cash" Clay, of Kentucky.

Second day, Republican Wigwam, Chicago, May 17, 1860

The convention was proceeding into battle. War then took place about credentials. A great deal of speechmaking followed. David Wilmot made an attack on delegations from slave States that had no constituencies. The next thing was a speech from Dr. Blakesly, of Kentucky, who mentioned that Kentucky had voted for Wilmot for Vice President in 1856, in the Philadelphia convention. He inquired whether he could be forgiven for that sin? Cries of "yes," and he sat down. First knockdown blow for old Kentucky.

Third day

First ballot:

Kentucky: Seward, 5; Lincoln, 6; Wade, 2; McLean, 1; Chase, 8; Sumner, 1. The leading contenders were William H. Seward, of New York, 173½; Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, 102.

Second ballot:

Kentucky: Seward, 7; Lincoln, 9; Chase, 6.

Result of second ballot of the leading men: Seward 184½; Lincoln 181. Cassius M. Clay, of Kentucky, received 2 votes.

Third ballot:

Kentucky: Seward, 6; Chase, 4; Lincoln, 13.

While this ballot was taken amid excitement that tested the nerves, the fatal defection from Seward in New England still further appeared. The number of votes necessary to a choice were 233, and I saw under my pencil as the Lincoln column was completed, the figures 231½—one vote and a half to give him the nomination. In about 10 ticks of a watch, Catter, of Ohio, was up. Every eye was on Catter. He said: "I rise, Mr. Chairman, to announce the change of four votes of Ohio from Mr. Chase to Mr. Lincoln." The deed was done. There was a moment of silence. Then, there were thousands cheering with the energy of insanity.

One of the secretaries, with a tally sheet in his hands, shouted, "Fire the salute. Abe Lincoln is nominated." As the cheering inside the Wigwam subsided, we could hear that outside, then the thunder of the salute rose above the din.

Ten States and the District of Columbia insisted upon casting unanimous votes for Old Abe before the vote was declared. One of the States was Kentucky.

During the dinner recess a caucus of the presidents of delegations was held. After dinner we had the last act in the drama.

The nomination for Vice President was not particularly exciting. Cassius M. Clay was the only competitor of Hamlin, who made any show in the race; and the outside pressure was for him. At one time a thousand voices called, "Clay, Clay" to the convention. If the multitude could have had their way, Mr. Clay would have been put on the ticket by acclamation.

First ballot for Vice President: The two leading contenders were Hamlin 194 votes; Cassius M. Clay, of Kentucky, 101½ votes. Kentucky cast 23 votes for Clay.

Second ballot: Hamlin 367 votes; Clay 86. Kentucky cast 23 votes for Clay.

Now that the business of the convention was transacted, we had the usual stump speeches, and complimentary resolutions, and the valedictory from the chairman, and the "three times three" upon adjournment for the candidate.

The city was wild with delight. The "Old Abe" men formed processions, and bore rails through the streets. A hundred guns were fired from the top of the Tremont House.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, on this day, when we are looking back 100 years to the nomination of President Lincoln, I would like, Mr. Speaker, to speak about another, who also played a great part in that era, and who also

was a candidate for the high office of President 100 years ago.

He was passed over for a far greater man, but William H. Seward was a great man in his own right and would probably be remembered more today had his career not been overshadowed by the man whom many consider the greatest and first American President. Lincoln was a true product of our own country; he was born well after the colonial times. In this he was different from the Founding Fathers, and for this reason his influence was altogether different from theirs.

Lincoln had the supreme gift of a great administrator, he knew how to choose the right man for the job he wanted to fill. This he did, regardless of personality or past differences.

He chose William H. Seward and surely never regretted that choice.

Seward was born in Florida, Orange County, N.Y., 1801. He graduated from Union College at 19.

He taught school in Savanah, Ga., to help defray his expenses and was admitted to the bar at Utica, N.Y., in 1822, at the age of 21. He then moved to Auburn, N.Y., where he made his home and entered upon the practice of law. He entered politics as a National Republican, a party whose only title to fame seems to have been that it was anti-Masonic. This party's life was of short duration, roughly 6 years, and Seward then changed his allegiance to the Whigs.

He received the Whig endorsement for Governor and was elected in 1838 and served for two terms, having come back after being defeated by one William L. Marcy. Seward, as Governor, favored public works and a liberal spending of public money, although the State was financially embarrassed at the time he took over the reins of government.

Seward was at heart a liberal and somewhat of a trailblazer. He was an early political opponent of slavery, but never a follower of such men as Garrison who devoted themselves to moral agitation.

After his second term Seward retired from public office and distinguished himself as a lawyer in his hometown of Auburn.

When the Whigs came back into power in 1849, for a brief period, they nominated and sent William H. Seward to the U.S. Senate. It can be truly said in this case that the office sought him; he did not seek the office. In his first prepared speech in the Senate he made the rather startling statement, and I quote: "There is a higher law than the Constitution." He was violently attacked by the Democrats for his statement and immediately tried to temporize and explain it away. This seems to have been one of the keys to his character. He believed supremely in compromise, and to use a modern term, never going beyond what the traffic, in this case public opinion, would bear. He also stated at this time:

An irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces, means that the United States must and will, sooner or later, become entirely a slave-owning Nation or entirely a free-labor Nation.

This statement he also tried to retract after a storm of protest broke over his head.

By 1854 it became evident that the Whig Party was moribund and Seward worked energetically and successfully to bring the remnants together into the newly emerged Republican Party.

Many expected that he would receive the nomination of this new party that he had done so much to create, but the party passed him over twice, for Fremont in 1856 and Lincoln in 1860.

Lincoln immediately appointed Seward Secretary of State. Although it seems hard to realize today, most of the Cabinet and many of the people considered the new President as somewhat of a nonentity and looked to Mr. Seward for guidance through the very difficult times ahead. Seward felt much the same, not out of vanity, but simply because he felt that his experience as Governor of New York and in the U.S. Senate fitted him for the arduous days ahead.

Seward felt strongly that the Union could be saved without a war between the States. He even had a fantastic idea of provoking a foreign war to unite the country and save the Union. Here President Lincoln stepped in and proved to all that he was indeed the helmsman of the Ship of State. The very first one to acknowledge and follow the President's leadership was William H. Seward.

Seward remained on as Secretary of State after the death of President Lincoln. He himself was attacked in his home by a fellow conspirator of John Wilkes Booth at the same time that the President was assassinated. Mrs. Seward died as a result of the shock and his son and two others who came to his assistance were wounded by the assassin.

Seward was an interesting character. He probably had more of the characteristics of a diplomat than any of the politicians of our country. He was a great believer in the adage that: He who fights and runs away will live to fight another day. This is, of course, the basis of true diplomacy.

Seward had visions, sometimes quite fantastic ones, but he was always willing to listen to reason and give up anything as impossible, for instance, as the consolidation of the Union through a foreign war. This faculty for broad and far-reaching undertakings is probably best exemplified by his purchase of Alaska from Russia for $7,200,000. This was long known, in fact still is in some quarters, as Seward's folly.

So here, once more at a crucial time in the history of the country, we had a man in high place, willing to give his life and talents to his country and his loyal devotion to his President without any personal ambition whatsoever.

As long as our country produces such men she will be great and we will be free.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the centennial anniversary of the nomination of Abraham Lincoln in the Wigwam at Chicago on May 18, 1860, will undoubtedly produce claims from many sections of the country that a certain State or locality had much to do with the selection of our first Republican President. In this connection it is not my inclination to belittle any such claims, but rather to reemphasize the important part played by the Keystone State delegation to that fateful convention when the Nation's future was in such precarious balance.

Two of the leading candidates were William H. Seward, of New York, and Simon Cameron, of Pennsylvania, both of whom were considered as "shoo-ins" by their respective delegations. Seward, however, was handicapped by the vigorous opposition of Horace Greeley who wielded a powerful influence across the Nation and also by the flat statement by Gov. Andrew Curtin, of Pennsylvania, who predicted a 50,000 Republican majority from his State but not if Seward was the candidate. At this juncture Cameron, who was guaranteed Pennsylvania's 56 votes on the first ballot, plainly indicated that he was more interested in being appointed Secretary of the Treasury and promised his delegates to Lincoln on the first ballot if he was assured of that post. From then on, despite Lincoln's refusal to be bound by any deals, Pennsylvania was in the thick of it on the Emancipator's side and joined in the jubilation when he was nominated on the third ballot.

My primary purpose, however, of injecting myself into this discussion of the political maneuvering leading up to Lincoln's nomination, is to bring forth for the record the part Chester County, Pa., my home county, had in preparing the way for the solid support Lincoln received from Pennsylvania shortly after that State's delegation arrived in Chicago in that fateful month of May 100 years ago. In 1955 the Republican County Committee of Chester County celebrated its 100th anniversary and on that occasion published its anniversary booklet from which the following article is taken:

LINCOLN AND CHESTER COUNTY

(By Priscilla Lewis Cox Southwell)

This is an old county one of the original three first formed under William Penn. West Chester is an old town too. Yet few will take note as they pass of the historic buildings and distinguished landmarks where so many county leaders lived, where so much of our county future was shaped.

At 28 West Market Street were made decisions that affected the Republican Party here and in the Nation too. The modest brick building 100 years ago contained two offices from which Abraham Lincoln was started on his way to become the first Republican President.

Two men had offices there and were joined in a common political aim—to give to the lawyer from Illinois enough recognition in the East to secure his nomination for President in 1860.

Joseph J. Lewis, a well-known lawyer, and Samuel Downing, a printer and publisher, were both at 14 East Market Street (since renumbered 28 West). Joseph J. Lewis was born in Westtown in 1801, burgess of West Chester for 5 years, delegate to the Harrisburg Convention of 1832 where the Whig Party was formed, and provost of the law department of Lincoln University. He was active in a period where political concepts and governmental control were fluctuating, a

half-century in American history where the lines were being drawn between what constitutes the two major political parties today.

One of his most famous cases was the defense of Casper Hanway, tried for treason. He had tried to prevent a Maryland slaveowner from recapturing a runaway slave. The Maryland man was killed, and Casper Hanway brought to trial. Joseph J. Lewis defended him and secured his acquittal.

About the same time in West Chester Samuel Downing was publishing the Chester County Times, a newspaper later absorbed by the American Republican. It was known for its abolitionist sentiments. Hence it is logical that these two men came together with kindred feelings about the threat of slaveholding in new States.

This feeling between the slave States and the free really prompted the formation of the Republican Party and in a sense drew the lines between the North and the solid South. The Democratic Party became allied with interests seeking to extend slaveowning, the Republican with those who wished for freedom in new States as they entered the Union.

In Chester County such beliefs appealed to a citizenry whose ancestors were largely Quaker, innately respecting the individual man. There had long been an underground railroad in the country, with stations in West Chester, Longwood, Willistown, and Uwchland, to name a few.

So here on Market Street were two men who sympathized with all the speeches being made by Abraham Lincoln out in Illinois. How they came to publish his autobiography introduces another Chester Countian.

In Toughkenamon, New Garden township, in 1808 was born Jesse W. Fell. He went west in 1828, to Illinois in 1833. When Lincoln was in the State legislature from Sangamon County, Ill., he and Jesse W. Fell lived in the same boardinghouse. They became friends, and the Lincoln-Douglas debates were undertaken at the urging of Jesse W. Fell.

In 1858 Fell began to think of Lincoln in terms of the Presidency. He had an essential humility which appealed to people, and his efforts on the slavery question were making him prominent and popular in the Midwest.

Then Jesse W. Fell remembered his own native State of Pennsylvania. He knew the weight that it carried in choosing the candidate for Presidency and was convinced that if Lincoln could become well known in the East, the Pennsylvania delegation with those in Illinois and Indiana would insure his nomination, regardless of any favorite son backed by the New York delegates. At that time New York and Pennsylvania had the most delegates at the nominating convention.

In Bloomington, Ill., a newspaper was also being edited by another Lincoln admirer, Edward J. Lewis, brother of Chester County's Joseph J. Lewis. Here originated the connection between Lincoln and this county. For Lincoln was persuaded to write a brief autobiography to be sent back to Joseph J. Lewis here.

Brief it was, only three pages in his own handwriting, of which, he said with characteristic and cadenced simplicity:

"There is not much of it, for the reason, I suppose, that there is not much of me."

These three pages are now in the Library of Congress, and a photostat copy in the Chester County Historical Society. When Joseph J. Lewis received this short autobiography, it constituted all that was known of Lincoln's life. For many years even Lincoln himself did not realize that his ancestors had lived near Morgantown, Pa., before they migrated to Kentucky.

Out of these simple pages Joseph J. Lewis reworked the first biography of Lincoln. Samuel Downing, his friend and associate, printed it. Almost at once it was reprinted in the New York Tribune and Chicago Press and Tribune, then in many other papers over the country. To this national recognition has been attributed Lincoln's nomination in 1860.

All this originated in the building that stands quietly on West Market Street, where today our Republican Representative PAUL B. DAGUE and the Republican County Committee, with C. Gilbert Hazlett as chairman, have their offices—where nearly 100 years ago two Republicans helped to start Abraham Lincoln on his way to become the first Republican President of the United States.

In commenting on Mrs. Southwell's article I have only one or two things to add. First, it might be mentioned that Lincoln's great-grandfather, Mordecai Lincoln, once worked at a forge in northern Chester County. Also it seems appropriate to call attention to the fact that the Jesse W. Fell who is reported as having played such an important part in the Lincoln buildup is an ancestor of former Gov. Adlai Stevenson, a fact that only emphasizes how so many otherwise brilliant people slip away from their conservative moorings. That my office was located for some 10 years at 28 West Market Street, West Chester, the scene of much political activity in the last century as well as in this, has no particular significance.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, today we are privileged to celebrate a momentous anniversary in the history of our Nation. It is the 100th anniversary of the nomination of Abraham Lincoln as the Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States of America.

In paying tribute to the memory of this great and beloved man, who gave so much to our country, I would like to emphasize three expressions of philosophy by President Lincoln which appear to me to have a strong bearing on present-day events.

They are:

First. On government:

In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere. * * * In leaving the people's business in their hands, we cannot be wrong.

The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all or cannot so well do for themselves in their separate and individual capacities.

Second. On liberty and security:

It has long been a grave question whether any government, not too strong for the liberties of its people, can be strong enough to maintain its own existence in great emergencies.

Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves and, under a just God, cannot long retain it. * * *

If there is anything which it is the duty of the whole people to never entrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions.

Third. Peace and war:

The man does not live who is more devoted to peace than I am. None who would do more to preserve it. But it may be necessary to put the foot down firmly.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NOMINATION OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago today, Abraham Lincoln was nominated for the Presidency. In the same year, 1860, he was elected the first President of the newly established Republican Party. He and his Vice President Hannibal Hamlin of Maine carried forward a program based on unity, progress, individual rights, and liberties. So vital have these principles appeared to the citizenry that of the 18 Presidents we have had since 1860, only 4 have been Democrats.

Few men in history have kept their courage so high through one failure after another as did Mr. Lincoln. A deeply religious man he never faltered once he had set his course. His consistent faith in the wisdom and understanding of the Eternal Father of all mankind gave him an inner strength, a balance, a steadiness which carried him through what to many seemed insuperable difficulties.

With it all he was a man of delightful humor, of great human understanding, simple in his own desires, gentle in his ways. It was said of him that wherever he went he took light with him. Once roused he was like a flame, but his objections were based upon fundamental principles that to him were the foundation stones of our whole way of life.

We do well, Mr. Speaker, to pause for a moment on the 100th anniversary of the nomination of one of the great men of history who served this country through a period of great darkness as its President and who gave his life in that service. Of Abraham Lincoln it can be said that he truly demonstrated that leadership is "just wisdom and courage and a great carelessness of self."

Let me leave with you a few lines written by James Thompson McKay known to us as "Lincoln's Burial or the Cenotaph":

And so they buried Lincoln? Strange and vain!
Has any creature thought of Lincoln hid
In any vault, neath any coffin-lid,
In all the years since that wild spring of pain?
'Tis false—he never in the grave hath lain.
You could not bury him although you slid
Upon his clay the Cheops Pyramid,
Or heaped it with the Rocky Mountain chain.
They slew themselves; they but set Lincoln free.
In all the earth his great heart beats as strong,
Shall beat while pulses throb to chivalry
And burn with hate of tyranny and wrong.
Whoever will may find him, anywhere
Save in the tomb. Not there—he is not there!

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of Tennessee). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the use of Calendar Wednesday procedures is orderly, and in line with long-established rules of the House.

In 1949, the so-called 21-day rule was enacted. A year later, the late Representative E. E. Cox, of Georgia, offered House Resolution 133 to repeal the 21-day rule. On January 20, 1950, it was debated. During the debate the following statements were offered in support:

Representative James Wadsworth, of New York. Two hundred and eighteen Members could take a bill away from us by signing a petition; and if we would only use Calendar Wednesday, the standing committees would have Wednesdays to call up bills which they have reported and which are upon the calendar.

Representative Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts. I think we should go back to our orderly procedure, and then on Calendar Wednesday allow the committee chairmen to bring up bills that they may not have gotten a rule on from the Committee on Rules.

Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts (then the distinguished minority leader). The adoption of this rule will not prevent legislation from coming to the floor. Through the vehicle of Calendar Wednesday, any committee can instruct its chairman to call up legislation. The will of the majority of the House cannot be refused.

On January 3, 1951, at the beginning of the 82d Congress, the late Representative Adolph Sabath, the then chairman of the Committee on Rules, called up House Resolution 7, which reenacted the rules of the 81st Congress. Judge Cox of Georgia proposed a substitute which went back to the rules prevailing before the 81st Congress and repealed the 21-day rule.

Once again the principal arguments in favor of repealing the 21-day rule were the citations of the discharge petition and Calendar Wednesday. The theme of the proponents of repeal was to return to orderly procedure. Some of the distinguished Members who spoke to these points were:

Representative LEO ALLEN, then as now the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, who said:

There are two ways that the membership of this House can get bills to the floor for final determination. You have the right to sign the discharge petition, which takes effect when 218 names appear thereon, and on Calendar Wednesday you also have the right to be recognized, so the Rules Committee does not have absolute power on any bills.

Representative Herter, now the Secretary of State in President Eisenhower's cabinet:

We have had in the rules of the House for many, many years a provision known as Calendar Wednesday. Why not return to what was an orderly method of procedure?

Representative Carl Curtis, of Nebraska said:

The notion that the Rules Committee can thwart the will of the majority is without foundation of fact. A petition signed by a bare majority can bring a bill to the floor. In addition * * * we have Calendar Wednesday. * * * A vote against the Sabath proposal and in favor of the Cox proposal * * * is a vote for orderly procedure.

Representative CLARENCE BROWN, then as now, a member of the Rules Committee, said:

In addition to that (the discharge petition) there was and is a provision in the rules establishing Calendar Wednesday * * * on which day the roll of the legislative committees are called and, if a majority of any committee wants to bring up any bill, it can do so when that committee is called.

COLLAPSE OF THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE UNDERSCORES NEED FOR A NEW AIRCRAFT CARRIER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of Tennessee). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the sobering news from Paris this afternoon that the summit conference on which so many of the hopes of the world had been focused has now broken up without ever getting started is a tragic development that has shocked and disturbed every Member of this House. I know we all deplore the outrageous performance of the Soviet Premier and deeply resent his disgraceful efforts to humiliate the President of the United States. In this critical hour I know we all stand with Mr. Eisenhower regardless of our own politics and completely repudiate the efforts of the Soviet dictator not only to interfere in our own domestic political elections, but also to drive a wedge between the United States and our free world allies. The President was completely right, of course, in not backing down at Paris and in not groveling in the dirt as Mr. Khrushchev said he must do. Indeed, when the day ever comes—and I know it never will come—that an American President has to grovel in the dirt before anybody, then this country is certainly at an end.

But, Mr. Speaker, while we stand together with the President it is also perfectly obvious that the disaster at Paris has altered almost overnight the whole world strategic and political situation.

We face a different world today than we faced just 2 weeks ago. And as Members of this House we must recognize the full extent of this shift and must move swiftly to deal with it. From here out the going gets tougher. From here out the true nature of the bitter struggle between communism and freedom will become more clearly apparent than it has been in the past several months.

Mr. Khrushchev thought he could lull us into sleep. He thought he could "con" our leaders, to use a vernacular phrase, into letting down their guard. He thought we would be willing to do almost anything to get peace. And when he found that this was not going to be the case after all, he blew his top, as we have just witnessed at Paris, and now has shifted crudely to a rougher, tougher line, but a line which is certainly familiar enough coming from the Kremlin, and a line which is directed to the same old Communist objective of world domination with the same old ruthless determination and energy.

It will be just a matter of time, Mr. Speaker, before the Russians put the squeeze on Berlin. We must be ready for that. And it will be just a matter of time before they put the squeeze on our other allies, too, from whose shores our worldwide military forces are presently operating. In fact, they are already putting on the squeeze, and have been since the shooting down of that U–2 aircraft.

The initial Russian attack has been aimed at Pakistan, at Norway, and at Turkey, with our other bases also coming under increasing attack.

The Governments of Japan, Norway, and Pakistan are relatively stable. We hope they will successfully weather these threats. But there is no question that the Japanese Socialist opposition will make the most of the U–2 incident in an attempt to wreck the proposed Japanese-United States mutual defense treaty, scheduled shortly for Diet debate and passage. And it is to be hoped that the rather shaky and crisis-wracked nations of Iran and Turkey will be able to withstand these latest Russian exercises in ballistic rocket blackmail.

Speaking recently at a National Day celebration at the Czechoslovak Embassy, Mr. Khrushchev warned that Soviet rockets would be used to retaliate against bases in any country that permitted U.S. planes to take off on intelligence missions over the Soviet Union.

It is conceivable, Mr. Speaker, that the Russian effort to squeeze us out of our oversea bases could be partially successful. Our Africa Moroccan airbases have already been written off. Those in Libya and Saudi Arabia are none too secure.

And the loss of any further Mediterranean, Middle East, Scandinavian, southeast Asia, or Far Eastern bases would certainly have very profound strategic consequences on our own defense structure as well as on NATO itself.

If the Quemoy-Lebanon crises of 1958 proved no further thing it showed how absolutely essential seagoing, mobile air bases are in any crises situations that may develop, from police actions to limited war or even total war.

The modern, mobile *Forrestal* attack carrier with its 100-plus aircraft can operate upon the vast ocean expanse, completely independent of any foreign land bases. Aircraft carriers operate in international waters and establish American sovereignty over that constantly changing patch of sea in which they operate. They are sovereign mobile bases of the United States. They are under tight supervision and control of our Navy. They operate without infringing upon the sovereignty of allied or neutral nations. They are not susceptible to the "zeroing in" of Khrushchev's rockets. They do not endanger the United States or our allies and friends.

Foresight is much rarer than hindsight, but it takes no great foresight to visualize a day—perhaps not too far in the future—when many of our present

fixed bases on foreign soil can be effectively neutralized either by Russian rockets or by their diplomatic and economic threats.

Surely we in Congress must act now to see that this great country of ours is never forced to defend itself without either fixed foreign bases or mobile floating bases.

And so, Mr. Speaker, as Mr. Khrushchev rattles his rockets so blatantly today across the seas there can be no more appropriate answer, in my judgment, than for the Members of this Congress to authorize construction of the new Navy carrier which the Defense Department has requested and which his actions have now made so necessary to our overall national defense in the difficult days that lie ahead.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill, H.R. 5, which was passed today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DOYLE, indefinitely, on account of official business.

Mr. THOMAS (at the request of Mr. PATMAN) for May 18 through May 23, on account of official business.

Mr. BREWSTER (at the request of Mr. ADDONIZIO), for May 18, on account of illness.

Mr. SANTANGELO (at the request of Mr. ADDONIZIO), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRATTON, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BROCK, for 10 minutes, tomorrow, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (at the request of Mr. ROBISON), for 10 minutes, on May 19.

Mr. COOK (at the request of Mr. KASEM), for 15 minutes, tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. DAGUE.

Mr. STRATTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAGNUSON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. ROBISON, the following Member was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KYL.

(At the request of Mr. KASEM and to include extraneous matter the following:)

Mr. BOWLES in two instances.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. HOGAN.

Mr. BRADEMAS.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 684. An act for the relief of Gerald Degnan, William C. Williams, Harry Eakon, Jacob Beebe, Thorvald Ohnstad, Evan S. Henry, Henry Pitmatalik, D. LeRoy Kotila, Bernard Rock, Bud J. Carlson, Charles F. Curtis, and A. N. Dake.

S. 2317. An act for the relief of Mary Alice Clements.

S. 2523. An act for the relief of Harry L. Arkin.

S. 2779. An act relating to the election under section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by the Augusta Furniture Co., Inc., of Staunton, Va.

S.J. Res. 166. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary and permanent construction work on the Capitol grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 19, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2159. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the economic and technical assistance program for Bolivia as administered by the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) of the Department of State and its predecessor, the Foreign Operations Administration, pursuant to the mutual security program for the fiscal years 1954 through 1959; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2160. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board covering the operations of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan System, and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation for the calendar year 1959, pursuant to the Federal Home Loan Bank Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2161. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2162. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Ng Ging Sheung, also known as Ng Wong San, Ng Ging Ngew, and Stephen Ng, A11056491, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2163. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Karl Knoepfli, also known as Charles Knoepfli, A7072404, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2164. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to establish a revolving-type fund in the Treasury for the Bureau of Reclamation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2165. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to strengthen the enforcement provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and extend the duration of the authorization of grants for State water pollution control programs, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

2166. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the report of the President on determinations under the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 for the quarter ending March 31, 1960, pursuant to section 103(b) of the act for transmittal to the chairmen of the House Committees on Foreign Affairs, Armed Services, and Appropriations; to the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 530. Resolution to amend House Resolution 27, 86th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1613). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 531. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7201, a bill to provide for the comprehensive operation of hydroelectric power resources of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1614). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 532. Resolution for consideration of S. 2130, an act to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1615). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 533. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 1157, a bill to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1616). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 8212. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the procedure for ordering certain members of the Reserve components to active duty and the requirements for physical examination of members of the Reserve components, and for other purposes; without

amendment (Rept. No. 1617). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 11787. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to make permanent the authority for flight instruction for members of Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1618). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 12200. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize reduction in enlisted grade upon approval of certain court-martial sentences, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1619). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 11952. A bill to repeal the act of May 29, 1958, which authorized and directed the Administrator of General Services to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations contained in an instrument conveying certain land by the United States to the State of Wisconsin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1620). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 402. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact related to the regulation of mass transit in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1621). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 12125. A bill to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 12108. A bill to provide for Federal grants and contracts to carry out projects with respect to techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution, and control of juvenile delinquency, and for the training of personnel; without amendment (Rept. No. 1623). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 8127. A bill to provide for the hospitalization at St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, of certain nationals of the United States adjudged insane or otherwise found mentally ill in foreign countries, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRICE: Committee on Armed Services. S. 747. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands which are a part of the Des Plaines Public Hunting and Refuge Area and the Joliet Arsenal Military Reservation, located in Will County, Ill., to the State of Illinois; with amendment (Rept. No. 1625). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 1502. An act to provide for adjustments in the annuities under the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System; with amendment (Rept. No. 1626). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Fifteenth report pertaining to selected aspects of military procurement (Rept. No. 1627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 9541. A bill to amend section 109(g) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 1628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 12286. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 12287. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax presently imposed on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 12288. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 12289. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 12290. A bill to establish a program of financial and technical assistance designed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in economically depressed areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FENTON:

H.R. 12291. A bill to establish a program of financial and technical assistance designed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in economically depressed areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 12292. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, to provide that whenever cotton is bartered or exchanged, either the identical cotton acquired from Commodity Credit or an equal quantity of substitute cotton shall be exported; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12293. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 12294. A bill to provide for a National Academy of Culture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H.R. 12295. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to market adjustment and price support programs for wheat and feed grains, to provide a high-protein food distribution program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H.R. 12296. A bill to provide for the striking of medal in commemoration of Century 21 Exposition to be held in Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12297. A bill to amend section 303 of the Communications Act so as to direct the Federal Communications Commission to consult with interested persons in small communities and rural and isolated areas on the technical and other problems in providing adequate television service at a reasonable cost, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 12298. A bill to establish a program of financial and technical assistance designed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in economically depressed areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 12299. A bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.J. Res. 709. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.J. Res. 710. Joint resolution to establish the third Thursday in August of every year as Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Res. 534. Resolution authorizing the printing of the prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, D.D., at the opening of the daily sessions of the House of Representatives during the 85th and 86th Congresses; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 12300. A bill for the relief of Abdulkarim Ahmad Ali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 12301. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jesus B. Verendia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 12302. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hilda Yen Male; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 12303. A bill for the relief of Yip Fook Q. and his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 12304. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine the claims of Mollers' Suidah Shipbreakers, Ltd., the Alpha Shipping Co., Ltd., and Lancashire Shipping Co., Ltd.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 12305. A bill for the relief of Caridad P. Buncab; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 12306. A bill for the relief of George Edward Barnhart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H.R. 12307. A bill for the relief of Erasmo Ramos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 12308. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Marrella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

467. Mr. STRATTON presented a petition of 130 members of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, residents of the 32d Congressional District, New York, urging the enactment of H.R. 4488, the minimum wage bill, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Bill To Prevent the Use of Stopwatches or Other Measuring Devices in the Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service. The purpose of this legislation is self-evident from its title.

Recently the Post Office Department introduced a work-measuring system known as the distribution guides program. So far as I am able to ascertain, this system is based on rule-of-thumb averages which, according to the Postmaster General, were obtained from a study of some 40 post offices differing in size, in physical conditions, such as lighting, the size of distribution cases, or other equipment factors. Everything I have heard about the system indicates that it is neither a scientific nor accurate system, and I subscribe to the view of the employees of the Buffalo Post Office that it is at best a speedup system. It fails to take into consideration the many factors which enter into an effective and honest time study, and particularly fails to take into account the hours of the day during which the work is performed. Dr. Frederic Lee, in his book "The Human Machine and Industrial Efficiency," has the following to say about nightwork in comparison with daywork:

> I have shown that nightwork is characterized by certain distinctive features: It imposes on a physiological organism attuned to one sequence of events a different and abnormal sequence; it is characterized by greater fatigue than is daywork; it is interrupted by sleep; its curve of output falls off at an excessive rate in the morning hours; its total output is less than with daywork; its accident rate and its proportion of lost time are in excess over those of the day; it has a deleterious effect on health. All these features are inimical to a high degree of efficiency.
>
> Night work is unnatural, unphysiological, abnormal, and it must ever remain so. It should not be allowed for women, and resort to it for men can only be justified by exceptional circumstances.

This distribution guides program is based on a system of measurement that is faulty in the extreme. The basic measure is 2 feet of mail. Theoretically, 2 feet of mail is supposed to equal 580 pieces. Actually, 2 feet of mail can vary anywhere between 350 pieces and 800 pieces, depending upon the thickness of the mail. The unit of measurement, therefore, is elastic.

The excuse for this system, as stated by the Post Office Department, is:

> We believe that any distributor is interested in knowing how well he is doing on the job and how his work production compares. We believe that a distributor has a right to know what the yardstick is in measuring his production and the distribution guides system was developed to let the employee know just how he is doing.

In my judgment, such a statement is just so much hogwash. Whatever other reasons there may have been for the distribution guides system, certainly a desire to let the employee know just how he is doing had to be the least important. The Post Office Department certainly did not take the time, the trouble, and the expense necessary to the development of this system merely to let an employee know just how well he was doing or was not doing.

Had the Department been sincerely interested in the employee's welfare, this system or any system of this nature, could only have been developed after adequate consultation with employee representatives and with the employees being represented every step of the way in the development of the program. Time and motion studies in private industry are not made without the consultation and participation of the employees through their union representatives.

According to the Post Office Department the vast majority of the employees readily meet the minimum requirements of the distribution guides program. This being true, it would seem to me that any system which requires that employees be detailed to nonproductive duties concerned principally with weighing, measuring, checking, and tabulating output, removes from productive effort at least as many hours as the system can be expected to save.

I have introduced this legislation after consultation with the officers of Local No. 374 of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks at Buffalo, N.Y., and with their national officers, and I commend it to the serious study of my colleagues.

Grain Storage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KYL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1960

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, one fallacy of the claim that all private grain storage facilities reap huge profits is demonstrated in the following record submitted to me this day.

An Iowa warehouse had 50,000 bushels of corn in storage. Recently the grain was shipped. Because the grain is now graded "sample" instead of "No. 1" or "No. 2," the warehouseman faces a loss of $10,000.

Now it should be pointed out that had this grain been stored by the Government there would be no recovery from this reduction in grade.

This factor was not given proper consideration at the time the Yates amendment was adopted, nor was it adequately considered when the politically inspired investigations of storage profits were made. It was this careless mass indictment which pressured the Agriculture Department to cut storage rates so drastically.

It would be beneficial to give this entire matter fresh, unprejudiced consideration.

Some Thoughts on the Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, like every patriotic American I am incensed over the treatment accorded our President at the now wrecked Paris conference and herewith set down my reactions, point by point, to the news reports as they have reached us by press and radio.

First. President Eisenhower, under the firm counsel of the late John Foster Dulles, steadfastly resisted the idea of a summit meeting until he was finally pressured into it by Macmillan.

Second. The British are criticizing Ike not because we spied on Russia but because we got caught at it.

Third. Walter Lippmann, the Olympian oracle, criticizes Ike not because we got caught at spying but rather because he refused to lie about it.

Fourth. Debate on our "right" to make reconnaisance flights over another nation is academic in the light of the Russian space vehicle presently passing over most of the countries of the world every 90 minutes, plus the obvious fact that in a few short months we will have in orbit observer satellites that can collect all the information, to be gleaned by a U–2 plane and no one will be able to do a thing about it.

Fifth. Mr. Khrushchev came to the summit with his own hands red with bloody repression of free people and with a record of infiltration and espionage not matched by any nation in history. And speaking of aerial surveillance, how do Russian observer planes find their way over our Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean without violating the air corridors of other powers?

Sixth. It is reassuring to have confirmed by most editorial writers my firm conviction that Mr. K. is not the unfettered dictator some believe him to be. The wily Russian quite evidently has been brought to book by the military and political hierarchy in back of him and told by them to back away from the summit.

Seventh. Khrushchev, in my opinion, never intended that anything constructive toward peace should come out of

the Paris conference. He lives on controversy and unrest and he would stifle in a peaceful world. The U–2 plane incident gave him an easy way out.

Eighth. The effect of this summit fiasco should be the enhancement of the stature of RICHARD NIXON as our next President since he has already demonstrated his ability to slug it out with Khrushchev toe-to-toe. That the Democrat front runners are equipped neither by temperament or experience for such a slugging contest is quite obvious. As for former Governor Stevenson, in his one conference with Mr. K. he came back to America literally shaken down to his shoes.

Ninth. In summation, let us never forget that the Russian leaders are not reasonable men. They are completely ruthless in the full meaning of that term. They are amenable only to force and as a result it behooves us to keep our defenses intact and our bombers and missiles on the alert. And then as reasonable people let us abandon this fiction of international comity and let us forthwith sever diplomatic relations that we should never have entered into in the first instance.

Tenth. And as a final thought, it is gratifying to see the alacrity with which the American people are uniting in back of their President, that Democrats and Republicans have closed ranks, if not in back of Ike then in opposition to a demagog who insults our intelligence and casts aspersions on our integrity and national honor.

Soil Stewardship Week in Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the conservation of topsoil is essential. We who live with aridity and wind erosion know this. Those who live with abundant rainfall also know the erosive power of water.

Next week is Soil Stewardship Week in Colorado. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to those who more than 25 years ago saw the great need for action to conserve the Nation's soil. As a result of their vision, some 4½ million farmers and ranchers have united to form 2,822 soil conservation districts. These districts include 1.7 billion acres of land, or a major portion of the United States. These soil conservation districts represent groups of landowners who have joined together to protect our land so that future generations may enjoy its blessings. All America owes them a debt. We are not really the owners of the land—we are but trustees for this generation, and we should view our obligation as involving stewardship.

The work is not finished. It may never be finished. But it is going forward. This Congress or the next one should establish a soil moisture conservation laboratory to help advance this work. The soil moisture conservation laboratory would study the principles involved in increasing the intake of water from the soil, improving the moisture retention characteristics of the soil and increasing the efficiency of soil moisture use by plants. In the great plains area, holding 8 percent of the moisture that now evaporates back in the soil until it can be put to work growing crops is equivalent to adding 3 inches to the scarce rainfall.

Such a laboratory could well be located at Fort Collins, Colo., but wherever located, it is needed.

Similarly, research in weather modification can contribute toward improving the productivity of our soil. The soil conservation program represents the finest kind of cooperation in research, education, publication and constructive action between Federal, State and local units of government. But even as we commend the soil conservation districts of Colorado, let us press forward to further the cause that they have thus far so nobly advanced.

Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Makes Another Important Step Forward Toward Unification of Defense Department Procedures and the Reassertion of Civilian Control Over Our Military Establishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Defense issued orders on May 12 that our long-range defense communications are to be integrated into a single communication system. The organization of this worldwide system to replace those of several agencies which now all operate over the same area is a great step forward in increasing efficiency in our Defense Department. This personal action by the Secretary of Defense, Hon. Thomas S. Gates, Jr., will most certainly improve the security and safety of this Nation.

Again, Tom Gates has given us another example of the fact that there is no substitute for decisive action applied where and when it is required. The tremendous responsibility of the Secretary of Defense has made it even more imperative that problems be resolved with wisdom and dispatch. Thomas S. Gates, Jr., since his appointment, has given new meaning to the Office of the Secretary of Defense and has restored real luster to the constitutional principle of civilian control—giving it meaning and reality—by his willing acceptance of the tremendous responsibilities which are part of his office.

His order, issued shortly after becoming Secretary of Defense, which directed that possible divergencies of opinion between the several members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff be promptly brought to his attention, was in complete agreement with the words and intent of the Constitution and the laws passed by Congress for the direction and organization of our vast defense effort. No organization can work and survive on form alone—it takes competence and courage on the part of the responsible leaders to make any organization function properly—and Mr. Gates has shown this leadership.

I understand that he has not stopped with this development, but has made it practice to meet regularly with the Joint Chiefs so that he, as the civilian head of our Defense Establishment, will have an intimate and up-to-the-minute knowledge of the major problems of defense direction and, most important, the facts behind these issues.

The directives recently issued by Secretary Gates providing for an integrated communication system is a perfect example of actual, meaningful implementation of the earlier steps taken by him.

Almost since the invention of the telegraph, the military problem of duplicating and parallel communications systems has been evident. It has been increased in magnitude by the technological advancements and tremendous increases in volume brought about by the demands of modern war. Mr. Gates, by his action, is the first Secretary of Defense who has both recognized this problem and provided a solution.

By his action, we will at once save money and resources and acquire a communication system responsible to the needs of modern war far beyond anything we have had in the past. The United States is fortunate in having a man of such competence as Thomas S. Gates, Jr., at the head of the Department of Defense.

Joseph W. Barr: Department of Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL HOGAN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1960

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting a speech which was given by my colleague, JOSEPH W. BARR, Representative from the 11th District, Indiana, before the Federal Government Accountants' Association at the Naval Weapons Plant in Washington, D.C. on May 13.

The speech, Mr. Speaker, points up the need for coordinated effort on the part of our Government in the field of research.

In the past 20 years the expenditures of the United States on research have increased about 110 times—from $74 million in 1940 to $8,400 million in fiscal 1961. In 1961 research expenditures will use up about 10 cents of every Federal tax dollar collected.

This amazing jump in research appropriations over a 20-year span seems to reflect an awareness by the people that we can survive in the sixties only through research. We do not have the population to field great land armies, so to remain secure in a military sense, we must out-research the rest of the world. Economically, research is probably the best weapon we have in a highly competitive world. Ours is a high-cost economy. From the chairman of the board, through engineering staffs, and on down to the production line, our people demand and get salaries that are very high by world standards. To support these standards and to compete, we must literally turn in a better research performance than our competitors in the world market.

These facts seem apparent and are generally accepted. There is, however, a growing concern from the voters and from the Congress that the expenditure of this $8,400 million is poorly coordinated, often wasteful, lacking in direction and purpose, and too often based on 'expediency' rather than logical long-term goals.

Research, unlike other Government functions, is not centered under a department head reporting to the President and through him to the Congress. Research is scattered all over the lot. Defense of course gets the lion's share—$5,840 million. Over a billion dollars goes to the Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Administration is next with $600 million, then the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with $375 million (mostly spent in the National Institutes of Health), Department of Agriculture gets $138 million, the National Science Foundation gets $101 million, and a group of other agencies gets $283 million among them.

In spite of the fact that research is a clearly established Government function—as clearly defined as defense, labor, or agriculture, in spite of the fact that it uses 10 cents out of every tax dollar, in spite of the fact that it is clearly vital to our continued existence, still there have been no attempts to make sense out of this sprawling mess. There is no clear line of authority to the President and to the Congress. And worst of all there seems to be no attempt to establish national science goals, to coordinate existing programs, or to give the taxpayer a break on this enormous expenditure.

In my opinion there are three areas of management problems involved that must be resolved quickly if our research efforts are to produce a reasonable return:

I

Some way, somehow, the President or the Congress must decide how much of our resources can be devoted to research. Today money is probably not as much a controlling factor as the sheer availability of scientists.

II

Some way, somehow, the Congress or the President must establish a direction and a goal for our efforts and this expenditure of tax funds. At the moment direction is imparted to research by departments concerned with their particular problems. It is only natural that people in Agriculture would emphasize their particular problems of research. It is only natural that Defense scientists would insist on the overriding importance of their efforts, and the same would be true of the doctors at the National Institutes of Health. Each group has its own ax to grind, and unfortunately the Congress judges research appropriations on this departmental basis. I think this approach is all wrong. It is not as important to argue whether cancer research is more important than research on heart disease, as to stack these programs up against the whole range of Government research efforts—space, defense, meteorology, oceanography, communications, etc. There may be some anguished howls, but in my opinion we can no longer afford to consider research efforts in a departmental context; we must line them up and give them priorities on the basis of total national interest.

III

Finally, the Executive is now faced with a management problem of the first magnitude in getting the most out of the tax dollar—this $8,400 million. As I understand it, management of research involves three basic problems: (1) What projects to start; (2) Continuing evaluation of the work; and (3) When to quit.

I also understand that the toughest problem is the last—when to throw in the sponge and quit on a line of research that is not panning out.

In the years 1957 to 1959 we probably "blew" about 4 billion in Defense research because no one blew the whistle in time. One weapon system after another was advanced to the production point and then abandoned. Someone should have and could have stopped these projects much earlier in the game when they were obviously not developing properly. This kind of waste is intolerable.

Now that we have laid out the problems, what is the answer. I know that my answer is repugnant to many people, but I predict that we will be driven into a Department of Research with a Cabinet officer reporting directly to the President and collecting under his direction most of the sprawling research efforts of this Nation. Hearings were held on this subject in 1959 and many scientists yelled "tyranny." They may have a point, but I know of no other way for this Government to get a national, not a departmental, direction to our defense efforts. I know of no other way to coordinate these sprawling projects. I know of no other way to assure the American taxpayer that he will get a fair return from his tax dollars.

The Quest for Safeguarded Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 18, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "The Quest for Safeguarded Disarmament Must Be at the Heart of U.S. Foreign Policy," which I delivered in Washington, D.C., April 27, 1960.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE QUEST FOR SAFEGUARDED DISARMAMENT MUST BE AT THE HEART OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

(Address delivered by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, at Washington, D.C., April 27, 1960)

It may seem a long way from the real mountains of West Virginia to the metaphorical summit of next month—but it is not. Like the people of Arizona and Alabama, Wyoming and Wisconsin, like people everywhere, the men and women I have been talking with in West Virginia are deeply concerned with peace.

I have no crystal ball, and I will not attempt to predict what the outcome of the summit meeting will be. I do earnestly hope, however, that the four leaders will give serious and thoughtful consideration to the problems of arms control and disarmament, and will be able to achieve real, even if limited, progress.

I recognize that the armament race and the lack of political settlements are as closely related as, for example, racial prejudice and racial discrimination. Both are vicious circles, and it would be easy to sit down and give up trying on the theory that you can't eliminate one unless you eliminate the other.

As a practical and optimistic people, however, we Americans like to break in on these vicious circles somewhere. For example, in recent years we have been enacting laws against racial discrimination. That does not mean that we fail to recognize the need to banish prejudice by education; it does mean that we recognize that education alone would take a long, long time to achieve results, and that having to cease some acts of discrimination by law has in itself an educational effect.

So it is with disarmament and political settlements. The Soviet leaders have given little ground for hope that they are ready to consider a practical political settlement for Berlin, let alone Germany as a whole. The same is true of other political problems which clutter the international agenda.

OUR MAJOR EFFORT SHOULD BE IN DISARMAMENT

That does not mean that we should forget them, or cease trying. It does mean in my view, however, that our major effort should be in the field of disarmament—a field in which, during recent years, the Soviet leaders have done rather less propaganda and rather more serious negotiation than over political questions. If we do manage to achieve some real progress in disarmament, we can return to the political questions with greater hope of success.

There are obvious reasons for this. Unfortunate as it is that there are—for example—two Germanies, two Koreas, two Vietnams, peace can conceivably survive this division. We can live with it for the time being, even if we do not condone it. But the armaments race threatens both sides with the imminence of mutual annihilation. Furthermore—as the recent news of strikes and riots among Soviet workers emphasizes—the Soviet leaders have urgent domestic reasons for seeking to beat some of their swords into ploughshares.

SOVIET UNION NEEDS PEACE

Over a year ago, on returning from my visit to the Soviet Union, I noted Chairman Khrushchev's urgent need for peace, and predicted that he would launch a big push for disarmament. We should have been prepared—but we weren't.

The four leaders at the summit might well take their text from Shakespeare—who, I understand, is in Boris Pasternak's excellent translations as popular in the Soviet Union as in the Western World. He might have been speaking directly to the summit when he wrote:

> "There is a tide in the affairs of men,
> Which, taken at the full, leads on to fortune;
> Omitted, all the voyage of their life
> Is bound in shallows and in miseries."

Such a tide is running now for disarmament—and I profoundly hope that the summit leaders will take it at the full.

TWO STEPS AT THE SUMMIT

There are two major steps that they can and should take. One of these is to resolve the most difficult obstacle standing in the way of a nuclear weapons test ban agreement—namely, the number of onsite inspections. The second is to give directions for the future course of the 10-nation disarmament negotiations.

DEFINITE POSSIBILITY OF TEST BAN AGREEMENT

There is a very definite possibility that a test ban agreement—the first real breakthrough toward peace—may be achieved this year, even if it is not concluded in time to be submitted to this session of Congress.

Most of you in this well-informed audience are familiar with the broad features of the proposed test ban treaty. I shall review them briefly:

1. The treaty would ban permanently all nuclear tests in the atmosphere, under water, and in outer space. It would ban underground tests down to a certain level—the level suggested by the United States being 4.75 on the earthquake scale, that is 19 kilotons of TNT in magnitude, roughly the size of the Hiroshima bomb.

2. A minimum of 180 control posts would be erected around the world to monitor shocks to the earth's surface, and to identify them as earthquakes or as nuclear explosions.

3. Up to a certain number of times each year, a mobile inspection team could make an on-site investigation of an event registered at the control posts which could not be identified as being natural in origin or an earthquake.

4. A coordinated program of research would be conducted by the three nuclear powers to improve the techniques of detecting and identifying nuclear explosions.

There is also the possibility of a separate agreement that, while this research is going on—and at least for a 2-year period—the nuclear powers would refrain from underground tests.

These four points are the major elements of the proposed treaty. There are other important points, and some of them are as yet unresolved. But, at this stage of the negotiations, the principal obstacle to agreement is the number or quota of "veto-free on-site" inspections to be carried out each year.

The U.S. position is that at least 20 inspections would be needed in the Soviet Union each year to check for possible explosions of 19 kilotons and above. If a lower threshold were to be selected, say 5 or 10 kilotons, a larger number of inspections would be required.

SENATE WOULD NOT SUPPORT INADEQUATE INSPECTIONS

The Soviet Union surely knows that a treaty cannot go into effect without a two-thirds vote of the Senate—we should advise them that a treaty which provides for less than 20 veto-free on-site inspections would have little or no chance of winning Senate ratification.

I hope that they will recognize—on this issue, our negotiators have no room to yield.

WHAT CAN WE EXPECT FROM THE SUMMIT?

The achievement of a test-ban agreement at the summit meeting—or even, to be more realistic about the prospects, the removal of this major obstacle to agreement—would raise a banner of hope for troubled and fearful mankind.

Such hopes, however, might be cruelly disappointed if the summit conference stopped there—and did not make a real effort to move the general disarmament talks off the dead center on which they are presently stuck.

The problem the summit should decide is in what direction to move forward. At present, the Big Four are like the horseman of the Canadian humorist, Stephen Leacock—they want to ride off furiously in all directions.

SOVIET EMPHASIS

The Soviet Union talks of complete disarmament in 4 years. On these occasions when it mutes this particular trumpet and talks of partial measures, it concentrates on proposals for Europe alone and for the elimination of foreign bases—the old Soviet propaganda line.

FRENCH POSITION

France evidently is opposed to any discussion of disarmament measures for Europe. The United States apparently does not want to negotiate about its overseas bases.

France would prefer to talk about nuclear delivery systems rather than nuclear ammunition. The reverse is true for the United States. And any mention of a control system for either ammunition or delivery vehicles seems to send cold shivers up the Soviet spine.

IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH ON CONTROLS

Indeed, we need to know much more about controls before we can seriously negotiate them. This is primarily an American responsibility. The Soviet Union is allergic to controls, and will accept as little of them as it can. We cannot expect Chairman Khrushchev to authorize a serious effort in this field—any more than he would set up classes to teach shrimps how to whistle.

In the entire area of arms control, only two items could be settled immediately, according to the latest U.S. proposal. One is the freezing of the level of United States and Soviet armed forces at 2.5 million. The other is the prior notification to an international control organization of proposed launchings of space vehicles.

Nothing else could be considered without very serious study. So far as I am aware, no studies have been started on any disarmament measure, other than techniques for detecting nuclear weapons tests—and this study has been proceeding on a substantial scale only for the past 3 months.

RESEARCH FUNDS ABSOLUTELY VITAL

It may be that more thought has been given to these subjects than Congress is permitted to know. But thought is not enough. The expenditure of very substantial funds is required. The Berkner panel estimated $30 million as the cost of a 2- or 3-year research program in nuclear test detection alone, and $8 million has been allocated for the first year.

SUMMIT CONFERENCE SHOULD PRODUCE GUIDELINES

One way out of the present impasse is for the summit conference to set forth directives on the next steps in arms control. With such directives, the 10-nation disarmament conferences could concentrate its efforts, instead of riding off in all directions at once. And, with such directives, our own Government would know where to concentrate major study and research in order to be prepared for the next steps in disarmament negotiations.

INADEQUATE U.S. PLANNING

We have not been prepared for such negotiations, as I have been warning for many months. At long last, the State Department itself has acknowledged this fact. I quote Mr. Raymond Hare, the Deputy Under Secretary of State:

"In reviewing our approach to disarmament, it was further found that the most serious deficiency in the U.S. approach has been the lack of adequate planning and studies in the field of disarmament."

At long last, too, there are reports of a possible upgrading of the Office of Disarmament within the Department of State. That is good as far as it goes—but it doesn't go nearly far enough. It comes late—I don't say "too late"—and it is certainly too little.

A MANHATTAN PROJECT FOR PEACE NEEDED

What we really need—as the Senate Disarmament Committee proposed as long ago as September, 1957—is a special agency devoted to the single and comprehensive problem of disarmament—a sort of "Manhattan Project for Peace."

Early in February I introduced legislation to establish a National Peace Agency. It should have the services of some of the ablest and most dedicated people in the country. It should have authority to coordinate the many different projects in the general disarmament field which are presently splintered among the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Department of State.

Its single, overriding assignment should be to find a way to end the arms race. In the existing agencies, this is at best a part-time or occasional assignment. Then, too, there is a built-in contradiction in expecting any Department of Defense to give wholehearted enthusiasm to limiting armaments—or any Atomic Energy Commission to show as much zeal for curtailing atom bombs as for developing more effective and varied ones.

The proverb tells us that poachers make poor gamekeepers. I don't apply this proverb in its totality to the Pentagon and the AEC. They can and should provide needed advice and technical services to the National Peace Agency. But, in this field, they should be valued servants and advisers, not masters.

The Department of State would continue, of course, to carry on disarmament negotiations—and I have introduced legislation to upgrade this function by establishing an Assistant Secretary of State for Disarmament and Atomic Energy affairs.

NATIONAL PEACE AGENCY RESEARCH ASSIGNMENTS

The National Peace Agency would provide the State Department, and other Departments concerned, with the fullest information and advice in the field of disarmament and related subjects. Its research assignments should include, among others:

1. The detection and identification of nuclear weapons tests.

2. The detection of missile tests and of the launching of outer space vehicles.

3. Measures to guard against surprise attack, either by long-range or conventional means.

4. Control systems to verify the cutoff of the production of nuclear weapons.

5. Control measures for reducing or eliminating the production of chemical, biological, and radiological weapons.

6. Studies of the feasibility of demilitarized zones and of the stationing of international police contingents in areas of potential conflict.

7. Political problems concerned with the inclusion of Communist China in an arms control agreement.

8. Studies of measures to slow down or embargo the arms traffic to disturbed areas, such as the Middle East.

9. Plans for the economic adjustments required in the event of a substantial reduction in armaments manufacture.

All this, and more, will be needed ultimately to achieve genuine disarmament. If the summit conference, as I hope, sets directions for next steps in negotiation, this will be most helpful in establishing priorities.

NEW EMPHASIS ON SAFEGUARDED DISARMAMENT REQUIRED

The quest for safeguarded disarmament must be at the heart and center of American foreign policy. It must be placed as far as possible within the framework of the United Nations—because disarmament is a concern of all countries, and not only of the great powers. By making our statements on disarmament in the forum of the United Nations, we can—if our case is sound—rally behind it the moral force and the conscience of mankind.

We have a better than even chance of making the last four decades of the 20th century decades of peace. The French have

a good proverb—amply illustrated by many buildings here in Washington—that nothing is so permanent as the temporary. And, if we can keep the peace for the next 40 years, there is real hope that the habit may take hold for good.

Consultation With TV Booster Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1960

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill, H.R. 12297, to make a very small addition to the Federal Communications Act directing the Federal Communications Commission to consult with interested persons in small communities and rural and isolated areas on the technical and other problems involved in bringing television programs to these areas at a reasonable cost.

For 5 years now I have been endeavoring to assist the small and isolated communities of our country, particularly in the West, in their efforts to provide themselves with even a part of the television service which those of us in the large metropolitan areas take so much for granted.

The residents of these communities first turned to the FCC for assistance, but were given no help. Undaunted, in typical American fashion, they set about to solve the problem for themselves by designing and installing the relatively simple television booster stations or repeater stations. These facilities, installed and maintained at a very reasonable cost through voluntary community action have provided a decent television service to thousands of families.

At every stage of the game the local people have had to contend with the stubborn opposition of most of the members of the Federal Communications Commission and its staff. It is my firm conviction that much of this opposition stemmed from some of the worst features of the bureaucratic mind—redtape, lack of imagination, more concern for the administrator's problems than those of the people, insufficient information, delay, and timidity.

But above all, I have felt that the long and needless struggle could have been avoided if there were better communication between the residents of the isolated areas and the agency staff in Washington, D.C., a greater mutual understanding of each other's problems and points of view.

I feel that this communications gap could be bridged if the Commission would appoint five, or even three, field consultants on the television problems of the isolated communities. These specialists could operate out of scattered field offices at, for example, Denver, Colo.; Spokane, Wash.; Douglas, Ariz.; Grand Island, Nebr.; and Fairbanks, Alaska. They could travel around to the small towns to meet with the community leaders interested in television, inspect the terrain, look over the local television repeater facilities and pass on information on what other communities and the FCC itself are doing.

From time to time the field specialists would report back to Washington, D.C., on what they had learned, could pass on suggestions for improvements in the equipment or for changes in licensing procedures, and also could submit recommendations on specific license application.

With these field specialists doing their job conscientiously, I am confident that almost overnight the present feelings of mutual suspicion and mutual antagonism would dissolve.

Heretofore, with but few exceptions, every representative of the FCC who has visited these small towns has done so as an enforcement officer, a policeman, seeking only to find law violations and to close down the community-sponsored television repeater facility which offers the only means the residents have to enjoy television.

By contrast, the field specialists I envision would be welcomed as friends, not antagonists, who are trying to help, not hinder. They would work in mutual cooperation with the local residents to help work out a system for providing good television service within the framework of the administrative responsibilities of the Commission. The local people are more than ready and willing to cooperate with the Commission if only the Commission, in turn, will demonstrate it is willing to cooperate with them. I believe the field consultants quickly can bring about this much desired spirit of mutual cooperation.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Federal Communications Commission could employ these field consultants now, without any nudge from Congress, if only it decided to do so. But when I informally have suggested this course in the past, the response has consisted of a series of typical bureaucratic reasons why it can't be done: They do not have the money, they do not have the authority, they already are studying the problem and there is no need for these additional personnel, anyway. So unless the new chairman of the Commission and the men he has brought with him are motivated by the desire to solve problems and accomplish results rather than to spend their time thinking up reasons why something cannot be done, then I am afraid that some congressional action is necessary.

Last year I introduced a bill, H.R. 3737, designed to spur the Commission through creating a Community Television Bureau. Both the Commission and the Bureau of the Budget have filed the expected adverse reports.

The principal objection raised to that bill is a procedural one, namely, that it is unwise from an administrative point of view for Congress by law to create a specific bureau with statutory powers within a larger agency. Recognizing that this argument has some validity, I have taken a new approach in the bill introduced today, H.R. 12297, which consists of adding to the list of powers and duties of the Commission under section 303 of the Communication Act the simple statement that it—

(s) Consult with interested persons in small communities and in rural and isolated areas on the technical and other problems involved in providing adequate television service at a reasonable cost.

I hope that action can be taken on this simplified bill before adjournment.

Where We Stand in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective and hard-working Members of the House is my good friend and distinguished colleague from the First Congressional District of Connecticut, the Honorable EMILIO Q. DADDARIO.

"MIM" DADDARIO long ago acquired a habit of attaining distinction in anything he attempts. From his college days at Wesleyan University in Middletown, Conn., where he became one of Wesleyan's alltime star athletes, he proceeded to compile an enviable military record in World War II with the Office of Strategic Services. In the postwar period, he became mayor of Middletown and later judge of the Middletown municipal court. With the outbreak of the Korean conflict, he returned to military service, this time in the Far East, again compiling a distinguished record.

As a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, "MIM" DADDARIO has made significant contributions to the pioneering work of this group. His grasp of the difficult and complex problems of the exploration and development of outer space are clearly shown in an article he has written for the May 1960 issue of the Wesleyan University Alumnus, entitled "Where We Stand in Space." Under leave to extend my remarks, I call the article to the earnest attention of my colleagues. The text follows:

WHERE WE STAND IN SPACE
(By Hon. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO)

The exploration of space and the development of its use for service to man is a major responsibility of Congress and its Committee on Science and Astronautics. Because we are not the only nation so interested, a race for space has been created with every success or failure tallied on the chart of world public opinion. We cannot ignore so great a challenge. Involving as it does both the military survival of the Nation and its economic well-being, it demands an ultimate effort. This is a capsule report on the outlook as it appears to me after studying reports and listening to statements by our scientists, military leaders, and industrialists as presented to the Committee on Science and Astronautics, of which I am a member.

MAN IN SPACE

There is great public interest in the project to put man himself into space. This represents a new frontier, one without limit, unlike the vanished frontiers of the earth's

surface. It is too early to say whether putting man into space in this manner will have immediate economic or military significance, but no one can doubt the psychological impact in the world power struggle, or the ultimate consequences both for military development and for scientific and economic endeavor.

Putting man into space successfully for any length of time is the culmination and synthesis of a great amount of our modern scientific knowledge and technical achievement. It involves reliable propulsion, materials of remarkable qualities, intricate guidance and communications, and a collection of environment controls to overcome the absence of air, the presence of radiation, weightlessness, and the fierce heat of reentry. It also requires a vast system of ground support including tracking and computing facilities and effective recovery means. To have all this combined and made to work reliably is a major undertaking resting on the base of billions of dollars of research, development, and testing.

As of this date it is difficult to predict with certainty whether it will be the United States or the Soviet Union which first achieves the successful orbiting and recovery of a man in a ballistic capsule. It would not be surprising if the Russians do it first. This is because they have had larger rocket powerplants for a longer period of time, and because they early pursued a vigorous and highly successful program of biological experiments in space which have included the successful recovery of living animals from some very ambitious vertical probes into space.

The U.S. effort is centered in Project Mercury. Although it has its limitations, it represents our first important hope for success. It is well thought out and is proceeding in an orderly way at a very high level of priority.

Particular public interest has centered on the seven chosen astronauts. Having met these young men, I can assure you that they are skilled and dedicated, and that they will bring this country success if it is within the capabilities of man.

No positive timetable can be given on such an experimental program. However, our tentative goal is to make the first ballistic-type attempt with a modified Redstone carrying the capsule and astronaut some time this year. If all goes well, it may be possible to orbit a man in 1961. It is most likely that he will orbit the earth three times in a period of 4 hours and then skip down from outer space into the upper atmosphere, beginning over the Pacific, crossing the continental limits of the United States, and landing in the Atlantic Ocean.

Follow-on projects at various stages of development or study include Dyna-Soar, which in advanced versions will orbit a man, and allow some choice as to point of landing through use of a winged glider reentry instead of the straight ballistic fall with blunt nosecone and parachute as intended with Mercury. Farther away but under study are manned space stations and ultimate expeditions to the Moon, Venus, and Mars.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITES

One of the earliest and surest payoffs from our space research is in the area of space communications. The most compelling urgency is to have a sure system of worldwide communications. The volume of military messages being far in excess of our commercial traffic illustrates the importance of communications to our national security. We know how vulnerable most of our communication channels are from solar disturbances and how terrible the consequences would be in this missile age if immediate commands could not be passed between headquarters and our strategic forces both on airfields and in the air the world over, and how our defensive tracking and command systems also can falter when communications become difficult. Ordinary communication channels are not only overcrowded, but can blank out for days, and yet military requirements call for instantaneous linkage.

These are the compelling arguments advanced for putting the first generations of communications satellites called Project Notus under the control of the Defense Department. Project Notus includes several parts: Project Courier will be an improvement of the Project Score Atlas which carried the President's voice and teletypewriter messages around the world in December 1958. It is called a delayed repeater active satellite because its tape recorders pick up messages for delivery on command from the ground at a later time. Project Steer will be somewhat similar, but will relay messages instantaneously by rebroadcast. It offers the opportunity for developing virtually jamproof, sunstorm-proof line of sight narrow beam signal transmission. Project Decree will come about when we have more powerful launching vehicles to place the real time repeater satellite 22,300 miles over the Equator so that its speed in orbit matches the rotation of the earth exactly enough to hold it with minor corrections in fixed position relative to the surface of the Earth. Three properly spaced equatorial orbit satellites will allow line of sight communication to all except the extreme polar regions. All these devices are practical, but will call for careful design to create reliability of circuits and a durable power supply from either solar cells or a nuclear source of energy whether isotopic battery or a miniature reactor with heat exchanges, turbine, and generator.

While we are waiting for these military projects to reach perfection, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will be pursuing the passive relay of signals by placing large reflecting objects in orbit against which anyone may bounce signals just as the Navy is bouncing signals off the surface of the Moon. This passive satellite relay is called Project Echo and will include the placing and inflating of exceedingly thin 100-foot-diameter metal-coated plastic balloons into orbit. It is planned that these balloons will stay in orbit for a time before they gradually slow and are destroyed on reentry to the upper atmosphere.

Once urgent military needs have been cared for, and perhaps partly in parallel, we are going to see a commercial use of communications satellites. The research for this is already under way among the big telephone, cable, and radio companies. The reasons are fairly simple. Not only can such links be free from the delays of solar activity, but they offer many more channels through which information can be poured. Satellites will prove cheaper than laying more ocean cables, will provide many additional channels, and will make intercontinental television a practical thing. As of today pictures sent live across the Atlantic take hours of broadcasting and taping to produce a few minutes of pictures and the results are hardly satisfactory for regular or instantaneous use.

In contrast, the satellite planned for Project Decree will be able to carry 300 voice channels or two television channels through the 8,000 pounds of weight in orbit. This project should be a going thing, in less than 5 years, and will be just the beginning, for one industrial company has plans for an advanced satellite capable of relaying 50,000 voice messages simultaneously. Once the big 1.5 million pound thrust Saturn booster is perfected, stations of this type can be placed in orbit.

The needs for high capacity are very great. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has shown that there were 1.5 million oversea telephone messages in 1950, that 3 million are expected this year, and that the saturation capacity of slightly over 4 million messages will be reached by 1962. By 1970 the number of messages could rise to 21 million if facilities were provided. Since no cables are planned to keep up with this project demand, communication satellites will be a virtual necessity during the present decade. The present two Atlantic cables carry only 36 voice channels each. Compared with the estimate above as to what satellites will do, one can envision the kind of "quantum jump" which is coming in our contacts with the rest of the world. Indeed, it was Arthur Clarke, author of "The Exploration of Space," who suggested to my committee that the first nation to achieve a practical television satellite might set the universal language for all the world. This will exert a force on the course of history far greater than ever previously experienced.

WEATHER SATELLITES

Although not a commercial project in itself, the weather satellite is likely to exercise a profound influence on the world economy within a decade. Leading weather experts have said that the United States alone may realize benefits from this one type of satellite in excess of $4 billion a year. Such a saving would be more than enough to pay for the entire space program.

The weather satellite is still an experimental device and is under development by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under the code Project Tiros. This will be followed by the more sophisticated Project Nimbus. Success here will give continuous reports on cloud cover, heat balance, solar activity, and many other related matters. Weathermen on the ground can then feed the worldwide information into computers and complete studies now based greatly on theory. Only then will we begin to have reliable weather reports useful to agriculture and industry in a definitive way.

The weather satellite will have military uses as well. For example, when reconnaissance military satellites are able to broadcast the immediate position of ships at sea to missile launching pads, these ships will lose some of their present invulnerability. Information from weather satellites relayed to ships will give them cloud cover reports allowing them to keep out of sight much of the time, and thus reduce their vulnerability.

NAVIGATION SATELLITES

The Navy in particular has a very keen interest in a navigation satellite called Project Transit. In effect it will become a manmade radio star which regardless of weather can be sighted through instruments and very exact readings on location can be made through the Doppler shift of signals as it passes. It is expected that these devices will be available within 2 years to guide ships and Polaris submarines at a cost well below the presently maintained long-distance range stations. Their signals will also have practical commercial value and will be available to other countries as well.

VEHICLE FAMILIES

My discussion above is largely in terms of the important end uses which are coming most immediately. Equally significant is the development of the launching vehicles themselves.

Ballistic missile experience is the foundation of by far the largest part of our space effort. Powered with the H–1 rocket engine, the Atlas, Thor, and Jupiter have put up all but the nominal payloads of the Vanguards and the early Explorer satellites. However, the relatively limited Vanguards and Explorers of the 1958 period have provided components for the upper stages of the more versatile vehicles of the present. Still better is the new Agena second stage for use on either Thor or Atlas. It has been placing 1,700-pound Discoverer engineering test satellites into polar orbit.

The Agena B version which will be ready presently will have a restart capability in space. This development will be essential to attaining the controlled and circular orbits in space needed for the communications and other advanced satellite applications. An additional improvement because of the greater efficiency of hydrogen as a fuel will be the Centaur upper stage. This will have important military assignments and also will provide the first significant capability for lunar soft landings of instruments and interplanetary probes.

However ingenious we are with improved upper stages, our present total lifting capacity will be limited to that possible with our largest launching booster, the Atlas. Atlas has a thrust of 360,000 pounds, only about half that used for the first three sputniks and first three lunik Soviet rockets. This gives a clue to the importance of Saturn, a clustered arrangement of eight H–1 engines of the type used by our present boosters, and expected to give a first stage thrust of close to 1.5 million pounds.

Along with the big booster are to come super upper stages fueled with hydrogen, and delivering in final version 800,000 pounds of thrust for the second stage, tapering to a fifth Centaur stage. This ultimate arrangement is the kind which will carry men around the moon and perhaps support a landing there. Such landings are feasible with our present technology within a decade.

Saturn is not the end of the line in booster development. Some funding has been given the F–1 engine, to deliver from a single chamber 1.5 million pounds of thrust. With clustering in the Nova concept, we may see as many as 12 million pounds of thrust made available, the basis for a manned round trip to Mars.

Many people close to the work also wish we were pushing with more speed on Project Rover. This is a nuclear heat exchanger rocket already ground-tested which will ultimately increase tenfold the payload that can be sent on interplanetary missions. Here is an opportunity for a significant surge ahead in space for the United States.

Another possibility in the nuclear field is Project Orion, a nuclear bomb propulsion system which would propel a spaceship by firing a sequence of modest-sized nuclear weapons. Enthusiasts see the opportunity for lifting literally thousands of tons of payload by this means.

Electrical propulsion development is showing another important gain for interplanetary work. These may include electrostatically accelerated ions or electromagnetically accelerated plasmas.

All of these plans will see much further development and some applications within the next decade or two, the speed being largely a matter of how much support we give to the work.

IMPLICATIONS OF SPACE DEVELOPMENT

There is not room here to develop the full implications of our entry into the space age. I have reviewed in general terms some of the applications which will come in our spacework and the vehicles which will carry out these tasks. We must realize that our needs for scientific discovery are linked with space research and that our success in meeting these challenges affects our status as a world leader in the eyes of people all over the globe. There is no doubt that we have at this moment the technical ability and the industrial skill to accomplish leaps ahead in space. We also have the inherent abilities and skills in government and in the universities. It will all take a combination of time, money, and good management. In the background there must be attention to scientific education and training, and an understanding of the importance of this program extending far beyond the current funding of the particular projects being developed.

My review would not be complete without a clear recognition that however we may wish to dedicate space to peaceful uses and to practical applications which are financially self-supporting, there are some very urgent military aspects as well. Quite aside from the ballistic weapons which are becoming for the immediate future the mainstay of the nuclear deterrent of both the United States and the Soviet Union, space has an immediate and urgent significance of military concern. The Midas infrared detector for satellite observation of any missile launchings, and the Samos photographic, television, and electronic ferret satellite for advance warning of military activity represent key projects which involve our very survival. They represent a means to have sufficient warning of any sneak attack on this country which may in fact rule out such sneak attack as being a practical strategy to use against us. Civil defense and retaliatory strikes are back in the picture to a worthwhile degree if we could have even a full half hour of warning from Midas. The present hoped for 10 to 15 minutes of warning is almost meaningless. Modern defense involves many complex issues and forces, and space development is inseparable from consideration of our defense.

There remains the very real hope that space activity in some form will eventually rule out the waste of military preparations, and may serve as a unifying force in human endeavors. This is something for which we should all fervently hope. Meanwhile we have no real choice but to do our best to increase our understanding of the space environment and to increase the skill to use this environment. These are goals worthy of man's best efforts and high faculties.

Should the Public Interest Be Represented?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1960

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I never thought the time would come when anyone would tell the American public that they are not the public. Yet that is what this administration is trying to do. It has refused to reappoint to the Federal Power Commission the only member of that Commission, William R. Connole, who has fought consistently and courageously to protect the consumer from unjustified increases in his gas and electric bills. The administration has given as its reason that Mr. Connole is too consumer minded, that he represents a special group, the consumers.

This is indeed a strange distinction. Since when are the public and the consumers two different groups? Since when are the consumers a special group? When Congress authorizes the Food and Drug Administration to protect the public interest against dangerous drugs, whom does Congress mean by the public if not the people who buy those drugs, the consumers? And when Congress tells the Federal Trade Commission to protect the public from misleading advertising, whom does Congress mean if not the people who will be fooled by that advertising, the consumers?

And when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the Federal Power Commission's job was to protect the public interest, whom did it mean but the consumers, the users of gas and electricity? Or does not this administration understand that the only function of the Federal Power Commission is to protect the interest of the public? And does it not know that the consumers are the public and that the only way the Federal Power Commission can protect the interest of the public is to protect the consumers? If a man does not understand this—if he is not ready and willing to do this—he does not belong on the Commission. And an administration that does not understand it has no right to make appointments to the Commission.

I am completely amazed by this reason given by the administration for its refusal to reappoint Mr. Connole. I would think that even this administration would know why regulatory commissions have been created. Utilities are given an absolute monopoly to render an essential service for the public. With this monopoly position, if utilities were not regulated or controlled, they could charge almost any prices and give almost any prices and give almost any kind of service. As an example, take an electric utility. People must have their electricity. They can buy it usually only from one source and that source is the power company serving that area. To get that service, they must pay whatever rates the power company charges. Obviously, unless there is some group to control what the companies do and what they charge, the public—the consumers—would be at the complete mercy of the power companies. To protect the public—the consumers—regulatory commissions were created. They were created in the States to protect the public as far as intrastate matters are concerned. And the Federal commissions were created to protect the public insofar as interstate transactions are involved. But every commission, State or Federal, was created solely to protect the public. It is perfectly clear that a utility which has a monopoly for rendering an essential service to the public needs no protection from the public—but just as obviously the public needs protection from the utilities. And unless they get that protection from the regulatory commissions, they are at the complete mercy of the utilities.

I saw this at first hand. For years I was counsel for a rural electric cooperative in North Dakota. I know how important good regulation is to the public. I know that because the Federal Power Commission is allowing electric power companies to keep for themselves, and not pass on to the consumers, the savings realized from accelerated depreciation, the consumers are being compelled to pay much higher rates for electricity than they should be paying. I also know that when the Federal Power Commission granted a private power company a license to build 3 small dams instead of one high Hells Canyon Dam it meant that the farmers of North Dakota would be denied the low-cost fertilizer which the high dam would have made possible.

These are only two illustrations out of many which show how costly to the consumers—to the public—poor regulation is.

If the public only realized how important good regulation is to them, they would do everything in their power to insure that only men who had the public interest—the consumer's interest—at heart would be appointed or elected to the regulatory commissions. Unfortunately, the average citizen does not realize that he pays with his own hard-earned money for the poor appointments made to regulatory commissions. He does not understand that whenever a commission allows a utility to overcharge in its rates—and this happens all too often—every consumer pays more on his utility bill; that when the Federal Power Commission allows increase after increase to the big wholesale gas companies, those companies pass the increases on to the retail gas companies which serve the individual consumer and the individual consumer's gas bill goes up. The same is true in the case of every other type of utility service.

I wish it were possible to carry this message to every one of our citizens. I wish they could be made to realize that they are directly concerned in every action that the Federal Power Commission—and every other regulatory commission—takes. I wish the public could be made to realize that they pay the cost of poor regulation both through unnecessarily high bills for their utility services and through the increased costs of the other things they must buy.

Certainly, the administration should understand these plain facts of life. Even if it did not understand these facts before 1956, it must have known about it since that time. Because in 1956 the Supreme Court of the United States, in two cases decided at the same time, made it unmistakably clear that the sole function of the Federal Power Commission was to protect the public interest. In the cases of *United Gas Pipe Line Co.* v. *Mobile Gas Service Corp, et al.* (350 U.S. 332), and *Federal Power Commission* v. *Sierra Pacific Power Company* (350 U.S. 348), the Supreme Court emphasized the fact "that the purpose of the power given the Commission is the protection of the public interest, as distinguished from the private interests of the utilities."

These decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court both gratified and shocked me. I was gratified that the U.S. Supreme Court so plainly and clearly told the Federal Power Commission what its function was. On the other hand, I was shocked that it was necessary for the Supreme Court to remind the Federal Power Commission why it was created and why it existed. You would think that the Federal Power Commission would know at least that much. Despite these decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court, however, the administration refuses to reappoint to the Federal Power Commission the only man on it who has demonstrated the ability and desire to perform his duties as they should be performed and to protect the public interest.

I was interested to see, a few months ago, an article in the magazine Fortune. Fortune, you know, is the magazine of big business. It ran an article which reviewed and analyzed the work of our Federal regulatory commissions. When the article discussed the Federal Power Commission it said that of the five Commissioners on that Commission there was only one who was doing his job and that one was William R. Connole. This was not the appraisal or opinion of consumer-minded groups, but it was the conclusion reached by the magazine of big business. I congratulate Fortune for conducting such a study and making such an honest and objective presentation. But this administration, which has proved itself to be the instrument of big business, refuses to go along even with the magazine of big business when that magazine presents an honest and fair story. Apparently the motto of this administration is: "Whether it be right or wrong, we are always for big business and against the consumer."

In a recent broadcast, NBC Commentator Martin Agronsky noted that many Senators, the mayors of large gas-consuming cities, 10 professors of law and government regulation at Columbia, Harvard, Pennsylvania, and Yale Law Schools, many consumer groups and major newspapers have urged the reappointment of Mr. Connole, and that the regulatory commissioners of Mr. Connole's home area—the New England States—have praised him as being the most preeminently qualified person in New England in the field of regulation. Martin Agronsky then comments:

> None of this seems to have registered with the President. The price of dissent, like the price of gas, keeps going up.

I would make only one addition to this splendid statement by Martin Agronsky. I would say that the price of dissent, when the dissent is in favor of the public, like the price of gas, keeps going up. I am sure that if the dissent was in favor of big business, the commissioner who dissented would have guaranteed his reappointment.

Ever since 1953, we have witnessed the deterioration of our regulatory commissions by the appointment of men who have no understanding whatsoever of their duties and functions, of men who often disagree with and disapprove of the very statutes they are to enforce. But the refusal of the administration to reappoint to the Federal Power Commission the only man on it who understands and conscientiously endeavors to do his duty—William R. Connole—and the explanation made for this refusal establish a new low.

I fervently pray that the Senate will not permit this continuing deterioration in the makeup of our Federal regulatory commissions. The Senate, of course, has no appointive powers. Only the President can make the appointment. But I sincerely hope that no man will be confirmed who does not understand that his function as a commissioner is to protect the public interest, or who does not intend to do all that he can to protect the public interest—and that means to protect the consumer.

Speech by Senator Kenneth B. Keating Before the Americans for Competitive Enterprise System, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 18, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a speech delivered by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], in Philadelphia, May 13, contains so much of general interest and is so soundly reasoned that I believe it should receive much wider attention. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech of Senator KEATING before the Americans for the Competitive Enterprise System, Inc.—ACES.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR KENNETH B. KEATING, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE AMERICANS FOR THE COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM, INC., PHILADELPHIA, MAY 13, 1960

I am delighted to be here this afternoon to talk to the Philadelphia Americans for the Competitive Enterprise System.

The purposes for which your fine organization stands are the greatest ideals of all history—freedom and its many facets. It motivates and inspires men, and has done so from the beginning of recorded time. It is mankind's eternal trump card.

Speaking to the ACES, I suppose I should have held on to my trump card, but in 20 minutes or so one can't do too much finessing with a subject as broad as that which I have chosen for today.

I want to talk today about the attitudes and ideas which people have towards government and towards its impact on our society.

Let's begin by getting things in the proper perspective.

All of us with no small anticipation have been watching the recent growth of our gross national product. This is the statistical index which sums up all of the goods and services produced in the United States. The reason for its receiving special attention in recent months is that this index is about to reach 500 billion or one-half trillion dollars. In fact, the annual rate for the January-March quarter was $498 billion, just 2 billion short of the half trillion mark.

I realize full well that we must not allow ourselves to become hypnotized by the level of this index of national output. There are still a great many questions as to what will be the course of our economy in the months ahead. However, despite these various uncertainties, there is little doubt that at one time or another we will reach and surpass the half-trillion-dollar rate. In fact, we may have already done so.

It will, I am sure, take a statistical giant to determine at exactly what time this event occurred. Maybe it is happening right now as I am speaking. Perhaps it was just at the moment that the President wound up at Griffith Stadium to throw out the first American League baseball. Perhaps it happened at 3 o'clock in the morning.

I am impressed and excited by this half-trillion-dollar figure, because in my mind it affirms and illustrates the great prosperity of our Nation—a record of which all of us can be proud. We must, of course, look to

the future more than we gloat over the past. I know that all of you are concerned, as am I, about the best and most effective route to a gross national product of $600 billion and then 700—and eventually a trillion dollars.

In 1959, total spending by Federal, State, and local governments totaled $97.9 billion. This represents roughly 20 percent of our gross national product, which means that approximately $1 out of every $5 spent in 1959 was spent for government.

On the overall, when you compare national income and total tax revenues an average of 1 day out of every 5-day workweek goes toward providing and maintaining the services of our Federal, State, and local governments. Half a day's wages each week go for national defense alone.

One mustn't take these figures lightly. Because of the high proportion of our time as well as our income which is devoted to government, there is every reason for all taxpaying Americans to take government seriously.

To an unhappily large proportion of Americans, government is like a New Year's Eve party. It comes once a year—as do elections—and the rest of the year is spent wondering blearily why such a fuss is made about it.

As a Member of Congress for over a decade and as an active private citizen for several, I have had a chance to observe and study people's attitudes toward the Federal Government and toward the various uses to which it puts the over $90 billion each year which we pay in taxes.

I want, at this point, to discuss two distinct and certainly extreme attitudes toward government. The first is that of a fellow whom I call the "rant and raver" (he's the nonmusical counterpart of the "rock and roller"). The figures which I have just cited are well known to him. He is all too well aware of them. However, he makes absolutely no attempt to learn about and analyze the ways in which the Government's resources are put to use.

Instead of breaking down the total cost of government and distinguishing between those governmental expenditures which are good and necessary and those which may be bad and unnecessary, he prefers to generalize. To him, government simply costs too much and does too little.

In his mind, the Federal Government is a giant groping carnivorous octopus, reaching in every direction and strangling every living income-receiving thing which it can lay a tentacle one. The only person to whom the octopus of big government responds is the politician—complete with frock coat, plaid pants, and stale cigar.

The politician, deft in the ways of octopi, carefully conditions the beast to spare from his stranglehold just enough voters to get him reelected. Not a happy picture, and fortunately not representative of the attitude of the great majority of informed Americans.

The "rant and raver" is most easily revealed by what I call the "exception deception." He's furious about high taxes, huge bureaucracies, and payola. The Government does too much. We ought to break the whole thing up. But, the only thing which gets him madder than the Government, is the refusal of the party or parties in power to make an exception in order to build him a dam, grant him a special pension, or build a monument for his great grandmother's third cousin, a veteran of a battle of long ago.

The second character whom I want to call to your attention is cleverer and perhaps more sophisticated than the "rant and raver." He is the "gravy train engineer." He starts with the same fundamental assumption as does the "rant and raver," namely that the Government already does too much for too many people. This is his first axiom. The corollary is that since everybody is so well subsidized, the best and only course of action for him is to see to it that he gets his full share—and then some.

You have heard this fellow many times. "Look what so and so gets and how much money goes for something even sillier—why shouldn't I get my fair share of the gravy?"

A serious fallacy common to the "gravy train engineer" is the notion that the Federal Government can do anything it wants far more cheaply and easily than anyone else. In his all-unknowing view, since the Federal Government controls and prints money, it has or can get as much as it needs.

The victim of this unfortunate misconception, which for lack of a better term might be called "mint madness," rejects all forms of therapy. He deliberately and blissfully adheres to his strange and illogical belief that the Government is so big and so unique that the only thing one needs to do to make it work is to plead successfully to an Appropriations Committee of the Congress.

The victim of "mint madness" can frequently be cured by a special kind of shock treatment administered on April 15 of each year by the Internal Revenue Service.

These two imaginary and fictional characters, the "rant and raver" and the "gravy train engineer," are, of course, extremes. And yet, isn't it true that we often recognize similar tendencies in people we know? In fact—if the whole truth be known—don't we find ourselves falling on occasion into the unfortunate habits of the "rant and raver" and his more sophisticated fictional colleague?

What then is the best and most effective attitude for the private as well as the public citizen in thinking about Government and its impact upon his life?

In my mind, it is important that we focus on the basic question as to what is the proper size, scope, and function of Government in our society. In brief, what should the Government do? What should it not do?

Let me cite some common examples of ways in which these fundamental questions relate to existing and proposed activities of the Federal Government. Should the Federal Government insure home mortgages, pay teachers' salaries, subsidize our farm economy, build public housing, underwrite the merchant marine, finance the Weather Bureau, pay for school lunches, provide electricity, build theaters, and assist private colleges?

The answer to these several questions, of course, depends upon the philosophy and ideology of every American, as an individual—and as a free man.

Knowing of the principles and purposes of the ACES, I am sure that it is within this general framework that you appraise both new proposals for governmental action and the performance of the Government in carrying out the various activities with which it is presently charged.

It is not enough merely to think about government and its overall role in our society. It is necessary, in addition, that every effort be made to be kept fully informed as to the intent and mechanics of our various major governmental programs. This is not a subject matter which should be reserved to academicians and politicians. America's vigorous free press puts at the disposal of every citizen the means by which to keep informed of the events of the day and of the objectives and activities of the various agencies of government at all levels. This is an opportunity which cannot and must not be neglected.

I want to make it absolutely clear that I do not mean to be partisan in suggesting that one take as his basic frame of reference an analysis of the proper size, scope, and function of government in our society. There are and must be honest differences of opinion between our two major parties (and amongst individuals within each) as to what should and should not be the proper functions of government. Today I want merely and primarily to stress the importance of a rational and realistic frame of reference for all informed citizens in understanding and actively participating in the vital business of government. Such a framework avoids the pitfalls experienced by the "rant and raver" and the "gravy-train engineer."

This is by no means all that I intend to say on this subject. I would certainly be short changing you intellectually if I did not address myself to the type of considerations which underlie the frame of reference which I have just described. It is absolutely imperative that every American define in his own mind those principles which are of greatest importance to our Nation and which are crucial in determining the proper size, scope, and function of our Government.

My recipe for good government depends, above all, on the wholesome taste of freedom. This includes freedom of speech, religion, thought, and, certainly of special significance to all of you, freedom of opportunity, which is basic to our American competitive-enterprise system.

The history of our country clearly demonstrates that economic expansion, stemming from the energy and enthusiasm of our American free enterprise system, has made our Nation great and powerful.

Free enterprise does not belong to one social stratum or one political party. It is an inalienable right. It encompasses and supersedes all social, political, and economic groupings.

What is the crux of freedom? Where does it come from?

I can't give you the answers. Freedom is delicate and illusive. Freedom is an intangible. One often cannot appreciate its cost and understand its value until it has been taken away. I am sure the people of Soviet Russia and of her lifeless and downtrodden satellite nations understand this proposition far better than we.

I am confident that, as ACES, your understanding of the proper role of government in our society depends primarily upon the need to maintain a structure of society wherein people can and must do things for themselves. This is freedom in the simplest possible terms. In a nutshell, it is therefore the function of government to do those things which people cannot and would not otherwise take care of on their own.

This need not be an altogether narrow and unyielding concept of a free society. It is a concept which can and must grow and change with the times. As men of vision, it is absolutely imperative that your philosophies of government borrow from the past, conform to the present, and grapple with the future.

The Federal Government does not and cannot stand alone. The relationship between the Federal Government and the governments of our 50 States is a broad and vital subject, which has been all too frequently neglected. Last year I introduced a bill in the Senate calling for the establishment of a congressional committee on Federal-State economic relations charged with the responsibility of studying this entire subject and then within a limited time reporting back to Congress with specific proposals for action to modernize and improve the links between Washington and our 50 State capitals. This bill was not approved. In its place, Congress enacted a bill setting up a commission in the executive branch to make a long-run study of this general field.

To me this isn't the solution. The best way to solve a problem is not merely to establish a commission to study it.

There are many important considerations which arise here. Our State governments have not been firm enough in asserting

their jurisdictional rights. For a subsidy—they have all too often sold themselves down the Potomac. On the other hand, the Federal Government, having preempted the best sources of tax revenue, has left the States little choice.

In giving attention, as we are today, to the role of the Federal Government in our society, we must not ignore the role of State governments and their place in the Federal system.

To sum up, in evaluating an existing or proposed governmental program, one must decide whether or not it satisfied his own personal views as to the meaning of our democracy and as to the most desirable size and scope of the activities of government in a free society.

In a democracy, every citizen can and must think about and participate actively in this process of governing if his Nation is to persevere. The vitality and lifeblood of the United States rests on a spirit of active participation in Government on the part of people like yourselves who are sincerely and conscientiously devoted to and concerned about good government.

Political participation is far more than a fine phrase. I have given you some of my own personal thoughts on this subject. Encouraging Americans to be active citizens and to get out and vote is not enough. It is necessary that we also devote attention both to the ways in which citizens should participate in government and to an enlightened and realistic understanding of the major political and governmental issues of our day.

I commend you, as ACES, for your willingness to think about and talk about the most constructive and positive approach for Americans to take to the big and terribly important business of government.

American Mining Congress Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the honor of accompanying the Secretary of Interior on a visit to a coal mine. At the instance of our mutual friend, Stephen F. Dunn, president of the National Coal Association, the Secretary's party toured the Thomas Portal area of Mathies Mine, which is operated by the Pittsburgh Coal Division of Consolidation Coal Co. Other members of the group included Michael J. Widman, assistant to the president, United Mine Workers of America; Marling J. Ankeny, Director of the Bureau of Mines; Royce A. Hardy, Assistant Secretary of the Interior; Consolidation Coal executives George A. Shoemaker, Walter F. Schulten, S. M. Cassidy, and D. L. McElroy; and G. Don Sullivan and Mr. Dunn, of National Coal.

I commend Secretary Seaton for his interest in an industry that is vital to America in peace and war. On our return trip to Washington after the tour of Mathies Mine, he expressed his enthusiasm for the joint efforts of management and labor that have made this Nation's mines by far the most proficient in the world. Mr. Seaton also told me that he is eagerly awaiting Senate passage of the coal research bill so that his office will be able to undertake carrying out the purposes of the legislation as soon as it becomes law.

Mr. Speaker, the visit to the mine took place on the afternoon of May 9, which marked the opening session of the American Mining Congress Coal Convention in Pittsburgh. The morning session was devoted to a national fuels policy, in which I participated at the generous request of Mr. Julian D. Conover, executive vice president of the American Mining Congress. Among the other panelists was the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Mr. ASPINALL.

Because of my colleague's objective analysis of the Nation's fuel situation, I ask unanimous consent to have his statement printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The coal industry is grateful that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has such an energetic and impartial chairman. Without his dedicated effort, coal research legislation would not have reached the floor of the House and carried through to success in the early weeks of this session. His conscientious analysis of the need for a fuels study will determine whether such an investigation will materialize.

Following the reprint of Chairman ASPINALL's address to the coal convention, I ask that the brief remarks of Mr. Stephen F. Dunn also be printed. When I discussed the possibility of the need for a continental fuels study, Mr. Dunn referred to points that would have a bearing on the decision. His remarks are brief, but they are poignant.

The address and remarks follow:

NATIONAL FUELS POLICY

(Statement of Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, before the Coal Convention of the American Mining Congress, Pittsburgh, Pa., May 9, 1960)

It is indeed a pleasure for me to participate in this panel of the American Mining Congress on national fuels policy.

The proposed study of fuels policy is concerned with conservation and development of the fuel resources of the country. It involves the energy requirements and supplies of future generations. It involves the continuing competition that we have between the producers of fuel and energy. I trust that in any policy that we develop we shall have a maximum degree of free competition.

This keen spirit of competition between the fuel industries intrigues me. It seems to be in the true spirit of free enterprise. It might be likened for a moment to the advertising race between cigarettes.

I wonder which is the thinking man's fuel?

Each of the fuels, of course, maintains that it is the one that satisfies.

Which fuel would I be justified to "walk a mile for?" Perhaps there is not much these days that anyone walks a mile for.

This question of a national fuels policy is closely related to my duties as chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It touches closely in my own congressional district, where all of the major energy sources—coal, oil, gas, waterpower, and atomic energy—are well represented.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, through its Mines and Mining Subcommittee, has had before it in this Congress some important mining legislation. The first coal research bill passed through Congress last September but was vetoed by the President. The second coal research bill has passed the House and is now awaiting action in the Senate. We are assured of at least $1 million to get this program started in its first year of operation.

During the past year a resolution was adopted by both Houses stating a national minerals policy, in very general terms. The President was asked to survey the functions of Government agencies and redirect them where feasible to come to the aid of depressed industries and communities. A report to Congress was requested. The report has been promised by the President's office, but has not been received.

The House has passed important legislation affecting mineral leasing on Federal lands. The legislation saves money by simplifying procedures and raises revenues by increasing the minimum rentals for oil and gas leases.

Of closer interest to the coal industry is a measure, passed in the first session of this Congress, raising the acreage of coal leases in Alaska to the same limit that applies in the other States.

I recently attended the first anniversary dinner of the National Coal Policy Conference, in Washington. The operators, owners, workers, railroads, utilities, and consuming industries making up the conference are to be congratulated on their unique organization. Like the American Mining Congress and the National Coal Association, it is doing a fine job keeping the public informed and advising those of us in Congress on legislation.

It is clear, I think, that the three great fuel industries—coal, oil, and gas—are fundamentally in agreement on one thing. That is that the ultimate consumer is really the king. The consumer should have free choice of the fuel that he wants to purchase.

No one could seriously disagree that each of the fuel and energy resources should make their proper contribution toward the public interest. The question is, In which direction is the public interest?

In our rapidly growing economy, the forces of government have become increasingly significant. It is not surprising, I am sure, when I remark that competition between fuels is marked by efforts to influence the course of government. I use the term "influence" in its general sense, with no criticism intended.

Let me give you an example.

In its report to its stockholders, a major oil company states its public relations policy. It says: "During 1959, as in previous years, we reported to the public our views on issues affecting the company's operations." The statement goes on: "We warned of the dangers of a national fuels policy, that, if adopted, would penalize consumers by reducing competition."

The writer of this statement interprets the movement for a study of national fuels policy as an effort to undermine the freedom of choice of the American public. I take it from the information that I have, however, that the Coal Policy Conference and other advocates are not wedded to any preconceived results of a fuels policy study. On the contrary, the resolution now before Congress calls for an objective study taking into consideration conservation measures and efficient uses, rather than a preconceived finding that consumer controls are needed.

My information is that the coal industry, and the industries linked with coal, are merely asking for a study which would look into the possibility of a set of rules whereby each fuel source may have a fair chance to compete with the others, with due regard to the wise use of resources. Insistence merely on the status quo—whatever it may be—sometimes does not lead to the best results.

At the dinner of the National Coal Policy Conference an address on the coal industry

was given by Dr. Joseph Fisher, president of the Resources for the Future Foundation. Dr. Fisher praised what he called the objective attitude of the coal industry toward pending legislation. He said, and I agree, that coal people realize that legislative requests should point to a gain for the people generally, not just a private gain for one firm or one industry.

I would hope that this interfuel rivalry will be exhibited to the public on an honest basis. Exaggerated statements building up one fuel or tearing down another should be avoided. Malicious or distorted statements have no place in honest advertising. They usually come back to haunt the one who thought he would gain the advantage.

On April 27 my colleague on this panel, Representative SAYLOR, addressed the House of Representatives on the recent increase in the quota for residual oil imports, placed in effect by the Department of the Interior. This is an incident that I shall leave for his discussion with you. I will say, however, that I have conferred with coal industry people on the matter, and I have suggested to them that an examination be made of the procedure used in setting the quotas. Frankly, I was surprised to find that the quotas are set without advance notice, without open hearing, and without appeal of any kind within administrative process.

A major inconsistency in the economic policy of our Government is evident. Reports received from Government departments consistently oppose financial relief to domestic mines and mining industries. The grounds cited are that financial aid is uneconomic since it would prolong or create submarginal industry. Yet tremendous sums have been spent to aid foreign minerals production, and these same departments strongly advocate a new system of financial aid to exporters to make their financing problems simpler.

It has been truthfully said that our country has deliberately exported its know-how to other lands, and has given away or loaned these countries the funds to establish great raw material exporting industries. We have lowered our tariffs to these countries. The number of U.S. industries that are being hurt or ruined is mounting yearly. The mining industry is not alone in its plight or in its plea for readjustment of the policy.

The revised version of the fuels policy resolution makes it clear that the objective of the study is to determine whether there is a need for an overall national fuels policy, and if so, whether there is a need for legislation to adopt or implement a policy. The joint congressional committee to be set up under the resolution would submit its report and recommendations within 2 years to Congress. Thereafter any proposed legislation would have to be considered by the Congress in the usual manner.

This seems to me to be a fair procedure. I do not think that it would be unfair to any particular industry or group.

These considerations have convinced me of the need for the study, and I think that the method of conducting it is feasible. Accordingly, I have joined with my colleague from Pennsylvania in introducing the revised resolution. The numbers of the Aspinall-Saylor bills are House Concurrent Resolution 661 and House Concurrent Resolution 662.

I am advised that the chairman of the House Rules Committee, Judge SMITH of Virginia, has promised an early hearing on the Aspinall-Saylor resolutions. This is favorable to the outlook for adoption of the resolution in the present session.

A source of some competition concerning the resolution is the existence of a measure to do a rather similar job as part of a larger venture. I refer here to the bill to authorize the "Resources and Conservation Act of 1960." This bill is pending before the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of both Houses. It provides for the creation of two new permanent agencies—a Joint Congressional Committee on Resources and Conservation, and a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers in the Office of the President. The resources and conservation bill covers a broader scope than fuel or energy resources. The advisory council contemplated in the resources and conservation bill is similar to the agency that was recommended in 1952 by the Materials Policy Commission as a means of correlating information and policy concerning materials resources.

The coal industry and the coal organizations have done a good job of presenting a case for a study of national fuels policy. Industry spokesmen are prepared to document their case further at the appropriate time. You have many friends who will come to your support in committee and on the House floor. You are assured of my continued interest and support in this and other matters affecting the welfare of mines, mine workers, their families, and dependent industries and communities of America.

STATEMENT BY STEPHEN F. DUNN, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL COAL ASSOCIATION

I congratulate the distinguished panel members on their most interesting statements. The National Coal Association fully supports the view that Congress should initiate a comprehensive study of the fuel requirements of the United States. We are working closely with Joe Moody and his policy conference on this and other matters which we feel are essential to the national economy and security, and which, at the same time, would tend to correct inequities harmful to the coal industry.

It is no secret that chief opposition to the proposed fuels study has come from those fearing prohibition or restriction of dump gas sales. Numerous official pronouncements have been made against the practice of dumping gas into industrial markets at prices far below those charged residential customers. I should like to quote from just one of these documents. I think it is important to recall this statement from the report—issued in February 1955—of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy. It is excerpted from the recommendation on sales below cost by interstate pipeline companies:

"Sales either for resale or direct consumption below actual cost plus a fair proportion of fixed charges which drive out competing fuels constitute unfair competition and are inimical to a sound fuels economy.

"The committee recommends, therefore, that appropriate action be taken that will prohibit sales by interstate pipelines either for resale or for direct consumption, which drive out competing fuels because the charges are below actual cost plus a fair proportion of fixed charges."

Gentlemen, we believe that the proposed study would further emphasize the need for stopping this practice which is patently unfair which illicitly usurps coal markets.

I might add that I was extremely interested in Congressman SAYLOR'S remarks about a continental fuels policy. In attempting to acquaint myself with the history of the Canadian gas cases, I observed that some 5 or 6 years ago—I believe that it was in 1954—the Federal Power Commission issued an opinion to the effect that Canadian natural gas should not be permitted to enter this country unless the American people were assured of supplies through an intergovernmental agreement. This observation seems to illustrate the possible need for a continental fuels policy so far as natural gas is concerned.

Current developments in the oil industry also seem to point up the need for such a policy. A member of the national coal staff spoke in Minneapolis this week. He sent me a copy of a current Minneapolis Tribune containing an article on plans for a series of pipelines to carry crude oil from Saskatchewan to the Midwest. The plans are most ambitious and would unquestionably have a heavy impact on U.S. energy supplies and resources. I shall send the article to Congressman SAYLOR for whatever use he might be able to make of it. Everything considered, a continental fuels policy may be necessary.

In closing, let me congratulate Julian Conover for arranging this important discussion as a part of an outstanding coal convention.

Congressman Chester Bowles of Connecticut Interviewed on "Meet the Press," May 8, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD the transcript of a television program on which our distinguished colleague, the Honorable CHESTER BOWLES, of Connecticut, was interviewed.

Congressman BOWLES appeared on the National Broadcasting Co. program, "Meet the Press," on May 8, 1960, and was questioned by Peter Lisagor of the Chicago Daily News, Chalmers Roberts of the Washington Post, John Steele of Time-Life, Inc., and Frank Bourgholtzer of NBC News. Moderator was Ned Brooks.

The transcript follows:

TRANSCRIPT FROM "MEET THE PRESS"

ANNOUNCER. Now "Meet the Press," produced by Lawrence E. Spivak. Ready for this spontaneous, unrehearsed conference are four of America's top news reporters. Their questions do not necessarily reflect their point of view; it is their way of getting a story for you.

Mr. BROOKS. Welcome once again to "Meet the Press." Our guest today is Congressman CHESTER BOWLES, of Connecticut. He recently was chosen as the chairman of the committee which will write the platform for the 1960 campaign. Work on the platform already has begun with a series of regional meetings. Republican leaders this past week opened an attack on the makeup of Congressman BOWLES' committee. They said it is dominated by radicals of previous campaigns. Congressman BOWLES has been mentioned as a possible dark horse candidate for President, but he has declared his support for Senator JOHN KENNEDY. He is serving as an adviser to Senator KENNEDY on matters of foreign policy.

Congressman BOWLES was the wartime Administrator of Government price controls. He later was elected Governor of Connecticut, and he served as our Ambassador to India. He was elected to Congress in 1958. His books and articles on both foreign and domestic affairs have been widely quoted.

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. Mr. BOWLES, if you were foreign policy adviser to a President, rather than to a candidate, in this situation

where an American pilot has been shot down by the Russians and has admitted being a spy, would you advise just admitting that he was a spy as has been done?

Representative BOWLES. You have asked a very tough one. It seems to me that the administration did about all they could with a very, very difficult, very unpleasant and highly embarrassing situation. It is pretty clear that Mr. Khrushchev knew what was going on. He appears to have the evidence with which he could confront the world and presumably persuade the world. I think it would have only made a bad situation—and I think it is a very bad situation—worse if we had tried to cover it up.

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. On the same question there are a lot of aspects, but I am wondering particularly what your viewpoint would be, thinking of the upcoming administration, on the point of the President being unaware of such an activity, as apparently is the case in this incident. Do you think the President should be kept purposely unaware of certain Intelligence operations?

Representative BOWLES. Let's start with the fact that I believe this will go down in history as probably the most embarrassing and in some ways shocking, occurrence in the last 7 or 8 years. It is terribly embarrassing, difficult; it has put us in a very bad situation before the world. We are going to hear a lot more of it.

I wish I were talking about it 2 or 3 days from now when perhaps we will have a better chance to settle down and think it through, and certainly anything I say I want to be sure is very responsible and thoughtful, because no one has any desire to make this worse, certainly not for partisan reasons. But it seems to me the whole situation has placed the State Department in the position of having deliberately told a falsehood. We assumed they did not know the actual facts, that these facts were simply given them. As you go on to say, the President himself is placed in the position of not appearing to know a very major development in regard to our foreign policy. The Soviet Union was encouraged to be suspicious of us. They are already very suspicious on this whole matter of controls inspection. They have always charged that the reason we want this inspection is for spying work and espionage generally. They also have been granted a beautiful opportunity to use this, and they will use it certainly very adroitly to embarrass us and to weaken our already weak position as we approach the summit. And the whole world has been given a very deep contrast between our apparent desire for peace, our desire to try to negotiate a peace, while carrying on this kind of activity almost simultaneously. I think it is a very bad situation.

Mr. STEELE. I want to get one thing straight. Are you criticizing the activities of the plane, or are you criticizing the pilot getting caught?

Representative BOWLES. Let me say this: that I don't think any one of us, as simply an outsider and a newspaper reader, as I am, can know what is essential here in the way of espionage. We all are realists. We all know that this is a difficult and complex world. We know we are at a disadvantage, that the Soviet is a closed police state and has certain very great advantages over us. However, it seems to me that that is not really the point here. The point is the timing. This may be necessary under certain circumstances, depending, of course, on the technical problems, of how great our lack of knowledge really is. But the point is, we are preparing for a summit meeting. The whole history of the world may depend upon our ability to negotiate with the Soviet Union, to talk with them on a basis of mutual trust, or at least some greater degree of mutual trust. By timing this particular excursion at this particular time, we have certainly gone a long way to undermine that hope.

Mr. STEELE. Let's see if I understand. You mean these activities are all right except when we have an international meeting, is that correct?

Representative BOWLES. I don't know that they are all right at all, because I don't know the inside story of how much information we have or what we lack or what risks should be required to get it. I would assume that we should not do this sort of thing for a marginal gain. Only if the gain was so very, very vital to our security that it could be justified on the basis of our national security to the utmost degree. But the point is that here we are in a very delicate position, and certainly this would be a time to be far more circumspect than obviously these people have been. I think they have committed a very gross case of misjudgment, and I think it is highly reckless, and I think it is dangerous and hurtful.

Mr. STEELE. You are the foreign policy adviser to Senator KENNEDY and presumably will become Secretary of State if he is elected President.

Representative BOWLES. I wouldn't presume that for one minute.

Mr. STEELE. You would not presume it?

Representative BOWLES. No. There will be lots of possibilities.

Mr. STEELE. There has been talk of keeping the candidates informed about developments in foreign policy. Have you been kept informed as to these flights, either as Senator KENNEDY's foreign policy adviser or as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee?

Representative BOWLES. No, I have not heard of them, I have not been kept advised in any way, and I doubt that he has. I am very sure that none of us have.

Mr. ROBERTS. I would like to turn to politics for a minute. Everybody says you are a darkhorse in the Democratic outlook. It seems apparent or possible that the convention may be deadlocked in Los Angeles for some time. If that happened, and if there was a turn to you as a possible compromise candidate, would you accept?

Representative BOWLES. I think this talk of my being a darkhorse is rather farfetched. I am grateful for the friends I have had around the country who have advanced it, and I have been flattered by it, and naturally it is pleasant to know that what I have been trying to say over a long period of years has at least taken hold with some people. However, I have never taken it seriously. I have done all I can to discourage it. I am for JACK KENNEDY, first, last, and always. I am sticking right thoroughly with him, and I think he is going to get nominated.

Mr. ROBERTS. As you would say, if I was a witness on the Hill, that is not a responsive answer. Can't you tell me yes or no, if drafted would you accept?

Representative BOWLES. It is such an impossible situation I can't even visualize it. I was brought up under F. D. R. He said never answer questions that have that much "if" in them. They are too far and too remote.

Mr. ROBERTS. Let me turn it around the other way: Will you make a Sherman statement that you wouldn't accept it if it were offered?

Representative BOWLES. I think I would look very silly and presumptuous if I did.

Mr. LISAGOR. I would like to ask you in connection with an earlier question, do you think the Democrats ought to be kept informed on basic foreign policy developments, specifically on the nuclear test suspension talks? Won't the Senate have to ratify any treaty we might agree to, and do you think the Senate members, the Democratic members, the important ones, are being taken into those councils sufficiently——

Representative BOWLES. No, I don't. I think it is very bad. Let's go back to 1918: In October 1918 Woodrow Wilson made a very partisan appeal for the election of a Democratic Congress. He got instead a Republican Congress elected in the bielection, the off-year election, of 1918. He then left 3 weeks later for the peace conference in Paris taking with him only one Republican who was so far down the line in Republican circles that people didn't even know he was a Republican. While I am a tremendous admirer of Mr. Wilson, and I feel he is one of the really great Americans of all times, I think that was an abysmal political mistake. It led the way to a good deal of the misunderstanding and challenge and difficulty and final frustration in the U.S. Senate when we failed to get the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations through. I might say that I think this administration is making the self-same error.

Mr. LISAGOR. Would you say that they ought then to take Democratic Senators to the summit conference?

Representative BOWLES. I certainly think they should. I think they ought to be kept more carefully informed. We have not had honest bipartisanship in these last 7 or 8 years. I think it is dangerous not to have it. I think the Democrats under the circumstances have behaved with a good deal of responsibility, in the absence of real bipartisanship.

Mr. LISAGOR. On another point, in Milwaukee last night I believe you made a speech blaming a good deal of Mr. Khrushchev's bitter blasts at the United States recently on what you called China and the extreme rightists within the Soviet Union, suggesting, according to the accounts I read, that these people want to torpedo a summit conference. How do you square that kind of a statement with the general belief here in Washington that Mr. Khrushchev needs peace and needs certain relaxation in order to get his 7-year plan to work?

Representative BOWLES. My statement as it was quoted—I haven't seen the paper—that wouldn't be quite accurate if that is the way it appeared.

What I asked was the question, How much influence have the Chinese had in this situation; how much influence does exist among the old Stalinist regime within the Soviet Union? I asked that as a question, and I think it is a very proper question, too. The Chinese have always timed a lot of their intransigence in the Far East, Quemoy and Matsu and the rest, for just the periods when we were trying to negotiate and talk with the Soviet. It is my guess that Mr. Khrushchev would really like to try to develop an easier atmosphere, here. I felt this strongly when I saw him and talked with him a little over 3 years ago in Moscow. I had a long 3-hour talk with him, and I came out of it quite convinced that he wanted a détente; he wanted to see the situation ease; he felt the need of it for his own country, but he was highly suspicious and feeling his way. It would seem to me clearly that this is not in the interests, necessarily of the Mao Tse-tung government in Peking. They naturally want to keep the cold war between the Soviet Union and the United States, just as active and vigorous as they possibly can, because this assures them of a flow of material and loans and all the things they need from the Soviet Union. I would assume that there is quite a clash here, at least a potential clash, between Chinese Communist interests and the Kremlin's interests.

Mr. LISAGOR. But do you not believe that Mr. Khrushchev is secure enough today in Russia so that he can move on toward relaxation if he so chooses at a summer conference?

Representative BOWLES. I don't think we really know. I hope so. I visited Belgrade this November. I wanted to go there to talk to some of the Yugoslavs who often follow

pretty much the Soviet line. For instance, in regard to Berlin, their line is almost identical with the Soviet. But they do have some insight on what is going on in the Soviet Union and also in China. I wanted to try to probe this question with them. There is the general feeling there that Mao Tse-tung's government in Peking had some contacts and some hope for support of an extreme position from certain elements in the Soviet military. I don't think they knew it for a fact, but they are inclined to feel that this was the case.

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. I'd like to ask a question, Mr. BOWLES, directed to your role as chairman of the platform committee. You have spoken in many of your speeches about the challenge of Soviet economic ability and their production and so on. In translating this into an American program, would you suggest that the Russians have developed the art of economic planning to a point that we should perhaps copy their planning methods?

Representative BOWLES. I don't think that is necessary. I am concerned about our slow lack of growth. Indeed, if you were to ask me what I thought was the single most important question before the American people today it would be our capacity to grow at a much faster rate without inflation, with stable prices. I feel if we can develop our growth rate to around 5 percent or 4½ percent without rising prices—I think we can do all of these things: We can build up our defenses adequately; we can tackle questions of foreign aid; we can build the schools we need; we can get rid of our slums; we can build this country as the dynamic, positive force it should be in world affairs. And if we don't grow fast enough, we can't. I think the interesting thing is this: The Soviet Union is growing at a rate of about 7 percent annually. But so is capitalistic Germany. So is capitalistic Mexico. So is capitalistic Japan. Indeed, I think the average growth rate in western Europe is around 6 percent, all under capitalism. There is nothing wrong with our system. It is simply that the system is now in the hands of rather timid people who are thinking timidly, and I just don't think they have enough confidence in the dynamism of this economy.

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. You would say that it doesn't require a greater degree of Federal planning, then?

Representative BOWLES. I would think that the question of national goals is related to this, and I would certainly favor this. Mr. Hoover originally suggested it back in 1930. I have talked about it, and so have many other people since. I think it would be a very good thing to hold hearings every summer, let's say, before a committee or board of very highly respected Americans, representing all qualities and areas of our economy, and talk out and plan to see what our goals should be in housing, and schools, and roads, and urban renewal, and defense, and all these other facets of our economy. But I don't think the plans should have any particular bite to them in the sense that they are totalitarian or anything of that kind. I think we simply set the direction in which we like to go, and familiarize Congress and the American people fully with where we can go and where we need to go if we are going to do what we have to do in this next 10 years.

Mr. BROOKS. Congressman, you are going to have to cover a great many domestic subjects in the platform. I am wondering to what extent the South is going to be recognized in the drafting of the platform?

Representative BOWLES. The South is certainly going to have its big chance to be heard as is the East and the West and the North. All sections are. My own views on all these questions are pretty well established. I have written and spoken a lot on them, but I am simply one member of an 110-man-and-woman committee.

Mr. BROOKS. The next question that comes out of that: are you ready to risk a walk-out of some of the southern delegates if you write a civil rights plank which is not acceptable to them?

Representative BOWLES. Some people have gone so far as to become very annoyed with some of our Democratic brethren to the south and have said, "What if they do walk out; let's do whatever is required even to see that they do walk out." I simply can't accept this. I would like to see this Democratic Party remain a united party. We are the only national party, and I think this is a great advantage. It also carries with it certain problems; because it is a national party, our whole difficulty of getting a consensus is obviously much greater, but my guess is that we can work this out. There are lots of good, forward-looking groups of people in the South, who I know understand this world we are living in, who believe in the dignity of man and are willing to accept the word of that great Virginian, a former Governor of Virginia, Thomas Jefferson, who asserted in our Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal. I think we can handle this, and I think our Republican friends, I suppose, are hoping we can't, but I am very confident that we can.

Mr. STEELE. A couple of your Republican friends the other day, Senator GOLDWATER and Congressman MILLER, chairmen of the Senate and House campaign committees, said that your whole committee was masterminded by a few radicals with leftover ideas. Is this correct?

Representative BOWLES. I saw that, and I was very intrigued because he simply listed the people who have written the various council reports, the advisory committee of the Democratic Party. I know all these people very well, I think they are remarkably fine men, and many of them are my very good friends, and I admire them very greatly. So here you have definitely guilt by association on my part. But I would like to call your attention to the fact that on this very day, Mr. GOLDWATER also teed off against Mr. Eisenhower who, he said, was dabbling in socialized medicine, and he also accused Mr. Flemming of going in for a "dime store New Deal." So, I'm in highly respectable company.

Mr. STEELE. One of the gentlemen from your own State, Senator BUSH, on a somewhat different line, had a proposal that each platform plank carry a price tag, how much it was going to cost. You are Chairman of the Democratic Platform Committee. Do you think this is a good idea?

Representative BOWLES. I would be delighted to do that. I don't think it is very practical because I don't think we can always tell just what it will cost, but I think it is perfectly fine to know what it costs. I also think we ought to know what it will cost not to do some of these things. What are our slums costing us today? What is an inadequate military costing us? What is inadequate foreign aid costing us? What is inadequate education costing us? Let us know the cost of not doing things as well as the cost of doing them.

Mr. ROBERTS. I was reading a magazine article you have written about the China problem recently, and one thing struck me. The man you are supporting, Senator KENNEDY, has said publicly that if he were elected he would do something about ending the American commitment to Quemoy and Matsu, the offshore islands. But I notice you avoided that question, or did not mention it. Do you disagree with him on this?

Representative BOWLES. No. I think we are very wrong to stake the future of our American prestige and strength on two islands just off the coast of China. I also feel it would be a great mistake to get off those islands under fire and under pressure. I think that is the difficulty. When there is no pressure, I agree that we should try to negotiate our way off them, neutralize them, find some way to neutralize this thumb that we have that is sort of sticking in the Communist's eye.

Mr. ROBERTS. Do you expect in the platform this year that for the first time the Democrats will come out in favor of a two-China policy?

Representative BOWLES. I don't know, because, of course, I can't speak for this committee, but I do feel very strongly that the recognition question is pretty much a dead-end street. If we could visualize our Government calling up Mr. Mao Tse-tung and saying, "Look, we have decided to recognize your people," I think he'd get a very fast answer back which would be "Do you recognize our sovereignty over the island of Taiwan or Formosa?" And we would say, "Of course not, we will defend Formosa," as, of course, we must. I think Mr. Mao Tse-tung would then hang up the telephone and that would end the conversation. I think our China policy really ought to start with that point. What we need is a China policy that goes beyond this narrow debate, this rather sterile debate on recognition and goes to the question of how we can make some contacts with the Chinese people. I think we have something to learn from the question of the Soviet Union. From 1918 to 1933 we did not recognize the Soviet Union. We had all kinds of contacts with the Russian people, however. We sent our newspapermen there; many of them went there; many Russians came here, tradesmen, and engineers, and doctors, and people from universities, and we had contacts with China.

I happen to think that China is probably the biggest question, the biggest challenge that we are going to meet in these next 20 years. I think China is inherently aggressive in many of the situations that exist there. It has too little land, too many people, too few resources, and worse still, politically and economically and militarily soft neighbors, which almost invite aggression. We are not coping with this problem. I don't think we have a plan for what we would do if the Chinese started to move into southeast Asia. I think we should have a plan, a comprehensive one, a military plan, a political plan, an economic plan. I think that there is some hope here—it may be a very farfetched hope—that we may have some situations here where our interests cross with the Russians. It is conceivable that they are as frightened of this possible development as many of us are.

Mr. LISAGOR. You have written that there is a national consensus in this country on foreign policy. Do you still believe that?

Representative BOWLES. I believe it very deeply, and I have been all over the United States in the last many months, traveling from one end to another, talking to all kinds of people, and I feel an extraordinary feeling of oneness to a degree with all kinds of audiences.

Mr. LISAGOR. Doesn't that bring us down to the fact that you are really going to vote on personalities then in this election insofar as foreign policy is concerned? It isn't a question of which man you choose is better qualified to lead you?

Representative BOWLES. I hate to disagree when we are so close to the end of this program, but I will have to disagree with that. I do feel the approaches, what the two parties say they are for, are quite similar. They are both for peace; they are for negotiation; they are against colonialism; they are for foreign aid, and so on. When you begin to examine the way these two parties go after these objectives, you find a tremendous difference. First of all, the Republicans, I

think, accept this world of chance with great unhappiness. They would like to see everything frozen—if everything would only stand still, if only Africa would stand still and Asia and Europe and Latin America.

I think we Democrats recognize that we are in a revolutionary world of great change, enormous potential. That this revolution is not something we should be frightened of; it is something we should welcome, something we should try to influence and positively, creatively push in the direction of greater human dignity.

I think there is a tremendous difference here. Emerson once summed it up in saying that wherever there is politics you will find people grouping around two ideas, one associated with memory and the other associated with hope. I think our party is the party of hope.

Mr. LISAGOR. Could I be a little more specific: How then do you disagree with Vice President NIXON basically on foreign policy?

Representatives BOWLES. I think we disagree on approach, largely. I think his approach would be more expedient. I think his military aid program would probably be much more expedient than ours. I think it would be less creative. I think there will be less emphasis on the initiative—not necessarily because Mr. NIXON himself feels that way, but after all, he is tied to Mr. HALLECK, and I might also say he is tied to Mr. GOLDWATER, who has been brought already into this particular broadcast. He has to settle with those people.

Mr. BROOKS. Gentlemen, I am sorry to have to interrupt. Thank you very much, Congressman BOWLES, for being with us.

A Thoughtful Proposal for Shorter Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and able colleague from Connecticut, the Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN, has advanced a proposal to shorten our national election campaigns. I think his suggestion makes excellent sense. I commend to the careful attention of my colleagues his article from the May 8, 1960, issue of the New York Times magazine, entitled "Campaign for Short Campaigns."

The text of the article follows:

CAMPAIGN FOR SHORT CAMPAIGNS—A CONGRESSMAN CONTENDS THAT MANY ILLS OF OUR PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION SYSTEM COULD BE REMEDIED SIMPLY BY CUTTING THE TIME BETWEEN CONVENTIONS AND ELECTION DAY

(By JOHN S. MONAGAN)

WASHINGTON.—Any thoughtful American must admit that our presidential campaigns have got completely out of hand. When it comes to the method of choosing our principal administrative officer, we rank at the bottom of the list of democratic countries.

I find myself looking enviously at the efficient, brief, and effective manner in which England and Israel, for example, select their national governments. The contrast with our quadrennial Roman circus is no compliment to our political maturity.

Our campaigns are objectionable for many reasons.

They are overelaborate. Is there any real need for the pageantry and pomp? Do they really contribute to our understanding of the basic requirements of the country? Is it necessary that we have not only buttons and posters and newspaper advertising but also the live elephants and the prancing donkeys, the squads of winsome models and the helicopter rides? Is the apathy of the voting public so abject that it can be dissipated only by this sort of emotional shock treatment?

Our campaigns generate more heat than light. What begins as a sober discussion of national problems degenerates into an exchange of epithets and limping, laboratory-created catch phrases. Frenetic politicians shout about "slave-labor laws" and "red herrings" and "traitors to democratic principles," and "20 years of treason."

In the "give 'em hell" slambang campaign, candidates of stature often are pressed into positions that are not representative of their real thinking and that are not at all conducive to the enlightenment of the public, the objective of any campaign. One thinks, as an example, of the subsequent rueful apology of the late Wendell Willkie for his assurances during the 1940 campaign of American nonintervention in the European war. He justified his promises as campaign exuberance.

Campaigns are unduly expensive. No one can say how much is really spent for a presidential election, but estimates run as high as $33 million. Democrats and Republicans spent over $7 million for radio and television alone in 1956. The Democratic National Committee as of this date is still $250,000 in debt as a result of the 1956 contest, and no one who has read of the pathetic weekend hat passing to which the Truman emissaries were forced by opposition expenditures in the 1948 campaign can be happy about a custom which requires this unseemly scramble for funds.

Inevitably, too, as the devices become more elaborate and the demands more extreme, the fundraising becomes more dubious and the resort to questionable sources and means becomes more common. The temptations inherent in this helter-skelter collection and distribution of vast sums have led to legislation like the imperfectly enforced Hatch Act and to laws limiting contributions.

They have also resulted in various suggestions—that private campaign contributions be eliminated entirely, that reasonable election expenses be paid for by the Government, or even that radio and TV networks, as public monopolies, be required to allocate regular program time to presidential hopefuls. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, always fertile in ideas, has come up with the suggestion that we inaugurate what I have called a "political community chest" which would finance campaigns by donations from millions of small contributors.

Our campaigns emphasize the unimportant. They consume time and energy with silly ceremonies—with donning Indian headdress, milking cows and laying wreaths. They require candidates to perform endlessly before audience after audience of sworn supporters instead of allowing them to preach to the unconverted or to persuade the unconvinced.

They also interrupt our dealing with the problems of the country and of the world. Once the election machinery starts grinding, the chancelleries of other nations lock up their files on American affairs and declare an unwilling recess in the discussion of vitally important international issues.

The most regrettable aspect of our campaigns is their physical effect upon the candidates themselves. Most of us can recall Wendell Willkie stumbling through the final days of the 1940 contest, his eyes heavy with fatigue and his voice reduced to a hoarse croak. And I well remember seeing Adlai Stevenson, in New Haven in 1956, so tired that he could not have said whether he was in Connecticut or Illinois, losing his train of thought during his speech through sheer fatigue, and then, after the meeting, being stood up against a wall by party wheelhorses to pump the hands of the faithful.

In spite of improved communications, the trend today is toward more traveling and more speaking, instead of less. In 1932, Franklin Roosevelt traveled about 15,000 miles and made about 100 speeches. In 1956, Adlai Stevenson traveled 75,000 miles and made 300 speeches.

It is obvious, therefore, that there are many ways in whch our campaigns can be made more effective and I suggest that it would be a distinct public service to provide some measure of improvement.

I believe that the principal place to attack the abuses which I have described is on the point that can most easily be adjusted—the length of our campaigns. If the campaigns could be shortened, I am confident that many of the other objectionable features would be reduced and possibly eliminated.

Under our present system, the Democratic convention will open at Los Angeles on July 11 with the nomination coming on or about July 14, while the Republican convention will open at Chicago on July 25 with the nomination coming on or about July 29.

Since election day will be November 8, there will be nearly 4 full months between nomination and balloting for the Democrats and almost 3½ for the Republicans. And, candidates being competitive, and campaign managers being insistent, this means that the candidates will begin peddling their wares as soon as they decently can after the close of the convention.

Surely, these contests are now too long; undoubtedly their prolongation beyond a certain stage yields no dividends for the country or for the candidates themselves. What that stage is no one can say exactly, but that it exists is certain.

My own boiling point may be abnormally low, but I feel that all the amenities and necessities of an election debate could easily be satisfied in 2 months. The British, whose campaigns used to run on for several months now hold them to approximately 20 days from the time of the issuance of the original writ to the day of election. (Churchill posted a 17-day period in the crucial postwar election of 1945). No one has ever suggested that English candidates suffer as a result.

Certainly I would not want to choke off any presidential aspirant so long as his labor served a good purpose, but when he begins to talk more and more to himself, and his audience resolutely switches to "What's My Line?" or "Gun Smoke" through sheer boredom, I submit that the time has come to ring the bell.

(It should be noted that the deadening effect of too much campaigning upon the candidate and upon the public results in part from the time involved in primaries, which must be added to the presidential campaign itself. But primaries are regulated by State law and their limitation on a national basis would run into technical and practical difficulties that would not be involved in the regulation of national elections.)

As a start toward solving critical campaign problems, therefore, I have introduced two bills in Congress to limit our presidential campaigns to 60 days from nomination to election.

House bill 9584 provides that no person nominated over 60 days before the election date shall run for the office of President. House Joint Resolution 547, which is calculated to eliminate constitutional objections, proposes an amendment to the Constitution that would place in the qualifications for the Presidency a requirement that the presi-

dential candidate be named within 60 days of election day. These bills would have no effect on the 1960 campaign.

There is, of course, no magic in the 60-day period. It simply seems to be a reasonable outside limit. (Laos nominates 45 days before the actual balloting date; the Israelis average 60 days for their canvass.) A shorter period than 60 days would be perfectly acceptable to me and I believe that 6 or 7 weeks would be entirely adequate.

In considering the advisability of shorter campaigns, it is illuminating to hear what the experts have to say. Surely no more reliable testimony could be elicited than that from men who have been through the campaign mill themselves.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, who in 1958 battled his way through a combined primary and election campaign in Connecticut, wholeheartedly agrees that presidential campaigns should be shortened.

"Campaigns are much too long," he says, "and also much too costly. The British have real controls and enforce them and I think we've got to come to it here, too. It's the only way it can be fairly done because nowadays the amount of money spent is just shocking and unnecessary."

Senator DODD adds his opinion that the campaign should really not be of more than 4 weeks' duration.

Representative CHESTER BOWLES, who was DODD'S main opponent in the Connecticut senatorial primary contest, not only would limit Presidential campaigns to 60 days but would extend the limitation to all contests involving candidates for Congress and State office.

"This is not a question merely of ever-growing financial costs, many of which are far greater than our political parties, the candidates or their supporters can be expected to meet," BOWLES says. "It is also a serious question of the wear and tear on the candidates themselves, the nervous exhaustion, the endless speechmaking and the sleepless nights of travel and talk."

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, when he paused temporarily in the midst of the recent Wisconsin primary, expressed the fervent hope that the limitation might be extended to primary campaigns as well as regular elections.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, who slogged his lonely way through mile after mile of primary contests and then went through a presidential campaign as candidate for second place on the ticket in 1956, believes that some restriction is advisable.

"I certainly can understand," he says, "how a long campaign can be a drain on the physical and emotional resources of candidates. No one knows this better than I and I would be in favor of doing anything possible, within constitutional limits, to shorten the campaign period."

Jim Farley, not unacquainted with presidential campaigns, agrees with the objectives of shortening them, as does Paul Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, chairman of the Republican National Committee, also approves the purpose of the bills.

All three, however, have some reservations—natural enough in those concerned with the mechanics of campaigns and bound by tradition.

Farley feels that "the idea is all right," but that there might be a time problem in getting the national campaign machinery under way in a shorter period. Butler says that "long campaigns impose an unconscionable physical drain on the candidates," but he is chary of any limitation "that might prevent the American public from fully knowing the candidates or understanding the issues."

MORTON says, "I certainly agree that a long campaign is tough on the physical and emotional resources of the candidates and party managers." He would move warily, however, on any limitation of the time which might be available to establish customary campaign apparatus. He has some feeling that the size of our country makes our problem different from that of the British. He also believes that the primary is a greater drain on candidates than final election, but he asserts that these qualifications in no way lessen his sympathy for the "end objective" of limitation.

I concur with everything that these professionals say, but I submit that the 2-month period, properly used, provides adequate time to accomplish the purposes they set forth.

Of course, there have been objections to my proposal. It is pointed out that the presidential nominee is the head of a ticket on which many others, including Senators and Representatives are running, and that their demands for a personal appearance by him to help them necessarily make for a long and grueling campaign. It is my opinion that the value of such appearances is overrated and that they can be largely eliminated with profit to the candidates and without injury to the ticket. Even now, off-year and special elections do not enjoy the presence of presidential candidates and they have adequately served their traditional purpose.

Some also feel that my proposal flies in the face of the American tradition of giving free rein to political discussion. Others believe that any such limitation would prove beneficial to the party that was better financed. Still others point to specific campaigns—such as the Truman 1948 election—and argue that they would have resulted otherwise but for the length of the canvass.

I find none of these arguments convincing. Proper organization can adjust itself to a different time schedule. To the Trumanites I would say that a 12-month campaign would probably have several shifts of voter sentiment depending on economic or political developments, but that is no reason to make our campaigns longer than they are.

Apathy and an unwarranted regard for tradition will suggest reasons against change. But the full realization of our democratic potentialities requires that we suppress our native exuberance, cut out the unnecessary horseplay, and get back to the real purpose of campaigns—the discussion of the issues affecting our national destiny and the selection of the candidate offering the greater evidence that he will meet those issues with courage and vision.

International Cooperation—A Forward Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1960

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of listening to a thoughtfully provocative address by our colleague, Representative CHESTER BOWLES, discussing the future challenge and direction of our foreign assistance programs, both bilateral and multilateral.

The address was delivered on April 27 to the evening session of the seventh National Conference on International Economic and Social Development at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in Washington, D.C.

It is axiomatic that if we forget where we are headed, we may never arrive. Representative BOWLES, our former highly successful Ambassador to India and Nepal, here reminds us that "the purpose of economic assistance is to enable free peoples to remain free."

The speech follows:

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION—A FORWARD LOOK

As we gather here in the interests of international economic and social development, another new nation is born. Yesterday, on the West Coast of Africa, the people of French Togo achieved their independence.

Never has the pace of history seemed quicker or more vivid.

Since the end of World War II, more than a score of new nations with a total population of 900 million, have come into being. By the end of this year we shall be dealing with 9 or 10 new fully independent states in sub-Saharan Africa alone. Ten years from now there may be twice that number.

This Revolution of Rising Expectations, so dramatic and potentially so promising, is what brings us together in this conference.

Amid all the stress and confusion of our current political campaign at least one reassuring fact shines through: Our next President—whether he be a Democrat or a Republican—will almost certainly recognize the vital importance of this revolution and propose a more affirmative course of action to cope with it.

Messrs. Kennedy, Humphrey, Symington, Johnson, Stevenson, Nixon, and Rockefeller have each made it clear that our relations with the underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America will be at the top of his agenda next January.

Each has shown a keen awareness of the requirements and the possibilities. Some indeed have been in the forefront of new and constructive thinking about the policies and techniques which are most likely to enable us to play an effective role.

Yet despite this shared consensus among our leading presidential possibilities in both parties, the disturbing truth is that our oversea aid programs are receiving less and less support each year on Capitol Hill.

This year mutual security legislation has been under particularly vigorous attack.

What is the explanation? Why is such a vitally significant program increasingly treated as a legislative outcast, even by some of its erstwhile supporters?

The fault, I believe, does not lie with Congress. Instead, it lies with administration leaders who have failed to explain adequately the real purposes of economic assistance, who have failed to instill in Congress and the people any sense of the real motivation for foreign aid.

Our official explanations for foreign aid have been negative and narrow. They have failed to do justice to our real goals in world affairs.

We have said that the purpose of foreign aid is solely to block communism. This argument has helped to make local Communist minorities abroad worth their weight in American dollars.

We have discreetly claimed that foreign aid will win military allies or support for us in the United Nations. This is a futile argument because it is no more possible to buy the long-term loyalty of a nation than it is to buy the enduring loyalty of a friend.

We have cynically asserted that foreign aid will turn Asians, Africans, and Latin Americans into loyal supporters of the status quo simply by filling their empty stomachs.

This is an equally mistaken argument because a landless laborer or a tenant farmer who lacks a sense of belonging and of justice will not be satisfied with marginal economic gains.

Until we shake loose from such sterile negativism in our official explanations, our economic assistance programs will continue to be in trouble with the Congress and the people.

The time is past due to give the American people the real reason and to repeat that reason again and again until it is rooted deep in the American consciousness:

The purpose of economic assistance is to enable free peoples to remain free, to create within the framework of their own cultures and beliefs independent societies which provide an increasing measure of literacy, good health, economic progress, individual dignity and justice. Our purpose, therefore, is to help assure the non-Communist peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America freedom of choice, in the knowledge that free peoples—whatever their disagreements with us—will never choose communism.

Before we examine some of the practical problems with which our new President must cope in getting this crucially important effort back on the track, let us look quickly at what has gone before.

For well over a decade now our Nation has been involved in the problems of international economic development. In 1945 we vigorously supported the first steps to bind up the wartime wounds of Europe and Asia through UNRRA. In 1947 we made the momentous decision to prop up the embattled societies of Greece and Turkey.

In 1948 through the Marshall plan we plunged into the creative and massive programs to reconstruct the war-ravaged economies of Western Europe.

And in 1949 with point 4 came our imaginative decision to come to grips with the challenge of economic and technical assistance in the whole underdeveloped world.

Unhappily we were diverted in 1950 from the high-minded but realistic objectives of the Marshall plan and point 4 by the ruthless invasion of South Korea by Communist forces and by the sudden utter necessity for countermilitary action by us and our United Nations associates.

The Korean war which followed was a tragedy in more ways than one. Outside of the huge loss of life its most destructive effect was to narrow our view of world affairs.

Precisely at the time when new nations in Asia and Africa were dramatically emerging on the international stage, we began to regard the world largely as the arena for a vast and unending military struggle between the Soviet and American power blocs.

This diverted us from our budding concern with international economic and social development to an overriding obsession with military aid anywhere, and under any conditions.

Many American leaders began to test the bona fides of each new nation by its willingness to support our policies willy nilly. The doubtful or reluctant ones were written off as neutralists, as cowards, fellow travelers, or worse.

Today, 10 years after the outbreak of the Korean war we have come a long way from such narrow thinking. Our old polarized view of world affairs is increasingly accepted as out of date.

We now face the clear fact that a billion and a quarter people are alined with neither Moscow nor Washington, and we have a new understanding of why this is so.

Experience has given us a deeper understanding not only of the vital need for economic assistance but also of its limitations. We also have a clearer view of the shifting nature of the Soviet challenge under new Soviet leadership.

It is fair to say that we have arrived at a watershed in the history of the postwar era. In a very special sense it is also a watershed in the brief history of what we call foreign aid.

Behind us lie years of experimentation, of successes and disappointments. Before us lie years of unparalleled opportunity and danger.

It is a time generally for sober review and fresh thinking. And nowhere are these qualities more urgently needed than in the field of international economic and social development.

From the 1950's we have inherited policies and programs which often overlap, which often compete with one another, which sometimes hinder orderly political growth, and which are largely inadequate to the realities of the new decade.

Let us consider, therefore, some of the criteria on which a fresh approach may be based, and let us do so with particular reference to the need and the opportunity for the greater internationalization of aid.

DECISIONS FOR THE SIXTIES

I believe that most of us here tonight will agree on the following general principles:

1. Orderly political growth in non-Communist Asia, Africa, and Latin America is essential if we are to live in a peaceful and relatively free world. Continuing economic and technical assistance to the new underdeveloped nations is essential to that growth.

2. The capital needs are great and they will grow rapidly as the new nations are able to expand their efforts. In addition to responsible private investment, major government grants and loans, in both hard and soft currencies, will be required.

3. To the maximum degree possible such assistance should be placed on a long-term foundation so that the recipient nations can plan the effective and economical use of all available resources.

4. There should be greater stress on regional development which necessarily goes beyond bilateral nation-to-nation relationships.

5. The excessive budgetary priorities we have given to fragile military allies and our often grudging approach to the so-called neutrals should be revised.

6. In the words of last year's amendments to the mutual security bill, highest priorities should be given to those countries "which show a responsiveness to the vital long-term economic, political, and social concerns of their people; demonstrate a clear willingness to take effective self-help measures; and effectively demonstrate that such assistance is consistent with and makes a contribution to workable long-term economic development objectives."

Having listed our areas of general agreement, let us move from generalities to the more specific courses of action which derive from our common outlook.

It is no longer sufficient to "be for foreign aid" and economic development. It is imperative that we spell out more precisely what we need to do and how best we can do it, for history is moving fast.

THE MANY INSTRUMENTS OF AID

Our economic assistance programs have assumed a wide variety of forms over the past decade. We are confronted today with a proliferation of agencies and organizations, each of which has grown up under its own set of circumstances.

To some extent, this variety is a sign of health. It means that more and more people and governments are caring about the explosive gap between the very rich and the very poor of our world. It also means that people and governments are experimenting with different approaches to the problems of economic development.

Out of such variety—and the competition it implies—can come better techniques and institutions.

But too great multiplicity of approaches can also lead to inadequate planning, piecemeal development, and dangerously uneven distribution of resources.

Of particular importance in the 1960's will be our ability to coordinate and give proper degrees of emphasis to bilateral aid and multilateral aid—to the aid given directly from one country to another, and the aid channeled through an international body.

Let us briefly consider some of the agencies now operating within each of these two categories.

Today U.S. assistance to underdeveloped nations is given bilaterally through the International Cooperation Administration, the Development Loan Fund, the Export-Import Bank, and the Department of Agriculture.

U.S. assistance is also channeled through such multilateral agencies as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the U.N. technical assistance program, and the U.N. Special Fund, the World Health Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization, UNICEF, the International Finance Corporation, and the newly formed International Development Association.

Most of these institutions and programs were established to meet specific needs. Each is performing an important function. And yet inevitably the beginnings of tension between the two forms of approach have emerged.

To a degree the administrators of nation-to-nation development and those who work through international agencies have come to view each other as competitors rather than collaborators.

Now there are many substantial reasons for the continuation of our nation-to-nation bilateral assistance. The Development Loan Fund, which deals largely in soft currencies, the Export-Import Bank, which finances American exports into underdeveloped countries, have a continuing major role to play. Other bilateral programs, like those in Korea, Formosa, Turkey, and Vietnam, have special relevance for military, political, and strategic reasons.

Having taken these factors into account, let us examine the advantages of an increasingly multilateral international approach.

Multilateral aid gives all the nations, givers and receivers alike, a vitally important sense of partnership. The psychological advantages are substantial.

Such aid often results in more for our money, both from contributors, and recipients. In next year's budget it is predicted that the United Nations Special Fund will achieve a ratio of nearly 1 to 3 in terms of matching by the recipient governments.

Multilateral aid usually assures that the underdeveloped nations receive funds only for programs rather than projects—and for programs to which their own governments attach importance.

Multilateral aid also means that technical assistance experts can be recruited over a wider area by international bodies at considerably lower salaries than are required to recruit American experts.

Finally, multilateral aid means that the United States need not bear alone the psychological reaction against the donor which frequently occurs in recipient countries when difficult, adverse decisions must be made or when the results of an aid program fail to meet expectations. Here as elsewhere the World Bank has operated with extraordinary competence.

Thus, the advantages of multilateralism are clear. But let us not overlook two formidable drawbacks to the multilateral approach.

In the first place, there has been considerable administrative confusion, overlapping authority, and bureaucratic conflict in the operations of many of the U.N. agencies.

Second, it is extremely difficult to persuade other prosperous nations to contribute their proper share to multination programs of economic aid. All too often, such programs must be largely underwritten by America.

In the absence of larger contributions from others, Congress will continue to take a dim view of bolder international concepts, which offer such promise.

Although these drawbacks are in no sense insurmountable, they must be taken into account by those of us who favor increased aid through international agencies.

I believe a fresh, imaginative review of the coordination or lack of it among the U.N. specialized agencies is long overdue. Such stocktaking would also encourage these agencies to think in bolder terms about their own functions and potentialities.

As for increased help for other nations to balance a greater effort by ourselves, this too is largely a matter of abler dramatization and persuasion, not only by high officials but by American leaders.

Another factor in a revitalized program of foreign economic assistance must be a much bolder and more imaginative approach to the problem of food distribution.

Ours is the first nation in history to solve its food problem. Yet we continue to view our extraordinary agricultural productivity, and so-called farm surplus that flow from it as a curse.

The irony of such views in a world of hungry people is abundantly clear. This year we are spending more money—$1 billion—just to store our surplus wheat than we will spend on our entire economic aid program for all of Asia and Africa.

The effective and imaginative use of our agricultural productivtiy to establish a system of "food banks" in areas now subject to frequent shortage will require careful international planning. Public Law 480 is a step in the right direction. I am convinced that a new administration, however, must seek techniques for putting our surpluses to work on a much broader scale. And we should learn how to make more imaginative use of the local currencies generated by this effort in education, public health, roadbuilding, and so on.

A new approach to the problems of economic development abroad should also take into account the need for more stable trade conditions. The economies of underdeveloped nations are largely based on the sale of raw materials to industrially advanced countries and downward speculative swings in the market can completely wreck the best-laid development plan by disrupting the flow of foreign exchange.

This situation is further complicated and embittered by the fact that these trade relations between developed and backward regions were largely formed under the institutions of colonialism. As a result, precarious single-crop economies which can be badly hurt by a relatively modest drop in the price of cocoa, tea, copper, tin, or rubber are sitting ducks for nationalist outbursts against the former imperialist powers.

A thoroughgoing effort is therefore needed to achieve greater stability in the international commodity markets. One means may be the establishment of minimum prices for basic raw materials which guarantee a reasonable return and some stability to the producers.

The establishment of maximum prices may be included in such agreements to discourage the kind of massive speculation which drove prices sky-high after the outbreak of the Korean war.

Finally, let us maintain a balanced view of the role of private capital investment in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In the early stages of a new nation's development, two major obstacles to substantial private investment, by American, Canadian, or West European interests are apparent.

First, the primary individual needs are for the building of an economic infrastructure—roads, railroads, bridges, docks and multipurpose river projects. These developments are seldom self-liquidating.

Second, in the early stages of economic growth, political instability is likely to be great. Foreign investors therefore are reluctant to move ahead unless their immediate profit expectations are extremely high, and new governments are often unable or reluctant to accept such profits for fear of giving more ammunition to local Communist attacks on the capitalist exploiters.

What we must do, therefore, is circumvent these obstacles and to create new techniques, perhaps through management contracts and other devices, to bring America's industrial know-how to bear on the critical problems of Asia, Africa, and Latin American on acceptable terms.

As political stability grows, the opportunities for private investment in these enormously promising continents will multiply.

One of the greatest virtues of this conference is its concern with specifics. The panel discussions of today and tomorrow are geared to problems of approach, finance, techniques, and administration in various countries and regions.

To give specific illustrations of the general proposals which I have outlined, I shall refer to the development of Africa.

THE EXAMPLE OF AFRICA

The African continent presents American policymakers today with a dramatic opportunity for creative, sensitive long-term planning and decisive action.

It is a relatively underpopulated continent of enormous undetermined natural wealth. The relation between land, resources, and people is generally favorable to the use of modern technology which permits higher wages and more rapidly rising living standards. It is still largely removed from the pressures of the cold war.

And aside from the major exceptions posed by Algeria and the Union of South Africa on its northern and southern rim, it offers virtually limitless long-range possibilities for the evolution of free peoples toward self-government and economic viability.

Yet we have been tragically slow to sense the importance of Africa.

In the spring of 1960, we still have no effective policy toward Africa. Indeed, it is fair to say that we have not even reacted to Africa as Africa. Rather, our response has been to Russia's new interest in Africa or to the African attitudes of our NATO allies whom most Africans view as keepers of the colonial past.

The establishment of Guinea, for instance found the United States without even a consular agent in its capital, and we required over a month even to recognize its new government. As might be expected, the Soviet Union promptly moved in to fill the political and economic vacuum. Today 80 percent of Guinea's foreign trade is with the Communist dominated nations.

A realistic political policy in regard to the emerging new nations of Africa must be grounded in a coherent policy toward economic and technical development. And that, I am convinced, calls for much more of an international approach than we have used elsewhere.

The achievement of independence is only a beginning. It is a means, not an end.

If a new nation is to make a go of independence, it must have access to able planners, administrators, and technicians.

It must also have access to grants and long-term loans and to foreign trade that respects the long-term interests of the two parties and breaks clearly with the unequal conditions imposed by the old despised colonial relationships.

We have no desire to run Africa. We want no African satellites. Our sole objective is an independent, free Africa, developing in line with the aspirations of the African people.

If we could look forward to an Africa willing and able to remain independent and even aloof from both the United States and the Soviet Union in the years ahead, it would be a handsome bargain.

THE CASE FOR INTERNATIONAL AID TO AFRICA

Our objective of an independent self-sufficient Africa can best be achieved by avoiding to the maximum possible extent the sterile habits and approaches of the cold war. Let us hope therefore that the new administration will press for the maximum channeling of our aid effort to Africa through the multilateral agencies of the United Nations.

Meanwhile, it is encouraging to note that the Secretary-General himself is pressing for increased U.N. attention to the specific problems of Africa.

In this regard I would like to make a special plea for the strengthening of one of our most promising international agencies, the new United Nations special fund under Mr. Paul Hoffman, who served so brilliantly as administrator of the Marshall plan.

The most critical African need lies in creating the economic foundation on which a modern society can be built. As someone has put it, you cannot draw water from a tap without first building a cistern. As I have previously noted, the first order of business is the creation of the foundations of economic development: that is, transportation, roads, bridges, power, irrigation, schools, and hospitals.

The United Nations is particularly well qualified to undertake the preinvestment surveys and plans. With an increased budget, the United Nations special fund could effectively underwrite this basic task.

With Africa as well as Asia in mind, I would also make a special plea for increased American support to the International Development Association. This new agency—the brain child of Senator MIKE MONRONEY of Oklahoma—is geared to make long-term loans payable in local currencies under multilateral administration and in close cooperation with the skilled staff of the World Bank.

However, if the United Nations is to play the expanded role which all this implies, there must be improved coordination among the U.N. agencies themselves. Although criticism of interagency rivalries is somewhat less valid than it was a few years ago, the 33 U.N. resident representatives in the countries, in which multilateral programs are being undertaken should, I believe, be given greater authority. If he is to become the essential direct link between the U.N. and the local government, each representative should become the U.N.'s mission chief responsible for all international operations in the nation of his assignment.

As I have already suggested, the role of the specialized agencies, such as WHO, FAO, and UNESCO, should be carefully reviewed. Some experienced observers believe that their functions may increasingly lie in the realm of policymaking and standard setting within a more coordinated international effort rather than in direct program administration.

Yet the political realities of Africa assure that bilateral aid will continue in some form for many years to come.

The United Kingdom, for instance, will continue to channel a sizable amount of aid to former African colonies that remain within the Commonwealth. Continued economic

ties to France will result in similar relations between Paris and former French colonies.

However, our national interests and those of the new African nations will best be served by the use of international agencies serving as a worldwide clearinghouse for bilateral programs, in conducting preinvestment surveys, in providing specialized and technically trained personnel, and in fostering a regional approach.

The coordinated regional efforts of the United Nations in developing the Mekong River project in southeast Asia, and the recent success of the World Bank in dealing with the Indus Valley development suggest the possibilities.

THE VITAL CORE: PERSONNEL

This brings us to the question which in Africa may turn out to be the most decisive of all. I refer to the extraordinary dearth of administrative and technical personnel available in the new nations of Africa.

In contrast to India and the former British colonies, such Asian countries as Indonesia suffered greatly from the failure of the colonial powers to provide adequate training of administrators, engineers, and technicians for self-rule.

But how much more difficult are the prospects for the Belgian Congo, now on its precipitous way to independence, with less than 40 college graduates in the entire country? What can we say of the many areas where there are no mathematics teachers, let alone tax experts?

Africa's simple, overriding, urgent need today is trained personnel. Unless able, dedicated men and women are made available in the next decade by the tens of thousands, economic development and orderly political growth in Africa will be impossible.

Where will the teachers, engineers, technicians, and administrators be found?

Will they come largely from the two superpowers—the United States and the Soviet Union—in a massive contest for political influence? Do the urgent demands for African development require that Africa become a new battleground in the cold-war power struggle?

Right here the United Nations and its agencies may find their most decisive role—that of recruiting a major reservoir of trained administrators and technical experts available for the use of new nations everywhere; in short, an international recruitment agency leading to an international civil service.

In the decade of the 1960's Africa will largely be ruled by black men, but to a considerable extent administered by white foreigners. That must be the case until the Africans themselves can create the new generation of leadership.

The needs vary all the way from schoolteachers to nurses, from extension workers to men of Cabinet ability who can operate ministries of agriculture, industrial development, education and public health until competent national administrators and technicians become available.

Two years ago the General Assembly approved an experimental program of technical assistance in public administration. This program, called OPEX, is operating on a very small budget, and the Secretary-General has received far more requests than he can fill.

Some such approach, greatly expanded, is, I believe, essential to the success of international economic and social development everywhere, but most particularly in Africa.

Salaries would be paid partly in the currency of the country to which the new international civil servants have been assigned, with the difference between local salaries and international salaries, together with pension allowances, made up from an international fund.

The long-term administrative requirements will ultimately, of course, be met by Africans. American and European universities can do much to hurry the day by vastly increasing their scholarship programs for Africans.

In the interval, which will last at least a generation, the one way to fill the gap without turning Africa into a cold war battlefield lies in the creation on a bold and adequate basis, of an internationalized civil service, open to men and women of all nationalities recruited by and responsible to the U.N.

The problems which Africa poses to us in the crucial 1960's are many and complex. Some are unique to that vast continent, and some are common to all underdeveloped nations.

There will remain for some time, for example, extreme sensitivity to all forms of imperialism—including what may be considered, justly or unjustly, as attempts at economic domination by the former colonial powers and their American ally.

The many-sided challenge of African development as a prerequisite of orderly political growth underscores the urgent need for a new global approach to the problems of international economic and social development.

Such a new approach can only come through effective American leadership by a new administration—Republican or Democratic—in the early months of 1961. It cannot be delayed, watered down, or sidestepped any longer.

Let me conclude, then, by restating the chief lines which I hope such leadership will follow next year and in the decade to come:

1. I hope we will approach oversea economic development with a broad creative view that takes into account the need for increased international trade; for fair, stable prices for raw materials produced in Asia, Africa, and Latin America; for new techniques to encourage responsible private investments; for the more effective use abroad of our enormous capacity to grow food; and for greatly expanded facilities to train development specialists.

2. I hope that our aid efforts will be increased in size, direction, scope, and duration to meet the needs of long-term national and regional development programs and to encourage large-scale planning.

3. I hope that we will make increased use of United Nations multilateral aid as a supervisory and coordinating umbrella for bilateral programs.

4. I hope that we will press for the formation and use of a vast corps of able and dedicated international administrators and technical experts in the form of an international civil service.

The colonial powers did things to the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

In recent years, however inadequately, we have been doing things for them.

In the 1960's we must learn to do things with them.

An approach both direct and through the United Nations must be flexible, imaginative, and positive.

It must be attuned to the varying needs, cultures, and political backgrounds of specific nations.

It must be rooted in an understanding of the full significance and challenge of international economic development as a vast new frontier for our Nation and its people.

Only if the new administration which takes office next January senses the opportunity and acts in these terms can we restore the partnership atmosphere of the Marshall plan and of Point 4. And only through such a relationship can we work effectively toward the ultimate abolition of poverty, hunger, ignorance, and disease from the face of this earth.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1960

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Senator GALE W. MCGEE, of Wyoming.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God of all truth, judge of all men, grant us the grace to keep our hearts with all diligence, knowing that out of them are the issues of life.

When harsh voices are strident and cruel, may we know that the wisdom of the ages is in the affirmation of the Book that reveals Thy heart—

"He that ruleth his spirit is better than he that taketh a city."

In a clamorous day filled with angry accents of unreasoning hate, give us ears to hear the voices calm and still that speak of justice and freedom and world brotherhood. In a sad and mad day, give us sanity of head and heart and a glad hope that sends a shining ray far down the future's broadening way.

"Lord, in this hour of tumult,
Lord, in this night of fears,
Keep open, O keep open,
Our eyes, our hearts, our ears.

Not blindly nor in hatred,
Lord, let us do our part.
Keep open, O keep open,
Our eyes, our mind, our heart."

Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1960.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. GALE W. MCGEE, a Senator from the State of Wyoming, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MCGEE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 18, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 44) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the following committee and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Committee on Public Works.

The Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation Subcommittee, of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs, of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors, of the Committee on Public Works.

SOVIET PROPOSAL TO GO BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under all the circumstances, the Soviet proposal to go before the United Nations has the trappings of a propaganda circus. There is a serious question as to whether the Soviets are looking for a method of settling disputes or a sounding board for further propaganda.

Over the years, and through two Presidents, the United States has repeatedly sought to use the United Nations as a discussion body through which the issues that really divide the world can be resolved. The record of Soviet moves to block such action is well established.

Premier Khrushchev's appeal to the United Nations might carry greater conviction if the Soviets were to demonstrate a real willingness to negotiate on such issues as armaments control, the integrity of smaller nations, and the fate of subjugated peoples.

It is obvious that we are in for a period of heightened tensions. I am confident the United States has the internal fortitude to stand up to the problems before us. I hope that somewhere along the line the Soviet Premier and those who are behind him will realize the very real dangers into which they are now plunging the whole world.

VETO OF THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the President has sent to the Senate a veto message on Senate bill 722. I have conferred with Senators on both sides of the aisle concerning what action the Senate may desire to take in connection with this veto message.

It is now the plan of the leadership to ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the veto message on either Tuesday or Wednesday of next week, and to have the Senate decide whether the bill shall become law, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

I am prepared to vote today or tomorrow. But in the interest of orderly procedure, and in order that all Members of the Senate may have adequate notice, and in accordance with the desires of the authors of the bill and the States which have very special interest in the bill, I believe all Senators should be on notice that very likely the veto message will be laid before the Senate on Tuesday, after the morning hour. I cannot tell how long Senators will wish to discuss it. But this measure is of such far-reaching importance and it affects the lives of so many citizens that I have no doubt that there will be several speeches on the subject, and we shall either vote on Tuesday or, if necessary, go over until Wednesday.

But all Members should be prepared to hold themselves in readiness for a vote, on either Tuesday or Wednesday, on the question of overriding the President's veto of Senate bill 722.

SENATOR JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to make, in the morning hour, a very brief statement, because I shall have to be away from the Chamber, and I understand that a little later today Senators will pay tributes to one of the great men of this century. Although I have spoken earlier in regard to the retirement of Senator O'MAHONEY, I do wish to make a brief statement at this time.

I think one of the warmest friendships I have formed during my years in the Congress has been that with the senior Senator from Wyoming, JOE O'MAHONEY.

Senator O'MAHONEY is one of the outstanding figures in the history of the U.S. Senate. Every person who knows him, knows him to be a man of fearless dedication to his principles and of absolute determination to represent his people as they deserve to be represented.

All of us are familiar with the outstanding record JOE O'MAHONEY has made in the service of the United States—as secretary to a Senator, as a member of the "Little Cabinet," and finally as one of the towering giants in this body. He has been a consistent opponent of monopoly; and the comprehensive study of the Nation's economic system, conducted under his direction, as chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee, remains a monument to him.

But behind Senator O'MAHONEY as a statesman there is JOE O'MAHONEY, the man. Basically, he is a man who embodies all of the finest qualities of his State and of the Nation which he loves so dearly. I have visited Wyoming a number of times in the last few years, Mr. President, at the invitation of this great man; and I would recommend to all the Members of the Senate and to the people of the Nation such a visit by them, because those who believe that the American spirit of adventure and of daring and of building is dead, ought to go to Wyoming and see what is happening there. There is a striving, a bustling, a hustling, a can-do feeling in Wyoming. The people of Wyoming are dedicated to progress, and they face the future with confidence. They are not discouraged by adversity, and they know how to make the best out of their resources. And this is how I like to think of JOE O'MAHONEY.

JOE O'MAHONEY has decided to retire at the end of this term. All of us can understand, and we must respect his wishes.

But a man like JOE O'MAHONEY will never really retire from the Senate, because he has put into it his courage, his imagination, his vigor, and his patriotism; and these are qualities that will endure so long as the institutions lasts.

Mr. President, one of the earliest tales I heard at my father's knee was of my ancestors' trips to Wyoming and their experiences in the cattle industry there. I am proud to say now that Texans and the sons of Wyoming have many things in common. Among them are sheep. I remember that once the Speaker said that every time he saw JOE O'MAHONEY come down the corridor, he prepared to get ready for some action in connection with the wool bill.

We look to the great Wyoming Hereford ranch for leadership in the field of some of our best bred cattle.

Mr. President, it is with a feeling of great regret that I shall see JOE O'MAHONEY leave this body, because not only do we have so many interests in common, but he is the type of public servant I should like to see every young man emulate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair rules that the words just spoken were among the most eloquent ever uttered in this Chamber.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS ON U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the U.S. Soldiers' Home, for the fiscal year 1959, and a report of the annual inspection of the home, 1959, by the Inspector General of the Army (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS TO PURCHASE U.S. OBLIGATIONS DIRECTLY FROM THE TREASURY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

A letter from the Chairman and members, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, covering the operations of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan System, and the

Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, for the calendar year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR BOLIVIA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on the examination of the economic and technical assistance program for Bolivia as administered by the International Cooperation Administration, Department of State (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ESTABLISHMENT OF REVOLVING-TYPE FUND IN THE TREASURY FOR THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a revolving-type fund in the Treasury for the Bureau of Reclamation, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, EAST BENCH UNIT, THREE FORKS DIVISION, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT, MONTANA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the East Bench unit, Three Forks division, Missouri River Basin project, Montana, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT, RELATING TO INTEREST RATE FORMULA OF SPECIAL OBLIGATIONS PURCHASED FOR RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACCOUNT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 15(b) of the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended, to revise the interest rate formula of special obligations purchased for the railroad retirement account, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Council of the City of New York, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide a National Youth Act with provisions for Federal grants to assist local communities in establishing expanded youth programs; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS BANKERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Bankers Association held its 73d annual convention in Topeka, Kans., last week. At this meeting several resolutions were adopted, two of which are related to legislative matters now pending in Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF TWO RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY KANSAS BANKERS ASSOCIATION 73D ANNUAL CONVENTION, TOPEKA, ON MAY 14, 1960

Resolved, That the Kansas Bankers Association, duly assembled in regular session, go on record as unequivocably opposing any Federal legislation which, by its terms, proposes to require a withholding tax on dividends or interest paid by corporations.

Resolved, That the Kansas Bankers Association, assembled in regular session, go on record as approving and recommending to the Members of the Congress all legislation designed to equalize the basis of taxation of financial institutions; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the proper officials in Washington who represent the State of Kansas.

RESOLUTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three resolutions adopted by organizations of the State of New York.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF POUGHKEEPSIE HELD ON MONDAY, MAY 16, 1960

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Poughkeepsie, composed of both Republicans and Democrats, duly elected to such office, hereby wish to go on record as endorsing the firm stand taken by our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, at Paris during the current summit conference in upholding the united desires of our Western allies, and we express the wish that all public bodies take a similar position in order that the Soviet people be made aware of such spontaneous action that we support our Commander in Chief in his efforts to maintain peace in the world.

HOWARD H. GIBBS,
City Chamberlain.

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, YONKERS, N.Y.

Whereas on April 8, 1960, Governor Rockefeller signed into law chapter 418 of the laws of 1960; and

Whereas this chapter authorizes the imposition of a tax for school purposes on general telephone services on a countywide basis; and

Whereas additional funds are urgently needed by the Board of Education of the City of Yonkers to provide more adequately for the educational program in the public schools; and

Whereas the city of Yonkers is presently within $10,326.14 of its constitutional tax limit of 2 percent, and is thereby restricted in providing additional funds for the educational program; and

Whereas the Board of Education of the City of Yonkers, in order to serve more adequately the educational needs of the more than 25,300 pupils enrolled in the Yonkers public schools, wishes to utilize the revenues from this source beginning September 1, 1960, in the event that the Federal Government does not reimpose this tax: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of the City of Yonkers, pursuant to chapter 418 of the laws of 1960, hereby requests the imposition of a local tax for school purposes on general telephone services as specified in article 24 of the tax law, a public hearing having been held on the imposition of said tax on the 5th day of May, 1960; and be it further

Resolved, That the said board of education hereby requests that the said tax become effective during the calendar year 1960; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be filed with the Commissioner of Education of the State of New York, the mayor, the city manager, the members of the common council, the comptroller and city clerk of the city of Yonkers, the county clerk of Westchester County, the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING, the Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS, and the Honorable ROBERT R. BARRY.

Resolution sponsored by:

ANITA F. WOLF,
Member, Board of Education.

Recommended by:

STANLEY S. WYNSTRA,
Superintendent of Schools.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE EMPIRE STATE PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION, APRIL 28, 1960

Whereas Empire State Petroleum Association has continually maintained a position in favor of the removal of control of wellhead prices for natural gas as now exercised by the Federal Power Commission; and

Whereas the President of the United States has recently signified his support for legislation to bring about removal of these controls; and

Whereas there is now pending or about to be introduced before the Congress of the United States a bill that will in general accomplish this purpose: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives from the State of New York and to Otis H. Ellis, general counsel for the National Oil Jobbers' Council, with the urgent request that every effort be made to promote the passage of this legislation at the current session of Congress.

HARRY B. HILTS,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 113. An act to prohibit the severance of service connection which has been in effect for 10 or more years, except under certain limited conditions (Rept. No. 1394);

H.R. 276. An act to amend section 3011 of title 38, United States Code, to establish a new effective date for payment of additional compensation for dependents (Rept. No. 1395);

H.R. 641. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to make uniform the marriage date requirements for service-connected death benefits (Rept. No. 1396);

H.R. 7502. An act to revise the determination of basic pay of certain deceased veterans in computing dependency and indemnity compensation payable by the Veterans' Administration (Rept. No. 1397);

H.R. 9785. An act to provide for equitable adjustment of the insurance status of certain members of the Armed Forces (Rept. No. 1398);

H.R. 9788. An act to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the

furnishing of benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to any child on account of the death of more than one parent in the same parental line (Rept. No. 1399);

H.R. 10703. An act to grant a waiver of national service life insurance premiums to certain veterans who become totally disabled in line of duty between the date of application and the effective date of their insurance (Rept. No. 1400); and

H.R. 10898. An act to amend section 315 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional compensation for seriously disabled veterans having four or more children (Rept. No. 1401).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 9322. An act to make permanent the existing suspension of duties on certain coarse wool (Rept. No. 1402); and

H.R. 9881. An act to extend for 2 years the existing provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders (Rept No. 1403).

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE TO PERMIT TAXPAYERS TO ELECT AN OVERALL LIMITATION ON THE FOREIGN TAX CREDIT—MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H.R. 10087) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit, and I submit a report (No. 1393) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the minority views of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Virginia.

COMMISSION ON PROBLEMS OF SMALL TOWNS AND RURAL COUNTIES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Government Operations, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 3140) to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Problems of Small Towns and Rural Counties, and I submit a report (No. 1392) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, coincident with these remarks, I am today filing a report from the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate on S. 3140, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on the Problems of Small Towns and Rural Counties. This bill was cosponsored by my able colleagues, Senator CASE, of South Dakota, and Senator MANSFIELD, of Montana.

I am very happy to have this bill placed before the Senate for consideration through the filing of this favorable committee report. The problems of rural America—its small towns and counties—are among the most neglected.

I am sure that the people who live in the heartland of our country, in the rural areas, will be grateful that the Senate has decided to do something to help them with their problems.

We have made an effort in Congress to assist, where needed, in solving the social and economic challenges of nearly every distressed segment of American life. We recently aproved in the Senate a bill providing for a study of the problems of metropolitan areas. We have made studies for labor, for farmers, for industry, for large cities, for education, and on many other subjects. It is logical, then, that we turn our eyes toward a portion of our Nation that we desire to see survive, and that is the small town and the rural area of our Nation.

The force for good that comes from the rural towns and communities is almost immeasurable. Every group dealing with population problems comes to recognize that from the small towns comes a great ground swell of moral responsibility and strength. The support of many of our traditions and institutions comes, very often, from the training and background which people have acquired in a rural setting. Character and leadership are the real treasures of the Nation. Nowhere can they be acquired better than in a small town or rural environment. I speak of these things to indicate that a program for preservation and advancement of the small town has something more important than an economic argument to support it.

I am sure that is the reason why so many church groups, groups which deal with rural problems and rural sociology, give their support to the idea of a commission on small town problems.

For instances, most of those who have contacted me in regard to the need for establishing a commission on small town problems, indicate that they see a general breakdown in smaller towns which threatens the existence of churches and other forces for good in these areas. The economic factors which cause deterioration must be combated so that rural churches and schools will survive.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters which I have received from Mr. Willis J. Ray, of the Colorado Baptist General Convention; Mr. William H. Hillmer, executive secretary, the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod; Mr. William H. Rhoades, executive secretary, American Baptist Home Mission Societies; Mr. M. Wendell Belew, director, division of missions, Southern Baptist Convention.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLORADO BAPTIST
GENERAL CONVENTION,
Denver, Colo., March 4, 1960.

U.S. Senator KARL E. MUNDT,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: I have been advised that you have introduced bill S. 3140 which seeks to provide for the establishment of a commission on problems of small towns.

We assure you that we feel this study is essential. Many of our leaders in all walks of life have come from the rural communities. In fact I have read that 28 of the 33 Presidents have come from small towns or the open country.

We assure you that we will be backing you in the passage of this bill.

Our convention operates in Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and western Nebraska. We have 1,500 communities and villages of less than 2,500 population, where they need help to preserve and build for the future.

Yours very truly,

WILLIS J. RAY,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH,
MISSOURI SYNOD,
BOARD FOR MISSIONS IN
NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA,
St. Louis, Mo., March 1, 1960.

The Honorable KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: I am in receipt of your letter of February 11 in which you bring to my attention a bill which you have introduced in the Senate calling for a Commission To Study Smalltown Problems (S. 3140). I have read the bill and your supporting speech carefully and want to say that I would most heartily endorse the action called for in your bill.

The church denomination to which I belong, namely, the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, has a membership of over 2½ million. Of these, 27 percent are members of rural congregations and represent a total of 535,000. In our statistics we designate as rural those churches located in communities of 2,500 or less. If we were to use your definition of a small town as consisting of 10,000 or less then the number would be much greater.

One of the reasons why I am particularly interested in your bill is that I have had occasion to observe how closely the life and work of our churches is related to the life and problems of the community or the small town. Anything which the Government can do to help small towns look at their problems and find solutions will also directly and indirectly benefit our churches.

On the other hand, I want to say that I believe our churches also have a responsibility to the community in the small town. We have been trying to emphasize the responsibility of the churches through institutes, conferences, and literature. I am enclosing a booklet entitled "Rural Digest," which shows the approach of our church with reference to the churches located in small towns.

And so may I again heartily endorse the legislation which you are proposing.

Cordially yours,

WM. H. HILLMER,
Executive Secretary.

AMERICAN BAPTIST HOME,
MISSION SOCIETIES,
New York, N.Y., February 25, 1960.

Hon. KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: It was thoughtful of you to enclose in your letter of February 11 a copy of S. 3140, a bill providing for a commission to study small town problems. You are, of course, correct that the American Baptist Home Mission Societies have a very real concern for and interest in the problems of communities of the character which you describe. The proposed bill and your remarks related to it have been considered by members of our staff.

We note one point which is unquestionably clear to you but which was not particularly noted in your remarks. While it is probably true that a sizable proportion of our American population lives in communities of 10,000 or less, there is some reason to question as to whether or not all of such communities are of the distinctly rural or small-town character which you describe. We are constantly aware of many small towns which are so closely involved in the life and activities of neighboring metropolitan communities and are so distinctly in the orbit of the larger communities that their problems are substantially different from the small towns which are representative of the States which have a more rural characteristic. I am sure that any considerations which a proposed commission might give would take adequate recognition of the varying characteristics of these towns of the designated size which is specified in the provisions of your bill. Whatever may be the actual facts in this area of consideration, it is true that there remains a very significant portion of our American population with the peculiar problems of the community which you describe. Clearly these are within the range of concern of our American Baptist Home Mission Societies and any conclusions or facts which might be developed by the proposed commission would be of very substantial value to us as we project our town and country program of mission work.

In our mission work within the United States we are obviously concerned also with the development of the large urban areas and in particular we have in mind the so-called strip cities or communities which are developing as the metropolitan areas of some of our great cities meet each other and develop an almost continuous urban situation in substantial areas of our country. While it is true that the growth of these great urban areas is based to some significant degree upon the rapid increase in our population, it is also true that this growth depends to some extent at least upon the problems which are involved in the smaller communities and the movement incident to the shift of population from small communities to large. It occurs to us that the solutions which you anticipate will be found for some of the problems of the small communities may well point the way to some solutions for the congested program areas in which we have equal concern.

If the commission should be established on the basis of a plan proposed in your bill, I am sure that our staff would be grateful for the opportunity to work constructively in any way that will be helpful to the communities which are intended to be benefited by this proposal.

With appreciation for your consideration in informing us of your proposal, I am,

Cordially yours,

WILLIAM H. RHOADES,
Executive Secretary.

HOME MISSION BOARD,
SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION,
Atlanta, Ga., February 23, 1960.

Senator KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: The rural church work of the Southern Baptist Convention is included in the Department of Associational Missions of the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. I am delighted with the bill, S. 3140, which you have introduced in the Senate. I appreciate so very much your endeavor in this field and assure you of my support.

You may be interested to know that nearly 24,000 of our present 32,000 Southern Baptist churches are located in small towns or open country. We of the Old South appreciate a need for a study in this area.

If there is any way in which I can be of benefit, do not hesitate to let me know. I will express my interest to other Members of the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

M. WENDELL BELEW,
Secretary, Department of Associational Missions.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to have printed in the RECORD copies of two articles which have appeared in church-sponsored organization publications in support of S. 3140. The first is one which appeared in the Methodist Rural Fellowship Bulletin of March 1960. With it, I would like to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a letter which I received from James E. Hankin, the editor of the bulletin.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MUNDT PROPOSES BILL ON SMALL TOWNS

[From the Methodist Rural Fellowship Bulletin, March 1960]

Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, has drafted a proposed bill for the establishment of a Commission on Problems of Small Towns. The bill is S. 2621.

The purpose of such a commission would be to make full investigations and studies of Federal policies and programs relating to the needs and problems of the Nation's small-town areas.

The commission would try to determine the present and future needs of the small towns in the field of public services, including but not limited to planning, highways, water resources, schools, recreational facilities, prevention of juvenile delinquency, municipal financing, and business expansion, including ways and means to induce new businesses to small towns.

The commission would be a Hoover-type commission with 18 members all of whom would serve without salary.

For the purposes of this commission a small town would be one with 10,000 or less population.

If the reader feels that this would be a good bill for your area, you may write to Senator MUNDT, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., for a copy. If after studying the proposed bill, you find such a bill was needed, a letter to your Senator and Representative could follow.

METHODIST RURAL FELLOWSHIP,
Rogersville, Tenn., February 17, 1960.

The Honorable KARL E. MUNDT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MUNDT: Thank you for the opportunity to read your bill S. 2621 and also your speech at the time the bill was introduced.

I have read both the proposed bill and your remarks. It is evident you have hit upon an area of great need in America. I have shared the proposed bill with our local newspaper editor and find that she is very much in agreement with your position.

Your letter came just at the time we were going to press with our Methodist Rural Fellowship Bulletin. I will clear some space and do an article on it. Around the first of March I will mail you a copy of the Bulletin.

Enclosed you will find carbons of letters to Senators KEFAUVER and GORE.

Perhaps the most helpful thing I can do is to alert our Methodist laymen and ministers of the bill in the pages of our Bulletin.

It is a joy to know of a Senator who is concerned about the problems we face in the small towns of our Nation.

If I can be of further service to you in the passage of this bill, don't hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. HANKINS,
Bulletin Editor.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the second article is from Catholic Rural Life, a publication of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference. In addition, I would like to have printed in the RECORD, a letter which I received from Rev. James L. Vizzard, S.J., who is the acting executive director of that organization.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article and letter printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill to establish a Commission on the Problems of Small Towns has been introduced in the U.S. Senate by KARL E. MUNDT, U.S. Senator from South Dakota.

In a speech preceding formal presentation of the bill, Senator MUNDT called attention to the fact that we have many commissions created or proposed to study the problems involved in big government. These he described as the problems of our metropolitan areas, farm problems, labor problems, and the like. He then went on to point out that no agency of Government, no research department, no commission of the Congress has been charged with the responsibility of finding facts and making recommendations of value to America's small towns.

The Senator mentioned many of the problems confronting our small towns. Among them he listed the tendency of transcontinental highways to bypass small communities, the tendency of business to become more concentrated in administration and greater in size, the elimination of many railroad services and the high cost of adequate airport facilities.

Stating that the march of industrial and technical development has not always been in conflict with the advantages of living in small communities, Senator MUNDT pointed out the plus values of small-town life.

"Here," he said "families can be raised, free from the temptations, the turmoil and the disillusionments of life in the big city." He pointed out how air transportation has made it possible for people living in small towns to reach a city within a matter of minutes. Television, he said, brings to people in small towns the same public information and entertainment that are available to people in cities.

The Senator made it clear that he believes small towns are not on the way out. While some have faltered and failed, he told his colleagues, others have made real advances.

The purpose of establishing the commission, he said, is to "obtain reports and recommendations which will enable all of our smaller communities to do what some of them are doing presently: to analyze their opportunities, reappraise their advantages, create new enterprise, attract more people and capital, and move forward into eras of happier living and more prosperous economic activity."

NATIONAL CATHOLIC RURAL LIFE CONFERENCE,
Des Moines, Iowa, February 18, 1960.

The Honorable KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: Thanks very much for calling to my attention your bill S. 2621. You are quite right in judging that the purpose of this proposed legislation follows within the scope of NCRLC's interest.

Enclosed is a copy of a brief article which will appear in the March issue of our monthly magazine, Catholic Rural Life. As you will see, we are urging our NCRLC members to let you know of their support.

With every good wish.

Very sincerely yours,
JAMES L. VIZZARD, S.J.,
Acting Executive Director.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, some of these letters and articles refer to S. 2621 instead of S. 3140. That is because on August 31, 1959, I introduced S. 2621; but on March 5, 1960, I replaced it with S. 3140, which is identical to my earlier bill except it has been expanded to include rural counties as well as small towns, and I was happy to add the names of Senators CASE of South Dakota, and MANSFIELD as cosponsors of S. 3140.

A question may be raised as to the need for such a commission to study the changing conditions and the problems of small rural towns. It should be immediately apparent that these small towns are totally without resources to assist themselves in this type of survey. They do not have the research facilities to undertake studies, nor the finances to underwrite them. They do not have organizations to bind them together closely, so that there can be communication on common problems and the factors leading to them. Whatever argument we can put forward to support a study of metropolitan problems can be multiplied tenfold when applied to our small towns.

Yearly, some of our smaller communities wither; at the same time, others flourish; and no one can explain why one prospers and the other does not.

It may happen that an activity not related to the community at all is the contributing factor in both instances. In some cases that activity may have Federal direction and control. We ought to know when, where, why, and how this happens.

In our big highway program, we are going to have an impact on hundreds of small towns in rural America. The transcontinental trunk lines make it easy for people to whiz by the small town. It throws the smalltown merchant into direct competition with the stores in a larger city which now becomes only minutes away with high speed cars and superhighways for the convenience of the people. This is progress, and no one wants to turn back the clock, but we should continue to review the new problems created by progress and to assess our situation so that we can preserve that which is good and that which is essential, even as we go forward to better living.

Other Federal activities which may have the capacity to contribute to the growth or to the demise of the small town is the Government's policy in selecting sites for Federal facilities. Efforts to channel more of the Government's procurement to small firms which operate in smaller communities can be a contributing factor in assisting these communities to survive.

However, Federal planning in its special activities as they relate to small towns is not the final answer. As we travel about, we witness one town that is struggling to survive. Farther on, we see another that is on the move, growing and expanding. To the casual observer, the reason why one does not grow and the other booms is not apparent, but there must be a reason. A study which such a commission as this can undertake is to try to find out what factors need to be considered, what efforts can be expected to succeed, and what pitfalls should be avoided.

Throughout history, Mr. President, the American small town has made tremendous contributions to the development of the American way of life. History is replete with examples of the small-town boy who gained national recognition and assumed national leadership. The existence of small towns has helped to contribute the necessary balances to check against the political and economic extremes and excesses in one direction or another which have plagued and destroyed other governments and countries.

The small towns of America provide the stabilizing forces. They are the bastions for producing the freedoms of Americans at home and for preserving the great institutions of private ownership and competitive enterprise which have teamed up to make America great and to keep it strong.

It follows, then, our Nation's welfare depends on the reservoir of strength which comes from our small towns and rural areas. It is only good business to keep them strong and to preserve them in the American tradition.

It is my hope that the leadership of the Senate will place S. 3140 on its legislative calendar for early action. I am confident the Senate will approve it, and that it can do much toward preserving and promoting that great American institution known as the small town of rural America.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is a pleasure for me to be associated with my distinguished senior colleague in the presentation of this bill to the Senate. The place of the small town in America has never been better stated than it was in a poem by Badger Clark, our poet laureate in South Dakota, who passed away a few years ago.

I should like unanimous permission to insert that poem at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL TOWN
(By Badger Clark)

The circling cones of bison hide,
That made the village of the Sioux,
Rose near as high, spread near as wide,
O little western town, as you!

But small-town skylines all are great,
And small-town air is clear and sweet,
And small-town folk are friend and mate,
Not flitting shadows on the street.

No smoke of factories uprolls;
No market roars with shouted bids.
The small town's finest fruit is souls;
Its prize commodity is kids.

For while the city struts in pride,
And trumpets far its loud renown,
The men who govern, there, and guide,
Are children of the little town.

That is the small town's latent power—
Some name upon its schoolroom page,
The future hero of the hour,
The future glory of an age.

'Twas always so; 'twill always be—
Small town, the great folks' starting place,
A small-town boy in Galilee
Re-routed all the human race.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Badger Clark points out in this poem that it was from the small town of Galilee that came He who rerouted the entire human race.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator for his very important contribution, as well as his cosponsorship of the proposed legislation.

I also appreciate the fine help we have had from the assistant majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], in supporting this measure.

Badger Clark was indeed a great American. His poem was read around the world. I think it is most appropriate that the poem be published at the point in the RECORD suggested by my colleague.

UNITED STATES AGAINST LOUIS SHOMER—APPEARANCE OF CERTAIN SENATE EMPLOYEES AS WITNESSES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. EASTLAND], I report three original resolutions and ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

From the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York there have been issued and served subpenas ad testificandum and duces tecum to Elizabeth McGill, chief clerk, of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, and Joseph A. Davis, chief clerk, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, to appear, produce certain papers, and testify in the pending case of *United States* v. *Louis Shomer* (C 153–26).

There has also been issued and served from the same District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, a subpena ad testificandum to Peter N. Chumbris, minority counsel,

of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, and formerly associate counsel of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, in the above-mentioned case which is now pending.

The appearance of these witnesses concerns certain testimony, under oath, which was taken during the course of hearings conducted by the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of the Committee on the Judiciary, in New York, N.Y., during May and June 1955.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to these three resolutions so that the persons named may appear and testify in the scheduled trial of United States against Louis Shomer.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first resolution will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 322) as follows:

Whereas in the case of the *United States* v. *Louis Shomer* (C 153–26) pending in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, a subpena ad testificandum and a subpena duces tecum was issued upon application of S. Hazard Gillespie, Jr., United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York and addressed to Elizabeth McGill, Chief Clerk of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, directing her to appear as a witness before the said Court and to bring with her certain papers in the possession and under the control of the Senate of the United States, and to give testimony which may relate to matters which are in the possession and under the control of the Senate, and

Whereas said subcommittee held hearings in New York, New York, on May 24, 26, 31, and June 9 and 18, 1955; and

Whereas said case is the trial of an indictment alleging that Louis Shomer on May 26 and May 31, 1955, committed perjury, in violation of title 18, United States Code, section 1621, in testifying before said subcommittee at hearings held in New York, New York, on May 31, 1955: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of the Senate no evidence under the control of or in the possession of the Senate of the United States (which possession and control extends to evidence in the possession or under the control of any committee or subcommittee of said Senate) can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession except by its permission; and be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order or process of a court or of a judge and for or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders or processes of such court or judge that documentary evidence in the possession of or under the control of the Senate is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or any legal officer for the promotion of justice the Senate will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of the Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order or process of a court or of a judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders or processes of such court or judge that testimony of an employee of the Senate is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer for the promotion of justice and further, when it appears that such testimony may involve matters under the control of or in the possession of the Senate, the Senate will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of the Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That Elizabeth McGill, chief clerk of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, be, and she hereby is, authorized, in response to the aforementioned subpenas to attend at the trial of such case at the date and time specified in said subpenas or at an adjourned date and time and to testify and to answer such questions as may be put to her, and in the giving of her testimony she be, and she hereby is, specifically authorized to testify as to matters which are or have been in the possession or under the control of the Senate of the United States and which are deemed by the court to be material and relevant; and be it further

Resolved, That said Elizabeth McGill, be and she hereby is specifically authorized at said trial to produce and identify copies of, and testify as to the preparation, receipt, filing, transmission and whereabouts of, documents which are or have been in the possession or under the control of the Senate of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That in accordance with the privileges of the Senate and established Senate practice designed to prevent loss of documents and interference with Senate business, no original document in the possession or under the control of the Senate shall be removed from its place of filing or custody for production at said trial: *Provided, however*, That any original documents in the possession or under the control of the Senate, which have been deemed material and relevant by the court may be inspected and/or copied by said court or any of its agents or officers, or the proper parties to the proceedings; at their usual place of custody; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpenas aforementioned.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 322) was considered and agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next resolution will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 323), as follows:

Whereas, in the case of the *United States* v. *Louis Shomer* (C 153–26) pending in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, a subpena ad testificandum and a subpena duces tecum was issued upon application of S. Hazard Gillespie, Jr., United States attorney for the southern district of New York, and addressed to Joseph A. Davis, chief clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court and to bring with him certain papers in the possession and under the control of the Senate of the United States, and to give testimony which may relate to matters which are in the possession and under the control of the Senate; and

Whereas a Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of said Committee on the Judiciary, held hearings in New York, New York, on May 24, 26, 31 and June 9 and 18, 1955; and

Whereas said case is the trial of an indictment alleging that Louis Shomer on May 26 and May 31, 1955, committed perjury, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1621, in testifying before said subcommittee at hearings held in New York, New York, on May 26 and May 31, 1955: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of the Senate no evidence under the control of or in the possession of the Senate of the United States (which possession and control extends to evidence in the possession or under the control of any committee or subcommittee of the Senate) can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession except by its permission; and be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order or process of a court or of a judge and for or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders or processes of such court or judge that documentary evidence in the possession of or under the control of the Senate is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or any legal officer for the promotion of justice the Senate will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of the Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order or process of a court or of a judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders or processes of such court or judge that testimony of an employee of the Senate is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer for the promotion of justice and further, when it appears that such testimony may involve matters under the control of or in the possession of the Senate, the Senate will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of the Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That Joseph A. Davis, chief clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, be, and he hereby is, authorized, in response to the aforementioned subpenas to attend at the trial of such case at the date and time specified in said subpenas or at an adjourned date and time and to testify and to answer such questions as may be put to him, and in the giving of his testimony he be, and he hereby is, specifically authorized to testify as to matters which are or have been in the possession or under the control of the Senate of the United States and which are deemed by the court to be material and relevant; and be it further

Resolved, That said Joseph A. Davis be, and he hereby is specifically authorized at said trial to produce and identify copies of, and testify as to the preparation, receipt, filing, transmission and whereabouts of, documents which are or have been in the possession or under the control of the Senate of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That in accordance with the privileges of the Senate and established Senate practice designed to prevent loss of documents and interference with Senate business, no original document in the possession or under the control of the Senate shall be removed from its place of filing or custody for production at said trial: *Provided, however*, That any original documents in the possession or under the control of the Senate, which have been deemed material and relevant by the court may be inspected and/or copied by said court or any of its agents or officers, or the proper parties to the proceedings, at their usual place of custody; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpenas aforementioned.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 323) was considered and agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The third resolution will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 324), as follows:

Whereas in the case of the *United States* v. *Louis Shomer* pending in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, docket number C 153-26, a subpena ad testificandum was issued upon application of S. Hazard Gillespie, Jr., United States attorney for the southern district of New York and addressed to Peter N. Chumbris, minority counsel of the Subcommittee on Monopoly and Antitrust Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, and formerly associate counsel of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court and to give testimony which may relate to matters which are in the possession and under the control of the Senate; and

Whereas said Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency held hearings in New York, New York, on May 24, 26, 31 and June 9 and 18, 1955; and

Whereas, said case is the trial of an indictment alleging that Louis Shomer on or about May 26 and 31, 1955, committed perjury in violation of title 18, United States Code, section 1621, in testifying before said Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency at hearings held in New York, New York, on May 26 and 31, 1955: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of the Senate no evidence under the control and in the possession of the Senate of the United States (which possession and control extends to evidence in the possession or under the control of any committee or subcommittee of the Senate), can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession except by its permission; and be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order or process of a court or of a judge thereof or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders or processes of such court or judge that testimony of an employee of the Senate is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or any legal officer for the promotion of justice and further, when it appears that such testimony may involve matters under the control of or in the possession of the Senate, the Senate will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of the Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That Peter N. Chumbris be, and he hereby is, authorized, in response to the aforementioned subpena, to attend at the trial of said case at the date and time specified in said subpena or at an adjourned date and time, and to testify and to answer such questions as may be put to him, and in the giving of his testimony he be, and he hereby is, specifically authorized to testify concerning matters (documentary or otherwise) which are or have been under the control of, or in the possession of, the Senate of the United States and which are deemed by the court to be material and relevant; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena aforementioned.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 324) was considered and agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 3571. A bill to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 3572. A bill to permit the State of Nebraska to modify the agreement heretofore entered into by it pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act so as to exclude service performed within such State by justices of the peace and constables, and to provide for social security coverage of certain justices of the peace and constables as self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3573. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to provide for the further use of foreign currencies acquired thereunder for certain foreign expenses requisite to participation by foreign nations in trade fairs in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 3574. A bill to strengthen the enforcement provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and extend the duration of the authorization of grants for State water pollution control programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Flemming, setting forth what the bill which I have introduced today will do in extending and amending certain provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, May 18, 1960.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am enclosing for your consideration a draft of a bill to amend certain provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Public Law 660, 84th Cong.) approved July 9, 1956. This bill has four principal objectives:

1. To strengthen State and interstate water pollution control programs;

2. To make more effective assistance to municipalities in the construction of necessary sewage treatment works;

3. To provide for more effective prevention and control of water pollution caused by Federal installations; and

4. To strengthen the role of the Federal Government in abating pollution of interstate waters.

To carry out these objectives, the bill would make the following changes in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act:

Extend, for an additional 5 years, the provision for Federal grants to State and interstate water pollution control agencies for administration of their programs;

Make it possible for several communities to get individual Federal grants and use these funds in the construction of a single joint sewage treatment facility;

Make all interstate navigable waters and coastal waters subject to Federal abatement enforcement authority whether or not there is a showing of interstate pollution if abatement action is requested by a State or a municipality with the concurrence of the State, and authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to issue final orders in enforcement actions;

Make discharges from Federal installations subject to administrative findings and recommendations in Federal water pollution abatement actions conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(We also propose a clarifying amendment in section 12, which preserves existing functions of other Federal agencies in the water pollution control field.)

The proposed amendments will, we believe, provide an improved statutory base for the Federal-State water pollution control and abatement program. They contain our legislative recommendations for strengthening the enforcement provisions of the act in accordance with the President's 1961 budget message and his message dated February 22, 1960, returning H.R. 3610 to the Congress without his approval.

Before explaining in greater detail the purpose and effect of these amendments, I believe it would be helpful to put them in a perspective of the development of the present Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the programs of water pollution control in which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been engaged under this law.

BRIEF HISTORY OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL LEGISLATION

The first specific Federal water pollution control legislation was enacted in the 1890's primarily for preventing impediments to navigation. The Public Health Service Act of 1912 contained provisions authorizing investigations of water pollution related to disease. The Oil Pollution Act of 1912 was directed to control oil discharges in coastal waters causing damage to aquatic life, harbors and docks, and recreational facilities.

Comprehensive water pollution control legislation was nearly enacted by the 74th Congress in 1936. Legislation was enacted by the 75th Congress in 1938 but vetoed by the President because of technical defects. Again in 1940, the 76th Congress narrowly missed passing such legislation.

No further serious efforts were made to advance water pollution control legislation until 1947 because of World War II.

The 80th Congress enacted and on June 30, 1948, the President signed the first legislation in the history of the Federal Government which provided for a comprehensive Federal, State, and local cooperative approach with respect to water pollution control.

The Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 (Public Law 845, 80th Cong.) was enacted as temporary, experimental legislation which was to be reviewed after a trial period (5 years) and revised on the basis of experience. It was extended for an additional 3-year period to June 30, 1956, by Public Law 579, 82d Congress.

In 1955 President Eisenhower recommended that the Congress enact permanent comprehensive Federal water pollution control legislation. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare prepared and submitted such legislation, and after study and debate by both Houses, the 84th Congress enacted Public Law 660, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, which was essentially an improvement and extension on a

permanent basis of the 1948 act. In large measure, the Congress adopted the recommendations of this Department.

The basic policy of the 1948 act was declared by the Congress "to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in controlling water pollution * * *." The Congress declared the same basic policy in subsection 1(a) of the 1956 act, viz "to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of States in preventing and controlling water pollution * * *." This policy is underlined in subsection 1(b) which provides that "Nothing in this act shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the States with respect to the water (including boundary waters) of such States."

This basic policy is reflected in the principal programs provided both in the 1948 act and the improved, permanent 1956 act and has been faithfully followed in the administration of these programs.

PROGRAMS UNDER 1948 (PUBLIC LAW 845) AND 1956 (PUBLIC LAW 660) ACTS

The principal programs under the 1948 act, together with the improvements effected by the 1956 act, and a statement of the record of accomplishments in their administration is set forth below.

1. Collection and dissemination of information

Public Law 845 directed the Surgeon General to prepare and publish reports of studies, research, etc., made under the act. Public Law 660 broadened this duty to cover the collection and dissemination of all information, including basic data on chemical, physical, and biological water quality, relating to water pollution and its prevention and control.

A national water quality network was established in 1957 to determine present pollution conditions and long-term trends in water quality improvement or deterioration. Seventy-two of the projected 300 sampling stations needed to provide reasonable water quality intelligence on interstate streams have been established, and results are evaluated and published annually.

National inventories of municipal and industrial waste facilities have been published and scheduled for updating at 5-year intervals. An inventory of municipal water supplies in communities of over 25,000 population has been published and one for communities under 25,000 population is nearly completed. These are scheduled for updating at 5- and 2-year intervals respectively. These inventories show status and needs for water supply and waste treatment facilities. Contract award data are collected and published annually and serve as a measure of progress in meeting needs. Basic data are being recorded by modern machine tabulating methods to be quickly available to water resources agencies and others.

2. Research

Authority was conferred by Public Law 845 for undertaking and supporting research in problems of water pollution control with emphasis on industrial waste.

Although resources were limited under Public Law 845, several research breakthroughs were made. An example is the development of the sewage oxidation pond which has proved to be an efficient but inexpensive sewage treatment method for the smaller municipalities and communities. Other examples are the development of the dissolved oxygen analyzer and the carbon filter technique. The former is the first continuous recording instrument of its kind, vitally needed in stream studies and surveillance. The latter technique has greatly helped to further our knowledge of minute quantities of new organic pollutants in water. Industrial waste guides were prepared for major industries for their use in water pollution prevention and control.

Public Law 660 broadened the authority to conduct and support research by including prevention as well as control of water pollution and by adding authority to make grants for research and training projects and demonstrations to public and private agencies including universities and other qualified institutions and to establish and maintain research fellowships.

The water supply and water pollution research program has been substantially expanded under Public Law 660. Significant progress has been made through the application of the engineering, chemistry, physics, microbiological, biological, and related sciences to the problems of water supply and pollution control. An example is a greatly enlarged arsenal of tools now available for detecting new synthetic contaminants and their pollution characteristics and effects. Another is the initiation of a major research effort to develop entirely new processes for removing much more of the pollutants from waste waters than is possible by existing methods. The success of this latter project is of utmost importance with respect to the problem of increasing pollution and the need to reuse water over and over to supply demands.

3. Technical assistance

Authority was conferred by Public Law 845 for giving technical assistance to State and interstate water pollution control agencies.

The program of technical assistance to State and interstate agencies took the form of stream surveys, biological investigations, special studies of industrial wastes, solution of complex pollution problems, and the loan of engineering specialists to States to assist in water resources studies.

Public Law 660 broadened the authority for technical assistance to State and interstate agencies to include authority to provide training in technical matters, and to make grants-in-aid to public and private agencies for training and demonstration projects, and to contract with these agencies for such projects.

Technical assistance to State and interstate agencies has been widely expanded under Public Law 660, including technical training of their personnel. With the improved State programs that have been strengthened by Federal program grants, it has been possible for the Public Health Service to put more of its resources into the larger problems requiring assistance. These projects have included full-scale river studies, laboratory evaluations, special industrial waste studies, and assignment of specialized technical personnel to water pollution control agencies.

4. Program grants

Authority was conferred by Public Law 845 for assistance to State and interstate water pollution control agencies in the form of grants for industrial waste studies. Under Public Law 845, the appropriation authorization was limited to $1 million per annum and funds were made available only for fiscal years 1950, 1951, and 1952.

Public Law 660 recast and broadened this authority to make grants for 5 years to State and interstate agencies to assist them in meeting costs of establishing and maintaining adequate water pollution prevention and control programs including cost of training personnel and administration of programs in accordance with effective, comprehensive plans, subject to review and approval by the Surgeon General. The annual appropriation authorization was increased from $1 million to $3 million.

Program grants to State and interstate agencies have served the purpose of improving and strengthening their water pollution control programs, and stimulating increased State appropriations. Since 1956 the level of State appropriations has increased from $4.2 million to $7.6 million for fiscal year 1960. Federal appropriations for this purpose were $2 million in fiscal year 1957 and have been $3 million each for fiscal years 1958, 1959, and 1960.

State and interstate agencies have increased their technical and supporting staffs by nearly 50 percent. They have been able to initiate or expand pollution surveys, research, basic data collection, and more aggressive enforcement of State laws. Grants have made possible the purchase of major items of field and laboratory equipment needed to support the expanding programs.

5. Construction grants

Authority was conferred by Public Law 845 to make loans to States and municipalities to help finance the construction of sewage treatment plants.

In one respect Public Law 660 went beyond the recommendations of the administration by providing for Federal grants to localities to pay part of the cost of constructing municipal sewage treatment works. This construction grants program supplanted the loan program in the 1948 act for which no funds had ever been appropriated by the Congress.

As of March 31, 1960, a total of 2,082 Federal grant offers to municipalities have been made in support of projects costing an estimated $1.016 billion. The Federal grant offers totaled $175 million contrasted with local commitments of $841 million, showing a local-to-Federal dollar participation ratio of 4.8 to 1.

6. Comprehensive planning

Authority was conferred by Public Law 845 and continued by Public Law 660 for the development of comprehensive plans for water pollution control by major water drainage basins in cooperation with State and interstate agencies, municipalities and industries.

Under Public Law 845 the Public Health Service published 71 water pollution control program reports on river basins that were cooperatively prepared with the appropriate State agencies. These reports covered all of the major drainage basins of the country and are serving as the framework for the development of comprehensive water pollution control plans.

Under Public Law 660 the Public Health Service has expanded its initiation of major special project activities and initiated the development of comprehensive water pollution control plans. An expansion of these important activities had been recommended strongly by committees advisory to the Public Health Service and by supporters of water pollution control.

At present 24 special projects are under way and these studies cover such problems as land management practices affecting water quality, the effect of water resource projects and other construction on water quality and use, insecticide hazards, water evaporation control, radioactive pollution, development of master regional plans for water supply and waste disposal, and many others.

In addition, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has agreed with the Department of the Army to cooperate in the administration of the Water Supply Act of 1958 by determining municipal and industrial water supply requirements over the next 50 years and the economic value thereof in connection with authorized Corps of Engineer construction projects. Ten requests for such determinations have been complied with and work in connection with 46 other construction projects is proceeding.

7. Interstate compacts

Authority was conferred by Public Law 845 and continued by Public Law 660 to promote

interstate cooperation in water pollution control through encouragement of interstate compacts.

Technical assistance has been given in the development, negotiation, and consideration by the Congress of seven interstate compacts, as follows:

Water Pollution Compacts

Klamath River Basin compact—California and Oregon. Congressional approval, Public Law 85–222, August 30, 1957.

Tennessee River Basin compact—States eligible: Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. States which have enacted the compact: Tennessee, Mississippi, and Kentucky. Congressional approval, Public Law 85–734, August 28, 1958.

Columbia interstate compact—States eligible: Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. Still in process of negotiation. Latest proposal is to emphasize water pollution control.

Water Resources Compacts With Minor Provisions on Water Pollution Control

Bear River compact—Idaho, Utah, and Wyoming. Congressional approval, Public Law 85–348, March 17, 1958.

Wabash Valley compact—Indiana and Illinois. Congressional approval, Public Law 86–375, September 23, 1959.

Northeastern water and related land resources compact—States eligible: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont. States which have enacted the compact: Rhode Island, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire. Bills for congressional approval introduced in this session.

Great Lakes Basin compact—Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. New York and Ohio have not yet enacted the compact. Bills for congressional approval pending in this session.

8. Improvement of State laws

Authority was conferred by Public Law 845 and continued by Public Law 660 to encourage the enactment of better State laws governing water pollution control.

In 1949 the Public Health Service developed a suggested model water pollution control law in cooperation with the Council of State Governments and with State and interstate water pollution authorities which was published in 1950. Its purpose was to encourage uniform State water pollution control legislation. While Public Law 845 was in effect, 28 States passed new legislation or modified existing statutes; 7 more States have taken such action since Public Law 660 was enacted.

9. Research and training facility

Authority was conferred by Public Law 845 for the construction of facilities for research and study of water pollution and training of personnel for water pollution control work.

The Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center was completed and placed in operation in 1953. It is the largest and finest research facility of its kind in the world.

10. Advisory board

A water pollution control advisory board was established within the Public Health Service by Public Law 845 to review its policies and programs under the act and to make recommendations to the Surgeon General. The board has held seven meetings since being reconstituted under Public Law 660 and has made many substantive recommendations to the Surgeon General and a report to the President in 1958. Its next meeting is scheduled to be held at the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati.

Measures Against Pollution of Interstate Waters

In addition to the principal programs discussed above, both Public Law 845 and Public Law 660 established a role for the Federal Government to take action to abate pollution of interstate waters.

The enforcement provisions of Public Law 845 were considered to be so weak as to be ineffective, and opinion corroborated in the statement of the House Appropriations Committee in 1955 when funds for enforcement activities were denied. Indeed, only one enforcement action was undertaken under Public Law 845 when, on the basis of surveys, findings and reports, and informal requests for assistance from the State water pollution control agencies of Arkansas and Louisiana, the Surgeon General initiated enforcement action in the Corney River Basin involving these two States. Although this case was successfully completed under the provisions of Public Law 845 in 1957, this result was doubtless somewhat induced by the enactment of the new enforcement provisions of Public Law 660.

In Public Law 660 the provisions dealing with the Federal enforcement role were revised to make more effective the Federal role in abating interstate pollution. An accelerated interstate enforcement program was initiated under Public Law 660. Enforcement actions have been taken in 11 interstate pollution situations, 7 on the Surgeon General's initiative and 4 at the request of 1 or more States, and these required 11 formal conferences and 2 public hearings. These actions were taken to abate pollution in 4,000 miles of interstate streams. It is estimated that the remedial measures agreed upon at the conferences and required by findings of the public hearings will include the construction of at least $500 million worth of waste treatment facilities.

Detailed Statement of Legislative Recommendations

Now, after more than 3 years of operating experience under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, we have certain suggestions and modifications which would further improve the program.

To strengthen State and interstate water pollution control programs

Section 5 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act authorizes appropriation of sums up to $3 million annually, for a period of 5 years, for grants to State or interstate water pollution control agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of water pollution. Authority for appropriation of these grant funds expires on June 30, 1961.

As we have stated earlier, in the almost 4 years these Federal grants have been in operation they have stimulated and encouraged significant progress in State and interstate water pollution control programs. Among the effects of these grants on State programs have been increased appropriations, technical and supporting staff, water quality monitoring activities (including some radiological surveillance now performed by about half the States), stepped-up enforcement, and expanded research.

Despite this progress, the current State and interstate expenditure rate of $10.6 million (inclusive of Federal grant funds) must be increased in order to make a significant impact on the Nation's pollution problem in the next decade. Lack of current data on the condition of waters in most of the States, information on industrial wastes, and new control techniques, as well as the qualified personnel to carry them out, remain serious problems.

Continued Federal financial support of State and interstate water pollution control programs is essential to consolidate and build upon the gains stimulated by the first 5 years of the grant program. Withdrawal of this support would be detrimental to the cooperative Federal, State and interstate water pollution control effort; assurance, at this time, of continued support after June 30, 1961, would facilitate State planning for effective control programs. We therefore recommend amendment of section 5(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to extend for another 5 years the appropriation authority for State and interstate agency program grants.

To make more effective assistance to municipalities in the construction of necessary sewage treatment works

In order to facilitate multimunicipal projects, we recommend an amendment to section 6 (which authorizes grants to a State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for the construction of necessary sewage treatment works), to apply the present ceiling of 30 percent of the estimated cost of a project, or $250,000, separately in the case of a project serving more than one municipality, to each municipality's share of such project (as determined by the Surgeon General on a reasonable and equitable basis).

We also suggest amendment of subsection (c) of section 6 to permit reallocation of construction grant funds that are not obligated for the construction of approved projects within 18 months. The proposal is that these funds would then be reallotted to States which were in a position to go forward (during the 6 months that the grant funds remained available) with projects that had been approved by the State water pollution control agency. Such reallocation authority would improve the construction grant program by assuring use of the full amount appropriated for this purpose each year.

To provide for more effective prevention and control of water pollution caused by Federal installations

Section 9 of the present act gives congressional recognition to the importance of cooperation on the part of Federal installations in preventing or controlling pollution of waters into which such installations discharge polluting matter. In order to emphasize congressional endorsement of the policy that the Federal Government should participate fully and responsibility in cases where the enforcement provisions of the Federal act are invoked, it is recommended that section 9 of the act be amended to provide that summaries of conferences prepared pursuant to section 8(c)(3) shall include references to discharges from Federal installations, that notices of hearings pursuant to section 8(e) shall be sent to Federal agencies having jurisdiction over any property involved, and that findings and recommendations of the hearing board shall also include references to discharges from Federal property which are contributing to pollution found by the boards.

To strengthen the role of the Federal Government in abating pollution of interstate waters

We have carried out the enforcement provisions authorized by section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in a vigorous manner and are happy to report that the results of this Federal-State water pollution control activity have been gratifying. Many complex problems of long duration have proved amenable to solution by the enforcement procedure provided by the Federal act. Based on experience with this procedure, we recommend strengthening these enforcement provisions.

The enforcement procedures outlined in section 8 of the act provide a mechanism for bringing into play the combined strengths of State water pollution control

agencies, interstate agencies, and the Federal Government. In harmony with the policy declaration of the act, this Federal-State cooperative enforcement program is characterized by its use of conferences and public hearings to achieve full investigation and a thorough understanding by all interested agencies of the nature and extent of pollution problems and the remedial action required. Ample opportunity for action by State control agencies is provided for at appropriate stages of these procedures.

These procedures are now authorized only for cases of pollution which are damaging to health or welfare of persons in a State other than a State of origin, and they can be set in motion either by the Surgeon General, on his own initiative, or by a request addressed to the Surgeon General by a State Governor, or a State water pollution control agency.

Our first recommendation for the amendment of section 8 would make these procedures available also whenever there is pollution affecting legitimate uses of the waters of any navigable interstate stream, whether or not there is interstate pollution. Federal jurisdiction in this kind of pollution situation, however, would be exercised only upon request by the State (or, as explained below, a municipality) and then only when the interference with legitimate uses is judged to be of sufficient significance to require the initiation of enforcement procedures. Such an extension of Federal authority could serve to improve serious pollution situations which are also of great national importance although not endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates. Inclusion of navigable interstate waters within the scope of the water pollution enforcement procedures is consistent with constitutional authority over these waterways.

Our second recommendation for improving enforcement procedures is to provide a mechanism for the initiation of such procedures by a municipality adversely affected by pollution. This avenue for remedial action should, however, we believe, be limited to situations in which the Governor or State water pollution control agency has concurred in the municipality's request to the Surgeon General. Statutory recognition of the vital interests of municipalities in pollution abatement problems—and of the propriety of their setting in motion all the normal Federal-State enforcement procedures—would encourage active participation by municipal government agencies without detracting from the responsibilities of State pollution control agencies. Accordingly, with that qualification of State concurrence, we recommend inclusion of the governing bodies of municipalities in section 8(c), which specifies the agencies which may request action by the Surgeon General.

In addition, we recommend clarifying and strengthening the Secretary's role in the enforcement process by providing that the findings and recommendations of the hearing boards (after the public hearing now authorized by section 8) shall be the Secretary's findings and recommendations except to the extent modified by him and by providing for issuance of an order (instead of a notice) by him for abatement of any pollution found to exist. To afford adequate protection for the parties in interest, provision is made for appeal from the order to be taken within 60 days to the U.S. Court of Appeals; the court's review would be on the record and these provisions of the draft bill are consistent with the judicial review provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. Jurisdiction of civil actions brought by the Attorney General, at the request of the Secretary, to enforce any order issued by the Secretary or by a U.S. Court of Appeals would be vested in the U.S. district courts.

Finally, the draft bill would amend the definition of "interstate waters" in section 11(e) of the present act so as to include all waters which flow across or form a part of State boundaries. Coastal waters would be specifically included within the definition.

The draft bill would also amend section 12 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to mention specifically the Atomic Energy Commission as one of the Federal agencies whose functions with respect to water pollution would not be superseded or limited by the act.

I would appreciate it if you would be good enough to refer the enclosed draft bill to the appropriate committee for consideration.

In compliance with Public Law 801, 84th Congress, there is enclosed a statement of cost estimates and personnel requirements which would be entailed by enactment of the proposed legislation.

Bureau of Budget advises that enactment of this legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Secretary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3575. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to eliminate any discrimination against married female employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 3576. A bill for the relief of Imre Tokodi, Piroska Tokodi, and Eva Tokodi; and

S. 3577. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Clemente; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIRS AND EXPOSITIONS

Mr. JAVITS submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 106) concerning increased participation in international trade fairs and expositions, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

UNITED STATES V. LOUIS SHOMER—APPEARANCE OF CERTAIN SENATE EMPLOYEES AS WITNESSES

Mr. MANSFIELD, for Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported three original resolutions, which were considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 322. Resolution to authorize Elizabeth McGill, chief clerk of the Juvenile Delinquent Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, to testify and produce certain records in the Federal court in the case of *U.S.* v. *Louis Shomer;*

S. Res. 323. Resolution to authorize Joseph A. Davis, chief clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary, to testify and produce certain records in the Federal court in the case of *U.S.* v. *Louis Shomer;* and

S. Res. 324. Resolution to authorize Peter N. Chumbris, minority clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary, to testify in the Federal court in the case of *U.S.* v. *Louis Shomer.*

EXPOSITIONS FOR PEACE PROGRAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be brief. I know Members of the Senate are anxious to pay tribute to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. President, I am today introducing, for appropriate reference, proposed legislation which would provide for a sharp increase in the number of trade fairs held in the United States and for much greater U.S. participation in foreign-trade exhibits, as part of a new program called expositions for peace. The number of trade fairs in which the United States would take part during the next 18 months under the bill could be expanded from about 50, as presently planned, to at least 80, while the number of foreign nations—about 25—expected to participate in three or four major U.S. fairs would be doubled, so that 50 foreign countries would exhibit in large and small fairs across the United States.

The reciprocal nature of the fairs would be advanced by permitting counterpart funds to be used to defray some of the costs incurred outside the United States by foreign governments in connection with their participation in trade, industrial, agricultural, horticultural, and scientific fairs and exhibits staged in this country.

The introduction of the proposed legislation comes during the week which President Eisenhower has proclaimed World Trade Week, immediately after the successful conclusion of the World Trade Fair at New York City's Coliseum, which had some 3,000 exhibits displaying goods from 65 foreign countries.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3573) to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to provide for the further use of foreign currencies acquired thereunder for certain foreign expenses requisite to participation by foreign nations in trade fairs in the United States, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, since 1954, when President Eisenhower launched U.S. participation in foreign trade fairs, U.S. exhibits have scored some notable successes—most recently in New Delhi at the agricultural fair which the President visited. There has been a significant strengthening of cultural and economic ties between us and the people of the host nation, while displays of U.S. goods have testified to our dedication to peaceful pursuits and higher standards of living for peoples in less developed areas.

We have already crossed the threshold into a new era in world trade, when U.S. businessmen must pioneer new outlets for their goods abroad, develop new products to attract oversea customers and actively support world trade in the United States and abroad which can help us to retain our status as the great common marketplace for the free world.

The key to the vast expansion of trade opportunities so necessary to sustain economic growth in industrialized and less developed nations is a new program of expositions for peace, dependent upon the legislation I am proposing today. The resolution has four main objectives: First, to step up U.S. participation and encourage individuals and businesses to take part in the various types of fairs and expositions provided for in the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 and in the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; second, to increase the number of U.S. trade fairs and expositions and encourage foreign exhibitors to arrange displays on a reciprocal basis, by making available to them technical, administrative, and financial assistance in part financed by counterpart funds; third, to encourage much more extensive participation in these fairs by U.S. labor-management, consumers, investors, and farmers; fourth, to use U.S.-owned foreign currencies resulting from mutual security and agricultural trade development programs to promote more expositions for peace at home and abroad.

Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 106) concerning increased participation in international trade fairs and expositions, submitted by Mr. JAVITS, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas increased trade among nations is the key to sustained economic growth both for the industrialized and the less developed countries;

Whereas the export trade of the United States represents a vital and necessary part of our economy and increased exports are vital for the elimination of the international balance of payments deficit which the United States is presently experiencing;

Whereas international trade fairs have contributed greatly to the economic, and cultural ties among nations, have made the peoples of the world better acquainted with each others' productive capacity and economic capabilities and have strengthened communications and understanding among them;

Whereas exhibitions at trade fairs abroad, supported in part by the Government of the United States, have helped greatly to project our true image to foreign peoples, proven important forces in the promotion of understanding, and contributed substantially to the growth of trade between the United States and foreign nations; and

Whereas there is substantial room for the expansion of these efforts for the increased promotion of U.S. products abroad and the products of friendly foreign nations here, and for U.S. participation in foreign trade fairs and the establishment of foreign trade fairs in this country, for the promotion of peace and economic well-being for all the peoples of the world; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), that it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the President of the United States, acting through the Departments of State and Commerce and through such other agencies as he may deem appropriate, should provide for increased participation by the United States and by U.S. individuals and businesses in international trade fairs and expositions abroad, including trade, industrial, agricultural, horticultural, and scientific fairs, expositions, and exhibits, participation in which is provided for in the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956, as amended, and in the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (Public Law 480, 83d Congress);

(2) encouragement be given to the increased establishment of trade fairs, expositions, and exhibits in the United States by foreign governments, businesses, and other foreign exhibitors on a reciprocal basis, by making available to them technical, administrative, and financial assistance through our missions abroad and through the appropriate use of any U.S. owned foreign currencies counterpart funds which may be available for such purposes;

(3) U.S. business (including labor-management, consumers, investors, and farmers) both for the promotion of its own economic well-being and for the further dissemination of the benefits of the free enterprise system, should participate in an increased extent in such international fairs, expositions, and exhibits; and

(4) the development of such international trade fairs and expositions and exhibits, both in the United States and abroad, should receive support through the use of U.S. owned foreign currency funds to the greatest extent compatible with other requirements for such currencies so that these funds, resulting from mutual security and agricultural trade development programs, may result in continually increased trade opportunities and thus continually increased economic well-being for all the nations of the world.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the amendment I am introducing is to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 and would authorize the use of some of the hundreds of millions of dollars in counterpart funds now held in 60 countries to help defray costs requisite to participation in the fairs by foreign nations and other foreign exhibitors.

The balance of payments deficit of $7 billion run up by the United States in the past 2 years came as an unexpected shock to many American businesses accustomed to discounting their foreign competitors. Their reaction was quick, and so far this year U.S. exports are running ahead of our sales abroad in early 1959—but so are U.S. imports. We do not have a monopoly on ingenuity, new production methods, or attractive consumer items, but neither do our competitors monopolize initiative and good salesmanship.

If under the expositions for peace program, the United States participated in some 80 to 90 international fairs in the next 18 months instead of in some 50 exhibits as now planned, the increased promotion and sales of U.S. products abroad notwithstanding the increased sales here of goods from friendly foreign nations would furnish much needed assurance that our imbalance in international payments will be reduced.

A primary U.S. foreign policy objective is to prevent the spread of communism into the free world's less developed areas, and it is their young industries which often have a very hard time selling in foreign markets. The Soviet bloc is competing actively in trade fairs, having participated in 433 exhibits in more than 50 countries of the free world between 1957 and 1959, with the emphasis on expansion. From 123 fairs in 40 countries 3 years ago, the bloc went to 133 fairs in the same number of countries in 1958 and to 177 fairs in 51 countries last year.

It is very important to us that the citizens of the less developed areas of the free world utilize the machinery of the private enterprise system to develop their economies so they can provide decent living standards for the average individual and family. What better showcase can we find for the products of the U.S. private enterprise system than in international trade fairs on both sides of the Iron Curtain? And what better showcase can we provide the less developed nations than the display of their products in the United States, partially financed through the use of counterpart funds? Businessmen from every State and almost every nation can come to buy, to sell, to see new goods, to get new merchandising ideas, and to form new associations as these expositions spur foreign trade and foster international peace and good will.

Mr. President, I conclude upon this note: We have all been deeply moved by the situation in Paris and the breakup of the Summit Conference. I, for one, feel we are going to do two things now. First, we shall strengthen the United Nations and make it the forum for world negotiation which must now ensue. Second, we shall integrate the free world in a far more active and vigorous way than we have before.

I consider this effort in respect to trade fairs, Mr. President, to be a very important aspect to our program; a very important aspect of our new export drive, signaled by President Eisenhower; a very important aspect in regard to redressing our imbalance of international payments. A demonstration of U.S. progress, I believe, is the only thing which will convince the Communist leadership of the Kremlin of the fact that the vital, dynamic, and successful character of the free world system makes it the superior system, and that if the Communists do not negotiate with us in an honest and sincere way what will happen is that their system rather than ours will go by the board.

DEFINITION OF TERM "VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES"—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of of the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG] be added as an additional cosponsor at the next printing of the bill (S. 2201) to amend section 601 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration facilities," introduced by me (for myself and Mr. GRUENING) on June 17, 1959.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON EASTPORT HARBOR, MAINE (S. DOC. NO. 98)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated May 6, 1960, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on Eastport Harbor, Maine, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted December 6, 1950.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate Document, with an illustration, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, will return today from the summit conference to a united Nation. I wish to pay tribute to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have contributed to this unity, for it means strength for our country.

I wish to join with millions of Americans everywhere in commending President Eisenhower for his steadfastness and his devotion to truth and principle. His leadership is appreciated by freemen everywhere.

To my mind the summit conference proved four things:

First. That it is far better for a conference to reach no agreement than to reach an agreement that is wrong in principle and that would jeopardize the future of our Republic.

Second. That the American people are alert as well as united; that they will back to the limit a Government that stands for principle.

Third. That Khrushchev is now known to the whole world for what he is—the ruthless leader of a godless ideology.

Fourth. These recent events have also proven that communism has not changed.

Father James Keller, the founder of the Christophers, in his valuable book, "Three Minutes a Day," carries this bit of history that should never be forgotten:

"War is inevitable" were the strong words used by Dimitri Manuilsky, when he addressed the students of the Lenin School of Political Warfare in 1930.

His dire forecast continued:

Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years.

In order to win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep, so we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record.

"There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalistic countries—stupid and decadent—will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends.

"As soon as their guard is down we shall smash them with our clenched fists."

Father Keller went on to say:

This terrifying statement merits much thought, prayer, and action. Do something constructive to strengthen every weakness and thus prevent catastrophe.

VICE PRESIDENT RICHARD NIXON

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in the U.S. News & World Report for May 16 is an excellent interview with the Vice President of the United States, RICHARD NIXON, on how he has discharged the expanded and expanding duties of his office in the administration of President Eisenhower.

I think it may be said in all truth that never in the long history of our country has a Vice President been given the multitudinous responsibilities which Vice President NIXON has been given these last 7 and more years.

I would wish to add that never has a Vice President more diligently or more honorably discharged those duties. Never has one more faithfully served the President with whom he has held office as Vice President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the interview with Vice President NIXON be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIXON'S OWN STORY OF 7 YEARS IN THE VICE-PRESIDENCY—EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW ON HOW A VICE PRESIDENT FOR THE FIRST TIME IN HISTORY SERVES AS THE PRESIDENT'S DEPUTY

(Here, from the Vice President himself, are the inside facts on the country's No. 2 job, and the change that has taken place in that job during the Eisenhower administration. The extent to which a Vice President today participates in executive work has never before been revealed. What it all means, now and for future Vice Presidents, is disclosed in impromptu answers to questions in this exclusive interview.)

Question. Mr. Vice President, are you the first among American Vice Presidents to play a major role in the day-to-day operations of Government?

Answer. It is the first time a Vice President has had these responsibilities in this magnitude. In the previous administration, Vice President Barkley was a member of the National Security Council by law, as I am, and I understand he was also invited to attend Cabinet meetings.

In administrations before that, there were occasions when the Vice President was invited to attend Cabinet meetings as well as other gatherings, as the President then in office saw fit.

President Eisenhower has made it a rule of his administration that the Vice President shall attend all Cabinet meetings, all Security Council meetings and all meetings of the legislative leaders. In fact, he also includes any other meetings at the White House which might affect overall policy.

Question. What has been the President's reason for this?

Answer. I think the reason was perhaps best stated by him when I met him for the first time after he had approved my selection as Vice President. I remember in 1952 going from the Stock Yards Inn at Chicago, near the convention hall, to the Blackstone Hotel, where I talked with General Eisenhower. He said he had submitted a list of names to his close advisers and they recommended that I be selected as the vice-presidential nominee. He said that he approved of their decision and paid me the courtesy of asking if I would accept the nomination if it were offered. I indicated that I would.

Mr. Eisenhower then said that he wanted me to know that he did not want the Vice President in his administration to be merely a figurehead, handling protocol matters and, as he said, "pounding the gavel in the Senate." He said he felt it was vitally important, based on his experience in command of military enterprises in years past, that a deputy, who might at any time go into the top position, should always be completely informed on existing policies. He said, therefore, that he wanted to be sure that I participated in the meetings where policy was developed during the course of his administration, and that I would have assignments which would prepare me for the possibility that I might have to assume the highest office.

Question. Was the President concerned about continuity of policy in case anything should happen to him?

Answer. I think this was perhaps the primary reason. For example, I remember in this same conversation—and, incidentally, this shows that he is a student of political history in this country—he indicated that Mr. Truman was not informed on many of the basic and important decisions which had been made by President Roosevelt and which Mr. Truman had to execute on assuming office. Mr. Eisenhower said be believed it vitally important that this should never occur again.

So I would say his first reason was to see that, if the Vice President should have to assume the office of the Presidency, he would be prepared to do so.

I think he had a second reason, too. In the same conversation, he said that the Vice President, who is the only man in the Government elected by all the people other than the President, simply should not be wasted in a purely ceremonial position.

In other words, Mr. Eisenhower has always felt that it is important to make use of the talents of people within his official family to the greatest extent possible.

Question. Broadly speaking, what percent of your time is spent in executive work?

Answer. I would say at least 90 percent—and while the Senate is not in session, of course, 100 percent.

Question. Does your day end at any particular time? Are there sometimes night sessions at the White House, too?

Answer. Yes. If you were to include the evenings, I spend 95 percent of my time on executive assignments.

Let me put it in terms of hours: I would say that, on the average, the amount of time I spend presiding over the Senate is a half hour to an hour a day—that is, out of a 14-hour day.

I should add that I have other functions which keep me at the Capitol. I have meetings with legislative leaders, with Senators and Congressmen, and with various people who are interested in legislation.

These functions are related both to my legislative and executive duties. But as for presiding over the Senate itself, the only constitutional duty the Vice President has, I should say that perhaps no more than at the maximum 10 percent, and usually around 5 percent, of a Vice President's time is spent in that fashion.

Question. Do you have time to do this executive work?

Answer. I certainly have. As a matter of fact, I would say the Vice Presidency, if it did not include executive assignments, would be the dullest office that I can conceive of.

Question. When you talk about doing executive work, what do you mean?

Answer. Well, perhaps we could separate it in terms, first, of meetings. On the average, I have three formal meetings a week at the

White House: These are the Cabinet meeting, the National Security Council meeting, and the meeting with the legislative leaders. These meetings usually take approximately 2 hours. While they do not take place every week, when Congress is in session they are held more often than not.

As a matter of fact, I had my office do a tabulation of the meetings that I have attended since January 1953 as recorded in my daily calendar. I have attended 173 meetings that the President has had with legislative leaders, and presided over 2 of those. I have attended 217 meetings of the National Security Council and presided over 26 of those. I have attended 163 meetings of the Cabinet and presided over 19 Cabinet meetings.

Now, in addition to such meetings, there are occasions when I see the President alone, and other occasions when I attend informal meetings in his office with selected Cabinet members or other associates within the administration. In addition, I, of course, have meetings with Cabinet officers and other Government officials on specific legislation that may be under consideration at a particular time.

Question. Would you say that the bulk of your executive work is attending meetings?

Answer. I would say the rule in Government is about the same as it is in business or any other kind of activity. For every hour that you attend a meeting, you spend at least 2 hours preparing for it or executing the decisions made at a meeting.

For example, the meetings of the National Security Council require studying the intelligence reports before the meetings are held, and also consulting with various members of the Security Council with regard to decisions that are pending and with regard to carrying out decisions that are made.

Question. Do you have access to highly classified material?

Answer. Virtually all the material before the Security Council is confidential or secret in classification. For example, every morning my assistant for National Security Council affairs, Brigadier General Cushman, puts on my desk the intelligence reports from the day before from all over the world. I read these reports every day, whether there is a Security Council meeting planned or not. And I read an additional, more comprehensive, report on the mornings that the Security Council meetings are actually held.

Question. Do these reports give you a picture, so to speak, day after day and week after week of what is happening?

Answer. I get a picture not only of what is happening around the world, but, in addition to that, every morning I receive an up-to-date summary report of all actions being taken by various Government agencies affecting domestic affairs—for example, from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce—from every one of the Government agencies in which decisions have been made.

By reading these reports, and by reading the classified reports on international affairs, I am thereby able to talk with Members of the Congress with whom I may meet during the day or members of the press with whom I might have appointments, with some degree of knowledge as to what the facts are affecting a particular question.

STUDYING WORLD PROBLEMS

Question. Have you been given an insight into current developments in the world?

Answer. Yes. There is no question about that. For example, during the recent Korean crisis I received daily reports as the crisis developed.

This is true of all the various problems around the world. To the extent that intelligence information is available, I am able to keep abreast of world developments on a broad basis.

Question. How does what you have learned day by day differ from what comes out in the press either concurrently or later on?

Answer. The difference necessarily is that what comes out in the press contains no classified information. The reports that I read, for example, go into such classified matters as an ambassador's appraisal of the motives and the personal backgrounds of the various world leaders.

Such opinions could never be made public, of course, because, if they were critical, that would immediately make an ambassador persona non grata.

It is this kind of reporting that is extremely valuable in giving the President, or me, or anybody else who has access to such information, the kind of background that enables us to comment with balance and judgment on world affairs. You must know of the forces behind the action that we might be taking, or that another government might be taking, in a particular case.

Question. Would you say that your experience has given you an understanding of this country's relationships with other governments?

Answer. I think there is no question about that, and I think it is vitally important that the Vice President in future administrations be given the same opportunity that I have had in this respect.

Question. How about domestic problems? How do you become informed on them?

Answer. Well, this is very easy to explain. All that I do is simply call a Cabinet officer on the telephone, if he has jurisdiction over the matter, and either discuss it with him by telephone or go to his office or have him come to mine to discuss it. In some instances, I have one of the members of my staff get the information directly from him.

I should add that, in addition to these formal meetings to which I referred earlier, informal meetings of this type are far greater in number, of course, and consume more time than all the formal meetings put together.

Question. How many countries have you visited as Vice President?

Answer. A total of 54 in all.

Question. Were those visits usually related to some objective in foreign policy?

Answer. In some cases, yes. In other cases, the President felt that the trip would be helpful in establishing better communication between the leaders of those countries and the American Government.

For example, the first trip I took abroad to Asia, in 1953, covered 20 countries in Asia and southeast Asia. It lasted 70 days, and it proved to be very helpful in obtaining for the President direct information from the leaders of those countries with regard to their attitudes toward our policies, their criticisms—where they did have criticisms—of our personnel or of programs that we might be following.

After that trip and after each other trip that I have taken abroad, I have made recommendations to the President. Some went to him alone, others went to the State Department, with the President being informed and approving, and some were made in reports that I gave to the National Security Council. These recommendations have dealt with a number of issues.

In some instances, in the case of the State Department, I have dealt specifically with the problem of personnel. After my visit to Africa, for example, I came back convinced that we were not assigning enough high-quality personnel to the African area. I believe that the most important and explosive area, as far as the outcome of the world struggle is concerned in the next 10 years, will be Africa. There, 26 nations will be independent by about 1970.

At the time I visited Africa in 1957, it was, with some exceptions, a low-priority area in terms of the general quality of personnel assigned there. When I came back, I said that it was time we began to recognize that, while the African posts were difficult in many instances and would have to be classified as hardship posts, we should be sending our best people there. We should not be sending less-experienced people who, after service there, are promoted to easier and presumably more important posts in Europe.

I feel that the recommendations I made on Africa did have a very salutary effect. Today the State Department and other agencies have not only upgraded the importance of our African posts, but, in addition, we have an African desk in the Department—something we did not have until the year 1958.

Question. You've gone all around the world—have you been to every continent?

Answer. I've been to every continent—to Africa, to Asia, to South America, and, of course, to the Soviet Union and Europe.

After I visited Austria to investigate the Hungarian-refugee situation, I was able to make some recommendations with regard to bringing Hungarian refugees into this country on a more liberal basis than we had been following.

When I was in Central America in 1955, I saw that the Inter-American Highway was being built in a disgracefully inefficient way. Because of the way Congress was dribbling out the funds, it would not be completed for 25 years and, by that time, the parts of the road built first would already be practically useless because of the need for repairs. I made recommendations at that point that we should step up the allocation of funds to the highway to complete it in 3 to 4 years at the most, because in the end this would not only be more economical but it would also open the way for communications among and between the Central American countries and the United States. My recommendation was approved.

Had the trip not been taken, this probably would not have been done. So here is an indication of what a Vice President, or any other visitor from the official family, can accomplish.

Question. How many miles would you say you have traveled outside the United States while you have been Vice President?

Answer. Approximately 160,000 miles.

Question. Is that a record for a public official?

Answer. No, I would say that Secretary Dulles had a considerable bulge on me in travel abroad. And I might say he was a very remarkable man to be able to travel as he did and withstand it as well as he did. I am considerably younger than he was, and, despite the fact that my travel was not nearly as extensive, I sometimes wondered after I finished my trips how he was able to travel even farther and without showing any physical strain.

HOW TRIPS WERE PLANNED

Question. How can you, as Vice President, act as an emissary of the President abroad and not come in conflict with responsibilities of the Secretary of State?

Answer. This question is extremely important, and I would like to emphasize that I have taken no trips abroad which have not been approved by the Secretary of State. They were all approved by Secretary Dulles, and then, after his death, by Secretary Herter.

A Vice President, or any other Government official, cannot be useful in such trips unless he works in close cooperation with the Secretary of State. It would be very detrimental to U.S. foreign policy to have a Vice President go in and, in effect, undercut the Secretary of State in his primary responsibility for U.S. foreign policy. I have had no difficulty in this respect, because my relation with the Secretaries of State, both Mr. Dulles and Mr. Herter, has been not

only friendly but one of complete cooperation. They welcomed these trips that I have taken, and, as a matter of fact, in every instance they joined with the President in urging me to go.

Question. When you visited a country, was your position as Vice President regarded as higher than that of any Cabinet officer?

Answer. I cannot say that the position of Vice President was regarded as of greater importance. I will say, however, that the receptions that Mrs. Nixon and I have received abroad have been—with the exception of Venezuela's—extremely friendly. In effect, we have been accorded the same hospitality and the same respect that would have been accorded the President had he made the trip.

These countries all considered me the direct representative of the President and, in addition, the second-ranking elected official in the Nation. This meant that I had direct access to all the top officials of the governments, and the conversations I had were just as complete and frank, I believe, as would have been the case had the President himself been there.

VISITING WORLD LEADERS

Question. How many individual dignitaries have you talked with in the various countries?

Answer. I believe I have had extended discussions with some 35 presidents, 9 prime ministers, 5 kings, 2 emperors, and the Shah of Iran.

Question. Were officials in some countries complimented that an official as high ranking as the Nation's Vice President was sent to visit them?

Answer. That's exactly the point. The receptions were not just for me as an individual, but they were more for (1) the people of the United States, (2) for the President whom I represented, and (3) for the office which I held.

For example, when we visited Japan in 1953, there were more than a half million people on the streets of Tokyo when we came from the airport. This was repeated when we were in Manila for the 10th anniversary of the independence of the Philippines. President Magsaysay and I spoke together on that occasion, and the crowd in the great public square, where such meetings are held, was estimated at three-quarters of a million.

The most moving experience was when we came to Poland after our visit to Russia, and when, without any notice by the Government of the route we were going to take into the city—because they were making no effort to get out a crowd—over a quarter of a million people crowded the streets to welcome us.

I emphasize that these welcomes from the people were for the reasons that I mentioned above, and not personal in character.

But they do show that any Vice President of the United States who goes abroad representing the President can have a great impact upon the people of these countries and also will inevitably be received by the leaders of those countries in a way which will enable him to get information which can be very helpful in the development of foreign policy.

Question. In your trips abroad you could be called a special ambassador. How would you describe your role at home—that of an Assistant President or an Executive Vice President?

Answer. It's very difficult to classify the work by either of those terms. Let me put it this way: A Vice President of the United States can be only as effective as the President wants him to be. In other words, a Vice President has, except for his power to break a tie vote in the Senate, no power of his own.

I think perhaps the best way to classify the work of the Vice President domestically is that he serves as the deputy of the President and as the representative of the President. His position differs, however, from those of the members of the President's White House staff in this very important respect: The Vice President is an elected official of the Government. He has a position of political influence and political power that the appointed members of the White House staff lack completely and that members of the Cabinet generally do not have.

This means, therefore, that when the President gives the Vice President an assignment, the Vice President, with the President behind him, can exert more influence and can be more effective than a member of the White House staff or even a member of the Cabinet.

I go back to the settlement of the steel strike, for illustration. I am convinced, in this instance, the fact that I was Vice President and the fact that I was representing the President were decisive factors in enabling me to be the catalytic agent to bring the two parties together so that they would discuss this matter and eventually reach a settlement.

Had I simply been somebody from private life whom the President might have assigned to this responsibility, or somebody from his White House staff, I don't believe that the parties could have been brought together.

The fact that I was speaking for the President and the fact that I had the added official prestige of being Vice President in my own right formed a combination which was necessary in this instance, and probably decisive in bringing about the settlement.

Question. In the parliamentary system of government, is there some Cabinet member without portfolio who might fill the role you have come to fill?

Answer. We've often discussed such matters with members of foreign governments when I have visited other countries, but there are very few who have vice presidents, to begin with, and, second, in other forms of government there simply aren't offices that are similar to the Vice-Presidency. I suppose the closest parallel you find is a prime minister and a deputy prime minister in a parliamentary system. But the office of vice president is somewhat unique. Far more countries get along without vice presidents than have them.

MEETINGS AT CAMP DAVID

Question. Did you attend all the meetings at Camp David that President Eisenhower had with Premier Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan, President de Gaulle, and Chancellor Adenauer?

Answer. I have not attended all of them. I have attended several. Some of these meetings are more social in character, and the President very properly does not invite others. However, he has been most considerate in seeing that I am in attendance when important issues are discussed, so that I might be able either to contribute to the discussion or obtain information it would be necessary for me to have in carrying out any duties which might fall upon me in the future.

I would like to add, too, that, in those cases where I do not attend such meetings, the President always makes available to me his memoranda of conversations dealing with other than purely personal matters.

In other words, even though I do not attend such meetings, I am always familiar with decisions that are made and discussions that take place. Then, when I meet these leaders—as I do when I have a dinner for them, or when they call on me at my office, or when I call on them—I am able to speak with knowledge of all the conversations they have had with the President.

Question. Do you get in on budget making and fiscal affairs under this policy of having the Vice President play an executive role in addition to the limited role common in the past?

Answer. Well, let me say first that my participation in the development of such policies has naturally increased as I have gained experience in office. For example, in each of the last 3 years when the budget was under consideration, I have consulted with the Director of the Budget and with the various departments on the budgets that they were submitting. During and after these consultations, I have had an opportunity to make recommendations in Cabinet meetings or, in some instances, directly to the President himself with regard to my views on the budget.

At the President's direction, moreover, in the past 3 years various Cabinet officers have brought their key budget decisions to me for any suggestions or recommendations that I might have.

Question. Is the same thing true in other fields? Where do you fit in when labor problems are involved?

Answer. In this instance, the Secretary of Labor consults with me to see what my views might be on legislation before he recommends it to Congress. The same, incidentally, is true of the other Cabinet officers when they face major issues which may involve congressional action.

Question. When farm policies are up for consideration, have you been kept informed?

Answer. I have not spent as much time on agricultural policy as on labor, defense, foreign affairs and overall budget policies. On the other hand, I have had the opportunity, as far as agriculture is concerned, to participate in the discussions on agricultural policy which have taken place in the legislative leaders' meetings. Because agricultural policy affects such a broad segment of the country, decisions with regard to agriculture are generally considered in the legislative leaders' meetings before they become final.

Question. Have you had to deal with any of these programs that relate to exploring outer space?

Answer. In the field of outer space I have a close association with Dr. Glennan [Dr. T. Keith Glennan, head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration] and with members of his staff. I see him approximately once a month, and more often during the period when the budget is being made. For example, this year I felt very strongly that there should be more unified direction of our outer-space programs than had been the case previously, and also that there should be a stepped-up program for the development of large boosters.

In my conversation with Dr. Glennan, and also when these matters were discussed at meetings of the National Security Council over which the President presided, I strongly supported decisions which the President made in this area.

ACTION ON STEEL STRIKE

Question. How did you get in on the steel strike settlement?

Answer. The President has no rigid rules as to what matters I will take responsibility for. In the case of the steel strike, he was, as you know, starting on a trip abroad. He indicated prior to that trip, on a national television broadcast, that he believed it was vital that the strike be settled while he was gone.

In view of that exhortation, and in view of private conversations in his office at which the Secretary of Labor and I were present, I considered that it was our responsibility while he was gone to explore every possible avenue for finding a basis for settlement which would meet the criteria which he had laid down.

While the President was gone, we started the series of meetings with the leaders of the union and the leaders of the steel industry. These meetings culminated shortly after the President's return in a recommendation for settling the strike—a settlement recommendation which the President approved.

Question. Has President Eisenhower called on you for a wide range of tasks?

Answer. Well, of course, I am Chairman of the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth and, as is generally known, I serve as Chairman of the President's Committee on Government Contracts. This Committee meets every month and has as its responsibility the making of recommendations to contracting agencies for their enforcement of the clause in all Government contracts that there shall be no discrimination in employment where an individual or a corporation has a Government contract. This is an assignment which the President gave me shortly after the administration came into office in 1953.

The President has also given me some specific assignments in the national-security area. For example, I was responsible for the development of public support for our mutual security program, for an intensive study which was made within the administration on the economic aspects of the cold war, and for other matters of this type.

Question. What role do you play in Cabinet meetings, for example? You are not a Department head. Do you have a chance to speak up?

Answer. Yes, I have always had the opportunity to express myself, not only at Cabinet meetings but at the other meetings over which the President presides. Usually it is his custom once a matter is presented at any one of these meetings, to ask the various people around the table for their comments and suggestions.

In fact, the President always invites all of us who participate in such meetings to indicate our views before he, the President, reaches a decision.

Question. Who makes the decisions in meetings? Are they committee decisions?

Answer. I think one of the essential rules for any orderly government is that there can be only one man who makes the final decisions. I, for one, have never believed in government by committee, because what happens then is that the decisions made represent the least common denominator of what everybody will agree to, and this means leadership at its lowest level, rather than at its highest level.

Now, I know that there have been those who have suggested that the President believes in government by committee, that he does not make decisions or overrule members of his official family on issues. Nothing could be further from the truth. The President is a very patient man. He always invites full and free discussion. He tries to bring about agreement among all of the members of his Cabinet and Security Council when important decisions are being made.

But, in the final analysis, the President recognizes that the Cabinet and Security Council are advisory to him only.

The President, during the 7 years that I have been with him, has never put a matter to the vote of the Cabinet, the Security Council or the legislative leaders. I believe he is absolutely correct in following this practice because, in the final analysis, he, the President, should make the big decisions rather than pass the buck, in effect, to his advisers. I don't mean that he isn't affected by what we all say, but he himself, after he hears what we all say, announces the decision.

Of course, there have been instances in which the view adopted by the President has been the view held by others in his official family than myself.

But I would say that the number of cases in which this has happened has been very small compared to the number of cases in which I have shared the views that the President has eventually approved.

Question. If an accident happened and you were required to take over the Presidency, would there be much of a gap in your familiarity with the duties to be performed?

Answer. As far as information is concerned, there would be no gap—no significant gap whatever.

Question. How about familiarity with the problems of the Government itself on pending matters?

Answer. I would say there would be very few pending matters in Government with which I would not be familiar. I do not mean that I am aware of all the conversations the President has with his Cabinet officers, but it would take a relatively small amount of time for me to get up to date on all the matters under discussion and consideration by the President.

Question. Examining this problem impersonally and looking ahead many, many years, do you think that the system which has been instituted by President Eisenhower, whereby the Vice President has been kept informed daily of what's going on in the Government, could have an effect eventually on the efficiency and effectiveness of our governmental system?

Answer. I most certainly do. While I speak as a not-unbiased observer, I would still say that, when President Eisenhower's administration is judged, it will receive high marks in several areas. From a long-range standpoint, one of its most important achievements—one of the President's most significant achievements—has been upgrading the office of the Vice-Presidency.

As a result of what President Eisenhower has done, I believe neither political party in the future will ever again look upon the Vice-Presidency as simply an office to be used for purposes of balancing a ticket geographically or religiously or politically. I think that in the future both political parties will recognize, first, that a vice-presidential candidate must always be qualified and prepared to serve as President.

In addition to that, his views must be close enough to those of the President so that he will feel completely confident in using the Vice President to the utmost in foreign policy and domestic assignments.

In the future, building on the precedents that the President has established in this administration, even greater use can be made of the Vice President. I think that, as a legislative troubleshooter at home, as a coordinator and executor of administration policies, and as a representative in the foreign policy area, the Vice President can serve the President immensely in the years ahead.

In the foreign-policy area particularly, this is not only constructive but I believe absolutely essential. The burdens of international affairs upon the President have become increasingly great as more nations have acquired their independence and as U.S. responsibilities in the world have increased.

In the future, the Vice President can assist the President by visiting countries that the President is unable to work into his schedule and by carrying out specific foreign-policy assignments which the President and the Secretary of State find that his particular office qualifies him to execute.

GAINING PUBLIC SUPPORT

Question. If this formula of the Vice-Presidency is continued in the future, irrespective of party, would you expect a Vice President to become a logical choice or at least be given serious consideration as a possible nominee for the Presidency in future years?

Answer. Without referring to my own situation, I would say that one of the reasons Vice Presidents have been buried politically in times past is because they simply have not had enough important things to do. If the Vice President does have assignments of importance, he inevitably will be in the public eye and will develop political support in his own right. For that reason, I would say that, if future Presidents use their Vice Presidents as President Eisenhower has used me, we can expect future Vice Presidents to be among those who are most seriously considered as presidential candidates.

Question. Do you think that the Vice President of the future who serves as deputy to the President is likely to have an advantage over other candidates who might be in the running for the party's nomination?

Answer. Again, I may have a prejudiced view in this respect, but it seems inevitable that one who is familiar with all aspects of the major problems confronting the Nation has a head start on others who have to learn the issues pretty much from the ground up.

While the fact that an individual has served for a certain number of years as Vice President and has had the opportunity to obtain information on the working of the Government, both at home and abroad, does not in itself qualify him for the Presidency, it undoubtedly gives him an invaluable opportunity to learn, to test his capabilities, and to prove himself in the eyes of the people.

Question. Again, looking at this thing impersonally and assuming that your own political party had been out of power and a new President were elected, what do you think are the handicaps and disadvantages to the country in the fact that 2½ months must elapse between the time of an election and the inauguration of a new President and his opportunities to become familiar with the intricacies of the Government itself?

Answer. Well, of course, looking back on our own administration, we ran into exactly that situation in 1953. There obviously has to be a period of time in which a new administration must learn the ropes, in effect, with regard to the intricacies of foreign and domestic policies. This, of course, is not an insurmountable problem if there is genuine cooperation between the incoming and outgoing administrations. The American people in many instances have seen fit to take the inevitable temporary inefficiency which is involved in such a changeover rather than to continue in power an administration in which they have lost confidence. But, when an administration has a good record and when there is no real disagreement with its policies, there is probably a natural tendency upon the part of the people to think twice before they throw that administration out of office and replace it with one that will have to pick the new personnel and build the machinery which is needed for operating the biggest business in the world.

REPORTS TO EISENHOWER

Question. Have you seen the President alone—absolutely alone with nobody else present—very often in the last 7 years?

Answer. Prior to my trips abroad I always have extended conversations with the President so that he can give me his views on the countries I am visiting. When I return I always see him alone before reporting to the National Security Council. When the President returns from his trips, he calls me into the office and gives me an evaluation of the foreign leaders that he has met and of the problems which he ran into.

I have not had and do not have regular private meetings with the President. There are some weeks that I will not meet him alone at all, since I see him three times a week at our regular meetings. There are other times when an issue, such as the steel strike, is up during which I may have four

or five conferences with him—either individually or by telephone—during 1 day. I don't have a record of the complete number of the conferences, but this gives an idea of the type of conversations I have.

Question. Do you talk to the President on the telephone from day to day?

Answer. I always follow the practice, unless he has asked me to call, of not talking to him on the telephone unless he calls me. The only exception that I have made in this respect was during the course of the steel strike when I had to keep him posted daily on developments. He calls me on the telephone, but I would say that telephone conversations are the exception rather than the rule. Usually they occur when he is out of Washington. Since my office is only minutes away from the White House, it is usually more convenient, when he wants to see me, for him simply to have his secretary call. Then I go down to the White House to see him.

AN OPPOSITION ISSUE

Question. Do you believe that the Constitution imposes on you a requirement to spend all your time in presiding over the Senate when it is in session?

Answer. I know there are some who believe that is the case. Indeed, some Members of the Senate in the opposition party may want to make an issue of the fact that I have not presided over the Senate for as many hours as did some of my predecessors.

I, of course, welcome this complaint, because I think people generally throughout the country recognize that the responsibilities I have undertaken are infinitely more important and more in the interest of serving the American people than simply sitting in front of the Senate.

Question. Has the Senate recognized this by providing under its rules for a President pro tempore who is a Member of the Senate itself?

Answer. The President pro tempore is supposed to preside in the Vice President's absence. I might add also that, according to senatorial practice, any Senator can preside over the Senate.

The only thing that the Vice President can do—and must do—that the President pro tempore or another presiding officer cannot do is to break a tie. That is why the only limitation I have as President of the Senate is that I must always be on hand in Washington when there is a possibility of a tie vote.

In the 7 years I have been Vice President, I have broken eight ties. While this is an average of a little more than one a year, it still indicates the importance of being present when the division of the Senate is as close as it is.

Question. Have you ever missed any votes when there was a tie that could be broken on anything important?

Answer. No; I haven't. I think there was one occasion when I was not present on a tie vote, but my unavoidable absence caused no problem because the same issue came up the next day. It was brought up when I was present and able to decide upon it.

CRUCIAL VOTES IN CONGRESS

Question. Have there been some occasions when the opposition party would have preferred you to be absent on some of those ties, too?

Answer. That is certainly true because the eight tie votes in which I did participate were on important issues. You may remember that I broke the 47–47 tie on whether or not the Senate would approve a massive Federal-aid-to-education bill which would have made teachers' salaries a Federal responsibility. My breaking of the tie on that vote was considered a significant step, and I did not take it hastily.

Question. Don't you usually know in advance when some important issue is going to come up that might result in a tie?

Answer. Exactly. This is another reason why the possibility of a tie vote should not keep the Vice President from taking other assignments. The work of the Senate is generally so planned that you do not have votes called on the spur of the moment. Generally speaking, votes in the Senate are taken at specified times, particularly on critical issues.

Question. Is most of the work that you do for the executive branch in Washington itself, rather than out of town?

Answer. Yes; except when a trip abroad is involved. However, good-will trips are generally scheduled for congressional recesses or for periods when we do not expect any legislation. Otherwise, I am in Washington. I may be at the White House, for example, and I might point out that, at the White House, I am exactly 7 minutes—I know exactly how long it takes—from the Senate floor. So, if a vote should occur while I am at the White House, I am always able to get there in time to vote.

Question. In this rather intimate official relationship with the President for the last 7 years, it is presumed you have gotten to know each other pretty well. How would you describe your personal relations with the President?

Answer. Why, I would say that, thanks to him, those relations have been friendly, and certainly very memorable as far as I am concerned. I have been able to see how he reacts in handling difficult problems—problems like Lebanon, and Quemoy and Matsu, for example. There is nothing that quite takes the place of witnessing firsthand the making of great decisions.

WHEN A CRISIS ARISES

Question. Would you say that in crises Mr. Eisenhower is any different from what he is in the normal routine of everyday work?

Answer. I think everyone is different in a crisis. In the case of the President, what impresses me the most is his complete objectivity and impersonal approach to a crisis. You can describe it as coolness in a crisis, but simply saying that he is cool in a crisis does not adequately describe his attitude. In fact, those who have seen him, as I have, when he has made important decisions, get the impression that here is a man who is carefully weighing all the pros and cons of a particular course of action, without thinking at all about the effect that such action may have on his personal popularity—thinking only of what he believes is in the best interests of the country. And, most important, by watching him in these moments of crisis I was impressed by the fact that the hotter the discussion became, the cooler he became. This is probably one of the greatest lessons that I have learned while working under the President and with him during the past 7 years.

There is one other thing I might say in this connection which I think is important: Once he makes a decision, it is made. He does not continue to worry about it and to second-guess it. This, I think, also is important in leadership.

Question. What is your feeling as you watch the President? Is the Presidency itself something toward which there is a sense of awe and perhaps of great reverence?

Answer. Strangely enough, as you were stating that question the words "awe" and "reverence" were exactly the ones that came into my mind. Whenever I see the President making a tough decision I recognize how easy, by comparison, my responsibilities are. Another thing that is very impressive about the President is that, no matter how much he may have on his mind, he seldom gives the impression of carrying the world on his shoulders. He has the ability to keep a relaxed mind when he makes the important decisions. Some men, when they have tough decisions, inevitably tense up right in front of your eyes. I have seldom seen the President give that impression, if ever.

THIRTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF LINDBERGH'S SOLO FLIGHT ACROSS THE ATLANTIC OCEAN

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, 33 years ago tomorrow the world was electrified by a singular act of courage which stirred the imagination of mankind and signified the entrance into a new era. I refer to the first flight across the Atlantic Ocean by Charles A. Lindbergh.

Since that hour of triumph, Colonel Lindbergh has passed through many fiery trials. He has been visited alike by success and disappointment, by tragedy and achievement.

Last Sunday's issue of This Week magazine supplement featured a brief but moving article by Lindbergh, a statement reflecting the insight and experience of an unusual life. It is an eloquent plea for a rejection of the materialistic philosophy by the free world and for subordination of politics and science to the aims of a philosophy based on eternal moral truths.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHALLENGE

(By Charles A. Lindbergh)

I grew up as a disciple of science. I know its fascination. I have felt the godlike power man derives from his machines—the strength of a thousand horses at one's fingertips; the conquest of distance through mercurial speed; the immortal viewpoint of the higher air. I have sensed the harmony of muscle, mind, and mechanism which gives the illusion of life to substance until levers move with thought as hand or foot, until the rhythm of an engine is geared to the beat of one's own heart, and wing in turning flight seems an extension of one's own body.

Now, I have lived to experience the early results of scientific materialism. I have watched men turn into human cogs in the factories they believed would enrich their lives. I have watched pride of workmanship leave and human character decline as efficiency of production lines increased. I have seen the lifesaving miracles of medicine perverted toward the murderous ends of biological warfare. I have seen the science I worshiped, and the aircraft I loved, destroying the civilization I expected them to serve, and which I thought as permanent as earth itself. In memory, the vision of my mailplane boring northward over moonlit clouds is now mingled with the streaks of tracers from my fighter, flaming comets of warplanes, and bombs falling irretrievably through air.

We still have the possibility, here in America, of building a civilization based on man, where the importance of an enterprise is judged less by its financial profits than by the kind of community it creates; where the measure of a man is his own character, not his power or his wealth. If we have sufficient desire, we can still build a civilization whose leadership rests on the respect and confidence it instills in others, and whose standard of life is the quality of life itself.

But time is short. Looking at the destruction already wrought, at the materialism growing on every side, at the increasing bitterness and unrest throughout the world, at

the tremendous power of our latest weapons, a realist might well conclude that many of us now living will see the start of another war, one which will end in more dark ages.

There is no materialistic solution, no political formula, which alone can save us.

Our salvation, and our only salvation, lies in controlling the arm of Western science by the mind of a Western philosophy guided by the eternal truths of God. It lies in the balanced qualities of spirit, mind, and body of our people.

TALE OF TWO CITIES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter entitled, "The Tale of Two Cities," which appeared this morning on the editorial page of the Washington Post.

Written by Carl Levin, chairman of the Citizens Committee To Save Lafayette Square, the letter points out the need for adequate facilities in Washington for the presentation of opera and other forms of the performing arts.

I wholeheartedly support Mr. Levin and his committee and hope that the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds will report favorably on this project following hearings scheduled for Monday.

I want to commend Senator RANDOLPH, chairman of the subcommittee, and Senator CHAVEZ, chairman of the Public Works Committee, for their efforts in scheduling hearings on this most worthy project.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Levin's letter be printed in The RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALE OF TWO CITIES

Your May 11 editorial, "Tale of Two Cities," brought out pointedly the sad incongruity of the relative facilities for the presentation of the arts in New York City and in our Nation's Capital.

The newly formed Citizens Committee to Save Lafayette Square, however, hopes that our effort will be neither "too little" nor "too late."

Though it is true that we undertook our effort late—for the west side of Lafayette Square apparently already is lost—we are convinced that there is still time to save the quiet dignity and utility offered by the old buildings facing on the east side of the White House park.

As you pointed out so well in your editorial, New York City has rallied to save and is saving Carnegie Hall. Simultaneously, it is proceeding to build the Lincoln Center, all of this in addition to numerous other facilities such as the City Center where the New York City Ballet and other such groups are able to offer their art in appropriate and adequate surroundings.

By contrast, Washington, probably alone among the great capitals of the world, has no existing adequate facility for the presentation of opera and other forms of the performing arts.

The Belasco Theater, originally known as the Lafayette Square Opera House, can be restored to its former beauty, elegance, and utility, and it would certainly seem that a country which has spent tens of millions of dollars restoring foreign opera houses and other public buildings abroad could afford the small expenditure required to put the old Lafayette Square Opera House back into a proper and usable condition.

It may even be that in the immediate future we will have a President who will take pride in, and derive great pleasure from, being able to take a state guest across the park to a lovely opera house for an evening of ballet or opera or for a recital by some great American artist.

Not long ago, a group which wished to exhibit the work of student artists of a foreign country had to take their exhibit to a little public library on upper Connecticut Avenue, because Washington lacked a building in which such exhibits could be held.

The American Art League, one of the numerous groups combining their efforts within the organism of the Citizens Committee to Save Lafayette Square, has pointed out that either the old Dolly Madison House or the Benjamin Tayloe House would serve ideally for exactly such purposes.

With organizations representing millions of citizens—national organizations such as the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Federation of Music Clubs, and the American National Theater and Academy, and such local entities as the D.C. Recreation Department, the Children's Theater of Washington, the Washington Ballet Guild and others—pleading for sympathetic understanding of the wisdom of saving the buildings and the atmosphere of Lafayette Square, we of the citizens committee feel that in coordinating and sparking these efforts we at least are not bringing "too little" effort to bear.

We have been heartened by a promise of public hearings before the Senate Public Works Committee and by pledges of assistance from many enlightened Members of Congress. However, this is a problem on which much additional support is needed and your readers are urged to assist where they think they can help.

CARL LEVIN,
Chairman, Citizens Committee To Save Lafayette Square.

ACTIVITIES OF CYRUS EATON

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, among this morning's bulletins from Paris was the story that Cyrus Eaton, a well-known American apologist for world communism, flew to Paris last night and held a conference with Khrushchev at the airport before the departure of the Kremlin dictator.

This is the latest of many incidents in which Mr. Eaton has meddled in the conduct of American foreign policy through personal meetings with officials of foreign governments. Mr. Eaton is only one of a growing number of private citizens who are making a fad out of Mecca-like pilgrimages to the Kremlin, constituting themselves as messengers from the United States to Khrushchev and from Khrushchev to the United States, and, in general, involving themselves in the worldwide propaganda operation of the Communist movement.

For the benefit of Eaton and others, I quote the key provision of the Logan Act which was passed in 1799.

Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

Cyrus Eaton is a materialistic, meddlesome, evil old man, who has been a useful tool of the Communist movement. He has made a habit of exchanging visits and gifts with Communist leaders. He has made a practice of criticizing the United States in Russia and praising Russia in the United States.

He is the object of continuing Communist accolades and awards, the latest being the Lenin Peace Prize.

It is in his statements that the best picture of Eaton himself emerges. I wish to quote for the RECORD what Mr. Eaton has said about the United States of America. On one occasion he said:

The scientist is conscious that the FBI is breathing down the back of his neck all the time, scaring him * * * we have even praised the FBI for violating the rights of free men. But if you were to take the police forces of the cities and of the countries and of the State and the governmental agencies and add them up, Hitler in his prime, through the Gestapo, never had any such extensive spy organization as we have in this country today.

He accused Secretary Dulles, the Pentagon generals, and American politicians in general of "relentlessly driving us to war." He has said that American officials do not represent the American people—this is interesting—whereas in the Soviet Union the Government speaks in the name of all the people. He has said: "There is more spirit of war in the United States than in any other country in the world and it's dangerous."

He has publicly urged Canada to "completely disassociate itself from America's stubborn attitude in foreign affairs." If he has said in his many private conversations with Canadian officials what he said in this public meeting, then he has violated the express provision of the Logan Act and should be prosecuted.

So I direct the attention of the Attorney General of the United States to what Mr. Eaton has done.

Mr. Eaton has publicly praised Khrushchev's integrity, his popularity, his ability, his sense of humor, his honesty and his desire for peace. He described the completely phony disarmament plan Khrushchev announced to the United Nations as the "most statesmanlike utterance in my lifetime."

During questioning before the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., he said that Russia doesn't really mean to communize the world; that Dr. Zhivago was suppressed because the fanatical young people of the Soviet Union cannot bear any criticism of their beloved government; that the Russian massacre of Hungarian patriots was no different from our sending troops to Lebanon."

This is a man in the United States who is comparing what we did in Lebanon to the butchery of the Hungarian patriots by Khrushchev.

I say again that I urge the Attorney General to keep a special eye on Mr. Eaton and whenever he violates the letter of the Logan Act, as he has so frequently violated its spirit, the Government of the United States should move

promptly against him and against all others who unlawfully interfere with the conduct of American foreign policy.

I hope the Attorney General will carry out his duty. It is time we put an end to such activity in this country.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut that he has brought to our attention a very pertinent and important factor in present-day American politics in its broadest sense. I think the Senator has done a service today by the very vigorous remarks he has made.

The strange aberrations of this man Eaton are not understandable to most of us. This incident serves only to illustrate how far the tolerance of the American people goes in the field of freedom of speech. We have tolerated the ununderstandable conduct and ununderstandable statements of this man simply because this is America, and we respect the right of free speech. However, as the Senator has pointed out, there is a limit, so far as the public good is concerned and so far as the public weal is concerned. There is a limit to so-called freedom. When freedom becomes license we have always recognized that it must be curbed. It must be curbed sensibly and unemotionally.

I congratulate the Senator on his statement. I think this is a matter to which we should pay more attention in the future than we have in the past. The peculiar mental gyrations of this man Eaton, who apparently has great affection for the Communist system and apparently has great admiration for the autocracy and dictatorshop or Russia, are not understandable. We should pay more attention to his utterances, because he happens to be a man of wealth, which fact enables him to indulge in publicity of this kind. It can do nothing, and has done nothing, but bring about very unfortunate difficulties for the United States.

One might go a little farther. Although I am not particularly charmed with this kind of an attitude, one might say, as has been said a few times in the past, when people do not seem to like the United States, want to tear down what we have done, and seem to love other systems, "Why do you not go there to live? Why do you not join the system for which you seem to have such great admiration, and simply abandon the citizenship which you do not seem to appreciate and the privileges which you do not seem to appreciate?"

I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. I point out that this latest performance by Eaton is particularly objectionable. His flight, apparently hurriedly, to Paris last night to greet Khrushchev at the airport, after the terrible incident in Paris yesterday, when Khrushchev called the President of the United States a thief and said all these dreadful things about our country and our President, is to me unconscionable. It is unforgivable that an American citizen would fly to Paris and confer with Khrushchev in the most cordial manner, as reported this morning. We do not know what was said. What he did was particularly offensive.

As the Senator has said, I am not at all taking the position that anyone should be denied his right to criticize his Government or any of us. I am simply pointing out to the Attorney General that there is a statute on the law books which forbids private citizens from entering into conversations or correspondence with the heads of other states concerning matters about the U.S. Government and its relations with other governments. That is the law of the land. I believe this man is violating the law. Some others may have been doing so as well. I think the Attorney General ought to prosecute.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not, by the slightest suggestion, mean to indicate that I deny the right of an individual to criticize his government or to criticize me or anybody else.

Mr. DODD. Neither do I.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is an American privilege. I only wished to point out a moment ago that when free criticism reaches the point of injury to the general body politic of this country it is time we look into it very carefully.

I suggest also that although I, of course, am not a physician and have no medical competence, I have read about what has taken place, and a question is raised as to a matter of psychological quirk which might be investigated to some profit, so far as this man is concerned. There are evidently certain delusions of grandeur which are not well-founded on the record. It might be well to examine them a little more.

I congratulate the Senator again.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa. I agree with what he says and I emphatically agree with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. His statement was something which should have been said on the floor of the Senate. What he has said is right and appropriate, and I commend him for it.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

SPY PLANE INCIDENT

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I discussed with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] the fact that I was going to speak on the subject on which I am about to address the Senate, and he very kindly agreed that he would be present in the Senate today to discuss the matter with me.

Yesterday the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] in a statement took issue with Vice President NIXON, who disclosed in a speech in Buffalo that at the very time Mr. Khrushchev was making a speech before the United Nations, agents of our country arrested two Russian spies in this country, one of whom at least, I believe, was a member of the Russian mission to this country.

The junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] took issue with the Vice President on his disclosure of that fact yesterday. In turn, I wish to take issue with the junior Senator from Tennessee.

In most fields of national defense, especially in the field of atomic energy tests and activities of that kind, the junior Senator from Tennessee and I are in very substantial agreement. I admire his zeal and his devotion to the problems involved in international affairs. However, I am sorry that in this instance I must disagree with him very definitely.

Since the U–2 incident was first publicly disclosed I had felt it was high time that we of the United States spread upon the record the days, the dates, and the names of those concerned with Communist espionage in this country over the past years. If we will lay that record before the people, in my judgment, we will find that no country in modern times has engaged in such a vast network of espionage, which has extended on occasions even into the U.S. Government itself. I believe it is high time that those activities should be documented publicly. I was earnestly hopeful that they might have been documented in Paris.

So far as the U–2 incident is concerned, there is no question that the Russians knew all along, and for a substantial period of time, that these overflights were occurring. It so happened that this particular incident occurred a short time prior to the conference which was supposed to be held this week in Paris, of which Mr. Khrushchev and the high command took advantage to torpedo the conference. If it had not been for the public knowledge of the U–2 incident, there is no doubt Mr. Khrushchev and his group would have found some other excuse to scuttle the conference.

To return to the criticism of Mr. NIXON by the Senator from Tennessee, I believe it is time that some statements were made, not alone concerning the 2 spies who were captured, but concerning the whole list of those who have spied in this country on behalf of Russia.

We talk much about overflights across Russia. To me there is little difference between a man walking along the ground and gathering information, a man riding in a train and gathering information, a man riding in a commercial airplane and gathering information, and a man flying at 50,000 feet and gathering information. The Russians have been gathering information in this country brazenly. We know that. We have had documentation of their activities.

But what the United States did in the interest of peace was to refrain from bringing these matters before the world, in the hope that a conference in Geneva could be operated on a basis of as much harmony as possible. Therefore I am quite sure that our purpose in refraining from bringing these activities before the Geneva Conference was to avoid contributing additional tensions. However, since the Russians have brought these occurrences before the world, I think we should likewise bring before the world the information which we have. I dis-

agree with the Senator from Tennessee in his criticism. I quote from this morning's issue of the New York Times. The Senator from Tennessee will correct me if this is a misquotation:

Only a few days ago, the Tennessean added, Mr. NIXON was "basking in credit for having arranged the Khrushchev visit to the White House." The Vice President "is an old hand at being hard on Communists and Democrats, as well as with the spy-cop-robber-treason technique," Mr. GORE said.

Mr. President, in all sincerity and in all friendship for the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and in the light of our long and cordial association, I still say I believe he was unduly brutal and unduly harsh on the Vice President of the United States, who probably did as much as any other man in this country to point up the espionage ring which existed a few years ago in our country. I do not believe he merits criticism for revealing that activity.

The Vice President needs no defense for his own defense of the integrity of the American system. I believe he needs no defense for pointing out after the fact—and he pointed out only two instances of the scores which can be documented—that we refrained as a country from stirring up international tensions by making a big issue out of the spy incident in this country, so that we might have some basis of harmony on which to approach the discussions of peace and the discussions of international tensions.

I feel that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is unduly harsh in his criticism, and I feel that he is unjustified in saying that, because the Vice President of the United States in his speech at Buffalo yesterday disclosed only two instances as an illustration, the Vice President should be charged with making cheap politics out of an issue of this kind.

As I said a moment ago, I regret every disagreement which I have with my friend from Tennessee, for in the majority of cases we find ourselves in substantial agreement on questions of international interest. But I do feel that this whole article is unwarranted, and I believe the attack by the Senator from Tennessee was unwarranted and unjustified. I do not believe that American public will accept it as a justifiable attack, under all the circumstances.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the article from this morning's issue of the New York Times, written by Russell Baker, referring to this incident.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GORE CRITICIZES NIXON ON SUMMIT—CALLS TALK ON SOVIET SPIES A CAMPAIGN MOVE—FOUR TOP DEMOCRATS PRESS UNITY

(By Russell Baker)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—Senator ALBERT GORE shattered the domestic political calm over the collapse of the summit meeting with an attack today on Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON'S response to the Paris crisis.

It was the first open political clash to come out of the summit breakdown and it came while Democratic leaders for the third consecutive day were making extraordinary efforts to maintain a unified national front behind President Eisenhower.

Senator GORE, a Tennessee Democrat, did not criticize the President, or raise a question on events leading to the summit collapse, but he delivered a cutting denunciation of Mr. NIXON'S reaction to the news from Paris.

The Gore attack was provoked by the Vice President's speech in Buffalo today, in which Mr. NIXON gave hitherto secret reports of Soviet spies spotted in Springfield, Mass., during Premier Khrushchev's tour of this country last fall. Mr. NIXON in his speech also challenged the Democrats to investigate the President's refusal to apologize to Mr. Khrushchev in Paris.

While Democrats were "withholding criticism and pleading for unity," Senator GORE said, "Mr. NIXON is talking of how to be hard on communism, and how to deal with Communists, and giving forth about the arrest of Russian spies. Maybe the old NIXON is going to be nominated after all instead of the new."

Why, he asked, was new spy information being made public "in a campaign speech, only after the get-along-with-Khrushchev treadmill has come to a crashing halt?"

Only a few days ago, the Tennessean added, Mr. NIXON was "basking in credit for having arranged the Khrushchev visit to the White House." The Vice President "is an old hand at being hard on both Communists and Democrats, as well as with the spy-cop-robber-treason technique," Mr. GORE said.

Other developments here in the wake of the Paris breakdown included these:

Disclosure that four leaders of the Democratic Party had cabled the President yesterday urging him "to convey to Premier Khrushchev the views of the opposition party in your country that he reconsider his suggestion for postponement of the summit conference until after the national elections in this country."

The message was signed by Sam Rayburn of Texas, Speaker of the House; Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas, Democratic Senate leader; Adlai E. Stevenson, Democratic presidential candidate in 1952 and 1956, and J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

A spokesman for the Republican National Committee said that sentiment was building to arrange a big homecoming demonstration in Washington for President Eisenhower when he returns from Europe Friday afternoon.

Congressional leaders quietly dispelled speculation that a special investigation of the administration's presummit maneuvers would be countenanced at the Capitol this year.

PROSPECTS FOR CONGRESS

The prospect was that questions about presummit maneuvers and reassessment of the national position in the wake of a new tough line from Moscow would be dealt with piecemeal in routine committee proceedings.

The renewal of the Democratic leadership's call for unity was based on fears that any deep division within the United States at this time might weaken its international position while new Soviet intentions were still uncertain.

Another factor was the disgust many Democratic leaders feel for the prospect of making grave international policy a partisan spectacle in this election year. Many of these same Democrats still resent Republican political exploitation of Korean war issues and do not want a Democratic reprisal.

One other factor is the expectation that President Eisenhower will receive a wave of public sympathy in reaction to Mr. Khrushchev's behavior in Paris. At the moment, the Democrats are disposed to wait for the dust to settle before arguing background issues.

The Democratic leadership's message to the President was worked out at the Capitol Monday while Mr. Stevenson was there to testify on the use of television in political campaigns.

"We feel that total failure of the [summit] conference and increasing mistrust on both sides will be serious and deeply disturbing to the world," it said.

"All of the American people earnestly desire peace, an end to the arms race and ever better relations between our countries. We ask you as the leader of this nation to see that these views are conveyed to Mr. Khrushchev."

Aside from its value as a demonstration to the Russians of the U.S. internal unity, the message was designed to destroy the idea that Mr. Khrushchev might get a better bargain by waiting for a new President to be elected. The Soviet Premier proposed postponing summit conferences until after the national election in the United States. Both parties are sensitive and angry about this Soviet interference in domestic politics.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am grateful for the generous references of my friend and distinguished colleague, the able senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. As he has done, I, too, wish to pay tribute to the warm friendship which he and I enjoy serving together, as we do, on two committees and having found ourselves upon many occasions not only personally agreeable to each other, which relation, I say to my friend, I have enjoyed thoroughly, but also many times we have had an affinity of views upon questions affecting our national security.

The Senator has just said there are many more cases which are being suppressed. Are they, too, to be fed out piecemeal for campaign oratory?

The essential question I raised yesterday was that of secrecy. Why has this information so long been withheld from the American people? If there are scores more, I call upon the Government of the United States to give this information to the American people. Secrecy in Government has gone entirely too far. I do not wish to refer to incidents prior to or involved in the regrettable tragedy of the Paris Conference. As other Members of the Senate have said, there will be a proper time to discuss our individual feelings of humiliation and that of our country. The proper time has already occurred to express resentment, which every American must have felt, at the insults heaped upon the President of the United States. I expressed my resentment on the floor of the Senate.

I do not wish now to make reference to other sentiments and views which I have withheld and will withhold until the proper time.

However, I am not sure that a suppression of the news involving Russian espionage in our country has contributed to peace. If there are scores of additional incidents, I call upon the Government to release the information to the American people.

I read from a dispatch from United Press International, of today:

The Vice President, who made the disclosure during a political swing through upstate New York—

I asked two questions yesterday. Why had this information been kept secret

from the American people since last September? When did these other score or more occur? Has that information been suppressed, too, for 6 or 8 or 10 months, or longer?

The second question I asked was, Why is it now made public in a political speech after the debacle in Paris? I interpret this as an effort to convert the tragedy in Paris to political advantage.

My friend the distinguished Senator from Iowa says that in that judgment I am harsh. I do not wish to reach harsh judgments, or to render brutal verdicts. I submit to the Senate the record and ask each Senator to determine for himself whether the cause of peace has been served by the suppression from the people of the United States, by secrecy, of information involving espionage attempts reaching into scores of incidents, as we are told; whether such secrecy is proper and in the public interest.

Each Senator may determine for himself whether this was a political use of information which heretofore had been denied the American people, but which on yesterday was used, according to the news dispatch, on a political swing through upstate New York.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or would he prefer to continue?

Mr. GORE. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. With regard to the Senator's contention that this is information which has been kept secret, I certainly join him in saying that we should now make these cases public, that they should be documented and should be told to the world.

Mr. GORE. Before the Senator goes further, I am glad that he joins me in that expression. Will he also join me in the suggestion or request that the Government of the United States, through its established agencies having jurisdiction, make this information public rather than making it public piecemeal through political speeches?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is the point I was just approaching. It has been made public. It has been made public repeatedly over the years. I call the Senator's attention to the insertion in the RECORD of yesterday made by the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], at page 10548 of the RERORD, where there appears a list of 65 Russian spy cases, naming names, naming incidents which have occurred in the United States since 1946, which have had full publicity and which are known. I shall not repeat the names now; they are all printed in the RECORD beginning at page 10548. To supplement that information, there is listed a very substantial number of foreign cases in which Russian spies have been convicted, and sentenced in most cases—activities in Switzerland, West Germany, Greece, Japan. I shall not take the time to delineate all of them, but they are in the RECORD. These are all cases that have been made public, but the last two the Senator refers to were apparently the most recent ones that had occurred.

The American public and the world should know these things. They should know that the Russians have been the masters of espionage in the world, and have probably exceeded all other countries in the world in espionage. I think it is high time we let that fact be known. I did not think we should stir up this situation prior to the great attempt at the summit to achieve a peaceful solution of the tensions of the world. I thought it wise not to bring up these irritants beforehand.

However, now that Mr. Khrushchev has found this "fish out of water"; now that he has disclosed what the intentions of the Russians are, and that he has no intention of seeking a solution of world tensions on any realistic basis, I think the time has come for us to tell the world exactly and to emphasize exactly what the Russians have been doing in the field of espionage, and thus lay the activities of most of the other countries in the shade.

However, that list was placed in the RECORD yesterday by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and is now available for all to see.

Mr. GORE. I again shall decline to refer to the assumptions upon which the U.S. approach to the summit conference was rationalized. At the proper time, I shall address the Senate upon that and related subjects. I do not regard today as the proper time to do that.

I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Iowa if the list to which he refers, which appears in the RECORD, as I understand, and is available only this morning, and therefore was not printed before the disclosures in the upstate New York political swing yesterday, includes the two instances in September, to which the Vice President referred.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. A cursory reading of the list indicates that they do not appear. I cannot find them in the list at the moment. The list comprises one column on page 10548, three columns on page 10549, and one and three-quarters columns on page 10550. So upon a quick examination, I cannot say whether the two cases are included. However, it is my impression that the list does not include those two cases.

Mr. GORE. One question seems to remain between us. The Senator from Iowa has joined with me in a request and a suggestion that a full disclosure of Soviet espionage efforts be made public. Would the Senator also join with me in asking that such information be released by the departments and agencies of the Government having jurisdiction over such matters, and of whom, I feel certain, the representatives of the free press will soon make inquiry, rather than to have it fed to the public piecemeal in a political campaign for political advantage and use?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I must say to the Senator from Tennessee that I would not necessarily support a full disclosure of all espionage cases in this country, for the very reason that the American self-interest and security might not warrant such a disclosure. In certain cases, if knowledge of espionage activities were disclosed at the present time, it might give information to the enemy, to the detriment of the United States. There are some cases which cannot be disclosed at the time they are discovered, and should not be disclosed. They should be kept very secret, simply because of the techniques which are used. The espionage effort in which the Russians are engaged is a very clever game.

Generally speaking, I believe the number of cases which can be disclosed without harm to the national security and without harm to our friends should be documented, so as to counter the Soviet espionage activities. I think such cases should be disclosed. It does not make any difference to me how they are disclosed, but I think the circumstances of them should be available to the public.

I had hoped, for instance, that if the conference took place, and Mr. Khrushchev began to make much of the so-called U–2 incident, the President would have with him a list of Soviet espionage cases to throw right back in Khrushchev's face. But the conference did not take place. I do not know whether what I have suggested would have been done. However, I had hoped we would be prepared to do that.

Mr. GORE. The able Senator, in replying to my question, instead of answering it, has raised two more questions.

Shall the Vice President, in a political campaign, determine what shall be secret and what shall not be secret? The Senator from Iowa says it does not make much difference to him as to how such information is released. I say that is a matter of propriety and importance. It is one of the two principal issues I raised. The other was secrecy. The Senator from Iowa has said that in some cases the interests of this country might well be served by disclosure. If so, I am willing to have the proper authorities make that determination.

However, I wonder if the Senator would agree that any information which can be disclosed in a political speech, to be specific, should, in an orderly way, be made available to the American people and the free press by the agencies of Government having proper jurisdiction?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I see no reason why any information along that line, the release of which would not be detrimental to the activities of the United States, should not be disclosed to everybody or should not be made available to everybody.

Mr. GORE. Shall it remain classified until a candidate for political office decides that it may be fortuitous to release such information?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; I do not believe in the system of classification by convenience, and I never have. I do not think what the Senator says is necessarily so. Nevertheless, I think it is high time that the Government disclose to the American people what is taking place. So far as I know, the only persons who can disclose it are the officials who know about it.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Iowa has used some rather strong language. It is not the most pleasant experience

that one can have in this body to have one of his esteemed colleagues and friends say that he has reached a brutal judgment. I thought I reached an entirely justified judgment. I thought I raised proper questions. I think the record bears me out.

I ask the Senator again, specifically and pointedly, since he has joined with me in a request that such information as will not be injurious to the national interest be disclosed to the public, will he also join with me in the request that the agencies concerned reach such a determination and disclose the information to the public, rather than reserve it until a candidate for political office, in an upstate swing in New York, or in a political swing in some other State, decides it is fortuitous to release it?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have not joined with the Senator from Tennessee in any particular request. I have merely stated that I think the spying activities of the Kremlin which are taking place in this country and elsewhere should be documented and disclosed to this country and to the rest of the world, except in those cases where it would be a disservice to our own national security or the national security of our allies to disclose individual incidents.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator from Iowa does not wish to join with me in that request, I join with him in what he has said.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I welcome the Senator's statement. So far as my accusing the Senator from Tennessee of being brutal is concerned, I did not intend to accuse the Senator of being brutal. I think the phrase I used was that I thought he was unduly harsh in his criticism. I take it there is a little difference in the connotations of "brutality" and "harshness."

Mr. GORE. I accept the modification.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think "harsh" is a little less brutal than "brutal."

Mr. GORE. I accept the modification with appreciation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I would never accuse the Senator from Tennessee of being brutal, because he is not a brutal man. It is not his instinct to be brutal.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. However, I think the Senator from Tennessee on occasion, perhaps, can put himself in a position where I think he is undoubtedly harsh, and without doubt I can put myself in a position where the Senator from Tennessee may think I am unduly harsh. I think there is a difference; and I do not wish to have the RECORD indicate that I am accusing the Senator from Tennessee of brutality, because that is furthest from my thought.

Mr. GORE. I may have been accused of worse, I may say.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Of course, those of us who have been in politics for some years have been accused of a great many things, and we get used to that.

But so far as concerns disclosing something in a political campaign, let me say that political campaigns are for the purpose of discussing the issues. I take it the Senator from Tennessee is raising the objection because of the fact the Vice President disclosed the incident referred to in connection with a speech on what might be considered to have been a political occasion. I see no reason why he should not have disclosed it. I do not know that it was classified information beforehand. It may have been; I have no knowledge about that.

But I repeat that I think the world should know with some detail of the activities of the Kremlin. And regardless of what may be considered the wise way to issue such information, I think it should be put out. I think it should be laid down for all to see; and then I think it would answer, or should answer, the questions asked by a number of well-meaning people in this country.

I have received letters from several persons who have had the effrontery to say that we should apologize to the Russians—although most of the letters I have received have expressed just the opposite view. But when the few who favor the making of an apology realize what we have done by way of gathering necessary information to protect the security of this country, as against what the Russians are planning to do over there, from a military standpoint, and when they consider what our country has done by way of gathering such information and what the Russians have done in this country for years and years and years, I think such persons will change their opinion as to the desirability and the necessity of our securing information as to what the enemy is plotting against us.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall not press my friend further.

I shall close by recalling that as soon as I heard the report that the Russian dictator had demanded an ignoble apology by the President of the United States, I rose on the floor of the Senate and expressed resentment, and said the American people could be confident that the President of the United States, the embodiment of America's pride and hopes for peace, would respond as a gentleman of honor.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON AT JAMESTOWN, VA.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 15, Mrs. Talmadge and I had the privilege of joining the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] in attending the impressive ceremonies held at Jamestown Island, Va., commemorating the landing of the first permanent English settlers in America and the rededication of the Robert Hunt Memorial Shrine, which honors the founder of the first Protestant church in America. The combined services were sponsored by the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, with the cooperation of the Bruton Parish Church, the College of William and Mary, the Colonial National Historical Park, Colonial Williamsburg, and the Jamestown Foundation.

The principal address of the occasion was delivered by the respected junior Senator from Virginia, and was an eloquent and stirring tribute to the unwavering faith in God and stanch adherence to the tenets of freedom of our Founding Fathers. It was an inspiring experience; and I came away with the firm conviction that it would be beneficial, indeed, if every man and woman in public life in America could visit and see for themselves this historic site from which have sprung the institutions of liberty which have given us on this continent the greatest and freest Nation in the history of mankind.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the full text of the remarks of the junior Senator from Virginia on that occasion be printed herewith in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAITH OF OUR FATHERS

(Remarks of Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON at the 353d anniversary of the first permanent English settlement in America at Jamestown, Va., May 15, 1960)

On this 353d anniversary of the landing of English settlers at Jamestown, I welcome the privilege of joining with distinguished church leaders in paying tribute to the memory of Robert Hunt, the first chaplain of the Jamestown settlement who served in that capacity until his death in July of 1608. The fact that those first settlers had a deep and abiding faith in the teachings of the Bible is not as well known as the faith of those who settled at Plymouth 13 years later. The latter had come to a new land in search of religious freedom, whereas the Virginia settlers had come in search of gold. But members of the church of England had made a substantial contribution to the London Co. which financed the Jamestown settlement on the condition that it could send with the first settlers a chaplain and the further condition that the Christian religion would be brought to the savages of the North American Continent. Evidently, therefore, the first chaplain, Robert Hunt, was chosen by the Archbishop of Canterbury and his work was highly praised by Capt. John Smith who said that he was "an honest, religious and courageous divine." Smith also said of the first religious services at Jamestown: "We had daily common prayer morning and evening, every Sunday two sermons, and every 3 months the holy communion, till our minister died: but our prayers daily, with an homily on Sundays, we continued 2 or 3 years after, till more preachers came: and surely God did most mercifully hear us."

At the untimely death of their rector, at about 40 years of age, the colonists not only paid tribute to the religious and social work that he had done among them but to his readiness to defend the settlement, upon any alarm as quickly as any man and of his constant encouragement to the men at Jamestown to persist in their attempt to plant a successful colony. Again, when the first session of the assembly met in 1619 (incidentally, the first elected governing body ever to serve in this country) the first order of business was a prayer by Reverend Buck, then the minister at Jamestown. That action was noted in the records of the assembly in the following terms: "But for as much as men's affairs do little prosper where God's service is neglected; all the Burgesses took their places in the choir, till a prayer was said by Mr. Buck, the minister, that it

would please God to guide us and sanctify all our proceedings to his own glory, and the good of this plantation."

In the Senate of the United States we have an organization known as the Breakfast Group, which meets each Wednesday morning at 8:30 for breakfast and then for a 30-minute discussion of some religious topic for which some member is designated each week as the leader. I am proud of the fact that four members of that Breakfast Group have accompanied me to Williamsburg and Jamestown not only to join in our tribute to the memory of the first chaplain of the Jamestown settlement but also to indicate their appreciation of the significance in the subsequent development of the most powerful nation in the world, of the religious faith that was translated into George Mason's Bill of Rights, into Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence, and into the Philadelphia Constitution of 1787, all of which are based upon the teachings of the Bible.

Needless to say, all members of our Senate group share the sentiments concerning this historic area of the Old Dominion expressed by Daniel Webster at the laying of the cornerstone of the Bunker Hill Monument when he said: "We are justly proud of being descended from men who have set the world an example of founding civil institutions on the great and united principles of human freedom and human knowledge. To us, their children, the story of their labors and sufferings can never be without interest. We shall not stand unmoved on the shore of Plymouth, while the sea continues to wash it, nor will our brethren in another early and ancient colony forget the place of its first establishment till their river shall cease to flow by it. No vigor of youth, no maturity of manhood, will lead the Nation to forget the spots where its infancy was cradled and defended."

Last night we were privileged to see a moving picture made for use during the Jamestown celebration of 1957 which, among other things, depicted the debate in the House of Burgesses concerning the oppression of the sister colony of Massachusetts by the British Crown and the adoption on May 24, 1774, of the following resolution:

"This House, being deeply impressed with apprehension of the great dangers, to be derived to British America, from the hostile invasion of the city of Boston, in our sister colony of Massachusetts Bay, whose commerce and harbor are, on the first day of June next, to be stopped by an armed force, deem it highly necessary that the said first day of June be set apart, by the members of this House, as a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer, devoutly to implore the divine interposition, for averting the heavy calamity which threatens destruction to our civil rights, and the evils of civil war; to give us one heart and one mind firmly to oppose, by all just and proper means, every injury to American rights; and that the minds of His Majesty and his Parliament may be inspired from above with wisdom, moderation, and justice, to remove from the loyal people of America all cause of danger, from a continued pursuit of measures, pregnant with their ruin.

"*Ordered*, therefore, that the Members of this House do attend in their places, at the hour of 10 in the forenoon, on the said 1st day of June next, in order to proceed with the Speaker, and the mace, to the church in this city, for the purposes aforesaid; and that the Reverend Mr. Price be appointed to read prayers, and the Reverend Mr. Gwatkin, to preach a sermon, suitable to the occasion."

George Washington, who helped to frame that resolution of 1774 knelt in the snows of Valley Forge to ask the help of God to carry on an unequal military struggle for independence and it was Washington who was presiding over the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention in the summer of 1787 when his friend, Benjamin Franklin said: "In this situation of this assembly groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, Sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Light to illuminate our understanding? In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger we had daily prayer in this room for the divine protection. Our prayers, Sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending providence in our favor. To that kind providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future national felicity. And have we now forgotten that powerful friend? Or do we imagine that we no longer need His assistance? I have lived, Sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?"

Again, in 1789, Washington said in his inaugural address: "It would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes, and may enable every instrument employed in its administration to execute with success the functions allotted to his charge."

All Members of the Congress, and I assume that laymen generally, are aware of the fact that the Soviet Union possesses intercontinental missiles capable of reaching any part of our Nation in the course of some 25 or 30 minutes after being fired, that the hydrogen warhead of those missiles has a destructive force for a radius of 10 miles or more, that the fallout from such a missile will poison the exposed food and water supplies for a radius of several hundred miles and that we have no adequate nor satisfactory defense against a missile attack of that character. And since we can fire a nuclear weapon from a submerged submarine, it is only reasonable to assume that the Soviet Union has the same capability. It is also a matter of common knowledge that in the event of an all-out nuclear war, our casualties in the first few days of such a conflict would be tabulated in terms of millions.

It is, therefore, with the hope of staying the hand of a possible aggressor that in recent years we have been devoting more than one-half of the total tax revenue of our Government for the operation and development of our Defense Establishment.

In our visit today to this historic area whose contribution to the birth of our Nation should never be forgotten, we should be acutely conscious of the fact that we are as much in need for God's help as were the 3 million relatively poor and untrained colonists in their struggle for freedom against the then strongest military power in the world. The recent destruction in Russia of a CIA observation plane indicates how easily a cold war could suddenly turn into a shooting war. It illustrates the urgent need for a program of international disarmament, while at the same time casting a grave shadow over prospects for a successful summit conference in Paris.

By our presence here where our experiment in representative democracy started, where our concept of personal liberty under God was proclaimed to the world, the Members of our Senate Breakfast Group desire to indicate our deep concern over the fact that at a time when our beloved Nation is threatened from without by a deadly foe she also is threatened by destruction from within by spiritual indifference and moral deterioration.

The conflict of deepest concern is not might against superior might. The major issue which faces us today is this: Will America accept the moral challenge of this hour, as she has accepted the military challenge of past years, or will she allow this glorious opportunity to slip from her grasp forever?

This, my friends, is the world leadership to which we are called: to stand before the nations of the entire world and say with young David: "Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a shield: but I came to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts."

In stemming the tide of the anti-God ideology of communism—the unseen forces of a mighty God are on our side, and we can go confidently forward in the power of His might when we take Him at His word as He says: "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from Heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield, so that I may comment on the same matter?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I had the honor and the privilege of attending the ceremonies commemorating the landing of the first permanent English settlers in America, and the rededication of the Robert Hunt Memorial Shrine on Sunday, May 15, at Jamestown Island.

As has already been mentioned, our distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] delivered an outstanding address on our heritage as a nation and our obligation to preserve it.

It was 353 years ago on May 13 that three small ships, the *Discovery*, the *Godspeed*, and the *Susan Constant*, dropped anchor at an island in Virginia, which the settlers immediately named Jamestown.

The little settlement at Jamestown passed through many crises; and I am confident that the story is familiar to everyone who has read our early history.

Dr. Louis B. Wright, director of the Folger Library, has said:

> No other spot in either hemisphere carries so much significance as Jamestown.

On this occasion we were again commemorating the fact that the landing with not only the beginning of a new nation, but it was also the beginning of religious worship in our Nation.

It should be remembered that the settlers who landed at Jamestown were in many instances very religious people. The first thing they did when they landed on the sandy soil of Point Comfort was to erect a cross. And when they reached Jamestown Island, they took some of the sails from the ship and made a tent-chapel in which they thanked God for a safe voyage. The pastor of the colony was a remarkable man by the name of Robert Hunt.

In 1907, the dioceses of Virginia, southern Virginia, and West Virginia dedicated a memorial to the Reverend Robert Hunt, in the form of a handsome bronze relief tablet. It was at that spot that our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia, delivered his stirring address.

This monument and the restoration of Williamsburg are not only memorials; they are also reminders to every American citizen of the sacrifices our forefathers endured in order to establish a true Republic based on the rights of the individual.

The Nation is indebted to the late John D. Rockefeller, Jr., for his foresight and his dedication in preserving these historical landmarks for all generations. It was his aim to recreate a shrine where great events of colonial history might be visualized in their proper setting, and where a revival of crafts, music, and literature would not only comprise major activities of the city of Williamsburg, but also would bring to the 20th century an appreciation of the important cultural gifts it has received from colonial times.

In this age, we of this generation must again rededicate ourselves to the principles of those who have gone before. We must, as the settlers of old, again give thanks to divine providence for the many blessings that have befallen this Nation, and at the same time pray for divine guidance in order that this heritage may be preserved for future generations.

I thank the Senator from Georgia for yielding to me.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on last Sunday, May 15, it was my privilege to attend the ceremonies at Jamestown Island, commemorating the landing of the first permanent English settlers in America and the rededication of the Robert Hunt Memorial Shrine. We met there to pay honor to these and other early settlers who founded our great Nation, and to rededicate ourselves to their basic principles in meeting the problems of today.

The speaker for this occasion was well chosen indeed, our colleague, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. He did a masterful job, just as always, in paying tribute to those patriotic and spiritual leaders who settled and founded this Nation. His interesting and inspiring message held the audience of more than 1,000 people in rapt attention.

Mr. President, I also wish to mention briefly the fine contribution Colonial Williamsburg is making in enlightening our people of our early history, and in inspiring the members of this generation to adhere more closely to those principles on which our Nation was founded. While we were at Williamsburg, the flags were at half-mast, in memory of that great benefactor who made Colonial Williamsburg possible, the late John D. Rockefeller, Jr., to whom this and all future generations owe a great debt. The administration of Colonial Williamsburg is most ably directed by its president, Mr. Carlisle H. Humelsine.

Again, I congratulate the junior Senator from Virginia on his masterful address, which is worthy of the careful reading and study of each Member of the Congress. I am happy it is being placed in the RECORD, thereby being made available to all citizens of our Nation.

THE NEUTRON BOMB

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last week I made a lengthy statement to the Senate on the fallacy of the test ban. Among other things, I warned that if the Kremlin were to beat us to a major technological breakthrough, we might shortly find ourselves confronted with a choice between surrender and annihilation. One of the possible breakthroughs which I mentioned was the development of a neutron bomb.

Commenting on my statement, Newsweek Periscope for this week said:

THE DODD BOMB A DUD

Senator THOMAS J. DODD's demands for information on the neutron bomb—a weapon that supposedly kills by radiation alone without blast or heat—will be ignored. Reason: There is no such device. Scientists explained that they know no way to produce a radiation weapon without heat and blast. (A reactor would do it, but bombers don't drop reactors on the enemy.)

I have the greatest respect for Newsweek. In general, I think its reporting reflects a careful regard for the truth. In this case, however, I feel that Newsweek could not have read my statement too carefully and that they were, in addition, the victims of calculated misinformation from pro-test-ban sources.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement in respect to the neutron bomb be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Then there is the matter of the neutron bomb, to which there has already been some reference in the press. Such a bomb can theoretically be produced by tailoring the energy of a fusion explosion so that, instead of heat and blast, its primary product is a burst of neutrons. Such a burst would do negligible physical damage, but it would immediately destroy all life in the target area. It would, in short, operate as a kind of death ray.

I have heard that, in the light of present theoretical knowledge, the neutron bomb is no more questionable than the hydrogen bomb was 6 months before it was demonstrated that one could be built. Although there have been a few fragmentary references to the neutron bomb in the press, I was told, when I tried to obtain more information, that the matter was classified. When I pressed my physicist friend further, he threw up his hands in despair and said: "You must forgive me, I have never heard of a neutron."

I consider all the hush-hush that surrounds the neutron bomb to be a glaring instance of the official abuse of secrecy. To keep the facts of life on the nuclear age from the American people is foolish, and potentially disastrous. If there is a possibility that a neutron bomb can be built, if there appears to be any chance that the Soviets may succeed in building one before we do, then the American people have a right to the facts.

The current issue of Foreign Affairs contains a remarkable article on the question of the test ban by Dr. Freeman J. Dyson. Dr. Dyson quotes a paragraph from a report by the prominent Soviet physicist, L. L. Artsimovitch entitled "Research on Controlled Thermonuclear Reactions in the U.S.S.R.," printed in December 1958. Let me read this paragraph very slowly:

"It may also be possible to realize a pulsed thermonuclear reaction under conditions in which the high temperature is produced by a charge of conventional explosive (such as TNT or something more powerful) which surrounds a capsule containing heavy hydrogen. Without dwelling on the experimental details, we may note that conditions have been found under which the generation of neutrons in hydrogen reactions has been established reliably and reproducibly. In experiments carried out in 1952, there is no doubt that we have observed neutrons which are formed as a result of the heating of matter to extremely high temperatures."

From this, it is apparent that the Russians were experimenting with fission-free hydrogen devices as far back as 1952 and that, as a corollary of this, they have for years had some understanding of the possibilities of the neutron bomb.

Once upon a time there was no hydrogen bomb. But there were a few scientists, a tiny but brave minority, who said it could be made and who urged that we embark on a crash program of development, lest the Kremlin beat us to it. At that time we had a President, Harry Truman, who gave the facts to the people. Had he not done so, had he not enjoyed the public support that only comes from understanding, the production of the H bomb might have been deferred beyond that fateful day in 1953 when the Soviets exploded their own first H bomb.

I believe President Eisenhower owes a similar duty to the American people in the case of the neutron bomb. The President should tell the people what the scientists told him. Not to do so would be a dereliction that can only lead to the most dangerous kind of speculation.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the Newsweek article said there is no such device as a neutron bomb. I never said that there was. I simply said that there were many scientists who were convinced it could be made. The Newsweek article implies I said that scientists know of a way to produce a radiation weapon without heat and blast. I said no such thing. I said that there was no theoretical reason why a neutron bomb could not be produced, and I implied that there were quite a few scientists who considered the project practicable. I said that if such a bomb were produced, a burst of neutrons would be the primary, but not the exclusive manner in which it released its energy.

For the record at this point, I want to say that I checked all of the facts in my statement carefully, not with one expert or even two experts, but in most cases with either three or four experts in the field. I am convinced that my facts were accurate.

For the record, too, I would like to point out that there have been references to the possibility of producing a neutron bomb in a number of scholarly publications. For example, the eminent nuclear physicist, Dr. F. J. Dyson, in the article in Foreign Affairs which I have quoted, said:

There seems to be no law of nature forbidding the construction of fission-free bombs. The question remains whether this theoretical possibility is likely soon to be realized.

There are some very able physicists who believe that the neutron bomb—which would be a fission-free bomb—is

in the cards for the next few years. There are other physicists who believe that it may be a very long time away.

There were many scientists who said the A-bomb could not be built. There were many more, including Dr. Hans Bethe, the President's chief adviser on the test ban, who said the H-bomb could not be built. I have seen it stated that our ICBM program was delayed for 2 years because Dr. Vannevar Bush held the project was impractical. In general, it would be fair to say that the pessimists have been proved wrong and the optimists have been proved right.

Personally, I see the greatest resemblance between the situation that obtains today on the question of the neutron bomb and the situation that obtained in the immediate postwar period, on the question of developing the hydrogen bomb. At that time, there were many scientists who were so horrified by Hiroshima that they were emotionally opposed to the development of even more terrible weapons of destruction. Sometimes they would say the H-bomb could not be made. At other times they would say that, even if it could be made, it should not be made.

There was no willful sabotage. On the other hand, the human mind being what it is, I am convinced that those scientists who were emotionally opposed to the creation of an H-bomb, were disposed, by virtue of this opposition, to be pessimistic and defeatist. Since they felt it should not be done, they argued that it could not be done. In fact, they actually believed it could not be done because, as I see it, their terror and their sense of guilt robbed them of their capacity for scientific as well as political judgment.

Where would we be today if it had not been for the handful of brave and persistent scientists who took the stand that, precisely because the H-bomb was so horrible, the free world could not permit the Kremlin to beat it to it?

Once again we are confronted with a situation in which a minority of scientists take the stand that radically new types of nuclear weapons probably will be built, and, if they are built, we must build them first. On the other hand, there are those who have grave misgivings about any qualitative or quantitative expansion in the field of nuclear weaponry, and who, not very surprisingly, question the feasibility of any major breakthrough. In the present critical situation, whose words shall we take? The word of those scientists who say "we should not" and "we cannot," or the word of those who say "we must" and "we can"? I think this question is most effectively answered by recent history.

ARMED FORCES DAY: DEDICATION OF U.S. POWER FOR PEACE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 21, the Nation—as proclaimed by President Eisenhower—will observe Armed Forces Day. In 1960 the overall theme for the observances is "Power for Peace."

Across the Nation, special activities will be undertaken to promote greater public understanding of the need of power for peace. The programs will include:

Paying tribute to men and women of our armed services for their contribution to our security;

Stressing the civilian-military teamwork that, historically, has preserved our freedom;

Displaying the land, sea, air and space weapons and equipment to illustrate the scope of our power for peace;

Creating greater understanding of the need for such defenses as a deterrent to aggression; and

Rededicating ourselves to the traditional U.S. policy of utilizing such Armed Forces—mighty and powerful—only for defense, halting aggression, or for promoting stability in areas threatened by outside forces.

Mr. President, last night for 2½ hours Mr. Khrushchev had the television stations of this country opened for his abuse, for his tirade. I could not help thinking, Will there be reciprocity in that respect for the President of the United States and the people who want to speak on the subject, to tell the people of the Kremlin the true story.

Khrushchev, we know, sort of "let the cat out of the bag." He said that when he was at Camp David he was going to ask the President about the trips such as the flight of the U–2, but he did not, for the President was so kindly then. Khrushchev has known for years that in order to protect our own country and to protect the West we have been seeking to get the facts of life in relation to the Kremlin and what it is doing. We have seen the threats. We have seen countries taken over; for instance, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, the Baltic States, and part of Finland. The world knows that, but it has a tendency to fall asleep.

In a crisis-weary world, all of us yearn for the time—yet somewhere in the unforeseeable future—when we can beat our swords into plowshares and turn a vast volume of resources, manpower and brainpower to programs that will benefit—not threaten to destroy—mankind.

The turn of world events at the Paris meeting, however, provides us more evidence of the need for maintaining a strong defense, coordinated with our allies, as a matter of self-interest and security.

The tantrums of Premier Khrushchev—pounding the table, spewing insults, shouting threats and "flexing his missiles"—regrettably recalls images of tirades and tyrants of the past. The world, I believe, would rather forget such bad memories.

In the face of such emotional outbursts—created by "cooked up" rather than real factors—the thermometer readings of the global temperature—or perhaps, more accurately, "temper"—regrettably are "shooting up." As a world leader, however, we need—as President Eisenhower so nobly demonstrated in Paris—to be calm and cool, making reasoned evaluations (a) of the impact of Mr. Khrushchev's antics and (b) insofar as possible, an assessment of what it really means as a greater threat to world peace.

The Armed Forces Day observances, I believe, offer a real opportunity not to illustrate counter "rocket-rattling" but rather a rededication to peace; at the same time, the defense displays themselves, I believe, will be ample worry to any enemy that—if attacked—we are ready, willing and able to defend ourselves, and world peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, several Armed Forces Day statements on its purposes and objectives.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMED FORCES DAY STATEMENTS

Robert B. Anderson, Secretary of Treasury: "On this Armed Forces Day, all Americans join in paying tribute to the men and women of our armed services who are making such a vital contribution to the strength and security of our country. The preservation of our free way of life depends in large measure upon their faithful and efficient performance of duty. However, the responsibility for keeping America strong rests not only upon our Military Establishment, but also upon the dedicated efforts of all our citizens to maintain a vigorous and progressive economy. Let us all go forward, therefore, in the common effort to build an America capable of playing its full part in the maintenance of world peace."

Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army: "The U.S. Army proudly joins in the observance of Armed Forces Day. Designated for public celebration throughout the Nation, it is a fitting reminder of the civilian-military teamwork that has played—and will continue to play—such an essential part in the preservation of our way of life."

W. B. Franke, Secretary of the Navy: "The Armed Forces Day slogan, 'Power for Peace,' means not only the military might of the United States but the power of 178 million Americans—aware of their responsibilities—working daily within the framework of our Constitution to maintain freedom and bring about a lasting world peace. We of the Navy—which steadfastly upholds the cause of freedom and peace—invite our fellow Americans to visit with us on Armed Forces Day 1960."

Dudley C. Sharp, Secretary of the Air Force: "Armed Forces Day gives all Americans an opportunity to join in grateful tribute to the men and women of our military services. We acknowledge that their strength is our best hope of peace and our assurance of survival. On this day the Air Force salutes its sister services, the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. Also, the Air Force opens its bases to the public and is glad to welcome its many friends so that they may become better acquainted with the Air Force and the part it plays in the defense of our country and our allies."

Gen. N. F. Twining, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff: "To an important extent the effectiveness of the Armed Forces is dependent upon the intelligent support of the American people. The observance of Armed Forces Day is one of the traditional opportunities for the men and women in uniform to explain and demonstrate to our fellow Americans the adequacy of our equipment, training, and combat strength. An honest appraisal of our defenses should convince the public that we are using, and will continue to use, our available resources to the best advantage in our national interest."

Gen. L. L. Lemnitzer, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army: "Each year, Armed Forces Day offers the American people an opportunity to see at firsthand how their Military Establishment is accomplishing its missions in the defense of our Nation. The United States Army extends a cordial invitation to all Americans to visit its posts and activities on Armed Forces Day—1960."

Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations: "The Navy has made great strides forward in technology, but the ultimate weapon of defense is still the alert, dedicated individual, both in and out of the Armed Forces. On this Armed Forces Day we invite our fellow countrymen to visit our bases, inspect our facilities, and meet our Navy men and women in order that they may become better informed of the status of their Navy."

Gen. Thomas D. White, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force: "On this 11th Armed Forces Day, we in the U.S. Air Force rededicate ourselves to the preservation of freedom and continued peace.

"Our Air Force is a powerful deterrent to aggression. While our Nation will never commit aggression, we must stand ever ready to defend our freedom.

"We salute our sister services, proud of our position on the integrated defense team which serves to protect our cherished heritage."

Gen. David M. Shoup, Commandant of the Marine Corps: "Armed Forces Day, 1960, is an excellent opportunity for Americans to become better acquainted with their Armed Forces and with the vital role played by each of the services in maintaining our national security. The U.S. Marine Corps, our Nation's amphibious force in readiness, extends a hearty 'welcome aboard' to one and all."

Vice Adm. A. C. Richmond, Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard: "In these difficult times, it is imperative that our Nation maintain a strong and efficient Military Establishment. I urge, therefore, that all Americans take advantage of this Armed Forces Day to find out what is being done to protect our hard-won heritage of freedom."

SENATOR WILEY SAYS WASHINGTON WORKLOAD PREVENTS HIS ADDRESSING REPUBLICAN CONVENTION, BUT RESTATES OFFER TO CAMPAIGN AFTER PRIMARY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the following is the text of a message I sent to Mr. Claude Jasper, chairman of the Republican Party of Wisconsin:

I find that it will be impossible for me to address Republican convention this year. Critical world situation, legislation of vital interest to Wisconsin, and important weekend conference demand my presence in Nation's Capital. I stand ready, however, to assist after the primary. The year 1960 offers the Republican Party of Wisconsin a new opportunity to serve the people both in the State legislature and the U.S. Congress. The programs endorsed by the convention will go a long way toward showing the voters that we are ready, willing and able to meet the economic and political problems facing State and Nation. Ours must be a party responsive to the challenges of today. With warmest regards to all my friends, I remain,

Sincerely,

THE SUMMIT TRAGEDY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the tragic events which affect the destiny of the free world, with consequences no one can foresee, are naturally absorbing the attention of all public-spirited Americans and even more particularly of those who, like ourselves, are charged with responsibility in Government.

Public opinion is still confused and uncertain as to what may be the consequences of these events. I think it useful therefore that the comments on the contemporary crisis of three well-known and distinguished columnists be brought to the attention of as wide an audience as possible, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have these printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. The first, by Mr. Walter Lippmann, was published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, and is entitled "First of All." The second is by James Reston and published in this morning's New York Times, entitled "The Summit Tragedy." The third is an article written by Drew Pearson, published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, entitled "Ike's Hopes Crashed With U–2."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 19, 1960]

FIRST OF ALL

(By Walter Lippmann)

Amid the wreckage, and as we recover from the shock, the long work of rebuilding will have to begin. Where must it begin?

It must begin at the point where the most critical damage has been done. Where is that point? It is not in what Mr. Khrushchev said or did to us. It is in what we did to ourselves. It is that we "first did help to wound ourselves."

The wound has been made by the series of blunders on the gravest matters in the highest quarters. These blunders have not only angered the Russians and wrecked the summit conference but, much worse than all that, they have cast doubt among our allies and among our own people on our competence to lead the Western alliance on the issues of peace and war. Mr. Khrushchev's harsh and intemperate language has produced a reaction and evoked sympathy for the plight of the President. But we must have no illusions about the depth and the extent of the loss of confidence in American leadership, in the judgment, sagacity, and political competence of the Government in Washington.

This is the damage to which we must address ourselves. We are a free people, and one of the blessings of a free society is that, unlike an unfree society, it provides a way to deal with error and correct mistakes. This is to investigate, to criticize, to debate, and then to demonstrate to the people and to the world that the lessons of the fiasco have been learned and will be applied.

In a situation like ours the damage to our prestige would be irreparable if we all rallied around the President and pretended to think that there was nothing seriously wrong. For that would prove to the world that the blunders will not be corrected but will be continued, and that our whole people are satisfied with bad government. It is the dissenters and the critics and the opposition who can restore the world's respect for American competence. We cannot do this by pretending that the incompetence does not exist.

These are hard words. But in what other words shall we describe the performance on Sunday night when the Secretary of Defense, who is in Paris as one of the President's advisers, ordered a worldwide alert of American combat forces? On Sunday night Mr. Macmillan and General De Gaulle were still struggling to find some way out of the affair of the spy plane. Yet this was the time chosen by the Secretary of Defense to "stage a worldwide readiness exercise" which, though not the last stage before actual war, is one of the preliminary stages to it.

Why Sunday of all days? This blunder was not the work of some forgotten colonel on a Turkish airfield. This was the work of the Secretary of Defense and of the President. The timing of the "exercise" was just a shade worse than sending off the U–2 on its perilous mission 2 weeks before the summit. The timing of the so-called exercise makes no sense whatever. For if the alert was concerned with a possible surprise attack, when in the name of common sense could there be less danger of a surprise attack on the Western World than when Mr. K. in person was in Paris?

Unhappily, too, Secretary Gates' "exercise" was just about as incompetently administered at the top as was the affair of the spy plane. This time, it appears, the top people forgot to say anything about the "exercise" to their press officers who did not know what to say, and were not even in their offices, when the public was being frightened by the "exercise."

A great government faced with a most formidable adversary, itself the leader, champion, and mainstay of the non-Communist world, cannot be conducted in such a reckless and haphazard way. That is the damage that first must be repaired before we can begin to deal with the general international wreckage, and to regain our confidence in ourselves.

[From the New York Times]

THE SUMMIT TRAGEDY—BREAKDOWN OF PARLEY SHAKES WORLD'S FAITH IN WISDOM OF TOP LEADERS

(By James Reston)

PARIS, May 18.—The tragedy of the Paris Conference, which ended tonight, is that it shook the confidence of the world in the wisdom and judgment of the two nations that hold the key to war and peace.

What troubled Paris tonight was not primarily what President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev would do now—which nobody knows—but the realization that the two most powerful nations in the world are also the least experienced of the great powers: both subject to the element of accident, to the ingrained habits of the past and to the whims of personal pride and caprice.

This was the conference that everyone lost. It did something no one thought possible; it outfailed the Paris Conference of 1919. After 41 years President Eisenhower, Premier Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan, and President de Gaulle made Wilson, Clemenceau, Lloyd George, and Orlando look good.

It was this sense of uncertainty about the giants of the world that dominated the atmosphere in Paris today. Here was Mr. Khrushchev this afternoon in the great hall of the Palais de Chaillot shouting at the West, paying deference to the glowering Marshal Rodion Y. Malinovsky on his left and threatening to smash American planes like an impudent cat against a wall.

EISENHOWER SILENT AND ANGRY

Here, too, was the President of the United States, angry and silent, visiting cathedrals while his allies praised his dignity and sympathized with the failure of his last great chance for an East-West accommodation, but condemned in private his absent-minded behavior on the reconnaissance flights over the Soviet Union.

Everyone was trying to be very considerate and hopeful about the mess, but all had to admit it was a mess, brought on by the unplanned blunders of Washington and the savage planned reaction of Moscow.

The general reaction to the two men was quite different. One was restrained, the other was violent; one was silent and defensive today, the other loud and offensive.

One was trying to remove misunderstandings, the other was exploiting them. But the main point was that both were shaking the world, one by accident and the other by design.

The nub of the whole thing seemed to be that both President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev, for different reasons, had lost control over the direction of the immense power they are supposed to govern.

The fact that the President came here and announced that he grounded all flights over the Soviet Union for the rest of his term in office is clear enough proof that, if he had been aware of the fact of these flights at this sensitive moment, he would not have approved the flight of the U–2 that was downed in Soviet territory on May 1.

CONFIDENCE IN UNITED STATES SHAKEN

The President has conceded this here in his private talks with Mr. Macmillan and General De Gaulle. They do not condemn his objective or his personal motives; in fact, he is so obviously disappointed by the melancholy turn of events since the sky-spy case that the British and French leaders are more sympathetic to him now than ever before.

Nevertheless, the lack of control and discipline over the Central Intelligence Agency by General Eisenhower, and the failure of the State Department to retain civil authority over the administration's intelligence-gathering activities have inevitably shaken the confidence of the Allies in the judgment of the Nation that is their primary line of defense.

Mr. Khrushchev lost control too, apparently for different reasons. General Eisenhower led his party out of isolationism, but Mr. Khrushchev has been engaged in the even more delicate operation of fraternizing with the "capitalist enemy."

By doing so, he was going against the militant Communist philosophy that nothing matters except the class struggle. Many of his own powerful associates in the Communist Party's Central Committee apparently did not approve of the manner in which he was hobnobbing with the capitalists, and the Chinese Communists felt that this whole process of itinerant good fellowship was bound to create what they called ideological confusion within the Communist world.

So long as it appeared that Mr. Khrushchev might sweet talk the Russians into West Berlin, his jaunts were tolerated. But when this dream began to fail, and particularly when it was discovered that President Eisenhower was responsible for sending the U–2's over Soviet territory, the other leaders of the Soviet Union, it is felt here, demanded change—with or without Mr. Khrushchev's approval.

Western leaders who were present at the Monday meeting at the Elysée Palace with Mr. Khrushchev got the impression that the Premier was nervous and perhaps even a little unhappy in his about-face role. But by this afternoon, he was as hard as Vyacheslav M. Molotov and as vivid and vituperative as Andrei Y. Vishinsky.

The last time Mr. Khrushchev saw Paris he was the benign and jovial Mr. K. He made a special point then with President de Gaulle that their conversations should be held without anyone present except the interpreters.

JOVIALITY IS PUT ASIDE

This week all was changed. The jovial Mr. K became the arm-waving naughty Nik, and Marshal Malinovsky was there as a witness of his every word and move, even when Mr. Khrushchev said goodby to President de Gaulle.

None of this was missed by the press of the world or the diplomatic corps of Paris, and the inevitable reaction was not only that the giants were quarreling—which always terrifies the world—but that they were blundering in a most extraordinary way.

This was particularly true of Mr. Khrushchev after he got well into his new role. He overplayed every card he had. He was rude and primitive. He was not only a boor, but what is worse in Paris, he was a bore. And instead of splitting the Allies, he even drove the press of London and Paris to the President's support, which is not easy to do.

There are the things that have spread the feeling of uneasiness about the leadership of the great powers. The two men who started out to reduce tensions ended up by increasing them here in Paris, and the question now is how far the present "dukes-up" attitude will go.

About this, no one really knows, probably not even Mr. Khrushchev. For until he gets back to Moscow and reports to the Central Committee, there is no way of knowing what will happen to Berlin, or for that matter what will happen to Mr. Khrushchev.

[From the Washington Post, May 19, 1960]

IKE'S HOPES CRASHED WITH U–2

(By Drew Pearson)

It is apparent that a lot more than a former Air Force officer and some photos of Soviet airplanes came down with that U–2 plane May 1 flying 1,300 miles inside Russian borders. With it came down Ike's greatest ambition and, more important, mankind's hopes for better understanding and eventual world peace. Also gone aglimmering may be the Republican chances of electing a President in November.

Mr. Eisenhower's greatest ambition after 40 years as a military man was to go down in history as a builder of peace.

This became more and more apparent to those who talked to the President weekly at his legislative conferences in Washington and to Republican Party leaders. One of them confided shortly before the summit conference here that it was difficult to get the President to concentrate on domestic problems any more. When the subjects of water pollution, education, and taxes were raised in conferences Ike would listen impatiently and then change the subject to foreign aid or international problems.

When THRUSTON MORTON, Republican national chairman, tried to persuade Mr. Eisenhower to take Vice President NIXON to the summit, he urged that NIXON go from its start to the finish. Ike flatly refused, finally compromised that NIXON come as a standby, all of which caused the frank GOP chairman to exclaim to friends: "This guy doesn't seem to know that we've got to win an election. All he's interested in is peace!"

HOPES GO GLIMMERING

All this of course has now gone glimmering—both political hopes and personal peace hopes—gone with the flights of Pilot Francis Gary Powers over Russia.

Regardless of the considerable fumbling of the Eisenhower administration there are two great things Ike has had as a salesman for peace. One is his background as a military man which made it possible for him to sell better relations with Russia to the isolationists and the GOP doubters as could few other American leaders.

Second, Ike has had the smile, the personality, the gestures that won millions of people to his support. The Spaniards have a word for this contagious charm: sympatico. Ike had it and used it effectively to win friends for the United States all over the world. Recently he confided to GOP leaders that he planned two more trips abroad following the scheduled, now canceled, trip through Russia before his term ended. He loved this type of international salesmanship and wanted to devote to it the rest of his months as President.

However, big dreams are sometimes upset by small details. And bad administration shows also that no man can serve as President of the United States on a part-time basis.

LOOSE ADMINISTRATION

For 7 years extremely efficient Press Secretary Jim Hagerty plus a sympathetic American press have been glossing over the fact that President Eisenhower doesn't know what is going on in a large part of his administration and that it is impossible for any man to be an effective President yet spend several days every week away relaxing at golf and almost every evening relaxing over a bridge table.

Franklin Roosevelt spent almost every night until 1 a.m. in private study. Mr. Truman knew the intimate details of government as few others in his administration. On the eve of such an important conference as the summit here, with great hopes for permanent peace at stake, they would have required that all flights over the Soviet Union be cleared with the White House. But the looseness of the Eisenhower administration permitted the left hand to do what the right hand knew not.

The tragedy of this great anticlimax to President Eisenhower's fine work for peace is that we have been posing as moral leaders of the world and as custodian of honesty and righteousness. We have caught many Soviet spies, but catching spies doesn't absolve us from getting caught spying. And once we were caught, all the Madison Avenue techniques which had been so effective in selling Mr. Eisenhower in election campaigns seemed to evaporate.

We have let the Russians outpropagandize us at every turn. Even here in Paris the Russians got the first headlines Monday by issuing their ultimatum before Hagerty, supposedly trained in the best newspaper and Madison Avenue techniques, could get his statement to the American press.

THE DEPARTMENT OF MODERN AND CLASSICAL LANGUAGES, UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I have in my hand a summation of the record of a very outstanding department of the University of Wyoming, the department of modern and classical languages. The dynamic head of this department of the university is Dr. A. J. Dickman.

This summation records the participation of the special students in the Fulbright exchange program during recent years. Considering the relatively limited numbers of students coming under Dr. Dickman's tutelage at the university, one is at once impressed by the high percentage who have met the severe requirements of the Fulbright program and who have represented both our University of Wyoming and the United States very effectively overseas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the summation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the summation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WYOMING FOREIGN LANGUAGE BULLETIN

(Editor, Adolphe J. Dickman)

(Published by the Department of Modern and Classical Languages, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo., spring 1960)

GOOD NEWS: FULBRIGHT AWARDS OF LANGUAGE STUDENTS FOR 1960–61

The department of modern and classical languages is happy to announce that three of our students have been granted Fulbright scholarships for the year 1960–61.

Miss Kay Kepler, from Laramie, Wyo., major in zoology and minor in French, will study at the University of Melbourne in Melbourne, Australia.

Miss Katherine Ann Wells, from Kansas City, Mo., major in art and minor in Spanish, will study at the Central University in Caracas, Venezuela.

Miss Patricia O'Melia, from Rawlins, Wyo., major in French and minor in Spanish, will study at the University of Besançon, France.

These students are proof that the University of Wyoming graduates continue to receive excellent preparation in their studies and are able to compete with the best in the country.

We are listing below those University of Wyoming graduates who have received previous Fulbright awards in foreign lands:

Byrl D. Carey, Jr., University of Glasgow, Scotland, 1950–51.

Michel Hoch, University of Paris, France, 1952–53.

Beverly Rogers, University of Nancy, France, 1952–53.

Elizabeth Beresford, University of Rennes, France, 1952–53.

Virginia Evans, University of Bordeaux, France, 1953–54.

Stanley Brooks, University of Rennes, France, 1954–55. Appointed lecturer, 1955–56.

Sally Jackson, University of Bordeaux, France, 1955–56.

Robert J. Hall, University of London, London, England, 1955–56.

Larry S. Slotta, Delft Technical University, Delft, Holland, 1956–57.

Thomas L. Hanks, University of Paris, France, 1956–57.

Robert Mahoney, University of Oslo, Norway, 1957–58.

Donald Ericksen, New South Wales University of Technology, Sidney, Australia, 1957–58.

Mary Lee Herman, University of Durham, England, 1958–59.

John B. Morgan, Delft Technical University, Delft, Holland, 1958–59.

Barbara Smith, University of Clermont-Ferrand, France, 1958–59. Appointed lecturer, University of Grenoble, France, 1959–60.

Don M. Ricks, Bristol University, Bristol, England, 1959–60.

Joan Anderson, University of Oslo, Norway, 1959–60.

Robert Sullins, Ecole des Beaux-Arts, Paris, France, 1959–60.

We should like also to mention that Darlene Huhtala, graduated in 1950, won a French Government award as assistante d'Anglais at the Collège de Jeunes Filles at Amiens, France, for 1951–52. Charles Sargent, Jr., graduated in 1958, received a Rotary scholarship for the year 1959–60 to study economics at the University of Lyons, France; his major was economics, his minor, French. Hjalma Person, graduated in 1958, won a Scandinavian seminar scholarship for 1959–60 to study in the Scandinavian countries; her major was art, her minor, French. James Couch, who graduated in 1947, won a Mexican Government award for 2 years of study at the National University of Mexico after obtaining in 1948 his master of arts degree in Spanish at the University of Wyoming.

HOW TO TUNE IN ON THE WORLD

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the importance of an informed public opinion in all the countries of the free world is emphasized by the recent collapse of summit talks in Paris. In this process of getting the facts to the people of all the countries, including those behind the Iron Curtain, radio is an indispensable instrument. Shortwave radio particularly makes possible intercontinental communication. By this means there is an exchange between our people and those of the rest of the world on points of view, approaches to international problems and also their cultures and characters.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which emphasizes the importance of listening to worldwide shortwave broadcasts, entitled "How To Tune in on the World," by Arthur Settel, which appeared in Pageant magazine for May, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO TUNE IN ON THE WORLD

(By Arthur Settel)

If you'd like intelligence reports direct from behind the Iron Curtain—

Or the inside information explaining those incomprehensible headlines from Laos and the Chinese-Indian border—

If you enjoy live entertainment from such exotic spots as Nyasaland, Quito or Cairo, a ringside seat at a real-life drama of rescue at sea, a listening post in the war of nerves as the great powers hammer away at one another—

All you need are:

1. A shortwave radio set.

2. The patience of Job.

3. The stamina to go without sleep indefinitely.

4. An ever-loving wife willing to go visiting alone, sleep alone, virtually live alone.

5. A soundproof den where you can fiddle with static-laden frequencies without bringing the house down on your head.

These are the requirements of the bona fide shortwave radio listener who seriously undertakes to become an eavesdropper. You will not need:

1. Knowledge of any language except your own—English.

2. A skyscraping antenna built at staggering cost on the roof of your home.

3. An intimate knowledge of electronics.

The rewards for the conscientious listener to shortwave are varied. Whether it's tom-tom music from Ng'oma, hot jazz from Moscow, or the chimes of London's Big Ben—it's all for free, available in unlimited volume. There are analyses of political problems from sources of every hue in the spectrum; commentaries on architecture, religion, rock 'n' roll; folksy chatter and bantering tidbits; anniversary celebrations, interviews and book reviews—from every corner of the globe. You can eavesdrop on fatuous chit-chat among radio hams, ship-to-shore telephone calls, exchanges between commercial airline pilots and their control towers.

Shortwave listening has been compared to photography: you get as much out of it as you put into it. You can buy a shortwave receiver for as little as $25 (RCA), or a shortwave transistor portable for as much as $275 (Zenith). Shortwave listening combines the features of travel without motion, rubber-necking without fear of detection.

But perhaps its greatest dividend is the power it gives you to ransack the world's most elaborate and expensive storehouse of ideas—elaborate because virtually every culture known to man is ceaselessly airing its views these days; expensive because sending shortwave—as opposed to receiving—costs a very pretty penny.

The United States, for instance—one of the smaller spenders—has appropriated $22.3 million this year to operate the Voice of America 84 hours a day in all languages. The Soviet Union and its satellites are on the airwaves 387 hours a day in all languages, at an estimated annual cost of $170 million. European, Latin American, African and Asian Governments have lower time and money budgets, but all consider shortwave broadcasts vitally important to their information, propaganda and communications programs.

So within the span of a single-evening's monitoring, your shortwave will bring you the following typical mishmash of programing: German language lessons; a Bible lesson from the Andes; a biography of Nikita Khrushchev from Moscow; a discussion of country houses from London; yodeling from Switzerland; a talk on astrology from Madrid, and a police call from your own neighborhood.

The most important listening usually comes after dark, when the air is suddenly shot through with verbal fireworks. The not-so-cold war warms up perceptibly as words and ideas rather than bullets and bombs fly crazily in the great artillery duel between East and West. With your dials twirling, you hear the most dramatic struggle in history for the minds of men.

Although there are no nerve-rasping commercials on international shortwave, there is hardly a broadcast without a hard or soft sell behind it—sometimes shyly peeping out from under a thin veil of kultur. At other times, the propaganda is so obvious that it will send your blood pressure soaring.

Radio Moscow's gems, for instance, are particularly maddening. Broadcasting on 15 to 24 frequencies simultaneously, Radio Moscow can perform breathtaking acrobatics in its policy postures. Take, for instance, the case of RICHARD NIXON.

Until his visit last year to the Soviet Union, where he officially opened the U.S. exhibition, the Vice President was among the top 10 on Moscow's hate parade, second only to J. Edgar Hoover in the number of times he was denounced for his views on Soviet expansionist aims and communism in general. But when it served the Kremlin's purpose, NIXON'S name was dropped from anti-American broadcasts, and his statements paying tribute to Russian industrial progress and the people's desire for peace were freely quoted. For the time being, NIXON was no longer included among the ruling circles bent on atomic war. The erstwhile "missile rattler" was now "well informed," "a believer in coexistence."

But once he had returned home, NIXON again—on Russian radio—resumed his role as provocateur, supporter of the policy of encirclement, and a member in good standing of the ruling circles driving America toward the brink. Moscow Radio was back in form.

While others heard about it secondhand, the shortwave listener was treated directly to Moscow Radio's best example of the hard sell when Premier Nikita Khrushchev toured the United States last September. American shortwave listeners were told of the Soviet Union's peaceful intentions, but every

broadcast included a clear threat that the Kremlin was ready to fight to have its way, and had the means to do so.

And what did the programs beamed to Russia say? (This is an advantage of shortwave listening—not even the Kremlin can prevent eavesdropping.)

"America is a rich, capitalist country," said a Captain Vasiliyev over Radio Volga early in September in a program intended for Russians. "But it is a paradise only for a small number of imperialist magnates. The billionaires use the money they make from sucking the blood of the workers for golden bathtubs, swimming pools filled with champagne, and carousing."

Such statements were somewhat different from those Premier Khrushchev was delivering in New York, Washington, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Detroit.

What are the short-wave broadcasts—most of them government-sponsored—trying to sell us that we don't already have? The Russians, the Red Chinese, the Czechs, the Rumanians are all, of course, trying to sell us communism. But what about the naughty songs coming to us over the airwaves from Paris; the opera from Rome; the symphonies from West Germany; the folk songs from Mexico; the travel talks from Montreal? Chiefly, they are designed to acquaint listeners with the broadcasting country; perhaps entice us to go there one day and spend a vacation—and some dollars.

With all this mass persuasion going on, language is no clue to the identity of the country whose broadcast you're hearing. A Russian-language newscast is usually the Voice of America trying to catch some ears in the Soviet Union. Polish-language broadcasts come from London, Greek-language broadcasts from Warsaw, discussions in Turkish from Bucharest in Rumania.

Radio National de España in Madrid broadcasts in Chinese; Radio Luxembourg in Hungarian. Radiotelevision Italiana transmits in 24 European languages, plus Hindi, Urdu, Bengali, and Esperanto. The Vatican City Radio—perhaps most logically of all—programs in Latin. Radio Cairo broadcasts in Hebrew to Israel, although the Egyptian Government, which owns the station, doesn't officially recognize Israel's existence.

But you can't twirl the dial without bumping into a program that is perfectly understandable to you, because nearly every country in the shortwave business broadcasts part of the time in English.

So, if the corny comedy and the contrived drama of domestic television begins to pall, if you become weary of giant, economy-size, commercial commercials—get a shortwave radio set. You'll find uncontrived drama, unconscious comedy, and a wide, wide world ready to entertain you, confound you, or invite you to visit lovely Tanganyika and exotic Singapore.

A GARDEN

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, why do people put a geranium, or a lily, in the window instead of a book, or a photograph, or an article of clothing? Why do people plant morning glories and lilac bushes and rose bushes in their meager yards? Why do men who have achieved a degree of independence and a competence buy a place in the country? What is there about the country which draws the majority of mankind like a magnet, even if all their days have been spent in the roar and dust and smoke of a great city?

The answer is found in the first book of the Bible:

And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed.

Man has never been able to throw off the influence of that early environment.

The Lord God planted a garden
In the first white days of the world,
And set there an angel warden
In a garment of light enfurled.

So near to the peace of Heaven,
The hawk might nest with the wren;
For there, in the cool of the even,
God walked with the first of men.

And I dream that these garden closes,
With their shade and their sun-flecked sod,
And their lilies and bowers of roses,
Were laid by the hand of God.

The kiss of the sun for pardon,
The song of the birds for mirth—
One is nearer God's heart in a garden
Than anywhere else on earth.

EXTENSION OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, for the special attention and leadership he has given to the Library Services bill. He was one of the first in Congress to recognize the need for and introduced legislation giving status to library services. As chairman of our Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Subcommittee he has supported funds necessary to operate and broaden this program.

It has been my pleasure to join the Senator from Alabama and others in sponsoring S. 2830, extending the Library Services Act of 1956 for 5 additional years. The original act will expire in 1961, and I am grateful that the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has favorably reported a bill—S. 2830—to extend this important program.

Mr. President, this program has been of great benefit to many rural communities throughout the United States. Because of the pace of modern living, with changes and discoveries of far-reaching importance occurring almost daily, there is a growing need for making current information available to all segments of our population who want to form their opinions based on actual facts. The rural services libraries are meeting these objectives for an important part of our population, and at the local level they are received with ever increasing enthusiasm. While we are making great progress in bringing library services to more people, there are millions who do not now have access to local public libraries. Many of these people come from rural families who would welcome an opportunity to obtain greater knowledge and improve themselves through books and other information obtainable only through the library service program. A 5-year extension of this program would maintain existing programs and would assist in extending this service to new areas.

Mr. President, this program is an outstanding example of cooperation between the Federal Government, State governments, and local communities in filling a basic need by assisting rural communities in improving their educational opportunities. I would like to pay tribute to the librarians in the local areas who have helped to guide this program to assure its success. I would also pay tribute to the men and women who serve without compensation on the boards of public libraries. These outstanding leaders have given unselfishly of their time and efforts in making library services available to thousands of local communities who would otherwise be deprived of this service.

Mr. President, I am especially proud of the fine library program we have in Mississippi. It is growing. This is evidenced by the expansion of this program into many new areas of our State. Since January 1957, 14 Mississippi counties have added new library services, 13 counties have access to bookmobile service for the first time, 6 new multicounty library systems have been created, and 32 towns have public libraries for the first time. Also many of the existing library services have been expanded and modernized. Of significant importance is the statewide book pool which has been established to furnish a clearinghouse for unusual and duplicate book titles.

Our local leaders cooperating with State and Federal library services have done an exceptional job in developing this program.

I predict that with the passage of S. 2830 more people will avail themselves of this service. It will greatly strengthen our educational program and make possible a better way of life for millions of our people.

I hope that this bill will receive the full and unanimous support of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND FEDERAL SERVICE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Boswell B. Perkins, although a relatively young man, has compiled a distinguished record of public service as a former Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and as a former counsel to Governor Rockefeller of New York. He has been active in numerous legal activities and is presently a partner in a leading New York law firm.

As chairman of the special committee on the Federal conflict of interest laws of the Association of the Bar of the city of New York, Mr. Perkins supplied important leadership in the compilation of a comprehensive report entitled "Conflict of Interest and Federal Service." The legislative recommendations in this report have been embodied in a bill of which I am a cosponsor (S. 3080). The report is considered a milestone in efforts to deal with the complex issues in this field.

Recently, Mr. Perkins discussed the recommendations of his bar association committee in testimony before the Special Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery. This testimony outlines a program for legislative action in this area which merits the attention of all Members. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that a copy of Mr. Perkins' testimony be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRACT FROM PREPARED STATEMENT OF ROSWELL B. PERKINS, CHAIRMAN, SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST LAWS, OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL POLICY MACHINERY, MAY 13, 1960

The report of our special committee, which will be published by Harvard University Press in about a month, has two themes. The first is that ethical standards within the Federal Government must be beyond reproach, and that there must, accordingly, be effective regulation of conflicts of interest in Federal employment. The second is that the Federal Government must be in a position to obtain the personnel and information it needs to meet the demands of the 20th century.

These themes are coequal. Neither may be safely subordinated to the other. What is needed is balance in the pursuit of the two objectives. We need a longrun national policy which neither sacrifices governmental integrity for opportunism nor drowns practical staffing needs in moralism. We need a careful regulatory scheme that effectively restrains official conflicts of interest without generating pernicious side effects on recruitment.

The basic conclusion of our special committee is that such a scheme can be worked out. Our report and the Executive Conflict of Interest Act which we propose contain a recommended new program for achieving this result.

I shall state the 13 major recommendations of our special committee. As you will see, some of them point in the direction of broadening and closing loopholes in the present laws. Nevertheless, these recommendations for expansion and tightening will not, in our view, in any way adversely affect recruitment. Others of the recommendations point toward realistic adjustment of the laws in ways which will help facilitate recruitment, and I will return to these recommendations for a more detailed consideration after my listing of all 13.

The capsulized statement of these recommendations may seem underly general and vague to you. However, I ask you to keep in mind that each is backed up by precise statutory language in S. 3080, our proposed Executive Conflict of Interest Act, and a detailed technical commentary in our report on each provision.

Recommendation 1: Conflict-of-interest problems should be recognized and treated as an important, complex, and independent subject of attention and concern in the management of the governmental establishment.

Recommendation 2: The present scattered and uncoordinated statutes relating to conflicts of interest should be consolidated into a single unified act, with a common set of definitions and a consistent approach. Archaic provisions should be repealed.

Recommendation 3: The restraints contained in the present statutes should be greatly expanded in their scope by making them applicable to essentially all matters in which the public deals with the modern Federal Government.

Recommendation 4: Certain important restraints now covered in regulations or not at all should be included in the basic statutes, particularly restraints relating to receipt of gifts and coercive use of office.

Recommendation 5: The statutes should permit the retention by Government employees of certain security-oriented economic interests, such as continued participation in private pension plans.

Recommendation 6: Wherever it is safe, proper and essential from the viewpoint of recruitment, the statutes should differentiate in treatment between regular employees and citizens who serve the Government only intermittently, for short periods, as advisers and consultants.

Recommendation 7: Regular, continuing and effective enforcement of the law and regulations should be assured by emphasizing administrative remedies, rather than the clumsy criminal penalties of present law.

Recommendation 8: The statutes should create the framework for active and effective administration of the system of conflict-of-interest restraints, headed up with clear responsibility in the President. The President should designate, pursuant to the proposed act, an administrator to assist him in this function.

Recommendation 9: In addition to the statutes themselves, there should be a second tier of restraints, consisting of Presidential regulations amplifying the statutes, and a third tier, consisting of agency regulations tailored to the needs of particular agencies. The responsibility for day-to-day enforcement of the statutes and regulations should rest upon agency heads.

Recommendation 10: At all levels of administration potential conflict-of-interest problems should be headed off by preventive action, such as, for example, orientation programs for all new employees to acquaint them with the applicable conflict-of-interest rules, and periodic reminders as to such rules.

Recommendation 11: There should be more effective prohibitions and penalties applicable to persons outside Government who induce or participate in conduct by Government employees in violation of the conflict-of-interest laws.

Recommendation 12: Each committee of the Senate considering a presidential nominee for confirmation should be given the benefit of a full analysis, prepared by the administrator in consultation with the Department of Justice, of any conflict-of-interest problems the nominee's particular situation may present. The confirming committee should give due consideration to this analysis and to the protections afforded by a modern and effectively administered overall scheme of conflict-of-interest restraints, if one is put into effect.

Recommendation 13: The Congress should initiate a thorough study of the conflict-of-interest problems of Members of Congress and employees of the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

Let me now focus on three of the foregoing recommendations which would help to facilitate recruitment.

Recommendation 5 calls for clarification of present laws to permit the retention by Government employees of certain security-oriented economic interests, such as continued participation in private pension plans.

Hallmarks of modern American society are the pension plan, the group insurance plan, and other kinds of security-oriented arrangements. They are the basis of long-range economic planning by millions of individuals and families. Under present conflict-of-interest laws—passed when few, if any, of such plans existed—there is some doubt whether an employee of the Government may legally continue as a member of some plans maintained by his former employer, at least if contributions to the plan by the employer are regularly made which benefit the Government employee. This overhanging doubt presents a great deterrent or creates a severe hardship to the noncareer employee.

Our proposed act permits Government employees to continue their participation in certain private plans under some circumstances and with adequate safeguards. For example, it would permit a Government employee to remain a member of a pension, group insurance or other welfare plan maintained by his former private employer so long as the employer makes no contribution to the plan on behalf of the former employee who is in Government service. Similarly, a Government employee could continue to belong to certain of these plans even if the former employer does make contributions on his behalf, so long as the plans are qualified under the Internal Revenue Code and so long as the payments by the former employer continue for no longer than 5 years of Government service.

We think our recommendation No. 5 is extremely important. It is simple in concept, and, I am confident, acceptable even to the most ardent advocates of more stringent conflict-of-interest laws.

Our recommendation No. 6 calls for some differentiation in treatment between regular employees and citizens who serve the Government only intermittently, for short periods, as advisers and consultants.

To an ever-increasing extent the Government is dependent for information and advice—for learning not only how to do it, but what to do—upon part-time, temporary, and intermittent personnel. These serve individually, or as members of committees, but that service is in addition to their regular private work as scientists, technicians, scholars, lawyers, businessmen, and so on. Technically, they are, however brief their service, employees of the Government, and at present, all of the conflict-of-interest statutes apply to them. This fact has brought about both refusals to serve and conscious or unconscious ignoring of the statutes by those who do serve. It has also resulted in a welter of special statutory exemptions.

Our proposed act distinguishes, in a few key places where it is safe and proper, between rules for regular full-time Government employees and rules for what are defined as "intermittent employees." Under the proposed act, an "intermittent employee" is anyone who, as of any particular date, has not performed services for the Government on more than 52 out of the immediately preceding 365 days. The 52-day limit could be increased to 130 days by Presidential order in a narrow class of cases.

For these intermittent employees, we suggest certain special rules under the proposed act. For example, regular full-time employees would be forbidden to assist private parties for pay in transactions involving the Government; intermittent employees, who have to earn a living in addition to their occasional Government work, would be allowed to assist others for pay in such transactions, except in cases where the particular transaction is, or within 2 years has been, under the intermittent employee's official responsibility or where he participated in the transaction personally and substantially on behalf of the Government.

Similarly, since intermittent employees, by definition, are employed by organizations in addition to the Government, they would not, under our proposed bill, be subject to the rule forbidding their Government pay to be supplemented from private sources in return for personal services. Finally, the rules we propose as to receipt of gifts are somewhat different for the two classes of employees.

Our recommendation No. 13 deals with the problem of Senate confirmation. There is substantial evidence that the Government's efforts to recruit top-level executives have been impeded by the requirements of stock divestment imposed by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate.

This problem cannot be dealt with by statute. The confirmation power is a constitutional prerogative. However, this problem should be a subject of joint concern and increased cooperation between the executive branch and the Senate. There is some evidence that recently the executive departments have taken more pains to prepare their nominees for confirmation. Legal opinions have on occasion been furnished by the Justice Department; plans have been worked out in advance of hearing as to what need be sold and what could be kept, and representatives of the appointing department or agency confer in advance of hearing with appropriate authorities of the committee.

If the proposed act were passed, the Administrator would become the central repository for all information concerning conflict of interest and he would be expected to assist the executive branch in working out regular procedures for preparing nominees for confirmation. He could, in cooperation with the Department of Justice and general counsel to the agency in question, prepare a full analysis of the conflict-of-interest problems of the particular nominee. Over a period of time, these analyses might be given substantial weight by the confirming committees.

Furthermore, if a modern and effective system of statutory restraints is adopted by Congress and implemented by active executive branch administration, the confirming committees might be willing to place greater reliance on the statutory rules and procedures. One clear example is the procedure for disqualification recognized by the proposed act where a Government official holds a particular economic interest in a private entity.

For example, take the case of Robert Sprague, who came before you early in your deliberations. Mr. Sprague was nominated as Assistant Secretary of the Air Force in January 1953. The Senate Armed Services Committee opposed his confirmation because he refused to sell his shares in his family firm, the Sprague Electric Co. His nomination was thereupon withdrawn on February 11, 1953.

I feel confident that if there had been on the books a strengthened version of the present 18 U.S.C. section 434, which is aimed at self-dealing, and if there were presently in operation a well-established and effective system for self-disqualification of officials from any matters in which they might conceivably have a personal economic interest, the Sprague appointment could have been saved. In other words, the confirming committees will relax their efforts to impose a broad wall of disqualification prior to assumption of office only if they can be assured that a strong and workable program exists for disqualification after assumption of office in specific situations. In brief, the confirming committees can be greatly aided in performing their function realistically, in the light of recruitment needs, only if Congress as a whole lends support by modernizing the entire structure of conflict-of-interest restraints.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I was at the hearing at which Mr. Perkins testified, and I am delighted that my colleague has called attention to his testimony. Mr. Perkins gave a splendid account of himself, which makes both my colleague and me very proud of his performance.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the remarks of my colleague.

SUMMIT FAILURE AND A WARNING FOR THE CONGRESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the summit failure reaffirms the truth which we have long known and often ignored or forgotten, and that is that Soviet leaders of today, like those who have gone before, intend to continue their efforts to communize the world, liquidate freedom, destroy the capitalistic system, violate their obligations, step up their aggressive techniques, threaten their neighbors, continue their espionage and keep the world tense.

From the very day in 1933 when we recognized Red Russia until this good hour there has been little or no change in these Soviet objectives. The Senate document printed a few years ago showing the host of treaty violations by the Soviet Union speaks eloquently on this point. The convicted spies now serving long prison sentences are further evidence of this fact. The recent jamming of the Voice of America speaks plainly enough that truth is unwelcome. The threats to Norway and Pakistan show the bully at his worst.

For 27 years we have seen this pattern unfold. It is not new. It has not changed. Where there has been retreat from these objectives it came only because we were firm. Where Soviet words were softened they were only dictated by guile. When the hand of friendship was extended it was a sham and a mockery.

For the Congress these difficult bygone years have a lesson and a warning.

There are some who would sharply curtail the mutual security program—this collective economic, military, and technical effort in which we are mutually engaged with many other countries to strengthen both the resolve and the capacity of the free world to stand its ground and firmly meet the continuing Red challenge.

I could think of no greater mistake. To curtail this program would be to retreat. To ax it would bring dismay to those who need this help. To weaken would mean the destruction of one of the real assets which comes out of the ashes of the summit failure, and that is the conviction inspired in the peoples of many countries that the United States will not retreat. It will stand firm and honor its obligations and its responsibility to the cause of freedom and the free world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2131) to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, as amended.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, A SENATOR FROM WYOMING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with the agreement entered into on yesterday, the Senate is meeting at this time to honor one of our most esteemed, one of our most gracious, one of our most likable, and one of our best, if not our best, Member. I refer, of course, to the senior Senator from Wyoming, the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, who has graced the Senate for approximately 25 years, and who has made many contributions not only to the welfare of his State and to his country, but also to the free world as a whole.

JOE O'MAHONEY is one of those northeasterners who came West, settled down, and made his mark and established a great reputation.

He is known by many as Mr. Wool, because of the many activities he has pursued in behalf of the wool industry in his State of Wyoming. He is also known as Mr. Wyoming, because of his attitude toward all the factors which go to make up that great State. He is also known as Mr. Democrat. But to all of us he is known as a great Senator, a man whom we wish well in the years ahead and for whom we wish, along with Mrs. O'Mahoney, the best of everything in the future.

JOE O'MAHONEY is going into a well-deserved and well-merited retirement. We only hope that he will come back to see us occasionally, and that he will give us the benefit of his advice, his counsel, and his wisdom, and that he will keep in touch with us, so that we may continue to be better men and women because of our friendship with JOE O'MAHONEY, a Senator's Senator.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, we are assembled here today because of the decision of one of our Members to retire from this body. That we are not assembled here alone is testified to by the wide interest across the country in this particular moment in our history. I hold in my hand editorial comments selected at random from many papers in many sections of the country.

One reads: "May Happiness Hold Him Fast." Another: "A Champion of the West." Another: "His Record Will

Stand." Another: "When the People Were Involved." Another: "Hail and Farewell."

I ask unanimous consent that these be inserted in the RECORD in full following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McGEE. They point up the deep feeling of regret, and yet at the same time the pride and exaltation over this occasion which permits many of us to say something that is not only statewide, is not only personal, but involves all levels of American interests.

I make my statement today because I was in the State of Wyoming at the time the announcement by my senior colleague, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, was made a few days ago.

The days which have elapsed since I have returned from there have not helped me greatly to decide what ought to be said. I say that for a reason. When one speaks of a man whom he has known so affectionately, and with whom he has been involved so deeply and has grown to admire without exception on all occasions, it is difficult indeed for a mortal to select the right words to describe fully what is a deep, eternal emotion.

In the talk which has centered about Senator O'MAHONEY in Wyoming, one of the greatest tributes that is paid constantly to him is that he is known as "JOE." At the State convention, from which I have just returned, the name on everyone's lips was "JOE." No finer thing can be said from the heart about any man when he has reached this level of public life than that endearing phrase.

I said at the outset that this was an occasion filled with mixed feelings. While there were those of us who desperately and fervently hoped that somehow it might be possible for Senator O'MAHONEY to continue in this body, this was a matter which he, and he alone, had to decide. Those are considerations which none of us dare question. But they are considerations which all of us must, in full faith, understand and respect.

I wish to speak for just a moment about what I regard as the more exalting aspects of this occasion; the reasons why this is a moment for great pride. That pride stems, in part, from the knowledge that all the people of our State share with me the realization that we have a spokesman for us and for all the people in this body, which is sometimes described as the most exclusive club in the world. It stems from the great privilege accorded to me personally of having served on Senator O'MAHONEY's staff in 1955 and 1956. It stems from my student and teaching days in the field of American history and diplomacy, when the name of JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, as it is today, was on the lips of every student in America, when Senator O'MAHONEY wrote pages of our country's history by making that history himself. In short, it stems from knowing JOE O'MAHONEY and knowing what he believes in.

Some of the Members of this body are familiar with the story of Senator JOE's life before he entered the Halls of the Senate. It is a simple story, one that is inspiring to those of us who are working toward the building of a better world in which to live. It is marked with rugged individuality, initiative, and perseverance, and is well worth recounting at this time.

Senator O'MAHONEY was born in Chelsea, Mass., on November 5, 1884. His father, Denis O'Mahoney, was from County Cork, Ireland, and came to this country to make his home. He fought for the Union in the Civil War with the famed Irish Brigade.

Senator O'MAHONEY attended Cambridge Latin School, but left before graduation when his father died in 1903. He moved to New York to live with an elder brother, and, studying nights, while working in the daytime for a publishing house, he soon passed his college examinations. He then enrolled in Columbia University, earning his way by working at odd jobs, including freelancing several articles for the Associated Sunday Magazine.

One of those articles, entitled "One Hundred Years Hence," was dug up by an alert reporter 50 years later, and readers were astounded by Senator O'MAHONEY's predictions, made in 1906, of television, REA, nuclear science, and other modern marvels. One can see that even then my senior colleague had the imagination and foresight which marked him for leadership. He anticipated the future, and was not content merely to contemplate the past.

The ill health of a brother forced Senator O'MAHONEY to move to Boulder, Colo., where he took a job on the Boulder Herald and immediately immersed himself in the problems of the West, with which area he has now been concerned for half a century.

Early in 1916, Senator O'MAHONEY accepted a position as an editorial writer on the Cheyenne, Wyo., State Leader. The owner of the Leader was Gov. John B. Kendrick, a Wyoming stockman, who was campaigning for the U.S. Senate at the time. As the new editor, Senator O'MAHONEY plunged into the fray with great vigor.

So impressed was Kendrick with Senator O'MAHONEY's abilities that when he came to Washington he brought JOE O'MAHONEY along as his secretary, and one of the deepest and most lasting friendships that I think the annals of this body shall ever record was formed.

While serving in the position of secretary to Senator Kendrick, JOE O'MAHONEY attended Georgetown University, where he studied law, and received his law degree in 1920.

As Democratic national committeeman for Wyoming in 1932, he helped to draft the party platform. He regularly served on the platform committees of later conventions.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt named him as First Assistant Postmaster General under James A. Farley in March 1933.

Senator Kendrick passed away that November, and Wyoming's Governor, Leslie Miller, appointed JOE O'MAHONEY to Senator Kendrick's seat. Senator O'MAHONEY held that seat until his commission from the people was temporarily withdrawn in 1952. His tenure in Congress, which dated back to his secretarial days with Senator Kendrick beginning in 1917, was resumed 2 years later.

As a newcomer to the Senate in 1934, Senator JOE inherited his predecessor's committee appointments, including one on the Appropriations Committee. Eventually he rose to be chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, as well as chairman on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. In the latter position, he was an active advocate of programs to decentralize production and to expand air power.

He twice put through the Senate, by an unanimous rollcall vote, defense funds designed to make the air power of this country the most effective in the world. For his efforts in this field, he and the present distinguished majority leader were awarded the Gen. H. H. Arnold Trophy by the Air Force Association as aviation's Man of the Year in 1952.

Mr. President, in looking over the accomplishments of the senior Senator from Wyoming while he served this body, I scarcely know where to begin in recounting them. His activities and energies have been so diverse, so intense, and so successful that they defy grouping or generalizing. However, with the thought in mind that no one could possibly list all the significant contributions to humanity made by Senator O'MAHONEY, I would suggest that some definite guidelines appear in retrospect. In looking back at legislative history during the past quarter century four areas have the Joe O'Mahoney label—development of the West, his great dedication and devotion to the Constitution, and his labors for economic freedom.

As a member of the Public Lands Committee, Senator O'MAHONEY effected many impressive accomplishments in advancing the development of Wyoming and the West. When the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was created in 1949, he became its chairman. He was later urged to seek the position of Secretary of Interior when Harold Ickes retired, but he declined in preference to serving his State. He went back to the Interior Committee in 1954 when he was reelected.

Senator O'MAHONEY's constant battle for the development of the West's natural resources, however, began even before he was elected Senator. As assistant Postmaster General he appeared with Senator Kendrick before a Cabinet meeting to urge construction of the Casper Alcova project, later renamed the Kendrick project on Senator O'MAHONEY's initiative. As a Senator, he sponsored numerous bills affecting western reclamation and has been vigorous in securing appropriations for various projects. In 1944 he presented to Congress the overall bill for development of the Missouri River Basin, a program

which has transformed many acres of formerly arid land of the West into productive acres.

During the same year, Senator O'MAHONEY and Senator Millikin, of Colorado, introduced an amendment to the Flood Control Act which has protected the priority of western waters for irrigation purposes against diversions by downstream users. He was also instrumental in sponsoring and securing passage of the Upper Colorado River Basin storage project in 1956.

In 1937 Senator JOE worked tirelessly for legislation sponsored by another of my boyhood idols—Senator George Norris of Nebraska—to create the REA.

In the minerals field, the O'Mahoney-Hatch Act of 1946 has been a prime stimulus for the great increase in oil drilling discoveries and production in the Rocky Mountain area since World War II. Due to his identification with oil problems, he served as chairman of the special Senate Committee To Investigate Petroleum Policy in 1947. Those committee hearings have become textbooks for the oil industry. In 1943 he introduced and ushered through Congress the synthetic liquid fuels law which authorized the Bureau of Mines program for production of synthetic fuels from coal, oil shale, and other substances. At this very moment his mineral leasing bill is pending Senate action.

I doubt if there is a man in this Chamber who would not agree that Senator O'MAHONEY has done more to preserve the intent of the U.S. Constitution than any other person during recent history. Long a recognized authority, he has frequently been called upon in the Senate to settle questions bearing on the constitutionality of proposed legislation. He has never let us forget for a moment the principles of the separation of powers.

He has labored tirelessly to maintain the balance between the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government.

His opposition to President Roosevelt's attempt to pack the Supreme Court, his fight against the drafting of labor during World War II, and his exposition of the constitutional principles at stake in the Strauss case all bespeak the depth of his conviction and the splendid vigor of his courage in defense of the Constitution.

Mr. President, it is difficult to single out any one contribution Senator O'MAHONEY has made to this Nation as the outstanding one, but certainly high on that list would be his ever vigilant fight for economic freedom. A man who has stood first and foremost for fair play and fair competition he has led the attack on stifling monopolies and concentrations of economic power.

The hearings and reports of the Temporary National Economic Committee, created on the initiative of and chaired by him, have become "bibles" and are on the shelves of every university library in the country.

In the book entitled "Congress Makes a Law" by Stephen Kemp Bailey, published by the Columbia University Press in New York in 1950, on page 119 is to be found the following account of the effective speech by Senator O'MAHONEY in support of the Full Employment Bill of 1945:

> Then, after a full day of debate on the first Radcliffe amendment, the high point of the sponsor's strategy was reached in the dramatic speech of Senator O'MAHONEY. It is rarely that a speech on the floor of the Senate actually changes stubborn Senate minds. O'MAHONEY's presentation was an exception. It is generally conceded by friend and foe alike that the Wyoming Senator's dramatic, illustrated lecture on the economics of S. 380 had a marked effect on the final vote. With the use of charts and graphs placed in the well of the Senate floor and against the back wall of the chamber, O'MAHONEY breathed economic respectability into the pending legislation. With the attitude of a patient professor he explained technical economic concepts to his colleagues, emphasizing that he was opposed to deficit spending and that was why he was supporting the bill. He pulled out all the stops in the semantic organ: "I am arguing for the investment of private capital under a free enterprise system, and the elimination of deficit spending"; or again, "The chart (on the back wall) was not prepared by any 'leftists.' It did not come from any organization interested in Federal spending. It came from the Cleveland Trust Company of Cleveland, Ohio"; or finally, "There is nothing in this bill which is in any way antagonistic to big business or to wealth."
>
> He flattered the collective ego of Congress: "Mr. President, this is a bill to vest in Congress the power and the responsibility of meeting the issue, instead of continually delegating the power to the executive branch of the Government. This, Mr. President, is a bill to restore the functions of Congress."
>
> At the close of O'MAHONEY's presentation, Senator Taft addressed the chair with the words, "Mr. President, I think that I can agree with about 90 percent of everything which the Senator from Wyoming has said." Aging Senator Bailey walked out of the Chamber shaking his head and saying, "If I'm ever tried for treason, I hope JOE O'MAHONEY can defend me."

He exerted tremendous leadership in the eventual enactment of the Full Employment Act which provided for the stabilization of business and employment. This led to the establishment of the President's Council of Economic Advisors and the Congressional Joint Economic Committee of which Senator O'MAHONEY served as chairman during the 79th, 81st, and 82d Congresses.

In 1955–56, it was my privilege to serve on the Senator's staff.

I should like to share several personal memories I have of Senator O'MAHONEY, who has meant so much to me, and has unselfishly done so much for me.

It was during this time that I experienced a learning process and a personal inspiration for integrity in public service that no textbook ever written for use in academic halls could ever supply. Many times I have had occasion to state that during the wonderful year I served with him, Senator O'MAHONEY himself was the finest professor under whom it was ever my privilege and opportunity to study.

I recall that during the course of hearings which he so tirelessly conducted, often alone, when he was assaulted again and again and was interrogated by batteries of experts in their respective fields—and, it mattered not, what those fields were, Senator O'MAHONEY proved himself to be the master of all. During the study of the concentration of power in the Electric Bond & Share Corp., after a host of the finest lawyers from Wall Street had done their best with their case, in opposition to this one man, the chief spokesman for the legal counsel of the electric utilities said to me, following one of those long and tortuous sessions:

> McGEE, let me say just one thing: I would rather face all the lawyers in New York at the same time than face that boss of yours alone.

That was a great tribute to the mental clarity, the wisdom, and the conviction commanded by Senator O'MAHONEY when under tremendous pressure.

I remember that during the General Motors Corp. hearings, a monumental inquiry into the accumulation of economic power in this country—which Senator O'MAHONEY pioneered—after days and days of hearings, one of the spokesmen for the giant corporations would say, "But, Senator, the statement you have just now attributed to me is not what I said yesterday."

Then Senator O'MAHONEY would say, "Let the clerk read the record."

And when the clerk read the record, it immediately became apparent that Senator O'MAHONEY's recollection was faultless.

Senator O'MAHONEY has consistently demonstrated an almost unbelievable faculty for accurately recalling the proper interrelationship of facts—with the result that always he was able to ascertain the truth, the point of quest in all the hearings.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to refer to a bit of personal philosophy of Senator O'MAHONEY's that has served as a guideline to me. As I left my service on his staff, he said to me, "If you decide to go into politics, I hope you will remember one simple rule that I have always found most helpful: It is wise not to try to 'keep books.' Do not 'keep books'; do not remember old scores; do not try to hold old grudges, because they will detract from your central purpose and will woo you away from the main path."

I have had many occasions to reflect upon that perceptive counsel—and always with the conclusion that it is the wisest of all.

I think it might be said of my beloved colleague that: "He ever bore, without abuse, that grand old name of 'gentleman.'"

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Does the Senator from Wyoming desire to complete his statement without interruption?

Mr. McGEE. If it is permissible, I should like to complete my statement as a base for a tribute, if that will be agreeable to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that the able former Senator from Colorado and former Governor of Colorado, the Hon-

orable Edwin C. Johnson, has come to the floor of the Senate. When I told him that we today would pay, in our limited fashion, our humble measure of tribute to one of the greatest Senators of the West, the distinguished Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, Ed Johnson said he wanted to be on the floor. I do not know how long he can remain with us.

I shall be happy to wait until the completion of the statement of the Senator from Wyoming. I do not want to interfere with his presentation.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator from Colorado asked me whether I wished to continue. I said, "Yes." The Senator from Colorado did not tell me the reason for his request. I should certainly say it is important that we acknowledge the presence of the distinguished former Senator and former Governor of Colorado at this time, and I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Colorado for that purpose.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. Our cherished friend, the former Senator from Colorado, is well known to every Member of the Senate. He served here with great distinction for three terms and has been the Governor of Colorado for three terms. No living citizen of Colorado holds the respect, admiration, and veneration of Colorado's people to the same degree as this remarkable man who sits beside me.

Ed Johnson of Colorado appeared this morning before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, of which the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has been one of the great leaders.

The junior Senator from Colorado could not express a deeper regret at losing a friend than he does upon the departure of the able senior Senator from Wyoming.

The junior Senator from Colorado has a vital stake not only in Colorado; he has a vital stake in the senior Senator from Wyoming.

It is my humble judgment that if it had not been for the senior Senator from Wyoming and the distinguished former Senator and former Governor of Colorado taking an active part in the senatorial campaign in Colorado in 1956, the junior Senator from Colorado would not be here today. It is too bad the majority leader is not present to hear this. If the junior Senator from Colorado had not been elected to the Senate in 1956, the Democratic Party would not have had a majority the following year. The Democrats needed one vote to have a majority in the Senate. They seem to have forgotten that. One vote gave us a majority in the Senate in 1957. It was a close race. The Democrats did not think they could win in Colorado. But when the able senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] came into Colorado and spoke, as he has always spoken in his legislative career, about the concentration of economic power in this country in the hands of giant corporations, the voice of Senator O'MAHONEY was heard, and was heard not only in Colorado, but also throughout the Nation.

He spoke about the cost-price squeeze on the farmers and ranchers of our two States. He spoke about the power of monopoly, and how it can control the economic lives of working people, white-collar people, and small business people. He warned that the tremendous concentration of economic influence in the hands of a few persons demands the constant vigilance of watchdogs who will act in the people's behalf. He was at his fiery, fighting best that night, and I feel certain his words influenced many Colorado citizens to vote for the Democratic candidate.

When the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] came into Colorado, we held a great meeting at the West Denver High School, and the meeting was televised throughout the State. The junior Senator from Colorado, then a candidate, introduced Ed Johnson, who, in turn, introduced Senator O'MAHONEY. And between the hammer and the anvil, I was able to be elected to the U.S. Senate. I say this by way of emphasizing my appreciation of some of the many things we owe to the great senior Senator from Wyoming.

The Carroll family has always felt most warmly and strongly toward the O'Mahoney family. Mrs. O'Mahoney, the former Agnes V. O'Leary, of Winchester, Mass., has been a great source of strength and comfort to Senator O'MAHONEY ever since their wedding in 1913.

Senator O'MAHONEY's contributions to the political and the economic history of the Nation have been truly outstanding.

As other Senators have said, during the 1930's Senator O'MAHONEY headed the T.N.E.C. study, which took inventory of our economy, and formed a sound basis for legislation passed thereafter.

I wish to say of the able senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] that as a speaker and as a constitutional lawyer, he has had few peers in this body; certainly this fact is widely recognized. Coupled with his brilliant mind and forceful delivery, he has a rugged, western independence. All Senators have the highest respect for him. We pay the utmost attention to the amendments he proposes and to the arguments he makes.

The announced retirement of my friend and teacher, Senator JOE O'MAHONEY, has evoked expressions of deep regret from all over the Nation, and most especially from the Rocky Mountain West.

In our part of the West, no two States share a closer community of interest than Colorado and Wyoming. And with all due respect to other Members of this body, I doubt that any Senator will miss JOE O'MAHONEY's presence, leadership, and splendid guidance more than the junior Senator from Colorado.

Of all his accomplishments as a legislator, he may be remembered most in the Rocky Mountain West for his excellent service as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, followed by his unique achievements on the Committee on the Judiciary—and particularly as chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, on which I have been privileged to serve.

JOE O'MAHONEY deeply loves the West, and has battled in the great tradition of western progressives. He has a capacity for fierce indignation and dedicated effort against those who would extract great riches from our Nation's soils and waters without making a contribution for the benefit of future generations.

His knowledge of corporate structure and financing, and of the nature of monopoly, is broad and deep. There are corporate empires in this Nation far richer and more powerful than many of our State governments; some of them, indeed, have in past years held the people of various States in economic subjugation. The tendency today is toward ever greater concentration of economic power. JOE O'MAHONEY has stood fearlessly against many of these giants in his time. He has not only defied them successfully—he has turned the searching spotlight of public information upon them so that the people might know of what is involved. Serving with him has been one of the great experiences of my own legislative career.

At this point, I wish to insert a tribute to Senator O'MAHONEY which appeared in the Rocky Mountain News of Denver, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, on May 11, 1960:

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BIG CHANGE FOR WYOMING
(By Pasquale Marranzino)

U.S. Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY sent word to his Wyoming constituency that he is hanging up his gloves and will not seek reelection.

The news isn't surprising, but it comes as a disappointing change to Wyoming Democrats who have been voting for the craggy-faced, bushy-browed Senator since 1933.

Only once in that interim, 1952–54, did the colorful lawyer fail in his bid to go to Washington as Senator, swamped in the overwhelming GOP victory that brought Frank Barrett into office.

His impressive career was halted last June in the midst of a typical O'Mahoney battle. He led the forces that successfully opposed the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss as Commerce Secretary. Weary from days of testifying and speaking against the nomination, O'MAHONEY collapsed as he left the Senate floor, a victim of a stroke.

Even though the stroke kept him bedridden for months, it couldn't lick JOE. He made an amazing recovery and continued his work from his hospital bed by telephone and in consultation with his staff and colleagues.

JOE's most brilliant—and possibly one of the most vital coups for the commonweal—came in those days of the Roosevelt administration when the Wyoming Senator led the fight to keep intact the size of the U.S. Supreme Court. F.D.R., who had hoped to enlarge the Court and pack it with birds of his feather, broke his party pick on JOE's stubborn opposition.

This break with F.D.R. was made after considerable wrestling with the O'Mahoney conscience. He had been one of the first New Dealers. He helped write the Democratic platform that carried Mr. Roosevelt into power. And he was rewarded with the first Assistant Postmaster General job in that first administration.

The 75-year-old Senator has Colorado roots. He was born in Massachusetts and came West in 1908 to Boulder. There he

worked on a Boulder newspaper as city editor and also was a correspondent for the Rocky Mountain News and the Associated Press. He left Boulder in 1916 to go to work for a Cheyenne paper owned by the late Gov. John B. Kendrick.

His newspapering was interrupted when Kendrick ran for the Senate, JOE serving as campaign manager and secretary. He went to Washington, with the successful Kendrick, as secretary. When Kendrick died in 1934, O'MAHONEY was named to the job.

Although JOE's close New Deal associations made him a national power, he never placed the good of the West in second spot.

He battled for reclamation, for rural electrification, for domestic wool, for the farmer and rancher, and for more water to irrigate more acres and help his arid State.

In recent years he has been a thorn in the side of the Eisenhower administration. Although a New Dealer, he didn't have the New Deal propensity for big spending. He was tight-fisted with the dollar and kept hammering away at inflation, high prices, and Government participation in private industry through foreign deals.

He probed the national oil import program and suggested that the administration quit having the big oil companies formulate foreign policy. He was an ardent supporter of the antitrust laws, asking for crackdowns on meatpackers, insurance companies, and monopolies.

He has served long and well and with devotion to the West. Retirement for JOE will be rough, but we expect he still will remain the No. 1 Democrat in Wyoming.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I see my old friend, JOE O'MAHONEY, sitting here today; and I am delighted to see him.

He has been referred to as a statesman; and he is that.

He has been referred to as a great lawyer; and he is that.

He has been referred to as "Mr. Democrat"; and he may be that.

He has been referred to as "Mr. Wool," and I fancy that he is.

But I think of JOE O'MAHONEY as a man, and I think of him with affection and respect, because we have sat together and have battled together for so long in probably the most controversial committee of the U.S. Senate, the Judiciary Committee. Out of my esteem for Senator O'MAHONEY, I can testify that conversely to our differences, my regard and my affection for him have grown with the years.

We have differed very frequently on many things, and we have fought most stoutly on this floor on many things. But always his word has been his bond, and what he had to say here was always dictated by conviction, plus what he thought was in the interest of the people of the United States of America.

In brief, Mr. President, as we look back upon the record of Senator O'MAHONEY, we see most clearly that one outstanding feature of his career is that he has given so much more than he has received, and that his contributions to the well-being of this country are priceless and immeasurable.

Mr. President, I count myself fortunate that I can call Senator O'MAHONEY my friend. I count myself fortunate that I have been enriched by my association with him.

As a man, Senator O'MAHONEY symbolizes what I have always thought of as the real enfoldment of history. A man is not a means to an end; he is an end in himself. So I think of Senator O'MAHONEY as a man unfolding over a long period of time, as an end in himself. And during that long period of time he has, indeed, had great influence upon many people, and has enriched the country.

So, Mr. President, I rise today to say of Senator O'MAHONEY, blessed is he; and blessed, also, is his consort, who has stood so nobly beside him for so long a period of time.

I salute Senator O'MAHONEY as a friend. I wish we could keep him here. But I know the verities that have dictated his retirement.

To him I say, good luck, and God's blessing.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Wyoming yield.

Mr. McGEE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, it has been a great privilege to me to serve in the Senate with Senator O'MAHONEY. We have been together in the Senate for nearly 26 years. I have great admiration and respect for him, and I consider that his record of service is one of the most outstanding in this generation.

One of the recollections I will carry with me as long as I live is of the debate between Senator Joseph Robinson, of Arkansas, the then majority leader of the Senate, and Senator O'MAHONEY, when President Roosevelt recommended passage of the bill which provided for the "packing" of the Supreme Court. On that day, Senator O'MAHONEY delivered extemporaneously one of the greatest orations in opposition to that bill that it has been my privilege to hear. The debate between the two was very forceful, and at times was bitter. It has always been my conviction that the speech delivered on that day by Senator O'MAHONEY was one of the impelling reasons for the withdrawal by President Roosevelt of the Court-packing bill.

Senator O'MAHONEY is a great constitutional lawyer; and throughout the years he has been alert, active, and very effective in his efforts to preserve the Constitution and our fundamental principles of government.

I simply wish to say to Senator O'MAHONEY today that I shall always treasure our very close association; and I wish to express my deep regret at his retirement, which will be a great loss to the Nation; and I desire to extend to him my cordial regards and best wishes for the future.

I pay my respects to Senator O'MAHONEY as a very great Senator and a very great American.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. President, I was still a student at the University of Georgia when the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] first became known to me. That was during the controversy to which the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has just now made reference—the fight over the so-called Court-packing bill.

The able senior Senator from Wyoming took a leading role in opposing that proposal; and, from reading the press reports about it, I became very much impressed with the ability, knowledge, courage, and eloquence of the senior Senator from Wyoming. At that time I had no idea that I would ever have the privilege of sitting with him in this body and knowing him intimately.

Mr. President, one of the things which makes service in the U.S. Senate so pleasant and rewarding is the fact that the nature of our work in this body serves to bring all of us together in a close, intimate, and highly personal relationship. During the short period of time I have had the honor to serve in the Senate, I have come to know well the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming, and knowing him, my respect for his eloquence, his judgment, and his character has increased. I know that he will fight the battles of the people of this great country against all odds and obstacles. I have seen him do it with courage, with credit to his State and Nation, with distinction to himself, and—yes—with a great degree of success.

The Senate of the United States will not be the same without JOE O'MAHONEY. His years of service in this body has enhanced its distinction and prestige. He is without doubt one of the greatest constitutional lawyers who ever sat in the U.S. Senate.

When I think of JOE O'MAHONEY, I think of him as a truly great liberal; a liberal of the stature of Borah and Walsh; a liberal who, while proudly bearing the liberal banner, has not used his liberalism as an excuse for introducing coercive proposals which would restrict the liberties of the people rather than protect them.

I am happy to pay tribute to this great man today. We will miss him, but we hope we will have the benefit of his wise counsel and respected judgment for many years to come.

I thank the Senator from Wyoming for yielding to me.

Mr. McGEE I yield to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in the Black Hills of western South Dakota, where my home is, the name of JOE O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, is widely respected. We are neighbors and during the years I have been in Congress we have come to regard JOE O'MAHONEY as almost as stanch a defender of the interests of western South Dakota as any Senator from South Dakota could be.

I feel a personal sense of gratitude for the great help Senator O'MAHONEY has given me on legislation, both when I was in the House of Representatives and here in the Senate. A number of

years ago it was my privilege to work with him in securing the enactment and the extension of legislation dealing with the development of synthetic liquid fuels. In Wyoming, South Dakota, and Montana we have many coal deposits that have possibilities in that field; and JOE O'MAHONEY took the lead in securing the enactment of the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act.

Again, when we were legislating for the development of our uraniferous lignite deposits, it was because of JOE O'MAHONEY's understanding that we were able to get timely legislation from the Interior Committee that was needed to permit development and protection of claims in the coal reserve.

Again, when working on water conservation projects—and I have in mind particularly the Pactola Reservoir in South Dakota—I went to Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, and Senator Ken Wherry, of Nebraska, who also understood the problems in that field, and was successful in having the initial funds provided which made possible the starting of that project.

But, Mr. President, I rise to speak not alone because of these instances of personal legislative association with Senator O'MAHONEY. I rise to speak because I want to pay tribute to the service he has given as a constructive legislator in broad fields of national interest.

During many years when I was in the House of Representatives I was on the Military Appropriations Committee, or, as we then called it, the Appropriations Subcommittee for the War Department. During much of that time Senator O'MAHONEY was a member, and later chairman, of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Military Appropriations in the Senate. I know something of the battles he has fought to get sound defense, and at the same time to try to prevent cost-plus contracts. Senator O'MAHONEY has been a leader in trying to see that the United States got sound defense, and honest defense, for every dollar spent.

I want to allude also to the matter which has previously been mentioned by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from West Virginia, the place Senator JOE O'MAHONEY played in the great, historic constitutional debate which took place in the Congress in 1937. I was a freshman Member of Congress then in the 75th Congress. The great epochal fight of that year was the battle over the proposal of the then President to reorganize the Supreme Court, the proposal generally known as the Court-packing plan.

I did not particularly know Senator O'MAHONEY personally at that time, but I was impressed by the fact that among younger Members of the Senate when that great battle took place, which was marked by the participation of men like Senator Pat McCarran, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, Senator Burton Wheeler, and others, JOE O'MAHONEY, a younger member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary that year, was given the opportunity and responsibility of writing the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. And I have never forgotten—I have cited on many occasions—the ringing words with which he closed that report. I am paraphrasing now, but I remember the sense of it: That the Court-packing plan should be rejected so decisively that such a proposal would never again be presented to the representatives of a free people.

Mr. President, the free people of the United States will always be indebted to JOE O'MAHONEY for the contribution he made in preserving the independent judiciary of this country.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, few men have served in this body with such great legislative skill as has the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming. Few men have served so effectively in this body, in our long history, dealing with so many complex subjects, as has the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming.

In all of these broad and diverse areas, Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming discharged his duties and responsibilities with great care and with great skill.

Many Members come to this body and specialize in one subject or two subjects. But, Mr. President, the senior Senator from Wyoming has left many monuments in this body that will stand for years to come.

I remember, when just out of school, studying that great undertaking by him, in the late 1930's, I believe it was, the Temporary National Economic Committee. It is one of the finest studies ever made of the complex American economy. But the Senator from Wyoming was not content with just that problem. At the same time, he devoted great energy and skill in the field of appropriations, first covering military appropriations, then interior appropriations, and later, after the war, the Atomic Energy Commission.

In all of these areas, his work was remarkable indeed. He served as chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee with great skill. His work as a member of the Judiciary Committee in the field of constitutional law and in the field of antitrust law is well known to our colleagues and to the entire Nation.

In all of these endeavors, the senior Senator from Wyoming brought to this body a keen mind, born of intellectual honesty and great logical and legal skill that made it possible for him to concisely define a matter with such clarity that at the conclusion of any presentation made by him there could be no doubt as to the issues.

In addition, I must say that in his long labors in this body he has always maintained a fine sense of humor. He is a kindly and gentle man, always respectful of the rights of other Members of this body.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks heretofore made. We will indeed miss him, but we will always look forward to his wise counsel and advice in the years to come.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to be numbered among those who are very sorry to know of JOE O'MAHONEY's decision to retire as a Member of this body at the end of his term.

New England, as everyone knows, Mr. President, is a very generous area, but one of the most generous things we ever did was to give JOE O'MAHONEY to the West and to the Nation. It has been well said today by the junior Senator from Wyoming that after JOE O'MAHONEY arrived in the West, he was almost immediately appreciated by the discerning people of Colorado and later by the people of Wyoming, and he progressed rapidly and constructively up the ladder until he came to the U.S. Senate, where it was my good fortune to become acquainted with him some 20 years ago.

JOE O'MAHONEY is one of the most human, friendly, sympathetic men I have known as a Member of this body.

There is one thing which has been said about him which perhaps needs a little explanation. The junior Senator from Montana referred to the fact that in the West JOE O'MAHONEY is frequently referred to and is known as "Mr. Wool." I will say that if there is any wool in the system of JOE O'MAHONEY it is not Shropshire wool, because in the 20 years I have known him I have never seen any wool growing over his eyes. Time and again I have seen JOE O'MAHONEY exercising his astute legal mind and preventing the Senate from making mistakes which it would have had reason to regret later.

Politically, I think JOE O'MAHONEY is perhaps almost in a class by himself. He is a liberal without being reckless, and he is a conservative without being static. I hope everybody understands what I mean by that, but that is the only way I can describe him politically.

Once more I say we are very sorry he has decided to retire from this body. I join with all the others in expressing the hope that in the years ahead he may have improved health and enjoy life and happiness for many years in the future.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I welcome this privilege to join with my colleagues in expressing sincere regret that one of the ablest and finest Members of this body has decided to retire. I express to him our deep appreciation for the type of public service he has rendered over a long period of time.

The junior Senator from Virginia was first privileged to know his colleague in 1933, while serving on the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, when the distinguished Senator from Wyoming was then the First Assistant Postmaster General. Later in that year, as I recall, he was appointed a U.S. Senator.

Mr. President, as my colleagues know, the junior Senator from Virginia is interested not only in the history of our Government, but also in the preservation of our Constitution as it is written and not as some people think it should have been written. The junior Senator from Virginia believes that there are absolute prohibitions in the Constitution, which should not be overridden either by the legislative branch or by the judiciary, for reasons of expediency, whether they be political, social, or what not. Consequently, it has been a source of the greatest pleasure to me to serve with one of the best constitutional lawyers who has been in this body for many years.

I was privileged to be in the House of Representatives when the Senator from Wyoming made a great speech against the packing of the Supreme Court, in order to get decisions which were desired. The Supreme Court did not have any positive prohibitions in that regard, but it was desired that the Court interpret the Constitution to meet so-called new social needs.

I was privileged to be a Member of this body when Senator O'MAHONEY presented, as few Senators have ever equaled and as perhaps none has surpassed, the appropriation bills for the Department of Defense. He was familiar with every detail of those vast operations and expenditures.

I was privileged to be a Member of this body when the issue was raised, for political expediency, of passing a Federal law to prohibit the imposition of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting. There never has been a finer, better, clearer speech made on that subject than was made by the Senator from Wyoming. The subject did not involve his home State at all, but it did involve the Constitution, which provides that the States shall be the judges of the qualifications of their electors, provided they do not impose a different qualification for the electors of Federal officials than for the electors for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. As I have said, that subject did not involve his State at all, but it did involve the Constitution, which he loved, and which he knew. He did not want to see first one pillar and then another pulled from that great instrument, until in the end it would collapse and carry down with it the glorious structure which, as Daniel Webster said, has united national sovereignty with States rights and individual liberty.

Again only 3 years ago, in 1957, there was not a finer speech made on the floor of the Senate than was made by our distinguished friend in behalf of the Anglo-Saxon, cherished right of trial by jury, when he insisted that if criminal contempt proceedings were to be invoked the defendant should be entitled to a trial by jury.

Mr. President, I cannot add anything to the tribute which has been paid to our friend, but I can say I agree with all of the things which have been said about him today. There is no one who appreciates more than I the type of service he has rendered his State and his Nation, first in the executive branch of the Government and later in the legislative branch.

No one regrets more than I to see that type of clear and radiant mind, possessing courage of conviction, leave us in this period.

We never before have been in such need of legislators who know what the Constitution means, who can present to us the decisions of the court interpreting it, and who have the courage of their convictions to express their views on the floor of the Senate.

Again I say, Mr. President, I regret to see our colleague retire, but he will do so full of honor, to go back to his beloved State with the knowledge that his memory will be kept green in the hearts of those with whom he has served.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Before expressing my fervent hope for many, many happy days in the future for our beloved friend JOE O'MAHONEY, and before expressing my regret upon hearing his decision to retire, may I begin by saying to JOE O'MAHONEY that it is good to have you with us today. You have made a magnificent recovery with the fine Irish fighting spirit which you have always displayed on the floor of the Senate. I know you are going to enjoy many, many happy years in retirement, during which we will continue to benefit from your counsel, your suggestions, and your recommendations.

Many times it has been said that JOE O'MAHONEY is a man of great judgment, great perspicacity, and great comprehension. As the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] said, he had the good judgment a long time ago to move into the West. He had the excellent judgment, having moved into the West, to remain in the West. I know that every Senator who has served with him in the Senate recognizes the tremendous contributions which JOE O'MAHONEY has made to his adopted area of the country, which he has come to love so well, and which in turn has come to love him so enduringly.

Anything which JOE O'MAHONEY did for the West—and he did a great many things—inevitably was helpful to the great State which I am happy to represent. South Dakota and Wyoming are neighbors, and we share a great many of the good things of life. Of the oil which bubbles from the bowels of the earth in the State of Wyoming, they share a little better than we do. But we compensate for that deficit by having more productive grainfields.

By and large, however, the attitudes of the people in our areas, the challenges which they confront, the occupations in which they engage, make us not only good and friendly neighbors, but also make us concerned about each other's problems.

In at least three different instances I have had personal opportunity to work closely with JOE O'MAHONEY, and to observe the skill with which he approaches a legislative problem or a public problem.

We used to have around these parts what was known as the conference of Western Senators, when another great fighting Irishman by the name of Pat McCarran was among us. Of late, we have not been meeting as frequently as we should, but in that conference of western Senators, JOE O'MAHONEY's voice was always raised skillfully, intelligently, and persuasively to try to unite us, across party lines, behind projects and programs beneficial to the great West. In that connection I came to know him very well.

Early in my days in the Senate I was privileged to be a frequent guest of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. I believe that of all the committees in the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary is the most neighborly and hospitable, which I testify because my experience has been that whenever I have had a bill which has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, the members of the committee have invited me to sit with them, to confer with them, to counsel with them, and to answer questions, treating me as though for a day, or a series of days, or a week, I was a member of the committee.

There were hotly contested and very difficult decisions to make in connection with the so-called Mundt-Nixon bill, which was before the Senate in my first year in this body, because it had carried over from the period when I was a Member of the House.

I used to sit in the hallowed confines of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and, being a layman and not a lawyer, I always was overwhelmed by the erudition which was evident in the committee. I was greatly impressed by the manner in which the members of the Judiciary Committee dissected a piece of proposed legislation, the manner in which they made it into a tool, as would a carpenter, for legislative consideration. During those times this great draftsman and lawyer, JOE O'MAHONEY, was always present with his wise counsel and sound advice.

Finally, I was privileged to serve with him when he was the active chairman of the Theodore Roosevelt Commission. There he was, a great Democrat—referred to a couple of times today as "Mr. Democrat of the West"—devoting his talents and his skills toward bringing proper recognition to another great westerner, one who happened to be a Republican more closely identified with the State of North Dakota than the State of South Dakota. However, it was left to South Dakota to perpetuate the memory of Teddy Roosevelt in the immortal granite of the Black Hills in Mount Rushmore's famous piece of sculpture by Gutzon Borglum. In that famous monument we have commemorated and perpetuated the memory of the great Theodore Roosevelt. JOE O'MAHONEY, who led that commission, was most generous to all his associates, as he was in every other way.

I regret that he is leaving the Senate, but I rejoice that he is leaving the Senate in good health, in good vigor, and in good mind. I know those factors will enable him to continue to make contributions to the welfare of our country for many, many additional years.

JOE, wherever you go and wherever you roam, we wish you an abundance of luck, and we hope some of those good days will be spent on the South Dakota side of the beautiful Black Hills of South Dakota and Wyoming.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, Senator O'MAHONEY is one of the closest friends I have ever had in the Senate. He and I worked very closely together on the Committee of the Judiciary. I know that no Member of this body can take his place in the committee or in the Senate. I have watched his work in the Judiciary Committee for many years. Not one time has he ever made a move without being guided solely by the public interest. The public interest and welfare to him has always been the paramount consideration.

Today JOE O'MAHONEY is the most highly respected and the most influential member of the Committee on the Judiciary. I know that he is one of the most highly respected and ablest Members of this body. His retirement will leave a void which cannot be filled.

JOE is a Senator's Senator. In my judgment he has been one of the great Senators in the history of the United States. He is a man of unimpeachable integrity, who has been guided in all of his affairs, personal and public, by patriotism and by what he believes to be for the welfare of our country. I know that no man in the modern history of the Senate has waged a stronger campaign to protect the American system of government than has JOE O'MAHONEY. In addition, both in the committee and in the Senate, he has been one of the most effective Senators.

JOE, we hope for you a long and fruitful life. We are going to miss you in the Senate. You occupy a place I think cannot be filled.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I was greatly shocked when I learned that the Senator from Wyoming had announced that he was retiring from the Senate. I know, of course, that he made that decision, as he made all of his decisions, based upon the realities. I was shocked not so much in knowing that he had made the announcement as I was to realize that when he went away it would leave a great void here in the Senate.

I first came to know Senator O'MAHONEY a good many years ago. In fact, it was when I first came to the House of Representatives, in January 1937. I used to come over to the Senate quite often to listen to Senators debate. I soon learned to admire Senator O'MAHONEY's keen intellect. Of course, I knew something about the tremendous job he did with the TNEC, heading up one of the great economic studies of this country, one that has stood as a monument to him since it was made, and which will continue to help chart the course of our history.

JOE O'MAHONEY has been not only a great Senator, a great leader, a great advocate, a great originator, but at the same time he has been a man who is realistic and is willing to meet conditions as they actually exist and not necessarily as we might wish them to exist.

I recall particularly that in the early part of 1937, in February, if I remember correctly, President Roosevelt, in whose Little Cabinet Senator O'MAHONEY had served, presented what was called the Supreme Court packing plan. There followed a long, hard, and sometimes, I think, a bitter debate in the Senate over that question.

Members of the House would come to the Senate to listen to that debate. JOE O'MAHONEY is the one who pulled that one out of the fire. He was one of those who helped work out a final solution which was agreed to. I recall at the time seeing the piece of paper in his hand as he stood on the floor of the Senate reading off the terms and conditions of the plan that had been agreed upon. He stuck that piece of paper, which was written out in the handwriting of President Roosevelt, in his pocket. I dare say that he still has it as one of his souvenirs.

I said he was a great originator. He has originated a great many pieces of helpful legislation. I remember that a good many years ago—it must have been 10 or 12 years ago—he introduced a plan in the Senate which would have set up some kind of central organization for the purpose of making credit available to small business.

Senator O'MAHONEY left the Senate for 2 years, unfortunately. While he was gone, I introduced his bill, and I have referred to it many times, as I said, as originating, so far as legislation of the Senate was concerned, with Senator O'MAHONEY.

Senators will remember that year before last we finally passed legislation to set up a credit system for small businesses throughout the country. That was based largely upon the legislation that had been initiated by the Senator from Wyoming. I could go on and on and give many cases, involving mergers and consolidations and antimonopoly legislation, and such matters.

JOE O'MAHONEY has been one of the greatest friends the American free enterprise system has ever had in the Senate. He has always tried to move in such a way that would make certain that the free enterprise system, under which we have grown great in this country, should be continued.

I regret to see JOE O'MAHONEY leave the Senate. I know he is taking the right course. He knows that in his own heart, or he would not have made the decision. I wish for him and for his loved ones many more years of good health, great happiness, and success. If any man has earned that right, that man is JOE O'MAHONEY.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I, too, wish to join the great number of friends of Senator JOE O'MAHONEY in expressing sentiments of regret that he is leaving the Senate. I have always considered JOE O'MAHONEY to be one of the ablest Members of the Senate. I am sure that the lawyers in the Senate regard him as one of the greatest lawyers in this body.

One of the yardsticks in determining the worth of a Senator is not the amount of publicity he receives through all the news channels, but the impact he has upon the deliberations of the Senate. JOE O'MAHONEY is leaving a record of a wholesome impact upon the deliberations of this body. His name is attached to much important legislation, and especially that affecting the Western State he has been so much a part of.

I am sure that what all of us have liked most about JOE O'MAHONEY is the fact that he has always used such good judgment in all important matters coming before the Senate.

I know that all of us will miss him a great deal. I agree that he is entitled to years of rest, happiness, and enjoyment, and I hope those will come to him.

I hope, too, JOE O'MAHONEY, that you will continue to come back here as long as we who are here have the privilege of serving in the Senate. You will always remain one of our most loved and respected colleagues.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to start on a personal note. Some 11 years ago Mrs. Holland and I moved into what was then the Wardman Park Hotel, which since has become known as the Sheraton Park Hotel. At that time we found that our close neighbors on the same floor were the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and his gracious and charming wife. They have been such wonderful neighbors, such considerate friends, and such altogether kind people to have near us, that I cannot help express the hope that the Senator's retirement from the Senate will not mean that they will leave us at the Sheraton Park Hotel, because we would very, very greatly miss the many kindnesses and many acts of consideration which have characterized their every attitude toward us.

Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to hear all that has been said, and there may be repetition in what I may say about the Senator as a Senator. He is a great Senator. He is a Senator's Senator. In addition, he is a gentleman and a scholar in the truest meaning of both of those words.

I have been impressed with two things about him as a Senator, which I wish to state for the record. One is his scholarly qualities, the second is his strong support of the Constitution. Everything he has handled, every speech he has made, every position he has taken in the 14 years I have had the chance to observe him, has been based not only upon conviction, but also upon great knowledge and a firm grasp of the facts lying behind the principles which he advocated.

I remember that every year he used to handle the defense appropriation bill. We have become so hurried in the Senate, in these later years, that I am afraid we are departing from the practice which he invariably followed in handling that great bill, covering the tremendous amounts of money involved in it, and serving the completely necessary objective of the defense of our Nation, with such thorough finesse from beginning to end that any Senator who wished to know about anything in the bill was

assured the chance to learn just exactly what it meant. I hope the Senate may always have both the leadership, in the chairmanship of its committees and subcommittees, and the necessary time, to handle matters of such great importance with the skill, with the finesse, with the patience, and with the scholarly grasp which the Senator from Wyoming always exhibited in handling that most important of all our appropriation bills.

That same scholarly quality pertains to so many other matters which he handled that I shall not attempt to mention them all. One of the finest speeches I ever heard made was the Senator's speech in support of the admission of Alaska to statehood, at a time when the effort was not successful, but when the predicate was being laid for the success which came a few years later.

I recall that when I came upon the floor on that occasion the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming made some comment about an incident in connection with the admission of my own State in 1845, and he pointed to a similarity between that incident and something which pertained to Alaska. The RECORD will show a colloquy based upon that comment, indicating the breadth and the depth of his grasp of the problem to which he was addressing himself.

There have been many, many other bills and objectives to which the Senator from Wyoming has addressed himself, and as to which he has demonstrated his great ability, including, among others, measures having to do with the production of wool and the protection of that strategic agricultural industry, as to which we have a deficit rather than a surplus. In that field he has long been an authority.

In every field where he has accepted leadership, he has been an authority by reason of his scholarly grasp of the facts. That is true of antitrust matters and monopoly investigations. It is true of conservation measures and programs for national resource development. It is true of various matters which have not been popular for him to handle.

I heard a Senator mention a while ago the great speech of the senior Senator from Wyoming on the so-called Court packing bill. Surely that was not an easy thing for him to do, coming, as he had a short time before, from an executive position as First Assistant Postmaster General under the same administration that was making the suggestion to which he objected. But he had a perfect constitutional background on which to base his objection.

I remember that in my rather brief service in the Senate, I have heard him speak, I believe this time before a committee, although he had spoken earlier on the floor of the Senate, on the poll tax question. He showed a scholarly grasp of the Constitution, and of the record made by those who drafted it, which few persons possess. He took a strong position, based on the Constitution, a position which others who were as liberal as he wanted to bypass by passing a Federal statute in order to ban the poll tax. He kindly, but with complete firmness, swept that contention aside, because, he said, the Constitution does not permit it, and it would require a constitutional change to take away from the States the right to fix the qualification for electors which is given them by specific words in the Constitution.

I remember when the Senate was debating a bill which he was supporting, the Civil Rights Act of 1957. The question arose as to the place of jury trials in our Anglo-Saxon system of jurisprudence. I remember how sternly and strongly the senior Senator from Wyoming took the position, which probably was not an easy one for him to take in his State, that the right of jury trial to one accused of criminal contempt out of the presence of the court was an inherent right under the Constitution and under the Anglo-Saxon system of law, and must be protected regardless of how worthy was the objective which the proposed legislation under consideration sought to serve.

There have been many matters of that kind which I could mention. I shall not take the time to do so, because I know other Senators wish to speak.

I simply say that I wish we had more Senators, and the assurance of more Senators in the future, willing to acquire a thorough grasp of all the facts, willing to be national in their point of view, rather than provincial, willing to stand back of, behind, under, and in support of the Constitution, in every way within their power, and to insist that it be observed, as the Senator from Wyoming has invariably insisted.

Senator O'MAHONEY found time in his busy life as a Senator, only 3 or 4 years ago, to go to my State and to consider the adequate establishment of a great national park there, a park which was then in the making, and to come back to the Senate and, as chairman of the subcommittee, take a position which I think was right, and which I think subsequent events have justified. I believe his decision will be justified more and more in the minds of millions of people as the years pass in the future.

Senator O'MAHONEY was and is a Senator's Senator, the Nation's Senator, a servant of the Constitution, a very great and outstanding American.

I tell you, "JOSEPHUS"—because that is what I have always called you—I shall miss you terribly. I shall not know where to go when I need constitutional advice, which I very frequently do.

Good health, good luck, good fortune, and a long life to you and your lovely lady.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, much has been said in the Senate this afternoon about the outstanding public service of the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming. With those statements I not only am in accord, but I appreciate the Senator's great service.

Much has been said about his great influence in the halls of Congress. That, too, I appreciate fully and understand, because I have had the privilege of serving with Senator O'MAHONEY for many years.

But that is not what I desire to discuss. I wish to refer to his qualities as a friend and as a neighbor. As has been mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], Mrs. Carlson and I, too, have had the privilege of living at the Sheraton Park Hotel for 10 years as a neighbor of the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming and Mrs. O'Mahoney. This has given us many opportunities to meet and visit with them. It is always a pleasure to have the privilege of meeting them in the lobby or in the halls. No matter where we meet, they are always friendly. It is like greeting friends from home when we meet them. It is then that we have taken pleasure in speaking of things pertaining to everyday life. Those friendly greetings and casual visits always reminds one of the type of friendly neighbors the O'Mahoneys are.

There is one thing especially which Mrs. Carlson and I have noticed, and for which we commend Senator and Mrs. O'Mahoney. Every Sunday morning they go to church. I think that is not only a mark of distinction, but it shows that the Nation can have confidence in the type of people it sends to the Halls of Congress to legislate in their behalf. They are sound, substantial people, having a firm religious background. Mrs. Carlson and I have appreciated that, and have remarked it on many occasions.

There is another side of life besides one's public life in the Halls of Congress. It is the life of the individual as he conducts his everyday home life and activities. Someone has said, "actions speak louder than words." I know of no finer example than the one we have in the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and Mrs. O'Mahoney. Mrs. Carlson and I have enjoyed very much our associations with them. We appreciate their friendship. We shall miss them. But we wish them much rest, which is well deserved and well earned after these many years of public service.

To Senator and Mrs. O'Mahoney, Mrs. Carlson and I say, Godspeed and God's blessing.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it was with much regret that I learned that my good friend, Senator O'MAHONEY, planned to retire and not seek reelection. One of the men who have impressed me most during the time I have been in the Senate has been the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming. He is a profound lawyer.

Someone has said that a lawyer must possess at least three qualities. First, he must be a man of integrity—the most important quality. Next, he must be a man of industry, one who is willing to work, because the law is a jealous master. Third, he must possess knowledge—knowledge of the law and knowledge in general. The profound senior Senator from Wyoming possesses all these qualities, and he is known far and wide as being one of the ablest lawyers in the United States.

Next, the Senator from Wyoming is an able Senator. He is a man of principle—and possibly that should be the

first quality of a Senator. He possesses a keen mind, and he is a hard fighter. These qualities are essential to a Member of Congress.

Senator O'MAHONEY has great courage. I have seen him take positions which may not have been popular in his own State, because the particular problem involved may not there have been considered of paramount importance. I personally shall never forget the magnificent fight he waged on the floor in 1957 in favor of the preservation of the right of trial by jury. For this he earned the everlasting gratitude of millions of Americans.

In the debate over proposed changes in Senate rule 22, concerning the method of invoking cloture, Senator O'MAHONEY demonstrated great courage. He believes the U.S. Senate to be the greatest deliberative body in the world; and he opposed any rule which would enable a bare majority of the Senate to limit debate here.

Senator O'MAHONEY is a natural leader of men. He is a handsome man. He is a man who commands respect. He is tactful, forceful, and vigorous. He is decisive. He does not quibble. He does not mislead.

The great senior Senator from Wyoming is a fine American. He is a true patriot. He stands for the best ideals for which our country was founded. He believes in individual liberty and personal freedom. He believes in the free enterprise system of this country; and, in fighting against monopolies, he has helped maintain the private enterprise system of these United States.

It is with very deep regret that I learn that Senator O'MAHONEY is about to leave the Senate. I cherish his personal friendship. As a lawyer and as a Senator, he is able and profound. As a man, he is kind, courageous, and true.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, both Senator O'MAHONEY and I were born in Massachusetts and were raised in Massachusetts. The only thing I hold against him is that he left Massachusetts. But perhaps that was just as well, because he would have been a difficult Democrat to defeat; so perhaps his departure from Massachusetts made it possible for some of us who are Republicans to win at the polls.

My family and I had the honor and the pleasure of knowing Mrs. O'Mahoney long before I knew Senator O'MAHONEY. From knowing her and her family, I knew she had chosen well when she selected JOE O'MAHONEY.

When I came to the Senate, I had the opportunity to meet Senator O'MAHONEY, and to serve with him on the Appropriations Committee, and to debate with him there, and also on the floor of the Senate, from time to time. He always injected humor into the debate. He always had great knowledge of the subject he debated, and he always had the lightness of touch which is so characteristic of those of Irish descent in Massachusetts.

As members of the Appropriations Committee, Senator O'MAHONEY and I have served together on the Defense Subcommittee. There, he was one of the first to realize the importance of building up our defenses, for the greater security of our country. He always proposed the making of substantial appropriations for improvements in missiles and in the air defenses and the aircraft of our country. All of us knew that he realized, as did we, that there was a great future in the air and a great need to build up our defenses in the air, as well as our defenses on the ground.

Mr. President, because of my necessary attendance on committee meetings, I have not been able to be in the Chamber throughout the session today, to hear all the tributes which have been paid to Senator O'MAHONEY. Of course, I do not wish to reiterate; but I desire to assure Senator O'MAHONEY that I have very greatly enjoyed his personality and our friendship, and I have always been benefited by his outstanding speeches.

All Members of the Senate have the greatest respect for Senator O'MAHONEY, because of his intelligence, his conscientiousness, and his integrity.

When Senator O'MAHONEY retires, he will be greatly missed by every Member of the Senate.

All of us wish him the best of fortune.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, a few days ago, I had the opportunity to express my regret that the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] had decided to retire from the Senate at the end of this session.

The departure of Senator O'MAHONEY from the Senate will be a tremendous loss to this body. It will also be a very great loss to me, personally.

As a youngster in my teens, I had the opportunity to watch Senator O'MAHONEY perform on the floor of the Senate; and many times since then I have had the opportunity to follow his career.

Perhaps one of the best sermons ever delivered by a Chaplain of the U.S. Senate was delivered here by the late Peter Marshall, who, at the opening of the Senate session, one day, delivered this short but meaningful prayer:

> O Lord, help us to stand for something, lest we fall to stand for anything.

Over the many years of his service in this body, Senator O'MAHONEY has, on this floor, stood every day for something, and often times for a great many important things.

Some of us have felt that if a nation were to be great, it must have great liberals and great conservatives, and sometimes persons who were a mixture of both. If our Nation had not had great liberals, there would not today be a free and independent United States of America. If our Nation had not had great conservatives, the ancient landmarks which have guided us so well would never have remained.

Senator O'MAHONEY is an outstanding liberal who has consistently fought to improve and strengthen the basic freedoms of our country; and as a conservative he has fought, in good times and in bad, to preserve the foundations of our country.

Perhaps Senator O'MAHONEY's greatest achievement has been his courageous and determined stand throughout the years to resist the trend toward monopoly on the part of big business, and to make it possible for the American ideal of free enterprise to survive.

He has fought that battle since the day he came here, and he is still in the very thick of that battle. As a matter of fact, today on the floor I asked how he is coming along with hearings on what I think is one of the most vital issues facing America today—the situation whereby large corporations do $6 billion worth of research at Federal expense, and take out patent rights to deny to others the right to use that knowledge which was developed at Federal expense. Senator O'MAHONEY is conducting hearings on that question now. I asked him how the hearings were coming along and what the chances were of getting a bill out of the Judiciary Committee on that subject. He told me, as is so characteristic of him, "Well, the time is short. We are still pressing for it, and I believe we have a chance."

Mr. President, fighting monopolies is a rather thankless task, because those who would be most affected by antitrust laws, those who are most interested, and those who understand the legislation best are those who would benefit by monopolies. There are, of course, exceptions to that statement.

It is a rather thankless task, but surely a spiritually rewarding undertaking to one who knows what it means to preserve the freedom of the Nation's economy.

Senator O'MAHONEY has fought for conservation of our natural resources for a long while, and also for the development and effective use of those natural resources.

He has been a supporter of civil rights legislation. Yet those of us who have on occasion differed with him on the merits of such legislation have admired him for the conservatism which he has shown in efforts to preserve the ideals of America, as in 1957 when he offered the jury trial amendment to the civil rights bill. That amendment, to preserve jury trials for persons accused of crimes and to retain the right to be tried by one's neighbors and peers, was the most important amendment adopted to that bill.

It would be very difficult to add much to what has been said by others here of the great achievements and accomplishments of Senator O'MAHONEY, and it would be far beyond my abilities to do so; but I do wish the Senator to know that we shall truly miss him. I hope we shall have occasion, particularly during those events when the Senator will be available to us, to visit with him and have his views for the benefit of those of us who will attempt to carry on, in some measure, in his tradition.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, one of the most eloquent voices, logical minds, and pleasant personalities with which this Chamber has ever been graced has been embodied in the distinguished, able, revered, and venerable senior Senator from Wyoming.

Senator O'MAHONEY has brought to public life a conception of public duty, and dedication to the public welfare, and devotion to the principles which have made our country and our Government great. The record he has written is one to which, down through the decades, young men will point with pride; and, along with those of lesser talents, perchance now and then one may come along with equal talents who will seek to emulate him.

As he voluntarily departs this forum at the conclusion of the present session, Senator O'MAHONEY carries with him the love and the esteem and the respect of every Member of this body and of uncounted teeming multitudes who have watched his work, who have admired his record, and who hold his personality in affection.

As I close, I wish to bid you, Senator O'MAHONEY, the best of wishes and Godspeed as you journey forth in this romantic career which for you has not yet ended.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it is difficult to add to what has been said about Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY. He is my neighbor, and represents my neighboring State of Wyoming.

I felt a strong sense of personal loss when I learned of the decision of Senator O'MAHONEY to retire from the Senate at the end of his term in January. For years before I came to Washington I was very much aware of the towering reputation of this great Democratic Senator from my neighboring State of Wyoming, and it has been a privilege to serve for this brief period with him.

During his years in the Senate, JOE O'MAHONEY has implemented in many ways his strong belief that there can be no permanent political liberty without economic freedom. His name has become almost synonymous with antimonopoly legislation. It was under his leadership, as chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee, that an inventory was made of our economic system which served as the basis of legislation to protect our small and middle-sized businesses from entrenched wealth and great concentrations of economic power.

Another high moment came as floor manager for the Full Employment Act, which established the Council of Economic Advisers for the President, and the Joint Economic Committee, two guiding factors in the management of our fiscal affairs.

JOE O'MAHONEY's love of the Constitution has been an inspiration to everyone around him. His knowledge of it, combined with his keen legal mind, has made him an authority who will be sorely missed.

His dedication to conservation, and to all of the pressing problems of the West, is well known. His years as chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee were productive and profitable ones for the section of the country which he and I represent.

Mr. President, there are some men with whom we walk who bring challenge and inspiration. JOE O'MAHONEY is one of these. His departure will leave a great void in the Senate.

All of us will miss him sorely. But we know that when we visit with him we may partake anew of the inspiration and the spirit of this great man and may learn from his great intellect.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, this is a time for rejoicing, and for sorrow. It is a time for sorrow because we are expressing our first farewells to JOE O'MAHONEY. It is a time for rejoicing because we have opportunity to tell Senator O'MAHONEY, and to tell the world, how we feel about him. It is very clear from what has been said this afternoon that we think very well indeed of him. And we should, as should all the people of this Nation. For, whether they realize it or not, their lives have been improved and their lot bettered by the contributions to the national welfare made by this outstanding U.S. Senator.

JOE O'MAHONEY's vision, which is unusual, has been translated in ever so many ways into constructive action. He has been, during his legislative career, a specialist; but, unlike most specialists, his interests and talents have not been confined to one interest or to one area. They have roamed far and wide and helpfully.

I shall not be repetitive by seeking to give a detailed account of his career, a service which has been performed by others, and in better manner than I could.

However, I do wish to say that although he comes, as I do, from a State with a small population, his talent, his integrity, his keen intelligence, and his devotion to country quickly carried his reputation beyond the boundaries of Wyoming, beyond the boundaries of the West, and over the entire country. A great lawyer, an expert in economics, Senator O'MAHONEY has one of those penetrating and incisive minds which are the envy of those of us less well equipped. His warmness, his liking for people, his unfailing courtesy, his wonderful qualities as a Christian gentleman—all these have endeared him, and endear him, to everyone who knows him.

His was the decision, and he has made it; a decision to leave the Senate after this year. Much as we regret that decision, none of us can quarrel with it, because this is a determination which must be entirely personal. But for me, should I be fortunate enough to return to this great body next year, there will be always something missing, with the familiar figure of JOE O'MAHONEY absent from his accustomed place so near the desk I occupy.

Mrs. Bartlett has asked especially that she be permitted to join me in expressing affectionate greetings to JOE O'MAHONEY, and to wish for Mrs. O'Mahoney and him in their honored and deserved retirement the best of whatever they may wish.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it is always a sad time when we rise on the floor to take more or less formal notice of the departure of a friend. At a time like this it is only natural that we review, I suppose, the qualities of the friend which have impressed us most and which we admire most.

In my 6 years in the Senate it has been my good fortune to serve with our good friend, JOE O'MAHONEY, on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I think it is at this place rather than some other areas where he is perhaps better known that I have come to appreciate him and the work he has done the most. I am not unaware that he is the father—yes, he could be called the grandfather—of oil shale development in this country. I will go so far as to call him the great-grandfather of oil shale development in this country, because he was the first to recognize the tremendous importance of this resource and what this great natural commodity of ours can mean for this country. We have still to reach the real threshold of its development, but one among us saw this many years ago and devoted himself unstintingly to progress in this field, as he has in many other areas.

When I think of JOE O'MAHONEY in the days ahead, I shall think of a great lawyer. Only a few weeks ago, in connection with some proposed legislation before our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I saw the brilliant, incisive, mental play which demonstrated to everyone present the great legal ability he has and the clarity with which he sees legal problems and their relationship to constitutional law.

I shall always think of JOE O'MAHONEY as a fighter, as what we in the West call a "scrapper." This is not to be taken in the wrong sense, but instead in the sense that all of us respect a man who believes in something and is willing to carry forward a real fight to espouse the principle.

There was in Colorado some years ago a man whom the Senator may remember, by the name of Alva Swain, who used to write a column called "Under the Capitol Dome" for one of the Denver newspapers. He once wrote an article entitled "The Last Mile." In this article he pointed out how many people in the world had failed because they had failed to walk the last mile. This illustrates, I think more than anything else, the quality which has made our friend so great and which, above all others, will endear him to my heart, because no matter what the words, what the circumstance, what the situation, what his health, he has always been willing and

ready—yes, anxious—to walk the last mile. This is why, in my opinion, he leaves behind him a great wealth of accomplishments.

I cannot question, and it is not for any of us to question, the motives which induce him to depart from us. Health, yes. A desire to be with his wife, yes.

All I can do, my friend, is to wish to you a continuation of the life which has been productive of so much so far. I am sure, that so long as the Lord wills you to be on this earth, life will continue to be as productive, no matter whether it be in the Halls of the U.S. Senate, in Wyoming, or in some other place.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. When I arrived in Washington, D.C., almost 16 years ago, one of the very first Senators I met was JOSEPH O'MAHONEY. From that day until this I have become more and more aware that he is a person who works for and votes for his own convictions. When a man follows his convictions without being led astray any time, that man is worthy of being a leader.

JOSEPH O'MAHONEY has served on the Committee on the Judiciary for many years. Well do I remember many occasions, when the heat of debate was pretty hot, when JOE would step in to pour some oil upon the waters, so to speak, and to bring the two parties, or the parties broken up into factions within the committee, together. He would bring out of chaos some legislation which was worth while.

I appreciate his friendship, his leadership, and his activities in the Congress of the United States.

The story of the political life of JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming, is one of a man who prepared himself to be a good politician. I use the word "politician" in the sense of one working for the good of his country. It was 44 years ago that JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, a young lawyer with newspaper experience, came to Washington as secretary to former Senator Kendrick of Wyoming. From the first day Senator O'MAHONEY came to Washington, his career as a politician and servant of the people was set out before him, and he served to the best of his ability.

He has served with distinction the people of his State and Nation through the trying years of "boom and bust," through the troublesome thirties, and the war years. It is in the more recent years of his long and colorful career that I have had the pleasure and honor of working with him in various ways in the Senate. It is especially in the Judiciary Committee of the Senate where Senator O'MAHONEY has distinguished himself in our history and endeared himself to respecters of sound judgment and law.

Many is the time that I have known this colleague to stand on the unpopular side of the fence because he knew it was the just and right side of the fence. The leadership in the Senate from both sides of the aisle will miss his good judgment and his forceful way of leading legislation through the Senate.

I feel it is a personal honor that I can rise to commend the Senator from Wyoming for the distinguished service he has rendered the Senate and the Nation. I regret to see him retire but I wish for him many happy and healthy years in the future.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for yielding.

It is an honor for a Senator to pay tribute to so renowned and distinguished a Senator as is Senator O'MAHONEY of Wyoming. I would like to pay my tribute to our dear friend and colleague by recalling two physical instances to his mind so that he may have visually before him how I feel about him and the impact he made upon me.

In 1957 during the debate in the Senate on the civil rights bill the senior Senator from Wyoming sponsored a jury trial amendment with which I did not agree. Yet I remember so distinctly that the senior Senator was coming from Wyoming in a plane one day and was not due to arrive until late in the afternoon. The Senate marked time until he arrived. He then stood in the aisle next to the desk of the acting majority leader and made his speech on the amendment with such eloquence and force and with such erudite citation of legal authority as literally to sweep all before him. Although I was not persuaded, I greatly admired the character, the loftiness of mind, the erudition, and the eloquence which was displayed by him on that occasion.

There is one other physical circumstance which is very appealing to me, and I hope will be to him. Early in the days of airplane travel from New York to California, I frequently took one of the small Boeing planes which were then available in order to carry on my profession as a hard working lawyer. Invariably the plane would stop at Cheyenne, which I came to know pretty well. The city had a quality which always made me feel as we landed that I was at last in the West. It had a clean quality. It had almost a nobility as it appeared, sharp and distinct against the clear western sky. It is a quality one cannot identify. Yet one would know what it meant, what it stood for, and that it was the portal to a great, new, adventurous land.

Senator O'MAHONEY has always appealed to me as that kind of personality. He is like the city, clean and sharp in the atmosphere. We know what he represents, what he means, and what his objectives are. They are expressed very clearly.

These are two pictures in my mind which I shall always hold very dear. The Senate is a difficult place in which to serve. There are many pitfalls. There are not only the pitfalls of election but, more importantly indeed, the pitfalls of policies and the pitfalls of personal relationships in this Chamber. I know of no man who has made a more enviable reputation here than has Senator O'MAHONEY. I know of no man who has more friends as shown by what has occurred today, no man whose personal presence has been more beloved, and whose personal presence will be more missed. I hope in the days ahead, when all of us wish for our colleague health, happiness, sunlight, fresh air and all the joys of retirement, he will not forget us. I know he will not. He will have the responsive feeling of warmth for us which we will have for him.

May I again express to the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] the sense of privilege which comes to me in being allowed to participate in these ceremonies and in saying au revoir to a dear friend and colleague.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the people of the United States, and the Senate particularly, have suffered three body blows in recent weeks. We suffered first the untimely death of Richard Neuberger, of Oregon, and then the announced retirement of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. We must now sadly add to those the announcement by our beloved colleague, JOE O'MAHONEY, that he, too, will retire at the end of the 86th Congress and will not be a candidate for reelection.

Mr. President, the Senate and the Nation can ill afford this loss. The Senate will not be quite the same without the benefit of his incisive thinking and eloquent expression developed from his vast experience, his broad outlook, his creative and independent approach to every problem, large or small, and his unfailing and militant dedication to the public interest, which have been made available to the Senate and thereby to the people of the United States.

Mr. President, others of our colleagues have commented upon and will pay tribute to the great variety of services which Senator O'MAHONEY has rendered as one of the great defenders of economic freedom and as a leader in our time in pointing to the perils of monopoly and to the dangers inherent in the great concentrations of economic power.

No one in the Senate or in public life has been a keener appraiser and opponent of all forms of arbitrary power in the body economic and the body politic. Hence his unfailing insistence on the provisions of the Constitution and his opposition to the increasing usurpation of and delegation of powers vested in one of the three branches of our Government by and to another branch.

No one has more stoutly resisted the encroachments of the executive upon the legislative branch of our Government. Senator O'MAHONEY's public career is so replete with battles for the enduring principles which have made our country great that it would take hours to list them in detail. I wish, however, to refer to one great service that he has rendered, which is very close to some of us,

and to me particularly, and that was the fight he initiated in Congress to bring in Alaska and Hawaii as States of the Union.

Senator O'MAHONEY was chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in 1950 when that committee held the first full-length hearings held for the Senate on the admission of Alaska as a State.

As might be expected, he conducted that hearing so thoroughly and searchingly that the groundwork was effectively laid for the debate which followed. In that debate his eloquence was memorable. I should like to read, from the many speeches he made in behalf of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii, a few excerpts, which illustrate his power of expression, his fervor, and the great skill with which he presented the cause. My only regret is that I shall not be able to simulate here the clarion voice with which he delivered these sentiments:

A glance at this map, Mr. President, makes it clear that Hawaii and Alaska are the arms of Uncle Sam stretching toward the Pacific. Are they going to stretch forward carrying the torch of liberty and freedom, or is the Congress of the United States going to say, by rejection of the statehood bills, that we do not actually believe in the principle of self-government and freedom about which we talk? We promised statehood when we incorporated these Territories. We have promised repeatedly statehood in our political platforms. The arguments against statehood are as thin as air; the arguments for statehood are unassailable.

But up to this hour, Mr. President, the two remaining incorporated Territories of the United States, extending into the Pacific Ocean, which, as Secretary Seward predicted in 1867, has become the center of the great world political struggle, have been denied statehood. The contest is on to win the minds of the teeming millions of the Old World.

How true that was 8 years ago, and how true it still is.

How easy it would be for us in the Senate to say that, so far as we are concerned, we want the word to go out from that melting pot of the Pacific—Hawaii—that we do believe in freedom for all men and self-government for all men, and that we are not imperialistic colonizers, as Jacob Malik has called us.

It is only necessary to look at this map and to turn our minds back over the pages of history to know that the march of freedom has been westward around the globe. Whenever the peoples of Europe felt themselves oppressed, or unable to govern themselves, they turned to the west. The movement of mankind toward liberty and freedom has steadily marched forward in a westerly direction across the face of the earth.

The march of freedom has been toward the west. The founders of our Government settled along the Atlantic Ocean, and when they were dissatisfied with economic conditions they also moved west. They crossed the Alleghenies, they crossed the Northwest Territory, they crossed the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, they crossed the Rocky Mountains, they crossed to the Pacific Ocean. Territory after territory was incorporated and State after State was created, and here we built up the greatest industrial power in all history, the greatest power that a free people ever created, because we have been devoted to the principle of granting opportunity to individuals.

Mr. President, that western trek has continued up into Alaska, and now again we come face-to-face with what may be a mortal combat with arbitrary political power and arbitrary economic power. We have carried freedom, political, and economic freedom, steadily west across the North American continent. We carried it into Alaska in the beginning, but Alaska now is held back from development because it does not have the statehood which this bill would grant. People who enjoy political and economic freedom in the United States are loath to move into a territory where their activities are controlled from beyond their borders, controlled, let it be said, by Government bureaus in Washington, insofar as some things are concerned; controlled by private organizations on the Pacific coast of the United States so far as other things are concerned.

At this point, Senator Knowland asked Senator O'MAHONEY to yield, which he did. And after Senator Knowland had spoken, Senator O'MAHONEY continued:

Other Senators have come onto the floor since the discussion began, and I should like again to bring out the point that the march of liberty and freedom has been westward across the face of the globe, and now it has reached Alaska and Hawaii. It has reached an Iron Curtain, a curtain which has been lowered not alone by the totalitarian dictators of the Kremlin, but by some of us here at home who do not comprehend what has been transpiring in the world. The progress of freedom may be stopped unless we carry it forward.

How timely that summons today, and what a legacy of guidance is that last sentence before Senator O'MAHONEY was again interrupted:

The progress of freedom may be stopped unless we carry it forward.

That was the real beginning of the legislative fight which brought the two States into the Union. The bill that year was defeated by a single vote. It was recommitted by a vote of 45 to 44. However, the impulse and the impact which was given to statehood for Alaska by JOE O'MAHONEY, with the fervor of his conviction, his masterful marshaling of all the arguments, and by his eloquence, carried the cause of statehood to victory a few years later.

When the history of this decade is written—the fifties—a decade of much frustration and stress and turbulence, no achievement will stand out more in the history of our Nation than the admission of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union, and the carrying thereby of the frontiers of democracy to America's farthest north and farthest south. There in his Senate seat sits the father of that great achievement, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY. Alaska and Hawaii will always be grateful to him.

Mr. President, as JOE O'MAHONEY leaves us at the end of the 86th Congress, he will be retiring not merely as the senior Senator from Wyoming. He is not even merely a great western Senator, although of course he is that. He is a national figure. If we go back into the history of this great body during this century, I am sure that very few will stand with equal eminence. I think of William E. Borah, of Idaho; Hiram Johnson, of California; George W. Norris, of Nebraska; Robert La Follette, of Wisconsin; Thomas Walsh, of Montana. I believe I have exhausted the list. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, is the peer of those giants.

JOE, we are going to miss you. But you will leave a record of achievement that is immortal.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had no knowledge, until I entered the Chamber a few moments ago, that the Senate was engaged in paying a deserved tribute to one of its greatest Members. This morning I was engaged in work in the Committee on Appropriations. It was a happy circumstance that brought me here at this time, because I would indeed have been deprived of attempting to express sentiments of my heart if I had not had an opportunity to say just a few words on this occasion.

It is sad for me to try to imagine or contemplate the Senate without JOE O'MAHONEY. JOE O'MAHONEY is a Senator in the great tradition of the Senate. JOE O'MAHONEY is a great independent. No group, no cult, no class, no organization, however powerful it might be in these United States, could move JOE O'MAHONEY the smallest fraction of an inch beyond the limits that were dictated by his conscience and by his great intellect.

It is unfortunate that from these great independents, men not only of ability but men of character and courage, we should lose one of those who remain.

Mr. President, there have been few phases of legislation which affect the lives of the people of the United States that have not felt the impress of his genius and his capacity. He has operated in farflung fields—from antitrust laws to military appropriations, from matters affecting the Department of the Interior to atomic energy operations. In every one of those assignments he has contributed greatly. He has drawn on the reserves and on the store of his physical strength and of his intellect and of his courage.

The Constitution of the United States will lose one of its greatest friends in this body when JOE O'MAHONEY departs from these halls. He knows the Constitution of the United States. When he swore at the desk of the Vice President to undertake to defend the Constitution, he was not uttering empty words. He took that oath to his heart. Would that every man who comes into the Senate would respect it and have the courage to defend it and to express the convictions of his mind and heart with the same freedom and the same determination that have characterized JOE O'MAHONEY.

All of us cannot be so eloquent as the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming. God has vouchsafed to him the great gift of expression which few men enjoy. But more of us could emulate the courage and the intellectual honesty with which he approached every one of his assignments.

I repeat: The Senator from Wyoming is a Senator in the great tradition. He is a Senator in the great tradition in his ability to express himself upon the floor of the Senate. He can speak eloquently, intelligently, and convincingly on more different subjects than can any other Member of this body. He can do it with-

out a prepared statement. He can do it without typewritten pages. He can do it on the spur of the moment, on the impulse of his heart and his mind, and in his devotion to his senatorial duties.

I have laid great store on a few rather elemental characteristics of men in measuring them and cataloging them in my mind, and in reserving to them a place in my heart. One trait of character which has always appealed to me is loyalty. Senator O'MAHONEY is loyal to every cause in which he has ever believed. He is loyal to every friend he has ever had. I say that as one who has been vouchsafed the great benediction of enjoying his friendship over a period of almost 28 years. His outstanding characteristic, however, is what, in this day, is called intellectual honesty; what we used simply to call courage; and in the common vernacular what we call guts. Senator O'MAHONEY has this trait. This characteristic has stood out in the Senate time and time again, as this man followed the dictates of his own heart and his own conscience.

We are in a time when we almost catalog Members of the Senate. We have our professional liberals and, indeed, we have our professional conservatives in the Senate. But I can look at JOSEPH O'MAHONEY and say, "There stands a man." When his convictions told him to do so, he took positions which caused the conservatives to call him a radical; and when his convictions told him in other circumstances not to follow blindly a path which was laid out by others, he took positions which caused the radicals to call him a reactionary.

All in all, to me, those traits sum up JOSEPH O'MAHONEY as one of the great Senators who have adorned the Chamber of the Senate of the United States.

I salute you, my friend; and may a benign providence attend you for many years to come in the manner to which your services entitle you.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I join in the words of tribute today to one who has been my good friend over the years, both in the other body and here, our able colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

We have often agreed and often disagreed on various issues. But whether in agreement or disagreement, Senator O'MAHONEY has always been most courteous, most cooperative, and most kind to me personally. More often than not, I suspect, particularly in our work on the Committee on the Judiciary, we have stood shoulder to shoulder on important matters.

I am especially familiar with Senator O'MAHONEY's great contributions in legal and judicial affairs. His work in this field has been prodigious, and his many activities to improve the judicial process, to reform the antitrust laws, and to strengthen our laws against subversion are important milestones in the progress our Nation has made.

I remember very vividly the manner in which Senator O'MAHONEY so successfully championed the so-called Jencks decision bill to protect the FBI files against Communist agents. It so happens that I was then serving in the House of Representatives, on the Committee on the Judiciary, and was working there on legislation in this field. Senator O'MAHONEY was most helpful, cooperative, and effective in this joint venture, as he has always been in those issues, objectives, and principles to which he attached himself.

Senator O'MAHONEY's place in the history of this body and in the history books of the Nation is secure. His name is written indelibly on the statute books in numerous cases. We who have served with him in the Senate, the people of Wyoming, and indeed all Americans, can be very grateful for his long and fruitful career of public service.

I know that every Member of this body wishes him continued happiness and success in the days ahead. I express the hope that Senator O'MAHONEY will continue to contribute his very outstanding talents to those causes which he has so ably, effectively, and sincerely championed over the years.

We wish him Godspeed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, people of New Jersey most certainly share the pride of all Americans in Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY of Wyoming, and are grateful for his great achievements for our Nation that have been the product of a thoughtful, kind, and courageous, great American. We are also proud, however, that our opportunity for friendship with Senator O'MAHONEY has been more intimate than just as a U.S. Senator from Wyoming.

Senator O'MAHONEY's brother sometime ago came out to Summit, N.J., to enjoy the relaxing and wholesome residential opportunities of that fine suburban town. There, he raised his family; there, his brother and our beloved colleague came on many occasions to visit, and from these visits New Jersey people came to know personally the man we honor today. Not long ago, a businessman friend of mine told me how as a young veteran he had met Senator O'MAHONEY in Summit, and the Senator encouraged him to go into business and to avail himself of the opportunity to start business with a GI loan. With this encouragement, Terry Dempsey started his business, and he is grateful daily for the consideration and kind advice of Senator O'MAHONEY. I know that this example of thoughtfulness can be multiplied thousands of times across the Nation.

The Senator's nephews are still living in Summit, and of this we are proud. The O'Mahoney name we know will be forever with us, through the achievements of Senator O'MAHONEY and the connections of his fine family.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I desire to join with my colleagues in the deserved tributes which they have paid to the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming, the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY. I regret very much that he has concluded not to seek reelection. I am confident that had he done so, he would have been triumphantly returned by the citizens of Wyoming to another 6-year term.

I know of no man who is held in higher esteem, either on the floor of this body or in his home State, than is JOE O'MAHONEY.

It was my privilege to know him before I came to the Senate. During the 3½ years I have served in this body, my affection for and gratitude to him has increased many times over. He took me, a new and untried Senator, by the hand and showed me the ways of this august and sometimes inscrutable body, and has been kindness itself in making my way in this body easier.

We had a happy little joke together, Senator O'MAHONEY and I, because it has been my privilege since 1924 to have owned a small ranch property in the Jackson Hole area in Teton County, Wyo. I spent eight happy summers there, running a dude ranch for young boys of the teenage group, while I was going through law school and in the first years when I was trying to establish myself in the practice of the law. JOE O'MAHONEY knew that; and when I came to the Senate, he was kind enough to refer to me as the "summer Senator from Wyoming."

I had the privilege, on one occasion, of appearing with Senator O'MAHONEY on his regular television program, which is shown all over Wyoming. We found ourselves able to agree on a number of matters involving conservation, irrigation, and the development of water resources in his home State. He presented me with great courtesy to his audience, and some of my friends in Jackson Hole later wrote me notes telling me they had enjoyed the program and saying how happy they were that Senator O'MAHONEY had done me the honor to refer to me as the third Senator from Wyoming, although one who was in residence only during brief periods in the summer.

I wish my good and dear friend long life and happiness, and reassure him on a point on which I am sure he needs no reassurance; namely, that he has the undying and lifelong admiration and respect of every one of his colleagues who serve with him in this body.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, one of the great leaders of the Senate of the United States has announced his plan to retire. His colleagues will miss JOE O'MAHONEY, the senior senator from Wyoming.

On many occasions in the last half dozen years we have sat here and listened to him, as with vigor and courage he stood in the Senate to fight, as he believed he should, for that great panorama of causes which he undertook to espouse.

I have known him also as a fellow member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, a committee primarily charged with responsibilities to the western States of America, including my own; charged, too, with the determination of legislation for the territorial areas owned by our country.

Not once, but again and again, I have seen the senior Senator from Wyoming give of his valued time to causes in which other States in the West were vitally interested. My own State has been no exception. I very much doubt that congressional approval would have been given to important reclamation projects for California had not the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming, having determined them to be in the public interest, helped to make them become a legislative reality.

Surely the admission of the two new States to the Union is in part the result of his belief in their honorable availability to become States of our beloved Union.

Mr. President, beyond all those things, I am most honored to call JOE O'MAHONEY my friend.

Over the years since our country was born, there have been in the Senate Chamber great leaders of thought, some sitting on the Democratic side of the aisle, and some on this side of the aisle. One of the reasons for their renown is that on many occasions they stood impervious to any and all cries for blind partisanship. They spoke out for what they believed to be in the interests of the people.

On many occasions I have listened to the senior Senator from Wyoming describe colorfully and most entertainingly his friendship with one of the great Senators who graced this Chamber for so many years, and who came from the State which I now have the honor in part to represent. Hiram Johnson was an outstanding Senator. I think perhaps I can indicate the warmth of my respect and my feeling for Senator O'MAHONEY when I say of him that the plane upon which the great Hiram Johnson operated is also the plane upon which Senator O'MAHONEY has operated.

All of us who are Members of the Senate hope to see much of Senator O'MAHONEY in the future.

We pray that his health will continue to be restored, and that he will find great comfort from the friendships he will take with him from this Chamber when this session concludes. Those friendships will continue with him all the rest of his days.

To Senator O'MAHONEY, Mr. President, I say good luck and God's blessing.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President——

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I am delighted to yield to the senior Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the announcement by our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], that he will retire at the end of his present term of office has been a cause for extreme and genuine regret.

When Senator O'MAHONEY leaves the Senate, at the end of this session, he will be able to look back over the span of a quarter of a century during which the Senate has seen him devote his skill, his energy, and his voice to the everlasting betterment of this body, this country, and its people.

Except for a temporary political setback in 1952—or what he, himself, terms "a leave of absence"—he has served continuously in every Congress beginning with the 73d.

Although Senator O'MAHONEY was struck by illness almost a year ago, he rallied with his characteristic courage and vigor; and he has continued to maintain his well-deserved reputation of being a Senator's Senator.

Senator O'MAHONEY was sworn into office for his present term—following his temporary "leave of absence"—on November 29, 1954. I well remember that date, because 3 days later I, myself, subscribed to the same oath of office.

During the last 5½ years, I have come to know Senator O'MAHONEY extremely well and intimately, through our service on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. His contributions to the work of that committee have been limitless, and he has justly earned the title of being one of America's outstanding conservationists.

Mr. President, regardless of whether the subject under consideration has been one in the field of conservation, reclamation, constitutional law, baseball, monopolies, or patents, Senator O'MAHONEY has continued to be an acknowledged expert in each.

He is a gentleman of the finest instincts, and he is a Senator in the finest traditions of statesmanship.

Certainly Senator O'MAHONEY will leave on the Senate the indelible imprint of his truly great characteristics and qualities.

All of us hope that he will return to this Chamber very often.

Mr. President, I echo the sentiments which have been expressed many times today by so many Members of the Senate when I say to Senator O'MAHONEY, good luck.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. It would be difficult for me to add to the words of praise that have been expressed today for the senior Senator from Wyoming. Speaking at this point in the RECORD would be, in a sense, gilding the lily; but I join in the wonderful tributes paid to the senior Senator from Wyoming, and especially in those remarks addressed to him by his junior colleague, who knows him best and whose protege he is.

We all deeply respect him for the long years the senior Senator from Wyoming spent in government before he came to the Senate of the United States. Subsequent to that time he demonstrated a tremendous competence, not only as a lawyer, but as a legislator. He has been one of the most respected constitutional lawyers to serve in the U.S. Senate. When Senator O'MAHONEY rose to speak on a constitutional point he had the respect and the attention and the careful consideration of every man in the Senate, and this body does include some of the finest constitutional lawyers in the country today.

Senator O'MAHONEY's record in this Congress will be indelibly imprinted, not only upon the State of Wyoming, but upon all of the Far West, because of his dedication to conservation and the development of our great natural resources.

The State of Wyoming is indebted to her great senior Senator for his efforts in the field of water development, where he has been a leader. The entire West is indebted to and appreciative of Senator O'MAHONEY for his efforts not only in that field, but also in the field of mining, which is a field in which the West has needed help and support in recent years.

But aside from his interest in what one might call local considerations, those that directly affected not only his own State, but also the Far West, Senator O'MAHONEY has taken an active hand in legislation of great national consequence. He has devoted himself to the problems of the economy of this Nation, which is one of the least understood, and perhaps one of the least spectacular fields in which a legislator can engage, although it is one of the most important. In that area he has demonstrated the high competence that has been referred to by the junior Senator from Wyoming.

Senator O'MAHONEY has given leadership in the liberal principles of the Democratic Party in trying to maintain a national economy of great stability and of full employment.

Senator O'MAHONEY's stepping out of the Senate, for the unhappy reason which he has stated makes it necessary at this time, is not only a great loss to his State and to the area of the Far West, for which he was an outstanding spokesman, but also to the Nation as a whole.

I join with my colleagues in expressing my appreciation to him, and my admiration for his great services, and to say to him that he will leave the Senate of the United States poorer because he is not here.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in the Senate in paying tribute to the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], following his announcement that he will retire late this year, after serving in this body for a quarter of a century. It has been my privilege to serve with the Wyoming Senator on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. During that close association I had an unusual opportunity to observe his keen insight into many of the problems which confront the public lands States of the West, including Wyoming and Idaho.

Likewise, I have been aware of his long and persistent efforts to protect the water rights of the Western States against encroachment by the Federal Government.

I have also had an opportunity to serve with Senator O'MAHONEY on the Appropriations Committee for many years. It is true that during the past few years he has not been a member of that committee, but I recall a decade or so ago when he rendered outstanding service in helping to draft the appropriation measures providing funds for the operation of the Federal Government.

Although I did not always agree with the Senator from Wyoming on appropriation items, I always recognized him as a champion of the interests of the West in all of the varied programs.

Mr. President, I also recall, back in 1936 or 1937, that the Wyoming Senator was intimately associated with the late Senator Borah of Idaho in their joint efforts to prevent the so-called court packing. At that time, of course, it was quite difficult for the Senator from Wyoming, being a Democrat, to oppose his Democratic President and leader. However, he received wide acclaim at that time because of the dauntless courage and indomitable determination he displayed in preventing what he considered to be a serious threat to the Supreme Court and to constitutional government.

I am sure that the Senator from Wyoming has made a wise personal decision in announcing his retirement. He is deserving of many years of leisure. I extend to him my own best wishes and the best wishes of the people of Idaho for health and happiness in his years of retirement. This felicitation also includes Mrs. O'Mahoney, who has so ably assisted him throughout his many years of public service.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I would like to add a word of tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming. I am sure that all of us are moved by mixed emotions on this occasion. We are proud to have been associated with a man who has been a Member of every Congress, beginning with the 73d, and who has for more than a quarter of a century devoted his exceptional talents to the work of the Senate. At the same time, we are deeply saddened to realize that his retirement from active public service draws near. The West, of course, has a special claim upon the distinguished Senator from Wyoming but, as a New Englander, let me say that we too would want to emphasize his birth in Chelsea, Mass., and his early education in that State before he went West as a young man. I had admired Senator O'MAHONEY at a distance for many years and appreciated his great qualities of leadership and statesmanship. As a new Member of the Senate in the 86th Congress, I have had the opportunity to know his warm personal qualities and his generous and sympathetic nature. In looking back upon a lifetime, rich in achievement and in contributions to the common welfare of our great Nation, Senator O'MAHONEY can be justly proud, as we are proud to be associated with him.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, when the retirement was announced of the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming, I spoke at length in recognition of his invaluable contribution to the American way of life, and expressed my sincere regret that time and circumstances have caused him to decide that he should not continue his service in the Senate beyond his current term. My remarks appear at page 10306 of the RECORD of May 13, 1960, under the heading "JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY: Wyoming's Great Senator."

Mr. President, all of us in the Senate recognize that the able and distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming is the outstanding constitutional lawyer of the Senate, and well qualified, in my opinion, to grace the highest Court of this land, and he has been so qualified for many years. He would have been an ornament to the highest Court in our land, just as he has been an ornament to the Senate in the great constitutional debates which have taken place in the Senate.

In my remarks of May 13 I pointed out the great bond of the cultural background that binds the people of Wyoming to the people of Texas. One year after the Civil War the Texas cattle herds were pointed north, and by 1868 they were in Wyoming, at a time when Wyoming had a population of less than 10,000. The longhorn cattle there helped to furnish labor for the many people who moved in. There resulted a blended population which came from the North and Southwest and South, and the older sections of the country. As a result there came into being a new, vigorous State, typified by the dynamic leaders which the people of Wyoming have sent to Congress year after year.

I have already referred to one of the Texans, John Benjamin Kendrick, who as a young man of 22 was one of the cowboys who followed a herd of cattle to Wyoming. He grew up 20 miles from where I was reared in east Texas. He was one of Wyoming's great triumvirate of Senators—Frances E. Warren, John B. Kendrick, and Joseph C. O'Mahoney.

In Senator O'MAHONEY's leaving the Senate, the Senate is losing one of its real treasures and one of the gems of its history. All the people of my State regret your leaving, Senator O'MAHONEY. All of us here have been proud, as all in my State have been proud, of what you brought to us in legal learning and constitutional knowledge. You have established a record of service in the Senate that will live as long as the history of the Senate lives.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, Senator O'MAHONEY's decision to retire from the Senate is a cause of sadness to all of us. For more than 25 years, his service here has been that of a loyal friend, faithful steward, and eminent constitutionalist.

His grasp of national problems and his relentless efforts to solve these problems in the best possible way has made America stronger, and a better place to live.

The opportunities for independent business, the fertile valleys of the West which replaced desert wastes, improved management of our natural resources, and preservation of the sacred right of trial by jury all bear testimony to his long career of devoted and constructive service. The fruits of his efforts here will be enjoyed and appreciated by Americans in the ages to come.

We here in the Senate share the affection the people of Wyoming have demonstrated for this great statesman. We will miss him; his friendly counsel, his friendly association, and his sincere dedication to great causes.

Certainly we wish for him the fullest happiness in years to come: a restoration to full health, an opportunity to reflect on his magnificent career, and the secure knowledge that the best wishes and prayers of his colleagues follow him always.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, when the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, Mr. O'MAHONEY, announced that he will retire at the end of his present term and thus end one of the most outstanding 25 years of service in national affairs, I was filled with a sense of personal loss.

As one who has been a Member of this body for nearly 2 years, I felt the warmth of his friendship and the willingness with which he distributed his wisdom to those of us who have been comparatively recent arrivals to the Senate.

No greater tribute can come to any man than the tribute of the record he himself compiled in national affairs for a quarter century.

Some of the great milestones in legislation are embodied in his long and successful battle against monopolies, which have had the effect of stifling much of our business activity. I wish to assure Senator O'MAHONEY that I and others in the Senate will continue the battle that he nobly initiated against the monopolies and for independent business.

There is another field in which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming compiled an enviable record of direct interest to the people of my State. I refer to his far-reaching program for the development of our rivers, for the conservation of our precious supplies of water, and for the reclamation of our desert wastelands.

Throughout his long career, his policies were always within the framework of the document that he loved, respected, and lived by—the Constitution of the United States.

Senator O'MAHONEY's monumental work in this Senate will never be forgotten. I join in the genuine expression that has already been stated by my colleagues who spoke of this great man. The expression that his spirit will continue in this Chamber, and his example will inspire those who are to follow him.

My wish is for Senator O'MAHONEY to enjoy in happiness and contentment the feeling of achievement in the comparative quiet of the years that are ahead of him. But I am sure that his sagacious counsel and vast experience and information will be made available to us even through the good Senator's retirement.

He is a credit to his State and to his Nation, and Senator O'MAHONEY's patriotism and dedication will long remain and be respected.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, it is a great privilege to be associated with the distinguished Senators who have been paying tribute to the senior Senator from Wyoming, JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, who has announced that he will not seek reelection to this body.

Outside of the State of Wyoming, I am confident that the people of no other State will receive this news with greater regret than the citizens of Hawaii. They have reason for their expressions of regret and also appreciation for Senator O'MAHONEY, both as a man and as

a public official. No other Member of the Senate developed a greater understanding of the people of Hawaii nor a greater appreciation of their qualities and worth in relation to their devotion to American institutions and the American way of life.

Senator O'MAHONEY first visited Hawaii in 1937. That was 23 years ago. On that visit, he showed clearly his belief that the only basis on which a territory could be considered for statehood was the kind of people that make up its citizenry. Doubtless, he was just as much intrigued by the scenic beauty of Hawaii as other visitors. I am certain that with his great interest in economy, he recognized the possibilities of Hawaii in relation to commerce and trade.

He was among the first, however, to say that Hawaii's real greatness would never be measured in terms of natural resources and wealth, but rather in terms of a people who have demonstrated to the world that men and women of different cultural and racial backgrounds, of varying hopes and aspirations, could live together with complete understanding and work cooperatively on desirable community goals. This was the thought he most often expressed on that first visit and through a long period of years he never ceased talking about it.

It was because of this conviction that during the next 23 years he worked, in season and out of season, for statehood. As chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, he spent long hours planning the several hearings that were held on statehood. He gathered all available information and, with a skill and logic unsurpassed, he wove an argument for statehood that ultimately could not be rejected.

He persisted in this course until that day of March 12, 1959, when the Senate, by a vote of 76 to 15, granted statehood to Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union. For this the people of Hawaii will forever be grateful.

When an ordinary worker leaves his job, there is always someone to pick up where he left off. His place can be taken. This is not so with the poet, the painter, the sculptor, the musician, or any leader who is really creative.

Senator O'MAHONEY is leaving this body. There will be another Senator elected to represent his beloved State in the Senate of the United States, but there is no one who can take his place. Every one of his colleagues will be aware of a loss sustained. We are reconciled at this time, however, by the thought that we will have happy memories of our association with him. His influence will continue to be a constructive force in the life of the Nation.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in concluding these reflections this afternoon, I think it is significant that our colleagues here have recounted with a personal touch, with the warmth of personal memory, the contributions that Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY has made to all. But I say, my colleagues, that these are contributions that are not alone for now. These landmarks of the pages of our country's history for the past quarter of a century are the guideposts that will steer us unerringly in the days ahead. And that to me is the great debt that we owe to my beloved senior colleague and my dearest friend, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.

Senator JOE, I wonder if you would like to have the floor at this moment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUSK in the chair). The Chair is privileged to recognize the senior Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It may be appropriate for me to state for the record the remarkable coincidence that today is the 11th month after my suffering the stroke which took me to the naval hospital. Eleven months ago today I was taken into that hospital, utterly unable to stand or to use any part of my left side. I have made great progress, but it is that fact which has compelled me to make the decision which my colleagues have mentioned here today.

My heart is full of gratitude for what has been said by my junior colleague, Senator McGEE, of Wyoming, and by all the other Senators who have joined him on this occasion. I know very well, of course, that it is all beyond my deserts. I know how generous my colleagues have been, and I do appreciate it.

However, I want the record to show that I recognize the services I have had from a great staff. From the very beginning of my services in the Senate, when the late Julian Snow was my secretary, I have been surrounded by men and women who have loyally, intelligently, and devotedly served the ends of that office.

Today my administrative assistant, Mr. Mike Manatos, is the president of all the administrative assistants in the Senate. My legislative assistant, Mr. Jerry O'Callaghan, has been of immeasurable help to me in various committee work. I also wish to pay tribute to my personal secretary, Miss Marie Mathew; my press secretary, Mrs. Louise Love; and the other members of my staff, including Miss Mary Ann Ellis, of Sheridan, Wyo., Mrs. Mabelle Knight, Mrs. Betty Turk, and Miss Mary Normington.

I want my colleagues to know that I thank them most sincerely for this memorable occasion, which, of course, I can never forget.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Wyoming State Tribune, May 11, 1960]

MAY HAPPINESS HOLD HIM FAST

Few Wyoming men achieve national importance, countrywide impact, and influence.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY did, in a Senate career which now encompasses more than a quarter of a century. The doing has redounded to the imposing benefit of Wyoming and the West.

Dignity and decision, O'MAHONEY character hallmarks, highlight his just-disclosed decision not to stand for reelection in 1960.

He said, in about so many words, that his ability to serve has been mitigated by reasons of health. (The Senator suffered a stroke nearly a year ago, from which he is effecting remarkable recovery.)

Senator O'MAHONEY left us to understand (and this is what we would have expected from him) that he will not compromise the public entitlement to complete effort, particularly in an arena of public service as eminent as the U.S. Senate.

Readers do not have to be told that this column has often and over many years contested with Senator O'MAHONEY on political ways and means. Honest conviction has prevailed and we are confident that mutual respect has not been eroded. The record of what we are talking about attests (above all else from where we sit) the Senator's formidability.

We praise Senator O'MAHONEY because, as it is said, he's got it coming.

Although born to Massachusetts, he is of and for Wyoming.

His talents, tailormade for Senate service, are immense. What has been going on between O'MAHONEY and the Senate is a love affair. One gauging it that way (a proper view) realizes just how difficult it will be for the Senator to move to the gallery of ex-Senators.

But move he will. The moment will be sad, historic, and regrettable. It will close a Wyoming political era. (Wyoming has given longer Senate tenure to but one other, the late Francis E. Warren, also of Cheyenne, whose more than 37 years service is a Senate record.)

The praise and tribute going out to Senator O'MAHONEY, from all parts of Wyoming, is warm, sincere, and bipartisan.

The hope of all is that good health will return to and abide with him, that happiness will hold him fast.

[From the Laramie (Wyo.) Boomerang, May 11, 1960]

WHEN THE PEOPLE WERE INVOLVED

The term "statesman" is one of the most overworked in our modern vocabularies, but certainly it applies to Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY who announced this week that he would not seek reelection.

There are many terms that apply to Wyoming's senior Senator: "scholar," "friend of the people," "spokesman for Wyoming," "attorney," "legislator," etc.

This man of many talents and a vast array of accomplishments has represented Wyoming and its people well. He is highly respected by his colleagues and in the area of monopoly law and in matters concerning water rights.

It will be a long time before Wyoming is represented by a man of his stature, courage, and intelligence. He operated within a firm code of morals and ethics. He was highly articulate in explaining that code in relation to issues.

He was even more articulate, if that is possible, in carrying Wyoming's story to all the Nation.

How do you tell such a man that his service is appreciated, that his courage is admired, that his works are the pattern for future generations?

Senator O'MAHONEY would be the first to turn from flowery praise. But some of the more blunt expressions which we use might not find favor either.

The best way we can think of putting it is like this: When the people were involved, as they are in just about everything, Senator O'MAHONEY was their spokesman—able, mature, and convincing.

We owe a lot to Senator O'MAHONEY. His type of lawmaker is all too rare. We hope the pattern hasn't been lost, because we need men like him in these times.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, May 11, 1960]

CHAMPION OF THE WEST

If reports on his health are accurate, the decision of U.S. Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, not to seek reelection is a wise one. It is characteristic of the sober judgment of the 75-year-old lawyer-lawmaker who suffered a stroke about

a year ago. Although he has partially recovered, his health and that of his wife, who has had two strokes, is not good. Because of his tendency to push himself to the limit, his decision to retire well could prolong his life.

Senator O'MAHONEY's record in Congress is one of which the Nation and particularly the Intermountain West can be proud. Brilliant, articulate and forceful, he has worked hard for reclamation, wool, public land, and other programs he believed were for the benefit of the intermountain region. He was a stanch Democrat, but on many occasions demonstrated dramatically that he wore no man's collar. One was his vigorous fight against President Roosevelt's "court packing" attempts in 1937 and another was his long-term effort to cut waste in Government spending and to strengthen the economic welfare of the country.

O'MAHONEY, formerly a Cheyenne newspaper editor, went to Washington first in 1917 as secretary to Wyoming's late great Senator Kendrick. He was named First Assistant Postmaster General in 1933, but Senator Kendrick suddenly died that year and O'MAHONEY was named to succeed him. O'MAHONEY was in the Senate continuously for 19 years but was beaten in 1952 by the combination of the Eisenhower sweep and Republican Frank Barrett, vigorous spokesman for livestock and allied interests. He surprised the experts and staged a comeback in 1954. That term expires this year.

The voluminous report of the Joint Economic Committee, which he headed for years, is just one of the many monuments to Senator O'MAHONEY. The Tribune joins in paying tribute to a gentleman of integrity and stature, a forceful spokesman for the West.

[From the Rocky Mountain News, Denver Colo., May 11, 1960]

A BIG CHANGE FOR WYOMING

(By Pasquale Marranzino)

U.S. Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY sent word to his Wyoming constituency that he is hanging up his gloves and will not seek reelection.

The news isn't surprising, but it comes as a disappointing change to Wyoming Democrats who have been voting for the craggy-faced, bushy-browed Senator since 1933.

Only once in that interim, 1952–54, did the colorful lawyer fail in his bid to go to Washington as Senator, swamped in the overwhelming GOP victory that brought Frank Barrett into office.

His impressive career was halted last June in the midst of a typical O'MAHONEY battle. He led the forces that successfully opposed the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss as commerce Secretary. Weary from days of testifying and speaking against the nomination, O'MAHONEY collapsed as he left the Senate floor, a victim of a stroke.

Even though the stroke kept him bedridden for months, it couldn't lick JOE. He made an amazing recovery and continued his work from his hospital bed by telephone and in consultation with his staff and colleagues.

JOE's most brilliant and possibly one of the most vital coups for the commonweal—came in those days of the Roosevelt administration when the Wyoming Senator led the fight to keep intact the size of the U.S. Supreme Court. FDR, who had hoped to enlarge the court and pack it with birds of his feather, broke his party pick on JOE's stubborn opposition.

This break with FDR was made after considerable wrestling with the O'MAHONEY conscience. He had been one of the first New Dealers. He helped write the Democratic platform that carried Mr. Roosevelt into power. And he was rewarded with the first Assistant Postmaster General job in that first administration.

The 75-year-old Senator has Colorado roots. He was born in Massachusetts and came West in 1908 to Boulder. There he worked on a Boulder newspaper as city editor and also was a correspondent for the Rocky Mountain News and the Associated Press. He left Boulder in 1916 to go to work for a Cheyenne paper owned by the late Gov. John B. Kendrick.

His newspapering was interrupted when Kendrick ran for the Senate, JOE serving as campaign manager and secretary. He went to Washington with the successful Kendrick as secretary. When Kendrick died in 1934, O'MAHONEY was named to the job.

Although JOE's close New Deal associations made him a national power, he never placed the good of the West in second spot.

He battled for reclamation, for rural electrification, for domestic wool, for the farmer and rancher and for more water to irrigate more acres and help his arid State.

In recent years he has been a thorn in the side of the Eisenhower administration. Although a New Dealer, he didn't have the New Deal propensity for big spending. He was tightfisted with the dollar and kept hammering away at inflation, high prices and Government participation in private industry through foreign deals.

He probed the national oil import program and suggested that the administration quit having the big oil companies formulate foreign policy. He was an ardent supporter of the antitrust laws, asking for crackdowns on meatpackers, insurance companies, and monopolies.

He has served long and well and with devotion to the West. Retirement for JOE will be rough, but we expect he still will remain the No. 1 Democrat in Wyoming.

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) Eagle, May 11, 1960]

HIS RECORD WILL STAND

When Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY lost his bid for reelection in 1952, an editorial writer for a Denver newspaper said:

"The empire's biggest loss and perhaps the country's was that of Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, a statesman of national stature who never forgot the home folks."

Two years later, the citizens of Wyoming paid O'MAHONEY one of the highest tributes ever paid to a former public official. They insisted, through a tremendous, statewide draft movement, that he give up his law practice and run for the U.S. Senate again. He finally bowed to their wishes and agreed to run, and the voters returned him to the Senate where he belonged.

Although technically he went to Washington in January, 1955, as the junior Senator from Wyoming, he was not treated as such. Because of his 19 years in the Senate before his 1952 defeat and because of the stature he had attained during those years, he was given important committee assignments and his counsel was sought on many subjects.

Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, took up right where he had left off—as a statesman of national stature and a champion of the Rocky Mountain West.

Now, 8 years and hundreds of accomplishments after that 1952 election defeat, it appears that Wyoming, the West, and the Nation are going to have to do without the services of Senator O'MAHONEY.

In a letter to Democratic Party officials, convened in State convention at Thermopolis Monday, the Senator said he would not file for reelection.

And that was bad news for everyone. For many, many persons agreed that even at the age of 75 and in spite of his stroke a year ago he was a more effective U.S. Senator than most. In fact, it was said that even while he was in the hospital, operating by telephone and through his staff, he got things done more effectively than most Senators operating within the Senate Chamber.

Many believe he could have won reelection again this year, even with a minimum of campaigning.

But the decision was his, and he based it upon his own health and the health of Mrs. O'Mahoney, who also suffered a stroke 2 years ago.

In his letter to Thermopolis, the Senator reminded he told the people of Wyoming in 1954, when he agreed to run again, that he would not be a candidate for reelection.

"I have kept the faith with the people of Wyoming," he wrote. And indeed he has—for 25 long years.

For a quarter of a century, Senator O'MAHONEY has given his time and energy to the welfare of the people of Wyoming, the West, and the Nation, with Mrs. O'Mahoney always at his side.

He and Mrs. O'Mahoney richly deserve the many years of leisure and happiness their thousands and thousands of friends wish them.

Senator O'MAHONEY's presence on the floor of the U.S. Senate will be sorely missed. But his record will stand in history—a challenge to all future Senators from Wyoming.

Because he is a leader, the Senator undoubtedly will remain in the limelight of State and National Government and politics. And he and Mrs. O'Mahoney most certainly will remain very much in the hearts of Wyoming citizens.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, May 18, 1960]

HAIL AND FAREWELL

An impressive record of service to the Nation and to their party has been written by three veteran Democratic Senators who have announced their intention of not seeking re-election this year. It is a record that goes back to the middle 1930's, to the years when the New Deal of President Franklin D. Roosevelt was changing the course of the country's social and political history. Each of the trio now retiring—Senators GREEN of Rhode Island, MURRAY of Montana, and O'MAHONEY of Wyoming—first took his place in the Senate Chamber during that momentous period. In the years since, each has spoken with a strong and influential voice in the Nation's affairs and in Democratic Party councils.

Among them, Senator GREEN at 92 is the oldest and is, in fact, the oldest man ever to serve in either branch of Congress. Many years of Democratic Party activity, including two terms as Governor of his State, preceded Mr. GREEN's election to the Senate in 1936. In his four terms here, this Rhode Islander of Colonial Yankee ancestry has become identified as a "loyal liberal" on domestic legislative issues and an internationalist on foreign policy. When the 86th Congress organized last year, Mr. GREEN stepped aside as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee but retained a place in that group as well as in the Rules Committee. He is still chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library and a member of the Senate Democratic Policy Committee.

At 83, Mr. MURRAY is junior in age among Senators only to Mr. GREEN. First elected to the Senate in 1934, the Montanan has directed his attention mostly to matters in the jurisdiction of the Interior and Labor Committees. He is a member of both and chairman of the former, as well as being a member also of the Policy Committee. His claim to liberalism in social legislation is a valid one.

Mr. O'MAHONEY, now 75, came to Washington first on the staff of the late Senator Kendrick of Wyoming and returned as Assistant Postmaster General under President Roosevelt. In 1933, he was appointed to

complete the unexpired term of Senator Kendrick and was elected in his own right in 1934. He was defeated in 1952, but was elected again in 1954. His present committee assignments—Interior, Judiciary, and Joint Economic—reflect his principal legislative interests. An effective orator and popular with his colleagues, Mr. O'MAHONEY was one of the "workhorses" of the Senate in earlier years.

Those who follow the Senate most closely will miss this threesome on the Democratic side of the aisle.

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) Eagle, May 10, 1960]

O'MAHONEY HAS LONG OUTSTANDING RECORD AS U.S. SENATOR

(By Bernard Horton)

When Wyoming's Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY leaves his office next January, he will be ringing down the curtain on one of the most outstanding public service careers in the history of Wyoming.

His loss will be felt throughout the Nation—and particularly in Wyoming and the West. For this State and the entire Rocky Mountain West have never had a greater champion in any capacity in Washington.

At the end of this year, when his current 6-year term expires, the Senator will have served 25 years as Senator from Wyoming. During that time, he has gained a stature equalled by very few Senators, indeed.

O'MAHONEY was city editor of the Cheyenne State Leader from 1916 to 1920, when he entered law practice.

In March 1933 he was appointed first assistant postmaster general, and in December that same year, he was appointed by then Gov. Leslie A. Miller to fill the vacancy in the U.S. Senate caused by the death of John B. Kendrick.

On November 6, 1934, he was elected to both the unexpired term, ending January 3, 1935, and the full term ending January 3, 1941.

He was reelected November 5, 1940, and again on November 5, 1946.

He lost his bid for reelection in 1952, but 2 years later he submitted to a statewide draft movement and ran for U.S. Senator again. And this time, too, he ran for both a short term, to fill the unexpired term of the late Senator Lester C. Hunt, and the full, 6-year term. He won both, and by virtue of the short term he served in the only Congress he might have missed since 1933.

When he was defeated in 1952, he was one of the most powerful Members in the entire U.S. Congress by virtue of his 19 years of seniority in the Senate.

He had won recognition far and wide as a statesman and champion of western development.

In 1952, for instance, the National Wool Growers Association gave him the title of "Mr. Wool" because of his tireless efforts in behalf of the domestic wool industry.

And it was he who, in 1950, secured legislation establishing a national forestry advisory board of appeals, to which livestockmen might appeal controversies which might arise in connection with the grazing of livestock in national forests.

When former Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman announced his approval of the $15 million trona project in Sweetwater County as a defense project, he gave O'MAHONEY full credit for gaining that approval.

It was O'MAHONEY who brought about the establishment of the alumina plant at Laramie during World War II.

Many times, he has been credited with saving Warren Air Force Base for Cheyenne, for he recognized its economic value to Cheyenne and Wyoming and the function it could serve for the entire Nation.

He has championed Wyoming's sugar beet industry. In 1952, an article in the Mountain States Beet Growers magazine paid him this tribute:

"The sugar industry, and sugar beet growers in particular, have always known the Senator to be one of the most sincere and helpful protagonists of the western sugar beet industry. He has never failed in championing the cause that has brought the sugar beet to a position of national prominence in our economy."

He has always been popular with labor circles because of his philosophy that "the prosperity of this Nation and all its people depends on full employment at good wages."

He has long been recognized as a leader in national and international affairs, and he has been particularly recognized for his leadership in the field of national defense.

In 1952, he was named Aviation's Man of the Year for his leadership in contributing to a strong and more efficient airpower program for America.

Always he has been strong for clean and honest government. In 1951 he procured passage of an amendment to the Defense Appropriations Act which provides for the cancellation of any procurement contract for the armed services if the contractor gives or offers to give any gratuity to any procurement officer or employee of the Armed Forces.

But those are just a few of the accomplishments for which he is recognized.

When Senator O'MAHONEY returned to the Senate in January 1955, after a 2-year absence, he was not looked upon as a freshman Senator, which technically, he was. He was given important committee assignments and his counsel was sought.

Right now he is a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the Joint Economic Committee—all powerful groups.

When he bowed to the statewide draft movement in 1954, and became a candidate for the Senate, he said:

"The people, however, are entitled to a frank expression of the principles which guide me.

"1. I shall not be a candidate for reelection.

"2. No voter has ever heard my voice in personal attack upon any opponent, nor will any hear it so raised in this campaign.

"3. I have no personal nor partisan objective to serve and I pledge all the people that I shall labor for only those causes which in my judgment are for the public good."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9862) to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. FORAND, Mr. KING of California, Mr. MASON, and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4029) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the proration of the occupational tax on persons dealing in machineguns and certain other firearms, to reduce occupational and transfer taxes on certain weapons, to make the transferor and transferee jointly liable for the transfer tax on firearms, and to make certain changes in the definition of a firearm.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H.R. 6482. An act relating to the credits against the unemployment tax in the case of merged corporations;

H.R. 6779. An act to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable contributions for certain individuals); and

H.R. 9308. An act to extend for 3 years the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 5) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage private investment abroad and thereby promote American industry and reduce Government expenditures for foreign economic assistance, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 5) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage private investment abroad and thereby promote American industry and reduce Government expenditures for foreign economic assistance, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

RECONNAISSANCE SATELLITES

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the summit conference is over. Its collapse has wrecked any hope of an early thawing of the cold war.

One thing is already clear. Mr. Khrushchev overplayed his hand. He left Moscow planning to split the free world asunder; he is returning to Moscow with the free world more united than before. His was the failure of a mission.

A second thing is clear: The unfortunate U–2 incident did not itself cause the collapse of the Paris meeting. It was merely the excuse Mr. Khrushchev seized upon to torpedo the conference.

I grant that the Kremlin leaders, with their Iron Curtain mentality, may be ultrasensitive about incursions into the air space over the Soviet Union. Yet Mr. Khrushchev's treatment of the U–2 flights was cynical in the extreme. He has tried to create the impression that an end to the U–2 flights would suffice to end the problem of aerial intelligence gathering. He knows better. He knows that both his scientists and our scientists are working around the clock to develop a reconnaissance satellite. The time is drawing close when the first model of such a satellite can be launched.

Mr. President, Senators are no doubt familiar with the revolutionary importance of the reconnaissance satellite. It will be equipped with cameras of incredible precision and other information-gathering and transmitting instruments. As an information-gathering device, it

will ultimately compare in efficiency to the U–2 as a modern jetplane compares to Kitty Hawk.

It will eventually be possible to manufacture these reconnaissance satellites in great numbers. Their orbits will crisscross over every portion of the earth's surface.

The reconnaissance satellite means that the age of the Iron Curtain is drawing to a close. It will soon go the way of the Great Wall of China.

What are we going to do about it? Think back 15 years ago when we first grappled with the political problems created by the atomic bomb. We took the right and proper course. We offered, subject to safeguards of elementary prudence, to place our atomic stockpile under United Nations stewardship. Only Soviet intransigence kept that program from being adopted.

There is only one military reason why we are developing the satellite—to safeguard our country and our free world partners from surprise attack. We ask nothing of other nations that we are not willing to do ourselves.

The reconnaissance satellite now gives our Nation another chance to act as a responsible member of the world community.

Mr. President, I have written to President Eisenhower, formally recommending that, subject to necessary safeguards, we offer to place our reconnaissance satellites at the service of the United Nations as a part of an international inspection program designed to prevent nuclear Pearl Harbors for any nation. If accepted, this offer would help to lay the groundwork for the beginnings of an enforceable disarmament program.

I have also respectfully suggested to the President that we now reappraise our technical program for achieving the first reconnaissance satellite, toward the end of getting in the sky at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Khrushchev can have no rational objection to such a move. After all, the Soviet Union, with its first sputnik, was the first to fly over the air space of other nations.

A still more important point. There is now growing reason to suspect that a man may be sitting in the Soviet spaceship circling the globe at this very minute and that the Soviets may very shortly attempt to return this man—alive—to earth.

Mr. President, it is our duty to build the armaments needed for our survival. But it is also our duty to do everything within our power to put the instruments of science and technology under effective international control. One great move in this direction would be to establish an international program for guarding against surprise attacks. The reconnaissance satellite will give us a chance to start such a program. Let us seize that chance.

CONSTRUCTION OF SAN LUIS UNIT, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 44.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 44) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. (a) That for the principal purpose of furnishing water for the irrigation of approximately five hundred thousand acres of land in Merced, Fresno, and Kings Counties, California, hereinafter referred to as Federal San Luis unit service area, and as incidents thereto of furnishing water for municipal and domestic use and providing recreation and fish and wildlife benefits, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the San Luis unit as an integral part of the Central Valley project. The principal engineering features of said unit shall be a dam and reservoir at or near the San Luis site, a forebay and afterbay, the San Luis Canal, the Pleasant Valley Canal, and necessary pumping plants, distribution systems, drains, channels, levees, flood works, and related facilities, but no facilities shall be constructed for electric transmission or distribution service which the Secretary determines, on the basis of an offer of a firm fifty-year contract from a local public or private agency, can through such contract be obtained at less cost to the Federal Government than by construction and operation of Government facilities. The works (hereinafter referred to as joint-use facilities) for joint use with the State of California (hereinafter referred to as the State) shall be the dam and reservoir at or near the San Luis site, forebay and afterbay, pumping plants, and the San Luis Canal. The joint-use facilities consisting of the dam and reservoir shall be constructed, and other joint-use facilities may be constructed, so as to permit future expansion; or the joint-use facilities shall be constructed initially to the capacities necessary to serve both the Federal San Luis unit service area and the State's service area, as hereinafter provided. In constructing, operating, and maintaining the San Luis unit, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto). Construction of the San Luis unit shall not be commenced until the Secretary has (1) secured, or has satisfactory assurance of his ability to secure, all rights to the use of water which are necessary to carry out the purposes of the unit and the terms and conditions of this Act, and (2) received satisfactory assurance from the State of California that it will make provision for a master drainage outlet and disposal channel for the San Joaquin Valley, as generally outlined in the California water plan Bulletin Numbered 3, of the California Department of Water Resources, which will adequately serve, by connection therewith, the drainage system for the San Luis unit or has made provision for constructing the San Luis interceptor drain to the delta designed to meet the drainage requirements of the San Luis unit as generally outlined in the report of the Department of the Interior, entitled "San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project," dated December 17, 1956.

(b) No water provided by the Federal San Luis unit shall be delivered in the Federal San Luis service area to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed and which will be in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized, on behalf of the United States, to negotiate and enter into an agreement with the State of California providing for coordinated operation of the San Luis unit, including the joint-use facilities, in order that the State may, without cost to the United States, deliver water in service areas outside the Federal San Luis unit service area as described in the report of the Department of the Interior, entitled "San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project", dated December 17, 1956. Said agreement shall recite that the liability of the United States thereunder is contingent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out its obligations under the same. No funds shall be appropriated to commence construction of the San Luis unit under any such agreement, except for the preparation of designs and specifications and other preliminary work, prior to ninety calendar days (which ninety days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) after it has been submitted to the Congress, and then only if either the House nor the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has disapproved it by committee resolution within said ninety days. If such an agreement has not been executed by January 1, 1962, and if, after consultation with the Governor of the State, the Secretary determines that the prospects of reaching accord on the terms thereof are not reasonably firm, he may proceed to construct and operate the San Luis unit in accordance with section 1 of this Act: *Provided*, That, if the Secretary so determines, he shall report thereon to the Congress and shall not commence construction for ninety calendar days from the date of his report (which ninety days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days). In considering the prospects of reaching accord on the terms of the agreement the Secretary shall give substantial weight to any relevant affirmative action theretofore taken by the State, including the enactment of State legislation authorizing the State to acquire and convey to the United States title to lands to be used for the San Luis unit or assistance given by it in financing Federal design and construction of the unit. The authority conferred upon the Secretary by the first sentence of this section shall not, except as is otherwise provided in this section, be construed as a limitation upon the exercise by him of the authority conferred in section 1 of this Act, but if the State shall agree that, if it later enlarges the joint-use facilities, or any of them, it will pay an equitable share of the cost to the United States of those facilities as initially constructed before utilizing them for the storage or delivery of water and will bear the entire cost of enlarging the same and if, as a part of said equitable share, it makes available to the Secretary sufficient funds to pay the additional cost of designing and constructing the joint-use facilities so as to permit enlargement, it shall have an irrevocable right to enlarge or modify such facilities at any time in the future, and a perpetual right to the use of such additional capacity: *Provided*, That the performance of

such work by the State, after approval of its plans by the Secretary, shall be so carried on as not to interfere unduly with the operation of the project for the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act and the use of the additional capacity for water service shall be limited to service outside of the Federal San Luis unit service area: *And provided further*, That this right may be relinquished by the State at any time at its option.

SEC. 3. The agreement between the United States and the State referred to in section 2 of this Act shall provide, among other things, that—

(a) the joint-use facilities to be constructed by the Secretary shall be so designed and constructed to such capacities and in such manner as to permit either (i) immediate integration and coordinated operation with the State's water projects by providing, among other things, a capacity in San Luis Reservoir of approximately two million one hundred thousand acre-feet and corresponding capacities in the other joint-use facilities or (ii) such subsequent enlargement or other modification as may be required for integration and coordinated operation therewith;

(b) the State shall make available to the Secretary during the construction period sufficient funds to pay an equitable share of the construction costs of any facilities designed and constructed as provided in paragraph (a) above. The State contribution shall be made in annual installments, each of which bears approximately the same ratio to total expenditures during that year as the total of the State's share bears to the total cost of the facilities; the State may make advances to the United States in order to maintain a timely construction schedule of the joint-use facilities and the works of the San Luis unit to be used by the State and the United States;

(c) the State may at any time after approval of its plans by the Secretary and at its own expense enlarge or modify San Luis Dam and Reservoir and other facilities to be used jointly by the State and the United States, but the performance of such work shall be so carried on as not to interfere unduly with the operation of the San Luis unit for the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act;

(d) the United States and the State shall each pay annually an equitable share of the operation, maintenance, and replacement costs of the joint-use facilities;

(e) promptly after execution of this agreement between the Secretary and the State, and for the purpose of said agreement, the State shall convey to the United States title to any lands, easements, and rights-of-way which it then owns and which are required for the joint-use facilities. The State shall be given credit for the costs of these lands, easements, and rights-of-way toward its share of the construction cost of the joint-use facilities. The State shall likewise be given credit for any funds advanced by it to the Secretary for preparation of designs and specifications or for any other work in connection with the joint-use facilities;

(f) the rights to the use of capacities of the joint-use facilities of the San Luis unit shall be allocated to the United States and the State, respectively, in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon. The United States shall not be restricted in the exercise of its right so allocated, which shall be sufficient to carry out the purposes of section 1 of this Act and which shall extend throughout the repayment period and so long thereafter as title to the works remains in the United States. The State shall not be restricted in the exercise of its allocated right to the use of the capacities of the joint-use facilities for water service outside the Federal San Luis unit service area;

(g) the Secretary may turn over to the State the care, operation, and maintenance of any works of the San Luis unit which are used jointly by the United States and the State at such time and under such conditions as shall be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State;

(h) notwithstanding transfer of the care, operation, and maintenance of any works to the State, as hereinbefore provided, any organization which has theretofore entered into a contract with the United States under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and amendments thereto, for a water supply through the works of the San Luis unit, including joint-use facilities, shall continue to be subject to the same limitations and obligations and to have and to enjoy the same rights which it would have had under its contract with the United States and the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 1 of the Act of July 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 483, 43 U.S.C. 485h–1) in the absence of such transfer, and its enjoyment of such rights shall be without added cost or other detriment arising from such transfer;

(i) if a nonreimbursable allocation to the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife has been made as provided in section 2 of the Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080, 16 U.S.C. 662), as amended, the features of the unit to which such allocation is attributable shall, notwithstanding transfer of the care, operation, and maintenance to the State, be operated and maintained in such wise as to retain the bases upon which such allocation is premised and, upon failure so to operate and maintain those features, the amount allocated thereto shall become a reimbursable cost to be paid by the State;

(j) the State shall not serve any lands within the Federal San Luis unit service area except as such service is required as a consequence of its acceptance of the care, operation, and maintenance of works under paragraph (g) of this section.

SEC. 4. If the Secretary proceeds to construct, operate, and maintain the San Luis works under the terms of section 1 of this Act solely as a Federal project, the operation shall be subject to the following restriction: Whenever the chlorides in the water at the head of the Delta-Mendota Canal exceed one hundred and fifty parts per million during the months of July, August, or September, the mean daily diversion from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to San Luis unit via Tracy pumping plant and Delta-Mendota Canal as measured at the San Luis pumping plant shall not exceed the mean daily import to the Sacramento Valley from the Trinity project.

SEC. 5. In constructing, operating, and maintaining a drainage system for the San Luis unit, the Secretary is authorized to permit the use thereof by other parties under contracts the terms of which are as nearly similar as is practicable to those required by the Federal reclamation laws in the case of irrigation repayment or service contracts and is further authorized to enter into agreements and participate in construction and operation of drainage facilities designed to serve the general area of which the lands to be served by the San Luis unit are a part, to the extent the works authorized in section 1 of this Act contribute to drainage requirements of said area. The Secretary is also authorized to permit the use of the irrigation facilities of the San Luis unit, including its facilities for supplying pumping energy, under contracts entered into pursuant to section 1 of the Act of February 21, 1911 (36 Stat. 925; 43 U.S.C. 523).

SEC. 6. The Secretary is directed to plan the works authorized in this Act in such a manner as to contemplate and make possible the future provision of Central Valley project service, by way of the Pacheco Tunnel route, to lands and municipalities in Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, and Monterey Counties heretofore anticipated as a possibility by the Acts of October 14, 1949 (63 Stat. 852) and August 27, 1958 (72 Stat. 937). Construction of additional works to provide such service shall not be undertaken until a report demonstrating their physical and economic feasibility has been completed, reviewed by the State, and approved by the Secretary, and the works have been authorized by Act of Congress.

SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized, in connection with the San Luis unit, to construct minimum basic public recreational facilities and to arrange for the operation and maintenance of the same by the State or an appropriate local agency or organization. The cost of such facilities shall be nonreturnable and nonreimbursable under the Federal reclamation laws.

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the works of the San Luis unit, including joint-use facilities, authorized by this Act, other than distribution systems and drains, the sum of $290,430,000, plus such additional amount, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in costs of construction of the types involved in the San Luis unit as shown by engineering indexes. Said base sum of $290,430,000 shall, however, be diminished to the extent that the State makes funds or lands or interests in land available to the Secretary pursuant to sections 2 or 3 of this Act which decrease the costs which would be incurred if the works authorized in section 1 of this Act (including provision for their subsequent expansion) were constructed solely as a Federal project. There are also authorized to be appropriated, in addition thereto, such amounts as are required (a) for construction of such distribution systems and drains as are not constructed by local interests, but not to exceed in total cost the sum of $192,650,000, and (b) for operation and maintenance of the unit: *Provided*, That no funds shall be appropriated for construction of distribution systems and drains prior to ninety calendar days (which ninety days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) after a contract has been submitted to the Congress calling for complete repayment of the distribution systems and drains within a period of forty years from the date such works are placed in service. All moneys received by the Secretary from the State under this Act shall be covered into the same accounts as moneys appropriated hereunder and shall be available, without further appropriation, to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have only two or three very short comments to make. The Senators from California, I am sure, will desire to say a few words on this subject.

This is a project which I have personally inspected several times. It is a project on which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs worked at great length. The Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation successfully recommended to the Senate favorable action upon the bill. The bill was passed by the Senate and was sent to the House of Representatives.

I am pleased the House has taken the action it has taken upon the bill. I have examined, I think carefully, all the House amendments. If I correctly interpret them, as I think they should be interpreted, I believe the House has improved the bill.

Therefore, I now move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 44. I know the Senators from California will desire to express themselves upon this motion.

Mr. ENGLE and Mr. KUCHEL addressed the Chair.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield first to the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I concur wholeheartedly in the statement made by the Senator from New Mexico. I agree that the House work upon this particular piece of proposed legislation has improved it. It is substantially the same bill which passed the Senate. The language is a little different. I would say it is only different in the sense that it is somewhat more precise than was the language we passed in the Senate. As a consequence, I agree it would be proper to concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. President, I have gone over the amendments, as has the Senator from New Mexico, and as has, I believe, my senior colleague from California. I am sure my colleague agrees that the present provisions of the bill represent an improvement rather than the contrary, and that as a consequence no good purpose would be served by going to conference.

I express my appreciation to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for his assistance in handling this proposed legislation. The Senator from New Mexico has been the chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for a number of years. He was the chairman of that subcommittee during the time I was the chairman of the equivalent subcommittee in the House of Representatives. He was the chairman of that subcommittee during the time I was the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, at which time I had the privilege of working with the Senator on numerous western reclamation projects, including the upper Colorado Basin project.

Those of us from California, intensely interested as we are in water development, are deeply grateful not only to the Senator from New Mexico but also to his associates on the committee.

We are deeply grateful to the senior Senator from California, who has been a splendid leader in the water programs for the Far West, and also to the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. President, I would not conclude my remarks without saying that we are very grateful indeed to the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado, who has been a constant friend of western reclamation during many years. Representative ASPINALL gave his tremendous and powerful support to this proposed legislation when it was before the House.

Our California colleague, Representative B. F. SISK, who is on the floor of the Senate with me today, is the author of this proposed legislation. To him we give great credit for his effort.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a year ago the Senate passed Senate bill 44, introduced by my colleague from California [Mr. ENGLE] and myself. It has been described, accurately, I think, as one of the finest reclamation projects ever to come before a Congress. I am most grateful that the House saw fit to pass the bill earlier this week, with some amendments which I believe have improved the bill.

The legislation before us envisages a great storage reservoir to be constructed and used jointly by the Government of the United States and the Government of California. It will serve a Federal reclamation project on the one hand, subject to Federal reclamation law, and it will also serve a State project, the Feather River project, on the other hand, under State law. An expanded area of the Central Valley Project, a Federal reclamation project, will receive supplemental water in accordance with Federal statutes, and the lower San Joaquin valley and the parched areas of southern California will receive an additional water supply under State statutes.

I have before me a brief statement of the rather technical amendments which the House made in the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HOUSE-PASSED SAN LUIS BILL AND S. 44 AS PASSED BY SENATE

(Page and line references are to printing of S. 44, as it was passed to the House of Representatives on May 14, 1959.)

1. On page 2, line 9, after "facilities," the House bill adds a prohibition against construction of electric transmission or distribution lines if the Secretary determines on the basis of a firm 50-year contract from a local public or private agency, that necessary power to operate San Luis can be obtained at less cost than by construction and operation of Federal facilities.

2. On page 3, lines 14, 15, and 16, there is a clarifying change in the House bill which merely accurately identifies the report referred to.

3. On page 4, starting on line 12, the House bill adds provisions stating that the agreement with the State shall specify that the liability of the United States is contingent upon appropriations, and further providing that no funds shall be appropriated to commence construction until the agreement between the State and the Secretary has been submitted to Congress and has lain there during 90 session days without disapproval of either the Senate or House Interior Committees.

4. On page 5, starting on line 15, the House bill inserts provisions requiring the State, if it enlarges the joint-use facilities after initial construction, to pay an equitable share of the cost to the United States of the facilities as initially constructed, and to bear the entire cost of enlarging them.

5. On page 6, on line 2, before "and provided further," the House bill inserts a requirement that the State's use of the joint-use facilities shall be limited to service outside of the Federal San Luis unit service area.

6. On page 8, line 23, the House bill deletes the word "title" so that only the care, operation, and maintenance of the works shall be turned over to the State.

7. On page 9, in the middle of line 4, the House bill inserts a provision that any organization which has contracted with the Federal Government for water, in the event operation is turned over to the State, "shall continue to be subject to the same limitations and obligations" as it would have under continued Federal service. This insures the continuance of the 160-acre limitation.

8. On page 9, after line 23, the House bill inserts a new subsection prohibiting the State from serving any lands within the Federal San Luis unit service area, except as such service is required if it accepts operation under paragraph (g).

9. On page 9, after line 23, and the preceding new subsection, there is inserted by the House bill a new section 4 restricting the withdrawal of Federal San Luis water from the delta whenever Delta-Mendota water exceeds 150 parts per million of chlorides during the summer months, unless the Trinity project is adding an equal amount of water to the Sacramento Valley. Remaining sections are renumbered.

10. On page 10, starting on line 22, the Senate bill directly authorizes construction of an extension of CVP via Pacheco tunnel to serve Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, and Monterey Counties with certain provisos. The House bill has the effect of including these areas in the Central Valley service area and authorizes a report on feasibility, which would require a later authorization by act of Congress.

11. On page 11, after the sentence ending on line 18, the House bill inserts a provision that the authorization for appropriations of $290,430,000 shall be diminished to the extent that the State makes funds or lands available which decrease the cost of the works to the Federal Government.

12. On page 11, line 22, after the word "interest," the House bill inserts a limitation on the total cost of distribution and drainage systems of $192,650,000, and adds the further provision that no funds may be appropriated for distribution and drainage systems until a contract for complete repayment has lain before Congress for 90 session days.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this is the last happy chapter in the enactment of this beneficent bill which will serve the best interests of the United States, and of the State of California. It has the approval of the State and Federal Governments and their respective agencies. The President has urged it. The Vice President has urged it. I ask adoption of the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the senior Senator from New Mexico if he will yield for a question.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I recall, this is the bill which the Senate passed last year.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Can the Senator inform me whether this bill, as it comes from the House, makes any substantial changes in the bill as it passed the Senate last year?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin that there are no substantial changes. There are a few changes in wording, which I think probably improve the bill. Many of them

were suggested by Representative SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, who is a stanch friend of those who wish to keep reclamation within reasonable bounds. I think the bill is a satisfactory bill. I believe no substantial change has been made in it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I recall, there was a lengthy debate on the floor last year on the acreage limitation feature, the 160-acre limitation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That has not been affected?

Mr. ANDERSON. The bill has been strengthened, if anything. There was a possibility that the State of California could have diverted water from its share and put it on Federal lands. We did not think that was possible. It might have been possible, but the House added a provision which would make it impossible. It provides that in all Federal sections the areas must be supplied from Federal units. Hence, the 160-acre limitation would apply.

I think the House strengthened the bill. I do not believe it needed strengthening. Nevertheless, the House added a provision to safeguard the item which we had long debated. I can assure the Senator that I was interested in that point, because if the bill had been varied in any way, those of us who were trying to protect the situation would have been subject to criticism. I am sure the bill has been strengthened rather than weakened.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] that the Senate concur in the House amendment to Senate bill 44.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the House amendment was concurred in.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OLD FOLKS, WITHOUT MEDICINE, DIE LIKE ANIMALS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, all too often we discuss major issues in terms of statistics and averages and we lose sight of the all-important human element. This is particularly true in the case of providing medical care for our senior citizens.

The statistics in this case, however, come to life in the actual hard experience related in letters from our older constituents. Here, for example, is a case study that tells the story better than any set of facts and figures. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SIR: It is some time since I wrote to you about not so very important matters to anyone but me. I waited so patiently for the age of 62 when I could have my pension and could have a little easier life. Well, I got my pension—$23.90 a month. Can an old person live on that? I am not a widow. My husband gets $68. He hasn't worked for many years. He has a heart condition. We can't even buy medicines. We could only dream of a hospital. We old folks must just die like animals. I know you have more important matters to think about, but please try to help us.

Respectfully,

———— ————.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the calendar in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, when the Senate adjourns this afternoon, it will adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

On Monday, after the morning hour, it is planned to have the Senate consider items on the calendar beginning on page 10, with Calendar No. 1374, Senate Resolution 279, a resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Government Operations, and continuing to the bottom of page 13, ending with Calendar No. 1407, Senate Concurrent Resolution 97, submitted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], a resolution authorizing the reprinting of a certain joint committee print.

I desire to give further notice that there are several bills on the calendar which have been cleared by the policy committee, and which may be taken up on motion in the early part of next week. Among such bills are: Calendar No. 921, Senate bill 2168, a bill to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine; and Calendar No. 924, House bill 8315, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lease a portion of Fort Crowder, Mo., to Stella Reorganized School District, Missouri.

On Tuesday it is planned to have the Senate consider the President's veto message on Senate bill 722, the area redevelopment bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. What date did the Senator say the veto message would be taken up?

Mr. MANSFIELD. On Tuesday next.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to note that. I hope, for the RECORD, that it will not be postponed until Wednesday. I wish to be present, but I cannot be present on Wednesday because of an important engagement in Harrisburg.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] stated at the opening of the session today that it would be taken up on Tuesday, and that if it were not possible to complete consideration of the debate on the question of overriding the veto, it would be carried over until Wednesday.

Mr. CLARK. I have no doubt that the Senate can conclude the debate on Tuesday. If the Senate is ready to vote on Tuesday, I hope the vote will not be postponed until Wednesday, merely in order to accommodate Senators who cannot be present on Tuesday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That was not the idea. The idea was that if the Senate could not conclude debate on Tuesday, it would go over until Wednesday; but the majority leader expressed the hope that debate will be concluded on Tuesday. We shall do the best we can.

It is expected also that the agricultural appropriation bill will be reported next week, and it is hoped that it can be considered at an early date.

As other legislation is reported and cleared by the policy committee, it will be announced and considered expeditiously. We are coming into the home stretch of the session. It is very important that committees meet and report proposed legislation as soon as possible.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. May I inquire of the Senator what may be taken up on Monday? I was absent from the Chamber.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is planned to consider measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1374, on page 10, and including all of pages 11, 12, and 13, plus the possibility, if time and circumstances allow, of consideration of the oleomargarine bill and the Stella School bill.

It is planned to consider on Tuesday the question of overriding the President's veto of the area redevelopment bill.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the distinguished acting majority leader.

WORLD TRADE WEEK

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Pennsylvania's two largest cities will be saluting World Trade Week this month. On Wednesday the Greater Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce and the Committee of American Steamship Lines gathered at the great river port of Pittsburgh for a 2-day foreign trade celebration.

On Sunday, May 22, World Trade Week will begin in Philadelphia, with a program including a cruise, an open house at the Philadelphia Naval Base, a distinguished service award luncheon, and many other events.

The third great Pennsylvania port, Erie, located on the lake of that name, and which is developing its foreign trade rapidly as a result of the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, is also very much interested in World Trade Week.

I ask unanimous consent that two articles describing World Trade Week and the importance of world trade to the economy of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the two articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENNSYLVANIA AND AMERICA'S MERCHANT MARINE BUILD SILENT PARTNERSHIP IN WORLD TRADE

America's merchant marine will salute Pennsylvania and make Greater Pittsburgh—one of the Nation's great river ports—an ocean port on May 18 and 19, during World Trade Week.

Some 40 steamship executives from 15 lines, representing all U.S. seacoasts, will journey hundreds of miles inland to Pittsburgh to spotlight the area's reliance on ocean commerce and merchant ships flying the American flag.

They will deliver a foreign trade message that means jobs to tens of thousands of manufacturing workers, farmers and miners in the Keystone State. They will reveal, for example, that over 80 percent of Pennsylvania's total work force of nearly 4 million workers earning $13 billion annually are affected directly or indirectly by world trade. And they will also reveal how America's passenger and cargo ship fleets connect the iron and steel capital with every major coastal city and county in the world.

The 2-day foreign trade celebration is sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh in cooperation with the Committee of American Steamship Lines. The committee's 15-member lines sail more than 300 passenger and cargo ships on the Nation's essential foreign trade routes under operating differential subsidy contracts with the Government.

Heading the east, west and gulf coast steamship operators, representing some of the oldest shipping interests to serve this country in peace and war, will be Mr. J. R. Dant, president, States Steamship Co., San Francisco, and vice chairman of the steamship committee, and Tom Killefer, the committee's executive director, Washington, D.C.

The shipping men's message will, in some way, touch the lives of every one of the 11 million Pennsylvania inhabitants in their efforts to better acquaint the citizens of Greater Pittsburgh and the Keystone State, a growing U.S. world trade center, with the meaning of foreign trade and to stimulate the movement of more exports overseas on American ships. This ties in with Secretary of Commerce Mueller's current promotion drive to increase export sales abroad from 10 to 15 percent in 1960.

The people in Pennsylvania directly affected by foreign trade work in manufacturing plants, in mines and on farms which either make products directly for export or need imports for their operation. The steel industry, for instance, imports nearly 30 percent of its required iron ore, more than 80 percent of its nickel, 90 percent of its chrome and other necessary ingredients. Farmers grow produce for canners to put up for foreign trade. Electrical companies ship complete generating plants as well as components to purchasers abroad.

And 670,000 metal-using workers, earning $3.7 billion in Pennsylvania, could well worry about their jobs if it weren't for ore imports. If all the imported ores used in the United States in 1958 were loaded aboard ships at one time, a fleet of 1,400 extra-large, 20,000-ton capacity ships would have been required.

Those indirectly affected by foreign trade in Pennsylvania include merchants who handle such items as coffee or sugar, those who finance foreign trade, those who make such things as the barges or railroads which must move goods for overseas shipment * * * and the housewife and the man in the street who must look daily to exports and imports to enjoy the thousand and one comforts and pleasures of modern living.

What is the dollar value of foreign trade to Pennsylvania?

According to a recently completed study by the steamship committee of the financial impact of foreign trade on the Keystone State; its share of total U.S. exports in 1958 was $1 billion, of which $225 million could be attributed to the Greater Pittsburgh area.

The effect of foreign trade on workers in the iron and steel industries is of major importance: the committee's study shows that in 1958 in Greater Pittsburgh 120,000 persons were employed by the steel industry, or about 17 percent of all steelworkers in the United States.

It further shows that Greater Pittsburgh's share of steel-mill products exported in 1958 was about $85 million.

Significantly, about 90 percent of Greater Pittsburgh's total work force of 775,000 are directly or indirectly affected by foreign trade. And without exports and imports, many of Greater Pittsburgh's 2,400 plants would be seriously crippled and payrolls cut.

Importance of exports to Greater Pittsburgh's key industrial firms is revealing too. Westinghouse Electric Corp., with 24,000 Greater Pittsburgh employees, manufactures 8,000 products exported to 148 countries—ranging from light bulbs to nuclear reactors. H. J. Heinz Co., with 2,800 workers in Greater Pittsburgh, has doubled its export volume since 1955, and sends shipborne canned goods and other products to some 200 foreign countries. All told, there are 270 Pittsburgh area exporting companies which export a multiplicity of goods to hundreds of overseas outlets.

Although Greater Pittsburgh is not a major farming area, Pennsylvania is the dairyland of the Atlantic Coast States and plays a part in the exporting of agricultural products. It is estimated that 5 million acres are harvested in Pennsylvania each year and about 1 in 8 acres were probably devoted to export.

And it has been estimated that the Pennsylvania farmers' share of exports of processed foods in 1958 was about $18 million.

The story, then, to be told by deepwater shipping men in Greater Pittsburgh, May 18–19, is one of economic health and prosperity for Pennsylvania through overseas commerce, 99 percent of which moves in and out of this country by ocean ships.

NEWS RELEASE FROM THE DIVISION OF PUBLIC INFORMATION, CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Some 200 importers and exporters of outlying areas of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York will join local shippers in celebrating Maritime Day, Tuesday, May 24, on a riverboat tour of the historic port of Philadelphia, America's leading import center.

One of the principal features of World Trade Week, the 5-hour cruise is sponsored by the Port of Philadelphia Maritime Society and its affiliated organizations. It will be conducted aboard the Riverview Line's excursion steamer, *State of Pennsylvania,* which will sail from pier 4 south, foot of Chestnut Street, at 10:15 a.m.

The visiting exporters and importers will be guests of the Delaware River Port Authority. Approximately 900 persons are expected to take the cruise. The vessel will move down river to the Walt Whitman Bridge, where it will turn north and proceed to the giant Fairless Works of the United States Steel Corp. at Morrisville.

Off Pennsbury Manor, historic Bucks County home of William Penn, the Reverend James F. McElroy, chaplain and director of the Seamen's Church Institute, will hold shipboard memorial services for those who have given their lives in the service of the U.S. Merchant Marine.

Col. T. H. Setliffe, chief, district Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, will point up the progress which is being made in dredging the upper Delaware River channel to its authorized depth of 40 feet.

A buffet luncheon will be served, with music provided by the Girard College Band.

George Burnham, chairman of Mayor Richardson Dilworth's World Trade Week Citizens Committee, said the overall program of the week will be marked by special day to day activities.

The Philadelphia Naval Base ushers in the celebration next Sunday afternoon (May 22) with an open house day salute to international trade. Here the public will be invited to see the Navy's new guided missile cruiser, the U.S.S. *Galveston;* to inspect exhibits of the Navy's outer space project; and to tour other base operations.

City Representative and Commerce Director Fredric R. Mann will be one of the main speakers the following Monday, May 23 at the week's distinguished service award luncheon in the Barclay Hotel ballroom. The award will be presented to the PNB for its outstanding service in port promotional work.

Dr. Edward H. Litchfield, chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh and head of the U.S. Board of Governmental Affairs Institute, will address the Council of International Visitors' luncheon on Wednesday, May 25, in the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel.

The tugboat owners and operators of the port of Philadelphia will pay tribute to Capt. Horace O. Derrickson on Thursday afternoon, May 26, in the Seamen's Church Institute. Derrickson will receive the Maritime Service Award for safely guiding nearly 30,000 ships in and out of the port during 33 years of service as a tugboat skipper.

The Foreign Traders Association holds its annual World Trade Week banquet Thursday night in the Benjamin Franklin Hotel. Dr. Jose A. Mora, Secretary General, Organization of American States, Pan American Union, is the principal speaker.

The Philadelphia chapter, Pennsylvania Motor Truck Association, celebrates Highway Transportation Day on Friday, May 27, and the colorful presentation of Aviation Day, Sunday afternoon, May 29, at International Airport, climaxes the week's activities.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSAL FOR MEDICARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, like the King's horses and the King's men, the administration—through its Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—has marched up to Capitol Hill and marched down again, no less than eight times in the past year, promising each time to return with a sound proposal for solving the problem of financing the health care of America's growing number of aged. Poor Dr. Flemming, who would like to come to grips with the problem, but is not allowed to do so, must be getting pretty discouraged.

Each time Congress, along with the Nation's elderly and their families, has waited patiently for such a proposal. Each time we were cajoled into waiting until next time. Finally the administration put out a press release outlining their solution. There is still no administration bill before the Congress. And we will adjourn the first week in July.

We have waited patiently for an administration bill; but we can wait no longer. We must express publicly our views on the administration's proposal as reported in the press.

To begin with, it is clear that the administration is not really out to fight the foe of illness and its costs for the aged.

No pious expressions of sympathy can conceal the fact that the administration's plan just does not fit the needs of our aging citizens. Nor is the claim that the plan avoids compulsion an honest one. The $1.2 billion to finance the proposal would have to be raised through compulsory Federal and State taxes. The issue, therefore, is really, which type of compulsory financing do we want? The Democrats' social security approach of paid-up insurance upon retirement or the administration's plan which would require membership fees and deductible outlays after retirement?

More concretely, the administration's plan has these additional obvious defects:

First. It places a very heavy burden upon the States to raise, through taxes, at least $600 million in matching funds at a time when every State is in a precarious financial condition. After 15 States are still unable to match Federal funds for the medical care of the most needy aged under old-age assistance. These States could thus automatically exclude at least 2½ million people over 65 at the outset. And how long would it take for the rest of the States to join?

Second. It would be an administrative monstrosity requiring the Federal Government to develop complex administrative arrangements with 50 different State plans and perhaps hundreds of insurance companies.

Third. Regardless of the label used by the administration, the income limitations for eligibility—$2,500 for an individual, $3,800 for a couple—amount to a means test, requiring aged individuals to subject themselves to an income investigation to prove poverty—and on an annual basis. These limitations further exclude from eligibility at least 3½ to 4 million elderly citizens who have just as great a need for adequate health care at a minimum cost.

Fourth. It does not help the average older person very much. Even after a means test he would have to pay $24 a year to enroll. He still would receive no benefits until he paid $250 out of his own pocket—$400 for a couple. After all of this outlay, he would still have to pay 20 percent of the rest of the cost.

Fifth. The deductible feature of the proposal creates a major burden for all the aged electing the plan by forcing them to become bookkeepers, in order to prove that they have spent at least $250 in medical expenses. They would have to keep an accurate, authenticated record of every single medical expense they would incur.

Sixth. The deductible feature, by definition, sets up a barrier to an initial seeking of early medical diagnosis and attention on the part of the aged before they become seriously ill. It rejects the principle of preventive medicine which results in more effective and less costly medical practice. Under the administration's plan, an aged person must become catastrophically sick in order to benefit from it.

Seventh. The use of private insurance carriers, combined with redundant Federal-State administrative machinery, would sharply reduce that portion of the medical dollar returned to the individual in the form of direct medical services. Considering the recognized need for the most efficient use of the medical dollar, the administration's program for aging citizens is extravagant.

Eighth. The administration's plan rejects outright the sound principle of small premium payments during work life leading to a paid-up medical policy on retirement. Aged persons, after retirement—when income is low and illness high—should not be required to continue paying for basic medical coverage.

Ninth. Finally, and most important, an analysis of the actual medical expenses incurred in typical illnesses will reveal the illusory feature of the administration's plan and its unfavorable rating, when compared with the McNamara bill, S. 3503.

The following table shows the comparative amounts provided under each of the two alternatives, for a variety of illnesses. The one type of illness in which the administration's formula—80 percent of the excess over the first $250, or $400 for couples, plus a $24 membership fee—is more advantageous than the McNamara bill, for the patient and his family, would be in those cases requiring exceptionally long custodial care in institutions such as nursing homes. I cite example 6.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table to which I have referred may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Medical expenses of patient and amounts paid under McNamara bill versus administration plan

Type of illness	Total medical costs	Amount paid by—		Amount paid by patient or family	
		McNamara	Administration	McNamara	Administration
1. Widow, 70, carcinoma of breast, surgery, 10 days in hospital; doctors' visits; 120 days in nursing home for terminal care	$1,850	$1,500	$1,280	$350	$594
2. Married man, 68, heart failure; 3 10-day stays in hospital; home care; doctors' visits; drugs	2,160	1,600	1,408	560	776
3. Single man, 66, acute appendicitis; surgery; 10 days in hospital	450	300	160	150	314
4. Married woman, 67, pneumonia; diagnostic X-rays; home care; doctors' visits; drugs	200	130	0	70	224
5. Married man, 72, fractured hip; surgery; 10 days in hospital; home in bed 5 months; doctors' visits; nursing home 1 month	1,195	850	636	345	583
6. Widow, 80, mild senility; year-round nursing home stay; monthly doctors' visits	3,770	1,800	2,816	1,970	978
7. Married man, 70, carcinoma of stomach; diagnoses; 100 days in hospital; surgery; doctors' follow-up visits, etc	3,775	2,825	2,700	950	1,099

Basis of cost estimates:

Hospitalization	$30 per day.
Nursing home	$10.
Home health care	$5.
Surgeon's fees	Blue Shield schedule.
Medical fees	$25 first hospital visit, $5 thereafter; 10 home visits.
Drugs	Estimates based on type and severity of illness.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, an examination of this table reveals, first, that despite the claim by the administration that its plan is aimed at meeting catastrophic illnesses, the McNamara retired persons medical insurance program covers such cases more favorably for the aged patient and his family. Second, in the less catastrophic illness, which is more frequent, the administration's plan is of little value.

Furthermore, the McNamara program still leaves ample room for individual and family responsibility. No one would be "pampered" in this program of financing the basic costs of medical care for

the aged. For the same reason, private insurance companies are provided an unprecedented opportunity to offer supplementary policies, especially to cover medical and surgical costs, such as under Blue Shield.

S. 3503, the retired persons medical insurance bill, introduced by Senator McNAMARA and myself, along with 18 other Senators, would cover all retired aged men and women, the group whose health problems and ability to finance medical care are the most critical.

The McNamara bill would prohibit a means test for eligibility, and thus would avoid any degrading experience for the aged.

Its benefits have been shaped by modern principles of preventive medical care, oriented toward outpatient diagnostic services and restorative medicine through home health services, and related programs.

The individual need not wait until he becomes critically ill, in order to benefit from the provisions of the bill.

Specifically, the McNamara bill would provide to retired elderly Americans the following benefits:

First. Ninety days of hospital care per year, or 180 days of skilled nursing home care, or 240 days of home health services.

Second. Diagnostic services, including lab tests and X-rays.

Third. Payment of a major portion of expensive drugs.

Fourth. Research and demonstration programs to improve the quality and efficiency of health care for the aged.

While it is difficult, if not impossible, to compare the administration's vague and complicated jungle gym proposal with the McNamara bill so far as costs are concerned, it can be said in general terms that the administration cost figures—if all the States participate and if the estimated number of aged elect to become eligible—would be about $1.2 billion. Half of this would come from the Federal Treasury, and the other half from the States.

Under the McNamara bill, there would be little in the way of additional new costs to the Federal Treasury. While the total price tag would be about $1.5 billion by the time all benefits became available, about $1.1 billion would be paid for by an additional ½ of 1 percent social security deduction from payrolls—of the first $4,800. The remainder would be appropriated from the general fund, from which approximately $240 million is already being expended under existing earmarked medical care for old-age groups covered by our proposal. In other words, the additional new costs would be about $130 million from the Treasury, or general funds.

In actual practice, the retired persons medical insurance bill would protect many more millions of aged persons than would the proposal now being floated by the Republican administration. For this reason and the other arguments I have presented here, there is only one sensible answer to the issue before us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an analysis of the McNamara retired persons medical insurance bill.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR PAT MCNAMARA, CHAIRMAN, SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PROBLEMS OF THE AGED AND AGING—ANALYSIS: RETIRED PERSONS MEDICAL INSURANCE ACT

This suggested bill for introduction by Senator MCNAMARA proposes to do the following:

MAJOR PROVISIONS

1. Cover under a system of prepaid health insurance all retired aged (men over 65 and women over 62 who are not employed).

2. Provide for 90 days of hospital care per year, or

3. One hundred and thirty-five days care in a skilled nursing home, or

4. One hundred and eighty days of care at home in a supervised home health program.

5. Provide diagnostic outpatient services for such items as laboratory tests and X-rays.

6. Pay for a portion of the cost of very expensive drugs.

7. Provide for research and demonstration programs to improve quality and efficiency of health care.

RELEVANT DATA BEARING ON THE ABOVE PROVISIONS

1. We estimate that this bill will cover 14.8 million men and women as follows: 11.3 million OASI beneficiaries; 1.7 million who are receiving old-age assistance and no OASI; and 1.8 million other retired aged—men over 65 and women over 62.

The act would exclude from its coverage all men and women and their spouses who are working full time. In the ordinary case, these men and women will be covered by a group health insurance policy. The bill is thus limited to the retired aged. It further provides authorization for future participation by the railroad retirement.

2. Estimates of cost for the above provisions: Total cost, computed as conservatively as possible, is estimated at $1.5 billion or $101 per capita (i.e., per retired person); 11.3 million OASI beneficiaries would cost $1.14 billion: financed by a one-quarter of 1 percent increase in the social security tax on the employee and employer; 1.7 million old-age assistance recipients would cost $172 million estimated cost: to come from general revenue fund; and 1.8 million other persons would cost $182 million: to come from general revenue fund.

3. Hospitalization: This bill provides for 90 days hospitalization for the aged but aims at reducing excessive use of hospitals through the following features:

Provision is made for diagnostic services as a preventive program.

An incentive is provided to use nursing homes and home health services instead of hospitals when not needed.

Cost of hospitalization $1,023 million.

4. Skilled nursing home care: For each day of unused hospital care, the bill provides 1½ days of care in a skilled nursing home following a physician's certification—total days authorized, 135; total estimated cost, $215 million.

5. Home health services: For each day of unused hospital care, the bill provides 2 days of home health services by a community-sponsored agency—total days authorized, 180; total estimated cost, $10 million.

6. Outpatient diagnostic services: The bill provides for preventive services through early diagnosis of incipient illness by means of X-ray and other laboratory tests—estimated cost, $111 million.

7. Very expensive drugs: A portion of the cost of very expensive drugs prescribed by a physician using generic names is included in the insurance program. The amount and kind of coverage is to be determined by the Secretary after a year's study—total estimated cost, $147 million.

8. Effective date: The bill would provide for phasing the effective dates of the various benefits so as to provide an opportunity to build up the financing fund, conduct adequate planning and develop the necessary facilities:

Hospitalization effective July 1, 1961, and not later than January 1, 1962.

Nursing homes, January 1, 1963, and not later than July 1, 1963.

Home health services, January 1, 1961, and not later than July 1, 1962.

Diagnostic outpatient services, July 1, 1961, and not later than January 1, 1962.

Very expensive medicines, July 1, 1962, and not later than July 1, 1963.

The Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to designate the dates within these periods when the act would be effective.

9. Summary:

Cost of benefits ($101 per retired person):	
Hospitalization	$1,023,000,000
Skilled nursing homes	215,000,000
Home health services	10,000,000
Diagnostic services	110,000,000
Expensive drug benefits	147,000,000
Total	1,505,000,000
Revenue source:	
From OASDI tax (¼ percent on employer and employee, ⅜ percent on self-employed)	1,150,000,000
General revenue	355,000,000
Total	1,505,000,000
Offset to general revenue:	
Federal share of OAA recipients' medical costs (estimated)	133,000,000
Federal expenditures for medical care of others who would be covered (estimated)	100,000,000

10. Research and demonstration:

The bill would direct the Secretary of HEW to conduct research on the health care of older persons and on improvements in the quality and efficiency of health services.

The Secretary is also authorized to conduct appropriate demonstration programs on how to meet the health needs of older persons as effectively and efficiently as possible in their communities.

11. Other important provisions:

Persons receiving social security benefits or old-age assistance payments are automatically eligible for benefits. Other individuals who have not earned in the preceding month more than the amount set in the retirement test under OASI will be covered.

The Secretary is to publish annually a listing of hospitals, nursing homes, and home health agencies which are included for payments under the act. It is expected that for hospitals, the Secretary may use the A.H.A. accrediting service; and that for nursing homes, only those will be included which meet adequate standards for care and rehabilitation.

State health agencies can be given authority to inspect whether standards are being met and whether professional services are adequate.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to administer the act with a national health service advisory council.

The Secretary may use the services of private nonprofit organizations in administering the program.

Railroad retirement and Federal employee pensioners could come under the program at any time such legislation is enacted.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRISIS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I desire to comment briefly on the present world situation and its implications on the work of this body. I have welcomed the expressions of national unity which have come from the leadership on both sides of the aisle of this body during recent days. Surely it is important that America should be united at a time of serious international crisis, at a time when our President has been gratuitously insulted by the dictator of the Soviet Union. I, for one, hope that partisan politics will not interfere with efforts to find solutions to pressing international problems now or during the coming political campaign.

Yet I must say in all candor, Mr. President, that I applaud the comments of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], as they appeared in the press this morning. I felt that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] did the country a service by pointing out that it is a little premature to start making political capital out of a situation in which we should be trying to find a unified solution; and that it is a little early in the day for the declared candidate of one of our two great political parties to start shifting from a "let's sit down at the summit and have a peaceful discussion with Mr. Khrushchev" line to the old line of "let's shake our fists at the Communists, and let's be a little concerned about whether the opposing political party might be 'soft' on communism."

Mr. President, I can assure that young gentleman that the Democratic Party is not "soft" on communism—never has been, and is not now; and I can also assure the Vice President of the United States that the American people are quite sincere in their search for peace, and that they mean to continue that search with intelligence and persistence.

I suggest that the attitude our country should take in this regard was very well expressed in an article entitled "First of All," which was written by Walter Lippmann, and was published today in the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 19, 1960]

FIRST OF ALL

(By Walter Lippmann)

Amid the wreckage, and as we recover from the shock, the long work of rebuilding will have to begin. Where must it begin? It must begin at the point where the most critical damage has been done. Where is that point? It is not in what Mr. Khrushchev said or did to us. It is in what we did to ourselves. It is that we "first did help to wound ourselves."

The wound has been made by the series of blunders on the gravest matters in the highest quarters. These blunders have not only angered the Russians and wrecked the summit conference but, much worse than all that, they have cast doubt among our allies and among our own people on our competence to lead the Western alliance on the issues of peace and war. Mr. Khrushchev's harsh and intemperate language has produced a reaction and evoked sympathy for the plight of the President. But we must have no illusions about the depth and the extent of the loss of confidence in American leadership, in the judgment, sagacity, and political competence of the Government in Washington.

This is the damage to which we must address ourselves. We are a free people, and one of the blessings of a free society is that, unlike an unfree society, it provides a way to deal with error and correct mistakes. This is to investigate, to criticize, to debate, and then to demonstrate to the people and to the world that the lessons of the fiasco have been learned and will be applied.

In a situation like ours the damage to our prestige would be irreparable if we all rallied around the President and pretended to think that there was nothing seriously wrong. For that would prove to the world that the blunders will not be corrected but will be continued, and that our whole people are satisfied with bad government. It is the dissenters and the critics and the opposition who can restore the world's respect for American competence. We cannot do this by pretending that the incompetence does not exist.

These are hard words. But in what other words shall we describe the performance on Sunday night when the Secretary of Defense, who is in Paris as one of the President's advisers, ordered a worldwide alert of American combat forces? On Sunday night Mr. Macmillan and General de Gaulle were still struggling to find some way out of the affair of the spy plane. Yet this was the time chosen by the Secretary of Defense to "stage a worldwide readiness exercise" which, though not the last stage before actual war, is one of the preliminary stages to it.

Why Sunday of all days? This blunder was not the work of some forgotten colonel on a Turkish airfield. This was the work of the Secretary of Defense and of the President. The timing of the "exercise" was just a shade worse than sending off the U–2 on its perilous mission 2 weeks before the summit. The timing of the so-called exercise makes no sense whatever. For if the alert was concerned with a possible surprise attack, when in the name of common sense could there be less danger of a surprise attack on the Western World than when Mr. K. in person was in Paris?

Unhappily, too, Secretary Gates' "exercise" was just about as incompetently administered at the top as was the affair of the spy plane. This time, it appears, the top people forgot to say anything about the "exercise" to their press officers who did not know what to say, and were not even in their offices, when the public was being frightened by the "exercise."

A great government faced with a most formidable adversary, itself the leader, champion and mainstay of the non-Communist world, cannot be conducted in such a reckless and haphazard way. That is the damage that first must be repaired before we can begin to deal with the general international wreckage, and to regain our confidence in ourselves.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it must be very clear, indeed, that in the field of international affairs the American people must have better leadership in the future than they have had in the past. This is perhaps just as important as it is to rally behind the President of the United States when international affronts are offered to him.

I hope that in this body there will be a climate of unity against foreign threats, to be sure, but one which will put peace as our most important objective, and which will see—in view of the tragic blunders which have been made during recent weeks—the necessity of refurbishing our alliances, and the desirability of gaining additional friendships by such actions as repeal of the iniquitous Connally amendment to the World Court bill—a climate which will make clear to the administration that if it requests ratification by the Senate of an intelligent nuclear arms test ban, the Senate will consider such a treaty fairly and intelligently, and will not be determined in advance to reject it—a climate in the Senate which will encourage a disarmament conference, in the hope that some small start along that line may be made.

In short, Mr. President, I hope we shall not be panicked into an insensate belligerance which could result in our turning our backs on peace. Instead, we must look forward clearsightedly and intelligently, with the interests of America at heart, to a continuing program of seeking world peace through law, which is the only practical and feasible alternative to an ever-accelerating arms race which in the foreseeable future could well bring destruction to all of us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

FUSE POINTS OF A PLANETARY EXPLOSION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of New Jersey, recently concluded a speaking tour of several cities in the western part of the United States. His topics included everything from conservation to world peace and civil defense bomb shelters.

In his speech at a Democratic luncheon in Los Angeles, on March 18, the Governor asked some particularly probing questions about world peace and our policies in pursuing world peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech of Governor Meyner be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF GOV. ROBERT B. MEYNER, OF NEW JERSEY, AT DEMOCRATIC LUNCHEON, GALERIA ROOM, BILTMORE HOTEL, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., MARCH 18, 1960

My talk tonight is concerned with some aspects of American security not very widely discussed.

I begin by asking a question of critical importance to every American citizen. Suppose, tomorrow, you should read in your newspapers that Communist China had successfully tested its first atomic bomb? How would you feel if you knew that the country with the largest population in the world—a country whom we declared to be our enemy when we said we would underwrite the security of Nationalist China—how would you feel if you learned that Communist China was now in possession of the ultimate weapon?

I can't think of a single event in the world today that would cut as deeply into American security as the possession by Communist China of atomic weapons. For China is one of the two or three countries in the world with the kind of dispersed population and industrial centers against whom a nuclear war might not necessarily be fatal.

By contrast, the United States has some two dozen highly concentrated population centers. Our heavy industry, most of it, is near those centers.

The moment Communist China develops its own bomb, the present policy of the nuclear deterrent becomes as obsolete as the idea of a underground shelter against a megaton atomic bomb.

The policy of the deterrent is based on the theory that you're going to be able to hurt an enemy more than he can hurt you if he decides to attack—and that therefore he won't dare to attack. This theory has holes in it even without respect to Communist China. But it loses all meaning when applied to Red China.

Let's consider a specific hypothetical instance.

Suppose Communist China should decide once again that it would not tolerate Nationalist Chinese military garrisons on Quemoy and Matsu. Suppose the Communists should decide to seize these islands so close to their own shores.

Now suppose, too, that the United States should issue an ultimatum to Communist China, saying we will use our battleships to prevent such a seizure. Then suppose the Communists issue a counterultimatum, ordering us to keep out of their internal affairs and saying that they will not tolerate any interference.

Suppose, further, that both sides mean exactly what they say. Communist China thereupon attacks Quemoy and Matsu, we jump in, and Communist China responds by using its new atomic weapons against our fleet.

Two years ago we could issue ultimatums and the Communists could only fulminate against us. But what happens when they have the atomic weapons? Will they hesitate to use them? Will they hesitate to fight a major war against the United States if they know they possess weapons that can be far more damaging against the United States than the same weapons used by us against them?

These are terrifying questions. These are life-and-death questions. These are questions with a deadline on them. These are time-bomb questions.

The moment Communist China develops an atomic weapon, our foreign policy will have suffered its greatest defeat since Pearl Harbor.

I make this statement advisedly.

Was there any way the United States could have stopped the development of an atomic bomb by Communist China? Is there any way it can stop the development today?

In order to consider these questions we have to go back a bit. We have to consider many other problems bearing on those questions. We have to consider our relations with the Soviet Union, we have to consider the relations of the Soviet Union with Communist China, we have to consider the various efforts made to set up an effective system of world control over nuclear weapons.

While Joseph Stalin lived, the record seems clear that the Soviet Union would not have been willing to get into the kind of hard-and-fast, enforceable, iron-clad arms control agreements that could have marked the beginning of a world system of effective nuclear control.

With the passing of Joseph Stalin, however, there came many changes in Soviet policy—internal and external. Things began to loosen up, inside and outside. The individual Soviet citizen began to be more important as a consumer. He was able to acquire things to make his life less drab. The Iron Curtain began to go up—not altogether but at least enough to allow for some important exchanges. People were allowed to see foreigners and mix with them. Soviet leaders and citizens began to see something of the outside world.

In its foreign policy, the Soviet began to indicate a willingness to give and take.

The one big blot in the recent history of Soviet foreign policy, of course, has to do with Hungary.

The suppression of the Hungarian freedom movement was as brutal and as uncompromising as anything the world knew under Joseph Stalin.

By contrast, the lenient policy of the Kremlin only a few months earlier toward the Polish freedom riots was startling. Why did the Kremlin give ground and make important concessions in Poland, yet crack down ruthlessly in Hungary only a short time later?

A possible answer is that the situation over Suez had erupted in the meantime. France and England jumped into the campaign against Egypt. The Soviet Union was convinced that France and England would not have acted without the full knowledge of the United States. It appeared that the attack on Egypt was just the opening state of what might be a world war. The Soviet promptly viewed Hungary in the total context of its world security position.

I claim no originality for this guess. Various European leaders have expressed themselves in this direction in attempting to account for the contradiction between the response in Poland and the response in Hungary to the freedom fighters.

In any event, with the notable exception of the Hungarian suppression, Soviet foreign policy has departed substantially from the go-it-alone methods of Joseph Stalin.

In one particular, Soviet policy has indicated a considerable willingness to negotiate seriously.

This is in the area of arms control, particularly with respect to nuclear weapons.

For the past 3½ years, the Soviet Union has sounded as though it meant business when it talked about bringing nuclear weapons under control.

On one point the Soviet has seemed especially anxious. This has been on the matter of banning nuclear tests.

Why?

Is it possible that the Soviet Union is no more eager to see nuclear weapons in the hands of Communist China than we are? How is it that in the 11 years since the Soviet Union was able to work with fissionable materials, it has not given any stockpiles of nuclear weapons to Communist China? How is it that there have been no missions of Russian atomic scientists and engineers in Peking, helping to set up the elaborate installations to release and harness atomic energy?

I have no way of knowing whether the present leaders in the Kremlin are apprehensive about the fact that by 1975 China will be the first nation in history with a population of more than 1 billion people. There is not enough space in China for 1 billion people. Where will they go? Southeast Asia? Too crowded already. Tibet is part of the answer, but perhaps only a small fraction. The main outlet has to be Outer Mongolia and southern Siberia.

Is it possible that this future danger may be considered more weighty than various ideological considerations? The Russian leaders, I believe, are Russians even before they are exponents of any philosophy.

Whatever the reason for the change in Soviet foreign policy these past few years, it is a fact that the Russians have been apparently eager to get into serious negotiations on nuclear arms control.

Were they hopeful that any effective agreements with the United States might lead to an effective plan for total world control?

Whatever the answer, it is nonetheless interesting that at the London arms control talks in 1957, the Soviet Union said they would accept a workable ban on nuclear tests. We knew then that we could have had such an agreement if we wanted it, but Governor Stassen was called back to Washington at precisely the moment it seemed that an agreement was about to be concluded.

I believe that Governor Stassen took his job seriously. It was an important job. That job was to make an effective beginning in stopping the runaway nuclear arms race. I believe the original instructions from the President convinced Governor Stassen that he was engaged in an enterprise in which he would have the full backing of the administration.

At London, Governor Stassen made considerable progress. He was able to get the Russians to agree to our first proposal, which called for an effective ban against further nuclear testing. But as soon as he was on the point of concluding what could have been an historic agreement, he was pulled out of London and given a new set of instructions. These instructions were to attach other conditions which it was certain the Russians would not accept.

The size of that blunder is incalculable.

If in 1957 we could have gotten started on world nuclear controls, it is conceivable that the United Nations might have been in a position to declare the testing or manufacture of nuclear weapons by any nation to be an illegal act against the world community.

Naturally, it would not have been as easy for the United Nations to exercise jurisdiction and control over countries that were outside its membership as it would have been over member nations.

We might have realized that we were only harming ourselves by restricting the jurisdiction of the U.N. We might have come to accept the fact that the purpose of the United Nations was not to dispense privileges but to exact obligations.

The U.N. is not an exclusive gentleman's club but a world organization set up to save the peace. It is supposed to govern the world, not just part of the world. The more dangerous a nation may be, the more important it is that the United Nations be in a position to deal with it. Indeed, if all the nations in the world knew how to behave themselves, we probably wouldn't have needed a United Nations in the first place.

In any event, the main point I am making is that we passed up a chance of historic dimensions when we didn't seize the opening we had in 1957 to get an effective agreement on a ban against nuclear tests. We lost time. We lost the chance to set up what might have become effective machinery that could have been extended.

And even today, we are backing and filling at Geneva. Our initial proposals at Geneva were sound. We had good men to represent us at Geneva. James P. Wadsworth was genuinely determined to arrive at an effective plan for nuclear arms control. The proposals he made calling for comprehensive inspection were absolutely correct.

But now that the Russians are coming around, now that they have withdrawn their objections to many of our proposals for inspection, we are shifting our ground. It is beginning to sound like the London talks all over again. And I naturally wonder whether Mr. Wadsworth is being Stassenized.

The trouble is that we have two foreign policies.

We have the foreign policy of the President. His ideas, I believe, are basically correct. What he says about the peace seems to me to be positive and important. He believes that world peace can only be based on world law. He has a clear idea of what the next war would be like.

But then there is a second foreign policy. This is what happens when the Atomic Energy Commission and the Pentagon get into the act. The President may be able to initiate measures that point in the right direction, but these measures somehow manage to run afoul of obstacles bearing the labels of the AEC and the military.

In short, what the President advocates in foreign affairs often makes good sense. What

the opposition does inside his administration, however, keeps these ideas from getting past the stage of advocacy. The President appoints a Coolidge Commission to undertake a study and make recommendations on arms control. The Coolidge Commission makes its report, but the report is stifled. It is now several months since that report was turned in. The American people have a right to know what it says.

I began by saying we do not have much time. It is much more difficult today than it was 3 years ago to make a start in the direction of effective world control over nuclear weapons. It is much more difficult to head off Communist China's entry into the society of atomic powers than it would have been a few years back.

But one thing is certain. It is going to be even more difficult with each passing day unless we start moving now. Once Communist China gets the atomic bomb, then all our problems are multiplied hundreds of times.

What do we do now?

It seems to me we have to make a beginning. It seems to me we have to labor mightily, imaginatively, and powerfully in clearly defined directions. We have to make a serious effort to keep the Geneva nuclear talks from ending in stalemate.

If we can get an agreement to end nuclear tests with inspection and verification, let's grab it.

And if the Russians have objections to provisions that we honestly believe are essential to the effective operation of a ban, I believe we should carry our case direct to world public opinion. Peoples everywhere have a stake in what is going on at Geneva. The negotiations concern them. If we feel that good proposals are being blocked, it is our duty to let the world's peoples know about it.

The same holds true of the Russians with respect to us.

It is high time that both the United States and the Soviet Union recognized that 2.5 billion people are going to benefit or suffer by what they do or fail to do at Geneva.

Next, I believe we should turn our attention to the United Nations. I believe we should do everything we can now to bolster the United Nations and make of it a world organization strong enough to carry out world peace—strong enough, incidentally, to have universal membership.

For if the United Nations can be transformed into an agency with effective powers, then the real question will be, not should Communist China be admitted to membership, but rather what can the world do to make sure that Communist China doesn't stay out.

American security is too important to rest on the flimsy reed of military deterrents. It must rest on powerful ideas, ideas that have something to do with the creation of a world organization strong enough to underwrite essential national sovereignty and independence, strong enough to protect peoples against aggression, strong enough to carry out effective arms control, strong enough to deal with basic world tensions, strong enough to keep incipient world crises from becoming the fuse points of a planetary nuclear explosion.

If we are going to move in this direction, we had better begin moving fast.

And we had better give some thought to getting started on a foreign policy with followthrough built into it, a foreign policy concerned with getting specific things accomplished, and not just with preliminary ideas.

We have a tough job ahead of us. We can do that job if we give it the thought, the work, and the attention it requires. Thank you.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILLIAMS OF NEW JERSEY AT BRIEFING CONFERENCE ON SECURITIES LAWS AND REGULATIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on April 29, it was my pleasure to address a briefing conference on securities laws and regulations, at Atlantic City, N.J. The meeting, sponsored by the Federal Bar Association and the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, in cooperation with the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., gave me an opportunity to discuss legislation and issues now under study by the Senate Subcommittee on Securities, of which I am chairman.

Mr. President, the address announces executive sessions on pending bills, and refers to possible future action by the subcommittee. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR HARRISON WILLIAMS, CHAIRMAN, SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES, AT BRIEFING CONFERENCE ON SECURITIES LAWS AND REGULATIONS, SPONSORED BY THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION AND THE FOUNDATION OF THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION IN COOPERATION WITH THE BUREAU OF NATIONAL AFFAIRS, INC., ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., APRIL 29, 1960

Gentlemen, the optimistic title of this speech is "Securities Legislation—1960." Though I cannot promise action by Congress, perhaps I can give you my own thoughts of legislation on the stock market.

Philosophically, I am a good student of free enterprise. I believe that an overcontrolled economy can never promise to our distant descendants what our grandfathers did for us. Too much liberty, however, may of itself engender a need for discipline. Historically, at least, Federal discipline first appeared when the Securities Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee became involved in the stock market in 1933. I say "involved" advisedly, for the parade of abuses following the unrestrained freedom of the capital markets forced themselves upon Congress' attention.

I, who was only 10 years old in 1929, nevertheless would like to recall to you some facts resulting from those abuses. From 1920 to 1933 some $50 billion of securities were sold in the United States, at the end of which half were worthless. The aggregate value of all stocks listed on the New York Stock Exchange on September 1, 1929, was $89 billion. By 1933 the aggregate figure was down to $15 billion—a loss of $74 billion in 2½ years. The bond losses increased the total drop in values to $93 billion.

From 1932 until at least 1940 few people felt that corporate securities, whether debt or security, were proper mediums of investment. This exhaustion of corporate capital has been considered symbolic of a lack of confidence which the American public investors demonstrated in the functions of the capital markets.

In contrast the confidence of today's investors appears full blown. The 1959 Dow Jones industrial average closed at 679, a new peak, and a rise of 16 percent over the final 1958 final figure. The upsurge of the combined value of common stocks listed had broken all expectations. Of course, it would be foolish not to recognize that many closed below their similar 1958 quotations and that there is evidence since last year justifying a bearish attitude.

Moreover, last year's reported stock volume of the New York Stock Exchange was some 820,296,279 shares, the third largest yearly total in exchange history. And at present over 12½ million individuals in the United States own corporate securities, nearly double those in 1952.

Merely as a statistical comparison, I am convinced that the ballooning of stockholder ownership demonstrates renewed confidence by investors in our capital markets. I award a large measure of credit for this metamorphosis to the interest of Government in the stock market. Whether or not the diet of an average buyer can digest a prospectus, his appetite for facts has been whetted by the Federal securities laws. And he will never see many indisputably wretched stocks which cannot brave the publicity which awaits them under present law.

I need not tediously declaim before you the verses of these laws, for it is you who have charted the pathway between Scylla and Charybdis to find their practical operation. Suffice it to say that the Securities Acts of 1933 and 1934 are predicated on a policy of disclosing pertinent facts to the investor—though you may believe it subverted. Later statutes, the Public Utility and Investment Company Acts, are paternalistic in nature. They followed painstaking studies by the newborn Commission illuminating flagrant betrayal of shareholder interests. In contrast to the latter two, the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 has been called little more than a continuing census of the Nation's advisers.

THE PRESENT REASON FOR LEGISLATION

But note my conviction that each of these statutes was written by Congress only when overwhelming necessity and abuses arose. Each act was fitted to clothe the form which demanded covering. Moreover, as information requisite for intelligent legislation was unearthed or stresses in them revealed, the statutes were reshaped or whole members added to them.

A good example of this history is found in the over-the-counter market. Two years after the passage of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, Commission rules for registration of brokers were codified. In 1938 the Maloney Act incorporated into the statute a philosophy of cooperative regulation by securities associations. It also expanded SEC's authority in the over-the-counter market by granting it additional specific power to prevent fraud and safeguard financial responsibility.

By 1954 time had unraveled the fabric of the original Securities Act. It was, therefore amended to permit written offers before date of sale. According to Louis Loss, this type of revision is made every 20 years by the British to their Companies Act.

Of course, it is logical to ask whether new legislation is needed now. Do we have in 1960 the spectacular abuses we once faced? In all honesty, I cannot compare present market activity to that preceding the crash of 1929.

But abuses by a group quite outside the industry have become legion. Since the war new warrens of boiler room rabbits have been educated in the Federal securities laws, groups whose prolific activities often defy suppression from overseas. I will return to SEC enforcement problems later.

Moreover, on another count, I believe securities legislation justified. By this year, 20 years after the last major body of law, Congress can face its past. It now has sufficient awareness of segments of the stock market to fulfill promises made. Two pertinent illustrations are the over-the-counter market and investment advisers.

In the anxiety of Federal legislation in 1933 and 1934, Congress admitted frankly that it did not have access to facts on the activity in the over-the-counter market.

At that time there was no agency of the Government supervising nor a daily quotation service reporting on it. Once created, the Securities and Exchange Commission studied and reported to Congress information which became the broker registration, 15(d) reports, and Maloney Act amendments just mentioned.

Since 1938 the mystery of the over-the-counter market has been greatly dispelled; moreover, in number of issues traded it is much bigger than all the exchanges combined. As yet, however, I do not find that Congress has replied to its early promise nor availed itself of the information now heaped in libraries. That is, many companies in the unlisted markets are not reached by provisions of the 1934 Exchange Act affecting proxy practices, reports, and insider trading. For stockholder "democracy," corporate honesty, and elimination of conflicts of interest, these are the cutting teeth of the statute.

THE DOUBLE STANDARD

You have no doubt espied the dormant shape of S. 1168, the brainchild of first, Senator FREAR, and then Senator FULBRIGHT. But I have no intention of introducing this orphaned bill in the 86th Congress. Nevertheless, the injustice of a double standard of investor protection is now put to you. As things stand today, some of the most salutary provisions of the 1934 statute are only applied when a company volunteers its stock upon an exchange. I believe enactment of similar legislation would close a capricious gap in Federal securities laws and culminate a half-century campaign waged on behalf of Federal standards for interstate corporations.

A note on the history of the Frear bill: The suggestion of extending such basic protection to shareholders of certain large, publicly owned companies was made on a number of occasions in the 1930's. One version of several bills embodying this idea, S. 1168, was reported to the Senate by the Banking Committee in 1957. Unfortunately for the bill, some of the provisions recommended by the committee did not receive SEC approval. The lukewarm support of SEC Chairman Sinclair Armstrong, who testified that the extra appropriation necessary to administer it would be better spent elsewhere, seriously weakened interest in the bill as reported, and it was allowed to die.

Before developing additional if less important current proposals in the over-the-counter market, I should like to praise the Commission for conscientious review of its acts with an eye to correction. Since its wide reaching legislative program of 1941, enforcement has revealed heavier strain on the original statutes. To cure these defects, the SEC submitted extensive proposals late in 1956 and again in the 85th and 86th Congresses.

Uninvolved with these suggestions until that time, I do not feel obliged to defend the Banking Committee or Congress against charges of inaction on the program. For in my first session in the Senate I held 7 days of hearings on the bills. Notwithstanding, the alleged necessity for immediate action seems hardly oracle inspired, since the bills were changed with almost each session of Congress.

DEBATE DURING HEARINGS

Moreover, I can speak personally of the value of "loyal opposition" by the industry. For example, an amendment to the Investment Company Act was objected to on the grounds of dual regulation. A suggestion from Senator JAVITS during the hearings resulted in unassayed compromise language with the ICC, overcoming opposition from one source.

Other suggestions from subcommittee members occasioned SEC modifications in regard to holding of customers' securities by brokers, their aggregate indebtedness, and the imposition of a $100-a-day fine for late reports. Moreover, the proposal for the fine was originally inspired by the investigation into SEC operations not of the Banking Committee, but of a House subcommittee, an investigation characterized by a former SEC Chairman as a "travesty."

Do not mistake me, however. The best tempering of legislative steel is in the fire of agency-industry debate—and the efforts of the Commission to make an alloy of suggestions without sacrificing its strength deserve praise.

Let me mention specific amendments in the Commission's present legislative program, S. 1178 through S. 1182. Of the 87 amendments to five securities acts and one to the Bankruptcy Act, I will concentrate on those perhaps less familiar to you.

AMENDMENTS IN THE OVER-THE-COUNTER MARKET

Under the Exchange Act of 1934 increased jurisdiction is sought over brokers and dealers, in the form of rulemaking with regard to their financial responsibility and lending, borrowing and holding of customers' securities.

One proposal so reasonable that it earned NASD support, would allow suspension of a broker-dealer license rather than the more drastic penalty of revocation. One which did not earn NASD support would give the Commission authority equivalent to that over the exchanges to make rules over "when issued" or "when distributed" trading in the over-the-counter market.

Let me not slight perhaps the most significant expansion of power in S. 1179, that allowing suspension of trading in the over-the-counter market. There have been several recent summary suspensions by the SEC under its present 10-day power over listed stocks, and a similar power, for successive 10-day periods, is requested for the over-the-counter issues. No matter what objection is advanced to this broad power, it might in the hands of an alert Commission prevent the sudden rise and fall, for instance, of an Oreclone stock—which you remember fell from quotes of 29 last January 14 to nothing the following day.

In other ways as well, the SEC proposals, more indirectly than former ones, seek to subject the over-the-counter market to increased agency direction and rulemaking power. This movement is the logical result of new importance of the market, and in harmony with my belief that Congress has the necessary information to follow the path set forth upon in 1934, 1936, and 1938.

Mention might be made of an amendment, passed twice by the Senate, to the Securities Act of 1933. It would increase the exemptive limit under 3(b) from $300,000 to $500,000. However, the accompanying new criminal and civil liability raised the specter of future suits and thus inspired opposition from the Small Business Administration.

INVESTMENT ADVISERS LEGISLATION

Though generally unrecognized, square in the bull's eye of the Commission's program are the investment advisers. If the over-the-counter market was mysterious in 1934, in 1940 the advisers could only be described as mythological. At the present time, however, 1,800 are registered under the act of 1940, ranging from the lowly touter to the lofty investment counsel firm of Madison Avenue.

The amendments to the act were worked out with the Investment Counsel Association, representing 50 firms. They received no advisers industry dissent.

A curious oversight in the Advisers Act is the basis for revocation of their licenses. Once registered, the license of the adviser may not be revoked for willful violation of the act itself. Moreover, an insolvent registrant under the Exchange Act and Advisers Act may have his license revoked as a broker under the first, but not the second. For the latter does not even permit the denial of an adviser's license for violation of the 1933 or 1934 acts.

It is more alarming that under the present act the SEC cannot require books and records to be maintained. To prevent fraudulent financial practices which have recently occurred, the amendment would require bookkeeping subject to reasonable inspection as distinguished from actual investigation.

As written, the act penalizes fraud only when committed by registered advisers—those who are not registered or who do not choose to do so are immune. The proposal here would parallel earlier statutes in extending the penalty for fraud to any person under jurisdiction of the act, including those exempt from registration.

It should be clear that of five statutes proposed for amendment, the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 is sadly inadequate. And, insofar as advisers resemble brokers, the bill is sheltered in the wing of my sympathy for over-the-counter legislation.

HEARINGS SCHEDULED

Since I have not been chary in giving you my thought on future legislation, I can announce executive hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Securities on S. 1178 through S. 1182 during May or early June. I shall devote myself to their passage as the subcommittee sees fit. My justification for the first major revision of Federal securities laws in 20 years is, as I have indicated, demonstrated need in enforcement areas, outmoded machinery for registering small issues and controlling advisers, and improved reconnaissance of the over-the-counter market.

SEC APPROPRIATIONS

I now turn to a subject even more cherished by the Commission than its protean legislative program. That subject, of course, is money. The testimony of the Commissioners has convinced me that their task is becoming larger and more important in the second postwar decade, whereas their appropriations and employment in proportion to increased workload have become smaller.

For the current fiscal year (1960), the SEC appropriation is $8,100,000, only $395,000, or 5 percent, above that for fiscal 1959. For fiscal 1961 the Bureau of the Budget allowed $8,900,000, representing 1,092 positions. The House reduced this figure by $375,000, or by 46 positions.

Under its acts the Commission is entitled to collect the following fees: Under the 1933 act, 10 cents per thousand dollars' worth of aggregate offering price of securities registered. For fiscal 1960 there is estimated $1,500,000 from this source; and in 1961, $1,866,300. Under the 1934 act, from stock exchange sales for fiscal 1960, there is estimated receipt of $1,080,000; for 1961, $1,100,000. From other sources there is estimated a sum of $28,700 for both years. Subtracting estimated fees from 1960's appropriation gives a net cost of $5,491,300; for 1961, $5,905,000.

It is immediately apparent that the fees charged by the Commission in nowise support the cost of its work. You know that they go directly to the Treasury. What is the overwhelming need of the Commission for more money?

A large chunk of its workload is processing registration statements under the 1933 act. In fiscal 1959 there were 1,226 statements filed, 1,119 examined; in 1960 it is estimated 1,600 will be filed, of which 1,452 will be examined; in 1962 it is estimated 400 will be carried over, 1,600 filed, a total of 2,000. Without more money, 475 statements may not be completed.

The securities industry has already felt the impact of receiving letters of comment within an average of 26 days and clearance within 41, rather than the 1958 averages of 14 and 24 days. To stem this tide, the SEC's

1961 budget requests 33 additional employees for the full disclosure program, which also includes proxy statements and annual reports.

CRIMINAL VIOLATIONS

I stress another Commission activity of concern to me. Preliminary and full investigations are necessary to discover civil or criminal violations of stock market laws. It is apparent that accompanying the 12½-million member family of shareholders are new parasitic swindlers who believe they have a right to live off this body. Not only have frauds become more insistent from overseas, but the sophistication of our domestic con men would surprise the most ardent fan of Ellery Queen. Warnings of the SEC and the New York Stock Exchange remind us that boiler rooms are volatile as never before.

Particularly disquieting to me is the charge that certain elements of the securities industry are being infiltrated by the organized underworld. In any case, the indictment for trial returned April 19 in Cleveland against Arthur Tortorello, Stanley Younger, Louis DeFilippo, "Vicky" Leinen alias Linda Lord, Lincoln Securities Corp., and others on charges of criminal violation of Federal securities laws will receive the close scrutiny of the Senate.

Under its enforcement program the SEC asks for 38 new employees to undertake the 990 investigations pending at the end of fiscal 1960 and hopes to close 580 during 1961.

The workload imposed by new investment companies staggers the imagination. Since 1940, 890 have been registered (378 being deregistered), and their increased worth has entranced their creators, as was Pygmalion, rising from $2.5 billion to $20 billion. At the present rate of inspection, the SEC will only be able to inspect 28 companies in 1960, placing the program on a 20-year cycle. Despite information submitted by these companies for other reasons, such rare inspections are absurdly small protection for the type of person who invests in mutual funds.

The total number of new positions requested in the Commission's budget for fiscal 1961 is 92.

INCREASED FEES

Though I am not on the Appropriations Committee my concern for SEC budget problems is directly related to the topic of this speech, "Securities Legislation—1960." That is, I believe in principle that a group which receives a special benefit or causes a special workload to a Government agency should pay as nearly as practical the cost of the service.

I am here referring to the workload imposed by registration statements. The total volume of 2,000 statements expected in 1961 may maintain or prolong the clearance period to 41 days. Last year, in addition to proxy statements, this work utilized about 80 percent of the time of the Division of Corporation Finance. Six years ago, after congressional request, the Commission attempted to estimate the cost of processing such statements under the Securities Act of 1933. If such an approximation can currently be made, it is my proposal to raise the fee under section 6(b) of the act to a point where it may more equitable pay for the cost of issuers' statements.

Likewise, it must be recognized that applications for registration and inspections of exchanges and broker-dealers cause a substantial workload to the Commission. Some years ago the SEC suggested that section 31 of the Exchange Act of 1934 have increased fees charged exchanges, from 2 to 5 cents. In practice these are passed on to the customer who benefits from the exchange's service and from SEC supervision. In addition, the resulting bill would impose for the first time the same fee for sales upon a group which has never directly paid a fee under the securities acts, the over-the-counter brokers and dealers.

The Commission has estimated that should the bill have been enacted in fiscal 1960, it would increase the receipt from exchanges by $1,600,000 and bring in $1 million from broker-dealers. This would have increased the percent of fees collected to total obligations from some 30 percent to 65 percent in fiscal 1960 and in fiscal 1961, 62 percent.

These estimates do not consider what would be collected if the fees for issuers under the 1933 act were raised. I hope that such an increase would more nearly approximate the operating cost of the Commission.

To impose higher fees upon the industry for the enlarged workload would be unfair without results on its behalf. Though the fees go into the general Treasury, I pledge myself to obtaining as much of these sums as possible returned to the Commission in appropriations.

The bill raising fees for exchanges and imposing them on broker-dealers was passed by the Senate in 1957. Similar bills have been introduced in the 86th Congress, H.R. 6294 and S. 737. Although the House has never voted on such a bill, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee announced hearings on H.R. 6294 for May 3, since postponed. To my knowledge, there has never been a bill introduced raising the fees under the 1933 act. Although the Senate Subcommittee on Securities did not have hearings last June on S. 737, the exchange and broker fee bill, it will be pending before us when the subcommittee holds its executive sessions.

It is my expectation, then, that from these varied proposals I will be able to confirm some legislation, "1960."

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires to address the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate stand adjourned, under the previous order.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, to Monday, May 23, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 19, 1960:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following for permanent appointments to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, subject to qualifications provided by law.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Ray M. Sundean	Morton K. Meiers
Lawrence S. Brown	Robert M. Davidson
Karl R. Anderson	Ray E. Moses
George M. Poor	Pat T. Redden
James A. Ten Eyck	Douglas J. Wilcox
Gordon N. Orr	Frederick A. Ismond
Charles K. Townsend	Peter A. Martus
Ronald L. Newsom	Donald R. Tibbit
Donald W. Moncevicz	Charles G. Elliott
Doyle D. Harper	Gerald C. Saladin
Will Connell	Donald C. McIntosh
Richard L. Hess	Michael L. Olivier

To be ensigns

James Collins	William D. O'Neill
William A. Drohan	Archibald J. Patrick
Douglas O. Farrand	William G. Proffitt, Jr.
Richard Hull	E. Douglas Schwantes, Jr.
Bernard F. Karwisch	Robert H. Seay
Thomas E. Krakowski	Charles D. Strawman
Henry A. Mathis, Jr.	R. Lawrence Swanson
George A. Maul	
Park A. Nelson	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Carl E. Burrows, Trinity Methodist Church, Fort Ashby, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

The Lord is faithful in all His words, and gracious in all His deeds. (Psalm 145: 13.)

Almighty God, who art wondrous in power and glory, who stretched forth Thy hand and shaped the heavens and the earth: We are not worthy of the least of Thy blessings. Forgive us for sinning against Thee and grieving Thy spirit. Save us, O Lord, from selfishness and pride, that we will be enabled to serve our fellow man and give glory to Thee.

We give thanks to Thee for the beauty of another day, for the blessings of life, and for Thy kind providence to the children of men. Help us to be more aware of Thy revelations to us and lead us to glorify Thee in Christian living.

We pray this in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the bill H.R. 12261.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight Friday to file a privileged report on the public works appropriation bill for 1961.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MINORITY VIEWS ON H.R. 12261

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority members of the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tomorrow to file minority views on H.R. 12261.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RURAL LIFE SUNDAY

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House a very significant observance next Sunday, May 22, which has been designated as Rural Life Sunday. This fifth Sunday after Easter has traditionally been set aside to emphasize spiritual values in rural living. Not only churches but other rural institutions, organizations, and agencies concerned with the improvement of rural life participate in this observance.

It is fitting that the people of the Nation should set aside this day to ask God's blessing on rural life, its resources, its land, and its people. Rapid changes are taking place in the rural community, and Rural Life Sunday should be a day of reflection and inventory of our basic values leading to better understanding of the present day community and closer relationships and coordination among organizations serving our rural community. It is always easy in a period of rapid change to lose sight of these basic values, and the observance of Rural Life Sunday on May 22 should be a reminder of our past heritage and future understanding of both the benefits and problems of rural living.

NECESSITY FOR MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, if there is still one who doubts the necessity for a mutual security program, let him reflect on the events of the last few days at Paris.

After months of preparation, in the expectation that the two Presidents and the two Premiers would at least come to grips with the causes of the world's tensions, the meeting broke up without a glance at the agenda.

To all intents and purposes, the meeting was over 3 hours after it started.

The only subject of discussion was a demand that the President of the United States apologize to the Russian people for authorizing an act of unarmed reconnaissance against a regime which believes that war is necessary to revolution, and that revolution is necessary to the ultimate Communist victory.

I am glad that our President did not apologize for an act necessary to free world safety, and that he displayed—not wrath—but forbearance.

I am proud also to note that our country has closed ranks behind the President to support him in his actions and utterances.

It is to be hoped that this whole disappointing affair—if it served no other purpose—proved the ability of the free world to stand resolute and unafraid against yet another attempt to bully it into submission.

This solidarity is essential to our U.S. defense posture, to our whole strategy. The key to our containment of communism is mutuality of effort; we act in concert with our allies, and we complement each other.

The mutual security program, in its many facets, permits us to project our force nearer to the borders of the Communist bloc.

The military assistance program provides our allies with modern weapons and the skills to operate and maintain them. It enables them to behave with an assurance not otherwise possible, for the cost of modern arms is simply beyond the means of some countries.

Those countries which can support modern-day forces do so; those which cannot, and which also value human freedom and dignity, require assistance from us.

It is money well spent. Proportionally, we get more defense per dollar because of lower costs and pay scales, among other things. The alternative is to maintain more U.S. forces abroad at higher cost and with a greater drain on our dollar reserves.

But the more important consideration is how our allies will view any curtailment at this time. The most compelling reason is the requirement to show our allies, some under the very shadow of the Russian bear, that we value their friendship, and it is our intention to make every reasonable and honorable effort to maintain it.

LEWIS DESCHLER, PARLIAMENTARIAN OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is no person who plays a more important part in the consideration and deliberations of this body than our distinguished Parliamentarian who is highly respected by all Members and whose service to the House of Representatives has been a dedicated service throughout the years and has been outstanding in its nature. We were all grieved a few weeks ago when we heard of his sudden illness, and I know I speak the sentiments of all of my colleagues when I say we are so thankful and so happy that he is back with us again, our friend, Lew Deschler.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, FISCAL YEAR 1961

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the passage of the bill (H.R. 12232) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer their names:

[Roll No. 98]

Albert	Durham	Miller, George P.
Alexander	Edmondson	Mitchell
Bailey	Elliott, Ala.	Morris, Okla.
Baring	Fogarty	Powell
Barry	Forand	Preston
Blitch	Fountain	Rains
Bonner	Gavin	Rooney
Brewster	Green, Oreg.	Santangelo
Brown, Mo.	Gubser	Scott
Buckley	Hébert	Short
Burdick	Johnson, Colo.	Taylor
Byrnes, Wis.	Kasem	Udall
Carnahan	Kilburn	Walter
Celler	Kitchin	Williams
Chelf	Laird	Wolf
Cooley	Landrum	Wright
Davis, Tenn.	McMillan	
Dawson	Martin	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill, H.R. 12232.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 10809) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

CHESAPEAKE & OHIO CANAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, MD.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 488 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2331) to establish the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park and to provide for the administration and maintenance of a parkway, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,

the bill shall be read for amendments under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

MATS VERSUS COMMERCIAL AIRLINES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL].

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, various committees of the Congress have been concerning themselves in recent weeks with the problems being faced by the Military Air Transport Service. Judging from some of the things I have been hearing lately I think these committees might well concern themselves with our privately owned, certificated, and scheduled international airlines who find that MATS has become their biggest competitor, notwithstanding the rapid strides being made by Government-owned and wholly subsidized foreign-flag carriers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a recent book written by Mr. Temple Fielding, entitled "Fielding's Travel Guide to Europe." Mr. Fielding is to travel what the late Duncan Hines was to food and this book which is selling for $5.95 is certain to be high on the priority list of Americans who will be traveling abroad this year.

Of particular note, Mr. Speaker, is this paragraph contained in the Fielding book:

> Tip: If everything is sold out and your mission is very urgent, ask the American consulate or Embassy about getting in touch with MATS (Military Air Transport Service). This successor to the Air Transport Command, like so many Government bureaucracies, has expanded unchecked to the point where it is now the world's largest airline—bigger than Pan American and TWA put together. Since you've long been paying your share of this monstrous taxpayers' burden which steals such a colossal amount of traffic from the legitimate commercial carriers, you might as well try to cash in on its extremely low fares if the excuse comes up. Nonofficial civilians accepted on emergency basis only; U.S. military planes and pilots, with daily schedules to almost every corner of Europe.

Mr. Speaker, if there was any doubt that the Military Air Transport Service has become the Frankensteinian monster of the Department of Defense, Mr. Fielding's article removes it.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 488 provides for the consideration of H.R. 2331, to establish the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park and to provide for the administration and maintenance of a parkway, and for other purposes. The resolution provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

H.R. 2331 would establish the C. & O. Canal National Historical Park in the State of Maryland. The park will comprise about 15,000 acres, of which about 4,800 acres are now in Federal ownership; hence, the bill would authorize the purchasing of some 10,000 additional acres extending some 165 miles along the Potomac River from just above Great Falls to Cumberland. It will also include a 25-mile scenic parkway from Maryland's Route 51 near Paw Paw, W. Va., to the existing Long Ridge Road near Woodmont, Md.

The park is to be so administered, under the laws generally applicable to the national park system, as to preserve its historic, scenic, and recreational values and features. However, under an amendment recommended by the committee, lands within the park are to be available for public nonpark uses when such uses are found, in consideration of the public interest, to be of greater public necessity than park or parkway uses and are authorized under an act of Congress.

The park and parkway, if developed and administered as contemplated by the committee, promises to realize more enduring human values and serve far more people than would ever have been possible when the canal was used as a commercial waterway or than is possible under existing law.

About 18.5 million people live within 150 miles of the canal area. These include the people of Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, and the District of Columbia, seven-eighths of the population of Pennsylvania, two-fifths of that in West Virginia, and smaller percentages of the populations of New Jersey and Ohio.

The old Chesapeake & Ohio Canal affords a glimpse into history. It is also an important recreational site for tens of thousands of persons yearly from all the States of the Union. Its place in national history, its location close to the Nation's Capital, and its unique character clearly give it a national significance.

Situated along the banks of the Potomac, for a distance of some 185 miles from Washington to Cumberland, Md., the canal and towpath form one of the most scenic and picturesque riverside trails in the country. The canal itself is generally in a better state of preservation than the other large canals of the era during which they were built and used commercially.

The National Park Service is now in the process of formulating a master plan for the area that would be included within the park and parkway contemplated by H.R. 2331. Generally the plan will provide for facilities to interpret the historic features and natural history of the area, a museum, and trailside exhibits. Provision will be made for access and parking, camping, picnicking, hiking, boating, and fishing.

Land acquisitions will be required in accordance with the master plan and within the limitations of the act, to provide access routes and sites for facilities. Where the canal right-of-way is narrow, there is a need for scenic buffer areas. Such acquisitions are not possible under existing authorizations for the protection, maintenance, and improvement of the canal.

Estimates submitted by the Department of the Interior indicate that the costs of establishing, administering, maintaining, and protecting the park and parkway during the first 5 years of its existence would total $8,550,000. The aggregate costs of the additional land acquisition and development are estimated at $12 million.

Mr. Speaker, I know there is controversy over this proposed legislation, but I urge the adoption of the rule; and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Missouri has explained, this rule makes in order, under 2 hours of general debate, consideration of the bill, H.R. 2331, which, to say the least, is a very, very, very controversial measure. I opposed, as did some others, the granting of a rule by the Committee on Rules on this bill because, in my opinion, it is one of the most wasteful and unneeded proposals that has been brought before the Committee on Rules in the many years I have been a member of it. And I say that without any animosity toward the author of the legislation for whom I have a great personal affection and whom, of course, I cannot blame for wanting this bill which would provide a park anywhere—I do not know—from 50 to 100 feet wide and from 165 to 185 miles long through the very heart or center of his district.

This bill, as I recall it, and I am speaking a great deal from memory—for we have had some other problems in the Committee on Rules in the last few days, which have occupied my time—this bill provides not only for the use of some 4,800 acres of land the Government already owns between Washington and Point of Rocks in Maryland, which should be sufficiently large to give a proper recreational area for use of the people of Washington, and especially the younger folks who may want to drive out into that park for different and various reasons. But in addition to the use of that 4,800 acres of land, and I have no objection to the use of that particular land for park purposes, this bill would provide that the Government shall purchase over 10,000 additional acres to add to this proposed new park. The first cost would be anywhere—as they estimate the figures—from $8 million to $12 million. But if you will read the bill carefully, or study the report, you will note it also provides for the construction of a scenic highway of some 25 or 30 miles in length, out in the mountains where I am told by people who reside in that area, you could not possibly build that sort of parkway or special highway, double lane or triple lane or quadruple lane, I suppose, with a median strip in the center, for anything less than $1 million a mile. Of course, I am also informed, and I have the letters from people in the area who are protesting against it and people who know that country and live in it, where they have all sorts of mountain wilderness, if you please, to seek recreation, and a river in which to go fishing, that the real purpose behind this bill, once it is passed, to

not only add all this 10,000 acres additional land, and, build these access highways from Federal Route 40, and other public roads, but to also build a complete new highway, a new boulevard, or a new parkway, perhaps by extension of the George Washington Parkway we now have running as far as Great Falls or approximately so clear through to Cumberland, Md. Now I drive Federal Route No. 40 to Ohio along the old canal which is empty in many spots, and filled with water in some places, and lies between the Western Maryland Railroad tracks and Route 40—the old National Road. The canal is very narrow and of not much use for parkway construction.

I know some of our friends on the Supreme Court love to walk up and down that old towpath along the canal. But in my opinion, when you take into consideration the serious situation throughout the world, and the fiscal situation here at home; and when we have all sorts of appeals to expend public moneys on every kind of program the mind of man can conceive, to go ahead and do this thing now along this canal which has been there, and available for hikes, for the people who wish to go along it, for more than 125 years and will be there for a long, long time to come, it is simply wrong to even consider legislation of this type at this time. After all, unless conditions change a great deal, we will have to go out and borrow the money to meet the cost of acquiring this land and building these access roads and the other roads which will be needed if we establish this new national park. In my opinion, this is not a piece of legislation we should deal with. I have no objection, if we want to designate as a national park the 4,800 acres of land the Government now owns. That is in itself a large amount of land. That is nearly 8 square miles of land that can be used for recreational purposes. But to go out and buy 10,000 more acres of land, and then take over the canal area for some 165 miles beyond the end of the present Washington Parkway, so we will have, as I said a moment ago, a public park 50 or 100 feet wide in many instances, 165 miles long, and to say it is needed for recreation, when the people—and I have the letters here to show it—who live out there say they do not want it and do not need it, and that they have all the recreational areas they want, I think this is simply a waste of public money.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the rule goes through and we appropriate the money, are we likely to be prepared to vote for raises for postal employees and for Federal education and for foreign aid?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Let me answer the gentleman by saying that I have consistently voted for economy and efficiency in the conduct of our public business, but in my opinion there are a great many places where we can spend this amount of money more wisely than we can through the passage of a bill such as this for a narrow parkway 165 or 185 miles long, one just as narrow as it can be, and then buy extra land to add to it. Then, of course, later on, if this legislation is approved and becomes law, they will be back here soon asking for multiple millions of dollars to build a gigantic parkway, and multiple roads, through that area, and through those mountains.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; I yield further.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have a very distinct recollection that when we had WPA along all the streams they built pathways, stone-lined, some with cobblestones along the outside so as to make it easy for the fishermen. Is there anything in this bill to protect the rights and interests of fishermen along the Potomac?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. You already have those along the river and the canal, to be enjoyed by you, by the people of the country, and some Justices of the Supreme Court.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not together, not together.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If this bill is enacted into law you can still go for strolls along the canal. The spenders are only asking for $8,500,000 now, but nobody knows how many millions they will ultimately ask.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Down along the Rappahannock we cannot even get to the water because the people have acquired the land there in such a way as to make it almost impossible from Fredericksburg down.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There is nothing to keep you from now walking along the C. & O. Canal right-of-way or towpaths, if you want to, except the many gaps you may find in it.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, I hope this rule is not adopted, and certainly I hope this bill is never approved by the House or enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been here 24 years but I seldom take the floor of the House unless it is something I have to appropriate for. If this bill ever passes, the Appropriations Committee will be called upon to appropriate money for it. That is why I take the floor at this time.

The title of the bill reads "To establish the Chesapeake and Ohio National Historical Park," and the bill states it is for the "purpose of preserving and interpreting certain property in the State of Maryland for the benefit and inspiration of the people" of the other 49 States. What generosity on the part of the State of Maryland. She wants to share this with the other 49 States. Usually when a State has something of interest within its borders it sets up its own park to exploit it for its own purposes.

They talk of this being an historic canal. Let me tell you what an historic canal really is. In the district I represent we had a canal 125 or 130 years ago before the day of the railroads. It served Youngstown, Canton, Akron, and Cleveland along the Mahoning River that curved around into the Cuyahoga River. Two youngsters drove a mule along that canal. Those two youngsters went into the Civil War and afterward became famous. One became a general and the other a major. They both rose high enough to serve in the National Congress and were elected to the district I represent. Time passed, and they went even higher, being elected to the Presidency: Cleveland and Garfield. If you want a canal park for purely historical reasons go down there and build something in Ohio where there is a canal with a real historical significance. But I would not presume to ask this Congress to build such a memorial to these two great men in Ohio.

Just in Washington, D.C., and nearby Virginia and Maryland, the Federal Government already owns 42,000 acres of parks. It takes over 1,000 employees and over $2 million a year just to manage the national parks in this area.

The Park Service already has expenditures planned totaling over $160 million on over 50 projects in the District of Columbia, Virginia, and Maryland. Suppose the folks back home knew that. They would certainly call us to account.

Now we are being asked to authorize an expenditure of another $12 million for Maryland. Why this request is being brought up now I do not know. We say that this is the greatest lawmaking body in the world. Yet 3 years ago we authorized a study of the Potomac River at a cost of $1.5 million, and we have appropriated $790,000 to date for that study, and another $400,000 is budgeted for next fiscal year. The Corps of Engineers has filed its review report with the Appropriations Committee indicating that 12 reservoirs will be needed in this area, involving 57,400 acres, to meet the estimated minimum water supply and pollution-abatement requirements. If we build these 12 dams and reservoirs in this area, it will be the most scenic place in all of the United States. We should not be authorizing the purchase of another 10,000 acres of parkland in this area at the same time we are appropriating funds to survey the need for these reservoirs. The Corps of Engineers is spending $1.5 million to make this study, and yet this bill would give the go-ahead to buy and develop 10,000 additional acres of parks that will stand in the way of necessary development of the reservoirs for water storage. There has never been a major dam or reservoir built within a national park since the Park Service was created, in 1916.

Mr. Speaker, there are billions of dollars' worth of projects which we have authorized throughout the Nation, including parks, reclamation, flood control, and so forth, that we will never be able to afford to appropriate for in the foreseeable future, and maybe never. Certainly we should, at the most, add only the most urgent projects to this staggering group of authorizations.

I inserted in yesterday's RECORD a report from the Wall Street Journal. In the steel industry in my district there

are some 66,000 employees. It is the fourth largest steel center in the world. But the Youngstown mills are only at 45 percent capacity this week. So you can imagine there are thousands idle throughout the district. Steel mills for the Nation as a whole are only operating at 71.7 percent of capacity, so the whole Nation is down to the slowest pace in a non-strike-affected period since December 1958. I am not blaming anybody. What the trouble is I do not know.

We were told that in 1929 we were headed for the poor house. But there is one thing about that today: We are headed in the same direction, but we are going there in Cadillacs. We are already spending over $100 million a year for recreation, including appropriations to the National Park Service, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, et cetera. We are spending millions of dollars just for recreational planning and I have supported these programs, but there is a limit as to what we can afford. We had better stop, look and listen, because as steel goes, so goes the Nation's economy. When you see the fourth largest steel center in the world working only 45 percent of capacity, you had better stop, look and listen before we authorize nonessential projects like this which will cost the taxpayers $12 million.

The Youngstown Sheet and Tube is on a short week. It has laid off several hundred workers in recent weeks. That is one of the biggest fabricating plants in the country. And yet we are in here today talking about buying 10,000 more acres of park land for the State of Maryland.

I am for the canal. We already have a Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Park covering 4,800 acres along the canal from here to Cumberland. We are now appropriating money annually to manage, maintain, and improve this area. I am for it. But to go up in the hills and buy 10,000 more acres at this time when we are studying the area for water storage and when our Federal budget is one of the highest in peacetime history, is just not justified in my opinion.

Maryland is a State that has much pride. Our Lord created some points of scenic beauty, and I cannot see why it should not have enough pride to issue bonds and buy this land and develop the area. But instead here in Maryland, and I repeat—it is a nice gesture—trying to share with the other 49 States and let them all participate in the payment. I do not know whether you will defeat the rule or defeat the bill, but I would like to see something done, because I do not want to be turning it down next year in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to rise in support of my bill. I do not propose to take too much time, but I urge upon the Members of the House that the statements made by the previous speakers, in my humble judgment, indicate there is genuine merit in the bill and thus full consideration of the proposals contained in H.R. 2331 is amply justified.

As a starting point, I respectfully call your attention to certain statements made in the report filed by the Committee on Interior, on page 2 thereof.

> The Chesapeake and Ohio Park and Parkway, if developed and administered as contemplated by the committee, promises to realize more enduring human values and serve far more people than would ever have been possible when the canal was used as a commercial waterway or than is possible under existing law. No other proposal—

And I emphasize this—

> No other proposal that has been before the committee in recent years for the establishment of a new unit of the national park system has offered more people of the country such promise of an opportunity to appreciate a historical scene and at the same time to enjoy a natural setting of singular beauty.

I am urging that this rule be granted. You have heard the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] say that he is not against the park. I do not believe I am amiss if I interpret that as meaning that he is not against making this a national historical park, which does not cost 1 cent of money. I urge upon you that statement as an argument for the rule. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] stated that he is not against the canal. In that connection, I want to emphasize, that we are talking now about, and this bill pertains solely to, Federal property, property that has been owned by our Federal Government since 1938. We are not considering property owned by the State of Maryland.

I wish to present to the Members the fact that this is the last and only continuous canal surviving from the 1820's and 1830's. We are not talking about a strip of land. We are talking about a very famous historical relic going back some 130 years. We are seeking to preserve by my bill, basically without any cost of money, this canal as a national historical relic, as a source, may I say to you, of inspiration to future generations.

These are some of the things we propose to present to you upon consideration of the merits after approval of the rule.

Twelve years ago this Congress authorized a study of the use of the C. & O. Canal, and the results of this study are contained in House Document 687, 81st Congress, 2d session, filed on August 16, 1950; and in 1956, 1957, and again in 1958 the Congress, both the House and the Senate, considered proposals for the development of the C. & O. Canal as a national historical park. I wish to call attention of the Members of the House to the fact that in July of 1957, just about 3 years ago, this particular measure now before the House for consideration passed the Senate. I emphasize that this bill passed the other body in July of 1957 without a dissenting vote.

H.R. 2331 provides for the establishment of a national historical park. There are now eight historical parks. They are Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va.; Appomattox Courthouse National Historical Park, Appomattox, Va.; Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, border of Virginia and Kentucky; Independence National Historical Park, Philadelphia, Pa.; Morristown National Historical Park, Morristown, Pa.; Chalmette National Historical Park, New Orleans, La.; Saratoga National Historical Park, Saratoga, N.Y.; Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park, Harrodsburg, Ky.

The C. & O. Canal is steeped in the history of the westward development of our country. To appreciate its historical status, one should recall that only the Erie Canal in New York State, connecting Lake Erie with the Hudson River, was on the same grand construction scale. The historic purpose of the C. & O. Canal can only properly be determined by reviewing the expressed thoughts of the dreamers, designers, and developers of the canal.

In 1770 Benjamin Franklin was one of the promoters of a new settlement in the area beyond the Ohio River. He advertised in London for colonizers and pointed out the access way through the mountains by way of the Potomac River.

In 1784 Gen. George Washington was the founder of a canal corporation to build a canal along the Virginia Potomac River banks. The canal was built to the vicinity of Great Falls by 1802. In over 36 years the Potomac Co. expended $725,000 on canal construction.

President Washington wrote to Thomas Jefferson the following:

> All the world is becoming commercial * * *. Nature has declared in favor of the Potomac and through the channel offers into our lap the whole commerce of the Western World * * * the ways are preparing and the roads will be made easy through the channels of the Potomac.

By 1820 George Washington's original corporation had become exhausted and ended operations. But his westward dream remained fresh and vital. On Washington's birthday, February 22, 1823, the Potomac Canal Co. was chartered by the Virginia General Assembly, as a successor of the original corporation to continue building the canal westward.

The need and importance of the canal project was emphasized by President James Monroe in his message to Congress on December 3, 1823.

> Many patriotic and enlightened citizens, who have made the subject an object of particular investigation, have suggested an improvement of still greater importance. They are of the opinion that the waters of the Chesapeake and Ohio may be connected together by one continuous canal, and at an expense far short of the value and importance of the object to be attained. If this could be accomplished, it is impossible to calculate the beneficial consequences which would result from it. A great portion of the produce of the very fertile country through which it would pass, would find a market through that channel. Troops might be moved with great facility in war, with cannon, and every munition, and in either direction. Connecting the Atlantic with the western country, in a line passing through the seat of the National Government it would contribute essentially to strengthen the bond of union itself.

A few weeks following President Monroe's declaration of support for the canal, the Virginia General Assembly on January 27, 1824, adopted an act incorporating the Chesapeake & Ohio

Canal Co., as a successor to the Potomac Canal Co. The enabling act was in the nature of an interstate compact with Maryland. The Maryland General Assembly on January 31, 1825, approved the compact to build the C. & O. Canal. Within weeks the Congress gave its consent to the compact by an act approved by President Monroe on March 3, 1825. The Federal act of consent appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, May 11, 1960.

The Potomac Canal Co., original successor of George Washington's canal corporation, assented to the interstate compact on May 16, 1825. It thereby surrendered all its rights to build the canal and transferred its property to the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Co.

The basic plan of the new canal company was to connect by one continued canal the tidewater of the Potomac River with the steamboat navigation of the Ohio River and the southern shore of Lake Erie. The canal was to be in two divisions, the eastern section from the District of Columbia to Cumberland, Md., and western section from that terminal point to Pittsburgh.

When the Pennsylvania Legislature affirmed the interstate compact in 1826, it did so only on the condition that the canal "shall be extended to and terminate at Pittsburgh." This plan was approved by President John Quincy Adams in his message to Congress on December 7, 1826.

As soon as the Congress consented to the compact in early 1825, the Select Committee on Roads and Canals of the House of Representatives began an exhaustive study of the feasibility of the canal, the need and practical use for same, as well as the estimated cost of the facility. On January 30, 1827, the 2d session of the 19th Congress, the committee filed its report, No. 90, a 122-page document with exhibits and appendix.

The report is a major source of historical data on the C. & O. Canal. Throughout the report, the committee repeatedly refers to the project as, "this great work," "this great undertaking," "this great national work of unrivaled local as well as national utility," and constructing the canal would be to the "permanent advantage, security and honor of the entire Union."

The committee was seeking House approval of its recommendation that the Federal Government subscribe to 25,000 shares of canal company stock. Such subscription was to be made in five annual installments of $500,000 each for a total investment of $2,500,000. The Federal funds were to be limited for use only on the eastern section of the canal. Furthermore, the Congress required that the canal be constructed to "dimensions adapted to future and permanent national use, to make it subserve purposes of great and lasting public utility rather than of immediate profit."

The important national purpose of the C. & O. Canal is described by the committee at page 7 of Report 90 as follows:

> The subscription here invited and which the committee recommended, is to a work yet to be begun, but which, if successful, and of that no rational doubt any longer exists, if adequate funds for its execution be supplied, will supersede a navigation not only obstructed, but at all times dangerous, and a portage of many miles, over numerous rugged and lofty mountains, separating a population of two million souls from the residue of the same people, who are destined to multiply with a rapidity unexampled but among themselves, on both sides of the great barrier to their friendly intercourse which this canal is designed to surmount.
>
> The committee did not unanimously concur in recommending this subscription, without duly considering every other mode of accomplishing a work, as essential, in peace, to the permanent Union and commercial prosperity of the Eastern and Western States, as in war, to their common defense and safety.

At the time of the committee's report, there were 24 States in the Union. The 1820 population of the continental United States was 9,638,453. This increased to 12,866,020 in 1830, of which the rural population was 11,738,773. In that same year of 1830 there were 23 miles of railroad track in the United States. Sailing merchant vessels, including canal boats and barges, in 1830, amounted to total documented gross tons of 1,127,304. In 1828 when the C. & O. Canal construction started, sailing vessels were of 1,701,474 gross tons.

By 1924, when the C. & O. Canal closed operation, railroad trackage in the United States had reached 415,028 miles. Sailing vessels in the U.S. merchant marine in 1924 were of 1,184,867 gross tons. However, canal boats and barges in 1924 separately had a gross tonnage of 1,240,347. By 1945 sailing vessels were only of 114,725 tons but canal boats and barges had grown to 2,451,566 tons.

These facts are of historic and timely interest since the use of canalboats has steadily increased in commercial transportation since 1876. The Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park is a fitting monument as the last survivor of the grand scale canal building era of our history.

The members of the Select Committee on Roads and Canals in 1827 proved themselves men of vision. In pages 11 and 12 of Report No. 90, they stated:

> In founding a durable work, its remote as well as proximate benefits are to be regarded, and what scale of measurement can determine the future extent of the population, wealth, and consequent consumption of the District of Columbia, if it shall become, as its great founders confidently anticipated, the emporium of the West.
>
> A work calculated to perpetuate to the American people, and their latest posterity, the blessings of peace, freedom, and independence; objects which in themselves, can have no limit to their values; because, without them all other advantages, public or private, national or individual, are precarious and fleeting: The expediency of providing for objects of such magnitude can be bounded only by the extent of the public resources.
>
> And no provision, among the many internal improvements which solicit the favorable counterance and pecuniary aid of the Federal Government can surpass, in this tendency, the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal.

It is clear that in the minds of committee members the construction of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal was of historic, in fact heroic stature in dimension and importance. It was infused throughout with promoting the national interest. The committee report, however, is specific in defining the advantages of the canal to State and local interests. At page 13, the following highly descriptive language is used in this regard:

> No State of this Union; not one of its many markets; no branch of its industry, whether it speed the plough or spread the sail, or ply, at home, the shuttle or the hammer; whether its activity be exerted on land or the sea, to the North or South, the East or West, is without an interest in the accomplishment of this national work.

The Congress has been vitally interested in the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal since that first comprehensive report of January 30, 1827, 133 years ago. Between the 18th and 25th Congresses, a period of 16 years, a total of 52 committee reports and Executive communications specifically pertaining to the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal were filed.

On December 16, 1913, a report by the district engineer to the Secretary of War—House Document No. 893, 63d Congress, 2d session—estimated the total indebtedness of the canal at $27,166,604.69. The bonded indebtedness was $1,959,500 and State liens made up the balance. The cost of initial construction, major repairs, improvements, and interest on the company's indebtedness, thus totaled about $27 million. Of this amount, the United States and the District of Columbia provided $2 million.

The historic economic difficulties of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Co. have filled the records of law courts and newspaper files. For on July 4, 1828, when the first spade was turned on the canal by President John Quincy Adams, the first spike on the B. & O. Railroad track was driven at Baltimore by Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, the last surviving signer of the Declaration of Independence. A marathon economic conflict between the canal and the railroad had started. By February 19, 1830, the House Committee on Internal Improvements reported that it was a quandary as to which means of transportation, the canal or the railroad should cross the mountain at Cumberland, Md. Its historic hesitation and wonder are expressed as follows:

> The committee have had their attention drawn to the conflict which exists between the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Co. and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Co.; the course, however, which they have adopted, supersedes the necessity of explaining this disagreement. It is the opinion of the committee, that the contemplated highway over the Allegany mountains will need the assistance of the National Government; but they cannot perceive any public inducements to aid both a canal and a railroad. The committee have reflected much on the interesting question, now in agitation in England and this country, namely, whether railroads are to be preferred to canals in ordinary cases, and on routes where there are no intermediate water communications, and they rejoice that the experiment is now about to be fairly made.

The race between the C. & O. and the B. & O. began on the same day, July 4, 1828. The railroad reached Cumberland in 1842. The canal was completed and opened to Cumberland on October 10, 1850, 110 years ago. In the early

1900's, the railroad bought the canal. On August 6, 1938, the B. & O. Railroad sold the canal to the U.S. Government for $2 million in settlement of a Reconstruction Finance Corp. loan. Since 1938 the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, has had the canal within its jurisdiction.

From 1938 through the 1959 fiscal year, expenditures by the Federal Government for restoration and improvement of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal properties have been in the amount of $1,512,961.

As previous speakers have described in full, H.R. 2331 creates a National Historical Park of that 165-mile portion of the canal from Great Falls to Cumberland. The acreage requested to enlarge the park area, mathematically is equivalent to a 500-foot additional additional strip of land area for the full 165 miles. The profile of the adjacent land is such that for 40 of the total miles, the adjacent 500 feet is of the same level as the canal. The remaining 125 miles has, within 500 feet of the canal, elevations from about 25 feet to 200 feet in the mountainous areas.

The bill also authorizes in section 2, for the establishment of a scenic parkway of approximately 25 miles in the mountainous western part of the canal area. The parkway would run for its whole course through the Maryland Green Ridge State Forest, adjacent to the Potomac River gorge. Construction of the parkway would not begin until Maryland had donated the 100 acres per mile required by Federal law.

Careful consideration must at all times be given to the judicious use and development of federally owned lands. This principle applies equally to consideration of Federal funds on the federally owned C. & O. Canal. A wise and prudent investment of such funds pursuant to the authorization contained in H.R. 2331 would freely promote the public interest in my judgment.

If doubts as to this exist among the Members, it would seem proper to hearken back to Report No. 90 of the House Select Committee on Roads and Canals. On January 30, 1827, at page 17, our predecessors there stated in recommending Federal subscription to C. & O. Canal Co. stock:

> Subscriptions to the structure of canals may be founded on loans, therefore, without affording to posterity cause to complain; since their benefit descends unimpaired with the debt they control, the cheap price of the countless blessings which they diffuse.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by saying there are three aspects contained in the bill H.R. 2331. One aspect costs nothing and would take the 165 miles of a national historic relic and make such property a national historical park. That costs nothing. If I understand both of the gentlemen from Ohio, they are not against that principle. We are seeking in another section of the bill to increase the present canal land area by 10,000 acres. We are anxious to debate the need and justification of this proposed enlargement and accordingly are requesting a rule. Finally, there is a third proposal to create a scenic parkway for 23 miles. We would like to present to the Members of the House the justification for that proposal. In light of the fact that thousands of dollars have been spent in studies of the use of this particular canal during the past 12 years, and since $1,500,000 has been authorized and spent since 1938 for the development and maintenance of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, we are seeking to have this wonderful relic preserved for all time by passage of H.R. 2331.

I urge upon you the granting of the rule.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has spoken of the low production rate in steel. In 1957 we imported 1.1 million tons of steel mill products. Last year, 1959, we imported 4.4 million tons. In 1957 we exported 5.2 million tons of steel mill products. Last year our exports dropped to 1.5 million tons, a decline of 3.7 million tons in 2 years.

Combined, these factors indicate that 7 million tons of finished steel products were not produced in American mills, or by American labor. This is the equivalent of 10 million tons of steel ingots, or about 11 percent of our 1959 production.

Had this steel been produced in this Nation, it would have provided employment for 56,000 more people in the steel industry.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, to expedite the situation and to save time, I ask for a division.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BROWN of Ohio) there were—ayes 34, noes 62.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 134, nays 227, not voting 71, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—134

Aspinall	Church	Gallagher
Ayres	Coad	Garmatz
Baldwin	Coffin	Gathings
Barr	Cohelan	George
Barrett	Collier	Giaimo
Bass, N.H.	Curtis, Mo.	Gilbert
Bass, Tenn.	Daddario	Granahan
Bennett, Fla.	Dent	Gray
Bentley	Derwinski	Green, Pa.
Berry	Diggs	Gubser
Blatnik	Dingell	Hagen
Bolling	Doyle	Harmon
Bowles	Dulski	Healey
Brademas	Evins	Hechler
Brooks, Tex.	Fallon	Hogan
Broyhill	Farbstein	Holland
Burke, Mass.	Flynn	Ikard
Byrne, Pa.	Foley	Jarman
Casey	Friedel	Johnson, Calif.
Chenoweth	Fulton	Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.	Morris, N. Mex.	Roush
Karsten	Moulder	Rutherford
Karth	Multer	Saund
Keith	Murphy	Saylor
King, Calif.	Nix	Shelley
King, Utah	O'Brien, N.Y.	Shipley
Kowalski	O'Hara, Ill.	Sisk
Lesinski	O'Hara, Mich.	Slack
Libonati	O'Neill	Smith, Iowa
McCormack	Oliver	Smith, Miss.
McDowell	Pfost	Sullivan
McFall	Poage	Teague, Tex.
McGinley	Porter	Teller
McSween	Powell	Thompson, N.J.
Madden	Price	Thompson, Tex.
Mahon	Prokop	Thornberry
Matthews	Quie	Toll
Merrow	Quigley	Ullman
Meyer	Randall	Vanik
Miller, Clem	Reuss	Wampler
Miller, George P.	Rhodes, Pa.	Watts
Montoya	Rivers, Alaska	Wier
Moorhead	Rogers, Colo.	Wilson
Morgan	Rogers, Mass.	Wolf
	Roosevelt	Zablocki

NAYS—227

Abbitt	Flood	Moore
Abernethy	Flynt	Moss
Adair	Ford	Mumma
Addonizio	Forrester	Murray
Alford	Frazier	Natcher
Alger	Frelinghuysen	Nelsen
Allen	Gary	Norblad
Andersen, Minn.	Gavin	Norrell
Anderson, Mont.	Glenn	O'Konski
Andrews	Goodell	Osmers
Arends	Grant	Ostertag
Ashley	Griffin	Passman
Ashmore	Griffiths	Patman
Auchincloss	Gross	Pelly
Avery	Haley	Perkins
Barden	Halleck	Philbin
Bates	Halpern	Pilcher
Baumhart	Hardy	Pillion
Becker	Harris	Pirnie
Beckworth	Harrison	Poff
Belcher	Hays	Pucinski
Bennett, Mich.	Hemphill	Rabaut
Betts	Henderson	Rains
Boland	Herlong	Ray
Bolton	Hess	Reece, Tenn.
Bosch	Hiestand	Rees, Kans.
Bow	Hoeven	Rhodes, Ariz.
Boykin	Hoffman, Ill.	Riehlman
Bray	Hoffman, Mich.	Riley
Breeding	Holt	Rivers, S.C.
Brock	Holtzman	Roberts
Brooks, La.	Horan	Robison
Broomfield	Hosmer	Rodino
Brown, Ga.	Huddleston	Rogers, Fla.
Brown, Ohio	Irwin	Rogers, Tex.
Budge	Jackson	Rostenkowski
Burke, Ky.	Jennings	St. George
Burleson	Jensen	Schenck
Cahill	Johansen	Scherer
Canfield	Jonas	Schneebeli
Cannon	Jones, Ala.	Schwengel
Cederberg	Jones, Mo.	Selden
Chamberlain	Kearns	Sikes
Chiperfield	Keogh	Siler
Clark	Kilday	Simpson
Colmer	Kilgore	Smith, Calif.
Conte	Kirwan	Spence
Cook	Kluczynski	Springer
Corbett	Knox	Steed
Cramer	Kyl	Stratton
Cunningham	Lafore	Stubblefield
Curtin	Lane	Taber
Curtis, Mass.	Langen	Teague, Calif.
Dague	Latta	Thomson, Wyo.
Daniels	Levering	Tollefson
Davis, Ga.	Lindsay	Trimble
Delaney	Lipscomb	Tuck
Denton	Loser	Utt
Derounian	McCulloch	Van Pelt
Devine	McDonough	Van Zandt
Dixon	McIntire	Vinson
Donohue	McMillan	Wainwright
Dooley	Macdonald	Wallhauser
Dorn, N.Y.	Machrowicz	Weaver
Dorn, S.C.	Mack	Weis
Dowdy	Magnuson	Westland
Downing	Mailliard	Wharton
Dwyer	Marshall	Whitten
Elliott, Pa.	Mason	Widnall
Everett	May	Willis
Fascell	Michel	Winstead
Feighan	Miller, N.Y.	Withrow
Fenton	Milliken	Yates
Fino	Mills	Young
Fisher	Minshall	Younger
	Moeller	
	Monagan	

NOT VOTING—71

Albert	Fogarty	Metcalf
Alexander	Forand	Mitchell
Anfuso	Fountain	Morris, Okla.
Bailey	Green, Oreg.	Morrison
Baker	Hargis	O'Brien, Ill.
Baring	Hébert	Preston
Barry	Holifield	Rooney
Blitch	Hull	Santangelo
Boggs	Inouye	Scott
Bonner	Johnson, Colo.	Sheppard
Brewster	Judd	Short
Brown, Mo.	Kasem	Smith, Kans.
Buckley	Kastenmeier	Smith, Va.
Burdick	Kee	Staggers
Byrnes, Wis.	Kelly	Taylor
Carnahan	Kilburn	Thomas
Celler	Kitchin	Thompson, La.
Chelf	Laird	Udall
Cooley	Landrum	Walter
Davis, Tenn.	Lankford	Whitener
Dawson	Lennon	Williams
Durham	McGovern	Wright
Edmondson	Martin	Zelenko
Elliott, Ala.	Meader	

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Barry.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Preston with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Judd.
Mr. McGovern with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Brewster with Mr. Short.
Mr. Kitchin with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. FALLON, Mr. LESINSKI, and Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GAVIN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND FOR THE WEEK OF MAY 23

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader concerning the program for the rest of the day, the balance of this week, and the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are two bills I should like to dispose of today; H.R. 6851, authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Bent's Old Fort in Colorado which I understand the gentleman from Colorado will call up as the next order of business or after the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] has disposed of some matters. The other bill is H.R. 8226, to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida.

If those two bills are disposed of as intended, we shall go over until Monday. It looks as though we ought to be able to dispose of those two bills today, as contemplated.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say that so far as I know they can be disposed of today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Notice I say, as contemplated.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday is District Day, but I understand there is no business from the District of Columbia Committee.

Then there is the public works appropriation bill for 1961.

On Tuesday, Kentucky and Florida have primaries. There will be two bills taken up on that day, H.R. 10572 pertaining to Agriculture, Forests, National Administration; and H.R. 11761, Farmer's Home Administration.

Wednesday is Calendar Wednesday. Unless a rule is reported out, I understand Calendar Wednesday will be exercised in connection with the School Construction Assistance Act of 1960, H.R. 10128.

Mr. HALLECK. Might I inquire of the majority leader on that point, whether or not he intends to ask at this time to dispense with Calendar Wednesday of next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. As I have said heretofore, if any Member, no matter on what side, tells me that he would object to the request, I would not put that Member in the position to have to object. If any Member tells me they would like to exercise Calendar Wednesday and would not want me to make a unanimous consent to dispense with that, I feel I owe it to that Member in view of the relationship of the majority leader with each and every Member of the House, always endeavoring to cooperate as much as possible, I would not make such a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand it, as it is listed here, if a rule is not granted and if Calendar Wednesday is not dispensed with, it is the purpose to call up the School Construction Assistance Act on Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is in the discretion of the proponents of the legislation to do so. If a rule is reported out, I will program it for Wednesday. Again, in that connection, I would want to discuss that further, but I will program it for Wednesday if a rule is reported out, so far as the legislative program for next week is concerned.

The program for Thursday, Friday, and Saturday is as follows:

S. 2130, the bill relating to the payment to the Government of Japan. I understand that relates to the Bonin Islands.

H.R. 1157, relating to the development of the Ryukyu Islands.

There are primaries in North Carolina on Saturday next, and I might say there is a State convention in North Carolina today.

The reason I use the words "intended" or "contemplated" is I had that in mind.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate that. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Memorial Day comes along on the following Monday, can the majority leader give us any information as to what the situation might be here at that time?

Mr. McCORMACK. I can assure the Members that with their cooperation, there will be no rollcalls on that day. I do not want to commit myself as to adjourning over now, but my mind is open in that respect.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts is very fair as he always is.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is always my purpose to give Members their day in court and if some of the minor bills could be brought up and gotten out of the way, it will be very helpful to the Members because, as we all know, at the tail end of the session some of the bills are going to be lost. Yet, these bills are important to individual Members and I like to give all Members their day in court. Perhaps I may be overemphasizing this, but to me it is a question of a very solemn trust and that is why Members can make their appointments and we will protect them on May 30. As I said, my mind is open about adjourning over, yet if there are some bills that we might dispose of by taking advantage of that legislative day, that might be done, but as I say, I do not commit myself to that at this time.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Subsequent to the above announcements, I have received the request to reassign the public works appropriation bill for 1961 from Monday to Tuesday, which I have done. After consultation with the minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and other interested Members, the program for the week of May 23, 1960, is as follows:

Monday: District Day—No business; S. 2130, payment to Japan; H.R. 1157, development of Ryukyu Islands; H.R. 6851, Colorado, Bent's Old Fort Historic Site; H.R. 8226, Florida, Castillo De San Marcos National Park.

Tuesday: Kentucky and Florida have primaries; public works appropriation bill for 1961.

Any rollcall votes on Monday or Tuesday will go over until Wednesday.

Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday: H.R. 10128, School Construction Assistance Act of 1960; H.R. 10572, Agriculture, Forests, National Administration; H.R. 11761, Farmer's Home Administration.

North Carolina primary on Saturday.

Any further program will be announced later. Conference reports may be brought up at any time.

AMENDING SECTION 170 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6779) to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable contributions for certain individuals—with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out all after "following:" over to and including "years." in line 9 on page 2 and insert: " 'For purposes of this

subparagraph, in the case of taxable years ending before January 1, 1961, within such 10 preceding taxable years, if the sum of the charitable contributions and the income taxes paid during the taxable years in any period of two consecutive taxable years exceeds 90 percent of the sum of the taxpayer's taxable incomes (as so computed) for such two consecutive taxable years, and if the sum of the charitable contributions and the income tax so paid during each such consecutive taxable year exceeds 75 percent of the taxpayer's taxable income (as so computed) for such year, the 90 percent test shall be considered satisfied with respect to both such consecutive taxable years; but no taxable year shall be included in more than one period of two consecutive taxable years and not more than two periods of two consecutive taxable years within such 10 preceding taxable years shall be taken into account.'"

Page 2, line 18, strike out "1959" and insert "1960".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, was this bill unanimously reported from the committee?

Mr. MILLS. This bill was unanimously reported by the committee. It was passed last year. What we are considering now are some amendments of the other body, which I must frankly admit tighten up the bill, as it passed the House, and tighten the application of it. They are entirely acceptable to those who are in favor of the bill and to the Treasury and to our staff insofar as the technicalities are concerned.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under present law, an individual is entitled to an unlimited deduction for charitable contributions if, in the current year and in 8 out of the 10 preceding years, he has given 90 percent of his income to charity or to the Federal Government in the form of income taxes. However, in certain cases, taxpayers did not qualify for this unlimited charitable contributions deduction even though in 8 out of the last 10 years more than 75 percent of their income went to charities or for taxes and even though the 90-percent test would have been met if it had been computed on the basis of the average charitable contributions and taxes paid in 2-year periods during the last 10 years.

The House bill provided that the 90-percent test was to be considered as having been met for any 2 consecutive years in the 10-year period preceding the current year if the total of the charitable contributions and taxes for such 2-year period met the 90-percent test. However, in order to qualify under the House bill, the individual's charitable contributions and taxes in each of the 2 years had to represent 75 percent of his taxable income and no one year could be included in more than one 2-year period.

As amended by the Senate, no more than two periods of 2 consecutive years may be taken into account in determining whether the 90-percent test has been satisfied in 8 out of the 10 preceding years. The Senate also amended the House bill to provide that the period to which the bill applies and within which the averaging device may be employed is limited to the 10-year period ending before January 1, 1961. Accordingly, under the bill as amended by the Senate, this averaging device will not become a permanent feature of the tax law. However, it is permissible for taxpayers to qualify for the unlimited charitable contribution deduction in the current and future years by averaging income and contributions and taxes in years prior to January 1, 1961. Furthermore, although the bill applies to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1956, a taxpayer will be permitted to average two periods of 2 consecutive years whether such 2-year period occurred prior to or after December 31, 1956, so long as those years come within the 10-year period ending before January 1, 1961. Finally, because of the passage of time since the bill was acted upon by the House, the Senate amended the effective date provision to provide that although the bill will continue to apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1956, no credit or refunds are to be paid as a result of this bill for any years beginning before January 1, 1960.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, existing law permits a charitable contribution deduction to an individual up to 20 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income. The limitation is 30 percent in the case of contributions to churches, schools, colleges, and hospitals. Existing law contains a provision for the deduction of unlimited charitable contributions under certain circumstances. In general, to be eligible for the unlimited deduction, a taxpayer must be able to establish that in the current taxable year and in 8 out of 10 preceding years he has given 90 percent of his taxable income to charity or to the Federal Government in the form of income taxes.

The bill before us today, H.R. 6779, pertains to this requirement involving a pattern of giving in 8 out of 10 years.

The House bill provided that the 90-percent test was to be considered as met for any 2 consecutive years in the 10-year period preceding the taxable year if the total of the charitable contributions and taxes for the 2-year period met the 90-percent test. The House bill contained a further safeguard by requiring that in each of the 2 consecutive years the charitable contributions and taxes had to represent 75 percent of the taxable income and no one year could be included in more than one 2-year period.

The Senate in acting on this legislation amended the bill as follows: First, only two periods of 2 consecutive years may be taken into account in qualifying; second, the applicable period in which the averaging device is available is limited to the 10-year period ending before January 1, 1961; third, a clerical amendment clarifying the definition "taxable income"; and fourth, amendment to the effective date provision so that no refunds or credits are to be paid as a result of enactment of the bill for any years beginning before January 1, 1960.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment these amendments approved by the Senate should be accepted by the House.

AMENDING INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 RELATING TO CERTAIN WEAPONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4029) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the proration of the occupational tax on persons dealing in machineguns and certain other firearms, to reduce occupation and transfer taxes on certain weapons, to make the transferor and transferee jointly liable for the transfer tax on firearms, and to make certain changes in the definition of a firearm, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 5, line 2, strike out "1959" and insert "1960".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the House will recall, this bill amends the special excise tax provisions in the Internal Revenue Code relating to short-barreled firearms, machineguns and the so-called any other weapon category.

The Senate amendment merely changes the effective date with respect to the changes in the occupational tax rates from June 30, 1959, to June 30, 1960, so as to make the application prospective. The bill passed the House unanimously last year, and the Senate amendment was necessitated simply by the passage of time.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the House passed version of H.R. 4029 amended the sections of the Internal Revenue Code which were developed from the National Firearms Act so as to facilitate control of weapons used for illegal purposes. In essence, the legislation seeks to make it more difficult for criminal elements in our society to obtain weapons. The Senate in acting on this bill included an amendment having to do with the effective date of changes in the occupational tax rates applicable to certain types of weapons covered in the bill. This is a technical amendment made necessary by the passage of time since the bill was approved in the House.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that the House has acted to approve the Senate amendment.

CREDITS AGAINST THE UNEMPLOYMENT TAX

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6482) relating to the credits against the unemployment tax in the case of merged corporations, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 6 over to and including line 14 on page 2 and insert:

"(d) SUCCESSOR EMPLOYER.—Subject to the limits provided by subsection (c), if—

"(1) an employer acquires during any calendar year substantially all the property used in a trade or business of another person, or used in a separate unit of a trade or business of such other person, and immediately after the acquisition employs in his trade or business one or more individuals who immediately prior to the acquisition were employed in the trade or business of such other person, and

"(2) such other person is not an employer for the calendar year in which the acquisition takes place,

then, for the calendar year in which the acquisition takes place, in addition to the credits allowed under subsection (a) and (b), such employer may credit against the tax imposed by section 3301 for such year an amount equal to the credits which (without regard to subsection (c)) would have been allowable to such other person under subsections (a) and (b) and this subsection for such year, if such other person had been an employer, with respect to remuneration subject to contributions under the unemployment compensation law of a State paid by such other person to the individual or individuals described in paragraph (1)".

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act relating to the credits against the unemployment tax in the case of certain successor employers."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House will recall, under present law contributions made by employers to State unemployment funds may be claimed as a credit against the 3-percent Federal unemployment tax. Ordinarily, since wages paid by a predecessor employer are deemed to be paid by a successor with respect to the calendar year in which the successor succeeded to the business, the successor employer is entitled to a credit against its Federal unemployment tax for State unemployment taxes paid by its predecessor. However, in some situations, although a predecessor has been considered an employer for State unemployment tax purposes, it has not been considered an employer for Federal unemployment tax purposes. In these situations, the successor has been denied a credit against its Federal unemployment tax for the State unemployment taxes paid by its predecessor and has been unjustly taxed by the Federal Government.

As passed by the House, H.R. 6482 corrected this situation where there has been a statutory merger or consolidation of corporations. However, the House bill did not take care of similar situations involving unincorporated businesses.

As amended by the Senate, the relief provided under the House bill would be extended to situations in which any employer acquires substantially all the property used in the trade or business, or in a separate unit of a trade or business, of another person and continues to employ some or all of the employees of the other person. In such a situation, the successor will be entitled to a credit for State unemployment taxes paid by the predecessor employer notwithstanding the fact that the predecessor is not considered to be an employer for purposes of the Federal unemployment tax.

The amendments contained in H.R. 6482 will apply to calendar years beginning after 1950. Since the effective date provision does not refer to a period of limitations for claiming credit or refund, no refunds or credits will be allowed where the calendar year involved is closed by the running of the statute of limitations.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6482 pertains to the unemployment tax imposed under the Internal Revenue Code. The legislation would remove an inequity involved in the availability of the credit against the Federal unemployment tax for contributions to State unemployment funds.

The legislation as it passed the House was specifically applicable to incorporated taxpayers. The Senate has amended the bill to make the provisions applicable to unincorporated businesses as well as corporations. I have joined with the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in supporting the House approval of this Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEMPORARY TARIFF TREATMENT OF CHICORY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9308) to extend for 3 years the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That sections 1 and 3 of the Act entitled 'An Act to suspend for two years the duty on crude chicory and to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to chicory', approved April 16, 1958, as amended (72 Stat. 87; 19 U.S.C. 1001, par. 776 and note; Public Law 86-441), are each amended by striking out 'July 16, 1960' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1963.' "

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to extend until June 30, 1963, the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the House will recall, as it passed the House of Representatives H.R. 9308 provided for the continuation for a period of 3 years of the existing suspension of duty on crude chicory—except endive—and for the continuation for the same period of the statutory rate of duty of 2 cents per pound for chicory, ground or otherwise prepared. Under the House bill the termination date of April 16, 1963, was provided.

The Members will further recall that, since the original passage of this bill, a Senate amendment to another bill—H.R. 9307—was accepted by the House, providing a 90-day continuation, from April 18, 1960, to July 16, 1960, of the existing duty treatment on chicory, in order to give the Senate adequate time for further study of the situation before acting on the 3-year extension.

The Senate amendment to the pending bill, which provides for a termination date of June 30, 1963, instead of April 16, 1963, takes into account the previously enacted 90-day extension and makes the termination date coincide with the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9308 pertains to the tariff status applicable to crude and ground chicory. The House-passed version of this legislation would have continued until the close of April 16, 1963, the suspension of duty on crude chicory—not including endive—and would have continued for the same period the statutory rate of duty of 2 cents per pound on ground chicory or chicory that is otherwise prepared. The Senate has amended the House-passed bill so that the suspension and reduction with respect to the duty would continue until the close of June 30, 1963.

The membership of the House will recall that the Congress has recently approved a continuation of the existing tariff treatment through June 16, 1960. It is appropriate that the House should concur in this Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF IMPORT DUTIES ON CERTAIN SHOE LATHES AND CASEIN

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9862) to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the amendment of the Senate, and request a conference with the Senate on the disagreed votes of the two Houses.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. MILLS, Mr. FORAND, Mr. KING of California, Mr. MASON, and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCHARGES OF INDEBTEDNESS OF RAILROAD CORPORATIONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 11405) to provide for the treatment of income from discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation in a receivership proceeding or in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 205), commenced before January 1, 1960, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 108(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to income of a railroad corporation from discharge of indebtedness) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) RAILROAD CORPORATIONS.—No amount shall be included in gross income by reason of the discharge, cancellation, or modification, in whole or in part, within the taxable year, of any indebtedness of a railroad corporation, as defined in section 77(m) of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 205(m)), if such discharge, cancellation, or modification is effected pursuant to an order of a court—

"(A) in a receivership proceeding, or

"(B) in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act,

commenced before January 1, 1960. In such cases, the amount of any income of the taxpayer attributable to any unamortized premium (computed as of the first day of the taxable year in which such discharge occurred with respect to such indebtedness shall not be included in gross income, and the amount of the deduction attributable to any unamortized discount (computed as of the first day of the taxable year in which such discharge occurred) with respect to such indebtedness shall not be allowed as a deduction. Subsection (a) of this section shall not apply with respect to any discharge of indebtedness to which this subsection applies."

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendment made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 1959, but only with respect to discharges occurring after such date.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after "That" insert: "(a)".

Page 2, line 11, strike out "occurred" and insert: "occurred)".

Page 2, strike out lines 20 through 23, and insert:

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 1959, but only with respect to discharges occurring after such date.

"SEC. 2. Section 97 of the Technical Amendments Act of 1958 (26 U.S.C., sec. 162 note; 72 Stat. 1672), relating to deductibility of accrued vacation pay, is amended by striking out 'January 1, 1961,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1963,'."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for the treatment of income from discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation in a receivership proceeding or in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act commenced before January 1, 1960, and for other purposes."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, H.R. 11405 makes two changes in existing law. Both of these changes relate to the continuation of provisions which previously have been in effect.

First, present law provides that the discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation in a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1958, is not to result in taxable income for the railroad if the discharge occurred as the result of a court order in a receivership proceeding, or in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act. The bill continues the application of this provision to discharges after December 31, 1959, but only if the court proceeding involved commenced before January 1, 1960.

Second, Congress in the Technical Amendments Act of 1958 provided that a deduction for accrued vacation pay is not to be denied for any taxable year ending before January 1, 1961, solely because the liability for it to a specific person has not been fixed or because the liability for it to each individual cannot be computed with reasonable accuracy. However, for the corporation to obtain the deduction the employee must have performed the qualifying service necessary under a plan or policy which provides for vacations with pay to qualified employees. The bill extends this same treatment to deductions for taxable years ending before January 1, 1963.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it does not object to the provisions of this bill, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Florida, Representative A. S. HERLONG, JR.

The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in recommending the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 11405, makes two changes in existing law, both of which relate to the continuation of provisions which previously have been in effect.

The first of these changes pertains to the discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation and would provide that such a discharge will not result in taxable income for the railroad if the discharge occurs after December 31, 1959, but only if the court proceeding involved commenced before January 1, 1960.

The second change pertains to the allowed deduction for accrued vacation pay and extends the present treatment to deductions for taxable years ending before January 1, 1963.

The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in reporting this legislation to the House and it is appropriate that the House should have given the bill its approval.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON METAL SCRAP

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 11748) to continue until the close of June 30, 1961, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 2 of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 869, Eighty-first Congress), is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1960" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1961": *Provided,* That this Act shall not apply to lead scrap, lead alloy scrap, antimonial lead scrap, scrap battery lead or plates, zinc scrap, or zinc alloy scrap, or to any form of tungsten scrap, tungsten carbide scrap, or tungsten alloy scrap; or to articles of lead, lead alloy, antimonial lead, zinc, or zinc alloy, or to articles of tungsten, tungsten carbide, or tungsten alloy, imported for remanufacture by melting.

SEC. 2. This Act shall not apply to any article provided for in section 4541 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 11748, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable THADDEUS MACHROWICZ, is to continue for 1 year, from the close of June 30, 1960, to the close of June 30, 1961, the suspension of duties on metal scrap. Under the bill, the proviso of existing law that the suspension shall not apply to lead scrap, lead alloy scrap, antimonial lead scrap, scrap battery lead or plates, zinc scrap, or zinc alloy scrap, or to any form of tungsten scrap, tungsten carbide scrap, or tungsten alloy scrap, or to articles of lead, lead alloy, antimonial lead, zinc, or zinc alloy, or to articles of tungsten, tungsten carbide, or tungsten alloy, imported for remanufacture by melting, would be retained. The bill also continues the existing provision that the suspension shall not apply to any article provided for in section 4541 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to copper-bearing ores and concentrates and articles of which copper is a component material.

Favorable reports were received on this legislation from the Departments of the Treasury, State, Interior, Defense, Commerce, and Labor, and from the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, as well as an informative report from the U.S. Tariff Commission. The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in recommending the enactment of the bill.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11748, which was unanimously approved by the Committee on Ways and Means, provides for the continuation to July 1, 1961, of the suspension of duties on certain metal scrap. During its consideration of this legislation the committee received no indication of any opposition to the bill. Favorable departmental re-

ports were received from Treasury, State, Interior, Defense, Commerce, and Labor. A favorable report was also received from the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and an informative report was received from the U.S. Tariff Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I have joined with the committee chairman in urging the House approval of this legislation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] and the authors of the various bills, if they so desire, and I, have permission to extend our remarks in connection with the Senate amendments and also the bills that were passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

BENT'S OLD FORT NEAR LA JUNTA, COLO.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6851) authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Bent's Old Fort near La Junta, Colo.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6851, with Mr. EVINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a comparatively small bill. It is true that it does have for its purpose the authorizing of a small historical site in the southeastern part of Colorado. I shall ask my colleague, the gentleman from the southeastern district of Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH], to explain the bill in detail.

Mr. Chairman, Bent's Old Fort, which is the subject matter of this legislation, was one of the great centers of fur trading during the height of its activity in the Rocky Mountains. It played a unique part in pioneer settlement of the Southwest. The Board, established by act of Congress, to advise on national parks, historic sites, buildings, and monuments, has stated that Bent's Old Fort has exceptional value to commemorate and illustrate the history of the country.

The State of Colorado at present owns 5 acres of land containing the actual site of the fort. This land is administered by the State Historical Society. This small area, however, is inadequate to conserve the historic setting and allow proper interpretation of the fort to the visiting public.

H.R. 6851 directs the Department of the Interior to establish Bent's Old Fort as a national historic site. This is not an expensive project. Land acquisition cost is estimated at $46,240. The 5-acre tract owned by the State, it is understood, will be donated.

An excellent report of the National Park Service demonstrating the suitability of this site for addition to the national park system is in the committee file and I welcome any of my colleagues to examine it.

A brief history of Bent's Old Fort starts with the year 1821, the year in which Mexico became independent from Spain. American merchants opened trade relations at Santa Fe in what is now New Mexico. In 1829, Charles and William Bent, fur traders, entered business at Santa Fe. In 1833–34, the St. Vrain Co. completed Bent's Old Fort on the Arkansas River as a center of operations for both the business of the Santa Fe Trail and the Indian trade. In 1836, the fort served as the base of operations for John Fremont's third expedition and the fort became headquarters for the Upper Platte and Arkansas Indian Agency. After serving as a depot for U.S. Army supplies during the Mexican War, the old fort was abandoned in 1849. Reopened in 1861, it served as a stage station for the Barlow-Sanderson Overland Stage, Mail, & Express Co.

In 1926, a 5-acre site was acquired by the Daughters of the American Revolution of La Junta, Colo. Then in 1924, the State historical society acquired the site and subsequently partially excavated the remains of the old buildings.

Located on State Highway 194, just off U.S. Highway 50, I am sure that the old fort, as it is proposed to be restored, will be a very popular and instructive attraction. I urge adoption of the bill with the committee amendments.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he might require to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for his very fine presentation and excellent statement on this bill, which authorizes the establishment of Bent's Old Fort as a national historic site. I am happy to be the author of this bill and I hope it will receive the favorable consideration of the House.

This site at Bent's Old Fort is located, as the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] mentioned, in the southeastern part of Colorado, in Otero County, on the Arkansas River between La Junta and Las Animas.

I feel that Bent's Fort has national significance and should be designated as a national historic site. This fort was located on the old Santa Fe Trail which extended from St. Joseph, Mo., to Santa Fe, N. Mex., and played such an important part in the development of our great Southwest.

Mr. Chairman, there is a favorable report on this bill from the Department of the Interior. The Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments has approved Bent's Old Fort for designation as a national historic site and has indicated that it has "exceptional value in commemorating and illustrating the history of the United States."

I would like to state to the committee that there has been a great deal of interest in the preservation of Bent's Old Fort which played such a prominent part in the development of Colorado and the entire Southwest. Several books have been written about the fort, as well as numerous articles, reports, and accounts.

In 1953 the Daughters of the American Revolution presented a deed to this property to the State Historical Society of Colorado. This site comprises 5.07 acres. The State historical society has been most diligent in its efforts to obtain recognition of Bent's Old Fort as a national historic site.

The schoolchildren of Bent and Otero Counties helped raise funds to restore the fort, as did chambers of commerce and other organizations. Some restoration work has been done under the direction of Dr. Herbert W. Dick, archeologist of the Trinidad State Junior College, at Trinidad, Colo. A plan was worked out by Dr. Dick under which certain excavations of the fort's foundations were made, and some of the walls restored to a small extent.

Bent's Fort was truly a most important landmark of the old West. It served the hardy pioneers who blazed the trail and settled southern Colorado and New Mexico.

The fort was first constructed by Charles and William Bent, and Ceran St. Vrain about 1833. The dimensions were 100 by 150 feet. The walls were 17 feet high, 2 feet or more thick, and constructed of adobe bricks. The fort contained a corral for cattle, sheep, and horses, and there was room for the large freight wagons which transported supplies over the Santa Fe Trail.

The fort became the center of the fur trade in the Southwest. It served as protection from the different Indian tribes, some of whom were hostile and unfriendly, and who presented a constant threat to the safety of the traveler.

This trading post served as the principal outpost of civilization of the Southwest. It was the rendezvous of famous scouts, trappers, and traders, such as Kit Carson, Thomas Boggs, James Beckwourth, John Smith, Bill Williams, Lucien Maxwell, and "Uncle Dick" Wootton. It was the principal point of contact in the region for the Cheyenne, Arapaho, Comanche, Kiowa, Prairie Apache, Ute, and other Indian tribes, who came to the fort to trade. Both the Army and the Indian Service used this fort in dealing with the different tribes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this legislation. It so happens that I started the practice of law near Bent's Old Fort, and have

been at the site on many, many occasions. Southeastern Colorado at one time was all Bent County, named after the people who came as traders with the Indians on the Santa Fe Trail. The fort was near the Arkansas River and at the point the trail turned off across the mountains to Santa Fe, N. Mex. These traders and the Indians were together for many years. This fort was the meeting place for all southeast Colorado. The fort itself was destroyed by the progress of civilization, but the people there recognized that this historical site should be preserved.

I commend the gentleman for introducing the legislation, and I am hopeful we can adopt it here this afternoon.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman from Colorado. The first time I ever met the gentleman was in Las Animas where he was a prominent lawyer. Las Animas is the county seat of Bent County, which was named for William Bent, who along with his brother, Charles, and Ceran St. Vrain, constructed and operated Bent's Fort.

Mr. Chairman, mention was made by Mr. ASPINALL that some additional land must be acquired in order to properly protect this site. The Park Service has indicated that additional land will be necessary in order to develop and preserve this site. I hasten to state that I know of no one who is interested in this project for the purpose of making any profit out of the same. The land which is under question is owned by a Mr. Baldridge, who operates a farm and lives close to the site. He has been acting as caretaker for the fort property for the State Historical Society. This 5 acres of land includes a road from the highway to the site which passes through his land. It is important to obtain this additional land in order that the site may be properly protected and preserved. Part of the land surrounding this site is irrigated land. Some of it is pasture land and some is submarginal. I have not talked to Mr. Baldridge, the owner of the land. I do not know that the land has even been appraised. However, I am informed by the Colorado State Historical Society that Mr. Baldridge has no desire or intention of trying to profit from the sale of this land. He is interested in Bent's Old Fort, and I am sure that a satisfactory price can be worked out.

Mr. Chairman, the sum of $46,200 has been mentioned as the maximum amount that might be spent for additional land as recommended by the Park Service. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have reason to believe that it may be possible that this land may be made available to the Federal Government without any cost to the Park Service. After this bill is passed—and I sincerely hope it will be approved, I can assure the committee that I shall personally make every effort to get this land donated. I have been reliably informed there are those who are interested in the development of our national park system who may be willing to make this land available without cost to the Federal Government. I want to make it absolutely clear that this is not a situation where the owner of the land is trying to dispose of his land at a big profit. I can assure the committee that I shall do everything within my power to cooperate in getting this land without any cost to the Government. I have good reason to believe that this may be possible.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman support an amendment to strike section 3, which authorizes Federal funds, from the bill?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I will state to my friend from Iowa, that I cannot support an amendment. Some money will have to be spent in developing and operating this site. I am trying to make it clear that I shall do what I can to have the additional land made available to the Federal Government without cost. But, we must pass this bill and get the fort designated as a national historic site before anything can be done.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, section 3 applies only to the authorization of funds. It does not have anything to do with the rest of the bill.

Mr. CHENOWETH. We will need some funds, as I have mentioned. We may not be able to get all of this land without cost, although I hope we can, The Park Service would have to do what is ordinarily done in connection with historic sites. There will be some buildings, some markers, and other necessary expenses, I will say to the gentleman. I am talking about the acquisition of this additional land which the Park Service will need. I do not know how much they will require. Perhaps they will not need as much as they have indicated, but in any event, as the author of this bill, and one very much interested in preserving Bent's Old Fort as an historic site, I am just as much interested in saving money for the Federal Government as is the gentleman from Iowa or any other Member of the House. I am certainly going to use every influence I have to make certain that this land will be made available without expense to the Government. I am encouraged to believe this can be done. There will be some expense of operation and maintenance which is true of any historic site.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take more time of the committee. I hope I have made it crystal clear that this is a project which is of great importance to us in southeast Colorado. For the 15 years of its active existence Bent's Old Fort stood alone in the vast southwestern plains as the center of a fur and Indian trading empire, as a vital factor in the relations between the red man and the white man, as the only reliable way station on the long Santa Fe Trail. It was a symbol of the great influence of William and Charles Bent and Ceran St. Vrain in promoting good relations and trade with New Mexico, and a rendezvous point for explorers and military expeditions in the Southwest.

I might state that the wagon trains from Bent's Fort made trips to the Texas Panhandle, and up into Colorado, Wyoming, Nebraska, and the Black Hills of South Dakota. This gives some idea of the vast area served by Bent's Fort and the influence exerted by the Bents and St. Vrain, as well as the importance of Bent's Old Fort.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill will be passed. There is no controversy in Colorado over this proposed legislation, but on the contrary a great deal of interest in this project.

I will greatly appreciate your support of this bill and I urge the Members of the House to vote for this measure.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, this legislation was carefully considered in hearings before the Subcommittee on Public Lands of which I am chairman.

The distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH], the author of the bill, who just preceded me, has explained the bill in his usual able manner. He has conscientiously worked for passage of this measure since May of last year when he introduced the bill. The gentleman presented a very strong case in favor of the adoption of his bill when he appeared before the subcommittee to explain the merits of the legislation. I wish to commend the gentleman for his persistence and for the excellent presentation he made to the subcommittee, as well as the thorough explanation he gave for the benefit of Members on the floor today.

Establishment of this historic site has been requested by the Colorado Historical Society and other groups in the State of Colorado. There is no known opposition.

The Department of the Interior recommends enactment of this bill, based upon a thorough study by its experts, and the favorable recommendation from the advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments.

This site is of special importance in portraying the story of the Santa Fe Trail, the administration of Indian matters, and the events as the civilian population traveled back and forth from middle western settlements to Rocky Mountain areas. Bent's Old Fort stands out above all other spots in southwestern history during this period.

The site of Bent's Old Fort is on the banks of the Arkansas River each of La Junta, Colo. At present, almost all of the historic remains of the old fort are underground. The lands in the vicinity of the site, except for the 5 acres owned by the State of Colorado, are included in what is now farm property. The property owner has expressed no opposition to the purchase of some 165 acres of land as proposed by the bill.

The committee has a copy of the account of the excavation at Bent's Fort in 1954. This project, under the volunteer labor of students at Trinidad State Junior College, of Trinidad, Colo., was fully successful in outlining the foundations of the old fort building. The excavation has confirmed the many available eyewitness accounts of the build-

ing and its use as the principal outpost in the Southwestern Plains and the only one on the famous Santa Fe Trail.

The land proposed for acquisition is believed to be the minimum necessary to provide a setting for the site and take care of access, parking, and administrative facilities.

I hope the House will act favorably on the bill.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentle lady yield?

Mrs. PFOST. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ULLMAN. I want to commend the gentle lady, who is the very able chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands, for her diligence in bringing this matter before the House and for her consideration of many other similar matters that are so vital to the preservation of the great history of this Nation of ours.

Mrs. PFOST. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask some questions about what is going to happen if we pass this bill. I address these questions to the chairman of the subcommittee, some member of the subcommittee, or, perhaps, the author of the bill. What is this going to cost if the Federal Government makes this a national site? What will be the cost in the future?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that there will have to be a building erected, as the Park Service always does on these historic sites. I cannot tell the gentleman the exact amount. I think it will be a very nominal sum.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any idea how many thousand dollars a year it will take to manage this place?

Mr. CHENOWETH. It will be a very small amount, but I would just be speculating if I mentioned any specific amount. I should say perhaps $10,000 a year, but that is just pure speculation.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know what is meant by a small amount.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I have mentioned $10,000 a year. I do not think the cost of operation would vary too much from this figure.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any other member of the committee who can shed any light on that? Let us assume we make a national site out of this. The Federal Government takes it over and then in perpetuity the taxpayers' money is going to be spent on this enterprise, to manage it. I would like to have some idea what this sort of thing costs.

Mr. CHENOWETH. This is no different than any other historic sites which we have authorized in the Congress, and which are now being enjoyed by the American people. I can assure the gentleman this historic site will be an attraction to the many tourists and to all who visit this area. I am sure they will be happy that this historic landmark has been preserved.

Mr. GROSS. But it is still going to be a burden upon the taxpayers of the entire country; is that not correct? I am not trying to single out this particular project, but I am thinking in terms of the other projects that we have and those that are yet to come. I think the House of Representatives ought to stop, look, and listen when it comes to taking over these so-called historic sites and putting the management of these sites in the hands of the Federal Government. I would like to have some idea of what a thing like this is going to cost in perpetuity, or even some idea what it is going to cost for a year or 5 years. Another question: Will this necessitate the building of a road or is there a road there already? What is this going to require?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. There is no highway contemplated. There might be a little lane from the highway into the old fort.

Mr. GROSS. There is a lane there now?

Mr. ASPINALL. A little lane in but no road as such.

Mr. GROSS. Then a road will have to be built.

Mr. ASPINALL. As far as the expenditures are concerned, if my friend will permit me to say, the way this bill is worded and the way the legislation is worded, the Committee on Appropriations of the House will have absolute control over any road improvements. It so happens that we are spending throughout the United States Federal moneys to go ahead and develop like areas. We are charging admission fees to get into most of those areas. Moneys collected as admission fees come back to the Treasury of the United States. The Congress has already gone along with what is known as Mission 66 of the Park Service, and many of the areas of importance to the traveling and visiting public have been improved. I would say that never in the history of any country, and especially so in our history, has the public ever demanded, as they are demanding today, the improvement and development of historic sites and recreation areas, areas with natural phenomena and so forth.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and the House only a few moments ago spoke very decisively, did it not, by refusing to even consider legislation dealing with the expansion of a national park.

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes, and I think if the gentleman will permit me to continue further, I understand what happened to the bill this afternoon. There is much more to the history of that bill than came out on the floor today.

Mr. GROSS. Well, go ahead, but just do not take all of my time to make a speech in favor of this bill because I want some time to oppose it.

Mr. ASPINALL. My colleague did not ask me about this bill. My colleague asked me if I knew what took place this afternoon, and I was trying to answer him. The legislation on which we worked this afternoon has a long history.

Mr. GROSS. And so does Bent's Old Fort have a long history.

Mr. ASPINALL. And if I were to say what took place this afternoon, I would say that a part of our trouble arose because of the manner in which a part of our local treated the matter.

Mr. GROSS. I recall that the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KIRWAN, the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee that provides money for these projects, came into the well of the House and vigorously and effectively opposed that project earlier this afternoon saying he would be confronted, as with this project, appropriating money from now to doomsday. But let me ask this question: Why does not the State of Colorado operate this?

Mr. CHENOWETH. The State is not in a position to operate such a project.

Mr. GROSS. Why does not the State of Colorado go ahead and operate Bent's Old Fort?

Mr. CHENOWETH. It is felt that this site is of such historic value that it should be designated a national historic site. I personally feel it deserves this recognition.

Mr. GROSS. I am asking why the State of Colorado does not go ahead and operate Bent's Old Fort, charge admission fees and administer this project?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I do not know if there will be any admission fees charged in the future, but this may be possible. But the State of Colorado does not operate historic sites like this. This site belongs in the National Park Service.

Mr. GROSS. The State historical society is presently managing this old fort, is it not?

Mr. CHENOWETH. They own it, yes; and employ a caretaker.

Mr. GROSS. Why does not the State of Colorado go ahead and operate this site?

Mr. SAYLOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. I will be happy to answer the question. The gentleman was a Member of the House when we passed an act which called for acquiring national historical sites and buildings. As a result of the findings of that group, authorized by this Congress, they reported that Bent's Old Fort was one that should be a national historical site. As a result of that, this legislation was introduced. So it is here because the national agency which Congress created has recommended that it be made a national historical monument.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman favor all recommendations that are made in every survey that is authorized by Congress?

Mr. SAYLOR. I do not. The people who represent the State of Colorado first introduced this bill to carry out the recommendation. After full and complete hearings before our committee, this bill is before the House.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I do not want the gentleman to get the impression that the Colorado State Historical Society is going to give up all interest in Bent's Fort, because it is not. The society will continue to cooperate in every way possible.

Mr. GROSS. I understand, but the real cooperation will come from the taxpayers all over the country if this bill is passed.

May I ask the gentleman this question: You want 170 acres of additional land and you are asking $46,240 for land acquisition?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I mentioned three types of land. Some irrigated land, some pastureland, and some submarginal land.

Mr. GROSS. How much is irrigated?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I think about 54 acres; 48 acres are pastureland and about 48 acres are submarginal land. It is pretty well divided.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think $290 an acre is a pretty good price for that type of land?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Three hundred dollars an acre for irrigated land in this area is not an excessive amount.

Mr. GROSS. This is not all irrigated land.

Mr. CHENOWETH. No. I can assure the gentleman that regular prices will be paid for this land. This site is located just off of State Highway No. 194. The access road is there, but will of course have to be improved. The building of a new road is not involved.

Mr. GROSS. Who owns the 5.8 acres?

Mr. CHENOWETH. The Colorado State Historical Society.

Mr. GROSS. Is that society an official part of the State of Colorado?

Mr. CHENOWETH. The State historical society is by statute an educational institution of the State of Colorado.

Mr. GROSS. Is that the State?

Mr. CHENOWETH. It could be considered a part of the State of Colorado. It solicits members who pay annual dues, and reports are made to the Governor.

Mr. GROSS. Why could not the State of Colorado acquire this land?

Mr. CHENOWETH. That might be possible. The State might be able to help in the purchase of this land, if that should become necessary. However, I have information, as I said a moment ago, that leads me to believe that we can get this land donated and without any expense to the Government.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not want support from the Government? I will agree to support his bill if he will take out section 3.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman knows Federal funds will be necessary in the operation and maintenance of this site.

Mr. GROSS. That is why you want this bill. You want the Federal Government to take this deal over.

Mr. CHENOWETH. We want to preserve this national historic site.

Mr. GROSS. You want the Federal Government to take over the financial responsibility and I am opposed to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, this is not a new fight. I have some bruises as the result of an earlier fight, which was the same fight as this. If the Congress has come to the conclusion that the national park system is against the national interest, and the saving of money is more important than having a system of parks and monuments that commemorate the history of our country, then I have a proposition for the House. Perhaps the greatest wonder of this country is the Grand Canyon. If it is the taxpayers that we are so completely concerned about, I am sure that if we put this park on the open market we could get half a billion, or a billion dollars for it. This seems to be the direction we are sliding in.

I think we ought to look it squarely in the face. This is a little bill; it is not going to involve any great expenditure. I support it. I think it is soundly conceived. I think the park system itself is one of the glories of our country. I think if we ever reach the day when we cannot lend support to our national park system, when we are not willing to expand it, or to spend a little money on it, it will be a shame. I am a spender when it comes to parks; I am a spender when it comes to schools, and I am very shameless about it, I may say to the gentleman from Iowa. I will go along with the bill because I think this is the kind of thing that makes America glorious.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall acquire, on behalf of the United States, by gift, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, all right, title, and interest in and to such lands, together with any improvements thereon, as the Secretary may deem necessary for the purpose of establishing a national historic site at the site of Bent's Old Fort on the Old Santa Fe Trail, located in Otero County, Colorado, approximately seven miles east of La Junta, north of the Arkansas River.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "all right, title, and interest in and to such lands, together with any", and insert in lieu thereof "such lands, interests therein and".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) The property acquired under the provisions of the first section of this Act shall be designated as the Bent's Old Fort National Historic Site and shall be set aside as a public national memorial to commemorate the historic role played by such fort in the opening of the West. The National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall administer, protect, and develop such monument, subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935, as amended.

(b) In order to provide for the proper development and maintenance of such national historic site, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and maintain therein such markers, buildings, and other improvements, and such facilities for the care and accommodation of visitors, as he may deem necessary.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill H.R. 6851 and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EVINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6851) authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Bent's Old Fort near La Junta, Colo., had come to no resolution thereon.

ADDING CERTAIN LANDS TO CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NATIONAL MONUMENT, FLA.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8226) to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 8226, with Mr. EVINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule general debate is limited to 1 hour. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, which is the subject of this legislation, was established in 1924. Two small tracts of land, proposed to be acquired, will enhance the setting of the monument and will provide parking for visitors. It will also make possible the relocation of an inadequate existing street and permit restoration of part of the grounds.

In 1958 the Department of the Interior entered into an arrangement with Florida State officials and officials of the county and the city of St. Augustine to overcome traffic problems at the site. The arrangement makes it possible for the State and local agencies to proceed with an improvement program for the streets and for part of the bayfront property. Enactment of H.R. 8226 will permit acquisition of property standing in the way of this commendable development.

This small acreage of land—less than 3 acres—unfortunately is quite expensive. This land is in the heart of the city of St. Augustine, part of which is occupied by an old hotel and other buildings. The cost of acquiring the parcels of land is estimated at $606,000. The alternatives have been explored and no other feasible alternative has been offered.

Enactment of H.R. 8226 will allow the Government to carry out its obligation, as owner of the monument grounds, in achieving a solution to the present highway bottleneck. At the same time, the usefulness of the monument will be increased and the attractiveness to tourists will be improved.

We are dealing here with one of the most important historic sites in southeastern United States. It attracts hundreds of thousands of visitors from all parts of the country. The visitations in 1959 exceeded 450,000 persons. The admittance fees to the monument, together with income to the Treasury from concessions, in 1959 exceeded $66,000.

Enactment of this measure has been recommended by the Department of the Interior and amendments have been suggested. These amendments have been adopted by the committee. I recommend favorable consideration of the measure.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, many of you who have visited St. Augustine recently will realize that traffic congestion, in the area of our historic monument in that city, is probably as bad as anywhere in the State of Florida. To relieve the traffic congestion, it has been suggested by our Park Service that a tract of land in the immediate vicinity of the monument be acquired, in order to make it possible for the tremendous number of visitors who are coming to that area to find places to park and to visit our national monument.

Now, as is always customary when the Federal Government or any State or local agency acquires a tract of land in a concentrated metropolitan area, the price is high. The owners do not like to part with their property, but in the service to many the rights of a few must be subjugated, and that is the situation that the committee finds itself in today.

There are several owners of the tract of land which is involved, and it is necessary for the Federal Government, if they expect to continue to have adequate use of our facilities at St. Augustine, to acquire the additional tract of land.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, following the statement of our chairman, that the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs differs a great deal from some of the other standing committees of the House in that they meet and have sessions 5 days a week, every week that the House is in session. It is necessary, because over the years the history of this Congress and other Congresses will show that this commiteee turns out between 20 and 25 percent of all of the legislation that is passed by any Congress—with the exception of private bills coming from the Committee on the Judiciary—handling such myriad of phases as Indian affairs, territories, and insular possessions, mines and mining, public domain—which includes all of our national parks which were created out of the public domain—and irrigation and reclamation. The work of this committee is tremendous. And, I want to say that in the years that I have been a member of this committee, all of the chairmen from both parties are to be commended for the fact that if a member from any area of the country introduced a bill which affected his district, there has always been a conscientious effort by the chairman and the subchairmen, as well as the members of the committee, to see that the bills are given a hearing, that reports are received from the departments downtown, and that the matter is brought to the floor of the House. And, it is the purpose of this committee to see to it that legislation is presented and that the House work its will.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not a fact that every bill that our committee has reported to the House for consideration has met all of the criteria under which we operate?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. And when legislation is brought up here, if the Members of the House are not in accord, that is the time for them to express their position.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is the time. If it does not meet with their approval, that is the time for the House to work its will, and that is an example of the legislative process that our committee, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, gives to the House in order to prove that it is a real democratic organization and that it has a chance to work its will.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, this bill simply implements an agreement made by the city commissioners of the city of St. Augustine, the county commissioners of St. Johns County, and the Florida State Road Department, with the Department of the Interior. It covers the acquisition of slightly less than 3 acres of land adjacent to the fort which is the historical feature of the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument.

The purpose of this agreement, and of the land acquisition, is to permit the restoration of certain historic areas of the fort grounds and to facilitate traffic and parking conditions for the people from all over the country who visit the fort each year.

In addition to furthering the Mission 66 program, these improvements will make an important contribution to a forthcoming event which is of the greatest historical significance to every American. In 1965 will be celebrated the 400th anniversary of the founding of beautiful St. Augustine, the oldest city in the United States. It is highly desirable that H.R. 8226 be enacted so that the restoration and improvements can be completed by that year, when it is estimated that many times the number of visitors to the Castillo de San Marcos, now running nearly half a million a year, will make the pilgrimage to the lovely and historic city of St. Augustine.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this bill be approved.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the Members of the House that this is one of the very few bills where the State of Florida is asking that a historical monument and park be set aside. Usually the State has acquired these lands itself. For instance, with reference to the Everglades National Park, we acquired the land necessary to establish that park and turned it over free and clear to the Federal Government. This is one instance where the economic situation of the city itself does not permit that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I should like to address a question to the gentleman in charge of the bill. Approximately how much longer will consideration be given to this bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. I should expect about 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I should like to repeat one thing that has been pointed out and that is that the income from this monument by way of admissions and concessions runs about $66,000 a year to the Federal Government. That is more money than it takes to operate the facility. So this is one national monument that pays a profit to the Federal Government.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, this legislation—H.R. 8226—provides for the acquisition of two small parcels of land to the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument at a cost of $606,000. The author of this bill, the gentleman from Florida, has been industrious in his efforts to get favorable consideration of this measure. He made a very able presentation before our subcommittee in explaining his bill.

Testimony before the Subcommittee on Public Lands made it clear that there is at present no parking space of any kind at the fort, and heavy traffic is causing a serious problem.

One of the properties to be acquired is now occupied by an old hotel. This building, of frame construction, some 75 years old, is presently for sale and can be acquired at this time with the consent of the owner. It is the site value of the real estate, rather than the value added by the building itself, that gives this property a rather high value.

The highway that runs past the monument is U.S. Highway No. 1. There is a highway bypass to avoid traffic

congestion in the city of St. Augustine, but there is still a great deal of heavy traffic going past the monument.

The Board of County Commissioners of St. Johns County and the City Commission of St. Augustine have adopted resolutions favoring the actions proposed to be taken through this legislation.

As a part of its obligation, as a landowner in the city of St. Augustine, the Federal Government, as recommended by the Department of the Interior, has an obligation to correct the situation, and I therefore recommend that the measure be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to procure in such manner as he may deem to be in the public interest, including procurement with funds which may be appropriated therefor, the following described lands, or interests therein, situated in the city of Saint Augustine, Saint Johns County, Florida, for addition to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument:

AREA A

Starting at a point in the seawall of Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, which is the southeast corner of the present Federal reservation; thence westerly 81.86 feet, more or less, along the existing boundary of Castillo de San Marcos National Monument to the intersection of said line with the west right-of-way line of Bay Street, the point of beginning;

Thence southerly along the west right-of-way line of Bay Street 143.5 feet, more or less, to the intersection of said right-of-way line with the north right-of-way line of Cuna Street which is the southeast corner of block 1; thence westerly 194.0 feet, more or less, along the north right-of-way line of Cuna Street to the intersection of said right-of-way line with the easterly right-of-way line of Charlotte Street, which is the southwest corner of block 1;

Thence northerly along the east right-of-way line of Herrea Way 25.0 feet, more or less, to a point where said right-of-way line is intersected by a prolongation of the northerly right-of-way line of Cuna Street;

Thence westerly across Charlotte Street to the northwest corner of Charlotte and Cuna Streets, which is the southeast corner of block 7;

Thence northerly along the west right-of-way line of Charlotte Street 57.0 feet; more or less, to a point;

Thence northwesterly 28.3 feet, more or less, to a point located 20 feet west from the west right-of-way line of Charlotte Street on the southerly property line of land now or formerly owned by Mrs. J. C. Windsor, being lots 13 and 14, block 7;

Thence westerly along the said southerly property line of land now or formerly owned by Mrs. J. C. Windsor 149.0 feet, more or less, to a point on the easterly property line of land now or formerly owned by Blanche L. Serveau, being lot 10, block 7;

Thence northerly 88.5 feet, more or less, along said easterly property line of land now or formerly owned by Blanche L. Serveau to a point on the southerly property line of land now or formerly owned by Mary Peck, being lot 18, block 7;

Thence westerly along said southerly property line of land now or formerly owned by Mary Peck 125.5 feet, more or less, to the easterly property line of land now or formerly owned by Colonial St. Augustine, Inc., being lot 5, block 7;

Thence northerly along said property line of land now or formerly owned by Colonial St. Augustine, Inc., 42.0 feet, more or less, to the southerly property line of land now or formerly owned by Frank Upchurch, being lot 4, block 7;

Thence easterly along said southerly property line of land now or formerly owned by Frank Upchurch, 50.0 feet, more or less, to the westerly property line of land now or formerly owned by Mary Peck;

Thence northerly along said property line of land now or formerly owned by Mary Peck and along said property line prolonged 149.0 feet, more or less, to a point on the southerly property line of land now or formerly owned by F. Victor Rahner, fragment of lot 1, block 7;

Thence westerly along said southerly property line of land now or formerly owned by F. Victor Rahner 40.0 feet, more or less, to a point on the easterly property line of land now or formerly owned by the R. L. Parks estate, portion of lot 1, block 7;

Thence northerly along said easterly property line of land now or formerly owned by the R. L. Parks estate 95.0 feet, more or less, to the intersection of said property line with the southerly right-of-way line of Fort Alley which point is the northeast corner of lot 1, block 7, and the northwest corner of lot 21, block 7;

Thence northerly on a prolongation of said right-of-way line 14.0 feet, more or less, to a point on the north right-of-way line of Fort Alley;

Thence westerly 5.0 feet, more or less, to the point on said right-of-way line which is the southwest corner of lot 5, block 6, and the southeast corner of lot 4, block 6;

Thence northerly 148.0 feet, more or less, along the lot line which is common to lot 5, block 6, and lots 2 and 4, block 6, and said line prolonged to a point on the southerly property line of land now or formerly owned by the Gulf Oil Company;

Thence westerly along the southerly line of said land now or formerly owned by the Gulf Oil Company and its prolongation to a point 60 feet eastward of the easterly right-of-way line of Saint George Street;

Thence northerly along a line parallel to and 60 feet eastward of the said easterly right-of-way line of Saint George Street a distance of 95.0 feet, more or less, to a point in the present boundary of the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument;

Thence easterly along the said present boundary of the monument a distance of 107.98 feet to a marble cornerstone, being the northeast corner of said block 6; thence continuing along the said present boundary of the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in a general easterly and southeasterly direction to the point of beginning, containing in all about 2.45 acres of land.

AREA B

Beginning at a corner in the existing boundary of the present Castillo de San Marcos National Monument which is the northeasterly corner of Orange Street located about 20.0 feet west of the city gates;

Thence westerly along the northerly right-of-way line of Orange Street, which also is the present boundary of the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, a distance of about 180.0 feet to a point 2.0 feet east of the east wall of the school dental clinic building;

Thence in a northerly direction on a line parallel to and 2.0 feet east of said building wall a distance of 75.0 feet, more or less, to a point in the north boundary of the historic "Lines";

Thence easterly 180.0 feet, more or less, to a westerly corner of the present boundary of the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument lying northwest of the city gates;

Thence southerly along the present boundary of the national monument 75.0 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning; containing in all an area of about 0.31 acre of land.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 25, strike out the words "feet, more or less, to" and insert in lieu thereof the words "feet to".

Page 3, line 9, strike out the word "Serveau," and insert in lieu thereof "Cerveau,".

Page 3, line 13, strike out the word "Serveau" and insert in lieu thereof "Cerveau".

Page 4, line 21, strike out the word "right-of-way" and insert in lieu thereof "property".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I just wish, if it is possible, to impart a little information to the gentleman that I just acquired which is to the effect, coming from those in charge of the bill, that the passage of this bill would bring into the Government and not take out certain moneys; did you hear that?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I heard it. But I wonder, if the return is going to be six hundred and some odd thousand dollars? Does the gentleman know that? That is what intrigues me at the moment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, as always, I was relying on the gentleman's statement and I will have to continue to do so as much as I dislike to question.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know whether we are going to recover the $606,000 in Federal funds that the bill provides and as stated in the report is being requested? How long will it take to recapture that—does the gentleman have any idea?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; I have not. As I said, I was relying on the statement from the other side, and if the gentleman contradicts it, I will have to reserve my opinion, of course.

Mr. GROSS. Let us wait until we get the answer from the gentleman on the other side who, I am sure, knows.

Mr. HERLONG. I will say to the gentleman, I cannot say exactly how long it will take to get the $600,000 back, but this will take in more money than the cost of operation involved. More money will come in by reason of the fact that more people can get there and see this facility, if this other area is taken care of. I will say to the gentleman, if he does not think that the preservation of this monument, the oldest of its kind and the best example of a medevial fort in the United States in the oldest city in the United States, is not worth something, then I recommend that the gentleman vote against the bill and do so enthusiastically. On the other hand, I believe that it is worth something and that is why I am in favor of it.

Mr. GROSS. There is no danger of losing this historic site at St. Augustine. If this bill is not enacted, it will still be there; is that not correct?

Mr. HERLONG. St. Augustine will still be there, but in not nearly as good shape as it would be if this is taken care of.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; this adds to, but it does not take from; is that not correct? The failure to enact this bill would not destroy the historic site that is presently there. It would still be there. In other words, this would add to it and, perhaps, a little more; is that not correct?

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HERLONG. What we are trying to do is to fix it so that more people can see it and take advantage of it. That is exactly the purpose, and I think this bill would accomplish that purpose. I do not think there is any question about it. I do not believe the gentleman would deny that.

Mr. GROSS. No, I have been pondering this afternoon how I could promote some project out in my district and get some Federal money. Can the gentleman from Michigan suggest some way that I can get a historic site in my district?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am very happy indeed to know that the gentleman is consistent and that he is trying now to make an effort to save the country a little money. Yes; you can help me get a monument at St. Ignace. Father Marquette is buried there. If you want to go along with that, we can save there. Or you can get the lock at Sault Ste. Marie changed from Blatnik to Vic Knox. I do not know why they ever named the locks after Blatnik of Minnesota. He did not have anything to do with it. Or you could name the bridge across the straits Knox.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was recognized for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. To help the gentleman out, I understand Mr. Benson made a speech in Iowa one time.

Mr. GROSS. Please do not bring that up.

Mr. HAYS. That was a good thing for the Democratic Party. I would be glad to help build a monument to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has again expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) When title to the lands, or interests therein, described in the first section of this Act is acquired by the Secretary of the Interior, such lands or interests so acquired shall become a part of the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument.

(b) All laws, rules, and regulations applicable to the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument shall be applicable with respect to such lands or interests acquired by the Secretary pursuant to this Act.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill H.R. 8226 and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EVINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8226) to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida, had come to no resolution thereon.

FALSE CONFIDENCE IN FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we must face the fact that the experiment of insuring the public's savings, through the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, has proven a failure under the present management. The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation is riding on the coattail of Government to give the public confidence, a false confidence, under its present management.

Over its 25 years of operation, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation has only about $305 million reserves to insure over $50 billion of savings. Of this $305 million, the Insurance Corporation has committed over 25 percent to cover a false emergency created by its own unwarranted acts, leaving three-quarters of its assets to protect the remaining nearly 4,000 savings and loan associations. Its own reserves at the most are less than three-quarters of 1 percent of the amounts insured.

A select committee of Congress in a prior investigation of the Federal Insurance Corporation stated:

> The action here complained of was not only a disservice to the Government, but a greater disservice to the people for the protection of whose rights and affairs our Government exists. Should the time come when our Government is incapable of discharging that fundamental function, it must cease to exist in the form and for the purpose for which the Government is identified. The necessity for unquestioned rectitude of purpose, and sound, just, and impartial administration of governmental endeavor is paramount.

Over its years of operation, there has been a continuous pressure and grasping for more and more power from this agency. Its ultimate aim appears to be to seize and confiscate the peoples' wealth, under police powers, without the right of the aggrieved to redress. This bureaucratic insurance agency, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, claims it is above and beyond the courts, it is a law unto itself.

My esteemed colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT], Republican, in the April 28, 1960, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, reported there is "the invisible and faceless bureaucracy operating through boards, bureaus, and commissions, so that our citizens are governed by people they have never seen, never voted for, cannot recall through any process of law, and who administer more administrative law than statute law." Mr. UTT's statement seems to fit the operations of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

Two major congressional investigations have attempted to ferret out its fallacies. The Special Select Committee of the House of Representatives, headed by the gentleman from Virginia, the Honorable HOWARD SMITH, found the acts of the Home Loan Bank Board, the alter ego of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, to be vindictive, capricious, and a disservice to the public because of its acts of seizing the Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association in 1946, as a retaliatory plenary penalty.

The Long Beach Association shareholders sued for the recovery of their property. The Insurance Corporation evaded its liabilities by asserting it was beyond the law. It asserted that there was no designated agent upon whom valid service could be made, that it could pick and choose at its own whims which claims it would accept or reject.

By 1949 the shareholders were vigorously pressing to procure an accounting for multimillion dollars of property seized by this Government bureau and never returned. The Home Loan Bank Board and its alter ego, Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, responded by attempting to again reseize the Long Beach Association for liquidation. A special committee of the Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives under the chairmanship of the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, commenced investigation of the Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and its various alter egos.

A Deputy Attorney General was placed on the witness stand before this second congressional committee in 1951, and admitted that the so-called charges against the association management upon which the attempted liquidation was to be based were for "horse-trading purposes." An admission that spurious charges were made against the association management to trade the association and its shareholders out of their claim against the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. Spurious charges to blackmail our citizens out of multimillions of dollars of their wrongfully seized and confiscated property.

Congress, following such investigations, enacted laws to prevent ever again such disaster happening to our citizens. The Housing Act of 1954 was to be a bill of rights for savings and loan associations. Such 1954 act set up an orderly judicial procedure to settle bona fide disputes between supervisory authority

and the savings associations, and established strict procedure to force the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to designate an agent upon whom court process could be served. The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation responded by first attempting to divorce itself from any supervisory control, but Congress refused.

The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation then responded by attempting to gain summary police powers over all insured associations, both State and Federal, including the rights to control who shall manage each association. Congress again refused.

The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and its alter ego, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, then responded by adopting rules and regulations giving itself exclusive police and seizure powers over all Federal savings and loan associations. These self-adopted, self-serving Federal regulations propose to deny the courts the right to intervene while the agents of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, its alter ego, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, seize, refuse receipts for negotiable assets, confiscate private property, misrepresent and deceive the public, and intimidate our citizens out of their savings.

Mr. Speaker, my investigation shows the latest seizure of the Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association on April 22, 1960, has proven the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and its alter ego, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, to be guilty of these vicious acts of dishonesty and misconduct.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board adopted a resolution declaring a so-called emergency. A self-declared emergency was necessary even under their own rules to justify summary seizure. An analysis of the resolution with the fact demonstrates it is fraudulent and adopted in language intended to conceal the facts and deceive the people.

For example, the resolution charged the Long Beach association did not pay the premium for insurance of accounts since 1948.

The Home Loan Bank Board had knowledge of and suppressed the evidence that such premiums were paid into the U.S. courts pursuant to law, and that such court payment was necessary, for to have done otherwise might have forfeited the just claims of the association and its shareholders against the Insurance Corporation.

The second charge asserted the association had not purchased stock in the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco as required by law.

Again the Federal Home Loan Bank Board had knowledge of and suppressed the fact that the $800,000 payment for such stock had been deposited in the U.S. court as a legal tender pursuant to law. Such bank board further suppressed the fact that the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco was the recipient of U.S. Government bonds confiscated from the Long Beach association during the first 1946 seizure, and that such bank held a rigged and collusive conversion of such bonds to its own use in violation of law. Litigation is pending for the recovery of nearly $10 million from such bank by the Long Beach association. The other charges specified by the Federal home loan bank to establish an emergency are equally without merit and just as deceiving and misleading to the innocent public.

Armed with a certified copy of a Federal Home Loan Bank Board order, 44 auditors, accountants, examiners, and assorted personnel moved in on the Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association, Friday evening, April 22, 1960, with a seizure order. Despite the listing of false charges in the order, the avowed purpose for the seizure was to prevent the shareholders and management of the association from converting it into a State savings and loan association that would be free from the arbitrary and capricious abuse of authority and administration of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and its alter ego the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

In an apparent attempt to justify the seizure of the Long Beach Association, the Home Loan Bank Board sent their spokesman, J. Alston Adams, regional supervisor, to brainwash and mislead the public with statements to the newspapers. Such statements were issued and printed in the press that "we couldn't get an examination in his place—Long Beach Federal—for 6 years up to 1958."

This statement is a deliberate falsehood. Adams, in his official capacity, knew of the numerous and extensive examinations during the years 1953, 1956, and 1957. I have been informed that each of these examinations extended over many weeks or months, one of which lasted 5 months.

Again through the press, Adams in describing the seizure stated:

> It took from 5 minutes to 8 Friday night to 5 a.m. Saturday to issue receipts for everything.

The truth is that at the hearing in Federal court on May 15, 1960, to increase the bond of C. E. Ault, the Board's appointed supervisor, sworn testimony revealed that the association's officers were able to procure receipts numbering less than 10, which covered less than one-half of 1 percent of the assets seized.

I am of the opinion that the refusal of receipts was intentional and brutal, evidenced by the fact that there were eventually an admitted 74 bureaucratic agents swarming over the place, intimidating and hindering association employees from making an inventory by threats of criminal prosecution if they did not leave the premises.

The taking of property without giving a receipt is a violation of law, a violation for which each and every one of these agents should be prosecuted, together with their superiors.

Adams further stated through the press that the line of customers withdrawing their funds "was orderly—nobody got excited." Another falsehood by Adams. The fact is there were over 1,000 people milling about. Long Beach police rushed 15 extra policemen to help set up barricades and rope off a section to contain the crowd. Armed guards were at the doors, letting only two or three in at a time, behind closed doors with drawn blinds. Elderly people were forced to stand in line for 4 and 5 hours. Some fainted, some had heart attacks, ambulances were called.

Approximately $40 million has been withdrawn. Over $700,000 in earnings lost to these elderly people. This is not a pleasant situation to contemplate when you consider Mr. Adams in his "other hat" is also president of the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco. The bank that converted to its own use over $5 million in U.S. Government bearer bonds, which in fact belonged to the Long Beach association.

Litigation for the 1946 seizure had progressed to the point that the San Francisco bank might have to pay some $10 million or more for its frauds. The Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco is an arm of the Home Loan Bank Board, the alter ego for the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. It seems when one agency cannot get by with illegally confiscating the people's savings, the others rush in to perpetrate the fraud.

Mr. Speaker, I remember the flouting of a congressional subpena by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. It was claimed a middle western association was insolvent, and it was seized. The Insurance Corporation admitted making a profit out of the liquidation but would not produce its records to show who did not get paid or the necessity for the liquidation. Congress to this day does not know.

Complaints of the abuse of this agency are mounting from all parts of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this all brings us to the point that Congress has authorized the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to call upon the U.S. Treasurer for $750 million in the event of an emergency. An emergency to be determined by this same group who have exhibited their dishonesty and incompetence and who have flouted Congress and the courts.

Mr. Speaker, Congress would be derelict in its duty if it sits idly by and exposes this huge sum of taxpayers' money to the same type of mishandling through a trumped-up emergency.

Congress appropriated the funds to protect the people. It is our obligation to do so. It is not our intention to be a part of a fraud upon the people.

Is it not possible that private insurers, who do not flout our courts, can do an able and honest job for the public?

Would not this emergency fund be better administered where court review is assured? The record is compelling that Congress withdraw its support from the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation which has so flagrantly abused its fiduciary trust, and support private enterprise in the best interests of the public welfare.

ALFRED H. KIRCHHOFER

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to call the attention of the House to an award which has been made to one of Buffalo's distinguished citizens, Mr. Alfred H. Kirchhofer, editor of the Buffalo Evening News.

The board of regents of Canisius College in Buffalo, N.Y., conferred its third annual distinguished citizen's achievement award upon Mr. Kirchhofer. The recipients of this award are leaders who, in addition to earning the respect and admiration of their colleagues in their profession or industry, have been outstanding for their personal contributions of time and effort toward the progress and enhancement of their community. They symbolize the vision, drive, comprehension, and resoluteness which have contributed greatly to the progress of America.

Mr. Kirchhofer became managing editor of the Buffalo Evening News in 1927 and editor in 1956. He is executive vice president and a director of the Buffalo Evening News, Inc., and president and a director of WBEN, Inc. In addition, he is a member of the advisory board of the American Press Institute, and also a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors which he headed in 1937. He was president of the American Council on Education for Journalism from 1950 to 1952.

In 1956, Mr. Kirchhofer received the University of Missouri School of Journalism medal for distinguished service in journalism and, 2 years later, a similar award from the Syracuse University School of Journalism. Last year he was elected to the National Journalism Hall of Honor at the University of Missouri.

Mr. Kirchhofer is a member of the State Society of Newspaper Editors and the Syracuse University School of Journalism council of editors and publishers.

Over the years Mr. Kirchhofer has been extremely active in the affairs of our community. He is a director of Crippled Children's Camps, Inc.; secretary of the board of visitors of Roswell Park Memorial Institute; and a director of Millard Fillmore Hospital. He is also a trustee of the Buffalo YMCA; a member of the State Defense Council; a director of the Buffalo and Erie County Tuberculosis Association; the Buffalo chapter, American Red Cross; the Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra Society; and a member of the council of the University of Buffalo.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following commendation delivered by the Very Reverend James J. McGinley, S.J., president of Canisius College:

COMMENDATION

"The Canisius College board of regents with other eminent citizens honors Alfred H. Kirchhofer at dinner and awards to him the Distinguished Citizen's Achievement Plaque, May 9, 1960, the Buffalo Club."

There is a Jesuit university in the heart of a large metropolis whose exterior wall has an inscription:

> "St. Bernard loved the valleys,
> Benedict the hills;
> Francis loved the little towns—
> Ignatius sought great cities
> To house his caps and gowns."

Canisius College is in phase with this 400-year tradition followed by Ignatian institutions of higher learning. It therefore finds itself at the busy intersection of Main and Jefferson, Buffalo, N.Y. It is part of the very fabric of this community, in other words. It breathes the same air, rides the same buses, enjoys talking about the same weather, frets at the same problems, faces the same worries, enjoys the same triumphs, obeys the same traffic lights, and in general has the same hopes and fears as Buffalo. In fact, Canisius College has been doing all of this right here for 90 years—an independent institution for collegiate education.

It is, of course, a college. Education is its business, albeit nonprofit in fact and theory. This means its relation to its community is not that of a remote ivory tower, wherein learning is sought in cloistered and comfortable abstraction from the sounds and the sights of every day living. No; we are not a retreat from things Buffalo. In fact, we are not withdrawn at all—if I may borrow from the psychologists.

On the other hand, an educational institution cannot be a pollster's booth armed only with questionnaires and immersed only in current events, opinions, facts. Socially, intellectually, and ideologically, it cannot go in for that degree of "togetherness" which would efface its own distinct personality as a purveyor of real education. It has to hold for tradition, for the universals, for the timeless and even spaceless judgments and values. It has to preserve, add to and pass on to succeeding generations an intellectual heritage. That heritage, perforce, is an abiding and stable thing, which transcends the current scene in part.

Now somewhere between the ivory tower and the pollster's booth, somewhere between that withdrawal contemplation unreferred to life's framework and that overexhilarated "togetherness" wherein an educational institution loses its raison d'etre, somewhere between the two extremes, is the formula of Canisius College.

Our board of regents knows this philosophy well. They know how keen the college is for civic consciousness, awareness, being part of the community we all love. But they also know that we are awfully serious about right education for the right reasons and the consequent demands in time, energy, and principle.

Similarly, the selection committee of the board of regents of Canisius College is well groomed in this basic philosophy. This committee, in conjunction with the entire board, was commissioned to face up to the task of selecting a distinguished citizen to receive the annual achievement plaque. By mandate of the board of regents, March 24, 1958:

"The gentleman so designated shall have earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues in his chosen profession or industry. He shall be accounted as preeminent in his personal contribution of time and effort toward the progress and enhancement of the community with which he is associated."

Now, Mr. Kirchhofer, this committee selected you, unanimoulsy and in the name of the entire board. I cannot pay higher tribute to you. Yet, I do wish to add that I approved their selection, immediately upon receipt of their decision.

The words inscribed on this plaque tell you why, partly but permanently.

Let me add only this. There is an affinity between a good newspaper and a good educational institution. Each must serve but also lead a community, voluntarily. Neither can be true to its commitment and also indulge in the quest for sheer popularity. Both must be open to frank evaluation and criticism daily. Neither can become complacent and stay alive. Each demands concentration by all coworkers and often requires a type of discipline and self-denial which borders on the ascetic. Each must blend the new and the old, the local and the distant. Each must make responsible decisions on what to feature and in what proportions. Above all, each in its area of responsibility must be consistent, truthful, and convinced.

Your achievement in your profession and in this community is very real. The regents of Canisius College tonight single out and award you for your record of achievement, very definitely. And I am pleased wholeheartedly to approve, to applaud, and also to accept an honor which thereby comes to Canisius College herself on this historic night. Since we try to produce excellence, we are surely glad to recognize it.

Thank you and God bless you.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE DEPRESSED AREAS BILL

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for I minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the President's veto on Friday, May 13, 1960, of the area redevelopment bill passed by both Houses of Congress repudiates the people's will for the second time and threatens the healthy adjustment of our community to the changing character of our economy. It represents a conservative position turned reactionary. The President denies American distressed communities in this country the benefits he has urged us to lavish bountifully on other countries. In the name of economy he exhibits callous disregard of the pleas of Americans for help to become self-supporting. The President says his heart bleeds for a point 4 program for the depressed areas of the world but he vetoes a point 4 program for America.

The veto message is a denial of an every claim to statesmanship. The rate of unemployment in this country continues to stand at 5 percent. In my district and many others it stands at 20 percent. This is an intolerably high rate, which the President wants us to accept as normal. We cannot and must not submit to this gloomy prospect and become inured to allow such human suffering.

Those of us who have promoted the area redevelopment legislation have sought to address ourselves to the basic difficulties causing the high volume of long-term unemployment and the great waste of human and capital resources of this country, by converting the specific distressed and underdeveloped areas from stagnant and declining regions into active centers of healthy economic

activity. We hoped to minimize the need for general measures of an emergency nature designed to change our national economic institutions. The constructive course of action is being denied by the President. He fears Federal aid, he insists that communities which are flat on their back should lift themselves by their own bootstraps at a time when they have exhausted their financial resources in the pursuit of local economic development.

This denial of the right to attack specific causes of difficulties will make it necessary for all of us to urge stronger and broader and national measures for the entire economy. We must lower the national level of unemployment and make the recovery movement strong enough to reach even the depressed areas.

The President's criticism of the qualifications for benefits and the funds in the bill are disingenuous. Those of us who have made efforts to negotiate an understanding with the administration know that opposition stems not from disapproval of specific provisions, but from rejection of the entire idea of area redevelopment legislation. Secretary of Commerce Mueller has made it clear to Republican Members of the House of Representatives that he is opposed to the legislation no matter what concessions we would make. Under Secretary of Commerce Ray and Under Secretary of Labor O'Connell, in meeting with Republican Congressmen, have made it clear that the administration would not compromise their own bill and have intimated that they were not even sold on their own proposal. Despite the informal encouragement from officials of the Department of Labor and the Secretary, they have repeatedly indicated their inability to convert the Secretary of Commerce and that Department.

Raymond J. Saulnier, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, has never endorsed action in this field nor taken the interest that his predecessor Arthur Burns had. The Secretary of Agriculture and his Under Secretary have been handing out news releases to reporters on the accomplishments of the rural redevelopment program repeating the same isolated illustrations of improvements, but have never told of the disillusionment of local committees. Their recommendations for action following their own extensive studies of local rural needs could not be implemented for lack of funds. They have been given advice and studies but not the means with which to implement their programs.

Instead of seeking a genuine program for economic rehabilitation of distressed areas, the administration has sought to enlarge on the letter-writing activities of the existing agencies, which have not met the needs of these areas. Economic distress has persisted both in urban and rural areas. "Jawboning" and "penpushing" do not rebuild communities or help economic distress.

While the President is boasting of the improvement in the conditions of employment between March and April 1960, reports from the Bureau of Employment Security show that in 28 of the major labor-market areas the total insured unemployed increased between these months. Four other labor markets showed no change in the number of insured unemployed, and the remaining 104 areas reported some decline. In a considerable number of instances the drop was due to the exhaustion of unemployment benefits.

Congress has just passed legislation for foreign aid to underdeveloped and distressed foreign nations at the request of the President. We have recognized that urban areas in Europe which are adversely affected by economic change and by loss of industries through the integration of the European market should be helped. We are giving money to agencies which finance unemployment insurance and resettlement and retraining allowances to Europeans displaced by the closing of mines, textile mills, and other industries. We have approved of area-redevelopment legislation in England, France, Holland, Belgium, Sweden, Norway, and Italy, but the administration refuses such action on behalf of American workers and communities. Our foreign aid bill will grant wheat to hungry India. It will furnish money to Pakistan to help their underdeveloped areas. We are financing the uplifting of Iran and their depressed people. We are providing schooling for Latin Americans who lack vocational training. We are helping other nations build public facilities, as they are prerequisites to industrial development. We boast of the factories we have financed in Latin America through the Import-Export Bank and the factories of Africa and Asia which are to be built by the International Development Corporation. Are not American underdeveloped areas, industrial and rural, equally entitled to aid from fellow Americans?

The President in his veto message on S. 722 seeks to absolve himself of the responsibility for our national failure to have area redevelopment legislation—the cause for this gap in our structure of law is the President himself. He has vetoed two bills passed by Congress. He has insisted on the letter of his own proposals. None of his spokesmen has shown any inclination to adjust the differences with the majority of the Congress.

In his new veto message, he remained adamant on excluding rural counties. The alternative he offers is the rural development program and the Small Business Administration. The first has depended solely on voluntary efforts in pilot counties—the second is designed to help small businesses with some local funds. But the problem of these communities is to build a new economic base for economic redevelopment so that they may become advantageous sites for industrial development. They require grants and loans for public facilities, for without them the most depressed will be unable to lift themselves from their desperate levels of poverty. They are in need of commercial and industrial buildings for economic expansion—these the President denies them.

The other stated objections in the message are conjuries of a man unfriendly to the entire idea, rather than one determined to perfect a piece of legislation. The President and every legislator knows that the Administrator appointed by the President will be able to exercise the judgment as to the communities which should enjoy priorities in receiving the aids provided by the act and the type of assistance which best fits the area. We presume the President will appoint a fairminded, responsible citizen dedicated to the realization of the purposes of the act. Moreover, he will be guided by an advisory citizen's committee fully conscious of its purposes. The objection that the truly desperate communities will not secure the assistance is one without foundation.

The President's fundamental lack of understanding of the needs of the depressed urban communities is revealed in the other objections. The communities "desperately" in need of a "full measure of assistance" do not have the financial resources to build local facilities essential in many instances to economic recovery. The citizenry and banks in these areas have drained their private funds through repeated efforts at local development. These communities have used funds from the State loan organization, even though they have received awards for outstanding effort and economic development. The results have not been sufficient to graduate them out of the depressed state. They now call for Federal aid and the President is telling them to go back and use their own resources which have been exhausted.

The President objects to some communities being on the eligible list though they may not need Federal assistance. The fact is, that only communities with 18 or more months of unemployment of 6 or more percent in the last 2 years, and currently suffering from 6 or more percent unemployment will be so eligible. In a number of instances this high level of unemployment has persisted for several years. As soon as the rate of unemployment falls below 6 percent they become ineligible for benefits. Should unemployment drop below this level while the applications are being considered the communities will become ineligible. None of these communities have suffered only temporary economic difficulties. The high level of unemployment has persisted for long periods and their economies are in permanent difficulties for which they must seek a solution. Federal assistance will not be "squandered" in the terms of the President's callous words, but become the base on which a constructive planning and redevelopment effort can be built.

The U.S. Department of Commerce has resisted and fought area redevelopment legislation for the last 6 years. Its Secretaries have been opponents and are out of sympathy with the provision of the bill. It is our conviction that the Department did frustrate the administration of the act and prevent its realization should the law be entrusted to it. Moreover, the Department, unfortunately, has no experience in this area and has no personnel qualified to administer such a law.

The administration is repudiating every promise the President made beginning with a speech he delivered in 1952 in which he promised aid to depressed areas. He is turning the back of the Federal Government on the people of the distressed communities of the United States.

In the election of 1958 the American people elected a host of new Democratic Congressmen from distressed communities, replacing former Republican Members who had fought this legislation. The American people will again define their attitude at the forthcoming election.

This administration has abandoned its slogan, "Progressive and Conservative," and turned reactionary.

I promise, Mr. Speaker, as I did 2 years ago when the President vetoed a similar bill, that I will introduce the depressed areas bill in the House on the 1st minute of the 1st day of the next session of Congress in January and I am sure Senator DOUGLAS will do the same in the Senate. There will be a different President in the White House and I am positive we will have our bill before next Easter.

A PROPHETIC LETTER FROM BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it is dramatic timing indeed that a friend of mine should today receive a rather remarkable letter from a young engineer in East Germany. The letter, written just before the summit meeting, is not only prophetic; but there is a real lesson here for all of us. Indeed, this is not just a letter—it is a document of nourishing wisdom written by an articulate, idealistic young man living behind the Iron Curtain. I want to quote a few excerpts:

I am writing this to you the day before the summit meeting, but when you will have received this letter, the failure of the meeting will be an accomplished fact. The reason is, of course, that the conditions brought forth by Big Brother are quite unacceptable to the West, and Big Brother probably does not even want them accepted.

Everything that the Communists have done during the last few years with regard to Germany has tended to deepen the clash between East and West. The consciousness of the hopelessness of it all is continually with me, and all the time I think that life could be so wonderful if—well, I suppose it is rather selfish of me to keep talking of our own little worries, but then, you see, to us it is the most important thing in the world. As things look now, the final separation of this city will not be delayed very much longer. God knows what will happen then.

I am glad to see that people in the United States are slowly becoming aware of the fact that the East is making enormous and successful efforts to outrace you in all fields. The sputniks are not just a chance success in one field. They are symptomatic of what is going on in all fields of science and technology.

As long as the West and the United States keep playing and fooling around the way they have been doing and are still doing, they have not the slightest chance of survival. You must not be deceived by the apparent misery of everyday life in the countries behind the Iron Curtain. This does not count.

You will not win an inch of ground with fancy food, elaborate household gadgets, and streamlined private cars. I admire your country for these real achievements. I should like to share them. I should like everyone in the world to enjoy them, and I wish and trust you will go on having and developing the individual's maximum enjoyment of life. But do not think that because in this respect the other side is miles behind that they have a worse chance in the world contest. Their chance is better, because by economizing on their people's backs, they can afford to concentrate on national strength. The United States is developed enough to do both, if it would only will it.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the most important domestic issue facing this session of the Congress is the question of providing health care for the aged. The volume of mail coming into congressional offices on this subject is proof of the widespread concern among all our people over the lack of health protection for the aged.

The people want a broad and comprehensive program of social security as insurance against various economic hazards. This is particularly true of Federal employees and retired Federal workers because they have lagged behind other groups in acquiring such benefits. For instance, it was many years before Federal employees became entitled to unemployment compensation, even though workers in private industry had become eligible for such benefits long ago.

It is difficult for me to understand why the Government should be so neglectful of its own employees concerning wages and fringe benefits. Its shortsighted policy toward its employees and its annuitants contradicts the glowing picture it draws of the advantages enjoyed by those who work for the Federal Government. The predicament of those who have retired after a lifetime of service as civilian employees is particularly distressing to me.

It is inevitable that some form of health insurance will be provided for the aged in our population, as distinct from those who are pensioned off under the U.S. civil service retirement system.

It is to remedy this oversight that I ask favorable consideration before Congress adjourns of my bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government.

Medical benefits for those who have been employed in private industry is a logical extension of the social security system. Medical benefits for those who have worked for the Government should be, in the same manner, a development of the civil service retirement system.

Furthermore, the Government has a special obligation to contribute toward the health insurance of those who have served it so long and faithfully. Federal annuitants have two or three times as much chronic illness as those who are still working for the Government. These illnesses are frequently those of a long-term nature, requiring extended periods of care or hospitalization. It is an irrefutable fact that the cost of medical care has climbed far beyond their reach. With their fixed annuities that are so seldom upgraded to meet the cost of existence the predicament of these people becomes progressively worse. The erosion of the annuitants' pensions and of their morale is a fact that does not go unnoticed by younger people. As a result, the Government finds it increasingly difficult to recruit them for careers as civil servants.

Pending legislation covering active employees will become effective on July 1, 1960. It would be a cruel discrimination if we stopped there and failed to provide similar protection for the retired employees of the Federal Government.

Under H.R. 8835, the U.S. Civil Service Commission "is authorized and directed to establish a health benefits program for annuitants and members of their families who are not eligible for coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959. If an annuitant enrolls in a health benefits plan under this act for himself only, there shall be withheld from his annuity, as his contribution, an amount not to exceed $3.80 monthly, and the Government shall contribute a like amount. Except as provided in paragraph (c), if an annuitant enrolls in a health benefits plan under this act for himself and members of his family—"family" meaning an annuitant's spouse, unmarried child under 19 years of age, or unmarried child regardless of age who is incapable of self-support because of a mental or physical incapacity that existed prior to his reaching the age of 19 years—there shall be withheld from his annuity, as his contribution, an amount not to exceed $9.20, and the Government shall contribute a like amount."

The Government's cost would, according to estimates of the Civil Service Commission, fall within the range of $15.5 million to $22 million in the first year. Even if it turned out to be somewhat higher, it would be a small price for the Government to pay in return for the solicitude and the help it would extend to those who have served it so well.

If it is not feasible for the Government's contribution to be financed from the proceeds of the sale of securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, then it can be financed through direct appropriation by the Congress. A decent respect for the faithful service performed by Government workers who are retired, will be expressed and appreciated through prompt enactment of the Federal Annuitants Health Benefits Act of 1960.

NATIONAL PENSION POLICY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend a resolution at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION GRANTING TO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I PENSIONS COMPARABLE TO GRANTS TO VETERANS OF AMERICAN WARS PRIOR TO WORLD WAR I—CITY OF LYNN, MASS., IN THE YEAR 1960

Whereas the national policy of the United States, concerning veterans of the United States, has been to grant assistance to them in declining years by a pension, all in consideration of their military service in defense of our country; and

Whereas there has been no general pension granted to veterans of World War I by the United States; and

Whereas the United States has been and is aiding many foreign countries in restoring their economy; and

Where if our Government can afford to give away tens of billions of dollars for years to come, in addition to more than $70 billion in aid already given to foreign nations, then surely we can afford to give needed help to disabled and aging Veterans of World War I who have proved their loyalty to America by defending our Nation on the field of battle: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the honorable mayor and city council of the city of Lynn, Mass., hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting a pension to Veterans of World War I comparable to grants to veterans of wars prior to World War I; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the city clerk of the city of Lynn, Mass., to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth, and to members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee in the House of Representatives of the United States.

In city council, April 12, 1960.

Adopted:

———— ————, *City Clerk.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted a leave of absence for 10 days on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE LOUIS CONVERS CRAMTON

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, announcement was made a few weeks ago of the retirement of one of the most outstanding, distinguished, and well-beloved legislators in the State of Michigan's history. His name is Louis Convers Cramton, and he is presently State representative from Lapeer County, Mich. Representative Cramton, 84 years old, for half a century has served his beloved State as a U.S. Congressman, judge, and longtime member of the State legislature. As both a legislative and judicial official, he has displayed fearlessness in battling for what he believed to be right, the courage to oppose his own Republican Party when he believed it was wrong and strict adherence to conscience. Representative Cramton, long a champion of fair employment legislation and civil rights bills, while in Congress from 1913 to 1931 won the respect of Negro groups for his support of Howard University, a Negro college. He foresaw and understood the silent, bloodless social revolution and often stood alone on reforms which he regarded not only proper but inevitable.

Representative Cramton was born in Lapeer County and graduated from the University of Michigan law department in 1899. He served in the State house of representatives from 1909 to 1910; was elected to the 63d and to the eight succeeding Congresses—March 4, 1913–March 3, 1931; was special assistant to the Secretary of the Interior in 1931 and 1932; was circuit judge of the 40th judicial circuit from November 21, 1934, to December 31, 1941; resumed the practice of law; elected to the State house of representatives in November 1948, and has served continuously since that time.

Representative Cramton leaves the State legislature with an alert mind, a zest for the lawmaking process, and a sound heart that beats in a tempo responsive to the times and in tune with the people.

Let this Congress recognize our former colleague, Representative Louis Convers Cramton, for the outstanding public service he has rendered to the State of Michigan and to our Nation. Our best wishes go out to him for many pleasant years of well-deserved retirement.

CORRECTION OF INADEQUACIES IN PAYMENTS FOR HAZARDOUS DUTY

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to authorize the establishment of pay differentials for employees in the classified civil service for irregular or intermittent duty involving unusual physical hardship or hazards. The purpose of this bill is to correct the inequity which has long existed with respect to the treatment of white collar employees as compared to blue collar employees who may be exposed to identical hardship hazards.

In perhaps a majority of the cases where a white collar employee is required to perform duties involving physical hardship or hazard, there is adequate recognition of the hardship or hazard in terms of the grade and rate of pay assigned to the position. For example, the position of an employee performing dangerous law-enforcement work or of an employee working regularly with radioactive material, is classified at a grade which takes into account the degree of risk involved in the work. My bill does not propose to provide a differential for employees in such positions.

On the other hand, there are many cases where a white collar employee whose job does not involve regular exposure to hazard or hardship and whose grade does not include recognition of inherent risk is required to perform duties on an occasional basis under circumstances involving physical hardship or hazard. For example, a civilian engineer engaged in the development of machinery or equipment may from time to time be required to perform duty aboard a submarine for the purpose of inspecting or testing the equipment on which he is working. Under present law such an employee is not entitled to receive any extra pay for these hazardous duties, although the Navy crew members and blue collar workers aboard the submarine do receive additional pay. It is this kind of inequity which my bill would propose to correct.

The matter of additional pay for hazardous duty has been recognized as a problem for many years. The Classification Act of 1949, as approved on October 28, 1949, contained a section which required the Civil Service Commission to make a study of the problem and to submit recommendations to the Congress "for a future policy and plan with respect to additional compensation for hazardous employments." The Commission's report, which was submitted in October 1950, included a recommendation that in regard to positions under the Classification Act, the effect of occupational hazards on duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements should be given due consideration in the allocations of positions to classes. However, no recommendation was made with respect to the treatment which should be given those cases where the assignment to hazardous duty is on an occasional basis and, for this reason, cannot be appropriately recognized in the classification grade of the position.

This problem has also been recognized in compensation studies which have been initiated in the executive branch. For example, the so-called Cordiner Committee, which was set up to study and advise the Secretary of Defense on needed adjustments in the provisions for compensating civilian personnel, submitted a report in May 1957. This report contained the finding that—

> There is no system of complete coverage either in terms of additional compensation or benefits for Classification Act employees performing hazardous work in the Federal Government. In contrast, there is complete coverage for defense blue-collar workers when the hazard is of sufficient dimension to warrant additional compensation.

No steps were taken to correct the inequity reflected by this finding.

My bill would propose to provide the clear and effective solution to this long-standing problem by providing authority for the establishment of pay differentials which would be paid to white-collar employees in those cases when they are assigned to hazardous or hardship duties.

The cost which would be involved in this bill would depend on the extent to which classified workers are assigned to hazardous or hardship duty, the length of such assignments, and the basic pay rates of the employee so assigned. In any event, the total cost would be negligible in terms of the total Federal payroll for classified employees and in terms of the increased effectiveness and morale which should result from the equitable treatment of the employees concerned.

LET'S GREET IKE

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Washington Daily News, the New York Times, and the Paterson Evening News:

[From the Washington Daily News, May 19, 1960]

LET'S GREET IKE

We suggest that as many of us as possible be on hand to give the President a cheer when he returns tomorrow. His plane is due to arrive at Andrews Field at 3 p.m. The President's route will be over the South Capitol Street bridge, Pennsylvania Avenue, 14th Street and New York Avenue to the White House. We think we all owe him a warm greeting for his performance in Paris.

Neither by temperament, training, nor experience—as soldier or statesman—is President Eisenhower a man to submit readily to contempt or denigration, let alone to turn the other cheek to insult.

His restraint in Paris in the face of Khrushchev's deliberate billingsgate, therefore, is evidence not only of his self-discipline and innate dignity but also of his selfless devotion to the cause of peace; the peace for which all humanity hopes, and which almost any sacrifice is worth making to attain.

Giving the soft though self-respecting answer to the synthetic and cynical wrath of the Russian Premier was, therefore, a gesture which—probably as much as anything Khrushchev himself did—swung free world opinion, which had been critical of the United States for the U–2 plane episode, around a full 180 degrees, so that it is today unanimous in denouncing Russia's behavior.

No amount of patching could put the summit conference back together now. It would be useless and foolish to try. However, whatever mistakes may have been made, groveling before a grotesquely insolent Khrushchev was not one of them. In the circumstances, such a futile gesture could only play into the hands of the Soviet boss.

But there is one thing can be done. And it is more important than any other choice we have.

That is to close ranks. And we can symbolize that by your welcome of the President tomorrow.

In the days ahead, let's show the whole world, including the Soviets, that the American people, the American political parties and the U.S. Government are solidly together on these things:

That there is no doubt of this country's eternal devotion to the principles of individual liberty and the sovereignty of free peoples.

That whatever other differences may divide our public opinion or our political parties there is no division on our determination to stay strong, to do whatever is necessary to maintain that strength, but to use it with wisdom and restraint.

Top leaders of the Democratic Party already have given the cue, as revealed in the Senate yesterday. Before the summit collapsed, four of them—Adlai Stevenson, Senators Johnson and Fulbright, and Speaker Rayburn—quietly had sent President Eisenhower a cablegram to demonstrate American unity.

This demonstration of agreement on purpose, as Senator JOHNSON later explained to the Senate, does not require any forfeit of the democratic right and duty realistically to assess the management of American policy by the Eisenhower administration. But such assessments can be made in a manner which will reinforce the national strength, rather than detract from it.

So, when Mr. Eisenhower returns to Washington tomorrow, we have an opportunity to represent our whole country and to show where it stands. We hope Washingtonians will turn out en masse to welcome the President home. And that all around the land, wherever possible, there will be similar demonstrations of loyalty and national unity.

In a showdown, we are one people. Let us make that clear to everybody, especially Khrushchev.

[From the New York Times, May 19, 1960]

MR. KHRUSHCHEV'S ADIEU

At his final press conference in Paris yesterday Premier Khrushchev renewed his accusations against the United States. Essentially his argument fell into two parts: a complaint that President Eisenhower has promised the ending of the espionage flights only until the end of his own tenure in office next January, and a complaint that this country's promises cannot be respected since they can be changed from administration to administration.

On the first point it may be noted that neither Mr. Khrushchev nor any of his subordinates have even promised to halt for 1 day—let alone the remainder of Mr. Khrushchev's stay in office—the gigantic espionage effort his country maintains constantly against the free world. And Mr. Khrushchev surely knows that if he really wants the end of aerial espionage for all time he need only accept President Eisenhower's "open skies" proposal and formalize that plan in an international treaty which would be binding upon all American administrations once it had been duly ratified.

On the second issue it may be suggested that Premier Khrushchev is the last man in the world who is entitled to raise questions about the value of the promises of others. Has he forgotten how many Soviet promises have been betrayed under his own and earlier Soviet administrations?

In Hungary in November 1956, for example, were not all kinds of promises and pledges made to the Hungarian people and their legal government and were not all betrayed? Premier Nagy and General Maleter have long since already paid with their lives for having believed Soviet promises. Has Premier Khrushchev forgotten Poland, where Stalin once promised that a representative democratic government would be installed? Has he forgotten Molotov's long-since violated pledge that the institutions of Rumania would be respected, a pledge made as Soviet troops entered that country during World War II? Has he forgotten Soviet promises about Western access to West Berlin, promises that Stalin broke in the era of the Berlin blockade and which Mr. Khrushchev himself now threatents almost daily to break again? We of the free world know that on the issue of broken promises Mr. Khrushchev lives in a very glassy house indeed.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Evening News, May 18, 1960]

WE ARE ONE—ALL AMERICA BACKS THE PRESIDENT IN THESE DARKEST HOURS

This is a time for all of us to keep our feet on the ground, our heads steady and clear, our hearts filled with prayer.

The world is on the brink of what could be Armageddon, because madmen are again loose and who can tell when they might unleash the terrible instruments of destruction which all mankind has devised in these recent years?

Nikita Khrushchev came to America last year ostensibly to learn all about us, to absorb some of the niceties of a land of liberty. He returned the compliment and invited our President, the man of peace coming down the end of the road with one ambition—to end wars and permit nations to dwell in amity.

Suddenly all this is destroyed by this same Khrushchev, stalking his bullheaded, chesty Communist front around Paris, where leaders had gathered for peace and now confer only on how to guard against a new and more terrible Pearl Harbor.

It is well indeed that all parties in America now join hands in a common unity.

President Eisenhower, with just a few brief months remaining of his final term of office, had gone to Paris to join his Western allies to work out a program of disarmament and permanent peace with the Soviet leader.

Instead, he ran into a raging bull, bellowing insults, cancelling Ike's visit to Russia, demanding abject apology from America.

Well, Mr. K., we don't like fights, and we abhor war.

But we don't bend before madmen, before dictators.

Our country was founded in the spirit of rebellion against oppression.

Was the spy flight over Russia a tactical blunder?

Well, maybe it was. But it was only an incident. And "Khrushie" blew it up into the propaganda blast he needed to prove to his real bosses behind the scenes that he can be a tough guy.

Mr. Khrushchev, literally spitting in the face of our President, is doing it to every man, woman, and child in America, whether we be Republicans or Democrats.

So we'll take it together in whatever spirit President Eisenhower accepts it.

Whatever the Lord decrees and our President tells us to do in this crisis, let's all remember:

We are one made up of 175 million strong.

NASA PEACEFUL EXPLORATION AGENCY?

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, in the next few days we will have before this body a bill from my committee to revise the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958.

In the light of the U–2 experience, it becomes eminently clear to me that a very thorough understanding must be reached on exactly what the area of responsibility of NASA is to be. With this thought in mind, on May 13 I wrote to my distinguished chairman the following letter which I think speaks for itself on this point:

MAY 13, 1960.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Chairman, Science and Astronautics Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you because of my concern over the recent revelations that NASA is being used as a cover-up for spying activities by the Central Intelligence Agency.

As you are well aware, we have been under the impression that the activities of NASA were to be of a purely peaceful and nonmilitary nature. This has been what the heads of NASA have told us and this is the way the law is written. This law is being flouted. I do not believe the Nation can afford to let Congress follow the bumbling and irrational leadership given the country by this administration. It is our manifest duty to insist that the moneys appropriated for a specific purpose are used in strict compliance with the law as stated by Congress. Unless Congress intends to abdicate its responsibility in these areas, I strongly urge that a full-scale investigation be initiated in order to ascertain (1) whether there are other activities similar to these, which are hiding under the cloak of NASA; and (2) in what other instances NASA has given out information which is at variance with the facts.

The New York Post editorial of May 11 made the most profound observation on the execution of our foreign policy when it stated:

"We said the other day that there is no ground for partisan delight in the national humiliation. Neither, however, do we accept the view that this is an occasion for polite acquiescence in an inexcusable blunder that has shaken the world. * * *

"It is not an excess of debate that imperils the country. It is lack of debate, failure to explore great questions, refusal to challenge the tired premises of our foreign policy, bipartisan agreement to postpone all serious matters, that are undermining our world position. * * *

"Certainly Mr. Khrushchev should not be deluded into believing that any substantial number of Americans will accept his prescription for world order. But neither should there be any doubt about the extent to which millions of Americans are troubled and dismayed by the fabulous follies of recent days, and demanding better answers than we have received.

"In these last few fateful hours before the summit there should be full, free examination of all the positions we have taken, of all the imponderables in our world view, of all the sacred cows on our animal farm. The most tragic aspect of the plane episode is the evidence of abdication by the President of the United States."

Mr. Chairman, we have all been shaken badly by the facts which have recently come to light. We should not be so shocked and feckless as not to go forward and ascertain all the facts regarding the operations of NASA and the apparent interlocking operations of big airplane corporations in spying activities in conjunction with the CIA.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I urge that a full-scale investigation be initiated by our committee on the whole subject of the operation of NASA. Either that agency should be what we have been telling the world it is—an operation set up for the peaceful exploration of outer space—or it should be disbanded and its area of responsibility returned to the military.

Respectfully yours,

LEONARD G. WOLF,
Representative in Congress.

SUBSIDY ELIGIBILITY OF DOMESTIC TRUNK AIRLINES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BROCK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, 1960, I introduced H.R. 12234 which seeks the repeal of that portion of section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act that provides subsidy eligibility for the domestic trunk airlines. This bill is identical to that introduced by my distinguished colleague and fellow committee member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK].

I was impelled to introduce this measure for many of the same reasons Mr. MACK mentioned in his able remarks in the RECORD of April 5, 1960.

For example, I am convinced that both the trunkline industry and the Civil Aeronautics Board would be more economically realistic if subsidy eligibility for the domestic trunks ceased to exist.

I cannot believe that Capital Airlines would have pursued its reckless course of expansion and taken the gambles which have brought it to the brink of bankruptcy had it not been possible to apply for Federal subsidy to make up the losses when the gambles failed.

I cannot believe that the Civil Aeronautics Board would have authorized the multiple competition, often putting four or five more carriers in the same market, but they had not had the assurance that subsidy was available for any airline unable to survive in these competition-saturated markets. If subsidy eligibility is terminated, I share Mr. MACK'S confidence that the Civil Aeronautics Board will employ more careful analysis of the economic factors and give more weight to sound business principles in subsequent route cases.

Similarly, I share my colleague's concern about bailing out a carrier whose bad management and improvident gambling with expansion have gotten it into serious financial trouble. I agree that payment of Federal subsidy to a carrier competing with self-sufficient trunklines can lead to only one thing—industrywide subsidy.

But, Mr. Speaker, while all of these factors are very important and constitute valid reasons for passage of this legislation, it seems to me there is an even more important reason why Congress must act to eliminate this subsidy eligibility for the domestic trunkline carriers. Stated in its simplest form, we must disqualify the domestic trunks in order to prevent encroachment upon the funds which Congress has appropriated to support the local service industry and the other parts of the industry that are still in the developmental stage of their operations.

On May 16, 1960 the Civil Aeronautics Board held a prehearing conference in the Capital subsidy case which started in motion the administrative machinery to process Capital's claim. Had the Board not inaugurated the proceeding it is clear under section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act and title 28, United States Code, section 1337, that Capital, or another subsidy claimant, can obtain a mandatory injunction in a U.S. district court compelling the Board to process the claim.

Once the claim is in process it is clear that the Civil Aeronautics Board can—by granting the request—create a valid legal obligation enforceable in the Federal courts which would be satisfied out of the appropriation Congress intended for carrier payments to the local service carriers and other developmental industries. Thus, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the money was appropriated for other and worthy purposes, under present law a valid legal claim can be created which encroaches upon and diverts these funds for other purposes. Thus it is completely possible that important activities such as the local service industry could be placed in jeopardy, or irreparably harmed, by trunkline subsidy claimants.

Nor is it any answer or comfort that the Civil Aeronautics Board might summarily turn down the claim of Capital Airlines. The Board is compelled to use the same standards and precedents it uses in other subsidy cases such as the local service cases. Should the Board arbitrarily or capriciouly depart from its standards or the statutory requirements, Capital could sue under section 1006 of the Federal Aviation Act and get judicial review in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

Fortunately the Civil Aeronautics Board had the foresight to include in its investigation of the Capital subsidy claim the issues of merger or dismemberment which may well prove to be the answer in this case. However, the fact remains that until the law is changed and subsidy eligibility for the domestic trunklines discontinued, there is a continuing risk that encroachments will occur on the funds appropriated to develop the local service carriers which provide vital service in Nebraska and elsewhere in the Nation.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is essential to pass this legislation to protect both segments of the airline industry; first, to protect the self-sufficient trunklines from subsidized competition which can only result in industrywide economic deterioration; and, second, to protect the developmental portion of the industry—especially the local service carriers—from encroachment upon funds appropriated to foster their growth and progress.

Mr. Speaker, this matter of domestic trunkline subsidy is a unique opportunity. It not only provides us a chance to circumscribe and reduce the area of potential Government liability for subsidy expenditures but it actually pre-

sents us a challenge to do so or risk an enormous increase in transportation subsidies. I personally shudder to think of the possible consequences of our failure to act. If the relatively minute operations of the local service carriers can require a subsidy that has increased from $21 million in 1955 to $68 million in fiscal 1961, an economic chain reaction set off by federally subsidized domestic trunkline competition would inevitably result in hundreds of millions of dollars of subsidy requirements.

Mr. Speaker, we have already spent approximately $200 million to put this industry on its feet. It has been operating for nearly a decade on a self-sufficient basis which proves that the industry can be self-sustaining. Airline traffic continues to grow and new revenue sources such as increased airfreight and first class mail are supplementing airline revenues. I think we have come to the point when we must remove this subsidy eligibility before it corrupts a mature and self-reliant industry. I think we must remove this subsidy eligibility before it undoes the good work it accomplished during the developmental period.

This action cannot be postponed. This legislation should be given high priority and enacted this session of Congress.

WARTIME EXCISE TAXES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, just as the cherry blossoms come to Washington every spring, so does the annual season for extending the wartime excise taxes imposed upon automobiles.

Because of my vocal opposition to this tax I have been dubbed by some as the automobile horn of Congress. This does not offend me. On the contrary, I am proud of this recognition because it refers to my persistent and insistent efforts to repeal the unfair 10-percent wartime excise tax on automobiles.

I again insist that in keeping such a tax, while enacting legislation for depressed areas, such as Detroit, and when American workers need to be fully employed, the Federal Government is cutting off its taxes to spite its revenue. This tax was levied for the specific purpose of decreasing automobile production in order to divert it to war production. The purpose for which this tax was imposed no longer exists, but we still permit this tax to retard sales, production, and employment.

During the past few days our press has joined in sounding the "automobile horn" to arouse the public about this tax. For this I am grateful.

The "ignition" for two recent articles in Detroit papers was provided by an editorial by Robert B. Powers, editor and publisher of Ward's Automotive Yearbook for 1960, and which I had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this past Tuesday.

On May 12, 1960, the automotive editor of the Detroit Free Press, Fred Olmsted, had this to say of Mr. Powers' editorial:

Immediate removal or reduction of the Federal excise tax on automobiles was urged by Ward's Automotive Yearbook for 1960, released Wednesday. "The dawn of the era of American compacts and the consequent arrival of direct competition with their European counterparts make this imperative," the 22d annual edition of the industry handbook said.

Ward's called the tax (10 percent on the manufacturer's price) "politically immoral, punitive and a wartime emergency measure."

The statistical reporting agency said action was vital "to forestall possible future injury to the industry."

The leading editorial of the Detroit News, of May 11, 1960, was devoted to the adverse effects of this discriminatory tax upon our economy. I agree so completely with the content of this editorial that I would like to take this occasion to read it to the Members of the House:

UNITED STATES IN COMPACT CAR RACE—THE EXCISE HANDICAP

For many years this newspaper has campaigned against the injustice of the automobile excise tax, a levy which costs motorists billions of dollars on the pretext that the utilitarian automobile, like a billiard table or mink stole, is a luxury item.

We now find a new and persuasive argument for abolishment of the tax. Robert B. Powers, editor and publisher of Ward's Automotive Reports, in his yearbook released today, sees the levy as a potential peril both to the industry and the Nation in the forthcoming struggle for the U.S. compact car market—a struggle between U.S. manufacturers and European exporters to this country.

In the yearbook editorial, these are some of the points made by Powers:

In 1959, Federal excise tax collections on motor vehicles totaled more than $3.6 billion, bringing to more than $14 billion the amount paid since the levy was decreed in 1917 as a wartime emergency measure.

Counting the tax on raw materials and components, the excise taxes now approximate 17.3 percent of the wholesale value of a motor vehicle—or $346 on a car valued at $2,000.

This politically immoral, punitive tax, if continued, will be a severe handicap to the automotive industry in competing with foreign-made compacts, only 253 of which were imported in 1940, but 668,070 of which were sold in the American market in 1959.

If Congress and the administration delay tax repeal or reduction until a faltering U.S. auto industry precipitates a crisis, Government action to discourage imports then will have to be drastic—and "it may cost us those friends throughout the world we have worked so diligently and expensively to win and influence."

One of the additional facts brought out by Powers is that the three European manufacturers with a lion's share of the American market are government owned or government controlled. This enables them to pretty much set their own sales prices, be in a position to influence internal taxes on their products, and if need be operate wholly without profit for the sake of employment and their nations' general economic health.

In the instance of Iron Curtain motor cars, sometimes priced at less in the United States than in the country of origin, cost figures and taxes can be juggled to get around the U.S. ban on dumping.

If there is statesmanship left in Washington, the time to act is now. The tax never was justified except as a wartime measure to discourage the demand for automobiles. It is less than ever defensible now when the very survival of a large segment of the industry is in danger of becoming an issue.

It will not be long before we will be asked to extend this tax. Between now and then, it is my hope that my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee will find time to ask themselves if it is not politically immoral to penalize an industry—which is the basis for one of every seven jobs—and one of every six businesses—by exacting a tax not levied on other manufacturing.

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY, OHIO

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a telegram from President Eisenhower.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago today, May 19, 1910, Gov. Judson Harmon, of Ohio, signed the bill which established Kent State Normal School, the beginning of the great present day Kent State University, of Kent, Ohio.

The past 50 years have seen Kent State grow from an enrollment of 42 students in 1910 to a student body of 10,500 members today. During this same period of time, 100,000 students have registered at the university, 56,000 of them in the last 10 years. It is clearly one of the fastest growing universities in the United States. Although the university primarily serves the northeastern portion of Ohio, its student body also consists of many students from the other 49 States as well as students from foreign lands.

Not only has it grown population wise, but constant additions and improvements to the physical plant of the university, since its establishment, have made it into the 360 acres of beautiful grounds and 33 campus buildings of today. The present value is estimated to exceed $31 million.

Regardless of the financial amounts involved, the campus of Kent State University, sitting high upon a hill overlooking Kent, Ohio, is generally regarded to be one of the most beautiful university campuses in the United States.

The university educationally offers its students curriculums in five different colleges: Business, arts and sciences, fine arts, education, and graduate school. Each of these courses of study offers the best in education to those it serves.

In recognizing those who have contributed so much to the founding and growth of this great university, one cannot help but give much of the credit to Dr. George Bowman, present president

of Kent State. For the past 16 years he has lead the school during the years of its greatest growth. His leadership has been an inspiration to the students, faculty, and alumni of Kent State University. In this respect, he has been given the unqualified support of the board of trustees, presently consisting of John R. Williams, president of the board for 16 years and a former Ohio State legislator; Robert C. Dix, publisher of the Kent-Ravenna Record Courier; Dr. Otto Korb, former superintendent of schools of South Euclid-Lyndhurst and East Cleveland; Frederick M. Broda, president and treasurer of Webb-Broda & Co.; Robert H. Stopher, associate editor of the Akron Beacon Journal; Ray P. Dinsmore, vice president of Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., of Akron, Ohio; and the Honorable John McSweeney, a former distinguished Member of this House. All of them should be congratulated for their interest and effort in the future of Kent State University.

Certainly this opportunity should not pass without paying tribute to the efforts of those who preceded Dr. Bowman in the president's chair: Dr. John McGilvrey, Dr. James Engleman, and Dr. K. C. Leebrick. They have made this day possible by their work on this great campus.

As an alumnus of this great university, I am extremely proud to join today with the students, faculty, and my fellow alumni of Kent State University in celebrating the school's 50th birthday. I am doubly proud because today is also my own birthday. Although I am not as old as my alma mater, it is of great personal pride to me to look forward to celebrating our birthdays together in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD a copy of a telegram sent by President Dwight D. Eisenhower to Kent State University on the occasion of its 50th anniversary:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., May 13, 1960.

GEORGE A. BOWMAN,
President, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio:

It is a pleasure to join in the observance of the 50th anniversary of Kent State University.

Over the past 50 years this university has achieved a fine record of growth and service in the field of higher education. In this tradition I know it will continue to advance the welfare of its students and the national community.

Congratulations and best wishes.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, today, June 19, 1960, marks the golden anniversary of Bowling Green State University at Bowling Green, Ohio. I would like, at this time, to enumerate some of the accomplishments of this outstanding institution of higher learning.

On May 19, 1910, Bowling Green Normal School was established. This school initially was designed to serve the northwestern part of Ohio. However, at this time its student body consists also of many people from the other 49 States as well as many foreign lands. When Bowling Green was founded it evidenced an amazing amount of vigor. This vigor lead to the establishment of the schools of business administration, liberal arts and the graduate school.

From a school consisting essentially of one building Bowling Green State University has become a huge, sprawling campus with some of the most modern and functional classrooms and dormitories in the United States. The building program during the past 10 years has been phenomenal. Many additional classrooms and dormitories plus one of the finest and largest student union buildings in the country have been built.

A special debt of gratitude must be extended to President Ralph W. McDonald who came to Bowling Green State University in 1951 and has since dedicated his life to its ever-changing needs. Dr. McDonald's forward look at the American educational system has immeasurably aided him in his constant efforts to improve the academic standards and the physical facilities of the university.

Another vote of thanks must go to Dr. McDonald's exceptional faculty, for without their help his task would have been virtually impossible. They are nationally recognized for their exceeding devotion to the advancement of higher learning. This is evidenced by the great number of fine scholars who have emerged from Bowling Green State University.

The president, Dr. McDonald, and the faculty have been blessed with a board of trustees who have done everything within their power for the advancement of the university. We are most grateful to them.

I am very proud to join with the students, faculty and alumni of Bowling Green State University in celebrating the school's 50th anniversary. I am informed that congratulations have been received on this occasion from President Dwight D. Eisenhower. It reads as follows:

Through Congressman DELBERT L. LATTA I have learned of the plans to celebrate the 50th anniversary of Bowling Green State University at a convocation this Thursday.

Before leaving for the summit conference in Paris I want to send my congratulations to your students, faculty, and friends. The American standards of character and intellect which are the strength of your university are also the strength of our country's dealings with neighbors around the world.

I am delighted to add my best wishes for the continuing growth of Bowling Green in honor and in service to the national community.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. COOK. I thank the gentleman. I am well aware of the fact that Bowling Green State University is a rival of Kent University and was also born 50 years ago.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOK. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio on his birthday.

In the months that he has served in this body, he has richly earned the reputation of being one of the most effective first-term Members of Congress, and I have confidence that he will be returned by his constituents.

I am also glad that the gentleman from Ohio has called attention to Kent State University, a small, great university, on the 50th anniversary of its establishment.

Mr. Speaker, many students from my section of West Virginia are familiar with Kent State University. Kent State is a member of the Mid-America Conference, and Marshall College in my hometown of Huntington, W. Va. participates with Kent State in numerous athletic and other events. We in West Virginia have great respect for this institution, and I commend the gentleman from Ohio for bringing to the attention of the House the 50th birthday of this institution which we are today celebrating.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I rise to compliment the gentleman, my colleague from Ohio, for the statement he is making today on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of one of our fine small American colleges, Kent State University. I offer heartiest felicitations on this occasion not only to Kent State University but to the gentleman who is also celebrating his anniversary on this occasion. Kent State University compares very favorably with the fine colleges in the 17th Congressional District of Ohio, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress: Denison University, at Granville, my alma mater; Ohio Wesleyan University at Delaware; Ohio State University campuses at Mansfield and Newark; Kenyon, at Gambier, and Ashland College, at Ashland. Many fine people from my district have graduated from Kent State and many are currently enrolled there. I extend my congratulations to this great institution of learning and my distinguished colleague from Ohio one of its outstanding graduates.

Mr. COOK. I merely wish to say as an Ohioan that I am very proud of the fine schools located in my district, and I assure the gentleman, as an alumnus of Kent State University, I take particular pride in my alma mater on this occasion.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ARMED FORCES DAY

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Armed Forces Day is the annual occasion when we take stock of the latest known developments in America's weapons of offense and defense, of the discipline and skill of the men of our Armed Forces, and of the spirit of patriotism that inspires the Nation whose sword and shield they are. For it is in the spirit of men, more than in wealth or the steel and explosives that wealth can purchase, that the security of America lies. Most important, of all the qualities that can make for the preservation or the destruction, of a country, is that intangible but immediately identifiable quality known as morale. Though it is in the Armed Forces that morale is immediately evident, and overwhelmingly important, the morale of the Armed Forces must derive ultimately from the morale permeating the citizenship of the country. We could not expect to draw individuals from a discouraged, disaffected, lazy, and luxury-loving population, and so spur and train and indoctrinate them that they would become courageous, disciplined, and energetic fighters for home and fireside, still less for such intangibles as freedom and justice. Out of the observance of this day, out of the display of weapons and material, out of the speeches and the marching and singing, we must draw one all important lesson—that we are all involved in the enterprise of American security, of the promotion of peace and justice in the world. Each of us is essentially involved in the Armed Forces, whose service to America we celebrate on this day.

PARIS CONFERENCE COLLAPSE: REALISTIC NATIONAL POLICY REQUIRED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the complete collapse of the Paris meeting of heads of governments is now a matter of history. Following as it did the sensational disclosures of the U–2 intelligence plane incident in the heart of the Soviet Union, the Paris failure has stirred the peoples of all countries to a degree not equaled since the world-shaking crises prior to World War II.

Featured by Premier Khrushchev's stern warnings against further intelligence flights by U.S. aircraft into Soviet territory and the President's suspension of them and promise not to resume such flights, without extracting a compensating concession from the Soviet leader, the situation is without parallel in American history. Yet, when examined closely, it is correlated to important political occurrences in other parts of the world, including the continental United States.

Among these have been agitations at Panama, fanned by Communist mentors, for what is described as reaffirmation of Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone land grant. An unfortunate statement at Panama by one of our high ranking diplomatic officials to the effect that the United States had recognized the "titular sovereignty" of Panama over the Canal Zone, whatever that is, and that Panama should have "visual evidence" of such sovereignty in the formal display of its flag on the Canal Zone, played into the hands of the international conspiracy for wresting the exclusive sovereignty control of the zone from the United States.

In view of the obvious Soviet policy of aggressive subversion in strategic areas, such as Panama, Cuba, and Indonesia, it was not difficult to foresee and to state to the House on January 13, 1960, that the pattern at Panama would supply the precedent for similar agitations with respect to Alaska, purchased in 1867 by treaty from Russia. It is indeed a sterile satisfaction to say that my predictions with respect to a vitally important question have again been fulfilled.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the situation in Alaska? It is common talk among people there about frequent radio broadcasts from Siberian stations across the Bering Sea urging in clear English the resumption of Soviet sovereignty over that part of the United States. But even more ominous, are persistent intelligence flights of Soviet planes over Alaska, which U.S. forces are not permitted to stop.

In Alaska today, we have a situation that combines the pattern of Panama with that of the flight over Soviet territory of the U–2 intelligence plane, which was shot down. Moreover, there have been other U.S. planes shot down in other areas.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, despite the significance of the Alaska situation the press of our country, with some minor exceptions, has been strangely silent. What is the influence that leads to such suppression of vitally significant news?

The net result of this silence could well make the United States a province of the one world of universal communism. Our safety demands that the Congress find out and remove the controls that now approach the ultimate in tyranny by denying such crucial information to the Nation.

I think I reflect the views of all peoples and all races, including those of holy Russia, when saying that they do not wish war. But war will not be prevented by abject surrenders on the part of the United States, as some Communist leaders and their collaborators in our country appear to desire and to expect. It can be avoided only by standing up for our just rights and by effective precautions to prevent the tragedy of another Pearl Harbor.

To these ends, Mr. Speaker, our Government should call for the arrest and deportation of Soviet spies, who form a far larger fifth column here than exists in the Soviet Union. For such procedure we have as a precedent the recent firm aciton of little Switzerland.

Meanwhile, the people of the United States will expect the President to issue orders to our Alaska commands to protect our positions there in the same way Premier Khrushchev protects those of the Soviet Union. These orders would include instructions to challenge Soviet planes and to shoot down those that do not comply with orders to land.

CANAL ZONE SECURITY: SIGNIFICANCE OF PANAMA FLAG

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, during the present session of the Congress the questions of the sovereign control of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal have been extensively debated. There is little new of basic nature that could be added to what has already been presented. Yet, because of the failure of our Government, in both the legislative and executive branches, to take a firm, forthright position with respect to our just rights at Panama, the Isthmian canal policies of the United States are still uncertain. It is imperative that these policies be made definite by reaffirmation of the long-established policies under which the Panama Canal was constructed and has since been maintained and operated.

Many will recall the attempted mob invasions of the Canal Zone on November 3 and 28, 1959, requiring the use of force by Canal Zone police and the U.S. Army to repel the invaders. Under radical leadership, some of it communistic, the prime purpose of these mobs was to plant the flag of Panama in the Canal Zone as the symbol of Panamanian sovereignty over that vital strip of land. These two attempts of the invaders failed but their real objectives are still uppermost in their minds, and these are sovereignty over the Canal Zone and eventually nationalization of the Panama Canal.

It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that subsequent to these two abortive efforts of Panamanian mobs, the Foreign Minister of Panama, Miguel J. Moreno, Jr., made extensive foreign travels, including a visit in Egypt to present Panamanian viewpoints and to be briefed on Egyptian experience in regard to the Suez Canal.

While there, Foreign Minister Moreno had ample opportunity to discuss the problems of the Panama Canal with Egyptian officials who had succeeded in bringing about nationalization of the Suez Canal. It is significant too that Panama and the United Arab Republic recently established diplomatic relations with each other.

Meanwhile, what had happened at Panama? Following the attempted November 3, 1959, invasion, the Government of the United States, instead of a stern warning against such future attempts, sent a diplomatic emissary to Panama to appease those stirring up the trouble. This emissary, Hon. Livingston T. Merchant, with the approval of his superiors in the State Department, issued a public statement recognizing Panama as "titular sovereign" over the Canal Zone and, according to Panamanian sources, agreed that the flag of Panama

might be displayed in the Canal Zone to show such sovereignty.

In addition, the President of the United States himself, on December 2, 1959, following the return of Secretary Merchant, publicly expressed the belief that Panama should be allowed to fly her flag in the Canal Zone to show Panamanian "titular sovereignty."

These actions, Mr. Speaker, taken without the consent of either the Congress or the treatymaking power of our Goverment, reflects a credulity and naivete that are simply unbelievable on the part of high U.S. officials.

Moreover, these irresponsible declarations startled the people of our Nation, who have deluged the Congress with letters expressing strong opposition to what they consider a pending surrender of our treaty rights at Panama.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I have yet to find one U.S. citizen well informed on Isthmian problems who favors such surrender. I have never seen an experienced Panama Canal official, present or former, or any member of the Armed Forces who has served on the Isthmus who does not vigorously oppose such an ignominious retreat from our solemn treaty responsibilities.

In fact, many are demanding to know what are the influences in our Government that have permitted U.S.-Panama relations to degenerate to the degree they have. To them, I would add the question: What more could be accomplished by open, bold, and shameless treason than has been done at Panama through the processes of vacillation and appeasement?

The responsible officials of our Government who have talked in such loose terms about permitting the display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone have never had any assurance from the Panamanian Government that such display would mean no more than a recognition of its "titular sovereignty," or more accurately, its mere reversionary interest in the sole event of the United States ceasing to operate the Panama Canal. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, it is certain that any Panamanian Government would never make such an agreement but would hold such display as our recognition of the complete sovereignty of Panama over the Canal Zone.

In view of the wide knowledge of the Isthmian question in the Congress, it is not strange, Mr. Speaker, that the House of Representatives, after a notable debate on February 2, 1960, passed, by overwhelming vote of 381 to 12, House Concurrent Resolution 459. This resolution expressed the sense of the Congress that any variation in the traditional interpretation in the 1903, 1936, and 1955 treaties between the United States and Panama involving the provisions of such treaties concerning territorial sovereignty shall be made only pursuant to treaty.

This action by the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker, was not merely a routine vote of our membership, but a reflection of strong views of the American people on a matter in which they are vitally interested. As such, it served as a rebuke to those, in and out of Government service, who, by naive intentions or devious methods, would undermine our position of exclusive sovereign control over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

Unfortunately, at the solicitation of the Secretary of State, House Concurrent Resolution 459, has not yet been passed by the Senate, his opposition being on the basis that such action might offend Panama. This, in effect, is the same as saying that its approval by the Senate would anger Panamanian mobs and the radical politicians who take their cues from them.

Returning now to the question of displaying the Panama flag over the Canal Zone to indicate what is loosely called "titular sovereignty," this is not a meaningless gesture of good will as some of our naive leaders would have us believe. The flag has but one meaning, and that is sovereignty.

For this reason, its display would be but the first step in the Panamanian program for eventual nationalization. The second step would be to secure its international recognition as evidence of full sovereignty. Then the way would be clear, in a legal sense, for the rest of their program through the most expedient means with the example of Suez before them.

The attitude of our Department of State touching these questions has undoubtedly given to our Latin American neighbors and the world at large the impression of weakness, timidity, and an excessive zeal for appeasement.

When considering this gravely important isthmian question, Mr. Speaker, we should never lose sight of the fact that the Panama Canal is a part of the coastline of the United States. The flag of our country there is the symbol of our status as a sovereign people over the constitutionally acquired domain of the Canal Zone. As long as our flag flies supreme there, it will fly over our territory here and elsewhere. The day another flag is raised over the Canal Zone will indeed be tragic and bode ill for the future of the United States.

It will not be long now before the Congress will adjourn. We should not leave this crucially vital issue in the hands of executive bureaucrats who have so long and so repeatedly demonstrated their inability to deal with it.

The time for action has long since passed. Because of the nonaction attitude of the Senate, the House of Representatives should now adopt its own independent resolutions on these questions. To this end I have introduced three House resolutions identical with the three concurrent resolutions previously introduced by me. Prompt consideration by the House is respectfully urged as an imperative necessity for the security of the United States.

The texts of the three indicated House resolutions follow:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 516

Whereas there is now being strongly urged in certain quarters of the world the surrender, by the United States, without reimbursement, of the Panama Canal, to the United Nations or to some other international organization for the ownership and operation of the canal; and

Whereas the United States, at the expense of its taxpayers and under, and fully relying on, treaty agreements, constructed the canal, and since its completion, at large expenditure, has maintained and operated it and provided for its protection and defense; and

Whereas the United States, following the construction of the canal, has since maintained, operated and protected it in strict conformity with treaty requirements and agreements, and has thus made it free, without restriction or qualification, for the shipping of the entire world; and, in consequence of which, with respect to the canal and the Canal Zone, every just and equitable consideration favors the continuance of the United States in the exercise of all the rights and authority by treaty provided, and in the discharge of the duties by treaty imposed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That (1) it is the sense and judgment of the House of Representatives that the United States should not, in any wise, surrender to any other government or authority its jurisdiction over, and control of, the Canal Zone, and its ownership, control, management, maintenance, operation, and protection of the Panama Canal, in accordance with existing treaty provisions; and that (2) it is to the best interests—not only of the United States, but, as well, of all nations and peoples—that all the powers, duties, authority, and obligations of the United States in the premises be continued in accordance with existing treaty provisions.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 515

Whereas the subversive forces known as international communism, operating secretly and openly, directly and indirectly, threaten the sovereignty and political independence of all the Western Hemisphere nations; and

Whereas the American continents, by the free, and independent position which they have assumed and maintained, are not subject to colonization or domination by any power; and

Whereas the intervention of international communism, directly, or indirectly, or however disguised, in any American State, conflicts with the established policy of the American Republics for the protection of the sovereignty of the peoples of such States and the political independence of their governments; and

Whereas, such a situation extended to any portions of the Western Hemisphere is dangerous to the peace and safety of the whole of it, including the United States; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, (1) That in any such subversive domination or threat, if it violates the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, and of collective security as set forth in the acts and resolutions heretofore adopted by the American Republics; and

(2) That in any such situation any one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance may, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense, and in accordance with the declarations and principles of above States, take steps to forestall or combat intervention, domination, control, and colonization in whatever form, by the subversive forces known as international communism and its agencies in the Western Hemisphere.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 517

Whereas the United States, under the Hay-Buanau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 with Panama, acquired complete and exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone in perpetuity for construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

Whereas all jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama over the Canal Zone ceased on exchange of ratifications of the 1903 treaty on February 25, 1904; and

Whereas since the time the United States has continuously exercised exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal; and

Whereas where responsibility is imposed there must be given for its effectuation adequate authority; and with respect to the Panama Canal the treaty of 1903 so provided; and

Whereas the United States has fully and effectively discharged all its treaty obligations with respect to the Panama Canal and the only legitimate interest that Panama can have in the sovereignty of the Canal Zone is one of reversionary character that can never become operative unless the United States should abandon the canal enterprise; and

Whereas the policy of the United States since President Hayes' message to the Congress on March 8, 1880, has been for an interoceanic canal "under American control," that is to say, under the control of the United States; and

Whereas the grant by Panama to the United States of exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone for the aforesaid purposes was an absolute, indispensable condition precedent to the great task undertaken by the United States in the construction and perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal, for the benefit of the entire world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, (1) That the United States, under treaty provisions, constitutionally acquired, and holds, in perpetuity, exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone for the construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

(2) That there can be no just claim by the Republic of Panama for the exercise of any sovereignty of whatever character over the Canal Zone so long as the United States discharges its duties and obligations with respect to the canal; and

(3) That the formal display of any official flag over the Canal Zone other than that of the United States is violative of law, treaty, international usage, and the historic canal policy of the United States as fully upheld by its highest courts and administrative officials; and would lead to confusion and chaos in the administration of the Panama Canal enterprise.

PANAMA CANAL: LONG-RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, since 1949 I have been actively interested in the problems of the Panama Canal and interoceanic canals generally. My first official assignment was as chairman of a special inquiry into the operations of the Panama Canal, which culminated in the reorganization of the enterprise under Public Law 841, 81st Congress. That law brought about the first major administrative change in the canal organization since April 1, 1914, and placed the enterprise on a self-sustaining basis.

Though reassigned to another committee in the Congress in 1951, my interest in the canal has never diminished. Instead, it has increased and I have been able to keep a close contact with developments, as well as to make contributions by means of inserting meritorious statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and participation in hearings.

Among the most gratifying features of this association has been the growing evidence of expanding public knowledge of important canal questions as evidenced by the publication of thoughtful and discriminating articles in the lay and professional press. So much has this interest grown that students of our colleges and universities, graduate and undergraduate, have undertaken to write these and papers on various phases of the canal question.

The latest contribution is a research paper on the long-range Panama Canal program by Midshipman Mark Melvyn Golden of the U.S. Naval Academy, class of 1960, prepared as part of his fourth year training.

Based upon an examination of evidence from many sources, independent as well as "official," Midshipman Golden's paper is a remarkably clear, logical, and concise statement of the major problems involved in the canal question. It shows up the pitfalls of extreme interpretation of any single factor as paramount in justifying predetermined objectives and presents conclusions that take into consideration all the main features involved in the economic operation of the Panama Canal as a great interocean link for the commerce of the world on terms of equality.

As such, Midshipman Golden's paper reflects high credit not only on himself but also on the great service Academy which encouraged him to undertake the arduous task of research which necessarily preceded its writing.

Particularly notable, Mr. Speaker, was Midshipman Golden's recognition of the fallacious premise of hypothetical security on which the 1947 drive for a vast sea-level undertaking at Panama was predicated. This, I wish to emphasize by repeating one of his quotable statements:

It is a matter of conjecture to say whether a sea-level or a lock canal could be more seriously damaged by an atomic bomb. It is a matter of fact to realize that either type would be so seriously damaged that defense should not be a factor in laying out long-range plans.

In order that the indicated paper may be recorded in the permanent annals of the Congress and thus be made available as an inspiration for students in other educational institutions, as well as for the legislative and executive agencies of our Government concerned with canal questions, I quote the text, footnotes, and bibliography:

LONG-RANGE IMPROVEMENTS ON THE PANAMA CANAL

(A research paper submitted to the head of the Department of English, History, and Government, by Mark M. Golden, midshipman, first class, U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., February 1960)

I. OBJECTIVE

The purpose of this paper is to study the most feasible of the proposed long-range improvements on the transisthmian waterway across Central America. The plans presented will be analyzed from the mission point of view; to provide a shortcut for shipping with reasonable tolls, minimum navigational hazards, and few delays in transit. The alternate plans are for (1) conversion of the present Panama Canal to an enlarged, modernized, lock-terminal lake canal; (2) conversion of the present Panama Canal to sea level; and (3) construction of a completely new canal through Nicaragua.

Some of the major factors to be considered are future traffic trends, cost, marine operational feasibility, diplomatic implications, and military defense.

II. THE PRESENT PANAMA CANAL

The Panama Canal is a lock and lake-type canal which provides a waterway for oceangoing vessels to use as a shortcut between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Fresh water is used for lockages, and is taken principally from Gatun Lake. Madden Lake serves as a reservoir for use during the dry season.

The minimum dimensions of the channel are 300 feet wide in Gaillard Cut and 37 feet deep at low tide in Balboa Harbor. From the Cristobal breakwater at the Atlantic terminus to San Jose Rock at the Pacific terminus the channel has a length of 51.2 miles, measured along its 23 courses.[1]

Transiting from Balboa Harbor at the Pacific entrance to the Atlantic Ocean terminus, ships encounter several major features of the Panama Canal. First they are raised to the 54 feet of elevation of Miraflores Lake by two pairs of Miraflores locks.[2] About 1 mile further, the single pair of Pedro Miguel Locks raises ships to the level of Gatun Lake, which is regulated between 82 and 87 feet. Gaillard Cut is the channel extension of Gatun Lake through the Continental Divide. At the northern edge of Gatun Lake, three continuous pairs of Gatun Locks lower ships to the level of the Atlantic Ocean.[3]

The locks themselves are built in two parallel lanes in order to handle two-way traffic. The size of the lock chambers, 1,000 feet long by 110 feet wide, is the factor that limits the size of transiting ships.[4]

The Panama Canal is operated and maintained by the Panama Canal Company, a corporate agency and instrumentality of the U.S. Government. The Panama Canal Company is financially self-sufficient, and not only pays for its own operation and depreciation, but also produces a net income.[5]

III. THE NEED FOR A CANAL

The Panama Canal is vital to the defense of the United States and the commerce of the world. The extreme weakness of extending lines of communications around the Horn was first felt by the United States during the Spanish-American War. The cruiser *Oregon*, which was berthed in San Francisco Harbor, consumed 90 days before being able to take part in the Battle of Santiago de Cuba. Fueling and replenishing had to be done by putting into South American ports en route.[6] In the present era of long-range warships with high cruising speeds, the voyage around the Horn has been greatly

---

[1] Report of the Governor of the Panama Canal under Public Law 280, 79th Cong., 1st sess. (Balboa Heights, 1947); 7. Hereafter cited as "Report of Government."

[2] All elevations given in this paper are above mean sea level.

[3] Panama Canal Company, "The Panama Canal" (n.p., n.d.), 16; and Report of Government, 7.

[4] Armed Forces Information and Education Division, "The Panama Canal—An Outpost of Hemisphere Defense," Armed Forces Talk 373 (May 18, 1951); 7.

[5] William G. Arey to Midshipman Mark M. Golden, July 17, 1959 (letter); 1–2.

[6] Andre Siegfried, Suez and Panama (New York, 1940); 285–286.

simplified. However, with the prospect of undeclared lightning warfare, time is so vital that the difference of even a few days could lose a war.

From the merchant marine point of view, the payment of tolls to go through the Panama Canal is cheaper than the delay that would result from an ideal, uneventful rounding of the Horn.[7] And the weather conditions in the Horn area are usually far from ideal. Also to be taken into consideration are the additional expenses of fuel and supplies for the longer trip. In fact, during the recent Suez crisis, some shipping found it more economical to use the Panama Canal than to steam around the Cape of Good Hope.[8]

During both World War II and the Korean conflict, the Panama Canal played a major part in transoceanic shipping. In World War II about 5,300 combat vessels and over 8,500 support vessels (transports, supply ships, et cetera made the transit through the Panama Canal. Throughout 1953, the last full year of the Korean conflict, 1,064 U.S. Government ships locked through the canal. Most of these vessels were carrying supplies and war materials to the Far East.[9]

As mentioned previously, a size limitation is imposed on ships by the dimensions of the lock chambers. The only merchant vessels that are too large to use the Canal are *Queen Mary* and *Queen Elizabeth*.[10] *Midway* and *Forrestal* class aircraft carriers are the only American warships that cannot fit in the Canal.[11] A war would probably force the conversion of *Queen Mary* and *Queen Elizabeth* from North Atlantic passenger ships to troop transports for use anywhere in the world. The flexibility of these ships and the supercarriers would be increased if they had the ability to transit the canal. Also, present trends in ship contruction, especially of tankers, are toward longer and wider vessels.

IV. OPERATIONAL PROBLEMS OF THE CANAL

The Panama Canal today has two major flaws, other than dimensions of the locks, that were inherent in the original construction. First, the Pacific locks are in two separate groups; the Pedro Miguel locks and the Miraflores locks. They should have been built together in one continuous structure, as were the Atlantic locks. The second fault is the lack of a summit level anchorage between Gaillard Cut and the Pacific locks.[12]

As a ship makes the approach to the Miraflores locks from the Pacific Ocean, a small boat rows out from the central wall with leader lines. The ship is maneuvered until it is dead in the water, and lines are secured to electric locomotives that move the ship through the locks area. The entire procedure must be repeated to go through the nearby Pedro Miguel locks. At least an hour is lost and additional hazards are undergone as a result of the extra approach.[13]

The most dangerous area of the Panama Canal is just north of the Pedro Miguel locks. A tremendous volume of water is drawn from Gaillard Cut each time the Pedro Miguel locks are filled, causing a surge reaching speeds of 25 knots and having an amplitude up to 3 feet. At times the surge overpowers vessels, resulting in their grounding on the rocky banks of Gaillard Cut.[14] The accident statistics illustrate that the safety of ships depends too much on the exceptional skill of the pilot, rather than the operational characteristics built into the canal.

If passage through Gaillard Cut is dangerous in clear weather, it is more hazardous in fog. This section of the channel is frequently covered with a heavy fog at night after 2200 hours.[15] In fair weather or foul, the Pedro Miguel locks are a dangerous constriction to traffic in their present location. The resulting traffic delay would be eased by having a summit level anchorage between Gaillard Cut and the Pacific locks.

V. THE TERMINAL LAKE—THIRD LOCKS PLAN

An obvious solution for the principal marine operational problems of the Panama Canal is that developed in the canal organization during World War II and presented by its author before the Panama Section of the American Society of Civil Engineers on May 20, 1943. Known as the Terminal Lake, third locks plan, it calls for the relocation of the Pacific locks in one continuous structure at Agua Dulce, an area near the present Miraflores locks. The level of Miraflores Lake would then be elevated from its present 54 feet to the height of Gatun Lake. The entire summit water level would be raised to 92 feet.[16]

Before work on the unsuccessful third locks project of World War II was halted, some $75 million was expended, for the most part on excavating.[17] The proposed modification includes construction of new and larger locks, using the excavations already started for the discontinued third locks project, but without sharp approach channel curves.[18]

In 1943 the cost of the Terminal Lake, third locks plan was estimated to be $283 million for all work except the widening of Gaillard Cut.[19] A more recent estimate, for the project with lock chambers 1,500 feet long and 200 feet wide, is $1,020,920,000. This proposed size would needlessly double the flooding volume of the lock chambers, which would double the consumption of fresh water.[20] Because of dry seasons in Panama, the additional water requirement would necessitate the construction of reservoirs in territory outside the 10 mile treaty width of the Canal Zone. This in turn would mean negotiating a new treaty with the Republic of Panama at a most inopportune time.[21] Locks with dimensions of 140 x 1,200 feet would be capable of handling modern aircraft carriers, and would be half the cost of the larger ones.[22]

This plan is unique in that it not only takes into consideration the engineering feasibility, but also is based on marine operating experience and painstaking studies of marine accidents throughout Panama Canal history. The completed project would eliminate the dangerous surge in Gaillard Cut, remove the bottleneck Pedro Miguel Locks, effectively widen constricted channel areas, provide the badly needed summit level anchorage, improve navigation, reduce the effect of fog on operations, save time now wasted on an additional approach to the Pacific locks, and increase the capacity of the canal.[23]

VI. THE SEA LEVEL PLAN

In December of 1945, the Governor of the Panama Canal was authorized by Congress to conduct a comprehensive investigation of the transisthmian canal problem, with the proviso that the results of the studies be submitted by the end of 1947. The Canal Zone Government radically interpreted the phrase "capacity and security" from their authorization to mean making defense the main consideration for their recommendations.

Advocates of the sea level canal point out that a single atomic bomb or a well-directed attack with conventional explosives could put a lock canal out of commission for an extended period of time by either of the following means: (1) Seriously damaging the lock structures or (2) draining the water supply in the terminal lake by breaching one or more of its dams.[24] Actually, a sea level canal would be no better off than a lock type. A nuclear explosion would so severely damage even a sea level canal that prompt repairs would be impossible.[25] If an atomic or hydrogen bomb were detonated in the vicinity of Gaillard Cut, the blast would probably cause major landslides which could conceivably fill that portion of the channel. Using defense as a criterion for the long-range improvements on the Panama Canal is therefore unrealistic. There is no way any object can be made impervious by its construction features, as time will yield a means of destroying it.

The Governor's 1947 report recommended that "in order to meet the future needs of interoceanic commerce and national defense, the Panama Canal be converted to a canal at sea level."[26] The proposed plan calls for the draining of Gatun Lake to lower its surface to sea level. Some 1,069 million cubic yards of earth and rock would be excavated to construct a channel 60 feet deep at low tide and 600 feet wide at a depth of 40 feet below low tide.[27] Yet, wartime studies conclusively showed that the majority of marine accidents occurred in the restricted channel through Gaillard cut. Replacing the terminal lake with a restricted channel extending the entire length of the canal would increase navigational hazards.

There is also the possibility of slides occurring during excavation for a sea level canal. Geological studies made throughout the history of the Panama Canal have shown that the ground in Panama is not homogeneous. The earth on the Atlantic side is composed of tertiary sediments, while the Pacific side consists of tertiary volcanic rock. An instability results from the two types of ground not being capable of adhering to each other, which causes underground slides. Disintegration of rocks moistened by rain and humidity causes surface slides as the particles give way to gravity.[28] Both types of slides have plagued engineers from the time construction was begun on the Panama Canal.

The 1947 report points out that there is an inherent navigational difficulty in a sea level canal due to the different tides of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Tides at the Atlantic side generally do not vary more than 2 feet, and so are not a problem. The

---

[7] Interview with Col. William C. Golden, USA (St. Petersburg, Dec. 23, 1959).

[8] Idem.

[9] Panama Canal Company, 13.

[10] Armed Forces Information and Education Division, 7.

[11] There is also the possibility that the nuclear warships designed in the near future will be too large to use the Panama Canal.

[12] Capt. Miles P. DuVal, U.S. Navy, "And the Mountains Will Move" (Sanford University, 1947); 297. Hereafter cited as "Mts."

[13] Interview with Lt. R.R. Robertson, U.S. Navy (Annapolis, Jan. 22, 1960). Hereafter cited as "Robertson, 'Int.'"

[14] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (Jan. 5, 1959); 1.

[15] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (Apr. 21, 1948); 2.

[16] DuVal, "Mts.", 342–343.

[17] Hon. Clark W. Thompson to Midshipman Mark M. Golden, Jan. 6, 1960 (letter on "The Isthmian Question"); 6. Hereafter cited as "Thompson, 'Isth. Question.'"

[18] The Third Locks project contained three sharp angles in by-pass channels of 28°59', 46°17', and 37°30'.

[19] Thompson, "Isth. Question," 6.

[20] M. R. McCann to Hon. Clark W. Thompson, 1959 (letter with comments on proposed Panama Canal improvement projects from a consulting engineer); 2. Hereafter cited as "McCann."

[21] See sec. VII of this paper.

[22] McCann, 2.

[23] Capt. Miles P. DuVal, U.S. Navy, "Isthmian Canal Policy—An Evaluation," U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings (March 1955); 270.

[24] Report of Government, 61.

[25] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (Apr. 21, 1948); 3.

[26] Report of Government, 114.

[27] Ibid., 79.

[28] Siegfried, 210.

Pacific tides vary as much as 22 feet over a period of 12 hours from low to high tide. The tidal variations on the Pacific side of the present Panama Canal cause a 2- to 4-knot current in the vicinity of Rodman Naval Base, south of the Miraflores Locks.[29] The sea level channel would probably result in alternating currents up to 4.5 knots throughout the sea level canal. The solution in the 1947 report is to install a tidal regulating device near the Pacific terminus of the proposed canal, to be used twice daily, during the times of maximum currents. A barrier to an unrestricted bypass channel would be opened at all times the currents are below 2 knots. Since the tidal lock would function only to lift ships in or out of the canal, there would be no summit lake.[30]

The initial estimated cost in 1947 for conversion to sea level was $2,483 million, but this estimate did not include the costs involved in negotiating a new canal treaty with Panama. Since then construction costs have doubled. The present day costs of converting the Panama Canal to sea level would not be an appreciable savings over construction costs of a new canal through Nicaragua.[31]

VII. A CANAL THROUGH NICARAGUA

The Bryan-Chamorro Treaty of 1914 between the United States and Nicaragua gives the United States the exclusive option to construct, maintain, operate, and protect a transisthmian canal through Nicaragua.[32] This route has been the major rival of the Panama route throughout canal history.

Although the Nicaraguan route is considerably longer, it is simplified by the many natural waterways present. Lake Nicaragua has an average elevation of 104 feet and has maximum dimensions of 45 by 100 miles. Lake Managua, with an average elevation of 127 feet, is 40 by 20 miles, and drains into Lake Nicaragua through the Tipitapa River. The proposed route features the use of the Deseado and San Juan Rivers to Lake Nicaragua. It would go across the southern end of Lake Nicaragua, then along a channel to be excavated through the Continental Divide. This takes advantage of the pass through the Continental Divide being at its most favorable ground profile at a relatively low elevation of 153 feet.[33]

The lakes provide the principal means of transportation and communications in Nicaragua. The construction of a sea level canal would entail the draining of at least one of the major lakes. Furthermore, excavation for such a canal would be prohibitively costly. Any canal through Nicaragua would have to be of the lock type.

A summit lake-lock canal similar to the Panama Canal, but enlarged and modernized, could be completed for $4,095 million. The use of the lakes would leave only a narrow part of the route to be excavated, and conditions along the route appear to be ideal for nuclear blasting.[34]

Some of the more important defects of the Nicaraguan route are as follows:[35]

1. Panama has good harbors on both terminal points of the Panama Canal. Nicaraguan harbors would have to be built with considerable difficulty.

2. One region along the Nicaraguan route has an annual rainfall of 256 inches, which would pose a real problem for excavation and construction.

3. The large amount of rainfall would mean poor marine operating weather.

4. There are active volcanoes and occasional earthquakes in the route area.

5. There is a complete lack of construction, not only for a canal, but of essential housing and facilities for workers.

Therefore, from the engineering point of view, it is obvious that Panama is the better route.

VIII. DIPLOMATIC IMPLICATIONS

It has become the vogue among some officials in the Government of Panama, as well as influential merchants and wealthy aristocrats, to divert the Panamanian working class from noticing their own pocket lining by making an international issue of Canal Zone sovereignty. The friction has been increased lately by having outside elements hop on the bandwagon. Nasser of Egypt was quick to offer lessons in canal management, although the original treaties with Panama were nothing like the Suez agreements. The Suez Canal was to have been built and controlled for 99 years after its opening by a private company formed under deLesseps—and would have been returned to the Government of Egypt within the next decade if Nasser had not abrogated the pledges.[36]

Nasser was not the only power to back Panama. In February, 1959, the 21st congress of the Communist Party, at their meeting in Moscow, stressed assigning agents for infiltration into Latin America to forment hatred toward the "arrogant Yankees" that might eventually lead toward internationalization of the Panama Canal.[37] This did not mark the first signs of Communist activities in Panama. To gain a foothold in a focal area of the Western Hemisphere is as old a concept for the Communists as the party itself. Their plans to take over the Panama Canal are a major steppingstone toward their goal of world domination.

Three times, Panamanian mobs marched on the Canal Zone to plant Panamanian flags there. The first time was on May 2, 1958, and the second was on November 3, 1959. The second invasion, led by Dr. Quilino Boyd, a candidate for the Presidency of Panama, resulted in 4 hours of violence. Known Communists and fellow travelers were spotted in the crowd. During the rioting, the U.S. Embassy in Panama overheard broadcasts instructing the Panamanian National Guard [38] not to intervene in any demonstrations against the United States. As a result, the mobs were able to surround the U.S. Embassy in Panama and leisurely desecrate the American flag.[39]

The Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 between Panama and the United States is in effect today. The key articles of the treaty grant exclusive sovereign control over the Canal Zone to the United States in perpetuity for the perpetual maintenance, operation, and protection of the Panama Canal, and specifically, to the entire exclusion of the exercise by Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority. Thus the only interest that Panama can have in the Canal Zone is one of reversionary nature in the sole event the United States should discontinue its operation of the Panama Canal.[40]

The treaty of 1903 was a recognition of a fact admitted even by many leading Panamanians today—that the Republic of Panama is too politically and economically unstable to be able to handle a major project such as the Panama Canal. Rather than consider this a reflection on the good people of Panama, it should be an indication of their foresight. However, they seem to be losing their perspective lately.

Fortunately, the U.S. Congress has several well-informed spokesmen on the issue of sovereignty of the Canal Zone. Although the State Department of the United States wants to use a policy of concessions, the Congress is looking out for the United States, and will not tolerate the actions of Panama in trying to grab what they have no right to, either morally or by the supreme law of their land.

The United States made the Panama Canal. Not just with steamshovels and cement—but with blood and sweat; with victims of yellow fever and malaria; with people like the great Rear Adm. John G. Walker, Theodore Roosevelt, John F. Stevens, William C. Gorgas, George W. Goethals, William L. Sibert, and many others. The American people must guard their investment carefully.

IX. SUMMARY

The Panama Canal has safely and adequately served its purpose since its opening to traffic on August 15, 1914. The trend toward increasing traffic and the few flaws originally built into the Panama Canal require long-range improvements in the near future.

Recent political developments in the Republic of Panama indicate a desire to abrogate the grant in perpetuity of sovereign powers over the Canal Zone to the United States. Although the State Department of the United States has long been inclined to make concessions to Panama, the Congress is fighting the the rights of the United States according to treaty and law. If the Canal Zone should slip out of the hands of the United States, or if there is a probability that it will, the construction of a new transisthmian waterway through Nicaragua should be seriously considered.

Any extravagant and unnecessary expenditures on the Panama Canal would have to be reflected in considerably higher tolls, which would defeat the mission of the Panama Canal to commercial shipping. With this in mind, any routes other than Panama or Nicaragua must be ruled out. The stupidity of spending more for no special advantages, but rather several major disadvantages, also applies to the conversion of the present Panama Canal to sea level.

It is a matter of conjecture to say whether a sea level or a lock canal could be more seriously damaged by an atomic bomb. It is a matter of fact to realize that either type would be so seriously damaged that defense should not be a factor in laying out long-range plans.

From the marine operating point of view, the only plan that adequately provides for safe transit of ships and the anticipated increase in traffic at economic cost is the terminal lake-third locks plan. By replacing the heterogeneous Pacific locks with a continuous structure at Agua Dulce, the Pedro Miguel bottleneck is removed, dangerous lockage surges in Gaillard Cut are eliminated, and a terminal lake anchorage is provided—without interrupting the use of the Panama Canal for an extended period of time.

The 1947 report recommended that a sea level canal replace the present Panama Canal. The plan is unrealistic, as it would dangerously increase the probability of collisions and groundings by replacing the relatively wide lakes with a restricted channel. Possibly the recommendation was influenced by powerful companies interested

---

[29] Robertson, "Int."

[30] Report of Government, 73–74.

[31] McCann, 3.

[32] W. L. Bales, "The Nicaraguan Canal; a Study in American Diplomatic History From the Beginning of Trans-Isthmian Canal Discussions to 1926" (Quantico, 1930); 107.

[33] Report of Government, 28.

[34] McCann, 3.

[35] Willis John Abbott, "Panama and the Canal in Picture and Prose" (New York, 1913); 23–38.

[36] William Storrs Lee, "The Strength To Move a Mountain" (New York, 1958).

[37] Dan Smoot, "Panama Canal—Part I, "The Dan Smoot Report (Dec. 21, 1959); 407.

[38] The Panamanian National Guard serves both as the army and as the police force.

[39] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (Jan. 13, 1960); 423.

[40] Ibid., 357.

in the tremendous bulk of excavating the plan requires. Also, to convert to sea level might involve closing the Panama Canal for an extended period of time.

X. CONCLUSIONS

A firm political stand should be taken against the efforts of the Republic of Panama to acquire, bit by bit, sovereignty over the Canal Zone. Then the terminal lake-third locks project should be started to increase the capacity and safety of the Panama Canal. Should the United States lose control of the Canal Zone, the Nicaraguan lock canal plan could be made operational, although at a greatly increased cost.

REFERENCES CONSULTED

I. Nonofficial publications, individual

Willis John Abbot, "Panama and the Canal in Picture and Prose"; New York: Syndicate Publishing Co., 1913.

W. L. Bates, "The Nicaraguan Canal; a Study in American Diplomatic History from the Beginning of Trans-Isthmian Canal Discussions to 1926"; Quantico: Marine Corps Schools Press, 1930.

Reuben E. Bakenhus; Capt. Harry S. Knapp, U.S. Navy; and Emory R. Johnson, "The Panama Canal"; New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1915.

Samuel Flagg Bemis, "The Latin American Policy of the United States"; New York: Harcourt, Bruce & Co., 1943.

Ira E. Bennett, "History of the Panama Canal; Its Construction and Builders"; Washington: Historical Publishing Co., 1915.

Joseph Bucklin Bishop, "The Panama Gateway"; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.

Philippe Bunsu-Varilla, "From Panama to Verdun"; Philadelphia: Dorrance & Co., 1940.

Floyd Cramer, "Our Neighbor Nicaragua"; New York: Stokes, 1929.

Capt. Miles P. DuVal, U.S. Navy, "And the Mountains Will Move"; Stanford University: Stanford University Press, 1947.

Capt. Miles P. DuVal, U.S. Navy, "Cadiz to Cathay"; Stanford University: Stanford University Press, 1940–1947.

Esteben Escobar, "Biografia del General Dom Pedro Joaquin Chemorro, 1818–1890"; Managua: Tipografia la Prensa, 1935.

John Foster Fraser, "Panama and What It Means"; London: Cassell & Co., Ltd., 1913.

Willis Fletcher Johnson, "Four Centuries of the Panama Canal"; New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1906.

J. H. Latane, "A History of American Foreign Policy"; New York: Doubleday, 1934.

William Storrs Lee, "The Strength To Move a Mountain"; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1958.

Norman Judson Padelford, "The Panama Canal in Peace and War"; New York: The MacMillan Co., 1942.

Luis Quintanilla, "A Latin American Speaks"; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1943.

Andre Siegried, "Suez and Panama"; New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1940.

Arthur P. Whitaker, "The United States and South America"; "The Northern Republics"; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948.

II. Official and semiofficial publications

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; Washington: Government Printing Office

January 6, 1948: "The Panama Canal: Operations or Engineering?"

April 21, 1948: "What of the Panama Canal?"

May 21, 1948: "Tribute to the Late Sidney B. Williamson."

May 28, 1948: "Panama Canal Problem."

January 5, 1949: "Panama Boondoggling."

October 13, 1949: "Panama Canal—President Theodore Roosevelt's Decision."

January 15, 1952: "Interoceanic Canal Problems."

June 4, 1956: "Panama Canal Improvements: Views of Experienced Engineers."

May 24, 1957: "The Panama Canal."

May 29, 1957: "Panama Canal: U.S. Ownership and Control."

March 26, 1958: "Panama Canal Zone: Constitutional Domain of the United States."

April 2, 1958: "Panama Canal Zone: Constitutional Domain of the United States—Further Supplementary."

June 9, 1958: "Panama Canal—Latest Developments."

January 15, 1959: "Panama Canal: More on 'Digging the Ditch.' "

June 17, 1959: "The Untold Story of Panama."

August 26, 1959: "Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD awarded the certificate of merit of the Patriotic Order Sons of America."

September 7, 1959: "Birth Centennial of Theodore Roosevelt—Notable Canal Zone Celebration."

September 9, 1959: "Communist Triple Threat: CIA Findings."

January 13, 1960: "The Panama Canal: Symbol of a Fourth Front."

January 27, 1960: "Panama Canal Zone: 'Yankee Go Home.' "

Gov. J. C. Mchaffey, "Report of the Governor of the Panama Canal Under Public Law 280," 79th Congress, 1st session; Balboa Heights, 1947.

Sullivan and Cromwell, Comp., "Compilation of Executive Documents and Diplomatic Correspondence Relative to a Trans-Isthmian Canal in Central America"; New York: Job Printing House, 1955.

Toribio Tijerino, "El Tratado Chamorro-Bryant y Sus Proyecciones en la America Central"; Managua: Tipografia La Prensa, 1953.

III. Periodicals and pamphlets

Armed Forces Information and Education Division: "The Panama Canal—An Outpost of Hemisphere Defense," Armed Forces Talk 373, May 18, 1951, pages 1–15.

Mary Barclay, "Panama Canal—Lifeline of National Defense," Report to America, January 1960, pages 4–5.

Douglas B. Cornell, "Panama Canal More Important by the Minute," St. Petersburg Times, January 24, 1960.

Leon Debayle, "Historia del Canal de Nicaragua," Revista de la Academia de Geografia e Historia de Nicaragua, Diciembre 1947, pages 87–99.

Deslant Staff, "Destroyerman," November 1959, page 8.

Capt. Miles P. DuVal, U.S. Navy, "Isthmian Canal Policy—An Evaluation," U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, March 1955, pages 262–331.

Earl Harding, Economic Council Letter 341, August 15, 1954.

John V. Horner, "Stakes in Row Over Panama's Sovereignty," the Washington Star, January 17, 1960.

Capt. William R. McDaniel, U.S. Army, "Nicaragua, Land of Lakes," June 1940, pages 17–19, 43–46.

Panama Canal Company, "The Panama Canal, Funnel for World Commerce" (not dated—estimated 1952).

Dan Smoot, "Panama Canal—Part I," The Dan Smoot Report, December 21, 1959.

D. I. Sultan, "An Army Engineer Explores Nicaragua," National Geographic, May 1932, pages 593–627.

Luis Marden, "Land of Lakes and Volcanoes," National Geographic, August 1944, pages 161–184.

Herbert D. Vogel, "Panama Canal Problem Calls for Action," U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, December 1947, p. 1348.

IV. Manuscripts

William G. Arey, to Midshipman Mark M. Golden, U.S. Navy, letter with summary of recommendations made in 1947 by Canal Zone, Gov. J. E. Mehaffey, July 17, 1959.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, to the President of the United States, open letter on treaties with Panama, December 3, 1959.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, press releases, November 14, 1959.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, press releases, December 6, 1959.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, press releases, December 24, 1959.

M. R. McCann, to Hon. CLARK W. THOMPSON, letter with comments on proposed Panama Canal improvement projects from a consulting engineer, 1959.

Hon. CLARK W. THOMPSON, to Midshipman Mark M. Golden, U.S. Navy, letter on "The Isthmian Question," January 6, 1960.

V. Interviews

Capt. Miles P. DuVal, U.S. Navy (retired); at Comos Club, Washington, January 3, 1960. Background: Captain of the Port, Balboa, Canal Zone, 1941–44, in charge of marine operations in the Pacific Sector of the Canal; Navy Department Liaison Officer and Coordinator of Isthmian Canal studies under the Chief of Naval Operations, 1946–49.

Col. William Charles Golden, U.S. Army (retired); at his home in St. Petersburg, December 23, 1959. Background: Staff officer at Headquarters, U.S. Army Caribbean, Fort Amador, Canal Zone, 1949–51; Deputy Commander and Chief of Staff, U.S. Army Forces Antilles, 1952–53.

Lt. R. R. Robertson, U.S. Navy; at Bancroft Hall, Annapolis, January 22, 1960. Background: Commanding officer, U.S.S. *Jasper*, PC486, immediately prior to reporting to the U.S. Naval Academy in June 1959.

SOVIET ESPIONAGE ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, during his barbaric performance in Paris Mr. Khrushchev made an interesting observation. He swore that before God his hands were clean and his heart was pure. I wonder just how clean they are. I wonder if they are any cleaner than they were the day he signed the order for the horror of Hungary. I wonder just how pure a heart can be that seeks to replace freedom with slavery, that substitutes falsehoods for truth, that corrupts words until they are meaningless. I wonder how pure a heart can be that calls upon God while the very system which he leads denies the existence of God. I remember when I was in Russia, a student at the university told me that he believed that there was a God but could never discuss it with anyone because if it were found out he would be considered unfit to attend Moscow University. He said the Communist teachings deny God and that the state was supreme, and that to believe in God was considered a weakness.

The Soviet Government seeks to keep recent events alive by today moving to have the U–2 incident taken up by the Security Council at the United Nations.

I thought perhaps it would be of interest to all who are interested to take a look at the bloody hands of Khrushchev and to peer into his black heart on the matter of espionage.

I thought perhaps this House would be interested in a bill of particulars on the espionage activities of the Soviet

Union and its Communist apparatus. These activities were carried on relentlessly, regardless of the temperature of the cold war. Of course this list cannot be complete. Many cases are classified, others for various security reasons have never been reported. These cases are documented and supported by evidence of which there is no reasonable doubt. Further, it does not take into consideration cases which could not be proven by the rules of American jurisprudence.

This present posture of American-Soviet relations emphasizes once again the great difficulties of dealing with the Communists. They who deny God call upon God to assist their case. They who invented and perfected international subversion and espionage find themselves able to condemn the U.S. activities which were undertaken not only for our own defense but on the defense of the entire free world.

It places us in a position where we must constantly justify our need to survive in the minds of our friends who themselves are the beneficiaries of our own survival.

I do hope that this information will, in some small way, contribute to a better understanding of the magnitude of the problem we face.

If it does nothing else I do hope that it will serve as one more indictment of communism and of Khrushchev. If Mr. Khrushchev insists in bringing the U–2 incident before the Security Council, let us bring his record of espionage before the Security Council and have a full disclosure of all the facts laid before the court of world opinion.

Let us also bring before the Security Council the entire record of Communist sabotage to peace, to progress, to understanding, to freedom, to governments, to nations, to the mind of man, and to the principles of God.

Mr. Speaker, the following is a bill of particulars on reported cases of Soviet espionage in the United States and other Western Allied nations that I hereby make part of this record:

(NOTE.—Those instances involving diplomatic personnel are indicated by the word "diplomatic.")

Vice President NIXON, in a speech in Syracuse, N.Y., said that two Soviet spies were arrested in Massachusetts while Premier Khrushchev was in the United States last fall.

May 18, 1960 (diplomatic): The State Department has just confirmed that one of them was a Soviet employee with the United Nations. His name was Vadin Alexandrovich Kirilyvk. He was here on a diplomatic passport. A request was made that his services to the United Nations be terminated. He was expelled from this country and returned to Russia. The name of the other is still classified.

May 11, 1960 (diplomatic): The Swiss Government arrested and expelled two Soviet Embassy officials for attempting to collect secret information on Swiss army installations and U.S. rocket bases in West Germany.

April 1, 1960: Anthony M. Wraight, a former Royal Air Force officer, was found guilty in London of having given military information to Russia and was sentenced to 3 years in prison.

January 30, 1960: Horst Ludwig and Fritz Briesemeister were sentenced by a West German court to 4 and 5 years at hard labor, respectively, for treason. Two other defendants, Werner Jaeger and his wife, Hanni, were sentenced to 3 years and 18 months.

February 21, 1959: Einar Bleckinberg, a former Danish diplomat, was sentenced in Copenhagen to 8 years in prison for spying on behalf of Communist Poland.

November 20, 1958: Lt. Hans Berli was sentenced by a Swiss military court to 4 years hard labor for giving classified military secrets to Czech agents.

November 20, 1958: Mark Zborowski was convicted of perjury in denying to a Federal grand jury investigating espionage that he had known Jack Soble. He was sentenced to 5 years in prison.

July 18, 1958: Brian Linney, an engineer, was sentenced to 14 years imprisonment by a British court for selling secret information to Col. Oldrich Pribyl, a former Czech military attaché in England.

June 7, 1958 (diplomatic): Nikolai I. Kurochkin, third secretary of the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata for the improper procurement of U.S. Army manuals and other materials.

May 19, 1958 (diplomatic): Aleksandr Solovyev, assistant military attaché of the Soviet Embassy in Rome, after being detained on charges of espionage was asked to leave Italy.

February 21, 1958: M. Sgt. Roy A. Rhodes was convicted by a U.S. Army court-martial of conspiring to deliver U.S. secrets to the Soviet Union and was sentenced to 5 years' imprisonment at hard labor and was dishonorably discharged.

November 15, 1957: Col. Rudolf I. Abel, a Soviet intelligence officer, was sentenced to 30 years in prison and fined $3,000 for passing U.S. defense and atomic secrets to Russia.

November 1957: German officials reveal that a former first lieutenant in the West German Air Force has been convicted of espionage.

October 8, 1957: Jack Soble was sentenced to 7 years in prison after pleading guilty to heading a spy ring for the Soviet Union.

September 25, 1957: An Austrian Customs Service official was arrested for espionage and confessed that he turned information over to Czech Communist agents.

September 20, 1957: U.S. Air Force Capt. George French was convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment for attempting to sell military secrets to the Soviet Union.

September 5, 1957: A former Japanese Foreign Office official was fined and sentenced to prison for selling secrets to a Soviet agent.

August 9, 1957: Jacob Albam was sentenced to 5½ years in prison after pleading guilty to espionage in behalf of the Soviet Union as a member of the Soble spy ring.

August 9, 1957: Myra Soble, wife of Jack Soble, was sentenced to 5½ years in prison after pleading guilty to charges of espionage.

July 23, 1957: West German security officials broke a Communist spy ring headquartered in a Bonn hotel.

May 7, 1957: Three men were sentenced to death in Greece after being convicted of treason and espionage for the Soviet Union. Another man was given a life sentence and five other persons were given lesser terms.

April 24, 1957: Robert Folke Damstedt, assistant secretary of the Swedish Atomic Energy Commission, was convicted of stealing secret papers, and was sentenced to 5 years in prison.

March 16, 1957 (diplomatic): Jiri Stejskal, third secretary of the Czechoslovak Legation in Vienna, was expelled from Austria for attempting to bribe a police official to carry out espionage work.

March 12, 1957: A Swedish court sentenced Bedros Zartaryan, a Turkish engineer employed by a firm which was building Swedish naval and airbases, to 10 years at hard labor for grand espionage for the Soviet Union.

February 27, 1957 (diplomatic): The Danish Government expelled Soviet Lt. Comdr. Mikhail Ruditchev, assistance naval attaché of the Soviet Embassy, on the grounds that he was attempting to obtain secret military information.

January 28, 1957 (diplomatic): Vassili M. Molev, a clerk attached to the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata by the State Department. He was later named as a coconspirator in the indictment of the Sobles' spy ring.

January 14, 1957 (diplomatic): Maj. Yuri P. Krylov, assistant military attaché of the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata for purchasing classified electronic equipment and attempting to purchase secret military information.

December 18, 1956 (diplomatic): Mate Vegh, former Hungarian second secretary, was expelled from Switzerland for spying.

October 5, 1956: Jean Joseph Philip, a code clerk at the Budapest Legation in Paris, and Roger Dubois, legation press attaché, were convicted in France of spying for the Hungarian secret service and were sentenced to imprisonment.

October 5, 1956: Anatole Ericson, a radar instrument maker, was convicted of giving military secrets to Russia by a Swedish court and sentenced to 12 years at hard labor.

September 5, 1956 (diplomatic): Sweden expelled Peter Mirosnikov for receiving secret data from Anatole Ericson and sent a formal protest to Moscow about its spy activities in that country.

August 29, 1956 (diplomatic): Rostislav Shapovalov, second secretary of the Soviet mission to the U.N., was requested to leave the United States after it was discovered that he exerted pressure on a Russian refugee in the United States to become a Soviet agent.

August 24, 1956 (diplomatic): Victor I. Petrov, a translator in the languages section on the U.N. Secretariat, was discharged from the United Nations after the U.S. delegation issued a statement saying that Petrov had sought to get information vital to the security and defense of the United States.

July 13, 1956 (diplomatic): Gennadi Popov, the Soviet second secretary, was expelled from Canada for spying.

June 14, 1956 (diplomatic): Col. Ivan A. Bubchikov, assistant military attaché of the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata for activities incompatible to his continued presence in this country.

March 1, 1956 (diplomatic): Maj. Anatoli Kuznetsov, assistant military attaché of the Soviet Embassy in Teheran, was expelled from Iran after being arrested with Iranian Air Force Warrant Officer Hussein Rejaei Tehrani who confessed to espionage.

September 14, 1955: An Australian Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage released its report. The Commission, created after Vladimir Petrov, third secretary of the Soviet Embassy, sought asylum from the Russians on April 13, 1954, declared that two Soviet spy apparatuses had been functioning in Australia since 1943. At least 120 Australians, all of whom were Communists, assisted the Soviet spy rings but because of the Australian law on espionage and the admissibility of evidence no prosecutions were undertaken.

December 22, 1954 (diplomatic): Maj. Ludvik Sochor, Czech military attaché in Geneva, and two of his assistants were expelled from Switzerland for espionage.

August 28, 1954: Nobunori Higurashi, a Japanese Foreign Office official, committed suicide after he had confessed to giving secret information to a Soviet spy ring. The central figure in the ring was Yuri A. Rastvorov, former member of the Soviet mission

to Tokyo, who has been granted political asylum in the United States. Two other Foreign Office officials have also been implicated.

May 29, 1954 (diplomatic): Leonid E. Pivnev, assistant air attaché in the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata and expelled for engaging in espionage.

February 3, 1954 (diplomatic): Alexander P. Kovalev, second secretary to the Soviet delegation to the United Nations was declared persona non grata and expelled for espionage activities.

February 3, 1954 (diplomatic): Igor A. Amosov, assistant naval attaché at the Soviet Embassy in Washington, was declared persona non grata and expelled for engaging in espionage.

October 31, 1953: Private Robert W. Dorey was sentenced to 15 years in prison after pleading guilty to fleeing to East Germany, then twice returning to the U.S. zone with Soviet agents whom he guided around U.S. military installations.

June 8, 1953 (diplomatic): Yuri Novikov, second secretary of the Soviet Embassy, was named as a coconspirator in the Verber-Ponger indictment. He was then declared persona non grata by the U.S. Government and returned to the Soviet Union.

June 8, 1953: Kurt Ponger and Otto Verber were convicted of conspiracy to procure and transmit Army, Air Force, and aircraft plant data to the Soviet Union. They were sentenced to 5 to 15 years and 3½ to 10 years in prison, respectively.

June 8, 1953: Air Force Staff Sergeant Giusseppe Cascio was convicted by court-martial in Taegu, Korea, of conspiracy to give jet plane secrets to the Communists. He was given a 20-year jail sentence and a dishonorable discharge.

June 5, 1953: William Perl was sentenced to 5 years in prison for perjury for having told a grand jury in 1950 that he did not know atom spies Julius Rosenberg and Morton Sobell.

May 30, 1953 (diplomatic): Christache Zambeti, first secretary of the Rumanian Legation in Washington, was declared persona non grata for attempting to blackmail a U.S. citizen into espionage acts.

February 25, 1953: Lev. C. Pissarev, Tass correspondent, was deported from the Netherlands for spying after being arrested on December 23 in the act of receiving secret documents from a Dutch official who was cooperating with the police.

February 4, 1953: William Remington was found guilty of perjuring himself at his first trial in 1951 when he said he never gave any secret material of the War Production Board to Elizabeth Bentley, a self-styled Communist spy. He was sentenced to 3 years in prison.

October 1952: Nikolai Skvartsov, a political officer in the United Nations Department of Security Council Affairs, was discharged after the State Department notified the U.N. that he had "violated a U.S. law."

November 14, 1951: Ernest Hilding Andersson, a petty officer in the Swedish Navy, was sentenced to life imprisonment after being found guilty of "gross espionage" for the Soviet Union. Andersson admitted supplying Russians with secret data on the Swedish Navy, coastal defense installations, and suitable invasion areas along the coast of northern Sweden. He named N. P. Orlov, Konstantin Vinogradov, a Soviet Embassy secretary, and Tass correspondent Victor Anissimov as his accomplices.

September 26, 1951 (diplomatic): Nicholai P. Orlov, the assistant naval secretary of the Soviet Embassy in Stockholm, was ordered to leave Sweden immediately in connection with the Andersson espionage case.

April 6, 1951: David Greenglass admitted to giving atomic data to the Fuchs-Gold ring while working as an Army technician at Los Alamos, N. Mex., and was sentenced to 15 years imprisonment.

April 5, 1951: Morton Sobell was sentenced to 30 years in prison for giving nonatomic secrets to the Fuchs-Gold spy ring.

April 5, 1951: Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were sentenced to death for procuring and transmitting United States atom bomb secrets to Russia during and after the Second World War. They were both executed on June 19, 1953.

December 9, 1950: Harry Gold pleaded guilty to transmitting atomic secrets to the Russians and received a 30-year prison sentence.

November 22, 1950: Miriam Moskowitz was convicted (together with A. Brothman) of conspiring to mislead a grand jury and was sentenced to 2 years in prison and fined $10,000.

November 22, 1950: Abraham Brothman was convicted of conspiring to mislead a grand jury (which was investigating espionage) and of influencing Harry Gold to give false statements to the jury. He was sentenced to 7 years imprisonment and fined $15,000. In July 1951, the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the 2-year sentence and $10,000 fine for misleading a grand jury, but reversed the 5-year sentence and $5,000 fine for influencing Gold.

September 22, 1950: Alfred D. Slack pleaded guilty to giving samples of a secret explosive to Harry Gold and was sentenced to 15 years in prison.

April 15, 1950: Air Force Corporal Gustav Mueller was convicted of attempting to give U.S. military secrets to Russia. He was sentenced to 5 years at hard labor.

March 9, 1950 (diplomatic): Valetin A. Gubitchev, a United Nations employee, was found guilty as Judith Coplon's codefendant. He was sentenced to 15 years imprisonment but the sentence was suspended on condition he leave the United States. Gubitchev sailed for Poland on March 20.

March 9, 1950: Judith Coplon, in her second trial, was found guilty of conspiracy to commit espionage and was sentenced to 15 years in prison. On December 5, 1950, the U.S. Court of Appeals reversed the conviction on the grounds of illegal arrest and use of illegal wiretap evidence. The Supreme Court refused to review the case on January 28, 1952.

March 1, 1950: Klaus Fuchs was sentenced by a British court to 14 years imprisonment after pleading guilty to giving atomic secrets to Russia.

January 25, 1950: Alger Hiss was found guilty of lying to a grand jury in 1948 when he declared that he had never given any secret State Department documents to Whittaker Chambers, who then passed them on to the Soviet Union. He was sentenced to 5 years in prison.

October 31, 1949 (diplomatic): Dr. Erwin Munk and a clerk named Horvat of the Czech Embassy in Washington were declared persona non grata.

June 30, 1949: Judith Coplon was convicted of taking Justice Department secrets and using them to aid Russia. She was sentenced to from 40 months to 10 years in prison. On January 28, 1952, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that she was entitled to a new trial because the Government used illegal wiretap evidence. She was never retried on this charge.

May 1, 1946: Allan Nunn May, a British scientist who worked on atomic energy in Canada, was sentenced to 10 years in prison by a British court. May was part of the Soviet espionage ring in Canada which was exposed by Igor Gouzenko, a code clerk in the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa, who broke with the Russians and sought political asylum. Seventeen Soviet Embassy officials charged with espionage have been expelled from Canada. Eight Canadian citizens, including a member of Parliament, were convicted of espionage and given various jail sentences.

May 23, 1960: U.S. News & World Report described Communist espionage in West Germany as follows:

"Last year, in West Germany alone, 2,787 Communist spies were caught. * * * East Germany sent most of them * * * but 264 were from Russia, 114 from Poland, 63 from Czechoslovakia, 11 from Rumania, 8 from Hungary, and 2 from Bulgaria.

"During the first 4 months of this year, 820 more Communist agents were arrested, including 691 from East Germany, 72 from Russia. Yet only a fraction of all spies sent from the Soviet bloc to West Germany are caught.

"The current estimate is that 17,000 Communist spies are operating in West Germany. * * * Red agents also make West Berlin the kidnaping center of the world. Since the war they have tried 340 kidnapings, succeeded in 255.

"West German estimates of 17,000 active agents do not include either the 'silent group' (Polish, Czech, and Rumanian spies posing as refugees) or the 35,000 members of the outlawed West German Communist Party.

"Over the years, more than 15,000 Red agents have been arrested in West Germany. Of these, fewer than 2,000 have been convicted. Many were let off because they confessed, voluntarily, not long after they entered West Germany. Others showed they were coerced into spying by Red threats to their families."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted follow:

Mr. BENTLEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for week of May 23, on account of appointment as Congressional Adviser to the Eighth Pan American Highway Conference of Bogota, Colombia.

Mr. SHEPPARD (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for today, May 19, and through June 5, on account of official business in his district.

Mr. BREWSTER (at the request of Mr. GARMATZ), for Thursday, May 19, 1960, on account of illness in family.

Mr. LENNON (at the request of Mr. HEMPHILL), for today, May 19, on account of official business.

Mr. BONNER (at the request of Mr. HEMPHILL), for today, May 19, on account of official business.

Mr. KITCHIN (at the request of Mr. HEMPHILL), for today, May 19, on account of official business.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. HEMPHILL), for today, May 19, on account of official business.

Mr. SCOTT (at the request of Mr. HEMPHILL), for today, May 19, on account of official business.

Mr. ALEXANDER (at the request Mr. HEMPHILL), for today, May 19, on account of official business.

Mr. WHITENER (at the request of Mr. HEMPHILL), for today, May 19, on account of official business.

Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mr. HEMPHILL), for today, May 19, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legisla-

tive program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD, for 30 minutes, today on two subjects and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. MILLS), for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STRATTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana.

(At the request of Mr. ROBISON and include extraneous matter the following:)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. DOOLEY.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

Mr. NORBLAD in two instances.

(At the request of Mr. EVINS and to include extraneous matter the following:)

Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. DIGGS in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 23, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2167. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for the month of April relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2168. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of the development and procurement of nine different series of new combat and tactical vehicles by the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2169. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of March 31, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2170. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the erection of Freedom Monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee of Conference. H.R. 10809. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1629). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 225. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to official recognition by the United States of the centennial anniversary of the unity of Italy; with amendment (Rept. No. 1630). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 627. Joint resolution to authorize appropriations incident to U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 672. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation with respect to the 1960 Pacific Festival, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1632). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 12049. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1633). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 12309. A bill to strengthen the enforcement provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and extend the duration of the authorization of grants for State water pollution control programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 12310. A bill to allow individuals to deduct for Federal income tax purposes not to exceed $100 each year of political contributions made to candidates for elective Federal offices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 12311. A bill to extend for 1 year the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 12312. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer or spouse who is deaf; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H.R. 12313. A bill to increase the pay of certain permanent professors at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LAFORE:

H.R. 12314. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H.R. 12315. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $5,000 a year the amount of outside income permitted without deductions from benefits, and to provide that all types of income shall be taken into account in determining whether an individual's benefits are subject to such deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 12316. A bill to authorize Federal financial assistance for school construction and teachers' salaries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 12317. A bill to permit the Secretary of the Interior to revoke in whole or in part the school and agency farm reserve on the Lac du Flambeau Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 12318. A bill to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day at the grave of Francis Bellamy, the author of the pledge of allegiance to the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROKOP:

H.R. 12319. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12320. A bill to equalize certain rates of wartime disability compensation by amending section 314 (a), (b), (c), (d), (l), and (j) of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 12321. A bill to provide for the admission of certain specified refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 12322. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 12323. A bill for the relief of Yoshinori Yamai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 12324. A bill for the relief of Marguerite Lefebvre Broughton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 12325. A bill for the relief of Rosalinda Tacdol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

468. By Mr. BARR: Petition of members of Teamsters Local Union No. 135 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America for a hearing on the right to elect its officers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

469. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city clerk, Lynn, Mass., relative to enacting legislation granting to veterans of World War I pensions comparable to grants to veterans of American wars prior to World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Descendants of Israel Surmount Overwhelming Odds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1960

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the 12th anniversary of the rebirth of Israel, May 2, recalls a saga of a suffering people as potent, fraught with drama as a movie spectacular, and as intensely histrionic as the journey of Moses and his followers to the Promised Land.

Fiction writers would not dare the literary license of depicting the trials and tribulations of the wandering tribes of Israel. It is unbelievable to conceive the perpetuity of the dream of independence for Israel as it has coursed through generations of exiles without loss of one spark of its original fire.

Descendants of Israel, surmounting overwhelming odds in pursuit of their dream of a homeland, have worked to build Jewish pride and world respect, and clung tenaciously to the idea of rebuilding a Jewish commonwealth in the face of international manifestations of anti-Semitism and Nazi cruelty. For 2,000 years the vision of a new Zion has spurred a decimated people, tottering under the yoke of bloodthirsty attacks, yet faithful to the vow that "their hands would lose their cunning and their tongues cleave to the roofs of their mouths" if they forgot Jerusalem.

In the pilgrimage to Israel exiles came from 4 continents and 70 countries—singly, in single family groups, and in patriarchal clans; from behind the Iron Curtain; from behind store counters in the United States and Canada; from the remote Atlas Mountains and the bazaars of Casablanca; from the foggy grotesquerie of England and the parched deserts of the east. They came to pool their skills, their knowledge, and their finances, to be the forerunners in the creation of a great country, culled out of barren, acrid land; the earth to be tilled and cajoled into verdancy with loving hands and willing, if not strong, backs.

Exiles seeking the promise of this new frontier taxed the sparse resources to the bursting point.

Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, on the 10th anniversary of the rebirth of Israel, commended the jews of the world for embodying the sole ally of infant Israel, "when the United Nations and all the nations of the world failed to come to Israel's aid." They sent money, and arms, and fighters, from 60 different countries to suckle and nurture the nestling state.

Israel has met in 12 years every threat to national security and integrity—communism, economic struggle, domestic strife, and the necessity for living within its narrow borders and absorbing all who wanted to come to Israel.

The people of Israel and the Jews of the world have the right to flex their muscles with pride of accomplishment and tenacity of purpose.

It is our hope that Israel in its struggle will serve as a criterion for African nations, now straining at the leash of colonialism and near to breaking the yoke of servitude.

In a century when man has mastered his physical hospice, and his struggle is pointed toward the human barriers of prejudice, hatred and poverty, ignorance and intolerance, Israel represents a touchstone to the United States from which it may renew its standard of justice, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all its citizens.

Annual Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1960

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith the results of my annual poll of my constituents.

The answers to questions 5—farm supports—and 11—Federal aid to teachers salaries—were broken down and tabulated as to those giving their occupation as farmers in the first instance and teachers in the second instance.

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Should labor unions be brought under antitrust laws?	87	9	4
2. In an effort to combat juvenile delinquency, should the Federal Government at taxpayers' expense establish a Youth Conservation Corps for boys 16 to 21 to work on reforestation and other conservation projects on publicly owned lands?	60	35	5
3. Do you favor diplomatic recognition of Communist China?	20	69	11
4. At present, persons drawing social security benefits are penalized if they earn more than $1,200 a year. Do you believe they should be permitted to earn a greater amount without penalty?	76	18	6
5. Do you favor continuing agriculture price supports?	20	74	6
Those giving their occupations as farmers on this voted as follows	31	65	4
6. Do you believe the Federal Government should have more authority to regulate radio and TV programs?	38	56	6
7. In some areas in the South, certain people because of their race are reportedly not permitted to register to vote. Where this happens should the Federal Government provide Federal registrars on a temporary basis?	70	21	9
8. Do you favor legislation to provide Federal aid for school construction?	41	50	9
9. Should we make an all-out effort to surpass Russia in the exploration of outer space, regardless of cost?	26	69	5
10. Sould Congress increase postal rates to help meet postal deficits?	50	47	3
11. Would you favor Federal aid to raise teachers salaries?	21	74	5
Those giving their occupation as teachers on this voted as follows	23	74	3
12. Do you favor the proposed summit conference between the free world and the Soviets?	84	10	6
13. Would you favor giving the Federal Government greater power to abritrate and enforce agreements between labor and management when disputes such as in the recent steel strike affect a major sector of the national economy and/or national defense?	83	14	3
14. Do you believe merging our Army, Navy, and Air Force into a single military service would increase efficiency, reduce waste and duplication of effort and materiel, and remove interservice rivalry?	77	18	5

Preliminary Tabulation of Replies From Questionnaire in the 32d Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last month I sent out to some 55,000 residents of my congressional district, embracing five upstate counties in New York State, a questionnaire dealing with some of the major items of legislation pending before this 2d session of the 86th Congress. These questionnaires were sent out on a purely random basis to telephone subscribers within these five counties. By way of background in interpreting the results I might add that these five counties are traditionally recognized as a conservative area. Republican Party enrollment outnumbers Democratic enrollment by 3 to 1. President Eisenhower carried the district over Governor Stevenson in 1956 by 119,000 to 44,000; Governor Rockefeller carried the district in 1958 by 37,000. As Members are aware, I am the first member of my party to have the honor to serve this district in the House of Representatives in 42 years.

I mention these facts only by way of background for a tabulation of the answers I have received. Out of 55,000 questionnaires mailed out we have received 9,337 replies, or a return of 17 percent, which, I am told, is an amazingly high percentage. In addition I have also had the privilege of receiving a great number of letters and communications expanding on the yes-or-no replies provided by the tabulated questionnaire itself.

While a Congressman must, of course, make up his mind on legislation on the basis of many factors, certainly the desires and wishes of his constituents, expressed in many ways, particularly through the means of a questionnaire like this, should be a most important factor in his final decision.

I want to express to all of the people of my district who took the trouble to answer our questionnaire and particularly to those who went to the added trouble of sending me their amplified comments, my sincere appreciation for all the great help which they have given to me in my effort to be an effective and responsive representative of their wishes and interests in this body. I am hopeful that those who have written to me will forgive me, incidentally, for the delay that has been encountered in replying to their letters. So many individual letters have been received with these questionnaires that it has been physically impossible for my office staff to answer all of them as yet and still keep up with our other work. However, we do anticipate answering all of them soon, and in the meantime all are being read and pondered carefully.

In general, the replies we have received seem to indicate that our district overwhelmingly supports restrictions on foreign imports, Federal assistance for unemployment areas, elimination of the telephone tax, civil rights, the Forand approach to health insurance for retired citizens, a youth conservation corps, and a balanced budget. Aid to education and an increase in the minimum wage are also supported, though by less substantial majorities. Legislation to promote milk consumption loses by a small edge. The soil bank and a ban on nuclear weapons testing which does not include effective inspection and control procedures are opposed by substantial majorities.

The detailed results are summarized below:

[In percent]

Question	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you favor legislation to protect American job opportunities by increased restrictions on foreign imports?	74.6	19.3	6.1
2. Would you oppose President Eisenhower's proposal for a major increase in the soil bank program?	52.3	25.1	22.6
3. Would you favor Federal legislation to promote the consumption of fluid milk?	40.3	40.6	19.1
4. Do you favor some measure of Federal assistance to help local communities hard hit by unemployment in attracting new industry?	76.2	18.1	5.7
5. Do you favor continuing the Federal telephone tax beyond June 30, 1960, the date on which it is now scheduled by law to expire?	16.3	76.0	7.7
6. Do you favor some Federal tax concessions for industries which move into areas of serious unemployment or expand in such areas?	66.1	25.0	8.9
7. Do you favor strengthening civil rights legislation to insure the right to vote regardless of race, creed, or color?	88.6	5.7	5.7
8. Would you oppose legislation to improve our educational program by extending Federal grants to States to help build new schools or classrooms?	36.4	55.3	8.3
9. Do you favor an increase in the present $1 Federal minimum wage?	57.3	36.5	6.2
10. Do you favor expanding the Federal social security program to include some form of health insurance for retired persons?	72.4	19.8	7.8
11. Would you approve a ban on nuclear weapons tests before agreement is reached on effective inspection and control procedures?	22.2	67.8	10.0
12. Do you favor promoting conservation and combating juvenile delinquency by establishing a voluntary Youth Conservation Corps?	74.7	14.6	10.7
13. Do you support a balanced budget?	80.9	6.6	12.5

14. Which of the following do you now favor for President in 1960:

	Percent
Nixon	39.9
Kennedy	35.4
Stevenson	9.7
Rockefeller	5.0
Humphrey	4.0
Symington	3.3
Johnson	1.7
Stratton	[1] 1.2

[1] Write-in.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1960

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously obtained, I insert in the RECORD an address I delivered at the Rumanian Independence Day rally in Cleveland, Sunday, May 15, under the auspices of the Carpatina Society and the American Legion, on "Rumanian Independence Day":

May 10 is a day of great importance to Rumanian people everywhere in the world because it is Rumanian Independence Day.

In these days it has special significance because the people of Rumania have been robbed of their national independence by the Russian imperialists.

It was 15 years last March 6 that the Russians destroyed the free government of that old and honored nation and imposed upon the Rumanian people a form of government which is completely alien to their rich culture, traditions, and love for human freedom.

In the darkness of those 15 years, the people of Rumania have never lost faith in the destiny of their nation.

They remain convinced that justice will triumph throughout the world—that the cause of free men will prevail in the affairs of nations and that Rumania will rise once again in all the splendor and beauty of her ancient civilization.

It is this dedication, this unwavering conviction, which holds the people of Rumania in an unbreakable alliance with the people of the United States and all other free countries.

The people of Rumania will be prohibited from celebrating this memorable day by the alien government which has been imposed upon them by the masters of the new imperialism in Moscow.

No public observance of this day will be allowed because the Russians are dedicated to destroying all hope for a return of national independence and because such public manifestations carry the possibility of getting out of hand so far as the occupiers are concerned.

However, the Rumanian people will find ways to observe this historic day, despite the efforts to prevent them from doing so.

What rests firmly in the hearts of men cannot be wiped out by the order of a dictator.

Rumanians in the free world will properly celebrate this day.

I am happy and proud that in my district one of the most significant of these celebrations is taking place today.

Free Rumanians will carry high the hopes of the captive people of Rumania.

They will, as in the past, remind all those who love freedom that these past 15 years of darkness have strengthened the determination of the Rumanian people to regain their national independence.

In this they will be performing a service for their adopted country, the United States, because the cause of peace with justice requires the dedication of all our citizens.

Tomorrow the second summit conference will open in Paris.

There a contest will take place between men who represent the cause of human freedom and those who lead the cause of slavery for all mankind.

This will be a test of justice as the foundation for a lasting peace, that is, justice for all nations and all people.

The one paramount issue, the issue which rises above all others at the Paris conference, is that of political status quo.

The spotlight of public attention has been focused upon such issues as disarmament, a ban on nuclear weapons, the future status of Berlin and a free and united Germany.

Important as these issues are, they avoid the critical question of human rights, the rights of nations and the unnatural division of humanity by the Russian Communists.

It is clear beyond any reasonable doubt that the Russians are going to Paris with but one objective in mind.

That objective is to force the free world leaders to accept a political status quo, that is, to put a stamp of finality upon their empire of captive nations.

Nor can there be any doubt that the Russian leaders desperately need this recognition.

A serious internal crisis grips the vast empire of the Russian Communists.

It is not an economic crisis, even though there is a critical shortage of food and consumer goods throughout the empire.

It is not a crisis at the top, resulting from the constant struggle for total power which is the common characteristic of the regime.

It is a political crisis brought on by the failure of the Communist regime to win the confidence and support of the people and the corresponding demand by the non-Russian peoples of the empire for a complete change in the order of things.

The old order of Russian imperial communism is bankrupt.

It is centuries behind the needs and aspirations of the common man.

Its failures are well known to those who are its captives.

The need for drastic change to avoid total collapse is evident to all who are confined behind the Iron Curtain, including Khrushchev and his crowd.

It is beyond the ability of Russian imperial communism to grant the changes necessary to avoid the great human explosion which is in the making.

If the Communist leaders grant the changes demanded by the realities of life they will open the floodgates to their own destruction.

They cannot possibly accommodate their system to the changes needed to preserve the empire.

The leaders in Moscow recognize these hard facts of life and are accordingly going to use the Paris conference as a temporary remedy for their internal crisis.

They seek to cause the nations of the free world to associate with them in efforts to preserve the empire.

The Russians insist that the captive peoples must be made to realize that there is a finality to their unhappy state of life, that there is no hope for their future, that they must make their peace with communism and adjust to the imposed peace of Moscow.

The Russian leaders also need a legal license to employ whatever methods become necessary to hold the empire together.

They feel they must neutralize the conscience of the West so that there can be no public protest or legal proceedings in the United Nations against such future actions as they may find necessary, including genocide and the other crimes against humanity.

This is the insurance policy they want the leaders of the free world to underwrite at Paris.

So, to secure these objectives, the Russians propose a status quo and Khrushchev has announced that this will be his goal at the Paris meeting.

Now the question is: How will the leaders of the free world meet this challenge?

Up to this moment there is no evidence available to the public which would indicate what we might do or not do to prevent a Russian victory on this critical issue.

However, it is clear to all that if President Eisenhower fails to raise in principle the right of all nations to self-determination, to self-government, in the context of the Captive Nations Week resolution as defined in Public Law 86-90, the Russians will win their point by default.

Khrushchev has made it clear in public statements that he considers the basic question of the Paris meeting to be status quo.

By so doing he has established the issue as pertinent to all the discussions which will take place.

If our leaders fail to raise the issue and state our position on it, silence will be taken as assent to the demands made by Khrushchev.

This is a fundamental law of international diplomacy.

It is entirely possible that the Russians can leave the Paris meeting with sound precedent to believe that the United States has accepted a status quo.

Nor is it necessary for the three Western Powers to have unanimity on this issue in order for our President to speak out. Rumors are rampant in Europe that the British are actively pushing for a status quo, even to the point of a permanently divided Germany.

It is unlikely that France could make herself party to such a deal.

In any case, it is imperative that the United States make its position clear on this issue regardless what Great Britain and France elect do do about it.

The future of Rumania and all the other captive non-Russian nations hangs in the balance at the Paris summit.

While Rumania as a nation will not be an agenda item, the future of Rumania is involved in the issue of status quo which has been created by Khrushchev.

Nor is status quo likely to become an agenda item, but it will hang over all the proceedings and discussions at Paris. It is the unavoidable issue.

It is, in fact, the reason why Khrushchev forced the leaders of the free world into a second summit meeting.

These are fitting thoughts for this Rumanian Independence Day commemoration.

Those of us who have fought for the rights of the Rumanian nation, for justice for all the nations of the world, do not give lipservice to this cause. More than words are needed.

Political action must be given to this cause.

I, therefore, have urged President Eisenhower to seize the initiative at Paris, to flush out into the open the issue of status quo, to disclaim any degree of acceptance of status quo for the American people, and to rekindle the hopes of suffering millions behind the Iron Curtain by a firm advocacy of the rights of all nations to self-government, to freedom, and to national independence.

Let us pray that President Eisenhower will lead all free nations of the world in a successful fight for the right of self-determination for all nations and people. Such positive, affirmative, political action will enable the great nation of Rumania to determine its own destiny and to take its proper place among the free nations of the world.

A Compromise Area Redevelopment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 18, there was introduced in both Houses of Congress a compromise area redevelopment bill in an effort to meet the objections contained in President Eisenhower's veto message regarding S. 722.

In the Senate S. 3568 was introduced by Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania while in the House companion measures were introduced by my colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative IVOR D. FENTON, who introduced H.R. 12291, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative JOHN SAYLOR, who introduced H.R. 12298, and the number of my own bill is H.R. 12290. All of these bills have been referred to the committees having jurisdiction over this type of legislation and it is hoped that immediate action will be accorded them.

Following is a comparison of House area redevelopment bills including S. 722 vetoed by the President together with H.R. 4878 which I offered as a compromise measure at the first session of this Congress and H.R. 12290, 12291, and 12298 introduced yesterday as the revised version of H.R. 4878 and designed to meet the objections on which the President's veto of S. 722 was based.

Comparison of area redevelopment bills

Subject	S. 722 as passed and vetoed	H.R. 4878, original form	H.R. 12290, H.R. 12291, and H.R. 12298
1. Organization	Separate Area Redevelopment Administration.	Department of Commerce	Department of Commerce.
2. Division of redevelopment areas	Administrator to designate industrial and rural areas.	Only industrial and public facility loans in areas of persistent and substantial unemployment.	Same; removed reference to rural. Note technical assistance can cover.
3. Revolving fund loans	75		
Industrial	$100,000,000	$100,000,000	$75,000,000.
Rural	$75,000,000	None	None.
Public facilities	$50,000,000	$25,000,000	$25,000,000; reference to machinery removed.
4. Federal participation in loans	65 percent	33⅓ percent class I areas, 50 percent class II areas, and 75 percent class III areas.	35 percent; area classifications removed.
5. Maximum loan period	40 years; 10 percent State contribution.	25 years; not less than 15 percent State contribution.	Same.
6. Grants for public facilities	$35,000,000	$25,000,000; Federal participation 33⅓ percent class II areas, 75 percent class III areas.	None.
7. Retraining subsistence payments	$10,000,000	$5,000,000	$5,000,000.
8. Vocational training grants	$1,500,000	Secretary of Labor to determine needs; Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide through existing facilities.	Same.
9. Technical assistance	$4,500,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000.
10. Criteria of unemployment	At least 6 percent at time of application and 12 percent for 12 months preceding, or 9 percent for 15 of 18 months preceding, or 6 percent for 18 of 24 months preceding.	An average of 6 percent, excluding seasonal, throughout qualifying period, and 50 percent above national average for 4 out of 5 years preceding in class I areas, or 75 percent above national average for 3 out of 4 years preceding in class II areas, or 100 percent above national average for 2 out of 3 years preceding in class III areas.	Same; area classifications removed.
11. Interest on loans	Maximum permitted, 2 to 7 percent	To be determined by Secretary based on going rates.	Same.
12. Cost	$251,000,000	$158,000,000	$108,000,000.

Polish Constitution Day Marks Thousand Years of Travail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1960

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the commemoration of Poland's Constitution Day, May 3, 1960, proffers an opportunity for introspective thinking as well as a chance to join other Members of Congress in giving accolades to the valiant, patiently courageous people of what might now well be called re-Stalinized Poland.

Some of us, who in dark moments of frustration decry the absence of light shining upon our own personal freedoms, civil rights and liberties, can then look to the bloody history of Poland for hope; and to its heroes for faith.

We can take heart in the dying words of the great Polish patriot, Ignace Jan Paderewski, whose 100th anniversary of birth coincides with Poland's millennium, in 1966. His words, as life slipped away were: "Polska powstanie." Acclaimed by the American public as the "King of pianists," Paderewski's greatest happiness came in contributing his time, his talents, and his resources, to the needy of his own and other lands. He will take his place in history with all the heroic sons of Poland. Significant then were his dying words, translated: "Poland will rise again."

These words give solace to the people of Poland, though now compelled to endure Soviet oppression and to live in the vacuum of Eastern tyranny and the insecurity and uncertainty of moral and economic aid from the West. The situation in Poland today remains fluid only because of the vigorous anti-Communist resistance by intrepid Poles.

In keeping with a tradition of the past 20 years, the U.S. Congress has solemnized Poland's May 3 Constitution of 1791 with a twofold purpose: First, to remind the Polish people that Americans have not forgotten their pledge to help Poland restore her freedom and independence and to facilitate her return to the Western family of nations; second, to review and place in proper perspective Poland's contribution in the development of Western civilization and culture.

The 1960 convocation of Poland's Constitution is of special importance to the Polish people in my home State, Michigan, as well as to the 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry and those still fighting communism in the homeland.

Bearing as it does an analogy to our own celebration of July 4, the date of May 3, means more than a calendar date to the people of Poland and others of the free world—it draws foci to the indomitable spirit of the people of Poland; underscores the travail of a near-thousand years of glorious, though sometimes bloody history; namely, the valorous but sanguine insurrections of 1830 and 1848, as well as the millennium of the founding of Christianity by the Polish State.

The Polish May Constitution convocation might well serve as a rededicatory process for these compatriots who through no fault of their own have been forced to endure Communist enslavement. It might also remind those of us in America, of the consequence of rededicating our own lives to the kind of freedoms engendered by the signing of that famous companion document—the American Constitution.

The Polish Constitution was patterned after our own American Constitution and its creators were motivated by the same principles that fired the fighters for the independence of the United States. Now in 1960, the people of Poland have placed their entire hope and sympathy with the United States again.

The Poles were magnificent in defending Christendom against the onslaught of the barbarian East; in creating the first Commonwealth of Nations in Europe; in contributing to American freedom through the services of Pulaski and Kosciuszko, and other Polish immigrants.

To these dauntless people whose history has been stalked by tragedy due largely to geographic position, predatory and aggressive neighbors, we add our hope and our prayerful wish for full freedom in our time.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ran across an article appearing in the newspaper Labor, dated May 14, 1960, headlined "Says United States Lags in Medical Care." This article purports to quote our colleague Congressman Moss as follows:

> The United States is the only large industrialized country in the world where the Government does not, in some form or other, provide medical care for most of its citizens.
>
> All European countries, with the exception of Finland, operate some type of government health and maternity program, and most of the 59 countries of the globe which have such programs provide medical care benefits under some sort of a social insurance program.

I think this article lets the cat out of the bag, just as similar statements made by other proponents of the Forand bill call attention to what these people really have in their bag of wonders.

Our society has the finest health program, and this includes health care for the aged, of any society in history. These other systems have the Government in some form or other provide medical care for most of its citizens. This results in a system of inferior health care for the citizens, as a study of the health programs of these other industrialized societies reveals.

Should that not suggest to these other societies that socialism is the wrong way to achieve success in this area, even if it does not convince some of our own political theorists?

I must add a further statement to try to forestall what the Forand bill proponents usually fall back on to answer their critics. Their critics, they say, are standpatters and want no progress. This is false. Any program, no matter how good it may be, can be improved. There is plenty of room for improvement in the health program our society has, even though it is the best program ever set up. However, to improve it and not damage it, we must first understand what it is. The Forand bill supporters imply that there is no program even though the Federal Government today is spending over $12 billion a year on care for the aged. Let us first lay the facts of our present program for health care out on the table, then debate the issue of how we can improve it. Is this such an illogical suggestion?

The article follows:

SAYS UNITED STATES LAGS IN MEDICAL CARE

"The United States is the only large industrialized country in the world where the Government does not, in some form or other, provide medical care for most of its citizens," Congressman JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, of California, noted last week.

"All European countries, with the exception of Finland, operate some type of government health and maternity program," he said. "And most of the 59 countries of the globe which have such programs provide medical care benefits under some sort of a social insurance program."

Moss predicted that Congress this year will also enact medical insurance legislation for those over 65 years of age.

Export Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the principal objectives of the Agricultural Trade and Development Act, Public Law 480, was the creation and building of export markets for American agricultural commodities. From time to time I have been informed that an effective job was being done. Recently the administration announced an export promotion campaign and called on industry and agriculture for their complete cooperation. This, too, seemed like a good idea.

However, one of our Texas rice mills has anticipated the administration's program by at least 4 years. They produce and market a high-quality parboiled rice, which is not generally available in foreign markets. In one country, Greece—truly one of our real friends among nations—they had developed a business of

approximately 2,000 tons annually, or less than 5 percent of the Greek domestic production. In so doing they expended approximately $100,000 in advertising and promotion. Their sales do not interfere with sales of Greek rice, having been largely to hotels, tourist resorts, and the carriage trade. Greece does not produce a parboiled rice and their rice is hardly of comparable quality. Price-wise, U.S. rice in Greece sells far better than 50 percent more than Greek rice.

Last November all imports of rice were embargoed by the Greek Government. After a protest by our State Department, a clarifying regulation was promised. Late in February one was issued permitting imports on license where the importer could show he had exported twice the quantity of Greek rice for currency acceptable to the Greek Government. This tied things up tighter than ever.

Among such good friends as the Greeks and ourselves, such a situation will undoubtedly be straightened out without undue delay. The tonnage and exchange is small, but the impact can be great. I trust that the State Department, through the exercise of a high order of sound, practical diplomacy, will resolve the differences of opinion in ample time so that it will not sound a sour note just as the administration's export promotion program is about to get under way.

The Nightly Radio Program: "Today in Congress"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1960

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the nightly radio program "Today in Congress" for devoting the entire time segment last Friday night to the complete and unedited remarks made by President Eisenhower upon his arrival from Portugal.

This has always been a valuable and unique program; the only one aired which is devoted exclusively to the happenings here on Capitol Hill.

Its sponsors, the Independent Airlines Association, and its editor, Joseph McCaffrey, combine to give the listening public a "Congressional Record of the Air." This program not only has a great listening audience among Members of the House and Senate, but also among staff members on the Hill and administrators and key personnel in the executive branch.

Last Friday night, the entire format of the program was revamped so that Mr. Eisenhower's own personal report on the summit could be given wider coverage.

This, I think, is a tribute to the feeling of public responsibility of the association and of Mr. McCaffrey.

Assistance for Our Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1960

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying that the Committee on Education and Labor has reported favorably a bill to provide for Federal grants and contracts to carry out projects with respect to techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution, and control of juvenile delinquency, and for the training of personnel. The bill reported is similar to one I introduced.

Juvenile delinquency has reached terrifying proportions throughout our Nation. All communities are beset by the problem—urban and rural, in the higher social and economic levels as well as the lower. Our youth are the future of our Nation; they are our hope in the years ahead; on them will fall the burden of the preservation of our democracy. It is incumbent upon the Federal Government to recognize its duty and obligation to our young people; investments of necessary funds and time and effort must be made now in assistance to our youth; there is a crying need for more research on causes and prevention of delinquency.

It was recently charged that we, as a Nation, have more information about pigs than we do about children. This is a startling accusation, but true, in my opinion. We recently heard the heartbreaking prophecy that between 4 and 5 million children will be referred to juvenile courts within the next decade. It is not enough to ask "Why?" and "Who is to blame for failing in its duty—the home, school, or community?" The problem must be attacked with vigor and vision; our children must have help.

The Federal Government should take positive steps to increase the ability to prevent delinquency and rehabilitate offenders. This requires support for research, field and pilot studies, and demonstration projects. The present acute shortage of adequately trained personnel to cope with delinquency must be relieved. The basic aim in combating juvenile delinquency must be to foster in the young a respect for the law—for its reasonableness and fairness and for the values of the community. This means that the community itself must set a good example and uphold those values which it expects its youth to respect, in an effort to prevent lawlessness among our youth. It is as important to try to understand our young people—their aims, beliefs, dreams, fears—and to help them in their struggle for security and happiness, as it is to try to rehabilitate them after crimes have been committed and their names have been besmirched and their futures blackened by the pall of misdeeds.

Because the assistance to our youth, as provided in the bill which has been reported, is so vitally necessary, and because time is of the essence in dealing with the increasing problems of juvenile delinquency, I urge that the bill be brought before the House for action, without delay. It is incumbent upon the 86th Congress to pass this proposed legislation before the close of the session.

National Science Foundation: 10th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, the Congress took cognizance of the increasing importance of science and technology to the national interest and established the National Science Foundation as the successor to the emergency World War II Office of Scientific Research and Development. Seldom has there been a more important action taken by the Congress. In the intervening years, advances in science and technology have run the whole gamut of our national lives and throughout all this time, the National Science Foundation has played a fundamental role in our scientific effort. As the importance of the work increases year by year, the Foundation, in my opinion, merits the full cooperation of the Congress to the extent that when necessary, encouragement should be given by increases in needed funds.

The Foundation is meeting the challenge of the scientific and technologic revolution through which we are passing by supporting programs designed to stimulate improved scientific training and by encouraging young men and women to choose careers in science. It supports basic scientific research without which our country would soon reach an impasse in new scientific discoveries. The scholarship and fellowship grants each year to high school and college students promote interest in an area vital to our national security. Equally important are the institutes the Foundation sponsors for the training of teachers in science and mathematics. Under its jurisdiction, also, are made research grants in all the fields of science with which the Foundation deals—biology, medicine, physics, mathematics, and engineering, as well as the social sciences. Abroad, National Science Foundation activities are directed toward general purpose basic research and the support of those programs which strengthen the scientific effort of the United States.

Much of the credit for the magnificent work the Foundation is doing must go to Dr. Alan T. Waterman who has been its director since its establishment. Those who have followed the hearings of the Committee on Science and Astronautics have heard witnesses testify many times in praise of the competence, the vision and the high level of leadership displayed by Dr. Waterman and his staff.

In this age of space, we have become acutely aware of how important to our very existence are the developments in the field of science. To the National Science Foundation—one of the most important Federal agencies to contribute to our progress in this field—on its 10th birthday, I want to add my congratulations for a job well done and to voice my confidence that the accomplishments of the next 10 years will be equally praiseworthy.

A Waste of White House Time and Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following exchange of correspondence between Mr. Bryce N. Harlow, Deputy Assistant to the President, and me. It speaks for itself:

MAY 17, 1960.

The Honorable CHARLES O. PORTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PORTER: On Saturday last, as he completed preparations for the summit conference in Paris, President Eisenhower requested me to send to you, in his behalf, this note of gratification and appreciation for your support of the mutual security authorization bill. He stressed once again his profound conviction that this program is indispensable to our own and free world defense against Communist imperialism, and indispensable also in encouraging struggling millions in less fortunate nations in their effort to live their lives in freedom. It is a program requiring, he said, unreserved support by all of our informed citizens and officials, and he feels it would be the height of folly to allow isolated administrative shortcomings and disappointments, or local considerations, political or otherwise, to tempt anyone to jettison or cripple the entire undertaking.

Especially the President voiced this hope, and asked that it be communicated to you in his behalf, that your responsible act of support for the mutual security authorization be matched by a determined resistance to any effort to effect massive reductions in the mutual security appropriations soon to be considered by the House. Massive reductions, he pointed out, can be accomplished only by undermining our own security, free world security, and the cause of human freedom everywhere in the world.

The President asked me to explain that he would have advised you himself of these views had his time permitted before leaving for Paris.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

BRYCE N. HARLOW,
Deputy Assistant to the President.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1960.

Mr. BRYCE N. HARLOW,
Deputy Assistant to the President,
The White House.

DEAR MR. HARLOW: I have just received your letter telling me that the President told you to tell me that he approved of my approval of the mutual security authorization bill. I note you say that the President himself would have advised me but that he was busy preparing for the summit conference.

In all frankness, however, I do believe that the White House automatic typewriters, clerical staff, and your own services could be more usefully employed than in getting out these letters to me and my colleagues. Such transparent and artificial devices as your form letter are a waste of time and money.

Of course I am pleased to know that the President is seeking to lend his support to the mutual security program, but I do believe there are better ways.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

Arthur E. Wullschleger Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, Arthur E. Wullschleger, of the town of Mamaroneck, N.Y., one of the bright residential areas of my fine constituency, came to Washington on May 17 to be honored with a special ceremony at the Smithsonian Institution at which he presented to that world famous depository of historical treasures a priceless Jacquard loom.

The loom, invented in the year 1801 by the man whose name it bears, is one of the most ingenious devices ever fashioned by the mind of man in the field of weaving. Thousands of cards, very similar to the IBM cards used today in machines all over the world, constitute an integral part of the loom and through the use of the punch-hole technique guide the design on the frame.

In presenting this century-and-a-half-old treasure to the museum—Mr. Wullschleger had it restored to working condition at great expense—Mr. Wullschleger was merely doing what he has done often before, namely, giving to his fellow citizens some of the benefits of his wealth and knowledge.

As a citizen of Mamaroneck, Mr. Wullschleger is regarded as one of the most amiable of men and one of the most helpful and considerate people in the community. He has traversed the world many times, his trips to Europe alone totaling more than 100 voyages, but his interests lie with the men and women of his community. He has served as chairman of the zoning board of the town of Mamaroneck and in that capacity has rendered outstanding service.

At the ceremony at the Smithsonian Institution Mr. Wullschleger was presented to the audience by his son-in-law, Arthur "Red" Motley, the distinguished president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, well-known publisher and famous after-dinner speaker.

Mr. Motley and Mr. Leonard Carmichael, the master of ceremonies, who is the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, pointed out to those present that Mr. Wullschleger had come to this country as a young man to seek his fortune. He not only attained his monetary objective but in the process became one of the world's outstanding authorities on colors and fabrics. His impact on his field of operation has been extraordinary.

As his Representative I took pleasure in welcoming him to Washington and showing him every courtesy.

Results of Survey Concerning Some Important Issues Facing Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1960

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, recently I sent a questionnaire on some important issues facing Congress and the Nation to 22,000 of my constituents. Of the number sent, 17 percent were returned. Under permission previously granted I am placing in the RECORD the results of that questionnaire, together with some additional information about the age groups and occupations of those who answered:

Age groups: Under 25, 1.3 percent; 25 to 30, 4.6 percent; 31 to 40, 18.2 percent; 41 to 50, 20.8 percent; 51 to 60, 19.8 percent; over 60, 25.8 percent; no answer, 9.5 percent.

Occupations: Retired, 15.8 percent; farmers, 3.3 percent; laborers, 6.5 percent; housewives, 8.8 percent; professional, 21.8 percent; businessmen, 22.5 percent; government employees, 11.5 percent; students, 1.0 percent; armed services, 0.6 percent; no answer, 6.4 percent.

DEFENSE

1. Should we, in 1960 and 1961, gear our defense effort to a dollar amount we can afford within a balanced budget? Yes, 78 percent; no, 15 percent.

2. Should we concentrate our defense effort on:

(a) Deterrent capabilities (mainly missiles)?—14 percent.

(b) Conventional weapons, aimed at fighting limited wars?—3 percent.

(c) A combination of both?—78 percent.

3. Do you feel:

(a) Terribly worried over allegations that we are behind the Russians in certain types of missiles?—13 percent.

(b) Confident that our overall deterrent capability will, for the foreseeable future, prevent a Russian attack?—81 percent.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

1. In our attitude toward Communist nations, are we:

(a) Too soft?—76 percent.

(b) Too hard?—1 percent.

(c) About right?—20 percent.

2. Do you feel that:

(a) We should increase our pressure on international communism, even at the risk of all-out war?—60 percent.

(b) We should keep deterrent capabilities militarily, and coexist with communism, hoping Communists will eventually see that our system is better than theirs?—28 percent.

(c) We should do something else?—21 percent.

3. Foreign aid will cost the American taxpayer about $3.2 billion this year. Below are listed the principal expenditures.

Do you favor continuing:

(a) Military aid ($1.3 billion this year) to the armed forces of our allies?—40 percent.

(b) Defense support ($695 million this year) to bolster the economies of many of our allies?—27 percent.

(c) Special assistance ($245 million this year) to bolster the economies of so-called neutralist or undetermined countries?—15 percent.

(d) Technical cooperation ($181.2 million this year) supplying instruction and know-how to underdeveloped nations?—54 percent.

(e) Development loans in dollars ($550 million this year) to underdeveloped countries repayable mainly in the currencies of those countries?—40 percent.

(f) None of these; end the program?—24 percent.

SPACE

1. Do you feel it is important for us to be able to travel in space as soon as possible? Yes, 42 percent; no, 52 percent.

2. Do you feel that ability to travel in space will have military significance in the foreseeable future? Yes, 51 percent; no, 40 percent.

FARM PROGRAM

1. Do you favor an immediate end of all farm price supports?—36 percent.

2. Do you favor high rigid price supports to guarantee farmers return of their growing costs and return on their investment?—4 percent.

3. Do you favor reducing farm price supports over a period of several years until a free farm economy is restored?—60 percent.

FISCAL

1. Do you believe that the budget of the U.S. Government:

(a) Should always be balanced?—53 percent.

(b) May be unbalanced in years of decreased business activity to stimulate business?—43 percent.

2. Do you favor:

(a) Lowering Federal taxes immediately, without regard to a balanced budget?—9 percent.

(b) Increasing Federal taxes if necessary for additional public services?—6 percent.

(c) Lowering Federal taxes after reducing expenditures and reducing the national debt?—83 percent.

3. Do you favor:

(a) Systematically reducing the national debt each year?—88 percent.

(b) Increasing the national debt in order to provide additional Federal services without raising taxes?—3 percent.

(c) Keeping the national debt at its present level of about $290 billion?—5 percent.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

1. Do you believe the Federal Government should assume a definite part of the responsibility for public school education in America, including payment of administration costs and teachers' salaries?—8 percent.

2. Do you favor Federal assistance for public school construction on a general basis?—10 percent.

3. Do you favor limiting Federal aid to the programs we now have, including assistance to federally impacted areas?—32 percent.

4. Should we have no Federal aid whatsoever?—44 percent.

MEDICAL BENEFITS TO THE ELDERLY

1. Do you favor free medical care for all people over 65 paid for by the Federal Government?—7 percent.

2. Should we include surgical and hospital care for persons over 65 as a part of social security?—26 percent.

3. Do you favor Federal incentives to private insurance companies to provide health insurance to the elderly?—18 percent.

4. Do you feel there should be no Federal program of any kind to provide medical assistance for elderly persons, leaving this to States and private resources?—50 percent.

VETERANS PENSIONS

1. Paying pensions to veterans without service-connected disabilities on a basis of need?—16 percent.

2. Giving all World War I veterans an honor pension of $100 per month without regard to need or disability?—8 percent.

3. Pensions to disabled veterans should go up automatically with the cost of living?—60 percent.

4. Other?—35 percent.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 23, 1960

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. C. Edward Gammon, D.D., minister, Fairlington Presbyterian Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

O God, who hast been the refuge and strength of good and wise men in many generations, we cry unto Thee for our world, tense with suspicion, haunted by the pain of yesterday's wars, our own countryside garrisoned with slender stalagmites of terrible, radioactive death. Thus we implore Thy mercy for all who this day must represent free peoples before the forums of world conscience.

We beseech Thee to grant physical stamina, intellectual vigor, and sensitivity of soul to all honored men of government—for men living with harsh, insistent pressures, struggling conscience, complex decisions, the vulgar demands of entrenched greed; the never-ending pleas of injured minorities and conflicting parochial interests; the outraged cries of the sluggard, men of borderline morals who went too far; the tragic victims of war, hunger, disaster, and disease; men living each day with the tensions of domestic politics.

O dear God, we Americans are hard on our public servants. Be merciful and gracious, a strong God of infinite love and grace to them.

Dear God, in these boisterous days when we Americans go about the business of selecting our leadership for the coming years, grant that, when all is said and done, and the campaigns of 1960 shall have become history, these walls, hallowed by the memories of radiant ideas, flaming words, and courageous men, shall once again be filled with men of honor whose abiding dedication shall be to sustain a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity.

These things we ask in the name of God, the Father of Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 19, 1960, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 18, 1960,

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported favorably, with amendments, on May 20, 1960, the bill (H.R. 12117), making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 1404) thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2130) to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9465) to authorize the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10809) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 11405. An act to provide for the treatment of income from discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation in a receivership proceeding or in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act commenced before January 1, 1960, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11748. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1961, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12232. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 4029. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the proration of the occupational tax on persons dealing in machineguns and certain other firearms, to reduce occupational and transfer taxes on certain weapons, to make the transferor and transferee jointly liable for the transfer tax on firearms, and to make certain changes in the definition of a firearm;

H.R. 6482. An act relating to the credits against the unemployment tax in the case of certain successor employers; and

H.R. 9308. An act to extend until June 30, 1963, the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 11405. An act to provide for the treatment of income from discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation in a receivership proceeding or in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act commenced before January 1, 1960, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11748. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1961, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 12232. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar, under the rule, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGE ON DEPRESSED AREAS BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting majority leader about action on the President's veto of the depressed areas bill. It was my understanding that it would be called up tomorrow, and that the debate might run into Wednesday. But I had hoped we could set a definite day and hour when we could have the Senate vote on the vetoed bill, and probably divide the time equally, if there was to be debate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would say that, definitely, the President's veto of the depressed areas bill will be brought up tomorrow, Tuesday; and I hope the attachés of the Senate will notify all Senators accordingly.

As to the matter of the time, if the minority leader has a suggestion, I shall see, later this afternoon, whether something can be worked out, to the end that a time limitation can be set. It might be possible for us to vote tomorrow on the vetoed measure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall be glad to confer further this afternoon, with the acting majority leader, in order to ascertain how much time may be taken by Senators on our side; and I presume he will ascertain the number of speeches to be made by Senators on his side. Perhaps we can contrive an agreement as to an hour certain, so all Senators may be on notice as to the time when the vote on the vetoed bill will come.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be delighted to work on that; and later in the afternoon we shall see what we can arrange.

COMMISSION TO FORMULATE A MEMORIAL TO JAMES MADISON

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 417, 86th Congress, approved April 8, 1960, has appointed the following Senators as members, on the part of the Senate, of the Commission to Formulate a Memorial to James Madison: Mr. HOLLAND, of Florida; Mr. ROBERTSON, of Virginia; Mr. CARLSON, of Kansas; and Mr. BENNETT, of Utah.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that there have been no significant developments to report for the month of April 1960 relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, 36 reports covering 49 violations of appropriations within that Department (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS

A letter from the Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of the Army Research and Development contracts, for $50,000 or more, awarded during the period July 1, 1959, through December 31, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CHANGE OF METHOD OF PROMOTION OF CERTAIN RESERVE OFFICERS OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to change the method of promotion of Reserve officers of the Air Force to Reserve general officer grades (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, covering the first quarter of 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF AUTOMATIC DATA-PROCESSING INSTALLATION, NEW ORLEANS COMMODITY OFFICE, COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of automatic data-processing installation, New Orleans Commodity Office, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, October 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT AND PROCUREMENT OF NEW COMBAT AND TACTICAL VEHICLES BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on the review of development and procurement of new combat and tactical vehicles by the Department of the Army (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT OF BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAM

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the initial report on review of administrative management of the ballistic missile program of the Department of the Air Force, dated May 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ERECTION OF FREEDOM MONUMENT

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the erection of Freedom Monument, symbolizing the ideals of democracy, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of March 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1960

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to strengthen the enforcement provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and extend the duration of the authorization of grants for State water pollution control programs, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

RESOLUTION OF INDONESIAN PARLIAMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to the request of the Indonesian Government, a resolution of the Indonesian Parliament, concerning the Sahara atomic tests conducted by the French Government, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Finance:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 12

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose passage of H.R. 1884, which if enacted will prohibit the States from imposing a length-of-residence requirement as a condition to receiving welfare benefits under the Social Security Act

"Whereas H.R. 1884 has been introduced in the House of Representatives, and if enacted will prohibit the States from establishing a minimum length-of-residence requirement as a condition to receiving welfare benefits under the Social Security Act; and

"Whereas the right to require a minimum period of residence in the State is a right properly exercised by the States; and

"Whereas passage of the proposed bill will greatly increase the amount required to be expended by the State of Nevada to provide social security benefits; and

"Whereas depriving the States of the right to impose a length-of-residence requirement as a condition to receiving such benefits is an unjustified invasion of their sovereign powers: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to oppose passage of H.R. 1884, thereby preserving the sovereign right of the States to require a minimum length of residency as a condition to receiving welfare benefits under the Social Security Act; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be prepared and transmitted forthwith by the legislative counsel to the President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each member of Nevada's congressional delegation.

"Passed by the senate March 11, 1960.

"REX BELL,
"President of the Senate.
"LEOLA H. WOHLFEIL,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the assmbly March 10, 1960.

"BERNARD POELE,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"NATHAN T. HURST,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
"GRANT SAWYER,
"Governor of the State of Nevada."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 7

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a system of payments by the Federal Government to the State of Nevada or its local governments, which payments will be made in lieu of property taxes on federally owned property in this State, which property is immune from State or local taxation

"Whereas the Federal Government owns approximately 60,500,000 acres of the total area of 70,745,600 acres of land in the State of Nevada, being approximately 86.2 percent of all land in the State of Nevada; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has indicated a desire of withdrawing additional lands from the public domain; and

"Whereas the constitution of the State of Nevada prohibits the taxation of such lands unless otherwise provided by the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas the ad valorem property tax in effect in the State of Nevada is a primary source of revenue for the State of Nevada; and

"Whereas the several county assessors in the State of Nevada have estimated the value of all such lands held by the Federal Government in the State of Nevada to be $767,884,511; and

"Whereas the Commission on Intergovernmental Relation, in its 1955 report to the President of the United States, has evidenced its complete awareness that the immunity of federally owned property from State and local ad valorem taxation has greatly reduced the tax base of many communities which rely on property taxes as their chief source of revenue; and

"Whereas the impact of this immunity is unequal and particularly severe in areas where the value of Federal property is a large part of the total property values; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has realized this problem in the past and has developed a variety of financial arrangements between such Government and State and local governments; and

"Whereas the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has recommended that the Federal Government inaugurate a broad system of payments by the Federal Government to State and local governments in lieu of property taxes on federally owned property; and

"Whereas such commission is of the opinion that such payments, or other financial arrangements whereby State and local governments can be reimbursed for tax losses arising by virtue of Federal real estate holdings, are necessary to help preserve financially healthy governments; and

"Whereas such immunity has weakened many local governments in the State of Nevada; and

"Whereas the Federal Government and State governments share the responsibility for avoiding the impairment of the financial ability of local governments; and

"Whereas equity as between the Federal Government and local taxpayers requires the Federal Government to make appropriate payments to the State of Nevada or its local governments, or both; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has given no indication of its intention to grant any part of its land to the State of Nevada; and

"Whereas in nearly 100 years of statehood, the State of Nevada has received less than 3 million acres as the result of Federal land grants; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has both the ability and power to compensate the State of Nevada and local governments for tax losses arising by virtue of the immunity of federally owned property from State and local taxation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of Nevada most respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to establish an effective system of payments by the Federal Government to the State of Nevada or its local governments, or both, as a means of reimbursing this State and its local governments for the tremendous tax losses which arise by virtue of the immunity from State and local taxation which federally owned property in the State of Nevada enjoys; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be prepared and transmitted by the legislative counsel to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Secretary of the Interior and to each member of the Nevada congressional delegation.

"Adopted by the senate March 8, 1960.

"REX BELL,
"President of the Senate.
"LEOLA H. WOHLFEIL,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Adopted by the assembly March 1, 1960.

"BERNARD POELE,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"NATHAN T. HURST,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly."

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 4

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to prepare adequate State water rights legislation

"Whereas despite repeated congressional recognition in many statutes, such as the Federal Power Act, the Desert Land Act, and, more recently, the Water Supply Act of 1958, that the States have and should have the primary interest and responsibility for the control and coordination of water use, a series of judicial decisions in the last decade and a half has cast some doubt on the authority of the States to perform their appropriate tasks in this field, and has suggested the possibility of unlimited Federal prerogatives concerning water which casts doubt on the basis of vested water rights and weakens the ability of the States successfully to coordinate water redevelopment; and

"Whereas factors involved in water development are peculiarly dependent on local geography, climate and economic needs and are consequently best handled within our Federal system by the State level of Government; and

"Whereas the traditional role of the States in the administration, conservation, and utilization of their water resources has led in the direction of optimum harmonious development of these water resources; and

"Whereas Federal agencies which have compiled with State water laws in obedience to the expressed intent of Congress have not thereby jeopardized any of the legitimate interests of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas doubts raised by these judicial decisions as to theb asis of vester water rights, present and future, and doubts as to the relationships between the Federal and State Governments will, without corrective congressional action, tend to delay much-needed water development for an indefinite time and discourage the States in their efforts to make such needed improvements in their facilities for water resource planning and development: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memori-

alized to enact legislation in unmistakable and effective terms to provide that the States shall have primary responsibility and authority for the administration and development of water resources within their boundaries; that such law be so clear and unambiguous as to be incapable of evasion by either executive order or judicial interpretations; and that such law require every agency, permittee, licensee and employee of the Federal Government, as a condition precedent to the taking or use of any water, to acquire a right to the use thereof in conformity with State laws and procedures relating to the control, appropriation, use or distribution of such water; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to enact legislation defining the waters originating on federally owned or controlled lands which contribute to flowing or moving surface or ground waters, and thereby eliminate the doubts created by recent judicial revisions, and clarify the relations of the Federal and State governments in the water field, so as to minimize litigation and delays and allow water development by the Federal and State governments to proceed on a harmonious basis; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be prepared and transmitted forthwith by the Legislative Counsel to the President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Agriculture, Speaker of the House of Representatives and each member of Nevada's congressional delegation.

"Passed by the senate February 22, 1960.

"REX BELL,
"President of the Senate.
"LEOLA H. WOHLFEIL,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the assembly February 15, 1960.

"BERNARD POELE,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"NATHAN T. HURST,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
"GRANT SAWYER,
"Governor of the State of Nevada."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 7

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to propose constitutional amendment abolishing income, estate and gift taxes and prohibiting the Federal Government from engaging in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise except as provided in the Federal Constitution

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, jointly, That the 50th session of the Legislature of the State of Nevada respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to propose to the people an amendment to the U.S. Constitution or to call a convention for such purpose to add to the Constitution an article providing as follows:

" 'ARTICLE ——

" 'SECTION 1. The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution.

" 'SEC. 2. The Constitution or laws of any State, or the laws of the United States shall not be subject to the terms of any foreign or domestic agreement which would abrogate this amendment.

" 'SEC. 3. The activities of the U.S. Government which violate the intent and purposes of this amendment shall, within a period of 3 years from the date of ratification of this amendment, be liquidated and the properties and facilities affected shall be sold.

" 'SEC. 4. Three years after the ratification of this amendment the 16th article of amendments to the Constitution of the United States shall stand repealed and thereafter Congress shall not levy taxes on personal incomes, estates, and/or gifts'; and be it further

"Resolved, That the legislative counsel forthwith prepare and transmit certified copies of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and each Member of the Nevada congressional delegation.

"Passed by the senate March 1, 1960.

"REX BELL,
"President of the Senate.
"LEOLA H. WOHLFEIL,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the assembly March 11, 1960.

"BERNARD POELE,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"NATHAN T. HURST,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
"GRANT SAWYER,
"Governor of the State of Nevada."

Resolutions of the City Council of the City of Lynn, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Milwaukee, Wis., Traffic Club, favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal the excise tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Finance.

ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL LAND AT FORT RILEY, KANS.—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Fort Riley, Kans., is one of the Nation's oldest and most important military establishments. At the present time it is the home of the 1st Infantry Division of the U.S. Army and other important defense units.

The military affairs committee of the Junction City Chamber of Commerce at a meeting on May 10 adopted a resolution stressing the need for the acquisition of additional land at Fort Riley.

Modern weapons and modern warfare require large training areas in order that our military personnel may familiarize themselves with the new equipment.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the military affairs committee of the Junction City Chamber of Commerce be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF JUNCTION CITY, KANS.

Whereas Fort Riley, Kans., is one of the Nation's oldest and most important military establishments; and

Whereas Fort Riley, Kans., is the home of the 1st Infantry Division of the U.S. Army and other important defense units; and

Whereas the military affairs committee of the Junction City Chamber of Commerce has for several years adhered to a policy of supporting its adjacent military establishment, Fort Riley, to the end that its needs have been met, so that this historic post will continue to be utilized to maximum effectiveness; and

Whereas the military affairs committee has seen fit to recommend to the board of directors a program for the acquisition of land at Fort Riley, Kans.; and

Whereas, the board of directors of the Junction City Chamber of Commerce in legally authorized action did unanimously adopt as policy on March 20, 1959, a program for the acquisition of additional land at Fort Riley: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the military affairs committee of the Junction City Chamber of Commerce requests that members of the Kansas congressional delegation take all necessary action to acquire the additional required land at Fort Riley, Kans., to the end that this post continues to be utilized to maximum effectiveness.

This resolution adopted May 10, 1960.

ROBERT J. FEGAN,
Chairman.
LEE RICH.
R. A. SCHERMERHORN.
C. W. LAMER,
President.
FRED BRAMLAGE.
W. S. KENNEDY.
JOHN D. MONTGOMERY.
E. W. ROLFS.
G. C. WALPOLE, Jr.,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ENGLE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 2998. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to extend the life of certain vessels under the provisions of such act from 20 to 25 years (Rept. No. 1406).

By Mr. HARTKE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments:

S. 1787. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of decorative hardwood or imitation hardwood products (Rept. No. 1405).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. 3179. A bill to increase the authorization for appropriations for construction of facilities for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory (Rept. No. 1409); and

H.R. 8238. An act to authorize and direct the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to make a study and report to Congress, from the standpoint of the public health, of the discharge of substances into the atmosphere from the exhausts of motor vehicles (Rept. No. 1410).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment:

S. 3025. A bill to amend title II of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, relating to practical nurse training, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1411).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

S. 2830. A bill to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1412); and

S.J. Res. 127. Joint resolution to help make available to those children in our country who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to help make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments those specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps (Rept. No. 1414).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 3420. A bill to provide further for permissible writing and printing on third- and fourth-class matter, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1413).

ADMINISTRATION OF NATIONAL FORESTS FOR MULTIPLE USE AND SUSTAINED YIELD

Mr. HART. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on behalf of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], I report favorably with amendments, the bill (S. 3044) to authorize and direct that the national forests be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1407) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with supplemental views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

REPORT ENTITLED "A BUILDING FOR A MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY" (S. REPT. NO. 1408)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 106, 84th Congress, 69 Stat. 189, from the Joint Congressional Committee on Construction of a Building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, I submit a report entitled "A Building for a Museum of History and Technology." I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (by request):

S. 3578. A bill to amend parts I and III of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to make unlawful certain discriminatory rates, charges, and practices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCLELLAN (by request):

S. 3579. A bill to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See remarks of Mr. MCCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 3580. A bill to establish a revolving-type fund in the Treasury for the Bureau of Reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. JORDAN):

S. 3581. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, to permit Federal savings and loan associations to invest in or lend to business development credit corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. ERVIN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARROLL:

S. 3582. A bill for the relief of A1c. Percy J. Trudeau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 3583. A bill to amend section 507 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the preservation of basic compensation in downgrading actions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (by request):

S. 3584. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide eligibility for annuities for certain employees who were serving on the date of the enactment of the act of May 22, 1920; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S.J. Res. 196. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of June 20, 1960, as "National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

CONTINUANCE OF STUDY OF RELATIVE WATER RESOURCE AND RELATED DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS OF THE UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA

Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. GRUENING, and Mr. MUSKIE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 325); which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Whereas the Senate, by committee action, public hearings, and floor vote on Senate Resolution 248 (85th Congress, 2d session), has been engaged in a continuing study of the relative water resources and related development programs of the United States and Soviet Russia since 1957; and

Whereas that endeavor, through the joint efforts of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works, has now resulted in a factual, eyewitness report revealing the remarkable effort and accomplishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to overtake and then surpass the United States of America in this vital field: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this report be received, accepted, ordered printed, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Committee on Public Works for appropriate consideration in relation to their other duties; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works continue the joint studies as previously requested, including, as appropriate, securing similar information concerning developments elsewhere in the world, and continue also, as previously requested, to submit their recommendation of ways and means to accelerate the development and utilization of the natural resources of the United States.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT, RELATING TO STANDARDS FOR CERTAIN RAILROAD RATES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to apply to proposed railroad rates standards similar to those in the Robinson-Patman Act. The bill would require a common carrier petitioning the ICC for a lower rate in one geographic area to make available equal rate reductions over its whole system, when the requested rate is lower than necessary to meet competition from other forms of transportation.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has, since its formation wrestled with the complex problems of our transportation system. The problems of competitive ratemaking, long a controversial matter, are among the most complex of these issues—particularly when viewed in the perspective of the mandates of the national transportation policy enacted in 1940. This proposed legislation, which offers a possible solution to these problems by applying antitrust principles to competitive ratemaking, is a new approach worthy of consideration by the committee.

I introduce the bill today in order to provide the basis for meaningful discussion and thought on this aspect of competitive ratemaking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3578) to amend parts I and III of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to make unlawful certain discriminatory rates, charges, and practices, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PAYMENT IN ADVANCE FOR REQUIRED PUBLICATIONS

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes.

This proposed legislation was submitted to the Senate by the Secretary of the Interior and referred to the Committee on Government Operations on April 6, 1960.

Mr. President, in order that Members of the Senate may have full information relative to the objectives of the bill, I request that the letter transmitted to the President of the Senate by the Secretary of the Interior be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3579) to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN, by request,

was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1960.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill, "To provide agencies of the Government of the United States with authority to pay in advance for required publications."

We suggest that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

Section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) prohibits advance payment for articles purchased by the Federal Government. The act of June 12, 1930 (46 Stat. 580), permits the advance payment of "subscription charges" for newspapers, magazines, and other periodicals. This language however, does not cover charges for publications that do not fall into the category of periodicals.

The proposed legislation would permit advance payment of subscription or other charges for newspapers, magazines, periodicals, and other publications.

Our acquisitions program has suffered as a result of our inability to make advance payment for publications. In some cases we have been unable to procure publications at all; in others we have had to pay a premium either to the publisher or to an agent.

For example, we were unable to obtain the proceedings of the Fourth World Petroleum Congress held in Rome in 1955, since we were prohibited from complying with the fiscal requirements of the Congress for advance payment of $70. Likewise, we were unable to procure the fifth decennial index of Chemical Abstracts published by the American Chemical Society at a prepublication price of $900. The postpublication price is likely to be $1,200 and in all probability more. The Comptroller General has ruled in 37 C.G. 720 that the index is not a periodical and consequently advance payment canot be made.

The Bonneville Power Administration has difficulty in purchasing the American Standards Association standards which are published as separates at 25 to 50 cents each. It is the association's practice to add 50 cents to each order not accompanied by a remittance. In order to facilitate advance payments of small amounts they sell coupon books, but the General Accounting Office has ruled that we cannot legally purchase them.

In recent years many State governments which formerly gave us their publications such as session laws have changed their policy and now require advance payment. These must now be ordered through a dealer who charges a premium for advancing the money.

These are but a few examples of the difficulties encountered in attempting to procure with facility, and at savings, much needed and required publications for the offices of this Department.

There is ample precedent for liberalizing the statute to permit this Department, as well as other agencies, to pay in advance for required publications. Set forth below are the statutory exceptions which have previously been made for the Department of Agriculture, the Quartermaster Corps, and the Veterans' Bureau (now Veterans' Administration) to pay in advance for subscriptions to publications without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes.

1. The appropriation act for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1910, approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 1054), provided that "hereafter section 3648 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to the subscriptions for publications for the Department of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to pay in advance for any publications for the use of this Department."

2. The act of April 27, 1914 (38 Stat. 362) provided that the Quartermaster Corps may pay in advance for "other publications" from funds authorized for the corps.

3. The appropriation act for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, provided that "Hereafter section 3648 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to subscriptions for publications for the U.S. Veterans' Bureau and the Director is authorized to pay in advance for any publications for the use of the Bureau."

The same authority should be given to this and other departments in the furtherance of our library services.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress, but that the Comptroller General has recommended the inclusion of a section 2 that repeals the present special laws granting similar authority to specific agencies. We have no objection to the inclusion of a provision of this kind if the Congress believes it is advisable, and if the inclusion will not delay the consideration of our proposed legislation. The language suggested by the Comptroller General is as follows:

"SEC. 2. The following parts of acts and all amendments thereto are repealed:

"1. The proviso to the paragraph headed 'General Expenses, Library' under the caption 'Library, Department of Agriculture' in the Act of March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 1054);

"2. The first proviso to the paragraph headed 'Regular Supplies, Quartermaster Corps' in the Act of April 27, 1914 (38 Stat. 362);

"3. The first parenthetical phrase under the caption 'Pay, Miscellaneous' in the Act of March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 929);

"4. Section 5 of the Act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1049);

"5. The tenth paragraph under the caption 'United States Veterans' Bureau' in the Act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 533)."

Sincerely yours,

D. OTIS BEASLEY,
Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior.

REVOLVING-TYPE FUND IN TREASURY FOR BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of the Interior to the President of the Senate, under date of May 16, 1960, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill "to establish a revolving fund in the Treasury for the Bureau of Reclamation and other purposes."

This proposed measure has far-reaching consequences with respect to reclamation appropriations. If referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, we will certainly consult the Appropriations Committee.

The text of the letter of February 16, 1960, from the Secretary of the Interior and the draft of the bill are attached. I ask unanimous consent that the copy of the letter with the draft of the proposed bill be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3580) to establish a revolving-type fund in the Treasury for the Bureau of Reclamation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is established in the Treasury of the United States an account to be known as the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund. To this fund there shall be credited:

(a) All receipts from the operation of projects and facilities under the jurisdiction of said Bureau;

(b) All funds advanced or contributed in accordance with law to said Bureau by water users, Federal agencies and others;

(c) All other receipts arising in connection with the operations of said Bureau;

(d) All appropriations made by the Congress for credit to the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund and unexpended balances of appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation outstanding as of the effective date of this Act; and

(e) The unexpended balances as of the effective date of this Act in the emergency fund authorized by the Act of June 26, 1948 (62 Stat. 1052; 43 U.S.C., sec. 502); the Fort Peck continuing fund established by the provisions of section 10 of the Act of May 18, 1938 (52 Stat. 403, 406; 16 U.S.C., sec. 833i); the Upper Colorado River Basin fund created by section 5 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 105, 107; 43 U.S.C., sec. 620d); the Colorado River dam fund established by the provisions of section 2 of the Act of December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1057; 43 U.S.C., sec. 617b); the Colorado River development fund established by the provisions of section 2 of the Act of July 19, 1940 (61 Stat. 56, 43 U.S.C., sec. 618a); the special deposit account for the Umatilla Project, Oregon, established by the provisions of section 4 of the Act of October 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 941); the special deposit account established for the North Platte project by the provisions of section 4 of the Act of July 17, 1952 (66 Stat. 754); the Boulder City municipal fund established by section 6 of the Boulder City Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 1729, 1731); the Disposal of Coulee Dam community fund maintained under the Coulee Dam Community Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 524); the special funds for "Payments to Farmers' Irrigation District (North Platte Project, Nebraska-Wyoming)" and for "Refunds and Returns"; and the Trust Fund account established for contributions, deposits and advances. Each of the foregoing funds and accounts is hereby abolished.

SEC. 2. The Bureau of Reclamation operating fund shall be available when so provided in appropriation acts and within such limitations as may be included in such acts, without fiscal year limitation, for the following purposes as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to the Bureau of Reclamation: *Provided,* That moneys heretofore or hereafter appropriated shall be used only for the purposes for which they have been or are appropriated:

(a) Expenditures for engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects; investigation of projects for the conservation, development and utilization of the water resources of Alaska,

but only to the extent that general funds for such expenditures are appropriated by the Congress for credit to the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund; studies of water conservation and development plans; formulating plans and preparing designs and specifications for authorized Federal reclamation projects or parts thereof prior to initial allocation of appropriations for construction of such projects or parts; and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects;

(b) Expenditures for construction and rehabilitation of authorized projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, but only to the extent of funds appropriated by the Congress for credit to the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund for such purposes;

(c) Expenditures for operation, maintenance and replacement of reclamation projects or parts thereof and of other facilities, as authorized by law; for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; and for expenses required to be incurred because of unusual or emergency conditions, as defined by law (43 U.S.C., sec. 503), in order to assure continuous operation and maintenance of irrigation or power systems: *Provided,* That nonreimbursable expenditures for these purposes shall be made only to the extent that general funds are appropriated therefor by the Congress for credit to the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund.

(d) Expenditures for general administration and related functions in the office of the Commissioner of Reclamation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Reclamation;

(e) Loans to irrigation districts and other public agencies for construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects, and for loans and grants to non-Federal agencies for construction of projects, as authorized by the Acts of July 4, 1955, as amended (69 Stat. 245, 70 Stat. 155; 43 U.S.C., sec. 421a–421d), and August 6, 1956, as amended (70 Stat. 1044, 71 Stat. 48; 43 U.S.C., sec. 422a–422k), including expenses necessary for carrying out the program, but only to the extent of funds appropriated by the Congress for credit to the Bureau of Reclamation Operating Fund for such purposes;

(f) Within the receipts of the Boulder Canyon Project available therefor under the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, as amended, the payments provided for in subsection (c) and the expenditures provided for in subsection (d) of section 2 of said Act which but for the provisions of this Act would have been made from the Colorado River dam fund and the Colorado River development fund, respectively;

(g) Expenditures and transfers for the purposes specified in section 6 of the Boulder City Act of 1958 within the proceeds from the disposal under said Act of Federal property lying within the Boulder City municipal area, except that expenditures for the purposes specified in subsection (b)(2) of said section 6 may at the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior be made only to the extent that general funds for such expenditures are appropriated by the Congress for credit to the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund for such purposes: *Provided,* That the reference in subsection (c) of said section 6 to the Colorado River dam fund shall be taken to refer to the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund and the references in said section to the Boulder City municipal fund shall be taken to refer to the proceeds from the disposal under the Boulder City Act of 1958 of Federal property lying within the Boulder City municipal area: *Provided further,* That the reference in subsection (e) of said section 6 to appropriations available for municipal operations of the city shall be taken to refer to allotment of moneys in the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund for municipal operations of the city;

(h) Payments and expenditures for the purposes set forth in sections 7 and 9 of the Coulee Dam Community Act of 1957 within the proceeds from the sales made under sections 2 and 3 of said Act, and the transfer to the reclamation fund of any balance remaining from such sales as provided in subsection (a) of section 9 of said Act;

(i) Within the total amount authorized for such purpose by the Act of August 13, 1957 (71 Stat. 342), the payments to the Farmers' Irrigation District on behalf of the Northport Irrigation District provided for in said Act;

(j) Within the miscellaneous revenues accruing pursuant to subsections I and J of section 4 of the Act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 685, 703; 43 U.S.C., secs. 501, 526), on behalf of those who have contracted with the United States pursuant to the Act of July 17, 1952 (66 Stat. 754), the expenditures provided for by section 4 of said Act;

(k) Within the payments therein referred to, the expenditures and transfers provided for in section 4 of the Act of October 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 941);

(l) Expenditure of funds advanced or contributed in accordance with law for the purposes for which advanced or contributed;

(m) Expenditures for the purpose of refunding overcollections and to return deposits in excess of amounts applied to the purposes for which the deposits were collected;

(n) Payment at least annually to the credit of the reclamation fund or miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury as the case may be, in accordance with law, from moneys in the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund in excess of the amounts required for the foregoing purposes: *Provided,* That for the purposes of the second paragraph under the heading "Increase in the Reclamation Fund" in the Act of May 9, 1938 (52 Stat. 291, 318; 43 U.S.C., sec. 392a), the net revenues derived from the sale of power in connection with a project shall be deemed to have repaid those construction costs of such project allocated to be repaid by power revenues when the total net power revenues heretofore realized in connection with such project together with those hereafter realized and credited to the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund in accordance with this Act shall have equaled such construction costs.

SEC. 3. (a) In the application of this Act to the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, the references in section 5 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 105; 43 U.S.C., sec. 620d), to the revenues credited to and in the Upper Colorado River Basin fund shall be taken to refer to the revenues collected in connection with the operation of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects and credited to the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund.

(b) Hereafter, the computation of charges under the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, as amended, for electric energy generated at Hoover Dam and in determining the obligation to repay advances and readvances for the construction of the project as defined in said Act (including the determination of nonprofit investments or expenditures), the references in said Adjustment Act to advances and readvances to the Colorado River dam fund shall be taken to refer to funds appropriated for credit to the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund for construction of the project and the references to receipts or revenues from the project shall be taken to refer to receipts or revenues from the project credited to the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund. For the purpose of computing interest on advances and readvances of funds for construction of the project, such funds shall be considered as advanced when they have been transferred to the credit of the account on the books of Treasury from which they are to be disbursed.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this Act shall take effect on July 1, following the date of its enactment.

The letter presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1960.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed for your consideration is a draft of bill "To establish a revolving-type fund in the Treasury for the Bureau of Reclamation, and for other purposes."

I request that this draft bill be referred to the appropriate committee of the Senate and I recommend that it be enacted.

The proposal, if it is enacted, will authorize the establishment of a fund, to be known as the Bureau of Reclamation operating fund, into which all revenues and receipts of every nature arising from the operation of projects and facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation would be deposited. Similarly, all appropriations made by the Congress for the Bureau and related unexpended balances thereof, as of the effective date of the act, and the unexpended balances in the special funds enumerated in section 1, paragraph (e) of the draft bill, would be deposited in the fund. The operating fund would, within such limitations as may be included in appropriation acts, be available without further appropriation and fiscal year limitation for meeting the costs and expenses of the program administered by the Bureau as stated in detail in items (a) through (m) of section 2 of the proposal. However, the draft bill does provide that moneys appropriated shall be used only for the purposes for which they are appropriated. The Bureau will continue to request annual appropriations for construction and rehabilitation, loans to irrigation districts and other public agencies, investigations of water resources projects in Alaska, the soil and moisture conservation program, and certain nonreimbursable operation and maintenance costs. The draft bill would not authorize, expressly or by implication, any new projects for construction or any new activities by the Bureau.

A basic objective of the legislation is to place on a revolving-fund type of operation four activities of the Bureau; namely, operation and maintenance—except insofar as this activity will depend upon appropriated funds to cover expenditures which are allocated to nonreimbursable purposes—general administration, general investigations, and emergency repairs. Current gross revenues from the projects operated by the Bureau exceed the funds required to defray the costs of these programs. Favorable action on the legislation would remove the activities from the normal annual appropriation procedures and thus reflect the results of these business-type operations in the budget on a net basis. Appropriations for these purposes in fiscal year 1960 aggregated $37.3 million with total appropriations for the Bureau in that year amounting to $255.5 million.

Enactment of the proposed legislation will result in our judgment, in bringing about a simplification and improvement in the overall financial operations of the Bureau of Reclamation. For one thing, it will reduce the number of cash accounts with Treasury and the resultant time-consuming reconciliations. In addition, the number of

funds in use would be reduced from 13 to 2, i.e., the reclamation fund and the Bureau of reclamation operating fund.

The Bureau, in accordance with prescribed law, is currently maintaining a series of special fund receipt accounts and revolving funds in addition to the reclamation fund. These include the Colorado River Dam fund; Colorado River development fund; proceeds from sales of property, Coulee Dam Community, and Boulder City municipal fund; and Fort Peck and Colorado River Basin funds. The draft legislation will authorize the discontinuance of the use of these special and revolving funds and the revenues and receipts pertaining thereto will henceforth be deposited directly to the operating fund. However, it is not the intent of this draft legislation to change in any way the use or disposition of funds as presently prescribed by law. The proper use and disposition of these funds will be assured through administrative accounting and fund control by the Bureau of Reclamation rather than by the use of the separate funds for each type of activity.

The reclamation fund established by the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), will be maintained to receive as heretofore proceeds from sales of public lands, royalties from oil and mineral leases and other accretions. With the establishment of the operating fund the balances in the reclamation fund will be available for construction purposes. Upon congressional appropriation the amount thereof would be transferred from the reclamation fund to the operating fund and construction expenditures would be made from this latter account.

The draft bill is not designed to effect nor would it result in a change in the principles on which the accounting system of the Bureau is based. This system is fully integrated to encompass budgeting, programing, and accounting, is patterned after the uniform system of accounts prescribed by the Federal Power Commission and has the approval of the Comptroller General.

A feature of the draft bill which should be noted is contained in subparagraph (n) of section. This provides for an annual transfer of funds to the reclamation fund or miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, as the case may be, in accordance with law, of the balance in the operating fund in excess of the amounts required to finance the programs (see subparagraphs (a) through (m) of section 2) of the Bureau. With respect to the construction costs of a project allocated to be repaid by power revenues the draft bill provides that, when the aggregate of such net power revenues credited to the operating fund equals the construction costs, such costs shall be deemed to have been repaid for purposes of the reclamation fund (see the special provision in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1939, relating to increase in the reclamation fund).

In summary, if the attached draft bill is enacted, the Bureau of Reclamation would have two basic funds, (1) the reclamation fund and (2) the operating fund. The reclamation fund as indicated would receive all accretions and ultimately will be the main source of funds appropriated for the construction program of the Bureau. The operating fund would serve as a depositary for all funds available for expenditure and all disbursements by the Bureau of Reclamation. Control by the Congress over the activities of the Bureau would not be decreased since the various programs of the Bureau of Reclamation would continue to be included in the President's budget, either on a gross or net basis, and subject to whatever action the Congress may take, including the imposition of limitations on expenditures which may appear in appropriation acts.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that the enactment of this proposed legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

AMENDMENT OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933, RELATING TO CERTAIN INVESTMENTS BY FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 so as to permit certain Federal savings and loan associations to invest in or to lend to business development credit corporations very small portions of their assets.

Business development credit corporations have been established in many States. Generally these make it possible for banks, insurance companies, and other financial institutions to contribute their backing to the development of their States through private financing of sound ventures, without any Federal or State money. The Banking and Currency Committee has issued a committee print on the subject of development corporations and authorities which contains much useful information.

I am proud to say that North Carolina, along with the New England States and New York, was one of the leaders in this movement. The Business Development Corp. of North Carolina has been operating effectively for 4 years. Its fourth annual report, for 1959, shows that the corporation had made disbursements on 49 loans totaling $3.8 million, and that it expected to disburse soon 16 additional loans totaling $2.7 million. According to the report the loans helped to maintain the employment of more than 5,000 people and created employment for an additional 8,000 people. The report shows that the North Carolina Business Development Corp. is financed by $1 million received from its 1,860 stockholders and by over $2 million advanced by its 145 members, including 92 commercial banks, 13 life insurance companies, and 40 State savings and loan associations. It has been paying interest on money borrowed from its members at the rate of 4¼ percent and 5¼ percent.

In North Carolina and a number of other States, including, I understand, Kentucky, New York, Oregon, Tennessee, and Pennsylvania, State savings and loan associations or State building and loan associations have been specifically authorized to participate in financing these State development credit corporations through buying stock, making loans or some similar device. These States have imposed restrictions on the amounts which these State savings and loan associations may make available to business development credit corporations, both in order to protect the savings and loans against the risks inherent in these commercial enterprises, and in order to prevent diversion of more than a nominal amount of the assets of the savings and loan associations away from their primary purpose of making loans on real estate.

The bill which I am introducing would impose stringent restrictions on the advances of Federal savings and loan associations to business development credit corporations. In the first place, it would only authorize a Federal savings and loan to participate in a business development corporation in a State if the State law specifically authorized a State savings and loan association to do so. In other words, if the State law establishing or permitting the establishment of a business development credit corporation does not contain sufficient safeguards so that the State will specifically authorize State savings and loan associations to invest in the development credit corporation, then a Federal savings and loan association in that State could not do so either.

In the second place, a Federal savings and loan association could only invest in a business development credit corporation if the association's general reserve, surplus, and undivided profits amounted to 5 percent of its withdrawable accounts. This formula, designed to limit this activity to well-financed savings and loan associations, is based upon the amendment to the Home Owners' Loan Act with reference to loans to develop real estate which Congress enacted last year.

In the third place, the amount which a Federal savings and loan association could invest in or lend to a business development credit corporation would be limited to the amount which a comparable State savings and loan association might invest or lend, or 2 percent of the Federal savings and loan association's general reserve, surplus, and undivided profits, or $50,000.

Subject to all of these limitations, it would seem that the bill would create no substantial risk to Federal savings and loan associations or those who have invested their savings in them, and no substantial diversion of the assets of Federal savings and loan associations from their basic purpose. And at the same time, the bill would permit Federal savings and loan associations to participate with State savings and loan associations in supporting these valuable business development credit corporations.

I am introducing this bill at this time, even though it is late in the session, so that there will be ample opportunity to consider the bill before the next Congress meets, and so that the views of all interested can be obtained.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3581) to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, to permit Federal savings and loan associations to invest in or lend to business development credit corporations, introduced by Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. JORDAN),

was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5(c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 (12 U.S.C. 1464) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Without regard to any other provision of this subsection, any such association whose general reserves, surplus, and undivided profits aggregate a sum in excess of 5 per centum of its withdrawable accounts is authorized to invest in, to lend to, or to commit itself to lend to any business development credit corporation incorporated in the State in which the head office of such association is situated, in the same manner and to the same extent as the statutes of such State specifically authorize a savings and loan association organized under the laws of said State to invest in or to lend to such business development credit corporation, but the aggregate amount of the investments, loans, and commitments of any such association outstanding at any time shall not exceed 2 per centum of its general reserves, surplus, and undivided profits, or $50,000, whichever is lesser."

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT TO PROVIDE ELIGIBILITY FOR ANNUITIES FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide eligibility for annuities for certain employees who were serving on the date of the enactment of the act of May 22, 1920. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement, prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3584) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide eligibility for annuities for certain employees who were serving on the date of the enactment of the act of May 22, 1920, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"(c) Any person who was serving as an employee on May 22, 1920, who was separated from the service after having performed not less than fifteen years of civilian service, and who is not otherwise eligible for annuity under this Act, shall be entitled to an annuity beginning at age 70, computed as provided in section 9."

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, benefits provided by the amendment made by this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

SEC. 3. This Act shall become effective the day following its enactment and no annuity provided herein shall be paid for any period prior thereto, except to those persons who had previously filed applications therefor and had been denied by the Civil Service Commission.

The statement presented by Mr. YARBOROUGH is as follows:

This bill will amend the Civil Service Retirement Act by clarifying the eligibility for retirement of certain former Government employees, to wit, those who had a minimum of 15 years classified civil service at the time of the passage of the original Civil Service Retirement Act of May 22, 1920.

The effective date of this act was August 20, 1920. It provided:

"That beginning at the expiration of ninety days next following the passage of this Act, all employees in the classified civil service of the United States who have on that date, or shall have on any date thereafter, reached the age of seventy years and rendered at least 15 years of service computed as prescribed in section 3 of this Act, shall be eligible for retirement on an annuity as provided in section 2 hereof."

This would give the impression that it was the intent of Congress to provide an annuity for all service employees then in the service who were 70 years of age, or who should later attain that age.

During the months and years that followed the effective date of that act, various employees who had been in the Government service at the time of its passage, left in order to accept positions in private employment, believing that when they had attained the age of 70, they would be entitled to receive an annuity for the years—15 or more—of their Government employment.

The Civil Service Commission ruled that they could not do so, unless they were still in the Government service on attaining the age of 70. This was probably a literally correct interpretation of the act, though probably not the intent of Congress, for in later acts, Public Law 411, 77th and others, Congress specifically provided that persons leaving the Government service before retirement age might still draw whatever annuity their years of service in the Government might entitle them to, when they had attained retirement age.

The Civil Service Commission, however, ruled that this privilege did not apply to those oldtime Government employees who worked 6 days a week (without benefit of coffee breaks) for piteously low salaries in the days before 1920.

This bill simply provides that these oldtime Government employees—there, are only a few, and these are 75 years and upwards of age—may have the privilege of drawing the annuities to which their years of former Government service will entitle them.

Since there are only a few, and since their annuities would be based on the piteously low salaries prevailing during their period of service, the cost to the Government would be negligible.

As indicated above the few beneficiaries of this bill are all of advanced age and early action upon it will be necessary if they are to receive in their few remaining years this long-delayed privilege.

AMENDMENT OF NAVY RATION STATUTE, RELATING TO SERVING OF OLEOMARGARINE—AMENDMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and Mr. PROUTY) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2168) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

EXTENSION OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, at the next printing of the bill (S. 2830) to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations, and for other purposes, introduced by me, for myself and other Senators on January 14, 1960, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators ALLOTT and CASE of New Jersey may be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPANSION AND EXTENSION OF SALINE WATER CONVERSION PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 16, 1960, the names of Senators KUCHEL, MOSS, ALLOTT, SYMINGTON, JACKSON, KERR, SMATHERS, CASE of South Dakota, HUMPHREY, JAVITS, YARBOROUGH, MURRAY, GRUENING, CARROLL, CHURCH, CLARK, MANSFIELD, MCGEE, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and MONRONEY, were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3557) to expand and extend the saline water conversion program under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior to provide for accelerated research, development, demonstration, and application of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON) on May 16, 1960.

HUMANE TREATMENT FOR CERTAIN ANIMALS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 18, 1960, the names of Senators WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and CHURCH were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3570) to provide for the humane treatment of animals used in experiment and tests by recipients of grants from the United States and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. Government, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and other Senators) on May 18, 1960.

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN DEAF INDIVIDUALS — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, at the next printing of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 127) to help make available to those children in our country who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to help make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments those specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps, introduced by me, for myself and other Senators, on August 6, 1959, I

ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators YARBOROUGH, GRUENING, and HUMPHREY may be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LOREN K. OLSON TO BE A MEMBER OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in accordance with section 22 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the President, on May 16, 1960, submitted to the Senate the nomination of Mr. Loren K. Olson to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1962, of Commissioner John F. Floberg, who has submitted his resignation to the President.

The Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will hold a public hearing on Friday, May 27, 1960, beginning at 10 a.m. in room P–63, the Old Supreme Court room of the Capitol, for the purpose of considering this nomination.

For the information of the Members of the Congress and the public, I request unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD biographical data on the nominee, Mr. Loren K. Olson, which has been furnished to the Joint Committee by the Atomic Energy Commission.

There being no objection, the biographical data was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUALIFICATION DATA OF LOREN KEITH OLSON

Personal: Born February 28, 1914, Wheeler, Wis., married—two children.

Education: B.S. Eau Claire Teachers College, Wisconsin, 1939; LL.B., University of Wisconsin, 1940.

Experience:

March 19, 1958, to present, USAEC, General Counsel.

January 1951 to March 18, 1958, partner, Shook & Olson, Washington, D.C.

November 1946 to December 1950, attorney adviser, Office of the Comptroller, Navy Department.

February 1946 to November 1946, personal services consultant contract, Office of General Counsel, Navy Department.

July 1943 to February 1946, officer, U.S. Navy.

November 1942 to June 1943, examiner, National Labor Relations Board, Minneapolis, Minn.

July 1936 to November 1942, examiner, Wisconsin Industrial Commission, Eau Claire, Wis.

Other affiliations: Member, District of Columbia Bar Association; admitted to Wisconsin bar.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement by him, entitled "WILEY Urges Greater Efforts To Go Over the Heads of Communist Leaders to People Behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains With Truth of World Affairs"; and excerpts from an address prepared by him, for broadcast over Radio Liberty, to the people of the Soviet Union.

By Mr. BEALL:

Statement, prepared by him, entitled "Washington, D.C., International Race, the Olympics of Racing."

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Address entitled "The U.S. Merchant Marine and World Trade," delivered by Secretary of Commerce Mueller, before Port of Washington Propeller Club, in celebration of National Maritime Day, May 20, 1960.

BIRTHDAY GREETINGS TO SENATOR BUSH AND SENATOR DODD

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last week I commented on the fact that the two distinguished Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING] had birthday anniversaries on the same day. I thought that was of particular significance, and quite unusual.

I now discover that the two distinguished Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH and Mr. DODD] have birthday anniversaries which fall on the same day—May 15.

I suppose that if I were an astrologer, I might spell out some rather interesting implications—for instance, that a person should pick out the right day on which to be born, if he had future ambitions to be a Member of the Senate of the United States.

I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and also the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

PLATFORM ADOPTED BY MIDWEST FEDERATION OF COLLEGE YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUBS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs at its meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, adopted a platform on April 9. I believe the platform is very timely, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the platform was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLATFORM ADOPTED IN DES MOINES, IOWA, BY THE MIDWEST FEDERATION OF COLLEGE YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUBS, APRIL 9, 1960

Preamble: We of the Midwest Federation of College Young Republicans are acutely aware that the effort of the U.S. Government resolutely to oppose the international Communist threat must be bolstered by sound and responsible public policies. In order to pursue this objective, we must strengthen the foundations of constitutional liberty by returning to the principles of true fundamental Republicanism. It is with this idea in mind that we submit the following platform:

I. AGRICULTURE

Whereas the Republican Party has sought to solve agricultural problems along lines consistent with our free enterprise economy; and

Whereas the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs is in agreement with this philosophy which endeavors to place farmers in a stable, independent, and self-supporting position; and

Whereas this policy must be carried out in such a way that individual farmers affected by the agriculture revolution are adequately protected against undue market fluctuations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the following steps be taken to provide a responsible public policy toward agriculture:

1. Increase in the soil bank program by an addition of 60 million acres of land beyond the present level.

2. Further development of plans for oversea distribution of our farm surpluses, in lieu of foreign aid, with the requirement that these surpluses be paid for in hard currency.

3. Offering of surplus commodities, in lieu of cash payments, to farmers who participate in the soil bank and other conservation programs.

4. Further utilization of sliding scale parity payments based on a moving average of the last 10 years combined with a progressive elimination of all planting, acreage, and marketing controls as supply and demand are brought into equilibrium.

5. Increased rights for farmers to grow as much as they want as long as they do not grow the commodity for sale on the market.

6. Establishment of the right of all farmers, regardless of the number of acres of a crop which they may grow, to vote in polls to choose between different degrees of acreage control and different levels of parity prices.

II. ECONOMIC POLICY

Whereas our Nation must remain economically strong if our people are to remain free: Therefore be it

Resolved, That—

1. We favor lowering rates on present corporate and excise taxes.

2. We favor the increased taxation of cooperatives.

3. We favor the further examination of the taxation of insurance companies.

4. We favor lowering marginal tax rates in upper income brackets.

5. We oppose any efforts to increase the present debt limit of $295 billion.

6. We favor raising the interest ceiling on long-term Treasury bonds.

7. We favor economic and technical aid through private channels to foreign countries as a "good investment" for our own economy.

8. We favor careful scrutiny by Congress of all governmental foreign aid programs with an eye toward reducing the amount appropriated.

9. We favor participation by the United States in the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, with the reservation that Congress be given a stronger voice in the determination of our foreign trade policies.

10. We favor taking positive steps to improve the dollar's value abroad by fighting inflation at home.

III. EDUCATION

Whereas the Young Republican National Federation has in two consecutive conventions gone on record in opposition to Federal aid to education; and

Whereas we share their judgment in holding Federal aid to be both unnecessary and a potential avenue to Government influence on the curriculum; and

Whereas we believe that America's schools must be kept free of Government interference: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention expresses its unalterable opposition to Federal aid to American schools.

IV. FOREIGN POLICY

Whereas the Castro regime has abused the integrity of the United States by irresponsible attacks on our integrity; and

Whereas the Castro regime has made indiscreet and unfounded, accusations of sabotage against the United States; and

Whereas the rights of U.S. citizens have been repeatedly violated in Cuba: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs urges the administration to take appropriate diplomatic measures and such economic sanctions as are necessary to remedy the situation,

Whereas the ruling class of South Africa has repeatedly violated the basic human rights of the Africans: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs go on record as supporting peaceful efforts for the establishment of basic human rights in Africa; including gradual abolishment of apartheid; but be it further

Resolved, That we are not in favor of direct or indirect intervention by the United Nations in this matter because we feel such action is a violation of the U.N. Charter: be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs urges the administration and the Congress of the United States to comprehensively review our foreign aid policy in view of the changing status in the world markets, our international deficit of payments, and the ability of recipient nations to handle their problems themselves; and be it further

Resolved, That foreign aid, when given, be on a loan basis wherever feasible.

Whereas the coming summit conference at Geneva may potentially influence peace in the world; and

Whereas diplomatic agreements made in the past with the U.S.S.R., such as at Yalta, were violated and in some instances completely disregarded when such action furthered the cause of world communism: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs ask that the diplomatic leaders of the Western Nations keep the actions of the Communist leaders of the past in mind and take all precautions not to lead the free world into agreements or commitments that could be again violated by the U.S.S.R. in a manner that would better the causes of world communism.

Whereas it is in the best interests of the United States that West Germany remain a loyal partner in the NATO alliance; and

Whereas there has been expressed a doubt in European countries that the United States will maintain a strong stand on the Berlin issue: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs urge that the United States reaffirm our belief in the strategic position of West Berlin in the NATO Alliance and our desire to protect the freedom of Berlin at all costs: Be it

Resolved, That, the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs approve the technical aid and assistance approach to the foreign aid problem as exemplified specifically by the U.S.S. *Hope*.

V. GOLDWATER, BARRY M.

Whereas he has rendered outstanding service in defining and clarifying the sharp difference between the Republican and Democrat parties, and

Whereas he has waged an unremitting battle to restore freedom and dignity to the American individual: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention urges that Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, be nominated for Vice President of the United States by the Republican National Convention in 1960.

VI. HEALTH AND WELFARE

Whereas the need for Federal medical assistance to our elder generation is temporary because the amount of private health insurance protecting this group has risen at a substantial rate; and

Whereas the voluntary effort at the community level is rapidly developing and expanding special facilities for the health, care of the aged; and

Whereas the cost of medical insurance provided by the Federal Government would be prohibitive; and

Whereas any health care offered to our aged by Government legislation would result in overcrowding of local hospitals and other facilities and a general deterioration of medical care: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs go on record as opposing any attempt by the Federal Government, such as the Forand bill, to socialize medical care.

VII. LABOR POLICY

Whereas the Republican Party has fought for laws which would help labor unions become more responsible and representative institutions; and

Whereas we feel that the Landrum-Griffin Act was a step in the direction of establishing labor-management relations on a sounder basis; but

Whereas we are of the opinion that further action is needed to protect American workers in their rights: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs go on record as favoring:

1. The right of any individual to choose his own bargaining agent without being compelled by public law or private agreement to belong to any association in order to earn a living.

2. The outlawing of all secondary boycotts and coercive blackmail picketing not covered by the Landrum-Griffin Act.

3. Adequate development of legislative safeguards to prevent any type of organization from operating in restraint of trade.

VIII. LOYALTY OATH AND DISCLAIMER AFFIDAVIT

Whereas the National Defense Education Act was created to provide for the national defense: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs go on record as supporting Senator STYLES BRIDGES, chairman of the Republican senatorial policy committee, in his fight to preserve both the loyalty oath and disclaimer affidavit provisions of that act.

IX. NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SECURITY

Whereas we believe that this country's deterrent force is second to none, and we decry the politically unjustified attempts to generate hysteria over the alleged armed might inferiority of the United States defenses; and

Whereas it is noteworthy that the same Democrat politicians who in 1956 were frightening Americans with cries of an alleged "bomber gap"—a gap which never existed—are now claiming that the United States is behind the Soviet Union in missile and nuclear capabilities; and

Whereas the public record clearly shows that the men who sold America short then are trying to sell her short today: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we favor the continued elimination of wasteful interservice competition, with greater emphasis on a more centralized and unified mission command.

We encourage the continuing strengthening of our NATO, SEATO, and other collective security alliances, with more effective military protection of the Americas through OAS.

We urge additional public educational activities by the Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization, particularly in the areas of nationwide alerts and the need for better civilian bomb shelters and emergency needs. And being aware that the real strength of Communist subversion rests upon public apathy and ignorance, we feel that a more active job must be done by the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the feeling of the Midwest Federation of College Young Republicans that sound judgment rather than dollars should be the main criterion when considering our national defense and security program.

X. NIXON, RICHARD M.

Whereas Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON has demonstrated his ability as a statesman and diplomat; and

Whereas he has been closely associated with the present administration and having this most favored position is the best qualified person to manage and deal with the present world situation; and

Whereas he has the integrity and experience necessary for national leadership: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Federation of College Young Republicans Clubs endorse the candidacy of RICHARD M. NIXON for President of the United States.

XI. PROGRAM AND PROGRESS COMMITTEE REPORT

Whereas our President Dwight D. Eisenhower has appointed a commission of outstanding Republicans to map a statement of long-range policy and objectives for the Republican Party; and

Whereas the report issued by that commission represents a published statement of farsighted constructive long-range goals; and

Whereas the report has been acclaimed and endorsed by President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON, and by the national chairman of the Republican Party: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Midwest Federation of College Young Republicans, commend the Percy committee for its work in establishing the policy guides and ideas contained in this report.

ADLAI STEVENSON'S CRITICISM OF THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed, in the morning hour, for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to speak a little about crowbars and sledge hammers.

Last week, in his speech at Chicago, Governor Stevenson stated that Khrushchev wrecked the summit conference; and then Mr. Stevenson added:

> We handed Khrushchev the crowbar and sledge hammer to wreck the meeting.

The crowbar and the sledge hammer, according to Governor Stevenson, were the alleged blunders and mistakes.

Then followed his salute to unity, a reminder that his party also had a responsibility, an anticipation of what Republicans would say in the campaign, a recital of the Democrat duty to inform the people, and then the usual political "punch" that—

> This administration has helped make successful negotiations with the Russians—negotiations that are vital to our survival—impossible so long as they are in power.

In so doing, he projected crowbars and sledge hammers right into the middle of the campaign, notwithstanding the very

refreshing recitals of unity that came from the distinguished acting majority leader the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and from the very distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and from a great many others.

Mr. President, whose crowbar did the wrecking? That is the question. According to Radio Liberty, Khrushchev knew of the reconnaissance flights in 1956. If true, why was he silent these many years? Why did he fail to raise the question at Camp David? Why did he fail to raise the question at the Press Club? Why did he fail to raise the question in the course of his tour? Why did he fail to raise the question at the closed meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee?

I was in attendance at that meeting; and I asked Mr. Khrushchev quite a number of questions, and got a rather curt brushoff when we got around to the censoring of American dispatches, when Mr. Khrushchev said:

How do we know they are not all spies?

The U–2 incident was immaterial, and nothing more than a smokescreen. But I must get back to the crowbar.

On the day Khrushchev arrived in Paris, Governor Stevenson was quoted in an interview by the Paris press. It was first reported to us by William Stoneman, a competent, reliable reporter on the staff of the Chicago Daily News foreign service. Mr. Stoneman reported that in this interview Governor Stevenson made three suggestions. They were as follows, and they were headlined in the Paris papers on the day that Khrushchev arrived:

First, that he favored concessions on Berlin in return for an agreement with Russia on cessation of atomic tests.

Second, that he favored a reduction of American forces in West Berlin from 11,000 to 7,000.

I would gather from that suggestion that the distinguished former Governor of Illinois wants to close the last remaining hole in the Iron Curtain.

Third, that a disarmament accord might be sought on the basis of the Rapachi plan, under which forces would be reduced by both the East and the West in the area of central Europe.

Since then David Lawrence, in today's issue of the New York Herald Tribune, discusses the matter further under the caption, "Stevenson Is Seen Involved in Strange Circumstances." Mr. Lawrence comments at length on the matter, and then says:

The strangest episode of all, however, is the interview with Mr. Stevenson, which Soviet Premier Khrushchev read in Paris-Presse-l'Intransigeant just after his recent arrival in Paris. That interview was written by Robert Bulay, after a visit to Mr. Stevenson's home at Libertyville, Ill., where he said he spent an afternoon together with other guests.

The article with a streamer headline across the page said that Adlai Stevenson had proposed virtually a retreat from Berlin and American troop withdrawal from Europe. The published interview was a shock to Americans abroad coming as it did just a few days before the summit conference was to open.

That makes quite a picture. On the eve of the conference, the man who was twice the candidate of his party for the presidency, and in an election year, suggests publicly through the Paris press just how we should make the soft approach to Mr. Khrushchev.

When a reluctant prospect for the Democrat nomination—and I suppose he is a reluctant prospect, and who shall say what might happen—shows his hand in such fashion, Mr. Khrushchev would have been a fool not to consider postponement of the conference for 6 or 8 months—that is, until after election day—on the theory that he might be dealing later with a more gentle, a more tractable, a more flexible, and a less firm President. Or could it be with a more tractable Secretary of State?

In Mr. Khrushchev's comment to Mayor George Christopher at the San Francisco dinner, he rated Mr. Stevenson "the best among U.S. politicians."

Along with all this was the suggestion by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] in Oregon that, no matter who was nominated, Governor Stevenson would be a good candidate for Secretary of State.

Did Mr. KENNEDY read Governor Stevenson's interview in the Paris press? If he did not, how did he come on the statement that Khrushchev had made in East Berlin, that for the last 7 years Chancellor Adenauer has been the Secretary of State for the United States? Adlai, and only Adlai, used that phrase, and it appears in the Paris interview.

So we get back to the question, Whose crowbar brought about the wreckage of the summit? Perhaps it would be more appropriate to say it was a stick of dynamite with a delayed action fuse. Or, since Adlai is a Navy man, we might remain in character and say it was a well-placed, well-timed torpedo that found its mark.

To make sure that all this is documented, I submit and ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the following:

No. 1: The address in full made by Governor Stevenson to the Cook County Democrat $100 Dinner, on Thursday, May 19.

No. 2: The dispatch by William W. Stoneman, under the caption, "Was Nikita Influenced By Adlai?"

No. 3: The press release of the American Committee for Liberation, which refers to the U–2 flights.

No. 4: The article by David Lawrence from the New York Herald Tribune, dated Monday, May 23, 1960.

No. 5: The article from the Portland Oregonian in which Senator JOHN KENNEDY stated, in response to a question at St. Helen's High School, that:

Khrushchev laid down two conditions to President Eisenhower for going on with the summit meeting. One was to apologize. I think that might have been possible to do.

That is Mr. KENNEDY suggesting that the President of the United States apologize to Mr. Khrushchev. I let this amazing statement speak for itself.

No. 6: The translation of the article by Special Correspondent Robert Boulay, based on his interview with Governor Stevenson at Libertyville, Ill., and bearing a Chicago dateline, in which appear all the questions and answers, including Governor Stevenson's statement that—

For 10 years there has not really been a Secretary of State for foreign policy. During this period, the real American Secretary of State has been German Chancellor Adenauer.

No. 7: A dispatch by Douglas Dales, under the caption "Farley Condemns Stevenson's Stand," in which Mr. Farley called upon the forthcoming Democratic National Convention to "condemn and repudiate Adlai E. Stevenson's criticism of the Eisenhower administration over the U–2 spy-plane incident."

No. 8: An article by Gould Lincoln, appearing in the Washington Star of May 21, 1960, under the caption "Would Adlai Have Banned the U–2?"

No. 9: The expression of viewpoint, much healthier and more refreshing, by the Honorable Averell Harriman, former Ambassador to the Soviet Union and former Governor of New York, which was written especially for United Press International. The article speaks for itself. I am glad to note that Mr. Harriman points out what President Eisenhower symbolizes to the Soviet people, and how enthusiastically he was received in 1945 when invited to Moscow by Premier Stalin. There was no crowbar in this.

No. 10: A declaration of confidence and support by the Western Governors Conference, adopted at Seattle, Wash., May 18, 1960, and subscribed by 12 western Governors.

Mr. President, I fancy we shall be hearing a lot more about crowbars and sledge hammers in the coming campaign if this is the line to be pursued by the opposition party.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all of these exhibits be printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY ADLAI STEVENSON TO A COOK COUNTY DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE DINNER

It appears that this year's campaign will be waged under the darkest shadows that ever hovered over the world—the mushroom clouds of a nuclear war that no one wants. This terrible danger—and how to avert it—will and should overshadow every other issue.

For the chances of a more stable world, which seemed to be brightening, have been rudely reversed by the breakdown of the summit conference in this historic week.

Premier Khrushchev wrecked this conference. Let there be no mistake about that. When he demanded that President Eisenhower apologize and punish those responsible for the spy-plane flight, he was in effect asking the President to punish himself. This was an impossible request, and he knew it.

SERIES OF BLUNDERS

But we handed Khrushchev the crowbar and the sledge hammer to wreck the meeting. Without our series of blunders, Mr.

Khrushchev would not have had a pretext for making his impossible demand and wild charges. Let there be no mistake about that either.

We sent an espionage plane deep into the Soviet Union just before the summit meeting. Then we denied it. Then we admitted it. And when Mr. Khrushchev gave the President an out by suggesting that he was not responsible for ordering the flight, the President proudly asserted that he was responsible. On top of that we intimated that such espionage flights over Russia would continue. At this point if Khrushchev did not protest he would be condoning our right to spy—and how long could he keep his job that way? Next we evidentially reconsidered and called off the espionage flights. But to compound the incredible, we postponed the announcement that the flights were terminated—just long enough to make it seem we were yielding to pressure, but too long to prevent Mr. Khrushchev from reaching the boiling point.

ALERT CARD NOTED

And, as if that wasn't enough, on Sunday night when there was still a chance that De Gaulle and Macmillan could save the situation, we ordered a worldwide alert of our combat forces. Is it unreasonable for suspicious Russians to think such a series of mistakes could only be a deliberate effort to break up a conference we never wanted anyway?

We Democrats know how clumsy this administration can be. We are not likely to forget the fumbles that preceded the Suez crisis on the eve of the 1956 election.

But nothing, of course, can justify Mr. Khrushchev's contemptuous conduct, especially after President Eisenhower had announced that our espionage flights had been called off. But his anger was predictable, if not his violence. How would we feel if Soviet spy planes based in Cuba were flying over Cape Canaveral and Oak Ridge? And also we could predict with certainty his efforts to use the situation to split the Western Alliance and intimidate the countries where our bases are situated.

Republican leaders are now saying that in this grave crisis we must all rally around the President in the name of national unity. Our respect for the Presidency will find us joined in salute to President Eisenhower upon his return. We resent deeply and bitterly the gross affront to the President and his Office.

NO QUESTION ABOUT UNITY

There is no question about national unity in a time of crisis. But errors must be corrected, and must not forget that the opposition party also has an obligation to our country and to our allies whose security is also involved. It is the duty of responsible opposition in a democracy to expose and criticize carelessness and mistakes, especially in a case of such national and world importance as this. We must see to it that we profit from such grave mistakes and misfortunes.

It is particularly regrettable that this happened in an election year. And we can already predict what the Republicans will tell the people in the months ahead.

They will stay that President Eisenhower's patience and dignity in Paris scored a diplomatic triumph by exposing Khrushchev's insincerity.

They will say that the Russians are hoping that a "softed" Democratic President will be elected in November. They will tell the people that a vote for the candidate the Russians distrust is a vote against appeasement.

It will be our duty, it will be the duty of all thoughtful, concerned citizens to help the situation and to face the hard, inescapable facts; that this administration played into Khrushchev's hands; that if Khrushchev wanted to wreck the conference our Government made it possible; that the administration has acutely embarrassed our allies and endangered our bases; that they have helped make successful negotiations with the Russians—negotiations that are vital to our survival—impossible so long as they are in power.

MUST SEEK UNDERSTANDING

We cannot sweep this whole sorry mess under the rug in the name of national unity. We cannot and must not. Too much is at stake. Rather, we must try to help the American people understand the nature of the crisis, to see how we got into this predicament, how we can get out of it, and how we get on with the business of improving relations and mutual confidence and building a safer, saner world in the nuclear age.

For in this age, unprecedented in human history, all of us, Americans and Russians alike, have one common enemy. The enemy is the danger of war. We must defeat the enemy together. Despite his hysterics last night, Mr. Khrushchev says he still believes in peaceful progress by negotiation. Let us hope he proves it, and let the United States come into the United Nations not content with the ordinary speeches, not content with the usual anti-Russian majority votes, but with constructive, positive, affirmative proposals to restore the hope of peace.

To those who will see nothing but Russian vice and American virtue, to those who will cry appeasement to any acknowledgment of our mistakes, I say that this is the toughest kind of common sense. For there is no future for any of us in a spiraling arms race propelled by mounting suspicion and distrust on both sides. The fact that Khrushchev seems to have lost his temper in Paris makes it all the more important that we not lose ours—or our heads.

[From the Daily News Foreign Service]

WAS NIKITA INFLUENCED BY ADLAI?

(By William H. Stoneman)

PARIS.—A startling statement by Soviet Premier Khrushchev expressing hope that he could do more business with one of Ike's successors than with Ike himself is being connected by imaginative Europeans with an interview recently given to a French newspaperman by Adlai Stevenson.

In an interview published by the Paris-Presse-l'Intransigeant on Saturday—the day of Khrushchev's arrival here—Stevenson was quoted as willing to make concessions to the Russians on a number of points.

One of Stevenson's alleged statements which startled and disturbed members of the American delegation to the summit indicated that he favored concessions on Berlin in return for an agreement with Russia on cessation of atomic tests.

One concession he was quoted as favoring was reduction of American forces in West Berlin from 11,000 to 7,000.

Of more importance was his suggestion that a disarmament accord might be sought on the basis of the Rapacki plan under which forces would be reduced by both the East and West in the area of central Europe.

This has been opposed by the Western Powers because it might involve retirement of American forces from Europe.

Stevenson was quoted as being willing to face this eventuality.

"I think Europeans—Germans, French and British—should be in a position to defend themselves in Europe," he was quoted as saying.

KHRUSHCHEV KEPT 4-YEAR SILENCE ON U.S. FLIGHTS; SOVIET PREMIER REJECTED PROTEST TO UNITED STATES IN 1956

(News release from American Committee for Liberation)

NEW YORK.—When did Nikita Khrushchev first learn of the U.S. U–2 flights over the Soviet Union? The question assumes importance in view of the Soviet Premier's temper tantrum in Paris on Monday.

According to Radio Liberty, Khrushchev himself has stated he first knew of the U.S. reconnaissance flights in 1956. Moreover, by his own admission, the Soviet Premier refused at the time to lodge a protest with the U.S. Government. Instead, he said he ordered improvements in Soviet rocket power.

It was a Soviet rocket which, according to Khrushchev, brought down the highflying Lockheed U–2 piloted by Francis Gary Powers near Sverdlovsk last May 1.

"The record thus indicates that Mr. Khrushchev first learned about the U.S. overflights almost 4 years before he raised the issue in an obvious effort to torpedo the Paris summit conference," said Radio Liberty. "The question naturally arises as to why the Soviet Premier waited 4 years to protest."

Radio Liberty also noted that it was during those 4 years—following the alleged 1956 plane episode—that Nikita Khrushchev roamed the world as a salesman of "peaceful coexistence." Later, after he succeeded in being invited to the United States, he began expounding the so-called spirit of Camp David.

"There is nothing on the record to suggest that Mr. Khrushchev ever brought the subject of these flights to President Eisenhower's attention during his U.S. visit last fall," said Radio Liberty. "Why—if they pained him so deeply—he waited 4 years to finally broach the subject in Paris on Monday should be of considerable interest to the peoples of the Soviet Union, to whom peace is as important as it is to the peoples of the free world. Is it possible Mr. Khrushchev had other considerations in mind when he decided to torpedo the summit conference?"

Radio Liberty, which is the voice of former Soviet citizens, is providing thorough coverage of the Paris summit developments in its around-the-clock broadcasts to all parts of the Soviet Union in Russian and 17 other languages from powerful transmitters in Western Europe and the Far East.

According to Gene King, U.S. programing chief of the network, Radio Liberty is placing special emphasis on news developments which official Soviet communications media appear to be ignoring. For example, President Eisenhower's announcement that the United States was not going to resume survey flights over the U.S.S.R. was not immediately reported by Soviet press and radio.

"We are also transmitting balanced accounts of world reactions to the latest developments in Paris," Mr. King declared. "We are fully aware of the Soviet citizens' desire to be fully informed on matters which concern them as much as they do us."

According to Radio Liberty, a study of Khrushchev's recent speeches indicates that he referred to three specific U.S. flights over Soviet territory. The first one apparently occurred on July 2, 1956; the second on April 9, 1960; and the third, Francis Powers' ill-fated flight on May 1, 1960.

The July 2, 1956, flight was disclosed by Khrushchev at a reception in the Czechoslovak Embassy in Moscow last May 9. According to the text provided by TASS, the official press agency, this is what the Soviet Premier said:

"I shall say further, when Twining, the then Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, arrived here we welcomed him as a guest and

entertained him. He left our country by air and the next day he sent a plane flying at great altitude into our country. This plane flew as far as Kiev.

"The question arose: Should we protest? I proposed that no protest should be lodged. Only an animal might act like Twining, which, eating at one place, might do its unpleasant business there. From such behavior, we drew the conclusion: To improve rockets, to improve fighters. Our fighters can fly as high as 28,000 meters. But the difficulties of a fighter are that though it can rise high, it is not so easy and simple to find the target in the air: a plane in the air is like a needle in the ocean.

"But the rocket finds its targets itself. This is the advantage of the rocket and we made use of it."

The record shows that Gen. Nathan F. Twining arrived in Moscow on June 23, 1956, for what the then Air Force Chief of Staff later termed an 8-day "controlled" inspection of some Soviet air and military installations. The day after his arrival, he later reported, he attended a Moscow party tendered by the Defense Ministry on Soviet Air Force Day. At the party, Khrushchev drunkenly insulted the United States, British, French, and West German air officials present while Nikolai Bulganin, then the Soviet Premier, vainly shouted, "Shut up."

General Twining left the Soviet Union on July 1, 1956. According to Khrushchev, the following day an American plane "flying at great altitude * * * flew as far as Kiev," the capital of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, about 500 miles southwest of Moscow and about 600 miles north of Turkey. Khurshchev gave no further details.

Last May 5, in his speech before the Supreme Soviet, Khrushchev dramatically announced that a U.S. plane, which had violated Soviet airspace on May 1—May Day—had been shot down by a Soviet rocket. But he also disclosed this:

"Previously, an aggressive act was committed by the United States of America on the 9th of April 1960. A U.S. aircraft invaded the airspace of our country from the direction of Afghanistan. Naturally, no person of common sense could think or suspect that this violation was carried out by Afghanistan, a country which is friendly toward us. We are convinced that this aircraft belonged to the United States and was evidently based somewhere on the territory of Turkey, Iran, or Pakistan.

"When this invasion occurred, some of our comrades raised the question as to whether the United States should be warned. We exchanged views within the Government and decided not to take any special measures, not to write notes or memorandums because from previous experience we knew that this leads to virtually nothing. We then gave a stern warning to our military, especially those who are directly responsible for the aerial defense of the country, that they must act resolutely and not permit the invasion of our airspace by foreign planes to go unpunished.

"The American military evidently liked the impunity which they experienced on April 9, and they decided to repeat their aggressive act. For this purpose they selected May Day, the most solemn occasion for our people and for the working people of all countries."

In his May 9 remarks at the Czechoslovak Embassy, Khrushchev returned to the April 9 episode. "Even now," he said, "this flight is denied in the United States. In this case the thing is: If the thief is not caught, he is no thief. But this time we caught the thief and now the whole world knows about it.

"The reconnaissance plane should have been brought down on April 9, too. But our military, to put it mildly, let a chance slip by. And we, as one says, took them to task for it. On May 1 the reconnaissance plane was shot down. The military splendidly coped with the task when the opponent grew bold."

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 23, 1960]

STEVENSON IS SEEN INVOLVED IN "STRANGE CIRCUMSTANCES"

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, May 22.—Does Nikita Khrushchev want to see Adlai Stevenson elected President of the United States in November so that he can negotiate a deal at the next summit conference?

Does Mr. Khrushchev hope that Mr. Stevenson, if not nominated, will be considered for the post of Secretary of State in a Democratic administration, as Senator KENNEDY hinted the other day?

Why was Mr. Stevenson, in an interview published in Paris a week ago Sunday quoted as favoring an Allied retreat on the Berlin problem?

Why did Mr. Stevenson last Thursday night tell a political dinner meeting in Chicago that the administration has "helped make successful negotiations with the Russians—negotiations that are vital to our survival—impossible so long as they are in power?"

A STRANGE SEQUENCE

These questions are prompted by a strange sequence of circumstances. Thus on March 9 last the New York Times printed a United Press International dispatch from Moscow which read:

"Soviet Premier Khrushchev has his own opinions about the U.S. Democratic Party's presidential possibilities, he revealed tonight. He put Adlai Stevenson at the top of his list in comments to Mayor George Christopher of San Francisco at a dinner. Mr. Khrushchev's rating of the Democrats:

"Mr. Stevenson: the best among U.S. politicians.

"Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts: able, but some reservations about his youthfulness.

"Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri: he's a good man."

No other Presidential aspirants were mentioned, not even Senator HUMPHREY, who had once participated in a marthon conference of several hours with the Soviet Premier. Mr. Stevenson also conferred at length with Mr. Khrushchev in Moscow and wrote articles about him, but they did not contain any of the sting that the Minnesota Senator included in his published remarks.

DIPLOMACY RULE IGNORED

Mr. Stevenson, therefore, apparently is the favorite of Mr. Khrushchev, who has brushed aside the old rule of diplomacy that a foreign government must not interfere in the political campaigns of another country. The Soviet Premier evidently thinks Mr. Stevenson, as the titular head of the Democratic Party, speaks for it.

But James A. Farley, former Postmaster General in the cabinet of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and a former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, has just issued a statement urging the Democratic Party to repudiate Mr. Stevenson's speech of last Thursday night. Mr. Farley said in part:

"The unwarranted attack of Mr. Adlai E. Stevenson on the President's conduct of the summit negotiations, in my opinion, in no way represents the thinking of the Democratic Party. * * * In his few remaining weeks as titular spokesman of the Democratic Party has indicated every reason why the Democratic Party in convention should select a spokesman who speaks for it in fact. I can think of no more effective way of doing so than by a unanimous resolution of condemnation and repudiation of his absurd speech in Chicago as representing the views of the Democratic Party."

HIS TALK OF RETREAT

The strangest episode of all, however, is the interview with Mr. Stevenson which Soviet Premier Khrushchev read in "Paris-Press L'Intransigeant" just after his recent arrival in Paris. That interview was written by Robert Boulay after a visit to Mr. Stevenson's home at Libertyville, Ill., where he said he spent an afternoon, together with other guests. The article, with a streamer headline across the page, said that Adlai Stevenson had proposed virtually a retreat from Berlin and American troop withdrawal from Europe. The published interview was a shock to Americans abroad, coming as it did just a few days before the summit conference was to open. Evidently Mr. Khrushchev read it carefully, because in his own speech at East Berlin last Friday he paraphrased one of the points in the interview to charge that Chancellor Adenauer had succeeded "in worming his way to the post of Secretary of State of the United States."

Mr. Boulay, in his interview, quotes Mr. Stevenson as having said:

"For 10 years there has not really been a Secretary of State for American foreign policy. During that period the real American Secretary of State has been German Chancellor Adenauer."

ON REDUCING TROOPS

In other parts of the same interview, Mr. Stevenson is quoted as favoring American concessions, such as a substantial decrease in allied troops in West Berlin. He is reported to have declared also that he could foresee in the future the pulling of American forces out of Europe. When asked whether there would be a change in American foreign policy after the November elections, Mr. Stevenson is quoted as having said: "There will be important changes in American foreign policy."

Mr. Stevenson last Tuesday denied ever having given any interview at all to any Paris newspaper. But he issued a statement to the Chicago Daily News the next day admitting that he had talked with Robert Boulay but calling the published interview incorrect. He said it did not represent his views and that "the most charitable explanation of such irresponsibility, presumption, and discourtesy is that his English was poor and my French no better."

In Paris, however, Americans who know Mr. Boulay say he writes and talks English very well and is a reliable reporter. Just what did Mr. Stevenson really say to Mr. Boulay? Maybe all this is something for Democrats in Congress to include in their investigation of recent events. For there is no doubt that an appeasement faction exists today inside the Democratic party, and certainly Mr. Stevenson's speech—just 4 days before the all important debate at the United Nations Security Council—helped to wreck bipartisan unity in this country.

[From the Portland Oregonian]

KENNEDY SAYS SOFTER U–2 STANCE MIGHT HAVE SAVED SUMMIT TALKS

(By Mervin Shoemaker)

If Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, were President he might apologize to Soviet Premier Khrushchev for the U–2 spy incident, but the Pope would keep his hands out of U.S. governmental affairs.

The Democratic presidential primary candidate made these points Wednesday, a day of appearances spanning St. Helens and Oregon City which ended with a campaign-climaxing rally at Benson Tech High School in Portland.

In Friday's election he is matched against Oregon Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, who is campaigning actively, and Senators STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, and LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who are not appearing in the State. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, will have his name on the ballot, but he has withdrawn from the contest.

It was at St. Helens High School, following a breakfast meeting for which he arrived too late, that KENNEDY spoke for a degree of mollification of Khrushchev in answering a question on how he would have reacted to the Soviet Premier's attack in Paris.

POSSIBILITY SEEN

"Khrushchev laid down two conditions to President Eisenhower for going on with the summit meeting," said KENNEDY. "One was to apologize. I think that might have been possible to do. The other was to put on trial and punish those responsible for the U–2 flight. That couldn't be done. The men involved were acting under orders."

Later KENNEDY modified the word "apologize," and said the President might "express regret."

KENNEDY told several audiences during the day that he particularly criticizes the timing of the U–2 flight such a short while before the scheduled summit meeting, "letting the risk of war hang on the possibility of an engine failure."

Throughout Wednesday—at high school, supermarket, and industrial plant—KENNEDY used a defense against attacks on his Catholic faith that apparently was developed after his mid-April visit to Oregon.

He is telling audiences that he "swore an oath to God" to uphold the Constitution when he entered Congress, and that the President takes the same oath. The Constitution, he points out, provides for separation of church and state.

When KENNEDY says he would not let the Pope interfere with his duties as President, there is more behind the statement than an Irish Catholic's independence. The Pope, it follows naturally, would be asking him to violate an "oath to God."

KENNEDY says he doesn't think the Pope would interfere with him as president. any more than he does with Charles de Gaulle in France and Konrad Adenauer in West Germany.

MILL VISITED

The candidate toured the Crown Zellerbach paper mill at West Linn, and a sampling of Democratic workmen opinion here brought nothing of comfort to MORSE, SYMINGTON, and JOHNSON.

Of 15 men in a lunchroom which KENNEDY had visited, 10 were Democrats, and 7 of them held up a hand to signify he favors KENNEDY for the nomination. None responded to a call for a show of hands by MORSE supporters.

Random Democrats at the papermill, separated by a sprinkling of Republicans—Leroy Saulsbury, 41, Milwaukee, a millworker, and Art Goldade, 33, West Linn, a pipefitter—were mostly for KENNEDY.

One man asked: "What's wrong with MORSE?" He got no answer.

There is a small chill for Republicans in one reaction to these questions, which came from Richard Buse, 33, a millwright.

His wife likes KENNEDY. She is a Democrat and a Catholic. But Buse likes KENNEDY, too. He's going to vote for him if he gets the nomination. Buse is a Lutheran and a Republican.

There was another party line-crossing incident at Gateway Shopping Center, where a long queue of persons followed KENNEDY from shop to shop in the rain.

A girl in a barber shop was a Democrat. She's for KENNEDY.

"Most of us in here are Republicans," said one of several men present, "but we're going to vote for KENNEDY in the fall."

KENNEDY got unusual support from a fellow Democrat in another Wednesday incident, one which dramatized the widening Democratic Party breach occasioned by the election campaign.

At a meeting of the East Multnomah County Democratic Women's Forum, MORSE, the speaker, vigorously criticized KENNEDY, and KENNEDY was defended by State Senator Monroe Sweetland, Milwaukee, a member of KENNEDY's committee. The unusual part is that Sweetland is a candidate for Democratic nomination for secretary of state, and a candidate for major office does not often expose himself to the enemies of any other candidate.

NO TAX CUT SEEN

In the question period at Sandy Union High School KENNEDY was asked if he would favor increasing the income tax personal exemption from $600 to $800.

"In a dangerous time, and we stand on the razor's edge," he answered, "I don't think we can have any tax reduction."

In his Benson Tech speech KENNEDY criticized the Republican administration for its "record of failure" in natural resource development.

Nearly 1,800 persons filled the Benson auditorium nearly to capacity to hear KENNEDY, who bore down hard on significance of the Oregon primary, again contending that Democrats should not "waste their vote" on a candidate not seriously in the running for President—meaning MORSE.

KENNEDY was introduced by Representative EDITH GREEN, Portland.

TRANSLATION OF ARTICLE BY SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT ROBERT BOULAY

I passed an afternoon with Adlai Stevenson at his farm at Libertyville, 80 kilometers from Chicago. This is the man who could be the next President of the United States. Despite the fact that he has already failed twice against Eisenhower, he still has a chance. Until now, Stevenson has repeated that he was not a candidate. But when interrogated on what he would do if drafted, he replied that he was not a deserter. And having spent 4 hours with Stevenson and several of his friends I have the definite impression that the lawyer-farmer of Libertyville has not abandoned hope of succeeding Eisenhower. In any case he is certainly aiming at becoming Secretary of State if a Democratic candidate other than himself were elected next year.

It was the Saturday of Easter. Stevenson had just returned from a study trip of South America. Tanned, a little overweight, smiling, he nevertheless appeared to me rather nervous. He had just finished lunch in the company of his two sons and daughter-in-law, his grandchildren and the British economist, Barbara Ward. Stevenson moved from one to the other, offering candies, moving the same book around three times, and straightening out the coffee table.

Everyone then left for a tour of the property. Stevenson lent boots to his visitors and himself ensuring that everything was properly taken care of. For an hour and a half he showed us his fields, his sheep, his horses, and the river which was slowly draining off his flooded fields. In his corduroy suit, bareheaded, a scarf around his neck, he was the typical American gentleman farmer.

We returned to the house at 5 o'clock. Adlai Stevenson helped his grandchildren look for Easter eggs and gifts which he had hidden himself. He was more relaxed. Tea was served. Stevenson then invited me to follow him into his office and I never would have believed that he was about to speak to me as he did.

Question. What, according to you, Mr. Stevenson, is the most important question in the political world today?

Answer. The suspension of atomic tests—this is a prime question.

Question. Can it be achieved?

Answer. It must be possible to reach agreement through mutual concessions.

Question. I take it that you refer to agreement with precise control—inspection?

Up till now the Russians have not accepted the minimum inspection formula proposed to them by the Western Powers.

Answer. Naturally, an agreement with inspection * * * but I repeat to you that an agreement must be possible. This problem of atomic tests must be considered as absolute priority. With mutual concessions * * *.

Question. Does this problem appear to you of such importance as to justify concessions on other matters?

Answer. Yes certainly.

Question. Does this mean that the Western Powers should make concessions on the German problem?

Answer. Yes certainly.

Question. On Berlin?

Answer. Yes.

I was surprised and persisted—

Question. Do you establish a connection between atomic agreement and Germany and more particularly Berlin?

Answer. There is no connection. But an atomic agreement is basic and justifies concessions on other matters. Since you mention Berlin incidentally, the present situation cannot be maintained.

WHY 11,000

Question. But the Western Powers are not the petitioners in Berlin. It is the Russians who seem to wish to force the Western Powers to leave Berlin?

Answer. Mr. Boulay, the present situation in Berlin cannot be maintained. Strategically, the presence of 11,000 American soldiers is meaningless * * *.

Question. Must I understand that you are prepared to accept a reduction of American forces in Berlin?

Answer. Yes. * * * One could have for instance 7,000.

Question. Why 7,000 rather than 11,500? Would you accept 5,000, or 3,000, or none at all?

Answer. Yes, but not now, later.

(I once again expressed surprise, and asked Mr. Stevenson to explain himself more fully.)

Question. Do you believe it is possible to take the political and moral risk of such a decision?

Answer. Mr. Boulay, do not be surprised. All I am telling you, I have already said and written several times.

(This explanation surprised me for to the best of my knowledge Mr. Stevenson has never gone so far or been so precise in the direction of seeking an East-West agreement.)

I WAS AT BERLIN

Question. Do you appreciate what would be the reaction of the Berliners and of the Europeans, of the Germans, of the French, and perhaps even the English and others, and even the Americans? Do you think that——

(My host interrupted.)

Answer. Mr. Boulay, I have been in Berlin several times; I know the situation.

(I permitted myself the following answer):

"Mr. Stevenson, I have also been in Berlin. Less often than you perhaps, but perhaps for a longer period. I remained for 5 weeks. I saw Berlin, even both Berlins; I have seen and listened to the Berliners. I have seen and listened to the refugees * * * the refugees whose number I believe has not diminished, on the contrary during recent weeks. Do you really think one can leave 2 million West Berliners 'alone' "?

Answer. I believe that one must first arrive at an agreement which will guarantee free access between West Berlin and the Federal Republic.

RUSSIAN GUARANTEES

Question. But how?

Answer. An agreement must be reached with Russian guarantees.

Question. The experience of the last 10 years does not encourage any optimism on what you refer to as "Russian guarantees."

Answer. That is true, but a change is possible in the future. The agreement must be sought and a solution may be found.

(Mr. Stevenson then spoke to me of the necessity and of the possibility of reducing Soviet pressure on Eastern Europe, particularly by a withdrawal, more or less substantial, of Moscow's military forces. He cited particularly as a happy precedent the Austrian Peace Treaty. I pointed out that if it is true that the Russians withdrew militarily from Austria, as did the Western Powers, they did so from a country where the political power was not held by the Communists. The problem for the Soviets is not only to withdraw such-and-such military force from such-and-such country, but to envisage the strategic consequences, and above all the political consequences of even a localized withdrawal. The Russians must fear the consequences for the political power of the Communists in any Iron Curtain country as well as the example which would be furnished to other Iron Curtain countries.

(Mr. Stevenson admitted the great difficulties, but maintained a relative optimism. He insisted in telling me that he believed a sort of political decompression might be possible in the countries behind the Iron Curtain.)

GI, GO HOME

Question. Do you believe, therefore, that an agreement can be reached on European disarmament?

Answer. I believe that the Rapacki[1] plan could serve as a basis for discussion.

Question. Your answer surprises me. Up to the present the Western Powers, and especially the Americans, have always opposed the Rapacki plan which is considered by the Atlantic Powers as the beginning of the neutralization of Europe. This policy could be summarized by the formula "G.I. Go Home." Do you really envisage the withdrawal of American forces from Europe?

Answer. Yes, in the future.

Question. You have just made, Mr. Stevenson, a very important answer. Does this mean that Europe would have to provide for its own defenses alone?

Answer. I believe that the Europeans—Germans, French, English, etc.—must be in a position to defend themselves in Europe.

Question. Do you believe, then, that the Americans should put atomic weapons at the disposal of European forces?

Answer. This could be discussed.

(During the rest of the conversation Mr. Stevenson gave me no further definition on this point. He nevertheless reminded me that in the past, he had said and repeated, especially to General de Gaulle, that in his opinion, European forces should concern themselves only with conventional weapons, the Americans being alone to have at their disposal atomic weapons.)

ADENAUER—U.S. SECRETARY OF STATE

Question. Will there be a change in American foreign policy after the election?

Answer. There will be important changes in American foreign policy.

(I persisted.)

Question. Mr. Stevenson, you told me there will be important changes after the elections. Would you repeat this? Do you think there will be changes regardless of the results of the elections?

(Mr. Stevenson slams the table with the palm of his hand to confirm.)

Answer. Definitely yes; there will be major changes whatever the results of the election.

(Mr. Stevenson goes on, while severely criticizing the decisions of Foster Dulles and those decisions which followed, and this is his categorical conclusion.)

For 10 years there has not really been a Secretary of State for American foreign policy. During this period the real American Secretary of State has been German Chancellor Adenauer.

DANGEROUS WORDS

(I prepared to leave.)

Goodby, Mr. Stevenson. Thank you for your hospitality. I may see you at the summit conference. Not the next but perhaps the following.

Mr. Stevenson, while appearing very satisfied with my polite reference, answered me "Oh no." But I sensed in his voice that he had not lost hope of some participating in the discussions between the Big Four as President of the United States, or at least as successor to Mr. Herter, or, more exactly, Chancellor Adenauer.

But on the basis of what he said to me, how could he find enough votes to be elected to the Democratic Convention if he holds to these statements? If a Democrat other than he were elected, could he really choose Stevenson as Secretary of State if Stevenson holds himself strictly to his statements of this Saturday of Easter?

FARLEY CONDEMNS STEVENSON STAND—ASSAILS SPEECH ON SUMMIT—SAYS HIS NOMINATION WOULD BE DISASTROUS

(By Douglas Dales)

James A. Farley assailed Adlai E. Stevenson yesterday for his criticism of the Eisenhower administration over the collapse of the summit conference.

He warned the Democratic Party that the nomination of Mr. Stevenson for the Presidency would be disastrous.

The former Democratic National Chairman, in a caustic statement, charged that the party's standard bearer in 1952 and 1956 was using the failure of the summit meeting as a vehicle to promote a third nomination for himself.

The basis of his attack was Mr. Stevenson's speech Thursday at a party gathering in Chicago in which he declared that it was the obligation of the Democrats, as the opposition party, to expose and criticize any carelessness and mistakes of the Eisenhower administration.

As Mr. Farley directed his fire at the party's titular head, the Stevenson-for-President Committee of New York increased its activities with an advertising campaign to obtain support for Mr. Stevenson. Scores of volunteers were out in the city and suburbs, gathering signatures to petitions urging Mr. Stevenson's nomination.

Mr. Farley said he was impelled, as a matter of honesty and in furtherance of national unity, to reject Mr. Stevenson's thesis that the administration had furnished Premier Khrushchev with the "sledge hammer and crowbar" to wreck the summit conference.

"On the contrary," he said, "it occurs to me that Mr. Stevenson is attempting to use the incident to 'sledge hammer and crowbar' another disastrous nomination for himself as the Apostle of Appeasement out of the Democratic Party."

Meanwhile, the Republican National Committee criticized the Chicago speech as "reckless" and declared that Mr. Stevenson was falling "like a ton of bricks for the Khrushchev line."

The statement by Mr. Farley, who often voices the views of the conservative wing of the Democratic Party in the State, foreshadowed the possibility of a major division in the party on the question of foreign policy as a campaign issue.

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt endorsed Mr. Stevenson's speech at a news conference here Friday. And a substantial group of Democrats in the House of Representatives have framed a series of questions for the Republicans on the U–2 plane incident and other developments on the eve of the Paris summit meeting.

UNWARRANTED ATTACK

Mr. Farley, terming Mr. Stevenson's speech an "unwarranted attack" on the President's conduct of the summit negotiations, said Mr. Stevenson did not represent the thinking of the Democratic Party.

Mr. Farley said that for Mr. Stevenson to say that the President had provided the tools to wreck the conference "indicates to me that Mr. Stevenson continues to be as misinformed on the facts as he is infatuated with his own writing style."

"It is my experience," the former party leader said, "that adroit phrasemaking does not necessarily indicate sound policymaking, a view which I find fortified by the rejection of Mr. Stevenson on two occasions by the American electorate."

Mr. Stevenson was particularly out of his field, Mr. Farley said, in criticizing the President's calling of a military alert on the eve of the Paris meeting. Recalling that the attack on Pearl Harbor had occurred immediately after negotiations with the Japanese mission had broken off in Washington, he said:

"I feel that the most felicitous use of the language, even Mr. Stevenson's, would be totally inadequate to explain away the enormity of a magnified Pearl Harbor, in the event of a surprise Soviet attack. If Mr. Stevenson is suggesting that the Commander in Chief should refer all measures of defense to Mr. Stevenson before issuing orders to adequately protect the country, the idea is both impractical and unconstitutional."

CHINA SUGGESTION NOTED

Mr. Farley's reference to Mr. Stevenson as an "apostle of appeasement" was based in part on the suggestion last September by Mr. Stevenson that the United States should cease leading the "anti-admission" lobby against Communist China at the United Nations.

"It is part of Mr. Stevenson's appealing, if adolescent, naivete in international affairs," the statement continued, "that it appears not to occur to him that the admission of Red China by the United Nations would establish another Red spy nest in New York City under full diplomatic protection."

Mr. Farley said that during his recent travels in the Far East, heads of government had insisted to him that the slightest wavering in the country's policy of nonrecognition of Communist China "would result in a worldwide diplomatic disaster for the cause of freedom, not second to an ignominious surrender of Berlin."

Mr. Stevenson has given the National Convention every reason to select a spokesman "who speaks for it in fact," Mr. Farley said, continuing:

"I can think of no more effective way of doing so than by a unanimous resolution of condemnation and repudiation of his absurd speech in Chicago as representing the views of the Democratic Party. As a former National Chairman and as one who has been proud to be a Democrat for over 50 years. I shall call upon all Democrats to keep the symbol of our party the Democratic mule and not Mr. Stevenson's umbrella."

Mr. Stevenson, who left Chicago for New York late yesterday afternoon could not be reached for comment.

---

[1] The Polish plan referred to as "Rapacki" from the name of its author provides principally for a partial European disarmament dealing with the production and stockpiling of nuclear weapons.

[From the Washington Star, May 21, 1960]

WOULD ADLAI HAVE BANNED THE U–2?

(By Gould Lincoln)

Adlai Stevenson's blast at President Eisenhower and the administration's handling of the U–2 intelligence flights over Russia raises some interesting questions—while at the same time thrusting an issue into the political campaign, with Mr. Stevenson as its first and perhaps principal spokesman.

Among the questions raised by the titular leader of the Democratic Party, who has been called a willing candidate for a third presidential nomination—if he can be drafted—is the following: Would Mr. Stevenson, had he been President during the last 4 years, have banned U–2 intelligence flights over Russian territory? These flights have been called by men intimately connected with the security of the United States and the free world not only essential but of great value.

Second: Is Mr. Stevenson in any way denying that we should seek information regarding the intentions and the strength of a potential enemy—particularly during a period of constant sabre rattling and threats of destruction of the United States by Soviet Premier Khrushchev and other leading Russian Communists?

This is a subject which Mr. Stevenson has not thoroughly discussed in his comments so far. But it is one that, should he be nominated by the Democratic Party, he will be asked many times, and will have to answer. It is obvious he cannot have it both ways. Mr. Khrushchev in his recent widely publicized press conference in Paris, when he torpedoed the summit conference, said in answer to a question that he had known for some time of the U–2 flights over Russia; that he knew all about them at the time he visited the United States and President Eisenhower at Camp David. If he did, his restraint—he did not mention these flights to President Eisenhower in their intimate conversations—was in remarkable contrast to his outbursts in Moscow on May Day and in Paris.

RESPONSIBILITY OF PRESIDENT

Had Mr. Stevenson been President he would have been told by the country's defenders in all probability that it was of vital importance to rise above the Iron Curtain and obtain as much information as possible regarding Russia's military strength and her intentions, so that this country could be alerted before a surprise attack. Presumably Mr. Stevenson would have agreed to this form of espionage. He would have known, as did President Eisenhower, the need for our security in the face of the constant threat of Soviet attack. He would have known, too, of the wideflung espionage carried on—and with much success—by the Soviet, both in this country and in the rest of the world.

Nevertheless, Mr. Stevenson has undertaken to thrust this whole subject of intelligence work for national security into the political campaign. Another question rises: Have Mr. Stevenson's charges against the President and his handling of the use of these intelligence flights tended to create a picture in Russian minds and in the minds of our allies of a divided America? The titular leader of the Democratic Party was careful in his Chicago speech to denounce the demands of Mr. Khrushchev for an apology from President Eisenhower because of the U–2 flights and for the punishment of those responsible for launching them. He was careful to say that this is no time for America to be divided. But what he said, taken as a whole, may well be interpreted as showing a serious division among the people of America. It may be interpreted as a backhanded apology.

Certainly, Mr. Stevenson seems to have indicated that the country must get rid of the Republicans and Mr. Eisenhower and all his works if the United States is to be able in the future to negotiate with Soviet Russia and the Communist world. This, in a measure, is exactly what Mr. Khrushchev declared in Paris. If Mr. Stevenson intended to exhibit himself as a better negotiator for a peaceful world, he has not given an impression that he would be a stronger one.

SPEECH POLITICAL

Mr. Stevenson in Chicago was addressing a Democratic political rally, a Cook County fund raising dinner. His speech was a political speech and so intended. The issue of the U–2 flights, their handling, and all other implications, so far as Mr. Stevenson is concerned, are firmly in the campaign. It may be that other Democratic leaders will follow a similar course. The question naturally arises: Will this issue gain votes for the Democratic nominee for President— whether Mr. Stevenson, Senator KENNEDY or another? Will Mr. Stevenson picture the President as a wrecker of the Paris Summit Conference—or won't he? It would be a difficult task to put that across in the minds of Americans, in view of Mr. Khrushchev's exhibition at Paris. In his Chicago speech, Mr. Stevenson called Mr. Khrushchev the wrecker of the conference. But he said Mr. Eisenhower had placed the crowbar in Mr. Khrushchev's hands by ineptness, by contradictory statements emanating from this Government. This raises the question: Would Mr. Stevenson, as President, have denied the whole business of the U–2 flights, have disclaimed any responsibility for them?

The American people have learned over the years that President Eisenhower is devoted to peace and the preservation of a peaceful world. He, however, has never been an advocate of peace at any price. He has insisted that the country be prepared and strong and informed in order to forestall or prevent Communist attack. Now he is charged by Mr. Khrushchev with seeking war, with a desire to prevent a successful summit conference. Mr. Stevenson would not have the American people believe any such thing. His contention is that the President has been stupid—more stupid than a Democratic President would have been. That, however, is still to be proved.

RUSSIANS WANT TO HEAR PEACE MESSAGE FROM IKE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Probably no living American has known Russia and the Russians over as many years as Averell Harriman, former New York Governor and Ambassador to the Soviet Union from 1943 to 1946. He returned several months ago from a 6-week tour of the country during which he had a long series of conversations with Nikita Khrushchev and leading government officials.)

(By Averell Harriman)

The success or failure of the summit conference hangs largely on the decisions of one man—Nikita Khrushchev. But even Khrushchev, powerful as he is, cannot prevent President Eisenhower's visit to the Soviet Union from being a tremendous success, and of lasting benefit to our country.

To the Russian people, Dwight D. Eisenhower is not just a President of the United States. He is the supreme commander of the allied forces who with the Soviet armies fought to victory over the ruthless Nazi invaders. During the war his reputation was built up by the Soviet Government, through the press and other ways, as a great ally and friend of the Soviet Union. In July 1945, Stalin invited him to visit Moscow, and he was given a hero's welcome.

He stayed with me at the Embassy, and I vividly recall his reception by the people, particularly at the Dynamo football game. The 80,000 spectators who jammed the stands raised the sky with their applause when he and Marshal Zhukov stood up to take a bow, with their arms around each other's shoulders.

Then we were invited to review the youth parade in Red Square. The participants, 100,000 strong, from all over the Soviet Union, saw him standing with Stalin and Zhukov on top of Lenin's tomb.

Last year, when I visited the Soviet Union, wherever I went—Moscow, or central Asia, or the wilds of Siberia—people talked to me about peace, expressed their fear of war, and asked why we planned to attack them.

It is hard for us Americans to believe that the Russian people think the threat of war comes from us. But the propaganda has been constantly dinned into them that our Government is controlled by a small industrial clique, and this clique wants war for profit.

When President Eisenhower gives his message of peace and friendship, it will reach the hearts of tens of millions of Russians.

Peace with the United States is the message the Russian people want to hear, and President Eisenhower is the one living man who can give it convincingly.

DECLARATION OF CONFIDENCE AND SUPPORT BY WESTERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, SEATTLE, WASH., MAY 18, 1960

Resolved, That the Governors of the Western Conference declare their strong and wholehearted support of the President of the United States in his dignified and unyielding response to the ignoble and outrageous demands of Chairman Khrushchev. We express our hope that the obstacles placed by Mr. Khrushchev in the path of discussion of grave international issues at the summit can be overcome by the leaders of the free world in furtherance of our deep desire to build a world where all peoples can live in freedom and justice, peace and dignity; unmolested and unafraid.

Gov. Grant Sawyer, of Nevada; Gov. William F. Quinn, of Hawaii; Gov. Albert D. Rosellini, of Washington; Gov. Mark O. Hatfield, of Oregon; Gov. Edmund G. Brown, of California; Gov. George Dewey Clyde, of Utah; Gov. John Burroughs, of New Mexico; Gov. J. J. Hickey, of Wyoming; Gov. William A. Egan, of Alaska; Gov. J. Hugo Aronson, of Montana; Gov. Robert E. Smylie, of Idaho; Gov. Stephen L. R. McNichols, of Colorado.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I listened with interest to what the distinguished minority leader had to say about a speech by the two-time candidate of the Democratic Party, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, which speech was given in Cook County, I believe, last Thursday. Evidently the minority leader thinks that a man high in party councils should remain quiet when, in all good conscience, he perhaps feels a deepening disquiet.

It appears to me that so far as the Democratic leadership is concerned there will be an inquiry, which I understand, from reading the press reports today, has the tacit support of the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. One of our distinguished correspondents grabbed me this morning as I was coming into the Capitol and began to ask about a possible investigation. I think I qualified my remark by saying, "If there is going

to be an investigation," that probably the Foreign Relations Committee might undertake it.

I begin to have some doubts about the merit of an investigation, when we are dealing with such a sensitive matter as the whole intelligence system of this country. Once that door is opened, I doubt whether it will be closed again. Then who shall say what will be the repercussions?

So my statement was a qualified statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I accept the Senator's statement, and of course I believe it. I was simply referring to a ticker tape report which indicated that if an inquiry were to be held the Foreign Relations Committee was the place to hold it.

It happens that after every international conference of any significance the Secretary of State and other interested individuals almost always appear before the Committee on Foreign Relations and gives the committee a report. Although my knowledge comes from press reports, I understand from that source that there may be a suggestion tomorrow, when the Committee on Foreign Relations meets, that it conduct not an investigation but instead an inquiry, to furnish an opportunity for many interested Senators to raise questions which have been bothering them.

Speaking about questions, I dare say there is not a Member of this body on either side of the aisle who does not have at least one question which he would like to have answered.

If the inquiry is forthcoming, I wish to express the hope, as I have previously expressed it, that it will be an inquiry based upon the facts, that it will not become a political football and will not become such a campaign issue that the welfare and the unity of the country may well be lost in the shuffle.

I think Mr. Stevenson had the right to make the kind of speech he made. I do not think that speech is going to disrupt national unity. I would invite the attention of my colleagues to the fact that we still live in a free country and that we still have the right to express our opinions as we see fit. As a responsible official of the Democratic Party I can find no fault with Mr. Stevenson for making his honest views known in a speech in Cook County.

The minority leader has mentioned the fact that a story, so called, came out during the course of the summit conference, or prior thereto, in which Mr. Stevenson said something about the fact that he hoped the nuclear test ban negotiations would continue. Well, I hope they will continue, also, because I think what happens at Geneva in regard to the ban on nuclear testing is going to have a great effect not only upon this country, but also upon mankind as a whole.

The minority leader said that Mr. Stevenson advocated a reduction in U.S. forces in Berlin from 11,000 to 7,000. I do not desire to be picayunish, I assure the Senator, but it is my understanding that the forces of the three Western Allied Powers in Berlin are comprised roughly of 11,000 men, and the American forces comprise something on the order of 4,000 to 5,000 of the total.

The third thing with which the story seems to find fault, on the part of Mr. Stevenson, is the fact that he advocated consideration of the Rapacki plan, by means of which there might be created a neutralized zone in middle Europe. Others of us have advocated that, also. I have advocated consideration of the Rapacki plan, the Eden plan, and the Gaitskill plan, with the proviso that there be a quid pro quo in return before anything definite is done along these line. I see nothing wrong with that.

I can understand the opposition of the Republican Party to what Mr. Stevenson has said, because, frankly speaking, I think the Republicans look upon him as a possible presidential candidate. He may be. He may not be. This is one way of anticipating something in advance.

However, I find it extremely difficult to understand why Democrats should go out of their way to find fault with Mr. Stevenson for expressing his honest opinions. Some of them, in effect, want to "read him out" of the party. He will not be "read out" of the party, because he has made many contributions to our country in the past, and I anticipate he will make many more in the future.

Some people say, "Well, Mr. Stevenson is going to be our next Secretary of State." He may well be. I have heard the names of Mr. CHESTER BOWLES and of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] mentioned in that respect, also. That is a matter which will be determined by the next President, if he is a Democrat. If he is not a Democrat, we may rest assured that none of these three will be appointed. If the next President is a Republican, of course he will have to make his own decisions.

The reference to the 6 to 8 months, laid down by Mr. Khrushchev in the hope that a new administration will come into power, carried the implication by the distinguished minority leader that if the new President happened to be a Democrat, and most specifically if he happened to be Mr. Stevenson, things were going to be easier, that we were going to be "softer." Well, I do not think we are the ones who have been "soft" on communism, to revive an old Republican phrase. We did not invite Mr. Khrushchev to America. Mr. Khrushchev never invited a Democratic Presidential candidate to visit him in the Kremlin.

I do not know what Senators mean when they say that, because of the statement made by Mr. Khrushchev that 6 or 8 months would be time enough to hold another conference, if a Democrat is to go to such a conference it would indicate a sign of softness. It is hard for me to follow that reasoning.

I would advise my Republican colleagues, if I may, not to look too far ahead and not to arrive at too many assumptions too early.

I think we ought to find out something about the crowbar and something about the sledge hammer, and the place to find out about these articles and the place to raise these questions is in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

We have the Foreign Relations Committee to look into matters affecting the foreign policy of the United States; and what has been affected is the foreign policy of the United States. Mr. President, I have never heard of a statement attributed to another outstanding presidential candidate, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] to the effect that he advocated apologizing to Mr. Khrushchev. I do not know of any Democrat who has ever at any time advocated apologizing, publicly or otherwise, to Mr. Khrushchev. The Senator from Massachusetts will return to the Senate shortly, and I am sure he will take care of himself in that respect.

In respect to the interview, it is my understanding that Mr. Stevenson stated, as soon as the news of this interview broke, that he had had nothing to do with it, and that he did not give an interview of that nature, but I cannot vouch for that, because I am calling on memory, and going back to the public print.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish that the Republicans would let us take care of our business and that they would take care of their own business, but let us together take care of the Nation's business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I try always to be careful about documentation. Everything I have said this morning has a documentary article to support the statement. The interview in Paris was pretty lengthy. It was a translation of an article by special correspondent Robert Boulay. The heading is "I Passed the Afternoon With the Possible Successor to Mr. Eisenhower—Adlai Stevenson Told Me, 'The Americans Must Quit Berlin and Europe if They Wish To Achieve Atomic Peace.'" That is the headline. It has a Chicago dateline, and after the introductory portion the interview was on a question and answer basis. It is all here. It was done at Adlai Stevenson's home at Libertyville, Ill. It must have appeared in the Paris newspapers because there is no more reputable foreign correspondent than Bill Stoneman on the Chicago Daily News foreign staff. He commented on it. David Lawrence also commented on it. I shall leave the entire question and answer statement to speak for itself as to precisely what Governor Stevenson said.

Then, of course, there is the factor of timing. The article hit the papers on the day Khrushchev got to Paris, and he had to read it, because he gave himself away in East Berlin when he mentioned that Adenauer had been our Secretary of State for 7 years, and that is precisely what Adlai Stevenson said to Robert Boulay at Libertyville, Ill. It would be amazing indeed to have words flowing out of two different mouths

3,500 miles apart, each individual being insensible of what the other said.

I have only one further comment to make, because I do not want to preempt the floor. My distinguished friend from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] said we had invited Mr. Khrushchev here. That is correct. We had invited Mr. Koslov. We had invited Mr. Mikoyan. We got them on the "home diamond." But I can remember another period in the history of this country when the President of the United States went to Yalta and when he went to Teheran, to their orbit, rather than have them here, and so it was much better to have them on the "home diamond." But all the articles are there and all the quotes are there; they must speak for themselves, including the estimate of the whole matter uttered by a very distinguished Democrat, James A. Farley, of New York.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as I understand, what the distinguished minority leader has just said is that Mr. William Stoneman, a very reputable journalist, did write a story on this matter, but is my understanding correct that he got the story from a story carried in a Paris newspaper?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so. He saw it in the Paris newspaper, and sent a dispatch to the Chicago Daily News. That was the only reference I saw to it until these other developments arose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I ask one question: Did Adlai Stevenson deny the interview?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not heard him deny it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did the Senator read it? I read a report that he denied it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would be amazing indeed if a correspondent for a French newspaper could journey all the way to Libertyville, Ill., in the northern section of the State, and say he was there with other correspondents, and then to reduce to question-and-answer form, with interpolated comments, this kind of statement.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, while I was in the Middle West, I read a report in the press that Mr. Stevenson denied having given the interview in the way it was presented by the French journalist. He said that the French journalist's English was wrong, that he again wanted to deny the assertions made in the story by the French writer. I do not have that denial here at this time, but I ask for unanimous consent that Mr. Stevenson's statement in the press as I read it be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY ADLAI E. STEVENSON ISSUED TO PRESS MAY 18

My recollection is that the young man was brought to my home by friends. I never give exclusive interviews without request. And he would not have received one had he asked in such circumstances.

As I recall, he wanted to discuss all of the problems of Europe; and evidently confused discussion with opinion.

What he reports me as saying have, of course, never been my views and are not my views today.

The most charitable explanation of such irresponsibility, presumption, and discourtesy is that his English was poor and my French no better.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Connecticut. Before I do so, I wish to say I am very happy to see so many Republicans in the Chamber at this very early hour, and also so many Democrats. But I was caught cold, and I believe we were all caught cold, by what the distinguished minority leader said this morning, so if I can find some documentation, I shall try to get it later and put it in the RECORD, because I know the Senator from Illinois would be delighted to have it there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed I would.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I was glad to hear the Senator speak on the subject of an inquiry by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. What concerns me very much about such an inquiry is the question whether it would be held in executive session by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say to the Senator from Connecticut that I did not make a request for an inquiry, though I have stated on this floor that at the proper time the questions should be asked, and in the course of that earlier statement I stated as my belief that any queries of this kind ought to be held in private, that they should not become the subject of political controversy. I am very happy to read in this morning's paper that a Member of the Senate on the other side of the aisle, the distinguished Senator from the State of New York [Mr. JAVITS], indicated that he thought it would be worth while to have an inquiry at this time, one conducted by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, let me observe, in conclusion, that I am very glad to hear the acting majority leader speak of this matter in this way. I assume that such an inquiry would have his support, and that any inquiry into the entire business of the U–2 incident and subsequent developments would be in executive session and of a private nature. I express the very urgent hope that that will be the case, because, as the acting majority leader himself said a few moments ago, we are dealing with a very sensitive subject, a very sensitive situation, in which not only our own security, but the security of the whole free world and that of our allies, is involved. Whatever the temptation may be, I do not believe that this subject should become a political football. I believe that if Senators or other political leaders have something to say on their own responsibility, they have, as the acting majority leader pointed out, the right to say it if they wish to take the consequences. But because of the overall seriousness of the whole situation and the sensitiveness of it, I believe that Members of the Senate, who are all responsible men, should not engage in a public inquiry into this subject which might imperil our position, because we are not in a position to afford that kind of a wild goose chase, so to speak. I compliment the acting majority leader for the position he has taken upon that issue.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I do not wish to have any misunderstanding about my position. I express the hope that we will act responsibly. I have expressed the hope, and I again express it, that this matter may be kept as far out of politics as possible, because if we do not know by now the precarious and delicate situation we are in, we will never know it. I hope no one has the idea that the "summit that never was" turned out to be a victory for us. If so, let him disabuse his mind completely. It was anything but a victory. We had better recognize that fact and remember that in this day and age in which we live, if things go too far, there is going to be no differentiation between a Democrat and a Republican. So I hope that we will act together in the interest of our country, not in the interest of a particular political party. I now yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I have a brief statement to make in connection with the proposed investigation.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me first?

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Montana has yielded to me. I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. BUTLER. I thought the Senator had yielded to me to make a brief statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have yielded to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it has been most revealing to observe the increasing number of politicians who have been eager to cry "Me too" about the U–2. In their eagerness to gain a few headlines and perhaps votes, they have muddled and muddied the events of the last few weeks so that the U–2, the summit, the events prior, during, and after have all been thrown together into an incredibly tangled mass. Now the cry has gone up for investigation by a committee of the Senate.

Mr. President, no matter how sincere and impartial the gentlemen of any such committee might be, their actions and their words will be turned into political ammunition for the coming election. It might even be that some of these gentlemen are well aware of this at the present time and that their interest in an investigation is not so impartial. Indeed, the Democratic advisory council has cleared summitry as an issue in a statement made public today.

That statement is filled with the most intemperate and ill-considered remarks. For example, "The foreign policy of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration is a shambles." Or "It has become obviqus

that the operations of the Government of the United States in its most important areas are chaotic." Or "During the first 2 weeks of May 1960 the foreign policy of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration collapsed." Perhaps it is not necessary to point out the obvious, but it is a fact that the party of the majority of the proposed investigating committee and of the advisory council I have just been quoting are one and the same. Can one operate without being influenced by the other? I think not.

As the cry for investigation of the U–2, of the summit, of the CIA, of every person and agency connected with our foreign policy goes up, I would like to raise this question: Does the legislative branch have the authority to investigate the Executive? I think not. Foreign policy is the responsibility of the executive branch. The State Department, the CIA, and all the other agencies of our foreign policy division are responsible to the President and to the President alone.

If the Democratic advisory council and the majority of this Senate are dissatisfied with what has happened in the last few weeks and want to do something about them other than engage in a debate, I believe they have two paths open to them.

One, they may impeach the President for giving a sledge hammer and a crowbar to Mr. Khrushchev with which that most sincere and peace-loving individual wrecked the summit conference. If they believe that the President has been derelict in his duties as the Chief Executive and as the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, let them start impeachment proceedings against him, or let them stop their ridiculous talk about investigating the President.

There is a second path open to the experts in hindsightmanship, those who are now howling and wringing their hands about what happened in Paris. They may work to convince the American people to vote against the present administration. Those are the two alternatives and the only alternatives.

Mr. President, I am not suggesting that we should not have debate on this issue. I believe that there should be long, serious, and dignified discussion of the U–2 and the summit. But a full and open committee investigation of these issues with television, radio, and newspapers blowing it up to the best of their considerable ability and skill would provide nothing but the most grotesque and meaningless Roman circus.

Criticism does not weaken a country, Mr. President, but selfish vindictive exploitation always does.

Mr. President, I would be the very last Member of this body to argue that we did not make some errors in the handling of the U–2 incident. But it would be well in the present atmosphere to remember that there are positive sides to this issue.

One, the U–2 proved that the United States is able to engage in the most difficult and demanding espionage for as long a period of time as 4 years without being publicly discovered. Two, the U–2 penetration to a distance of 1,300 miles into the heartland of Russia proves the ineptness and inability of Soviet air defenses. No wonder Mr. Khrushchev lost his temper and his control in Paris—he was revealed as the leader of a nation unable to defend itself against unarmed reconnaissance nonjet airplanes.

Mr. President, let me make myself absolutely clear. I am not against discussion and debate of the U–2. But, I am against investigation because I believe it to be unconstitutional and because its proceedings and consequences would end in a severe schism of the American people when we must all stand united.

If there are those who believe the events of the past few weeks to have been wrong, let them use the constitutional and electoral means at hand to set right such wrongs. But let them not raise a political banner and ask Americans sincerely concerned about the future of this country and the free world to follow them.

These are not easy times, Mr. President. Times of crisis never are. It is my sincere hope that the critics of the administration will not attempt to follow the easy way and blacken every issue and every action of the last several weeks with mud. Cries of blunder will not lead us to victory in the fight against communism, Mr. President, but into confusion and mistrust of each other. Let us fight together—not against each other.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania, I should like to say that I am delighted that the Senator from Maryland recognizes that criticism has a valid part under our system of government. Speaking only for myself, I would say that, so far as I am concerned, I do not wish to see a propaganda field day made of such a delicate situation. I now yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in order to throw a little light on whether or not Mr. Stevenson did or did not give the interview, it should be noted that an article appeared in the Paris Press-L'Intransigeant of Sunday-Monday May 15–16, 1960. Mr. David Lawrence, in his article published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 23, states:

> Mr. Stevenson last Tuesday denied ever having given any interview at all to any Paris newspaper. But he issued a statement to the Chicago Daily News the next day admitting that he had talked with Robert Boulay but calling the published interview incorrect.
>
> He said it did not represent his views and that the most charitable explanation of such irresponsibility, presumption, and discourtesy is that his English was poor and my French was no better.

Others, however, have noted, as appears in Mr. Stoneman's article, that:

> In Paris, however, Americans who know Mr. Boulay say he writes and talks English very well and is a reliable reporter.

This interview has, in my mind, the Stevensonian touch, to which has been added, I should say, and as Mr. James Farley has referred to it, the Stevensonian umbrella instead of the Democratic mule.

Mr. Stevenson joined Senator KENNEDY in the role of hindsight heroes; and if there is any question as to whether Mr. Stevenson gave this interview to Mr. Robert Boulay, I suggest that the appropriate committee of the Senate, either in executive session or in open session, request Mr. Boulay to appear in this country and request Governor Stevenson to appear, and let us have noted whether or not Governor Stevenson advocated the withdrawal of American forces from Europe, as he puts it, at some time in the future; an immediate reduction of forces in Germany; and concessions to Khrushchev all along the line; together with the statement that there would be important changes in American foreign policy next year; and the statement that "the real American Secretary of State has been German Chancellor Adenauer."

I might also add, in connection with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], as reported in the Portland Oregonian, that the Senator himself said:

> Khrushchev laid down two conditions to President Eisenhower for going on with the summit meeting. One was to apologize. I think that might have been possible to do.

Then the quotation goes on to other matters. The report in the Oregonian is that:

> Later KENNEDY modified the word "apologize," and said the President might "express regret."

It is my hope that neither the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts nor that other candidate for the Presidency, Governor Stevenson, will—either one of them—brand himself as a "turnquote." It is my hope that they will relieve themselves of the curse of suspicion of appeasement, and it is my hope that the unity, which started out so well in support of the President and in support of the administration, may somehow be found again.

But as Mr. Farley has so well said, he has no part in the appeasement process as exemplified by the unfortunate statement of Governor Stevenson.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I may say, in reply to the Senator from Pennsylvania, that I think he is doing a disservice to the country when he puts words in the mouths of Stevenson and KENNEDY which were never uttered. The idea of calling those men appeasers. What does he mean, "appeasers"? Both of them served their country in times of emergency. Stevenson was an apprentice seaman in the First World War; JACK KENNEDY was a PT-boat commander in the Second World War. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania call those men appeasers? What kind of tactic is this? I thought we were trying to keep this matter out of the field of politics. Why does the Senator from Pennsylvania pick on those men? Why put those titles and those names upon them? They are not appeasers, and the Senator from Pennsylvania knows it. They are good, decent, honest, upright Americans, and should be so considered by everyone.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator from Montana will yield, I did not ascribe to them the word "appeasers." I said they had an opportunity to divest themselves

of reference to appeasement, as exemplified by the statement of Mr. Farley.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The implication is clear, and the term "curse of suspicion" was used.

Mr. SCOTT. If they are appeasers, let the record speak for itself. If they are not appeasers, let that record speak for itself. But above everything else, let us find out whether Governor Stevenson made the statement he is reported to have made; and let us find out whether Senator KENNEDY made the statement reported and attributed to him.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I think the remarks which have been made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] with respect to the character and the patriotism of Governor Stevenson and Senator KENNEDY are most unfortunate. I am consoled by the source from which they came.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it seems to me that if we shoot off any more fireworks around here, we will not have any left for the Fourth of July. Our job now is to make certain that we will have the Fourth of July from now on, and that we have the right to celebrate it. It may be all right to shoot off fireworks, but I think we are shooting them off too close to the gas works to be helpful.

Like others, I have no doubt that Mr. Stevenson might have spoken rather indiscreetly in his speeches. He appears to be one of the ever-hopeful variety, so perhaps we should accept his remarks in that sort of hopeful atmosphere.

I, myself, do not regard Mr. Stevenson as being representative of more than one section of the Democratic Party. I think Mr. Farley represents another viewpoint within that party. Perhaps the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] may represent an element greater than the others put together. At least, that is what has been said. Whatever position they have to take, they probably have the right to take it.

However, in view of all the verbal fireworks which have taken place, both on the Senate floor and around the Nation, during the last few days, it appears to me that we have gone too far not to have a discreet, judicious, and careful inquiry into the events of the last 2 or 3 weeks, in the hope that we may fill in two or three gaps in our information. I do not see how this type of inquiry can hurt anyone. I should think it might prove helpful in the long run. I intend to be present, if that inquiry is made by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which is the place where it should be made, to see that there is no unfairness during the proceedings.

If we undertake to suppress an inquiry now, it will look to the world as if we really had something to cover up. I do not think anyone wants to do that. I do not think we have anything to cover up.

I think Mr. Khrushchev got himself on one wonderfully hot spot, and he had to have time—6 or 8 months, or, heaven knows, probably more than that—before he could get off the hot spot, and get out from under the various pressures which have been bearing down on him, and which made him scuttle the conference. I do not say he did not want to scuttle it anyway, but certainly he came to the conference intending to scuttle it, one way or another.

It has been said by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], though I do not think it was said exactly in that way, that an ICBM certainly cannot tell the difference between a Democrat and a Republican. Even the IBM has not gotten to the point where it can do that yet, simply by having a person walk past a machine. Certainly an ICBM—an intercontinental ballistic missile—could not tell any difference between us, should the point be reached where any enemy might see fit to use it against us.

We have a common job now. It is to assure the security of the United States, and to make every endeavor we can to lessen international tensions, and to lessen the risk of international conflict, which would be so terrible to contemplate that we should not be thinking of getting even with each other. We ought to be getting together, to make certain that the United States will not face any cataclysm in the future. I do not think we will have to face one, but I think it is important that we work together; that we find some other issues for November; and not concentrate on something which may prove injurious to all of us on the international scene.

I simply want to make certain that we have the right to shoot off fireworks on Fourth of July, and that we will celebrate the Fourth of July for a long, long time to come.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to what the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has just now stated, I wish to say that, as always, in a few words he reaches the heart of the matter. I think his statement is one to which all of us—Democrats and Republicans alike—can subscribe.

I wish to assure the Senator from Vermont and the Senate that, so far as I am concerned, there are no political implications and there is nothing picayunish in my attitude. But there is a desire to find the answers to some questions. In seeking those answers, I hope we try to avoid personalities and not raise charges or strawmen against persons such as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who is not now in the Chamber, to defend himself, or against Adlai Stevenson, who—like every other American—has a right to state his views. After we find the answers, if there then are criticisms, they can be answered.

I only hope that the next time something of this sort occurs, we shall have a little prior notice.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I had no prior notice of the Stevenson speech.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was made last Thursday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And generally I have no prior notice of the statements which from day to day are made on the floor of the Senate. Therefore, I usually find myself in the same dilemma in which the acting majority leader now finds himself.

The other point is that today, with the acceleration of events, it becomes difficult to document one's speech. I try to document the statements I make; I endeavor to state for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the sources and every document and every report. That was the reason for what I said.

I make this final comment: I am unhappy when this matter gets into the political field or in the newspaper headlines. The headlines in the newspapers, particularly those in the Midwest, were printed in very large letters, "Adlai Charges Use of Crowbar"—or something to that effect. Obviously, we cannot "blink" it, because public opinion begins to be manufactured in exactly that way, and that is not conducive to unity.

Last week, when the majority leader made such an excellent statement, here on the floor, he mentioned the fact that the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Governor Stevenson, the titular head of the Democrat Party, and twice its candidate for the Presidency; the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and the majority leader had signed a cablegram which was sent to the President, in Paris; and I said it was a refreshing note, and I was delighted to see it.

But one has to take judicial notice when a former candidate for the Presidency—who, first of all, is watched with interest and, second, travels about South America, Europe, Asia, and elsewhere, and confers with the foreign leaders—makes such a statement. How can one "blink" it? One has to take account of it. I was only taking judicial notice of what I have seen; and what I was able to put in the RECORD today was by way of documentation. Obviously, I am always contented to let that speak for itself.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I was not being serious when I said I hoped we would receive a little prior notice the next time an incident of this sort occurs, because I recall that I have asked very serious and delicate questions of the minority leader, without giving him prior notice. I appreciate what the Senator from Illinois has said.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President——

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall not long detain the Senate.

I regret that I was not in the Chamber at the beginning of this debate. I had no idea that attacks of this kind would be made at this hour on Monday.

Last week, in response to an inquiry in regard to the Foreign Relations Com-

mittee, I stated that it is customary for the committee to hold briefings and hearings on matters of importance. I think that, without exception, following every international conference which has been held since I have been here, always upon their return the Secretary of State and others have come before our committee, to inform it and, through it, the Senate and the Nation. I see nothing irregular about that. I think it entirely in order.

I am a little surprised that Members of this body on the other side of the aisle would be so aggressive about this particular matter. It seems to me something must be hurting their conscience, and they seem to be counterattacking before any attack is made. No one has attacked anyone, so far as I know—that is to say, no one in this body. People outside, who have their impressions, can say what they like, for ours is a free country.

I do not know enough about all the background and the reasons and the explanations of the various statements made preliminary to the final breakup of the conference, to be able to reach any final conclusion. That is why I think a study and an inquiry by the Foreign Relations Committee is in order.

I propose, tomorrow morning, at the regular meeting of our committee, to submit this question; and I hope that after thorough discussion, the procedure the committee will follow will be agreed upon. I expect the procedure of the inquiry to be agreed upon by the members of the committee of both parties, because it is entirely in order, and follows the usual precedent, which I believe always has been followed in the past, when anything of importance in the international field has occurred.

I do not think it promotes the effort to keep this matter on a nonpartisan plane, to indulge in such acrimonious attacks here on the floor of the Senate on leading Members of either party—and, in this case, on Members of my party. I think it is most unfortunate; and certainly it is premature, because I do not believe any one of us is now able to arrive at firm and final conclusions in regard to the very tragic event which occurred last week, in Paris.

The only advice I gave to some of my friends of the Republican Party was that I hoped they would not try to pretend that what happened at Paris was a great triumph. I said that if that were done, necessarily it would call for rebuttal. I said I hoped we would soberly approach this matter, in a serious endeavor to determine, first, what happened; and, second, the practices and procedures which have grown up in our Government. I do not mean only the practices and procedures in the executive branch; I think the Congress itself has much to learn in this field, and I believe there are ways and means by which our procedures can be improved. Last year, the Foreign Relations Committee suggested ways which I think would have been a great improvement; and from time to time other Senators make similar suggestions. Certainly I do not believe that either the Congress or the Executive has perfected its methods of dealing with these very complex matters.

So I believe that the purpose of the proposed inquiry is, in the first place, to understand just what has happened; and, in the second place, if the circumstances call for it, to make some changes, in order to tighten up the administration.

But I believe the worst thing, from the national point of view and from the point of view of the welfare of the Nation, would be to pretend that we have experienced a great triumph, and that nothing need be said about what happened. Everyone knows what happened is a great tragedy for the entire world. Who is to blame, and so forth, is a subject of legitimate inquiry.

But at the moment I do not wish to indulge in a debate attacking Members of my party or Members of the other party. At this point, I believe that would be quite premature.

However, if, following inquiry, there are found to be reasons for criticizing the conduct of our policies, then, of course, it will be our duty to do so; and I do not believe that any plea for unity should foreclose any justified criticism based upon an inquiry which is held in a sober and responsible manner.

I am confident that the members of the administration, including the Secretary of State, have no objection at all to coming before the Foreign Relations Committee and giving their explanation of what happened. That is appropriate. That is what Secretary Dulles did. That is what Secretary Acheson always did after international meetings. He came before our committee and explained what happened, his reasons why, and his point of view. Then it was up to us to draw our own conclusions therefrom. That is the way I expect to proceed now. I think it will be beneficial at the proper time to make a report or observations or, if conditions warrant it, a criticism of the way things have been handled.

In the meantime, I think we ought to be careful in what we say, and ought not to inflame anyone's thoughts, and make sure we do not lose a sense of objectivity in forming our judgment on what the facts are after we develop them in a proper inquiry.

I do not propose at this time to pursue this debate on the substance of the speeches or what happened in Paris.

Mr. SCOTT and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Ohio. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, may I say at the outset, I completely agree with the statement made today by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the acting majority leader, and I admire very much the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I agree with him. Certainly, the distinguished Senator from Vermont made a very moderate and very wise statement with which all of us can agree.

Mr. President, unfortunately for President Eisenhower, and also unfortunately for the American people, the law of averages caught up with our President. His good luck over the years seemed to have deserted him, and at a time when he needed it most.

Without a doubt, President Eisenhower hoped to end his administration in an aura of peace and good will. He had been the supreme commander of the greatest army ever gathered under the bending sky of God. He had hoped that the high point and final public service in his life would be that, as Chief Executive of the United States, he would be regarded by future historians as a peacemaker. He even envisioned himself as the father of permanent peace. Instead of that, he returned from Paris to Washington at a time when the increased tension in the cold war between this Nation and the Soviet Union has become more violent. In fact, he returns at a time when that relationship between our two nations could not become much worse, except by the temporary ending of diplomatic relations on the part of one or both nations.

He himself did not cause this situation. Inept officials in his administration created an appearance of saber rattling and jingoism that President Eisenhower had wished to avoid.

President Eisenhower, from the time of his 1952 campaign for election—that "clean as a hound's tooth" campaign—has placed an accent on teamwork on the part of all his associates. Morality has been glorified, as is entirely proper, yet, in an emergency that occurred due to the downing of an American reconnaissance plane far within the territory of the Soviet Union, American people—and in fact, peoples the world over—were given conflicting and utterly false statements by administration officials in authority in the United States.

Leaders of friendly nations were startled over the muddleheaded, mentally inert, and inept handling of the controversy by administration officials over the downing of this plane.

American prestige throughout the world dropped, and no one is to blame more than officials of the Eisenhower administration.

Doubtless, President Eisenhower himself must share in the responsibility. It appears he failed to know personally details of the work of our Central Intelligence Agency. It may be that had he been an alert, active, strong President, he would have been in constant touch with the actions and activities of all administrative agencies and in position to hold in check any which directly or indirectly acted in violation of the law and customs of nations.

Apparently the President had no knowledge that our U–2 plane penetrated behind the Iron Curtain in an aerial reconnaissance and was approximately 1,300 miles within the borders of the Soviet Union a few days before the last Big Four summit conference meeting to be held during his administration.

What should have been feared, occurred. This resulted in a propaganda

victory for Premier Khrushchev, who instantly, violently, and unmercifully pushed his advantage to the uttermost. Leaders of friendly nations were shocked and our Chief Executive was humiliated by the tongue lashing from Premier Khrushchev brought on by the failure of his trusted subordinates.

It is true President Eisenhower endured with dignity and restraint a vituperative face-to-face tongue lashing from the Communist Dictator Khrushchev. Personally, I would prefer a President who would have lashed back instantly and forcefully with some blunt, uncensored Texas, Missouri, or Massachusetts language and plain spoken epithets.

Mr. President, I assert that what seems to be the Eisenhower concept of the Presidency of the United States, frequently by remote control from Augusta and Gettysburg, and frequently altogether at the discretion of subordinates, is not sufficient for 1960 and this grim period of international anarchy.

Operating the Presidency on a part-time basis and not in the personalized manner of Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry Truman, removed President Eisenhower from key decisions and left our allies and our own citizens, even President Eisenhower himself, in a state of uncertainty about what was going on.

In addition, Secretary of Defense Gates calling the alert of the Armed Forces for Sunday, May 15, was an extraordinarily reckless act. Bear in mind, Sunday, May 15, was a bitter day for us. A mischance had occurred. Blunder was compounded upon blunder. The tension of the cold war between the Soviet Union and this Nation was increased.

The slogan of peace and prosperity was not being uttered in even the softest whisper. This was the hour and day picked by Secretary of Defense Gates for an exercise to parade the armed might of this Nation before the world. This, added to false statements and deceit and the confusion of a right-about-face statement, plus a bristling declaration that invading the air over the Soviet Union was necessary, plus an inference that this practice would be continued—all of this was just a little too much.

Then, a little too late, came the statement backing down on the previous statement that aerial spying would be continued. This despite the fact that the Vice President had publicly reaffirmed the policy of continuing aerial reconnaissance.

Mr. President, we can truly say that these have not been our proudest hours.

I thank the Senator from Montana for yielding to me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, would the Senator from Montana at this time consider yielding the floor?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator have in mind raising a question of personal privilege?

Mr. SCOTT. No, I do not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Because, if the Senator did, I wanted to read rule XIX.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator does that, he may force me into raising a point of personal privilege. I hope not to be pressed into doing so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I had understood the Senator was going to rise to a point of personal privilege, but I understand now he is not, and therefore I am delighted to yield to him.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, am I recognized in my own right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Chair. I had originally planned to raise the point of personal privilege, because I wished to make it crystal clear that I did not at any time, nor have I ever at any time, impugned the patriotism of any other Member or of any candidate for the Presidency, and I do not now impugn the patriotism of any Senator, or of Governor Stevenson, whose recent unfortunate remarks have infuriated a good part of our Nation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. If I may do so briefly, I am glad to yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. My remarks will be very brief. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The statement issued by Gov. Adlai Stevenson was issued to the press May 18, and I shall quote it.

> My recollection is that the young man was brought to my home by friends. I never give exclusive interviews without request. And he would not have received one had he asked in such circumstances.
>
> As I recall, he wanted to discuss all of the problems of Europe; and evidently confused discussion with opinion.
>
> What he reports me as saying have, of course, never been my views and are not my views today.
>
> The most charitable explanation of such irresponsibility, presumption and discourtesy is that his English was poor and my French no better.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri had been on the floor—or, if he was on the floor and had been paying attention—he would have heard me read several times part of that statement myself. I added that Mr. Boulay, among those who know him, is known to speak English very well, and therefore is presumed to be able to understand English when it is addressed to him.

I further suggested that the way to clarify this matter is to have the testimony of Mr. Boulay and to have the testimony of Governor Stevenson to see what was really said.

However, I rose for the purpose of saying that I do not impugn the patriotism of anyone. I regret that the Senator from Missouri, who is my very good friend, used the phrase with reference to myself of "considering the source." I am not a candidate for the Presidency. I hope that "considering the source" has no reference to presidential candidacy.

I will leave the remark where it has been made, since I rose in good faith and I am proceeding in good faith to make a certain point, which is that when I spoke on the floor about a week ago I praised the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] and the distinguished majority whip, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for their patriotism and for their true show of a bipartisan approach to these critical circumstances.

However, after that speech a certain speech was made by the former Governor of Illinois, and a certain speech was made by the distinguished, patriotic, and able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. Those speeches did appear in the press. An issue was raised by those speeches which had not been raised on the floor, and which all of us had expressed the hope would not be raised. That issue was whether President Eisenhower should apologize to Khrushchev or whether President Eisenhower should seek to reopen the negotiations with Khrushchev by retreating from a previous position.

A further issue raised again, I will say, by my friend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] a moment ago, was the issue of the action of the Secretary of Defense in calling an air alert.

Therefore, these matters become legitimate subjects of discussion on the floor of the Senate.

My answer as to whether the President should have apologized is that, in my opinion, he should not have. My answer as to whether the President should have appeased Mr. Khrushchev, or reopened the negotiations at the expense of an expression of apology or regret on our part, is that he should not have.

My answer as to the calling of an air alert ought to be familiar to all of the American people.

The tragedy at Pearl Harbor occurred immediately after the break up of a conference with the Japanese leaders. Lest another tragedy occur in America, the Secretary of Defense, undoubtedly with the approval of the President, certainly as a matter of policy, upon the breakup of this conference, or observing that it was about to terminate, in any event, put this country on an air alert.

Some have suggested that President Eisenhower should have met Khrushchev with his own kind of attack, that he should have lashed back, that he should have assaulted Khrushchev with similar tactics.

Mr. President, Theodore Roosevelt a long time ago advised us to speak softly and to carry a big stick. I do not believe that President Eisenhower should have demeaned himself by adopting the method, the manner, the tactics or the language of Khrushchev. I believe he was correct in speaking with dignity at that time, and I believe he was right in showing that America had a big stick, by reason of the calling of the air alert.

I hope, if there is to be an investigation—if the Committee on Foreign Relations believes such an investigation should be had—that an investigation

will be made of American foreign policy as a whole, if the committee wishes to do so, and that such an investigation will also look into the charges which I regard as being unfounded, as being politically inspired, as being motivated by desires to be either President or Secretary of State.

All of these charges—some of which would appear to be reckless, unfounded, and certainly unduly deferential to the leader of the Soviet Government at this time—ought also to be included in such an investigation.

Finally, Mr. President, the Russians have asked for a hearing at the United Nations, charging the United States as an aggressor. Surely, the Russian Government should not be given ammunition by any responsible American and should not have the benefit of being able to argue that responsible Americans agree with Khrushchev that he ought to have an apology. The Russians should not have the benefit of this attitude of some people that the Russians were right and we were wrong.

It would be well, if this is to become an issue in a political campaign, that we have a moratorium on it until after the issue raised by the Russians has been fully heard in the United Nations, so that we do not furnish them with ammunition.

Mr. President, I am very glad that President Eisenhower, no matter what any other person may think, did not crawl on his belly to a bully.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator recommends that there should be a moratorium on this discussion. What puzzles me, and what I still do not understand, is why the Senator and his colleagues chose this particular time to precipitate this violent attack upon certain leaders of the Democrats. We did not open up this matter. What is the logic of the Republicans choosing Monday morning, immediately before the United Nations meeting is to consider these charges, to open up this violent partisan attack?

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to point out to the Senator from Arkansas that these remarks should not be considered violent attacks. They should be considered as rebuttal and reply to the very unfortunate statements attributed to at least two responsible leaders of the Democratic Party, including the titular head of the Democratic Party.

I seek to express, as I think surely we should express, our regret that these particular statements have been made, if in fact they were made during the past week.

I appreciate the blandness of the comment of the Senator from Arkansas, but it does not conceal who made the statements.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The statement attributed to Mr. Stevenson he has very clearly denied he made. I think a great deal was made of that.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator will permit, Mr. Stevenson has not withdrawn the statements which he made on other occasions last week within the United States in public bodies, which were publicly reported. He has merely refused to accept the quotations attributed to him in the article appearing in a French newspaper.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not wish to argue the merit of that point. It seems to me rather ill advised to begin an open and very strong attack upon the Democrats before any Member of this body, at least of whom I am aware, has tried to be critical at all.

I have not been critical. I consciously refrained from making critical comments on this subject, both when I arrived at the airport and later this morning in order that there might be a proper inquiry. I did not wish to inspire the very kind of political attack which has taken place today. I was taken aback by it. I do not think it makes it easier for us to conduct a reasonable, objective, and quiet inquiry into what has taken place.

Mr. SCOTT. I say to the Senator from Arkansas, for whom I have the highest respect, that the Senator is evidently not aware of the statement issued by the Democratic Advisory Council and approved by the membership, including a number of Senators, or the action taken by at least 12 Members of the other body, all of which contributed to initiating an unfortunate controversy.

Does the Senator from Missouri wish me to yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I understood the Senator was yielding the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON rose.

Mr. SCOTT. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and then I shall yield the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. May I express to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] the hope that he will take a good look at his language, because I know he did not mean it when he said:

> It is my hope that neither the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, nor that other candidate for the Presidency, Governor Stevenson will—either of them—brand themselves as turncoats.

Mr. SCOTT. "Turnquotes," is the phrase. I shall be glad to examine the language.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish the Senator would, because it comes close to violating the rule. The transcript reads:

> So it is my hope that they will relieve themselves of the curse of suspicion of appeasement.

I wondered if the Senator intended that language.

Mr. SCOTT. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from New Mexico, and if my language appears at any point to be intemperate, I shall be glad to revise it in accordance with my own better judgment, if it seems necessary.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator will withdraw his remarks with respect to Adlai Stevenson and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I will be glad to withdraw mine.

Mr. SCOTT. I must decline the offer of my friend from Missouri. The remarks of Adlai Stevenson and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] appeared in the public press and unfortunately cannot now be withdrawn.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I then ask unanimous consent that the reporter read into the RECORD the statement made by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield the floor?

Mr. SCOTT. I wish to address the same question to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] which was addressed to me by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and that is: Is the Senator rising on a question of personal privilege?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am not rising on a question of personal privilege.

Mr. SCOTT. Then I will yield the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the stenographic record be read at this point to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the reporter will bring in the transcript.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What particular part of the transcript is to be read?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The part which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and I requested to be brought to the floor of the Senate with respect to the remarks about the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and former Gov. Adlai Stevenson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the clerk reading the transcript as described? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read it.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> I might also add, in connection with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, as reported in the Portland Oregonian, that the Senator himself said:
>
> "Khrushchev laid down two conditions to President Eisenhower for going on with the summit meeting. One was to apologize. I think that might have been possible to do."
>
> Then the quotation goes on to other matters.
>
> The report in the Oregonian is that:
>
> "Later KENNEDY modified the word 'apologize,' and said the President might 'express regret.'"
>
> It is my hope that neither the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts nor that other candidate for the Presidency, Governor Stevenson, will—either one of them—brand himself as a turncoat. So it is my hope that they will relieve themselves of the curse of suspicion of appeasement, and it is my hope that the unity, which started out so well in support of the President and in support of the administration, may somehow be found again.
>
> But as Mr. Farley has so well said, he has no part in the appeasement process as exemplified by the unfortunate statement of Governor Stevenson.
>
> He said it did not represent his views and that "the most charitable explanation of

such irresponsibility, presumption, and discourtesy is that his English was poor and my French no better."

Mr. SCOTT. I believe the clerk is still reading from my statement, but I call attention to the fact that the word is "turnquote."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the RECORD has been read to my satisfaction at this point, and unless the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would like to have the reading continued, I wish no further part of the RECORD read.

Mr. SCOTT. I request that no further portion of the RECORD be read.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I have not heard the debate except in the last few minutes. I shall make some comment on my own time shortly. My parliamentary inquiry is this: Is it proposed that the RECORD be changed in any way from what was stated on the floor of the Senate today?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No. In answer to the inquiry of my friend from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I state that the reverse is now true.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wished to suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania that the term "turncoat" is an unfortunate term, and also the expression "suspicion of appeasement" is an unfortunate term, and I expressed the hope that those terms might be modified.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. May terms spoken on the floor of the Senate, no matter how unfortunate they may be, but nevertheless spoken in debate, be changed by the spokesman or withdrawn by the spokesman in the absence of unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). I am advised by the Parliamentarian that a Senator may correct an error which may have been made, but he may not substantially change the context.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Chair advise the Senator from Oregon the definition of the word "error" under the ruling?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that such an error would be a misstatement, possibly a misquotation, as to the form of the statement, but not as to content.

Mr. MORSE. Not as to content.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, does the Senator wish me to yield further?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the parliamentary situation cleared up. So that the RECORD may be perfectly clear, speaking hypothetically, if a Senator makes a statement which is critical of some Government policy or some Government official and then has a second thought minutes later which causes him to wish he had not said what he had said and asks to have the matter stricken from the RECORD, does such request require unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that such a request would require unanimous consent.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Chair for the ruling, and I wish to serve notice now that I shall object to any change in today's RECORD.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President——

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to make clear, so there will be no misunderstanding concerning the remarks of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who was not present when the statement was made, that I have no intention of changing the sense or meaning of anything I have said. If I have made grammatical errors or errors of syntax, I reserve the same right which is available to other Senators to make such corrections; and I will, of course, be my own judge. I say to the Senator from Oregon, as to what changes or revisions I make, exercising the same privilege as is available to the Senator from Oregon. But I wish now to make it perfectly clear that I reject any inference that I desire to withdraw the meaning of anything that I have said.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from Pennsylvania that I made no implication that the Senator had any intention to change any of his remarks. There was a request or suggestion made that an opportunity be offered to change remarks. To that, I object. I merely wish to say that the Senator from Pennsylvania, under the rule, is free to comply with the rule, but when he says he will be his own judge as to what he will change, I say the Senate will be the final judge in case he makes a change outside the rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, for the past hour and a half we have heard a series of nonpolitical, nonpartisan statements from both sides of the aisle. All of these remarks contained suggestions about what should or should not have been done at the summit, as well as attempted to assess the blame for what was or was not done.

In making these remarks, many Members of the Senate, as well as most of the presidential candidates, have been quoted. However, in listening to these remarks, I note that one very important presidential candidate has been ignored. To my knowledge, he has not been quoted in the Senate today. Yet it is my opinion that this presidential candidate, in his speech on the floor of the Senate last week, made one of the most statesmanlike speeches which have been made in connection with the summit conference, and again, in Indianapolis, Ind., last week made another very appropriate comment, one which I believe every Member of the Senate would do well to ponder before we get too partisan.

I refer to a statement made by our majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], in which, when he was asked to assess blame for the Paris fiasco, he observed:

> Any jackass can kick down a barn, but it takes a good carpenter to build one.

[Laughter.]

ONE LESSON FROM THE SUMMIT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, an unseen but potent consideration at the summit tragedy was the administration's fiscal policy of placing expenditure ceilings above military strength.

If this administration had approached the summit conference from a position of relative strength over the Communists, the rude but shrewd Kremlin chief would have been less belligerent.

The Soviet leader, on the other hand, approached the summit with certain knowledge about:

Our small and relatively immobile ground forces with their antiquated equipment.

Their rocket and missile superiority.

Our failure to provide an airborne alert capability and the consequent vulnerability of our retaliatory strength.

Their great numerical superiority in submarines, with and without missiles.

Moreover, the Soviet leader knew that the United States would have been stronger in all of these respects if our military experts, rather than our budget bookkeepers, had been listened to.

Instead major attention has been given in this country toward feeding the American people a diet of complacency, backed up by appealing slogans.

We cannot afford to waste any time in abandoning these policies of weakness. In fact, if we do not act promptly, it may soon be too late, because, at our present pace, and under existing policies, we may find ourselves shortly in a very critical position.

Therefore, I recommend the following program now:

That the Secretary of Defense be authorized and directed, at once, to raise overall expenditure ceilings in his Department so as to carry out this program.

That the Secretary of Defense direct the removal of all overtime limitations on high priority projects and order a sharp acceleration in those projects.

That the Air Force be authorized and directed to take the procurement and crew-training actions for the SAC air alert capability which General Power recommended, and that the Congress appropriate $415 million above the budget request for that purpose.

That the Congress appropriate $360 million above the budget request for going ahead as fast as possible with the B–70 weapons system project.

That the Congress appropriate $1.3 billion over and above the budget request for acceleration of the Atlas-Titan, Minuteman, Polaris, Hound Dog, and Sky-Bolt programs.

That the Congress authorize an increase of Army personnel strength from 870,000 to 925,000, and appropriate $120 million for that purpose. In addition, that $800 million be appropriated over

and above the budget request for procurement of new equipment for the Army.

That the Congress authorize an increase of Marine personnel strength from 175,000 to 200,000 and appropriate an additional $40 million for that purpose.

That the Congress appropriate $465 million over and above the budget request for antisubmarine warfare.

The above recommendations for air alert, B–70, missiles, Army personnel, Army procurement, Marine personnel, and antisubmarine warfare would amount to $3½ billion over and above the budget request for those progams.

This total of $3½ billion is the equivalent of less than 3 days of our gross national product, and would seem to be a small contribution to greater national security in view of the threat facing the free world.

It is hoped that the recent failure of high level negotiations will awaken us to action and, to that extent, make a similar but more permanent contribution to reality than did Sputnik I when it broke the space barrier.

ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES ON THE PART OF LABOR RACKETEERS AND MANAGEMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, during the course of the hearings of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, we have on numerous occasions communicated with local law enforcement authorities when our investigations have disclosed illegal activities on the part of labor racketeers or management.

I should like to place in the RECORD an editorial of the Long Island Daily Press, dated May 17, 1960, entitled "Victory and Warning," an editorial of Newsday of the same date, entitled "A Big Victory," as well as a letter dated May 18, 1960, from the district attorney of Nassau County, N.Y., Mr. Manuel W. Levine, enclosing these editorial comments on the successful prosecution of labor racketeers who operated juke box Local 266 of the Teamsters Union.

Both the officials of this union and the owners of a juke box company were convicted of conspiracy. The officials of this local were also convicted on charges of coercion and extortion. These convictions were hailed by the newspapers as a great victory on the side of law enforcement.

I may say that much of the information upon which these prosecutions were based was developed by the Senate select committee.

I wish to commend and congratulate Mr. Manuel W. Levine, the district attorney of Nassau County, N.Y., for the monumental accomplishment of securing convictions of these racketeers after a trial which lasted for 3½ months.

The district attorney in his letter pointed out that it was unfortunate that some of the defendants were freed from prosecution due to inability of the prosecutor to introduce into evidence certain wiretaps which would have proved them guilty of a crime.

I understand that had they been permitted to use wiretap evidence which was available to them, in all probability all these defendants would have been convicted. Those who escaped, escaped upon that one technicality.

These were taps made pursuant to New York State laws and pursuant to a New York State court order. Some States, such as New York State, have enacted laws to enable their enforcement agencies to intercept communications under proper safeguards and to eliminate the dangers of promiscuous and improper use. In New York, for example, the enforcement agencies must apply to the court of highest original jurisdiction for a warrant to permit the interceptions. This warrant is only granted when the court is satisfied that reasonable grounds exist that evidence of crimes will be obtained as a result of the wiretap.

The inability to introduce these wiretaps stems from the decisions in the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in the case of People against O'Rourke, which follows the decisions in the *United States* v. *Benanti* (355 U.S. 96).

In its decision, the Supreme Court ruled wiretap evidence obtained by State officers under authority of a State law was inadmissible in the Federal courts. The language of the decision left a cloud on the right of States to legally authorize law-enforcement agencies to obtain court warrants to intercept communications under proper safeguards.

The lower courts—People against O'Rourke—have followed the line laid down by the Supreme Court and have indicated that, while not enjoining the State courts, the introduction of wiretap evidence by State officials in State courts would be in violation of section 605, Federal Communications Act of 1934, and thus would constitute a crime.

The district attorney pointed out that the inability to use wiretaps in local law-enforcement cases is a severe blow to the side of law and order. He expressed the hope that Congress would be able to do something in this session so that one of our most effective tools against bigtime racketeers and hoods would not have been removed.

On January 16, 1958, shortly after the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the Benanti case, I introduced a bill, S. 3013—85th Congress, 2d session—amending section 605 of the Communications Act, to clarify the right of State law enforcement agencies to use wiretaps to uncover evidence of the commission of serious crimes.

The Supreme Court in the Benanti case did not rule on constitutional questions. The decision was based solely on the interpretation of the intention of Congress when it passed section 605 of the Federal Communications Act of 1934, which declares:

> No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person.

It is my belief that Congress, in the enactment of section 605, never intended to cripple and hamper law enforcement agencies in their efforts to stamp out crime and punish criminals.

When I introduced S. 3013, I predicted that the detection, investigation, and prosecution of crime, particularly organized crime, would be seriously handicapped and weakened by the Supreme Court decision that is proving to be true. In many cases, prosecution and investigation of crimes would be completely thwarted and would collapse were wiretapping to be denied to the law enforcement agencies.

Recent developments show that the court decisions have created an intolerable situation and that there are many cases pending in the courts which the district attorneys' offices cannot prosecute because of the strictures against the introduction of wiretap evidence.

It is my contention that Congress has never intended that it permit the criminal to use the modern means of communication with impunity, or that it intended to enjoin law enforcement agencies from intercepting these communications.

To accept a contrary interpretation would mean that Congress would permit criminals a free license to use telephone communications in the commission of crimes without fear of detection, and thus provide them with a "privileged sanctuary." I say again, this is an interpretation that I cannot accept, and that it is one Congress should correct by appropriate legislation.

In the field of criminal detection and prosecution, the law enforcement agencies are constantly waging a war against criminals who attack society. To do so effectively, it is necessary and essential to intercept their communications.

The Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and Representative CELLER introduced, respectively, S. 3340, and H.R. 11589, on April 6, 1960, and with certain minor changes, these are bills which follow almost the exact language of S. 3013, except that they amend title 18 of the United States Code rather than the Federal Communications Act of 1934.

I feel that these are all good bills and I strongly urge that action be taken to pass one of them and give law enforcement agencies a tool to prevent crime instead of affording the criminal element a haven and refuge from detection and prosecution. I have read with appreciation the statements made by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] on April 20, 1960. I am impressed with the almost unanimous support granted in editorial comments of the New York Mirror of April 16, 1960; the New York Herald Tribune of April 15, 1960; the New York Times of April 16, 1960; the New York Journal-American of April 16, 1960; the New York Daily News of April 16, 1960; and the Rochester Times-Union of March 22, 1960, all of which are set

forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 20, 1960, pages 8306 and 8307.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will give attention to and take action on these measures before adjournment.

Mr. President, may I have a ruling on my unanimous-consent request to have certain material which I have heretofore offered printed in the RECORD?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter and articles will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter and articles are as follows:

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY
OF NASSAU COUNTY,
Mineola, N.Y., May 18, 1960.

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: On Friday, May 13, 1960, a Nassau County jury convicted three union officials of Teamster Local 266, "a jukebox local," of conspiracy, coercion, and extortion. The three officers convicted were Joseph De Grandis, president, Frank de Forte, vice president, and Ernest Zundel, secretary-treasurer. In addition thereto, two jukebox operators, Eugene Jacob and Herbert Jacob, coowners of the Nu-Way Vending Machine Co., were convicted of conspiracy.

The result was hailed by the press as a victory for the decent people of this county and two newspapers circulated in Nassau County, Newsday and the Long Island Daily Press, had editorials.

I feel, Senator, that both you and your committee are deserving a great deal of the credit, since the minutes of your hearings were a great part of the base which we used as a jumping-off place for our investigation. In fact, I consider this to be an example of the proper cooperation between the agencies of the Federal Government such as yours and the law-enforcement officials who have the burden of the prosecution on the local level. I might say, a most effective combination when employed.

It is unfortunate that some of the defendants were let out, but it is my considered opinion and that of my staff, that the primary reason for this was our inability to introduce wire taps, the result of a ruling of our county judge after the decision of the U.S. circuit court of appeals in *People* v. *O'Rourke, et al.*

I might add, the inability to use wire taps in local law enforcement is a severe blow and I sincerely hope that Congress will be able to do something in this session so that one of our most effective tools against big-time racketeers and hoods will not have been removed.

I want to thank you for the very gracious and generous statements you made to me and to the press and once again I am sure I speak for the people of Nassau County when I say we are deeply grateful to you and to your congressional committee for the help and cooperation we received.

Your very truly,
MANUEL W. LEVINE,
District Attorney.

[From Newsday]

A BIG VICTORY

"This shows the underworld goons that they can't set up paper unions out here."

The words are those of Nassau County District Attorney Manny Levine, but the sentiments are those of every decent citizen after yesterday's happy ending to the marathon jukebox rackets trial.

The conviction—and stiff sentences that can follow—of three top Teamster officials in local 266 should prove that "paper" unionism is no basis for coercion and extortion by the goons who run such phony unions. Yesterday's verdict, after 23 hours of deliberation by the jury can result in 17-year sentences for Joseph de Grandis, Frank de Forte, and Ernest Zundel, the three officials of the local.

This knockout blow against paper unions could not come at a better time. Following the directed acquittal of Teamster boss John J. O'Rourke last month, there were those who doubted the goons could be convicted. Yesterday's verdict erased those doubts as emphatically as it should erase the jukebox racket in Nassau County, a racket first exposed by Newsday.

Levine, prosecutor William Cahn and the staff of assistants who worked hard for 18 months deserve the cheers they are getting today.

[From Long Island Daily Press, May 17, 1960]

VICTORY AND WARNING

The convictions of three officers of the so-called jukebox local on charges of extortion, coercion, and conspiracy should be a warning to all who would misuse organized labor's good name to prey on others.

These three Teamster Union Local 266 officials—Joseph DeGrandis, Frank DeForte, and Ernest Zundel—face prison terms of 17 years each. Two jukebox operators, convicted on a conspiracy count wtih them, face a year in jail.

The now famous trial, which ran 3½ months, stemmed from the shakedown of a tavern jukebox owner by the use of illegal picketing to extract dues.

Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Rackets Committee, has hailed the convictions as a monumental accomplishment. Honest working people everywhere agree. Our congratulations to Nassau District Attorney Manuel W. Levine, Assistant District Attorney William Cahn, who presented the State's case, and the able staff.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS TO CLAIR R. McCOLLOUGH

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, recently my attention was called to an address delivered by Mr. Clair R. McCollough early last month at the convention of the National Association of Broadcasters, held in Chicago.

It was at this gathering that Mr. McCollough received the 1960 Distinguished Service Award.

For the information of the Senate, Mr. McCollough is the president and general manager of the Steinman stations, and resides in Lancaster, Pa.

The Distinguished Service Award was conferred on Mr. McCollough for a 30-year "record of industry citizenship unique in the annals of broadcasting." The award citation noted that he had served with distinction as a board and committee member of the association and had never failed to respond when called on for organizational tasks requiring the utmost skill. Additionally, the citation saluted him for being a broadcaster who "has directed the stations and under his management in a manner consistent with the highest ideals of the broadcasting profession."

Believing that Mr. McCollough's address will be of much interest to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE KEYS TO STABILITY IN BROADCASTING: PERFORMANCE, GOOD PRACTICES, UNITY OF PURPOSE

(Address by Clair R. McCollough, president and general manager, the Steinman Stations at the 38th Annual Convention of the National Association of Broadcasters, Chicago, Ill., April 4, 1960)

I am pleased and gratified to receive the Distinguished Service Award which is being conferred by my fellow broadcasters of the National Association of Broadcasters.

The award itself traditionally notes the contributions which it is said the recipient has made to the industry and the association.

Such contributions as I have made over the past 30 years would not have been possible without the loyalty and endeavor of my associates in the Steinman Stations as well as my longtime friends and fellow broadcasters throughout the industry. I see many of these faces in the audience today.

Upon this occasion I also recall many other broadcasters whose names were synonymous with industry leadership at the time I started in broadcasting—fine men who are not here because they did not live long enough or retired too soon to see their industry emerge from the age of the pioneer into the age of the plaque.

I think of them often, as do many of you: Chuck Myer, Al McCosker, Johnny Gillin, Arthur Church, Harold Ryan, Harry Shaw, Deac Aylesworth, Ed Klauber, Don Lee, Joe Maland, Edgar Bill, Gene O'Fallon, and Paul Kesten.

There are others—too numerous to mention, too worthy to forget.

Looking through our family album, the names and faces of these people can be related to classic experiences in broadcasting—industry adventures that contributed to the tedious process of carving an important social and economic institution out of the raw stone of invention.

This has been done before, but never quite so quickly nor under such pressure as has attended the growth of broadcasting. It has been done in transportation, in the printed media, in education and in government—but never at such intense speed.

In truth, the evolution has been so swift that yesterday's problems—and yes, yesterday's passions—sometimes are forgotten in the welter of current events.

Most of the vexing problems we have today, we have had before—in one degree or another.

The problem of freedom of speech.

The problem of industry standards.

The problem of legislative investigations.

The problem of regulatory ills.

The problem of advertising surveillance.

The problem of music licensing fees.

The problem of trade practices such as rate juggling, trade deals, competitive policies.

The problem of rigging, payola and perhaps others that have been overlooked by the overseers—phenomena not peculiar to us.

We have had them and—to the extent that law and custom allow—we have made prodigious efforts as an industry to solve them ourselves; to resist the assistance of Government which so frequently, as now, has been offered.

The most effective effort we have put forward in every direction has been through this association, the NAB.

A moment ago I mentioned the names of some of those who were responsible for starting this association, some of those who carried on its work through the difficult days

of the 1920's and early 1930's. Many broadcasters of this same period are still active today.

But with increasing frequency, the baton is being passed to younger men who have more recently entered the field of broadcasting and are taking up the burdens of the NAB.

These young executives represent, in conservative estimate, a clear majority of the Nation's licensees.

By way of confession, I should like to say that I have participated, on occasion, in informal discussions with some of my fellow broadcasters about this influx of young executive talent—this vast homesteading rush onto the reservation which for so long a time has been a more or less private preserve.

There have been remarks, about "Johnny-come-latelies," the "new order of confusion" and similar expressions. It is a truism that elders in their wisdom frequently look upon the young with annoyance tempered by compassion.

BROADCASTING'S NEW GENERATION

But there they came after the late great conflict—this new generation—casting aside their wartime uniforms and acquiring broadcast licenses in all manner of communities around the Nation.

Their enthusiasm and their well-intended zeal have led, at times, to a certain amount of fretful grumbling among their fellow broadcasters.

More recently I have noticed, however, and perhaps you have, too, the emergence from this group of numerous highly intelligent, public spirited, successful broadcasters upon whom must rest the responsibility for the profession's future.

Thus today, presuming upon the prerogatives of tenure, if not of talent, I should like to address a few remarks to three general subjects, in this order: (1) Our trade practices, (2) our performance before the public, and (3) our national association.

It may be that the most important activities in American broadcasting, other than legislative and regulatory, fall within these three general categories.

A PERIOD OF ADJUSTMENT

As we know, any human pursuit, whether in industry, or in art and letters, in government or in education, must undergo a period of adjustment through experience before it stabilizes.

This "experience cycle" in broadcasting has not reflected a steady, predictable curve.

Just prior to World War II, we had reached a comfortable plateau. There was limited competition within radio itself and a consequent prosperity that assured good programing and acceptable advertising.

This placid situation was disrupted, of course, by the postwar radio stampede and the astonishing growth of television; by the consequent changing patterns in broadcast programing; by the dislocation of radio network economy and by the unrestrained performance of some of the newcomers in their anxiety to capture audience and revenue by whatever means at their disposal.

Thus, during the last 15 years, we have found ourselves engaged in a frantic and occasionally untidy search for economic and regulatory equilibrium.

Changing fortunes in radio and allocation problems in television have attended this struggle.

In the subsequent scramble for position—and even, in some cases, for survival—there have been harmful doings.

CONSTRUCTIVE COMPETITION INSTEAD OF GUERRILLA WARFARE

In far too many instances within our own industry, the pursuit of stability and reasonable prosperity has taken on the character of guerrilla warfare, rather than hard-hitting constructive competition.

We have moved from the enervating period of rate cutting to the far more dangerous situation where some radio stations do not have established rates.

Indeed, manifestations of the same practice are now appearing in television.

Are we, in truth, such poor businessmen that we do not know how to price our product and stay with the decision?

Are we not, through such practices, depicting ourselves before our fellow businessmen and advertisers as immature, if not worse?

Quiz rigging and payola per se are not the major shortcomings with which we must contend.

These are symptoms of something deeper—symptoms of certain business malpractices whose only cure is self-treatment.

Among the fundamental, underlying ills of broadcasting are rate manipulations, trade deals, downgrading the competition in our own media and kindred activities.

Until we cure them—and we can only cure them individually, not in concert—we run the continuing risk of loss of advertiser confidence.

More disturbing than that, however, is the greater peril of attracting to our industry the charlatans, the dealmakers, the unprincipled who, by erosion through the years, can destroy the confidence of the public itself.

What I would suggest as a corrective measure is not easy to accomplish. It requires courage, determination, a high sense of business values, and a certain amount of moral rearmament.

AN INVENTORY FOR THE AUDIENCE

All of us should take inventory of our business practices.

Do we have a profit and loss statement for the listeners and viewers we serve as well as for our auditors?

Are we selling a valuable service—or are we bartering it?

Are we selling a valuable service—or are we auctioning it?

Please count me among the first to resist to the wall any effort by Government, or any other outside agency, to dictate our policies, our programs, or our profits.

But nonetheless I think it is time for something more than causal circumspection. It is time for intensive self-inspection.

If such self-inspection, accompanied by thoughtful and determined action, is undertaken by individual broadcasters, then we may attain more surely the stability of business practice that underlies the whole process of sound free enterprise.

STRENGTH AT THE FOUNDATION

In the absence of such strength at the foundation of the broadcasting economy, we may expect further depredations of one sort or another—and consequent injury to our defenses against our detractors.

We must remember always, it seems to me, that individual action is not alone sufficient to the purpose.

In those areas where custom dictates and the law permits us to act in concert, we must allow no abridgement. The broadcasting industry must place great stress upon this "oneness" factor in the days that lie ahead.

Thus, in related context, I would like to speak briefly about the National Association of Broadcasters.

What is a trade association? It is an organization of institutions or individuals, or both, gathered together to pursue common objectives and defend the principles for which its membership stands.

The National Association of Broadcasters was organized right here in Chicago. At that time, the organization included 16 members and the common objective was to do something about music copyright fees. This was a reasonably uncomplicated objective, but not so uncomplicated that it has gone away. It was the first objective but not, by any means, the last.

Since that time, the industry has increased in broadcasting units in the nature of 842 percent and the Association membership in the order of 850 percent. The number of objectives has increased in no less startling manner.

Over the years, the association has encountered and contended with such problems as freedom of speech, tax legislation, industry standards, copyright quarrels, regulatory ills, political broadcasting, editorializing, labor problems, engineering complications, research ventures, and others far too numerous to relate.

NAB FOLLOWS DEMOCRACY'S PATTERN

An association, such as ours, follows the pattern of democracy itself. At times, its members may find it cumbersome and unwieldy. The frustrations that grow out of organized action in a system dedicated to freedom are caused by the very virtue which spawns the system itself—action by consent.

Broadcasting is a large and complicated business, multifaceted in its problems, populated by an extraordinary potpourri of humanity; performers, administrators, salesmen, newsmen, engineers, inventors, legislators, regulators, financiers, and many others. To obtain consent on any given problem in such a complex is a tedious, time-consuming task.

Therefore, it sometimes may seem that the NAB mills are grinding slowly—when indeed they really are, through the orderly chaos of membership soundings, committee recommendations, board actions, and staff implementation.

In any lag that exists between incubation of a problem and unified effort to obtain a solution, some may become impatient and place upon the executors of policy unusual and unfair burdens—when they themselves, the members, are frequently responsible for the lag through inaction or disinterest.

HUMAN RESERVES OUTWEIGH CASH RESERVES

Cash reserves are not as important as human reserves in the success of an association. If the new order of broadcasters will remember this and act upon it, the NAB will grow ever more effective.

There is a trace of dissension among some of you about the multiplicity of organizations in present-day broadcasting.

Besides the NAB, there are the Radio Advertising Bureau, the Television Bureau of Advertising, the Television Information Office, the Clear Channel Broadcasters Association, the Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, the Regional Broadcasters Committee, the Community Broadcasters Association, the National Association of FM Broadcasters, the Daytime Broadcasters Association, 48 State associations and perhaps others.

We need not be perplexed by this situation. It is a known fact that there are more associations in the newspaper business, than there are in ours, and yet the newspaper industry is much less fractionated.

Each of our associations, many of which were generated by the NAB itself, has a specialized job to perform and each is doing it well. The NAB remains the single organization of unquestioned mutual interest to all of us. In the sensitive task of dealing with Government as well as public and economic relations and a myriad of other day-to-day problems, it excels.

If you are among those who, in an occasional moment of doubt, question the vitality of the NAB, listen:

In July of 1937, the NAB Standards of Good Practice for Radio Broadcasters were promulgated.

On March 4, 1941, ASCAP signed the consent decree.

On March 7, 1946, the blue book was issued and fought to extinction by the NAB.

On April 16, 1946, the Lea amendment to the Communications Act outlawing featherbedding in the music field was adopted by the Congress.

On July 1, 1949, the Mayflower decision was rescinded.

On March 1, 1952, the television code was promulgated.

I could continue this list for the next hour.

You name it; the NAB was there.

You could pay your dues to the NAB from now on for the rest of your natural life and still owe money on the obligation.

The NAB performs the most essential function of any organization in broadcasting. Yet, at times, the impossible is expected of it. There are those who would have the NAB negotiate their union contracts; try their cases before the FCC; rebuke their competition and explain their audience ratings.

Times have changed. The NAB cannot be all things to all people. It has a prescribed course and must be what it set out to be—an organization devoted to the advancement of its members' objectives and a protection for their interests. These objectives and these interests must exist in a climate untainted by program interference or any other kind of artificial intrusion.

If we cannot be together on these essentials, in one single forum, regardless of our individual broadcasting problems, we might as well surrender now.

And, if you will forgive a personal allusion to old friends, in this time of your generous tribute to me as their courier, we might as well dismiss the principles for which they fought so valiantly through the years, not alone in their own interest, but in the interest of the public as well.

Broadcasting is a vital industry that demands the capacities of vigorous men with originality, courage, and a dauntless determination to unite in purpose and in action.

STRENGTH OF PURPOSE AND INTEGRITY

We must value self-respect highly, not alone in our conduct before the public, but also in our conduct among ourselves; we must lend to our associated activity the same strength of purpose and integrity of character that we should and must espouse in our own communities.

I, for one, am satisfied that those who hold such beliefs will firmly fix the conditions of broadcasting in the future, and, as our industry marches along the road to destiny, good broadcasters will far outnumber those who do not care.

THE ROLL OF HONOR

The Distinguished Service Award of the National Association of Broadcasters was instituted in 1953 as the Keynote Award. The award was given its present name in late 1959.

Previous recipients were:

In 1959: Robert W. Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the National Broadcasting Co.

In 1958: Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.

In 1957: The Honorable Herbert C. Hoover, former President of the United States.

In 1956: Robert E. Kintner, then president of the American Broadcasting Co.

In 1955: Mark Ethridge, publisher of the Courier-Journal and Louisville Times and a former NAB president.

In 1954: William S. Paley, chairman of the board of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.

In 1953: Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, then chairman of the board of the National Broadcasting Co.

CONDEMNATION BY THE NEW HAMPSHIRE STATE COUNCIL OF CARPENTERS, AFL–CIO, OF THE SALE AND DISTRIBUTION OF OBSCENE AND OBJECTIONABLE MATERIAL

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, because of my cosponsorship of Senate Joint Resolution 160 in regard to obscene literature, and my deep concern in this matter, I have been greatly heartened by the public response which indicates a general concern, without which legislative action is almost impossible. Indicative of public reaction is Resolution 11, passed by the New Hampshire State Council of Carpenters at their eighth annual convention on April 16, 1960.

I certainly wish to commend the New Hampshire State Council of Carpenters for their forthright expression on this matter, and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may, at this point, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 11

Whereas being publicly mindful of the general increase in the sale and distribution of obscene matter on the newsstands and through the mails, and the showing of indecent pictures and programs on the cinema and television screens; and

Whereas the continuous dissemination of this objectionable material has contributed more than anything else in an alarming increase of adult and juvenile delinquency; and

Whereas a condition of this nature being allowed to continue without repression will bring about a general demoralization of our people, thereby making our country vulnerable to attack by an enemy that has sworn to destroy and eradicate from this earth, the Judeo-Christian concept of society; and

Whereas mindful of the many unsuccessful attempts in the past to stop this flow of obscenity in our midst: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates of the New Hampshire Council of Carpenters in its eighth annual convention assembled, do and hereby go on record favoring and supporting the establishment of a statewide committee which will seek to devise ways and means to:

1. Seek the cooperation of all store owners, theater operators and television program directors to sell, distribute and show only decent and wholesome literature, pictures and programs.

2. Refuse to patronize or encourage any establishment that will continue to sell, distribute and show obscene material; and furthermore, be it

Resolved, That we commend and support all those individuals, organized groups, newspaper editors, and public officials who have undertaken a mission to combat obscenity; and be it also

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to General Postmaster Summerfield, to U.S. Senator H. Styles Bridges, to Mr. William Loeb, publisher of the Union-Leader, and to Hon. J. T. Benoit, editor of L'Action.

CONQUERING THE PAST

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, British Army bulletins of 1918 tell of a certain Colonel Elkington, who in the early part of the war was cashiered from the army for conduct unbecoming an officer. The public dispatches do not state the nature of this misconduct, but the inference is that it was cowardice in the face of the enemy.

The disgraced man, with his name dropped from the rolls of the British Army, went back to Paris, assumed another name, and enlisted in the Foreign Legion. Wherever the men of the legion went into action, this man was conspicuous for his daring and gallantry. After one of his feats of heroism he was decorated by the Government of France. In some way his real identity was disclosed, and the facts were brought to the attention of the British Government. His commission was given back to him; and, resuming his name and title, he again joined his old regiment at the front. By wounds and daring and fidelity he won back the honors and the rank that cowardice had forfeited him.

Start where you stand and never mind the past;
The past won't help you in beginning new.
If you are done with it at last,
Why, that's enough. You're done with it, you're through;
This is another chapter in the book,
This is another race that you have planned.
Don't give the vanished days a backward look—
Start where you stand.

The world won't care about your old defeats.
If you can start anew and win success,
The future is your time, and time is fleet,
And there is much of work and strain and stress;
Forget the buried woes and dead despairs.
Here is a brand-new trial right at hand;
The future is for him who does and dares—
Start where you stand.

Old failures will not halt, old triumphs aid;
Today's the thing, tomorrow soon will be;
Get in the fight and face it, unafraid,
And leave the past to ancient history.
What has been, has been; yesterday is dead,
And by it you are neither blessed nor banned;
Take courage, man, be brave and drive ahead—
Start where you stand!

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 44. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6779. An act to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable contributions for certain individuals).

A FOREIGN POLICY FOR THE 1960's—ADDRESS BY SENATOR AIKEN BEFORE WORLD AFFAIRS COUNCIL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on May 20 the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] delivered an address entitled "A Foreign Policy for the 1960's," before the

World Affairs Council in Boston. It is an excellent statement of the problems which confront us in the years ahead and sets forth a sound philosophy for dealing with them effectively. In this statement, the distinguished Senator, who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, reveals once again the deep human wisdom and the sound grasp of world affairs which mark him as an exceptional leader of this body, beyond party, in matters pertaining to our relations with other nations.

I should like to direct the attention of the Senate to the very fine address previously referred to, and therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FOREIGN POLICY FOR THE 1960'S

(Address by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, at the World Affairs Council annual meeting, Boston, Mass., May 20, 1960.)

It is my good fortune to be able to spend this time between planes with you this afternoon. I was very glad indeed to accept the invitation of my friend, Chris Herter, Jr.

I approach my assignment, however, with some diffidence and trepidation, not only because of the formidable requirements of the subject but also because of the formidable qualifications of the audience.

Massachusetts has traditionally been at the center of American involvement in world affairs. It has supplied—and is today supplying, perhaps more than ever before—some of our most notable practitioners of diplomacy. I need cite only three or four examples among the many which come to mind, beginning, of course, with the Secretary of State himself, who is bringing grace and distinction to one of the most difficult offices in our Government.

Mention should also be made of Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., at the United Nations, and Ambassador John Moors Cabot, in Brazil, who are ably representing us under circumstances that are rarely easy, often trying, and sometimes impossible. Also we are very fortunate to have Dick Wigglesworth representing us in Ottawa.

I understand your own group here is getting a Peabody Award this year for your excellent television series entitled "Decisions 1960." You indeed deserve the greatest commendation for this effort, because the basic decisions which will determine our foreign policy for the 1960's cannot be made solely by the State Department or even by the State Department and the Congress.

They must be made by the American people, and they will be sound only to the degree that the people have the intelligent insight which is necessary.

In my discussion this afternoon I do not intend to let the events of the last 3 weeks—crucial as they are—divert me from the announced subject of my talk—"A Foreign Policy for the 1960's."

There is no doubt but what incidents influence the course of history, and the incidents of the last few days may be no exception to that premise.

However, until we know more about the circumstances surrounding the capture of the U–2 and its pilot by the Russians, and until we know more about the reasoning back of Mr. Khrushchev's determination to scuttle the summit conference, we must regard these incidents for what they are and not at this time undertake to use them as the basis for a totally new foreign policy.

Although the climate in which our foreign relations are conducted is obviously different this month from what it was last month, the framework for those relations is not, I think, essentially or fundamentally changed. We make a great mistake if we change our basic policy every time Mr. Khrushchev changes from a smile to a scowl or vice versa. We ought not to be diverted from our essential purpose by the ups and downs of this remarkable character's blood pressure.

Personally, I do not believe that the events of recent weeks will have a cataclysmic effect upon the Western World. While the collapse of the summit conference is indeed regrettable it may serve to put the relationship of the Communists and the Western World in a clearer and less illusory perspective.

The ease with which unarmed American planes have been able to penetrate the vaunted impregnable air defenses of Russia is more likely to produce a radically profound effect upon the Government of Russia.

Therefore, I feel that our long-range purpose will best be served by sticking to my original subject, "A Foreign Policy for the 1960's."

However, I shall not be so presumptuous this afternoon as the title of these remarks indicates. I shall not leave you, at the end of this talk, with a neat blueprint of our foreign policy over the next decade.

I shall, however, attempt to set up some broad guidelines and especially to deal with the factors which our foreign policy will have to take into account. It seems to me that an understanding of these factors is the first prerequisite.

There are limits to foreign policy. It is not omnipotent. We cannot order the world to our liking. A realistic foreign policy must, therefore, have limited objectives.

In making foreign policy, we are not given clear choices between black and white, but among various shades of gray; and the problem is to produce the lightest possible shade of gray from a mix into which somebody else is assiduously pouring all the black pitch he can lay hands on.

Robert Browning wrote that "The common problem—yours, mine, every one's—is not to fancy what were fair in life provided it could be, but finding first what may be, then find out to make it fair up to our means."

This is the problem we face—not how to bring about the millenium by 1970, but how to make the 1960's "fair up to our means." It is a problem, really, of how to turn history to our advantage. We cannot repeal history, nor can we reverse the forces which are dominant in the world today. But if we have the wisdom and patience, it may be that we can shape and influence those forces so that they work more to our advantage and less to our disadvantage.

We have to take the world as we find it and then do the best we can to strengthen what is in our interests and to minimize what is opposed to our interests. The dominant forces at work in the world in this decade of the 1960's set forth in no particular order of importance, are these:

First, the growth of nationalism in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Second, and closely related in the same areas, the demand for economic development.

Third, the economic strength of Western Europe and the trend there toward economic integration, possibly to be followed by political federation.

Fourth, the industrial growth of the Soviet Union and Communist China.

Fifth, the pace of technological and scientific change throughout the world, but especially in North America, Western Europe, and the Soviet Union.

These add up, I suggest, to a fundamental shift in the position of the United States in the world compared with so short a period as 20 years ago.

I do not want to become involved here in the argument over whether the United States is in danger of becoming a second-rate power. This argument misses the essential point, which is that the world is going through a period of revolutionary change, the like of which has not been seen in at least 200 years. It is stating no more than what should be the obvious to say that in such a period changes inevitably occur and revisions are consequently called for in our attitude and approach.

Americans, of all people, have no cause to be alarmed by revolution. Indeed, of the five forces which I mentioned as being involved in the current world revolution, the United States bears a substantial responsibility for four.

The only one to which we have not made a significant contribution is the industrial growth of the Soviet Union and Communist China, and even here we have unavoidably contributed something in the form of accumulated technological know-how which is freely available in any library or university of the West.

The 20th-century drive of nationalism in Asia, Africa, and Latin America is largely fueled on French and American philosophical writings of the 18th century and frequently seeks to build parliamentary institutions modeled on those developed in 19th century Britain.

The demand for economic development was triggered at least in part of the comforts of home which American GI's scattered over the world in 1941–45. It draws at least part of its force from the technology of modern communications which provide an irresistible demonstration of how the favored one-fifth of the human race lives.

The economic strength of Western Europe is largely a tribute to the Europeans' own work and ingenuity, but a significant part of it is the result of the Marshall plan. It should also be remembered that from the beginning of the Marshall plan the United States pointedly and repeatedly has encouraged greater European integration.

Finally, the research and development which is the basis of the technological revolution has been largely carried out, at least until recent years, in the United States and Western Europe.

It is one of the curiosities of our time that, now that we have started all this, some Americans have a tendency to recoil aghast from what we have done as though we have unleashed a Frankenstein on the world and on ourselves.

This is hardly a proper frame of mind from which to approach our problems. Like Disraeli, "I have ever been of the opinion that revolutions are not to be evaded." We cannot evade this one, nor could we have prevented it even if we had tried.

I am reminded of a member of the ruling oligarchy with whom I talked in a rather turbulent foreign country some months ago. "Our trouble here," this gentleman explained to me, "comes from the fact that we have taught too many people to read."

Of course, when people read, they get ideas, and my informant made it very plain that he found many of these ideas distasteful. The United States has nothing to be afraid of, so far as ideas are concerned.

In the field of economics, you will recall, Gresham's law holds that bad money drives good out of circulation. Well, in the field of ideology, I hold that the opposite applies and that good ideas drive bad out of circulation.

And I have enough faith in American ideas not to be afraid of competition. I also have enough realism to know that, if we are going to survive competition, we have to compete. We can't win wars, hot or cold by waiting for the other fellow to fall on his face.

So, it is quite clear that as far as Asia, Africa, and Latin America are concerned, the primary task of our foreign policy in the

1960's is to protect the nationalist revolution, with its subsidiary social and economic aspects, from the scavengers, whether of the Communist left or the totalitarian right.

This is not an easy task, because the nature of nationalism is such that it resists any kind of external influence, even a beneficent, protective one. On the whole, however, we have not done badly; and as we grow in experience, we can reasonably expect to do better.

I turn now to the problems posed for us by the wholly new situation in Western Europe resulting from the Common Market and the still unresolved relationships between the Common Market, the Outer Seven, and ourselves.

The Common Market is, in part, as I have said, an American creation. It may, but it need not, turn out to be an instrument of discrimination against American commerce and a means of luring American industry from the United States to Europe.

If it is not so to turn out, we had better undertake a hard reexamination of our basic trade relationships with Europe and prepare ourselves for some adjustments.

Experience indicates that the richer a country is, the better trading partner it makes for us, to our mutual benefit. It follows, therefore, that if the Common Market makes Europe richer, we should benefit on balance, but the balance will be the algebraic sum of a number of pluses and minuses.

Our job is to keep the minuses down and build the pluses up, and we should certainly not so concentrate our attention on either the plus or the minus side of the ledger that we ignore the other side and accordingly, but falsely, conclude that the Common Market is either undiluted good or unmitigated evil.

Nor can it be judged purely in economic terms. To the degree that the Common Market makes Europe a stronger and more cohesive entity, it will strengthen the whole Western World.

Equally important, it will, to the same degree, tend to reduce the bipolarity in world power relationships which we have seen growing since the beginning of the cold war between the United States and the Soviet Union.

This bipolarity, in which there are two and only two superpowers in the world, is at the root of many of the world's political tensions and contributes to the danger of inadvertent war.

Our relationship to the Soviet Union, is, of course, at the heart of our foreign policy problem for the coming decade. Here, too, we see great changes in process, the consequences of which no man can foresee.

Of this much, however, we can be certain: the Soviet Union of Khrushchev is a vastly different character from the Soviet Union of Stalin.

Now, what are the characteristics of this new creature? It has an advanced technology supported by a solid and growing base of heavy industry. It is in a position, not only to shoot rockets to the moon and Heaven knows where else, but also to export sizable amounts of capital and substantial numbers of technicians to underdeveloped countries.

Because of the emphasis which its leaders have put on heavy industry, its economy is distorted with consumer goods, housing and agriculture lagging well behind. But it has ruthlessly carried out the priorities it has assigned in its scale of values, and it has got just about what it wanted.

In the process, the Soviet economy has inexorably matured and become more sophisticated. Its inter-relationships have grown more complex. As its capacity to trade has increased, so will its dependence on trade increase.

These economic changes have been accompanied by social changes. A new elite has established itself in the form of a managerial class and the new scientists and engineers.

Education has been made universal, for all practical purposes, and though it is heavily oriented toward science and political indoctrination, the Communist oligarchy—like the oligarchy of my foreign friend whom I quoted earlier—may yet find that it has made a mistake in teaching too many people to read.

But this, if it comes, is far in the future. All we can say now is that the Soviet Union is undergoing a social evolution which has already had some political repercussions and which is bound to have more.

The net result seems to be a trend in the direction of greater conservatism. This is hopeful and should be encouraged by whatever means are at hand. These means are few and, at best, of marginal effectiveness. They include such things as reasonable trade in nonstrategic goods and greater travel by westerners to the Soviet Union and by Russians to the West.

From this point of view—as well as from others, of course—it would be greatly to our interests to be able to conclude a satisfactory disarmament agreement, even one on so modest and limited a point as the suspension of nuclear testing.

It must be admitted in the light of recent events that the prospects of reaching constructive agreements in this field have become dimmed. However, by every means at our command we must strive to convey to the Russian people the fact that we are fully desirous of continuing our efforts to promote a franker and more peaceful understanding between us.

There is some reason to believe that Mr. Khrushchev's behavior in Paris this week is a reflection of the pressures of those forces in the Soviet bloc—found principally in the army and among the Chinese Communists—which are resisting the evolutionary changes taking place in Soviet society.

To the degree that this is true, then the process of social change has been slowed, if not halted. But the dynamics of the situation are such that this slowdown is most probably temporary.

Beyond the Soviet Union, lurking ominously behind the eastern horizon, nine-tenths hidden—like an iceberg—lies Communist China, a restless, growing giant. At some point during the 1960's, we shall have to adjust our foreign policy to take account of this fact.

We shall have to put behind us the passions of 10 years ago and discuss it calmly and objectively—not in terms of appeasement or no appeasement, of a hard policy or a soft policy, but of a realistic policy.

I am not suggesting that we recognize Communist China day after tomorrow, or that we withdraw our opposition to seating Communist China in the United Nations. In fact, it would not be the part of wisdom to do either. Neither Communist China nor any other country should be permitted to blackmail its way into a respectable society of nations.

I am simply recommending that we consider, dispassionately, Communist China's place in the world and our relationship to it. This place is already important, and it is bound to become more so. There are more than 600 million Communist Chinese. Soon, there will be a billion. They are industrious, hard-working people, with their energies harnessed and driven by a ruthless regime which is out to do us no good.

It is not a wholly sufficient reaction for us to stand fast around the periphery of this mass, that is China, though certainly an important part of our policy should be to strengthen the peripheral states, especially India and Japan.

The Chinese Communist regime is not going to collapse. I doubt very much that it is going significantly to change its direction in the next decade. Its power is most likely going to continue to increase. It will have to be reckoned with sooner or later, and we will be better off for doing it sooner rather than later.

One of the interesting possibilities involved in a possible disarmament agreement with the Soviet Union is that any inspection system would have to include Communist China. This might provide an opening wedge to change the basis of United States-Chinese relations.

Although the United States and Soviet Union are agreed that Communist China would have to be included in such an agreement, it is by no means certain that the Chinese would welcome the opportunity.

On the contrary, they might very well brush it off or even resist it. That is a bridge which can be crossed only when we come to it. In the meantime, it is worthy of note that the Soviets see this particular problem the same way we do.

Although it is easy—and dangerous—to jump from a wishful thought to a premature conclusion about Soviet-Chinese relations, I cannot believe that the Soviets view the growth of Communist China with entire equanimity.

Just as it is in the interests of the Soviets to attempt to drive a wedge between the Western allies, so it would be in our interests to attempt to drive a wedge between the Communist allies. It may not be possible, and one should not expect spectacular results soon, but it is at least worth some imaginative thought and subtle effort.

I come now to the last of the five forces which I mentioned as being at work in today's world—the quickening pace of scientific and technological change.

This deserves a great deal more public discussion than it has yet received, because it is fraught with the most incalculable social implications.

It is a the bottom of the social evolution in the Soviet Union to which I alluded.

It is intimately involved in the nationalism and the demands for economic growth which we find in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

It is one of the things which makes the growth of Communist China so awesome.

It is changing the face of the world and of our own country. I am not at all sure that we have learned how to cope with it.

When technology, even rudimentary technology, comes to a primitive society, it introduces cultural changes and these can be destructive of the fabric of a traditional society, even though in the long run they result in better standards of living.

Increased agricultural production so that a farmer has a surplus to sell means the introduction of money into a subsistence economy, and this sometimes means a rather drastic rearrangement in the social hierarchy of a village.

Industrialization means at least some kind of work discipline—if nothing more than starting and quitting on time—and this frequently disrupts established cycles of work and leisure.

The more primitive the society, the less flexible it is likely to be in adjusting to changes of this sort. All of this, of course, has the most significant political implications.

By reducing the death rate through such things as DDT and antibiotics, technology is responsible for the population explosion which is one of the most dramatic factors of the decade.

Through hybridization of plants and animals, through fertilizers, and cultivation methods, it is responsible for our domestic farm surpluses and it may yet be responsible for a world food sufficiency, even taking into account the population explosion.

Through nuclear fission and thermonuclear fusion, it is responsible for the delicate balance of terror in which the human race lives, and it may yet be responsible for extinction of the human race.

Or it may—if we guide it and control it properly—be responsible for the final elimination, for all practical purposes, of human want.

Technology, in other words, is bringing us closer, at an accelerating pace, to the day when we, as human beings, will indeed have a choice between black and white.

Well, as Ralph Waldo Emerson put it in his essay, "The Scholar," "I have exhausted your patience, and I have only begun. * * * but it is so much easier to say many things than to explain one."

At the risk of exhausting your patience further, however, let me take a couple minutes to try to pull together the many things I have said, or at least talked about.

The essential point, is that in making our foreign policy for the 1960's, we have got to accommodate it to the facts of life in the world—to the nationalism of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, to the industrial power of the Soviet Union, and to the growing power of Communist China.

We cannot undo any of these things, but we can, perhaps, capitalize on the advantages of some and minimize the disadvantages of others.

We cannot do anything to make Communist China weak, but we can do something to make India and Japan strong.

We cannot do anything to keep the Soviet Union from having more scientists and engineers, but we can do a great deal to see that we have more ourselves.

We cannot do anything to quench the desire for land reform in Latin America, but we can do something to help our friends there carry it out in a responsible and democratic manner.

We might as well resign ourselves to the fact that all of this is going to require a considerable national effort and is going to cost substantial sums of money. Our taxes may go up.

The question to be decided here is not, "Can we afford it?" but "Do we want to do it badly enough?"

To sum up, my prescription for our foreign policy in the 1960's is to concentrate on doing what is feasible and to stop worrying about doing what is impossible.

And in this connection, the advice which comes to us over the ages from that wise old Greek—Demosthenes—is still sound:

"As a general marches at the head of his troops, so ought with politicians, if I dare use the expression, to march at the head of affairs; insomuch that they ought not to wait the event, to know what measure to take; but the measures which they have taken ought to produce the event."

INDUSTRIAL SLOWDOWN IN FACE OF COMMUNIST ECONOMIC CHALLENGE REQUIRES CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as the Senate considers, in these closing days, depressed-areas legislation, housing bills, and other crucial economic legislation, I suggest we take a long, careful, and thoughtful look at our economy.

The bellwether of the American economy is steel. The longest steel strike in history is only a few months behind us; but this morning's newspapers report the alarming news that in regard to the steel industry, which now is down to a shocking less than 75 percent of capacity, market experts are now expecting that the percentage rate of operations will sag to the lower 60's in June, and will probably go lower in July. This means that actual steel production may sink below that of Russia, this year.

At the same time, the National Industrial Conference Board forecast at its annual meeting was announced in this morning's newspapers as an expectation that U.S. economic growth would slow down during the next 10 years. In view of the rising pace of Communist economic expansion in Russia and China, this is deeply alarming. Mr. President, I think this economic situation indicates how urgently congressional action all along the economic front is needed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Orders for Steel Below Forecasts," which was published today in the New York Times; and an article entitled "U.S. Economic Growth To Slow Down in 1960's, Industry Leaders Say," which was published today in the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 23, 1960]

ORDERS FOR STEEL BELOW FORECASTS—MOST OFFICIALS NOW FORESEE NO BUYING SPURT AND DROP FOR MILL OPERATIONS—USERS CUT INVENTORIES—MAKERS OF APPLIANCES, CARS TRIMMING STOCKS MOST—BUILDING METAL GAINS

PITTSBURGH, May 22.—The expected slight pickup in steel order volume has not materialized and steelmakers look for a series of declines in operations. This trend may be affected temporarily by summer seasonal factors.

Most sales officials are convinced that customers do not intend to step up their buying at this time. The consensus is that many steel users will cut inventories and will continue to buy on a hand-to-mouth basis.

As expected by some of the older steel officials, the market has all the earmarks of the so-called normal markets of years past. That many steel users were able to weather the 116-day steel strike has brought a new and sobering factor into the steel market picture. There seems now to be a strong trend toward much smaller inventories than before.

USERS CUT INVENTORIES

In the last few weeks there have been warnings from steelmakers that customers might do well to take a second look at their inventories and perhaps slow the cutting. The users apparently took the second look and decided to keep going on the inventory cut. That is probably why Iron Age magazine has interpreted the low demand as presaging seasonal cuts of less than moderate proportions in the steel operating rate. Some market experts believe that the percentage rate of operations will sag to the lower 60's in June and will probably go lower in July. Most top steel officials, however, are keeping mum.

The largest cutters of steel orders have been auto and appliance manufacturers. But other steel users are quietly cutting orders and using more of their inventories.

Shipments of construction steels have improved slightly. But in many cases structural units made from steel ordered some time ago were assembled during the bad weather a few months ago. They are now being shipped. However, new structural awards have been trending slightly upward in the last few months. Part of this was said to be because of the improvement in spending for new plant and equipment.

In recent weeks tinplate users have been a little slow in releasing tinplate made and stored for shipping releases. This could mean that tinplate users—especially makers of cans—are well supplied and may be in no hurry to take in large tonnages after midyear.

GALVANIZED SHEET IN DEMAND

Galvanized sheet demand was still strong, but with the unusual capacity that has been built, there has been no tightness in the last month. That was in sharp contrast to market conditions of 3 months ago when deliveries were unusually extended and when all mills had large backlogs.

Few, if any, steel experts see increases in steel prices in the foreseeable future. The softness in prices of concrete reinforcing bars in the Southeast, the East, and the Southwest reflect strong competition with lower price foreign steels. The price change or reduction in special vacuum processed steels reported by some makers was attributable to the combination of domestic and foreign competition and decreased production costs being passed on to the customers in a highly competitive market. There was no evidence that the mill prices of regular steel products had been or were about to be affected by the "special cases" in other steels.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 23, 1960]

U.S. ECONOMIC GROWTH TO SLOW DOWN IN 1960'S, INDUSTRY LEADERS SAY—INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE BOARD TOLD BANK LOANS, STOCK PRICES WILL RISE LESS SHARPLY IN DECADE

NEW YORK.—Slower growth faces the Nation in the 1960's in several spheres of economic activity, the National Industrial Conference Board's 44th annual meeting was told.

Forecasts were presented, for example, that bank credit demand and stock market prices may rise less sharply in the present decade than in the 1950's.

John D. Wilson, vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, gave several reasons why he expects bank loan demand to be "somewhat less pressing in the 1960's." Among these factors he cited less inflation, higher bank lending charges and heavier corporate debt. Mr. Wilson expects banks to continue to be quite heavily "loaned up" in the 1960's, so that they are not likely to go after lending business as aggressively as in the past decade.

According to Regnar D. Naess, senior partner of Naess & Thomas, a securities firm, the stock market in the 1960's as a whole will show only a modest advance compared with the sharp runup in stock price averages in the 1950's. His reasons: The market in the past decade was pushed up by several special postwar factors, notably the rebuilding of Western Europe, the supply to consumers of goods cut off during the war, and the establishment of a "huge U.S. defense industry."

A number of industry-by-industry forecasts were made to the conference. One of the most optimistic was presented by a spokesman for the electronics industry, Donald C. Power, chairman of General Telephone & Electronics Corp., who predicted electronics sales and revenue would jump from $14 billion to $27.25 billion by 1970. As recently as 1950, he noted, the industry posted total receipts of only $5 billion.

E. B. Germany, president of Lone Star Steel Co., said he expects "the 10 years ahead will be difficult for U.S. steelmakers," due largely to the prospect that steel exports will decrease and imports will increase as a result of lower cost operations of foreign

competitors. He called for a stiffer industry stand on labor to promote greater efficiency and so make U.S. prices for steel more competitive in world markets.

The conference board itself predicted that the annual gross national product—total output of goods and services—would rise to nearly $800 billion by 1970, an increase of 60 percent from the present level of slightly over $500 billion. That would compare with a rise of about 65 percent to $479.5 billion during the 1950's.

The board also predicted in its survey, titled "Economic Growth in the 1960's," that the country's output per man-hour will continue to rise at a postwar rate of 3.2 percent. The board anticipates additionally, among other things, that capital spending by business for new plant and equipment will run about $58 billion annually in the 1960's, a rise from the $38 billion businessmen say they expect to spend on expansion this year.

AMENDMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived; and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2131) to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, as amended.

LIFE MAGAZINE AND NEW YORK TIMES GREAT DEBATE ON THE NATIONAL PURPOSE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, America's greatest need today, in the wake of the disaster at the summit and the revelation of Premier Khrushchev as an unstable bully, shouting insults at the United States of America, remains as before. Of course we need the material strength of military and economic power and the educational strength to give it meaning. But, even more, we need a sense of national purpose. Somehow we need to bring to every schoolchild and farmer, every housewife and salesman, a far clearer comprehension of American freedom, its heavy responsibilities, as well as its immense opportunities.

Life magazine, with its vast 6 million-plus circulation, and its tens of millions of readers, together with the New York Times, with its broad national readership, have set out to do this in a series of four articles.

Judging by the quality of the men selected to discuss the national purpose, and by the excellent "kickoff" article written by John Jessup, the chief editorial writer of Life magazine, this promises to be an immense contribution to the national will.

Because the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD represents an appropriate repository of this historic contribution, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the first article of this series be printed at this point in the RECORD, preceded by a letter I have written at the invitation of publisher C. D. Jackson, of Life magazine, in commenting on the series.

There being no objection, the letter and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. C. D. JACKSON,
Publisher, Life Magazine,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. JACKSON: Congratulations on your decision to plunge directly into what so many of us have been vaguely calling for: a great debate on our national purpose by eight leading American thinkers.

An America that has some idea of where it is going and why is even more necessary than closing the missile gap, stepping up the pace of our economic growth, or even pouring more of our resources into education. Quite essential as are these means of achieving our ends, understanding of what our ends are and why and inspiration to spark the desire and fuel the drive must come first.

Since 1945 victorious power throughout the world has come not from planes or tanks or factories or even nuclear power. It has come from people who know what they want and are willing to work and sacrifice and die for it. This has resulted in successful revolutions in Ghana, Nigeria, Guinea, the Sudan, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, Iraq, Syria, Cuba, Tunisia, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, Indochina, India, Israel, Indonesia, and China. In every revolution except Czechoslovakia since the end of World War II, military and industrial power has been on the side of the government in power. But in each case people who understand their purpose well enough to fight and die for it have succeeded.

The initial article by Life's chief editorial writer, John Jessup, surmounts the tough job of framing this cosmological subject in a workable perspective. He provides two vital ingredients of any beginning in arriving at a national purpose: a historical comprehension and a moral framework. This Democratic Senator is reminded of how difficult, but how useful, this is in the painful present—after our grave national difficulty over the U–2 reconnaissance plane and the Khrushchev explosion at the summit. How strengthening now are the words quoted by Jessup from Wisconsin's Carl Schurz in replying to Stephen Decatur's "our country, right or wrong," with "our country * * * when right, to be kept right; when wrong, to be put right." How very pertinent in the decade of this greatest American weakness of privatism to be reminded of Teddy Roosevelt's shout that "the rights of men have to be earned afresh each day."

How central to this inquiry the historical fact that since the Mayflower Compact, whose ultimate purpose, as Jessup says, "was the quest of God's truth"—and how inevitably it follows today in Jessup's words that "it is the highest of man's political purposes to contrive his human institutions in conformity with this order, while realizing that all human institutions are subject to constant change."

I hope that subsequent articles will grapple with the big problem to which Jessup has ably brought this series, i.e., how do we contrive to adjust these institutions to the fantastic change of the past few years of the nuclear age, the space age, and the relentless and brutal march of communism.

The big task is to challenge the American people to the immensity of their power and resources and to the enormity of the task that confronts us armed with these resources. Innovation has been the genius of America's mighty economic system and our Nation's unparalleled material progress. No nation on earth is so richly armed. More important, thanks to our Jeffersonian birth, we Americans enjoy a political tradition founded on the open, searching, reaching mind pursuing justice as well as happiness. Our task is to convince our countrymen that the mountain in all its bristling enormity is not only there to climb but that no men have ever been better equipped to climb it than this generation of still reluctant Americans.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE.

THE NATIONAL PURPOSE

(The words above, The National Purpose, have begun to sound increasingly throughout the country, stirring up uneasy questions, forcing Americans to reexamine themselves and their aspirations, engaging men of high position in what can be the most crucial debate of our generation.

(But the discussions sometimes produce only earnest confusion or empty declamation. To explore what the phrase has meant to America and what it means—or should mean—today, Life here begins a five-part series on "The National Purpose": what we as citizens and as a nation wish and hope to achieve.

(It is a question important in an election year when the great issues must be brought out by the men who wish to lead the Nation, but it transcends partisan politics. Life has asked eight eminent Americans to explore the question. This week the background of the debate is set down on the following pages. In four succeeding issues "The National Purpose" will be discussed by Adlai Stevenson, twice a presidential candidate; Archibald MacLeish, Pulitzer Prize poet and playwright; Billy Graham, the evangelist; David Sarnoff, chairman, RCA; John Gardner, president, Carnegie Corp. of New York; Albert Wohlstetter, national defense specialist for the Rand Corp.; Clinton Rossiter, author and professor of government, Cornell University; Walter Lippmann, political commentator.

(The debate, of course, cannot be left to the country's leaders. Life invites all Americans to join in. For upon the Nation's purpose depend the lives of all—not in some comfortably remote future but right now and in the years just ahead.)

A NOBLE FRAMEWORK FOR A GREAT DEBATE

(By John K. Jessup)

(The words and deeds that expressed our past purpose are the starting point for discourse on aims today.)

"The critical weakness of our society is that for the time being our people do not have great purposes which they are united in wanting to achieve. The public mood of the country is defensive, to hold on and to conserve, not to push forward and to create. We talk about ourselves these days as if we were a completed society, one which has achieved its purposes, and has no further great business to transact."

So wrote Columnist Walter Lippmann a few months ago. It is a disturbing charge for three reasons. First, Lippmann is not alone in making it. The same complaint is heard, with varying emphasis, from many other critics and leaders of opinion, and also, according to a recent survey of Life's correspondents, from many an average anonymous American as well. Some of them speak like Lippmann of our lost or mislaid national purpose or purposes; others use an older phrase, "the American dream." Thus William Faulkner: "What happened to the American dream? We dozed, and it abandoned us. And in that vacuum now there sound no longer the strong voices * * * speaking in mutual unification of one hope and will." As though he also felt something missing, the President himself has appointed a Commission on National Goals "to develop a broad outline of national objectives and programs for the next decade and longer." So much palpable concern, in quarters high and low, suggests that the vacuum of purpose may be a real one.

Second, the charge is disturbing because if it is true it is new. The United States has hitherto been a country associated with great purpose. If that purpose is now absent, we are not what we were. Is there not a connection between the rise of nations and great purposes, between the loss of purpose and their decline. A United States without a purpose, or no greater purpose than "Don't rock the boat," may well be a United States in decline.

Third, the world needs a purposeful America. Even if the United States could ever be a "completed society," to use Lippmann's phrase, the world is not. Mankind has much further great business to transact—if not with the active leadership of the United States then without it, and probably with the leadership of communism.

It may be argued that Lippmann's charge, even if true, is irrelevant. Does the United States really need a self-conscious purpose in the world? Is not a democracy its own raison d'être, and survival the whole of its duty? Many feel that only individuals, not nations, are capable of high purposes; and that the proper role of the American Nation is simply to provide the political framework in which each American citizen defines and conducts his own private pursuit of happiness, nobly or ignobly, to suit himself. Yet this theory of a passive role for the Nation has not satisfied the growing uneasiness. "Why are many Americans fearful that we have lost our sense of national purpose?" asks Adlai Stevenson. "Why is there a slackness about public problems and a wholesale retreat to the joys of private life?"

Our onetime confidence

If America is in fact an elderly, status quo nation, it has had one of the briefest runs for its money in the history of great nations, and its early senescence will have belied more prophecies and grander promises than any nation ever made. During most of its brief history America has been bursting with confidence in its own unlimited destiny. A French visitor in the 1840's asked one of these confident spokesmen, Senator Lewis Cass of Michigan, "If such is the youth of the Republic, what will be its old age?" Replied the Senator, "Sir, it will have no old age." Cass' bold prophecy is already proved doubtful by the fact that so few Americans feel like repeating it today.

Thus there appears to be a real vacuum in the national will, or at least the widespread fear that such a vacuum exists. To explore this disturbing condition, Life here begins a series of articles which we hope may stimulate a fruitful national debate. Does the United States lack a national purpose? Does it need a national purpose in the world? If so, what should that purpose be?

The present article is a résumé of what earlier generations have felt about the American national purpose, together with a few remarks on the new historical conditions that may have affected these beliefs. How far are the older beliefs relevant to the problems that face our country now, in this strange era of communism, megaton weaponry, fractured empires, mushrooming sovereignties, and continuing moral, social, and technical revolution? The answers hinted at in this introductory article are not offered as definitive. Fuller answers will be presented in the subsequent articles by leaders of opinion.

The motivating beliefs of a nation are to be sought in its deeds and illuminated by the words of its leaders, its spokesmen and its key documents. Deeds and words do not always match, but in America they have matched often enough to show a pattern to those who look for one. Thus when Roger Williams expounded the principles of religious liberty and democracy, his authority did not run beyond colonial Rhode Island; but the practical experience of mutual accommodation among the sects in other colonies eventually established religious liberty as part of the American political creed. Thus, too, township self-government and the common law, which helped to make the Constitution workable, were the slow deposit of English and colonial experience rather than the decree of towering prophets or statesmen. But on occasion sudden flashes of great documentary lightning have also illuminated our beliefs. The greatest of these was, of course, the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776.

The Declaration turned what had just a few months before been an Anglo-American family quarrel into a defiance of all tyranny everywhere. Colonial loyalty to the English crown, the dominant American sentiment of 1775, was transformed into national loyalty to the cause of political freedom for the human race.

Thomas Jefferson achieved his masterpiece not by taking an opinion poll, nor yet by sucking the words from his thumb. In writing the Declaration he borrowed some current political ideas from England, from Virginia, from Massachusetts, from Tom Paine and from other sources. He carefully listed the colonists' grievances against George III. But above all he related the cause of American independence to certain timeless beliefs about the nature of man, society and government.

Men are created with equal and inalienable rights—all men everywhere. The chief purpose of any government is to secure these rights, and its just power comes only from the consent of the governed. Although this news took decades to spread and has yet to penetrate everywhere, all other theories of government were doomed by this Declaration and the American independence that followed it. Tom Paine did not exaggerate: "Despotism felt a shock, and man began to contemplate redress." The Declaration went round the Western World, adding an important stimulus to the revolution in France, the independence of Latin America, the national movements in Germany, Italy, Greece, and Eastern Europe, and eventually the political reformation of England itself.

Small wonder, then, that in America the Declaration became the focus of that sense of special destiny and vocation which most vocal Americans had long associated with their country. Just as the Puritans had felt akin to the Israelites, chosen by God for a holy experiment in rule by conscience on new soil, so George Washington's generation felt themselves to be the vanguard of a new political dispensation. They were a watershed in human history, agents of what John Adams had called "a grand scheme and design in Providence for the illumination and emancipation of the slavish part of mankind all over the earth."

Added Adams: "The institutions now made in America will not wholly wear out for thousands of years. It is therefore of the last importance that they should be right." In this self-conscious spirit was our Constitution written. It was to be the test of the basic question whether men, as Alexander Hamilton put it, can achieve good government by "reflection and choice," or whether they must always be governed by "accident and force."

The Constitution was not a universal document in the same sense as the Declaration. It was a working document for Americans, not for Laplanders or Chinese. It has nevertheless proved an adequate political franchise for Americans while they subdued a continent, added 37 new States, fought seven wars and changed from an agricultural Federal Republic into an industrialized democratic Nation. We have seen fit to amend the Constitution 22 times but not to change a word of the preamble, which is a summary statement of what the founders thought to be the true purposes of government—any government. Here are those purposes: "To form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty."

Focus of patriotic reverence

These purposes, and the principle of strong but limited government under law which imbues it, have made the Constitution a focus of American patriotic reverence second only to the Declaration. It is a much stronger focus of loyalty, for example, than the American land, for all this land's purple majesty and beloved rocks and rills. An English visitor in 1837 remarked on the transient place-sense of this migratory people: "Give the American his institutions, and he cares little where you place him." Said Hawthorne, "We have so much country that we have really no country at all." The land has been an inestimable stimulus to effort and to wealth, but the system that enabled every man to take up his pursuit of wealth and happiness has been the most valued part of the whole. The American system has always been held to be far wider than American geography. As Walt Whitman said, "O America, because you build for mankind I build for you."

By Whitman's time the United States, like its great poet, was taking pride in the title of "democracy," a word the Founding Fathers had not much liked. Our 19th century legislation—from free schools and no-jail-for-debt to the Homestead Act, not to mention the emancipation of slaves—maintained an egalitarian bent. Its purpose and effect were to widen the suffrage and enlarge the opportunities of the average man. John Locke had made the amount of its emigration a test of whether a country is truly governed by consent or not. Waves of immigration, visibly assimilated, were evidence that America was the most consent-governed country in the world. As one not untypical immigrant wrote home: "Here a highway to honor, wealth, and renown is open to all." Our national mission was to exemplify the success of free self-government, to let our democratic light so shine before men that they could see its good works and become democrats too. Many did, including most of Europe.

The first internationally recognized American historian, George Bancroft, saw American democracy as the highest revelation of God's purpose in history and the consummation of all previous civilizations. "In the fulness of time," he wrote, "a Republic arose in the wilderness of America. Thousands of years had passed away before this child of the ages could be born * * * from her the human race drew hope." This viewpoint, which today sounds primitive or jingoistic, was as self-evident to many 19th century Americans as the rights of man were to those of the 18th. Both were vindicated by continuing success. Indeed, the American experiment was succeeding in so many directions that the sense of national purpose, though no less intense, became somewhat diffuse. Patriotism became identified with practically every virtue except patience. Thus Emerson: "I wish to see America a benefactor such as no country ever was * * * the office of America is to liberate, to abolish kingcraft, priestcraft, castle, monopoly, to pull down the gallows, to burn up the bloody statute book, to take in the immigrant, to open the doors of the sea and the fields of the earth." In the swelling tide of immigration and expansion he also foresaw the advent of "a new race, a new religion, a new state, a new literature."

By the end of the 19th century there were at least four great causes which America could be said to exemplify and which many Americans were eager to urge on the human race. These were:

1. Democracy: Bancroft called it practical Christianity and said: "The duty of America is to secure the culture and the happiness of the masses by their reliance on themselves." The people's voice was the voice of God, and of progress and of civilization as well.

2. Individual liberty: The wisdom of the Founding Fathers in making the free individual the cornerstone of our institutions was proved by his accomplishments. The individual was especially credited with our economic feats and therefore not begrudged his unequal rewards through the free enterprise system. He was the agent of that conquest of poverty which America had anticipated since colonial times.

3. "Pluralism": This became the scholar's word for our harmonious diversity of races, creeds, and conditions. Scientist-Author E. E. Slosson was to define America as "the finest of all the fine arts, the art of getting along peaceably with all sorts and conditions of men." Our pluralistic laboratory proved the beneficence of the Federal system, crowning our good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea. Since federalism had shown that it could govern and harmonize a continent, why not a world?

4. Morality: The universe is moral and civilization depends on morality, said Emerson. Our system was assumed to be in closer touch than others with what Seward called a higher law than the Constitution. The old Stephen Decatur formula, "our country, right or wrong," was offensive to intellectual patriots like Senator Carl Schurz, who amended it thus: "Our country * * * when right, to be kept right; when wrong, to be put right." Kept or set right by reliable methods, the vocal conscience of responsible citizens manifested itself through free institutions.

These four diverse national purposes could get somewhat out of alinement. Such was the case when Theodore Roosevelt came on the scene. Creative individualism had made it seem that America's dominant purpose—as it seems to many today—was merely to get rich. T. R., a great teacher as well as politician, used the White House as a pulpit to stir the national conscience to higher aims than the amassing of wealth. He preached the responsibility of the individual citizen, the social necessity of personal character, the central role of righteousness in democracy. He attacked that optimistic fatalism which assumed the country could always, in a contemporary's words, "slide down hill into the valley of fulfillment" and warned that the rights of men had to be freshly earned every day. He reasserted America's championship of popular rights. He told us that the history of America is now the central feature of the history of the world. He sought to put U.S. foreign policy in the central position in that history, a position it was soon to occupy in fact.

A defiant doctrine

American foreign policy before Teddy Roosevelt was sometimes summarized as the Monroe Doctrine and the Golden Rule. Both were thoroughly consistent with American beliefs. If the Monroe Doctrine seems too defensive today, it was for a century defiant of half the globe. It aimed to keep European autocracy out of Latin America as well as to allow the spread of democracy through our own territorial expansion. It was not just the manifest destiny of continental geography, but also democratic idealism that carried our flag to California, Hawaii, and the Philippines. It was George Bancroft himself who, as Acting Secretary of War, gave the order that sent U.S. troops into Texas in 1846—just as young T. R., as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, sent Commodore Dewey into Manila Bay in 1898.

Preoccupation with our own hemisphere did not always blind us to the cause of freedom and democracy elsewhere. National revolutionaries like Kossuth in Hungary, freely admitting American inspiration, could also count on at least unofficial American support. Commodore Perry in opening Japan, John Hay in proclaiming the Open Door against colonialism in China, Captain Mahan in his lectures at the Naval War College—all were prophets of the fact that American interests were becoming as global as the American cause.

In 1909 the Monroe Doctrine was reanalyzed by Herbert Croly, author of "The Promise of American Life," which greatly influenced T. R.'s thinking. Now that Europe was democratized, Croly argued, Europe's interests, and America's could no longer be considered "essentially incompatible," as some interpreters of the Doctrine had maintained. A time was coming when we would have to assume a wider and more active role. George Washington, in his Farewell Address, had enjoined us to avoid foreign entanglements and "give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence." These words, said Croly, had been more honored in the letter than in the spirit. The time was coming when we should seek allies in order to build democracy into a world system. In such a system, peace would inevitably depend on the righteous use of superior force, and America's force would be needed on that righteous side.

Croly's contemporary patriots, however, were happier setting a no-longer-so-novel example than leading a magnanimous crusade. They responded more to the idea of a happy American destiny than to a clear American purpose. To Woodrow Wilson fell the sad task of proving the unreality of this distinction and of testing the American devotion to righteousness in a great European war. His war message of April 2, 1917 linked our destiny with that of democracy all over the world:

"The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. * * * Civilization itself seeming to be in the balance. But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free. * * * America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth."

The concerts of free peoples eventually became the Wilson-inspired League of Nations. The League failed for various reasons, but one of them was surely the failure of follow-through in America's political will. Another and even greater war, another and even more pluralistic league called the United Nations, and the Wilson-era failure has at least been patched up. Said Franklin Roosevelt in 1945: "We have learned that we cannot live alone, at peace; that our own well-being is dependent upon the well-being of other nations far away."

The preamble and the stated purposes of the U.N. contain many statements in which Americans can take pride, since they could never have been written had not America long preached and exemplified them—most notably the declaration of equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small. Yet this declaration is made hypocritical by the nature of the U.N.'s membership, which includes Communist states and thus severs the cause of peace from its anchor in freedom and principle. The word "righteousness," which to Wilson as to T. R. was synonymous with the higher patriotism, was not popularized by F. D. R., is not used in the U.N. charter and is seldom heard in its debates.

Our greatest spokesman

Wilson's war message was in many ways the last great documentary link between modern America and the principles that gave her birth. Its echoes of the Declaration of Independence are not mere rhetoric. Those echoes had been enriched for Wilson's generation by the memory of our most profound national experience, the Civil War, and our greatest spokesman of national purpose, Abraham Lincoln.

Lincoln's first show of stubborn grandeur, said Carl Sandburg, was in the passionate seriousness with which he took the words of the Declaration. To him it was a charter of political truth for augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors everywhere. Because slavery was incompatible with the Declaration, the Declaration was the real issue of the Civil War. But this issue had been so long evaded and compromised that Lincoln could exploit it only within the larger cause of saving the Union. Thus political and military necessities robbed the words of his Emancipation Proclamation of great documentary lightning, but the deed was as fundamental and astounding as anything he said. Forced into the Constitution by war, by conscience, and by the Declaration, the proclamation was what Whitman called "by far the greatest revolutionary step in the history of the United States."

Lincoln's greatness was more than verbal. It lay in the resolution with which he preserved the idea of union through our most tragic crisis. Such resolution could be sustained only by faith in the proposition that all men are created equal. The national purpose that Lincoln stated for the Union was that free government of the people, by the people, and for the people should not perish from the earth.

Since Lincoln's time government by the people has been broadened step by step and deepened here and abroad with a cumulative effect scarcely less revolutionary than the Emancipation Proclamation itself. The abstraction for which Lincoln fought is now operative in more than half the world. Scores of new nations have been born since World War I because of the conviction that men should govern themselves, and the 1960 crop will be at least a half dozen more in Africa alone. Yet the popularity of Lincoln's abstraction has not made democracy any safer. On the contrary, some of the nations for whose freedom we fought under Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt, notably in eastern Europe and the Far East, have long since succumbed to ancient tyranny in its newest and most insidious guise, Communism. In all countries the new tyranny, like the old, is still abetted by ignorance and poverty, and in the poorer ones by a widespread belief that freedom and morality are luxuries—"first the grub, then the morals." Meanwhile in America, suffused in real luxuries, freedom and morality are taken for granted as casually as bread.

This does not mean that the United States has altogether forsaken its traditional purposes in foreign affairs. They have guided our reactions to many new and puzzling challenges, such generally creditable reactions as the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic Treaty, the defense of Korea, the upholding of the U.N. in the Suez and other crises, the spending of billions for alliances and aid. At vast expense but with fair success, the United States has contained communism since 1949. We have defended the

chance of many nations to choose freedom and establish self-government, from Guatemala to Vietnam.

But at other times and places we have failed to defend this right. From Hungary in 1956 the appeal to American principles for American help was so direct and unmistakable that many Americans, in our Government's blank failure to respond, thought they heard the snapping of a great cord to the most precious part of our past. To others this sound was muffled by the very scope and complexity of the challenge, for tyranny is only one of the conditions of human life that wears a new, confusing and very non-18th century mask.

The whole order of organized power has changed. The once worthy title of "nation" may now denote either a monster or a pygmy state. Both weaponry and economics have made nonsense of long-established boundaries between nations. Strange new alinements seem to be forming, one perhaps being an alinement of races. The scientific and technical revolution, which has already overthrown the social structure of some very old nations, may have overnight changes in store for many others, either from within their own laboratories or from some point in outer space. As for what communism has done to international politics, in the words of a recent Rockefeller Brothers Fund report, "The chessboard itself may be said to have disappeared."

Nation states may no longer be the most meaningful integers of creative political thought. No existing state is or can be safe for democracy or freedom. Whatever may be hoped or feared from regional or racial alinements, any lasting political purpose must take the whole great globe for its arena. Nor is it just the Ghanaian, or the American, whose chance at happiness is threatened by technology. Human nature itself is threatened by dehumanization. A great political purpose today must have something to say about human nature, how to keep it as human and as rational as may be.

Such are the fantastic new conditions in which our old beliefs must find a home, a grave or a toehold. How can we best adapt our beliefs to the conditions? What purposes may rightfully be considered today?

Survival: Sensible patriots have proposed that our true cause today is sheer national survival. They say that this is important enough, and doubtful enough, to engage our full attention. Biology tells us that survival is a primary concern. Yet if survival by military means is meant, modern weapons are two-edged. Our present strategy of nuclear deterrence, if ever tested, could so reduce our population that its survivors, the bearers of our beliefs about liberty and self-government, might prefer to live elsewhere. On the other hand, since America is now the world's chief home and hope of freedom, a refusal to defend it could demoralize the cause of freedom for a thousand years. From this dilemma the only escape is to perceive that survival alone is not an adequate goal.

What is, then? No single goal, perhaps. A great power's foreign policy cannot be reduced to a phrase. The Council on Foreign Relations, analyzing our "basic aims" for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, made a multiple recommendation: that while maintaining our negative policy of resisting and containing communism, we must at the same time do much more to anticipate "the world's other problems," and try to link the non-Communist nations more closely through more and better institutions of law and order, security, economic development, freedom and peace. A large order—but not necessarily an inspiring one. Although the United States has virtually unlimited responsibilities, can it respond to all alarms everywhere in the free world at once?

Self-government: The one principle that Americans have preached most consistently since their own founding is that men can govern themselves in freedom under law, and that all of them deserve a chance to try. Perhaps this simple message is too 18th century for the world's needs today, or America's complex relation to it. But the millions who have not yet had their chance seldom say so. Self-government is clearly a central purpose for many peoples of the world.

Moral law: Democracy, though we have treasured it, is not the highest value known to man. Indeed, it is only because enough Americans have had still higher allegiances that we have made democracy work.

America's public love affair with righteousness, for example, was not confined to the speeches of T. R. It began with the Mayflower compact, whose ultimate purpose was the quest of God's truth. The same quest underlies our insistence on religious freedom, and the assumption of a moral order in the universe underlies much of our constitutional law. Said John Marshall, the great interpreter of the Constitution: "There are principles of abstract justice which the Creator of all things has impressed on the mind of his creature man, and which are admitted to regulate in great degree the right of civilized nations." Our very right to self-government is derived from "the laws of nature and of nature's God," and to its harmony with these laws democracy owes its moral sanction.

If this moral order of the universe exists in fact—if there is such a thing as the natural law in which our Founding Fathers trusted—then it is surely the highest of man's political purposes to contrive his human institutions in conformity with this order, while realizing that all human institutions are subject to constant change. No more challenging task faces American leaders and intellectuals, if they believe in natural law, than to find its mundane applications in this revolutionary age. Certainly there resides in every human breast a natural instinct for justice, which experience has refined into the world's systems of law. A world that needs peace, which is the work of justice, needs clearer codifications of its sense of justice—i.e., more and better national and international law.

But those of us who make world law our national purpose must be sure the positive laws that we champion enjoy maximum consent. For example, by throwing its economic weight around, the United States can do much to promote free enterprise and freer trade in the non-Communist world. But it could do this better with less friction if Americans should produce a new definition of the right to property, which John Locke and our Founding Fathers considered basic to liberty. Such a definition would have to appear in harmony with natural justice to farmers and workers as well as to businessmen in all industrialized societies.

Private purposes: Many Americans will approve the above-mentioned purposes and still deny that they should be avowed by the Nation or its Government. A consensus of private purposes can give shape and direction to our national life without getting into formal policy at all. Yet in the fatness of these pursy times our private purposes do not add up to anything so firm. As one Air Force lieutenant wrote to Time, "What America stands for is making money, and as the society approaches affluence, its members are left to stew in their own ennui."

As monarchies were said to live by honor, so republics live by virtue. Yet republics have no public means of supplying a lack of virtue in the sovereign people. The public educational system can set and inculcate standards of the mind, and with this aim the Rockefeller Bros. Fund proposed to raise these standards, calling its report on our schools "The Pursuit of Excellence." Even the citizen who thinks that virtue is old fashioned, or that it is none of the State's business, can perhaps subscribe to excellence as a public purpose, and in a context of intellectual excellence, moral excellence (which must always be an individual purpose and achievement) may have a better chance. As T. R. used to say, a patriot will make the most of himself. If enough do, so will the Nation.

These are a few of the paths which thoughtful Americans can follow in their search for a new or renewed national purpose. There are undoubtedly others. But with the background for debate now sketched in, we can proceed in the individual views of Life's eminent contributors.

DESPERATE NEED FOR MEDICAL CARE FOR AMERICA'S AGED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, we are pledged as a nation to the ideal of bringing to mankind the "four freedoms." But our own senior citizens can know no freedom from want, can know no freedom from fear, so long as the grim specter of sudden and costly illness hovers over them.

We in the Senate, faced with the realities of the international situation, acknowledge the need for economic aid to the peoples of other lands; but how can we expect the older people of our own land to understand why, in the same breath, we deny millions of them any real opportunity for medical care in their old age? This is especially shocking in view of the far greater sacrifice other countries of the free world make to assure adequate medical care for their elderly people.

This is the question posed in many of the letters we receive. I ask unanimous consent to have one letter of this sort printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SIR: Was wondering if and when you fellows are going to do something about giving those on social security hospitalization and doctors care. Maybe you can tell me what we are supposed to do when we're sick. The hospitals charge from $15 to $25 a day and that's only for board and room and the doctors bills are extra. I had my wife in the hospital last year one afternoon and overnight and the hospital charged $49. Do something to get hospitalization added to our social security. They raise the taxes on gas and parcel post and everything else and give to the foreign countries but never anything here at home.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

EDGAR E. WITT, OF TEXAS, HAS OUTSTANDING RECORD OF DEVOTED PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a dedicated, able, faithful public official is soon to leave the Washington scene.

Edgar E. Witt, of Waco, Tex., Chief of the Indian Claims Commission, has written a record of fairness, of diligence, and of successful service with that Commission which could serve as a model for any public official serving on any commission in Washington.

Governor Witt—as a former lieutenant Governor of Texas—he is called "Governor" in his native State—was a leading public official of the State of Texas before he came to Washington. After having served on other Government commissions, he became Chief of the Indian Claims Commission at the age of 68, an age at which most men have retired.

In the 13 years he has served as Chief of the Indian Claims Commission, he has written as many opinions as have all the other justices of the Commission combined. In every case in which he has dissented, his dissent has been upheld on appeal.

When Edgar E. Witt retires to Texas, he should take with him the thanks of officialdom of Washington and the appreciation of the citizenry of this Nation for a job well done.

In the Dallas Morning News for Monday, May 16, Mr. Walter C. Hornaday, the able chief of the Dallas News Washington Bureau, has written a very fine article entitled "Retirement Due for Claims Chief." As a long-time friend of Edgar E. Witt, I am glad to see him receive this recognition, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News, May 16, 1960]

RETIREMENT DUE FOR CLAIMS CHIEF

(By Walter C. Hornaday)

WASHINGTON.—When Edgar E. Witt of Waco was named Chief Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission in 1947, he had reached an age when most men are taking it easy in retirement.

Witt, a former Lieutenant Governor of Texas and a learned and skilled lawyer, assumed his duties at the age of 68.

He has been the Commission's only head during its 13 years of existence. He and his two colleagues on the Commission have wrestled with some tough questions involving Indian tribes who claimed they were cheated and otherwise financially abused in years gone by.

Witt is retiring from his job on June 30 at the age of 81. It was time and the rules of bureaucracy, not ill health or lack of physical and mental vigor, that is causing him to step down.

Under the regulations, Chief Witt should have been moved out some years ago, but no one noticed his calendar age as the Commission continued to function as well, perhaps even better, than it ever had.

The Indian Claims Commission, under Witt's direction, charted new courses in the law as it handled the cases brought before the agency.

The act creating the Commission gave it authority to settle claims in law and equity and on other bases and then added: "Claims based upon fair and honorable dealings that are not recognized by any existing rule of law or equity."

"This means applying the yardstick of fair and honorable dealings by our Government with the Indians," Witt said. "No other act I know of writes that into law."

The Indian tribes had 5 years in which to file claims. The cutoff date was in August 1951. Through 1959, the Commission allowed claims involving 20,602,341 acres of former Indian land and final judgments of $17,655,606 out of claims amounting to $123,824,395.

Some of the cases go back more than 100 years and are steeped in history at the time the white man, frequently backed by the Federal Government, was seizing Indian lands and paying the tribes little, even threatening them with disaster if they refused to accept the offers.

Edgar Witt was born near Salado, Bell County. He received his academic and law education at the University of Texas and began practicing law in Waco in 1906. He served as a State senator 12 years and was elected Lieutenant Governor in 1930 and 1932, serving under Ross Sterling and Mrs. Miriam Ferguson. In seeking his second term without opposition, he received at that time what was the largest vote any person seeking State office had ever piled up.

Witt made an unsuccessful bid for Governor in 1934.

Shortly after leaving the Lieutenant Governor's office, Witt was employed by the Dallas Chamber of Commerce and other interests to work for a $3 million legislative appropriation to help finance the Texas Centennial. Witt's efforts were successful and Congress followed with a similar appropriation.

Witt's long-time friend, Senator Tom Connally, told then President Franklin D. Roosevelt about Witt, and the Waco man was named chairman of a special Mexican Claims Commission to distribute $5,500,000 the Mexican Government had offered to make available to settle claims resulting from destruction of American property during revolutions. The Commission finished its work ahead of time. When Witt asked Roosevelt to terminate the agency, a shocked President said:

"I never heard of a Democrat quitting office before his job terminated."

Witt returned to Waco to resume the practice of law but was recalled to Washington in 1943 as Chairman of the American-Mexican Claims Commission. This was another agency to settle claims of American citizens against Mexico due principally to expropriation of American-owned land. This job ended in 1947.

Senator Connally and President Truman decided Witt was the perfect man for the job of heading the Indian Claims Commission when it was cerated. Witt knew little if anything about Indians, and a mild objection was raised against his Senate confirmation on that score. One group thought an Indian should be picked but the Senate believed otherwise.

Connally, with a twinkle in his eye, told Witt at the time that he thought, when he had urged his appointment to the Mexican claims agencies, that he was lining him up with a job that didn't require any work.

"But a lot of lawyers who have seen you operate are urging me to recommend you for this new job," Connally added.

Lawyers and others having contact with Witt on the Indian Claims Commission during the last 13 years want him to remain in spite of his 81 years.

They have pointed out that during the last 2 years he has rendered almost as many opinions and findings of fact as have been rendered by his two colleagues. They also refer to the fact that when the Chief Commissioner dissented from his colleagues, the U.S. Court of Claims has agreed with Witt's viewpoint in every instance.

Chief Judge Marvin Jones of the Court of Claims, a Texan, has indicated he would tell President Eisenhower that Witt shouldn't be allowed to retire if the White House asked his opinion.

Witt and his wife, the former Gwyn Johnstone of San Antonio, plan to live in either Austin or Corpus Christi when they return to Texas. Witt said almost all of his friends in Waco are dead.

BREAKUP OF THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, many comments have been made about the breakup of the summit conference, and we can expect many more comments to be made. I doubt whether we can expect any more reasoned or more moving comment than that made in an editorial published on yesterday in the Detroit News. The title of the editorial is "Requiem for a Summit—Innocence Age Ended."

I hope the editorial will receive very wide reading, and I ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit News, May 22, 1960]

REQUIEM FOR A SUMMIT—INNOCENCE AGE ENDED

Man must always look up, but today we look up to a summit that no longer is there. It is lost in a sky red with abuse. Yet the angry storm clouds that have made a mockery of our hopes do not have to be the shroud for our good intent.

The forecast is for more storms. But in the winter of our discontent and demolished hopes we cannot retreat to the foothills. We must go on, persevering for peace. We have failed, but we must still look upward.

We learn from failure. What have we learned this time?

We have learned something about ourselves.

We have learned that we have spy planes. We learned that we had violated another nation's aerial sovereignty and that because of equipment and men and luck we had been doing so unscathed for some time. We have been engaged in a dirty business which is made no more clean by the fact that neutrals who plan no war are engaged in it, too. Our age of innocence is past.

We were glad to think that the men who lead us had taken this elementary precaution to give us somewhere near an even break in a nuclear world where surprise attack and evil are concomitant. We were sorry we had been caught. But also we were dismayed by the Washington bungling that followed the denouement.

We had shot our U–2 arrow in the sky and when it fell we were not sly. We were just plain stupid. Never in the field of human handouts have so many owed so little to the few in authority who confused ourselves, our allies, and the uncommitted world by saying what they did not mean and meaning what they did not say.

We and the world have learned about Nikita Khrushchev and what he represents.

The last few yards to the summit for us were the toughest. Yet when we got there it was the bully boy who had baited the propaganda trap for us, who saved us from a fate worse than obloquy.

He who professed to want a world with no arms threatened to unleash his. He whose protestations of peace had given hope to the smaller NATO nations so near his frontier shattered his own loving cup. In fact, the only spirit of Camp David left in him was a raging hangover. He tore off his own mask. He was revealed as a Santa Claus with horns and an empty sleigh when the world had been led to expect from him the priceless gift of peace.

If we had bungled with a U–2, he fell flat on his face in exploiting our error. Some of our allies, nervous at being involved in our spying, were fortified in their will to maintain the Western alliance. We didn't get them back into line. Khrushchev clubbed them back.

He had won neutral good will by being a prime organizer of a meeting to reduce world tensions. He lost it by breaking up the meeting. He had nothing to offer but tears and blood.

Where do we stand now?

It is the tragedy of a generation that can split an atom that it cannot splice a divided world. We have created a nuclear terror and now are scared at living with it. And we know that if our ring finger was not on the pushbutton marked "retaliation" we might not even be living to be scared.

We and the Communists talk of uncommitted nations in the cold war, forgetting that in a hot one we commit all mankind because radioactive fallout knows no frontier of neutrality. We must, therefore, still press on to try to save ourselves, the neutrals and the Russian people themselves.

All this we know as the requiem for a summit begins. Yet it is not a time for morticians. We may beat our breasts, but we need not bury our hopes. Man never has, and that is why he can still look up even when no summit is there.

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION: THE 1960 SITUATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, American political history reflects periods when the role of the trade-union movement in political action, and the role of business in political action, have been hotly debated. Because ours is a society which requires the broadest possible understanding and participation in developing the answers to our public questions, I have always felt that participation by both groups was proper and to be encouraged. In recent months, a great American corporation, the Ford Motor Co., has planned, and has now put into action, an imaginative and responsible program which will encourage political action and participation by all of its employees. It is my hope the program will prove most effective. The management of the Ford Motor Co. must have devoted much time and effort in the creation of this program, which is known as Ford effective citizenship program.

I ask that a speech which Thomas R. Reid, of the Ford Motor Co., gave at Detroit, Mich., on May 6, outlining the program be printed in the RECORD following my remarks. I ask this in the hope the speech may come to the attention of others who share the concern of Ford, and who may be moved to undertake a comparable effort. Since politics is the housekeeping job of a democracy, it is imperative that this free people pay close attention to this housekeeping job, lest we fail the test which is ours in this 20th century.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION: THE 1960 SITUATION—MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS TO ENCOURAGE PARTICIPATION

(Remarks of Thomas R. Reid, of Ford Motor Co., at Industrial Relations Research Association, Detroit, Mich., May 6, 1960)

The great game of politics in America has become a spectator sport. It is like baseball—everybody loves to read about it and talk about it, but only a few of our millions of people participate actively for the full season in the two major leagues of either politics or baseball.

I have no plea to offer today for more sandlot baseball players, desirable as that may be, but I do urge that factory workers, farmers, housewives, businessmen, and other citizens of whatever occupation play a more active role in public affairs and politics.

The encouragement of political participation is not a union-management matter. This is something which clearly should be outside the realm of labor-business controversy and just as clearly is a matter of transcendent importance to all of the American people.

Anyone who approaches this subject in the context of business versus labor reflects an attitude already far too prevalent in America that practically everything in the public domain, including even the American system of representative government itself, has a labor side and a management side.

I say these things so bluntly at the outset of my remarks because I have been concerned from the time I first was invited to appear on this program about the wisdom of scheduling separate treatments of the labor point of view and the management point of view on this subject. The format itself suggests a debate or a disagreement.

In spite of this concern, I wanted to accept the invitation to participate in your program today because:

1. The subject of encouraging political participation is of such vast importance to the American people that free and open discussion of it should take place wherever the opportunity is presented.

2. There is active participation of the academic profession in the association. The widespread influence of what professors and teachers will be saying on this subject in our schools and colleges is so vital to a clear understanding of the topic for years to come that every opportunity to present the facts to the academic world should be welcomed.

The course of public affairs customarily has been shaped by the professional politicians and a relatively few interested individuals. This has come about not only because they have had so much to say on the subject while others have remained apathetic and silent, but because the politicians and these individuals too, oftentimes, have taken the trouble to inform themselves and work at this business of government while others have not. I would be the last to criticize those who are active and articulate in public affairs. My contention is simply that there should be more activity, more participation, more voices raised from all segments of American society, if we are to retain government of, by, and for the people.

Government in this country cannot be the private preserve of the professional elite, the political elite, the financial elite, or the organized elite of any category. In this age of specialization, it is interesting that two of the most fundamental responsibilities we have in a democracy—parenthood and political participation—are largely entrusted to amateurs. Parents have no choice. Once the offspring arrives he has to be taken care of—and parents learn by doing. It is different with our political responsibilities, however. No one really is forced to assume them. We can always let George do it—let him and Sam and Bill make the decisions and run our town, or our country, for us.

It seems far less important to me who does the encouraging of citizenship participation than that there be a great deal of encouragement from all quarters. I don't think of this as a question at all of whether unions or business should encourage participation—I simply think that everybody who loves his country should encourage participation.

This movement toward greater interest in political affairs that we have seen just in the past year or so should not be confined to business people. Everybody belongs in the act. It is every bit as desirable that lawyers, doctors, housewives, bricklayers, and bankers be encouraged toward more active citizenship participation by the organized groups to which they belong.

In short, there is absolutely nothing wrong in any group in our society with organizational influence over any category of citizens encouraging more active participation by such citizens. There is everything right about it.

Now, I recognize full well that exhortation alone will not produce wholesale citizen participation in public affairs. We are not going to see the great mass of the American people battering down the doors of their political clubhouses seeking admission. Apathy will always be with us so long as men retain their human shortcomings.

But I am not too discouraged by this. I hold to the optimistic view that a meaningful measure of new participation can be achieved by:

1. Creating a climate of positive encouragement;

2. Repairing the unfavorable public image of politics and politicians; and

3. Making politics familiar, acceptable, and convenient for people.

Business, and in particular the public relations and advertising fraternity, likes to think it knows something about shaping public images. Probably no group in America is in a better position than business to do something to correct the unfavorable public image of politics. One reason is that business is itself partly responsible for creating and fostering that unfavorable image. And the aversion toward politics heretofore so typical of business has had far more serious implications than just undermining the effectiveness of business in its dealings with government. It is not too much to say that it has tended to undermine the vigor of our free democratic system.

Prof. Andrew Hacker, the Cornell University political scientist, made this point in his widely quoted study on "Politics and the Corporation," published by the Fund for the Republic in 1958. He holds that the American corporation has helped to remove a great body of the middle class from any real participation in our political processes. And he shows that historically we have depended heavily on middle-class participation in public affairs for the success of our democratic system.

His indictment of the corporation was not that it seeks to dictate the political behavior of its people, but rather that its net influence is to discourage any participation by them in political affairs.

It is interesting to reflect that the many business firms which have announced political participation programs have been in remarkable agreement as to their fundamental philosophy. Considering the diversity in size, interest and management personalities of these many business firms, it is amazing in a way that there has been so little difference in the underlying tenets of the programs announced in the last year or so.

The businessmen in politics movement really began to gain momentum in America when businessmen finally admitted to themselves that representative government in America could best be served by urging able people to become active in both political parties and abandoned the idea that the only hope for America was building up one party and tearing down the other.

I don't know exactly how this particular business philosophy came into being. Some say that a brief paper by Raymond Moley first enunciated the principle subsequently so widely accepted by business. Others say that it just grew, like Topsy, and suddenly emerged full-blown upon the American scene. I do know that the first time we ever saw it in writing or considered stating it for our own company occurred on January 7, 1959, when I prepared a memo as a

draft policy for a Ford Motor Co. public affairs program. I said in that memorandum: "The proper role of the corporation in government and politics is twofold:

"1. The corporation should express its position on public affairs issues and legislation at all levels of government in which it has interest, either favorable or opposed, because anything which affects its business becomes its business.

"2. The corporation has no business in politics as a corporation but it has a responsibility as a community of interest in modern society to encourage its members of management and its employees to voluntary participation as individual citizens in the political party of their choice.

"I have in mind on this that there has been a great deal of confusion in interpreting the reawakened interest of corporations in government and politics as a move on the part of corporations to use their power and their money to strengthen the Republican Party in the same way the big labor unions have used their power and their money to strengthen the Democratic Party. I do not believe this is right. I believe that corporations' direct participation in a single political party would only compound the error and eventually make a farce of our two-party system by lining up corporate power and money in support of another party. The preservation of the two-party system is integral to the American governmental system and the real objective should be to improve the interest and participation of all citizens in both political parties and in governmental affairs to keep government representative of all the people."

This was adopted and continues to be our program. It is essentially the program of all businesses with public affairs programs in America today. Although the same statement of fundamentals may have been expressed in a thousand different ways in as many articles and speeches since January 7, 1959, this remains the essence of the business position on this subject. It thus far has met every contingency which threatened it. I think it accurate to say that it has won the support of the press, the public, the politicians and the people generally. I am sure this political philosophy for the businessman is here to stay.

This, incidentally, points up a significant difference between the company and the union approaches to political participation. While the general business attitude is that it is not a proper function of the company to take sides in a partisan way, the unions do so as a common practice. The AFL–CIO nationally has endorsed candidates for President. Local labor bodies endorse candidates for local and State offices, and much of the weight of the union organization is thrown behind the favored candidates.

Organized labor can and should press its views on the issues affecting it with vigor and candor, and it can and should urge union members to participate in political affairs. But I want it understood that I do not condone the employment of the union organization or of union funds for partisan political purposes, wherever that occurs. It is not right for a company to do it. It is not right for a union to do it.

But espousing a philosophy is one thing and putting it into practice is quite another. For purposes of illustration, I would like to outline to you how Ford Motor Co. launched its public affairs program.

Essentially, we have done three things: we have declared our intention to speak out as a corporation on important public issues; we have encouraged our employees to participate in political and governmental activities within their party; and we have tried to do our part in encouraging the spread of this activity by suggesting programs that may prove useful to smaller businesses and other organizations.

When we started, we had several things in our favor. We had a management that was wholeheartedly in favor of such a program, and we had a civic affairs office of 10 years' standing to serve as a nucleus for our new organization. In 1959, our management authorized the following expanded public affairs program:

1. A top management civic and governmental affairs committee, whose members include the chairman of the board and the president, was created to review legislative and governmental issues that affect the company and was charged with formulating positions on these issues.

2. A staff of public affairs specialists was assembled to engage in public affairs research and to plan and carry out a civic and governmental affairs program.

3. Eight regional offices were established to provide field services throughout the country. These offices were staffed with men with special knowledge of their area. One of their functions is to give direct assistance to local company management in civic and governmental activities.

4. An information program in public affairs was established. Management is reached through public affairs bulletins, employees are reached through plant newspapers, and dealers are reached through regular dealer publications.

Of course, we have always done some of these things. We have made our views known to stockholders, employees, elected representatives, and the public generally. We have spoken out on issues, testified before congressional committees, and participated in any activity that was important to us. But we hadn't recognized the importance of these activities to the health of the corporation and to our political system. Furthermore, we hadn't placed the emphasis where it belonged—on the individual.

In an effort to stimulate bipartisan interest in governmental affairs, Ford Motor Co. recently announced a novel plan aimed at encouraging its employees to work for and financially support the political party of their choice.

Meetings have been held in company locations throughout the United States during April to explain the plan, known as the Ford effective citizenship program.

The new program provides employees an opportunity not only to learn the mechanics of this country's political system but also to volunteer for service with and to contribute financially to the party of their choice.

The political training course, consisting of eight 2-hour sessions, to be held after working hours, and the party activity plan will be offered initially to supervisory employees of the company.

Because of practical problems involved in reaching the company's 120,000 hourly employees in plant locations throughout the United States except by mail, the company has communicated information on the program to them by letter, and will later distribute to all employees printed informational material on political processes.

The political party participation plan provides employees with an opportunity to decide voluntarily whether they wish to engage in politics, and to what extent.

It is not a discussion of issues, nor is it propaganda for anybody's views about legislation. Rather it will provide an understanding of the processes and techniques of political party committees, conventions, and election procedures in all levels of government.

At the risk of some repetition in order to illustrate the spirit of our communications, let me read to you at this point the full text of a letter sent in the first week in May to Ford Motor Co. employees, signed by the appropriate executive of each plant or office:

"The company encourages all its employees to take an interest in political affairs in the party of their choice as a citizenship responsibility. Under our free system of government such participation should be truly representative. Each party depends on the voluntary participation of individual citizens to maintain its program. Each party also depends on the voluntary contributions of individual citizens to cover the cost of political party operations and campaign expenses. These costs are particularly high in an important presidential election year like 1960.

"In order to provide a convenient method for Ford employees to contribute to the party of their choice, a simple contribution plan has been developed. The plan is designed to safeguard completely the privacy of each employee's party choice and to assure the employee that the company will have no knowledge of the confidential voluntary action that he takes as a private citizen.

"Enclosed for your use are a contribution card; an inner envelope and an outer envelope.

"If you wish to make a contribution, simply place your check, or cash if you prefer, with the card properly filled in, in the inner envelope. Then seal it and check the party to which you are contributing on the front of that envelope. Then, place it in the outer envelope, seal that envelope and drop it in one of the collection boxes which will be placed at convenient locations throughout the plant beginning Monday.

"Do not write your name or otherwise identify yourself on either sealed envelope.

"For your information, checks intended for the major political parties should be made payable to the (Democratic State Central Committee, or to the Republican State Finance Committee.)

"The contribution envelopes will be turned over directly to the proper representatives of the political party you have checked on the inner envelope. The collection boxes will be kept in the plants throughout the week beginning May 9.

"Which party you contribute to and in what amount you contribute is entirely up to you. Any support you give to the political party of your choice will help to strengthen our American political system.

"Signed by plant manager or appropriate local executive."

The contributions plan has the endorsement of the UAW–CIO. Following discussion of the proposed procedure with company officials, Ken Bannon, director, national Ford department, UAW, addressed a letter to presidents of all Ford local unions encouraging cooperation.

The initial indications of response to our new Ford effective citizenship course have been most encouraging. To date, with returns in covering over half of our supervisors throughout the country, we find that 31 percent of those attending the presentation sessions are enrolling in the course.

We know, naturally, that no such 8-week course will transform a neophyte into a skilled politician, or anything near it. What we do hope is that we will whet the appetite of at least some of the participants for more direct involvement in political affairs.

In one of our first courses, one of the men was asked to find out who his party precinct chairman was. He called the county committee, was informed that the post was vacant, and was asked to take it himself. He did, and he is now up to his elbows in local politics. And I'll bet he is having the time of his life. This little occurrence undoubtedly is being repeated time and again all over the country where business people are taking this type of course.

It is not our purpose to develop candidates for office, incidentally. However, if experience to date is any guide, some of our employees will certainly run for office and be elected. Hundreds already have served, or are serving, in some public office, normally a part-time one.

We firmly believe in helping to strengthen government in this way, and we give such employees all the recognition we can. We note their election or appointment in our employee publications, and often Mr. Ford writes them a personal letter of congratulations.

In addition, we have extended nationwide our practice of publicly presenting Community Service Awards to those employees, hourly and salaried, who have achieved success in any type of public service. And we have recently announced a leave-of-absence policy for those elected to full-time public office. This policy safeguards certain rights and benefits while the employee is away from the company. He is provided in effect somewhat the same assurances that are given to employees inducted into military service.

This brings me to the final activity I want to discuss this afternoon. Our civic and governmental activities are tailored to Ford Motor Co., one of the country's largest corporations. Many organizations, whether business concerns, professional associations, or other groups would find such a program beyond their scope. At the same time, they have an interest in political participation and we are looking for program guidance.

While a number of the larger companies have taken the lead in combating apathy and encouraging activity, they cannot do the job singlehanded.

Companies with less than 1,000 employees have 62 percent of all business employment. Even if all the larger corporations adopted and carried out effective participation programs, their efforts would have limited effect.

Recently, we suggested this nine-point program as suitable for adoption by most American business firms:

1. Study the problem of impact of governmental and political affairs at all levels of government on the individual business firm and determine the extent to which public affairs matters directly affect its business operations.

2. Consider the social responsibility of the company to the community, State, and Nation in advancement of the public interest.

3. Establish a written policy on company statements pertaining to public issues and legislative action on issues directly affecting it, and on encouragement of employees to express their individual convictions and participate in the political party of their choice.

4. Inform and educate employees on the importance of citizen participation in public affairs and political activity through discussion meetings or political training courses.

5. Take inventory of employees active in civic, governmental, or political affairs and give them suitable recognition.

6. Arrange for elected representatives in city governments and State legislatures to visit the company plants and offices and for key company executives to become acquainted with their Congressmen and Senators.

7. Devote a reasonable percentage of the total content of house organs, management bulletins, and other communications with employees, to the subject of public affairs and political participation.

8. Designate an executive within the company with functional responsibility for civic and governmental affairs, with the portion of his time allotted to it depending on the size of the company and the scope of the program undertaken.

9. Regard the public affairs program as a continuing added dimension of company activity; as a positive, affirmative program that must help meet community and national needs as well as needs within the company.

This is a course of practical, positive political action that may be adopted by any company in America.

Before I close, I would like to say that people sometimes ask us what motivates the businessman to enter politics. I have given you most of the reasons already, but let me answer one or two specific questions that often arise.

We are sometimes asked if we are not trying to create a big business party in this country, to build a massive business lobby, or to out-politic organized labor.

We do not consider our program an effort to do any of these things.

We have no intention of trying to create a big business party. A corporation, as such, has no business dealing in party politics. Should business align itself with either political party, it would be the surest way of creating a labor party.

As for creating a business lobby, let me make it clear that, acting as a corporation, we intend to articulate a business point of view on the public questions that concern us. We feel it is part of the democratic expression of all interested parties to make known the stand of the company on such matters, and we do not intend to be bashful.

At the same time, we realize that we must formulate a point of view that serves the public interest. It is often difficult to resist narrow, self-interested objectives. We realize that. But we are convinced that we must apply ourselves to public problems and attempt to offer truly constructive solutions.

Finally, we are not trying to outbid organized labor's interest in the political field. Mr. Henry Ford II said recently: "Despite the growing political power of labor unions, I think it would be a great mistake for businessmen to regard political activity in negative, stop-union terms. Business and unions could well be together on issues more often than they are apart."

The real issue in citizenship participation is not management versus labor but pressure groupism versus total democracy. There is nothing wrong with our Government or political system that participation by more people won't cure.

THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE—PARTISAN ATTACKS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, unfortunately the spirit of Camp David, which both the Republican Party and the Democratic Party hoped would offer an avenue for peace, is dead. But here in the Senate Chamber, in the course of debate by many Members of the Senate, including the minority leader, we find that the spirit of the Republican campaigns of 1952, 1954, and 1956 is very much alive. We have been given a "flashback" to the 1952 speech by Vice President Nixon, at Texarkana, when he said that President Truman, Secretary Acheson, and Mr. Stevenson "are traitors to the high principles in which many of the Nation's Democrats believe. Real Democrats are outraged by the Truman-Acheson-Stevenson gang's toleration and defense of communism in high places"; and to his statement on television, in 1954, "Isn't it wonderful that we finally have a Secretary of State who isn't taken in by the Communists, who stands up to them?"

Today, we have had the rather peculiar spectacle of Republicans trying to document a defense of the administration with an English translation of a repudiated interview by a Frenchman with a leading American, the titular head of the Democratc Party.

It was also said that Senator KENNEDY, one of our most distinguished candidates for the Presidency, had stated that President Eisenhower should apologize to Premier Khrushchev. It was attributed to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]; but it never has been shown that such a statement definitely was made by him.

Mr. President, once I was a newspaperman; and I know something of the errors and confusions which come from discussing in two languages vitally important matter of State. I certainly am ready to take the word of Governor Stevenson that he did not say what he was quoted as saying in regard to pulling out of Berlin; and I believe that extreme attempts to stretch the truth, in order to give a wrong impression, have been made by Republican Members of the Senate today in the quotations which have been bandied about. They referred to statements made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] when he was being interviewed. Obviously the interview by the Portland Oregonian was an extemporaneous matter, probably between speeches or between television appearances. He was asked about the Summit. What Senator KENNEDY finally said—and I do not believe this has been denied—was that he felt the President should express regrets over what had occurred. To determine what went on before that statement is like trying to read the minds of Members of the Senate as they search for words with which to express their meaning properly.

As Senators scraped the bottom of the barrel, to "document" these two alleged statements it is reminiscent of another Senator who once waved papers and shouted "I hold in my hand * * *." We are tired of that sort of procedure.

Mr. President, Americans are tired of the attacks which are made strictly for the purpose of diversion, in an attempt to light another fire, to try to direct attention somewhere else. If the members of the Republican Party here today are serious about bipartisanship, why did not all of them support—as some of them did—the proposed investigation of these matters which was advocated by the respected chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], whose remarks were echoed by the acting majority leader? They said it was going to be a factfinding inquiry, not a witch-hunting expedition. They said the inquiry would be made in as intelligent and as sane and as quiet a manner as the facts and the situation would possibly permit. Instead of supporting that approach, the Republicans seem to want to turn this into a sort of mock trial to try to discredit one of the leading candidates and the man who is the titular head of the Democratic Party.

I think if they had wanted to make a constructive speech—and one for which I would respect them—they could have

defended one of the seven fatal presummit blunders that led to the summit collapse, and gave to Mr. Khrushchev a tailormade excuse for breaking up the summit conference. None of them did so.

I heard no Republican speaker defend any of the seven tragic steps so clearly outlined by Governor Stevenson in his speech in Chicago last week. I do not know why they are trying to duck defending these steps, or how they can duck defending them, unless they are willing that someone should investigate them.

Certainly, Governor Stevenson was not the first person to point out these tragic errors. One of the great institutions of our country is the American press. The American press, no matter what their political orientation, universally reported this tragedy step by step. This was not just true of Democratic newspapers. Many of them which are extremely hostile to the Democratic Party published documentation of every single instance cited by Governor Stevenson in his speech in Chicago. If that be true, and considering the Governor's speech in this context, why do not the Republicans defend the administration against the charges of the press throughout the United States, rather than placing all their emphasis on Governor Stevenson's speech, and defend the tragic blunders that prejudiced our position to our great disadvantage at the summit? It would be far more valid for them to do that. I have never seen a time when the press of the United States so universally printed the cold, hard facts, regardless of the impact they may have had. Many writers have done a great job. I regret that I cannot place all the stories in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I do ask to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of columns which have appeared in the Nation's finest newspapers within the last few days. They are columns entitled "The Spy Business," by Walter Lippmann, "The U–2 in Paris," by Walter Lippmann, "First of All," by Walter Lippmann, "The Summit Tragedy," by James Reston, "Paris, How To Turn Defeat Into Victory," by James Reston, "The Democrats' Message to Eisenhower," by Arthur Krock, and "The Grim Outlook After the Summit," by Marquis Childs.

There are times of desperate national need when the American press redeems, in burst of greatness, the debt of all the sensationalism which it tolerates. This is such a time. Here, then, are the beacons of American journalism—Lippmann, Reston, Krock, Childs—burning with a light they only achieve when fueled by national necessity.

There being no objection, the columns were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post]

THE SPY BUSINESS

(By Walter Lippmann)

In the whirl of incidents following the capture of the spy plane the administration has ventured, perhaps the right word for it would be stumbled, into an untenable policy which is entirely unprecedented in international affairs. Our position now seems to be that because it is so difficult to collect information inside the Soviet Union, it will henceforth be our avowed policy to fly over Soviet territory, using the territory of our Allies as bases.

Although the intention here is to be candid and honest and also to make the best of a piece of very bad luck, the new policy—which seems to have been improvised between Saturday and Monday—is quite unworkable.

To avow that we intend to violate Soviet sovereignty is to put everybody on the spot. It makes it impossible for the Soviet government to play down this particular incident because now it is challenged openly in the face of the whole world. It is compelled to react because no nation can remain passive when it is the avowed policy of another nation to intrude upon its territory. The avowal of such a policy is an open invitation to the Soviet government to take the case to the United Nations, where our best friends will be grievously embarrassed. The avowal is also a challenge to the Soviet Union to put pressure on Pakistan, Turkey, Norway, Japan, and any other country which has usable bases. Our Allies are put on the spot because they must either violate international law or disavow the United States.

Because the challenge has been made openly, it is almost impossible to deal with this particular incident by quiet diplomacy.

The reader will, I hope, have noticed that my criticism is that we have made these overflights an avowed policy. What is unprecedented about the avowal is not the spying as such but the claim that spying, when we do it, should be accepted by the world as righteous. This is an amateurish and naive view of the nature of spying.

Spying between nations is, of course, the universal practice. Everybody does it as best he can. But it is illegal in all countries, and the spy if caught is subject to the severest punishment. When the spying involves intrusion across frontiers by military aircraft, it is also against international law. Because spying is illegal, its methods are often immoral and criminal. Its methods include bribery, blackmail, perjury, forgery, murder, and suicide.

The spy business cannot be conducted without illegal, immoral, and criminal activities. But all great powers are engaged in the spy business, and as long as the world is as warlike as it has been in all recorded history there is no way of doing without spying.

All the powers know this and all have accepted the situation as one of the hard facts of life. Around this situation there has developed over many generations a code of behavior. The spying is never avowed and therefore the government never acknowledges responsibility for its own clandestine activities. If its agent is caught, the agent is expected to kill himself. In any event, he is abandoned to the mercies of the government that he has spied upon.

The spying is never admitted. If it can be covered successfully by a lie, the lie is told.

All this is not a pretty business, and there is no way of prettifying it or transforming it into something highly moral and wonderful. The cardinal rule, which makes spying tolerable in international relations, is that it is never avowed. For that reason it is never defended, and therefore the aggrieved country makes only as much of a fuss about a particular incident as it can make or as it chooses to make.

We should have abided by that rule. When Mr. K. made his first announcement about the plane, no lies should have been told. The administration should have said that it was investigating the charge and would then take suitable action. We should then have maintained a cool silence.

This would have left us, of course, with the unpleasant fact that our spy plane had been caught. What really compounded our trouble, and was such a humiliation to us, is that before we knew how much Mr. K. knew we published the official lie about its being a weather plane. Then finding ourselves trapped in this blatant and gratuitous lie, we have tried to extricate ourselves by rushing into the declaration of a new and unprecedented policy.

[From the Washington Post]

THE U–2 IN PARIS

(By Walter Lippmann)

As of Monday, afternoon, eastern time, there is only the faintest chance that the summit meeting will not break up. It is certain that the President will not go to Russia, the invitation having been withdrawn. Thus the attempt to arrive at a truce in the cold war and to relax the tensions has, unless there is a diplomatic miracle, ended in a tragic fiasco.

The issue on which the conference has been disrupted is the flight of the U–2, or more precisely the position taken by the President and his administration. We must remember that when the plane was captured, Mr. Khrushchev opened the door to the President for a diplomatic exit from his quandary; he did not believe, said Mr. K., that Mr. Eisenhower was responsible for ordering the flight.

Undoubtedly Mr. K. knew that Mr. Eisenhower must have authorized the general plan of the flights but he preferred to let the President say what in fact was a sorry kind of truth, that he did not authorize this particular flight. The diplomatic answer would have been to say nothing at the time or at the most to promise an adequate investigation of the whole affair. Instead, Mr. Eisenhower replied that he was responsible, that such flights were necessary, and then he let the world think even if he did not say so in exact words that the flights would continue. This locked the door which Mr. Khrushchev had opened. It transformed the embarrassment of being caught in a spying operation into a direct challenge to the sovereignty of the Soviet Union.

This avowal, this refusal to use the convention of diplomacy was a fatal mistake. For it made it impossible for Mr. Khrushchev to bypass the affair. Had he done that, he would have been in a position of acknowledging to the world, to the Soviet people, to his critics within the Soviet Union, and to his Communist allies, that he had surrendered to the United States the right to violate Soviet territory. No statesman can live in any country after making such an admission.

The news from Paris on Monday shows that Mr. Eisenhower had already realized that his making an avowed policy of the flights was a crucial mistake which had to be corrected. On Saturday there was, it appears, a briefing of the correspondents to tell them that we had never meant to say that the flights would continue. On Sunday in a broadcast in this country Mr. George V. Allen said the same thing. And on Monday the President told Mr. Khrushchev that the flights over Russia have been suspended "and are not to be resumed." A week ago this might have sufficed to quiet down the affair.

The withdrawal was, however, late, and it may prove to have been too little. For during the past week the flight and the way it was handled have given the Soviet Government a rich opportunity to weaken the ring of America's allies around Russia. Those who say that Mr. K. has seized upon the opportunity solely in order to make propaganda have not, I think, realized the gravity

of the disaster which has befallen us. For the Soviet Union there is in this much more than propaganda. There is an instrument for disturbing if not disrupting the encircling alliance.

It would be wishful thinking to suppose that the Soviet Government will not seize this opportunity to push countries like Norway, Iran, Pakistan, Turkey and Japan into pledges and into measures which in some considerable degree neutralize them as American air bases. Morally and legally these allies of ours are defenseless against these Soviet demands.

The Soviet Government is at least as interested in neutralizing our allies around her borders as she is in neutralizing West Berlin. We dare not hope that the Soviet Government will not make the most of the opportunity which has so unexpectedly and so unnecessarily been opened up to her.

Before the affair of the plane, there had been, as Mr. Reston wrote on Monday from Paris, a strong indication that Mr. Khrushchev was very uneasy about the prospects of the summit meeting. I myself was one of those who talked to his personal emissary, Mr. Zhukov, when he came to Washington in April. The burden of Mr. Zhukov's complaint was that about March 15 American policy had suddenly hardened against a negotiation about the status of West Berlin, and that this was a reversal of the understanding given to Mr. K. by the President at Camp David.

Almost certainly, therefore, the affair of the plane offered Mr. K. an opportunity to make a diplomatic gain against the small encircling allies from Norway to Japan. If he was stymied in Berlin, he had the chance to recoup elsewhere. We have not heard the last of the troubles of the encircling allies.

There is not much comfort for us in this. For our own blunders provided Mr. K. with his opportunity.

At this writing it is still conceivable that a way will be found to carry on in Paris. Let us hope so.

[From the Washington Post, May 19, 1960]

FIRST OF ALL

(By Walter Lippmann)

Amid the wreckage, and as we recover from the shock, the long work of rebuilding will have to begin. Where must it begin? It must begin at the point where the most critical damage has been done. Where is that point? It is not in what Mr. Khrushchev said or did to us. It is in what we did to ourselves. It is that we "first did help to wound ourselves."

The wound has been made by the series of blunders on the gravest matters in the highest quarters. These blunders have not only angered the Russians and wrecked the summit conference but, much worse than all that, they have cast doubt among our allies and among our own people on our competence to lead the Western alliance on the issues of peace and war. Mr. Khrushchev's harsh and intemperate language has produced a reaction and evoked sympathy for the plight of the President. But we must have no illusions about the depth and the extent of the loss of confidence in American leadership, in the judgment, sagacity, and political competence of the Government in Washington.

This is the damage to which we must address ourselves. We are a free people, and one of the blessings of a free society is that, unlike an unfree society, it provides a way to deal with error and correct mistakes. This is to investigate, to criticize, to debate, and then to demonstrate to the people and to the world that the lessons of the fiasco have been learned and will be applied.

In a situation like ours the damage to our prestige would be irreparable if we all rallied around the President and pretended to think that there was nothing seriously wrong. For that would prove to the world that the blunders will not be corrected but will be continued, and that our whole people are satisfied with bad government. It is the dissenters and the critics and the opposition who can restore the world's respect for American competence. We cannot do this by pretending that the incompetence does not exist.

These are harsh words. But in what other words shall we describe the performance on Sunday night when the Secretary of Defense, who is in Paris as one of the President's advisers, ordered a worldwide alert of American combat forces? On Sunday night Mr. Macmillan and General de Gaulle were still struggling to find some way out of the affair of the spy plane. Yet this was the time chosen by the Secretary of Defense to stage a worldwide readiness exercise which, though not the last stage before actual war, is one of the preliminary stages to it.

Why Sunday of all days? This blunder was not the work of some forgotten colonel on a Turkish airfield. This was the work of the Secretary of Defense and of the President. The timing of the exercise was just a shade worse than sending off the U–2 on its perilous mission 2 weeks before the summit. The timing of the so-called exercise makes no sense whatever. For if the alert was concerned with a possible surprise attack, when in the name of common sense could there be less danger of a surprise attack on the Western World than when Mr. K. in person was in Paris?

Unhappily, too, Secretary Gates exercise was just about as incompetently administered at the top as was the affair of the spy plane. This time, it appears, the top people forgot to say anything about the exercise to their press officers who did not know what to say, and were not even in their offices, when the public was being frightened by the exercise.

A great government faced with a most formidable adversary, itself the leader, champion and mainstay of the non-Communist world cannot be conducted in such a reckless and haphazard way. That is the damage that first must be repaired before we can begin to deal with the general international wreckage, and to regain our confidence in ourselves.

[From the New York Times, May 19, 1960]

THE SUMMIT TRAGEDY—BREAKDOWN OF PARLEY SHAKES WORLD'S FAITH IN WISDOM OF TOP LEADERS

(By James Reston)

PARIS, MAY 18.—The tragedy of the Paris Conference, which ended tonight, is that it shook the confidence of the world in the wisdom and judgment of the two nations that hold the key to war and peace.

What troubled Paris tonight was not primarily what President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev would do now—which nobody knows—but the realization that the two most powerful nations in the world are also the least experienced of the great powers: both subject to the element of accident, to the ingrained habits of the past and to the whims of personal pride and caprice.

This was the conference that everyone lost. It did something no one thought possible: It outfailed the Paris Conference of 1919. After 41 years President Eisenhower, Premier Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan and President de Gaulle made Wilson, Clemenceau, Lloyd George and Orlando look good.

It was this sense of uncertainty about the giants of the world that dominated the atmosphere in Paris today. Here was Mr. Khrushchev this afternoon in the great hall of the Palais de Chaillot shouting at the West, paying deference to the glowering Marshal Rodion Y. Malinovsky on his left and threatening to smash American planes like an impudent cat against a wall.

EISENHOWER SILENT AND ANGRY

Here, too, was the President of the United States, angry and silent, visiting cathedrals while his allies praised his dignity and sympathized with the failure of his last great chance for an East-West accommodation, but condemned in private his absent-minded behavior on the reconnaissance flights over the Soviet Union.

Everyone was trying to be very considerate and hopeful about the mess, but all had to admit it was a mess, brought on by the unplanned blunders of Washington and the savage, planned reaction of Moscow.

The general reaction to the two men was quite different. One was restrained, the other was violent; one was silent and defensive today, the other loud and offensive.

One was trying to remove misunderstandings, the other was exploiting them. But the main point was that both were shaking the world, one by accident and the other by design.

The nub of the whole thing seemed to be that both President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev, for different reasons, had lost control over the direction of the immense power they are supposed to govern.

The fact that the President came here and announced that he had grounded all flights over the Soviet Union for the rest of his term in office is clear enough proof that, if he had been aware of the fact of these flights at this sensitive moment, he would not have approved the flight of the U–2 that was downed in Soviet territory on May 1.

CONFIDENCE IN UNITED STATES SHAKEN

The President has conceded this here in his private talks with Mr. Macmillan and General de Gaulle. They do not condemn his objective or his personal motives: in fact, he is so obviously disappointed by the melancholy turn of events since the sky-spy case that the British and French leaders are more sympathetic to him now than ever before.

Nevertheless, the lack of control and discipline over the Central Intelligence Agency by General Eisenhower, and the failure of the State Department to retain civil authority over the administration's intelligence-gathering activities have inevitably shaken the confidence of the allies in the judgment of the Nation that is their primary line of defense.

Mr. Khrushchev lost control too, apparently for different reasons. General Eisenhower led his party out of isolationism, but Mr. Khrushchev has been engaged in the even more delicate operation of fraternizing with the "capitalist enemy."

By doing so, he was going against the militant Communist philosophy that nothing matters except the class struggle. Many of his own powerful associates in the Communist party's Central Committee apparently did not approve of the manner in which he was hobnobbing with the capitalists, and the Chinese Communists felt that this whole process of itinerant good fellowship was bound to create what they called "ideological confusion" within the Communist world.

So long as it appeared that Mr. Krushchev might sweet-talk the Russians into West Berlin, his jaunts were tolerated. But when this dream began to fail, and particularly when it was discovered that President Eisenhower was responsible for sending the U–2's over Soviet territory, the other leaders of the Soviet Union, it is felt here, demanded a change—with or without Mr. Khrushchev's approval.

Western leaders who were present at the Monday meeting at the Elysée Palace with Mr. Khrushchev got the impression that the Premier was nervous and perhaps even a little unhappy in his about-face role. But by this afternoon, he was as hard as Vyacheslav M. Molotov and as vivid and vituperative as Andrei Y. Vishinsky.

The last time Mr. Khrushchev saw Paris he was the benign and jovial "Mr. K". He made a special point then with President de Gaulle that their conversations should be held without anyone present except the interpreters.

JOVIALITY IS PUT ASIDE

This week all was changed. The "jovial Mr. K." became the arm-waving "naughty Nik," and Marshal Malinovsky was there as a witness of his every word and move, even when Mr. Khrushchev said goodby to President de Gaulle.

None of this was missed by the press of the world or the diplomatic corps of Paris, and the inevitable reaction was not only that the giants were quarreling—which always terrifies the world—but that they were blundering in a most extraordinary way.

This was particularly true of Mr. Khrushchev after he got well into his new role. He overplayed every card he had. He was rude and primitive. He was not only a boor, but what is worse in Paris, he was a bore. And instead of splitting the Allies, he even drove the press of London and Paris to the President's support, which is not easy to do.

There are the things that have spread the feeling of uneasiness about the leadership of the great powers. The two men who started out to reduce tensions ended up by increasing them here in Paris, and the question now is how far the present "dukes-up" attitude will go.

About this, no one really knows, probably not even Mr. Khrushchev. For until he gets back to Moscow and reports to the Central Committee, there is no way of knowing what will happen to Berlin, or for that matter, what will happen to Mr. Khrushchev.

[From the New York Times, May 20, 1960]

PARIS—HOW TO TURN DEFEAT INTO VICTORY

(By James Reston)

PARIS.—The official line of the U.S. Government on the summit conference is almost as surprising as the conference itself. For the White House theme, put out nightly by James C. Hagerty and his aids at official briefings, is that U.S. officials won a victory here over Nikita Khrushchev and solidified the Western alliance.

Even when allowances are made for the difficulties of any U.S. spokesman at the summit, this is an extraordinary claim, and it is all the more astonishing and even disturbing because some of the American officials actually believe it.

They justify their conclusion very simply. They merely leave out the U–2 spy incident and the contradictory explanations which followed it in Washington. All that, they say, is old stuff, whereas what happened in Paris, rather than Sverdlovsk, was pretty good.

On this sharply limited ground, there is something to be said for the argument. Nobody could have been worse than Khrushchev in Paris. It is not only that he was badmannered and inaccurate, but there were times in yesterday's press conference when he seemed almost out of control.

In the face of this obvious determination to try to humiliate and intimidate President Eisenhower, it is also true that President de Gaulle and Prime Minister Macmillan rallied to the President, and De Gaulle in particular handled a difficult situation with serenity and skill.

CATALOG OF DEFEAT

There is another gain: Unlike the summit conference of 1955, which concealed the hard realities of the East-West struggle (again with the aid of Mr. Hagerty's press-agentry), this one at least dispelled the rose-colored fog of the last few years and exposed the unpleasant truth.

Nobody is against expressions of sympathy for the sad conclusion of the President's efforts at accommodation, but the truth is unpleasant and dangerous, and it is not going to be handled by adding jingoism to sloppy staff work and absentminded administration in the White House.

This whole thing is not a victory for anybody. It is a serious defeat for Secretary of State Herter and his aids who did not alert the President to the dangers of these flights before the summit. It is a serious defeat for Allen Dulles and the Central Intelligence Agency for not coordinating the timing of the May 1 flight with the State Department's summit plans.

It is a serious defeat for the President and his whole system of delegating presidential power to subordinates at critical moments in the history of the Nation. It is a serious defeat for Prime Minister Macmillan, who defied 300 years of British diplomatic experience and pressed relentlessly for summit diplomacy. And it is a serious defeat for Khrushchev and his policy of coexistence.

There would be no point in going over this tiresome catalog of gloomy facts if there was any evidence that the President was now prepared to put his official house in order, but there is no evidence of this. On the contrary, we are now told officially that the relationships between the White House and the CIA, the State Department and the CIA remain the same.

SELF-PITY, SELF-DECEPTION

The events of the last few weeks have not only exposed the weaknesses of the National Security Council system within the U.S. Government but dramatized the failure of the alliance members to plan together in their common interest.

There has seldom been better paper preparation for any conference since the war than for this summit. Literally hundreds of thousands of words were written and exchanged among officials in Washington, Paris, and London. But the British and French knew nothing about the U–2 flight on May 1, and neither did the Turks, Pakistanis and Norwegians, who are now under threat of rocket retaliation from Moscow as a result.

Everybody in the top rungs of the U.S. delegation here agrees that the test of the alliance now lies ahead on Berlin. It is not going to be possible to coast and wait for the next administration. The pressure is starting now at a time when the confidence of the alliance in Washington's judgment has been badly shaken.

This is inevitably going to call for better administration in the United States and better coordination within the alliance, and these things are not likely to occur in a mood of self-pity or self-deception.

[From the New York Times, May 19, 1960]

THE DEMOCRATS' MESSAGE TO EISENHOWER

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—The Democratic leadership policy toward the international crisis produced by Premier Khrushchev's sabotage of the summit conference is implicit in the telegram sent to President Eisenhower yesterday by four principal party spokesmen, and in a speech made to the Senate today by Majority Leader JOHNSON.

This policy is to keep the Nation united in the aftermath of the U–2 espionage episode, including the collapse of the summit conference, and to make certain the Soviet Premier realizes he cannot look to a Democratic administration for concessions on matters of principle he could not force upon the current Republican administration. The policy, furthermore, is to make sure Mr. Khrushchev fully understands that he cannot count on the Democratic leadership in Congress to make a partisan political issue of the astonishing series of recent Government stumblings in an operation area full of the explosives which could set off a nuclear war.

To understand the purposes of the telegram sent to President Eisenhower and signed by Speaker Rayburn, Senators Johnson and Fulbright, and Adlai E. Stevenson it is necessary first to know that it was sent yesterday before the summit conference had collapsed, not today after this had happened. The message was written and dispatched on information that there was to be another attempt to convoke the meeting with Mr. Khrushchev as a participant.

Noting that the Soviet Premier had mentioned "6 or 8 months" as a waiting period before a summit conference he would find any reason for attending, which, of course, meant after President Eisenhower's successor had been chosen, Senator JOHNSON drew two conclusions: One, that the Soviet Premier thought he could do more profitable business for his side with the Democrats in power; and, two, that it was in the paramount interest of the United States to inform him that assumption was unfounded.

In consultation with the other signers it was agreed that the President was the proper channel of views "to be conveyed" to the Premier (by any means the President might choose); also that this procedure furnished direct assurance to the President from responsible opposition leaders of their full support of him as the representative of the American Government and people. For a time today it was not made clear that the message was sent yesterday in the belief the summit conference might still convene. But when the timing became known, an impression died away that the Democratic leaders were suggesting the impossible, knowing it was, as a pretty hollow campaign gesture.

The same leadership attitude was inherent in a statement by JOHNSON to the Senate concerning means whereby Congress and the American people could learn the facts behind the U–2 episode. "We shall treat errors," he said, "as mistakes to be corrected, not as a leverage to separate our Nation." There will be "a cool and objective assessment of whatever mistakes have been made," but "under conditions and circumstances * * * to contribute to the information of the American people and the strengthening of the country * * * not as a search for scapegoats."

These words could be taken to forecast a formal congressional inquiry into the sorry executive U–2 record of quickly exposed denials and amateurish confessions, culminating in impression possibly left by the President's announcement at Paris, in an atmosphere of compulsion created by Premier Khrushchev, that the State Department was bluffing again when it left open the implication that the U–2 overflights would continue.

It appears, however, that the majority leader will not lend his influence to establish this kind of inquiry. Apparently he confidently expects the President to give the full facts in the U–2 record to the key congressional leaders and as much of these to the public as his estimate of security permits. It remains to be seen whether either account will furnish the answer to these prevalent questions:

Did the U–2 espionage overflights become so much of a "milk route" that nobody in the security complex gave a thought to the special hazard if an expedition were inter-

cepted at the time Powers' was? If nobody did, was this the consequence of poor judgment, entrenched bureaucracy or a mechanical lack of the coordination between act and policy that the National Security Council and the "secret subcommittee" of the Operations Coordinating Board were established to provide?

[From the New York Times, May 20, 1960]

THE DEMOCRATS' MESSAGE TO EISENHOWER—II

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 19.—There are occasions when a political party's interest and that of the Nation coincide and the result is an act of constructive statesmanship. The latest instance was the telegram of support which four Democratic leaders sent to President Eisenhower Tuesday afternoon when Western efforts were continuing in Paris to persuade Soviet Premier Khrushchev not to sabotage the summit conference.

The service of the telegram to the national interest was plain on its face. It demonstrated to Premier Khrushchev and to the American people that the opposition political party in the United States stands solidly with the party of the administration behind the President in this crisis. It also notified Mr. Khrushchev that, if his suggested postponement of 6 or 8 months implied belief that a Democratic President would yield to demands President Eisenhower had firmly rejected, he was very badly mistaken. And this statement of the Democratic position by four of its principal spokesmen—Speaker Rayburn, Senators Johnson and Fulbright, and Adlai E. Stevenson—further promoted the national interest by the precept of unity it commended to the American people.

The service of the telegram to the special interest of the Democratic Party in this presidential election year was not visible on the surface. But the signers were fully aware that the message to President Eisenhower and its contents would have this effect. They were also fully aware that this step needed to be taken promptly to protect the Democratic Party and its national ticket from the curse of preference by the Soviet Premier that he had indicated in his 6 or 8 months delay proposal and in his violent attacks on President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon.

These threaten to create a psychology of interference by Mr. Khrushchev in the American electoral process. History has shown that this tactic by the representative of a foreign government can be fatal to the American political party for which it indicates a preference. The hazard unquestionably would be greater for the Democrats if they permitted a public impression to take root that the Soviet Premier has reason to hope for substantial concessions from a Democratic regime.

TWO-EDGED POLICY

Thus he supplied one of those occasions when essential political party strategy is indivisible from an act of the highest national statecraft. And Senator JOHNSON, in proposing the message to the President that was made authoritative by the identity of the signers, put his party in the happy position where it could achieve both objectives by a single stroke of policy. Though there is dissatisfaction in the ranks of the majority leader's veto of a formal congressional inquiry into the official sources of the incredible series of administration errors in the U–2 episode and the veto may be overridden in some committee, Democratic approval of the Paris message has been virtually unanimous.

But behind the nonpartisan front it presented to Premier Khrushchev there is a tumult of speculation in the political community over the effects of what happened this week in Paris on the prospects of the Presidential candidates. The questions being deeply debated are: Which Democratic aspirants for the nomination did Mr. Khrushchev's violent performance at Paris help or hurt? Will the collapse of the summit conference and its causes make Vice President NIXON a stronger or a weaker Republican nominee? Will party estimates of this bring any change in the prospective mood at Chicago?

It is far too early even to guess at answers that new developments in international tensions could alter fundamentally. But the following is a composite of the speculations heard among politicians here:

The new critical aspects of the world situation have raised the Democratic convention stock of JOHNSON and Stevenson. They also have given Senator SYMINGTON a better opportunity to exploit his pioneer criticisms of the Eisenhower military defense programs. They tend to accent unfavorably Senator KENNEDY'S youth and administrative inexperience. NIXON will be hurt in the campaign by his obligatory defense of Executive handling of the U–2 episode, but Khrushchev's attacks will make his nomination even more certain and help his electoral prospect.

Currently all this is only dope. But American politicians and people are incurably addicted to its use.

[From the Washington Post, May 20, 1960]

THE GRIM OUTLOOK AFTER THE SUMMIT

(By Marquis Childs)

PARIS.—With the end of negotiation between East and West—the ruin of the summit conference means scarcely less than that—the cold war warriors will try to take over both in the Soviet Union and the United States. The extent to which they succeed will be the measure of the danger in which the world now stands.

Of that peril there cannot be the least doubt. In a fall from the summit, where the Western powers had until quite recently talked themselves into a strange and unreal complacency, it is hard to stop at a halfway point.

The faction in Washington that has consistently opposed any understanding with Soviet Russia, however limited, is well identified. It consists, on the one hand, of the hard-core anti-Communists who are convinced that the Communist system is so immoral, wicked, and menacing to Western civilization that a policy that sanctions its existence is not acceptable. Somewhat less emotional but no less implacable are the men in the Atomic Energy Commisison and the Pentagon who are convinced that America's policy must be one of strength pushed to a point at which in one way or another it will overwhelm the Soviet Union.

The danger inherent in these attitudes is evident enough. At its furthest limit are the Pentagon planners who prepare detailed papers to prove that the United States can absorb 40 million casualties in a nuclear war and yet emerge the eventual victor. They will now be pushing for more ready alerts, greater defense appropriations, and an end to all contacts with the enemy to the east.

In the Communist bloc the faction convinced of the inevitability of the cold war is harder to define but it may be equally important in the equation of uncertainty and fear that we now confront. It is on the opposition of these elements that the best explanation of Prime Minister Khrushchev's violent and intractable behavior here in Paris may be found.

Little noticed outside the Communist bloc, a drumfire of attack on Khrushchev has grown louder in recent months. Coming in its purest form from Red China, the attack has centered in Khrushchev's heresy in the weird subterranean world of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine.

When President Eisenhower at his press conference last week not only accepted responsibility for the U–2 plane incident but seemed to be saying that he approved the continuance of such flights, Khrushchev was put in an extremely embarrassing position.

Whether, as satellite observers here insist and some Westerners agree, Khrushchev waited until Sunday night for a sign that Eisenhower would voluntarily disavow the flights is perhaps now irrelevant. What is important is that Khrushchev was compelled to react with a violence that would prove to his critics that he had discovered the error of his ways.

After all, as the American Ambassador to Moscow, Llewellyn Thompson, confirmed in reports to Washington, the Soviet Premier was preparing for Eisenhower's visit to Russia in June such a welcome as rarely has been accorded a citizen, to say nothing of a foreigner. This was being done for a hero of peace whose halo had been fastened on under Khrushchev's direction. With the unmasking of this hero Khrushchev was driven to react in violence.

But propaganda and violence to one side, there is a large element of genuine fear in the Soviet reaction to the U–2 episode. To ignore this, to assume that the cold, calculating Soviets have made every move at Paris out of cold calculation, is to indulge in a kind of ostrichism especially dangerous for this moment.

The Russians seem to have been anxious up until now to deny nuclear weapons to the Red Chinese. But what if Peiping, against the background of their rightness in the doctrinal dispute over communism versus capitalism, demands such weapons?

Once such weapons have spread throughout the two blocs, the chances of averting nuclear war are narrowed to a vanishing point. The boastful planners in Red China have proclaimed that they can absorb 200 million casualties in nuclear war and with their vast territory and vaster population they will be the only real survivor.

[From the Washington Post, May 19, 1960]

BOTH SIDES LOSE IN U–2 FRACAS

(By Robert Hotz)

The whole truth of Francis Gary Powers' 1,400-mile penetration of the Soviet Union in a Lockheed U–2 on a Central Intelligence Agency mission of photo and electronic reconnaissance has not yet been told.

Mr. Khrushchev's most blatant lie is his statement that the U–2 was hit by a Red Army antiaircraft missile at an altitude of 65,000 feet near Sverdlovsk after it had penetrated the air defenses of the Soviet Union for some 1,400 miles. This lie was necessary because the citizens of the U.S.S.R. could understandably grow uneasy over the admitted ability of the U–2 and other specialized aircraft to penetrate Soviet airspace consistently with impunity.

The fact is, and Mr. Khrushchev undoubtedly knows it, that Powers' U–2 had an engine flameout at the altitude that it and other U–2 aircraft cruised safely beyond the reach of the Soviet air defense system. The flameout forced Powers to descend below 40,000 feet where the denser atmosphere made an attempt to restart his jet engine feasible. Either Powers failed to restart his engine or his plane was damaged at this relatively low altitude.

Another obvious lie was used to bolster this originally false claim for the Soviet air defense system. A picture of some badly battered scrap from an Aeroflot TU–104 crash near Sverdlovsk last February was officially released by the Soviets labeled as the U–2 wreckage to convey an impression of terrible damage wrought by the antiaircraft missile. When this fake was exposed by

Lockheed's U–2 designer, C. L. (Kelly) Johnson, the remains of the genuine U–2 were finally produced for an exhibition in Moscow's Gorki Park.

Further contradiction of the missile hit scored at 65,000 feet was the Soviets' own claim that they recovered most of the U–2 photo and electronic reconnaissance equipment in good condition, were able to examine the cockpit ejection system in detail and to retrieve miscellaneous gear from the cockpit intact.

Nor is Mr. Khrushchev telling the truth when he announces that the Soviets have switched completely from bombers to ballistic missiles and that they no longer are producing or developing or exercising bombers because they are obsolete for modern warfare. The U.S.S.R. is still producing long-range jet bombers, although at far from maximum possible rates.

When we turn to the record of our own Government agencies involved in the U–2 adventure the record of deliberate falsification is equally bad. The series of interagency bungles give us a quesy feeling over what might happen in a real emergency with survival or defeat hinging on the speed and acumen of the official reaction.

First, there are the ivory tower researchers of the old NACA now with NASA who had their hard-won reputation for scientific integrity shredded overnight by the exposure of their role as unwitting dupes of the Central Intelligence Agency.

This damage to NASA's scientific integrity may count for little in the calloused calculations of CIA supersleuths, but it will do irreparable harm in the international scientific community where this country has many of its stanchest friends.

The official U.S. policy as finally stated by President Eisenhower some 10 days after Powers' U–2 hit the Siberian earth also carries some future forebodings.

It officially commits the United States to a continuous and deliberate policy of violating the Soviet airspace and formally makes espionage an integral part of U.S. policy. Although virtually every American citizen can see the need for continuous surveillance of the Soviet Union by whatever effective methods are available and will tacitly support these efforts, it is quite another matter to publicly announce that espionage and violation of another country's territory have become an official policy.

Third, of course, comes the Central Intelligence Agency, in this incident stripped of all its protective secrecy, and standing nakedly exposed in an incredibly amateurish performance compounded from inadequate training, faulty execution and rather transparent cover operations. Apparently, all that was adequately provided in this operation was the $30,000-a-year salaries for the pilots. Whatever reasons impelled Francis Powers to decline to carry out the traditional self-destruction orders of the espionage agent apprehended redhanded by the enemy may never be known. Suffice to say his embarrassing survival was not in the best tradition of either USAF, the agency that originally trained him, or CIA, the Agency that hired him without training him properly in its specialized requirement.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I could put into the RECORD dozens of editorials from papers like the Chicago Sun-Times, papers that have never supported the Democratic Party during the Eisenhower epoch, in which they concede the blunders.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a full-page article from the Chicago Sun-Times of yesterday, outlining what these are. No one in his right mind would think the Chicago Sun-Times represents a position hostile to President Eisenhower.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 22, 1960]

POLITICKING ON THE U–2

(By Milburn P. Akers)

The gift of 20–20 hindsight possessed by so many is now being demonstrated anew by some of the political opposition to President Eisenhower.

Few persons would contend the entire U–2 incident was conducted without fault. It wasn't. Nonetheless there is no assurance that the critics would have done any better, if as well, or that, had they been at the helm, the summit conference would have convened and solved any of the world's tensions even partially.

By this time it is obvious to most persons that Soviet Prime Minister Nikita S. Khrushchev went to Paris with the intention of aborting the conference as quickly as possible. It is equally obvious that he used the U–2 incident merely as an excuse for doing so.

Why he wrecked the conference which he himself had long sought is undetermined except by some of the theorists, many of whom will have a new theory in another week or less. His reasons, if any, will be clear some day. When they are, the U–2 and matters related to it will not be numbered among them.

To consider errors in the handling of the U–2 incident calmly, as mistakes to be corrected, not as a leverage to separate our Nation, as has been suggested by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, is statesmanship.

To treat them otherwise is politics.

Men's motivations are difficult to determine. So whatever motivations Adlai E. Stevenson may have had in his Thursday speech to Illinois Democrats can be left to his own conscience to determine. But the speech itself raises a lot of questions which Stevenson himself did not answer.

The occasion was political.

It is difficult to imagine anything more political than the manner in which Stevenson marshaled the various events in the U–2 incident and commented upon them. At no time did he concede that it is essential for the United States to obtain military intelligence. At no time did he concede that the Soviets have and are engaged in widespread espionage intended to obtain similar information. Everything done by the administration subsequent to the U–2 disclosure was a mistake, according to Stevenson.

He asserted that, as a consequence of the U–2, and events subsequent to it, Russia would no longer negotiate with the present administration.

To suggest, as Stevenson did, that only a Democratic President can negotiate with Khrushchev is politics, simple but not pure.

True, Stevenson did not say that in so many words. But no other construction can be placed on his statements.

He did say "they [the administration] have helped make successful negotiations with the Russians—negotiations that are vital to our survival—impossible so long as they are in power."

Vice President NIXON is an integral part of the administration. He is the likely Republican nominee for President. Unless Stevenson specifically excludes NIXON from the administration, which he didn't, and which he cannot, he was saying that negotiations with the Russians can be resumed only if the Democratic nominee is elected in November.

Stevenson said Democrats must "help the American people understand the nature of the crisis, to see how we got into this predicament, how we can get out of it, and how we can get on with the business of improving relations and mutual confidence and building a safer, saner world in the nuclear age."

Stevenson's speech didn't accomplish this result; didn't answer the questions he himself raised.

He merely said, in effect, that a Republican President had gotten us into a mess and suggested that only a Democratic President could get us out of it.

It's impossible to read any other interpretation into his verbiage.

Supposedly, Stevenson will amplify his indication that the Democrats have the solution for the "building of a safer, saner world in the nuclear age."

That's what every one wants, of course. But some persons must be forgiven if they have reservations that all this can be accomplished merely by a change of administration.

Unfortunately, Khrushchev, his colleagues, and their successors will have something to say about it, too.

Will Mr. K. and company recede from their position on West Berlin, merely to cite one example, as a consequence of the election of a Democratic President?

Stevenson's somewhat partisan speech may have served a partisan purpose.

It will not rank among the greatest.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 22, 1960]

ADLAI GAINS GROUND

(By John Dreiske)

Ofttimes accused of being a bit of a starry-eyed amateur at practical politics by the professionals of his own Democratic Party, Adlai E. Stevenson has shown them he can be very practical indeed.

In fact, many of them privately but enthusiastically applauded Stevenson's apparent recognition of the fact that "bungling at the summit" currently is the biggest issue the Democrats have in the 1960 elections.

The former Illinois Governor showed himself to be not only a practical politician but a canny one as well. He was the first prominent Democrat to put into words the wonderment of many ordinary folks over the handling of the spy plane incident.

Stevenson now has an issue and he isn't likely to let go of it. He seemed to be appropriating the role of loyal opposition leader who has respect for the Presidency but sheds all hypocrisy in bringing out that the specific incumbent is not infallible and that there is evidence to indicate that he is not.

It is likely that Stevenson helped himself toward the Democratic presidential nomination at the July 11 Democratic convention in Los Angeles.

The opportunity to make himself an issue which, in a sense, was ready-made and to exploit it came at a most opportune time. Stevenson's principal competition for the nomination, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY Democrat, of Massachusetts, was embroiled in a crucial Oregon primary on the eve of the voting when caution probably dictated no chance-taking.

But Stevenson, with little to lose and much to gain, could take the chance he did take that he would not be denounced by the general public for being a bit of a traitor by not adhering to charitable sweetness and light treatment of the President.

Stevenson said he thought it "unfortunate" that the spy plane fuss and the summit collapse should have occurred in a campaign year. He must be credited with the realistic knowledge that, as they clamor for "unity" to support the President right or wrong, the Republicans are playing politics right to the hilt.

Whether he has hurt his own cause or not, Stevenson probably has done his party a service whichever nominee it selects at Los

Angeles. Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON is the most likely GOP presidential nominee at the moment; failure at the summit is now highlighted as Republican failure and NIXON is a Republican, an important part of the Eisenhower administration.

Republican efforts to disassociate NIXON from Ike's handling of the spy plane matter leading to the summit collapse probably will be difficult to say the least. Such efforts must include a sort of public shelving of Mr. Eisenhower himself. In such a circumstance, a party split is something to be looked for and then maybe Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, can run through this hole in the line. At any rate, any possible GOP split is, of course, to the Democrats' advantage. And Stevenson has spectacularly set the stage for such a division.

Mayor Daley's withholding of approval of Stevenson's sentiments expressed at Thursday night's $100-a-plate fund-raiser at the Conrad Hilton Hotel was notable and probably will chill those Illinois convention delegates who look to Daley for their national convention cue.

The mayor's reluctance might be traced to his reported loyalty to KENNEDY'S candidacy. It could logically be presumed, perhaps, that Daley would not want to seem to be switching to Stevenson at a time when even the flick of a facial expression is interpreted by eager pundits as an expression of partiality toward this candidate or that.

It should also be noted that, with his 7-minute speech, Stevenson ran the official star of the evening, CHESTER BOWLES, right out of the spotlight.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 22, 1960]

FACTS NEED FACING

(By Joseph Alsop)

PARIS.—After the ugly scenes of the aborted summit meeting, it is wise to make up a sort of balance sheet of facts to be faced.

The first fact that needs facing, alas, is the grave loss of prestige and confidence that President Eisenhower has suffered. As Walter Lippmann has written, it is right that men of all parties should rally to the President, but it is also wrong to be self-deluding. The affair of the U–2 has caused America's greatest friends in the Western alliance to conclude that America's present leadership is bumbling and maladroit.

The second fact to be faced is less painful to American self-esteem but decidedly more alarming. The leadership of the other great world bloc is even more dangerous and implacable than all but the worst of pessimists had imagined in their gloomiest moments.

After seeing Nikita S. Khrushchev do everything but froth at the mouth and chew the carpet at his incredible press conference, a great many observers in Paris began to use the grim adjective "Hitlerian." But those who know the man best believe that he was doing this from calculation.

But even if Khrushchev is not semilunatic, as Adolf Hitler was, the consolation is trifling.

As for the third and final fact to be faced, it flows directly from the second. A major effort to strengthen the military defenses of the West is now a matter of great urgency.

There are two reasons why a strengthened defense effort is now urgent. No one doubts Khrushchev is capable of striking at the United States and the West with every bomb in his arsenal.

The main things that need doing are the same things that were discussed during the debate on national defense at the beginning of the year. Appropriations are needed to inaugurate a maximum airborne alert of the Strategic Air Command's entire force of B–52 bombers. The airborne alert ought to begin now, and continue at full strength until the U.S. striking power in long-range guided missiles has been massively augmented.

Similarly the buildup of the long-range missiles ought to be increased in every way possible, and every dollar should be appropriated that can be used to speed the two reconnaissance satellite projects, Midas and Semos. In addition, the affair of the U–2 plainly proves the shortsightedness of the policymakers who have cut back production of the B–52H bomber almost to zero.

Here is a bomber with the range, speed, and altitude characteristics that will allow it to imitate the U–2's performance. It can go almost where it will in the skies above the Soviet Union, just as the U–2 did for so long. It is not menaced, so far as is known, by improvements in the Soviet air defense system, whereas the B–52, flying at lower speeds and at somewhat lower altitudes, may well be menaced later on.

It is hard to understand how any policymaker can have all but stopped production of the B–52H bomber, with the example of the U–2 before his eyes. But this is what was done. And this is what should now be undone as far as possible.

More costly defense programs; still deeper distrust of the Kremlin; apologies needed for our own leadership's performance—they make an unpleasant list, but we have now been warned. It can be very dangerous indeed if the warning is ignored.

Mr. MONRONEY. We have before us today this documentation by an almost unanimous American press, and yet we find the minority leader going to a French correspondent, to a story carried in a French newspaper, translated back into English and printed here, and denied by the man who was allegedly quoted, and saying "I hold in my hand the documentation."

Then we have this example, and this is only an example, of turning the word "turncoat" into "turn quote," or vice versa. Now "turn-quote" is an interesting word, but in Webster's giant dictionary, where there appear the words "turn back," "turn out," "turn over," "turn tail," and all the other "turns," I cannot find "turn quote."

It seems to me it might be an afterthought. I do not blame anyone for wishing to change that word of opprobrium against a respected American.

It seems to me, in times like these, we ought to do what the press itself is doing, and ask the questions, "Who? What? When? Why? Where?" What happened to so diminish America's world stature on the eve of the summit conference? Was this flight necessary? Why the original handling of it and the blunder of calling it a weather plane? Why give to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—one agency of government which, if we are to reach an understanding on science with the other nations, should be above suspicion—the handicap of being used to cover intelligence operations? Why, after the denials, and counterdenials, and reasons that were manufactured, then admit that this was done, and admit it had been done for 4 years? That factor was not in question at all.

Then why did we leave in question for so many days whether these flights would be continued? The world's press interpreted official statements to mean that they would be continued, on the eve of the conference. Then, when that position was changed, apparently someone forgot to notify the information officer. When it was possible to have those facts go to the world and the Paris Conference, the message somehow did not get out.

But the worldwide alert did receive publicity attention. Mr. President, out West people did not reach for their guns at a poker table, unless they saw some danger of shooting. Certainly I would not have thought the alert to be necessary with Khrushchev in France, so that a catastrophic thermonuclear war would result in losing the Russian Chief of State.

It seems to me the best way to go about this matter is to have an investigation, which I think the Foreign Relations Committee can make, into the pre-summit position. There was much complaint about it. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee and many others complained before the Senate that there not much preparation was being made. Little did we know that the preparations some people, somewhere, somehow, were making were dangerous, more dangerous than the lack of programs for the success of the summit.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. First, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Oklahoma for one of his typically clear presentations to the Senate. Every Member of this body knows he speaks only with the facts. In my opinion, this morning he has made a great contribution to the security of our country.

I ask the Senator: Is it not the function of the legislative branch to look into matters of this character in order to find out how they happened, and make recommendations on a constructive basis so as to prevent their happening in the future?

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree completely with the Senator. Democracy can only purify, correct, and eliminate future error by constructive criticism. The only ones who can properly do this—I think the only ones who should do this—are the opposition. It is the duty of the opposition at least to point the finger at the need. This we have done. Our leading Democrats are criticized in the most intemperate language for pointing the finger at some things which the newspapers in the United States have universally decried as blunders.

As Governor Stevenson said:

> We cannot sweep this whole sorry mess under the rug in the name of national unity. We cannot and must not. Too much is at stake. Rather we must try to help the American people understand the nature of the crisis, to see how we got into this predicament, how we can get out of it, and how we get on with the business of improving relations and mutual confidence and building a safer, saner world in the nuclear age.

This is the day of loyal opposition.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that chronological statement of the facts with respect to the U–2 incident be printed in the RECORD, in support very completely of the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does the Senator have that information prepared?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have the information.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am delighted to have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I welcome this information, because it is very important if we are going to face this program like men instead of like children. We should not try to say, in the name of national unity, that we must continue to tolerate great, tragic errors which go on uncorrected.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The article to which I refer was written by the Associated Press, and was published May 17, 1960. The headline is "Chronological Account of U.S. Reports on U–2."

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator says it is an Associated Press article?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think we can all trust the Associated Press not to editorialize on behalf of the Democratic Party.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator. I again congratulate the Senator.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHRONOLOGICAL ACCOUNT OF U.S. REPORTS ON U–2

Following is a chronological account of conflicting statements and comments about the spy plane incident as made by administration spokesmen and agencies.

May 6 (5 days after the flight), an announcement by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration:

"One of NASA's U–2 research airplanes, in use since 1956 in a continuing program to study gust-meterological conditions found at high altitudes, has been missing since about 9 o'clock Sunday morning, when its pilot reported he was having oxygen difficulties over the Lake Van, Turkey, area.

"If the pilot continued to suffer lack of oxygen, the path of the airplane from the last reported position would be impossible to determine. If the airplane was on automatic pilot, it is likely it would have continued along its northeasterly course.

"The pilot, as are all pilots used on NASA's program of upper atmosphere research with the U–2 airplane, is a civilian employed by the Lockheed Aircraft Corp., builders of the airplane.

May 6: Comment by State Department Spokesman Lincoln White at a news conference:

QUESTION. "Has there been any change in the orders under which the planes continue to operate in the vicinity of the Soviet border?"

Mr. White: "There is no change to be made. This gentleman (the pilot) informed us that he was having difficulty with his oxygen equipment. Now our assumption is that the man blacked out. There was absolutely no—n-o—deliberate attempt to violate the Soviet airspace."

May 7: Statement by the State Department:

"As previously announced, it was known that a U–2 plane was missing. As a result of the inquiry ordered by the President it has been established that insofar as the authorities in Washington are concerned there was no authorization for any such flight as described by Mr. Khrushchev.

"Nevertheless it appears that in endeavoring to obtain information now concealed behind the Iron Curtain a flight over Soviet territory was probably undertaken by an unarmed civilian U–2 plane.

The "necessity for such activities as measures for legitimate national defense is enhanced by the excessive secrecy practiced by the Soviet Union in contrast to the free world."

"It is in relation to the danger of surprise attack that planes of the type of unarmed civilian U–2 aircraft have made flights along the frontiers of the free world for the past 4 years.

May 7: Comment by White House Press Secretary James C. Hagerty when asked about a report that Mr. Eisenhower has ordered a halt to all further spy fights over Russia:

"I know of no such order."

May 7: Statement by Secretary of State Herter:

"In accordance with the National Security Act of 1947, the President has put into effect since the beginning of his administration directives to gather by every possible means the information required to protect the United States and the free world against surprise attack and to enable them to make effective preparations for their defense.

"Under these directives programs have been developed and put into operation which have included extensive aerial surveillance by unarmed civilian aircraft, normally of a peripheral nature but on occasion by penetration.

"Specific missions of these unarmed civilian aircraft have not been subject to Presidential authorization."

May 9: Comment by Mr. White at second news conference:

Mr. White: "As this statement says, it is incumbent upon us to take any measures we can to guard against surprise attack."

Question: "You realize that a normal interpretation of this would be that we intend to continue?"

White: "Well, I will leave it to your interpretation."

May 12: President Eisenhower said at his news conference:

"No one wants another Pearl Harbor. This means that we must have knowledge of military forces and preparations around the world, especially those capable of massive surprise attack. The safety of the whole free world demands this."

"We do not use our Army, Navy, or Air Force for this purpose, first to avoid any possibility of the use of force in connection with these activities, and second because our military forces, for obvious reasons, cannot be given latitude under broad directives but must be kept under strict control in every detail.

"The normal agencies of our Government are unaware of these specific activities or of the special efforts to conceal them.

"How should we view all this activity? It is a distasteful but vital necessity."

May 12: U.S. note replying to Russia's protest:

"In its note, the Soviet Government has stated that the collection of intelligence about the Soviet Union by American aircraft is a 'calculated policy' of the United States.

"The U.S. Government does not deny that it has pursued such a policy for purely defensive purposes. What it emphatically does deny is that this policy has any aggressive intent, or that the unarmed U–2 flight of May 1 was undertaken in an effort to prejudice the success of the forthcoming meeting of the heads of government in Paris or to return the state of American-Soviet relations to the worst times of the cold war.

"Indeed, it is the Soviet Government's treatment of this case which, if anything, may raise questions about its intention in respect to these matters."

May 15: Comments by George V. Allen, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, in replying to questions on a television panel show (ABC's "College News Conference"):

Mr. Allen: "I will say that I know that the spokesman of the State Department who gave out the information was acting in entirely good faith when he said that it was a weather plane.

"There has been a great misunderstanding that I would like to correct today. Mr. Herter, the Secretary of State, has not said that we are going to continue to fly. He has said that there is an obligation and a responsibility on the part of the Government of the United States and of the free world to try to obtain information to guard against surprise attack but he has not said that we are going to continue to fly. He hasn't said one way or another."

May 15: Vice President NIXON, answering questions on the television program "Open End":

"There is never a right time to make one of these flights if you're going to get caught.

"The plus is this. You realize that this flight clearly demonstrates the feasibility of the 'open skies' proposal of the President.

"This flight demonstrates that unarmed planes can take photographs without causing any damage, any harm at all to commercial aviation or the national security of the country over which the flights are made."

May 16: Mr. Eisenhower's remarks at summit meeting in Paris:

"We pointed out that these activities (plane flights) had no aggressive intent but rather were to assure the safety of the United States and the free world against surprise attack by a power which boasts of its ability to devastate the United States and other countries by missiles armed with atomic warheads.

"There is in the Soviet statement an evident misapprehension on one key point. It alleges that the United States has, through official statements, threatened continued overflights. In point of fact, these flights were suspended after the recent incident and are not to be resumed."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. It occurs to me—and I ask my friend from Oklahoma if he agrees with me—that this would be a good place to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of eight questions concerning the chronology of events about which the Senator from Missouri has spoken. These questions were asked by a number of Members of the House of Representatives of President Eisenhower. In my judgment, these eight questions go to the heart of this situation. I commend my friends in the other body for taking this action. I ask the Senator to request that the questions be printed.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish we could have the names of all those asking the questions. I think already some 35 or 40 brilliant young Members of the other

body have signed the statement. Does the Senator know the names of those who have signed?

Mr. CLARK. I know that Representative CHESTER BOWLES and Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT are among the ones who have signed, but I do not have the names of the others.

Mr. MONRONEY. Representative METCALF is another.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the questions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the questions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COPY OF QUESTIONS ASKED BY GROUP OF HOUSE LIBERAL MEMBERS IN LETTER TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER ON MAY 20, 1960

We are distressed over the collapse of the summit meeting and the damage to our prestige and leadership in the world. The cause of world peace has been endangered. We believe that Congress and the people must ask the following questions. We believe it is the administration's responsibility to answer these questions:

1. Why was the U–2 flight over the Soviet Union ordered just prior to the summit meeting?

2. When the U–2 incident became public, why was a series of contradictory and false statements issued by administration officials—and who was responsible?

3. Why did the administration order a worldwide military alert from Paris on the eve of the summit?

4. Why did the administration first indicate that as a matter of national policy it would continue manned flights over Russia, and then reverse itself and say that it had ordered them discontinued?

5. Was it necessary to compromise the announced peaceful role of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) by using it as a cover for an espionage operation?

6. Why was there no coordination between the agency responsible for the U–2 flight and the agency responsible for our diplomatic functions?

7. Why did the President announce in advance that as our Chief of State he might return to Washington before the conference ended?

8. Has the traditional American policy of civilian supremacy over the military been impaired?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma and to congratulate the Senator upon the clarity of his remarks, and his service to this body and to the American people by answering the scurrilous attack made within these walls today upon two great Americans. The very party which calls for unity is doing everything it can, by this type of scurrilous attack, to assure there will not be any unity.

The attack made upon these two great Americans was a typical example of partisan Republican so-called bipartisanship.

The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has clearly exposed the fallacy of the attack.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I cannot resist suggesting some additional documentation for the points the distinguished Senator has been making.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would welcome the information.

Mr. MUSKIE. On this past Sunday I happened to be in Des Moines, Iowa. I purchased a copy of the Des Moines Sunday Register, for May 22, 1960. The lead editorial had the following to say with respect to one of the distinguished Democrats who has been referred to so vehemently this morning:

But the President knows also that a period of harsh questioning and some political maneuvering is ahead in this election year. The speeches made Thursday night by Adlai E. Stevenson, the titular head of the Democratic Party, and by U.S. Representative CHESTER BOWLES, an adviser on foreign policy to presidential candidate JOHN KENNEDY, make this very evident.

The views and criticism of such responsible and well-informed leaders as Stevenson and BOWLES are welcome. The administration's handling of foreign policy is a proper matter for discussion at any time, and especially during a presidential campaign. Restraint, of course, is called for.

Mr. Stevenson did exercise restraint in his talk. It was made after he had earlier signed a telegram, along with Senators Johnson and Fulbright and House Speaker Rayburn, sent to Mr. Eisenhower in Paris. This telegram was intended to make it clear to Soviet Premier Khrushchev that he could not expect concessions from a Democratic administration that would not be made by a Republican administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD in its entirety at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Des Moines Sunday Register, May 22, 1960]

IKE'S SAD HOMECOMING

It was a sad, not a triumphal, homecoming for President Eisenhower when he returned to Washington Friday. His primary goal in his last year in office has been to bring about some easing of tensions between the Soviet Union and the United States, some tangible progress toward agreements that would end the cold war and make a war of annihilation impossible. These hopes are now crushed by what happened at the summit conference in Paris.

The sympathy of all Americans, Republicans and Democrats alike, is extended to Mr. Eisenhower at this time. This is the meaning of the big reception he received in Washington and of such heart-warming events as a "Welcome Home Eisenhower" day in far-off Oelwein, Iowa. It is not, of course, rejoicing over the failure of the summit conference.

The President can be assured, we feel certain, that there is unity in the United States on basic goals, of resistance to Communist aggression and of a desire, as Mr. Eisenhower said in Portugal, to work with other members of the United Nations and our partners in NATO "in the common cause of peace and justice for all men."

But the President knows also that a period of harsh questioning and some political maneuvering is ahead in this election year. The speeches made Thursday night by Adlai E. Stevenson, the titular head of the Democratic Party, and by U.S. Representative Chester Bowles, an adviser on foreign policy to Presidential Candidate John Kennedy, make this very evident.

The views and criticism of such responsible and well informed leaders as Stevenson and BOWLES are welcome. The administration's handling of foreign policy is a proper matter for discussion at any time, and especially during a presidential campaign. Restraint, of course, is called for.

Mr. Stevenson did exercise restraint in his talk. It was made after he had earlier signed a telegram, along with Senators Johnson and Fulbright and House Speaker Rayburn, sent to Mr. Eisenhower in Paris. This telegram was intended to make it clear to Soviet Premier Khrushchev that he could not expect concessions from a Democratic administration that would not be made by a Republican administration.

Mr. Stevenson did not express the view, as had Senator Kennedy, that the President of the United States should have apologized to Khrushchev about the U–2 spy incident. He said Khrushchev had made an "impossible" demand on Mr. Eisenhower. He also pinned the blame for the wrecking of the summit conference on Khrushchev—but contended that the administration by its "carelessness and mistakes" had made it very easy for the Soviet Premier to wreck the conference. Mr. BOWLES took a similar view: he called for "constructive" debate and a reexamination of the administration's record on foreign relations.

There is very good reason to believe that Khrushchev would have wrecked the summit conference if there had been no U–2 incident and its aftermath of diplomatic blundering. Just why, when he had worked so strenuously to get a conference, is uncertain. The most likely theory is that Khrushchev had finally realized that he couldn't get concessions he wanted from the West on the Berlin and Germany issues. Pressures from Red China and from Communist rivals in Russia are other possible explanations.

But mistakes were made by the administration in its handling of the U–2 affair. The explanation for these mistakes, which may or may not be made in the near future, may clarify the situation somewhat. The mistakes indicate the need, as James Reston points out in his article on today's editorial page, for studying the relationship between the White House and the CIA, whether the National Security Council system is functioning properly and whether there is a failure to coordinate our activities with those of our NATO allies.

A presidential campaign is not the ideal time for studying these problems. But they can't be entirely ignored just because there is a campaign. So foreign policy, and the administration of it, will be an issue.

We can only hope that the discussion and debate will be kept on a high level which will make it clear, to the Communists and to our allies, that there is national unity on our goals and aspirations.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, would the Senator from Oklahoma appreciate having some additional documentation?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would appreciate it. I think we are making a pretty good record. Certainly it is a physical impossibility to print the hundreds upon hundreds of stories, all in the same vein, with regard to the error, the blunder, and the need for correction, which the Senator is documenting from these papers published far away from Washington, D.C. I am sure these are not Democratic newspapers.

Mr. MUSKIE. No. The documentation which I now offer the Senate is from the grassroots—from the Maine grassroots. I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that the Maine voters are restrained people. They are not inclined to write inflammatory letters.

I picked up these three letters on my way to the floor, simply as an illustration of the kind of mail I am receiving these days on this subject. I read to the Senator a part of one of the letters:

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I wish to express my opinion of the recent "summit conference."

The Russians never got a chance to sabotage the conference, we did it first.

I read another selection from the same letter:

Mr. Eisenhower had no right to so disgrace the United States. I am furiously resentful of the whole performance as well as embarrassed by it. This is my country, too. We had better start electing Presidents who are young enough to keep their wits until they finish their terms.

I read from a letter from another constituent:

Reluctantly, I feel obliged to express to you my bewilderment and horror at the manner in which our Government is handling its foreign policy. I resent having to appear, out of loyalty, to condone behavior which I consider to be both disgraceful and inept.

The same constituent also writes:

Could it be that the President, with his apparent distaste for work, has left too much control to undesirable underlings? We have a right to know what is being done in our name since the contradictions and the propaganda of the Government have rendered their policy and their methods entirely unintelligible.

I quote from one further letter from a constituent:

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: This letter is written as a protest at the inept handling, by the administration, of the U–2 incident. But, more particularly, at the series of blunders perpetrated after the incident.

This constituent further says:

I have been a registered Republican in the State of Maine for 25 years. I shall vote Democratic in the presidential election.

I offer these few excerpts from letters by constituents for the RECORD, to indicate there is a cry which I have heard from all over the country for answers to questions which are deeply troubling people. I may say I traveled this past weekend into Minnesota and Iowa. These are people at the grassroots, people who have no political axes to grind whatsoever.

I think the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is rendering a distinct service to the country by asking these questions.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague for the great contribution he has made by adding to the RECORD, particularly the sage comments of his constituency. We know Maine people are not generally as explosive in their character or as quick to make judgments as are people from some other parts of the country.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] if he does not agree that one of the sad characteristics of this recent episode is the fact that it shows a lack of coordinated organization between vitally important departments of our Government.

Mr. MONRONEY. I quite agree. The distinguished Senator from Missouri has labored for days on end and for years back to point out from his own vast experience where there are gaps in communication resulting in lost motion and misunderstanding, and the failure to coordinate with others who are vitally concerned. The Senator has repeatedly done this, and I think the Nation should be grateful.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator for his kind remarks.

I have pointed out for years that in my opinion the present organization is not only unnecessarily costing the taxpayers many billions of dollars annually, but also is not giving the Nation that type and character of security so necessary in this nuclear space age. If we do not reorganize our defenses and our whole diplomacy around the world on the basis of progress instead of continuing to let them drift in tradition, not only will we continue to waste money, but also we do not have adequate security.

Does not the Senator agree with me that the latest incident verifies the fact we must coordinate our entire governmental structure on a more modern basis if we are to bring peace to the world?

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly agree with the Senator completely and praise him for the work he has done in trying to push toward that direction from the seat he occupies on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, what is so terrible about the speech of Adlai Stevenson? Let me read the first three paragraphs, which have not received wide press coverage:

It appears that this year's campaign will be waged under the darkest shadows that ever hovered over the world, the mushroom clouds of a nuclear war that no one wants. This terrible danger, and how to overcome it, will and should overshadow every other issue.

For the chances of a more stable world, which seemed to be brightening, have been rudely reversed by the breakdown of the summit conference in this historic week.

Premier Khrushchev wrecked this conference. Let there be no mistake about that. When he demanded that President Eisenhower apologize and punish those responsible for the spy plane flight, he was, in effect, asking the President to punish himself. This was an impossible request, and he knew it.

SERIES OF BLUNDERS

But we handed Khrushchev the crowbar and the sledge hammer to wreck the meeting. Without our series of blunders, Mr. Khrushchev would not have had a pretext for making his impossible demand and wild charges. Let there be no mistake about that either.

Then the Governor details the well known point with which we all agree about what happened in the sending of the U–2 plane over Russia. He goes on:

We Democrats know how clumsy this administration can be.

That is not an unusual statement for a Democrat to make. I expect that we shall be making it continually as long as Republicans are in power, and when they go out of power the Republicans will reverse the process upon us. So there is no slanderous misstatement of fact in Mr. Stevenson's speech; it is a restrained statement of a Democratic observation.

We are not likely to forget the fumbles that preceded the Suez crisis on the eve of the 1956 election.

But nothing, of course, can justify Mr. Khrushchev's contemptuous conduct, especially after President Eisenhower had announced that our espionage flights had been called off. But his anger was predictable, if not his violence. How would we feel if Soviet spy planes based in Cuba were flying over Cape Canaveral and Oak Ridge. And also we could predict with certainty his efforts to use the situation to split the Western Alliance and intimidate the countries where our bases are situated.

I do not think there is much debate about that.

Republican leaders are now saying that in this grave crisis we must all rally round the President in the name of national unity. Our respect for the Presidency will find us joined in salute to President Eisenhower upon his return. We resent deeply and bitterly the gross affront to the President and his office.

NO QUESTION ABOUT UNITY

There is no question about national unity in a time of crisis. But errors must be corrected, and must not forget that the opposition party also has an obligation to our country and to our allies whose security is also involved. It is the duty of responsible opposition in a democracy to expose and criticize carelessness and mistakes, especially in a case of such national and world importance as this. We must see to it that we profit from such grave mistakes and misfortunes.

It is particularly regretable that this happened in an election year. And we can already predict what the Republicans will tell the people in the months ahead.

They will say that President Eisenhower's patience and dignity in Paris scored a diplomatic triumph by exposing Khrushchev's insincerity.

They will say that the Russians are hoping that a "softer" Democratic President will be elected in November. They will tell the people that a vote for the candidate the Russians distrust is a vote against appeasement.

I think we have had a sample today of what the line will be. We will hear again that the Democrats are soft on communism and that an effort to negotiate for peace and to avert thermonuclear war is a selling out of this Nation. We apparently must not discuss the realities of our situation with anyone.

Mr. President, I can find no quarrel with this speech. I believe it is an excellent speech. I believe it is a statesmanlike speech. Instead of general condemnation of the scathing attack which Adlai Stevenson is supposed to have made, let us find out where the attack is in error. Let us discuss the facts.

Mr. President, in closing I wish to say I have seen a sample of the reaction from Des Moines and other parts of the country. Let me say in behalf of a grateful Nation, thank God for a free press. This was an hour which required courage, and it found the press of all political faiths not willing to sweep any of the hard, critical facts under the rug.

Let me say also, Mr. President, that in times of crisis our political system, so much maligned, inevitably produces a leader adequate to the task; and that if the situation is sufficiently desperate, the American people have yet to fail to recognize and welcome his leadership.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the complete statement from the wisest voice in the Democratic Party and the most influential voice in the Western World, Adlai Stevenson, of Illinois.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 20, 1960]

TEXT OF STEVENSON'S SPEECH ON SUMMIT CRISIS

It appears that this year's campaign will be waged under the darkest shadows that ever hovered over the world—the mushroom clouds of a nuclear war that no one wants. This terrible danger—and how to avert it—will and should overshadow every other issue.

For the chances of a more stable world, which seemed to be brightening, have been rudely reversed by the breakdown of the summit conference in this historic week.

Premier Khrushchev wrecked this conference. Let there be no mistake about that. When he demanded that President Eisenhower apologize and punish those responsible for the spy-plane fight, he was in effect asking the President to punish himself. This was an impossible request, and he knew it.

SERIES OF BLUNDERS

But we handed Khrushchev the crowbar and the sledgehammer to wreck the meeting. Without our series of blunders, Mr. Khrushchev would not have had a pretext for making his impossible demand and wild charges. Let there be no mistake about that either.

We sent an espionage plane deep into the Soviet Union just before the summit meeting. Then we denied it. Then we admitted it. And when Mr. Khrushchev gave the President an out by suggesting that he was not responsible for ordering the flight, the President proudly asserted that he was responsible. On top of that we intimated that such espionage flights over Russia would continue. (At this point if Khrushchev did not protest he would be condoning our right to spy—and how long could be keep his job that way?) Next we evidently reconsidered and called off the espionage flights. But to compound the incredible, we postponed the announcement that the flights were terminated—just long enough to make it seem we were yielding to pressure, but too long to prevent Mr. Khrushchev from reaching the boiling point.

ALERT CARD NOTED

And, as if that wasn't enough, on Sunday night when there was still a chance that De Gaulle and Macmillan could save the situation, we ordered a worldwide alert of our combat forces. Is it unreasonable for suspicious Russians to think such a series of mistakes could only be a deliberate effort to break up a conference we never wanted anyway?

We Democrats know how clumsy this administration can be. We are not likely to forget the fumbles that preceded the Suez crisis on the eve of the 1956 election.

But nothing, of course, can justify Mr. Khrushchev's contemptuous conduct, especially after President Eisenhower had announced that our espionage flights had been called off. But his anger was predictable, if not his violence. How would we feel if Soviet spy planes based in Cuba were flying over Cape Canaveral and Oak Ridge? And also we could predict with certainty his efforts to use the situation to split the Western alliance and intimidate the countries where our bases are situated.

Republican leaders are now saying that in this grave crisis we must all rally round the President in the name of national unity. Our respect for the Presidency will find us joined in salute to President Eisenhower upon his return. We resent deeply and bitterly the gross affront to the President and his office.

NO QUESTION ABOUT UNITY

There is no question about national unity in a time of crisis. But errors must be corrected, and must not forget that the opposition party also has an obligation to our country and to our allies whose security is also involved. It is the duty of responsible opposition in a democracy to expose and criticize carelessness and mistakes, especially in a case of such national and world importance as this. We must see to it that we profit from such grave mistakes and misfortunes.

It is particularly regrettable that this happened in an election year. And we can already predict what the Republicans will tell the people in the months ahead.

They will say that President Eisenhower's patience and dignity in Paris scored a diplomatic triumph by exposing Khrushchev's insincerity.

They will say that the Russians are hoping that a "softer" Democratic President will be elected in November. They will tell the people that a vote for the candidate the Russians distrust is a vote against appeasement.

It will be our duty, it will be the duty of all thoughtful, concerned citizens to help the situation and to face the hard inescapable facts; that this Administration played into Khrushchev's hands; that if Khrushchev wanted to wreck the conference our Government made it possible; that the administration has acutely embarrassed our allies and endangered our bases; that they have helped make successful negotiations with the Russians—negotiations that are vital to our survival—impossible so long as they are in power.

MUST SEEK UNDERSTANDING

We cannot sweep this whole sorry mess under the rug in the name of national unity. We cannot and must not. Too much is at stake. Rather we must try to help the American people understand the nature of the crisis, to see how we got into this predicament, how we can get out of it, and how we get on with the business of improving relations and mutual confidence and building a safer, saner world in the nuclear age.

For in this age, unprecedented in human history, all of us, Americans and Russians alike, have one common enemy. The enemy is the danger of war. We must defeat the enemy together. Despite his hysterics last night, Mr. Khrushchev says he still believes in peaceful progress by negotiation. Let us hope he proves it, and let the United States come into the United Nations not content with the ordinary speeches, not content with the usual anti-Russian majority votes, but with constructive, positive, affirmative proposals to restore the hope of peace.

To those who will see nothing but Russian vice and American virtue, to those who will cry "appeasement" to any acknowledgement of our mistakes I say that this is the toughest kind of common sense. For there is no future for any of us in a spiraling arms race propelled by mounting suspicion and distrust on both sides. The fact that Khrushchev seems to have lost his temper in Paris makes it all the more important that we not lose ours—or our heads.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I again wish to congratulate the Senator for his statement. I think it might well be capped by this quotation from Murrey Marder which appeared in the Washington Post for Sunday, May 22, 1960, entitled "The American in Paris Practically Squirmed." I would like to read a section of the story. The writer refers to the time of agony in Paris:

During that time, searing words echoed around the world to the gross embarrassment of the United States; words like "aggressor," "bandit," "treacherous," "apologize," "punish," "guilty." The American on the scene who was only an observer and not a participant subconsciously squirmed under the indignity being heaped on his Nation and President, no matter what his political affiliation.

He squirmed, too, over the bumbling stumbling record of U.S. actions in the U–2 affair, which caused headshaking in the corridors, bars, and hotel lobbies here by the nationals of every American ally. He squirmed most while Khrushchev, like a master showman, was "milking" every minute of the greatest East-West propaganda battle in recent years. The United States, feebly and fumblingly, was drawing its only effective defense from the fact that it was being pushed too far.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD in my remarks the entire text of the story by Murrey Marder.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 22, 1960]

THE AMERICAN IN PARIS PRACTICALLY SQUIRMED

(By Murrey Marder)

PARIS.—It was like watching a sad, old-fashioned film where the movements are too fast and jerky and you don't quite know whether to laugh or cry. This was high drama at the pinnacle of world affairs, but low comedy and satire and melodrama kept intruding, and the stage revolved so rapidly that it mixed them all up together.

The American knew before he came that a global storm was probably in the making at the summit, but the speed and fury with which it broke was not anticipated. Suddenly it was over, in the erratic, contradictory rush of events which often merge to form a major moment of history; the world's two leading powers had collided head on, and their relationship to each other and to the rest of the world was altered.

What the American present felt most deeply was not that Soviet Premier Khrushchev had turned more menacing about West Berlin, or disarmament, or nuclear test suspension—or even that the summit had ended before it began: underneath these facts was something more profound, the Soviet Union, second to the United States in industrial power and world influence, had "told off" the United States in some of the most insulting language ever used against a major world power—and had gotten away with it.

A DIFFERENT CHALLENGE

Perhaps, as American officials claim, the United States did come out of the encounter with a net gain in weight of world public opinion. Perhaps Khrushchev overplayed his threats and warnings and the Soviet Union will have to back off later. A final answer awaits future events.

But at the moment, the American on the scene is struck by the fact that while the Soviet sputniks, Lunik and space satellite demonstrated physical power, the collapsed summit meeting recorded a new kind of direct, blunt challenge to America's influence, prestige, and honor.

Short, squat Nikita Khrushchev, the son of a peasant, who schemed and elbowed his way to the leadership of a still rough, raw nation, was telling the proud President of the leading nation on the globe to get down on his knees and humble himself before the world. Unless he did, the momentous conference which the President came here to attend could not start.

The fact that the President did not do so, and turned away in disgust, only partially dims Khrushchev's triumph. For the President went as far as the strained dignity of the United States would permit without groveling before the Soviet leader, over the admitted transgression of Russian territory by an American plane on a spying mission.

HOPELESS MEDIATION

For 3 days, from Sunday to Tuesday, when it was formally admitted that the conference had failed, attempts were made to mediate the differences between the Soviet and American leaders, although there was never any doubt that the original demands were repugnant and uncompromisable for President Eisenhower.

During that time, searing words echoed around the world to the gross embarrassment of the United States; words like "aggressor," "bandit," "treacherous," "apologize," "punish," "guilty." The American on the scene who was only an observer and not a participant subconsciously squirmed under the indignity being heaped on his Nation and President, no matter what his political affiliation.

He squirmed, too, over the bumbling, stumbling record of U.S. actions in the U–2 affair, which caused headshaking in the corridors, bars, and hotel lobbies here by the nationals of every American ally. He squirmed most while Khrushchev, like a master showman, was "milking" every minute of the greatest East-West propaganda battle in recent years. The United States, feebly and fumblingly, was drawing its only effective defense from the fact that it was being pushed too far.

CONTROLLED ANGER

In the spectacular windup Khrushchev press conference of Wednesday, the description of the Soviet Premier in some news reports as "raging" or "almost incoherent with anger" were hardly fitting. Khrushchev indeed worked himself into several outward furies. He gestured violently. He used coarse language. He was undoubtedly really angry over embarrassing holes in Soviet defenses disclosed by public revelation that for years American reconnaissance planes have penetrated Soviet territory.

As a citizen of any country, and particularly Russia, would be, he was affronted and insulted by foreign violation of his nation's borders. But there is a great difference between a Khrushchev and a shrill, reckless, fanatic Hitler.

The Soviet Premier by no means allows his emotions to go beyond his control. He measures every reaction purposefully. Specifically, he allots his time for anger, for mirth, for scorn, for mockery.

Much more than marking his heights of anger, Khrushchev's performance here marked his heights of triumph. He toyed publicly with the United States, undoubtedly enjoying himself hugely. No one ever before has mocked the power of the United States in such terms of derision and scorn.

Khrushchev's famous remark, "We will bury you," was a boast which the United States could scoff at, but this time he had the United States on the defensive, its morality tarnished, its dignity sullied, its righteousness pinched.

"Look what self-assurance," he baited President Eisenhower, "what generosity. Even children are told, if you have made mischief, admit it and say, I shall not do it again."

Physical power lacking can be gained; missile or satellite gaps conceivably can be closed. But honor wounded, nose punched, "face" lost cannot be measured precisely. To the American in Paris they seemed at least equally damaging to a great nation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I commend my friend from Oklahoma for the splendid address he has just concluded. I am particularly grateful that he inserted the entire text of Governor Stevenson's speech in the RECORD.

I should like to read the last few sentences to my friends across the aisle, because they seem to me to be sentences which every patriotic American can agree upon.

Let us hope he proves it and let the United States come into the United Nations not content with ordinary speeches, not content with the usual anti-Russian majority votes, but with constructive, positive, affirmative proposals to restore the hope of peace.

To those who will see nothing but Russian vice and American virtue, to those who will cry appeasement to any acknowledgment of our mistakes I say that this is the toughest kind of common sense. For there is no future for any of us in a spiralling arms race propelled by mounting suspicion and distrust on both sides. The fact that Khrushchev seems to have lost his temper in Paris makes it all the more important that we not lose ours—or our heads.

I commend this sound advice to my colleagues across the aisle.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he has had occasion to read and perhaps put into the RECORD the text of the statement issued by the Democratic Advisory Council, which appears in the press this morning.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think it would be appropriate to put it in the RECORD. I have not had a chance to clip it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement issued by the Democratic Advisory Council be printed in the RECORD at this point in our remarks. I read, for the benefit of my friends across the aisle the final two paragraphs of the statement:

The Democratic Party stands solidly behind the President in any sound efforts he may undertake to salvage, from the wreckage of the Paris meeting, the means whereby the peace of the world can be assured.

Above all, the United States must be ready, along with its allies, to take part in the earliest possible renewal of meaningful negotiations at the United Nations and elsewhere for agreement on disarmament and the settlement of outstanding questions.

I am sure my friend from Oklahoma agrees with me that what we want is some benefit from the mistakes which have been made, and that we will come forward with a positive policy, and not cry over spilled milk, although we must find out what the facts are. Our only obligation is to continue to try to create a climate in this body in which this can be set up successfully with the cooperation of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, instead of getting into *political* strictures, which I regret very much our friends on the other side of the aisle saw fit to start this morning.

There being no objection, the text of the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 23, 1960]

TEXT OF STATEMENT BY DEMOCRATIC COUNCIL

All Americans resent the manner in which Mr. Khrushchev treated the President of the United States in Paris. Mr. Khrushchev killed the summit meeting. He thereby did incalculable harm to the cause of peace. But the Eisenhower-Nixon administration handed him the opportunity to do so by embarking on a policy which it knew and had declared to be unsound, and by handling the incident of the American U–2 plane in a manner for which there is no precedent.

President Eisenhower had declared repeatedly that he would attend a summit conference only if preliminary negotiations had shown substantial progress toward a settlement. In this he was right. Yet he went to Paris in the full knowledge that no progress had been made toward the settlement of the issues which most threaten the peace of the world: Berlin and the arms race. In this he was wrong, and disaster followed.

The foreign policy of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration is in shambles. It has become obvious that the operations of the Government of the United States in its most important areas are chaotic. The integrity of the word of the United States has been put into doubt. The danger of an all-destructive nuclear war has been increased.

Citizens of our country have not only a right but a duty to speak out on these important matters. If the Democratic advisory council were to keep silent in this grave hour and with regard to issues of such historic importance, it would fail to meet its responsibilities. Constructive criticism is the very lifeblood of mature representative government. Only thus do we correct past errors and avoid future mistakes.

RESPONSIBLE CRITICISM

The need now is for responsible criticism and for constructive proposals to lay the groundwork for the creative actions which are required if we are to get on with the all-important task of building peace.

During the first 2 weeks of May 1960, the foreign policy of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration collapsed. After the Soviet Government announced that the U–2 plane had crashed on Russian territory, the Eisenhower-Nixon administration floundered in a series of contradictory statements put out by a number of different agencies. First, it was said that a weather observation plane whose pilot had oxygen trouble had strayed into Soviet territory. Then it was said that this was a reconnaissance flight but that it had been undertaken without authorization from Washington. Then it was said that similar flights had been undertaken before and it was implied that they would continue. Then the President assumed responsibility for this particular flight and declared such flights to be vital to the security of the United States. Vice President NIXON took the same line. Finally, and in spite of his earlier declaration that they are vital to the Nation's security, President Eisenhower declared that he had suspended all such flights for the duration of his administration. As the head of the Washington bureau of the

New York Times wrote yesterday: "President Eisenhower was responsible, directly or indirectly, for the greatest series of humiliating blunders suffered by the United States in a decade."

These events were not just an isolated series of blunders. They were the result of deep-seated deficiencies in our foreign and domestic policies and in the management of our Government. Our foreign policy has failed not because of the recent blunders related to the summit meeting but because of its fundamental lack of purpose and integrity. We failed in May 1960, because we had been failing before.

COMPETENCE QUESTIONED

The fiasco in Paris raises again the whole issue of the lack of competence of the present administration. Our disarmament policies provide a typical exemple of the chaotic condition of the executive branch of the Government. The executive branch is deeply divided on the issues of disarmament and, more particularly, on the cessation of atomic tests. Yet the conflicts dividing the Government have never been resolved definitely by the President. They have been glossed over by meaningless formulas, or else they have been referred back to the respective agencies to gloss them over by similarly meaningless formulas.

The first lesson which we must learn from the recent debacle is, therefore, the urgent need for the restoration of the President's authority within his own house.

The contemptuous and insulting fashion in which Mr. Khrushchev dared to deal with the President of the United States in Paris was intolerable. We must, however, recognize that Mr. Khrushchev's conduct was a direct reflection of his confidence in Russian power and his lack of respect for our strength and prestige. The events in Paris have made it clear that the inadequacies of the United States in building economic growth in developing science and education, and in strengthening its defenses are contributing to the dangers to world peace.

Moreover, these same shortcomings which tempt the Soviets to excesses tend to weaken the confidence of our allies not only in our strength but also in the wisdom and competence of our Government.

NO ROOM FOR DESPAIR

The reverses which have befallen us can well be turned to good advantage if we learn the lessons which the events of recent weeks teach us. We must not allow dismay at these recent events to turn into despair. We must see to it that out of the wreckage of the Paris meeting we build new strength in our own country and in all the world, and a new drive for a world at peace.

If there ever was a time for national debate, that time is now. We urge that this debate be carried on without rancor and without motivation of mere partisan advantage. Regardless of our differences we are all Americans. We are facing an unprecedented danger. Unless America is able to restore her damaged prestige, the principles to which we are so deeply committed will be increasingly in retreat in all parts of the world.

We hope that out of the present confusion may be born new policies, new understandings, and new attitudes which will lay the foundation for peace among nations and dignity for all men.

While we are considering and debating these issues and policies, elementary prudence and common sense demand immediate action.

We must tighten up the processes by which our national security policies are formulated and executed.

We must expand our economic growth for security here and abroad.

We must step up our defense program.

We must increase the effectiveness of our aid to the underdeveloped countries of the free world.

These things ought to be done at once—vigorously and in full cooperation with the NATO countries and with our friends and allies in this hemisphere, in Asia, and in Africa.

The Democratic Party stands solidly behind the President in any sound efforts he may undertake to salvage, from the wreckage of the Paris meeting, the means whereby the peace of the world can be assured.

Above all, the United States must be ready, along with its allies, to take part in the earliest possible renewal of meaningful negotiations at the United Nations and elsewhere for agreement on disarmament and the settlement of outstanding questions.

Senator KENNEDY, in approving the statement by telephone, took exception to one paragraph. His position as the leading prospect for the Democratic nomination made his comment significant.

The paragraph criticized President Eisenhower for going to the summit conference despite the fact that "no progress had been made toward the settlement of the issues which most threaten the peace of the world: Berlin and the arms race."

DEFENDS PRESIDENT

Senator KENNEDY said:

"While summit meetings should be preceded by meaningful negotiations, given the state of world opinion and that of our allies, the President, under then existing circumstances, could not have avoided attending the conference without harm to the prestige of the United States."

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for his helpful remarks; also for putting in the resolutions of the Democratic Advisory Council.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, at pages 11 to 13 of the legislative calendar, there appear 31 resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, which relate to authorizing the printing of committee reports and payments of gratuities to relatives of deceased employees of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed with the call of the calendar for the passage of measures and resolutions to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 1377 and concluding with Calendar No. 1407.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISTRIBUTION OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD TO FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The bill (S. 3036) to authorize the distribution of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to former Members of Congress requesting such copies was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 73 of the Printing Act, approved January 12, 1895, as amended (44 U.S.C. 183), is amended by inserting after the paragraph relating to ex-Presidents and ex-Vice Presidents a new paragraph as follows:

"To each former Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from a territory, or Commissioner from Puerto Rico, upon request to the Public Printer, one copy of the daily."

MEMORIAL TO MARY McLEOD BETHUNE

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 502) authorizing in the District of Columbia a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I trust the Senate will give its stamp of approval to this measure, which authorizes the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the incomparable Mary McLeod Bethune. This memento in stone will immortalize the life of a wonderful woman whose life was dedicated to the quest for knowledge.

It will stand as a lasting tribute to a great woman who has walked among us and left her mark in so many hearts. The career of this woman is a lesson in perseverence and accomplishment. She served her Nation and her people well, both in filling important positions in the Federal Government and in founding institutions of learning.

Hers was a life devoted to the development of knowledge to be used for good works. It was a life devoted to the search for knowledge, not merely for its own sake, but as a source of service, as the handmaiden of understanding, as the key that would open doors and lead her people toward the self-fulfillment that is the hunger—the spiritual hunger—of each and every one of us.

Mary McLeod Bethune has earned her monument. It is in the hearts of all who have been touched by her love, by her genius, by her devotion to the cause of giving meaning and substance and nobility to the lives of those privileged to dwell in the wide circle of her influence.

It was my privilege just last weekend to participate in an important activity of another of Mary McLeod Bethune's lasting monuments, the National Council of Negro Women, of which she was the founder and organizer. This outstanding conference demonstrated well the outstanding manner in which the national council is carrying on the work and promoting the ideals of its founder.

It is significant that the memorial honoring Mrs. Bethune will also commemorate the 100th anniversary of the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation. In her life and works she exemplified the great fruits of that historic pronouncement and it is therefore doubly appropriate that they be linked in this lasting tribute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PRESENTATION OF OFFICIAL FLAG OF THE UNTED STATES TO SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE STATE OF HAWAII

The resolution (H.J. Res. 546) authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to present to the Senators and Representatives in the Congress from the State of Hawaii the official flag of the United States bearing 50 stars which is first flown over the west front of the U.S. Capitol was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PANEL DISCUSSIONS ENTITLED "INCOME TAX RESCISSION"

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 558) providing for printing additional copies of the panel discussions entitled "Income Tax Rescission" was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF VETERANS' BENEFITS CALCULATOR

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 579) authorizing the printing of additional copies of a Veterans' Benefits Calculator was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 586) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on civil rights was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF A HOUSE DOCUMENT

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 607) authorizing the printing of a House document of the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government, What Is It? How Does It Function?" was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF FINAL REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN THE LABOR OR MANAGEMENT FIELD

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 90) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the final report and indexes to hearings and reports of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations not to exceed three thousand additional copies each of parts 2 and 3 of the final report of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field (S. Rept. 1139, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session), pursuant to S. Res. 44 and S. Res. 249, Eighty-sixth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS PERTAINING TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 91) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings before the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 with respect to exchange of military information and material with allies during the 2d session of the 85th Congress was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be reprinted for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy two thousand additional copies of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on Amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 with respect to exchange of military information and material with allies during the second session of the Eighty-fifth Congress.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT PERTAINING TO NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 94) authorizing the printing of additional copies of a committee print containing the reports of the States to the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources four thousand additional copies of the committee print, prepared by that committee, containing the reports of the States to the committee on their water resources and problems.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT REVISED EDITION OF INTERNAL SECURITY MANUAL

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 96) authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Internal Security Manual as a Senate document; and providing for additional copies was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed as a Senate document a revised edition of the Internal Security Manual; and that five thousand additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT COMPILATION OF STUDIES ON UNITED STATES-LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 99) to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies on United States-Latin American relations was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed as a Senate document a compilation of the studies on United States-Latin American relations prepared under the direction of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, pursuant to S. Res. 330, agreed to July 31, 1958, as amended by S. Res. 31, agreed to February 2, 1959, and S. Res. 250, agreed to February 9, 1960.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed ten thousand additional copies of such Senate document. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs.

PRINT AS SENATE DOCUMENT STUDIES ON U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 100) to print as Senate document a compilation of studies on U.S. foreign policy was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed as a Senate document a compilation of the studies on United States foreign policy prepared under the direction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, pursuant to S. Res. 336, agreed to July 31, 1958, as amended by S. Res. 31, agreed to February 2, 1959, and S. Res. 250, agreed to February 9, 1960.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed ten thousand additional copies of such Senate document. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The resolution (S. Res. 277) to print for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business additional copies of its 10th annual report was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate, three thousand additional copies of Senate Report Numbered 1044, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session, entitled "Tenth Annual Report."

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ON PROBLEMS OF THE AGED AND AGING

The resolution (S. Res. 278) to print additional copies of the report on the problem of the aged and aging was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare three thousand additional copies of its report to the Senate pursuant to S. Res. 65, Eighty-sixth Congress, first session, entitled "The Aged and Aging in the United States: A National Problem".

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 807 ENTITLED "FEDERAL DISASTER RELIEF MANUAL"

The resolution (S. Res. 281) authorizing the printing of additional copies of

Senate Report No. 807, 86th Congress, entitled "Federal Disaster Relief Manual," was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF QUESTION-AND-ANSWER REVIEW OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The resolution (S. Res. 299) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the question-and-answer review of the St. Lawrence Seaway was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations eighty thousand additional copies of a question-and-answer review of the Saint Lawrence Seaway.

PRINTING OF STAFF REPORT ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ON FEDERAL PROJECTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 302) to print for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare a staff report on labor-management relations on certain Federal projects, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, in line 2, after the word "Welfare," to insert "three thousand," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare three thousand additional copies of the committee print of the Eighty-second Congress, second session, entitled "Labor-Management Relations in Federal Projects Involving the Davis-Bacon Act", a staff report to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF FINAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS

The resolution (S. Res. 303) to print for the use of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems additional copies of its final report was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems three thousand nine hundred additional copies of its final report to the Senate pursuant to Senate Resolution 196, Eighty-sixth Congress (S. Rept. 1206, Eighty-sixth Congress).

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON "ORGANIZING FOR NATIONAL SECURITY"

The resolution (S. Res. 306) to print additional copies of hearings on "Organizing for National Security" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations one thousand five hundred additional copies of the hearing entitled "Organizing for National Security", which was held by that committee during the second session of the Eighty-sixth Congress.

PRINTING OF STUDY ENTITLED "EXPORTS, IMPORTS, AND THE U.S. BALANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PAYMENTS"

The resolution (S. Res. 307) to print, with illustrations, a study entitled "Exports, Imports, and the U.S. Balance of International Payments" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the study entitled "Exports, Imports, and the United States Balance of International Payments" prepared by Doctor Howard S. Piquet, Senior Specialist in International Economics of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

PRINTING OF 61ST ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

The resolution (S. Res. 318) to print the 61st Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution as a Senate document was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sixty-first Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1958, be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document.

PRINTING OF 62D ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

The resolution (S. Res. 319) to print the 62d Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, as a Senate document, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sixty-second Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1959, be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document.

PRINTING OF REVISED EDITION OF "ELECTION LAW GUIDEBOOK"

The resolution (S. Res. 320) to authorize the printing of a revised edition of the "Election Law Guidebook" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That a revised edition of Senate Document Numbered 97 of the Eighty-fifth Congress, entitled "Election Law Guidebook," be printed as a Senate document.

MARY A. RUESCH

The resolution (S. Res. 314) to pay a gratuity to Mary A. Ruesch was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary A. Ruesch, sister of Belva M. Ratchford, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to seven months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ILLYENE MARDEN AND OTHERS

The resolution (S. Res. 313) to pay a gratuity to Illyene Marden, Vera Davis, Roy McGuigan, and Art McGuigan was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Illyene Marden and Vera Davis, nieces of John J. Kenney, and Ray McGuigan and Art McGuigan, nephews of John J. Kenney, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to two months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and other allowances.

ELIZABETH M. HICKEY AND OTHERS

The resolution (S. Res. 312) to pay a gratuity to Elizabeth M. Hickey, Edward D. Murphy, and Walter D. Murphy was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Elizabeth M. Hickey, daughter of James W. Murphy, and Edward D. Murphy and Walter D. Murphy, sons of James W. Murphy, an Official Reporter of Debates and Proceedings of the United States Senate at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to four months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ELLA JOHNSON

The resolution (S. Res. 315) to pay a gratuity to Ella Johnson was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Ella Johnson, widow of Robert Johnson, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

CONNIE YOUNG

The resolution (S. Res. 316) to pay a gratuity to Connie Young was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Connie Young, widow of Charlie A. Young, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

MARY NELL SISSON

The resolution (S. Res. 317) to pay a gratuity to Mary Nell Sisson was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to

Mary Nell Sisson, widow of W. D. Sisson, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to three months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

REPRINTING OF JOINT COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "SUMMARY-ANALYSIS OF HEARINGS ON BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR WAR"

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 97) authorizing the reprinting of the Joint Committee print entitled "Summary-Analysis of Hearings, June 22–26, 1959, on Biological and Environmental Effects of Nuclear War" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be reprinted for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy six thousand additional copies of the Joint Committee print entitled "Summary-Analysis of Hearings, June 22–26, 1959, on Biological and Environmental Effects of Nuclear War" printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the Eighty-sixth Congress, first session.

AGRICULTURAL AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is the Agricultural Appropriation bill before the Senate at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not before the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it on the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is on the calendar, but not before the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that it be laid down and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar No. 1467, H.R. 12117, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I merely wish to have the bill laid down as the pending or unfinished business. If it is possible during the day, we shall try to debate the measure and, if we can, reach the third reading of the bill. There will be no votes on the bill today if we reach it, but if we do get to third reading, there will be a yea-and-nay vote on the appropriation bill tomorrow.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am not familiar with the position which the members of the Committee on Appropriations on this side of the aisle may take with respect to the bill. I ask the Senator from Montana whether, if any investigation on our part determines that they desire to offer amendments, he will be a little flexible with respect to the time element.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, yes, indeed. I may say that I discussed this subject this morning with the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and with other Senators. All things being agreeable, they would just as soon have the bill taken up this afternoon.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

THE IMPACT OF THE SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY UPON THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, yesterday, May 22, was officially designated as Maritime Day by Presidential proclamation. This affords me a timely opportunity to make certain remarks and comments on the merchant marine and maritime industry of this Nation. I have always felt that this vital segment of our national defense and our national economy has not received a sufficiently vigorous emphasis and attention commensurate with its status of importance.

INTRODUCTION AND HISTORY

Prior to World War I, the United States had virtually no maritime industry. Our foreign trade was conducted by ships of other nations. It became necessary for us to construct vessels in order to maintain our trading position during the period of neutrality between 1914 and 1917 when British, French, and German vessels were denied to us.

In 1916, the Congress enacted a Shipping Act "to establish a U.S. Shipping Board for the purpose of encouraging, developing, and creating a naval auxiliary and naval reserve and a merchant marine to meet the requirements of the commerce of the United States with its Territories and possessions and with foreign countries; to regulate carriers by water engaged in the foreign and interstate commerce of the United States; and for other purposes."[1] We found it difficult and expensive to become a maritime power in a very short period of time.

After the outbreak of hostilities in the spring of 1917, an intensive program was instituted to build ships to transport troops and supplies to the European battlefront and to act as auxiliaries to our growing Navy.

At the end of World War I, many of these costly shipbuilding facilities were abandoned, the vessels were sold, scrapped, or laid up, and within a very few years most of our international trade was again transported by ships flying foreign flags.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1920 ostensibly provided "for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine," but it repealed "certain emergency legislation" and provided "for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes."[2]

In 1928, the Congress enacted a Merchant Marine Act "to further develop an American merchant marine, to assure its permanence in the transportation of the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes."[3]

On March 4, 1935, President Franklin D. Roosevelt presented to the Congress a report which had been prepared by an interdepartmental committee known as the "Committee on Shipping Policy," appointed June 18, 1934, by the Secretary of Commerce, together with another report from the Postmaster General on ocean mail contracts prepared pursuant to an Executive order of July 11, 1934.[4]

In his message to the Congress, President Roosevelt said:

> I present to the Congress the question of whether or not the United States should have an adequate merchant marine.
>
> To me there are three reasons for answering this question in the affirmative. The first is that in time of peace, subsidies granted by other nations, shipping combines, and other restrictive or relating methods may well be used to the detriment of American shippers. The maintenance of fair competition alone calls for American-flag ships of sufficient tonnage to carry a reasonable portion of our foreign commerce.
>
> Second. In the event of a major war in which the United States is not involved, our commerce, in the absence of an adequate American merchant marine, might find itself seriously crippled because of its inability to secure bottoms for neutral peaceful foreign trade.
>
> Third. In the event of a war in which the United States itself might be engaged, American-flag ships are obviously needed not only for naval auxiliaries, but also for the maintenance of reasonable and necessary commercial intercourse with other nations. We should remember lessons learned in the last war.
>
> In many instances in our history the Congress has provided for various kinds of disguised subsidies to American shipping. In recent years the Congress has provided this aid in the form of lending money at low rates of interest to American shipping companies for the purpose of building new ships for foreign trade. It has, in addition, appropriated large annual sums under the guise of payments for ocean mail contracts.
>
> This lending of money for shipbuilding has in practice been a failure. Few ships have been built and many difficulties have arisen over the repayment of the loans. Similar difficulties have attended the granting of ocean mail contracts. The Government today is paying annually about $30 million for the carrying of mails which would cost, under normal ocean rates, only $3 million. The difference, $27 million, is a subsidy, and nothing but a subsidy. But given under this disguised form it is an unsatisfactory and not an honest way of providing the aid that Government ought to give to shipping.
>
> I propose that we end this subterfuge. If the Congress decides that it will maintain a reasonably adequate American merchant marine I believe that it can well afford honestly to call a subsidy by its right name.

[1] The Merchant Marine Act, 1936, the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, the Shipping Act, 1916, and the Merchant Marine Act, 1928 (as amended through the 84th Cong.), 85th Cong., 1st sess., report by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, p. 139.

[2] Op. cit., p. 112.

[3] Ibid., p. 155.

[4] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 79, pt. 3, 74th Cong., 1st sess., Mar. 4, 1935, pp. 28, 59–60.

Approached in this way a subsidy amounts to a comparatively simple thing. It must be based upon providing for American shipping Government aid to make up the differential between American and foreign shipping costs. It should cover, first, the difference in the cost of building ships; second, the difference in the cost of operating ships; and finally, it should take into consideration the liberal subsidies that many foreign governments provide for their shipping. Only by meeting this threefold differential can we expect to maintain a reasonable place in ocean commerce for ships flying the American flag, and at the same time maintain American standards.[5]

On April 15, 1935, Senator Royal S. Copeland, of New York, introduced a bill, S. 2582, 74th Congress, to implement this program.[6] It ultimately became the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. This basic legislation established as a declaration of policy that:

SEC. 101. It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of the water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign water-borne commerce at all times, (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, (c) owned and operated under the U.S. flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable, and (d) composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine.[7]

This act also created an independent agency known as the U.S. Maritime Commission.[8] Later it was abolished by Reorganization Plan No. 21 of 1950, and its functions were transferred to the Department of Commerce.[9]

The wisdom of this act was quickly justified by the situation which confronted the United States as we approached World War II. Once again, foreign shipping was unavailable and it became imperative for us to construct vessels on an emergency basis to handle our cargoes during the period of so-called neutrality, prior to Pearl Harbor. Lend-lease shipments as well as normal commercial trade were completely dependent on American shipping, since German submarines and British cruisers made it virtually impossible for other nations to carry our cargoes with any degree of safety.

After the United States became a belligerent, American shipbuilding of all types was expanded, since we had the task of feeding our Allies and supplying our troops in every theater of action during World War II. At the conclusion of this conflict, the United States once again had a large surplus of ships, and the fleets of other maritime powers were depleted due to enemy action.

This relative advantage did not continue for any lengthy period because American vessels had been hastily constructed. Many of them had inadequate engines, had a low speed capacity, and could not compete with the newer and more modern ships which other maritime nations rapidly started to build. One of the final acts of President Truman was to send a message to the Congress concerning the maritime subsidy programs. On January 16, 1953, he advised Congress as follows:

I believe that the one compelling justification which now exists for subsidizing an American-flag merchant fleet is the national defense requirement. For this purpose, we cannot reasonably expect to keep in active peacetime operation the number of ships that would be needed in the event of war. We must instead concentrate upon maintaining a modern and efficient nucleus fleet, capable of rapid expansion in the event of mobilization. We must supplement this active nucleus with a well-maintained reserve fleet of inactive vessels, and with an effective shipbuilding industry.[10]

It should be noted that an effective shipbuilding industry was an essential element of our program of maintaining our defense posture without accumulating all of the vessels that would be needed during a period of hostilities. President Truman continued:

If we satisfy fully such defense requirements for an active fleet, we could at the same time satisfy, in large measure, whatever requirements may exist for an American merchant marine for national economic and national prestige reasons.

Since the cost of supporting even the presently subsidized fleet has grown substantially in recent years, the Government should, I believe, be most hesitant to undertake commitments for even broader subsidies, unless a compelling national defense need is established.

Since most of the ships now in operation are adequate in size and speed to meet existing competition, the shipping lines have little incentive to incur the higher capital costs of postwar replacements until their present ships reach a normal retirement age of 20 years. This problem could be overcome by a temporary amendment to the 1936 act, authorizing the Maritime Board to provide liberal trade-in allowances as a special incentive for advance replacement of a portion of the present fleets.[11]

In May 1954, the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, Mr. Robert Murray, presented a report which had been prepared by the Maritime Administration, in cooperation with the Defense Department, to the Commerce Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This report recommended the construction of 60 new commercial vessels a year which would provide the nucleus of a wartime merchant fleet while avoiding the problem of block obsolescence.

In addition, it concluded that the United States needs approximately 36,000 shipyard workers as a peacetime nucleus on which to base a future wartime building program. In 1953 there were only 23,000 workers employed in our large coastal shipyards. Secretary Murray believed that during 1954 this force would decline to about 10,800 workers, and to 1,200 workers by 1955, unless a 60-ship annual building program was instituted.[12]

The Murray report made nine specific recommendations. Among them were the following:

1. Appropriations for pending applications for construction-differential subsidy: The Department of Commerce should request appropriations to cover the Government's share of the cost of construction of ships for which construction-differential subsidy applications are pending. New ship construction should be financed privately to the greatest extent possible. However, if Government financing is required requested appropriations should exclude the purchaser's down payment.

2. Construction revolving fund: The revolving fund authorized under section 206 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, should be made available for use in connection with ship construction, conversion, betterments, research and development. There should be authorized for deposit in this fund: (1) appropriations for ship construction; (2) receipts from sale of ship mortgages; (3) interest and principal payments on ship mortgages owned by the Government; and (4) sale and charter receipts. Reports on the activities with respect to the source and application of such funds should be made periodically to Congress.

3. Procedure for the determination of construction subsidy: The Department of Commerce should request legislation to facilitate the determination of construction-differential subsidy rates. Provisions required are: (1) The Board should be authorized to determine construction-differential subsidy rates for major types of vessels, i.e., cargo, combination, and tanker, to be effective for a certain period of time; (2) language in existing law that has given rise to controversy should be clarified; and (3) the Comptroller General should be required to audit the construction subsidy rate as determined by the Federal Maritime Board within a period of 30 days.

4. Accelerated depreciation for new vessels: The Department of Commerce should request legislation to provide that any vessel contracted for after July 1, 1954, and delivered prior to January 1, 1962, may be depreciated on a 20-year basis. In addition, the owner should be authorized to take additional depreciation on a sliding scale basis as follows: (1) an amount not to exceed 3 percent each year if the ship is delivered before January 1, 1962; and (2) if in connection with such construction a vessel of less than 20 years is traded in pursuant to section 510 of the Act, an additional one-half of 1 percent per year depreciation should be allowed for each year the vessel is less than 20 years old. Such depreciation should be used in the year taken to reduce the unpaid balance of any mortgage outstanding against the vessel and subsidized operators should be required to deposit such depreciation in their statutory reserve fund.

5. Trade-in-and-build tanker program: The Department of Commerce should urge

---

[5] Op. cit., pp. 2859–2860.

[6] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 79, pt. 5, 74th Cong., 1st sess., Apr. 15, 1935, pp. 5617–5618.

[7] The Merchant Marine Act, 1936, the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, the Shipping Act, 1916, and the Merchant Marine Act, 1928 (as amended through the 84th Cong.), 85th Cong., 1st sess., report by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, p. 1.

[8] Ibid.

[9] U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1959–60, pp. 689–690.

[10] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 1, 83d Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 20, 1953, p. 449.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Daily report of executives, the Washington Daily Reporter System, division of the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., Washington, D.C., No. 85, May 3, 1954, p. A–1.

enactment of legislation dealing with the trade-in-and-build tanker program similar to that sponsored by the Department during the 1st session of the 83d Congress. This legislation authorized the Maritime Administration to acquire tankers which are at least 10 years old under the terms of section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, for the purposes of creating a national defense reserve of tanker vessels and of encouraging the construction of modern tankers in U.S. shipyards. Under section 510, the Government is authorized to acquire an old vessel and grant an allowance against the purchase price of a new vessel. Consideration should be given to the use of a statutory formula for establishing trade-in values in lieu of the present method of section 510 of the 1936 Act.[13]

As has already been indicated, the American merchant marine was then already approaching an advanced state of obsolescence. The Murray report said:

Eighty-one percent of the 1,297 ships in the commercially-operated U.S. fleet were built during World War II, and will become 20 years old during the 1961–65 period. Thus, if the fleet is replaced only as ships become obsolete, a total of 936 keels will have to be laid during the 1961–63 period. This would require 174 shipways, while only 63 are available.[14]

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Following the passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, there was a general acceptance of the concept that our national security required not only American-flag ships on the high seas, but shipbuilding and repair facilities within the continental United States.

This approach was consistent with the Buy-American Act which provided that the Federal Government should show a preference to American firms in purchasing goods and services for its own needs so as to preserve those industries and skills which would be necessary in time of war.

At that time, our war mobilization plans were based on the view that any war in which we might become engaged would undoubtedly be a protracted conflict. Under such conditions, many vessels would be lost. In order to maintain a continuous flow of supplies and personnel to distant theaters of action, it would be necessary to replace those ships destroyed by enemy action and to construct many additional ones to meet the added burdens of war mobilization. Furthermore, we would have to meet the deficiencies in our available supply of shipping due to the fact that foreign ships formerly carrying our cargoes would no longer be in a position to do so.

Within the past 18 months, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Office of Civil Defense and War Mobilization have reappraised our defense needs based on the concept that a probable future war would be of very short duration because of the use of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles.

Accordingly, they recommended a complete reevaluation of our strategic and critical stockpile requirements as well as a review of the shipbuilding program. Under this premise, only vessels already in service could play a substantial role in achieving a victory.

It would be difficult to challenge the thesis that a war involving nuclear weapons on a worldwide scale would be of short duration. However, there is a serious question as to whether any major powers, aware of the fact that other belligerents also possess such weapons, would be willing to be the first to authorize their use. In World War II the troops of all belligerents as well as the civilian populations in many European countries were supplied with gas masks and every possible precaution was taken against the hazards of gas warfare. While every participating country had its own noxious gases, they were never used because each of the warring nations was unwilling to face the retaliation which would ensue if such a method of warfare were adopted.

Although the United States during the Korean conflict had exclusive possession of the atomic bomb it, too, was not used. During the past 10 years, in addition to the fighting in Korea, there have been armed conflicts in French Indochina, in Algeria, in Egypt during the Suez crisis, in Lebanon, and in many other parts of the world. Yet, military operations were conducted entirely with conventional weapons.

There is every reason to believe that if a minor war should occur, we would make every effort to avoid extending its dimensions by using these new modern weapons. Accordingly, under such conditions, we might expect that our forces would be deployed overseas, and it would be necessary to maintain once again a supply of ships and shipbuilding facilities as we have done in our past military conflicts.

In recent months, there has been a further reappraisal of the military and strategic stockpile requirements on the premise that if major producing facilities are destroyed in a nuclear war, vast amounts of material will be required in order to reconstruct our economy. A factor for this contingency has now been included in the computation of stockpile requirements. The maintenance of shipyards also is essential to provide for the reestablishment of our normal way of life after a nuclear conflict is ended, should such an eventuality develop.

Inasmuch as our privately owned shipyards are spread along the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts, and the Great Lakes it is unlikely that they all would be destroyed in any type of war. If this ultimate tragedy should befall our Nation, we certainly would require a shipbuilding industry as a part of the necessary base to restore once again civilization for those fortunate few who may have survived the holocaust of a nuclear war.

Everyone is concerned with government economy, and no program should be accepted without question or challenge. In comparison with the farm subsidy program which accumulates quantities of unneeded food and fiber, however, the Federal assistance to the shipbuilding industry represents a very small outlay. In fact, the Federal Budget provides roughly $150 million to assist in ship construction.[15] This includes the construction-differential subsidy, the development of new ships, the construction and design of nuclear-powered vessels, and other similar projects. In a way, these expenditures may be regarded in the same context as those for civil defense. Perhaps they are not productive in the sense that in a peaceful world we could secure more needed goods and services from these expenditures. It would be possible to acquire necessary shipping from foreign yards, but if such a course were adopted, we would soon lose the facilities and the skills to maintain our maritime position should an emergency arise.

In appraising this program, it might be well to compare it with civil defense which, also, is a burden on the taxpayer and contributes nothing to our economic advancement. The 1960 budget recommended allocating $25 million for Federal contributions to the States to be matched equally with State funds for civil defense programs.[16] It also included provisions for $14 million to purchase emergency supplies and equipment,[17] $12 million to finance, on a consolidated basis, the civil and defense mobilization functions of other Federal agencies under clarified and expanded assignments of responsibility,[18] and $7 million for research and development on measures and plans for evacuation shelters and the protection of life and property.[19] These activities would cost the Federal Government $58 million.

Even though our citizens derive no immediate satisfaction from these expenditures, the Federal Government would be derelict in discharging its proper responsibilities if it made no provision for a civil defense program.

There have been frequent criticisms that the program recommended by the President is inadequate, and Governor Rockefeller has long advocated the construction of shelters which would ultimately cost billions of dollars. In this context, the small amount of Federal funds necessary to maintain essential shipbuilding facilities becomes a relatively insignificant item in the total Federal Budget.

While some contend that we might purchase our ships abroad for less money, it must be remembered that in many cases our bottoms are more costly because features have been incorporated in their design to facilitate their immediate conversion for military use. In many cases, the plans and specifications demand fireproof construction, special bulkheads, advanced hull designs of a secret nature to insure maximum speed, and other special devices which are classified. It would be impossible to maintain military security and yet disclose the essential technical information to a foreign builder so that these engi-

[13] Op. cit., pp. A–2, A–3.
[14] Ibid., p. A–4.
[15] The Budget of the U.S. Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, Washington, D.C., 1959, p. 418.
[16] Ibid., p. 69.
[17] Ibid., p. 70.
[18] Op. cit., Budget, June 30, 1960, p. 72.
[19] Ibid., p. 71.

neering concepts could be incorporated in the construction of a ship destined ultimately to fly the American flag.

The steamship *United States* provides a perfect example of this advanced construction. It is completely fireproof and has held the speed record on the Atlantic crossing ever since it was commissioned. Probably no one outside of the naval service and the Maritime Administration really knows the maximum speed that the steamship *United States* is capable of attaining.

Facilities to construct new ships are not sufficient since in a protracted conflict there will be many opportunities to repair damaged vessels and restore them to active service. If they incorporate these classified military features, then it becomes essential that all repair work be performed under the American flag.

FREE ENTERPRISE AND SUBSIDIES

Many Americans who believe in a system of free competitive enterprise abhor subsidies of any kind. They believe that the elimination of trade barriers, monopolies, and Government interference with a free market will best promote the economic welfare of everyone. In fact, this is the doctrine which was enunciated so clearly by Adam Smith in "The Wealth of Nations."

While Adam Smith showed that free trade would maximize the opulence of every country, it is significant that he recognized that opulence must give way in a world beset by animosities. One of the impediments to free trade in the England of Adam Smith's time was the act of navigation. This act placed a heavy burden (tariffs and other restrictions) on foreign trade. Adam Smith, however, stated:

> The act of navigation is not favorable to foreign commerce, or to the growth of that opulence which can arise from it. * * * As defence, however, is of much more importance than opulence, the act of navigation is, perhaps, the wisest of all the commercial regulations of England.[20]

The full text of Adam Smith's views taken from "The Wealth of Nations" provides ample justification in a world beset with existing tensions for subsidizing our ship construction industry. Book 4, Chapter II, of "The Wealth of Nations" states:

> The first is, when some particular sort of industry is necessary for the defense of the country. The defense of Great Britain, for example, depends very much upon the number of its sailors and shipping. The act of navigation, therefore, very properly endeavors to give the sailors and shipping of Great Britain the monopoly of the trade of their own country, in some cases, by absolute prohibitions, and in others by heavy burdens upon the shipping of foreign countries.
>
> When the act of navigation was made, though England and Holland were not actually at war, the most violent animosity subsisted between the two nations. It had begun during the government of the long parliament, which first framed this act, and it broke out soon after in the Dutch wars during that of the Protector and of Charles II. It is not impossible, therefore, that some of the regulations of this famous act may have proceeded from national animosity. They are as wise, however, as if they had all been dictated by the most deliberate wisdom. National animosity at that particular time aimed at the very same object which the most deliberate wisdom would have recommended, the diminution of the naval power of Holland, the only naval power which could endanger the security of England.
>
> The act of navigation is not favorable to foreign commerce, or to the growth of that opulence which can arise from it. The interest of a nation in its commercial relations to foreign nations is, like that of a merchant with regard to the different people with whom he deals, to buy as cheap and to sell as dear as possible. But it will be most likely to buy cheap, when by the most perfect freedom of trade it encourages all nations to bring to it the goods which it has occasion to purchase; and, for the same reason, it will be most likely to sell dear, when its markets are thus filled with the greatest number of buyers. The act of navigation, it is true, lays no burden upon foreign ships that come to export the produce of British industry. Even the ancient aliens duty, which used to be paid upon all goods exported as well as imported, has, by several subsequent acts, been taken off from the greater part of the articles of exportation. But if foreigners, either by prohibitions or high duties, are hindered from coming to sell, they cannot always afford to come to buy; because coming without a cargo, they must lose the freight from their own country to Great Britain. By diminishing the number of sellers, therefore, we necessarily diminish that of buyers, and are thus likely not only to buy foreign goods dearer, but to sell our own cheaper, than if there was a more perfect freedom of trade. As defense, however, is of much more importance than opulence, the act of navigation is, perhaps, the wisest of all the commercial regulations of England.[21]

America has endeavored to follow the advice of Adam Smith, and in keeping with this philosophy, we have lowered our tariffs. Except for a few agricultural commodities, we do not employ import quotas, and there are no currency or monetary controls on our foreign trade.

We have never advocated providing a merchant marine that could handle our entire foreign trade as the Congress has always accepted the fact that many maritime nations through the sale of shipping services secure needed dollar exchange to purchase products produced here in the United States where we have a comparative advantage over other nations.

WHY DOES IT COST MORE TO BUILD VESSELS IN AMERICA?

American costs, unless offset by great comparative advantage, will be higher than those in other countries in almost every instance. This is demonstrated by our loss of gold, which has paid for the imports of goods and services we have purchased from abroad.

In 1949, U.S. gold stocks reached a postwar high of $24.6 billion. At the end of 1958, they stood at $20.6 billion, a decline of $4 billion. The reduction in the year 1958 alone totaled $2.3 billion.[22] The final data for 1959 will show a further reduction in our gold reserves. In fact, the monthly figures show a falling gold stock for every month since January 1958. While a $20 billion gold stock provides an adequate base for our currency, it must be self-evident that a decline of about 10 percent a year can no longer continue without completely destroying our own economic system. This, perhaps, is the best way for us to fully appreciate the impact of imports on our economy, since an excess of demands for dollar payments abroad over purchases from us will sooner or later be reflected in our monetary reserves. These terms are used broadly as they include goods, services, and capital investment.

President Eisenhower, in his State of the Union message delivered to the Congress on January 7, estimated that expenditures would total $79.8 billion in the 1961 fiscal year.[23] Based on previous budgets, major national security expenditures included for the Department of Defense, the atomic energy program, and military assistance aspects of the mutual security program, as well as stockpiling and other activities authorized by the Defense Production Act will total more than $45 billion, or in excess of 55 percent of the total budget request.[24] There is only one way that these costs can be met, namely through taxation which ultimately must be reflected in the price of every product as well as in the wages and salaries of all our employees. Insofar as the United States is forced to assume a disproportionate share of the effort to preserve the free world, its prices are less competitive than they otherwise might be.

Until recently Western Germany has had no sizable military budget, and this has been an important factor in enabling her producers to operate with lower costs and hence quote lower prices in the world's competitive markets.

While the President has proposed an $80 billion budget, total payments to the public by the Federal Government in the 1960 fiscal year, including the operations of the many trust funds, will represent a total of almost $95 billion.[25] The total gross national product in 1958 was $437 billion so that actually 21.7 percent of our total production is channeled through the Federal Government.[26] To this must be added the vast sums for the maintenance of State and local governments. Taxes on American wages and salaries provide a large portion of the funds to maintain this structure in one form or another, and many of our labor unions in formulating their demands at the bargaining table have begun to think

[20] Abbott, Leonard Dalton, ed. "Masterworks of Economics," Doubleday & Co., New York, 1946, "An Inquiry Into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations," by Adam Smith, p. 162.

[21] Op. cit., Abbott, Leonard Dalton, pp. 161–162.

[22] Federal Reserve Bulletin, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, January 1959, Washington, D.C., p. 86.

[23] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, House of Representatives, vol. 106, No. 2, Jan. 7, 1960, Washington, D.C., p. 138.

[24] "The Federal Budget in Brief, Fiscal Year 1960," Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D.C., p. 18.

[25] Ibid., p. 54.

[26] Economic Report of the President, Jan. 20, 1959, Washington, D.C., p. 139.

exclusively in terms of take-home pay. Hence, increasing costs of government will eventually be reflected in less competitive world prices.

It is apparent to any observer of the Washington scene that it will be a miracle if the President's proposed budget for the 1961 fiscal year, which starts July 1, will survive the onslaughts of those who are determined to authorize new public works programs, public housing, and many other desirable projects, without any consideration as to how we are to pay for them without destroying our economic base.

For years to come, it will be necessary for American producers to be far more productive than their foreign competitors, merely in order to maintain their share of our own market, while we undertake the many tasks to which we are committed in the world struggle against communism. This will result in situations in which we shall have to resort temporarily to various devices, in order to relieve pressures which could be destructive.

In many fields of activity, American products, even though our wage rates are far higher than those prevailing in other countries, have no difficulty in competing for a large share of the world market. An examination of these products invariably shows that they are manufactured by industries in which the productivity of labor is high because the efforts of each worker are supplemented by a large capital investment. In most instances there must be some relationship between the wage rates paid within any given community for jobs requiring comparable skills. A large segment of American industry can afford to pay relatively high wages and still compete in world markets, because of our mass-production techniques. These industries determine the general level of wages. Products can be mass produced, so that individuals with relatively little skill can perform most of the manufacturing operations. This is made possible by extensive expenditures on special tools, dies, and fixtures; and these expenditures can be recovered only if many identical units are produced.

In shipbuilding, as in the construction industry, higher skills are needed, as compared to the needs in most of the mass-production industries. However, mass-production techniques cannot be used in shipbuilding or in the erection of most buildings, as each building or each ship is a unique, tailormade product.

In the case of construction, foreign competition is impossible, since a building or a highway must be developed on the site; and the wages for those employed on a project, although linked to the wages paid those in the mass-production industries, presents no competitive problem. This premise is not valid in the case of ship construction, because foreign yards will always be able to furnish vessels at lower costs. Unlike buildings, ships can be sailed into an American port.

The following table contrasts the average straight time and hourly earnings for a number of basic industries, including all manufacturing. It should be noted that domestic shipyard and construction wage rates compare favorably with the highest found in American industry:

AVERAGE STRAIGHT-TIME HOURLY EARNINGS [1]

[September 1959]

All manufacturing industries	$2.14
Durable goods industries	2.28
Primary metal industries	2.66
Blast furnaces, steelworks, and rolling mills	3.10
Machinery (except electrical)	2.51
Transportation equipment	2.71
Motor vehicles and equipment	2.78
Aircraft and parts	2.65
Ship and boat-building and repairs	2.60
Nondurable goods industries	1.95
Products of petroleum and coal	2.91
Petroleum refining	3.03
Rubber products	2.47
Nonmanufacturing industries:	
Contract construction	3.16
Nonbuilding construction	2.85
Building construction	3.26

[1] Survey of Current Business, U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics, December 1959, Washington, D.C., pp. S–14, S–15.

A similar problem prevails with respect to operating subsidies. Americans will not become seamen unless their prospective earnings compare favorably with those in other available occupations here in the United States. Although immigration is restricted, our treaties of navigation make it possible for foreign seamen to enter our ports and to carry our cargoes. All of the enactments described in the introductory section of these remarks clearly show that the Congress and the Administration, under both Democratic and Republican control, agree that a subsidy program is the only available and practical means to maintain a naval auxiliary. It also insures that our ships are constructed in American yards, thus providing a margin to meet the demands of a protracted military conflict.

The funds provided by the Congress to further American ship construction do not represent a net outlay. They are a gross cost. While no accurate data on the taxes paid by shipbuilding employees are available, in December 1959, there were 123,500 shipbuilding employees [27] in the United States, and they were making an average weekly salary of $102.18.[28] Depending on the individual's personal circumstances, the Federal Government derives a substantial revenue from the personal income taxes paid by these workers. In addition, it receives corporate income taxes paid not only by shipbuilding industries, but also by the countless supplying firms, as well as by their employees and stockholders. Hence, the net subsidy, after the payment of all the taxes on the income generated by this activity, is a very small sum.

[27] Shipbuilders Council of America, annual report, Apr. 1, 1959, New York, table 20.

[28] Op. cit., Shipbuilders Council of America, annual report, table 7.

SHALL WE BUILD SHIPS OR SUPPORT DEPRESSED AREAS?

When the United States entered World War I, there were virtually no American-flag ships. Although American shipyards built only 24 vessels of 2,000 tons and over in 1914, by 1919 this number had been increased to 680 vessels.[29] Construction from then on decreased steadily, until in 1935 only two steel, self-propelled merchant ships were constructed in private shipyards.[30]

In 1936, the newly formed Maritime Commission again expanded the shipbuilding program. While in that year only eight ships were built, the number increased year by year; and by 1943, because of the need that World War II had created, American ship construction reached an all-time peak. Federal subsidies to maintain and promote the merchant marine at a time of maximum war effort in 1943 cost $3,576 million.[31] In order to build 1,661 ships under such conditions, 1,655,500 people were employed in our shipyards and related industries.[32] Needless to say, there was unnecessary waste and inefficiency in a program which required an expansion of this magnitude, because many workers needed extensive training, and were ill-suited to the requirements of the tasks before them. In addition, absenteeism was high; and acute problems, including those because of the needs for additional housing, schools, police and fire protection, developed because of the migration of workers to coastal areas. Vessels built under these conditions were not only costly; in many cases, they were inefficient and uneconomic for normal commercial use when the war ended.

As the war drew to a close, ships were no longer needed for defense purposes, and we were plagued with a surplus of bottoms. Yet, the United States could not adopt a policy of allowing all of our existing yards to discontinue operations. By 1954, there were only 355 shipbuilding and repairing establishments.[33] As of April 1959, they employed only 149,700 persons.[34]

Ship construction, of necessity, must be performed where there is ready access to the high seas. As a result, many of our shipyards are located in towns which are dependent upon them for their economic well-being. In such a situation, the abandonment of an active operation represents a loss of income for the entire area, for usually no other industries in which the employees will readily be able to find work are close at hand.

Although there have been frequent proposals to assist so-called chronically

[29] Shipbuilders Council of America, annual report, Apr. 1, 1959, New York, table 23.

[30] Ibid.

[31] "Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1950," U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 71st ed., Washington, D.C., p. 313.

[32] Op. cit., Shipbuilders Council of America, annual report, table 20.

[33] The Economic Almanac of the National Industrial Conference Board, 1958, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York, p. 188.

[34] The Handbook of Basic Economic Statistics, Economic Statistics Bureau of Washington, D.C., vol. XIII, No. 7, July 1959, p. 51.

depressed areas, the elimination of ship-construction subsidies would create numerous new ones. Those who advocate Federal programs to relieve this condition describe depressed areas as those which have "lost certain historic locational advantages, where local enterprise and initiative have usually been smothered and repressed by the existence of persistent and chronic unemployment" and which have "low financial resources" and are, therefore, "least capable of raising the capital required for long-term bold programs for rehabilitation." [35]

Chronic unemployment necessitates an expensive burden which absorbs vast sums in unemployment compensation and relief payments. Because the citizens of such areas have little purchasing power, they do not contribute a proportionate share to the Nation's output or to local, State, and Federal tax revenues.

It would be ironic for the Federal Government to attempt to reduce budgetary expenditures by abandoning a tried and proven program of ship-construction subsidies, and then later be confronted with additional appropriations for Federal aid to depressed areas which will produce no return whatsoever. Furthermore, the efficacy of any such program, in terms of restoring such an area to a healthy economic condition, is still to be proven.

As an example of what might happen if the ship-construction subsidy program were discontinued, an examination of the conditions prevailing in Newport News, Va., is illustrative. Of the city's 120,418 people, 12,500 are employed in ship construction.[36] This represents more than 10 percent of the community's total population, including children, retired persons, and housewives. At an average weekly salary of $90, these employees earn about $58 million a year.[37] A discontinuance of shipbuilding activities at the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. not only would represent a temporary loss of jobs for those employed; but, because within the immediate area there are no other industries which could absorb these workers, it would constitute almost a permanent loss of their incomes. Unless their families were able to relocate themselves in other communities, the present employees would be forced first to accept unemployment compensation, which, based on their normal earnings, would represent a cost to the State of Virginia of approximately $20 million. Ultimately, they would be forced to accept relief or public assistance; and, in many cases, this, again, would involve Federal funds to match State funds. In addition, the Federal Government would no longer receive the revenues derived from either the corporate or personal taxes which formerly were produced from this economic activity.

While data has been assembled respecting Newport News, this approach would apply to other yards on the east coast, such as the Bath Iron Works, at Bath, Maine; to yards on the Gulf coast, such as the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp., at Pascagoula, Miss.; and to yards on the west coast, such as the National Steel & Shipbuilding Corp., at San Diego. Other yards are located in major metropolitan areas, such as New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. If their workers were displaced, they might find employment, but they would probably receive lower wages in another occupation, where their skills could not be used to their maximum effectiveness.

If unemployment were more than 10 percent of the entire population, which implies a much higher percent of the civilian labor force, the community would be classified as a depressed area, which, by definition in the Area Redevelopment Act, S. 722, of the 86th Congress, is one where unemployment is at a level of 6 percent or more in a period when the economy as a whole is in a healthy condition.[38]

The political and budgetary implications of measures to assist depressed areas are indicated by the fact that both major parties proposed, in their 1956 platforms, Federal aid to meet this problem. Within the past 5 years, four congressional committees have considered legislation on this subject.

In 1958, S. 3683, of the 85th Congress, was passed by both Houses of the Congress, but was pocket-vetoed by the President on September 6, 1958.[39] This bill provided for an Area Redevelopment Administration under a Commissioner. The proposed responsibilities for this new Federal bureaucrat were defined as follows:

> The Commissioner would designate as industrial redevelopment areas, those areas suffering from substantial and persistent unemployment, and as rural redevelopment areas, those areas with a large number and percentage of low-income families and substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment. An overall program for the economic development of each area would then be prepared and approved by the Commissioner. This program would be prepared by the leaders of the area with the advice and assistance of the appropriate State and local authorities and the Area Redevelopment Administration.
>
> The Commissioner could make loans for industrial projects in industrial redevelopment areas out of a revolving fund of $100 million. He could make loans for industrial projects in rural redevelopment areas out of another $100 million revolving fund. These funds would be obtained by borrowing from the Treasury. The Commissioner could also make grants for public facilities from appropriated funds of $75 million a year.
>
> The Commissioner could give information and technical assistance to redevelopment areas. Financial assistance under the urban redevelopment program under the Housing Act of 1949 could be given in redevelopment areas. The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare could provide information and financial assistance in connection with vocational training programs and the Secretary of Labor would be authorized to arrange for subsistence payments up to 13 weeks to persons receiving such vocational training, but not then receiving unemployment compensation.[40]

If American shipyards are abandoned, the dislocations will extend beyond the coastal areas. Once again, employees working for suppliers to the maritime industry are, in many cases, primarily dependent upon it for employment. Accordingly, if we adopt a policy of eliminating ship-construction subsidies, based on the premise that it is cheaper to build American ships abroad, it will have far-flung consequences. As an example, there are approximately 33 companies which manufacture structural shapes or sheared and universal plates.[41] These are important in the construction of vessels. Over one-third of the facilities devoted to the production of these finished steel products are situated in areas which might well become depressed if the level of economic activity slackens, and if shipbuilding there is discontinued.

The Area Redevelopment Act, S. 722, introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], was passed by the Senate, by a vote of 49 to 46, on March 23, 1959,[42] and was passed by the House on May 4, 1960, by a vote of 201 to 184. It provides for total authorizations of $251 million, distributed as follows: $75 million for the purpose of loans to establish new plants in industrial areas, $75 million for loans to establish plants in rural areas, $50 million in loans to construct needed public facilities, $35 million for grants to public facilities, $10 million for subsistence payments for retraining, $1.5 million for vocational training grants, and $4.5 million for technical assistance.[43]

The bill provides the following criteria in order to define eligibility for depressed-area aid:

1. Unemployment of 12 percent of the civilian labor force persisting for 12 months;

2. Unemployment of 9 percent of this group for 15 out of 18 months;

3. Unemployment of 6 percent of this group for 18 out of 24 months.[44]

The proponents of this measure define their objectives in the preamble of the bill, as follows:

> The Congress declares that the maintenance of the national economy at a high

[35] Area Redevelopment Act, report of the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, 86th Cong., 1st sess., together with minority and individual views on S. 722, H.R. 360, Washington, D.C., May 14, 1959, p. 6.

[36] Editor and Publisher Market Guide, Editor and Publisher Co., Inc., New York, 1959, p. 444.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Area Redevelopment Act, report of the Committee on Banking and Currency, together with minority and individual views to accompany S. 722, U.S. Senate, 86th Cong., 1st sess., Rept. No. 110, Mar. 18, 1959, p. 15.

[39] Op cit. Area Redevelopment Act, H. Rept. No. 360, p. 2.

[40] Area Redevelopment Act, report to accompany S. 3683, Rept. No. 2099, 85th Cong., 2d sess., House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., July 1, 1958, p. 3.

[41] Directory of Iron and Steel Works of the United States and Canada, American Iron and Steel Institute, 28th ed., New York, 1957, pp. 468, 469.

[42] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 86th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 105, No. 47, Mar. 23, 1959, p. 4438; vol. 106, No. 81, May 4, 1960, p. 8798.

[43] Op. cit., Area Redevelopment Act, H. Rept. 360, p. 7.

[44] Op. cit., Area Redevelopment Act. H. Rept. 360, p. 31.

level is vital to the best interests of the United States, but that some of our communities are suffering substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment; that such unemployment and underemployment cause hardship to many individuals and their families and detracts from the national welfare by wasting vital human resources; that to overcome this problem the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should help areas of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment to take effective steps in planning and financing their economic redevelopment; that Federal assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in areas needing redevelopment should enable such areas to achieve lasting improvement and enhance the domestic prosperity by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies; and that under the provisions of this act new employment opportunities should be created by developing and expanding new and existing facilities and resources without substantially reducing employment in other areas of the United States.[45]

The Department of Labor makes regular reports on 149 communities, in terms of the percentage of unemployment prevailing among the civilian labor force. Based on these studies, early in 1959, approximately 20 of these areas would meet one of the criteria set forth in S. 722 for depressed-area aid.[46] The Administration, the Republican and Democratic congressional leadership, as well as the supporters of the more liberal bill referred to above, are in agreement that depressed areas constitute a serious problem, which justifies some Federal assistance. At the present time, most existing depressed areas fall into one of the following categories:

Coal-mining towns in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, eastern Kentucky, and sections of adjoining States; particularly hard hit are anthracite mining areas such as the Wyoming Valley of Pennsylvania—for example, Scranton, Pa.

New England towns in which textile employment has materially declined; for example, Lawrence, Mass.

Areas where employment in railroad shops was reduced as a result of dieselization of the railroad industry; for example, Altoona, Pa.

Resort and other areas which have never established a solid industrial base sufficient to support full-time employment of the community's labor force; for example, Asheville, N.C.

Towns in which the economy depended on a natural resource which has been largely exhausted—northern Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin towns formerly dependent on copper or iron mining or lumber; for example, Iron Mountain, Mich.[47]

One-industry towns are characteristic of many shipbuilding industries. Before discarding existing programs which enable us to maintain necessary facilities, careful consideration must be given to the ultimate cost to all taxpayers of creating additional depressed areas. These costs include not only possible Federal grants, but, in addition, the loss of existing tax revenues. Most important is the loss of personal dignity for the individual directly concerned, and, for the community, the loss of the skills he possesses.

Inasmuch as shipbuilding subsidies are admittedly the only means of meeting the urgent problems of national defense under a series of probable conditions in a future emergency, it is foolhardy to attempt to save less than $150 million in gross outlays and thereby destroy an essential industry. Furthermore, these savings are ephemeral. The ultimate cost includes a loss of revenues as well as expenditures to support new nonproductive Federal programs.

Ships or any other necessary element in our national defense are preferable to make-work projects which are implied in all of the depressed area legislation which has been before the Congress. Under existing world tensions, and with rapid technological progress on so many different fronts, we cannot afford to become dependent on other nations to provide advanced designs for our merchant marine and naval auxiliaries.

[45] Bill analysis, American Enterprise Association, Inc., 86th Cong., 1st sess., Rept. No. 7, Washington, D.C., Feb. 25, 1959, p. 8.

[46] Op. cit., bill analysis, p. 2.

[47] Ibid.

FOREIGN POLICY PROBLEMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments on some of the foreign policy problems which confront the Republic. I am not surprised at the Republican attack which has been made today on the floor of the Senate on Adlai Stevenson, because the Republicans very well know that if Adlai Stevenson should be nominated at the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles, he would be overwhelmingly elected President of the United States in November 1960.

This is a typical Republican downgrading strategy which we on this side of the aisle must expect in the months ahead. In fact, we must expect it regardless of which Democrat is nominated.

Adlai Stevenson is one of the greatest minds in American public life, and the White House calls for a great mind. We have sorely needed one in the White House for almost 8 years.

As Democrats we have the responsibility in the campaign ahead to discuss openly and frankly with the American people the issues of American foreign policy.

I want the RECORD to show this afternoon that I stand behind every word Adlai Stevenson spoke in his Chicago speech which has been referred to. I am glad the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has already put it in the RECORD. It was a typical, statesmanlike speech from Adlai Stevenson.

It is my opinion and judgment that if the American people had elected him as President of the United States in 1952, we would not be as close to war today as we are. I wish to say to my Democratic colleagues I think they ought to stop the practice of sneezing every time President Eisenhower coughs about a foreign policy matter. The Democrats have themselves to blame, in large measure, for the plight in which our party finds itself in regard to the matter of foreign policy, because we have had too many Democratic leaders who have been rubber-stamping a wrong foreign policy.

The Democratic Party owes it to the American people to take the foreign policy issue to the people and give them a choice on foreign policy.

It is my opinion that if we continue to follow the Republican foreign policy for many more years, we shall be in the midst of a nuclear war, out of which no one will be victorious, because, in my judgment, the evidence is abundantly clear that neither side can win a nuclear war.

Therefore, because this issue has been raised on the floor of the Senate today, I wish to make a few statements about it for the RECORD.

AMERICAN PEOPLE UNINFORMED ON FOREIGN POLICY

The United States and Russia are equally feared and jointly feared, and rightly so, in many parts of the globe, as the two great threats to the peace of the world. I know the American people want peace; we, the people, are dedicated to peace; but the sad fact is our Government is following a foreign policy that is bound inevitably to end in a nuclear war, unless the American people make it very clear to the leadership of the country that they want that policy changed. How can they make it clear? The American people are uninformed on American foreign policy due to the fact that the Eisenhower administration, during the last 8 years, has taken the people a long way down the road to Government by secrecy. Government by secrecy does not end up in freedom. Government by secrecy frequently ends up in war. And we are on the way.

The time has come, in my judgment, when the Democratic Party should offer to lead the American people back to the Wilsonian doctrine of open covenants openly arrived at, and make clear to the American people, in the historic campaign ahead, that we are through with secret diplomacy, that we are going to stop rubberstamping the secret diplomacy of the Eisenhower administration. Therefore, it is time we make clear to the American people that, as the Democratic Party, we are through with undercutting and undermining the United Nations, and that we propose to return to a sound democratic policy of seeking to follow the doctrine of international decisions based upon law, and take our case to an international organization, such as the United Nations, with such reforms in the United Nations as are sorely needed.

We are, in my judgment, in an immoral nuclear armaments race, an armaments race that cannot be reconciled by a single moral principle to which we bow our heads on Sunday. Those principles of morality ought to be practiced the other 6 days of the week, as well as revered on Sunday.

We are in danger of writing a sordid chapter in world history by a continuation of an immoral nuclear armaments race along with a nation the leadership of which we know to be amoral. Is it

not an historic commentary that the great, moral Nation of the United States is permitting itself to be drawn into an immoral nuclear armaments race, without paying attention to the other part of the paradox in which we live?

MILITARY SPOKESMEN ON FOREIGN POLICY

We live in a paradox, Mr. President. We live in a paradox in which we have to keep ourselves so militarily strong that Russia will understand she will have everything to lose and nothing to gain by an aggressive action against the free world. But, Mr. President, if that is the end of our goal, if that is the sum and substance of our procedures with regard to foreign policy, then the end result is bound to be war.

I listened to testimony of an expert, not very many weeks ago, who was talking about what would happen in a moderate nuclear war. He made very clear that there is not such a thing, of course, as the possibility of a moderate nuclear war, because the probabilities are that if a nuclear war should start it would be a total war, and all the bombs would be dropped in a relatively short period of time.

Speaking hypothetically about a moderate nuclear war, this expert said such a war would result, in the first 10 days, in the loss of 50 million lives in the United States and more lives in Russia and Europe. Let us try to reconcile that, Mr. President, with moral principles. We simply cannot forget that history goes on and on. Nations rise and fall.

Mr. President, it happens to be our patriotic duty, as I see our patriotic duty, to do what we can to give the greatest guarantee of an ever-rising America for centuries to come, rather than to follow a foreign policy which, in my judgment, increases the risks of war month by month.

We only have to sit and to listen to the top military brass testify, Mr. President, to know how dangerous is the period in which we live.

There is one thing the Democratic Party ought to make perfectly clear. It is that if the Democrats are elected to power in November 1960 the military will stop issuing foreign policy statements. The military under a Democratic administration, will learn once more a lesson which it seems to have forgotten, that the job of the American military group is to administer a foreign policy determined by a civilian government and not in any way to interrupt it or usurp it.

Periodically, Mr. President, we listen to statements by Admiral Burke as to what is going to happen in the Formosa Straits or in the Caribbean, and we listen to statements by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in regard to foreign policy. If we had a President who thoroughly understood the meaning of a civilian government, Mr. President, that top brass would have been removed from control immediately after it violated its constitutional duty to stay out of foreign policy determinations.

BIPARTISANSHIP DEAD

Mr. President, I point out to my Democratic colleagues that under this administration there has been no bipartisan foreign policy at any time, from the time the present President of the United States took his oath of office after his election in 1952 to date. Oh, there have been some conferences with leaders now and then at the White House. I am afraid some of my Democratic colleagues have permitted a little window dressing to go a long way with them. The honor of being briefed has taken the place of real consultation.

The Democratic Party has had no voice in helping to determine American foreign policy under the Eisenhower administration. There has been, in fact, no bipartisan foreign policy. That is why I am always surprised when I pick up the newspapers and read statements by Democratic leaders rubber stamping a foreign policy, after the fact, of the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. President, of course, in an hour of crisis we can always be counted upon to close ranks behind any President of the United States, Republican or Democrat. But I am one Senator who is not going to close ranks behind a President in connection with a wrong foreign policy prior to our getting into a situation where we are at war and before we have exhausted every possibility of correcting a wrong foreign policy by a wrong President. Mr. President, this President of the United States has been wrong many times on foreign policy since he has been in office.

I offer no apology to the American people. I am proud to let my descendants read my record of dissent with this President in regard to foreign policy time and time again.

Well I remember my refusal in 1955 to go along with the Formosa resolution and the warning which the Senator from New York and the Senator from Oregon gave the Senate on that historic occasion—that the Formosa resolution would settle nothing, that the Formosa resolution would increase the danger of war. So it has, Mr. President, and that danger is increasing year by year.

DEMOCRATS FAILED TO SUPPORT UNITED NATIONS

Mr. President, I think it is well understood that within the next few years Red China will have nuclear weapons. Can we think that the Formosa resolution, at that time, is going to be a contribution to peace? If the Democrats had not followed Eisenhower on the Formosa resolution in 1955, if they had supported the Senator from New York and the Senator from Oregon, as we pleaded on the floor of the Senate, taking a position of seeking to get the United Nations to accept a trusteeship over the Formosa Straits, with the United States guaranteeing to the United Nations that it would militarily defend Formosa and the Pescadores, we would be nearer to peace in the Formosa Straits than we are today.

But the Democrats rubberstamped what I consider to be that wrong foreign policy of this administration, which was a foreign policy, again, outside of the United Nations, and which represented once again the record of the Eisenhower administration for unilateral action outside the United Nations rather than through it.

History will record that the Eisenhower administration has bypassed the United Nations time and time again on the major issues which have threatened the peace of the world. The Middle East doctrine is another example. Once again the majority of the Democrats rubberstamped it. More of them stood with us on that than in regard to the Formosa Straits, Mr. President, but even in that instance we heard the pleas for unity. We heard the plea, "You cannot let the President down." We heard the plea, "The President, right or wrong."

That is dangerous doctrine, Mr. President. We have a duty, as Senators—at least, as I see my obligation, I do—to try to correct a wrong Presidential policy. I say, most respectfully, that we Democrats have done a rather poor job of that under this administration. I am glad to see that eyes are, at long last, opening, and at least the Democratic voters of this country—and I will also say, many fine independent and Republican voters of this country—are beginning to recognize that the Eisenhower administration foreign policy, if long continued, is going to lead us into war.

That policy has to be stopped, Mr. President. We have to stop it by stopping our support of the President of the United States every time he circumvents the United Nations, every time he resorts to secret diplomacy, and every time he keeps from the American people the facts about our foreign policy which endanger the people.

DEMOCRATS MUST OFFER ALTERNATIVES

Mr. President, it is one thing to criticize the Republican foreign policy but it is another thing to tell the American people a constructive program which ought to take its place. That is the responsibility of the Democratic Party, in my judgment. We must come forward with a constructive program, rather than constantly be sneezing as Eisenhower coughs, on foreign policy, rather than constantly standing up in the Congress of the United States to plead for unity behind the President on a wrong foreign policy. We have, first, a duty to lay out what is wrong with the administration's foreign policy; and then to offer a constructive program to replace it.

Mr. President, I like the way Adlai Stevenson talks. I like the way Adlai Stevenson thinks.

I like the programs which Adlai Stevenson has presented to the American people for a number of years. I remember the courage of Adlai Stevenson in 1956 in regard to nuclear testing. That was the act of a great man; and we all know the smear job that was done against him by the Republicans in 1956. They were talking then as NIXON has been talking in the past few days—"You are an appeaser if you criticize American foreign policy."

Let me point out that if we do not start criticizing the Eisenhower administration foreign policy, if we do not bring some reforms in regard to it, and if the Democratic Party does not begin in the Congress by offering constructive suggestions to replace the Eisenhower foreign policy, I repeat that within a few

years we shall be at war; and out of that war there will be no victory for the United States and the Western Powers, or for Russia. It will not be the end of civilization; it will merely be the end of American civilization and Russian civilization. There will be much civilization left, but it will be in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, because I am satisfied that a nuclear war would be bound to result in the simultaneous destruction of the civilizations in Europe, the United States, and Russia. I do not think there is any way of stopping it once the trigger is pulled on the first hydrogen bomb. There would be such a chain reaction of the pulling of triggers that it would be merely a matter of days until we had only a remnant of Western civilization and Russian civilization.

So I say to the Democratic Party that the time has come for it to come forward with a constructive program to meet the threat of war, because if we continue the program of the Eisenhower administration, in my judgment our country will end up with war in a very few years. I have said before, and I say again, that if we get into a critical war in which aggression is committed against us, of course we will stand united behind whoever is the President of the United States for the duration of that war, if we have any chance at all of surviving, which I think is highly remote.

Mr. President, I do not share the Democratic talk that we must not even whisper and criticize the Eisenhower policies with regard to foreign policy. In my judgment President Eisenhower and his administration have gotten us into the precarious position we occupy in this dark hour in American and world history.

MANY BELIEVE WE SHOULD FIGHT RUSSIA SOON

If my major thesis is correct—and I am satisfied it is—that this nuclear armament race is immoral, that this nuclear armament race will never stand the moral judgment of history which follows us, then we ought to be at work trying to win the peace, rather than giving aid and comfort to those within our country who are trying to sell the sinister propaganda across America, "We must fight Russia some time anyway; we are probably in a better position to fight her now: So let us get on with fighting her."

My heart is heavy when I reflect on how widespread that sinister propaganda already is. We call it the preventive war theory, an expression which I have heard from the lips of the high brass in this country. In 1955 I argued against the Formosa resolution because I knew the testimony before us had disclosed that we were considering a preventive war resolution. I again raise my voice in opposition to preventive war propaganda in the United States.

If we continue to follow the policy of the Eisenhower administration we shall end with a preventive war, but I do not think it is too late to win the peace. It will call for some courage. It will call for the raising of horizons. It will call for the return to and the putting into practice of a great American ideal.

I know that when I raise my voice lustily and make a plea for implementing a system of international justice through law my critics are heard to say, "That is what happens when you put a professor in politics. He becomes impractical."

I have many answers to the criticism, but I will give only one at this moment in the form of a rhetorical question: I would have these critics tell the American people what is practical about a nuclear war. What is practical about a nuclear war? I can think of no greater impracticality.

Even when the war would be over such civilization as would survive for centuries would live in chaos, because if we stop to reflect for a moment on the chaotic conditions of this globe following a nuclear war, the sad thing is that all the problems which confronted us before the war would have to be solved by the world that remained after the war. The war would solve nothing.

We are told that it would get Russia out of the way. I am satisfied it would get Russia out of the way—and the United States, too; and I do not wish to see the United States put out of the way. I think we have the system of government, and a system of ideals which come nearest to making it practically possible to implement the great spiritual beliefs and teachings to which we are all dedicated as religious men and women in this country. What concerns me so much is that the course of action which we are following cannot be reconciled with those spiritual principles.

CONSTRUCTIVE ALTERNATIVES NEEDED

So once again I plead this afternoon for an effort to implement a system of international justice through law; and I make these suggestions, which I hope will be considered constructive.

First let me say, before I submit such a list, that no one can hold any brief for the course of action the United States took in regard to the spy plane, and no one can hold any brief for the course of action that Khrushchev took, either.

I am a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate; and as a member of that committee I know the huge sums of money within our authorizations which are going into so-called intelligence work, which is but a polite name for spy work. Everyone else ought to know, and I presume does know, that, of course, we spend great sums of money for espionage, and so does every other powerful nation. Of course, we have spies in many parts of the world and we know that other countries do, too, including some of our friends in our own country.

We certainly have no doubt about the fact that Russia has spies. But I was highly amused to hear the alibi given by the Vice President of the United States, Mr. NIXON, in talking about the spy plane incident. He sought to attract attention to the fact that there had been a couple Russian spies detected in Massachusetts some months ago.

That is no surprise to anybody. But if I have ever listened to a non sequitur argument, that is one, and I am accustomed to hear such arguments from the Vice President of the United States. What does the detection of intelligence personnel have to do with a course of action followed by the United States in regard to what is interpreted around the world as a form of constructive aggression? That is exactly what the sending of the spy plane over Russia was. It was a form of constructive aggression. We can alibi it and rationalize it all we want to, and we can wave the American flag into tatters over it, but the fact remains that our friends and enemies alike around the world are going to decree that we cannot justify our course of action in the spy plane incident under international comity well recognized in the field of espionage.

At no time, as I sat in the Committee on Foreign Relations or on the floor, and as I voted for the use of funds for intelligence work, was there even a whisper from anyone within the administration, military or civilian, that any of that money would be used for the sending of an instrumentality of war over a foreign sovereign power.

I am satisfied that if any such suggestion had been made, the result with respect to the request for authorization would have been a great deal different, both in committee and on the floor of the Senate. The administration did great damage to the standing and prestige of the United States by following a policy which has shocked our friends around the world in sending an instrumentality of war in the form of a spy plane over Russia.

Let us not forget, in these days of high hysteria, bordering almost on panic, in the thinking of many people, one never knows when such an incident will cause some misguided, uninformed, emotionally aroused person in some foreign country to make a false deduction as to the purpose of such a plane, and a nuclear war will be started thereby.

It was a risk that the administration had no moral right to ever run. They ran it. The plane was shot down. I do not know what the facts are. We hope to get the facts after a thorough investigation. I do not know yet how the plane was shot down.

I am not convinced by any statement coming out of this administration that it was not shot down by a land-to-air missile. There are reasons to doubt the statement. I am satisfied that this administration would like to save face, if it can, with regard to this unfortunate and stupid mistake it made. I do know that one of the pleas made to us for a long time in the Senate for crash programs in connection with the development of land-to-air missiles was that, we were told—and I violate no secrecy by saying this, because this has appeared in periodicals and press reports throughout the country—that the Russians were ahead of us in land-to-air missiles.

The result was that huge sums of money were appropriated for Bomarc—over $3 billion. On the basis of the latest findings, the record of Bomarc is not so good. Of course we know, when we appropriate huge sums of money for these programs, that some of them are not going to be the success we hoped they would be, and that some of them

are going to be failures. I am not greatly concerned about the fact that we appropriated that money. The program apparently resulted in failure. I would vote to do it again. I will do it tomorrow if the administration can come forward with a program that shows an appropriation may help us speed up a crash program on land-to-air missiles. I say that because I have voted in the past and will continue to vote in the future for those appropriations which are necessary to let the Russians at all times know that they have everything to lose and nothing to gain by an aggressive course of action against the free world.

WEAPONS ARE NOT ENOUGH

What I am trying to bring before my country is that merely an arms race will not win the peace. An armaments race will not do that but, in my judgment, will surely assure a nuclear war in our time. That we cannot justify, unless we know that we have done everything that possibly can be done by moral people to try to set up a system of international justice through law which can enforce a total disarmament program.

Khrushchev shot the plane down. One would expect it from an amoral people. International comity and recognized principles of international morality dictated that he not follow that course of action. He has one of the best jet fighter armadas in the world. There are some people who think that they are better than our own. I am not expert enough to testify on that.

However, I raise the point that it is good enough so that there is great concern on the part of our experts as to the comparison between our jet fighter armada and Russia's. All he needed to do was to send three or four of his jet fighters to that plane and surround it and give it orders to ground itself. If it violated that request, then and only then, in my judgment, under the rules of international law, in such a situation, would he have been justified in shooting it down.

He did not follow that course. I have a hunch that he saw a great opportunity. He knew as well as we did that Bomarc has been no great success, and he seized the opportunity to make a demonstration to the world in regard to land-to-air missiles. I think that is a great probability. Be that as it may, he did get a great propaganda advantage over us. Then, having followed that course of action, he went to the summit undoubtedly with a determination to humiliate not only the President of the United States, not only the Presidency of the United States, but also the American people. He wanted to bring into disrepute the President as a man, the position, and the American people.

PRESIDENT DID WELL AT PARIS

Although I have been highly critical of President Eisenhower's foreign policy on many issues, I wish to say that the President went as far in the Paris conference as he could go with honor. He deserves credit for announcing at the very beginning that it was the plan of this Government to suspend any further use of spy planes. That should have been said, and that is all that the President needed to say, if Khrushchev really wanted to have the summit conference be a vehicle and a forum for negotiation and agreement on peace.

Obviously, he did not want that. Therefore, I wish to say that in my judgment the President of the United States conducted himself at the Paris conference within the proprieties, and Khrushchev did not.

I listened to Khrushchev's press interview. I could close my eyes at times during that interview and almost come to the conclusion that I was listening to Hitler, because there were sections of the interview which had many of the characteristics and overtones and undertones of the type of totalitarian propaganda that Hitler preached at his height.

Be that as it may, Khrushchev is a reality. Be that as it may, Khrushchev is at the head of a government that obviously is our potential enemy. Therefore, I believe that, with honor and within procedures that will protect the security of our country, we must proceed now to find out what we can do and to answer the question, "Where do we go from here?"

I am not one to cry over spilled milk. It is better to survey the facts that get us into a position in which we find ourselves at any given time.

But after I have surveyed that position, then I always ask myself the question: Where do we go from here? The Russians apparently thought that they might get more propaganda value by having this matter referred to the Security Council. I think we all know that the Security Council cannot solve it, and undoubtedly will not solve it.

There is not much hope that the Security Council can solve the great problem which confronts us, the problem of winning the peace, by bringing about a sure-proof, enforceable, total disarmament program in our time. I am not an "overnighter." I recognize that such a peace will not be won overnight. It will not be won in 2, 3, or 5 years.

In fact, to secure such a peace probably will consume many years. However, I want to stress that we ought to be taking forward steps toward winning the peace, rather than marching in reverse, as we are at present. I am satisfied we are marching toward war not toward peace. So I wish to make a few suggestions this afternoon which I think we ought to try to implement in the years immediately ahead.

If we do the negotiating within the framework that I suggest this afternoon; if we have the nations of the world negotiating for peace; then, interestingly enough, we will have a form of moratorium on war at the same time, because if the nations of the world are negotiating for peace, the probability will be increased that they will not proceed to fight one another in a war.

ROLE OF RED CHINA NEEDS TO BE UNDERSTOOD

So there are a few reforms which I think we ought to stand for in the field of foreign policy as it affects all nations. Let me stress the word "all" for a moment, because no longer can we divide the world into those nations with whom we will converse, and those nations against whom we will drop an American iron curtain.

Of course, I refer specifically to Red China. No one in this body hates the form of government of Red China more than does the senior Senator from Oregon. Nevertheless, we are following a blind, myopic policy with respect to Red China, because I am satisfied that Red China will be a nuclear power within 10 years. We cannot possibly start negotiating for peace leading toward a total disarmament program, and not include Red China.

This does not mean that the senior Senator from Oregon advocates the immediate recognition of Red China. I do not; although I point out to the American people that Red China has never asked to be recognized. Red China has never made a request for diplomatic recognition on the part of the United States.

However, I hope the time will come when we can recognize Red China with honor to ourselves. We cannot do that now. We cannot do it until we get some very definite proof that we can rely on the commitments of Red China which will show that we can count upon Red China to keep her international commitments.

There are two such commitments which we have the right and also the duty, it seems to me, to ask of her, in order to demonstrate to the world that the United States stands upon its principles of recognition. One of those criteria is the criterion that a nation must demonstrate to us or satisfy us that we can count upon it to keep its international commitments.

So I refer to the allegations which we have made, over and over again, and which I think were merited, that Red China has violated the Korean truce time and time again. The second allegation is that Red China has not followed the recognized procedure of civilized nations in respect to the treatment of our captured nationals. We must ascertain the facts.

Therefore, I suggest that as a condition precedent to any proposal that the United States recognize Red China diplomatically, the United States, through the United Nations, ought to ask Red China to permit a survey or an investigation to be made by an appropriate team of the United Nations concerning the extent, if any, to which Red China has kept to her international commitments in respect to the Korean truce, and in respect to her treatment of American nationals whom she has allegedly tried in her courts and sentenced to various types of punishment in Red China.

Does anyone think for a moment that the United States would object to a similar survey to be made by the United Nations in the United States, in case any sovereign power alleged that we were violating the well established principles of civilized nations in the matter of handling prisoners, or in the living up to our treaty or truce obligations? Of course we would not.

The point I am making is something different from that of diplomatic recognition. I am simply asking for recognition of the fact that if an attempt is made to work out a disarmament program, a part of the world cannot be left out of that disarmament program. It does not follow that because we recognize the right of Red China to a voice in negotiations with respect to worldwide disarmament, we are, in effect, thereby diplomatically recognizing her.

U.N. VETO POWER SHOULD BE ELIMINATED

So if we expect to establish a system of international justice through law, which will promote and attain total nuclear disarmament, then we must look to the existing procedures available to us. When we do that, we see that many of those procedures will have to be changed. We ought to be exercising leadership in making proposals for a change in the international rules which already exist in those organizations of which we are already members.

Thus I refer to the veto power of the United Nations. Certainly, that power must be eliminated. We know the history of the veto power. There are those who have written authoritatively and spoken authoritatively of the San Francisco Conference and have pointed out that when the American delegation at that Conference split over the veto issue, then the veto became a certainty, because the Russians were insistent upon the veto power.

Many persons at the San Francisco Conference were against the veto power. But when the American ranks broke over the issue, then there was no question, from that time on, that the veto power would go into the charter, and it did. It finally became a part of the charter, as the record shows, and with the vote of the American delegation, too. That was a great mistake.

There were only a few of us on the floor of the Senate at the time the San Francisco charter came before this body for ratification, and who spoke against the veto power in the charter. It was obvious at that time that that particular section of the charter was bound to rise to plague us, and it has risen to plague us many, many times.

It will not be possible to have the veto power removed immediately, but I believe it can be removed. As we marshal the leaders of the world behind a request for a modification of the veto power, in due course of time the Russian leaders themselves will come to recognize that they will have to assume the responsibility for losing the peace, if they are unwilling to make a concession in a matter which makes so much commonsense as the elimination of the veto power. I do not know how many years it will take, but I believe that the very discussion of it, that the making of it the subject of one or more special sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations for world debate, discussion, and resolution, if possible, will have an effect on the exercise of the veto during the period of time the discussion is taking place.

The discussion of these problems, in and of itself, will further the cause of peace in the international councils of the world as they are carried on through the procedures of the United Nations.

U.N. MUST BE CORNERSTONE OF U.S. POLICY

Third, I suggest that the time has long passed—is long overdue—when the United States also will serve notice on the world that we are going to stop our end runs around the United Nations; that we are going to stop circumventing the United Nations, that we are perfectly willing to lay our cases on their merits before the procedures of the United Nations, before the tribunals of the United Nations, before the General Assembly of the United Nations, for open world surveillance.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think public opinion in this country should give heed to the need of the United States to notify the world that we are going to help strengthen the United Nations, instead of continue to weaken it.

INTERNATIONAL LAW MUST BE STRENGTHENED

Fourth, I wish to point out that there is no existing body of international law sufficient in depth to be applied to all the international issues which arise to endanger the peace. International law, as it now exists, is, after all, very limited in scope. Therefore, if we are to set up a system of international justice through law, we must expand the existing body of international law, so that as each threat to the peace arises, as each dispute between and among nations occur, there will be a set of principles which can be applied for the adjudication of those disputes, thus eliminating the kind of policy the United States has been following, namely, one of threatening massive retaliation, of proposing to keep 25 percent of our bombers in the air at all times, loaded with nuclear bombs.

What a shocking bit of news that was when it went around the world. How shocking it was to make such a statement, and then profess that we are seeking peace, when people in other parts of the world know that the nuclear weapons on any one of those bombers could go off by accident or by design or by disobedience of orders, and could start a holocaust. We have to start to square our actions with our talk for peace; and such a proposal as that is not a proposal of peace, but threatens war. Instead, we must have something to supplant the American policy of military threats.

The sad thing is that around the world we have the reputation—and with cause—of being threateners, just as Khrushchev has the reputation of rattling the saber. One of the sorriest things in the history of this administration was the proposal for mass retaliation; and the sad thing is that the Democrats as a body did not oppose it. Too many Democrats went along with that proposal, and, in my judgment, aided and abetted the Eisenhower administration in following the wrong policy for some 8 years.

If we are to expand international law, so there will be a body of law to which we can turn before international tribunals, if rule and reason are to be applied to international disputes, we must be willing to submit disputes which are subject to adjudication under existing international law to the tribunals of the United Nations which are provided for the handling of such cases. But we do not do so in regard to any matter of consequence. We may do so in regard to some little fishing dispute or some minor dispute in regard to a vessel or in regard to a question about harbor damages. But when there is a major issue, such as that over the Formosa Straits or that in regard to the Middle East or a good many issues which have arisen in connection with our mutual security program, we simply lean back and proclaim our sovereign rights, wave the flag, and say we are going to decide this for ourselves. But whenever we do that, we lose more and more prestige around the world.

So I suggest that we begin to apply the judicial articles of the United Nations Charter, and that we carry a peace offensive against Russia whenever we have a chance to do so, by calling upon Russia to join us in submitting disputes not only to the World Court, but, under the articles of the United Nations, also to other tribunals which can be set up by agreement under the judicial article of the United Nations Charter, for the settlement of such disputes.

That will start expanding international law with a body of precedents, much in the same way that the great common law was built up. The common law is a body of judicial precedents; and we should now be engaged in the process of building up a body of precedential law for international-law tribunals to apply to disputes which threaten the peace of the world, as they arise from year to year.

But more than that must be done. We also must expand international law by "a statutory process or procedure." I suggest that we can do so by calling a series of extraordinary sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations from time to time, with the agenda limited to specific questions for debate and negotiation, the purpose being to arrive at the adoption of resolutions, with the understanding that they will have the force and effect of international law until they are repealed. Is that idealistic? Yes, it is. Is it theoretical? Yes, it is. Is it practical? It is highly practical, because, as I have said before, the only thing that is practical happens to be to put to work an ideal in the field of foreign policy and also in the field of governmental domestic policy.

But the sad thing is that the Eisenhower record on this matter is practically nil; and the sad thing is that too many Democrats have rubber stamped the Eisenhower position on that issue.

It is time for the Democratic Party either to fish or to cut bait on the matter of foreign policy, and in the months ahead to come forward with a constructive foreign program which will lead to peace, instead of the Republican program which rapidly is taking us down the road toward war.

A series of such conferences over the years—and let it be remembered that earlier in this speech I pointed out that I am discussing a program which, in my

judgment, may take as long as 20 years but, nevertheless, we should get on with the work, and should have conferences of the sort I have suggested through special sessions of the General Assembly—will, in my judgment, promote the cause of peace and strengthen the chances for peace, and will bring us closer to a total nuclear disarmament program, without which, in my judgment, in our time we shall wind up with a nuclear war.

PEACE OFFENSIVE NEEDED

But for the immediate future—and I close with this suggestion—I believe we have a right to look to our allies around the world to rise to their obligations at this hour. I believe the heads of great governments, such as those of Great Britain, Canada, France, Italy, and India—those of all the free nations of the world—ought right now be joining in focusing attention on the need for the adoption of a system of international justice through law for the settlement of these disputes, leading to a total disarmament program.

If ever there was a time when the United States needed the moral support and backing of her allies, that time is now; and I am speaking of the need to take to Khrushchev a peace offensive within and through the United Nations.

But we are not doing so, because time and time again we have demonstrated that we are not willing to submit specific questions to the processes of the United Nations for final determination. So I make the plea that our allies join in asking for an extraordinary session of the United Nations in the immediate future, because, in my judgment, it has got to be done through the General Assembly, not through the Security Council. In the first place the Security Council cannot speak for all the nations in the world, and only a few nations are on the Security Council. But every nation, large and small, has a stake in peace. Every nation, large and small, has a stake in what the United States, Great Britain, France, and Russia do.

SUMMIT MEETING SHOULD BE HELD AT U.N.

That is why I have been heard to say before, as I protested the kind of summit conference that was called in Paris, that, in my judgment, we should not proceed in that kind of summit conference. I think it was a mistake from the beginning.

Any summit conference in which we participate, as I have said for a long, long time, should be conducted under the jurisdiction of the United Nations, with the Secretary General of the United Nations sitting as permanent chairman of that conference, and with any arrangements or agreements reached in that summit conference going to the United Nations for approval.

Why? Because if that is not done, in my judgment we shall return to international power politics. International power politics will not produce peace. It never has. The use of international power politics, throughout the history of mankind, has produced only intervals between wars, because always the nonparticipants resent the fact that a few powerful nations decide the fate of the rest of the world.

I make it a point of getting myself briefed on broadcasts coming from southeast Asia, Latin America, and Africa. I say to Members of the Senate they had better get themselves briefed on what is coming out of southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America these days. Those radio broadcasts indicated to me that loud dissents were already beginning to arise among the nonparticipants at the summit conference, and questions were being asked.

One can call it any kind of propaganda he desires; nevertheless, it is a reality. One cannot deny that it is being beaten into the eardrums of millions and millions of people in that part of the world, people who in numbers greatly exceed our population, and people who have to be won over to freedom if freedom is to survive. In my opinion, freedom will not survive if it is limited to the United States and the Western nations. It will survive in the decades ahead only if we win over to freedom the people in those parts of the world to which I have referred.

Mr. President, we will not sell international politics to them. They want none of it. Why should they? Would we?

I heard it said earlier this afternoon by the Senator from Pennsylvania or the Senator from Oklahoma—I think it was the Senator from Pennsylvania—when he quoted extensively from the Stevenson Chicago speech, from which I quoted a few minutes ago, what the reaction would be in our country in case a Russian spy plane was over our country. We know what the reaction would be. Can we not hear the clamor? There would be those who would want to break off diplomatic relations immediately. There would even be those who would want us to go to war.

In regard to the matter of international power politics, there are millions of people who want none of it; but they can be brought along, and they will cooperate if we give them a voice. That is why I made the suggestion, in which I hope our friends around the world will join us, and I hope our country will exercise leadership in proposing, that we start, in the immediate future, in the United Nations building in New York City, a series of conferences open to the world, to which will be invited the head of every state in the world, large and small, for the purpose of laying down the blueprint for peace, of telling the world the concessions he is willing to make in behalf of his country, for the cause of setting up a system of international justice under law, with the immediate goal of total disarmament, to be enforced by a police system agreed upon by the United Nations to enforce such a disarmament program.

I know there are those who will say, "Too idealistic. Too theoretical and impractical." But again I ask the question, What is practical about a nuclear war?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. In just a second.

I think the world is up against it, and I think the world has no choice but either to go to war in our generation or to give the world a system of permanent peace, which can be attained only by bringing to an end this immoral nuclear armaments race.

I yield for a moment to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to commend the Senator from Oregon for the fine speech he is making in support of a peaceful solution of the world's difficulties. I thank him for joining me and the Senator from Oklahoma and a number of other Senators earlier today, who made the specific point that our job is to continue that search for peace, regardless of the calamities and blunders which resulted in the breakup of the summit conference. While it is important to establish what went wrong in the summit conference, and who made the mistakes, and why, the more important matter is not to be turned aside from the one great goal of this generation, which is peace, and cessation of nuclear testing, and surrender of nuclear weapons, and international agreement to bring about world peace through world law.

Our zeal in that cause should not be abated one iota by reason of anything that has happened in the world in the last 6 weeks.

I ask the Senator from Oregon if that is not the great task which lies before America as the leader of the free world, and whether we do not have to create in the Senate a climate in which that task can be pursued assiduously, and in which those who do pursue it get the plaudits of this body, and not one in which there is a feeling that they are doing something unpatriotic or being soft on communism?

Mr. MORSE. I could not agree more with the Senator from Pennsylvania. That is the burden of my whole speech this afternoon.

NATIONS SHOULD PUT BLUEPRINT FOR PEACE BEFORE U.N.

This is not the first time the Senator from Pennsylvania and the senior Senator from Oregon have stood shoulder to shoulder on the floor of the Senate in the interest of permanent peace. But I want to stress the fact that we have got to come forward with what I consider to be constructive, practical proposals for establishing that procedure. I have made specific references to those goals. The one point I was on—and I reiterate it—when I gladly yielded to the Senator from Pennsylvania, who has been so helpful on this speech, was that we should invite, and others must join us, the heads of all States, large and small, to participate in an extraordinary session of the United Nations, which has nothing to do with membership in the United Nations at all. I would like the head of every nation, large and small, whether that nation is a member of the United Nations or not, to have an opportunity to take a world platform in the United Nations Building in New York City and lay down his nation's blueprint for peace, and the concessions that nation is willing to make in order to establish what the Senator from Pennsylvania, I, and others in the Senate have been urging for many, many years in the

Senate, namely, the establishment of a system of international justice through law for the purpose of enforcing peace.

Mr. President, that is going to take weeks and perhaps months. I am all in favor of taking as much time as we need, because, I repeat, if we have the heads of state around the world devoting themselves to the consideration of programs for peace, in my judgment, we shall have an unwritten moratorium on war. These nations are not going to be fighting each other so long as they are seeking to work out a peace program. I think we need that time, Mr. President.

I happen to think a tremendous amount of good can come from such a program as I am outlining, because I am satisfied there is not a spot on the world today in which the people are not greatly concerned about the danger of a nuclear war. The hearts of mankind, generally speaking—including, I am satisfied, the overwhelming majority of the rank and file people of the Soviet Union of Russia—want peace.

We know we are dealing with some irresponsible leaders in various parts of the world, but they happen to be a reality. We must stop, it seems to me, trying to escape from reality in this field of working for peace. We have to recognize that at least those leaders whom we consider to be irresponsible have to be drawn out into the open. We have to carry to them and to the world, through the United Nations, the great ideals of the United States for peace.

I happen to think that even at the head of state level we might be in for some very pleasant surprises as to the amount of progress which could be made in developing a program for peace. People would have to come and go at the conference. I recognize that, in many instances, about all we could expect would be to have the head of state come to lay out his program. If a head of state did not want to come in person but wanted to send a foreign minister to speak on his behalf, that should be his right. I think most heads of state, however, would come themselves.

After the heads of state had laid out their programs, Mr. President, it would be necessary for them to go back to attend to administrative and executive duties at the heads of their governments. After the heads of state program had been laid out before the world I think the next step should be negotiations and diplomatic exchanges among the foreign ministers.

It is at that point, Mr. President, I think months could be spent, and very profitable negotiations could be had, again under the auspices of the United Nations, in trying to see what agreements and understandings the foreign ministers could reach.

Third, Mr. President, I propose, after the foreign ministers have done the best they can in regard to trying to reach an agreement upon the program for the various phases of this very important problem of peace, to which I have alluded this afternoon, that the recommendations and proposals go back once more to the General Assembly of the United Nations for the purpose of a determination of what agreements can be made within the United Nations, among the members thereof, at least with respect to a disarmament program.

Mr. President, highly theoretical as it may be dubbed, I happen to think this has a terrific amount of commonsense, because if the leaders of the world really want peace the road I offer them is the road they should travel, toward the citadel and the cathedral of world peace, rather that the road which I think they may travel if we do not take spiritual leadership in the world, before it is too late—the road toward nuclear war. I do not think we have much time left. We have only our generation, at the most.

Franklin Roosevelt never spoke a greater truth than the truth he spoke in the depths of the depression, when he uttered the words which are more applicable today than they were in the depths of the depression, that our generation has a rendezvous with destiny. I think our generation, Mr. President, has a rendezvous with a great decision, war or peace. If the decision is war, America will be no more. If the decision is peace, then mankind will have the opportunity to rise to those great heights of civilization which still are high for us to climb, the great heights which I believe God intended for us. But God also intended that we do our share, and that share calls at this historic hour, in my judgment, for our trying to lead the world into putting into implementation and practice the great, divine teachings which I think God intended us to follow.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I heard quite by accident a statement by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon on television during the Oregon primary campaign, which I assume originated from Oregon. This was long before the collapse of the summit. I thought the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon in 2 minutes made more sense than any other statement I had heard on television. At that time the Senator spoke of the necessity for moving into the United Nations with this terribly important problem.

Would not the Senator from Oregon agree that after some 3½ years of trying to ease the tensions in the world, of trying to eliminate fear and suspicion, we are in a worse situation than we were in 3 years ago?

Mr. MORSE. There is no doubt about it. That is part of the burden of my speech this afternoon.

Mr. CARROLL. Would not the Senator from Oregon agree with the junior Senator from Colorado that we went into the so-called summit conference under the most adverse conditions? We had to have as our bargaining agent Mr. Macmillan of Great Britain or President de Gaulle of France. We were not there on equal terms. How much better would it have been if we had gone to the United Nations. Would not the Senator agree with that?

Mr. MORSE. I do not know what the record will show, but, as the Senator knows, I think the record will show that probably as many as four to six times, at the very beginning of the talk about having a summit conference 2 or 3 years ago, the Senator from Oregon spoke on the floor of the Senate against a summit conference held outside the United Nations.

From the very beginning, I have urged that all summit conferences be held under the United Nations, with the Secretary General serving as permanent chairman of the conference and with the understanding that the deliberations of such a conference and any proposed agreements reached would come to the General Assembly of the United Nations for approval.

I have said that for some years now because I think the United States is repeating a great mistake of history. We are participating in international power politics, in the kind of summit conference which was proposed. I think those are always bound to end in historic failure.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Would not the Senator agree that at one time, in June of 1950, I think, when a serious crisis confronted the world, we met it through collective action through the United Nations in Korea? It was an unhappy event. We had to go to Korea. The results did not satisfy anyone, but at least we avoided world war III.

Would not the Senator agree that when we had the second great international crisis, in the Middle East, we again functioned through the United Nations?

I am no special champion of a theoretical United Nations, but I agree with the Senator from Oregon when he says that we must use the machinery of the United Nations when we are in a critical situation such as this. The United Nations should be used because not only big nations are concerned, but all the nations of the whole world will be affected in event of an atomic war. I should think all nations should be given a chance to find out what are the facts in this case.

May I say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that I read the wire service reports on some of the violent attacks that were made today upon Adlai Stevenson and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. I was not on the floor at the time the remarks were made. I cannot understand the motivation. Have we reached the point in America where American citizens are not entitled to know whether the leadership of their Government has its fingers on the control of the military? Have we reached the point in our history when we cannot determine whether civilian authorities are supreme over the military?

I was not on the floor of the Senate at the beginning of the debate, but I heard the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I have withheld any criticism of the failure at the summit until the President came back to Ameri-

can soil, because I did not want to embarrass him while he was on foreign soil. However, I think we now have held our fire long enough. I think we are now entitled to know the answer to this one question: Who initiated the U–2 flight on May Day? Why was it done on May Day? Who did it? Did the President of the United States know the flight was in motion?

Mr. MORSE. May Day is one of the great Russian holidays.

Mr. CARROLL. Exactly. Why did this flight take place virtually on the eve of the conference? Over 10 years ago when I was in the Congress I knew that there were forces within this Nation which believed in preventive war. I ask today whether there might be persons in the military who wished to torpedo the summit conference. Was there someone in the Central Intelligence Agency who wished to torpedo the conference? Perhaps there are people within these departments who do not desire to ease the tensions and have peace in the world.

These are the questions to which we are entitled to have answers, and as representatives of the people we are entitled to have our committees investigate and determine the answers. The Senator from Oregon sits on the important Foreign Relations Committee. I hope that if the Committee on Foreign Relations conducts hearings, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is reported in the press to have predicted, these questions will be asked. I know the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will be at every one of those hearings and he will attempt with all his might, power, and eloquence to determine this basic question: Why was this spy plane permitted to make its flight on May Day and just preceding the conference? Who was responsible?

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. If the Senator will permit me to make a further observation, I am frightened when I think of the possibilities of trouble arising from one of our outlying bases. We have delegated enormous power and authority to the military. The military are composed of human beings, and therefore are not perfect. Some military man could make an error in judgment and an atomic bomb might be released. That military man might set in motion a chain of events that could bring on the greatest man-made disaster in the history of the world.

We are living in a new age, in a new era, and Adlai Stevenson, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are among those who are saying the people are entitled to know our weaknesses and where the imperfections are in our society.

Who initiated the May Day flight? Was it done out of stupidity? Did our President know it?

It is not enough for the President to say, "I am responsible." Of course he is responsible because under the Constitution he formulates foreign policy. It is not a question of responsibility. The question is, Who did it? Who killed cock robin? Who did this monstrous thing? The American public are entitled to know the answer.

What I have said is not in criticism of the President of the United States. I wish to make that point perfectly clear. Such criticism on this issue at this time would be premature. Why? We need the facts, and that is why I commend the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], I commend the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and others who say, "We are going to have a hearing." But let us not wait too long.

Following up the statement of the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I suggest that only a fool today would believe that in 6 or 8 months all damage which has been done will be restored. All the fear and the suspicion that existed during the Stalin regime has now been greatly accelerated. It will not be 6 months, 8 months, a year or 2 years.

I can see only one course ahead and that is working together in the General Assembly of the United Nations. We cannot rely on the action of the Security Council because of its veto power. The General Assembly in discussing these issues can discuss surveillance of planes, disarmament, and perhaps through this medium we can again remove some of the fear and suspicion. If we do not do so history will record that if this great Nation and the other leaders of the world among our allies do not get together to settle this question, there will not be much history left.

Mr. MORSE. Those who write will not be American historians. Perhaps some in Asia may write the history.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator is exactly correct.

If the Senator will yield for one further observation, I have just had placed before me a news ticker dispatch which comes from Denver. This is a UPI dispatch.

DENVER.—The Denver Post said editorially today that Adlai Stevenson had a perfect right to criticize the administration's ineptness before the summit meeting and that "it is a proper subject for the political campaign."

The Post, which has supported the Republican candidate in the past two presidential elections, also said that former Democratic National Chairman James Farley "should know better about the proper role of the opposition in a democracy."

After Stevenson had criticized the administration's presummit activities Farley in turn criticized Stevenson for making the matter a political issue.

Stevenson had said the administration gave Khrushchev a crowbar with which to wreck the summit meeting through the U–2 plane incident.

The Post said in an editorial headed "Come Off It, Mr. Farley," that Stevenson "neither implied that the administration deliberately helped wreck the summit, nor did he hint that Americans were anything but united behind the President in his humilitating trials."

"But Stevenson did say that GOP tactics were very inept before the summit, which is true, and he did say that this is a proper subject for the political campaign, which is also true," the Post said.

Mr. President, the Denver Post is a Republican independent newspaper. The Denver Post twice gave its wholehearted support to President Eisenhower. It extolled his virtues day in and day out. But the editors also have courage. They have had the courage to point out the President's weaknesses time after time, whether they dealt with western reclamation, water pollution, or the depressed area problems which affect the State of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] so vitally.

The Denver Post has provided outstanding leadership in the Western States against the manner in which this administration has run the Federal Power Commission. The Denver Post has charged the FPC with failure to protect the public interest.

This newspaper then is one of the outstanding independent Republican newspapers in the Nation, standing most of the time, in my opinion, in the public interest. The reason I cannot give it a 100-percent rating is that it did not support me all the time. But it is a very fine newspaper, even though it did not support me in the last election.

Mr. MORSE. It even opposed me in Oregon before the last election.

Mr. CARROLL. I am not under any political obligations to the Denver Post, but I am pleased to tell my colleagues in the Senate that once again it puts its finger right on the issue. The issue is not an attack upon President Eisenhower. The issue is not an attack upon the President of the United States. The issue is crystal clear. The issue is whether the American people are entitled to know who is running their Government. If the President is running the Government, then who has sabotaged the cause of peace? We are not concerned especially with Khrushchev. We will take care of Khrushchev in our own time, but I agree with the Senator from Oregon that we ought to take care of Khrushchev and all his cronies in the forum of the United Nations and let the people of the world participate.

We do not have to give up our sovereignty. We have only one short opportunity left. The main point is that I am in support of the able Senator from Oregon. As I say, we have only one short opportunity left before some fool launches us into atomic war. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Colorado very much for his wonderful contribution to my discussion on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

I agree with almost everything he said. I certainly agree with his thesis. I am not at all surprised to find that there is opposition to Stevenson by the Republicans and the Farleys. We have opposition to Stevenson within our own party, as well as opposition by the Republicans.

There are those who are very anxious to see that he be not nominated at the Democratic convention. They recognize that, if nominated, unquestionably he will come out the victor. They have the right to oppose any nominee they wish to oppose. I am not at all surprised by Mr. Farley's criticism of Mr. Stevenson,

because I am well satisfied as to where he stands in the fight within our party so far as the Democratic nomination is concerned.

The second thing I wish to say is that I reserve only one dissent from the observations the Senator from Colorado has made, and that was with respect to the course of action we followed with relation to the Middle East doctrine. In my judgment we did not make use of the United Nations procedure, as we should have. I made pleas at the time that we ought to take to the United Nations certain proposals for commitments from countries of the Middle East prior to exercising our right—and we have the right—to enter into agreements with those countries.

I felt at the time that we would have greatly strengthened the cause of peace if we had required or sought to require an agreement through the United Nations with respect to certain conditions before the fact, before we made the agreement under the doctrine.

But other than that the Senator from Colorado has expressed the thesis of the Senator from Oregon. Our difference is that I would have made greater use of the United Nations in that instance than we did. I am grateful indeed to the Senator from Colorado for strengthening my record this afternoon as history will read it on the subject which I rose to discuss.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I ought to say, to keep the record clear, that Jim Farley is my friend. We must remember that there are some political differences in the State of New York. For example, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and former Senator Herbert Lehman support Stevenson. In 1956 Jim Farley was a strong Stevenson supporter. Now he may have another candidate. However, that is no reason for him to speak as harshly as he has about Adlai Stevenson. My able friend from Oregon, who is on the floor today, if he does not read it tonight, will probably read tomorrow morning, that another friend of mine, former President Harry Truman, is on the news wires today. He wrote an article for Look magazine, on Adlai Stevenson. This current article has nothing to do with the statement on the summit by Stevenson. However, he is not speaking in any commendatory terms about Adlai Stevenson. It is obvious that he has a candidate too. He has a right to have one. Therefore, I believe that people must look at these statements——

Mr. MORSE. I had one until last week.

Mr. CARROLL. Yes. The Senator from Oregon had a very good candidate. Many times good horses do not run strong for a short stretch. The junior Senator from Colorado has been that type of candidate. I have to have a longwinded campaign, sometimes lasting 6 or 8 years before I am successful. Some runners are not sprinters. I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon in conclusion, if I may, with respect to these statements, that I am absolutely convinced that Stevenson has a deep-seated feeling that this issue affects the survival of this Nation, and that he feels that we must raise this issue with the people of the Nation. I am confident that Stevenson did not raise this issue as a partisan political issue, but because he believes we must discuss these matters.

For more than 2 years the junior Senator from Colorado has been trying to stir up interest in Stevenson as a candidate. I do not know Governor Stevenson well. He is more an acquaintance of mine. I have met him only a few times. However, I look upon him as a great political and philosophical leader. He represents a new era in politics. I believe that is also true of JOHN KENNEDY. I think it is true of the new group that is emerging in the Democratic Party. I think it is true of other candidates. It is true of the distinguished Senator from Oregon. And that is nothing new about him. He has been ahead of the field for years. That is true of Senator SYMINGTON and Senator JOHNSON. I look about the Chamber to see if there are any other candidates. [Laughter.]

We are moving into a new era. My friend the able Senator from Montana has advocated—and I supported his resolution in 1957, when only a few of us stood here with him on the floor of the Senate—some supervision over the Central Intelligence Agency. I do not like the idea of voting money for an Agency and not knowing a little about what it is going to be used for. Only a selected few Members of the body know what CIA is doing. I do not like that. I represent a million and a half people, and I am entitled to be able to go home and say to the people a little something about what the CIA is doing.

Mr. MORSE. Let me correct the Senator's statement on that point. There is not any select group in the Senate that knows what CIA is doing. I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. There are many things I cannot find out about what they are doing. They use the top secret label against us, too.

Mr. CARROLL. I can understand that some things ought to be kept secret. But we ought to have general knowledge about the guidelines and about the controls and about who gives orders and who makes reports.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to make this comment at this point. I do not think anything should be kept top secret without a check, under our system of government. It cannot be spread out worldwide, but at the same time I do not believe in vesting any branch of our Government with police-state power and top secret power, where there can be no check upon its administration.

That is a step in the direction of police-state powers. I have always opposed it. I happen to think that the elected representatives of the people can be trusted with the type of top secrets that any President or any head of the CIA can be trusted with. Most of the people who do have access to top secrets have never been elected to political office in their lives. So I do not buy the argument that we should not have a check on the President of the United States in respect to this matter of top secrets.

We can have a check on it without having it known throughout the country and known throughout the world. I am not going to give any man, even the President of the United States, unchecked power, because that is what brings about tyranny in times of crisis.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, of course I agree with that. The Constitution provides for that. I wish to make this personal reference. I had personal knowledge at one time that President Truman, when he was President, would get every morning at 9 o'clock a report from his intelligence liaison, so that he might know what was going on. He got those reports every morning. I assume that this is being done with President Eisenhower.

Mr. MORSE. Let us hope so.

Mr. CARROLL. There may be some things withheld from him. I reiterate this because I think it is very important. I think that all Americans are entitled to know, of course, who gave the order for the May Day flight. Why was it done on May Day? What was its purpose? Was it done stupidly, blindly; was it merely a colossal blunder, or was it some force working even against Eisenhower and against the administration, to blow up this conference? I think we are entitled to know what the facts are.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to say to the acting majority leader that I am about to yield the floor. Would he like to have me suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not at this time.

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor.

YI YOUNG AN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1289, S. 2681.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2681) for the relief of Yi Young An.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 8, after the word "said", to strike out "Yin" and insert "Yi", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Yi Young An, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Staff Sergeant and Mrs. John L. Brown, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Yi Young An shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the pertinent parts of the report as they relate to the desirability of this measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (Rept. No. 1252) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to grant to the minor child adopted by citizens of the United States the status of a nonquota immigrant which is the status normally enjoyed by alien minor children of U.S. citizens. The bill has been amended to correct the spelling of the beneficiary's name.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 19-year-old native of Korea, presently residing there, who was adopted in Korea on February 22, 1960 by citizens of the United States. He receives his full support from them. His adoptive father has served continuously with the Air Force since 1943 as a chaplain. After attaining the rank of lieutenent colonel he was retired under a reduction-in-forces program, and thereafter enlisted and is presenly serving a tour of duty in Korea which terminates in June 1960. After retirement in 1963 he plans to resume his ministry in the Southwest Texas Conference of the Methodist Church. The adoptive parents of the beneficiary were married in 1938 and have a 13-year-old daughter. Information is to the effect that they are financially able to care for him.

A letter, with attached memorandum, dated December 16, 1959, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary from the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with reference to the bill reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., December 16, 1959.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: In response to your request for a report relative to the bill (S. 2681) for the relief of Yi Young An, there is attached a memorandum of information concerning the beneficiary. This memorandum has been prepared from the Immigration and Naturalization Service files relating to the beneficiary by the Houston, Tex., office of this Service, which has custody of those files.

The bill would confer nonquota status upon the 19-year-old alien to be adopted by U.S. citizens. It also would provide that the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act. It is noted that there is a difference in the spelling of the beneficiary's name in lines 5 and 8 of the private bill. According to the records of this Service the correct spelling is Yi Young An.

As a quota immigrant the beneficiary would be chargeable to the quota for Korea.

Sincerely,

J. M. SWING,
Commissioner.

MEMORANDUM OF INFORMATION FROM IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE FILES RE YI YOUNG AN, BENEFICIARY OF S. 2681

Information concerning this case was obtained from Mr. and Mrs. John L. Brown, foster parents of the beneficiary.

Yi Young An, a native of Korea, was born on July 18, 1940. He has never been in the United States. He presently resides in Korea with Mr. Brown and is fully supported by him. The foster parents intend to adopt the beneficiary under the laws of the State of Texas when he arrives in the United States. The beneficiary is the son of Yi Man Sok and his wife, Pak Pun Sik, both residents of Korea. They have agreed to his adoption.

Mr. and Mrs. John L. Brown are U.S. citizens by virtue of birth in Athens, Tex., on Otcober 30, 1912, and Calcasieu Parish, La., on February 28, 1910, respectively. They maintain their principal residence in Nome, Tex. Mr. and Mrs. Brown were married in Georgetown, Tex., on August 6, 1938, and have testified that this is their only marriage. They have a 13-year-old daughter, Doris Kay Brown. Mr. Brown has served continuously in the U.S. Air Force since March 3, 1943, and he plans to make the Armed Forces his career. His present rating is staff sergeant, and his annual income is $4,200. Mrs. Brown is employed as a teacher in the public-school system at Nome, Tex., with an annual income of $4,250. Their joint assets consist of $14,200 in U.S. savings bonds, insurance with a face value of $17,000 a checking account of $6,000, and other real and personal property valued at $5,000.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, the author of the bill, has submitted the following information in connection with the case:

21ST FINANCE DISBURSING SECTION,
APO 381, San Francisco, Calif.,
August 22, 1959.

Hon. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
Senator from the State of Texas,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE DEAR SIR: I am writing to inquire whether it would be possible for you to give me assistance in securing a special bill for the admission to the United States of a Korean national whom I plan to adopt in order that I might give him an education and other opportunities for development which I feel that I am in position to offer. For your preliminary consideration, I submit the following information:

I am 48 years of age, married (22 years), wife 49 years old. Both are in excellent health. We have one child 13 years old. Unfortunately after the birth of our daughter, we found that we could have no other children. I am a Methodist minister, of the Southwest Texas Conference; I served as a chaplain in the Air Force from March 1943 to February 1958, at which time I became a victim of the reduction-in-forces program. I still hold my Reserve commission in the grade of lieutenant colonel. After the reduction-in-forces, I enlisted in the Air Force in order to qualify for retirement. Upon retirement (1963) I will again resume my place in the conference as a pastor or missionary. I feel that I am financially able to undertake this project (if one can call an act of love for another a project) without any strain on either my financial or physical well-being.

The young man, whom I plan to adopt (or sponsor), is 18 years old. He has lived with or worked for Americans since the age of 10. He is the third son in the Korean family. Although both his parents are living, they are agreeable to both the adoption and his emigration from Korea. This boy has worked for me during my tour in Korea, and from observation—and closely at that—I can honestly say that I have never met a young man with a higher character quality than this lad. In spite of the many temptations which have presented themselves to him while in his status as houseboy to the GI's, he has never adopted the profanity or loose moral habits so common to many of the other "boys" who find it profitable to cater to the wishes of the man they work for. His habits and character bespeak the excellent family background from which he comes. Both his mother and father are practicing Christians—Methodists. His older brother, who is now in the Republic of Korea Air Force, hopes to become a Methodist minister, if the opportunity could be found to further his education in that direction—which assistance I may be able to secure through the help of some local church which may sponsor his training. As for my boy, I plan to place him first in a special school or private tutor to prepare him for entrance into Lon Morris Junior College, Jacksonville, Tex., and then to Southern Methodist University. Because of the extreme poverty of the family all the sons, except the youngest, have had to stop school at the end of the free-school period, which roughly is equivalent to our grammar school. I have checked his school record and find that he stood sixth in the class of almost a hundred children. He has a ready and eager mind, and I feel that he will have no difficulty in pursuing his studies.

I shall appreciate you advising me of the proper steps I should take in this matter. I am due to return to the United States in March of 1960, and I should like very much to be able to take the boy with me as I go. If I have to await the normal quota for Korean immigration the time would be a minimum of 5 to 6 years, since he does not qualify for a student visa or passport. By that time he would be too old to undertake the training contemplated for him.

With best wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. BROWN,
Staff Sergeant, USAF, AF18553644.

P.S.—Sir, I failed to mention that my home address is Nome, Tex.

21ST FINANCE DISBURSING SECTION,
APO 301, San Francisco, Calif.,
February 6, 1960.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senator from the State of Texas,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I am writing in reference to a bill for the relief of Yi Yong An, S. 2681, 86th Congress, 1st session, which you so kindly introduced in my behalf and that of my adopted son. I wish to report that I have been informed that the adoption has been approved by the district court of Seoul, Korea, and that as soon as the matter has been recorded in the Myon Office (similar to the county court in the States), I shall receive the certificate of adoption.

I am most happy with the progress of events. I have extended my tour of duty in Korea in order to secure concurrent travel with the boy upon my return to the States. I am now due to return on or about June 1, 1960. However I read an article in the January issue of the Coronet magazine which has filled me with some uncertainties and anxieties. The article is entitled "When Uncle Sam Gets Sentimental," by Al Toffler. One particular paragraph in the article appeared to be significant as far as this case is concerned:

"Not every private bill is passed. In fact, the majority are shelved. Only the most meritorious are acted upon. For they require passage by both Houses of Congress and signature by the President."

Since so many of my plans and hopes hang on the outcome of this particular piece of legislation, as far as school for the boy and other plans for his welfare are concerned, I wonder if you could give me any idea of its status in the committee and if any additional information is needed. I have heard nothing since supplying the Immigration and Naturalization Service at Houston, Tex., with all the information they requested. I realize that I may be acting like a new father, but if you've never had a son in the family and had just acquired one, I think you could understand my concern.

Thank you for your special interest in this matter, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. BROWN,
Staff Sergeant, USAF, AF18553644.

21ST FINANCE DISBURSING SECTION,
APO 301,
San Francisco, Calif., February 29, 1960.

Re S. 2681, a bill for the relief of Yi Yong An.

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE DEAR SIRS: I enclose herewith a photographic copy of the certificate of adoption of the Kimchon district court, Kimchon, Republic of Korea, of Yi (the Korean symbol 01 being variously rendered in English as Lee, Rhee, or Yi) Yong An, for whom Senator YARBOROUGH, of Texas, has introduced a bill of relief, S. 2681, September 11, 1959.

Is it possible for you to advise me of the progress the bill is making. I am due to return to the United States about the 1st of June and would like very much to have the boy accompany me on the journey.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN L. BROWN,
AF18553644, Lieutenant Colonel,
USAF Reserve.

SEOUL DISTRICT COURT, REPUBLIC OF KOREA,
CERTIFICATION OF ADOPTION

1. Adopting father:
(a) Name: John Larkin Brown.
(b) Domicile: Jefferson County, Tex., United States of America.
(c) Date of birth: October 30, 1912.
(d) Occupation: U.S. Air Force.
(e) Nationality: American.
2. Adopting mother:
(a) Name: Doris Bean Brown.
(b) Domicile: Jefferson County, Tex., United States of America.
(c) Date of birth: February 28, 1910.
(d) Occupation: Housewife.
(e) Nationality: American.
3. Adopted child:
(a) Name: Yong An Lee.
(b) Domicile: 499 Kaikwang-Dong, Kenyung-Myun, Keumneung-Kun, Kyungsang-Bukdo, Korea.
(c) Date of birth: April 28, 1943.
(d) Occupation: None.
(e) Nationality: Korean.

I hereby certify that in the matter of the adoption of the above-named child adopted by the above-named adopting father and mother, concerned laws of the Republic of Korea have been complied with and that said adoption is legal and valid as of

Date 22d day of February 1960.

———— ————,
Judge, District Court of Kimchon, Republic of Korea.

The committee, after consideration of all the facts in the case, is of the opinion that the bill (S. 2681), as amended, should be enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1370, H.R. 9818.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9818) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend very highly the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] upon the wonderful cooperation he extends to me in respect of the long-established, 1946 Morse formula principle in connection with the disposal of Federal property.

The bill under consideration provides that the fair market value, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, shall be paid for the property. This is completely in conformity with the Morse formula. I am delighted with and appreciative of the action of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind comment of the Senator from Oregon. So that the RECORD may show, briefly, what is involved, there was a tract much larger than the 500 acres to which the bill relates.

An old resettlement project was conveyed, or allowed to be conveyed, from the Federal Government to the State for an average price of some $54 an acre, provided it be used for forestry purposes. It now appears that the State needs 500 acres of this larger tract for the building of a new penitentiary.

The bill provides, as the Senator from Oregon has already stated, that the State of Florida must pay, if it secures this land, the market value of such land as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. I know of no possible objection to such a provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MEDICAL INSURANCE FOR RETIRED OLDER PERSONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on Thursday, May 19, I discussed in the Senate the bill introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], S. 3503, to provide medical insurance for retired older persons. I placed in the RECORD an analysis of the McNamara bill, but now I find that this memorandum was an earlier draft, later revised to provide for 2 days of skilled nursing care for each day of unused hospital care, instead of 1½; and 2⅔ days of home health services for each day of unused hospital care instead of 2 days. Cost estimates also were revised to include these changes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the revised analysis of the McNamara retired persons medical insurance bill.

There being no objection, the revised analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR PAT MCNAMARA, CHAIRMAN, SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PROBLEMS OF THE AGED AND AGING

ANALYSIS: RETIRED PERSONS MEDICAL INSURANCE ACT

Major provisions:

1. Cover under a system of prepaid health insurance all retired aged (men over 65 and women over 62 who are not employed).

2. Provide for 90 days of hospital care per year, or

3. One hundred and eighty days of care in a skilled nursing home, or

4. Two hundred and forty days of care at home in a supervised home health program.

5. Provide diagnostic outpatient services for such items as laboratory tests and X-rays.

6. Pay for a portion of the cost of very expensive drugs.

7. Provide for research and demonstration programs to improve quality and efficiency of health care.

Relevant data bearing on the above provisions follow:

1. We estimate that this bill will cover 14.8 million men and women as follows: 11.3 million OASI beneficiaries; 1.7 million who are receiving old age assistance and no OASI; 1.8 million other retired aged—men over 65 and women over 62.

The act would exclude from its coverage all men and women and their spouses who are working full time. In the ordinary case, these men and women will be covered by a group health insurance policy. The bill is thus limited to the retired aged.

2. Estimates of cost for the above provisions: Total cost, computed as conservatively as possible, is estimated at $1,578 million or $106 per capita (that is, per retired person): 11.3 million OASI beneficiaries would be financed by a one-quarter percent increase in the social security tax on the employee and employer; 1.7 million old age assistance recipients would cost $180 million to come from general revenue fund; 1.8 million other persons would cost $190 million, to come from the general revenue fund.

3. Hospitalization:

This bill provides for 90 days' hospitalization for the aged but aims at reducing excessive use of hospitals through the following features:

Provision is made for diagnostic services as a preventive program.

An incentive is provided to use nursing homes and home health services instead of hospitals when not needed.

4. Skilled nursing home care:

For each day of unused hospital care, the bill provides 2 days of care in a skilled nursing home following a physician's certification.

Total days authorized, 180.

5. Home health services:

For each day of unused hospital care, the bill provides 2⅔ days of home health services by a community-sponsored agency.

Total days authorized, 240.

6. Outpatient diagnostic services:

The bill provides for preventive services through early diagnosis of incipient illness by means of X-ray and other laboratory tests.

7. Very expensive drugs.

A portion of the cost of very expensive drugs prescribed by a physician using generic names is included in the insurance program. The amount and kind of coverage is to be determined by the Secretary after a year's study.

8. Effective date:

The bill would provide for phasing the effective dates of the various benefits so as to provide an opportunity to build up the financing fund, conduct adequate planning and develop the necessary facilities:

Hospitalization effective July 1, 1961, and not later than January 1, 1962.

Nursing homes, January 1, 1963, and not later than July 1, 1963.

Home health services, January 1, 1962, and not later than July 1, 1962.

Diagnostic outpatient services, July 1, 1961, and not later than January 1, 1962.

Very expensive medicines, July 1, 1962, and not later than January 1, 1963.

The Secretary of HEW would be authorized to designate the dates within these periods when the act would be effective.

9. Summary of costs:

The one-fourth percent increase on the OASDI tax on employer and employee and

three-eighths percent on the self-employed would be sufficient to finance the medical benefits for the retired OASI beneficiaries.

Three hundred and seventy million dollars from the general fund would finance the medical benefits for those not eligible for OASI benefits.

Partially offsetting this $370 million appropriation are current Federal expenditures for:

Medical care under old-age assistance, $153 million.

Medical care for other groups who would be covered, $85 million.

Thus, it is estimated that net additional costs to the Federal Government would be approximately $132 million.

10. Research and demonstration:

The bill would direct the Secretary of HEW to conduct research on the health care of older persons and on improvements in the quality and efficiency of health services.

The Secretary is also authorized to conduct appropriate demonstration programs on how to meet the health needs of older persons as effectively and efficiently as possible in their communities.

11. Other important provisions:

Persons receiving social security benefits or old-age assistance payments are automatically eligible for benefits. Other individuals who have not earned in the preceding month more than the amount set in the retirement test under OASI will be covered.

The Secretary is to publish annually a listing of hospitals, nursing homes, and home health agencies which are included for payments under the act. It is expected that for hospitals, the Secretary may use the AHA accrediting service; and that for nursing homes, only those will be included which meet adequate standards for care and rehabilitation.

State health agencies can be given authority to inspect whether standards are being met and whether professional services are adequate.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of HEW to administer the act with a national health service advisory council.

The Secretary may use the services of private nonprofit organizations in administering the program.

Railroad retirement and Federal employee pensioners could come under the program at any time such legislation is enacted.

MANDATORY IMPORT PROGRAM

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I learned only a few days ago of a very disturbing development in my State of Kansas concerning one of our most important industries—petroleum production. I refer to the price reduction of 20 cents a barrel instituted on Monday of this last week covering more than 15,000 barrels daily of oil produced in Kansas. This action, coming as it does on top of several other price reductions over the past few months, points up the serious need to take a second look at some of the factors which are causing this continual deterioration in the petroleum industry in my State of Kansas as well as in the Nation as a whole. These price reductions are already having a serious impact on the ability of petroleum producers to continue to find and develop the necessary reserves that are absolutely essential to us for national security.

In my State of Kansas, crude oil production averaged about 310,000 barrels daily during the first 4 months of this year, compared with 337,000 the same period last year, a drop of 27,000 barrels daily, or 8 percent. In May, the Kansas production allowable is cut another 25,000 barrels per day and actual production during the first week in May was down almost 50,000 barrels per day or 15 percent from the same week last year. As things now stand, no improvement in this situation is now in sight.

The combination of depressed prices and reduced markets for Kansas crude has caused severe curtailment of exploratory and development activity. Exploratory crews active during the first quarter of 1960 are down 15 percent from a year ago level. The average number of rotary rigs active this year is down 18 percent and the total number of wells drilled to date is down 24 percent.

I understand that for the Nation, during the first 4 months of this year, there have been more than 22 specific price cuts ranging from 4 cents to 20 cents per barrel. Product prices of the four principal products have dropped 23 cents per barrel in the past year. These various factors spell out only one thing—the petroleum producing industry is in a serious condition which if not remedied could become chaotic.

Mr. President, this situation in light of recent worldwide developments only serves to point up the urgent need for our Government to take a real cold hard look at the situation to determine if its policies on petroleum imports are adequate to assure this Nation of a strong and healthy domestic petroleum producing industry.

Mr. President, I would be the first to emphasize that there are many causes other than oil imports which are contributing to the sad state of affairs we now find in our domestic petroleum industry. We must recognize that the inroads being made into crude oil markets by natural gas liquids, natural gas, which is priced at the wellhead at artificially low prices due to Federal regulation, and many other factors are serving to depress domestic crude oil production as well as crude oil prices. However, on analysis, it can be seen that the biggest adverse factor in the picture is that of petroleum imports. Just because there are other adverse factors, it does not mean that we can ignore the biggest one—imports.

As is quite well known, a little over a year ago, President Eisenhower instituted what is commonly known as the mandatory oil import program. This action was taken in line with policies laid down by Congress in which we declared that the President shall act to curb imports of a commodity whenever they are found to be a threat to national security.

Following the institution of this firm governmental program, the people in my State took heart and set about increasing their search for and development of new oil reserves in line with the announced goal behind the program. However, this was a short-lived situation. It was not long before evidence began to develop that although the mandatory import program had stemmed the tide somewhat the actual level of imports was too high. The latest statistics show that even with the mandatory import program, imports are now running at a rate higher than at any time in our history. Back in 1954, the Cabinet Committee on Fuels established by the President declared that imports in excess of the 1954 ratio would be a threat to national defense. At that time, the ratio of imports to domestic crude production was 16.6 percent. Today, total imports are running at a ratio of 25.4 percent, the highest ever. It must be noted that these totals include residual fuel oil which we do not produce in sufficient quantities in this country to meet our needs. However, excluding residual fuel oil, the facts show that the other oil imports are running far in excess of the total which the Cabinet Committee in 1954 declared must not be exceeded if our national security position is to be preserved.

Mr. President, as I mentioned earlier, imports are only one factor but a big factor. I, therefore, urgently call upon the President and the responsible officials in Government concerned with oil import policies to immediately take a cold, hard look at this situation and see if the goals they laid down when import controls were established are being met. This situation calls for immediate action as I understand the administrator of the program is now in the process of establishing the allowable imports for the second half of 1960. Once these are established, it would be very difficult to change them. Therefore, I urgently suggest that a reevaluation be made right now of the total level of imports to the end that sufficient reductions can be made to assure that our national security goals will be met.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1467, House bill 12117, so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENGLE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am very glad to yield to the acting majority leader.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 10 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to make a request which may, in the end, turn out to be tentative.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE ON VETO BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2 o'clock tomorrow, a yea-and-nay vote be taken on the proposal to override the President's veto of the depressed areas bill, with the time to be divided equally between the proponents and opponents of the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, by that statement, I assume the acting majority leader means the time is to be controlled by the leadership.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; by the majority leader and by the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

ORDER FOR LIMITATION OF MORNING HOUR TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting majority leader if it is contemplated that there be a morning hour tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I presume there will be a morning hour, which I hope will not take up too much time; but, in order to overcome that particular aspect of the problem, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour tomorrow, and that the morning hour be concluded by 11 o'clock a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous consent request is agreed to.

The unanimous-consent agreements subsequently reduced to writing, are as follows:

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENTS

Ordered, That when the Senate concludes its business today it adjourn until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow (Tuesday, May 24, 1960); that morning business be in order, and that at 11 o'clock a.m. the Senate proceed to the consideration of the question of overriding the veto of the President of S. 722, the Area Development Act; that at the hour of 2 o'clock p.m., the Senate proceed to vote by yeas and nays on said question, and that the intervening time be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents, and controlled, respectively, by the majority leader and the minority leader. (May 23, 1960.)

RESEARCH ON CONVERSION OF SALINE WATER TO FRESH WATER

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I rise to announce my cosponsorship of the bill (S. 3557) introduced by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas], together with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and others, to provide for accelerated research and development of practical means for converting saline water to fresh water suitable for consumptive use.

The bill removes present restrictions of time and money on the desalinization program, and provides loans to communities to build developmental conversion plants.

While desalinization of seawater is not expected to provide a direct supply for interior States like mine, at least, not very soon, we in Utah have a real interest in seeing our sister States, and California in particular, develop adequate water supplies from seawater.

Today, Utah and southern California both look to the same source—the Colorado River—for much of the water to support a rapid growth of population and industry. California has just received a blow in the recommendation of a special master of the U.S. Supreme Court for division of the water of the lower Colorado.

We in Utah have long been at odds with California over the division of the Colorado waters between the lower and the upper basin States. The real solution to the problem, however, is for us to work together to develop an alternative means of providing California with the water she needs. This would then relieve pressure to claim for California a larger portion of the Colorado streamflow. The upper basin States would be safe in their use of the water.

Since all of the Nation's present supplies of water that are inexpensive and readily accessible are already in use, we look to a means of making available the enormous resources of the sea.

The Office of Saline Water has done a creditable job with the funds and personnel it has. Three experimental plants will soon be under construction, and plans are going forward for the establishment of the two more that have been authorized by Congress.

I agree with the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], however, that, despite real efforts, we are losing this water race. Our progress on desalinization is too slow, and present storage and conservation efforts are not keeping pace with increased water demand.

Our society has reached the place where the necessities and uses of water are so tremendous that they stagger the imagination. It has taken us 352 years to build up our population of 180 million Americans. Yet the Census Bureau assures that the number will double in the next 40 years.

This means that the Nation as a whole will require 2½ times as much municipal water in 1980 as was used 5 years ago. And the statistics on the coming water needs of agriculture, manufacturing, metal fabricating, and the new synthetics industries, which have been previously cited in the Senate and with which the Members are familiar, tell the same story.

Mr. President, there is another aspect to America's water problem that has particular significance in view of the tragic international developments of the past week.

As the Senate is aware, I had the opportunity of visiting Soviet Russia last fall as head of a subcommittee representing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works. Our task was to study comparative water and power resource development. One of the points made by the subcommittee report is this—that the Soviet Union possesses the largest water resources in the world. Russia has about 10 percent of our earth's supply of fresh water, compared to our 3 percent.

It is true that a portion of the water in Siberia is difficult to develop because it flows northward into the icebound Arctic Ocean, it is true that much of Russia's water is great distances from the centers of population; but this still leaves Russia with vastly greater water resources than we enjoy.

And, Mr. President, it must be said that the Eisenhower-Nixon administration has failed to recognize the vital character of our water problem, and has refused to follow policies calculated to develop supplies fast enough to keep up with demand. In some cases, our attempts to solve the problem have been ridiculed.

I refer to the vote of Congress to override the President's veto of the public works appropriation bill last session, which Press Secretary James Hagerty was allowed to call the "lure of the pork barrel." Yet these projects were for flood control—to prevent wasting of water; or for small water projects—to use water supplies more efficiently.

And the "no new starts" policy has unreasonably slowed the development of water storage and development projects. Incidentally, this policy was quietly dropped for this election year.

The President even vetoed the bill to use adequate amounts of Federal funds to assist and encourage States and localities to control water pollution. Yet the fact is that we are losing this race also—we are contaminating our water at a faster rate every year.

The leadership in providing adequate water supplies has therefore had to come from Congress. And this leadership is welcomed by the States and municipalities which are daily struggling with this problem.

One forward-looking step taken by the Senate is the appointment of the Select Committee on National Water Resources, which is making a study of the Nation's future water needs and supplies. We have held public hearings in all sections of the country, and are issuing a series of comprehensive reports covering all phases of our water problems. Our report will be made to the Senate next year.

In the meantime, I am pleased to support this move to step up all phases of our saline water program. This bill

provides for improved research, for process development in both pilot and full-scale plants, and for establishment of a needed central testing laboratory. Economic studies will be undertaken to provide communities with the cost figures they need to make intelligent decisions on the possibility of using desalinization for municipal water supply.

In addition, the bill provides for loans to communities to aid plant construction. Many communities could now provide their water supplies more cheaply through commercial desalinization. They hesitate to do so because of uncertainty, the expense involved, and the general lack of knowledge in this field.

In many places in this Nation, we already have a water shortage. The Geological Survey tells us that there were 1,000 communities in 47 States that had to restrict water use in 1957. The Department of Commerce estimates that the cities and towns of America must invest $80 billion in the next 20 years to keep abreast of their requirements for municipal and industrial water. A reasonable expenditure now to provide the research and development to make our greatest potential source of water—the sea—available for human use is one of the wisest investments we can make in the future of America.

AGRICULTURAL AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that H.R. 12117, the annual appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, has been made the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, that the bill as thus amended be considered as original test for the purpose of amendment, and that no point of order be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 7, after the word "stations", to strike out "$67,934,000" and insert "$70,247,600", and in line 10, after "(21 U.S.C. 113a)", to strike out the comma and "or to not to exceed $1,000,000 to remain available until expended for the construction and alteration of buildings."

On page 4, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "$52,011,000" and insert "$52,236,000", and in line 5, after the word "conditions", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That no funds shall be used to formulate or administer a brucellosis eradication program for fiscal year 1962 that does not require minimum matching by any State of at least 40 per centum."

On page 4, line 14, after the word "employed", to strike out "under contracts and cooperative agreements".

At the top of page 6, to insert:

"CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

"For construction of facilities and acquisition of the necessary land therefor by donation or exchange, $3,700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That $300,000 of the amount appropriated herein shall be available for payment of expenses for construction of a headquarters-laboratory building at the National Arboretum, which is hereby authorized to be constructed under contract authorization in an amount not to exceed $1,500,000."

On page 6, line 16, after the word "Agriculture", to strike out "$31,053,000" and insert "$32,053,708," and in line 19, after the word "all", to strike out "$31,553,000" and insert "$32,553,708".

On page 7, line 24, after "(7 U.S.C. 347a)", to strike out "$54,220,000" and insert "$56,220,000"; on page 8, line 2, after the word "all", to strike out "$55,715,000" and insert "$57,715,000", and in line 7, after the word "year", to strike out the colon and *"Provided further,* That all of the additional funds provided herein shall be used to meet expenses at the county level."

On page 8, line 12, after the word "employees", to strike out "$5,875,000" and insert "$5,961,000".

On page 8, line 22, after the word "possessions", to strike out "$2,255,000" and insert "$2,275,000".

On page 17, line 2, after the word "estimates", to strike out "$16,315,000" and insert "$16,605,000".

On page 17, after line 9, to insert:

"Marketing services: For services relating to agricultural marketing and distribution, for carrying out regulatory acts connected therewith, and for administration and coordination of payments to States, $26,579,900, including not to exceed $25,000 for employment at rates not to exceed $50 per diem, except for employment in rate cases at not to exceed $100 per diem pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), in carrying out section 201(a) to 201(d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1291) and section 203(j) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946."

On page 18, line 25, after "(7 U.S.C. 1766)", to strike out "$4,447,000" and insert "$4,487,000", and on page 19, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "$2,493,000" and insert "$2,539,000".

On page 19, line 21, after the word "expended", to insert "of which amounts not less than $4,400,000 shall be available to purchase currencies which the Treasury Department shall determine to be excess to normal requirements of the United States: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall not be used for the purchase of currencies available in the Treasury for the purposes of section 104(f) of such Act unless such currencies are excess to the normal requirements of the United States".

On page 20, line 21, after "(7 U.S.C. 1-17a)", to strike out "$930,000" and insert "$941,325".

On page 21, line 18, after the word "expended", to strike out "$310,000,000" and insert "$335,000,000".

On page 22, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$60,000,000".

On page 25, at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "$30,500,000" and insert "$31,467,650", and in line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,100,000".

On page 27, line 1, after the word "Department", to strike out "$1,478,000" and insert "$1,523,000"; in line 8, after the word "than", to strike out "one hundred and fifty-one thousand" and insert "two hundred and thirty-three thousand and fifty"; in line 16, after the word "of", where it occurs the second time, to strike out "one hundred and sixteen thousand five hundred and twenty-five" and insert "fifty-eight thousand two hundred", and at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "$90,000" and insert "$45,000".

On page 30, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$44,726,000" and insert "$45,726,000", and on page 32, line 12, after the word "provision", to strike out the semicolon and *"Provided further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to formulate or administer any program which does not provide for maximum use of Government-owned facilities for storing surplus commodities, consistent with the economical operation of the Corporation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have a brief statement to make regarding some of the items in the agricultural appropriation bill.

As reported to the Senate, the bill carries direct appropriations in the amount of $4,000,222,683. This bill is $135 million under the budget estimates, and $62.3 million over the figure as passed by the other body. For the regular activities of the Department, $1.3 billion is recommended, which is $11.4 million under the budget requests.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

An appropriation of $1,226,500,000 is carried in the bill to restore capital impairment. This includes $632 million for the balance of losses incurred in fiscal 1959, and $594,500,000 of the estimated losses for fiscal 1960. The difference of $98,500,000 between the estimate and the amount proposed in the bill will have to be restored in some future appropriation bill.

An appropriation of $1,443,634,000 is recommended to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the estimated cost in fiscal 1960 of carrying out several authorized programs.

The principal committee changes from the bill as it passed the other body are as follows:

MARKETING SERVICES

First. The restoration to the bill of the "Marketing services" item of $26,579,900. This item was stricken in the House on a point of order.

Mr. President, in this item there is included the sum of $10,296,000 for poultry inspection, as requested in the budget, together with funds requested for several marketing service programs.

The administration has proposed legislation, which is pending before the standing committee on Agriculture and Forestry, dealing with continuation of authority to exempt poultry-food-processing food plants from mandatory inspection.

Unless the Congress enacts the proposed legislation before next July 1, the Department will be required, under the poultry products inspection law, to provide federally supervised inspection to further processing plants which the Secretary is now permitted by law to exempt from inspection. In that event, the Department will be obliged to submit a

supplemental budget request to cover the additional cost of inspection in the poultry-food-processing plants. Included in that category are a wide variety of mixed foods, such as chicken pies, chicken with vegetables of one kind and another, and canned chicken.

CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

Second. The other major increase recommended by the committee is a restoration of $25 million to make the mandatory rental payments, and for other costs under the conservation reserve program. The program authorization to enter into new contracts has expired, but this appropriation item will be required for several years for the contracts in force. The amount of $335 million is recommended, the same amount as for 1960, which, together with balances carried forward of about $20 million, should provide the funds required for fiscal 1961.

RESEARCH AND EXTENSION

The committee recommends an appropriation of $70,247,600 for the Agricultural Research Service. This amount is $1,265,900 over the budget request and is $2,313,600 over the amount provided in the other body.

The bill includes the full increase in the budget estimate of $1,502,800 for accelerating research to avoid pesticide residues, and an increase of $1,200,000 for utilization research.

The committee recommends several increases outside the budget which, it believes, are urgently needed, totaling $1.5 million over the House bill. It also recommends that $3.7 million be appropriated for the construction of new research facilities for pesticide residues, poultry disease, and management for the National Arboretum, and for plans and specifications for soil and water research facilities.

The committee recommends a $1 million increase for payments to State experiment stations. This is the increase requested in the budget and it was denied by the other body.

For payments to the States for cooperative extension work, an increase of $4 million over fiscal 1960 is recommended. This is $1,135,000 over the budget request.

A provision in the other body restricting the use of increased funds to the county offices has been stricken from the bill.

SOIL CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES

The committee concurs in the action taken in the other body to restore to $250 million the advance authorization for the 1961 ACP program. This is the third successive year that the President's budget has requested a reduction of either $125 or $150 million in the advance authorization for the ACP program.

For programs administered by the Soil Conservation Service, the committee recommends an appropriation of $143,132,000, which is $7.5 million over the estimates and almost $10 million over fiscal 1960.

SCHOOL LUNCH AND SCHOOL MILK

The bill carries a total of $155 million of Federal financing for the school lunch program, of which $45 million is from section 32 funds. This is a $5 million increase over the budget for section 32 funds.

In addition to the $155 million of Federal funds provided in this bill, an estimated $90 million of funds will be available under the special milk program. In addition, surplus foods acquired through CCC operations and surplus removal programs will be available for donation to the school lunch program. In fiscal 1960 these donations of food commodities are estimated to have a value of $73 million.

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

The bill provides $280 million authorization for electrification loans. This is comprised of $110 million regular authorization, requested in the budget, a carryover into 1961 of $110 million, and a contingency authorization of $60 million.

For telephone loans, a total available authorization of $141 million is provided. This is comprised of a carryover of $1 million, regular authorization of $80 million, and a $60 million contingency authorization.

The committee recommends regular authorization of $227 million for lending programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration. This compares with $226 million used this fiscal year. This is $50 million over the budget estimate. In addition, a contingency authorization of $40 million is provided.

Mr. President, on tomorrow I can discuss these and any of the other items in the bill, and I shall undertake to answer any questions which may be propounded.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator, the chairman of the subcommittee, a question in regard to an appropriation we have had in Kansas for many years with respect to research funds for a study of electricity in our State, through the Kansas State College. We have, I think, the finest relations between the private power companies in Kansas and the Rural Electrification Administration, working together. Excellent progress has been made. These groups have cooperated by contributing funds, to be used with Federal funds, for the study of uses of electricity.

I have a telegram from the dean of agriculture and the head of the Department of Agricultural Engineering of the Kansas State College, which I should like to have printed as a part of the RECORD, and I should like to ask the Senator if he has any comment in this regard.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as the Senator has correctly stated, research as to the uses of electricity on the farm has been carried on in various forms for some years. This year, for some reason, the Bureau of the Budget recommended that that project be discontinued, but due to a revision of terms in the appropriation bill, for which the subcommittee can claim no direct credit—we merely approved what came from the other body—the same amount of money has been made available for the work at Manhattan as was expended during the present fiscal year.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, we in Kansas appreciate that very much. We know the money is not wasted. It serves a very useful purpose. I am delighted to learn that the work will be continued.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the telegram to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANHATTAN, KANS.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Kansas Agricultural Experimental Station assisted by funds from Kansas electric power suppliers and cooperating with the Farm Electrification Branch, ARS, USDA, has developed a program of constructive research directed at the betterment of farm living and the improvement of farm production efficiency.

Current research efforts are concerned primarily with utilization of electric equipment and controls to provide comfort conditions for the farm home, to modify and control environment for livestock and poultry, to dry crops and to utilize solar energy as a source of supplemental heat in agriculture.

We understand that USDA research funds may be diverted from this program. Loss of these funds would seriously disrupt the continuity and orderly progress of research that has received wholehearted support from experiment station and industry personnel the past 12 years.

A. W. WEBER,
Dean of Agriculture.
G. H. LARSON,
Head of Department of Agricultural Engineering.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the rural electric cooperatives have requested substantial increases in the item for research.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further in regard to the research program?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not inviting any amendments, but I wish to support the Senator's statement as to the importance of the work.

Mr. CARLSON. I assure the Senator that I shall not offer any amendments. I desired to make a short comment as to research.

I am delighted to note from the report that the committee has increased the appropriations for research. I notice the committee added several additional research items. I am not going to discuss those, but they are to be found beginning on page 2 of the report. The committee is recommending different establishments in different areas and in different fields.

Mr. President, those of us interested in wheat realize it is a major farm problem and one of the problems in dealing with this subject is the surplus.

Congress has approved legislation which restricts production through acreage controls and votes substantial sums of money for the export of the commodity.

It is my opinion that one place that we are lacking is in research. This appropriation bill recommends $70,247,600 for

research. This research is for all farm research programs and is used directly and cooperatively with State institutions.

It is not my intention to offer an amendment to the pending bill for establishment of a modern grain research laboratory on or near the campus of the State university at Manhattan.

I mention it at this time because in the next session of Congress, I expect to introduce legislation and urge its approval, which would give our Nation a sound, adequately staffed, well-rounded research organization which would be housed in facilities that would be in keeping with the needs for research on wheat.

Our present program of research is handicapped and limited in scope and is progressing more slowly than is necessary or desirable because of the absence of the following types of modern research equipment and facilities:

First. A battery of small controlled temperature-humidity rooms for use on grain storage and grain insect and micro-organism activity as related to conditions of temperature and humidity. Facilities for exploring sealed grain storage would be needed to determine the effect of air composition on grain quality and insect activity.

Second. Modern equipment and instruments for grain quality evaluation research including the latest scientific instruments and small milling and baking equipment for rounding out work on wheat quality particularly in relation to grade standards and to milling and baking performance.

Third. Facilities for employing radioactive tracers for determining airflow patterns, the movement of fumigants, and insect activity through stored grains.

Fourth. Facilities for exploring irradiation treatment for control of insects in stored grains.

Fifth. Pilot plant space in which temporary experimental equipment can be erected for the purpose of testing out new research developments in the area of grain quality maintenance.

Sixth. A small engineering and instrumentation shop.

Seventh. Modern offices and chemical, entomological, and engineering laboratories.

To accomplish the above-mentioned research objectives, a team approach of engineers, chemists, entomologists and other scientists is required. The work of the research team housed in the proposed facilities should be directed toward solution of problems in three broad areas. They are:

First. Quality identification and measurement; in other words, developing a better basic understanding of the inherently useful quality characteristics of wheat and other grains. With this information develop more meaningful grain standards and more objective instruments and methods of measuring wheat quality in the market.

Second. Prevention of damage to wheat quality during drying, conditioning, handling, storage, and transportation would come in for major research attention. New methods and equipment for use in the above operations would be explored. Basic studies of optimum storage environment, moisture equilibrium, micro-organism activity during storage and transportation and basic changes in wheat composition during storage and their effect on milling and baking quality would be analyzed.

Third. Research having to do with the control of insect damage to grain in storage, milling, and transportation channels should be strengthened. A small unit with responsibility for stored grain insect research is now located in Manhattan, Kans., in a wholly inadequate, rented private dwelling and temporary structures in the backyard. Because of the recent problems in the field of pesticide residues, added attention should be given to new chemical treatments and methods of applying chemicals that would control insect infestation and reduce or eliminate residues in grain and grain products.

The Great Plains Wheat Market Development Association, which is an organization representing wheatgrowers in the Midwest, is supporting this program and in the next session of Congress, we hope to come up with some definite figures and will recommend an appropriation for the construction of this wheat research laboratory.

I informed the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that I shall not offer any amendments at this time, but I serve notice that in the next session of Congress I am going to see if we can provide funds for the establishment of a research laboratory which will go into this subject thoroughly.

I merely bring up this subject at this time because I feel keenly the importance of research in the field of wheat, not only with respect to the type of wheat we export but also with respect to the uses of wheat. I am pleased to see that the committee recognizes the value of research generally.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

If the Senator will look into the subject, I think he will find that the appropriations for research, particularly as to the diseases which affect wheat, have certainly not been neglected by the committee over the past several years. Those appropriations have been increased by several hundred percent.

The distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who is the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, has urged increases over and above the budget request, to deal with such problems as rust and other diseases or plagues which afflict wheat.

I certainly agree with the distinguished Senator as to the importance of research. Some of our friends from the cities say it is a rather anomalous situation to be appropriating money for research at a time when the granaries are full, when we are plagued with surpluses, and when we are reducing farm acreage, but if it had not been for the research which brought down the per unit cost of production for the American farmers, they would be practically out of business. If the cost to produce were as much per unit today as it was many years ago, before some of these new and startling developments in the field of research came about, very few farmers would still be in business in this country.

Research has served a very useful purpose in reducing the losses the farmer has incurred by lowering his per unit cost of production.

I believe in research. We have increased the appropriation every year not only above the figure which came to us from the other body, but also above the budget estimates. We increased the appropriation over $3 million above the budget estimates in this field. We intend to move forward, and we would be delighted to receive the suggestions of the distinguished Senator from Kansas and will give very careful consideration to any suggestions from him as to further progress we may make in this field. It is one of the few areas in which we have been able to do anything for the American farmer.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I rise to pay my respects to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the committee for what I believe is a foresighted and a proper program for not only dealing in research of questions relating to wheat but also all agricultural commodities, because, as the distinguished chairman of the committee well knows, all of them are under pressure, and we need not only to provide the proper type of market for products but to find new uses for the products.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not wish to go into the field of utilization research. We endeavored to increase the appropriation in that area, but despite the advances in the past several years we still have a long way to go in the study of soils, the conservation of water, and other related studies which not only assist in the production of crops, but which will also help in the preservation of the fertility of our soils for generations unborn.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am very glad to join with my colleague in his commendation of what the committee has done with reference not only to research but also the matter about which Dean Weber of Kansas State University consulted us, which was a research fund with reference to a study that was made. Did I correctly understand the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to say that that research program will be continued and that funds will be made available for it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The Senator's colleague asked about the item which has to do with rural electrification research, which the budget recommended be discontinued.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Through the reapplication of funds, as the bill now stands and comes before the Senate, it provides for that work to be done for another year at Manhattan, Kans.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the distinguished Senator and the members of the committee for that consideration

because, as I understood from the reports that we had, that was in its completion stage, and provision should be made for completing it.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the fighting friend of agriculture, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I thank my friend from Georgia for those kind comments. The bill as approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee I believe represents a reasonable approach to the many involved agricultural problems. I wish to commend the Senator from Georgia for his usual good job in the handling of the bill. Not all farm organizations and other groups got all they wanted, but I think the adjustments made in the bill were necessary ones and the ones which will please the great majority of the Members of Congress as well as people generally.

As the Senator pointed out, there were only two sizable increases in the appropriation bill, and those were necessary ones which had to be made because a point of order was raised on the House floor on the ground that contracts had been entered into regarding the conservation reserve program. The remainder of the increases made by the Senate committee were very worthy ones involving, for example, increases in loan authorizations for REA and RTA, some research items, and some other adjustments. On the whole, as I said previously, I think it is now a very good bill and one which should provoke very little debate on the Senate floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I think the bill is as well balanced as we can make it in these times.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish merely to take time enough to commend both the chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee and the ranking member of the committee and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] on the excellent job they did in respect to the agricultural appropriation bill, not only this year but for several years last passed, and ever since I have had the privilege of being a member of the subcommittee. I believe the fact that American agriculture is now the best in the whole world is due largely to the foresight and the attention which these two men on the subcommittee, composed of able Senators, in particular have given to our requirements.

I become a little tired when I hear people complain because we have enough to eat and wear in this country and a little besides. We can imagine what the situation would be today if we did not have a good supply of wheat, feed grains, and other farm commodities on hand. What happened at the summit conference would have been almost a minor matter compared with what would happen if we became a deficit agricultural country. We could not stand up. The attention given to the preservation of our soil and water resources by the committee headed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has been outstanding. If we do not take care of our soil and water resources in this country, it will not make a bit of difference how many missiles we have, or how far they will shoot, because we shall be the underdog in any international controversy which may arise.

I am glad to take this opportunity to thank these leaders of American agriculture who have done such outstanding work.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to express to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, for myself, and for the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] our deep appreciation for his complimentary references. It was a very happy and fortuitous day for the Appropriations Subcommittee when the distinguished Senator from Vermont came to be an ex officio member and brought to the committee the results of his years of experience on the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as well as his sympathetic interest in the problems of American agriculture, the future of our soils, and in the preservation of our resources.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the livestock producers in Texas suffer tremendous losses each year from screwworm infestation, and there is a tremendous need for an eradication program in the Southwest similar to that which has so effectively brought the screwworm under control in the southeastern part of the country. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will remember that I brought this situation to his attention last year, and I was pleased to see that on page 3 of the committee report the committee took cognizance of the menace facing the livestock producers in the Southwest and requested the Department to investigate the feasibility of developing an eradication program and to report to the committee on the feasibility and requirements for such a program.

I have explained to my constituents that the committee would expect the Department to act on this request in the near future, and in any event in time for the report to be considered by the committee during the next session of the Congress, when it considers the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1962.

I inquire of the distinguished Senator from Georgia if that is his understanding of what the committee had in mind when it included this language in the committee report on page 3?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The distinguished Senator from Texas urged the committee last year and again this year to consider the interest of the livestock producers of Texas and the Southwest in the eradication program. We know as a matter of common knowledge that the screwworm has caused heavy losses to those livestock producers.

A number of producers wrote to members of the committee. Judge Montague, who headed the Livestock Producers Association for many years, discussed the matter with me. I have canvassed the subject informally with the Department and they have advised me there are a number of problems which would require intensive research and planning before they would undertake to start an eradication program such as was applied in the Southeast.

The committee has directed the Department to investigate this matter fully and we certainly expect to have a report on this subject not later than the time the Department of Agriculture budget is submitted for fiscal year 1962.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator for his complete response to my inquiry. I am very grateful for the interest he always shows to the solution of problems in our section of the country.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I note that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and the Senator from Illinois are in the Chamber. This afternoon the Senator from Pennsylvania made some statements on the floor of the Senate with regard to some statements of mine, as follows:

I might also add, in connection with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, as reported in the Portland Oregonian, that the Senator himself said:

"Khrushchev laid down two conditions to President Eisenhower for going on with the summit meeting. One was to apologize. I think that might have been possible to do."

Then the quotation goes on to other matters.

The report in that Oregonian is that:

"Later KENNEDY modified the word 'apologize,' and said the President might 'express regret.'"

It is my hope—

The Senator from Pennsylvania went on to say—

that neither the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts nor that other candidate for the Presidency, Governor Stevenson, will—either one of them—brand himself as a "turnquote." It is my hope that they will relieve themselves of the curse of suspicion of appeasement, and it is my hope that the unity, which started out so well in support of the President and in support of the administration, may somehow be found again.

Now let me quote from an Associated Press dispatch headed "Summit," which I have just taken from the news ticker, as follows:

SCOTT replied heatedly that he had not called them appeasers. But he said quotations attributed to them indicated to him they wanted to follow a soft line in dealing with the Russians. He said they should be called before an investigating committee to testify on their views.

Mr. President, is the Senator from Pennsylvania suggesting that I be called before an investigating committee?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator will continue to read my notes and other notes which other Senators made, he will note that I did not suggest that he be called before an investigating committee. I suggested that Mr. Boulay, the author of the French newspaper article, be called to testify if the committee saw fit, with

respect to the interview which he allegedly had with Governor Stevenson, and that Governor Stevenson be invited to appear to give his version of the interview.

At another point I said that I see no objection to an investigation of all the facts involving American foreign policy if the Committee on Foreign Relations wished to make such an investigation, and that it might call all the witnesses it wanted to call, including Mr. Boulay and Mr. Stevenson.

I have reread my own notes, and I do not recall at any point ever suggesting that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, for whom I have a very high regard, as he knows, be asked to appear before any investigating committee. To that extent the Associated Press statement, as read by the Senator from Massachusetts, does not seem to follow the RECORD in the Senate.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator if he believes that I am under suspicion of appeasement?

Mr. SCOTT. On the contrary; I suggested that the Senator from Massachusetts may relieve himself—and I made the suggestion in good will—of the suspicion of appeasement.

I made reference to a newspaper article printed in the Portland Oregonian, written by Mr. Marvin Shoemaker, which quotes the Senator as saying:

Khrushchev laid down two conditions to President Eisenhower for going on with the summit meeting. One was to apologize.

Then the report in the Oregonian stated:

Later KENNEDY modified the word "apologize," and said the President might "express regret."

I may say that if the Senator from Massachusetts feels that President Eisenhower should apologize to Khrushchev, as first reported in the paper, that he now has an opportunity—and I am very hopeful indeed that he will use it—to relieve himself of any suspicion of appeasement, because in my opinion it would be appeasement to have the President apologize. If, however, the Senator's later explanation, with respect to expressing regrets, which he made in Oregon, is correct, and he was misquoted—then, in my mind, it does not qualify him in accordance with my previous remarks.

Mr. KENNEDY. Has the Senator from Pennsylvania any other source, besides the newspaper in Oregon, of the statement which he later said was a misquotation?

Mr. SCOTT. My only source is the newspaper publication itself, and that the byline is by Mr. Marvin Shoemaker, the political writer of the Portland Oregonian. If the Senator is prepared to say that he made none of these statements, and that the newspaper writer is incorrect or made an error in having attributed it to the Senator, I will be very glad indeed to take note of what the Senator says.

Mr. KENNEDY. And from what paper did the Senator get the statement that I had been misquoted?

Mr. SCOTT. I believe the context states that the Senator from Massachusetts made the statement:

"Khrushchev laid down two conditions to President Eisenhower for going on with the summit meeting. One was to apologize."

Later KENNEDY modified the word "apologize," and said the President might "express regret."

The newspaper article indicates that the Senator himself modified the earlier remark. To be entirely fair, I repeat that, if he did not make the first remark or if he did not make the second remark, I am very happy that those remarks were not made.

Mr. KENNEDY. Does not the Senator think it would have been more in keeping with Senate rule XIX if he had informed me that he was going to make an attack on me?

Mr. SCOTT. I may say to the Senator that it is not always possible to know when the Senator from Massachusetts is available, and that because of the Senator's other obligations, this is probably more true of him than of many other Members of the Senate, and we fully understand it and are in accord with the reasons for the Senator's absences. Further, my remarks were made subsequent to the remarks made by the distinguished minority leader. At the time I rose I had not fully made up my mind as to what references I might make to the material which had already been inserted in the RECORD by the minority leader, including the news item to which I have referred. It occurred at the convening of the Senate today. Certainly I did not intend any discourtesy to the Senator from Massachusetts. However, it is virtually impossible to know when the name of the Senator from Massachusetts will be mentioned in the Senate. That is not the fault of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KENNEDY. I consider it to be completely the fault of the Senator from Pennsylvania. This is not just another mention of my name. It is a unique situation. I do not recall that any other Senator has ever made the suggestion that I come before the Senate or before an investigating committee to purge myself of the suspicion of appeasement. Certainly the courtesy of advance notice should have been extended to the Senator from Massachusetts by the Senator from Pennsylvania, especially when his remarks were coming close to being a violation of rule XIX, part 2, which states:

No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

The actual record of the Official Reporter uses the word "turncoat." I am aware of the fact that the Senator from Pennsylvania may well have coined an original phrase on later consideration, or he may have made it at that time. But his accentuation was not distinct, and the Official Reporter took down the word "turncoat."

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a correction, because the Senator is proceeding on a line which is not in accordance with what actually happened? Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that I had written down on a newspaper at the time, on one of the desks here, the word "turnquote" before I spoke it. It was clearly understood in the gallery and was so recorded on the first teletype report of my original remarks; that when someone, on the other side of the aisle, used the "turncoat," I immediately rose to correct him; and the third time I rose to correct him, I used the word "turnquote." I enunciated it quite clearly.

So, although the Senator will have to forgive me if my accent failed at the time, I am certain the press clearly understood the word "turnquote."

It is not a word coined by me; it is not a word in the dictionary, because I have since looked it up; but it is a word commonly used. I have seen it in the newspapers and magazines. It is well known to the press. I may say, too, that the Senator has had many sad experiences with the use of the word.

Mr. KENNEDY. Let me read what I actually did say in Oregon, so that the Senator will be clear about it. This afternoon, after I had heard about the Senator's attack on me—and I would have been glad to discuss his accusations and my statement in Oregon with him, and even with the Senator from Illinois—I called the school in Oregon where I spoke and talked with Mr. Monroe, who is the principal of that school.

A recording of my remarks had been made. I will read what I said, because I think it throws some light on what my thoughts were. I made these statements in answer to questions asked by the students.

There was a series of questions from the students, dealing with the summit, and finally, although Mr. Monroe has only the answer and not the question on his tape—came the question to which I gave the answer which is being discussed here today.

But first let me read the two questions of the students which led to this question:

First, "Do you think the U–2 incident was handled properly by the Government?"

I do not think that the timing of the U–2 incident is defensible. I think it was obviously the wrong time. Engine failure is always a possibility. Every time we go up in a plane we have to realize that it may come down sooner than we thought. That being true, it seems to me that you always have to consider what the results of that failure will be, and therefore, you would have to consider that there is 1 chance in 5, and 1 in 10, and 1 in 100 chances that a flight a week before the summit would fail and, therefore, it was a risk you would not want to take at that particular time.

Then the next question evidently was whether I thought Mr. Khrushchev would have broken up the summit meeting if there had not been the U–2 flight.

I said:

No, I don't think that it would have been abandoned. Except for the U–2 incident it would not have had a psychological argument for breaking up. Then the burden

would have been his alone and while the summit may never have been a success, he never would have taken all the responsibility unless he had what he felt was an adequate provocation to justify his position before world opinion. He never would have taken on the burden himself.

Then, while as I have said, the next question is not recorded, Mr. Monroe's recollection was—and the answer which I gave would seem to be responsive to it—that it was:

What would you have done if you had been Mr. Eisenhower?

My response was:

Once the summit had broken up and once Mr. Khrushchev indicated his refusal to continue I don't think that the United States could—but—he said there were two conditions for continuing. One, that we apologize. I think that that might have been possible to do and that second, we try those responsible for the flight. We could not do that. It would be highly unfair because the flight had been authorized and therefore that was a condition Mr. Khrushchev knew we couldn't meet and therefore it indicated that he wanted to break (it) up. If he had merely asked that the United States should express regret then that would have been a reasonable term. To say we should try those involved—quite obviously that meant that he wanted to break it up and we had no alternative but to let him do so.

This statement is quite clear to me, at least, when taken in its context, and particularly taken in the context of the AP story of the same statement—which I have here. I have AP story as carried in the Des Moines Register. It says:

PORTLAND, OREG.—JOHN F. KENNEDY said * * * he would have expressed regret.

Then it says:

KENNEDY, campaigning here for votes in Oregon's presidential preference primary, said: "I certainly would express regret at the timing and give assurance that it would not happen again." He said, "I would express regret that the flight did take place."

Let me be a bit specific about this. It seems to me that my answer should be taken in its entirety and in its context. Among all the newspapermen who were present, including the representative of the Associated Press, no one deduced from my answer that I wanted the President to apologize to Khrushchev. And I did not say that the President should apologize. But I did state that, if necessary to keep the summit going, I would have been willing to express regret at the timing of the U–2 incident. And I do regret the timing because it helped lead to the question of the chances of a successful summit. It certainly lessened the prestige of the United States in the eyes of the world. It has helped destroy the prestige of the President in the eyes of the Russian people which was one of our greatest national assets. And it has given the impression that the President does not completely control some of the military or some of his intelligence officers.

So I would have expressed regret if such an expression would have kept the summit going. That does not make me in any way a party to appeasement. I do not have to come before any investigating committee to rid myself of the suspicion of appeasement. I am not a "turnquote." That statement is wholly inaccurate, because the total explanation of my entire position was in the one answer given to the schoolchildren, and was carried by the Associated Press.

I think this is a difficult time in the life of the United States. I think that quite obviously we on the Democratic side who have a responsibility to suggest alternative courses of action to conduct an examination of our policies so that we may learn from past mistakes. After all, that is a function which the party of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] has assumed on many occasions in the past.

I have never abused the President personally. I do not now advocate a policy which I think would weaken the United States—nor have I ever advocated such a policy. Instead, year after year, I have stood on the floor of this Senate and voted for the appropriations and programs which would have made America stronger—defense appropriations and programs to build up the strength of our education, our economy, and our health. It is these things which are the real test of a desire for a strong America.

I say to the Senator from Pennsylvania, who has been a colleague of mine in both the House and the Senate, and to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], that if the Senator had informed me in advance of his projected attack, I would have given him my entire statement, so that he might know my entire point of view.

Second, I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania cannot justify his calling me an appeaser or cast a suspicion of appeasement on me. Once we begin to make that sort of charge—and I have already been attacked along a similar line by the Governor of New Hampshire—the great debate of the 1960 campaign will be doomed to become abusive rather than a fruitful discussion of the great problems which confront this Nation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator from Massachusetts regard the Oregonian as a substantial, solid newspaper?

Mr. KENNEDY. I do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator know Mr. Shoemaker?

Mr. KENNEDY. I do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the Senator's estimate of Mr. Shoemaker?

Mr. KENNEDY. He is a good newspaperman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator believe he is a careful newspaperman?

Mr. KENNEDY. I do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator deny that Mr. Shoemaker, in the article which he read, and which I placed in the RECORD, said there was one thing which the Senator from Massachusetts said could be done, namely, that the President could apologize? Does the Senator deny that he used the word "apologize"? Does the Senator deny that statement, if Mr. Shoemaker is a good, competent newspaperman?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am attempting to present my entire answer. I had hoped that when I had presented the entire answer, the Senator from Illinois, with his customary judicious, fair nature, would recognize that any implication that I had said the President should apologize—that I was an appeaser—was a breach of the rules of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the point I am getting at—whether I have treated the Senator from Massachusetts unfairly or not. Did I treat the Senator unfairly?

Mr. KENNEDY. I should say that the Senator from Illinois did not treat me unfairly. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] did.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I regret that the Senator from Massachusetts has resorted to what might be called guilt by association by bracketing me with some remark, with which I am not familiar, alleged to have been made by the Governor of New Hampshire. I hope he will not further follow those tactics.

Mr. KENNEDY. Bracketed only by party membership.

Mr. SCOTT. I regret it if I have at any time seemed to be unfair. If I have been unfair, the Senator from Massachusetts has my apology. I do not believe, myself, that I have been unfair.

The Senator's comment seems to be based upon the fact that while many Members of the Senate were in attendance in the Senate when it was called to order, and an item was put into the RECORD by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I made comments upon a matter already inserted in the RECORD.

If the Senator thinks that was unfair, I am sorry; and, first, I should like the Senator to be sure that he is quite fair, as I am certain he wishes to be. Following my statement to the Senator from Massachusetts—I refer to my statement that I did not suggest that he be investigated by anyone—he said the Senator from Pennsylvania demanded an investigation of the Senator from Massachusetts.

I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that is not a correct quotation of what I said; and I told him that that was not a correct quotation of what I said. However, even after I told him that that was not a correct quotation of what I said, he continued to advert to it.

Further, he admits that the exact words which appear in the article published in the Portland Oregonian were stated by him:

One was to apologize. I—

That is, the Senator from Massachusetts—

think that might have been possible to do.

If the Senator from Massachusetts thinks it might have been possible for President Eisenhower to apologize, how can the Senator from Massachusetts now say the phrase is taken out of context?

Mr. KENNEDY. In the first place, those words are not the precise words that came off the recorder this afternoon.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator read the same words himself, as coming from his own remarks.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator should judge the statement in the context in which the answer was given, and that context was accepted by every member of the press who was there.

Let me read my answer again:

He said there were two conditions for continuing: One, that we apologize. I think that that might have been possible to do; and that, second, we try those responsible for the flight.

The Senator from Pennsylvania stops his version with the words "might have been possible to do," and leaves the clear implication that, therefore, I said we should apologize.

What I said was that if Mr. Khrushchev had proposed the first condition alone—the apology—it was possible that Khrushchev and the President of the United States might have had a meeting of the minds—it was possible that some sort of an agreement might have been reached.

However, my answer went on that the second condition was obviously unacceptable because the flight was authorized by the Government and it was inconceivable that we would punish the men involved. Therefore Mr. Khrushchev knew it was a condition we could not meet, and by making it a condition of resuming the talks he clearly demonstrated that he intended to break off the summit conference. If he merely had asked that the United States express regret, that might have been a reasonable term, and would have indicated a willingness on his part to proceed.

It seems to me that I expressed this view quite clearly in what I said; and the Associated Press, the United Press, and other press agencies took that view. Furthermore, I stated my clarification of it, not at some later time, but in the same paragraph.

Therefore, I merely say that the record will speak for itself, and that I do not have to purge myself of any suspicion of appeasement.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me, so that I may, in fairness, make a statement?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I have not said the Senator from Massachusetts was an appeaser. I said—as nearly as I can remember the words I used; the Senator from Massachusetts now has my notes—that I hoped he would take an opportunity to resist the suspicion of appeasement, which turns on the suggestion that Eisenhower should have apologized to Khrushchev.

The Senator from Massachusetts feels that that statement was taken out of context. I am perfectly willing to abide by the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts and by his own interpretation; and I make it quite clear to this body that I have not said, and I do not now say, the Senator from Massachusetts was an appeaser. I hope that will satisfy the sensitivity of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania still feel there is a suspicion of appeasement about me?

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator from Massachusetts feels that he had no intention to appease by making the statement, I will accept the Senator's version as my own.

Mr. KENNEDY. I appreciate the Senator's somewhat grudging response.

Mr. SCOTT. It is not grudging at all. I like the Senator from Massachusetts very much.

Mr. KENNEDY. I never thought the day would come when I would say Harold Stassen's judgment was not completely inaccurate. But I must say perhaps he was wiser than we knew, when he spoke the other day in Pennsylvania.

I think it comes with poor grace for Senators to refer to each other in derogatory terms.

Neither do I think Governor Stevenson has to appear before an investigating committee in order to purge himself of the Senator from Pennsylvania's suspicions.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. The able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the able Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the minority leader, the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the junior Senator from Colorado all served together in the House of Representatives. The Senator from Pennsylvania was at one time national chairman of the Republican Party. The minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, has a responsibility to support his President, no matter how fumbling the action taken may have been.

But to accuse the junior Senator from Massachusetts of appeasement, under the evidence I have heard here tonight, is not only unfair, it is ridiculous.

All that needs to be done is to analyze carefully what has been said, and then look at the political partisanship in back of it. It is clearly an attempt to strike down one of the foremost young political leaders in America today, in an attempt to give the impression that he is asking the President of the United States to apologize to Khrushchev, when implicit in every sentence of the statement the Senator from Massachusetts made was that the President might have expressed his regrets. What is wrong with that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, Mr. President——

Mr. CARROLL. I ask the Senator to let me finish, please.

All America would agree that that might have brought success to the summit—which the President and his minority leader wanted, I am sure. There would have been nothing wrong with expressing regrets.

But Senators try to misinterpret the text of the statement the Senator made to make it appear as a request by the junior Senator from Massachusetts that an apology be made. What is this situation, Mr. President? It is a raw, partisan, political effort to put the Senator from Massachusetts at disadvantage, because they are afraid of the strength he is manifesting throughout the Nation today. That is the sole purpose—a raw, partisan, political effort, which the American public will see through and quickly understand.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield, to permit the Senator from Illinois to make a response.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Colorado, that I am not afraid of anybody or anything. I started out with a very mild expository statement on the subject of crowbars. That is where I started, and that it where I tried to wind up.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator from Illinois started with a crowbar and a sledge hammer, but he tried to put the junior Senator from Massachusetts between the hammer and the anvil—a raw, partisan, political piece of chicanery. But the Senator from Illinois will not succeed; the American people will not permit him to do that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But I love the Senator from Massachusetts too much to do that under any circumstances.

Mr. CARROLL. Then why did not the Senator from Illinois abide by the Senate rules?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Because I was talking about Adlai.

Mr. CARROLL. If the minority leader was talking about Adlai, the Senator from Illinois, who is one of the most skilled politicians in the business——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CARROLL. I mean that sincerely; and the able junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], formerly national chairman of the Republican Party, is another skilled politician. Are they now asking us to believe that they were not trying to "put the tag" on the junior Senator from Massachusetts? I warn you, the American people will not believe it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I can only say to my good friend that his party has not yet had its convention. What we are interested in is what we are going to do to his party in November. We do not know what member of his party will receive the nomination of his party. We have our candidate, and we are going to win in November.

So we are not playing favorites as between all the candidates his party has. We simply want to make sure that the record is clear, and that any "anvils" are kept out of it—because I did not refer to any "anvil"; I referred only to sledge hammers and crowbars.

So I wish to be sure, always, that when they talk about sledge hammers and crowbars, they are talking about a fellow who lived on the land, and knows what a crowbar is, and knows what a sledge hammer is, and knows what they are

used for, and how they are used, and has used both of those instrumentalities a great many times.

Mr. KENNEDY. Let me say that the Senator from Illinois seems to suggest that this type of campaign technique—of suggesting that Senators are guilty of a suspicion of appeasement, and are "turnquotes," and so forth——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. Does not the Senator feel that this type of debate will not make a great contribution to the discussion of the issues?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say this never would have happened if Governor Stevenson had left one phrase or one clause out of the statement he made to the $100 dinner in Cook County, last Thursday night. There, he said, after the recital of unity and then the responsibility of his party to inform the country, this administration could not carry on these negotiations with the Russians, involving the survival of the country, and had to be taken out of power. And if that is not politics, then I do not know the meaning of the word.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is disloyal. That is what it is; is it not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. What?

Mr. KENNEDY. Would you not be inclined to say that it is disloyal? Would that be the appropriate charge?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; it is just plain politics, spelled with a capital "P." Having lived in this atmosphere for about 30 years, I think I know a political sentiment when I see it; and when it is in cold print, the English language does have a meaning.

Mr. KENNEDY. Let me ask the Senator from Illinois, who is quite precise, does the Senator see anything inappropriate or in contravention of the rules of the Senate in anything the Senator from Pennsylvania said?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not pass on that. I am not sitting up there in the chair. I am not the Parliamentarian.

Mr. KENNEDY. Does the Senator care to make a judgment on it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know of no reason why I should, particularly.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is the "leader of the army."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have high regard for the delicacy of the situation.

Mr. KENNEDY. I, myself, have the same reticence about commenting on it as the Senator from Illinois has.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know the Senator from Massachusetts never would have made the statement Adlai made in Chicago. He certainly would have made a consistent appeal for unity, even as the majority leader and the acting majority leader have from time to time made on the floor of the Senate, and in which I have always been delighted to concur.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it proper, then, to say the Senator from Illinois never would have used the words the Senator from Pennsylvania used?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not pass on that question. I can never pass on words I have not uttered or with which I have no particular connection. But I know what Adlai said, and I have to get back to crowbars. Someone made the crack about "eating crowbars." I thought that was a nifty expression and that we will hear more about it. But this was nothing more than a visitation on the subject of crowbars and sledge hammers, and I tried to remain within it pretty much.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I can understand the sensitiveness of the Senator from Illinois——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I am not sensitive. I am the least sensitive man in this body.

Mr. CARROLL. I can understand how he may have been wounded deeply, because here is a Member of the United States Senate who happens to be the brightest star that has been blazing across the political horizon. The implication is made that he is a turncoat through applying an invented phrase "turnquote" in connection with whether Senator KENNEDY asked for an apology or an expression of regret.

I want to ask the minority leader, who is a very experienced statesman and politician, was it an accident that the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Pennsylvania got together on this subject, or was it for the purpose of cutting down the junior Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I had no idea who was going to be on the floor this noon. I did not know that the majority leader was not going to be here. I did not care. I do my own thinking, when I have a little time, and then I get all the material together, because I have no ghostwriters. I have no staff to get this material together for me. I do it myself.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator from Illinois does not need ghostwriters.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not conferred with a single Member on our side or the side of the Senator from Colorado or with a person in any other place as to what was going to happen this afternoon. I had all my ducks in a row. I had 10 documents in a sheaf; and, like a good lawyer—and my friend is a good lawyer—when one goes before the judge, he lays it out and says, "Judge, here are the citations." I made the allegations, and then I gave the citations from Adlai Stevenson's speech on down; and it will be a pretty good campaign document, if that is the way Adlai wants it, because I wanted to be sure that everything, including the whole press dispatch from the Paris newspaper, and the questions and answers, will be there for reference when the time comes.

While I am about it, there was a question as to whether Mr. Robert Boulay, who was the author of this interview for the Paris paper, had an inadequate perception of the English language. Maybe so, but he is the Time-Life correspondent in Paris; and if he does not know English, I had better write Henry Luce a letter. [Laughter.]

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator did this all by himself?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. The sledge hammer and the crowbar?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, no. Adlai did that.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator from Illinois did it by himself?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; Adlai did that.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator did not know that others would be here in the Chamber to help attempt to cut down and hamstring one of the great political figures in contemporary American history?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would not do it for the world. I have too much affection for the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. CARROLL. I am sure of that. We have heard about sledge hammers and crowbars, but who put the monkey wrench in the summit? If the majority leader and minority leader said that we should have an investigation——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I said nothing about an investigation.

Mr. CARROLL. Oh, the Senator does not want an investigation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not care who wants an investigation. I make the decisions for myself. I know what I want to say. I have some notion about what the English language conveys. I did not say anything about investigation. Now that the Senator has brought up the subject of monkey wrenches, I think we had better add that to Adlai Stevenson's instrumentalities, because he will probably need it.

Mr. CARROLL. Let us be careful that those instrumentalities do not combine to produce nuclear fatalities, brought on by those responsible for the blunders.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have been living in the same State with Adlai for years. I love him. I just disagree with him.

Mr. CARROLL. I may say to the Senator from Illinois I was not talking about him personally, because I recognize the tolerance, the statesmanship, and the political sagacity of the Senator from Illinois. We are talking about a different matter here today.

Will not the Senator from Illinois agree with me, from our years of service in the House, there is nothing about the junior Senator from Massachusetts that shows he is either an appeaser——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not say he was an appeaser. I am responsible only for my own words.

Mr. CARROLL. Does the Senator say the Senator from Massachusetts is not an appeaser?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have never used other than the most polite and courteous language to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts; and if I say anything about him, it will be only to toss him a dainty bouquet. [Laughter.]

Mr. KENNEDY. May I say it comes late, but I am a grateful receiver.

Before I take my seat, I wish to point out that the other day the Republican chairman said that—

> Loyal Americans will not take kindly to any politician willing to run down the President for the sake of personal advantage.

The key words in that sentence are "loyal Americans."

Under this formulation of the Republican chairman—today and for the next few months—any of us who feel obligated to criticize American foreign policy run the risk, of being accused as "disloyal appeasers" and "turnquotes."

But despite that risk the criticism is going to continue. It is our function and responsibility to criticize when there are weaknesses to criticize. And we propose to meet that responsibility. The Democratic Party would be unworthy of its traditions and its responsibility as a party if it did not fulfill the vital function of legitimate criticism, heedless of whether the Governor of New Hampshire may say we are soft on communism or the Senator from Pennsylvania may say it is necessary that I purge myself of the charges of appeasement. These points—these critical issues—will continue to be debated, and I hope much of this debate will be carried on on the floor of the Senate—as well as across the Nation.

Before I sit down, I thank the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for their kind remarks.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I wish to make a further correction. I again invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that I did not use the phrase that he should purge himself of a suggestion of appeasement. The Senator has my notes before him. The Senator knows that I said—as nearly as I can remember, since the Senator has my notes and is holding on to them—that he should resist the suspicion of appeasement. The Senator has made a very good case in so resisting.

I also add that I mentioned earlier I had made a note——

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator did not say what he says. He is "turn quoting."

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator has my notes.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is "turn quoting."

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator has my notes.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator said:

> It is my hope that they will relieve themselves of the curse of suspicion of appeasement.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator accepts that as what I said?

Mr. KENNEDY. I know the Senator wanted to say what he has said, but he did not say it. He did not say "resist;" he said "relieve."

Mr. SCOTT. "Relieve." I accept what I said. I do not withdraw it. The Senator may recall that I made some reference to the question whether I said "turn quote" in the first instance.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator does not withdraw the statement?

Mr. SCOTT. I said that there were notes around on some Senator's desk which showed I had that notation. A page, while the Senator from Massachusetts was talking, has found that paper. I leave it with the Senator from Massachusetts, among his mementos. The Senator will see that the word written in my notes is "turn quote."

Mr. KENNEDY. Does the Senator withdraw the statement: "It is my hope that they—" which would include me—"will relieve themselves of the curse of suspicion of appeasement"?

Mr. SCOTT. I will say to the Senator, as I said before, I do not feel that the Senator is an appeaser. The Senator, in the statement which he made, claimed that the statements by a newspaperman were taken out of context. If that is correct—and I have no reason to feel that it is not correct—the Senator has, to that degree, removed himself from the application of my remarks with respect to appeasement.

I desire at all times to be fair with the Senator from Massachusetts, but I do not and cannot withdraw from the RECORD the newspaper report which was put into the RECORD not by me but by the Senator from Illinois. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts understands that.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. I appreciate what the Senator has said, and the remarks of the Senator from Illinois.

The statement of Mr. Shoemaker has been added to by the entire statement. I think that the full statement quite clearly shows what I intended to say—my point of view—which was reported, as I said, that way by the Associated Press. Therefore, I am delighted that the Senator has chosen to withdraw his statement.

Mr. SCOTT. Obviously no one questions the courage, the devotion, or the patriotism of the Senator from Massachusetts. My question was pointed up on the newspaper article. We have discussed it thoroughly. The Senator has offered his explanation. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to let it rest with the article and with the Senator's explanation. I assume that that will be satisfactory to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Not quite as satisfactory as it was a moment ago; but in that case I yield the floor.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 23, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 44) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment, in accordance with the order previously entered, until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 24, 1960, at 10 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 23, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Colossians 4: 3: *Continue steadfastly in prayer.*

Almighty God, Thine is the strength which sustains us, the love which redeems us, the sympathy which comforts us, and the light which leads us.

Grant that we may never lose our faith in Thee, even though we are standing amid what seems to be the defeat of our fondest hopes and dreams.

Help us to believe that the vision of universal peace vouchsafed to our minds and hearts is not too lofty and too wonderful to be fulfilled by Thy divine wisdom and power.

Inspire us with steadfast devotion to continue to pray fervently and to labor faithfully that our disappointed and disheartened humanity may soon find the way of peace and men everywhere shall be mingled in an alchemy of brotherhood.

Humbly we offer our prayer in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 19, 1960, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

> S. 44. An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

POSTPONING OF ROLLCALLS TODAY AND TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any rollcalls today and tomorrow on the passage of any bills or amendments thereto, or a motion to recommit, be postponed to the following Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LOAN OF NAVAL VESSEL TO REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9465) to authorize the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 12, insert:

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding section 7307 of title 10, United States Code, or any other law, the President may, under conditions which he prescribes, lend one submarine to the Government of Canada for a period of not more than five years and may, in his discretion, extend such loan for an additional period of not more than five years. All expenses involved in the activation of this submarine including repairs, alterations, outfitting, and logistic support shall be paid by the Government of Canada. The authority of the President to transfer a submarine under this section terminates on December 31, 1961."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to authorize the loan of one submarine to Canada and the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BIPARTISAN FIASCO

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, after every unbelievable, fantastic, foreign policy blunder by the United States, there is the inevitable call for unity. The collapse of our abortive attempt at appeasement in Paris is no exception.

The greatest aid to Khrushchev is American unity behind the wrong policy. His best friend so far is and has been this bipartisan foreign policy of the United States. Yalta, Potsdam, aid to the Chinese Communists in 1946 to 1949, United States delay at Panmunjom in Korea, Geneva, Camp David, and now Paris were all defended by a chorus of coverup, censorship, and an appeal to unity and patriotism. This is the surest and quickest road to complete disgrace and defeat of the United States. The late Senator Arthur Vandenberg lost a great opportunity when he joined the bipartisan foreign policy of appeasement and failure. He could have saved Western civilization much anguish by exercising the traditional role of the minority to point out the utter fallacies of Yalta and Potsdam. Through such efforts, the Western peoples could have been alerted to the Communist menace.

Today this bipartisan hayride to destruction must be reversed. We must have a complete change in policy. The Communists must and can be put on the defense. They can be put on the defense by our constant demand that Poland and the captive nations be given their freedom. This bipartisan policy of wasting our strength all over the world, thus pleasing Khrushchev, must be and can be halted. Much of our foreign-aid money should have been and should be spent on making the United States supreme in the air and in space. The greater the mistakes of this so-called bipartisan policy, the greater the clamor for unity behind the same old crowd and the same personnel. We need a change now. Tomorrow will be too late.

QUESTIONS ON NATIONAL POLICY

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, speaking on behalf of a large number of Members of this body who last Friday asked the President to answer a series of questions on the U–2 incident and related subjects, I deplore and resent the remarks made by the chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee.

The questions which we raised are questions which the American people have been asking. They are questions of national policy which affect every American.

When the chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee accuses us of "following closely the Khrushchev line," he is impugning our patriotism and casting an unwarranted reflection on us as individuals and as elected Representatives of the American people.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that an apology is in order.

I suggest further, Mr. Speaker, that the answers to our questions should come from the President of the United States. The Congress and the people have a right to know.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] I ask unanimous consent that the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10809) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. ARENDS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana has informed me that he has spoken with the minority committee members and they are in agreement on this.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes; the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] are here, and they are supporting it.

Mr. ARENDS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1629)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10809) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter contained in the House bill and in lieu of the matter contained in the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 4. The sum authorized by section 1(e) for emergency 'Construction and equipment', and any amount, not to exceed $5,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(c) hereof, shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand or modify laboratories and other installations if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds

so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations until the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof, including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest. No such funds may be used for any construction, expansion, or modification if authorizations for such construction, expansion, or modification previously has been denied by the Congress.

"SEC. 5. Paragraph 203(b)(2) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2473(b)(2)), is amended by striking out 'ten' and inserting in lieu thereof 'thirteen', and by striking out 'two hundred and sixty' and inserting in lieu thereof 'two hundred and ninety'."

And the House agree to the same.

OVERTON BROOKS,
JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.
JAMES G. FULTON,
GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
JOHN STENNIS,
STEPHEN M. YOUNG,
THOMAS J. DODD,
HOWARD W. CANNON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
THOS. E. MARTIN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10809) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

Senate amendments one through ten are all of a technical, or conforming, nature. The House recedes on these amendments.

The Senate amended the bill in two other respects, both of which were of a substantive nature. On one of these amendments, the Senate receded and on the other, the House receded.

The first of the substantive Senate amendments (amendment No. 11) provides for an increase of $50,000,000 of emergency authorization authority for "Research and development." The conditions under which the additional authorization provided under the Senate amendment may be used are set forth as follows:

"SEC. 3. The sum authorized by section 1(d) for emergency 'Research and development' shall be available for expenditure to defray the cost of research and development activities which the Administrator has determined to be urgently required in the national interest to exploit technological or scientific breakthroughs, to assure safety of personnel, to fund required research and development program changes, to meet unusual cost variations in research and development activities, and for the other purposes of section 1(b). No portion of such sum may be obligated for expenditure or expended to defray the cost of research and development activities until the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of the research or development item or activity, (2) the cost thereof, and (3) the reason why the research or development item or activity is necessary in the national interest."

The Senate amendment was agreed to by the managers on the part of the House in order to be sure that neither the space program nor the safety of personnel are jeopardized by lack of funds. In seems apparent that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has made little or no provisions in its 1961 estimates for contingencies, cost increases, or unplanned program modification. Oftentimes necessary changes, in order to insure safety of personnel and system reliability, such as the Project Mercury Program, cannot be accomplished by reprogramming alone without adverse effects on other important elements of the space program. Furthermore, information has been received that several of NASA's programs have increased in cost over original budgeted estimates. For example, current estimates of the Atlas-Agena vehicle procurement program have increased $14,620,000. Current estimates on the Thor-Agena vehicle procurement program have increased $300,000. Due to decisions to utilize the Centaur engine in the Saturn program, it is now estimated that $1,500,000 must be incrementally funded in fiscal year 1961 to secure availability of Centaur vehicles for planetary missions. In all, original budget estimates are already $20,565,000 less than the revised current estimates. It is understandable that reprograming to fund these revised programs would have serious effects on other important programs.

The managers on the part of the House recognized that it must be anticipated that plans for, and estimated costs of, various individual research and development programs will be subject to continuing change. It is not possible to make precise forecasts for programs in which, in some cases, we are going beyond existing scientific knowledge.

The total authorization in the House bill was for $915,000,000. The Senate amendment increases the authorization to $970,000,000. This includes the $50,000,000 of emergency authorization for "Research and development," explained above, and in addition a $5,000,000 emergency authorization for "Construction and equipment." The latter $5,000,000 emergency authorization was contained in the House bill, but since it was an emergency authorization it was not totaled with the general authorization figure. The Senate amendment included both general authorizations and emergency authorizations to make a total of $970,000,000.

The other Senate amendment of a substantive nature, deleted section 4 of the House bill which provided 30 additional "excepted" positions with 13, rather than 10, of these positions authorized to be paid salaries up to $21,000. The remaining positions would be within the salary ranges $14,000 to $19,000. The House position was that these positions were essential and that the space program could be expected to be slowed down if NASA was restricted in its efforts to employ first-class personnel. The Senate, therefore, receded to the House position. This Senate amendment also writes back into the bill the emergency "Construction and equipment" authority of $5,000,000. This provision was in the House bill and has been rewritten merely for purposes of clarity.

OVERTON BROOKS,
JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
JAMES G. FULTON,
GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING COMPENSATION TO JAPANESE GOVERNMENT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 532) providing for the consideration of S. 2130, a bill to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2130) to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 532 provides for the consideration of S. 2130 to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The term "Bonin Islands" as used in S. 2130 includes the Bonin Islands proper, the Volcano Islands, Rosario Island, Parece Vela, and Marcus Island. This group lies about 700 miles south of Tokyo. During the war the Japanese Government evacuated from these islands the 7,000 civilian residents, all of whom were Japanese nationals. Immediately after the war the United States allowed 135 former residents of partial

occidental ancestry to return, but, for security reasons, has refused to allow any others to return.

Under article 3 of the peace treaty with Japan, the United States has the right to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants of these islands, including their territorial waters.

The former residents of the islands have not been successfully integrated into the Japanese economy and live in distressed economic conditions. The Japanese Government provides them with economic assistance and spends a substantial sum annually for this purpose.

The Defense Department is opposed to the repatriation of the former residents of the islands for security reasons. Failing in its efforts at repatriation, the Japanese Government sought compensation. Initially it requested $12.5 million, but it has now agreed to accept $6 million.

The Department of State and the Department of Defense recognize that the former residents of the islands have a legitimate claim. One problem has been how to determine the land value that would form the basis for compensation. The land has not been used for more than than 15 years. It was decided to base the value on the formula used in the calculation of land values in the Ryukyu Islands, former Japanese islands now under U.S. administration. The figure adopted was $1,060 per acre, or $4 million for the total land value of the islands. To this was added interest dating from April 28, 1952, the effective date of the peace treaty with Japan. This brought the total up to $6 million, the amount contained in S. 2130.

The United States will not adjudicate individual claims. When the money has been appropriated, the United States will enter into a written agreement with the Japanese Government under which the latter will engage to distribute the money to the individual families concerned. The subcommittee was assured that this payment is regarded as adequate compensation by the Bonin Islanders and will constitute full satisfaction and settlement of all claims of the former residents against the United States.

The Bonin Islands situation is unique and the subcommittee was assured that the payment of the claims there do not constitute a precedent.

Our continued indefinite reservation of the Bonin Islands for security purposes makes impossible the repatriation of the former residents in the foreseeable future. Without any compensation the Bonin problem will remain a constant and, quite possibly, growing irritant in United States-Japanese relations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 532.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the bill and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 533) providing for the consideration of H.R. 1157, a bill to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1157) to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, House resolution 533 provides for the consideration of H.R. 1157 to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 1157 is to establish a basis in law for U.S. programs for the promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands.

The interest of the United States in these islands is indicated by strategic military considerations of the highest importance. Consequently, the task of administering the islands has been assigned by the President to the Department of Defense, an assignment necessitated by the inextricable linking of civil and military functions there. In the tightly constricted area of the Ryukyus, virtually all activities and policies of the local government directly affect military planning and operations. The proposed legislation would formalize existing arrangements for performing the responsibilities of the United States under the peace treaty with Japan and would provide means for maintaining and increasing the effectiveness of the performance of the basic military mission.

The Ryukyu Islands lie southeast of Japan, northeast of Formosa and the Philippines, and west of the Bonin Islands. Okinawa, the main island, is almost 6,000 miles from San Francisco, 970 miles from Tokyo, and about 920 miles from Manila.

Since 1945 the United States has exercised full powers over the Ryukyu Islands, of which Okinawa is the largest. Prior to the war these islands were an integral part of Japan, but following Japan's surrender they were treated as a separate and distinct territory for the purpose of occupation. Unlike Japan, where occupation was carried out nominally under Allied authority, the occupation of the Ryukyus proceeded solely under American control. The measure of U.S. control was determined by international customary and conventional law as well as unilaterally by the United States. While control was restored to local institutions as they manifested a capacity to exercise it, the United States retained all powers, subject only to limitations imposed by international law.

As the sole occupier, the United States was charged with the responsibility for providing government in occupied territories, including all measures necessary to preserve public order and safety.

Although we have rebuilt and expanded the Ryukyuan economy and have given it new direction, it continues, nevertheless, to be an economy of scarcity, and from the viewpoint of natural resources it will never be anything other than that. Prior to the war, as one of the most indigent prefectures of Japan, it received annual subsidies of from $4 million to $6 million from the Central Government in Tokyo. Today, its population density of over 1,000 persons per square mile is twice that of Japan and one of the highest in the world. A substantial portion of its food requirements is imported each year. It has a serious shortage of industrial and commercial skills and inadequate venture capital to exploit such resources as are available. So, in spite of the reconstruction of the major part of the physical plant and the restoration of normal activity, there remains the difficult task of promoting the welfare and well-being of the Ryukyuan people, of bringing their economy closer to viability, of making them as self-sustaining as possible.

That the action proposed by H.R. 1157 is one which has been considered and approved by the Congress previously is illustrated by the fact that similar legislation has been enacted with respect to the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Philippine Islands and Puerto Rico.

Administrative costs of the civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands will continue to require annual budgetary provision; such costs will not, however, be increased as a result of this proposed legislation. The provisions of section 4 of the bill will provide a level of economic assistance somewhat less than one-half of the average annual amount appropriated for economic aid during the period fiscal years 1947–58.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 533.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING COMPENSATION TO JAPANESE GOVERNMENT

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2130) to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, S. 2130, with Mr. JONES of Missouri in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us, S. 2130, authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the Government of Japan the sum of $6 million. The payment of such sum shall constitute full satisfaction in settlement of all claims of Japanese nationals resident on the Bonin Islands arising from use and benefit and exercise of property rights or interests in the Bonin Islands by the United States for security purposes. The term "Bonin Islands" as used in this bill includes the Bonin Islands proper, the Volcano Islands, Rosario Island, Parece Vela, and Marcus Island. This group of islands is about 700 miles south of Tokyo. We are holding these islands for security reasons. We have some very important military installations on these islands.

On June 2, 1959, executive communication 1055, consisting of a letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitted a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan." This was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and, in turn, referred by the chairman to the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific. Before action was completed by the subcommittee the Senate passed S. 2130 which was referred to the committee. Since this bill is identical with that proposed in executive communication 1055, the subcommittee held hearings on the Senate bill on August 27 and 28, 1959. On August 28 the subcommittee ordered S. 2130 favorably reported to the full committee. On January 20, 1960, the full committee unanimously ordered S. 2130 favorably reported.

To my knowledge there is no opposition to this legislation.

The interests of the United States in these islands was summed up in the communique issued by President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Kishi in 1957:

> The President reaffirmed the U.S. position that Japan possesses residual sovereignty over these islands. He pointed out, however, that, so long as the conditions of threat and tension exist in the Far East, the United States will find it necessary to continue the present status.

The former residents of the islands have not been successfully integrated into the Japanese economy and live in distressed economic conditions. The Japanese Government provides them with economic assistance and spends a substantial sum annually for this purpose.

In conversations with Japanese officials in 1955, 1957, and 1958, Secretary of State Dulles reiterated the opposition of the Defense Department to the repatriation of the former residents. Failing in its efforts at repatriation, the Japanese Government then sought compensation. Initially it requested $12.5 million but it has now agreed to accept $6 million.

The Department of State and the Department of Defense recognize that the former residents of the islands have a legitimate claim. One problem has been how to determine the land value that would form the basis for compensation. The land has not been used for more than 15 years.

During the hearings the subcommittee inquired whether the payment of the Bonin Islands claims involved a precedent for claims by former residents of other islands that had been under Japanese jurisdiction prior to the war. In a memorandum submitted by Assistant Secretary of State Parsons the subcommittee was assured that "the Bonin Islands situation is unique and that the payments of the claims there do not constitute a precedent."

Mr. Chairman, our continued indefinite reservation of the Bonin Islands for security purposes makes impossible the repatriation of the former residents in the foreseeable future. Without any compensation the Bonin problem will remain a constant and, quite possibly, growing irritant in United States-Japanese relations. For this reason I am confident the House will pass this legislation without any dissenting vote.

I reserve the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of our subcommittee [Mr. ZABLOCKI] has explained the reason for this bill to compensate Japan for land in the Bonin Islands to which the 7,000 persons who owned it prior to the war are not being allowed to return. These persons were evacuated by Japan. They would like to go back and resume cultivation of their land, but our Armed Forces, for good and sufficient reasons, does not want any non-Americans on these islands for the present. There are about 150 persons of mixed blood and Japanese citizenship on one small island. They will not be permitted to go to the other islands.

This is a case in which I believe we are getting more than value received. We have several strategic installations in that part of the world with value up to perhaps $1 billion Our control of these islands and installations is essential to our security in the western Pacific. By making this payment, which has been negotiated between the two governments, we can strengthen our position in Japan where at the present time there is great opposition on the part of some students and others to continued close cooperation between the Japanese Government and our own Government. They use this case as a source of propaganda against the United States.

When we make this payment the Japanese Government takes responsibility for handling those 7,000 former residents of the Bonins who are being barred by us from returning to their homes and property. When the tense world situation is over and we do not need such installations in the Pacific and pull out, the Japanese may want to return them to the Bonins. They can do with them as they please. But we will have discharged fully our obligations and be in the clear.

Control of these islands for as long as we need them is essential to our national security. There should be no opposition to the passage of this bill.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before the House, S. 2130, authorizes a payment of $6 million to the Government of Japan. But the money is not intended for Japan or the Japanese. The ultimate beneficiaries of the payment will be the 7,000 Bonin Islanders who live in Japan and who cannot return to their native soil because our Government, as part of its defense strategy, must continue to occupy the Bonin Islands.

We do not own the Bonin Islands. We are the lawful occupants by the terms of the peace treaty we made with Japan. The payment authorized in this bill will not give us title to these islands. Nor is the payment a rental of any kind. It is compensation that is to be paid to the former residents of the islands because we have taken their land for an indefinite time. The Department of State advised our committee that the sum will constitute full satisfaction and settlement of all claims of these people against the United States.

Thus far the Bonin Islanders have been living on the margin of economic collapse. They are a simple agricultural people with a minimum of skills. Although they are Japanese nationals, they have not been able to establish themselves in Japanese economic life. Some may ask what the future holds for these people after the $6 million is distributed among the 7,000 former residents. No one can answer with certainty. But the sum should provide them with a modest amount of capital to establish themselves on the land or in small commercial activities or to improve their skills in order that they may enter the mainstream of the Japanese economy.

We have a right to occupy these islands. But I submit that we have a responsibility where the exercise of our right brings hardships. Our Government is neither too powerful nor too insensitive to ignore the distress of small and alien people whose plight arises from our need to use their land

for our security. It is because this bill fulfills an obligation on our part that I urge its passage.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to get the record straight. We hear that this $6 million expenditure is necessary for security reasons; and perhaps that is true. Then someone else says that it is necessary to compensate some people for an injustice, to take care of people who are in distress. Then someone else says this expenditure must be made because pressure is being put upon the Japanese Government. If this is for the security of the United States, that is one thing; but if this is for the other reasons that have been stated, I cannot go along at all with spending $6 million because it was the Japanese who evacuated the 7,000 people who are to be benefited. We did not do it; the Japanese evacuated their own nationals and then fortified the islands. From that standpoint I can see no reason why we should compensate anybody for anything.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would like to add to the statement the gentleman just made that Marcus Island was the first target I bombed in the Pacific. The gentleman will be interested to know that the heaviest fortifications in the Pacific were in Marcus Island, and we suffered perhaps some of our greatest losses there.

Mr. GROSS. Is Marcus Island part of the Bonins?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. The Japanese removed these people, then erected fortifications and we lost many American lives taking the Bonin Islands.

From the standpoint of the Japanese Government and the people who were evacuated I do not think we owe them anything.

If we are now paying for some security purpose, that is a different story. I understand it is proposed to pay $879 or something like that to each displaced person. That is approximately the figure; is it not?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes; it comes out to about that.

Mr. GROSS. It is said these 7,000 people have not been integrated by the Japanese. If they have not been absorbed into the economic and social life of Japan by now they probably never will be and the $879 per individual is not going to take care of the situation in the future.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I can assure the gentleman that the primary reason for this bill is because it is essential to our security. I can best explain it by reading from page 2 of the hearings, a statement by the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs:

> The State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee decided in 1945 that the Bonin Islands should be closed for security reasons to all other settlement. This policy, which has subsequently been reviewed several times, remains in effect.

That is the decision that was made and the reasons for the decision. It has been necessary for us to keep control of these islands.

Maybe we should have taken them in the peace treaty, I do not know. But the fact is we did not take them, and we do not own the islands. Japan owns the islands.

Mr. GROSS. The Japanese Government has residual sovereignty, whatever that means.

Mr. JUDD. The Bonins are not like some of the other areas where we have control. Japan has renounced ownership of those. Here is a case where they own the islands and we need them for the present. Japan has agreed to this arrangement. It quiets all of the claims against us and gives us security—physical, emotional, and military—in that area.

Mr. GROSS. Let us get this down to cases. I can go along with this bill if it is for security reasons.

Mr. JUDD. I give the gentleman that flat assurance.

Mr. GROSS. But I do not go along with it if we are paying off the Japanese.

Mr. JUDD. Neither would I.

Mr. GROSS. Then let us leave out the extraneous and specious statements in behalf of the bill.

Mr. JUDD. The only reason we bring that consideration in is because a troublesome situation has arisen for us and Japan on account of the agitation of some individuals and groups over this issue. The Japanese Government says it can quiet the situation and remove this thorn in our relations and settle the problem with this payment.

Mr. GROSS. I do not think it is going to be done that way. Let me say now that I hope you will not come in here with another bill for $6 million or more in order to placate these people later on.

Mr. JUDD. There is no other situation in the Pacific at all comparable to this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I may say the gentleman from Iowa, knowing something about this situation, that I add my word of endorsement to this proposition. It is a matter of security and goes directly to the point the gentleman, I know, will agree with.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, but I want to say again I do not like these other issues being brought in. I do not think we are going to satisfy these people over the years with the payment of $879 apiece. I do not think that is going to happen, and I want to clear the record now and say that we are paying this $6 million for security reasons.

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the Japanese Government first wanted $12.5 million but in a very short period of time reduced the asking price to $6 million, more than 50 percent. I hope this will be the last we hear of this deal. I do not like it, but if it will take care of a vital security problem, affecting our own people, I will go along with it.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to be learned in matters of our relations with foreign nations, but I do have confidence in the work of our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is very modest when he says he is not learned in foreign affairs. I consider the gentleman one of the most impressive and learned gentlemen on that subject.

Mr. ASPINALL. Our distinguished floor leader is very charitable in his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this bill is in the interest of our national security. You heard a moment ago the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] state that he was one of the first who saw this particular area when our military drive was taken us towards Japan. May I say that the gentleman now speaking is one of the Members of Congress who last saw this area.

It so happens that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has jurisdiction over the Pacific area. We have jurisdiction over the Marshalls, the Carolines, and the Marianas to the west.

In that jurisdiction we have some responsibility over the northern part of the Marianas. This last year it was necessary for the committee, composed of the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MCGINLEY], the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], and myself together with a staff member, to go into this particular area. We received permission from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to visit in the Bonin Island area. Our committee does not have jurisdiction over the Bonins. However, we thought it would be appropriate for us, with his permission, to go into the area. Accordingly we visited Iwo Jima and Chi Chi Jima. These names mean very much to us. The name Bonin Islands is practically unknown to the American people. But, when I speak of Iwo Jima and Suribachi, you know what we are talking about.

Mr. Chairman, I am interested in this legislation for two reasons, and it is because of these two reasons I wish to secure some information from the committee handling the bill. The first question has to do with the 140 or so citizens of Japan citizenship presently living on Chi Chi Jima Island. I also wish to know if there is any relationship or if any comparison can be made between the moneys that we are to pay

in this particular instance and the moneys which we are paying or are to pay for lands in the Marshalls area.

Last fall when we visited the Bonins we were in the company of Rear Adm. W. R. Eardman. If you do not think that this is an isolated area so far as we in the United States are concerned, you are mistaken. It is very difficult to get into. And, when one finds living in Chi Chi Jima approximately 140 people, many of whom have their family heritage in our own country, names like Savory and Webb from the New England area, descendants of New Englanders formerly engaged in the whaling business, and Washington, another name that is very common there, then he can understand why it is that those 140 have been allowed to return while others have not been given such permission.

There were almost 10,000 Japanese civilians living on these islands during the time just preceding the war. The war came on and most of the civilians were removed to other areas under Japan's jurisdiction. After the fighting was over most of the former residents of the Bonins were found to be in Japan proper. We permitted people of American lineage to return, and that is how the 140 happen to be there at the present time.

In the Marshall Islands to the east, where we have such islands as Kwajalein, we have 70.4 square miles of land area, while in the Bonin Islands we have 45 square miles of land area. There are 14,350 inhabitants living in the Marshalls at the present time. You can see what that land means to them. On Kwajalein, one of the larger islands in the group, the Defense Department has been using the entire area since its occupation by our military forces in 1944. For years we have been negotiating with the Marshallese on a fair value of their land. We do not know how much longer we will have use for it, but probably indefinitely, something like we have with the Japanese in their Bonin Island group. The Marshallese want the title to the land to remain in their names also. We have offered them $500 an acre for an indefinite term of use. Some of the owners have accepted this price; others have not accepted the price offered.

Now, with that in mind, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], a few questions. What items of reimbursement are covered by the $6 million? Are they public, private, personal, or liability values?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Private and personal items of reimbursement are covered.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not a fact that when people are taken from an area under conquest, by tradition they are usually allowed to return to that area?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is true.

Mr. ASPINALL. Here they are not permitted to return.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. They are not permitted to return because we have decided that it is not in our national interest.

Mr. ASPINALL. Where will the title to the land involved remain?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Title to the land will remain with the Japanese, but, in effect, we obtain title to that land since we have indefinite use of these islands.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will this legislation permit claims to be made by individual Japanese against the United States?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No, sir.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the present 140 inhabitants of the Bonin Islands—and these are the descendants of the Saveries and Webbs and Washingtons—be able to occupy or use the land as long as the United States remains in possession of the islands?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. On Chi Chi Jima, presumably, yes; on other islands, no.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the residents of Chi Chi Jima receive their proportionate share of these moneys?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No. This money is only for those former Bonin Islanders who are not permitted to return to the islands and who are now residing in Japan.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will these inhabitants of Chi Chi Jima be able to get any title to the lands they now occupy?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No; not under this legislation.

Mr. ASPINALL. Does the gentleman think that this $6 million sum could be considered as rent for the use of the land since 1945 to date? If so, within a few years, if the United States continues to occupy the islands will there be another payment forthcoming?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No; this is a final settlement. May I point out to my distinguished friend that it is not a rental payment.

Mr. ASPINALL. As I stated just a moment ago, I am interested because of the effect that this has relative to the Marshall Islands of the Trust Territory. For example, on Kwajalein Island, one of the many islands of the Marshall group, the entire area was taken over by the military in 1944. The title still remains with the Marshallese landowners. The High Commissioner of the Trust Territory has been given authority to offer the Marshallese $500 an acre for the use of the land since 1944. The Marshallese, through their attorney, have refused the offer and have brought court action. Now my question is this: How did you arrive at the figure of $1,060 per acre for the land in the Bonins? I realize that land is a very valuable asset to the Japanese but I do not know how it can be more valuable than it is to the Marshallese.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. In answer to the gentleman, it is my understanding that the Department of State in negotiations with the Japanese used land value plus labor and input value of various kinds. I wish to call attention to the statement on page 11 of the hearings where Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Parsons, in reply to a question states:

> The figure of $6 million is based on the formula used in the calculation of Ryukyuan land values where you assign 40 percent of the production from a given unit of land to land value and 60 percent to labor and imput of various kinds. Then the 40 percent is capitalized at 6 percent; this is multiplied by 16⅔, and you arrive at the figure through that process.

The value of land in the Ryukyus, as the gentleman will recall, is $1,060 per acre.

Mr. ASPINALL. Can my distinguished colleague state whether or not he believes there is any relationship between the formula which his committee has used in this instance and the formula that might be used in determining the values of the Marshallese?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No; there is no relationship.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I would like to add that they have no relationship because in the Marshall Islands we are paying rent. In the Bonins we are paying the Japanese Government the value of the land and it can do as it pleases with respect to these citizens. It intends to compensate them for this land. There is no precedent in this case that could be applied to the Marshalls.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say that that is exactly what I wanted stated while we are considering this legislation. We do have this legal controversy; we do have a suit in court at the present time and if we are not careful this action might be used against us.

Mr. Chairman, may I make one statement to my colleagues of the House. We held a special meeting with the Bonin Islands Council members when we were on Chi Chi Jima. If my friends would like to have some very interesting reading—it would take about 10 minutes—it would bring to their minds how people who have their heritage in our own country feel about their ties to a country with which they have no common citizenship, but who wish to have such ties in the future, if they can obtain them.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If the gentleman will yield further, may I suggest that the gentleman insert the minutes of the council meeting at this point in the RECORD?

Mr. ASPINALL. I shall be glad to do that.

Mr. Chairman, the following is the transcript of the hearings of the meeting held by the Council of Chi Chi Jima when our special committee was present in that area:

> CHI CHI JIMA, B.I.—MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL BONIN ISLAND COUNCIL MEETING OF NOVEMBER 19, 1959
>
> The meeting was called to order at 19:35. Present were Lt. Comdr. T. G. Rice, military government representative; Rodrick Webb, president; Jerry Savory, member; Jessie Webb, member; Mitsuru Ikeda, member; Frank Gonzales, member. Special guests were Hon. W. N. Aspinall, Representative from Colorado; Hon. D. F. McGinley, Representative from Nebraska; Hon. D. K. Inouye, Representative from Hawaii; Hon. B. F. Sisk, Representative from California; Rear Adm. W. L. Erdmann, COMNAVMARIANAS; Dr. Jack Taylor, Consultant on Territorial Affairs. Guests were Lt. Comdr. L. E. Trabaudo, MC, USN; Lt. (jg.) S. L. Erwin, Assistant OIC; Richard Washington, judge, Bonin Island court.

The military government representative opened the meeting by introducing the House Insular Affairs Committee to the council members. He explained to the committee members that the Bonin Island Council was comprised of five members elected by a general election. The member receiving the most votes sits as President of the council. The term of office is for 1 year. He explained that all persons over 18 years of age were eligible to vote and that we have experienced 100 percent participation as a result of an ordnance whereby a person is fined if they fail to vote. He also explained that the judge of the Bonin Island court is an appointed office and that the council members sat as the court. He told the committee that the council met once a month, and that the minutes were recorded and sent to the Military Governor via the Deputy Military Governor. He explained that the president of the council presided at the meetings. At the request of the president, the military government representative reads the minutes of the previous meeting and then presents to the Council any information that is pertinent received from the Military Governor or Deputy Military Governor, and any other information of interest, i.e., ship and airplane arrivals, problems of a logistic nature, etc. The president of the council then asks each member to present anything that they wish and to bring up any problems that they have been presented with during the previous month. The council discusses and votes on any matter that requires a decision. He explained that revenue is obtained by taxation of gross income. The tax at present is 3 percent. This money goes to the community fund, and is used as the council sees fit. At the present there is $1,831.88 in the community fund. There is only one person on the island receiving their support from this fund; the rest of the islanders are gainfully employed and are self-sufficient. He explained that the economy of the island is increasing each year.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if the resolutions and ordnances passed on by the council were subject to veto by the military government representative.

The military government representative replied that none had been vetoed.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if the military government representative sat with the members of the Bonin Island Council at the monthly meetings.

The military government representative replied that he sat with the council at all meetings, and that he also sat with the Bonin Island court as an advisory member.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if the military government representative acts in an advisory capacity at the council meetings when decisions of a legislative nature, especially those involving raising revenue and appropriating funds are acted on.

The military government representative replied that he did.

Congressman ASPINALL asked the president of the Bonin Island Council if he exercised his prerogative as president by presiding at the monthly meetings or if the military government representative presided at the monthly meetings.

Rodrick Webb replied that he presided at the monthly meetings.

The military government representative again reiterated that due to the close proximity, so many of the civil problems dovetailed with those of the military that he acted in an advisory capacity on these matters. Matters solely of a civil nature were left to the members of the council insofar as possible.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if any member of the Bonin Island Council had ever served in a governing capacity when the Japanese governed the island.

He was informed that no member had served in such a capacity.

Congressman ASPINALL asked the council members if they were satisfied with their present form of government.

He was informed by the council members that they were satisfied.

Congressman ASPINALL asked the Deputy Military Governor if he or members of his staff reviewed the minutes of the Bonin Island Council meetings.

The Deputy Military Governor replied that he personally reviewed the minutes of the council meetings and without exception he has passed on these minutes and has then forwarded them to the Military Governor.

Congressman ASPINALL asked the age of the person receiving help from the community fund.

Jerry Savory, council member, informed him that she herself did not know her true age, but information gathered from other elderly people of the island placed her age in the vicinity of 70 years. He explained that she had no one to care for her and that each month she received provisions paid for by the community fund from the Bonin Island Trading Co.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if there were any other elder people of the island that felt they too should receive help from the community fund.

Jerry Savory said that to his knowledge there were none. He explained that the rest of the elderly people either were still gainfully employed or had children and family to care for them.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if it was more or less the custom of the people of the islands to care for their elder people within the family if such was possible.

Jerry Savory replied that it was the custom.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if the members of the council were paid for their services.

Jerry Savory explained that the president of the council received $10 per month, members $5 per month, and that the judge of the Bonin Islands court received 10 percent of fines imposed.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if there were many cases tried by the Bonin Islands court.

The military government representative explained that very few cases were tried by the court and that the offenses were minor in nature.

Congressman ASPINALL explained to the members of the council that the committee which he represented had jurisdiction over only the unincorporated or Trust Territories of the Pacific but inasmuch as they were to be in this area they had requested permission to visit the Bonin Islands as guests of the Deputy Military Governor and military government representative to meet with the representatives of the people of the Bonin Islands to hear their views and to find out if they were satisfied with their present form of military government, and that they would report to Congress on their findings. He asked if any members of the council had anything they would like to discuss with the committee.

Jessie Webb asked if the committee could give any information on any decisions pertaining to the ownership of the houses and land on which the people of the Bonin Islands lived.

Congressman ASPINALL explained that as he understood it, until land titles could be determined that it would be impossible to give title to any person living on the property.

The military government representative explained that the Bonin Islanders were concerned over titles to property and houses in the event the Japanese again took possession of the islands. He explained that he believed that the houses would belong to the Bonin Islanders as long as the Navy remained on the islands.

Congressman ASPINALL told the council that Senator FULBRIGHT had introduced and the Senate had passed a bill whereby $6 million would be paid to the Japanese Government to settle with the Japanese people that were dispossessed from the Bonin Islands for the property they owned.

Congressman SISK asked when the Japanese originally settled the island.

Jerry Savory explained that Nathaniel Savory and his party of settlers whom the vast majority of the Bonin Islanders are descendents settled the island in 1830, and the Japanese did not settle the island until 1871. The Japanese were not successful in their attempt to settle in 1871 and left the island to return in 1873, this time to stay.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if the Japanese settled on land owned by the Savory settlers or settled on land of their own.

The military government representative informed him that the land acquired by the Japanese was by legal methods as far as known.

The military government representative explained that basically what the Bonin Islanders are concerned with is that with the exception of possibly three, none of them live on their own homesteads and as they develop their homes and property they are concerned about the security of their homes and homesteads. Therefore, they would like to know that if the Japanese Government accepts the $6 million as payment for land rights if they will then be given title to the homes and properties.

Congressman ASPINALL explained that it was his understanding that if the Japanese Government accepts the $6 million in lieu of claims to property by the former Japanese inhabitants of the Bonin Islands, then the U.S. Government would then hold title to the land, at which time a land officer representing the Navy would see that the land was surveyed and that the people that lived in these areas would be protected in their properties.

At this point Congressman ASPINALL read the bill passed by the Senate whereby $6 million would be paid to the Japanese Government for land rights in the Bonin Islands.

Congressman ASPINALL explained that the bill meant that as long as the U.S. Government maintained possession of the Bonin Islands that neither the Japanese Government or the Japanese nationals that were former residents of the Bonin Islands would have any claims against any of the property. In the event that the United States should enter into an agreement to turn the islands back to Japan then there would have to be some provision in that agreement as to the property rights of the Bonin Islanders that have returned and made their homes here.

Congressman SISK said that as he understood the wording of the bill that the payment of the $6 million would be nothing but payment for an indefinite use permit without any title at all, similar to the bill proposed in the Marshall Islands, maintaining the residual sovereignty of Japan, so that if the Japanese came back to these islands they could reclaim their lands without any reimbursement. He asked if he was right in interpreting the bill this way.

Congressman ASPINALL said that he was correct unless provision was made in the final agreement whereby the Bonin Islanders would be protected.

Congressman SISK said that he was pursuing this line of questioning to aid him in determining which position he would take when this legislation reached the House of Representatives. He said he had doubts as to whether the Japanese people had a legitimate claim to the $6 million for the land in view of the fact that the people presently living in the Bonin Islands had a claim due to prior settling of the islands. He asked when the Bonin Islanders were sent to Japan.

Jerry Savory told him that they were sent to Japan in 1944.

Congressman SISK asked if any of the members of the council owned land in the Bonin Islands at that time.

Frank Gonzales said that he owned the land that is presently known as Jack Williams Beach.

Congressman SISK asked if he now lived on that land.

Frank Gonzales said that he did not live on that land at the present.

The military government representative said that it appeared to him that even if provision was made in the final agreement for protection of the Bonin Islanders' property, they would be dependent upon the Japanese Government to honor the provision and would have to go through Japanese courts for that protection.

Congressman ASPINALL said that in his opinion they would be protected by international law and could go to the Hague Court of the United Nations for protection.

Congressman SISK said that if the Japanese broke the treaty, then it would fall under the jurisdiction of international law and would then have to be taken to the Hague court.

Congressman SISK asked that assuming this treaty was written into the present bill, and these islands were returned to Japan, if the Bonin Islanders were fearful of the Japanese not honoring the treaty.

Jerry Savory said that the majority of the Bonin Islands were, but they were especially concerned for the security of the younger generation. He said they all hoped the United States would keep the responsibility of the islands as long as possible.

Congressman INOUYE asked if the sentiments expressed by the Council were those of the people of the island.

Jerry Savory said that they were.

Congressman Aspinall asked approximately what percentage of the people were in favor of the United States retaining administrative control of the Bonin Islands.

Jerry Savory explained that in 1952 when a delegation of Bonin Islanders went to Washington that 100 percent of the people signed a petition stating they wanted the United States to retain control.

The military government representative polled the Council and asked that if they were asked to sign a petition now if the same percentage of people would sign.

Each member of the Council said they believed that 100 percent of the people would sign such a petition.

Congressman ASPINALL asked how the people would feel if the islands to the south were returned to Japan.

Jerry Savory said that he felt the people would be grateful if Haha Jima could be retained in view of the number of young people. He said he felt that they should have more area in which to settle and make their homes.

Congressman SISK asked how far Haha Jima was from Chi Chi Jima.

The military government representative explained that Haha Jima, a larger island than Chi Chi Jima was located 25 miles to the south.

Congressman SISK asked if there were any families presently living on Haha Jima.

The military government representative told him that the island is uninhabited at the present.

Jerry Savory said that if the United States could retain possession of Haha Jima, the large number of young people that will soon reach adulthood would then have a place to settle and make homes for themselves.

Congressman MCGINLEY said that he had heard that there was difficulty in the Bonin Islanders getting married and asked if someone would explain that situation to him.

Jerry Savory explained that due to the close relationship of the Bonin Islanders, that it was not desirable for them to intermarry. Therefore, the vast majority of the male population go to Japan to seek wives.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if the young females of the islands could go to Japan to seek husbands.

Jerry Savory said that although none had, that it was possible for them to do so.

Congressman ASPINALL asked that if they went to Guam or Japan and married, if they would be permitted to return to the Bonin Islands.

Jerry Savory told him that it would not only be possible, but they would be welcomed.

The military government representative explained there was one island woman married to a Saipanese and another to the principal of the school, a U.S. citizen from Hawaii, and that they were quite happy.

Congressman INOUYE asked if the Bonin Islanders were satisfied with their school system and medical facilities.

Rodrick Webb said that they were satisfied.

(NOTE.—The above transcription is but a portion of the minutes. No further minutes were recorded.)

RODRICK WEBB,
President, Bonin Islands Council.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to congratulate my esteemed friend, the distinguished gentleman from Colorado, and to commend him for his fine presentation. He has a thorough understanding of the problems at hand and has consistently shown deep concern for the security of our Nation and for our position in that part of the world. The gentleman from Colorado has presented in detail arguments why this legislation should be passed. I wish to thank him for his contribution.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is timely that S. 2130, which was passed by the other body unanimously, which was reported out by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs unanimously, and which was granted a rule by the Rules Committee unanimously, should come before us today. It is a bill of equity and good conscience, presenting Uncle Sam in the image of fairness and of honesty. It is just and meritorious.

I have said that its consideration today is timely. Only last week, on May 19, the treaty of mutual cooperation and security with the United States was approved by the Japanese House of Representatives after a bitter battle with Communists and neutralists. The Japanese House of Councilors still must give its concurrence. The great majority of the men and women of Japan I am sure have a friendly sentiment toward the United States, but there are elements that are seeking to undermine that sentiment of friendship. The prompt and I hope the unanimous passage of S. 2130 will remove one of the irritants that the enemies of the United States have been using in their propaganda.

Aside from my desire as a Member of the Congress of the United States to join with my colleagues in presenting to the world the image of Uncle Sam always as fair and honorable, I have a personal interest in the passage of this bill. At one time, a few years ago, I had the distinction of representing more Japanese-American constituents than any other Member of the House. That probably is not the case at the present time, but certainly there are not more than three or four congressional districts today in which more Japanese-Americans reside. Mrs. Mary Ono, of my staff at my Chicago office, was the first Japanese-American congressional secretary in the history of the Congress.

There are no finer or more stanchly loyal Americans than those of Japanese blood and descent. The parents of some of the Japanese-Americans in my district as well as in other districts came from the Bonin Islands and they with all Americans of Japanese ancestry are concerned with bettering relations with Japan in the interest of peace and prosperity in the Pacific.

I lunched last week with Shig Wakamatsu, national president of the Japanese American Citizens League, and I am proud to say one of my most distinguished constituents, Mike M. Masaoka, the popular and tireless Washington representative of the league, and John Yoshino. The conversation centered on S. 2130. They thought that the enactment of this legislation was long overdue. It is merely a matter of doing the right and the decent thing, not for the Government of Japan, but for human beings, men and women and children whose lands were taken for military use by our Government and who are in need due to their enforced dislocation. I trust the bill will pass unanimously.

Mr. Chairman, I am extending my remarks to include excerpts from a letter by Mr. Masaoka:

Although it has not been officially acted upon by the JACL because we have not had a Biennial National Convention since 1958, many of our members whose parents are from the Bonin Islands and many more of us Americans of Japanese ancestry, who are concerned with bettering cooperation and relations with Japan in the interests of peace and prosperity in the Pacific, are most assuredly for it.

The bill itself was passed unanimously by the Senate and reported unanimously by the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the House Rules Committee. It has the approval of the State and Defense Departments.

The bill simply corrects an inequity in our treatment of two former Japanese island chains in which residual sovereignty continues to be in Japan but whose administration remains, under the identical provision of the Treaty of Peace, with the U.S. Armed Forces. In the case of the Ryukyus, including Okinawa, Japanese nationals whose lands are used for military purposes by our Government are paid rentals. In the case of the Bonins, however, including Ogawasara, Japanese nationals whose lands are being used for military purposes by our Government have never received compensation of any kind whatsoever from the United States. Moreover, Japanese nationals who are former residents of these islands still are not permitted to return to their native home 15 years after the end of hostilities.

This legislation, long overdue, merely attempts to equalize the treatment accorded to Japanese nationals of both the Ryukyus and the Bonins. It provides authorization for the payment of $6 million to the Japanese Government for distribution to these

former residents of the Bonin Islands. To our mind, this is much too small an amount to be paid, but, since the Japanese Government has agreed to this sum we have no alternative at this time but to agree.

There are realities in the world today that make it more important than ever that we do everything possible to maintain cordial relations with Japan. This is the centennial of diplomatic relations between Japan and the United States. The Japanese House of Representatives approved only yesterday (May 19) the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security with the United States after a long and bitter battle with the Communists, leftists, and neutralists. The House of Councillors must still concur in that ratification. The Prime Minister of the Soviet Union last week threatened Japan, and other nations that allow us to base our planes on their territories, with annihilation by nuclear missiles. Neighboring Red China constantly and continuously tries to lure Japan away from the free world. The President of the United States is scheduled to visit Japan in about a month, while the Crown Prince and Princess of Japan are slated to return that good-will visit this fall. Surely, in the light of these circumstances, there can be no reason to deny the former Japanese residents of the Bonin Islands the same treatment in the use of their lands as we have done and are doing for the Japanese residents of the Ryukyus.

The amount is small, but the principle of discrimination that currently characterizes our consideration of the Japanese nationals of the Ryukyus and the Bonins looms large in the hearts and minds of all the Japanese people, not just those formerly resident in the Bonins. The former residents of these islands have conducted themselves with dignity through the past 15 years since the end of hostilities, even though they have and are suffering privations on the so-called Japanese mainland, never resorting to the undemocratic methods of the totalitarians and the Communists but constantly appealing through the democratic system of petition in the faith that American sense of fair play and good conscience would vindicate their gentlemanly procedures. Now that they are on the threshold of witnessing democracy in action correcting an injustice, we trust that the House of Representatives will not frustrate them and their dreams.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to pay to the Government of Japan a sum of $6,000,000. The payment of such sum shall constitute full satisfaction and settlement of all claims of Japanese nationals, formerly resident in the Bonin Islands, arising from the use, benefit, or exercise of property rights or interests in the Bonin Islands by the United States for security purposes, for the period beginning April 28, 1952, and continuing until such time as said use, benefit, or exercise is relinquished by the United States.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $6,000,000 to carry out the purpose of this Act.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Colorado seems to want to give the impression that this problem arises as the result of our conquest of the Bonin Islands. I want to reemphasize that this problem grows out of the Japanese evacuation of their own nationals from those islands at the start of the war and their subsequent fortification of the islands and then the military necessity for us to take the islands. So the problem does not grow out of our conquest of the islands as such. These were Japanese nationals who were removed by the Japanese Government and taken to Japan at the start of the war. The care of these people is basically a responsibility of the Japanese Government.

Now, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. In his opinion, will this set a precedent for future payments?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No, it will not set a precedent. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the reply made by the Assistant Secretary of State, J. Graham Parsons, to the very question I asked him publicly, which appears on page 6 of the hearings. I asked:

Are we setting a precedent for future claims in the Pacific?

And he answered:

We have not so foreseen it. There has been no other case that has come to my attention, in my time in the Department at least, where former residents have claimed that they should either be allowed to go back or that we should compensate them.

In other words, he said this would certainly not set a precedent.

Mr. GROSS. And, in the personal opinion of the gentleman from Wisconsin, we are not setting a precedent?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. On the basis of the testimony we have received, I can give the gentleman the unequivocal answer that we are not setting a precedent.

Mr. GROSS. Will Japan reimburse us when we leave the Bonin Islands if and when we no longer need this area for security purposes? In the opinion of the gentleman, will Japan reimburse us for the $6 million to be appropriated?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No, under the treaty negotiated with Japan, Japan certainly will not be repaying us the $6 million that we are actually giving to the Japanese Government for distribution to the Bonin Islanders who are no longer residents on the islands or permitted to return to the Bonin Islands.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman permit me to ask the sponsor of this legislation whether or not there was any testimony which would indicate that these Japanese nationals while on these islands in any way were helping the Japanese armed forces at the time our own young men were trying to capture those islands?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I will be very happy to answer the gentleman's question. I am sure, if the gentleman read the report, he would see that these former residents of the Bonin Islands were no longer on the islands at the time that we captured them and they were of no assistance to the Japanese either in holding the islands or in fighting our forces. They were evacuated and moved to Japan.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If that is the case, then I think the gentleman from Iowa certainly makes a very strong point. The fact is that these people were evacuated not as a result of any of our activities, but rather as a result of the activities of the Japanese Government, and yet we are being asked to compensate them for their loss.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. But the gentleman from Illinois should bear in mind that we are now preventing them from returning to these islands.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to apologize to the gentleman from Iowa personally. I was unavoidably detained. But does the gentleman think he needs a quorum or does it make no difference?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Michigan does not have to apologize to me for anything.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman think he should have a quorum? Do you need any help for this economy program that you have been on?

Mr. GROSS. No; the gentleman from Iowa is not interested in a quorum at this time, but he is interested in all the help he can get in behalf of economy and he knows be can depend upon the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JONES of Missouri, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2130) to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan, pursuant to House Resolution 532, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the legislation may extend their remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State

of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1157) to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1157, with Mr. JONES of Missouri in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is now recognized.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, although this bill, H.R. 1157, bears my name, it is actually one which not only is sponsored by the executive branch, and specifically the Army, but also has received the special attention of the Secretary of Defense, who not long ago urged by a letter to Mr. VINSON that the bill be given prompt consideration because of its importance. I might mention that the former Delegate from Hawaii, John A. Burns, who has known the Okinawan people so well, also sponsored this legislation.

A single sentence description of what the bill will do is that it will permit the retention in the Ryukyu Islands of funds which would be used in the Ryukyus for various governmental purposes.

The bill, however, required more detailed description of these funds and their use in the Ryukyus since there are at least three types of funds covered by the bill.

Section 2 of the bill deals with fines, fees, forfeitures, taxes, and other moneys received by the government of the Ryukyu Islands.

At this point, I would like to describe briefly what the government of the Ryukyu Islands is. It is headed by a chief executive who is appointed by the U.S. High Commissioner. The rest of the government, which is made up of mayors and other local governing officials and a unicameral legislature, are all elected officials. In section 2, it is this part of the government of the Ryukyus which is being referred to.

The funds received by the GRI, as it is called, are derived—as the bill indicates—from fines, fees, taxes, and so fourth. In 1960, it is estimated that they will total $22.4 million. These funds are now retained in the Ryukyus and with respect to them, the bill would provide specific legal sanction for this practice.

The section 2 funds are used today and would continue to be used for the cost involved in all of the normal functions of a national government except those pertaining to national defense and international political relations. These functions would, of course, include education, public health and welfare, public safety, public works and services, economic development, and general government.

The next group of funds involved in the bill are those which are the subject of section 3. These are funds which are derived by the U.S. civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands from the several sources set out in the bill itself, that is to say, public-benefit trusts, business type operations, corporations—wholly or partly owned by the civil administration, and from fines, fees, and forfeitures. These funds are estimated to total $3 million in 1960. They would be used for programs approved by the Federal Government for matters such as typhoon relief, aid to municipalities and other similar functions. The funds referred to in (a) and (b) of section 3 are, like the section 2 funds, now retained in the Ryukyus for expenditure for the purpose I have described.

The funds referred to in subsection (c) of section 3, however, now are deposited into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. This represents the smallest amount of funds involved in the bill being only about $50,000 for 1960.

Section 4: This section injects a new concept into the financing of activities in the Ryukyu Islands. The funds referred to in this section are Federal income taxes withheld from the pay of U.S. citizens in the Ryukyus. These funds now aggregate about $9 million annually. At the present time, of course, these taxes are covered into the U.S. Treasury. The Federal Government through the annual budgetary process, appropriates funds for the purposes set out in 4 (a) and (b), that is, promoting the economic development and improving the welfare of the people of the Ryukyus, and reimbursing the GRI for services performed by reason of our Armed Forces in the islands.

Under section 4, not to exceed $6 million in any fiscal year could be appropriated to the High Commisisoner of the Ryukyu Islands to be spent for the purposes stated in the section.

With respect to subsection (c) of section 4, I would like to point out that disaster relief funds, which have been provided by the United States up to this time, have been obtained by reprograming, with serious difficulty and delay, cash proceeds from Public Law 480 commodity sales in other parts of the world. Actually, commodity grants would be continued to be sought to meet the emergency food requirements but section 4(c) would provide funds for rehabilitation construction.

We all know that Okinawa and the Ryukyus generally are subject every year to devastating typhoons. And the care of the people and the rehabilitation of structures destroyed must be considered as an essential part of their fiscal administration.

The question quite naturally arises as to why present procedures of financing in the Ryukyus are not permitted to continue as in the past.

In the first place, the legal authority for the retention of those funds now kept in the Ryukyus is not absolutely clear, and legislation to render this authority clear is, therefore, necessary.

Section 4 of the bill, regardless of its reference to Federal income tax collections in the Ryukyus, is actually nothing more or less than a straight authorization for the appropriation of funds for the specific purposes stated in the section itself. These purposes are, generally, to promote the economy generally of the Ryukyu Islands, to reimburse the government of the Ryukyu Islands for services performed on account of the presence in the islands of our Armed Forces, and for emergency purposes relating to disasters, including typhoons, in that area.

It will be noted that the bill as submitted by the Department has been modified in several respects, the most important of which is through the insertion of language on page 3, lines 7 and 8, which render entirely clear that the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of the Congress will actively participate and, indeed, make all of the final decisions with respect to the funds that are appropriated under this section. The language that I am referring to is as follows: "within such limitations as may be provided hereafter in appropriations acts."

As the bill read prior to the committee's amendments, the language gave every appearance of actually appropriating funds. This action is not within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee. Ours is an authorizing committee. We have neither the desire nor the power to appropriate funds. The Appropriations Committees are the ones to make recommendations in this respect based upon a specific authorization which is being provided in this bill.

Perhaps more important than the specific legal reasons for enacting legislation of this kind is the very special relationship which exists between the people of the Ryukyus and our Government. The Ryukyus are, at least from a lay standpoint, a strange mixture of a foreign country and a country that is not foreign.

Under the treaty of peace with Japan, Japan retained what is called residual sovereignty. This term is extremely difficult to define, but I believe a fair statement of its practical effect is to give the United States complete control over all matters relating to the administration of these islands.

These rights are accompanied by responsibilities, and the responsibilities, too, are rather special in this instance, because, for one reason or another, the entire nonfree world has fastened a most interested eye on Okinawa and the rest of the Ryukyus and it has, therefore, become, as it has frequently been expressed, a showcase of democracy.

This bill will give legal sanction to the retention of essential moneys in the Ryukyus. It will establish a sound relationship, both fiscal and psychological, between those islands and this country—a relationship which all informed persons state to be of paramount importance.

At the recommendation of the Comptroller General, a new section 8 was added to the bill which would render certain that all the financial transactions of the U.S. civil administration in the Ryukyus shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950.

Because of questions which quite naturally arise with respect to section 4, I would like to deal with it in a little more detail at this time.

The language in section 4 is by no means unique. Section 4 adopts a policy which has general precedents in the case of the Philippine Islands and Puerto Rico in that in those two places, certain taxes were, and in the case of Puerto Rico are, for exactly the same reason as they would be in section 4.

In addition to these general precedents, there are very specific precedents in the case of the Virgin Islands and Guam. In the case of the Virgin Islands, all of the U.S. income taxes collected there are covered into the treasury of the Virgin Islands and held for use in the Virgin Islands.

In the case of Guam, all Federal income taxes are covered into the treasury of Guam and are for use in Guam.

So we are not embarking on anything brand new here.

I make particular note of these precedents only because of the somewhat unusual language of section 4. Actually, the bill by no means grants authority even remotely as broad as the previous acts of Congress relating to the Virgin Islands of Guam. In those cases, the taxes are actually covered into the local treasury. In the case of the Ryukyus, it is our intention only to indicate in a very general way that some funds are generated through income taxes in Okinawa and the Ryukyus and that within clearly defined limitations, a portion of these can be authorized for appropriation to the Ryukyus for use in that area for the purposes stated.

The authority previously granted for Guam and the Virgin Islands is very much broader than the bare basic authority which is being sought here. Appropriations must still be made under the language of section 4 of the bill. Since, as I indicated previously, the committee carefully amended the bill so as to require that the obligation and expenditure of any of the moneys in section 4 shall be "within such limitations as may be provided hereafter in appropriations acts."

Prior to the war, Okinawa and the rest of the Ryukyus were an integral part of Japan. Following Japan's surrender, they were treated as a separate and distinct territory for the purpose of occupancy. And the occupancy was not under allied authority but solely under American authority.

From 1945, when we took Okinawa by conquest, until 1952, our rights and responsibilities were those expressed in the Hague Convention of 1907 and later carried over to the Geneva Convention of 1949.

In 1952, we entered into a peace treaty with Japan. Under article III of that treaty, the United States obtained the right "to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants" of the Ryukyus. Japan retained only what is called residual sovereignty.

Because the islands are under the jurisdiction of the United States, they do not qualify for the generous benefits provided for free foreign governments under the Mutual Security Acts or other assistance programs. Neither do they receive the benefits which are accorded territorial and insular possessions of the United States.

Because of this peculiar relationship, which I have said is unique, we have assumed rather unusual responsibilities. One of the hardest of these responsibilities to convey as an idea is the importance of providing the Ryukyus with what I will call a reasonably assured source of revenue for necessary works in the islands and thereby give them a reasonably stable economy.

The committee language will have a strong psychological effect in that it will give strong evidence of our intentions to stay in the islands, help the local people, and provide a truly stable economy.

I think it will be of interest to the Members of the House to know that the Comptroller General has expressed his general agreement with the purposes of this bill in his letter dated March 30, 1959, addressed to the chairman of the full committee. The Comptroller General states:

> We agree that legislation such as that contained in H.R. 1157 is desirable in order to provide a basis in law for the programs referred to therein. Furthermore, the provisions of section 3(b) would serve to remove any doubt as to the authority of the United States Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands to create corporations wholly or partly owned or controlled by the Civil Administration which might arise by reason of section 304 of the Government Corporation Control Act.

I have already referred to the Comptroller General's other recommendation with respect to insuring his right to audit the accounts of the High Commissioner.

The one objection which the Comptroller General set out in this letter has, I think, been adequately disposed of through the insertion of language in section 4 which renders entirely clear the fact that the Appropriations Committees and the Congress generally will participate actively in any appropriations made for Okinawa and the Ryukyus pursuant to this section.

The bill is a sound one and is one which has been long needed in order to provide a sound legislative basis for our operations in the Ryukyus. I urge prompt and favorable consideration of the bill as a necessary step toward the proper maintenance of what is without doubt the most important military installation of our country in the Far East.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman mentioned residual sovereignty. Does not Japan have residual sovereignty over the Ryukyus?

Mr. PRICE. Yes; it does.

Mr. GROSS. Do we have residual sovereignty over Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and other islands that the gentleman mentioned?

Mr. PRICE. The real point is how long we are going to be in the Ryukyus. The indications are we are going to be in the Ryukyus for many, many years.

Mr. GROSS. But is there a real comparison as between the Ryukyus and the other islands you have mentioned?

Mr. PRICE. At the present time, I would say that there is.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1157 has but two purposes. The first of these is to provide clear legislative authority for the retention in the Ryukyu Islands of funds which are today retained in the islands and used for governmental purposes there.

The second purpose which the bill will serve is to provide a legislative basis for the making of appropriations for certain essential programs in the Ryukyu Islands.

Now, what is our interest in Okinawa and the other Ryukyu Islands? Well, it is simply this.

We took Okinawa and the other islands during World War II—took them by combat. At that time, the islands were an integral part of Japan.

At the time of the peace treaty with Japan which was ratified by the Senate on April 28, 1952, Okinawa and the other islands were separated from Japan for all administrative purposes.

Article 3 of the treaty between this country and Japan provided that Japan would concur in any proposal of the United States to the United Nations to place these islands under its trusteeship with the United States as the sole administering authority, and that pending such disposition "the United States will have the right to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants of these islands."

Under the treaty, Japan did not renounce all right, title, or claim to the islands but it did confer upon the United States what could be called de facto sovereignty.

Ever since that time, there have been really two governments in the Ryukyus. One of them is the GRI, or the Government of the Ryukyu Islands, and the other is our own High Commissioner who is appointed by the Secretary of Defense and who exercises administrative control over the islands.

The Government of the Ryukyu Islands is the local government and is composed completely of people of the Ryukyus.

The GRI is headed by a chief executive who is appointed by the High Commissioner after consultation with representatives of the local legislature. The local legislature consists of a single

House of 29 members who are elected biannually by the various districts in the islands.

Now, the government of the Ryukyu Islands functions in most respects like any local government notwithstanding the fact that the High Commissioner exercises a great deal of veto power over their actions. In the process of running their government, the Ryukyuans, of course, have to provide for the public health, schools, road construction, sanitation, and all of the other things any local government must concern itself with.

In order to carry out these activities, it, of course, must have funds. These funds are derived from the normal sources such as taxes, fees, fines, and such. These will total about $22.5 million for this year. This is their money and they spend it on the governmental functions that I have described.

Now, it is section 2 of the bill which deals with the government of the Ryukyu Islands, the funds which it collects from taxes and so forth and spends for governmental purposes. This money, of course, is all retained in the islands and under the bill will continue to be retained in exactly the same fashion. The reason for section 2 is to give sound legislative authority for the situation which presently exists under the authority of the treaty with Japan. Section 2 does not change anything. It merely gives an existing situation a firm basis in legislative authority.

Section 3 of the bill deals with what I will call the extension of our own Government in the Ryukyus. This is the government headed by the High Commissioner who is also the military commander. His organization also derives certain funds from its governmental activities. These activities are set out in section 3 and include public benefit trusts, business type operations, corporations, fines, fees, and so forth. These will total about $3 million this year.

Now, these funds—except for about $50,000—are today retained in the Ryukyus and are used for those aspects of the High Commissioner's governmental operations.

So, again, section 3, except in a very minor respect, relating to about $50,000 a year, does not change the existing situation at all but does in this instance, too, give a sound legislative basis for a situation which has existed many years. Here, also, the source of the authority so far has been the treaty between our Government and Japan.

Section 4 of the bill, although it might appear on its face to be somewhat unusual, is nothing but legislative authority which will serve as a basis for the making of appropriations by the Congress in an amount not to exceed $6 million each year for the purposes enumerated in the bill itself. That is to say, promoting the economic development of the islands, reimbursing the government of the Ryukyu Islands for services performed for our Armed Forces, and emergency purposes relating to typhoons or other disasters in the islands.

Now, that is all that the bill does. It merely provides sound, well considered basic authority for what is going on today on the one hand and providing clear legislative authority for the making of appropriations for the purposes I have just described.

I have thought it unnecessary to deal with our prime interest in Okinawa and the other islands since this is a matter well known to the Members of this House. It is our most important military base in the Far East and one in which we have invested a very great amount of money. We have been there for a good many years and we will be there for a good many more years to come. Everyone from the President down agrees to this fact and for those who would wish to see from official statements to this effect, I will refer them to pages 9, 10, and 11 of the committee report which provides abundant support for our continued tenure in that part of the world.

This bill is wholly sound legislation and has the approval of the responsible civilian and military officials of the Department of Defense and of the Bureau of the Budget.

I urge support of this bill as one additional step toward the maintenance of our defensive and offensive military power in the Far East.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], the chairman of the committee that handled this legislation.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to use the 5 minutes because the bill has been well explained by the two gentlemen from Illinois.

When this bill came to our subcommittee I was a little bit worried about it, but the committee went into it thoroughly. After studying it, I felt that it was something that should have been done several years ago because under the present procedure, as you can see from reading the bill and the report and the hearings, they are using these funds received from taxes, fines, and forfeitures without authority from the Congress or without any auditing by the General Accounting Office. This bill requires that they get authority from the Appropriations Committee and it also requires auditing by the General Accounting Office.

The income from these funds runs to something like $9 million a year. Of course the people out there wanted, I believe, $7 or $8 million. We authorized $6 million and put the control back in the hands of the Congress, where it should have been in the beginning. Not only does this have to be handled by the Committee on Appropriations but also checked by the General Accounting Office, which is nothing but sound procedure.

If you will refer to the map on the back of the report and look at the position of Okinawa and the Ryukyus and their strategic position, I believe you will agree that they are the most important islands we are holding today in this troubled world. I do not think we can change that very much at the present time.

Another important factor is that this particular area has the highest density of population of any place in the world. I believe it is 1,000 people or more to every square mile, which is a very high density of population in a section like that. So it is important that we try to stabilize and at least help them as much as they were helped by the Japanese Goverment, because they were appropriating money there to take care of the population before we ever took the islands. So in effect it is what has been done there for many years.

If you will look at the hearings at page 3997, you will notice this is one place that we have been reducing the cost. It has gone down and down every year. We are not spending anywhere near the $6 million and we will not spend that this year. I believe it is something like $1,500,000 or $2 million this year that has been agreed to by the High Commissioner and the authorities there to be spent. So, all in all, I think this bill is a good bill. I think it is a sound measure and one that is in the interest of our national security. We feel this is the right thing to do in the treatment of these people. Also, I think in the long run we are getting out much cheaper than we are getting out in many other parts of the world. The people are growing in stability and they are growing in economic wealth. They are trying to do something and they are doing something. I believe their total budget expenditure runs to something like $30 million a year.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois, Do I understand correctly that the Ryukyu Islands are being administered under a United Nations trusteeship?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. No. They are being administered by the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Does the United Nations have anything to do with the administration of the Ryukyus?

Mr. PRICE. No.

Mr. GROSS. I thought somebody said the United Nations was involved.

Mr. PRICE. You may be referring to the statement in the report on the bill which reads as follows:

> Under the terms of article 3 of the treaty, Japan agreed that it would concur in any proposal of the United States to the U.N. to place these islands, as well as certain others, under its trusteeship with the United States as sole administering authority and that pending such disposition "the United States will have the right to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants of these islands."

Mr. GROSS. What have we been paying for the administration of the Ryukyus out of the U.S. Treasury?

Mr. PRICE. Since 1947 we have been appropriating as high as $50 million, down to a million dollars a year.

Mr. GROSS. Is that for the civil administration of the islands?

Mr. PRICE. Yes, and all the matters connected with such administration.

Mr. GROSS. Does that include the building of a powerplant, or was there anything extraordinary involved in the way of expenditure where the figure was $50 million?

Mr. PRICE. This is all for the purposes set out in the bill, including "promoting the economic development of the Ryukyu Islands and improving the welfare of the inhabitants thereof; reimbursing the government of the Ryukyu Islands for services performed for the benefit of and by reason of the presence of the Armed Forces of the United States within the Ryukyu Islands, including but not limited to reimbursement for such services in the fields of public health and safety," and so on.

Mr. GROSS. This is interesting. How did that come from $50 million down to $1 million?

Mr. PRICE. Immediately after the war great expenditure had to be made because of the great devastation there.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, the tax revenue from the natives or local citizens has increased to make up the difference?

Mr. PRICE. That is part of it.

Mr. GROSS. Where else do we divert income tax money as proposed in this bill?

Mr. PRICE. I have a whole list of places here. We did it in the Philippines; we do it in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, Samoa, and we do it in many other instances. There are at least 20 or 25 instances where we have done it. They are fully listed in the report and in the hearings on this bill.

Mr. GROSS. We have sufficient American citizens there to accumulate $6 million in Federal income taxes?

Mr. PRICE. They collect more than that; they collect on an average of $9 million a year in income taxes alone.

Mr. GROSS. That is paid mostly by military personnel, is it not?

Mr. PRICE. Almost all. There are a few American businessmen there, but mostly it is military.

Mr. GROSS. There are more people there than I suspected.

Mr. PRICE. Yes; it is one of our biggest and most important installations in the Far East.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. I would remind the gentleman that this bill provides a sound legislative basis for our operations in the Ryukyus. This bill also places a limit of $6 million on any annual appropriation; they cannot exceed that.

Mr. GROSS. Then do I understand correctly that the expenditures must be approved by the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct; we appropriate it here in Congress, and the authorization for that is in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. There is no other way by which the appropriations can be made?

Mr. DURHAM. No; and the activities dealt with in section 3 have to be audited by the General Accounting Office, I might mention.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the exercise by the President of the authority over the Ryukyu Islands granted the United States by article 3 of the treaty of peace with Japan, every effort shall be made to improve the welfare and well-being of the inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands and to promote their economic and cultural advancement, during such time as the United States continues to retain authority over the Ryukyu Islands.

SEC. 2. All fines, fees, forfeitures, taxes, assessments, and any other revenues received by the Government of the Ryukyu Islands shall be covered into the treasury of the Ryukyu Islands and shall be available for expenditure by the Government of the Ryukyu Islands.

SEC. 3. Revenues derived by the United States civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands from the following sources shall be deposited in separate funds, which are hereby authorized to be established by the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands, and shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with annual budget programs approved by the President:

(a) Public-benefit trusts, business-type operations, funds, and enterprises established by the civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands, or its predecessor agencies;

(b) Corporations wholly or partly owned by the civil administration of the Ryukyu Island; and

(c) Fines, fees, and forfeitures received by the civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands.

SEC. 4. Beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury shall ascertain, from information furnished by the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands, the amount of Federal income taxes withheld at the source during the fiscal year, under the internal revenue laws of the United States, from persons stationed or employed in the Ryukyu Islands. An amount equivalent to that so determined, less the estimated amount of refunds and credits, and not to exceed $6,000,000 in any fiscal year, is hereby appropriated to the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands. Such appropriations shall be credited to a separate account to be established by the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands, and shall be available for obligation and expenditures, in accordance with programs approved by the President, for: (a) promoting the economic development of the Ryukyu Islands and improving the welfare of the inhabitants thereof; (b) reimbursing the Government of the Ryukyu Islands for services performed for the benefit of and by reason of the presence of the Armed Forces of the United States within the Ryukyu Islands, including but not limited to reimbursement for such services in the fields of public health and safety, in annual amounts which may be paid in advance to the Government of the Ryukyu Islands; and (c) emergency purposes related to typhoons or other disasters in the Ryukyu Islands. Preference shall be given to programs in which the Government of the Ryukyu Islands participates by sharing part of the costs of contributing other resources. Any unobligated balance in the account in excess of $6,000,000 at the end of any fiscal year shall be transferred and paid over to the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated by the Congress of the United States such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

SEC. 6. The term "Ryukyu Islands," as used in this Act, means Nansei Shoto south of twenty-nine degrees north latitude, excluding the islands in the Amami Oshima group with respect to which all rights and interests of the United States under article 3 of the Treaty of Peace with Japan have been relinquished to Japan.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to extend the application of any law of the United States to the Ryukyu Islands which would not otherwise be applicable there.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, line 2, strike the word "appropriated" and insert the words "set aside".

On page 3, line 3, strike the word "appropriations" and insert the word "credits".

On page 3, line 4, strike the words "credited to" and insert the words "kept in".

On page 3, line 6, following the comma after "expenditure" insert the following: "within such limitations as may be provided hereafter in appropriations acts".

On page 3, line 20, strike "of" and insert "or".

Page 4, following line 12, insert a new section 8 as follows:

"SEC. 8. All financial transactions of the United States civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands, including such transactions of all agencies or instrumentalities established or utilized by such administration, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950, as amended. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files, and all other papers, things or property belonging to or in use by such administration, agencies or instrumentalities, and necessary to facilitate the audit. This section does not apply to the Government of the Ryukyu Islands."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JONES of Missouri, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1157) to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands, pursuant to House Resolution 533, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

BENT'S OLD FORT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6851) authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Bent's Old Fort near La Junta, Colo.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6851) with Mr. EVINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Thursday, May 19 last, the committee amendment had been agreed to and all debate under the 5-minute rule on the bill and all amendments thereto was limited to 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is legislation that would authorize the addition of Bent's Old Fort as a historic site of the national park system. This project has been given satisfactory approval by those having the responsibility for determining the values of such historic places. They have suggested that the legislation is worth while and that this particular facility would fit nicely into our national park system. We debated the legislation at some length last Thursday. I sincerely hope that the bill receives the approval of the House.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill which establishes Bent's Old Fort as a national historic site is a meritorious bill. This legislation has a favorable report from the Department of the Interior, and was unanimously reported by the Subcommittee on Public Lands, and by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Mr. Chairman, this site was checked by the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, and was approved by the Board for designation as a national historic site. As I mentioned in the debate on this bill last week, I feel that Bent's Old Fort has such historical significance and importance that it is entitled to this consideration.

I have tried to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that it may be possible for the Federal Government to acquire the additional land adjacent to the site without cost. I shall certainly do what I can to obtain this land for the National Park Service without expense to the Government.

I again urge the House to pass this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Has all time expired on this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired, and, under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EVINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 6851, pursuant to House Resolution 509, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously made in the House, further proceedings on this bill will go over until Wednesday.

Does the gentleman insist on his point of order under those circumstances?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, Mr. Speaker; I insist on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman just make the point of order that a quorum is not present?

Mr. GROSS. I am objecting to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There is no unanimous consent that we do not have a yea-and-nay vote on it; is there?

The SPEAKER. There has been such in the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In the House?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I understood that applied only to a certain day. I did not understand it applied forever, to all yea-and-nay votes.

The SPEAKER. The unanimous-consent agreement was entered into late last week that that would obtain today and tomorrow.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is to say, there is no way to get a yea-and-nay vote on any of these bills if they come up today?

The SPEAKER. Not today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Or tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. Or tomorrow.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, that is certainly a strange sort of unanimous-consent proposition.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] withdraw his point of no quorum?

Mr. GROSS. No, Mr. Speaker; I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the vote will go over until Wednesday. If the gentleman insists on his point of order of no quorum, it will have no effect except to get a quorum, but there will not be any vote on the bill.

Mr. GROSS. With that understanding, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of no quorum.

LAND TO CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NATIONAL MONUMENT, FLA.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8226) to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 8226, with Mr. EVINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Thursday last, May 19, committee amendments had been agreed to. All debate on the bill and all amendments thereto were limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this bill refers to improvements in one of our best and most visited facilities of the National Park Service. The old fort at St. Augustine, Fla., is involved. The proposed improvements are necessary so that the old and renewed place can be visited easily and receive the attention by the visiting public that it deserves. This legislation is necessary and timely. I trust that my colleagues will give their unanimous support to the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EVINS, Chairman of the Committee

of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8226) to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida, pursuant to House Resolution 510, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INACCURATE STATEMENTS ON FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial and a news feature article published in this morning's issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald make such inaccurate and distorted statements relative to me with reference to the appropriation for foreign aid—and at a time when truth and objectivity are especially needed in dealing with public affairs—that I believe it is well for me to remind the House at this time that these misrepresentations are groundless, completely without foundation in fact.

I have for a number of years been, and now am, the target of a barrage of uninformed attacks and unwarranted pressures, emanating from many and varied sources, both from within and from without the Government. So I say to you now that I can, and will, prove the validity of my stand—even to the doubting ones, if they will only listen—when the foreign aid appropriation bill for fiscal 1961 is brought to the House floor.

My position on foreign aid needs no defense; it needs only to be understood. I have lived with this monstrosity as chairman of the subcommittee handling the money bill for 6 turbulent years, and for 2 additional years prior to that as a member of the subcommittee. If those in high authority would only find the time to listen patiently, with open minds, while unrefuted facts are revealed, they would then readily admit that the amount of funds requested should be drastically and permanently reduced.

There are numerous instances in which we are now supporting governments that are operating with substantial surpluses; and the only justification offered is that we are giving this money not for economic reasons, but for political purposes. It is admitted that we are being subjected to political blackmail.

Many programs and literally hundreds of projects are being started for which no testimony has ever been presented, justification made, or authorization given by or before the committees of the Congress. Some of these undertakings commit us as far ahead as 1975 with obligations which, if carried to a conclusion, would require the expenditure of tens of billions of dollars.

When the bill is brought to the House floor for debate, I will do my best to acquaint the Members and the public with as many phases as I can, within the time limitations, of many of the deplorable conditions prevailing. Meantime, I urge that the Members personally study the thousands of printed pages of the record of our subcommittee's hearings, copies of which should be available by month's end.

There is nothing personal, Mr. Speaker, about my efforts to reduce the spending for foreign aid which, in all of its phases, is costing our country considerably more than $10 billion a year; but I am convinced that just as surely as night follows day, this program will wreck the economic structure and future well-being of our Nation if allowed to continue unchecked and uncontrolled. My conclusions are based upon factual evidence, and not the unsupported wishes of dreamers and schemers.

I stand on this statement, and can prove its validity. I am confident that I will so prove it when the bill is considered by the House.

May I request your further indulgence in order to express my belief that as long as there is world tension there will be incidents which cause emotional upsets. The knowledge that this is so should fortify us, I believe, in our position that unjustified, unproductive funds, wastefully used, should not be provided for worldwide spending programs. We should guard at all times, and particularly so now, against letting our emotions commit us to poorly planned and unrealistic undertakings.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, once again the question of Federal aid for education has been brought to a focal point of attention. As in past years, there are many individuals and groups pressuring the Congress to enact legislation and appropriate large sums for aid to our public schools. And, as in past years, their thesis is that problems which now face American education are of such magnitude that they can be solved only by a substantial investment of Federal money.

The matter has been discussed and legislation attempted at several sessions since I came to Congress in 1953. I shall not attempt to enumerate the bills that have been proposed in past sessions, before or since I came to Congress, nor shall I cite their fate. Suffice to say that several hundred bills were introduced over the period from 1871 to 1949, to authorize Federal financial assistance for the general support of elementary and secondary schools. A few succeeded in passing either the Senate or the House, but none was ever enacted into law. In more recent years, the Federal aid bills have shifted emphasis to school construction. This is true of H.R. 10128 soon to be considered by the House. If enacted, this would serve only as a prelude to additional Federal aid for teachers' salaries and other educational purposes. In fact, during this session, the Senate passed, on February 4, S. 8, an act "to authorize Federal financial assistance for school construction and teachers' salaries" following almost 3 days of continuous debate, and this bill is now before the House Committee on Education and Labor. One need only read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 2, 3, and 4 to see the interest and diversity of opinion which the question of Federal aid to education has aroused in the other body. The matter is of equal interest in the House, where we are now ready to consider same.

Emerging from the testimony to date on this very important subject is the fact that proponents and opponents of Federal aid for education equally share the desire for a public school system in America which shall be second to none. The method of securing and maintaining such a system seems to be the very crux of the question. There are wide variations as to the extent of need.

Proponents of Federal aid urge forcefully that only by substantial Federal grants can the Nation's schools be maintained and prepared to serve the present generation adequately while readying future generations for their respective responsibilities in a space age.

Mr. Chairman, I propose, if given the opportunity when we discuss H.R. 10128, to offer an amendment which I believe would provide substantial assistance to the schools of our Nation and which would eliminate once and for all the threats implied by and inherent in Federal control of an educational system.

My amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That 1 per centum of all income taxes collected on individual and corporate income under Federal statutes shall be deemed to be revenue for the State or Territory within which it is collected, for use, for educational purposes only, without any Federal direction, control, or interference.

"SEC. 2. District directors of internal revenue are hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the treasurer, or corresponding official, of the State or Territory within which their respective internal revenue districts are situated, at the end of each quarter, an amount equal to 1 per centum of the taxes from individual and corporate income collected within such State or Territory during said quarter.

"SEC. 3. For purposes of information only, district directors of internal revenue shall report the amounts transferred to State treasurers, or corresponding officials, as authorized in section 2, to the Department of the Treasury, accompanying such report with receipts from the proper State officials verifying the amounts received."

I consider myself among those who have an overwhelming fear of Federal control of education. It is my sincere belief that magnificent progress has been made in the past decade to overcome deficiencies that developed in our public school system over the war years, and I believe we have the most all-inclusive and representative system of education in the world. Having said this, I would add that there is still room for improvement, and that improvement lies in avenues which finances alone cannot reach.

This Congress, in my opinion, must act wisely in the evolution of Federal aid programs, and must look beyond immediate education needs into the far future. Such a forward look can reveal only one picture if we promote an unwise program of Federal financing of education: there will inevitably follow a gradual loss of State and local responsibility for the schools, with a consequent gradual gain of control over the schools and their programs by a centralized body.

In laying the predicate for my amendment, I should like to review as briefly as possible some of the more controversial aspects of the question of Federal aid for educational purposes so that it may be clearly seen in what respects my proposal differs from others that have been introduced on this important subject, and the manner in which I believe hitherto irreconcilable issues may be reconciled.

Among the first questions raised in regard to Federal aid to education are:

First. What is the extent of Federal responsibility for education under the provisions of the U.S. Constitution?

Second. What is the extent of State responsibility under the State constitution?

Third. What precedent do we have for or against Federal aid for educational purposes?

First. Answering the first of these questions, there is nothing in the U.S. Constitution which makes education a Federal function. We are a Nation of 50 sovereign and independent States operating under a Constitution which reserves to them or the people thereof all powers not delegated to the Central Government. To embark on a program of Federal subsidization of education is tantamount to abandoning the principle of States rights and ignoring the constitutional provision that "powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

Second. Nearly all State constitutions have education clauses making public education the concern and responsibility of the State and local communities thereof.

Third. Proponents of Federal aid support their views by pointing to "historical precedents" for such action including the passage of the Morrill Land-Grant College Act; the Smith-Hughes Act for vocational education; the national school lunch program; assistance to schools in federally impacted areas; the GI bills for World War II and Korean war veterans; and, more recently, the National Defense Education Act. They argue that these programs have operated with a minimum of Federal control and with maximum efficiency and contend that the principle for Federal educational aid having already been established, the enactment of additional legislation at this time looking toward alleviating the national education needs would in no way violate our Constitution nor invite Federal controls with unfavorable consequences.

What the proponents fail to observe is that the foregoing programs have not been related to general education, but rather to grants of land or money for the development of certain study areas, for child health programs, or to fulfill definite responsibilities which were a direct result of Federal activity. The Federal Congress has resisted for nearly a century other types of Federal aid legislation which might directly or indirectly influence the minds and thinking of American youth. In this respect, I fervently pray that the Congress will continue to resist.

Next, we come to questions relating to the financing of school needs such as, first, do the States have the fiscal capacity to take care of school needs?

Second. What resources does the Federal Government have which are beyond the reach of the States?

Third. Which has expanded its indebtedness and tax collection more within the past 30 years—the Federal Government or the State and local governments?

First. In response to the first question, proponents of Federal aid claim that schools are woefully underfinanced and that States and local communities are either unwilling or cannot provide adequate taxation to meet ever-growing needs; that only by intervention of the Federal Government, with its superior taxing powers, will a sufficient share of the Nation's income be allocated to educational needs, and thus avert a national calamity.

Recent statistics of the U.S. Office of Education show that in the past two decades enrollments in educational institutions increased 56 percent while educational expenditures increased 642 percent. In considering these figures we must be mindful of the fact that during the period prices more than doubled, but even then a 56 percent enrollment was accompanied by an increase in educational expenditures of 253 percent computed in dollars of constant purchasing power. The comparative tabulation follows:

Educational expenditures and enrollment, 1940–60

School year	Expenditures	Enrollment
	Thousands	
1939–40	$3,199,593	29,751,203
1949–50	8,795,635	31,319,271
1955–56	16,811,651	39,103,059
1959–60	24,000,000	46,480,000
	Percent	*Percent*
Increase, 1940–60	642	56

The percent of national income devoted to education has increased from 3.7 percent in 1930 to 6 percent in 1960, with expenditures for education increasing from $3.2 billion for the school year 1929–30 to $22 billion for the school year 1958–59, a net increase of 580 percent. By contrast, national income increased for the same period from $87.8 billion to $366.2 billion, a net increase of 317 percent. The comparative tabulations follow:

Educational expenditures and national income, 1929–58

	Calendar year 1929 or school year 1929–30	Calendar year 1958 or school year 1958–59	Increase
Expenditures for education	*Billions* $3.2	*Billions* $22.0	*Percent* +580
National income	87.8	366.2	+317
Educational expenditures as percent of national income	*Percent* 3.7	*Percent* 6.0	

These figures would seem to indicate an almost phenomenal support of education according to our traditional State and local pattern. Since the end of World War II, the American people have spent $19 billion for public-school buildings. They have spent this, moreover, with very little Federal aid—only $300 million, or less than 2 percent, has been provided by the U.S. Government, which has gone largely for buildings in federally impacted areas.

I am exceedingly proud of the achievements of my own State of Florida where great educational gains have been noted along with other types of growth. I should like to insert in the RECORD a table showing the expenditures of the State of Florida for public education from kindergarten to 2 years on the junior college level, from 1955–56 to 1958–59, and estimates for the biennium 1959–61. The figures show that State and county expenditures for public schools in 1956 amounted to nearly $185 million whereas the estimated expenditures for 1961, that is the last year of the biennium, will be approximately $374 million. You will note that in a period of 5 years the expenditures have doubled. I say this is a remarkable record. This is a record that shows how my great State of Florida has decided, in every way it knows how, to accept its just and proper responsibility in the field of public education. I am sure most of the other States have a comparable significant record of achievement.

State of Florida: State and county expenditures for public schools (grades K–14) 1955–56 to 1958–59 and estimates for the biennium 1959–61

	Actual expenditures				Appropriations and estimated expenditures	
	1955–56	1956–57	1957–58	1958–59	1959–60	1960–61
Operations:						
Minimum foundation program, public schools:						
Instructional salaries	$73,494,358	$80,050,317	$104,251,934	$106,391,602	$118,423,914	$128,392,813
Transportation	3,808,810	3,901,858	4,230,371	4,276,402	4,298,605	4,525,933
Other current expense	7,349,426	7,977,906	8,872,721	11,866,435	9,950,475	10,761,663
Total, minimum foundation program, public schools	84,652,594	91,930,081	117,355,026	122,534,439	132,672,994	143,680,409
Minimum foundation program, junior colleges:						
Instructional salaries	(1)	(1)	1,090,049	1,925,259	2,924,117	3,813,900
Other current expense	(1)	(1)	187,513	350,630	477,415	622,931
Total, minimum foundation program, junior colleges	(1)	(1)	1,277,562	2,275,889	3,400,532	4,436,831
Minimum foundation program, State supervisory service	132,819	136,891	158,080	168,700	203,450	203,450
Minimum foundation program, sales tax distribution to county schools (to enable counties to match State salary and building funds)	0	0	18,000,000	16,633,636	21,078,794	21,493,926
Purchase of textbooks	1,859,432	2,340,450	2,290,872	2,635,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Public school driver educational fund	0	410,749	559,094	649,500	701,970	777,570
Total State funds for operations	86,644,845	94,818,171	139,640,634	144,897,164	160,557,740	173,092,186
Capital outlay:						
Minimum foundation program, $400 per unit from motor vehicle license fees:						
Public schools	10,360,028	11,945,673	13,012,607	14,165,560	15,079,264	16,891,200
Junior colleges	(1)	(1)	115,980	212,472	259,920	347,200
Additional capital outlay, $200 per pupil increase in ADA	0	0	11,479,602	10,054,243	14,140,000	13,360,000
Additional junior college capital outlay	4,197,652	0	2,003,586	2,529,582	5,540,971	(2)
Total, State funds for capital outlay	14,557,680	11,945,673	26,611,775	26,961,857	35,021,155	30,598,400
Total State funds for public schools and junior colleges	101,202,525	106,763,844	166,252,409	171,859,021	195,577,895	203,690,586
County effort:						
Minimum foundation requirement	21,677,389	23,167,955	26,086,067	31,469,695	38,462,538	42,308,793
Additional county effort	61,908,409	72,214,290	85,485,294	98,530,305	117,537,462	127,691,207
Total, county effort	83,585,798	95,382,245	111,571,361	130,000,000	156,000,000	170,000,000
Total, support of Florida public schools and junior colleges	184,788,323	202,146,089	277,823,770	301,859,021	351,577,895	373,690,586

[1] Junior college funds were included in minimum foundation program-public schools calculations prior to 1957–58.
[2] For biennium.

Source: Budget Director's Office, July 7, 1959.

The State superintendent of public instruction for Florida, in commenting on the 1959 legislative actions, stated:

Financing of public schools was given top priority throughout the session, and an examination of the entire scope of the legislative action pertaining to public schools indicates that education received fair and equitable treatment by the 1959 legislature. The needs of grades 1–12 in the minimum foundation program were met in full, as requested and estimated by the State department of education. No program was eliminated and no program was cut below its current level.

State matching funds for school construction were increased. Additional construction was provided for existing community junior colleges and provision was made for starting needed new community junior colleges * * *.

Allocation of teacher training scholarships was placed on an up-to-date enrollment basis. The summer enrichment program was broadened to include the teaching of academic subjects * * *.

And, equally as important, no legislation which would be considered harmful or detrimental to the future of the public free school system was enacted into law.

To the above, I should like to add that the combined annual budgets for the institutions of higher learning in the State of Florida for the identical periods increased commensurately, as shown by the following figures:

The combined operating expenditures of State supported institutions of higher learning for 1955–56 amounted to $28,194,172. Budgeted for 1960–61 are $50,525,884, an overall increase of $22,331,712. These figures are exclusive of auxiliary enterprises, debt service on revenue certificates or building construction. This is nearly a 90 percent increase in 4 years.

Second. The second portion of the larger question of finances relating to resources of the Federal Government may be answered simply: The Government, of itself, has no funds beyond those which it extracts from taxpayers. Federal aid would merely mean a substitution of the tax collecting power from the States and/or local governments to the Central Government. All money comes from taxpayers.

Third. In regard to the third phase of the question, namely, "which has expanded its indebtedness and tax collection more in recent years—the Federal or State and local governments?" comparative data indicate that Federal taxes increased more steeply, are now leveled at far higher rates, and have become more burdensome than State and local taxes.

Federal taxes multiplied 20 times between 1927 and 1958, State and local taxes 5 times. The following figures illustrate the relative increase:

Federal, State, and local taxes for the period 1927–58

	Federal taxes	State and local taxes
	Billions of dollars	
1927	$3.4	$6.1
1958	68.0	30.4

Federal, State, and local taxes for the period 1927–58—Continued

	Federal taxes	State and local taxes
	Percent of national income	
1927	4.1	7.4
1958	18.6	8.3

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Historical Summary of Governmental Finances in the United States, 1959"; "Governmental Finances in 1958, 1959."

And the following table illustrates the relative debt situation:

Federal, State, and local debt for the period 1927–58

	Federal debt	State and local debt
	Billions of dollars	
1927	$18.5	$14.9
1958	276.4	58.2
	Percent of national income	
1927	22.6	18.2
1958	75.5	15.9

Source: "Federal Debt," report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1958. "State and Local Debt," American Enterprise Association, Inc., Report No. 1, Jan. 15, 1960, pp. 32–33.

In brief, the Federal debt multiplied 15 times between 1927 and 1958, the State and local debt only 4 times. State and local debt declined as a percent of na-

tional income while the burden of the Federal debt multiplied more than three times.

It is claimed that the national debt of the United States now exceeds the combined national debts of all the nations of the world. Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, it would seem the height of folly to add to the tax burden of the Nation at this time. We should all bear in mind this statement by Chief Justice Marshall:

The power to tax is the power to destroy.

Closely allied to the foregoing major points in the general discussion of finances is this: Is resistance to higher taxes caused by the increasing burdens of Federal taxes or of State and local taxes?

The heavy burden of Federal taxes has certainly adversely affected the fiscal capacity of State and local governments. Federal taxes have preempted the tax field and severely limited the income of State and local governments. As verification for this statement, I call attention to the results of a questionnaire sent out in May 1959 by Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, to Governors of States and territories, in conjunction with the committee's consideration of H.R. 22, School Support Act of 1959. The questionnaire and replies formed a supplemental committee report on H.R. 22. Five questions were asked by the chairman which were deemed pertinent to the problem of financing education. In my opinion, and in the opinion of some of the recipients, they were leading questions premised on the assumption and anticipated conclusions that most of the States would declare their dependency on Federal aid for their educational programs. Three items in particular were stressed in the general accompanying letter:

First. That there seems to be a consensus in the country today concerning "national goals in school financing."

Second. That the States are already straining their tax resources to meet current needs.

Third. That increasing taxpayer resistance means a Federal program to equalize the tax burden at the national level is indispensable.

The five questions propounded are these:

1. Considering the political realities in your State, do you consider it likely or unlikely that the combined efforts of your State legislature and local school districts will increase school appropriations to the point that your State will come reasonably close to the national goals outlined above by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Rockefeller brothers report?

2. Does taxpayer resistance to increased school taxes seem to be increasing or diminishing in your State?

3. Is it realistic to look for increases of at least 5 percent each year in school appropriations by the State legislature during your term of office?

4. Judging by the performance of your legislature during the past 4 years could you predict the percentage that schoolteachers' salaries will be increased in your State in the next 5 years?

5. The following conclusion appeared in the Rockefeller report: "It is the weakness in the State and local taxing systems more than anything else that gives rise to current proposals for increased Federal support of education. For those who wish to resist or postpone the resort to Federal funds and at the same time not constrict educational services there seems to be only one alternative: a thoughtful, painful, politically courageous overhaul of State and local tax systems." Is such overhaul presently under way in your State?

We are interested in all of these questions, but primarily interested at this point in question No. 2. Many of the Governors quickly distinguished between "taxpayer resistance to increased taxes" as such, and "taxpayer resistance to increased taxes for school purposes." Many acknowledged an increased resistance to all types of taxation, but not specifically to school taxation. When citizens understood the needs for school programs, they generally favored school taxes. The only fly in the ointment seemed to be the dearth of local taxes by virtue of the more lucrative sources of taxation having been usurped by the Federal Government.

Now let us take a look at the interest in and need for so-called Federal aid for education, as well as the financial picture with respect to schools, coming directly from the heads of States, that is, the Governors or their spokesmen.

Nine of those addressed did not even reply. Most of the replies—a total of 25—were noncommittal, merely giving a résumé of the laws affecting the financing of their school systems. The majority seemed to imply that their laws were inadequate. One State, Arkansas, indicated the financial outlook was not good, but expressed no desire for Federal aid. Ten of this noncommittal group indicated excellent financial backing and outlook for their public schools; in some instances the outlook was better than the so-called national goals cited by Chairman BAILEY in his letter. Fourteen were completely noncommittal and merely cited their laws.

Many Governors objected to the assumption underlying the proposed questions, namely, what actually constituted national goals. The Governor of Virginia criticized the questions as "too limited in source and number to constitute a solid basis for assuming that they represent a consensus for national goals, and any attempt to broaden the source of opinion on this important matter is weakened by requesting answers to specific questions that in themselves stem from a doubtful assumption."

Eight Governors categorically denied any need for Federal aid and were strongly opposed to same.

Four Governors only came out strongly for Federal aid: Alaska, Michigan, Minnesota, and Nebraska. Alaska as a Territory had always had aid through the Department of the Interior and the transition to statehood would entail difficulties without continued support for the Alaska educational system.

Michigan indicates a bad financial situation, though one is left to wonder if the cause is political or financial. In any event, she would favor Federal aid. Nebraska seems to be in a desperate plight and would favor relief. Minnesota thinks it could do a better educational job with Federal aid.

Three additional States have no real objection to Federal aid: Colorado does not need help, but does not object to Federal aid; Maryland and North Carolina prefer local and State control, but are not especially opposed to Federal aid even though they do not need it.

Lastly, there are several States outspoken against Federal aid to education. These include Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Montana, North Dakota, South Carolina, Virginia, and Texas. Comments of some of the governors are enlightening:

The Governor of Iowa says:

The mechanism of Federal aid to education will not make available economic resources not already available to the various States and the local political subdivisions financing public school systems in this country.

The Governor of Indiana says:

Excellent local support has been given to public education in Indiana.

And he points out that:

Americans have always regarded public education as the particular province of local communities, and history has demonstrated that when the people lose control of the education of their children—and vest it in one centralized authority or bureau—that socialism, nazism, fascism, and communism can more easily gain control of the government with the immediate and complete loss of individual freedom.

The Governor of Kansas says:

In a moment of hysteria, it is possible that the country may be stampeded into action that will destroy further the traditional responsibilities of local governments in providing for the educational needs of the citizens. * * * It is my opinion that given anywhere equal opportunity the local and State governments are better able to solve educational problems than are members of a Federal bureaucracy.

The Governor of Montana says:

Rather than being trapped by a loaded question of the "when did you stop beating your wife?" variety, I would like to point out that, in my opinion, as Governor of Montana, that the educational needs of Montana and Montanans are best determined by those at the local and State levels, rather than from a distant office in Washington or New York.

The Governor, incidentally, gives a remarkable picture of support at the State level in Montana.

The Governor of North Dakota says that with appropriate tax overhauling "we would not need Federal aid for education. I consider it likely that the combined efforts of our State legislature and local school districts will increase local school appropriations to continue the advancement of and improvement in public education. Taxpayer resistance seems to be decreasing as far as school support is concerned."

The Governor of South Carolina says:

I would like to say we are very proud of our program and we propose to continue that program through State efforts. Two years ago the special Presidential Commission studying the so-called national emergency in public schooling found that in only 13 States in America is a child not being denied an education for the lack of a classroom or a schoolteacher. Low per capita income South Carolina is one of these 13. We do not want Federal aid. We do not need Federal aid.

The Governor of Virginia, among other things, says:

Virginia is recognized nationally for its sound fiscal policy in governmental affairs. * * * Despite the fact that Federal programs in health, welfare, and the like have required matching funds locally to such an extent that the residual resources have correspondingly dwindled for education, it would appear wise to reflect carefully before embarking on elaborate Federal aid programs in general education under the guise of national defense. The power of control that inevitably accrues to the holder of the purse string can often be visibly guarded when applied to ships and roads and buildings. It subtly escapes this scrutiny, however, when applied to training the mind of youth in the form of education. * * * It is not the seen enemy we fear half so much as centralized control of the affairs of the mind.

And the Governor of Texas, in quoting from a report of a committee appointed by him says:

The advancement and continuing support of public education is a fundamental obligation of State and local government. A free society must develop its human potential by identifying, nurturing, and wisely using its talents.

In other words, the Governors of the several States, as I analyze their replies as objectively as possible, do not appear to feel the need of Federal aid as legislation presently before this Congress contemplates. Though not asked to specifically comment on their attitudes toward Federal aid for education, many nevertheless spoke out against it and did not even attempt to answer the main questions that were asked them. Many have problems of taxation, but they feel there is no special resistance to taxation when it is known that it is for school purposes. I am sure that all realize that if the Federal Government spent less they would certainly have more to spend on their own respective State services.

Much of the clamor for Federal aid revolves around the alleged problem of classroom shortage and the inability of State and local governments to finance school construction rapidly enough to overcome the present gap and the ever-widening shortages predicted for the foreseeable future. This particular facet of Federal aid is the one selected for primary emphasis at this time and is, indeed, the main purpose of H.R. 10128. If enacted, it would be an opening wedge for the National Government to step into the educational picture. Where this bill calls for a billion dollar appropriation, this would be a mere bagatelle to the billions that would be demanded in the future. Statistics offered in the committee report on H.R. 10128, and in various studies by staunch proponents of Federal aid, are in no way conclusive of the need for Federal aid to alleviate shortages. Here are some of the statistics offered in support of Federal aid, derived from reports of the U.S. Office of Education:

Estimated shortage, 1950, 250,000 classrooms.

Estimated shortage, 1953, 312,000 classrooms.

Estimated shortage, 1954, 370,000 classrooms.

Interestingly enough, I understand these figures were obtained on the basis of a nationwide school facilities survey which cost $5 million.

In 1956 the Committee for the White House Conference on Education reported the result of its own shortage survey at 198,625 classrooms. During the autumn of 1956, and the 3 succeeding years, the U.S. Office of Education showed the following classroom shortages, as compiled from information furnished by the State departments of education:

Estimated shortage, 1956, 159,000 classrooms.

Estimated shortage, 1957, 142,300 classrooms.

Estimated shortage, 1958, 141,900 classrooms.

Estimated shortage, 1959, 132,400 classrooms.

According to their own figures, this would represent a reduction in classroom shortage between 1954 and 1959 from 370,000 to 132,000. There is such variation in the reports from the State departments of education that grave doubt has been raised regarding the accuracy of these estimates; however, we may assume that they are indicative of the general overall picture of classroom shortages.

A comparison of classrooms in use with pupil enrollment from surveys made in 1954 and 1959, respectively, shows:

	1954	1959	Increase (+) or reduction (−)
Classrooms in use	983,000	1,279,000	+30
Pupil enrollment	30,045,000	35,990,000	+20
Pupils per classroom	30.6	28.1	−2.5

A recent forecast of classrooms needed for the next decade is 610,000. To take care of an increased enrollment of 8.7 million students, it is alleged that 312,000 new rooms are needed; a backlog holdover of needs from the 1959 survey is indicated at 132,000 rooms; and for anticipated abandonments which must be replaced, an additional 166,000 will be needed. This would average 61,000 classrooms per year during the decade, whereas classroom construction without any Federal money, averaged 66,700 per year, during the past 5 years. If the States make the same effort during the next decade as they have in the past five, classrooms can be constructed to meet increased needs without any Federal intervention. Moreover, if there is a lessening of State and local support as a result of Federal assistance, the picture would be far less optimistic so far as the final net results are concerned. The American people have spent an average of $1 billion per year since the end of World War II on school construction. I raise the question: would they continue to make the effort to raise $1 billion annually for the next 10 years, if the Federal Government enacts a Federal assistance program? I believe the answer to this question would be the same today as that which was given in May 1957 when Time magazine sampled opinion. The May 13, 1957, issue of Time magazine carried the following:

Of all the items in President Eisenhower's domestic program, few seem less likely to succeed than Federal aid for school construction. But would the defeat of this proposal be as great a calamity as its backers insist? Last week Time surveyed 48 States to find out. The answer: No. Though the Nation as a whole must keep building classrooms faster than ever before, a surprisingly big proportion of the States do not need—or do not want—any help from the Government.

Some of the States which got off to a slow start in meeting their increased classroom needs have now taken positive action in that direction. Alabama may be cited as an example. Last August the State legislature authorized a substantial aid program to be financed by issuance of $100 million of State bonds. This will take care of two-thirds of the reported existing shortage of classrooms in the State of Alabama. Others are taking similar action.

The minority views included in the committee report on H.R. 10128 point up with great clarity the weaknesses of this bill. They deserve our strictest scrutiny. They complain that "neither the Subcommittee on General Education, nor the full committee, held any public hearings on the subject of this bill, or the bill itself, in the present session of Congress. There is a positive need for such hearings."

The objectivity and reliability of the committee's favorable recommendations are open to question in view of the significant progress that has been made in meeting needs during the past several years, without any Federal aid, and the relative decline in backlog estimates. The minority wisely states the obvious, namely, that "no adequate and effective program of Federal aid can properly ignore the rapidly shifting patterns of need and response which have taken place in education in this country."

With specific reference to backlogs, page 16 of the report states:

We do not question the existence of some backlog. We do believe, however, that there is and will continue to be an irreducible minimum backlog of classroom need, regardless of any question of Federal aid. To the extent this exists, and for other reasons discussed later in this report, the urgency of the presumed classroom shortage is considerably diminished.

On page 18, the report further states:

It is also evident that the construction peak has been crossed and within 5 years the number of classrooms required to keep fully abreast additional needs will be only half as much each year as actually have been built in the past few years.

Much credence has been given to the distress signals created on the ground of alleged school district debt limitations. Proponents of Federal aid for school construction claim that over the years "more and more school districts have exhausted their resources," and can no longer build their own classrooms. A careful reading of pages 22 and 23 of the minority views on H.R. 10128 show that such districts are an infinitesimal part of the whole; that—

The 237 borrowed-up districts reported in the last survey amount to only six-tenths of 1 percent, or 6 out of every 1,000 of the Nation's 40,000 school districts. The enrollment in these districts is less than 1.5 percent of the U.S. total.

In other words, the fiscal capacity of only a limited number of the 40,000 school districts in the Nation has been exhausted. One member of the committee very aptly raised this question:

> Why, indeed, should we spread nearly a thousand million dollars tax money around the country in order to help these districts?

Another weakness pointed to by the minority is that H.R. 10128, if enacted, would allocate funds without regard to need or financial ability to construct schools. It constitutes a sort of Government "payola" whereby the States are led to expect something for nothing, whereas, in reality, none will ever recover what it is compelled to put into the program by way of additional taxation. In fact, many, including some of the poorer of the States, may find themselves in the position of being taxed without any appreciable possibility of recovering on their investment for this reason. Section 7(a) states:

> The amount allotted to any State under section 4 for any year shall be reduced by the percentage (if any) by which its State school effort index for such year is less than the national school effort index for such year. The total of such reductions shall be reallotted among the remaining States by proportionately increasing the amounts allotted to them under section 4 for such year.

According, if a poorer State finds itself incapable of raising by legislative enactment enough for maintaining its school system, plus a sum sufficient to meet the "State school effort index" prescribed by this bill, it will in effect be paying taxes to support a program from which it cannot profit.

The bill, by implication, looks to future extensions, for it makes provision for this option:

> In lieu of making grants of State funds required under subsection (a), any State which wishes to pay the principal and interest annually becoming due on bonds or other obligations issued to finance school facilities projects may elect to have its allotment (or a designated portion thereof) for any fiscal year made available to it in the form of Federal commitments to pay all of the principal and interest annually becoming due on an equivalent amount of such bonds or other obligations.

Obviously a billion dollar appropriation, spread over 3 years, as contemplated by H.R. 10128, would not be adequate to assist States with bond issues within the life of the bill.

Though H.R. 10128 relates only to Federal aid for school construction, as already indicated, we should not overlook the fact that S. 8, which also includes aid for teachers' salaries, has already passed the Senate and is now pending before the House Committee on Education and Labor. Enactment of H.R. 10128, which is not needed, would be only a prelude to enactment in this session and forever hereafter of vast appropriations not only for school construction purposes but teachers' salaries and other educational purposes. For that reason, the question of Federal aid for teachers' salaries should also be discussed as a component of the general subject.

The matter of teachers' salaries and teacher shortage seems to deserve the thoughtful attention of every right-minded citizen. I should like to say here that all of my adult life with the exception of 4 years spent in military service during World War II was devoted to the field of education, until I came to Congress in 1953. I was a high school teacher, a high school principal, and I held an administrative office in a university for a total service of 21 years in the cause of education. My home is Gainesville, Fla., the home of the great University of Florida. Some of my closest and dearest friends and associates are engaged in the field of education.

I am well aware of the acute need of better teacher salaries. I know from experience the sacrifice entailed in trying to maintain minimum decent standards of living for one's self and one's family on a teacher's salary. I am aware of the fact that participation in the adventures and uncertainties of the new space age will require greater numbers of technically and scientifically trained personnel. I am aware of the present rapid increases and predicted future increases in the public school enrollments.

Because of my personal interest in the subject of teachers' salaries, I have been pleased to observe the increased and deserved attention given this matter in recent years. Florida enacted a minimum foundation law several years ago which has brought substantial relief by way of increased salaries to our teachers. Although salaries for competent teachers are not yet so adequate as they ought to be, I call attention to the relative increased earnings of teachers as a group, compared with Federal Government employees and other persons working for wages or salaries during the period 1929 to 1958:

Earnings of teachers and other groups 1929 and 1958

	Teachers	All persons working for wages or salaries	Civilian employees of Federal Government
1929 (actual dollars)	$1,400	$1,405	$1,933
1929 (in 1958 dollars)	2,358	2,366	3,255
1958 (actual dollars)	4,792	4,324	5,514
Percent increase in constant dollars	+103	+83	+69

Since the turn of the century there has been a gradual downward trend in the ratio of pupils to teachers in our public schools. During a 60-year period student enrollment increased 132 percent, instructional staff increased 234 percent, and the ratio of pupils to teacher declined by 30 percent, indicating that a sufficiently large number of persons have been attracted to the teaching profession to bring about a constant lowering of pupil-teacher ratios.

During the past decade there has been a substantial increase in the number of college students whose professional choice is directed toward the field of education. Should this favorable trend continue for another decade beginning with 1960, the output of teachers will be doubled, while the annual increase in school enrollment should be only about half as much as it was in the last half of the decade just ending.

The same question raised in conjunction with the question of Federal assistance for school construction may be asked here: If the Government through a Federal assistance program makes grants to States for teachers' salaries, would the magnificent effort made at the State and local level for insuring more remunerative teachers' salaries be maintained? Would there not be a lessening of local effort when confronted with the reality of Federal aid?

I come now to the crucial point of conflict in the controversial issue of Federal aid for education, and that is Federal control. The fear engendered by the threat of a Federal-controlled system of education is genuine. Aside from the questionable constitutionality of Federal aid for education, the chief obstacle to enactment of such legislation in the past has been an overriding fear of the consequences of Federal control of our educational system. Woodrow Wilson once said that:

> The history of liberty is the history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it.

I need not remind this Congress that it was the educational control of Germany—of German youth—under the Nazi regime, after Hitler came to power, and the control of all educational media in the Soviet Union after the 1917 Revolution which first conditioned Germany to precipitate a catastrophic world war, and secondly, enabled Russia to threaten increasingly and unceasingly the peace of the world since the end of that war.

Speaking as the father of three children, I fear possible Federal control over the schools of this Nation as much as I do the menace of communism itself. If and when our educational system passes to the Federal Government, the Constitution of these United States, with all of its matchless guarantees of freedom, will be rendered obsolete.

All of the recent bills introduced, relating to the subject under discussion, have tried to allay the underlying fear of Federal control by including a section to this effect:

> In the administration of this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy, determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

Let me say emphatically that I believe this particular clause, although representing the sincere sentiments of those who formulated it, is no more than a pious platitude. Whenever you have the type of overall educational support for school construction or teachers' salaries on the Federal level, called for in the Federal aid for education bills, you will inevitably have Federal control.

Management of a Federal aid program, if enacted, would be vested in the Commissioner of Education of the U.S. Office of Education. Two former U.S. Commissioners of Education unequivocally have declared that Federal

aid without Federal control is an illusion. Dr. Jno. J. Tigert, former U.S. Commissioner of Education and president emeritus of the University of Florida—my alma mater—has said:

> If we embark upon a program of turning over Federal money to schools without any strings attached, it is only a question of time until the waste, extravagance, and misuse of these funds will result in a reaction or a change. The alternative is Federal control.

Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, another U.S. Commissioner of Education, stated:

> On the one hand, we have presented to us arguments that there will be no Federal control accompanying Federal aid. Alongside, we find evidence showing the inadequacy and inequality of education in States able to support a good educational program, and evidence of inefficient or inadequate efforts by these States to eradicate inequality and inefficiency within their borders. If there is to be little or no Federal control accompanying Federal aid, what right have we to expect a major improvement of the education within States under the same leadership that they now have? Thus, if Federal aid is to bring about better schools, it seems apparent that there must be some Federal control.

I realize that times are different and great changes have taken place in our political and economic thinking since these gentlemen spoke out a number of years ago. This fact is dramatically borne out by the following:

When the national defense education bill came up for consideration before the Congress during the close of the 85th Congress in 1958, it was represented as a temporary emergency need specifically related to our defense effort. It was our partial answer to the sputnik launching. But, I fear it was motivated by a more far-reaching objective—eventual Federal support for American education on a large scale. The fears engendered by Russian scientific progress had excellent propaganda value in gaining an entering wedge for such a change in traditional policy, which theretofore had been barred under the impact of sound public opinion. I call attention to remarks of the present U.S. Commissioner of Education, Mr. Lawrence G. Derthick, made on November 24, 1958:

> The National Defense Education Act represents a major breakthrough in the area of Federal concern for education. Its impact will be felt for many years to come. Congress has taken a significant step forward in the field of education.

This act was hailed by professional and nonprofessional educators as one of the most important legislative measures of the Congress. But this act is already under severe criticism by many who report "scents of Federal control." According to press reports, widespread dissatisfaction with the act has been expressed by some of the Nation's school administrators. The act has been described as having "Federal control written into it" in spite of honest congressional efforts to the contrary.

The lack of restrictions imposed by the Federal loan funds have, I understand, often set aside well established and smoothly working State programs, and the latter have been replaced by undesirable aspects of Federal control which proponents of Federal aid are always insisting will never come to pass.

It is the consensus of opinion among some of the outstanding deans of graduate schools that there is grave danger in the method of awarding fellowships under the act. I fear if the U.S. Office of Education should be given enough money to control 25 percent of the fellowship awards in our universities, and if methods already initiated are continued, our system of graduate education would be forcefully directed and almost exclusively directed from Washington, D.C. Few institutions would care to institute programs which the U.S. Office of Education would fail to support, while meritorious programs would wither from lack of strong students and the competitive incentives which Federal aid provides. Emphasis has been placed by those administering the act on new and expanded graduate programs, leading, it is feared to Federal support of programs of questionable quality in untried situations and in second-rate institutions which presently are unable to provide even the basic support needed for already-established programs.

Speaking at a nationwide convention of the American Association of School Administrators, Dr. Degar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, in outlining experiences that have alerted school men to flaws in what they otherwise considered a welcome act, said:

> It has Federal control in it, because there is a Bureau of the Budget, a Bureau which is manned with people who feel their duty is to follow every dollar down to the end. When this situation obtains, there is bound to be Federal control, there is no way to prevent Federal bureaus from following every Federal dollar to the end.

As I have stated before, in my opinion, every American citizen has an obligation to do all in his power to insure an adequate school system for the students of today and tomorrow. In spite of the magnificent progress that we have made, there is a continuing need to do better, to provide more and better facilities, a greater number of better trained teachers, and more adequate compensation for dedicated teachers. Men of good will in this Congress and out are divided on the best ways to meet the challenge which an adequate educational system for America poses. We are beset with statistics from the National Education Association, the U.S. Office of Education, the Rockefeller Brothers, and other sources reiterating limiting factors in our educational system. A sort of national inferiority complex has developed because of reported educational advances made in the Soviet Union in recent years. Much of the pressure now on Congress stems, I fear, from the propaganda value which long-time proponents of Federal aid have derived from visitors' reports on Russian education. I do not believe we should be pressured by fear into actions that may have a disastrous effect on our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment about which I talked at the beginning of my remarks is not altogether new in concept. A similar amendment has been introduced in previous years. My amendment, in brief, would provide that 1 percent of all income taxes collected on individual and corporate income under Federal statutes be returned to the States and territories within which it is collected for use for educational purposes only, without any Federal direction, control, or interference.

The amendment I propose would meet, I sincerely believe, the many and significant objections that have been raised to Federal aid for education bills that have been introduced in successive congressional sessions. It would provide substantial additional assistance for school purposes in the simplest sort of way. While it might not initially provide the resources envisioned by some of the bills that have been introduced, it is conceivable that, with any attenuation in the defense or military needs of the Nation, the amounts returned to the States would more than take care of their increasing educational needs. I could wish, too, that my bill, if enacted, might establish a precedent whereby, in the future, there would be a return of additional tax funds to the States with an accompanying return of programs which rightfully are the responsibility of the States.

My amendment, if enacted, would first of all provide a large measure of aid for education without additional taxation. Any increase of Federal taxes or in the Federal debt, which would be necessary to finance other proposals now before the Congress, would be prevented.

Second. It would definitely not contribute to the socialization of our educational system.

Third. It would require no additional Federal agency, nor extension of any existing Federal bureaucracy to handle the remittances to the various States.

Fourth. The distribution would be fair and just, because a State would receive funds in proportion to Federal income tax collections within it. By making this specific money available at a time of need, State efforts to meet the demands of their own educational programs might be encouraged while the avenues of Federal control, as already pointed out, would be eliminated.

Fifth. There is a precedent for earmarking certain Federal tax collections. Congress has for several years directed that funds equal to revenues from certain taxes shall be made available to the States for designated purposes, that is to say, proceeds of excise taxes on firearms, shells, and cartridges are used for wildlife restoration, and excise taxes on fishing rods, and so forth, for fish restoration and management projects; and certain Federal tax collections in Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa are now made available for the exclusive use of such possessions.

Sixth. One of the greatest arguments that proponents of a gigantic aid program for education have is that the Federal Government has appropriated to itself all of the so-called attractive tax raising sources such as the income tax. What I propose would take some of that

income tax and give it back to the States to use exactly as they want to use it in the field of education.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment, if enacted into law, would give us a saner approach to the fiscal problems of this Nation. It would make us realize that money does not grow on trees and, if we appropriate money in Washington, we are going to have to raise the money from the people of the respective States. I sincerely believe that my amendment would meet with general approval for if it were enacted it would effectively stay the hand of reckless spending and the inevitable Federal control that would come as a result of other measures now before the Congress.

I am sure that I speak for a vast number of our citizens when I say that we should keep our hands completely off a vast new program of Federal aid for education. With increased local citizen interest in education, and accelerated State efforts on behalf of the schools, we shall find each citizen doing his own part in support of education. In this manner current demands will be met and foundations for the future soundly laid. The success of the public school system of America depends, after all, upon the participation, interest, and support of all citizens in every community of the Nation. The work of the State and local governments in education has, in the past, given us an educational system unequalled in the world. These same efforts can yet best serve us if we but allow them to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD the amounts of tax money to be returned to the States for educational purposes, in the event my amendment is passed. The statistics are for 1958; the amounts for 1960 would, of course, be much greater. I earnestly appeal to each of you to vote for this amendment and to avoid the evils of Federal control of education and the useless pyramiding of our Federal debt:

State or region	Income tax collections, fiscal 1958 [1]	1 percent of tax collected
Alaska	$41,531,000	$415,310
Alabama	473,419,000	4,734,190
Arizona	224,899,000	2,248,990
Arkansas	174,185,000	1,741,850
California	5,891,243,000	58,912,430
Colorado	824,622,000	8,246,220
Connecticut	1,240,454,000	12,404,540
Delaware	771,539,000	7,715,390
Florida	991,644,000	9,916,440
Georgia	743,900,000	7,439,000
Idaho	129,181,000	1,291,810
Illinois	5,647,218,000	56,472,180
Indiana	1,456,282,000	14,562,820
Iowa	585,562,000	5,855,620
Kansas	489,738,000	4,897,380
Kentucky	535,661,000	5,356,610
Louisiana	609,711,000	6,097,110
Maine	180,880,000	1,808,800
Maryland and District of Columbia	1,580,683,000	15,806,830
Massachusetts	1,987,301,000	19,873,010
Michigan	4,610,879,000	46,108,790
Minnesota	1,124,961,000	11,249,610
Mississippi	163,489,000	1,634,890
Missouri	1,644,189,000	16,441,890
Montana	130,512,000	1,305,120
Nebraska	386,909,000	3,869,090
Nevada	92,574,000	925,740
New Hampshire	142,487,000	1,424,870
New Jersey	2,109,289,000	$21,092,890
New Mexico	149,509,000	1,495,090
New York	13,519,459,000	135,194,590
North Carolina	823,112,000	8,231,120
North Dakota	85,104,000	851,040
Ohio	4,728,546,000	47,285,460
Oklahoma	607,327,000	6,073,270
Oregon	446,569,000	4,465,690
Pennsylvania	4,985,558,000	49,855,580
Rhode Island	289,145,000	2,891,450
South Carolina	274,185,000	2,741,850
South Dakota	84,108,000	841,080
Tennessee	577,334,000	5,773,340
Texas	2,411,953,000	24,119,530
Utah	181,184,000	1,811,840
Vermont	70,540,000	705,400
Virginia	851,945,000	8,519,450
Washington	847,471,000	8,474,710
West Virginia	314,080,000	3,140,800
Wisconsin	1,290,021,000	12,900,210
Wyoming	64,075,000	640,750
Hawaii	157,330,000	1,573,300
Puerto Rico	20,013,000	200,130
Total	67,763,510,000	677,635,100

[1] Figure used for the total tax collected was obtained by combining figures reported for State income and employment taxes and State corporation income and profit taxes (including tax on business income of exempt organizations).

Source: U.S. Treasury Department. Combined statements of receipts, expenditures and balances of the U.S. Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958, pp. 116-117.

KINZUA DAM PROJECT

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Subcommittee on Public Works reported out the appropriation bill for 1961. In spite of a rising tide of public concern over the so-called Kinzua Dam project, $4.53 million is being appropriated for this project in fiscal 1961. The Kinzua Dam will require the flooding of 9,077 acres in the Allegheny Reservation of the Seneca Nation of Indians, cutting the heart out of what is left of Seneca land. It is the general belief that the Kinzua project will ultimately destroy the Seneca Nation by separating them from their beloved lands. For the past 3 years a swelling controversy has raged around the possibility of alternate projects accomplishing as much or more than the Kinzua, without hurting the Seneca Indians. Dr. Arthur Morgan, a former chief engineer for the TVA and a renowned expert in hydraulic engineering, has prepared a thorough comparison of the Kinzua Dam and the alternate Conewango Dam projects. Under unanimous consent, I include Dr. Morgan's analysis in the RECORD at this point for the benefit of all Members:

A COMPARISON OF THE KINZUA PLAN AND THE CONEWANGO PLAN FOR CONTROL OF THE UPPER ALLEGHENY RIVER

(Statement presented to the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by Arthur E. Morgan, May 5 and 6, 1959)

There are two proposed methods for controlling the Upper Allegheny River for flood control, and for increasing the low-water flow downstream.

DESCRIPTION OF THE TWO PROJECTS

The Kinzua plan provides for a dam across the Allegheny River a few miles above Warren, Pa. It would store water during floods, and let it out as soon as possible afterward, so as to be ready for the next flood. Also, it would store a limited amount of water, claimed by the Corps of Engineers to be 550,000-acre feet, for increasing the low-water flow.

The Conewango plan would divert the flow of the Allegheny River through a 6-mile channel into a large glacial depression, where it would be stored for flood control and for increasing the low-water flow. The regulated low-water flow would pass partly down the Allegheny and partly down the channel of Conewango Creek. In case of a flood too large to be held in the Conewango Reservoir, the excess would be passed through an outlet channel and through control gates to Cattaraugus Creek, and so to Lake Erie.

The Conewango-Cattaraugus site is a rare occurrence in nature. Being out of the ordinary and unexpected, it is not surprising that the possibility was overlooked. Before the last glacial period the Allegheny River flowed north into Lake Erie. The ice of the glacial period dug a big hole, in the same way that it dug the Finger Lakes in New York State, and pushed the earth and rock ahead of it, making a dike which turned the Allegheny River away from Lake Erie and to the Ohio River. If we cut through this dike, and use this glacial hole to store water, we have a reservoir with about three times the capacity of Kinzua. The old Allegheny River channel and South Cattaraugus Creek provide a rock gorge, for much of its distance hundreds of feet deep, to carry away the excess floodwater to Lake Erie. A diversion channel about 5 miles long would carry floodwater from the Conewango Reservoir to this deep-rock gorge, and just before it enters the gorge there would be control works to regulate the flow.

Where the Conewango Creek flows out of this Conewango Reservoir site there would be a relatively small dam, which would control the flow. Here the part of the regulated low-water flow which did not pass directly down the Allegheny River would pass down Conewango Creek, entering the Allegheny at Warren, Pa. Conewango Reservoir would completely protect Warren, Jamestown, and the area between from floods from the upper Conewango Creek. Kinzua would give no protection from floods on the lower Conewango.

Just below where a channel would divert the Allegheny River into Conewango Reservoir there would be a relatively small dam across the Allegheny to prevent any flood water from flowing down the Allegheny. Thus, all floodflows from above that point would be entirely removed from the Allegheny and Ohio Rivers. Most of that floodwater could be stored in Conewango Reservoir for use during low water. In case of unusually large floods the excess would pass down the very large preglacial channel of the Allegheny (Cattaraugus Creek) to Lake Erie. A limited amount of regulated low-water flow should be passed down that channel to take care of a very bad pollution condition on the Cattaraugus Creek.

Most of the Conewango Reservoir site is a great marsh, much of it useless. The margins are used for pasture. Almost no one lives on the marsh, but there are dairy farms and several villages around the edges. There are almost no industries in the locality. It is an economically depressed area. The parts of the villages which would be flooded could be moved up the hill for a fraction of a mile without destroying or disrupting the communities. A permanent lake of at least 28 square miles would be created, with all its recreational and economic advantages.

I shall have time here to present only a summary of our findings with reference to the Kinzua and Conewango projects. The evidence and the details which support these findings are given in a longer statement which I shall supply to the Committee. I have dealt with this situation from

the background of more than 50 years of almost uninterrupted experience with water control projects. Incidentally, several of my most striking successes have resulted from a persistent policy of overall exploration of situations in search of unexpected possibilities which conventional or routine engineering had overlooked. At this late date I would not risk my professional reputation on an irresponsible venture. I am thoroughly convinced that my conclusions are sound.

AN ENGINEERING OVERSIGHT

There was an engineering oversight more than 30 years ago when the Kinzua plan was, in fact, selected. Unless that oversight is corrected, Pittsburgh, Warren, and other cities will have less flood protection from the upper Allegheny that they need, and far less than is readily available by the use of Conewango. Unless corrected, that oversight will cost the country much more than $100 million, and probably three or four times as much, in added cost or loss of values. This is not an irresponsible guess, but the result of applying the methods used by the Corps of Engineers in estimating benefits for requesting appropriations; or in one case, determination of costs or loss by the rules established by the American Association of Highway Officials.

In the years since the original oversight, much officework and some fieldwork has been done on the details of Kinzua, and massive reports on those details have been made by the corps, but no general exploration and study have been made either by the corps, or by engineers employed by the corps, to review the original decision of more than 30 years ago, as to what alternative possibilities existed. The best of those alternative possibilities remained undiscovered and unrecognized. This statement applies to the recent work of the Tippetts firm, which was employed by the corps, as well as the work of the corps itself.

I am not here to criticize or blame. The issue far transcends personalities. If we are correct, and we believe that we are, the country will gain greatly by adoption of the Conewango plan. Fortunately, as rarely occurs, the opportunity exists to correct an oversight of 30 years standing.

KINZUA IS INADEQUATE

The trouble with Kinzua is that it does not have enough storage capacity, and that it cannot be enlarged. The approximate location of the Kinzua Dam site is fixed by natural conditions, and cannot be changed. The city of Salamanca, located in the valley bottom, upstream from the dam, sets the limit of how far upstream the water can be stored. Kinzua has capacity for just so much storage, and no more. No amount of engineering calculations can change those hard facts.

Kinzua storage is not enough. All the Corps of Engineers can do with Kinzua is to whittle down their estimates of requirements until they are as small as the absolutely limited capacity of Kinzua, and then to call those quantities enough. This whittling down has been of serious proportions.

To begin with, the corps decided that Pittsburgh needs to be protected against only half of the maximum probable flood, as determined by the U.S. Weather Bureau, at the request of the corps. The great flood catastrophes of the short history of our country have mostly come from rare, unusual, so-called unprecedented storms. I believe that, in view of the concentration of people and property at Pittsburgh, and the extreme vulnerability of that city to floods, it would be good policy to provide a greater degree of protection. With Kinzua such increase is impossible.

In contrast, Conewango, at a cost of $25 million less than the Army estimate for Kinzua, and $50 million less than the real cost of Kinzua, would fully and completely protect Pittsburgh and Warren from the most extreme flood, up to 2½ or 3 times what Kinzua would fully protect against, and would provide as much storage as is claimed for Kinzua for increasing low waterflow.

If the capacity of Conewango should be increased to the point where it would cost $105 million, or $8 million less than the Army Engineers estimate for Kinzua, and I recommend that course, Conewango would not only protect against the most extreme maximum flood, but in addition would have capacity to store three times as much water as is claimed for Kinzua for increasing the low waterflow. The findings summarized here are on the basis of that larger capacity. Such storage would enable Conewango to store for low-water increase the entire year's flow during low-water years, and in addition to hold over much of the flow of wet years for use in dry years.

Now, in order to consider some of the whittling down that must be done for Kinzua to make it appear large enough to give full protection from even half the maximum flood, let us assume for the moment that Pittsburgh needs to be protected from a flood only half as great as the probable maximum, as estimated by the Weather Bureau.

To begin with, the flood storage provided for Kinzua in the Army plans is not 50 percent of their own estimate of the maximum flood, but for only 43.2 percent. The deficiency is 117,000 acre-feet.

A further deficiency arises from the fact that, whereas the Army plans presume to store 745,000 acre-feet for flood storage, and 573,000 acre-feet for increasing low waterflow and for dead storage, yet the total storage capacity of the reservoir falls short of this amount by 138,000 acre-feet. The reasons why, in case of Kinzua, the same storage space cannot be used both for flood control and for low water storage are given in our longer statement.

Again, the Army plans for Kinzua have inadequate provisions for snow on the ground at the time of the flood storm. Here is a deficiency which may amount to 200,000 acre-feet or more.

The Army plans assume that two-thirds of the storm rainfall would run off, including snowmelt, if any. We have dependable record, for a similar area on flatter land—the Dayton flood of 1913—with similar rainfall conditions, with no snow on the ground, where the runoff was more than 90 percent of the rainfall. If we assume even 80 percent of runoff, instead of 66 percent, this deficit is 158,000 acre-feet.

These items, amounting to more than 600,000 acre-feet, indicate a very large deficiency below a factor of safety which would be desirable, even on the basis of protecting against only half the maximum flood. That deficiency is more than the entire storage assumed to be provided for low water control.

Against such possibilities and uncertainties, reasonably conservative engineering judgment will seek for a margin of safety, especially as some of these possibilities tend to be cumulative—that is, they tend to accentuate each other, and to occur at the same time. It is the good fortune of the Upper Allegheny situation that all this factor of safety, and much more, can be secured by the Conewango plan at less than the cost of Kinzua. And, because of the smaller and simpler structures required, the Conewango construction would require 2 years less time.

If we consider that protection against two-thirds of the maximum storm would be desirable, rather than against a storm half the maximum, the deficiency would be increased by about 290,000 acre-feet, making a total deficiency for Kinzua of more than the whole flood control storage planned for Kinzua.

THE ECONOMIC AND HUMAN LOSS OF KINZUA

Additional storage capacity, to provide a reasonable margin of safety against even half the probable maximum flood at the Army estimate of the cost per acre-foot of storage in Kinzua, would be worth $57 million.

The storage of three times as much water for increase of low waterflow, estimated by methods adopted by the U.S. Public Health Service and the Corps of Engineers, would have an additional value of $9 million to $30 million.

The Army plans for Kinzua require that after a flood the flood-control portions of the reservoir shall be emptied as soon as possible, at the rate of 25,000 cubic feet per second, so as to have storage space for the next flood. That water must go down the Allegheny past Warren, to Pittsburgh and into the Ohio River. To empty the Kinzua Reservoir at this rate after a standard design flood would take about 3 weeks. In at least three quarters of the cases this release would be during the flood season, just the time of year when the Ohio and Mississippi are most likely to be in flood.

Moreover, a decision would have to be made at the time of every moderate flood whether to recognize the possibility of a subsequent great storm and to keep storage space for it by letting the early part of the flood go down to Pittsburgh, with moderate damages of from $3 million to $30 million, or to hold the water behind the Kinzua Dam and save Pittsburgh the moderate damages, but to take the chance of having used up the storage, and so of having exhausted that much storage capacity when the catastrophic flood comes. Usually the guess that the flood will be moderate would be right. Only in case of great floods would it be wrong. In every one of the more than 25 cases where the Corps of Engineers has estimated the benefits which would have accrued to Pittsburgh if Kinzua had been built, they assumed that only a moderate flood would occur. The operation of the Kinzua Dam, as the Corps of Engineers announce they would operate it, would be on the assumption that there would be no storm greater than 43.2 percent of the probable maximum, and that none of the possibilities and exigencies I have mentioned would occur. Kinzua would protect Pittsburgh from moderate flood losses only at the risk of increasing damage from a very large flood. With Conewango, no such issue arises, since the storage capacity plus discharge capacity to Lake Erie is more than ample for all purposes.

As another element in the situation, the National Government is spending hundreds of millions of dollars to control floods throughout the Ohio and Mississippi River Valleys. This commonly is by storage reservoirs, which can hold the flood back for a limited time. The Conewango plan would take the part of this unwanted water which could not be stored in Conewango for increase of the low water supply, and would remove it entirely from the Ohio-Mississippi River system, discharging it into Lake Erie. Taking the value of removing such excess of floodwater as it is variously estimated by the Army Engineers, we have an estimated value of somewhere between $60 million to $200 million.

There is another serious disadvantage of Kinzua. The Kinzua Reservoir would destroy the only water level highway through the mountains in that region, one of the finest highway locations in Pennsylvania, and would replace it with a steep, crooked two-lane highway along the precipitous mountainside, with grades of 10 percent at sharp curves. This would then be one of the

poorest through highways in Pennsylvania—far below the minimum standards for American highways. Using the basis of estimate established by the American Society of Highway Officials, we estimate the loss and damage of this change, which is a proper element of cost of Kinzua, to be $25 million. Conewango does not have any similar item.

The Allegheny Valley from Warren to Salamanca is one of the finest recreation, fishing, and hunting areas in Eastern America, as is indicated in the report of the Army Engineers. The valley bottom provides almost the only winter forage for the deer and wild turkey in the State parks adjoining it, and is essential to the maintenance of the good hunting. All this would be destroyed by Kinzua Dam, whereas Conewango would not only preserve this resource and give it a good nearly uniform flow of water the year round, but in addition, would create another recreation area far greater than the lake at Kinzua. The loss of public value due to the destruction of the Allegheny Valley recreation area would run into millions of dollars.

The Kinzua project would require the removal of the Pennsylvania Railroad from a long stretch of the Allegheny Valley. In view of its use as a heavy coal-carrying route and of actively pending industrial developments along the valley, especially in papermaking, this is a matter of consequence.

In the entire Ohio-Mississippi River system there is no other point where a given amount of storage for increasing low water flow would be so valuable. Conewango would double the minimum flow of the Ohio at Pittsburgh, and for some distance below, and would increase the minimum flow through the entire length of the Ohio and lower Mississippi Rivers. Because of salt beds, cheap coal, and abundant labor, this area promises to be the chemical industry center for America, the chief limiting factor being the water supply. Conewango would conserve that to the utmost. Kinzua would waste the greater part of it.

ADVANTAGES OF CONEWANGO

The advantages of Conewango over Kinzua to which we have applied financial estimates, using the minimum figures in all cases, amount to more than $100 million, and if less than the maximum figures are used, to about $400 million.

It is almost embarrassing to mention such large figures in speaking of the advantages of Conewango over Kinzua, when a fraction of that difference should be conclusive. The fact is that in the Conewango setting and the natural enormous outlet channel to Lake Erie we have a most unusual situation. In probably not one reservoir building job in a thousand would one find such a combination of favorable conditions. But there it is, and these surprising values naturally follow from it. Why throw them away for the sake of not admitting an error of 30 years ago?

It may be argued that if Kinzua is built now, in a few years when the air is cleared, Conewango can then be built. But this would mean a great loss. The irreplaceable water-level highway along the Allegheny would have been destroyed. The exceptionally fine recreation area along the Allegheny would have been wiped out. And since both reservoirs are not needed, most of the cost of building Kinzua would have been wasted.

THE COST OF CONEWANGO

Now as to cost estimates for constructing Conewango. Our estimate is $60 million less than that of the Tippetts firm for the same degree of protection they planned. About half that difference is due to the fact that the Tippetts firm overlooked the best of the possibilities, that is, the outlet to Lake Erie by Cattaraugus Creek. When they started their study I told them that I had only begun to look into the many possibilities of Conewango and that further exploration might disclose great opportunities for economies. I urged them to make those further studies. They did not do that, but only looked into the specific suggestions I was able to make at the time they began. I continued my inquiry, and turned up other possibilities so much superior as to make my earlier suggestions obsolete. When I asked the Tippetts engineers to look into other possibilities I had found, they replied that they did not have time to do so. They never made a general study of the situation, and never qualified themselves to pass on all the major alternatives.

Diversion down the Cattaraugus, which the Tippetts engineers did not study, reduces the cost by $20 million under the plan for diversion down Silver Creek, which they did study. A proper treatment of the Pennsylvania Railroad, which they overlooked, further reduces the cost by about $9 million. These two corrections alone would reduce the Tippetts estimate of cost for Conewango to where it is no higher than Kinzua. But there are other large errors in the Tippetts estimate, to the extent of another $30 million.

Construction conditions for Conewango are strikingly different from those for Kinzua. For instance, excavation for Kinzua highways is on precipitous mountainsides, and a large part of it is in solid rock. In contrast to this, the principal earthmoving for Conewango highways is on level bottom land, where there is no rock, but only sand, gravel, and clay. There are millions of yards of this exceptionally favorable work, which would actually cost only about a third as much per cubic yard as would the earth and solid rock on the precipitous mountainside in Kinzua. The Army Engineers estimated $1 a cubic yard for this difficult mountainside earth and rock excavation. The Tippetts engineers took that price per yard and applied it throughout for highway and railroad earthmoving for Conewango, where the real cost would be about a third as much per cubic yard.

The Tippetts engineers took the same course concerning timber clearing. For the Kinzua job, the timber clearing is mostly on steep, rocky mountainsides, or along riverbanks where the trees lean toward the water, and fall into it when they are cut, making it necessary to haul each one out by cable. There are more than a hundred miles of such riverbanks on the Kinzua project. For the Kinzua job this clearing was estimated at $500 an acre. On the Conewango project the timber clearing is in large tracts of flatland, where modern clearing equipment is at its best, and where the actual cost per acre of clearing would be about a third as much for Kinzua. Yet here the Tippetts firm used the same price, $500 per acre, for the broad flatlands in Conewango as was used for the steep mountainsides and miles of riverbank clearing on Kinzua.

This same careless process of transferring unit costs on one job to very different conditions on another job was used in relation to earth dam construction. That is not responsible engineering.

Also, the Tippetts engineers, in estimating highway changes for Conewango, ignored the published and accepted standards of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads and the New York Department of Public Works, which provide that such an improvement is responsible only for meeting the extra expense made necessary by the improvement. The Tippetts engineers planned farflung highway changes, with standards of construction far more expensive than anything now existing or (with the single exception of U.S. Route 17) beyond anything even remotely planned in that area, and charged the whole cost to the Conewango project, thus improperly adding millions of dollars to their estimate.

In order that there should be the least possible reason for differences of opinion about cost estimates, we used the Tippetts estimates unchanged except where we had clear reason and data for changing them. For a large part of the Tippetts estimates they give almost no data from which their estimates can be checked. We took their estimates without change in such cases, not because we think they are right, but because they gave almost no information for checking them. We believe they are too high by a further $5 to $10 million more of improper cost.

With the corrections in unit costs which I have mentioned, and with the change of outlet and treatment of the Pennsylvania Railroad, our estimate for Conewango to fully protect Pittsburgh and Warren from three times as large a flood as would Kinzua, and to store the same amount of water for low water increase, is somewhat less than $85 million. If the project should be enlarged to cost $105 million, which still is $8 million less than the Army engineers estimate for Kinzua, then in addition to all these values it would also store three times as much water as Kinzua for increasing the low water flow.

THE BASIS OF THE DECISION OF THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS AGAINST CONEWANGO

The Tippetts engineers, in their letter presenting their report to the Corps of Engineers, made just three points against the Conewango plan. They were:

First, that the plan would cost more;

Second, that more people would be displaced; and

Third, that more land would be taken.

The charge that Conewango would cost more is inaccurate.

As to persons displaced, the six villages in the Kinzua Reservoir would be completely buried under water, and according to the explicit statement of the Army Engineers, 90 percent of the population in the Kinzua Reservoir would have to be removed to entirely new locations at a considerable distance.

In the Conewango area, on the contrary, at least 75 percent of the persons affected live in six villages around the margins of the marsh. The parts of these villages which might be flooded would be moved up hill a fraction of a mile without interrupting the community life. These are extremely quiet places in an economically depressed area. In one of these village only one new house—a 4-room cottage—has been built in the past hundred years. These old villages would be changed to live communities in one of the best recreation areas in the region.

The Tippetts report improperly included the entire population of these villages among the persons displaced by the Conewango improvement. If these villages are omitted from the count, the displacement is far greater for Kinzua than for Conewango. Therefore, that criticism is misleading and inappropriate. Moreover, the Tippetts report failed to count approximately 400 of the 835 Indians who would be displaced by the Kinzua project.

As to land taken, it is not acres which count, but values. The Conewango Marsh has little value. Omitting the villages mentioned, the market value of the land, as estimated by the Corps of Engineers and by the Tippetts engineers, and including the State park land, is greater for Kinzua than for Conewango. That criticism of Conewango has no validity.

These three reasons are the only ones given by the Corps of Engineers to the public and to the Congress in announcing the decision rejecting the Conewango plan.

An engineering oversight of more than 30 years ago never has been competently reviewed during the years since, either by the

Corps of Engineers or by engineers employed by them. If not corrected, it will cause the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars in cost and values. If I should be able to contribute in some degree to preventing that loss, and to avoid the breaking of the oldest living treaty of our country, I should feel that I had at least justified my food and lodging for my lifetime.

Respectfully,

ARTHUR E. MORGAN.

APPENDIX

HOW THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS CHECKED ESTIMATES FOR THE DIVERSION PROJECT TO LAKE ERIE

When I testified before the Senate subcommittee in April 1957, my testimony and that of Barton M. Jones was given by Senator ELLENDER of the Senate subcommittee to the Corps of Engineers with a request that our estimates be appraised. Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the subcommittee, said:

"At this point I wish to state that I am going to ask Mr. Tofani to bring the suggestion of Mr. Morgan to the attention of the Army Engineers, and when I recall them in the next 2 weeks that they are prepared and give us an estimate of the costs and advisability of such a method to control the waters of the Allegheny.

"I wish to give you assurance that before this committee acts we shall go into the details of your views. * * * And I hope that the engineers give you the same treatment that you give to them. * * * I have been dealing with them, the Army Engineers, 20 years now. I haven't found them wanting." (Public Works Appropriation, 1958, pp. 2464, 2471, and 2473.)

Without doubt the action of Congress has been in part based on the assurances given them by the Corps of Engineers.

The reply of the corps to the Senate committee was characterized by a lack of understanding and an inaccuracy which we can scarcely imagine coming from a great public agency. The Conewango setting makes possible several different types of design. One of these, as described by Barton Jones in his testimony, calls for a very large channel, with 160 million yards of excavation, to carry all flood water quickly to Lake Erie below ground level, with almost no reservoir storage, and therefore requiring the taking of relatively little land—in this case 8,000 acres. It would, in fact, drain and reclaim several thousand acres of the Conewango marsh. Another type of design called for large storage capacity in that same marsh, requiring the taking of 32,000 acres of land, but calling for the excavation of 60 million cubic yards of earth—100 million cubic yards less.

In estimating the cost for the Senate committee, the corps took the big estimate of 160 million cubic yards of excavation from one type of plan, and the big estimate of 32,000 acres of land from another very different design, and included the cost of both as though they were part of one design. It would be physically impossible for these two major elements to be parts of the same plan.

The land to be taken by the large channel would be mostly in the lowest part of the Conewango marsh. The actual sales prices for the lowland which would be occupied by this channel, were recorded by the Tippetts engineers, runs from $6 to $30 per acre. The estimate presented by General Person is $567 an acre. Thus, General Person's estimate of the cost of land required is more than 75 times what it should be.

It is clear that whoever made this estimate was ignorant of the fundamental conditions of the plans for which he was making an estimate, and similarly uninformed as to the nature of the land taken and as to its going value. Of course, this resulted in a totally false and inaccurate estimate of cost.

This impossible combination of elements from strikingly different plants was accompanied by an excessive estimate of unit cost and the mistaken classification of material. The Corps of Engineers estimated that the work proposed in Mr. Jones' testimony would cost $200 million as against Mr. Jones' estimate of $80 million. The largest single item in the estimate of the corps, as estimated by General Person, was for construction of a section of large channel calling for the excavation of 77 million cubic yards of glacial sand, clay, and gravel.

Now the Tippetts engineers, who made their study a few months later, in the employ of the Corps, had a large item for substantially identical material, to be excavated under less favorable circumstances.[1] In that largest item in the project, their estimated cost, for identical material under less favorable conditions, was considerably less than half as much per cubic yard as in the estimate presented by General Person for the Corps of Engineers.

The work involved in this very large item is standard, large scale excavation, with no complications, and the cost can be estimated within quite narrow limits. On such work a difference of 25 percent either way from the mean would represent a very wide range for competent bidders who are financially and otherwise equipped to do the work to advantage. The variation of more than 100 percent in the estimates for such work is beyond all reason. It does not represent responsible estimating.

For another large item of 25 million cubic yards of identical material, that in the diversion channel, the estimated cost per cubic yard given to Senator ELLENDER by General Person for the corps is more than twice as high per cubic yard as that estimated by the Tippetts engineers for that identical material a few months later.

In addition the estimate which General Person presented to the Senate committee improperly classified more than 20 million cubic yards of excavation, and estimated it at more than five times the cost per cubic yard estimated by the Tippetts firm for substantially identical material. On these three earth moving items alone the estimate of the Corps of Engineers, as given to the Senate committee, is about $50 million higher than it would be at the Tippetts estimate of unit cost for the same material.

The very careful and detailed analysis we had made of this cost indicated that the Tippetts estimates are somewhat high. Our estimates were made by a man whose work for 25 years has been to make detailed working estimates by which large contractors make their bids on large earth moving contracts. The estimates he made for this work were in the same careful detail with which he makes estimates for contractors' bids.

The estimate made by General Person for the Senate committee might be excused on the ground that in the short space of 2 weeks no adequate estimate could be made, and that mistakes were probable. Yet when General Person presented this estimate to the Senate committee, he testified:

"We feel the studies have been completed, and that further studies would not affect our conclusion."

That has been the position of the corps all along.

Is it not a serious matter that when a Senate committee specifically calls for the judgment of a great national agency as to the adequacy of an estimate it is considering, that this agency should present a statement prepared without even a rudimentary understanding of the work under consideration, and that its estimates of cost should be more than double those made by responsible engineers? Under such circumstances, what chance is there for a fair hearing to be had? This, I regret to say, is somewhat typical of the publicity which has issued from the Pittsburgh office of the corps.

---

[1] The chief differences were that the length and size of the channel in the Person item was larger, and that therefore the cost of equipment per cubic yard would be less in the item estimated by the Corps of Engineers than in the item estimated by Tippetts; and that the larger dimensions of the Person item would be more favorable to the method of excavation proposed (by Tippetts), the use of suction dredge. The actual unit cost for the Person item would be about 15 percent or 20 percent less than for the Tippetts item.

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter to the President.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, a letter asking a series of questions on the U–2 incident and the summit meeting has been sent to the President of the United States by a large group of Members of the House.

The letter was sent to the White House Friday afternoon. Since then additional Members of the House have expressed a desire to sign their names to the letter.

A report listing additional signatures will be made to the House.

Mr. Speaker, following is the text of our letter to the President:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 20, 1960.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am authorized by the undersigned Members of the House of Representatives to send you this letter.

We are distressed over the collapse of the summit meeting and the damage to our prestige and leadership in the world. The cause of world peace has been endangered. We believe that Congress and the people must ask the following questions. We believe it is the administration's responsibility to answer these questions:

1. Why was the U–2 flight over the Soviet Union ordered just prior to the summit meeting?

2. When the U–2 incident became public, why were a series of contradictory and false statements issued by administration officials—and who was responsible?

3. Why did the administration order a worldwide military alert from Paris on the eve of the summit?

4. Why did the administration first indicate that as a matter of national policy it would continue manned flights over Russia, and then reverse itself and say that it had ordered them discontinued?

5. Was it necessary to compromise the announced peaceful role of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) by using it as a cover for an espionage operation?

6. Why was there no coordination between the agency responsible for the U–2 flight and the agency responsible for our diplomatic functions?

7. Why did the President announce in advance that as our Chief of State he might return to Washington before the conference ended?

8. Has the traditional American policy of civilian supremacy over the military been impaired?

Cordially,

FRANK KOWALSKI, Member of Congress, Connecticut; CHET HOLIFIELD, 19th District, California; LEE METCALF, 1st District, Montana; STEWART L. UDALL, 2d District, Arizona; ROY W. WIER, 3d District, Minnesota; GERALD T. FLYNN, 1st District, Wisconsin; JAMES ROOSEVELT, 26th District, California; JEFFERY COHELAN, 7th District, California; THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, 1st District, Michigan; WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, 28th District, Pennsylvania; HENRY S. REUSS, 5th District, Wisconsin; ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, 2d District, Wisconsin; FRANK THOMPSON, JR., 4th District, New Jersey; JOSEPH E. KARTH, 4th District, Minnesota; DON MAGNUSON, 7th District, Washington; LEONARD G. WOLF, 2d District, Iowa; B. F. SISK, 12th District, California; MERWIN COAD, 6th District, Iowa; DOMINICK V. DANIELS, 14th District, New Jersey; JOHN A. BLATNIK, 8th District, Minnesota; CLEMENT W. MILLER, 1st District, California; BYRON L. JOHNSON, 2d District, Colorado; J. EDWARD ROUSH, 5th District, Indiana; HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR., At Large, Delaware; JOHN F. SHELLEY, 5th District, California; EDITH GREEN, 3d District, Oregon; AL ULLMAN, 2d District, Oregon; CHARLES O. PORTER, 4th District, Oregon; JOHN BRADEMAS, 3d District, Indiana; LEROY H. ANDERSON, 2d District, Montana; JOHN D. DINGELL, 15th District, Michigan; JAMES C. OLIVER, 1st District, Maine; HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, 11th District, New Jersey; PETER W. RODINO, JR., 10th District, New Jersey; SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, 7th District, Maryland; THOMAS L. ASHLEY, 9th District, Ohio; CHESTER BOWLES, 2d District, Connecticut; ELMER J. HOLLAND, 30th District, Pennsylvania.

Additional signers to letter to President on U–2 and summit:

THADDEUS J. DULSKI, 41st District, New York.

GEORGE P. MILLER, Eighth District, California.

KENNETH J. GRAY, 25th District, Illinois.

CECIL R. KING, 17th District, California.

CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., 13th District, Michigan.

JOHN R. FOLEY, Sixth District, Maryland.

WINFIELD K. DENTON, Eighth District, Indiana.

VICTOR L. ANFUSO, Eighth District, New York.

EDNA F. KELLY, 10th District, New York.

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, Eighth District, Illinois.

GEORGE A. KASEM, 25th District, California.

JAMES M. QUIGLEY, 19th District, Pennsylvania.

More names to be added to the list of signers for the letter to the President on the U–2 flight and summit:

LEONARD FARBSTEIN, 19th District, New York.

HERMAN TOLL, Sixth District, Pennsylvania.

WILLIAM H. MEYER, at large, Vermont.

EMANUEL CELLER, 11th District, New York.

JOHN H. DENT, 21st District, Pennsylvania.

EARL HOGAN, Ninth District, Indiana.

EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION BECAUSE OF AGE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, years ago this country recognized its responsibility to its children, and the first child labor laws were enacted. By the enactment of these laws, the Congress of the United States said that it believed there should be a minimum age established when a child could work.

The bill I introduce today will recognize another responsibility which I feel has become the responsibility of this Congress. That is to insure that men and women who desire to work, who are physically able, and who have proper technical skills and employment experience for the positions for which they apply, are permitted to work without regard to age.

Recent congressional hearings and studies reveal the fact that discrimination because of age can begin to haunt an individual as early as age 45 or even before. As our economy experiences more and more automation we find that workers in the 45 to 65 age group find it increasingly difficult to secure new employment.

To be unemployed because of age is a deep humiliation to a worker in the age group just mentioned, and jeopardizes the livelihood of themselves and their families. At the same time our Nation is deprived of one of our most valuable resources, the skill and experience of the mature person.

The American Legion and the Fraternal Order of Eagles, in both of which I am a member, have been concerned about this problem for some time, and I want to commend them for the educational campaign which they have carried forward to acquaint employers with the advantages of hiring workers in the 45 to 65 age bracket.

My bill would make discrimination because of age an unfair labor practice. It would amend the National Labor Relations Act by making it unlawful for an employer or a labor organization "to refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise discriminate against any individual with respect to his terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, otherwise lawful, because of such individual's age, when the reasonable demands of the position do not require such an age distinction."

Mr. Speaker, the reasons usually given for refusing to hire older workers is that they have "slowed down" or are "irregular in reporting on the job."

This assertion, Mr. Speaker, is not borne out by the facts which are included in the reports from the McNamara Subcommittee on the Aged and Aging in the United States, and a study conducted by the Department of Labor in 1956. These studies showed that older job seekers are more highly skilled and more stable in terms of job changes and job tenure than younger workers. Also, these studies showed that there were no significant differences in absenteeism and safety records between young and older workers.

The hearings of the McNamara subcommittee make it clear that little progress has been made through voluntary or State action, and that it must now become a national legislative issue to overcome discriminatory employment practices.

My bill will make it plain that national policy is strongly opposed to such a waste of human resources and manpower, and that we are determined to do something about it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES] be permitted to extend his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $243; and that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] notwithstanding an estimated cost of $384.75, may have the same permission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman tell us what is the total cost where these extensions exceed the authorized cost?

Mr. McCORMACK. On the two cases I have just referred to?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. One was in the sum of $384.75 and the other $243.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Both Democratic requests?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is an unnecessary observation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Undoubtedly it is unnecessary, but——

Mr. McCORMACK. If we go into that, it will apply both ways.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 12176.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

CASCADE, IOWA, MEDICAL CENTER EXAMPLE OF RURAL AMERICA IN SUCCESSFUL SELF-HELP PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, America's increasing population and higher living standards have created the need for more and better hospital and medical facilities. The Federal Government has

already recognized this need, and its responsibility in this field by helping communities, through their State agencies, to construct those hospital and medical facilities which are necessary to meet their needs. It has done this through the well-known Hill-Burton hospital program.

This program has been a great help. The needs of all communities, however, cannot be accommodated as only those areas which State agencies determine have the greatest needs or priorities have been able to construct hospital and medical facilities with Hill-Burton matching funds.

There is located in my district in northeastern Iowa a community which provides an excellent example of the action which a community can follow when it finds that it must construct modern medical facilities, without Federal aid, in order to attract and keep a local doctor. The community to which I refer is Cascade, Iowa. It has a population of 1,500.

I would like to point out the tremendously vital service which the local newspaper performed in informing the citizens of the area of possible courses of action and in creating enthusiasm for the project. The efforts of the Cascade Pioneer-Advertiser contributed a great deal to the successful culmination of the community's efforts. The work of this newspaper, in stimulating local interest and cooperation, can serve as an example to other newspapers in communities with similar problems.

On June 4, 1959, the local newspaper, the Cascade Pioneer-Advertiser, carried an editorial pointing out the need for resident doctors and a hospital. The editorial stated:

CASCADE NEEDS RESIDENT DOCTORS; HOSPITAL HERE DEEMED NECESSARY

What is one of the major problems facing small town Americans? That might be cataloged under one heading, adequate medical service. Hundreds of small towns, all over the United States, have that vexing problem, among them Cascade. What is the true picture regarding medical doctors locating in small towns? If you, as a citizen, interested in your community, in its growth and well being were to ask that question of one or all three of the committee appointed within recent months by the Commercial Club to look into the local doctor situation, you would be greatly concerned and shocked.

The day of the old family physician is passé. Gone is the day when the old family doctor, answered your summons, day or night, in fair weather or foul. Probably one of the last of that kind, Dr. M. I. Nederhiser, is just now returning to office practice, following an illness of several months, brought on by overwork. In their place has come the specialist.

Today's doctors demand and get something more than just an office in which to practice. Yes, the doctor of today wants and must have hospital facilities. If those facilities are not available the doctor goes elsewhere.

It doesn't take a seer or someone versed in business projection to reach that conclusion. All it requires is a visit with one or all three local men acting as a doctor committee, or by your own personal contacts, both inside and out of the medical profession.

As one young doctor who recently visited Cascade put it, "Our class has it made. We can practically dictate our own ticket. This is a business proposition with us just as it is with anyone else about to engage in business. There must be adequate facilities available. What do you have to offer?"

Cascade as it is presently constituted is similar to other small towns needing additional medical service. It has plenty of work, too much for one doctor to handle. True hospital facilities are as near as 8 miles in one direction and 25 in another direction but evidently that does not suffice. They must be here.

One of Iowa's small towns which can boast to top medical service is Buffalo Center, population 1,200. It has three medical doctors, all under 40 years of age. How did they secure three such doctors? First and foremost the town has hospital facilities. Originally started by a Dr. Dromlage, the hospital with a recent new addition is 100 by 40 feet of brick design, modern in every way. It has 14 rooms containing 20 beds. Twenty-three people are on its payroll including nurses, nurses' aids, cooks, and so forth.

A basic requirement for any community, if it is long to remain in the sun, is to be constantly alert toward improving itself. One of those basic requirements is adequate medical service. What then must we do as citizens of this community to insure the health of not only ourselves but our neighbors, as well. We must meet those challenges which face the small town and make every attempt to solve them. First, by being a booster for community betterment and second, whenever and wherever possible to assist in a monetary manner.

On June 18, 1959, the Cascade Pioneer-Advertiser explained to its readers the Buffalo Center, Iowa, Hospital and Clinic project as follows:

BUFFALO CENTER HOSPITAL AND CLINIC

The town of Buffalo Center, population 1,200, has the above fine hospital available for use by the residents of the area. The hospital has 20 rooms and last year admitted 936 patients. Services available include: obstetrical, surgical, X-ray, complete lab, physical therapy, and general medical. Three young doctors are on the staff of the Buffalo Center Hospital, which was founded by a fourth doctor, Dr. George Francis Dolmage. Considerable effort is now being expended by interested persons trying to build a hospital in Cascade.

WHAT'S YOUR IDEA?

An editorial in this column 2 weeks ago on the possibilities of building a hospital here and through such a hospital alleviate our medical doctor shortage, drew much favorable comment. Everyone agreed a hospital or clinic should be built. Not only was the local comment favorable, but it was well received in other localities. The editorial pointed up the fact that Buffalo Center, a town of 1,200 people, which is about 300 smaller than Cascade, has its own hospital the 3 young medical doctors. That hospital is self-sustaining. The editorial was read over quite a wide area, as the writer has been told of a number of other towns who now have hospitals or realize they must provide better health facilities for residents of their communities. Three towns who are presently building hospitals or will get them underway shortly are Guttenberg, Cresco, and Decorah. Each of those three towns now have hospitals but within recent months those hospitals failed to meet State requirements. In each instance it was a case of either building a new hospital, completely revamping their present one, or just quitting. As can be imagined not one chose the last. On the contrary each decided to provide their people with the best facilities possible. Under such community momentum, new hospitals will be built, assisted by the Hill-Burton Federal plan which provides that the Federal Government furnish 33⅓ percent of the cost. Location of each of the towns mentioned bears out the fact they are within easy driving distance of other towns having hospital facilities. Buffalo Center is close to Clear Lake, Mason City, Lake Mills, and Forest City. Decorah is only 1 hour removed from the Mayo Clinic at Rochester. Guttenberg is the same distance or approximately so as is Cascade from Dubuque. Will we as a community unite and give the hospital or clinic our fullest consideration or shall we just forget the whole proposition?

On July 2, 1959, the Cascade Pioneer-Advertiser in citing the Guttenberg, Iowa, Hospital as an example, stated:

ANOTHER TOWN LOOKS FORWARD

Guttenberg, Iowa, a town of 1,900, 38 miles north of Cascade, with only 400 larger population, has broken ground for a beautiful new 30-bed hospital. It can in reality accommodate 40 beds. When complete it will be ultramodern and compare favorably with any Dubuque hospital, only on a smaller scale.

The present hospital at Guttenberg was condemned in recent months by the State board of health. It therefore became necessary to do one of three things, remodel the present structure, build a new one, or fold up, so to speak, insofar as home hospital facilities were concerned. Having had the many benefits, over a long number of years, that a hospital can and does bring, there was only one thought uppermost in the minds of the majority of the people of that community, and that was of course to build.

Originally it was planned to start on a small scale, around $50,000 to $100,000, a unit for the handling of minor surgery, confinements, etc. When the fund drive actually got under way there was so much enthusiasm generated it immediately became apparent they could do much better.

Application for a Federal grant brought the information that the area actually needed a 30-bed hospital, and on that premise, money would be available. To fulfill that requirement it was necessary for the community to project its thinking: $300,000 was raised by contributions, a $100,000 bond issue passed with the Government furnishing the $200,000.

Cascade does not need a $600,000 hospital or one of anywhere near that amount. The above does show, however, what another Iowa town, in our population bracket is doing to cement its community. What Cascade probably does need is what Guttenberg originally started out to get, a $50,000 to $100,000 hospital where minor surgery, confinements, etc., may be taken care of. We either move forward or slip backward. There is no middle ground insofar as community life is concerned. In your measured judgment which of the two has Cascade done in the past 3 years?

On July 16, 1959, the new medical clinic in Elizabeth, Ill., was cited by the Pioneer-Advertiser:

ANOTHER SMALL TOWN LOOKS FORWARD

Elizabeth, Ill., on U.S. Highway 20, is about 25 miles east of Dubuque and has a population of 800. It has recently completed a medical clinic at a cost of $28,000. Information provided by Mr. John H. Gerkman, owner of an appliance center bearing his name, furnishes the Pioneer-Adviser with the following data relative to that clinic:

The building is 44 by 36 and was built in accordance with the Sears-Roebuck Foundation plan. The Sears Foundation furnished the building plans free. Mr. Gerkman said it was not necessary for the Sears Foundation to help them further but that help was available. "The building is very modern," Mr. Gerkman wrote. "It is brick veneer, has two examination rooms, two treatment rooms, consultation room, nurse and reception room, large waiting room, emergency room, X-ray room, utility room, two washrooms. The building is air conditioned, gas heated."

Mr. Gerkman also writes they had been trying to secure a doctor for more than a year but none were approachable because of the lack of modern facilities.

An organization, known as the Elizabeth Development Association, numbering 14, was set up. Each member subscribed for $2,000 in shares, total $28,000. A board of directors and building committee were elected. This board took office in December of last year. Today, Mr. Gerkman writes, "We have a young doctor who likes the setup very much."

Mr. Gerkman invites people from this area who might be interested in the clinic to drive to Elizabeth and see it close up.

Having shown the residents of the area what other towns of comparable size had accomplished in providing adequate medical and hospital facilities for their people, the Pioneer-Advertiser on August 13, 1959, announced a community-wide hospital survey in Cascade under the direction of the Sears Foundation of Chicago, Ill., to ascertain the community needs in the way of increased hospital and medical services. The text of this announcement follows:

SURVEY TO DETERMINE MEDICAL STATUS

Going forward this week is an impartial random, communitywide sample survey to ascertain what this community needs in the way of increased medical services.

This survey is being made under the supervision and direction of Sears Foundation, Chicago, Ill. Assisting in the work are two separate groups, Cascade Woman's Club and members of a committee from American Legion and business circles which has been meeting regularly Monday evenings to try and seek an answer to more adequate medical service for this area.

NEED NEW INSTRUMENTS

Cascade is not the only small community which finds itself in the position of having curtailed medical service. Other small communities are likewise handicapped when competing with larger towns and cities for the services of doctors. The reason: doctors today need laboratories, X-rays, modern instruments—all the facilities of modern medicine to verify their diagnosis and speed patients' recovery.

MUST HAVE FACILITIES

Doctors now locate in cities where they have the facilities they need, at the local hospital. But if they settle in small communities they usually must either buy the equipment or do without.

Consequently, as doctors die or move away, few younger doctors take up their practice. The people in such communities are then forced to go to larger towns or cities for their medical care. And even when some doctors remain, who have inadequate facilities, the people rely on them mainly for emergencies and first aid. Their more serious ailments are treated by larger towns and city doctors.

NEED MODERNIZATION

To combat that, small communities like Cascade must provide themselves with modern medical facilities. Only then will competent young doctors be induced to settle in small communities, like ours. And only then will people of this area receive the quality of medical care they need.

WILL SHOW NEED?

The community survey which is now being conducted will show whether a definite need exists for a doctor or doctors in this community. This preliminary survey provides a factual evaluation of the medical needs of this area—and if such do exist the community has something of definite value with which to interest the doctor or doctors.

PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECT

Sears Foundation has retained a professional architect who specializes in medical architecture. Plans are available through them for a one- and two-doctor unit that is adaptable to local conditions, modern in design, and contains many built-in features. Complete plans and specifications are given to cooperating communities.

The community that provides modern medical facilities increases also its competitive position with larger communities in obtaining a physician. Sears, Roebuck Foundation has a close working relationship with the American Medical Association and the State medical societies. The foundation will also assist the doctor or doctors in setting up forms, accounting procedures and policies. It will also assist as an expert in medical business practice.

Sears, Roebuck Foundation is a nonprofit corporation and endowed by Sears, Roebuck & Co. to aid in the economic and social improvement of the American community.

In summing up what the committee has been doing and is still doing, with the help of the local woman's club, if the survey returns are favorable and a definite need is established for more adequate medical services, we must become more self-reliant and adopt also a do-it-ourselves plan, fashioned somewhat after the lines of those appearing in the Sunday daily newspapers. We either move forward or backward. There is no standing still.

A report on the medical economic survey was published in the Pioneer-Advertiser on September 10, 1959, as follows:

MEDICAL ECONOMIC SURVEY OF CASCADE, IOWA, BY THE SEARS, ROEBUCK FOUNDATION

It is the purpose of this survey to evaluate the community and its trade area as to its medical habits, economic potential, and ability to support a doctor. The foundation has been conducting such surveys for over 2 years and in those communities surveyed that have secured doctors, the doctors' actual experience shows, in every case, the economic potential as stated in the survey, to be conservative.

POPULATION COMPOSITION

Cascade, Iowa, is a town of 1,423 population, located 25 miles west of Dubuque. The population is mainly German and Irish, consisting of 42.7 percent adult, 57.3 percent children. Main industry is beef raising and farming.

HOSPITALIZATION

During the last 12 months, it is estimated 16.5 percent of the population was hospitalized. They went to:

Town:	*Distance (miles)*	*Percent*
Monticello, Iowa	10	48.3
Dubuque, Iowa	25	38.0
Iowa City, Iowa	60	12.6
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	45	1.1

The causes were:

	Percent
Medical	52.8
Surgical	26.4
Obstetrics	20.8

SICKNESS IN THE AREA

During the last 12 months there was an estimated 4,477, separate illnesses necessitating 8,155 individual visits to the doctor. This averages 27 patients a day visiting doctors. The breakdown shows these patients are visiting doctors in the following communities:

Town:	*Distance (miles)*	*Percent*
Monticello	10	61.5
Dubuque	25	20.8
Cascade	--	11.2
Dyersville	16	4.5
Other towns	--	2.0

DISTANCE TRAVELED

In order to visit doctors, the people of the Cascade area, in the last 12 months, traveled 228,580 miles. This averages 790 miles per day, round trip or roughly the distance from Cascade to Birmingham, Ala.

Economic potential

Estimated expenditure for medical care based on office calls and inoculations only	$22,675
Estimated expenditure for medicines (bought in towns other than Cascade)	17,000
Estimated annual expenditure for gas and oil driving to and from doctors offices	4,070
Total	43,745

In addition, these persons, when visiting doctors in neighboring towns purchase household supplies (other than medicines) estimated to total $72,530.

INSURANCE

Fifty-four percent carry hospital insurance.

Forty-three and three-tenths percent carry health insurance.

AN INVITATION

You and your family are urged to attend a meeting of utmost importance to the future of this entire community, a medical center, bringing with it increased medical coverage. This meeting will be held at 8 p.m., Monday, September 14 at Legion Pavilion, Cascade.

Speaker will be Mr. Norman H. Davis, from Sears Foundation, Chicago, Ill., who will tell us how we, as a community, may secure increased medical coverage.

Slides of other medical centers will be shown.

COMMITTEE ON EXPANSION FOR MEDICAL SERVICE.

A communitywide meeting was held on September 14, and the results of that meeting were reported by this local paper on September 17 as follows:

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Sept. 17, 1950]

OVERWHELMING MARGIN FAVORS CENTER PROJECT

By an overwhelming margin of 231 to 6, those persons attending Monday evening's public meeting voted to work with the Sears Roebuck Foundation to secure increased medical facilities for Cascade and community. The written vote was taken following a 2-hour meeting in Legion Pavilion.

Norman H. Davis, director of the foundation's medical program, gave a talk on the community medical assistance plan and showed slides of one- and two-doctor units the foundation has helped communities build.

The next step will be organizational. A nonprofit corporation will be formed and an executive committee appointed. This committee will then form solicitation teams for the fund raising which will be in the form of pledges of loans to the corporation. The pledges will be called in at a later date. Retirement of these loans (they are not donations) is determined by the executive committee and will be done as the corporation is financially able to do so. Income for the loans comes from rent of the doctors. The stockholders may decide at a later date if they wish to sell the building to the doctors, should they want to buy it.

Davis pointed out that no less than a 2-doctor unit should be considered for Cascade. The cost of such a medical center can be guaranteed by the foundation not to exceeed $35,000. That cost would be for a building 48 x 44 and would include everything but the doctors' equipment, which

they will purchase themselves. Davis pointed out that the Sears-Roebuck Foundation has nothing to sell, but is only interested in giving its services to those communities needing them.

SECURE DOCTORS

Another service that will be performed by the foundation will be to use its contacts with the placement service of the American Medical Association, the State medical society and the efforts of its own medical advisory board in interesting physicians to come to Cascade. Davis pointed out that when a community accepts the program offered by the Sears-Roebuck Foundation and raises money to build the medical center, then the foundation feels obligated to work toward securing doctors until they are successful. He said the foundation takes the responsibility of getting doctors because of working with the community on the problem.

The following eight excerpts from the Cascade Pioneer-Advertiser depict the fund-raising drive, the election of temporary officers, the selection of a hospital site, the start and progress of construction:

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Oct. 1, 1959]

MEDICAL CENTER FUNDRAISING DRIVE TO BEGIN NEXT WEEK

The fundraising drive to build the medical center for Cascade and area will start early next week. Campaign materials have been received from the Sears, Roebuck Foundation and precampaign planning is now being taken care of.

A recent survey made in Cascade by the foundation shows that an average of 23 patients a day travel to surrounding communities for medical care. This results in a cash loss of medical fees of $22,675 and $17,000 for medicines. It requires $4,070 for gas and oil to visit these communities. In addition, these persons, when visiting doctors in neighboring towns purchase household supplies (other than medicines) estimated to total $72,530. This brings the total economic loss to Cascade to $116,275.

The Community Medical Assistance Plan of the Sears, Roebuck Foundation offers Cascade an opportunity to stop this economic loss as well as make our area a trade center for this rural area.

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Oct. 8, 1960]

ONE-THOUSAND-DOLLAR LOAN TO MEDICAL CENTER

The American Legion Auxiliary of Cascade at its Monday meeting voted to loan $1,000 to the fund for the construction of the Cascade Medical Center, Inc. Mrs. R. P. Neiers, auxiliary president, presented the check Tuesday morning to R. L. Tucker and Adrian Kurt, committee members. The fund drive was officially opened Tuesday evening when over 40 captains met to receive their instructions and pledge cards. Every person in the area will be contacted to help reach the goal of $50,000.

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Oct. 15, 1959]

PROGRESS NOTED—MEDICAL CENTER CAMPAIGN TARGET DATE IS SATURDAY

Target date for completion of the fundraising drive for the Cascade Medical Center, Inc., has been set for Saturday, October 17. This was the date set at the meeting of the captains on October 6.

The captains should turn in their checks and completed pledges at the Cascade State Bank before 4 p.m. Saturday. A special account has been opened at the bank to handle the fund.

Workers have been busy all week making their calls to help reach the goal of $50,000. To insure the drive's success, it will be necessary for everyone to lend as much as possible. Anyone not contacted by Saturday who desires to make a loan to the center may do so at the bank or by calling one of the captains listed in last week's paper.

Additional captains named since last week's paper include Robert Curoe, Ray and Duane Recker, Walter Callahan, and Ralph McCarthy.

All captains are asked to meet Saturday night in the auxiliary room of the Memorial Building at 8 p.m.

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Oct. 2, 1959]

GETTING CLOSE—MEDICAL CENTER FUND PLEDGED $44,000

The fundraising drive to build the Cascade Medical Center, Inc., is nearing completion thanks to the generous support accorded it by approximately 480 individuals, clubs, and organizations. As of this date the fund has reached the total of $44,937.

A few area captains have yet to make their reports so it now appears that the goal of $50,000 will be reached. No doubt some persons wishing to make loans to the Center were missed in the solicitation. The committee would appreciate those persons stopping at the Cascade State Bank or contacting one of the committee members who will fill out a pledge card for them. Those persons can help immensely in reaching the final goal.

MEETING SATURDAY

Any captain who has not made a report as yet is urgently requested to do so on or before Saturday. Cash and pledges can be turned in at the Cascade State Bank or may be turned in at a meeting set for the captains Saturday night at 8 p.m. in the auxiliary room. Saturday night will be the final report so all captains are urged to attend.

Monday's Commercial Club meeting produced another $500 loan when the club members voted to lend that amount.

ARCHITECT HERE

The committee has been informed by the Sears-Roebuck Foundation that its architect, Mr. Don F. Putney, of the Technical Service, Burlington, will be in Cascade Tuesday of next week to look at possible building sites for the Center. He will make a recommendation as to the best site available.

Final results of the drive will be announced in next week's paper.

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Oct. 29, 1959]

MEDICAL CENTER—TEMPORARY OFFICERS, DIRECTORS ARE NAMED

A temporary slate of officers and directors has been named for the Cascade Medical Center, Inc. The group will hold office until the first annual meeting of stockholders.

R. L. Tucker has been named president; Edward Kremer, vice president; and W. T. McDermott, secretary-treasurer. Named as directors were Adrian Kurt, Ray Noonan, Dr. E. J. Bisenius, Mrs. R. L. Tucker, Richard Devaney, Mrs. Charles Schneiter, Mrs. Roy Ganfield, and Leo Sullivan.

Don S. Putney, R.A., medical facilities planning consultant, Burlington, was here Monday to look at possible building sites. E. C. Whiting, medical structures consultant, Iowa City, creator of modular coordinated medical practice facilities, was here Monday evening to meet with the committee to discuss the building and construction procedure. He will return Monday evening to again meet with the board.

GOAL ALMOST REACHED

With almost all captains having reported in, the financial goal has been almost reached. It is hoped all captains will be finished with their calls by Saturday night.

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Nov. 5, 1959]

ENTER CONTRACTS—SELECT EAST SIDE LOTS FOR MEDICAL CENTER

E. C. Whiting, of Iowa City, consultant for Modular Coordinated Medical Practice Buildings, met Monday evening with the Cascade Medical Center Committee. Following a long discussion, second in 2 weeks, the committee entered into contracts with Mr. Whiting and Lyle Rogers, of Warsaw, Ill., who will act as general contractor, to erect a Modular Medical Building here. Mr. Rogers will work under the supervision of Mr. Whiting.

Two building sites were given careful study. The committee acting upon advice from both Mr. Whiting and Don S. Putney, engineer consultant, of Burlington, selected what is known as the Legion lots in East Cascade.

Mr. Whiting has been consultant to about 60 of these buildings this year. Mr. Rogers has three or four of those buildings in various stages of completion at this time.

Bids will be offered local concerns on lighting, heating, plumbing, air conditioning, and floor coverings.

Because work is starting almost immediately and at an accelerated pace, it will be necessary for stockholders to move up the date of their pledges. It is hoped that other public-spirited citizens will join in this community-wide project. Stock purchases are available through members of the committee or at Cascade State Bank.

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Nov. 19, 1959]

MEDICAL CENTER BUILDING STARTED

Construction started last week on the Cascade Medical Center, Inc. The footings were dug Friday, and Monday the cement was poured. A picture shows the building-site after the footings were dug. The picture was taken with American Legion Post 528's park in the background. Steel for the 44-foot-5½-inch by 49-foot 5½-inch building will be shipped from Elizabeth, Ill., on November 28. Pledge reminder letters are now being mailed to stockholders so that building expenses can be met as they arise. Payments on the pledges can be returned in the return envelopes enclosed with the pledge reminders, paid at the bank, or paid to one of the center officers.

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Dec. 10, 1959]

MEDICAL CENTER PROGRESSING

Work on the Cascade Medical Center is rapidly progressing. Work was just starting on the steel bar joists and steel fabricated trusses Tuesday when a picture was taken. Workmen finished the steel installation yesterday (Wednesday) and now have started on the roof. A photo also shows the exterior prefab wall panels. Lyle Rogers, Warsaw, Ill., the general contractor, has been supervising the construction. Art Dehner is the subcontractor. Completion date is tentatively set for mid-January.

Mr. Speaker, the dedication ceremonies of this new medical center were held on April 3, 1960. As the newspaper said:

It was through the combined efforts of everyone that a dream became a reality.

Perhaps this is why on a cold, damp, raw day, almost a thousand people came to the ceremonies and viewed the medical center with shining eyes and pride in their own personal accomplishment.

The Pioneer-Advertiser on April 7, 1960, reported as follows:

This community's new medical center was dedicated with appropriate ceremonies Sunday. The weather was not 100 percent cooperative but the number of people at both the program and open house following was nothing short of tremendous. Had good weather prevailed, it is doubtful if the crowds could have been handled. It is estimated 500 people attended dedication ceremonies in Legion pavilion and no fewer than 800 viewed the center during the afternoon.

Program speakers were lavish in their praise of the medical center, as well they might be. Its exterior beauty is eye-catching. Its interior, circular in design, is novel at the same time labor-saving for the doctor. Sears-Roebuck Foundation is to be highly complimented for the features incorporated into this building. One speaker at Sunday's dedication said it compared favorably with any to be found in Chicago, New York or San Francisco. Another voiced the opinion it was comparable to any in the Nation. In both instances they were right. This entire community may take pardonable pride in this medical center. It was through the combined efforts of everyone that a dream became a reality. This medical center should prove conclusively that small communities are far from gasping for their last breath. Each community is just as good as its residents wish to make it.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to speak at the dedication ceremonies, and the report on my remarks follows:

"If this town is dying, then I would like to be a part of it." So spoke Representative LEN WOLF at the dedication program Sunday of the Cascade Medical Center. WOLF's words were in reply to recent articles in a neighboring newspaper which implied that rural America (the small towns) was dying and would become a thing of the past.

Over 500 persons attended the dedication program and an estimated 800 visited the center during the open house which followed.

RURAL AMERICA ON THE GO

Representative WOLF, in his dedication address, referred to the completion of the medical center as, "Rural America in action; rural America on the go." He praised the area for its adjustment to changing times and its ability to get things done by the action of its own people.

"It's easy to write to Congressmen in Washington," WOLF said, "and say we need help, but first you must prove that you can help yourself. This has been done here in Cascade and community."

Speaking on "Community Relations and Medical Care" WOLF concluded his address with, "God bless you for the work you've done, I'm proud to be a part of you today."

TUCKER MASTER OF CEREMONIES

R. L. Tucker, president of the board of directors of the medical center, turned in an excellent job as master of ceremonies at the formal program.

The Reverend Thomas Bisenius, chaplain of Post 528 and assistant pastor at St. Lucas, offered the invocation.

Several distinguished guests were introduced including Mayor Leo Hirtz, Bernard; Mayor William Mausser, Epworth; Mayor Cliff Knippel, Dyersville; Mayor Leo Dolphin, Cascade; and E. C. Whiting, consultant for the center project.

Dr. Robert Myers, president of the Jones County Medical Society, was present representing the society. He congratulated the Cascade area on the completion of its fine center and extended best wishes to Dr. Mehrl as he started practice in Cascade. "From my own experiences," Dr. Myers said, "You couldn't have picked a better town."

DAVIS SPOKE

Norman Davis, director of medical programs for the Sears-Roebuck Foundation, extended his congratulations for the rapid completion of one of the best medical centers in the United States. "This medical facility could be put in any size city in the country and would rank at the very top," Davis told his audience. He presented a plaque to the center from the foundation in recognition of the project's completion.

Aslam Zafar, in this country from Pakistan to study Democratic policies and agricultural practices, accompanied WOLF from Washington and spoke briefly. Zafar has been assigned to WOLF because of the latters interest in agriculture.

Dr. William J. Mehrl, who started practices in the center Monday, expressed his gratitude for the help and kindnesses that had been extended to him and his family since they moved to Cascade the previous Thursday. Dr. Mehrl said they are looking forward to living in Cascade and becoming a part of the community. He also announced that Elizabeth Carr, R.N., would be the nurse at the center. Later, he officiated at the ribbon-cutting ceremony at the center.

LEGION COLOR GUARD

Personnel from Cascade American Legion Post 528 comprised the color guard. Making up the guard were Jerry Green, Pat Kean, Dave Dolphin, Herb Green, and Dick Sullivan.

The Dubuque American Legion Drum and Bugle Corps provided the days musical entertainment.

The Cascade Women's Club served coffee and cookies during the open house at the center.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this presentation of Cascade's accomplishments will show other communities which are faced with similar difficulties that they can cause miracles to happen through their own concerted efforts.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CHIPERFIELD (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for May 23 and 24, on account of attending United Nations sessions in New York City.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WOLF (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 20 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. QUIE), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, May 25.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DULSKI in two instances and to include an editorial.

Mr. SISK and to include a speech by Mr. WOLF.

Mrs. KEE.

Mr. BOSCH.

Mr. ALGER.

(At the request of Mr. MCCORMACK, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska.

Mr. FOGARTY in three instances.

(At the request of Mr. QUIE, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4029. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the proration of the occupational tax on persons dealing in machineguns and certain other firearms, to reduce occupational and transfer taxes on certain weapons, to make the transferor and transferee jointly liable for the transfer tax on firearms, and to make certain changes in the definition of a firearm;

H.R. 6482. An act relating to the credits against the unemployment tax in the case of certain successor employers;

H.R. 6779. An act to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable contributions for certain individuals); and

H.R. 9308. An act to extend until June 30, 1963, the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 44. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 24, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2171. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting 36 reports covering 49 violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, entitled, "Administrative Control of Appropriations Within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679(i)(2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2172. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to change the method of promotion of Reserve officers of the Air Force to Reserve general officer grades"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2173. A letter from the Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, transmitting a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts for $50,000 or more which were awarded during the period July 1 through December 31, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2174. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 51st quarterly report, covering the 1st quarter 1960, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2175. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting the anual report of the American National Red Cross for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, pursuant to the act of Congress approved January 5, 1905 (33 Stat. 599), and as amended by the act approved July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 173); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2176. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the initial report on the review of the administrative management of the ballistic missile program of the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2177. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the automatic data-processing (ADP) installation, New Orleans commodity office, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, October 1959; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2178. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 19, 1960, the following bills were reported on May 20, 1960:

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 12326. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1634). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 12261. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to market adjustment and price support programs for wheat and feed grains, to provide a high-protein food distribution program, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1635). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted May 23, 1960*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 9883. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Sixteenth report of the Committee on Government Operations; (Rept. No. 1637). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 9996. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to prescribe procedures to insure that foreign excess property which is disposed of overseas will not be imported into the United States to the injury of the economy of this country; with amendment (Rept. No. 1638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 9866. A bill to establish Federal agricultural services to Guam, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1639). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 11615. A bill to amend section 4 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1640). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 12176. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1642). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 536. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 10128, a bill to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1643). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 11854. A bill to clarify the ownership of certain church properties located in the Virgin Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1641). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 19, 1960, the following bill was introduced May 20, 1960:

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 12326. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

[*Introduced and referred May 23, 1960*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 12327. A bill to provide for the erection of Freedom Monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H.R. 12328. A bill to extend and improve the special education and rehabilitation services provided by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 12329. A bill relating to the gift and estate tax treatment of the relinquishments of certain powers in the case of reciprocal and other trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H.R. 12330. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the special milk program for children for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 12331. A bill for recovery by the United States of costs and expenses to it arising out of the negligent or wrongful acts of third persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H.R. 12332. A bill to establish an Arms Control Research Institute; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 12333. A bill to extend to nonprofit sport fishing or fishing fair or contest organizations and associations the third-class mail rates applicable to certain categories of nonprofit organizations or associations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.R. 12334. A bill to decelerate depreciation of income of cotton producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 12335. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12336. A bill to amend section 507 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the preservation of basic compensation in downgrading actions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12337. A bill to provide for allotment and advancement of pay with respect to civilian employees of the United States in cases of emergency evacuations from certain areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 12338. A bill to amend certain laws of the United States in order to abolish the death penalty, and to substitute in lieu thereof life imprisonment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H.R. 12339. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12340. A bill to provide for allotment and advancement of pay with respect to civilian employees of the United States in cases of emergency evacuations from certain areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 12341. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported shelled walnuts, dates with pits, dates with pits removed, and products made principally of dates; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 12342. A bill to provide for the erection of Freedom Monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 12343. A bill to strengthen the enforcement provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and extend the duration of the authorization of grants for State water pollution control programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 12344. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 with respect to the procurement of

property and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 12345. A bill to require the use of competitive bidding to the maximum practicable extent in the procurement of property and services by the Armed Forces through the establishment of specific standards governing the use of negotiated contracts for such procurement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 12346. A bill to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 12347. A bill to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 12348. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make it an unfair labor practice for an employer or a labor organization to discriminate unjustifiably on account of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 12349. A bill to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.J. Res. 711. Joint resolution designating the red and white carnation and the blue cornflower as the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.J. Res. 712. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the death penalty under the laws of the United States, any State, or any other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.J. Res. 713. Joint resolution to authorize the use of surplus grain by the States for emergency use in the feeding of resident game birds and other wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. Con. Res. 692. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Con. Res. 693. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 198 of the 84th Congress, entitled "The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Con. Res. 694. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. Res. 537. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 9883, a bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 12350. A bill for the relief of Marion John Nagurski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 12351. A bill for the relief of Charles B. Forrest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 12352. A bill for the relief of Marta Manelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 12353. A bill for the relief of Edgar Allen Gallegos and Ana Gloria Gallegos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 12354. A bill relating to the effective date of the qualification of Plumbers Union Local No. 12 pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 12355. A bill to validate the homestead entries of Leo F. Reeves; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 12356. A bill for the relief of Masaki and Yaeko Ouchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.J. Res. 714. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to confer a medal on Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 538. Resolution providing for sending the bill H.R. 4426, with accompanying papers, to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a system of payments by the Federal Government to the State of Nevada or its local governments, which payments will be made in lieu of property taxes on federally owned property in this State, which property is immune from State or local taxation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to propose constitutional amendment abolishing income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibiting the Federal Government from engaging in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as provided in the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose passage of H.R. 1884, which if enacted will prohibit the States from imposing a length-of-residence requirement as a condition to receiving welfare benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

470. By Mr. HARMON: Petition of Harold J. Crowley, Shelbyville, Ind., and 16 others, opposing the enactment of H.R. 10033; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

471. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Charles Fluhrer, president, Machine, Tool & Die Local 155, United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to supporting and requesting enactment of the Forand bill, H.R. 4700; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 21, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, May 21, 1960)

Future historical analysis of the summit may record that President Eisenhower's conduct scored a great victory for the free world. Meanwhile, we can all be "Monday morning quarterbacks." We all can expect, also, the bitterest, least-temperate appraisals to come from politically motivated office-seekers. At the moment, the nicely staged show of bipartisan support represented by the Democrat leadership's message to Ike at the summit has been rudely shattered by presidential-aspirant Stevenson's sharp attack on Eisenhower's administration. A spirit of constructive criticism would be more apparent if Mr. Stevenson had not alleged that it will take a Democrat administration and himself to do the job. Of course, we all know each person's evaluation of himself is high. That's human. But it's another thing to suggest against the background of the Yalta, Potsdam and Teheran Conferences that a Democrat administration can better handle or solve foreign problems.

Health care for the aged continues as the focal point of the social security bill being prepared for House debate. A move to hold hearings to get further information was defeated. To me it is inconceivable that a right solution can come from ignorance of the facts. We still have no comprehensive knowledge of medical services available or of medical needs and how they are being met, since we lack information on State and local programs. All we have, as data, is Health, Education, and Welfare Department information on Federal programs, which are only a part and not the major part at that. In my view, this is not responsible conduct, neither to other Members of Congress who look to the Ways and Means Committee for guidance in this field nor to the people of the Nation, including the aged and all taxpayers. Fortunately, the final page of this story has yet to be written. I hope politics will not dictate it.

The Small Business Investment Act of 1960 expands the Federal effort to make equity type capital and long-term credit more readily available for small business concerns. We thus add to the Federal bureaucracy and

the tax load, so that we can turn around and lend businessmen money to replace that taken from them in taxes. Tax relief, I believe, would be the greatest and soundest aid that businessmen or anyone else could ask of the Federal Government.

Debt reduction: Can debt be reduced by borrowing money to pay on it? To me, that's hardly more sensible than setting up a savings account by getting a loan at the bank. Yet there is periodic and favorable mention of a bill which would force Federal debt reduction without compelling a balanced budget or limiting the power to borrow further, which would leave us in exactly that situation. A better solution, it seems to me, would be enactment of a constitutional limitation on the Government's power to tax, spend, and borrow and which would require a yearly balanced budget.

H.R. 5, the Foreign Investment Incentive Act, passed narrowly 195 to 192. Earlier this year it was left hanging in midair after partial floor debate. Though aimed basically at according U.S. firms doing business abroad the same tax treatment given foreign-based subsidiaries of U.S. companies, the 61-page bill was complicated and technical. It was not understood by many, I am sure, among both the proponents and opponents. Originally a move to simplify and equalize tax treatment, the bill soon became one of concern to the State Department (to help develop officially designated underdeveloped countries); Labor Department (that wage levels and working conditions in these industries must not be substandard according to each country's standard); Commerce Department (only 10 percent of goods manufactured by U.S. industries located abroad can be shipped back into the United States); and so on. Thus a tax bill became the vehicle for a lot of social proposals in no way related to taxes.

Construction of a Federal Center Building in Dallas may have been delayed indefinitely by a strictly partisan move among Democrats on the Public Works Committee. The vote, I'm told, was 18 to 7 with all Republicans voting for approval of the project and all Democrats (including 10 proxies) against.

Controversial issues lie ahead in the short time left before adjournment and political conventions: (1) Federal aid to education; (2) Federal aid to depressed areas; (3) Federal aid to the housing industry; (4) interest rate ceiling. These are some that will provoke bitter partisan arguments. This does not assure a proper solution for the problems, of course.

Random notes: The television series will continue on WFAA–TV Sundays at 10:30 a.m. * * * A preliminary tabulation of the questionnaire returns is complete, and I hope to finish a survey of this year's answers by June 1. Any who mean to reply to the current questionnaire and have not yet done so should send it to me this month.

Award to Dr. J. Fred Rippy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I announce to the House the 1960 William Volker Distinguished Service Award for outstanding achievements as a scholar and teacher to Dr. J. Fred Rippy, history professor emeritus of the University of Chicago. A stipend of $15,000 goes with the award.

Dr. Rippy was a member of the University of Chicago faculty for 31 years until his retirement in 1958. He was internationally recognized as America's foremost authority on Latin America. He now resides in Durham, N.C.

It will interest my colleagues to know that this distinguished scholar for years has been a regular reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. No matter how busy his schedule, he has found time to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of his daily must.

Hon. Leonard G. Wolf Discusses Role of Congress in Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. F. SISK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and able colleague from Iowa, the Honorable LEONARD G. WOLF, of Iowa, was selected as the guest speaker at the National Aeronautical Electronics Conference at Dayton, Ohio. Congressman WOLF is a distinguished member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, upon which I also have the honor of serving. I have had an opportunity to observe his fine work on the committee, and I think every Member will want to study Congressman WOLF's description of the work of the committee and his pertinent comments on America's position in the space age, which formed the theme of his speech at the Conference on May 3.

The text of Congressman WOLF's address follows:

I am indeed flattered to have this opportunity to speak to you tonight. It is always a stimulating experience to address an audience of well-informed and highly professional people such as you. By the way, I stand here, as a one-time Navy electrician, World War II vintage and I know the difference between an ohm and a watt, or a resistor and a condenser, and especially the difference between a hot line and a ground. I find this very inadequate after today's experiences at Wright Patterson.

But I think that if I were now pursuing a career in the field of electronics I would be greatly excited and stimulated by the great events that are taking place in the programs of rocket research and space exploration currently being pursued by the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. These events have a significance to developments in electronics research that stretches out into the future far beyond our ability to envision. The implications in the single fact of being able to communicate with and receive information from a space vehicle—Pioneer V—out to 50 million miles or more are to me simply staggering. We are only now approaching the threshold of achieving manned flight through space to the moon and to the planets, which could not be possibly accomplished without the unceasing drive toward progressive development that has been demonstrated over the past years not only by you and your colleagues, but also by our great national industrial complex that has made possible the comparatively recent growth of the electronics industry. Today I met a man who is still working, yet worked with the Wright brothers just a few short years ago.

Now, let me go into the role of Congress in the development of our space programs, and in a much larger sense, its interest in all aspects of scientific research and development.

For many years, perhaps more positively since World War II, there has been a growing awareness in Congress, particularly in the House of Representatives, of the increasing importance of scientific research and development in the everyday life of our people and, equally important, as a very important part of our defense and national resources.

If we reflect upon the historical significance of our great economic and social advances that followed World War I, of the roaring twenties, of the depression, of the thirties, and of another great industrial and economic upsurge coming out of World War II, we can then perceive more clearly the recent emergence into early maturity of a vigorous approach, nationally, to scientific research and development as the root-source of future security and economic prosperity. Congress and the executive branch, including the military departments, have been keenly aware of this fact, and nowhere has this awareness been more pointedly expressed than by the Department of Defense in its requests for steadily increasing appropriations to pursue military research and development programs submitted to Congress every year.

For instance, the budget for research, development, and engineering submitted by the DOD for the coming fiscal year is almost $6 billion. And the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has almost doubled its budget in its 2 years of existence from $500 million to more than $900 million. Congress has expressed its awareness of the importance of R. & D., by appropriating almost all the funds requested.

Of course, we have had outstanding scientific organizations within the many Departments of the Government for many years. I need only point to the National Bureau of Standards and the National Science Foundation, as examples. But, in comparison to the DOD, the funds required by these organizations have been very small indeed.

My committee, the Committee on Science and Astronautics as well as the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, is the latest and perhaps the most significant expression of Congress of its awareness that productive research and development, both basic and applied, has become a factor of major importance to our national community. Incidentally, my committee is the first standing committee that has been created by the House of Representatives since 1900. During the 2d session of the 85th Congress, the Select (that means temporary) Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration, working with great energy and drive, created the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and dedicated it to the peaceful exploration of space for the benefit of mankind everywhere.

My committee is the direct descendant of that select committee and has functioned with even greater vigor and action. My committee has a record of having held more hearings in its first year than any committee in the history of Congress. To give you an idea of the extent of our interests and jurisdiction, aside from our legislative responsibilities, we have held definitive hearings on the international control of outer space, ground-cushion phenomena, satellites for world communication, missile development and space science, space propulsion,

nuclear explosions in space, to name only a few. Yes, and in earth sciences, oceanography, social sciences, too.

But, you may ask why does a congressional committee take the time and expend the energy to make such detailed investigations? Why doesn't it just concern itself with enacting legislation and acting as a watchdog over the executive branch? The answers to such seemingly innocuous questions are really quite complex.

Ladies and gentlemen, it has been my continuing mission since being elected to Congress, to point out as emphatically and as often as I can, that within our country there is no longer existing a clear division between civilian and military. We no longer live during times of peace and of war.

We are, and have been for many years, continually and unceasingly at war—with only the shooting suspended and not always is this true. Now, no one doubts that Western civilization is faced, in the form of the Communist philosophy, with its most deadly threat since Genghis Khan stormed out of Mongolia with his "golden horde" and brought Europe almost to the brink of complete political and social disintegration in the 12th century. To quote Gen. John B. Medaris, who appeared before our committee on February 18 of this year, "Fundamentally [the United States-Soviet competition] is a clash between different philosophies as to the position of the individual in society. The field of conflict is so broad, so profound, that it encompasses every element of international power—military, economic, diplomatic, political, psychological, and spiritual."

Coupling my first premise that scientific research and development is assuming a paramount importance to the lives of all our people, with the realization and acceptance of the fact that we are engaged in a universal conflict, which can result only in unconditional surrender either by the West or the East, Khrushchev's "We will bury you" was no figure of speech, then it should become clear that each and every one of you, and your colleagues in the other scientific disciplines, hold presently, to a major degree, the responsibility for our continued existence as free people. It therefore becomes the objective of Congress and my committee to support and foster, as a principal national resource, the scientific mission in every field of endeavor.

In this connection, let us consider the education of our young people. We have held considerable hearings on this subject and received testimony from many outstanding educators and educational administrators. And I am sure that many of you have a deep interest in this field. In this very basic, fundamental area, we are, right now, seeing the Soviet Union turning out scientists and engineers at a rate far surpassing our own. The Red bosses recognized years ago that the success of their mission to communize the world would depend upon excelling all other nations, particularly the United States, in science and technology. Such success would depend totally on the quality and quantity of trained scientists that would be available to their research and engineering programs, and ultimately making world dominion possible. We must come to grips with the great needs in the field of education and quit arguing over who has the responsibility to do it and get the education program going.

You can see why we in Congress and in my committee are concerned with the education of scientists in our country, and also for the material well-being of much of the world.

Let me speak now about the interest of our committee in the space program.

During the International Geophysical Year recently terminated, the United States assumed the responsibility for placing a satellite in orbit around the earth to explore the regions beyond our atmosphere. The Navy, and the Naval Research Laboratory was assigned the Vanguard mission and proceeded with the necessary design, engineering and tests, despite the fact that the Army's Ballistic Missile Agency at Huntsville, Ala., by slightly modifying the existing Redstone missile, was ready to place a satellite in orbit almost a year before the scheduled Vanguard. Then, as we all know, came the great awakening; inaugurated by Sputnik I. Our complacency had been jolted. False illusions regarding the Soviet Union's technological capabilities were thoroughly dissipated. And we stood before the world, figuratively, with our scientific halo down around our ears. We learned there was no longer room for complacency. I left Russia just a few days before Sputnik I, when, in my first speeches, I suggested Russia had some scientific surprises for us my audiences laughed with pompous self-esteem. And then sputnik—then my audiences would say, "Now how come? What happened to American leadership?"

Between Sputnik I and now has evolved gradually, grimly, and often painfully, the comprehensive space research program now underway in NASA. And there is no question that in the last few years, our satellite and deep probe projects have paid off handsomely. It is an established fact that our space vehicles have contributed data to the scientific communities of the world that quantitatively and qualitatively exceeds that of the Soviet Union by several orders of magnitude.

I'd like to read two significant comments from Mr. Baldwin of the New York Times.

Baldwin says the reason for this is that we Americans have not recognized sufficiently the psychological and political aspects of the space race. "The nation's space program," he writes, "has been too much under the authority of the mathematical scientists—the 'pure' researchers to whom scientific facts and findings are ends in themselves—and the budget planners, economists and cost accountants."

However, in awareness of the political and psychological importance of space achievements Moscow has been far more perceptive than Washington. Our greater proficiency in the accumulation of scientific data has been more than offset in world opinion by the Russian "firsts"; first sputnik; first deep-space probe; first picture of the "dark side" of the moon; first rocket to hit the moon. Moreover, the Soviet space program excels our own in the greatly superior thrust of the Soviet booster rockets.

And a comment of Dr. Eberhardt Rechtin, the Chief of the Telecommunications Division, states this in the following manner: "At the present time, one of the most remarkable features of the U.S. position is the almost complete lack of urgency in the space program. Our space program costs less than $10 per year per U.S. adult or roughly, one evening's entertainment per year."

Yes, insofar as booster thrust and weight lifting capabilities are concerned our rocket development is still several years behind that of the U.S.S.R., whose Sputnik III exceeded in weight, the total sum of the payload of every satellite and space probe we have sent up, to date.

However, in many long hours of hearings our committee has heard from Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and his associates, regarding the progress of current NASA satellite launching programs, the development of large and superlarge boosters, and the plans for a continuously productive program leading to an ever-growing space capability. And I can assure you tonight that our future in space looks very promising indeed, particularly with regard to the development of large boosters such as the Saturn and the Nova. However, I cannot equate our relationship with Russian progress. They are not standing still. But despite our successes so far the history of the management process that have characterized our missile and space programs has left much to be desired. To put it bluntly, they were delayed by an almost pathological inability to choose our objectives and to make management decisions on the top level, to organize Government resources for the job needed to be done.

And I say this despite the brilliant success of our Armed Forces in bringing their ballistic missiles to operational status in record time. To quote Dr. Simon Ramo, outstanding scientist and industrial organizer of our day, who appeared before our committee: "We have become bogged down again with the real bottleneck—not the limited technical and physical resources available in this Nation, but instead, the slow process of decisionmaking, organization, and arrangementmaking.

"Today, years after complete demonstrations of our technical capability and years after the unprecedented simultaneous implementation of all of the production tools and facilities and operational military planning for the full utilization of these technical accomplishments, we still seem to be involved in major debates as to how many should be the numbers of missiles that we provide to insure inevitable retaliation—this, even though a substantial part of America's capacity for competitive hardware production stands unused." I might say at this point, that most of the rivalry and friction between the services has been caused by this decisionmaking problem at the top. The individual chiefs have had to fight to maintain their programs. And they hoped that the rival chiefs would do the same. But all of this should have been unnecessary, had proper decisions been made and on time at the summit.

This is where Congress and my committee has made the largest contribution—the continuous insistence and polite prodding that all the responsible Government agencies develop, by every means available, the most efficient organizations possible, obtain the best scientific talent available, and provide leadership to American industry which, in the final analysis, is the only instrumentality by which our national scientific objectives can be achieved.

I have tried in these few brief moments to give you an idea of the depth and breadth of my committee's responsibilities and areas of action. We Americans are living in a period of fateful decisions made by men who are motivated either by a belief in moral law and the inherent dignity of man, or in the supremacy of the state. These decisions will inevitably and permanently effect our lives as free people, surrounded by an incredible plentitude that has been the product of our science, our technology, our industires and hard work, a plentitude that is experienced nowhere else in the world. We are richer far beyond what our fathers ever envisioned we could be. And our material wealth is the envy of all peoples. Our danger lies in the complacency bred by plenty.

I have had an opportunity to travel extensively in the world, only recently returning from southeast Asia and the Orient. There I saw human degradation of a fantastic order that beggars description. I have seen people who are struggling to survive without even the basic human needs of food, clothing and shelter, living in the midst of squalor that makes our worst city slums look like the hanging gardens of Babylon. I have been in places where a cupful of rancid, spoiled food is worth more than a human life. And yet, these people live in hope, striving as best they may for a better future for their children. And they have before them two avenues that they could travel toward that future—one posted with

the hypocrisy and blandishments of communism, the other with the promise and truth of democracy. I say to you that we are competing with the Soviet Union, not for space, not for the marketplace, but for the minds and trust of uncommitted peoples all over the world.

How is American science, research, technology a part of this competition? We have made it irrefutably evident that the products of hard work, the exploitation of our natural gifts and the unceasing development of our scientific and technical aptitudes have been combined to give America what it has today. And this, the most important point of all, has been done within a society of free men and women in less than 200 years. And, the same is possible for all peoples. This is the message we must bring to those struggling people. This is the bright hope we must give them. Material and spiritual progress is possible without destroying the basic freedoms.

I think, ladies and gentlemen, that perhaps our greatest virtue is not solely in our abilities to produce, but rather too, in our willingness to give. I think that most of us believe that we are our brother's keeper, and have acted that way over the years. I do not mean to imply that in helping to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and shelter the homeless of the world that each one of us were self-conscious in doing so. Nor do I believe we have sent our bounty overseas like the ostentatious philanthropist.

No. Because I have seen in these countries American shovels, tractors, combines, looms, all types of machinery along with American scientists, technicians, engineers, doctors—there to teach and instruct those people how to help themselves, and to have pride in their own accomplishments. We must increase this area even more. We must lead in this area, not as a military power, but as a free nation whose only desire is to help raise up mankind.

I need only point to our enormous contributions to the rebuilding of war-devastated nations, particularly Japan, now a thriving, vigorous commercial country 15 years after almost complete economic disaster.

These are the things that American science has made possible. And thus through our technology have we affirmed our principles of morality and humanity. We must be sure that those countries which have not as yet finally chosen the road down which they will march toward the future, have an opportunity to respond to those same eternal principles and hopefully create a better life for their people through the democratic process.

Therefore, you and I, as participants in this great outpouring of scientific discovery, energy, and accomplishment, in our own humble way, strive for the common goal so earnestly desired by everyone. You, more directly than I, can be part of translating concept into reality.

The goal of my committee, as the instrument of the greatest form of human government the world has ever known, guides and attempts to give to our national research and development programs a positive and constructive emphasis. It is the firm belief of my colleagues that the results achieved through our national and scientific efforts should benefit all mankind. As an instrument of the Government that stands as a symbol of intellectual fredeom for everyone, the Committee on Science and Astronautics has the incomparable opportunity to play a major role in assuring to ourselves and the free world the security and tranquility that is sought and dreamed of by so many. And with God's help, that opportunity will lead man ever closer to realizing the promise that was given to him 2,000 years ago in Bethelhem, "Peace on earth, to men of good will."

Graphic Arts Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, each year the Buffalo Newspaper Guild, Local 26, in Buffalo, N.Y., sponsors a competition whereby staff members enter their respective work which was published in their newspaper during the year.

More than 300 entries were submitted by staff members of four Niagara Frontier daily newspapers. The winners were selected by newsmen in Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Toronto.

Buffalo Evening News staff members won all five awards in the graphic arts—three in photography, and one each for cartooning and illustration. Its reporters and editors took both sports writing prizes and also scored in the editorial writing, individual reporting, woman's page and headline writing categories.

The Buffalo Evening News winners were:

Millard H. Browne, chief editorial writer of the News, who won the prize for the best editorial with an inspiring observation directed toward the "Class of 1959."

Pulitzer Prize winning cartoonist, Bruce Shanks, scored again with a cartoon that asked what Premier Khrushchev had in his other hand on the occasion of his American visit last year.

For his analysis and description of the uproar attending the Buffalo reassessment job, Ernie Gross, a News city hall reporter, carried off the prize for the best individual reporting.

A heading on a story about the button industry's woe—"Buttons All at Loose Ends as Zippers Pull to the Top"—gained the best headline awards for Elwood M. Wardlow, assistant copy desk chief.

Jean Reeves Allan won the prize for the best woman's page writing, with three interviews with home economists at a convention.

A stunning story about people who drive in the classic 500-mile Memorial Day race at Indianapolis won Jack Horrigan, sportswriter, the accolade for the top sports feature.

Dick Johnston's piece about a preseason clash between the world champion Montreal Canadiens hockey team and the Buffalo Bisons won the sports news story award.

A warm pen-and-ink sketch of St. Bonaventure University's late Reverend Thomas Plassman to accompany a feature story about the famous "Father Tom" won John A. Sunley this year's illustrator's award.

The Buffalo Courier-Express had three winners—one in feature writing, one in spot news category, and the other in interpretive writing. They are:

Richard Hirsch, who won his award in feature writing for his weekly column "Offhand," which has appeared in the Sunday Courier-Express for more than 2 years. This is the second award he has won for his column. He also won another award last year for a series, and a fourth award as well as the Walter O. Bingham plaque in 1956 for journalistic achievement.

George Wyatt won his award in the spot news category for an interview of a Massachusetts resident who was kidnaped in his car and threatened with death until he escaped in Amherst. He was cited for presenting the interview in "an interesting and dramatic manner."

William Folger, a previous winner in 1956, won his award in interpretative writing for his weekly column on the church page. His column also won him a Freedom Foundation award earlier this year.

Three photography awards went to the following News staffers:

Robert L. Smith's shadowy dramatic picture of physicians at Our Lady of Victory Hospital trying to revive an asphyxiation victim won the spot news picture award.

Merrill D. Matthews scored in the feature picture category with a Thanksgiving picture showing a small boy trying to hold down a large turkey.

Two speeding girls racing to the finish wire in the Erie County Junior Olympics gave William Dyviniak the honors in the sports picture department.

One winner will be selected from all these categories for the 1959 Walter A. Bingham Memorial Award, a prize honoring a late Buffalo Evening News photographer.

Steuben Society of America Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, May 21, 1960, the Steuben Society of America held its 41st anniversary banquet in New York City. This society which bears the name of Baron Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben of Revolutionary War fame lists under its policy and program:

1. This society aims to loyally support the Constitution of the United States of America, advocates the proper application of its provisions, and endeavors to inculcate the principles underlying government by a federal republic with limited, delegated powers.
2. This society is dedicated to maintaining the independence and sovereignty of the United States of America and its freedom from all foreign influence.

The society was very fortunate in having for its speaker at the 41st anniversary banquet the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING, U.S. Senator from the State of New York. The Senator delivered a very timely and stirring address of tremendous interest to his audience and which I believe should be read by every citizen of the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the address to which I have referred:

STEUBEN SOCIETY, MAY 21, 1960

Mr. Chairman, members of the Steuben Society of America, it is a profound source of pleasure to me to have the opportunity to be with you here tonight. Your famous Steuben Society is more than an assemblage of outstanding and loyal American citizens. It is a part of the America that we love and cherish—a symbol of the great stream of culture, of talent, of patriotism that has flown into our Nation from the great source of the German peoples, to strengthen and to ennoble this land we are proud to call our own.

Baron von Steuben can never be a mere name to Americans. He remains forever a part of our history, a part of our greatness, a part of our pride as a nation.

This is a time to be proud to be an American. This is a moment in history when the spirit that has made us great—the spirit of free men in a free society—is facing a challenge unique in the annals of our Nation.

And that challenge is being met—therein should lie our pride—by a massive and intense dedication to the principle that man is a creature of God, a creature of dignity—and that nothing we can strive for, nothing we can fight for represents a greater or more compelling cause.

We have known the face of danger here in America. It has surged before our eyes, cold and menacing, from the years of our history.

It was the ugly face that Americans braved with men like Baron von Steuben at their sides and in their vanguard.

It was the pitiless face we have seen on land and sea and in the air through all the wars of our birth, our growth and our maturity. A familiar face—but a foredoomed face—because the valor of American hearts, the strength of American arms crushed it to earth.

Now danger stalks the world again. It is not the danger dressed in uniform, the one we know only too well. It is rather the danger dressed in a garb of philosophy that is not only anti-God, but also anti-man. I here speak of man as a spirit, not as an animal, as an individual, not as a number. I speak of the mass operation to dehumanize man, to brutalize him, to legislate out of existence his soul, his conscience, his personality.

This is a new and ominous visage of danger. And it is not distant. It is not isolated in some remote land. It is pervasive. It is present. It is glaring at us on all sides. And you can read its identity card. It says, "communism."

Geography is no longer a lesson for children. It is a lesson for us all. The map of the world represents a study that should command far more attention than it does. For its blood-red areas are vast and growing.

The red stain has spread—is spreading—and as it seeps across new frontiers, as it trickles into new areas, the homeland of freedom undergoes a concurrent shrinkage, loses ground, loses strength, loses prestige.

This is the silent battleground upon which we fight this day. This is the threat to our way of life. This is the face of danger.

It is so often a well-masked face that we are prone to ignore its presence. As a nation we have been accustomed to fight conventional battles with conventional weapons.

Today the enemy may put on the very disguise of freedom in order better to fight freedom. In the name of liberation he practices enslavement. In the name of the people he oppresses the people. In the name of peace he would destroy peace.

This is a new pattern of conquest in the history of our world, new and ominous and deadly. As a symbol of its technique we have only to consider the ill-fated summit conference.

It is apparent, grimly apparent, that Khrushchev went to Paris to obstruct, to confuse, to attempt to divide, rather than in the spirit of peace seeking or peace making.

And the pretext he has used to promote failure is in itself an affirmation of the Soviet code of expediency, of total disregard for concepts of right and wrong.

Here we have the supreme irony of perhaps the greatest spymaster in history demanding an apology because his nation has been spied upon. Moral indignation is a mask that fits him poorly, yet he flaunts it before the world like an angel of innocence. Meanwhile, his espionage agents, scattered like termite colonies throughout the world, are eating away at the foundations of freedom wherever they are to be found.

And while those agents walk through our open doors, a great black expanse of secrecy marks the Communist areas on the strategic map of the world. It is a world hermetically sealed—in the military sense. Historically, our American cry of vigilance has been "on the ramparts we watch." And watch we must, so long as the shadow of an upraised fist falls across the sunlight of our freedom.

The resolve of the United States to live up to its role and responsibility as the leading Nation of the free world has been made unmistakably apparent to the Kremlin.

And if we must choose a symbol of this resolve it is to be found in Germany—in our unqualified support of the magnificent citadel of freedom that West Germany and West Berlin represent to this divided world.

Standing literally on the battleline of two opposing global forces, free Germany is an eloquent testimonial to human courage, to the spiritual quest for freedom, for self-determination, no matter what the risks, no matter what the sacrifices.

It is one thing to be brave behind a wall of security; it is another and higher courage to face up boldly to danger, head high, heart high, firm in the sense and assurance that one is in the right, that there can be no compromise with principle, no dilution of the basic freedom that means more than life itself. Our support, our identification with the cause of free Germany is, to be sure, a great bulwark in their struggle. But we did not invent the raw courage of the German people.

We did not put the fire of patriotism, of dedication in the hearts of Chancellor Adenauer, of Mayor Willy Brandt, of all the millions of free Germans who stand solidly, steadfastly, and unafraid on the very rim of danger.

In this regard, may I say a word or two about the matter of Khrushchev's threat to conclude a separate peace treaty with East Germany and turn over access to West Berlin to the Communist regime. It is seriously to be questioned whether the facts of life—facts growing out of the very German character he has attempted to subjugate—will make such a move politically practicable.

By this I mean that the strong signs of instability in Germany—which is another way of saying the presence of the free spirit of Germany—may well make a peace pact with East Germany fraught with danger for the Kremlin. For it implies an Ulbrecht regime that will be on its own both in foreign affairs and in domestic state security, and such an eventuality may create more problems than it solves, so far as the Communist grand design is concerned.

It is especially appropriate, in these days when the fate of freedom is at stake in the world, that I should have the opportunity to speak before the Steuben Society. For in your charter, in your reason for existence, is typified not only the spirit of a free America but the vigilance to keep it free.

Our strength, as a nation, must be measured by people, not by armaments. Our true strength is not in our military muscles, but in our citizens' hearts—in the spiritual dedication of people like yourself to the living honor of our great country, to the love it inspires in Americans, to the respect it inspires in all corners of the world.

Particularly is this spirit of dedication called for in an age of tremendous counterforces that press hard against our house of freedom, that chip away at its foundations, that would engulf it in the new, dehumanized society that communism seeks to create.

What is imperatively called for in this hour is an awareness of the presence of danger—and it is in this field that the mission of the Steuben Society becomes of paramount importance.

It is my feeling that too many Americans are prone to confuse their material well-being with a sense of security—to confuse their inalienable rights with permanent, impregnable liberty, to assume that labor-saving devices and freedom-preserving devices come in the same packages. The Steuben Society serves this Nation well when it raises its voice to remind us all that freedom is something that we can lose as well as win—and that to keep it in our possession, cherished for the God-given attribute it is, we must have the eyes to keep watch on it, and the heart to fight for it in its hour of danger.

We live in a new and dangerous world, and we need Paul Reveres like yourselves to alert the country to the perils of indifference, of apathy, of the assumption that freedom is a birthmark that no power can remove—when it is actually an inheritance that can be lost by default.

Above all, the struggle we are engaged in must be seen in the true perspective of our sense of survival as a nation, not in the false and twisted perspective of irrationality and blurred values. In this regard, let me say that I have been appalled at the number of letters I have received openly condemning our Nation for conducting spy flights over Russia. In the eyes of these citizens—yes clouded by a woeful misunderstanding of the facts of political life—we had no right to try to protect America and all free men from the sudden fist that strikes out of the dark to smash our freedom, to smash all that we have fought and died to create, before and since the founding of the Republic.

These are honest, well-meaning citizens. Happily, they are a small minority. Yet it is symptomatic of the confused values of our time that such people are prone to plead the cause of the enemy of liberty by seeking to apologize for one manifestation of the very acts of intelligence-gathering which are employed against us unceasingly, night and day, year by year.

If we were the victims of a nuclear Pearl Harbor—and heaven grant that terrible visitation may never come—these same citizens would assail our Government for failure to have secured the intelligence that would have rendered such an attack impossible.

Patriotism, like charity begins at home. And that, too, is where vigilance begins—where security begins—in the minds and in the hearts of the American people.

We must be an aware people—an informed people—if we are to preserve intact and undiminished the precious gift of freedom that was handed down to us—that remains our sacred trust for so long as we live.

That is why I would wish to see the influence of your wonderful Steuben Society radiated throughout our land—why I would wish to see it galvanize to action a love of country, a devotion to country that too often slumbers in the soft featherbed of apathy, of indifference, of sheer unawareness of the tremendously meaningful hours and days we are living, in this world of hostility, of challenge, and of change.

In closing, may I leave with you this one observation. It has significance, I feel, in the light of what has been said here tonight. History has recorded for us the many ways in which human freedom has died—gloriously, cravenly, forlornly—but the saddest, most ignominious death of all is when freedom dies in its sleep.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address which I delivered at the AFL–CIO Joint Council Meeting on Juvenile Delinquency, New York, N.Y., on May 12, 1960.

RESPONSIBILITY IN JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

It is a pleasure to be here with you today, and I welcome this opportunity to share with you my thoughts on juvenile delinquency.

As a Member of your Congress and chairman of the Appropriations Committee for health, education, and welfare funds, I have been fighting for new programs and legislation to help reduce juvenile delinquency. I know you are just as concerned with this as I am. And so, what I have to say to you will be a reminder of our shared responsibility for meeting and dealing with this serious problem.

Moreover, I shall point out some of the ways by which we can more strongly attack and deal with the growing menace of juvenile delinquency. The situation is not hopeless. Far from it. But there are things we need to do that we are not doing—and the time for action is now. So, what I shall say will show the gloomy side—the staggering statistics of juvenile delinquency. But it will also reveal the hopeful side—the opportunities for positive programs and action.

Juvenile delinquency is reaching epidemic proportion in our society. It is causing grave concern not only to you and to me, but to every American concerned about the present and future welfare of our country.

The statistics are shocking. The number of delinquency cases disposed of by juvenile courts in the United States nearly tripled between 1948 and 1958. During this period the child population of delinquency age increased by about a third, while the delinquency rate per thousand children in this age group doubled. Cause for further alarm is the fact that acts of violence against persons are increasing more rapidly than almost any other form of juvenile delinquency. The cost of delinquency in dollars and cents is also staggering. FBI estimates indicate that juvenile delinquency currently represents a drain on our national economy of $4 billion each year.

But the problem is even more serious than the surface facts make it appear. It is reliably estimated that one boy in five in this country now has a delinquency record by the time he is 18 years old. Though it is true that many of the offenses that are counted in establishing this figure are relatively minor, it is also true that the statistics on delinquency are limited to cases known to law enforcement agencies and courts. For every child who becomes a juvenile court statistic there are two or three who are dealt with informally by the police, even though they may have committed similar offenses. About half of all arrests for burglary and larcency and almost two-thirds of the arrests for auto theft involve persons under 18 years of age. Yet in these three categories, slightly less than one offense in four results in an arrest.

It is obvious then that the figures on delinquency represent only the surface portion of a menacing iceberg—an iceberg in which we should include all of the thousands of youngsters with delinquent behavior patterns. These young people must also be seen as people, not merely as statistics. They are the citizens, the workers, the parents of the next generation. They are individuals with productive potential—and many of them have the basic abilities to make important creative contributions to our society. We simply cannot afford this kind of waste of our productive youth. No country, not even ours, is rich enough or ever will be rich enough to afford it.

The child population of delinquency age will increase by about 50 percent in the next two decades. On top of this, in the next 2 decades many more of our people will be living in or near big cities. At present, the big city delinquency rates are three to four times the rural and small town rates, and adult crime rates also increase with the size of the city. It seems very likely, therefore, that as we become a more urban nation our delinquency and adult crime rates will continue to rise, with more delinquents in the juvenile age bracket and more and more of them moving into adult crime as they grow older.

For the last 13 of my 19 years in the Congress, I have been active—either as a ranking member or chairman—on the House committee responsible for levels of programs that include the field of delinquency. The subcommittee which I head has become increasingly alarmed at the national juvenile delinquency problem. Accordingly, last year our committee asked the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to coordinate a special effort and give leadership to persuade more of our scientists to turn their attention to study in the behavioral sciences. Such studies, we felt, should include inquiry into the psychological, emotional, and environmental factors leading to deviant behavior in youth.

From such knowledge we could hope to find a way of preventing juvenile delinquency. Let me quote from our report:

"In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare we have the Children's Bureau and the National Institute of Mental Health, both with interest, experience, and resources in the fields of child behavior, child welfare, and child psychology. It would seem that a collaborative effort by these two agencies, one oriented to research in behavioral, psychological, and psychiatric sciences, and the other oriented to research in sociological science with emphasis on child welfare, could lead to methods for helping reduce the tragic social burden that juvenile delinquency represents."

We asked the National Institute of Mental Health and the Children's Bureau to undertake a most careful and thoughtful study of what can and should be done in future years in the field of juvenile delinquency prevention.

The joint report of the National Institute of Mental Health and the Children's Bureau has now been received. Its contents indicate that, though we do not now have any final answers regarding the nature of delinquency and the most effective ways of treating different types of delinquents, we do have a good deal of useful knowledge resulting from scientific studies and from the experience of people working in the field of delinquency.

We are not completely ignorant and helpless before this crisis. We can identify the problem, we can plot its course, at least crudely, and we can take preventive measures. It is not enough to be against delinquency—it is our responsibility to develop a major national blueprint for the control of this epidemic. Fortunately, it is not too late for prevention and control if we are willing to take bold, expensive, and large-scale action, to conduct field experiments and demonstrations, to train needed personnel, and to do more research.

Our committee is recommending such action and is also recommending an appropriation of $1 million to the National Institute of Mental Health and $60,000 to the Children's Bureau in the coming fiscal year to inaugurate the first steps for such a program. We recognized, of course, that substantially larger sums will be needed in the succeeding years as demonstration, research, and training projects get under way, and as State and local governments begin to apply the findings from these projects.

But while Federal leadership and help are needed in attacking the problem, it must be clearly recognized that this effort requires the active teamwork of responsible private organizations such as the community service organizations of AFL–CIO, social and health agencies, schools, churches, and many other civic and community organizations. Such teamwork of public and private resources is required not only because the problem is reaching epidemic proportions but also because delinquency is so deeply interwoven into the fabric of our society.

Since it is obviously impossible to completely remake our society, it is appropriate to concentrate on a few strategic factors which people who have worked extensively with delinquents consider to be crucial.

There are numerous families with inadequate incomes in the deteriorated areas of our big cities. Many such families are unable to do an adequate job of child-rearing because of physical health and mental health problems, and because of lack of meaningful ties with religious, social, educational, and health agencies in the community. Health, counseling, remedial education, recreation, welfare, and voactional guidance services must be provided to these families, where needed, on an individual basis. Also, the basic structure of health, education, and welfare services for the entire community must be strengthened to prevent the spread of delinquency and other social contagion from these malfunctioning families. By focusing on such families and the services which they and their neighbors need, it is possible to launch an attack on delinquency now, even though we cannot deal with all the myriad factors associated with delinquency at once. The rationale for such an approach is derived from an examination of certain dominant trends in the American way of life today.

In our huge, complex, industrialized and mechanized urban society, we no longer have the informal social controls that characterized the rural way of life in America during the 19th century. For those who would achieve a rewarding position in legitimate society, a long educational preparation is required. Besides, there are widespread pressures which prevent youth from holding jobs or even learning jobs before they are 18 or older. At the same time, our society becomes increasingly complex and keeps changing so rapidly that it is more and more difficult for youth to establish a meaningful way of life and select a suitable career.

The child of today, unlike his counterpart 100 years ago, or even 50 years ago, does not have a sense of belonging, of never questioning his place in the community, in the economy, and in the world at large. In our medium-sized and larger cities there are many children in the low-income areas who are faced with the fact that neither they, their parents, their neighbors nor their

friends feel that they belong to the community or have a responsible role to fulfill. Particularly if they are part of a minority group, they constantly feel rejected or at least ignored by the bulk of the population. When the urban low-income child starts school he is likely to find that his previous life experiences have not prepared him for this setting, and that school represents preparation for a way of life that appears to have no place for him except in the most menial and lowest paid occupations.

Unless an understanding parent, teacher, neighbor, clergyman, or social worker can help him, through a continuing relationship, to understand this educated world better and see a meaningful role in it for himself, he is unlikely to develop the feeling that he belongs to this complex education-ridden society. This process of alienation from productive society can start very early indeed in the case of a child whose home is extremely deprived in human relationships and material needs.

Unfortunately, the major social trends of our time that accompany urbanization tend to create more and more of these rootless, alienated, and finally rebellious children. These trends include industrialization, increasing technology, larger and larger organizations, and the overall continuing expansion of our economy.

It is apparent that there are not going to be any easy answers to the problem of delinquency. It is equally apparent, also, that we cannot expect to make any real inroads against delinquency unless we simultaneously launch a broad campaign in the whole field of child welfare.

We need more and better professional services for children and families before problems arise. And in our programs designed to treat the juvenile delinquent, we need more emphasis on coordinating and strengthening all of the basic local social services for children. Such a program is impossible without broad citizen support at every level.

As chairman of the committee in Congress that has supported research programs to a very great degree of success in the medical and biological sciences, I believe it is possible to attack the juvenile delinquency problem through similar programs. I believe the Federal Government must support research, demonstrations, and training to provide the necessary scientific knowledge and personnel. The State and local governments do not have the resources for all that is needed of this kind of activity. On the other hand, the actual services to children and their families must be provided in the individual community, with the help of the State and local governments.

This will be done, but only if people everywhere want it strongly enough. Citizens and citizen groups, including such outstanding leadership groups as the AFL–CIO Community Services program, must indicate that they are willing to support Federal and State tax levels sufficient to maintain adequate child welfare research, training, and service programs. They must take the initiative in insisting that local governments, agencies, and civic groups mobilize to improve social services—and that careful and thoughtful planning is done before any action is initiated.

A careful blueprint is also needed in order to attack delinquency adequately. The Federal Government has a substantial role in this program and has already begun to take action through some of its agencies. For example, the National Institute of Mental Health is now conducting a substantial program of research focused on basic processes involved in social problems, development of effective preventive and treatment methods, and methods of training personnel to do work connected with these social problems. The Institute is attempting to acquire more scientific knowledge about the many processes involved in producing delinquents.

The major effort, however, is concentrated on effective application of current knowledge and skills. The consensus of experienced professionals in the field is that serious delinquency usually involves a long-term social and psychological process. In many delinquents the first symptoms appear in early childhood, with onset varying between ages 2 and 10. There is evidence that the process can be reversed or at least arrested, but early intervention and continuing attention are required. In this respect delinquency roughly resembles diabetes, which physicians are able to control if they spot the illness early enough and provide continuing care for an indefinite period. With delinquency, however, such control methods are less reliable, though promising.

Preventive care needs to continue at least through the adolescent years, perhaps beyond. In mild cases, such care may involve no more than an initial diagnostic study, followed by periodic contact with a trained probation officer or other experienced person, plus occasional provision of necessary health, counseling, remedial education, recreational, and vocational guidance services. In more serious cases, a continuing and intensive rehabilitative process is required, involving a concentration of coordinated services.

An essential counterpart to such individual and family care is an attempt to modify the spirit of the community in high-delinquency areas so that adults in these areas will show a more accepting, helping, and nurturing attitude toward all children in the area, including delinquents, and will participate in mobilizing and improving all community services for youth.

Since many experienced delinquency workers feel that they could do a much better job if they had adequate resources, the Institute of Mental Health is supporting three research and service groups who are testing out special delinquency control approaches. In order to provide these and similar groups with more effective tools to carry out control programs, support is also being provided for projects focused on early identification of delinquents and predelinquents, special methods of treating such children and their families, and methods of evaluating the effectiveness of preventive and treatment programs.

One of the three special projects at the University of Michigan is being carried out in a city of about 200,000 population. Thus far it has involved an intensive study of the social and psychological characteristics of delinquents in the community as compared with children whose behavior is exemplary and outstanding. There has also been extensive study of community services and of social and institutional factors involved in delinquency.

The next phase will be to transmit results of the study in appropriate form to a group of leaders in community services for youth, as well as to the community at large. This feedback process should mobilize a groundswell of community interest and concern which will insure total community support for a carefully planned delinquency control program. If community resources are insufficient to provide services needed in such an all-out control program, they will be supplemented in order to carry out the program at an effetcive level for an adequate demonstration period.

Another special project, set up in a middle-sized city in Massachusetts, is attempting to devise methods for classifying a sample of all delinquents coming to the court so that they can be referred for appropriate treatment. This effort is based on the observation that most communities lack resources and techniques needed for adequate diagnosis and disposition of delinquents. These diagnostic instruments have now been developed and are being applied to a sample of all delinquents coming to the court. The next phase will include a tryout of the recommended dispositions or treatments, with local services for this purpose being augmented as needed.

The largest project undertaken thus far is that of mobilization for youth, on the Lower East Side of New York City. This project, still in its formative stages, is expected to include both preventive and treatment services for predelinquents, delinquents, and their families, plus a broad program aimed at modifying community attitudes toward youth and at reorganizing and augmenting services designed to help youth move into productive adult lives.

Mr. James McCarthy, who is here today, can tell you more about this project, since he is the director of its action program. All three of the special projects being supported by the National Institute of Mental Health are of the type that need extensive participation by community service programs such as your own.

Aside from general support for such programs, there are a number of special ways in which organizations concerned with community health and welfare, and in particular your organization, can help attack the problem of juvenile delinquency. Let us first consider the problem of youth employment.

Early in this century child labor laws were introduced to prevent the exploitation of children and youth in unhealthful work situations. At the same time public education was expanded on a compulsory basis so as to permit all children to complete high school. We are now finding that many children have such serious difficulties with education that they are ready to leave school by the time they reach their teens. Many of them now do leave school by age 14 on a formal basis, or informally by very frequent truanting and by being inattentive and disruptive in class.

The great bulk of delinquents are recruited from this group. Over half of all delinquents are educationally retarded and a large proportion of school dropouts become involved in delinquent acts. However, automation and the shorter work week have made it extremely difficult to bring younger teenagers into the labor force, and organized labor has legitimately been concerned about attempts to lower the working age.

Yet some means must be developed for gradually preparing the school-rejected and school-rejecting teenagers for a useful work career. In some European countries such youth serve as apprentices in a wide variety of occupations and are thus gradually introduced into the adult labor force. I offer no solutions to you at this time, but would suggest that this is a problem which merits the special concern of your organizations.

The advent of the shorter workweek brings increased concern for constructive use of leisure time. It is within their leisure time that many of our teenagers get into difficulty. Certainly the opportunities for constructive use of leisure time are extremely limited in some of the deteriorated areas of our large cities. There is a great need for hobby programs, recreation programs of all kinds, and for the help of a large number of responsible citizens in developing such programs. These programs must be adequately planned and supervised.

Here in New York City there are a variety of such programs. For example, some schools are open all day and also during the evening, providing supervised hobby and recreation programs as well as programs throughout the summer months. Other agencies, including schools, are carrying on activities which help new migrants from Puerto Rico or from rural

areas of the South to become acquainted with the customs, services, and opportunities of the big city.

Experienced workers in the field of delinquency recognize the importance of citizen and voluntary organization participation in carrying out prevention and treatment programs. The actual or potential delinquent and his family in a low-income area may require a variety of remedial education, health, counseling, recreation, and vocational guidance services. If such services are to be provided in a way that meets local needs in a coordinated fashion, a large number of responsible local citizens must serve on boards, in planning agencies, and as volunteers. Such support is needed not only for agencies serving delinquents but for all agencies concerned with the welfare of the child and his family.

Although public interest in a problem like delinquency is aroused when an epidemic of vandalism, theft, or violence occurs, such interest is apt to subside as other pressing problems arise. Besides, delinquents have no lobby, as do, for example, the physically handicapped and mentally retarded children. Parents of delinquents do not organize as do the parents of these other handicapped children.

Therefore there must be continuing support from responsible organizations like yours for constructive legislation and for community efforts in the field.

Finally, and perhaps most important of all, much help is needed in spreading community concern for every child of the community, in setting standards, and in sharing these standards with parents of children in our most deprived areas. Because we are living in what has been called an affluent society, we are too apt to assume that prosperity has filtered around all of the corners in our economy. We are too apt to assume that significant portions of our society who do not share the comforts and opportunities on which middle-class values are predicated will nevertheless owe full allegiance to such values.

Delinquency is a growing, threatening epidemic in our national life, and only a portion of it is visible. National leadership and help is required to cope with this problem. And a larger part of that leadership must come from the teamwork of many public-spirited orgnizations, one of the more important of which is the community services program of the AFL–CIO.

Inactivation of 449th Fighter-Interceptor Squadron, at Ladd Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I consider it my duty to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House an alarming development with regard to our national defense. I refer to the incredible decision of the Air Force, recently announced, that it will inactivate and phase out the 449th Fighter-Interceptor Squadron at Ladd Field, near Fairbanks, Alaska, in August 1960. This unit, which is the only one of its kind in Alaska north of the Brooks Range—the only other fighter-inceptor squadron in Alaska being at Elmendorf Air Force Field near Anchorage, Alaska—has for many years been regarded by the highest military authorities as an indispensable shield against potential aggression by the Russians. Ladd Field, only 600 miles from Siberia, is a part of our northwest bastion of defense; a vital link in our perimeter of national defense, which includes Alaska as the corridor between Asia and North America, being an area once characterized by the late great Army officer, William "Billy" Mitchell, as "the most important strategic place in the world."

As recently as last March the Air Force programed replacement of its 25 F–89 aircraft at Ladd AFB for F–101Bs, in line with strengthening the defensive power of the 449th Fighter-Interceptor Squadron. This occurred at a time when international tensions appeared to be relaxing. Now in the midst of a worsened world situation stemming from our U–2 observation flights over Russia, we are confronted with the Air Force's sudden plan to withdraw from Ladd Field, soundly established on American soil in the shadow of the Iron Curtain, as contrasted with many of our foreign airbases which are built on political quicksand.

On July 4th last, at Auburn, N.Y., I had the privilege of speaking at a ceremony honoring our 49th State, in which I extolled the foresight and wisdom of former Secretary of State, William Henry Seward, in effectuating the purchase of Alaska from Russia, and noted the disadvantage the rest of North America would now be suffering if Alaska were yet in the hands of the Russians. Both the audience and I visualized the idea of Russian bombers and missiles being located in Alaska pointed toward the great industrial centers of the older States and Canada, and we did not like what we saw, which lent enhanced meaning to the memory of William Henry Seward.

Now we are told by Gen. Curtis LeMay, who requested the construction of Eielson AFB a decade ago as a launching ground for SAC bombers just 26 miles from Fairbanks, that Alaska is now of subordinate strategic importance and that for economy reasons the risk of phasing out the 449th Fighter Interceptor Squadron may be taken. This, in the face of the fact that said squadron has been on the alert for years to defend not only Ladd Field and environs against the possibility of a Russian paratrooper attack or destructive bombing mission, but to likewise defend the great SAC installation and runway at Eielson AFB with resultant protection of our whole country.

Since long-range missiles presently under development are presumably not yet operational, the Russian airpower according to Gen. Thomas D. White, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, is still Russia's most dangerous weapon. To my mind this makes the problem elementary and the answer apparent—this is no time to inactivate any part of our manned fighter-interceptor forces. Comes the day when East and West will have each other thoroughly pinpointed with adequate arrays of ICBM's, there may be no further use for Air Force bases as we know them today, but the time is not now, any more than it is time to phase out the Air Force itself.

I realize that the Air Force is hurting because of the recent congressional appropriation cutback on Bomarc widely regarded as an extravagant fifth wheel in our overall missile program, but do not think this justifies the economy reaction displayed in the plan to chop down our manned fighter strength. This reaction is equivalent to saying to the Congress, "You want economy so we will give it to you—where it hurts." Instead, the money saved on Bomarc should be made available to strengthen our manned fighter defenses. Such approach would be consistent with the fact that the top stratum of the Air Force has turned down the request of Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, Jr., Commanding General of the Alaskan Command, for intermediate range missile installations in Alaska to offset the 27 Russian missile installations in Siberia across the Bering Strait. If Alaska is not an area usable for exchanging missile blows with the Russians, it must be regarded as an area vulnerable to attack and attempted occupancy by the Russians for use against the rest of our country as a nearby launching platform.

An excellent and more complete treatment of this whole subject is found in the remarks of Senators BARTLETT and GRUENING of Alaska set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 17, 1960, beginning on page 10407 with the speech of Senator GRUENING. I invite all of you to read the able presentations of the two Senators, for the vital interest of all the people of the United States is at stake.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1960

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include a copy of my newsletter released today:

WASHINGTON, MAY 23, 1960.

KEENOTES BY REPRESENTATIVE ELIZABETH KEE

The collapse of the summit conference raises many grave problems for the United States and the rest of the free world. One thing appears to be certain—the cold war will be resumed with all of its dangerous implications.

The country is united behind the President. In view of Premier Khrushchev's violent and bitter attacks on Mr. Eisenhower, there is nothing else the country can do. A show of weakness at this point on our part or that of our allies could be fatal.

The failure of the summit negotiations to produce results is not surprising. But what is surprising is the violent manner in which Khrushchev chose to prevent them from even getting under way. The shooting down of the U–2 plane was the excuse he used. Obviously, he had made up his mind before coming to Paris to block any meaningful talks.

The important thing now is to present a united front to the world to meet an expected series of crises in the coming months. An inquiry into an unfortunate series of events preceding the Paris meeting can wait until a more appropriate time.

VETO BY PRESIDENT UNFORTUNATE

The veto by President Eisenhower of legislation to help in the economic rehabilitation of distressed areas is unfortunate. Twice Congress has passed this bill and each time the President has seen fit to kill it by veto.

In my opinion, the need for this legislation has been clearly established. There are thousands of people in various parts of the Nation who are at present leading hopeless lives. Their jobs are gone and the prospects of finding gainful employment are dim.

This legislation would have launched a cooperative program to rebuild these areas and create jobs for the unemployed. The President's six reasons for vetoing the bill did not seem to be very convincing to me.

Eventually, a program of this kind must be put into operation. The President's two vetoes have cost us valuable time in attacking a serious national economic problem.

WATERSHED PROTECTION PROGRAM STRENGTHENED

The House has voted an additional $4.9 million for the watershed protection program.

The idea behind the program is this: By building dams and other water checking facilities on small streams, the danger of downstream flooding on larger streams is lessened without the need for large, expensive dams. Also, the damage to productive farm land is kept to a minimum.

This program has been a success. In West Virginia and other States, some projects are actually under construction and others have been completed. There have been so many requests by local interests for inclusion in the program that additional planning funds were essential.

Protection of soil is one of the major problems facing the Nation. Soil is one of our most precious assets. We must not squander it.

I also strongly support the soil conservation program under which locally managed districts are formed to install soil conserving practices on a broad scale. Millions of acres are now included in soil conservation districts which are practicing the latest methods of conserving and preserving the soil.

This is a fine program which enjoys almost unanimous support in Congress.

Prices Charged by Hospitals for Drugs Administered to Patients

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, since medical plans for the aged have been advanced, many problems have come to light. A study made 2 years ago revealed that 40 percent of our retired people have some form of health insurance. Even this is often inadequate, and it is expensive in view of the limited resources of the greater majority of our senior citizens. In the meantime, medical costs continue to rise.

I return to my district every weekend and meet with many constituents, some of whom have had the misfortune of illnesses that have run into exorbitant costs.

In recent months public attention has been glaringly focused upon the high drug prices in our country, and emphasis has been properly placed on the wide disparity between the manufacturing cost of certain drugs and their retail selling price. I have followed the hearings conducted by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, of which Senator ESTES KEFAUVER is chairman, and I have noted one aspect of this problem which has not yet been explored. This is the price charged by hospitals for drugs administered to patients. Since the patient in a hospital is a captive customer with respect to the drugs that are administered to him, I feel that this should also be an area for investigation by the subcommittee.

In reviewing the many complaints that I have received from constituents, I find that many of the statements rendered by hospitals, for the drugs administered to the patient, are not itemized. Also, in every case, it was felt that the charge for drugs was excessive.

I shall include a copy of a bill which one of my constituents received from a hospital, covering 1 week's expenses last October for one of his relatives. I was astounded when I saw the charge for drugs—$676.25. This was over half the cost of the entire hospital bill:

The following is a duplicate of this bill:

Board and room (7 days, at $21.50)	$150.50
Cardiogram	15.00
X-ray	20.00
Oxygen	78.00
Glucose	11.00
Laboratory examinations	207.00
Surgical dressings	9.08
Special medicines	676.25
Total	1,166.83

Under "Special medicines," or drugs, we find the following items:

Aqueous penicillin (190,000,000 units)	$380.00
Molar NA Lactate I.V.	21.00
Chymar	5.00
Cediland I.V	4.00
Hydrocortisone	24.00
Solu Cortel	15.00
Vitamin B_{12}	10.00
Digalon	2.00
Streptomycin	8.00
Saline	.75
ASA suppositories	7.50
Chloromycitin	102.00
Levaphed	3.00
Sulfadiazene	12.00
Glucose	75.00
Rontine	7.00
Total	676.25

It is my earnest hope that the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee will delve into this aspect of drug prices since it is evident that a great quantity of drugs is dispensed through the medium of our hospitals. In view of the lack of competition in this area, corrective legislation may be necessary as determined by the facts after careful exploration by this subcommittee.

Washington, D.C., International Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a statement which I have prepared on the Washington, D.C., International Race, the "Olympic of Racing," held on Veterans Day at the Laurel, Md., racetrack.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., INTERNATIONAL RACE—THE OLYMPIC OF RACING

On November 11, Veterans Day in the United States, the unique Washington, D.C., International Horserace will be presented to the sporting people of the world for the ninth time. As each year becomes history, global interest shows a decided increase, not only among the peoples of the world who breed, own, and race thoroughbreds, but also by racing's millions who thoroughly enjoy keen competition anywhere.

By its very nature, the Washington, D.C., International is an "Olympic of Racing." By adding a sound sporting idea to modern air transportation, the Laurel Racecourse has developed an international spectacle already ranked the equal, if not surpassing, other worldwide contests featuring representatives of various countries in a struggle for global supremacy.

The Washington, D.C., International, with its Olympic overtones, is especially significant this year, a year in which the United States engages the nations of the world in athletic prowess.

Horseracing is not included on the official Olympic agenda at Rome, but what could be more fitting than for this great Maryland racing classic to serve as an Olympic vehicle? Understandably, it would be unofficial. But it isn't too far-fetched to see this sporting equine test, involving all the skill, speed, and stamina connected with the ancient Olympics, as a part of the games every 4 years, albeit not counted officially.

The race, begun in 1952 by Laurel President John D. Schapiro, was planned with this very idea in mind, that the best horses in each country, meeting on grass, the natural footing for a thoroughbred, and at the classic distance of a mile and a half, should have the opportunity of competing for the world championship of racing, in the same manner the various nations battle for supremacy in other sports. This certainly parallels the Olympic pattern.

Present-day air travel, with its speed and up-to-date equipment, has been largely responsible for this new era of international racing, but it remained for Laurel to do the pioneering and earn the success. It has meant work—hard work—and a lot of time, but the sporting people of the world now have a race of worldwide importance, a race in which the various champions of each nation can meet on equal footing in a battle for the bluest of all blue ribbons—a world championship.

It is especially fitting that this "Olympic of Racing" is held on Maryland soil. A small State in size and population, Maryland is nevertheless one of the Nation's leading producers of the thoroughbred horse. Over 55,000 acres are devoted to this industry, and farms range from the 2,500-acre Holly Beach farm near Annapolis to the

half-acre lot near Timonium where the fabulous Maryland-bred horse, Yes You Will, was raised.

The area comprising Baltimore, Howard, Harford, Prince Georges, and Montgomery Counties, produces 13 percent of all the thoroughbreds foaled yearly in the United States. And yet, with all this production, all but a small minority of breeders retain their produce for racing purposes, as compared to the commercial breeding establishments of Kentucky and Virginia.

So it is with a great deal of pride that I am able to point out that Maryland is the scene of the Washington, D.C., International. Despite the name of the race, it is Maryland's own, being staged by Marylanders on Maryland soil. It carries the name of Maryland all over the world, something no other sporting event in the State does, because racing, unlike other American sports, is known far and wide. And the Washington, D.C., International, by its very name, is of prime importance to the vast amount of people all over the globe who have a strong affinity for the sport of horseracing.

Repeal the Two-Term Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, just a few years ago, the 22d amendment to the Constitution was adopted, limiting the number of years a President could serve as Chief Executive of our Nation.

Since this amendment became a part of the supreme law of our land, there have been many criticisms of this provision.

There have been charges that it would seriously cripple the power of a President in his dealings with Congress. It has been said that this amendment even affects his role as titular head of his own political party and makes it extremely difficult to win support for his own programs among Members of Congress.

All these are valid criticisms, and we have seen the truth of these accusations during the past few years here in Washington.

But now we are faced with a much more serious effect of this amendment upon our Nation. We are faced with the very survival of civilization, with our existence as a nation.

The fact is that Premier Khrushchev has used our own Constitution against us. He has taken advantage of the 22d amendment to try to force his will upon us, to insult our President and the people of our Nation.

Mr. Khrushchev has said that he will not go to the summit for another conference until such time as President Eisenhower is out of office and a new President is elected.

We, as Americans, are prevented from returning President Eisenhower to office by a decisive margin to rebuke Premier Khrushchev, to show him that we oppose any such meddling in our internal affairs, particularly by one who has shown such a great disregard for truth, for honesty, for freedom and humanity.

What if Premier Khrushchev had not had the 22d amendment to lean on during his Paris outburst? Could he have successfully insulted our President and our people?

I do not believe so. The reason is that we, as Americans, would have had a means of showing up Premier Khrushchev in very short order.

We could have demonstrated to the world that we stand behind our President, and that we do not want to be pushed around by anyone. We could have returned President Eisenhower to the White House for a third term.

Under such circumstances, I doubt very seriously if there would ever have been a walkout by Khrushchev at the Paris conference. I believe he would have had to tone down his remarks and his accusations about the U–2 flights. I believe he would have considered what a resounding vote of confidence by the American people in their President would do to his threats and insults.

Quite likely, there would have been no Paris walkout. There would have been no period of renewed tensions and a dashing of hopes for peace.

The dangers in Russian prestige would have been too great. The odds would have been against Khrushchev.

President Eisenhower is the first President who has served under the terms of the 22d amendment. Already, this amendment has done great harm to our people, has caused serious damage to efforts to secure world peace, to end tensions and permit the world to live in some sense of security.

The weakness of this amendment has made itself readily apparent, and we should see to it that a President of the United States never again finds himself in this predicament.

Therefore, I urge repeal of the 22d amendment in the best interests of our people and our future.

I am well aware of the fact that some members of my own political party were the strongest advocates of this amendment. However, it was not foreseen—it could not be foreseen—that this amendment would be turned against us.

If we are to give our President the responsibility for our foreign policy, for maintaining world peace, then we must give him the authority to cope with these problems.

It is asking too much of any man to take on a dangerous and deadly foe with one hand tied behind his back, and that is exactly what we have asked our President to do.

A recent editorial in the Daily Tribune of Royal Oak, Mich., points out the dangers very clearly, and at this point I would like to have this article inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Daily Tribune, May 18, 1960]

REPEAL TWO-TERM LIMIT

When the Premier of Soviet Russia calls the President of the United States a "lame-duck President, it is time we reconsider the 22d amendment.

This amendment was adopted in spite. It limits the terms of the President to two. It was urged by those whose sole intellectual gift was hindsight; men with little real understanding of the legitimate use of governmental power but with a vast greed for it—if it is held by someone else.

By telling President Eisenhower that perhaps the Soviet Union will extend a new invitation for a Presidential visit—"in 6 or 8 months"—Premier Khrushchev automatically made the summit conference a 1960 campaign issue. It is bald interference in our internal affairs.

The choice of paths to peace is, of course, a legitimate campaign issue. But an issue for Americans. We may disagree among ourselves as to which is the wisest course to pursue, and vote accordingly. But the point is that the discussion and decision will take place within a general agreement, as Americans, that our primary concern is with the security and future of the United States of America.

The danger in Mr. Khrushchev's gambit, for us as well as for the Soviet Union, is that he may misread the election returns as either for or against the Soviet Union—as he already has chosen to misunderstand the meaning of the U–2 flight.

Mr. Eisenhower, the first President to hold office under the 22d amendment, already has felt the effect of limitation on Presidential power in his relations with Congress.

It was well understood before the adoption of the 22d amendment, that a President in a position to succeed himself was in a more effective position to secure carrying out the decisions our Constitution requires him to make. Now Khrushchev has pointed up an even more dangerous limitation on the power to represent the United States effectively in foreign affairs.

Economics, Ethics, and Mental Illness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address which I delivered at the 11th Mental Hospital Institute, Buffalo, N.Y., on October 20, 1959:

ECONOMICS, ETHICS, AND MENTAL ILLNESS

(Address of the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, Member of Congress, Second District, Rhode Island, at the 11th Mental Hospital Institute, at the Hotel Statler in Buffalo, N.Y., on October 20, 1959)

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am greatly honored by your invitation to present the academic lecture at this 11th Annual Mental Hospital Institute. I have a sense of some temerity, however, in addressing a group such as this on the subject of ethics and mental illness. All of you have, in the most practically real and effective way, dedicated yourselves to improving the condition of the mentally ill. The staffs of the outstanding hospitals that have received the Mental Hospital Service Achievement Awards here tonight are in the front echelons of an army of many thousands who work against tremendous odds. These people, despite the magnitude and seeming hopelessness of the task, have made substantial gains in the campaign to improve care and treatment for the mentally ill, to help them recover more rapidly and more fully. As a layman, I can

add to your great effort only my indirect help, my understanding, and my support for your work.

I have been closely concerned for a long time, as many of you may know, with the problems of mental and emotional disorders. The prevalence of these illnesses, and the regularity with which they afflict a large proportion of our people in every class and condition of society put them in a critical category all by themselves. If mental illness were acutely contagious instead of causing chronic invalidism and disability, our country and all the countries of the civilized world would long ago have declared a state of emergency against this epidemic.

As a nation, we are painfully aware of the economic costs of mental illness; we have deep sympathy for the misery of those who suffer from mental illness and the hardships endured by their families; we want to do as much as we can to alleviate this suffering—but we are not sure how much we can afford to do; what limits we should set to our efforts in the light to what we know at present; in what directions we should exert our efforts most vigorously.

The dilemma was posed most succinctly in the recent report on the economics of mental illness. This report is the second in a series being issued by the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health as part of a national mental health survey initiated by Congress. The purpose of the survey is to bring together a comprehensive body of findings and recommendations that will serve as the basis for planning a stepped up, comprehensive national mental health program.

Dr. Rashi Fein, the economist who worked out methods for estimating the direct and indirect costs of mental illness in the United States, estimates them conservatively at a minimum of $3 billion each year. This figure obviously does not represent the full cost of mental illness. It includes direct costs of caring for the mentally ill expended by public and private agencies, by the patients and their families, by public institutions and private foundations. It includes estimates of such indirect costs as loss of production and loss of earnings. It does not include the costs of private care outside the hospital, of public assistance to the mentally ill or the handling of the mentally ill by police, court, penal, social welfare and other public institutions. Nor does it include the costs of related problems such as drug addiction, alcoholism, juvenile delinquency, and mental retardation.

The $3 billion figure includes $100 million as an estimated minimum direct cost of care provided by psychiatrists in full-time practice. It does not include the cost of payments to psychiatrists in part-time practice, to general practitioners, or to internists for the care of the mentally ill. I am sure that you who work in the field are well aware of the difficulty of gathering accurate statistics on this subject. It has been estimated that perhaps 50 percent of the patients consulting general practitioners are suffering from complaints of an emotional origin. If this cost were included, we would have to add another $1 billion to our $3 billion annual total.

We all are, of course, painfully aware that even though we pay out $3 billion annually, we are not providing our mentally ill with anything like the best care presently possible. The average expenditure per patient in a public mental hospital is just a little better than $4 a day. This compares with a daily cost of approximately $25 in a general hospital. The staff of the Joint Commission raise some very provocative questions in their preface to Dr. Fein's report. They ask: "How much would it cost to provide the highest possible standard of care for the mentally ill? Can we afford these costs? More exactly, which can we better afford—the cost in human misery caused by mental illness or the cost in dollars to provide the best care we know how to give?"

As a people, we Americans are committed morally and ethically to the proposition that each man and woman is entitled to the opportunity to realize his best capabilities. This includes the opportunity to receive proper medical care, regardless of income, social class, or the nature of the illness. We subscribe to the statement in the constitution of the World Health Organization that "the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health is one of the fundamental rights of every human being without distinction of race, religion, political belief, economic or social condition." However, we are a practical people. We also want to know whether large increases in the money spent to treat mental illness would be justified from an economic as well as a humanitarian viewpoint. Will increased expenditures tend to reduce the extent of the problem in the future? Where will the money come from? Should available increased funds be spent to step up research that hopefully will reduce the problem drastically at some future date—and, in the meantime, limp along with inadequate care for those who now are mentally ill or who become mentally ill in the near future?

From an ethical point of view, I do not believe that we have any choice. We cannot abandon one iota of the available potential for uncovering useful new knowledge through research. Equally, we cannot abandon the mentally ill. We are morally obliged to strive, to the limit of our abilities and resources, to improve the lot of the mentally ill, to make treatment more effective, to increase our efforts at cure and rehabilitation. Certainly people suffering from this illness are entitled to the same consideration as those with physical illness. As you know any person with acute appendicitis can obtain a good surgeon to remove it regardless of his ability to pay. We do not provide similar services for the mentally ill.

But because our resources are far from unlimited, we must make choices. What kinds of expanded services for the mentally ill are likely to be the most profitable? Where will our efforts be apt to bring the greatest payoff in terms of patient recovery?

Until fairly recently these were questions which could be answered almost solely on empirical evidence. And as a glance back over history will remind you, the answers that were accepted and applied in treatment were colored more often by the intellectual attitudes of the times than by detached analysis. Thus, little of constructive value was done to help the mentally ill in Western Europe until the age of enlightenment at the end of the 18th century. Paradoxically, the period of the Renaissance, during which new emphasis was placed on the dignity and worth of the individual, was characterized by cruel and repressive treatment for the mentally ill.

As you know, it was not until the 1800's that a systematic approach to mental illness was predicated on the belief that the mentally ill are entitled to the humane treatment that is the inalienable right of all human beings. This era of moral treatment, based on principles advocated by Pinel and Tuke, stressed the importance of attempting to influence the mentally ill by appealing to them with kindness and understanding rather than by regimenting them. Although it was believed that mental illness was caused by some unknown pathological process in the brain, the advocates of this type of treatment felt that their approach would do much to help their patients.

In that era, there were so few mental hospitals in the United States that only a small fraction of the people who needed hospital care would be admitted, but the hospitals that did exist were operated along excellent principles. They were small. The superintendents were highly intelligent and well motivated. The atmosphere was friendly, comfortable, hopeful, and the superintendent was able to talk to each patient daily. Despite the paucity of treatment methods, the number of discharges and recoveries in these hospitals was substantial.

Further advances in care and treatment were made in the big mental hospitals that were established during the latter half of the 19th century. New discoveries made during the first half of the present century enabled us to conquer the psychoses due to pellagra and general paresis. The use of shock therapy changed the entire picture with respect to involutional melancholia. The various psychotherapies were developed, and much was learned about the anatomy, physiology, and pathology of the nervous system.

In our own day, we have witnessed a period of remarkable progress which began shortly after World War II. Stimulated by the realization that mental and emotional disorders were a dangerous hazard to our safety as a nation, Congress, at that time, initiated our present ongoing program of support for research, training, and service in the field of mental health. In the short span of years since then, this activity has grown manyfold. Equally important, new work in the field of mental illness has been begun and stimulated by State and local government agencies, institutions, private foundations, citizens' organizations, universities and medical schools, training centers, and groups of all types throughout the country.

I have watched this campaign grow and spread, as you all have, and I must say the results have been impressive. New research findings have emerged—the tranquilizers and other psychoactive drugs have come into general use—we have developed new ways of training personnel and using people now available to treat patients—we have set up new kinds of treatment facilities and changed our uses of present facilities. The growth in treatment resources and know-how has been little short of phenomenal. Though we are still far from our goal, we have, I believe, what no previous period had. We have a handle with which to grasp the problem of mental illness. We have some tools that can help us decide, on a scientific basis, where our expanded efforts are most likely to bring results in terms of patient recovery.

Among the more useful tools, it seems to me are the epidemiological studies of mental illness. These studies have provided new knowledge about who becomes ill, how long they remain ill, what happens to the mental patient both in and out of the hospital, and the effects of new therapies and new kinds of domiciliary and outpatient care. This kind of information, obviously, is of first importance in long-range planning and in making critical decisions which will affect the patterns of caring for the mentally ill for decades to come. A great deal of this information has come from the many statistical studies of mental hospital populations sponsored and conducted by the States in the Model Reporting Area for Mental Hospital Statistics, with the guidance, cooperation, and assistance of the National Institute of Mental Health. Experts in this field have charted new ways of analyzing the problems of mental illness.

To me, one of the most significant changes that has taken place in recent years is that communities are assuming more responsibility for the care of the mentally ill. Services and facilities that make it possible to keep people out of mental hospitals and still give them adequate care are being established throughout the Nation.

Of particular importance has been the increase of psychiatric facilities in general hospitals. The numbers of these hospitals accepting psychiatric patients rose from 43 in 1939 to almost 1,000 in 1958.

The increase in the number of outpatient clinics and the extent of their services has been equally phenomenal.

New types of outpatient facilities and day-care and night-care centers have been opened.

Emergency psychiatric services are being developed which hopefully will obviate the need for hospitalization in some instances.

Nursing homes and chronic-disease hospitals are being used more and more for care of such groups as the aged mentally ill.

There has also been an increase in after-care facilities in the community so that patients who have been released are less likely to relapse.

Within the mental hospitals, there have also been significant changes. In fact, from what I have read I would say that there has been a virtual revolution in the way in which the hospital views and handles the mental patient, a revolution that has been reflected in the more hopeful attitude toward mental illness prevalent throughout our society today. The use of total push programs, begun about 10 years ago, have demonstrated that many backward patients—the ones for whom hope had long since been abandoned—could improve to the point where they can be returned to the community.

The open hospital has been another major step forward in the attempt to prevent long-term hospitalization and its associated ill effects. The healthy activity and sense of purpose that characterize the modern mental hospital are a far cry from the atmosphere that surrounded the mental hospital even as recently as 25 years ago. The idea of the open hospital has come to our shores in recent years from England where it has worked out very successfully in a number of hospitals. As yet it is not so generally accepted here as abroad.

A number of commentators have pointed out an apparent difference in the amount of violence among British and American patients and have suggested that something in the British personality or the more uniform culture in Great Britain may make the open hospital more feasible there than here. But the precedent for patient freedom in this country existed long ago. In 1842, Charles Dickens described, in his "American Notes," scenes in the Boston Lunatic Asylum that would do justice to the more enlightened of our present-day institutions. "Every patient in this asylum," Dickens wrote, "sits down to dinner every day with a knife and fork; * * * At every meal, moral influence alone restrains the more violent among them—but the effect of that influence—is found, even as a means of restraint, to say nothing of it as a means of cure, a hundred times more efficacious than all the strait-waiscots, fetters, and handcuffs. * * *"

One might logically conclude, therefore, that the success of the "open door" is dependent upon a real change in attitude toward the mentally ill. Opening locked doors and giving patients the social freedom that is rightfully theirs is not enough. There must be real conviction on the part of the entire hospital staff that the patient can improve. Patients must be given treatment; all the available therapies—chemotherapy, psychotherapy, physical therapies and so on—must be marshalled and organized on an individual basis so that each patient is given the benefit of all that is now known about treating mental illness.

More and more the hospital must take its place as part of a network of mental health services in the community. The treatment and rehabilitation programs of the hospital need to become more closely integrated with community health and social services, so that the patient can receive continuous psychiatric and social assistance that will change as his needs change—and so that he will be able to maintain his links to the community and to his family throughout the course of his illness.

Dr. Robert Felix, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health and president-elect of your American Psychiatric Association, pointed out this need at your meeting 2 years ago when he said: "I would envision the time when we would consider the hospital period not as a separate entity, but as an entity in the total therapeutic program of the individual." The hospital also must share its responsibilities in the total community forces available for fostering preventive programs and positive mental health activities. Dr. Felix has also said: "* * * members of our hospital staffs are going to be much more effective as a total therapeutic instrument in hospital programs if there are devices set up whereby they must spend some of their time in consultation with other agencies in the community."

This means that hospital staff would become involved in a whole array of community activities—such as industrial mental health, school mental health, the mental health aspects of law enforcement programs, and various community mental health activities in cooperation with civic leaders. Although these activities would, of course, burden the already overcrowded schedule of hospital staff, the benefits would far outweigh the difficulties—and the advantages would probably spur renewed and successful efforts at expanding hospital staff. Closer contact with the community would give the hospital physician, nurse, social worker, and psychologist a clearer understanding of the problems confronting the patient when he leaves the hospital. Such contacts would also stimulate professional personnel and other people working and living in the community to provide services within the hospital and help the hospital staff.

Ideally, if we are to make the mental hospital an effective therapeutic instrument, it must be set within a larger community which itself is a healing community—in which the general climate and the available services tend to minimize the unhealthy stresses which contribute to mental illness, and tend to promote mental health in a positive way. Recent research leaves no doubt that an individual's social environment has a tremendous influence on his mental health. In the hospital, a therapeutic environment means a climate in which the entire staff brings help to the patients and the patients help one another—in which there is increased emphasis on patient self-government and the patient is given more responsibility for managing his own affairs—in which treatment and help and rehabilitation are dominant. In the community a situation conducive to mental health means ready and adequate help for families in trouble, before one of their members breaks down—it means helping families recognize the early signs of mental illness and seek the proper kind of help as soon as possible—it means halfway houses, sheltered workshops and social-therapeutic clubs for discharged patients—it means the establishment of mental health centers to serve as screening and referral agencies—it means psychiatric emergency services and foster-home care and other measures to avoid long-term mental hospitalization.

The problem of avoiding long-term mental hospitalization is perhaps most acute with the aging—the group who are the particular focus of this Mental Hospital Institute. The problem represented by the disproportionately large number of persons 65 years and over being admitted to public mental hospitals will become an even more critical one in the years ahead. It is estimated that by 1980 the number of people 65 years and over in the general population will double. If the current trend remains fixed, the increased numbers of older people in our mental hospitals will be tremendous. This will pose additional problems, because older patients require a great deal of physical and medical care and special staff attention.

This emerging problem suggests increased emphasis on research in many directions. For example, we need to know more about the aging process itself, about the cause of mental illness in the aged, and about the cultural and economic factors that determine choice of the hospital for needed care. Not all patients with mental diseases of the senium are cared for in mental hospitals. There are a variety of other facilities available—homes for the aged, nursing homes, chronic disease hospitals. We need more facts before we can decide which facility can furnish the most appropriate care.

Perhaps we should give more thought to foster home care of the aged patient whose condition does not necessitate hospitalization but who does not have a family able or willing to give him the help he needs. In thinking of such foster care, we should not ignore the contributions that might be made by the increasing numbers of healthy and active older people in our population—people for whom the responsibility of providing a foster home for aged patients would mean the difference between aimlessness and a sense of purpose and being needed that are essential to everyone's mental health. Payments for providing such foster care might mean the difference between self-respecting independence for thousands of healthy elderly people and the economic dependency on others that in itself can breed psychological problems for the aged. Perhaps this approach could help the older people to help themselves.

But the question of institutional or community or home care of the aged mentally ill, as of other types of mental patients, is only one aspect of the problem. The choice of treatment and treatment facility will change with constantly changing medical knowledge about prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation. It will change as attitudes of the community toward mental illness keep changing. It will change as we learn more about the complex interactions of biological, psychological, economic, and social forces that influence mental health and mental illness. The mental hospital is in a strategic position to contribute to the accumulation of that knowledge as well as to test it out with patients. It can be a living laboratory for the study of mental illness. The establishment of research activity within the hospital itself would help to strengthen its ties with university and other research centers, and would make the hospital more attractive as a place to work and learn. In thus branching out into other activities, the mental hospital may help to solve the chronic problems of insufficient staff that has tended to keep it ingrown and isolated in the past.

I am aware that most of these thoughts have occurred to all of you, perhaps many times. I am also aware of the numerous practical problems and obstacles that daily frustrate your attempts to move ahead. But, as you carry on your deliberations at this institute, and as you work in your respective hospitals throughout the coming year, you should know that there is broad and generous public support for your efforts. I believe I express the feelings of the vast majority of our people when I say that our country is committed to a full program of activity in the field of mental illness, up to the limit of our economic, and scientific abilities.

The U.S. Merchant Marine and World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "The U.S. Merchant Marine and World Trade," delivered by the Honorable Frederick H. Mueller, Secretary of Commerce, before the Port of Washington Propeller Club, in celebration of National Maritime Day, at the Statler Hotel, in this city, on May 20, 1960.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE AND WORLD TRADE

(Text of address by the Honorable Frederick H. Mueller, Secretary of Commerce, prepared for delivery before the Port of Washington Propeller Club in celebration of National Maritime Day, Statler Hotel, Washington, D.C., Friday, May 20, 1960)

It was just 27 years ago today that the Congress, by joint resolution, established May 22 as National Maritime Day and provided for its annual proclamation by the President. It provides an occasion to commemorate the first transoceanic voyage of any ship powered by steam. For on May 22, 1819, the SS *Savannah* started the voyage which ushered in a new era in merchant shipping.

This year another chapter in maritime history will be written. As President Eisenhower noted in his Maritime Day proclamation, "This year will witness the harnessing of the atom for the benefit of mankind as the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship, the NS *Savannah*, sails out upon the high seas."

But, as the President also noted, National Maritime Day each year also provides an occasion to honor the U.S. merchant marine and all who help to maintain an industry and service so essential to the economy and security of the free world.

In all of our proper celebrations all over the country, however, it behooves all of us to remember another anniversary—for it points a moral. A century ago last month the famous Pony Express began operating between St. Joseph, Mo., and Sacramento, Calif.

You might be interested in the kinds of ads used to recruit the boys who manned this wild and woolly route to carry messages at the rate of $5 a half ounce—later reduced to a dollar. One was reproduced in the Washington Evening Star for April 9:

"Wanted—young, skinny, wiry fellows not over 18. Must be expert riders willing to risk death daily. Orphans preferred. Wages $25 a week."

In its short life the Pony Express sure had glamor. Buffalo Bill Cody and Wild Bill Hickok were in the select company of riders, and Mark Twain penned their praises. They astonished the world with their record of 7 days and 17 hours carrying Lincoln's first inaugural address.

But the enterprise went broke, for a variety of causes, in about 18 months. It was given the final blow when the first transcontinental telegraph line, building from both coasts, was finally joined and completed at Salt Lake City in October 1861. Technological progress, which within the lifetime of men and women still living has seen the world move from the Pony Express days to jet planes that can cross the entire continent between breakfast and lunch, has been inexorable. However glamorous the good old days, competition in new and improved methods of transportation and communication have sounded their knell.

I say this not to play the specter at the feast on this occasion, but to note another purpose of Maritime Day celebrations. Past accomplishments inspire them—but we must look ahead, reflect upon our problems, and plan a better future for the maritime industry.

I say "we" advisedly. The Department of Commerce, the U.S. Government, in fact the people of the United States and the whole free world, have a vital stake in your economic health and growth. Before getting into some specifics, let me spell that out as a step in enlisting the kind of help we shall need to do what sorely needs to be done.

We have survived two world wars and were able to end the bloody stalemate in Korea, aiding our allies in all of these struggles, in great measure because we could stay in business on the world's sea lanes. Today, with an even greater threat, U.S.-flag ships must be available to deliver U.S. economic and military aid to nations whose strength and growth are vital to our own.

On the strictly commercial side, we need your help. As you know, the President recently intiated a national export expansion program—a partnership by the Federal Government and private industry to sell more American goods abroad. The Departments of State and Commerce are stepping up services to help business to do more business overseas.

We urge the maritime industry to take a fresh look at the trade and tourist picture. I am sure that your great industry will join with other American business enterprises in seeking new markets for American products and new traffic for American shipping.

As our foreign trade expands—and expand it must—we have a job to convince both exporters and importers that they should move a substantial portion of their cargoes on fine American ships.

Now for those specifics. What is plaguing your industry? We don't have all the answers, but we've been learning fast.

Recently, I submitted to the President the report which he requested me to make, as Secretary of Commerce, on Federal transportation policy and program. The problems of the merchant marine were identified in the light of general problems of public policy in transportation. The general recommendations we made were stated in summary form, and require further elaboration in detail.

As the decade opens, the strategic position of the United States has undergone a transformation. In former years we felt as a nation that we faced but a single acute threat to our national security. The response to it was specific and decisive: specific plans for defending the security of the free world.

This specific, decisive policy had all the virtues of a simple issue which could be stated in term easily understood. It had its influence on our merchant marine policy. Since our objective was specific our merchant marine policy could be equally specific; we could say that our defense plans and assumptions required a civilian merchant marine of X number of tons or X number of ships to augment our logistical plans. Merchant marine planners could look to the military authorities for their specific logistical requirements and could attempt to build a merchant marine policy on the assumptions presented to them.

Under today's conditions in international affairs, this simple, black and white way of planning a national merchant marine is no longer possible, let alone desirable. We have a whole economy to think about. What was once a simple issue of military power between the free world and the Soviet bloc has become a problem of more uncertainty and more complexity. We face continuous threat and tension in many areas.

This evolving situation has introduced great uncertainties into military planning, and consequently into the national defense aspects of our merchant marine policy. We can no longer plan merchant marine policy on the basis of a specific set of figures on national defense requirements. While defense plans must recognize that a backlog of merchant ships is of great potential value, this value must be measured against a great variety of other military problems.

Furthermore, our economic policies in this coming decade will have important impacts on our political relationships. Like the world strategic situation, the world economic situation is evolving from the severe simplicity of the past to increasing complexity. Our foreign trade and balance of payments have reflected this changing picture. We know that we must be competitive if our economy is to survive in a world of growing productivity.

The growing competitiveness of world trade has made a profound impact on our shipping industry. Our national merchant marine now carries less than 20 percent of our foreign trade tonnage, a lesser rate than any time since before the First World War. Furthermore, wide cost differentials exist between our maritime industry and those of other countries in the construction and operation of ships.

Historically the Government has sought to meet this particular competitive disadvantage with a variety of subsidies. Construction and operating differential subsidies have been granted, and such subsidy costs have increased. Under cargo preference laws, reserving to privately owned and operated American flag merchant ships at least 50 percent of Government-financed cargoes, the unsubsidized part of our foreign trade fleet is also being aided.

One of the major policy goals recommended in our transportation report is to improve the efficiency of shipbuilding and ship operation to meet foreign competition and reduce the need for Federal subsidy. The research and development programs of the Department of Commerce have been greatly expanded over the past 5 years. The NS *Savannah* is one result, and others—such as the hydrofoil vessel and the automation of ship operations—are on the way.

These measures looking toward industry and Government cooperation toward greater efficiency, obviously require the full cooperation of American labor.

Here I feel we all—and again I say "all" advisedly—have done very little. I refer to the fact that the connection between the worker's job and the safety and security of his home and family has not been emphasized.

On the face of it labor has been a major beneficiary of our merchant marine subsidy policy. And no one would argue with the fact that labor and management in your industry have a common interest in the continued existence of American ships and shipyards. But are the implications of these facts sufficiently known on both sides of the bargaining table?

American labor has learned, in many industries, that mechanization and automation make and keep jobs, and make a higher standard of living possible. American management has learned that labor has a right to a measure of protection and a voice in decisions affecting their livelihood. And great progress has been made.

But it is later than we think. New means of labor-management cooperation must be found to improve the competitive position of our merchant marine. We need new machinery where automation does not apply—human machinery to provide flexibility and rapid change in service to meet the changing demands for service.

The least that the public has a right to demand is that those who are the beneficiaries of subsidies as well as the payments of customers should work together to give value received. I have high hopes that our transportation report, emphasizing competition and deemphasizing subsidies, can gradually permit the Government to concentrate our tax money upon those programs which the Government alone can undertake and carry through.

Maritime management and labor surely have the know-how to do the job. Our foreign trade and domestic commerce are growing, as is our population and the world's population. Subsidies should operate as an incentive to greater initiative and efficiency on the part of the American Merchant Marine. No one knows better than you in the industry that subsidies do not guarantee a profit to the operator.

That happy solution to your difficulties depends, in the final analysis on your ability to secure cargoes at remunerative rates. The Maritime Administrator, implementing section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, has appointed a committee to study and develop ways and means to induce importers and exporters to give preference to vessels under U.S. registry.

It is not unreasonable to shoot for a goal of at least half of our export and import traffic to move in American-flag bottoms. Yet in 1958 only a third of such traffic moving by liner ships over essential foreign trade routes moved in U.S.-flag ships. If bulk cargoes are included, this proportion drops to 16 percent.

All of us can do a better job than that. We can bring home to those controlling selection of carriers that U.S.-flag carriers usually—and subsidized operators must—purchase and use U.S. products except under emergency conditions. Your service—unlike foreign shipping operators who come and go as they please—is stable and regular. Our shipyard workers and seamen benefit from use of American-flag ships and in turn increase purchase of American goods and services.

These are but elements of good salesmanship, and we need the hard sell in your industry as much as we need it to better our whole export position.

Meanwhile we in Government are going ahead with further proposals for merchant marine construction and operation, based upon our evaluation of shipping needs and such strategic assumptions as seem reasonable. But our concentrated attention will increasingly be on means of increasing the competitive quality of our merchant marine to assist in the improvement of the competitive position of your industry in world trade.

This effort will involve hard decisions and the solution of difficult problems. For many it will require a new outlook. Industry and labor must make their own constructive suggestions to the Government on means of improving the value of the merchant marine to American business in foreign trade. And much more emphasis must be given to research and development.

The program I have described, based upon the findings and recommendations in our transportation report, will be a major experiment in industry-labor-government partnership. The stakes are high. They involve our national survival as well as that of your industry. Upon its success rests not merely our own prosperity. The peoples of the world of the 1960's will grow even closer together in time—and we hope in freedom—through progress in science and the exchange of goods made possible by peaceful trade.

The pony express beat the then world's record for carrying messages 2,000 miles at about 250 miles a day a century ago. Yet with all its gallantry it couldn't beat the competition of technological advance.

But the spirit of those young men, whose exploits have enchanted several generations of Americans, is still with us. It is that spirit which will yet carry the message of freemen and free enterprise around the world and perhaps to the unexplored reaches of the universe.

Libraries, Education, and Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address which I delivered at the Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia, Pa., on May 17, 1960:

LIBRARIES, EDUCATION, AND SOCIETY

(Remarks made by Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY at Drexel Institute of Technology on May 17, 1960, on occasion of his receiving the Distinguished Achievement Award from the Graduate School of Library Science and the Library Alumni Association)

Today I saw for the first time the impressive new quarters of the library school here at Drexel.[1] I am sure they bring to you a deep sense of pride and gratification—much as your Distinguished Achievement Award, and this opportunity to meet with you have given me. It is a fine thing to feel that one's efforts have played some part in strengthening the American heritage.

A library school—or legislation to aid libraries—can do just that: It can enrich society and strengthen the Nation. It does this mainly through the enduring contribution of libraries to education.

America's strength was once felt to lie predominantly in her agricultural and geographic advantages. Since the turn of the century, industry and natural resources have been paramount. Both, of course, remain essential to our country's strength and her leadership among free peoples. But the close of World War II brought sharply into focus another basic resource—education; and recent years have commanded its critical appraisal. It is now clear to many that agriculture and industry, however prolific, cannot insure supremacy or even survival without a stronger fiber of education in the social fabric.

The modern concept of education is a broad one. Besides the schools at all levels, many institutions and media are recognized as educational—partly because of their mounting interest in the role. There are more and more educational uses of films and recordings, radio and television, magazines and newspapers, pamphlets, and books. There is an upward trend in the publication of all factual matter. I believe these changes reflect generally a felt need of people for a broader view of the world about them.

One institution with a growing educational mission is the library. It is axiomatic, of course, that libraries should serve scholarship; but I refer to a more active part in the educational process. Increasingly the progressive library is concerned with information—with collecting, lending, and promoting current reading matter, films, recordings, and other educational materials. Thus the library aligns itself with institutions and forces that are shaping our national destiny.

It is my conviction that this is the way in which libraries of all types can best serve the community in our dynamic times. Libraries are more than storehouses; their broader function is to teach.

For many years I have given my best thought to certain needs and aspirations of our people. This has been basic to my responsibilities as a Representative to Congress from the Second District of Rhode Island, and as chairman of the subcommittee in the House of Representatives which is concerned with appropriations to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I am pleased to say that many libraries and library groups are closely allied with the Department in several of its programs. They collaborate in activities of the Office of Education and the National Library of Medicine. They share particularly the interests of the Public Health Service in aging, juvenile delinquency, and blindness.

As an interested layman, I should like to express briefly some views on the library's role in these tremendous problems.

One of the great paradoxes of the modern world is the problem of our aging population—the medical and social needs that have risen as a result of our longer life span, which is largely attributable to advances in medicine and public health. Since 1900, people over 50 have increased in our population from 13 percent to more than 22 percent. By 1970, nearly 25 percent of the American people will be over 50, and 10 percent will be over 65. This implies a continued increase in those burdens that weigh so heavily upon the aged—health problems, occupational difficulties, lowered income, unsatisfactory living conditions, loneliness.

In attempting to come to grips with such a problem one naturally turns to institutions and individuals that might be expected to help. A group that has outlined its objectives with regard to the aged is the National Library Association. It has spelled out in congressional testimony[2] how the public library renders direct services to the elderly; supplies middle-age groups with literature on retirement plans, housing and income; coordinates interested civic groups and educational programs; and assists personnel who work with the aging through books, films, and exhibits.

These seem to me excellent, practical objectives that might well be extended to all libraries. In addition, I should like to see library schools expand the training of librarians to work with the elderly. Some studies should be undertaken to settle the question whether cultural and educational interests can actually retard mental decline, and to learn how libraries can help bring out and utilize the older person's best attributes. It would be a great credit to library science, and quite fitting, if some library group were to lead the way toward salvaging the elder population's vast resource of experience and skills.

The library's place in our culture is nuclear: it offers literature, information, and recreation to many groups, the young as

[1] The Graduate School of Library Science (third oldest in the United States and among the first five in enrollment) and the Drexel Library are housed together in the Library Center, opened in the fall of 1959, and the latest addition to the physical plant in the current expansion program.

[2] Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Aug. 4, 1959.

well as the old. I feel that its values to youth have barely been tapped. In many young people, there is a spirit that rebels against education—or rather, against being taught. This finds a terrible and ruinous expression in the juvenile delinquent, whose rebellion may lead to total loss of educational contact. And yet the delinquent or predelinquent does not necessarily resist learning. His indifference or hostility may embrace only the formal aspects of education—the classroom and its implication of discipline and conformity. The same individual may sometimes be reached through an appeal to his curiosity, his need to excel, or his natural love for reading, music, or some related pursuit. Every era has its Bohemian movement, which is essentially rebellious and yet intellectual or artistic.

The difficulty, of course, is to capture and hold interest. The library has strong competition, and I can offer no formula. I only know that the mind of youth is capable of intense application in response to the right appeal. With no coercion whatever, youth can master difficult sports, jazz music, automotive mechanics, radio engineering. And we have all seen young people come to public libraries in underprivileged metropolitan sections, drawn by up-to-date material on invention, the space age, sports and recreation, career opportunities, and interesting lives. I have seen this in districts where crime and violence beckon constantly to every child. In light of these things, I am confident that ways can be found to enhance the appeal and effectiveness of libraries in helping the prospective citizen.

You may be interested in certain resolutions passed at the recent White House Conference on Children and Youth, which included nearly 100 librarians among the delegates.

One resolution called for adequately supported studies to determine the effects of reading books, magazines, and newspapers upon young people. Another recommended that much more extensive use be made of films and other instructional material in both formal and informal education. Several resolutions were aimed at augmenting the opportunities for training and participation in dramatics, theater arts, and film production.

With direct reference to libraries, it was resolved that action should be taken to extend the availability of public library service to every citizen; that libraries be established in schools, colleges and universities, with a view to helping them achieve higher standards; and that reading, training in the selection of literature, and recruitment of personnel trained in reading guidance be vigorously promoted.

One of the forums resolved that young people should be encouraged to study the great ethical, moral and religious truths, and to use these to formulate codes of conduct for their guidance toward good citizenship.

I believe we shall soon see legislation and other efforts to implement these recommendations at local, State, and Federal levels. Meanwhile, library workers will be able to draw on the resolutions in seeking interest and aid.

Another medical and social area in which libraries are making a valuable contribution is blindness. Despite public and private efforts over many years, the number of blind persons in this country is about 350,000 and is steadily increasing. The Public Health Service's National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness is attacking the problem from the medical standpoint. On the social side, I believe there is need for a good study on problems related to blindness and the needs of the blind. One objective would be to help create a national atmosphere more favorable to the blind person and his role in society. This would call for studies of existing conditions, including the problem of providing books and recordings. The best library services now available for the blind should be augmented and extended.

Some of you may not know that the Library of Congress program to provide books for the blind is currently operating under an appropriation of $1.6 million, which is a little more than ever before. To date, the Library has provided about 5,600 titles in Braille and Moon type and 4,000 talking books. Approximately 70,000 of the Library's machines are now in use.

As I have indicated, many grave medical and social problems call strongly on libraries among other key groups. Assistance to libraries themselves has been made available through the Library Services Act. In fiscal year 1960 allotments are based on the maximum authorized appropriation, $7.5 million. In this session of Congress, I have introduced a bill to extend the act for another 5 years beginning July 1.

This Office of Education program has helped to bring library services to 30 million people in rural America. It has provided trained personnel, 200 bookmobiles, and 5 million books and other materials. Fifty-two States and territories are now participating. Since the beginning of the program in 1957, the matching requirements have stimulated local governments to increase their library appropriations by 45 percent. One of the most encouraging results is the development of an effective system of libraries, with strong centers, cooperative processing, and so forth. And throughout the Nation there is a growing awareness of the meaning of libraries in education.

In my own State of Rhode Island, progress under the act has been typical. A special unit, Public Library Services in Rural Areas, was set up in the office of the secretary of state to administer the program. A director, assistant director, clerical staff, and a bookmobile were added and new quarters obtained. A book grant was made to rural libraries, with provisions for emphasis on reference materials. Books are ordered and processed by the State agency. A series of workshops has been held at headquarters, and State consultant and bookmobile services have steadily grown.

Another law that has much significance for libraries is the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This is primarily designed to strengthen, improve, and expand education in the United States at all levels. Libraries are specified as basic to the educational process. I should like to call attention to the fact that projects developed under the act may include books and other materials, and that these are not yet available in adequate quantity and quality. Library materials to aid both teachers and students are needed for a balanced program.

Of the 10 titles in the act, title III offers the most direct opportunities for libraries. This authorizes $70 million a year until July 1962 for improved science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction in public schools. Federal funds are available for laboratory and other special equipment. By the language of the act, special equipment includes printed materials (except textbooks) and audiovisual materials and equipment. Minor remodeling and special equipment needed by the library because of its necessary expansion may be included under projects approved by the State educational agency and the U.S. Office of Education.

Other titles also pertain to libraries and librarians. Title II, for example, which provides loans up to $5,000 for college students. Persons training to become librarians are eligible, and 50 percent of the loan will be canceled for those who serve as school or teacher librarians for 5 years. Another example is title IV, which provides graduate fellowships aimed particularly at the preparation of teachers for colleges and universities.

I urge all of you to review the provisions of the National Defense Education Act (Public Law 85–864) and to be sure your students are familiar with the aspects pertaining to libraries. The ALA or the U.S. Office of Education will gladly supply details.

While speaking of Federal aid to libraries, I will make a point that may seem to the older hands here a little obvious. I refer to the fact that a library in the modern sense, adequately stocked and staffed to pull its own weight in an educational program, requires strong support from many quarters—particularly in the form of funds. A school of library science would do well to train its advanced students in the practice of fund raising. You must have support at local, State and National levels. To this end, librarians should take steps to increase public awareness of the library—to make it felt as a part of the community. It is largely through trustees and friends of libraries that the trend toward a more educational role must be advanced.

Such a role is necessarily diversified, and I have mentioned only some aspects. I have merely alluded to the library's part in cultural enrichment. Society depends upon the library for many things, not the least of which is its capacity to deepen appreciation and stimulate interest in the arts and sciences, in our principles and traditions, and in the peoples of other lands. This is an intangible role, but nonetheless a real one. It evokes a vital spirit in every American—the spirit to see our country progress and lead.

In this complex troubled world, the sciences loom in importance. Our prestige among nations depends largely upon our scientific preeminence. No amount of military preparedness could compensate for a lag in scientific knowledge or manpower. Nor can we ignore the value of the health sciences in a military and economic sense, for the cost of disease is the greatest burden any country can bear in war or peace. All this has direct bearing in the library field. You must continue, and I hope expand, your efforts to interest more people in the various sciences—in their support, their progress, and their application. Again the library is a powerful force for motivating, guiding and teaching.

It is a responsibility of libraries to help keep alive the spirit of culture and learning. I know of no better way than to cherish and promote the freedom to read. As a nation we are not given to slogans or glib phrases for expressing our deeper values. It is not easy to tell in a word or two what America stands for. Yet we can say that our country and its Constitution are flatly opposed to censorship—that anyone can go to a public library and read any book fit to print, whether or not the ideas it expresses are generally accepted. This is specific enough, and should be widely proclaimed as a basic fact. It is the librarians who make such freedom possible by seeing that all sides of a social issue are presented, trusting in the American way to speak for itself. Freedom to read is fundamental to true democracy.

I have rambled a good deal, but I believe I can sum up the main theme. The library in modern society is particularly important as an educational institution. To enhance its social value, it must strengthen its educational role. This may be effected through the teaching of librarians, studies in the use of the library as an education instrument, promotion of science, and aid to special groups such as the young at critical ages and the elderly. Progress along these lines will require friends, funds, and a strong voice in the community. Finally, libraries of all types, in preserving the freedom to read, in the broadest sense, both serve and exemplify the American ideal.

Address by Senator Wiley Over Radio Liberty to People of the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the light of recent events—particularly Mr. Khrushchev's new hard line at the Paris meetings—the free world, I believe, must make a renewed effort to get across the truth about world affairs to the people under Communist domination.

Now, how can this be accomplished?

There are, of course, a number of ways:

We recognize, however, that the construction of the Bamboo and Iron Curtains make it exceedingly difficult to get through to the dominated peoples.

Recently, I was privileged to participate in a broadcast to the people of the Soviet Union over Radio Liberty.

Incidentally, I believe the splendid work carried out by Radio Liberty, Radio Free Europe, Voice of America, and other private and publicly sponsored efforts to get the truth to the people under Communist domination, are indeed most commendable, and deserve the gratitude of the Nation.

The purpose of my broadcast was to provide the people behind the Iron Curtain with a realistic picture of the significance of the summit, of the U–2 flight, of the conduct of Mr. Khrushchev. Too, the talk reiterates the dedication of the free world—despite Mr. Khrushchev's unwillingness to discuss differences at the Paris meeting—to continue, in a resolute, fearless, undaunted effort, to find peaceful ways to resolve the differences between the East and West, and to create a better world.

Despite the resumption of Soviet jamming of radio broadcasts, I am hopeful that this message will get through.

Such broadcasts, I believe, represent the kind of efforts which will need to be broadened, not only through radio and television, but also through other contacts, in the light of the new hardened Soviet policy.

Reflecting further upon this need, I ask unanimous consent to have two items printed at this point in the RECORD:

First, a statement released today, stressing the need for "going over the heads" of the Communist leaders to the people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains with the truth of world affairs; and, second, excerpts of my address over *Radio Liberty*, scheduled to be broadcast early this week to the people within the Soviet Union.

There being no objection, the statement and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY URGES GREATER EFFORTS TO GO OVER THE HEADS OF COMMUNIST LEADERS TO PEOPLE BEHIND THE IRON AND BAMBOO CURTAINS WITH TRUTH OF WORLD AFFAIRS

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, senior Republican of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, today urged a greater free world effort to go over the heads of the Communist leaders to dominated people with the truth on world affairs.

"Around the world, people of the globe find themselves alternately involved in hot and cold wars, because of Communist activity," Senator WILEY said.

"Today, the hard core of Communists actually comprises only about 4 to 6 percent of the people in the Soviet Union; and about 2 percent in Red China, with additional scatterings of Communists elsewhere in the world—although fortunately a very, very small portion of the population.

"The question, then, arises: How long will the world tolerate the troublemaking of these perpetrators of discord, and advocates of a political-economic system of dictatorship contrary to the yearning, and will for freedom of all mankind? How long will we—as a world—allow such a minuscule minority to keep us on the brink of war?

"We recognize, of course, that the hard-core Communists, particularly in Red China and the Soviet Union, have an iron grip of control on these countries. Insofar as possible, however, I believe that we need a greater effort to go over their heads to reach the almost 1 billion people under domination, with: The truth about world affairs—for example, the real story of Khrushchev's torpedoing the Paris meeting; and the dedicated efforts, outside the Communist orbit, to promote a real peace—based upon justice and order—by the non-Communist people and nations.

"In such efforts, of course, we must be careful not to drive the Communist leaders so tightly into a corner that they push the panic button and touch off a nuclear-missile war.

"Despite this need to tread carefully, however, I believe the United States and the free world can—and should—be far more effective in getting across the story of freedom.

"Last session, I introduced a bill, S. 2188, to provide a Citizens Council to make a reevaluation of our effectiveness—or lack of effectiveness—in getting the truth to the people behind the Iron-Bamboo Curtains. The purpose of the Council would be to: reevaluate the Communist global ideological challenge and reappraise our own efforts in the light of that challenge; increase public awareness of the importance of the battle of men's minds, and our efforts to (a) counter the Soviet offensive, and (b) lay a foundation of free ideas, translated into the language that people of other lands can more easily understand—upon which to build a better world; and, extremely important, to increase the use of ingenious know-how which our free enterprise system has developed for mass media, to a better freedom-spreading program.

"Encouragingly, the idea of the Freedom Council has been endorsed by a number of outstanding individuals—well qualified to evaluate the need in the field, including the following:

"Former President Herbert Hoover: 'Your idea is magnificent.'

"David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corporation of America: 'I heartily agree with your view that a greater United States and free world effort is needed to combat the Communist ideological offensive.'

"Howard K. Smith, CBS News: 'It's an excellent idea. One of our chief faults—an odd one for a nation that has produced so many fine speakers—is a recently acquired inability to articulate our case. It is most noticeable in our time when our chief adversary is a natural genius in public relations.

" 'I hope the bill is passed and the Council can become effective as soon as possible.'

"Eric Johnston, president, Motion Picture Association of America: 'I like your idea to establish a Citizens Council for Advocacy of Freedom. It deserves the support of Congress.'

"Dwayne Orton, president, Council for International Progress in Management; also editor of Think, published by International Business Machines Corp.: 'I am very much interested in your bill, S. 2188. This strikes me as a very sensitive and needed stroke on the ideological offensive.'

"Robert F. Hurleigh, president, Mutual Broadcasting System, Inc.: 'I am most grateful to you for contacting me regarding your proposed Citizens Council for Advocacy of Freedom, for the ideas outlined in your pending bill support the very philosophies on which the heavily accented news schedules of the Mutual Broadcasting System are now based. * * *

" 'If there is anything the Mutual Network or I can do to further your Council plans, please do not hesitate to call on us.'

"Julian Goodman, NBC News: 'The purposes of your plan for a Citizens Council for Advocacy of Freedom are highly laudatory, and I certainly endorse them wholeheartedly. Any move we can make in this direction would certainly be useful.'

"The proposal—providing a mechanism for improving our 'salesman's' techniques—should, I believe, be enacted by Congress.

"We can expect, of course, that the Communist leaders—through jamming of Western radio broadcasts and through maintenance of the Iron-Bamboo Curtains—will continue to obstruct our efforts to get through to the dominated people. If we can achieve our objective—and I believe this is possible to a much greater degree than is now occurring—however, it would represent a major step toward reducing the power and threat of international communism and establishing ultimate peace in the world," Senator WILEY concluded.

EXCERPTS OF INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY, SENIOR REPUBLICAN, SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, FOR BROADCAST OVER RADIO LIBERTY, TO THE PEOPLE OF THE SOVIET UNION

Citizens of the Soviet Union: I welcome the opportunity to send warmest greetings to you from the people of the United States.

Historically, we have enjoyed friendship and mutual respect. Although people of different lands, we seek the same goals: Good homes for our families; freedom to go to the church of our choice; ever-better schools for our boys and girls—to enable them to grow intellectually, morally, and spiritually; jobs for our workers; an ever-higher standard of living; and better and better cities, farms, factories, roads, modes of travel—overall, a better way of living for all our people.

Although there are differences in the world, I do not believe any real difference exists between our people—who seek, and yearn for, a peaceful world in which to build what—to each of us—is the "Good Life."

Now, why can't we accomplish this objective?

As a nation, we are sorry that Mr. Khrushchev could not find it in his heart to sit down at the conference table with Prime Minister Macmillan, President de Gaulle, and our own beloved president, Mr. Eisenhower in Paris to discuss—reasonably and rationally—the issues troubling the world.

His excuse was the U–2 flight. However, he has known for a long time—as we have known of counter activities—of air surveillance and other types of information-seeking activities. Had Mr. Khrushchev been willing to agree to an "open skies" proposal—as recommended by President Eisenhower; or to work in a really constructive way to establish peace, the U–2 flight or, conversely, the spy activities directed by Mr. Khrushchev would not occur at all.

Realistically, there had been no great hopes for finding answers—magiclike—to all questions at the summit. However, we had thought that a pattern might be estab-

lished for frank, open discussions on how to resolve some of the differences between our governments and create a more peaceful atmosphere.

We regret, too, that President Eisenhower will not be able to visit with you next month—as he had been invited to do—by Mr. Khrushchev. We had hoped that he could bring to you, personally, the warm greetings and "handshake of friendship" of the American people. A man devoted to peace, you will recall that he fought with your sons and daughters against a common enemy—nazism—in the Stalingrads of Europe—to free the world from fear of aggression.

If he could have visited you, we felt that across your great country—as throughout the world—would ring out resounding the familiar, warm, hearty greeting: "I like Ike."

Now the invitation has been withdrawn. Why?

Mr. Khrushchev again says it was because of the flight of the U–2 over the Soviet Union. Was it really?

For years, both our Governments—even though Mr. Khrushchev has not as yet willingly admitted this—have tried to find out about each other's activities, particularly as these relate to military power.

Was the U–2 flight, then, really the basic cause of your Premier's refusal to contribute to world peace at the Paris Conference?

No, I don't think so; since it was only one small act, blown up out of proportion, indulged in for purposes of national interest by nearly all countries in the world, including the Soviet Union.

What, then, was the real reason for Mr. Khrushchev's refusal to sit down with the leaders of the Western Powers to try to find a road to peace?

Perhaps you, the people of the Soviet Union, best know the answer.

Any great guilt, however, and yes, condemnation, must be placed upon those who continue to thwart real progress toward peace.

Unfortunately, we have listened much to Mr. Khrushchev "flexing his missiles," threatening us, and others, with military destruction.

We don't like what we hear. We wish it had not been said. But we cannot ignore it.

Like you, the Russian people, we, too, feel we have a great country with proud traditions and real hopes for the future.

The objectives of U.S. policy—and this reflects the will of the people and leaders alike—are not to fight with you, but to be your friends.

In the face of warlike threats, however, we do not feel that we can go to sleep, then possibly be attacked, and one morning wake up to find ourselves slaves of another country.

Instead, we have found it necessary, against our will and traditions, to put more and more money, manpower, and brainpower into an effective, powerful, jet missile, atom space defense; incidentally, a strong, mighty force to be reckoned with carefully by any would-be aggressor.

If we had our way, however, we would like to beat our swords into plowshares, to channel great resources, skill, and human ingenuity of our country and the world into farm machinery, hospitals, homes, schools, roads, food for the hungry, books and teachers for the millions in the world who cannot read or write; more electric and atomic power for factories, homes, and farms, and a million other uses for peaceful purposes.

In America, we are fortunate that most of our population enjoys a great many of these advantages. Yet we know that until the good things of life are brought to all people, at home and abroad, there can be no real peace.

We seek for other countries what we wish for ourselves, the right to create and live under a self-determined form of government. But our philosophy is more than live and let live; instead, we are willing to live and help live.

Unfortunately, this cannot be accomplished in a world of threat and counterthreat by the great powers.

Recognizing the destructive power of modern weapons, we know that in a nuclear-missile war, both attacker and attacked would be largely, if not wholly, destroyed. Consequently, we shall continue to do all we can to establish a world of order, justice, and peace.

Despite the unwillingness of Mr. Khrushchev to negotiate at Paris, we as a nation, and our President, and other leaders are undaunted. We shall go ahead—relentless, fearless, in a dedicated way, to try to find ways and means—to create a more peaceful world.

In our efforts we shall depend also upon you—the people of a great country—to assist us in spirit, and as you can, in fact, to find the right road to a better world and a life of peace.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 24, 1960

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as with a new day another chance for love and service comes from Thy hand, may we be solemnly conscious that wrought deeply in the texture of human life are inexorable laws far beyond the reach of debates or legislative fiats. In the crises of these explosive days, give us to see that one of those fundamental laws, as framed by man's Best Man, is that to selfishly save life is to lose it, and to lose it for humanity's sake is to find it. Thou art making it plain on this rapidly shrinking globe that there are no borders or frontiers to neighborliness and brotherhood.

As we seize this day, may its fleeting hours remind us in solemn tones that life is too short to be little, and that the most potent truth which can guide our actions and fix our goals is that he who does not guard his fellow's security is diligently engaged in the destruction of his own, as the ages confirm.

We ask it in the name of Him who is the way and the truth. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 23, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1157. An act to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands; and

H.R. 8226. An act to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1157. An act to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8226. An act to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have been asked to object to that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and myself, I present, for appropriate reference, resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to increase the compensation for postal employees.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION INCREASING THE COMPENSATION OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States legislation, including H.R. 9883 and H.R. 9977, which would increase the compensation of postal employees; and

Whereas the Post Office Department requires adequate means for attracting and retaining efficient and well-qualified personnel in order to maintain the operations at a high level of service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that will increase the compensation of all postal employees; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

Adopted by the Senate, April 25, 1960.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Adopted by the house of representatives in concurrence, April 27, 1960.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

Attest:

JOSEPH D. WARD,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Schenectady County, N.Y., urging the President to sign the distressed areas bill.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 84

Resolution in support of Federal aid to distressed areas

Whereas Schenectady County is one of the areas in the Nation still suffering from chronic unemployment with all the attendant influences on the economic life, stability and future growth of our community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Schenectady County Board of Supervisors urge the President of the United States to sign the $251 million aid to distressed areas bill approved by the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, Senators KENNETH B. KEATING and JACOB K. JAVITS, and Congressman SAMUEL S. STRATTON.

HAWK MOUNTAIN DAM—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Delaware County, Delhi, N.Y., protesting against the construction of the Hawk Mountain Dam in the east branch of the Delaware River, at the town of Hancock.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 38

Resolution on Hawk Mountain Dam

Whereas the Town Board of the Town of Hancock has presented to the Delaware County Board of Supervisors a resolution passed by said town board opposing the proposed dam at Hawk Mountain, in the east branch of the Delaware River, town of Hancock; and

Whereas said town board opposes said dam because their supervisor, Fred R. Dix, was informed on the 4th day of May 1960, at a public hearing held at Port Jervis, N.Y., that the proposed dam area would not be taxable; and

Whereas the town of Hancock and the county of Delaware would lose the tax on approximately 25 percent of the assessed valuation of the town of Hancock; and

Whereas there now exists two dams in the county of Delaware built by the city of New York, namely; one at Downsville which floods 5,700 acres of land, and one now being built at Stilesville which will flood approximately 4,900 acres of land. The proposed dam at Hawk Mountain would flood approximately 8,100 acres of land: Now be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of Delaware County go on record as opposing the proposed Hawk Mountain Dam, first because of the loss of tax on approximately 25 percent of the assessed valuation in the town of Hancock, and secondly, because of the loss of livable, beautiful land wherein our people and those wishing to come into our county may find suitable locations where they may dwell in peace and quiet and enjoy rural life to the fullest in the natural scenery which God has given us; and be it also

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent the U.S. Army Engineer Corps office, 2635 Abbottsford Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.: Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., and Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C., and Senator KENNETH KEATING, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

W. J. STORIE,
Clerk of Board.

REPEAL OF TELEPHONE EXCISE TAX—RESOLUTION AND LETTER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, stockholders of the New Ulm, Minn., Rural Telephone Co., at their annual meeting adopted a resolution asking repeal of the telephone excise tax. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and letter transmitting it to me be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution and letter were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas toll telephone services are now subject to a Federal excise tax; and

Whereas this tax was considered to be a World War II revenue measure and also a measure to curtail the use and construction of new telephone facilities; and

Whereas it has been many years since the end of World War II; and

Whereas said tax is discriminatory toward the telephone interests: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the stockholders of the New Ulm Rural Telephone Co., an independent telephone company with headquarters in New Ulm, Brown County, Minn., respectfully ask that said tax on toll telephone services be repealed as it is no longer necessary and has served the purpose for which it was originally placed on all toll telephone services; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the U.S. Senators for the State of Minnesota and to the various Congressmen from the State of Minnesota.

JOHN G. HOLLAND,
Manager.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR PLANT QUARANTINE AT PORTS OF ENTRY—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as a Senator from one of the great Midwest States bordering the St. Lawrence Seaway, I would like to express my gratification that the Department of Agriculture asked for, and has been allowed, additional funds that will strengthen the quarantine inspection services needed to protect the United States from the entry of foreign diseases and pests. With the opening of the seaway, deep water cargo vessels are enabled to move far into the midst of our valuable agricultural areas. Expert and unceasing care is needed to guard against new plant and animal diseases which, if undiscovered, could lead to untold millions of dollars of loss.

Many organizations and business people of Minnesota, sensitive to this threat and their responsibility, have asked that Congress take the steps necessary to avoid this hazard. Many organizations have passed formal resolutions asserting their interest. Typical is one received yesterday by the Senator from Minnesota, passed by Union Local No. 63 of the Public School Employees. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON QUARANTINE AND GRAIN INSPECTION

Whereas agriculture is one of the Nation's most important industries and the harbor of Duluth-Superior is well on the way to becoming the greatest lake port for the export of agricultural products and the import of other goods; and

Whereas it is of utmost importance to safeguard the agricultural heartland of the United States and Canada from infestation by foreign plant and animal diseases and insect pests which may be introduced through the port of Duluth-Superior in ships or cargoes originating abroad; and

Whereas millions of dollars worth of crops and animals and thousands of hours of manpower are in jeopardy if destructive pests infest port facilities, elevators or warehouses necessitating fumigation or causing quarantines which might result in embargoes being placed on any shipments in and out of the port of Duluth-Superior by domestic or foreign buyers; and

Whereas there are several State and Federal inspections involved before ships can dock, unload or load whereby uncoordinated inspection operations could lead to duplication, loss of time and money by labor, management and shipping: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this body urge the Federal and State administrators having jurisdiction over the various types of ship and cargo inspections, both incoming and outgoing, to provide enough inspectors to permit adequate, prompt inspections and avoid delays of shipping; and be it further

Resolved, That coordination of the various types of inspection be worked out by those in authority to avoid duplication of effort, loss of time for labor and delay of shipping operations.

ADOLPH ROLEK,
Recording Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 11405. An act to provide for the treatment of income from discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation in a receivership proceeding or in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act commenced before January 1, 1960, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1416).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1889. A bill to authorize the transfer of three units of the Fort Belknap Indian irrigation project to the landowners within the project (Rept. No. 1417).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

H.R. 8295. An act to authorize the transfer to the Navajo Tribe of irrigation project works on the Navajo Reservation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1418).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment:

S. 2634. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, relative to the return of certain alien property interests (Rept. No. 1419).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

S. 3226. A bill to amend section 809 of the National Housing Act (Rept. No. 1420).

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936, TO REMOVE CERTAIN LIMITATIONS ON CONSTRUCTION DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDY — INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. 1415)

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 2584) to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations on the construction differential subsidy under such title, and I submit a report thereon.

I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed, together with the individual views of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance:

Arnold Raum, of Massachusetts, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States;

Allin H. Pierce, of Illinois, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States;

Graydon G. Withey, of Michigan, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States; and

Irene F. Scott, of Alabama, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3585. A bill for the relief of Dr. Benigno R. Lazaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 3586. A bill to authorize additional funds for public facility loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3587. A bill for the relief of Hamish Scott MacKay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 3588. A bill to amend the act of September 2, 1957, relating to the settlement of certain inequitable losses in pay suffered by commissioned officers under emergency economy legislation; to the Committee on Finance

S. 3589. A bill for the relief of George Michael Barakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY) (by request):

S. 3590. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S.J. Res. 197. Joint resolution to give recognition to the two American scientists who discovered the great radiation belt surrounding the earth; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

(See the remarks of Mr. BEALL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF CERTAIN PUBLICATIONS

Mr. DODD submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 107) authorizing the printing of certain publications for the use of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring) That there shall be printed, for the use of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, the numbers of copies specified of the following publications:

(1) The Effect of Red China Communes on the United States (hearing before the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, March 24, 1959), five thousand copies;

(2) Statement by J. Edgar Hoover (S. Doc. 80, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session), ten thousand copies;

(3) The Revival of the Communist International and Its Significance for the United States (committee print, Eighty-sixth Congress, first session), five thousand copies;

(4) Contradictions of Communism (committee print, Eighty-sixth Congress, first session), twenty thousand copies;

(5) Report of the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws to the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, for the Year 1958 (committee print, Eighty-sixth Congress, first session), ten thousand copies; and

(6) The Communist Party of the United States of America—A Handbook for Americans (S. Doc. 117, Eighty-fourth Congress, second session), twenty thousand copies.

RESOLUTION

UNITED STATES AGAINST WILLIAM PRESSER—ATTENDANCE OF CERTAIN WITNESSES

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 326) requesting the production of certain Senate committee records for the trial of William Presser in the U.S. District Court, Cleveland, Ohio, and authorizing Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN and Walter J. Sheridan to testify in said trial, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MCCLELLAN, which appears under a separate heading.)

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the public facilities loan authorization by $100 million.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3586) to authorize additional funds for public facility loans, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 203(a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out "$100,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$200,000,000."

SEC. 2. Section 203(b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by inserting "be" immediately after "may".

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the public facilities loan program is for the purpose of purchasing obligations of, or making loans to, State and local governments for building or improving essential public works where financing is not otherwise available on reasonable terms and conditions. Priority is given to loans to smaller communities for such essential public works as storage, treatment, purification or distribution of water; sewage, sewage treatment, and sewer facilities, and gas distribution systems.

The Housing and Home Finance Administrator, acting through the Community Facilities Administration, is authorized to purchase the obligations of and make loans: first, to States; second, municipalities and other political subdivisions of States; third, to public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States; and fourth, to public corporations, boards, and commissions established under State law to finance specific public projects under State or municipal law.

By law, applications for public facility loans which are received from communities of less than 10,000 population having an urgent and vital need are given priority consideration. The maximum loan term is 40 years. The interest rate is established from time to time, taking into account the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities. The interest rate paid by the community varies according to the type of obligation issued to secure the loan. On general obligation bonds, the current rate is 4⅝ percent, and on revenue bonds the rate is 4⅞ percent.

The public facilities loan program is by no means a new or recent program. For 21 years, the Public Agency Division of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation assisted municipalities in financing public facility improvements, such as sewage and water distribution systems. During that period, the program, aggregating more than $1.5 billion, was operated without loss to the Federal Government. Upon dissolution of the RFC, the authority for this program was specifically retained, to be operated by an agency to be designated by the President. When such agency was not so designated, the Congress approved legislation in 1954 directing the Housing and Home Finance Agency to administer the program. Since very little was accomplished toward assisting communities needing vital public works during the year following this congressional action, legislation was enacted in 1955 to revive the program and place it on an operating basis. One of the provisions contained in the 1955 legislation established a revolving loan fund of $100 million.

Since 1955, some 257 communities have had applications approved for approximately $80 million of loans to assist them in the construction of needed public works projects, practically all of which have been water and sewer projects. This leaves a balance of $20 million in the fund. According to the Community Facilities Administration, applications on hand as of the end of April of this year amounted to $22.8 million; thus, applications exceed the balance on hand by approximately $1 million.

The President's budget message called for an additional $100 million of funds for this program. In requesting this amount, the President stated that this was necessary because the present funds would be exhausted by early 1961. It is obvious from the number of applications on hand that, for practical purposes, the fund is exhausted now.

I would like to include in the RECORD at the end of my remarks a table showing the communities in my own State and those in the State of Alabama which have participated in this beneficial program.

Mr. President, although I am introducing this bill—and supporting it—to provide for a continuing public facilities program, I would prefer to reconstitute and liberalize the program as proposed by S. 1955, the Community Facilities Act of 1959, which I and several other Senators sponsored during the 1st session of the 86th Congress. But I must face reality and be practical. The present administration is opposed to S. 1955, and it appears hopeless to assume that such a measure could be enacted into law during the few remaining weeks of this session of the Congress.

On January 3, 1961, a new Congress will convene. On January 20, 1961, a new Executive will take office. I am very hopeful that the outlook then for a more general community facilities loan program will be more favorable than it has been throughout the present administration. In the meantime, the bill I am introducing can provide for the continuation of a program which is still useful, even though it is unduly restricted, and carries unnecessarily high interest rates, under the present administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tables bearing on this subject be also printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Community Facilities Administration, public facility loans program

LOANS APPROVED IN STATE OF ALABAMA (FROM INCEPTION THROUGH MAY 15, 1960)

Applicant and location	Type of facility	Amount	Applicant and location	Type of facility	Amount
Town of Akron, Hale County	Water	$66,000	Town of Loxley, Baldwin County	Water	$122,000
City of Bridgeport, Jackson County	Gas	250,000	Town of New Hope, Madison County	do	130,000
Town of Brookside, Jefferson County	do	240,000	Town of Ohatchee, Calhoun County	do	38,000
Town of Double Springs, Winston County	Water	68,000	Town of Orrville, Dallas County	do	87,000
Town of Fort Deposit, Waterworks and Sewer Board, Lowndes County.	Water and sewer	140,000	Town of Phil Campbell, Franklin County	Gas	150,000
			Town of Vincent, Gas Board, Shelby County	do	420,000
Greene-Hale Counties Gas District	Gas	900,000	Town of Wilton, Shelby County	do	50,000
Town of Hobson City, Calhoun County	Sewer	44,000			
Town of Killen, Lauderdale County	Water	124,000	Total		3,509,000
Lamar County Gas District	Gas	680,000			

LOAN APPLICATIONS PENDING IN STATE OF ALABAMA (AS OF MAY 15, 1960)

Applicant community	Type of facility	Amount of loan requested	Applicant community	Type of facility	Amount of loan requested
Adamsville	Water	$646,000	Scottsboro	Gas	$1,300,000
Beatrice	do	95,000			
Littleville	do	105,000	Total		2,342,000
Loxley	Gas	196,000			

Community Facilities Administration, public facility loans program—Continued

LOANS APPROVED IN STATE OF ARKANSAS (FROM INCEPTION THROUGH MAY 15, 1960)

Applicant and location	Type of facility	Amount
City of Altus, Franklin County	Water	$112,000
City of Amity, Clark County	do	85,000
City of Bald Knob, White County	do	320,000
City of Blevins, Hempstead County	do	38,500
City of Bradford, White County	Water and sewer	118,500
City of Buckner, Lafayette County	Water	50,000
City of Chidester, Ouachita County	do	67,500
Crossett:		
Natural Gas Improvement District No. 2 of Ashley County.	Gas	188,000
Water and Fire Protection District No. 1 of Ashley County.	Water	419,000
City of Danville, Yell County	do	114,000
City of Delight, Pike County	do	101,000
City of Dierks, Howard County	do	102,000
City of Elaine, Phillips County	Water and sewer	126,000
City of Emmet, Nevada County	Water	82,000
City of Hackett, Sebastian County	do	52,000
Water Improvement District No. 1 of Hackett	do	24,000
Town of Huttig, Union County	Water and sewer	100,000
Town of Imboden, Lawrence County	Water	63,000
Water Improvement District No. 1 of Imoden	do	80,000
City of Lavaca, Sebastian County	do	89,000
City of Lamar, Johnson County	do	73,000
Water Improvement District No. 1 of Lamar	do	53,000
City of Leslie, Searcy County	Water	$85,000
City of McRae, White County	do	90,000
City of Ola, Yell County	do	125,000
City of Pangborn, White County	Water and sewer	121,000
City of Perryville, Perry County	Water	160,000
City of Plainview, Yell County	do	70,000
Water Improvement District No. 1 of Plainview	do	27,000
City of Plummerville, Conway County	do	97,000
City of Ratcliff, Logan County	do	72,000
City of Salem, Fulton County	do	66,000
City of Salem, Fulton County	do	53,000
City of Sparkman, Dallas County	Water and sewer	144,000
City of St. Francis, Clay County	Water	62,000
State Highway Commission, in Phillips County	Bridge	[1] 8,000,000
City of Swifton, Jackson County	Water	113,000
City of Thornton, Calhoun County	do	108,000
City of Washington, Hempstead County	do	45,000
City of Watson, Desha County	do	55,000
City of Weiner, Poinsett County	Water and sewer	[2] 200,000
City of West Fork, Washington County	do	60,000
Waterworks District No. 1 of West Fork	do	60,000
Total		12,270,500

LOAN APPLICATIONS PENDING IN STATE OF ARKANSAS (AS OF MAY 15, 1960)

Applicant community	Type of facility	Amount of loan requested
Caraway	Sewer	$146,500
Carthage	Water	97,000
Coal Hill	do	125,000
Crawfordsville	Sewer	94,000
Dover	Water	92,000
Water Improvement District No. 1	do	48,000
Dyer	do	65,000
Humphrey	Water and sewer	123,000
Magazine	Water	70,000
Water Improvement District No. 1	do	70,000
Melbourne	Sewer	$48,000
Sewer Improvement District No. 1	do	47,000
Mineral Springs	Water and sewer	110,000
McCrory	do	55,000
Water Improvement District of the City of Pangborn.	Water	58,000
Scranton	do	56,000
Water Improvement District No. 1	do	20,000
Turrell	Water and sewer	138,500
Total		1,463,000

[1] Loan reduced to $7,000,000 due to reduction in costs.
[2] $65,000 sold to others, and loan reduced to $135,000.

HAMISH SCOTT MacKAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Hamish Scott MacKay.

This bill is designed to authorize the Attorney General to discontinue deportation proceedings against MacKay. The facts of this case are comparable to those of another Oregonian who has been subjected to deportation proceedings—Willia Niukkanen, also known as William Albert Mackie—on whose behalf I introduced the bill, S. 3543 on May 13.

A résumé of the facts in Mr. MacKay's case is contained in a letter dated April 28 addressed to me by Mr. Nels Peterson, a Portland, Oreg., attorney. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Peterson's letter be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 28, 1960.

Re deportation of Hamish Scott MacKay.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Supreme Court of the United States denied certiorari for the above named on Monday, April 18, 1960.

Herewith follows a summary of the life of Hamish Scott MacKay and the course of the deportation proceedings instituted against him.

Hamish Scott MacKay was born near Calgary, Alberta, Canada, in 1905. His father was born in Scotland and immigrated to the United States, and in 1900 was living in North Dakota and there obtained American citizenship by naturalization. In 1903 the father of Hamish Scott MacKay was married to Hamish Scott MacKay's mother who was a native born American citizen, one of whose ancestors signed the Declaration of Independence. Immediately after their marriage, they moved to the wilderness of Canada. In 1905 Hamish Scott MacKay's father became naturalized, but having resided there less than the requisite 3 years to become entitled to be naturalized. The relationship between Canada and the United States was governed by a treaty dated May 13, 1870 (16 Stat. 775), which provides that citizens of either country naturalized as citizens or subjects of the other should be treated as citizens of such country by the country of origin. The treaty further provided that in case citizens of one country naturalized in another, wished to renew their residence in the country of origin, they could be restored to the privileges of citizenship "on such conditions as the government may think fit to impose." The foregoing is only background information as explanation of our later contention that Hamish Scott MacKay was an American citizen by derivation of a naturalized citizen of the United States, his father, and by a native born citizen of the United States, his mother. We contended upon the petition for writ of certiorari, as we did in the lower courts, that the intention of the treaty between Great Britain and the United States was to prevent statelessness and that Hamish Scott MacKay acquired derivative citizenship under this treaty. Hamish Scott MacKay came into the United States for permanent residence with his father and mother in 1924. His father (James Scott MacKay) attended a chiropractors' school in Davenport, Iowa, went to the State of Colorado and practiced chiropractics for approximately 2 years. His father returned to Canada in the fall of 1927 and died on February 9, 1928. Hamish Scott MacKay returned to Canada for a short time and reentered the United States for permanent residence on November 28, 1928, at North Portal, N. Dak.

Hamish Scott MacKay settled in Portland, Oreg., in the early thirties after having served in the National Guard in the State of Illinois. Hamish Scott MacKay was a carpenter by trade and was married in Portland, Oreg., to a native born citizen of the United States. Two sons were born as issue of the marriage. During World War II the wife of Hamish Scott MacKay abandoned her husband and the children and he obtained a decree of divorce from her and was awarded the custody of his two sons, whom he thereafter substantially reared alone until his marriage in 1949 to his second wife, a native born American citizen.

On May 25, 1949, a warrant of arrest was issued for the arrest of Hamish Scott MacKay on the ground that he was an alien subject to deportation, in that after entry into the United States he was alleged to have been a member of an organization, association, society or group that advises, advocates or teaches the overthrown by force and violence of the Government of the United States, pursuant to the act of October 16, 1918 (40 Stat. 1012, as amended). Hearings began July 24, 1950, and continued from time to time thereafter. During the course of the hearings, an additional charge was lodged against MacKay that he was deportable for being a member of the Communist Party after entry into the United

States, pursuant to the Internal Security Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 987) enacted September 22, 1950. At the original hearing, a witness, one Paul Crouch (now deceased) allegedly then living in Florida, testified as to the aims and purposes of the Communist Party. His testimony was hardly credulous (e.g., he testified he was able to read newspapers at the age of 6 years) and he testified that the Communist Party, during his membership in the thirties, advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. This witness, Paul Crouch, had been court-martialed in Hawaii but by some mysterious circumstance had been released. (Incidentally, after the passage of the Internal Security Act of 1950, proof that the Communist Party of the United States advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence no longer became necessary, hence the lodging of the additional charge against Hamish Scott MacKay of membership in the Communist Party.)

Following the hearings, he was ordered deported, which order was affirmed by the Board of Immigration Appeals. In October, 1955, MacKay filed with the Board of Immigration Appeals a motion to reopen the hearing for the purpose of filing an application for suspension of deportation. On October 31 MacKay filed a petition in the U.S. District Court for a writ of habeas corpus and for injunctive relief. The trial judge denied the writ and the injunction, but the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued a restraining order and allowed his release upon bail. In June, 1956, a hearing on his application for suspension of deportation was held and the relief requested denied, although the Government admitted that hardship was shown. The appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, by stipulation, was dismissed and the matter referred back to the U.S. District Court where an amended petition for injunctive relief and for a writ of habeas corpus was filed on March 5, 1958.

The amended petition challenged the constitutionality of the Internal Security Act of 1950 and we contended that the case of *Rowoldt* v. *Perfetto* (355 U.S. 115, decided Dec. 7, 1957) was controlling, and that the Government had failed to prove "meaningful association" with the Communist Party. Our contentions were based upon the evidence presented by the Government by the witness Lee Arthur Knipe and by the testimony of the divorced wife of Hamish Scott MacKay. We also contended that MacKay had not been afforded a fair hearing on his application for suspension of deportation because the "special inquiry officer" at the hearings was one and the same person who served as a hearing officer upon his deportation hearings.

At this moment, Hamish Scott MacKay is buying a modest home in Portland, is married and has a 17-year-old son in high school. His older son has served honorably in the U.S. Army after graduation from high school in Portland, Oreg. His older son is married and has a child. He is married to a native-born American citizen, Annabelle MacKay. Hamish Scott MacKay has been active in the Boy Scouts, has belonged to various unions, and the only testimony against him related to activities of the unemployed for bread and butter and relief in the depression of the thirties. The evidence, vague in nature, covered the years 1936 to approximately 1941.

Hamish Scott MacKay has been active in the Oregon State Grange, in school activities for his sons and other community activities. He has never been convicted of any crime and denies that he was ever a member of the Communist Party.

All of the reasons, except a shorter period of residence in the United States of America, apply to Hamish Scott MacKay as apply to William Albert Mackie.

I believe that my review of the legal aspects in Mackie's deportation apply equally to Hamish Scott MacKay.

We respectfully urge that appropriate special legislation be introduced to permanently stay his deportation and permit his continued residence as a person of good moral character, with deep family and property involvements, here in the city, State and country of his choice.

Yours sincerely,

NELS PETERSON.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a point that I cannot stress too much in these deportation cases is the fact that individuals such as Hamish MacKay, under existing law, are being subjected to the loss of a very precious privilege—that of residence in the United States—without trials by juries of their peers. In these cases the basic facts are determined by a special inquiry officer. I am strongly of the opinion that, when such a privilege is at stake and the possibility of banishment to foreign soil is involved, the basic facts should be determined by American jurors. There can be no substitute for the decision of jurors who, by the very nature of their citizenship rights, understand the importance not only of national security but of the humanitarian interests involved.

I urge early consideration of this case by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and it is my hope that the committee will report on this bill well in advance of the end of the current session. It would be better to keep MacKay in the United States under surveillance, if deemed necessary, rather than send him to Canada. My bill proposes the humane, Christian approach to these unfortunate cases. Here is a man who has lived most of his adult life in the United States. He claims he was never a Communist. If he was caught in the tentacles of the Communist net in the United States, it was before the end of World War II. His record for years has been one of loyal patriotism to the United States. He is an uneducated man, a hard-working man, a family man, a man who should be allowed to continue to live in this country on condition of continued patriotic good behavior.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3587) for the relief of Hamish Scott MacKay, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Hamish Scott MacKay. From and after the date of enactment of this Act, the said Hamish Scott MacKay shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

SETTLEMENT OF INEQUITABLE LOSSES IN PAY SUFFERED BY CERTAIN COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of September 2, 1957, relating to the settlement of certain inequitable losses in pay suffered by commissioned officers under emergency economy legislation.

Under the act of September 2, 1957, Public Law 85–255, commissioned officers of the uniformed services finally received, after 25 years or more, the increased pay to which they were entitled when advanced in rank during the period 1932–34.

Notwithstanding the pay was earned over 25 years ago, the Treasury Department required the Comptroller General to deduct 18 percent withholding tax in the case of every living officer. In a Treasury Department ruling published as Revised Rule 58–443, the Internal Revenue Service admitted that the money paid under Public Law 255 "qualifies as back pay" as remuneration received by a Federal employee.

The bill which I introduce today, would simply make effective as a practical matter the Treasury Department ruling. For example, in the case of Rear Adm. R. E. Bakenhaus, he was admittedly due back pay in the total sum of $3,450.46. When he applied for payment under Public Law 255, all he actually received was $2,850.45. The Comptroller General deducted $590.01 as withholding tax. If he had been paid in 1932–34 he would have been liable for little or no income tax whatever.

Had this situation been realized and foreseeable, of course, Congress would have prevented it when Public Law 255 was enacted by including language similar to this bill.

There should be no objection to this correctional bill. It would not apply to widows of officers as the Comptroller General did not deduct a withholding tax in their cases when payments were finally made under Public Law 255.

It is estimated that since 2,381 officers were compensated under Public Law 255, and that at least 20 percent are now deceased, this bill would allow the remaining living officers, about 1,900 in number, to receive the tax withheld from them. This bill would at last end the injustice which arose more than 25 years ago.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3588) to amend the act of September 2, 1957, relating to the settlement of certain inequitable losses in pay suffered by commissioned officers under emergency economy legislation, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT TO STRENGTHEN INDEPENDENT COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, by request, I am introducing on behalf of myself and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] a bill to prohibit certain loss leader sales. I offer this bill in order that the appropriate Senate committee may have an opportunity to study the subject and to conduct hearings on the proposed legislation.

Many small businessmen and associations of small businessmen feel that this legislation is necessary to the survival of our traditional economic system. Among the associations strongly endorsing the bill are the National Association of Tobacco Dealers and the National Independent Dairies Association.

Similar legislation has been introduced by the chairman of the House Small Business Committee and by several of his colleagues.

Mr. President, I hope that the introduction of this proposal may provoke study, discussion, and constructive criticism.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3590) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RECOGNITION TO AMERICAN SPACE SCIENTISTS

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on my own behalf and on behalf of the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to give recognition to the two American scientists who discovered the great radiation belt surrounding the earth. The two scientists are Prof. S. F. Singer, of Maryland, and Prof. J. A. van Allen, of Iowa, who have worked together in many cooperative space undertakings.

Prof. Van Allen made the discovery of the radiation belt through the use of the U.S. Explorer satellites launched by the Army Ballistic Missile Agency in Alabama in cooperation with the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in California.

The theoretical existence of the Van Allen Belt was advanced earlier by Prof. S. F. Singer, of Maryland.

The world scientific community has recognized the great value of this discovery. The discovery has changed the concept of the radiation environment of the earth, has illuminated the origin of important geophysical phenomena, and also has important implications for manned space flights.

The Russians, following their custom of claiming credit for all of history's great scientific discoveries, have recently credited themselves with this discovery by our own American scientists. On April 21 last, the Soviets announced that four Russian physicists had been awarded the Lenin Prize for 1960 for discovering the external radiation belt around the earth. Such a claim is completely without justification; the radiation belt was discovered by our own professors Van Allen and Singer 2 years ago, and that distinction should not be denied them by Russia's false claim.

Since long before Russia's Sputnik I, American scientists have been carrying out research projects which have greatly contributed to the knowledge of space and the powers operating in it. These scientists have come from universities and research institutions of every section of the United States. Their accomplishments portray the working of the American system, in which Government and non-Government scientists work side by side, in which public and private resources are combined for the public good. Our space scientists, unlike their Soviet counterparts, are free agents, contributing their work to the national space effort of this free Nation.

I think it is appropriate that the Government of this country undertake in the future to give official recognition to important accomplishments in scientific fields.

I hope that the joint resolution which I am introducing will act to express to the two scientists connected with the discovery of the great radiation belt some of the appreciation that the people of this country feel for their important work.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 197) to give recognition to the two American scientists who discovered the great radiation belt surrounding the earth, introduced by Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

UNITED STATES AGAINST WILLIAM PRESSER—ATTENDANCE OF CERTAIN WITNESSES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations has in its possession certain records pertaining to an investigation dealing with William Presser, President of the Ohio Conference of Teamsters and President of Joint Council 41, and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its Locals and other affiliate organizations; which investigation was conducted in 1958 by the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field; and

Whereas the Senate referred to the Department of Justice the transcript of the records on a citation of contempt of the Senate, which transcript contained allegations of the mutilation and destruction by said William Presser of certain records under subpena by the Select Committee; and

Whereas the matter of United States against William Presser, now pending trial in the U.S. District Court, Cleveland, Ohio, charges said William Presser with obstruction of justice; and

Whereas the Department of Justice has requested the production of the records in this matter and has requested that Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, former chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field and present chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, and, further, requested that Walter J. Sheridan, formerly an investigator for the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field and presently an investigator for the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, to appear and testify in the above proceedings; and

Whereas by the privileges of the Senate no Member or Senate employee is authorized to appear or testify or to produce Senate documents but by order of the Senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations is granted leave to permit the copying and presentation of certain records for examination in connection with the aforementioned court case, the records thereupon to be returned to the possession of the Subcommittee on Investigations; and be it further

Resolved, That Honorable JOHN L. McCLELLAN, a Member of this body, and Walter J. Sheridan, an investigator employed by the Senate, are authorized to appear and testify in the above-mentioned proceedings.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the resolution is self-explanatory.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 326) was agreed to.

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN VESSELS TO AMERICAN REGISTRY—AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING) submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3516) to admit the vessels *Fort Town*, *Maple City*, and *Windmill Point* to American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

ADVANCEMENT OF MARINE SCIENCES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] be added as a cosponsor of the bill—S. 2692—to advance the

marine sciences, to establish a comprehensive 10-year program of oceanographic research and surveys; to promote commerce and navigation, to secure the national defense; to expand ocean resources; to authorize the construction of research and survey ships and facilities; to assure systematic studies of effects of radioactive materials in marine environments; to enhance the general welfare, and for other purposes, introduced by me on September 11, 1959.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM AND TRAVEL ADVISORY BOARD—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill—S. 3102—to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel and Tourism and a Travel Advisory Board, introduced by me on February 25, 1960.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A STUDY BY DR. HERMAN KAHN ENTITLED "THE NATURE AND FEASIBILITY OF WAR AND DETERRENCE" (S. DOC. NO. 101)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a study by Dr. Herman Kahn entitled "The Nature and Feasibility of War and Deterrence," along with a short foreword which I have prepared.

This paper summarizes some of the points in a forthcoming book by Dr. Kahn, which is to be published by the Princeton University Press later this year. I want to indicate my appreciation to Dr. Kahn for his granting me permission to present this provocative study to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN BILLS BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON DONABLE PROPERTY OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that the Subcommittee on Donable Property of the Senate Committee on Government Operations will hold public hearings on (a) S. 2725, S. 2732, S. 3154; (b) S. 3489; (c) S. 3493; and (d) S. 2605 and S. 2388, beginning on Wednesday, June 1, 1960, at 10 a.m., room 3302, New Senate Office Building. Those desiring to testify should so inform Mr. Glenn Shriver of the committee's staff.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL:

Address delivered by Senator SMATHERS, of Florida, before the Atlanta Bar Association.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address delivered by him at Bethany College, Bethany, Va., on May 5, 1960, relating to disarmament.

Address delivered by him, entitled "The War That Can Be Won," at Wheeling College, Wheeling, W. Va., on May 5, 1960.

INQUIRY, RESPONSIBILITY, AND SOLIDARITY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are in a situation which demands the utmost in calmness and coolness from all of our people. This is definitely a time for all good Americans to be responsible.

The concept of responsibility and the concept of solidarity call for some forbearance from all participants, and demand that we keep foremost in our minds the basic objective of our Union, which in this case is to preserve our freedoms and our way of life from the maneuverings and the tactical moves of communism.

When I was a very young boy, my father taught me that no man's judgment on any given question is any better than the information that man has on that question. What we in this country need now is information that will shed light, instead of partisanship which will generate heat.

We have two Senate committees which have distinguished themselves by their responsibility and by the objectivity with which they have gathered information. I refer to the Foreign Relations Committee, headed by the very able and distinguished Rhodes scholar, the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and to the Government Operations Subcommitee on National Policy Machinery, headed by the very able junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who for more than a year have been studying questions pertinent to this subject. Both of these committees have discussed with the appropriate officials the wisdom of receiving briefings, pursuing studies, eliciting the truth, and gathering the facts, in order not only that the Congress will be fully and adequately informed but also that all the information in the national interest can be given to the American people.

In addition, other committees which have jurisdiction in this field, such as the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, may conceivably gather some information.

Mr. President, this is not the time to anticipate the work of those committees by coming to conclusions on the basis of alleged newspaper interviews which may well have been garbled in translation or which, through improper emphasis, may have changed a thought. What we need is information about what happened, not suspicions about each other.

Mr. President, in this case there is no individual who is in particular trouble. It is our country about which we must be concerned. I have said, and said repeatedly, that unity does not require sweeping the facts under the rug, no matter how unpleasant those facts could or might be. I do not think there is any disposition to do that; but the situation does require treatment of the facts candidly, calmly, coolly, in an objective vein and in a nonpartisan vein. I think the Nation will be well served if we proceed in that manner.

I know of no reason why all the pertinent information available to the Executive cannot be given without transgressing security, to the people of this country. I am informed that that is the policy of the President, following international conferences, and that that practice will be adhered to, as announced, on Wednesday evening.

It is also the policy of the Congress, following conferences with other nations, to have the Secretary of State and other appropriate officials report to the Congress or to the appropriate committees on the developments at those conferences.

Last week, following the return of the distinguished Secretary of State and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I discussed at some length with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. FULBRIGHT, the wisdom of having his committee meet with the Secretry of State and with the appropriate officials to receive full and adequate briefing and elicit all the information possible in order better to serve the national interest.

I have also conferred with other committee chairman who may have jurisdiction in connection with some of the subjects discussed. From time to time, I am sure they, in cooperation with the executive branch, will sit down and will reason together, not for the purpose of finding a scapegoat, but for the purpose of building a strong policy that will better serve America in the days ahead.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think I can concur in nearly everything the majority leader has said. Certainly I shall not replow old ground.

With reference to the item about the possibility of a garbled newspaper dispatch or inverview, of course I let that speak for itself. I thought the record was pretty well documented.

Yesterday, I referred to the refreshing viewpoint expressed by the majority leader. I expressed my consternation of spirit that my fellow compatriot from Illinois, the former Governor, saw fit to use the language he did employ in his address in Chicago, and to give it such a very definite partisan cast. Beyond that, I need not go.

We shall watch the enfoldments as time goes on. If and when comment is called for, obviously that comment will be made.

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to say just a word in commendation of the distinguished ma-

jority leader for the remarks which he has just made. He has spoken, as he usually does, as an American, and not as a partisan. This is one very important reason for his effectiveness in this body.

It is, of course, the desire and aim of all of us to look to the future, rather than to the past. If mistakes have been made, they can and must be used in building a better and more hopeful future. That is what the American people want and that is what they deserve.

The Congress, of course, has a perfect right to inquire into these matters. It has a perfect right to obtain all information available which is consistent with the security requirements of the Nation.

If these committees will approach their studies in this vein and in consonance with the convictions expressed by the majority leader, our country will be the stronger for these actions.

Certainly, the approach of the distinguished majority leader to this problem is worthy of merit. It is one which as I have said, I hope will be followed by many others in the forthcoming inquiries which are to be made into the U–2 incident and its surrounding circumstances.

ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF SECRETARY OF STATE JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, 1 year ago, our late Senate colleague and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles passed to his reward.

This morning, at the Department of State, his successor, Mr. Christian Herter, and colleagues in the Department commemorated the day. It is interesting to note that on Tuesday next, representatives of the SEATO powers will convene in Washington to discuss matters of mutual interest. SEATO was the brainchild of Secretary Dulles, and I was privileged, along with him and Senator J. Alexander Smith, to be one of the three signatories for the United States.

Mr. Dulles was a lifelong student of diplomacy and statecraft. He was a man of determination and will power. He could always see the other side of the coin, in connection with any matter brought to his attention.

He was a devoted public servant, a man of devout religious conviction, and one who always carried the interests of our country in his heart and in his head.

This statesman of brilliant intellect and keen insight has left his mark. We shall continue to miss him, and we shall always remember him with affection and respect.

We are happy that he has been succeeded by his former associate in the Department of State; and Secretary Dulles himself would be proud of the man who has taken his place in the State Department—Christian Herter, of Massachusetts.

I note this anniversary because of the many services Secretary Dulles rendered to our country. He was a good man, a good Senator, and an outstanding Secretary of State.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad that the junior Senator from Montana has taken this occasion to recognize the anniversary of the death of the late Secretary of State.

A year ago John Foster Dulles died. We remember him today, as he will be remembered by future generations, for his devotion to the United States and to freedom throughout the world. In every capacity in which he served he brought honor to our country.

NOW IS THE TIME TO GO ALL OUT FOR PEACE—STARTING WITH ENFORCIBLE ATOM TEST BAN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, with all the tumult and the shouting about appeasement, there is the danger that all of us in the Senate will lose sight of the fact that the prime purpose of a U.S. Senator is still to work for peace with freedom. Of course, freedom is absolutely essential. I am sure there is not a U.S. Senator who would not prefer to die for freedom than to have this country submit to Moscow as the price of peace. Personally, I think it is a terrible waste of time for us to stir up the country's emotions by pretending there are any Americans of any influence in either party who do not share this determination.

At the same time, Mr. President, while we insist on freedom, the junior Senator from Wisconsin believes we should go all out to achieve peace, especially now, when every American citizen who can read a newspaper knows how tragically the prospects for peace have dimmed in recent days.

This is a time when the world is rocketing on to one cataclysmic triumph after another in the art of destroying life on earth. A few years ago it was the H-bomb, now mass produced, a few hundred of which could wipe out life in this Nation. A few thousand could destroy life on earth. The H-bomb is said to have its fallout drawbacks to the aggressor as well as the victim. Today we have developed missiles capable of delivering H-bomb warheads literally thousands of miles precisely on target in a matter of minutes. Tomorrow we will develop the neutron bomb, the death-ray bomb, that can kill without danger to the aggressor. What will come next?

Mr. President, can anyone read the history of mankind, with its steady, rhythmic pulsation of a war every generation, without recognizing it is not enough to hope that, in Churchillian phrase, "Safety will be the twin brother of annihilation, survival the child of terror?"

With all the dangers we confront, we must act, we must risk, we must work for peace—or we know in our hearts we are doomed.

Mr. President, this is why even now—I should say especially now—there must be voices raised in this government pleading that one of the last great hopes for peace—that great first step towards armament control—the conference on suspending nuclear tests, will not fail.

With this in mind, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent letter by Prof. Herbert Jehle, a professor of physics at George Washington University, to the Washington Post, setting forth the practical prospects and promise of the test-ban negotiations, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERSPECTIVES ON DETECTION

There has been a lot of misunderstanding about the hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the detection of nuclear explosions. Last week, a critical evaluation of the congressional hearings on that topic was given by the eminent nuclear physicist, Dr. H. A. Bethe, professor of physics at Cornell University, former member of the President's Science Advisory Committee, who was a member of the technical team at the Geneva test-ban negotiations.

What follows is a summary of Dr. Bethe's remarks.

The test-ban negotiations are the only negotiations between East and West which got somewhere. A great many articles have been agreed upon, though the more sticky articles are still to be negotiated.

East and West have a different way of approaching the issue. The Russians started these negotiations from the political point of view; no controls, no detection, no inspection. We moved a long way from this point. The West started from the position that nuclear test cessation agreements must have safeguards.

And because the U.S.S.R. is sensitive to the presence of visitors, we will make the safeguards as technical as possible. We will ask for 20 control stations in Russia, and 180 altogether in the world.

It is easy to detect nuclear explosions which occur in the atmosphere.

But now we have the underground tests. They were first made in 1957 in the series known as Operation Plowshare, or experiments in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. These are quite difficult to detect, but we can be proud of the achievements in the field of test detection. We can detect the major underground explosions.

The technical situation is fully taken into account by the President's proposal of February 11 which covered ban on tests in the air, in water, in near space; and underground insofar as explosions stronger than 20,000 ton TNT equivalent, i.e., 4.75 earthquake magnitudes are concerned. This means that we want the test ban to be enforcible, or limited to those explosions that we can detect with present techniques.

What the Holifield hearings in April established was that the basis of this proposal was technically sound. In all essential points this proposal was accepted by the Russians.

Since the question is being asked, where does our detection capability stand? With the 1958 Geneva network of stations we can detect underground tests of magnitude 20 kilotons or larger ones in Nevada type geological conditions. There are about 130 earthquakes above magnitude 4.75 (20 kilotons equivalent) annually in Russia; 50 percent of them would be identifiable as earthquakes—not explosions—by the first motion of the seismographic recordings. This would leave about 60 events per year unidentified.

With a slight extension of the net from 20 to 30 stations inside Russia as suggested by Dr. Richard Latter, one can improve the detectability of 20 or more kiloton events, leaving only 10 unidentified events per year. This makes it possible to reveal clandestine nuclear tests by on-the-spot inspection.

The idea of concealing large nuclear explosions in cavities can't be taken quite seriously. Natural cavities (which are usually too small), and big artificial salt domes, constructed for the purpose, are the proposed means of achieving decoupling. Though such an Albert Latter hole is technically possible, it usually cannot be dug secretly, even if we disregard information leaking through defectors from behind the curtain.

We are, however, by no means powerless against muffled bomb tests in cavities, and it is in this context in which I proposed a network spacing of 125 miles instead of the 1958 Geneva network spacing of 600 miles. In such a net we would detect even the muffled explosions of 20 kilotons, decoupled to 70 tons. This would mean some 600 stations if we put them evenly all over Russia.

But it would only be necessary to put the stations this close in the seismic regions, that is, in regions in which there are many earthquakes and in regions where there are possibly salt domes. If you spread them this close in those regions only, you would need about 200 stations inside Russia.

The extra stations would be of the small unmanned type which are relatively inexpensive, costing only about $100,000 apiece. I am confident that, given 2 years' time, unmanned stations can be developed which are tamperproof in the sense that it is possible to know if they have been tampered with.

After we have been forced to discuss technical details about concealment for over a year, the next round, on the technical level, should now go to the improvement of detection systems. Several proposals have been made for improved detection schemes in the well-known Berkner report of March 1959.

But it is a great mistake to inject a demand for hundreds of stations in Russia into the negotiations at this point. This is a position to fall back on in a couple of years if there is no improvement in our techniques of detection. And that is not at all hopeless. The really important issues are not these technical details. It makes no sense at all to go for 100 percent security in this field while depending entirely on the good will of the Russians in much more important fields.

HERBERT JEHLE.

HIGH COST OF MEDICAL CARE CRUEL BURDEN TO AGED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the sincere and unsolicited letters we all receive on the question of medical care for our senior citizens go to the heart of the issue and, properly, to the hearts of us all.

I have here a letter that contains a simple but compelling lesson in arithmetic that cannot be denied and a plea that must be heeded. A couple receiving $96 a month on social security can not well afford $11.50 for health insurance. Millions of aged, of course, receive far less than this. What are they to do? I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR: With the tabling of the Forand bill it looks as though nothing will be done this session for aid to older people. This is a pity. There is no place where the need is greater. Let me give you an example:

A couple we know have a total social security check of $96. They have carried Blue Cross health insurance for more than 20 years. This week they were notified that the monthly costs have now risen to $11.50.

Also they cannot carry any other similar coverage without forfeiting their Blue Cross protection.

In addition a change has been made in their policy requiring them to pay 20 percent of the first $300. This is for 70 days hospitalization, unless 90 days have intervened.

$11.50 out of $96. just for health insurance is prohibitive. And of course it will go higher, as it does every year.

With our President and many other high-salaried members of Government beneficiaries of nonprivate systems it seems hardly fair that they should be indifferent to the tragic needs of millions of aged. There is nothing the aged fear more than what can happen in case of extended illness.

I am hoping you will exert your influence so that the present Congress will do something in this direction.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

EXPANDED AIR POLLUTION RESEARCH AND CONTROL EFFORTS NEEDED

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I call attention today to an editorial which appeared in yesterday's New York Times comparing the air pollution control programs of Los Angeles and New York City, and calling for greater efforts, at all levels of government, to curb and control the amount of harmful substances in the air above our Nation's major metropolitan areas.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the New York Times be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 24, 1960]

SMOKE PROGRESS—ELSEWHERE

Officials of New York City's Department of Air Pollution Control have been advised that the new budget of the Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District in California is $3,640,000, compared with the $674,380 budget for the New York department. Los Angeles has a staff of 458, and some private help in addition; the New York department's staff numbers 111.

Yet Los Angeles officials are not satisfied and are looking around for ways to improve matters. The county engineer's office out there has reported that in recent years air pollution control "has only maintained the status quo on smog, since State legislation to control the auto exhaust, the major contributor, has only recently been enacted."

Accordingly, the county engineer summed up, humbly and modestly we think: "In view of the small inroads thus far in actually reducing smog, our officials seek all information available on legislation and other control actions by the many jurisdictions that have attacked the air pollution control problem." We commend the Los Angeles diligence to our own city government, and point out that the effectiveness of New York City's antismoke efforts must be directly related to the availability of funds and facilities.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the subject of air pollution control has increased markedly in importance over the past several years.

There is often a tendency to limit the discussion of air pollution problems to certain west coast metropolitan areas in which this matter is especially serious. My colleagues in Congress from the State of California have devoted a considerable amount of energy to the control and alleviation of smog conditions in the Los Angeles area and in other west coast communities.

I want to make it clear, Mr. President, that the consideration of this subject must not be limited to Los Angeles and the west coast. We need to analyze and deal with it in all of the areas in which smog conditions exist or in which there is even a potential danger that this problem will become serious in the future.

In my own State of New York, New York City, as evidenced by the above editorial, has an active air pollution control program. Buffalo is becoming increasingly concerned about smog conditions. Other large cities, such as Cleveland and Houston, are in the same position. Both Pittsburgh and St. Louis have launched intensive and highly successful programs to reduce air pollution.

In all, 250 American communities have some form of local or State air pollution control programs. New York's Air Pollution Act was enacted in 1957. It establishes a State Air Pollution Control Board, which has been devoting considerable effort to problems in this field.

Under the Air Pollution Control Act passed in 1955, the Federal Government, through the Public Health Service, has spent some $20 million for research on the causes and possible methods of curbing air pollution conditions harmful to the health and safety of the citizens of our Nation.

Mr. President, I was extremely pleased that the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee last week approved H.R. 8238, an act passed by the House on August 17 of last year, which provides for a study of the effect of motor vehicle exhaust fumes. The House bill calls for a 2-year investigation by the Surgeon General as a public health matter.

I am hopeful that this bill will be enacted and that the Surgeon General's research reports will indicate what, if any, type of governmental controls are necessary in this area and, if necessary, at which level of government they should be imposed. Basically, I believe that, whenever we can, it is desirable to deal with air pollution control matters relative to such factors as automobile exhaust fumes through voluntary action on the part of private groups. At the same time, I have personally looked into various legislative approaches to this problem, should it be found that such approaches are necessary.

Mr. President, on the matter of automobile exhaust fumes, I noted with interest that Secretary Flemming of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in testifying on February 24 before the Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, commented on the extent to which automobile exhaust fumes contribute to metropolitan air pollution conditions. This was in connection with the renewal of the Air Pollution Control Act, which is

presently pending before the relevant committees of Congress. Although Secretary Flemming does not feel that Federal action is presently needed in this field, he placed considerable stress on his opinion that automobile air pollution problems must be dealt with on a national basis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD extracts from the testimony.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Emission of pollutants from automobile operations is a common phenomenon throughout the country. These are of concern in various areas because of irritative characteristics, their possible adverse effects on health, damage to vegetation, and interference with visibility. It does not appear feasible that this type of problem be approached on an individual community basis. The national character of automobile manufacture and distribution is such that consensus as to desirable actions should be obtained on a broader geographic basis.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am not prepared to discuss the more technical aspects of the various devices for reducing the amount of hydrocarbons in the air from automobile fumes in the air. I do, however, call attention today to an excellent and thoughtful article on this subject printed initially in Fortune magazine and reprinted in abbreviated form in the April issue of the Reader's Digest. I ask unanimous consent that the Reader's Digest article to which I just referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUTO FUMES—AND THE AIR YOU BREATHE

(By George A. W. Boehm)

A malodorous nuisance in many cities, these exhaust fumes can become a positive menace if they remain uncontrolled. There are practical solutions to the problem—California and the auto industry are edging toward them.

The automobile is now the only major source of air pollution in American cities that is not under some degree of control. Through the switch from soft coal to oil and gas in industry, and through the use of filters and precipitators on industrial chimney stacks, smoke and soot are now kept within bounds. But comparatively little has been done to reduce automobile fumes.

These are a growing nuisance, if not menace, in almost every big city. They are malodorous. In some cities they are the chief cause of haze and smog. Health experts suspect they may be partly responsible for the alarming urban rise in lung cancer.

The trouble comes from a small but potent fraction of gas vented through the crankcase or tailpipe. The modern internal-combustion engine is not 100-percent efficient. The gasoline it burns the way it is supposed to emerges from the cylinders as water and carbon dioxide—the harmless products of complete combustion. But even a perfectly tuned engine wastes a little fuel, about 2 percent on the average. This waste, unburned or partially burned, carries the hydrocarbons that worry pollution-control experts.

We need not banish automobiles to end the trouble. Since 1953, the auto industry has spent $6 million on air-pollution research and now has half a dozen feasible ways of reducing fumes. Engineers know that for perhaps $10 per car they can eliminate 50 percent of the hydrocarbons; for perhaps $300 they can do an almost complete job. What we need now is to decide officially that something must be done, and how much.

The smog in Los Angeles is notorious. Now other cities—Cleveland, Buffalo, and Houston among them—are beginning to complain about smog chiefly in downtown areas. To date, only California has been moved to act. At the legislature's order the State board of health set standards for exhaust purity to be considered as the basis for laws requiring control devices on California automobiles. Under the proposed program, every car manufactured after January 1, 1961, for sale in California must be equipped with an approved exhaust-control device. Any solution that proves acceptable in California may be applicable in other areas where auto exhaust is a serious problem.

Where air pollution is only a marginal problem, simple and cheap methods of reducing hydrocarbons may prove adequate. The simplest is a gadget that recycles gases from the crankcase vent back into the carburetor. Getting these gases burned in the engine can eliminate roughly 40 to 50 percent of the total hydrocarbon emission.

Another simple method of reducing hydrocarbons is to give a car regular maintenance. (How much hydrocarbon comes out the tailpipe depends largely on the condition of the engine. One fouled spark plug can double the emission of hydrocarbons.) Last year a group of Chrysler engineers compared the fumes from their engineering department's fleet of 40 service cars, which had had a tune-up every 5,000 miles, with the fumes from a sampling of privately owned automobiles in Los Angeles. The comparison was eye-opening. The carefully tended company cars gave off 60 percent less hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide than the average Los Angeles car.

But such halfway measures as crankcase recycling and regular maintenance don't satisfy California air-pollution officials. Smith Griswold, director of the Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District, estimates that at least 90 percent of the tailpipe emissions will have to be eliminated if smog is to be rolled back to the level of 1940, when there was occasional haze but no eye irritation.

How?

After 6 years of work, Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler have each come up with a practical device which, doubling as a muffler, burns up the hydrocarbons on their way out the exhaust pipe. The Chrysler device does this by concentrating the normal heat of the exhaust and using it to heat the hydrocarbons to 1,600°, at which temperature they burn readily. The Ford and General Motors devices pass the exhaust gases over pellets of a ceramic-like catalyst which makes the gases burn at relatively low temperatures—as low as 700° in one Ford model.

The devices vary in effectivenes. They burn from 60 to 90 percent of the hydrocarbons, cost from $100 to $300, and require maintenance or replacement after anywhere from 8,000 to 25,000 miles.

Although the Big Three's burners are still only in the advanced development stage, any one of them can be made ready for production within less than a year. It makes little difference to the manufacturers which burner is chosen. All the companies—Studebaker-Packard and American Motors as well as the Big Three—are bound by a cross-licensing agreement to share patents and designs free of charge.

A more radical and direct proposal for eliminating hydrocarbons has come from Ralph M. Heintz of Los Gatos, Calif. Heintz, now retired, was the cofounder and engineering ace of Jack & Heintz, the Cleveland firm that makes aircraft and missile parts. He insists that the only really satisfactory solution to the exhaust problem is to burn the fuel completely in the engine. Installing afterburners to consume wasted gasoline, he holds, is "like inventing rubber gloves because your fountain pen leaks."

Heintz has modified automobile engines so that they emit about 70 percent less hydrocarbon than the conventional engine. Working with Prof. Alexander L. London of Stanford University and E. Finley Carter and Dale Hutchison of Stanford Research Institute, he has replaced the carburetor with auxiliary combustion chambers, one for each cylinder. From these chambers just enough burning fuel is fed into a large excess of air in the cylinder to satisfy the immediate power demand of the engine. The result is inherently more efficient combustion.

After 2 years of experimentation, Heintz has a sound engine which can probably be improved further. It clatters a little, like a diesel, and it cannot yet match the power of conventional carburetor-fed engines. On the other hand, it gets several extra miles to the gallon.

Since the proposed California legislation primarily affects new cars, there won't be much reduction in California smog for several years. (Turnover of cars is approximately 50 percent in 6 years, 85 percent in 12 years.) And the program will be costly. At, say, $150 per car, and at the present rate of turnover, Los Angeles alone will become a $40 million per year market for burners.

There will have to be inspection stations. To inspect each car twice a year, Los Angeles will need about 1,000 stations. An inspection instrument which may prove suitable has recently been put on the market at $1,475. This cost, multiplied by 1,000 stations, plus the pay of 1,000 technicians, amounts to a sizable sum.

But the nuisance of smog is sizable, too. Los Angeles and other American cities will have to weigh the intangible cost of that, as well as the possibility—still to be determined—that smog may play a deadly role in promoting lung cancer.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am very much concerned about the hazard to the health of our Nation created by harmful substances in the air. This problem cannot be tossed off lightly. The air we breathe must not become America's wastebasket.

WIRETAPPING LEGISLATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it was necessary for me to be absent from the Chamber yesterday when the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] urged that we take action at this session to make it clear that wiretapping by State law-enforcement officials, under court order, did not run afoul of Federal law. I have since had an opportunity to read his statement and I want to commend him for his excellent analysis of the problem.

There is no doubt that the present law is seriously hampering law enforcement, is placing State district attorneys in jeopardy of Federal prosecution, and is establishing the telephone as a privileged instrument for criminal operations. The whole problem of eavesdropping, of which wiretapping is only one aspect, needs to be explored by Congress, and I have introduced a comprehensive measure for this purpose.

The immediate and urgent necessity, however, is to prevent the suppression of

evidence obtained against organized crime under State court orders. Enactment of S. 3340, which is modeled after a bill introduced by Senator McCLELLAN in the last Congress, would accomplish this limited but essential objective. Certainly, where State statutes require court orders before wiretapping can be done, the evidence thus obtained should be admissible in evidence and should not be held to violate any Federal law.

I am very grateful to the Senator from Arkansas for the very strong support which he gave to this point of view, and I am confident that his powerful influence will be helpful in advancing such legislation.

SUMMIT CONFERENCE WHICH WAS NEVER HELD

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, last Friday at 2 o'clock many thousands of Government workers were given a holiday for the remainder of the week and told to greet President Eisenhower. Some schoolchildren were dismissed. Units of the Armed Forces including bands, were ordered to the National Airport and to places along the route selected for President Eisenhower's return to Washington. Newspapers editorially urged a grand welcome for President Eisenhower—in fact, even included printed maps showing the route, thus catering to the well-known American habit of loving a parade.

Mr. President, the cruel fact is that President Eisenhower should not have been greeted as a conquering hero. What did he conquer? What great accomplishment was his at the summit conference?

Were not American citizens and leaders of friendly nations shocked in the first instance over false statements issued by a panic-stricken administration official who should have remained silent? Heads of state of friendly nations may well have been shocked by the ineptness of officials in the Eisenhower administration in the varying statements following the time the U–2 was downed some 1,300 miles within the borders of the Soviet Union.

These officials suffered humiliation, along with the citizens of our Nation, over the mistakes made by officials in NASA and the State Department. They could well reason that if appointive administration officials failed in this emergency, how likely it is that they would likewise fail if even a greater emergency were suddenly thrust upon us by Soviet action or aggression.

President Eisenhower, and the entire country with him, sustained a humiliating rebuff. Due to this failure and to ineptness and mistakes, the summit conference never took place. Whatever hope there was among leaders of the nations of the free world that some good result might come from a conference at the summit, was destroyed.

Our appointed officials let the President down. They utterly failed to do anything other than to furnish Khrushchev with grounds for bombast, bluster, and uncontrolled vituperation.

Officials guilty of authoring the shockingly false and then conflicting statements and flagrantly failing, at a critical time, in the performance of their duties, should be downgraded or dismissed from the public service. Better yet, they should have been seated in an automobile directly following that of the President after his arrival at the National Airport. It would have been appropriate to have draped that automobile in mourning over the hopes that were dashed partly as a result of their failures. It is unfortunate that the one principally responsible was not installed as a dummy in that Soviet satellite now in orbit.

It is true that our President conducted himself—in the face of charges from Khrushchev and the disappointments of the heads of State of our allies—in a dignified manner. He showed he could take all the abuse Khrushchev was capable of giving. I wish he had retaliated with some sharp language. But it is unfortunate his own officials—by clumsy and confused mishandling—distorted facts, permitted officials of NASA to publicly state that our aerial observation plane was on an innocent mission gathering information on weather, and then followed this with State Department officials denying that the pilot of the plane was spying.

This is an incredible performance.

Khrushchev disclosed the evidence, and then these same officials who should have said "we are investigating the incident," or remained silent, issued the provocative statement that those whose responsibility it is to defend this Nation would be failures if they did not do everything necessary, including spying, to "overcome the danger of a surprise attack" from the Soviet Union. This language clearly applied to the future.

A State Department official, very unfortunately for us, said: "Well, I will leave it to your interpretation." Then, apparently without notifying Vice President NIXON—who publicly defended aerial reconnaissance spying as necessary to penetrate the Iron Curtain and secure for our Armed Forces and for our allies information as to missiles on launching pads and aggressive preparations behind the Iron Curtain, and asserting that it was necessary to continue these defensive actions—this same appointive official pulled the rug from under him and handed Khrushchev an additional propaganda weapon for his bluster and bombast. Our President announced discontinuance of such aerial flights, which had, a couple of days before, been declared so necessary. Both President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON were let down by administration officials who proved inadequate to cope with an unexpected misfortune.

It is time for Americans to hold a postmortem. Their hopes died in a welter of contradictory statements which should never have been made and which led to insult of the leader of our Armed Forces and national humiliation.

It is due to our own failures that Khrushchev was given opportunities which he eagerly grasped, to stifle a conference which promised some hope to peace-loving peoples the world over. He did this, in a lusty manner, before it even commenced.

Then, to compound confusion, Secretary of Defense Gates, from Paris, called for an Armed Forces alert for Sunday, May 15. We rattled our sabers; Khrushchev menaced with his missiles.

The prestige of the United States has been lowered due to clumsy, embarrassed, contradictory, and frequently false statements and conflicting explanations. In truth and fact, Communist Russia has had its spies in America constantly during the past years.

There was no excuse for inept and inadequate failure of CIA and other officials to cope with an unexpected mischance. We, unfortunately, were placed on the defensive, where we should not be. Our President was insulted. Officials of his administration were at fault and caused his discomfiture and frustration.

The truth is that there is little indication—in fact, no indication—of any accelerated war threat, but the tension of the cold war has become more evident.

Our citizens have not, as yet, fully recovered from the shock to our pride and confidence. When we do, we should take to heart the lesson that in this 20th century, we must have in the White House a full-time President who does not delegate responsibility and leadership. In this grim period, the times demand that; and we should have confidence that following the coming election, we shall once again have a strong leader as President and Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces.

It is the irony of fate perhaps that President Eisenhower, following a period of years when Dame Fortune had smiled upon him, now finds the law of averages catching up. He sought a relaxation of warlike tensions. Increased warlike tensions resulted. He hoped, in the final months of his administration, his would be a constructive achievement in face-to-face conferences with a dictator, to stem the tide of aggression and promote permanent peace.

Our high hopes for that success were denied—not so much by Khrushchev as from the Eisenhower lack of leadership and failure of our own officials in high places of authority.

Now it is for us to tear aside this false facade presented in the carefully planned Presidential parade from the National Airport, and for us to rebuild—as painful and gradual as it may be—toward further face-to-face conferences, seeking, as a powerful nation, to end the armaments race but maintaining adequate safeguards.

To accomplish this we must have great and strong leadership, a President with vigor and industry, who devotes full time to his job.

PUBLICATION ENTITLED "DESIGN OF SMALL DAMS"

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate, I desire to call attention to a new publication being issued by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, entitled "Design of Small Dams."

This publication, it seems to me, is a substantial contribution to western water development. In fact, it should be of nationwide interest since the design of small dams concerns areas throughout the country. I desire to commend the Bureau of Reclamation for its foresight and ingenuity in this field.

Of course, much of the work on this publication was done under previous administrations like that of former Secretary Oscar L. Chapman and former Commissioner of Reclamation, Michael W. Straus, as well as the former chief engineer of the Bureau, Leslie N. McClellan.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a copy of a letter to me under date of May 20 from Hon. Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner of Reclamation, and an advance copy of a news release from the Information Service of the Department of the Interior.

There being no objection, the letter and news release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D.C., May 20, 1960.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Knowing of your deep concern over the need for nationwide conservation of natural resources and your familiarity with the Bureau of Reclamation's work toward this end, including our engineering structures in the Western States, we believe you will be interested in the new publication Design of Small Dams.

We believe the technical assistance offered in this publication will be of great value in the furtherance of the development of the water resources in this country. It should be of particular assistance in the development of small water resource projects in the West, where many small dams remain to be constructed, in that it will make available to private engineers and engineering firms that would perform the engineering services for such projects, the specialized technical knowledge and experience of the Bureau of Reclamation as applied to low dams. The demand for such assistance was so great that an earlier publication had been exhausted, and the technique of design and construction so advanced in 22 years that it would be a disservice to simply reprint the old book, which was sponsored by the Water Resources Committee of the National Resources Committee.

It is our belief that the store of knowledge and 50 years' experience of a Government agency in this field should be available to the public. It can be readily appreciated that passing on this technical knowledge to the public will benefit not only those directly associated with the Bureau of Reclamation program, but the thousands of conservation districts, engineers, and planners interested in water conservation and utilization. We believe it will provide a guide to the information and data needed for the hydrological and structural design of small dams, provide specialized technical knowledge in readily usable form for engineers who are new in the field of dam design, and greatly simplify the design procedures for low dams. From this should come economy in engineering and design costs.

No doubt this publication will be of interest to you and your committee. Should additional copies be desired for your use, do not hesitate to let us know.

Your interest in and continued support of the reclamation program are most appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
FLOYD E. DOMINY,
Commissioner.

NEW RECLAMATION BOOK PRESENTS DATA FOR USE IN DESIGN OF SMALL DAMS

A new technical book, "Design of Small Dams," has been published by the Bureau of Reclamation as a guide to small water resource organizations, public agencies, and private engineers engaged in the design and the construction of small dams and retention reservoirs, the Department of the Interior announced today.

In announcing the release of the new publication, Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy said that because of the Bureau's international reputation in the field of dam design there was a wide, continuing demand by the public for technical assistance by the Bureau's staff in the planning for and design of small dams. He said this demand was becoming more acute since an earlier Government publication, "Low Dams," published in 1938, had been out of print for several years during the current worldwide boom in water resource development.

Mr. Dominy explained that the public is entitled to the knowledge and experience amassed by the Bureau in a half century of dam building. "We believe," he said, "that making this information public is not only a substantial technical contribution to the water conservation program, but also that it will help bring about full upper-basin water development, with correlative benefits to large downstream storage reservoirs. Furthermore, by stimulating private and local initiative to construct the smaller dams, it will be contributing to the overall Federal policy of encouraging private capital and non-Federal agencies to assume a large and challenging public resource development task without turning to the Federal Government."

In the preface of the 611-page volume, Commissioner Dominy pointed out that the new book is intended to serve primarily as a guide to safe and economical practices for those concerned with the design of small dams in public works programs in the United States. "The book will serve this purpose in three ways," he said. "(1) It will provide engineers with information and data necessary for the proper design of small dams. (2) It will provide specialized and highly technical knowledge concerning the design of small dams in a form that can be used readily by engineers who do not specialize in this field. (3) It will simplify design procedures for small earthfill dams."

Only the more common types of small dams now being constructed are discussed. These include concrete gravity, earthfill (rolled type) and rockfill dams. Emphasis is placed on the design of the common, rolled earthfill type. Small dams are defined as earthfill and rockfill structures with heights less than 50 feet above streambed, and concrete dams on previous foundations whose "head" from headwater to tailwater does not exceed 20 feet.

In addition to discussions of the design of dams, spillways, and outlet works, the book contains chapters on project planning, flood studies, foundations and construction materials, diversion during construction, and maintenance and operation. Appendixes are provided on hydraulic computation, construction of embankment, concrete in construction, sample specifications, and other supplementary features. A total of 331 illustrations and engineering plates is included.

The book was prepared by Bureau personnel at the Commissioner's office in Denver, Colo., under the direction of Grant Bloodgood, Assistant Commissioner and Chief Engineer, and L. G. Puls, Chief Designing Engineer. More than 30 engineers and many technicians participated in the preparation of the book and in its critical review. Special recognition was given to O. L. Rice, Chief of the Dams Branch; H. G. Arthur, Supervisor, Design Unit, Earth Dams Section; and E. H. Larson, Head of the Manuals and Technical Records Section, all of the Denver engineering staff, and to other Federal agencies which provided technical material.

"We believe that 'Design of Small Dams' not only will provide guidance in the most common type of water storage development, but that it also will furnish a technical reference reflecting the knowledge and experience the Bureau of Reclamation has gained through extensive operations in this field during the past half century," Commissioner Dominy said.

Copies of the new publication may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., or the Bureau of Reclamation, Denver Federal Center, Denver, Colo., Attention 841. The price is $6.50, postpaid.

AERIAL RECONNAISSANCE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "The Business of Aerial Reconnaissance," written by Holmes Alexander, of the McNaught Syndicate.

The article is significant and helpful both because of its timing and its content, with particular reference to the events of recent days on the Eurasian land mass and in Paris.

Mr. Alexander discusses the Tactical Air Command's aerial reconnaissance function. He emphasizes the vital importance of TAC's photographic reconnaissance mission as distinct from similar strategic operations, and calls attention to certain technical limitations which we might largely remove by making available for this mission up-to-date processes and developments already in use in private industry.

The crucial role of this TAC function in our national defense, particularly as we enter a new phase of the cold war, and the ease with which we may be able to effect needed improvements make this article and its proposals important reading for all Senators.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUSINESS OF AERIAL RECONNAISSANCE

(By Holmes Alexander)

SHAW AIR FORCE BASE, S.C.—Unbeknownst to most Americans, something like 3,000 personnel and 288 aircraft of the Tactical Air Command are very much in the business of learning and practicing frontline, up-to-the-minute aerial reconnaissance.

This work should be distinguished from "spying" and from the gathering of "strategic" information about enemy capabilities. Our Tactical Air Command (TAC) deals with winning the battle, while Strategic Air Command (SAC) deals with winning the war. But by the very nature of midcentury facts of life, the first battle could be of more importance than ever before in history. Moreover, the potential of nuclear knockout punches on both sides means that dispersion of troops, concealment of weapons and especially the mobility of the new missiles take on a crucial significance. The ever expanding and ever refining science of airborne photography gives our side a chance to know not what the enemy can do, or

plans to do, but what the enemy has actually moved into a warlike position to do just a few minutes previously.

Between the time this piece is written and published, the Sino-Russian Communists may have cocked a fist for a surprise assault in the Far East against South Korea or Formosa, or in West Europe by intercepting our land or air access into Berlin; but it is most unlikely that the enemy could move so much as one missile launcher or one flight of planes without being caught in the act by TAC cameras.

There is a TAC reconnaissance unit officially located at Misawa Air Base, Japan, but it is roaming at will throughout the Far East commands. There are four squadrons of daylight reconnaissance planes, designated RF–101's, at Laon, France. There are two more such squadrons at Phalsbourg, France. In addition, there are four squadrons of night reconnaissance planes, designated RB–66's, based at Schulethorpe, England.

Apart from these oversea units, there are reconnaissance wings operating from three home base air forces—the 9th near Sumter, S.C., the 12th at Waco, Tex., and the 19th at Seymour-Johnson Air Base, N.C. These Zone of Interior TAC wings are, in fact, ready for duty anywhere in the world. Two summers ago they turned up in Lebanon and Formosa with less than 3 days' notice. On top of the regular units, there are four National Guard reconnaissance wings—operating out of 22 fields in 12 separate States.

These data are given in some detail because it may well be that the United States of America has passed into the cold war phase where tactical, frontline, instantaneous intelligence is more significant than any other kind. Today, the galaxy of Russian satellites in the sky, and the long-range plans of world communism to subvert and invade Latin America and Southeast Asia may not be nearly so vital as the enemy's intention to move troops or weapons down a highway, into a forest, or to shift a flight of aircraft from inland bases to the coasts and borders.

If the enemy does these things, we will have photographic proof—dropped by parachute for fast development—in a matter of minutes and hours. And we will have the chance—if we dare—to strike, rather than wait and be struck.

One of the prime purposes of your reporter on this trip was to learn what our tactical reconnaissance air units need to press their work toward a greater degree of perfection. I am told that the following methods exist in our photographic industry, but are not today as available as they should be for operational and training units:

1. A simple device within the navigational equipment to mark the exact geographical location of aerial pictures. At present, headquarters must rely largely on the memory of pilots who may be wounded or exhausted.

2. Infrared developments to improve night photography and bad weather reconnaissance.

3. Dry film processing.

4. High-resolution radar equipment of a more advanced stage than presently available.

5. The development and assignment of an airplane for day-night reconnaissance. At present, the RF–101 works at supersonic speeds by day and the RB–66 works at subsonic speeds by night.

Most of these improvements can and should be had almost immediately. We need to know—what's the enemy up to now?

DAVID E. LILIENTHAL ON POST-SUMMIT U.S.A.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by David E. Lilienthal, first Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and before that Chairman of the Tennesese Valley Authority. In an eloquent way Mr. Lilienthal has recognized the firm challenge facing our Nation for a long time and now, upon the dawn of what must be a new postsummit era of American consciousness of the world's situation, calls for action—action of which only freemen are capable because it results from their most profound personal convictions.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Mirror, May 17, 1960]

LILIENTHAL POINTS A WAY TO SURVIVAL

May 1960, may be remembered as the month when we Americans returned to the harsh reality of the world as it is. Once again our feet are on the rough and long and painful road to survival. Two years of wishful thinking and fantasy about the approach of an era of peaceful coexistence and nuclear disarmament are about to come to a close.

Three recent events can be thanked for this awakening:

First, the demonstration of how little substance there is—in terms of survival—to all the fanfare over summit meetings outside the United Nations, and the essential hollowness of ceremonial visits of heads of state and lesser lights.

Second, the collapse of the technical, and therefore the political basis for an agreed ban on the testing of nuclear weapons.

Third, the furor over an American reconnaissance flight into Russia.

The barrenness of trying to slow up or halt the nuclear arms race by an inspection agreement on an issue so collateral and essentially remote from disarmament as a ban on the testing of nuclear weapons and the impending debacle of the summit conference are events that the free world may view as a turning point of historic proportions. Something graphic was needed to awaken the people of America and Britain to the facts of life.

The major significance of the crackup of one of our reconnaissance planes within Russia, it seems to me, is that this episode dramatizes for the average citizen what has, quite unwisely I think, been hidden from him by the words of many of the world's political and intellectual leaders, West and East—namely, that the not-so-cold war has not and cannot in fact be abated by wishful thinking or a verbal escape from the evidence of the Soviet's determination to dominate the world, and the free world's equal resolution to remain free of such domination, come what may.

Once again we may begin to live in the world of reality, which is a world of constant danger. It may continue to be just that for a generation or more.

To face up, as now I believe even the most optimistic must, to the realities of how wide is the chasm between the Soviet world and our own is, I think, the only hope for the avoidance of war, and for building a solid foundation upon which two basically opposite concepts of life can manage to live side by side.

The sure road to war is to live in a fantasy, in a world that does not exist. Neville Chamberlain at Munich demonstrated how tragic this kind of escape from reality can be. World War II was direct product of that kind of wishful thinking. The French confidence that the impregnable Maginot line made an attack by Germany impossible is the older equivalent of the current doctrine that nuclear weapons possessed by both antagonists have produced a stalemate that frees the world from the danger of a nuclear war.

It is through such a dream world that the West has been passing. During this incredible period, however, the hard-bitten, realistic, and aggressive Communists were softening up our American resolution—their prime target.

They flooded us with horror stories of mutual suicide by atomic warfare and alluring but empty offers of peaceful coexistence, total disarmament, and an end to nuclear weapons.

They realized that if by threats and promises our will to resist was eroded, freedom might perish without a single shot being fired. I think we must admit that their campaign was partly successful.

Now we are ready, I hope, to put aside the superficial hopes engendered by the spirit of Camp David, or the notion that visits of Russians to this country, and Americans to Russia, highly desirable and beneficial as they are in themselves, have any basic relation to survival. We are now ready, I hope, to recognize that these are only sideshows that to many have obscured the real and basic obstacles to getting along with the Soviet system.

We are, I hope, ready to put aside, too, the wishful thought that the Russian political leadership desperately wants disarmament because they must keep their people happy with consumer goods, and cannot do so unless their huge costs of armament are dismissed.

Perhaps now we can come to grips with the central problem. That is to return to our efforts, exhausting but essential, to learn, step by cautious step, case by case, the process of negotiation with political leaders whose concept of life is almost as far from ours as if they were being on another planet.

It is in the American temperament to be sanguine, to believe the best of others. It is also in the American temperament to face up to whatever must be faced, but only when some dramatic fact forces us to. The story of Pearl Harbor is a classic in this category.

There is a wealth of impressive evidence that the American people can face hard, cruel, and disappointing facts, and can act with vigor, toughness, tenacity, and firmness. Here, I think, is the hopeful side, and the saving grace of the rather sudden disillusionment of the past weeks.

It was American firmness and readiness to face up to facts that helped get the Red Army out of Iran, that rebuilt our Armed Forces and thereby kept the Chinese out of South Korea, that saved Greece and Turkey, that helped produce a peace treaty for Austria, that saved Berlin by the amazing airlift. On almost any of these acts of resolution, the Soviets might have gone to war. They didn't.

We are dealing with a revolutionary and highly successful enemy. We must be at least as realistic as the Russians have shown themselves to be. We do not want to compete with them by imitating their closed society, their lying to their own citizens. We need above all to be ourselves, Americans at our best. And at our best we do not flinch from facts, we do not insist that our public servants feed us only good and pleasant words, but that they tell us the truth, however distasteful.

Let us hope that the debacle of the summit and the maneuvers of the nuclear test ban negotiations will mark the beginning of a period of realism in our dealing with the Soviet.

A peace that is no peace, a "thaw" that is no warming up except in the most superficial ceremonial sense, a consequent lulling and deterioration of American resolve and will to stand firm for what we believe—this is not the road to peace. On the contrary, it is the road to disaster.

Stockpiled atomic and other weapons are inert machines. They have no deterrent

value whatever, unless there abides the will to use those weapons rather than surrender freedom.

There is as yet no evidence that facing up to reality in dealing with the Soviet adds to the risks that already exist.

My own opinion is that the greatest risk of all would be to continue to nurse the illusion that international tension is relaxed because we ourselves have been relaxing.

ANOTHER SUMMIT—LABOR-MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the past week has seen the complete collapse of a summit conference on the international scene and the failure of another summit conference on the domestic scene. The urgency of the threat to free institutions throughout the world was made clear by Chairman Khrushchev when he scuttled the meeting of the leaders of the free and Communist worlds. Let us not have any failure of a U.S. labor and management summit meeting now. This is the danger faced by and the pitfalls so far in the way of the President's labor-management summit meeting. See the attached affidavit from the New York Times of May 23, 1960.

It may be fruitful, too, it seems to me, to give an underpinning to a labor-management summit and to place the work of forging mutual confidence and labor-management cooperation into the hands of those on the plant and community level whose immediate interest resides in such confidence and whose daily efforts must make such cooperation a reality. Mr. President, last February I introduced S. 3121, to promote increased productivity, and foster peaceful labor-management relations through the establishment in the executive branch of a bureau of productivity councils. This Bureau, jointly administered by the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor, would stimulate and encourage the establishment of productivity councils on the community level through regional advisory committees, pilot projects in various communities, and the distribution of information and publicity. I believe that this approach contains much hope for practical results because the spirit engendered by face to face discussion of mutual problems among men whose daily work depends for its success on the solution of these problems removes many of the obstacles standing in the way of agreement at summit conferences which take place in the spotlight. After the bases for cooperation have been put down at the working level, summit conferences have a chance for success.

The urgent need for labor-management cooperation to increase the productive power of the United States has been highlighted by the darkening international scene. The decade of the 1960's will see a greatly intensified economic struggle between the free world and the Communist bloc. In this struggle, the United States cannot afford to repeat the loss experienced during the 1950's of 340 million man-days of work and more than $15 billion worth of production—all as the result of labor-management disputes. In terms of the economic struggle, this figure represents almost as much as the United States spent for economic aid to the underdeveloped nations and as much as the entire cost of our missile program, excluding research expenditures, during the 1950's.

Mr. President, labor-management cooperation is a matter entirely in the hands of the American people. In this matter, we are not at the mercy of foreign powers and inimical interests. Only we could answer for any failure to act in our own self-interest. I do not think that the American people will accept such failure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial in the New York Times of May 23, which represents an expression of profound concern on this subject.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 23, 1960]

AN EMPLOYER-LABOR SUMMIT?

The first meeting of the union-management summit conference has not given as much promise as the soundness and urgency of its objectives deserve. The mere fact that it has taken about 6 months even to get the first meeting and to complete the conference personnel suggests a lack of enthusiasm on at least one side. This impression is reinforced by the postponement of another meeting for 6 weeks or 2 months on account of other commitments of the members—which presumably seem to them more important.

Then the proposed makeup of the two groups has already disclosed disturbing differences of views. AFL–CIO President Meany has appointed the top officials of two of the most important unions to serve with him—men with nationwide experience in labor-management negotiations. Mr. Meany doesn't feel that the management representatives chosen by President Bannow of the National Association of Manufacturers are of equal stature, with one a president of a company that has had a strike by the union headed by a Meany appointee. Regardless of the obvious general competence of Mr. Bannow's designees, Mr. Meany's reservations are not good omens for summit success. But Mr. Bannow has promised to add some others.

As for the agenda, it looks as if the conference hasn't got that far. But surely there must be genuine agreement in advance of a meeting schedule of what is to be discussed and how—with an emphasis on a better mutual understanding by each group of the other's point of view rather than agreement on specific policies. Anyway, we wish the undertaking well in spite of the difficulties and dangers that seem to lie ahead.

"TROJAN HORSE" RECOMMENDATION BY CHICAGO CONGRESSMEN THAT DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE UNDERTAKE POLLUTION STUDY IN LAKE MICHIGAN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as my colleagues may recall, there is a bill, H.R. 1, pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The measure would propose to divert large volumes of water—dangerously large volumes, I believe—from the Great Lakes Waterway system, for sanitation purposes at Chicago, draining into the Illinois Waterway.

As of now, the effort to enact such legislation, contrary to Great Lakes interests, has been consistently either defeated in Congress, or vetoed by the President. Now, however, the pushers of this ill-advised legislation are trying for an "end run" under the guise of a proposal offered by Congressmen O'BRIEN and YATES, of Illinois, which would provide that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriate $12 million for a study of pollution in the Great Lakes area. The proposal would also authorize the Chicago Metropolitan Sanitary District to divert an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second of water from Lake Michigan as part of this study.

The sudden interest of the Chicago Congressmen in a pollution study was merely an excuse to enable Chicago to carry out unauthorized diversion of water from Lake Michigan, contrary to the wishes and welfare of all the other Lake States.

The issue of further water diversion from the Great Lakes is now properly before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Supreme Court of the United States. It is, therefore, unfortunate that a new effort is being made to bypass the regular responsible consideration of this issue by the appropriate legislative and judicial agencies.

Now, I want to say this: I am fully in favor of carrying out necessary and effective antipollution studies needed in the Great Lakes. However, let us not be fooled by this ruse for attempting to increase diversion of water from the Great Lakes.

Believing that the proposed amendment to the HEW funds before the Appropriations Subcommittee is a "Trojan horse" operation, I have contacted Senator LISTER HILL, chairman of the subcommittee on this matter.

To give my colleagues in the Senate the benefit of the subterfuge, which I believe is contained in the proposal, I ask unanimous consent to have a recent letter I submitted to Chairman HILL, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR HILL: I am writing to you in connection with the testimony presented before your subcommittee on May 5 by Congressmen O'BRIEN and YATES urging a special appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in order to conduct a pollution study in the Great Lakes area. As I shall proceed to show, this request for a study of pollution in the Chicago area is intended to serve as a Trojan horse. The request for a study of pollution is merely a guise to enable Chicago to carry out further diversion of water from Lake Michigan—contrary to the wishes and welfare of all other riparian owners.

I believe it was unfortunate that Representatives O'BRIEN and YATES came before your subcommittee in an effort to bypass the regular responsible consideration of the issue of further water diversion from the Great Lakes by the appropriate legislative and judicial agencies. The subject of the Chicago diversion of waters from Lake Michigan is now appropriately before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Supreme Court of the United States.

The subject of water diversion from Lake Michigan by the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago has been a subject of continuing controversy between Chicago, the State of Illinois, and the other States adjoining the Great Lakes for many years. As far back as 1928 the Supreme Court of

the United States was brought into the conflict in order to determine the equities involved. At that time the Court approved a temporary diversion of 3,300 cubic feet per second. In recent years there has been continuous effort on the part of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago to divert additional quantities of water from the Great Lakes.

During this session of Congress, as in many previous ones, a bill was introduced by Representative O'BRIEN (H.R. 1) authorizing an additional diversion of 1,000 c.f.s. from Lake Michigan. A companion bill, S. 3, was considered by the Committee on Public Works, which, after long hearings, reported it to the Senate. There was much discussion on the merits of this legislation on the floor of the Senate—with particular emphasis on the Canadian opposition to such diversion. The bill was finally referred to the Foreign Relations Committee for its consideration. At the request of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Department of State has contacted the Canadian Government in order to ascertain the Canadian position on this matter.

Simultaneously, the Supreme Court of the United States, which assumed jurisdiction over this subject in 1928, again proceeded to look into the problem, and on June 29, 1959, appointed a special master to hear the evidence in connection with this controversy. The master, U.S. Senior Court Judge Albert Maris of Philadelphia, has been holding hearings on this subject in Chicago and in other places since August 4, 1959, and has not yet completed his study.

Primarily, the issue relates to the diversion of additional water from Lake Michigan for the benefit of the Chicago Sanitary District. The controversy arose from the fact that between the years 1892 and 1900 the city of Chicago and its suburbs carried out a plan to dispose of the sewage of the Chicago metropolitan area by cutting a canal across the low continental divide about 10 miles west of Lake Michigan and discharging the sewage of the entire metropolitan area into the Mississippi watershed.

Ultimately the States of the Great Lakes Basin, all the way from New York to Minnesota, brought action in the U.S. Supreme Court to enjoin Chicago from the continued abstraction of waters from the basin. After extensive hearings the Supreme Court, in 1930, issued a decree based upon the findings of Special Master Hughes, later Chief Justice, ordering the reduction of the diversion of water to its present level. It was the view of the Supreme Court that such diversion would be sufficient to maintain the navigation levels of the Chicago Canal and the Illinois River, and would be adequate to provide water circulation for sanitary purposes.

But in recent years, the Chicago Sanitary District has undertaken a tremendous program of expansion. From some 508 square miles in 1954, the District, through annexation grew to more than 920 square miles in 1958. Unable to cope with its sewage problem through sewage disposal, Chicago again desires additional water in order to flush its sewage down into the Mississippi watershed. To obtain authority for such additional diversion, Chicago has sought all possible excuses and has dragged the matter from one agency to another in a fashion somewhat reminiscent of the man who not being satisfied with one judge's determination, sets out on a shopping expedition to find a judge that would agree with him.

H.R. 1, which was introduced last year, sought to authorize additional diversion under the guise of navigational needs in the Chicago area. The amendment that Congressmen O'BRIEN and YATES are now seeking to the Health, Education, and Welfare budget would authorize diversion under the guise of a pollution study. But all these measures are designed to do the same thing: To provide Chicago with water for flushing down its sewage; and this contrary to the original Supreme Court directive to the sanitary district to treat such sewage in another fashion, through the establishment of sewage disposal plants and facilities.

Now that this matter is pending both before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Supreme Court, I find it rather surprising that the two Representatives from Illinois have undertaken to bypass these responsible agencies. The other States adjoining the Great Lakes continue in their opposition to further diversion. Recent communications from the Canadian Government indicate that the Government stands by its earlier position that further unilateral diversions would be in violation of the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty between the United States and Canada.

I believe that this difficult question is now properly dealt with by the Special Master appointed by the U.S. Supreme Court and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. We must certainly await their judgment before further action in this matter could be undertaken. It would certainly be inappropriate for your committee, or any other committee, to bypass the careful and responsible consideration and decision of these other Government authorities which have jurisdiction in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Is there further morning business?

SETTING OF FIRST COLUMN FOR EXTENDED EAST CENTRAL FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have been asked by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in his capacity as Chairman of the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol, to invite the Members, officers, and employees of the Senate to witness the setting in place of the first large marble column in the portico of the extended east central front of the Capitol, at 9:30 a.m., Thursday, May 26, 1960.

This is a historic occasion in which I feel each Senator will be deeply interested. All are invited to enter the construction area at the door to the fenced enclosure just south of the entrance to the Senate Wing, from where they will be directed to a safe and appropriate vantage point.

The old records indicate that the original sandstone columns were erected in 1824 and that the stonecutters at the Capitol participated in a procession and exhibit celebrating July 4, 1824.

The new columns are duplicates of the originals except that they are of Georgia white marble instead of sandstone. They are monolithic, weigh about 18 tons each, are 24 in number, and are 24 feet 9 inches high. The columns are of the Corinthian order and taper uniformly from a diameter of 3 feet at the base to 2 feet 6 inches at the top.

The original columns were designed by Charles Bulfinch in carrying out the overall plan for the east portico prepared by his predecessor, Benjamin H. Latrobe. Mr. Latrobe and Mr. Bulfinch were the second and third architects of the Capitol, respectively.

The column to be set on Thursday, May 26, will be the one located immediately to the southeast of the main entrance leading to the rotunda.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to query the majority leader about the program for the latter part of this week, inasmuch as next weekend will be Memorial Day weekend.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have checked with the Parliamentarian. I am informed that in recent years it has been the policy of the Senate not to meet on Memorial Day, so I am in the position to definitely inform the Senate there will be no session on Memorial Day.

Judging from the bills which have been reported to the Senate and which are available for discussion, I do not anticipate there will be a necessity for a session on Saturday. Therefore, I think we will go over from Friday until Tuesday.

As to whether we shall have any yea-and-nay votes on Friday, I shall have to wait until we see what progress we make on proposed legislation which is to be considered this week. We have before us the question of overriding the President's veto on the depressed areas legislation. We shall have a yea-and-nay vote on the Agriculture Department appropriation bill.

We shall have a meeting of the Policy committee for the purpose of considering the scheduling of the wheat bill, S. 2759, Calendar No. 1339.

The bill which relates to the disclaimer affidavit in the National Defense Education Act, S. 2929, Calendar No. 1411, may be considered. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has indicated a desire to have that bill considered this week. If it meets with the convenience of the other members of the committee and if it is agreeable to the policy committee, the bill will be scheduled for consideration as early as possible.

We hope to consider also the bill relating to the shrimp convention between the United States and Cuba, Calendar 1412, Senate bill 2867; the International Development Association bill, Calendar 1414, Senate bill 3074; and the bill enacting certain provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1959, Calendar 1417, House bill 7681.

In addition, there are a number of bills from the Finance Committee and the Labor and Public Welfare Committee on the calendar. Among the bills from the Labor Committee are those relating to nurse training, the extension of the Library Services Act, and special teachers for the deaf, Calendar Nos. 1473, 1474, and 1476.

None of those measures have been cleared for consideration, but I anticipate that all of them will be scheduled at an early date, and as soon as the committee has acted upon them, I will promptly make that announcement to the Senate.

Senators may expect the Senate to be out of session from Saturday through Monday, Memorial Day. Later in the

week I will announce whether any legislation which will require rollcalls on Friday is to be anticipated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY HON. HOWARD W. SMITH AT DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION AT VIRGINIA BEACH, VA.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks an outstanding address made by the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives, as the keynote speaker at the State Democratic convention held at Virginia Beach, Va., on May 21, 1960.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HOWARD W. SMITH AT THE STATE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION, VIRGINIA BEACH

My fellow Democrats, you are assembled here today as the chosen representatives of the Democrats of Virginia, the home State of Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party. The party that has survived the vicissitudes of political warfare throughout a century and a half. The party that could only survive because of the basic principles of government upon which it was founded.

Broadly speaking, those principles are that the best governed peoples are the least governed, that the closer the local self-government is to the people, the better. That the centralization of power in the Federal Government is an evil that will eventually strangle the sovereignty of the States and destroy the carefully preserved concept of free, sovereign, and independent States. Sovereign States with every right, duty, and power save only those specifically granted to the Central Government by the Constitution.

This was the universally accepted concept on which the Constitution was ratified by the States. Without that concept written into the Constitution and reemphasized in the Bill of Rights, the compact would never have been ratified by the States.

In other words, under the Constitution as written and adopted, the Federal Government has no power whatsoever outside of those specifically granted by the Constitution. All other powers of government are specifically reserved to the States, and when we speak of States rights it embraces every right of the sovereign government, with the exception of the limited powers granted to the Federal Government. The complaint so persistently and loudly voiced by those of us who believe in a strict interpretation of the limitations imposed by the Constitution which every Federal officer (legislative, executive, and judicial) is solemnly sworn to uphold.

Perhaps we have drifted away so far from the moorings that bound us to our forefathers' conception of our system of government that it is too late to return. Perhaps we have drifted so far into that conception of socialistic government that presently infests the whole world that we can never return. There are, however, those of us who will maintain until we die that the course we are now pursuing will lead this Nation, the greatest the world has ever known, into pitfalls of disintegration, deterioration, and ultimate disaster. We see in Washington today in the Congress a reckless disregard of fiscal responsibility and extravagant expenditures on almost every fanciful, do-good scheme that the mind of man can conceive to drain from the people of the States the taxes to feed the hungry maws of Federal expenditures. While, in spite of this unbearable burden of taxation, Congress passes—and the President approves—expenditures which over the past 20 years, have resulted in unbalanced budgets that have required annual and continuous increases in the Federal debt to meet deficiencies in Federal revenues. In these transgressions against financial responsibility, there is little difference between the Democratic and Republican National Parties.

As a result, the American dollar, which for decades had been looked upon as the soundest currency in the world, has been reduced to the purchasing value of 48 cents. The national debt has climbed to around $290 billion. World financial centers have been shaken in their faith in the soundness of our currency until the Treasury has found it impossible to float American long-term securities at the interest rates allowable by law. The astounding result is that American taxpayers are called upon to pay interest on the national debt of $9 billion a year, which is more than the entire budget for 1930 which was $4,665,236,678.04.

I selected the year 1930 because it was the year that I was first elected to Congress. At that time and in that year, the total expenses of the Federal Government including interest, debt retirement and operating expenses was a little over $4½ billion, while this year in interest alone we will pay $9 billion, twice as much as the whole expense of the Federal Government in 1930. With an annual budget now of around $80 billion a year and a public debt grown to $290 billion, is it any wonder that the public cries out for a return to fiscal sanity and a reduction in Federal expenditures. And in the face of that cry, a Democratic Congress and a Republican administration continue to find and promote, and pass and pay for, new and untried schemes of social welfare that you and I and the rest of the American taxpayers are called upon to pay.

From the time of the adoption of the Constitution to the year 1946, the total expense of the Federal Government was a little over $233 billion for the whole period of 152 years.

In 7 years of the Truman administration, from 1946 to 1953, the total expenditure in those 7 years was $335 billion—far more than the whole expense of the Government in the preceding 152 years.

In the 7 years of Republican administration, from 1953 to 1960, the Republican administration expended the enormous sum of $528 billion, more than twice as much as was spent in the 152 years preceding the Truman administration.

The platforms and the leaders of both great national parties have fastened upon the taxpayers of our country what is apparently a permanent expenditure of around $4 billion a year for foreign aid to other nations, who have more and more come to look upon this bonanza as the answer to their economic and financial difficulties. All in the name of world peace—and while we cry peace, peace—there is no peace. In a futile and timid attempt to buy the friendship of foreign nations, we have extended our socialistic, giveaway program to nearly every nation on earth. Our welfare programs at home have been extended to carry on the backs of our burdened taxpayers the woes and economic problems of nearly all the nations on the face of the globe.

While we meet here today the Congress is considering new schemes, new bills, new plans, for the new and additional extravagance that will further burden the American taxpayer and further increase the national debt, further increase the interest rates, and further burden the American taxpayer, and further reduce the value of the dollar.

If the things which I here decry lie outside of the proper and constitutional functions of the Federal Government, both of the great national parties are equally guilty.

Aside from our misguided fiscal policies, there are those well meaning individuals and organizations in our midst who believe that all the evils of the present world situation can be cured by a so-called world government.

The first step in this movement shows itself in the present agitation to repeal the so-called Connally amendment to the treaty of the World Court. That treaty sets up an international court with power to make determinations as to certain international disputes, but provides that each sovereign country reserves the right to determine everything relating to its domestic problems. The Connally amendment further provides that each country shall determine what are its domestic problems; the country itself to decide what is, or is not, a domestic problem. The repeal of the Connally amendment would leave it to the World Court to decide this vital question.

Thus, there would be placed in the hands of a foreign court in which we would have minority representation to determine whether our immigration policy, our tariff policy, and numerous other policies could be dictated by foreign countries against our will. It would be a fatal step in the altruistic dream of a world government. This proposal has the endorsement of important public officials in both the Democratic and Republican Parties.

Fundamentally, all of the things of which I speak arise from a disregard for the limitations of power placed upon the Federal Government under the Constitution. Nor can we confine these transgressions to any one of the three divisions of Government created by the Constitution. The executive department, the legislative department, and the judicial department all have contributed to the grasp for powers that they do not rightly possess under our system. All from time to time have sought to deprive the States of the Union of their sovereign rights guaranteed us by our charter of government devised by our forefathers out of bitter years of experience with misrule and oppression, and imitated throughout the world by peoples seeking new freedom.

We have seen the Chief Executive invade a sovereign State with the Armed Forces to impose the will of the Central Government on the people of that State in open and flagrant violation of the specific prohibition contained in the Constitution, unless done at the request of the legislature or the Governor of such State.

We have seen the legislative department of the Federal Government, the Congress, recklessly assume power to govern, control and rule in the exercise of the local functions of the government reserved to the people of the sovereign States.

Saddest of all have been the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, that vital and final bulwark against the encroachment of the Federal Government on the rights of the sovereign States and the individual liberties of our people.

Time permits only the mention of a few instances where that Court, guided by its own sociological ideals, has reversed previous decisions of that Court that have stood as the law of the land for generations.

By its decision in the school segregation case it changed the constitutional rights of the States to operate their public school systems and reversed decisions of the former courts that had stood the test of time and had been the law of the land for a hundred years. Basing its decision, not upon the law of the land, but upon the writings of a socialist Swedish author.

In the Girard College case where Stephen Girard a hundred years ago had established a fund of his own money in trust to the city of Philadelphia for the education of poor white children, and though it had been operated for a century under the conditions laid down by the donor, the Supreme Court substituted its own will for the will of Stephen Girard and held that Negro children must also be permitted to share the bounty of this benefactor against his will.

In the case where the Health Department of the State of Alabama under State law undertook to inspect unwholesome foods, the Supreme Court by its decision deprived the State of Alabama of its inherent right to protect the health of its citizens against impure food because of the mere fact that Congress had enacted a pure food law.

In New Mexico where State law prohibits license to practice law except to persons of good character, authorities of the State of New Mexico decided that a person with a record of subversive and treasonable activities was not of the good character that the State desired to license, the Supreme Court substituted its judgment of good character for the judgment of the sovereign State of New Mexico in dealing with a purely local problem.

In the city of New York where the State legislature, in enacting a city charter, provided that any schoolteacher who in any procedure took advantage of the fifth amendment automatically severed his employment with the city, and where the city authorities discharged a schoolteacher for violation of its charter provision as being a person not desirable as a teacher of the youth of that community, the Supreme Court substituted its judgment as to whom New York should hire for the education of their youth, for the judgment of the State legislature of that State.

In the famous Steve Nelson case where a known and active working Communist seeking to overthrow the Government by force was convicted under the law of Pennsylvania, the Supreme Court denied to the sovereign State of Pennsylvania, and all other States having similar laws, the inherent right to protect itself against subversive criminals seeking to overthrow the Government by force.

What we do here today, what we say here today, may be, I fear, an exercise in futility. A call for return to constitutional government as designed by the framers of this government; a call for a fiscal policy to restore the solvency of the government and relieve our people of the burden of taxation for improvident expenditures; a call to restore to the States their just rights of local self-government; a call for a Supreme Court that would confine its present exercise of unlimited powers to the functions prescribed in the Constitution; these calls may be a voice calling in the wilderness at the National Convention of the Democratic Party which will shortly assemble in Los Angeles. Such a call would be equally futile if addressed to the Republican Convention.

But we can at least voice to our friends and fellow Democrats who will assemble and assume to speak for the Democratic Party, our hopes, our desires, and our pleas for a moderate and sympathetic consideration of the hopes and aspirations of that great body of loyal and conservative Democrats throughout the Nation who view with the gravest apprehension the political motivations that have brought about the division in the great party of Jefferson. The Democratic Party that for a century and a half has carried the banner in battle after battle for good government, unselfish government, local self-government, and government in the best interests of the masses of the people, but never unmindful of the constitutional basis upon which foundation rests the success or failure of our efforts.

There are those among us who feel that we should divorce ourselves from the National Democratic Party. There are others of equal patriotism and equal apprehension as to the course of the party who feel we can be more effective in our efforts by remaining within the party. Certainly the National Republican Party offers no haven of refuge for unhappy Democrats. Southern Democrats should not forget that it was the Republican leader in the Senate who proposed in the recent civil rights legislation he introduced, to approve as the law of the land the infamous decision of the Supreme Court in the school desegregation case and was defeated only by the dogged and persistent opposition of those 18 Senators from the Southland, with the timely aid of the Democratic majority leader in the Senate.

It was the Republican civil rights bill, written and masterminded by the Republican Attorney General, that was finally passed and signed by the Republican President. No, my friends, there is no haven of refuge in the Republican Party for the beleaguered southern Democrats.

On the other hand, we have under Virginia law the power to reconvene this convention after the national convention if the Butlers, the Hoffas, and the Reuthers, and others fix upon us a situation that is intolerable.

It is my hope that this convention may proceed to its work in harmony and friendly understanding. Certainly the objectives of all gathered here are in accord. It is my hope that we endorse to the national convention a candidate of demonstrated ability and fundamental belief of our system of constitutional government, and with the courage to lead us in turning the tide of socialism back into the quiet channels of responsible constitutional government and fiscal sanity.

THE U–2 PLANE INCIDENT—EDITORIALS IN AVIATION WEEK

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, two penetrating editorials have appeared in Aviation Week, both on the U–2 situation, and both written by Robert Hotz, editor.

The first, entitled "Lockheed U–2 Over Sverdlovsk: A Study in Fabrication," appeared May 16.

The second, entitled "Fallout From the U–2," appeared May 23.

Both of these editorials merit the thoughtful reading of Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Aviation Week, May 16, 1960]

LOCKHEED U–2 OVER SVERDLOVSK: A STUDY IN FABRICATION

(By Robert Hotz)

The whole truth of Francis Gary Powers' 1,400-mile penetration of the Soviet Union in a Lockheed U–2 on a Central Intelligence Agency mission of photo and electronic reconnaissance has not yet been told. It may never emerge from the welter of official lies pouring from Moscow and Washington.

Nevertheless, there are some points that have already emerged from this adventure that are worth examining. Let us start with the fabrications that have been bullroared from the rostrum of the Supreme Soviet by Nikita Khrushchev because they reveal much about his fears and problems over the current state of the world.

Mr. Khrushchev's most blatant lie is his statement that the U–2 was hit by a Red Army antiaircraft missile at an altitude of 65,000 feet near Sverdlovsk after it had penetrated the air defenses of the Soviet Union for some 1,400 miles. This lie was necessary because the citizens of the U.S.S.R. could understandably grow uneasy over the admitted ability of the U–2 and other specialized aircraft to penetrate Soviet airspace consistently with impunity. The spectacle of Soviet air defense system futility for the last 4 years in trying to stop these penetrations must provide a chilling counterpoint for Soviet citizens to the bellicose blustering of their leader over the aggressive strength of his military power.

The fact is, and Mr. Khrushchev undoubtedly knows it, that Powers' U–2 had an engine flameout at the altitude that it and other U–2 aircraft cruised safely beyond the reach of the Soviet air defense system. The flameout forced Powers to descend below 40,000 feet where the denser atmosphere made an attempt to restart his jet engine feasible. Either Powers failed to restart his engine or his plane was damaged at this relatively low altitude by the Red Army missilemen to whom Mr. Khrushchev awarded medals.

Another obvious lie was used to bolster this originally false claim for the Soviet air defense system. A picture of some badly battered scrap from an Aeroflot Tu–104 crash near Sverdlovsk last February was officially released by the Soviets labeled as the U–2 wreckage to convey an impression of terrible damage wrought by the antiaircraft missile. When this fake was exposed by Lockheed's U–2 designer, C. L. "Kelly" Johnson, the remains of the genuine U–2 were finally produced for an exhibition in Moscow's Gorki Park.

Further contradiction of the missile hit scored at 65,000 feet was the Soviets' own claim that they recovered most of the U–2 photo and electronic reconnaissance equipment in good condition, were able to examine the cockpit ejection system in detail and to retrieve miscellaneous gear from the cockpit intact.

Mr. Khrushchev has good reason to worry about the ability of the U–2 and other aircraft to skim over his huge air defense system. For it must come as a real shocker to Soviet citizens, fed a steady diet of propaganda on the superiority of Soviet military might, to hear the admissions from Mr. Khrushchev and Andrei Gromyko that these U–2 flights have been going on successfully for at least 4 years. The Soviet citizens must wonder, if this is true, how much credence they can place in the assurances they receive from Mr. Khrushchev that manned bombers are obsolete and cannot penetrate the Soviet air defense system. Even if his claim of a missile hit at Sverdlovsk was true, how does Mr. Khrushchev explain a 1,400-mile penetration from the Pakistan border to the Urals?

It is obvious that Mr. Khrushchev does not really believe his own claims about the difficulty of manned bomber penetration into the U.S.S.R. because he has been pushing a gigantic expansion of his air defense system for the past several years. This includes new improved surveillance, and ground control intercept radar, passive detection systems, new interceptors and a tremendous program of new antiaircraft missile installations around key military and industrial areas. If Mr. Khrushchev really believed the Strategic Air Command B–47, B–52, and B–58 fleet of manned bombers were as ineffective as he publicly blusters, he would hardly waste the vast resources that he has and is still putting into his air defense system.

Nor is Mr. Khrushchev telling the truth when he announces that the Soviets have switched completely from bombers to ballistic missiles and that they no longer are producing or developing or exercising bombers because they are obsolete for modern warfare. The U.S.S.R. is still producing long range jet bombers, although at far from maximum possible rates. It is developing

new supersonic bombers and a nuclear-powered bomber and it is exercising its current operational jet bomber fleet at an accelerated rate in long distance Arctic missions. Mr. Khrushchev would like us to believe his lies on the future of the bomber in the Soviet arsenal. This belief would encourage the trend, already started, toward cutting back our own air defense system.

Mr. Khrushchev is also ignoring some pertinent facts when he stresses the "provocative" nature of the U–2 flights. The Soviet espionage system in this country has been exposed in many aspects of its hydraheaded operation. The record from the atomic secret snitching of Klaus Fuchs to the cozy Brooklyn espionage nest operated by the Soviet Colonel Abel has offered ample provocation for anything this country cares to make of it.

The Soviets are fighting the reconnaissance war with every method at their disposal all around the periphery of the Iron Curtain, cutting transatlantic cables off Newfoundland, grappling for Caesar antisubmarine warfare stations, fishing for nose cones off Ascension Island, monitoring the Atlantic Missile Range communications, shadowing Polaris submarines and conducting electronic reconnaissance on our frontiers by trawler, submarine and aircraft. The Soviets do not require deep penetration of the United States for photo reconnaissance because of the availability of this information from public sources and their espionage system. Their prime need is for electronic intelligence and this they are gathering with every means at their disposal.

When we turn to the record of our own Government agencies involved in the U–2 adventure the record of deliberate falsification is equally bad. The series of interagency bungles gives us a queasy feeling over what might happen in a real emergency with survival or defeat hinging on the speed and acumen of the official reaction.

First, there are the ivory tower researchers of the old NACA now with NASA who had their hard-won reputation for scientific integrity shredded overnight by the exposure of their role as unwitting dupes of the Central Intelligence Agency. They saw no reason to sniff suspiciously at an offer of a free research program for high altitude weather and gust loading research from the military. This bailment of military aircraft to NACA was traditional, since NACA had no budget of its own for this purpose. NACA wrote the test program requirements, sporadically got back data from missions executed according to its specifications and apparently never did much analytical research into the geographic locations of the U–2's or the isolation of the agency from any contact with their personnel. NACA and later NASA, dutifully published three technical reports in 4 years on this work and worked happily in the traditional role of the piano player in a bagnio who was never told what was going on upstairs.

This coupling of CIA (which Washington wags are now saying stands for "caught in the act") with NASA in an international espionage venture will badly damage, if not altogether destroy, the fine foundation NASA was organizing for international cooperation in the scientific exploration of space. NASA can hardly blame foreign nations already solicited in this program for inquiring as to how much of a tracking station, launching site, or payload instrumentation is earmarked for CIA missions. Nor can they be blamed for politely declining to take a chance with an agency that apparently doesn't know all it should about its own activities.

This damage to NASA's scientific integrity may count for little in the calloused calculations of CIA supersleuths, but it will do irreparable harm in the international scientific community where this country has many of its stanchest friends.

Second is the spectacle of the State Department turning a complete slow-motion somersault from the flat lie that "there was no deliberate attempt to violate the Soviet airspace and there never has been," to a mousy admission that there might have been such flights but that they "were not authorized by Washington," to a final complete admission that the U–2 penetrations were in fact an integral part of U.S. national policy. What the State Department can command as a credibility factor in future roles as a U.S. spokesman will be interesting to see.

The official U.S. policy as finally stated by President Eisenhower some 10 days after Powers' U–2 hit the Siberian earth also carries some future forebodings.

It officially commits the United States to a continuous and deliberate policy of violating the Soviet airspace and formally makes espionage an integral part of U.S. policy. Although virtually every American citizen can see the need for continuous surveillance of the Soviet Union by whatever effective methods are available and will tacitly support these efforts, it is quite another matter to publicly announce that espionage and violation of another country's territory have become an official policy.

This policy, which is unprecedented in the history of nations, leaves our allies in an untenable position and forces the Soviets to carry this matter much further than they may have originally intended. It appears to be another one of those hasty, poorly thought out, improvised policies aimed at a quick fix with not much thought for future consequences or other implications.

Third, of course, comes the Central Intelligence Agency, in this incident stripped of all its protective secrecy, and standing nakedly exposed in an incredibly amateurish performance compounded from inadequate training, faulty execution and rather transparent cover operations. Apparently, all that was adequately provided in this operation was the $30,000-a-year salaries for the pilots. Whatever reasons impelled Francis Powers to decline to carry out the traditional self-destruction orders of the espionage agent apprehended redhanded by the enemy may never be known. Suffice to say his embarrassing survival was not in the best tradition of either USAF, the agency that originally trained him, or CIA, the agency that hired him without training him properly in its specialized requirements.

The need for a congressional or some other "watchdog" operation over CIA was never more apparent.

Finally the most important aspect of the U–2 episode is the illumination it must shed for most Americans on the simple salient fact that we are in fact fighting a war against the forces of communism. It is a far different war than we have ever fought before and it is being fought with weapons that we are not accustomed to using. The bungling, naivete and innocence our various Government agencies have displayed in the U–2 episode show clearly that we are not yet organized for this type of conflict nor do we yet really understand its scope and strategy.

Although too few Americans realize it, we are already deep into this struggle to determine whether the Soviet system or our own will prevail. If we hope to preserve the basic elements of this civilization we cherish, we must dedicate ourselves more thoroughly to this task and organize our national resources and policies more effectively to achieve this goal.

[From Aviation Week, May 23, 1960]

FALLOUT FROM THE U–2

(By Robert Hotz)

Last week we warned that the extraordinary statements of Secretary of State Herter and President Eisenhower making aerial espionage and violation of foreign airspace with the Lockheed U–2 an official U.S. policy would produce serious repercussions in the future. The presses printing these words had hardly stopped rolling when the first diplomatic fallout from these incredible statements began raining down. At this writing it is still continuing with no prospect of early abatement.

One of the extremely harmful effects of these statements has been the embarrassing position in which we have placed our allies on the edge of the Iron Curtain. By those statements this country formally implicated them in an official espionage effort against the Soviet Union and provided the Communists with more potent ammunition against the NATO countries than they themselves have been able to generate in a decade. The gravity of this allied position is indicated in the formal diplomatic protests already lodged with the United States by Norway and Pakistan and the cannonade of Soviet threats to rocket-blast these allied bases if any further U–2 operations are conducted from them. Denmark finds it necessary to make an official statement barring its airfields for unauthorized flights over countries not members of NATO. It is hard for people in this country to realize the courage required by our allies on the edge of the Iron Curtain to stand fast behind our cause in the face of the constantly growing Soviet military threat, economic and cultural exploitation and diplomatic pressure. Norway and Denmark by their very presence in the NATO organization provide proof positive of the free world's determination to resist Soviet aggression. Both these countries saw their neutrality shattered by Nazi Germany in World War II, lived under a despot's occupation and resisted it with every means at their disposal. They have learned that there can be no compromise with brutal aggression no matter what political label it bears. Norway has a common frontier with the U.S.S.R. Denmark sits on the shores of the Baltic, now practically a Communist lake, and is flanked by Communist Germany to the landward. Both have stood firm in the face of earlier Soviet bluster against their NATO role.

Both of these countries have made vital contributions not only to NATO's strength but to the over-all U.S. military position in the Western World. Norway's underground airfields carved from its rocky northern coast are practically impervious to destruction even by nuclear weapons. The giant radar on the North Cape looks down into the beehive of Soviet air activity on the Kola Peninsula and covers an Arctic flank. The Danish radar on Bornholm Island in the Baltic does a similar job on the Communist periphery from Lithuania to East Germany. The use of key air bases in Greenland along with the BMEWS site is another vital Danish contribution. Both Norway and Denmark maintain small but modern jet and missile forces at considerable expense to their modest national economies to back their determination to remain free and fly their own flags.

Now we have rewarded this loyalty and courage by ineptly pulling the rug from under their exposed position and providing the Soviets with the only valid evidence for diplomatic protest in a decade of searching. Turkey, which has a historic antipathy to the surge of Russian imperialism toward warm water and has never lacked the courage to fight invaders when they threaten, has made similarly important contributions to NATO and is now left in a similarly embarrassing position.

The next chapter in this unnecessary humiliation of ourselves and our allies will be staged in the great world sounding board of the United Nations. It is difficult to see at this time how a successful public defense can be made for our right to unilaterally penetrate other nations' airspace for the purposes of espionage. No matter how anybody feels privately about this matter it will be difficult, if not impossible, for any nation to

formally support such a position in an international forum.

But even worse than the position in which some of our firm allies find themselves because of our handling of the U–2 situation is the casual and thoughtless manner in which our top official spokesmen pulled the rug from under their carefully constructed and stoutly defended international position in relation to the Soviet Union. We cannot hope to retain the leadership of the free world unless we exercise it with considerably more intelligence, skill and effectiveness than has been displayed in the U–2 incident.

The belated anouncement by President Eisenhower that he had suspended U–2 flights for the duration of his administration came too late to do much good at the summit and if continued will leave this country in a position of losing its sharpest eyes inside the Soviet Union at a time when we need them most. For there is little doubt that the temperature of the cold war is rising. And the knowledge that no prying U–2 cameras will be roaming the Soviet airspace certainly makes the prospect for surprise military action more tempting than ever to Soviet leaders.

As predicted, President Eisenhower's assumption of responsibility for the U–2 flights closed the door on the exit provided for him in Khrushchev's original discussion of the incident and left the Soviet leader no further room for maneuver. It obviously stirred him to magnify the U–2 episode into a far larger issue than originally intended, if only to pacify a rising tide of domestic criticism.

Collapse of the summit was based on unresolved issues far deeper than the U–2 flights although the official U.S. handling of this episode provided Khrushchev with an unusually convenient escape hatch and an unusually fine opportunity to bellow equally well for both international and Russian consumption.

Perhaps the real value to this country of the sorry summit spectacle is that the artificial mask of friendliness slipped from Soviet leadership, revealing its true nature and the fact that its goals have not changed one iota since the days of Stalin's cold war. Mr. Khrushchev's brutal threat to the West of "peaceful coexistence or war" and his post-summit behavior should make it abundantly clear that by peaceful coexistence the Soviet leadership means peace on their terms with the naked threat of war to force compliance.

The spectacle of the summit should convince the American people that the basic problem of opposing Soviet imperialism has not changed one whit during the recent "palsy-walsy" era when this country's official policy was to pursue peace without defining the price we were being asked to pay.

It is worth while now to recall that there are many American leaders who warned against altering U.S. policy on the basis of this false front of Soviet smiles and who stoutly maintained that our best position for any negotiations would be a position of unchallenged military strength. In the historic light of the summit collapse and the policies that "summitry" stood for, the American people must think seriously on which type of leadership they should look to for future guidance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

AGRICULTURAL AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1961—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10809) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of May 19, 1960, p. 10828, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I understand that this is a unanimous report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, there were only two amendments in controversy, involving certain positions of the Senate, with respect to which, after conferring with the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senate conferees agreed to the House position, with the understanding that that met with the approval of the distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The other position of the Senate was that $55 million should be added to the amount of money requested by the President, for two purposes: First, primarily to take care of any increase in cost that had developed since the President's budget estimate was submitted; second, to take care of any breakthroughs that had not been anticipated, or any developments that were not known at the time the budget was submitted.

It must be borne in mind that this is merely an authorization. The conferees unanimously agreed to the position of the Senate that the $915 million should be increased by an additional $55 million authorization. So in the event that, either by reason of cost increases or breakthroughs, a larger amount should be needed, the administration would not find it necessary to ask for an additional authorization, but could submit a request for a supplemental appropriation.

I believe that both of these positions are in the national interest. They are unanimously agreed to by Mr. OVERTON BROOKS, Mr. JOHN MCCORMACK, Mr. GEORGE MILLER, Mr. OLIN TEAGUE, Mr. JOSEPH MARTIN, JR., Mr. JAMES FULTON, and Mr. GORDON MCDONOUGH, on the part of the House, and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], on behalf of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 11 o'clock has arrived; and, under the order entered on yesterday, the Chair lays before the Senate the enrolled bill, S. 722, the Area Redevelopment Act, returned to the Senate by the President without his approval.

The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Debate for 3 hours, to be equally divided, is permitted under the order entered on yesterday.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield myself such time as I may require.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE VETO

Mr. President, for the second time in two successive Congresses—namely, the 85th and the 86th—the administration has dealt a cruel blow to the people in the labor-surplus areas of high unemployment in our country and in the low-income rural areas of underemployment.

For the second time, these people in industrial areas of high and persistent unemployment, spread throughout 28 of our States, and representing a labor force of approximately 1¾ million people, together with millions more in 500 struggling rural counties in 20 different States, have been led down the path of hope, lured by administration promises and expressions of interest in their problems, further encouraged by widespread congressional interest and positive legislative action, only to be finally rudely awakened in the most irresponsible manner by another shocking Presidential veto of the area development bill.

Senate bill 722 can, if passed over the President's veto, provide an effective approach to the solution of the economic problems of areas of chronic unemploy-

ment and underemployment in the midst of generally prosperous business activity in the United States. These areas, in the opinion of a majority of Congress, are entitled to a domestic point 4 program. The President has asked us for—and, indeed, has demanded from us—appropriations for all types of economic assistance abroad; yet he will not countenance a small—but effective—fraction of such aid for our own people here at home.

I repeat, this veto was a cruel blow to an important part of our society, men and women who want nothing more than a chance to help themselves and their communities by sound economic development, under private enterprise, of the areas in which they live.

This legislation is one of the most important domestic issues facing both Congress and the country. It will be a gage of the promises and performance of both political parties. It tests not only our concern for pressing human needs, but also our capacity to utilize the great idle resources of manpower, and thus add to the Nation's goods and services and productive facilities.

Sometimes we forget that perhaps the greatest waste in our society is the waste of human labor, of laborers who want to work, and are competent to work, but who cannot find employment. If means are found, through private enterprise, but with Government loans to provide these men with capital and industries to give them employment, this will add greatly to the productive wealth of the Nation, and can do so without inflation, because there will be increased production to match the increased investment in plants and equipment.

The vote which very shortly will be taken in the Senate will be an acid test of political responsibility.

Senate bill 722 and its predecessors have been before us since 1956, the first year in which an area redevelopment bill was presented to Congress. Since 1956, Congress has twice answered this challenge by passing constructive measures, only to be met, first, by the pocket veto, in 1958, of Senate bill 3683, and now by the present veto of Senate bill 722. Unless there is repentance by a sufficient number of the administration's supporters to override this veto, I believe this whole history will conclusively demonstrate the need for action at the polls in November. If my memory serves me correctly, the 1958 elections have already revealed the views of many people on this matter. The veto, the present debate, and the ensuing vote of this body will be important, and in some cases decisive, factors in the choices which the voters will make in November. This may be an issue which ultimately will be determined at the grassroots and the closed factory gates of our country if we have not the wisdom and the will to decide it here.

HISTORY OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION AND OF PARTY LINEUPS

In order that the responsibility for what is done may be clear, let me briefly recount the history of Congress' action on this problem.

In the spring of 1955, I introduced the first comprehensive bill on this subject, and in 1956 it passed the Senate with a 2-to-1 majority. It was killed in the House, however, during the last days of the session. It was killed because of the efforts of the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Weeks, and the Republican Members of the House and the Republican administration. This was hard to understand, for the President from the summer White House in Denver had called for a "bold" program to help chronically depressed areas and for congressional action. At the end of the session, during a press conference, the President was asked why his Secretary of Commerce had been opposed to the bill. The President said that he was not aware of that fact, and that he was sorry. That was in 1956.

The unsympathetic attitude of the administration toward this legislation, however, was further demonstrated at this time during the House consideration of the measure. I am advised that a last desperate effort to secure action was made by the House leaders working for the bill, who got in touch with the then Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Frederick H. Mueller—now the Secretary of Commerce—and made an offer even to accept the watered down administration bill in order to have some basic legislation. It was late in the session. Adjournment was imminent. The messengers reported that Assistant Secretary Mueller requested 24 hours to consider the offer. And what did he do? I am informed that he advised the House leaders that the administration did not want any bill—not even the one which ostensibly was its own.

In the meantime, the President in each of his economic messages to Congress in the 3 years 1956, 1957, and 1958 called for legislation to help solve this problem. And recently he referred to this Congress as a "do nothing Congress." These are reasons why it is so difficult to understand how and why he again vetoed this year's bill.

In 1958, the area redevelopment bill, which I had introduced—of which we made Senator Payne, of Maine, a coauthor—again passed the Senate. The vote was 46 to 36. Of the votes in favor of the bill, 29 came from Democrats—71 percent of the Democrats who voted, and 17 votes from Republicans—41 percent of those voting. Of those who opposed the bill, there were 12 Democrats—or 29 percent—and 24 Republicans—or 59 percent.

Although there was no yea-and-nay vote on the question of final passage in the House, the key vote was on the motion to recommit the bill. That motion, if adopted would have killed the bill. But the motion to kill the bill was defeated by a vote of 188 to 170. The party breakdown of the vote was as follows:

Motion to recommit (kill) the Douglas bill, 1958

Opposed to killing the bill, 188:	
Democrats (72 percent)	139
Republicans (30 percent)	49
For killing the bill, 170:	
Democrats (28 percent)	54
Republicans (70 percent)	116

In other words, the Democratic Senators voted 2½ to 1 for the bill; the Republican Senators voted 2⅓ to 1 against the bill. That was the bill which was given a pocket veto by the President.

On January 27, 1959, I introduced another area redevelopment bill (S. 722), with 38 cosponsors, from both sides of the aisle; and we made the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the joint authors of the bill, in an effort to get bipartisan cooperation. It is this third bill, with House amendments, which most recently was passed by the Congress, and which the President has vetoed, and which is before this body today.

After further lengthy hearings and full debate, the vote on S. 722 was as follows: The Senate first passed the bill by a margin of 49 to 46. On that yea-and-nay vote, 45 Democratic Senators and only 4 Republican Senators voted "yea," although we had made every effort to obtain Republican cooperation; and 30 Republicans and 16 Democrats voted against it.

In other words, we Democrats voted approximately 3 to 1 for the bill, and the Republicans voted 7½ to 1 against the bill.

Subsequently, the House passed the amended bill by a vote of 202 to 184. Those voting for the bill consisted of 179 Democrats, joined by 23 Republicans, while 115 Republicans and 69 Democrats opposed the measure.

The Democrats on the House side voted almost 3 to 1 for the bill. The Republicans on the House side voted precisely 5 to 1 against it.

On the final vote in the Senate a short time ago to accept the House-passed bill, which was 45 to 32, 40 Democrats and only 5 Republicans supported the bill, while 21 Republicans and 11 Democrats voted against the bill.

In other words, the Democrats voted approximately 4 to 1 for it; the Republicans voted approximately 4 to 1 against it.

The record of the votes in Congress on an effective area redevelopment bill thus makes it clear, by the action of the President, and by the actions of the Republicans, that this has become a party issue, despite all the efforts which we have made to make it a nonpartisan issue. It has become a party issue not by our actions but by those of the Republican Party.

The repeated acts of the President in using his veto power to deny to Congress the type of legislation which a majority believe should be enacted, range the Republican Party leadership clearly on the side of opposition to any effective measure to deal with this problem. If they wish to redeem themselves on this issue, there is still time for them to vote to override. They have one more chance to take this out of political controversy.

A final opportunity is now presented to this body to demonstrate to the Nation that the legislative branch of the Government accepts its responsibility to study and pass legislation according to its wisdom and the dictates of its conscience, and that, notwithstanding the unwillingness of the executive branch to permit this legislation to be enacted with its approval, and, indeed, notwithstanding the determination of the executive

branch to prevent this legislation by its veto, the Congress can nevertheless overcome these obstructions by voting to override that veto by a two-thirds vote.

I plead for the cooperation of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, and those on this side of the aisle who in the past have opposed this measure, to join with us in asserting the independence of the legislative branch of the Government in helping to promote the welfare of the people of the United States. There is a chance for redemption at the last minute for all of these men, and those who enter into the gate at the last hour will be as welcome as those who have borne the heat and the burden of the day during the long, hard struggle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an analysis which I have made of Senate bill 722 be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF S. 722, A CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAM

The program set forth in S. 722 will go a long way toward effecting a permanent solution to the national problem of chronic unemployment and underemployment. It establishes a program which will put wasted manpower and undeveloped resources to work not only to meet the pressing immediate needs of our unemployed, but also as an aid to developing an expanding economy.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

Section 1. The short title of the act is the Area Economic Redevelopment Act.

Section 2. Finding of facts: The purpose of the act is to help areas needing redevelopment to expand their economic activities so as to alleviate substantial unemployment and underemployment that prevails within such areas. This would be accomplished by assisting communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in providing new employment opportunities and by expanding existing facilities and resources without reducing employment in other areas of the United States.

Section 3. Area Redevelopment Administration: An Area Redevelopment Administration would be established under the direction and control of an Administrator who is to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The salary of the Administrator is to be $20,000 a year.

Section 4. Advisory Committees: The bill provides for the establishment of two advisory committees. Subsection (a) creates a Government Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment. In addition to the Administrator, 11 heads of Federal departments or Federal independent agencies are designated as members of this committee. The committee is required to meet twice annually and is to make recommendations to the Administrator with regard to carrying out his duties.

Subsection (b) creates a National Public Advisory Committee to be appointed by the Administrator to consist of 12 members representing labor, management, agriculture, and the public in general. This committee is to make recommendations to the Administrator in carrying out his duties.

Subsection (c) authorizes the Administrator to call ad hoc industry committees representing the parties in interest when employment has dropped substantially over a number of years in such industry resulting in high levels of unemployment in various areas designated by the Administrator as redevelopment areas. The industry committees are to recommend plans and programs to the Administrator with reference to such industry.

Section 5. Redevelopment areas: The bill recognizes two types of redevelopment areas—industrial and rural—which are eligible to receive Federal assistance under this bill.

Under subsection (a) an area may be designated an industrial redevelopment area in either of the following two ways: (1) the Administrator may, at his discretion, determine that a given area has been subject to substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time and designate the area an industrial redevelopment area; or (2) an industrial area must be classified an industrial redevelopment area if it meets any one of the following four tests and has 6 percent unemployment at time of application: (a) not less than 12 percent of the total labor force in the area has been unemployed for a period of 12 months immediately preceding the date on which an application for assistance is made; (b) not less than 9 percent of the labor force in the area has been unemployed for a period of 15 months out of the last 18 months prior to such date; or (c) not less than 6 percent of the labor force was unemployed during at least 18 months in the 2 years immediately preceding such date; or (d) not less than 15 percent of the labor force in the area has been unemployed for a period of 6 months immediately preceding such date.

Subsection (b) sets forth the criteria for designating a rural area as a rural redevelopment area. The Administrator is directed to designate as rural redevelopment areas those rural areas in which he determines that there exists the largest number and percentage of low-income farm families and a condition of substantial and persistent underemployment. In making these designations, the Administrator is required to consider, among other relevant factors, the number of low-income farm families in the various rural areas in the United States, the proportion such low-income families are to the total farm families of each of such areas, the relationship of the income levels of farm families of each such area to the general levels of income in the same area, the current and prospective employment opportunities in each such area, and the availability of farm manpower in each such area for supplemental employment. The Administrator shall designate the 500 counties in the United States ranked lowest in level of living of farm-operator families, or which have the highest percentage of commercial farms producing less than $2,500 worth of products for sale annually.

Subsection (c) provides that in making determinations concerning redevelopment areas, the Administrator is to be guided—but not conclusively governed—by the available information published by the various Federal agencies, State and local governments, universities and private organizations.

The Administrator may also request from the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of the Bureau of the Census special studies and such information and data as he deems necessary to enable him to make the determinations provided for in this section. The Administrator is required to reimburse these agencies for expenditures which they incur in connection with filling his requests.

Subsection (e) defines the term "redevelopment area" to mean any area within the United States which has been designated by the Administrator as an industrial redevelopment or a rural redevelopment area.

Section 6. Loans for industrial and rural projects: Section 6 of the bill provides two $75 million revolving funds, one for industrial projects in industrial redevelopment areas, the other for rural redevelopment areas. These revolving funds for loans were provided because witness after witness testified that in these urban and rural areas where unemployment and underemployment have been substantial and persistent, the communities own resources are not sufficient to make it possible for industrial development to proceed. These loans are intended to help provide for plant, equipment and machinery, but not for working capital or the purchase of raw material and payment of labor. These loans are to be for no longer than 30 years. Government participation is never to exceed 65 percent but may be less. Local and State authorities must put up at least 10 percent and at least 5 percent must be from nongovernment sources.

Section 6 expressly provides that loans made under it for industrial projects must not be granted to assist establishments relocating from one area to another when such assistance will result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location. This provision reflects the declaration of purpose of the act, to create new employment opportunities by developing and expanding facilities and resources without substantially reducing employment in other areas of the United States.

Sec. 7. Loans for public facilities: The bill provides a revolving fund of $50 million for loans to States, Indian tribes, or organizations representing redevelopment areas to help in financing the purchase of development of land for public facility usage, and construction or alteration of public facilities, if the project will tend to improve the opportunities in the area for the establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities. These loans may run for a period up to 40 years.

A depressed area may have many of the assets sought by industry—buildings, labor, community facilities and the like—but it may lack one public facility without which all the others are useless, for example, adequate water for industrial use, adequate sewage facilities, or access to a navigable river or a railroad.

Interest rates: The bill authorizes appropriations of $251 million for the program. The Administrator is to pay interest on these loans at a rate determined by the Secretary of Treasury, but such rate shall not be greater than the current average yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations.

Loans made to industrial projects must pay interest to the administrator at this same rate plus one-half of 1 percent. Of this, one-quarter of 1 percent is allocated to a sinking fund for payment of losses.

The interest rate in the case of public facility loans is a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, but which shall be not greater than the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the year in which the loan is made and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent, plus one-quarter of 1 percent per annum.

Section 8. Grants for public facilities: The bill authorizes appropriations of $35 million for grants to States or their subdivisions, Indian tribes, or public or private organizations representing redevelopment areas for land acquisition or development for public facilities usage, or construction or alteration of public facilities in the area, if the project will improve the opportunities in the area for the establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities. Financial participation by the applicant is required to the extent financial ability will permit.

Some redevelopment areas have inadequate economic resources, either because of chronic unemployment or underemployment or a

generally low level of economic development, to borrow money to develop public facilities which would make the areas attractive to new industry. For this reason, the bill provides for grants to improve public facilities in these localities.

Sections 9 and 10. Information and technical assistance: The Administrator is directed to provide assistance, technical information, market research, and other forms of advice available from the Federal Government which would be useful in alleviating unemployment and underemployment in the areas. In addition, the Administrator is authorized to provide technical assistance to the areas including studies evaluating the needs of and developing potentials for economic growth for such areas. This may be done either through the Administrator's staff or by employing individuals, firms, or institutions. Appropriations up to $4.5 million annually are authorized for this program.

Section 11. Powers of Administrator: Usual corporate powers.

Section 12. Termination of eligibility: When unemployment ceases to meet the criteria set forth, the area is no longer eligible. Contracts, however, continue in force.

Sections 13 and 14. Urban renewal: The bill makes available to economically depressed areas the benefits of the Federal urban renewal program. Under this section, urban renewal assistance may be provided to a municipality designated as "an industrial redevelopment area" if there is a reasonable probability that with such assistance the area will be able to achieve more than a temporary improvement in its economic development. Such an area need not comply with the predominantly residential test and thus areas which are predominantly commercial or industrial and which will be redeveloped as commercial or industrial areas are eligible.

Sections 15 and 16. Vocational training and subsistence retraining payments: The bill provides that the Secretary of Labor shall determine the needs of the area for vocational training to meet the employment opportunities created by the bill and shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and existing State and local agencies to make these services available to the area. Authorization for an appropriation of $1.5 million annually is provided for vocational training.

In order to enable unemployed persons to get the benefits of this training, the bill also provides that the Secretary of Labor may make weekly retraining payments through State agencies to unemployed persons in the redevelopment areas of 13 weeks at the average weekly unemployment compensation rate in that State, but limited to those not receiving unemployment compensation. A ceiling of $10 million is placed upon this program.

THE ESSENCE OF S. 722

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I may say that fundamentally what this bill aims to do is to provide loans at low rates of interest to help establish new industries in areas of high and persistent unemployment; to require local participation; to require participation by private parties, but to provide seed capital to help put the unemployed to work turning out goods which are needed by society under the private enterprise system. This would take men and women off relief, and help to prevent the progressive drying up of afflicted communities, and, in general, to raise the national product.

As I have again and again pointed out, this method is used by the Tory Government of Great Britain and by the conservative government of West Germany, and yet it is regarded as too radical by the Republican administration of this country.

This problem is far more serious than the administration believes. I have had a map of the United States prepared, which is in the back part of this Chamber. The areas designated with the red pins represent both the larger and smaller labor market surplus areas of the United States, those that would meet the qualifications laid down in Senate bill 722.

There are 40 of these major, large labor market areas, and 122 of the smaller.

We have just received word from the Department of Labor that there are approximately 1,770,000 unemployed people in those regions, or, on an average, 8.4 percent of the labor force of this area.

In some of these areas, unemployment is vastly greater than the average of 8 percent. In West Virginia there are areas where unemployment runs from 11 percent to 25 percent.

In my own State of Illinois, in the southern portion of the State, which was primarily a coal-mining area, there is unemployment in some areas of 12, 15, and 18 percent.

There is high unemployment in the textile centers of New England, New York, and Pennsylvania.

This is a problem which, as the map shows, and as the table shows, is not sectional. It applies all over the country, although, so far as unemployment is concerned, it is primarily confined to regions where formerly textiles were manufactured, coal-mining regions, areas where timber has been cut over or natural resources have given out.

The colored areas on the map represent the rural low-income areas of the United States. It will be seen that they exist primarily in the South and Southeast. The degree of severity of the rural low-income situation is shown by the colors, the areas with the most depressed rural income being shown in red, the next most depressed in blue, and those depressed, but not as badly as the others, in yellow.

Very frankly, I cannot understand why so many Senators and Representatives from those areas, which would benefit perhaps more than any others from starting new industry to help the low-income families who live there, seem to be opposed to this bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would not want to break the continuity of the presentation of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, except to say that when he asks the question and answers it, that indicates, of course, as one looks at this map, that the reasons are overriding for assistance in area redevelopment legislation.

I desire to supplement the discussion on the current legislative situation by indicating that if we have an economic erosion in any area of the United States, it quite likely will become an erosion to the neighboring sections. So the damage does not stop at a line.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It flows over in its tragic implications to affect people of other sections. Certainly, when there is an economic erosion there comes a lessening of the strength of the people—of all the people, not simply a few of the people—to help themselves.

All we are requesting in the proposed legislation is a strengthening of the total economy. We do not seek handouts from the Federal Government. We seek legitimate and, as provided in the pending bill, moderate assistance to States, to areas within States, and to people who find themselves unemployed throughout these chronically depressed areas of the Nation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank my good friend from West Virginia, who has been a stalwart supporter of this proposal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table prepared by the Department of labor, which sets forth the history of the designation of these areas as labor surplus areas, and a list of counties which would be designated as rural redevelopment areas.

There being no objection, the table and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Initial dates of labor surplus area classification and subsequent classification experience,[1] July 1951 to present—Urban areas that may qualify for Federal assistance under various legislative proposals [2]

MAJOR AREAS [4]

Area redevelopment bill (S. 722 as passed by Congress) (40 major areas)	Douglas bill (S. 722 as originally passed by the Senate) (17 major areas)	Dates of labor surplus classification	Unemployment	
			Date	Rate [3]
Connecticut:				
Bridgeport		January 1958 to November 1959	March 1960	6.6
New Britain		March 1958 to November 1959	do	6.4
Indiana:				
Evansville	Evansville	May 1954 to January 1956 to May 1955 and present	do	8.7
Terre Haute	Terre Haute	July 1951 to present	do	8.8
Kentucky: Louisville		January 1958 to November 1959	do	7.5
Maine: Portland		March 1955 to July 1955 and March 1958 to July 1959	do	8.2

See footnotes at end of table.

Initial dates of labor surplus area classification and subsequent classification experience,[1] July 1951 to present—Urban areas that may qualify for Federal assistance under various legislative proposals [2]—Continued

MAJOR AREAS [4]

Area redevelopment bill (S. 722 as passed by Congress) (40 major areas)	Douglas bill (S. 722 as originally passed by the Senate) (17 major areas)	Dates of labor surplus classification	Unemployment	
			Date	Rate [3]
Massachusetts:				
Brockton		July 1951 to November 1952, March 1958 to September 1959, and November 1959 to present.	March 1960	8.4
Fall River	Fall River	November 1951 to May 1953, May 1954 to November 1955, and January 1957 to present.	do	9.9
Lawrence	Lawrence	July 1951 to present	do	6.7
Lowell	Lowell	July 1951 to present	do	9.8
New Bedford	New Bedford	March 1952 to March 1953, January 1954 to November 1955, January 1958 to present.	do	9.4
Springfield-Holyoke		March 1958 to present	do	7.4
Worcester		March 1958 to September 1959	do	6.4
Michigan:				
Detroit	Detroit	January 1952 to May 1952, February 1954 to January 1955, May 1956 to January 1957, and July 1957 to present.	do	7.2
Flint		January 1952 to May 1952, May 1956 to November 1956, May 1957 to November 1957, and March 1958 to January 1960.	do	6.2
Minnesota: Duluth-Superior		March 1954 to July 1956, March 1958 to present	do	11.0
New Jersey:				
Atlantic City	Atlantic City	November 1951 to present	do	15.3
Newark		January 1958 to September 1959	do	6.2
Paterson		March 1954 to September 1955 and January 1958 to September 1959.	do	7.2
Trenton		January 1958 to September 1959	do	6.9
New York:				
Albany-Schenectady-Troy		May 1954 to July 1955, May 1958 to November 1959, and March 1960 to present.	do	8.2
Buffalo		May 1954 to May 1955, March 1958 to present	do	8.7
Utica-Rome		March 1952 to May 1953, May 1954 to November 1955, and January 1958 to present.	do	9.5
North Carolina: Durham		May 1952 to present	do	7.1
Pennsylvania:				
Altoona	Altoona	July 1951 to present	do	8.8
Erie	Erie	May 1954 to July 1956 and July 1957 to present	do	10.1
Johnstown	Johnstown	May 1953 to present	do	10.6
Philadelphia		May 1954 to November 1955 and January 1958 to September 1959.	do	6.6
Pittsburgh		May 1954 to November 1955 and January 1959 to present	do	8.0
Scranton	Scranton	July 1951 to present	do	13.3
Wilkes-Barre—Hazleton	Wilkes-Barre—Hazleton	do	do	14.6
York		March 1958 to September 1959	do	6.5
Rhode Island: Providence	Providence	July 1951 to present	do	8.4
Tennessee: Chattanooga		March 1954 to November 1955 and March 1958 to present	do	7.1
Texas:				
Beaumont-Port Arthur		July 1951 to March 1952 and March 1958 to present	do	9.1
Corpus Christi		March 1958 to September 1959	do	7.9
Virginia: Roanoke		May 195› to present	do	7.7
West Virginia:				
Charleston	Charleston	March 1954 to present	do	8.7
Huntington-Ashland	Huntington-Ashland	March 1954 to September 1955 and January 1958 and present	do	13.0
Wheeling	Wheeling	March 1954 to July 1955 and January 1958 to present	do	13.7

SMALLER AREAS [4]

Area redevelopment bill (S. 722 as passed by Congress) (102 smaller areas)	Douglas bill (S. 722 as originally passed by the Senate) (58 smaller areas)	Dates of labor surplus classification [3]	Unemployment	
			Date	Rate [3]
Alabama:				
Florence-Sheffield	Florence-Sheffield	November 1954 to November 1956 and February 1958 to present.	December 1959	7.2
Gadsden		January 1954 to July 1955 and February 1958 to present	January 1960	9.7
Jasper	Jasper	March 1952 to present	April 1960	7.3
Talladega		April 1954 to September 1955 and January 1958 to present	November 1959	7.0
Alaska: Anchorage	Anchorage	March 1958 to present	August 1959	7.8
Connecticut:				
Ansonia		February 1958 to present	December 1959	6.9
Bristol	Bristol	July 1954 to November 1955 and March 1958 to present	do	8.9
Danielson	Danielson	March 1952 to January 1953 and March 1955 to present	October 1959	6.7
Meriden		March 1958 to present	December 1959	5.1
Middletown		do	do	5.4
Norwich		May 1952 to January 1953 and March 1958 to present	do	7.1
Thompsonville		March 1958 to present	do	6.7
Torrington		March 1955 to November 1955 and February 1958 to present	do	5.5
Illinois:				
Centralia	Centralia	May 1958 to present	November 1959	7.3
Harrisburg	Harrisburg	December 1954 to present	March 1960	18.7
Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort.	Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort.	September 1951 to present	February 1960	17.7
Mount Carmel-Olney		February 1955 to present	December 1959	6.5
Mount Vernon	Mount Vernon	April 1954 to present	April 1960	11.3
Indiana:				
Connersville		May 1952 to January 1953, January 1955 to May 1955, and April 1958 to present.	March 1960	6.9
Vincennes	Vincennes	September 1951 to present	February 1960	7.9
Kansas:				
Coffeyville-Independence-Parsons		December 1951 to present	November 1959	7.2
Pittsburg	Pittsburg	May 1954 to present	March 1960	12.3
Kentucky:				
Corbin	Corbin	July 1953 to present	March 1960	11.5
Hazard	Hazard	do	do	12.9
Madisonville	Madisonville	September 1953 to present	do	10.6
Morehead-Grayson	Morehead-Grayson	August 1954 to present	do	16.8
Paintsville-Prestonsburg	Paintsville-Prestonsburg	July 1953 to present	do	15.0
Pikeville-Williamson	Pikeville-Williamson	do	October 1959	20.9
Maine:				
Biddeford-Sanford	Biddeford-Sanford	May 1952 to September 1952, March 1954 to present	February 1960	13.2
Lewiston-Auburn	Lewiston-Auburn	May 1952 to September 1952, March 1958 to September 1959	March 1960	8.2

Initial dates of labor surplus area classification and subsequent classification experience,[1] July 1951 to present—Urban areas that may qualify for Federal assistance under various legislative proposals [2]—Continued

SMALLER AREAS [5]

Area redevelopment bill (S. 722 as passed by Congress) (102 smaller areas)	Douglas bill (S. 722 as originally passed by the Senate) (58 smaller areas)	Dates of labor surplus classification [3]	Unemployment	
			Date	Rate [3]
Maryland:				
Cambridge		September 1959 to present	December 1959	16.6
Cumberland	Cumberland	September 1951 to present	February 1960	10.5
Massachusetts:				
Newburyport		February 1958 to September 1959 and January 1960 to present	December 1959	8.3
North Adams	North Adams	March 1954 to July 1955 and March 1957 to present	February 1960	11.4
Michigan:				
Bay City	Bay City	March 1952 to July 1952, March 1954 to May 1955, and July 1957 to present.	do	8.3
Iron Mountain	Iron Mountain	March 1952 to September 1953, April 1954 to November 1957, and February 1958 to present.	do	10.2
Marquette	Marquette	July 1955 to September 1956 and January 1958 to present	do	7.6
Monroe	Monroe	March 1954 to May 1955 and May 1956 to present	March 1960	9.6
Port Huron	Port Huron	March 1952 to November 1952, March 1954 to July 1955, and March 1956 to present.	February 1960	8.5
Mississippi: Biloxi-Gulfport		March 1959 to present	January 1960	7.5
Missouri:				
Flat River	Flat River	March 1958 to present	December 1959	9.5
Joplin		May 1952 to January 1953, May 1954 to November 1955, and February 1958 to present.	November 1959	6.6
Washington		March 1959 to present	August 1959	6.1
Montana:				
Butte	Butte	April 1958 to present	December 1959	26.8
Kalispell	Kalispell	do	do	11.8
New Jersey:				
Bridgeton	Bridgeton	March 1955 to present	April 1960	9.9
Long Branch		February 1955 to present	March 1960	9.9
New York:				
Amsterdam	Amsterdam	June 1954 to November 1956 and March 1958 to present	April 1960	11.2
Auburn	Auburn	January to September 1955 and April 1958 to present	March 1960	8.9
Elmira		April 1958 to present	February 1960	6.8
Gloversville	Gloversville	March 1952 to November 1955 and April 1958 to present	December 1959	12.9
Jamestown-Dunkirk		May to November 1954 and April 1958 to present	March 1960	9.6
Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon		July 1958 to present	November 1959	8.1
Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone		November 1959 to present	December 1959	13.9
Plattsburgh		March 1959 to present	February 1960	14.7
Wellsville		November 1958 to present	April 1960	8.7
North Carolina:				
Fayetteville	Fayetteville	February 1955 to present	March 1960	10.3
Hendersonville		March 1959 to present	January 1960	7.6
Lumberton		do	February 1960	13.7
Mount Airy		September 1955 to present	December 1959	5.9
Ohio: Portsmouth-Chillicothe	Portsmouth-Chillicothe	May to September 1952 and July 1957 to present	November 1959	7.1
Oklahoma:				
Ardmore		September 1958 to present	February 1960	7.9
McAlester	McAlester	September 1954 to present	January 1960	10.2
Muskogee		September 1954 to November 1955 and September 1959 to present.	February 1960	12.5
Okmulgee-Henryetta		May 1958 to present	March 1960	7.9
Pennsylvania:				
Berwick-Bloomsburg	Berwick-Bloomsburg	May 1954 to present	October 1959	10.0
Butler	Butler	November 1954 to November 1955 and March 1958 to present	March 1960	8.9
Clearfield-Du Bois	Clearfield-Du Bois	May 1952 to present	do	13.3
Indiana		January 1954 to September 1956 and March 1959 to present	January 1960	9.2
Kittanning-Ford City		March 1954 to November 1956 and March 1959 to present	February 1960	12.0
Lewistown		March 1955 to present	November 1959	7.1
Meadville		March 1955 to November 1955 and May 1959 to present	October 1959	9.0
New Castle	New Castle	April 1954 to November 1955 and May 1958 to present	March 1960	9.6
Oil City-Franklin-Titusville		September 1954 to November 1955 and October 1958 to present	do	8.5
Pottsville	Pottsville	September 1951 to present	do	18.7
Sayre-Athens-Towanda		June 1958 to present	do	7.4
St. Marys		July 1955 to November 1955 and March 1959 to present	February 1960	10.3
Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel	Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel.	July 1952 to present	March 1960	13.0
Uniontown-Connellsville	Uniontown-Connellsville	September 1951 to present	do	17.8
Williamsport		March 1954 to November 1955 and September 1958 to present	do	8.2
Tennessee: La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell	La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell	January 1954 to present	October 1959	14.1
Texas:				
Laredo		July 1951 to March 1952 and March 1958 to present	March 1960	9.9
Texarkana		January 1954 to present	do	9.5
Virginia:				
Big Stone Gap-Appalachia	Big Stone Gap-Appalachia	September 1953 to present	April 1960	10.7
Richlands-Bluefield		June 1954 to July 1957 and July 1958 to present	November 1959	9.2
Washington:				
Aberdeen	Aberdeen	March 1958 to present	February 1960	7.4
Anacortes	Anacortes	do	do	15.9
Bellingham	Bellingham	do	do	11.5
Bremerton		do	do	7.2
Port Angeles	Port Angeles	do	do	7.8
West Virginia:				
Beckley	Beckley	March 1953 to present	do	25.8
Bluefield	Bluefield	March 1954 to July 1956, and February 1958 to present	December 1959	17.9
Clarksburg	Clarksburg	March 1954 to December 1955, and May 1958 to present	April 1960	11.4
Fairmont	Fairmont	May 1952 to present	do	10.4
Logan	Logan	April 1954 to present	February 1960	16.0
Martinsburg		March 1952 to July 1953, and May 1958 to present	April 1960	9.9
Morgantown	Morgantown	March 1953 to December 1955, and May 1958 to present	do	13.6
Parkersburg		May 1952 to December 1955, and February 1958 to present	December 1959	8.3
Point Pleasant-Gallipolis	Point Pleasant-Gallipolis	July 1952 to present	February 1960	12.1
Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs	Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs	March 1952 to present	do	14.9
Welch	Welch	February 1954 to present	December 1959	25.4
Wisconsin: La Crosse		May to November 1952, February 1954 to September 1955, and February 1958 to present.	January 1960	10.6

[1] Dates areas listed were officially classified by the Department of Labor as "areas of substantial labor surplus."

[2] Listing of eligible areas is preliminary and tentative, and is based largely on bimonthly or semiannual data compiled from area labor market reports prepared in connection with the Bureau of Employment Security's program for the classification of areas according to relative adequacy of labor supply. Data used cover a 2- to 5-year period, generally extending through March 1960. Later data, now becoming available for some areas, could result in several changes in the above listing.

[3] Unemployment rates for major areas are as of March 1960. Data for smaller areas are for latest month available as reported in official area labor market reports prepared by State employment security agencies.

[4] Major areas are the 149 areas included in the Bureau of Employment Security's regular area labor market reporting and classification program. Unemployment and labor force data for these areas are generally available on a bimonthly basis.

[5] Smaller areas: Areas with a labor force of 15,000 or more which are officially classified as "smaller areas of substantial labor surplus" by the Bureau of Employment Security. Data for such areas are generally available on a semiannual basis. Information for smaller areas which are not classified, or for areas with a labor force of less than 15,000, are not available in Washington on a consistent basis.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, Office of Program Review and Analysis, Washington, D.C., May 23, 1960.

APPENDIX B. LIST OF COUNTIES WHICH MUST BE DESIGNATED AS RURAL REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

Alabama: Autauga, Barbour, Bibb, Blount, Bullock, Butler, Chambers, Chilton, Choctaw, Clarke, Clay, Coffee, Conecuh, Coosa, Covington, Crenshaw, Cullman, Dallas, De Kalb, Elmore, Escambia, Etowah, Fayette, Franklin, Geneva, Greene, Hale, Henry, Houston, Jackson, Lamar, Lawrence, Lee, Limestone, Lowndes, Macon, Marengo, Marion, Marshall, Monroe, Montgomery, Morgan, Perry, Pickens, Pike, Randolph, Russell, Sumter, St. Clair, Tallapoosa, Tuscaloosa, Walker, Washington, Wilcox, Winston.

Arkansas: Ashley, Baxter, Boone, Bradley, Calhoun, Chicot, Clark, Clay, Cleburne, Cleveland, Columbia, Conway, Crittenden, Dallas, Desha, Drew, Faulkner, Fulton, Grant, Greene, Hempstead, Howard, Independence, Izard, Jefferson, Johnson, Lafayette, Lawrence, Lee, Lincoln, Little River, Logan, Lonoke, Madison, Marion, Miller, Monroe, Montgomery, Nevada, Newton, Ouachita, Perry, Phillips, Pike, Polk, Pope, Randolph, St. Francis, Scott, Searcy, Sebastian, Sevier, Sharp, Stone, Union, Van Buren, White, Woodruff, Yell.

Florida: Baker, Calhoun, Gilchrist, Hamilton, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Lafayette, Leon, Madison, Okaloosa, Suwannee, Union, Walton, Washington.

Georgia: Appling, Atkinson, Bacon, Baker, Baldwin, Brantley, Brooks, Bryan, Burke, Butts, Carroll, Charlton, Chattooga, Clay, Clayton, Clinch, Coffee, Coweta, Crawford, Dade, Decatur, Dodge, Douglas, Early, Echols, Elbert, Evans, Fannin, Fayette, Glascock, Gilmer, Greene, Hancock, Haralson, Hart, Harris, Heard, Henry, Jasper, Jeff Davis, Johnson, Lamar, Lanier, Liberty, Lincoln, Long, Marion, Meriwether, Montgomery, Murray, Newton, Oglethorpe, Pierce, Quitman, Rabun, Randolph, Rockdale, Screven, Stewart, Taliaferro, Tattnall, Taylor, Telfair, Towns, Treutlen, Twiggs, Union, Walker, Warren, Washington, Wayne, Wheeler, White, Wilcox, Wilkes, Wilkinson.

Illinois: Hardin, Johnson, Pope.

Kentucky: Adair, Allen, Breathitt, Breckinridge, Butler, Carter, Casey, Clay, Clinton, Cumberland, Crittenden, Edmonson, Elliott, Estill, Floyd, Grayson, Graves, Green, Greenup, Hopkins, Jackson, Johnson, Knox, Laurel, Lawrence, Lee, Lewis, Magoffin, Marshall, Menifee, McCracken, Metcalfe, Monroe, Morgan, Ohio, Owsley, Pike, Powell, Pulaski, Rockcastle, Rowan, Russell, Wayne, Whitley, Wolfe.

Louisiana: Avoyelles, Bienville, Beauregard, Caldwell, Catahoula, Claiborne, Concordia, De Sota, East Feliciana, Evangeline, Franklin, Grant, La Salle, Lincoln, Livingston, Morehouse, Natchitoches, Red River, Richland, Sabine, St. Helena, St. Landry, Union, Vernon, Webster, West Carroll, West Feliciana, Winn.

Michigan: Alcona, Clare, Iosco, Iron, Wexford.

Minnesota: Aitkin, Itasca.

Mississippi: Adama, Alcorn, Amite, Attala, Benton, Bolivar, Calhoun, Carroll, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Claiborne, Clarke, Clay, Coahoma, Copiah, Covington, De Sota, Franklin, George, Greene, Grenada, Hinds, Holmes, Humphreys, Issaquena, Itawamba, Jasper, Jefferson, Jefferson Davis, Jones, Kemper, Lafayette, Lamar, Lauderdale, Lawrence, Leake, Lee, Leflore, Lincoln, Lowndes, Madison, Marion, Marshall, Monroe, Montgomery, Neshoba, Newton, Noxubee, Oktibbeha, Panola, Perry, Pike, Pontotoc, Prentiss, Quitman, Rankin, Scott, Sharkey, Simpson, Smith, Sunflower, Tallahatchie, Tate, Tippah, Tishomingo, Tunica, Union, Washington, Walthall, Warren, Wayne, Webster, Wilkinson, Winston, Yalobusha, Yazoo.

Missouri: Bollinger, Butler, Carter, Dent, Douglas, Howell, Iron, Madison, Oregon, Ozark, Reynolds, Ripley, Shannon, Stone, Taney, Vernon, Washington, Wayne, Wright.

New Mexico: Mora, Rio Arriba, San Miguel, Sierra, Socorro.

North Carolina: Alexander, Alleghany, Anson, Ashe, Avery, Bladen, Buncombe, Brunswick, Burke, Caswell, Catawba, Cherokee, Clay, Cleveland, Columbus, Davidson, Duplin, Graham, Halifax, Haywood, Hyde, Jackson, Lincoln, McDowell, Macon, Madison, Mitchell, Montgomery, New Hanover, Onslow, Pender, Person, Polk, Rutherford, Scotland, Stanly, Swain, Transylvania, Tyrrell, Washington, Warren, Watauga, Wilkes, Yancey.

Ohio: Gallia, Guernsey, Noble.

Oklahoma: Adair, Atoka, Cherokee, Choctaw, Coal, Creek, Delaware, Haskell, Hughes, Latimer, Le Flore, Lincoln, McCurtain, McIntosh, Okfuskee, Okmulgee, Pittsburg, Pushmataha, Seminole, Sequoyah.

South Carolina: Abbeville, Allendale, Anderson, Barnwell, Beaufort, Berkeley, Charleston, Cherokee, Chester, Chesterfield, Clarendon, Colleton, Dorchester, Edgefield, Fairfield, Greenwood, Georgetown, Greenville, Hampton, Horry, Jasper, Kershaw, Lancaster, Laurens, Lee, Lexington, McCormick, Newberry, Oconee, Orangeburg, Pickens, Saluda, Spartanburg, Union, Williamsburg, York.

Tennessee: Anderson, Benton, Bledsoe, Blount, Campbell, Cannon, Carroll, Carter, Claiborne, Clay, Cocke, Cumberland, Decatur, De Kalb, Dickson, Fayette, Fentress, Giles, Grainger, Greene, Grundy, Hamblen, Hancock, Hardeman, Hardin, Hawkins, Haywood, Hickman, Houston, Humphreys, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Lauderdale, Lawrence, Lewis, Lincoln, Loudon, McMinn, McNairy, Macon, Madison, Marion, Meigs, Monroe, Moore, Morgan, Overton, Perry, Pickett, Polk, Putnam, Rhea, Roane, Rutherford, Scott, Sevier, Sequatchie, Smith, Stewart, Sullivan, Sumner, Unicoi, Union, Van Buren, Washington, Warren, Wayne, White, Wilson.

Texas: Angelina, Anderson, Bastrop, Bowie, Burleson, Camp, Cass, Cherokee, Duval, Franklin, Freestone, Harrison, Henderson, Houston, Lavaca, Leon, McMullen, Madison, Marion, Morris, Newton, Panola, Polk, Rains, Red River, Robertson, Rusk, Sabine, San Augustine, San Jacinto, Somervell, Titus, Upshur, Trinity, Walker, Wood.

Virginia: Alleghany, Appomattox, Bath, Bedford, Buchanan, Buckingham, Carroll, Charlotte, Craig, Dickenson, Floyd, Fluvanna, Grayson, Greene, Greensville, Halifax, Henry, Highland, Lee, Lunenburg, Mecklenburg, Patrick, Prince Edward, Russell, Scott, Tazewell, Washington, Wise, York.

West Virginia: Brooke, Barbour, Braxton, Cabell, Calhoun, Clay, Doddridge, Fayette, Gilmer, Harrison, Jackson, Kanawha, Lewis, Lincoln, Mason, Marion, Mercer, Monongalia, Monroe, Nicholas, Pleasants, Pocahontas, Preston, Putnam, Raleigh, Randolph, Ritchie, Roane, Summers, Taylor, Tucker, Tyler, Upshur, Wayne, Wetzel, Wirt, Wood.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to point out that some of the areas have had high unemployment, of more than 6 percent, for 10 years, at least. For instance, Lawrence and Lowell in Massachusetts, ever since the survey was started in July of 1951, although formerly great textile centers have had over 6-percent unemployment. The last figure, as of this year, shows an unemployment of 6.7 percent in Lawrence, and 9.8 percent, or almost 10 percent, for Lowell, Mass.

Atlantic City, N.J., has had continuous, chronic unemployment ever since November of 1951. At the last account the figure was 15 percent.

Altoona, Pa., has had continuous unemployment since July of 1951. At present the unemployment rate is 8.8 percent.

Providence, R.I., has had continuous high unemployment since July of 1951. At present Providence has unemployment of 8.4 percent.

There are large numbers of the so-called smaller areas which have had continuous unemployment for long periods of time. All of this will be revealed by a close study of this table, which is being printed in the RECORD.

I wish to point out that of the 102 smaller areas designated, 77 have been surplus labor areas for longer than the past 5 years, and this number represents 75 percent of the total of the 102 smaller areas.

The Department of Labor, as is well known, classifies these surplus areas into three groups, called D, E, and F. Group D represents areas of unemployment from 6 to 9 percent; group E areas of unemployment from 9 to 12 percent; and group F areas of unemployment over 12 percent. Groups A, B, and C have less than 6-percent unemployment and are not classed as surplus labor areas.

OUR NATIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Mr. President, I know that some will ask a question at this point, and it is a logical one. Why do these people stay in these places? Why do they not leave and seek work elsewhere? The answer is that they do. That is why unemployment rates are 12 instead of 25 percent, or 20 instead of 40 percent. But migration alone cannot solve the problem.

In the first place, many of the persons thrown out of work are over 40 or 50 years of age, and face discrimination because of their age when seeking a job. They leave their families only to return more defeated than before. Second, they lack training for the available jobs in other areas. Third, their roots and homes are in these areas, and they keep up their hopes for the future. It is hard for someone to give up all he has worked for in his home, neighborhood, church, and local groups, especially after investing most of his life in them. Fourth, some families have gone deeply in debt and do not like to "run out" on their obligations. Moreover, those who migrate and find jobs are, because of low seniority in their new employment, the first to be laid off in a recession. So they head "back home."

There are other reasons. But the basic answer to the question "Why don't more persons in these areas move?" is that they would if they could, but they cannot.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield again to my good friend from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Illinois is correct when he discusses the lessening of population in these areas, though the people still have roots in them. West Virginia, on the basis of a preliminary compilation of the current census, has lost, in some of the coal-producing counties, over a 10-year period, as many as 17,000 people. I say to the Senator from Illinois, that is the population loss within one county alone.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We know now, on the basis of figures which are not yet official but which are substantially correct, that West Virginia will lose one

Member of its House delegation. We now have six Members of the House of Representatives. Beginning in 1962, with the election in that year, we are quite likely to have only five Members of the House of Representatives from our State.

This is a very serious problem. The Senator is presenting it in a very factual manner.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, the next questions, also logical, might be, "Well, what can we do about it? Why send good money after bad? What good would it do? Anyway, is this not a local rather than a national problem?"

In some cases, perhaps, little can be done, for the program envisaged by our area redevelopment bill is not a handout or a dole. It is not a relief measure. Rather, it is a program of long-term investment in repayable loans to help these areas to help themselves.

The fact is that many of these areas have natural resources, strategic locations, and an available labor supply. They are ripe for new industries, but private capital is not available. In such communities local capital is normally limited and less venturesome than in places where greater prosperity prevails. Moreover, outside capital is reluctant to enter. Credit on favorable terms and at low rates of interest is needed in such communities both to develop their public facilities so as to make them more attractive to new industry and to establish new enterprises to create new jobs in the area.

I wish to emphasize, this is not a handout or a dole. This is not a relief measure. Rather, it is a program of long-term investment in repayable loans to help these areas help themselves. The Federal Government can be most helpful in assisting such communities, with the cooperation of private lending institutions and State and local governments, to raise the funds necessary to expand the economic base. A long-term loan at a low rate of interest granted by the Federal Government in some cases may be exactly the added incentive necessary for the unleashing of other private capital to develop many of these areas.

Failing to aid badly distressed areas which might recover with a little help is a waste of valuable resources. A prolonged depression in an area means the gradual disintegration of community facilities—schools, stores, hospitals, banks, office buildings, homes, churches, paved streets, sidewalks, sewer and water supply systems, and all of the community services which were acquired at great expense and which are now wasting away.

These facilities will have to be duplicated if we have a mass, wholesale migration from these areas into other areas. Moreover, a successful area redevelopment program would serve to reduce public outlays for unemployment compensation, relief, and various other forms of public assistance—payments for which no current production is received in return. It would help to replace the dole by constructive work.

The Employment Act of 1946 declares that the Federal Government should promote maximum employment. But there is a limit to the effectiveness of broad-scale programs to alleviate joblessness. Many—probably most of the cities of the United States—are not badly depressed. Moreover, a blunderbuss nationwide program to alleviate joblessness and poverty at this time, which affects all areas alike, might create inflationary pressures by causing new investments where unemployment is small.

In these cases, there would be no slack for the additional expenditures and employment opportunities to take up, and pouring new money into such areas would tend to bid up prices instead of actually increasing production.

Channeling investments into areas of high unemployment or underemployment is a different matter. Large reservoirs of idle manpower would be put to work and production would increase. This added output would offset in whole or in large part the extra monetary purchasing powers added to the industrial sector of the country, and hence cannot be called inflationary.

Thus, the area redevelopment bill will reduce unemployment and poverty where it is the worst. It will attack joblessness with carefully aimed rifle shots instead of a sawed-off shotgun. It is not a program designed to cure great industrial depressions or seasonal unemployment—and we have never claimed it to be so. But would reduce the persistent and deep pockets of unemployed workers and hence decrease so-called structural unemployment, which general monetary and fiscal policy cannot reach.

To make this problem clear to the membership, I have, as I have said, prepared charts which show the history of the high and long-term unemployment in these areas which are available at the rear of the Chamber for your inspection. If you examine these, I believe you will agree they completely refute the charge of the administration that the distress in the areas covered by S. 722 is only temporary in nature. It is clear that the problem is not a local one or a regional one, but is a national one that demands our favorable attention.

STATED REASONS FOR THE VETO ANALYZED

Let me now examine the reasons set forth by the President for this most recent veto:

First. The President states that S. 722 would "squander the Federal taxpayers' money where there is only temporary economic difficulty, curable without the special Federal assistance provided in the bill." Those are his words.

To answer this argument I have had a chart, to which I have referred, prepared, which gives the history of each of the areas presently qualified for participation under the bill.

Shown on this chart are 40 major labor market areas which would qualify under the provisions of S. 722, and 102 smaller labor market areas which would also qualify. Of the 40 major labor market areas, 11 are shown to have been so designated since 1951; 30 of these major areas have been so designated for at least 5 years, and 77 of the 102 smaller labor market areas have also been so rated for over 5 years. All of the areas designated have at least 2 years of excessive unemployment experience.

Two years of excessive unemployment can produce dire effects upon the economic base of a community. And with three-quarters of the areas, both large and small, having over 5 years of such experience, the records show that there is just no truth in the statement that the areas that would be covered by S. 722 are only temporarily in these economic difficulties.

In these 142 labor market areas, obviously there are great variations in the severity and nature of the needs. But the Administrator is not bound to give every form of assistance to every area. Under sensible administration, therefore, there is no reason to fear that areas needing only urban renewal or technical or planning assistance will "deprive" more heavily hit communities of needed loan funds, as the President charges. The President's use of the word "squander" is also ill suited to a bill in which $200 million of the $251 million authorized are in the form of repayable loans—and two of the grant programs are in the administration's own bill.

Second. The President next states that the provisions of S. 722 would "inhibit" local, State, and private initiative, and further that the 65-percent maximum Federal participation provided in the bill is too high a Federal share for an effective redevelopment program. First let us note that a lesser percentage than 65 may be granted; the 65 percent is only a maximum limitation. But some of the hardest hit areas may need that much to get started. My colleague, the minority leader, once urged upon the committee an even higher ceiling.

One has only to read the full provisions of S. 722, moreover, to see the lack of understanding of this bill by the administration. Subsection (b)(2) of section 6 specifically provides that such assistance shall be extended only to applicants which have been approved for such assistance by an agency or instrumentality of the State or political subdivision thereof in which the project to be financed is located, and which agency or instrumentality is directly concerned with problems of economic development in such State or subdivision.

In the event there is no such State or local agency, which will be the exceptional case, there is the further provision in subsection (c) of section 6 that the Administrator appoint a local redevelopment committee, but it must be composed of not less than seven residents of the area—representatives of labor, commerce, industrial, and agricultural groups and of the residents, generally, of the area, to form the basis for the redevelopment program of the area.

These are specific requirements designed to stimulate, not to stifle, local initiative. The bill recognizes that the success of redevelopment of these areas is dependent upon the will and efforts of the local citizens.

Third. The President next objects to the inclusion of the provision for Fed-

eral financing of plant machinery and equipment for the stated reason that such expenditure is "unwise and unnecessary and therefore wasteful of money that otherwise could be of real help."

This provision was included in the bill as a result of the recommendations of several witnesses who appeared during three congressional hearings conducted during 1956, 1957, and 1959, and which hearings developed 3,520 pages of hearings before three Senate committees. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee conducted the hearing in 1956, and the Senate Banking and Currency Committee conducted the subsequent hearings during 1957 and 1959. This authorization will be especially helpful where the area has available buildings and public facilities, but needs only new and different machinery.

At one point during the committee consideration in 1958, Senator Purtell, himself a manufacturer from Connecticut, strongly expressed the opinion that the inclusion of a provision for the use of funds for plant machinery and equipment was wise and necessary to do the job that needs to be done in these areas. The committee was persuaded by his argument and the other testimony before it. Surely the Administrator in his discretion will deny unneeded or unduly risky loans for this purpose. But to meet the exceptional need, the authority seems desirable—and surely is not grounds for veto.

Fourth. Objection is next made to the public facilities loan and grant program set forth in S. 722, and the President states that there is available under existing Government loan programs sufficient money to cover these needs.

The hearings developed information that in many areas, notably areas of New England, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and eastern Kentucky, where the communities are located in somewhat narrow valleys, new lands must be developed for industrial parks for industry location. A program of this type requires the development of all types of public facilities—access roads, powerlines, grading and ground clearing, sewerage systems, and water, often large requirements of water for industrial use. These facilities may be the essential key to redevelopment. I know of no Federal programs which cover all of these needs.

The President suggests the Community Facilities Administration under the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which has a general authority for loans for some of these types of public facilities. But in this administration, it is apparent that they are largely concerned with building sewerage and water systems for small communities. This in no sense meets the needs of these areas which require a variegated, sizable, and adequate provision of industry water and industrial parks. It would also take away from the desirable coordination of major redevelopment programs to have the public facilities assistance handled separately. I know of no Federal program which covers all this need.

The grant program set forth in S. 722 is also criticized. In this connection, I would like to say that the evidence before us clearly showed that unfortunately there are a number of areas in the United States which are unable to repay all the costs of loans for public facilities needed for an effective economic redevelopment program. To meet these exceptional but needy cases, grants are authorized. But S. 722 cautiously requires that the Administrator obtain from the area seeking assistance a contribution to the costs in proportion to the ability of the area to contribute.

Fifth. The President then states that the provisions for a Federal loan program for the development of our rural areas is "incongruous and unnecessary," and again states that there are in existence Federal programs, namely the Small Business Administration and the Rural Development Program, which are capable of giving the needed assistance for curing the problems of the low-income rural areas.

The problem of underemployment in our rural areas is just as great as the problem of unemployment in our industrial areas. I think it is quite clear and that the record shows that the rural development program administered by the Department of Agriculture is wholly inadequate to solve this long-term problem of our poverty-ridden rural areas. For the most part, the rural development program of the Department of Agriculture does little other than organize and counsel. It should be termed the conversation department. There has been some vague talk about increasing industrialization and nonfarm employment opportunities. But the program has no funds to implement that talk. The Small Business Administration, as shown by the hearings, is wholly ineffective in reaching a solution to this rural redevelopment problem.

We propose to help start new industries where the families of low-income farmers may be employed, and the farmers themselves may be employed in the off seasons. Of course, the Small Business Administration has virtually nothing to do with this.

It was the opinion of the Senate committee which considered this bill that a rural program as set forth in S. 722 was the most effective way to solve the problem of rural underemployment. Perhaps one of the most cogent statements made by any of the witnesses before both the House and the Senate Banking and Currency Committees was that of Mr. Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange, and I quote:

> From the long-range standpoint, it (area redevelopment legislation) could be one of the most important pieces of agricultural legislation during the 86th Congress.

I might add that the rural program set forth in the bill was also supported by the Farmers' Union.

Sixth. The sixth and last objection made by the administration is that a new Federal agency is not needed. The Department of Commerce, the President asserts, should administer the program.

This point has received much consideration and has been the subject of much debate. We decided that the Department of Commerce should not administer the proposed legislation. The major reason is that the Department of Commerce is the agency in which the principal opposition to this bill has been found, and to give Secretary Mueller the power to administer this program would be like designating a fox to take care of the chickens.

Mr. President, today we pass on the question of overriding the President's veto. I do not think the administration has been wholly forthright in dealing with this issue.

The bill before the Senate is a broad bill which seeks to provide a number of ways of meeting this widespread, long-term economic blight that exists in the United States. The unemployment fact gathering of the Department of Labor, the vocational training programs of the Department of Labor, and the subsistence retraining payment program, all suggest a definite interest of the Department of Labor in administering some phases of the bill. The rural program set forth in the bill is foreign to the functioning of the Department of Commerce. But the most basic reason why the program should not be under its jurisdiction is the unsympathetic if not downright hostile attitude displayed by the Department of Commerce through these last 5 years toward redevelopment of these areas in the broad sense.

The stated grounds for the President's veto thus are without foundation in reason or in fact. When coupled, as they are, with renewed expressions of interest in some affirmative action—affirmative action which the veto, however, seeks to block and which the administration has steadily fought—these appeals of the President are contradictory and confusing.

Only Congress by a reaffirmation of its support for an effective program, with enlarged majorities, can give the clear lead that is essential to the meeting of this problem.

Let me turn briefly to some of the main, affirmative reasons why we should enact S. 722, notwithstanding the veto.

HOW MUCH DOUBLETALK CAN THE PEOPLE TAKE?

Each year the President has asked for an area redevelopment program, and each time when Congress passes such a bill the President vetoes it on one pretext or another.

His callous acts as compared with his soul-warming and solicitous words reminds me of Lewis Carroll's story of the walrus and the carpenter who lured a multitude of oysters into taking a little walk with them along the beach and then after some pleasant and soothing talk, proceeded to eat them all up.

> "I weep for you," the Walrus said;
> "I deeply sympathize."
> With sobs and tears, he sorted out
> Those of the largest size,
> Holding his pocket handkerchief
> Before his streaming eyes.

The hypocrisy of the walrus is well paralleled by the hypocrisy of the administration in dealing with this measure.

ARE WE TO HAVE MINORITY RULE? IS THE PRESIDENT TO BECOME THE LEGISLATURE AS WELL?

There is another principle involved in our action on this bill. It is whether we are to substitute minority for majority rule in this country. The President has boasted that through the veto, as long as he can command one more than a third of the votes in either House, he can stop anything the majority of the Nation, expressing themselves through their representatives, want, or dictate the terms of any legislation which is passed.

He has already vetoed the water pollution bill under these conditions, and he has twice vetoed this area redevelopment bill. He vetoed the housing bill twice, and has threatened to do it again this year, and he has the ax poised in a similar position for any school aid bill.

This is an assertion of minority rather than of majority rule.

Under the strict terms of the Constitution, the President, of course, has the power to do this. But is it wise and in the interest of the Nation, and in the interest of national unity for him to carry out this policy.

The President and his followers are demanding the most rigid obedience to their will and tactics in the field of foreign affairs. Even the most reasonable criticism of methods is bitterly resented and denounced as unpatriotic.

I believe that history will record that never has an opposition party holding the majority of Congress been so understanding and so cooperative in its relationships with a President of the opposite political faith than we Democrats have been during the last 7½ years. One need only to compare our behavior with that of the Republicans toward Woodrow Wilson in 1919–20, and toward Franklin D. Roosevelt from 1935 to 1945, and throughout the Truman administration, when an eminent Republican led the pack in referring to the Korean war as "Truman's war." The contrast is almost one between daylight and darkness.

Not only does the administration demand that we follow them to the last comma and numeral on foreign policy and foreign aid, but they resent and attack any suggestion from us as to how they might carry out those policies in a better fashion.

The bitter words which have been uttered by them during the last few days indicate that they would put a figurative gag in the mouth of every prominent Democrat who, although not questioning their motives, criticizes their competence.

COOPERATION SHOULD BE A TWO-WAY STREET

We are willing to cooperate in the field of foreign policy for the sake of national unity. I believe we have done that, and we will continue to do so. We will continue to cooperate. However, cooperation is a two-way street. It is a reciprocal affair. Should not the administration in turn cooperate with us in domestic affairs, instead of repeatedly trying to impose its will in the smallest degree in these matters as well as in foreign affairs? We have tried to meet the administration halfway. We have cut the total amounts included from $379 million to $251 million, or by $138 million. We eliminated the authorization for bond issues in order to require later appropriations. Apparently that is not enough. The President now demands complete and final submission. He wants to be the legislature as well as the Executive. He wants to prevent the majority from legislating, by the free use of his veto, and to heap scorn upon us, for partisan effect, that we have not accomplished much and have not passed much legislation. If he would cooperate we could pass the legislation but his stubborn vetoes are making this impossible.

The dignity of the legislative branch alone demands that we override the veto. But more than the dignity of the legislative branch is involved. The welfare of the Nation is involved, and that demands that we put into the hands of the unemployed the means for them to go back to ployed the means for them to go back to

The President of the United States is insisting that we spend billions of dollars for foreign aid, and in great detail. I have in my hand a list of some of the projects which have been compiled by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. This book, which I hold in my hand, weighs 6 pounds 4 ounces. The projects are listed in great detail. They are in nearly every country of the world. The President is saying, "Do not cut a single cent from these foreign projects." Yet he refuses to permit a more-work program to go into effect for the people of this Nation.

I say for the sake of our dignity and for the sake of the country and for the sake of the people of the United States, we should override the veto.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Illinois. He is the author of the depressed areas concept. He carried the first depressed areas bill satisfactorily through the Senate, only to see it die in the House of Representatives. He carried the second depressed areas bill successfully through the Senate. It passed the House. Then it was vetoed. He undauntedly and untiringly arose again to lead in the passage through the Senate of a third bill, a better bill than the one the President has vetoed.

I congratulate him for his indomitable will and his strong feeling of urgent need to help those unfortunate people who are without jobs through no fault of their own. I only wish that his efforts had been more successful. However, he who fights and runs away will live to fight another day.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not running away.

Mr. CLARK. No. However, we can see the handwriting on the wall. To not let this matter be entirely serious, I notice that the Senator quoted from Lewis Carroll. In that connection I wonder if he does not recall these lines also from Lewis Carroll's "Through the Looking Glass," as appropriate and quite pertinent to the mess which the administration has created during 7 years of inaction in dealing with depressed areas. I am sure the Senator from Illinois will recall these lines:

> "If seven maids with seven mops
> Should sweep for half a year,
> Do you suppose," the Walrus said,
> "That they could get it clear?"
> "I doubt it," said the Carpenter,
> And shed a bitter tear.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to thank my friend from Pennsylvania for his comment, which I do not deserve but which I appreciate. Ever since the Senator from Pennsylvania has joined the Senate, no one has been more faithful or more determined in pushing for the passage of a good bill as has the Senator from Pennsylvania. He deserves as much credit as I do in this whole matter.

Mr. CLARK. Would that it were true, but it is not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I rise in support of the effort to override the veto. I do so without much hope of success, but I think it is worth while to at least make the record of how many Senators disagree with the President in his veto message.

I do not even know if it will turn out to be a majority. I hope it will be a substantial majority. I am afraid it will not be the necessary two-thirds majority. However, I concur in the judgment of my colleagues that it is worth making the effort, anyway.

Let me point out that the bill which we are trying to pass, notwithstanding the action of the President, is not nearly so good a bill as the one which passed the Senate a year ago. It goes further in meeting the President's untenable objections than the bill we passed. Yet when all things are considered, it is clearly a better bill than no bill at all.

I should like to deal with the six unsound reasons given by the President of the United States for vetoing the bill. He says, first:

> S. 722 would squander the Federal taxpayers' money where there is only temporary economic difficulty.

Yet it is clear to the most casual observer that the bill does not provide 1 cent of money. How can the taxpayers' money be squandered when the bill does not call for an appropriation? Actually, one of the defects in the House bill was that it required appropriations for the loan funds instead of permitting them to be financed through borrowing from the Treasury. I think any junior high school student would know that the President was wrong when he said an authorization bill would squander the taxpayers' money. Surely a man cannot have served for 7 years in the White House and be unaware of the distinction between an authorization bill and an appropriation bill. Equally clear, if the President believes the bill calls for too much of an authorization, all he has to do is either to propose a smaller appropriation or not spend the money if Congress ignores his will. So the first reason given by the President is clearly untenable.

Second, he says that Federal participation up to 65 percent on industrial projects as a loan is excessive. Yet, again, this is not a requirement; it is a ceiling. The administrator appointed by the President would not have to make a loan of more than 5 percent, if he did not want to. The 65-percent ceiling, in my judgment, was desirable, as anyone who has taken the trouble to travel through the depressed areas, which the President has not done, would know.

So it should be equally clear to a student in high school that the objection to a 65-percent limit is not tenable, because 65 percent is not a requirement; it is a ceiling. Again, the President's own administrator could determine how far it was desired to have Federal participation go.

The President's third objection is to the inclusion of loans for machinery and equipment, in addition to lands and buildings. This provision he thought unwise and unnecessary. Again, this provision is not a directive; it is merely an authorization. Again, the President's own administrator could determine not to make a single loan for machinery and equipment, if he did not want to make it. Anyone who has traveled through the depressed areas of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky which the President has not done will realize the critical condition of the economies in those communities, and will, I believe, conclude that there will be many cases where loans on machinery and equipment would be not only wise but also sound. But, in any case, they would not have to be made.

So I say again that any junior high school student who studied the President's veto message carefully would see that there is no merit in the President's third objection.

The President's fourth objection is that loans for public facilities are unnecessary because such assistance is available under another program. That is not true. The community facilities program has run out of money. True, the President has asked us to replenish it, but there is no priority in that program for areas of heavy unemployment that would have been helped under this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I have 3 additional minutes?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as I have said, the funds for loans for public facilities are not now available. Certainly the President must know this. Certainly he must also know that even if he got the funds he has requested, through the authorization process and then through the appropriation process, for the Federal loans for public facilities, there is no authority which is meaningful to assist depressed areas. Therefore, I believe that any reasonably intelligent teen-age boy or girl would recognize that this objection of the President is simply untenable.

Fifth, the President says that provisions for loans for the industrial development of rural areas are incongruous and unnecessary. I suggest that the President has not stopped shooting quail long enough to go out and look at some of the rural areas close to where the big plantations of some of his Republican friends are located, where the desperate need and the poverty-stricken condition of their inhabitants, together with their inability to obtain an income from the produce of their farms sufficient to support themselves in any standard of decency, constitute a shocking national disgrace.

Therefore, I say that anyone, regardless of his age, who undertakes to study this objection must come to the same conclusion: that the President's fifth reason for vetoing the bill is wrong.

Finally, the President objects to the creation of a new Federal agency. He says it is not needed and would delay the program. In this case, perhaps, theoretically, one could make a strong case for the President. Actually, there would not be any more employees. There would have to be the same number of employees if the program were conducted in an existing agency. There would be no saving to the taxpayer by having the program administered by the Department of Commerce. I believe most people in the administration know why a new agency was proposed in the bill. It was done because the whole administration, from the Secretary of Commerce through the Secretary of the Treasury to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget—and all down the line—is publicly opposed to any program of this kind. If it were placed in the Department of Commerce, that Department would kill the program. That is why a new agency was proposed.

However, there will be a new administration in January, and there will be a new Secretary of Commerce. I hope he will have a little more compassion in his soul than his predecessors had.

If this were the only objection to the bill, we might be able to meet the President on the ground that, organizationally speaking, this arrangement might be satisfactory.

So I think it must be abundantly clear that none of these six reasons given by the President for vetoing the bill would convince even a reasonably intelligent adolescent who wanted to study the problem.

I turn now, briefly, to that double standard, of which the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Alaska have spoken so eloquently on the floor during the past few weeks. It is all right to take care of the depressed areas in Ceylon, in Formosa, in Vietnam, in India, and elsewhere. That is all right; it is patriotic. But to take care of people in the United States is socialistic and wrong. The cynical nature of this untenable position must be clear to all Americans.

I shall vote for the foreign aid program, in view of the current world crisis in world affairs. I shall vote for every cent the President asks for the foreign aid program. However, I believe it is utterly indefensible to say at the same time that we will not do anything for American citizens because of an alleged "squandering" of taxpayers' money particularly at a time when no real effort has as yet been made to bring in the billions of dollars of additional revenue which are available through adequate tax enforcement and for closeup of iniquitous tax loopholes.

Finally, let me speak about the President's somewhat—well, I will not use the adjective of which I was thinking. Let me talk about his profound hope that sound new legislation will be promptly enacted.

I do not want to question anybody's motivation, but, again, I think it is abundantly clear that any reasonably intelligent high school youngster would know that there will be no new legislation on this subject enacted at this session of Congress. Why? Because it is not possible to get one Republican vote in the House Rules Committee to report a bill in that body. Two conservative Democrats and the four northern Republicans are ganging up together to make it impossible to pass any bill of this kind in the House.

I see my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] on his feet. If he thinks I am not right, let him go over to the body, where he served with such distinction, and get a bill passed in the House. Then I will undertake, with the help of my friend from Illinois, to help get it passed over here. Let us not kid ourselves. It is the Republican Party in the House, headed by CHARLEY HALLECK, which is preventing the bill from going through that body at this session of Congress.

I take it my colleague [Mr. SCOTT] desires to speak on the subject, so I yield to him.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I should like to have some time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I understand that my colleague [Mr. CLARK] has yielded the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Yes. I thought my colleague wished to ask me a question.

Mr. SCOTT. I should like to direct a question to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

I think it extremely unfortunate that we inject politics into this issue, because the senior Senator from Pennsylvania and myself are arguing for the same thing.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, my colleague feels that way about the colloquy on yesterday also; does he not?

Mr. SCOTT. I shall confine my remarks to today's colloquy.

I said that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and I are arguing for the same thing, namely, for the passage of an effective bill to aid

depressed areas and to relieve the problem of chronic unemployment. To me, the unemployed are not to be considered as either Republicans or Democrats. Instead, they are to be considered as unemployed.

Mr. CLARK. Unfortunately, most of them are Democrats.

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly, the passage of a bill to aid the unemployed is desperately needed.

With that fact in mind, my colleague has referred to my 16 years of service in the other body, some of it on the Rules Committee. He knows very well that if I were presently a Member of the House and a member of its Rules Committee, my vote would be in favor of a distressed areas bill.

Mr. CLARK. I am sure it would.

Mr. SCOTT. But in my considered opinion, my colleague has gone a little too far, as he is sometimes tempted to do—because he is an earnest and extroverted and intelligent gentleman—in suggesting that the present minority members of the House Rules Committee would automatically vote against any depressed areas bill.

Mr. CLARK. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. SCOTT. One moment, please.

I would suggest that the administration bill, which was sent here, and was introduced in this body and in the other body, was introduced in the other body, at the direction of the minority leader, by Representative WIDNALL, of New Jersey; and it bears the stamp of the approval of the administration. Although it is not, in the opinion of either Senator from Pennsylvania, precisely what we would like, I have no doubt that the minority members of the House Rules Committee would lend the necessary support to the reporting of that bill to the floor of the House. It would be my hope that in so doing, it would come under an open rule, and therefore would be subject to amendment.

But I do hope the senior Senator from Pennsylvania will revert to the position which both he and I have heretofore taken, namely, that the important thing is to get a bill. I am going to ask for hearings on my own bill and on the administration bill and on any other bills which may be introduced by Members on that side of the aisle; and I am prepared to support any bill that we can get out of committee, if the bill is pointed toward the areas of need.

I ask the senior Senator from Pennsylvania whether he is prepared to make as comprehensive a statement as that.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the calm, judicious, and nonpolitical approach made by my distinguished junior colleague moves me, as it always does. Needless to say, I would support any meaningful bill, and would stand, if not shoulder to shoulder, at least at arm's length with my colleague from Pennsylvania in working to get such a bill through.

But, again, I say to my good friend that the place to get that done is in the other body; and I urge my good friend to use his good offices, as a former Member of the other body, with the quarreling factions over there, so we can get from the House a bill which we can accept over here, instead of going through the futile gesture of having the Senate pass a bill, and then have it die in the House of Representatives because the Rules Committee will not support it.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as a former Member of the other body, let me say that when one leaves that body and makes the journey down the long corridor to this body, he often is regarded in the other body as a stranger far from home, and does not have in that body any exceptional influence—and perhaps not in this body, either.

Mr. President, I rise to do something which I very much dislike to do, because I am caught between my loyalty to the President and my conviction that something must be done for the unemployed.

I do not accept the suggestion of my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] that there is any absence of compassion on the part of the administration or the officers of the Cabinet. The Secretary of Labor, Mr. Mitchell, has visited the areas in Pennsylvania, and has indicated that he is aware of the problem, and that he fully supports as considerable aid as can possibly be obtained by the Congress to the depressed areas; and a committee headed by the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Ray, has reached the same conclusion.

The fact that the President has compassion for these areas makes it almost incredible that anyone would suggest that President Eisenhower is not a compassionate man. His compassion has been demonstrated long before those who now make the most noise about the problem became aroused in the interest of this cause.

On several occasions the President announced that he would support and would approve a bill which would meet the needs of the depressed areas, which are concentrated largely in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, southern Illinois, Kentucky, and parts of Massachusetts.

The difficulty was that in the other body, in presenting such a bill, the House Members went far beyond the criteria employed in the Senate bill which had been passed by the Senate, after being introduced by my friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and also went far beyond the criteria set forth in the bill which was offered here as an amendment, but was not accepted; and the House increased the number of regions to which such assistance theoretically would have been applicable.

Without impugning the motives of anyone, I think that in order to secure a broad area of support for the bill, elements of the pork barrel or the grab bag may have entered into the final bill which went to the President.

The President has submitted another bill.

Assuming that the veto will not be overridden today, I now urge that hearings be held on the President's message, which does go to meet these criteria and these needs; that hearings be held on the bills which may be introduced by Members on the other side of the aisle; and that hearings be held on the Scott bill, which is Senate bill 3568.

I believe that this body and the other body have equal obligations. I believe it is incorrect to say that the only way to get a bill is to have the other body act on it. The other body will have an opportunity to act following the introduction of the bill and its passage through the ordinary procedures. But, in my judgment, if the will exists on the part of both parties over there, we shall get a bill from the House.

Meanwhile, we should not wait and listen to the counsels of futility, which indicate that it is too late to get a bill. It is not too late for either body to take some action on things the people need and on a measure the President has requested. After all, it has not been too late for this body to indulge in all manner of oratory on all manner of subjects.

It is high time for us to get down to an agreement with the President on a bill which will meet the needs of the needy.

I have said that I am torn between my loyalty to the President and my conviction that something for the unemployed must be done. I think it is fairly well known that I got quite a few delegates for the President in 1952, at the convention—delegates greater in number than those represented by many a State. I think it is pretty well known that I love the President and that I support him wholeheartedly in matters of foreign policy, and usually in matters of domestic policy.

But on this issue, I wish to make crystal clear the fact that my support——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 additional minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as I was about to say, I wish to make crystal clear the point that on this issue my support of depressed areas legislation can be made manifest here only by voting to override the President's veto.

This bill, as the President has rightly said, has many faults. This bill, which the President has vetoed, would give less assistance to the unemployed people of my State of Pennsylvania than my $200 million amendment would have given. It would even give less assistance than the $50-odd million bill first introduced by the administration. And that has not yet been successfully controverted by anyone.

Therefore, in passing a bill which was in effect a pork-barrel measure, the sponsors of the bill defeated the purpose of depressed areas legislation. And because they did, and because we must fight this issue out, and because I want my record to be clear, and not because I question the accuracy of the President's reasons, or the factuality of the President's reasons for vetoing the bill, but because I want to make it clear I have gone as far as I can on this bill to get out a good bill, I shall do as I have stated.

Then, when the veto is sustained, as, in my judgment, it will be, I am going to renew my efforts to get a good bill. In my judgment, we can get one, and get it without resort to politics. We do not need political references because, if the bill is passed, the people of the areas involved are going to know it has got to be passed with the support of both parties. The Democratic Party has a two-thirds majority in both Houses. However, the situation being what it is, the support of my party is essential to the passage of a good bill, and that support should be forthcoming.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? If he does not have enough time, I shall get some time if it is needed. I have asked the Senator to yield at that point because I am interested in the question of whether any Republican should vote to override. I voted for the bill, and naturally, to be consistent, I would, in the normal course, vote to override. I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if he agrees with me that the reason why this matter is before us today is solely to make it a political issue, because everybody knows the veto is not going to be overridden. The theory is to say, "Well, the President did the wrong thing," in view of the fact that the administration has put in a bill now to get the legislative process started all over again, which the Senator from Illinois introduced, and of which I am a co-sponsor.

Is it not a fact that Republicans who voted for the bill and who vote to override the President's veto are affirming the fact that we are for depressed areas legislation, and that we are not allowing ourselves to become strictly partisan, and that we intend to follow through to get such legislation, therefore getting some of the political heat out of the issue on the question of overriding the President's veto?

Mr. SCOTT. I will say to the Senator from New York that if some of the Republicans wished to gain the maximum political advantage, the thing to do would be to vote to sustain the President's veto, to assert unequivocally that we support the position taken by the President without reservation, and then turn to the majority party and say, "You are wrong and you must bear full responsibility."

I think, on the other hand, when we feel it necessary to vote against action taken by our President, we indicate that we wish to keep the issue alive on a bipartisan basis, and that it is our duty to insist on hearings, rather than to do nothing and let this become a political issue.

Both the Senator from New York and I are aware of the fact that there are people who would prefer to have issues rather than laws. One of those people certainly is not the majority leader of this body, who has consistently asserted—and I agree with him—that the important thing is to get legislation rather than political issues. If we are going to play this straight down the line on the basis that the unemployed need help, in my opinion we are pursuing the right path.

Mr. JAVITS. Would another point served by a vote in favor of overriding be the fact that those who supported the bill know that a bill which involves approximately $250 million comes a lot nearer the mark, considering what needs to be done, than the measure proposed by the administration, starting with something in the neighborhood of $60 million?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes. The administration proposed something on the order of $55 million or $57 million. It is now proposing an ultimate expenditure of something like $180 million.

Mr. JAVITS. That is much nearer the mark; is it not?

Mr. SCOTT. That is much nearer the mark. I introduced a bill which would provide for the expenditure of in the neighborhood of $100 million, and on that I wish to have something to say.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on Friday last I introduced without comment a new area redevelopment bill, S. 3568. At that time the Senate was working under a consent agreement which precluded a discussion of my bill.

At this point I desire to include a brief explanation of the bill and give the reasons for its introduction. I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD, following my remarks, a comparison of the area redevelopment bill as vetoed, with revisions incorporated in S. 3568.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD following my remarks an editorial from the Harrisburg Sunday Patriot-News of May 15, 1960; an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer; an article from the Harrisburg Patriot of May 19, 1960; an article from the same newspaper of Saturday, May 14, 1960; and an article from the same paper of May 13, 1960.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, ever since becoming a Member of the Senate, I have been identified with legislation to secure relief for economically distressed areas in my State, and others similarly situated, where persistent unemployment and drying up of financial resources are of many years' duration.

When S. 722 was still in the Senate, and while it was delayed in the House Rules Committee, I urged that we enact a reasonable bill and one that would have a chance of avoiding veto. Efforts were made in the House, and by myself in the Senate, to substitute a revised version, prior to final action on S. 722.

The bill I introduced on Friday is another effort in this direction, in that it would meet the principal objections set forth in the President's veto message of May 13.

There is invitation and encouragement in the President's message to reintroduce a new bill on which the Congress and the Executive can agree.

Whether or not we can agree on all of the points at issue, I am sure most of us would rather see a revised bill acted upon than no bill at all. The latter would serve only our own annoyance or chagrin, and not the welfare of the people whom we try to serve.

There seems to me not much politics to be made out of the misfortune and misery of our fellow citizens.

I was not advised of the second administration distressed area bill presented. Perhaps if those of us who have fought for area redevelopment legislation—and that goes for those on both sides of the aisle—had been brought into the discussion of a compromise measure, the Scott-Van Zandt bill would not have been introduced; but a compromise between the administration bill and the Scott-Van Zandt bill might have been agreed upon.

However, I am inclined to feel that S. 3568 is the better of the two bills and that it offers a solution which will be acceptable to many of my colleagues. I point out that it relates directly to the areas in need and that the aid could be given promptly. The bill in large part would meet the President's objections to the other bills. I urge it be given prompt attention by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, of which my colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, is a member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 more minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I hope that my colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, with his active interest in this proposed legislation and his influence as a member of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, will in good part and in total absence of politics urge that hearings be held, as adequately as may be needed, on the administration bill and on any other bill which may be introduced, including the Scott bill. I assure my colleague I am prepared to testify at any time, and I am prepared to support any reasonable bill which will help to solve the problems of unemployment in Pennsylvania, in West Virginia, in southern Illinois, in Massachusetts or in Kentucky.

Every effort will be made by my colleagues in the House, I am sure, to secure similar action upon a companion measure.

Mr. President, in conclusion I make one more plea. I plead that we try to avoid politics on this issue. I am not a candidate for election in the coming election. Neither is the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. We are both, however, concerned and compassionate, I am sure, when the needs of Pennsylvanians are concerned. Those needs have been

too long neglected. Those needs have been neglected by both bodies of the Congress, despite repeated requests of the President of the United States for compassionate action.

If we are to act, there is ample control in both bodies, through the leadership and through the committee system, to see that an adequate bill is presented. I do not insist upon my bill. I do not insist upon the administration bill. I do not insist upon any one bill. I simply point out that if no bill is sent to the President reasonably along the lines he has suggested, the fault will be that of those who do not support the proposed legislation, no matter what may be their party and no matter in which House they may serve.

I thank the distinguished minority leader for yielding me the time.

EXHIBIT 1

Comparison of area redevelopment bills

Subject	S. 722 as passed and vetoed	S. 3568, H.R. 12290, H.R. 12291, and H.R. 12298
1. Organization	Separate Area Redevelopment Administration	Department of Commerce, with Administrator having Secretary status.
2. Division of redevelopment areas	Administrator to designate industrial and rural areas of persistent unemployment and underemployment.	Industrial areas only. No industrial loans for rural areas. (NOTE.—Technical assistance available to rural.)
3. Revolving fund loans:		
Industrial	$75,000,000	$75,000,000. (Reference to purchase of machinery removed.)
Rural	$75,000,000	None.
Public facilities	$50,000,000	$25,000,000.
4. Federal participation in loans	65 percent	35 percent (and not less than 15 percent participation by State, Agency, or instrumentality).
5. Maximum loan period	40 years	25 years.
6. Grants for public facilities	$35,000,000	None.
7. Retraining subsistence payments	$10,000,000	$5,000,000.
8. Vocational training grants	$1,500,000	No funds specified. Secretary of Labor to determine needs. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide through existing institutions.
9. Technical assistance	$4,500,000	$3,000,000 (also available to rural areas).
10. Criteria of unemployment	At least 6 percent at time of application, and 12 percent for 12 months preceding, or 9 percent for 15 of 18 months preceding, or 6 percent for 18 of 24 months preceding.	An average of 6 percent, excluding seasonal, throughout qualifying period, and 50 percent above national average for 4 out of 5 preceding years; or 75 percent above national average for 3 out of 4 years preceding; or 100 percent above national average for 2 out of 3 years preceding.
11. Interest on loans	Maximum permitted 2⅞ percent	To be determined by Secretary based on going rates.
12. Cost	$251,000,000	$108,000,000.
13. Urban areas that may qualify for Federal assistance under these two proposals: [1]		
Major	40 areas	16 areas.
Smaller	103 areas	48 areas.

[1] Estimated upon current unemployment figures by Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor.

EXHIBIT 2

"NO" A SECOND TIME, ALAS

The $251 million depressed area bill, vetoed by President Eisenhower, is not nearly as bad as he made it out. It is, as Mr. Eisenhower's Secretary of Labor, James M. Mitchell, pointed out in a speech at Scranton less than 24 hours before the veto a bill "good enough so that any Senator or Congressman from a State with areas of chronic unemployment would have no alternative but vote for it"—even though it might not be exactly what the individual Senators and Representatives might want.

Secretary Mitchell spoke before an audience of prominent Scranton business and industrial leaders who had worked long and hard for passage of the depressed area bill and who had then appealed to President Eisenhower to sign it. The Secretary's audience was made up of members of the Scranton Chamber of Commerce. (Perhaps it hadn't been emphasized nearly enough that the chambers of commerce at the State and National levels are speaking strictly for themselves, and not especially for the organizations with the same name back in the home communities when, with such great fanfares of publicity, they brand a program of Federal loans and aid for depressed areas as such a terrible thing.)

What the President has done—again—is done.

It is probably impossible for the depressed area bill to be passed over his veto, in either House or Senate, although the majority Democrats probably will go through the motions just for the tremendous political talking point it will give them in the presidential-congressional campaign. For the same reasons the Republicans, too, will go through the motions of trying to get action on a new compromise bill that is somewhere in between the inadequate Eisenhower administration bill and the program the President rejected. With less than 2 months to go and with the makeup of this Congress what it is, it is doubtful that a new depressed area loan-aid bill can be achieved the second time around. Just the same, Republican Senator SCOTT and Republican Representative VAN ZANDT deserve all the "good luck" wishes they can get as they make the attempt. They deserve, too, the support of Pennsylvania's Democratic Congressmen, who, we are sure, are willing to put party partisanship second and Pennsylvania first on this issue. Pennsylvania, with its chronic unemployment, has a bigger stake in the depressed area legislation than any other single bill that will come before this Congress.

The President, when he gets back home, might support his own Republican Pennsylvania Congressmen—for a change—on this issue. When the Van Zandt-Scott bill is unveiled, the least the President can do is announce publicly whether he's for it or against it.

Secretary Mitchell, after getting a first-hand look at what Pennsylvania's depressed communities have been doing to help themselves, started out his Scranton speech this way:

"One thing I learned today is not to have a preconceived notion about an area. As a result of today, my point of view with relation to Scranton and the people in it has caused me to tear up my prepared speech."

It is a pity it was not the President instead who made the excursion into Pennsylvania's depressed areas. If he had, Mr. Eisenhower probably would have torn up his veto message.

TIME YET FOR AID TO DEPRESSED AREAS

Introduction of two new measures to provide Federal aid for redevelopment of economically depressed areas gives grounds for hope that in spite of politics something may yet be done by Congress this year to meet this urgent need.

President Eisenhower was right in vetoing the $251 million measure railroaded through Congress by legislators who for the most part were motivated by political considerations. It was an extravagant proposal, which could have opened the way to inexcusable waste, and probably would have been opposed by many of those who voted for it if there had been any real prospect of its becoming law.

The administration's move to introduce a new bill that would cost about $70 million less than the one vetoed, and a still less expensive proposal by three Pennsylvania Republicans, Senator HUGH SCOTT, and Representatives JAMES E. VAN ZANDT and JOHN P. SAYLOR, offer a sounder basis for providing help.

In many areas, this rates as the No. 1 problem. It is certainly high on the list in Pennsylvania, including not only such areas as Pottsville, Uniontown-Connellsville, Wilkes-Barre-Hazelton, and others, but Philadelphia as well.

The revelation the other day that even though job opportunities are high in this city, the relief rolls are more overburdened than ever, showing the longrun gravity of the problem. It isn't only that new industries must be found in regions where old ones have succumbed but that hundreds of thousands of workers whose old jobs have been eliminated by modern technology must be retrained; and that equally large numbers of totally unskilled jobless must be shown how to make themselves useful.

This is not a temporary economic difficulty. It is one, in fact, that could become increasingly burdensome to a vast number of communities as the pace of technological progress accelerates, unless a systematic program to speed retraining is set up.

In that respect, the administration measure could be strengthened by recognition that the needs of those being retrained must be met somehow until they are competent to find new employment. On one point those supporting the original depressed areas bill are right; it is as important for the United States to deal fairly with its own distressed as it is with those in lands overseas.

Congress should not let politics interfere with this responsibility.

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot, May 19, 1960]

TWO AREA AID BILLS SUBMITTED BY GOP

(By Milton Jaques)

WASHINGTON.—Two Republican compromise area redevelopment bills were introduced in Congress Wednesday in a move to get action after President Eisenhower's veto last week of a $251 million measure.

The administration picked a New Jersey Congressman to offer a bill which asked $180 million, while three Pennsylvanians, led by Senator HUGH SCOTT, presented a $108 million program designed to meet White House objections. Previously the administration had held to a $53 million limit.

There was momentary confusion when the Pennsylvanians were confronted with the so-called administration bill at the same time they were going ahead with their own attempt at compromise. They had been given no advance warning that the $180 million bill was on its way.

Democrats had no immediate comment on compromise efforts in the wake of the President's stern rejection May 13 of their aid program.

The House meantime, Wednesday, was embroiled in the educational bill debate, with no prospects for an attempt to override the President's veto or to consider a new bill for area redevelopment.

In the House, Republicans JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Altoona, and JOHN P. SAYLOR, Johnstown, introduced the Scott compromise version.

VAN ZANDT said he did not object to the administration bill but thought it would have been better for administration forces to consult with veteran backers of area redevelopment and with the Democratic leadership in the committees handling such legislation.

"It just shows the lack of political understanding of these (administration) people downtown," VAN ZANDT said.

"But the $180 million indicates the administration is weakening as far as the amount of money is concerned," he said.

VAN ZANDT said if a program is finally enacted it will come only through compromise "because the Democrats can't override the President's veto." It takes a two-thirds vote to override.

VAN ZANDT indicated his bill would not be necessary if the administration and the leadership of both Houses "could work out a bill acceptable to the President."

"They're playing politics with distressed areas," he charged, "and it's not going to satisfy these people who are living on surplus commodities."

Both the administration's version and that drafted by the Pennsylvanians are similar on provisions for administering and allocating Federal aid to community industrial redevelopment projects.

The administration bill, introduced by Representative WILLIAM WIDNALL, Republican, a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, includes an additional $100 million authorization to be used by the housing and home finance agency for public facility loans to cities.

The loans would help hard-hit communities with industrial plant construction or "refurbishing" utilities and streets serving industrial sites.

Representative IVOR D. FENTON, Mahanoy City Republican and dean of the GOP State delegation, said he would support either bill "as long as it has a chance of becoming law."

The bills were referred to the House Banking and Currency Committee where a spokesman indicated they faced a chilly outlook.

One of the major differences between the Eisenhower administration's aid program and that passed by Congress is choice of agency for running it. The administration wants the Commerce Department to handle the program, while Congress sought a new agency similar to the HHFA.

The Scott-Saylor-Van Zandt bill includes $75 million for industrial loans and $25 million for public facility loans. It removes Federal aid for purchase of machinery to which the President objected in his veto message.

It also carries $5 million for subsistence for jobless workers during retraining, $1.5 million for vocation training and $3 million for technical assistance to depressed areas seeking new industries.

STATE DEPRESSED AREAS DEPEND ON WHOSE LIST YOU HAPPEN TO READ

(By George Draut)

When are the depressed areas in Pennsylvania under terms of the $251-million loan-aid bill just vetoed by President Eisenhower?

It depends upon whose list you accept.

The hard-hit coal communities are on everybody's list.

One list reports President Eisenhower's farm is in the "depressed area" of Adams County.

LISTS DON'T JIBE

The U.S. Labor Department has issued one tabulation at Washington.

The Pennsylvania Labor and Industry Department has issued another one here.

They don't jibe.

Various Congressmen involved in the controversy don't agree either.

There's even disagreement on whether Philadelphia and York of the State's main labor market areas would have qualified for depressed area aid under the Democratic bill, with unemployment of more than 6 percent for 18 of the last 24 months.

Yes, says the Labor Department at Washington.

No, says Labor-Industry here.

SEASONAL FACTORS

Philadelphia had 6.6 percent unemployment at last report and York had 6.5 percent, but this was due to "temporary and seasonal factors," the bad weather of March and April which held down construction employment, a Labor-Industry spokesman said. Both areas were under the 6 percent break point last year and probably will be again when this month's report is completed, he added.

But at nearby Scranton on Thursday night, Labor Secretary Mitchell declared in a speech:

"The most obvious fault with this present bill is the broadness of criteria for identifying areas that qualify for loan assistance. Certainly Scranton should not be in competition with New York or Philadelphia for Federal funds. Under the present criteria, that situation could easily occur because of a temporary, seasonal shift in monthly employment figures."

DIFFERENCE IN BILLS

President Eisenhower bore down heavily on the same theme in his veto message. He scored the most striking defect of the bill this way: "It would make eligible for Federal assistance areas that don't need it—thus providing less help for communities in genuine need than would the administration's proposal."

In Pennsylvania, the Democratic bill covered seven more areas than the administration proposal on the Labor-Industry Department tabulations. The seven: Pittsburgh labor market of Allegheny, Washington, Beaver, and Westmoreland Counties; Indiana County, Oil City-Franklin-Titusville, Sharon-Farrell, St. Marys-Emporium, Williamsport, and Wellsboro.

NEW AREAS

That leaves 30 Pennsylvania areas both bills would have included, Labor-Industry statistics show. For the first time, this listing includes as depressed areas, eligible for aid under administration or Democratic plans, these midstate districts:

Gettysburg and Adams County.

Marysville-Newport (Perry County).

Chambersburg-Waynesboro (Franklin and Fulton Counties).

Huntingdon County.

Labor-Industry refused to disclose the unemployment statistics upon which these tentative depressed area classifications are based. A spokesman argued it would only confuse the public and if they were made public for one area, all of the areas in the State would demand the same information.

OTHERS IN GROUP

Fifteen of the thirty-seven areas named by Labor-Industry as depressed on a tentative determination made on a basis of insured unemployment rates are in this "you'll just have to take our word for it" group. Others are: Bedford, Clarion, Forest City-Montrose, Punxsutawney, Tunkhannock, Waynesburg, Coudersport, Dushore-Laporte, Honesdale, Wellsboro, and Lehighton-Palmerton.

None of them are covered in regular labor market surveys and reports, but the percentage of covered workers drawing unemployment compensation is available for each place. It is this information which Labor-Industry refuses to announce. Total unemployment also includes the jobless who are not eligible for jobless benefits, and this is projected conservatively by adding 1 percent to the cold fact UC jobless total.

OTHERS ON ALL LISTS

The President's home county of Adams has substantially more than 6 percent unemployment right now, the Labor-Industry Department spokesman said, but he refused to reveal what "substantially" is.

It would take a month to 2 months to officially classify any of the areas, he reported.

Other areas of the State, besides those already mentioned, which are classified by all lists as depressed: Scranton, Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, Pottsville, Uniontown-Connellsville, Erie, Johnstown, Berwick-Bloomsburg, Clearfield-Du Bois, Kittanning-Ford City, Sunbury-Shamokin-Ford City, Altoona, Butler, Lewistown, Meadville, New Castle, and Sayre-Athens-Towanda.

STATE REPUBLICANS READY WITH NEW AREA AID BILL

(By George Drault)

Pennsylvania's Republican Congressmen, fighting against the political disaster of another depressed area bill veto by President Eisenhower, have a substitute plan ready to go.

A compromise bill—in between the $251 million proposal now on the President's desk and the restricted $53 million administration program—will be flagged simultaneously in the Senate by Republican Senator HUGH SCOTT and in the House, probably by Republican Representative JAMES VAN ZANDT, of Altoona, when President Eisenhower announces his expected veto. The Presidential turndown, second in a row on the long-sought depressed area aid program, may come today.

With the congressional agenda already piled up because of the long civil rights fight earlier in the session and with only 2 months to go chances are very much against a second depressed area bill's clearing Congress. The Dixie Democrat-controlled House Rules Committee even refused to clear the present bill, and it was pried loose only with an extraordinary parliamentary maneuver that probably would not be successful a second time.

But the Republicans will have a campaign talking point to throw against the Democrats in the Pennsylvania campaigning. One GOP leader conceded privately that this

will be the only chance to salvage the candidacy of Republican William W. Scranton against the incumbent Democratic Congressman, STANLEY A. PROKOP, in the 10th District. PROKOP ousted the Republican Congressman 2 years ago, largely on the strength of the first Eisenhower veto of a depressed area bill.

The shape of the GOP answer to Democratic campaigning was lined up Thursday by SCOTT.

"We have a conviction," he said, "that the Democrats would rather have a Presidential veto than any program to help our depressed areas."

The new depressed area bill, to be pushed by SCOTT and the Republican Representatives from Pennsylvania, will call for $125 to $150 million program with requirements for a depressed area to qualify for Federal loans and grants more stringent than are now laid down in Senate bill 722, which the President will veto.

This will be largely in the pattern of proposals earlier urged in floor debate by SCOTT and VAN ZANDT, along with Representatives JOHN SAYLOR, of Johnstown, and IVOR D. FENTON, of Mahanoy City.

SCOTT insisted Thursday night that he is "sure" the President would sign a bill taking the "Van Zandt-Scott approach."

"Without attempting to quote the President," SCOTT said, "I am perfectly satisfied in my own mind that the President would sign a $150-million program tailored to meet the needs of the States and regions which have the really depressed areas."

What States or regions?

These would be Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, Massachusetts, and southern Illinois, SCOTT said.

Democrats earlier made a point-blank issue of what the President would or would not sign during the debate on Senate bill 722.

At one point, Pennsylvania's Representative JOHN H. DENT asked VAN ZANDT and SAYLOR if they could "promise" that Eisenhower would sign a $150-million bill. The Republicans said they could not.

The Pennsylvania GOP Congressmen's new depressed area appeal will come in the wake of the unsuccessful appeal by State GOP leaders and Congressmen to President Eisenhower to sign the pending bill.

But at his press conference this week, the President said that the bill, takes a "shotgun" approach and is "getting to be a pork-barrel bill, as I see it."

Although the President said Wednesday he hasn't made up his mind yet, his decision to veto the depressed area bill is one of the worst-kept "secrets" in Washington.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the minority leader desire that the time be charged to him?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that cannot be done, under the previous order, for the vote must occur at 2 o'clock.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the unanimous-consent agreement calls for a vote at 2 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then, automatically, any time for the call of the roll would have to come from the time of both sides. I must therefore object to the request of my colleague from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask if the minority leader has any speaker at the present time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is a speaker present, but he is not quite ready to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the senior Senator from Illinois desire to avail himself of any time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is an extraordinary situation. We have used approximately an hour of our time. Apparently the minority is not ready to proceed with a discussion in opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that this time must necessarily be charged to the minority leader or to the majority leader or to both.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I intend to vote to uphold the veto of the President and against the bill. I shall not recite the parts of the veto message of which I approve or disapprove. My objection to the bill has already been indicated, when I voted against the bill at the time of its passage. I think it is an unrealistic bill which does not deal properly with the subject matter. It seeks to set off the urban and industrial distress against agricultural situations which in many instances are merely fancied distress, as I shall show in a moment. It does not concentrate upon bringing help to the places where it ought to be brought, where I would be glad to participate in having it brought—such areas as those in West Virginia, in Pennsylvania, in Kentucky and in other States where there has been long, continued, and distressful unemployment. Such situations as those call for the sympathy of every good American.

Mr. President, without belaboring the matter at great length, I simply wish to say that those who are familiar with the bill know that substantially half of the total amount to be provided would be devoted to expenditures in so-called rural counties. The map which is displayed at the rear of the Chamber has been prepared by the Department of Agriculture, as shown by the text, in the effort to carry out the mandate of the bill. As I understand it, the map displayed is relied upon by the advocates of the bill.

Mr. President, I know something about the counties of my own State. I know something about the counties of the States of Georgia, Alabama, and other States shown on the map. I shall simply refer to certain situations in my own State.

Mr. President, this map shows in the most serious classification—branded as serious and shown in pink upon the map, with respect to low income and low living standards—counties in my State which are highly prosperous, which are doing well, which do not want and do not require any assistance. It would be a travesty for me to vote for a bill which pretends to bring relief to distressed areas, when these counties in Florida are listed among those requiring such aid.

Mr. President, in the bill we note there would be covereage for the County of Escambia, the county in which Pensacola is located, with the great naval air training station and numerous large and prosperous industries there located. Some of those are of recent establishment. That county is one of our fast-growing counties, one of our highly prosperous counties. Anyone who, with the faintest show of seriousness, could describe that county as one requiring aid as a depressed area simply does not know anything about the county.

Mr. President, I could mention several other counties. Let us consider Okaloosa County, where the great Eglin Air Force Base complex is located. In 1950 that was the fastest growing county in our State. It is still one of the fastest growing counties in our State. It is a highly prosperous county. Anyone who could ascribe to that county a characterization as a seriously depressed area simply does not know anything about it.

Mr. President, looking at the map a little further, the county in which our capital is located, Leon County, is indicated as one of the seriously depressed areas. Mr. President, Leon County is a highly prosperous county because, among other things, much of the State business of one of the fastest growing States in the Nation is concentrated in that county. The county and the city of Tallahassee have grown tremendously and are highly prosperous. In addition to the State personnel, Mr. President, two great universities are there located, Florida State University and Florida A and M University. There are many other activities which make that county a fast-growing and highly prosperous area. There is not any semblance of reason for classifying the county as a depressed area needing Federal help.

Mr. President, the county adjoining Leon County is Gadsden County, the county in which much wrapper-leaf tobacco is grown. Gadsden County is generally characterized as perhaps the most prosperous basic agricultural county in our State or in our whole area. That county is shown as a depressed area on this map.

Without laboring the question further I simply wish to call attention to the fact that the county of Alachua, where the city of Gainesville and the University of Florida are located, a highly prosperous and fast-growing county, is also shown as a depressed area requiring assistance under the terms of the bill.

Mr. President, no self-respecting Senator from the State of Florida, no matter how sympathetic he is with situations such as those which exist—and they are terrible—in parts of the State so well represented by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH],

who is seated by me, could agree that the counties which I have mentioned and others listed in our State are depressed or distressed counties. I do not know why we cannot bring up appropriate legislation which concentrates on the bringing of aid which should be brought and aid which is needed by human beings who are suffering.

I wish to say to my friends from West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and other States where there are actual hard pressed areas that I long for the time when we will have a realistic approach to the problem, and when I can in good conscience vote for a bill which would give them aid.

Without going into great detail, I notice that just above the Florida-Georgia State line, Thomas County, Georgia, is classified as seriously depressed. Thomas County is thriving—it is almost wholly occupied with great plantations which are known all over the Nation.

Thomasville is a city of rapid growth and prosperity, populated by fine people, and they would not appreciate being placed in a category of depressed areas which need the help of the United States to get on their feet.

Going to North Carolina, which I do not know so well, I notice that Henderson County, in which is located the city of Hendersonville, is labeled a depressed and distressed area. Hendersonville is one of the greatest resort cities in our whole southeast, and one of the most prosperous cities, a city teeming with visitors and people spending money, and a city of stable prosperity. In addition the county is a very fine vegetable producing area, which is almost without equal in our whole southeastern area.

Why we cannot be realistic I do not know. I do not think it is necessary to play politics with this venture. I do not think it is necessary to hold out bait to people who are not suffering to influence them to vote for people who are.

This Congress has been noted, and our people have been noted, for coming to the aid of human beings, whether in our country or elsewhere, but particularly in our country, when they are shown to be in distress and in need of assistance. The Senator from Florida wishes always to be counted among those who desire to do that kind of service which he thinks is not only good government, but is decent human consideration and good Christianity.

There cannot be any justification for the approach built into this bill. For that reason, much as I dislike to do so, I shall certainly vote to uphold the veto of the President.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I wish to cooperate with the minority leader and my colleague from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall not talk for more than 5 minutes. I am grateful to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. I have an appointment for 12:45 in the radio section of the gallery.

Mr. President, like other Members of the Senate, I have been vexed as to what to do about this veto. It seems clear to me that the veto will be sustained. Certainly this is clear from the votes in the Senate and the votes in the other body. There are political overtones in the matter of bringing before the Congress this measure, and the delay—which has been symbolized by the cart before the horse—before the measure was brought up is significant.

Nevertheless, I have decided to vote to override for the following reasons: Having tried to work out a compromise on this very critical matter, and coming from the State which is the largest taxpayer in the United States, it would be ill-befitting now to part company with that effort to compromise. I feel I must lend by my vote support for the proposition that we need to stress area redevelopment legislation in about the magnitude which is incorporated in the proposed legislation.

I join in urging favorable consideration of the new administration bill, which I think comes very much closer to meeting the need, and I am very hopeful that after we are through with this proceeding, we shall yet have a bill in this session.

The essence of my position is incorporated in the following: When I voted against the original distressed areas bill because the amount of money involved was far more than was needed, due, I think, to the wrong inclusion of the opportunity for supplying machinery and equipment to the areas which were designated as distressed under the bill, I voted out of a conviction that we should not proceed wastefully. When the bill returned from the House to the Senate it was still in a form containing the machinery and equipment feature which I still thought was entirely wrong, but with the amount very much cut. I felt that with a reduced amount it was very unlikely that any administrator would have any money available for machinery and equipment.

I think the question now is not whether the vote will be large enough to override—I am confident that the veto will not be overridden—but will the vote be large enough to bring about action at this session?

I wish to contribute to that endeavor because I feel that in my State with its enormous business complex interested in the general prosperity of the country, there must be a spirit of generosity and understanding of the difficulties in States like Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and other States in which there are depressed areas.

Second, in representing a State which is thoroughly committed to the mutual security idea and to its critical importance to the future of freedom and peace in the world, I feel that I must at the same time take a sympathetic look at the distressed areas in my own country, and where it is possible to do something about the problem in a way remotely approaching a degree of size and effectiveness, I feel it is my duty to do so. So I am very hopeful that by some Republican votes upon this question we can remove the political colorations which, most unfortunately, I feel, are sought to be placed upon the measure, and that we can affirm by our vote, on this side at least, our desire to cooperate in seeing that there is depressed area legislation at this session of the Congress.

This is also of some importance to a good many communities in New York State. Not only places of lesser population are included in the bill—namely, Amsterdam, Auburn, Elmira, Gloversville, Jamestown-Dunkirk, Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon, Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone; Plattsburg and Wellsville—but also if unemployment goes up as high as 6 percent, it might conceivably encompass New York City. The bill relates also to the Buffalo, Utica-Rome and Albany-Schenectady-Troy areas.

For all the reasons stated, Mr. President, I shall vote to override the veto.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] yield some time to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there is a crucial need for the overriding of the President's veto of S. 722. Lengthy and exhaustive hearings have been held; the testimony of expert witnesses has been received; and both bodies of the Congress have deliberated fully the merits of this bill. Therefore, I will address my remarks to the logic and assumptions of the President's veto message.

Mr. President, during the past 2 years, the Democratic leadership in the Congress has compromised in meeting the administration's position on this issue—as well as on many others.

To go further would be to surrender the two-party principle of our Government, and even surrender of the equal status of the legislative with the executive branch. But the President has maintained unyielding opposition. He has recently enunciated his philosophy of representative government as "one-third plus one," and now he lectures the Congress of the United States to the effect that "The people are properly becoming increasingly impatient and are rightfully desirous of constructive action." In this respect, at least, I agree most heartily. Indeed, the people are becoming impatient. The people of West Virginia as well as the people of many other States are becoming impatient. But if there is still no constructive action on this measure, let us by our votes again today declare that the responsibility for inaction rests not with the Congress but with the executive opposition.

The veto message of the President maintains that the passage of S. 722 "would squander the Federal taxpayers' money where there is only temporary

economic difficulty." That is not a correct characterization of the reasons why this legislation is before us. When applied to chronic conditions of human suffering, this is stretching the term beyond the bounds of compassion and understanding. It will bring small comfort to the thousands of willing but unemployed citizens who wish to work, and to their families, in the distressed areas of West Virginia and the neighboring States of Kentucky and Pennsylvania, as well as in many other sections of the country, to be told that theirs is only a "temporary economic difficulty." That is not correctly appraising the situation. It causes me to plead—and I use the word advisedly—for an overriding of the veto.

The President then says that "local, State, and private initiative would be materially inhibited" by the passage of the bill. I can only say that that statement is predicated upon misunderstanding, because it is a misconception of the true character of the people of the State of West Virginia and of the other States. It flies directly in the face of all Federal experience in the use of matching funds. The people in the communities of our distressed areas are not asking for a handout. They are asking for and deserve the opportunity and the means to aid themselves.

I am reminded by the curious logic of the President's veto of one of the prevailing arguments against the establishment of social security during the early days of the New Deal, when I was privileged to be a Member of the House of Representatives. It was maintained then by some persons, in the most serious and lofty fashion, that if men and women had social security there would no longer be an opportunity for the beneficent act of Christian charity.

By the same logic, I presume that the President would find S. 722 sapping the rugged independence of West Virginia's unemployed. That is not true. These people are rugged folk. They desire only an opportunity for gainful employment, and also responsibility under a free government.

They ask for the necessary assistance with which they can help themselves. I know these people. I have more faith in the quality of the American character than those who declare Federal assistance in this instance is leading us down the road to economic instability.

Overreaching all the specific reasons in the President's veto message is the unacknowledged but all-pervasive one which lies at the heart of this message and of so many other vetoes during recent years. I speak of the tragic failure of this administration to acknowledge the meaning of "a more perfect Union." We are the United States, Mr. President, in which the effects of economic distress, of unemployment, of inadequate school facilities, and of insufficient care of our aged, are communicated throughout the length and breadth of our Republic.

These are not merely local issues. These are fundamental and chronic problems in many sections of the country which have sapped the strength and vitality of our entire Nation, not only of these particular sections.

I ask every Member of this body to give most careful consideration to the overriding of this veto, because our first obligation is to help maintain the respect of every loyal, law-abiding, hard working citizen of this Nation.

This means that we must give to him an opportunity to use his strength and skill and to put forward his intelligence in some form of constructive labor, to enable him to assume his role as a freeman and as a provider for his wife and for his children. No one can gage the dreadful cost in human terms and in the erosion of morale which is brought on by enforced idleness, which I must face in West Virginia, and which must be faced by other Members of the Senate in their areas, when we know these conditions exist in certain sections of our States and of our country.

We have ample statistics on the loss in the gross national product because of chronic unemployment. Indeed, the total cost of S. 722 would be a mere pittance as compared with the cost of the recession of 1958.

Who, I ask, can gage the psychological cost of thousands of skilled men forced into idleness by technological changes, not in the last few months or years, but over a long period of time? Who can gage the cost in self-respect and the dislocation of family life when men, in some instances, leave their families so that their wives—it is tragic, but true—may claim nonsupport and thereby qualify for public assistance? Yet these conditions exist even now as we begin to bask in the glow of the "Fabulous Sixties"— as the coming decade has been described by certain persons.

I hope it will not be considered untimely if I say that we should take a sterner look at the inventory of our national needs. At the present time I refer only to the area redevelopment bill, although there are others which the 86th Congress must face and which deserve our attention by affirmative action during the remainder of the year. The need for S. 722 is immediate and pressing.

Convincing testimony has been given before the committees of Congress, and the Senate and the House have acted favorably. The evidence is set down, not only in the written record, but more grimly in the dulled eyes of men who find no work for willing hands, and in the drawn and desperate faces of their weary wives and hungry children. This is the hour to aid those who deserve our assistance.

Mr. President, in urging that we override the President's veto, I am not taking partisan action for the purpose of creating a political issue, as some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle allege. Rather, I seek the enactment of legislation—a vitally needed measure.

Neither was I taking partisan action when, on May 12, 1960, I sent a telegram to the President urging him to approve S. 722. In that sincere message to the Chief Executive, I said:

> Senate bill 722, incorporating House amendments and providing for a program of area redevelopment, is vitally needed legislation. Your favorable consideration of this measure is urgently and respectfully recommended. West Virginia and other States need the encouragement and assistance which S. 722 would provide citizens and communities in their efforts to help themselves.

Yes, Mr. President, I sent that telegram to the Chief Executive urging that he sign this second bill passed by the Congress since 1958 to aid distressed areas. But for the second time he maintained unyielding opposition. I urge the overriding of the veto.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned over the plight of certain areas of this country which are chronically affected by unemployment. I believe strongly that action must be taken to alleviate the conditions in these so-called distressed areas and to achieve a healthier economic status of a continuing nature.

I am in agreement with the President that S. 722 does not do the job effectively and properly. I believe that the bill which he has not approved is wasteful in that it applies funds where they are not needed; harmful in that it would inhibit badly needed local and State initiative and resourcefulness; and unwise in its provisions for financing industrial buildings in rural areas, plant machinery and equipment, sewers, and access roads and the like.

With particular reference to my own State, S. 722 would encourage pirating of industries away from Massachusetts, which is one of the reasons for some of our depressed areas, in the first place. Federal funds must not be used for the stealing of industries from communities which already have and need those industries. I regret that the Senate rejected an administration amendment to S. 722 which would have prevented aid in cases where industries would be shifted between areas.

The fact that the bill which has been returned by the President would stifle local initiative is an important argument in itself against passage of this bill. Cities of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts have a proud record of resourcefulness, energy, and dedication in rebuilding themselves and improving their economic health. These worthy activities might even be penalized by Federal intervention under S. 722 which could aid less diligent areas, and thus discourage self-help and self-sufficiency.

The bill does not focus on the real basic causes of unemployment, and creates in my opinion a dispiriting illusion that simply by the construction of buildings and purchase of equipment jobs can be created on a continuous, deep-rooted and dependable basis.

Furthermore, I feel that S. 722 is discriminatory through unrealistic standards for determining aid. Conceivably, citizens of Massachusetts cities could be forced to aid other areas both inside and outside of the State when their own city itself is in need but does not happen to qualify. For example, a city with 8 percent unemployment might get no benefits while a neighboring city with 9 percent unemployment would get

benefits, as indicated in the minority views of the House Banking and Currency Committee report. Page 31 of this same report states that an area such as Kinston, N.C., would be considered a depressed area under this bill with unemployment of 4.5 percent. It is interesting to note that Pittsfield, Mass., with unemployment of 6.1 percent at the present time, would not be eligible for Federal aid under this bill.

A major provision of S. 722 would grant aid to 663 rural depressed areas. Massachusetts has none of these. This is clearly indicated on page 32 of the House Minority Report. Assuming that this kind of Federal aid is sound in the first place, Alabama would benefit with 55 out of 67 counties eligible for aid. Mississippi would also reap substantial rewards, as would other southern States—524 of the 663 rural areas scheduled for aid under the bill are found in the South.

The State which I represent, in part, would receive disproportionate treatment under the bill. Massachusetts taxes would support the programs established by this legislation without balanced returns, and the opposite ratio would be the case with certain other States. Therefore I believe that Congress should work to pass legislation which does not depend upon arbitrary standards which largely discriminate against already-industrialized areas of the Northeast.

The President has indicated his keen awareness of the need for area redevelopment legislation, and has submitted an administration bill which would fairly and realistically move forward to alleviate unhealthy conditions which we are concerned about—in his own words "truly sound and helpful legislation." He has urged the Congress to enact legislation in this area for 5 years, and expressed his sincere cooperation in obtaining a law within certain general standards, accepting the eligibility criteria originally set forth in the Senate version of S. 722.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to rise to this challenge of constructive cooperation. I shall vote to sustain the President in his veto of S. 722 for the reasons which I have expressed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I shall vote to sustain the President's veto of S. 722, the area redevelopment bill, for reasons I outlined in a statement on the Senate floor on Monday, May 16.

I express again my hope that the majority party will abandon attempts to reap political capital from the plight of areas having chronic unemployment, and will accept the President's offer to cooperate in the enactment of sound legislation which can give genuine, not illusory, assistance to such areas.

I have joined with the minority leader, the able senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and other Senators in introducing S. 3569. Although this is not an administration bill, it was drafted in an attempt to meet the President's major objections to S. 722, and to provide a sound, workable program to meet the problems of areas of chronic unemployment which are in need of special assistance.

I invite attention to the fact that the new bill flatly prohibits, as I have consistently advocated, the use of Federal funds to assist business establishments in relocating from one area to another. I am confident, Mr. President, that the President's veto of S. 722 will be sustained, and express the hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will promptly consider S. 3569.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senate bill 3569 may be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the text of S. 3569 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Area Assistance Act of 1960."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress declares that, even during periods of prosperity for the Nation as a whole, some of our communities suffer substantial and persistent unemployment; that such unemployment causes hardship to many individuals and their families and detracts from the national welfare by wasting vital human resources; that to overcome this problem the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should help areas of substantial and persistent unemployment to take effective steps in planning and financing their economic development; that Federal assistance should enable communities to achieve lasting improvement and decrease economic vulnerability by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies; and that new employment opportunities should be created rather than merely transferred from one community to another.

AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

SEC. 101 (a) The Secretary of Commerce, hereinafter referred to as the Secretary, may designate as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment any area certified as eligible for such designation by the Secretary of Labor.

(b) To assist areas in the United States designated as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment, the Secretary is authorized—

(1) to make grants for technical assistance for such areas in accordance with the provisions of section 106(a) of this Act; and

(2) to provide loans for such areas in accordance with the provisions of section 107 of this Act.

(c) The Secretary is also authorized—

(1) to extend the full cooperation of the Federal Government to all areas in the United States (including Puerto Rico) in promoting the more effective use of local resources, in the establishment of new industries based on local resources, and in the expansion of existing industries; such cooperation to be provided through technical advice and consultation and, when necessary, through the conduct of special studies.

(2) to decrease, through grants made in accordance with the provisions of section 106(b) of this Act, the economic vulnerability of (i) towns predominantly dependent on one industry, (ii) small towns which could serve as centers for economic diversification of low-income rural areas, and (iii) other low-income rural areas not subject to assistance as in (ii), by helping them to develop manufacturing, processing, and other activities calculated to diversify and improve their economies; and

(3) to coordinate his functions under this Act with those of the Secretary of Agriculture and other officials administering Federal programs affecting local economic conditions.

(d) As used in this Act:

(1) The term "United States" includes the several States and the District of Columbia;

(2) The term "State" refers to an individual State or the District of Columbia; and

(3) The term "loan" includes loans, immediate participation in loans, and purchase of evidences of indebtedness.

AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF LABOR

SEC. 102. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall from time to time, or upon the request of the Secretary, certify the existence of areas eligible for designation as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment whenever he finds, on the basis of available labor force data, or studies which he initiates when he deems necessary that—

(1) the rate of unemployment in the area, excluding unemployment due primarily to temporary or seasonal factors, is currently 6 per centum and has averaged at least 6 per centum for the qualifying time periods specified in (2) below; and

(2) the annual average rate of unemployment in the area has been at least—

(A) 50 percentum above the national average for three of the preceding four calendar years, or

(B) 75 per centum above the national average for two of the preceding three calendar years, or

(C) 100 per centum above the national average for one of the preceding two calendar years.

(b) In the case of labor market areas for which appropriate historical labor force data have not been complied, the Secretary of Labor shall certify as eligible for designation as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment those areas in which the unemployment rate and duration, based on a survey of available labor force data, generally equals or exceeds the rate and duration specified in section 102(a).

(c) The Secretary of Labor may also certify under subsection (a) or (b) of this section the existence of eligible areas upon request of any appropriate State government agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision.

(d) The Secretary of Labor is authorized, upon request and whenever he determines that such studies are needed, to undertake, or to provide assistance to others in studies of the size, characteristics, skills, adaptability, occupational potentialities, and related aspects of the labor force of an area certified under this section.

(e) When skills of the labor force in an area designated under section 101 are not such as to facilitate full utilization of the human resources in such area, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to provide advice and technical assistance in developing and carrying out a program to improve the utilization of such labor force.

(f) Whenever the Secretary of Labor finds a need for vocational education services in an area designated under section 101 and when such area has an economic development program as provided in section 107 (b)(9), he is authorized to assist interested agencies to determine the vocational training needs of unemployed individuals residing in the area, and he shall notify the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the vocational training or retraining requirements of the area. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through the Commissioner of Education, is authorized to provide assistance, including financial assistance when necessary or appropriate, to the State vocational education agency for

the provision of such services in the area. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $1,500,000 annually for the purpose of providing financial assistance under this subsection.

AUTHORITY OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 103. Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding the following new heading and section at the end of title I:

"AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL AND PERSISTENT UNEMPLOYMENT

"SEC. 113. (a) When the Secretary of Commerce certifies to the Administrator (1) that any county, city, or other municipality (referred to as 'municipality' in this section) is situated in an area designated by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to the Area Assistance Act of 1960 as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment, and (2) that there is a reasonable probability that with assistance provided under the Area Assistance Act of 1960 and other undertakings the area will be able to achieve lasting improvement in its economic development, the Administrator is authorized to extend financial assistance to a local public agency in any such municipality under this title and the provisions of this section.

"(b) The Administrator may provide such financial assistance under this section without regard to the requirements or limitations of section 110(c) of this title that the project area be clearly predominantly residential in character or that it will be predominantly residential under the urban renewal plan.

""(c) Financial assistance under this section may be provided for any project involving a project area including primarily industrial or commercial structures suitable for rehabilitation under the urban renewal plan for the area.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, a contract for financial assistance under this section may include provisions permitting the disposition of any land in the project area designated under the urban renewal plan for industrial or commercial uses to any public agency or nonprofit corporation for subsequent disposition as promptly as practicable by such public agency or corporation for the redevelopment of the land in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *Provided,* That any disposition of such land to such public agency or corporation under this section shall be made at not less than its fair value for uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *And provided further,* That the purchaser from or lessees of such public agency or corporation, and their assignees, shall be required to assume the obligations imposed in conformity with the requirements of section 105(b) hereof.

"(e) Following the execution of any contract for financial assistance under this section with respect to any project, the Administrator may exercise the authority vested under this section for the completion of such project notwithstanding any determination made after the execution of such contract that the area in which the project is located may no longer be an area of substantial and persistent unemployment.

"(f) Not more than 10 per centum of the funds authorized for capital grants under section 103 after June 30, 1960, shall be available to provide financial assistance under this section."

SEC. 104. (a) The first sentence of section 202(c) of title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) In the processing of applications for financial assistance under this section, the Administrator shall give priority to applications of counties, cities, and other municipalities and political subdivisions for financing needed public facilities in areas determined to be areas of substantial and persistent unemployment under the Area Assistance Act of 1960: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Commerce certifies there is reasonable probability that with assistance made available under the Area Assistance Act of 1960 and other undertakings such areas will be able to achieve lasting improvement in their economic development; and equal priority to applications of smaller muncipalities for assistance in the construction of basic public works (including works for the storage, treatment, purification, or distribution of water; sewage, sewage treatment, and sewer facilities; and gas distribution systems) for which there is an urgent and vital public need; the Administrator shall give a first priority above all others to applications for financing needed public facilities in connection with, and that will directly serve, a project eligible under section 107 of the Area Assistance Act of 1960."

(b) The first sentence of section 203(a) of title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) In order to finance activities under this title, the Administrator is authorized and empowered to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time and to have outstanding at any one time in an amount not exceeding $100,000,000, notes and other obligations, which limit shall be increased by such amounts, not exceeding $100,000,000, as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts."

URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

SEC. 105. Paragraph (3) of section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting after "Cities, other municipalities, and counties which" the following: "(A) are situated in areas designated as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment under section 101(a) of the Area Assistance Act of 1960, or (B)."

GRANTS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 106. (a) In carrying out section 101(b)(1), the Secretary is authorized to make grants for technical assistance including studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of areas designated under section 101(a). These grants may be made without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529). Appropriations are hereby authorized for these grants in an amount not to exceed $1,500,000 annually.

(b) In carrying out section 101(c)(2), the Secretary is authorized to make similar grants for the benefit of towns and areas described therein. Negotiations taking into account the financial ability of the grantee and other relevant considerations shall be made for contributions to costs of projects undertaken hereunder. These grants may be made without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and appropriations therefore are hereby authorized in an amount not to exceed $2,000,000 annually.

LOANS

SEC. 107. (a) In carrying out section 101(b)(2) of this Act the Secretary is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans (including immediate participations therein) to aid in financing any project within an area of substantial and persistent unemployment for the purchase or development of land and facilities for industrial usage, for the construction of new factory buildings, for rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied factory buildings, or for the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of any existing buildings for industrial use. Such financial assistance shall not be extended for working capital, for purchase of machinery or equipment, or to assist establishments relocating from one area to another.

(b) Financial assistance under this section shall be on such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, subject, however, to the following restrictions and limitations:

(1) The total amount of loans and loan participations (including purchased evidences of indebtedness) outstanding at any one time under this section shall not exceed $75,000,000;

(2) Such assistance shall be extended only to applicants, both private and public, approved by the State (or any agency or instrumentality thereof concerned with problems of economic development) in which the project to be financed shall be located;

(3) The project for which financial assistance is sought is reasonably calculated to provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment within the area of substantial and persistent unemployment wherein it is, or will be, located;

(4) No such assistance shall be extended hereunder unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available from private lenders or other Federal agencies on reasonable terms;

(5) No loans shall be made unless it is determined than an immediate participation is not available;

(6) No evidences of indebtedness shall be purchased and no loans shall be made unless it is determined that there is a reasonable assurance of repayment;

(7) No loan, including renewals or extension thereof, may be made hereunder for a period exceeding thirty years and no evidences of indebtedness maturing more than thirty year from date of purchase may be purchased hereunder: *Provided,* That the foregoing restrictions on maturities shall not apply to securities or obligations received by the Secretary as a claimant in bankruptcy or equitable reorganization or as a creditor in other proceedings attendant upon insolvency of the obligor, or if extension or renewal for additional periods, not to exceed, however, a total of ten years, will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loans or of such evidence of indebtedness;

(8) Each loan shall bear interest at a rate equal to the interest rate currently payable under section 108(e) on advances from the Treasury, plus one-half of 1 per centum per annum for administrative expenses and a reserve for losses on loans;

(9)(A) Not less than 15 per centum of the aggregate cost to the applicant (excluding all other Federal aid in connection with the undertaking) of acquiring or developing land and facilities, and of constructing, altering, converting, rehabilitating, or enlarging the building or buildings of the particular project shall be supplied by the State or any agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision thereof, or by a community or area organization, as equity capital or as a loan repayable only after the financial assistance hereunder has been repaid in full according to the terms thereof and, if such loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing the financial assistance hereunder;

(B) Of the remaining 85 per centum of the aggregate cost, 35 per centum of the aggregate cost may be loaned by the Secretary under the terms of this Act and security for such a loan may be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens which secure any loan or financing other than funds required by section 107(b)(9)(A).

(C) Loans shall not be available hereunder unless other funds are available in an amount which, together with assistance provided hereunder and funds provided under section 107(b)(9)(A), shall be sufficient to pay such aggregate cost; and

(10) No such assistance shall be extended unless there shall be submitted to and approved by the Secretary an overall program

for the economic development of the area and a finding by the State, or any agency, instrumentality, or local political subdivision thereof, that the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall authorize financial assistance for any project prohibited by laws of the State or local political subdivision in which the project would be located.

AREA ASSISTANCE FUND

SEC. 108. (a) There is hereby authorized to be established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund to be known as the area assistance fund (hereinafter referred to as the "fund"), which shall be available to the Secretary for the payment of all obligations and expenses in connection with the loans authorized under section 101(b)(2).

(b) When requested by the Secretary, advances shall be made to the fund from the appropriations made therefor. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of making advances to the fund, without fiscal year limitation, an amount not exceeding $75,000,000.

(c) Receipts arising from the loan program shall be credited to the fund.

(d) Any moneys in the fund determined by the Secretary to be in excess of current needs shall be credited to the appropriation from which advanced to be held for future advances to the fund.

(e) There shall be paid into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury at the close of each fiscal year interest on advances to the fund at rates which shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury at the time the advances or commitments for advances are made after taking into consideration the current average market yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to loans made by the Secretary.

(f) Contributions shall be made from the fund to the civil service retirement and disability fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Civil Service Commission, for the Government's share of the cost of the civil service retirement system applicable to employees (and their beneficiaries) performing activities authorized under section 101(b)(2). Contributions shall also be made to the employee's compensation fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Secretary of Labor, for the benefit payments made from such fund on account of employees performing activities authorized under section 101(b)(2). The annual billings shall also include a statement of the fair portion of the cost of the administration of the respective funds, which shall be paid by the Secretary into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR FURTHER ASSISTANCE

SEC. 109. Whenever the Administrator shall determine that employment conditions within any area previously designated by him as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment have changed to such an extent that such area is no longer eligible for such designation under section 101(a) of this Act, no further assistance shall be granted under this Act, with respect to such area and, for the purposes of this Act, such area shall not be considered an area of substantial and persistent unemployment: *Provided,* That nothing contained herein shall—

(a) prevent any such area from again being designated an area of substantial and persistent unemployment under section 101(a) of this Act if the Administrator determines it to be eligible under such section, or

(b) affect the validity of any contracts or undertakings with respect to such area which were entered into pursuant to this Act prior to a determination by the Administrator that such area no longer qualifies as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment. The Administrator shall keep the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and interested State or local agencies, advised at all times of any changes made hereunder with respect to the designation of any area.

BUDGET AND AUDIT

SEC. 110. In the performance of and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by section 107 of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(a) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended; and

(b) maintain a set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided,* That the Secretary with respect to the program of financial assistance authorized by section 101(b)(2) shall determine the character of and the necessity for obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to provisions of law specifically applicable to Government corporations.

AREA ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 111. There shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate an Area Assistance Administrator in the Department of Commerce who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to that received by Assistant Secretaries of Commerce. The Administrator shall perform such duties in the execution of this Act as the Secretary may assign.

POWERS

SEC. 112. In the performance of, and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties vested in him under this Act, the Secretary may—

(a) adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed; and subject to the civil service and classification laws, select, employ, appoint, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and define their authority and duties;

(b) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he may deem advisable;

(c) under such regulations as he may prescribe, make such findings and determinations as may be required for the proper administration of this Act and such findings and determinations, together with those required to be made by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 102 hereof, shall be final and shall not be subject to review in any court by mandamus or otherwise: *Provided,* That with respect to the validity, effect, and enforcement of section 101(b)(2) hereof or security taken thereunder, statutes, rules, and regulations pertaining generally to suits by and against the United States shall be applicable;

(d) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as the Secretary shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of loans granted under this title, and to collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by him and all legal or equitable rights accruing to him in connection with the payment of such loans until such time as such obligation may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

(e) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, rent, or sell for cash or credit, upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as the Secretary shall determine to be reasonable, any real property conveyed to or otherwise acquired by him in connection with the payment of loans granted under this title;

(f) pursue to final collection by way of compromise or other administrative action prior to reference to the Attorney General, all claims against third parties assigned to the Secretary in connection with loans made by him. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), shall not be construed to apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of property obtained by the Secretary as a result of loans made under this title if the premium therefor or the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute in the name of the Secretary deeds of conveyance, deeds of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real property or any interest therein acquired by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this title may be exercised by the Secretary or by any officer or agent appointed by him for the purpose;

(g) acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized in section 101(b)(2) of this Act; and

(h) in addition to any powers, functions, privileges, and immunities otherwise vested in him, take any and all actions, including the procurement of the services of attorneys by contract, determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, servicing, compromising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise administratively dealing with or realizing on loans made or securities acquired under the provisions of this title: *Provided,* That no attorney's services shall be produced by contract in any office where an attorney or attorneys are or can be economically employed full time to render such service.

ADVISORY BOARD

SEC. 113. To advise the Secretary in the performance of functions authorized by this Act, there is authorized to be created an Area Assistance Advisory Board, hereinafter referred to as the "Board", which shall consist of the following members, all ex officio: The Secretary, as Chairman, the Secretaries of Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, Labor, and Treasury, the Administrators of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and of the Small Business Administration. The Chairman may from time to time invite the participation of officials of other agencies of the executive branch interested in the functions herein authorized. Each member of the Board may designate an officer of his agency to act for him as a member of the Board with respect to any matter there considered.

DEPOSITARIES AND AGENTS

SEC. 114. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as custodians and fiscal agents for the Secretary in the general performance of the powers conferred by this title. Each Federal Reserve bank shall be entitled to be reimbursed for all expenses incurred as such fiscal agents. Any banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, when designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, may act as custodians and depositaries for the Secretary.

PENALTIES

SEC. 115. With respect to financial assistance authorized by this Act:

(a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by renewal defer-

ment of action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Secretary, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this Act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Secretary—

(1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to him or pledged or otherwise entrusted to him, or

(2) with intent to defraud the Secretary or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Secretary makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Secretary, or without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, or

(3) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Secretary, or

(4) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Secretary which might affect the value of securities, or, having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Secretary shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

(c) As used in this section, the term "Secretary" shall mean, with respect to the lending activities of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator authorized under this Act, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

USE OF OTHER FACILITIES

SEC. 116. (a) To avoid duplication of activities and minimize expense in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary shall to the extent practicable and with their consent use the available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government on a reimbursable basis.

(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act. This Act shall be supplemental to any existing authority and nothing herein shall be deemed to be restrictive of any existing powers, duties, and functions of any other department or agency of the Federal Government.

CONSULTANTS

SEC. 117. The Secretary is authorized to obtain services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55(a)), at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 118. The Secretary shall make a comprehensive annual report of his operations under this Act for the fiscal year ending on the preceding June 30, to the President, for transmission to the Congress as soon as practicable in each year, but in no case later than the third day of the following January.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 119. In addition to appropriations specifically authorized by sections 106 and 108, appropriations are further authorized for the carrying out of other provisions and purposes of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the minority leader desire to avail himself of additional time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if the minority leader has a speaker ready, I shall be glad to defer to him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I thank the minority leader for yielding me time to speak on the President's veto of S. 722.

I shall vote to override the President's veto of S. 722. Since 1957, I have supported bills to provide assistance to the depressed areas of the United States; in fact, I am one of the original cosponsors of S. 722, the bill which has been vetoed and about which we are speaking today.

In 1959, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] asked me to join with him in sponsoring S. 722. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], and I introduced S. 722. I have supported this bill and similar legislation as strongly as I could with my votes, in many speeches on the Senate floor, and in consultations with the President of the United States.

I do not intend today to speak at length or in detail concerning the reasons which have led me to support legislation to assist areas of chronic unemployment in the United States. In simple language, I have done so because I know that thousands of men and women are out of work in the depressed areas—some in cities, others in rural communities, many in semirural communities, such as the areas in which the coal industry operates. These people are out of work without fault of their own. Technological changes in industry, mechanization, automation, and the shift of industry from one section of the country to another, have put these people out of work.

The dynamism of our economy and the more effective use of tools—the very factors which have increased the wealth of most of our people in most of the areas of the Nation, have brought unemployment to thousands in the depressed areas.

It has been my position that the growing wealth and prosperity of the Nation, its increased production, its large increase in wages to the organized workers of the country, the increase in personal income and in corporate profits, the increase in investment, and the higher standards of living which have been enjoyed, yes, since 1953, by most of the people of the Nation, are reasons which make it more imperative that those who have prospered and that a rich Nation take action to assist their fellow countrymen who have been left behind in the march of progress.

I have never considered the area redevelopment bill the only means of providing help to these depressed areas and needy people, and I do not believe that my cosponsors have argued that the bill is the perfect answer. But the bill is one means, and it is the only instrument now before the Congress. For that reason, I was glad to cosponsor and to support the bill.

Today, because this bill is one instrument available to us to help those who are in dire need, and because of the prosperity of the great part of the Nation, I think it just, human, and decent to provide a means of developing the areas which have been left behind in the great march of progress in our country.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote to override the President's veto.

Without further discussion of my reasons for supporting S. 722, for I have elaborated them many times in the last 2 years—I now turn to the future.

I think it is generally assumed that the Senate will sustain today the President's veto. The question which then will arise is, What will the Congress and what will the administration do about this problem? Shall we forget it? Shall we sweep it under the rug? Shall we treat it as a political issue? It is a political issue, and I am not so naive as to think it is not. But the fact that it is a political issue is not an argument for deferring until after the November election action to help those who are in need. It would be cynical and cruel if the Congress and, I may say the administration did not work together to produce, this year, a bill to give assistance to these areas. It would be cynical if the veto and the vote on this bill were used simply for politics alone—and no further effort made to secure a bill.

So, Mr. President, I shall appeal, as I have done before, to the majority leader of the Senate, to the majority leader of the House to the minority leader of the Senate, to the minority leader of the House, and to the President of the United States to consult and to see whether it is possible to agree and work out a bill which can be passed before this session of Congress adjourns.

During the last month I have talked twice with the President of the United States about this legislation. The President told me that he favored legislation, and that he hoped appropriate legislation to assist the depressed areas could be passed.

I find some comfort in section VI of the President's veto message, in which the President says:

> Moreover, during the process of developing a new bill I would hope that in other areas of past differences solutions could be found satisfactory to both the Congress and the Executive.

I would say to my cosponsors and to my friends on the majority side, with whom I have worked so hopefully for 2 years in an effort to secure the enactment of this bill—and they know that I have been loyal in my efforts—that the amount authorized by the bill should not be the decisive factor at issue, because it is hardly probable that a large amount could be allocated and put to work in the next fiscal year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. COOPER. May I have 3 additional minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. COOPER. On the other side, I point out that the proposal of the administration that the States or local communities advance 66⅔ percent of the cost of a project is, to my mind, unrealistic. The very fact that these communities are depressed and their tax bases are in consequence adversely affected, make it impossible for such communities to advance two-thirds of the amount needed to initiate business projects.

I hope the administration and the President of the United States will accept the provision of Senate bill 722 that only one-third of the cost shall be advanced from local resources.

Mr. President, while I stand firm in my belief that Senate bill 722 should have been approved by the President, I now urge my colleagues and the leadership on both sides of the aisle to consult with the President during the few weeks remaining in this session of Congress, to agree upon a bill which can be passed, one which will initiate a program that will bring help and relief to those who are out of work. Men and women are out of work, and they and their children are in need; surely they should be the objects of our thoughts today and in the remaining weeks of this session of Congress.

So, Mr. President, I shall not vote reluctantly to override the veto. I vote to override it because a program should be started, and to voice my concern that we take steps to help those who are unemployed and do not share in the general prosperity of the Nation.

I plead with my colleagues and with the leadership to do something in the days which lie ahead to produce a bill which can be passed and approved before this session of Congress adjourns.

At a later date I will speak again, as I have spoken several times during the session, on the elements of a Federal-State program to build up the basic resources of such coal mining areas as eastern Kentucky, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the veto message sent to Congress by President Eisenhower when he returned the area redevelopment bill has little relationship to the needs the bill is aimed to meet.

I recommend to my colleagues the analysis of the President's veto message delivered in this Chamber on May 16 by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. They will find it on page 10325 of that day's RECORD. I wholeheartedly agree with Senator CLARK that the six points made by the President beg the issue and miss the point.

The point of this dispute, Mr. President, is this: In this country there are hundreds of areas which need help. They are depressed through no fault of their own. The changing economy and the changing utilization of resources and automation have thrown many out of work.

One of our great national challenges is to increase our productivity. We must keep ahead of the Soviet Union, which we are told is increasing its output by something like 7 percent a year, as compared to our 2½ percent.

But, more than this, we must make our economy fit the needs of our people. It does not meet the needs when millions are unemployed and—worse—unemployable because of industrial changes and because they therefore need retraining.

A great national problem was created when changing industry, migrating industry, and displaced industry left areas full of willing workers no longer competent to contribute to their country's strength and well-being. The most notable example of this has been in the coal mining industry. But it is by no means solely confined to that industry.

This bill is a step toward meeting the national need in this regard. I do not say it is an adequate bill. But it is moderate and it is a step. To end up with no bill, should the President's veto be sustained, or to end up with one scaled down to meet the administration's pygmy requests, would be tragic in the one case and most inadequate in the other.

The vetoed bill would set up a small administrative organization to handle the problem.

It defines areas in need of redevelopment—both urban and rural—and proposes to assist them through loans and participation by the Federal Government.

It will provide low-cost loans and grants to local governments to develop badly needed public facilities.

It provides for gathering of information for depressed areas.

It provides technical assistance to determine needs and set up programs in distressed areas.

It continues the urban renewal programs which have been so successful in rebuilding blighted areas in cities and towns.

Most important, it provides for vocational training for persons who became unemployed by virtue of changing industry in their area.

The bill gives the depressed areas of the Nation an opportunity to retrain their people for new endeavors. It will help industries rebuild themselves. It will help communities rebuild themselves. Most of the cost of the programs—which the President finds excessive, but which I feel is quite the contrary—will be repayed.

I think this is sound national policy. Without it our efforts to keep abreast of Soviet strength will be badly crippled. Even the President recognizes that area redevelopment is sound national policy. But he says redevelopment should be accomplished locally, with local funds. Every expert on local scenes tells us this is impossible.

Even though I look upon this program as sound national policy, Mr. President, I want to add that few States are in as great a need for it as is my State of Tennessee.

We have two major areas in need of redevelopment help: the Chattanooga and Knoxville sections.

We have two smaller areas of great need: La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell and Bristol-Johnson City-Kingsport.

In addition, 41 of our rural counties are in need of help and would qualify under terms of the bill which Mr. Eisenhower has vetoed.

In all, a total of 1,500,000 Tennesseans reside in these areas. This is 44 percent of my State's population:

In last year's Senate Banking and Currency Committee hearings on this bill, three distinguished Tennessee officials appeared to urge enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RANDOLPH in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield an additional half minute to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for an additional half minute.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Herbert J. Bingham, executive secretary of the Tennessee Municipal League; Hugh Heatherly, city recorder of La Follette; and Mayor Dwain Peterman of Livingston, told about the depression in the State, especially in the coal mining regions of eastern Tennessee.

They pointed out the staggering loss which the State has incurred in migration of young people—255,000 in the years 1950 through 1957 alone.

They pointed out the folly in the past of trying to finance redevelopment on strictly State and local bases.

They showed that the State of Tennessee and these specific communities simply have not got the resources to do the job alone.

Mayor Peterman summarized their presentation. He said simply: "We need help."

Mr. President, there are areas in every State of our Union which echo his words: "We need help."

We must meet this national problem by voting to pass this measure despite the President's objections.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the area redevelopment bill, I was much disappointed that the President saw fit to veto it again.

I cannot agree with the President that many of the economic difficulties covered by this bill are temporary.

Nor do I agree that the bill would impair local initiative. It would, in fact, increase it.

I have been in many distressed areas in the last few months, and have talked with many of the people concerned with their development.

They do not lack initiative. They lack money.

And that is precisely what this bill, vetoed by the President, would provide.

Experience has shown that if it is to attract industry, a community must offer good living as well as good business.

It takes more than a new factory building, ready for occupancy. It takes roads, schools, sewers, playgrounds, plus all the other things which make any town a good place in which to live and work.

One of the best investments we can make is in job security for working people.

A plan that will create jobs for American workers is a gilt-edged, blue-chip investment. This is true because the American worker outproduces every other in the world.

Since our Nation is now producing at the rate of $500 billion a year, surely we can afford to insure that no area of this country—and no family—need live under the cruel cloud of continued high unemployment.

Personal security is as important to our freedom as national security.

To attain this job security, every man and woman willing to work should be able to work—at a wage consistent with self-respect.

But the basic question is not whether we spend this money, but how we spent it.

Do we invest it in new jobs and prosperity, as this bill would do? Or do we give it out for relief, unemployment compensation, and the other medications of a sick economy?

Surely, every American would choose the prosperity of production to the emptiness of idleness.

This must be the choice, if ours is to remain the No. 1 economy, symbol of the good life to all the world.

Therefore, I urge we vote to override this veto, and get on with this redevelopment project, which has been stalled for so long.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I quote a United Press International News Service story, dated May 21, 1960:

PITTSBURGH.—West Virginia, as a result of the 1960 census, will lose at least one of its congressional seats because of declining population, it was revealed here today.

Regional census Director Edgar L. Bryan also said that when complete figures are in from all parts of the country, the Mountain State might lose two of its Representatives.

Although census figures are not expected to be completed for several weeks, Bryan said there was no doubt West Virginia would lose at least one of its seats in Congress.

To magnify this story, I point to the Fifth District of West Virginia. Three of the seven counties in this southern West Virginia district have lost a total of over 40,000 citizens in the past 10 years.

The basic reason for this population loss is the lack of employment opportunities in this particular area.

I use the loss of population in the State of West Virginia as an example of what is happening in some parts of the country.

The President objects to several aspects of S. 722. He says we should not have a program for rural areas in this country suffering from chronic unemployment. It would be well to note that during the tenure of the present administration farm income has fallen precipitately. On the average, income for the 4,600,000 farms in America was $32 a week. This is almost unbelievable; but last year the total farm income was only $11 billion. Take away the food grown on the farm and the rental value of the farm housing and that figure drops to $7½ billion. The picture would not be so dark were the rural areas to receive aid for industrial development.

The President does not agree with that section of the bill which provides for the retraining of workers. We must be farsighted enough to realize that unskilled workers, and those with specialized skills, are being displaced by machines. A worker may spend a lifetime learning a trade, and then see that trade, or skill, become obsolete overnight. Not only does this worker have to be retrained in another skill; but there are those workers who must be trained to operate in an automated factory or office. There must be a balance between the number of jobs available and the number of jobseekers. Jobseekers must be equipped to perform in new jobs.

This bill would not provide for Federal handouts, as some opponents say. This would be an investment in the future of the country. Benefits would redound to the people and also to the Federal Government.

Mr. President, we have been asked to provide in excess of $4 billion to help people overseas; yet, the President proposes an area redevelopment measure of $53 million here at home. He continues to call for an effective bill—Congress gives him this bill—he does an about-face and vetoes it.

The people of this country want depressed areas legislation. The people of this country wanted the President to sign the bill. Congress met its challenge. The President did not. It is up to Congress, therefore, to override the veto of Senate bill 722.

As of May 1960, there were 40 major areas and over 100 so-called minor areas which could have qualified for loans under this bill. For this reason alone there is certainly need for such legislation.

We are considered the richest nation in the world; yet, we do not meet this responsibility. The civil needs of this country must be met. Not only is Senate bill 722 a sound business investment, but it is also humanitarian in its results.

I urge that this Chamber override the President's veto of the depressed areas legislation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask how much time we have remaining and how much time the minority leader has remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In answer to the Senator from Illinois, the Senator has control of 14 minutes and the minority leader has control of 27 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder if the minority leader would be good enough to use some of his time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I regret that I find myself in disagreement with the conclusions which the President has reached with respect to this legislation.

I voted against the original area redevelopment bill last year, because I felt it not only went too far, but also was not soundly conceived, and the formula under which the money would have been apportioned to the various States was not a sound one. The vetoed bill, speaking parochially for a moment, would affect and benefit 20 communities in the State of New York, which I ask unanimous consent to outline in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

There being no objection, the outline was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

New York State communities which would qualify under the requirements contained in the pending bill, according to statistics supplied by the Department of Labor: Albany, Amsterdam, Auburn, Beacon, Buffalo, Dunkirk, Elmira, Gloversville, Jamestown, Malone, Massena, Middletown, Newburgh, Ogdensburg, Plattsburg, Rome, Schenectady, Troy, Utica, Wellsville.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a most significant feature of the measure now under consideration is the fact that it would provide substantial help to these many harder hit communities in my State. In this respect it is thus a great improvement over the limited number of areas which would have benefited under the original bill considered by the Senate last year.

This bill is also a great improvement in terms of the formula under which funds would be supplied to New York State. Whereas most Federal programs are rigged in such a way as to give my State very much the short end of the stick, this bill provides a much more equitable means of apportioning funds. It gives my State a much better break than usual.

Mr. President, we are enjoying the greatest prosperity in our history. Every index of economic activity is up. Employment is up. It does remain a fact that there are certain areas where there are pockets of unemployment, pockets of poverty, in this country. I believe it to be a legitimate and necessary function of government and a matter of both local

and national concern if there is any single man or woman who wants a job—who is ready, able, and willing to work—who cannot find employment. I feel strongly that we should act to provide needed relief to these critical areas of our country.

I have toured through my own State in some of these areas and have witnessed at first hand the need for assistance, which is very real and very pressing. The most significant and fundamental problem which arises is the human suffering which results from having large numbers of persons out of work in limited areas of chronic economic difficulty. The dignity and, in fact, the physical well-being of the affected workers and their families are the real test of the need for this proposed legislation.

In a related sense, Mr. President, this measure is sound because it does not in any way contemplate that affected areas should become "wards" of the Federal Government. I could not for a moment dream of such an arrangement, nor would the communities involved.

We need above all to get these areas over the hump—to give them the technical assistance and loanable funds which will enable them to revitalize and revive their ailing economies. It is clearly both preferable and more economical to provide helpful loans than it is to pass out public relief checks in these depressed areas.

Of course, this bill is no panacea. It merely provides for a little wherewithal by means of which these areas can and should be better able to help themselves. It also contains protections against the pirating of industries between States. This is very important and is another reason why this legislation is a very definite improvement over the original bill submitted to us for action.

Mr. President, the doctor has been diagnosing the disease for many months. He has a pretty good idea as to the type of medicine which will help. But he knows that the real and long-run cure depends in the final analysis upon the spirit and desire of the patient.

I believe the measure before us represents a proper vehicle for promoting the economic well-being this Nation needs. It represents a way to do it in line with the proper diagnoses which have been made.

This measure is a moderate but substantial means for the Federal Government to live up to its national responsibilities to eliminate those pockets of unemployment where joblessness has become chronic and depressing. It is not a budget-busting measure. It does meet the human and economic realities of this problem.

I regret we are going through the motions through which we are going. I see no great purpose to be served by this, because it is obvious there are not sufficient votes to override the veto.

For this reason, I am far more concerned about further action on legislation in this field this year than I am about today's vote. I hope the relevant committees of Congress will now get down to work, taking the administration's new bill as the basis for action. What we need is a sound and effective measure that can be passed, that will be signed into law, and that will go into effect very shortly to help these tragic areas of chronic unemployment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois.

I was shocked and disturbed when I learned of the President's veto of S. 722. His ill-timed and ill-considered veto came on the heels of a legislative message in which the President asked for a bill to help economically depressed areas to help themselves.

This bill would do exactly that. It represents a bare minimum program. It is, in the first place, an authorization bill and not an appropriation measure. In the second place, $4 out of every $5 authorized are for loans and not grants. These loans would have to be repaid with interest by local communities which need these funds to augment what they have been able to raise themselves to rebuild sick economies.

Anyone who has availed himself of the opportunity to read figures knows, Mr. President, that there are 31 chronic and acute depressed areas in our country today. Unemployment is about 4 million—more than 5 percent of the available labor force. Regardless of honeyed words and slogans about prosperity and figures from profit statements of certain corporations, a great portion of our Nation is not sharing in this abundance. On the closing day of the first session of this Congress, we in the Senate adopted a resolution directing the establishment of a committee to study unemployment in this country and to report to the Senate. I was named as a member of this committee, which thereafter studied unemployment problems in many sections of the United States—North, South, East and West. It was my privilege to participate in more of the field hearings than any other member.

Certainly no one who heard the pleas of the jobless, who viewed the empty stores and factories, the abandoned mines and silent railroads, who listened to stark statistics and stared into eyes of men whose jobs no longer exist could vote to sustain such a veto. These people do not want handouts. They get surplus food, barely enough to keep their bodies functioning, but food all the same. They have had unemployment benefits. They have walked the streets in search of work. They seek no more handouts. They simply want jobs to be available. They are willing to do almost anything simply to be able to work for a living.

Now, the Committee on Unemployment Problems received a substantial appropriation to study the plight of the jobless, and then was given an additional sum with which to continue certain operations beyond its originally scheduled life. Meanwhile, it has reported findings to the Senate, many of which were agreed to by both majority and minority members. Among these unanimous findings was the need for an area redevelopment bill.

Was the establishment of this committee, a move supported unanimously by the Senate, a mere idle gesture? Was it merely sop for the 4 million unemployed? If it was merely that and nothing more, it was a waste of time, energy and money. When I sacrificed many days of a vacation period to gather information and to help prepare reports, I felt I was serving a great national need. If the veto is sustained today, there are many who will believe with some cause that our work was, indeed, in vain.

We learned as we traveled the country for these hearings that most of the chronic unemployment areas have tried mightily to help themselves. We learned that some have been successful. We learned that fierce local pride in a few areas among a few organizations resisted any Federal aid. But, by and large, we learned that aid from the Federal Government was solicited and needed.

In my own State of Indiana, there are 5 communities listed among the 31 of the Nation which are severe depressed areas. Many more barely escaped this list.

Permit me for a moment, Mr. President, to point out the particular plight of one city—my own hometown of Evansville. A series of events over which the community itself had no control resulted in the loss, during a comparatively short period, of some 20,000 industrial jobs in a city of 140,000 persons. This city then undertook a complete community evaluation survey. Following this, $1 million in private capital was raised for potential industrial expansion and $300,000 for small business risk capital. This has not been enough to solve the problem since workers must be retrained and since unemployment is a problem that knows no community or State boundaries.

It is obvious that the country has an obligation to assist those communities which need help. This is no less a crying need than that which the administration sees as an obligation abroad. It is difficult for me to see how we can justify assisting sick areas overseas while denying sick areas in this country a modest domestic point 4 program. Frankly, our own unemployed, our own suffering businessmen, see their own communities as underdeveloped and in need of assistance. In the name of decency and justice, we must help them.

I hope that all Senators will put aside their feelings of partisanship or their feelings of kinship for the President and will recognize that his veto has been ill-advised. I hope the Senators will support an authorization for loans and grants to needy American communities to help themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we have only one speaker remaining on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the language of checkers, I think it is the move of the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader says he has only one other speaker.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well. Since I am forced to use up our time I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in his message returning without approval S. 722, a bill of which I was happy to be a cosponsor, the President had this to say with respect to one part of the Congress-passed area redevelopment program.

S. 722 would authorize Federal loans for the acquisition of machinery and equipment to manufacturers locating in eligible areas. Loans for machinery and equipment are unnecessary, unwise and costly.

These were to be loans repayable in American dollars. Still the President was against them.

A week ago Monday I indicated what the Eisenhower-Nixon administration, operating under its double standard, is telling Congress it must approve to the last penny—or face a special session.

I mentioned two projects which the Eisenhower-Nixon administration said were not unnecessary—were not unwise—were not costly—even though they were for projects of exactly the same type as those contemplated under S. 722.

At that time I mentioned the loan of $1,350,000 for the Taiwan Aluminum Corporation, repayable in 5 years in New Taiwan dollars.

At that time I mentioned a loan of $5 million to India, repayable in 15 years in Indian rupees.

It puzzles me—this double standard. It also nauseates me.

I have been for some time now searching for the distinction between what the Eisenhower-Nixon administration opposes at home but not only proposes, but also insists upon abroad. What can be the basis for this distinction? Does a project take on some special aura because it is to be carried out in some far distant foreign clime?

What is the factor missing from domestic projects? Can it be, perhaps, that the Eisenhower-Nixon administration is opposed to loans repayable in American dollars but prefers loans repayable in soft foreign currencies?

A look at the steadily mounting public debt, at the mounting interest rates, at the Eisenhower-Nixon administration's hard money policies, would cause one to doubt that this can be the explanation for the double standard.

Let us look further. Perhaps an answer can be found if we can but examine another example or two.

Let us consider the loan, under the Development Loan Fund, of $2,800,000 to Turkey for the Koruma insecticide plant. This is repayable in 10 years at 5¾ percent in Turkish lira. What is the money to be used for? Information from the fund states:

This loan is to be utilized to import machinery and equipment needed to construct a chemical plant for insecticides and related byproduct chemicals.

This also is for a project which would be permitted under S. 722 but which the Eisenhower-Nixon administration has branded as "unnecessary, unwise, and costly" if it were to be carried out at home.

Even after examining this additional foreign project, Mr. President, I must confess that I can still find no reason for the distinction between domestic and foreign projects which would explain the strange attitude of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration favoring foreign projects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Alaska has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I will further confess that after careful examination of the many projects contained in this book setting forth the fiscal 1961 estimates of the Development Loan Fund, a summary of which I inserted in the RECORD, Monday, May 16. I can still find no reason for the distinction which the Eisenhower-Nixon administration makes between what is needed at home and on what it insists must be given abroad. I for one can discover no reason for such a distinction and I think the American people, when this matter is brought to their attention, will come to the same conclusion.

I could go on indefinitely citing the contradictions of the double standard of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration.

Mr. President, the foreign aid program, is carried on by this administration, is essentially an area development program, but it is an area development program for 104 foreign countries, and we are enjoined by the administration not to cut that program a nickel. If we do, we are threatened with a special session of Congress.

The difference between the program which is sacrosanct in the eyes of the Eisenhower administration and the one before us is that few loans under the foreign aid program are repayable. It consists largely of grants, is badly administered, is gaining the United States few friends, and is 25 times the size of the program which we are considering for our own people at home. So I shall vote to override the veto, calling attention to the undeniable, unanswerable, and irrefutable fact that the Eisenhower-Nixon administration will go down in American history as the first administration to prefer the interests of the people of other lands to the interests of the American people.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, since I understand I have only 7 minutes remaining and the minority leader has 24 minutes remaining, I suggest that he use some of his remaining time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall use all of my remaining time at one time, and I respectfully suggest that the proponents of overriding the veto conclude their argument now, and then I shall conclude my argument to sustain the veto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois wish to be recognized?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Illinois that a time certain has been set for the vote at 2 p.m. If there is a quorum call now, the time for such a quorum call will come out of his time. To rescind the order for the quorum call would require unanimous consent, which might possibly not be forthcoming.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we have been engaged in an extraordinary debate, in which the defenders of the President have really not tried to discuss the bill or justify his actions. Three of the Senators to whom time has been assigned by the minority leader have, in fact, spoken in favor of overriding the veto. I believe only two Republican Senators spoke in favor of sustaining the veto. We have been forced into a situation in which we are using up our time and our opponents are holding back, reserving their remaining time for a final speech. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who was to conclude the debate for us, is on his way to the Senate Chamber. I suggest, in the interest of good sportsmanship, that the minority leader use some time now and then allow the Senator from Minnesota to speak when he arrives, and then my colleague will have an opportunity to conclude the debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, only one speaker will address the Senate on behalf of those who wish to sustain the veto, and that will be the minority leader. I prefer to make my remarks continuous and consecutive, and for that reason I respectfully insist that the proponents use their time and then I shall conclude the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The minority leader is pointing a pistol at our heads. He has so manipulated the discussion as to insist upon closing the debate. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is on his way to the Senate Chamber.

I wonder whether the minority leader would give us a philosophical discussion of the double standard followed by the Eisenhower administration?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to inform the Senator that time is running. The Chair would like to suggest that the time remaining be split into two equal parts, if that is agreeable.

Mr. DIRKSEN. To that suggestion I must object.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, since the Senator from Minnesota apparently will not reach the floor, I will say that this vote is the real test. Members of the Republican minority can talk all they wish about their desire to have an area redevelopment bill. They have balked at every turn, with the exception of a few very gallant and high-minded Senators on the other side, to whom I individually pay tribute. But these fine Senators have voted to work against the overwhelming majority of the Republican Party, which in this body and the other body has voted in overwhelming proportions against similar bills on every occasion. The President has vetoed such bills twice. Now we have a final chance, and we shall welcome 11th-hour and 59-minute converts. We will welcome them. But I do not wish to hear such talk as, "Oh, we are for a bill. We are for a good bill. If we do not override the President's veto, you must do what we want and agree to the bill that we suggest."

Such procedure is legislation by a minority, and I protest against it, not only for the sake of upholding the dignity of this body, but in the best interests of the people of the United States.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not a fact that, in attempting to reach a compromise position, dollarwise, at least, the Senate has yielded to the extent of $137 million.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true; and we have also compromised in making these provisions mere authorizations instead of mandates for bond issues.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not a fact that the legislation on which we shall vote within a few minutes, in reference to the President's veto, is in fact a moderate approach to an overriding problem in many sections of the United States?

Is it not also true that a cursory attention to this problem will not suffice? It is a full-time obligation of the Senate to act on a measure of the moderate proportions of the one which we embrace affirmatively in an attempt to override the veto.

I shall also ask the Senator from Illinois this question——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. I have 24 minutes remaining. The vote is scheduled for 2 o'clock. I did not yield any time. I am not accountable for the interplay which was indulged in a moment ago, and I must respectfully insist that I be given my allotted time. If the vote is to be at 2 o'clock, I am entitled to 2 minutes more than the clock presently shows.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I request the opportunity, under a parliamentary inquiry, to say that I did not realize I was transgressing on the time of my friend the minority leader; so if I have failed to observe the rules of debate, I wish to have him understand it was not my intention to do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thought I was contributing to the debate under time still remaining under the time controlled by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair considers himself at fault. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 21 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the President's veto message he alludes to the fact that for 5 consecutive years he has asked Congress for legislation in the field of area redevelopment. A bill did get to him in 1958. The amount was rather astronomical. The President found it necessary to veto that bill. Now comes another bill, passed by the Senate and passed by the House, in a reduced amount of $251 million. The President finds a defect here, and I believe he clearly sets out in his veto message what he regards as defective in the bill.

First, he says the bill includes areas of only temporary need, and points out that the number of areas over and above the administration position were doubled.

Second, he says there is an excessive Federal share, and that about 65 percent of Federal funds can be spent under this program, and only 35 percent either from a proprietary interest of States or localities. He points out that that would diminish local initiative.

He says the bill includes machinery and equipment, and that might be considered a subsidy for those who might move into an industrial plant.

The distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and also the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] undertook to have that provision removed from the bill in the Senate. However, it remains in the bill now, and it was a proper subject for comment by the President.

Fourth, the President points out that grants and loans for public facilities are provided up to 100 percent of the cost, and he points out that there are a great many areas where, because of tax exemptions, it would be possible for them to finance facilities and projects of a public character.

He pointed out also that the facility loan program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency was under way and that an additional $100 million in credit had been requested in the form of an authorization to carry on that program.

Finally he said the bill makes 600 or more rural areas eligible for industrial loans, and then pointed to the authority of the Small Business Administration and also the rural development program to operate in that field.

Then he pointed out that it creates a new agency. That is true. It was the President's desire—and I believe also the desire of others—to have this authority located in the Department of Commerce, rather than to create another agency. Everyone knows the proliferating character of a governmental bureau once it is set up. I believe in that respect the President was on good ground.

He urged action on this Congress in his veto message, and he did say that he would set a broader definition of criteria.

There is a new bill, which has been introduced with cosponsorship, and among other things it includes broader eligibility criteria. It adds 1 major area and 11 smaller areas to the earlier bills. There are $75 million provided in loans for industrial plants. The limits in the bill are set at 35 percent for Federal assistance. Then it doubles the Housing and Home Finance Agency authority for public facilities from $100 to $200 million.

A million and a half dollars are provided for vocational assistance, and a million and a half for technical assistance. There is also an authorization of $2 million for technical aid to rural areas and so-called one-industry towns.

I believe that the President's veto should be sustained, first, because he clearly sets forth defects; secondly, because the attack on the veto thus far has been political in nature.

My distinguished colleague from Illinois, when the veto message was written last week, referred to the message as "ignorant, unduly unctuous, and hypocritical." That is fine language, indeed, to apply to a message from the President of the United States, no matter how one figures it.

It was also said in the course of the Senator's remarks that "in all probability the President did not write the message."

I could point out how many staff members come on the floor to assist Members of the Senate, and I might point out how much assistance is rendered with respect to other statements and speeches and messages that are prepared. Here is the President of 180 million people. I simply say it is in poor grace to say that the President did not write the message. Perhaps he did not. But clearly there was an innuendo in the very statement itself. It was on political grounds also. There was a reference in the speech of last week by my colleague that after the 1959 bill was passed in the Senate, Republican leaders in the House refused to consent to a rule. That puts is squarely on a partisan, political basis.

There is not any question in the mind of anyone who heard the remarks in the Senate this afternoon as to exactly what is being designed.

I sent to the Office of the Official Reporters so that I could quote a little from the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. Perhaps I should send for him. However, we have other work to do, we cannot always be sending for Senators. I should like to read from the official transcript a portion of the Senator's remarks:

I do not want to question anybody's motivation, but again I think it is abundantly clear that any reasonable, intelligent high school youngster would know that there will be no legislation on this subject enacted at this session of Congress. Why? Because it is not possible to get one Republican vote in the House Rules Committee to report a bill in that body. The two southern Demo-

crats and the four northern Republicans are ganging up together to make it impossible to pass any bill of this kind in the House.

"They are ganging up." He does not question the motivation, so he says, but they are ganging up. What do we do when we gang up? Ganging has a peculiar, conspiratorial connotation, if I know anything about the law. However, I will not charge the Senator with the intention to make the implication. I merely say that he is setting the foundation, not I. They set it with a kind of unrestrained language that has been used on the floor. I do not mean to let it go by unchallenged.

My colleague from Illinois referred to the 1959 bill in his address last week, and he came here late in the evening. However I was here and I heard it. There were only a few other Senators on the floor. The Senate was practically vacant, and most of the galleries had been vacated. But with respect to the 1959 bill he said:

> There is a coalition of four Republicans and four southern Democrats to prevent a rule.

A coalition, Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, does the Senator deny the truth of my statement?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I do not yield. The language speaks for itself. It is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. How does my distinguished friend from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] think about it?

I have never asked one southern Senator to vote for or against depressed areas legislation. I have never asked one of them to vote one way or the other upon the veto message. But there is my colleague's language. He talks about the message, calling it "ignorant, unduly unctuous, and hypocritical"; and then he talks about a coalition.

Then he goes on to discuss the 1958 bill. The vote was 216 to 170. What was the comment on that vote?

> Of the 170 who voted nay, 57 were Democrats—almost all of them southern Democrats.

That is not the language of the majority leader; that is the language of my colleague from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] as it appears in the RECORD. Yes; a coalition; putting it on a strictly political basis, and making light of a serious message by the President of the United States.

Then finally came the vote on Senate bill 722, which passed this body in March and passed the House recently. What was the vote? 202 to 184. It got out of the House by 18 votes. Evidently a number of Members of the House were not persuaded of the merits and the virtues of the bill which was sent to the House and later modified by that body.

What was the vote in the Senate when this bill was passed? We voted on the 23d of March. The bill certainly did not overwhelm the Senate, because the vote was 49 to 46. It got through this body by 3 votes. It got out of the House by 18 votes, despite the frustrations, despite the limitations, despite all the activities at the wailing wall. Evidently there were many Members of the House and Senate who were not persuaded on this point.

The bill which is talked about contains major areas, 40 in number, and 103 smaller areas. What are the major areas? Louisville, Ky. It is no wonder that a distinguished Ohio Representative referred to Louisville as the sweepstakes depressed area.

Atlantic City is included. So are Detroit, Mich.; Albany and Buffalo, N.Y.; Newark, N.J.; and Terre Haute, Ind.

Among the smaller areas, if time permits, I shall refer to only one, in my State, the little town of Olney. The center of population is located at a point, according to the Census Bureau, just a mile north of this town—and it is a lovely town. In the Olney Daily Mail for May 10 a letter was published which refers to an article in the U.S. News and World Report. In the time remaining, let me see if I can read most of it. It is entitled "Well, Come Along," and reads as follows:

> At page 125 of the issue of May 16 of the U.S. News & World Report edited by David Lawrence, Olney is referred to as being among the "depressed areas." News to us, Mr. Lawrence. Along with Olney, is placed in the same category our neighbors, Centralia, Harrisburg, Herrin, Murphysboro, West Frankfort, Mount Carmel, and Mount Vernon.
>
> The writer not being too familiar with the prosperity of these neighboring cities, will not venture an opinion as to whether they are depressed areas (which he doubts) or that this designation is just the mouthing of political candidates for office who are trying to garner votes for themselves.
>
> For the information of Mr. Lawrence and any other politicians interested, the combined assets of the two banks in Olney and the Olney Loan & Building Association, as to their last report was $17,652,000 and of this $7,084,000 was in savings accounts.

And that is a little town, Mr. President.

I continue to read:

> Is this the earmark of a depressed area?
>
> When it became necessary to raze one schoolhouse and build a new one, to build and equip additions to four schools, repair and equip seven schoolhouses, we didn't go down to Washington and beg for Federal funds. Our citizens last fall voted by a big margin a bond issue of $572,400 and will pay for it out of general taxation.
>
> Is that the earmark of a depressed area?
>
> For several years Olney has been the leader in southeastern Illinois in sales tax collected.
>
> Is this the earmark of a depressed area?
>
> For the further information of the erudite author of the article, Olney has a branch of the International Shoe Co., the Carmi Ainsbrooke factory, both employing numerous people, and a branch of the Prairie Farms Creamery Co., which spends thousands of dollars weekly in payroll and the purchase of milk, the State accounting offices of the General Telephone Co. and many small industries. We could in addition list several oilfields supply and service companies, as well several drilling companies engaged in the drilling of oil wells.
>
> Our chamber of commerce through its activities, is now building a factory for Kex Products, to be occupied this coming fall, at which time it plans to start work upon another factory, which will employ several hundred persons. The money for this is being raised locally, and not by grants from Washington.
>
> Since 1936 the citizens of Richland County have been the recipients of large sums of money monthly for oil royalties, many of its citizens have been employed in the oilfield.
>
> Farmers of the Olney area have been industrious and prosperous, through soil conservation practices, bringing our soil to comparatively high fertility.
>
> Thank you, Mr. Lawrence and your political friends. We are not a depressed area, and we resent your insinuation that we are. We are red-blooded Americans, able to stand upon our own two feet, and we do not ask, seek, or want any dole from the Federal Treasury. If we have any problems, we are fully capable of handling them ourselves.

Mr. President, do they want a bill? The new bill has been introduced. It provides for $80 million. It has been changed in some respects. The machinery and equipment item, to which the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] objected, has been removed. The House version of the bill has been modified and made consistent with the Senate bill. The bill is in the Committee on Banking and Currency. I wrote the chairman of that committee a letter and urged that he summon his committee and take some action on the bill, because it is pending there at present.

I have pointed out what is contained in the bill. For the benefit of the Senate, I shall simply reiterate. It broadens the criteria. It adds 1 new major area and 11 smaller areas to the original administration bill on depressed areas. It provides $75 million in loans for industrial plants. It limits Federal aid to 35 percent. It doubles the authorization from $100 million to $200 million which will be available to the Housing and Home Finance Agency with respect to the program for public facilities.

The bill includes $1,500,000 for vocational training. It includes $1,500,000 for technical assistance. It includes $2 million for technical aid to rural areas and one industrial town.

The bill is pending before a standing committee of the Senate. There is the President's request in the veto message. There he says, "For 5 consecutive years I have asked for legislation, and I hope that before this Congress concludes its labors there will be legislation on this subject."

The bill now before the committee will do the job. Are we going to get action? We have no control of the committee. We have one-third of its membership. What happens finally will have to be energized by the majority. If there is no legislation on this subject, after all these repeated requests, then the responsibility is certainly not on this side of the aisle, because we have asked for legislation and we have refined the bill.

The bill is waiting for action. I earnestly hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will meet at a very early date, and that the bill will be reported.

Mr. President, the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, I have completed my statement. I earnestly urge the Senate to sustain the President of the United States, because I think he has made an

effective case in his veto message against the bill which is now before the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD prior to the vote on the overriding of the President's veto, my statement on the subject, which urges that the Senate override the President's veto.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Once again the President has vetoed legislation approved by Congress to bring new life and new hope to thousands of American families in economically depressed communities throughout the Nation.

In so doing, the President ignores the plight of almost 150 American communities with chronic unemployment and lagging economies. He ignores the plight of thousands of men and women without jobs in these depressed and declining communities.

The Department of Labor currently lists 142 areas with substantial unemployment. I have seen the heart-rending human suffering behind the statistics. I have seen this suffering in Duluth and northern Minnesota, and I have seen this suffering in West Virginia and many other communities throughout the Nation.

We have an obligation to assist in alleviating the economic difficulties of these areas. But this administration seems to be more concerned with balancing the fiscal budget than in balancing the budget of human needs. I want to see America's economy thriving. I want to see America's people happy and productive, adequately fed and well housed.

The President's veto is contrary to the desire of the American people that their government promote maximum employment. The Employment Act of 1946 pledges that the U.S. Government will follow policies to promote employment. It does not say that Duluth, Minn., or Charleston, W. Va., or any other city with serious unemployment is not covered by this law.

I say that this administration is ignoring the will of the people by imposing a veto straitjacket on carefully planned legislation to help depressed areas with persistent unemployment.

This administration argues that the Government of the United States cannot afford to help families and communities recover and develop their full economic potential. I say that we cannot afford not to give constructive aid to such communities.

What are we trying to do in this area redevelopment bill?

We are trying to stimulate economic activity with low interest loans for private industry and public projects. With grants for public facilities and technical assistance to help State and local governments and development groups we will increase the number of permanent jobs in depressed communities. And we are authorizing subsistence payments to unemployed workers who go into a training program to acquire new skills to help them find jobs.

How much would it cost?

Of the total $251 million cost of this program, $200 million is for secured loans which will be repaid with interest. These loans include $75 million for redevelopment in depressed industrial areas, $75 million for redevelopment in depressed rural areas, and $50 million for public facilities loans.

And I might add that these loans will be made only if there is State and local financial support for redevelopment projects.

Our redevelopment bill provides for direct grants of $35 million for public facilities and $4½ million for technical assistance, which includes economic studies and economic planning for economic development in depressed areas. The bill also includes $10 million for subsistence retraining payments to help the States support unemployed people as they prepare themselves for new jobs.

Let us briefly examine the President's objections to the area redevelopment bill.

First, he says this bill would squander the taxpayers' money where only temporary economic difficulties exist. If a community's economic problems are only temporary, the community will not be eligible for redevelopment assistance as soon as its unemployment rate drops below 6 percent.

Second, he says State, local, and private initiative would be inhibited by excessive Federal participation. Any one who has visited a depressed area knows that local initiative and local resources have been overtaxed and exhausted. If these poverty-stricken areas do not get Federal assistance, they will just not be able to break out of the demoralizing circle of unemployment, declining purchasing power, declining economic activity, and declining tax revenues.

Third, the President says that it is unwise and unnecessary to provide Federal financing for machinery and equipment. If the President is right, this authority will never be used, but I believe that many depressed communities will find occasions when they will have to provide financing for plant and machinery as well as for land and buildings to attract new industries.

Fourth, the President says that loan assistance for public facilities is unnecessary because such assistance is already available under existing Government programs. There is a public facility loan program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, but there is almost no money available under this program. Furthermore, it seems reasonable to consolidate assistance for depressed areas in one agency, rather than dividing responsibility among executive agencies with differing purposes.

Fifth, the President says that Federal loans for creation of jobs in rural areas are unnecessary. I must disagree with such a conclusion. There are hundreds of rural counties which do need economic redevelopment and rehabilitation just as much as depressed urban areas. Low-income farm families suffer just as much as low-income city families, and usually there is much less opportunity for the rural families to get the welfare services which are available to city families.

Sixth, the President says that creation of a new Federal agency is not needed. Apparently he thinks the Department of Commerce should handle this program. Congress approved establishment of a new agency instead of giving area redevelopment authority to the Department of Commerce largely because of this administration's open lack of sympathy for the objectives of this program.

The area redevelopment bill is a sound constructive approach to economic blight and human suffering in the depressed communities of America. These is no excuse for these conditions being allowed to continue in our wealthy country.

The free people of America can mobilize the strength and their resources—but they cannot do so if the President's veto stops constructive action approved by large majorites in both Houses of Congress.

I urge my colleagues to override this veto.

It is time that our concern for people takes precedence over slogans about balancing the budget. It is time we restore prosperity and hope to those communities and those people who have endured too long the indifference of this Administration to their distress and suffering.

Mr. McCARTHY subsequently said: Mr. President, because of the limitation of time for debate on the depressed areas bill, I was unable to speak before the vote was taken on whether the President's veto should be sustained. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that these remarks may appear in the RECORD prior to the vote on the veto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, at the end of the last session the Senate established a Special Committee on Unemployment Problems. The nine members were directed to investigate unemployment conditions in the Nation and to give particular attention to areas of chronic unemployment. We were also instructed to report back our recommendations for alleviating the effects of unemployment and for reducing this problem.

The members and the staff worked diligently, and I believe that the report which we submitted last March 30 represents an objective appraisal of the problems. Both the majority and the minority members were in general agreement that unemployment is a serious national problem and that the Congress should take a number of steps to reduce unemployment and to alleviate its effects.

Mr. President, after its study the majority members of the committee reached the conclusion, while a variety of programs are required, that "highest priority be given to the enactment of an effective area redevelopment program." I ask unanimous consent that pertinent paragraphs from the committee's study be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE, LOCAL, AND STATE EFFORTS

At nearly every hearing the committee received evidence that local communities are trying to rehabilitate their own areas, to enlarge their economic base, and to provide employment opportunities. The spirit of determination and the vigor of these efforts certainly deserve commendation.

Several thousand industrial development organizations, usually begun as a project of the business community, have been organized in the United States. In labor-surplus areas these organizations often develop into community and regional enterprises, and represent a united business, labor, and civic effort. Funds are raised by individual contributions and by borrowing money and, in some instances, by issuing bonds.

The financial activities of the industrial development groups range from making outright grants to extending credit. The local development organizations often make plant sites and even plant "shells" available to prospective occupants. Some offer technical assistance in advertising campaigns describing community facilities, and detailed counseling in management, production, engineering, and marketing problems.

Every State in the Nation has an agency whose function is to promote economic development. During the past decade a number of States have sponsored statewide privately financed development credit corporations to stimulate industrial growth.

A COMPREHENSIVE FEDERAL PROGRAM

Postwar experience has demonstrated that existing local, State, and Federal programs are inadequate to deal with the serious problems of chronic unemployment and underemployment.

The committee received convincing testimony that communities subject to chronic unemployment cannot solve their problems alone. Most local leaders of business and labor agreed on the need for Federal action to assist distressed areas. The statement submitted by the Scranton, Pa., Chamber of Commerce is typical:

"While Scranton's industrial development program in itself has infused new life and new hope in its industrial economy and provided jobs for thousands of its people, it is felt, nevertheless, that by itself it is inadequate to overcome a continuing unemployment problem which has plagued the area for so many years that it has become intolerable. It is clear, therefore, that the time has arrived when the resources of the Federal Government itself should be mobilized in one nationwide effort to finally and completely eradicate these pockets of chronic unemployment from our national economy."

The president of the Northeast Pennsylvania Industrial Development Commission also asserted strong support for a Federal area redevelopment bill.

With few exceptions, the mayors and civic leaders of distressed areas testified to the inability of their communities to solve the problem of chronic unemployment. At the hearings in West Frankfort, Ill., five mayors and five representatives of local chambers of commerce asked for Federal action. One of the most effective industrial development groups is the Community-Area New Development Organization (CAN DO) of Hazleton, Pa., described in a special paper written for this committee. CAN DO has collected or borrowed $6 million from individuals, banks, and the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority to assist in locating new industry. But its problems are immense. Approximately 3,000 new jobs were created as a result of community efforts, yet unemployment in 1959 was estimated to be 16 percent of the area labor force. The author of the committee study concluded:

"Because of the magnitude of Hazleton's problem and because of the economic and social costs that accumulate as long as the problem remains (in 1958, for example, over $5 million was expended in Hazleton for unemployment benefits, and this is aside from the much greater cost in wasted manpower which can never be retrieved) any outside assistance which would accelerate the Hazleton program seems warranted."

The principal rural redevelopment efforts of the Federal Government have in the past been directed toward assisting individual farmers maintain parity of income and providing education and guidance through the county and State extension services. Little has been done on a community or regional basis. Greater economic interdependence and a sharing of social services and facilities have brought farmers and citizens of towns and smaller urban cities closer together, however, and many common problems would probably respond best to a rural-regional approach. The committee heard testimony on the success of the rural-resource development approach of the 15 counties in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. The Michigan program, under the leadership of the Michigan State University Extension Service, indicates that the traditional roles of the county agent and the State extension services might profitably be reviewed.

A program to help economically distressed areas does not constitute a new area of Federal activity. Such a program is consistent with the spirit and intent of the Employment Act of 1946, and with established Federal policies of helping selected industries. Traditionally, the Federal Government has been active in developing and fostering industries through tariff, subsidy, and tax policies. The 1956 platforms of both major political parties called for Federal legislation to aid economically depressed areas.

No single remedy will cure the deep-rooted problems of chronic unemployment and underdevelopment. A Federal program must offer various forms of assistance adaptable to the varied needs of the depressed areas. These forms include direct financial aid, technical assistance, training and retraining facilities, urban renewal programs, homebuilding incentives, Government contract preference, a Youth Conservation Corps, and community facilities programs.

Mr. McCARTHY. Other Members of the Senate have pointed out the differences between the analysis of the special Senate committee and the veto message of the President. I should like to add an additional comment on one phase of the veto message, that concerning the rural redevelopment program.

The President stated:

The provisions for Federal loans for the construction of industrial buildings in rural areas are incongruous and unnecessary.

Later in the message the President added:

S. 722 would make a minimum of 600 rural counties eligible for Federal loans for the construction of industrial buildings in such areas. The rural redevelopment program and the Small Business Administration are already contributing greatly to the economic improvement of low income rural areas. Increasing the impact of these two activities, particularly the rural development program, is a preferable course.

Mr. President, I believe that members of the special committee were in complete agreement as to the need for a rural redevelopment program in addition to existing agencies.

The existing agencies are not able and were not devised to solve problems of chronic unemployment that exist in rural areas. Mr. President, this is not a partisan issue. It is simply a fact. In their minority views, the three Republican members of the committee, Mr. COOPER, of Kentucky, Mr. PROUTY, of Vermont, and Mr. SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, stated:

It is a matter of prime importance that an area redevelopment bill be enacted and that it contains means for stimulating local effort.

In specifying conditions for such a bill, the minority members wrote that the area redevelopment legislation should, among other objectives:

Provide for industrial development of rural areas suffering from chronic unemployment or underemployment. Many coal mining areas fall into this category.

I ask unanimous consent that the section of the minority members concerning rural redevelopment be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. AIDING DISTRESSED AREAS THROUGH AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

It is a matter of prime importance that an area redevelopment bill be enacted and that it contain means for stimulating local effort. Our task is to evolve a practical program which will be assured of approval at this session of Congress.

* * * * *

(k) Provide for loans for industrial development of rural areas suffering from chronic unemployment or underemployment. Many coal mining areas fall into this category.

* * * * *

RURAL AREAS

It is absolutely essential that assistance be provided for rural areas. Many of the coal mining areas are in this category.

Numerous witnesses testified to the gravity of unemployment and underemployment in rural areas. Moreover, studies by the Department of Labor and the Department of Agriculture indicate that the number of farm jobs required in the 1960's will decline further, as they have in the last three decades. If many of the people now living on farms, and especially the young people, are to find a livelihood without moving out of the area it will be necessary to develop industrial activity. This is widely recognized. Work is under way through the rural development program of the Department of Agriculture to improve the situation in these areas, but that program is primarily oriented to agriculture and makes no provision either for technical assistance or for loans for industrial development. Therefore, the minority believe that aid to rural as well as urban areas is essential to the attack on the problem of chronic unemployment.

We recommend that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor be authorized to develop more effective measures for the identification of chronically depressed rural areas, within a broad provision indicating that they are to be selected from low-income areas with high levels of unemployment and underemployment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BEALL (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea," as would the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on this vote, I have a pair with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], both of whom, if present and voting, would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], are absent on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] are absent because of illness.

On this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] are paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from

Nevada and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea" and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] are paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of a death in his immediate family.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] is absent on official business as a member of the official delegation to attend the 150th celebration in Buenos Aires.

The pair of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has previously been announced. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 45, nays 39, as follows:

[No. 199]

YEAS—45

Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Bible	Hill	Morse
Byrd, W. Va.	Humphrey	Moss
Carroll	Jackson	Murray
Chavez	Javits	Muskie
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Cooper	Keating	Proxmire
Dodd	Kefauver	Randolph
Douglas	Kennedy	Scott
Engle	Kerr	Smith
Gore	Long, Hawaii	Sparkman
Green	Lusk	Symington
Gruening	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Hart	Magnuson	Yarborough
Hartke	Mansfield	Young, Ohio

NAYS—39

Aiken	Eastland	Martin
Allott	Ellender	Morton
Bennett	Ervin	Mundt
Bridges	Frear	Prouty
Brunsdale	Goldwater	Robertson
Bush	Hickenlooper	Russell
Butler	Holland	Saltonstall
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Schoeppel
Carlson	Johnston, S.C.	Stennis
Cotton	Kuchel	Thurmond
Curtis	Lausche	Wiley
Dirksen	Long, La.	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—16

Bartlett	Church	McNamara
Beall	Fong	O'Mahoney
Cannon	Fulbright	Smathers
Capehart	Hennings	Talmadge
Case, N.J.	Jordan	
Case, S. Dak.	McGee	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 45; the nays are 39. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting not having voted in the affirmative, the bill, on reconsideration, has failed of passage.

Mr. DOUGLAS subsequently said: Mr. President, during the discussion of the area redevelopment bill, the distinguished senior Senator from Florida questioned the classification of certain counties in his State as being major problem areas. There was not time at the moment to go into the statistics prepared by the U.S. Department of Agriculture from which the map which I presented was drawn. Since the vote has been taken, I have had the sources looked up. I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared on this subject be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of the vote on the question of overriding the veto of the President of the area redevelopment bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection to the inclusion of the statement in the RECORD. My point was that there was no real distress in the areas which I mentioned, and there is none, and that the standards set up by the bill were not, in my opinion at least, sufficient to separate the areas of real depression and distress in the Nation which need help from those which do not, as was true in the case of the counties in my State which I mentioned, and with respect to other counties as well. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Florida for his very courteous comment. I do not wish to carry this discussion further. However, I will say that the list of 500 or 600 counties merely constitute eligibility under the area redevelopment bill. They do not require the administrator to make loans for new industries in any one county. They merely provided a panel of counties in which the administrator could use his discretion according to relative needs. Therefore the list was in no sense a mandate to the Administrator that remedial loans must be made.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

The Florida counties which are shaded pink on the map [not printed in RECORD] which is in the rear of the Senate Chamber were selected by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and listed among the major problem areas, in the study issued by the Department on April 27, 1955, and entitled "Development of Agriculture's Human Resources," now House Document No. 149, 84th Congress.

As reference to the study will show on pages 6, 7, and 8, the map in the Senate Chamber is a faithful and accurate reproduction of the map presented in the study.

In describing the selection of these areas the study states as follows:

"THE MAJOR PROBLEM AREAS

"Farms with low income are found in all parts of the country, but such farms are most numerous in areas of dense rural settlement with high birth rates, where there are few outside jobs, and where topography or other obstacles hinder the use of modern machinery. In some places the land is overcrowded, so to speak. The abundance of hand labor has tended to reduce the incentive for making adjustments which would give the farms higher earning power per worker.

"Problem areas are shown on the map. Of course the nature of specific problems and the range of possible adjustments vary greatly among and within these generalized areas.

"These areas were set up on the basis of three criteria: Net income of full-time farmers, level of living, and size of operation.[1] Thus areas with incomes under $1,000, or having a level of living in the lowest fifth of the Nation, or having 50 percent or more of the commercial farms classed as low production, were selected for study. The area colored red on the map shows where all three of these criteria are applied and represents those parts of the country where the problem is more serious.

"These problem areas, so-called, strikingly contrast with the rest of the United States. Within these areas in 1950 there were a million full-time farmers of working age who sold less than $2,500 worth of products. Out of this gross sum they had to pay expenses and rent as well as family living. They represented about 40 percent of all the farms in these areas. Another 40 percent also sold less than $2,500 of products but were primarily nonfarmers or were more than 65 years old. Less than a fifth of the farms in these areas produced and sold $2,500 worth of products.

It is clear from the more detailed statement of the criteria for the selection of these counties found in the footnote on page 8 of the study that the references are to levels of farm income, levels of living on farms and production levels on farms—and the statements of the Senator from Florida, Mr. HOLLAND, about other enterprises not related to farming thus do not contradict the data reported by the Department of Agriculture and shown on the map.

It is true that the data upon which the map was based by the Department of Agriculture are for the year 1949. But it is interesting to note that in the 1957 study by the Library of Congress, 15 of these same counties in northern Florida, including Leon County and Okaloosa County mentioned by the Senator from Florida, are among the 500 counties marked lowest in levels of living of farm operator families for the year 1954.

In addition three more of these northern counties marked pink on the map together with two more counties, Taylor and Valousa in northern Florida but not marked pink on the map, were included in lists of 500 coun-

[1] The criteria by which each State economic area in the low-income and level-of-living areas was delineated are as follows:

1. A residual farm income to operator and family labor in 1949 of less than $1,000 provided the State economic area had a level of living index below the average for the region and had 25 percent or more of its commercial farms classified as "low production." Residual farm income to operator and family labor represents the income (including value of home use) above operating expenses and a return to capital invested in land and machinery. See Strand, E. G., Heady, E. O., and Seagraves, James, "Productivity Levels in the United States," USDA, ARS, Tech. Bul. (in process).

2. A level of living index in the lowest fifth of the Nation. Items in the index include (1) percentage of farms with electricity, (2) percentage of farms with telephones, (3) percentage of farms with automobiles, and (4) average value of products sold. See "Farm Operator Families Level of Living Indexes," by Hagood, M. J., USDA, BAE, 1952.

3. "Low production" farms comprising 50 percent or more of the commercial farms. Low-production farms are those with sales of $250–$2,499 with the operator not working off farm as much as 100 days and farm sales exceeding family income from other sources. See "Low Production Farms," Agri. Inf. Bul. 108, by McElveen, J. V., and Bachman, K. L., USDA, BAE, 1953.

ties furnished to me by the Bureau of the Census in 1956 as among the 500 counties with the highest percentage of commercial farms producing less than $1,199 and $2,500 worth of products for sale in 1954.

By any authoritative information we can secure from appropriate governmental agencies, therefore, the data submitted on the map presented to the Senate seems fully supported.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2130. An act to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan;

H.R. 9465. An act to authorize the loan of one submarine to Canada and the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China;

H.R. 9818. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida;

H.R. 10809. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 502. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune; and

H.J. Res. 546. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to present to the Senators and Representatives in the Congress from the State of Hawaii the official flag of the United States bearing 50 stars which is first flown over the west front of the U.S. Capitol.

LAUNCHING BY UNITED STATES TODAY OF 2½-TON MIDAS EARTH SATELLITE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, some very interesting news has just come over the wire. We hear so much criticism and so much talk about failures of the United States, about the missile race, the satellite race, the gap in the air, and so on, that I think the Senate should take due notice of this event.

I read from a news dispatch dated today:

CAPE CANAVERAL.—The United States launched a 2½-ton Midas earth satellite today to test a spy-in-the-sky system for detecting hostile missiles within seconds after they are fired.

An 88-foot, two-stage Atlas-Agena blasted from the cape at 12:37 p.m., e.s.t, (1:37 p.m. e.d.t.) with the limousine-sized moonlet. The rumble may echo in diplomatic halls.

The satellite, dubbed Midas II and essentially a repeat of a shot which failed February 26, was equipped with a super-cooled infrared sensor to spot missile launchings from an orbit about 300 miles above earth.

The space-borne alarm system, peering over thousands of square miles each second, would give America a 30-minute warning of an impending missile onslaught. This is about twice the warning time available with present radar systems.

The Air Force planned to test the satellite with flares fired at Edwards Air Force Base and Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif., this week. It also was reported the Air Force might time the launchings of intercontinental ballistic missiles to coincide with a pass by Midas II.

Sources said the flares will be seen as a rosy glow over a radius of 50 miles. Scientists also said the satellite would be able to tell the difference between missile firings and other heat sources on earth.

Midas—short for missile defense alarm system—is the first step in a top-secret U.S. military plan for an international open skies arrangement of its own, hinged on space satellites circling in polar orbits above every inch of earth's surface.

In the three-part system, Midas satellites will pick up enemy missile firings almost instantaneously, Samos reconnaissance satellites will get television views of military installations and Advent communications satellites will relay the information to U.S. authorities.

Operational versions of the spy satellites may be in the skies in groups of about one dozen within 2 years.

Midas II—last of the series to be launched here—was a prototype designed to see whether the alarm system will work. It was aimed toward an orbit that would carry it over a comparatively narrow band around the Equator, but not over Russian territory.

The big rocket eased from its pad slowly at first as its 360,000-pound thrust engines built up power. This was the same propulsion system which drove an Atlas missile a record 9,000 miles last week.

The Atlas was to drop away after burnout. Then 10 minutes of coasting and after that, the firing of the bullet-shaped Agena section to drive the satellite into orbit.

During the coasting phase two small helium jets perform their task of getting the satellite into proper position with its nose pointing to earth and putting the payload into an orbit as nearly circular as possible.

The instrument package weighed more than 3,000 pounds, largest ever sent into space by a U.S. rocket. The instruments and the second-stage casing were designed to remain attached for a gross weight of about 5,000 pounds.

The planned orbit would carry Midas II 28 degrees north and south of the Equator—as far north as Cape Canaveral and the southern section of Red China and as far south as the southern tips of Brazil and Africa.

The complex satellite was secret but the key to its success lay in the performance of the deep-frozen "eye" which was designed to spot a missile by infrared radiations from its exhaust.

Mr. President, I think that is one of the most gratifying and one of the most successful things we have achieved since we have been part of the space age, and certainly since the Russians sent up the first sputnik in October 1957.

We hear a great deal about the failures of the United States of America. The minute a missile which is fired from Cape Canaveral fails, the information is hurled all over this country and all over the world. The Russians advertise only their successes, and conceal their failures.

All along during the last few months, and in the last 2 or 3 years, we have heard never a word about any failure of the Russians, but we have always heard of their successes. I think it is time to talk about some of the American successes. One of our successes was the 9,000-mile shot of the Atlas missile the other day. Today, Midas II, which is a tremendous step forward, a step of which all Americans can be proud, is another of our great successes.

QUESTIONS FOR RUSSIA TO ANSWER

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, when the Foreign Relations Committee hears representatives of the State Department and others on the developments which took place in connection with the contemplated summit meeting, I will wish to get the answers to the following questions:

First. To what extent has the Soviet Union been spying in the United States, West Germany, and other nations?

Second. How many times it has breached its commitments to other nations in the world—especially the captive nations?

Third. Is there a difference between spying by foot on land on the one hand, and by plane in the air on the other?

Fourth. Is it in the interest of our country that we abandon the general and traditional methods of acquiring intelligence?

Fifth. If we do so, what are the probabilities of the Soviet Union following a similar course?

Sixth. Why did the Communists break their treaty with the Poles in World War II and stab the Poles in the back while the latter were fighting the Nazis?

Seventh. What are the details concerning the brutal massacre of Polish soldiers by the Communists in the Katyn forests?

Eighth. Why, in World War II, did the Reds, while advancing westward and nearing Poland, induce the Polish people of Warsaw to heroically rebel against the Nazi occupiers and then abandon them to slaughter by the Nazis?

Ninth. Why did the Soviet break its pledged word that the people of the satellite nations, under free and open elections, would be permitted to choose the type of government they wanted?

Tenth. Why did the Soviet aid and induce the Red Chinese to use their military power against South Korea, resulting in death and injury to thousands of American boys?

Eleventh. Why did the Soviet encourage the Red Chinese in the bombardment and killing of innocent people at the Quemoy and Matsu Islands?

Twelfth. What is the explanation for the mass and merciless murder of the freedom fighters of Hungary, Poland, and East Germany, who were fighting for liberation in those respective countries?

I do not contemplate, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, allowing a crafty leader of a Communist government to point the finger of suspicion and guilt toward our Nation, when the hands of that person are dripping with the blood of innocent people.

THE RIGHT TO CRITICIZE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, it was almost 10 years ago on June 1, 1950, when I made what ultimately was referred to as the "declaration of conscience." In that statement I stated my disagreement with some segments of my own Republican Party on certain political tactics. In that statement I said that I believed in certain basic rights—among them being the right to criticize, the right to protest and the right of independent thought.

I still believe in those rights—and that the Democrats should have them in the fullest extent for criticizing the Republican administration. I do not believe that anyone should have to appear, out of loyalty, to condone behavior with which he takes issue.

I believe that the Republican administration is subject to criticism on the handling of the U–2 affair—and consequently fair game politically for the Democrats. I do not believe the Democrats should be silenced by a loyalty gag.

Instead I believe that full and open discussion is in the best interest of our country and our people. I believe that honestly expressed difference of opinion—constructively expressed difference of opinion—should never be smothered. I believe that the opposition party has the obligation to criticize that with which it does not agree.

I believe that private citizens are to be commended for speaking their minds whether by letters to the newspapers, publicly, or by letters to their Senators and Representatives.

Yes, Mr. President, I believe in speaking up when I disagree with the President of the United States even though he be the head of the political party of which I am a member. I have done it in the past. I have done it today in voting to override his veto of the depressed areas bill. I shall do it in the future.

But, Mr. President, in my belief in the full right to disagree and criticize, I do not believe that President Eisenhower has disgraced the United States, as was implied on the floor of the Senate yesterday.

I do not believe that the overwhelming majority of the people of Maine believe that President Eisenhower has disgraced the United States, as was implied on the floor of the Senate yesterday.

Nor do I believe in publicizing and upholding the slur made upon the President of the United States, as was done yesterday on the floor of the Senate, with the reading into the RECORD of the statement that "we had better start electing Presidents who are young enough to keep their wits until they finish their terms." Nor do I believe that the overwhelming majority of the people of Maine subscribe to such a slurring statement against the President of the United States.

I believe that the administration is subject to criticism on the handling of the U–2 affair. But I want no part of slurring statements charging the President with disgracing the United States, and reflecting upon his mentality.

AGRICULTURAL AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Georgia, unfortunately an emergency matter has arisen which will take me from the floor of the Senate, and I have a statement on the agriculture bill which I shall ask to insert in the RECORD. However, there happens to be one special question which I would like to have answered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to answer the question if I can.

Mr. MORSE. May I say now, as I said in my statement, that there is not a single Senator who does not appreciate the wonderful work which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has done on the agricultural appropriation, as he has done in so many years past.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for that commendation.

Mr. MORSE. In the course of my statement I would have observed:

I am happy to see that the committee has seen fit to institute a pilot program for estimates on tomatoes and celery. In this connection I can only express my hope again to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that this action this year may break the logjam which has precluded the Department of Agriculture from submitting requests for funds to provide crop reports upon our cane and bushberry production. Can the chairman provide me with any suggestions as to how those of us who recognize the importance of these small fruits to the agricultural economy of our States, may further impress the Department with our needs in this area?

Mr. RUSSELL. The distinguished Senator from Oregon will recall that last year, I believe, we included some funds in the appropriation bill for this purpose.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Department has taken a rather dim view of the proposal.

The department officials seem to be very dubious about the value and the necessity for it. All that we have been able to get from them is a statement that they would furnish us with a report as to the yearend production, and would begin developing a plan for a reporting service that they would submit if the Congress desired to adopt a more complete program.

Mr. MORSE. There is no question about the fact that the chairman of the subcommittee has made clear that he thinks we should have such reports.

Mr. RUSSELL. Last year the subcommittee added language in the committee report that within the amount provided in the bill, that the Department should institute this program. The matter was brought up in the hearings again this year, and we were told that they would make yearend reports as to the total production and would submit to us next year some plan for a reporting service.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Georgia very much. I intend to continue to press for Agricultural Department approval of this request. In my State it is of importance.

The people in the fruit and berry industry of my State, in my judgment, are entitled to this service from our Department of Agriculture. Again I wish to thank the Senator from Georgia for the assistance he has been to us. I am pleased to repeat on the floor of the Senate what I have said to farm groups in Oregon, that we have not a better friend in the Senate Committee on Agriculture than the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the subcommittee, and I am sure he will do everything he can to be of assistance to us in getting the reports we have been pleading for.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am grateful to the Senator for his remarks. Because of the condition in which the farmers of this country find themselves today, there is very little Congress can do for them. Therefore, I have felt a greater desire to assist them in such ways as I can in the appropriation bill in view of the fact that we have been unable to secure the two-thirds vote necessary to enact new legislation over the President's vetoes.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the statement I prepared to use in the debate this afternoon.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

The distinguished Senator from Georgia and his colleagues have earned our thanks for having improved the agricultural appropriations bill in many particulars as the result of their study. Those of us who hail from the Western States particularly would commend the increases which have been provided for soil and water research and facility needs. The increase of $495,800 for this program for operating funds and the $200,000 for the development of plans and specifications for needed construction at existing facilities are sound expenditures.

The $25,000 for a further step-up in the sheep scabies eradication program and the $19 million provided for brucellosis eradication will both be welcomed by many Oregon farmers. Likewise the committee action to restore the full amount of the budget request for State experiment stations is laudable. Even though the increase for this purpose is over a million dollars more than allowed by the House, it is justifiable.

The Extension Service increase of $1.13 million over the budget reflects a confidence in the importance of this vital program which is shared by a great many of us who have profited by the advice and counsel of our own extension agents. I am particularly gratified that the committee is recommending $250,000 over the budget estimate to permit the staffing of 20 additional soil conservation districts. Letters from every part of my State have told me of the difficulty faced by existing districts as SCS personnel were spread thin to service the districts being newly organized. Small watershed protection funds, a million and a quarter over the

budget estimate, and $9,250,000 over fiscal 1960 will be of great help in protecting this most important natural resource.

The $18 million provided by both House and Senate for flood prevention work in the 11 authorized watersheds, is $3 million more than the Bureau of the Budget was willing to recommend. Here, too, in my judgment the committee took action in the public interest.

The Agricultural Marketing Service recommendations of the committee, especially those relating to accelerating the lamb-on-feed reports will be particularly important to many sheepmen of our Western area.

Both the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farmers Home Administration increases are to be commended highly. The services provided by these agencies to our farmers are among the finest contributions made by any of the farm agencies. Both agencies have in the past striven to help the farmer to help himself in the improvement and modernization of his farmstead. Both are based upon sound financial principles, and each needs to have its operations extended.

The soil and water loan program of Farmers Home Administration has been especially helpful to many of our farmers, in the past, and, in my judgment, as funds and personnel to administer them are made increasingly available, the productive use of this financial resource will again increase.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wish to join with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], first in his well-merited commendation of the Senator from Georgia for his great work on this appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture.

Second, I testified before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations in connection with the expansion of the crop reporting service, particularly for the crops which were mentioned, that is, the small fruits that are presently not given the reporting services that are required for good economic programming.

The State of Minnesota is one of the 17 States which we call the small fruit-producing States, which vitally need this service. The people have asked me to make representations to the appropriate committees, which I have done. As I understand, and as I have told our constituents, so far as new legislation is concerned, there is adequate authority right now to do this job, and the committees and the Congress have provided funds to make at least a beginning on this job, but the resistance is in the Department of Agriculture where, despite the authority and the funds, no effort has been made to adopt a program. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Department has not approved any part of this program even though it has had substantial support. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] as well as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] have both been before the committee on two different occasions, I believe.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. They have urged some action, and the committee has been impressed to the extent that it recommended in last year's committee report that the Department make some start on reporting on these small-fruit crops.

We feel that in view of the attitude of the Department of Agriculture we are making as much progress as we can at the present time. We will get the year-end report this year—which we have not had before—and we will have submitted next year a program for a more complete reporting service for fruits and berries. I must say, however, that we have no assurance the department will approve such a program.

DIRTY WORK OF DOCTORS OF ALEXANDRIA, VA.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received a copy of a letter from Mr. Guy L. Brown, grand chief engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, which he has sent to Hon. Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in regard to a very sad case of an old person who is living in great misery these days because of a failure, in my judgment, on the part of the Government of the United States to carry out its moral obligation to the old people of America.

I think this case is what we can call a very fitting exhibit of our dereliction as a Congress in respect to a duty which we owe the old people of this country.

I ask that there be inserted at this point in my remarks a letter from Guy L. Brown, grand chief engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, to Hon. Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated May 13, 1960, and a copy of the letter which this elderly person had sent to Mr. Brown, in the first instance, which caused Mr. Brown to write the letter to Mr. Flemming.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD OF
LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS,
Cleveland, Ohio, May 13, 1960.

Hon. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am attaching a Verifax copy of letter addressed to me by a member of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers living in Alexandria, Va., which as you will see describes one of the most pitiful conditions I have ever seen.

It does not seem possible that a condition such as this can exist in these United States, and my purpose in bringing this to your attention is with the hope that it is evidence that will in turn be helpful in progressing legislation to assist our older citizens who have through no fault of their own arrived in the position in which this man now finds himself. If anything can be done to relieve this specific case certainly it will be appreciated not only by the man himself but by us.

I am furnishing our national legislative representative, Mr. John W. Turner, room 816 Labor Building, 400 First Street, NW., Washington, (phone District 7-7936) with a copy of this letter and also a Verifax of the letter from Mr. Layman. If he can be of any assistance to you do not hesitate to call upon him.

I will appreciate any action you may take.

Sincerely yours,

GUY L. BROWN,
Grand Chief Engineer.

DIRTY WORK OF DOCTORS OF ALEXANDRIA, VA.

To All Members of Our Grand Lodge.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHERS: As I am a retired engine man, 70 years of age. Spent 35 years on engine out of Alexandria, Va., and now nothing but a wreck. I lost my wife in 1955 on Thanksgiving Day. At that time we were both in hospital for 2 months which the doctors, druggists, hospital and undertaker took all my life's savings, left me flat. Since then my health hasn't been any too good and at present time I manage to get to bathroom on two crutches. I draw $164.20 pension, pay house rent $107, water, light, and fuel so you see that doesn't leave much to live on, pay doctors and hospitals.

On April 8, 1960, I got down almost helpless in both legs which comes from bad circulation, legs were injured when on engine about 20 years past. Today I sit here unable to get a doctor to come to my home to examine me or try to give me a little relief, just sit for day suffering with swollen stomach, short of breath, pains in legs severe. And every doctor I call says they don't make any home calls, for me to meet them in the hospital. First place I can't walk on second floor, cannot get down steps and on $60 how can I get to any hospital, $25 a day, doctor $8, ambulance $10 each way, bottle of pills $5 or $10, then other expenses. It is impossible to get any help or relief. Therefore, I sit here and suffer day and night. I have carried hospitalization with American Assurance Society of Richmond, Va., for 30 years or more. When the hospitals jumped to $25 I was 68. I tried to increase my amount like the younger ones did but nothing doing, so I get $11 for so many days in hospital. This may not do any good now but do hope it may help some one in the future, or in making laws to help the disabled pensioned men. I have wrote my condition up to Senator BROYHILL and told or tried to show him the dirty work of the doctors in this city right in the shadows of the Capitol doors. I do know that there is cases of illness that requires the hospital and there is an untold number sent to hospital that are not able to pay, that can be treated at home by the doctor and traveling nurses. They are not treating the traveling nurse as they should yet every time you turn around or pick up a paper they are begging for donations to build another hospital. The doctors have a hospital here but a poor man cannot stand their fees.

It sure looks hard. I owe no man one cent, have no bills whatever and in my old age and crippled up I can't get a doctor to come in and wait on me. The doctors call at home all out through the country but nothing but colored doctors will call in Alexandria and but few of them only treats venereal diseases and the whites is afraid of them. About all they give you is a bottle of dope to numb you. I have one of them next door to me here.

If you see fit at any time to put this where it can cause laws to be made to give us disabled men some medical help you can use every word of this with my name signed to it as I can prove it. There sure must be a clique between the doctors and hospitals and half the time in Alexandria hospitals halls are full of maternity cases, and maybe a curtain around you a few minutes then move it to another one. And the hospitals here are after the city all the time as there

is an immense bill against the city that the city has to send there down-and-out destitutes.

I hope both or all pensions will soon form some kind of relief to help the poor and aged and force the doctors to help charity. All stop and think a doctor charging you $15 to $35 for a physical exam just because he has put a speciality to his name.

Brothers, I do hope that my few words here will be of some help to cut out the dirty work of the doctors as they are doing and try to give the people a little service. I pray to our God for help.

Yours fraternally,

A. J. LAYMAN.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT—VETO

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I deeply regret that the Senate did not override the President's veto of the so-called depressed areas bill. I had hoped to participate in that debate, but because of the limitations of time, this was not possible. The arguments which I heard advanced to sustain the Presidential veto only further convinced me that there is an urgent need for the type of legislation which was passed in both Houses and sent to the President. It is my understanding that the so-called administration bill is before one of the committees of Congress, and I hope that that committee will act.

I hope that in the process of acting, it will add amendments which are a part of the bill that the President vetoed. I do not believe Congress should retreat 1 inch. I believe I have some personal knowledge from personal observation in several States of the Union as to the need for legislation along the lines of that we passed in Congress on two separate occasions, not this halfhearted, weak, and totally inadequate proposal advanced by the administration.

U.S. LEADERSHIP FOR PEACE—THE WORLD COURT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Wichita, Kans., Morning Eagle has used the recent comments of an Indian diplomat to point up most effectively the basic contradiction between American statements and actions as the leader of efforts to secure peace with justice and the American failure to recognize the appropriate role of the World Court in this effort.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Wichita Morning Eagle of May 9 1960 entitled "U.S. and World Court," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. AND WORLD COURT

Indian Ambassador Chagla chides the United States for making a mockery of the International Court of Justice by restrictions on its jurisdictions. This refers to the so-called Connally amendment reserving to the United States the right to determine whether a dispute is essentially a domestic matter and not subject to adjudication by the World Court.

"You must not forget," said the Indian Ambassador, "that the United States claims to be the leader of the free world. She wants peace but peace with justice, and how can you ever have justice if the only forum which can settle international disputes is reduced to a humiliating position where it cannot entertain any disputes which ought to be properly decided by it?"

President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON, the American Bar Association and many others have advocated repeal of this amendment. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, has a repeal resolution pending in the Senate. It is vigorously opposed by many powerful organizations as a surrender of U.S. sovereignty.

But the Indian diplomat is right in saying that the World Court will never amount to much until the United States, and all other nations supposedly adhering to it, use it as an instrument for the adjudication of international disputes. No doubt a few well publicized decisions by the court would accustom the peoples of many nations to the rulings of a body designed to promote world order.

RETENTION OF THE CONNALLY AMENDMENT—PRO AND CON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, two distinguished American lawyers, both past presidents of the American Bar Association, debated in the columns of the Christian Science Monitor of April 28, 1960, the question: "Should the Connally Amendment Be Retained?"

This exchange between Frank E. Holman, arguing for retention, and Charles S. Rhyne, arguing for repeal as called for in my proposal, Senate Resolution 94, is a great service to the responsible discussion of methods for peaceful settlement of disputes among nations. The participants and the Monitor are to be complimented on presenting it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this most interesting and valuable debate be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the debate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD THE CONNALLY AMENDMENT BE RETAINED?

(At the request of the Christian Science Monitor, two prominent American lawyers have agreed to present this written debate on the question of whether to retain the Connally amendment. This is the amendment which specifies that the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice shall not apply "to matters * * * essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States as determined by the United States." Both debaters are former presidents of the American Bar Association.)

ARGUMENTS FOR

(By Frank E. Holman)

Nature of the reservation

The United Nations Charter, in establishing a World Court, accorded it no compulsory jurisdiction except as each nation agrees in a "declaration" deposited with the Secretary-General. The U.S. declaration reserved the right to determine when a particular matter is domestic and hence not properly a subject of international control.

Domestic questions protected by the Connally reservation

Immigration: The reservation prevents the Court holding that the United States, contrary to its immigration laws, must absorb nationals from overpopulated areas—China, India and elsewhere.

Tariffs: Traditionally a domestic matter; yet this affects world commerce. Without the reservation, the Court could treat tariffs as international, and regulate them.

Offshore rights: These involve fisheries, oil and other natural resources. The Court could internationalize offshore rights, holding they should be shared with other nations.

Panama Canal: Its control is essential to the safety and welfare of the United States. We paid for it. Without the reservation, the Court could internationalize this strategic waterway.

Foreign aid: The World Court has jurisdiction over breaches of international obligation and the nature and extent of reparation. The United Nations Charter contains many humanitarian obligations—committing nations to promoting full employment and social and economic progress for all peoples of the world. Undeveloped nations could complain we have not complied with such obligations, and the Court could grant reparations therefor.

It is said the Court can be trusted to treat such matters as domestic. This is unlikely, as demonstrated by the known activities of the Human Rights Commission.

Comparison between World Court and Commission on Human Rights

Actually, the World Court is not a court. No tribunal functions as a court where not bound or guided by definite rules of law. Formulating its own rules, it adjudicates according to the individual concepts and national interests of its members.

The Court is only an international commission of 15 members—one each from United States, Great Britain, and Australia—others from United Arab Republic, Nationalist China, Greece, Poland, France, Mexico, Panama, Argentina, Uruguay, Norway, Pakistan, and the Soviet Union.

The Human Rights Commission also had one member each from the United States, Australia, and Great Britain. Like the Court, other members came from countries having different historical and legal backgrounds not fitting them to appreciate what, to us, is domestic rather than international in character.

Why should the Court approach matters differently than the Commission, whose members were likewise distinguished citizens of their respective countries—a number also able lawyers? The Commission reflected their differing historical and legal backgrounds so that, regardless of charter prohibitions (like art. 2, subpar. 7), against intervention in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction, they formulated various conventions violating such charter provisions. The Court, man for man and in the aggregate, represents no different ability or integrity than did the Human Rights Commission.

The difficulty is inherent in both instances. Nations like Pakistan, United Arab Republic, Greece, Lebanon, Poland, South American countries, and the Soviet Union are grounded in systems of law not fitting them to understand what to us is a domestic matter.

Among many unbelievable results in the Commission's deliberations was that, after 400 meetings, the majority refused to include in the Human Rights Covenant any provision recognizing the basic American right to own private property and be secure in its enjoyment against arbitrary seizure by government.

In connection with many other American concepts like freedom of speech and of press, a majority of the Commission, in formulating covenants, so little understood our concepts that these freedoms, rather than being recognized and protected, were highly restricted to conform to a common denominator agreeable to the political systems of other counties.

Violations of the letter and the spirit of the charter

At first, Americans believed the charter provisions sufficiently protected our control over our domestic affairs. Soon, disillusionment followed.

John P. Humphrey, Director of the Human Rights Commission, stated (January 1948) that the Commission proposed to establish a supernational supervision over the relationship of a state to its citizens—a matter "traditionally within the domestic jurisdiction of nations."

Moses Moskowitz, of the United Nations staff, stated (April 1949) that, under the official view, any matter becoming the subject of a U.N. convention or even of a resolution ceased to be a "matter essentially within the jurisdiction of a member state."

The Acheson State Department (Publication 3972) stated: "There is now no longer any real difference between domestic and foreign affairs."

Following such pronouncements, without the Connally reservation, named for its sponsor, former Senator Tom Connally, Democrat of Texas, why would the Court hesitate to hold that domestic affairs are international and hence subject to adjudication by the Court?

Favorite arguments for repeal of the Connally reservation

These arguments assert that in making and retaining the reservation, we are guilty of an unworthy act which is a disturbing factor in the achievement of world peace. Such arguments are fallacious.

When we limited our adherence to the Court by the Connally reservation, we only exercised a right granted under the Court Statute (chap. 2, art. 36(5)).

Other nations filed declarations limiting their acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction. Our American internationalists do not consider those declarations as unworthy acts, disturbing to world peace.

The reservation does not prevent use of the Court for the settlement of truly international disputes. It does not occasion the paucity of litigation in the Court. How could it possibly deter the Court in trying international issues? Governments presently believe that genuine international questions should be settled at the diplomatic level through negotiations and conferences and not at the judicial level. Since Communist countries refuse outright to use the Court, settlement of international issues at the judicial level is not realizable. Moreover, the causes of wars are often political or economic, and not usually judicable by a court. As a result, not only has the Court been bypassed, but also other United Nations agencies. Major powers prefer conferences, regional, summit or otherwise, organized outside the United Nations.

The reservation has existed for 13 years. Until recently resurrected by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, a world-government-minded enthusiast, nobody was suggesting that its existence adversely affected world peace.

Conclusion

In any consideration of the matter, the background events connected with the activities of the United Nations—particularly the deliberations of the Human Rights Commission—must never be overlooked. The Commission had no hesitation in promulgating covenants and conventions interfering with the sovereignty of the United States as to its internal affairs. The only protection against similar interferences by the World Court is the Connally reservation.

Interference with our courts: In 1949, the United Nations entertained a complaint from one of its consultative organizations, condemning Judge Harold R. Medina for his trial, in the Federal court, of 11 Communists, as a violation of the Human Rights Declaration. Only a member state may file a complaint in the Court; but Uruguay or any other nation, under leftwing pressures, could file complaints criticizing our courts. Due to such pressures in Uruguay, our State Department interfered in Caryl Chessman's execution. Without the reservation, Communist and leftwing nations could complain against the United States for prosecuting Communists and other culprits.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST

(By Charles S. Rhyne)

Violence as decision method

The world today is poised between hope for total peace and fear of total war. Ending war is mankind's greatest need. A frenzied unchecked race is on to improve nuclear warheads and their delivery via intercontinental missiles—today's ultimate method for resolving disputes between nations. A new method is urgently essential to avoid atomic holocaust. President Eisenhower has said:

"Man's hope for world peace does not rest in opposing armed camps, but in an idea. That idea is the concept of a rule of law as the means for settling disputes among sovereign states."

Courts best nonviolent method

Finding facts and applying law in a court are the best nonviolent methods conceived since the dawn of history for resolution of disputes. A court is a worldwide symbol of peaceful decision. No one decisionmaking process is surrounded with such an aura of fairness or commands more public esteem, confidence and trust.

In the beginning of time disputes between men were settled in a fist fight; then with sticks, stones, spears, and guns. Today in civilized nations such disputes are decided in courts. But from the beginning until now, the primitive rule of violence is the ultimate resort in disputes between nations.

The creators of the United Nations knew this, and sought to substitute a courthouse for the battlefield. They established the World Court to decide:

"All cases which the parties refer to it and all matters specially provided for in the Charter of the United Nations or in treaties and conventions in force."

An empty Court

Speedy communications and transportation create more international contacts and disputes. Yet the World Court has remained almost empty—deciding only 11 cases on their merits in 14 years. For this our U.S. Senate is primarily responsible. In accepting the Court's compulsory jurisdiction it attached an amendment, sponsored by Senator Connally, of Texas, which makes that acceptance a sham. Senator Connally's amendment provides that when sued in the World Court, the United States itself will decide whether the case involves domestic or international issues. Since the United Nations Charter prohibits the Court from exercising jurisdiction over domestic affairs of any nation, Connally gives us control over whether a case against us may be decided.

No sovereignty can be surrendered

Eliminating Connally is not a surrender of sovereignty over our domestic affairs—the United Nations Charter prohibits the Court from accepting or exercising such sovereignty even if offered. The real question here is shall we keep power to bar a decision in those few close cases where a decision might go against our position on whether a matter is "domestic" or "international." Should the slight change of a wrong decision in such a close case be allowed to continue to render useless the best peaceful decision method known to man when even a wrong Court decision—if contrary to fact or law—can be changed, whereas the millions of gravestones the world over are mute evidence of the unchangeability of the results of war?

Connally violates the age-old maxim that "no person should sit as a judge in his own case." By it we are turned into a judge in every case to which we are a party.

Consent court won't work

Six of the seven complaints filed there by the United States (for damages through attacks upon our airplanes) have been dismissed because the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Hungary refused consent that they be decided. This proves both Communist distrust of the Court and jurisdiction based on case by case consent will never work. The thousands of disputes decided by national course, however, prove that obligatory jurisdiction does work. President Truman has said:

"When Kansas and Colorado have a quarrel over the water in the Arkansas River, they don't call out the National Guard in each State and go to war over it. They bring a suit in the Supreme Court of the United States and abide by the decision. There isn't a reason in the world why we cannot do that internationally."

But Kansas would hardly sue if Colorado could cause summary dismissal of its complaint by refusing consent for a Court decision.

If traffic court jurisdiction depended upon each defendant's consent, traffic courts would have few cases to try. In fact the police would hardly waste their time arresting traffic offenders. And so it is with the World "consent" Court. Few nations sue other nations there. Nations do not really prefer war to the Court. The "blight of Connally" destroys their ability to get a decision there.

We need Court most

Because of our worldwide involvement we need the Court more than any other nation. But Connally closes the door to us. Under the Court's statute all rights are reciprocal. Any nation sued by us can rely upon Connally, refuse consent, and our complaint is dismissed. Connally is thus a two-way street with a boomerang effect.

If performance is proof, the fact that the Court never has exceeded its jurisdiction indicates Connally is unwarranted. Further, the Court's decisions in reasoning and result compare favorably with those of the best national courts.

The empty courtroom at The Hague is therefore not due to lack of a competent court or a lack of justiciable disputes.

Best informed urge Connally elimination

Those best informed on weapons available for international decision by violence support Connally's repeal. These include: President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, Secretary of State Herter, Attorney General Rogers, and many Senators and Congressmen on a bipartisan basis. Over 90 percent of the newspaper editorial comments urges repeal. The American Bar Association adopted a resolution in 1947 condemning Connally as "a serious backward step." The Catholic Association for International Peace, and the Board of World Peace of the Methodist Church are illustrative of organizations adopting similar recent resolutions.

Connally abandoned by others

Acquisition of the A-bomb by the Soviet Union, and its ever-increasing capacity to deliver it, has seemingly caused other nations who copied Senator Connally's idea to now abandon it. England, India, and France have led the way. Thirty-three nations now accept the Court's jurisdiction without a Connally-type reservation. President Eisenhower said in India:

"Plainly, one foundation stone in this structure (for peace) is the International Court of Justice (World Court). It is heartening to note that a strong movement is afoot in many parts of the world to increase acceptance of the obligatory jurisdiction of that Court. I congratulate India on the leadership and vision she has shown in her new declaration accepting its jurisdiction."

Law in a court is no "cure-all." It supplements other peace machinery whereby nonjusticiable disputes are resolved. We now exercise our sovereignty to maintain peace internationally through men, money, bases, and military might. Since disputes are inherent in the nature of men and nations, no more essential need exists today than a further exercise of our sovereignty to strengthen the World Court to avoid decision of disputes by atomic weapons.

Time has come to end war

In civilization's evolution the time has come when court justice must replace war violence if mankind is to survive. To speed that evolution few steps offer more in promise or potential than Senate repeal of Connally. Elimination of Connally is an imperative step forward out of the current balance of terror toward world peace which only our Senate can take. Our Senate will fail all mankind in the urgent quest for peace if it does not take that vital step.

REBUTTAL BY MR. HOLMAN

Many Americans are fooled today by internationalist phrase-makers. One current phrase is "world peace through law." Upon this, Mr. Rhyne largely bases his argument for repeal of the Connally reservation.

At the American Association of Law Libraries Meeting, July 2, 1958, Washington, D.C., Mr. Rhyne announced:

"There is no reason why peace through law cannot be sold with the same verve and enthusiasm that we sell soap and other products and programs."

The following day, no less an internationalist than Dean Acheson observed:

"While it may be that peace through law may be offered for sale with the same verve and enthusiasm as soap, the chances of a consummated sale seem to me infinitely less. If you think of yourself as ringing Mr. Khrushchev's doorbell with two packages in your hand, you can, I firmly believe, have no doubt as to which is salable and which is not."

Mr. Acheson then indicated why Mr. Khrushchev would not buy the Rhyne rule of law:

" 'Whose rule of law?' he (Khrushchev) would ask. You answer with verve and enthusiasm. 'Rhyne's grade A fancy, approved by the American Bar Association.'

" 'You have a nerve,' he shouts back as he slams the door. 'I'm the proprietor of Khrushchev's rule of Khrushchev, grade triple A, super-colossal. Guaranteed to bury you. Use it either as a tonic or embalming fluid, or both. Ask the Poles.' "

Mr. Rhyne, in selling peace like soap and other products, resorts to the patent medicine sales technique of casting epithets. He refers to Senator Connally's reservation as a "sham," as "generating distrust," as having a "boomerang effect," as the "blight of Connally" (although the Senate approved 51 to 12), as violating the maxim—"no person should sit as a judge in his own case."

The reservation does not violate this maxim. American law permits one to elect whether to submit his case to a particular tribunal. Relying on diversity of citizenship, he may remove his case from a State to a Federal court; or he may take a change of venue. Similarly, the World Court Statute permits a nation to elect not to submit to that Court the question of whether a matter is domestic. There is a basic difference between judging one's case, once in court, and, as of right, not submitting a particular question to that court.

Mr. Rhyne not only relies on epithets rather than argument, but also upon personalities and newspaper editorials. Space is insufficient to analyze all his statements, but it is denied that "over 90 percent of the newspaper editorial comment" urges repeal. Many oppose repeal—Los Angeles Times, Arizona Republic, Dallas News, Times-Picayune, Indianapolis Star, Chicago Tribune, and others. A majority of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee opposed repeal. A modern enigma is that President Eisenhower and some in his administration should approve any measure authored by Senator HUMPHREY, explainable only on the theory that they thoughtlessly succumbed to the Rhyne "soap sales" program for "world peace through law."

However much we favor settling matters by law instead of by force, we are still compelled (through no fault of ours) to deal at arm's length with the Soviet Union and other nations and are not ready for military disarmament nor for legal disarmament, by abandoning the Connally reservation and its protection of our domestic affairs.

The present nonuse of the World Court is occasioned, not by the Connally reservation, but by the refusal of nations, chiefly the Soviet Union, to use it, and by their preference for dealing with world affairs by negotiation and conferences.

To insure peace through law requires the following governmental powers: legislative (to establish law), judicial (to interpret law), executive (to enforce law). Without these, a rule of law is as impossible as is water without two parts of hydrogen and one of oxygen. In absolute monarchies, all three powers were merged in the monarch; in other governments they were partially merged; in ours there is a separation of powers. But to have effective government, national or worldwide, there must be legislative, judicial, and executive authority; thus the achievement of "world peace through law" inevitably adds up to world government.

Mr. Rhyne does not recognize this stubborn fact. His sales program is, therefore, based on cure-all phrases and vague unfounded hopes substituted for reality. Assuredly war is terrible. But Americans should not be panicked into world government where their lives and liberties, even their religious faiths, would be dominated by alien majorities, for we represent only 8 percent of world population.

Mr. Rhyne says: "The United Nations Charter prohibits the Court from exercising jurisdiction over domestic affairs." But the United Nations has nullified this supposed protection by official statements and overt acts, as shown in my principal article. Why trust the Court, itself an organ of the United Nations, to enforce this protection? The Connally reservation insures it.

REBUTTAL BY MR. RHYNE

Fear of the Court

Mr. Holman supports Connally because of fear the World Court may exceed its specified jurisdiction. He cites not one thing that the Court has said or done as a basis for his fears. He selects other targets, agencies, and people totally unconnected with the Court, and by farfetched innuendo seeks support for his fears. He favors existing dispute settlement methods internationally—methods which have never prevented war—to decisions in court, yet he gives no logical reason for this negative position.

U.N. Charter, not Connally, protects domestic areas

He erroneously claims Connally protects six domestic areas from World Court decision. Actually it is the United Nations Charter, not Connally, which prohibits World Court jurisdiction over domestic matters. Under universally accepted international law, immigration, tariffs, and offshore rights are clearly domestic matters outside the Court's jurisdiction. The treaty of 1903 with Panama confers all rights, powers, authority, and sovereignty upon the United States over the canal so the Court could not possibly internationalize it. Our domestic court cases and what we spend on foreign aid are irrefutably domestic matters which the World Court cannot pass upon. The extremity of Mr. Holman's six illustrations destroys the reasonableness of his fears. Connally and the World Court have no possible relation to our State Department's interference in Caryl Chessman's execution.

A false analogy

Finding nothing in the Court's record to support his position, Mr. Holman selects the record of the Human Rights Commission to assail. Realizing this glaring weakness, he seeks to strengthen his case by himself declaring the World Court is not a court but a commission. The U.N. Charter and the Court's statute flatly refute this legerdemain. They require the Court to follow fixed legal procedures and law principles. The Commission is a political body. Membership qualifications, functions, and work products of the Court and Commission are vastly different. It is interesting to note that Mr. Holman is unable to point out one instance where the World Court has exceeded its jurisdiction. Since he cannot do so, he attempts to impute to the Court the alleged shortcomings of an entirely different body. Use of such a technique discredits his position rather than the Court.

His claim that justices from other nations cannot recognize domestic issues is directly refuted by decisions of the Court. And other nations guard their domestic affairs as jealously as we do.

Illogical deductions

Reliance upon strained interpretations of statements made 12 years ago by John P. Humphrey, a United Nations official from Canada, and 11 years ago by a private person, Mr. Moses Moskowitz, plus lifting of one sentence out of context from a 99-page State Department publication demonstrates how desperately unfruitful has been the search for evidence to support his "fear the Court" position. Mr. Moskowitz, contrary to what Mr. Holman says, was in 1949 and still is an employee of the Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations—never "of the United Nations staff." Yet on the basis of these statements—by people never even remotely connected with the Court—Mr. Holman argues the Court would hold domestic affairs are international, hence subject to adjudication by the Court. Obviously, he would offer real evidence if any existed rather than that presented. The Court's record and the law governing its jurisdiction prove the opposite of Mr. Holman's thesis.

Trial by battle

To keep the record straight, it was President Eisenhower, not Senator HUMPHREY, who first suggested repeal of Connally.

Reliance upon settlement of disputes between nations by negotiation has resulted in many bloody battles. When Connally was adopted the Soviet Union had neither the H-bomb nor intercontinental missiles. Since then the arms race has accelerated. And every such race since the dawn of history has exploded into war. Trial by battle today is a negative backward step into extinction of mankind. If allowed a choice, mankind would certainly choose the Court over atomic holocaust. Disarmament according to Secretary Herter depends upon rules of law which prevent "nations from attacking other nations" plus "a world court."

Undecided

Mr. Holman concludes by another attack on the Human Rights Commission rather than the Court. These somewhat confusing arguments and targets of Mr. Holman are understandable when one realizes that he has changed his mind before on Connally. Perhaps he is on the verge of changing his mind again. We hope so. Fear of the Court is wrong in principle and experience.

I close with Mr. Holman's own words to the American Bar Association in 1947 vigorously urging repeal of Connally:

"We as lawyers ought to speak, and speak now, for the jurisdiction of the Court. * * * We should keep our consistent position as to the World Court, not lag behind with those who are afraid of it." (Quoted from 33 American Bar Association Journal 401.)

CONGRESS, THE UNITED STATES, AND THE WORLD COURT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, although my proposal, Senate Resolution 94, calling for repeal of the self-judging reservation to the U.S. adherence to the Statute of the World Court has been temporarily postponed, there are certain practical steps which can be undertaken now to make a repeal a reality in the near future.

Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has clearly set forth these practical steps in an address before the section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association in Washington, May 19, 1960. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS, THE UNITED STATES, AND THE WORLD COURT

(Speech by Senator CLARK at section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association, Washington, D.C., Thursday, May 19, 1960)

The collapse of the summit conference, disclosures of illegal espionage flights, and threats to Allied air bases and to West Berlin—all appear to make sadly misdated this discussion of the relationship of the United States to the World Court.

What has U.S. participation in the infrequent and relatively unimportant litigation at the Court in The Hague got to do with the burning issues which divide East and West and endanger world peace today? Discouragingly little, it must be admitted by even the stanchest supporters of the Court.

And yet the errors, hostilities, fears, and disillusionments of the last 2 weeks demand stock-taking and reassessment. What better time than now to focus renewed attention on our relationship to one of the institutions known to be essential to the achievement of a just and lasting peace. What better time than now to concentrate on the limited but obtainable objectives in the continuing and vital effort to promote the rule of law in the world community.

The repeal of the self-judging Connally reservation to the United States ratification of the Statute of the International Court of Justice is such an objective—obtainable next year, if not in 1960.

We can take little pride in reviewing U.S. ties with the World Court over the last 14 years.

On August 2, 1946, the Senate adopted 55–12 Senator Connally's 8-word amendment to add the clause "as determined by the United States of America" to the reservation of U.S. jurisdiction over domestic matters after a brief and inadequate debate. Only three Senators spoke against the amendment. The three reasons given by Senator Connally in support of his amendment—that it was needed to prevent the Court from taking jurisdiction over immigration, tariff and Panama Canal matters—were all shown to be inaccurate in the excellent report filed last August by the Tondel Committee of this section.

And yet the damage was done. A number of other nations followed our example and enacted similar self-judging reservations, although it is encouraging to note that France, the United Kingdom, and India dropped such reservations in recent years.

The United States has invoked the self-judging reservation in one of the handful of cases brought against us to date, a complaint lodged by Switzerland in the Interhandel case, although the Court decided the case in our favor on other procedural grounds.

The substantive arguments for repeal are familiar to this section's members, who have taken such a commendable lead in advocating full U.S. participation in the Court's jurisdiction: (1) A recognized body of international law, a court system to administer such laws, and adequate enforcement sanctions are as essential to peace with justice on the international scene as they are in national and local community life; (2) While purely domestic questions are beyond the jurisdiction of the International Court under the terms of Article XXXVI of its Statute, the decision as to what is a domestic issue should be made by the Court rather than the litigant nation; (3) The Connally amendment permits the United States to determine unilaterally what is a domestic question and to decide whether we will let other nations take us to court.

We must indeed plead guilty, at least in part, to the charge leveled at us by our good friend, Ambassador Mahommedali Currim Chagla of India, when he stated recently that the Connally amendment "reduces the Court to a mockery and effectively prevents any rule of law from ever being established in the international field." The London Economist echoed this charge in an editorial earlier this month which stated that "the work of the Court has been hampered greatly because so many other countries follow the American example."

An analysis of the so-far unsuccessful effort to repeal the Connally reservation in the 86th Congress leading to suggestions as to ways in which that effort can be made successful in the future may be useful at this time.

The history of the repeal move to date is the old, old story of too late and too little. Although 12 of those who voted for the Connally amendment in 1946 are still in the Senate and only Senators FULBRIGHT and MORSE remain of those who voted against it, the approach to the repeal question has been entirely casual.

In December of 1958 the Washington press corps indicated that the President would ask for repeal of the Connally amendment. Accordingly it was no surprise when Mr. Eisenhower's state of the Union speech on January 9, 1959, included the following statement:

"It is my purpose to intensify efforts during the coming 2 years in seeking ways to supplement the procedures of the United Nations and other bodies with similar objectives, to the end that the rule of law may replace the rule of force in the affairs of nations. Measures toward this end will be proposed later including a reexamination of our own relation to the International Court of Justice."

Early in the first session of a new Congress with elections almost 2 years in the future is an ideal time to take up controversial issues. Committees have time for full hearings. Floor debates that take 2 or 3 days can be scheduled without upsetting adjournment plans. But during the first 2½ months of 1959 the 86th Congress received no further message or requests from the administration regarding the World Court.

On March 24, 1959, Senator HUMPHREY introduced his resolution (S. Res. 94) to repeal the Connally amendment, and it was referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. On March 25, the committee asked the State Department and the Department of Justice for comment on the resolution. In the end of April an Assistant Secretary of State wrote to Chairman FULBRIGHT to advise him that State supported repeal. A similar letter from a Deputy Attorney General was received in early June.

The further message promised by the President in his state of the Union message was not forthcoming and Congress adjourned in September without taking further action on the repeal proposal.

It was not until late last November that the President's views in favor of repeal were elicited in response to a written appeal by Senator HUMPHREY. When Senator JAVITS and I spoke to Secretary Herter to urge Executive support of Senate Resolution 94 at about the same time, we learned that the Department still had no poll indicating whether the Senate would support the measure.

The President's state of the Union message on January 7, 1960, contained a few sentences reiterating the support for the repeal resolution stated in his letter to Senator HUMPHREY.

At this stage some proponents of repeal thought they could relax since so many formal statements of support had been obtained from the administration. The opponents of repeal were just beginning to roll.

Although my mail last year reflected a slight majority of opinion in favor of repeal, in the early weeks of 1960 I started to receive mass mailings directed against Senate Resolution 94, stirred up by the press of the right fringe, the American Legion, the DAR, and other self-styled patriotic organizations. The communications were violent and extreme and contained all the misconceptions you would expect: Our courts and Constitution would be subverted by passage of the resolution; proponents were guilty of treason.

Senator FULBRIGHT saw the storm signals and requested the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to appear personally in support of the repeal resolution when hearings were held in January to indicate genuine administration support. Both Cabinet members did testify in favor of Senate Resolution 94 on January 27. Many requests to be heard required a second day of hearings on February 17.

By the time the opposition mail campaign was in high gear and the earlier estimates that Senate Resolution 94 would receive the support of two-thirds of the Senate (necessary to modify a treaty reservation) began to look dubious.

On March 28 the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, much to the distress of Chairman FULBRIGHT, voted 9 to 8 to postpone indefinitely further consideration of the Humphrey resolution. Opposition to the measure and fear that it would be defeated if reported to the floor combined to produce the result * * *.

Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, was the only Republican on the Committee who voted against the tabling motion and in favor of reporting the repeal resolution to the Senate.

What more could the administration have done, you may ask, in view of the Administration's formal support which I have already referred to.

The answer is: "A lot." A few sentences in favor of a legislative proposal in a presidential address mentioning scores of proposals and indications of approval in routine statements of Departmental officers submitted on request by Congressional Committees present one type of support. Special pleas for legislative action in talks to the Nation, which characterized the President's interest in labor reform last summer, followed by phone calls and visits to the Hill to round up needed votes by the White House staff

and other Executive officials, present another type of support. Plainly Senate Resolution 94 rates only the former.

It has been reported that the repeal issue has not been the subject of any of the White House sessions with Republican congressional leaders. The subject was omitted from the list of legislative matters on which the Administration wanted action before the end of the session in the message transmitted to Congress by the President on May 3.

The exertion of real executive leadership will inevitably result in the votes of more than one lone party member on a large committee. Obviously the repeal proposal has been assigned a low legislative priority by the Executive. Apparently this is another instance where words replaced deeds.

Similar expressions of support for the repeal resolution by lawyers and others have been far from overwhelming. My mail this year has run 560–180 against repeal. Other Members of Congress have reported even higher opposition mail. If my own correspondence were a true reflection of attorney sentiment in the Commonwealth, there is far more interest in passage of the Keogh tax relief bill for worthy, self-employed members of the bar than in U.S. participation in the World Court. If the lawyers are disinterested in the World Court, imagine the apathy of other groups.

Clearly it will take a concentrated effort by the executive branch and public interest groups to reactivate and pass Senate Resolution 94 this year, and at this date there is no indication that such an effort will be made. Floor discussions and correspondence I have had with a number of my colleagues on and off the Senate Foreign Relations Committee lead me to believe that less than two-thirds of the Senate, and possibly not even a majority, are in favor of repeal at this time.

Certain steps will have to be taken to make repeal a reality, this year or next.

1. Interested groups and persons, especially attorneys, will have to demand by word and letter that the executive branch assign high priority to the repeal effort and that the President put the full weight of his office behind it. Of course, resolutions at yearly meetings are helpful, and I hope that at the coming convention the American Bar Association will be able to defeat those opposed to repeal by a larger margin than the 100 to 93 edge recorded at the midwinter meeting. Such resolutions, however, can never substitute for personal appeals.

2. The report prepared in August of 1959 by a special committee of the section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association in support of repeal of the self-judging reservation is unquestionably the best paper that has been prepared on this subject. I hope that it will be supplemented and brought up to date to cover the hearings of this year and the latest actions at The Hague, and then distributed to all Members of the Senate with covering letters from attorneys in each of the States.

3. Senator Kennedy, Governor Stevenson, Senator Symington, and the Vice President, are on record as favoring repeal, but Senator Johnson is uncommitted. The successful candidates should be pressed to give the matter a high priority early in 1961.

4. Candidates for the Senate on both tickets should be briefed on this issue and commitments for repeal sought before November.

None of these suggestions may work. Even the extremely modest step of accepting the full jurisdiction of the World Court may remain too controversial to gain Congressional approval. The rule of law may never be more than a goal for lawyers to talk about. The unhappy events of recent days may place in the ascendancy forces who believe that security can only be achieved by armed might.

The nuclear arms race may have gone too far to be stopped. If so, the sooner we establish that fact the better, because the military effort we will have to make to keep the race in balance in coming years as well as the risks of failure will be stupendous.

But I submit that the rule of law is the only hope for the survival of civilization; the only practical goal for this Nation and others at this advanced date; that the isolationist goal of the 19th century ultranationalists is no longer tenable; that world peace through world law can and must be achieved in the 1960's—and the early 1960's at that—before it is too late.

INTEREST DISCLOSURE BILL

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD following my brief remarks a news story from the New York Times of Sunday, May 22, 1960, headlined " 'Simple' Interest Isn't So Simple; Lending-Truth Bill Stirs Dispute."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, this news story is the result of a recent address in New York by our distinguished colleague, Senator WALLACE BENNETT, of Utah, and describes the difficulty which would ensue after the passage of the so-called interest disclosure bill in its present form.

I wish to make clear that I was one of the original sponsors of the bill, on the basis that I believed in the principle of disclosure, and also on the basis that I thought the bill had some desirable anti-inflationary aspects. However, the hearings we have held so far indicate to me that the interest rate disclosure requirements of the bill, as now drafted, cannot be made effective.

Furthermore, despite the fact that some 34 States have legislation dealing with this same subject, the committee has not heard a single representative of the enforcement agencies of any of these States. We have had no testimony at all from the States as to how these disclosure laws are working or how they have been enforced.

Furthermore, the enforcement provisions of this bill call for the policeman to be the Federal Reserve Board. The Board has testified through its Chairman, Mr. Martin, that it does not feel able to do the job, that it does not want the job, that it is not a credit matter, that it is a policeman's job, and they do not feel competent to take it on.

The Federal Trade Commission has been suggested as an alternative, but they have not been invited to testify before the committee.

Yet, despite the fact that we have these gaps in the testimony—and they are very important gaps—and we have not heard other witnesses who would have something to say on this important subject, the subcommittee reported the bill to the full committee not very long ago, and there the bill is.

In view of the remarks I have made and the reasons I have stated, I withdraw my support from the bill, although I was one of the original sponsors, until we can have more hearings and get testimony which I think is essential before Congress should consider such a measure.

EXHIBIT 1

"SIMPLE" INTEREST ISN'T SO SIMPLE; LENDING-TRUTH BILL STIRS DISPUTE

(By Albert L. Kraus)

How simple is simple interest?

Elementary, says Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, whose truth-in-lending bill would require that installment finance charges be stated in simple annual rates. The Illinois Democrat taught economics at the University of Chicago 28 years before being elected to Congress.

Beyond the comprehension of ordinary retail clerks, says Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT who asserts that the DOUGLAS bill would place an impossible burden on American businesses and Government enforcement agencies. The Utah Republican runs a department store and automobile agency in his hometown of Salt Lake City.

Behind these opposing views of the state of the Nation's arithmetic lies the latest debate over consumer credit. People have been buying too much, too fast on the installment plan, Senator DOUGLAS believes, because the cost of credit has been camouflaged.

Even the young, he says, have become targets of the creditmongers. Teenage credit, he said recently, is "aimed at a youngster too old to spank, too young to garnishee, who should be learning the savings habit."

Senator BENNETT, on the other hand, finds nothing alarming in the present levels of consumer credit. Economists, he notes, can't seem to agree on what constitutes a dangerous or unstabilizing level of consumer credit. And anyway, over the last 4 years, installment credit has held at a relatively stable 10 percent of disposable personal income and 7 percent of the gross national product, the total of the Nation's goods and services.

Few would deny Senator DOUGLAS' assertion that if the consumer got more information on the cost of credit, he should be able to decide better when to buy and when to borrow. To oppose such a view, Senator BENNETT has said, would be to favor sin.

But a number of lenders have questioned the ability of retail clerks, automobile salesmen and television dealers to express financing charges in simple annual interest.

Nothing to it, Senator DOUGLAS has said in effect. "Most people learn about rates early in grade school—in simple annual terms. As a saver in a bank or savings and loan association, he is paid in simple annual terms. As a homeowner he pays his mortgage in simple annual terms."

The lenders say there would be no problem if all contracts were to run for an even year, with payments made in equal installments at equal time intervals. But few contracts, they note, are written that way. They generally are written for periods shorter or longer than a year, with payments weekly, biweekly, or monthly, often with no payment for the first month or two of the contract, or with smaller payments at first and larger payments at the end.

Senator BENNETT tried out such a problem—the purchase of a $20 battery on which there would be a $2 finance charge—on a member of his staff who is an economist, on the Library of Congress, on a professor of marketing, and on several other persons, including a statistical expert.

The problem ran thus:

The battery was bought on a Monday, with four biweekly $5 payments beginning the following Friday and the final $2 payment made 2 weeks afterward. The finance charge was calculated variously at 129.5 percent, 118.9 percent, 80 percent, 117.7 percent and 125.33 percent.

The California Bankers Association tried out a simpler problem on seven mathematicians at three universities in the State. It asked them to calculate the effective rate of interest charged on a loan of $1,000 when a total of $1,060 was repaid over 12 equal montly payments. The mathematicians took five pages to describe the formulas they used in arriving at their answers. Even then, the answers varied.

One way out would be to figure the answers in advance—assuming the experts finally could agree—and supply store owners with the tables. But Senator BENNETT says that every merchant in the country would have to have a book of interest tables bigger than a Sears, Roebuck catalog. And their clerks would have to get special training to use them.

NO STATE HAS STATUTE

While an amended version of the Douglas bill would give enforcement to the States if they met minimum standards of disclosure, not 1 of the 31 States that have automobile installment sales laws would qualify because none require that finance charges be stated in simple annual interest rates. Senator DOUGLAS says he won't back down.

This reflects on States such as New York, where a fellow Democrat, former Governor Harriman, several years ago pushed through what he considered was model consumer credit legislation—with finance charges stated not in simple annual rates but in dollars of purchase price a year. The New York law says installment lenders may not charge more for credit than $6 a year for each $100 of purchase price.

It also reflects on the Congress. For, only several weeks ago, the Congress passed an automobile installment loan law for the District of Columbia that uses the same method.

CROWDED DOCKETS OF FEDERAL COURTS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, shortly after coming to the Senate, I began an effort aimed at providing more realistic recognition of the appalling problem facing our Federal courts. In my own State of Colorado, the backlog of cases has forced litigants to wait as much as 3 or 4 years before their cases come up for hearing.

This situation is not unique in the Nation. Everywhere we are besieged by jurists and lawyers, by bar associations, and private citizens to provide the necessary relief. Articles in all media of the press have appeared almost universally in favor of speedy action by this Congress to create the needed judgeships.

Mr. President, a very timely, clearly written article of this nature appeared in the May 15 edition of the Denver Post. Its author, Reporter Tom Wilson, who spent part of last year here as an intern in government with the Congress, documents the judicial logjam in our area in a manner I am sure will be of interest to all. So that all Senators may have the opportunity for study of this article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTICE IMPAIRED BY OVERLOADED DOCKET IN DENVER'S FEDERAL COURT

(By Tom Wilson)

Justice delayed is justice denied.

This legal axiom has a special pertinence for the U.S. Federal District Court for Colorado. In this court, justice is constantly delayed and therefore, in many cases, denied.

The delay is not deliberate. The court's two judges, Chief Judge Alfred A. Arraj and newly appointed Judge Hatfield Chilson, work long hours.

The court has no summer recess. Visiting judges are brought from other districts to hear Colorado cases. The pretrial conference and revised rules for filing and administering the legal actions have been instituted to speed justice.

But because cases are filed at a faster rate than they can be disposed of, the backlog continues—and grows.

At the end of July 1957 there were 314 civil cases and 57 criminal cases pending before the court. Last April 30 the court faced a backlog of 427 civil cases and 75 criminal actions.

In fiscal 1959 the average Federal judge held nine criminal jury trials. Colorado's 2 judges held 41. North and South Dakota, each with two Federal judges, held eight such trials.

The delay particularly affects civil actions. The Federal Constitution requires a speedy trial for those accused of criminal violations.

Criminal cases, therefore, have precedence over civil cases. Thus new criminal cases push existing civil cases further back on the court's docket.

The court's average of 3 to 4 months between the filing of criminal complaint and the beginning of trial is one of the best in the Nation, according to Judge Arraj.

The 2-year average for civil cases is one of the worst.

There are many ways a 2-year delay can work a hardship on a litigant.

A court trial is a search for truth. Most attorneys agree the major problem in a trial is keeping the evidence as factual and as distinct as possible.

Facts are presented by witnesses or by documents presented by witnesses. In 2 years, memories dim, witnesses move or die.

The litigant is often forced to pay for an expensive search for a witness. Sometimes he finds he cannot afford such a search or meet the cost of bringing the witness to Denver for the trial.

And for the lack of a witness the case may be lost.

Financial hardships suffered by the plaintiff in waiting for a civil damage trial may lead to an out of court settlement, at a figure less than just, because he cannot afford to wait for justice.

A man injured in an accident may have a just claim for damages. He usually will have large expenses in medical bills and loss of time on his job.

Though the case must wait 2 years for a hearing, the plaintiff's creditors often will not. Thus a settlement that may serve the creditors but not justice often takes place.

In tort cases, those not involving contracts, the defendant who must pay damages does not pay interest on them until they are awarded at the trial.

In Colorado cases, the defendant will thus have the use of his money for 2 years. The plaintiff gets no compensation for the delay.

A man who files suit in Federal court to compel a defendant to comply with the terms of a contract or lease may find the disputed agreement has expired before the trial is set.

The law that establishes the district of Colorado says that the court shall hold sessions in Denver, Durango, Grand Junction, Montrose, Pueblo and Sterling.

No trials have been held outside of Denver for 4 years, Judge Arraj says, because the court cannot afford the extra time the judicial trips would use.

Litigants have been faced with the fact that it would cost them more to bring their attorneys, witnesses, and evidence to Denver than they would gain in their suit, if they won.

Outstate attorneys must pass on clients to Denver associates because they cannot expect the clients to pay for frequent trips to Denver to handle the many preliminary actions that precede the actual trial.

If Colorado were to get a third judge, the court would resume outstate sessions to try cases in the area where they originated, Judge Arraj says.

This third judge solution has been before Congress for several years.

A bill to create 45 new Federal judgeships, including one for Colorado, has been approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee and is before the same committee of the House of Representatives.

But the pressure of the early adjournment date, necessitated by the coming political conventions, and the unwillingness to deal with a major patronage plum just before the voters designate the relative strength of the parties, will probably put the issue off until the next Congress.

Next year the bill's chances may improve.

Many attorneys believe that delay in the administration of justice is not only unfair to the persons involved, but may be eroding away this Nation's traditional respect for justice.

"The judicial branch of Government is designed to protect the rights of the individual citizen," U.S. Attorney Donald G. Brotzman says.

"The citizen should have confidence that this branch will assist him in obtaining his basic legal rights and it is important that this confidence is maintained.

"I fear that as the public experiences injustice due to delay, their confidence in our judicial system will be diminished to the detriment of our whole concept of justice."

Without a third judge, Judge Arraj believes the Colorado Federal docket can be kept little more than current.

This would involve the continued use of visiting judges—an expensive and inefficient expedient—and the continued pressure of the backlog on the whole court.

The 2-year delay for civil cases would remain.

THE U–2 SPY PLANE INCIDENT AND THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have in my hand an article which is of particular significance in view of President Eisenhower's recent return from Paris. With the overwhelming display of affection and national unity represented by the tremendous crowd here in Washington still fresh in our minds, with the clarity of purpose and statesmanship of Mr. Eisenhower becoming more evident every day, here is one more piece of evidence to add.

Many correspondents, many spokesmen, were quick to leap upon the trap baited by the Russians into which we were supposed to have fallen when the announcement of the U–2 spy plane was made. But the facts have tended to show a somewhat different picture in recent days in light of Khrushchev's vile performance, his almost maniacal tirade before the press in Paris, and his insistent hammering at a single, threadbare theme. How threadbare is shown in this article by Nicholas Blatchford which appears in the May 20 edition of the Washington Daily News.

Mr. President, in a point-by-point countdown, Mr. Blatchford gives the lie to Khrushchev's tale of the shooting

down of the U–2, of his double deceit during his visit to this Nation, and of the premier's obvious intention to sabotage the summit, no matter what the excuse.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be reprinted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks so that we may have its added weight as permanent proof of the Russian premier's deceit.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KHRUSHCHEV AND THE CAT

(By Nicholas Blatchford)

Khrushchev made two serious errors in the raucous press conference he held after the summit collapse. The first could even cost him his hide.

Things were going along famously—bluff, bombast, threat, smile, snarl—when a correspondent for the National Broadcasting Co. cleverly baited a trap for him—proving that at least some radio-TV correspondents are on the ball. And Khrushchev promptly fell in—proving that he is not always as fast on his feet as he sometimes seems.

"Why," the NBC man asked, "since you knew about these (U–2) flights, did you not tell President Eisenhower about them and ask him to stop them when you visited the United States?"

It was a sneaky question—sneaky because the Russian leaders had not acknowledged, to their own people or to anyone else, that they knew of the U–2 flights until they'd brought one down.

Nevertheless, Khrushchev waded right in, saying, "I will answer that question with pleasure." He explained that when he was at Camp David with Ike "I almost opened my mouth to make that statement" but then decided "not to raise the matter with this friend of mine."

The cat was out of the bag. Here was a stark admission that:

Khrushchev had known about the U–2 flights ever since last fall and probably ever since we first started making them, some 4 years ago. Why did no one demand a public apology then?

He and his cohorts in the Kremlin had concealed these "aggressive espionage flights" from the Russian people. (For obvious reasons: They couldn't knock the U–2 down, probably because it normally flies too high.)

The big show of outrage, surprise, shock, indignation and horror at the ill-starred flight of Pilot Powers was, therefore, so much eyewash, a convenient way to scuttle the summit conference before it was launched.

We doubt that Khrushchev will be forgiven this slip by his stony-eyed friends back home.

The other blooper was made when Khrushchev told the assembled correspondents two true stores:

When he was a child and the family cat would try to mooch some cream, his mother "usually took the cat by the scruff of the neck and gave it a good shaking."

Apparently this left its mark on the boy, because we find Khrushchev coming back to the theme later in the conference.

"This recalls to my mind," he said, "what we used to do in the Donbass when I was the young boy. Whenever we caught a cat in the pigeon's loft, we would catch the cat by its tail and bang its head against the wall and that was the only way it could be taught some sense."

With that statement, Khrushchev probably lost twice as much ground as he had gained in all his travels. We don't just mean he lost the vote of all the nice, little old ladies in Dubuque, Iowa.

It is one thing for a boy to swing a cat against a wall by its tail. It is another thing for a grown man to boast of it.

AGRICULTURAL AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the pending bill is a good bill, a sound bill, and one which will continue support for many of the tried and proved programs of American agriculture. In this bill there is much of the ability, much of the knowledge, much of the experience, and much of the wisdom of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who has served as chairman of the Senate Agricultural Appropriation Subcommittee since he first came to the Senate in 1933.

Mr. RUSSELL. I might remind the Senator from Alabama that for 2 terms, unfortunately, the electorate brought about a Republican majority in the Senate.

Mr. HILL. That was unfortunate indeed. However, ever since the Senator from Georgia has been in the Senate he has served as chairman of the subcommittee when the Democrats were in control of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. There is a certain implication contained in the remarks of the Senator from Alabama, but I am sure that he did not mean to imply it was unfortunate that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] was the chairman at the time there was a Republican majority in the Senate. Being a southerner, he may feel that it was unfortunate we had a Republican majority in the Senate. However, I am sure he will agree with me that it was good to have Senator YOUNG at the helm at the time.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that, since we had to have a Republican Senate, we were extremely fortunate to have the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], my good friend, the friend of the farmer, the very outstanding Senator from North Dakota, as chairman of this subcommittee.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe the reason that we had to have a Republican Senate—and it was certainly essential that we had one—had nothing to do with what the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] always does when he is at the helm of a committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Through the years, the distinguished Senator from Georgia has been a most eloquent spokesman in the battle to enable the farmers of our Nation to obtain a fair share of the national income and to enjoy the fruits of American prosperity.

As a member of the Senate Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee, I have had the privilege, over a number of years, to witness at close range the ability, intelligence, and integrity, the fearless dedication and the absolute determination, of the Senator from Georgia to win justice and equity for our farmers.

The farmers and the farm families of America have no greater friend than DICK RUSSELL. His name stands in the forefront of any rollcall of Senators who have sponsored and worked and fought for price supports on basic farm commodities, rural electrification, soil conservation, farm credit, farm housing, the school lunch program, and many other great programs benefiting our farm families.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to commend and congratulate my able and distinguished colleague from Georgia for his understanding, for his devotion, and for his magnificent leadership in the cause of agriculture and the farmers of America.

I am delighted that the good people of Senator RUSSELL's home State of Georgia had the richly deserved appreciation of him to again this year nominate him without opposition to a fifth full term in the Senate.

We all know that he is one of the great Members of this body, and we do hope that he may enjoy many more fruitful years of service to his State and to our country.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am overwhelmed by the very eloquent speech delivered by my beloved friend, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I am sure he must view me through eyes which are colored by glasses of friendship; otherwise he would never have made those statements. I am highly honored and deeply grateful.

Not in a back-patting attitude, I may say that I have often thought that of those who serve in the Senate today—and there are many great Senators here—the distinguished Senator from Alabama, through his great contribution to the cause of health in this country, through the Hill-Burton hospital program, and through his sponsorship of research to conquer the diseases that plague our people, is one of the few Members who will find a permanent place in the history of this country. That makes me all the more grateful for his very complimentary references to me.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is my understanding that H.R. 12117, the fiscal 1961 appropriation measure for the United States Department of Agriculture, does not include new funds for fruit research in the Agricultural Research Service.

The commercial fruit industry—and I refer particularly to the production of apples and peaches—is most important to the economy of West Virginia. In 1958 and 1959, West Virginia ranked 7th

in the Nation in the production of apples, which, in 1959, amounted to 5,700,000 bushels. In 1958, the cash value of our apple crop amounted to $8,500,000.

In the matter of peach crop, West Virginia ranked 17th in the Nation both in 1958 and 1959.

The labor force required to produce, harvest, and market in the industry is also important because of its contribution to needed employment in West Virginia. However, conditions in marketing are subject to constant change, and these changes bring new challenges which must be met by intensified and expanded research.

By and large, when we appropriate a dollar for research and apply it to the specific purpose for which the money has been appropriated, there is not only a return of the 100 cents on the dollar invested, but, also, a further return in the form of a dividend to the industry, to the productivity of the persons, and to development within the industry. This is important to a State like West Virginia.

I have received two communications in recent days from the organization which is representative of the apple growers in the States of West Virginia, Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania. Carroll R. Miller, who is the secretary-manager of the Appalachian Apple Service, Inc., and who is a citizen of West Virginia, residing at Martinsburg, set forth in his communication this language which I call to the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who presents the appropriation bill this afternoon, for his consideration:

> In apples, as in many fruits and vegetables, most growers are literally battling for survival in this riptide of change that has been gaining momentum in the past 10 years or more—nationally and worldwide. These changes have brought new conditions—new facts that must be faced. Only systematic research can find these facts. Research is the prime necessity today.

Then Mr. Miller uses this expression:

> We seem to be about 20 years behind with the facts, and it is hurting.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the telegram dated May 12, 1960, from Mr. Miller, and his subsequent letter of May 18, 1960, both of them on the subject matter which I have been discussing during the last few minutes.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARTINSBURG, W. VA., *May 12, 1960.*

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Senate Offices, Washington D.C.:

House agricultural appropriations bill seems to have denied all funds for vital new fruit research asked for repeatedly by the highly responsible deciduous fruit advisory committee. Bill also cuts vital pesticide research funds from requested 1½ million to only 250,000. Both funds are most important to applegrowers and fruit and vegetable growers just now. This four-State organization of 1,308 applegrowers earnestly asks your help in restoring these funds.

APPALACHIAN APPLE SERVICE,
CARROLL R. MILLER, *Secretary.*

APPALACHIAN APPLE SERVICE, INC.,
May 18, 1960.

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
The Senate Offices,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JENNINGS: Thank you for your quick response to our May 11 wire about the slashes the House inflicted on fruit and vegetable research funds; for both this threatening pesticide problem and for our marketing problems.

In apples, as in many fruits and vegetables, most growers are literally battling for survival in this riptide of change that has been gaining momentum the past 10 years or more nationally and worldwide. These changes have brought new conditions: new facts that must be faced. Only systematic research can find these facts. Research is the prime necessity today.

New chemicals have brought problems not yet understood by anyone as yet; fearsome to many; and fodder for sensation-hunting publicists, with possible sudden and ruinous effects on the industry. Only quick, competent research can get at the facts. The House slashed the considered request for $1½ million for this to a quarter million.

This tidal wave of change is running also in marketing. A successful independent grocer told me the other day that over two-thirds of the items on his shelves now come from a double handful of the giant food manufacturing firms: Swift and Armour, General Mills, Pillsbury, and General Foods, and so on. Apples must sell in this highly organized competition—but how? The right answers to this are imperative. The National Apple Institute has asked the Department of Agriculture to help find the facts, since they have the authority and the trained research personnel. They are willing, but it takes funds not yet authorized. We seem to be about 20 years behind with the facts and it is hurting.

We will genuinely appreciate your continued efforts to repair the House's slashes.

Sincerely,

CARROLL R. MILLER,
Secretary-Manager.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am in the position, in a sense, of being after the fact rather than before the fact. The House did not act in the manner in which my constituency and the constituency of the Senators from the other States in the apple belt feel it should have acted in reference to new research moneys, especially for apples and peaches. However, I understand—and I feel certain there will be a clarification by the able Senator from Georgia—that the money which was requested—the figure proposed is $100,000—is not available during fiscal 1961 for intensified research in the field of commercial fruit. I believe the need is not only in the specific area for which I plead, but is also national in its scope and application, if the funds were to be provided for the purpose I have indicated.

I had the privilege earlier this afternoon of conferring with the Senator from Georgia. I am sure it is his desire to clarify the situation for me, and also perhaps to make a comment on the possibility of having funds, if not included in the present appropriation bill, at least actively considered for incorporation in the bill next year.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia is always impressive and compelling in his statements. The approach to this subject is no exception to that rule.

I can reassure him as one of the matters which is dealt with by the telegram from his constituents. So far as concerns appropriations for needed research into pesticides and insecticides, and the residue therefrom, the Senate committee appropriated all the many funds which were requested by the Senator's constituents. We appropriated the full $1,500,000 which was asked for this very important study.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Georgia is certainly correct and is helpful in this situation. I advised my constituency of the fact that the Senate had so acted, and we are grateful to the committee for the recognition of that need.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have listened with careful attention to the Senator's statement. As I said yesterday, and as I have indicated on other occasions, the subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee have been most attentive to all requests for research which have been submitted to us. I do not know just what the Senator's constituent has in mind as to any specific area of research which would be beneficial to the fruit and vegetable interests of the Nation.

There is included in the bill some $500,000 for basic research in fruit—in apples, pears, peaches, and other stone fruits. Without knowing exactly what specific project the Senator's constituent has in mind, I cannot advise the Senator as to whether any of that money will be expended for that particular purpose or not.

But if the fruit producers will develop a specific program and will bring it to the attention of the committee, I can assure the Senator from West Virginia that next year we shall give it very sympathetic consideration.

Mr. HOLLAND. And perhaps this year, by means of a supplemental appropriation bill item.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that if the Senator can obtain a detailed statement, then—as suggested by my friend, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] who is such a valuable member of the subcommittee—we might be able to give it consideration in connection with a supplemental appropriation bill before the adjournment of this Congress.

But without more definite information as to the specific area of research which Mr. Miller has in mind, I cannot inform the Senator from West Virginia whether the bill provides an adequate amount of money for such purpose or not.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in response to the clarification the Senator from Georgia has given, which is helpful, and also in response to his assurance, which is, frankly, very pleasing, I wish to state that I believe the attitudes expressed by both the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Florida are, indeed, most fair and much appreciated.

There rests upon me the responsibility to work with these apple growers, in reference to an intensification of research in the fruit industry which they believe to be necessary. I believe that

the hope of possible consideration of this subject in connection with a supplemental appropriation bill will give us an opportunity to move in the direction which these men have indicated should be taken.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me say to the Senator from West Virginia that there is an old maxim that applies to these research items, as well as to many other areas of appropriations: "A squeaking axle gets the grease."

Over a number of years I have noticed that agitation which is carried on unremittingly for a number of years nearly always gets some results. So if the Senator from West Virginia will obtain detailed information and will press vigorously enough, I am sure that one of these days we shall be able to direct some research to the areas in which his constituents are interested.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will indulge me long enough to permit me to make an observation in connection with my friend's reference to the squeaking axle, I would turn for a moment to the words of the poet, Josh Billings, who said in reference to a wheel:

I don't believe in kicking; it aint likely to bring one peace.
But the wheel that squeaks the loudest is the one that gets the grease.

So, although I would not want the wheel to turn improperly in connection with a matter of this kind, I repeat that I am grateful to my friend, the highly competent Senator from Georgia; and I am also grateful for the suggestion in which he is joined by my equally good friend, the able and diligent Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to direct the attention of the chairman of our subcommittee [Mr. RUSSELL] to one item in the bill, in order that we may ascertain, by way of a statement of the legislative history, the intention of the Appropriations Subcommittee in marking up the bill in reference to the conservation reserve program.

I think perhaps the report as it appears on page 10 is not completely reflective of what the subcommittee had in mind.

So I should like to call to the attention of the chairman of our subcommittee the language which appears on page 21 of the bill. On that page, the bill shows that the House of Representatives allowed $310 million for the conservation reserve program—for the expenses of liquidating and administering the program which now is under way. But to that item, our committee added $25 million, so as to make a total of $335 million, and added the following proviso:

Provided, That not to exceed $12,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, of which not less than $10,000,000 may be transferred to the appropriation account "Local administration, section 388, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938":

My reason for directing the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee to this item is that at times there is a feeling, when money is earmarked in this way and is lumped together, as funds for both Washington office expenses and State office expenses, that there is a tendency for the State office expenses to be curtailed, in favor of the administrative expenses incurred in the central office in Washington. But certainly that was not the intention of our subcommittee.

We recognized, from what we heard during the hearings and from our observations of the programs, that, basically, these programs are administered by the county committees; and next in priority are the State offices and the State committees, which must supervise the administration in the respective States.

So I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Georgia: Is it not true that what we had in mind in this connection, and in including the additional $25 million appropriation for this purpose, was that after the legitimate needs of the county committees are first met, our next concern is to see to it that the State offices and the State committees have sufficient administrative funds with which to work with the county committees in meeting the local problems?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly that was the committee's intention, as I understand it. As a matter of fact, this program has expired, insofar as the assuming of any new contracts is concerned; and no policies are to be formulated on the national level. The supervision on the national level is at a very minimum; and it seems to me that the only proper order of priority would be first to take care of the needs of the county offices which deal with the conservation reserve program; and second, to take care of the requirements of the State offices. And if there is to be any substantial reduction, it should occur in the Washington office, because of the fact—as I have stated—that the program has expired, and is now to be administered only in the field, in dealing with those who already have Government contracts in connection with the conservation reserve program.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee. That certainly confirms the understanding of the subcommittee as I comprehend it, and what the chairman of the subcommittee has pointed out is emphatically correct. Since this program is expiring and new contracts are not to be entered into, and obviously no new policy is to be available, the funds for administering this particular program are not great. However, it is important that, at the State and county level, there be adequate funds to see that the contracts are fulfilled in conformity with the manner in which they were written.

I thought it was well, since the report did not go into these matters, specifically to add this statement as a part of the legislative history, so those administering the funds will know precisely and exactly what the subcommittee had in mind.

Before taking my seat, I should like to add my own words of felicitation to the wonderful services being rendered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in the U.S. Senate as a whole, and specifically today in connection with his chairmanship of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture.

I can say, as one who has sat in that committee for some time, that he questions the witnesses with penetration, with sympathy, and with an eagle eye for economy and for making a dollar do a dollar's worth of work. He administers the committee and conducts it in a completely nonpartisan manner. I cannot recall at any time in the history of our committee when we have had a vote divided on party lines. We have had differences of opinion as individuals, as Senators should have, but never has there been any partisan or political maneuvering in the committee. I think it is good for the country as a whole, and the farmers in particular, to know they have a good friend in DICK RUSSELL as chairman of the subcommittee, who watches over their interests, as do the taxpayers who do not happen to live on farms, but who can be assured that the economic philosophy of the Senator from Georgia is not limited to the committee room.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to express to the Senator from South Dakota my profound gratification. "Praise from Sir Hubert is praise indeed." The distinguished Senator from South Dakota has been an active, intelligent friend of the farmers of this country since he first took the oath as a U.S. Senator. I am pleased that he has stated there is no partisanship in this committee. I can certainly bear testimony to the fact that partisan considerations on the part of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota have played no part whatsoever in his activities on the committee. His sole guiding star is the welfare of the farmers of the United States, and during my tenure of office the farmers of this country have had no truer, more diligent, or more determined friend than the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I hesitate to inject a discordant note at this time, but I shall vote against H.R. 12117, the Agricultural and Farm Credit Administration appropriation bill, 1961, in protest against the refusal of this and other Democratic-controlled Congresses to cooperate with President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson in the enactment of a farm program which makes sense.

The people of Connecticut are becoming increasingly outraged by the failure of this Congress to take action to solve the farm problem, and end a wasteful program which does not work, and never will work unless changes are made in existing law, as repeatedly recommended by the President.

Opinion in my State was accurately reflected in an editorial entitled "Three Thousand Seven Hundred and Fifty Dollars a Minute" in the Bridgeport Post of March 22, 1960, which points out that the taxpayers of the Nation "are paying a terrible price" for the present unsuccessful farm program and "are also paying a terrible price for the failure of our statesmen to develop a program that will work, or be big enough to scrap the one that doesn't."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred may be included in the RECORD following these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, H.R. 12117 provides funds for programs which I heartily endorse, such as lunches for school children, watershed protection, State experiment stations, and emergency famine relief to friendly peoples. I wish it were possible for me to vote separately in support of adequate funds for these worthy purposes. However, of the $4 billion in the bill, approximately $3 billion is for the support of activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This agency administers the high, rigid price support programs insisted upon by the majority of this and prior Congresses. As a result, despite efforts to reduce CCC's inventories, the taxpayers' investment in surplus farm commodities is estimated to increase to $9.5 billion by June 30, 1961, from $8.6 billion at the start of the current fiscal year.

I cannot acquiesce in this continued waste of the taxpayers' funds. Consequently, I shall vote against the bill.

EXHIBIT 1

THREE THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY DOLLARS A MINUTE

In a recent statement, President Eisenhower told the taxpayers that it costs them $1,500,000 a day for the Government's wheat program. That is at the rate of about $1,000 a minute. But that's only part of the story as the wheat bite is only a small part of the cost of agricultural stabilization, which costs the taxpayers more than $3,750 a minute, or about $5,400,000 a day.

A lot will be heard about this figure in the coming presidential campaign. There are only three brackets of taxpayers whose annual payments to the Treasury could pay for this program.

There are about 5 million citizens whose adjusted gross income runs from $5,000 to $6,000 a year. On the average they are heads of families, own one car and work hard. Each year they turn in to Uncle Sam about $3 billion. The stabilization program costs about $2 billion.

Then there are 3 million in the $6,000 to $7,000 bracket who pay about $2.4 billion a year. The third rich vein of income paydirt are the $10,000 to $15,000 people. There are about a million of these who turn in a little more than $2 billion annually.

The point is that the entire take of millions of taxpayers must go each year to pay for an unsuccessful farm program. The one undisputed fact about the program is that it does not work, never has worked, and it never will. The program is wasteful and ineffective and the taxpayers are paying a terrible price for it. They are also paying a terrible price for the failure of our statesmen to develop a program that will work, or be big enough to scrap the one that doesn't.

The farm problem is almost 40 years old and getting worse and more expensive.

But there is one thing the politicians never forget—the farm vote, and they are being just as careful about it today as they were in 1920, when the farm population was two and a half times greater than in 1960.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware and Mr. KERR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I was going to offer an amendment to the bill, but I am willing to withhold if the Senator from Oklahoma is in a hurry.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am going to offer some amendments to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from Delaware, in an effort to be impartial in the recognition of Senators.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am willing to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma, if the Senator from Oklahoma is in a hurry. I can offer my amendment later, if that will accommodate the Senator.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I would be very grateful. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. President, I have at the desk three amendments. One relates to the amount in the bill for planning under the watershed protection program. One relates to the amount to be appropriated for the watershed protection program. The other has to do with the appropriation for the flood prevention part of the program.

I have given a copy of each one of these amendments, Mr. President, to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

I wish to say that I have listened with great interest to the kind things which have been said about the Senator from Georgia this afternoon. I know how well-founded they are, and I am happy to join in the spirit of what has been said in tribute to the Senator for the great work he has done as chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, I arise in behalf of items in the agriculture and farm credit appropriations bill which, in my opinion, must be adjusted before this bill is finally acted upon by the Senate.

I refer Senators to page 7 of the Senate report, under the headings "Watershed Protection" and "Flood Prevention." The language in the report is as follows:

> The committee recommends an appropriation of $32 million, as proposed by the House, an increase of $4,250,000 over the budget request, and $9,250,000 over the appropriation for 1960. The committee recommends $3,500,000 for investigations and planning as proposed in the budget. This action provides an additional $1,400,000 for installation of works of improvement to be prorated proportionately between the pilot watersheds and those approved under Public Law 566.
>
> An appropriation of $18 million for continuing work in the 11 authorized watersheds is recommended. This is the amount of the House bill, $3 million over the budget request, and the amount provided for fiscal 1960.

As I understand the action of the Senate committee, they have appropriated $32 million for the watershed protection program. Only $3,500,000 of that can be used for investigations and planning for projects under this great program.

Mr. President, I was greatly in hopes that the Senate committee would see fit to raise the construction figure to $50 million and increase the planning funds to $5 million. These were the figures that the Oklahoma State Soil Conservation Board urged to be appropriated on the basis of current needs. In my opinion, their request was the minimum which should be considered at this time.

Senators will note that, under the flood prevention program, the Senate committee suggests $18 million for the continuing work in the 11 authorized watersheds. Again, I was in hopes that this amount would be increased to $25 million. This I believe to be the minimum amount consistent with the need for getting the work on these watersheds completed, in order that the benefits accruing from them can be realized.

This program has been under construction now for 14 years, and it is time that we are finishing up the job rather than stretching it out and delaying the benefits which flow from it. Each year that we delay means the cost is greater than if we go ahead and finish the program as originally anticipated.

Let me return now to the matter of the funds for the planning parties to work on the watershed protection programs. The present planning party organization was built up over a period of several years of recruitment and training in the face of strong competition for critically scarce engineers, hydrologists, geologists, and so forth. Failure to maintain this planning group at the present level will set back the small watershed program by several years.

Applications for assistance under Public Law 566 continue to exceed the planning assistance now available. Even the current $4.9 million of Federal planning funds supplemented by the current $1.1 million of State and local funds, there is a backlog of 733 unserviced applications, a number one-third larger than the total of 549 that have received planning help since 1954.

In Oklahoma there are 43 applications before the State soil conservation board and 8 which have already been approved for planning, making a total of 51 projects for which planning parties will be needed this year.

Under the present rate of planning in the State of Oklahoma, we can only plan six watersheds so, at that rate, if not one single application were to be submitted, it would be 8 years before the planning could be completed. This, I think, is a fair example of what we do to this worthy program when we fail to make adequate funds available for the planning of these projects.

Therefore, I would urge the chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations to accept three amendments, one increasing the funds for planning of these programs to $5 million as a first priority, the second increasing the funds to $44,250,000 for watershed protection, and the third increasing the flood prevention funds to $20 million as a third priority.

I hope that the chairman may see fit to accept all three amendments.

Mr. President, I did not pull these amendment out of thin air. In the first place, the Oklahoma State Soil Conservation Board, after careful consideration of these matters, urged that I support even a larger amount for planning

and construction under the watershed protection program than I am proposing.

I did, however, contact the Department of Agriculture and asked them to supply me with figures to indicate what this program should be and I shall place in the RECORD a table which shows that, as a minimum requirement, $44,250,000 is needed for the watershed protection program and $20 million is needed for the flood prevention program for the fiscal year 1961.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to read a statement from the House report which I believe fully justifies the action I am seeking, entirely aside and apart from the recommendations of the Soil Conservation Service, or my folks in Oklahoma.

Watershed protection and flood prevention: For watershed protection, the bill carries an appropriation for 1961 of $32 million. During the 1960 fiscal year, a total of $32,276,964 is available for this program, including an appropriation of $22,750,000 and a carryover of unused funds from fiscal year 1959 of $9,526,964. The amount of $32 million included in this bill, therefore, will make available approximately the same amount for fiscal year 1961. The amount is sufficient to restore the planning funds available in 1960 and to finance a total of 42 planning parties during the next year.

Testimony before the committee indicates that more than 1,200 communities throughout the Nation have requested help in developing watershed plans. It further shows that assistance has been authorized for about 500 of these, that some 200 plans have been approved, and that construction has started on about half of these. In view of the large number of applications still awaiting plans, and in view of the large number of approved projects awaiting construction funds, the committee has increased the watershed protection funds above the amounts requested. In the opinion of the members of the committee, the amount of interest in this program in all areas of the country, and the urgent need for increased attention to the conservation of the soil and water resources of this country, warrant even larger amounts than those recommended in the bill.

For the flood prevention work in the 11 major watersheds authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944, the committee has included an appropriation of $18 million, the same as provided for fiscal year 1960.

Legislation just enacted authorizes additional works of improvement in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act in connection with the 11 watershed improvement programs provided for by the Flood Control Act of 1944. It also authorizes the making of loans to cover the local share of both the flood prevention and nonflood prevention features of these 11 watersheds. Therefore, language has been included to make the flood prevention appropriation available for these purposes.

As pointed out in last year's report, the work under this program has lagged far behind that envisioned when the program was initiated in 1944. It now appears that this flood prevention work, which was originally estimated to take 15 years to complete, will take 40 years or more to complete at the present rate of progress. If slowed down even more, as proposed in the 1961 budget, this time could be extended another 10 years.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma in support of the amendments which he has offered. I join the chairman and the other members of the committee in expressing appreciation for the watershed program. I think it is an excellent program. It is doing a great deal of good. There is much interest in it all over the Nation.

I know that in my own State of Tennessee many watersheds are being planned, but we do not now have the necessary personnel and teams to do the planning and engineering work. The head of our Watershed Association has called me, to urge that the $1.4 million particularly not be taken from the amount for investigation and planning.

Mr. President, I certainly join the Senator from Oklahoma in urging the chairman of the subcommittee and the Senate to restore the $1.4 million for investigations and planning. I think the other amendments of the Senator from Oklahoma are well-founded, and should also be agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Tennessee for those remarks and his support.

I wish to invite attention to the fact that my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is also a sponsor of these amendments.

In further support of the amendments, and in further urging consideration of this matter by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, I invite attention to the fact that on February 8, in response to a letter from the senior Senator from Oklahoma, the Department of Agriculture submitted a table of the requirements for these programs for fiscal years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966. In that table from the Department of Agriculture it is shown that for planning in fiscal year 1961, $5.5 million would be required; for watershed protection, including planning for 1961, $44,250,000, the amount asked for in my amendment, would be required; and for installations under the flood prevention program $20 million, as asked for in the third amendment which I have offered, and which I now urge the distinguished Senator from Georgia to accept, would be required.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I asked the Senator to yield so that I might lend one extra voice to a plea for acceptance of these amendments. I can think of no programs which yield greater dividends for every dollar invested than the Soil Conservation Service program, the watershed protection program, and the flood-control program, all of which involve watershed protection and soil conservation. It is quite obvious that unless there are adequate funds for planning these great efforts cannot be undertaken in an economic and feasible manner.

The requests of the Senator from Oklahoma are modest. The watershed protection request, as I understand it, is for $44 million instead of the committee recommendation of $32 million. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. $44,250,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. The flood protection would have an additional $2 million, to raise the figure from $18 million to $20 million?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The funds for work planning would be increased to $4.9 million?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely wish to join in support of these amendments. These are areas in which I have previously indicated, in my testimony before the subcommittee, my interest, and also the interest of the people of the State of Minnesota. I had a number of letters and resolutions, as well as personal visitations, from members of the soil conservation districts in our State, and the people who are deeply concerned about watershed protection. These people came to call upon me. I forwarded the information to the committee.

Today I merely wish to state the great support which this program has in the State of Minnesota. I know that what I am asking for now, in support of the Senator from Oklahoma, is exactly what the people of my State would expect as a prudent and reasonable program in this area of soil conservation and watershed protection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

I have only one further thing to say, which is that no man in the Senate has done more for this program than has the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. That fact is reflected in the history of the proposed legislation. It is also reflected in the status of this work in the great State of Georgia.

It was my privilege to be in Georgia a few days ago, as well as in the State of South Carolina, where we were holding some hearings for the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources.

One of my outstanding impressions in my visit to that part of the country was the great progress of this program which had been made in the State of my great friend from Georgia. In offering this amendment I know that I am doing so in connection with a program which is as near and dear to the heart of the distinguished Senator from Georgia as it is to any Member of this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inquires of the Senator from Oklahoma as to which amendment he wishes to have considered first.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Chair permit me to make a statement before the Senator from Oklahoma makes his election?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Georgia may proceed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for the remark which he last made. I am and have been greatly interested in the entire program of soil and water conservation. I know of no other program within the entire farflung scheme of our Gov-

ernment that carries more promise for the future of this country than these soil and water conservation projects. It is difficult to realize that within a period of some 40 years we will have twice our present population. These people will have to be fed and clothed. That food, clothing, and fiber must come from these very acres, because we are not going to create a great deal more agricultural land in this country.

I have a direct, almost selfish interest in every phase of this program. It so happens that my own State has submitted a total of 74 applications under Public Law 566. We had two projects under the old pilot program, which are embraced within this appropriation. We have 1 project in Georgia among the 11 projects under the Flood Control Act of 1944 which have been under way for many years. Rising costs have postponed the scheduled date of completion, even though we have consistently increased the appropriation.

I have tried not to be swept away completely by my intense interest in these projects, and yet I have endeavored to carry them forward. For the last 3 years we have appropriated more money than was requested by the Bureau of the Budget in all three of these areas. I do not feel authorized to accept an amendment which would cut back the allocation which was made in the committee for the planning of new projects and for the surveys. However, I can assure the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that I will not be adamant in a conference if the House desires to insist upon its position. It was thought in the committee when the subject was discussed that we were getting these projects planned a great deal faster than we were authorizing funds to complete them. For that reason the subcommittee voted, although not with any great determined position, to allocate more of the funds for construction rather than for planning.

For the 11 authorized projects, we are already carrying in the bill $3 million above the budget estimates; and I do not feel that, in the light of the action of the subcommittee that I would be authorized to accept any increase in the proposed amount, but we do have a great backlog on the small projects.

In an effort to confirm what the Senator has said, I would be willing, if no member of the subcommittee present in the Senate objects, to accept a $5 million increase for Public Law 566 watershed protection item, which would give us some room to negotiate on the surveys and would provide for a very substantial increase above the budget estimates for installation of works of improvement under that program. I do not feel authorized to go beyond that limit.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am grateful for the statement of the Senator from Georgia, but in light of the fact that the $4,900,000 figure was the figure included in the House measure, would not the Senator be willing to accept that amendment and the $5 million addition on the watershed protection provision, which in reality would not change the total amount?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to agree with my distinguished friend, but I feel that in view of what transpired in the subcommittee, I would not be authorized now to accept the cutback in the operational funds. I have told the Senator I would be glad to consider the proposal carefully in conference, but I do not think I could accept the $4,900,000 now for planning. I think the $5 million additional for watershed protection work is as far as I feel justified in going.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I modify my amendment to conform with the suggestion of the chairman of the subcommittee as to what he would be willing to accept.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Oklahoma proposes, in his amendment No. 2, on page 11, line 10, to strike out "$32 million" and insert "$37 million"?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Would the proposed increase be exclusively for the pilot project?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it would be for Public Law 566 and the pilot projects. We stated in the report that the fund would be distributed proportionately.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The increase, then, would go to both projects?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I am frank to say the great bulk of it would go to the Public Law 566 projects, but the pilot projects would not be excluded. Is that agreeable to the distinguished member of my subcommittee?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is satisfactory.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will accept that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "$32,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$37,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I should like to direct my remarks to the attention of the Senator from Georgia in connection with the proposal on page 32 beginning at line 23, wherein it is provided:

> The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation is authorized to make such expenditures, within available funds and in accordance with law, as may be necessary to liquidate its assets: *Provided*, That funds realized from the liquidation of assets which are determined by the Board of Directors to be in excess of the requirements for expenses of liquidation shall be declared as dividends which shall be paid into the general fund of the Treasury.

As the Senator from Georgia knows, this agency is a depression-born agency and one which has not functioned since 1947. It has not made a single loan since 1947 and in 1955 it disposed of all of its remaining assets under instructions from Congress. It then sold its remaining notes to the 12 Federal land banks.

I am advised that last year its outstanding accounts were reduced to eight notes, payable annually. It collects eight checks from the Federal land banks, which is a semigovernmental agency. It receives those eight checks and turns them over to the Federal Treasury, and last year that little bit of work cost about $5,000 or about $600 or $800 per check. I understand from the Senator from Georgia that the agency has advised the committee that it could probably operate with $600 or $800 next year, but even that is close to $100 for the handling of each check.

Remember this is just the transfer of eight checks from one agency to another.

This agency should be abolished and gotten off the taxpayers' backs.

Why not stop appropriating money to an abandoned agency? There is a bill before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which would abolish the agency.

This agency, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, has no authority to make any loans. Congress repealed that authority 23 years ago. Nevertheless, the agency does have authority to borrow $2 billion in the name of the U.S. Government and to pledge the credit of the Government.

I agree that the bill to abolish the agency should be dealt with by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; however, I am hoping that the Senator from Georgia will accept this amendment to stop its appropriation. Its work is done; let us get it off the taxpayers' backs for good. In conference, if for some reason it were found necessary to protect the transfer of these checks temporarily, the matter could be worked out. However, I am advised that this appropriation is not needed. The eight Federal land banks can simply make their checks payable to the U.S. Treasury and mail them direct. Why have the Government pay $75 to $100 per check merely for transferring them? Last year it cost about $5,000 to process these few checks. That was an average of about $800 per check.

I am wondering whether the Senator from Georgia would accept the amendment to strike out that language of the bill dealing with this subject and thereby eliminate this appropriation. I realize that the amount involved is small, but it is the way to get this agency abolished. We cannot forget that the real danger here is that this agency has $2 billion in borrowing authority.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is a great deal of merit in the Senator's position, but I would not feel authorized to accept the amendment, because I do not know exactly what effect it would have. The Senator has a bill pending in the standing committee to abolish the corporation. It would be a much more orderly procedure to handle it through the enactment of that bill. It provides for an orderly transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury of all the cash, accounts receivable, and other assets which are owned by the Farm Credit Mortgage Corporation.

I understand that the bill has been approved by the Farm Credit Administration. I understand also it has been

approved by the General Accounting Office, and is not resisted by the Department of Agriculture.

The matter could be handled much more efficiently through the enactment of the bill the Senator has introduced. It would be much better to handle it in that way than by striking out the language from the pending bill.

I understand that it has cost only $600 per year for this, and it could cause some confusion with reference to the transfer of these funds. As of December 31, 1959, there was still outstanding $3,933,000 that was owing to this defunct Corporation from the Federal land banks.

Of course all the money belongs to the Treasury of the United States. The Senator's bill is the appropriate way in which to transfer these assets to the Department of the Treasury. I hope the Senator will not press his amendment to strike out this language in the bill, because I do not know what effect it will have.

I will be glad to join him in undertaking to pass his bill, which apparently has been drawn with great care, and which transfers all of the rights to these assets to the Treasury Department and provides for the proper handling of any suits or actions at law that may be instituted for the collection of any sums owing to the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. That would be a much more orderly way of handling it than by striking the item the Senator refers to from the bill. If the adoption of the Senator's amendment would result in a substantial saving, I would be glad to support the Senator. However, only a $600 saving is involved.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree with the Senator that the bill itself should be enacted. However, I point out that the agency does not have any assets other than the eight notes. Those notes are due from the Federal Land Bank. The money all belongs to the Treasury. All the Federal Land Bank will have to do is write checks payable to the Secretary of the Treasury. At least we could save $600 if this language were stricken. Of course it is not only the amount of money that is involved. It has been my experience in the Senate that as long as we keep appropriating money to an agency, it keeps up their hopes that an emergency may arise again so that they can continue in operation. The adoption of this amendment would remove what little opposition there might be remaining, and we would finally be putting this agency to rest.

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot agree that the adoption of the amendment would in any way remove or eliminate the powers and authority of the Farm Mortgage Corporation. The organization would still be in existence. It would be on the books, and could be revived at any time if an appropriation were enacted by Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is true, but it would be a step toward its abolishment.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator's bill provides the only orderly procedure for handling the matter. In 1955 the Corporation owned papers valued at $11,600,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But it cost $572,000 to handle that $11 million.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe that is correct. However, now it has gotten to the point where it has only $3,933,000, and is now a quiescent agency, which is costing only $600. I believe that striking out the language would be a rather imprudent way of handling the situation. I hope the Senator will not press his amendment. He has received some favorable reports from all the Departments on his bill, and I hope the bill will soon be reported to the Senate. I am sure it will pass on the call of the calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I hope so. Nevertheless, I would still very much like to strike out the language in the pending bill. At least it would serve notice to these agencies that Congress expects them to get off the taxpayer's backs. It seems to me to be a ridiculous situation to pay a governmental agency between $75 and $100 for transferring a check from one Government agency to another. We could eliminate this agency and save the money.

This agency has not made a loan in 23 years. It has disposed of all its assets. Even its capital stock has been retired to the Federal Treasury. All of its assets except eight notes have been liquidated. Those eight notes represent balances due from the eight Federal Land Banks. The process for handling those checks costs $75 to $100 each—merely for the acceptance of those checks and turning them over to the Treasury.

Mr. RUSSELL. Unfortunately, the Senator does not know whether they can turn over those checks without this authority in the bill. If we struck out the language, there might be something in the law which would prevent them from doing that. The Senator has been a most valued Member of the Senate in pursuing useless agencies. This is the first time I have seen him level his lance on a $600 dragon. This is the smallest of all dragons in the Government's stable of dragons. He is getting very much exercised about this teenie-weenie little dragon. It is so small that he could hardly pursue it with his lance, it seems to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It may be a teenie-weenie little dragon to the Senator from Georgia, but this little dragon in 1951 cost the American taxpayers $1,128,836. In 1952, it cost $989,810; in 1953, $834,731; in 1954, $691,945; in 1955, $572,539. Let us remember that all that now happens is that some people will be sitting around waiting for eight checks to come in. They had a few more accounts in those years but not many more.

They have this tremendous task of picking up the eight checks and forwarding them to the Secretary of the Treasury each year, when the checks could have been sent direct. Certainly, it should not cost $75 to $100 to handle each check.

Why keep an agency with a $2 billion borrowing authority alive with this $600 appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand the $600 is used to pay a small part of the salary of someone who handles the machinery in the processing of these checks. I do not want these checks stopped. It may have cost a great deal of money in the years to which the Senator has referred.

It would be just as logical to say that because a war was carried on at a cost of $200 billion a year, therefore the Department of Defense ought to be abolished. That is about as sensible as the argument the Senator makes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. When the war has ended, a peace treaty is signed. But when the service of an agency is no longer needed it is kept alive 20 years by these token appropriations.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator does not know whether checks could be issued under existing law. He is trying to use this bill to propagandize his bill in the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He has all the reports. I am sure that if he would attend the meeting of that committee, of which he is one of the most distinguished members—no; I believe he left that committee a short time ago to become a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations—if he would go before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I am certain they would report the bill. That is the orderly way to proceed.

The Senator from Delaware did not come before our committee, where we could investigate and determine the effect of striking the language from the bill. Without having some knowledge of what the effect of striking the language would be, I could not accept the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is not simply the fact that we can save $600 next year. They did spend about $5,000 last year. This subject will still be in conference if we adopt the amendment. I have been advised that the adoption of this amendment would not handicap the Government in any way.

We should not lose sight of the fact that we are keeping alive an agency which has authority to borrow $2 billion and to pledge the credit of the United States in repayment thereof. That is a lot of authority to allow to lie around loosely and idly; and to continue to appropriate $600 or $800 to this abandoned agency only serves to keep it alive.

If this amendment is approved, the conferees could work out any language they thought appropriate to accomplish the purpose. I think it is time that we served notice on these agencies that when their useful life has been ended we expect them to be abolished.

Mr. President, I submit the amendment. I hope the Senator from Georgia will take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, beginning with line 23, it is proposed to strike out all the language to and including line 6, page 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask a few questions of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. First, I should state that perhaps my questions may not be in conformity with the bill itself, but they will be in conformity with an operation of the Department of Agriculture.

The first question is: Is there any amount of money provided in the bill for the administration of Federal milk marketing orders?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is the sum of approximately $300,000 under the Agricultural Marketing Service for the administration and policing of milk marketing orders.

Mr. FREAR. Is that by way of direct appropriation or by way of assessment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not too certain about that; we have not considered the matter of milk orders for some time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think there must be an appropriation for the maintenance of the Washington office. However, the marketing area expenses, I am sure, are paid by assessments on the farmers who ship milk into the areas. That is true of Boston and New York and of other cities with which I am familiar, and I believe it to be true of all of them. There is a deduction of a certain amount per hundred pounds—2, 2½, or 3 cents.

Mr. RUSSELL. About $300,000 is provided for general administration; and that is for the activity in the Washington office. However, the direct cost of the supervision of the milk orders is, as the Senator from Vermont states, supported by something in the nature of a tax.

Mr. FREAR. I shall ask questions along that line in a moment.

Mr. AIKEN. I am trying to be helpful to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. I know the Senator is. I will let him be helpful in a little while. However, he is getting me out of line.

If the $300,000 was not appropriated, what would happen to the administration of the local milk marketing areas?

Mr. RUSSELL. Very frankly, I cannot answer the Senator.

Mr. FREAR. Then I shall ask the Senator from Vermont to answer, if the Senator from Georgia will permit him to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that when there is any program requiring any Federal supervision at all, there must be a Federal appropriation for it. In the case of milk marketing orders, the Secretary is required to find a fair minimum price, and to fix the minimum price for each order area. However, the expenses of the area itself are taken care of by a deduction from the price of the milk which the farmer receives. In my own area, I believe it is probably 2 or 3 cents a hundred pounds, though I am not certain of that. However, that will pay the local administrator and his assistants, and will pay the cost of the salaries of clerks, secretaries, and so forth, in that area. The farmer himself pays that amount.

Mr. FREAR. I am certain the Senator from Vermont can answer the question I asked. What would happen to the administration of the milk orders, at the local level, if the $300,000 were not appropriated to the central office?

Mr. AIKEN. I am not sure. What would happen if there was no amount of any kind appropriated for the maintenance of the White House?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have been thinking over the matter since the Senator asked his question. I do not believe it would have any direct application, but it would prevent the formulation of any new marketing orders.

Mr. AIKEN. I never contemplated any such horrible thought as apparently runs through the mind of the distinguished junior Senator from Delaware. If he is inclined to take away the $300,000 which maintains an orderly marketing system for some 50 percent of all the milk production in the United States, I simply would not want to contemplate such a situation.

Mr. FREAR. Anyhow, it is reasonable to assume that if the $300,000 were not appropriated, the Department of Agriculture, in its central office in Washington, could no longer render assistance in the administration, at the local level, of the Federal milk-marketing orders in the local areas, could it?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am inclined to believe that they would not be able to lend any assistance. Certainly they could not formulate any new marketing orders or to embrace any new areas. It has been a long time since the passage of the bill providing for marketing orders. I doubt very much that the refusal to appropriate $300,000 would completely close the local administration of the milk-marketing orders.

Mr. FREAR. The most charitable thing I could say to the Senator from Vermont, and the most horrible thing I could think about the Senator from Delaware, is that he did not propose this a year ago, before the Order No. 127 went into effect.

Mr. AIKEN. The Dairy Division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has other functions besides the administering of milk-marketing orders. I think practically the entire cost of the administration of the milk-marketing orders is borne by the farmers themselves. However, the Dairy Division has many other things to attend to.

Mr. FREAR. I believe the Senator from Vermont said that the entire cost of the administration of the area in which the milk-marketing order is issued by the Department of Agriculture is borne by the producers of that area.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that practically all of the cost is borne by the producers.

Mr. FREAR. Where does the other money come from?

Mr. AIKEN. What other money?

Mr. FREAR. If all the cost is not borne by the producers, where does the remainder of it come from?

Mr. AIKEN. The Dairy Division of the Department of Agriculture existed long before the orders for the marketing of milk. The Dairy Division has the oversight of the dairy industry of the United States, just as there is a division for the oversight of cotton, grain, foreign agriculture, and so on.

Mr. FREAR. Then it comes from the Department of Agriculture, through an appropriation? Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. Undoubtedly it costs a little money to maintain the Dairy Division; and it may cost a few thousand dollars more because it has oversight of the dairy marketing areas. I would not be surprised to find that was so. But what part of the $300,000 is used for that purpose, I am unable to say.

Mr. FREAR. Do any of the funds which are used to pay the cost of administration for a local area, in connection with a milk-marketing order, come from the handlers?

Mr. AIKEN. The funds come from the farmers, the producers. I think the funds come indirectly; the deductions are made from the checks which go to the farmers, and are paid to the district area offices.

Mr. FREAR. Is it not a fact that when a Federal milk-marketing order is issued and is put into execution, demand is made on the handler or the distributor to pay whatever percentage per hundredweight is authorized by the order; and that is collected from the producer?

Mr. AIKEN. I think so. In the marketing areas with which I am familiar, the distributors themselves do not vote on the question of whether to have a milk-marketing order or not; and thus far it seems to have worked out fairly well for them.

Mr. FREAR. I am glad the Senator from Vermont has made that point, because I had it in mind, too.

Just how is a Federal milk-marketing order established?

Mr. AIKEN. A petition is made to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FREAR. By whom?

Mr. AIKEN. By the farmers of the area.

Then the Department of Agriculture, if it finally approves the formula which is set forth, submits it to the vote of the farmers. In my area, if two-thirds of the farmers vote for the marketing order, it goes into effect.

It so happens that in my area some 90-odd percent of them do vote for the marketing order. In fact, I think almost 100 percent of them vote for it. There may be a few who do not.

Then, since it has been approved by the farmers of the area, it goes into effect.

I understand that in some places a 75-percent affirmative vote is required.

I am sure the Senator from Delaware now has further questions.

Mr. FREAR. Yes, I have several.

Then, apparently the Federal milk-marketing orders are not established in the same way in all areas; that is to say, in Vermont, such an order can be established by the affirmative votes of two-thirds of the farmers; but in another area, the affirmative votes of 75 percent of the farmers may be required; and it is conceivable that in another area the affirmative votes of 100 percent of the farmers would be required.

Mr. AIKEN. If they so voted beforehand, yes.

Mr. FREAR. But the provision would have to be included in the order before it could be put into execution, would it not?

Mr. AIKEN. A two-thirds favorable vote is required, I believe, in all the New England marketing areas. A 75-percent affirmative vote may be required in some other areas; I am not sure.

Mr. FREAR. So there is no uniformity about it; is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know that it is uniform throughout the country.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I can cast a little light on that point. There are two types of orders. One is the marketing type of order; it requires a two-thirds favorable vote of those who participate in the referendum. The other type is a handler order. It requires a three-fourths favorable vote by the handlers.

I am not too familiar with this matter, because in my State we have a State law which deals with the subject. We have no Federal milk marketing orders in the dairy industry there.

Mr. FREAR. Again I say I think the State of Georgia is extremely wise in that respect and has used very good judgment. I think State control is much superior to the Federal control which is had in the States which have Federal milk marketing orders. Under State control, the respective areas have the right to determine for themselves.

Mr. AIKEN. From 85 to 90 percent of the milk produced in Vermont is marketed outside of Vermont.

Mr. FREAR. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Vermont to say that in the area which serves Vermont approximately 90 percent of the producers voted in favor of the order?

Mr. AIKEN. No other areas serve Vermont. Instead, Vermont serves other areas. Vermont exports almost 90 percent of the milk which is produced in Vermont. It is exported to Boston, Hartford, southeastern New England, Haverhill, Lawrence, and New York City areas.

Mr. FREAR. Did the Vermont producers vote on the question of whether they wanted to have a Federal milk-marketing order or not?

Mr. AIKEN. That is true, I think; nearly 100 percent of them—certainly more than 90 percent of them—voted for it.

Mr. FREAR. Then I correctly understood the Senator from Vermont. I know he has a fine background on this matter, on which I should like to be educated.

May I have the permission of the Senator from Georgia to continue a short time for that purpose?

Mr. RUSSELL. Indeed, so. As chairman of the subcommittee, I regret that for the first time I find myself with an almost complete lack of information on these milk-marketing orders. I do not think the question has been brought up during the 24 years I have presided over the subcommittee. No questions in regard to the Federal milk-marketing orders have been presented during that time. Of course, the legislation for them is handled in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and thereafter is handled in the milksheds. So I am not too familiar with the matter.

Mr. FREAR. If the farmers in Vermont and whatever other area was covered by the milk-marketing order had voted 50 percent in favor of the establishment of a milk-marketing order and 50 percent against its establishment, would a milk-marketing order have been issued?

Mr. AIKEN. No.

Mr. FREAR. Then did the producers themselves decide that they wanted to have a milk-marketing order issued?

Mr. AIKEN. They did.

Mr. FREAR. In other words, each producer had one vote and each distributor had one vote; is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know if the distributors vote. I think not. But each producer has one vote.

Mr. FREAR. Would a two-thirds affirmative vote or a three-fourths affirmative vote be required? Just now I understood the Senator from Georgia to say that in order to have a producer order, a two-thirds affirmative vote would be required. And in order to have a distributor or handlers order, a three-fourths affirmative vote would be required; is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. The latter is a different kind of order.

It so happens that in the Boston area, which is the largest market, the producers only participate.

Mr. FREAR. So a producer can vote in either one of them—either in the one in which a three-fourths affirmative vote is required or in the one in which a two-thirds affirmative vote is required; is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. Well, a producer could not vote in connection with the setting up of an order on a distributor basis.

Mr. FREAR. Yes. But a producer could vote in connection with either a producer order or a distributor order, could he not?

Mr. AIKEN. If the formula so provides.

Mr. FREAR. Who provides the formula?

Mr. AIKEN. The formula was approved originally in Boston in 1937. That was when milk was bringing $1 a hundred pounds, which is a very low price for it—2 cents a quart. The distributors did not like the order at the time; but it was put into effect, for the producers had to have something. The Department of Agriculture, under Secretary Wallace, approved it.

At that time, I was Governor of Vermont, and I approved it, and it worked out well. Then the price of milk began to reach a reasonable level.

At first, the distributors opposed it; but after a while they found that it stabilized their business, too; and in the last 20 years there has been no opposition from distributors, so far as I know.

Mr. FREAR. I think that was quite commendable, for certainly at that time the farmers were not being overpaid for the milk they produced; neither do I think they are overpaid today.

Mr. AIKEN. No, they are not.

Mr. FREAR. However, I am trying to obtain the answers to some of my questions.

My next question is as follows: If an order, however formulated, required the affirmative votes of two-thirds of the producers, in order to put the Federal milk-marketing order into effect, but if the affirmative votes constituted less than two-thirds of the total number of votes, such an order would not be issued, would it?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. In other words, if 34 percent opposed the issuance of the order, it would not go into effect.

Mr. FREAR. Thirty-four percent?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, a little more than one-third.

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Are there marketing cooperatives in that area?

Mr. AIKEN. Almost every dairy farmer in Vermont belongs to a marketing cooperative.

Mr. FREAR. How did the marketing cooperative count the votes of its producer members when they voted on the question of the issuance of a Federal milk-marketing order?

Mr. AIKEN. They voted en bloc. That is why the dairy farmers joined the cooperative—so their votes would count, and so they could get out of the difficulties they were in.

I would say that 98 percent of all the milk going out of Vermont to other States is shipped by cooperatives—and probably more than that, probably 99.9 percent. But I wish to be conservative in my statement.

Mr. FREAR. The Senator from Vermont is always conservative, and certainly I would not question his statement.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not always called too conservative.

Mr. FREAR. Well, I have read something of that sort, too; but I do not always agree with what I read.

In voting on the question of whether such an order shall be issued, they vote as a bloc, do they not? If there were 300 producers in one cooperative, and if a majority of them voted in favor of the issuance of the order, all 300 votes would be recorded in the affirmative, I assume.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. If 149 producers voted in the negative and 151 farmers voted in the affirmative, then all 300 votes would be cast by the cooperative in the affirmative; is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, but that is not the whole story. If the 149 felt differently, they would not belong to the cooperative. There is no requirement to join in a cooperative. The reason why they do so is so they can vote together and work together, and pool their products, and ship their products together, and thus save their industry.

The Senator is right. If 151 voted for the marketing order and 149 voted against it, I think there would be 300 votes cast for it; but that cooperative would not last overnight if it was that evenly divided.

Mr. FREAR. I recognize that the people of New England and that area are a bit different, perhaps, from people in other regions of the Nation.

Mr. AIKEN. Not so much.

Mr. FREAR. I think they have many qualities that are very beneficial to this country, and we count on them for a lot of things to keep our country stabilized. They are pretty sound people, and I recognize it.

Mr. AIKEN. Almost all of them are.

Mr. FREAR. And the Senator is a fine representative of those people.

The Senator may have thought the question I asked was a hypothetical question.

Mr. AIKEN. No.

Mr. FREAR. The Chesapeake Bay marketing order went into effect 2 months ago, and is known as Order No. 127. To make that order become effective, a cooperative voted as has been stated. It voted for the entire membership in the affirmative. I do not know the figures exactly, although from a pretty official source we have had it told to us that approximately 40 percent of the producers voted against it and 60 percent of the producers voted for it. But it was voted 100 percent. Assuming there were 1,200 members of the cooperative, to use a round number, 1,200 producers were voted in favor of a marketing order by the Federal Government. Outside of this one cooperative, whose concentration of delivery is in the city of Baltimore, Md., there are other producers in the area circumscribed by the order, who are not members of the cooperative. Those producers had the right to vote and did exercise the right to vote. They voted in the majority against the marketing order. So when the number of votes against, on the outside, were added to those who voted against in the cooperative, those voting against the order amounted to more than 50 percent of the total.

Mr. AIKEN. The solution to that problem, of course, is that no one has to belong to the cooperative; and if they do not belong to the cooperative they cast their own votes as individuals rather than en bloc. They have to weigh one value against the other.

Mr. FREAR. Then the Senator would want to penalize a producer member of the cooperative by having him get out of the cooperative to get his vote counted as he voted.

Mr. AIKEN. Oh, no.

Mr. FREAR. Because he wants the advantage of belonging to a co-op, he joins, but, in order to get his vote counted, he would have to get out of the co-op.

Mr. AIKEN. No. The majority rules in a co-op, as it does in a town meeting, or in the Senate. The Senator from Delaware would not want to get out of the Senate just because he had lost a couple of votes.

Mr. FREAR. I have lost a few.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Senator is still here, and very likely, he will continue to be here for a long time.

Mr. FREAR. But I would not be here if a majority of the people of my State did not want me to come back again. I hope they do not feel that way.

Here is a situation in which a man who voted in the negative had his vote counted in the affirmative for something he did not want. That is why the milk order was put into effect, because the total vote of the cooperative was counted in favor.

Does the Senator from Vermont agree with that type of operation or voting?

Mr. AIKEN. Do I agree with majority rule in a cooperative? Yes.

Mr. FREAR. If the majority votes a certain way, the entire membership can cast all of their votes in the affirmative?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I would say that would be representative of the views of the cooperative members as such.

Mr. FREAR. I think, if that was the only co-op voting, I could agree with the Senator; but when they were put on the defensive—or on the offensive in this case—against those who were voting individually on the outside, it seems it was a bit unfair.

Mr. AIKEN. If I had not gone through this some 25 years ago, perhaps I would feel differently about it, but I vividly recall the time when dealers who wanted to come into my State, which had half of the producers in New England, would say, "We will give you an extra price if you do not do so and so, which will help the rest of the farmers." They worked it pretty well for a long time, until milk was worth but 1 to 2 cents a quart. They carried it too far, and they forced the farmers to get together in their cooperatives. They have been in them ever since. As I said, about 99 percent of the milk that is shipped out is shipped by the cooperatives, and the voting on the marketing orders is voted on by cooperatives today.

Mr. FREAR. The Senator has been diligent in answering my questions, and he has been quite persuasive, but not quite enough. I wish to ask a question or two. I would not want to impose too much on the time of the Senate, because it wants to vote on the bill, and my colleague has something to say that is perhaps more important than this.

The Senator is familiar with classification of milk under milk marketing orders, is he not?

Mr. AIKEN. I am. There are classes I and II.

Mr. FREAR. Class I and class II.

Mr. AIKEN. And in some cases there is a class C.

Mr. FREAR. What are the classes?

Mr. AIKEN. They are class I and class II. Class I is the milk which is sold for family consumption and to restaurants. It is sold as fluid milk. Class II represents the surplus, which is more than can be sold for direct human consumption in the form of fluid milk. That is called class II. It goes into powdered milk and cheese and into butter and powder.

In New England, I do not think they break even on class II milk. Nevertheless, for a dealer to be sure of enough milk to meet his trade on weekends and holidays, he has to have about 20 percent more milk than he needs, on the average—at least 20 percent of class II milk—in order to meet the demand, day in and day out.

Formerly there were dealers who would go to certain farmers and say, "We will take your milk. We will pay you this price, which we can afford to pay, because we will sell all of your milk for household use, and you will not have to take any of the loss on the surplus milk that is produced in the area."

They worked that fine for a while, by paying the best of the farmers a fair price, and paying all the rest of the farmers a low price. They were carrying all of the class II milk. However, after the farmers got together and organized cooperatives, all of the farmers got more than the best paid farmers had previously gotten for the fluid milk. All of the farmers then got a uniform minimum price, and they all had to bear their share of the surplus production of the area. It worked out very well.

After we got away from that $1 a hundredweight milk, or $1¼ a hundredweight milk, which was the price in 1937, the price gradually went up. It is not high enough today. The price of milk has not gone up anywhere near in proportion to costs of production. However, the price is definitely better than it would have been if the farmers had not organized, because otherwise they would all be getting a much lower price.

Mr. FREAR. I do not want the Senator from Vermont to get the idea that I am not in favor of producers joining together to obtain better prices for milk.

Mr. AIKEN. I know the Senator favors that.

Mr. FREAR. I am leading up to another question.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator simply has in his State a higher percentage of farmers who have sales for class I milk than I have in my State. That makes for a difference of opinion.

Mr. FREAR. It is a fact that some States have more surplus milk than other States. There is no question about that.

Mr. AIKEN. Not for the same reason, however.

Mr. FREAR. It is also true that any producer is a pretty good producer if he can keep his flow of milk even for 365 days a year.

Mr. AIKEN. He cannot.

Mr. FREAR. And no distributor can keep his sales on a level for 365 days a year.

Mr. AIKEN. Neither can the farmer.

Mr. FREAR. There has to be some fluctuation, both in regard to production and distribution. I recognize that there has to be some tie-in to take care of the ups and downs on either side.

The Senator has told me that the class I milk is the fluid milk for human daily consumption. The class II milk is the surplus, and the class III milk has some other distinction.

Mr. AIKEN. In the marketing order areas the class II milk is usually of the same quality as the class I milk, only it is in a supply which is more than is needed on a particular day for fluid milk consumption.

Mr. FREAR. As a matter of fact, if the fellow is on a blended price, two-thirds of a can of milk would be class I milk and one-third of it would be the class II milk. I can recognize that. There is no difference in the milk.

Mr. AIKEN. Not in the marketing order areas. Where there is no marketing order area there could be a difference in the milk.

Mr. FREAR. Does the Senator mean that cannot happen?

Mr. AIKEN. In practically all of the areas the milk is subject to board of health requirements. There are certain sanitary requirements.

Mr. FREAR. I do not think the Senator quite understood me.

Mr. AIKEN. I think so.

Mr. FREAR. So far as the sanitary requirements are concerned, if the butterfat content is correct and the bacteria count is low enough and the temperature below a certain degree, the milk will come to the producer or the handler and will be class I or class A or whatever it may be called. That producer will have two-thirds of the sales in fluid milk and one-third of the sales in byproducts.

Mr. AIKEN. It is all of the same quality.

Mr. FREAR. Every can of milk that producer receives is class I milk.

Mr. AIKEN. It could qualify as class I milk, but if it is not all sold for fluid milk consumption the part which is left over in any area is the class II milk.

Mr. FREAR. We are basing this discussion upon the quality.

Mr. AIKEN. The class II designation does not change the quality.

Mr. FREAR. It does not make any difference whether it is the top half of the milk or the lower half.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. Does the Senator know of any class II milk which is purchased for the class II established price in a Federal milk marketing area and which is sold for fluid milk, without there being considered the blend price which is paid to the producer?

Mr. AIKEN. Oh, yes. That used to be done quite often. The class II milk was taken from one area into another market and sold as class I milk. That way the price received would be $6 a hundredweight instead of $3 a hundredweight.

Mr. FREAR. Very well.

Mr. AIKEN. That was done rather extensively in New England. The farmers were losing $1.5 million or $2 million a year as a result of that practice, so they petitioned to have the area to which the class II milk was being transported and sold for class I milk included in the larger marketing area. That was voted. Now the farmers really get a better price; and the distributors, I suppose, are doing very well, but not making their earnings quite so easily as they were before.

Mr. FREAR. Let us forget about the distributors and assume they are on a par.

Mr. AIKEN. We cannot forget them.

Mr. FREAR. Yes, we can.

Mr. AIKEN. Oh, no.

Mr. FREAR. If the producer is in a class I area and if he has a surplus and he sells it as class II milk, and it goes to another area as class II milk and is sold in that area as class I milk, at a much higher price——

Mr. AIKEN. That is a common practice, where it can be done.

Mr. FREAR. Then how would that producer be paid?

Mr. AIKEN. He would be paid the class I milk price for the overall production of the class I milk, but he would be paid the class II milk price for that which the distributor takes into another market, which he sells as class I milk or which is used for manufacturing purposes.

Mr. FREAR. Very well. I do not agree with all of that, but let us assume that is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. It is a fact. I can prove every word of it.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, no.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, I can.

Mr. FREAR. No. I will contest with the Senator on that, because I can give examples.

Mr. AIKEN. I have particular areas in mind, where that has been done extensively.

Mr. FREAR. I agree with regard to the practice, as to what the Senator said has been done. I agree with that.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, I do not know whether it is being done in Delaware, in Maryland, or in the Baltimore area.

Mr. FREAR. If a producer is in an area where the blended price is 95 percent class I, and that area is a class I area because of increased consumption of fluid milk in that area, the producer would get the advantage of the difference between two-thirds and 95 percent in that instance, would he not?

Mr. AIKEN. Well, if he sends the milk to market and two-thirds of it is sold as class I milk, we will say at $6 a hundredweight, he will get $6 a hundredweight for two-thirds of the milk. The other one-third will be the class 2 milk. He may get $3 a hundredweight for the other one-third of the milk.

Mr. FREAR. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. The blend price would be the composite price as between $6 and $3. It would come out about $4.50 or $5 per hundredweight.

Mr. FREAR. Four dollars and fifty cents?

Mr. AIKEN. Four dollars and fifty cents or five dollars a hundredweight.

Mr. FREAR. That is correct. If the producer is getting $4.50 or $5 per hundredweight on that basis and the distributor makes the area a 95 percent class I market, what would the producer get?

Mr. AIKEN. Well, if the distributor sells the milk as fluid milk in that marketing area——

Mr. FREAR. He has to, if it is class I.

Mr. AIKEN. Then he would have to pay the fluid milk price for what is sold as fluid milk. If he can ship to another market——

Mr. FREAR. That is not the question.

Mr. AIKEN. Then he can get the higher price. The farmer would not get that.

Mr. FREAR. That is not an answer to the question. That is not a solution to the problem. If the distributor makes the area a 95 percent class I market, he will have to pay the producer 95 percent class I prices, will he not?

Mr. AIKEN. I never heard of a distributor paying 95 percent class I price for class II milk. He will pay for about 50 percent of it as class I.

Mr. FREAR. Again I have a question for the Senator from Vermont. I can show to the Senator that there are distributors who do that.

Mr. AIKEN. If any area can get 95 percent of the class I price for the class II milk, it is a very fortunate area, I would add.

Mr. FREAR. I agree. There is an area like that. What the Federal milk marketing order is doing now is cutting down the price. The producers in the area, instead of getting 95 percent class I prices, are assessed so that they have to put the milk in a pool, so that the farmer in another area is going to benefit and the producer in the particular area is going to have the money taken from him.

Mr. AIKEN. It would all depend upon whether the 95 percent class I price which is received for the class II milk amounts to more than what the farmer and all of his neighbors would get if they cooperated and all of them went under an order.

Mr. FREAR. Well, there is an area laid out. It comprises two counties.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. As a matter of fact, we can take the whole peninsula.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not questioning the situation set forth by the Senator from Delaware. It is entirely possible, because before we got the marketing order in New England we had certain distributors who would favor certain groups of producers, but the result was that the distributors kept down the prices for all producers, with the possible exception of those few.

They were used as a lever, and they would pay a high price when production was short. They would go out and steal each other's producers. But when the surplus season arrived, they would drop all the producers down to the bottom.

Mr. FREAR. Yes. I believe also there were people who used to put rotten apples in a basket.

Mr. AIKEN. I have seen that happen.

The Senator from Delaware has observed that the people of Vermont do not do that any more.

I will not admit that they ever did.

They are much better off now than they used to be.

Mr. FREAR. Yes. And that is due in no small part to the efforts of the Senator from Vermont. I will say that for him.

In response to an inquiry addressed to the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Clarence L. Miller, Assistant Secretary, in explanation of the

background of the Federal marketing program in Upper Chesapeake Bay, Order No. 127, stated in part:

Since the minimum prices which all handlers must pay are equal in each use, no handler is placed at a competitive disadvantage with respect to his sales of milk within the regulated marketing area.

I will take that for granted. He goes on:

The other major facet of the order program is the equal sharing among farmers of returns from sale of milk. In this way, all farmers have an equal share in the Class I market and also assume an equal share in any surplus delivered to the market. This method of sharing returns is an important stabilizing influence, for it removes the necessity for farmers to undercut each other in an attempt to retain an equitable share of the Class I market.

This equal sharing of returns is carried out through a so-called equalization fund. Handlers use different proportions of their receipts of milk as Class I and Class II. Hence, the utilization prices of individual handlers will vary from the marketwide average price. The attainment of uniform returns to all producers, therefore, requires that those handlers whose utilization price is higher than the market average uniform price pay the difference between such uniform price and their own particular utilization price into the equalization fund, and those handlers whose utilization price is lower than the market uniform price draw money out of the fund.

That statement struck me as a little curious, because it has not been too long ago when this administration was talking about some type of social order. To me that is taking money from a producer in one area and putting it in a pool so that a producer in another area can draw it out. To me that is economic equalization. Does the Senator from Vermont agree or disagree?

Mr. AIKEN. I will say that Mr. Miller is correct when he says each producer is required to carry his share of the surplus production of that area. He is not quite correct when he states they all get the same price for the milk, because under the Federal marketing order the Secretary fixes a minimum price for the milk. Conditions may be different in the Baltimore market from what they are in the Boston market or other markets. Distributors in the New England markets frequently pay premiums, and some of them pay premiums at certain times of the year which run up to 60 or 80 cents a hundred pounds. Others will pay a premium only a few cents per 100 pounds above the minimum price fixed by the Secretary under the marketing agreement. For example, for milk in bulk tanks, most of the companies up to now have given about 15 cents per 100-pound premium for the milk above the price paid for milk shipped in cans. So there is nothing in the marketing order which would prevent any distributor from continuing to pay a higher price to special producers if he saw fit. But they will have to carry their share of this surplus, and that will be based on the average price.

Mr. FREAR. I have a great deal of respect for Mr. Miller, but I have a little more respect for the Senator from Vermont because I think he knows a little more about what he is talking about.

Mr. AIKEN. I have seen people in the milk business for 40 years who have not learned all there is to know about the business. I have seen them get tripped up after spending all their lives in the business by someone who had outfoxed them. It is one of the most competitive businesses on the face of the globe.

Mr. FREAR. Yes. I believe the Senator is looking at one right now. There are a number of small producers and small handlers in our State. In my opinion, if some large distributors on the other side of the bay wished to take another area into their distribution system, they might use the milk order as a means of forcing those handlers and producers under a milk order, and the only result would be to put the small handlers out of business, and then the small producer would be at the mercy of the large operator.

Mr. AIKEN. Frankly, I do not know what the formula for the Baltimore marketing area is. I believe the situation on the Eastern Shore is undoubtedly as described by the Senator from Delaware, and if it is—and I expect it is—I would be doing exactly what he is doing here. I recall that 20 or 25 years ago in New England there were 18 auctions of dairies in 1 town in 1 week; small dairies going out of business. The milk producers just had to get together.

Mr. FREAR. I believe the producers have every right to get together in order to market their milk, and I believe the distributors have a right to have a fair margin of profit. But the ones I am most interested in are the producers of milk. I am frank to admit that. I do not wish to see the producers of milk in Delaware compelled to market 95 percent of their class I milk in the 66⅔-percent class. That is the whole object of the proposal.

I think the Senator from Vermont has taken care of his constituents in Vermont, and I know they are grateful to him for it. The senior Senator from Delaware and I wish to do a little something for our constituents in Delaware. I apologize to the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Vermont for utilizing so much time, but I am grateful to both of them.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the people of Delaware are fortunate to have such able Senators as the senior and junior Senators from Delaware.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Delaware need not apologize to me. I expect Senators to represent their constituency with the same feeling and determination which the Senator from Delaware always displays. Again may I say that I discussed this subject at an earlier date with the senior Senator from Delaware, and I can say that the farmers of Delaware are mighty lucky they have representing them the two Senators who are presently with us.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself I send to the desk an amendment and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware on behalf of himself and the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 14, lines 1 and 2, to strike out "$250,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$100,000,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the budget request for this particular item, which is for the ACP payments, is only $100 million. The testimony of the representatives of the Department of Agriculture clearly states that all that they are requesting or all that they think they need is $100 million. I talked with officials of the American Farm Bureau, and they recommended that this item be reduced to $100 million; and they stated emphatically in the testimony before the committee that they thought the money could better be used elsewhere so far as the American farmer was concerned.

The purpose of this appropriation is to finance a portion of the cost of lime and other types of fertilizers for farmers. The Government pays about half of the cost under certain conditions.

Thus we have a situation in which we are spending $4 billion to $5 billion a year to support the prices for American agriculture. We have about $9 billion worth of agricultural commodities on hand, and in the proposed legislation we would be giving $250 million presumably to enable the farmers to produce more surplus. The proposal is to give free fertilizer to produce more crops at the expense of the American taxpayer. This is a ridiculous contradiction. There may have been a use for these programs in the past, but I do not think they are needed at a time when we have more agriculture crops than we need.

There are many other features of the bill which deal with soil conservation that can be justified, but I think this is one item which can well be returned to the budget request, thereby saving $150 million. I know the Senator from Georgia will agree that we cannot reduce the amount of the appropriation this year. This is an item under which we appropriate one year in advance. Last year we had a similar debate in an attempt to cut the figure back, and we lost. Congress last year insisted upon the $250 million figure. As a result we are appropriating in this bill $242 million to pay last year's commitments.

I agree fully with those other Members of the Senate who say it will be unrealistic to try this year to cut the $242 million figure, although I did try to cut it last year. Last year when we rejected an amendment similar to the one which is now being offered, we in effect instructed the Department of Agriculture to make these contracts with the American farmers to the extent of $250 million annually. Once they are made they must be paid. We have no alternative.

By the same token if we reject the amendment today we will automatically increase the expenditures in the next fiscal year by $150 million over and above the amount which is recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. I repeat that the Department of Agriculture, the

American Farm Bureau, and many other farm organizations have endorsed this reduction.

I do not for 1 minute question the sincerity of the Senators who are opposing the amendment—they believe in the program—but it is significant that the strongest supporter for the $250 million in the bill is the National Agricultural Limestone Institute. As a matter of fact, they favor raising the amount to $500 million, which would be an increase to five times more than the request of the Bureau of the Budget. The membership of this institute sells most of the lime under this program. It maintains a Washington representative, Robert M. Koch, as a lobbyist. It realizes, of course, that its best customer is the U.S. Government and that all they have to do is to have the appropriations increased in order to sell more lime. All they have to do is sit back and sell the lime to the U.S. Government. In an effort to get larger appropriations they circulate millions of copies of letters throughout the various States calling the direct attention of the farmers as to how Members of the Senate voted on this appropriation. They pointed out in their letters how disastrous it would have been if the appropriation had been cut even a little bit.

Disastrous for whom? Disastrous for the organization which is selling the lime to the Government. Mr. Koch sent this letter over his signature as president of the organization throughout the country. Certainly I do not question his sincerity, because he has a nice thing, living in Washington as a lobbyist and getting an appropriation out of the Government under which the Government will buy his lime. All he has to do is sit back and let the Government pay for it.

I have before me what is allegedly a reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that was circulated by this high-powered lobbyist. It even has the seal of the United States of America on it to make it look official.

It is labeled "Congressional Record" and is described as "proceedings and debate of the 86th Congress, 1st Session, June 2, 1959." It indicates that this was the entire debate on the amendment last year. However, even though it looks like a reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is actually not a reprint at all. He has skipped around on several pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and taken excerpts from speeches of various Senators, and then assembled those excerpts as being the debate in support of his big appropriation. This is definitely and deliberately misleading.

Various Senators are quoted in this allegedly true transcript of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 2, 1959, but the quotes are taken out of context and reassembled to support his own argument.

I realize that everyone has the right to quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is public property once it has been printed. No one has the right, however, to go through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, take out of context statements by various Members of the Senate, assemble those excerpts, and then present them as a statement of a Senator's position, and further to indicate that he has reproduced the Senate proceedings and debate. That is deliberately being misleading.

Every Member of the Senate knows that if we wish to make a reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD we must print the transcript in its entirety or clearly state that it represents excerpts only. We cannot just eliminate the remarks of Senators who happen to be in opposition to what we advocate.

These letters with the alleged reprints of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were mailed to millions of farmers. They call the attention of the farmers to how the Members of Congress from their States voted and indicate that those who voted to cut the appropriation almost destroyed the American farmer.

I have here the letter that was sent throughout the State of Delaware. Its enclosure allegedly is a reprint of the debate last year when an effort was made to reduce this same appropriation. The letter states that Senator FREAR and Senator WILLIAMS voted against this program and continues by saying:

> Fortunately, they were in the minority, and the program was left at $250 million.

The letter further states that the vote was 51 to 26 to defeat the Williams amendment. Presumably they think it would have been disastrous if the amendment had been accepted. They even claim that 84 percent of the farmers in Delaware were against the vote cast by Senator FREAR and Senator WILLIAMS. Mr. Koch knows how to sell lime to the Government, but he does not know the Delaware farmers. I think the two Senators from Delaware know what we are doing when we represent our farmers. It might interest Mr. Koch to know that our farm organizations have strongly supported the position we have taken here on the floor of the Senate. Mr. Koch is just another lobbyist whose only interest in the American farmer is how much money he can make selling lime to the Government.

Whether a lobbyist is for or against a bill or proposal is his business, and I respect his right to represent his clients; but I raise serious question with respect to the propriety of any lobbyist's taking excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, assembling them in this fashion, and then circulating them throughout the country, representing them to be the complete Senate proceedings, in an attempt to obtain a larger appropriation. Unquestionably, this is a threat by a lobbyist to defeat the representatives in Congress who do not comply with his wishes by voting as he says.

I wonder whether Mr. Koch should not register the expenditure for circularizing what is supposedly an accurate reproduction of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and whether he should not also file with the appropriate elections committees the contribution he is making toward the election or defeat of various Members of Congress who do not knuckle down to what he wants.

I will ask the Department of Justice to review these letters to see if it is a proper lobbying activity for a registered lobbyist to take. I do not believe it is proper for him to take from the congressional proceedings excerpts from several pages and assemble them in such a fashion as to make them look like a continuous debate. Can this be charged off as expenses which would be indirectly attributed to lobbying?

The strongest supporters of this increased expenditure are those who stand to make the most money; namely, the Limestone Institute. It wants to sell $500 million worth of lime throughout the United States without the necessity of having salesmen go out on the road, as they ordinarily would have to do. They know that they can get a good price for it in this way.

I raise a question about the advisability of appropriating two and a half times as much money as the Department of Agriculture or the Bureau of the Budget recommends. Why should we spend $250 million to furnish free fertilizer or to subsidize lime for American farmers to produce more crops when we already have an overabundance of these agricultural products? We are already paying around $350 million under the bill to get farmers to take out of production some of their land.

This contradictory program will bankrupt the American taxpayers.

In the interest of the farmer and in the interest of the taxpayers I believe it is about time that Congress made up its mind in which direction it wishes to go. Do we want to curtail the surpluses or are we trying to increase them? If my amendment is rejected it will automatically increase the appropriation in the bill by $150 million above what is needed. In the interest of economy and in the interest of America the amendment should be agreed to. It may not be in the interest of the American Agricultural Lime Institute, but I am not concerned about the Lime Institute. It is about time that they realize that if we are going to have a free enterprise system in this country they had better accept some responsibilities. As one Member of the Senate, I do not hesitate to tell them that it is not their place to sell their lime here in Congress but to get out on the American farms and do it the way it used to be done.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Delaware has just mentioned the National Agricultural Limestone Institute. About 3 months ago I received an invitation to be present at a banquet sponsored by that association. The letter came to me about a week after I had received a letter from an Ohio constituent, a farmer, which enclosed a letter which the Limestone Institute had sent to Ohio farmers. The letter was written by the Limestone Institute, and in substance stated:

We call your attention to the fact that Senator LAUSCHE voted in favor of the Williams amendment, which would have reduced the appropriation for this program from $250 million to $100 million. We do not point this out to you for the purpose of prejudicing Senator LAUSCHE in his political position, but we want you to know that he voted against the amendment.

I wonder why they pointed out that I voted against it, if they did not intend that I should be prejudiced in the eyes of Ohio voters.

The Ohio farmer who wrote to me said, in effect, "Instead of being influenced by the letter, I have become fortified in the conviction that the position which you and Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, took is right." I do not know whether it has been disclosed on the floor of the Senate that letters of the type which my Ohio constituent referred to were sent out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have just discussed that point and pointed out how they were being mailed to farmers in several States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In what unprejudiced, objective, national-serving purpose is this institute engaged? Is it interested in the strength and the fiscal stability and the goodness of our Government? Or is it sending out letters of this type for the purpose of insuring that there shall be made available to them a large lime-purchasing public? The questions are rhetorical; they answer themselves. The interest of the Limestone Institute is the selling of lime, even though the taxpayers generally have to pay for it.

I want it clearly understood by the farmers of Ohio, in particular, and by all the taxpayers of Ohio, in general, that I will not vote for the spending of money to reduce farm production, on the one hand, and then for the spending of money for the purpose of increasing farm production, on the other hand. It is similar to the situation of a man who is building up the front of his house while the back of it is on fire.

I commend the Senator from Delaware for the position which he has taken in this matter. If we intend to reduce farm production to, in a measure, equal the consumption of farm products, the way to do it is not by spending this amount of money to provide fertilizer and other things which will increase farm production.

I commend the Senator from Delaware for the position which he took. I shall gladly support him in the amendment which he has offered today.

The time has come to declare the facts as they exist. It is argued that each farmer will get about $170. There are 1,100,000 of them—1,100,000 voters. How can we afford to pay each one $170? The farmer has rebelled against this. He does not want to be offended in that way. Yet that is what we are doing on the floor of the Senate. I will not be a party to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his statement. I fully agree with his statement. I say again that I know there are Members of the Senate who sincerely believe in the full appropriation for this program. I respect the right of any Senator to differ with the position I take and which I know the Senator from Ohio takes. But I join with the Senator from Ohio in questioning whether there is any degree of sincerity in the statement of Mr. Koch, the president of the National Agricultural Limestone Institute, so far as the American farmer is concerned. His only interest is in selling $500 million worth of lime to the U.S. Government. He is interested in what he can make on the farmer and not in what he can do for him.

I point out again that in the letter sent throughout Ohio and throughout Delaware as well as throughout other States he has noted that the amount involved is $250 million and has suggested that instead of cutting it to $100 million it should be increased to $500 million a year. He is strongly against the action of those who voted against the increase.

He was careful in the letters to point out and emphasize the fact that the institute is calling this to the reader's attention not with the idea of defeating a certain Senator; but that objective is certainly foremost in his mind. The letter was sent out for only one reason, and that was to be a warning to Members of the Senate that if we continue to vote against their recommendations for appropriations, they will circularize the farmers of our States in an attempt to defeat us in the election. There is an implied threat in every one of the letters.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator have a copy of that letter?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have not been able to locate my own copy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It so happens that I have a copy of the letter that went to the farmers in Ohio as well as copies of the letters which were sent to the various other States including Delaware.

I call attention again to the fact that along with each of the letters that went to the various farmers was an alleged reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was described as a part of the proceedings of the 86th Congress, 1st session, under date of June 2, 1959.

That enclosure was not the proceedings of the Senate of that day on the debate on this question. All contain excerpts from statements which various Senators made as they spoke on the amendment. It is made to appear that practically all the speakers were opposed to the amendment.

If a man wishes to distribute the proceedings of the U.S. Senate from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, they are supposed to be printed in their entirety. He does not have a right to take a paragraph from a man's statement at one place and another paragraph from another man's statement, assemble them, and send them out under the heading "CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Proceedings" without an indication that they are only excerpts from the RECORD.

I believe Mr. Koch has gone a little too far in his concern to sell lime to the U.S. Government. I wonder if it would not do him good to get out in the old-fashioned way, as many American farmers do, and work for a living rather than to sit back and gouge the American taxpayers as well as the farmers as he has been doing for the last several years.

I hope the amendment will be adopted, not as a repudiation of Mr. Koch, but on its merits. Certainly the taxpayers can well use the saving of $150 million, which would be saved, and it would bring the amount down to the budget recommendations.

COMPACT FOR APPORTIONMENT OF WATERS OF BIG BLUE RIVER BETWEEN STATES OF KANSAS AND NEBRASKA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1605. After I make a short explanation, I desire to move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill—S. 1605—granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the apportionment of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries as they affect such States, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the interests of such States in the waters of the Big Blue River and all its tributaries, and providing for an equitable apportionment between said States of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries and for matters incident thereto: *Provided*, That one qualified person appointed by the President of the United States shall participate in such negotiations as chairman, representing the United States, and shall make a report to the President and to the Congress on the proceedings and on the compact. The person so appointed shall be chosen from among persons who are regularly employed full time by a department or agency of the United States and shall receive no additional compensation by reason of appointment under this Act. His travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, shall be borne by the department or agency from which he is appointed. No compact, the negotiation of which is authorized by this Act, shall be binding upon the parties thereto until it has been ratified by the legislatures of each of the respective States, and approved by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the House has amended the bill, which was passed last year by this body, by inserting an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The effect of the amendment is to limit the appointment by the President of the United States of the person who will represent the United States to

a person who shall be chosen from among persons who are regularly employed, full time, by a department or agency of the United States, and it is provided that such person shall receive no additional salary.

The Senate version allowed the appointment of the Government representative to be made by the President from among persons either within the Government or outside the employ of the Government.

Before I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House, let me say that I consulted with the Senators from Kansas and also with my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]; and all of them are in agreement with the motion which I shall make, and are in support of it.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I understand that the amendment relates to Senate bill 1605, which grants the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the apportionment of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries as they affect such States.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. I also understand that, under the bill, the President will make the appointment; and I further understand that, under the amendment of the House of Representatives, instead of appointing any person, the President must appoint someone who already is employed by the Federal Government.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct; and no additional compensation will be paid to such person for his services on the Compact Commission.

Mr. CARLSON. Very well.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, having made that explanation—and let me say that the matter has been cleared by the leadership on both sides—I now move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

CONTINUATION FOR 2 YEARS OF EXISTING SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON CERTAIN LATHES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to House bill 9862.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9862) to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. BENNETT conferees on the part of the Senate.

AGRICULTURAL AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Let me say that I can understand the feeling of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]; but I should like to suggest to the Senate that when Senators vote on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, they should distinguish between the two issues.

The Senator from Delaware has been talking about the practices of a representative of the Limestone Institute, as I understand it. But when the vote is taken, Senators must vote on the ACP on its merits.

I know nothing about the matter of propriety to which the Senator from Delaware has referred. I assume that whatever he has said is correct. But I say that when the Senate proceeds to vote, it should consider whether it wishes to support the ACP.

I should like to point out to the Senate that the agricultural conservation program is a cost-sharing program. The costs are shared between the Federal Government and the farmers themselves.

As to the limestone used in the program, I believe I am correct in saying that a few years ago, in 1953 or 1954, because questions had been raised about the use of limestone to increase crop production, the Department of Agriculture changed the regulations so as to provide that ACP limestone could no longer be used on any farmland for any crop, but must be restricted to land already in grass or legumes, or land being put into permanent or rotation pasture. That is, limestone can now be used only on fallow ground, for green-manure crops, for soil-building and conserving practices, not for crop production purposes. In most cases, I understand, the land must remain in grass for 3 or 4 years. If limestone is being used on cultivated land to increase crop production in the State of Delaware, that is something about which the Senator from Delaware can inquire.

I think the ACP has been one of the best farm programs, reaching large numbers of small farmers at a relatively small cost per farm. It encourages a great variety of soil-building and water-conserving practices, and the farmers share the costs. The ACP makes it possible for thousands of farmers to build up their soil, establish and maintain vegetative cover, provide erosion control, follow better forestry practices, and engage in any number of other sound conservation practices. I have always supported this program, and I have seen the results it has brought to Kentucky.

I intend to support the action taken by the committee to provide the full regular authorization of $250 million for the ACP. With all due deference to my friend the Senator from Delaware, I call attention to the fact that when the vote is taken, Senators will not be voting on whether some representative of the Limestone Institute followed a practice which might not be proper. Instead, we shall vote on the agricultural conservation program on its merits. I shall oppose the amendment, and I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as an illustration of the worth of the ACP, a statement about the agricultural conservation program in Kentucky.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM IN KENTUCKY

Again for 1959 the owners and operators of over 40,000 Kentucky farms made use of agricultural conservation program (ACP) cost-sharing to make additional progress on their soil, water, and woodland conservation goals. These farmers, whose farms include about three-eighths of the cropland in the State, utilized over $7 million of ACP funds, and matched that amount by their own contributions.

The establishment and improvement of permanent vegetative cover for soil and watershed protection have continued in recent years to be the most used ACP practices. However, there has been some reduction in the percentage of Kentucky's ACP funds used for these purposes, while forestry and mechanical or earth moving types of practices have increased. The establishment of livestock water facilities as a means of protecting vegetative cover or making practicable the utilization of land for vegetative cover, is an important practice in the State, accounting for about one-seventh of the program. During the last 5 years, over 22,000 livestock water storage dams have been constructed in the State with ACP assistance.

For several years there has been a strong increase each year in the acreage of forestry practices. The latest annual report shows that 11,524 acres of trees were planted for forestry and erosion control purposes on almost 3,000 farms in 91 counties, and that 3,242 acres of timber stands were improved in 49 counties. The leading counties in tree planting were Perry, 763 acres; Clay, 548 acres; Floyd, 546 acres; Johnson, 457 acres; Knott, 449 acres; and Ohio, 443 acres.

During 1959, 1,735 farms in small watersheds organized by local groups in 20 counties, usually under the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566), utilized $410,000 of ACP funds to carry out land treatment

measures in the 12 watersheds involved, which had been authorized for operations. When local groups are ready to move forward with organized watershed efforts, the ASC State committee gives special consideration to the allocation of ACP funds to the counties in which these small watersheds are located in order that the funds can be used as effectively as possible in advancing the farm and watershed conservation programs in the area. Additional amounts of ACP cost-sharing were used in several watersheds authorized for planning, but not then authorized for the construction of major works of improvement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In my remarks I made it clear that there can always be an honest difference of opinion among Senators and that many Senators and organizations are sincerely supporting this program.

Certainly I do not question their sincerity, but I do question the sincerity of Mr. Koch. I think he is primarily interested in selling lime regardless of what the farmers get out of its use; and furthermore I seriously question the propriety of the manner in which he seeks to generate support in having these appropriations increased. I think that is an entirely off-base activity by him and his organization.

In this country we have a system in which lobbyists have a right to submit their views to Senators—and certainly I respect the right of any organization to present its views to us—however, I believe that as a lobbyist, Mr. Koch has gone too far. When he tried to distort the RECORD by attempting to make the farmers believe that all Members of Congress, except a very few, are in favor of this proposal he goes too far.

Furthermore, I point out that it is definitely established that the material which Mr. Koch distributed as a reproduction of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was only excerpts from the RECORD. Obviously he did not include all of the congressional proceedings in connection with that matter. Nevertheless, the material which was sent out by him was handled in such a way as to give the impression that it constituted all of the congressional proceedings in connection with the debate of June 2, 1959.

I have offered the amendment on the basis that it will be better for the American farmers if my proposal is adopted.

In my opinion it is time to stop spending this extra $150 million to produce more crops when we already have more than we know what to do with, and I think the taxpayers can use the $150 million which would be saved.

But again I want it clearly understood that I desire to have the amendment voted on on its merits.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am delighted that the clarification has been made, and that it is now clear that the Senate will not vote on the practices or activities of Mr. Koch.

Mr. President, 1,114,459 American farmers are putting up their own money in order to participate in this great program to conserve the fertility of the soil of the Nation and to defend against erosion by wind or water.

Every Member of the Senate is familiar with this program, and it is not necessary to discuss it at any great length at this time.

For some incomprehensible reason, ever since Mr. Benson took over the Department of Agriculture, he has undertaken to weaken and, in fact, to defeat the agricultural conservation program.

I say for some incomprehensible reason; I would not say that if Mr. Benson had not equally urged the conservation phase of the soil bank program, under which the Government finances 100 percent, and which reaches only 300,000 farms, and costs 3 times as much per acre as the agricultural conservation program.

In my opinion, we get more conservation value per dollar from the appropriation for the agricultural conservation program than we do from any other activity for which we appropriate.

There are a great many different phases of the constant struggle to defend the fertility of our soil, in order that it may be handed down unimpaired to coming generations. We get more real value out of this program than any other. The farmers are all familiar with it. Plans are made 2 or 3 years ahead, sometimes, as to the practices farmers will employ on their farms.

The Senator from Delaware is correct in saying that this provision goes to the 1961 program. It does. But it would be a great tragedy to cut this program back to $100 million. I have said before, and I repeat now, that it would be better to cut it out altogether than to cut it back to that amount. Some $42 million of this amount goes to pay for the local county committees, and other agencies in administration of the program. It would be better to abolish it altogether than to undertake to carry on what would amount to a $56 million conservation program and spend some $40 million to administer it.

I think the Senator is familiar with this program. We have had this program before us time and time again. I think it would be a distinct step backward to adopt the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to identify myself with this particular recommendation of the committee. I believe, as the chairman of the subcommittee has stated, that the ACP is the most constructive endeavor that we make in the field of conservation. To cut it back to the dimensions proposed by the Senator from Delaware would make it totally ineffective, and really highly discriminatory, because it surely could not cover the amount of programing for conservation which is contemplated. What is more, it seems to me that, rather than think in terms of a reduction of this particular program, we might well give serious thought to a greatly revised and expanded conservation program, in which there is farmer participation and cost sharing, because that kind of program lends itself to better soil management than pulling whole areas out of production and letting them stand idle.

If any Senator wants a demonstration of what happens when vast areas are taken out of production under the soil bank, all he has to do is travel around this country and see the great growth of weed patches. That is happening in area after area.

In my State we do not use much lime. After all, the use of lime relates to the condition of the soil. In some areas we use lime. In others we do not. If the soil is alkaline, lime is not used. If it is acid or rancid, lime is used. As has been indicated, under a previous order of the Department of Agriculture, lime is supposed to be used for soilbuilding, so it cannot be used, under the ACP program, on soil that is seeded for crops. The purpose of the program is to encourage soilbuilding practices, and is related to the long-term fertility of the soil.

I never have had any opportunity to associate with the Limestone Institute. It seems to me once I attended a banquet at the Statler Hotel and heard a good speech. That was about all. They do not spend much time on me. I was for the soil conservation program long before I heard of the Limestone Institute. I know, as a druggist, that lime is a reasonably good chemical. The institute has probably gotten a little free publicity here today. It seems to me that when these institutions are publicized on the floor of the Senate they are given undue attention. I prefer to publicize the agricultural conservation program.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I did not want this opportunity to pass without at least expressing my approval of the soil conservation program. I concur in the statement that has been made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. It is an annual program. It is a program in operation. I think it is the best farm program we have at the present time. Not only that; it is not a program to increase crop production, but a program for the conservation of soil.

There has been much discussion about lime this afternoon. Lime is being used, under the program, where it is needed. It is not a case of sending out for lime to be placed on soil. In my State there are areas where we do not need lime, but there are areas where it is needed. I am glad it is part of the soil conservation program. I am glad the Senate recognizes that we should not reduce an item which is a very important item in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I recognize that one of the most unpopular things we can do is to try to cut appropriations. It is always easier to vote for increased appropriations. Nevertheless, it is the increases in appropriations that have caused the

deficits we have had for the past several years. This is one place where we can save $150 million.

Many Members of Congress have expressed concern over our inability to live within our national income. The reason for our inability to live within our national income is that Congress continues to appropriate more money than is collected from the American taxpayers.

This is another instance in which the bill provides for $150 million more than recommended by the Budget Bureau, by the Department of Agriculture, and by a great farm organization, the American Farm Bureau, as well as many other American farmers.

Certainly, the American taxpayers can use this $150 million saving resulting from the adoption of this amendment.

I think the amendment should be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. RUSSELL] to that portion of the bill which deals with brucellosis treatment.

On page 4, line 1, the committee figure of $52,236,000 represents the plant and animal disease and pest control program, of which a part will be for the brucellosis program.

Mr. President, I recognize that members of the Senate Appropriations Committee increased this item from the amount proposed by the Department of Agriculture, $15,582,000, to the more nearly adequate sum of $19 million. The committee members recognized that the Department recommendation would fall far short of the needs. The economics of the accelerated brucellosis eradication program have been discussed previously when the agriculture appropriation bill has been brought up.

Each year, the Department's own figures show that the sooner we bring this disease under control the sooner we can reduce this expenditure. And each year, the Department recommends a reduced appropriation. Last year this program was cut back almost 20 percent, even though Congress did not concur in a figure as low as that requested in the budget. Department expert witnesses have said that at the level of program activity permitted by an appropriation of around $16 million it would take 14 more years before we could attain a nationwide modified, certified brucellosis-free condition. However, the same expert witnesses state that under an accelerated program, this certified condition would be reached, not in 14 years, but in approximately 6 years. Following nationwide certification, another 5 to 10 years would be required to accomplish complete eradication.

It is a simple matter of mathematics that the go-slow program will cost the Nation more in the longer period of time it will take to reach a successful conclusion. I appreciate that the committee took this into account when it increased the appropriation to $19 million. I ask that we take the additional step which will bring the program operations almost to the level of the 1958 program, when the Federal contribution was $22,252,000.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "$52,236,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$55,236,000."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the amendment would restore the brucellosis funds to the level of operations which we had in 1958. The testimony of the Department of Agriculture shows that there is a great need for this money. Actually, the expansion or the spread of the brucellosis disease results in one of the most costly operations we have in this country. If we can strike a greater blow at the brucellosis condition—which means, of course, essentially, buying up the herds once they become infected—we shall have that much better chance of reducing the costs in the long run and getting our country in a so-called brucellosis-free condition.

As I recall the testimony before the committee, it indicates that the Department witnesses, as I have mentioned, were of the opinion that with a stepped up program we could reduce the time element by about 50 percent. I hope that the chairman of the subcommittee will not find it too difficult to accept an amendment which would restore the appropriations not to some new high figure but to the level of the 1958 program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the committee is fully aware of the great importance of the brucellosis program.

I regret that I cannot accept the amendment which the Senator has offered. This proposal was discussed in great detail in the subcommittee. The subcommittee agreed on the figure of $19 million. The figure we have allowed for this very important program is $3½ million above the budget estimate.

It is quite true that in years gone by the appropriation for this item has been as great as $25 million, I think, in 1 year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. We have made great progress with this program. There are a number of States which are practically free of this, and a larger number of States which have modified certification.

There is another reason why I would oppose increasing the appropriations for this item at this time. We have provided adequate funds to carry on the work in the States which are carrying their full share of the load. We have been endeavoring to get some equality of participation on the part of each of the States in this program for several years, without having succeeded in doing so. At present the participation runs from 85 percent in one State to as low as 16 percent in another State. If we continue to dole out and to shovel out Federal funds as requested we will maintain this inequality as among the several States.

I do not wish to be invidious by calling out the names of any of the States which have low participation, but the committee feels very strongly that the Department has failed in the effort to get some of the States to contribute as substantially as they should for this program.

The $19 million, when weighed against the job remaining to be done, is really more money in proportion than the $25 million was when that amount was appropriated, because we have made great progress in this campaign. There are entire States which now have been declared completely brucellosis free. There are 1,718 counties in the United States—including 21 entire States—which have received the modified certification of complete elimination of brucellosis.

This is undoubtedly a vital campaign. It is important to public health. It is important to the people who own dairy herds. However, we are making splendid progress with the program. I do not think we can justify increasing the appropriation by that great an amount above the budget estimate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I make one other observation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe it was stated in the testimony that in the 1960 budget the appropriation was approximately $16¼ million. The Senate provided some $17½ million, while the House provided approximately $15 million, and the final amount, as the bill came from the conference, was $16¼ million. I believe that was the figure for 1960.

According to the testimony, within 30 days after Congress adjourned last year it appeared that the Department of Agriculture would be short at least $5 million of funds necessary for carrying on the brucellosis eradication program, and additional funds had to be requested of the Congress for the brucellosis eradication effort.

While there are some discrepancies in the level of State participation, and while I agree with the Senator that those wide variations ought to be narrowed down and it would be desirable if there could be some uniformity as to the amounts the States contribute, there is no doubt that the brucellosis program thus far conducted has been a great asset. While the $25 million, the high peak of appropriations, related to the need, was not as much in proportion, let us say, as $19 million would be now, the need for action is still very great.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is very true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have a feeling that, while there is, of course, a good deal to be said on behalf of trying to bring these programs along in an orderly way and on a more uniform basis, there is nothing in the bill to compel the Department to exercise its good influence upon the States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, indeed. We did include a provision in the bill to be ef-

fective for the following year. We did not let the provision affect the appropriations for next fiscal year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That relates to 1962?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. We did not think it was fair to make it applicable now, while the State legislatures are not in session. We did not undertake to put the provision in the bill for the next fiscal year.

We have stated in the committee report year after year that the Department should take steps to require a larger participation on the part of some States which were failing to participate properly, and the Department paid no attention to the request, so we have put a provision in the bill for the 1962 campaign.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I observe that has been done.

Mr. RUSSELL. We will get some results now. I have a deep feeling with respect to this program. I think it is a very important program. It might be true that $3 million or $4 million more could be spent to advantage but we are making fine progress and the incidence of this disease has been reduced by 50 percent in the past 5 or 6 years

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are making fine progress. Let us have a chance to get the States participating on a more equal scale, and then I will go along with the Senator on bringing the program to a conclusion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I say most respectfully that I know the Senator from Georgia has been most helpful in respect to this subject all along. I might add that had the Congress not increased the appropriations, we would be so far behind now that the figure the Senator from Minnesota is indicating would be puny indeed.

Mr. RUSSELL. This is the third successive year in which we have suggested substantial sums above the budget estimates.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe those sums have lent themselves to wise economy, because there is nothing more expensive than the failure to get this disease under control.

Mr. President, I offer my amendment, and in the light of the discussion which the Senator from Georgia has stated in respect to the action of the committee, I gather that the opposition is rather strong. Nevertheless I feel rather strongly about the importance of increasing the appropriation of these funds, so I ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, line 16, it is proposed to strike "$83,132,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$83,882,000."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to add additional funds in the sum of $750,000 for the technical services which are provided by the Soil Conservation Service to the farmers who are participating in the soil conservation program at the soil conservation district level.

The proposed amendment would increase the funds available for the technical assistance which would be available to the soil conservation districts. As reported by the committee, the appropriation is $250,000 more than the budget estimate. I had intended to offer an amendment which would request a substantially larger sum than that proposed in the present amendment, but I believe the most important consideration is to continue to make some recognizable progress in the expansion of technical assistance efforts for the Soil Conservation Service.

The increase provided by the committee of $250,000 is for the staffing of an additional 20 districts during fiscal 1961.

Mr. President, soil and water conservation is one of the most important subjects which ever comes before this body. We have discussed it considerably this afternoon. Actually only about one-third of the Nation's agricultural land today is adequately safeguarded, and I have listened to much discussion about how we spend the taxpayer's money on matters relating to conservation.

I have just returned from my home State. While there, I talked with some accountants who had figured the income tax returns for some of the farmers in the southern part of the State of Minnesota, which is one of the most productive agricultural areas in the Nation. One accountant after another told me that farm income in that area was down anywhere from one-quarter to one-third of what it was the year before. If there was as much concern in the Senate for the income of our farmers as there is for some of the so-called expenditures that we make for farmers, we would not have to make as many expenditures for farmers. I have never been able to agree with the philosophy that the way to protect the United States is merely to cut back its expenditures. I happen to believe in the increase of its income, because there is a basic minimum on expenditures below which we should not go. There is a time when we either must abandon a program entirely or make it effective.

I have gone very carefully into the matter of technical assistance for soil conservation districts. In my own State of Minnesota, which has a fine soil conservation program, farmers find themselves handicapped because of inadequate technical assistance. I am not talking about grants of money or payments to farmers. I am talking about employing trained soil conservation specialists who are needed for the soil conservation program. Our farmers are not able to progress with their plans to maintain the resources of their farm lands.

Recently, I received a letter from a constituent, Mr. E. F. Borgmann, of Sauk Centre, Minn., regarding the Soil Conservation Service personnel situation in his area.

Mr. Borgmann wrote to me as follows:

It is my understanding that the local Soil Conservation Service is running out of funds and the service unit at Sauk Centre will be hampered because of lack of personnel out of this office.

Will you kindly check into this matter as to reasons for this lack of funds and, if you will, kindly advise what we can do from this end toward counteracting this. We feel very strongly this office should expand rather than curtail their services.

Thank you for this consideration.

This letter was referred to the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, Mr. D. A. Williams, and I have an exchange of correspondence which I am going to insert in the RECORD in a moment.

I am sure the situation Mr. Williams describes is as true nationally as it is in my own State. In order to know the exact situation in the State of Minnesota, I requested that information be supplied showing how many farmers were denied the opportunity to share in the agricultural conservation program because there simply were not sufficient funds available. The reply I received from Mr. E. J. Person, an administrative officer of the Minnesota State ASC office, revealed that in 1959 the requests of 1,659 farmers for assistance were turned down. Mr. Person estimates that in 1960, 1,675 Minnesota farmers will be turned away.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of these respective communications, the one from Mr. D. A. Williams, the Administrator of the U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service, the letter from E. J. Person, administrative officer, Minnesota State ASC office, and the letter from Mr. E. P. Borgmann, of Sauk Centre, Minn., be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BORGMANN IMPLEMENT CO.,
Sauk Centre, Minn., April 30, 1960.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: It is my understanding that the local soil conservation service is running out of funds and the service unit at Sauk Centre will be hampered because of lack of personnel out of this office.

Will you kindly check into this matter, as to reasons for this lack of funds and if you will kindly advise what we can do from this end toward counteracting this. We feel very strongly this office should expand rather than curtail their services.

Thank you for this consideration.

Yours very truly,

E. F. BORGMANN.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1960.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: This is in response to your communication of May 5, 1960, with an attached letter from Mr. E. F.

Borgmann, Sauk Centre, Minn., regarding a shortage of Soil Conservation Service personnel in the Sauk Centre area.

As you know, the primary responsibility assigned to the Soil Conservation Service by the Congress is to provide technical assistance to farmers in planning and applying conservation programs on their land through local soil conservation districts. The Congress appropriates funds for the Soil Conservation Service for this purpose.

The situation in Mr. Borgmann's area is a familiar one to us. We are currently assisting some 2,865 soil conservation districts throughout the country. District governing bodies from every State report urgently needed soil and water conservation work that cannot progress as rapidly as it should because of a shortage of technicians. The problem is that the resources available at this time will not permit staffing districts with the additional technicians which are needed. Therefore, technical manpower is the limiting factor in the amount of conservation work which can be done in many areas.

We are appreciative of Mr. Borgmann's evaluation of the services rendered by the Soil Conservation Service. His letter is herewith returned as requested.

Sincerely yours,

D. A. WILLIAMS,
Administrator.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURE STABILIZATION AND
CONSERVATION COMMITTEE,
St. Paul, Minn., May 12, 1960.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: We are enclosing the material which we stated in our letter dated April 26, 1960, would be furnished to you as soon as we received a report from our county ASC offices. A report was received from every county except for Martin County. In this particular county we did experience some difficulty in getting the SCS technician to accept additional referrals under the 1959 agricultural conservation program, and probably some farmers were denied cost sharing because of inadequate technical service by the SCS. However, we do not believe the number involved would be very substantial and, therefore, would not materially affect the totals for the 1959 and 1960 programs. It will be noted that we have listed only the names of those counties reporting that farmers' requests for practice approvals under the 1959 ACP were disapproved because of inadequate technical services by the SCS or where it is estimated that some of the farmers' requests under the 1960 program will be disapproved for the same reason. In the unlisted counties adequate technical services were available in 1959 and will, no doubt, be available for 1960 so that all approved requests will be serviced by the SCS. For your information we are also enclosing a copy of our communication to the county ASC offices requesting the data furnished herewith.

Under the 1959 program a transfer of approximately $271,000 was made to the Soil Conservation Service so as to provide for additional technical services to farmers who desired to participate in the agricultural conservation program. However, over 1,600 farmers were unable to participate in the 1959 program because of inadequate technical services from the SCS technicians. The same amount of transfer will be made for the 1960 program, but it appears that even a larger number of farmers will not have the opportunity to participate because of a shortage in the needed technical services from the SCS.

We appreciate having the opportunity to be of service to you. It is our desire that the information which we have submitted will be beneficial to you in resolving the problem which materially affects farmer participation in the ACP. This is especially true where we have available adequate funds to approve these farmers' requests.

Very truly yours,

E. J. PERSON,
Administrative Officer,
Minnesota State ASC Office.

County	Number of referrals not serviced in 1959	Estimated number of referrals that will not be serviced in 1960
Beltrami	25	20
Brown	16	
Clay	60	25
Clearwater		25
Cottonwood	49	15
Dakota	25	15
Fillmore	110	50
Goodhue	81	54
Grant	124	150
Houston	100	65
Kittson	109	50
Lyon	10	
Mahnomen		25
Marshall	368	400
Mille Lacs	15	25
Murray		50
Olmsted		24
East Otter Tail	50	60
Pine	16	47
Pipestone		25
West Polk	59	65
Red Lake	144	120
Roseau	100	125
Scott		130
Swift	48	
Wabasha	150	50
Wadena		30
Wilkin		30
Total (28 counties)	1,659	1,675

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I gave some of my colleagues present in the Senate the contents of the Borgmann letter. I took this communication through channels. I went directly to the national office in Washington and to the State office in Minnesota. Let me report what the State office in Minnesota said:

> Farmers' requests for practice approvals under the 1959 ACP were disapproved because of inadequate technical services by the SCS or where it is estimated that some of the farmers' requests under the 1960 program will be disapproved for the same reason.

I have here a chart submitted by the Minnesota SCS committee showing that the number of referrals for technical assistance under the soil conservation program in 1959 not serviced was 1,659. The estimated number of referrals which will not be served in 1960 is 1,675.

These are farmers who live within soil conservation districts, and I believe I am correct in saying that the State of Minnesota has one of the better soil conservation district programs.

I read the third paragraph of the report of the National Administrator:

> The situation in Mr. Borgmann's area is a familiar one to us. We are currrently assisting some 2,865 soil conservation districts throughout the country. District governing bodies from every State report urgently needed soil and water conservation work that cannot progress as rapidly as it should because of a shortage of technicians. The problem is that the resources available at this time will not permit staffing districts with the additional technicians which are needed. Therefore, technical manpower is the limiting factor in the amount of conservation work which can be done in many areas.

Mr. President, the State of Minnesota has suffered another very serious flood. Every year I plead in the Senate for some flood control funds. Every time someone says we cannot afford it. Mr. President, we could have put 14-carat gold-plated levees along the Minnesota River for what this flood cost us this weekend, with 12½ inches of rain in 28 hours. I get a little tired of hearing that we cannot take care of this wisest and best investment in the world, namely, the United States of America. We are talking about the Soil Conservation Service. It is a great program. I do not believe it costs the taxpayers one penny. In fact, the Soil Conservation Service makes money for the Government of the United States. If we have any vision, if we can look ahead for more than 5 minutes, we must realize that we are not legislating merely for this afternoon. I certainly trust we are not legislating merely for this afternoon.

I have seen the rolling hills of southeastern Minnesota, which are some of the most beautiful areas to be found anywhere in the land, eroded from water erosion. I have seen the rolling plains of western Minnesota eroded from wind erosion. I have seen the Soil Conservation Service restore those lands. Today they are productive lands. They need technical assistance. They do not need merely payments. Important as payments are, we do need technical assistance.

The committee was wise in its judgment in adding an additional $250,000 over the budget estimate. However, the $250,000 over the budget estimate is only a drop in the bucket. Funds for technical service and technicians are not expenditures. They are investments. When we put competent technicians into a business, we should not consider the costs expenditures, we should consider them investments.

The $750,000 that I am requesting is only a thimbleful of what is needed, but it will make it possible for some of the soil conservation district programs to supply the required services to the farm people in these areas.

I hope the committee will see fit to accept the amendment. At least it represents a little more progress than represented by the small amount which has been granted by the committee.

THE KIWIS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may make a brief comment on another subject?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KEATING. A very interesting organization is meeting in Washington this week. It is called the Kiwis. It is made up of former airline hostesses who retired from that profession when they were married. They use the name "Kiwis" because, as we all know, a kiwi is a bird that cannot fly.

It is an appropriate time to pay tribute to these fine young women who have so many of us in their care when we fly, as all of us do. It is appropriate that we welcome them to Washington. I appreciate my friend from Minnesota permitting me to make this intervention during his remarks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted with the intervention, so to speak, because while I was speaking on a rather earthy subject, soil conservation, I want the Senator to know that I have an esthetic nature also.

Both the charm of these lovely young ladies and the atmospheric areas in which they work give me reason to be happy with the comment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator from Minnesota travels about the country as much as any one of us. I know he appreciates, as we all do, the fine service which these young women have given every one of us.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely do. Although the Senator from Minnesota has not always been too successful in his travels, he nevertheless always appreciates the kind thoughts and gentle words of the lovely young ladies who serve as stewardesses on our airlines. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope that Senators will not confuse the issue before the Senate with what has been said in commendation of the airline hostesses of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If it will help, that is all right.

Mr. RUSSELL. In such a case I would be completely eliminated in my attempt to defend against the amendment.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Now to get back to the soil conservation amendment——

Mr. RUSSELL. There is a great deal of merit in the position taken by the Senator from Minnesota. Technically speaking, in light of the amount that is involved and the number of districts which have been created, I suppose we could even justify a much greater increase in the appropriation than is suggested by the Senator from Minnesota. However, there is more money available for this purpose than the Senator from Minnesota has indicated. If he will look at page 10, line 20, of the bill, he will find that there is a reappropriation of $600,000, which is made available for transfer and merger with this appropriation.

I am sure that he is likewise familiar with the fact that two and a half million dollars are available for employment in the Great Plains area. Three and a half million dollars—and before the bill goes to the President this may go to $4,900,000—are available for surveys in the watershed areas. That is directly connected with the work which the Senator from Minnesota so eloquently depicts. In addition, the sum of $5 million is transferred from the regular agricultural conservation program for technical work by the Soil Conservation Service.

All in all, while more money would be justified—and I would like to see it provided—I believe we have gone about as far in increasing the appropriation as we can. I hope Senators will realize that we are voting on the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to increase the appropriation by $750,000 over and above the amount in the bill, which is already an increase over and above the budget estimate. It has nothing whatever to do with the comment made by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it is only fair that the Senator from Georgia should dissociate the comments of the Senator from Minnesota in that respect, if those comments should be prejudicial—even though I would like to have the comments be prejudicial slightly in my favor.

The comments of the Senator from Minnesota were made in the awareness of the soil conservation program for the Great Plains and for the regular soil conservation efforts. In fact, my letter to the Administrator, enclosing a letter from Mr. Borgmann, took into consideration that fact.

I believe I understood the Senator from Georgia to state that there is a need for additional soil conservation technical service, but he believes that we have made substantial progress in this bill, and therefore does not support the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not believe that we shall ever close down this program. We shall never finish with the program of undertaking to preserve the soils of our country and to protect the water resources of the United States. As nature moves on, we shall have other problems, and we shall have to institute more intensive programs. Our increasing population will make it mandatory that we exercise the greatest care on each acre of land. However, I do say that in light of all that is involved in the bill we have a bill which deals fairly with the Soil Conservation Service as compared with the other activities. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope the Senate will not reject it. We have voted $250 million for the ACP program, which I strongly supported. There is a direct relationship between ACP and SCS. The technical services for the ACP come from SCS, and the SCS is no better than the technical program. Therefore, the conservation programs are no better than the technical personnel. It seems to me that the importance of additional technical personnel cannot be overestimated, because they use the funds which have been made available for payment purposes for the different tools or works that are utilized in the soil conservation program. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit another amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "$110 million" and insert in lieu thereof "$135 million."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is very simple. It adds to the school-lunch program the sum of $25 million, which I think is required in order to maintain the school-lunch program on a basis which will meet the needs of the growing school population and the increased cost of food supplies which are needed for the school-lunch program.

The committee provided or recommended for the fiscal year 1961 the basic appropriation at exactly the same level as was provided for fiscal 1960—in other words, $110 million.

It seems to me that this program should be strengthened. The enrollment in the schools increases each year, and the number of schools which participate in the program increases. The cost of the food supplies increases. Therefore, to maintain the program at the same level is, in effect, reducing it.

In other words, Mr. President, if you have in your family six children, and the average food budget for the six children is $150, that is $25 for each child. Then you add 2 more children, the average for the year is still $150. You may be able to say that you are providing the same amount of money for food as you used to provide, and, therefore, you are a good provider. But I am afraid that having two additional children at the table to be fed will cause a realization that the same amount of money or the same budget will not provide the same amount of food as would have been provided for a smaller number of children.

In this instance, the Nation has a growing school population. In 1961 the school population will be larger by well over a million children—almost 2 million more—than there are in fiscal 1960. Therefore, the school-lunch program, so far as the Federal contribution is concerned, should take into consideration an elementary fact—the census.

When we take into consideration the school census, it becomes obvious that to provide the same amount of money for the next year as was provided for the last year is not holding the line, but is, in fact, retreating.

I also note that the administration recommended a reduction in the transfer of section 32 funds to the school-lunch program for the purchase of additional high protein foods. I note also that the Committee on Appropriations, in its wisdom, increased this item by $5 million, instead of decreasing it, making

$45 million available for the purchase of turkeys, ground pork, dried eggs, and similar high protein foods.

I hope the words dried eggs, which are constantly bandied around, might also be expanded to include fresh eggs, because the dried egg diet is hardly one which is conducive to happy living. It is conducive to survival, but not to joyful living. I have seen the time when the purchase of a few fresh eggs would do much good for not only those who would eat them, but also for the market.

I commend the committee for rejecting the attitude of the administration to attempt to reduce the transfer of section 32 funds. By the way, there is more than $400 million in section 32 funds. I cannot, for the life of me understand why the administration would want to reduce that amount of money for transfer to the school lunch program. That money was collected from tariffs; it is not a taxpayers' fund. Surely, it should be made available to those who are in need. A short time ago I saw the need for the use of some of this money by hungry people in this country.

Mr. President, I ask for the favorable consideration of my amendment, which would increase the direct appropriation for the national school lunch program to $135 million for fiscal year 1961.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota probes me in a sensitive spot every time he offers one of these amendments. He places me in the position of a hard-hearted father, who resists the efforts of the country salesman who comes in and implores the husband to buy a dress for his wife.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would not do that, because the Senator from Georgia is not that type of person.

All I am attempting to do is to state what I believe, according to my conviction and my conscience, is necessary. When I see the growth of the school population, and I see that we are holding to the same amount of funds, I merely want the RECORD to be clear concerning the views of HUBERT HUMPHREY, U.S. Senator from Minnesota. I will be accused of being a spender, and I am willing to spend when it is necessary. I will be accused in my home State of trying to raise this budget item by a substantial amount of money. I welcome the accusation, because as the father of four children I have found that it costs more to feed four children than it does three; more to feed three than it does two; more to feed two than it does one. I have lived with children long enough to know how hungry they can get.

When there will be about 2 million more children in the schools next year, I do not want anyone to kid me by saying that $2 million more for the school-lunch program is holding the line. It does not take into consideration the increase in the school population.

I am willing, however, to stand the public test by voting for additional funds for school lunches.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I have said, I have long been interested in the program. It was my distinct honor and privilege to be the first to introduce in Congress the bill which is substantially the existing school lunch law. I wrote that bill myself. I did not have the help of any drafting service or of anyone from the Department. With very slight changes, that bill is still on the statute books, although it carries a House number. So I have great pride in the school lunch program.

I confess that the school population is greatly increasing. But the $110 million provided in the bill is not all the money we have for the school lunch program. We have $45 million of section 32 funds, which really makes $155 million of direct appropriations.

As the Senator from Minnesota has said, that is about $5 million over and above what was appropriated for the current year. In addition to that program, there is the surplus commodity program. There have been very few years when that amount has fallen below $70 million. For the current year, it is estimated to be about $75 million. It will be at least that much, probably more, in my opinion, in the coming fiscal year.

One of the most important parts of the whole program is the special milk program, which is very helpful, indeed, to the schoolchildren, particularly those who come from underprivileged families. That program will be increased by some $7 million next year, to a total of $95 million.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The first step-up of that program was for the present fiscal year, 1960. It was stepped up from $81 million to $85 million. The second step-up, in the bill which we recently passed, was to $95 million for fiscal 1961, which is the next fiscal year.

Mr. RUSSELL. If that figure is correct—and that legislation came from the Senator's committee—that is a total of around $330 million of Federal funds for the school lunch and school milk program. That is a rather substantial sum of money. Of course, more money could be spent. There is practically no limit to the amount of money which could be spent on the school lunch and school milk program. It depends, in the last analysis, upon the local administrator properly applying the program and properly choosing those who are to receive their milk and their lunches free, and fixing the proper charge upon the great majority of children who purchase their lunches each day.

This program runs into a tremendous sum of money—almost a billion dollars in total—when we consider the amount paid by the children who are purchasing their lunches.

More money could be justified, but we tried to have a balanced bill. I think the allowances we have made for the school lunch and the school milk programs are in keeping with the general distribution we have made throughout the bill.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, first I may say that unless one had served with the Senator from Georgia on the subcommittee handling the Department of Agriculture appropriations, one could hardly understand the fairness with which the school lunch and school milk programs were handled. While these are only two of the programs handled by the subcommittee, I think they constitute a fair test of the generosity of the subcommittee this year.

I commend the Senator from Georgia for having done so many things which are not only reasonable, but also generous, in our attitude to the whole school lunch program, including not only that part which is under the statute which bears that name, but also the milk program, which, by the way, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has supported, under the recent advance of that program, and the other programs which are included in the sum total of what makes up the program for the children of the Nation.

In the report, on page 7, will be found a new item added by the committee; namely, "$115,000 to initiate a pilot program of estimates for tomatoes and celery."

There is a particular reason why I mention this matter at this time; it is because the Department's report and recommendation, which really serve as a justification for this item, unfortunately arrived a day or two after the record had gone to the printer. So the able clerk of the committee had the report of the Department on this subject matter printed in the side slips; and therefore it will not appear in the permanent RECORD of this debate unless it is placed in the RECORD at this time, as a part of the debate.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that that statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT, MAY 11, 1960

COMMERCIAL VEGETABLES FOR FRESH MARKET: PILOT PHASE OF PROPOSED PROGRAM FOR REPORTS ON SHORT-TIME SUPPLIES

The present program of reports on vegetable acreage and production for the fresh market is not filling the needs for timely information to guide the planting and aid materially in the marketing of the important vegetable crops.

The broad objective of the proposed program is to provide, through periodic inventories of acreage planted and frequent checks on progress of harvest, reliable and quick information on the supply of each important vegetable available, for short periods of time (monthly, semimonthly, or weekly) in each competing area of the country. Considerable experimental work has been done along this line on Florida tomatoes. A limited amount of such information also has been collected for Florida celery and California carrots and lettuce.

Before attempting to launch a full scale program of this type for nearly 2 dozen vegetables in the 27 important producing States, it seems desirable to work with a limited program in a few States. Such a program would provide operational experience under the different sets of cultural and marketing conditions existing in different sections of the country, and also would test the feasibility of quickly exchanging information between States for fast dissemination to growers, shippers, and marketing factors. To this end it is proposed to start with a modest program comprising tomatoes in Florida and Texas and celery in California, Florida, and Arizona.

For tomatoes, it is proposed to issue weekly reports on Florida plantings and to include other information relating to progress of the crop, rate of harvest, shipments, weather, etc. Tomatoes were selected in Florida because growers are keenly conscious of the marketing problems confronting them and are attempting to do something about these problems. Florida produces fall, winter, and spring crops of tomatoes. For Texas, which also grows fall, winter, and spring tomatoes, it is proposed to inaugurate a weekly program of reports for the Lower Valley and monthly reports for other areas in the State. Because of the large number of small growers in the other areas (Laredo-Winter Garden-Eagle Pass and Coastal Bend-East Texas), it seems best to start with a program of monthly reports in these latter areas. In the development of monthly reports from these areas, methods will be explored to apportion plantings after they have been completed into weekly or biweekly groups according to age. Florida and Texas grow 37 percent of the country's total tomato acreage for the fresh market.

From the basic information obtained on acreage, workable procedures will be developed to determine more accurate indications on inventories and future supplies in the producing areas involved. The principal factors in developing this moving inventory of acreage and supply information will be the number of acres harvested to a given date, the acreage remaining for harvest, the condition and yield prospects on this acreage, the probable rate of harvest, and the volume of supplies indicated for the monthly period.

For celery, the plan is to inaugurate monthly reports on acreage planted during the past month in California, Florida, and Arizona.

As with the monthly tomato reports, methods will be explored to ascertain, at monthly intervals, the number of acres harvested, the number remaining for harvest, condition and yield prospects, and the probable supply for the market the following month. These 3 States grow about four-fifths of the country's annual celery acreage, accounting for all of the winter and spring acreage, 36 percent of the summer acreage, and 76 percent of the fall acreage.

Emphasis will be placed on the quick distribution of information to growers, shippers, and other marketing factors. A system of exchanging acreage and supply information by telephone and telegraph between State offices of the Crop Reporting Board will be tested so that this information will be available to everyone within 3 days of its collection instead of 10 to 12 days, as is now the case with crop reports. A summary of the information by States, also will be released from Washington at the same time.

The attached table shows pertinent data concerning acreage, value and number of growers for the two crops covered in the proposed pilot project. The proposed project would cover, for the 2 crops concerned, a total of about 105,000 acres grown by approximately 12,600 farmers. In 1959 production from this acreage had a value of $82.4 million.

Cost per year $115,000.

State and season	Acres harvested in 1959		Value of production, 1959 (thousand dollars)	Number of growers, 1954 census
	Number of acres	Percent of season's total		
	Celery			
Florida:				
Winter	8,100	60	6,161	
Spring	5,200	63	3,059	
Total	13,300		9,220	77
California:				
Winter	4,600	34	6,515	
Spring	3,100	37	6,008	
Summer	2,500	36	4,563	
Fall	7,100	76	11,466	
Total	17,300		28,552	489
Arizona: Winter	750	6	531	12
3-State total	31,350	[1] 82	38,303	578
	Tomatoes			
Florida:				
Winter	16,100	100	16,298	
Spring	14,700	21	16,174	
Fall	8,600	29	6,708	
Total	39,400		39,180	1,798
Texas:				
Spring	34,000	48	4,854	
Fall	600	2	90	
Total	34,600		4,944	10,266
2-State total	74,000	[1] 37	44,124	12,064

[1] Percent of U.S. annual total.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to state, briefly, that the Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, which is a very large organization in our State which represents the vegetable producers and others, but particularly the vegetable producers, has for some years been conducting experimental programs, helped by its own funds and by State funds and to some degree in the past, I believe, by small amounts of Federal funds, in order to ascertain what can be done in connection with the best handling of market reports to the producers of fresh vegetables, which not only are highly perishable and have a short season, but also compete with vegetables which come from offshore areas, such as Cuba and the Isle of Pines, as Senators know, and also with similar products from Texas, Arizona, and California.

We presented to the committee a request, on behalf of the Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, which spoke not only for itself and its own members, but also was speaking for the producers in California, Texas, and Arizona, and covered the need to supply market information on these highly perishable crops.

According to the view of the Department at that time, as voiced by Secretary Peterson and Mr. S. R. Newell, the proposed program would have been too large; and they felt, as did we, that although all of us recognized the great need for such a program, it should be approached on a pilot program basis.

We therefore suggested that the Department's statement or justification be sent to the committee; and it has now been printed in the side slips.

I think it might be well for me to read two paragraphs from the statement. I now read from the Department's recommendation:

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT MAY 11, 1960

COMMERCIAL VEGETABLES FOR FRESH MARKET: PILOT PHASE OF PROPOSED PROGRAM FOR REPORTS ON SHORT-TIME SUPPLIES

The present program of reports on vegetable acreage and production for the fresh market is not filling the needs for timely information to guide the planting and aid materially in the marketing of the important vegetable crops.

The broad objective of the proposed program is to provide, through periodic inventories of acreage planted and frequent checks on progress of harvest, reliable and quick information on the supply of each important vegetable available, for short periods of time (monthly, semimonthly, or weekly) in each competing area of the country. Considerable experimental work has been done along this line on Florida tomatoes. A limited amount of such information also has been collected for Florida celery and California carrots and lettuce.

Before attempting to launch a full scale program of this type for nearly 2 dozen vegetables in the 27 important producing States, it seems desirable to work with a limited program in a few States. Such a program would provide operational experience under the different sets of cultural and marketing conditions existing in different sections of the country, and also would test the feasibility of quickly exchanging information between States for fast dissemination to growers, shippers, and marketing factors. To this end it is proposed to start with a modest program comprising tomatoes in Florida and Texas and celery in California, Florida, and Arizona.

One of the two crops which the recommended program covers is tomatoes—that is to say, the winter, spring, and fall tomato crops in Florida and the spring and fall tomatoes in Texas, which, incidentally, supply 37 percent of the entire amount of table tomatoes that are used by the Nation.

As for celery, the program covers the year-round production in California, the winter and spring production in Florida, and the winter production in Arizona. The celery crop covered would be 82 percent of the national table supply of celery.

Senators will observe in the compilation which now has been placed in the RECORD how the program is broken down between the States of Florida, California, Texas, and Arizona.

I think this program is an exceedingly useful one. It is a pilot program which, supplementing the programs already carried out in part in Florida and in California, will give a general view of how much good can be accomplished in the case of these highly perishable and highly important crops, for which nothing as regards price supports or anything of the sort is being requested. But the program proposed may be of great use to the Nation as a whole, as well as to the growers in the particular States immediately concerned.

I wished to make this statement, because the hearings, as printed, unfortunately do not show what is involved in this program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, before the vote on the bill is taken, I should like to refer to an item which many of the people of Kansas have called to my attention—namely, the importance of the conservation reserve and the necessity of providing adequate funds for it.

In connection with the conservation reserve and the 1,444,237 acres in Kansas which are used for it, it is interesting to note that 951,064 acres of the 1,447,237 acres comprise whole farms which have been taken out of production.

This matter is of concern to our people, first, because they are not able to take care of the applications for the program; and, second, because they feel that there are not sufficient funds to pay for the personnel needed in connection with the operation. So, first, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether he feels that sufficient funds are provided in order to take care of the applications for the acreage reserve.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator mean sufficient funds to pay the contractors the amounts due them?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes, and to take care of additional requests.

Mr. RUSSELL. There will be no funds to take care of additional requests, because no additional requests can be received. The program has ended, insofar as new applications are concerned. The only program now is to pay those who are operating under the old contracts.

Mr. President, I think the amount provided in the bill is adequate. As a matter of fact, the Department has consistently overestimated the amounts necessary, and from year to year there has been a carryover.

The Senate committee has increased by $25 million the amount recommended by the House; and it has developed that there will be a carryover of at least $20 million from the present year, and that it will be available.

We are within about $6 million of restoring the full amount requested by the Department of Agriculture; and I assure the Senator that we shall make good the amounts due under these contracts; and if it happens that not quite enough money is provided in this bill, the additional money needed will be the first money to be included in the supplemental bill.

The Senator knows there is also a question about the amount necessary for the contracts; and from year to year there is always a carryover.

Mr. CARLSON. Then, based on the statement made by the Senator from Georgia, I can assure the people of Kansas that their interests will be cared for.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator can assure them that so long as the Senator from Georgia is in the Senate——

Mr. HUMPHREY. And that will be a very long time, thank goodness.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Kansas can assure the people of his State that so long as the Senator from Georgia serves in the Senate, there will be sufficient funds to take care of what is due them under these contracts.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Let me ask whether I correctly understand that the $13,783,000 requested for the conservation reserve program, as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, will be cut to $12 million?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, from approximately $13 million to $12 million.

Mr. CARLSON. $13,783,000 was recommended for 1961; and the committee has cut it to $12 million; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. CARLSON. Does the Senator from Georgia think that amount will be sufficient to carry on this program?

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe it will be adequate. Of course, that is a substantial reduction from the amount provided this year; and that reduction will be made because there will be no new contracts. The only question will be to police the existing contracts.

If the Senator from Kansas will read the language which appears at the bottom of page 21 of the bill, he will find that not less than $10 million of that amount will be available for local administration, and that is where the program is really administered.

We have undertaken, in the discussion with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], today, to clear up the point that it was the intention of the committee that the county committees shall be first provided for, then the State committees, and that the principal reductions should be at the Washington level, because there are no more policies to be formulated, or matters of that kind. It is more a question of seeing that the contracts are complied with and also of conforming to the Government's share by seeing that these are paid.

I believe the agency will be able to function with this administrative fund.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Kansas has such a high regard for the Senator from Georgia that he is going to go back to his people in Kansas and say they are taken care of.

Mr. RUSSELL. There may be a little pinching. There may not be the money they think they should have. But the agency should be able to administer the program with this money.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to direct the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee to the appropriation for the Extension Service. I notice that the committee recommended an appropriation of $57,715,000, which represents an increase of $2 million over the figure provided by the House, and $4 million over the amount provided for fiscal 1960.

Am I correct in assuming that the State land grant colleges and the extension services in each State can determine, within the scope of the program, the use to be made of these funds? For example, could they use these funds to bring the salaries of extension workers and home demonstration agents up to a level that would be more nearly equal to the salaries paid in other States?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. We have assumed the money would be used largely for that purpose. However, of course, the needs vary as between the States. The State of Oregon, for example, pays its county agents a great deal more than any other State in the Union does. Oregon has a large State appropriation for that purpose. The State may desire to hire different specialists in some fields, such as for fruit production. However, generally throughout the United States, I think the funds will be used to increase the compensation of the county agents and home demonstration agents who work on the farm level.

Mr. COOPER. Recently the Kellogg Foundation made a grant of approximately $750,000 to the State of Kentucky, to be used under the supervision of the director of the State extension service, for research and activities toward the development of 30 counties in the eastern section of the State. Peculiarly enough, today we debated the depressed areas bill, which also was designed to give help to such areas. This $750,000 grant will be available to help build the agricultural and other resources of 30 counties in the depressed areas of Kentucky.

Under this appropriation for the cooperative extension work, would the extension service in Kentucky be empowered to use a part of those funds in the rural development program, or in the extension service program in those counties, to make it a more effective program?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator means to use the Kellogg funds——

Mr. COOPER. No, not the Kellogg funds.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, indeed. They could use the appropriated funds to increase personnel and, if necessary, select 20 counties in Kentucky and give them the rural development treatment. There is no question about it, if the State of Kentucky desired to do it. The only overriding requirment is that the States, or the local units thereof, shall match the appropriation dollar for dollar. As a matter of fact, most of the States spend a great deal more than they receive from the Federal Government; but that is the overriding requirement to obtain those funds.

Mr. COOPER. I know my State will be very appreciative of the fact that the committee retained the $250,000 item which had been placed in the bill in the House, and largely through the initiative of my colleague, Representative WILLIAM NATCHER, of Kentucky, to initiate a tobacco research center in Kentucky.

I wish to thank the committee and the Senator from Georgia for maintaining that appropriation.

Mr. RUSSELL. We hope and trust that the developments at that research station will not only be helpful to the

burley tobacco growers, but will also help the Flue-cured tobacco growers of Georgia.

Mr. COOPER. And the dark tobacco growers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate, as I know all of us do, the great interest of the Senator from Georgia in the farm programs and the fine work of the subcommittee of which he is chairman. We are grateful to him and to the other members of the committee for their good work.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, may we have the third reading of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask that we have the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE and Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senators from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA and Mr. HART], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of death in his immediate family.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] is absent on official business as a member of the official delegation to attend the 150th celebration in Buenos Aires.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 1, as follows:

[No. 200]

YEAS—74

Aiken	Fulbright	Magnuson
Allott	Goldwater	Mansfield
Anderson	Gore	Martin
Beall	Green	Monroney
Bennett	Gruening	Morton
Bible	Hartke	Moss
Bridges	Hayden	Mundt
Brunsdale	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Butler	Hill	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Proxmire
Carlson	Humphrey	Robertson
Carroll	Jackson	Russell
Clark	Javits	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cotton	Johnston, S.C.	Smith
Curtis	Keating	Sparkman
Dodd	Kefauver	Stennis
Douglas	Kerr	Thurmond
Dworshak	Kuchel	Wiley
Eastland	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Long, La.	Yarborough
Engle	Lusk	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	McCarthy	Young, Ohio.
Frear	McClellan	

NAYS—1

Bush

NOT VOTING—25

Bartlett	Hart	O'Mahoney
Cannon	Hennings	Randolph
Capehart	Jordan	Scott
Case, N.J.	Kennedy	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Chavez	McGee	Talmadge
Church	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Dirksen	Morse	
Fong	Murray	

So the bill (H.R. 12117) was passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. McCARTHY in the chair) appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. DWORSHAK conferees on the part of the Senate.

PERMIT NAVY TO SERVE OLEO

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 921, Senate bill 2168.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2168) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

RESOLUTION OF JOINT TEXAS LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE APPROVES PADRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE AREA

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the beach study committee of the Texas Legislature, a joint committee of both houses of the Texas Legislature, headed by two very able and experienced legislators, Senator Robert W. Baker, of Harris County, and Representative Ben A. Glusing, of Kleberg County, has adopted, on May 20, 1960, a resolution favoring creation of an 88-mile-long national seashore area on Padre Island.

This expression of cooperation and support by our Texas legislators of the project already recommended by President Eisenhower, Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton, and supported by Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, should in my estimation assure establishment of Padre Island National Seashore Park for the pleasure and benefit of all Americans.

Action of the Texas legislative beach study committee shows that leaders at the State and National level are working in harmony on this project, which will permit the improvement of national seashore recreation facilities on the longest, southernmost natural beach left in America. With this legislative beach study committee favoring enabling legislation on the State level for an 88-mile national seashore park, it is virtually certain that the Texas Legislature will pass such a bill next session. In 1959 the Texas Legislature passed a resolution favoring a 50-mile park and it would be simply a matter of increasing the designated park area.

Mr. President, that was a forward step, because in 1958, when I first introduced the bill to authorize the Padre

Island project, it was said that the Texas Legislature would never give its consent to the creation of a Federal seashore area on Padre Island, and the local interests bitterly opposed the project in the Legislature of Texas. The forces of conservation scored one of their biggest victories in enacting a statute in 1959 providing for a 50-mile-long seashore area.

The Secretary of the Interior has recommended an 88-mile-long seashore area. My proposal was for 100 miles of the 117-mile-long island, but the joint committee of both Houses unanimously recommended the 88 miles, and we have agreed to attempt to have amended the Texas law, which now provides for a 50-mile seashore, and to provide for 88 miles. That is one of the most forward steps in the conservation of recreational resources in the history of my State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Texas on achieving a much needed development of the shoreline of the United States for park purposes. We are rapidly losing our shorelines on the oceans, the gulf, and the lakes, and the Senator from Texas has with others been trying to develop a whole series of national parks to conserve the shoreline and to enable the people to have access to the sea and to the lakes. We have met with many discouragements. I congratulate the Senator from Texas upon obtaining this much needed park for Texas and for the country, and to congratulate him upon the progress which he has made.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for his very generous words. His interest in the conservation of our national resources and the recreational areas for the American people is long known. He worked at this project for many years before I reached the Senate. His fight for the Indiana Dunes is a national legend now. His great fight for the cleaning up of the pollution in our rivers and in every facet for the improvement of the habitat of the American people is well known. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Illinois for the leadership he has given to those of us who have come here since he laid out the pattern of work in that field.

The resolution passed by the Texas Legislature beach study committee is another vital and significant step toward establishment of Padre Island National Seashore Park. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full text of this important resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the names of the State senators and State representatives who headed this legislative joint study committee and who signed the resolution be printed in the RECORD with the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution with signatures was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the National Park Service, through its pioneer work has awakened our country to the urgency of the need to save our shoreline and has particularly urged the preservation of Padre Island, the longest unspoiled natural beach in the United States, as a national seashore area; and

Whereas Senate bill 4, introduced in the Congress of the United States by the Honorable RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Senator from Texas, would authorize the acquisition by the Secretary of the Interior of the major portion of Padre Island, which legislation has the strong support of the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Senator from Texas, and other members of the Texas congressional delegation; and

Whereas a lengthy public hearing held on this legislation in Corpus Christi, Tex., on December 14, 1959 by the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the U.S. Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, presided over by Senator FRANK E. MOSS, of Utah, indicated that the people of Texas are strongly in favor of the creation of a national seashore area on Padre Island; and

Whereas the Department of Interior has recently recommended to the Congress of the United States the creation of an 88-mile national seashore area on Padre Island; and

Whereas the Texas Legislature, at its last session, recognized the desirability of such a project and charged this committee with the responsibility of recommending to the next session of the legislature necessary legislation to implement the creation of a national seashore area on Padre Island: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Texas legislative beach study committee, That it endorse the recommendation of the Department of Interior and that it recommend to the next session of the legislature the approval of the creation of the 88-mile national seashore area on Padre Island as recommended by the Secretary of Interior; and be it further

Resolved, That said committee commend the Honorable RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, the Honorable JOHN YOUNG, the Honorable JOE KILGORE, and all other members of the Texas delegation to the U.S. Congress for their efforts to secure for the people of Texas and of this country a national seashore area on Padre Island; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each member of the Texas congressional delegation.

Passed at Galveston, Tex., on the 20th day of May 1960.

ROBERT W. BAKER,
State Senator, Harris County, Chairman of Texas Legislative Beach Study Committee.

BEN A. GLUSING,
Representative, Kleberg County, Vice Chairman of Texas Legislative Beach Study Committee.

THE CONNALLY RESERVATION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, earlier today the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a discussion of the Connally reservation, as it appeared in the columns of the Christian Science Monitor.

I request unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD two articles appearing in the May issue of the American Bar Association Journal, which I feel deserve the attention and consideration of every Member of the U.S. Senate.

These two articles present in eloquent yet dispassionate terms the pragmatic considerations which caused the Senate of the United States in 1946 to attach the six-word Connally amendment to the formal declaration of the United States accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. Both authors recognize that in the continuing ferment of international affairs caused by the clash of the democratic philosophy of the free world with the totalitarian philosophy of the Sino-Soviet bloc that the Connally reservation remains as a vital and indispensable protection to the domestic sovereignty of the United States.

I am, indeed, proud that the author of the first of these articles is a fellow South Dakotan, Roy E. Willy, a distinguished practitioner of the law in South Dakota for the past three decades and the former chairman of the American Bar Association's house of delegates. Roy Willy has courageously taken up the cudgel in defense of the Connally amendment and is currently campaigning within the house of delegates, urging repeal of action taken 13 years ago, at which time the house of delegates favored the elimination of the Connally reservation.

The second article is authored by a scholarly and highly respected member of the Minnesota bar, Charles W. Briggs, of St. Paul. In a most erudite presentation Mr. Briggs traces the historical development of our Anglo-American concepts of the law, and he ably focuses attention on the one irrefutable lesson of history, that "law is the command of a sovereign power."

Before any action is taken in this legislative body with respect to the Connally amendment, I sincerely hope that all of my colleagues will read and carefully reflect on the contents of these two pragmatic discussions of the immediate prospects for peace through law.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORLD COURT AND THE CONNALLY RESERVATION

(By Roy E. Willy of the South Dakota Bar (Sioux Falls))

(References made for statistics quoted are largely taken from the report of a special committee of the House Judiciary Committee on the International Court of Justice and the International Criminal Police Organization made to the 1st sess. of the 86th Cong. on April 1959. (Reference to this report will be abbreviated H.J.C.).)

(Reference is also made to publication of the United Nations entitled "The International Court of Justice" in 1957, which is cited as "I.C.J.")

One of the principal purposes of the United Nations is stated to be: "To bring about by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace."[1] This same object was also the purpose of the League of Nations. Peaceful settlement of international disputes which might, if not so disposed of, lead to the manifold horrors of war has long been the aim of many people and of many nations, including our own.

Unfortunately, in international affairs between nations, as in private transactions between individuals, it still requires two parties to make a bargain, and in the past it has not always been possible to secure the consent of the necessary parties to insure peaceful solution of international disputes. Certainly, in those cases in the not-

[1] ICJ, p. 1.

too-far distant past in which dictatorship has sought to enlarge its scope of influence by extending the territorial boundaries of its country, a peaceful solution could be secured only at the cost of abject and unconditional surrender.

Whether the United Nations can prove any more successful in preventing deliberate acts of aggression on the part of ruthless and predatory dictatorship than its predecessor, the League of Nations, still remains an open question. The issue was presented to the world in the recent Korean struggle where, although there was intervention by the United Nations, a major conflagration was avoided. Whether this same result would have been reached had the forces of the United Nations waged other than limited warfare was not determined.

As an adjunct to the League of Nations, there was created in 1920 a "Permanent Court of International Justice," [2] under provisions contained in the League Covenant. Its jurisdiction depended solely upon the consent and voluntary participation of the parties to a dispute. Its activities were interrupted by the outbreak of hostilities in World War II and in 1946, its existence terminated with the dissolution of the League of Nations.[3]

Historically, the first serious effort to create machinery for the settlement of international disputes by other than armed hostilities occurred in 1899 in connection with the First Hague Conference, at which time the powers who participated in this conference signed the "Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes." [4] In 1907 at the second Hague Conference, a Permanent Court of Arbitration was created, a body that still remains in existence.[5] The extinction of the League of Nations carried with it the Permanent Court of International Justice. This gap in the world judicial organization was filled by the creation of a new judicial structure provided for in the Charter of the United Nations. The form and judicial substance of this organization is almost identical with the old Permanent Court of International Justice and at the first meeting of the new body, it adopted, with few changes, the rules of court of its predecessor.[6]

The present International Court of Justice consists of 15 judges who, under the provisions of its Charter, are elected by the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations. The judges are chosen from lists of persons submitted by the various national groups who, as members of the United Nations, also belong to the Permanent Court of Arbitration, and in the case of members of the United Nations who do not belong to this court, separate lists are submitted. The General Assembly and the Council each holds a separate election and the successful candidates must obtain a majority of votes from each of these two separate bodies. Judges of the International Court are elected for nine-year terms and are eligible for re-election. Their terms are staggered so that five judges are selected every 3 years. Provision is also made that in any case before the court in which there is a judge of the same nationality as one of the parties, the other party may choose a person to sit as judge ad hoc and if the court contains no judge of the nationality of any of the parties, each party may select a judge ad hoc who will serve in that case with the right of participation and vote. Under the Charter, not more than one judge from any member nation can be a member of the court at the same time.[7] The yearly compensation of the judges is $20,000 each and the cost of its administration since its creation in 1946 has been $8,457,000.[8]

Since its organization in 1946, the Court has entertained 20 contentious cases [9] and 11 advisory questions have been submitted to it by the United Nations for opinions.[10] However, of the 20 cases presented to the Court, in 7 the Court did not have power to consider because either it lacked jurisdiction or the cases were withdrawn. One was a reconsideration of an earlier case, and 2 are still pending, making a net of 10 cases in which the Court has actually rendered a decision on the merits in the 13 years of its existence.[11] Of the 11 advisory opinions which were submitted to the Court, none were concerned with peaceful settlement of disputes.[12] In this respect, its record does not approach that of the old Permanent Court of International Justice created by the League of Nations. In the 17 years of its active existence, the Court dealt with 79 cases, of which 51 were contentious cases referred to it by states either by special agreement or by unilateral application, and 28 arose from requests for advisory opinions submitted by the Council of the League of Nations.[13]

Under article 93 of its charter, all members of the United Nations are automatically members of the International Court of Justice. However, no member nation is bound by the compulsory jurisdiction of the court without a specific declaration accepting such jurisdiction. To date 39 member nations have by declaration accepted compulsory jurisdiction by the court in specific areas of international law.[14] None of the Communist block of nations, including the Soviet Union, have accepted the court's compulsory jurisdiction.[15]

In connection with the work of the court, much has been said and much more written about the Connally amendment, which came about in 1946 when the United States recognized and accepted the jurisdiction of the court.[16] This acceptance of the jurisdiction of the World Court is subject to a six-word amendment to subparagraph (b) which reads: "Disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States." To this phrase Senator Connally added the words "as determined by the United States." Of 39 nations which have accepted the jurisdiction of the International Court, many of them have likewise placed limitations on the court's power with regard to its jurisdiction. In addition to the domestic jurisdiction reservation, several countries, including the United States have likewise restricted the applicability of their declarations to "legal disputes hereafter arising." Others have excluded disputes which affect their national security and others disputes arising out of events occurring at a time when they were involved in hostilities.[17]

The cold war was waiting in the wings in 1946 and had not yet made its appearance on the stage. The House of Delegates had been represented by an official group of observers at the birth of the United Nations. As lawyers, we were well aware of the fact that a feeling existed in the world that the failure of the League of Nations to accomplish its mission of insuring world peace might, in a degree at least, have been due to the failure of the United States to ratify its covenant. Peace and harmony appeared to prevail throughout the world. There was a strong sentiment to the effect that the Connally reservation might jeopardize this situation and that the failure of the United States to accept the full jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice without reservation would have an adverse result on the rest of the world. This sentiment in the American Bar Association was responsible for the resolution introduced in the Assembly at the 71st annual meeting at Atlantic City in 1946. The resolution contained a recommendation to the effect "that the Senate of the United States should reconsider the subject of the declaration of compulsory jurisdiction, and should eliminate therefrom the right of determination by the United Nations as to what constitutes matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction." [18] The resolution was brought before the House of Delegates and action on the resolution was postponed to the midyear meeting of 1947.[19] At the 1947 midyear meeting, the House of Delegates adopted a resolution embodying the context of the Assembly proposal and recommended that the Senate of the United States "authorize the filing of a further declaration which shall not contain the reservation or condition to which the foregoing resolutions relate." [20] This amended resolution was approved by the Assembly at its 1947 annual meeting.[21] The Senate of the United States took no action toward repealing the Connally reservation and the matter remained more or less dormant until it was brought to attention by a number of prominent individuals, including the present Attorney General.

On March 24, 1959, Senator HUMPHREY introduced Senate Resolution 94, which reenacts the resolution of August 1946, but deletes the six-word amendment proposed by Senator Connally and adopted by the Senate. The matter did not again come before the house of delegates until the midyear meeting at Chicago on February 22, 1960. At that time a resolution was introduced, signed by 11 members of the house of delegates, the purpose of which was to ask the house to rescind the action taken in 1947 and urge upon the U.S. Senate the retention of the Connally reservation. This resolution was not debated before the house on its merits but on motion was referred to a special committee on world peace through law.

A report of a special committee of the House Judiciary Committee on the International Court of Justice and the International Criminal Police Organization presented at the 1st session of the 86th Congress uses this language with reference to the Connally amendment: "The Connally amendment basically is of good purpose. It seeks to safeguard matters which are essentially of domestic concern to the United States. Under the United Nations Charter, the International Court has jurisdiction only over questions of international law—not domestic matters. It therefore does not seem unwise, in the absence of treaties and any developed principles of international law, that such items of immigration and certain aspects of our postal or atomic energy laws which are essentially domestic matters be reserved to the United States for a decision." [22]

This same report further calls attention to the fact that so far as the special committee could determine, there are no clear-cut rules recognized in international law as to

[2] I.C.J., p. 4.
[3] I.C.J., p. 4.
[4] I.C.J., p. 3.
[5] I.C.J., p. 3.
[6] I.C.J., p. 5.
[7] I.C.J., pp. 5 and 6.
[8] HJC, p. 9.
[9] HJC, p. 2.
[10] HJC, p. 2.
[11] HJC, p. 2.
[12] HJC, p. 6.
[13] HJC, p. 5.
[14] Vital Issues, vol. IX, No. 6.
[15] HJC, p. 3.
[16] S. Res. 196, Aug. 2, 1946.
[17] HJC, p. 7.
[18] 71 ABA Rep. 91.
[19] 71 ABA Rep. 148.
[20] 72 ABA Rep. 77.
[21] 72 ABA Rep. 82.
[22] HJC, p. 7.

what are and what are not domestic issues.[23] Therefore, the United States reserved to itself the right to decide this question in controversies in which it is involved. This possessed the advantage at least of preventing an encroachment on domestic jurisdiction. At the present time the United States is and for many years has been engaged in a worldwide relief program, under which billions of public funds have been expended in military aid, as well as in varied forms of economic assistance to less fortunate nations. Questions involving these voluntary gifts made by this country, made on an international scope, certainly involve questions of purely domestic policy which the United States would not wish to surrender to a Court of International Justice.

The future of the Panama Canal which is vital to the safety and security, as well as economic prosperity of the United States, might easily be determined to be a question of international law by an international court. Our security depends upon its remaining a domestic question, free from possible interference by a hostile international court.

Questions involving immigration have an international aspect but so far as this country is concerned, are purely domestic questions. The retention or discontinuation of the sugar subsidy which has bolstered the economy of Cuba for many years is, so far as the United States is concerned, purely a domestic problem and not one which should be submitted to an international court in the event this country should seek to change, alter, or discontinue the subsidies entirely.

The International Court as an instrumentality seeking to maintain world peace is deserving of the support of every lawyer and of every citizen not alone of this country but of the world. The consequences resulting from holocaust possible under an atomic war stagger the imagination. However, there are benefits and privileges which come to the citizens of the United States which we feel are worth retaining and should not be sacrificed as the price of membership in the present International Court. Less than 50 percent of the present members of the United Nations have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. Of those who have accepted, many have done so with one form of reservation or another. Neither Soviet Russia nor any of its satellites have accepted compulsory jurisdiction by the World Court. Until the world, or, at least, a substantial portion of it, including the principal great powers, have accepted compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court, the Court as such has but little influence in the settlement of disputes between powers, except as the powers themselves voluntarily consent to the Court's jurisdiction. If, as, and when circumstances should arise that would make it possible for a world court to be a true representative of a judicial structure as understood by the English-speaking world, the United States will be jeopardizing this domestic peace, tranquillity, and security by accepting without the reservation compulsory jurisdiction of the present International Court.

It is true that the scope of the Court's activities has been severely restricted by virtue of the fact that a majority of its members have never accepted its compulsory jurisdiction. It is doubtful if the Connally reservation and similar reservations by other complying members have had any material effect on the Court's activities. At least the United States and the 38 other nations which have accepted compulsory jurisdiction do submit their international disputes to the Court. However, there is no way of compelling noncomplying members to accept the Court's jurisdiction and no means exist other than by consent of the nonmembers to acquire jurisdiction over such nations. It is also worthy of note that even the General Assembly of the United Nations has made but small use of the facilities of the Court and in the 14 years of the Court's existence has referred but 11 questions to it for advisory opinions. It is unfortunate that the International Court does not have a wider recognition but certainly it is not the Connally reservation which has deprived it of the opportunity to be of service to the world.

The matter of the Connally reservation was again brought before the house of delegates at its midyear meeting because of the fact that the failure of the house to reverse the action taken in 1947 is continually cited by those who favor the repeal of the Connally reservation as representing the present sentiment of the American Bar Association. Those who favor the repeal of the Connally reservation continually use in their propaganda the fact that the American Bar Association has since 1947 favored its repeal.[24] It is self-evident that this attitude does not represent the unanimous sentiment of either the American bar or the house of delegates. The sponsors of the resolution which was presented at the midyear meeting and referred to the Committee on World Peace Through Law feel that the members of the house are entitled to an opportunity to consider again the matter fairly on its merits and are confident that this opportunity will be presented to the members at the Washington meeting.

THE CLOUDY PROSPECTS FOR "PEACE THROUGH LAW"

(By Charles W. Briggs, of the Minnesota bar (St. Paul))

There is danger that hopes for "peace and liberty under law" are being exaggerated.

From time to time great social and political explosions in the world produce strange philosophical fallouts upon the legal mind. One of these is the nature of law. Periodically fragments of strife descending upon men become so intense that they become notionate and wishful thinkers about peace on earth. There is a rush to the fetish of rules of law as manna from heaven, to the supreme disregard of practical matters involved. It is good that lawyers check their pragmatic bearings once in a while.

Today it is difficult for some skeptical and inquiring minds to avoid the conclusion that a close examination should be made of concepts back of such slogans as "the Rule of Law," "Peace Under Law," and "Liberty Under Law." Before we know it we are apt to become involved in occult revelations about the law after the manner of a spiritualistic medium.

Some such apprehension is created by an article entitled "Leader of the Few: A Royal Air Force Background of Law Day," appearing in the April 1959 issue of the American Bar Association Journal (45 ABAJ 355). The author, on page 370, quotes from Lord Dowding's "Leader of the Few" in part:

"The evidence for the conscious survival of death, and the possibility of intelligent communication between the quick and the dead is in my opinion quite convincing to the open mind * * * I confidently predict that all these ideas will be commonly accepted in a hundred years' time, when those who reject them will be classed with those who now believe that the earth is flat * * * the more we know the better are we qualified to cooperate with the unseen Forces of Light in helping distressed humanity on both sides of the Grave."

The author of the article goes on to say:

"To all skeptics Lord Dowding may well quote Hamlet: 'There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio than are dreamt of in your philosophy,' and 'There's a divinity that shapes our ends, rough-hew them as we will.' "

Further this author says:

"The belief of Lord Dowding is not only significant and entitled to respect, but, as appears from the increasing number and variety of spiritual books in the Western World, has been spreading since the nuclear bombs appeared. Aside from the cynics, there appears to be a growing consciousness that the survival of the human race and the civilized part of it, depends on unseen spiritual forces. For all these reasons, if 'liberty under law' is the hope for a peaceful world, the 'Leader of the Few' deserve[s] for our sakes, to be known and remembered by the American bench and bar in connection with 'Law day' as a continuity."

The continuity here envisaged is with the school of natural law whose chosen votaries would extract the law from a supernatural authority.

Now, with what indemonstrable assumption is the "Rule of Law" concept to be associated? One answer comes in the May 1959 issue of the Journal (45 ABAJ 482). It is the dogma of natural law. In an article entitled "The Way of the Law" the author says:

"The question to be answered by philosophy is whether, on the one hand, law is only an accidental product of irrational forces. Or whether, on the other hand, law reflects and must seek to reflect a structure of justice established by the Creator of all things for the right relation of man to man and nation to nation.

"The classic phrase 'natural law' is a stumbling block for many thoughtful people. For others it has most satisfactory meanings, reflecting that structure of justice of which I have spoken."

Again:

"In American thought and feeling the rights of man are not derivable from physical nature nor from any Rousseauian theory of noble savage or social compact. The rights of man are derived from his Creator."

Also:

"What then is it, this rule of law? It is, as we have noted, a fundamental concept of political philosophy."

Then the author would wipe out the privilege of the United States to stay the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court if in our judgment the matter in dispute involves domestic jurisdiction of the United States. He says:

"Meanwhile there is the World Court of the United Nations—the most unused court in history. This means that the Connally amendment must be repealed."

Within that jurisdiction as an adjunct of a world government we are supposed to attain liberty and peace under the law. And the law? It must be what to the judges is revealed as a structure of justice established by the Creator.

THE SLOGANS USED RAISE SEARCHING QUESTIONS

This business of the rule of law and peace under law raises very searching questions and points to some areas of serious misunderstandings. Some of these questions it is the purpose of this article in all candor to raise. But as a prologue let us lay down an approach. Most people favor peace as against war, but not peace at any price.

We are not too proud to fight for the defense of our land and the institutions liberty-loving men hold dear. We are not to be misled by emotionalism when we appraise a proposed method of attaining peace. We live in a hard world which gives little or no heed to weakness, humility, or unpro-

[23] HJC, p. 8.

[24] The American Bar Association has consistently opposed it since 1946: "Vital Issues." vol. IX, No. 6.

tected virtue. The practical aspects and workability of any formula for human happiness are always to be thoroughly explored.

First. What is meant by peace? Is peace freedom from war? Is it tranquillity enforced by war or the threat of military force? Does Hungary have peace? Do East Germany and the Balkan States? Does it concern civil wars? Do Cuba and Iraq have peace? Is Yugoslavia at peace? Is France? Were the Pax Romana and the Pax Brittania real conditions of peace, although made possible by legions and warships? Is there peace under law where the law is observed under compulsory processes? Very definitely peace to some does not mean the cessation of attempts at conquest nor the end of the class war.

Second. What is law? This is not a captious question as we shall see.

Mr. Webster says that law is a "rule of conduct which is prescribed or is formally recognized as binding and is enforced by the supreme governing authority," i.e., by a sovereign power.

Now this at first blush seems to be a rather simple matter. But it is that by no means. What is law has been the subject of violent controversy for centuries and centuries. Scholars, lawyers, clerics, philosophers, and even laymen with a flare for dialectics and scholastic mysticism, have divided themselves into two factions.

On the one hand, we have the school of natural law. On the other hand, we have the positivist school. These schools differ sharply and almost irreconcilably on the origin of law.

The naturalists teach that natural law signifies the laws for the direction of human conduct which proceed immediately and infallibly from the Deity. This law is asserted to be an essential and external code which the conscience and rational powers of man are capable of perceiving. We may well amplify the explanation of this concept by referring to the teachings of its devotees. St. Thomas Aquinas, a monk writing in the 13th century, founded his legal philosophy squarely and explicitly upon a theological basis. From there he proceeds to arrive at logical sequences and consequences in the field of law by the deductive method of scholastic logic. He taught that law operated throughout the universe as a complete and immutable system. In his system God is the supreme ruler; law is derived from Him, and that law is supreme in the state. Lord Chief Justice Coke lived in the 17th century. His philosophy of natural law is often referred to by the naturalists as an authority. He said:

The law of nature was before any judicial or municipal law and is immutable. The law of nature is that which God, at the time of creation of the nature of man, infused into his heart for his preservation and direction.

Blackstone belonged to the naturalists. He held this:

"When the Supreme Being formed the universe * * * He impressed certain principles upon that matter from which it can never depart. This, then is the general significance of law."

But he displayed feet of clay to them when he wrote:

"I know it is generally laid down more largely that acts of Parliament contrary to reason are void, but if the Parliament will positively enact a thing to be done which is unreasonable, I know of no power in the ordinary forms of the constitution that is vested with the authority to control it."

A quotation on the subject from the president of a modern university pretty well sums up the philosophy of the naturalists. He says:

"The natural law is not an ideal; it is a reality. It is not the product of men's minds; it is a product of God's will. It is as real and as binding as the statutes in the United States Code. It is not a mere ideal toward which all statutes and court decisions and systems of law should tend; the actuality is that any statute or court decision or system of law which does not conform to natural law simply has no valid, binding force; it is inherently vitiated. It lacks an element required for essential validity."

We find also in a report of the 1947 proceedings of the Natural Law Institute this statement:

"Nevertheless, all prescriptions of human reason can have force of law only inasmuch as they are the views and the interpreters of some higher power on which our reason and liberty necessarily depend."

Thus we have the dogma that all rules prescribed for the government of men must be derived from divinely revealed principles. This means interpretation by the human mind. Some Lord Coke is always ready to constitute himself the proper intermediator between divinity and the governed. If more than one Coke turns up, then there is the eternal conflict of lawgivers. No code of the natural law has ever been written; nor has anyone ever seen a treatise on how the vast body of modern rules of conduct can be traced to immutable principles of that law.

Mr. Felix Oppenheim, in the American Political Science Review (vol. 44, No. 4, December 1950), gives us this summation:

"The natural law doctrine is characterized by philosophical absolutism. This absolutism holds that there is such a thing as 'absolute reality' which can be communicated by or be understood by man through revelation, intuition, or 'right reason.' * * * Absolutism is not tolerant of competing ideas and opinions. So it would seem that the naturalist, being an absolutist, has a natural affinity for absolutist government, or totalitarianism."

Now let us take a look at the positivist school of law.

Inasmuch as Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes was one of the most illustrious and trenchant exponents of this point of view, we may present his views as typical. He stood at the end of a road surveyed by other positivists such as Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Jeremy Bentham, Immanuel Kant, David Hume, John Austin, Hegel, James and Dewey.

In his book, "The Common Law," Justice Holmes drew the following conclusions:

"The life of the law has not been logic: it has been experience. The felt necessities of the time, the prevalent moral and political theories, intuitions of public policy, avowed or unconscious, even the prejudices which judges share with their fellow men, have had a good deal more to do than the syllogism in determining the rules by which men should be governed. The law embodies the story of the Nation's development through many centuries, and it cannot be dealt with as if it contained only the axioms and corollaries of a book of mathematics. In order to know what it is, we must know what it has been, and what it tends to become. We must alternatively consult history and existing theories of legislation. But the most difficult labor will be to understand the combination of the two into new products at every stage. The substance of the law at any given time pretty nearly corresponds, as far as it goes, with what is then understood to be convenient."

In this work he further says:

"A legal right is nothing but a permission to exercise certain natural powers, and upon certain conditions to obtain protection, restitution, or compensation by the aid of a public force. Just so far as the aid of a public force is given a man, he has a legal right, and this right is the same whether his claim is founded in righteousness or inequity."

THE POSITIVIST VIEW—MR. JUSTICE HOLMES

Holmes' positivist legal philosophy may be summed up briefly: He held that judges made law, as do legislators, for in substance the growth of the law is legislative. He never lost sight of the inductive method in declaring the common law. To him "the secret root from which the law draws all the juices of life" are views of what is salutary and feasible for the community concerned. He never questioned the privilege of men to indulge in legislative experimentation to regulate or improve their law. He believed that man, speaking collectively, made his own law; that law is a sovereign's command, and nothing else; that law in a democracy is necessarily the command of the majority of the social group. He maintained that force is the ultimate ratio of the law. Inalienable rights he never acknowledged.

In *Southern Pacific Company* v. *Jensen* (244 U.S. 205), Justice Holmes made the now famous remark:

"The common law is not a brooding omnipresence in the sky but the articulate voice of some sovereign or quasi-sovereign that can be identified."

In *Black & White Taxi Co.* v. *Brown & Yellow Taxicab & Transfer Co.* (276 U.S. 518), Justice Holmes said:

"'Law' is a word used with different meanings, but law in the sense in which courts speak of it today does not exist without some definite authority behind it."

Third. Which philosophy is apt to prevail in establishing rules of law, be they for peace or liberty or otherwise?

While we are still in the area of argument, it is pretty safe to conclude that the pragmatic approach of the positivists to the law will be accepted in preference to the approach of the naturalists.

The natural law is not meaningful nor useful in human society for evident reasons:

1. As a dogma it is purely subjective. Its truth can be tested by standards which can be applied only by the individual making the judgment. It can exist only in the individual mind. From it can be extracted all manner of rules of conduct to suit the interest of the interpreter.

2. The dogma is indemonstrable. It is a pure assumption and a double abstraction.

For most people the value and soundness of rules of conduct can be judged only in their operation as they concern actual facts. These rules are evolved by some sovereignty under whose power is the ultima ratio. A conclusion as to the propriety of a rule of law can be reached only by applying standards derived from the value of precedents and expected results.

3. The dogma is devoid of concreteness and determinateness, which are qualities found in the positive law.

It is used to characterize a set of rules of the most patent generality that are claimed to supersede manmade laws. The initial difficulty with the concept of natural law in respect of concreteness arises because (a) no lawgiver exists or is identifiable; (b) no organized power exists to enforce it; (c) it exists in a vacuum.

It is altogether inscrutable.

Fourth. Can we rely upon an assumption that there are absolute and immutable rules of law not dependent upon some sovereign power for promulgation and enforcement?

It would seem not.

If there are such rules they have never come to us except as formulated and expressed by a human mind acting as an interpreter. The question then arises: through what mind? Through a Moses, a Louis XIV, a James I, a Richelieu, or a Thomas Aquinas, proceeding, of course, on the basis of divine right or sanction? Or through multiple minds in a democracy?

If we assume that law must have supernatural sanction, then we cannot escape the conclusion that there have always been, and always will be, irreconcilable differences between interpreters of the divine will.

LAW PROCEEDS FROM THE FORCE OF THE SOVEREIGN

We are not at liberty to reject the teachings of history that rules of law have proceeded from the exercise of sovereign power. Such a power must evaluate, and pass judgment upon divergent human views. It must authoritatively decide what view shall prevail as a positive rule of conduct.

We must realize at the outset that there is no such thing as a choice between the rule of law and the rule of force. Force complements the law as the beginning and end of it—its ultimate sanction. So does history run.

The ancient Israelites put the sword back of the Torah. The judges of Israel never hesitated to use force when the commands of Jehovah were defied. The Ark of the Covenant was at home in an armed camp. In modern Israel, the rule of law as it is revealed there is maintained by military force. In ages past religious wars over interpretations of revealed law have drenched the earth with blood. The Crusades of the Middle Ages were hardly expeditions to establish peace under the rule of law alone. The prophets of Islam broadcast the rules of the Koran by fire and sword. Hindu and Mohammedan look to force to determine whose interpretation of the divine law shall prevail. When the Hindu philosophy crosses that of Islam, the next step is the crossing of swords and the arbitrament of war.

Today, all over the world, rules of conduct are laid down by sovereign power. The dove of peace once perched upon a spear; now she must ride in the atomic warhead of a ballistic missile.

The Nuremberg trials were a striking instance of positive law made for the occasion and administered ex post facto by sovereign powers to suit their convenience. Vengeance presided as law was improvised to accomplish "justice for the victors". Where is the peace that flowered from that rule of law?

The Founders of this Nation understood well that strife can arise over spiritual doctrines. Thus they erected in the first constitutional amendment in impenetrable barrier between theology and the law. They said: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." They learned well a sad lesson from endowing any man with power and authority to determine the law by the standards of his religious belief. They were in no mood to reestablish the "Divine Right of Kings" or any similar groundless abstraction. They had ample reason to mistrust judges who claimed to be vicegerents of God with assumed warrants from Him to declare the law. And they appreciated full well that these interpreters of the supernatural were always ready to invoke the desired amount of force to uphold the law they found to be natural.

Fifth. The question then arises: What sovereign power is going to decide what the law shall be and how and by whom it is to be enforced?

The choice is between a world sovereign and independent nations.

If a world government or federation is to discharge these sovereign functions, it must be vested with governmental powers, just as our national government is. If it meets our specifications, it must have a legislator, a court and a sheriff. If the United States becomes a party to such supranational authority, it makes itself subject to the compulsory jurisdiction of that legislator, that court and that sheriff. To the extent of the powers delegated, we should cease to be sovereign and self-governing. Think, if you will, of a world parliament to enact laws binding upon us against our will. Of a world court with compulsory jurisdiction to invade our domestic domain. Of police forces, including military components, to put us under the lash of rules of law, perhaps foreign to our concepts of justice and individual rights.

THE INSURMOUNTABLE PROBLEMS OF ESTABLISHING WORLD GOVERNMENT

Would it not be impossible to establish a supranational government? Impossible, because no one is able to formulate a workable structure for it. Right at the threshold we meet head on insurmountable problems:

1. How are the peoples of the world to be represented?

2. What powers are to be delegated?

3. How are military forces to be assembled, located and commanded?

4. What are to be the rules for immigration and citizenship qualifications?

5. What constitutional principles are to be established?

6. What is to be the philosophy and ideology behind such a government?

There are now and have been widely differing systems of national government throughout the world with equally divergent legal structures. We may enumerate just a few: Mohammedan, Chinese, Hindu, Slavic, Germanic, Anglican, Japanese and Romanesque. Before them came others: Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Hebrew, Greek, Maritime, Roman, and the Papal or Church. (See Wigmore's "The World's Legal Systems.") Now must be added the Soviet, or communistic. Each has or had its distinctive rules of law. From this welter how is a supranational legal system to evolve?

The roots of these systems differ. Ideas about moral and personal conduct are in conflict. Religious prejudices are insoluble. Racial backgrounds cannot be effaced. Traditional enmities persist.

Nationalism is ingrained in peoples. It has not lost but gained in fervor throughout the world. It has grown despite erasures of time and space, despite the improvements in transportation and communication. International rivalries have not been lessened. The swifter spread of knowledge concerning rival systems has served to intensify the struggle for national independence and supremacy. Our easier means of evangelism throughout the world have not brought converts to our system but belligerent enemies. Colony after colony has broken away from the mother country. National independence is a battlecry everywhere else. Why all of a sudden should it be feeble in the United States?

Attempts to codify international law have dismally failed. So have attempts at collective security. Plans for organizing, equipping, and commanding an international police force died aborning. NATO is a standing example of aversion to yielding sovereignty to a supergovernment. NATO, however, has been able to carry on through international agreements in pursuance of a common purpose. The signatories prefer to maintain their separate autonomies.

Engagements in armed conflicts since the great alliance of World War II have been carried on by individual sovereign nations, although on one side in the name of the U.N.

There is not even a faint hope that a world organization could be created with governmental power to declare or enforce the law.

There is little reason to expect that the nations of the world could establish a World Court with compulsory jurisdiction. How could it keep the peace? The longstanding and operative causes of war do not constitute justiciable controversies. Nations go to war over problems that no court can settle. Here are a few of them:

1. Expanding populations;
2. Commercial rivalries;
3. Unequal distribution of natural resources;
4. Conflicting ideologies;
5. Religious differences;
6. Traditional enmities;
7. Lust for power.

Most people prefer peace most of the time. At times they prefer war. They justify war where great principles are at stake. The issues involved in our Revolutionary and Civil Wars could not have been resolved by the peaceful processes of the law and judicial decision. In the Dred Scot decision and the hanging of John Brown the law was precisely followed; but they lit the flames of war nevertheless. Oftentimes the passions and prejudices of men are not to be subdued by a rule of law. The Boston Massacre was exonerated in a court of law but it aroused the people to a war for freedom. Recently the law as enunciated by our Supreme Court was enforced at bayonet point. What court could have decided the political issues involved in the outbreak of the First and Second World Wars? The law was silent. There is no international law to speak today effectively for peace.

National power ratings alone get a hearing. "How many divisions has he?" cynically asked the Russian dictator, when a great spiritual force for peace was mentioned.

LAW IS THE ORDER OF THE MASTER

Who is going to decide that there shall be peace under the rule of law? We may be sure that the wealthy, cultured and soft nation at its zenith will prefer peace and if it can will promulgate the law to attain it. Mature civilizations tend to wallow in pleasures and avoid the sterner virtues that raised them up. The urge to fight wanes. But the tough and growing nation is not averse to conquest in order to gratify its ambitions for wealth and power. The law rides with its armies. Law becomes the order of the master not the supplication of the conquered.

There is nothing in the natural law philosophy that guarantees peace or individual liberty. It can well be and has often been the concomitant of rule by force. This philosophy certainly is compatible with autocracy or the totalitarian state. Today we cannot safely rely upon a belief that liberty will not be lost and that peace will reign if only we hold to the assumption that natural rights to life, liberty, and property are inviolable. And surely democracy carries no absolute guarantee of individual liberty. We will preserve liberty only if the people in their sovereign capacity demand it.

The conflicts that array nation against nation today are not differences between systems of law. The controversies that disturb the peace of the world are not concerned with the law of property, of domestic relations, or estates, of tort liability. They are not concerned with the guilt or innocence of a few accused persons or with civil rights of individuals; not with procedural law. They are concerned with what sovereign power is to be paramount and supreme. We are skirting the borders of Armageddon while the real question at issue between nations is: Whose law is to be the law that governs? That law will not be established by good will, not by persuasions of justice, nor by purchase, nor by "right or reason"; but by predominant sovereign power. Did the Russians take their tanks into Hungary to protect a Hungarian rule of law? Are the Chinese Reds going to recognize the Tibetan rule of law? If Russia takes over in Iraq, does she intend to observe the

Iraqi rule of law? It ought to be clear that no communistic nation will ever yield to our system of law and its principles until the present ruling leadership is uprooted by force from within or without.

The plain fact is that the United Nations has been inefficient because it was not endowed with power to do anything either for the maintenance of peace or the conduct of war. Governmental power remains with the signatory nations. The U.N. must look to the exercise of sovereign power by these constituent nations. The sovereignty of each of these nations was left unimpaired. Nothing it does has the character or force of law. Unfortunately, there was created the impression that the U.N. was the perfect instrument for finding, interpreting and applying by moral force to all peoples that great body of immutable and absolute rules and principles of national and international law. Now the disclosure comes that law results from a meeting of minds. There is no concensus in the U.N.; and one independent nation scorns the legal system of the other and its principles. And then comes the imponderable and insoluble difficulty that the peace is broken by political, not judicial questions.

CONCLUSION

We must abide with independent sovereign nations. World government is only a dream, a fruitless venture into idealism. Think of giving power to a world government to make a declaration of war "to keep the peace" binding upon us and which might well be against our wishes and national interests. And how fantastic it is to think that the rising tide of human passions that break the peace can ever be resolved by a court of law.

Law is the command of a sovereign power. Force is its ultima ratio. Law is not a self-generating mechanism; nor is it self-enforcing, as the naturalists would have us believe. We are ruled by positive law which arises from considerations of public policy and social convenience.

Justice Learned Hand says this: "The law must have an authority supreme over the will of the individual, and such an authority can arise only from a background of social acquiescence * * *. In essence, law is the conduct which the government, whether it is a king, or a popular assembly, will compel individuals to conform to, or toward which it will at least provide forcible means for securing conformity."

Mr. Justice Holmes concludes: "Just so far as the aid of the public force is given a man he has a legal right, and this right is the same whether his claim is founded in righteousness or iniquity." And further: "The life of the law has not been logic: it has been experience. The substance of the law at any given time pretty nearly corresponds, as far as it goes, with what is then understood to be convenient."

Roscoe Pound epitomizes the philosophy of law as follows: "But I am skeptical as to the possibility of an absolute judgment. * * * Is the end of law anything less than to do whatever may be achieved thereby to satisfy human desires. * * * What I do say is, that if in any field of human conduct or in any human relation the law, with such machinery as it has, may satisfy a social want without a disproportionate sacrifice of other claims, there is no eternal limitation in the nature of things, there are no bounds imposed at creation to stand in the way of its doing so."

What Pound implies is that the hand of the supernatural cannot be discovered in the acts of legislatures, in the decisions of courts nor in the orders of administrative boards.

We may well quote here the trenchant words of Mr. Mortimer Adler used at the Notre Dame Law Institute in 1947:

"Nations, like individuals, who live together under natural law alone, are in a state of war, whether or not actual shooting is going on. However sound morally the precepts of international law may be as conclusions deduced from natural law they lack the coercive force of positive law. International law is not the kind of law which can keep peace. It is not sufficient to ask for a worldwide reign of law. It must be positive law. The doctrine of natural law does the human face a great disservice if it in any way obscures this fundamental truth by empty eloquence concerning international law as the foundation of international peace.

Our dire predicament today is due in no small measure to such eloquence and to advocating world government without even as much as blueprinting its framework and the code of positive laws under which it would be expected to operate among the heterogenous peoples of the earth.

Before any World Court can function in any area, common standards must be arrived at. What would be the source of its law? Is it to be of supernatural origin as the Justices see it? There must be an accepted language which will convey the meaning of the parties, one that will silence the communistic wordtwisting.

We must look to the will of the sovereign for the law, and in this country the people are sovereign and responsible. Tracing the rules of law to a supernatural authorship is a futile effort. There certainly is nothing celestial about a tax code, a tariff law, or a labor law, or in the legislative history, fostering inflation. What spark of divinity is observable in an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in an order of the Federal Trade Commission, or in a decision of a court at any level, for that matter? Is the Congress under the aegis of a brooding omnipresence in the sky? This whole business of the rule of law is unmistakably earthly and manmade. If we do not recognize it as such and instead restore a pallid faith in an automatic rule of law founded upon the absolutism of divine revelation, we shall repeat an old mistake. We shall again put on the shackles forged by theological assumptions from which we thought we had freed ourselves. We shall not save the peace and individual liberty, but again put them in jeopardy.

Peace and liberty under law will be with us only if we possess and are willing to exert the sovereign power to preserve them.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 24, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2130) to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 25, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 24, 1960:

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named officer who is serving as Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard and whose term of office expires May 31, 1962, to be admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard, to be effective June 1, 1960.

Alfred C. Richmond.

The following-named officer who is serving as Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard and whose term of office expires May 31, 1962, to be vice admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard, to be effective June 1, 1960.

James A. Hirshfield.

U.S. PATENT OFFICE

Hyman Freehof, of the District of Columbia, to be an Examiner in Chief, U.S. Patent Office.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of colonel:

William H. Junghans, Jr.	Paul B. McNicol
John L. Hopkins	George C. Axtell, Jr.
Henry W. Seeley, Jr.	Charles Kimak
Henry G. Lawrence, Jr.	Louie N. Casey
William C. Ward, Jr.	John J. Wade, Jr.
John T. Bradshaw	Karl N. Smith
Robert E. Collier	Horace C. Parks
Alexander A. Elder	Bernard W. McLean
Ward K. Schaub	Olin W. Jones, Jr.
Maurice L. Appleton, Jr.	Henry H. Reichner, Jr.
Alvis H. Allen	Edwin B. Wheeler
Clifford F. Quilici	John B. Sweeney
Victor R. Bisceglia	Grant S. Baze
Nathaniel Morgenthal	William T. Bray
Louis G. Ditta	George D. Webster
John T. O'Neill	George F. Vaughan
Arthur H. Haake	Henry S. Campbell
Oscar F. Peatross	David M. Danser
Frank E. Garretson	James P. Rathbun
Norman R. Nickerson	Arthur J. Rauchle
Norman Pozinsky	Paul H. Millichap
Stanley S. Nicolay	Edward P. Dupras, Jr.
James K. Dill	Louis C. Griffin
	Houston Stiff
	James E. Herbold, Jr.
	John S. Hudson

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel:

Joseph C. Fegan, Jr.	Edward L. Fossum
Neely D. Butler, Jr.	Adolph J. Honeycutt
Robert F. Foxworth	Gale B. Gibson
Theodore R. Boutwell	Claude R. La Plant
Emmett O. Anglin, Jr.	Albert M. Roebuck
Earl P. Carey	Paul C. Trammell
Robert E. Brant	Edson W. Card
Emmett R. Hiller	Stephen Horton, Jr.
Leo B. Shinn	Fred E. Kiehle, Jr.
Frederick C. Dodson	Raymond F. Garraty, Jr.
Russell E. Corey	Leo V. R. Gross
David W. Banks	William D. Porter
Richard C. Smith	Bertram S. Ryder
Nels E. Anderson	Robert E. McClean
William O. Cain, Jr.	Edward R. McCarthy
Richard L. Moore	Thomas B. Wood
Leslie E. Brown	Francis C. Hogan
Jay W. Hubbard	Ephraim Kirby-Smith
William F. Lane	Franklin J. Harte
Richard C. Bryson	Richard A. Brenneman
Bruce F. Williams	Gilbert D. Bradley
Walter E. Stuenkel	Robert M. Krippner
William J. Zaro	William K. White
Rufus B. Thompson, Jr.	William P. Vaughan
William M. Graham, Jr.	Clyde S. Stewart
William P. Nesbit	Wesley W. Hazlett
Roland H. Makowski	Wiley A. Green
Edward H. Greason	Anthony R. Nollet
William H. Clark	Marion C. Dalby
Harry L. Givens, Jr.	John E. Cosgriff
Frank R. Berrar	Theodore J. Horner
Charles H. Greene, Jr.	Robert M. Ervin

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major:

Lavern J. Oltmer	Burneal E. Smith
George A. Brigham	John G. Theros
Francis C. Opeka	George A. Gibson
Raymond W. Mullane	Russel H. Stoneman
William J. Hinson, Jr.	Robert H. Emswiler
David P. Graf	Gus Robinson

Herbert E. Mendenhall
Robert E. Luther
Forrest E. Caudle
Eugene S. Kane, Jr.
Arnold S. Baker, Jr.
Mark A. Rainer, Jr.
Robert W. Taylor
Harvey E. Spielman
Wilmer W. Hixson
John W. Collier, Jr.
Gene M. Hoover
Maurice A. David
Angelo J. Sammartino
James F. Williams
Edwin S. Schick, Jr.
Gordon H. Keller, Jr.
Eugene Millette
Hiel L. Van Campen
Robert Lewis, Jr.
Robert G. Scurrah
Howard A. Blancheri
Leo G. Lewis, Jr.
Adolph G. Schwenk
James Landrum, Jr.
Samuel Taub, Jr.
Richard F. Peterson
Earl K. Vickers, Jr.
Emil M. Misura
Lyle B. Matthews, Jr.
Raymond McArthur
John H. Maloney
Charles S. Wilder
Joseph B. Harrison
Frank P. Stivers, Jr.
Loren R. Smith
Miller M. Blue
Patrick J. Dayson
Francis E. Finch
Jack Glenn
Melvyn H. Kerr
Richard H. Mample
Charles A. Arneson
William R. Affleck, Jr.
Thomas P. O'Callaghan
Ernest R. Olson
Mildridge E. Mangum
Wallace W. Crompton
David W. Graybeal
Don D. Ezell
Robert Zeugner
Joseph T. Odenthal
Theodore D. Hess
Thomas J. Horgan, Jr.
George E. Smith
William B. Creel
Willie J. Mixson
Stewart C. Barber
Albert W. Snell
Walter L. Hill
John B. Wilson, Jr.
John L. Hamilton, Jr.
Almarion S. Bailey
Charles E. Wydner, Jr.
George B. Woodbury
Chester V. Farmer
Daniel R. Evans
William D. Pomeroy
Theodore J. Mildner
Henry A. F. von der Heyde, Jr.
William H. Lanagan, Jr.
Paul D. LaFond
Jay V. Poage
William F. Koehnlein
Amo F. Judd
John Craig
Donald E. Watterson
Victor Stoyanow
Harry G. Robinson, Jr.
Louis J. Sartor
Frank A. Eldracher, Jr.
Marvin D. Volkert
Donald McGuire
Ralph D. Cail
William J. Beer

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain:

William P. Haight
Donald L. Gaut
Joseph A. MacInnis
William D. Anderson
Lee M. Holmes
Raymond D. Fortmeyer
Richard A. Froncek
Henry C. Bergmann
John J. Metzko
Donald J. Fulham
James F. Helsel
Thomas M. Reedy
Clifford A. Lindell
Brue Berckmans, Jr.
Nicholas K. Bodnar
Douglas A. Wagner
George B. Crist
Justin Williams, Jr.
George H. Ripley
Frederick R. Weinert
Richard F. Harrison
Ralph F. Moody
Warren L. Ammentorp
Richard L. Critz
Hugh S. West
Rawley M. Gregory
David W. Howell
Sam M. Gipson, Jr.
Gerald H. Hyndman
Dwayne Gray
Earl W. Bailey
Eugene E. Crews
Lawrence W. Fisher
Clayton G. Herbert, Jr.
John A. Scott
Richard W. Coulter
William T. Macy
Nathaniel N. Reich
John R. Stanley
John R. Roche III
Edward J. Rochford, Jr.
Malcolm C. Gaffen
Bradley S. Snell
Harry M. Runkle
Eugene E. Shoults
Charles A. Folsom
Walter J. McManus
Owen J. Butler
William M. Keenan
Arthur L. Mullen, Jr.
Donald W. Wilson
James L. Shanahan
Milton T. Hefty
Samuel G. Faulk
Stanley G. Tribe, Jr.
Harold J. Keeling
Thomas S. Brown
Donald R. Berg
James R. Bowser, Jr.
John F. Gould, Jr.
Thomas P. Goggin
Billy F. Stewart
Horacio E. Perea
Bernard V. Gustitis
Francis Andriliunas
William E. Riley, Jr.
Harold H. Hutter, Jr.
Joseph E. Hennegan
Carl D. Peterson
Raymond H. Graham
George E. Otott
Milton J. Olson
Maurice A. Lebas
Ronald E. Luley
Robert M. Otteraaen
Thomas F. Gray
Glen S. Aspinwall
William H. Knobel
Joseph W. Stevens, Jr.
Philip F. Buran
Oliver K. Johnson, Jr.
Joseph H. Oliver, Jr.
Rhys J. Phillips, Jr.
Allan J. Spence
Melvin H. Sautter
Gerald H. Polakoff
Robert H. Smith
Richard O. Bruce
William F. Bethel
David R. McMillan, Jr.
Martin F. Manning, Jr.
Prentice A. Lindsay
William W. Rogers
Herbert F. Olney
Ronald P. Dunwell
Thomas R. Morgan
William C. Roberts, Jr.
Robert E. McCamey II
Charles R. Gibson
Vincent J. Gentile
James C. Click
Richard F. Daley
Theodore J. Lutz, Jr.
Hans G. Edebohls
Charles W. Henry, Jr.
Ray G. Kummerow
Homer L. Litzenberg III
William C. Wilson
James R. Plummer
Kenneth R. Price
Richard B. Arneson
Albert N. Allen
Robert L. Leathers
Dwain A. Colby
Raymond H. Kansier
Allen C. Shelton, Jr.
Harry E. Taylor
Howard L. Cook
William J. Geiger
Talman C. Budd II
Warren C. Ruthazer
Robert W. Whaling
Paul K. German, Jr.
Robert H. Dent
Ralph D. First
James H. Olds
Albert E. Brewster, Jr.
Richard D. Taber
George P. Lawler
David W. Morrill
Roger B. Neilson
William J. Madigan
John S. Kyle
Paul W. McGillicuddy
William E. Rudolph
Frank E. Pirman
Harold S. Lonergan
Edward J. Townsend
Duwain E. Bjerke
Evan L. Parker, Jr.
Herbert F. Olsen
Bobby R. Hall
Thomas M. Culligan
William E. Starbuck
James C. Klinedinst
Donald E. Gunther
Dan C. Alexander
Robert W. McInnis
Garnett R. Bailey
Everett L. Malmgren
Robert E. Elmwood
Thomas L. Griffin, Jr.
Joseph P. Gagliardo, Jr.
Arthur B. Shilan
Donald R. Chapell
Edward C. Johnson
John R. Braddon
John J. Flynn
Robert L. Milbrad
Francis J. Heath, Jr.
William K. Hayden III
Rodolfo R. Enderle
Laurence A. Campbell III
Bernard D. Grooms
Charles M. Bengele, Jr.
Walter F. Bowron
William J. Hallisey, Jr.
Colin D. Roach
John V. Bancroft
Kenneth W. Weir
Raymond F. Crist III
Genaro Huerta
Richard O. Gillick
William A. Blasko
John M. Dean
Harold L. Blanton, Jr.
Wendell P. C. Morgenthaler, Jr.
John R. McCandless
Darrell C. Danielson
Paul P. Pirhalla
Edward A. Laning
Raymond C. Shinkle

The following officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Barker P. Germagian

The following officer of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James F. Knestis

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the rank of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John J. Salesses

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Russell R. Sutley, Clanton, Ala., in place of L. P. Bean, retired.

ARKANSAS

Clarence E. LaCotts, De Witt, Ark., in place of F. E. Stephenson, retired.

Rex Hutchison, Evening Shade, Ark., in place of M. A. Graddy, retired.

Herman A. Tuck, Fayetteville, Ark., in place of A. D. McAllister, retired.

Clyde Byars, North Little Rock, Ark., in place of O. W. Neely, deceased.

Gus L. Sanders, Springdale, Ark., in place of R. O. Hannah, deceased.

Worrence Whitlow, Strawberry, Ark., in place of Marvin Taylor, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Walter H. Miller, Chino, Calif., in place of B. L. Phillips, retired.

John Pokorny, Jr., Clovis, Calif., in place of I. H. Arbuckle, retired.

William T. Sprague, Compton, Calif., in place of C. L. Veitch, deceased.

Alberta F. Kinne, Douglas City, Calif., in place of V. M. Davison, resigned.

Virginia M. Benedict, La Honda, Calif., in place of E. J. Willett, resigned.

Oral J. Potts, Ojai, Calif., in place of G. L. Busch, retired.

Jean F. Johnson, Proberta, Calif., in place of F. M. Mills, retired.

Keneth G. Drown, Ramona, Calif., in place of F. M. Raub, retired.

V. Earl Roberts, San Diego, Calif., in place of W. E. Krenning, removed.

Novel B. James, Santa Ana, Calif., in place of F. R. Harwood, deceased.

George G. Hollis, Jr., Sun Valley, Calif., in place of Fred Jacobsen, retired.

COLORADO

Joe Snepenger, U.S. Air Force Academy, Colo. Office established June 28, 1958.

CONNECTICUT

John J. Dilworth, Columbia, Conn., in place of L. W. Beck, retired.

Austin M. Ackerman, Jr., Durham Center, Conn., in place of A. M. Ackerman, retired.

FLORIDA

Harold E. Lyon, Hobe Sound, Fla., in place of P. E. Mahan, retired.

Ruth G. Long, Roseland, Fla., in place of D. C. Taylor, retired.

GEORGIA

Joseph W. Gardner, Patterson, Ga., in place of I. S. Walker, retired.

HAWAII

Phyllis Y. Takase, Kualapuu, Hawaii, in place of R. M. Shimizu, deceased.

IDAHO

Roy B. Fields, McCall, Idaho, in place of C. L. Burdett, retired.

ILLINOIS

Harold E. Ririe, Flanagan, Ill., in place of M. D. O'Brien, retired.

Robert V. Newell, Mattoon, Ill., in place of H. A. Lange, deceased.

Richard F. Moffitt, Reynolds, Ill., in place of B. W. Sharp, retired.

Beulah B. Reynolds, Russell, Ill., in place of E. V. Crittenden, resigned.

INDIANA

Arthur L. Meyer, Moores Hill, Ind., in place of L. H. Barkley, retired.

IOWA

Joseph N. Shaner, Glidden, Iowa, in place of F. W. Franzwa, deceased.

KANSAS

Eugene L. Foland, Almena, Kans., in place of J. H. Eckhart, retired.

Richard R. Simmons, Ashland, Kans., in place of J. E. Hardesty, resigned.

Ted W. Kyle, Erie, Kans., in place of C. E. Yockey, retired.

KENTUCKY

Billy G. Rose, Hazel Green, Ky., in place of D. C. Rose, retired.

Roscoe M. Bates, Sadieville, Ky., in place of R. F. Gillispie, transferred.

Randall C. Day, Jr., Whitesburg, Ky., in place of W. F. Gibson, retired.

MICHIGAN

Neva A. Dalton, Concord, Mich., in place of A. L. Hyliard, deceased.

Delia A. Bickham, Hessel, Mich., in place of Frances Lindberg, retired.
Turley N. Thompson, Ossineke, Mich., in place of H. E. Vredenburg, retired.
William W. Donaldson, Pontiac, Mich., in place of G. L Stockwell, retired.

MINNESOTA

Hugh O. Smith, Alexandria, Minn., in place of H. W. Long, deceased.
Clement F. Stromwall, Foreston, Minn., in place of A. E. Smith, retired.
Donald M. Lynch, Kasota, Minn., in place of J. O. Barklow, resigned.

MISSOURI

Beulah I. Wood, New Cambria, Mo., in place of J. M. Baker, retired.

MONTANA

Norman J. Wagner, Lewistown, Mont., in place of E. J. Coyle, retired.

NEW JERSEY

V. Edith Mixner, Goshen, N.J., in place of H. C. Shaw, deceased.
Calvin R. Patterson, Neptune, N.J. Office established November 16, 1959.

NEW YORK

Frank G. Shosenburg, Jamestown, N.Y., in place of O. K. Palm, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Kelly M. Holmes, Bolton, N.C., in place of S. M. Blue, retired.
Charles W. Craig, Mount Holly, N.C., in place of J. W. Nantz, Sr., resigned.
Arthur C. Meares, Whiteville, N.C., in place of A. E. Powell, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Lester H. Paulson, La Moure, N. Dak., in place of A. F. Poehls, transferred.

OHIO

Harold E. Weikert, Covington, Ohio, in place of J. H. O'Roark, deceased.
Rolla L. Shoaf, Jr., London, Ohio, in place of G. G. Schlechty, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Jack M. Givens, Mangum, Okla., in place of R. K. Babb, transferred.
John L. Logsdon, Vici, Okla., in place of B. M. Skidmore, deceased.

OREGON

Lola F. Barclay, Crabtree, Oreg., in place of I. M. Brewster, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Adeline M. Waters, Gifford, Pa., in place of Elizabeth Shelley, deceased.
Francis J. Dillon, Glenside, Pa., in place of H. M. Ellis, retired.
Alice F. Burdick, Turtlepoint, Pa., in place of G. L. Carlson, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Norman W. Helmer, Andover, S. Dak., in place of T. W. DeBilzan, retired.

TEXAS

Malcolm O. Daugherty, Cherokee, Tex., in place of Graves Burke, retired.
Norene G. Chaney, Ira, Tex., in place of M. S. Huddle, resigned.
Herman L. Almond, Kermit, Tex., in place of R. S. Marion, retired.
James E. Winder, Springlake, Tex., in place of W. C. White, retired.
Robert B. Richardson, Wylie, Tex., in place of Della Duncan, retired.

VERMONT

Myrtle V. Clemons, West Charleston, Vt., in place of J. E. Hunter, transferred.

VIRGINIA

M. Lester Agee, Floyd, Va., in place of Archa Vaughan, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Martha K. Hope, Hansford, W. Va., in place of O. G. Toney, retired.

WISCONSIN

Violet M. Taylor, Eau Galle, Wis., in place of H. T. Taylor, deceased.
Robert C. Fitzsimons, Ridgeway, Wis., in place of Celia Stapleton, retired.

WYOMING

Kenneth W. Birch, Cokeville, Wyo., in place of V. C. Bennion, resigned.
Alexandria C. Yokel, Wilson, Wyo., in place of Hazel Titus, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 24, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Matthew 25: 40: *Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.*

O Thou God of all grace, who alone can change and control the intractable hearts of men and nations, grant us an insight that is clear and calm as we seek to advance toward a new day of blessedness for our troubled world.

We earnestly beseech Thee that in striving to win the minds of men to a way of life that is more magnanimous and unselfish in spirit we may awaken them to the lofty principles of the Golden Rule and the Sermon on the Mount.

May there be a new beginning in our own hearts when those gracious words which came from the lips of the lowly Man of Galilee shall fill us with feelings of generosity and an eagerness to share our blessings with all who are living in misery and in want.

Hear us in the name of the Master who went about doing good. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, joint resolutions, and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9818. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida;

H.J. Res. 502. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune;

H.J. Res. 546. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to present to the Senators and Representative in the Congress from the State of Hawaii the official flag of the United States bearing 50 stars which is first flown over the west front of the U.S. Capitol;

H. Con. Res. 558. Concurrent resolution providing for printing additional copies of the panel discussions entitled "Income Tax Revision";

H. Con. Res. 579. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a Veterans' Benefits Calculator;

H. Con. Res. 586. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on civil rights; and

H. Con. Res. 607. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?"

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2681. An act for the relief of Yi Young An;

S. 3036. An act to authorize the distribution of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to former Members of Congress requesting such copies;

S. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the final report and indexes to hearings and reports of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field;

S. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings before the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on Amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 with respect to exchange of military information and material with allies during the 2d session of the 85th Congress;

S. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a committee print containing the reports of the States to the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources on their water resources and problems;

S. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Internal Security Manual as a Senate document, and providing for additional copies;

S. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution authorizing the reprinting of additional copies of the Joint Committee print entitled "Summary-Analysis of Hearings, June 22–26, 1959, on Biological and Environmental Effects of Nuclear War," printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the 86th Congress, 1st session;

S. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies on United States-Latin American relations; and

S. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies on U.S. foreign policy.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10809) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed the Senator from Florida, Mr. HOLLAND, the Senator from Virginia, Mr. ROBERTSON, the Senator from Kansas, Mr. CARLSON, and the Senator from Utah, Mr. BENNETT, as members on the part of the Senate of the Commission To Formulate a Memorial to James Madison.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit during general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE SUMMIT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, so much attention has lately been focused in the press on the eight questions released by several members of the Democratic Party in this body on last Friday that there is a growing impression in the country that those who propounded these questions are speaking for all of the Democratic Members of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I for one want to issue a disclaimer. I was profoundly disturbed by the timing of these questions. However great may be the need for a responsible investigation of the events that led up to the fiasco at Paris, I for one believe that it was most important that the world and particularly the Communists should have been informed last Friday that we were all united in this country when it came to resenting insults directed against the President of our own country.

And, Mr. Speaker, there is a further note that disturbs me greatly in these questions. They suggest somehow a belief that there is something wrong with a country trying to protect its borders against surprise attack and avoid a repetition of the disaster that once struck us at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Speaker, I for one believe that we in the Democratic Party ought first of all to make it crystal clear—as I do not believe we have yet made it clear—that we do not think there is any future for our party in trying to outdo anyone else in not upsetting or disturbing or angering the man who ordered the brutal suppression of the Hungarian revolution, who keeps the brave people of Poland in subjection, and who insulted and humiliated our country last week when he insulted and humiliated our President in Paris. In my judgment, the issues involved in the collapse of the summit are far too serious to be made the subject for rhetorical questions propounded in an effort to gain a narrow, temporary, and tenuous partisan advantage.

SETTING OF FIRST COLUMN EXTENDED EAST CENTRAL FRONT OF CAPITOL

Mr. RAYBURN. As chairman of the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol, I wish to invite the Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives to witness the setting in place of the first large marble column in the portico of the extended east central front of the Capitol, at 9:30 a.m., Thursday, May 26, 1960.

This is a historic occasion in which I feel each Member will be deeply interested. You are invited to enter the construction area at the door to the fenced enclosure just north of the entrance to the House wing, from where you will be directed to a safe and appropriate vantage point.

The old records indicate that the original sandstone columns were erected in 1824 and that the stonecutters at the Capitol participated in a procession and exhibit celebrating July 4, 1824.

The new columns are duplicates of the originals except that they are of Georgia white marble instead of sandstone. They are monolithic, weigh about 18 tons each, are 24 in number, and are 24 feet 9 inches high. The columns are of the Corinthian order and taper uniformly from a diameter of 3 feet at the base to 2 feet 6 inches at the top.

The original columns were designed by Charles Bulfinch in carrying out the overall plan for the east portico prepared by his predecessor, Benjamin H. Latrobe. Mr. Latrobe and Mr. Bulfinch were the second and third Architects of the Capitol, respectively.

The column to be set on Thursday, May 26, will be the one located immediately to the southeast of the main entrance leading to the rotunda.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12326) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; and pending that I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 12326, with Mr. BOGGS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the bill appropriates a total of $3,914,798,985. This is $86,217,195 below the budget estimates but $41,070,671 above appropriations for fiscal year 1960.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, we bring this bill to the floor of the House many million dollars under the budget. The budget request for the Civil Functions Department of the Army, that is, the functions under the Army Engineers, was $936,749,000. The committee reduced that figure by $45,550,000. We did that by reducing the number of projects to the point where we felt, after lengthy hearings that the amount of money left in the bill for those projects—most of them quite large projects—was all the Army Engineers could properly and judiciously use during the fiscal year 1961.

For the Interior Department, Bureau of Reclamation, the budget request was $301,314,000. The committee reduced that in the amount of $23,951,295, again, we had very lengthy hearings. We reduced the budget to where we felt it should properly be reduced.

The budget request for the Atomic Energy Commission was $2,675,300,000 which the committee reduced by $16,240,000 where it cannot possibly effect our national defense in the slightest degree.

Over 1,000 people appeared before our Public Works Committee this year, from every State in the Union, with few exceptions. Many of them asked for more money than was in the budget, all of them defended at least the amount that was in the bill for their respective projects. It is very natural they do that because the projects in their respective areas, of course, are very important to their people from the standpoint of flood control and from the standpoint of saving life and property. Harbor dredging, hydropower, irrigation, reclamation, and so forth.

Last winter, as we all know, was a very severe winter which extended over almost the entire United States.

The ground froze deeply; then came much snow, more snow than had fallen in many years. Then this spring came the fast thaws, the water from that heavy coat of snow did not soak into mother earth. Most of it ran off into the streams and tributaries, finally into the main rivers, causing much damage and much loss of property and great anxiety among the people who suffered from those floods, which overall were greater than ever before experienced.

The budget, of course, was made up early last fall. These great floods could not be anticipated at that time. So here before our committee came people from hundreds of areas of our Nation asking that we put survey funds and construction funds in this bill to control the floods that are bound to come in the future.

Our committee saw fit to include 39 of those new projects. I feel we were completely justified in doing so because certainly a devastating flood is damaging not only to the people of the respective areas but, in the final analysis, to all people of the Nation. So I feel that the committee was completely justified in including these 39 projects which it did in this bill. Please remember this is an American bill for America.

It must be said the President's budget for fiscal year 1961 included 32 new starts of every nature scattered over the United States of America for which I commend him. May I point out in closing that all the public works funds requested in this bill are less than 1½ percent of our total Federal budget.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS

CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri, chairman.
LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan.
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio.
JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island.
JOHN J. RILEY, South Carolina.
JOE L. EVINS, Tennessee.
EDWARD P. BOLAND, Massachusetts.
DON MAGNUSON, Washington.
BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa.
JOHN TABER, New York.
IVOR D. FENTON, Pennsylvania.
H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota.
JOHN R. PILLION, New York.
Carson Culp, staff assistant to the subcommittee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 100]

Alexander	Farbstein	Machrowicz
Alger	Flynn	Moeller
Anfuso	Fogarty	Nix
Ashley	Fulton	Pfost
Bailey	Garmatz	Powell
Barden	Gilbert	Preston
Belcher	Granahan	Reece, Tenn.
Bentley	Gray	Rostenkowski
Blatnik	Healey	Scott
Bonner	Hébert	Siler
Buckley	Inouye	Spence
Cahill	Jackson	Staggers
Cederberg	Jennings	Steed
Davis, Ga.	Kasem	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Kearns	Teller
Dawson	Keith	Wallhauser
Dooley	Kilburn	Watts
Dorn, N.Y.	King, Utah	Willis
Dowdy	Kluczynski	Winstead
Doyle	Lafore	
Durham	McDowell	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOGGS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 12326, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 369 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa had consumed 8 minutes and the gentleman from Missouri 1 minute. Does the gentleman from Missouri require additional time?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to answer a few questions that have been raised.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield.

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman is familiar with the interest that I and other Members have had in flood control in the Missouri Basin. Particularly, I have reference to Milford Dam. I note that the committee changed the status of Milford Dam as recommended in the budget from $1 million for construction to $250,000 for completion of planning. I gather this is because the committee felt that the commitment made by certain beneficiaries of water supply storage was not adequate. I wonder if the gentleman would explain a little more fully the reason for the committee action.

Mr. BOLAND. What the gentleman says is true. This is part of a comprehensive flood control program for the Missouri River Basin. The committee did reduce the budget amount to $250,000 solely and only by reason of the fact that there were no local assurances for repayment of water supply. The Water Supply Act compels this committee to obtain assurance before construction is started. The construction has not gotten started. It would have been started had we had such assurances, and up to this time we have provided $522,000 for planning. The $250,000 which we have allowed in the budget will complete the planning.

Mr. BOLLING. I am sure the report goes into this matter rather fully. On page 18 it discusses Milford Dam specifically.

Mr. BOLAND. It might be well to include some of the language in the report. It states on page 18:

> The State of Kansas has requested the corps to include in the project a substantial storage for water supply. To meet this request, it is necessary to change the site of the previously contemplated project and substantially increase its capacity, with a resulting cost increase of something over $15 million.

Originally the cost was $45 million. Because of the change in site and request for water supply, the cost has increased to $60 million.

> There is no firm commitment on the part of the State or any of the possible local beneficiaries that the cost of providing this water supply storage will be reimbursed as is required under the Water Supply Act of 1958.

Mr. BOLLING. I thank the gentleman, and I want the gentleman and other members of the committee to know that we are most anxious to comply and move forward as rapidly as possible with this important flood-control program.

Mr. BOLAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. I want to assure the gentleman from Massachusetts and the other members of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee that the State of Kansas is not trying to escape its full responsibility for the cost of this supplemental storage. I can speak, I think, with force by saying that the Governor of Kansas and the Kansas Board of Water Resources have given full assurances to the Chief of Engineers; but since we are dealing in an area here where we have not had very much experience to go on, apparently the assurances that were given to the Chief were not considered sufficient by the committee. All the State of Kansas wants to know is what is wanted. We want to cooperate in every way possible to expedite the construction of this project.

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman states the case exactly as it is.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield.

Mr. FASCELL. The committee recommended on page 20 of the report relating to the central and southern Florida flood control project, and I ask the gentleman: Is it the committee's intention in making this recommendation to approve and direct the proposed action of the Chief of Engineers on the project as expressed in his letter of April 25, 1960, to me, a copy of which was submitted to the committee for its consideration and in which the Chief proposes specified works in Dade County, Fla., to aid in the emergency which exists and which he proposes to finance out of his authority to transfer to a program up to 15 percent of the funds immediately available?

Mr. BOLAND. That is exactly right. There is $10 million provided in this budget for the central and southern Florida flood control project. That is one of the most important and one of the most expensive flood control projects in the Nation.

The gentleman from Florida made an excellent case when his office appeared before our committee.

There is an emergency down there. We think the committee has provided for it, and it was provided for at the request of the gentleman from Florida. There will be no objection if the Corps of Engineers finds it possible to transfer an additional $1,500,000 under the transfer authorization.

Mr. FASCELL. As I understand, it was not specifically appropriated but the transferability authorization can be taken advantage of.

Mr. BOLAND. That is exactly right. As a matter of fact the language in the bill is here because of the gentleman's amendment.

NEW ENGLAND GRATEFUL FOR ADEQUATE FLOOD CONTROL FUNDS

Mr. Chairman, this public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1961 contains sufficient funds to enable the Army Engineers to carry on with an orderly program of flood control planning and construction in New England.

I want to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee, on which I sit, for their sympathetic consideration of the flood control needs of the Connecticut Valley and all of New England. We in New England are grateful to members of the Public Works Legislative Committee and the Appropriations Committee for patiently hearing our pleas since 1955 when this region of the country suffered millions of dollars in damages as a result of the hurricane-floods of that year.

THIRTY-ONE PROJECTS CONSTRUCTED OR IN PLANNING SINCE 1955 HURRICANE FLOODS

Since that time the Public Works Appropriations Committee have been generous to New England. Brig. Gen. Alden K. Sibley, the New England division engineer, told the Subcommittee on Public Works in his testimony that since 1955 the Army Engineers have completed and now have under operation in New England 15 flood control dams at a cost of $35 million, have 11 under construction today at a cost of $90 million; and 5 more are in the design stage at an estimated cost of $42 million.

This is 31 flood-control projects at a total cost of $167 million in just over 4 years, whereas in all of New England's history before August of 1955 only 23 projects had been built. I am quite proud of this record, and I deem it an honor to have been serving on the Appropriations Public Works Subcommittee during the last 5 years when these sums of money were appropriated for these worthwhile and much needed flood-control projects. Members of the subcommittee have supported me in my efforts to have these New England projects planned and constructed as soon as possible, in the orderly manner recommended by the Army Engineers, so that the lives and property of the people of our region can be better protected from the ravages of floods in the future.

VITALLY NEEDED CHICOPEE RIVER BASIN PROJECTS RECOMMENDED

Mr. Chairman, there are more projects in the survey and planning stages, including Littleville Dam and Reservoir, and Conant Brook Reservoir, both affecting my congressional district in western Massachusetts. In the northern sector of the Connecticut River Valley four projects, Ball Mountain, North Hartland, Townshend and North Springfield Reservoirs in Vermont, will be completely or nearly finished with the funds appropriated in this bill.

The flood-control project recommendations for the Chicopee River Basin include the Conant Brook Dam and Reservoir in Monson, to be constructed at an estimated cost of $2 million, and the local protective works in Chicopee Falls, at an estimated construction cost of $1,860,000. My bill, H.R. 11470, incorporating these projects is now before the Public Works Committee. These projects have been approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me again thank the members of the Public Works and Appropriations Committees for supporting my efforts to control New England's past flooding conditions.

Mr. FASCELL. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman for his part in this matter and also to the other members of the subcommittee and to the full committee for their interest in helping us meet this problem.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman and the subcommittee and especially to the distinguished chairman of the full committee, Mr. CANNON, for including in this bill the $50,000 for the Meramec Basin. Will the gentleman tell us briefly what the money will be used for?

Mr. BOLAND. This is for a resurvey of the Meramec Basin development.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, the members of the House Committee on Appropriations have shown great foresight by recommending funds that not only will continue on schedule the complete modernization of the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway, but will enable the full development of the Coosa-Alabama River system to proceed.

WARRIOR-TOMBIGBEE

Although the Warrior-Tombigbee is a historic artery of commerce and is now one of the busiest and fastest growing inland barge channels in the Southeast, its modernization did not actually begin until 1949. The system of 17 dams and 18 low-lift locks constructed on the waterway prior to that time were completed in the early part of the 20th century. The only major improvement on the river prior to 1949 came in 1940 with the completion of the William B. Oliver Lock and Dam—formerly the Tuscaloosa Lock and Dam—near Tuscaloosa, Ala. This installation eliminated locks and dams 10, 11, and 12.

By 1949 the existing installations that were constructed early in the 20th century had greatly deteriorated and, of course, had become progressively inadequate as commerce increased. Not only had these structures become obsolete, but in many cases they were extremely dangerous to navigation.

During the past 8 years it has been my privilege to work closely with congressional committees, with the Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association, with Alabama's two Senators, and with other members of the Alabama congressional delegation in efforts to carry out the phases of the modernization program recommended by the Corps of Engineers.

The first step in this modernization program involved the construction of the $19 million Demopolis Lock and Dam just below the confluence of the Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers. In 1949, Congress appropriated funds to begin the construction of this important installation which replaced four antiquated locks and dams. Additional funds were appropriated for the ensuing 5 fiscal years, and this new modern structure was dedicated in 1954.

During my second year as a Member of Congress, funds in the amount of $1,800,000 were appropriated to begin construction of the Warrior Lock and Dam located in Hale County. Additional appropriations for fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958 enabled construction of this facility to continue on schedule. This installation, which was built at a total approximate cost of $13,385,000 was opened to traffic in the fall of 1957. Its modern facilities replaced two outmoded structures and, in addition, the new installation effects a saving to navigation of approximately 5 miles.

For fiscal year 1957, Congress appropriated funds in the amount of $750,000 to begin construction of the third major replacement structure on the Warrior-Tombigbee—the Jackson Lock and Dam. The bill now before the House of Representatives includes an appropriation of $4,230,000 to enable completion by 1961 of this $21 million facility that will improve a 98-mile reach of the waterway below the Demopolis Lock and Dam.

The final replacement structure in the modernization of this great waterway is the Holt Lock and Dam that is to be constructed above Tuscaloosa to supplant four locks and dams that were built between 1905 and 1915. When in operation, this facility will greatly increase the operating speeds of barges and towboats above Tuscaloosa.

While construction of the Holt project is yet to begin, significant progress has been made toward its realization in a relatively short period of time. It was just 3½ years ago that the Army Engineers at my request made funds available for an authorization report on the proposed facility. That report, compiled by the Mobile District and South Atlantic division engineers, showed the improvement to be needed and economically justified. Their recommendation that it be built by the Government for navigation benefits was concurred in by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.

Seventeen months ago the Secretary of the Army authorized construction of the Holt installation under the River and Harbor Act of 1909. It was most fortunate that authorization could be obtained in that manner, for had it been necessary to submit the project to Congress for specific authorization, it could have been delayed by from 2 to as much as 4 years.

In spite of our best efforts, however, the Holt project was not authorized in time to be included in the budget which President Eisenhower sent to Congress last year. Because of the need for early construction of the Holt Lock and Dam, I was joined last year by members of the Alabama congressional delegation and officers of the Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association in an appeal to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate planning funds. Our request was answered when Congress appropriated $146,250 to enable the Corps of Engineers to initiate the advance planning.

Together with officers of the Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association, I appeared before representatives of the Bureau of the Budget last August to urge that adequate funds for the Holt project be included in the budget for fiscal year 1961. Further planning funds in the amount of $378,000 were incorporated in the President's budget that was submitted to Congress in January. An additional $171,000 was added by the Appropriations Committee.

If the $549,000 recommended by the House committee is approved by Congress, engineering and design work for the important Holt facility can be completed. Should the Senate earmark for construction purposes the amount added

by the House Appropriations Committee, actual construction could begin in calendar year 1961.

The Demopolis, Warrior, and Jackson locks and dams, replacing a total of nine obsolete structures, will create an efficient water artery between Mobile and Tuscaloosa. With the completion of the Holt Lock and Dam, the long-cherished dream of extending the benefits of a modern river channel above Tuscaloosa will be realized.

COOSA-ALABAMA SYSTEM

The other major river system in Alabama for which the Appropriations Committee has recommended funds is the Coosa-Alabama system. Second in size in the Southeast only to the Tennessee River, it is one of the greatest undeveloped waterways in the entire Nation.

For more than a century, efforts have been made to develop the Coosa River. As early as 1872 the Federal Government instituted the first improvement program that called for the development of navigation on the Coosa from Rome, Ga., to Gadsden, Ala., by the building of 31 low-lift locks and dams. However, only four locks were built on the upper end of the rapids below Rome, and in 1890 the Government abandoned its program.

Later the Alabama Power Co. obtained permission from the Government to build three dams—Mitchell, Lay, and Jordan—on the Coosa River. The last dam was completed in 1926, and the three of them have been operated as sources of hydroelectric power since their construction. They are the only dams on the Coosa River at the present time.

In 1945 Congress authorized the development of the Coosa-Alabama system for navigation, flood control, and power purposes. Overall planning by the Corps of Engineers was undertaken from 1945 through fiscal year 1952, but construction was not begun on any specific project.

With other members of the Alabama congressional delegation, I introduced legislation in 1954 to suspend the authorization previously granted by Congress for Federal development of the river system for hydroelectric purposes. The enactment of this legislation made it possible for the Alabama Power Co. to secure a license to construct four additional hydroelectric dams on the upper reaches of the Coosa River and to raise the level of one of its existing dams. The first of these, the Weiss Dam, is scheduled to be completed in 1961. With the construction of additional dams by private enterprise, the overall cost to the Federal Government for the development of the Coosa-Alabama for other purposes will be lessened considerably.

However, until the Government adds locks to the proposed and existing dams built by private interests and then constructs three additional locks and dams on the Alabama River, the Coosa-Alabama system cannot be used as a traffic artery.

With this in mind, I joined in 1955 with my colleagues from Alabama and Georgia and with the Coosa-Alabama River Improvement Association in urging that sufficient funds be made available for a traffic survey of the Coosa-Alabama River system. The sum of $180,000 was subsequently appropriated for that purpose. In 1957, the Corps of Engineers reported that the traffic survey of the Alabama River below Montgomery indicates that the three authorized structures on that river are economically justified. They recommended that the Millers Ferry lock and dam be constructed first.

Although the Senate for the past 2 years has designated $200,000 for planning the Millers Ferry facility, this amount has been eliminated from the public works appropriation bill each year by the House-Senate conference committee. We are very pleased, therefore, that this year the House Appropriations Committee has included $200,000 for planning and designing work on the recommended installation. If that amount is approved by Congress, 70 percent of the planning can then be concluded.

With the beginning of construction by the Alabama Power Co. of additional dams on the Coosa River, the development of this water artery has at last been resumed. To continue this orderly development, it is vital that the planning of the Millers Ferry installation also be recommenced as quickly as possible.

CONCLUSION

The improvements on the Warrior-Tombigbee and Coosa-Alabama River systems will be beneficial to the people of Alabama because they will provide increased employment, more and better products at a lower cost, new recreation facilities, and adequate hydroelectric power. At the same time, they will encourage the acquisition of industries through the abundance of water supply and power facilities. But the improvements will also extend benefits to the Nation as a whole, particularly in the form of water transportation, reservoirs, and hydroelectric power for national defense.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I commend the members of the Appropriations Committee for their foresight in recommending funds for the proper development of these two great river systems, and I respectfully urge the approval of these funds by the House of Representatives.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION], a member of the committee.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reinforce what has been said here by the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] in support of this bill. No member of this committee considers the bill to be a perfect one and, of course, it is not subject to mathematical exactness. I suppose there are many projects here that should not have been placed here and perhaps some projects that should be here have not been included in the bill; but, nevertheless, overall, this bill is a sound bill, it is a good bill and a practical solution to our problems in this field for the next year.

Mr. Chairman, the bill contains well over 500 different items and projects throughout the country. The job of examining into these projects with their many complications and mathematics was a tedious job. I would like to commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and the ranking member, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], for their patience in considering and encouraging a most exhaustive examination into the merits of the various projects.

It has been a privilege to be associated on this committee with the members of the committee. They are a hardheaded, practical group of men, and I say that in a complimentary way; at the same time they are also somewhat softhearted because I know that when any Member of this House presented their case to the committee, their case not only received full consideration but the benefit of any reasonable doubt. I might add that the members of the staff are most competent and performed a very valuable service in helping the committee to arrive at this sound and practical solution of our problems.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself at this time to a project contained in this bill which is a major one, the Kinzua project, in Pennsylvania. This project is a single purpose flood-control project. It proposes to construct a 180-foot dam at Kinzua for the purpose of protecting the communities in Pennsylvania from recurring floods, especially the city of Pittsburgh.

I sympathize with the communities and the people of Pennsylvania who have been subjected to these recurring floods, I realize their anxiety in obtaining a project of this sort to give them relief from serious damage that occasionally results from the floods. The bill here contains $4,530,000 for the construction of this dam. I would be one of the first to vote for this bill and support the project if I thought it were the proper solution to the problems faced by the communities in Pennsylvania; however, I believe the Kinzua dam project is a serious mistake. It is not the proper overall solution to the situation in Pennsylvania. An amendment will be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] to eliminate this item pending the study of an alternate site, the Conewango site, which we believe will be a much better solution to the flood control situation in Pennsylvania. Conewango is by far the most practical solution to this problem.

I would like to briefly explore and present a comparison of the different features of the Kinzua project and the Conewango project. First of all, the Kinzua project, as I said, is a one-dam project 180 feet high. It would form a reservoir for these flood waters, backing up to the city of Salamanca, about 20 miles away. The water level in that reservoir would fluctuate about 60 feet between high water and low water. On the other hand the Conewango Dam in New York State, draining the same area, would consist of a series of low dams covering lands that are today mostly swamp lands of very little value, and in that project the water level would only

fluctuate 10 feet between high and low water marks, and, of course, would furnish a better site and an area that could be used for recreation, whereas Kinzua would be of very little recreational value.

Now, let us examine the cost of these two projects. The Kinzua project is estimated to cost anywhere between $125 million to $150 million. On the other hand, the Conewango Dam is estimated to cost between $100 million and $125 million. So, right there, initially, the saving would be $25 million for the Conewango Dam over the Kinzua Dam.

But our prime interest is not a question of cost. Our prime interest is whether the benefits of one project exceed the benefits of another project. In the Kinzua Dam the floodwaters would be stored to the extent of about 600,000 acre-feet. In the Conewango Dam the floodwater storage would be triple that of the Kinzua Dam. The Conewango would store something like 1.7 million acre-feet of water and, of course, give three times the flood control benefits that we could expect out of the Kinzua Dam.

Mr. Chairman, the Kinzua Dam is not the solution to the serious damages that occur in Pittsburgh from these floods. Kinzua would reduce the high floodwater level at Pittsburgh by only 2½ feet and at Wheeling, W. Va., the reduction would only be 3 feet, and so on down the line, down the Ohio Valley. It is not a complete solution to the problem at all. It is a reduction, yes, in damages, but it does not do the complete job. It does not do the job that we in this Nation and in this House ought to expect from a job this large and from the amount to be invested in this project. The fight here is not between the State of New York and the State of Pennsylvania with respect to these two projects. This project is part of the Ohio Valley project, and the Conewango Dam would not only increase the benefits for the State of New York, it would greatly increase the job to be done for the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. Surely.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, would not the gentleman agree that the Kinzua Dam was first authorized in 1936 and that money was actually appropriated for construction work last year by the Congress?

Mr. PILLION. That is true.

Mr. MOORHEAD. And that actual physical work has already commenced at the site?

Mr. PILLION. That is true, except that I understand the physical work is very slight and that of the $3 million that has been appropriated, a great deal of it has not been expended and there would be no serious damage done by a stoppage of the construction at this time. Actually, this item today is the item that would really seriously start this construction.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I just wanted to call to the attention of my distinguished friend that $625,000 has been spent on the project report. All phases of the Conewango Dam have been studied. I also want to call to his attention that this the third time that an attempt has been made to delete the money for his project. An additional report was to be prepared 2 years ago at the request of the chairman. Such a report was prepared at a cost of $75,000. So $700,000 has already been spent in the study of the project that the gentleman refers to. Let us not mislead by saying that adequate study of all phases has not been given to this proposed project.

Mr. PILLION. The gentleman knows that I have the highest regard and esteem for him. No one here is attempting to mislead anyone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, this is a big bill yet a very important one. As has been indicated, this bill carries appropriations for the civil works functions of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior, and several power agencies, including the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern and Southwestern Administrations, the Atomic Energy Commission and funds for two new water study commissions; namely, the U.S. Study Commission for the Southeastern States and the U.S. Study Commission for the State of Texas.

The bill carries an appropriation of $3,914,798,985, and represents a reduction of $86,217,195 below the budget estimates.

Certainly this is a large amount—a big bill—but the funds appropriated are for capital investments in our own country.

Mr. Chairman, this bill properly should be called the National Resource Development appropriation bill because this is indeed a bill concerned with the development of our natural resources.

A great deal of the misunderstandings that sometimes arise about this bill comes from the failure to realize that appropriations for civil works of the Corps of Engineers and services of other allied agencies are indeed concerned with the development of our Nation's resources.

There are some who continue to think of this bill as a measure to provide employment. Others like to refer to the public works bill as a pork barrel bill. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Here we are dealing with investments—capital investments—for all our country. This is indeed an all-American bill.

I am sorry to say that the Bureau of the Budget and the President at times have tended to take a mistaken attitude about appropriations for the great programs of the Corps of Engineers. In preserving our resources we are building a foundation for the future growth and strength of our Nation. Such an investment is vital.

Any productive concern, whether it is a private business or a powerful nation, like our own, has to keep its productive capacity up to date.

This bill is concerned with keeping our productive capacity up to date, developing our natural resources and investing in the future of America.

Every region and area of our country wants to share equally with all the other regions in the growth of our Nation. However, it is impossible to develop all at once and simultaneously all of the water resources of our country.

Our committee has endeavored to reconcile the need of all areas and to maintain a balance between all the areas. The fact that this is a difficult task is evident from the printed hearings which this year filled five volumes.

Our committee has tried to effect a reasonable balance and as indicated appropriations are made for projects in all sections and all areas of our common country.

I want to pay a special tribute to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who personally carried on these hearings and labored with much of the details of this bill. His great knowledge and experience and his fairness and objectivity were, as usual, invaluable.

I deem it a great privilege to serve on this subcommittee with the gentleman from Missouri and the other distinguished members of our subcommittee—Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT, of Michigan; Hon. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, of Ohio; Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island; Hon. JOHN J. RILEY, of South Carolina; Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND, of Massachusetts; Hon. DON MAGNUSON, of Washington; Hon. BEN F. JENSEN, of Iowa; Hon. JOHN TABER, of New York; Hon. IVOR D. FENTON, of Pennsylvania; Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota; and Hon. JOHN R. PILLION, of New York.

The most significant thing about the national resource appropriations bill this year is the fact that at last the Budget Bureau and the administration have apparently realized that this is a national development program and that if it is to be effective and in the national interest it must be carried out on a coordinated, well-balanced, and continuing basis.

As we know, in the past few years the Budget Bureau and the administration have tried, shortsightedly in my view, to cut down this program of developing our water resources and particularly to eliminate the planning of future projects and the starting of projects already planned and scheduled. As we also know, this issue came to a head last year when the administration instituted its "no new starts policy." The Congress, taking the proper view that this is a program essential to our Nation's progress, refused to go along with the "no new starts policy" and, although it had to override a Presidential veto, the Congress did make it clear that this was in fact a continuing and orderly program for the development of our resources. It has been encouraging to note that in the budget presented this year the Budget Bureau and the administration has recognized

this fact and presented recommendations for continued construction of projects now under way and for 39 new starts.

Your committee has carefully studied the recommendations in the budget as well as recommendations made by Members of the Congress for projects throughout the Nation. In effect, the committee has accepted the recommendations in the budget for 32 of the starts, rejecting only 7 of them.

The committee also stopped two other projects which were not yet under actual construction. It added 5 additional unbudgeted construction starts and provided funds for initial planning on 15 new projects. It also provided a very small sum for the reevaluating of two other projects. The total amount recommended in this bill is approximately the same as the recommendation in the budget message.

The bill we are considering is a truly national bill. It provides funds for the development of our water resources in every section of the country—indeed in every State. The projects for which funds are provided will provide a good foundation for the future growth and progress of our Nation and will give every region and every section a fair opportunity to share in that progress and growth. The bill provides funds for continuing our water resource development program on schedule in an orderly and continuing program. Construction of projects already under way is being continued at an efficient rate; funds are provided for the start of new projects as others are completed; and funds are also provided for planning additional projects for future construction.

Included in the bill this year also are the funds for programs of the Atomic Energy Commission.

These include, among others, the production of raw materials, the special nuclear programs, weapons and reactor development, research, biology and medicine, education and information and other programs of the AEC. Our subcommittee and the full committee has given a great deal of time and attention to the proposed nuclear powered airplane. Certainly, a great deal of money has been expended on this program to date. A sum of $75 million is carried in the defense appropriations bill for the nuclear-powered airplane and our committee is recommending a limitation of $58 million in the amount of funds carried in this bill which may be used for the airplane propulsion reactor program. Thus a total of $133 million is to be used for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, America was first in the development of atomic energy, the A-bomb, the H-bomb, atomic weapons for war and atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

Admiral Rickover and those associated with him have developed the atomic submarine and there is no reason why America should not be first in the development of atomic powered airplanes. We could have had such a plane in the air by 1956 if our Air Force standards had not been so rigid and specific as to require the highest speed and altitude standards. In other words, Mr. Chairman, our course has been set so high—let us say like a precision Elgin watch that we have delayed completing and putting into flight the first atomic airplane. Let us develop the plane now and perfect the refinements later as time may indicate. I believe there will be both a civil and military application for the atomic powered airplane and that our experts and scientists both in the AEC and the Department of Defense should get on with the job. Personally, I have been disappointed in the delays, slowdowns, and indirection of this program. I am supporting the committee on this instance because I believe our agency concerned with this program should reevaluate it and give the program new purpose and direction and emphasis. Also, Mr. Chairman, as indicated, there is $75 million in the Defense bill for this purpose and a carryover by reappropriations so that the program for next year will have a minimum of $100 million—a limit of $133 million in funds.

The committee is not stopping the program, it is rather directing that proper action should be given to this national effort. We have been assured that these funds will be sufficient for the present. By next year the AEC and the Defense Department will be able to tell us what they have decided to do in reorganizing the project and how much they will need to keep it going. We will be in a far better position to assess the practicability of this entire project and the funds we devote to it will be utilized more effectively.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, the atomic energy program, the work of the TVA, the Bonneville Power Administration and our other great power agencies, and the work of the Corps of Engineers are all important and must go forward.

This is a great bill and a very important measure—and although it is difficult and impossible to satisfy everyone on such a bill, the measure is worthy of approval as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations and I urge its passage.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative of the First Congressional District of Maryland, I would like to present my views on H.R. 12326. First, I wish to commend the Committee on Appropriations for their labors on the Public Works appropriation bill for 1961. With the great need for public works improvements in our country, I am aware of the difficult task that confronts this committee in drafting a bill that would meet the needs of the many meritorious projects necessary to our public welfare.

In my district, there are several approved resolutions for surveys. And I am sure many other Members of Congress have proposed projects in their districts in which they are vitally interested. The First Congressional District of Maryland and, I may add, the State of Maryland, is perhaps confronted with as many navigational problems as any State in the Union. Many of our people and a great segment of our economy are dependent upon our innumerable waterways.

I endeavored to call the attention of the House Committee on Public Works to the needs of various areas in my district, and I was gratified when the committee passed resolutions authorizing the study of five proposed projects. I am painfully aware that it is a long step from a resolution to survey to the appropriation of funds to proceed with same, but I do feel that there exist certain proposed projects presently in need of serious consideration.

For example, there is a greatly needed improvement in the existing facilities at Rock Hall, Kent County, Md. Some years ago the Federal Government spent a considerable sum of money to provide Rock Hall with channels 8 and 10 feet deep and 100 feet wide, anchorage areas of the same depths, and twin breakwaters at the harbor entrance. Now, apparently the breakwaters have either sunken or the water level has raised, rendering the Federal project there ineffectual and the expenditure of money in vain.

On May 8, 1959, Gen. J. L. Person, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, stated:

> A study is warranted to determine if modifications of the project would result in a fuller utilization of the potential benefits.

The neglect of navigational improvements at Insley Cove, Wells Cove, Farm Creek, the Chester River, the Choptank River, St. Peters Creek, the North East River, and in the Smith Island area should be terminated and improvements made commensurate to their needs.

I am afraid that the amount appropriated for general investigations in H.R. 12326 falls short in providing the needs of a district so dependent upon its waterways for its economic livelihood.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the public works appropriation bill for 1961. I thank the committee for providing a sum of $50,000 for a general investigation and restudy of the Meramec River Basin. This Meramec Basin comprises a part of the Eighth Congressional District in my State of Missouri.

Meramec Basin Dams have long been under discussion and some studies have been made. However, it is felt necessary to update these studies and this sum is required by the Corps of Engineers in order to bring the study up to present-day requirements.

This Meramec Basin project has a long history. The construction of reservoirs in the Meramec River Basin was authorized in the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938. It is a part of the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Upper Mississippi River Basin.

Based on studies completed in 1949, a plan for flood control and other purposes in the Meramec River Basin was developed. This provides for three reservoirs: The Meramec Park Reservoir with dam site about 4 miles east of Sullivan, Mo.; Cedar Hill Reservoir on the Big River which is a tributary of the Meramec, with dam site about 2½ miles above Cedar Hill, Mo.; and Union Reservoir, with dam site on the Bourbeuse River, another tributary of the Meramec, about 6 miles upstream from Union, Mo.

This request for funds to up-date the studies previously made is necessary if the Corps of Engineers is to cooperate with the State of Missouri in planning further development in the basin. If this program, after an up-dating study, meets basic requirements, together with the approval of the appropriate Missouri State authorities and is desired by local interests, then the project can be restored to the active list and become eligible for future funding and completion.

By holding back disastrous floods on the Bourbeuse, Big and Meramec Rivers, this system of reservoirs would reduce flood stages in the basin and also on the Mississippi River. These reservoirs would eliminate crop damage on over 40,000 acres of downstream bottom land, as well as extensive damage to beaches, communities and to private and public clubhouses and recreational facilities.

I am advised that about three-fourths of the 1957 flood damage could have been prevented if these proposed projects had been operational. Another long-range benefit of this proposal is the fact that controlled releases from these reservoirs would aid Mississippi River navigation during critical low-flow periods. Proponents of these projects point out other advantages that might well result: the reservoirs would provide for conservation storage of water supply, pollution abatement and fish and wildlife propagation in addition to creating large new areas for much needed recreational facilities.

I urge approval of this appropriation to up-date this study so that a decision can be made as to further definite plan or plans required to best serve the interests of the Meramec Basin.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH].

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation now before the body. First, let me commend the Subcommittee on Public Works for their diligent efforts, the many long hours of hard work necessitated by extensive and intensive hearings. Then may I commend the full committee and in both instances the able leadership of the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. He is one who I am sure we can all agree, is capable of getting committee members from both sides of the aisle working harmoniously together for constructive legislation. I thank the distinguished gentlemen from Minnesota, Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. MARSHALL, for their personal interest and help on my project affecting St. Paul and South St. Paul, Minn.

For the inclusion of that project, all Minnesotans, I know, joint in thanking the committee. Specifically I know this is true of the St. Paul, South St. Paul people. The workers, the chamber of commerce, the St. Paul Port Authority, and particularly those people in the flood area, are most grateful.

Mr. Chairman this is a bill that on an overall basis means much to millions of Americans. That is why it is good for America.

Undoubtedly, there are many projects of great merit that are not in the bill. However, it was the good judgment of the committee to be sure, that all projects, just could not be included.

However, I confidently predict that all will agree the bill is of great variety and magnitude, and because of this serves well all of our Nation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations and the Appropriations Committee for bringing to the floor today a bill which I believe provides adequate programs for continued development and control of our Nation's water resources. I am particularly interested in title II which includes the Federal reclamation program. As chairman of the committee which authorizes the reclamation projects, I have appeared before the Public Works Subcommittee for the past several years in behalf of the overall reclamation program.

While I believe that an increase in our annual level of spending for reclamation is justified to keep this program in line with our overall Government spending, I recognize that this must be considered as a long-range goal. I am satisfied that the funds included in this bill are adequate to permit the efficient continuation of the projects that are now under way. I particularly congratulate the committee for again including several new starts for I believe that a few new starts each year are necessary for an orderly and progressive long-range program.

I want to personally thank the chairman of the subcommittee, who is also chairman of the full committee, and the members of the whole committee and subcommittee, for the courtesies extended me and for his and their cooperation and the cooperation of the staffs for their understanding of reclamation matters which are of mutual interest to all of us.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity to appear to urge appropriations for multipurpose irrigation and reclamation projects located in my congressional district in California.

I sincerely appreciate the cooperation which has been accorded me by the Appropriations Committee in past years and I appreciate the action taken by them this year.

The purpose of my appearance is to urge favorable House action on the following appropriations:

Terminus Dam on the Kaweah River, Tulare County, Calif.	$6,300,000
Success Dam on the Tule River, Tulare County, Calif.	2,588,000
Stone Corral Irrigation District	1,045,181
Teapot Dome Water District distribution system	925,427
East side unit, proposed extension of the Central Valley project, continued planning	566,257
Caliente Creek stream group, Kern County, Calif., completion of planning	15,000
Pine Flat Reservoir, Kings River	500,000

All of the above mentioned items are recommended in the President's budget in the amount which I have specified except the Caliente Creek stream group and this also has received the approval of Mr. CANNON's splendid committee.

I am sure that the Members of this Congress are well acquainted with the Terminus and Success projects and the urgency which dictated the appropriation of funds which have been expended thus far. The two dams are imperative to impound runoff waters from the Sierra Nevada Mountains which have caused an inestimable amount of damage in floods most recently in 1952, 1955, and 1956.

Both of these projects are currently under construction and, in fact, are rapidly nearing completion. The $2,588,000 recommended for Success Dam would be the final increment toward completion of the complete works at a total cost of $14,200,000. The appropriation of the recommended amount would permit this dam to be finished on the scheduled date of June 30, 1961.

The $6,300,000 contained in the bill for Terminus Dam would bring the project to a point of more than 80 percent completed and would leave $3,782,000 still to be appropriated.

I respectfully urge this House to appropriate adequate funds to permit these flood control projects to be completed as scheduled.

I will now comment on the request for funds for the Stone Corral Irrigation District and the Teapot Dome Water District, both located in Tulare County. In both instances irrigation distribution systems are in the process of construction by the Bureau of Reclamation under repayment contracts.

The estimated total cost of each project is $1,888,000. The $1,045,181 for Stone Corral would leave an additional $450,000 to be funded.

The $925,427 for Teapot Dome would complete the appropriations for this project.

With respect to the proposed east side project, feasibility studies have been under way for several years to ascertain ways and means of developing an additional water supply for the east side of the Southern San Joaquin Valley. The plans involve a proposed canal which would convey water from northern California along the east side of the valley into the water-deficient areas of Kern County and Tulare County.

I can assure you that there is a dire need for water in this area and that the situation worsens each year. The $566,257 which would be expended for planning surveys would be a continuation to extensive prior planning. Failure to continue such planning would nullify previous expenditures for this useful purpose.

Regarding the Caliente Creek Stream Group request, it is my understanding that estimates by the Corps of Army Engineers place the total cost of the remaining survey work at $30,000. I further understand that the Engineers have a capability of performing half of this work during fiscal year 1961 and the remainder during fiscal year 1962.

In view of this fact, I would respectfully urge concurrence in the committee's approving the sum of $15,000 for this undertaking.

Now I turn my attention to the $500,000 appropriation recommended for Pine Flat Dam and Reservoir on the Kings River. As the Committee is aware, the physical features of this dam have been completed for several years. Since that time, the construction of downstream channel and levee improvements has been delayed pending observation of changes in the streamflow as a result of the impoundment.

The channel clearance and levee work was authorized as a part of the project and I urge that the appropriation be approved in order that the work may be completed by 1962, as scheduled by the Corps of Army Engineers.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I will offer an amendment to eliminate $4,500,000 in this bill, which is scheduled to be spent for Kinzua Dam, the reservoir coming partially into my district in western New York. In the course of the discussions, you will hear a great deal of reference to Dr. Arthur Morgan. Let me give you a little bit of the background and the history of how this project developed. For some time there have been discussions of a project and actual authorizations by the Congress for a project in the Allegheny Valley in western New York and in western Pennsylvania to protect the downstream communities. These projects were actually designed to protect not only from flood, but from low water. The unfortunate thing was that the Kinzua project involved taking 9,077 acres right out of the best land of the Seneca Indians in western New York, and in essence destroying that nation and this in violation of the oldest treaty that this country has. I placed in the RECORD yesterday, and it is to be found on page 10849, a comparison of the Kinzua plan and the Conewango plan. I recommend it to you for your reading and to note particularly the language of Dr. Morgan in pointing out the advantages of the Conewango plan which would take no significant amount of Indian land as compared with the Kinzua plan, which would take an essential area right out of the middle of the Seneca land. Dr. Morgan is not a lightweight. He is a competent engineer of the highest professional standing. He was the chief engineer in the Miami Conservancy in 1913, working for the prevention of the recurrence of the Dayton, Ohio, flood. He was the chief engineer of the Pueblo Conservancy in Colorado. He has been the planner and supervisor of over 75 water control projects in this country. He was president of Antioch College for 16 years and was Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority from 1933 to 1938. I am told that he has worked in water control projects twice as long as the Army Corps of Engineers. In discussing Dr. Morgan's findings, let me say that he started 3 years ago to see if there was a way to protect Pittsburgh and the downstream communities and still save the Indian lands. In doing so, he made this comment as to his project. This is Dr. Morgan speaking:

> The oldest existing treaty of our Government should be treated seriously and with great respect, but so should other human interests be treated. If the health and safety of the great city of Pittsburgh can be protected in no other way then by taking the land of the Seneca Indians, then, it seems to me, the United States Government and the Seneca Nation should cooperate in protecting Pittsburgh.

Then he went on to say that he had witnessed at various times in his own experience, mistakes made by the Army Engineers in this field, and so he undertook the project. In doing so he found some very interesting situations that existed.

On page 10849 of yesterday's RECORD I inserted a full statement by Dr. Morgan including the following paragraph:

> The Conewango-Cattaraugus site is a rare occurrence in nature. Being out of the ordinary and unexpected, it is not surprising that the possibility was overlooked. Before the last glacial period the Allegheny River flowed north into Lake Erie. The ice of the glacial period dug a big hole, in the same way that it dug the Finger Lakes in New York State, and pushed the earth and rock ahead of it, making a dike which turned the Allegheny River away from Lake Erie and to the Ohio River. If we cut through this dike, and use this glacial hole to store water, we have a reservoir with about three times the capacity of Kinzua. The old Allegheny River channel and South Cattaraugus Creek provide a rock gorge, for much of its distance hundreds of feet deep, to carry away the excess floodwater to Lake Erie.

There are two major purposes for an undertaking like this. One is flood control and the other is augmentation of low water. The Conewango will store more than three times the amount of water. It will, in addition, protect against what is called "the maximum probable flood" in the Ohio River Basin.

The Army Engineers concede that the Kinzua will protect only 43 percent of the "maximum probable floods," but Kinzua cannot be expanded. If they try to expand it any further they will eliminate the city of Salamanca, in my district. There will be arguments made that prior studies have already been made, because when Dr. Morgan came into this, he began to raise questions that needed answering. This committee ordered that a private study be made and a study was made 2 years ago. The result of that study was to confirm the feasibility of Dr. Morgan's Conewango plan. The main question they raised with his plan was that they feared it would cost more than Kinzua. In this connection I want to quote Dr. Morgan:

> The earlier field work and calculations for this study were largely made by my longtime friend and associate, Barton M. Jones. On his sudden death I located such of his papers as I could and have continued the study. He commented frequently that the project has such a variety of promising alternatives that when the possibilities and economies are fully worked out the plans may have little resemblance to the ones he has prepared. * * * It is hoped that as Tippetts-Abbett-McCarthy-Stratton make their study with more adequate resources they will not simply determine the feasibility of the elements we propose, but will be alert to see further possibilities and economies, as well as any weak spots in our proposals.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. PILLION. The gentleman agrees that the greatest benefit we can obtain from these projects is the low water benefits, the use of water for human consumption; for industrial uses, for pollution along these rivers, down the Pittsburgh and down the Ohio Valley.

The Conewango will furnish three times the amount of water for these very essential needs that can possibly be furnished by the Kinzua.

Mr. GOODELL. I agree. I not only agree, but I am told that the Chief of Engineers in an address last October—speaking of this river basin said that by 1980 the demand for water will be 13 times greater than the dependable discharge into the lower Ohio River. This Conewango project, according to Dr. Morgan, and conceded by everyone now—would store three times more water than the Kinzua.

Quoting Dr. Morgan further. When he started these studies he said:

> I have only begun to look into the many possibilities of the Conewango. I continued my inquiry, and turned up other possibilities so superior as to make my earlier suggestions obsolete. When I asked the Tippetts engineers to look into other possibilities I had found, they replied that they did not have time to do so. They never made a general study of the situation, and never qualified themselves to pass on all the major alternatives.

Now, Dr. Morgan is a man over 80 years of age walking around the hills there making the surveys and explorations which are necessary to come up with a plan which would be feasible. He said he continued his inquiries and studies and the conclusions he came up with were so superior as to make his earlier observations obsolete.

When asked about the Tippetts study of the alternative Conewango, Dr. Morgan outlined and documented in detail the places where money could be cut out of what the Tippetts firm says is necessary to develop the Conewango program.

The Corps of Army Engineers, in replying to a question as to what would be

the benefit-cost ratio for this Conewango project in detail replied on last Friday, and I quote:

> Basic data are not available to the Corps of Engineers to support a reasonable estimate of cost for the Conewango-Cattaraugus alternative proposed by Dr. Morgan; and, accordingly, it has not been possible to determine the firm benefit-cost ratio for that plan. To develop accurate cost estimates for such a complex scheme, many explorations, tests, and surveys would be necessary.

In this connection the corps added that they considered no further refinement of costs necessary because the costs seemed obviously too high.

Mr. Chairman, this is a former Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority who has done these studies. I think the observations and recommendations he makes with regard to the Conewango project deserve a fair and impartial study, and so do the alternative proposals, before we appropriate $120 million of the taxpayers' money.

Dr. Morgan has claimed that this project would store three times as much water and would give full protection by an overflow outlet into Lake Erie against any possible floods, while the Kinzua would only protect against 40 percent of the "maximum probable flood" in this river basin.

Dr. Morgan has, in addition, contended that the Conewango would cost $105 million, while the Kinzua was estimated to cost $113 million and now it has grown to $119 million.

I am very much in favor of breaking down and analyzing all phases of these projects to determine which will be best for water augmentation and flood control, and to protect the people in the area. Remember, I have to sell this project to the people where this reservoir will be located. People are going to be severely injured as well as benefited by a project of this immensity. They deserve the assurance that all facts are known and evaluated impartially before they are asked to give up their lands. This applies equally to Indians and white residents of the Conewango Valley.

I ask your support of my amendment when presented.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to call the attention of the House to the fact that it was just 1 year ago today that Mr. John Foster Dulles lost his valiant fight against cancer, and our country and the world lost a valiant fighter for freedom for all men.

During his 6 years of service as Secretary of State there was strong disagreement with some of the firm policies and positions he advocated with respect to the never-changing drive of the Communists for world domination.

I, myself, think that history will vindicate those policies and positions and that the long shadow of Mr. Dulles will grow even longer with the passage of time. But I am perfectly willing to leave that to history.

Today we want to pay tribute to him as a great and noble man, a tireless and dedicated patriot, an intelligent and heroic crusader for justice and human liberty in the world as the only possible conditions upon which can be built a true and lasting, not an illusory peace.

America does not and will not forget Mr. Dulles and his services to our country and to mankind.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, a year ago today the United States lost one of its most consecrated public servants. I rise to add my little word of respect, my appreciation of a loyal servant of the country—he and I were not always in agreement, but we respected each other and worked as best we knew how for the fundamental principles upon which this great free land of ours was built.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], a member of the committee.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 12326, known as the public works appropriation bill for 1961, is a good bill. It has had thorough and complete hearings, and I hope the House will adopt it as presented.

Here we go again. It has been stated here that an amendment will be offered to make a further study of an alternative plan. I do not know how many more studies they want to make of the proposed Allegheny Dam.

I do not by any means pose as an expert on engineering, but I have listened to all of those who have spoken against the proposal of the engineers. Every Member of this body who has a project in his district must depend on the decisions of the Army Engineers and, certainly, on their truthfulness.

This Allegheny River Reservoir project is a part of the overall plan for water control in the Ohio River Basin. As I understand the project, it will reduce flood damages in important residential and industrial areas downstream, including the highly industrialized Pittsburgh area, and will maintain adequate flow during an extended drought period. It is a key project in the control plan for the Ohio. The plan for construction is the result of many studies, some prior to and others subsequent to the authorization.

Opposition has arisen to this project based on flooding of Indian land in the Seneca Reservation and the possibility of diversion of the floodflows on the Allegheny River to Lake Erie. The latter feature appears to have been offered particularly to eliminate the first.

In regard to the first objection, the President of the Seneca Nation of Indians stated in testimony before the subcommittee that—

> My people have steadily maintained the position that if the construction of this proposed Kinzua Dam was the only economic and engineering solution for the prevention of floods to downstream Allegheny, we would not oppose the taking of our lands.

Now, the Corps of Engineers have maintained that the construction as proposed is the most economical means of providing the benefits to accrue to the downstream area through flood protection and low waterflow augmentation.

I am informed that the Corps of Engineers consider the diversion of floodflows to Lake Erie as a feasible solution to the flood protection of the downstream Allegheny area, but that it is not the most economical. They have studied this approach to the flood problem as early as 1928 and have again recently considered the plan as proposed by the proponents of the diversion idea. Their recent conclusions are that the plan of diverting the floodflows to Lake Erie will cost the Federal Government about $200 million as compared to the $118 million which is the estimated cost of the Allegheny River Reservoir project.

Based on the testimony and information furnished me by the Corps of Engineers I am convinced that they have thoroughly investigated all alternative means of providing the control found to be necessary, and I am confident that their studies gave just appraisal to these alternative plans. I am therefore of the opinion that the recommended plan of the Army Engineers represents the most economical and desirable approach to meet the overall needs for development of water resources in this area.

Now, the chief reason for opposition to the Allegheny River Reservoir is that they have a treaty dating back to 1794 with the United States. Since the Supreme Court has decided in favor of the Army Engineers, this argument cannot prevail.

The following precedences are ample proof that the United States has treated the Indians fairly.

I had the Legislative Reference Service gather for me a list of the Indian tribes who have benefited from dam construction:

Flathead Indians of Montana. They received compensation from a private company for use of damsite and flooding of reservation land.

Warm Springs Indians of Oregon. They received compensation from a private company for use of damsite.

Fort Berthold Indians of North Dakota. They receive compensation from the Federal Government for flooding and other items, connected with dam construction.

Nez Perce Indians of Idaho, Warm Springs Indians of Oregon, Umatilla Indians of Oregon, Yakima Indians of Washington receive compensation from Federal Government for flooding of fishing sites at Celilo Falls on the Columbia and construction of Dalles Dam.

Wind River Indians of Wyoming receive compensation from Federal Government for inundation of reservation land, in connection with Boysen Dam.

Standing Rock Indians and Cheyenne River Indians of South Dakota receive compensation for Oahe Dam on the Missouri River.

Lower Brule and Crow Creek Indians of South Dakota receive compensation for Randall Dam on Missouri River.

Fort Peck Indians of Montana. Compensation for Fort Peck Dam on Missouri River.

Crow Indians of Montana. Projected Yellowtail Dam to carry compensation.

So, Mr. Chairman, without taking any more time at this particular moment, I want to say that I think the Army Engineers have given us a very fine evaluation of the various projects that they have looked into. When the amendment is offered, I certainly will oppose it, and I hope the House will stand back of the committee.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this bill calls for $1,238 million overall for the budget estimates that were considered, and a bill which the committee has considered calling over all for $1,685,500,000 for civil functions of the War Department and reclamation. It calls for about $28 million for Bonneville Power, most of which is for operation and maintenance. It calls for over $2 billion of funds for the Atomic Energy Commission.

The projects included in this bill are enormous. Along with those that have already been started they will call for from $8 to $10 billion of expenditures. To my mind the worst part of it is that instead of its being something that will maintain the resources of America, the bill contains many projects which do not maintain the resources of America but sap them. In other words, they are projects without a benefit-cost ratio. If they are figured on the basis of the present money market, there is hardly a project in the whole bill that would qualify. In other words, there are 19 projects in the bill which call for large amounts of funds where the benefit-cost ratio is less than 1.1 to 1, figured on a 2½ percent interest rate.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BECKER. Is it not also the fact, that while this bill amounts to about $1 billion, we are actually committing the country to an expenditure of several billions of dollars, because many of these projects are only starts? The Kinzua Dam calls for an expenditure in the bill of $4,500,000, but actually the cost will be about $120 million, if it is started; is not that true?

Mr. TABER. There is no question about it. On top of that the benefit-cost ratio figured on a 2½ percent interest rate is only 1.3 to 1; and if it is figured on a 3½ percent to a 4 percent rate, it is a minus quantity—there is no benefit-cost ratio.

Mr. BECKER. Heretofore under policies of public works we have always disapproved that type of project, have we not?

Mr. TABER. That is what we used to do. The worst part about the Kinzua Dam is that it is not presented primarily as a flood control project but as a scheme to store up water to flush the sewage out of the Ohio River in the dry season.

Mr. BECKER. I agree with my colleague.

Mr. TABER. That represents the main cost of it, and with that kind of picture it ought to have a local contribution of a very substantial character; but it does not have it.

Mr. BECKER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. On top of that, if you want to go up a couple of points, there are 51 projects, most of them new, in this bill without even a budget estimate, where the benefit-cost ratio on a 2½-percent interest rate is not better than 1.2 to 1 and where the benefit-cost ratio is a minus quantity if figured on an interest rate of 3½ to 4 percent.

I appreciate that a bill of this size could not come before the Congress because so many of the Members are getting the jitters and being ready to spend money that we do not have for a lot of projects that really cannot be justified at all. They are not projects to benefit and to maintain the status of the United States of America; they are projects put in to satisfy the greed of certain people in connection with so-called flood control.

For my own part I cannot go along with the bill. I cannot vote for it. I hope that when the time comes there will be a rollcall vote, so that I can go on record against it, even if I am the only one. I appreciate that mine is a voice crying in the wilderness, but it is a voice crying for something that the American people need, and that is, to put a brake on our expenditures where it is not absolutely necessary that we spend the money. I would feel that I was not doing my duty by the people of the United States if I did not say just what I have said. I have been very charitable in my approach to this bill. Maybe sometime we will wake up before it is too late and before the country is in such shape that we cannot withstand the deluge.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or another member of the committee will yield for a question? I see the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] has risen. May I ask a question of him?

On page 19 of the committee report it is noted with some concern on my part that the budget estimate for the John Day Lock and Dam on the Columbia River in the States of Washington and Oregon has been reduced by $3,655,700, part of a budgeted item, of course.

It is further noted in the report, correctly, that this reduction is the amount by which the Columbia Basin monetary authorization will be deficient in the fiscal year 1961 unless it is increased by the pending public works authorization bill which, as the gentleman knows, passed the House last July.

Inasmuch as the Senate Public Works Committee anticipates reporting this legislation in several days, my question is, Why could not the committee have included the full $37 million for this important project, budgeted, of course, contingent upon the raising of the Columbia Basin monetary authorization?

Mr. RABAUT. We could have, but we did not, because it has been committee policy to withhold funds until the monetary authorization was available.

Mrs. MAY. There was nothing that said you could not do this?

Mr. RABAUT. There was not.

Mrs. MAY. So the decision here was made on the basis that the monetary authorization had been reached.

Mr. RABAUT. That is right.

Mrs. MAY. It is my understanding that the members of the committee would look favorably upon the restoration of these funds for the John Day Lock and Dam and the raising of the monetary authorization by the other body; is that correct?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentlewoman is correct, the members of the committee would look favorably upon that.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is often spoken of as the bill which contains items that are not necessary. But we have a responsibility here as representatives of the people to do the best we can to see that life and property are not endangered. On all these Federal streams over which the Federal Government has jurisdiction, no State, no municipality, and no person dare under the law to stick a spade in that Federal stream or to try in any way to divert that Federal stream regardless of how small the stream might be. So in this great, huge country of ours, the Federal Government and this Congress has this responsibility to all the people. Our committee insists, however, that local people contribute their share of such expenses. This bill is a bill for America so far as all public works for all 50 States is concerned. The funds requested in this bill for all public works in America is less than 1.5 percent of the Federal budget for the fiscal year 1961.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I speak of the item of $542,000 contained in the budget request for a small boat harbor at Homer on the Kenai Peninsula, Alaska. This harbor would provide safe moorage for fishing boats and other small vessels for this fast-growing community and constitute a constructive step toward the growth and development of Alaska. Fishing is an important segment of the economy of

Homer, Alaska, but boating for tourists in this scenic wonderland is also a promising potential.

On page 233 of the hearings before the subcommittee the justification for this project under the head of local cooperation shows that there has been some discussion as to the exact location of this harbor. On page 234 Gen. Allen Clark of the Corps of Engineers stated that the corps had recommended a location on the north side of the peninsula, and local people feel it should be on the south side. In speaking of the "peninsula," General Clark was referring to the Homer Spit, a long narrow finger of land which projects a mile or more out toward the center of Katchemak Bay. Although the discussions mentioned had to do with the question of which side of the spit to utilize for the harbor, some members of the committee apparently thought that the word peninsula referred to the whole Kenai Peninsula, so in all good conscience declined to go along with the project until the site was determined. They also thought there was a substantial controversy which there is not. In a wire received today from the Homer Chamber of Commerce I am told that there is now 100 percent backing of the Corps of Engineers in regard to location of the harbor. Since the people of Homer are extremely disturbed about the deletion of the item for their long desired and needed harbor, they are sending a petition for reinstatement of the Homer boat harbor funds. I am also advised that in the very near future the Corps of Engineers will receive a field report from a representative at Homer confirming the complete accord which now exists in accordance with the above referenced telegram. By the time said petition and field report arrive H.R. 12326 will be in the hands of the Senate, and upon the strength of said documents I would expect the Homer boat harbor item to be restored by the other body. Likewise, I would surmise that the objections of our own committee would by then have been met and the cloud removed from the justification for this project. It is my ardent hope that the expected restoration will prove acceptable to our House conferees at the ensuing conference, and prove acceptable to all of my other colleagues when the time comes to act upon the conference report.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I was shocked to discover in the public works appropriations bill that our Committee on Appropriations had reduced the budget estimate for continuation of construction on the Sacramento River deepwater ship channel project in my district from $8 million to $5 million. This is the second year in a row that the committee has pared the administration's minimal recommendations for this project. Last year it cut $1 million from the budget estimate of $7.5 million.

On page 16 of its report—House Report No. 1634—the committee made the following statement with respect to its action:

> Sacramento deepwater ship channel, California: The budget estimate of $8 million for this project has been reduced to $5 million. Estimates of the total direct Federal cost have increased approximately $5 million in the last 4 years. The total estimated project cost is now $47,255,000, of which the direct contribution by the local beneficiaries is only $3,515,000. The committee continues to hold the opinion on projects such as this where a very high percentage of the total benefits are obviously local in nature, that there should be a higher local contribution to the direct cost. No effort has been made to increase the local beneficiaries' share of the increased direct project costs. As stated last year in its report, the committee feels that it would be wholly appropriate for the local interests to increase their contribution if they wish to achieve the advantages of a speedup in the construction schedule.
>
> The committee notes that the effect of its $1 million reduction in this item last year was completely nullified by transfer of funds to the project from other projects under the 15 percent transfer latitude which the committee has granted to the Corps of Engineers. The latitude in the transfer of funds between projects is not for the purpose of offsetting positive actions taken by the committee on specific projects. No funds, over and above the amount being provided, are to be transferred to this project during the fiscal year 1961.

Thus it appears the committee's action was aimed at the local interests and the Corps of Engineers. To the former it said, in effect, that their share in the cost of the project is insufficient; that if the project is to proceed at an economic and timely rate of construction a higher local contribution to direct costs will have to be made. To the Corps of Engineers the committee levels the accusation that it thwarted the will of the committee by transferring $962,000 to the project after the budget estimate had been reduced by $1 million.

I should like to examine the two grounds set forth as the basis for the committee's action. Before doing so I will set forth some background information on the project.

DESCRIPTION

Mr. Chairman, the Sacramento River deepwater ship channel projects consist of a ship channel from deep water in Suisun Bay, near San Francisco, to Lake Washington on the outskirts of California's State capitol at Sacramento, a harbor and turning basin at Lake Washington, and a 1½-mile shallow draft barge canal connecting the harbor and the Sacramento River. The project will open a tributary area embracing 24 California counties, 4 southern Oregon counties, and 13 northern Nevada counties to worldwide markets.

The project was authorized in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1946, and received its first appropriation in the bill covering the fiscal year 1949. Appropriations followed in the 2 ensuing years. Along with many other public works projects, work was suspended on the channel in 1951 because of the Korean war. It was resumed in 1956 and construction has continued uninterrupted since. At the time of authorization the corps estimated a reasonable construction period of 3 years. The project has now been under way for nearly 11 years.

COMMITTEE ACTION UNFAIR

Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly that, first, the committee action in conditioning a timely construction schedule on increased local contribution constitutes a complete repudiation of an agreement with the local people covering division of costs; and second, that the Corps of Engineers was completely justified in transferring funds to the project during the current fiscal year under the 15 percent transfer allowance. I will discuss these two points in order:

1. LOCAL CONTRIBUTION AGREEMENT

The act which authorized this project required that responsible local interests provide satisfactory assurance to the Secretary of the Army that they would:

> 1. Furnish without cost to the United States, all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas for the initial work and subsequent maintenance when and as required and make all essential utility changes necessary for the construction of the project.
>
> 2. Construct, operate, and maintain at the Lake Washington Basin an adequate public terminal with necessary utilities and rail and highway connections open to all on equal terms.
>
> 3. Hold and save the United States free from any damages which may arise from construction, operation, and maintenance of the improvement.

Mr. Chairman, immediately upon approval of the authorizing act, the local people established the Sacramento-Yolo Port District as the responsible local agency. Under date of December 24, 1947, the district executed "Agreement of Assurance to the Secretary of the Army" in the exact terms of the requirements as set forth in the preceding paragraph. On February 3, 1948, the Secretary of the Army approved the agreement of assurance.

I think that there can be no doubt that the establishment of conditions by the United States and their acceptance without any qualifications or reservations by the local people constitutes a solemn agreement. If the agreement was not a firm one at that point in the relationship, it certainly was when the local interests undertook to comply with the promises they made to the United States. At any rate, the people of my district felt and still feel that they had entered into a binding agreement. Based on the commitment they made they formulated their fiscal plans.

Almost immediately the voters of my district approved a $3,750,000 bond issue for local financing. The State of California approved the project and appropriated $750,000 to the port district for use in the acquisition of rights-of-way, easements, and so forth. In addition, the port district collected annual taxes from the property owners which collections to date have aggregated over $2 million.

The extent of local interests' compliance with the agreement with the United States is nowhere better documented than in the capital account of the port district. Among the items listed therein are the following:

Rights-of-way and real estate	$2,458,547.93
Channels (includes $75,000 construction advancement to Corps of Engineers)	336,751.00
Belt railroad	226,847.67
Highway pavement	58,690.25
Domestic water system	6,192.56
Fire protection system	26,611.43
Engineering and design	36,078.83
Sanitary sewer	40,513.20
Automotive and general office equipment	24,078.53
Port district capital investment	3,214,311.40

Not only has the port district proceeded in good faith to meet its responsibilities, but the State of California has diligently aided the project in every possible way. Already mentioned was the $750,000 it appropriated for rights-of-way acquisitions. The California Division of Highways provided an overpass across a recently constructed east-west freeway, thereby providing direct truck access to the port terminal area. The cost of this improvement was $288,000. In constructing this freeway the division of highways removed approximately 500,000 cubic yards of material from the channel at a savings to the United States of $150,000. The State is currently expending over $3 million in rebuilding its bridge across the channel at Rio Vista in order to permit free passage of deep-draft water carriers serving the port.

Thus, it is clear that any comparison of the requirements of local interests with their accomplishments shows that they have met and exceeded every obligation they assumed.

Mr. Chairman, I am disturbed also by the clear implication in the committee report that the local interest costs have remained static while the Federal costs have increased. The fact is that the local interest costs have increased at approximately the same rate as those of the Federal Government. The report mentions only the cost of rights-of-way borne by the local interests. Pursuant to the agreement of assurance the local people are required to furnish various terminal facilities such as wharves, transit sheds, and so forth. Had this project been completed in accordance with the initial plans, these terminal facilities plus the rights-of-way, easements, and utility relocations could have been completed by the port district for slightly over $4 million. Because of the delay in completion of the project, these facilities and easements, and so forth, will cost over $13 million. Thus, had the project been prosecuted to completion on a timely schedule the initial bond issue plus the amount appropriated to the port district by the State of California would have been sufficient to cover all local costs. Because of this situation the port district must go before the voters in a few months for approval of a new bond issue of between $10 and $11 million. I might add parenthetically that these same voters will be called upon to approve a State water bond issue of $1.75 billion, plus other bonds for local financing for schools, improvements, and so forth.

Needless to say, the delay in the completion of the port project, with the consequent increase in the Federal and local costs, was in no way caused by the people of my district. Time after time they have begged to have the project placed on an economic and realistic construction schedule. They have been more than diligent in supplying everything required of them well in advance of the corps' need. As a result of the stretchout of this project they have been forced to bear a heavy burden of taxation to meet the costs of bond servicing, operation and maintenance, and other expenses. After 11 years they still have not realized any of the benefits of a deep-water port.

Not only would a revision of the apportionment of costs be unfair at this late date, but it would cause fiscal havoc. I know of no way in which the people could make an additional contribution. Neither do I know how the United States could accept an additional contribution even if it could be made.

Lastly, the requirements of local contribution established for this project are no different than those on any other navigation project of the same kind. If the Congress wishes to establish new standards of local contribution, it should do so at the outset instead of waiting until a particular project is nearing completion, and long after the fiscal patterns have been established.

TRANSFER BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Mr. Chairman, I feel just as strongly that censure of the corps for transferring $962,000 to the project during the current fiscal year was not justified.

I am convinced that the corps officials would have been remiss in their duties if they failed to make the transfer. The transfer was necessary to keep two extremely advantageous contracts under way. To curtail or shut down either of these contracts would not only have meant a dollar loss to the United States, but would also have made it difficult for the corps to secure favorable bids on future work. One of these contracts covered a 9-mile stretch of the channel. I doubt that the engineers have secured a dredging contract anywhere in the United States on as favorable terms, as may be seen from the following:

Corps of Engineers estimate	$5,896,700
Highest bid	8,530,500
Lowest bid	4,145,800

The low bid was, of course, accepted. It represented a saving of $1,750,900 to the United States. The cost per cubic yard of material under the agreement is 16 cents per cubic yard as compared to 27¼ cents as had obtained previously. Can there be any doubt that the corps acted prudently in transferring funds in order to save this contract?

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, it would grieve me if my remarks today were to be construed as a criticism of the Committee on Appropriations, or of any of its able and conscientious members. I have always found them to be fair and reasonable men. Certainly, they have been most understanding in treating with the problems of our growing State of California.

I do feel, however, that it is unfair to call upon the people of my district to make an additional contribution to this project when they have already exceeded every possible part of their agreement. There can be no doubt that the costs to the United States have increased because of the unreasonably long construction period. But my people, although they were in no way responsible for that delay, have likewise paid dearly because of it. What they originally thought would cost them $4 million will, in fact, cost them over $13 million.

For the reasons I have stated, Mr. Chairman, I take strong exception to the language in the committee report calling on the people of my district to make a greater contribution to the port project.

Further, I feel that the Corps of Engineers should be commended rather than chastized for employing the 15 percent transfer allowance when by so doing they served the economic interest of the United States.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding me this time.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee for an interpretation of the language on page 4, beginning in line 16, as follows:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by a law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated.

What is the meaning of that language?

Mr. RABAUT. This language goes to the basic mandatory limitation.

Mr. GROSS. Is this language designed to provide appropriations for projects not authorized?

Mr. RABAUT. No.

Mr. GROSS. Are there any projects in this bill not authorized by law?

Mr. RABAUT. There are some.

Mr. GROSS. Could the gentleman tell me what they are?

Mr. RABAUT. I would have to look them up. I would have to make a survey of the several projects.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to know what they are so that perhaps I could lodge a point of order against them.

Mr. RABAUT. The language says the money cannot be spent until——

Mr. GROSS. What language?

Mr. RABAUT. This language.

Mr. GROSS. I do not find that kind of limitation.

Mr. RABAUT. Let me give you a different interpretation.

Mr. GROSS. This language could be subject to a lot of interpretations. I do

not know that I ever saw more confusing language in an appropriation bill in my time here.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York who has had so many years of service on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TABER. This language was not used in the old rivers and harbors and flood control bills, but it has been used lately. It is a subterfuge to get around the limitation that the appropriation must be authorized by law. It provides that if it is subsequently authorized by law they can go ahead and spend the money.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, what the gentleman is saying—and I appreciate his fair and frank statement—is that this is a subterfuge to get around the provision which requires that projects must be authorized by law before appropriations are made for such projects.

Mr. RABAUT. And the money cannot be spent until they are authorized. So what is wrong about it?

Mr. GROSS. But the rules of the House prohibit an appropriation until the project is authorized by law.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. PILLION. I believe the language is intended to take care of a number of projects that are in an authorization bill that passed the House and is now pending in the Senate.

Mr. GROSS. And the rules of the House strictly prohibit that procedure.

Mr. PILLION. I appreciate that very much, but I wanted to explain the situation.

Mr. GROSS. I would still like to know how many unauthorized projects there are in this bill, the purpose of these projects and their cost.

Mr. RABAUT. Without getting too personal in the matter, would you want to strike this language out so that the money could be spent for unauthorized projects?

Mr. GROSS. No; but I will say to the gentleman that on the basis of the statement by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] I intend to offer an amendment to strike out the language beginning with "which are authorized by a law limiting the amount to be appropriated for, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated."

I would leave in the language:

No part of this appropriation may be used for projects not authorized by law.

That is the fair way to legislate, and the right way to legislate.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I need not express my great pleasure at the House approval of $2,500,000 to begin work on Yellowtail Dam. I am sure it is very evident. It has been a long uphill fight and I am confident that the Senate will concur in the appropriation of these funds.

While actual construction of any proportions will not be noticeable for about a year, I know that it will mean a great deal to the employment situation in eastern Montana. Yellowtail Dam will need a large laboring force during construction and the new industries, which we believe will follow the installation of the hydroelectric generating plants, will contribute to a stabilized employment situation.

Large projects financed with Federal funds often are governed by policies which protect the local market. Federal agencies have found it desirable to make local purchases and use local products whenever practicable. They also prefer to make use of the local labor market.

Montana has an abundance of skilled and unskilled laborers and I am hopeful that the contractors who will be constructing this multipurpose project will make use of this labor market. There are two Indian reservations close to Billings—the Crow and the Northern Cheyennes. These people are constantly plagued with unemployment. These people need work. I am sure that they can do the job if the opportunity is made available to them.

At the appropriate time I intend to propose to the Secretary of the Interior that he issue a policy statement setting forth preferential status for Indians from these two reservations whenever they can fulfill the qualifications of the individual jobs.

The Indians have received such treatment in other projects, both private and Federal, and I feel that I would be remiss if I did not endeavor to see that the Crow and Northern Cheyenne Indians got a break in this instance.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa have any further requests for time?

Mr. JENSEN. No further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, and when authorized by law, surveys, and studies (including cooperative beach erosion studies as authorized in Public Law 520, approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented), of projects prior to authorization for construction, $10,895,800, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $50,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland: On page 3, lines 20 and 21, strike out "$10,895,800" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,913,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I hope I may have the attention of the Members of the House as I present my views concerning the amendment I have offered to H.R. 12326.

While I wish to commend the committee for adding funds for 33 surveys, of which 26 are unbudgeted, I am deeply concerned by their failure to include for survey what I consider to be one of the most needed and most worthy projects in my district. One has only to study the map of the State of Maryland and the First Congressional District of our State to know that we are confronted by innumerable navigational problems. One only has to study the reports to Congress over the past few years to ascertain the fact that our harbor and channel improvements in the district have been seriously neglected.

In the amendment I have offered, the sum of $18,000 is added for a survey of the project known as the Honga River and Tar Bay project. Approximately 1,000 people dwelling in this immediate area, commonly known as Hoopers Island in my district, derive their livelihood from the two tributaries mentioned, which flow into the Chesapeake Bay. These residents own hundreds of boats valued at several hundred thousand dollars. Engaged in the seafood industry, these industrious, seafaring groups pour approximately one and a third million dollars annually into the economy of Dorchester County.

Gen. J. L. Person, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, in his report to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, stated, and, I quote:

This region is one of the most highly productive hard-crab areas in the Chesapeake Bay. * * * Water-borne commerce statistics for 1957 show that 21,640 vessel-trips were made over the Honga River and Tar Bay. * * * This is a 50-percent increase in traffic within the last 10 years. * * * It is considered that a review to determine the advisability of improvements for navigation on the Honga River is advisable at this time. * * * The estimated cost of this survey is $18,000.

Last year, I personally visited the proposed project with Col. Stanley T. B. Johnson, district engineer. Colonel Johnson concurred with me that it was deplorable that this area, which possesses such a large number of boats and does so much for the economy of our district, does not have one decent anchorage basin.

The colonel agreed that an adequate basin facility was sorely needed and that the dredge material from the harbor area could be used to build up the tenuous land strip connecting the two islands—a needy protection against possible human suffering and loss of lives. These residents have been extremely patient to obtain this essential improvement. Their patience over the years has been rewarded by damaged boats and the constant threat of inundation by the Honga and Tar Bay Rivers. Gentlemen, the health and welfare of these people are paramount. It is obvious to me that the growth of this area will not only be impeded by the reluctance of this Congress to grant the sum needed to initiate this project, but their very lives may be at stake as well, without prompt action.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee had very, very many of these requests for unbudgeted investigations and surveys. The committee selected the 26 which in their mind were the most warranted at this time, of which this was not one.

The request of the gentleman from Maryland is for $18,000. However, the total estimate of cost set forth by the Corps of Engineers is only $10,000.

It is in the category of the type of surveys that are authorized in the districts of many of the Members of this House. There is no reason why it should have been placed in any different category than it is in. There is a limit to the number of projects which the committee can make provision for and it has done its best to select those which appeared most justified at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this bill because I personally feel it is a good one. The committee is to be complimented on a magnificent job in its report on an appropriation bill which is extremely complex, and the effect on millions of Americans will be tremendous. However, I do believe there are a few instances where the actual need is greater than is provided for by the bill as reported. Fishtrap Dam, I firmly believe, is one such instance.

Each year the good citizens of the Big Sandy River Basin, at great personal sacrifice, come to Washington to plead with the Congress for relief. Only in the most recent years has there been any progress. A review survey of the Big Sandy was completed last year which gave final recommendation for a system of flood control dams providing complete protection to the basin. This included the John W. Flanagan, Fishtrap, and Haysi Dams.

We have in this bill sufficient funds to complete the planning of Fishtrap Reservoir in the amount of $349,000. This was the amount that was in the budget. We do not have any construction funds in the budget, but the Army Engineers state they can efficiently utilize the sum of $301,000 for construction during the next fiscal year.

In different sections of the country, of course, everyone thinks their reservoir perhaps is the most important one and, naturally, the committee has to weigh the feasibility, the economic advantages, and so forth. But in this particular area I want to state to the committee that there is not a section in the United States of America, and the records of the Army Engineers will bear out this statement, that has suffered to the extent that the Big Sandy region in eastern Kentucky has suffered from lack of flood control. The 1957 flood alone caused property damages to this area in excess of $40 million.

When I came to Congress 11 years ago I had in excess of 25,000 coal miners mining in excess of 25 million tons of coal annually. Today, instead of having 25,000 coal miners I have about 9,000 or less mining approximately 19 million tons annually, 6 million tons less than 11 years ago.

In this same area we have the highest insured unemployment rate in the Nation, and have had one of the highest unemployment rates in the Nation since 1952, particularly in Floyd and Pike Counties. Unless we do something to protect these people from floods, we are going to just prolong this high rate of unemployment that we have in the eastern coalfields today.

Now, not only did the 1957 flood cause considerable damage, but we have had these recurring floods that take place practically every year that do millions and millions of dollars worth of damage in this particular section. We cannot hope to ever diversify the economy of this area, until we do get some flood control in eastern Kentucky.

Mr. Chairman, I felt that I would be derelict in my duty if I failed to call the importance of early construction of this particular reservoir to the attention of the committee on this occasion. At the present time, much of a highly flood-prone area has no protection at all. Freedom from floods and a conserved, dependable water supply are vital to the security and economy of the basin.

In February 1958 we had a schoolbus accident in Floyd County, Ky., where a schoolbus carrying 50 youngsters left Highway 23 near Prestonsburg, Ky., and plunged into the stream swollen by floodwaters. The Levisa Fork of the Big Sandy was a raging torrent, in some places 30 feet or more deep. The schoolbus was traveling in the direction of Prestonsburg, Ky., and when the accident occurred the bus went over an embankment without turning over. On the edge of the river, several of the schoolchildren escaped through the rear door, catching onto some willow bushes and wading through the water up the bank onto the road. Shortly the entire bus went under and the remaining 26 children were unable to escape. This accident happened on Friday morning when the children were being driven to school in Prestonsburg. The bus was not found until Sunday at noon and had only floated down the river a short distance, but was completely on the other side of the river next to the bank when discovered.

The true tragedy of this disaster is that few, if any, lives need have been lost. Let me explain this. After the 1937 flood, to be exact, a comprehensive survey of the Ohio River Basin was made and four reservoirs were authorized to give the people in the Big Sandy section flood control protection.

I refer to the Dewey Reservoir which gives the city of Paintsville and downstream communities some flood control protection, but gives no flood control protection to the cities of Prestonsburg and Pikeville, Ky., and communities in between. At the same time, Fishtrap and Pound Reservoirs were authorized. If the Fishtrap Reservoir, along with the other reservoirs on the Big Sandy had been constructed before the accident took place, no doubt the river at this point at the scene of the accident would have been much lower. This is an area with between 40 and 50 inches of precipitation annually, much of which falls in severe showers and storms in the winter and early spring, similar to that in late February 1958, the time of the schoolbus disaster, which caused serious and severely damaging floods almost every year. Year after year our people drearily rouse themselves from the mud and wreckage, only to suffer the pangs of drought during the summer and fall.

In the event the Senate was to approve much needed construction funds in the amount of $301,000, I want to take this opportunity to request the conferees to go along. Not only do I believe this project has tremendous support in the Senate, but I feel this worthwhile project has much support among the membership of the House Public Works Subcommittee. Initiation of construction of Fishtrap Dam this year would be a fitting memorial to the unfortunate victims of the bus disaster of 2 years ago.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law; detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction); and not to exceed $1,400,000 for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for conservation of fish and wildlife as authorized by law; $662,622,300, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by a law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated for "Construction, General", in this Act shall be used on the project "Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth", for any purpose other than bank stabilization work: *Provided further*, That $500,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAMPLER: On page 4, line 16, strike the amount "$662,622,300" and insert in lieu thereof the amount "$662,807,300".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. I have a point of order against the language to be found on this

page. Will the discussion of this amendment abrogate my right to make a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct, it would. If the gentleman has a point of order, it would have to be urged at this point.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is trying to obtain recognition from the Chair to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman to make the point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language to be found on page 4, beginning on line 18 and into line 21, "or which are authorized by a law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated."

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that language on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. I make the further point of order that this is authorizing appropriations for projects not authorized by law.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote briefly from "Cannon's Precedents," page 63:

> As a general proposition whenever a limitation is accompanied by the words "unless," "except," "until," "if," "however," there is ground to view the so-called limitation with suspicion, and in case of doubt as to its ultimate effect the doubt should be resolved on the conservative side. By doing so appropriation bills will be relieved of much of the legislation which is being constantly grafted upon them and a check given a practice which seems to the Chair both unwise and in violation of the spirit, as well as the substance, of our rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to explain the language. The legislative committee has placed outside limits on the amount of money which can be spent in a given river basin. Such basin may have a number of dams or projects in it. Without the language these monetary limits could be exceeded by action on an appropriation bill, thus setting aside the action of the legislative committee.

This is strictly a limitation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out to the Chair that more than one member of the committee has admitted that there are appropriations not authorized by law, that this is a subterfuge, and I say, Mr. Chairman, designed to controvert the rule of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JENSEN. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I have been on the Committee on Appropriations for the past 18 years. I cannot recall when a point of order has ever been raised against similar language in an appropriation bill. The language is simply limiting an appropriation expenditure, providing that the expenditure shall not be made until such project is authorized by law. I fail to see, Mr. Chairman, where a point of order could lie against this language because it is purely a simple limitation of expenditure on an appropriation bill; nothing more, nothing less.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOGGS). The Chair is prepared to rule.

It so happens that almost an identical point of order to an identical paragraph was raised on June 18, 1958, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. It also happens that the present occupant of the chair was in the chair at that time. The Chair ruled then that the language was specific, that there was no question about its referring to the controlling phrase "authorized by law," and none of the appropriation can be expended unless authorized by law.

The Chair overrules the point of order and sustains the ruling made on June 18, 1958.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, I speak to this body at a time when the lives of many are in danger and the agricultural farmlands in the heart of the Wabash Valley are constantly being destroyed.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is quite clear, and I might add quite clearly needed.

In essence, the amendment would provide an additional $85,000, during fiscal year 1961, to begin construction on the Sugar Creek, Ind., levee. The amendment also would provide for the appropriation of $100,000 for the construction start of the West Terre Haute, Ind., local protection project.

I have been assured, Mr. Chairman, by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers that the corps has the engineering capability to utilize, during fiscal year 1961, the sum of $85,000 for the Sugar Creek, Ind., levee and $100,000 for the West Terre Haute local protection project which my amendment seeks to have included in the appropriations measure presently before the committee.

There is included in this bill $15,000 which has been budgeted for the completion of advanced planning and design on the Sugar Creek levee.

Mr. Chairman, last year, that is, for fiscal year 1960, the Congress appropriated and thereby invested approximately $45,000 in preconstruction and advanced planning and design for the Sugar Creek and West Terre Haute flood control projects. Approximately $15,000 was invested in the Sugar Creek levee and approximately $30,000 in the West Terre Haute levee.

It would be, I think, Mr. Chairman, only wise and judicious financial procedure to appropriate the additional $185,000 which my amendment would provide for these two vitally necessary flood control units, thereby insuring that last year's appropriation of $45,000 for the two units would not be wasted or, in other words, unsoundly invested.

Although last year there was some doubt that the necessary local cooperation arrangements could be obtained by the Army Corps of Engineers for construction start on the Sugar Creek and the West Terre Haute units, that potential obstacle has now been thoroughly removed.

With the legally constituted formation of the West Vigo Levee Association, the Army Corps of Engineers has received full assurances of local cooperation for the Sugar Creek levee as of January 27, 1960, and for the West Terre Haute projects as of March 3, 1960. The association and the city of Terre Haute is ready, willing and able to fulfill all local cooperation requirements including the assignment to the Army Engineer Corps, without cost, of all necessary lands, easements and rights of way necessary for project construction.

Preliminary studies of the West Terre Haute local protection project were begun in November 1959 and will be continued now that the Federal Government has received full local cooperation assurances.

Project study of the Sugar Creek levee was begun in November 1959, and field mapping commenced in January 1960.

The Sugar Creek levee is located on the right bank of the Wabash River, south and east of the town of West Terre Haute in Vigo County, Ind. The project would consist of the enlargement and improvement of earth levee and the provision of necessary drainage structures.

The Sugar Creek levee, authorized by the 1938 Flood Control Act, would provide protection for about 1,500 acres of agricultural land, of which approximately 1,330 acres in the Sugar Creek area were inundated by the flood of February 1959.

The West Terre Haute local protection flood control project is located along the northern, eastern, and southern edges of the town of West Terre Haute in Vigo County, Ind., and would consist of approximately 2.6 miles of earth levee and the necessary interior drainage facilities. The West Terre Haute local protection project, also authorized by the 1938 Flood Control Act, would provide protection to the town of West Terre Haute which was totally inundated to the depth of 4 feet in the flood which occurred in 1913. The amount of $100,000, provided for in my amendment, would be used to initiate construction.

The Army Corps of Engineers advises me that upon project completion the West Terre Haute levee unit would be approximately 8 feet high and that the Sugar Creek unit would be about 12 feet high; however, because of the higher elevation of the Sugar Creek levee the West Terre Haute unit would be slightly lower than the Sugar Creek project and contained within the Sugar Creek project, thereby affording protection both to the town of West Terre Haute and the area agricultural acreage.

Mr. Chairman, agricultural, private property damage and loss of life due to the consistently flooding Wabash River is now a matter of such common knowledge that I hesitate to restate many of the recorded statistics which would portray such widespread and lamentable devastation.

However, for purposes of the record I would recall to the Committee that the town of West Terre Haute has been flooded out for 3 consecutive years. Flood crestings are so frequent and so severe that Terre Haute no longer records flood levels at the 14-foot mark; the 20-foot mark now is the only recorded level. In February of last year floods along the Wabash caused 60 Indiana major highways to become literally impassable thereby totally isolating entire communities.

During the February 1959 flood, expenses and losses both in agriculture and property cost the people of the State of Indiana a computed total of approximately $1,663,000; a total of more than one-half million dollars was spent and lost in the immediate area in and around West Terre Haute, Ind.

Mr. Chairman, this rather staggering tally of expenses and losses describes only those incurred during the February 1959 flood. The 1959 flood has been preceded by 22 major Wabash River floodings, 9 within the last 13 years.

As I stated before the distinguished Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Committee on Appropriations on April 6, 1960, the spring floods have already begun and presumably Indiana again will be visited, as it has so many times in the past, by a wave of uncontrollable water waste, filth, disease, destruction, and loss of life. An interesting, although tragic fact, Mr. Chairman, is that losses in Hoosier property, agriculture, commerce, transportation, and other economic segments have amounted to over $65 million, over the years, just along the lower reaches of the Wabash.

Mr. Chairman, I urge in the strongest possible terms that the Members of the Committee adopt this amendment for the benefit of that vast number of people who live and work along the lower reaches of the Wabash River and for the benefit of the entire State of Indiana.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, on the Sugar Creek levee, I would say to the gentleman from Indiana, we allowed the request of the engineers for $15,000 for advanced planning. The West Terre Haute project, which by the way was given priority No. 12 by the State flood control land water resources commission, was not budgeted. Indiana has done pretty well in this bill. We allowed 19 budgeted projects in Indiana for a total of about $14 million. We added the Whitewater River study and planning for the Cannelton lock and dam, both of which were unbudgeted and were higher on the State's priority list. So, Mr. Chairman, I rest my case and ask for a vote on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WAMPLER].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. WAMPLER), there were—ayes 17, noes 50.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: On page 4, line 16, strike out "$662,622,300" and insert in lieu thereof "$658,092,300" and on page 5, line 8, insert *"Provided further,* That none of the funds in this paragraph appropriated shall be used for the construction of the Allegheny River Reservoir in Pennsylvania and New York."

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOGGS). The Chair has looked at the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, which reads as follows:

On page 4, line 16, strike out "$662,622,300" and insert in lieu thereof "$658,092,300" and on page 5, line 8, insert *"Provided further,* "That none of the funds in this paragraph appropriated shall be used for the construction of the Allegheny River Reservoir in Pennsylvania and New York.

The proviso is, obviously, a limitation on an appropriation bill. The point of order, therefore, is overruled.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, at the outset let me make clear that I am not opposed to a flood control project on the Allegheny River. That issue is not involved in this controversy. This issue has revolved for a long time between the Kinzua Dam being constructed here or nothing at all.

Three years ago Dr. Arthur Morgan, former TVA chairman, and former chief engineer of the Pueblo project in Colorado, and of the Miami Ohio conservancy project, began a study of this area because the Kinzua project would confiscate the heartland of the Seneca Nation. His objective was to determine if there was another feasible way of doing this for the same or less money. As he progressed in his studies the Congress became interested. They ultimately became so interested and he had so many good points to present that they ordered that there be a study to see if his proposal was feasible. This is the study that these gentleman talk about when they say that this project has been studied to death. The result of that study confirmed that the Conewango project was feasible; that it was a good project as far as the program of flood control was concerned and water augmentation. There are two main purposes of this project. One is flood control in seasons of high water. In that respect Dr. Morgan contends that his program would do a complete job. It would protect against any floodwaters 100 percent of the maximum probable floods. The other objective is low water augmentation. Conewango would clearly store three times as much water for this purpose as Kinzua.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I appreciate very much the remarks the gentleman has made on this situation, because Dr. Morgan, to whom he refers, is one of the outstanding and distinguished citizens of my district. The gentleman made reference to the fine work he did as engineer in what has been recognized as the most effective flood control project in existence; that is, the Miami conservancy, which protected the great Miami Valley from floods. The doctor originated those plans. We have great respect for him, and I have great respect for the gentleman in backing up his position and I shall vote for the gentleman's proposition.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman and I might say that I was told by a prominent authority in the flood control field, with reference to the project the gentleman mentioned, the Miami project, that when Dr. Morgan planned it the Army engineer in charge of the Ohio River division issued a special publication condemning flood control reservoirs in general and the Miami system in particular.

Dr. Morgan's plan was adopted eventually and it is, I understand, a model system for the entire country today. I thank the gentleman for his support.

The main purposes are flood control and low water augmentation. The study made by TAMS confirmed that Dr. Morgan's program was feasible. It would guarantee 100 percent flood control. The Army Engineers' plan would protect only 43 percent. The study confirmed Dr. Morgan's contention that Conewango would store three times the amount of water. They contend that this whole TAMS report has condemned the Conewango project. In fact, the report confirms the feasibility of the project. I am not an expert. I do not know whether what Dr. Morgan says is correct or not, but to say that his contentions have been studied is false. I quote Dr. Morgan when he was told by TAMS that they would not look into his particular project to run water through the Cattaraugus Creek. He stated:

I continued my inquiry and turned up other possibilities so much superior to make my earlier studies obsolete. When I asked fhe Tippetts engineers to look into it further, they replied that they did not have time to do so. They never made a general study of the situation, never qualified themselves to pass on the major limitation.

In connection with this water storage, the Chief of Army Engineers last fall himself said that there was going to be a critical water shortage in this Ohio River Basin by 1980, but we are choosing at this time to construct a project which will store only one-third what the Conewango project would store if what Dr. Morgan says is true. And Dr. Morgan has documented his conviction that the Conewango would cost $105 million as compared to Kinzua's more than $120 million.

It is not my contention to say that Dr. Morgan is right and the Corps is wrong; I simply say that with the public interest that is involved here Dr. Morgan deserves to have his claims studied; the residents of the Conewango Valley deserve an impartial study; and the Seneca Indians deserve such a study. The Congress should order such a study. Last year the House of Representatives and this great committee ordered such a study. It was the feeling after looking over these reports, that it was necessary, that there should be a further study; and the committee prevailed in that respect. Then the Senate eliminated that particular proviso. The project continued, but the project is in its very infancy, its preliminary stages; it has not gotten into any construction which cannot be essentially reversed for a small amount of money.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman can get time in his own right. I cannot yield at the moment.

With reference to the Indian question, and this is critical: We owe it to these Indians to make a fair, a full study before we take the heart out of their land. It is bad enough in this age of materialism for our people to lose faith to the degree that they put a price tag on honor, that because it costs a little more or because it is a little more expedient we will not do it to save the honor of George Washington, to save our own honor in our commitments to these Indians. Are we now to mortify the memory of the Father of our Country with a dark deed, born not of dollars but of impatience? We ought to study this alternative proposal. A competent professional engineer tells us there is a better and cheaper way than Kinzua to protect our people from floods. The Corps of Engineers has confirmed that there is a feasible way and that it does do more than the Kinzua; they contend only that it will cost more and the increased cost is not worth it. In this connection, the Chief of the Corps of Army Engineers sent to me in writing last Friday a full comment which, among other things, answered my question about the benefit-cost ratio of Conewango, as follows:

> Basic data are not available to the Corps of Engineers to support a reasonable estimate of costs for the Conewango alternative proposed by Dr. Morgan, and it has not been possible to determine a firm benefit-cost ratio.

They said last Friday there is no sufficient data to say precisely how much the Conewango will cost.

To proceed with the Kinzua project will destroy the whole heartland of the Seneca Indians. It will, I am told, destroy their nation.

Listen to the words of George Washington spoken directly to the Senecas in 1790:

> Your great object seems to be the security of your remaining lands; and I have, therefore, upon this point, meant to be sufficiently strong and clear, that, in future, you cannot be defrauded of your lands; that you possess the right to sell, and the right of refusing to sell, your lands; that, therefore the sale of your lands, in future, will depend entirely upon yourselves.
>
> Remember my words, Senecas.

This is George Washington speaking as President of the United States:

> Continue to be strong in your friendship with the United States and you may rely upon their kindness and protection. If any man bring you evil reports of the intentions of the United States, mark that man as your enemy; for he will deceive you and lead you into trouble. The United States will be true and faithful to their agreement.

Now, there is no contention here that we should refuse to construct a flood control project because of the Indians; if it is necessary and if it is most economical, why, yes, build. But today the decision is in your hands as to whether we should order a study which will give the Indians and the residents of the Conewango Valley a fair deal on the matter. The contention that there has been a previous study which covers the matter is not true.

We today are the sovereign representatives of George Washington in 1960.

We cannot at this stage salve our consciences by saying that it is necessary to break a treaty to protect our own people from floods. In the face of such clear, clean words of honor, spoken by our first President to the proud and stalwart Senecas 170 years ago, can any of us wash our hands and hearts, like Pontius Pilate, with easy rationalizations?

I ask for a favorable vote on my amendment.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House that this case has gone to the U.S. district court on January 11, 1957, the U.S. Court of Appeals on January 21, 1957, the U.S. district court on April 14, 1958, the U.S. Court of Appeals on November 25, 1958, and the Supreme Court of the United States on June 15, 1959. The Supreme Court refused to hear the case. So let us have the record clear as far as whether or not the Seneca Indians have had their opportunity in court.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I regret, more than you can possibly know, that it becomes necessary for me to oppose this proposed amendment. However, I must do so because of the preponderance of testimony developed in our hearings in favor of this reservoir.

I have attended all of the hearings on this particular project.

I listened to many hundreds of witnesses on this bill. I, therefore, believe I am fair in stating that the testimony of the proponents for the Allegheny River Reservoir greatly outweighs the evidence of those opposed.

Now, the chief reasons for opposition to this reservoir is because the Seneca Indians have a treaty dating back to, I believe, 1794, with the United States, and they felt that this treaty should not be broken.

As a matter of fact they have resisted for years the construction of this dam and would not grant the Engineers permission to make a survey. So much so that the Engineers had to go to the Federal court for a decision in the matter.

Now I am sure that no one who is familiar with me will accuse me of not being willing to help our Indians.

Those of you who have served with me on the Interior Subcommittee will attest to what I have at least tried to accomplish for them in their health programs and particularly in tuberculosis.

So I was not one of those who was determined to break a treaty.

Many treaties with Indians from all sections of our country have been changed, some of them having more at stake, if that were possible, than the Seneca Tribe in this instance.

I have already given you a résumé of a study I have had prepared by the Library of Congress.

I had the Library of Congress check on this for me and this is what they say:

INDIAN TRIBES WHO HAVE BENEFITED FROM DAM CONSTRUCTION

Flathead Indians of Montana: Receive compensation from a private company for use of damsite and flooding of reservation land.

Warmsprings Indians of Oregon: Receive compensation from a private company for use of damsite.

Fort Berthold Indians of North Dakota: Receive compensation from the Federal Government for flooding and other items connected with dam construction.

Nez Perce Indians of Idaho, Warm Spring Indians of Oregon, Umatilla Indians of Oregon, Yakima Indians of Washington: Receive compensation from Federal Government for flooding of fishing sites at Celilo Falls on the Columbia and construction of Dalles Dam.

Wind River Indians of Wyoming: Receive compensation from Federal Government for inundation of reservation land, in connection with Boysen Dam.

Standing Rock Indians and Cheyenne River Indians of South Dakota: Compensation for Oahe Dam on Missouri River.

Lower Brule and Crow Creek Indians of South Dakota: Compensation for Randall Dam on Missouri River.

Fort Peck Indians of Montana: Compensation of Fort Peck Dam on Missouri River.

Crow Indians of Montana: Projected Yellowtail Dam to carry compensation.

The source of the information given by the Library of Congress is taken from the Office of Indian Affairs, Federal Power Commission, and Army Engineers.

I am interested in saving life and preventing property damage.

The people of Pennsylvania towns below the proposed site of the Allegheny Reservoir have had many experiences from recurrent floods.

Surely we must recognize the rights of other Americans in those localities especially when our Indian friends can be recompensed by our Government.

This reservoir project is a unit of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Ohio River Basin and is the key unit in the reservoir system for the protection of the Allegheny Valley, the metropolitan area of Pittsburgh and the upper Ohio Valley.

Now my interest stems from the fact that this comprehensive plan was authorized by Congress in the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, again in June 1938, and modified by the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941.

Over 20 years of recurrent floods has seen, according to the testimony given us, the loss of 36 lives in 1936 and damages of $231,492,000 based on values at the time of flood occurrences—that is 1936 through 1956.

These damages and deaths occurred in the Allegheny Valley below the Allegheny Dam and in the Ohio Valley to the vicinity of Wheeling, W. Va. At least $25 million damage occurred from the last flood. So that over $250 million damages have occurred from 1936 to 1960.

It is estimated that on a basis of present day values the damages would exceed $750 million.

With the construction of this reservoir it is estimated that the city of Warren would have a 100-percent protection. In the 1956 flood Warren had a $4.5 million damage. It would also give substantial protection to Oil City and Franklin because it would control the upstream drainage from those towns.

This is one of a series of dams, to prevent a repetition of the 1936 disaster in the Allegheny and Ohio Valleys, of which 10 have already been constructed and which no opposition was encountered.

Every phase of this project has been explored and studied and its economic justification has been proven.

For over 20 years the Corps of Engineers have been studying this project and alternative plans.

Every one of us concerned with projects in our own districts have to depend upon the Army Engineers recommendations for those projects. They are the ones who, in my opinion, are best qualified to pass on the merits or demerits of a plan. Who are we to pass on a technical problem of engineering?

The opposition would have us believe that the witnesses they brought forth during our hearings in favor of diverting the waters of the Allegheny into Lake Erie were original and the best method. Why bless your hearts that was proposed in 1928—almost 32 years ago—and was considered by the Army Engineers in their early studies of the Allegheny Basin and was discussed in an unpublished report prepared by the Pittsburgh district at that time.

The findings of that report and subsequent reports may be briefed as follows: Diversion for flood-control purposes only is not economically justified; diversion for water power development would be of marginal justification; a major reservoir on the Allegheny River would be required in connection with any effective plan of diversion for flood control or power development; and the Allegheny Reservoir would not preclude the later development of water power by diversion.

So you can see that the diversion to Lake Erie proposition was given a great deal of study 32 years ago and many times since.

Now what other plan was considered? The Army Engineers in their studies of this reservoir considered the construction of smaller reservoirs at the selected site and smaller alternative tributary reservoirs. Comparison of the cost of developing a large volume of storage capacity in the Allegheny Reservoir with smaller volumes located in several tributary reservoirs is illustrated by the present-day costs of existing projects such as Tionesta Creek and East Branch Clarion River Reservoirs, constructed by the Corps of Engineers on tributaries of the Allegheny River. Based on an analysis made last year, storage capacity for the Allegheny Reservoir was indicated to cost $87 per acre-foot, as compared with $106 and $115 for the Tionesta Creek and East Branch Clarion, respectively. To substitute storage capacity equivalent to that in the Allegheny Reservoir in a number of small reservoirs would be more costly and result in substantially less effective control of the floods.

The analyses I just gave you were given me by Gen. J. L. Person, the former Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, now retired.

General Person is very well qualified to give us his opinion on this reservoir. Before being promoted to Assistant Chief of Engineers he was Chief Engineer for the Ohio Basin and is intimately familiar with all phases of flood protection in that area.

As far as I am concerned I shall take the advice of this fine engineer.

General Person said in summary:

Based on our studies of possible alternative measures, it appears that the Allegheny Reservoir as now planned provides the most practical solution of the flood problem in the Allegheny Basin. You may be assured that we are attempting to work closely with the Indians in order to arrive at mutually acceptable arrangements.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes, and I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to indicate my support of the amendment. It seems to me that a matter of honor involving a treaty of the U.S. Government entered into in 1790 should not be set aside for reasons that are primarily matters of financial consideration. The honor of the United States is, indeed, at stake. More than that, I think the problem of flood control can be met by other means. I am advised—I am not able to evaluate this with precision—that at least one of the defenses of this is that it provides a device for flushing industrial sewage down the rivers. We are involved in a larger program of attempting to clean up the rivers of the Nation. I think we should attack those problems frontally and not defend dams which are located with that in mind, rather than with the larger issues of the public health and safety in mind. Most especially I think the question of honoring a treaty with another nation should be observed at all costs.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, in closing debate on this amendment, I want to refer to page 822 of the hearings, part IV, where we pay tribute to Dr. Morgan. Everybody realizes what a great man he is, what a fine engineer, and what wonderful work he did in the Tennessee Valley. But after all, we must be guided by the Corps of Engineers that are assigned to us in connection with these works. It is from them we gain the knowledge on which we make our decisions.

As late as the 18th of this month we had an official statement from the Chief of Engineers on the testimony of Dr. Morgan. It reads as follows:

STATEMENT BY CHIEF OF ENGINEERS ON STATEMENT AND TESTIMONY BY DR. ARTHUR E. MORGAN CONCERNING ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR AND ALTERNATE PROPOSALS

In a statement, published in the fiscal year 1960 hearings on the public works appropriation bill, I presented to this committee an analysis of the major factors involved in my determination that the Allegheny Reservoir should be built in preference to the alternate proposals advanced by Dr. Morgan. The fact that I did not reply point by point to Dr. Morgan's voluminous argumentative statements, many of which are matters of judgment or opinions, which cannot be positively proven or disproven without expenditure of time and money far in excess of that necessary to arrive at a valid determination in this matter, seems to be taken by Dr. Morgan as verification that his arguments are sound and factual. I cannot, however, agree with his conclusions.

Let me say at the outset that every one of the points raised by Dr. Morgan has been carefully analyzed by members of my staff, and by me personally, and that I have conscientiously weighed all the arguments, both pro and con, before arriving at my decision. I respect Dr. Morgan's professional prestige and, of course, his right to express his opinions. The charges he has made on the competence and integrity of the Corps of Engineers, as well as the engineering firm employed by us to study alternate plans, are without foundation.

The record is so clouded by charges and countercharges, many of which are of small moment, that I would like to clarify the situation by citing a few basic principles that are followed by engineers in arriving at a solution to an engineering problem. The judgment factor is basic in such determinations.

(1) First, it is essential to establish what the project is intended to accomplish. In the case at hand, the primary objectives of the project are to provide flood protection to cities and towns along the lower Allegheny River, and to augment low flows on the river during dry periods. Design requirements are then tentatively established on the basis of examination of all available records, as well as hypothetical determinations of possible storm intensities.

(2) The next step is the examination of available sites which are capable of meeting the design requirements. The various possible sites are only studied to the extent necessary to determine which will accomplish the established objectives at the least cost. It does not follow that every possible site and various combinations thereof must be studied in complete detail to arrive at this determination. For a basin the size of the Allegheny, it would be a most time-consuming, costly, and wasteful procedure. It is in this area that the judgment factor must govern.

(3) Once the relative advantage of a site is established, further efforts are devoted to finalizing design requirements and to extensive investigation of the site selected to develop fully the engineering plans for the project, its estimated cost, and economic justification.

The general principles I have enumerated were followed in our studies of the Allegheny Basin and our initial selection of the Kinzua site. I might add that as early as 1928 the corps considered a plan involving diversion of water into the Conewango Basin and into Lake Erie but found the plan to be of marginal justification. Because of the intensive interest that was generated when Dr. Morgan revived the diversion proposal in 1957, I decided to have an independent appraisal of the relative merits of various possible diversion plans and the authorized Allegheny Reservoir. The firm of Tippetts-Abbett-McCarthy-Stratton was engaged to make the necessary studies. The engineering firm consulted freely with Dr. Morgan during the course of their studies, and studied five plans which they considered would cover the principal possibilities for storage in the Conewango Basin and for diversion into Lake Erie. The results of those studies have been furnished to this committee. In brief, the alternative plans were estimated by the engineering firm to cost from 25 to 38 percent more than the authorized project, would require the taking of from 51 to 108 percent more land, and require the dislocation of from 150 to 180 percent more people.

In my opinion, those studies were accomplished in sufficient detail to establish reasonable estimates of cost for the various plans considered and an adequate basis for comparing their relative merits. This does not mean that these plans were developed with the same degree of detail that is available for the Allegheny Reservoir. For Allegheny Reservoir, complete field investigations and surveys have been made, and essentially all major elements of the project are designed. The cost of developing the project to this stage is in the order of $1.3 million. Obviously five alternate plans, covering a much larger area and involving several major structures, diversion channels necessary to handle vast quantities of water, and many many more dislocations, could not be developed to the same degree of detail that was already available for the authorized project. Such was not possible within the limits of time and money. However, the engineering firm made subsurface investigations to the extent considered necessary for the design of structures and channels and for estimating unit costs, established highway relocations as determined necessary in consultation with State and county highway officials, reviewed land sales in the Conewango Valley as a basis for establishing land costs, and with those data on hand, developed five workable engineering plans.

After this study was completed, Dr. Morgan wrote me a letter in which he stated that in his opinion the cost estimates for the alternate plans were overstated, particularly with respect to highway relocations and unit costs for excavation. I met with Dr. Morgan in the office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Mr. Dewey Short, in July 1958 and at that time asked him to give me any facts he might have to support his opinions, which he agreed to do. In October 1958, some 6 months after the engineering firm completed its report, Dr. Morgan came to my office and gave me copies of a memorandum in which he advanced still another proposal, which he called plan 6. This was the first time Dr. Morgan proposed the Conewango-Cattaraugus plan.

In his own words, this was the same plan as the engineering firm's plan 1, except for the outlet into Lake Erie. In effect, he took the engineering design for plan 1, deducted items pertaining to the Silver Creek outlet, and substituted the Cattaraugus Creek outlet which he claimed was superior in all respects. He also deducted certain highway relocation items, which by his standards were not necessary. He then reestimated this combination plan by applying unit costs which were materially lower than those developed by the engineering firm to arrive at his estimated cost for plan 6.

I might add that apparently all this was done on the basis of Dr. Morgan's observations, without the benefit of detailed field investigations and surveys, and even more importantly, without developing a fully coordinated engineering plan. For example, Dr. Morgan established the maximum capacity of the outlet works and the channel from the reservoir to Cattaraugus Creek at 60,000 cubic feet per second and indicated that such a flow or an even greater flow could be carried down that valley with little difficulty. Our studies of Cattaraugus Creek in 1946 showed that the maximum flood of record at Gowanda, N.Y., was 35,900 cubic feet per second on March 17, 1942, when flood damages were experienced at Irving, Sunset Bay, Gowanda, and in the Zoar Valley. Lesser floods also caused damages at these locations in 1956 and 1957. It seems obvious, therefore, that the 60,000 cubic feet per second discharge from the Conewango Reservoir as proposed by Dr. Morgan, combined with postflood flows on Cattaraugus Creek would create a serious flood problem in the Cattaraugus Valley.

After careful review of all of Dr. Morgan's arguments, I could only conclude that his plan 6 could not be constructed at a materially less cost than the engineering firm's plan 1, which was estimated to cost about $142.3 million, or over $31 million more than the authorized project. Accordingly, I see no purpose in spending time and a substantial amount of money to study that proposal in detail as has been suggested by Dr. Morgan.

I have gone to considerable lengths to explain why I have taken my position with respect to Dr. Morgan's plan 6. Unless sufficient additional benefits can be uncovered to justifiy the added cost involved, it is obvious that the cheapest plan which will accomplish the desired objectives should be built. In my opinion, the authorized Allegheny Reservoir is the most economic solution by a wide margin.

On the matter of benefits, Dr. Morgan tells about protecting Pittsburgh from a flood three times as great as would Allegheny (Kinzua) Reservoir and storing three times as much water for flow regulation. However, his plan makes no provision for storing or discharging that amount of water. In my statement to this committee last year, I discussed fully the adequacy of Allegheny Reservoir for flood control and flow regulation. The small amount of annual benefits that can be evaluated by increasing storage capacities for flood control and flow regulation would not justify the added cost involved.

In conclusion, I consider that the matter of alternative plans has been adequately studied, and that the results obtained conclusively established the desirability of proceeding with the authorized project, on which construction has been initiated. I recommend that it be allowed to continue. No useful purpose could be served by further study of Dr. Morgan's plan.

With that I rest my case, Mr. Chairman, and ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GOODELL) there were—ayes 48, noes 74.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the inclusion of funds in this bill for the Dillon Reservoir project is a great personal satisfaction to me, but, more importantly, it is a demonstration on the part of the Appropriations Committee and the President of their interest in this project to provide flood protection in southeastern Ohio. The bill includes the full $4,223,000 recommended by the President for the completion of this $30 million project during the next fiscal year.

For more than 20 years, the Dillon project has been anxiously awaited by the people of Zanesville and the Muskingum River Valley. Each year, as floods have occurred or threatened this populous area, the hope for the completion of the dam has been renewed. At such ominous times, the specter of an uncompleted dam has seemed ironic to families who have witnessed the destruction of their homes and possessions by the raging waters of the uncontrolled Licking River. The recommendation for these funds this year can best be translated into terms which, in fact, recommend the future alleviation of fear, misery, and destruction. These funds will assure the completion of the dam and vast human benefits which it will bring to southeastern Ohio. Our action here today also is a major step in assuring the last project in the flood control envisioned many years ago for the Muskingum Conservancy District, a system of protective dams that has become an internationally admired model for flood control and its byproducts of human betterment through effective land conservation and recreation uses.

I wish to express today the gratitude of the people of southeastern Ohio to the Congress and the President as well as to the many others whose continuing faith in this project over the past two decades has brought it to the verge of reality.

I wish, too, to urge the House to approve this bill containing, in addition to appropriations for the Dillon Reservoir, $15,000 in funds for the initiation of a review by the Corps of Engineers of flood control estimates in the Licking River Valley. In view of the new protection the Dillon Dam offers, previous estimates for this valley are obsolete. The review, estimated to cost $40,000 to complete during the next several years, is, in my opinion, a proper expenditure which will consider the need for long-contemplated local protection plans and other flood control measures.

This bill also contains a recommendation for $250,000 in additional planning funds for the Belleville locks and dam

on the Ohio River. The modernization of the navigation dams on the Ohio is important to the maintenance of progress of the Nation's industry and commerce. This proposed replacement structure at Belleville is part of that vital process and, I believe, fully justifies the expenditure which this bill recommends.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 4, line 18, after the word "law" strike the remainder of the line and all of lines 19 and 20 and strike the following language in line 21 "hereafter authorized to be appropriated."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I must respectfully dissent and vigorously dissent from the ruling of the Chair that this language which I sought to have stricken on a point of order, is not as the Chair ruled legislation on an appropriation bill. I insist that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and the words very clearly show that it is legislation. It is language which authorizes appropriations not previously authorized by law. I ask you to read this language again, which is found on page 4, lines 18 to 21. I will reread it; "which are authorized by a law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter"—note the word "hereafter"—and the language continues, "authorized to be appropriated."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does not that language mean that somebody can come in 25 years from now and proceed to use money out of this fund?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is eminently correct.

Mr. TABER. That is what it says.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman from New York or the gentleman from Iowa believe that any money that is appropriated now would not be spent before 20 years? More likely it would be spent in 20 days.

Mr. GROSS. As I was pointing out, the language reads, "hereafter authorized to be appropriated." In other words, somebody at some later time is going to have to determine how the money is to be spent and where it is to be spent. Who is going to make the decision? This is strictly legislation on an appropriation bill and it ought to be stricken. Let me say in closing, Mr. Chairman, if the Members sustain this kind of language in this appropriation bill, they can be prepared for the worst when other appropriation bills come along.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, as previously explained on the gentleman's point of order, the legislative committees in Public Works authorization bills set a monetary limitation on certain river basins within which a number of projects are individually authorized. The purpose of the language in question is to prevent the possibility of appropriating in such a fashion as to set aside these monetary limitations established by the legislative committees. I, therefore, recommend that the amendment be defeated as retention of this language is a desirable control in the appropriations process.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 21, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood control, and related works, including such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality, or other public agency, outside of harbor lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation; financing the United States share of the cost of operation and maintenance of remedial works in the Niagara River; activities of the California Debris Commission; administration of laws pertaining to preservation of navigable waters; surveys and charting of northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straightening channels; removal of obstructions to navigation; rescue work, and repair, or restoration of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood; and not to exceed $1,915,000 for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for conservation of fish and wildlife as authorized by law; $126,420,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is apparent that the Members are not of a mind to approve amendments offered on the floor to add projects to the bill under consideration. I recognize that there is all but an unwritten rule to that effect with respect to the public works appropriation bill.

However, I feel compelled at least to call the Members' attention to a project in my district which has particular merit and which, I hope, will be added to the bill when it is considered by the appropriate committees in the other body.

I speak of the Manistee River and Harbor project. In a report dated December 15, 1959, the Corps of Engineers recommended the following improvements: First, dredging to a depth of 25 feet over the full width of the entrance channel in Lake Michigan, and to a depth of 23 feet in the Manistee River channel; and second, Federal participation in the cost of replacing the Maple Street Bridge over the Manistee River, with local participation.

The Corps of Engineers recommended that local interests participate in the cost of replacing the bridge—under section 6, Public Law 647, 76th Congress, as amended—to the extent of $154,100.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to say that the people of Manistee have already evidenced their determination and willingness to bear their share of the cost by voting, on April 4, 1960, to authorize the issuance of bonds for that purpose.

Although this project has been recommended by the Corps of Engineers and approved for authorization by the Bureau of the Budget, unfortunately, it has not yet been authorized by the Congress. There is good reason to hope and expect, however, that the project will be included in the authorization bill soon to be reported from the Public Works Committee of the other body.

Mr. Chairman, the improvements recommended in connection with the Manistee River and Harbor project are urgently needed and are already long overdue. Request has been made for planning funds for the project in the amount of $75,000.

I express the hope that appropriate action will be taken in the other body to fulfill that request before the end of this session of Congress.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 12326, the bill pending before the House today, includes a number of projects of considerable importance to the first district, as well as the central west-coast areas of Florida.

A number of these projects have been worked on diligently by local public officials as well as interested citizens and by myself, as Representatives of the First District embracing the counties of Pinellas, Hillsborough, Pasco, and Hernando.

I call attention of the House to those proposed appropriations at this time, which include:

CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

Tampa Harbor project, $117,000.

Construction of the Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee to Anclote River, Fla.—continuing, $2 million.

SURVEY FUNDS

Little Manatee River—restudy survey, $12,000.

Ybor and Port Sutton Channels, $6,700—improvements to Tampa Harbor.

Flood control survey, Four-River Basin study—Hillsborough, Withlacoochee, Oklawaha, and Peace River Basins, $100,000.

TAMPA HARBOR PROJECT

The Tampa Harbor project has already been physically completed as of February of this year, and the $117,000 item referred to above is for reimbursement for funds advanced to complete the project, bringing the total Federal appropriation for the Tampa Harbor project, including the $334,000 for the Hillsborough River clearance project to $14,530,000. This means that approximately 50 miles of channel from the Gulf of Mexico to Tampa and Port Tampa involved in this project has been completed to the authorized depth of 34 feet, and width of 400 feet, together with improved turning basins and channel bends. Already the tremendous benefits to the community are being realized in that the 1959 tonnage will approximate 14 million tons with 3,500 vessels entering the port and with anticipated further study growth foreseen. In the last 5 years since the project started, since 1954, the volume of port tonnage has increased over 4 million tons—an increase of approximately 40 percent. In this connection, I am happy to report also that the Examiner for the Interstate Commerce Commission, in his report on the

Tampa import-export rate case recommended that the railroad rate for import-export commodities to the port of Tampa should be reduced and should be at a rate comparable to other gulf ports and we are hoping for favorable action on this matter.

In 1959 the House Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, adopted an appropriate resolution directing the Board of Engineers to review the reports of the Chief Engineer on the Tampa Harbor project with the view of determining the feasibility of modifying the existing project to include Ybor and Port Sutton Channels improvement. Congress appropriated the sum of $27,000 for this survey report and a request of $6,700 was made this year to complete these surveys. Industrial development already resulting from harbor improvements, in that the industries require the availability of adequate shipping facilities, is estimated at over $160 million during the last 5½ years.

There is also under way, as the result of authorization by the Public Works Committee, a survey study on the McKay Bay, Tampa Harbor expansion proposal which would have the effect of doubling the port facilities and survey funds in the amount of some $70,000 which was appropriated for this purpose in fiscal year 1960. This survey is expected to be completed in the near future. Thus, Tampa Harbor promises to be one of the largest and finest ports on the gulf coast.

INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY

The $2 million appropriations for the Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee to Anclote, Fla., provides for a channel 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide and about 150 miles long, starting south at Ft. Myers and going to the Anclote River at Tarpon Springs, along a series of protected inside waters, bordering on the gulf coast of Florida. The total estimated Federal cost of the project is $8,800,000 for which appropriation was made in the amount of $389,000 for completion of engineering studies in 1959 and $546,000 in 1960 for commencement of construction. This year's appropriation recommended by the President of $2 million will complete four additional segments of this important waterway. The requested $2 million will be applied to the following:

Initiate dredging Alligator Creek to Dona Bay	$800,000
Initiate dredging Dona Bay to Tampa Bay	225,000
Continue dredging between Charlotte Harbor and Alligator Creek	740,000
Engineering and design	100,000
Supervision and administration	135,000
Total	2,000,000

FOUR-RIVER BASIN STUDY

Concerning the Four-River Basin study, Hillsborough, Withlacoochee, Oklawaha, and Peace Rivers, the Army Engineers recommended, in their supplemental budgetary requests, this survey based largely upon the 1959–60 flood disaster, the latter causing an estimated $40 million in damages.

The President, of course, declared the area involved as a national disaster relief area by proclamation on March 23, 1960, and all governing authorities are apparently unanimous in their support of this $100,000 Four-River Basin flood control survey approach.

This survey involves some 14 counties in Florida and my personal visitation of the area thoroughly convinces me of the necessity of proceeding with this matter expeditiously in order to establish a flood control plan to prevent such future disasters to the extent that it is possible.

The Hillsborough River survey resolution was passed on my request by the House Public Works Committee, dated August 14, 1959, and likewise, the Withlacoochee River resolution was passed on the same date, incorporating the 4 prior authorizations.

It is our understanding that the Oklawaha Authority, the Peace River Board, and the governing authorities in the Withlacoochee and Hillsborough areas are wholly in accord with this Four-River Basin study request and likewise have emphasized the absolute necessity for the commencement of this survey. Planning and programing by local, State, and Federal authorities for the control of overflowing water in the area is dependent upon the development of this comprehensive study.

I have requested that the flood control survey be all inclusive and in connection with this have asked that the Senate Public Works Committee include in the omnibus public works bill, which has passed the House, an authorization for inclusion of the following areas as a part of the Four-River Basin study to be included in the $100,000 appropriation made by this pending bill. Those areas include Brooksville, Masaryktown, Cote River, Anclote River, and Lake Tarpon, all of which suffered severe flooding conditions during the 1960 flood disaster.

LITTLE MANATEE

This project was authorized by the 1945 Rivers and Harbors Act and provides for a channel 6 feet deep and 100 feet wide from Tampa Bay to a point 2,700 feet above the railroad bridge at Ruskin, and 75 feet wide in the Marsh Branch with a turning basin 6 feet deep in the Little Manatee River at U.S. Highway 541 and Bridge Ruskin for a total length of 5.4 miles.

The Army Engineers report, as a result of my request that the matter be reconsidered in that the project had been put on the deferred list, that a restudy is justified due to the changes in prospective waterway movements and since the last study in 1952 found the project to lack economic justification. The corps further found that recent evidence of increased use and benefits to be realized from the improvement of the waterway justified the requested funds for this year in the amount of $12,000 to accomplish a restudy of the project to determine its current economic feasibility under present conditions. I am glad that this restudy has been included in this year's appropriations and am hopeful that the restudy will find the project economically feasible so it can be considered for construction money.

The Clerk read as follows:

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood control, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood, as authorized by law (33 U.S.C. 702a, 702g–1), $69,560,000, of which $171,300 shall be available for development of recreation facilities at existing reservoirs, to remain available until expended.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 6, line 16, strike out lines 16, 17 and 18.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the general membership of the House recognizes the value of flood control projects and the necessity for flood control projects in this county; certainly I do, for it was my motion which saved many projects last year. However, frequently the membership, I am afraid, overlooks the fact that when you build big dams you greatly help the territory below the dams. Those below get the benefit; the people and counties above the dams have their richest lands taken away and off the tax rolls. Without exception it is their richest lands they lose.

When I first came to Congress, four huge reservoirs had been authorized as one project, for construction in my area, with all the ill effects in my district and the benefits going to a small part of my district, but the major part to adjacent areas. Two of these dams had been built when I came here and of course, the Congress built the other two, against the wishes of the people above the dam.

Now when the Corps of Engineers got these authorizations through and when funds were appropriated, the people at the damsite and above the dams were assured that the Federal Government would help protect the watersheds and would develop the area around the dams, thus inviting use by the general public and partially offsetting the economic loss to the people and to the counties affected.

The dams were built in short order. The damage to areas above the dams was immediate; however, the other part, that which was promised to the people above the dams, has been slow indeed to come as the following statement from the testimony of the Corps of Engineers will show:

Status (Jan. 1, 1960)

	Percent	Completion schedule
Sardis Reservoir	94	June 1970.
Features for primary use	100	
Recreation facilities	37	Do.
Arkabutla Reservoir	90	Indefinite.
Features for primary use	100	
Relocations	77	Do.
Recreation facilities	17	June 1970.
Enid Reservoir	93	Do.
Features for primary use	100	
Recreation facilities	11	Do.
Grenada Reservoir	98	Do.
Features for primary use	100	
Recreation facilities	27	Do.

Now what was recommended this year by the Corps of Engineers and approved by the Bureau of the Budget is no great amount, nor is it for any fancy facilities.

Let us see what would be knocked out if this amendment were adopted.

Sardis Reservoir: Requested funds—$50,000—will be applied to:

Initiate and complete:	
Bituminous road surfacing (damsite)	$19,500
Roads, construction, and bituminous surfacing (damsite)	2,900
Parking areas, construction, and bituminous surfacing (damsite)	7,600
Comfort station (damsite)	12,000
Family camping facilities (various locations)	800
Engineering and design	3,000
Supervision and administration	4,200
Total	50,000

Visitation at Sardis Reservoir amounted to 922,500 visitor-days in 1958 which is an increase of 109,500 over 1957. Public use areas and facilities in vicinity of dam are extremely overcrowded and wholly inadequate, necessitating continued expansion. Requested funds are to continue the established program designed to meet demonstrated needs. Attendance for first 10 months of 1959 was 1,229,000. Total for fiscal year 1961 is expected to reach 1,500,000.

Arkabutla Reservoir: Requested funds—$70,000—will be applied to:

Initiate and complete:	
Parking areas and roads, bituminous surfacing (damsite)	$38,600
Parking area construction, and gravel surfacing (damsite)	600
Road construction and gravel surfacing (damsite)	600
Site preparation (various locations)	1,000
Guardrail (damsite)	1,000
Launching ramp (damsite)	11,400
Family camping facilities (various locations)	3,700
Comfort station (damsite)	3,100
Engineering and design	4,100
Supervision and administration	5,900
Total	70,000

Visitation at Arkabutla Reservoir amounted to 261,300 visitor-days in 1958, which is an increase of 7,300 over 1957. Public use areas and facilities in vicinity of dam are extremely overcrowded and wholly inadequate, necessitating continued expansion. Requested funds are to continue the established program designed to meet demonstrated needs. Attendance for first 10 months of 1959 was 276,000. Total for fiscal year 1961 is expected to reach 400,000.

Enid Reservoir: Requested funds will be applied to:

Initiate and complete:	
Bituminous road surfacing (Persimmon Hill)	$13,700
Comfort station (includes water and power) (damsite)	10,000
Tent and trailer campground (damsite)	5,000
Well (hand pump) (damsite)	500
Family camping facilities (various locations)	4,200
Ski ramp (damsite)	2,000
Parking areas, construction and gravel surfacing (damsite and Persimmon Hill)	1,600
Parking areas, bituminous surfacing (damsite and Persimmon Hill)	$1,200
Site preparation (various locations)	4,600
Engineering and design	3,000
Supervision and administration	4,200
Total	50,000

Visitation at Enid Reservoir amounted to 426,100 visitor-days in 1958. Public use areas and facilities in vicinity of dam are extremely overcrowded and wholly inadequate, necessitating continued expansion. Requested funds are to continue the established program designed to meet demonstrated needs. Attendance for first 10 months of 1959 was 379,000. Total for fiscal year 1961 is expected to reach 600,000.

Grenada Reservoir: Requested funds—$30,000—will be applied to:

Initiate and complete:	
Road construction and bituminous surfacing (damsite)	$15,900
Parking areas, construction and bituminous surfacing (damsite and Grenada Landing)	8,100
Family camping facilities (various locations)	1,700
Engineering and design	1,800
Supervision and administration	2,500
Total	30,000

Visitation at Grenada Reservoir amounted to 1,248,300 visitor-days in 1958, which is an increase of 146,300 over 1957. Public use areas and facilities in vicinity of dam are extremely overcrowded and wholly inadequate, necessitating continued expansion. Requested funds are to continue the established program designed to meet demonstrated needs. Attendance for first 10 months of 1959 was 1,241,000. Total for fiscal year 1961 expected to reach 1,375,000.

Now I have pointed out that this amendment would break faith with the people and counties in the area. Also may I add, we would be failing to provide a minimum of convenience to these 3½ million visitors, including protection of public health.

If this amendment were adopted it would not save a dollar. This amendment would merely make this money available for further flood projects or more expensive flood projects. Then we would have to make further expenditures to alleviate the conditions adjacent to the dams and above them.

What is involved here in this section of the country where you do not have park services like you have in other areas? Where you do not have forestry park service? Such national parks as exist in this area have to be provided by the Corps of Engineers. All that is here involved are merely short stretches of road and comfort stations for the people who visit the area. Last year we had some 3½ million people who visited this area. To not provide in this section the same type of comfort for American citizens who visit these areas would not be in keeping with what is done in other areas.

Again, if the amendment were accepted the Corps would have the money available for further flood control works. However, remember there is already $69-million plus for worthwhile flood control projects. It should be remembered that when these reservoirs were established the people in these areas were assured that the Government would try to make the project one with which we could live; that the Government would try to offset some of the ill effects. I remind you these items have had the approval of the Corps of Engineers, the President, Budget Bureau, and the committee.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. The gentleman from Mississippi is correct, as always. Years ago the people in these areas where these great lakes were established were assured they would be protected to some degree. I believe that the language we have in the bill is proper for it simply gives to the people in Mississippi an assurance by the Government of what was promised to them years back, and I certainly hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is not agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There is a lot of logic to what the gentleman says, is there not? He says they were given assurances years ago they were going to be protected, and now we are going to dump 3 million visitors on them.

Mr. WHITTEN. They are there now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All well and good, but in my section of the country we like to let them be cared for by private enterprise.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that the attracting of private enterprise into these areas to ease the people's ills will largely depend on the very things we want to do here in affording these minimum facilities in these projects, and any commercial enterprise that might develop would pay the Government for use of Government land.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Your people down there are enterprising, they are thrifty, they are forward looking; the gentleman knows they can make a mint of money out of the resort business.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, it has been over 10 years, and the Government is still trying to lease most of the area. This development will help the Government to make money by lease.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The Government has been monkeying with it, that is the reason. If you will let your own people do it you will get somewhere.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, this is only a small part of what was originally promised.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I have looked into this matter and after quite some study I must say I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] who, as we all know, is not liberal with the taxpayers' money. He has asked very

little for his district, but he generally gets what he asks for because he is conservative.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank my friend from Iowa. I trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects, to remain available until expended, $4,575,000, of which $3,375,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and $500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River development fund: *Provided,* That none of this appropriation shall be used for more than one-half of the cost of an investigation requested by a State, municipality, or other interest: *Provided further,* That $200,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, upon reading the report I gather the impression that no budgeted investigation project for the Bureau of Reclamation has been disallowed; the only cut has been the $50,000 in the foreign currency fund?

Mr. RABAUT. That is right.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the legislative committee which authorizes these public works projects, I have been studying the list of projects set forth in the report on this bill on which funds are appropriated. One of these projects is Decatur Bend cutoff, Iowa, and $155,000 is allocated in construction funds.

I understand that this project is not authorized, and furthermore, it has not been cleared through the regular channels. I also understand that the regular survey report, which is the normal method of submitting such a project to the Congress as in all other civil works projects, has never been made by the Corps of Engineers, which is the procedure other Members have to follow to secure appropriations.

To emphasize the inconsistency in this whole matter, I would like to call attention to remarks in the committee report—page 3—stating that the Appropriations Committee has consistently refused to appropriate "for purely recreational undertakings with no benefits to others than small boat users." The Decatur Bend project is in this category.

I want the RECORD to show, Mr. Chairman, that as a member of the Committee on Public Works, I strongly oppose appropriations for projects which have not been considered by our committee and on which no regular reports have been made by the Corps of Engineers. This committee refused to allow funds for the completion of Devils Kitchen Dam in the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge although the Government has spent over $4 million to date. Over 1½ million persons visited the Crab Orchard Refuge last year and we need the facilities of Devils Kitchen very badly in order to accommodate the millions of visitors, yet we find this committee appropriating money for projects not even authorized by law and denying money for needed projects such as Devils Kitchen. I am calling this matter to the attention of the House in an effort to urge the committee to be a little more consistent and fair to all of us. Thank you very much.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, $166,444,880, of which $90 million shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations of the House has recommended a reduction of $1,494,000 in the Interior Department budget as proposed for the fiscal year 1961 in connection with the Columbia Basin project in Washington. On page 27 of the report it is stated that the reason for this action is that at the moment there is no alternative to bringing new construction work on this project to a close until satisfactory amended repayment contracts have been executed.

I had intended at this time to offer an amendment to restore this cut in budgeted funds, but I have been sitting here today watching the fate of similar amendments and, therefore, feel that such action is futile. My only hope is that when this bill goes to the other body it will see fit to make the necessary restoration of funds urgently needed for construction work on the Columbia Basin project and that if it does the House conferees will look favorably on their action for the reasons I would like to place before you at this time.

These reductions, as applied by the committee, and the report bears this out, would stop all work not now under way except for minor activities at Grand Coulee Dam.

The Columbia Basin project is in a critical stage of development. The proposed construction work is entirely within the $281 million expenditure ceiling established by the existing repayment contracts for construction of irrigation works. Certain work, although not at this time under way, is badly needed in order to complete significant facilities important to efficient operation of the project. In light of the irrigation expenditure ceiling and making maximum use of constructed facilities, the Bureau of Reclamation revised its fiscal year 1960 program to reduce the project area from an initially planned 1,029,000 to 479,000 acres. The work scheduled under the fiscal year 1961 budget proposal includes only that development which would utilize canal capacity already existing. A cut of $1.5 million now would further cripple project construction, reduce the project area below 479,000 acres and result in a needless waste of funds already invested.

Now, I believe it is important that these cuts be restored for the following reasons:

First. East High Canal studies: By the end of fiscal year 1960, a total of approximately $900,000 will already have been invested in this work. The necessary studies are nearly one-half completed. Therefore, to suspend activity there at the beginning of fiscal year 1961 would result in the loss of many of the accomplishments to date. Furthermore, a technical nucleus of 25 experienced and carefully trained staff members would be lost. It has taken years to prepare these people for the work they are now doing on East High Canal. Resumption of the work at a later date, even within a year after its cessation, would require expensive reorganization and reacquisition of personnel. In addition, data being developed in the East High studies are essential to completion of amendatory repayment contracts with the three Columbia Basin irrigation districts.

Second. Irrigation Block 23: Development of this block in the South Columbia Basin Irrigation District is covered by the existing repayment contracts with those already in existence. Basic water supply works to serve it are already constructed. Only the lateral system remains to be built. The block is an integral part of the project area and is favorably located with respect to the project's largest city and principal shipping center. This is the only irrigation block scheduled for start of construction in fiscal year 1961 and contains 8,800 acres.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

I was speaking on the enlargement of Potholes Canal.

Third. Enlargement of Potholes Canal: Provision for emergency wasteway facilities from Potholes Reservoir is urgent. The proposed work represents a continuation of that already begun. Return flows to the reservoir from project irrigation have been increasing each year with the result that the reservoir may have insufficient storage capacity in event of a major flood. This could result in extensive damage to improvements in or near Moses Lake and Westlake. Restoration of the funds deleted from the program would allow for an additional contract enabling enlargement of an important segment of Potholes Canal in order to provide for carriage of water to serve lands already under development.

Fourth. Operators' quarters, irrigation block 80: Construction of facilities to serve block 80 is now under way. Completion is scheduled for June 1961. Without these proposed dwellings, personnel needed to provide ditchrider service to the area and to insure maximum protection for the Hope Valley and Frenchman Hills pumping plants will not be able to operate.

Fifth. O'Sullivan Dam and Potholes Reservoir rights-of-way: In event of a major emergency, the entire flow of East Low Canal would be routed to Potholes Reservoir. This procedure would result in flooding beyond presently acquired rights-of-way. It is extremely critical that the proposed funds for this purpose be retained.

I urge appropriation of the entire amount of funds requested by the Bureau of Reclamation for the Columbia Basin project in fiscal year 1961.

I again emphasize that what has been cut out here is a budget request of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, may I state to the gentlewoman from Washington that I think her statement today is very impressive. She is a very able advocate.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman.

We have just completed excellent hearings on the Columbia Basin project contract dispute before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]. As a result it is felt we are soon going to get some place in agreeing on an amendatory repayment contract. Therefore, I urge that you give consideration when the proper time comes to the restoration of this cut.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the position of the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee, I wish to point out that the crux of this situation is a tremendous miscalculation on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation in figuring the drainage costs when this project was set up. The project was set up on the assumption that the drainage cost would be a little more than $8 million. Now new estimates put the drainage cost at something more than $44 million. The reason this project is in trouble at this point and the money has been cut out is that new repayment contracts have not been signed. The Bureau of Reclamation is asking that the settlers absorb this additional $36 million in drainage costs. I think you can hardly blame the settlers for not accepting casually such an increase in the cost of their land. I share the hope of the gentlewoman from Washington that this money in the course of the legislative procedure here will be restored.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that amendments and points of order to the remainder of the bill be now in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does that prevent us offering amendments?

Mr. CANNON. All amendments to the remainder of the bill or points of order to the remainder of the bill now will be in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have an amendment on page 20 and another one over on page 21.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendments will be in order.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the committee what is the hurry in passing this $4 billion bill?

Mr. CANNON. We are not in a hurry to pass it, but we are reaching the latter part of the afternoon. If we can pass it in a little less time without unnecessary delay, why not do so?

Mr. GROSS. I am not opposed to that, but I think there ought to be adequate time to discuss any phase of any $4 billion bill that comes into the House.

Mr. CANNON. There will be.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the discussion of this public works appropriation measure, I cannot let this opportunity pass without calling to your attention the serious flood condition which exists at Great Bend, Kans., the largest city in the western half of the State, located near the point where Wet and Dry Walnut Creeks converge and empty into the Arkansas River. The city of Great Bend has suffered severe floods since the year 1915.

Great Bend has attempted to solve its own problem, and large sums of money have been expended to provide all the protection possible in the form of diking, channel cleaning, and straightening of these three systems. This protection has proven to be inadequate.

Mr. Chairman, authority is available for an investigation of the flood and related water problems along the Arkansas River in Kansas from Great Bend to the Colorado State line, though the President did not include an item in the budget which he presented to the Congress this year for this survey.

Only last fall, there was a most serious flood in the vicinity of Great Bend, leaving many families destitute. The city of Great Bend has been subjected to serious flooding from the Arkansas River and its tributaries for the past several years. I hope and pray that this same condition will not repeat itself in the immediate future.

I have urged that the sum of $30,000 be set aside to be utilized for this study. The Corps of Engineers has stated that from an engineering standpoint, considering this study by itself, without reference to an overall program, it could utilize this amount on this study in the fiscal year 1961.

I urge that this item of $30,000 be included in the public works appropriation measure as passed in the House in order that this work can proceed.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I would like to compliment the Committee on Appropriations, and support H.R. 12326, which appropriates funds for the Atomic Energy Commission under title III, at pages 20–24 of the bill. The bill contains funds vitally necessary to keep our atomic energy program moving ahead.

However, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Joint Committee, I would like to speak in favor of two important research projects added by our committee.

I understand that there are no funds in this bill for these two projects, but primarily because time did not permit them to be included in the budget after final action on the AEC Authorization Act.

Project 61–f–8, which was added to the AEC authorization bill by the Joint Committee, and included in Public Law 86–457 as approved by the President on May 13, 1960, authorizes $5,600,000 for construction of a materials research laboratory at the University of Illinois. This laboratory would make possible new research in the critical area of materials, which has been a roadblock in the atomic energy program. Special new materials and alloys are needed, capable of withstanding radiation, to meet special requirements in new atomic energy machines and equipment. The University of Illinois has been doing outstanding work in this field, but a new laboratory is needed in order to bring together the various scientists in different participating departments and make it possible for them to work together. The laboratory would permit increased materials research in the following areas: Solid state physics, theoretical studies, diffusion effects, solid state chemistry, magnetic resonance studies, theory of alloys, physical metallurgy, fundamental diffusion studies, and ceramics, and refractories.

The University of Illinois is eminently qualified to conduct additional work in

this field. The university has on its staff scientists who are leaders in the field of materials research, one of whom is a Nobel Prize winner. Scientists and engineers from a number of departments at the university are available to direct the theoretical and experimental work in this critical field.

The Research Division of the Atomic Energy Commission has repeatedly proposed the University of Illinois materials research facility. Each time the project was eliminated in the Commission's budget review process.

It is estimated that the laboratory would be able to double its output of Ph. D.'s in this critical area where more qualified scientists are urgently needed.

Project 61–f–9, also added by the Joint Committee, but not included in this bill because of shortage of time in the budget process, authorizes $2,200,000 for construction of a radiation laboratory at the University of Notre Dame.

This project has also been proposed several times by the Research Division of the Atomic Energy Commission. Each time it also was eliminated in the Commission's budget review process.

The group presently at Notre Dame has been engaged in basic research in the field of radiation chemistry for over 10 years. The radiation chemistry project at Notre Dame is the largest offsite chemistry project in the Commission's program. The laboratory is recognized as one of the most outstanding in the field, both as a research center and as a training center for graduate students.

The basic work conducted by the Notre Dame group on the effects of nuclear radiation on chemical reactions has had wide applications in many of the Commission's programs. The data developed already has been applied to the solution of problems in the field of power reactors. It has also been used in Commission studies of new applications of radioisotopes and nuclear radiation in the chemical engineering field. The basic research being conducted is also applicable to many fields in the biological sciences and in the study of radiation effects on biological systems.

In order to carry out this research, use will be made of a 2 million electron volt Van de Graaff electrical generator, two cobalt 60 irradiators consisting of 1,200 curies each, X-ray equipment, special research spectrometers, and many pieces of scientific and electronic equipment.

The construction of this laboratory would permit increased research efforts into the effects of radiation, including radioactive fallout, which has been of special concern to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Congress, and the public.

In summary, funds for these two projects would permit increased research in the critical areas of atomic materials and radiation effects. The Joint Committee believes them necessary and they have been approved in the Authorization Act, Public Law 86–457, approved by the President on May 13.

It is understandable that time did not permit these two worthy projects to be included in the budget after final action on the Authorization Act, but I am hopeful that funds may be added in the Senate, and agreed to in conference.

AIRCRAFT NUCLEAR PROPULSION PROJECT

I also wish to commend the Appropriations Committee for its decision to support the Atomic Energy Commission's nuclear-propelled-aircraft development program.

Since my last statement here on the atomic aircraft on May 5, 1960, international developments have accented the importance of proceeding with this project. The irascible Khrushchev made it quite clear to us last week that our competition with the Soviets is far from being on a peacetime basis. My conversation with Emelyanov, the man in charge of the Soviets' atomic energy program, during my visit to the Soviet Union last September, made it quite clear to me that one of the important fields of competition we are engaged in is the development of an atomic aircraft. Emelyanov was quite explicit in his statements to me on the importance the Soviets attach to the development of a nuclear aircraft engine.

I would like to invite your attention to some of the realities of the job of developing a nuclear aircraft engine. My purpose in doing this is to allay any thoughts that this job can be completed in a short time. The project is technically extremely difficult. It probably ranks in complexity with the most difficult technical problems we have ever attacked. An understanding of this is important and vital to the successful completion of this work. Accordingly, this work requires stability in the level of its support by the Congress and, foremost, a minimum of administrative interference of the type which has plagued this work in the past.

On May 5, 1960, the Research and Development Subcommittee of which I am chairman, of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in executive session reviewed the progress of work on the atomic aircraft with the Atomic Energy Commission. Although many of the subjects covered were classified I can report to you that important progress has been made. Many problems remain to be solved but the work thus far performed has relegated most of them from the realm of basic feasibility questions to straightforward engineering problems amenable to direct attack.

As you know, the development of a nuclear aircraft engine is presently proceeding on two engine cycles. One is the direct air cycle which is being developed by General Electric. The other is the indirect cycle, which is based on the use of a liquid metal coolant to transfer the heat energy to the air and which is under development by Pratt & Whitney. The important thing to keep in mind relative to this two-pronged attack is the necessity of proceeding with both phases of the work until sound technical data based on real hardware is available to permit a choice between the two on a sound basis. This decision, I must also caution you, cannot be made on the basis of sound technical data in a matter of a few months. This decision, if it is to be sound, must wait the development of the technical data I referred to which may not be available for a couple of years.

All of these points bring out the importance of recognizing the magnitude of the problems involved in this project and the need for providing the support required for their solution.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, title III at pages 20 to 24 of H.R. 12326 appropriates the funds necessary to keep our atomic energy program in a position of world leadership, both with respect to military and peaceful uses of atomic energy. I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the committee, Congressman CANNON, and the other members of the committee for their careful consideration and well balanced judgment in the appropriations for the AEC.

There are several projects which the Joint Committee included in the AEC Authorization Act for the coming fiscal year, approved by the President as Public Law 86–457 on May 13, 1960, which are not funded in this bill. I believe the primary reason for the omissions was the short time interval between final approval of the Authorization Act and the consideration of this appropriations bill. But I would like to describe briefly two of the projects considered worthwhile by the Joint Committee and obtain the comments of the Appropriations Committee chairman as to his position on these projects.

The principal project added by the Joint Committee to Public Law 86–457 was project 61–d–10, $13 million for power reactor plants for the Antarctic. During the hearings before the Joint Committee, representatives of the Navy and AEC testified that replacement and supplemental heat and power sources will be needed at our scientific bases in the Antarctic in the near future. Statistics furnished the committee indicated the extremely high costs of transporting diesel fuel to our bases at McMurdo Sound, Byrd, and Pole stations. In addition, the Navy stated that 17 lives, and equipment valued at $10,500,000, including planes, have been lost in logistic operations in support of these sites in the past 3 years.

AEC has had under development for several years compact and reliable atomic powerplants which could be ready for shipment to the Antarctic by November 1961, the beginning of the short construction season in the Antarctic. Data furnished the committee indicated that the capital costs of the atomic powerplants would be higher, but that the operating costs would be substantially lower, so that total expenditures would be equalized after 1 to 8

years, depending on the site, and thereafter savings would accrue to the Government.

Based on the data presented, the committee concluded that three to five plants, depending on operational requirements, are needed in the immediate future to support our Antarctic operations. The committee believed that the actual number and location of reactors to be constructed under the authorization of Public Law 86–457 should be left to the determination of the Commission, based upon the technical aspects of the reactor plants selected, procurement economics and, in consultation with the Department of Defense, the requirements schedule. Three reactors are contemplated, but more may be possible under the $13 million authorization.

As a result of the hearings, the Joint Committee concluded that construction of atomic powerplants in the Antarctic would result in an immediate savings in lives and equipment, a saving in spending after several years, and would enhance our national prestige by developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy in the Antarctic, where the United States is participating in scientific work with 11 other nations.

Since the hearings by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the subject of atomic powerplants for Antarctica, the Joint Committee has received a letter from Mr. Stans, Director of the Bureau of the Budget. This letter indicates that the Bureau has reaffirmed its belief that the Department of Defense should fund these atomic powerplants and has requested the Secretary of Defense to undertake a review of the advantages, economic and otherwise, of atomic powerplants in the Antarctic.

I believe that the Secretary of Defense can readily determine these advantages by reviewing the record of the hearings before the Joint Committee, and by means of technical data from his own staff responsible for support of the Antarctic projects, including Captain Coxe of the Navy, and Dr. Mooney, Deputy Director of the Special Office of Antarctic Projects.

If necessary, I think it should be possible to work out some method of transferring the funds between the two agencies. Since this bill is now before the Congress, I would hope, when it reaches the Senate, that the $13 million recommended by the Joint Committee for the Antarctic atomic powerplants might be added, and later agreed to in conference.

I would like to say a few words also about project 61–h–1, which the committee increased from $4 million to $5 million, a net increase of $1 million for installations for support of biomedical research in atomic energy. In 1957, and again in 1959, the Special Subcommittee on Radiation, of which I am chairman, held full and detailed hearings on the nature of radioactive fallout and its effect on man. These hearings demonstrated that more effort was needed in the biology and medicine program of the AEC to investigate fully and to understand the nature and biological effects of fallout.

For these reason, the Joint Committee recommended adding $1 million additional construction authority for facilities in the biomedical research field. Included in this project are such items as a nuclear reactor to furnish bursts of radiation for the study of the effects of radiation on animals, radio-biological laboratory facilities, animal quarters to study the effects of chronic radiation, and modification of existing facilities in this field.

Because of the short interval of time, it was not possible to include these items in the budget after the action of the Joint Committee, but I hope that this modest increase of $1 million in this important field of vital interest to the public can be added in the Senate and agreed to in conference.

As I stated at the outset, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Appropriations Committee has fulfilled its duties conscientiously and I support the bill. I hope that these two minor additions can be made in the Senate, as well as the two which Congressman PRICE will discuss, and which I support. If made in the Senate, I hope that these additional construction projects, considered very important by the Joint Committee, may subsequently be agreed to in conference.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 20, line 14, strike out "official entertainment expenses (not to exceed $30,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 20, line 20, strike out "$4,000 each" and insert "$3,000 each".

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The amendment proposes to reduce the amount that may be paid for two automobiles from $4,000 to $3,000. All other automobiles will be purchased within the regular limitation of $1,500. These two cars are not additions but for necessary replacement of two of the automobiles furnished the Commissioners.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to invite the attention of the Committee to the report accompanying bill, H.R. 12326, the public works appropriations bill for 1961. On page 19, under the heading: "Freeport Harbor, Tex.," I note that the Appropriations Committee recommended deletion of $899,000 budgeted for improvement of that harbor. The report states that the benefits from it are uniquely local in character and the Corps of Engineers has testified that it is likely that the beneficiaries would dredge the harbor themselves if the Federal Government does not do it.

I invite the attention of the Appropriations Committee to the seriously crippling effect of this deletion. The project is not uniquely local any more than are the ports of Texas City, Galveston, Houston, Port Arthur, Brownsville, or Corpus Christi; and to require the citizens of that community to pay for improvements which traditionally have been made by the Federal Government is exceedingly unfair.

I have read the testimony before the committee, and I can understand the committee's conclusion that perhaps local interests would furnish the money if the Federal Government did not. However, I have checked with the witness who gave that impression and he has assured me that he intended no such conclusion to be drawn from his remarks. He points out that the Government has kept competing ports on a competitive basis. It has done so in the cases which I have just mentioned.

Traditionally, the Appropriations Committee has looked with favor on community enterprises in which the local interests do spend some of their own money. I invite to your attention the fact that the navigation district which is concerned with the Freeport Harbor has, in recent years, invested $4 million in dredging the turning basin and in constructing two large docks and transit sheds and in purchasing the necessary equipment to operate them. They did not ask for one cent of Federal aid and now they ask only that they not be penalized in their relationship to competing ports.

This port, incidentally, handled in 1959, 88 foreign and 41 American large cargo ships. Just as is the case in the port of Houston, or Texas City, or Port Arthur, there is a considerable tonnage of oil which is moved in tankers. These vessels have, in recent years, been built larger and with greater draft.

Should the other body see fit to include this budgeted item in the Senate version of the bill now under consideration, I trust that the conference committee will take a careful look at facts which can be furnished to refute the committee's previous conclusions as evidenced by the paragraph on Freeport Harbor in the report.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend members of the committee for directing in their report that up to $2,100 of the funds recommended in the bill for cemeterial expenses be allocated for maintenance of the Federal graves in the Congressional Cemetery, which is located in Southeast Washington, D.C. The budget recommended allocation of only $750 for fiscal year 1961 for the maintenance of the 806 Government burial sites which are scattered throughout nine burial sections in the cemetery.

The Congressional Cemetery was established on April 4, 1807. The cemetery is under the ownership and control of the Washington Parish, Christ Church. From the beginning it was intended that this cemetery would be used in part as a burial ground for Members of Congress

and other officials of the U.S. Government. At the beginning of the 19th century, it was, of course, not feasible to transport human remains long distances for burial. Thus, it was essential that there be a burial ground in the Federal Capital which would be appropriate to receive the remains of Government officials.

The church made a gift of a large number of burial sites to the Federal Government. Three Presidents—John Quincy Adams, William Henry Harrison, and Zachary Taylor—all died in Washington and their remains were taken to, and briefly interred in the Congressional Cemetery pending removal to their home cemeteries. Most of the Senators and Representatives and other high-ranking Government officials who died in Washington prior to the establishment of the Arlington National Cemetery were buried in the Congressional Cemetery. Many of these were later removed to their home cemeteries. There are now in the Congressional Cemetery the remains of about 14 Senators and 42 Members of the House of Representatives.

The establishment of Arlington National Cemetery in 1864 and the development of improved methods to ship remains over long distances terminated the necessity for Government burials to be made at the Congressional Cemetery. No interments have been made in any of the Government-owned lots since 1902. As a result of this situation Congress has tended to lose interest in the Congressional Cemetery. For a time, the Army Memorial Division sent its own personnel into Congressional Cemetery to care for the Government-owned graves. The transportation of these men to and from the Congressional Cemetery obviously made this work expensive, and several years ago, the Army contracted with the superintendent of the Congressional Cemetery for the cutting and trimming of the grass on the Government-owned lots and the filling of any sunken graves. The superintendent of the Alexandria National Cemetery was delegated to straighten and clean and replace headstones when such work was necessary and will continue to do so.

I feel that we are taking appropriate action in making better provisions for the upkeep of the historic Congressional Cemetery and I have inserted the foregoing information with the thought that many Members would be interested in it.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, recent events have made it more evident than ever before that we cannot rely on diplomacy alone to maintain our position of eminence as a world power. It has become more obvious than ever that the only way to negotiate with the Kremlin is from a position of unquestioned strength. The President has stressed the fact time and again that our defenses are based on the maintenance of a balanced military potential. One of the integral factors in such a balanced military system, we have been told by the experts, is the existence of a strong manned aircraft program, and it is becoming ever clearer that the need for such a program will be with us for years to come. We have heard convincing arguments made for the advantages of manned planes which can be projected far into the future—antisubmarine patrol, airborne alert, super high level reconnaissance are only a few.

Our decision must be whether or not to continue in full force a program which will have a direct and important bearing on the future success of our manned aircraft arm and which may well have a tremendous significance in areas of military technology not yet even imaginable. Only last week Deputy Chief of Staff, Lt. Gen. Mark E. Bradley, told an Armed Forces Day audience in Hartford, Conn.:

> The primary reason for the continued use of the bomber is, of course, their capability for launch and recall, as well as their capability for airborne alert.

Noting that he was not directing his remarks to any specific type of aircraft, he said:

> It could be a nuclear type of plane, a mark III type such as the B–70 or something else—if something else is feasible. But whatever its shape and performance, the case for the next generation-manned bomber is obvious. This Nation simply cannot abandon the development of military aircraft.

For Congress to take a chance on anything less than a wholehearted effort in the direction of operational nuclear powered aircraft would have been unthinkable.

I have no doubt that those who opposed continuation of this project were convinced that their action to strike these funds was in the best interests of the Nation's taxpayers. I feel that we have a strong responsibility to look hard at this program to evaluate its efficiency, but I also feel we have been unrealistic in our insistence on demanding to know exactly where and in exactly what fashion the nuclear plane will be used.

General Bradley, you will notice, admittedly said:

> A nuclear type of plane—or something else.

It may be the something else will be more feasible. But if the nuclear type of plane does prove to be the one on which we must depend I would not dare to be on record as having held up the program to develop that plane for one day.

The record shows that this program has been one of starts and stops, of concentrations and cancellations, and Congress has not been blameless in this regard. This may have been unavoidable, but it also seems unavoidable to me now that we must maintain this project. It has been said often before, but it seems to me to have never been more appropriate, that if we must err, at least let us err on the side of strength.

In closing I would like to cite statements made by three eminent authorities on the subject of the nuclear powered aircraft.

Gen. Thomas D. White in a recent issue of the Air University Quarterly stated:

> The military exploitation of airborne nuclear propulsion will provide a significant increase in our future deterrent capability, an increase which must be realized if this capability is to remain effective.

In the same issue of the Air University Quarterly, Lt. Gen. Roscoe C. Wilson, Deputy Chief of Staff, Development, USAF, in writing on aircraft nuclear propulsion, stated:

> The possibility of missions of several days duration permits the effective utilization of as high as 50 percent of the force on air alert. The use of the manned nuclear bomber in a high-endurance weapons system on air alert permits flexible and positive timing, control and target assignment.

Lt. Gen. Robert M. Lee, vice commander of the Air Defense Command, in a speech before the American Ordnance Association on December 2, 1959, in New York City stated:

> Long-range aircraft with great endurance are a needed element of our diversified aerospace force. Many continuing and new roles for manned aircraft can be foreseen. They may be based on airborne missile launching techniques; attack against previously unlocated, hard to locate and movable targets, reconnaissance requirements, and possible participation in local wars.

From an address from General Thomas D. White, before the Institutional USAF Conference on Air Force ROTC Affairs at Maxwell Air Force Base December 9, 1959. Speaking on the Hound Dog and other modern air-launched missiles, General White stated:

> Perhaps of more importance, such weapons when carried by our present bombers and someday by nuclear-powered aircraft of practically unlimited range and endurance will provide our country with the highest degree of flexible and mobile striking power ever achieved. Far-ranging aircraft armed with these weapons will be able to conduct patrols at hundreds of miles per hour. They would be comparable in air coverage to that of a police squad car as measured against a cop on the beat. Such forces would be virtually invulnerable to surprise attack.

From remarks by Lt. Gen. Roscoe C. Wilson, Deputy Chief of Staff, Development, USAF, before the American Ordnance Association meeting in New York City, December 2, 1959. In speaking of the atomic-powered aircraft, General Wilson stated:

> This airplane is still some years in the future, but the promise of unlimited range and resulting operational flexibility keeps us extremely interested in obtaining a capability with this type of propulsion.

General Wilson in a speech before the Aviation Writers Association convention in Washington, D.C., on May 15, 1959, stated:

> Nuclear power will enable us to penetrate enemy territory at low altitudes and high speeds undetected by long-range radars and thus relatively secure from interception by enemy fighters.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair Mr. BOGGS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12326) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies

of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GOODELL. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOODELL moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back with the following amendment: On page 4, line 16, strike out "$662,622,300" and insert in lieu thereof "$658,092,300"; and on page 5, line 8, insert *"Provided, further,* That none of the funds in this paragraph appropriated shall be used for the construction of the Allegheny River Reservoir in Pennsylvania and New York."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. We cannot have the yeas and nays today.

Mr. PILLION. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I withdraw the request.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RABAUT) there were ayes 22, noes 90.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. By unanimous consent, the vote will go over then until tomorrow.

Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order of no quorum?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order of no quorum.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has passed the 1961 public works appropriation bill. The bill includes a $1,500,000 appropriation to begin work on the widening and deepening of the Baltimore channel. It also contains the sum of $103,000 for additional studies and planning for improving the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. Both of these sums are grossly inadequate, if we consider the importance of the projects to which they are assigned.

The urgent necessity for deepening and widening the Baltimore channel and the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal has long been recognized. The increased use of large, deep-draft vessels in world trade makes the improvement of these two vital arteries imperative. The depth of the present Baltimore channel is 39 feet, with a general width of some 600 feet. The Chesapeake and Delaware Canal is presently 27 feet deep, with an average width of 250 feet. The volume of traffic in the canal exceeds the safe capacity of that waterway, and there has been an unfortunate record of long delays, groundings, and collisions.

The U.S. Corps of Engineers, after extensive studies and surveys, has strongly recommended that Baltimore's channel be deepened to 42 feet and widened to 800 feet. The Corps of Engineers has also recommended that the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal be widened to 450 feet and deepened to 35 feet. These improvements would mean tremendous savings to ship operators, and would benefit not only the port of Baltimore, but also the port of Philadelphia, and all others using these waterways.

Congress recognized the need for the improvement of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal in 1954, when it authorized the deepening of the canal from its present 27-foot depth to a depth of 35 feet, and its widening from 250 to 450 feet. In 1958, Congress also authorized the deepening of the main channel in the Chesapeake Bay and Baltimore Harbor proper from 39 to 42 feet, and the widening of the channels from 600 to 800 feet.

Sufficient funds, however, have never been appropriated for these projects. The Baltimore Harbor project has the highest benefit-to-cost ratio, almost five to one, of any such project in the United States. In addition, the Maryland Port Authority and Maryland industries are spending millions of dollars to improve the facilities of the port. This tremendous expenditure of money and effort will be of limited benefit unless the channel is improved to allow the full range of modern vessels to enter the port and use its facilities.

The world seaport of Baltimore is the largest bulk cargo port in the United States. It is the second largest seaport in the United States in terms of total tonnage of shipping using the port. Baltimore Harbor has the largest combined deep-draft ore carrier and tanker traffic in the United States.

Baltimore's facilities for the handling of bulk cargoes is unequaled in any other port in the United States. The port area contains four huge modern ore piers, three large coalbins, three waterfront grain elevators with more than a 13-million-bushel total capacity and extensive modern facilities for the handling of fertilizer, chemicals, produce, and similar commodities.

The Locust Point Marine Terminal of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad is the largest privately operated marine terminal in the United States. The terminal yard has a capacity of 3,500 freight cars. There are 10 piers, a grain elevator with storage capacity of 3,800,000 bushels, a latex storage and receiving plant with a capacity of 1,750,000 gallons, and many other facilities. The Sparrows Point plant of the Bethlehem Steel Co. is the largest steel plant in America and the largest tidewater steel plant in the world. This huge plant requires over 30,000 tons of iron ore per day in order to fulfill its annual capacity of over 8 million tons of steel ingots. The list of similar and related port facilities and industrial plants is almost endless. In addition, Baltimore offers the finest facility on the east coast for the repair and servicing of merchant ships. The plants of the Maryland Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. and the Bethlehem Sparrows Point Shipyard make Baltimore one of the major shipbuilding and ship repair centers of the world.

Baltimore's port is unique among North American seaports in that it has two deepwater routes to the sea. The northernmost route is through the upper Chesapeake Bay and thence through the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal to the Delaware Bay. The other route is the southerly course down the Chesapeake Bay to the open ocean at Hampton Roads, Va.

The port of Baltimore, with its maritime and related commercial activities, is the dominant factor in the economy of the entire State of Maryland. The maintenance and expansion of the port is vitally important to the job security of some 600,000 persons employed in the Baltimore metropolitan area. Over one-third of Baltimore's industrial employment of 200,000 is direct port-connected employment. These waterfront industries employ over 65,000 persons who annually earn over $350 million in wages and salaries. Less directly, Baltimore's harbor is responsible for the employment of thousands upon thousands of people in inland areas of our country who work for freight forwarding and handling concerns and the countless industries who depend upon Baltimore as a source of vitally needed raw material.

In the 250 years of its existence, well over a billion tons of cargo from all over the world have flowed through this port in a constant stream, feeding the insatiable raw-material appetite of America's industrial complex. Each year some 6,000 ships carrying over 30 million tons of export-import cargoes serve this inland port. Baltimore has achieved worldwide recognition for its use of modern methods and facilities in cargo handling and its impressive record for safe and speedy servicing of vessels at its piers. The port of Baltimore can berth over 90 cargo-carrying vessels at the same time.

Baltimore offers special handling for specialized cargoes. The bulk sugar pier of the American Sugar Refining Co. has made possible the import of bulk sugar

where previously all sugar had to be shipped in in bags. The new $4 million fruit pier, owned by the Maryland Port Authority, can accommodate 50 freight cars and handle over 4 million bunches of bananas a year. All areas of the port offer integrated rail-to-ship and truck-to-ship piers for fast, efficient handling of cargo.

Maryland's congressional delegation has vigorously urged the adequate financing of port improvements. Last year the needed appropriation was denied because of the President's announced policy of opposing any "new starts" in public works projects.

This year the President's budget recommended $1,500,000 for the Baltimore Channel project, and $103,000 for the C. & D. Canal project. These requests are shortsighted, unrealistic, and woefully inadequate. Experts agree that at least $7 million is needed this year to even begin to ease the Baltimore Channel problem.

The administration's request for $103,000 for the C. & D. Canal project makes even less sense. This amount will only be for some additional planning studies; no construction work will be begun this year. The time has come to stop studying the problem and come to grips with it. The district engineer has stated that $1,200,000 can be effectively used at once to start work on improving the canal.

In addition to their tremendous economic importance, both the canal and the harbor project have particular significance from the standpoint of national defense. Use of the canal saves 286 nautical miles on the trip from Baltimore to Philadelphia. It also provides a protected inland route between the naval bases at Philadelphia and Hampton Roads, Va.

During World War II and the Korean conflict the port of Baltimore was extensively used for the shipment of equipment and munitions to our troops overseas. Our country becomes increasingly more dependent on foreign sources for strategic raw materials—particularly iron ore and petroleum. It is surely in the interest of national security that these materials continue to flow freely through this port.

In 1958, the Public Works Committee authorized $28,161,000 for improvement of the Baltimore Harbor channel. To date not one penny of this money has been spent. It we proceed at the snail's pace indicated by the President's request, it will take 18 years to complete the work.

In April of this year, the Maryland delegation, the chairman of the Maryland Port Authority, and representatives of Maryland industrial and maritime interests, appeared before the Appropriation Committee's Subcommittee on Public Works and testified in detail as to the value and vital importance of these projects, and the need for increased funds.

In spite of the longstanding support of the Corps of Engineers and the overwhelming evidence in support of the request for increased appropriations, the committee did not see fit to grant the increases so earnestly sought. I am sure the committee's decision was strongly influenced by the impending threat of another "no progress is allowed" veto. This opinion is borne out by the fact that the bill, as passed, contains no increases over Presidential recommendations for construction work.

Last year this Congress overrode the President's veto of the 1960 public works appropriation bill. My State received almost nothing from that bill, but I voted to override because I was convinced that the country's best interest would be served by a passage of the bill.

I intend to ask Maryland's Senators to urge their Senate colleagues to increase the appropriation for the port of Baltimore. If they are successful, I believe my colleagues in the House will recognize our need and approve the increased appropriation.

PEACE IS TOO IMPORTANT TO BE LEFT TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. SPEAKER, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Otto von Bismarck said war was too important to be left to the generals. We in the non-Communist world are presently painfully aware that peace is too important to be left to the generals.

Under the Constitution the conduct of foreign affairs is assigned the President. Peace, however, includes more than foreign affairs. It is an ever-changing totality of relationships, an atmosphere, a climate, and always with a direction. Peace is too important to be left to the President and the Department of State.

Adlai Stevenson said last week that it was "the duty of all thoughtful concerned citizens to help retrieve the situation and to face the hard, inescapable facts."

Last week on the floor of the other body three Members of the minority party expressed their displeasure at the activities of a thoughtful concerned citizen of Cleveland, Ohio, Cyrus Eaton.

Mr. Eaton had just conferred with Khrushchev in Paris following the breakdown of the summit conference. He was accused of meddling in the conduct of American foreign policy through personal meetings with officials of foreign governments.

One member of the other body directed the attention of the Attorney General to Mr. Eaton's activities for possible prosecution under the Logan Act.

I have never met Cyrus Eaton but I wish there were more citizens like him. His five famous Pugwash conferences have brought together scientists and scholars from all over the world. Of lesser magnitude but of more personal importance, Mr. Eaton paid my expenses to an unofficial foothills disarmament conference of parliamentarians from 15 nations in London last February—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 10, 1960, page 2382.

On June 4 and 5 in Stockholm I shall attend another such conference, also at his expense. Mr. Eaton attaches no strings. He wants to help the cause of peace. So do I as best I can. I am not sure that my presence at these conferences will make much difference but I believe, as does Mr. Eaton, that every citizen ought to do whatever he can to prevent the war nobody wants and everybody has reason to fear.

ONE-THIRD OF MY TIME FOR PEACE

When I first campaigned for Congress, I made but one promise. I said I would spend at least one-third of my time doing whatever I could, however little, in the interests of peace. I have kept this pledge and I intend to renew it to my constituents in the campaign this fall.

For the minority members in the other body to suggest prosecution of Cyrus Eaton under the Logan Act is preposterous. Nobody has ever been prosecuted under that legislation since it was enacted in 1799.

The Logan Act provides that any U.S. citizen who, without authority, directly or indirectly has any intercourse with a foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the conduct of the foreign government in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, shall be fined up to $5,000 and/or imprisoned for not more than 3 years.

The only constitutional application, in my opinion, would be where an unauthorized citizen attempted to negotiate with a foreign government with respect to a particular dispute or controversy. It is difficult to conceive of circumstances where any foreign government would undertake to negotiate with an unauthorized citizen with respect to such matters.

The gentlemen in the other body raising this issue, I suspect, are looking to the Logan Act as a means of restricting the efforts of citizens like Cyrus Eaton who believe that peace is too important to be left to the President, the State Department, the generals or anybody else.

The gentlemen in the other body, of course, have a right to differ with the opinions of Cyrus Eaton and to criticize his conduct. I do object, however, to their invoking the Logan Act as a reason for denying Mr. Eaton the right to express his opinions and to meet with whomever he likes.

HOW FAR DOES THE LOGAN ACT GO?

Perhaps these gentlemen would also contend that Adlai Stevenson and several of their colleagues on both sides of the Capitol have violated the Logan Act by meeting with heads of various nations.

Is it their hope that no private citizen and no public officer except from the executive branch will meet with the leaders of other nations and discuss common problems, especially those relating to freedom and peace? If this is their hope, and it seems to be, they should recognize their dream for the fatuous fantasy it is.

Because these gentlemen showed a lack of factual knowledge about Cyrus Eaton,

his opinions, and his career, I am appending to these remarks certain articles about Mr. Eaton. I also refer them to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 3, page 3014, where the late Senator Langer inserted an article from the Nation of January 31, 1959, about Cyrus Eaton and entitled "Cyrus Eaton: Merchant of Peace."

Communication among nations must increase, not decrease, if we are to attain peace and avoid war. We can disagree profitably. We should not seek a legal pretext for denying others the right to speak and act. In our crusade for peace we need all the help we can get. We have too few thoughtful and concerned citizens like Cyrus Eaton spending their talents, time, and money for world peace.

The following articles make it clear why we should encourage, not discourage, a man like Cyrus Eaton:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Mar. 6, 1960]

THE EATONS APPRAISE THEIR PEACE CRUSADE—WILL HISTORY NOTE THEIR MISSION?

(By Ted Princiotto)

Cyrus Eaton has been rich at least two or three times in his life but never richer than today.

His personal fortune, running into many millions of dollars, is the largest accumulated in a lifetime of assembling empires of corporate wealth.

He is married to a young, talented and vivacious woman half his age. She has given him zest for the most peculiar of the many controversial roles he has undertaken in his career.

His health is remarkable for a man of 76. He still enjoys horseback riding and skiing and romps through the woods. Not even his multitude of financial activities seems slowed.

With Anne Eaton, the attractive bride he took December 20, 1957, shortly before he became 74, Eaton has still another rich prize—the easing somewhat of world tensions in recent months.

Both he and his wife, who has become a full partner in his peace crusade, believe that the cold war is a little colder and that, to some degree, their crusade for friendlier relations with Soviet Russia has begun to pay off in world dividends.

What will history say of the self-proclaimed mission of the rich man and his pretty, young wife confined to a wheelchair who, like him, is engaged in sweeping intellectual debate?

Will it take note of the efforts of the philosophers of Acadia Farms, the Eaton farm estate in Northfield, Ohio, where, steeped in books and fireside reflections, they concern themselves with world problems?

Will history credit the Eatons as influential patrons of world peace?

Contemporary critics can only speculate.

In the last few years the slowly emerging image of Eaton, the capitalist, embracing the Russian bear, confused many Americans, not to mention the bear.

Eaton's pronouncements, widely publicized, were bound also to stir up dissent. He had two generally unpopular tenets: (1) Russia meant well and could be trusted; (2) the United States was the aggressor in the cold war.

He also praised Communist Russia, its leaders and the people and sharply criticized such popular American institutions as the FBI. Singled out for special attacks was John Foster Dulles, the late Secretary of State.

Such high officials as FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and former U.S. Attorney General Herbert Brownell were among officials who, in turn, criticized Eaton, House un-American activities probers nipped at his heels with a subpena, which never was served.

A great volume of letters to the editor kept the controversy stirred up in public print.

Then, after returning from their trip to Russia in 1958, both Eaton and his wife took to the stump, making speeches in this country before clubs—controversial speeches.

If little else, this intellectual onslaught from Acadia Farms had many Americans talking about the Eatons and about Russia, world relations, and the danger of war.

Within more recent months some background events of history seem also to have been made. There is meat for history, no doubt, in the largest single enterprise Eaton has undertaken, the world-famous gathering of nuclear scientists in Pugwash, Nova Scotia, the fishing village where Eaton was born.

And it would be difficult to disassociate from the Eaton controversy the visit to the United States last summer by Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev and the visit President Eisenhower will make to Russia in June.

FAMILIAR SETTING

At snowscaped Acadia Farms, where visits from a bold little chipmunk outside the library window these winter days delight the Eatons and their household staff, the Eatons were asked in an interview to appraise their work to date.

The setting was, the same as when such famous personages as Sir Charles Darwin, grandson of the British naturalist, and Anastas I. Mikoyan, the Deputy Soviet Premier, chatted with the Eatons on visits to Acadia—a comfortable library where, among Eaton's treasures, is a shelf of Darwin won by Eaton as a prize in his youth.

"President Eisenhower's visit to Russia," said Eaton, sitting near the fireplace, "will be a crowning event for our efforts. It will be the great climax.

"He will receive a warm welcome and will be impressed, I am sure, by their great progress."

Eaton first suggested that the American and Soviet leaders exchange visits in an interview with Khrushchev in Moscow on September 1, 1958, on the Eatons' Russian trip. Khrushchev had cut short a vacation to return to Moscow to see the Eatons.

Eaton said he believed the interview and his suggestion to the Soviet Premier were a large factor in events that led to Khrushchev's visit.

"You ought to see the United States," Eaton said he told the Premier. "And he said, 'I would like to see it.' "

Was his suggestion, so far as he knew, the first ever made for Khrushchev to come to this country?

"Yes, I think so—the very first time," Eaton replied.

Correspondents in Moscow cabled back stories of the interview, with mention of Eaton's suggestion. Both the New York Times and the Plain Dealer commented editorially on the Khrushchev-Eaton talks, but neither thought enough of the visit suggestion to explore it in print then.

On other aspects of the interview, the Times commented editorially: "To most of us it will seem a hopeless task that Mr. Eaton attempted in Moscow; to convince the Soviet leader that capitalists really do not want war."

Eaton himself believes he not only planted the seed for the visit but also had succeeded in doing what the Times considered his hopeless task.

"I believe I persuaded him it was untrue that the American economy was geared solely to expenditures for armament," Eaton related in the Plain Dealer interview at his home. "I told him what a tremendous burden in taxes it meant and that Americans do not like taxes."

On one aspect there is no dispute: President Eisenhower, himself, at his August 3, 1959, news conference made it plain it was his own idea to invite the Russian leader.

But the President noted that the idea was not entirely or uniquely his own.

ON ONE POINT CONFIDENT

But on another point the Eatons were confident of results. The nuclear scientists who gathered at Pugwash, they believe, made great contributions to the cause of nuclear disarmament and the temporary ban on nuclear tests.

"The Pugwash conferences for the first time assembled world nuclear scientists and led to world realization of the great destruction that a nuclear war could bring," Eaton said.

It was on December 27, 1954, his 71st birthday, that Eaton announced he was turning his ancestral home at Pugwash into a "Thinkers' Lodge," where at his expense scholars and other thinking men could gather to meditate in rustic quiet.

Pugwash, a hamlet of 500 inhabitants, is a tiny lobster and lumber-shipping village at the mouth of the Pugwash River. The white, frame lodge overlooks the Northumberland Strait. Eaton has made it quite famous. For a number of years it has been a gathering place for business, education and other leading men.

It was in 1957 that the first group of nuclear scientists, from both sides of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, first met there.

"For several years before," Eaton explained, "we had been host to Pugwash gatherings of scholars."

FIRST INVITATION

He recalled that when the Russians were invited to send a scholar to a 1956 meeting "they sent a very distinguished metallurgist."

He was Alexander M. Samarin, a member of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. and assistant director of the academy's institute of metallurgy.

(Jokingly, the Russian advised Americans trying to pronounce his name to say "Submarine.")

"For a Communist," Mrs. Eaton said, "he was a revelation to the rest of us. He didn't have the slightest interest in political ideology. The Russians apparently thought we were going to talk about steel."

Eaton denies the Soviets had anything to do with starting the nuclear conferences, although it was believed by many that Russian propaganda had most to gain by such a gathering.

"Einstein was responsible," Eaton said. "Einstein and Bertrand Russell, the British mathematician and philosopher."

A brief London news item in the New York Times, July 10, 1955, gave Eaton the idea of sponsoring such a conference.

The story told of an appeal by nine eminent scientists, including the late Albert Einstein, calling on nations to forswear was because the hydrogen bomb threatened the existence of mankind.

RUSSELL WAS LEADER

Russell, a Nobel Prize winner, was the leader of the group. Einstein's letter joining in the appeal reached London the day he died in this country in 1955.

The appeal called on scientists from the Communist and free world to join together to drive home to the average man the very real danger of extermination of the human race.

Eaton promptly wrote to Russell, offering to finance such a gathering at Pugwash.

"We couldn't hold it in the United States because they wouldn't permit the Soviets to come," Eaton said. "India, too, had been suggested."

Eaton won out on his suggestion of Pugwash, where on July 6, 1957, the first Pugwash Conference of Nuclear Scientists was assembled with a score of leading scientists present.

The Canadian Government, according to Eaton, had agreed to allow the meetings with the understanding that it relied on me not to have the meeting turn into a platform for anti-West propaganda.

FOUR RUSSIANS IN GROUP

There were four Russians in the group. Among the American physicists was Dr. Leo Szilard, of the University of Chicago, who worked with the late Dr. Enrico Fermi in producing the first nuclear reaction at the university on December 2, 1942.

Communists and non-Communists were a little ill at ease to begin with. The Russians, said Eaton, seemed suspicious.

"They apparently felt, 'Here is a capitalist,' and seemed reluctant," Eaton recalled. "They seemed very wary.

"But Anne, who was there that year," he recounted with a grin, "broke the Iron Curtain."

"Before dinner," Mrs. Eaton related, "one of the Russians offered to wheel me down to the lodge. Later Mr. Eaton and I played croquet with two of them, although neither of them spoke English and at the time neither of us spoke any Russian.

"By the time we were through trying to explain croquet, being helpful to each other, the ice was broken."

UNFORGETTABLE EXPERIENCE

For her the meeting was an unforgettable experience, Mrs. Eaton said.

"Here were many of the men who had to do with the creation of the bomb, sitting together to prevent its use," she observed.

In a formal statement, given worldwide publicity, the scientists said they came to the "unquestioned conclusion" that unrestricted nuclear war would be a disaster of "unprecedented magnitude."

They also held the time had come for scientists to consider "the implications of their own work," in creating the bomb and new nuclear weapons.

Inspired to rhetoric, Eaton said of the first conference: "The moral chain reaction touched off hopefully may affect the future of mankind as profoundly as that first nuclear chain reaction of 15 years ago in the laboratories of the University of Chicago."

The second Eaton-sponsored conference of the scientists was held at Lac Beauport, a ski resort near Quebec City, because the Pugwash lodge lacked central heating. The session was held from March 31 through April 11, 1958.

ANOTHER WARNING

Out of it came another warning of the consequences of a nuclear conflict and agreement that fallout from nuclear tests, in which the United States and Russia had been engaged for 6 years would be responsible for an increase of about 1 percent over the natural incidence of leukemia and bone cancer in the next few decades.

In a period of 30 years, they computed, there would be 100,000 additional cases of these diseases.

In a general war, the group held, "hundreds of millions of people would be killed outright by the blast of heat and by the ionizing radiation at the instant of explosion," whether clean or dirty bombs were used.

Pointed out also was the danger that intervention by a nuclear power into a small war might lead to use of nuclear weapons.

"It was before and after the 1958 conference," Mrs. Eaton said, "that all the good things began to happen."

REDS STOPPED TESTS

"Just before it was when the Russians stopped nuclear testing. Then, later the same year at the Geneva conferences, there was a general understanding on the reliability of methods to detect atomic explosions, a step forward in the negotiations to end tests."

The third Pugwash conference was held in Vienna in September 1958, under the auspices of the Austrian Government. Eaton a cosponsor, on his way home from his Russian trip, addressed the group of 82 men from 22 nations. The fourth conference, still retaining the Pugwash tag, also was held in Austria.

For the fifth, held last August, the scientists, their memberships not always the same, met at Pugwash to begin to point a new finger of danger.

This session assessed the dangers of chemical and biological warfare. The world was told:

"In agreement with the third Pugwash conference in Vienna, we repeat that, in the end, only the absolute prevention of war will preserve human life and civilization in the face of the chemical and biological as well as nuclear weapons.

"No ban on a single type of weapon, no agreement that leaves the general threat of war in existence, can protect mankind sufficiently. We therefore must look forward to a day when the preservation of peace will transcend the ambitions of individual nations."

HISTORY WILL JUDGE

History, too, will assess the value of these warnings.

The Eatons believe their peace mission possibly has been more impressive upon Russians than Americans. They spoke to millions while in Moscow via television.

"I'm sure the Russian people loved her," Eaton said of his wife.

In his native Canada, Eaton long has appeared to be a man of great influence, although he many years ago became an American citizen.

In the volumes of data accumulated by Eaton's aids on the peace program, one of the most recent is gratifying to Eaton.

It is a clipping from the New York Herald Tribune of February 21, headed: "Canada for Red-Style Test Ban." The subhead ran: "Ignores Controls Sought by West."

The story quoted a House of Commons speech by External Affairs Secretary Howard C. Green, in which he said the Canadian Government was opposed to further nuclear tests, period.

The implication was strong that Canada had broken with the U.S. position that, before any test ban, acceptable inspection systems must be agreed upon.

WHY CONTROVERSY?

With the comforts and pleasures of millionaires that are theirs, why have the Eatons troubled to invite controversy by their peace moves?

"I was active in business in both wars," Eaton said. "My only brother, a Canadian, died of wounds in World War I. My son, Cyrus, was a prisoner of war in the last war.

"I saw we did not accomplish what we thought we were accomplishing. I saw the terrible waste."

Another factor, he went on, has been his long association with the University of Chicago, which his benefactor as a youth, John D. Rockefeller, founded with gifts of some $75 million. As a trustee since 1930, Eaton indicated he was close to the university's work in development of the first atomic reaction and also came to know well Dr. Fermi and the other scientists.

His interest in Russia also backtracks to the university and to Samuel N. Harper, son of the university's first president. The son studied Russia and the Russians for 40 years and was a leading scholar on their modern history.

MRS. EATON'S INTEREST

For her part, Mrs. Eaton said her interest stemmed from the writings of Russell and other philosophers and, later, from reading the "Bulletin of Atomic Scientists," circulated among leading men in the field.

From 1948 to 1952, because of an attack of polio, she lived at Warm Springs, Ga. On her return to Cleveland, she resumed an acquaintance with Eaton, whom she had known as a small girl—"the only grownup I knew who was interested in poetry."

Out of their renewed friendship came the marriage that has made a world-famous team of the Eatons.

"Anne and I have been—shall I say, fellow students?—since she was 8 or 9 years old," Eaton said. "We have a great deal in common in books. She is a writer of poetry and possesses literary talent. She was interested in the meetings we were having."

Mrs. Eaton added: "I finally asked him how much of a thinker you had to be to be invited to one of the scholars' meetings at Pugwash. I was invited."

At these meetings she makes people feel at home, Eaton said.

Together, they keep busy in the continuing battle for changes in American policies.

NO BRIDGE, MOVIES, TV

"We have no time for bridge, movies, or television," Eaton said.

Eaton arrives home from his Terminal Tower office with the newspapers of the day early in the evening. By the time they chat, and perhaps have tea, have a late dinner and have read "everything we want to read for the night," it is 11 p.m. and time to retire.

During the day Mrs. Eaton keeps busy answering peace correspondence, with a secretary, and with household affairs. In recent months she has also been speechmaking.

"Both of us, fortunately, enjoy fighting for a cause. Too often, though, only the bad things we say about this country are printed. Mr. Eaton believes in our country and our system, and so do I."

At Acadia Farms, at least, there are two minds of one accord.

[From Current Biography, 1948]

EATON, CYRUS STEPHEN, DECEMBER 27, 1883– ——, FINANCIER

Address: Business, Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio; home, Acadia Farm, Northfield, Ohio.

As one of the partners in the Cleveland (Ohio) investment banking firm of Otis & Co., Cyrus S. Eaton has been a prime mover in the efforts of midwestern financiers to divert U.S. financial power from Wall Street. A holder of utilities, coal, steel, and ore interests, Eaton was among the country's outstanding financial operators until the depression, when he lost most of his assets. Gradually he reintegrated his holdings, and by 1947 was again known as sponsor of the Steep Rock Mines in Ontario, organizer of the compromise which formed the Cleveland Cliffs Corp. Eaton was one of the principals in the SEC investigation of the breach-of-contract suit brought in 1948 by Kaiser-Frazer against Otis & Co., following the withdrawal of the latter from sponsoring a new Kaiser-Frazer stock issue.

Cyrus Eaton's ancestry can be traced to a John Eaton who came from Wiltshire, England, to Salisbury, Mass., about 1640. In 1760, David Eaton, of the fifth generation, left New England to settle in Nova Scotia, there to found the Canadian branch of a family which includes many well-known individuals in the United States and Canada.

Cyrus Stephen Eaton was born in Pugwash, Cumberland County, Nova Scotia, on December 27, 1883, to Joseph Howe and Mary Adelle (MacPherson) Eaton. Originally planning to enter the Baptist ministry, young Eaton studied at Amherst Academy and Woodstock College. When he was 17, he visited his uncle, the Reverend Charles A. Eaton (subsequently, a U.S. Congressman and a U.N. delegate to the San Francisco Conference in 1945), in Cleveland, Ohio. The Reverend Eaton obtained a clerical job for his nephew on the estate of a parishioner, John D. Rockefeller. Eaton later returned to Canada to study and to receive a B.A. degree from McMaster University, Toronto (1905).

The following year Eaton was back in Ohio, where he started to work as an adjuster for the East Ohio Gas Co., "pacifying citizens who objected to having their lawns torn up for gas mains." Later, while he was buying up franchises in the Canadian Northwest for a utilities company, the panic of 1907 wiped out his employers' holdings. Young Eaton, taking up one of the canceled franchises, raised capital and built a powerplant. This marked his entry into the utilities field. In 1912 he began extensive consolidation activities among electric and gas companies in the United States and Canada, eventually amalgamating them into the Continental Gas & Electric Co. He was admitted to partnership in Otis & Co., the Cleveland investment bank, in 1916.

The consolidation of the Lake Shore and Garfield banks with the Cleveland Trust Co. in 1919 was accomplished by Eaton. A subsequent merger of four utilities firms (including the Continental Gas & Electric, of which Eaton was chairman of the board of directors) resulted in the formation of the United Light & Power Co. in 1923, a corporation registered in Maryland, serving 12 Midwestern States, and attaining, by 1929, assets of more than $557 million. The 13 subsidiaries of United Light & Power, as well as various rubber and steel interests of Eaton's, came into the orbit of Continental Shares, Inc., in 1926, when Eaton organized the latter corporation for the issuance of shares. Continental Shares, under the leadership of Eaton as chairman of the board of directors, held assets of more than a hundred million dollars 3 years later.

Against the opposition of eastern steel interests, Eaton gained a toehold in the steel industry in 1925 when he invested $18 million in the financially weakened Trumbull Steel Co. and was gradually able to expand his control. With this firm and other affiliates, such as United Alloy, Corrigan McKinney, and Youngstown Sheet & Tube, Eaton was instrumental in forming the Republic Steel Corp. (later the third largest steel company in the United States) having assets which amounted to $331 million in 1930, the year of its establishment. In the meantime, in 1929, he and W. G. Mather, another Cleveland financier, formed the Cliffs Iron Corp., which had controlling interests in six iron and steel companies. The following year Eaton also acquired important interests in the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., as well as large interests in the Firestone and the U.S. Rubber companies. Eaton's original interest, utilities, was not neglected at this time, as he entered into a series of negotiations with Samuel Insull which resulted in the sale of Eaton's shares in Insull's utilities to the latter, who was anxious to hold control of his organization.

An attempt by the Bethlehem Steel Co. to merge with Youngstown Sheet & Tube was bitterly contested by Eaton and his associates, but the moral victory attained when the courts, in 1931, declared the merger illegal, cost Eaton his private fortune, then estimated at a figure between $80 and $100 million. The collateral pledged by Eaton to the Chase National Bank was auctioned off in 1933, with the result that Eaton was left (in Time's words) with "little except his Cleveland securities house, Otis & Co." Through Otis, Eaton began, in the next few years, to reestablish his financial equilibrium.

By 1942 Eaton was able to purchase the Steep Rock Iron Mines, Ltd., in Ontario, the proven ore of which lay under a deep lake, for $20,000. With iron needed for war purposes, Eaton successfully negotiated a $5 million loan through the RFC, while the Canadian Government contributed an equivalent amount for docks, roads, and a railway spur line. Steep Rock ore was marketed by the Cliffs Corp., with the Premium Iron Co., Ltd. (organized by Eaton) acting as middleman and agreeing to purchase all Steep Rock ore for a 10-year period. Under Eaton's direction, a compromise was worked out early in 1947, when the representative of Robert R. Young's Pittston Co. on the board of directors of Cliffs Corp. challenged the management of the latter corporation. The Eaton solution resulted in the Otis banking firm buying Pittston's 34,500 shares in the Cliffs Corp., while the lawsuits challenging the valuation on Cleveland-Cliffs common stock were dropped. The Cliffs Corp., holding about $25 million worth of steel stocks, and the Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co., with its shipping, ore, and coal interests, were merged to form Cleveland Cliffs Corp., an operating and holding company organized with assets of about $90 million. Eaton was also associated with Young in an attempt to buy the Pullman Co.'s sleeping-car interests in 1945, but their bid was rejected.

Shortly afterward, Otis & Co. sponsored most of the $17 million worth of common stock for the Kaiser-Frazer Automobile Co., and, in 1946, underwrote more than a million shares of the Portsmouth Steel Corp., set up by Eaton to supply Kaiser-Frazer with part of the steel requirements for their automobile production. Eaton, however, withdrew Otis & Co. from further financing of a subsequent Kaiser-Frazer stock issue in February 1948, several hours after a suit had been instituted against the automobile company by one of its stockholders, James F. Masterson. The brief characterized the stock offering as likely to impair the equity of the existent common stock, to remit overly high profits to the underwriters (Otis), and to "dilute" the corporation's capital by the process of stabilizing the market. (The latter statement was in reference to K-F's purchase of more than $10 million worth of the issue on the day before it was placed on the open market.) When a breach of contract suit was entered against Otis & Co. by Kaiser-Frazer, the SEC began an investigation of the entire negotiation. Charges by the various companies involved brought in other firms concerned with the deal, as well as the role of the SEC. Kaiser's assertion that the Masterson suit had been arranged by Eaton was denied by the Cleveland financier. By June the matter had been drawn to the attention of the Senate Banking Committee, which voiced its intention of investigating the conduct of the SEC. "When a chief participant in a transaction (namely the SEC) is pushed into the position of chief investigator of that transaction," said Eaton in reference to the SEC official conducting the inquiry, "it is time for Congress to act."

When a Federal district court ruled in October that the lawyers representing Otis & Co. and its underwriting partners were not obliged to testify in the case, the SEC abandoned its plan to bring proceedings against Eaton. The agency, however, continued its investigation of the stock transaction. Early in November the Eaton firm requested the Federal district court to enjoin the SEC from continuing these hearings, which Otis & Co. contended would be prejudicial to its case in the pending damage suits brought by Kaiser-Frazer.

Eaton, who describes himself as a "humanist," numbers among his friends Professor John Dewey of Columbia University and Dr. A. E. Haydon of the University of Chicago (Haydon dedicated his book, Biography of the Gods, to Cyrus Eaton). The financier has written several pamphlets and magazine articles which explore political and economic issues in the United States. These include "The Third-Term Tradition," in 1940 (although a Republican, Eaton supported the Roosevelt administration); "Investment Banking Competition or Decadence?" (1944); "A New Plan to Reopen the United States Capital Market" (1945). Eaton has been sharply critical of many of the practices of American capitalism. He has fought for open and competitive bidding in utility and railroad financing; he renewed his attack against New York City investment groups, charging that they were preventing Cleveland firms from financing that city's utilities. In the April 1947 issue of the University of Chicago Law Review, Eaton wrote: "The casualness with which we capitalists seem willing, nay, even eager, to invite the collapse of our economic system in almost every industrial dispute for the sole purpose of thwarting labor is utterly incomprehensible * * * capitalism cannot survive without the support of labor." During the coal strike in the winter of 1946 Eaton was active as a behind-the-scenes conciliator. According to news dispatches, he conferred privately with John L. Lewis and with the mine operators in an effort to effect arbitration.

The directorates held by Eaton in the past were on the boards of Republic Steel, Inland Steel, Youngstown Sheet & Tube, the Cleveland Trust Co., and the National Acme Co.; in 1948 he was chairman of the board of directors of the Steep Rock Iron Mines, Ltd., and a director of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., the Cliffs Corp., Sherwin-Williams Co., the National Refining Co., and the Arlington Mills.

Among Eaton's other posts are trusteeships for Denison University, Chicago University, the Case School of Applied Science, Fenn College, the Cleveland Museum of Natural History, and the Cleveland YMCA. Fond of fine saddle horses and yachting, Eaton belongs to the Chagrin Valley and Summit Hunt Clubs, the Royal Nova Scotia Yacht Squadron, the Glenelg Fishing (Nova Scotia), the Chester and the Liverpool Yacht Clubs. He is also a member of the Union and Mayfield Clubs of Cleveland, and the Metropolitan of New York. Eaton was married to Margaret House in 1907 and is the father of seven children: Margaret Grace, Mary Adelle (Mrs. Fay A. Le Fevre), Elizabeth Ann (Mrs. Lyman H. Butterfield), Anna Bishop, Cyrus Stephen, Augusta Farlee (Mrs. David Hume), and MacPherson. According to P. J. Phelan-Rand, of the New York Sun, the strictly reared Eaton "to this day doesn't smoke, drink, swear, or wear jewelry."

[From Time magazine, Sept. 15, 1958]

TYCOONS—CAPITALIST AND COMMISSAR

Moscow's reddest carpet rolled out last week, not for a visiting Communist, but for a Homburged, blue-suited visitor who looked like what he is: A capitalist tycoon. On hand to greet the TU-104 jet that brought Cleveland industrialist Cyrus S. Eaton (Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, Steep Rock Iron Mines) were crowds of children bearing flowers, and Soviet Minister of Agriculture Vladimir Matskevich bearing official greetings. Three years ago Eaton gave

Matskevich's department a prize Shorthorn bull, which had nobly performed to improve the quality of Russia's herds.

The Russians had another reason to welcome Eaton: As a self-starting elder (74) statesman on a personal campaign for world peace, Eaton had been corresponding with Premier Khrushchev, had been recently praised by Khrushchev for his efforts to soften U.S. policy toward Russia. The Reds were plainly grateful for such help—especially from such a prize specimen of capitalist. At an agricultural fair, Eaton was presented with a gold medal for his great contribution to Russian agriculture. Later he was escorted to the Kremlin for a 1½-hour talk with Khrushchev, whom Eaton found a clean-desk man.

"I have heard," Eaton told the Premier, "the Soviet impression that American industry is in favor of war so that war orders will continue to flow. Speaking solely as a capitalist, we industrialists are not at all happy about spending $40 billion a year for implements of war that, if they had to be used, would mean the destruction of all our property, and our annihilation at the same time. Don't forget that this arms race places a crushing burden of taxation on industry." Khrushchev understood, "because of the expense to us of our own defense effort," but said: "We are being driven most reluctantly to these expenditures." To illustrate the U.S. desire for peace, Eaton told Khrushchev about Industrialist Andrew Carnegie, who amassed a fortune of $500 million, gave a great deal of it away to promote peace. To make this more meaningful, Eaton paused and asked the translator to convert the $500 million into rubles. Added Eaton: "I would like you to think of a man like Andrew Carnegie as being representative of American industrialists."

Later, Capitalist Eaton gave his impression of the Communist leader: "He is a man who is not to be pushed around. You get the idea when you're with him that he's the boss. I have spent most of my life persuading myself that I can read men and their minds. Of Khrushchev I am convinced that he wants peace. For Mind-reader Eaton, the Red boss seemed to have an equally high opinion. As a farewell present, he gave Eaton a troika, an old-fashioned open carriage, and three matched horses, plus a trainer's services for 2 months.

[From Time magazine, Jan. 19, 1959]

KHRUSHCHEV'S FAVORITE CAPITALIST: CYRUS EATON

While junketing around the United States last week, Russia's Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan put one courtesy call at the top of his list—a special visit to Cyrus Stephen Eaton, 75, Cleveland multimillionaire and Red Boss Khrushchev's favorite capitalist. Greeting Eaton, Mikoyan cooed, "When Mr. Khrushchev talked about you, his whole face was beaming."

Now in his twilight years, Cyrus Eaton is the archetype of the fading dog-eat-dog capitalist. Tall and slim (5 feet 11 inches, 175 pounds) with frosty blue eyes and arctic white hair, he dresses like Daddy Warbucks (blue suits, gray Homburg) and resides in manorial splendor on huge farms (champion Shorthorn beef cattle) in Ohio and Nova Scotia. His personal wealth is estimated at something like $100 million, and his hard-knuckled grip on U.S. industry extends over a $2 billion empire of iron and steel, railroads, shipping, coal, and paint. Cy Eaton picked up his empire by lone-wolf feats of financial derring-do that have brought him more bitter court fights, proxy wars and Government investigations than almost any businessman of his time.

The son of a Nova Scotia farmer from the herring-heavy shores of Pugwash (population 950), Eaton first thought of entering the ministry but soon changed his mind after a visit to his uncle, who was pastor of Cleveland's Euclid Avenue Baptist Church. One of the parishioners was Standard Oil Tycoon John D. Rockefeller, who gave the 17-year-old youth a job as a clerk on his estate outside Cleveland. Later, he got Eaton a position in a utility company. Eaton learned the business so fast that he was able to build a powerplant in Canada a few years later. By mergers and purchases, he shortly controlled a utilities complex in which $2 billion was invested. By 1925 he was so rich that when he decided to refinance a small steelmaker called Trumbull Steel Co., he could say: "Gentlemen, if you have any doubt about my ability to underwrite the financing, just call the Cleveland Trust Co. and ask whether my check for $20 million will be honored."

Five years later, with Trumbull and other small companies as a base, he founded Republic Steel Corp. as the Nation's third biggest producer. That year he also won control of Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. Operating from his Cleveland-based Otis & Co., a securities firm, and a maze of holding companies, Eaton's deals were faster than the eye—or most financial experts—could follow. He helped topple Utilityman Samuel Insull by outfoxing him in a deal that cost Insull companies $56 million.

The depression clipped Eaton's wings but not his tongue. Railing at Wall Street and the "New York money ring," he became a New Dealer and prounion, as well as a violent enemy of Ohio's Senator Robert A. Taft because Taft's early isolationism was "a policy as fantastic in theory as it is impossible in practice." Eaton prevented the Taft family from merging Cincinnati's Enquirer with their successful Times-Star by lending the employees $7,600,000 to buy the paper from the management.

During the 1930's and 1940's, Eaton was busy parlaying what he salvaged from the depression into a second fortune even bigger than the first. With the financial help of RFC, Eaton diverted an Ontario river and drained a lake to get his huge Steep Rock iron-ore mine working, went back into steel by forming Portsmouth Steel Corp. with holdings in Detroit Steel and Cleveland-Cliffs Iron, helped that other great RFC beneficiary, Henry J. Kaiser, bankroll his ill-fated auto venture. Then, at a critical moment, Eaton backed out of a deal to underwrite $11.7 million worth of new Kaiser stock. (The court fight lasted four years; characteristically, Cy Eaton won.) One of his biggest deals: helping the late Robert R. Young win control of the New York Central Railroad in return for control of the profitable, coal-hauling Chesapeake & Ohio.

Eaton maintains that "what the world pays most attention to is success," and as a financial success he thinks the world should also listen to his political opinions. Perhaps the world is a little skeptical of them, but there is every reason why Khrushchev should agree. According to Eaton, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles is preaching "insane fanaticism," West German rearmament is "begging for trouble," recognition of Red China is "only common sense," and the U.S. position on Hungary is "stark hypocrisy." Says Eaton: "A truculent trinity of politicians, generals, and journalists are relentlessly driving us to war. * * * The only people in the United States who believe that communism is a menace are the boys on the payroll of the FBI."

POPULATION EXPLOSION

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in the course of extensive studies undertaken by the Committee on the Judiciary in the field of international migration and immigration into the United States we are paying particular attention to the worldwide problem of natural increase of population.

A foremost authority on that subject, Prof. Philip M. Hauser, chairman of the department of sociology, University of Chicago, has recently made a comprehensive presentation of the population problem when he addressed the Conference on World Population Emergency Campaign held at Princeton, N.J.

I believe that my colleagues in the House will find Professor Hauser's presentation worthy of their attention, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have his remarks inserted in the RECORD at this point.

POPULATION AND WORLD POLITICS

(By Philip M. Hauser, chairman, department of sociology, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., presented at the founding Conference of the World Population Emergency Campaign, Princeton, N.J., March 20, 1960)

Population is today receiving more attention than at any time since the publication by Malthus of his famous "An Essay on Population" in 1798. Population problems have become of increasing concern to the United Nations and the specialized agencies, to national governments, to a wide spectrum of public and private organizations, and to the public at large. Some aspects of the problem have received great publicity in the national and international press. Especially is this true of the controversy about birth control, which invokes emotional reaction because moral and religious values are involved. Of all the implications of rapidly growing populations which are under consideration, none is more important than the world political implications. For present and prospective explosive rates of population increase have world political implications which may determine the future way of life, and the very existence, of mankind.

The political implications of world population growth may be considered in two categories: first, the global, and second, the international.

THE GLOBAL

By "the global" is meant the kind of problems that transcend national boundaries—the kinds of problems with which world government, if we had one, would be concerned. A good example of this type of problem is that posed by fallout in nuclear explosions.

The global political problems created by contemporary rates of population increase may be considered in their long-run and short-run aspects.

In the long run the limiting factor to population growth is, without question, the limit of space on this finite planet. Of the some 200 million square miles of surface on this globe, approximately one-fourth is land. Of the land surface, approximately a tenth is arable and another tenth is potentially arable. The population that can be supported on this earth is necessarily a finite one, limited by the approximately 50 million square miles of land surface on the globe.

Since the end of World War II, world population has been increasing at the rate of about 1.7 percent per year. At this rate of growth, let alone the higher rates that are

projected by the United Nations, a population of 1 person for every square foot of land surface on the globe would be reached in less than 800 years.

If in addition to the problem of space alone, is introduced the idea of the capacity of the earth to carry population, that is the capacity as measured by ability of the world to provide food, fibers and other requisites for human life, the longer run implications of present rates of growth become even more compelling. The highest estimate of the population carrying capacity of the globe ever published by a responsible scholar is 50 billion. This calculation, by Harrison Brown, is based on two extreme assumptions. The first is that enough control of solar and nuclear energy could be achieved so that every "thing" needed for human life could economically be captured from the sea, the atmosphere or rock. The second assumption is that mankind would be content to use algae or manufactured yeast as his major foodstuffs. At the present rate of world population increase, this maximum population of 50 billion could be reached well within 200 years.

Projections of this type, of course, do not indicate what will actually come to pass. They are merely arithmetic exercises. But they do serve a useful function. They indicate that the present rate of world population increase cannot possibly be sustained for long. For the less than 800 years which would result in one person per square foot of land surface on the globe, while a long time as measured by an individual life span, is but a mere instant in the time perspective of the evolutionary development of man. And the less than 200 years during which the population would reach the maximum number the earth could support is but a fraction of human history—a time equivalent to that which has elapsed since the drafting of the Constitution of the United States—a period of less than six human generations.

Without question, however, the more urgent problems associated with world population growth are the short run ones. In the short run, the political implications of present global population growth center largely around economic factors, and particularly the world level of living. This is recognized even by those who tend to minimize the problems arising from explosive population growth and who affirm that what is required to deal with present population increase is a more equitable distribution of world resources. A brief analysis of the facts, however, point to a quite different conclusion.

In 1950, drawing on United Nations statistics, the world had an aggregate production of goods and services which permitted a per capita income of $223 per year (adjusted for revised population estimates). The per capita income of North America was $1,100, and that for Europe (excluding the USSR) $380. The hopelessness of effecting an appreciable increase in the average world level of living by means of a more equitable distribution of the world product, is apparent in the answer to the following question: How many people would the aggregate income of the world in 1950 support at the North American or European levels of living?

The total world product of goods and services in 1950 could have supported approximately 500 million persons at the North American level of living; and some 1.5 billion at the European level. The actual world population in 1950 was 2.5 billion. Although this is admittedly an oversimplification of the problem, the difference between these figures may be taken as indicating either world overpopulation in 1950, or of world shortage in the production of goods and services. This kind of arithmetic, rough as it is, adds up to a very significant conclusion: Although a completely equitable distribution of the world's product would raise the level of living of the underprivileged peoples, it would produce a world average living level less than three-fifths that of Europe and only one-fifth that of the United States. An appreciable increase in the level of living of the underdeveloped nations cannot be achieved merely by means of a more equitable distribution of the world's product. On the contrary, what is required, is a tremendous increase in the productivity of most of mankind. But as we shall see, contemporary rates of population growth, make the prospect of raising world productivity, and thereby average world level of living, a dim one indeed. The relationship between population increase and levels of living may be better perceived by an examination of the international implications of population growth.

THE INTERNATIONAL

The international implications of population growth may also be thought of in their long-run and short-run aspects. The long-run problems of individual continents or nations is essentially the same as that of the globe as a whole. At any of the rates of population growth that now exist, or are in prospect on a continental basis, space becomes the ultimate limiting factor. The time required for individual continent or nations to exhaust their living space, will, of course, vary. But in the perspective of either man's development or history, it would in each instance be a relatively short period of time.

Of much more immediate concern than this long-run factor, however, are the short-run international implications of the population increase. The major short-run problems arise from the interplay of the following four factors:

1. The differences in levels of living among the peoples of the world have, in our generation for the first time in the history of man, become felt differences. There are no areas left on the face of the globe that do not feel the differences in levels of living that exist between the have and have-not nations; and that are not insisting on attaining higher living levels plus independence, where independence has not yet been achieved.

2. The limited evidence that is available indicates that the gaps that exist between the have and have-not nations of the world are probably increasing rather than decreasing.

3. The world is experiencing a phenomenally rapid urbanization of population. Moreover, the rate of urbanization during the course of this century, has been, and will continue to be, much more rapid in the economically underdeveloped areas of the world than in the economically advanced areas.

4. We live in a politically bipolar world. The two largest and most powerful combination of nations ever assembled in the history of man—the free bloc led by the United States and the Communist bloc led by the U.S.S.R.—are engaged in an awesome competition on ideological, economic, social, and political fronts. This gigantic struggle is being witnessed by a third group of neutral or uncommitted nations, the allegiance of which is being sought by the two competing blocs.

The interrelationships of these factors help to explain the significant international political implications of contemporary population increases. Let us proceed to an analysis of the play of these factors.

In 1950, North America and Europe combined, with about a fourth of the world's population, had over 70 percent of the world's total income. At the other extreme, Asia, with 53 percent of the world's population had less than 11 percent of the world's income. Per capita annual income in the United States today is well above $2,000, in contrast with India or China where it is well below $100. These great differences in levels of living underline many of present day world tensions that threaten peace.

The gap in levels of living between the have and have-not areas of the world, moreover, is probably increasing. The economically advanced nations have the savings, the technology and the skill relatively rapidly to effect even further increases in productivity and, therefore, in average levels of living. The economically underdeveloped nations, with an inadequate base of savings, technology and skill, if they can increase productivity at all can do so only at much slower rates. The gap between the advantaged and disadvantaged peoples of the world is, therefore, likely to increase rather than decrease during the decades which lie ahead.

This general outlook is further darkened by a consideration of differences in population increase, and the role of population growth in economic development. For the projections of population increase made by the United Nations for the remainder of the century, when considered in relation to differences in levels of living, indicate a remarkable inverse relationship. The lower the level of living, the greater is the prospect of rapid population growth during the remainder of the century. During the fourth quarter of the century, for example, while population in Latin America is estimated to increase by 3.8 percent per year, Asia by 3 percent, and Africa by 2.8 percent, Northern America is slated to increase by only 1.2 percent and Europe (including the U.S.S.R.) by 1 percent per year.

The burden which rapid population increase imposes on the efforts of the economically underdeveloped areas to raise their levels of living may be seen by analyzing prospective population increases in relation to present and prospective national income.

The world as a whole, according to the United Nations "medium" population projections, will increase by 2.1 percent per year in the third quarter of the century, and by 2.6 percent per year in the fourth quarter. That is, world population will increase about 2½-fold during the second half of this century to reach a total of 6.3 billion by 2000. With this population increase, world aggregate income to match the 1950 per capita income of North America must by the year 2000 be increased twelvefold. To match the more modest per capita income of Europe in 1950, world aggregate income by the end of the century must be increased fourfold. A decrease in world population growth to 0.5 percent per year, the rate experienced between 1800 and 1850, would decrease the task of raising the aggregate product of goods and services by 75 to 80 percent.

A similar type of analysis shows that Latin America, with a population increase projected for the remainder of the century at 3.4 percent between 1950 and 1975, and 3.8 percent in the last quarter of the century, would have to increase her product eightfold to match the 1950 European level of living by the year 2000; and 23-fold to match the North American level of living. The projected rates of increase for Africa would require a 13-fold increase in continental income to match the 1950 European level of living by the year 2000, and something like a 38-fold increase to match the North American level of living. Asia, to match the 1950 European level of living by 2000, would, with her prospective rates of population increase, have to increase her 1950 aggregate income by a factor of 21; to match the North American level she would have to increase aggregate income by a factor of 62.

Calculations of this type, rough and oversimplified as they are, nevertheless demonstrate that contemporary and projected rates

of population increase in the economically underdeveloped areas impose impossible burdens upon them in their efforts to raise their levels of living.

This conclusion has a special significance in the context of the politically bipolar world. There is an intense competition between the free and Communist blocs of nations to win the allegiance, or the neutrality, of the uncommitted nations of the world which in large measure are also economically underdeveloped nations. Curiously enough, the world political situation has an interesting population dimension in that about a third of the world's peoples are to be found in each of the groups of nations—the free bloc, the Communist bloc and the neutral bloc, respectively. Since most of the uncommitted peoples are in south and southeast Asia, this area has, in the postwar world situation, assumed major strategic importance.

In the intense struggle, each side is employing powerful weapons. The weapons of the Communist bloc have combined aggression, remarkably effective propaganda (as I have witnessed in Asia) and more recently, and on an increasing scale, economic assistance to the underdeveloped areas. The weapons of the free bloc have been resistance to aggression (this is put differently in the Moscow and Peiping press), counterpropaganda (not too effective as I have also witnessed), and economic aid.

The Communists exploit the wide gap between the levels of living of the have and have-not nations and attribute the blame for the misery of the underprivileged peoples of the world on the "imperialistic," "colonial," and "capitalistic" practices of the have nations. Simultaneously, they insist that the Communist way constitutes the more effective road to higher levels of living. Needless to say the effectiveness of the Communist line is enhanced by the frustration experienced by the underdeveloped peoples in their efforts quickly to raise their levels of living.

The most important contest in the world today, much more important than the annual race for the world baseball championship in the United States, is the race between the free enterprise and the Communist systems to determine which is the more effective way to achieve economic growth. This race is under way on two levels. First, is the contest in economic growth between the United States and the U.S.S.R.—a race which Khrushchev had warned will be won by the U.S.S.R. because of the superiority of the Communist over the free enterprise system. The other is the race between India and China, the most populous nations in the world. Between 1955 and 1975, China may add to her population of about 600 million, some 300 million people; and India may add to her population of 375 million, almost 200 million. Each of these nations is aspiring to raise her level of living, one using the totalitarian Communist method, the other relatively free, democratic methods.

The outcome of these contests will be intently observed by all the underdeveloped nations of the world, including those in Latin America now aligned with the free bloc of nations. Needless to say the results will profoundly affect the ideology, the economic organization and the way of life of all of the underdeveloped nations in the world.

The increasing rate of urbanization, particularly in the economically underdeveloped areas, is also a significant element in the world political situation. For the concentration of population in great urban centers provides an effective base for the expression of discontent and mass frustration. Although urbanism as a way of life is generally associated with the industrialized and wealthier nations, the fact is there are more large cities and more people living in them in Asia, than in either Europe or North America; and that the rate of urbanization, the rate at which the total population is becoming increasingly concentrated in cities, is now greater in the underdeveloped than in the developed areas of the globe. The reason for this, of course, lies in the fact that the developed areas are already reaching maximum levels of urbanization, whereas the underdeveloped areas are in a relatively early stage of the process.

In the economically advanced nations, urbanization is both an antecedent and a consequence of high levels of living. It both makes possible and embodies great increases in technology, skill, and productivity. In the economically underdeveloped areas this is not the case. Large concentrations of urban population are not nearly to the same extent, symbols of man's mastery over nature. They represent more the transfer of poverty from an overpopulated rural countryside to an urban setting. They result more from the push of peoples from low levels of living or internal disorder, than from the pull of the city by reason of economic opportunity and higher living standards. In the 25 years between 1950 and 1975, projections I have made, tied to the United Nations total population projections, indicate that the city populations in Asia could increase by a minimum of two-thirds by reason of total population increase alone; and could triple through the combined effects of total population increase and the continuation of the observed rate of urbanization.

Thus, while the nations of the underdeveloped areas of the world are attempting to improve their miserable urban living conditions, urban populations will continue explosively to increase at rates exceeding that of total population increase. This is a setting conducive to political instability, unrest, and explosive political action—of a type already evident in the politically unstable areas of the globe—in Latin America, in sub-Saharan Africa, in the Near East, and through much of Asia.

It is scarcely necessary to mention that domestic unrest and political instability will not necessarily be contained within national boundaries. In the interdependent and shrinking world in which we live, there are few places left where domestic turmoil may not also constitute serious threats to world peace.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Present and prospective rates of population growth point to crisis possibilities for mankind, both in the long and short runs.

In the long run, neither the more equitable distribution of the world's product, nor the ability of food production to maintain pace with population increase, can resolve the problems created by contemporary and prospective rates of population increase. In the long run, the limiting factor on this finite planet is space.

In the short run, the more equitable distribution of the world's product would merely effect great reductions in the average level of living of the economically advanced nations, while doing little to raise the level of the impoverished peoples of the world. In the short run, the fact that increase in food supply may keep up with increase in population, also fails to resolve the crucial problems. The crises ahead, lie not in possible failure to maintain the present levels of nutrition but, rather, in the prospect of failure to increase this level and other elements in the level of living of the great mass of mankind. The maintenance of present international differentials in levels of living will not prevent domestic governmental instabilities, ease world tensions, nor eliminate the lure of Communism to the impoverished, disillusioned, and frustrated majority of peoples in the world. Only substantial increase in the levels of living of the underprivileged peoples, accompanied by diminution of the gap between the have and have-not nations, can ease the critical international problems with which the world is confronted.

The ability of the economically underdeveloped areas of the world to raise their levels of living will, in large measure, depend on their ability to dampen their rates of population increase. But present and projected rates of population growth in these areas impose impossible burdens upon them in their efforts to achieve higher living standards; and failure to dampen population growth may mean catastrophe, not only to the underdeveloped nations but, also, to the world as a whole.

How is the rate of population increase to be dampened? The answer to this question is readily apparent, particularly in light of the reason for present and prospective explosive rates of population growth.

The population explosion is the result of the great increase in "natural" increase, that is in the excess of births over deaths. The increase in natural increase is the result largely of death control, the great declines in death rates achieved either as byproducts, or the direct result, of technological advance, increased productivity, environmental sanitation, personal hygiene, and modern medicine.

Explosive population growth can be brought under control only by effecting a decrease in natural increase. This is true for the world as a whole, and with differences in phasing, for various individual nations. Solutions to the problems generated by rapid population increase, either in the long run or the short run, must include provision for decrease in the rate of natural increase. Other proposed solutions to the problems posed by rapid population growth, including increased international migration, foreign trade, redistribution of wealth, and the like, hold forth little promise—if any, even in the short run.

There are only three ways to decrease the rate of natural increase: one, by halting rates of decline in the death rate or actually increasing the death rate; two, by decreasing the birth rate; or three, by some combination of both.

It will be readily agreed that a deliberate policy to increase the death rate or to prevent its further decrease, is universally unacceptable. This being the case the first and the third alternatives of decreasing the rate of natural increase, are eliminated. There remains, therefore, as the only means of dampening the rate of population increase, decreasing the birth rate. In brief, to retain, or to continue to experience death control, it becomes necessary to practice birth control.

This conclusion, although it flows directly from the demographic facts of life, has provoked heated debate of the type recently manifest in the press.

There are two internationally wide value systems identified with opposition to the restriction of population growth. One is the Marxist—both the Communist and the non-Communist varieties—which holds that overpopulation is but a manifestation of the imperfections of, and maldistribution of product in, the capitalist order. The other is that of the Roman Catholic Church whose position is often misunderstood. Enlightened leaders of the Roman Catholic Church, including Pope Pius XII, have recognized the need to control population growth not only for biological but, also, for social and economic reasons. Family limitation is condoned by the Roman Catholic Church as an act of "responsible parenthood." But to achieve responsible parenthood the church

approves only methods consistent with her interpretation of the "natural law of God."

The controversy about the acceptable means of birth control has obscured the crucial problem involved that affects global and international policy. The most important thing to be realized about present methods of birth control is, that it is yet to be demonstrated that they are adequate to the task of controlling the birth rate in the economically underdeveloped areas of the globe. The great masses of impoverished mankind have uncontrolled birth rates, not because of the factors at issue in the birth control controversy we are witnessing in this country, but because they have neither the desire, the know-how nor the means to control their birth rate. But the economically underdeveloped nations are becoming increasingly aware of the relation between explosive rates of population increase and their levels of living. India has, for some time, and recently Pakistan, also, has adopted national policies designed to dampen rates of population increase. China has given evidence of concern with the problem, as has also Egypt. Other underdeveloped areas will without question come to grips with the relation between population growth and economic development in the coming years.

The major consideration, then, about birth control in the present world situation is the fact that even if the mass populations of the world had the desire to control their fertility, no really effective methods of accomplishing this objective are yet available. There has been, however, a considerable increase in research and experimentation with improved methods, including the oral contraceptive; and it is likely, on the basis of results achieved to date, that a breakthrough in obtaining birth control means adequate to the task of controlling population increase in the underdeveloped areas, may not be too far off into the future—may perhaps be achieved in less than a decade.

The policy of the Government of the United States on birth control has recently become a matter of national attention. The President has been drawn into the discussion, and he has made the statement that "birth control is no business of the U.S. Government."

This position makes policy sense to the extent that it is interpreted to mean that we have no business forcing our values upon other people. However, it is a position open to serious question when one takes into consideration the fact that the U.S. Government has made "death control" a matter of its business. That is, the U.S. Government maintains and directs very efficient health agencies, including the U.S. Public Health Service, which have contributed materially to effect decreases in the death rates throughout the world. It is doubtful that U.S. governmental policy can for long continue to make its business to export death control without becoming concerned about the problem of birth control. In this connection it is of some interest that Vice President NIXON has recently been quoted as stating that the U.S. Government should help nations, which request it, to obtain means of birth control.

In indicating that birth control was not the business of the U.S. Government, the President expressed the belief that it was a matter for private agencies. Whatever the official position of the U.S. Government on birth control may be, or become, it is clear that voluntary agencies are, and will continue to be, free to contribute what they can to the solution of the serious problems associated with contemporary explosive population increase. A major effort to mobilize private resources to help nations which request birth control aid is under way in the world population emergency campaign. Few opportunities exist to be of as much service to mankind as that represented by support given to this campaign.

Explosive population increase is the product of man's culture-building activities which have directly and indirectly reduced the death rate. It seems reasonable to assume that the mind of man which has achieved remarkable methods of death control will be able to devise effective methods of birth control consistent with his diverse value systems.

THE LATE DR. EDWIN E. WITTE

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I rise to call the attention of the House and the Nation to the passing of Dr. Edwin E. Witte, humanitarian, teacher, and economist on Friday last, May 20, 1960.

His long productive life spent in public service and his many personal contributions to his State and Nation have molded in large measure our present way of life and will serve as a memorial to him. As a teacher at the University of Wisconsin, Dr. Witte was a rare example of humble humanity striving for practical answers to man's problems and pointing out the alternatives to young minds. In joining the scholar's knowledge of economics to the humanitarian's understanding of the needs of the people, he helped bring about approval of the social security system.

Though he frequently disclaimed the appellation "father of social security" which was widely associated with his name, his work as executive director of the President's Committee on Economic Security, under appointment in 1934 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, was of paramount importance in the development of the Social Security Act. In fact, he is generally credited with having virtually written the Social Security Act.

On March 27, 1957, shortly after Dr. Witte retired as a full-time university professor at Wisconsin, more than 300 persons attended a dinner honoring him. Former Secretary of Labor, Frances Perkins, described how Witte "drove a team of wild horses" in fashioning the Social Security Act. "Those who have watched Witte serve his country and State as well as his university want to tell him in what esteem they hold him," she said.

Dr. Witte had served at various times on the former Wisconsin Labor Relations Board, the Defense Mediation Board, National War Labor Board, Atomic Energy Labor Relations Board, and had assisted innumerable Government agencies, including the State Department, congressional committees and Presidential commissions.

He was a graduate of Watertown High School in my hometown. From 1912 until 1913, he served as a statistician for the State Industrial Commission. Until 1914, he was secretary to Representative John M. Nelson of Madison and in 1917, he became secretary of the Wisconsin Industrial Commission where he remained for 5 years.

In 1922, he was appointed head of Wisconsin's legislative reference library, a post he held until 1933. He originally became associated with the University of Wisconsin as a teaching assistant in the history department in 1919. By 1920, he had become a lecturer in the department of economics and remained at that rank, on a part-time basis, until 1933 when he resigned from his library post to become a full professor of economics.

Besides his Government work, Dr. Witte served as a visiting professor at such universities as Harvard, Washington, California, Hawaii, and the American University of Beirut, Lebanon.

Of the more than 30 Government positions he held during his life, 9 of them full time, he described his activities in Washington heading the Committee on Economic Security as "the most rewarding experience of my life." He also wrote a staggering number of books, booklets, and articles on a wide variety of subjects.

Dr. Witte's career spanned the great years of social turmoil. His contributions not only to the humanitarian legislation developed during his time, but also to the understanding of this legislation, is deeply appreciated by all Americans.

I am sure that the Members of the House and all Americans join me in extending heartfelt sympathy to his wife and family in this bereavement.

A BILL TO GIVE THE PRESIDENT DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY TO RAISE OR LOWER INCOME TAX RATES FOR PURPOSES OF ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AND TO REDUCE THE FEDERAL DEBT; TO DECLARE A NATIONAL POLICY THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHALL INCREASE TAX RATES AS A MEANS OF CHECKING BUSINESS BOOMS AND CURBING INFLATION INSTEAD OF IMPOSING HIGH INTEREST RATES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which would give the President discretionary authority to make temporary increases in Federal income taxes in periods of prosperity. The bill would also give the President authority to make temporary reductions in income taxes in recessions or when a recession threatens.

The main purpose of the bill is to do away with the Federal Government's present method of trying to curb economic booms and busts, and check inflation, and to provide a better method for accomplishing these objectives.

ADMINISTRATION IS ASKING FOR A FURTHER INCREASE IN THE DEBT LIMIT

This bill has been prompted at this particular time because the Ways and Means Committee of the House is now considering a new request from the administration to raise the Federal debt limit again. I have proposed this legislation as an alternative. If the bill is passed, it will make a further increase in the Federal debt unnecessary, because it will reduce the Federal debt. It will reduce the Federal debt without costing 98 percent of the American people any more money; actually, in both the long run and the short run, it will cost 98 percent of the American people less money, and it will do a better job of accomplishing the objectives which the present high interest policy is supposed to accomplish.

At the present time, the Federal Government uses what is called monetary controls for these purposes. Specifically, in periods of business expansion, the Federal Government tightens the money supply and raises interest rates in the hope of dampening the expansion. Conversely, when recessions occur, the Government increases the money supply and lowers interest rates in the hope of stimulating business expansion.

RAISING INTEREST RATES IS THE SAME AS INCREASING TAXES, EXCEPT THE REVENUES GO INTO THE POCKETS OF THE WEALTHY FEW INSTEAD OF INTO THE TREASURY

Raising interest rates is precisely the same as raising taxes on all income groups—except that there are at least two notable differences in the final effect of this kind of tax as compared to a regular income tax.

First, the increased revenues from the high interest tax do not go into the Treasury where they can be used to pay the Government's operating expenses and reduce the Federal debt. The revenues go into increased profits for the banks and other financial institutions and into increased incomes for the small minority of very wealthy families. Furthermore, the high interest tax applies to the Treasury itself. It increases the Treasury's cost burden, and thus results in more Federal debt.

The second notable difference between raising interest rates and raising taxes in the normal sense is that the high interest tax effectuates an enormous redistribution of the income. It takes purchasing power out of the pockets of the many and diverts it into the vaults of the few.

To illustrate, the latest Department of Commerce report on personal income, which is for April, shows that personal income from interest has now reached the staggering total of $24.9 billion per year. This represents a jump of $3.8 billion within the last year alone. It is more than double the personal income from interest in 1952, when the Government was pursuing a policy of more reasonable interest rates.

PERSONAL INTEREST INCOME NOW MORE THAN TWICE THE FARM INCOME

To illustrate just what a staggering figure $24.9 billion of personal interest income is, I might point out that this is well over twice the total farm income of the country. We can be sure, however, that far fewer families benefit from personal interest income than benefit from farming. To illustrate, a Federal Reserve survey last year showed that 73 percent of the American families owned not so much as one U.S. savings bond; and 5 percent of the families owned 87 percent of all the U.S. savings bonds. Yet surely U.S. savings bonds are the most widely held of any kind of interest-bearing paper. It would be reasonable to assume, as to the total personal income from interest, that no more than 1 or 2 percent of the families at most benefit, on balance, from an increase in interest rates.

HIGH INTEREST ADDS TO THE PROBLEMS WHICH HIGH INTEREST IS INVOKED TO SOLVE

Assuming that the Government's objectives are good, that it is sincerely trying to aid in economic stability, and trying to prevent inflation in periods of business expansion—there is a question of morality involved when it chooses a method of pursuing these objectives which inevitably taxes the poor to fatten the rich. I will not elaborate this point, however, but will simply call attention to the fact that the method which has been used in recent years, and is now being used, is bad for other reasons. The method of raising interest rates adds to and compounds the very problem which the high interest rates are invoked to meet. In each of the past several so-called boom cycles, the Federal Government has, of course, raised interest rates all along the line. It has raised interest rates on all money for all uses anywhere in the economy. Yet its specific objective has been, not to curb and restrict all economic activity, but to curb and restrict the level of investment in new business capacity. It has sought to restrain investment simply for the reason that the Federal Reserve officials thought that business capacity was expanding at a more rapid rate than consumer demand, and consequently would lead to a greater bust later if not restrained sooner.

So, obviously, the problem which has been met by high interest has two possible solutions. One is to slow down the rate of business expansion, as has been done. The other is to increase consumer demand. But certainly the solution does not lie in reducing consumer demand. Yet that is precisely what the high interest policy has done and will continue to do. By taking purchasing power out of the pockets of 98 percent of the people and putting it into the pockets of 2 percent of the wealthy few, who already have more income than they would spend, the Government is most certainly reducing effective consumer demand.

On every count the high interest policy is a bad policy.

The bill I have introduced would, therefore, declare it to be the public policy of the United States that tax increases shall be made instead of interest rate increases, whenever in the judgment of the President high interest rates would otherwise be necessary. The President would exercise his discretion on the question whether some kind of action is needed. But if he decides some kind of action is needed, he could not choose between the two methods and still comply with the public policy. He would have to raise the tax rates.

The bill applies to both individual income taxes and corporate income taxes. The President could increase, or decrease, the tax rates only within limits, however. He could increase the rates by any amount up to an amount equal to 10 percent of the statutory rates. And he could reduce the rates by any amount up to an amount equal to 10 percent of the statutory rates.

POLITICAL ASPECTS OF THE BILL

The reason for the bill is manifestly in part political, but in larger part, sound management.

The bill is, in part, political in the sense that it is offered as a counterproposal to the administration's new proposal to further increase the Federal debt. Interest rates have now been raised to fantastic heights, and they are near their record peak, even for this administration. If there is enough prosperity and expansionary tendency in the economy to justify the imposition of any such interest rates as we now have, then these things justify paying off a substantial amount of the Federal debt. As I have pointed out, personal income alone from interest has jumped by $3.8 billion within the past 12 months. So, if interest rates were returned only to the level of a year ago, and the people paid the same amount of taxes in regular taxes, instead of the hidden high-interest tax, this would be a minimum of $3.8 billion that could go to debt reduction. Further, I have not even counted the amount of the increased interest income going to the finance companies and the industrial corporations.

The bill is also political in the sense that it would impose an alternative method whereby the administration would execute its political judgment. In passing this bill, Congress would not necessarily agree that it is a good thing for the Federal Government to put the damper on each period of business expansion. That is a judgment which has been made by the administration, and judgment which would continue to be made by the administration. In passing this bill, Congress would, in effect, be saying to the administration that if it wishes to put a damper and a restraint on economic expansion, it must put on the kind of restraint which will benefit all of the people and not just tax the poor for the benefit of the rich. And we would also be saying to the President that he must use a method which will really work—which will really accomplish the purposes which the high interest policy is supposed to accomplish.

REGULAR TAXES WILL HELP IN ECONOMIC STABILIZATION; THE HIGH-INTEREST TAX ONLY TAXES THE POOR TO FATTEN THE RICH AND CAUSES INSTABILITY.

Most of all, however, the bill is a good bill on its merits, and would provide a

much better means for economic stabilization. Why give the President the authority to raise or lower the tax rates? In addition to the political reasons I have mentioned, this is the only effective way that adjustments in the tax rates could be made quickly enough to accomplish their purposes. Obviously, the Congress could not go through the legislative processes to change tax rates quickly enough to meet the administration's rapidly changing estimates as to the economic outlook. The bill would, therefore, give the administration the flexibility it needed to meet rapidly changing situations in the business picture. The President could raise or lower the rates of the current tax year instantly, whenever in his judgment a runaway boom is in the offing, or a business recession is about to develop.

COPY OF THE BILL AND STATEMENT COVERING OTHER MATTERS WHICH CAUSE A DRAIN ON THE TREASURY AND INCREASE THE FEDERAL DEBT

Mr. Speaker, for the consideration of the Members I will insert a copy of the bill and also my statement to the Ways and Means Committee today. This statement deals with matters other than my bill which should be considered in connection with the proposal to further increase the debt limit. In fact, it deals with matters which are causing a terrific drain on the Treasury and causing a constant increase in the Federal debt. So these matters should receive the wide attention of the Congress without respect to any question of raising the debt limit.

The bill and statement follow:

H.R. 12360

A bill to provide for increases and decreases in income tax if the President determines and proclaims that economic conditions require such increases or decreases

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DECLARATION OF POLICY.—In order to keep the debt of the United States at the lowest level consistent with the provision of an adequate national defense and a reasonably sufficient civilian Government, and to make reductions in the debt of the United States in periods of prosperity, the public policy of the United States shall be to make temporary increases in the rates of Federal taxes as an alternative to, and a substitute for, any policy of the Federal Government to impose high interest rates on the economy as a means of curbing economic expansion or restraining inflation.

SEC. 2. ADJUSTMENT OF INCOME TAX RATES.—Subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to determination of tax liability) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART V—ADJUSTMENT OF RATES OF TAX TO REFLECT ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

"SEC. 51. INCREASE OR DECREASE IN TAX.—

"(a) Proclamation by President.—

"(1) Determination that increase is required.—If, during any year, the President determies that an increase in income taxes is necessary to balance the national budget and to provide for a decrease in the public debt and that economic conditions are such that an increase in such taxes is in the national interest, he shall proclaim such determination and the percentage increase in tax which he determines is necessary or desirable by reason of such conditions.

"(2) Determination that decrease is required.—If, during any calendar year, the President determines that a decrease in income taxes is necessary to prevent, or to assist in preventing or counteracting, an economic depression or recession, he shall proclaim such determination and the percentage decrease in tax which he determines is necessary or desirable for such purpose.

"(b) Increase or Decrease in Tax.—

"(1) In general.—If a proclamation is made under this subsection, then (subject to the provisions of this part) the tax imposed by this chapter (other than subchapter G, relating to additional taxes in cases of corporations used to avoid income tax on shareholders) for the taxable year during which such proclamation is made is hereby increased or decreased, as the case may be, by the percentage determined and proclaimed by the President.

"(2) Limitation.—The increase or decrease in tax for any taxable year under this subpart shall not exceed an amount equal to 10 percent of such tax as computed without regard to this subpart.

"(3) Application of change.—Any increase or decrease in tax under this subpart shall apply only with respect to taxable years during which the proclamation under subsection (a) is made."

STATEMENT OF WRIGHT PATMAN BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, MAY 24, 1960

Mr. Chairman, it is very kind of the committee to hear me.

I learned for the first time yesterday that the committee might consider legislation in this Congress to increase the debt limit. Yesterday afternoon I wrote you a letter, requesting to be heard in opposition, and my request was accepted for today. This means that I have had less than a half a day to prepare and organize the thoughts and facts which I felt the committee might wish to consider. I regret that there is such haste and urgency to dispose of this matter that I am unable to do the kind of job of preparation which the committee deserves, and I think the subject matter deserves. However, with the committee's patience, I will try to cover my points in abbreviated form.

THIS IS THE TIME TO REDUCE THE FEDERAL DEBT

First, I wish to call the committee's attention to a proposed bill which I plan to introduce today. I believe that this bill provides an alternative to the proposal to increase the debt limit, because it provides an alternative to increasing the debt itself. Further, I believe that the committee may decide that it is a bill which should be passed on its own merits, even though it decides that the debt limit should not be increased in any case.

Let me put the problem in perspective and then show how it relates to the level of the Federal debt.

There are, of course, several ways that our Government, and any other government, might execute a policy of trying to keep reasonable stability in the economy—avoid booms and busts—and also avoid inflation.

For several years past our Government has been trying to accomplish these things through monetary actions. The President's announced policy is to rely upon the Federal Reserve to accomplish these things. The Federal Reserve's method, in brief, is to tighten money and raise interest rates in periods of economic exuberance, then increase the money supply and reduce interest rates in recessionary periods.

In the last several so-called boom cycles, the specific reason for tightening money and raising interest rates has been to try to dampen investment and prevent there taking place an expansion of business capacity greater than that needed to meet what the Federal Reserve people thought was a foreseeable level of consumer demand. Without examining the correctness of these officials' judgment, nor appraising their success, let me point out the direct price paid for their success, if there was any success.

The price paid when the Federal Government raises interest rates is this: The Government is taking an action which, in effect, imposes a tax on all income groups. When the Government raises the price of money, it is raising the price of what is called the universal commodity. Everybody uses it, and everybody pays an increased price for its use.

But the revenues from this tax are not coming into the Treasury and are not being used to meet the Government's operating expenses or to reduce the Federal debt. The increased revenues resulting from this action on the part of the Federal Government are going into increased bank profits, increased insurance company profits, increased profits for all the other financial institutions, and for increased incomes for the small minority of wealthy families who receive more income from interest than they pay out in interest charges.

Department of Commerce figures, which were just made available in the "Economic Indicators" released yesterday, show that personal income from interest is now up to a rate of $24.9 billion per year. Think of this. Personal income from interest, which was considerably less than the farm income of the country only 8 years ago, is now well over twice the total farm income of the country. This represents a wholesale redistribution of the income in favor of the wealthy few.

For an indication of how few families benefit, on balance, from an increase in interest income, I would suggest that the committee note the distribution of U.S. Savings Bonds. Surely these savings bonds are more widely held by the American people than any other kind of interest-bearing paper. Yet, according to a Federal Reserve survey made last year, 73 percent of the American families own not so much as one savings bond; 5 percent of the families own 87 percent of all of these bonds outstanding. Manifestly, if we had information on the concentration of all personal income from interest, we would find it much more highly concentrated than the ownership of savings bonds.

Why not find a better method for checking economic expansion and checking inflation, if there is a better method?

Last year, as you know, the Joint Economic Committee made a year-long study of this matter. The committee reached the conclusion that monetary actions and so-called monetary controls provide an extremely poor way of trying to accomplish the objectives for which this method is used. It is a poor method because it has many other bad effects other than income redistribution, which I have mentioned. The committee recommended very strongly that the Government should employ its fiscal policies as a principal means of economic stabilization, rather than monetary policies. In general, the minority members of that committee agreed with this conclusion, even though the minority members disagreed on other matters.

Now I assume that all of us in Congress agree that the Federal debt should be kept to a minium consistent with the needs of Government, and that we agree, also, that in periods of prosperity the Federal debt should be reduced.

This is manifestly a time to reduce the Federal debt. The Federal Reserve authorities judge the expansionary tendencies in the

economy to be so strong and to be so in need of restraint that the Federal Reserve is maintaining short-term interest rates at a near record level. The American people are having to pay a fabulous tax as a price for restraining the economy. Why not let the revenues from this tax flow into the Federal Treasury and have it used to reduce the Federal debt, rather than approve an increase in the Federal debt?

That is the policy my bill would adopt. More specifically, the bill would give the President the authority to raise, by uniform percentages on a temporary basis, all Federal income tax rates—individual and corporate. The bill would give the President authority to raise these rates up to a specified maximum of 10 percent of the statutory rates. Further, the bill would declare the national policy to be that the President shall use this means of curbing economic expansion and checking inflation as an alternative to the policy of imposing high interest rates, whenever the policy of the Federal Government would otherwise be to impose high interest rates.

Under the bill, the President could raise tax rates promptly for the current tax year, at any time he should decide that high interest rates would otherwise be necessary to meet the economic problems of the day. Conversely, in recessionary periods, the President could also reduce tax rates by as much as 10 percent below the rate specified in the statute.

The reason for giving the President discretionary authority to amend the rates is to provide the flexibility needed to meet quickly changing situations. The Congress could not go through the legislative processes for this purpose, any more than it could legislate the level of interest rates the Federal Reserve is to maintain for this purpose.

I hope the committee will give serious consideration to this proposal. If the present level of prosperity and the present expansionary forces in the economy are such as to justify the level of interest rates which the Federal Reserve is imposing on the economy, then these things are sufficient to justify a quite substantial reduction in the Federal debt during the remainder of this calendar year.

Let me emphasize that I am not proposing that the American people pay both the high interest rates and increased taxes. I am proposing that they pay increased taxes instead of the high interest rates, and I have no doubt that shifting the revenues from the money-lenders into the Treasury will mean that the American people will pay less in total for the same amount of economic stabilization and inflation control.

STEPS TO CORRECT PRESENT FEDERAL RESERVE PRACTICES WHICH CAUSE AN UNNECESSARY DRAIN ON THE TREASURY

Mr. Chairman, a second suggestion made in my letter of yesterday is that the committee give careful consideration to taking some steps to reduce the drain which the Federal Reserve is placing on the Treasury. If these steps are taken, the Federal debt will be reduced, and there will be no need to increase the debt limit and allow more debt to be incurred.

As the committee knows, the Federal Reserve authorities have at their discretion two methods for increasing the money supply. One method is for the Federal Reserve to buy more Government securities from the open market. This extends more Federal Reserve bank credit to the private banks in the form of reserves. This means that the private banks may then create several dollars of new money for each new dollar of bank reserves. Under present regulations promulgated by the Federal Reserve Board, the banks are privileged to create between $6 and $7 of money for each dollar of reserves extended them.

The second way in which the Federal Reserve may bring about an increase in the money supply is to change its regulations so as to permit the private banks to create a greater number of dollars for each dollar of Federal Reserve credit extended them in the form of bank reserves.

Either of the two methods produce the same effect on the economy. A given amount of credit may be made available to business and consumers by any number of combinations of bank reserves and regulations prescribing the rate at which the banks may create money on each dollar of reserves.

Government securities bought by the Federal Reserve System are paid for in precisely the same way Government securities bought by the private banks are paid for. They are paid for on created money. Consequently, when the Government buys some of its own debt obligations, this would, in normal circumstances, reduce the Government's debt. In the peculiar circumstances under which the Federal Reserve operates, however, there is a threat at all times that the Federal Reserve may put these securities back in the market—in effect giving them away. The threat is that the Federal Reserve may sell some of these securities while simultaneously promulgating regulations which permit the private banks to create the money with which to buy the securities. Recently the Federal Reserve authorities have been leaning strongly in the direction of this threat. The Federal Reserve Board itself has recommended a systematic program of this kind in connection with the so-called vault-cash bill which was enacted last year.

Actually, the Federal Reserve's leanings toward giving away Government securities are much more than a threat. It is constantly leaning against the wind of more Federal Reserve ownership of Government securities and leaning with the wind of banker pressures and banker favoritism.

Let me point out three ways in which the Federal Reserve recently has been shifting the advantages in favor of the private bankers and away from the Treasury and the general taxpayers.

First, over the years, the Federal Reserve must, of course, permit a growth in the money supply. In the past 2 years, it has permitted the money supply to grow by 4.4 percent. As I have pointed out, in providing for this growth, the Federal Reserve could have acquired more Government securities and thus returned the interest payments to the Treasury. Or, it could permit the private banks to create a large share of the new money and thus acquire and hold a larger share of the Government securities. It has done the latter.

A second way in which the Federal Reserve might have acquired more Government securities during these past 2 years—and without inconveniencing the private banks—arose because of the gold outflow. When gold leaves the country, bank reserves are reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis, just as is the case when the Federal Reserve "sells" Government securities. Consequently, the Federal Reserve had to take some action to offset the effects on the money supply of this outflow of gold, which has amounted to several billions of dollars. Here again, it has either of two ways for meeting the problem. It can buy Government securities in an amount equal to the gold outflow, and thus restore the reserves, or it can amend its regulations so as to permit the private banks to create more money on the lesser amount of reserves. It has done the latter.

A third adjustment which the Federal Reserve has to make arises because of the increasing amount of currency in circulation. In the past 2 years, the amount of currency in circulation has increased by more than $1 billion. When more currency goes into circulation, this reduces the amount of reserves the banks have to their credit, just as is the case when there is a gold outflow or when the Federal Reserve sells Government securities. Here again, the Federal Reserve can make up for the reduction in reserve credits by buying more Government securities, or it can give the banks a windfall by changing its regulations so the banks can create more money in relation to the lesser amount of reserve credits. It has done the latter. It has taken actions which result in the private banks' acquiring, without cost, relatively more Government securities, and the Federal Reserve's having relatively less Government securities.

What have these actions amounted to over the past 24 months? In this period, the Federal Reserve has brought about a 4.4-percent increase in the money supply. If it had increased reserve credits proportionately, so that the public and the private banks would have shared in the money creating process in the same way they shared the benefits 2 years ago, the Federal Reserve would today have $3 billion plus $6 million more Government securities than it does have, and the private banks would have $3 billion plus $6 million less. In other words, the real public debt of the Federal Government would be $3 billion and $6 million less than it is today by reason of the fact that the Federal Government itself would have owned its own debt obligations in this amount.

It seems to me completely unjustifiable for the committee to recommend to the House that it permit further increases in the Federal debt while making no recommendations to stop the Federal Reserve's giving away Federal debt obligations.

THE TREASURY IS GOING INTO DERT UNNECESSARILY AND PAYING UNNECESSARY INTEREST CHARGES

Finally, Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out in my letter, the Treasury has, within recent weeks, been issuing more obligations than it needed to. It has consciously and deliberately borrowed money in the past few weeks which it will not need until next July, if at all. This means that the Treasury is paying interest, and a very high rate of interest, on funds it does not need, while it leaves the funds on deposit with the private banks, and these pay the Treasury no interest for the use of the funds.

May I again suggest that the committee give consideration to the fact that the Treasury is at all times carrying a debt of no less than $3.5 billion more than it needs in order to maintain a surplus on deposit for the private commercial banks.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I regret that I felt compelled to seek an opportunity to impose these suggestions upon the Committee, but as you know, I do have some strong feelings about these matters, and I hope that my suggestions may be of some assistance to the committee in its deliberations.

Thank you again.

MORE BIDDING AND USE OF CENTRAL PURCHASING AGENT COULD SAVE BILLIONS OF DOLLARS FOR TAXPAYERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the United States is the biggest buyer in the world. Last year for our civil and military procurement we spent or obligated ourselves to spend the vast sum of about $26 billion. This is more than the total cost of running our Government from 1789 through 1917, or from the time of George Washington until Woodrow Wilson; it is almost double the present cost of running the Government of Great Britain.

And yet this tremendous buying power is not hedged about by rigorous safeguards necessary to assure the most efficient and economical purchasing procedures. Our laws state that as far as possible purchases shall be made only after advertising and competitive bids. Faithfully following such practices should enable our Government to buy at the lowest available prices.

Yet, as a matter of fact, according to the best figures I can obtain for last year, only about $5 billion out of the $26 billion was spent pursuant to advertising and bidding. The other approximately $21 billion was negotiated. Ordinarily this means that there is little or no competition. Where there is the color of competition, every bidder may know what the lowest price is and only have to beat that price although it may be much too high. Also, this practice of negotiation favors the big contractor and tends to put small manufacturers, who are forced to be subcontractors, at the mercy of the big, prime contractor. It often means the additional cost of another layer of management and profits added to the Government cost.

Recently the Comptroller General testified that a failure to negotiate close prices had, in 16 cases he had reported to Congress, shown excessive costs aggregating about $27,800,000. This is only a small fraction of the cases involved, and many estimate that excessive costs total billions of dollars.

The idea of a central purchasing agent who can coordinate purchases and have employees specialize in purchasing fields has long been recognized as the most efficient and economical procedure both for industry and government. Great Britain has long used a central civilian purchasing agent for military supplies and thus avoided the undesirable concentration of power and abuses by professional military officials. Laws passed in the late 1940's were designed to incorporate the needed reforms, but, of course, there are exceptions to the general rule. A list of circumstances where the exception to the rule would apply where incorporated into the law; but the exceptions have now become the general rule. One exception to the requirement is where the President says an emergency exists. This seems innocent enough on its face, but the signing of forms stating that an emergency exists and that bidding should be waived have in recent years become so commonplace that the vast majority of buying is now outside the bidding protection.

There is a wide variance from agency to agency in the use of advertised procurement. Some, like TVA, the largest civil buyer, advertised for 99.1 percent of its purchases; the Bureau of the Budget for 100 percent and General Services for 84.5 percent. On the other hand some of the defense services advertised for only 14 percent; the Labor Department for 16.1 percent and the State Department for 7.8 percent.

Our procurement laws list 15 civil and 17 military excuses which justify negotiating in place of advertising and competitive bidding. One excuse is that a public exigency will not permit the delay incident to advertising; another that competition is impracticable. Such standards are so vague and indeterminate as to lay open the way to, if not to invite, abuse.

The Government Operations Committee, of which I am a member, is charged with the authority to investigate lack of efficiency and economy in the Government, and it is the committee which recommended the original Federal Property and Administrative Services Act setting up a central purchasing agency. It is altogether appropriate that we now try to improve the act and reduce the area of abuse of its provisions. Any possible amendment is so technical and far-reaching that a great deal of study is necessary. I have been working for almost a year on some amendments.

Meanwhile, the GAO made a report for us which gives an excellent background to the problem. Jack Wilson, an able reporter for Cowles Publications, has written an excellent series of articles which incorporate, in summary form, important parts of the GAO report and expand upon the surrounding circumstances. I believe it is such an excellent series of articles that I ask your indulgence to relate them to you at this time. The articles by Mr. Wilson are as follows:

PROVIDE LESS DEFENSE THAN UNITED STATES PAYS FOR—BUYING PLAN BRINGS WASTE, CONFUSION

(First of a series)

(By Jack Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Uncle Sam is widely known as the world's No. 1 hoarder, who never throws anything away and seldom sells it.

What is less generally realized is that the Department of Agriculture, which has $7 billion worth of surplus farm stuff squirreled away, is a piker in this line.

The Defense Department has surplus odds and ends adding up to nearly 4 times as much as Agriculture's little nest egg.

At the latest count, military surplus and excess stocks (there's a difference that we don't have to go into at the moment) had a book value of $26.7 billion.

At the same time, the armed services are in the process of buying $23 billion worth of new materials—some of it identical to the surplus supplies that are being stored or prepared for sale.

STORAGE COST

Aside from the fact that it is costing $134 million a year to store this stuff and keep track of it and try to figure out what to do with it, there are some other features of the military buying and selling operation that are important.

A lot of the material is useful to civilians—but the Government can't unload it without the risk of kicking the bottom out of the commercial market.

The average return when military surplus is sold is about 2 cents on the dollar, minus the cost of getting it ready for sale and selling it.

LOSS DEFENSE

Some of it is being transferred to the foreign aid program at the original book value, although today it's worth far less. The result is that the aid program, already under congressional fire, is paying for value it is not getting.

And what is more important, the Pentagon confusion in buying and hoarding and selling means that the country is getting less defense than it is paying for.

The picture has been brought into focus for the first time in a report prepared for the Joint Congressional Committee on Economics by two staff specialists, Ray Ward and Richard J. Newman, who have spent months analyzing military procurement practices.

NO ONE OFFICE

They found that there is no office in the Pentagon that has general supervision of the sprawling procurement activity, that it is difficult for one military service to find out what another is doing, and that in most cases they don't want to find out.

That is why, for example, the Army about a year ago was trying to buy $3 million worth of spare parts for helicopters, while the Air Force was wondering what to do with $6 million worth of identical parts in its excess stock.

It also contributes to the fact that the military needs more than 585 million square feet of warehouse space (that's roughly 21 square miles) to house its inventory of paper clips, office chairs, spare tires, gas masks, fire bombs, gents and ladies underwear, electric motors, machineguns, and what have you.

A committee staffer estimated the warehouse space cost around $4 per square foot.

STIRS OPPOSITION

The report recommended creation of a separate Pentagon service to handle procurement, a proposal that arouses nothing but bitter opposition among the Armed Forces.

The military argument is that supplies have to come along immediately, when needed, and that the only way to assure this is to keep the buying procedures under control of each service.

There is some joint procurement now. The Army, for example, buys food for all the services. The Navy buys medical supplies and petroleum products for everybody.

The whole thing represents a small fraction of the total procurement, and there is no serious effort being made to broaden the system.

Meanwhile, the surpluses are piling up. When a service finds it has more of something than it needs, the extra amount is declared excess. That means it's available for any of the other services if they need it.

If nobody needs it, it is declared surplus, and can be sold or distributed to schools or other public institutions.

This year the military is planning to sell $10 billion worth of surplus material, for which it expects to receive about $260 million. It will cost about $75 million to prepare it for sale and dispose of it.

It's only fair to note that the difference between the book value and the selling price doesn't accurately reflect the Government's loss.

Under the Federal bookkeeping system, everything is carried on the books at its original cost, until it falls apart or molders into dust.

NOT ALL JUNK

Some of the surplus property is old, and valuable only as junk. Not all of it is.

The list includes a lot of wholly new materials, such as metal sheets and pipes bought for some mysterious purpose, never used, and now headed for the cut-rate market.

It's the end product of the biggest business in the country, the weirdly complicated process of keeping the Armed Forces supplied. How big and how complicated the process is will be told in a later story.

AN ECONOMIC OCTOPUS: U.S. DEFENSE BILL—$24 BILLION SPENT IN 1959 FOR SUPPLIES

(Second of a series)

(By Jack Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Department of Defense last year spent $24 billion for supplies and equipment. That is more than twice as much as the Nation's total net farm income.

It's nearly twice as much as the whole country spent for public education, and 45 percent more than the total revenue from Federal corporation income taxes.

And that doesn't include $11 billion paid out for salaries of civilians and military personnel on the Defense payroll.

That payroll is one and a half times as large as the combined payrolls of the iron and steel industry and all other basic metal producers.

AUTO, PLANE INDUSTRY

It's more than double the payroll of the automobile industry. In California, where the aircraft industry is the biggest private business, the defense payroll is just as large.

The Defense Department owns $150 billion worth of property, in the form of military bases, arsenals, guns, rockets, typewriters, shoelaces, tanks, carbon paper, and almost literally anything else you can think of. The total represents about 10 percent of the Nation's wealth.

This economic octopus reaches into every State—and every pocketbook.

AFFECTS ALL

In one way or another, the management of the defense buying and selling program affects every businessman in the country, sending prices up or down, causing sudden shortages or market gluts.

Yet there is no centralized control over it. The Army and Navy try to control their buying through central organizations, while the Air Force gives its assorted commanders wide latitude in buying supplies independently from local producers.

Some of the facts about Defense Department spending were rounded up by Ray Ward and Richard J. Newman in a special study they made for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress.

SPENDING IN IOWA

Their report showed Defense spent $155,423,000 in Iowa last year for supplies, services, and construction.

Defense spent $238,400,000 in Minnesota, $17,416,000 in North Dakota, $12,315,000 in South Dakota, and $168,221,000 in Wisconsin.

These figures do not include salaries of civilians and military people in the States. For instance: The military payroll in Iowa was $8,045,000 for 1,987 persons on active duty there, plus $2,807,000 for 522 civilians.

The payroll in Minnesota was $19,123,000 for 4,756 persons on active duty, plus $9,423,000 for 1,752 civilians.

South Dakota had 7,050 military personnel drawing $29,139,000, and 1,519 defense civilians earning $8,168,000. For North Dakota, the payrolls added up to $12,364,000 for 2,960 military persons, and $3,634,000 for 675 civilians.

In Wisconsin, Defense paid $20,196,000 to 5,079 military personnel, and $10,979,000 to 2,043 civilians.

ADDITIONAL SPENDING

Nobody, including the economics committee or the Pentagon, professes to know how much additional money is being poured into the several States in the form of subcontracts.

As you would expect, the biggest contracts are going to builders of aircraft and missiles, with electronics equipment, petroleum products, and services—mostly research and development—trailing closely.

The 25 companies that hold the biggest prime contracts include most of the big and medium-size aircraft companies and all the major automobile producers.

SMALL BUSINESSES

Small business's share of the defense spending dollar has been declining in recent years, so far as prime contracts are concerned. There are no meaningful figures available to show how much small concerns get in the way of subcontracts.

Last year, small business contracts with the Defense Department totaled $3,782 million, or about 16 percent of the $23 billion that the Pentagon spent for goods and services.

The previous year the small-business share was 17 percent, and the year before that nearly 20 percent.

Small business's best opportunity to sell to the Defense Department was in the fields of textiles, construction, and food. More than 70 percent of all military textiles and clothing was purchased from small concerns.

The small companies have complained that in many cases they are in a better position to bid for military contracts than some of the big outfits are, but they don't get the chance.

BILLIONS ARE SPENT ON DEFENSE, WITHOUT BIDS

(Third of a series)

(By Jack Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—It's an old established Yankee business theory that the best way to get a good price when you're buying something is to get a batch of eager sellers bidding against each other.

Yet the Pentagon, which will spend about $23 billion of your money buying things this year, will buy most of them without ever calling for competitive bids.

PROFIT GUARANTEE

And beyond that for many of the most expensive items, it won't know what the price is going to be until the bill comes in. It offers the seller a guaranteed profit, regardless of his expenses, and if he charges too much it may be years, if ever, before he has to repay the excess.

Last year the Defense Department spent roughly $23 billion on goods and services. It asked for competitive bids on only $3 billion worth of these items, or 14 percent of the total.

The rest, over $19 bilion or 86 percent, was purchased through negotiated contracts.

That 86-percent figure is about standard now. Since the Korean war began in 1950, there has been only 1 year when purchases by neogtiated contracts amounted to as little as 82 percent of the total.

Negotiated contracts have been common in wartime, when it's important to get immediate delivery and the quickest way to get started is to call in a likely producer, tell him what you need, and put him to work.

The process never before has been so extensively used in peacetime.

COST-PLUS

The cost-plus system, used during World War II as an emergency measure, is gaining ground steadily. In 1951, defense bought 87 percent of its materials on fixed-price contracts, which obligated the seller to produce the stuff at a price specified beforehand.

Last year only 59 percent of the Pentagon's purchases were on fixed-price agreements.

The other 41 percent, representing over $9 billion, involved contracts under which the producer was guaranteed a profit, either a fixed amount or a percentage of costs, after he had finished the job and figured out how much it cost him to do it.

GOOD REASON

There is good reason for both negotiated and cost-plus contracts in many cases. If you're buying big equipment, a fleet of heavy airplanes or a submarine, for instance, there may be only one company available to handle the job, and you have no choice but to negotiate the best deal possible.

If you're buying something that nobody has ever built, like a new missile or a nuclear engine for an aircraft carrier, it's impossible to predict costs in advance and you have to go to the cost-plus system.

But, as a study prepared for the joint economic committee of Congress put it, an important reason for the wide use of the freewheeling contract procedures seems to be that it's easier.

CONGRESS INTENT

"The Defense Department appears not to be employing competitive bidding to the fullest extent possible," the report said, "but rather to be assigning conditions applicable to complex and urgent requirements to other procurements in order to contravene the intent of Congress."

Congress's intent is to require use of advertised, competitive bids whenever it is possible.

One of the big objections to the procedure, from the public's point of view, is that the manufacturer holds most of the trump cards when the negotiation game begins.

WEAK POINTS

The Comptroller General, the Government's head auditor, has listed some of the weak points in the Government's position:

The agency contract man doesn't have access to all the information needed to determine whether the manufacturer's cost estimates are reasonable, he can't know much about costs of items the manufacturer gets from subcontractors, and where only one concern quotes prices, there's little chance of making sure the prices are right.

All the contracts are subject to renegotiation if it turns out there are unreasonable charges, but the process is long and slow and before it can be completed the manufacturer may have been awarded a second contract based on the provisions of the first one.

ONE EXAMPLE

The General Accounting Office cited one example in which a prime contractor included in his cost estimates the list price of important components he was to buy from a subcontractor.

He used the list price although he had obtained the components at less than that in previous jobs, and could reasonably expect to get the same discount again. The Government paid the list price.

One solution suggested by the economic committee staffers is separate procurement of standard items used in specialized products.

IN SOME CASES

A rocket airplane or a nuclear submarine is a specialized item that may have to be produced by a specially qualified manufacturer. But the nuts and bolts and toggle switches and transistors, the steel tubing and copper wires and sheet metal that go into them are available in any hardware store.

The proposal is that the Government buy these shelf items under competitive bidding and turn them over to the prime contractor. It's done in some cases, but not in nearly enough of them, the staff members believe.

There are other factors that increase the cost of defense purchases, including duplication, wasteful distribution, and just plain overbuying.

Our strategic stockpiles, for instance, are now twice as big as even the stockpilers think they need to be. And they're still growing.

HOW WE SPEND OUR DEFENSE DOLLARS—DUPLICATION EATS TAX MONEY

(By Jack Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—The Defense Department is by far the biggest business in the United States.

The trouble is, it's a good deal bigger than it needs to be. The excess is what you are paying for military protection you are not getting.

There's no way to put an exact figure on the unnecessary spending, but there are plenty of examples to show that the total is worth worrying about. Some of them were rounded up in a staff report prepared for the Joint Economics Committee of Congress. For example:

Each of the armed services, despite all the talk about unification, insists on building and operating its own hospital system. This is a reflection of the subconscious feeling in each service that it has to be prepared to win a war all by itself, regardless of cost.

Together, the Army, Navy and Air Force are spending about $400 million a year to run their separate hospitals, of which there are 185 in the United States and 90 overseas. Less than 40 percent of the hospital beds are being used.

At Langley Air Force Base, Va., the Air Force has a 217-bed hospital, with only 62 patients on the average. Six miles away, at Fort Monroe, Va., the Army has a 141-bed hospital, with an average of 20 patients. At Carlisle barracks, near Harrisburg, Pa., the Army has a 73-bed hospital caring for 21 patients. The Olmstead Air Force Base hospital, near Harrisburg, has 23 beds and only 15 patients.

In California's San Francisco Bay area there are four military hospitals, two operated by the Army and one each by the Navy and Air Force. Total capacity is 5,235 beds, of which less than 2,850 are in regular use.

And the Navy and Army are proposing to abandon 2 of the present hospitals, replacing them with new ones with a total capacity of 2,500 beds—although there is an excellent 775-bed hospital presently not being used, at Mare Island Navy Yard.

There are many other examples of the same sort of expensive duplication, which extends, of course, to separate training schools for doctors and nurses for each of the services.

The services have been forced, by congressional pressure, to set up some joint procurement operations. The Army buys food and clothing for all the services, the Navy buys medical supplies and fuel and lubricants and the General Services Administration (GSA) buys office supplies.

There also has been some effort to standardize items so they could be purchased jointly and used by all the services. This is on the theory that, for instance, a bass drum or a catcher's mitt or a typewriter that is good enough for the Army is also usable by the Navy or Air Force.

The Armed Forces supply support center, which is concerned with this problem, has made a study of 25,116 separate items used in military administration and housekeeping.

The list includes furniture, food equipment, musical instruments, athletic equipment, toiletries, paper, and the like. It found that only 3,601 of the 25,116 items were used by 2 or more services.

Of 832 types of musical instruments, only 308 are used by more than 1 service—and that is the highest percentage of joint use of anything on the list.

There are 3,400,000 items in the Federal supply catalog from which the services are supposed to order their routine equipment.

The joint committee staff report said that a recent Defense Department study showed that about 52 percent of these items were usable by more than one service, although only about 14 percent had the same catalog stock numbers.

"Thus about 38 percent, or 1,300,000 items, while having similar fabrication or manufacture, differ among the services in such relatively minor respects as color, finish, markings, or only in terminology," the staff report said.

That means that the Defense Department is carrying some hundreds of thousands of duplicate items in its catalog, and buying and distributing them separately.

"The Department of Defense estimates that about $1 million a year in management expenses are saved for every 100 items eliminated from its supply system," the economic committee staff reported.

Or take the matter of separate warehousing.

Each of the armed services maintains its own supply depots—despite the fact that the other services may have similar depots handling identical items in the same area.

"In the southeastern area, Army's Atlanta (Ga.) general depot and Memphis (Tenn.) general depot, the Air Force's Mobile (Ala.) depot, the Marine Corps supply center in Albany, Ga., and four Navy primary stock points supply the needs of their respective services with the same supplies," the report said.

The situation is typical of that in other parts of the country. It is aggravated by the fact that one of the services may haul supplies hundreds or thousands of miles from its warehouses to the base that needs them, instead of getting them from one of the other services with a depot close at hand.

The Nation's strategic materials stockpile is administered by the GSA, but it's part of the defense structure and suffers from the prevailing defense ailment—excessive corpulence.

The stockpile program was established after World War II, to make sure that there would be enough vital materials to keep the defense industry going in another war. Originally it was planned to accumulate a 5 years supply of strategic materials.

In 1958 the plan was cut to 3 years.

At present, the stockpile program calls for accumulating $4 billion worth of critical materials. That's the goal. It has been reached, and surpassed.

The stockpile now contains materials valued at more than $8 billion, a little more than twice as much as the estimates say we need.

But GSA is still stockpiling. It has firm contracts to acquire $718 million worth of additional stockpile materials between now and 1965.

During the past year, GSA has been getting rid of some of the surplus by selling it to industry, but the process is slow and difficult because sudden large dumpings might seriously depress the market.

And then there's rubber. The stockpile contains somewhere around $350 million worth of natural rubber in excess of its needs.

Rubber deteriorates in storage, and the stock has to be rotated. It costs the Government more than $5 million a year just to sell old rubber and buy new rubber for the stockpile, considering the low selling price and the high cost of the replacement.

On top of all that, natural rubber is becoming less important as a strategic material as synthetic rubber is improved.

But no one, the committee staffers said, has yet gone up to Congress with any proposal to reduce the size of the rubber stockpile or get rid of the excess.

None of these conditions is new. The Government's penchant for overbuying, duplication, and costly hoarding have been repeatedly called to the attention of Congress and the Defense Department.

The Hoover Commission made extensive recommendations and criticisms. Neither Congress nor the Pentagon has taken them seriously to heart.

Meanwhile, we continue spending national defense money by the millions of dollars every year to buy things of which we already have more than we need.

Mr. Speaker, the need for legislation is abundantly apparent, and, accordingly, I have introduced two bills designed to produce better control of procurement procedures. The purpose is to prescribe uniform practices as to civil and military procurement so far as the legislation is concerned. The regulations promulgated by the respective agencies would reflect their special and peculiar requirements.

The bills are H.R. 12344 and H.R. 12345 and provide for a certificate of reasons for negotiations in instances such as "competition is impracticable" or "public exigency" and a report of these certificates to Congress. In clear-cut cases no certificate would be required. The present law makes negotiation possible when necessary in the public interest during a national emergency declared by Congress or the President. These bills would eliminate "or the President" and thus put an end to negotiating under a national emergency dating back to the Korean conflict.

The measures also provide for the negotiation of procurement from concerns in area of labor surplus or where there is a major disaster program. These exceptions have been provided with safeguards against abuse by means of regulations and reports to Congress.

Another added feature is a requirement of a report to the Attorney General in instances where there might be an antitrust violation. Specifically, where the claim is made that competition is impracticable or where the prices after advertising are not reasonable or have been independently arrived at.

A more technical discussion of each bill may be desirable, and therefore, I would like to set forth the objectives of H.R. 12344, which are:

First. To require each agency head, in invoking specific exceptions contained in section 302 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 authorizing the use of negotiated contracts, to make his determinations in conformity with standards established by regulations prescribed by the Administrator of General Services.

Second. To require those standards, to (a) provide for uniform practices to be followed in the making of contracts by negotiation, and (b) make effective provision for the use of competitive bidding in the procurement of property and services to the maximum practicable extent consistent with the policy declared by said section 302 which declares that "a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for supplies and services for the Government be placed with small business concerns."

Third. To require agency heads, in each instance in which a contract is negotiated under clause (10) or clause (14) of section 302(c) on the ground that effective competition cannot be procured, to report the facts and circumstances justifying such action to the Attorney General, who would be required (a) to determine whether any violation of law has contributed to such failure to obtain competition and (b) make an annual report to the Congress concerning the results of such investigations and recommending any proposed legislation he may consider advisable to prevent the impairment of procurement activities of the Armed Forces by unlawful restraints and monopolies.

Fourth. To require agency heads to keep for 6 years records concerning contracts negotiated under clause (2) of section 302(c) in addition to records required by present law to be preserved for that period as to contracts negotiated under other specified clauses of that subsection.

Fifth. To require agency heads, in making semiannual reports to the Congress with respect to certain categories of negotiated contracts, to include in addition thereto similar reports with respect to negotiated contracts made under additional clauses (1), (2), (10), and (14), of subsection 302(c).

Sixth. To make the declaration of a national emergency in clause (1) of section 302(c)(1) be declared by Congress and eliminate such declaration by the President.

Seventh. To provide for the possible negotiation of contracts in labor surplus areas or major disaster areas which, under the present law, would be negotiated in the public interest during the pendency of a national emergency.

Eighth. To require a certification of the nature of the public exigency under clause (2) and the certification of the conditions which make competition impracticable under clause (10) of section 302(c).

Ninth. To defer the effective date of the amendments made by the bill to provide a period of not less than 3 months within which the Secretary of Defense may make necessary studies for the purpose of formulating the regulations which he would be required to promulgate.

The objectives sought to be accomplished by H.R. 12345 are:

First. To require each agency head, in invoking specific exceptions contained in section 2304(a) authorizing the use of negotiated contracts, to make his determinations in conformity with standards established by regulations which the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, after joint consultation, shall severally prescribe for their respective agencies.

Second. To require the officials promulgating those standards, to (a) provide for uniform practices to be followed by all Armed Forces in the making of contracts by negotiation and (b) make effective provision for the use of competitive bidding in the procurement of property and services to the maximum practicable extent consistent with the policy declared by section 2301 of title 10, which declares that "a fair proportion of the purchases and contracts made under this chapter" shall be "placed with small business concerns."

Third. To require agency heads, in each instance in which a contract is negotiated under clause (10) or clause (15) of section 2304(a) on the ground that effective competition cannot be procured, to report the facts and circumstances justifying such action to the Attorney General, who would be required (a) to determine whether any violation of law has contributed to such failure to obtain competition, and (b) make an annual report to the Congress concerning the results of such investigations and recommending any proposed legislation he may consider advisable to prevent the impairment of procurement activities of the Armed Forces by unlawful restraints and monopolies.

Fourth. To require agency heads to keep for 6 years records concerning contracts negotiated under clause (2) of section 2304(a) in addition to records required by present law to be preserved for that period as to contracts negotiated under other specified clauses of that subsection.

Fifth. To require agency heads, in making semiannual reports to the Congress with respect to certain categories of negotiated contracts, to include in addition thereto similar reports with respect to negotiated contracts made under additional clauses (1), (2), (10), and (15), of subsection 2304(a).

Sixth. To make the declaration of a national emergency in clause (1) of section 2304(a) be one declared by Congress and eliminate such declaration by the President.

Seventh. To make clauses (14) and (17) of section 2304(a) somewhat more restricted in scope.

Eighth. To provide for the possible negotiation of contracts in labor surplus areas or major disaster areas, which under the present law would be negotiated in the public interest during the pendency of a national emergency.

Ninth. To require a certification of the nature of the public exigency under clause (2) and the certification of the conditions which make competition impracticable under clause (10) of section 2304(a).

Tenth. To defer the effective date of the amendments made by the bill to provide a period of not less than 3 months within which the Secretary of Defense may make necessary studies for the purpose of formulating the regulations which he would be required to promulgate.

I cannot imagine anyone opposing these bills except those who want to continue receiving unjust enrichment at the taxpayers' expense or who for some selfish reason do not want to reduce waste in government. This should not be considered a partisan matter either. In fact, these bills are in line with recommendations of the Hoover-Acheson Commission, which was a bipartisan Commission composed of many Members who are still in Congress.

Due to the separation of committee jurisdiction in the Congress, it is necessary to divide this subject matter into two bills. I hope both will be acted upon promptly, but I realize that it may not be possible to have sufficient hearings on both this late in the session. However, I have been assured of early consideration of H.R. 12344, and it could also provide the pilot model for better procurement in purchases covered by the provisions of H.R. 12345.

I offer these bills because I know of no single area where the opportunity for saving is as great. Some have estimated that waste in procurement may run as high as $8 to $10 billion per year. I believe the enactment of these bills would save the American taxpayer billions of dollars while giving smaller businesses a fair chance to compete for Government business rather than having to be contented with a discounted subcontract. The support of every Member is respectfully solicited.

VARYING STATE AND LOCAL TAXES

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, last week I placed in the RECORD a preliminary comparison of the taxes paid by an individual to his local and State governments in various parts of the country. Since then, I have refined these figures to eliminate entirely the influence of corporate and commercial taxes and I have extended the chart to include 48 States. Figures for Hawaii and Alaska are not readily available at this time.

This is a comparison of taxes paid by an individual. He is the head of a family, with a wife and two children. He makes $5,000 a year. He owns and drives an automobile 10,000 miles a year and

gets 15 miles to a gallon. He and his family together smoke a pack of cigarettes a day. His house belongs to him and has a true value of $10,000. He makes $800 worth of purchases a year which are subject to various State and local sales taxes.

It is my object to compare the amount of taxes that this man would pay to his local and State governments in Arkansas, Mississippi, Nevada, Connecticut, New York, and so forth. This becomes a true measure of the burden which the individual taxpayer is carrying to support his local and State governments. When we ask the Federal Government to move in and take up some of this burden, let us remember that the same families with identical circumstances in different parts of the country pay the following varying taxes to their State and local governments:

$5,000 per year

	Sales	Tobacco	Gasoline	Tangible property	State income	Real property	Total		Sales	Tobacco	Gasoline	Tangible property	State income	Real property	Total
Alabama	$24.00	$21.90	$46.62	$6.50	$27.00	$71.82	$197.84	Nebraska	None	$14.60	$46.62		None	$173.78	$235.00
Arizona	24.00	7.30	33.30		22.00	142.60	229.20	Nevada	$16.00	10.95	39.96		None	90.13	157.04
Arkansas	24.00	21.90	43.29		17.00	61.72	167.91	New Hampshire	None	10.95	46.62		None	297.15	354.72
California	24.00	10.95	29.96		8.00	153.02	235.93	New Jersey	None	18.25	33.30		None	335.07	386.62
Colorado	16.00	None	39.96		30.00	169.73	255.69	New Mexico	16.00	21.90	39.96		$21.00	72.22	171.08
Connecticut	24.00	10.95	39.96		None	172.07	246.98	New York	None	18.25	39.96		88.00	259.26	405.47
Delaware	None	10.95	33.30		53.00	84.80	182.05	North Carolina	24.00	None	46.62		76.00	91.19	237.81
District of Columbia	16.00	7.30	39.96		40.00	116.72	219.98	North Dakota	16.00	21.90	39.96		23.00	164.17	265.03
Florida	24.00	18.25	46.62		None	149.14	238.01	Ohio	24.00	18.25	46.62	$6.00	None	135.55	230.42
Georgia	24.00	18.25	43.29	2.50	8.00	151.07	239.94	Oklahoma	16.00	18.25	43.82		25.00	104.43	207.50
Idaho	None	18.25	39.96		119.00	120.90	298.11	Oregon	None	None	39.96		132.00	186.68	358.64
Illinois	24.00	14.60	33.30		None	144.65	216.55	Pennsylvania	32.00	21.90	33.30		None	230.19	318.39
Indiana	None	10.95	39.96		60.00	170.75	281.66	Rhode Island	24.00	18.25	39.96		None	204.23	286.44
Iowa	16.00	14.60	39.96		67.50	156.66	294.72	South Carolina	24.00	18.25	46.62		46.00	52.57	187.44
Kansas	20.00	14.60	33.30		45.00	131.58	244.48	South Dakota	16.00	18.25	39.96		None	199.80	274.01
Kentucky	None	10.95	46.62		28.00	111.20	206.77	Tennessee	16.00	18.25	46.62		Exempt	161.83	242.70
Louisiana	16.00	29.20	46.62	5.75	Exempt	105.51	203.08	Texas	None	29.20	33.30		None	131.59	194.09
Maine	24.00	18.25	46.62		None	336.17	425.04	Utah	16.00	14.60	39.96		48.00	85.02	203.58
Maryland	24.00	10.95	39.96	1.34	54.00	173.04	303.29	Vermont	None	25.55	43.29		100.00	288.32	457.16
Massachusetts	None	21.90	36.63		Exempt	319.50	448.75	Virginia	None	None	39.96		52.00	160.71	252.67
Michigan	24.00	18.25	39.96		None	166.33	248.54	Washington	32.00	21.90	43.29		None	98.67	195.86
Minnesota	None	20.07	33.30		114.50	312.31	480.18	West Virginia	16.00	18.25	46.62		None	58.16	139.03
Mississippi	24.00	21.90	46.62		Exempt	139.63	232.14	Wisconsin	None	18.25	39.96		64.50	237.54	360.25
Missouri	16.00	7.30	19.98		17.00	125.04	185.32	Wyoming	16.00	14.60	33.30		None	94.92	158.82
Montana	None	29.20	39.96		48.00	231.45	348.61								

$4,000 per year

	Sales	Tobacco	Gasoline	Tangible property	State income	Real property	Total		Sales	Tobacco	Gasoline	Tangible property	State income	Real property	Total
Alabama	$24.00	$21.90	$46.62	$6.50	$6.00	$71.82	$176.84	Nebraska	None	$14.60	$46.62		None	$173.78	$235.00
Arizona	24.00	7.30	33.30		8.00	142.60	215.20	Nevada	$16.00	10.95	39.96		None	90.13	157.04
Arkansas	24.00	21.90	43.29		3.00	61.72	153.91	New Hampshire	None	10.95	46.62		None	297.15	354.72
California	24.00	20.95	29.96		Exempt	153.02	235.93	New Jersey	None	18.25	33.30		None	335.107	386.62
Colorado	16.00	None	39.96		30.00	169.73	255.69	New Mexico	16.00	21.90	39.96		$11.00	72.22	161.08
Connecticut	24.00	10.95	39.96		None	172.07	246.98	New York	None	18.25	39.96		14.00	259.26	331.47
Delaware	None	10.95	33.30		27.00	84.80	156.05	North Carolina	24.00	None	46.62		42.00	91.19	205.81
District of Columbia	16.00	7.30	39.96		25.00	116.72	204.98	North Dakota	16.00	21.90	39.96		13.00	164.17	255.03
Florida	24.00	18.25	46.62		None	149.14	238.01	Ohio	24.00	18.25	46.62	$6.00	None	135.55	230.42
Georgia	24.00	18.25	43.29	2.50	Exempt	151.07	239.94	Oklahoma	16.00	18.25	43.82		10.00	104.43	192.50
Idaho	None	18.25	39.96		60.00	120.90	239.11	Oregon	None	None	39.96		66.00	186.68	292.64
Illinois	24.00	14.60	33.30		None	144.65	216.55	Pennsylvania	32.00	21.90	33.30		None	230.19	318.39
Indiana	None	10.95	39.96		45.00	170.75	266.66	Rhode Island	24.00	18.25	39.96		None	204.23	286.44
Iowa	16.00	14.60	39.96		30.00	156.66	257.72	South Carolina	24.00	18.25	46.62		24.00	52.57	165.44
Kansas	20.00	14.60	33.30		24.00	131.58	223.48	South Dakota	16.00	18.25	39.96		None	199.80	274.01
Kentucky	None	10.95	46.62		38.00	111.20	206.77	Tennessee	16.00	18.25	46.62		Exempt	161.83	242.70
Louisiana	16.00	29.20	46.62	5.75	Exempt	105.51	203.08	Texas	None	29.20	33.30		None	131.59	194.09
Maine	24.00	18.25	46.62		None	336.17	425.04	Utah	16.00	14.60	39.96		22.00	85.02	177.58
Maryland	24.00	10.95	39.96	1.34	24.00	173.04	273.29	Vermont	None	25.55	43.29		60.00	288.32	417.16
Massachusetts	None	21.90	36.63		Exempt	319.50	448.75	Virginia	None	None	39.96		32.00	160.71	232.67
Michigan	24.00	18.25	39.96		None	166.33	248.54	Washington	32.00	21.90	43.29		None	98.67	195.86
Minnesota	None	20.07	33.30		59.50	312.31	425.18	West Virginia	16.00	18.25	46.62		None	58.16	139.03
Mississippi	24.00	21.90	46.62		Exempt	139.63	232.14	Wisconsin	None	18.25	39.96		34.50	237.54	330.25
Missouri	16.00	7.30	19.98		8.00	125.04	176.32	Wyoming	16.00	14.60	33.30		None	94.92	158.82
Montana	None	29.20	39.96		22.00	231.45	324.61								

The following represents an explanation for the method at arriving at the above figures:

Sales: This figure represents the State sales tax levied and collected by the States and does not include local sales taxes. It is presumed the individual spends $800 per year on goods subject to this sales tax.

Tobacco: This represents the State tax on cigarettes. We presume the family consumes 1 pack of cigarettes per day.

Gasoline: This figure represents the State tax on gasoline gallonage. We presume the family drives 10,000 miles a year, getting 15 miles to the gallon, thus using 666 gallons of gasoline each year.

Tangible property: This figure represents the State tax on tangible personal property, which we presume to have a value of $1,000.

State income tax: This is the income tax on a yearly salary of $5,000, using the short form in each case of computation. The individual has a wife and two children whom he claims as dependents.

The rates for the above taxes were derived from a study made by the editors of Changing Times, the Kiplinger magazine, as published in the November 1959 edition of NADA, published by the National Automobile Dealers Association.

Real property tax: This figure was arrived at by dividing the total property taxes collected in each State by the total assessed value in each State to reach the rate. We presume the individual's house has a sale value of $10,000. The assessed value was reached by multiplying the sales value by the average sales based assessment ratio provided by the 1957 Census of Governments of the Bureau of the Census. The real property tax figure, therefore, represents real property taxes paid to State and local governments for the year 1957. Later figures are not now available.

Not included in the tax tables are local intangible taxes which are levied in some areas, Federal taxes, and special and temporary State taxes which might be levied from time to time in various States.

Estimated allocations to States in 1960–61 and 1961–62 under H.R. 12316 and estimated amount of State matching funds required [1]

State	Estimated allocations, 1960–61	Estimated allocations, 1961–62	Total estimated allocations, 1960–61 and 1961–62	Amount of State matching funds required [2]
Total, United States	$458,300,000	$469,730,000	$928,030,000	$229,150,000
Alabama	8,990,000	8,990,000	17,980,000	4,495,000
Alaska	600,000	660,000	1,260,000	300,000
Arizona	3,390,000	3,580,000	6,970,000	1,695,000
Arkansas	4,630,000	4,520,000	9,150,000	2,315,000
California	37,120,000	38,900,000	76,020,000	18,560,000
Colorado	4,660,000	4,860,000	9,520,000	2,330,000
Connecticut	5,630,000	5,780,000	11,410,000	2,815,000
Delaware	1,170,000	1,240,000	2,410,000	585,000
District of Columbia	1,690,000	1,730,000	3,420,000	845,000
Florida	11,360,000	12,070,000	23,430,000	5,680,000
Georgia	10,950,000	11,140,000	22,090,000	5,475,000
Hawaii	1,720,000	1,770,000	3,490,000	860,000
Idaho	1,850,000	1,880,000	3,730,000	925,000
Illinois	24,040,000	24,740,000	48,780,000	12,020,000
Indiana	12,150,000	12,510,000	24,660,000	6,075,000
Iowa	7,050,000	7,160,000	14,210,000	3,525,000
Kansas	5,500,000	5,660,000	11,160,000	2,750,000
Kentucky	8,280,000	8,300,000	16,580,000	4,140,000
Louisiana	9,120,000	9,380,000	18,500,000	4,560,000
Maine	2,370,000	2,380,000	4,750,000	1,185,000
Maryland	7,940,000	8,210,000	16,150,000	3,970,000
Massachusetts	11,050,000	11,170,000	22,220,000	5,525,000
Michigan	21,490,000	22,320,000	43,810,000	10,745,000
Minnesota	8,900,000	9,110,000	18,010,000	4,450,000
Mississippi	6,290,000	6,280,000	12,570,000	3,145,000
Missouri	10,240,000	10,450,000	20,690,000	5,120,000
Montana	$1,870,000	$1,930,000	$3,800,000	$935,000
Nebraska	3,670,000	3,760,000	7,430,000	1,835,000
Nevada	760,000	820,000	1,580,000	380,000
New Hampshire	1,400,000	1,430,000	2,830,000	700,000
New Jersey	13,850,000	14,270,000	28,120,000	6,925,000
New Mexico	2,630,000	2,730,000	5,360,000	1,315,000
New York	37,290,000	38,040,000	75,330,000	18,645,000
North Carolina	12,780,000	12,950,000	25,730,000	6,390,000
North Dakota	1,800,000	1,820,000	3,620,000	900,000
Ohio	24,460,000	25,310,000	49,770,000	12,230,000
Oklahoma	5,600,000	5,600,000	11,200,000	2,800,000
Oregon	4,640,000	4,740,000	9,380,000	2,320,000
Pennsylvania	26,580,000	26,920,000	53,500,000	13,290,000
Rhode Island	2,010,000	2,040,000	4,050,000	1,005,000
South Carolina	7,340,000	7,440,000	14,780,000	3,670,000
South Dakota	1,890,000	1,930,000	3,820,000	945,000
Tennessee	9,300,000	9,340,000	18,640,000	4,650,000
Texas	26,590,000	27,530,000	54,120,000	13,295,000
Utah	2,670,000	2,750,000	5,420,000	1,335,000
Vermont	940,000	940,000	1,880,000	470,000
Virginia	10,510,000	10,750,000	21,260,000	5,255,000
Washington	7,320,000	7,500,000	14,820,000	3,660,000
West Virginia	5,250,000	5,170,000	10,420,000	2,625,000
Wisconsin	10,210,000	10,470,000	20,680,000	5,105,000
Wyoming	900,000	920,000	1,820,000	450,000
Guam	190,000	190,000	380,000	95,000
Puerto Rico	7,590,000	7,570,000	15,160,000	3,795,000
Virgin Islands	80,000	80,000	160,000	40,000

[1] Allocations under H.R. 12316 are $10 per child of school age (5–17 years) in each State. The estimates of allocations were computed by using population projections for July 1, 1960, and July 1, 1961, based upon assumption of migration at 1950–57 levels, U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Projections of the School-Age Population, by States, 1959 to 1963," "Current Population Reports." Series P–25, No. 201, June 1, 1959.

[2] The matching provision in H.R. 12316 requires that in order for a State to receive its full allotment in the school year 1961–62 a State must increase its expenditures for public elementary and secondary education in 1960–61 above the amount it spent in the base school year, 1959–60, by an amount equal to 50 percent of the amount of Federal funds the State was allotted in 1960–61.

INCREASE IN PAY OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this issue I answered at the annual convention of the Michigan State Association of Letter Carriers on May 21, 1960, at Benton Harbor, Mich.

Permit me here to express my views. Few, if any, would oppose progress. I personally know of no one who is content with what he has. Ambition within reason is desirable. No one would be content to travel on thickened and calloused feet. But progress must be made with caution. A jet sometimes does not reach its destination. Let the dead past bury its dead, but let us profit by the experiences, sometimes bitter, of other people, of other nations.

With all our achievements, among them those which enable us to see, to hear, to talk with friends, whether miles above the earth in space which seemingly knows no limits, or on the other side of the world, let us remember there are still some natural and supreme laws which we cannot, with safety, violate.

Among them is one which proclaims that, before he may enjoy advantages, man must, through his own efforts, first create them.

Unless he is the beneficiary of charity or an inheritance, if he would have health, food, and clothing, man must work. This has been true since Adam and Eve were kicked out of the Garden of Eden—allegedly because they disobeyed a supreme command.

Many of nature's laws, like that of gravity which Newton discovered when he watched the apple drop from the tree, we have circumvented, as, for example, by our travels into space.

It may be that man will, in the future, find some way of avoiding all obstacles, but that day has not yet arrived and we have as yet been unable to substitute something for nothing.

As of today, if we would spend, we must first earn.

Unfortunately, many believe, or at least pretend to believe, that the Federal Government can provide for each and all whatever he may desire.

When first I came to Washington, I thought the Federal Government would soon be bankrupt, but have learned that the Federal Government will be bankrupt only when the people individually are bankrupt. But continued spending beyond our earnings will bring all of us into bankruptcy.

Uncle Sam has no income other than what he takes direct from you and me—there are no exceptions other than insignificant sums which he receives from duty on imports or other small items.

Nevertheless, from the people who must eventually in some way pay the cost, to the Congress, as to other legislative bodies, come continuous requests for ever-increasing appropriations for additional special benefits.

To increase these special benefits to special groups, the Congress has created 10 departments. We have the Department of Labor, which is charged with the duty, and I quote:

The Department of Labor is charged, among other things, with administering and enforcing statutes designed to advance the public interest by promoting the welfare of wage earners of the United States, improving their working conditions, and advancing their opportunities for profitable employment.

We have the Department of Commerce which is charged with the duty, and I quote:

The statutory functions of the Department of Commerce are to foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce, the manufacturing and shipping industries, and the transportation facilities of the United States.

And so on down throughout the whole list, but that is not the end.

Seldom a session goes by that the Congress is not asked to create a new or additional department, agency, group, or committee, and always, there is a committee of some kind studying and charged with reporting what can or should be done to benefit either all of us, or unfortunately all too often, just a few of us.

Having in mind the principles which are ever operative, that we cannot spend without producing, it is apparent by the existence of our national debt, the annual interest on which is more than $9½ billion, that the Congress cannot provide the means of complying with all the requests which come to it. We must evaluate and select.

To mention just a few, the veterans, for whose special benefits we spend many millions a year, who are entitled to and receive Federal aid because of special service rendered, are now asking for additional special benefits. One, for example, is that certain groups insist upon aid for dependents and relatives.

Another group demands legislation fixing minimum wages and special fringe benefits.

There are many requests for special tax exemptions, the granting of which would lessen the national income.

Among others, we have the present strenuous drive for the payment of additional wages by the Federal Government to teachers, to its employees, and demands for money to construct and maintain school buildings.

We have thrust upon the Federal Government the demands that it care for the aged and physically handicapped; that is, find the means to end the ravages caused by certain diseases. Certainly we can never let one starve or avoidably suffer hardship.

Oh, there are many, many more, all desirable, all have merit, but many of which, while attractive, are not absolutely necessary to our comfortable existence, and some of which should be taken care of by either individuals or the local communities or organizations.

Permit me to again remind you of what you obviously know—that there is not, there will not be, unless taxes are enormously increased and collected, sufficient funds to comply with all of these requests.

We must choose and there lies the difficulty. We must first determine whether we will curtail our efforts to help everybody, or increase the burden of taxation. Whichever we do, we have the monumental—and almost impossible to accomplish—job of justly, equitably distributing and apportioning the funds available.

But greatest of all, should the American citizen and taxpayer take upon himself the obligation of aiding the rest of the world, some of which it is claimed, is less fortunate, less prosperous than are we?

Since the inception of the Marshall plan to June 30, 1959, the foreign aid program has cost us upward of $82,566,200,000, in addition to the civil and military services rendered by Americans and which have cost us billions of additional dollars; a program which has not brought about its objective and which apparently is to be permanent; a program which apparently has not accomplished its purpose and which Walter Reuther at one time in writing advised President Truman calls for $13 billion a year for 100 years from the American taxpayers.

All of which brings me to your official demand, as voiced by your executives. Briefly stated, it in substance is that we increase the compensation of the letter carriers and of Federal employees—get this, our own employees—all Federal employees, practically all of whom have job security and retirement.

From the press I note that other speakers on this program are Governor Williams and Senator PAT MCNAMARA. It is assumed that, this being an election year, we will all acknowledge the justice of your demands, promise at least some degree of acquiescence.

The gentlemen to whom reference is made are fully capable of speaking for themselves. For myself, in view of the record I have made, in justice to all the people of the District, having in mind the truism that this is a government for all the people, that it is my duty to promote the welfare of all the people rather than that of a special group, I can only say that I cannot, unless a source of additional revenue is found, vote for your bill calling for something like a 9-percent increase.

Naturally, you will want to know my reasons.

The overall reason is that, as a nation, we do not have sufficient income to meet all the demands which must be met. I have not, nor will I, until the welfare of our own citizens is better protected, vote for foreign aid. At present, the demanded outlay is something more than $4 billion a year.

The most reliable information which comes to me is that the present bill, if passed, will be vetoed by the President, and that there are not sufficient votes to override a veto. Complying with your demands to support this bill, it is obvious, would be futile.

In 1958 and again in 1959, President Eisenhower expressly and earnestly asked the Congress to make a comparative study of the pay and special benefits given Federal employees as compared with those provided by industry.

Later, finally, the Congress did appropriate $500,000 to make a comprehensive study of wages and salaries, and that report, which should come up with the facts and some recommendations as to how all may be treated equitably, will be sent in in September.

Can we not afford to wait until we have that unbiased study and the conclusions for which we have appropriated so much?

For a moment, let me digress by a short statement which has to do with the Post Office Department's operations.

I realize that the Post Office Department is not supposed to be operated as a business, that it has educational and other duties which are a Federal advantage—duties which I am sure, under the proper management, will be carried out.

The Department's deficit for this year, without any further pay increases, will be around $603 million.

The overall accumulated deficit—since July 1, 1946, through 1959—from all sources—$15,300 million.

Put it this way, since July 1, 1946, through 1959, we have added to our national debt $15,300 million.

Of that deficit, $6,800 million is the postal deficit for that same period.

The interest on the Post Office Department's share of that national deficit—the $15,300 million—is $200 million a year, which you taxpayers must pay through added taxes.

So, $6,800,000,000 is the sum the taxpayers have dug up as a postal subsidy since July 1, 1946.

It would seem that the interest of the postal employees might be better served if some of their leaders in Washington would look at the facts, try to do something for the postal department—help the Department get rate increases and eliminate subsidies, which would make it possible for the Department to do more for the employees.

Are you asking that postal rates be increased? And, if so, what particular rates?

If the increase in pay goes into effect—as voted by the House—without a postal rate increase, the deficits for this year will be almost a billion dollars—instead of the $603 million, which it will be without the salary increase.

Postal employees have had more benefits from the Eisenhower administration than in any other administration in history.

Applicants for postal carrier jobs must know what the job pays when they apply for a job. Does it not follow in this, the Fourth Congressional District, that they are either adequately paid in one way or another, or that they lack intelligence? Why so many applicants for an undesirable job? I do not, and I cannot personally know whether carriers applying for jobs are or are not taking everything into consideration. I can only assume, from what I know of the average degree of intelligence possessed by our people, that there would not be so many applicants if the job was not, for some reason, desirable.

My attention is frequently called to the fact that a Congressman gets far more in salary and fringe benefits than do postal employees. That is undoubtedly true, though on the tables which I have seen, a few officials are getting or asking for $19,500.

There is, however, one drastic difference in our jobs. A Federal employee, certainly a postal employee, is under civil service. He has job security if he gives reasonable service. He continues in that job at least until he reaches the age of retirement. Members of Congress have no job security. They must go out every 2 years and beg for reelection.

In the 1958 primary, I spent personally something around $4,700 and an additional sum in the general election. Some spend more. Most of us maintain two homes. We have additional requirements which we must meet. If you suggest to me (as I have to some of you) if I am dissatisfied with the job I should get another, I can only reply that when I came here, retiring from law practice which was more remunerative than this job—and I was 59—that I actually was conceited enough to think that I might do something to lessen the waste, add to the efficiency and economy of our service here. I am satisfied with the job; I like the controversy, I think I owe it to the people to use my experience for the next term, at least—and that is a plenty—to continue my efforts to give us all a better, more efficient and cheaper government, and, I might add, less of it.

Permit me now to state a few facts given to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, which closed its hearings on Wednesday, May 18, last, in testimony by Deputy Postmaster General John M. McKibben in opposition to any general pay boost at this time. McKibben said:

Postal jobs are in demand and 238,000 persons applied for them in the first 3

months of this year. The total included 37,000 in New York City, 14,000 in Chicago, and 12,000 in Los Angeles.

Postal salaries have risen 137 percent since 1939 in comparison with a 111.6 percent increase in living costs.

The quit rate is low among postal employees. It was 0.57 per 100 employees a month last year compared with 0.70 for the entire Federal service and 1.25 for private manufacturing concerns.

Average straight time earnings of regular clerks and carriers is $2.31½ cents an hour compared with $2.19 for equivalent jobs in industry and $2.22 for all production workers.

My own personal experience is that, ordinarily, there are several applicants for rural carriers' jobs and, often, clerks desire to be transferred to a rural carrier job because they consider the opportunity to hold such a job superior to a clerk's job or to any job obtainable in that particular locality in private industry.

I will do the very best I can to comply with your requests, but, in considering them, we must—and I will—at all times endeavor to get information on the overall picture and then vote as I sincerely believe I should, having the interest of all in mind.

If the Commission appointed by the President comes up in September, after its long study, with a justifiable recommendation that Federal employees should receive an increase in compensation, either in salaries, wages, or fringe benefits, I certainly will be one of the first to go along.

Let us profit by the experiences of other nations. Let us today go forward. But let us at all times remember that the security of our Nation and the freedom of our people should be ever first in our minds.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. QUIE), for 30 minutes, on May 26.

Mr. MITCHELL (at the request of Mr. RABAUT), for 40 minutes, on Thursday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. EVINS and to include a news letter.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. JENSEN, remarks he made on the bill earlier today, and include the entire committee report, and the names of the members on the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. RABAUT) to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:

Mr. ANFUSO.

Mr. BARR.

(At the request of Mr. QUIE and to include extraneous matter the following:)

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. HOSMER.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2681. An act for the relief of Yi Young An; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3036. An act to authorize the distribution of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to former Members of Congress requesting such copies; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the final report and indexes to hearings and reports of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings before the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on Amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 with respect to exchange of military information and material with allies during the 2d session of the 85th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a committee print containing the reports of the States to the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources on their water resources and problems; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Internal Security Manual as a Senate document; and providing for additional copies; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution authorizing the reprinting of additional copies of the Joint Committee print entitled "Summary-Analysis of Hearings, June 22–26, 1959, on Biological and Environmental Effects of Nuclear War" printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the 86th Congress, 1st session; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies on United States-Latin American relations; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies on U.S. foreign policy; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 9465. An act to authorize the loan of one submarine to Canada and the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China;

H.R. 9818. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida;

H.R. 10809. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 502. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune; and

H.J. Res. 546. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to present to the Senators and Representative in the Congress from the State of Hawaii the official flag of the United States bearing 50 stars which is first flown over the west front of the U.S. Capitol.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2130. An act to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 23, 1960, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4029. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the proration of the occupational tax on persons dealing in machine guns and certain other firearms, to reduce occupational and transfer taxes on certain weapons, to make the transferor and transferee jointly liable for the transfer tax on firearms, and to make certain changes in the definition of a firearm;

H.R. 6482. An act relating to the credits against the unemployment tax in the case of certain successor employers;

H.R. 6779. An act to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable contributions for certain individuals);

H.R. 9308. An act to extend until June 30, 1963, the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory; and

H.J. Res. 640. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of General of the Armies John J. Pershing.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 25, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2179. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appro-

priation to the Department of Labor for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen" for the fiscal year 1960, has been apportioned on a basis that indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2180. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration of the Department on the activities and transactions of the Administration under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from January 1, through March 31, 1960, pursuant to section 13 of that act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2181. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the amount of obligations, issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, which may be outstanding at any one time"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2182. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Badger Creek Mill-Picayune Creek, Iowa, Marsh Creek, Ky., and Tenn., Persimmon and Burnt Corn Creek, Miss., Tabo Creek, Mo., Fishing Creek, S.C., and Bad Axe, Wis., pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and by Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2183. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Upper Black Bear Creek, Okla., Reelfoot-Indian Creek, Tenn. and Ky., and Olmitos and Garcias Creeks, Tex., pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and by Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1892. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Norman project, Oklahoma, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1644). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 11123. A bill to increase the authorization of appropriations for construction and equipment of facilities for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory; without amendment (Rept. No. 1645). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 11274. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territories of the Virgin Islands and Guam shall each be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1646). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2286. An act to authorize the leasing of certain land in Arizona which comprises a part of the Colorado River Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1647). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2456. An act to amend the act of April 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 44; 25 U.S.C. 635), to better promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1648). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 10310. A bill to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide for increased representation by regional banks for cooperatives on the Board of Directors of the Central Bank for Cooperatives; with amendment (Rept. No. 1650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6597. A bill to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1651). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOYKIN: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2618. An act to authorize the exchange of certain war-built vessels for more modern and efficient war-built vessels owned by the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1652). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7308. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey land to the Diocese of San Diego Education and Welfare Corp.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1649). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 12357. A bill to establish a Department of Public Information; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 12358. A bill to establish a Department of Public Information; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. COAD:

H.R. 12359. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the special milk program for children for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 12360. A bill to provide for increases and decreases in income tax if the President determines and proclaims that economic conditions require such increases or decreases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 12361. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN:

H.R. 12362. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Brighton School District, Kansasville, Wis.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H.R. 12363. A bill to supplement and amend the act of June 30, 1948, relating to the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, and to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior issued under the act of June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 12364. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to the level of price support for milk for manufacturing purposes and for butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 12365. A bill to require that all pieces of third-class matter mailed in bulk shall bear the sender's pledge to pay return postage at the current per piece charge; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 12366. A bill to amend sections 102 and 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to provide that misbehavior in the presence of either House of Congress, or any committee thereof, shall constitute a misdemeanor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 12367. A bill to provide for the admission of certain specified refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 12368. A bill to provide for the crediting of certain past service of secretarial and clerical assistants to U.S. commissioners for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 12369. A bill to amend section 362 of the Communications Act of 1934 relating to annual inspection of radio equipment on board ships; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 12370. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to raise the amount of outside income recipients of insurance benefits thereunder are permitted to earn, to lower the age after which outside earnings are no longer considered for purposes of deductions from benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H.R. 12371. A bill to amend section 507 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the preservation of basic compensation in downgrading actions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.J. Res. 715. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of June 16, 1938 creating the Niagara Falls Bridge Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H.J. Res. 716. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the Federation Aeronautique Internationale to hold the 1962 world sport parachuting championships at Orange, Mass.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARR:

H. Res. 539. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Ways and Means to conduct an investigation and study with respect to the desirability and effect of the repeal of certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 12372. A bill for the relief of L. C. Atkins & Son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12373. A bill for the relief of Quality Seafood, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 12374. A bill for the relief of William J. Hill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 12375. A bill for the relief of Zbigniew Ryba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNN:

H.R. 12376. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Antressian Sohigian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McSWEEN:

H.R. 12377. A bill for the relief of Concetta Aurora Cordaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 12378. A bill for the relief of Fung Kai Wing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 12379. A bill for the relief of Chin Ziang Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H.R. 12380. A bill for the relief of Iren Enevold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Res. 540. Resolution providing for sending the bill H.R. 3101 and accompanying papers to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

472. By Mr. HARMON: Petition of Rachel Treece as a member of Teamsters Local 298, relative to the denial of the right to elect officers of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

473. Also, petition of Vernon Reffett as a member of Teamsters Local No. 135, relative to the denial of the right to elect officers of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

474. By Mr. WESTLAND: Resolution by members of Haynie Grange No. 169, Ferndale, Wash., recommending the enactment of legislation which would require all imported farm products be plainly labeled to show origin and contents; to the Committee on Agriculture.

475. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Nicolas Nogueras Rivera, president, the Puerto Rico Free Federation of Labor, San Juan, P.R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to reaffirming their faith in democracy and condemning regional and international communism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

476. Also, petition of Harold Elsten, New York, N.Y., relative to a redress of grievance relating to a filed petition, pertaining to my submission of allied civil and criminal case to the District Court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Treatment of Narcotic Addicts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a statement which I submitted on May 16, 1960, to the President's Interdepartmental Committee on Narcotics at its meeting in New York City that day:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, PRESIDENT'S INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS, MAY 16, 1960, IN NEW YORK CITY

I have introduced H.R. 12120, which provides for Federal assistance to the States for the payment of one-half of the cost per bed patient for the treatment of narcotic drug addicts in closed institutions maintained and operated by the States. It is my hope that with financial assistance from the Federal Government the States having a severe narcotic problem will be encouraged to provide for a drug treatment program under which the narcotic drug addict is committed through a State civil action, to remain under treatment until released by competent medical authority as having attained maximum medical benefits.

Statistics recently presented to the Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office Departments Appropriations of the House Appropriations Committee by Commissioner H. J. Anslinger of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics caused me grave concern. Particularly was I appalled when I learned that of the total number of known drug addicts in the United States 45.7 percent, or 20,732, were recorded as being in my own State of New York. Furthermore, it was enlightening to know that nearly 80 percent of the known drug addicts are recorded as residing in only four States, New York, California, Illinois, and Michigan.

Since I am firmly convinced that drug addicts should be treated and cured of their drug addiction and that this can be successfully accomplished only through their compulsory confinement in a drug-free atmosphere, I endeavored to learn what the States were doing toward accomplishing this purpose. I was shocked to learn how little is being done by the States in this regard. I am convinced that with the proper impetus, which I believe my bill will have, the States will be willing to assume a more active participation in what has so far proved to be their weakest effort at curbing the narcotic drug problem—providing treatment facilities for drug addicts.

I learned that the State of Illinois is preparing to provide a treatment center as quickly as possible to take care of 300 drug addicts at one time. This bill will assist both New York City and Chicago in their efforts to cure the drug addict.

The enforcement of our criminal statutes against the drug peddler cannot alone eliminate drug addiction in this country. We must find a way of providing the much needed facilities for requiring the drug addict to remain under treatment in a hospital institution plus the additional facilities for rehabilitation and reinstatement into a normal life activity after being released from the institution. If we are going to admit that a drug addict is a sick person, we must be willing to spend the money necessary to cure him of his sickness.

The War That Can Be Won

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my address entitled "The War That Can Be Won" and describing the massive research effort that can defeat cancer be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I delivered these remarks on May 5 at Wheeling College, Wheeling, W. Va.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAR THAT CAN BE WON

(Remarks of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY at Wheeling College, Wheeling, W. Va., Thursday, May 5, 1960)

I take my theme for today's talk from one of the youngest of living Americans—former President Harry S. Truman.

He said on May 24, 1951: "The only kind of war we seek is the good old fight against man's ancient enemies—poverty, disease, hunger, and illiteracy."

Poverty, disease, hunger, illiteracy.

Each of these ancient enemies could be the topic of many volumes, let alone a single speech.

Today I shall talk mainly about the worldwide fight against one disease—cancer.

And it is appropriate that I should talk about it here in West Virginia.

During three decades, the late Senator Neely led the fight for cancer research on the floor of Congress—led it, with magnificent eloquence and determination, until he himself was cut down by this dread disease.

As long ago as 1928, he proposed an appropriation of $100,000 to the National Academy of Science to make a thorough study of the incidence of cancer in this country. It was slashed to $50,000.

In 1946, while a Member of the House of Representatives, he introduced a bill to appropriate $100 million to be used over whatever period was needed for a large-scale research offensive against cancer.

Matt Neely's words and efforts were not in vain. Last year Congress voted $90 million to the National Cancer Institute for 1 year's research.

When Senator Neely began his fight, 125,000 Americans were dying each year of cancer. Last year it was 260,000.

Because cancer has reached epidemic proportions in this country, we must mobilize every resource to conquer it.

I, therefore, pledge to the American people that, if I am elected President, I will call a

White House conference early in 1961 to bring together the best medical and scientific brains in this country to plan an accelerated attack upon this disease.

I earnestly hope that all other candidates for the Presidency will take the same position.

Cancer strikes without regard to political party. It struck down Senator Taft and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, just as it did Matt Neely and Senator Brien McMahon.

It pays no heed to the Iron Curtain, either. Almost a year ago a Senate Government Operations Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, issued a report entitled: "Cancer: A Worldwide Menace."

That document pointed out that cancer kills 2 million people a year in all parts of the world, that its incidence is rising in 33 countries, and that it is the second leading cause of death in the Soviet Union, as well as in the United States and most of Europe.

In transmitting this report to the Senate, I pointed out that this disease is one "whose ultimate conquest will undoubtedly involve an unparalleled effort of worldwide biomedical research."

American doctors who have visited the Soviet Union recently report that Russia has embarked upon a massive 15-year plan for medical research on cancer.

We keep secret—and the Soviet Union keeps secret—the research that goes into the development of ever more devastating weapons.

But we have no reason to keep secret—and every reason to share—the research aimed at this deadly enemy, which spares neither American Senators nor Communist commissars.

That is why, when I had my 8-hour talk with Mr. Khrushchev a year ago, I spent much of it urging upon him a worldwide attack upon the killers and cripplers of mankind—cancer, heart disease, tuberculosis, malaria, and many others.

It made sense to him—even to this hard, cunning, and dedicated Communist. He liked the idea of what I call "Health for Peace."

Indeed, I have long advocated a "Works of Peace" program aimed at poverty, hunger, and illiteracy as well as disease.

I have voted again and again for programs of oversea technical and economic aid. And I have always maintained that the Americans of Cabin Creek are as fully entitled to help—the kind that helps people to help themselves—as the people of Afghanistan or Africa.

I have talked, too, about "Food for Peace"—putting our God-given abundance of food to work providing balanced diets in West Virginia and wherever in the world people are hungry.

I have talked, too, of "Education for Peace"—a coordinated, worldwide attack upon illiteracy which would make use of the soft currencies we receive in repayment for development loans and for sales of surplus food.

These ideas—these "Works of Peace"—are not original with me. They draw upon a rich American tradition—and, may I say, a Jesuit tradition as well.

The great Jesuit missionaries preached the word of God—but they also healed the sick, fed the hungry, and taught the illiterate.

Indeed, in many places they gave the people among whom they worked the very gift of literacy—putting into writing languages that hitherto had been only spoken.

There are some people who say that wars among men will only end when we face the attack of a common enemy. Half cynically, half humorously, they have suggested that the world will unite only to repel invaders from Mars.

We don't need to wait for the little green men to launch their science fiction attack. Our common enemies—poverty, disease, hunger, and illiteracy—have always been with us.

Until day before yesterday, we lacked the knowledge and the resources to attack them effectively.

Now what we principally lack is the intelligence and the will.

I pray that, within my lifetime and certainly within yours, this will be the only war that anyone in this world will seek.

Jobs After 40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Senators JACOB K. JAVITS and HUBERT HUMPHREY have both been active in dispelling discrimination against older workers. The following are extracts from what each has said or written on the subject:

JOBS FOR OLDER WORKERS

(By Senator JACOB K. JAVITS)

One of the most critical issues in the American economic structure is our inability to deal with the unjust and unreasonable discrimination against workers over 45—indeed, in some instances over 40—in their opportunities for employment.

Such discrimination deprives the Nation of a most important resource of experience, highly skilled employees and it adds materially to the number of persons requiring public assistance. It deprives mature citizens of the dignity and status of self-support and continued participation in constructive economic activity.

You shouldn't take my word for the fact that this is a problem. Here are a few simple figures:

Statistics show men over 45 collecting unemployment compensation take substantially longer to find new jobs.

Opportunities for getting a job, once in the unemployed category, are about 50 percent less for the man who is over 45.

More than half of openings listed with employment offices in cities surveyed contained maximum hiring ages.

Yet the fact is that the older worker has greater skill, greater dependability in many cases and a lower accident rate.

Things that you can do to aid include:

1. Urge the Government Contracts Committee to end age discrimination in defense industries.

2. Back the pending bill, S. 1073, the National Act Against Age Discrimination in Employment.

3. Make an effort to get your State to pass a law against age discrimination in industry.

JOBS FOR OLDER WORKERS

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

Despite the fact that wisdom comes with experience, and experience comes only with time, our most precious human resource—wisdom—is nevertheless being wasted by the present social attitude toward our aging population.

Productivity: One of the arguments against employing workers over 40 has been the belief in management circles that low-cost mass production conflicts with the hiring of older jobseekers. Yet, Department of Labor studies indicate that older workers produce just as much and sometimes more than younger workers.

Proneness to accident: Other assumptions against hiring older workers also have been refuted, such as the argument that they are injured more frequently than younger workers. A study of 17,800 workers in a variety of manufacturing industries, published in 1948 by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, shows that the opposite is true.

Absenteeism: The same is true of attendance records which, according to a study conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of 15,500 men in 109 manufacturing plants, showed that older workers had a 20 percent better attendance record than the younger workers.

Pending before the present Congress is legislation, supported by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, which would make unlawful discrimination against an individual with respect to employment because of age. Also pending is a House joint resolution which would create a Commission of Manpower Utilization to conduct an investigation of all phases of employment of older workers in the United States, including the extent of bias against hiring older workers.

The Eagles "Jobs After 40" campaign is a most commendable and worthy project, and one which deserves wholehearted support. You certainly can count on mine.

Role of the U–2 and Past Efforts of President Eisenhower To Win Approval of His "Open Skies" Inspection Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago, a handful of men here in the House of Representatives made a fateful decision. The decision was to approve funds for the design and construction of the U–2 reconnaissance plane, the aircraft which has been receiving so much publicity in every corner of the world recently.

Besides Chairman CLARENCE CANNON of the House Appropriations Committee, one of the gentlemen "in the know" about the flights of our observation planes over the Soviet Union was my good friend and colleague, the Honorable JERRY FORD, of Michigan.

Recently Congressman FORD explained the role of the U–2 and the past efforts by President Eisenhower to win approval for his "open skies" inspection plan as a safeguard to world peace in a newsletter to his constituents.

Because of the excellence of his presentation and the good sense of Congressman FORD's remarks, I am placing them in the RECORD for the perusal of my colleagues:

The mission of Francis Powers may well be one of the most significant events in 1960. Reams of copy have been written on this event and its implications, and millions of

words have been spoken about it. In all of this, certain basic considerations must be established and emphasized:

1. It is the highest and most serious responsibility of the U.S. Government (the President, Congress, and judiciary) to protect the lives and property of all its people. In the year 1960 this means protection from any surprise attack by missiles or manned aircraft of the Soviet Union.

2. To carry out successfully this responsibility, certain agencies of the Federal Government must obtain sufficient essential information about the intentions and capabilities of the Soviet Union in order that our Government can provide an adequate defense program. To do less would amount to criminal negligence and could border on treason.

3. International spying as a diplomatic or military operation is as old as recorded history. The fact that the spies bring back excellent photographs of military installations rather than a "branch with one cluster of grapes" (Numbers 13: 23) does not change the nature of the business.

4. Because this business inevitably involves deceit, misrepresentation, falsehood, intrigue, and every devious avenue of approach, public officials may not jeopardize the national security by publicizing the true facts about the business. This in no way reflects upon their personal integrity nor upon the broader aspects of public morality. But when a given situation (no matter how embarrassing) becomes public knowledge, we commend a frank and honest disclosure.

5. As long as the cold war continues it is absolutely imperative that our Government continue to obtain essential information about the Soviet military potential. Aerial photography from high-altitude planes is a practical and effective method of getting this information. There is no good reason to eliminate this practice as long as there exists the possibility of a surprise attack upon the United States.

6. This event can help to assure the American people of our advancements in aeronautics and aerial photography, and in our ability to penetrate the Iron Curtain with manned and armed aircraft if that becomes necessary.

7. The overall direction and control of our intelligence program is in the hands of competent men, highly responsible, knowledgeable, and experienced. While the President approved the program, it is not expected that he must have personal knowledge of any given operation or of each specific plane flight.

8. The House of Representatives, through a special subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, has not only authorized the espionage program but has specifically supplied the funds necessary to carry it out. According to Representative CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, the Central Intelligance Agency was under specific instructions from the elected representatives of the people to make sure that we have no more Pearl Harbors nor any recurrence of the sudden Chinese Communist attack experienced in Korea in 1950.

9. The establishment and use of over 250 oversea military bases is an integral part of our national defense effort. We expect to keep these bases and to protect the sovereignty of all free nations, including their right to participate in a mutual security program.

All of this is not to say that we have no regrets concerning the incident. The downing of one of our U–2 planes 1,300 miles inside the boundaries of Russia while on an espionage mission and the apparent capture of its American pilot is indeed regrettable.

1. We regret the existence of a cold war which makes this sort of business necessary.

2. We regret that the event occurred so close to the date of a summit meeting.

3. We regret the temporary propaganda advantage presented to Mr. Khrushchev.

4. We regret that the incident may result in cancellation of the visit to the Soviet Union of President Eisenhower, America's greatest ambassador of good will whose person-to-person appeal to the Russian people would be a mollifying influence in the cold war.

5. Most assuredly, we regret what appears to be the capture of Francis Powers, the pilot of the plane, on this vital national defense mission.

However, we must point out that there are workable alternatives to cold war and espionage, and that out of this incident overall benefits may be derived.

1. At Geneva in 1955 President Eisenhower proposed that the major powers give to each other a complete blueprint of our military establishments. He suggested that each nation provide within our countries facilities for aerial photography to the other country. Regrettably this open skies plan was rejected by the Soviets. The United States is prepared to offer this plan at the summit meeting this month. Its acceptance by Russia will eliminate further need of U–2 flights.

2. President Eisenhower also said in 1955 that we were ready to consider a reliable system of inspections and reporting in an effort to reduce all armaments. Good faith on the part of the Communists at the disarmament conference at Geneva would help to ease world tensions. A safe disarmament program must be our ultimate goal.

3. We trust that the demonstrated success of our aircraft flights over Russia during the past 4 years will have a salutary effect on the Kremlin. The masters there must know that we are as sincere and effective in playing according to their rules as we are urging a change in the rules for the benefit of all mankind.

In closing, your Congressman highly compliments the Democratic chairman of my committee, Representative CANNON, who in a dramatic speech on the floor of the House of Representatives, fully endorsed U.S. policy in protecting our citizens and our cherished land. Mr. CANNON, a 38-year veteran in the House reemphasized there must be no more Pearl Harbors or Koreas. I concur without qualification or hesitation.

Afterthoughts on the Summit Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, we all agree with Stephen Decatur, the American patriot, who said:

Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong.

However, we would be derelict in our responsibility if we did not take precautions to see that errors are not repeated in the future. In this connection, in my newsletter this week I reported some afterthoughts on the summit conference, and, under unanimous consent, I include this newsletter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The newsletter follows:

AFTERTHOUGHTS ON THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

The tragic failure and collapse of the Paris summit conference this week has shocked the world. All Americans, and indeed the free world, had hopes that this conference might open the way to lessening the cold war and lead to a permanent and more lasting peace. Now the pathway toward peace is less clear. The cold war continues and the ways to solve it more difficult to determine.

In the midst of the blowup of the summit conference, our Nation and our President have been humiliated as never before in our history. Our friends and our allies have been given great cause to doubt America's competence, our judgment and effectiveness as a leader in foreign affairs.

Despite these results and the blasting of our hopes and plans for some progress toward peace, we must, as a nation, remain united. It was Stephen Decatur, American patriot, who said: "Our country. In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong."

Democratic leaders have joined with others in sending a telegram to the President to acquaint the people of the world with the fact that we in this country stand united in matters of international affairs. Our leaders cabled the President:

"We feel that total failure of the summit conference and increasing mistrust on both sides will be serious and deeply disturbing to the world. All of the American people earnestly desire peace, an end to the arms race and ever better relations between our countries."

Others have publicly said that we should not try to brush under the rug our mistakes, failings and shortcomings. It is known that Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union is difficult to deal with and having this knowledge our Nation should have fully and properly prepared for the summit conference. On the eve of a conference as important as this one—which carried with it the hopes of peace—the President should have required that all flights over the Soviet Union at this time be cleared with the White House. This was not done. It seems that one agency of the Government does not know what another agency is doing. Their work was not coordinated and most of all the President seemed not fully informed about the situation.

At first there was a denial that the plane had been ordered flown over Soviet Russia. Another report merely stated that the plane was on a weather observation mission. An additional report admitted that the plane was on a spying mission, and even at this point our leaders should have stated that the situation was being investigated and thus provide a cooling-off period. However, the President implied that reconnaissance flights or spy missions over Soviet territory would be continued. Later, at the opening of the Paris summit conference, he announced that such flights had been ordered discontinued.

In the face of these conflicting reports, the Soviet leader was given a wedge and an opportunity to sabotage and torpedo the conference, a device for which he was obviously looking.

While we must stand behind our country and behind our Nation's President, it seems only honest to admit that in our bureaucratic workings we are not infallible, and that administrative mistakes and mistakes in timing have been made; there has also been a lack of coordination in planning.

The miscalculations and unpreparedness which our country's leaders have displayed

in its presummit and summit activities are regrettable. The collapse of our plans at this crucial time has vividly pointed out the need for a reexamination and a reappraisal of our Nation's handling of foreign affairs.

The failure of the summit conference has thus demonstrated the failure of the President to come to grips with the vital details which are so very important in all matters and doubly important to this Nation and to the peace of the world.

Someone has said that there is no substitute for doing our homework and that there are some matters that cannot be delegated.

America will recover our position and its prestige, which has been shattered, but we must learn from the lessons of our bungling and failures. We must profit by our mistakes and, above all, we need to be ourselves, Americans at our best, and not flinch from facts, truth, and realities. In this hour we need to be fed not just good and pleasant words, but truth, however distasteful; then we can march forward together with new ideas and well-thought-out plans and policies in the field of foreign affairs and patiently continue to work for the promotion of peace.

Mr. Frank Austin Bond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the recent passing of Mr. Frank Austin Bond, native of North Adams, Mass., ended a career of distinguished service and unselfish dedication to civic activity which spanned more than 40 years. With the exception of his student days at Cornell University and honorable military service in World War I, Mr. Bond spent his entire life in the town of his birth which he so dearly loved.

In the years of his career the posts he held were many and varied. He first undertook civic responsibilities as a member of the school committee in 1916 and later as city councilman, both elected positions. But far and above official positions, he gave his time and energy to those voluntary tasks of incalculable community benefit. He was president of the YMCA, chamber of commerce, and Community Chest. During World War II and after, he served as a member of the North Adams Draft Board. In 1943 he was chairman of the war fund drive and in 1944 a director of the State war fund council of the National War Fund. The Governor appointed him a trustee of the soldiers' home in Chelsea.

In the wider field of politics, Mr. Bond was a member of the Republican State Committee and in 1944 attended the GOP national convention as a delegate.

His many offices of public service included membership in 1934 on the NRA committee for savings banks and advisory committee on civil defense for the State, in 1954.

His career as a businessman was varied and successful. He headed the North Adams Industrial Co.; president of the Richmond-Wellington Hotel Corp.; director of the former Blackinton Mills Corp.; and president of the Hoosac Savings Bank.

To all of these multiple activities, whether civic, public service, or business, he contributed his ability and energy, integrity of character, and humane dedication. His unselfish devotion merited the friendship and respect of the entire community which owes him so much.

I know that this distinguished body joins me in expressing my profound sympathy and deep condolences to his family. The city of North Adams remains as his monument, the only one I am sure, he would have liked best. We join this community in paying reverent respect to the memory of this great American citizen.

Disarmament and the Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on May 5, I was privileged to address faculty and students of Bethany College, Bethany, W. Va., on the subject of disarmament. I ask unanimous consent that my address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISARMAMENT AND THE SUMMIT—BETHANY COLLEGE, WEST VIRGINIA, MAY 5

Only 11 days from now President Eisenhower, Chairman Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan, and President de Gaulle will begin the summit meeting at Geneva.

I have no crystal ball, and I will not attempt to prophesy what the outcome will be. I do know what I hope President Eisenhower will work for, with all the influence and persuasive power he—and I mean he, and not any stand-in—can bring to bear.

I hope that he will propose that disarmament and arms control will be put at the very top of the agenda, and that the other three leaders will agree.

I know that armaments and political tensions among nations feed upon one another. I know that many students of international affairs maintain that you cannot make any progress on one without the other.

I cannot agree to that. It reminds me of the law that some town passed about the crossing of two railroad lines: "When two trains meet at the crossing, neither shall proceed before the other."

I think that, for the time being, we and the Soviet Union shall have to agree to disagree about Berlin—and, indeed, about the two Germanys, and all the other political problems that clutter the international agenda.

The Russians have given no indication that they are, in the field of political problems, ready to stop propagandizing and begin serious negotiation. That does not mean that we should forget these problems, or condone them.

It does mean, however, that our immediate major effort should be in disarmament, where the Russians seem in a mood to "talk turkey." There are obvious reasons for this. The Russians have come to recognize that the armaments race threatens both sides of the Iron Curtain with mutual annihilation. Moreover—as the recent news of strikes and riots among Soviet workers emphasizes—the men in the Kremlin have compelling domestic reasons for wanting to beat some of their swords into ploughshares.

Indeed, I noted over a year ago—on my return from my visit to the Soviet Union—that Chairman Khrushchev needed peace. I predicted even then that he would launch a big push for disarmament. We should have been ready, but we weren't.

There are two major steps toward disarmament that can and should be taken at the summit meeting. One of these is to resolve the major obstacle standing in the way of a nuclear test ban agreement. The second is to lay down general directives for the future course of the current 10-nation disarmament talks.

Because time does not permit, I shall not describe the test ban treaty in detail. Agreement on some important points has been reached; on others it has not.

I believe, however, that it is fair to say that the major obstacle to agreement is the dispute over the number of veto-free, on-site inspections that shall be permitted in the Soviet Union each year.

Like so much in this complex question of disarmament, this is a highly technical question. I shall explain it as best I can.

If the treaty is agreed upon, control posts would be set up within the Soviet Union—as elsewhere in the world—to monitor shocks to the earth's surface.

Up to a certain number of times each year, an international inspection team should have the right, free of veto, to make onsite investigations on an event registered at the control posts which could not be identified as an earthquake.

The U.S. position is that at least 20 inspections a year would be needed in the Soviet Union to check for possible prohibited explosions. I fully support that position. Indeed, I have publicly warned the Soviet leaders that no treaty which provides for less than 20 would command the two-thirds majority in the Senate needed for its ratification.

I know the traditional Russian bent for secrecy—a bent long preceding Soviet assession to power. But I hope they will recognize that this is a modest and reasonable adjustment to make.

The achievement of a test-ban agreement at the summit—or, to be more realistic, the removal of this major obstacle—would sound a trumpet of hope for troubled and fearful mankind.

Such hopes, however, would be cruelly disappointed if the summit conference stopped there—and did not make a real effort to get the 10-nation disarmament talks off the dead center where they are currently stranded.

The problem is that the great powers each want to ride off in a difference direction—and therefore are getting nowhere. If the summit conference can decide on the direction of the next steps in these negotiations, even in very general terms, it would be most helpful.

Meanwhile, there is a lot of urgent homework that we need to do. We need to know much more about controls before we can seriously negotiate them. We cannot expect the Soviets to do this work for us. They are allergic to controls, and will accept as little as they can. Asking them to develop controls is like expecting a man condemned to be hanged to make his own rope.

I have been warning for many months that we are not prepared for serious negotiation on controls. At long last, the Department of State itself has acknowledged this fact.

Here is a quotation from the testimony of Mr. Raymond Hare, the Deputy Under Secretary of State, before the House Appropriations Committee:

"In reviewing our approach to disarmament, it was further found that the most serious deficiency in the U.S. approach has been the lack of adequate planning and studies in the field of disarmament."

At long last, too, there are reports of a possible upgrading of the Office of Disarmament within the Department of State. That is good as far as it goes—but it doesn't go nearly far enough. It comes late—I don't say "too late"—and it is certainly too little.

What we really need—as the Senate Disarmament Committee proposed as long ago as September 1957—is a special agency devoted to the single and comprehensive problem of disarmament—a sort of "Manhattan Project for Peace."

Early in February I introduced legislation to establish a National Peace Agency. It should have the services of some of the ablest and most dedicated people in the country. It should have authority to coordinate the many different projects in the general disarmament field which are presently splintered among the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Department of State.

Its single, overriding assignment should be to find a way to end the arms race. In the existing agencies, this is at best a part-time or occasional assignment. Then, too, there is a built-in contradiction in expecting any Department of Defense to give wholehearted enthusiasm to limiting armaments—or any Atomic Energy Commission to show as much zeal for curtailing atom bombs as for developing more effective and varied ones.

The Department of State would continue, of course, to carry on disarmament negotiations—and I have introduced legislation to upgrade this function by establishing an Assistant Secretary of State for Disarmament and Atomic Energy Affairs.

The quest for safeguarded disarmament must be at the heart and center of American foreign policy. It must be placed as far as possible within the framework of the United Nations because disarmament is a concern of all countries, and not only of the great powers. By making our statements on disarmament in the forum of the United Nations we can—if our case is sound—rally behind it the moral force and the conscience of mankind.

We have a better than even chance of making the last four decades of the 20th century decades of peace. And if we can keep peace for the next 40 years, there is real hope that the habit may take hold for good.

The 1960 National Convention of Mothers of Men in Service (MOMS of America), Altoona, Pa., May 18–22

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Altoona, Pa., was the scene of the 1960 National Convention of the MOMS of America, an organization composed of mothers of men in service.

The host for the convention was the Hollidaysburg, Pa., unit of the MOMS of America under the leadership of Mrs. Mary Ratchford, president. The convention was well attended by delegates from many States. It was my privilege to deliver the principal address at the annual banquet, which follows:

SPEECH BY JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE 1960 NATIONAL CONVENTION OF MOMS OF AMERICA, PENN-ALTO HOTEL, ALTOONA, PA., MAY 19, 1960

It is a distinct privilege to address you on the occasion of your 1960 national convention and to join in welcoming you to my hometown of Altoona, Pa.

The Hollidaysburg, Pa., unit of the MOMS of America under the able guidance of its president has developed into an organization in which we of Blair County are pardonably proud for the part it plays in community life.

Not only has the Hollidaysburg MOMS of America maintained a lively interest in servicemen but it has also been very active in caring for the comfort and needs of veterans in the Altoona Veterans' Administration hospital.

In this connection the Hollidaysburg MOMS donated a tape recorder to the Altoona Veterans' Administration hospital and supplies the tape each year.

In addition patients are the recipients of gifts from the MOMS while an annual bingo party is one of the highlights of the MOMS hospital program.

At the community level the Hollidaysburg MOMS have an enviable record in support of local projects such as the public library, YMCA, Christmas baskets for the needy and other praiseworthy programs.

Therefore, on this occasion it is a pleasure to pay tribute to Mrs. Mary Ratchford, president, and the members of the Hollidaysburg MOMS of America as they play host to the 1960 national convention and welcome their national president, Mrs. Marjorie Estes.

I join my fellow citizens of Blair County in wishing the MOMS of America a highly successful and truly enjoyable 1960 national convention.

I need not tell you of my deep personal interest in the servicemen and the veterans of America.

This interest likewise encompasses your organization which came into being in 1941.

Each war crisis our Nation has faced has brought American women further and further to the fore.

Words of tribute are inadequate, indeed, to express to the mothers of servicemen and veterans, the love and devotion and respect America holds for you.

Since the days of the first settlers the women of America have stood side by side with the men in the making of our Nation.

The pioneer women who ventured forth with their men in conquest of the American Continent shouldered hardships, endured the perils, and won the victories of the frontier.

Throughout the years of our development, the hands that rocked the cradle have been instrumental in laying the foundations upon which our Republic has been built.

Home and family are by no means the least of these foundations.

The family in this atomic age faces the same drastic changes that confront other American institutions, our industries, our governmental agencies, our Congress, our schools, and our churches.

Actually the changes that have occurred since World War II have brought as much complexity to the problems of home and family as to business and government.

For many this theory may be difficult to accept.

The home and the family are basic institutions that are expected to "be there" in spite of any existing tension or emergency.

These facts place a tremendous burden on the mothers of our Nation.

It is not my intent to offer sympathy to the MOMS of America because of the sacrifice you have already made or because of the difficulties and uncertainties you face in the future.

I do not offer you sympathy.

Your actions indicate you accept our age as a challenger.

Your sacrifices have become elements of consecration rather than elements of surrender.

You utilize uncertainty as a tonic and existing difficulty becomes a rededication.

All of America could profitably follow this pattern and, as all mothers throughout the ages have done, set its face toward the future with confidence.

In the hurricane of our times, in this world of sudden revolutions, the family must remain a haven of sweet comfort and security.

The beauty of this fact is that whether among Samoans in Polynesia, Pennsylvanians in America, or Londoners in England the family is the center of human affections.

Beyond this, what the family teaches makes our world.

Through the ages the foundations of the family have been moral, from the long preaching in a Navajo hut to a New England mother's reading of the Bible to her children.

Right and wrong have come to sharp focus in the family through the years.

And at the core of the family is the joy and innocence of the child, the protective love for him as he learns to trust, the understanding love as he learns to be independent, to adjust to the world, and to imagine and develop ideas.

Where the family goes, the world follows.

So we can learn from the family something of mankind's direction.

Onrushing technology is reshaping the life pattern of millions.

But we cannot neglect to emphasize that onrushing technology is the direct result of individual thought.

And it is largely in the family—whether in the flamboyant green of a jungle or the vast impersonality of a city—that the identity of the individual takes form.

Robert R. Brunn, American news editor of the Christian Science Monitor, has reminded us that "Globally the trend is toward the Western family, now in the minority."

In centuries to come this could well be the universal pattern.

In Islam's sweeping crescent from North Africa through the Middle East to Pakistan and Indonesia ancient family modes are fading before 20th century enlightenment.

Slavery, the despotic father, the bargaining away of brides, and the wearing of the veil are still present—but all are faltering.

Young people demand change—and so do the women.

Turkey is a striking example.

There the veil and exclusion of women were outlawed years ago.

It is fortunate that in European countries the marriage of convenience is fading.

Father domination holds on in many sections, however.

It does appear though that a pattern of free individual choice and independence is forcing its way in to unlock social shackles in many areas of old Europe.

In Germany after the Nazi thrust for power which involved war occupation and the holding of tens of thousands of husbands and fathers in Soviet camps for years, the family has emerged triumphant.

Twenty long years of trials have strengthened the average German's devotion to family values.

Latin America's family patterns are in many ways closer to those of Europe and Asia than those of the United States and Canada.

But the pressure to change in South America comes from the north and in the Latin-American cities the American-type family is becoming plainly visible.

In all of the instances I have cited more education and more understanding is bringing more individual freedom, and in turn, an elevation of the influence of the family.

It is a gripping thought that dictatorship cannot accept loyalty to the family—loyalty to the mother or the father.

In the eyes of the dictator, loyalty to the family weakens the grip of the state on the individual.

Following the Red Revolution, Communist doctrine preached that the family was an outmoded and useless device, as outworn as private property.

In this belief the Soviets have gone against human nature, not to mention morality, taste, history, sociology, politics, and expediency.

Currently we see evidence that the Soviet Union is trying desperately to convince the eyes of the world that family is important.

But thus far their love of family has by no means become an example for the rest of the world.

There is not displayed in Russia a high regard for the individual.

The Soviet Union first and then the individual, that remains an integral part of their political philosophy.

In any national crisis our mothers—our homemakers—must first and foremost defend the homes of America.

For those who leave their homes for military service to defend the cause of freedom, the mothers of America have kept the home intact as a bright and shining institution.

Defense of the homefront should not be dropped from the docket, however, in times of peace.

There are certain hallmarks of American homelife that further the learning of the ways of our Republic.

These I would like to mention.

(a) The home has as its primary object and central purpose the welfare of all in the household.

(b) There is equal opportunity for all regardless of sex or age in a true American home.

(c) Our basic American liberties and the practices of these liberties are first started in the home.

(d) The economic, social, and political conditions of the home are maintained in order that all in the household may have enjoyment that is realized from these three factors.

(e) All in the home have the right to share and help determine the program and policies to be pursued.

(f) The homes of America teach that every privilege entails a corresponding duty and responsibility to that particular individual who in turn is held responsible to the family as a whole.

(g) The home trains the individual to be efficient in citizenship.

(h) The home promotes loyalty and understanding.

(i) The home develops in each individual of that home the ability to solve problems.

The MOMS of America and every American mother know better than I that the fine art of living together in peace must be established in our homes.

The past few decades have not been without change in the American family.

The American family no longer tends to determine careers, marriages, prestige, or a person's political position.

The American family has been freed to concentrate on personal relationships and moral evaluation to create an atmosphere of love and order devoted to the perfection of the family as individuals.

At a time when the freedoms of men and women are being efficiently and ruthlessly destroyed overnight the home in America stands as the fact and the symbol of individual freedom.

Not even our own Government can enter it without legal consent.

In how many places in the world is the home still inviolate?

This security of man in his own home, with his family, is one of the world's wonders, yet we Americans too frequently take it as a simple thing, natural to us.

You, as representative American mothers, preside over American homes which are equipped with the facilities for teaching our children during the precarious stages of growth.

Today we are deluged with gadgets, equipment, and devices for making homelife more efficient.

This is as it should be.

Modern technology has lessened the drudgery for our homemakers.

But the underwriter of the home continues to be the entirely reliable institution of motherhood.

The qualifications are those which call for the highest attributes of mind, personality, and executive ability.

The American home will continue on its way to build for a better world so long as mothers say to their sons and daughters, "I promise to match your honesty with my honesty, your loyalty with my loyalty, and your fairness with my fairness."

But most of all I am firmly convinced that the mothers of our Nation must create within our homes a fuller understanding of our world.

I do not wish to leave with you pure sentiment and mere platitudes concerning home, family and mother.

But I wish to emphasize your job as a living, practical symbol in a world of uncertainty.

It is your job to make home a place where we learn how to be free.

In the perfect home we stretch out on the floor, or cook hideous dishes in the kitchen at midnight, or bellow our favorite tunes in the shower.

But it is not enough to enjoy our freedom.

We have duties.

The snow must be shoveled.

The dog must be trained not to dig up the flowers.

The leaky roof must be patched.

The floor scratched by the party must be waxed.

The hedge must be trimmed.

This is the unyielding routine.

This is the slow forming of a character geared to the real world.

The homemaker who complains of drudgery can, if she will, beat her shackles into bracelets and turn toil into play.

In making her home beautiful, and her family happy, she too makes herself beautiful.

Finally, it is my belief that the mothers of our generation, and especially you who are dedicated to the high principles of the MOMS of America, wish for your children a future which will bring to the world a combination of peace and tolerance, a future where homes will turn self-interest and mechanics into a human civilization.

And now in conclusion let me summarize my remarks by simply saying that here in America our homes are the citadels of American freedom.

Area Development Legislation Is Still Possible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in the President's veto message on the area redevelopment bill, he stated:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 722, the area redevelopment bill.

For 5 consecutive years I have urged the Congress to enact sound area assistance legislation. On repeated occasions I have clearly outlined standards for the kind of program that is needed and that I would gladly approve.

In 1958 I vetoed a bill because it departed greatly from those standards. In 1959, despite my renewed urging, no area assistance bill was passed by the Congress.

Now in 1960, another election year, a new bill is before me that contains certain features which I find even more objectionable than those I found unacceptable in the 1958 bill.

The people of the relatively few communities of chronic unemployment—who want to share in the general prosperity—are, after 5 years, properly becoming increasingly impatient and are rightfully desirous of constructive action. The need is for truly sound and helpful legislation on which the Congress and the Executive can agree. There is still time and I willingly pledge once again my wholehearted cooperation in obtaining such a law.

After listing his objections to this bill, he again called upon the Congress to present legislation that would meet the approval of both the Congress and the Executive, as follows:

Again, I strongly urge the Congress to enact new legislation at this session—but without those features of S. 722 that I find objectionable. I would, however, accept the eligibility criteria set forth in the bill that first passed the Senate even though these criteria are broader than those contained in the administration bill.

Moreover, during the process of developing a new bill, I would hope that in other areas of past differences solutions could be found satisfactory to both the Congress and the Executive.

My profound hope is that sound, new legislation will be promptly enacted. If it is, our communities of chronic unemployment will be only the immediate beneficiaries. A tone will have been set that would hold forth, for the remainder of the session, the hope of sound and rewarding legislation in other vital areas—mutual security, wheat, sugar, minimum wage, interest rates, revenue measures, medical care for the aged and aid to education to mention but a few.

Only this result can truly serve the finest and best interests of all our people.

It is time for the Congress and Executive to give serious attention to the enactment of an area redevelopment bill. I call upon the leadership of the House to bring forth a measure that can be enactment of an area redevelopment bill. I done now. The President has asked for a moderate bill—let us, therefore, give

him one that will meet with the administration's approval and get this program going at once.

I, along with my colleagues Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. FENTON, have introduced measures in the House which represent a good compromise, and one that can become law during this session of Congress.

As part of my remarks, I include an editorial from the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat of May 14, 1960:

AREA DEVELOPMENT BILL STILL POSSIBLE

President Eisenhower's veto of the area development bill can hardly be called unexpected. It had been forecast in debate on the bill in both House and Senate. The bill was much the same as the one the President vetoed in 1958, though somewhat lower in amount, and no effort had been made by the bill's sponsors to meet the President's objections in other respects or to seek a compromise.

There is, however, one major difference between the veto this year, and the veto in 1958. That was a pocket-veto after Congress had adjourned, since the measure had been passed in the closing days of the session. This time the veto message was sent to Congress in sufficient time to permit passage of a more moderate measure such as Mr. Eisenhower has asked for years—if the Democratic Congress really wants area development legislation.

The veto, on the basis of the narrow margin by which the bill was approved in the House and Senate, cannot be overridden. But a compromise bill could be whipped through Congress on quick order; and if it is not, the political purpose of the original bill will become apparent. There is good evidence that its principal sponsors wanted an issue for the coming campaign, instead of a law.

If Congress does not pass a bill which would set this activity in motion promptly, the evidence will be conclusive that the original measure was simply designed to play politics with human hopes and human distress.

Like the President, this newspaper believes and has said that the vetoed bill was far too broad for an experimental effort of this kind, for which there had been no experiences on a national scale. A series of articles on this page has pointed out the sharp disagreements in Congress itself on several phases of the bill that Congress passed. It had to be altered on the floor of the House, for that matter, up to the last minute, though the subject has been under active consideration in Congress for more than 5 years.

We do not know how effectively a Federal area development program would work—nor does anyone else. There is one basic conflict within the plan itself. It seeks to help depressed areas attract new industry, but it also professes to avoid drawing such industry from other more prosperous areas. State and local activities for depressed areas do not contain such internal contradictions, since they are frankly competitive.

Certainly there is reason to approach such a Federal program cautiously, and this is what the administration wants to do. The amount of money is a far less serious matter; and, if the plan works, additional money would be forthcoming swiftly. Meanwhile, if those who have made such an outcry for this legisation are sincere, they will try now for a moderate start.

This newspaper is as anxious as anyone could be for a program which will help the area it serves, and the State of Pennsylvania. We do not, however, want legislation which would raise hopes, only to dash them later. We believe that the administration plan offers a sound approach to the problem of depressed areas. And we trust that those who have been calling upon Mr. Eisenhower to sign a bill he does not believe sound, will now be equally vociferous in calling upon Congress to pass a bill which can become law within a few weeks.

Our Federal Excise Tax Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. BARR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a resolution into the House of Representatives authorizing and directing the Ways and Means Committee to begin a study of our Federal excise tax structure. The purpose of this study is to determine which taxes the United States can give up and return to the States for educational and other purposes. We are estimating budget receipts of $9,100 million from excise taxes in fiscal 1960, and from a preliminary check it would seem to me that about 5 percent of this total, or about $500 million comes from taxes that could be collected efficiently by the States. All the taxes under the budget heading "Retailers Excise Taxes" and including the taxes on jewelry, furs, and so forth, could probably be efficiently collected by the States. The total under this budget heading comes to an estimated $377 mil-inary check it would seem to me that about $150 million from the budget heading "Miscellaneous Excise Taxes" and including taxes on admissions, club dues, billiard tables, and bowling alleys could be turned back to the States.

Because of the fact that our business is conducted more and more on a national level, it becomes increasingly difficult for the States to collect certain taxes. They simply cannot get the money stopped as it flows across the country. This is the reason I have asked for a study by Ways and Means to determine what excise taxes now collected by the Federal Government could be efficiently collected by the States. As I mentioned above, a preliminary check seems to indicate that taxes totaling about $500 million would fit this test.

Since the collapse of the summit conference, the Congress has been besieged by new spending requests. The very next day the Department of Defense came to us and asked that we put back in the appropriation bill about $300 million for an atomic aircraft carrier and about the same amount for Bomarc missiles. In my opinion this is foolish. I for one had no hopes of any results from the summit and voted for the defense budget assuming that the cold war would be around for quite a while. Khrushchev's belligerence came as no particular surprise to me, so I am not going to be stampeded into an enormous increase in military spending.

History has been telling us for several thousand years that nations are not murdered by an aggressor; they usually commit suicide by neglecting their internal problems. This is a good time to remember the lesson. If we are stampeded into diverting more and more of our national resources into military funds rather than facing the purely local problems of schools, teachers' salaries, sanitation, hospitals, libraries, police protection, and transportation, we can kill this Nation as effectively as the Communists could by aggression.

The solution of these local problems by local and State governments has become increasingly difficult because the United States has literally crowded them out of many fields of taxation. If local governments are going to solve local problems, they must get their hands on some money. The old standby of local government, the property tax, is just about "on the ropes." There is not much room for additional revenue from this source. So the alternatives are simple. The Federal Government can try to solve local problems, or it can vacate certain fields of taxation and let the States go after this money. I would favor trying the last alternative first for the simple reason that it is so difficult to devise a national program to fit the diverse problems of all the States in this country.

The proposal that I am bringing forward could provide an initial $500 million for local problems. This should mean about $12½ million a year for our State of Indiana and about $2½ million a year for my congressional district. It would at least be a start in facing up to our local problems of education, urban development, sanitation, and police and fire protection.

Address Delivered by Senator Smathers Before the Atlanta Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, last Friday the Bar Association of the City of Atlanta had the good fortune to hear a timely address by our distinguished and able colleague, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

The Senator's remarks dealt with the crisis that is confronting our Nation as a result of the U–2 plane incident and the subsequent breakup of the summit conference in Paris.

Mr. President, I believe all of us can profit from the calm and reasoned analysis that the Senator from Florida has made of these momentous events. Certainly all of us wholeheartedly support his conclusion, namely that this Nation must make it unmistakably clear to

Khrushchev that we intend to stand firm in the face of his blusters and threats. As he has so well stated it:

We must show that we do mean business—that we will not abandon our rights nor shirk our duties. * * * This is the surest road to peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the remarks of the Senator from Florida printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Let me turn now to a subject which has been dominating the world's front pages during all of the past fortnight.

I refer, of course, to the U–2 "spy-in-the-sky" incident and the consequent breakdown in the summit meetings at Paris.

First of all, let me say this about the crisis atmosphere in which we now find ourselves: Basically, all that has happened is a dashing of expectations; nothing fundamental has changed at all.

Regardless of what might have happened at Paris in the way of relaxing world tensions, the Soviet Union would not have given up its intention of converting the world, by hook or crook, to communism. The tactics may change, but never the final strategy.

Accordingly, just as there was never any ground for wild anticipation, neither is there, in the current situation, any reason for panic.

No doubt we will see, in the months ahead, a lowering of temperatures in the cold war. We must be prepared, again, for a series of challenges to Western solidarity and, again, we must meet them coolly—as we have met previous challenges.

Certainly, the danger of thermonuclear war has not been diminished by the developments of May 1960—but, neither, it seems to me, has this danger been much increased. Unless the Russians achieve military preponderance, they have nothing to gain from war.

No one wins a war of mutual annihilation. The Russians are realists, and they know this as well as we do.

One of our most important tasks is to see to it that the Soviet Union never obtains the military preponderance which will make the risk of war seem attractive.

If the "spy-in-the-sky" incident has not in fact materially altered the reality of the world situation—as opposed to its appearance—what then has occurred? What is all the fuss about?

Personally, I think there is a certain amount of real comfort to be derived from the U–2 flight. It demonstrates, to our citizens and to the world at large, that the myth of Soviet impregnability is exactly that—a myth. If a single, unarmed, slow-moving spy plane can penetrate Soviet airspace to a distance of 1,300 miles, then obviously a mass flight of Strategic Air Command bombers can also penetrate to perform SAC's assigned task of retaliation in event of surprise attack.

Nonetheless, while I take this consolation from the U–2 affair, I must say that the timing of the flight and our handling of its exposure were major blunders.

I say this for these reasons:

I have always believed in the positive value of conversation between East and West even though they cannot, in the nature of things, lead to a total resolution of differences. I think they could, in favorable circumstances, affect the nature of the competition between East and West, changing it from cold war competition to peaceful economic, political, and social competition.

Such a change would materially reduce the possibility of accidental war and the danger of limited but still quite deadly warfare such as we have experienced in Korea and Indochina.

Accordingly, I regret the timing of the U–2 flight insofar as that flight has become a factor in the interruption of conversations between Mr. Khrushchev and the Big Three.

Nonetheless, it must be clear from his performance in Paris that Mr. Khrushchev wanted the summit meeting to disintegrate, that the U–2 incident was the vehicle of the breakup but not its cause.

Had Mr. Khrushchev been disposed to continue the dialog between East and West he could have accepted, without damaging the world position of the Soviet Union, President Eisenhower's statement that U–2 flights had been canceled and would not be resumed.

Indeed he would have seemed magnanimous, and he would no doubt have won a considerable propaganda victory.

Instead, Khrushchev made a series of demands the United States could not meet under any considerable circumstances.

Why?

The answer, I think, crept out in Mr. Khrushchev's tirade Monday. The U–2 incident, he said, had become a factor in the internal politics of the Soviet Union.

We in the West have known for a long time of the behind-the-scenes jockeying in the Kremlin over the policy of peaceful coexistence. Arrayed against Mr. Khrushchev and his supporters have stood the Stalinist clique with its nostalgia for the old days of the mailed fist, and, in tandem, the generals of the Red army and air force. Over Khrushchev's shoulder at all stages has loomed the menace of Red China and its Stalin-type leadership.

These groups have never had any confidence in the policy of peaceful coexistence. They have, according to our certain knowledge, sabotaged it every inch of the way and now, with a boost from the U–2 incident, they have stolen the initiative.

Mr. Khrushchev, in other words, is playing the simple cat-and-mouse game of political survival in the toughest league there is—the Kremlin hierarchy.

Where does all of this leave the West?

Fortunately, I think, Mr. Khrushchev has overreached himself with world opinion.

His phony innocence deceives no one. "As God is my witness," he said on Monday, "I come here with clean hands and a pure soul."

The only way I know to describe this statement is with the Yiddish word "Hutspeh" ("u" like the "oo" in "foot") which may be defined as the quality shown by the man who murdered his mother and father and then demanded mercy because he was an orphan.

The world surely recognizes Nikita Khrushchev for the sanctimonious hypocrite he is.

And so I would judge that we have not lost much, if any, ground in our propaganda battle with the Soviet Union.

We will have to play our hand carefully with respect to the U–2 incident, but, for the moment at least, we do not seem to be at any great disadvantage. Happily, the Russians have done a very clumsy piece of work and have muffed their opportunity.

More serious, I think, are the pressures the Soviet Union is certain to exert on the circle of countries which serve as U.S. airbases. Norway, Turkey, Pakistan, Japan, and others have already felt the hot breath of Kremlin displeasure and they are squirming under it.

Given the delicate state of the political situation in many of these countries as it affects relations with the United States, we will have to exert the utmost dexterity to avoid the loss of our forward bases and at the same time prevent the raising of political issues which could do enormous damage to friendly governments with their own electorates.

This task will require cool and careful diplomacy on the part of the administration and great restraint on the part of all U.S. political leaders. We can afford no further blunders. Neither should criticism of the administration's handling of this episode be permitted to degenerate into a backbiting exchange of charge and countercharge. The country's interests are above personal or party interests. At all times we should strive to maintain bipartisan unity at the water's edge. It is the key to survival.

Now, let me add this further thought. We need as a people, in developing this bipartisan unity at the water's edge, to recognize that we are in for a long, hard pull.

The U–2 incident is merely an episode.

Those who were pinning all their hopes on a miracle at the summit were bound to be disappointed sooner or later. They have merely been disappointed sooner.

Let's remember that the springlike atmosphere of the 1955 summit meeting was subsequently dispelled by Hungary and by Suez—and yet the Big Four managed once again to find its way to the summit.

Regardless of which phase we are in—summit or contrasummit—we need to keep our vision as firmly fixed on our goal as the Soviet Union's vision is fixed on its goal.

Their cause is world revolution by whatever route; our cause is the spread of democratic methods and institutions as a means of checking communism and contributing to the economic progress of the free nations of the earth.

We dare not allow our glance to be diverted from our objective by scare tactics nor even by overt actions short of war.

If there is a nuclear stalemate in the world, if there is a balance of terror, then this stalemate and this balance affect the Russians as well as they affect us.

Cowardice in the face of danger will only cause us to give away what cannot be taken from us.

Regardless of what cards he draws, the man who does not know the value of his own hand will walk away from the poker table without his shirt. He will be bluffed into throwing away his winning hands and suckered into entering pots he cannot claim.

This metaphor, I think, holds except in three respects: The stakes are higher. The play of the hands is infinitely more complex. And this is no game.

We are in the deadly serious business of seeing to our survival as a nation, as a civilization, as a species.

The greatest danger, as I see it, to survival in all three of these categories is that our antagonist will miscalculate.

We must not in a moment of vacillation allow him to misjudge the point at which we will yield no further, as Hitler misread the intentions of the British in the aftermath of Munich.

We must show that we do mean business—that we will not abandon our rights nor shirk our duties. We must demonstrate that we shall stand firm in the face of threats—and, if we do this, then we shall make the men in the Kremlin realize that the line has been drawn and they cannot cross it without unleashing the fury of a war which no one can win.

This is the surest road to peace. It will not be an easy road—the Communists will put roadblocks every mile along the way and try to tempt us and our allies, with detours which they can make attractive looking indeed at the entrance, carefully camouflaging the beartraps to which they lead. But it is the road we must follow, whatever sacrifices it may require, if we as a nation are to survive—if Western civilization is to be preserved.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 1960

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, fronting unfinished tasks calling for courage and wisdom, we bow again in this hallowed shrine of our dear-bought liberties, asking that Thy completeness may flow around our incompleteness. With all our missing the mark, make us fit servants of Thy will in all the earth.

Upon those here entrusted with the stewardship of the Nation's welfare, pour, we beseech Thee, a double portion of Thy enabling grace.

May no ugly moods of thought or speech spoil the music of a united fellowship. May criticism be tempered with charity, convictions with tolerance, appraisals with magnanimity, and even judgments of disapproval with appreciation for honest motives and work well done, as we ascribe to others the patriotism without alloy we claim for ourselves.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 24, 1960, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SATELLITES AND PEACE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in light of the current world situation, the successful effort to launch an experimental Midas satellite by the Air Force could easily be one of the most significant events of the year. It could easily outmode a great deal of current thinking, and could make academic many of the disputes which now divide the world.

The immediate objective of the Midas satellite family, of course, is to provide early warning of any possible ballistic missile attack against the United States. Should the experiment now under way be successful, the time in which we would learn of such an assault would be materially increased.

Behind the Midas satellite, there is the reconnaissance satellite. This instrument—still in the future—can give us accurate information as to what is happening on the face of the globe.

It seems to me, however, that we must look upon these developments as more than merely weapons added to the military arsenal of the United States. If our vision is limited to methods of destruction, we shall not obtain the only truly worthwhile goal—a world of peace and a world of freedom.

The reconnaissance satellite, once it is in operation, will bring to a reality President Eisenhower's proposal for open skies. The issues of "overflights" and espionage will become dim echoes out of the past.

We live in a country which can flourish best in a world where secrecy and suspicion have been abolished. We have a system that can stand up under the closest scrutiny of other people seeking to find flaws in our way of life.

It is not necessary for our great country to build walls to keep people out or to shut our own people in. We can exist confident in the strength of our system which provides both freedom and prosperity to an extent never before known in history.

For this reason, it would seem to me, as I have suggested before, that it would be wise for our country to launch a crash program to develop the reconnaissance satellite. Once it is in orbit, we should offer in good faith to turn over the information that it would get to the United Nations.

A nation which is not an aggressor, but which truly desires to live in peace, has nothing to lose from such a step. It has, on the contrary, a great deal to gain.

We need a world in which people do not have to live under the haunting shadow of fear that a devastating attack may be launched at any time against their whole land. That world can become a possibility; and it may be that our able scientists and our great technicians and our great leaders in Government in their restless and eager quest for new knowledge may put into our hands instruments that can lead to peace.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN IOWA, KENTUCKY, TENNESSEE, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, SOUTH CAROLINA, AND WISCONSIN

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Badger Creek and Mill-Picayune Creek, Iowa, Marsh Creek, Ky., and Tenn., Persimmon and Burnt Corn Creek, Miss., Tabo Creek, Mo., Fishing Creek, S.C., and Bad Axe, Wis. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen," for the fiscal year 1960, has been apportioned on a basis that indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

TEMPORARY INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF OBLIGATIONS ISSUED UNDER SECOND LIBERTY BOND ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a temporary increase in the amount of obligations, issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, which may be outstanding at any one time (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN OKLAHOMA, TENNESSEE, KENTUCKY, AND TEXAS

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Upper Black Bear Creek, Okla., Reelfoot-Indian Creek, Tenn. and Ky., and Olmitos and Garcias Creeks, Tex. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

MEMORIALS

Memorials were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The memorial of Robert H. Kelly, of Houston, Tex., remonstrating against the adoption of the resolution (S. Res. 94) relating to the recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in certain disputes hereafter arising; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A memorial, signed by Ralph Marsh, and several other citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., remonstrating against the adoption of the resolution (S. Res. 94) relating to the recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in certain disputes hereafter arising; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1957. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of domestic tin (Rept. No. 1421).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1396. A bill for the relief of Ante Tonic (Tunic), his wife, Elizabeth Tunic, and their two minor children, Ante Tunic, Jr., and Joseph Tunic (Rept. No. 1434);

S. 2089. A bill for the relief of Henry K. Lee (Hyun Kui) (Rept. No. 1435);

S.2176. A bill for the relief of Antonio Abele Tarabocchia (Rept. No. 1436);

S. 2571. A bill to amend the Act entitled "An act for the relief of Karl Ullstein" (Rept. No. 1437);

S. 2646. A bill for the relief of Lloyd C. Kimm (Rept. No. 1438);

S. 2717. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Floriana Vardjan (Rept. No. 1439);

S. 2768. A bill for the relief of Frederick T. C. Yu and his wife, Alice Siao-Fen Chen Yu (Rept. No. 1440);

S. 2817. A bill for the relief of Joseph R. Paquette (Rept. No. 1441);

S. 2892. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Hatta (Rept. No. 1442);

S. 2918. A bill for the relief of Boris Priestly (Rept. No. 1443);

S. 2940. A bill for the relief of Zeldi Bornstayn (Rept. No. 1444);

S. 2941. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ming-Chen Hsu (nee Nai-Fu Mo) (Rept. No. 1445);

S. 2946. A bill for the relief of James (Demetrios) Dourakos (Rept. No. 1446);

S. 2967. A bill for the relief of Huan-pin Tso (Rept. No. 1447);

S. 3016. A bill for the relief of Walter F. Beecroft (Rept. No. 1448);

S. 3027. A bill for the relief of Samir Anabtawi (Rept. No. 1449);

S. 3091. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Mira (Rept. No. 1450);

S. 3142. A bill for the relief of Maria Luisa Martinez (Rept. No. 1452);

S. 3143. A bill for the relief of Angel Ardaiz Martinez (Rept. No. 1451);

S. 3168. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Georgiou Stavropoulos (Rept. No. 1453);

S. 3235. A bill for the relief of Cecilia Rubio (Rept. No. 1454);

H.R. 471. An act to amend chapter 561 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall have the same authority to remit indebtedness of enlisted members upon discharge as the Secretaries of the Army and the Air Force have (Rept. No. 1455);

H.R. 2588. An act for the relief of Buck Yuen Sah (Rept. No. 1456);

H.R. 4549. An act for the relief of Jacob Naggar (Rept. No. 1457);

H.R. 4834. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Antonio Turchi (Rept. No. 1458);

H.R. 5150. An act for the relief of Our Lady of the Lake Church (Rept. No. 1459);

H.R. 5880. An act for the relief of Nels Lund (Rept. No. 1460);

H.R. 6712. An act for the relief of Sam J. Buzzanca (Rept. No. 1461);

H.R. 7895. An act for the relief of Gloria Anne Loveday (Rept. No. 1462);

H.R. 8417. An act for the relief of Grand Lodge of North Dakota, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons (Rept. No. 1463);

H.R. 9106. An act for the relief of John E. Simpson (Rept. No. 1464);

H.R. 9170. An act for the relief of John J. Finn, Jr. (Rept. No. 1465);

H.R. 9249. An act for the relief of Marlene A. Grant (Rept. No. 1466);

H.R. 9442. An act for the relief of Charles Bradford LaRue (Rept. No. 1467);

H.R. 9563. An act for the relief of Josef Enzinger (Rept. No. 1468);

H.R. 9921. An act to validate certain payments of additional pay for sea duty made to members and former members of the U.S. Coast Guard (Rept. No. 1469);

H.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the West Virginia Centennial Celebration to be held in 1963 at various locations in the State of West Virginia, and for other purposes (Rept. 1483);

S. Res. 98. Resolution to refer to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 1284) for the relief of William E. Stone (Rept. No. 1431);

S. Res. 107. Resolution to refer to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 1651) for the relief of Archie L. Dickson, Jr. (Rept. No. 1432); and

S. Res. 140. Resolution referring to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 2243) for the relief of Ralph Feffer and Sons (Rept. No. 1433).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 2106. A bill for the relief of Emiko Nagamine (Rept. No. 1470);

S. 2237. A bill for the relief of Mico Delic (Rept. No. 1471);

S. 2964. A bill for the relief of Kang Sun Ok (Rept. No. 1472);

S. 2982. A bill for the relief of Eduardo Giron Rodriguez (Rept. No. 1473);

S. 2991. A bill for the relief of Ah See Lee Chin (Rept. No. 1474);

H.R. 2645. An act for the relief of Jesus Cruz-Figueroa (Rept. No. 1476);

H.R. 6816. An act to amend section 57a of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 93(a)) and section 152, title 18, United States Code (Rept. No. 1477);

H.R. 8888. An act for the relief of Angela Maria (Rept. No. 1478); and

H.J. Res. 678. Joint resolution relating to the entry of certain aliens (Rept. No. 1475).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 762. A bill for the relief of Manuel Alves DeCarvalho (Rept. No. 1479);

S. 2639. A bill for the relief of Tong Mo Loui (Rept. No. 1480);

S. 3038. A bill for the relief of Pak Jung Hi (Rept. No. 1481); and

H.J. Res. 638. Joint resolution relating to deportation of certain aliens (Rept. No. 1482).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 285. A bill for the relief of John A. Skenandore (Rept. No. 1422).

By Mr. COTTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1321. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to consent, on behalf of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, to a modification of the terms of a trust instrument executed by James B. Wilbur (Rept. No. 1423).

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1600. A bill for the relief of Grace L. Patton (Rept. No. 1424).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H.R. 7577. An act to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1425).

By Mr. CARROLL, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 1653. An act for the relief of Evelyn Albi (Rept. No. 1426).

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment.

S.J. Res. 181. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual Youth Appreciation Week (Rept. No. 1428).

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H.R. 6121. An act for the relief of Placid J. Pecoraro, Gabrielle Pecoraro, and their minor child, Joseph Pecoraro (Rept. No. 1427).

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 1430) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 108) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 214; 8 U.S.C. 1254(c)):

A-4337830, Balian, Hetoum.
A-3796156, Cocchiara, Franceso.
A-5805886, Diachuk, Anton.
A-3217992, Donati, Dante Joseph.
A-5957256, Friesen, Jacob T.
A-10367234, Goethals, David.
A-6683188, Gustafson, Elmer Knute.
A-5398546, Hing, Lee.
A-3753202, Kirsch, Helen Ann Hudson.
A-4678924, Knaisky, Alex.
A-2916574, Krasinski, Felix Frank.
A-1843781, Kulesza, Stanley.
A-5062680, Lebel, Morris.
A-4084621, Leto, Gaetano.
A-3479810, Loeb, Harry.
A-2278968, Matusiak, Walter.
A-5958294, Morten, William Richard.
A-3399434, Padilla, Joe.
A-5164925, Parsin, Nicholas.
A-5761121, Reyes-Perez, Manuel.
A-6953945, Rosen, Reuben.
A-2833184, Ventrera, Rocco.
A-4535016, Vlahos, Anastasio.
A-6948450, Zarate, Lorenzo.
A-3785377, Vitagliano, Feleciano.
A-10949520, Cicchetti, Biaggio John.
A-6782676, Vielkind, Joseph Rudolph.
A-6401740, Willumeit, Otto Albert.
A-10087628, Cheung, Pat Kwock.
A-1853197, Ignotis, Leonas Louis.
A-5070555, Kulakowski, James.
A-5751283, Lara, Lupe Rincon.
A-4454891, Nestroy, Joseph.
A-3207150, Plevinsky, John J.
A-10845906, Woon, Huey Gim.
A-1291890, Andrade-Marrero, Francisco.
A-2950893, Bigras, Norman John Leonard.
A-8874149, Hurtado, Raymond.
A-5206377, Ketzenzis, Basilios Demos.
A-5175516, McKay, Julia Elizabeth.
A-3028956, Moy, Yee.
A-8190474, Nadzam, John Andrew.
A-2561599, De Hernandez, Angelina Diaz.
A-3183469, Pagnozzi, Joseph Pepe.
A-5652064, Bagliore, Frank.
A-5731475, Folkers, Herman Richard.
A-11166168, Guillen-Porras, Marcos.
A-3173438, Herskovitz, Lajos.
A-1734315, Yeargle, Roy A.
A-5750516, Deutsch, Frank.
A-2079872, Glasser, Charles.
A-5480212, Hiracheta-Rodriguez, Anacelto.
A-10198028, Losa, Primitivo.
A-4682905, Russo, Guy Thomas.
A-10432443, Walter, George.
A-2323922, Phiskunoff, Peter.
A-2753700, Lopez, Manuel.
A-4963677, Andrews, Michael.
A-5938328, Hollander, Per Erik Gunnar.
A-5206147, Stern, Herman.
A-2610759, Alvanos, Blias.
A-10392830, Leppa, Michael.
A-1090977, Velasquez-Refugio, Francisco.
A-2539330, Mikkelsen, Hans Christian Gunnar.

COMPENSATION OF STATE OF OREGON FOR FIREFIGHTING COSTS—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original resolution referring S. 1153 to the Court of Claims, and I submit a report (No. 1429) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 327) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1153) entitled "A bill to compensate the State of Oregon for firefighting costs", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the

United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimants.

REPORT ENTITLED "ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE"—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1484)

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 61, as extended, I submit a report entitled "Administrative Practice and Procedure," together with the individual views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the individual views of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. I ask that the report, together with the individual views, be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Administrator of General Services, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Alfred C. Richmond, Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, to be admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard; and

James A. Hirshfield, Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, to be vice admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Roy L. Stephenson, of Iowa, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Iowa.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 17 flag and general officers in the Army and Navy. I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The nominations placed on the calendar are as follows:

Col. Joseph Leroy Bernier, Dental Corps, U.S. Army, for appointment as Assistant Surgeon General, U.S. Army, as major general, Dental Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general in the Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. Richard Steinbach, Army of the United States, colonel, U.S. Army, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, in the rank of major general; and

Col. Howard Allen Morris, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army); Col. Thomas DeForth Rogers, U.S. Army; and Col. Seymour Austin Potter, Jr., U.S. Army, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States in the grade of brigadier general;

Rear Adm. Morris A. Hirsch, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Director of Budget and Reports in the Department of the Navy;

Lt. Gen. William Stevens Lawton, and sundry other officers, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; and

Capt. William C. Mott, U.S. Navy, to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably a total of 3,035 nominations in the Navy and Air Force in the grade of captain and below. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk, for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Maine.

The nominations ordered to lie on the desk are as follows:

Lt. Col. Virgil J. O'Connor, for appointment as permanent registrar of the U.S. Air Force Academy;

Edwin M. Bradley, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

John W. Carlson, and sundry other distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps, for appointment in the Regular Air Force; and

Donald Joseph Stukel and Thomas Allen Walker, cadets, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force; and

Alfred J. Cler, and sundry other midshipmen (Naval Academy), to be permanent ensigns in the Navy.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3591. A bill for the relief of A. E. Waterstradt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 3592. A bill for the relief of Markos J. Janavaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S.J. Res. 198. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of June 16, 1938, creating the Niagara Falls Bridge Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 108) favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

RESOLUTION

COMPENSATION OF STATE OF OREGON FOR FIREFIGHTING COSTS—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 327) referring S. 1153 to the Court of Claims, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

NIAGARA FALLS BRIDGE COMMISSION

Mr. KEATING. I am delighted indeed that the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee is presently occupying the chair, for I am sure this is a matter of great concern to him.

Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and myself, I introduce a joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of June 16, 1938, with respect to the Niagara Falls Bridge Commission, and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 198) to amend the joint resolution of June 16, 1938, creating the Niagara Falls Bridge Commission, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Address in tribute to Jane Addams, delivered by Senator DOUGLAS at Rockford College on April 29, 1960.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Excerpts from speech by Stuart Tipton, president of Air Transport Association, at Morgantown, W. Va., May 24, 1960, and excerpts from remarks by Mr. RANDOLPH at same place and time.

A TIME FOR NONPARTISAN SELF-EXAMINATION ON THE SUMMIT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as a Democrat, I rise to say that in my judgment the wisest and the most sensible advice on the whole U–2 plane and summit debate has been spoken by a Republican, the Governor of New York, Nelson Rockefeller.

The full text of his speech was put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday; but because I think at least one part of his excellent remarks deserves special emphasis, I shall today read the concluding portion of Governor Rockefeller's speech, as follows:

The discussion and debate upon these matters must not degenerate into a clash of absurd partisan absolutes. It must not be allowed to become a thing of glib cliches or irresponsible invective or bitter slogans. It must be a thing of sense and substance.

CALLS FOR SELF-EXAMINATION

We know we have reason to be proud of our basic principles of policy in the world.

We know we have reason to be proud of the dignity and the integrity of the President in personifying these principles.

The special and powerful faculty of the democratic process, however, is not self-congratulation but self-examination.

We owe our friends in the world—and our own consciences—something more significant than an American proclamation of national perfection.

We owe them and ourselves an example—a powerful example—of a people who are morally and intellectually competent to pursue reasoned review and criticism of their own actions.

The future is what matters.

This defines the test for both political parties: to give positive proof that we can make a difficult and stressful time a thoughtful and creative time.

Let our reasoning be rigorous, our speech fair, our judgments honest. There is no other way to discover truth or to define purpose.

This is the way, and the only way, for a free people to act their age—and for their age.

CONGRESSIONAL HYPOCRISY ON HEALTH ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, we cannot ignore the just pleas of our senior citizens for adequate medical care. Neither can we sidestep the blunt charge of hypocrisy which is leveled at the Members of Congress in so many of the letters we receive—charges based on the free medical care we enjoy, supplementing our $22,500 salaries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter that is one of the countless number which contain that charge.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SIR: Why is it considered to be socialistic for the aged to get a little Government help during sickness when Government bigwigs can go into Walter Reed Hospital for free and we never hear anything about that being called socialism?

I paid dues into health insurance for years but never had occasion to use it. But when I reached 65 years of age they sent me a golden years policy stating the limited amounts I would be allowed to draw and raising my dues from $4.55 per month to $15.10 a month. I get $100 per month social security to live on, pay insurance, taxes, and any other expenses.

If the Forand bill is too objectionable why not set up some kind of old-age insurance that the old people can afford, so that they can be taken care of during sickness?

Yours truly,

——— ———.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR CHURCH, REGRETS FOR GOVERNOR NELSON, ON DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION KEYNOTER SELECTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday the Democratic National Committee selected the splendid young Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] as keynoter. He deserves our hearty congratulations, and I am sure he will do a splendid job.

At the same time, I think I must express my own very deep disappointment and regret that the Governor of Wisconsin, Gaylord Nelson, a magnificent speaker who has won widespread acclaim by citizens of both parties in Wisconsin, was not selected. I understand he was, along with Senator CHURCH, one of the two leading contenders. Mr. President, I greatly respect and admire the eloquence of Members of this body. We have among us some of the most eloquent speakers in the country. Governor Nelson is a match for the best.

I am sure Governor Nelson has before him an outstanding and brilliant future.

DESIRABILITY OF REVISION OF SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may address the Senate for 10 minutes in addition to the customary limitation in the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in January 1960, the Social Security Administration finished 20 years of paying monthly benefits. Checks were mailed to 13¾ million men, women, and children in communities throughout the country. Since January 1940, when the first Social Security checks were received, 21 million beneficiaries have received benefits totaling $50.4 billion. Retired workers and their dependents have received $38.1 billion of this amount. The survivors of workers who have died received $11.6 billion. Since July 1957, about $750 million has been paid to eligible disabled workers and their dependents. In addition to these monthly benefits, lump-sum death payments of $1.2 billion have been paid.

There should be pride that our social security plan, which began as a system covering only workers in commerce and industry, has won expansion, so that today practically all Americans who are earning a living are covered.

Presently, only 15.1 million persons in America's labor force are not under the Social Security system. This is out of a work force made up of 70.7 million in the United States. A breakdown of those not covered is as follows: 4.5 million are Federal, State, and local government employees; 4.1 million are unemployed; agricultural workers total 1.3 million; 1.3 million are unpaid family workers; 1 million are retired railroad workers; 0.9 million domestic workers are not covered; and miscellaneous workers total 2 million.

Liberalizations began in the 1939 amendments, when Congress recognized family need and provided benefits to dependents and survivors, as well as to the family breadwinners. Amendments extended coverage and increased benefits in 1950. In 1956, amendments provided benefits for people aged 50 and over who were so severely disabled that they could not work again.

There were other 1956 improvements, which I shall mention in a moment.

In West Virginia the effect of these programs has been dramatically illustrated. In 1950, only 46,253 persons received social security checks. By February 1959, the number totaled 159,399—almost four times the 1950 total. In 1950, monthly payments in West Virginia amounted to $294,000 per month. In 1959, the figure stood at $8,836,729 a month. This money means a great deal not only to the recipients, but also to the communities in which they live.

I would be the last to say, however, that the present system is perfect. For this reason, I urge lowering the eligible retirement age to 62 for men, to be the same as for women. Both should, also, receive full benefits.

The 1956 amendments provided full benefits for widows at the age of 62, and wives and women workers were given the option of accepting actuarially reduced benefits at age 62 or waiting for full benefits at age 65. I am one who has long been an advocate of a lower and more realistic retirement age for our social security program. I supported this change in 1956, even though I did not believe then, as I do not believe now, that it went far enough.

A recent collective report by the National Planning Association, entitled "Automation: Its Impact on Business and Labor," suggests some of the new job displacement problems which are already taking place and which will be multiplied in the future. The older worker is the target of such changes.

This report points out that many people fear that labor will suffer serious dislocation and hardship resulting from automation. They express deep concern that over the next 5 to 10 years, when the great changes from automation will become accentuated, there will be a growing surplus of jobseekers.

Automation has already produced graphic effects in my State. In 1950, West Virginia had 117,000 men employed in the coal fields. Today, a decade later, there are less than 40,000 men employed in West Virginia coal mines, and just as much, or more, coal can be produced.

West Virginia is not the only State so affected by automation. All States have their problems. It has been estimated that 154 engine blocks run through the production line in an hour, at the Ford plant in Cleveland, Ohio, requiring only 41 workers on the line—a production which, under the old methods, required 117 men. The Wall Street Journal reported recently that the Raytheon Manufacturing Co.'s Television and Radio Division plant is able to produce 1,000 radios a day, with just 2 workers on the line. To maintain that production rate,

standard hand assembly requires a labor force of 200 men. A new machine, called Autofab, can assemble in a little over a minute the same number of multiple-part electronic units that one worker, using conventional machinery, could do in a full day. It requires only two workers and a supervisor, and has a capacity of more than 200,000 assemblies a month, operating 40 hours a week.

I submit that we must, as one very important step in meeting the problems which automation is already creating, recognize that providing a lower retirement age under our social security system is absolutely essential.

Congress must face up to the challenge so clearly outlined for us in the report of the National Planning Association to which I have already referred. For, in the words of this report, workers—and especially older workers—displaced by automation will not automatically fit into those new jobs which will be created because—

> Unskilled workers, workers with specialized skills whose jobs have been taken over by machines, and older workers who have spent a working lifetime in a job only to find their skills made obsolete overnight, all have to be retrained so that they have a chance to acquire the new skills they need to work in an automated factory or office. Older workers, skilled or unskilled, present a particular problem. It is not easy for them to learn a new skill or, since employees are notably reluctant to hire them, to find a new job.

Summarizing its findings and their implications for the future, the report points to a lower retirement age as one of the adjustments which must be made:

> The effect of automation is to increase productivity, with the result that the problem of a dynamic balance between the number of jobseekers and the number of available jobs is very precarious. The solution is less work for each person, so that there is something for everybody to do. This can be achieved through the shorter workweek, through a lower retirement age, and through a raising of the age at which people enter the labor force. The balance can also be maintained by limiting the speed at which automation is introduced. If none of these steps is taken—or, if they are not all taken—the result will be mass unemployment, depression, and human suffering.

In the face of these facts, Mr. President, it is my conviction that we should take immediate steps to lower the retirement age in our social security plan from age 65 to age 62 for men, as is the case for women.

Opponents of any reduction in the retirement age maintain that such a move would be too expensive. Certainly it would cost more than the present program, but how much does it cost the Government when X number of workers are without jobs? Would not the reduced cost of public welfare and unemployment compensation programs go a long way toward equalizing the increased cost of lowering the age for retirement?

The Social Security Administration provided figures recently which indicate the cost to the employer, the employee, and the self-employed were the eligibility age reduced to 62 for men, with just men receiving full benefits.

The figures are based on the long-term or level-premium cost. For the employer and employee combined, the cost would be a fraction more than two-fifths of 1 percent of payroll—more easily understood, approximately $1.4 billion per year. The self-employed would be required to contribute a little less than one-third of 1 percent of the payroll. Approximately 1.5 million male workers would be affected immediately.

More feasible would be the plan, as I have stressed, for both men and women to receive full benefits at age 62. The cost here would, of course, be correspondingly higher. Still working with the level premium cost, the employee and employer would each pay approximately two-fifths of 1 percent of the payroll, the self-employed would pay about three-fifths of 1 percent of the payroll. The total cost of the program on an annual basis would be about $2½ billion, with some 2 million workers becoming eligible for retirement.

Theoretically, if each person eligible for retirement were to take advantage of the lowering of the age limit to 62, at least half of those 4 million Americans now unemployed would certainly have a better chance for a job.

Many of those eligible for retirement at age 62 would not retire, but it is conceivable that thousands—perhaps over a million—jobs would be made available.

For years I have advocated the lowering of the retirement age from 65 to 60. Opposition is strong to this. Perhaps, after hearing the feasibility of the lower age for social security retirement, those opponents could see their way clear to join me in the urging of a reduced age limitation to 62.

Columnist Walter Lippmann wrote recently:

> The central issue of the world struggle is whether the Soviet system or a liberal system can deal best with the problems that beset mankind. In that struggle we shall surely lose if we tell the world that, though we have the richest economy in all history, our liberal system is such that we cannot afford a sure defense and adequate provision for the civil needs of our people.

It is in this spirit that I urge revision of our social security system. A voluntary retirement age of 60 for both men and women is amply justified. Half a loaf is better than no loaf at all, however. A proper step toward this goal would be to lower the age for men to 62, so to equal the retirement age for women, and pay full benefits at 62 to both.

THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, somewhere in the Book of Books, there is the statement that "a little child shall lead them." It was my privilege yesterday to speak to a group of more than 42 children from a high school in, as I recall, Oshkosh, Wis. Then I submitted myself to questioning.

One of the questions was related to the recent U–2 plan incident and went something like this: "Senator, if we have agreed not to continue the exploratory missions with our U–2, how are we going to know what is going on inside Russia?" That question was asked before Midas was thrown into space—our recent wonderful demonstration that we are not behind, but that we are ahead, of the Kremlin. So perhaps that is the answer. But I could not answer the question except to say that in this age of exploration, we will find the answer or we will continue the U–2 exploratory plane missions. To me, that makes common sense.

But the little child had the answer, because what are we going to do if we do not know what is going on back of the Iron Curtain? My mail indicates clearly that that attitude exemplifies the attitude of a good many people. They realize we have got to be on our toes, that we cannot fall asleep, that as I have said many times, we have got to be adequate, that we cannot put ourselves in the position of running the risk of another Pearl Harbor. So that little child had the wisdom that some grownups do not have.

Tomorrow, or on Friday, as everyone knows, we expect to have the Secretary of State before the Foreign Relations Committee, and, of course, a great many questions will be asked him. Some of the questions were submitted on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Ohio yesterday. Let me say that practically all of the questions have been answered. The people know the answers now, because of the discussions over the radio and over television. As a matter of fact, one of our great American reporters, whom I heard last night, intimated that the people in Europe are not a bit upset, that they understand the situation. We want to know what the Kremlin is up to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILEY. I ask for 3 more minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILEY. They recognize the situation. They recognize also that spying has been going on from early days, and that there is a difference when one goes into a country in uniform, goes into that country armed, as a spy, and when a photographer, with the U–2 instrument, covers the space about which he wants to know what is going on. In other words, because we could not get behind the Iron Curtain, we had to go over it. When we got over it, we got, as many of us know, excellent pictures of what the Kremlin has built up.

One of the questions that has been asked is, "What was the underlying cause of Mr. Khrushchev's action in Paris?"

Fundamentally, I believe there were a number of factors, including:

The Soviet Premier did not want a conference, because it was evident that the allies, standing shoulder to shoulder, were not going to make concessions to the demands of the Communists.

Mr. Khrushchev, too, has troubles at home, economic and military, with the proposed reduction of armed forces, as well as political unrest.

Mao Tse-tung, opposing the relatively conciliatory line adopted by Khrushchev, needled him for a tougher policy.

The Kremlin, I frankly believe, was afraid of the tremendous impact which Mr. Eisenhower's visit would have upon

the Soviet people. After all, Ike has demonstrated his salesmanship over a great deal of this earth. The people know he speaks with conviction and that he speaks honestly. The people have faith in him. Khrushchev was afraid of the impact of his visit, there is no question about it.

One of the things I was particularly interested in was what was stated by this Russian youngster of 28 or 29 years of age, who recently left the Kremlin's espionage force. He said:

You know, there is a new generation of us youngsters in Russia. We are not satisfied with our standard of living. We are not satisfied with our voice in the government. We want something more to say.

That all intimated to me, at least, that Khrushchev is not having such an easy time.

Mr. President, all added up—they called for Khrushchev's grabbing at straws, in this case, the U–2 incident—to call off Soviet participation in a conference that would not give them what they were expected to demand.

Is there any known explanation of Khrushchev's personal attacks on President Eisenhower?

While it is only speculative, it seems reasonable to deduce that the pressures on Khrushchev were so great that he found himself in a position not only of denouncing U.S. policy, but because of previous past, relatively friendly relations with the U.S. President, now found it necessary to denounce him personally.

If there had been no U–2 incident, would the conference have been held?

From all evidence available, it appears that if Khrushchev had not used the U–2 flight as an excuse, he would have found another reason for refusing to hold the conference.

What was the significance of Malinovsky's attendance at the conference?

The presence of the general—looking over Khrushchev's shoulder—may well indicate a stronger voice of the military in Soviet affairs. In the past, military chaperons have proved far more ominous than just a traveling companion for leaders of communism.

What is the situation now inside Russia as a result of the blowup of the conference?

For the Communists, the hard core of Stalinists apparently have won a point. For the general population, however, all evidence points toward a great uneasiness—including fear of war from the blowup of the conference. A major objective of the U.S. policy now must be aimed toward stemming this uneasiness—insofar as possible—and separating the acts of the Communists—a 4- to 6-percent minority in the Soviet Union—from the people.

What was the reason for the U–2 flight behind the Iron Curtain?

The answer is simple. We were gathering information to prevent a sneak attack upon ourselves or any other countries of the world which are targets of Communist aggression. Until now, there has not, unfortunately, been developed any ways of obtaining information in specific detail, on activities behind the Iron, as well as the Bamboo Curtains, to provide us with the knowledge necessary to be aware of any buildup that might result in a sneak attack.

The overflights provided us with this information. They were not military attacks. The planes were not armed. The flight was an integral part of our policy of self-preservation.

If the Soviets were willing to adopt any realistic international agreements to prevent the possibility of armed aggression or sneak attack, these would not be necessary; or, if they were willing to agree to the open skies proposal as recommended by President Eisenhower, the flight would not have proved an incident at all.

We recognize, of course, that the whole field of airspace law still is relatively unexplored. The nations of the world have their job cut out for them to more clearly define national interests and boundaries in air and space.

Now, why were there seemingly contradictory statements about the U–2 flight?

Following the takeoff of the plane, it became known that the plane was not on schedule. However, there was no way of telling what had happened to it, or whether the Soviet claims of knocking it down were correct. Until this could be established by adequate evidence, there seemed some question as to whether or not it would be realistic to state that the plane had been involved in an overflight over the Soviet Union.

Could Governor Stevenson's actions have influenced Mr. Khrushchev's decision to "find an excuse" to postpone the summit conference?

From all indications, from statements made recently by the Governor, the situation is as follows: If the Democratic Party won the presidency in 1960, Governor Stevenson, if not President, would, from all indications, occupy a high place—perhaps Secretary of State—in Government.

From Mr. Stevenson's recent statements, it would certainly be reasonable to deduce that if there were a Democratic victory, the Russians might have a better chance to get what they wanted from the summit conference.

I am not, of course, inclined to say that the Democratic Party, in any way, is "soft on communism"; at the same time, Mr. Stevenson's statements indicate that if he had a voice in things, he would be far more likely to make concessions to the Soviets.

For example, I cite the translation of the article by Special Correspondent, Robert Boulay, which, though Mr. Stevenson says it "suffers from misinterpretation, or mistranslation," was published in the Paris newspaper, "Paris-Presse-l'Intransigeant," as follows:

Question. What, according to you, Mr. Stevenson, is the most important question in the political world today?

Answer. The suspension of atomic tests—this is a prime question.

Question. Can it be achieved?

Answer. It must be possible to reach agreement through mutual concessions.

Question. I take it that you refer to agreement with precise control—inspection?

Up till now the Russians have not accepted the minimum inspection formula proposed to them by the Western Powers.

Answer. Naturally, an agreement with inspection * * * but I repeat to you that an agreement must be possible. This problem of atomic tests must be considered as absolute priority. With mutual concessions * * *.

Question. Does this problem appear to you of such importance as to justify concessions on other matters?

Answer. Yes, certainly.

Question. Does this mean that the Western Powers should make concessions on the German problem?

Answer. Yes, certainly.

Question. On Berlin?

Answer. Yes.

I was surprised and persisted—

Question. Do you establish a connection between atomic agreement and Germany and more particularly Berlin?

Answer. There is no connection. But an atomic agreement is basic and justifies concessions on other matters. Since you mention Berlin incidentally, the present situation cannot be maintained.

WHY 11,000

Question. But the Western Powers are not the petitioners in Berlin. It is the Russians who seem to wish to force the Western Powers to leave Berlin?

Answer. Mr. Boulay, the present situation in Berlin cannot be maintained. Strategically, the presence of 11,000 American soldiers is meaningless * * *.

Question. Must I understand that you are prepared to accept a reduction of American forces in Berlin?

Answer. Yes. * * * One could have, for instance, 7,000.

Question. Why 7,000 rather than 11,500? Would you accept 5,000, or 3,000, or none at all?

Answer. Yes, but not now; later.

(I once again expressed surprise, and asked Mr. Stevenson to explain himself more fully.)

Question. Do you believe it is possible to take the political and moral risk of such a decision?

Answer. Mr. Boulay, do not be surprised. All I am telling you, I have already said and written several times.

THE NEUTRON BOMB

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in my remarks to the Senate on May 12, 1960, I indicated that there was a distinct possibility science could produce a neutron bomb, which could obliterate life without causing serious physical damage to property. I tried to point out that the nation developing this weapon first would have a tremendous advantage in limited war, strategic bombing, and defense against missile attack, and that a resumption of underground nuclear testing was necessary if we were to develop this weapon ahead of the Soviets.

I asked the President to inform the Nation of the possibility of developing a neutron bomb so that our leaders and our people might realize the critical nature of any test ban agreement which foreclosed this development, while permitting the Soviets to work on it through clandestine tests.

Thus far there has been no official response and last week, Newsweek magazine, apparently the victim of misinformation, curtly dismissed the possibility of a neutron bomb and treated it as a figment of my imagination.

An article in this week's issue of U.S. News & World Report takes a different view. It states that United States and Russian scientists are working on the neutron bomb and quotes scientists to the effect that we have only a million to one chance of finding out whether Russia is secretly testing neutron bomb weapons.

I ask unanimous consent that this article from the May 30 issue of U.S. News & World Report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, May 30, 1960]

MOST TERRIBLE BOMB OF ALL—NEW WEAPON NOW IN SIGHT

Next—a death ray bomb?

Such a bomb is being sought here—and in Russia, too.

Once ready, it could destroy human beings by invisible streams of neutrons, leave buildings standing.

Detecting tests of this neutron bomb will be almost impossible. That's why many U.S. scientists oppose a ban on nuclear tests.

Behind closed doors in the United States and in Russia, scientists are working on a weapon that could alter the cold war. It is the neutron bomb—the bomb that no one wants to talk about.

This new weapon, when perfected, could destroy men while leaving machines and buildings undamaged.

The weapon—in one possibility being discussed—could be built as a lightweight device able to send out streams of poison radiation greater than those produced by today's big, conventional nuclear bombs.

This version would be so compact, some sources predict, that a team of soldiers could fire neutron warheads into enemy concentrations from simple launchers. A team of saboteurs could carry a small neutron bomb into an enemy country to destroy men at essential nerve centers.

Some scientists call this the death ray weapon of the future. The blast it would create would be so negligible that buildings, trees, railroads and vehicles would remain almost intact. It would produce almost no uncontrolled fallout. Yet its radiation—the real "guts" of a nuclear bomb—would be a highly effective and invisible crippler or killer of human beings.

USELESS BANS

At a time when a ban on nuclear tests is in the news, it is suddenly discovered that a workable neutron bomb would make meaningless any attempt at enforcing such a test ban.

The chances of finding out whether Russia was secretly testing neutron-bomb weapons, civilian scientists say, would be a million to one because the blast signals would be so weak and disguised.

This is the real worry among scientists in this country who know all the facts about the neutron bomb. They are convinced, one of them says, that the Soviets could make a mockery of any test ban, even if both sides agreed to numerous inspection sites and listening posts.

How far both sides have advanced in their research on the neutron bomb is a closely held secret. No project in recent years is held to be more sensitive by experts in the Pentagon.

From the Soviet Union come only broad hints at interest—and progress—by Soviet scientists. But some experts have asked whether the neutron bomb is the fantastic weapon Khrushchev recently predicted for the Soviet arsenal.

NO COMMENT

What is known, in fact, about the ability to produce a neutron bomb comes mainly from civilian U.S. scientists not connected with the Government. The Atomic Energy Commission, by its rules, refuses to acknowledge that the bomb exists even in theory.

It was of this secrecy that Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, complained in a speech on May 12. He said that, although such a weapon—in the hands of either the United States or Russia—might be more than 6 months from reality, the Nation is being kept in the dark about the neutron bomb.

Senator DODD said that, despite the official secrecy, he learned this:

"Such a bomb can theoretically be produced by tailoring the energy of a fusion explosion so that, instead of heat and blast, its primary product is a burst of neutrons."

DEATH-DEALING STREAMS

The story behind the neutron bomb involves these further details:

When a nuclear bomb is exploded, it releases energy in several forms, but mainly as heat and light. Heat is what causes blast and shock and the big mushroom seen after an atomic explosion.

Another emanation from a nuclear bomb is lethal radiation, always in very small amounts in present weapons—about 3 percent of the total energy. One primary form of this radiation is streams of neutrons, the particles that are kicked loose from the core of the atom. Most of them don't travel very far—now—but, when they reach human beings, neutrons deform and destroy body cells and, in sufficient dosages, cause death. A high percentage of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki atomic victims died not from blast but from radiation.

Now it appears possible to build the kind of bomb that will cut down on the amount of blast and "hot" debris and send larger and more powerful streams of neutrons shooting out in all directions.

PICTURE OF A BOMB

One of the few reports ever published about the neutron bomb—in the Washington Post, on July 19, 1959—gives you an idea of how effective one version would be:

"To obtain the maximum range, the bomb would be exploded high enough to reach its intended victims without going through structures, trees, hills, or other barriers which might slow down the neutrons."

The neutrons would travel with enough force, however, said this article, "to go through the walls of buildings and military tanks."

The bomb would deliver "a lethal dose of radiation to a distance of 1 mile—about the range of the 20-kiloton Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs—yet produce far less damage and only about one-one thousandth of the total fallout."

Fallout in today's bombs is created when radioactive debris and dust are carried away from the immediate target area by the blast. Sometimes this "hot" debris is sucked up by winds that carry the fallout where it was not intended to go.

In the neutron bomb, only a small fission-type explosion would be needed as a trigger. This would create correspondingly less blast and fallout.

Now there is talk that TNT or another ordinary explosive could be used to set off a neutron bomb. If so, this would create a weapon with so little blast that not even the familiar atomic mushroom would appear.

ON THE BATTLEFIELD

Of what use is all this, anyway? some civilian scientists ask, when there already is enough destructive power in the world?

Such a weapon, according to one authority, could be used to great advantage tactically on a battlefield where two armies faced each other. It could be used to knock out an enemy division without contaminating friendly forces. The bomb would maim or anihilate enemy soldiers who have invaded friendly soil without destroying the industry or homes of allies.

That advantage works both ways, this authority points out: "The reason we think this principle is so important to the Russians is that any country that wants to conquer Europe and keep the production means of Europe intact must employ this kind of weapon.

"The Russians, with neutron bombs, could reduce the population of the Ruhr in a war, and move right in and keep the factories producing by using imported slave labor or military work battalions. Because there would be so little fallout, the area would be inhabitable almost immediately."

IF RUSSIA HAD IT

The danger of a neutron bomb in the hands of Russia alone is understood by U.S. Government officials, say civilian experts, although these officials are being told not to discuss the subject.

Despite the secrecy—and even some denials of U.S. interest in the project—it has been established that research is going ahead.

Work on the neutron-bomb theory in this country is said to be centered at the University of California's Radiation Laboratory at Livermore, where advanced weapons are developed for the Atomic Energy Commission. It was at this laboratory that the hydrogen bomb was perfected.

Livermore scientists consider the challenge of the neutron bomb in many ways to be more demanding than the hydrogen bomb.

In today's bombs, neutrons that are released are slowed down and "captured" in the bomb-blast process before they get very far and do much damage. A practical way must be found at Livermore to enable more neutrons to "escape" more easily and penetrate great distances with great speed.

The neutron bomb is more than a scientific problem, scientists say. It involves the whole cold-war picture. Against that background you are told this by non-Government scientists who know the story—

The big reason why scientists from the Livermore Laboratory, such as Dr. Edward Teller, its director, have been outspoken against a test-ban agreement with the Soviets is that they are worried about the neutron bomb and other atomic developments just ahead.

How, they ask, can you ever enforce a test ban?

It also explains why Dr. Teller and others who know the facts have said this Nation should resume underground testing of nuclear weapons at the first possible moment.

They say this Nation has no time to waste.

HOW FAR AHEAD?

Much work is said to remain before the neutron bomb is perfected.

Scientists see the Russians as moving ahead with research and possibly even with secret tests of the components of a neutron bomb. There is no way, under the "moratorium" supposedly now in effect, to detect what the Russians may be doing.

All this information, now in the hands of a growing number of U.S. Government, military and scientific officials, accounts in large part for increasing opposition in this country to a test-ban agreement of any kind with the Russians.

CONTROVERSY OVER NUCLEAR TESTING

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on May 13, the New York Times published a letter from Dr. John Kenneth Galbraith which stated the argument that the risks of

continued nuclear testing were greater than the risks of secret Russian violations of the test ban.

On May 19, the Times published a letter of mine in reply to Professor Galbraith. I believe that these two letters provide a brief summary of the important points put forward by each side of the controversy over nuclear testing, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the texts of these letters be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 13, 1960]

HALTING ATOMIC TESTS—CHOICE OF LEAST PERILOUS COURSE BELIEVED TO BE NECESSARY

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The recent hearings before the Joint Commission on Atomic Energy, like much earlier discussion, suggest the presence of a strikingly unrealistic attitude toward an agreement on halting atomic tests. I do not suggest that this attitude is universal, but it does seem sufficiently common to merit comment.

We must surely agree that our task is not to eliminate all risk from our lives—that is an impossible goal—but to find the course of policy that minimizes risk. This requires that we balance the dangers of different courses of action. In the present instance there is, on the one hand, the danger of illicit violation of any agreement to ban tests and that the violation will go undetected. On the other hand, there is the danger of continued explosions. We must choose the course which involves the least peril.

Almost everyone must agree—and most do agree—that the dangers inherent in continuing the tests are virtually total. The tempo of competitive development and testing will increase. The countries newly possessed of atomic weapons will claim their right to poison their just share of the atmosphere. Obviously those who are making tests themselves cannot deny them the privilege. All of these dangers are predictable and certain in the absence of agreement.

POSSIBLE BAD FAITH

Against this, as noted, we must reckon with the possibility of Soviet bad faith and that it will escape detection. Some of our estimate of the danger of bad faith, we must agree, will be the residue of the bad feeling of recent years. And bad faith that involves risk of discovery is not without disadvantage as a practical policy.

But it is not my purpose to argue that this course is riskless. Rather, what is clear is that whatever its dangers, they must be less than the dangers of the first course, which are certain and total. Yet this is not the nature of much of the present calculation. It holds that the danger of violation must be totally eliminated or we will continue the tests. One is reminded of the man who insists on suicide unless he is fully protected against automobile accidents. Surely we are more logical than that.

Nor is it reassuring that many who advise against accepting the lesser risk believe that any test ban makes poor military sense. We have recently heard that our military security requires a new series of tests this summer or autumn. And a high official of the Defense Department has recently stressed the need to develop atomic weapons which, though they burn, blind, disintegrate, mutilate, and otherwise commit to a disenchanting death, are nonetheless clean.

CONCEALED POSITION

The danger of illicit violation has thus become part of the case against the agreement as such. It has no part of this case. If we believe an agreement is unwise, we should say so. This position should not be concealed behind arguments over enforcibility. We fool no one with such transparent devices.

But I have difficulty in imagining that responsible military opinion can face with equanimity a world of uncontrolled tests. In the annals of armies there have always been examples of excessive and myopic preoccupation with military goals. Yet thoughtful military leaders certainly agree that the purpose of the armed services is to protect the continuing life and civilization of the community. Armed services are but one means to this end and diplomacy and diplomatic agreements are among the others.

It is to see the problem whole that we have civilian control of the Armed Forces. This will on occasion require the overruling of too parochial a military view. The danger lies not in doing so, but in failing to do so.

JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH.

[From the New York Times, May 19, 1960]

RISKS IN BANNING TESTS—JEOPARDY TO FREE WORLD FEARED IF CONCESSIONS ARE GRANTED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Prof. Kenneth Galbraith's letter published May 13 argues that in choosing between the test ban and continued testing we must choose the course which involves the least peril. With this general proposition no one can find any fault. The only trouble is that he failed to specify what kind of test ban he had in mind.

Is it to be a total ban based on an enforceable system of inspection that offers some reasonable chance—let us say a one-in-ten chance—of detecting and verifying sneak tests? Or is it to be a total ban without inspection, in which we would have to rest the security of the free world on nothing more substantial than the Kremlin's word of honor? Obviously, it makes a big difference. I do not see how the comparative risks can intelligently be assessed unless you first know what you are comparing.

Dr. Galbraith minimized the risk of bad faith in these words: "Some of our estimate of the danger of bad faith, we must agree, will be the residue of the bad feelings of recent years." With this sweepingly simple analysis of the cold war Professor Galbraith not merely succeeds in equating communism with democracy, but ignores the essential amorality of communism, its long record of perfidy and violated treaties. For my own part, I take it for granted that if there is enough to gain from cheating and if the cheating can be made reasonably safe, the Kremlin will cheat.

FACING CHOICE

What would the Kremlin gain from cheating? If the Kremlin were to get there first on the antimissile missile or the neutron bomb or on any other major technological breakthrough in nuclear weaponry, my conviction is that we would in short order find ourselves confronted with a choice between annihilation and surrender.

How easy would underground cheating be? Even the most elaborate inspection system yet proposed would provide detection capabilities only down to the level of a 20-kiloton (Hiroshima) blast. For the life of me I see no point to any detection system which would cost several billion dollars to install and probably another billion dollars a year to operate, and which would leave the Communists free to sneak test any device up to the size of a Hiroshima-type bomb.

Even at levels much lower than 20 kilotons it is possible to do a tremendous amount of significant testing. Such testing would not merely be immediately applicable to the entire range of clean, tactical nuclear weapons but would be applicable, by extrapolation, to the development of improved or radically different strategic weapons.

RISKS INVOLVED

My estimate of the relative risks differs fundamentally from Professor Galbraith's attitude. I believe that the greater our numerical and technological preponderance in nuclear weapons, the smaller the chance of war. I believe that an effective nuclear test ban, if such a thing were possible, would not decrease the danger of war by one iota. I believe that a test ban or moratorium observed only by the open societies would greatly increase the danger of a thermonuclear holocaust.

I believe that the opinion of mankind could be respected and the security of the free world served by an agreement based on President Eisenhower's proposal of February 11. This called for a ban on all tests that contaminate the atmosphere and detectable tests in space and underground, for a joint research program on detection, and for the extension of the test ban to other areas as improved means of inspection were developed.

Unfortunately, we have now departed from this position and agreed in principle to a ban on undetectable space shots and a moratorium on undetectable underground tests.

I fear that by these concessions we have placed the free world in grave jeopardy.

THOMAS J. DODD,
U.S. Senator.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a very interesting editorial was published in the Wall Street Journal of May 17, 1960, under the caption "Conflict of Interests." I thought the significant statement in the editorial was the last, which is:

It is really a matter of determination of character. For a conflict of interest is to be found not in a man's bank box, but in his heart.

I think the editorial is worthy of reproduction and wider dissemination, so I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

Mr. Edward K. Mills, Jr., an attorney, has requested President Eisenhower to withdraw his nomination as a member of the Federal Communications Commission. It is impossible, Mr. Mills said, for him to divest himself of an interest in stock in the communications field to a degree that can be "regarded as sufficient."

It is impossible because the stock is held by a bank acting as trustee for a trust fund established by his family with Mr. Mills as beneficiary some years ago. It is impossible for Mr. Mills to sell his stock—as Mr. Wilson sold his General Motors stock at great personal sacrifice, as it turned out—because he doesn't own it or control it. But he could benefit from a rise in its value, or suffer from a drop in its value.

If ever a situation could point to the unrealistic policy of expecting men to divest themselves of property in order to serve their government, this one surely does so. As to Mr. Mills himself, there might be objection to some of the policies he announced he would follow on the FCC; we certainly thought that he was going far afield in his proposals to raise the "standards" of TV and radio presentations by Government "persuasion."

But the irony is that if this were to be done on a broad enough scale, the TV and radio industries believe they would have lost revenues. So if anyone believes Mr. Mills might have acted in a way that would influence the value of the communications investments in his trust, they may very well be right. Mr.

Mills might, while raising the standards of the industries he was to oversee, have succeeded also in lowering his own revenues.

We don't mean that the bars ought to be so lowered that no attention ought to be paid to possible conflicts of interest. But there are other and surer guides in our view. What is a man's reputation for honesty and integrity? That seems to us the better way to choose officials of Government agencies.

A crook could divest himself of everything and still remain a crook seeking high office for further crookery. An honest man will remain honest no matter what he owns or what temptations are placed in his way.

It is not really a matter of divestment. If it were, we ought to require all Secretaries of the Treasury to get rid even of their dollar bills—on the ground that a man might induce the Government to follow policies that could make the dollar more valuable and thus benefit himself.

It is really a matter of determination of character. For a conflict of interest is to be found not in a man's bank box but in his heart.

AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1961—CONTINGENCY LANGUAGE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the welter of things happening yesterday I had hoped to invite attention to one item in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, but I was in and out of the Chamber so much during the day that I did not quite get around to it. However, I talked with some members of the committee and with other Senators with respect to the matter.

My comments relate to two items. First, in regard to the so-called Farmers Home Administration there was an appropriation provided and, in addition, there was language to the effect that the Administration would be entitled to spend an additional $40 million if it were required. It was my notion that perhaps the language ought to be safeguarded by requiring approval of the Bureau of the Budget, but there was some objection to doing so. Therefore, I did not offer the amendment.

I understand, however, that under the language as now carried in the bill, if the Administrator feels it is necessary to spend the money and goes to the Bureau of the Budget and insists upon having the additional money made available, the money must be made available.

The interesting thing about this matter is simply that we enlarge the expenditures for fiscal year 1961, but the enlargement does not show up in the budget total for that particular department.

A comparable provision was carried in the bill with respect to the Rural Electrification Administration, and made available an additional $60 million for telephone loans and $60 million for electrification loans, or a total of $120 million. The Budget Director has told me that if the demand is made it is virtually impossible for him to resist it, so the money may be expended.

This is a total of $60 million plus $60 million plus $40 million, or $160 million. If the $160 million is expended, then instead of the so-called $135 million reduction in the budget figure as reported by the committee, actually there will be an excess expenditure over the budget figure.

This is not exactly back-door financing. This is a contingent appropriation. I become a little concerned about it, because instead of a back door it might become a trapdoor.

I did not want the legislative record to be closed on this matter without alluding to this. I am sensible of the fact that the language was incorporated in the bill as it came from the House of Representatives. The Senate did not modify the language and did not modify the amounts provided, but simply concurred in the action taken by the House.

I am pretty confident that those who are beset with budget problems and an effort to maintain a balanced budget are looking upon this with dubious eye, because they may feel the budget is in balance and suddenly discover the demand for the contingent amounts will be made. If such a demand is made and the money is expended in the fiscal year to come, then of course what now looks like a budget cut will really be an addition to the budget.

Perhaps, Mr. President, I should read into the RECORD the contingency language in one of these paragraphs. It is after the regular appropriation:

> * * * and additional amounts, not to exceed $60 million for each program, may be borrowed under the same terms and conditions to the extent that such amount is required during the fiscal year 1961 under the then existing conditions for the expeditious and orderly development of the rural electrification program and rural telephone program.

There is, therefore, no authority in the Bureau of the Budget or in the executive to stop the expenditure of the money if the head of the agency says, "We need it. We want it. We are going to spend it."

This throws a little new light on a different budgetary procedure of the Appropriations Committee, and someone should bring it to the attention of the Senate, because it may happen again upon a contingency basis. I am delighted, indeed, that the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is presently occupying the Presiding Officer's chair. This is a matter, I am sure, of great concern to him.

VICE PRESIDENT NIXON ADDRESSES ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL SALES EXECUTIVES ASSOCIATION IN BUFFALO, N.Y.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, New York State recently welcomed distinguished visitors when Vice President and Mrs. Nixon appeared in several upstate cities. In a notable address before the annual convention of the National Sales Executives Association in Buffalo, the Vice President discussed the causes and aftermaths of the breakup of the summit conference.

More importantly, perhaps, he dealt with what all of this may mean for the future and with what America's role must be in leading the world to peace and security. Of particular pertinence were his remarks on the need to extend the mutual security program without serious cuts.

Mr. President, so that this address may reach the wide readership it deserves, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS DELIVERED BY VICE PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON BEFORE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL SALES EXECUTIVES ASSOCIATION ON MAY 18, 1960, AT BUFFALO, N.Y.

Tonight I want to talk to you about a major problem, certainly the problem that is in the mind of every person in this room and most of the people in this Nation and probably in the world. You have read and heard that the summit conference is over. Mr. Khrushchev has decided to return to Moscow and President Eisenhower, after his visit to Portugal, will return to the United States. And so people are asking questions: What does it mean? Why did it happen? Who was at fault? Mr. Khrushchev's answer is that the United States is at fault. He says President Eisenhower personally must assume responsibility because he ordered the flights which have occurred over the Soviet Union over the past 4 years for the purpose of obtaining information to guard against surprise attack against the United States and the free world. Mr. Khrushchev in effect has said that because of the U–2 incident, and because he was so shocked to learn that some of these flights had occurred and that the President had ordered them, the summit conference could not go forward. Then he went on to say he felt that no conference should be held now until the American people should have an opportunity to vote for another President and then possibly the climate might be changed.

Having said these things, of course, speculation immediately comes up as to whether Mr. Khrushchev is right and whether these are the reasons for the conference breaking up. I will give you my own opinion, and I am not alone in this opinion; it is that the U–2 incident was not a reason for the breaking up of the conference by Mr. Khrushchev, but an excuse. I talked to the President by telephone today in Paris and he indicated that was his view and the view of other allied leaders to whom he had talked when he said, in effect, that the conference was broken up by Mr. Khrushchev for apparently contrived reasons.

What were the real reasons, then? We can only guess; I can only report to you what many of those who are experts in this field have projected as possible reasons for Mr. Khrushchev's actions in torpedoing the summit conference as he did.

First, there is the possibility that he may be under pressure economically in his own country and that he needed a "foreign devil," so to speak, to blame for the distress that may have been developing, and to excuse his government from failing to provide more consumer goods for his people. Second, there are those who believe that a possible reason for his acting as he did was pressure that he was under from Stalinists or extremists within the Soviet Government, who had never liked his line of so-called "peaceful coexistence" and "peaceful competition" and believe that a more aggressive line should be adopted. Third, there are those who believe that he may even be under some pressure from his Chinese ally, Mao Tse-tung, who publicly has indicated that he does not agree with Mr. Khrushchev in the "peaceful coexistence" line which Mr. Khrushchev had been following prior to the summit conference. There are others who believe that one of the reasons

why he broke up this conference was that he was convinced, by reason of what President Eisenhower, President de Gaulle and Prime Minister Macmillan had said in the past few weeks, that he, Mr. Khrushchev, would be unable to get his way on the Berlin question; and that believing he was not going to get his way on the Berlin question; because of our firm position, in which we would be joined by our allies, he felt it was best not to participate in the conference at all, so that he would be free to act unilaterally.

These are some of the reasons that have been suggested. But whatever the reasons are, I will again repeat what I said at the outset: That the majority opinion seems to be that the real reason does not lie in the fact that the U–2 incident was so shocking to him.

Now if I may go to a second point. I believe that Mr. Khrushchev, in making his announcement that he was going to break up the summit conference, and in attempting to convince the world that he was doing it because of the U–2 incident, made three major mistakes in judgment.

One, he misjudged the intelligence and sophistication of the leaders of the world and the people of the world. These leaders and people could certainly not be taken in to believe that Mr. Khrushchev, who to put it in understatement is a master of espionage activities, would be so shocked to find that the United States was attempting to obtain information with regard to surprise attack in any method by which that information could be obtained. Certainly, I would think that most impartial observers would say he was the last person who would show shocked surprise at espionage activities. And so he misjudged the action and the temper of the world's leaders and people. Dispatches from all over the world indicate this because, although for a few days after the U–2 incident first hit the world's headlines there was support for Mr. Khrushchev, when he used this incident as an excuse for breaking up the conference, then that support drifted away; now there seems to be almost unanimous condemnation of him as the one solely responsible for this action. This was his first mistake in judgment.

His second was in misjudging the President himself. Apparently Mr. Khrushchev thought that he, in effect, would be able to blackmail the President, to bully him, by threatening to break up the conference unless the President apologized for attempting to defend the United States through surveillance by aerial activities and also punished those who were responsible. The President would not pay this price, in my opinion properly could not pay such a price. He refused to apologize under the circumstances which Mr. Khrushchev had laid down in his conditions for his participation in the conference. And so he misjudged the President and the President's determination in this area.

In addition, Mr. Khrushchev, I believe, misjudged the character of the American people. And I speak now not as a Republican, or as a party leader, but as an official of this Government and as an American citizen. When he tried to imply, as he did, that by waiting for 6 or 7 months to pass and for the American election to occur, that the American electorate then might select as President of the United States another individual who would take a different line with regard to his threats than President Eisenhower was taking, I think he misjudged the American people and he misjudged both the great American political parties.

Because, my friends, we know that the great majority of Americans—regardless of their partisan affiliates—resents any attempt by Mr. Khrushchev, or anybody else outside this country, to interfere in an American election in such a flagrant and arrogant way. And second, I think we would all agree that regardless of party, Americans believe in the cause of peace with justice which the President was representing at Paris; and Americans believe that the President of the United States was fully justified in adopting a course of action to protect this country from another Pearl Harbor surprise attack through aerial surveillance.

I do not suggest that the conduct of the administration in this—or any other area—has been without mistakes. I only suggest that as far as the basic policies and the basic attitudes of the American people are concerned, we stand united against attempts by outsiders to interfere with our elections and for the principles of freedom, peace with justice, and the right of self-determination for the 2,500,000 people of Berlin and others throughout the world.

And so, having analyzed the events to date, may I turn to the future. What will happen now? What will Mr. Khrushchev do—and what should we do? Again, we are in the area of conjecture. I would first say that as far as Mr. Khrushchev is concerned, no one can predict what he will do on Berlin, or with regard to the disarmament conferences that have been going on, or with regard to the conferences on atomic tests, until at least a few days have passed and he is able to assess world opinion. Because one thing I have noted about Mr. Khrushchev, and one thing other observers have noted, is that he is very sensitive to world opinion, particularly the opinion in the so-called uncommitted areas of the world. I think Mr. Khrushchev will have to have his assessment of that opinion in mind as he develops his course of action for the future. If he does not have that in mind, he could lose many of the gains and the advantages that he presently thinks he has in the ideological conflict going on in the uncommitted countries of the world—between communism on the one side and the forces of freedom on the other.

Second, does Mr. Khrushchev want war? My answer is: I do not believe so. I share the view, in this respect, which I think was very well stated, by Chancellor Adenauer who told me while visiting my house a few weeks ago, that Mr. Khrushchev without question—being a dedicated Communist—wanted communism to rule the world; that this was his objective and would continue to be his objective regardless of the means or the shifts in policy which he might adopt. But on the other hand, as Chancellor Adenauer put it very graphically, Mr. Khrushchev does not want to rule a world of ruined cities and dead bodies. And he knows, as we know, the terribly destructive force of atomic weapons; he knows, as we know, what a war would do to the countries which he may want to rule and what it might also do to his own country. And there is another argument Mr. Khrushchev might have in this respect: He firmly believes, I think, based on the conversations I've had with him—as well as other statements he has made—that he can gain his objective of domination of the world more effectively and more surely at less cost without war.

This brings us, then, to the key problem of the future. In the massive 2½-hour press conference that Mr. Khrushchev held in Paris today, I think that the most significant line in it was one that perhaps will go unnoticed in most areas of the reporting of that conference, or relatively unnoticed. It was this: Referring to this whole problem of elections in the United States, he said, well, if the next President doesn't take the right line, we'll wait for the next President and the next one after that. Then he said this significant thing: "Because we can afford to wait, we can afford to wait."

There is nothing that I think is more typical of the Communist attitude and the Communist line, and more a challenge to us, than what Mr. Khrushchev says in this respect. The Communist has a sense of history. He thinks in terms of not 5 years, but of a century, or 2 centuries if necessary; and he is willing to wait. He believes that he and his cause have the stamina and the strength to outlast the decadent societies of the West among which we, of course, are classified. So this is the challenge to us. Do we have the stamina, do we have the strength, do we have the determination in this nonmilitary struggle, which is going on now and which will continue to go in the years ahead: One, to resist further Communist gains; and two, to win the uncommitted areas of the world, who hold the balance of the power, to the side of freedom and away from those who would win it for communism. This is the key question of the next 10 years of the sixties and even beyond my day. I'd like to direct my remarks just briefly to this question in the time that remains tonight.

Let us look at this area. A billion people live in Asia, in Africa—a billion people who are unlike in many respects, but who are alike in that most of them are desperately poor and all of them need economic progress. Prime Minister Nehru put it very graphically to me when he said that the per capita income in India is one-twentieth of what it is in the poorest State in the United States.

You have never seen poverty until you have seen it in Asia and in parts of Africa, as I have seen it and my wife has seen it. You can see why the leaders of these countries say, "We must have progress." And so the question is, How are they going to get it? Which way are they going to turn? Some say, "Well, will they take progress without freedom?" The answer is that they would prefer not, and this is one of the main cards we have in our hands. Believe me, the leaders of these countries in Asia and of the newly developing countries in Africa, despite what you may hear to the contrary, want to be on our side. They prefer to have their progress and retain their independence and retain an opportunity to develop free institutions—not like ours, because they need different institutions since they have different types of development than we have, but institutions which at least give them the right of self-determination. But make no mistake about it: If the terrible choice left to these people is progress without freedom or staying where they are, they will take progress without freedom.

The Communists tell them, "Come our way." They don't tell them, of course, that the cost is freedom, but these people know that the cost is freedom. But the Communists say, "Look at what we've done in the Soviet Union, look at what we're doing in China; come our way, for this is the way to progress for the teeming millions who do not now have an adequate standard of living." There must be an alternative in which it can be shown that there is a way to have progress without giving up freedom; unless there is that alternative, the battle for the world will be lost in this area just as surely as if a war were fought in which we were the loser as well as civilization itself.

That brings me to a very unpopular subject. There now is a bill before the Congress for appropriations for the Mutual Security Act. Part of it goes for the purpose of maintaining adequate defenses abroad. Part of it goes also for technical assistance, for loans, for other programs designed to see to it that the people in these uncommitted countries that I have mentioned, who hold the balance of power in the world, are not faced with this terrible alternative of going the Communist way or staying where they are. Yet this is a bill which has no constituents at home; this is the one that is damned always as a giveaway; this is the one where people say, "Cut it down and spend it here in the United States." Particularly at this time,

when in my opinion there is no question but that Mr. Khrushchev will step up his activities in the nonmilitary aspects of the world struggle, the United States should support adequate programs in the mutual security area and particularly in the technical and economic aid areas of the program provided by this bill.

I could say many things that would be much more palatable to you, but this needs to be said and that is why I wanted to say it at this point.

One other point I would like to develop in that connection. In the years ahead, we will have to maintain adequate military strength so that we are never in an unfavorable position or an unequal position at the bargaining table. We also must maintain our mutual security programs, as I have pointed out, and we must maintain our programs of economic assistance abroad. Now, this means that the United States must have an economy which is strong, and sound, and productive. There is another point about the economy which, I think, should be made before this audience.

Mr. Khrushchev, in selling his wares around the world, constantly says: Ours is the way to the greater progress. He says, we are moving faster than the United States; the America economy used to be a pretty good one, but it isn't as good as it once was and, therefore, ours is the way of the future. I think he put it best, perhaps, with one of his very clever analogies, when he was speaking in India a few months ago. You may have read what he said. He likened this competition between the American economy and the Soviet economy, to a horse race. And in referring to the American economy, he said: "There was a horse, but now it's old and tired and limping, whereas our Socialist steed is young and vigorous and vital and moving faster; we will soon pass it by and it will never catch up." Is he right? My answer is, he is wrong, but only provided we stay on our horse and don't try to get on his, as far as the economic system is concerned.

We hear a great deal about growth these days in this country. How are we going to have adequate growth, they say, how is our economy going to grow fast enough? There are those, some very well intentioned, who say: The way to growth in the United States is to increase the size of Government and to spend more in Government, and that spending by Government of and by itself is a way to make the economy of the United States grow at a fixed level which the Government can set.

Let's understand exactly what we're talking about here. Government has some real responsibilities for spending—in the military area, in the national security area, in the economic-assistance area to which I referred, in the area of space, and in the necessary areas at home with which we are all familiar. But let us never forget that in our system Government should spend only what it needs to spend, and that Government spending should never be an end in itself. Or if I can put it another way: If we are going to have maximum growth of the American economy, that will keep us ahead of the Soviet Union as we are ahead of it today, the way to get that maximum growth is not to increase the size of Government or to increase Government spending; rather, the way to achieve this growth is to expand the opportunity for creative action for millions of individual Americans in the private enterprise system.

If we bear that lesson in mind in these years and months ahead, I am confident that we will win this struggle. We will be betting on the right horse, a horse that has served us well, and one that can continue to serve us well if we give it a chance, the chance that it can and should have.

Now, if I can bring one final thought to you, which is perhaps as important as anything I have said, if anything has been important in your minds up to this point. I've been speaking about our military strength, about our economic strength, about the battle for the uncommitted nations and the prospect ahead. I believe all of these are highly important parts of this struggle in which we are engaged. But they are not all of that struggle. There is another part which is even more significant and one which I can best illustrate by an example.

People have often asked, Why did the President get the magnificent reception he did in Asia and in South America? Part of the reason certainly is because he is a world-famous man and people in that part of the world—as here—like to see world-famous people. But it could not all be ascribed to that; certainly, part of it also was because of the country he represented. To prove the point, may I tell you how my wife and I had a reception which could not have been due to the fact that the people were trying to receive a world-famous man—nor his wife—but which, nevertheless, was the most moving experience of our life.

It occurred after our visit to Russia last year. We went to Poland on a Sunday afternoon from Moscow. The Polish Government, before we arrived, had tried apparently to discourage any crowds in the streets by not printing our route into the city and not indicating the time of arrival; but the word some way had gotten around. After the plane landed, we drove from the airport; as we went through the suburbs of Warsaw into the city, increasingly large groups of people came to gather on the streets, and they were singing, they were throwing bouquets of flowers onto our cars. When we got into the heart of the city—and understand, no notice by the Government, no attempt to get a crowd out—when we got into the heart of the city, a quarter of a million people were there, stopping the caravan eight times so that we had to move them out in order to move on. And when the caravan stopped, we were able to look into their faces, and they were singing and they were shouting and at least a third of them were crying.

Why? We were the Vice President of the United States and his wife. Why? We represented a powerful country, but Mr. Khrushchev had been there just a month before—he represented a powerful country, and he had not received a welcome like this. Why? Because to the people of Poland behind the Iron Curtain under totalitarian government since World War II, America stood for something more than military strength and economic strength. It stood for freedom, for the hopes of people everywhere, for the right to be free, and for moral and spiritual values which have always been the great heritage of our Nation. This is something we should never forget.

And so tonight, may I tell you that in this hour of difficulty in this Nation's and the world's history, we can and should have faith—faith in our country, faith in our principles, and faith in our future. We should have that faith because of our strength, our military strength and our economic strength; but we should have it mainly because we're on the right side, the side of freedom, the side of justice, the side of peace with honor, the side of a nation that wants not an acre of territory nor an economic concession for any other person in the world. Standing for these things, America can and will, I am sure, help lead the forces of freedom and justice and peace to victory in the years ahead.

Thank you.

MOTION PICTURE BASED ON RICHARD FREDE'S BOOK, "THE INTERNS"

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a motion picture based on Richard Frede's book, "The Interns," depicting the function and duties of interns in hospitals, is being made in Hollywood by Producer Robert Cohn for Columbia Pictures. I believe this picture will create considerable discussion of the manner of operation of modern hospitals and the way in which interns are treated.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief review of Mr. Frede's novel by Robert Cohn.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hollywood and the motion picture industry and Producer Robert Cohn are making a motion picture out of Richard Frede's book, "The Interns." While the book, which is now in its third printing, will reach many thousands of readers, the screen as a mass medium will bring the message of the novel to many millions in this country and abroad. The story of what goes on behind scenes in a hospital will unquestionably cause many hospital boards and administrators to cast a searching look at their own domains. The beneficiaries of this will be the sick and injured of the country and everyone who requires hospitalization at any time in the future.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES W. MURPHY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the entire Senate is saddened by the death on April 11, 1960, of James W. Murphy, senior member of the corps of the Official Reporters of the Senate.

As a Member of the Senate I feel deeply the loss of a dedicated, able public servant who, by his patience, his painstaking efficiency and his exceptional fund of knowledge in reporting and editing an accurate account of the proceedings of the Senate, has been of immeasurable assistance to me and to all my colleagues in our work. And as an individual I grieve the loss of a friend, a friend whose loyalty, kindness, good humor, wit, and unfailing courtesy have enriched my daily life during the nearly half century I have known him.

James Murphy came to the office of the Official Reporters on December 7, 1896, and from that day on, for close to 64 years, he gave unstintingly of his time and his very considerable talents to serve the Senate. I am convinced that no reporter ever gave better service to any parliamentary body in the world.

With Mr. Murphy's passing there ended 108 years of continuous official Senate reporting by his family. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD itself, the Senate section of which our esteemed friend and his most capable staff so carefully prepared every day the Senate was in session, was established largely through the efforts of the first Murphy to serve as Official Reporter. Dennis F. Murphy, the uncle of James W. Murphy, was selected in 1848 by Senator John C. Calhoun to give the Senate verbatim reports instead of the summaries by which debates and proceedings of the body had been recorded up to that time; 25 years later the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as we know it today, came into being.

Dennis Murphy served as Official Reporter of the Senate until 1896, the year his 17-year-old nephew, James, joined the corps as an amanuensis. He was the fourth member of the family to enter the employ of the Official Reporters' Of-

fice; at that time his father, Edward V. Murphy, had been a reporter since 1860, and the elder Murphy served until his death in 1919. Another uncle, James J. Murphy, had been an Official Reporter from 1854 to 1874. In all, the four members of the Murphy family served the Senate as Official Reporters for a total of 191 years, a record I doubt any other family can approach in any line of government service.

In the nearly 64 years James Murphy reported the colloquies, debates, and other proceedings of the Senate he recorded a wealth of American history and gave generously of his counsel and assistance to many of our Nation's leaders.

In 1917, when I came to Washington as secretary to the late Senator John B. Kendrick, of Wyoming, I first became acquainted with Mr. Murphy, and he was most helpful to me in my new duties. He was a good friend of Wyoming's senior Senator Francis E. Warren, and soon Senator Kendrick, as well as his secretary, also came to regard him as a valued friend. Mr. Murphy's and my friendship strengthened down through the years, with the result that the loss I feel today at his death is personal and deep. I shall miss this scholarly gentleman, this great American, during the remainder of my days.

To the members of Mr. Murphy's family I extend my most sincere sympathy. They may be comforted by the realization that he served his country well and that his memory will live long and honorably in the hearts and minds of countless men and women who considered him their friend.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

SERVING OF OLEOMARGARINE OR MARGARINE IN NAVY RATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2168) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the bill which is the pending business merely amends the Navy's ration statute to insert the words "margarine" or "oleomargarine." It gives the Navy permissive authority to use margarine for table use, which authority is not now explicit in the statute.

The Navy Department itself for some time has indicated it wanted this authority. In many cases it is not possible to secure butter and margarine can be used with no loss of nutrition and at less cost.

As I said at the time of the introduction of this bill:

> There is no valid reason why the Navy or any other branch of the armed services should not be given simple freedom of choice to buy what foods it wants or that necessity requires it to use, within the structure of the present ration statute. The omission of margarine from the ration statute is a simple discrimination against a perfectly good pure food product made from American farm products.

The bill S. 2168 is only permissive. It does not require the Navy to buy anything.

The bill limits this permissive authority by section 2, which provides that, except where the Secretary of Agriculture finds and certifies that there is a surplus of either soybean oil or cottonseed oil, margarine may not be used by the Navy for table use if surplus butter stocks are available to the Navy through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

It is apparent, therefore, that this bill is in no sense a restriction of or injury to the dairy or butter industries. It goes far to protect surplus butter's disposition channel in the armed services. It puts both butterfat and vegetable oils on the same level of treatment, insofar as those commodities may be in surplus.

I am now informed that there is no uncommitted stock of surplus butter. The great majority of CCC butter goes into the school lunch program.

S. 2168 is, therefore, a bill that seeks to remove a discrimination and to put two American farm products on the same basis in respect to use in Navy messes. I urge the Senate to approve this bill.

THE COMMUNIST INFILTRATION IN THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN MOVEMENT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in his statement of January 22, J. Edgar Hoover warned that Nikita Khrushchev's visit to this country had resulted in the reinvigoration of the American Communist movement and that the FBI was receiving increasing evidence of stepped-up Communist activities at many points.

Among other things, Mr. Hoover warned that non-Communist organizations dedicated to causes that command popular support could expect Communist efforts to infiltrate their ranks.

Evidence that has come into the hands of the Subcommittee on Internal Security indicates that the Communist Party has made the nuclear test ban movement the chief target of its infiltration operations. I think it important that this evidence be placed before Congress and before the public so that we may have a better understanding of the methods by which the Communists operate and of the goals they seek to achieve. I should like to detail to you some of the evidence of this infiltration, and to suggest the outline of a self-defense program for all organizations whose purposes make them particularly vulnerable to Communist infiltration.

I do not accept the thesis that if one happens to hold a position that enjoys the support of the Communist Party on any issue, one is, ipso facto, either a pro-Communist or a fellow traveler. The Communists are opposed to the poll tax: does that make all people who oppose the poll tax Communists? The Communists support the Forand bill. Does that make the many millions of Americans who have endorsed the bill Communist sympathizers? Obviously not. But on a foreign policy issue of overriding importance like the test ban, if a legitimate organization adheres to a policy which coincides with Communist policy, then it must be prepared to expect a concerted effort at infiltration by the Communist termites. The more urgent the issue, the more respectable the organization, the more illustrious the names on its letterhead, the greater the temptation from the Communist standpoint.

The Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy is headed by a group of nationally prominent citizens about whose integrity and good faith there is no question. Among them are people like Norman Cousins, of the Saturday Review, Mr. Clarence Pickett of the American Friends Service Committee, Mr. Norman Thomas, and so forth. They advocate a point of view which some of us consider unrealistic or utopian, but it is, nevertheless, a significant point of view on an issue of life and death importance. For the personal motivations of most of those associated with the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy I have the most sincere respect. The point of view they represent deserves a hearing—indeed, it must be heard.

Last Thursday evening, May 19, the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy held a rally at Madison Square Garden in New York City. Many eminent persons attended this rally. The speakers included Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Mr. Alfred Landon, Mr. Walter Reuther, Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, and Dr. Harold Taylor, former President of Sarah Lawrence College. At this meeting, the speakers urged that another summit meeting be convened for the purpose of attempting to arrive at an agreement banning nuclear tests.

Because I esteem the sincerity of the original founders of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy and the sincerity of the speakers I have named, it was for me an unpleasant duty to have to notify them that the unpublicized chief organizer of the Madison Square Garden rally, Henry Abrams, was a veteran member of the Communist Party; that there was also evidence of serious Communist infiltration at chapter level throughout the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; that the Communist Party and its front organizations had done their utmost to promote the meeting; that the Communists provided much of the organizing machinery for the meeting because they planned to use it as a pressure instrument in support of Soviet nuclear diplomacy.

This information was confirmed by the Subcommittee on Internal Security only several days before the Madison Square Garden meeting was scheduled to take place. Because I wished to be fair to all the decent and prominent people who were associated with the meeting as sponsors or as speakers, I had some doubt about the advisability of rushing into print with my information only 48 hours in advance of the rally. Instead, I decided to communicate the information, or at least certain essential portions of it, to Mr. Norman Cousins, the chairman of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. Mr. Cousins came to Washington to see me and we had a long and frank discussion about the problem.

The directors of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, it turned out, had some inkling of the existence of a Communist infiltration and were extremely unhappy about it. When the Communist affiliations of the chief organizer of the Madison Square Garden meeting were brought to Mr. Cousins' attention, he immediately suspended the organizer in question. This was 2 days before the meeting. It is my understanding that the national committee of the organization intends to take some further measures against Communist infiltrators.

If I have any criticism to make, it is that the directors of the organization have moved so slowly to confront the problem and that the measures they have taken have been inadequate. I was, for example, surprised to discover that one of the officers of the committee, Mr. Norman Thomas, had, as early as last January, expressed serious suspicion about the individual who later became organizer of the Madison Square Garden meeting—but that no action had been taken on Mr. Thomas' warning.

To me it is appalling that the Communists should be able to infiltrate and manipulate a movement founded on sincere humanitarian and pacifist motivations, and headed by so many reputable citizens. Perhaps this is a situation in which remedial legislation is indicated, a situation in which private citizens must have the assistance of Government to cope effectively with a movement that operates by stealth and by secrecy.

In accordance with the subcommittee's mandate from the Senate, it was clear that our duty required that we do everything in our power to get at the facts. In presenting the information we have gleaned to the Senate, it is my hope that I will be able to do so in a manner that will avoid injury to the innocent and will point the way to a constructive course of action by Government and private organizations.

The test ban has for several years now been the chief objective of the Communist propaganda apparatus. Of this there is ample documentary evidence.

In his speech before the congress of the Soviet Communist Party on January 27, Nikita Khrushchev, in his most militant rhetoric, called for a permanent ban on nuclear tests.

The main political resolution adopted by the 17th congress of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. in February 1960 said:

> The demand that the administration end nuclear testing and ban the H-bomb has found a widening response in community meetings, peace talks, petitions, and sermons from the pulpit.

On February 16, 1960, seven Communist foreign language newspapers took a full-page advertisement in the New York Times and called on the President—

> 1. To proclaim the achievement of total, universal, and controlled disarmament as the goal of national U.S. policy.
> 2. To restore the moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons and to do everything in your power to insure early agreement on the banning of all nuclear tests.
> 3. To oppose the sharing of nuclear warheads with NATO allies.

The Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy has not solicited the praise of the Communist movement, and most of its leaders, I am certain, would be much happier if they received no plaudits from Communist sources. The fact, nevertheless, remains that the committee in recent years has been the recipient of consistent and generous praise from the Communist press. The Communist organ, New World Review, for April of this year, for example, carried these paragraphs under the caption "Peace Groups in the United States":

> No amount of conspiratorial silence can wipe out the forces for disarmament and peace; but it can leave them isolated from each other and ignorant of the efforts their fellows are making.
>
> It is our purpose to bring to our readers' attention the main groups in our country working toward these ends, beginning in this issue * * * with a description of the main nonsectarian national organization.
>
> NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR A SANE NUCLEAR POLICY
>
> SANE offers a wide choice of channels for expression of the American people's desire for a world without war. Under the cochairmanship of Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review, and Clarence Pickett, executive secretary emeritus of the American Friends Service Committee, and with the sponsorship and support of many noted Americans, SANE provides an elastic organization and comprehensive program through which ordinary people can be effective.
>
> Local committees of SANE exist in many cities, towns, counties, and small communities throughout the United States. Their membership policy is flexible and they generally welcome additions to their forces, whether for one particular campaign or on a long-term basis.

Mr. President, to anyone who is familiar with the language of communism, the paragraphs I have just quoted constitute a clear directive to members of the Communist Party to enter into the ranks of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. These paragraphs, I might point out, were not the haphazard product of a novice or intellectual dilettante. They were written by the editor of the magazine, Jessica Smith, a hardened old-time Communist.

As for the Madison Square Garden meeting, the Communist organ, the Worker, in a series of its own advertisements, called upon all the Communist faithful to turn out in strength. The masthead of the Worker for May 15 carried a banner headline "For Sanity in Foreign Policy—All Out to Madison Square Garden, Thursday, 7:45 p.m."

Given this background, it was only natural to anticipate that the Communists would attempt to find their way into the organizing mechanism of the meeting.

The name of the Communist Party member who served as chief organizer of the Madison Square Garden meeting is Henry H. Abrams. As I have pointed out, Mr. Norman Cousins suspended Mr. Abrams several days before the meeting, when I brought the matter to his attention. Until the date of his suspension, however, Mr. Abrams devoted virtually full time to the organization of the meeting for many weeks. He did so, moreover, without remuneration.

On March 16, 1960, Mr. Abrams attended a meeting of the executive committee of the Greater New York committee of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. Let me read just two sentences from the minutes of that meeting, which clearly illustrates the central role this Communist agent has played:

> Dr. Lear reported that Gov. G. Mennen Williams has accepted our invitation to speak at Madison Square Garden. Henry Abrams then gave the rest of the Madison Square Garden report.

Henry Abrams' residence at 11 Riverside Drive, New York City, and his telephone number of Trafalgar 4–7769, is the address and telephone number used by the headquarters of the Upper Manhattan Sane Nuclear Policy Committee. Abrams has served as an accountant for both the Upper Manhattan Committee and the Greater New York Committee of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. From these facts it emerges that his association with the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy was a long and fairly prominent one.

Now let us look at Henry Abrams' Communist record.

In 1939, he resided at 972 East 14th Street, Brooklyn, N.Y. In that year he signed a Communist Party nominating petition from that address which appeared on page 4091 of the election records.

He was a member of the 11th Assembly District Club of the Communist Party which met at 2744 Broadway, New York City. On Tuesday, February 15, 1944, it was announced at a meeting of this Communist club that Henry Abrams would give a class for Communists on the preparation of income tax forms.

Henry Abrams was a member of the Young Communist League and later of the upper West Side section of the Communist Party of New York City. He has been a consistent financial contributor to the Communist Party, U.S.A.

As recently as September 28, 1958, the official Communist Party newspaper, the Worker, printed a letter from Henry Abrams endorsing the candidacy of Benjamin Davis for State senator in the 21st senatorial district of New York City. Benjamin Davis is national secretary of the Communist Party, and is, in fact, one of the most notorious of native Communists, a fact which is well known to most Americans. He was one of the leading members of the party convicted in the famous Foley Square Smith Act trials of a dozen years ago. He spent several years in jail for advocating the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force and violence.

Mr. Abrams has served as an accountant for the American Communist Party, for the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, and for the late Congressman Vito Marcantonio.

Abrams has carried out Communist policies in many ostensibly non-Communist organizations which have, in fact, served as fronts for the Communist

Party. Among the organizations promoted by the Communists in which he has played an active role are the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, the Hiroshima Commemorative Committee, the National Committee of the American Forum for Socialist Education, the American Labor Party, the United Independent Socialist Conference Committee.

I state all these things as facts, Mr. President. On Friday, May 13, Henry Abrams was given the opportunity to deny them in a hearing of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security. He invoked the fifth amendment in reply to all questions regarding his years' long record of service to the Communist conspiracy.

The obvious and declared purpose of the Madison Square Garden meeting was to influence American policy on the nuclear test ban. It is one thing when American citizens come together, in accordance with their rights, for the purpose of urging a specific policy on their Government. It is an altogether different thing when such a meeting is infiltrated by the Communists and when the chief organizing role falls into the hands of a member of the Communist Party, which, as we all know, is a quisling instrument of Soviet policy. Such a situation has an important bearing on American security, because it is axiomatic that all actions of the Communist Party are planned to subserve the ends of Soviet diplomacy.

Let me say here, parenthetically, that this is by no means the only occasion of Communist machinations in the field of nuclear policy. At a previous hearing, we established that Avrahm G. Mezerik, a man with a long Communist record, actually managed a so-called American Nobel Anniversary Forum and Dinner, held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on January 11, 1958, which concentrated on the theme of an American ban on nuclear testing. It was brought out in this hearing that this gathering while managed by a Communist, was financed by a prominent American capitalist, who was unaware of Mezerik's Communist record.

With all this interest in the subject, the Internal Security Subcommittee summoned Mr. Abrams to appear and testify. Through his attorney, Leonard Boudin, of New York, Mr. Abrams pleaded illness, and asked to be excused from coming to Washington to testify. We then arranged to hear him in New York City. He showed up with a doctor's certificate that he was suffering from heart disease, and moved a further continuance on the ground that his condition was so serious that being questioned might cause him serious harm. Since the committee was aware that Mr. Abrams had continued right up to that day to carry a heavy load as the man in active charge of arrangements for the May 19 meeting at Madison Square Garden, we were not impressed by these claims.

We had a New York City Public Health Service doctor present, and asked Mr. Abrams if he would consent to be examined then and there. He refused, so we denied the request for a continuance, and went ahead with the hearing, which was in executive session.

As I have indicated the hearing had been called in the hope that we could learn from Mr. Abrams the full story of Communist infiltration of and participation in this movement for a nuclear test ban, as a basis for determining what, if any, legislation may be indicated in this area.

The subcommittee has received evidence, much of it still of a classified nature, that Henry Abrams is not a lone infiltrator, that there exists in fact a serious Communist infiltration in the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

What, specifically, are the Communists attempting to achieve by their infiltration of the test ban movement, including their recent all-out support of the Madison Square Garden meeting? The answer to this is, I believe, obvious.

The Communist purpose in supporting the test ban agitation and in going all out to make the Madison Square Garden meeting a success is to exert pressure on the administration to make still further concessions to the Soviet viewpoint in order to arrive at a test ban agreement; to create a climate of public opinion which will make it impossible for the administration to resume small underground tests, even though there may be every reason to believe that the Kremlin is conducting such tests; to enervate the free world so that it becomes incapable of responding with appropriate measures to challenges at Berlin and at other points.

In the test ban negotiations that are now going on there are major differences between the Soviet position and our own. These differences hinge around the question of inspection. In my own opinion, we have already conceded too much, especially by agreeing in principle to a further voluntary moratorium on undetectable underground tests. But for those tests that are subject to detection, we still take the stand that there should be an inspection system based on an adequate number of fixed stations, with at least 20 or 30 onsite inspections per annum. The Kremlin wants a minimum of inspection. It wants as few stations as possible, and its spokesmen have indicated that they would not be willing to accept more than a few onsite inspections per annum.

The Kremlin apparently attached major importance to the Madison Square Garden meeting as a pressure operation in support of its nuclear objectives. This, I believe, is conclusively demonstrated by the generous and sympathetic coverage of the meeting in the Soviet press. I think this is interesting. According to an AP dispatch of May 21, Pravda headlined its account of the meeting with the words "We Want To Live in Friendship With the Soviet Union," while the Izvestia headline read "Rebuff to Advocates of War."

I believe that the heads of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy have a serious contribution to make to the great debate on national policy. But they can only make this contribution effectively if they purge their ranks ruthlessly of Communist infiltration and if they clearly demarcate their own position from that of the Communists, first, by stressing the need for adequate inspection, second, by reiterating at every opportunity their opposition to the tyranny of communism.

On the basis of the evidence that has come to me, I do not believe that the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy has taken the necessary measures to create a climate that is inhospitable to Communist infiltration. At the Madison Square Garden rally, for example, there was much direct and inferential criticism of American policy, but, according to the press accounts and reports from private sources—persons who were present at the meeting—there was almost no criticism of Khrushchev or of his arrogant, insulting, gutter-level behavior in Paris. On the contrary, the speakers called for an immediate effort to renew the summit conference.

Let me digress briefly for a comment on this last proposal, which has, unfortunately, not been confined to the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. Perhaps I am old-fashioned, but to me it seems that after the President of the United States has had to endure a barrage of the crudest insults ever leveled at a head of state, a petition to Khrushchev for another summit meeting would constitute a total abandonment of national dignity. The only conceivable political consequence of so craven an action would be to encourage Khrushchev to further arrogance and further demands.

As I have said, I have found no serious evidence that the Madison Square Garden meeting was organized and conducted in a manner which would have discouraged Communist participation. It was not surprising, therefore, that the Communists and their sympathizers turned out in force. Although no Gallup poll or breakdown was possible, I am convinced from reports that the Communists were responsible for a very substantial percentage of the overflow turnout. A number of well-known Communists, including Alexander Trachtenberg, a top party member, were observed in the audience. Outside the meeting, the Communists brazenly distributed literature in their own name.

If decent organizations like the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy wish to protect themselves against the danger of Communist infiltration, I cannot emphasize too strongly the need for an organizational climate that is openly inhospitable to Communists. This is a situation where a tepid declaration of devotion to democracy simply will not suffice, while a neutral silence is an open invitation to disaster.

I can think of other things that can and should be done by the directors of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy and of other non-Communist organizations which must contend with the problem of Communist infiltration. At top level, control is relatively easy. One can more or less assume that the people who are elected to a board of directors or to

a national committee have enjoyed public visibility over a period of years so that their records are known. At the local level, not even the FBI with all of its resources could offer a 100 percent guarantee against infiltration. However, I think it is possible for organizations to exercise a good deal of control by carefully examining the personal records and bona fides, first, of all those who volunteer to help establish local organizations; second, of those who are elected to office in local organizations; third, of all those assigned to organizing activities.

If any effort had been made to do these things, the Madison Square Garden situation might have been avoided. But for 25 years, Henry Abrams has been a Communist. Without looking up his record, the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy allowed him to become the chief organizer of the rally in New York City. That was not taking the necessary precautionary measures.

I think it is not too much to ask that all such committees, which are headed by good people and made up of thousands of good people, ought to give consideration to the question whether Communists like Abrams are taking a part in the running of their meetings. Many of these committees have been doing good work. But it is little wonder that they become infiltrated by Communists if they do not take the pains and the time to ascertain who some of their people are, before they allow them to become officers or chief organizers of mass rallies.

I believe it is not too much to ask our fellow citizens who are organizing committees for the purpose of exerting influence on Congress—as they have every right to do—to make a preliminary, cursory check of the persons who are working in their organizations, especially before they hold such meetings.

This would not be an easy task. But there is much that can be done. It will not always be possible to obtain accurate personal information, because many Communists operate underground as secret party members. But in the case of a man like Abrams, who has a public record of membership, the facts should be available without too much effort.

Perhaps this is a situation in which private organizations can in some way be assisted by Government. This is a problem that the Subcommittee on Internal Security is at present exploring.

Mr. President, in closing my remarks, I wish to pay my personal tribute to Mr. Norman Cousins, the chairman of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, for the manner in which he has reacted to the revelations of the subcommittee. Mr. Cousins has been a neighbor and a friend of mine for many years. I have the highest regard for him. That is why I called him up and told him what I knew about Abrams. He was good enough to come to Washington to see me.

I said, "I don't want to release this material 24 hours before your meeting. You have your plans all made. But many innocent people will be present, and a number of them will be prominent people. Why have you not checked on people like Abrams? Norman Thomas said in January that he was doubtful about the man's background. Here it is the middle of May, on the eve of your meeting, and you have not yet done anything."

Mr. Cousins was upset about the matter. He immediately suspended Abrams. Not only did he do this, but he told me he was glad we had informed him about Abrams. He offered to open the books of his organization to the subcommittee and to cooperate in every way to rid his organization of Communists.

I assured Mr. Cousins and other persons connected with his committee that the Subcommittee on Internal Security is ready to cooperate with them to help to prevent a repetition of the Madison Square Garden situation.

I think it is not too much to say that the subcommittee is desirous and willing to help any other organization to avoid infiltration by subterranean elements who are not there for any good purpose, and who are certainly not interested, as are the good people who make up the bulk of their membership, in the welfare of the United States.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 809 OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1482, S. 3226. I may say that the bill has been cleared with the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3226) to amend section 809 of the National Housing Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Committee on Banking and Currency will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 4, after the word "section," it is proposed to insert:

> The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or his designee, is authorized to guarantee and indemnify the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund against loss to the extent required by the Commissioner, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, in the case of mortgages referred to in this subsection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama give a brief explanation of the bill and the amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall be glad to do so.

Senate bill 3226 amends section 809 of the National Housing Act. Section 809 was added to the National Housing Act in 1956, pursuant to Public Law 574, 2d session, 84th Congress, to help solve the housing problems of essential civilian employees of the armed services at research and development installations. The establishment of this special program was necessary because in some instances homes built for such employees in towns near or adjacent to such installations would be above and beyond those needed for the normal economic growth of the community. In the opinion of the Federal Housing Administration, homes built in excess of those needed for normal growth of a community cannot meet the test of economic soundness required by statute as a prerequisite for FHA mortgage insurance. Section 809 permits the economic soundness test to be waived in such cases.

In order to qualify for insurance, section 809 provides that an individual is required to hold a certificate issued by the Secretary of Defense which certifies that first, the employee requires housing; second, the employee is, on the date of the certificate, a civilian employed at a research and development installation of one of the armed services of the United States; and third, the employee is considered by the armed services to be an essential, nontemporary employee on such date.

In addition, the Secretary of Defense is required to certify to the Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration that housing is necessary for these civilian employees and that there is no present intention to substantially curtail the number of such civilian personnel assigned or to be assigned to such installations. The latter certificate is conclusive evidence to the FHA Commissioner of the need for housing; but if the Commissioner determines that mortgage insurance on such housing is not an acceptable risk, he may require the Secretary of Defense to guarantee the armed services housing mortgage insurance fund from loss with respect to the mortgages in question.

This program has been very helpful in supplying needed housing to essential employees of the armed services in areas surrounding Cocoa and Eglin Air Force Bases, Fla.; China Lake, Calif.; and Redstone Arsenal, at Huntsville, Ala.

Administrative jurisdiction over certain research and development installations has recently been transferred from the Department of Defense to NASA. While these transfers do not alter the intent of section 809, it has been concluded by the HHFA and the NASA that the program as presently constituted is not available to essential civilian employees of NASA at installations so

transferred. The reason for this conclusion is that the Administrator of NASA has no present authority to certify eligible employees, and cannot guarantee the FHA against loss.

The amendment as proposed by Senate bill 3226 is designed to overcome these technical difficulties, so that essential civilian employees at installations transferred from the Department of Defense to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may use the section 809 program to obtain needed housing.

Mr. KUCHEL. Very well, Mr. President; I am prepared to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3226) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 809 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) A mortgage secured by property which is intended to provide housing for a person employed or assigned to duty at a research or development installation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and which is located at or near such installation, where such installation was a research or development installation of one of the military departments of the United States (on or after June 13, 1956) before its transfer to the jurisdiction of such Administration, may (if the mortgage otherwise meets the requirements of this section) be insured by the Commissioner under the provisions of this section. The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or his designee, is authorized to guarantee and indemnify the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund against loss to the extent required by the Commissioner, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, in the case of mortgages referred to in this subsection. For purposes of this subsection, (1) the terms 'Armed Forces', 'one of the military departments of the United States', 'military department', 'Secretary or his designee', and 'Secretary' when used in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, and the term 'Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force' when used in section 805, shall be deemed to refer to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or the Administrator thereof, as may be appropriate, (2) the terms 'civilian employee', 'civilians', and 'civilian personnel' as used in this section shall be deemed to refer to employees of such Administration or a contractor thereof or to military personnel assigned to duty at an installation of such Administration, and (3) the term 'military installation' when used in section 805 shall be deemed to refer to an installation of such Administration."

SERVING OF OLEOMARGARINE OR MARGARINE IN NAVY RATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2168) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine.

FEDERAL AIR POLLUTION LAWS NEED TO BE STRENGTHENED

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the necessity to strengthen the program under which the United States is assisting efforts to reduce air pollution becomes more obvious with the passage of time. From many quarters, there is being provided evidence that the proportions of the problem warrant removal of legislative shackles from the U.S. Public Health Service and sister agencies, which have been charged by Congress with helping clean up the atmosphere which is essential to existence.

Earlier this session, in company with my colleague from California and both colleagues from Pennsylvania, I introduced a bill, strongly recommended by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to allow greater latitude and flexibility in Public Health Service activities in this field.

Within the past few days, more reasons for enacting such legislation have been revealed. Among them is a report to the Air Pollution Control Association, to the effect that the extent of automobile-caused smog has increased greatly in the last 5 years. This alarming information is contained in an article published in the Washington Post and Times Herald, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, another illustration of the need to give the Public Health Service more tools for its air pollution program is the continuing and growing demand for the promulgation of standards and the establishment of criteria to govern the discharge of pollutants into the atmosphere.

My own State of California recently, by action of its legislature, has taken steps to reduce contamination of the air by automobiles. Only this week, related legislation has been reported to the Senate—specifically, a bill passed by the House last year, H.R. 8238, under which the Surgeon General would report on such discharges.

These incidents show that research must be stepped up. It is not now possible to do so under the ceiling retained by Congress last year on appropriations for air-pollution work. Furthermore, the time limitation in the present legislation handicaps the administrators of the program in planning long-term health studies with universities and other scientific institutions.

A task group of experts from outside the Federal Government has studied the national air-pollution research needs, and has approved in principle a draft report which recommends for the next 10 years an approximate threefold increase in the total effort, with a proportionate stepping up of Federal activity. This is not possible under the present $5 million ceiling.

In a recent issue, the Journal of the American Medical Association warned that—

In numerous places on the earth the air contains hundreds of substances which were never intended to be inhaled. Some of these make us uncomfortable or ill and at times hasten the end of human beings.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from this publication also be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit II.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, growing concern about the spread of air pollution is felt and expressed by responsible public officials. Recently, I have heard from California that the Board of Supervisors of Sonoma County feel that more needs to be done. Likewise, the Public Health Director of San Diego County, Dr. J. B. Askew, has written to me a letter in which he states his feeling that Congress should "if at all possible, allow expansion of the Federal activity" in this field. I ask unanimous consent to have these letters printed in the RECORD, following these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit III.)

EXHIBIT I

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

CRACKED RUBBER AND DAMAGED CROPS CITED AS RESULT OF AUTO-CAUSED SMOG

(By Morton Mintz)

CINCINNATI, May 23.—Two hallmarks of automobile-caused smog—cracked rubber and damaged crops—have been found in urban and adjoining rural areas in 20 States, as well as the District of Columbia and the Canadian Province of Ontario.

The two scientists who reported this to the Air Pollution Control Association today gave the first documented summary of how widespread the problem of this kind of air pollution has become.

The Nation is expected to have 114 million autos by 1976, compared with about 70 million today.

"Control of motor-vehicle exhaust must be achieved if the air is to be conserved as an essential national resource," Profs. John T. Middleton and Arie J. Haagen-Smit told the association's 53d annual meeting.

Middleton is a University of California plant pathologist. Haagen-Smit is a California Institute of Technology chemist. Both are pioneer smog researchers.

Middleton, who read the report, said that even 5 years ago it was unusual, if not rare, to find East Coast vegetation damaged by smog. But today, he said, such damage is found in and around Washington, Baltimore, Wilmington, Del., Philadelphia, Trenton and New Brunswick, N.J., New York City, Hartford, Conn., and Boston.

The gravity of the problem is most sharply indicated in the Delaware Valley. Here, he said, smog generated in metropolitan Philadelphia is damaging spinach planted in an area of about 500 square miles between, roughly, Cranberry, N.J., and Wilmington.

He identified the harmful agent as ozone, the irritant in smog previously found to have damaged tobacco plants at Beltsville, near the District in Maryland's Prince Georges County.

In experiments with laboratory animals ozone has caused lung injuries, some of them fatal.

Ozone also oxidizes rubber, causing, for instance, cracks on tire sidewalls. A standard test for ozone is to measure how fast and deep it cracks bent rubber strips exposed to the air.

EXHIBIT II

[From the American Medical Association Journal, Apr. 30, 1960]

THE AIR WE BREATHE

By rights the air we breathe is a mixture of oxygen, nitrogen, and argon, with traces of helium, neon, krypton, and xenon, and presumably it has been approximately so since man began to breathe. Today, however, in numerous places on the earth, the air contains hundreds of substances which were never intended to be inhaled. Some of these make us uncomfortable or ill and at times hasten the end of human beings.

Extraneous substances such as dust have been in the air for a very long time, and, while they protect us against the sun's actinic rays, they too have taken their toll. The more serious air pollution problem began well after the industrial revolution (1870), and it has increased year by year until the number of air pollutants is now almost as great as the number of human activities which produce them.

The chief air pollutants today are the oxides of nitrogen, the oxides of sulfur, the aldehydes, carbon monoxide, smoke, condensed fumes, and organic vapors, often referred to as hydrocarbons, of which there are said to be 200 in automobile exhaust fumes alone.

Automobile engines, according to Chambers, emit an average of 200 to 400 pounds (91 to 182 kilograms of hydrocarbons and from 25 to 75 pounds (11 to 34 kilograms of oxides of nitrogen, estimated as NO_2, per 1,000 gallons of gasoline used. Burning a ton of coal produce 8 pounds (3.6 kilograms) of oxides of nitrogen, estimated as NO_2. Carbon monoxide is produced by gasoline engines in normal operation at the rate of about 3,200 pounds (1,453 kilograms) per 1,000 gallons of gasoline. Diesel engines produce about 75 pounds of oxide of nitrogen, estimated as NO_2, per 1,000 gallons of oil burned.

One need only look at the window sills occasionally to see that the air we breathe in congested areas contains thousands of specks of soot. As for dust, for example, the Armour Research Foundation of the Illinois Institute of Technology reported that the average fall for 30 days of January 1960, for the city of Chicago was 53.1 tons per square mile, while in the Chicago Loop it was 124.1 tons per square mile. The list could be extended for both places and things.

In this issue of the Journal, Oderr reports a study of 200 lungs of adults who died of causes other than tuberculosis or lung cancer. He observed a correlation between parenchymal soot deposit and emphysema. His findings indicate that the common form of chronic emphysema begins in highly localized areas which tended to be in the pathways trapping soot particles. Lawther, at St. Bartholomew's Hospital in London, found that certain soot particles trap acid radicals internally, and when they are collected on cascade impactor slides coated with gelatin films containing a color indicator, a strongly acid reaction is observed after a time. Other mechanisms have been suggested by which air-polluting inhalants could produce structural and functional abnormalities in the lung.

The effects on public health of unsavory gases and solids in the air is of first importance. It seems obvious, in some places, that the effects have been detrimental. However, as yet scientific proof of the specific hazards to human health is fragmentary, making it difficult to arrive at valid conclusions. Many studies have been published, many are under way. The proceedings of the National Conference on Air Pollution, sponsored by the U.S. Public Health Service, published recently, contains much of the information here being reviewed.[1]

There is no doubt that during the episodes at Donora and London the death rates mounted. The evidence is clear that certain air pollutants can cause bronchitis. There is abundant evidence that the Los Angeles smog affects the eyes of its citizens, temporarily at least, to the point of distraction. Mills[2] said, "The present report shows a clearly significant association between Los Angeles smogs and rises in day-by-day respiratory and cardiac deaths in the exposed population." Evidence is accumulating which suggests that air pollution may be causally involved in asthma, emphysema, and lung cancer. Stocks and Campbell estimated that about 35 percent of deaths from cancer of the lung in the Liverpool area result from air pollution. Mancuso maintained that air pollution represents a highly probable and important factor in the excess of lung cancer in urban areas. Kotin said that atmospheric pollution, both epidemiologically and in the laboratory, must be regarded as one of multiple factors operating in combination to result in lung cancer.

In a symposium in San Francisco, January 16–18, 1960, sponsored by the University of California School of Medicine and Continuing Education in Medicine and the Health Sciences, University of California, northern area, David F. Eastcott, M.D., formerly assistant director, National Institute of Health of New Zealand, presented a paper entitled "Other Airborne Factors in Cancer." He said that immigrants to New Zealand from highly industrialized Britain run a risk of lung cancer 30 percent greater than persons born in New Zealand of the same stock and way of life. If they are more than 30 years of age on coming to New Zealand, their risk is 75 percent greater. This can only be explained logically, Dr. Eastcott said, in terms of atmospheric environment, and it is significant that the effects of the British environment are felt many years after the person has left Britain to live in the cleaner New Zealand environment. Work done on lung cancer and bronchitis in Britain is consonant with this interpretation and renders it difficult to uphold any other.

Public Health Service Surgeon General Burney in his welcoming address before the National Conference on Air Pollution said that "investigators are finding a definite association between community air pollution and high mortality rates due to cancer of the respiratory tract, including the lungs, cancer of the stomach and esophagus, and arteriosclerotic heart disease."

There is another part to this drab picture, that of the cost in damaged crops and livestock, damaged buildings, lowered real estate values, and excessive laundry, cleaning, and paint bills. And how about the housewives who scrub and scrub to keep the grime away? While no one knows the cost of air pollution in these areas, estimates place it at billions of dollars a year.

This enormous, complex problem will probably get worse before it gets better, since our cities and total industrial output are becoming larger each year. Dyktor,[3] commissioner of the division of air pollution control of Cleveland, has said that complete elimination of air pollution is not economically attainable. The aroused public will have its say about that. Already the 84th Congress of the United States has responded by enacting a law which directs the Public Health Service to conduct research and provide technical services to State and local governments and private agencies. The goal of this program is to determine the conditions under which toxic substances in the air affect human health, and the measures which must be applied to prevent adverse effects. A national air sampling network is at work and 180 cities and 51 nonurban areas have sampling stations. Each State has at least one urban and one nonurban sampling station and seven States have their own sampling networks.

The sanitary engineering centers in Cincinnati and in the field offer training courses, and more than 900 persons took part in them during fiscal year 1958. At least 14 universities were offering graduate courses in subjects related to air pollution as of November 1959. Cities are banding together to form countrywide air-pollution control districts. Thus, a good start has been made. We may be surprised at what can be done if everybody, managers of buildings, homeowners, industries, and research workers, will do their part in keeping toxic material out of the air we breathe.

[1] Proceedings of National Conference on Air Pollution, Washington, D.C., Nov. 18–20, 1958, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, 1959.

[2] Mills, C. A.: "Respiratory and Cardiac Deaths in Los Angeles Smogs," Am. J. M. Sc. 233, 379–386, (April) 1957.

[3] Dyktor, H. G.: Community Problem, Indust. Med. 19: 102–106 (March) 1950.

EXHIBIT III

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
San Diego, Calif., May 3, 1960.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate, Committee on Appropriations, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: Information has come to this office indicating that legislation which you introduced to extend Public Law 159, the Air Pollution Research and Technical Assistance Act, is now under active consideration as Senate bill 3108 and House bill 10696.

As air pollution control officer of this county, it has been my privilege to become familiar with the vast need for more information concerning air pollution and the proper approach to control same. Likewise, I attended the National Air Pollution Conference held in Washington in November 1958, at which time it was the unanimous recommendation of the conference that the authorization for the air pollution control program as a responsibility of the U.S. Public Health Service be continued indefinitely and that the ceiling limitations on the authorized expenditures be removed.

It is noted that your bill which would have provided for these two conditions was subsequently modified by committee action. Even though California has adopted air quality standards and exhaust discharge standards, and the recent session of the California Legislature adopted further air pollution controls, it is the opinion of all that these actions will not completely correct the problem and that there will be further need for research and development for future air pollution control activity.

It is, therefore, respectfully requested that you and the other California representatives do all within your power to continue the air pollution control program at its present level and, if at all possible, allow expansion of the Federal activity in air pollution research and technical development, if such can be justified by program proposals to be reviewed by the proper appropriation committees of the Federal Congress.

This matter is being brought to the attention of the board of supervisors of this county, who act as directors of the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District, with the recommendation and request that they act and communicate with our California representatives to urge the continuation and extension of the air pollution work by the

Federal Government. You may rest assured that we are behind you 100 percent in the continuation of this vital program.

Sincerely yours,

J. B. ASKEW, M. D.,
Director of Public Health and Air Pollution Control Officer.

COUNTY OF SONOMA,
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
Santa Rosa, Calif., March 21, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is gratifying to note your renewed activity relative to smog-control at the Federal level. This business of smog is definitely something to be concerned about.

We are pleased that Senator CLAIR ENGLE and the two Senators from Pennsylvania have added their weight to your effort.

This renewed activity will be a shot-in-the-arm to the San Francisco Bay Area Air Pollution Control District.

With kind personal regards, I remain,

Yours very truly,

LEIGH S. SHOEMAKER,
Supervisor, Second District, Board of Supervisors of County of Sonoma.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1833) authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Bent's Old Fort, near La Junta, Colo.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 12326) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1605) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the apportionment of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries as they affect such States, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 12326) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LAKE MICHIGAN POLLUTION STUDY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in a moment I intend to request unanimous consent to have a number of insertions made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and if and when those requests are granted, I intend thereafter to seek recognition by the Chair, in order to reply to a statement made yesterday, on the floor of the Senate, by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I notified the office of the Senator from Wisconsin about 30 minutes ago that I intended to make these comments, but I do not see him on the floor at this time. I therefore ask that the staff of the minority or the staff of the Senate seek out the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and again notify him of my intention. Then, after I have submitted my unanimous-consent requests, I shall proceed with the matter to which I have referred.

(At this point, Mr. DOUGLAS submitted certain matters for inclusion in the RECORD, where they appear under the appropriate headings.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I come now to the matter of the comments of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] in the Senate yesterday, which will be found at pages 10889 and 10890 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I deeply regret that the senior Senator from Wisconsin is not on the floor. As I said, approximately 40 minutes ago, I telephoned his office that I intended to comment on his remarks and indicated the nature of my comments, and asked that he be informed. When I came to the floor I found he was not here, and, as the RECORD will show, I have asked either the staff of the minority or the staff of the Senate to seek out the senior Senator from Wisconsin and so inform him. But he is not here and I cannot delay any further. I must therefore proceed, but I do so with the consciousness that I have tried to give to the senior Senator from Wisconsin a full opportunity to answer the statements which I am going to make.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who has always been an opponent of Chicago's efforts to deal with its sanitary problems, is continuing his obstructive tactics in a mutually contradictory fashion.

Yesterday on the floor of the Senate, he denounced the proposal by Representatives O'BRIEN and YATES that $12 million be appropriated for an overall survey of the sanitary problems of all five of the Great Lakes—namely, not merely Lake Michigan, but Lakes Superior, Huron, Erie, and Ontario—and the large number of cities adjoining the lakes.

In view of the widespread pollution of lake beaches because of the unsanitary practices of all the lake cities except Chicago, and in view of the grave pollution of Milwaukee's beaches, I had expected Senator WILEY to support this proposal of Congressmen O'BRIEN and YATES. But evidently Senator WILEY's well-known dislike of Chicago prevented him from doing this. Because the O'Brien-Yates proposal provided for an experimental diversion of 1,000 cubic feet of water per second at Chicago for only 1 year, he has announced his opposition to this modest and cooperative proposal.

It is extraordinary to find the Senator from Wisconsin giving as his chief excuse for opposing this appropriation the fact that H.R. 1, which was an attempt to deal with this problem for Chicago only, is supposedly under consideration by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, of which he is the ranking Republican member. He therefore labels the O'Brien-Yates proposal as a "subterfuge" and a Trojan horse, and says it is an attempt to bypass consideration of H.R. 1 by the Foreign Relations Committee, and that only this body should give the matter legislative consideration.

Now, the facts are these: When H.R. 1 was referred last fall to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as the result of the filibuster in which Senator WILEY played a leading part, the chairman of that committee, the junior Senator from Arkansas, promised to give it careful consideration. I charged at the time that Senator WILEY, as ranking minority member, would never permit the committee to consider or approve the bill. I was told that I was too suspicious, that the Senator was the soul of fairness and would certainly not object to our having our day in court.

The new session opened, but the Foreign Relations Committee did not bring up the bill for consideration. On February 25, I therefore wrote the chairman and asked for a hearing upon H.R. 1. After a somewhat fruitless exchange of correspondence during which Senator WILEY helped to block action because on the 15th of March the records of the Foreign Relations Committee show that my request was considered in executive session, but not acted upon, and I am informed confidentially it was not acted upon because of a filibuster led by Senator WILEY. I again renewed my request on March 22. Finally, I was asked to appear in person, which I did on March 29, and asked that the committee give us the courtesy of a hearing.

Senator MORSE, with his customary sense of fairness, then moved that this be done and a hearing be held, but his motion did not carry, both because of a filibuster led by Senator WILEY and another Senator from a lake State and because they were able to get half of the 12 votes, and therefore were able to prevent affirmative action on my request for a hearing.

Since then Senator MORSE has brought this issue up again and has asked once more that the committee give us a hearing. Each time Senator WILEY and his Lake and New England allies have prevented our even getting a chance to be heard. It was because of these obstructionist tactics on the part of the Senator from Wisconsin—I want to say that the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] had absolutely nothing to do with these unfair tactics—that Messrs. O'BRIEN and YATES sought to deal with the whole problem of lake sanitation which is so greviously afflicting Milwaukee, which wants to foist its dirty habits of returning sewage into the lake off on Chicago.

How can I characterize the behavior of the Senator from Wisconsin in terms which would not violate rule XIX? I want to characterize the action of the Senator accurately; yet I do not wish to violate rule XIX.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I will not yield. I wish to complete my statement. Then I will yield.

On the one hand, the Senator from Wisconsin prevents us from having a hearing. On the other he says constructive legislation should not be considered by another committee because we are having a hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee.

As a matter of fact, yesterday, May 24, the Senator from Wisconsin, after lengthy discussion in the Foreign Relations Committee, moved to postpone any further consideration of the lake diversion bill, and mustered six votes in support of his motion. The motion lost by merely a tie vote, and the motion to hold hearings was similarly lost by a tie vote, with Senator WILEY leading the opposition.

Senator WILEY then immediately hurried to the floor of the Senate saying that since H.R. 1 was under consideration by the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senate Appropriations Committee should not consider the O'Brien-Yates proposal. Language fails me in dealing with that contention.

The contradiction in this fast and ambiguous footwork is clear. The plea that the Appropriations Committee surrender the O'Brien-Yates measure to the Foreign Relations Committee for its consideration is obviously an effort not to get it considered, but to get it killed.

I notice that the very able and fair-minded senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is in the Chamber. The Senator from Oregon has been trying his best for some months now to see that we at least get a hearing and a fair deal. I appeal to the Senator as to whether my statement of facts is correct or incorrect.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I ask the Senator to yield with the understanding that the Senator from Illinois will not lose his right to the floor. I shall take only 2 or 3 minutes.

The Senator from Illinois has referred to the part which I played in the controversy within the Committee on Foreign Relations. I want to make a very brief statement for the RECORD in regard to it.

The Senate has heard me for 16 years—I fear sometimes to near boredom—stress over and over again that, after all, the substantive rights of people can be no better than their procedural rights. I do not know of any better illustration of that truism than the controversy which is waging over getting a hearing on the so-called lake diversion bill of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, the Senate referred the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is my interpretation that when the Senate referred the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations the referral carried with it by clear implication, if not by express provision, a mandate to the Committee on Foreign Relations that it proceed to consider the bill and to hold hearings in respect to the issues involved.

That is all I have asked for, Mr. President. I am perfectly willing to follow where the facts lead in regard to the bill, but I think it is only proper, fair and right that the Committee on Foreign Relations hold a hearing on the bill.

The motion which I have presented several times to the Comittee on Foreign Relations would send the bill to a subcommittee of the Commitee on Foreign Relations headed by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who is chairman of the subcommittee which deals with United States-Canadian relationships. I selected that subcommittee, Mr. President, because there has been raised a so-called international question with respect to this issue. Various allegations have been made as to the position taken by the Canadian Government in regard to the bill.

I do not intend to go into the merits of the argument. In fact, I am not a competent witness on the merits. The purpose of the hearing is to bring out the merits of the controversy.

What I have been saying in the Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. President, I repeat to the Senate. The Senator from Illinois is a colleague of ours in the Senate. The Senator from Illinois is the author of a bill of vital concern to his State. I happen to think that the State of Illinois is entitled to a hearing on the matter. I am at a loss to understand why roadblocks should be put in the way, against the procedure which would assure the making of a record on the facts. That is all I have been pleading for.

I have pointed out that men serve on the Committee on Foreign Relations who are opposed to the Senator from Illinois in regard to the bill. I have said in the committee, and I am perfectly willing to say on the floor of the Senate, I think this makes it all the more important that the Committee on Foreign Relations grant a hearing on the bill, so that it can never be charged that anyone on the Committee on Foreign Relations in opposition to the bill is using the Committee on Foreign Relations to "bottle up" the bill.

I think that we in the Senate owe a good-faith relationship to each other. I think when a colleague has a bill of as much consequence as is this bill, and the bill by a vote of the Senate is referred to a committee, the bill ought to be considered automatically, and there should be a hearing on it.

I am very fond of the individuals who are opposed to me in respect to this matter in the committee, but I said yesterday in the committee, "I think you are making a great mistake, procedurally."

I am going to continue to press for my motion for a hearing on the bill, Mr. President, as many times as I have a opportunity to make the motion. We are subject to a procedural rule in the committee, and the only time I can bring up the motion is on a so-called regular meeting date, unless the committee votes to bring it up at some time other than a regular meeting date. Our regular meeting date is usually Tuesday. Next Tuesday I shall offer my motion again.

I wish to offer the motion, Mr. President, in the hope that we can get a majority of the members of the committee, at least—and I hope the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] will be among them—to recognize the plain fairness of the procedure for which I am pleading.

Mr. President, I shall always oppose any "bottling up" technique.

It is my judgment that is what is happening to the bill on the part of some of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Some Senators are trying to block a hearing. I cannot reconcile that with fairness, with equity and, I will say, with proper relationships among ourselves as Senators. If we ever start letting this unhappy procedure take root in the Senate we are going to do great injury, in my judgment, to the work of the Senate itself.

It makes no difference whether the Senator involved might be my most bitter enemy, if a Senator has a bill and wants a hearing on it in the committee, the Senator from Oregon will vote for the hearing. I think any Senator would be entitled to that. I believe in the right to petition and the right to have a hearing on the substance of matters.

Mr. President, I am glad to join with my friend from Illinois today in supporting his general premise, that a wrong is really being done by those in the Committee on Foreign Relations who refuse to vote to give the distinguished Senator from Illinois a hearing. There are many reasons why we ought to have the hearing, but one is senatorial courtesy, if Senators consider no other.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his statement. I assume the Senator agrees with me that my recital of the facts has been an accurate recital.

Mr. MORSE. There is no question about the fact that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has led the fight in the committee against a hearing on the bill, and he has been joined by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in spite of the fine work of the Senator from Oregon and the other members of the committee I have about abandoned hope of getting a fair deal for Chicago on this matter from the Committee on Foreign Relations. It pains me to say this, but I have about abandoned hope. I think, therefore, the best thing to do is to proceed with the O'Brien-Yates proposal in the Appropriations Committee, which provides for an appropriation of $12 million to study the sanitary problems of all the lake cities—Milwaukee, Cleveland, Toledo, Erie, Buffalo, and others. If Canada wishes to come in on this, we would be glad to study the Canadian problems as well.

These cities are dumping sewage, either raw or treated, into the lakes, and polluting the lakes. If my information is correct, Chicago is now the only

city where one can enjoy lake bathing. This problem is going to increase in severity with the passage of time.

Even the city of Milwaukee, which has had a good record until recently, found its beaches so badly polluted last year that it was necessary to close the beaches. I am informed that the new sewage disposal plant in Milwaukee is merely a sedimentation plant, and therefore only about 40 percent of its sewage will be eliminated. This residue will shortly be dumped into Lake Michigan, and that will have a bad effect not only upon Milwaukee, but, also since the lake current moves from north to south, will endanger beaches in Kenosha and Racine and possibly across the line in Zion, Waukegan, North Shore, and other places in Illinois.

I appreciate the fine work of the Senator from Oregon. I understand the present distinguished Presiding Officer, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has also assisted. I think the Senator from Arkansas has been fair in the matter. Nevertheless, I do not have much hope. I raise this question simply to indicate the type of treatment we have been getting.

Most of all I am indignant, I will say, that a Senator should work to prevent consideration of a bill and then say that a general proposal should not be considered by another committee because the Committee on Foreign Relations is considering the bill.

It was this performance which really taxed my patience and strained my language and forced me to impose restraints upon myself lest I violate rule XIX. Frankly, if I said what I thought of this performance, rule XIX would be smashed to smithereens and I would be forced to take my seat. But being a law-abiding man, conforming to the rules of the Senate, I have restrained my language and will not violate rule XIX. Every Senator knows what my sentiments are, and if Senators will examine the RECORD, they will see I feel the same now as I have always felt about this matter.

Now I yield to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] who will present the defense of his colleague. I have tried to get the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] on the floor so that he could also hear what I said and make such answer as he thought it possible for him to make. Unfortunately, he is not present. Now I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. First, I wish to say that my senior colleague [Mr. WILEY] needs no defense from me. He has already handled this situation in such an effective way that he has infuriated the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sorry that the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] goes down in my esteem. I think that is a terrible statement.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to my friend from Illinois that when I rose about 10 minutes ago, I rose not to invoke rule XIX, although in my judgment the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] violated rule XIX, not by referring to my senior colleague, but because of his reference to the so-called "dirty habits" of the city of Milwaukee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are dirty habits.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That statement was a violation of the rule. It offends a State and offends the greatest city in my State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Wisconsin deny that the city of Milwaukee dumps its treated sewage back into the lake?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin is proud of the excellent handling of sewage by the city of Milwaukee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator deny that the city of Milwaukee dumps its treated sewage back into the lake?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course we do, but we treat it first.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it true that the new plant in Milwaukee is merely a sedimentation plant and does not use the method of activated sludge that Chicago and the first plant built in Milwaukee used? Is it true that the new plant is merely a sedimentation plant?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin tells the Senator from Illinois that the water which is taken from Lake Michigan by the city of Milwaukee for drinking purposes is pure and that no illnesses have been caused through its use.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I repeat my question.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois speaks of an entirely different subject. I am talking about the fact that the water of Lake Michigan taken for drinking purposes is clean. Competent medical authority has never indicated to the contrary at any time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The city of Milwaukee withdraws water north of the point at which sewage is dumped. The lake current is north to south. So of course the water which is taken for drinking purposes is all right. But the beaches are contaminated.

The Senator from Wisconsin does not deny the fact that the new plant is a sedimentation plant which will remove only about 40 percent of the sewage, leaving 60 percent of the sewage to be dumped into the lake by the city of Milwaukee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The city of Milwaukee has followed sanitary practices which have not endangered anyone's health. The Senator from Illinois has argued in favor of the proposed legislation for years and has yet to bring to the attention of the Senate an instance of a single person who has ever become ill as a result of the practices of the city of Milwaukee. Indeed I have repeatedly brought to the attention of the Senate testimony by the most authoritative medical and health experts in the country supporting the Wisconsin position against Illinois. I am still waiting for the Senator from Illinois to present a scintilla of competent medical or health testimony supporting his position.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wisconsin is therefore tacitly admitting what I have said by his refusal to reply to my question.

I propose that we get together and study all these problems. I propose that we try to improve the situation in Milwaukee, Cleveland, Toledo, Buffalo, Erie, Superior, Duluth, and all the other cities on the Great Lakes. I hope the junior Senator from Wisconsin, who is a very fine gentleman, will cooperate in such a study, displaying therefore an attitude unlike that of his senior colleague.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall be delighted to cooperate in any study which does not provide additional diversion of water from the Great Lakes for 1 year, as the Senator from Illinois so well knows is the proposal which he has supported. I ask the Senator from Illinois if his proposal provides for diversion of Great Lakes water to any other city except Chicago?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Chicago is the only city on the Great Lakes where the water runs from the Great Lakes toward the south. All other cities are located where the rivers flow into the lakes, and that was once true of Chicago. But in 1899 we reversed the flow of the Chicago River, so that instead of the waters of the river flowing into Lake Michigan, they go now into the Illinois River, then into the Mississippi and thence into the gulf.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois is a master at diversion, and of diversionary tactics, too. The Senator from Illinois knows that if there is to be equitable treatment among all the cities, they must be treated the same. If Chicago is singled out for diversion, which is really what the Senator from Illinois has been asking, the diversion of a thousand cubic feet of water per second per year——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Just as a trial.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Regardless of the justification for it, if Chicago is singled out and is getting special consideration and treatment, such a course would not be proper. We are saying that if a study is to be made, it should be made on the same basis for all cities, and all cities should be treated the same.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What does the junior Senator say about the behavior of his senior colleague?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I will say this about the behavior of my senior colleague: My senior colleague succeeded in what I think was a magnificent struggle last year to have the bill committed to the Foreign Relations Committee. The Senator from Illinois knows perfectly well there has probably been no bill in the history of the Senate of the moderate consequences of this bill which has been so thoroughly heard. We had hearings before the Public Works Committee last year during three or four separate periods. They were extensive hearings. There were volumes put in the record.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And on every occasion the judgments were favorable to the claims of the city of Chicago.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Last year after an extensive debate which lasted many days the Senate acted. A substantial majority of the Senate decided that the bill

should not be passed, but that it should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wisconsin is perfectly aware of the circumstances under which that vote was taken. If we could have brought the measure to a vote, we could have passed it, but the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and, I am sorry to say, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]—and I now will have to let the cat out of the bag—carried on such a filibuster as to wear out the Senate, and the bill was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations rather than have the discussion continue indefinitely. The junior Senator from Wisconsin, who has joined me in trying to check the institution of filibustering, was one of the worst practitioners of filibustering that I had ever seen at that time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that the bill was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations by a substantial majority of the Senate. There are 17 members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the majority of the members of the committee are outstanding, seasoned, mature, and thoughtful Senators. A majority has not seen fit to report this bill. The senior Senator from Wisconson had every right to oppose the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has he the right to oppose hearings on the bill?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course he has, if he believes hearings are not necessary. He is 1 Senator among 17 Senators who constitute the committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has he the right to rise on the floor of the Senate and say, "Since we are considering the bill, no other committee should deal with the matter of appropriations"? The Senator from Wisconsin would not do so. I am sure he would not. The junior Senator from Wisconsin is an honorable man. He would not take such action.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The junior Senator from Wisconsin will do all he can legally, morally, and properly to oppose this bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I say that the junior Senator from Wisconsin disappoints me. I yield the floor.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I inquire whether the pollution in the Chicago River has been aggravated to any extent by the use of oleomargarine?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the question is not germane.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a chronological statement of the legislative history of H.R. 1.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF H.R. 1

H.R. 1: Congressman O'BRIEN of Illinois introduced bill January 7, 1959.

February 17, 18, and March 3, 1959: Public hearings on H.R. 1 by House Public Works Committee.

March 9, 1959: Reported to House with amendments—House Report 191.

March 13, 1959: Amended and passed House.

March 16, 1959: Ordered to lie on table in Senate.

March 18, 1959: Referred to Senate Public Works Committee.

August 25, 1959: Reported with amendments—Senate Report 808.

September 2, 1959: Referred to Foreign Relations Committee.

September 3, 1959: Referred by committee to State.

February 15, 1960: Report received by committee from State.

March 15, 1960: Considered in executive session.

March 29, 1960: Considered in executive session.

March 30, 1960: Motion to table motion to hold hearings defeated 6 to 6.

May 24, 1960: Wiley motion to postpone further consideration defeated 6 to 6. Morse motion to hold hearings defeated 6 to 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill (S. 2168).

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY BRAZILIAN CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, we are particularly honored today by having as our guests some Members of the Congress of Brazil.

Brazil is one of our great and good neighbors. It is a country about which many Americans know too little. It is a country larger than the United States, if we exclude the northmost part, Alaska. It is a country so great that it does not yet know the vast extent of its own natural resources, since they are so enormous.

Brazil has recently established a great new capital, which has been a tremendous venture. This new capital is almost 600 miles from the old capital.

Brazil is a growing country, growing extremely fast, and has nearly 65 million people now. The population will certainly reach 100 million within the next few years.

Brazil is a great, free country. It is a country the government of which is probably nearer to our own than that of any of the other countries of the world. It is truly a very great neighbor of ours.

Mr. President, this afternoon it gives me great pleasure to introduce to this body six Members of the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies.

First I introduce the Honorable Angelo Mendes, a Member of the Chamber of Deputies from the former Federal District, a representative of the Social Progressive Party. It is the District of Guanabara.

The next guest I introduce is the Honorable Francisco Leite, a Member of the Chamber of Deputies from Sergipe, and the President of the Social Democratic Party of Sergipe.

Next I introduce the Honorable Manoel de Novaes. Senor de Novaes is a Member of the Chamber of Deputies of Brazil from Bahia, and is president of the Republican Party of Bahia. It is appropriate that we have Senor Novaes sitting on the right side of the aisle, since he is a member of the Republican Party of Brazil.

Next, Mr. President, I introduce the Honorable Estacio Souto Maior, a Member of the Chamber of Deputies of Brazil from Pernambuco, a member of the Brazilian Labor Party.

The Honorable Ernani Ayres Satyro Souza, who is a Member of the Chamber of Deputies of Brazil from Paraiba; and a member of the National Democratic Union.

Finally, the Honorable Lourival Baptista, who is a Member of the Chamber of Deputies of Brazil from Sergipe; and the National Democratic Union.

It has been a great privilege to have the honor of introducing these guests from the Congress of our great and good neighbor to the south.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], in welcoming our colleagues from the United States of Brazil. We are very proud of the relationship which has existed between our two great countries based on a policy of equality and mutual respect over so many decades.

We know, of course, that you are a venturesome people and that you are willing to take chances, because you recognize you have a great future in the affairs of this hemisphere, and I daresay in the affairs of the world as well.

The fact that you have moved bag and baggage, so to speak, from your old capital at Rio de Janiero to your new capital, Brasília, indicates to me a determination to open up your great country, to populate it, to exploit it, and to do so for the benefit of the people which you so ably represent.

I believe also that the Republic of Brazil is to be congratulated for the leadership it has assumed in recent years in trying to bring about a better economic development of the Americans, especially in the creation of a common market to which seven Latin American nations belong at the present time. It is my hope that from this initial impetus the common market will expand so that in time it will include not only all Latin America, but the United States and Canada as well. We look upon you as brothers, we respect you as colleagues, and you honor us by visiting this Chamber today.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I shall ask our guests to go to the rear of the Senate Chamber for a few moments, and I hope that Members of the Senate will join them there and greet them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 5 minutes so that we may pay additional honor to our guests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), the Senate took a recess until 2 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 10 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to inform Senators that the Senate will very likely be in session late this afternoon and evening in discussion of the pending business.

SERVING OF OLEOMARGARINE OR MARGARINE IN NAVY RATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2168) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I vigorously oppose the pending bill, for many reasons; first, for the perfectly obvious reason that I stand here as the junior Senator from Wisconsin, which is known throughout the country as the No. 1 dairy State. We are very proud of the fact that we export more milk and milk products than the next five States combined.

Wisconsin produces some 17 percent of all the milk which is produced in the Nation. At the same time, I think I should make it clear that dairying is an extremely important part of the Nation's farm economy. The dairy farmer produces the number one cash crop in America. The dairy farmers in my State and in the State of Minnesota, and also in many other States, are in very serious trouble. The fact is that prices have gone steadily down as costs have risen.

Recently, the Department of Agriculture made a study of the hourly farm income in Wisconsin. That study, I think, shocked many persons, because it showed that if we allowed the dairy farmer in Wisconsin—and we are very proud of the efficiency of our dairy farmers—a meager 4 percent return on his invested capital, he would have a labor income for the amount of labor he expended on his farm of 56 cents an hour, or only a little more than half of the present minimum wage, and, of course, far less than half the minimum wage which may become law in this country within a month or so. The dairy farmer is in serious trouble. He has been consistently in trouble for a long time.

The bill would amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the purchase of oleomargarine or margarine on the basis of the experience in the Army and the Air Force. It is perfectly obvious what will happen. That will mean that the Navy will do what the Army and the Air Force have done. The Navy will reduce its purchase of butter and will step up its purchase of margarine, and for a perfectly logical reason, a reason which, in most circumstances, would be perfectly defensible. By and large, margarine is cheaper.

The Navy officials can show a better record of economy if they buy margarine.

However, so far as the Government is concerned, that is very foolish economy, because the Government has had, in the past, very substantial surpluses of butter in the Commodity Credit Corporation. The newspapers in the last few days have reported that there is almost certain to be a substantial increase in butter purchases by the Commodity Credit Corporation. There will be increased stocks of butter. That will mean that the Federal Government will have surplus butter which can be used for the armed services. Instead, in order to have a better bookkeeping record, the Navy procurement officer, if the bill shall be passed, will, of course, step in and do what any good procurement officer would do. He will buy the commodity he can purchase at the lowest price, instead of getting it from the Commodity Credit Corporation at virtually no real cost to the Government, but at a bookkeeping cost to the Navy which will be somewhat higher than the cost of oleomargarine.

I particularly object to section 2 of the bill. I shall read several lines of section 2 to indicate why. I think the debate will focus around the problem I have already attempted to spell out; that is, whether there would be any real saving to the Government, overall, if the Navy should ignore the holdings of butter by the Commodity Credit Corporation and should buy margarine, regardless of the Commodity Credit Corporation holdings.

The authors of the bill have been conscientious. They have attempted to cope with the problem in section 2. They have attempted to cope with it, however, in a way which does not accomplish what most of us believe is necessary. I read from section 2:

> During any period when surplus butter stocks are available to the Navy through the Commodity Credit Corporation no oleomargarine or margarine shall be acquired for use by the Navy or any branch or department thereof.

The difficulty with that provision can be best understood by recognizing the situation which exists today. The fact is that right now—at this moment—to my knowledge, no surplus butter stocks are available to the Navy through the Commodity Credit Corporation. In about 10 days, there probably will be. How foolish it will be if the Navy buys oleomargarine now, and perhaps stocks up for a long period, but by the end of the month they can get the butter at no real cost to the Government, because it has already procured butter, and the Navy could get it simply by negotiating with the Commodity Credit Corporation.

So I think this section of the bill can be improved, and I have an amendment, which is pending at the desk, and which I shall call up later. I think my amendment will greatly improve the bill and will make it at least more workable, although I think the heart of the bill, the primary purpose of the bill, is wrong. This is why:

The fact is that dairy producers and the Government have cooperated in many ways to expand the consumption of fluid milk and dairy products. They have done this for many reasons. Milk is not only an important dairy product; it is a perfect food. It is perfect for children and is wonderful food for the young men and women in the armed services. One of the best customers for butter—in fact, the best customer, among all the services—has been the Navy.

The results of industry and government cooperation, plus the effect of a firm beef market, have contributed substantially toward bringing milk production and demand into as close a balance as they have been in for several years.

We who watch the dairy economy closely are gratified that, at long last, the dairy industry is getting into a situation where there is something of a balance between supply and demand, and where the cost to the Government of the dairy program has been exceedingly small—much smaller in recent weeks than it has been for a long time.

However, we should not be overconfident to the point where we feel that the dairy problem is solved. It certainly is not. The Wall Street Journal reported on Monday that the Commodity Credit Corporation expected in a very short time to begin purchasing butter again.

It is quite evident that a softening of the beef market will be reflected in higher milk production. Here, again, any proposal which would in effect curtail the outlets for dairy products would aggravate the situation, and make it more likely that the Government would have to get into this program again and purchase more milk, and that would make the management of the program more difficult.

In the second place, the lowering of the Navy ration by replacing butter with a vegetable substitute is certainly inconsistent with the efforts of the Department of Defense to attract capable young men and women to the military service, and to make such service desirable to such a point that they will make the service a career.

I shall not maintain that there is anything wrong with oleomargarine as a food. However, I think all Americans recognize that while oleomargarine may be acceptable under some circumstances, butter is a superlative, superior product. Oleomargarine is a good product, but we are very proud of butter because of the health it provides for those who consume it.

At a time when, because of the nature of the farm program, we can provide butter at no real cost to the Federal Government, and provide it for the people in the Navy, it seems very foolish for Congress to change the law and to put the Navy procurement official in a position where he will buy oleomargarine so that he will have a better procurement record. In doing that he will discourage people—admittedly, in a relatively minor way—from continuing in the armed services.

It has not been necessary in the past for the Navy to use a substitute for butter, any more than it has been necessary for the Navy to replace the meat requirement in its ration with calories from cheaper vegetable sources. The argument is made that the Navy ration should continue to be extended. I am certain a ration could be devised which would be far cheaper and would result in a diet which would be most unattractive and inedible. It is perfectly possible that the Navy people might be kept alive, but the Navy personnel are not cattle or animals which are fed certain ingredients in order to get production out of them. They are human beings. I think they should be treated as human beings. One way we can do it, and in a very modest way, at virtually no cost, is to provide the prospect that they can get wholesome milk and butter.

In the fifth place, it is abundantly clear that so long as milk and dairy products are in surplus supply, any action which would aggravate the situation would be costly and unwise.

The fact is that milk and dairy products are not, as I have said, in very great supply in the Commodity Credit Corporation at the moment. But dairy production is increasing, and the consumption of dairy products is not increasing to keep pace with the production. This is one way in which Congress can wisely and thoughtfully exercise its particular advantage as a Congress in looking at our Government overall, and not simply looking at one segment, by providing that the Navy will continue on its ration of butter, and not include oleomargarine, because to do so it is perfectly clear that damage will be done to the dairy farmer.

Mr. President, I expect to speak later on this subject, but at this time I yield the floor.

I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, this bill, S. 2168, would amend the Navy ration law, to permit the serving of oleomargarine or margarine to naval personnel. I believe many Members of the Senate know something about the history of this legislation.

The components of the ration to be served naval personnel are prescribed by law. Oleomargarine or margarine is not now listed as a component of this ration. Unlike the Navy, the Departments of the Army and the Air Force do not have a basic ration law. The elements of the Army and Air Force ration are prescribed by the President. The serving of margarine or oleomargarine by the Army and the Air Force is now permissive.

The Navy desires authority to serve margarine. Such authority would increase the adaptability of menus to existing operating conditions, and would place the Navy on an equal footing with the other military departments in being permitted the discretionary use of margarine, in lieu of butter.

House bill 912, of the 85th Congress, would have authorized the serving of margarine or oleomargarine by the Navy, except when surplus butter stocks were available through the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Senate passed an amended version of this bill late in the 85th Congress; but the Senate amendment was not agreed to, and thus the bill did not become law.

The existence of surplus butter stocks has complicated favorable action on legislation of this type. If the existence of surplus agricultural commodities is to be considered in prescribing ration components of the Navy, this bill would afford equal recognition to the possible existence of a surplus in either soybean oil or cottonseed oil, from which oleomargarine or margarine is processed.

In brief, the Navy would be permitted to serve margarine if both butter and either soybean oil or cottonseed oil were in surplus supply. If only butter were in surplus supply, the Navy would not be authorized to serve margarine.

The Navy must acquire margarine for use in emergency operations, when refrigeration facilities are limited or not available. Since stocks of margarine acquired for use in these circumstances must be rotated periodically, to keep the stocks fresh, the bill also provides express authority to permit the use of such rotated stocks for any purposes other than as a component of the Navy ration. In practical effect, this means that the rotated stocks are used for cooking purposes.

The enactment of this authority would result in no increased cost to the Government. It could result in savings. It is impractical to estimate the amount of such savings, because of many variable factors, such as personnel strength, the price differential between butter and margarine, and the extent to which margarine would be used as a substitute for butter.

Mr. President, it hardly is sensible for the Army and the Air Force to have permissive authority to serve margarine, but to deny such authority to the Navy. I do not believe that enactment of this bill would have a disastrous effect on producers of butter. If special recognition is to be afforded butter producers, it seems logical that equal recognition should be extended to producers of soy bean or cottonseed oil. The pending bill adopts such an approach and I urge that it be approved.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I am pleased to yield to my distinguished friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to ask the Senator from South Carolina why there were no public hearings held on the bill, in view of the very, very great interest which the entire dairy industry has in the bill, and the fact that the bill would affect literally hundreds of thousands of farmers, as well as a tremendous number of persons in the Armed Forces.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in reply to the question of the distinguished Senator I would say, in the first place, that no request for a hearing was received. In the second place, this is a very simple bill. The bill would merely give to the Navy the right to serve margarine, which authority the Army and the Air Force now have. It was felt there was really no need for any hearings on the matter.

Mr. President I will say further that the Senate Armed Services Committee reported the bill in the 83d Congress and again in the 85th Congress. This is the third time the Armed Services Committee has acted favorably upon the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that although there was no request for a hearing, the Senator knew there would be very strong, vigorous, determined opposition to the bill? Therefore, since it is a controversial bill, it is a simple matter of equity that both sides ought to be heard.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I would not reach any such conclusion, because ordinarily if a Senator is especially interested in a matter and wishes to bitterly oppose a bill it seems he has a very fine avenue in requesting the committee considering a piece of proposed legislation to give him a chance to be heard.

Furthermore, I do not think there is that much interest in the bill at all, because it is a very simple bill; it would simply permit the Navy to do what the Army and the Air Force now can do. The bill would give permission. The bill would not require the Navy to serve margarine, but would merely give the Navy the right and the authority to serve margarine if the Navy wished to do so. That authority the Army and the Air Force now have.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So far as the permissiveness aspect is concerned, the Army and the Air Force have indicated by shifting overwhelmingly to oleo how the permissiveness is likely to work out. I said in my short speech that the permissiveness is going to result in a very, very sharp diminution of the use of dairy products, with no real saving to the Government, but only a bookkeeping saving to the Navy procurement officer, who will rely upon that so that it can be said to Congress, "Look. We have saved $1 million," or "some very substantial amount of money." In fact, it will simply mean that the Commodity Credit Corporation will have to buy more butter.

So far as the bill being a simple bill is concerned, the bill is divided into two sections. The second section is divided into three excedingly complex parts. There is an initial sentence of four lines, which is followed by three provisos, each one of which complicates the one ahead of it.

As the Senator from South Carolina said in his presentation, this is a bill which would have at least a double effect. The bill would have an effect not only upon the dairy industry, but also upon the soybean industry and upon the cotton farmers. It is a bill which is complex in many ways, it seems to me.

The Senator from South Carolina made the point that there have been hearings on the bill before. I ask the Senator from South Carolina whether there were hearings on an identical bill, a bill with all of the provisos which are in the bill presently before us.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, this bill is somewhat different from the previous bills of this nature.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Indeed it is. There have been no hearings on a bill of this kind at all. The fact is that the other bills were substantially different from this bill.

It seems to me, Mr. President, for this reason the Senate should very seriously consider recommittal of the bill, if such a motion is made later, because there have been no hearings on the bill, substantially, as it is drafted.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in answer to the last question of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] with respect to the difference between the pending bill and previous bills concerning cottonseed oil and soybean oil, the bill presently under consideration limits the permissive authority so that if butter is available to the Navy from CCC stocks, permission to purchase margarine is withdrawn, unless cottonseed and soybean oil are certified by the Department of Agriculture to be in surplus. That is the main distinction between the present bill and previous bills.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The particular provision to which I referred is the one which most deeply concerns those of us who are extremely interested in the dairy industry. We feel that there will be a situation during many periods when there will be not only a surplus of butter but also a surplus of cottonseed oil, and that therefore this will be used as a pretext for the procurement officers to buy margarine.

Under the circumstances there will be no real saving whatsoever to the Government since there will be a surplus of butter, and the benefit to the cotton industry and the benefit to the soybean industry will be relatively very minor because, as I said in my statement, there are many other uses for cottonseed oil and for soybeans than this particular use, but there is no other use for butter or no other very common use except in cooking and as a spread, and so the damage which is done the dairy industry is far greater than any minor or modest benefit which is given to the soybean and cotton industries.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in reply to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, I would only say that in reporting the House bill in the 85th Congress—and I now read from the report—the committee states:

> The Department of the Navy indicated that on the personnel strength and price differentials existing at that time, an estimated saving of more than $1 million could have been realized by serving a ration component consisting of two-thirds butter and one-third margarine.

The factors vary so much, it is difficult to say what would be the saving. However, that was the situation at that time. The figures could change periodically; it could be more, and it could be less.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to emphasize that in the preceding sentence of the report, the committee itself states that it is impractical to make a realistic estimate of the savings; and I may say that the committee is somewhat favorable to margarine. That indicates that the committee felt that the previous estimate which had been made in the House was not realistic, and that it is not possible to make a realistic estimate of what the saving would be. It depends on what is likely to happen. If it were possible to do so, we would be able to solve our farm problem very easily indeed.

Mr. THURMOND. We can only judge by what was estimated in the 85th Congress. As I said, it could be more or could be less. Of course, we are interested in all segments of the economy of our country. We are interested in cottonseed, we are interested in soybeans, and we are interested in dairy products. The pending bill is a fair bill. It does not discriminate. It puts other crops on the same basis with butter. The purpose of it is not only to recognize cottonseed oil and soybean oil—and I am sure the State the Senator represents does produce some soybeans also—but the bill is also in the public interest. After all, the public interest should be the primary concern of the Government. If there is a saving of something like a million dollars a year, it is certainly worth passing this legislation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I do not want to be facetious, but I am quite astonished and shocked to hear the Senator say that. I never thought that the day would come when the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina would stand on the floor of the Senate and urge the integration of butter and oleomargarine, considering the purity of butter. I never thought he would be an integrationist, particularly on something like this, where the ingredients of butter are nature's own and those of margarine are so synthetic.

Mr. THURMOND. I would remind the Senator that this integration is confined purely to butter and oleomargarine.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. Contrary to what my friend from Wisconsin has suggested, I believe that the Senator from South Carolina is using extremely good judgment in suggesting the inclusion of some butter in oleo. Certainly the butter would improve it.

Mr. THURMOND. It is to be left entirely to the Navy. I am not going to suggest to the Navy whether they use all margarine or all butter or no margarine or no butter. We feel that the Navy should have the authority to make that judgment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Before I conclude these remarks and suggest the absence of a quorum, I wish to hammer home and emphasize again the fact that the real problem that is likely to develop in this debate, and the real reason why the bill ought to be recommitted, is that no public hearings were held on the bill. Only executive session hearings were held. Is there any military secrecy involved in the bill? Do the Russians care or do the Chinese Communists care whether our servicemen are fed butter or oleomargarine? Of course, not. The hearings were held in secret. No open hearings were held. No Senator had an opportunity to study the issue. We are presented with a report which gives a short description of the bill, a letter from the Department of the Navy—and the Navy, of course, has an interest in this particular bill—and a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, which is also a short letter, but a letter which, it seems to me, provokes more questions than it answers. Under those circumstances, and in view of the fact that the great dairy industry, which has many eloquent and deeply interested representatives, who were anxious to be heard on the proposed legislation, the bill ought to be recommitted.

The Senator from South Carolina has stated that no one raised any point about hearings. Well, of course, Senators cannot, with their tremendous obligations and duties and responsibilities, keep their eyes upon every single bill that is introduced and demand hearings on it. We must assume that when a controversial bill is introduced—and attempts were made to pass the bill in three sessions of Congress and it failed of passage three times—the Senate will be given the benefit of full-scale public hearings, so that at least one or two Senators who oppose the bill can be heard, as well as other people.

No one in opposition to the bill was heard by the committee, although the Senators from Vermont are vigorously opposed to it and the senior and junior Senators from Wisconsin are opposed to it. I am sure that there are a number of other Senators who are opposed to it.

In view of those circumstances, and also in view of the inadequacy of the report, although it was drawn by a very competent man, and certainly was adequate from the standpoint of ability, but inadequate when we consider the importance of this subject, and because no public hearings were held on the bill, I say the bill should be recommitted.

Mr. THURMOND. I again remind my good friend from Wisconsin that he did not request a hearing, and that no other Member of the Senate requested a hearing; no one requested a hearing.

It is a simple bill. The committee had considered it before. This is the third time the committee has acted favorably on this subject.

The bill attempts to bring about uniformity. The Army and Air Force now can use oleomargarine if they choose to do so. The bill merely gives the Navy the same right. It does not impose on the Navy the obligation to use margarine. It gives them the authority to use it. Therefore we in the Armed Services Committee feel that it is well to make the rules uniform, when it is possible to do so, with respect to all the armed services.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would say that we favor uniformity, too, and that it would

be a great improvement if the Army and the Air Force and the Navy would serve butter, not margarine.

Mr. THURMOND. I am confident that the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force all will use butter to some extent where practical. I am certain that the Defense Department and the services will give due consideration to using butter along with margarine, and will not discriminate in favor of one or the other. It is the duty of the services to save public money, and if they can get the same ration with the same nutrient and get it cheaper, the services naturally will consider that angle, and it is their responsibility to do so.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to say once again that this would be a bookkeeping saving, and because of it pressure would be brought upon a naval procurement officer—just as it has been in the Air Force and the Army—to make purchases of margarine, because in that way the procurement officer could show a bookkeeping saving. It will be a saving to the Navy Department, just as it has been a saving to the Army and Air Force. However, it is not a real saving whenever there is a surplus of butter. Under the bill there would be the situation, first, where butter would not be used even though there were a surplus, provided there was also a surplus of cottonseed; secondly, butter would not be used if a situation existed in which there was a temporary absence of butter in the Commodity Credit Corporation but a pending surplus. That is exactly the situation at the moment.

Mr. THURMOND. I should like to remind the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that the Bureau of the Budget favors the bill. The Bureau of the Budget generally does not favor a bill, certainly of this nature, unless it feels that the passage of the bill would be advantageous insofar as fiscal matters are concerned. The Bureau of the Budget concurs with the Navy's position on the pending bill.

I should like to read one sentence from the letter of Acting Secretary of Agriculture E. L. Peterson, on page 5 of the report:

> The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report. The Bureau further advises that it "favors proposed legislation such as H.R. 1948, which would simply add margarine or oleomargarine to the Navy ration list, thereby giving that service the same flexibility in this regard as is possessed by the other Armed Forces."

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IN DEFENSE OF THE SAILOR'S RIGHT TO EAT BUTTER

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I oppose the passage of S. 2168 because the very best in Navy rations is traditional and a minimum serving of butter has been prescribed by statute for many years. It has not been necessary to use substitutes in the past, and no compelling reason appears for changing this rule now.

It has been argued in support of S. 2168 that a change should be made to permit the Navy to use its discretion as to what foods it may serve. The same arguments are considered to be applicable to the entire statutory ration and if a change is to be made for that purpose then the entire ration should be repealed and the Navy should be permitted to prescribe its own ration.

It has also been argued that by serving part butter and part oleomargarine the Navy could save substantial sums of money. This, I believe, is false economy.

I can see the wisdom of saving money, but I cannot see the wisdom of serving cheaper foods to fighting personnel, particularly in time of emergency when our whole defense system is in a state of more or less constant alert. It is imperative that these men be kept at the very peak of their physical and mental ability. Furthermore, at a time when it is important to attract more men to the service and to hold those with experience, the providing of cheaper food would appear to be a step in the wrong direction.

Oleomargarine is cheaper than butter because the former is a vegetable product and the latter is an animal product, just as a vegetable plate in a restaurant costs less than a good steak.

Without depreciating at all the value of oleomargarine and a vegetable plate per se, I doubt that anyone would seriously consider putting our fighting men on a vegetable diet, even though tremendous savings in cost could be made by doing so. If it is necessary to save money by replacing a part of an animal diet with a vegetable product, then consideration should also be given to saving more money by replacing some of the meat ration with vegetables.

There is another most important reason why the pending proposal would result in false economy: If a pound of butter were displaced in Navy rations, the Government would be buying an additional pound of butter through the Commodity Credit Corporation under the price-support program; thus, for each dollar the Government saved on one hand it would lose probably more than $1 because of the storage and disposal costs on the other hand.

I am aware that cotton also is under support, but cottonseed oil is less perishable and can readily be put to more uses than can butter.

However, Mr. President, I may point out that as of February 29 of this year, the Commodity Credit Corporation reported that there was no cottonseed oil in inventory and no soybean oil in inventory. So today we have no problem in that respect.

Vegetable oils have many outlets and many uses. These oils are marketed for human consumption and for industrial use. They have a wide and varied market here at home, and there is also a growing market overseas. Butter is extremely difficult to store, while on the other hand, vegetable oils may be safely and cheaply stored over long periods of time. Butter must be refrigerated in storage and transit, while the oils may be stored and moved in bulk, with no special handling required.

Furthermore, the cost of removing cottonseed oil from the market, should that become necessary—although it certainly is not necessary at the present time—but should it become necessary, the cost of removing cottonseed oil from the market is 11 or 12 cents a pound, whereas the cost of removing butter is approximately 58 cents a pound. The removal of butter is necessary, in order to maintain even the current meager rates for the labor of dairy farm operators, which are shown by the Department of Agriculture to be less than $1 an hour in all three of its test areas.

Enactment of Senate bill 2168 would be a reversal of the important steps that have been made to utilize in the armed services our abundant supplies of dairy products.

This utilization of butter has contributed greatly to the improvement that has been made in the dairy price-support program. Surely it would be a mistake to overturn the cart now, just when we are beginning to emerge from the woods. The small amount of good that this bill might do for the producers of cottonseed oil, if in fact it would do any, would be seriously disproportionate to the harm that would be done to the dairy industry and the dairy price-support program.

The theory back of our increased use of dairy products in the armed services has been that since we have these fine dairy products in abundant supply, and are hard put to find a means of disposing of them, why not give our fighting forces as much of them as they want to use?

As a result, this program of increased use has correspondingly reduced costs to the Commodity Credit Corporation under the support program.

Similarly, it does not make sense to send our fighting forces oleomargarine and give our butter to peoples overseas or convert it to byproduct uses.

The benefit from this bill would go to relatively few in number, but large in size, oleomargarine manufacturing companies. I doubt that even the remotest benefit from it would trickle back to the American farmer.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call for the quorum be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, which is labeled "5–23–60—A," and I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will be read by the clerk.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 1, beginning with line 7, to strike out all down through line 9 on page 2, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. No oleomargarine or margarine shall be acquired for use by the Navy or any branch or department thereof during any fiscal year unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify (1) that no purchases of milk or dairy products have been or are intended to be made by any department or agency of the Federal Government in such fiscal year for the purpose of stabilizing or supporting the prices received by farmers for milk or butterfat, and (2) that acquisition of oleomargarine or margarine in the amounts and at the times specified will not cause or contribute to a surplus of milk or dairy products: *Provided*, That limited supplies of oleomargarine or margarine may be acquired for use in special operations where the use of butter would be impractical: *Provided further*, That this section shall not be construed as prohibiting the disposition of any unused stocks of oleomargarine or margarine acquired under the foregoing proviso by any means other than by serving as a component of the Navy ration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Congress has frequently been confronted with the question of the type of spread that is to be used in the Navy ration as a part of the general provisions for the U.S. Navy. The amendment which has just been read and which has been offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is, in my mind, the most constructive proposal on this controversal subject that we have ever had; and I compliment and commend the Senator for this wise and judicious proposal because, on the one hand, while it recognizes the very relevant facts of the price support program relating to dairy products, it also recognizes that there may be instances where there may be a need for the use of a substitute spread such as oleomargarine.

In other words, the amendment, if carefully analyzed, should reveal and, I think, recommend, an answer to the question of the Navy ration, as to whether it should be butter, a dairy product, or a substitute, a vegetable oil or oleomargarine.

Let us analyze the amendment very carefully. On line 4 of page 1 of the amendment, it provides, first, that "no oleomargarine or margarine shall be acquired for use by the Navy or any branch or department thereof during any fiscal year unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify."

Then it provides:

(1) that no purchases of milk or dairy products have been or are intended to be made by any department or agency of the Federal Government in such fiscal year for the purpose of stabilizing or supporting the prices received by farmers for milk or butterfat.

That particular language relates directly to the price support provisions of the agricultural acts relating to the proper and orderly marketing of agricultural commodities. We have on the statute books a price support provision for dairy products, providing 75 to 90 percent of parity price supports for dairy products, including butter and milk, and depending upon the supply, the price support varies. Sometimes it has been as high as 90 percent. It has been as low as 75 percent. It has been at 80 percent.

There are those of us who believe that the price support program for dairy products should be higher than it is presently. The amendment presented by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] to the particular bill now pending takes into consideration the established law of the land, namely, that there will be a price support program and that there is a price support program for dairy products.

How does that price support program work? It works essentially through Government purchases. It works upon the basis of the Government buying up the surplus over the consumer demand, and storing that surplus, whether it be in the form of cheese, dried milk, or butter. Then the Government has ways of disposing of the surplus.

Fortunately, the surpluses are rather low at the moment. There is very little dried milk and practically no butter, and I believe the cheese supplies are at a low, at least have been for the last several years.

Mr. President, what the Proxmire amendment proposes is simply stated. If the Government of the United States has available supplies of dairy products under the price support program then the Navy, which is a department of this Government which uses substantial quantities of foodstuffs, shall not purchase a substitute spread, since the Government has already purchased butter under its price support operations. What could be more sensible and more reasonable? The Government is in possession of a substantial amount of good, wholesome, nourishing, clean, delicious butter. The Government, through the Department of Agriculture, simply says, "We have this butter available." It says to the Department of the Navy, "Here is the butter. It has already been paid for. Why not use it?" In other words, the amendment says to the Department of the Navy, "So long as there are supplies of butter which have been acquired under the price support program, the Department of the Navy shall not spend some extra dollars of the taxpayers for another product."

The amendment, conversely, would state that if there is no butter available, if there is not an adequate supply, then the oleomargarine may be utilized as a foodstuff or as a spread for the Navy ration.

Point No. 1 made by the Proxmire amendment is in the public interest. It is in the taxpayers' interest. It is in the farmers' interest. I add, it is in the interest of the Navy, because good, wholesome, fresh, delicious butter is a good food, in or out of the Navy. The Government of the United States ought to have the interests of its servicemen enough at heart so that it will provide the best food it can find. Surely butter qualifies under that label, as being the best of nourishing food.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his very eloquent and persuasive exposition. It is very clear, and I think it is very convincing to anyone who reads or listens to the argument.

I should like to say, to underline the importance of what the Senator from Minnesota has said, that the Army and the Air Force may purchase margarine or may purchase butter. The procurement officers have the kind of incentive one would expect. Those officers want to have a bookkeeping saving, so even though there is a surplus supply of butter available in the Commodity Credit Corporation, those procurement officers turn around and purchase margarine. They purchase margarine because they can purchase it at a lower price. It is a lower price for the Navy. Then they can say, "Look, we made a savings of $1 million or $2 million."

Actually, those purchases have added a substantial amount to the costs of the Government. Why? That is so because the Commodity Credit Corporation has surplus butter available.

The reason why the Proxmire amendment is essential is that if we do not provide this safeguard we are going to have exactly the same situation in the Navy that we have in the Army and in the Air Force. That is why Congress is in such an excellent position, looking at the matter from an overall standpoint, to provide that so long as the Government has the butter available, the Navy should be able to use it.

The Senator from South Carolina earlier was calling for uniformity. The main argument made was for uniformity. If we call for uniformity, we ought to have the Army and the Air Force get in line with the Navy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator surely makes a point with which any reasonable person would agree.

The Commodity Credit Corporation operates under an act of Congress, under public policy, and is required under the law, through its price-support operations, to sustain or to maintain a price which is agreed upon under a formula of the flexible price-support program. A substantial quantity of butter is purchased on occasion, or cheese or powdered milk. We have gone through this process for several years.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, a public agency, owns butter. Frequently that butter has been sold back into the market at lower prices, not to the benefit of the taxpayers but instead to the benefit of a private entrepreneur, or else it has been given away in relief feeding, which is a desirable development, in a program I have consistently supported.

What the Proxmire amendment provides is that, so long as we have a price-support operation of the Government through the Commodity Credit Corporation, and so long as the Commodity Credit Corporation continues to purchase supplies of butter or dairy products, then the Navy will be required to utilize the product which the Government has

already purchased, rather than to have the Government continue to pay storage charges upon the butter which is already owned by the Government.

The Proxmire amendment simply says: "We will use in the Navy Department the butter which is owned by the Department of Agriculture."

The problem is that each department head looks upon his department as if it were a separate principality, a separate government. Each department head has his own budget, for his own department. So the Department of the Navy says: "Oh, we will save a few cents a pound on a spread. We will buy oleo, which is a little cheaper than butter, and it will make the Department of the Navy budget look a whole lot better."

In the meantime, the taxpayers, who pay for the Navy plus the Department of Agriculture plus everything else, own millions of dollars' worth of butter held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the taxpayers are paying thousands of dollars for storage of that butter. In the past some of that butter has gone rancid because of lack of use.

From the point of view of the taxpayers, instead of from the point of view of the Department of the Navy, it is important that the butter be used. The Congress is not about ready to repeal the price-support program for butter. This is an established program of the Government, and has been for years. It is necessary for the well-being of the dairy producers. It is necessary so that we may have an adequate supply of butter, milk, and cheese for the American consumers.

The argument in this debate runs as follows: If we consider the bill as reported by the committee, we are simply saying, "Look, the Navy can save a few dimes and a few nickels upon oleo, even though the Department of Agriculture is spending millions of dollars on butter." What the Senator from Wisconsin is saying is as follows: "Let us look at the Government as one Government instead of a series of departments. Let us look at the total Federal budget instead of the Navy budget alone, and then let us look at the taxpayer and see what we can do for him."

The taxpayer would be benefited by the Proxmire amendment. The taxpayer would be injured by the committee bill, because the Proxmire amendment is based upon the availability of supplies in the hands of the Government. The Proxmire amendment takes into consideration the price support laws which are on the statute books and places in relationship to those price support laws the needs of other departments of the Government. I say the Senator from Wisconsin has for the first time put this debate in proper focus by his amendment. He has pointed out that we cannot have two diametrically opposed policies operating without great cost and waste. The Senator has said that so long as we have a price support program for dairy products in which the Government of the United States becomes a holder, an investor, an owner of the dairy products, it makes good sense for the Departments of the Government to use what the Government already owns rather than stepping out and buying another product. I believe the Senator has done a real service in this respect.

The Senator points out further that his amendment provides:

Provided, That limited supplies of oleomargarine may be acquired for use in special operations where the use of butter would be impractical.

Of course, that part of the amendment refers, for example, to areas where there may be problems of refrigeration or where there may not be supplies readily available, or to some areas of the world where the Navy may have a base in which supplies of butter are not readily accessible. In other words, oleo is not excluded. What is more, oleo is not excluded if there is no surplus butter, if the butter program is in balance between the supply and demand, and in a situation in which the purchase of oleo does not contribute to the surplus of butter products or milk products. In that event the Navy, in coordination with the other agencies of the Government, can purchase on a free and equal basis with any other Department of the Government.

I believe the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin ought to be adopted, and I wish again to call to the attention of the Senate the two provisos. I hope when the Senator from Wisconsin speaks in his own right, since he is the author of the amendment, he will elaborate in some detail on the amendment because it is important that the RECORD be made very clear.

I say most respectfully that there will be Senators who will say that the Senators from Wisconsin and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] stood here in the Senate and tried to force upon the Navy the use of butter, which is a higher cost spread than oleo. That is not what we are attempting to do at all. What we are saying is that the Government of the United States ought to be considered as one Government instead of a series of separate departments. What we are saying is that when we have one policy of the Government which provides for price support operations which necessarily bring within the hands of the Government the ownership of certain butter supplies that they use, and which have been paid for once by the taxpayer, there is no reason why there cannot be a transfer of that commodity from one department to another at no extra cost to the American taxpayer.

The final proviso of this particular measure is:

Provided further, That this section shall not be construed as prohibiting the disposition of any unused stocks of oleomargarine or margarine acquired under the foregoing proviso by any means other than by serving as a component of the Navy ration.

I think there is some merit in that provision. The oleo can be used in the oversea program, and can be used in the relief feeding programs. I may add that I believe the vegetable oil stocks that the Commodity Credit Corporation owns ought to be used more generously in our oversea and charitable relief feeding program. I happen to know that the great voluntary agencies—Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, and the nonsectarian agencies—send vegetable oils for relief feeding in many parts of the world. I believe this is a good way to use those products. I come from a State which produces vast quantities of soybeans. I believe we are the second largest producer of soybeans.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to emphasize the fact that the Senator from Minnesota, who is speaking, comes from a State which produces more soybeans than any other State of the Union with one exception, and that means he speaks with authority. He speaks, not from a one-interest standpoint, but from a standpoint in which he takes neither side, neither the side of soybeans nor the side of the dairy farmer, but the side of the total public interest, the taxpayer, the consumer, and both the dairy farmer and the soybean producer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I add that soybean production in the State of Minnesota in terms of income and number of producers approximates its dairy production.

Therefore, as I speak on the subject of oleomargarine I am mindful of the economic interests of the respective groups in my State, but I wish to say again that it is in the public interest to see that vegetable oils are properly used. Vegetable oils can be used in relief feeding and in the school-lunch programs. They can be used in a great number of ways.

Had the Department of Agriculture been willing this year to purchase some vegetable oil in the market when the market was filled with soybeans, the farm producers of my State would have been getting approximately 80 cents a hundredweight more for their soybeans. A modest purchase of vegetable oil, soybean oil, could have increased the income of the farmer for his soybeans substantially. In other words, an expenditure of a few million dollars on the part of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the oil—not the beans but the oil—could have increased the income of the soybean producers $200 million or $300 million.

I had a table presented to me this past week, which I do not have with me at the moment, but which I shall make available during this debate, which pointed out that with a reasonable purchase of approximately $25 million of oil, which could well have been disposed of, and which was requested by the great oversea relief organizations, we could have increased the income to the producers of soybeans in Minnesota to over $150 million, and that would have been $150 million which would have gone into the community life of every one of our communities, towns, villages, and cities.

Such expenditure would have been good business, and it would not have run into conflict with the butter and dairy program.

Returning to my original point, I simply wish to add that the Senator from Wisconsin is asking Congress to quit storing butter and start using it. What

the Senator from Wisconsin is asking the Congress to do is that in the event there is a surplus of butter, the department—in this instance, the Navy—shall utilize butter which has already been bought and paid for by the taxpayers. What the Senator from Wisconsin is saying is that if there are circumstances in which none of these supplies are on hand and where the purchase of order will not in any way contribute to the surplus of the dairy products which are already protected under a price support program, that the Navy may go ahead and buy oleo.

What the Senator from Wisconsin is saying is that he does not wish to see the Navy's policies contribute to the problems of the Department of Agriculture. What he is saying is that he does not want to see the Navy purchases contribute to the surpluses that we have. What the Senator from Wisconsin is saying is, "Let us use the dollars we have frugally. Let us use them well. We have a price support program on dairy products. It is a program which was requested by the President, supported by the Department of Agriculture, and enacted by Congress."

The Senator from Wisconsin is merely saying that as long as the program is on the books, which he supports, which I support, which his senior colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] supports, and which the majority in Congress supports, that there is no sense in trying to throw a monkey wrench, so to speak, into the gears of the price-support program with respect to dairy products by enacting a special act which requires the Navy to buy oleo.

The Senator from Wisconsin has performed a real service. I know that some processors of oleo will be unhappy with my comments today. I should like to say a word to them. They have plenty of markets for their product. We are talking about Government business. We are talking about a department of the Government purchasing supplies for Government purposes.

The Senator from Minnesota is saying that if the Government already owns supplies. it should use them, and not go out looking for something else. In other words, if it already owns what it needs for edible food, if it has high nutritional value and high caloric value, and is good and delicious food, why go around shopping for something else, on the theory that the Government will save some money for the Navy, when, in fact, it will only add the cost to the Department of Agriculture?

I wish to thank the Senator for permitting me to make these observations. Of course I will support his amendment. I am much pleased that he has taken the leadership in this matter. I am confident that the people of the State of Wisconsin will feel, as I do, that he has done a great service not only to the dairy industry, but also to the taxpayers. I might add also that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is also a cosponsor of the amendment and that he is to be commended for his fight in this matter. I would surely like to be associated with the purpose of the amendment, and with the objective it seeks to fulfill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I had not expected to speak at this time. I had expected the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] to address the Senate. However, before I suggest the absence of a quorum, I wish again to thank the Senator from Minnesota. Ordinarily the author of an amendment, when he calls it up, immediately talks about the amendment and explains it. However, I could not resist the great opportunity, with the eloquent Senator from Minnesota on the floor, to take advantage of having him kick off the discussion. My judgment has been vindicated, because his justification and explanation of the amendment have been extremely convincing.

I should like to pinpoint a few details of the amendment, because they are very important. The bill as introduced does provide—and I must say this in all fairness to the authors of the bill—

> During any period when surplus butter stocks are available to the Navy through the Commodity Credit Corporation no oleomargarine or margarine shall be acquired for the use by the Navy or any branch or department thereof.

That is what the bill provides.

My amendment plugs loopholes in that language. The Senator from Minnesota has indicated quite eloquently the need for plugging those loopholes. This is what my amendment provides:

> No oleomargarine or margarine shall be acquired for use by the Navy or any branch or department thereof during any fiscal year unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify (1) that no purchases of milk or dairy products have been or are intended to be made by any department or agency of the Federal Government.

The difference, of course, between my amendment and the bill can be seen by analyzing the situation which exists at the present time. As far as I know, at least within the last few days, there has been no butter held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. We all know that within a couple of weeks there will be surplus butter in the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Under the circumstances, there would be nothing to prevent the Navy, if the bill is passed, from buying surplus oleo, which would last for as long as it would last without perishing. It would last for several months. At the same time, within a few days a surplus supply of butter would be available. I know the intention of the authors of the bill was a good intention, because they would not have included section 2 of the bill if they had not intended to protect the Government from the kind of loss I have described. However, I believe the argument that the amendment does protect it much more is an argument that cannot be dismissed.

Under the Proxmire amendment if during a fiscal year butter is in surplus in the Commodity Credit Corporation, or there is any intention to buy butter, then at the same time and under those circumstances the Navy would not procure oleomargarine. That makes a great deal of sense, I think.

There is one other phase to the amendment which I should like to explain, because it is a little technical, but it is exceedingly important. I am sure that the authors of the bill will be concerned about the difference I have in mind. I should like to justify the difference. The bill provides in the last proviso—I am now referring to the bill, not to my amendment—that the Navy shall in fact purchase margarine when there is butter in surplus as follows: It provides that even though butter is in surplus, the Navy can buy margarine provided that during any period of time the Secretary of Agriculture finds and certifies that there is a surplus of either soybean or cottonseed oil.

My amendment eliminates that proviso.

I feel sure that the authors of the bill had the best of intentions when they provided that butter and cottonseed oil should be placed on the same basis, and that if there is a surplus of butter, the Navy should be permitted to use margarine. That argument certainly has surface plausibility, and it would seem to be fair. The difficulty is that there is all the difference in the world from the standpoint of the cotton producers and the soybean producers on the one hand and the dairy producers on the other.

For example, it is true that cotton is under the support program.

First, cottonseed oil is less perishable and much more easily diverted to nonfood uses than butter. Even more important, the cost of removing cottonseed oil from the market, should that become necessary, is 11 or 12 cents a pound, which is much less than the cost of removing butter from the market, because the cost of removing butter from the market is 58 cents a pound. If there is a surplus of a commodity which costs the Government 58 cents a pound to remove it from the market, and there is a surplus in another commodity that costs only 11 cents to remove it from the market, from the standpoint of the Government it would be far better for the armed services to use the more valuable spread first. It would mean that then the Government would not have to step in and buy additional quantities of butter at 58 cents a pound. It would be more economical from the standpoint of the taxpayer to pay 11 cents a pound for the other commodity.

That is why it seems to me that the taxpayer is far better served by the amendment, which would provide that the Navy would continue to use butter as long as there is a surplus of butter, although at the same time that there is a surplus of butter, there is a surplus of cottonseed oil or soybean oil.

I expect to discuss the amendment later and in a little more detail.

Before I yield the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE DESCENT OF THE BATHYSCAPHE "TRIESTE" TO THE UTTERMOST DEPTH OF THE SEA

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in our preoccupation with missiles, sputniks, and outerspace, we have given far too little attention and credit to an event which is a milestone in mankind's exploration and conquest of the unknown—an event which, for cool audacity, has few equals in history.

I am referring to the descent, in January, of the Navy's deep-diving craft, the bathyscaphe *Trieste*, to the uttermost depth of the sea.

It is regrettable indeed that this descent of more than 7 miles into the Pacific has not received more attention. It has pointed the way for scientific exploration into the depth as well as the breadth of the 70 percent of the earth's surface which is covered by water.

The *Trieste* itself is essentially a two-unit vessel composed of a large cigar-shaped float 58 feet long and 11 feet in diameter, and a gondola 6 feet in diameter slung underneath. The craft is called bathyscaphe from the Greek words for deep and boat.

The main structure of the *Trieste*—the cigar-shaped float—is divided into 13 chambers, each separated by thin steel bulkheads. In these chambers the *Trieste* carries 30,000 gallons of aviation gasoline which, because it is lighter than water, provides buoyancy.

Seventeen tons of small iron pellets about the size of BB shot are carried as ballast in two containers or tubs, one forward of and one abaft the gondola.

The recordbreaking descent took place on January 23 in the central Pacific Ocean in the Marianas Trench known as the Challenger Deep. There the *Trieste*, with Lt. Don Walsh, U.S. Navy, and Swiss Scientist Jacques Piccard aboard, began its dive.

Descending at more than 200 feet a minute, at a thousand feet the deep-diving craft passed below the level of visible light. For tens of thousands of feet from that point downward, the small experimental craft made its descent in total darkness, completely beyond help of any sort in case of emergency.

As it dropped deeper and deeper into the Pacific, tremendous pressures were building up on the hull and gondola. At 24,000 feet, they passed the previous depth record set by the *Trieste* itself.

At 30,000 feet, Walsh and Piccard heard and felt a powerful crack in the bathyscaphe. "The sphere rocked as though we were on land and going through a mild earthquake," said Lieutenant Walsh later, as reported in Life magazine. "We waited anxiously for what might happen next. Nothing did. We flipped off the instruments and the underwater telephone, so that we could hear better. Still nothing happened."

If the float part of the bathyscaphe had been rendered ineffective, the two bathyscaphists would have been plunged downward to the ocean floor, without any hope of return to the surface. They would have been imprisoned in their small steel sphere for life—and life for them would have been very short, indeed, as their oxygen supply gave out in the cold darkness at the bottom of the sea.

If the gondola itself, or its Plexiglas portholes, had imploded—that is, exploded inward—the two young adventurers would have been instantly smashed shapeless by the force of untold thousands of tons of water.

Under these circumstances, not knowing for sure what damage had occurred to the bathyscaphe as it ventured into pressures never before experienced, to have turned back would have been no discredit.

Nevertheless, Walsh and Piccard elected to continue their epic journey downward.

After 4 hours and 48 minutes of descent, the *Trieste* reached the bottom. There Walsh and Piccard found that the balance of the vessel was so fine that the thin wire suspended beneath the vessel was sufficient to cushion the final few yards of descent, as the wire itself slacked off on the sea floor.

Then, through the clear plastic portholes 8 inches thick, in the sides of the gondola, and by means of floodlights beneath the hull of the float, Walsh and Piccard looked for the first time on a sight never before seen by the eyes of man—the ultimate depth of the sea. They also learned the source of the loud report they heard: one of the plastic portholes was badly cracked.

By marvelous chance, one of the foremost questions entertained by scientists about these great depths was answered on this first descent of the *Trieste* to the bottom of the Marianas Trench. A sole-like fish swam slowly through the area illuminated by the light shining from the *Trieste*, thus proving that higher forms of life can exist even at this depth, where the pressure on the hull of the bathyscaphe and on the fish itself was more than 8 tons per square inch.

The pioneer visit of man to the depth of the sea lasted only 20 minutes. The return to the surface was made by Walsh and Piccard in a little more than 3 hours.

Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, sent congratulations to the two men. He said their feat would "mark the opening of a new age in exploration of the depths of the ocean which can well be as important as exploration in space has been in the past."

Mr. President, I may say that today we know less about what is at the bottom of the ocean and in the depths of the seas than we know about outer space itself. That is why the great achievement made by these brave men is so outstanding, as they extend their explorations beyond known areas, into depths of the ocean heretofore wholly unknown to man.

Lt. Don Walsh, the Navy officer in charge of the *Trieste*, is a typical young Navy submarine officer. A native of Berkeley, Calif., he now makes his home in San Diego, while he is assigned as officer in charge of the *Trieste*. He is an Annapolis graduate, and has served aboard both surface ships and submarines. He is 28 years of age.

Mr. Piccard who, together with his famous father, Auguste Piccard, designed and built the bathyscaphe *Trieste*, and sold it to the Office of Naval Research in 1957, is 37 years of age. His permanent home is Lauzanne, Switzerland.

Mr. President, at this point I may say that it seems to me that the fact that we had to go overseas to obtain the underwater vessel necessary in order to accomplish this remarkable feat, is a reflection on the scientific progress of our Nation in this field. A vessel of that character is not now built in this country; neither do we have under way at the present time experimentation leading to the construction of such a vessel. I hope the proposed legislation introduced by the chairman of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which calls for further exploration in the field of oceanography, will be enacted into law this year, in order that our country may lead in this field of exploration, as it has led in others.

After their feat, Walsh and Piccard were flown to Washington, where the President presented Walsh with the Legion of Merit and Piccard with the Distinguished Public Service Award.

Walsh's citation read, in part:

> During deep-diving operations in the Marianas Trench, he successfully completed a series of recordbreaking dives, culminated by a dive to the unprecedented depth of 37,800 feet on January 23, 1960, this being the deepest spot on the ocean floor known to man. By his leadership, courage, and devotion to duty, he contributed greatly to the success of this project and upheld the highest traditions of the U.S. naval service.

Piccard was cited for his "outstanding services to the Department of the Navy in the field of oceanographic research." He was commended for dives "made at the risk of his own life" while "collecting scientific data for the U.S. Navy in this previously unexplored area of the earth."

Lt. Lawrence A. Shumaker, U.S. Navy, was also cited for his performance of duty as assistant officer in charge of the *Trieste*. Dr. Andreas Rechnitzer, a native Californian, who was Navy scientist in charge of the bathyscaphe program, was awarded the Navy's distinguished Civilian Service Award.

It is difficult to forecast the full scope and importance of the pioneering exploit of the *Trieste*. It is, however, readily apparent that the seas of the world are of enormously increasing importance. The surface of the sea has traditionally been the highway of world commerce; 99 percent of international trade moves on the surface of the sea. Now a vast new dimension of the sea has been opened to mankind.

What does this dimension promise to us? It is of tremendous military importance. The expanse of sea, with its almost unlimited opportunities for mobility and dispersal, has, at one stroke, been vastly increased to us.

Moreover, the *Trieste* itself is useful to the Navy, in planning new submarines which, by combining the ability to de-

scend to tremendous depths with the ability to cruise almost indefinitely by means of nuclear propulsion, will extend tremendously the military strength of the Nation.

The Navy expects the *Trieste* to be useful in planning a whole new order of vessels designed to advance the frontiers of learning in the increasingly important study known as oceanography.

Undoubtedly, many more descents will be made by the *Trieste*, in our efforts to learn more of this relatively little known medium on which we are so dependent.

When the *Trieste* has ended its days of pioneering exploration of the depths, and is supplanted by newer undersea craft, I propose, Mr. President, that it be placed in the Smithsonian Institution, with the Wright Brothers first airplane, with Charles Lindbergh's *Spirit of St. Louis*, and with other craft which, in this century have carried Americans on great pioneering adventures. The *Trieste* will be a fitting addition to that group.

Mr. President, in closing let me say that these heroic, great adventurers risked their lives in order to advance the cause of science; and they truly stand in the same position with reference to exploration as do the other great men who could be mentioned—those who have gone into the Arctic, those who have gone into the Antarctic, those who have gone into the upper atmosphere, those who first broke the sound barrier, and those who today are preparing to make the first visit by man beyond the atmosphere of the earth, into outer space.

If this adventure had "misfired" and if these men had been lost, they would have been counted authentic heroes of this country. I am glad no misfortune occurred; but I regret that more attention was not paid throughout the nation and in the press to their courageous and most important contribution to the exploration of an unknown part of the world and development of science in the United States.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES FOR WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I should like to offer comparative figures on the rate of water resource development in the United States in the past decade.

The administration last year, in justifying its now discredited no new-starts policy, attempted to show that public works expenditures approved by this Congress were threatening to skyrocket out of sight. The Bureau of the Budget presented to the Senate Select Committee on Water Resources a tabulation of fiscal data on Federal expenditures for the construction of water and power projects by all agencies—Reclamation, Corps of Engineers, Agriculture, TVA, St. Lawrence Seaway, Public Health Service, and International Boundary Commission. Projecting estimates beyond the budget table, Assistant Director Elmer B. Staats said that expenditures in fiscal 1962, assuming no new starts, would reach $1,200,000,000; and that with a number of new starts each year as provided in the bill, expenditures would reach $1,600,000,000.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and I questioned the Budget conclusion, considering the true value of the dollar as related to 1950. Accordingly using the Budget Bureau's figures on dollar expenditures, I have worked up a study of the effective level of water resource investment in each of the last 10 years, in relation to the changing value of the dollar and the increase in population. I shall offer the table for the RECORD.

It will be noted, Mr. President, that while our population has increased in the last decade by 19 percent, our real expenditures for water resource development have increased only three-tenths of 1 percent.

There is another point of special significance revealed in this table. Look what happened, Mr. President, when the present administration presented its first budget, which was for fiscal 1954. Equivalent expenditures, at 1950 prices, dropped off $79 million, or 9 percent. The decline continued, despite steady population increases, at a rate of 21 percent in fiscal 1955 and 47 percent in fiscal 1956. In fact, not until fiscal 1960 did real expenditures for water resource development regain the level of 1950—and then, as I have said, the total went up only three-tenths of 1 percent for the decade. I offer these figures as a significant study of our investment in America's future.

I ask unanimous consent to have the table I have referred to made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal expenditures for water-resource development

Fiscal year	Actual expenditures [1]	Value of 1950 dollar [2]	Equivalent expenditures at 1950 prices	Real change from 1950		U.S. population [3]	Increase in population		Fiscal year
				Dollars	Percent		People	Percent	
	Millions	*Cents*	*Millions*	*Millions*					
1950	$901	100.0	$901	----------	----------	151,683,000	----------	----------	1950
1951	944	92.6	874	−27	−3	154,360,000	2,677,000	1.8	1951
1952	983	90.5	890	−11	−1	157,028,000	2,668,000	1.7	1952
1953	1,037	89.8	931	+30	+3	159,636,000	2,608,000	1.7	1953
1954	918	89.5	822	−79	−9	162,417,000	2,781,000	1.7	1954
1955	792	89.7	710	−191	−21	165,270,000	2,853,000	1.8	1955
1956	650	88.4	575	−426	−47	168,176,000	2,906,000	1.8	1956
1957	769	85.5	657	−244	−27	171,196,000	3,020,000	1.8	1957
1958	971	83.1	807	−93	−10	174,064,000	2,868,000	1.7	1958
1959	1,031	82.9	855	−46	−5	176,890,000	2,826,000	1.6	1959
1960	1,089	83.0	904	+31	(4)	[5] 180,126,000	3,236,000	1.8	1960
Decade, 1951–60	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	28,443,000	19.0	----------

[1] Source: Bureau of the Budget, for construction of water and power projects by Reclamation, Corps of Engineers, Agriculture, TVA, St. Lawrence Seaway, Public Health Service, and International Boundary Commission.
[2] Source: Senate Banking and Currency Committee.
[3] Source: Census Bureau.
[4] +1/10 of 1 percent.
[5] Estimate.

CHINA AND THE BOMB

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I recently received a communication from Dr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., who is presently with Harvard University, in which he referred to an article written by Mr. Mervyn Jones, entitled "China and the Bomb," which appeared in the Observer of Sunday, April 24, 1960.

In the letter Dr. Schlesinger wrote to me as follows:

> Knowing your efforts to persuade our Government to take a more sensible look at policy toward Red China, I thought you might be interested in reading—and perhaps inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—the attached piece from the London Observer.
>
> The value of the piece, it seems to me, lies in the emphasis he places on the crucial issue—that is, the relationship of Red China to nuclear weapons and to future disarmament programs.

I would say he has put his finger on the crux of the question, because, no matter what kind of agreements we finally make with the Soviet Union and its satellites, if we ever make such agreements, if China is not part and parcel of those agreements and arrangements, tests can go forward in that area without any supervision whatever.

Dr. Schlesinger goes on to say:

> While a policy of protracted nonrecognition is obviously sterile, it seems to me equally foolish to suppose that recognition would make much impression on the revolutionary fanatics of Peiping.

I may observe here I have not favored, and I do not now favor, the present recognition of Red China; and I have not favored, and I do not now favor, the admission of Red China to the United Nations. On the other hand, it seems to me we have to find realistic ways of dealing with these people if we ever expect to get together and work for a practical disarmament program. No disarmament program is going to be realistic unless it includes the area controlled by the Red Chinese.

Dr. Schlesinger goes on to say:

> The British experience has been sufficiently discouraging about the significance of recognition per se. However, if we are serious about international disarmament and if we are concerned (as we well ought to be) with stopping the spread of nuclear weapons to Red China, then we must do something as soon as possible to implicate Peiping in the general arrangements and ordinances of the international community.

Mr. President, recent occurrences at the summit lend additional emphasis to the importance of what Dr. Schlesinger

has said in his letter. If anything, since the collapse of the summit conference, it is perfectly obvious that the Red Chinese will be more independent of Soviet Russia, if any dependence ever existed, and they will be without control both by the international community and by Soviet Russia itself, should they wish to be.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter and the article referred to made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass., May 12, 1960.

Senator CLAIR ENGLE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ENGLE: Knowing your efforts to persuade our Government to take a more sensible look at policy toward Red China, I thought you might be interested in reading—and perhaps in inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—the attached piece from the London Observer.

The value of the piece, it seems to me, lies in the emphasis it places on the crucial issue—that is, the relationship of Red China to nuclear weapons and to future disarmament programs. While a policy of protracted nonrecognition is obviously sterile, it seems to me equally foolish to suppose that recognition would make much impression on the revolutionary fanatics of Peiping. The British experience has been sufficiently discouraging about the significance of recognition per se. However, if we are serious about international disarmament and if we are concerned (as we well ought to be) with stopping the spread of nuclear weapons to Red China, then we must do something as soon as possible to implicate Peiping in the general arrangements and ordinances of the international community.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, Jr.

[From the Observer, Apr. 24, 1960]

CHINA AND THE BOMB

(By Mervyn Jones)

The study of politics, in our century, is to a large extent the calculation of the chances of disaster. It is foreseen, at first, as the problematical end result of still latent trends. Later, actual events make it, not indeed inevitable, but positively more likely than not. Everyone who is old enough remembers the point at which he admitted that the Second World War had become a probability.

The event that will make the third world war—in other words, the end of civilized and perhaps of all human life—a probability can now be foreseen. This event is the acquisition by China of nuclear weapons.

There is not much doubt that it is going to happen, unless it is prevented, quite soon. Even without the aid of men who have studied in Western countries, and more recently in Russia, Chinese science is on the necessary level of attainment. To underestimate it would be merely to repeat the error of those who supposed Russia to be incapable of the same achievement.

TWO YEARS, SAY SOME SCIENTISTS

Moreover, we must assume the Chinese effort to have the same urgent stimulus from authority, the same lavish use of resources at the expense of other projects, as had the Russian sputniks. The scientific report on which the Labor Party relied in framing its "nonnuclear club" proposals listed China among the nations which could make nuclear weapons within 5 years; and that was in 1959. Some British scientists believe the time is as short as 2 years.

For anyone who has not accepted with cynical resignation the human capacity to ignore unpleasant realities, the lack of public discussion of this prospect must seem extraordinary. True, many voices, from the Observer to the campaign for nuclear disarmament, warn us of the spreading of nuclear ambitions. But as a rule the danger is presented in terms of the sheer number of possible nuclear powers: "What—will the line stretch out to the crack of doom?"

There is no denying that each and every increase in this number makes the world more unsafe. The chance of war through accident or recklessness grows; the hope of agreed and controlled disarmament weakens. Both these effects, however, would be felt with special sharpness if the newcomer to the nuclear club were China: the former because the world has little practice in judging the seriousness of Chinese actions, the latter because China is wholly outside the circle of international negotiation. And there are other reasons to think that the danger of China armed with the nuclear bomb is of a unique kind.

A DISSATISFIED GREAT POWER

By reason of her size, her population, her developing industry, and the determined character of her rulers, China is about to become—with or without the bomb—a great power. In this context, a great power is a nation able to threaten or initiate a major war, not in the hope of dragging a stronger ally with her, but in command of weaker allies or independently.

The two existing great powers who are nuclearly armed, America and Russia, are satisfied powers. They are content with the present division of the world, or—at the least—disinclined to risk war over such minor aspects of this division as are not to their liking. China is a dissatisfied power, opposed to the consolidation of the status quo, which the others favor. To what extent China's claims are justified, and in what measure they ought to be conceded, is not the point in this argument; the point is the danger of the bomb in the armory of a dissatisfied great power.

There is another important difference. The rulers of China, if we assume them to mean what they repeatedly say, do not believe in the possibility of a peace securely based on negotiation and agreement, and are actively preparing for the hard necessity of war.

CONSEQUENCES OF WRONG GUESS

This does not mean that they are preparing for aggression. It does mean that in a time of crisis, or when faced with what they take to be an intolerable trespass on their own interests, they would reconcile themselves to entering into hostilities.

They would say to themselves: "Well, the moment we expected has come, and fortunately we are ready for it." To some extent, this was true of both America and Russia in the worst years of the cold war. It is not true now of either; but it is true of China.

If these are the characteristics of China as an incipient great power, it would be very rash to assume that such a power, when full-grown to greatness and equipped with the bomb, would be deterred by the threat of nuclear bombardment by her enemies. The ability to precipitate a worldwide massacre might make China more cautious, as apparently it has made America and Russia; or it might have the opposite effect.

It does not seem that China is likely to take Russia's current behavior as a model. In the Lebanon crisis of 1958, when Khrushchev refrained from going anywhere near the brink, the Chinese view was that he had made the wrong decision. The safe deduction seems to be that in any future crisis, if China's influence with Russia has grown, and more emphatically if China were directly involved, the choice might be otherwise.

What will happen if China has the bomb, admittedly, is guesswork. But the consequences of guessing wrong are so appalling as to entitle us to say that the only safety lies in preventing China from getting the bomb. To my mind, this aim of policy—being, at one short remove, the aim of saving the human race—must take precedence over any other objective.

The problem of dealing with China has the same overriding importance as had, a generation ago, the problem of dealing with Germany: not because Communist China can be accurately compared with Nazi Germany, nor because the solution can be what it should have been then, but simply because of the penalty that attaches to turning aside from the obligation to thought and action.

NATION THAT DOES NOT EXIST

This is what Britain and America are doing now, to a degree that makes one recall Stanley Baldwin as a paragon of foresight and resolution. Officially for America, and virtually for Britain, China does not exist. The Americans may thus be the first people in history to be annihilated by an enemy whose existence they did not admit.

China is the one nation on earth completely free from the obligations, and immune to the dictates or requests, entailed by membership of the United Nations. America and Russia move toward agreement, now tacit and perhaps soon formal, to limit their armed forces to 2,500,000 men; China is at liberty to keep 6 million under arms, or is it 8? The others laboriously evolve a system of inspection; China need be inspected by nobody.

All this happens not because of Chinese defiance, but because America wills it so. In Britain, not only does the Government not press its ally for an end to this absurdity, but the opposition does not press the Government. There seems to be nobody for whom China is real.

There is no way of preventing China from getting the bomb without first admitting to ourselves, and to China, that China exists. This is all the more true because China cannot be forbidden to have the bomb; she can only be dissuaded. She must be convinced, as Russia has slowly been convinced, that war is not inevitable nor preparation for it a task of prudence. In the time available, even if the channels of communication were open, this would be a task of the utmost difficulty. So long as they are closed, it is hopeless.

IN RUSSIA'S INTEREST

Yet, just as the West has ignored the elements of danger in this situation, it has equally ignored one enormously valuable element of hope. This can be simply stated. That China should not get the bomb is the common interest of the rest of the world. No demonstration is needed that it is the interest, both of the United States and her allies, and of India and other uncommitted nations. What has lately become clear is that it is also the interest—to the measure that peace is the interest—of Russia.

If China does become armed with nuclear weapons, it will be by making them herself. Russia, though allied to China, and though debarred by no undertaking to others, makes no move to supply them. It is relevant that Moscow has ignored a confident request by East Germany for nuclear missiles, breaking for the first time with the policy of copying step by step the rearmament of West Germany. Russia was evidently unwilling to give these weapons to a government which is now an ally of China as much as of her own; unwilling, above all, to provide a precedent which would have obliged her to give them to China.

If we face the fact that China exists and matters; if we consider every possible expedient that may serve the vital aim of preventing her from getting the bomb; if we avail ourselves in this of the cooperation of Russia, realizing that we are lucky to have it—then we shall have, instead of evasion, the makings of a policy.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SERVING OF OLEOMARGARINE OR MARGARINE IN NAVY RATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2168) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I rise in favor of the pending amendment. Before I address myself specifically to the amendment I should like, by way of prefatory remarks, to point out what is the law now and how the committee bill would change the law.

Under the Navy ration statute the members of the U.S. Navy are guaranteed a daily ration of butter for table use. The committee bill would take away that guarantee and would permit the Navy to serve to sailors either oleomargarine or margarine instead of butter. When we take a careful look at the text of the committee bill we note that although the bill states that when surplus butter stocks are available through the Commodity Credit Corporation oleomargarine cannot be purchased for table use by the Navy, such provision is rendered almost meaningless by another little proviso at the end of the bill which says, in effect, that if butter and soybean or cottonseed oil are in surplus then the Navy can use either butter or oleo.

Let us take a look at what the reported bill would do to the taxpayers' pocketbook, to say nothing of what it would do to dairy farmers. Suppose that both butter and cottonseed oil are in surplus. The committee bill would then permit the Navy to use either oleo or butter. This would mean that the Federal Government would be putting in warehouses butter it purchases at a price of from 58 to 62 cents per pound so that it will not have to store cottonseed oil which costs only around 11 or 12 cents per pound.

This is playing fast and loose with the taxpayers' pocketbook. When we note that between the years 1954 and 1959, almost 129 million pounds of butter were transferred from surplus stocks to the Defense Department, we can really see how much harm the bill could do.

Had the committee proposal been in effect during those years, 1954 through 1959, we would have been allowing the Navy to purchase oleo while butter piled up in the warehouses.

I am happy to say I join with the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] in supporting that amendment.

We who support the pending amendment do not believe that Congress ought to force upon American sailors oleomargarine for table use when butter, a much preferred product, is available. But we realize that the Senate may wish to settle on a compromise of the whole issue, and that is what we have proposed in our amendment.

The amendment would allow the Navy to use oleomargarine or margarine if the Secretary of Agriculture certifies—

First, that no purchases of milk or dairy products have been made or are intended to be made by any agency of the Federal Government for the purpose of stabilizing or supporting the prices received by farmers for milk or butterfat; and

Second, the purchase of oleomargarine or margarine in the amounts and at the time specified will not cause or contribute to a surplus of milk or dairy products.

Does not that provision in the amendment make sense? How can anyone argue that Congress should encourage the Navy to use oleo when another department of the Government is purchasing milk or dairy products to stabilize the support prices? Contrast this with the provision in the committee bill which would encourage the Navy to use oleo so that it could reduce a surplus of 12-cent cottonseed oil, while at the same time 58- or 60-cent butter stacks up in warehouses.

As of March 1, 1960, or February 29, 1960, the Commodity Credit Corporation reported that there was no inventory of cottonseed oil; there was no inventory of soybean oil; and those who purchase those commodities, certainly at the present time at least, and, insofar as we can ascertain, in the future, are not likely to experience any economic hardship whatsoever.

We also recognize the fact that the Navy may have on hand oleo which it has been using for cooking purposes. It could use up this oleo for cooking purposes so long as it was not served as a component of the Navy ration when dairy products are being supported or are in surplus.

Looking ahead to the not too distant future we can see that on the basis of reports from the Department of Agriculture or elsewhere, the supplies of milk in the marketing year 1960–61 could increase over the 1959–60 level because of such factors as a low beef market. Should this increased production become a fact and we take away one of the dairy producers best customers, the Navy, the taxpayer may find himself in a position where he is helping the Government to buy butter to put in the warehouses, at the same time that the Navy is using oleomargarine.

Mr. President, without this amendment, S. 2168 would be a knife thrust deep in the economic vitals of the dairy farmers of America.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I am happy to yield to my distinguished senior colleague from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to point out that the prospects are that the Federal Government is likely to purchase more dairy products from now on, the reason being that the import quota on foreign cheeses has recently been doubled. Such increase would mean a probable loss of market for the manufacturers of European type cheeses in America. The American manufacturers undoubtedly cannot compete with the foreign cheeses, which are produced under vastly different and cheaper conditions than is the case for example, with either the blue cheese or the Romano cheese produced in the United States.

As foreign cheeses are permitted to take over more of the American market, the American manufacturer will have to put the milk which he is receiving into other products—possibly butter, powdered milk, and Cheddar cheeses. Those products will then come into surplus and will likely have to be purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

So I think in voting on the amendment we must realize that the Government is likely to own more dairy products in the not distant future than it does today. I wish to make clear that I do not approve doubling the import quota for foreign cheeses at this time, when the supply and demand situation for dairy products in the United States is barely in balance, if it is in balance at this time. I believe it has been a mistake to authorize the importation of millions and millions of pounds of dairy products into the United States at this time, and certainly this is no time to substitute other fats for butter, except where it may be absolutely necessary.

I thank my colleague for yielding to me, because the point I mention ought to be taken into consideration by the Senate in taking action on the bill.

Mr. PROUTY. I am sincerely grateful to my colleague from Vermont. He always makes an invaluable contribution whenever he speaks on the Senate floor or off. Certainly I know that the dairy farmers in the United States, as well as farmers generally, have no greater champion than my senior colleague, who has devoted years and years of study in the interest of the agriculture welfare of this Nation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I, too, wish to say how grateful I am to the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, a man who has been the champion of all the farmers of America, not only the dairy farmers. He speaks with authority as well as from great experience. It would be foolish for us, indeed, to pass the bill at this time in view of the Government's increase in the quota of imported foreign cheeses—Edam, Gouda, and the Italian type cheeses. The fact is that this was a body blow to Wisconsin. It was a body blow not only to the dairy farmers of Wisconsin, but also to the small cheese factories, of which we

had hundreds in Wisconsin. Many of them were knocked out of business, after going through many years of plowing back their earnings into their factories. The Government, by one stroke of the pen, virtually wiped out a large number of them.

The point the senior Senator from Vermont has made is especially pertinent here because the bill provides no protection which will require the Navy to purchase butter when there is surplus butter in the Commodity Credit Corporation, although section 2 of the bill seems to give that protection. The reason is that if at any time during the year there happens to be no surplus in the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Navy can step in and buy enough oleo to last it for a long, long time. That is the kind of situation that prevails now. We know that in a few weeks there is every likelihood that there will be a surplus of butter. That is why the amendment I have offered is so essential, because it provides, among other things, protection against that kind of development.

Mr. PROUTY. I am grateful to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I wish to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont for the excellent defense he is making of the dairy industry of the United States. I believe he has made some very pertinent points. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the proposed legislation would provide an inferior product to naval personnel. Certainly butter has been long recognized as a better product than oleomargarine, both by the price it commands in the open cash market and by the fact that oleomargarine for years tried to copy butter by color and name and everything else. Is that not true?

Mr. PROUTY. I agree with my distinguished friend from North Dakota. He is absolutely correct. The manufacturers of oleo in their advertising programs have always suggested that their product tastes just like the higher priced spread. They have been trying to copy butter. Of course, certainly, we know it is impossible to do that, because butter is a much superior product, and I believe the American people basically recognize that fact.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Is it not also true that the enactment of the proposed legislation which is before the Senate would further aggravate the farm surplus problem in this respect: The pasture crops produced on an acre of land if used to feed dairy cattle, whose end product is butter, will produce far fewer pounds of end products like butter, than if the land were planted to soybeans and the soybeans then converted into oleomargarine? What I am trying to say is that an acre of land will produce far more pounds of oleomargarine as an end product of soybean and cottonseed than would be produced if it were a dairy farm operation.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is absolutely right in that respect. I agree with him wholeheartedly.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. If we wish to preserve a rural America as we knew it in the past, we shall have to do something to help the small farmer. I do not know of a better way to insure the keeping of the small type farm operations of America than through dairy farm operations. The production of any grain always lends itself to bigger operations, because of the tremendously high cost of the farm machinery that must be used. Although some oleomargarine legislation may have been necessary in the past, all of this has made it tougher for the small farmer to stay in business.

Mr. PROUTY. That is true. We must recognize the fact that the average dairy farmer operates a so-called family-sized farm, a small farm, which in many instances has been operated for several generations in the same family. Unless we give the small farmer some help, and unless we consider his interests, he cannot operate any longer. Once that happens, the whole economy is going to be drastically affected.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROUTY. I thank the Senator very much for his helpful contribution.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I interrupted the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont to commend the senior Senator from Vermont simply because the senior Senator from Vermont had just made his statement at the time I entered the Chamber. There is no question in my mind that the remarks which the junior Senator from Vermont is making show his devotion to the cause is very deep, and that he has a very deep understanding and knowledge of the issues. I am sure that before the bill is disposed of one way or another, the dary farmers of Wisconsin will certainly rise up and call him blessed. He is making a great contribution by his deep understanding and interest. I am grateful to him.

Mr. PROUTY. I am very grateful to the Senator from Wisconsin. I am proud to act as a cosponsor of his amendment, which we are considering at the present time. I commend the junior Senator from Wisconsin most highly for his support of the dairy farmers, not only in his own State, but also throughout the United States.

As I suggested earlier in my colloquy with the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, the dairy farmer is a small farmer. These farmers love the soil. They are a bulwark of American democracy. They keep the small communities of the country economically viable and they want to stay on the land even if it means a lower standard of living than that enjoyed by many Americans.

Since 1952, the average wholesale price received by farmers for all milk dropped more than 18 percent. The average price received for butterfat has dropped about 22 percent. During this same 7-year period, the retail price paid by consumers for milk has increased nearly 10 percent.

While the retail price of milk has been increasing, the farmer's share of the retail price has been decreasing. In 1952 the farmer's share of the retail price was 51 percent. In 1959 it was only 43 percent, a decrease of 8 percent during the 7-year period.

This widening spread between what the farmer gets and what the consumer pays for dairy products is highlighted further by other statistics published by the Department of Agriculture. In 1959 an urban worker's family of three paid $195 for the same quantity of dairy products, milk, butter, cheese, and ice cream, that it bought in 1952 for $191. But farmers in 1952 received $100 for these dairy products as compared with only $88 in 1959. Processors and distributors, however, increased their "take" for their services from $90 in 1952 to $107 in 1959.

Even though the retail prices of dairy products have been increasing, dollar for dollar, dairy products are the best buy on the housewife's shopping list. In the past 30 years, the real cost of milk to a factory worker in terms of work time required to purchase a quart of milk has dropped more than one-half. In 1929, it required the earnings of 15 minutes of factory work to purchase a quart of milk at retail. In 1947, the cost of a quart of milk had dropped to 10 minutes of factory labor. In 1959, it took the earnings of less than 7 minutes of factory labor to buy a quart of milk at retail. This is indeed an impressive record. However, consumers today are able to purchase milk at such relatively low prices largely because the farmer's share of the retail price has been constantly shrinking over the past 7 years.

Another important point which should be noted is that farm production costs, including interest, taxes, and farm wage rates, as of April of this year, are the highest on record. As a result of falling farm prices for milk, and the increasing production costs, the returns per hour to farm operators for their labor an managerial ability have been unreasonably low in recent years. A recent Department of Agriculture study, allowing a 5-percent return on invested capital, indicates that the average dairy farmer in one important dairy State receives about 57 cents an hour for his labor and managerial effort, including the value of food produced and consumed on the farm. What other workers today accept such a low return for services rendered or work performed?

Mr. President, another factor which should not be overlooked is the effect on the morale of Navy personnel if they are, at least figuratively, required to pour a so-called table spread out of an oilcan.

Strangely enough, many folks in the Navy originated in inland States, in small rural communities which are the backbone, the muscle, and sinew of America.

To force these people to eat a substitute for the rich, pure dairy products to which they are accustomed could very well prove highly disconcerting and upsetting to them.

Mr. President, no discriminating hostess would serve oil to her dinner guests. Certainly if that is true, it would be add-

ing insult to injury to force the fighting men of the U.S. Navy to consume a most inferior substitute.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and me is eminently fair and realistic. If the amendment is adopted, I feel certain that S. 2168 can be acted on with dispatch. If, unfortunately, such is not the case, then I am afraid that some of us will find it necessary to proceed at some length to try to persuade Senators that the bill as reported will have a tragic effect not only upon the welfare of the average dairy farmer, but upon the general economy as well.

I hope the Senate will appreciate the serious consequences which will follow the passage of S. 2168 as reported, and will approve the pending amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION DECISION LEGALIZING BOOSTERS OWNED BY AND REPEATING UHF TELEVISION STATIONS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, an announcement of great significance was made this afternoon by the Federal Communications Commission. I refer to its decision legalizing boosters which are owned by, and which repeat only, UHF television stations. Moreover, the FCC announcement provides for a maximum power of 5 kilowatts for these boosters or repeaters, as they sometimes are called.

This decision bears directly upon the viewing public, Mr. President, and more specifically upon viewers in the West, where booster-supported television is so widespread. The decision is significant because no UHF boosters are currently in operation to serve the mere handful of UHF stations in the country, 75 in number. Yet the people in those many isolated communities who depend upon VHF boosters, using one or more of the 450 VHF television stations, still await definitive action such as that embodied in Senate bill 1886, passed by the Senate last year. This measure, the so-called booster bill, lies in a House committee virtually untouched, still unscheduled even for hearings.

Mr. President, I commend the FCC for the foresight it has today demonstrated in taking action in an area where action will soon be demanded. I also commend it for showing the need for decision where decision is needed.

However, in my own State of Colorado, thousands of viewers in booster-supported areas still must hold their breath, in the hope that the FCC, still unguided by a lack of decision on Senate bill 1886, will make semiannual extensions on a decision to hold up destruction of existing VHF boosters.

Mr. President, the rules outlined by the FCC for UHF boosters are sound and reasonable. They take a professional view of power needs, and establish sound engineering standards. In short, these rules permit boosters, without permitting ungoverned broadcasting. In withholding comment on the ownership aspect of the announcement, I would say this decision will be greeted with enthusiasm by broadcasters and viewers alike.

I would also point out, Mr. President, that these rules, aside from the ownership provision, largely parallel those contained in the booster bill which this body passed last year.

The FCC has explained that its decision is confined to UHF boosters owned, and operated according to sound engineering principles, by the original station. Their use, according to the statement, is confined to filling in so-called shadow areas in the prime signal area of the UHF station in question. This is reasonable.

The FCC has explained that no decision was made regarding VHF boosters, because so many are presently operating, that guidance from Congress is needed. This, too, is reasonable.

Mr. President, I hope our colleagues in the other body will view in the same light today's decision by the FCC and will act speedily to assure uninterrupted television for rural families who depend upon boosters, and who look to us for help and assurance.

I should like to add just another word or two to my prepared statement, Mr. President. It seems to me that Mr. Ford, Chairman of the FCC, and the other members of the Commission have shown a great deal of foresight and "get-up" and "do it" in their attitude toward this particular mater. We are often prone to criticize, sometimes justly, I am sure, Federal agencies, particularly the administrative and regulatory agencies such as the FPC, the FCC, the FAA, the CAB, and all the rest of the regulatory agencies, without stopping to consider the job they have.

I should like to refer back particularly to the FCC. In 1926, I believe it was, there were six or seven hundred unregulated radio stations around the country. The situation was one of sheer, unorganized havoc. As a result, the Federal Communications Commission was established for the purpose of regulating them.

Then, in 1958, the Federal Communications Commission saw that the booster situation, the taking of television frequencies or signals out of the air and boosting them, or repeating them, to more remotely located communities, was very quickly getting in the same situation in which the radio stations had been back in 1926 and 1927.

So, in December of 1958, if my memory serves me correctly, the FCC issued an order suspending the operation of all booster stations. I disagreed with that order, and I disagreed particularly with some of the reasons on which it was based. Because of the widespread disagreement, the FCC has continually from time to time, continued the operation of that order of suspension, as it now has, and as it probably will continue to do until the House acts on this particular bill.

One of the first things the senior Senator from Colorado did when he returned to Washington in January of 1958 was to present a bill to the Senate to take care of the booster situation.

Some of our colleagues in the House and in the Senate seem to have very great difficulty in understanding that there are in existence areas which do not have a television station on about every other square mile. Out in the West we have no such abundance of television stations. We have TV stations in Colorado at Denver, Colorado Springs, Pueblo, and Grand Junction. Those are the only areas in Colorado where the population is concentrated enough to justify original television stations.

In addition, just west of the Denver-Colorado Springs-Pueblo axis, there runs a string of mountains which are a part of what is commonly known as the Continental Divide. Colorado has some 60-odd peaks over 14,000 feet high. Since television stations broadcast on a line-of-sight basis, it is very obvious that the signals cannot be lifted over those 14,000-foot peaks and over those 12,000 to 13,000 foot ranges without some kind of boosters or microwave signals.

In order to get around that difficulty, the Senate committee last year held very extended hearings upon the booster bill. I again wish to pay my tribute to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who held those hearings, and who showed great fairness and understanding of the subject, and who reported a bill which the Senate passed and which I thought was wholly reasonable. That bill has now reposed in the House of Representatives for just about a period of 1 year. If that bill is not passed and the FCC proceeds with its order of suspension toward boosters, a great portion of my State of Colorado is going to be darkened so far as receiving television broadcasts is concerned.

On the CATV matter, about which I spoke the other day in the Senate, I said that if one station, the Grand Junction TV station, were closed down, it would mean 36 boosters serving much of the western portion of Colorado and the eastern portion of Utah would be blacked out, and those people would be denied the right to the use of television.

I think, if the Federal Communications is willing to face up to its problems and face up to its challenges, there is no reason why the Congress of the United States should not act upon the booster bill and face up to its problem in acting legislatively upon the measure.

Mr. President, it is very rarely that I comment on action on legislation which has been determined in the Halls of Congress, and determined adversely to the position which I have taken, but I intend to do it at this time with respect to the CATV bill, which did not pass. Because of the failure of the Senate to face up

to its responsibilities on the CATV bill last week, it is going to have ultimately the same effect and reverberation on the people in the West—not merely the people of the State of Colorado but the people of all the western areas where boosters are necessary in order to get TV signals—as the effect the House has had by not acting on the booster bill which the Senate sent to it.

In conclusion, it seems to me we have a situation here in which, even though I disagreed with the reasons assigned by the Federal Communications Commission in its original suspension order, at least the FCC has lived up to its responsibilities. I believe it is about time the Congress started providing some legislative guidance in this respect.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SERVING OF OLEOMARGARINE OR MARGARINE IN NAVY RATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2168) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate agree to vote tomorrow at 12:30 p.m. on the Proxmire amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of the amendment, the proponents' time being in charge of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], or some Senator designated by him in his absence, and the time of the opponents being in charge of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] or some Senator whom he may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the morning hour tomorrow be concluded at 10:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, each side will then have an hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That upon the convening of the Senate tomorrow (Thursday, May 26, 1960), it proceed to the consideration of routine morning business; that at 10:30 o'clock a.m. the Senate resume consideration of the Proxmire-Prouty amendment (lettered "A"–5–23–60) to the bill (S. 2168) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine; that at 12:30 o'clock p.m., the Senate proceed to vote without further debate on said amendment; that the intervening time between 10:30 a.m. and 12:30 p.m. be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of said amendment and controlled, respectively, by Mr. PROXMIRE and Mr. THURMOND.

Ordered further, That upon the disposition of the said amendment it be in order for the Senate to proceed to the consideration of and vote en bloc on the treaties now pending on the Executive Calendar. (May 25, 1960.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is my understanding that under the order previously agreed to, the Senate will convene at 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is further agreed, consonant with the order requested by the distinguished acting majority leader, that the morning hour will end at 10:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is agreed that the Senate will then resume consideration of the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And that the time from then on will be equally divided, 1 hour on each side, the time of Senators speaking in behalf of the amendment to be controlled by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and the time in opposition to the amendment to be controlled by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. At 12:30 the Senate will vote on the Proxmire amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In order to further clarify and make certain this matter, I ask unanimous consent—and I dislike to do it, but in view of the circumstances I think it should be done—that the yeas and nays be ordered at 12:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I shall not delay the adjournment for any great length of time. I understand that after the discussion today the bill will go over until 10 o'clock tomorrow. I wish to speak in favor, first, of the Proxmire amendment, which I believe rationalizes the bill in question. It makes it workable.

In analyzing any measure, it is found that there are three interested parties. There is the public, first of all. I am sure the discussion of this bill, particularly the amendment, has clearly shown that to pass the bill itself would be detrimental to the public. I am not going into detail, however. The other day I had lunch with a young sailor. He is from my State. He said, as the butter was placed on the table, "Is that oleomargarine?"

I said, "No, sir."

He said, "You mean to say that you are going to have us Navy boys eat oleomargarine while you Senators won't eat it?"

I said, "That is not the idea."

So far as I am personally concerned, I think it is all important that we see to it that the Navy boys are given that most nourishing of all foods that come from the dairy cow—milk, cheese, and butter.

Mr. President, the cow has been called the mother of the race. The enactment of S. 2168 is against the best interest of the public. However, it is also against the best interest of the dairy industry. The dairy industry is facing serious economic conditions.

As has been so well suggested by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] today, we cannot muddy up the stream by compelling a sale, as it were, of oleomargarine, when the Navy has been eating butter all this time. Let me put it another way. When we talk about the Navy, we talk about ships and about ports where there is refrigeration, and where it is right and proper to have butter. Let us remember that these boys have been accustomed to butter. Therefore, in my opinion, the proposal before us is against the interest of the dairy industry, as I shall show.

Oleomargarine started out a few years ago holding a very small percentage of the spread market. Now it has over 51 percent of the spread market. The pending measure would add oleomargarine or margarine to the Navy ration, although the provision is qualified by the status of surplus of butter and soybean or cottonseed oil. However, the general effect would be to open the door for oleo to replace butter in the Navy rations.

I said there were three interested parties, or three interests that were involved. There is the Navy, or the boys in the Navy who have to eat the spread. They certainly do not want oleomargarine. That is what this young man in the Navy told me the other day. I am sure that when it is known that Senators insist on butter on their table there will be some people who will see a little red when they know that we are handing them another commodity.

Over the years there has been a concerted effort by the oleo interest to usurp the market, which has been created and expanded by the dairy industry, in providing high quality food for the American people. The effort has not been unsuccessful.

According to figures furnished by the Department of Agriculture, the increase in oleo utilization has been as follows: In 1938 the per capita consumption of butter was 16.6 pounds per person. By contrast, the consumption of oleo was 3 pounds. That is 16.6 as against 3 in 1938.

By comparison, the consumption of butter in 1958, 20 years later, was 8.4 pounds, which is half of what it was in 1938. However, the utilization of oleo had increased to 9 pounds per person. It had increased from 3 to 9 pounds. Butter had decreased from 16.6 to 8.4.

It does not take a very wise man or even a Solomon to see what effect that has had upon the dairy industry. This young sailor said to me, "You mean now we must eat oleo, that we cannot have buttermilk? You are importing cheese to such an extent that we cannot have our domestic cheese. What do you really think you are doing to the farmers, to say nothing about the factories that produce the butter and the cheese?" That point was stressed very well by the junior Senator from my State. He did a great job, as he always does when he undertakes to discuss an issue. I think no one can particularly blame us if they say, "You are fighting for the kinfolk. That is why you are interested."

Yes, that is true. My kinfolk are the people of the dairy industry, not only in Wisconsin but also in the other great dairy States in this country.

I am thinking, as was outlined by the Senator from Minnesota, how much less income this is going to mean to the farmers. The people in other States, in the Southland, for example, should be interested in this bill. They have been raising cows and producing milk and milk products. I have given the comparison between 1938 and 1958, which shows a reduction in the individual consumption of butter. In 20 years the oleo interests have increased their portion of the market from 15 percent in 1938 to 51 percent in 1958. The pending bill is one more effort by the oleo interests to take over this butter outlet, which is, after all, our own boys in the Navy, who want butter. I have not heard any of them say they want oleo served to them.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin may yield to me briefly, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor, in order that I may make an announcement of the plans of the leadership concerning the calendar for the rest of the week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Democratic policy committee has met and has cleared the following bills for the consideration of the Senate, the bills will not necessarily be taken up in the order in which I shall read them. I shall read them for the RECORD, so that all Senators who are interested may be prepared to debate these bills when they are brought before the Senate.

I desire all Senators to be on notice that any of the bills listed today may be called up in the Senate this week or the following week:

Calendar No. 290, Senate Joint Resolution 69, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

Calendar No. 361, Senate Resolution 131, referring S. 882, a bill for the relief of the heirs of J. B. White, to the Court of Claims.

Calendar No. 397, S. 1617, to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 447, S. 1789, to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 924, H.R. 8315, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lease a portion of Fort Crowder, Mo., to Stella Reorganized Schools R–I, Missouri. On this bill, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I believe, has an amendment. I should like to give the Senator from Oregon notice that the bill may be called up at any time. I desire this statement to constitute notice to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]; to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who reported the bill; and to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is the chairman of the committee.

Calendar No. 1040, S. 609, for the relief of the estate of Gregory J. Kessenich.

Calendar No. 1163, Senate Joint Resolution 170, a joint resolution to authorize the participation in an international convention of representative citizens from the North Atlantic Treaty nations to examine how greater political and economic cooperation among their peoples may be promoted, to provide for the appointment of U.S. delegates to such conventions, and for other purposes.

There is some controversy about this joint resolution. It was reported by a vote of 8 to 7 by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I desire all Senators to be on notice that there will very likely be a yea-and-nay vote on this joint resolution.

Calendar No. 1178, H.R. 4251, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, with respect to the limitation on the deduction of exploration expenditures.

Calendar No. 1196, S. 2850, providing for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the seventh circuit. The distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] is not on the floor now, but I give notice that I plan to ask that this bill be recommitted. I shall withhold that request until the minority leader is present.

Calendar No. 1267, S. 2131, to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, as amended.

Calendar No. 1277, S. 511, for the relief of the estate of Eileen G. Foster.

Calendar No. 1339, S. 2759, to strengthen the wheat marketing quota and price-support program.

Calendar No. 1369, S. 2977, a bill to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide for increased representation by regional banks for cooperatives on the board of directors of the Central Bank for Cooperatives.

Calendar No. 1371, S. 3070, to provide for the removal of the restriction on use with respect to certain lands in Morton County, N. Dak., conveyed to the State of North Dakota on July 20, 1955.

Calendar No. 1408, S. 2375, to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide an exemption from the provisions of such part for the emergency transportation of any motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce, by towing.

Calendar No. 1409, S. 1545, to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize elimination of a hearing in certain cases under section 408.

Calendar No. 1411, S. 2929, to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to repeal certain provisions requiring affidavits of belief.

Calendar No. 1412, S. 2867, to give effect to the convention between the United States of America and Cuba for the conservation of shrimp, signed at Havana, Aug. 15, 1958.

Calendar No. 1413, S. 1235, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences.

Calendar No. 1414, S. 3074, to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Development Association.

Calendar No. 1415, S. 2581, to amend the act of June 1, 1948—(62 Stat. 281)—to empower the Administrator of General Services to appoint nonuniformed special policemen.

Calendar No. 1416, H.R. 9983, to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments.

Calendar No. 1417, H.R. 7681, to enact provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959 with certain amendments.

Calendar No. 1418, S. 3366, to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency and to authorize their protection by the Secret Service.

Calendar No. 1419, S. 2744, to extend the term of design patent No. 21,053 for a badge granted to George Brown Goode and assigned to the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution.

Calendar No. 1420, S. 700, for the relief of Mladen Carrara, Tonina Carrara, Ante Carrara and Zvonko Carrara.

Calendar No. 1421, S. 993, for the relief of Christos G. Diavatinos.

Calendar No. 1422, S. 2277, for the relief of the Geo. D. Emery Co.

Calendar No. 1423, S. 2740, for the relief of Julia Sukkar.

Calendar No. 1424, S. 2942, for the relief of Eugene Storine.

Calendar No. 1425, S. 3049, for the relief of Oh Chun Soon.

Calendar No. 1426, S. 3032, for the relief of Samuel B. Pisar.

Calendar No. 1427, S. 3130, for the relief of Anne Marie Sletlin.

Calendar No. 1428, H.R. 1402, for the relief of Leandro Pastor, Jr., and Pedro Pastor.

Calendar No. 1429, H.R. 1463, for the relief of Johan Karel Christoph Schlichter.

Calendar No. 1430, H.R. 1516, for the relief of Juan D. Quintos, Jaime Hernandez, Delfin Buencamino, Soledad Gomez, Nieves G. Argonza, Feledidad G. Sarayba, Carmen Vda de Gomez, Perfecta B. Quintos, and Bienvenida San Augustin.

Calendar No. 1431, H.R. 1519, for the relief of the legal guardian of Edward Peter Callas, a minor.

Calendar No. 1432, H.R. 3253, for the relief of Ida Magyar.

Calendar No. 1433, H.R. 3827, for the relief of Jan P. Wilczynski.

Calendar No. 1434, H.R. 4763, for the relief of Josette A. M. Stanton.

Calendar No. 1435, H.R. 8798, for the relief of Romeo Gasparini.

Calendar No. 1436, H.R. 11190 for the relief of Cora V. March.

Calendar No. 1437, H.R. 1542, for the relief of Biagio D'Agata.

Calendar No. 1438, S. 2583, to authorize the head of any executive agency to reimburse owners and tenants of lands acquired for projects or activities under his jurisdiction for their moving expenses, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 1439, S. 1454, for the relief of Keitha L. Baker.

Calendar No. 1440, S. 2113, for the relief of George K. Caldwell.

Calendar No. 1441, H.R. 1600, for the relief of Francis M. Haischer.

Calendar No. 1442, H.R. 3107, for the relief of Richard L. Nuth.

Calendar No. 1443, H.R. 7036, for the relief of William J. Barbiero.

Calendar No. 1444, H.R. 8217, for the relief of Orville J. Henke.

Celendar No. 1445, H.R. 8806, for the relief of the Philadelphia General Hospital.

Calendar No. 1446, H.R. 9470, for the relief of E. W. Cornett, Sr., and E. W. Cornett, Jr.

Calendar No. 1447, H.R. 9752, for the relief of K. J. McIver.

Calendar No. 1448, H.R. 10947, for the relief of Aladar Szoboszlay.

Calendar No. 1449, H.R. 6081, for the relief of M. Sgt. Emery C. Jones.

Calendar No. 1450, S. 817, for the relief of Freda Filler.

Calendar No. 1451, S. 3560, to amend section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to further protect the internal security of the United States by providing penalties for malicious damage to certain communication facilities.

Calendar No. 1452, S. 2770, for the relief of Borinquen Home Corp.

Calendar No. 1453, S. 3018, to authorize the Maritime Administration to make advances on Government insured ship mortgages.

Calendar No. 1454, S. 3429, to amend section 216(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to permit the appointment of U.S. nationals to the Merchant Marine Academy.

Calendar No. 1455, S. 3140, to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Problems of Small Towns and Rural Counties.

Calendar No. 1456, H.R. 10087, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit.

Calendar No. 1457, H.R. 113, to prohibit the severance of service connection which has been in effect for 10 or more years, except under certain limited conditions.

Calendar No. 1458, H.R. 276, to amend section 3011 of title 38, United States Code, to establish a new effective date for payment of additional compensation for dependents.

Calendar No. 1459, H.R. 641, to amend title 38, United States Code, to make uniform the marriage date requirements for service-connected death benefits.

Calendar No. 1460, H.R. 7502, to revise the determination of basic pay of certain deceased veterans in computing dependency and indemnity compensation payable by the Veterans' Administration.

Calendar No. 1461, H.R. 9785, to provide for equitable adjustment of the insurance status of certain members of the Armed Forces.

Calendar No. 1462, H.R. 9788, to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the furnishing of benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to any child on account of the death of more than one parent in the same parental line.

Calendar No. 1463, H.R. 10703, to grant a waiver of national service life insurance premiums to certain veterans who become totally disabled in line of duty between the date of application and the effective date of their insurance.

Calendar No. 1464, H.R. 10898, to amend section 315 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional compensation for seriously disabled veterans having four or more children.

Calendar No. 1465, H.R. 9322, to make permanent the existing suspension of duties on certain coarse wool.

Calendar No. 1466, H.R. 9881, to extend for 2 years the existing provision of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders.

Calendar No. 1468, S. 1787, to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of decorative hardwood or imitation hardwood products.

Calendar No. 1469, S. 2998, to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, in order to extend the life of certain vessels under the provisions of such act from 20 to 25 years.

Calendar No. 1470, S. 3044, to authorize and direct that the national forests be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 1471, S. 3179, to increase the authorization for appropriations for construction of facilities for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory.

Calendar No. 1472, H.R. 8238, to authorize and direct the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to make a study and report to Congress, from the standpoint of the public health, of the discharge of substances into the atmosphere from the exhausts of motor vehicles.

Calendar No. 1473, S. 3025, to amend title II of the Vocational Education Act of 1956, relating to practical nurse training and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 1474, S. 2830, to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 1475, S. 3420, to provide further for permissible writing and printing on third- and fourth-class matter, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 1476, Senate Joint Resolution 127, to help make available to those children in our country who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to help make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments those specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps.

Calendar No. 1477, S. 2584, to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations on the construction differential subsidy under such title.

Calendar No. 1478, H.R. 11405, to provide for the treatment of income from discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation in a receivership proceeding or in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act commenced before Jan. 1, 1960, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 1479, S. 1889, to authorize the transfer of three units of the Fort Belknap Indian irrigation project to the landowners within the project.

Calendar No. 1480, H.R. 8295, to authorize the transfer to the Navajo Tribe of irrigation project works on the Navajo Reservation, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 1481, S. 2634, to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, relative to the return of certain alien property interests.

Calendar No. 1482, S. 3226, to amend section 809 of the National Housing Act.

Mr. President, I give notice also that Calendar No. 1414, S. 3074, to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Development Association, may be brought up at a very early date, if it is convenient to the authors of the bill and other interested Senators, and members of the committee. It will probably follow the action on the bill now under consideration.

I give notice also that it is expected to have the Senate convene early and stay late, until the pending business has been disposed of. Then we will follow with a calendar call, and very likely follow the calendar call with Calendar No. 1414, S. 3074, to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Development Association.

I expect the Committee on Appropriations to report some bills soon. Of course, all appropriation bills will always have the highest priority.

I desire all Senators to be on notice that several treaties are on the Executive Calendar, and that there will be yea-and-nay votes on the treaties. They may be considered en bloc.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Montana if there is controversy about any of the treaties?

Mr. MANSFIELD. So far as I know, none of them is controversial.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Can they be considered en bloc?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—and I shall ask that the order be vitiated if it is not agreeable to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]—that following the morning hour tomorrow there be a yea-and-nay vote on the treaties en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. An agreement has been entered that the morning hour tomorrow will be concluded at 10:30 o'clock, and that the next 2 hours will be allocated to the debate on the amendment now pending to S. 2168.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If it is satisfactory, I should like to have a yea-and-nay vote on the treaties after 10:30 o'clock. If that would be unsatisfactory, I shall ask that the vote on the treaties take place at 12:30 oclock, after the vote on the Proxmire amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to vote on the treaties, en bloc, immediately following the vote on the Proxmire amendment tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If there should be objection to that arrangement, I shall adjust it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the request which I made previously, and which was agreed to, that there be a yea-and-nay vote tomorrow at 12:30 o'clock on the Proxmire amendment be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do so because I understand there has been an agreement that requests of this kind are not to be made. There is no doubt that we shall have a yea-and-nay vote at 12:30 o'clock tomorrow anyway.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to have the RECORD show that when more Senators are present in the Chamber tomorrow, a request will be made that the yeas and nays on the Proxmire amendment be ordered by a show of hands.

I ask the Parliamentarians to take notice that it is not desired to have unanimous-consent agreements entered into for yea-and-nay votes, but that the regular procedure will be followed.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for his courtesy.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Texas is always welcome, if I have anything to say.

SERVING OF OLEOMARGARINE OR MARGARINE IN NAVY RATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2168) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have already mentioned that the oleo interests have increased their portion of the market from 15 percent in 1938 to more than 51 percent in 1958. Since 1958, the oleo interests have been taking over more of the market. The bill before the Senate is, I believe, one more effort by the oleo interests simply to take more and more of the spread market, as it is called.

What is the significance of S. 2168 to the American people? I have stressed a part of the argument. The country has, I firmly believe, a deep interest in providing the personnel of the U.S. Navy with the best diet available so as to keep our servicemen strong, healthy, and in fighting trim.

I believe that all medical sources and other sources indicate that the best food in the world is comprised of dairy products—butter, milk, and cheese.

Now I turn to the commitee report. The Department of Navy informed the committee that the enactment of the bill would result "in no increased cost to the Government and that it could result in some savings." That argument was hit squarely today by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. I shall not go into it further, except to say that if we are to regard our country in segments, and not realize that we are one people; that we are fixing on dairy products a ceiling; and if we are to proceed with this kind of reasoning, it means, probably, that someone has some interest in the oleo business.

How much saving would be made, no one states. It is not even estimated. In the Department's report to the committee, the Navy also indicated that it would "favor the enactment of S. 2168, provided section 2 is deleted."

In effect, the Navy would not even want to be guided by the permissive authority of the act, which would provide—and I quote from the committee report—

> Except when the Secretary of Agriculture finds and certifies that there is a surplus of either soybean oil or cottonseed oil, oleomargarine or margarine may not be used by the Navy, if surplus butter stocks are available through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In other words, the Navy would like a free hand in utilizing oleo, perhaps in some cases for budgetary reasons alone, instead of following the traditional course of using the health-giving products of the farms, in the interest of those who serve in the Navy and in the public interest.

Mr. President, in summation, let me state that I firmly believe that in the interest of the health of the Navy personnel, the economic health of the dairy industry, and the general economy of the Nation, the pending bill should not be enacted. However, if there is any thought of enacting the bill, I definitely believe that the amendment which has been submitted should be adopted. I take that position in the interest of the welfare of all three parties concerned—namely, the consumers, the producers, and the general public itself, from the standpoint of the economy and the economics involved.

Mr. President, I have spoken rather hastily this evening; but I have made these remarks at this time because I understand that tomorrow only 1 hour will be allotted to our side, and that the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] will consume a great deal of that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS CONCERNING UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS IN INDIANA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1119, Senate Resolution 258, authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings concerning unemployment problems in Indiana, be recommitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 25, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1605) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the apportionment of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries as they affect such States.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, May 26, 1960, at 10 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 6: 13: *Therefore take the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand.*

God of all grace, in these beshadowed days, when we are groping our way in the darkness of conflict and confusion, may we have the wisdom to commit and trust ourselves completely and unreservedly to Thy divine leading.

Grant that we may be alive and alert to the eternal truth that the God of righteousness is our refuge and fortress and that Thy love will never let us go.

Show us how we may strengthen the bond of unity among all the citizens of our beloved country and may it be strong enough to enable us to stand fast against the forces of evil which are seeking to destroy the foundations of our Republic.

May our minds and hearts be aglow with the enthusiasm and courage of lofty ideals and principles and inspire us with a faith that fulfills itself in faithfulness and a love that manifests itself in helpfulness.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12117. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. DWORSHAK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1605. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the apportionment of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries as they affect such States.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 9862) entitled "An act to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. BENNETT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 722) entitled "An act to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the Senate, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill do not pass, two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in the affirmative.

MESSAGE OF DISAPPROVAL ON H.R. 7947—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

MAY 23, 1960.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: An error appears in my message of disapproval on H.R. 7947, a bill relating to the income tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association.

In the last sentence of the second paragraph of my message the word "purchases" should be inserted in lieu of the word "sells."

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

MEMBERS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE TO MAKE THE NECESSARY ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT-ELECT AND THE VICE-PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 92, 86th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee To Make the Necessary Arrangements for the Inauguration of the President-Elect and the Vice-President-Elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1961, the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. RAYBURN, Mr. MCCORMACK, and Mr. HALLECK.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When standing in the well of the House I repeat the remarks of a Member previously published in the RECORD, am I entitled to reprint them if I pay for them?

The SPEAKER. Well, I think that would be a matter to take up with the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I had the Printer's ruling about it, and I just wondered where I should go to a court of appeals.

The SPEAKER. I think the Chair has answered that question.

HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

BENT'S OLD FORT

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on the passage of the bill (H.R. 6851) authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Bent's Old Fort near La Junta, Colo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill which would make Bent's Old Fort in Colorado a national historic site. This is not alone a question of the cost of some 160 acres of land to be purchased by the Federal Government and added to the site. The reason I am so strongly opposed is the fact that for all time the taxpayers of the Nation will be called upon to maintain and manage this site.

If, as contended by the proponents, this site should be maintained why should not the expense be borne by the State of Colorado? Why unload it upon all the taxpayers at a time when Congress is preparing to again boost the Federal debt which now stands at some $290 billion?

Mr. Speaker, I should like to add that I am surprised that the Department of the Interior, which is part of an administration that professes to be interested in economy and "belt tightening," supports this bill and many others of a similar nature which call for the spending of funds for projects which could be delayed until the finances of this Nation are put in order.

The situation demands more than lip-service on the part of all agencies and branches of the Government.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of S. 1833, an identical bill to the bill just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall acquire, on behalf of the United States, by gift, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, such lands, interests therein and improvements thereon, as the Secretary may deem necessary for the purpose of establishing a national historic site at the site of Bent's Old Fort on the Old Santa Fe Trail, located in Otero County, Colorado, approximately seven miles east of La Junta, north of the Arkansas River.

SEC. 2. (a) The property acquired under the provisions of the first section of this Act shall be designated as the Bent's Old Fort National Historic Site and shall be set aside as a public national memorial to commemorate the historic role played by such fort in the opening of the West. The National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall administer, protect, and develop such monument, subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes" approved August 25, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935, as amended.

(b) In order to provide for the proper development and maintenance of such national historic site, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and maintain therein such markers, buildings, and other improvements, and such facilities for the care and accommodation of visitors, as he may deem necessary.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 6851, was laid on the table.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 12326) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOODELL moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back with the following amendment: On page 4, line 16, strike out "$662,622,300" and insert in lieu thereof "$658,092,300"; and on page 5, line 8, insert *"Provided further,* That none of the funds in this paragraph appropriated shall be used for the construction of the Allegheny River Reservoir in Pennsylvania and New York."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GOODELL) there were—ayes 20, noes 71.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 110, nays 294, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

YEAS—110

Adair	Fino	Miller, Clem
Alger	Ford	Miller, N.Y.
Anfuso	Goodell	Minshall
Ayres	Griffin	O'Brien, N.Y.
Baldwin	Gross	Osmers
Barr	Gubser	Ostertag
Barry	Haley	Pillion
Bass, N.H.	Halpern	Pirnie
Bates	Harmon	Poff
Becker	Hays	Quie
Bennett, Fla.	Herlong	Ray
Berry	Hess	Reuss
Betts	Hiestand	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolton	Hoffman, Ill.	Riehlman
Bosch	Holt	Robison
Bow	Horan	St. George
Bray	Hosmer	Santangelo
Brown, Ohio	Jackson	Saylor
Broyhill	Johansen	Schenck
Budge	Johnson, Colo.	Scherer
Byrnes, Wis.	Jonas	Schwengel
Chamberlain	Judd	Short
Church	Kastenmeier	Smith, Calif.
Cohelan	Keith	Springer
Collier	Keogh	Stratton
Conte	Laird	Taber
Cramer	Langen	Teague, Calif.
Cunningham	Latta	Thomson, Wyo.
Curtis, Mass.	Lindsay	Udall
Curtis, Mo.	Lipscomb	Utt
Derounian	McCulloch	Wainwright
Derwinski	McDonough	Weis
Devine	Mailliard	Westland
Dixon	Meader	Wharton
Dorn, N.Y.	Metcalf	Wilson
Dulski	Meyer	Younger
Feighan	Michel	

NAYS—294

Abbitt	Burke, Mass.	Fallon
Abernethy	Burleson	Farbstein
Addonizio	Byrne, Pa.	Fascell
Albert	Cahill	Fenton
Allen	Cannon	Fisher
Andersen, Minn.	Carnahan	Flood
	Casey	Flynn
Anderson, Mont.	Celler	Flynt
	Chelf	Fogarty
Andrews	Chenoweth	Foley
Arends	Chiperfield	Forand
Ashley	Clark	Forrester
Ashmore	Coad	Fountain
Aspinall	Coffin	Frazier
Auchincloss	Colmer	Frelinghuysen
Avery	Cook	Friedel
Bailey	Cooley	Fulton
Baker	Corbett	Gallagher
Barden	Curtin	Garmatz
Baring	Daddario	Gary
Barrett	Dague	Gathings
Bass, Tenn.	Daniels	Gavin
Baumhart	Davis, Ga.	George
Beckworth	Davis, Tenn.	Gialmo
Belcher	Dawson	Gilbert
Bennett, Mich.	Delaney	Glenn
Blitch	Dent	Granahan
Boggs	Denton	Grant
Bolling	Diggs	Gray
Bowles	Dingell	Green, Oreg.
Brademas	Donohue	Green, Pa.
Breeding	Dorn, S.C.	Griffiths
Brock	Dowdy	Hagen
Brooks, La.	Downing	Halleck
Brooks, Tex.	Dwyer	Hardy
Broomfield	Edmondson	Hargis
Brown, Ga.	Elliott, Ala.	Harris
Brown, Mo.	Elliott, Pa.	Harrison
Burdick	Everett	Healey
Burke, Ky.	Evins	Hechler
Hemphill	Martin	Roberts
Henderson	Mason	Rodino
Hoeven	Matthews	Rogers, Colo.
Hoffman, Mich.	May	Rogers, Fla.
Hogan	Merrow	Rogers, Mass.
Holifield	Miller, George P.	Rogers, Tex.
Holland		Rooney
Holtzman	Milliken	Roosevelt
Huddleston	Mills	Rostenkowski
Hull	Mitchell	Roush
Ikard	Moeller	Rutherford
Irwin	Monagan	Saund
Jarman	Montoya	Schneebeli
Jennings	Moore	Selden
Jensen	Moorhead	Shelley
Johnson, Calif.	Morgan	Shipley
Johnson, Md.	Morris, N. Mex.	Sikes
Johnson, Wis.	Morris, Okla.	Simpson
Jones, Ala.	Morrison	Sisk
Jones, Mo.	Moss	Slack
Karsten	Moulder	Smith, Iowa
Karth	Multer	Smith, Kans.
Kasem	Mumma	Smith, Miss.
Kearns	Murphy	Smith, Va.
Kee	Murray	Staggers
Kelly	Natcher	Stubblefield
Kilday	Nelsen	Sullivan
Kilgore	Nix	Teague, Tex.
King, Calif.	Norblad	Teller
King, Utah	Norrell	Thomas
Kirwan	O'Brien, Ill.	Thompson, N.J.
Kitchin	O'Hara, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Kluczynski	O'Hara, Mich.	Thornberry
Knox	O'Konski	Toll
Kowalski	O'Neill	Tollefson
Kyl	Oliver	Trimble
Lafore	Passman	Tuck
Landrum	Patman	Ullman
Lane	Pelly	Vanik
Lankford	Perkins	Van Pelt
Lennon	Philbin	Van Zandt
Lesinski	Pilcher	Vinson
Levering	Poage	Wallhauser
Libonati	Porter	Walter
Loser	Powell	Wampler
McCormack	Preston	Watts
McDowell	Price	Weaver
McFall	Prokop	Whitener
McGinley	Pucinski	Whitten
McGovern	Quigley	Widnall
McIntire	Rabaut	Wier
McMillan	Rains	Williams
McSween	Randall	Withrow
Macdonald	Reece, Tenn.	Wolf
Mack	Rees, Kans.	Wright
Madden	Rhodes, Pa.	Yates
Magnuson	Riley	Young
Mahon	Rivers, Alaska	Zablocki
Marshall	Rivers, S.C.	Zelenko

NOT VOTING—28

Alexander	Cederberg	Sheppard
Alford	Dooley	Siler
Bentley	Doyle	Spence
Blatnik	Durham	Steed
Boland	Hébert	Taylor
Bonner	Inouye	Thompson, La.
Boykin	Kilburn	Willis
Brewster	Machrowicz	Winstead
Buckley	Pfost	
Canfield	Scott	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Spence against.
Mr. Dooley for, with Mr. Willis against.
Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Steed against.
Mr. Canfield for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bentley with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Cederberg with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Siler with Mr. Sheppard.

Mr. CLEM MILLER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 388, nays 18, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

YEAS—388

Abbitt	Dingell	Kelly
Abernethy	Dixon	Keogh
Adair	Donohue	Kilday
Addonizio	Dorn, N.Y.	Kilgore
Albert	Dorn, S.C.	King, Calif.
Alford	Dowdy	King, Utah
Allen	Downing	Kirwan
Andersen, Minn.	Dulski	Kitchin
	Dwyer	Kluczynski
Anderson, Mont.	Edmondson	Knox
	Elliott, Ala.	Kowalski
Andrews	Elliott, Pa.	Kyl
Anfuso	Everett	Lafore
Arends	Evins	Laird
Ashley	Fallon	Landrum
Ashmore	Farbstein	Lane
Aspinall	Fascell	Langen
Auchincloss	Feighan	Lankford
Avery	Fenton	Lennon
Ayres	Fino	Lesinski
Bailey	Fisher	Levering
Baker	Flood	Libonati
Baldwin	Flynn	Lindsay
Barden	Flynt	Lipscomb
Baring	Foley	Loser
Barr	Forand	McCormack
Barrett	Ford	McDonough
Barry	Forrester	McDowell
Bass, N.H.	Fountain	McFall
Bass, Tenn.	Frazier	McGinley
Bates	Frelinghuysen	McGovern
Baumhart	Friedel	McIntire
Becker	Fulton	McMillan
Beckworth	Gallagher	McSween
Belcher	Garmatz	Macdonald
Bennett, Mich.	Gary	Mack
Berry	Gathings	Madden
Betts	Gavin	Magnuson
Blitch	George	Mahon
Boggs	Giaimo	Mailliard
Bolling	Gilbert	Marshall
Bolton	Glenn	Martin
Bosch	Granahan	Matthews
Bow	Grant	May
Bowles	Gray	Meader
Boykin	Green, Oreg.	Merrow
Brademas	Green, Pa.	Metcalf
Bray	Griffin	Meyer
Breeding	Griffiths	Miller, Clem
Brock	Gubser	Miller, George, P.
Brooks, La.	Hagen	
Brooks, Tex.	Haley	Miller, N.Y.
Broomfield	Halleck	Milliken
Brown, Ga.	Halpern	Mills
Brown, Mo.	Hardy	Minshall
Brown, Ohio	Hargis	Mitchell
Broyhill	Harris	Moeller
Budge	Harrison	Monagan
Burdick	Hays	Montoya
Burke, Ky.	Healey	Moore
Burke, Mass.	Hechler	Moorhead
Burleson	Hemphill	Morgan
Byrne, Pa.	Henderson	Morris, N. Mex.
Byrnes, Wis.	Herlong	Morris, Okla.
Cahill	Hess	Morrison
Cannon	Hiestand	Moss
Carnahan	Hoeven	Moulder
Casey	Hogan	Multer
Celler	Holifield	Mumma
Chamberlain	Holland	Murphy
Chelf	Holt	Murray
Chenoweth	Holtzman	Natcher
Chiperfield	Horan	Nelsen
Church	Hosmer	Nix
Clark	Huddleston	Norblad
Coad	Hull	Norrell
Coffin	Ikard	O'Brien, Ill.
Cohelan	Inouye	O'Brien, N.Y.
Colmer	Irwin	O'Hara, Ill.
Conte	Jackson	O'Hara, Mich.
Cook	Jarman	O'Konski
Cooley	Jennings	O'Neill
Corbett	Jensen	Oliver
Cramer	Johansen	Osmers
Cunningham	Johnson, Calif.	Ostertag
Curtin	Johnson, Colo.	Passman
Curtis, Mass.	Johnson, Md.	Patman
Curtis, Mo.	Johnson, Wis.	Pelly
Daddario	Jonas	Perkins
Dague	Jones, Ala.	Philbin
Daniels	Jones, Mo.	Pilcher
Davis, Ga.	Judd	Pillion
Davis, Tenn.	Karsten	Poage
Dawson	Karth	Poff
Delaney	Kasem	Porter
Dent	Kastenmeier	Powell
Denton	Kearns	Preston
Derounian	Kee	Price
Diggs	Keith	Prokop
Pucinski	Schneebeli	Udall
Quie	Schwengel	Ullman
Quigley	Selden	Utt
Rabaut	Shelley	Vanik
Rains	Shipley	Van Pelt
Randall	Short	Van Zandt
Reece, Tenn.	Sikes	Vinson
Rees, Kans.	Simpson	Wainwright
Reuss	Sisk	Wallhauser
Rhodes, Ariz.	Slack	Walter
Rhodes, Pa.	Smith, Iowa	Wampler
Riehlman	Smith, Kans.	Watts
Riley	Smith, Miss.	Weaver
Rivers, Alaska	Smith, Va.	Weis
Rivers, S.C.	Springer	Westland
Roberts	Staggers	Wharton
Robison	Stratton	Whitener
Rodino	Stubblefield	Whitten
Rogers, Colo.	Sullivan	Widnall
Rogers, Fla.	Taylor	Wier
Rogers, Mass.	Teague, Calif.	Williams
Rogers, Tex.	Teague, Tex.	Wilson
Rooney	Teller	Withrow
Rostenkowski	Thomas	Wolf
Roush	Thompson, N.J.	Wright
Rutherford	Thompson, Tex.	Yates
St. George	Thomson, Wyo.	Young
Santangelo	Thornberry	Younger
Saund	Toll	Zablocki
Saylor	Tollefson	Zelenko
Schenck	Trimble	
Scherer	Tuck	

NAYS—18

Alger	Gross	Mason
Bennett, Fla.	Harmon	Michel
Collier	Hoffman, Ill.	Pirnie
Derwinski	Hoffman, Mich.	Ray
Devine	Latta	Smith, Calif.
Goodell	McCulloch	Taber

NOT VOTING—26

Alexander	Dooley	Scott
Bentley	Doyle	Sheppard
Blatnik	Durham	Siler
Boland	Fogarty	Spence
Bonner	Hébert	Steed
Brewster	Kilburn	Thompson, La.
Buckley	Machrowicz	Willis
Canfield	Pfost	Winstead
Cederberg	Roosevelt	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Bentley with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Dooley with Mr. Doyle.
Mr. Siler with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Canfield with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana.
Mr. Cederberg with Mr. Steed.

Mr. KEITH changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight next Tuesday, May 31, to file a report on the bill H.R. 12381.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1960

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 536) providing for the consideration of H.R. 10128, a bill to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10128) to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and also yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 536 provides for the consideration of H.R. 10128, to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities. The resolution provides for an open rule with 4 hours of general debate, making it in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now in the bill, to be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The educational finance problem in our Nation has been a concern since the end of World War II.

The interest and concern on the part of Congress was reflected by the enactment of Public Laws 815 and 874 in the 81st Congress. These laws were designed to assist local school districts to meet their education financing problem insofar as that problem was aggravated by the loss of State and local tax revenue as a result of Federal programs and activities in or near the local school districts. From time to time these two laws have been amended and their duration has been extended. During the second session of the 85th Congress, the Committee on Education and Labor, in reporting legislation to extend their duration, recognized the continuing and permanent responsibility of the Federal Government to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities.

Therefore, Public Laws 815 and 874, of the 81st Congress, were made permanent

legislation by the 85th Congress during its 2d session, insofar as they relate to so-called on-base children.

Subcommittees of the Committee on Education and Labor have conducted extensive investigations into the shortage of classrooms during the past decade. In three instances Federal participation in the financing of locally controlled education was recommended.

At the beginning of the 1st session of the 86th Congress there were introduced a number of bills authorizing Federal assistance to the States for educational purposes. These were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. Many bills followed the same school construction pattern adopted in legislation approved during the 84th and 85th Congresses. Others charted new paths, which provided for both school construction and teachers' salaries.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare submitted a draft bill (H.R. 4268) to authorize a 5-year program of assistance to school districts in meeting the debt service on loans for construction of urgently needed elementary and secondary public school facilities. This bill would cost the Federal Government about $2.2 billion.

Beginning on February 5, 1959, hearings were conducted by the Subcommittee on General Education. The subcommittee sat in open session 14 days.

State and school districts are making great sacrifices in order to construct adequate school facilities. In spite of this tremendous effort at State and local levels, according to data supplied by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Nation's school systems had been short 140,500 classrooms at the beginning of the 1958 fall term.

Projections indicated further substantial increases in school enrollment, as well as an apparent leveling off in the rate of construction of new school facilities.

On June 8, 1959, H.R. 22 was reported from the Committee on Education and Labor. This was a bill to provide financial assistance for the support of public schools by authorizing the appropriation of funds to the States to be used for the construction of school facilities and for teachers' salaries. H.R. 22, providing a 4-year program, would cost the Federal Government approximately $4.5 billion.

When the 2d session of the 86th Congress convened, the General Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor began drafting legislation which would be confined strictly to providing assistance for school construction, which would authorize appropriations considerably more modest than those authorized by H.R. 22, and which would recognize the procedures recommended by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The subcommittee had, as background for its deliberations, data from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicating that the shortage of classrooms at the beginning of the 1959 fall term amounted to 132,400. This represented a decrease in the shortage from the previous year of 9,500 rooms, or a reduction in the backlog of 6.7 percent.

Assuming that the decrease in the shortage each year continues at the 1959–60 rate, between 14 and 15 years would be required before the last school system eliminated the swing shift.

The data, however, indicate that school construction, which had been in an upward trend until 1957–58, fell off somewhat in 1958–59, and is expected to decline more sharply in 1959–60. Approximately 62,700 instruction rooms are scheduled for completion during the 1959–60 school year, a decrease of 7,300, or 10.4 percent, from the 70,000 completed in 1958 and 1959. Although 62,700 rooms are scheduled for completion in 1959–60, States estimate 41,000 rooms will be needed by the fall of 1960 just to provide for the annual enrollment increase of 1.2 million pupils, and another 17,000 rooms will be required to replace those which have been abandoned for various reasons, leaving but 3,700 classrooms to be applied against the backlog.

From the fall of 1956 to the fall of 1959, the unprecedented number of 210,730 classrooms have been constructed in the 50 States and the District of Columbia; yet during that same period of time the backlog has decreased by only 27,400 classrooms. Furthermore, at the beginning of the 1959–60 term, the number of pupils in excess of normal capacity in public elementary and secondary schools was 1,883,000, which was 1.8 percent more than the 1,850,000 pupils reported a year earlier.

The bill H.R. 10128, as amended, authorizes a maximum Federal appropriation of $975 million over a 3-year period. It is estimated that the appropriation will finance the construction of about 25,000 classrooms. Through the matching provision, the bill is designed to stimulate and encourage the States to finance the cost of another 15,000 to 16,000 classrooms. These would be classrooms that would not otherwise be built.

It authorizes appropriations of $325 million for each of fiscal years 1961, 1962, and 1963, amounts appropriated to remain available for 3 years.

Allotments to States are based on school-age population; once funds reach the State level they are deemed to be State funds. The State's allotment, if unpaid, remains available to it for 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 536.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of a bill that authorizes Federal financial assistance for school construction in the amount of $975 million covering a period of 3 years.

Thomas Jefferson, a great American said:

> The best government is the one which governs the least.

I fully subscribe to that philosophy and sincerely trust there are a sufficient number here who also believe in his philosophy.

I believe that the education of our children is the duty and responsibility of the various States and subdivisions thereof, that the Federal Government should be removed as far as possible in the field of education. I predict now that if the bill presently before us is enacted into law that the next move will be for Federal financial assistance for school equipment, then Federal financial assistance for the payment of teachers' salaries. In fact, there is such a movement on now. Then we can also expect a movement for Federal financial assistance for the purpose of purchasing textbooks, and that could eventually mean what books are to be used. It has been my experience that when the Federal Government finances a program they have some control over it. That is true of everything in which the Government has a stake.

Within the past few years 17 new private and public schools have been built in my congressional district. Let me tell you how they were built. The new parochial schools were built because the people who were interested in having them went to work. Millions of dollars were raised by popular subscription. It is safe to say that many gave until it hurt. They were not looking to Washington for handouts.

The new public schools in my congressional district were built because the Parent-Teachers Association, the teachers themselves, the Lion Clubs, the Rotary Clubs, the public-spirited citizens rolled up their sleeves and put over a bond issue to finance the program. The people did this knowing their taxes would be raised and they were willing that they be raised. They were not looking to Washington for help. They knew the education of their children was a local responsibility.

Now, I ask you why these people who are paying higher taxes because they had the pride to build their own schools, should be obliged not only to pay for their own but be compelled to pay taxes for schools in other localities where the people did not have sufficient pride to build their own schools.

Some will say that many communities have reached the limit of their taxing powers. It is probably true that in some instances they have bonded themselves to the limit by building parks, swimming pools, boulevard lights, and so forth, when they should have been building classrooms.

Let me remind you that $975 million is a lot of money especially when we do not have the money but must borrow it for future generations to pay back. I am certain that all are aware that our national debt is nearing $285 billion, and that the annual interest on our national debt is approximately $9 billion. These figures should make us stop and listen. It should make us think about tightening our belts. In the event we do not—there is only one course—and that is to raise the national debt again.

I do not believe that anyone present will deny that all the States are in a better financial condition than the Federal Government. Each day the newspapers carry stories that some particular State has a balanced budget. For

instance, the other day the Associated Press carried this story:

Gov. Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin, said: "Today the 1960–61 budget will be balanced without increasing taxes."

Governor Nelson said in a prepared statement before both houses of the Wisconsin Legislature:

Unprecedented growth and prosperity in Wisconsin means a $23 million deficit has been removed without increasing taxes.

Governor Nelson and the State Legislature of Wisconsin should be complimented.

I say that I am opposed to this bill, first, because the Federal Government does not have the money and would be obliged to borrow it for future generations to pay back; second, because all the States are better off financially than the Federal Government; third, because the education of our children should be considered a local responsibility; fourth, because it is the beginning of Federal financial assistance which will ultimately end in Federal financial assistance for teachers' salaries, school equipment, and textbooks; and fifth, because above all our schools should be free of Federal controls and domination.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that just yesterday the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Anderson, notified the Committee on Appropriations of the House that he would request legislation this session to increase the national debt limit to $293 billion.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that request was acted upon today in the Ways and Means Committee and we have applied for a rule to bring it before the House.

Mr. ALLEN. I also thank the gentleman from Illinois for his observation. The fact is, and I do not think there is anyone who can dispute it or deny it, that every State in this Nation is better off financially than the Federal Government. We read many statements in the papers to this effect. I have an Associated Press dispatch before me now which states under the heading "Balanced Budget Predicted," that Gov. Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin, said today that—

The 1960–61 State budget can be balanced without increasing taxes.

Unprecedented economic growth and prosperity in Wisconsin in 1959 means a $23 million deficit has been removed, the chief executive said in a prepared talk to both houses of the Wisconsin Legislature.

That is true of nearly all the States, but still they come down here asking for Federal aid.

I have here a letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation. I am going to read it because it states my position exactly. It is from the American Farm Bureau Federation and is signed by the legislative director:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALLEN: The Farm Bureau is opposed to the passage of H.R. 10128 or any legislation to establish an expanded program of Federal aid to general education.

As farmers and ranchers we have a vital interest in our public school system. We recognize the importance of constantly improving public education; however, we are strongly opposed to expanded Federal aid to elementary and secondary education.

The financing of general education is quite properly a State and local responsibility. An expanded Federal aid to education program would be a foot in the door toward a centrally controlled system of education. It is unrealistic to contend that the mere insertion in a bill of a pious clause disavowing any intention to authorize Federal control will prevent Federal encroachment. The greatest control available to the Federal Government is in its power to allocate funds. Federal aid means Federal control.

More than 680,000 new public elementary and secondary classrooms have been constructed since World War II. This represents almost 50 percent of such classrooms in use today. The so-called classroom shortage reported to be approximately 600,000 a few years ago has been reduced to 132,400. The national average teacher's salary is almost twice what it was 10 years ago in spite of a 43-percent increase in the total number of teachers. This phenomenal record of meeting school needs proves that State and local governments recognize the importance of and are financially able to meet school needs. Federal aid would result in slowing down the present rapid expansion of our educational facilities while local school districts waited for additional Federal aid.

Farm Bureau, with a membership of over 1,600,000 in 49 States and Puerto Rico, will continue to work at the State and local level for the improvement of our school facilities and for adequate pay for schoolteachers.

Federal intervention in this field would stymie local initiative in improving our schools, increase construction cost, and could very well result in fewer schools being built.

To transfer general education costs to the Federal Government would result in an increase in Federal taxes or a boost in the current national debt, thus feeding the fires of inflation. Either of these consequences would undermine our educational system and all other aspects of our economy.

We urge you to vote against all legislation to provide expanded Federal aid to general education.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. LYNN,
Legislative Director.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Is the gentleman in favor of Federal aid to farmers? The gentleman mentioned them.

Mr. ALLEN. I have generally followed the Farm Bureau and the National Grange on farm questions.

Mr. BAILEY. And you are for appropriations to take care of agriculture?

Mr. ALLEN. As I say, I generally follow the Farm Bureau and the National Grange recommendations.

Mr. BAILEY. But not for boys and girls?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Will the gentleman tell the House whether the rule makes in order an amendment which would provide for Federal assistance for parochial schools?

Mr. ALLEN. The gentleman had better direct that inquiry to the Parliamentarian of the House. I am sure he knows more about that than I do.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I was intrigued by a question that was addressed to the gentleman a moment ago by the gentleman from West Virginia. I have no doubt but what this type of question will be heard several times today, and the implication will be that those of us who are opposed to this legislation are against the boys and girls. I think that is very unfair. There is not a man or woman in this House who does not have a real concern for all the problems of our boys and girls.

I would like to ask the gentleman or any Member of the House, for that matter, if the boys and girls are not a lot better off under the American system than they are in places all over this world where education is controlled by a central headquarters somewhere?

Mr. ALLEN. I would say that the gentleman has made a very accurate statement of fact on that matter.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I believe the gentleman from Illinois, who has made a very good statement to his views with reference to this bill did state, if I understood him correctly, that in his own home community of Galena his people had bonded themselves to build a rather expensive educational plant. Is it the gentleman's understanding that under the provisions of this bill the people of Galena, who bonded themselves, and who have furnished their own money to build their own school facilities, will not only have to pay the taxes to meet those bonds as they fall due, as well as the interest thereon, but will be required to pay Federal taxes to furnish school construction for neighboring communities in which the people have failed or refused to bond themselves to take care of educating their own children? Is that a correct understanding of the gentleman's statement?

Mr. ALLEN. That is an excellent and a true statement.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, second to the problem of international peace, the most serious question this Nation must solve is the educational crisis facing millions of our American youth.

This Congress has been guilty of gross neglect and wanton disregard for the Nation's future security by sweeping this school legislation "under the rug" during the last several sessions.

Both political parties in their national platform in 1952 and 1956 advocated Federal aid for construction and expansion of school facilities throughout the country. President Eisenhower in two campaign speeches in 1952 said the Na-

tion needed 345,000 schoolrooms. The White House, after 7½ years, has refused to work for legislation to inaugurate this program. In fact, in the last session the Eisenhower leadership in the House, with the aid of some Democrats, defeated the so-called administration school bill by six votes.

On August 26 of last year, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur Flemming stated:

The number of pupils whose education is being impaired in varying degrees by classroom shortage is about 10 million.

How large is the present classroom shortage? For the past 4 years the U.S. Office of Education has compiled estimates of the shortages made by the Chief State School Officer in the various States. For these 4 years the estimating done by the State officers appear to be fairly consistent. The following are classroom shortage figures that have been reported to the USOE by the State school officers of 48 States and the District of Columbia.

Fall 1956	159,000
Fall 1957	142,300
Fall 1958	140,520
Fall 1959	131,600

This series of figures shows an average decline of only 9,130 classrooms annually over the past 3 years. At this rate it would take over 14 years to eliminate the present shortage of classrooms. To put it another way, many first-grade pupils who will next fall be crowded into inadequate classrooms will have either graduated from high school or dropped out of school before the first-grade room to which they are rightfully entitled is built. The education of a generation of children is being adversely affected by both the shortage of classrooms and the shortage of competent classroom teachers.

In April of 1960, the U.S. Department of Education in the so-called goals paper stated:

During the 5 school years from 1959 to 1964, construction of 416,600 classrooms are needed to take care of normal needs and to eliminate the backlog.

CLASSROOM TEACHERS

The NEA Research Division publication, in close cooperation with the departments of education in various States, have estimated the shortage of teachers on an annual basis. The latest of these reports estimates that the Nation's public and secondary school classrooms will be short approximately 135,000 classroom teachers in September 1960. Every major survey taken by the Department of Education and also the President's Special Commission of Education which has been made in recent years has pointed to the shortage of well qualified teachers as great determent to quality education for American children.

The Rockefeller Brothers' Fund Report on Education stated:

No educational system is better than its teachers. Yet we face severe problems both in supply of teachers at all levels and also as to their quality.

The report also said that this condition has existed and expanded since the start of World War II and recommended that Congress take prompt action to eliminate the shortage.

In a press release on May 24, 1959, accompanying the statement of the President's Science Advisory Committee Report, President Eisenhower said:

One subject discussed in this report warrants special emphasis—the importance of raising the standards of our teachers in their communities. Higher salaries is the first requirement. We need also to recognize the great importance of what teachers do and to accord them with encouragement, understanding, and recognition which will help to make the teaching profession attractive to increasing numbers of first-rate people.

SOVIETS

All tourist and officials who visit Russia agree that regardless of their backward economy in some fields the program of top education has been given priority. They have been graduating more scientists, technicians, and engineers than the United States for a number of years. The ratio is now about 3 to 1 in this branch of education. We are living in the scientific age of missiles, space, and modern production.

This next generation will condemn the leaders of today if we do not keep pace with this new age of science and economic expansion.

The remarks of Governor Hodges following the delegation of Governors touring Russia was:

We need to pay more attention to our professors and scientists and schoolteachers—seeing that they get the job done while at the same time seeing that they are adequately compensated, both in terms of money and respect, for their efforts. American education is important to national security.

Another important fact confronting school boards today is that they must spend $148 in 1960 to buy what $100 bought in 1950. This inflation factor requires an increase in school expenditures of $2.92 billion in 1960 over 1950.

The financial plight in school construction in a great number of urban and industrial areas throughout the Nation has been brought on greatly by the Federal Government and not by the local citizens. Since the beginning of World War II, the Calumet region of Indiana has almost doubled in population. The city of Gary in my congressional district is an example of population expansion caused by thousands of defense and industrial workers coming from all sections of the country to work in steel mills and other factories. The city of Gary has expanded in population from 110,000 to almost 180,000 in 20 years. Its citizens have been struggling to build schools under a financial burden and increased school tax rate which has now reached the financial limit for the local taxpayers to meet the demand for additional classrooms. For a 6-year period during World War II, the cities and towns of this area were prevented from carrying on the necessary school construction by reason of the Federal Government's limitations on critical building materials. All permits for school construction had to receive a permit from the War Production Board in Washington, in control of materials for the war purposes.

This morning I received a telegram from Walter E. Wiley, director of research, Gary public schools, Gary, Ind. I hold in my hand this telegram which in a very brief statement, outlines the critical school situation in but one of the numerous areas throughout the United States that are struggling with this educational problem.

Mr. Speaker, I under unanimous consent include Mr. Wiley's telegram with my remarks:

Hon. CONGRESSMAN RAY MADDEN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The school city of Gary is in dire need of Federal assistance. There are many other communities in our Nation whose problems are as acute as ours. Therefore, we beseech you to use all the influence at your command in urging your fellow Congressmen to pass the present Federal education bill which is before Congress.

The following examples illustrate the seriousness of the financial plight of the school city of Gary:

1. The present total tax rate is $9.62 per $100 assessed valuation of property.

2. The present school tax rate for operation and capital outlay is $5.05.

3. The sale of $1,500,000 worth of bonds at tonight's meeting of our board of education will raise our bonded indebtedness to $5,510,000 or within $31,321 of the debt ceiling—by Indiana law—of $5,451,321.

4. New bond payments and interest will necessitate an addition of 7½ cents to the present tax rate.

5. The tax rate will be increased, still, with the increase in enrollment, in September 1960, by 2,939 pupils, thereby necessitating additional teachers, supplies, equipment, nonlicensed personnel, and services. Number of schools built since 1956—15.

Number of classrooms and service rooms within these 15 schools, 381.

Number of classroom additions under construction, 37.

Number of buildings under construction, 2.

Number of classrooms and service areas within these two schools, 75.

Plans have been completed for 2 schools plus a 12-room addition to another school, 69.

Plans have been laid for the construction of 2 junior high schools to accommodate and enroll 2,700.

A total of 100 classrooms plus service areas will be needed for the two junior high schools.

Anticipated enrollment increase in all grades between the periods September 1959 to September 1965, 14,614.

At present we have approximately 9,000 pupils improperly housed, due to over capacitation.

We are compelled to use 76 portable classrooms.

In addition to the portables, we are using 341 outmoded classroom facilities built between the years 1890 and 1930.

Respectfully submitted.

W. E. WILEY,
Director of Research.

In other cities and towns in my congressional district, such as Hammond, East Chicago, East Gary, Hobart, Griffith, Munster, Highland, Dyer, Crown Point, Schererville, Merrillville, Black Oak, and other areas, are suffering from this over population explosion.

The Committee on Education and Labor, both in the House and in the Senate, have held hearings and made investigations throughout the country in cities like New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Pittsburgh, and other population centers, and have found the same lack of educational factilities for millions of American school children.

I fully realize there are some congressional districts where this school crisis does not exist and I do hope that the Members representing these districts, in voting on this legislation, will use the same consideration that Members from other districts cooperate when their areas are stricken by drought, flood or other critical situations which need Federal cooperation and aid.

In yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I inserted an editorial from the Wall Street Journal which sets out the critical school situation in Alabama as it pertains to financial problems. All Members should read this editorial.

Citizens in sparsely populated areas should remember that education is the greatest barrier we have against juvenile delinquency. Lack of school facilities is one of the greatest contributors to juvenile delinquency. J. Edgar Hoover, in a recent speech, stated that juvenile delinquency is increasing in the metropolitan areas throughout the Nation at an alarming rate. Juvenile delinquency and the crime which follows its expansion costs the American taxpayers upward from $3 billion per year. This affects the taxpayers in every congressional district in the United States, whether a school crisis exists in that locality or otherwise.

I have in my hand, statistics released by the Selective Service of the U.S. Government, setting out an alarming percentage of disqualified Selective Service registrants because of being educationally deficient. These statistics were taken during World War II between November 1940 and December 1944. In 7 States of this Nation, the educational deficiencies ran as follows: 29.2 percent, 29.7 percent, 22.9 percent, 24.8 percent, 29.4 percent, 25.5 percent, and 28.9 percent. These were seven of the States that most neglected their State educational facilities. The seven States in the better brackets had an amazing low percentage of rejectees under the Selective Service with the following figures: 1.8 percent, 1.9 percent, 1.4 percent, 1.7 percent, 2.7 percent, 2.5 percent, and 2.3 percent. There must be some reason why millions of our youth in certain localities have such subnormal educational I.Q. that they cannot serve their Nation in any capacity in our military forces.

We are now launching into the scientific age, not only in preserving liberty and independence of our Government, but also in the economic competition with the communist world. For over a quarter of a century, the Soviets have stressed education as their number one program to succeed for world conquest. Our Nation has remained dormant and allowed our educational competition to lag. That is why Secretary Flemming stated that 10 million American boys and girls are today attending school under subnormal conditions. Now is the time for Congress to awaken the public of America that we must build an educational system second to none if the future generations of America meet modern scientific and education competition.

I hope this Federal aid legislation for improving the education of all American children is enacted into law and signed by the President before this session adjourns.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN. I think maybe the gentleman should consider this, that while, as the gentleman says, this town is deteriorating so much, still they are paying and willing to pay for their education.

Mr. MADDEN. Absolutely.

Mr. ALLEN. While, on the other hand, the gentleman's community, where they have moved in by the tens and hundreds of thousands with fine jobs, wants this Federal handout.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the gentleman from Indiana would not yield. He raised the point that the city of Gary, Ind., I guess, had reached or come close to its debt limit. The question I wanted to ask, which was quite pertinent, was—when the debt limit had last been raised in that particular city. That is the same problem that might exist for other communities throughout the country. The Federal debt limit has been raised many times and there is going to come before the House next week or so a request that the debt ceiling at the Federal level be raised again. The issue here is—how best do we educate our children and not whether we do educate them. Anyone who attempts to put it on the basis of one side favoring educating the children and the other is not is just misrepresenting the facts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, if the money in the bill that is before us would be used for school construction in the areas where a genuine school crisis exists, I could go along with it. But the hard fact is that under this bill, most of the money would go to areas where there is no such crisis as the gentleman from Indiana has described. I hope he will support amendments that will allocate the money only to those States or areas with demonstrated need and inadequate financial ability—that is, where a crisis exists that requires outside help. I cannot find justification for taxing all our people to send more money to those States that are taking good care of their children than will go to those States which, although they are trying their best, do not have enough resources, as is certainly the case in certain States, to be able to meet the need or reach the national average.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. The method set forth in the bill to determine the need question is to let each State decide its needs and its priorities. Is such local self-determination not a pretty good approach to the problem?

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman from Arizona knows very well that if money is going to be handed out by the Federal Government, practically every State, whether it has a school crisis or not, is going to be here trying to get back the money, and more, that it sent to Washington. I have been in a dilemma on this problem ever since I first came to the Congress. I would like to give help where help is actually needed. But every time, in order supposedly to meet the genuine problems in certain areas, a bill is brought before the Congress that gives aid to all States whether they are in need or not. I do not think that is the way to meet the problem. Obviously, the more of our funds that we send to the areas without a crisis, the less there will be for the areas with a crisis. How can that do the job?

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily we do not cast negative votes against mere consideration of legislation, because to do so may prevent the passage of some good law that might be arrived at by amendment of the bill that is up for consideration. In the legislation before us today, however, the form of the bill that may come out of any legislative debate cannot be the basic issue that is to be decided. The basic issue is whether the Federal Government is to assume ultimately the responsibility of education in this country. We have approached this issue before, but never have we cast a final conclusive vote. Under the circumstances before us now, we are justified in voting to reject the unamended bill to show disapproval of the Federal Government assuming this new basic obligation of government. The existence of such legislation would be more important than its precise content.

I urge that we reject the idea of the Federal Government assuming this responsibility. I do this for a number of sound reasons.

The Constitution, of course, puts this responsibility in local hands; and, in all good faith with the people of the United States, we should not without democratically enacted constitutional amendment turn this power over to our Federal Government.

But aside from the constitutional reason, there is the danger that adding this substantial burden to the Central Government may be the straw that breaks the camel's back insofar as our national security and defense obligations are concerned. In my opinion, there is much left undone today in the field of adequate defense, and this is primarily because we are unwilling to spend and tax adequately even for this primary function of government. We have never really had an all-out program in intercontinental ballistics, space defense, and other tools of future warfare. We are not building enough Polaris submarines. Even our ground forces are using weapons which are outmoded and they are inadequate in numbers when their

counterparts across the Iron Curtain are realisticallly considered. We are not adequately handling many aspects of our defense. To assume a new multi-billion-dollar program of Federal Government in the face of inadequate handling of defense measures seems to me to be a very dangerous thing.

Another way in which our national defense will be endangered by the Federal Government taking over the educational system is by providing a centralized arm of government much more easily penetrated by enemy ideological and espionage agents than could ever be the case in our 50 and more existing educational systems.

It is folly to say that the Federal Government can finance a program of government without controlling it. It is fundamental that a government which takes the responsibility of financing work must ultimately control the nature of the governmental operations. Federal control would mean regimentation of thinking, and America would lose by this process the strength which now comes to the American scene from diversified points of view, best expressed in the motto on the front of our national seal, "E Pluribus Unum," or "From Many One."

Education is the last important function of government which will move to Washington if we pass this legislation. Almost every other consequential function of government has already moved here. This is a move away from democracy because here we each represent much larger segments of population than the State legislators and we are more remote from our constituents in daily contacts with them. If we relieve local leaders from the responsibility to act and lead in this field, we will be further stifling civic leadership at the grassroots.

Finally, there can be no truthful assertion that there is a need for nationwide financial assistance to schools from the Federal Government. Many localities are doing very well by their schools. Many States are doing very well by their schools. Others could do so if they would amend their laws or State constitutions. There are a few States, probably well under 10, where a very difficult situation exists from a financial standpoint. A measure limited to such States could solve all of the problems needed to be solved without the danger involved in the measure before us. It is my personal conclusion that we should defeat this legislation for these very adequate reasons.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] made a most eloquent and touching appeal, but he failed to mention some of the hard facts. Among them, his district's responsibility for its present situation; the State's freedom, until recently, from public debt.

The gentleman has a wonderful and prosperous community down around the south end of the lake, Lake Michigan, a lake which brings the district an unlimited supply of power water, shipping from all over the world, as well as an opportunity for an unexcelled recreational area.

There is no doubt but that the community is prosperous, that its people are intelligent and industrious; that they are law abiding. It is extremely doubtful that they would take pride in being characterized as being dependent upon other States for educating their children, for asking any other community to pay for any program which they thought necessary to the welfare of the community.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] was born on the 25th day of February, 1892. He lived there, as I understand for many years, perhaps all of his life. He is thoroughly familiar with the needs of his people, with their financial situation—with that of his State. There is no doubt about that.

I was 17 years of age when he was born. It was my privilege for 16 of those years to live at Constantine, Mich., on the banks of the St. Joe River, not many miles from the home of the gentleman from Indiana. Even in those days, Chicago was not too far away, and on many occasions, I had opportunity to go through his district and the adjoining territory with which I have been familiar ever since that time. It is a wonderful community; sand dunes; recreational areas; prosperous industries. The country back behind the dunes is very fertile, black rich land where they can grow anything. Sure, the gentleman is eloquent in behalf of his people. Justly so. He is able. He is industrious. He is progressive and he is aggressive. He is my cotenant over in the Methodist Building and has been for years. Under Bishop Oxnam, how could he be otherwise?

I doubt very, very much that his people, though he certainly knows their attitude far better than do I, who are self-supporting, who are proud of their community, who are intelligent, would be greatly pleased to hear him ask that other communities assume an obligation which is rightfully theirs.

But the gentleman from Indiana does not tell you how the situation which he describes so emotionally, so eloquently, so appealingly, and which we will all admit, is regrettable, came to exist. Permit me to tell you.

Some great capitalists, men with money, thought they could make some more money, so they went down there at the end of the lake, and what did they do? Steel plants. You can hardly see the sun at noonday because of the smoke. Mile upon square mile is covered with mammoth factories, factories which are in production from sunup until sundown, turning out steel and other products. Mammoth concerns, busy concerns, making great profit because the workers are industrious, the equipment up to date, and all, both capitalists and workers, competent, and industrious. Management brought in people from all over the country, steelworkers. How did they get them? They paid them more money than anybody else could afford to pay them. Business, industry, and the workers prospered, the community grew.

And today, as one flies over or drives through, he sees adequate highways, shopping communities, of which any city could well be proud, and industries continually in operation—a prosperous industrial community of which any State might well be proud.

And the gentleman comes here asking for a handout. The gentleman tells us they have thousands of children for whom they have no educational facilities. They have gymnasiums, they have tennis courts, they have bowling alleys, they have swimming pools, and they have Lake Michigan at their door. There would appear to be no reason why they should not have adequate schools. The gentleman and his constituents live in one of the world's most favored spots, it is one of the world's most industrious and profitable localities.

The gentleman has a big heart. He has a big heart not only for the residents of his own district, but I have often heard him speak, eloquently and pursuasively, always convincingly, in behalf of other people in other parts of the world. I suspect, though I do not know, that he would liberalize our immigration laws, that he would bring in from wherever in the world that they might be, people less fortunate than are his own people.

However, I doubt the wisdom of asking his community, his constituents, to impoverish themselves to take care of others less fortunate. Perhaps his factories need more workers and, if they do, the community as a whole should be prepared to take care of them and their children. The members of the increased population to which the gentleman referred, many of whom came in from other communities, will naturally have children.

You cannot prevent them from having children. Thank heaven for that. They should be taught, educated.

But what about the rest of us? It has been years since I have had anyone going to school, but I have voted for every bond issue that has come along.

Why do you not tax these capitalists who make all that money out of the steel industry? Why not tax the workers in the factories and the owners of the factories whatever may be needed to educate the individuals of that community? Are all the liberals in the gentleman's district in favor of creating a burden, then letting the rest of us carry it? Do the gentleman's constituents lack a willingness—they certainly have the ability—to care for their own needs, pay their own way?

I guess they have three shifts down there now, I am not sure, but I remember the day when they had two 12-hour shifts in their industries, and I hope we never return to it. But the money those boys get. There is only one group of workers, the electricians, who get more. They get $6 an hour, as I understand. The people of that district ought to pay to educate their own children.

But what does the gentleman want to do? After building up that community, providing an opportunity for the wealthy to get wealthier, for the worker to get ever more money, what do they do? They come along and they do not want to pay their own way, or, if they do want additional educational facilities, they do not expect to pay the bill themselves.

While we outside issue bonds and build our schools and pay our teachers, they spend their money in some other way—as is their privilege. But it is not their right to ask us to educate their children. Educators have forgotten all about the multiplication table and the alphabet. All they think about now is how they can get a free trip to the moon, recreate the universe, get something for nothing.

Look at the bill we had up here yesterday: $30,000 in it for entertainment. Not long ago another bill with a million dollars for liquor. Is that part of education? We are teaching altogether too many things which are desirable but not necessary and are asking someone else to pay for it. Is it fair? Is it right? I say it is not.

We ask those who get small wages to elect, let us say, Congressmen who will give them more—oh, yes; I see my good friend from Chicago, the chairman of our committee, a wonderfully capable gentleman, always in favor of giving somebody else something more, which is generous. I am glad you are here. You will vote for this bill, sure; you will vote for every doggoned bill that requires somebody else or a future generation to pay for it. Is it right? Is it fair? Is it decent? We love our children, we love all the children in the country; we want to do everything we can for them except pay the bills which we create that we pass on to them—to future generations.

In a few days will come a bill to increase the amount which we can borrow to $290 or $295 billion. Why go through the farce of writing a bill limiting our national indebtedness? It seems to be apparent that we will borrow as long as anyone will lend, spend, get reelected, but Hopkins-like, pass on to someone in the dim and distant future payment of the debts we make.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it was fartherest from my thought to get into such an argument as the one we have just been listening to. As chairman of the Subcommittee on General Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, let me tell you that both the subcommittee and the general committee spent months in the consideration of this legislation. It is particularly written and tailored to receive House approval. The job that faces me and other proponents of this legislation today is to see that it is not muddied up from the introduction of a lot of side issues.

I have listened to the talk of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], about our being so hard up that we are going to have to raise the debt ceiling; and he was joined by my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], of the Ways and Means Committee, who said they were seeking a rule to make in order a bill lifting the national debt ceiling because we would be overdrawn by the end of the fiscal year if that were not done. Let me say to those gentlemen that I have seen them vote here on the floor of the House for the foreign aid program of $4,088 million. Rather than up your debt let me suggest that we clip foreign aid a billion dollars. Vote for that.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Is he saying I voted for the foreign aid bill?

Mr. BAILEY. I notice the gentleman has a guilty look about him; I will yield.

Mr. ALLEN. Is the gentleman saying I voted for the foreign aid bill?

Mr. BAILEY. You voted for the rule that made it possible.

Mr. ALLEN. No, I did not.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman made a statement to the effect that a great length of time was spent in considering this bill. I believe the gentleman will agree with me that there were no hearings held on this bill before it was reported.

Mr. BAILEY. There have been hearings before the committee of which I am chairman.

Mr. GRIFFIN. When was the last time the gentleman's subcommittee held hearings?

Mr. BAILEY. We have held hearings in the field of school construction over the past 4 years and held hearings on H.R. 22 only last year.

There were plenty of hearings held. Our subcommittee spent weeks and weeks in the consideration of the drafting of this measure.

Mr. GRIFFIN. In view of the gentleman's statement concerning the consideration given to this bill, I believe it is incumbent to call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that hearings were held in the last session—not this year—on the Murray-Metcalf bill. No hearings were held on this bill.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman just does not want to understand, that is all.

The gentleman from Illinois quoted a letter from the National Farm Bureau in opposition to this legislation. I am sorry he did not also include the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, because those three are the major part of the opposition to this legislation.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the RECORD a list of national organizations that are supporting this legislation:

National Education Association.
AFL–CIO.
American Federation of Teachers.
National Congress of Parents and Teachers.
General Federation of Women's Clubs.
American Association of School Administrators.
Council of Chief State School Officers.
American Association of University Women.
National Farmers Union.
American Library Association.
National Classroom Teachers Association.
United Automobile Workers Union.
Jewish War Veterans of U.S.A.
National Child Labor Committee.
Americans for Democratic Action.
Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice.
Legislative Assembly, State of Oregon.
American Parents Association.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I am appreciative for this time. I am impelled to comment upon the solid logic and the plain, hard facts as given by the Rules Committee member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]. He hit straight and he hit home. His remarks, I believe, are very effective.

Mr. Speaker, quite to the contrary of popular opinion, this is not a school bill. This is not an education bill. This is a bill on behalf of the theory and philosophy of Federal aid—Federal aid to anything.

When we come to legislate in any committee, the first thing we should do is to examine the need, to find out if we have a need for the legislation. In accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], we have not held hearings in the last 2 years, during which time this whole picture of need has rapidly changed.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I would like to call the attention of the Members to the fact that if they will go over to the desk and ask for a copy of hearings on this legislation, they will find there are none available. The statement of the gentleman is correct that there were no hearings held during this session. Hearings were held a year ago on a different bill. Is that correct?

Mr. HIESTAND. That is correct. And there is no basis of need in the bill. If we are going to legislate to aid somebody or something we should have a basis of need so that the assistance will go to the places, the districts and the people who need it. But there is nothing like that in this bill, which to me is a basic weakness. Whether we agree on the philosophy of Federal aid to education or not, certainly that, in my judgment, is a fatal weakness.

Mr. Speaker, I direct your attention to the statistics in the minority report on this matter with reference to the basis of need. The trend has shifted. We are rapidly catching up with what was alleged to be need. There will always be some spots in the United States where they need more schools. It will vary from time to time as various districts catch up. I have one district in the fast-growing district that I represent that has 38 empty schoolrooms. They overbuilt a little bit, but they will catch up eventually. This lack of basis of need is fatal. This formula of distribution of funds in this bill is based upon the number of children of school age in the vari-

ous States and in various areas, regardless of whether there are schools that have a need or not.

We would take from the people either by direct or indirect taxes nearly one thousand million of consumer dollars to redistribute without regard to need.

Now, Mr. Speaker, cannot that just be called ridiculous? Is that a worthy bill, worthy of consideration by this House? Furthermore I asked the members of the subcommittee whether this was Federal aid in a temporary or an emergency or a permanent program. I could not get the answer. They dodged and twisted and turned and had to agree that it was a 3-year proposition. But, you and I know that once the camel's nose gets under the tent, even if it is for $10,000, up she goes from there. Most of this money, of course, will be spread, most of the actual money, right in the very first year, because there are no matching funds. From there on it is matching funds. But, from then on, Mr. Speaker, these will be consumers' dollars rather than taxpayers' dollars, because we may balance the budget shortly, and the money will have to be raised by indirect taxation.

Now, may I direct your attention to the fact that in the district I represent in Los Angeles County there is a very large school bond issue coming up this fall. And, I have no doubt that there are a lot of school bond issues coming up in many of your districts throughout the United States. If we pass this bill, do you suppose those bond issues are going to carry? Oh, no; they are going to fall flat, and they are going to fall flat rapidly.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the bill and I oppose the rule, and I hope it is defeated.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KASEM].

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I represent the district adjacent that of the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] who just preceded me. Our districts are very similar in character. We have both enjoyed a tremendous growth rate in the last 10 years. I cannot give you the specifics as to his district, but there is a desperate need for school buildings as well as for money to pay teachers in my district, although we have a high level of income compared to the rest of the United States in general.

Mr. Speaker, if there is any single reason that I wanted to be elected to the Congress of the United States, it was to come here and work towards the principle of Federal aid to education, because I realize that in these modern times—and it has been so for decades—the children of the United States are our principal and capital assets. To say that it is a local responsibility or State responsibility or national responsibility to educate and care for the children is the purest sophistry that has no logical base. The question is not who has the responsibility, but it is who is able to bear the responsibility. Home owners cannot indefinitely be asked to increase the burdens on their properties, and that is essentially where it comes from in our district in order to bear the cost of education. The cost of education is properly chargeable to the people in commerce, in industry, and it is chargeable on the ability-to-pay program, which inevitably draws the Federal Government into the area of responsibility. The responsibility is where the ability lies.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are now considering a resolution which would permit this House to deal with legislation providing Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities. It is my very honest opinion that we cannot deal with this problem unless we take into consideration the fact that one out every seven children in America today attends nonpublic schools. Later in the day I hope that an amendment will be offered which will provide a loan program for these private schools. Since I have reason to believe that a point of order might be raised, I should like to ask the gentleman from New York, the manager of this resolution, whether or not the Committee on Rules had in any way discussed or considered this particular aspect of this legislation: a proposal to provide a loan program for private schools in this legislation?

Mr. DELANEY. There was general discussion on many subjects in the Committee on Rules and there were a number of bills before the committee. We had the Metcalf bill, we had a Senate bill and we had the bill now before us, H.R. 10128. We granted a rule, H. Res. 538, which makes in order this bill. It is an open rule. I think the question the gentleman asked would have to be taken up with the Parliamentarian to determine whether or not it is germane to the bill before the House.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman for that explanation. I should like to ask one final question. Am I correct in assuming that the Committee on Rules did not reject an amendment, or suggestion that when the bill comes up for amendment, an amendment could be offered to provide the loan program for private schools?

Mr. DELANEY. Of course, that would have no bearing on what the Committee on Rules did. As I said, we discussed a number of things. I do not think it is of interest to the House to know just what happened in the Committee on Rules. I suggest to the gentleman that he offer his amendment and have the presiding officer rule on it.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN. I think this should be added, that we did not have any request before the committee waiving points of order. All who appeared before the committee asked for an open rule, which we granted.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, folks in Texas I strongly suspect are heartily opposed to Federal aid to education. At least, we were earlier sent a resolution from the State legislature, and the logic of that resolution, which all Texas Members received, is certainly appropriate today. Federal aid means Federal control. There is no Federal money. The money comes from the same pockets back home. There is no greater interest in children and in education than that of parents and local groups. Another Federal law changes nothing and in this case solves nothing.

Therefore, I personally am opposed to the bill. I hope we will vote down the rule and, if we pass the rule, that we will vote down the bill.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 35

Whereas the last few years have witnessed unprecedented growth in enrollment in the public school system of Texas, and it is estimated that there will be even greater growth in the future; and

Whereas enrollment in the public schools of Texas has increased 34.5 percent since 1941 and it is estimated that such enrollment will increase 74.6 percent between now and 1970; and

Whereas it is further estimated that more than 64,000 new classrooms at a total cost of at least $1,928 million will be required to care for this increased enrollment and to replace obsolete facilities; and

Whereas although many school districts in the State will be able to secure necessary financing of such additional facilities through ordinary commercial channels, others—especially those hard hit by drought conditions and other adverse economic factors, and those which have already incurred large bonded indebtedness—will find it difficult if not impossible to secure necessary financing through these sources; and

Whereas school districts in such circumstances will necessarily look to some higher level of government for aid and assistance in meeting their needs; and

Whereas there is currently pending in Congress a bill providing Federal aid for school construction which would provide about $19 million a year to Texas schools for the next 4 years—or a total of about $76 million for the 4-year period; and

Whereas Federal aid in the form of grants and loans is almost inevitably accompanied by Federal control and direction which could result in Federal usurpation of the right of the citizens of Texas to maintain, control, operate, and support their own public schools; and

Whereas the Texas Legislature now has under consideration a proposal to create a statewide public school building authority which would provide for the issuance of some $200 million in bonds to create a revolving fund which could be drawn upon by local school districts which cannot secure adequate financing for building construction through commercial loan services; and

Whereas this proposal, if adopted, would provide Texas school districts with more than twice the amount of aid called for to the current Federal proposal and would enable Texas schools to meet their building needs without accepting Federal assistance and control: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, the Senate concurring, most urgently recommends that the Texas congressional delegation in Washington oppose the bills now under consideration which would provide Federal financial assistance to local school districts, whether for construction of classroom facilities, supplementing teachers' salaries, or for other similar purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to members of the Texas delegation in the Congress of the United States.

WAGGONER CARR,
Speaker of the House.
BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a telegram from the president of the Congress of Parent-Teachers' Association of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, at this point I should like to call to the attention of the Members a telegram which I have received from Mrs. Horace H. Johnson, president of the Pennsylvania Congress of Parents and Teachers. Mrs. Johnson lives in Bridgeville, Pa., near Pittsburgh, and the telegram was sent from a meeting of the congress which was being held in Philadelphia on the event of our consideration of the education bill in Congress.

The telegram is as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *May 24, 1960.*

HON. JAMES G. FULTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As president of the Pennsylvania Congress of Parents and Teachers I respectfully request that this telegram be read on the floor of the House on Wednesday when Federal support for education is being debated and discussed.

The Pennsylvania Congress strongly favors Federal support for education as provided in the Senate bills, as amended by Senator CLARK, of our State. Our State congress joins the National Congress of Parents and Teachers in pressing for passage of a measure at this session of Congress which will provide Federal moneys to school construction and/or teachers' salaries. The great majority of our 2,500 local unit leaders express a concern for the need for Federal support to aid in financing educational programs in their communities. This is an appeal to the Congressmen from Pennsylvania to vote for a measure which will provide Federal support for construction and/or teachers' salaries.

Mrs. HORACE H. JOHNSON,
President, Pennsylvania Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker being in doubt, the House divided and there were—ayes 151, noes 47.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 309, nays 97, not voting 26, as follows:

[Role No. 103]

YEAS—309

Adair	Fallon	Lennon
Addonizio	Farbstein	Lesinski
Albert	Fascell	Levering
Alford	Feighan	Libonati
Andersen, Minn.	Fenton	Lindsay
	Fino	Loser
Anderson, Mont.	Flood	McCormack
	Flynn	McDowell
Andrews	Fogarty	McFall
Anfuso	Foley	McGinley
Arends	Forand	McGovern
Ashley	Ford	McIntire
Aspinall	Fountain	Macdonald
Auchincloss	Frazier	Mack
Ayres	Frelinghuysen	Madden
Bailey	Friedel	Magnuson
Baker	Fulton	Mahon
Baldwin	Gallagher	Mailliard
Baring	Garmatz	Martin
Barr	Gavin	Matthews
Barrett	George	May
Bass, N.H.	Giaimo	Meader
Bass, Tenn.	Gilbert	Merrow
Bates	Glenn	Metcalf
Becker	Granahan	Meyer
Beckworth	Grant	Miller, Clem
Belcher	Gray	Miller, George, P.
Bennett, Mich.	Green, Oreg.	
Boggs	Green, Pa.	Miller, N.Y.
Bolling	Griffin	Milliken
Bosch	Griffiths	Mills
Bowles	Gross	Mitchell
Brademas	Gubser	Moeller
Bray	Hagen	Monagan
Breeding	Halpern	Montoya
Brock	Hardy	Moore
Brooks, Tex.	Hargis	Moorhead
Broomfield	Harmon	Morgan
Brown, Mo.	Harris	Morris, N. Mex.
Burdick	Hays	Morris, Okla.
Burke, Ky.	Healey	Morrison
Burke, Mass.	Hechler	Moss
Byrne, Pa.	Hoeven	Moulder
Cahill	Hogan	Multer
Cannon	Holifield	Mumma
Carnahan	Holland	Murphy
Casey	Holt	Natcher
Celler	Holtzman	Nelsen
Chamberlain	Horan	Nix
Chelf	Hosmer	Norrell
Chenoweth	Huddleston	O'Brien, Ill.
Church	Hull	O'Brien. N.Y.
Clark	Ikard	O'Hara, Ill.
Coad	Inouye	O'Hara, Mich.
Coffin	Irwin	O'Konski
Cohelan	Jarman	O'Neill
Collier	Jennings	Oliver
Conte	Johnson, Calif.	Osmers
Cook	Johnson, Colo.	Ostertag
Cooley	Johnson, Md.	Patman
Corbett	Johnson, Wis.	Pelly
Curtin	Jonas	Perkins
Curtis, Mass.	Jones, Ala.	Philbin
Curtis, Mo.	Jones, Mo.	Pirnie
Daddario	Judd	Porter
Dague	Karsten	Powell
Daniels	Karth	Price
Davis, Tenn.	Kasem	Prokop
Dawson	Kastenmeier	Pucinski
Delaney	Kearns	Quie
Dent	Kee	Quigley
Denton	Keith	Rabaut
Derounian	Kelly	Rains
Derwinski	Keogh	Randall
Diggs	Kilday	Reece, Tenn.
Dingell	Kilgore	Rees, Kans.
Dixon	King, Calif.	Reuss
Donohue	King, Utah	Rhodes, Pa.
Dorn, N.Y.	Kirwan	Riehlman
Downing	Kluczynski	Rivers, Alaska
Dulski	Knox	Roberts
Dwyer	Kowalski	Robison
Edmondson	Kyl	Rodino
Elliott, Ala.	Laird	Rogers, Colo.
Elliott, Pa.	Lane	Rogers, Fla.
Everett	Langen	Rogers, Mass.
Evins	Lankford	Rooney
Roosevelt	Stratton	Wallhauser
Rostenkowski	Stubblefield	Walter
Roush	Sullivan	Wampler
Rutherford	Teague, Calif.	Watts
St. George	Teller	Weis
Santangelo	Thomas	Westland
Saund	Thompson, N.J.	Wharton
Schneebeli	Thompson, Tex.	Widnall
Schwengel	Thornberry	Wier
Selden	Toll	Wilson
Shelley	Tollefson	Wolf
Shipley	Trimble	Wright
Sikes	Udall	Yates
Sisk	Ullman	Young
Slack	Vanik	Younger
Smith, Iowa	Van Zandt	Zablocki
Staggers	Wainwright	Zelenko

NAYS—97

Abbitt	Gary	Pillion
Abernethy	Gathings	Poage
Alger	Goodell	Poff
Allen	Haley	Preston
Ashmore	Halleck	Ray
Avery	Harrison	Rhodes, Ariz.
Barden	Hemphill	Riley
Baumhart	Henderson	Rivers, S.C.
Bennett, Fla.	Herlong	Rogers, Tex.
Berry	Hess	Saylor
Betts	Hiestand	Schenck
Blitch	Hoffman, Ill.	Scherer
Bolton	Hoffman, Mich.	Short
Bow	Jackson	Simpson
Boykin	Jensen	Smith, Calif.
Brooks, La.	Johansen	Smith, Kans.
Brown, Ga.	Kitchin	Smith, Miss.
Brown, Ohio	Lafore	Smith, Va.
Broyhill	Landrum	Springer
Budge	Latta	Taber
Burleson	Lipscomb	Teague, Tex.
Byrnes, Wis.	McCulloch	Thomson, Wyo.
Chiperfield	McDonough	Tuck
Colmer	McMillan	Utt
Cramer	McSween	Van Pelt
Cunningham	Marshall	Vinson
Davis, Ga.	Mason	Weaver
Devine	Michel	Whitener
Dorn, S.C.	Minshall	Whitten
Dowdy	Murray	Williams
Fisher	Norblad	Withrow
Flynt	Passman	
Forrester	Pilcher	

NOT VOTING—26

Alexander	Cederberg	Sheppard
Barry	Dooley	Siler
Bentley	Doyle	Spence
Blatnik	Durham	Steed
Boland	Hébert	Taylor
Bonner	Kilburn	Thompson, La.
Brewster	Machrowicz	Willis
Buckley	Pfost	Winstead
Canfield	Scott	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Canfield for, with Mr. Taylor against.
Mr. Siler for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
Mr. Bentley for, with Mr. Dooley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Tollefson with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Cederberg with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Sheppard.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10128) to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10128, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I understand that inquiry has been made about the program for the rest of the week. I want to take this opportunity to advise the Members that if this bill is disposed of on tomorrow, and if there is no opportunity to bring up the bill H.R. 11761, there will be no further business for the balance of the week. In other words, we will complete consideration of this bill this week. It is the intention to meet on Friday so we can adjourn over until Tuesday rather than going from Thursday to Monday, which is May 30.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. What will happen to the two agricultural bills that were scheduled for consideration this week?

Mr. McCORMACK. If we dispose of this bill in time to bring up one of them, I should like to call up for consideration the Farmers Home Administration bill. The other one will go over until next week anyway. Maybe both of them will go over until next week. But if we complete this bill on tomorrow, and I imagine it will take a good part of tomorrow, and there is no time to consider one of these bills, it is our intention to have no more legislative business except, as I said, if there is time we will consider H.R. 11761. We do not intend to have any legislation up for consideration on Friday. We will meet only to adjourn so that we may go over until Tuesday rather than to adjourn from Thursday to Monday.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. I understand the majority leader has asked the House to convene at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. McCORMACK. I already have that permission.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, for the third time within the last 4 years, I speak here on the floor of the House in behalf of a bill authorizing appropriations to assist the States in the construction of public school facilities.

The bill that I recommend to my colleagues today is a compromise bill. You might say that it is the result of 4 years of effort to draft language which can be supported by every Member of the House who believes that it is necessary for the Federal Government to participate in the effort to improve educational opportunities for our boys and girls.

Before going into a summary of the bill, I should like to discuss the problem and the approach we have made to it in this bill.

In the first place I do not believe there is any responsible citizen of this country who does not believe that improvement is needed in our educational systems. In order to meet the challenge of the cold war, as well as the challenge of the future, we must make it possible to offer higher caliber educational opportunities to a greater number of boys and girls. To say that we believe this is almost as if we were to announce our opposition to sin.

Regardless of the cliches, better caliber education does cost more money; in fact, even if our quality of education were to remain static, the cost would rise as enrollment increases, so dollars become an important factor in improving education.

I, for one, am firmly convinced that the Federal Government has an interest in improving education. We have that interest because of our requirements for national security, and we have that responsibility because of the very high mobility of our population. There was once a time, perhaps, when the people of one section of the country just did not give a tinker's damn about the education offered in another section of the country. Even if that were ever true, it is no longer the case. So the only way in which citizens in one area may express an interest in the educational opportunities of another area, is through the Federal Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am not noted for having a pleasant disposition, and today it is especially bad, and I just want to tell the gentleman that I am going to hang around today and see that we have a quorum in order that the gentleman can be heard.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman. You are a gentleman and a scholar.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You deserve it.

Mr. BAILEY. Now, we have in this great land of ours a long tradition that education is controlled at the local level. Therefore, no one is about to suggest that the Federal Government express its interest in improved educational opportunities by imposing standards, by determining curricula, by determining teacher qualifications, and so on and so forth.

That leaves to the Federal Government only one avenue of assistance in upgrading educational opportunities, and that is by utilization of its broader tax base to provide the necessary funds.

Therefore, we come to the number of dollars which the Federal Government shall contribute; the purpose for which they will be contributed, and the duration of Federal participation, as the issues to be resolved. Broadly speaking, advocates of Federal participation fall into two major groups: One, those who feel that the Federal dollar should be used for the broadest possible support of education; and, two, those who feel that the Federal Government should be limited to what our colleague from Pennsylvania refers to as "brick and mortar."

Many who recognize the need for Federal participation—such as the President of the United States and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—have expressed the fear that if the Federal dollar is used for the payment of salaries of teachers, the risk of Federal control is too great. They subscribe to the theory that if the Federal Government assists in financing the cost of classroom construction, it will release additional State and local dollars to be used to pay higher teachers' salaries and for other educational costs. Furthermore, these folks believe that the best way to express the Federal responsibility is to get in now and get out quickly.

So, we have a bill which is confined to classroom construction assistance, and one that has the Federal Government getting out within 3 years; except for those States, if any, who choose the administration's debt retirement option.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that some of us have an additional feeling that if we can afford to spend millions of dollars building classrooms all over the world, we can also afford to spend some money for the same purpose here at home. I am advised that the current foreign aid appropriations bill contains something over $41 million in new money for educational purposes. This does not include an item of $20 million in the children's fund which is mostly educational. During recent years, we have spent over $100 million on education in the rest of the world, but not $1 to provide much needed classrooms in the United States except under Public Law 815, which, in part, is a payment in lieu of taxes.

Now what is the need, if any, for Federal assistance for classroom construction? As was indicated in the majority report, this bill was drafted with the 1959 survey on enrollment, teachers, and school housing as a basis. This is a survey conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Department obtains its information from the people who have the most knowledge of conditions in the States—the chief State school officers.

Through the years it has been a favorite pastime of many to play a "numbers game" with these annual surveys. Admittedly, they are not precise data, but if they are reviewed in the proper light, they become very persuasive, and, they do, in fact, clearly reflect trends.

The General Education Subcommittee, which has primary jurisdiction over this legislation within the Committee on Education and Labor, has been dealing with these surveys for a number of years. It is our considered conclusion that if the estimates submitted by the chief State school officers of needed classroom construction within the individual States have erred, they have done so on the conservative side. Furthermore, some of the data included in the fall survey are not subject to estimation, but are readily determinable. The data to which I refer are the figures on classrooms built and those on pupil enrollment. It is extremely significant to note that from the fall of 1956 to the fall of 1959, 210,730 classrooms have been constructed in the

50 States and the District of Columbia, and yet, as of last September, the number of pupils in excess of normal capacity was 1,883,000.

This clearly indicates that the States and local communities are making a tremendous effort to provide the classrooms necessary to educate our boys and girls, but they are falling short by more than 50,000 as of this school year.

The bill, H.R. 10128, provided the maximum amount of Federal and State dollars are used, will construct between 40,000 and 41,000 classrooms.

We have another yardstick against which to measure the data submitted by the Department, and that is the experience under Public Laws 815 and 874. These two programs operate in every State in the Union. On the basis of the final applications for current year entitlement submitted by about 75 percent of the participating school districts, we find that enrollment of Federally connected children has increased during the present school year by 8 percent from the 1958–59 school year, and that the cost per pupil has risen by 8 percent. I should point out that the per pupil cost under Public Law 874 is tied directly to the per pupil expenditures by the States and local communities. I believe this proves conclusively that the States and local communities will find it increasingly difficult to do more than try to keep pace with the rising tide of enrollment.

The favorite phase of the annual survey, which those who play the numbers game seize upon are the statistics relating to the obsolescent classrooms. The numbers game people would have us believe that some sinister plot exists to declare obsolete any schoolhouse that is somewhat less sumptuous than the most recently constructed luxury hotel on the Florida gold coast. Yet we find that time and again even our most modern schoolbuildings fall short of being adequate. We have seen a prime example under our very noses. Recently an elementary school at West Lanham Hills in Prince Georges County, Md., burned. Fortunately, the fire occurred at night when not one of the 600 pupils was in the building. The building was constructed in 1952. The Washington Evening Star for Thursday, March 24, in a page 1 news item had this to say:

> County Fire Marshal Lawrence R. Woltz said if the school had been equipped with the proper number of firestops—areas insulated with sheetrock—the damage would have been confined to a much smaller area. He said that the county building code calls for firestops, but it has not been enforced.
>
> Just last month architects told school officers that if the code was rigidly enforced, the cost of schools would rise 10 to 15 percent.

Fortunately, Mr. Chairman, not one life was lost in that fire, but I believe it points up the manner in which local school officials have been forced to cut corners to stretch the school dollar just as far as it possibly will go.

Let me give you one other example. One evening late last fall, at about 6:30, in Salt Lake City, Utah, a young mother came to the schoolhouse to pick up her 6-year-old daughter. Driving slowly, she turned a corner and ran over a 9-year-old boy coming home from this same schoolhouse on his bicycle. The boy died. This tragedy happened because the 9-year-old boy and the 6-year-old girl were attending school on a swing shift, and during many months of the school year, the schoolday closed after darkness had fallen.

Do we dare, Mr. Chairman, to beguile ourselves with doctrinaire arguments and the numbers game when newspapers remind us that the lives of children—the same little children we expect to lead us tomorrow—are endangered? I think not. Mr. Chairman, before going into the summary of the bill itself, I should like to discuss one other survey made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I refer to the survey of public school classroom shortages in the fall of 1959 in borrowed-up districts.

This survey showed that in 237 borrowed-up districts there was a classroom shortage of 3,056. Now, these data would tend to indicate that the problem of classroom shortage in school districts unable to finance new construction is very small.

The Department itself admitted that its definition of a borrowed-up district was narrow and restricted. It further admonished that only a small part of the problem of financing school construction is measured by the survey—the first such survey that has ever been undertaken. Furthermore, the Department is conducting a new survey in somewhat more detail in an attempt to determine the number of school districts where the issuance of new bonds is a practical as well as a legal impossibility.

I think I should need only to point out that in my own State of West Virginia, there are at least seven counties which, under the narrow limitations of the survey conducted in February of this year, would be shown to have borrowing capacity, but whose borrowing capacity amounted to $25,000 or less. In the fall of 1957, the Subcommittee on General Education submitted a questionnaire to each of the school districts in the county that has participated in Public Law 815 and Public Law 874. School district after school district reported that when they had used up 75 to 80 percent of their legal debt limit, it became a practical impossibility to market construction bonds.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill is not limited to the narrow purpose of providing classrooms only to those areas where there remains no more bonding capacity and where there exists a shortage of classrooms.

The goal of this bill, as well as the program recommended by the administration, is not only to accomplish this purpose, but to provide some assistance that will in turn release to the local community tax dollars for teachers' salaries.

This bill, H.R. 10128, is a modest bill. The annual appropriation of 325 million is the amount the President recommended himself in 1957. We have compromised conflicting ideologies within the subcommittee by having it a straight grant for the first year, and by providing for matching for the second and third year; also during the second and third year, we have given to the States the option of a capital grant or of debt retirement assistance. I might point out that this is the big area of compromise between the majority members of the committee and the administration.

The number of classrooms to be constructed under this bill is between 40 and 41 thousand, somewhat less than the number required to take care of the excess enrollment at the beginning of 1959, so that however you play the "numbers game," the bill is aimed most directly at the shortage that may be most accurately measured. Moreover, we have provided in the bill that the State education agency will make reports to the Commissioner annually with respect to the progress of construction of school facilities on forms to be provided by the Commissioner, and we require that the Commissioner shall report these data to the Congress. In this way we believe we can determine accurately whether this bill is adequate or inadequate.

This is a good bill, and if we pass it, I am confident we can reach an early agreement with the other body, and I believe that its modesty will act in its favor at the White House.

In February 1960 during hearings on the mutual security bill, Mrs. CHURCH asked—page 20, part 1 of hearings:

> What is the whole amount in the proposed bill for educational purposes?

Agency supplied the following information—page 34:

> In addition to the $20 million program for education and training in tropical Africa, the proposed fiscal year 1961 programs includes $41,955,000 in the field of education per se. This amount is made up of $31,676,000 under the bilateral technical cooperation program; $7,519,000 under special assistance; and $2,760,000 under defense support.
>
> It could be said that the entire technical cooperation program for which $206,500,000 is requested, is "education," in that it is primarily a program of exchange of knowledge. On this basis, the total for education and training in the fiscal year 1961 request is $236,779,000.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. Briefly.

Mr. DENT. Is it the gentleman's understanding that under the present amended Mutual Security Act counterpart funds owed to the United States by debtor nations are forgiven if that country uses said funds for educational purposes or loans them to other underdeveloped nations for educational purposes?

Mr. BAILEY. Provided they are allowed to engage in other improvements of a local character. What I am trying to say is that it is not confined alone to education. They can use it for educational purposes but there are other purposes for which they are permitted to use it.

Mr. DENT. The main point that I am trying to make is that the debts are forgiven if they use the money for educational purposes; and these debts represent American taxpayer dollars.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, let me make this observation. During recent years we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars on education in the rest of the world but not one dollar to provide much needed classrooms in these United States, except under Public Law 815 which in part is for payment in lieu of taxes.

May I remind you that I was the sponsor of Public Law 815. I know before the afternoon's debate is over somebody is going to say to the members of the Committee that it is a bad precedent for the Federal Government to get into the field of local educational matters. They say it is a bad precedent.

Let me remind the Members of the House today that in 1836 during the second administration of Andrew Jackson the Congress of the United States found itself with $47 million surplus in the Treasury. Do you know what the Congress did at that time? They passed legislation and they passed an appropriation distributing that money to the 38 States then members of the Union for the purpose of building school buildings. Every one of the 38 States took the money and built school buildings with it, and they did not destroy the National Constitution and they did not destroy the American way of life. The passage of this legislation today to build some classrooms will not destroy our Constitution nor destroy the American way of life.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Has the gentleman the thought in his mind that we will ever have a surplus in the Federal Government again?

Mr. BAILEY. We claimed to have money at the end of the last fiscal year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know, but I mean actually, does the gentleman think we will ever have any loose money?

Mr. BAILEY. I have never seen a balanced budget in the 14 years I have been in Congress, actually balanced. If I stay here 14 years more I do not expect to see one.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If you would cut out some of the things that you folks are competing for we might have one.

Mr. BAILEY. There the gentleman and I can agree.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to give my distinguished colleague 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Would the gentleman care to discuss section 4(d) at this time, or would he prefer to have the discussion of that feature delayed until the general debate has gone on further?

Mr. BAILEY. I am sure the author of the bill, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], who will be called on shortly, will give the gentleman the details. I am not prepared to analyze the bill section by section.

I would like to mention one other point. I mentioned previously the question of setting a precedent. How many Members of the House or of the committee, may I inquire, have any idea that under Public Law 815, the construction act of which the gentleman from California who addressed the House during the consideration of the rule is one of the largest beneficiaries. And I am talking now about Public Law 815. The gentleman from California is inclined to get money out of the Federal Treasury under Public Law 815 for those districts, and let me say that California got $37 million under the bill last year, and a good, big part of it went to the gentleman's district and, yet, he will not support general classroom construction.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield, yes; but I do not want an argument. I yield to the gentleman for an answer.

Mr. HIESTAND. I will say, since the gentleman has pointed me out, I appreciate his position, but we are not asking for any more money in those areas. In fact, I do not think we need any more money at all.

Mr. BAILEY. I am glad to know the gentleman is in the midst of prosperity.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] in support of the administration bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is obvious already that this subject we are discussing today is one in which there are sharp differences of opinion. Certainly, I will not attempt to resolve those differences. At the outset, I should like to make my own position clear.

I am very much in favor of a reasonable Federal program of assistance to help to build needed classrooms. Without any question there is a continuing and pressing need for such classrooms. That need, in my opinion, justifies an emergency Federal program to meet this shortage. I realize, of course, these questions of what constitutes an emergency and how long the program should be, are ones which cannot be resolved simply. In my opinion, if we do enact legislation and the shortage of classrooms is thereby substantially reduced, the emergency will cease and the need for a continuation of the program will be eliminated.

I feel a Federal program should be adequate in scope and the money should be allocated where it will be most useful. It should be developed along lines which are consistent with sound fiscal policy. For that reason I am very strongly in favor of the proposals of the administration in this area.

These proposals are incorporated in two bills, H.R. 11122, which I introduced on March 11, and H.R. 12259, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS]. In my opinion, these bills, if enacted, would provide a far less expensive way for the Federal Government to give assistance, and would build far more schools than the bill which we are presently considering. An estimated 75,000 classrooms could be built under this program as compared with a total of something over 40,000 under the committee bill.

If those of us who favor the administration approach are not successful in prevailing on this body to accept those ideas, I feel strongly that the committee bill should be tightened. I am often asked what sort of a bill this is that the committee has approved. What does it provide? How does it compare with the bills defeated on the House floor in 1956 and 1957? I am also asked along a slightly different vein how good a bill is this? How effective will it be? How might it be improved?

For me, the best way to provide any serious evaluation of the bill is to review previous efforts which have been made to develop school construction legislation. A brief, and of necessity oversimplified, recapitulation will reveal, among other things, that the present sharp disagreement regarding the Federal Government's responsibilities in this area is nothing new. Neither are we discussing for the first time the difficulty of developing a specific program, even though a majority unquestionably favors some form of assistance. Indeed, we must admit, disagreement on such points has led us previously to deadlock and defeat.

Many of us will recall that H.R. 7535 was defeated by a vote of 194 to 224 on July 5, 1956. Just over a year later, on July 25, 1957, H.R. 1 was defeated by the narrow margin of 208–203. Both these bills were commonly known by the name of their sponsor, the popular and respected gentleman from Pennsylvania, the late Augustus Kelley. I trust that in our present deliberations that the reasons for defeat of these bills can be examined, and a similar result avoided this year.

The Kelley bills had evolved slowly over a period of years and after the accumulation of considerable testimony. I was first assigned to the Education and Labor Committee back in January 1953, at a time when a new Republican President and the 83d Republican-controlled Congress were assuming historic new responsibilities. Our initial efforts as a committee under the inspired leadership of Mr. McConnell as chairman, were aimed first at the knotty question of amending the Taft-Hartley law.

A special subcommittee on education was established in the 83d Congress. It was headed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS], presently our distinguished ranking Republican and always a source of strength on educational matters. In December 1954, that subcommittee, of which I was a member, unanimously recommended that Congress promptly take steps the following year to enact Federal legislation "to encourage State and local efforts" to meet the construction problem. "Care must be taken," this report continued, "to avoid any possibility of Federal control over local school systems, or any tendency for Federal action to supplement State and local efforts."

In January 1955 President Eisenhower in the State of the Union message called attention to "grave educational problems" and "an unprecedented classroom shortage." The next month he sent an historic special message on education to Congress. I say historic advisedly for no President ever before had specifically addressed himself to this subject. Specific recommendations were made for Federal action to meet an "emergency" shortage of classrooms. These formed the basis for legislation which was developed some time later.

Just prior to this message, I might say, the other body through its Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, had begun hearings, presumably aimed at shaping legislation. Mrs. Oveta Hobby, the then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, was sharply questioned regarding her views, even before she could finish advising the President as to the kind of program he should recommend to Congress. The able Senator from Alabama, LISTER HILL, then as now was keenly interested in these matters.

Regrettably, however, nothing came of these early activities of the other body. It was the House Committee on Education and Labor which in the following years took the initiative. Bills were approved in the field of school construction, and legislation developed which resulted in the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Indeed, it was not until February 4, 1960, that the Senate again seized the initiative by passing S. 8.

We all know in a general way at least that this proposal, if enacted, would authorize a 2-year broad program of aid, costing some $1.8 billion, available both to build schools and to pay teachers. Despite this vote I have been unable to detect, either now or previously, much enthusiasm for this approach to an admittedly difficult question, that of developing an appropriate Federal role in strengthening our educational system.

While on the subject of S. 8, I might remind my colleagues that this bill was passed by a vote of 51 to 34. That would seem to reflect the opinion of a substantial majority of the other body, not only that something should be done, but also what the specific program should be. Efforts to restrict S. 8 so as to provide aid only in the building of schools were beaten off. Partly perhaps because of the strenuous activities of organizations representing teachers, Federal funds were specifically to be made available to help improve teachers' salaries.

This reference to S. 8 leads logically, though not chronologically, to H.R. 22. This bill was approved by our Committee on Education and Labor on June 8, 1959. It is more familiarly known by the names of its two distinguished sponsors from Montana, Senator MURRAY and Mr. METCALF, the latter for several years an able member of our Education and Labor Committee. This bill incidentally was discussed, along with H.R. 10128, by the Rules Committee only last week.

As the committee report on H.R. 10128 reveals, though somewhat cryptically, H.R. 22 has certain weaknesses. The bill apparently has flaws which would make its consideration by the House less likely to be successful than a more modest program. Those who had reported the bill favorably in June 1959 admitted, on page 7 of the present committee report, that by September it has become apparent that a bill as broad in scope as H.R. 22 would not be considered by the House of Representatives. It was for that reason that the bill we are presently discussing was developed.

Nonetheless it must be recognized that H.R. 22 is closer to the provisions of S. 8 than to H.R. 10128. Both bills involve large expenditures with few strings. In both, Federal funds can be used to pay teachers' salaries. Efforts may easily be made to broaden H.R. 10128 along the lines of H.R. 22. I trust that will not succeed. Excessive broadening of this bill could weaken its chances for enactment. What we need is not a scatter shot approach but a carefully defined Federal program.

H.R. 22, despite weaknesses, is one of the relatively few major current proposals for providing Federal aid. For that reason, perhaps, it should be described briefly. Even though apparently abandoned by many of its sponsors, its provisions may give us perspective. H.R. 22 as originally introduced would provide an estimated $4.4 billion annually for four years in Federal grants, allocated on the basis of school-age population. In committee the annual cost was reduced to $1.1 billion annually. No State matching of Federal grants was required, and the funds could be used by States for school construction or teachers' salaries. It can be argued that a broad diffusion of dollars such as envisaged in H.R. 22, without any attempt to define areas of need, would not result in an effective Federal program.

For those Members who were not here in 1956 and 1597, it should be noted that H.R. 22 abandons the legislative approach attempted in those years. The bills developed then sought to "pinpoint" aid to needy school districts. On both those earlier occasions, and now in H.R. 10128, the only aim has been to help build needed classrooms, not to subsidize teachers. All these bills differ also from H.R. 22 in their recognition of the value of matching Federal funds.

Perhaps a brief summary of the Kelley bills would be in order at this point. In 1956, H.R. 7535 provided for $400 million for each of 4 years, allocated on the basis of school-age population. In addition, provision was made for the purchase of school bonds under certain circumstances, from a revolving fund of $750 million. There was also to be a Federal contribution totaling $150 million to a reserve fund equal to a year's principal and interest on local school bonds.

In 1957, H.R. 1 would have authorized a 5-year program, with a total of $1.5 billion in grants to States on a dollar-matching basis. The allocation was to be made half on the basis of school-age population, and half on the basis of a State's per capita income and its effort to meet school needs. Once again provision was made for a $750 million revolving fund, and $150 million to improve the credit of State construction agencies.

This hasty recapitulation, I hope, indicates the type of programs actively considered in previous years. Both Kelley bills bear certain similarities to H.R. 10128. Nonetheless there are dissimilarities too.

For instance, no provision is now being made for the direct purchase of bonds. Instead of setting up a reserve to bolster the credit of locally issued bonds, the Federal Government is now agreeing, if any State so elects, to pay half of the principal and interest on certain bonds as they come due.

This brings me to the crucial questions. "How effective a bill is this? How could it be improved?" As has already been said, H.R. 10128 has much of the same kind of appeal as previous school construction bills. Appeal may not be quite the right word, but at least a program such as this might accelerate needed classroom construction.

In my personal opinion, however, other programs might be more effective, and less costly, than that contemplated in H.R. 10128. Federal grants-in-aid may not be the best way for Washington to lend a hand. I say this recognizing fully that President Eisenhower has in the past advocated this method of providing assistance. The administration's current recommendations, embodied in my bill, H.R. 11122, and Mr. KEARNS' bill, H.R. 12259, may provide far more help in building classrooms at far less annual cost.

The administration proposals would advocate over a 20- to 30-year period the expenditure of something over $2 billion of Federal money. This would be provided to States to help pay one-half of the annual principal and interest on a total of $3 billion of local school bonds. Under this program the impact on the budget would be far less than a direct capital grant program such as we are considering in H.R. 10128.

In the initial year, for instance, it is estimated that only $5 million would be needed. At the end of 5 years when the maximum expenditure will be contemplated no more than $90 million would be required.

The amounts allocated would be based on a combination of three factors: The relative income per child of school age in each State, the relative number of public school children in that State, and the relative financial effort for school purposes made by the State.

The allocation thus made would be reduced by the percentage, if any, that the State school effort index was less than the national index. A State school effort index, I might add, would be determined on the basis of the ratio of school expenditure per child in average daily attendance in public elementary or secondary schools to the State's income per child of school age.

This proposal would require a State plan which would restrict Federal grants to those local educational agencies which undertook to exert a reasonable

tax effort in financing their own school construction needs, and which would still be unable to finance their own school buildings even if they exerted this reasonable tax effort and fully utilized resources from all sources to pay the principal and interest on school bonds.

The plan would set forth standards of procedures for determining what a reasonable tax effort would be for each local educational agency. The highest priority would be given to those local school districts which would be least able to finance the full cost of urgently needed school facilities.

That, very briefly, is the basic approach of the administration's recommendations. However, as a practical matter, we must admit that Federal grants are a traditional form of assistance. Therefore, regrettably, the alternative which I favor may not be accepted. If that should be the case, it seems to me that H.R. 10128 very definitely needs improvement.

In the first place, the allocation of funds now proposed is simply on the basis of school age population. In other words, a State will receive an allocation based simply on the number of children of school age residing in the State as compared to the total in the Nation. In my opinion, the per capita income of a State should also be considered in any allocation of funds.

An even more serious weakness of the committee bill is its failure to provide for any matching by the States of Federal funds until the second year of the program. It is my hope to offer an amendment to provide for immediate matching. This is a valid and generally accepted principle which, as I have indicated, has been incorporated in bills considered by this body in 1956 and 1957. Matching of Federal grants is almost universally accepted as a reasonable way for the Federal Government to provide assistance. The recipient benefits from this encouragement of additional assistance from other levels of government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that unless the administration bill, so-called, which he referred to, is approved anything else would be unacceptable? Is that the term the gentleman used?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I can only reply to the gentleman by stating that I speak for myself and I assume the gentleman is speaking of my position.

I voted favorably on H.R. 10128 in the committee. If I have no alternative, I would certainly accept the basic provisions of the committee bill. However, I will try to improve those provisions.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman said he was talking about the administration bill, and I got the impression you take the administration bill or nothing. Was I wrong about that?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would accept a bill along these lines.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today, H.R. 10128, is in its very essence as simple, uncomplicated, and unadorned a bill as those of us who have been struggling with this problem for a number of years can design.

Briefly, it provides for the expenditure of $325 million a year for each of the next 3 fiscal years. The allocation is on the basis of the school-age population of the States; that is, the number of children between the ages of 5 and 17 years in those States, and the proportion in the State to the proportion in the Nation. The bill calls for matching in the second and third years, and in the first year for direct grants of each State's allocation. This was done after considerable thought relating to the problems of the States which have legislatures which do not meet each year, and to the immediate need for moneys to reach the States for classroom construction. In this manner the States can begin construction by the direct allocation of the first year's funds and will have time for their legislatures to meet and enact the necessary legislation, if required.

The funds appropriated are to remain allocated for a 3-year period, thus anticipating any legal difficulties which might arise in the State. The bill requires each State educational agency simply to certify that it has a plan and that the State educational agency will administer the plan. It has a very strong Federal disclaimer section.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point for a question?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. I regret to interrupt the gentleman's train of thought, but while you are on this question of Federal control I wonder if you would give the committee your opinion—and I am sure the committee will have a great deal of respect for the distinguished gentleman's opinion, because he is a very able attorney—with regard to whether any money allocated to a State school system or to an individual school system which practices segregation in the public schools could be withheld from that State by the Commissioner of Education or by any executive direction from the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Since the Supreme Court's decision in the case of Brown against The Board of Education, a decision which was based on the 14th amendment of the Federal Constitution, segregation of school facilities is unconstitutional and the States, through that decision, have been directed to proceed with deliberate speed to desegregate. Those which are proceeding with deliberate speed need have no fear. It would be my opinion that individual school districts in defiance of the opinion, without the addition of any amendment to this legislation, which would be extraneous—because we do not need legislation with respect to self-enacting clauses of the Constitution—could be deprived by enforcement of the existing law if they were in defiance, by order of the U.S. Attorney General.

Only after it has been adjudicated that a local school district is in defiance of the Supreme Court decision would the Commissioner be authorized to withhold funds from that district. The gentleman will note from the language of H.R. 10128 that it is mandatory for the Commissioner to allot funds to which a State is entitled and he must do so within 60 days after appropriation. Thus the funds would be in the hands of the State authorities. The fact that one or two authorized districts may be adjudicated in defiance by the Federal district court under Brown against The Board of Education, would mean only that those particular districts could be denied funds. In these cases, however, the Commissioner would not be authorized to withhold any of the funds from the State and, in turn, it follows that all other districts in the State would be clearly entitled to their share of the funds. The gentleman might note further that in the cases where the Federal Government intervened, State funds only have been involved.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further for just one brief question?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. LANDRUM. Would the gentleman state that he intends to say to the committee that it is his opinion that with or without to so-called Powell amendment, or segregation amendment, money could be withheld from a State or a school district—which is in defiance of the Supreme Court decision against segregation in public schools?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I do not know how my opinion would clarify the legal question; but it is my estimation that with or without a segregation amendment the law enforcement agencies of the Federal Government could deny funds to school districts that are in defiance of the courts.

Mr. LANDRUM. And is it the opinion of the distinguished author of this bill that the executive agency should deny those funds?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It happens to be my personal opinion, yes.

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. UDALL. The point that I think our colleague from Georgia misses—and I wonder if my colleague would agree with me on this—is that compliance is a matter of the practice of each school district. In his own State of Georgia today, for example, there are no school districts any of us know of that are not complying, that are under court orders, and under Public Law 815 and 874, there

is no obstruction to the receipt of Federal funds under any programs there at the present time.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is precisely the point.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further to me?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LANDRUM. I want to ask another question of the distinguished author of this bill relating to another field entirely. With regard to school districts now bonded to capacity under their State constitutions for school building purposes, is it the opinion of the distinguished author of this bill that school districts which are bonded to capacity, where the buildings have already been constructed, can receive any money under this bill for the payment of bonds issued to build buildings already constructed?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I conceive this to be a prospective bill. It is designed to build school buildings, and my answer would be in the negative. I might point out to the gentleman, however, that the funds are to be distributed on the basis of need within the States by the State agencies, and that there will be in many, many States sufficient tax relief so that the State will have funds freed to alleviate the distress of those districts in financial trouble now.

Mr. LANDRUM. One additional question, if the gentleman will kindly indulge me further.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I believe I can answer the gentleman's question, if the gentleman will yield to me.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. On page 14 of the gentleman's bill, subsection (d), there is clearly answered the question of the gentleman from Georgia:

> No funds from any year's allotment shall be used to assist in financing, through grants under section 5(a) or through Federal commitments under section 5(b), any of the costs of constructing a school facilities project which are incurred prior to the approval of such project by the State educational agency or prior to the beginning of the fiscal year for which such allotment is made.

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman from Montana. I agree that the bill does prohibit such payments, but I wanted to ask this of its author. Then a school district which is bonded to capacity but still in need of additional classrooms, cannot get any money under this bill except by direct grant; is that right? If it must do any matching, there is no money available; is that correct?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It is correct if one assumes that the State is so impoverished that the relief which it will get through this legislation cannot be distributed to that district. So that I would say as a practical matter the answer would be in the negative.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I notice in the gentleman's report that there is a list of States showing how much would be allocated. I believe Alabama starts off with about $5 million a year. If the States cannot assume their responsibilities now to construct schoolhouses and if the people of the States are unwilling to do that—and my people have assumed their responsibilities—where are they going to get the matching funds, if they have not had the guts or the sense of responsibility to build schoolhouses up to this point?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I do not think there is a State in the Union that has not made absolutely prodigious efforts in this direction. The fact is, however, that they are simply unable to transfer any further onto the backs of the local property owners more ad valorem taxes and school district taxes.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Would not the matching funds come from more ad valorem taxes? They have got to come from the people in some way.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It is inconceivable to me that any State in the Union would be unable to raise any of the matching funds required.

Mr. HEMPHILL. If they are able to raise the matching funds they ought to be able to raise the original school construction funds, if they are willing as States to assume their constitutional responsibility. I can cite the gentleman certain States which do not believe in integration but which have built schoolhouses. The people of South Carolina have built their schoolhouses.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. We are perfectly willing to help you because we pay more taxes than you do.

There has been a question raised by the distinguished gentleman from California in the minority report to the effect that there are only 237 districts in the United States which have reached the limit of their bonded indebtedness. I should like to put this to rest. The fact is that a survey was made on a very narrow ground by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It has been expanded. It has been ascertained since that figure came to light in a colloquy between two Members of the other body that there are 131,000 classrooms short in the United States.

In this connection I have the statistics available of two States, statistics made available since that survey. The State of Pennsylvania, which was shown as having very few classrooms short in the original survey on the narrow ground, in answer to the expanded line of questions from the Secretary has reported, after a careful survey, a shortage of 5,000 classrooms in 868 school districts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Will the gentleman from Georgia yield me his time? The gentleman in our colloquy said he would yield.

Mr. LANDRUM. If the Chairman is inclined to yield the gentleman the time, I will be glad to give it to the gentleman.

Mr. BARDEN. I want to know if the gentleman will be in my corner of the ring when the time comes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I probably will not vote the same way the gentleman will, but I am for him otherwise.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HIESTAND. In view of the fact that the gentleman referred to the statement I made in the minority report, may I ask if I understand him correctly to say that there are 800-some districts that are in financial trouble?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is in the State of Pennsylvania alone.

Mr. HIESTAND. Does the gentleman have a national figure he can give us at this time?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. We are informed by the Secretary that there are in the United States 131,000-some-odd classrooms short as of now.

Mr. HIESTAND. That is classrooms. I meant school districts in trouble.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The Secretary informed us only the day before yesterday that the survey is not complete. I have the figures for New Jersey and Pennsylvania here. I might point out to the gentleman from California that with respect to New Jersey, for the period 1958–59, 96 hearings were held on applications of borrowed-up districts. Sixty-three hearings between July 1, 1959, and March 1, 1960, were held on applications involving $77 million.

May I point out further that in the State of New Jersey, which has spent an average of $100 million a year for the last several years, 100,000 children are housed in substandard facilities or attend school on a part-time basis.

Mr. HIESTAND. That is on the basis of figures of districts in trouble?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. These statistics are from a letter dated March 25, 1960, from the New Jersey Department of Education.

Mr. HIESTAND. Would the gentleman care to project that nationally and hazard a guess as to the number of districts in trouble financially?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I cannot hazard a guess of the number that are in trouble financially because the standards vary so.

Mr. HIESTAND. Or those that are financed up to their limit?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I have no way of ascertaining that.

Mr. Chairman, for all practical purposes, this survey on the narrow ground on which it was made and the results of which were taken out of context does not include, for instance, a school district which has borrowed to within 5 percent of its statutory limitation and which, if it needed to construct classrooms or needed to raise money to construct needed classrooms, would go, perhaps, 50 percent over. So that you see this was on the narrowest possible ground, as the Secretary stated, in an exchange of letters with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

There are, the fact is, a great many and an unascertained number of bor-

rowed up districts and there are 131 thousand and some odd hundred classrooms short. This does not count a recent calculation. It was only a couple of months ago, last August, when Secretary Flemming said:

> However, if we add 5.9 million urban elementary pupils affected by overcrowding merely to the 1.8 million pupils enrolled in excess of capacity throughout the Nation, we have a figure of about 8 million children. We know, however, this is by no means the total number of pupils affected by crowding since it does not take into account additional pupils affected in this way in any high school or any rural school, elementary school anywhere in the Nation.
>
> Even this is not the only disturbing fact about the classroom shortage for in addition to the pupils reported as excess in the national study, there are more than 2 million others estimated as housed in obsolete or otherwise inadequate buildings. By this measurement alone, therefore, the number of pupils whose education is being impaired in varying degrees is about 10 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Pennsylvania have any time that he can yield to me?

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, in keeping with the spirit of good nature, I will yield the author and sponsor of the bill on the other side 2 additional minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank my distinguished friend.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I certainly yield to my chairman.

Mr. BARDEN. As the gentleman knows, one of my reasons for disliking this bill is the fact that $325 million is simply divided up among the 50 States without any formula on the basis of need being provided. The money is just simply divided up on a per-child basis. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] showed that illiteracy ranges from 1 percent to 27 percent in the various States. The gentleman from New Jersey, since he has been on his feet, has shown conclusively that there are areas where a great need exists—conclusively, that is, in his own mind. And since the gentleman points to the great needs that exist, it is just rather confusing to me when I hear the gentleman resist any formula on the basis of need.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I think I can clear up my chairman's confusion. In the first place, I do not know at the moment that I am resisting, but I might point out to my distinguished chairman there is in this legislation, and in any such terms, more than an inherent equalization.

Mr. BARDEN. I want one that is real. I want one that is obvious and real.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. In that case, I suppose the chairman would want something, I suppose, as was contained in the bill passed by the other body in which the actual figures of equalization were worked out to about 16 to 1. We think this is disparate. We think that the inherent equalization is caused by the fact that the States in the greatest need pay their teachers less; their construction costs are less; their land acquisition costs are less; their heating facilities are not as badly needed or as expensive; and all of these factors are involved in this inherent equalization and entered definitely into the picture.

NOT IN THE CONSTITUTION

> I do not look at all upon Federal aid to highways in the same manner I look upon Federal aid to education. When the Constitution has charged the Congress with a duty of doing something which requires money, not only do we have a right but also we have a command to do it. But never in the Constitution was it intended that this power should be extended to education (Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, Feb. 3, 1960, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1927).

It is always a temptation to speak for the Founding Fathers. Let us for a change allow the Founding Fathers to speak for themselves as regards Federal aid to education.

Pushing aside the mists of the historical past, what did George Washington have to say on this subject:

> In a country like this * * * if there cannot be money found to answer the common purposes of education, there is something amiss in the ruling political power, which requires a steady, regulating, and energetic hand to correct and control it.

A man soundly grounded in conservatism was Alexander Hamilton, our first Secretary of the Treasury. Echoing Washington, he stated:

> Whatever concerns the general interest of learning * * * are within the sphere of the national councils, as far as regards an application of money.

Bolstering their opinion that the Federal Government should have more than a passing interest in education was President John Adams:

> The whole people must take upon themselves the education of the whole people and be willing to bear the expense of it.

These are their words. What actions did they leave us as a part of our historical legacy that the Federal Government has a shared responsibility with State and local governments in the field of education? Can we forget that as early as 1785, in the most lasting contributions of the Continental Congress, the American Government provided for the ceding of the 16th section of every township in the public domain for educational purposes, and in the great Northwest Ordinance of 1787 stated:

> Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

Have we so forgotten our history that as we approach the centennial of the Morrill Act of 1862, through which the Federal Government set up the great land-grant colleges that now grace our educational endeavor, we ignore the act was signed by President Abraham Lincoln?

And as long as I am mentioning Republican Presidents, I might remind the House that it was President Theodore Roosevelt who declared:

> The share that the National Government should take in the broad work of education has not yet received the attention and care it rightly deserves.

Let us not forget that the Constitution contains a general welfare clause which was cited by the Supreme Court in the case of Helvering against Davis as giving Congress the authority to make "reasonable financial support of items of major national concern like education."

Knowing the history of his country the late great Senator Robert Taft said on the floor of Congress in 1948:

> I should like to point out that Federal aid to education is not new in principle, that the Federal Government has always shown an intense interest in education throughout the United States * * * the general interest of the Federal Government in education cannot be questioned from a historical standpoint.

THE CLASSROOM SHORTAGE

> "The number of classrooms short * * * is not 100,000, not 240,000, not 300,000, but 3,086. That is the number of classroom [sic] short in 237 school districts out of more than 40,000 which are today borrowed up" (Senator DIRKSEN, Feb. 3, 1960, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1917).

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, much has been made by the opponents of Federal support for education of figures purporting to show that America has a shortage of only 3,086 classrooms in 237 school districts out of more than 40,000.

The survey from which these figures are quoted was made by the U.S. Office of Education in telegrams addressed to the chief State school officers of the 50 States last January 8. It was undertaken for a limited purpose and dealt with only one minor phase of the school finance problem.

As the Office of Education reported in releasing results of the survey:

> Only a small part of the problem of financing school construction is measured by this survey, because there are many problems other than those caused by the ultimate legal limits of borrowing. This point was strongly emphasized by the respondents, as may be seen by reference to the table annotations for Kentucky, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee.

That, Mr. Chairman, is what the U.S. Office of Education had to say about the limitations of its own survey. It did not even pretend to measure the total classroom shortage. It measured only one small phase of it, the extent of the shortage in certain school districts which were "borrowed up."

Kentucky, for instance, reported that, in a technical sense, it had no "borrowed up" districts, because there was on the books an unused law, regarded as unrealistic and impractical, which set up special procedures for borrowing beyond the ordinary limits.

New Jersey reported that more than half of its school districts had exceeded their normal borrowing capacity for school construction at least once in the last 10 years and that more than half of the districts presently were faced with severe financial problems. A New Jersey provision enabling school districts to exceed their debt limits with the permission of the State commissioner of education and the State treasury department was, New Jersey pointed out, no guarantee against serious financial problems.

Pennsylvania reported it had school districts which just could not market any more school bonds although technically they were within debt limits. Tennessee reported no legal debt limit, but said that in practice a county or municipality with a debt of 10 percent or more of assessed valuation could not borrow except at prohibitive interest rates. There were 87 Tennessee school districts in which this condition obtained.

Just last month the U.S. Office of Education, reporting on "National Goals in the Staffing and Construction of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools," fixed the classroom shortage, in the fall of 1959, as 131,600 classrooms.

This report also estimated future needs. "During the 5 school years 1959–60 through 1963–64," it said, "construction of 416,000 classrooms is needed to take care of normal needs and to eliminate the backlog."

At present rates of construction, if new construction were distributed among the States as needed, the report added, the classroom shortage at the end of the 5-year period would be 63,600.

And, Mr. Chairman, we have no assurance that the present rate of construction can be maintained, without substantial assistance from the Federal Government. We have all read news reports, and some of us have observed in our own communities, that voters have been rebelling against needed school bond issues on the ground that local taxes were too high.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, under this bill we propose to divide $325 million around the country each year in order to build school buildings. There are four clear faults in my mind to this legislation that makes it bad legislation, no matter whether you are for or against extension of Federal aid to education. The first one was mentioned by our distinguished chairman, that the funds are not allocated according to need. They are divided all over the country according to the number of children of school age. This would be the same thing as if a local community around Christmas time decided to allocate a certain amount of money to give Christmas baskets to the needy people, but in order to get enough money they decided to give it to all the folks. The result would be that little would be left for the needy. That is the same situation here. I do not believe anybody can say here that there are no school districts that are in need. But this bill is the wrong way to go about it, if we want to spend the money most expeditiously.

Then, further than that, under the allocation formula, it allocates the money according to the number of children of school age, not children in public school. In some States there are less than three-quarters of the schoolchildren who go to public school while in others practically all go to the public schools.

The third defect is that it does not include the State matching formula the first year. If this principle is good, it should go into effect the first year. If the Federal Government aid finances the entire amount the first year, how difficult it would be to put it into effect the second year and third year.

Fourth, it would not be given only for academic facilities but other facilities as well. The provision in the bill provides aid for any structure except where the primary purpose of the building or rooms are for contests where admission is secured.

There can only be two reasons for giving Federal aid. One is that the States are unable to finance their education facilities; secondly, that they are unwilling to provide for adequate education facilities. First, let us take State and local governments' ability. Many people state it is not possible to provide adequate tax revenue in a State for education. I agree that local communities cannot finance the entire education load because they are almost entirely dependent upon real estate taxes. However, one of the reasons why schools have reached their debt limit is that the States refuse to tax according to the market value of property, but the State assesses a valuation considerably less than the market value. If the States took the situation in hand and raised their assessed values up to the market value, they would be able to stay below the debt limit. However, State governments have the ability to levy almost any tax; every tax that the Federal Government levies, with the exception of import duties, can be utilized. When you say they are unable to secure enough money, it is not true, because a State can have an income tax, a sales tax, a luxury tax, an excise tax, and all the various kinds of taxes necessary to secure enough money.

This bill does not take into consideration the State's ability to pay. To give you an idea of the disparity of this bill, take the situation in New York. The personal income per child of school age in New York in 1957 was over $12,000, but in the State of Mississippi it was $3,426.

At this time, I would like to present some very meaningful tables—which I have secured from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—which show the personal income per child of school age in every State in the Continental United States, which follows:

Continental United States (excluding District of Columbia and Alaska)	$8,576
Alabama	4,811
Arizona	7,050
Arkansas	4,284
California	11,380
Colorado	8,348
Connecticut	12,884
Delaware	12,245
Florida	8,062
Georgia	5,338
Idaho	6,029
Illinois	11,049
Indiana	8,482
Iowa	7,719
Kansas	7,854
Kentucky	5,208
Louisiana	5,859
Maine	$7,031
Maryland	9,086
Massachusetts	11,106
Michigan	8,977
Minnesota	7,643
Mississippi	3,426
Missouri	8,830
Montana	7,518
Nebraska	7,976
Nevada	10,966
New Hampshire	8,192
New Jersey	11,653
New Mexico	6,004
New York	12,185
North Carolina	4,945
North Dakota	5,467
Ohio	9,718
Oklahoma	6,740
Oregon	8,196
Pennsylvania	9,521
Rhode Island	9,475
South Carolina	4,094
South Dakota	6,214
Tennessee	5,426
Texas	7,047
Utah	6,189
Vermont	6,956
Virginia	6,662
Washington	8,994
West Virginia	5,816
Wisconsin	8,096
Wyoming	7,951

Now in H.R. 10128 we are going to give the same amount of aid per child in Mississippi as in New York, even though New York has about four times as much personal income per child of school age.

In Mississippi, State expenditures per public school child were $158 in 1957; in New York, $575. Let us now look at the record of school expenditures per public school child for the years 1955–56, which are supplied by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. They are as follows:

Continental U.S. (excluding the District of Columbia and Alaska)	$388.03
Alabama	194.20
Arizona	413.86
Arkansas	182.99
California	519.63
Colorado	442.16
Connecticut	435.67
Delaware	504.37
Florida	346.18
Georgia	269.21
Idaho	316.84
Illinois	468.16
Indiana	368.04
Iowa	368.95
Kansas	400.56
Kentucky	185.33
Louisiana	344.08
Maine	244.68
Maryland	414.97
Massachusetts	393.02
Michigan	448.52
Minnesota	457.87
Mississippi	158.55
Missouri	341.62
Montana	431.28
Nebraska	352.78
Nevada	471.77
New Hampshire	347.10
New Jersey	511.48
New Mexico	443.50
New York	575.35
North Carolina	228.78
North Dakota	343.88
Ohio	380.69
Oklahoma	324.98
Oregon	444.65
Pennsylvania	439.94
Rhode Island	353.33
South Carolina	281.38
South Dakota	361.74
Tennessee	217.31
Texas	337.69

Utah	$369.15
Vermont	312.31
Virginia	269.03
Washington	452.14
West Virginia	219.60
Wisconsin	429.52
Wyoming	542.68

Referring to these figures, we may well ask, Why does not Mississippi do better than that?

The fact is Mississippi is expending 3.4 percent of their personal income per child of school age toward education, while New York is expending only 2.5 percent.

At this point, we might consider statistics showing the expenditure and effort for public schools for the years 1955 and 1956. In this table, expenditures as a percentage of personal income are listed as follows:

Mississippi	3.4
Arkansas	3.0
South Carolina	3.5
Alabama	3.3
Kentucky	2.4
North Carolina	3.2
Tennessee	2.9
West Virginia	3.2
Average	3.1
Massachusetts	2.2
Illinois	2.2
California	2.7
New York	2.5
Nevada	2.6
New Jersey	2.4
Delaware	2.0
Connecticut	2.1
Average	2.3

A study of the statistics shows that Mississippi is expending considerable effort. You can go down through the eight States with lowest personal income per child and find the same thing happening, and also you can take the eight top States in personal income per child and find the same thing happening. Percentagewise the wealthy States are not spending as much for education as the poorer States are spending and shows the reasonableness of basing allotments on need.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield.

Mr. BECKER. Coming from the State of New York and having been identified with and familiar with the formula for State education of children for years, I cannot quite understand the gentleman's reasoning in saying that there is $12,000 of income behind each child of school age in New York. Does the gentleman mean income or property value?

Mr. QUIE. Income value, personal income.

Mr. BECKER. Personal income?

Mr. QUIE. These figures are based on personal income per school-age child.

Mr. BECKER. Is that gross income or net income?

Mr. QUIE. This is net income, the data derived from the Department of Commerce. I will put the figures in the RECORD so the gentleman may examine them tomorrow.

Going further, to the second reason why the allocation formula is bad, I will again compare New York with Mississippi. In New York only 75 percent of the children of school age go to public schools, but in Mississippi about 90 percent do. In New York the allocation formula will give aid according to the number of children of school age to the public schools only. This is the same in Mississippi but must be divided among proportionately more children. In Rhode Island only 66.6 percent of the children of school age go to public schools, but in the poorer States they do not have many private schools and parochial schools which is detrimental to them in this formula.

The following table shows public, full-time day school K–12 enrollment as a percentage of the July 1, 1958, school-age population from 5 to 17 years of age. Column 1, showing the population from 5 through 17, is an Office of Education estimate derived by interpolation. The second column, "Enrollments K–12," is composed of revisions of data in the fall 1958 survey:

	July 1, 1958, population, 5–17	Fall 1958 enrollments, K–12	Percent
Aggregate Total, 50 States and District of Columbia	42,719,000	34,668,553	81.2
	41,936,000	34,080,844	81.3
1. Alabama	878,000	780,000	88.8
2. Arizona	301,000	273,734	90.9
3. Arkansas	470,000	420,700	89.5
4. California	3,297,000	3,035,000	92.1
5. Colorado	421,000	360,972	85.7
6. Connecticut	516,000	440,832	85.4
7. Delaware	105,000	73,551	70.0
8. District of Columbia	153,000	113,030	73.9
9. Florida	1,000,000	857,723	85.8
10. Georgia	1,040,000	893,431	85.9
11. Idaho	177,000	149,638	84.5
12. Illinois	2,224,000	1,612,145	72.5
13. Indiana	1,121,000	910,000	81.2
14. Iowa	672,000	554,223	82.5
15. Kansas	507,000	441,620	87.1
16. Kentucky	809,000	614,607	76.0
17. Louisiana	850,000	655,191	77.1
18. Maine	228,000	191,622	84.0
19. Maryland	723,000	557,540	77.1
20. Massachusetts	1,053,000	809,100	76.8
21. Michigan	1,957,000	1,574,999	80.5
22. Minnesota	832,000	650,800	78.2
23. Mississippi	617,000	552,000	89.5
24. Missouri	965,000	787,419	81.6
25. Montana	175,000	136,901	78.2
26. Nebraska	344,000	267,618	77.8
27. Nevada	65,000	56,396	86.8
28. New Hampshire	134,000	98,953	73.8
29. New Jersey	1,268,000	971,000	76.6
30. New Mexico	243,000	204,137	84.0
31. New York	3,485,000	2,624,582	75.3
32. North Carolina	1,225,000	1,061,171	86.6
33. North Dakota	173,000	128,067	74.0
34. Ohio	2,239,000	1,782,637	79.6
35. Oklahoma	551,000	540,433	98.1
36. Oregon	432,000	359,215	83.2
37. Pennsylvania	2,522,000	1,915,051	75.9
38. Rhode Island	188,000	125,165	66.6
39. South Carolina	699,000	558,212	79.9
40. South Dakota	179,000	145,608	81.3
41. Tennessee	899,000	769,506	85.6
42. Texas	2,436,000	1,956,000	80.3
43. Utah	245,000	218,157	89.0
44. Vermont	92,000	71,061	77.2
45. Virginia	981,000	803,719	81.9
46. Washington	675,000	595,850	88.3
47. West Virginia	527,000	458,425	87.0
48. Wisconsin	951,000	675,000	71.0
49. Wyoming	84,000	77,218	91.9
50. Alaska	48,000	36,418	75.9
51. Hawaii	160,000	134,467	84.0
52. Puerto Rico	748,000	562,487	75.2
53. Virgin Islands	10,000	6,515	65.2
American Samoa	7,000	5,615	80.2
Guam	18,000	13,092	72.7

We talk about the unwillingness of some areas to provide adequately for their needs. National averages show a willingness, however. Look what has happened. Fifty percent of the classrooms in the country were built after World War II. If you take the figures from 1950 to 1960 you find a 56 percent increase in enrollment and 642 percent in education.

Here are statistics showing educational expenditures and enrollment from 1940 to 1960:

Educational expenditures[1] and enrollment, 1940–60

School year	Expenditures (thousand dollars)	Enrollment (pupils)
1939–40	3,190,593	29,751,203
1949–50	8,795,635	31,319,271
1955–56	16,811,651	39,103,059
1959–60	24,000,000	46,480,000
Percent increase, 1940–60	642	56

[1] Includes public and nonpublic schools at all levels (elementary, secondary, and higher education).

Sources: 1940–56, U.S. Office of Education, "Statistical Summary of Education, 1955–56." 1960, expenditures, estimate; enrollment, U.S. Office of Education release Aug. 30, 1959.

I would not say that this shows an unwillingness to provide for education. Also it is stated by many people that not enough of our income is spent for education, that too much is spent for liquor, tobacco, horse races, gambling, and everything else. Let us take the figures from 1950 to 1960. The percentage of the national income spent for education in 1950 was 4.1 percent. In the 10-year period following, it increased so that 6 percent of the national income goes for education in 1960. I think this shows that we have realized the necessity of providing adequately for education and that we can depend on the States and local communities to continue to do a good job.

I now present statistics showing expenditures for education as a percent of the national income from 1890 to 1960:

Expenditures for education as percent of national income 1890 to 1960

	Percent
1890	1.4
1913	2.2
1930	3.7
1950	4.1
1956	5.1
1960	6.0

(Sources: 1890 and 1913, Roger A. Freeman, op. cit., p. 5; 1930–56, U.S. Office of Education, "Statistical Summary of Education, 1955–56"; 1960, estimated.)

I think people are just deluding themselves if they think we can have Federal aid without regulations and controls.

There are already instances of Federal supervision in Federal aid to education—aid to federally impacted areas—the National Defense Education Act and vocational education. For instance, in order for a teacher to be an instructor in vocational education he has to be educated in specified schools, those under public auspices. That is a control that comes over Federal education.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Did I understand the gentleman correctly to say that there was lots of Federal interference under Public Laws 817 and 874?

Mr. QUIE. There is Federal regulation and control under both of those laws.

If you will look at the law and the controls that are available to the Department of Education for the construction of those facilities, this is very much in evidence.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman will agree that there is ample testimony before the Committee, given principally by such gentlemen as my colleague from California [Mr. UTT], that in the actual administration of the bill there has been no Federal interference. I think it is a wrong impression to leave, that there is any criticism.

Mr. QUIE. Not criticism. I doubt if there would be any criticism of this bill or any other effort in which the Federal Government actually had the proper regulation of the expenditures. But there are controls and I personally feel that the Federal Government has a responsibility to see that the funds are adequately used.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Any restrictions are simply designed to guarantee that they build classrooms and not such things as are not needed in an educational system. Does the gentleman call that control?

Mr. QUIE. There are regulations and there has to be regulations. If anybody says there should be no control whatsoever over the money, they are deluding themselves. There has to be a certain amount.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. We say there should be regulation. The State must certify an adequate plan under which the moneys will be distributed to the needy districts. To that extent, at least, we outline a course of action.

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. So that we get this a little bit clearer right now, there will not be a dollar of this money spent in building buildings that the Secretary of Labor does not supervise, fix the price of wages, and classify the workers. He fixes the wages that are paid to the men. I happen to know something about this because there was one in my area and it only took about 3 years to get it settled, because this man was rated as a bricklayer when he should have been a helper and the other man was rated something else, and that was it. I do not think it is quite accurate to say there is not any interference or regulation. If you do not think there are, ask contractors that have been through this.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman for bringing that up.

The Bureau of the Budget made a study recently of the Department of Education fall report for 1959 in which they reported a backlog of 132,000 classrooms and came up with information which is interesting.

Because of the great variation among the States—and even within many States—of standards as to what constitutes normal capacity or an unsatisfactory facility, the Office of Education leaves the matter of standards and specific definitions up to the judgments and practices of each State. In many cases, a State in turn depends upon local superintendents to apply local definitions and standards in reporting data.

As a result of the absence of agreed-upon standards, the Office of Education fall report represents a compilation of State reports which in most cases are similar compilations of local reports. The national totals consequently are to a large degree the result of the addition of nonequivalents, but since local communities are primarily responsible for their own education programs, the national totals are meaningful if the data reported to the Office of Education reliably reflect State and local standards as to need.

The field trips produced information which indicates that the methods of collecting data and the concepts used to measure need may have produced both understatements as well as overstatements of classroom building needs. Some examples follow:

(a) Some States do not make a questionnaire survey to collect data for the fall report, a method recommended by the Office of Education, but use information from other reports, collected for State use, to estimate classroom needs. Use of such separate feeder reports can produce some double counting of classroom needs in cases where excess enrollment is located in unsatisfactory facilities. It should be noted that the Office of Education questionnaire form cautions the States on this point.

(b) There is also the possibility that in some cases the States have reported an equivalent requirement of need rather than an actual building requirement. For example, in a situation of an unsatisfactory school plant located in an area which is rapidly changing from residential to commercial—not uncommon in large cities—the decision of the school authorities may be to continue to use the facilities until utilization declines to the point where the students can be assigned to other schools. However, the local school system may report the need to replace the unsatisfactory school when in fact there is no actual building requirement. It should be pointed out, however, that the Office of Education requests that the number of classrooms needed to replace unsatisfactory facilities be reported, not the number of unsatisfactory classrooms.

(c) Some States, instead of conducting a questionnaire survey each year, will revise the results of a previous year's survey by subtracting the number of classrooms subsequently built, adding the number of classrooms abandoned, and adding the number of classrooms needed for increased enrollment. This method has a conservative bias if statewide figures are used, since it necessarily assumes that all construction and abandonments occur in those school districts—and areas within those school districts—which had previously reported shortages. It has a possible liberal bias to the extent that some of the increased enrollments occur in areas where schools may be underutilized.

(d) There are some indications that local superintendents may have reported unsatisfactory facilities only to the extent that replacements are to be made under current building plans rather than actual building needs.

(e) It was found that in many areas enrollments hit an annual peak in January or February rather than in the fall when classroom shortage data are reported. For areas of continual enrollment growth, reports as of October understate the need for additional facilities.

(f) In areas of new development local school authorities, on the basis of studies of probable land use and population patterns, may forecast a peak enrollment from which there will be a decline. The decision may be to build schools to accommodate less than the temporary peak enrollment, rather than to have a school underutilized for a large part of its life. However, local officials may report excess enrollments and additional classrooms needed which would not represent an actual building requirement.

As these examples suggest, there may be both understatements and overstatements of need in particular areas. Although we cannot express these in quantitative terms, they undoubtedly affect the accuracy of the national totals. However, in our judgment, these overstatements and understatements would not invalidate a conclusion that there are sizable classroom shortages in certain areas in many States. The national totals do not represent a precise measure of building requirements and should be taken only as orders of magnitude.

In addition, the survey indicates that it is fallacious to compare successive years' totals to indicate a decline or increase in the classroom shortage. For example, Alabama used radically different means of determining the number of classrooms needed to replace unsatisfactory facilities in 1959 than it used in 1958, with the result that its shortage appeared to decline dramatically. Aberrations such as this negate year-to-year comparisons, but changes over a period of years probably are meaningful.

IMPROVEMENT OF CLASSROOM SHORTAGE DATA

The above indicates that the classroom shortage data could be significantly improved:

(a) Methods of collecting the data in the nine States varied from excellent to poor. We believe that the Office of Education should do considerably more than has been done in providing leadership and assistance to the States in improving collection methods.

(b) The concepts used to measure the classroom shortage could be significantly sharpened so as to clarify the requests for information. The questionnaire form now used by the Office has the virtue of brevity. There could be an elaboration of the instructions and definitions which might help produce more reliable data without mitigating that virtue.

The Bureau of the Budget plans to hire a consultant to evaluate certain statistical series of the Office of Education, including the fall report. The information gathered on these field trips should be beneficial in his task.

USEFULNESS OF FALL REPORT FOR PUBLIC POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The fall report figures on the classroom shortage have, in our opinion limited usefulness in discussions on Federal aid for school construction. This would be true even if these figures were precise measures of classroom needs, an elusive concept, indeed.

First. Although a sizable shortage exists, so long as school enrollments continue to grow there will be a normal shortage of unknown size for two reasons: (a) The physical inability of a school district to erect buildings fast enough to keep pace with enrollment growth, and (b) conscious administrative decisions not to attempt to build to keep pace with or ahead of enrollment increases. In the first instance, there are cases where school facilities have been built on the basis of enrollment projections that proved too conservative and there are other cases where the enrollments arrived before there had been enough time to plan and construct sufficient facilities. In the second instance, school districts will frequently hedge their projections by using temporary portable facilities—reported as unsatisfactory to the Office of Education—until such time as land use and population patterns stabilize. Florida is a notable example. A normal or frictional shortage obviously is not related to any need for Federal assistance.

Second. The classroom shortage figures reveal nothing about the financial capability of the States and local communities to handle the problem without Federal aid. This is the critical question which has remained unanswered. This is a question that affects considerations of Federal aid not only for school construction and other educational costs as well, but also for public services of all kinds. The present state of our knowledge is sufficient to establish the existence of sizable and persistent needs, but it is not adequate to state with certainty whether or not those needs can be met from State and local financial resources. I say every time there is a need it should not be necessary for the Federal Government to step in.

ALABAMA

Conclusions on State report on classroom shortage: In our opinion, neither the 1958 nor the 1959 report provides a reliable figure on the classroom shortage. Application in 1958 of school facilities standards developed by Teachers College, Columbia, may have resulted in an overstatement of the number of unsatisfactory classrooms in Alabama in terms of local standards. The 1959 reports by local superintendents totaled 2,416 unsatisfactory classrooms as compared to 10,037 in 1958, indicating that the Teachers College standards are much higher than those local superintendents in Alabama realistically expect to attain.

The method used to determine the 1959 shortage was inadequate because the form that was used by the State agency was not designed to obtain the data requested by the Office of Education. The State figure for classrooms needed for excess enrollment include in the case of many school system classrooms needed for replacement as well, a fact which probably accounts for part of the reported increase in shortage on account of excess enrollment from 1,899 rooms in 1958 to 3,948 in 1959. The 1959 State survey was so poorly designed that the resulting data are not meaningful. However, it would appear that the number of classrooms reported as needed for excess enrollment may be somewhat overstated as of fall 1959, although peak enrollments are generally not reached until later in the school year.

FLORIDA

Nature of classroom shortage: In fall 1959, 10 county school systems out of a total of 67 accounted for more than three-quarters of the total reported classroom shortage. Although the total shortage is divided about equally between classrooms needed to house excess enrollments and those needed to replace unsatisfactory classrooms, the shortage can be attributed chiefly to Florida's rapid population growth. This apparent contradiction is clarified by the fact that a large portion of the unsatisfactory classrooms are temporary portables. Typically, in an area of new development the school system will use portable facilities until such time as the pattern of population changes, land use, and school population become fairly stabilized.

Permanent facilities are then built, and the portables are transported to another area. Dade County, for example, reported a total shortage in fall 1959 of 680 classrooms, of which 397 were considered unsatisfactory. All of these rooms reported as unsatisfactory are portables.

GEORGIA

Nature of classroom shortage: Almost three-quarters of the total classroom shortage in Georgia is the result of enrollments in excess of normal capacity. State personnel indicated that as much as 90 percent of the classroom shortage is in 30—of 198—school systems, all of which are in metropolitan areas of substantial population growth; the five counties around Atlanta are the principal areas. This fact is a reflection of the growing industrialization and urbanization of the State.

State personnel expressed the opinion that the serious problem in the past of old and obsolete school facilities, chiefly in rural areas, had generally been overcome, in large part as a result of the operation of a State school building authority and State aid programs. The major current problem is to keep abreast of enrollment growth in the urban centers.

The superintendent of the Cobb County school system was interviewed. Cobb County has had continuous population growth since World War II. Currently it has the fastest growing school system in the State. A federally affected area by virtue of an aircraft plant, an Air Force base, and a naval air station, and other Federal installations, the county is also affected by the general suburban growth around Atlanta. Because of impossibility of building schools rapidly enough to keep pace with enrollments, nonteaching space has had to be converted into classrooms and nonschool buildings have been leased and renovated.

NEW YORK

Method of determining classroom shortages: New York has not developed a plan for providing the Office of Education with a consistent set of fall data each year. For example, the 1959 and 1958 data on 4,000 additional classrooms needed to replace unsatisfactory facilities are based on a single comprehensive inventory study done in 1958. Data for New York City are not available and there is no plan to maintain the inventory started in 1958. Because of the use of "feeder" reports, there is some double counting of additional instruction rooms needed where excess enrollment is located in unsatisfactory facilities.

Most of the discussion in New York City centered on the question of the usefulness of the concept "additional classrooms needed to accommodate excess enrollment" as a guide to needed construction. The problem of planning to accommodate a temporary peak enrollment is particularly difficult in New York City. It is impractical to build a new school to take care of peak enrollment for a few years where there may be a projection of a future decline in school population and then to have the school remain underutilized for the greater part of its life. The situation is generally met by planning the school's capacity below the anticipated peak enrollment and living with the temporary peak.

Now, in studying what in the world causes this need for classrooms, there are some figures that I will put in the RECORD showing what has happened to enrollment.

Number of children in following categories

	Ages 5 to 17	Entering 1st grade	Grades 1 to 8	Grades 9 to 12
1919–20	21,578,316	4,320,823	19,377,927	2,200,389
1921–22	23,239,227	4,176,567	20,366,218	2,873,009
1923–24	24,288,808	4,184,232	20,898,930	3,389,878
1925–26	24,741,468	3,976,750	20,984,002	3,757,466
1927–28	25,179,696	4,171,037	21,268,417	3,911,279
1929–30	25,678,015	4,150,919	21,278,593	4,399,422
1931–32	26,275,441	3,930,196	21,135,420	5,140,021
1933–34	26,434,193	3,716,852	21,765,037	5,669,156
1935–36	26,367,098	3,530,325	20,392,561	5,974,537
1937–38	25,975,108	3,317,144	19,748,174	6,226,934
1939–40	25,433,542	3,018,463	18,832,098	6,601,444
1941–42	24,562,472	2,930,762	18,174,668	6,387,805
1943–44	23,266,616	2,878,843	17,713,096	5,553,520
1945–46	23,299,941	2,894,588	17,677,744	5,622,197
1947–48	23,944,532	2,951,300	18,291,227	5,653,305
1949–50	25,111,427	3,170,343	19,386,806	5,724,621
1951–52	26,562,664	2,957,485	20,860,867	5,881,797
1953–54	28,836,052	3,666,466	22,545,807	6,290,245
1955–56	31,162,843	3,494,997	24,290,257	6,872,586
1956–57	32,334,333	3,491,387	25,015,873	7,318,460
1957–58	33,632,000	[1] 3,587,700	25,728,000	7,903,000
1959–60	[2] 35,286,177	----------	24,034,381	11,251,796

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Estimated figure, not comparable.

One interesting thing, I think, for the last year I have the figures is that the number of children entering first grade in public schools was 3,587,700. In 1919 that figure was 4,320,823. At no time since 1919 through 1930 have we had the enrollment in first grade as we had in that period of time. So, it is not the increase in birth rate so much that has caused this great increase in expenditures for classrooms. The reasons have been these. A greater proportion of the children are staying on through the eighth grade and into high school and through high school. And, a high school is a much more expensive proposition in building classrooms and educating these

children than the first few grades. This has added to the cost of education. The second reason, there is a tendency, and a very strong tendency, to close up the one-room schoolhouses in rural areas, because people have moved out from the rural areas. The average in the last 30 years has been 500,000 per year. This has caused necessarily the building of centralized school buildings in order that they can provide better education as the children move into the centralized areas. These are the two biggest reasons.

So, as we look at the projected enrollment, I think we find this to be the case. The children that were born in the 1920's were the ones that raised the children after the war and at the present time are causing this increase in enrollment. The children born in the late depression and war years are now coming to the age where they are bearing children, and therefore the curve will level off. It shows whereas from 1955 to 1960 the average annual increase in children was 1.2 million per year, in the years 1965 to 1970 it will drop to one-half, only 600,000 additional per year.

The following tables are important:

TABLE 1.—*Projected enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools and estimated number of additional classrooms needed, 1960–69*

School year	Projected enrollment (in thousands)		Estimated number of additional classrooms currently needed for each year		
	Number [1]	Net increase over previous year	For increased enrollment (rounded to nearest 100) [2]	For replacements [3]	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1960–61	37,196	1,212	40,400	16,000	56,400
1961–62	38,047	851	28,400	16,000	44,400
1962–63	39,187	1,140	38,000	16,000	54,000
1963–64	40,320	1,133	37,800	16,000	53,800
1964–65	41,484	1,164	38,800	16,000	54,800
1965–66	41,488	404	13,500	16,000	29,500
1966–67	42,514	626	20,900	16,000	36,900
1967–68	43,148	634	21,100	16,000	37,100
1968–69	43,840	692	23,100	16,000	39,100
1969–70	44,497	657	21,900	16,000	37,900

[1] Source: U.S. Office of Education, tabulation dated Jan. 21, 1960. Project enrollments based on Office of Education official school enrollment data and Bureau of the Census official projection of population aged 5–17.

[2] Computed on basis of 30 pupils per classroom (col. 3 above÷30). Most estimates in recent years are on this basis, although some use 28 pupils per classroom. Application of the 28-pupil basis would increase the annual figures by about 7 percent. On the other hand, it should be noted that these projections are on basis of total enrollment for the entire school year, which exceeds total enrollment at the beginning of each year and is approximately 11 percent greater than the average number of pupils actually in daily attendance in the schools.

[3] Based on average number (15,941) of classrooms abandoned or replaced during past 4 years, the only years for which data are available from Office of Education.

The dramatic decline in the annual enrollment increase begins for the school year 1965–66. Summary of the data is as follows:

Average annual increase, 1955–59_ 1,200,000
Average annual increase, 1960–64_ 1,100,000
Average annual increase, 1965–69_ 600,000

Translation of the enrollment increases into classroom needs is shown in column 4 of table 1. Summary of these classroom facts is as follows:

Average number needed annually, 1955–59 ---------- 40,000
Average number needed annually, 1960–64 ---------- 36,700
Average number needed annually, 1965–69 ---------- 20,000

Determination of the number of classrooms needed each year to replace facilities currently abandoned is much more uncertain. Where obsolescence is involved, the practice varies widely all over the country as to just how long a school facility will be continued in use or whether it will be remodeled rather than abandoned. For the purpose here we based the estimate on actual practice as reported by the Office of Education. The available data show that abandonments have averaged a little less than 16,000 classrooms per year.

Combination of these two categories of current classroom needs each year gives the total classroom requirements for additional new facilities needed. These annual totals, which appear in column 6 of table 1, are summarized as follows:

Average total needed annually, 1960–64 ---------- 52,700
Average total needed annually, 1965–69 ---------- 36,100

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION RATES IN RELATION TO THE NEED

When America's public schools open next fall for the beginning of the 1960–61 school year, the Nation's overall physical plant will contain approximately 1,330,000 classrooms. These are instructional rooms, including laboratories and shops, but not including auditoriums, gymnasiums, lunchrooms, libraries, study halls, and multipurpose rooms. Approximately 680,000 classrooms, or more than one-half the total, will have been constructed since World War II. With the exception of a relatively small volume of facilities constructed with Federal assistance in federally affected areas (under Public Law 815, 81st Cong., as amended) these classrooms will have been built with State and local resources.

The construction rate in each of the last 10 school years is as follows:

1950–51 ---------- 44,000
1951–52 ---------- 48,000
1952–53 ---------- 50,000
1953–54 ---------- 55,000
1954–55 ---------- 60,000
1955–56 ---------- 63,280
1956–57 ---------- 68,660
1957–58 ---------- 72,070
1958–59 ---------- 70,000
1959–60 ---------- 62,700

Summary of the construction rates is as follows:

Average annual construction, 1955–59 ---------- 66,900
Average annual construction, 1950–59 ---------- 59,400

In terms of the overall national outlook, it is perfectly clear that the States and localities have mounted the construction effort necessary to meet the need without any program of general Federal aid for this purpose. It is also evident that the construction peak has been crossed and within 5 years the number of classrooms required to keep fully abreast additional needs will be only half as much each year as actually have been built in the past few years.

Not only are past and present construction rates adequate to keep up with the future needs each year to house expected enrollment increases and provide replacements for abandoned facilities, but they are adequate, also, to produce a number of additional classrooms more than equivalent to the backlog of 132,400 as of the present school year—1959–60. Moreover, the backlog would be reduced to inconsequential proportions in little more time than the period covered by H.R. 10128.

The construction rate for the preceding 5 school years—1954–58—averaged 66,800 classrooms per year. Projection of this annual average, a rate which the States and localities have demonstrated they can attain, would produce 467,600 classrooms by the beginning of the 1966–67 school year. Since only 329,800 classrooms would be needed for annual enrollment increases and replacements up to then, the remainder would be more than equivalent to the 132,400 backlog for 1959–60.

This will mean if we continue to build schoolhouses at the average rate that we have in the last 5 years, in the next 5 not only will we have built enough school buildings to take care of the backlog, but also the increase in enrollment and the needed facilities to replace the obsolete classrooms. If this can be done, it will take about an extra year without Federal aid as it will be this way with Federal aid.

Similarly, the construction rate for the present school year is reported by the States as 62,700. Projection of this lower rate in like manner would produce 501,600 classrooms by the 1967–68 school year as compared with new enrollment and replacement needs of 366,900 or an excess of 134,700.

On the basis of still another assumption, namely, a declining rate that would average 58,000 classrooms per year, a total of 580,000 classrooms would be produced up to the beginning of 1969–70, as compared with additional enrollment and replacement needs of 443,900, or an excess of 136,100. It should be noted that the average annual rate of 58,000 classrooms used in this computation is less than the annual average of 59,400 classrooms constructed during the 10-year period 1950–59, and very substantially less than the highest annual rate of 72,070 in 1957–58.

These projections have made full allowance for the reported backlog as of 1959, in addition to new classroom requirements each year. Even making such allowance for the backlog, a great deal less construction will be required over the next 5 to 10 years than has taken place in recent years. But we are convinced that careful analysis of the actual composition of the backlog figure would reveal that a very considerable volume of the reported backlog is of an

unavoidable or temporary nature, having no direct bearing on the issue of the need for Federal aid, while some more of it arises out of the method of compiling the figures and is irrelevant to the question.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated construction of public elementary and secondary classrooms and excess over current annual needs, 1960–69* [1]

School year	Estimated classrooms constructed and excess over current needs for each year					
	At average annual rate for preceding 5 years		At present (1959–60) rate as an average annual rate		At a declining annual rate averaging below present rate [2]	
	Number	Excess over col. (6) in table 1	Number	Excess over col. (6) in table 1	Number	Excess over col. (6) in table 1
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1960–61	68,800	10,400	62,700	6,300	58,000	1,600
1961–62	66,800	22,400	62,700	18,300	58,000	13,600
1962–63	66,800	12,800	62,700	8,700	58,000	4,000
1963–64	66,800	13,000	62,700	8,900	58,000	4,200
1964–65	66,800	12,900	62,700	7,900	58,000	3,200
1965–66	66,800	37,300	62,700	33,200	58,000	28,500
1966–67	66,800	29,900	62,700	25,800	58,000	21,100
1967–68	[3]	[3]	62,700	25,600	58,000	20,900
1968–69			[4]	[4]	58,000	18,900
1969–70					[5] 58,000	[5] 20,100

[1] Source: Computations based on U.S. Office of Education construction data in tabulation dated Jan. 26, 1960, and related tabulations.
[2] The present rate for 1959–60 of 62,700 classrooms is a net 4,100 below the previous 5-year average. The projected average of 58,000 is 4,700 per year below the previous 5-year average. Construction has not been below 58,000 in any year since 1953–54 when the total was 55,000.
[3] Classrooms equivalent to backlog would be constructed as of beginning of 1966–67 school year since construction of new requirements for each year occurs largely during preceding year. Thus, construction rate beginning in 1966–67 need be no greater than necessary to meet current annual need in each following year (col. 6, table 1).
[4] See note 3 above. Backlog equivalent as of beginning of 1967–68 school year.
[5] See note 3 above. Backlog equivalent as of beginning of 1969–70 school year.

All that has been reported in the basic statistics is that as of the fall of 1959 a total of 132,400 classrooms were needed, of which 66,000 were to replace unsatisfactory facilities and 66,400 to accommodate excess enrollment. Before basing any national policy on these backlog figures, we ought to know the circumstances surrounding the classrooms that go into the count. For example—

First. How many of the backlog classrooms represent new or replacement facilities, the construction of which has already been authorized by local or State authorities, or which is in the planning stage preliminary to such authorization?

Second. How many classrooms in the backlog represent needed replacements, or additional new facilities, in school districts having adequate financial capacity, but whose voters or State authorities have not authorized the necessary bond issues or other financial arrangements?

Third. How many of the backlog classrooms represent replacements for outdated one-room schoolhouses or multiple-room facilities in districts which would be consolidated, but whose voters have not yet approved of the consolidation?

Fourth. How much of the backlog is made up of classrooms needed to replace unexpected losses because of fire, storm, or other disaster, and to what extent were such losses covered by insurance?

Fifth. What part of the backlog is attributable to an unexpected influx or shift in population, the essential problem being a lack of lead time in which to provide new facilities?

Sixth. Inasmuch as excess enrollment is "the number of pupils in excess of normal capacity" and "normal capacity" is, by definition, determined according to varying State and local standards, there can be little doubt that a considerable amount of the backlog reported as needed for excess enrollment is merely a "paper" shortage as far as any Federal aid question is concerned. For instance, "normal capacity" may vary anywhere from say 28 or less pupils per classroom in one place to 30 in another and if both places have 30 pupils in a class, one has excess enrollment and the other does not. More importantly, unknown thousands of the Nation's 40,000 school districts could and undoubtedly do report excess enrollments averaging 1 or 2 pupils per class. These would go into the national totals, even though the reporting districts have no intention, or any urgent need, to build new facilities for such enrollment. There is an average of about 33 classrooms per school district in the United States. Excess enrollment averaging only 1 pupil per classroom would contribute 33 pupils to the national total, although posing no particular problem locally and certainly no emergency. Similar contributions to the total from only one-third of the school districts would result in a national "paper" backlog of approximately 15,000 classrooms for this reason alone. Accordingly, before accepting such backlog figures as a reliable indication of classroom need, we should at least find out how many districts have significant excess enrollment problems and where they are—on a comparable basis from State to State.

We are firmly convinced that the answers to these questions and other related ones would enable us to see the classroom backlog problem in its proper perspective. There can be no doubt that refinement of the figure would show, as we mentioned earlier, that at any given time of enumeration there would be a substantial number of classrooms needed which would represent a residual or irreducible minimum. Classrooms in this category would be reported in the backlog whether or not there were any general Federal aid for school construction. We believe, also, that a substantial part of an accurate backlog count would be a reflection of a 1- or 2-year timelag in meeting the need rather than any indication of an emergency situation requiring Federal intervention.

The implication of this analysis is that actual State and local construction requirements, over and above the number of classrooms necessary to meet current new needs each year for the next 5 to 10 years, will be much less than the reported backlog of 132,400. Accordingly, overall construction rates can be expected to decline markedly, particularly within 5 years, and the financial obligations imposed upon State and local resources will correspondingly diminish. At the same time, most States and regions of the country can be expected to be on a approximately current construction basis.

Even without any refinement of the backlog figures as reported, many of the States already appear to be on or near a current construction basis. The Office of Education report on the 1959 fall survey shows the following States, for example, which are anticipating their needs and have scheduled more construction during the present year than the classrooms they reported in their backlog at the beginning of the year:

State	Total classrooms, fall 1959	Backlog as of fall 1959	Classrooms scheduled for completion 1959–60
Delaware	3,150	111	222
Indiana	33,930	1,505	2,000
Ohio	65,822	2,634	2,367
Wisconsin	31,241	310	1,650
California	108,000	4,600	10,000
Oklahoma	25,997	1,009	1,125

A most serious thing about this bill is that we use the shotgun method of giving aid. We should give the aid only to the areas that need it. Under this bill we are spreading it all over, throughout the whole country and that would have this effect. Every community will look to see whether it can get Federal aid before they build. This can have the effect of slowing down the building of classrooms, which is going on now at such a tremendous rate. If it has that effect this will be the most harmful piece of legislation we could possibly pass and it would be contrary to the best interests of the boys and girls of this country instead of to their best interests.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, in view of the very limited time I have to discuss a very important aspect of this legislation, I should be most grateful if my colleagues would withhold their questions until I have completed my formal presentation.

Mr. Chairman we are being asked today to enact legislation which would provide Federal assistance to the local communities of America in improving their educational facilities. The title of the legislation we are being urged to support is referred to as the "School Construction Assistance Act of 1960."

The bill before us states that Congress finds that despite sustained and rigorous efforts by the States and local communities, which have increased current school construction to unprecedented levels, there is still a serious shortage of classrooms, which requires immediate action on the part of the Federal Government. This legislation further recognizes the fact that the "financial resources available to many communities are inadequate to support construction programs sufficient to eliminate their classroom shortages." The bill concludes that "this shortage of classrooms is seriously restricting the quality of the Nation's educational program."

I am in full agreement with the findings of the committee which has prepared this legislation.

The legislation before us would provide $325 million in Federal aid during the first year to be distributed as outright grants for school construction to the individual States on a per capita basis of the recipient State's school-age population. The relief proposed in this legislation would be directed exclusively for solving the problems of our Nation's public schools.

But laudable as this legislation is, I am convinced that unless we recognize the problem with which the Nation's private schools are faced, and also make an effort to solve their problem, any action that this Congress may take on the question of Federal aid to education will indeed be inadequate.

In order to help the Nation's private schools, at the appropriate time I shall offer an amendment which would provide an additional 15 percent of the amount now proposed for public school construction, that is, $48,750,000, to be made available to the U.S. Commissioner of Education for the purpose of granting long-term loans to private, not-for-profit schools throughout the Nation for construction or renovation purposes.

I have selected the figure 15 percent because that is the percentage of American school-age children who are today attending nonpublic schools throughout the country. And I propose that these funds be made available in addition to the $325 million because I do not want to in any way reduce the help proposed for our public schools.

These loans would be repaid to the U.S. Government over a period not to exceed 40 years and at an interest rate based on the average that the Federal Government is now paying on its outstanding obligations. My amendment provides an additional one-quarter of 1 percent for the cost of administration.

I should like to emphasize that my amendment would provide loans and not direct grants to private schools. The money would be distributed to qualifying institutions in each State in an amount proportionate to the ratio which the private, nonprofit, elementary and secondary school population in any such State bears to such population nationally.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House of Representatives to seriously ponder the role of the private schools in America and the contribution they are making to our Nation's educational process.

According to statistics compiled by the U.S. Office of Education for 1957, one out of every seven pupils of grade school or high school age attended a nonpublic school in this country. These figures show that in 1957 there were 6,921,000 American youngsters attending public high schools and another 899,000 attending nonpublic high schools. At the grade school level, the enrollment in public schools for that year was 25,418,000, while an additional 4,293,000 youngsters attended nonpublic elementary schools.

Thus, we see that while roughly 32 million youngsters were being educated in public elementary and high schools, another 5 million were attending private elementary and secondary institutions. Excluding the cost of plant investment, the parents of these 5 million youngsters attending nonpublic schools were saving the taxpayers of this Nation an estimated $1,800 million in operating costs alone.

In other words, if the parents of these children today attending nonpublic schools were to rebel against this contribution which they are making for the tuition payments of their youngsters to private institutions, the local school boards across the Nation would have to raise their taxes by at least $1,800 million. This, of course, does not include the billions of dollars that would have to be found to either purchase the existing school plants of these private institutions or provide new facilities.

Bringing this whole picture down to an even simpler denominator, there was evidence presented to my committee when it discussed this particular amendment which indicated that in one school district in Pennsylvania, when there was a fear that a nonpublic school would have to close its doors and turn its 421 students over to the public school authorities, the tax rate in that community would have increased from $0.31 per $100 valuation on real estate to $0.51 per $100.

There is perhaps an even more compelling reason than the economics of this problem for the Congress of the United States to provide financial loans to private educational institutions. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this loan program is in the public interest for the very elemental reason that private schools serve a public purpose.

We Americans have no trouble accepting hospitals, orphanages, cemeteries as serving the public purpose—even to the point of giving them a great deal of help. We should have no less trouble recognizing an identical role for private schools.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has properly recognized this fact. The Office of Education 3 years ago published a document entitled "The State and the Nonpublic School." The opening sentences of the first chapter emphasize the place of private, nonprofit schools in American life:

> Nonpublic educational institutions are and have always been a significant part of the Nation's total educational resources. These institutions serve millions of American youth and adults each year.
>
> They play an enormous role in transmitting our cultural heritage and enriching it. They make contributions to all levels of education and in all areas. They exert a tremendous influence in fashioning the American way of life.

It is rather interesting to note that this study, in its own words, "describes the legal framework under which the nonpublic schools are enabled to enjoy desirable freedom in their operation and are encouraged to provide educational programs in the public interest."

We, therefore, in this Congress are faced with a strange paradox indeed. On the one hand, we have a responsible agency of Government recognizing the fact that the private schools of America are making a significant contribution to our educational development. On the other hand, we here in Congress are being asked to relegate the students, and parents of these students, who are attending nonpublic schools to a status of second-class citizens by refusing to include assistance in the form of loans for their institutions.

I am in full sympathy with the parents of those students attending nonpublic schools who have protested that their children will be included in a State's school-age population for the purpose of determining the State's share of Federal assistance for public schools, on the one hand, while the students in nonpublic schools in no way will be permitted to benefit from this assistance, on the other hand.

Let me give you an example of what I mean.

In Illinois we have a total school-age population of some 1,900,000 youngsters attending elementary and secondary schools. This is the figure that will be used in determining my State's quota of the $325 million which we are proposing today to give to the individual States for school construction. But in this figure of 1,900,000 youngsters are included 441,000 youngsters attending nonpublic schools, whose only benefits from this Federal aid could be measured in a possible ultimate reduction in their parents' local real estate taxes.

If it is true that the legislation which we are considering today is designed to meet the Nation's educational problems, then I believe it logically follows that the same problems exist in the Nation's nonpublic schools, and should be met with a workable solution within the framework of our Constitution. A determination that education needs Federal assistance must include an evaluation of the total

educational effort of our country. A partial solution will bring only partial results.

There are those who have said that they oppose this legislation on the grounds of principle. To them I would like to say that the system of government established by the Federal Constitution keeps alive the pluralism which has characterized our Nation. Neither the Founding Fathers nor Americans today have desired to embody any dedicated pattern of life, or to seek a least common denominator, or to marshal the people into any preconceived monolithic mold. The pluralistic nature of our society is one of the greatest bulwarks of freedom. An important element of that pluralism is represented in our multiple educational system. Such multiplicity is healthy for the Nation. My amendment to provide a loan program for these private schools will help to keep alive the pluralistic pattern in the field of education in conformity with the best of our traditions and heritage.

My amendment for providing loans to nonprofit schools has substantial legislative precedents.

Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, provides for long-term, moderate interest rate loans to construct collegiate dormitories, social centers, and related facilities. The formula determining the interest rate on college housing loans is the formula in my amendment.

In 1958 Congress enacted the National Defense Education Act. Title III provides for loans to nonprofit schools of an elementary and secondary level for the purpose of securing scientific and foreign language equipment. Title V of the same act makes provision for Federal grants to nonprofit educational institutions to maintain a program of testing and guidance.

In the same year the Hill-Burton Act, which provides for grants to public and nonprofit hospitals, was amended so that loans could be made to hospitals, nursing homes, and related health care institutions. This was done at the request of the Baptists, who contended that a loan program would not involve a violation of separation of church and state.

These acts were adopted after mature deliberation. They have not been challenged in any court. Today they are well established precedents representing a pronounced legislative trend and constituting a consistent construction of the constitutionality of a loan program for nonprofit institutions.

This trend was initiated at the time that the Supreme Court of the United States decided the latest church case, *Zorach* v. *Clauson* (343 U.S. 306). In the case the broad generalizations of earlier church-state opinions—McCollum against Board of Education and Everson against Board of Education—were brought within proper focus. The traditional norm of cooperation between church and state was reasserted and the Court declared that there must be a common-sense approach to the whole question for "otherwise the state and religion would be aliens to each other." The validity of my amendment rests on a common-sense approach to a commanding problem—the problem of constitutionally utilizing the maximum potential of the children in nonprofit as well as public schools.

As early as 1930 the U.S. Supreme Court upheld a Louisiana law providing free textbooks to children in church and other private schools. In 1947 the Supreme Court upheld a New Jersey law which authorized use of tax money to pay bus fares of children in nonpublic schools operated by a religious order.

In both these cases the Supreme Court held that such uses of public funds do not violate the Federal Constitution. With this Federal barrier removed, State after State in recent years has moved to extend public services to private school pupils. Free transportation to nonpublic schools is today being provided in at least some communities in 20 or more States.

The interest rate in my amendment is predicated in the last analysis on the average annual rate on all interest bearing obligations of the United States forming a part of the public debt, as computed at the end of the fiscal year plus one-fourth of 1 percent for the cost of administration. At the present time this interest rate is 3⅛ percent.

The question as to whether the college housing formula results in an interest rate which is in effect a subsidy was discussed before the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency at the first session of the 86th Congress. These hearings took place after the President's message disapproving S. 57. Dr. John Hanna, president of Michigan State University, submitted a detailed study demonstrating that the interest rate did not constitute a subsidy. He pointed out that the loans to nonprofit institutions are combinations of loans of varying terms, some quite short, others ranging up to 50 years. He observed that in many respects college housing loans resemble mortgages in that portions of the principal are repaid at regular intervals before the final maturity date. Since college housing obligation consists of long- and short-term obligations, there is a logical justification for tying the interest rate to the average rate for all interest bearing obligations of the United States, short and long. Moreover, since the interest rate periodically fluctuates, a college may liquidate a portion of its indebtedness at a rate substantially higher than 3⅛ percent. On the other hand, another portion may be liquidated at a rate lower than 3⅛ percent.

The testimony before the subcommittee indicates that, in the long run, the colleges would not be paying less than the average interest rate for long- and short-term Government obligations. On page 389 of the said hearings, a table was introduced submitting the rates of interest paid by the Treasury on borrowings from various trust funds. The average interest rate on the Insurance Trust Fund was 2.5 percent; the Railroad Retirement Fund, 3 percent; the Civil Service Retirement Fund, 2⅝ percent; the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund, 2¾ percent. The grand total of the borrowing from said funds was approximately $40 billion at an average rate of less than 3 percent.

Similar testimony was presented to the Subcommittee on Housing of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on May 21, 1958, by Dr. Lewis Jones, representing the American Council on Education.

How can anyone who has supported the National Defense Education Act, who has supported the National School Lunch Act, who has supported the Housing Act of 1950, who has supported the Hill-Burton Act of 1958, today effectively argue against the amendment which I proposed to this legislation?

Mr. Chairman, our Nation is today faced with a tremendous crisis in our educational institutions. If we are to win the great technological struggle we are now waging against the Soviet Union, we Americans must make sure that our youngsters have unlimited educational opportunities from the first grade on. I am certain that the great scientists who are now helping America maintain a strong position in the world were not asked what grade schools or high schools they attended. I am confident that at all levels of intellectual and scientific pursuits in America today we have men and women who got their educational start in nonpublic schools.

I could list a long line of famous Americans who received their initial education in nonpublic schools operated by Catholics, Lutherans, Baptists, other Protestant denominations, the Jewish community, and nonsectarian private groups. We are dealing here today with the problem of providing education for the children of America. Let us not permit ourselves to be divided in a sincere effort toward finding an answer to the many problems of our Nation's educational facilities by the charge that we are in effect violating this Nation's traditional separation of church and State.

I wish to assure you with all the vigor in me that I, for one, firmly believe in the doctrine of separation of church and state and never want to do anything that would in any way weaken the doctrine which has made America the greatest Nation in the world. But the principle of separation is not involved in this amendment.

What we propose here are loans for the schools which are today making such profound contribution to our educational process—loans that are badly needed to bring many of the private schools up to modern safety standards.

I have here, Mr. Chairman, photographs of the tragic fire which destroyed the Our Lady of Angels Elementary School in Chicago in 1958. I show you here the grieving parents of the 87 young children who died in this fire. While, for the most part, the private schools of America can be proud of their modern standards, the loans which my amendment would make available would help every private school in this country install the necessary standards to prevent another such tragedy.

Mr. Chairman, I witnessed this great tragedy in Chicago in 1958; and I determined at that time that if I ever had an

opportunity to do something about this problem, I would use every resource at my disposal to make sure that this would never happen again. I know of no other way that we can help these private schools, and I trust that my colleagues will judge this amendment in the real spirit in which it is being offered. That spirit is to give every youngster the right to attend the school of his choosing and to be able to receive his education in buildings that are safe, sound, and adequate. Since my amendment would provide long-term loans for these private schools which could be used for construction or renovation, adoption of this amendment would go a long way toward helping these private schools meet their building needs.

I urge the House to support my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I enclose herewith a copy of my amendment to H.R. 10128:

Amendment to the bill H.R. 10128 to authorize an emergency program of Federal assistance in school construction to the States, viz: On page 1 amend title by adding the following: "and to provide loans for the construction of private, nonprofit elementary and secondary school facilities."

On page 2, line 23, strike out "SEC. 3" and insert in lieu "SEC. 3(a)."

On page 3, line 5, add:

"(b) There is further authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and the succeeding fiscal year (or years), such sum, not to exceed $48,750,000 in any fiscal year which shall be equal to 15 per centum of such sums as may be appropriated by the Congress in accordance with section 3(a), for making loans to private, nonprofit elementary and secondary schools in each State for constructing school facilities. Such loans are hereby authorized to be granted by the Commissioner, and the total amount of such loans awarded for use by qualifying institutions in each State shall be in an amount proportionate to the ratio which the private, nonprofit elementary, and secondary school population in any such State bears to such population nationally. Any such loan—

"(1) shall be made upon application containing such information as may be deemed necessary by the Commissioner: *Provided*, That the Commissioner shall, in allocating the loans to the respective States, distribute them on a basis of priority to those applicants demonstrating the greatest degree of need;

"(2) shall be subject to such conditions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States;

"(3) may be in an amount not exceeding the total construction cost, as determined by the Commissioner, and shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Commissioner which shall not be more than the higher of (A) 2¾ per centum per annum, or (B) the total of one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum added to the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date on which the contract for the loan is made and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum; and

"(4) shall mature and be repayable on such date as may be agreed to by the Commissioner and the borrower, but such date shall not be more than forty years after the date on which such loan was made.

If any part of the total funds permitted to be allocated within a given State remain unused at the end of the first fiscal year, they shall be reallocated for use by institutions in other States at the discretion of the Commissioner. Such sums shall be over and above the sums duly appropriated in the succeeding fiscal year."

Renumber succeeding lines and pages as necessary.

On page 13, line 8, after "SEC. 3" add "(a)."

On page 25 add new line 4 and insert:

"(i) The term 'private, nonprofit elementary and secondary school' means an educational organization described in section 503(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is entitled to exemption from income tax under Section 501(a) of such Code. It further means, for the purpose of this Act, a school attendance at which meets the requirement of the compulsory attendance statutes of the State in which the applicant school is located."

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-one Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] is recognized.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like very much to compliment the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] who just spoke in behalf of loans to private schools. In my judgment, he has presented a sound case, and I would support it most actively. I introduced an amendment in committee to that effect, and I was disappointed that it did not carry. During the debate on the rule I talked about the basis of need. These schools not tax supported have a justification—they have need and they are doing a tremendous job. There is quite a case for the private schools of this country that are doing so valuable work.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much opposed to H.R. 10128 in its present form primarily because it does not include the basis of need. We are proposing in this measure to accept an additional Federal burden at a time when our long-range financial requirements, as that matter was discussed when we were debating the rule, are very difficult to appraise.

In view of the tense international situation it is incumbent upon us, in my judgment, to make sure that every possible tax resource available to the Federal Government be wisely devoted to the national defense. Our States and local communities have long had ample resources for the construction of schools and other public facilities, without any general assistance from the Federal Government. There would be far more justification for this program if the record showed that our communities were falling behind in the important task of constructing school classrooms to meet the need of our expanding population. However, any objective examination of the record clearly shows that this is not the case. In fact, the minority views filed in this minority report, No. 1426, on this bill clearly shows the dramatic progress that has been made in the construction of those facilities. The country has been building classrooms, as the saying goes, "like crazy."

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that a table from this report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to secure that permission in the House.

Mr. HIESTAND. The summary of the construction report reads as follows:

Average annual construction of school classrooms from the years 1950 to 1955 is 51,200 classrooms. The average from 1955 to 1959 is 67,400 per year.

In other words, we have stepped up the building of classrooms, and the population bulge of schoolchildren is about to decrease. According to the U.S. Office of Education and Bureau of Census, who have surveyed our prospective needs, the available annual increase in school enrollment during the period 1955 to 1959 was 1,200,000. In the 5 years 1960 to 1964 it will average 1 million annually. From 1965 through 1969 it will be only 600,000 per year. There has been a marked decline in the so-called backload of needed classrooms, including those necessary to replace obsolescent facilities, and the trend continues. At this rate we'll be catching up in 1963, and will be caught up with total demand in 1967 all without Federal aid. Surely there will always be spots of shortages but the communities are and will be taking care of those.

Under the provisions of the pending measure, a major portion of the funds authorized will be given to those States which are financially in the best shape to meet their own classroom needs, if their taxing powers are not burdened with additional obligations to the Federal Government.

In fact, of the $325 million in Federal funds available during the first year of this proposed bill, 42½ percent will be allocated to seven of our most populated and wealthy States. These funds will be distributed without regard to the rich districts which are well equipped, and to those districts which have done a magnificent job in taking care of their needs as well as to the poorer districts.

Any such program makes no economic sense, and merely imposes Federal controls instead of State supervision and financing, which has proved so effective in developing our educational processes.

There has been general agreement that this Nation over the years has done a magnificent educating job with the control in the districts. We say that with Federal money must come Federal control. Why should it not? Do we dare allot a thousand million dollars of the consumers' money to the States and to the districts without some kind of control on them to be sure that the money goes where it is intended? Is it not our duty as Members of Congress to do this? With Federal money must go a certain amount of Federal control despite the disclaimer in the bill.

When we were discussing the rule, I said that in my judgment this was not

a school bill. It was a bill to test further Federal aid to anybody or any particular community.

We have attacked the method of determining need. It can be further attacked when we quote the survey that was made by the Department of Education and the Department of the Budget in trying to find out what the needs were. Not having had any testimony for the past 2 years on the subject as to the basis of need, a check was required, and various figures have been quoted. It is reported from the areas of Atlanta, Dade County, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Detroit that there is a wide difference in definition of a classroom. The investigation revealed:

1. Wide differences in definition of a "classroom" and variations in the pupils per classroom assumed as a standard.

2. Duplication of reporting within a single State, i.e., children were reported in the total of "excess enrollment" as well as in the total of "improperly housed."

3. Differences from year to year in the methods of defining classrooms. For example, one year Alabama used the so-called Strayer-Engleheart formula in identifying "the shortage" and the next year a State evaluation form was used. One method made the shortage appear several times as great as the other;

4. Complete lack of any estimate of a State's or local school system's ability to meet the reported shortage;

5. Some States shifted from estimates to more reliable reporting from one year to the next. However, Office of Education totals did not indicate these year-to-year variations in computing "national totals" from the State reports;

An illustration of this would be that the cities, such as New York and Philadelphia, were not included (except by estimation) in the 1958 report, but were included in the 1959 report, thus cutting down on the amount that the national shortage was "reduced" during the year 1958–59;

6. The conclusion that a man from the Bureau of the Budget should be designated to review all Office of Education statistical surveys.

How can we logically write a law based upon such sketchy material?

I was unable to find out either in the committee or here in the House what the real number of school districts that had exceeded or are within striking distance of their financial bonding limits.

They drew the conclusion that a man from the Bureau of the Budget should be designated to review all Office of Education statistical surveys.

Mr. Chairman, much more could be said on this proposition. This is not a temporary or an emergency measure; it is freely confessed that it is a permanent measure. It starts small, but it is going to grow big. They have not and cannot show an emergency.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the bill be defeated. I suggest that if amendments are offered that would propose to include either measures such as salaries to teachers definitely we do then have to have more Federal control. That, in my judgment, would be fatal to the American formula for free enterprise or the protection of the consumer's dollar.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, the increased tension between the United States and Russia strongly points up the responsibility of Congress and the American people to strengthen the foundations of our democracy. No portion of that foundation contains greater strength than our educational system This is our ultimate weapon. There is no more critical claim upon Congress, and upon every American citizen, than the improvement of educational opportunity for all.

As the House considers this important educational bill, it is well to remind ourselves of the historical legacy that has given the Federal Government a shared responsibility with State and local governments from the years predating the Constitution. As early as 1785, in the most lasting contributions of the Continental Congress, the American Government provided for the ceding of the 16th section of every township in the public domain for educational purposes. The great Northwest Ordinance of 1787 stated:

Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

That the Founding Fathers agreed on the need for national support of the schools is readily seen from an examination of their words. President Washington stated:

In a country like this * * * if there cannot be money found to answer the common purposes of education, there is something amiss in the ruling political power, which requires a steady regulating, and energetic hand to correct and control it.

Alexander Hamilton, the brilliant first Secretary of the Treasury, declared that—

Whatever concerns the general interest of learning * * * are within the sphere of the national councils, as far as regards an application of money.

Washington's successor, President John Adams, felt that—

The whole people must take upon themselves the education of the whole people and be willing to bear the expense of it.

Said Thomas Jefferson, in words that echo in our ears today:

A nation that expects to be ignorant and free expects that which never was and never will be.

Less than a century later, in the midst of the tragedy of Civil War, the Congress of the United States passed in 1862 the Morrill Act, signed by President Lincoln, setting up the first land-grant colleges with the use of Federal funds and Federal money. Under this act my own State has been buttressed in its educational endeavors down the years by a great educational institution—South Dakota State College at Brookings.

Historically, the strengthening of our educational effort has received strong bipartisan support. President Theodore Roosevelt declared that—

The share that the National Government should take in the broad work of education has not yet received the attention and care it rightly deserves.

The late Senator Robert Taft, chief sponsor of Federal assistance for education in the 80th Congress, said in 1948:

It does not have the glamour that other things have, but it seems to me we must go forward in the field of education for our people and I know of no way of going forward in that field to any substantial degree without providing some Federal financial assistance.

Although, as we have seen, our history disproves it, we sometimes give the impression that this is a recent issue on the American scene. It is significant that the Republican Party stated in its platform 72 years ago that—

The State or Nation, or both combined, should support free institutions of learning.

In 1920 the Democratic Party platform carried the plank:

Cooperative Federal assistance to the States is immediately required for * * * the increase of teachers' salaries.

In his special education message to Congress on January 27, 1958, President Eisenhower asked for Federal funds to be used to "employ additional qualified science and mathematics teachers."

SOUTH DAKOTA SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman, in my own State of South Dakota some 81 percent of our local and State school revenue is derived from property taxes. We rank fourth in the Nation in this effort and first in the Nation in the percent of personal income going to State and local property taxes. We do not have to take a back seat to any State in our strivings to meet our educational needs. Yet I must also point out that in 1959 only 11.8 percent of our elementary-school teachers in South Dakota had the minimum of 4 years of college while 31 percent had less than 2 years of college. We also know that from 1957–63 our school-age population in South Dakota will increase 15 percent. There is no guesswork involved—the children are already here.

A MOBILE POPULATION

That this is a national problem is illustrated by the mobility of our population. We are a people on the go with over 35 million of us changing our addresses each year. Thus, the effect of education offered in a given school may be registered in a State far removed from where the education was acquired. For instance, 1950 census figures show that some 347,000 native-born South Dakotans are now living in other States while 181,000 of our citizens were born in other States and have since migrated to South Dakota.

TEACHER SALARY LEVELS

The continuing inability of State after State to keep up with teacher demand is understandable when we compare their

salaries to that of other professionally trained people. The average salary of classroom teachers in South Dakota for 1959–60 was $3,600. The national average was $5,025. It is little wonder that Dr. Arthur Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, said recently that a 100 percent increase in teachers salaries within the next 5 or 10 years was "a reasonable national goal."

LOCAL PROPERTY TAXES

As a rural State with property taxes among the highest in the Nation, a classroom and teacher shortage, and a rising school-age population, South Dakota seemingly faces an insurmountable obstacle. It has been suggested that States like South Dakota enact tax laws on out-of-State corporations. It is true that a significant portion of our business is conducted by corporate-owned enterprises who pay taxes in other States at their home offices on corporate incomes earned in South Dakota. South Dakotans contribute to the earnings of these corporations, but only through a Federal support program can our share of these taxes be returned to benefit the State. Faced with staggering financial burdens States such as South Dakota may be forced into levying corporate taxes, with the rates varying from State to State, unless Federal assistance for education is increased.

It is obvious that local and State tax systems, relying heavily on the property tax, cannot raise taxes to the point of driving people out of homeownership or placing their communities in an unfavorable competitive economic position with other States in their desire to raise educational standards.

South Dakota, with a per capita income in 1957 of only $1,531, was spending $333 for every child in school. These expenditures among the individual States range from a high of $535 a year to a low of $164, with a national average of $340 per pupil. This gross disparity in educational expenditure between our richest and our poorest States can be rectified only with Federal support.

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE COST

Let me also clear up the myth regarding the heavy cost of collecting the Federal tax dollar in comparison with that of the State or local government. The cost of collecting Federal taxes, according to Internal Revenue figures, was 44 cents per $100 in 1959. The cost of collecting State taxes generally is $1 per $100. The cost of collecting and administering local revenue has run as high as $5 to $10 per $100, according to experts who have studied the problem. You will note that I have omitted administration of State and Federal taxes, whereas I have included administration of local taxes. We have no figures on the costs of administration at the State level, but the cost of administering 10 grant programs of the Federal Government averaged 1.2 percent of the amounts administered. This means that the cost of collecting the Federal tax dollar and the administration of Federal grant programs totals about 1.6 percent.

None of us is so naive as to believe that money alone will solve our educational ills. But the extent to which we will apply our financial resources is, in part, a measure of our purpose in other respects as well. It is not encouraging to note that we spend slightly more on alcohol and cosmetics and more than twice as much on advertising as we do on education.

Federal support bills for school construction and teachers' salaries are an expression of the genius of our federalism. The Federal Government does what it can do best, namely, mobilize financial resources through taxation, and State and local governments do what they can do best, namely, make grassroots decisions and carry out functions under the direct control and close scrutiny of the local electorate.

NO FEDERAL STRINGS TO ASSISTANCE

I would favor a Federal support program for education that would enable each State to deal according to its own needs, with the shortage of qualified teachers and shortage of classrooms without dictation by the Federal Government.

We can make no more worthwhile investment in our Nation's future than to strengthen our most precious resource—the minds of our children. Let us move then to assure our children of a quality education sufficient for the demands of the space age.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, somehow I cannot reconcile the opposition to the legislation by Members of the Congress who vote subsidies to various groups, both domestic and foreign.

The question before us goes much deeper than the surface arguments presented here.

In our early formative days, education was more of a convenience than a necessity. Today my friends it is a necessity in every sense of the word. In our personal pursuit of health and happiness it is essential in making a living in our competitive economy. In our national life it has become a matter of life or death in our struggle for existence in a troubled world.

Need—not an extension of Federal aid just for the purpose of extending Federal aid.

The necessity for this legislation is based upon a plain, simple, economic fact.

The Federal Government has reached into every State, every subdivision of Government for more and more taxes. Revenues formerly available to school district are not longer available without jeopardizing the very existence of our local government.

My State, Pennsylvania, has State aid to education for the simple reason that many of the subdivisions could not maintain their educational standards with local taxations.

The fight for universal educational opportunities has been a long and hard fought battle.

It is not won yet, by any stretch of the imagination. When we place our opposition to this legislation on the basis of States rights many of us show the nimbleness of our minds and the flexibilities of our convictions.

The question came up on the restrictions in this bill which would deny any help to districts that have reached their bonded debt limit.

Of course this is true, however, under the Metcalf bill and behind the logical reasoning for allowing school districts to use this money for construction or teachers salaries.

The logic being that by giving aid for teachers salaries it will reduce the budgetary needs for this item which in turn will release funds to match Federal funds for construction needs.

We are rapidly approaching the final showdown on aid to education. All of us know or at least we are led to believe that there is something radically wrong with our education system. All of us are told that it is because of the lack of funds to properly house our education system and to pay our teaching staff a proper and reasonable salary scale. It does not take an expert to know that somewhere along the line we failed to keep abreast of our needs in both construction and salary schedules.

For 15 years since the end of World War II practically nothing has been done nationally to aid our local grade and high schools, except where the Federal Government itself created overcrowding by new or enlarged military posts or Government agencies. Yet the need for Federal aid is overwhelming. Take classrooms alone.

Every year the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare dismally announces the continuing classroom shortage. This past year HEW Secretary Arthur S. Flemming sent his usual Christmas message to the schoolchildren of America. He said loftily:

I can come to only one conclusion. The Nation is not moving fast enough to reduce the classroom shortage.

Then Secretary Flemming added a few facts: Last year the number of classrooms needed for pupils rose again. We now need 66,400 classrooms where we needed 65,800 a year ago. Today we are told that 132,000 classrooms are needed.

Number of pupils above normal size classes rose. We now have almost 2 million children who cannot fit into our classrooms. At the same time, the number of classrooms built fell for the second straight year. We fell more than 10 percent behind the previous year and built less than we did in the school year 1955–56.

Bond issues for new classrooms dropped. Most bond issues were limited to seven States. "In short," he concluded, "we have made very little progress over the year in dealing with the huge backlog of need for classrooms which developed during the war years, when school construction was virtually at a standstill." But what did Secretary Flemming's Christmas message propose?

Nothing. He said nothing about what to do on this shortage. He left this matter open until after Christmas for President Eisenhower's state of the Union message to Congress. This brings us to the second scene of this little act in our current national tragedy. President Eisenhower went up to address the Congress. He took a very high level approach to Federal action helping our schools. In fact he left them high and dry:

We cannot be complacent about educating our youth—

He announced.

But—

He carefully added—

the educational process, essentially a local and personal responsibility, cannot be made to leap ahead by crash centralized government action.

The President then proposed "to stimulate classroom construction, not by substitution of Federal dollars for State and local funds, but by incentives to extend and encourage State and local efforts." There is only one thing wrong with this proposal. It will not work.

Add to this the loss of good teachers to better paying jobs in other fields. This does not mean that teachers want to leave the schools, it means that their incomes in all cases are fixed by law, local and State, and in too many instances the level has been set by the ability of the school district with or without State aid to pay and not on the economic requirements of the teachers.

Even the school districts cannot be blamed universally because, in too many cases, the ability to raise more tax funds has been stretched to the breaking point. The Federal Government, over the years, has increased its tax take from local citizens leaving little for the local and States to draw from. There are many who believe that unless the Federal Government cuts down its take from States and local communities or gives some of it back to these entities the education system cannot meet its obligations for construction of new facilities and upgrading salary schedules.

These are the practical phases of the question of Federal aid to education. Overriding even the material and financial need is the political and philosophical approach. There is a great and distinguished group of well meaning Americans who are against Federal aid because of fear of interference by the Federal Government into State and local educational programs and institutions.

Then there is another group equally well meaning who say "we cannot afford it, we must balance the budget."

Finally we have the group which is fighting Federal aid because of the localized opposition in our Southern States who are fighting against any and all direct or indirect attempts to segregate education.

One thing that seems to escape all of these groups is that this Government is spending billions on aid to education, that is, in foreign countries under the guise of military and economic aid. Let us look at just a few of the aids to education in the last foreign aid bill.

We all know the United States gives billions to foreign countries each year to strengthen them in their fight against communism. But did you know that last year we agreed to pay $237,000 to improve teaching in Philippine schools? Did you know we earmarked over $1.18 million that same year for better schools and vocational training for youngsters in Thailand, which is the modern name for Siam? And that the little country of Korea was slated to get more than $2.1 million to improve its educational system? In varying amounts, every year we have assured Federal aid to education in Burma, Cambodia, Free China, India, Indonesia, Laos, Vietnam, Afghanistan, Ceylon, and a host of other countries in Asia and Europe and Africa and South America. We even allotted $112,000 to Yugoslavia, an admitted Communist but anti-Russian nation, to boost vocational training and teach English.

Year in and year out, we are tabbing between $30 and $53 millions for educating young people in nations throughout the world. For health, sanitation, and social welfare, we are yearly devoting even much greater amounts. We are told that this is a vital part of our continuing struggle. Every dollar we spend to educate and train and help our neighbors to stand on their own feet is a dollar well spent.

But what about education right here at home? Granted we are in a race with Russia, in which knowledge and know-how may be vital to our existence, what are we doing nationally to improve grade and high schools locally? The answer is almost nothing. The answer then, to those who oppose Federal moneys for education, to those who oppose Federal aid because "we cannot afford it," to those who want no interference with their local schools and finally to those who are against Federal aid to schools that are mixed by custom or law, is simple and plain. Can we afford to let our own internal school system deteriorate and still take tax moneys to build up external systems.

The majority of the Members, I am sure, want to help our educational system while at the same time keep the Federal Government out of our school system. There appears to be one answer and that is the direct approach by reducing Federal income taxes by a given percentage and allowing this amount to be collected by the State for educational purposes.

Even this approach can be argued against; but one thing remains sure. We must do something for our school system. Congress may be on the brink of a dilemma, but so are the parents of children seeking an education in a world where the proper education of our people is a requisite to survival. It appears certain that some legislation will pass this session.

The General Education Subcommittee has approved the following bill by a vote of 4 to 2. The subcommittee has a membership of four Democrats and two Republicans. The vote was on party line.

The full committee has met and voted 18 for and 10 against. Again, I am sorry to report the vote was on party line.

The next action will be on the floor, when and if the Rules Committee gives the necessary rule. It appears to be a certainty that many amendments will be offered when brought on the floor. I shall make a further report after House action.

You will note that the sum of $64,925,000 is the share allocated to our State. This means approximately $1,000 per teaching unit. This entire amount may be used by the State department of education to increase teachers' salaries, or for school construction, or the Department can use any portion for one or the other.

H.R. 22, AS AMENDED AND REPORTED BY THE GENERAL EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE ON APRIL 16, 1959

The title of the bill is "to provide financial assistance for the support of public schools, appropriating funds to the States to be used for constructing school facilities and for teachers' salaries."

SUMMARY

Section 1, short title: The bill may be cited as the "School Support Act of 1959."

Section 2, findings and purpose of act: The Congress finds that despite sustained and vigorous efforts by States and local communities to build schools and to increase teachers' salaries, there are still serious shortages of classrooms and of teachers which require emergency action on the part of the Federal Government. The purpose of this bill is to provide Federal financial support to help meet both the immediate and the continuing problems of financing adequate school facilities and teachers' salaries and thereby to strengthen our Nation's educational system.

Section 3, authorization of appropriation: Authorizes appropriations to be made for each fiscal year of a 4-year period beginning July 1, 1959, of $25 multiplied by school-age population. This subcommittee amendment establishes a terminal date where none existed, and it eliminates the escalator clause. For the 4 comparable years, the subcommittee amendment reduces the appropriation from $11.4 billion to $4.4 billion.

Section 4, allotments to States: The U.S. Commissioner of Education shall allot funds to each State on the basis of the State's school-age population, subject to such adjustments, if any, as result from the application of section 8.

The State education agency of each State which desires to receive an allotment under the provisions of this bill shall specify annually to the Commissioner the proportion of its State's allotment that will be expended for each of the two purposes: (a) School construction, and (b) teachers' salaries.

The subcommittee has added language making crystal clear that a State

educational agency may elect to use its allotment for construction, or teachers' salaries, or both.

Payments to the States must be made by the Commissioner of Education within 30 days after funds become available to him.

Section 5, school construction portion: The State education agency of a State which uses a portion of its allotment under this bill for construction of school facilities shall certify to the Commissioner that such funds allocated within the State will be: (a) Expended solely for the construction of school facilities in accordance with this bill, and (b) so distributed that priority is given to local educational agencies which have the greatest need for additional school facilities and which in terms of the economic resources available to them are least able to finance the cost of needed school facilities.

Section 6, teachers' salary portion: The State education agency of a State which uses for teachers' salaries a portion of its allotment under this bill shall certify to the Commissioner that such funds allocated within the State will be: (a) Distributed among its school districts to be used solely for teachers' salaries, and (b) distributed so that one-half of the total portion of its allotment that it specifies for teachers' salaries will be allocated to school districts on a per-teacher basis, and the other one-half on an equalization basis.

Section 7, certification by States: Upon receipt by the State, funds allocated under this act shall thereafter be deemed to be State funds. The State education agency shall certify that funds have been distributed and expended according to provisions of this act.

Section 8, maintenance of State and local financial support of schools: This section of the bill sets forth a formula by which a State's allotment under section 4 would be reduced if its relative effort to support schools from State and local sources is less than the average effort for all the States. The section provides that the total sum resulting from the penalties involved would be reallotted among the States that made an effort at least equal to the national average.

The subcommittee's amendments to this section are technical rather than substantive. The formula is, with some minor exceptions, the stock effort index formula appearing in bills previously reported by this committee. An important clause in this section defers application of the maintenance of effort provision for the first two years that allotments are made under the bill.

Section 9, labor standards: This section provides that the State education agency shall give assurance to the Commissioner that workmen employed on school construction projects financed by allotments under the bill will be paid as determined by the U.S. Secretary of Labor under the Davis-Bacon Act.

Section 10, appropriation for administration: Authorizes to be appropriated to the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary for the administration of this bill.

Section 11, assurance against Federal interference in schools: In the administration of this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration and operation of any school or school system. The subcommittee has added the words "and operation" in order to add rigidity to this disclaimer. It is significant that, even without this disclaimer section, the opportunity for Federal control of educational policies simply does not exist. To obtain funds a State educational agency must inform the U.S. Commissioner in what manner the allotment is to be divided between construction and teachers' salaries, and then he must certify that allocations for either or both of the two purposes were made within the broad guidelines set forth by the Congress.

Section 12, definition: This section is self-explanatory. The definitions are stock definitions commonly used in legislation previously approved by this committee. "Teacher" is defined to be what each State educational agency deems a teacher to be; "teachers' salaries" is so defined that funds may be expended only as compensation for teaching.

The estimated allotment to Pennsylvania under H.R. 22, as amended, is $64,925,000—approximately $1,000 per teaching unit.

Education bills are moving slowly through our Committee on Education and should be ready for action sometime in June or early July.

One of the big drawbacks to Federal aid to education is the fear of Federal domination. Congress must first resolve this phase of Federal aid before any real answer can be written into law.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, for those who believe that improved education and expanded educational opportunities for all our people constitute perhaps our country's greatest single national need, there will be many reasons to look with favor on the pending legislation.

The most immediate and most practical reason, in my opinion, is the fact that this bill is undoubtedly the best that can be enacted into law this year. And in view of the urgency of catching up with the demand for adequate school and classroom space, action this year is essential.

As a compromise measure, the present bill cannot be expected to meet fully the varied and conflicting standards of many of our colleagues. For example, the bill's $325 million annual authorization will be too little for many supporters of Federal aid and too much for others. The program's proposed 3-year lifetime will be too long for those who believe that "temporary" programs become permanent and much too brief for those who believe the Federal Government has a continuing responsibility to help fill the gaps in educational needs.

Likewise, there will be some who will object that the assistance does not include teachers' salaries and other educational necessities, or who will urge that Federal standards should be eliminated, or who will propose that greater emphasis be given to helping the neediest States, or who will insist that any Federal aid should be limited to retirement of school construction bonds.

It is apparent, however, that no bill could possibly meet these diverse demands. In some respects, it does not meet the requirements which I believe should be met by Federal-aid legislation. But I believe that Congress can no longer afford to postpone accepting its responsibility in this vital field. For more than 10 years, virtually every responsible group, public and private, which has studied the educational needs of our country has recommended a program of Federal aid to help reduce the backlog of needed classroom space. This recommendation has always been a fundamental and integral part of any plan for lifting American educational standards and for improving the quality of American public education.

The situation described by President Eisenhower in his message to Congress on January 28, 1957, is as pointed and pertinent today as it was then. The President said in part:

> The need for Federal assistance in eliminating this shortage is not theory but demonstrated fact. It cannot now be said—realistically—that the States and communities will meet the need. The classroom shortage has been apparent for a number of years, and the States and communities have notably increased their school building efforts. Each year, for several years, they have set a new record in school construction. And yet, in the face of a vast expansion in enrollments each year, many areas are making inadequate progress in reducing the shortage accumulated over many past years. The rate of State and local construction is spotty, with noticeable lags in areas where needs are expanding most rapidly.

The past 3½ years, Mr. Chairman, have not significantly altered a single one of the President's "demonstrated facts." Despite the bill's deficiencies, the need for legislation of this general kind is still most compelling.

The issue now before the House was described a few days ago by the education editor of the New York Times as "fairly simple." Either the pending bill passes in its present limited form, he said, or there is little hope for Federal aid. Any realistic person, I believe, must agree with this estimate.

Nevertheless, this point should also be stressed. However far it may fall short of the goals many of us share, this bill is on its own merits a good bill. It is an honest compromise in a most highly controversial area of public policy. It will provide for genuine progress to be made in meeting one of the most fundamental needs in education—sufficient classroom space to enable good teachers to obtain maximum results with a manageable group of students.

It is axiomatic, Mr. Chairman, that even the best teacher will find his or her effectiveness diminish in proportion to the overcrowded condition of the classroom. Yet, one of the most characteristic features of elementary and secondary education today is the harassed teacher facing a class of 40, 50, 60, and sometimes 70 or 80 restless and inattentive children.

This is not an atmosphere conducive to learning. This is not a situation in which even the brightest children led by the most talented teachers can hope to attain the levels of excellence to which we all subscribe.

The present bill will help improve this situation directly and, indirectly, can be a stimulus to States and localities to make greater efforts themselves toward this end. It has been estimated that the 3-year program will build directly about 25,000 classrooms and, by virtue of its provision for matching grants in the second and third years, will cause an additional 15,000 or so classrooms to be built which we otherwise would not obtain.

While this will not wipe out the present estimated classroom shortage of 132,400, it will represent definite progress at a time when progress is most important.

In my own State of New Jersey, the bill will provide funds to build about 250 classrooms a year with State matching funds adding an additional 250 classrooms for each of the last 2 years—making a total of about 1,250. At the beginning of the present academic year, New Jersey's estimated classroom shortage totaled about 1,800, after counting the number of classrooms already planned to be built this year.

Consequently, the present bill will play a significant part in helping to bring our State's educational facilities up to par, eliminate overcrowding, abolish double sessions and otherwise make possible a higher quality of instruction for our children.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that these would be eminently worthy goals at any point in our Nation's life. At this critical juncture in world history, they have become essential.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, my views on this general legislation I think are quite clear from my minority report which is available to all of you on the floor.

I would like to take this time, however, to discuss an aspect of this Federal aid to education problem that has been a little bit confusing to most of us. That is the question of how much each of these areas are bearing themselves in taxes to support the schools that are necessary in the opinion of the experts here in Washington for our national security or for other purposes. How do the States compare? We get all fouled up when we start to talk about this because we get the accusation that New York State's figures are loaded, that they have large commercial, international enterprises, and that we have the big cities like New York City that are essentially national in their scope and that these enterprises give us a great deal of tax income not available to other States. Why should a poor area that does not have these industrial giants have poorer schools than the wealthy areas, so-called? That is one of the major points that proponents keep stressing.

In order to clarify this situation I prepared a table which I put in the RECORD yesterday. It will be found on page 11009. This table compares the tax which will be paid by a family, call them the John Rover family, consisting of a wife and two children, if they live in New York State, Connecticut, Arkansas, or any other State in the Union.

The family has a total income of $5,000 per year. I have assumed that this family will have an automobile and that they will drive the car 10,000 miles a year; that they will get 15 miles to a gallon; that between the man and the wife they will smoke a pack of cigarettes a day; that they will own the house in their own name which has a true value of $10,000. This family owns $1,000 worth of tangible property and they make $800 worth of purchases subject to various State and local sales taxes.

Now, what do these figures come up with? Most of the States and localities rely for their revenue on a sales tax, a tobacco tax, a gasoline tax, a tangible property tax, a State income tax, and real property tax. These are the taxes which the average person pays to support his schools and his municipal and State operations. I have consulted the experts in the legislative and tax service of the Library of Congress and the Census Bureau and they have said that this table, in their opinion, is statistically valid. Now, an interesting thing was revealed when this table came in.

In Minnesota the total tax paid by the head of this family that makes $5,000 is $480.18. He makes $5,000, and all these other facts mentioned above apply to the family, the John Rover that we have assumed in Minnesota. If he moves to West Virginia, with the same conditions, paying the same Federal tax exactly, his support of his local and State governments is $139.03, $341 less than it is in Minnesota. Now, running down the line, Minnesota is the first State in the country in State and local taxes, with $480. Vermont second, $457; Massachusetts with $448; Maine with $425. This is the tax paid by the head of this family who makes $5,000 with two children. It is his personal tax. It is a not loaded picture, with industrial or commercial properties. Now, New York you have heard mentioned before today, as to the amount or percentage of tax that they devote to school purposes. In New York this family would pay $405.47 a year.

Now, I am going to put this table in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks so all of you can see how your State rates. This table will be put in to show the amount of money this family pays for their local and State taxes, starting with Minnesota and ending with the State of the chairman of the General Education Subcommittee, the gentleman from West Virginia, at $139.

Explanation of the method of arriving at the figures below:

Sales: This figure represents the State sales tax levied and collected by the States and does not include local sales taxes. It is presumed the individual spends $800 per year on goods subject to this sales tax.

Tobacco: This represents the State tax on cigarettes. We presume the family consumes 1 pack of cigarettes per day.

Gasoline: This figure represents the State tax on gasoline gallonage. We presume the family drives 10,000 miles a year, getting 15 miles to the gallon, thus using 666 gallons of gasoline each year.

Tangible property: This figure represents the State tax on tangible personal property, which we presume to have a value of $1,000.

State income tax: This is the income tax on a yearly salary of $5,000, using the short form in each case of computation. The individual has a wife and two children whom he claims as dependents.

The rates for the above taxes were deprived from a study made by the editors of Changing Times, the Kiplinger magazine, as published in the November 1959 edition of NADA, published by the National Automobile Dealers Association.

Real property tax: This figure was arrived at by dividing the total property taxes collected in each State by the total assessed value in each State to reach the rate. We presume the individual's house has a sale value of $10,000. The assessed value was reached by multiplying the sales value by the average sales based assessment ratio provided by the 1957 Census of Governments of the Bureau of the Census. The real property tax figure, therefore, represents real property taxes paid to State and local governments for the year 1957. Later figures are not now available.

Not included in the tax tables are local intangible taxes which are levied in some areas, Federal taxes, and special and temporary State taxes which might be levied from time to time in various States.

Comparative State and local tax table

	Sales	Tobacco	Gasoline	Tangible property	State income	Real property	Total	Amount less than Minnesota
1. Minnesota	None	$20.07	$33.30		$114.50	$312.31	$480.18	
2. Vermont	None	25.55	43.29		100.00	288.32	457.16	$23.02
3. Massachusetts	None	21.90	36.63		Exempt	319.50	448.75	31.43
4. Maine	$24	18.25	46.62		None	336.17	425.04	55.14
5. New York	None	18.25	39.96		88.00	259.26	405.47	74.71
6. New Jersey	None	18.25	33.30		None	335.07	386.62	93.56
7. Wisconsin	None	18.25	39.96		64.50	237.54	360.25	119.93
8. Oregon	None	None	39.96		132.00	186.68	358.64	121.54
9. New Hampshire	None	10.95	46.62		None	297.15	354.72	125.46
10. Montana	None	29.20	39.96		48.00	231.45	348.61	131.57
11. Pennsylvania	32	21.90	33.30		None	230.19	318.39	161.79
12. Maryland	24	10.95	39.96	$1.34	54.00	173.04	303.29	176.89
13. Idaho	None	18.25	39.96		119.00	120.90	298.11	182.07
14. Iowa	16	14.60	39.96		67.50	156.66	294.72	185.46
15. Rhode Island	24	18.25	39.96		None	204.23	286.44	193.74
16. Indiana	None	10.95	39.96		60.00	170.75	281.66	198.52

Comparative State and local tax table—Continued

	Sales	Tobacco	Gasoline	Tangible property	State income	Real property	Total	Amount less than Minnesota
17. South Dakota	$16	$18.25	$39.96	----------	None	$199.80	$274.01	$206.17
18. North Dakota	16	21.90	39.96	----------	$23.00	164.17	265.03	215.15
19. Colorado	16	None	39.96	----------	30.00	169.73	255.69	224.49
20. Virginia	None	None	39.96	----------	52.00	160.71	252.67	227.31
21. Michigan	24	18.25	39.96	----------	None	166.33	248.54	231.64
22. Connecticut	24	10.95	39.96	----------	None	172.07	246.98	233.20
23. Kansas	20	14.60	33.30	----------	45.00	131.58	244.48	235.70
24. Tennessee	16	18.25	46.62	----------	Exempt	161.83	242.70	237.48
25. Georgia	24	18.25	43.29	$2.50	8.00	151.07	239.94	240.34
26. Florida	24	18.25	46.62	----------	None	149.14	238.01	242.17
27. North Carolina	24	None	46.62	----------	76.00	91.19	237.81	242.37
28. California	24	10.95	29.96	----------	8.00	153.02	235.93	244.25
29. Nebraska	None	14.60	46.62	----------	None	173.78	235.00	245.18
30. Mississippi	24	21.90	46.62	----------	Exempt	139.63	232.14	248.04
31. Ohio	24	18.25	46.62	6.00	None	135.55	230.42	249.76
32. Arizona	24	7.30	33.30	----------	22.00	142.60	229.20	250.98
33. District of Columbia	16	7.30	39.96	----------	40.00	116.72	219.98	260.20
34. Illinois	24	14.60	33.30	----------	None	144.65	216.55	263.63
35. Oklahoma	16	18.25	43.82	----------	25.00	104.43	207.50	272.68
36. Kentucky	None	10.95	46.62	----------	28.00	111.20	206.77	273.41
37. Utah	16	14.60	39.96	----------	48.00	85.02	203.58	276.60
38. Louisiana	16	29.20	46.62	5.75	Exempt	105.51	203.08	277.10
39. Alabama	24	21.90	46.62	6.50	27.00	71.82	197.84	282.34
40. Washington	32	21.90	43.29	----------	None	98.67	195.86	284.32
41. Texas	None	29.20	33.30	----------	None	131.59	194.09	286.09
42. South Carolina	24	18.25	46.62	----------	46.00	52.57	187.44	292.74
43. Missouri	16	7.30	19.98	----------	17.00	125.04	185.32	294.86
44. Delaware	None	10.95	33.30	----------	53.00	84.80	182.05	298.13
45. New Mexico	16	21.90	39.96	----------	21.00	72.22	171.08	309.10
46. Arkansas	24	21.90	43.29	----------	17.00	61.72	167.91	312.27
47. Wyoming	16	14.60	33.30	----------	None	94.92	158.82	321.36
48. Nevada	16	10.95	39.96	----------	None	90.13	157.04	323.14
49. West Virginia	16	18.25	46.62	----------	None	58.16	139.03	341.15

Now, who can say that there is not room for any more local tax there in West Virginia. This man who makes $5,000 and has a family, if he can pay $405 in New York and if he can pay $480 in Minnesota, he can certainly pay something higher than $139 in West Virginia. We are not talking about people that cannot afford to pay. We are talking about a man that has $5,000 income and has a family. I think the comparison is fair. The table is subject to refinement and elaboration, which I intend to accomplish as discrepancies are noted. But up to this point every refinement suggested by doubters has merely served to accentuate the sharp differences in tax burdens from State to State.

Now, this table illustrates another point which I think is rather critical. The present bill which we are considering will not require matching funds in the first year. The reason they did not require matching funds is because they said there were poor areas in this country where the States could not put in matching funds; that they had to get them started the first year. As a matter of fact, there was a compromise and this aspect of the administration bill was included in order, I think, to get the bill passed.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman does not state precisely the reason. The reasoning principally was that there would be a long delay in starting if the funds were not granted directly for the first year; additionally that there would be the opportunity for the States to begin construction in their needy districts immediately, and this was the reason, and the gentleman is quite correct that the subcommittee compromised on a 2-year matching provision.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Now, I should like to mention one other aspect of this. The strongest proponents of this legislation seem to be the people from the States who are going to suffer the most, and who are going to get the least out of this. I wonder if they realize the disservice in terms of their own local interests that they are performing by advocating this bill? They may balance it by saying that the national need is great enough so that we will bypass our own personal interest and that of our constituents in this case. That is all right, if they evaluate the national need as being that critical. But let me give you an example of what they are doing. The Wall Street Journal of Wednesday, March 2, 1960, had this to say:

> Mississippi trims its corporate and personal income tax rates, chiefly to lure new industry. Governor Barnett approves a new law gradually reducing the present 6-percent maximum rate on both to 3 percent over a 6-year period.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you are aware how many of these States to which you are going to give massive aid now have tax exemptions to lure your industries away from you? I asked to have a special study made by the Library of Congress, the result of which I shall place in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, showing States that do have such provisions.

Now, for example, the State of Alabama has an exemption from State ad valorem taxes for pulp, paper, paper bags, and other pulp-producing manufacturing companies; and companies whose business involves the spinning of threads and yarns, et cetera. Any companies engaged in these businesses have a tax exemption for 10 years if they come down there. An exemption from county and municipal taxes is also provided to certain industries. In addition, in Alabama all factories and manufacturing plants, manufacturing calcium, cyanamid, aluminum or aluminum products—let me emphasize, aluminum or aluminum products—are exempt from State, county, and municipal taxes for 10 years. Do you want to send our tax dollars down there to support their schools so that they can take off more taxes and take more of your industries away from you? That is basically what this does. The money is there in those communities to support their own schools, if they will do it.

I am not criticizing these States who have these exemptions. It is their right to have them. I do criticize those who, in spite of these exemptions, want to give them more bonuses from the Federal Government on the grounds that these communities do not have the tax revenue to support proper schools.

Let me say in fairness about these States, that normally they are not the ones who are coming up here asking for such Federal aid. For the most part they are conscientious in standing up on this floor opposing the type of aid that is proposed in this bill. They are just as worried about where it is all going to end as some of us in the North are.

In Arkansas, capital invested in textile mills has a 7-year exemption from the tax to support schools. This is to get industries to move out of our areas to go down there. The Governor specifically is given the right in Arkansas under the constitution to give any new manufacturing or processing establishment to be located in the State of Arkansas an exemption from the State property tax for 10 years. Is that where you want to send your tax dollars from Massachusetts and Montana and New Jersey, where your people back home are paying real property and other taxes at such excessively high rates? I do not think so. I do not think your people back home want you to do that.

In Louisiana they have an exemption of 5 years from State property taxes for new manufacturing establishments, plus exemptions on a municipality or parish basis.

In Mississippi the county boards of supervisors and municipalities are given the authority to grant exemptions from ad valorem taxation for 10 years, with a long list of new enterprises that they can lure there through such tax exemption.

In Rhode Island, cities and towns are authorized to give a 10-year exemption to manufacturing property located there because of such exemption.

In South Carolina cities and towns, except for school purposes in South Carolina, are authorized to give 5 successive years of tax exemption to any type of manufactory.

And so forth, down the line. I shall not labor the point, but I shall include this report at the end of my remarks for the benefit of those who want to see it.

Aside from all the arguments about controls—I have presented those in my separate minority views in the report—and all the arguments about setting up a massive organization in Washington that eventually is going to control the distribution of so much of the funds that

they are going to control our educational system in this country—in addition to that argument, let us look at the practical approach to this question.

If we feel that there is not enough income at the local and State level to meet our educational problems and we have a critical need, why do we not just pass some of our Federal taxes back to these communities? I have introduced and been working very hard in favor of the proposal to give the telephone tax back to the States. Do you know the difference in the aid to the States for school and municipal purposes between the telephone tax going back to the States and this bill? This bill would grant $325 million a year in aid. The telephone tax alone, the 10-percent general-purpose telephone tax of the Federal Government, would give back $463 million to the States and localities. If there is such a need, and I do not grant that there is in most of these communities, then that is the sensible way of approaching the problem. Pass Federal taxes back and you have no problem of distribution of funds from Washington. Schools should be supported and controlled as they have been traditionally supported and controlled in this country, on a local basis. This is the genius of our system as it has been developed, that the local school boards control.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Does the gentleman have available the amount of money which his State of New York receives from the telephone tax?

Mr. GOODELL. New York would receive, I believe, $70 million.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Seventy million dollars of the four hundred and sixty-three million dollars.

Some time ago a former member of the committee from New York, Mr. Gwinn, suggested a 1-percent income tax rebate. This raises an interesting question, because it developed that the Montana Power & Light Co., a New Jersey corporation, does not earn 5 percent of its money in New Jersey but pays its taxes through our State. We would have gotten our share of that money from Montana earnings.

Mr. GOODELL. These telephone taxes are taxes collected within our State. They are taxes paid, for the most part, by our people. I am not wedded, however, to any particular plan. If not the telephone tax, let us give them back the Federal cigarette tax, or the liquor tax. Any one of these will work out all right. If it works out better for New Jersey or Montana that way it is all right with me, but I think the money ought to go directly to the State governments rather than come here to Washington and then go back again well wasted by its round trip.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. The trouble with such a proposal is that it is just inverse equalization. The gentleman's proposal for the telephone tax to go back provides that the wealthiest States get the most money.

Mr. GOODELL. In the so-called wealthiest State, suppose there is a family with a $5,000 income. Take John Rover, the head of that family, living in Geneseo, N.Y., or Belmont, N.Y. He is paying $405 a year on the average to support his local and State governments. Down in West Virginia, if he moved there, and was making $5,000 and supporting two children and a wife, he would pay $139. What is fair about that?

Mr. METCALF. I am in agreement that there should not be any needs basis, but a lot of people say this plan is faulty because it does not have a needs proposal. The gentleman's proposal would be an inverse needs proposal, and that could bring about just as many inequalities.

Mr. GOODELL. This shows how contradictory and involved arguments can get once we establish and accept the alleged fact that the Federal Government is a factor here. No longer can the State collect its own taxes within its State borders. You can carry your argument to the point where, for every single dollar a State collects in its own taxes, some portion of it is owed to other States that do not have as many industries or which by some other standard are not as wealthy. This is an extreme of centralized government which I certainly do not want. The average person living in a home with a market value of $10,000, and with two children and a wife, and $5,000 income in New York City, ends up not relying on the corporations to pay for his schools.

He is paying on the average, $405 for his schools and local and State governments, while in these so-called needy areas, under all the same conditions of income and participation in community economic life, he would not pay anywhere near that amount. Why should the man in New York, in addition, pay Federal taxes to support schools in these so-called needy areas?

Mr. METCALF. The idea of Federal aid is to get away from the local property tax to finance the schools.

Mr. GOODELL. But the answer is that your localities of need that you are talking about are not localities of need. It is simply that the States set up a maximum for borrowing purposes and they can set it on the basis of a completely fallacious assessment roll, and they say that a certain percentage of this assessment roll is the maximum that you can borrow. If they want to be conservative about it, they can set the borrowing limit low and then borrow right up to the limit to which the States tells them they can borrow. That way they can come here as borrowed-up school districts. Take some of the borrowed-up districts in parts of the country, the so-called poor parts, and put them along side the borrowing at Buffalo, Jamestown, and Geneseo, N. Y., and see if the comparison does not show that New York communities are carrying our own load in a responsible fashion. We are borrowing more than they have borrowed. It is just that our State has put the borrowing limit higher. And we are paying for our own schools with high taxes on individuals, as the table shows. These figures of the so-called borrowed-up districts are loaded and certainly it is a disservice to the country to talk about that factor as a basis for Federal aid to schools.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. What would your reaction be to the proposal that part of the first year's allocation of $325 million be specifically earmarked to apply to those particular needy districts and leave that in the hands of the chief State school officer of the several States?

Mr. GOODELL. If I were convinced that there was a valid method being applied for finding the truly needy school districts in this country and we felt that the State could not help those needy districts, as many States do, recognizing an equalization factor within their own State borders, if we had that kind of a bill, I would favor Federal aid on a hypodermic basis to those truly needy districts, instead of spreading our fire all over the country as we do in this bill.

At this point, I will place in the RECORD the compilation made for me by the Legislative Reference Service as to various State property exemptions.

LAWS OF SELECTED STATES WHICH PROVIDE A PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR NEW ENTERPRISES OPERATING IN THE STATE

(By Harold A. Kohnen, analyst in taxation and fiscal policy, Economics Division, May 19, 1960)

ALABAMA

In Alabama an exemption from State ad valorem taxes is provided to certain industries and plants as follows:

"For the purpose of developing a market for Alabama pine and other trees and the products thereof, and of encouraging the construction, extension and operation of plants, industries and factories in the State of Alabama for the manufacture or production of pulp, paper, paper bags, and other pulp products; the spinning of thread and yarns the department of revenue is hereby authorized and empowered to exempt from all ad valorem taxes for State purposes, each such factory and plant, and extension thereof or addition thereto, including the works, machinery and all other equipment, for a period of not exceeding 10 years from the date of completion of such factory or plant, or extensions thereof, or additions thereto, but in no event the land on which such plant or factory shall be located" (sec. 6, title 51, code).

The list of industries enumerated in section 6 is considerably more lengthy than covered in the extract above. In order to obtain the benefits of the exemption, written application must be made to the proper authority of the jurisdiction in which the plants are to be located.

An exemption from county and municipal taxes to certain industries and plants is also provided as follows:

"For the purpose of encouraging the building, extending and operation of plants, industries and factories in this State for the spinning of thread and yarns, the knitting and weaving of cloth and other fabrics of cotton, wool, rayon and silk; the manufacture of garments and wearing apparel; the

building and manufacturing of ships, airplanes or airships, the court of county commissioners, or other court or board having like jurisdiction of any county, and the constituted authorities of any city or town in which it is proposed to locate, or add to, are authorized and empowered to remit the taxes assessed for all county and municipal purposes, except for any schools and school district purposes, on such plants, industries or factories, for a period of not exceeding 10 years from the date of the incorporation or organization of such plants, industries or factories, if incorporated and organized under the laws of the State of Alabama, or for a period not exceeding 10 years from the date of being granted permission to do business in the State of Alabama, if a foreign corporation, or from the date of completion of such plant, industry or factory, or from the date of the completion of such addition or extension thereof" (sec. 3, title 51, code).

The section above includes types of industries in addition to those enumerated. The benefit of the exemption requires written application to the proper authority of the jurisdiction in which the plants are to be located. Furthermore, the exemption does not apply to the land on which the plant is located.

Another section of the law provides an exemption specifically for manufacturers of calcium cyanamide, aluminum or aluminum products as follows:

"All factories and manufacture plants manufacturing calcium cyanamide (lime nitrogen) aluminum, or aluminum products shall be exempted from State, county and municipal taxation for 10 years after the beginning of the construction of such plant or factory. The exemption provided herein shall apply solely to the factory or plant and to the personal property used therein or connected therewith in the manufacture of said articles; but shall not apply to the land upon which such factory or plant is located" (sec. 10, title 51, code).

ARKANSAS

The constitution of Arkansas provides for the exemption of cotton mills as follows:

"All capital invested in a textile mill in this State for the manufacture of cotton and fiber goods in any manner shall be and is hereby declared to be exempt from taxation for a period of 7 years from the date of the location of said textile mills" (amendment No. 12, constitution).

This exemption is repeated (in somewhat more detailed language) in section 84–208 of the code.

The constitution also authorizes exemption for new manufacturing establishments as follows:

"The Governor and the agricultural and industrial commission (or the agency created by law to assist in the industrial development of Arkansas) may investigate and contract with the owners of any new manufacturing or processing establishment to be located in the State, or owners making additions or additions to any manufacturing or processing establishment already located in the State, for the exemption from State property taxation: *Provided,* That no exemption from taxes shall be granted under this amendment for a longer period than 10 calendar years succeeding the date of any such contract" (amendment No. 27, constitution).

LOUISIANA

An exemption from the Louisiana State property tax is provided as follows:

"The State board of commerce and industry with the approval of the Governor may contract with the owner of any new manufacturing establishment in the State or with the owner of an addition or additions to any manufacturing establishment already existing in the State for the exemption from taxation of any such new manufacturing establishment or addition upon such terms and conditions as said Board with the approval of the Governor may deem to the best interest of the State. No exemption from taxes shall be granted under the authority of this paragraph for a longer initial period than 5 calendar years succeeding the date of any such contract; provided that upon application within 90 days before the expiration of the initial period of 5 years any exemption granted under the authority of this paragraph shall be renewed for an additional period of 5 calendar years." (Sec. 4, art. X, constitution).

The exemption from local taxes is provided as follows:

"Any municipality and any parish, respectively, may exempt a new industry or industries hereafter established therein, or an addition hereafter established to any industry or industries already existing therein, from the payment of any or all general municipal, and any or all general parochial taxes and any or all special taxes levied by such municipality or by such parish, or by any political taxing authority or subdivision in either such municipality or parish: *Provided,* That no exemption whatever shall be granted from school taxes: *Provided further,* no exemption from such taxes shall be granted hereunder for a period longer than 10 years" (sec. 22, art. X, constitution).

The exemption must be approved by the electorate and the competing industries of the local area.

MISSISSIPPI

The law of Mississippi implements the authorization for exemption of new enterprises as provided in section 186 and section 192 of the constitution. Only the statutory law is extracted below.

"County boards of supervisors and municipal authorities are hereby authorized and empowered, in their discretion, to grant exemptions from ad valorem taxation, except State ad valorem taxation, on all tangible property used in, or necessary to the operation of the manufacturers and other new enterprises of public utility hereinafter enumerated by classes, but not upon the products thereof, in the case of county boards of supervisors, for a period not to exceed 5 years, and in the case of municipal authorities, for a period not to exceed 10 years" (sec. 9703, code).

A long list of the types of new enterprises which may qualify for exemption is listed in section 9703. Chapter 420, Laws, 1952, gives the county board of supervisors discretion in the matter of granting exemption, provided a certificate is issued by the Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board.

Similar authority for exemption is also provided to municipalities by section 9708 of the code as follows:

"All municipalities may grant like exemptions from municipal ad valorem taxation for a period not exceeding 10 years to all manufacturers and other new enterprises mentioned in section 1 [§ 9703]" (sec. 9708, code).

RHODE ISLAND

The cities and towns of Rhode Island are authorized, as follows, to exempt manufacturing property located in their jurisdictions for a period not to exceed 10 years:

"The electors of any town or city qualified to vote on a proposition to impose a tax, when legally assembled, may vote to exempt, or may authorize the town or city council of such town or city, for a period not exceeding 1 year, and for a period not exceeding 2 years in towns or cities where elections are held biennially to exempt from taxation for a period not exceeding 10 years, such manufacturing property as may hereafter be located in said town or city in consequence of such exemption, and the land on which such property is located" (sec. 44–3–9, G.L.).

SOUTH CAROLINA

The constitution of South Carolina provides authorization for a general exemption to manufactories as follows:

"Cities and towns may exempt from taxation, by general or special ordinance, except for school purposes, manufactories established within their limits for 5 successive years from the time of the establishment of such manufactories: *Provided,* That such ordinance shall be first ratified by a majority of such qualified electors of such city or town as shall vote at an election held for that purpose" (sec. 8, art. VIII, constitution).

In addition to the general exemption applicable to all counties, the above section (sec. 8, art. VIII, constitution), contains special provisions regarding specific counties. Also, various exemptions of manufactories are granted by special laws applicable to counties and cities. The laws are contained in the code sections 65–1525 through 65–1572, which begin as follows:

"SEC. 65–1524. New manufacturing establishments in certain counties: All new manufacturing establishments located in any of the counties named in this section shall be exempt from all county taxes, except for school purposes, for 5 years from the time of their establishment provided such establishments:

"(1) Have a capital of (a) $15,000 in Abbeville County; (b) $25,000 in Greenville County" (sec. 65–1524, code).

Some sections of the law make special provision for specific types of industries, such as:

"SEC. 65–1541. Textile and veneer plants in Berkeley County: Any textile manufacturing plant or enterprise located in Berkeley County and any such plant which is in process of construction and the capital investment in which is not less than $50,000 and any veneer plant located in said county which shall have a capital investment of not less than $25,000 shall be exempt from the payment of all county taxes, except for school purposes, for a period of 5 years from the date of the location of such plant or enterprise in said county" (sec. 65–1541, code).

VERMONT

Manufactories, quarries, and mines in Vermont are exempted from the property tax as follows:

"If the amount invested exceeds $1,000, manufacturing establishments, quarries, mines, and such machinery, tramways, appliances and buildings as are necessary for use in the business, machinery placed in an unoccupied building to be used in business, and capital and personal property used in such business, may be exempted from taxation for a period not exceeding 10 years from the commencement of business, if the town so votes" (sec. 3834, title 32, V.S.).

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the subcommittee that drafted this particular legislation, and I should like for a moment to attempt to lead this discussion out of the narrow channel in which it rests. The tenor of our discussion would lead one to believe that the only real problem facing American education is that we are short 140,000 classrooms. I think this is a serious problem, but American education faces much greater problems. All of these major studies of American education in the last 2 or 3 years—I refer to the Rockefeller report—and my colleagues will notice I use that name tripplingly on my tongue—the Killian re-

port, the reports of Dr. Conant, and the White House Conference on Education have all concluded that if we are going to do the type of job we should be doing we must double our outlays for education in the sixties.

And Secretary Flemming last year stated that it was a reasonable goal for us as a people to double teachers' salaries in the next 10 years.

I want to discuss with you a moment these broad goals, because in focusing our attention on the classroom shortage, we are perhaps misleading ourselves as to the scope of the challenge we face.

One basic conclusion of the Rockefeller report was that in the years ahead education will have a strategic importance in our national performance and that what we do, or do not do, in the field of education may very well determine the posture of strength of our country and its capacity to perform great tasks in the years ahead.

Another of the basic conclusions of these reports is that the American people cannot meet these goals unless, in the words of the Rockefeller report, there is a "thorough, painful, and courageous overhaul of local and State taxing systems." This need for local tax overhaul was demonstrated just a moment ago by my colleague from New York, Mr. GOODELL, who preceded me in the well of the House. So the time has come when we must face the total problems of American education.

There are, I know, some who feel we are doing a good job in education. I do not. Ours is the richest country in the world—and, whether we like it or not, we wear the mantle of world leadership. If we are to move toward these reasonable goals, it seems to me we must determine now that we are going to spend more for our teachers and our schools. I will confess that on education, I am a spender. I do not think we are spending enough. The best investment we can make is an investment in the minds of our young people.

The details of this bill are based on sound experience. They are based in part on our experience under the land-grant college program, and in part on the system of State aid to education which has worked so well over the years. I am not only against Federal control; I am in favor of maximum local control. This bill provides, for the first time, maximum local control. If an amendment to be proposed by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], is agreed to, we will say to each locality: "You decide what your needs priorities are. If you want to build schools, fine—or if you prefer to raise the salaries of your teachers this also is satisfactory." The essential point is that these decisions should be made at the local level. This is the very essence of a sound system. It is based on our experience under State aid systems and puts the decision-making authority in the school boards where it belongs.

Every time the Congress passes a bill, like the National Defense Education Act, and we, in effect, say, "Spend it for this purpose and nothing else," we are not putting faith and confidence in local school boards. Therefore I am one of those who will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], to broaden the scope of this legislation. Let us trust the judgment of the State and the local people. Let them come forward and decide where the money should be spent. I think this is a very basic issue, and whether we thresh it out or not today, it will be on our desks when we return next January. We must have an educational system worthy of our country—one that will enable us develop to the full our human resources. We have voted a bill of nearly $4 billion earlier today, a public works bill, to develop our natural resources. Our proposal is a modest one, a proposal that we make a further investment in human resources.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I wonder if the gentleman will take another minute that I may ask him a question relative to his amendment?

Mr. UDALL. If the gentleman will yield me time for that purpose.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute to ask him if he will explain his variant so that we may be able to consider it before it comes up tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. UDALL. If the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], does not prevail, the amendment which I intend to propose, if the opportunity presents itself, will put the teachers' salary local option which is in the Senate bill into the committee bill. In other words, it is a narrow amendment and would merely give the State and local people the right to decide whether to use the money for construction or salaries.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I believe there is impelling need for enactment of this bill, the School Construction Assistance Act of 1960. I can think of no other piece of legislation that will have a greater and more beneficial effect upon our future success as a nation.

The educational finance problem of our country has been of special concern to me since the President's White House Conference on Education of 1955. It had seemed to me that this conference basically altered the country's sense of responsibility for our schools as a substantial group of educators and citizens swung over to favor Federal support for education.

In my own district, which is the north coast of California, our city and country school districts are making prodigious efforts to keep up with the fast-growing classroom populations. But too many of them are falling behind. Migration from other States and the high birth rate have caused the school population to increase faster than proper classrooms can be constructed.

In California, as in the Nation, we have two educational problems—the growth problem and the quality problem.

The school building financing problem in California staggers the imagination.

More than 80 percent of the students in California schools are being educated in school districts that have already voted override taxes beyond the legal tax limits in order to continue to operate.

California now has more than 3 million pupils in the elementary and secondary schools. This is the largest school system in the United States. On conservative estimates, we shall have, by 1970, 5½ million children in the public schools.

Our State bonded indebtedness for schools alone, not counting local school district bonded indebtednes, exceeds $900 million. We shall have on the ballot on June 7 a request for an additional $300 million, which may last us for about 2 years.

In the system used in California much of this money is not repaid to the State by the local school districts. We will have accumulated in 2 more years $1,200 million in State indebtedness for school buildings alone. This debt has accumulated only since 1950.

If we project what it will cost on State bonding, in addition to local bonding, we shall accumulate by 1960 some $3 billion of State indebtedness for schools. This is an impossible situation. We cannot continue to pay high interest rates on State and local school bonds in amounts that will shortly equal the amount actually expended per year for actual construction of classrooms.

I am also concerned with increasing the quality of education, so that America may meet the great challenges of our time.

California now has 15,000 people teaching in the public schools who hold substandard teaching credentials. This is primarily because of our school districts' inability to compete with other job opportunities available to college graduates.

We have pushed our local property tax beyond reasonable limits already. And in the last general session of the California Legislature there were enacted a whole series of new taxes designed to produce about $200 million in additional revenues. Of the $200 million about $25 million went for additional help to our hard-pressed schools—just enough to reduce the elementary class load by one student. One of our problems in California is that we have about the highest class load per teacher.

I would like to say to those who tell us there is no need in the State of California for this legislation that they have a responsibility to tell the people of California where we are going to get the money to educate 2½ million additional schoolchildren by 1970.

And where are we going to get the money to reduce the high school English teacher's average class load to 100 students, as recommended by Dr. Conant in his report on the American high school?

The heart of the quality problem is class size, and the quality of the teacher.

This is why I wish to identify myself with the amendment the gentlemen from Montana [Mr. METCALF] is about to offer concerning Federal support for teachers' salaries as well as construction.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I agree wholeheartedly with those who argue that primary responsibility for public education should be exercised by local authorities. Our public schools take much of their strength from the devotion of millions of private citizens who are involved directly in their affairs—the boards of trustees, the PTA's, and so forth. I have a very personal reason for having this respect for local control of public education inasmuch as I was secretary of the North Haven Board of Education for 5 years.

On this matter, I share the thinking of Adlai Stevenson who, in regard to schools, once said:

> Local control keeps alive continuous debate and freedom to experiment. It insures a wholesome diversity in educational plans and practices. It helps to keep public education from becoming an instrument of stifling conformity and uniformity. Not sentimental attachment to tradition but hardheaded good sense demands that by keeping control of education in the local community we keep the spreading branches of an ever-enlarging democracy always close to its roots.

Our thinking regarding the financing of our schools must start with an insistence that it is first of all the responsibility of local and State governments; they must always make available the largest possible revenues to sustain our public educational system. But what happens when they fail?

I think we are beginning to see the consequences of insufficient funds being furnished for education. Across America millions of parents and children are putting up with overcrowded schools. On October 14, 1959, Secretary Arthur Flemming of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicated that a shortage of more than 130,000 classrooms now exists. On the basis of official reports to the U.S. Department of Education by the 50 States, it has been estimated that 1,883,000 children are now enrolled in public schools in excess of normal capacity. As you know, these 1,883,000 children are not the only ones to suffer from the classroom shortage when a classroom built to accommodate 30 pupils is forced to serve 40 students. It is not merely the excess 10 but all 40 of them who are overcrowded. On this basis Secretary Flemming, stated last August, "The number of pupils whose education is being impaired by the classroom shortage is about 10 million." These 10 million children are forced to attend schools that are too full and noisy for effective teaching.

Some people have argued that bigger and newer schools do not mean better education; I agree. Providing an adequate plant for learning is only half the battle. Without properly trained, efficient teachers our educational system will continue to decline. This, then, brings us to the problem of teachers' salaries. We cannot obtain the best brainpower to teach our children if we consistently offer bargain-basement wages and working conditions. School systems all over the country not only compete with each other for the good teachers but they also compete with our growing industries for the talented college graduates. Private business is depending more and more upon professional people for research, administration, and so forth. Unless our school systems keep pace and compete, they will be able to attract only the least capable college graduate. I do not think we want the least—we want and should get the best for our children.

It has been argued that the States and localities, alone, in their individual ways can solve the problem and raise the necessary funds. The very first fact to cope with is that, by law, most schools must rely very largely for their support on property taxes. But property tax revenues do not necessarily go up as the population of a community increases. Another method of raising funds is by borrowing. However, today, 24 percent of the Nation's 50,000 school districts have reached their legal debt limit and, by law, are not permitted to float new bonds.

Assuming that the States received a greater ability to tax, I question whether sufficient revenue would be channeled into such needs as our schools. My reason for having doubts lies in a very practical, businesslike view of our 50 States—all competing with each other to attract industry. No State is willing to raise taxes when its neighbors might be lowering theirs.

For these reasons and many more, I fear that State and local government, while providing the bulk of the financial support for our schools, cannot, as a practical matter, sustain the entire burden.

And the problems being faced today will increase. There will be an increase of about 2 to 3 million children of school age every 2 years for the next 20 years. Since 1900 more youths have stayed in school longer and this trend will continue; by 1963 the school-age population of my own State of Connecticut will increase 26 percent over what it was in 1957.

The picture becomes bleaker when we study what the States and localities are doing about it. According to the U.S. Office of Education, the States and local communities plan to build 10 percent less classrooms this year than were built last year. The slackening of the school construction pace is further documented by a downtrend in bond issues. During the first 11 months of 1959 voters of all States approved $1,230,736,000 worth of school bond issues, compared to $1,364 million in the comparable period of the previous year. Many authorities look upon this drop in bond issues as evidence that many communities are nearing the saturation point in local tax sources.

I believe Federal assistance to our educational system is a necessity. Indeed there are ample precedents in our national history of Federal support of education. Support for specific purposes has been provided without Federal control, and the legislation now being considered will provide adequate safeguards against any Federal control in the future.

Nearly 2 centuries of American history and experience testify that the need for financial assistance can be met without the slightest degree of control by the central Government. No such control followed Congress' grant in 1785 of a section of every township in the Federal domain for the maintenance of public schools. Nor has President Lincoln's approval of the land grant college system resulted in Federal control. The GI Bill of Rights has done great good, so has the National Defense Education Act, and the various research programs of the National Institutes of Health. And there has been no accompanying Federal domination.

We have been reminded of the cost involved. Permit me to remind you that bad education for our children is not cheap—it does not save us anything. Its high costs are paid for in other budgets—combating poverty, unemployment and juvenile delinquency. The question you should ask is, "Can we afford to continue wasting our resources by not providing adequately for our youth?" The real waste occurs when Government abdicates its function and refuses to serve the best interests of the people.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I joined with a majority of the committee in voting favorably on measures providing Federal funds for construction and teachers salaries. I continue to support this program. I do not believe that a responsible Government can afford to shortchange the adults of tomorrow by refusing to provide them with the tools for a proper education today.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the arguments for and against this legislation. The principal argument of those who are against it is that many localities are not taxing themselves sufficiently to provide for proper schools for their children and this bill will be a burden on those who are already doing their share. Others have said education is purely a local matter and, consequently, school construction must be a local matter also. Both arguments have great weight with me.

The bill affirms and reaffirms local autonomy and states explicitly "that the control of the personnel, program of instruction, formulation of policy, and the administration of the Nation's public elementary and secondary schools resides in the States and local communities." I entirely agree with this and with the further statement that "the primary responsibility for financing the costs of public school facilities resides in the States and local communities."

In accordance with the purposes of the act, this bill aids the States and local communities in meeting this responsibility.

In these days of world competition for mens' minds all our children must have superior educational facilities. In many parts of our country children are not receiving proper education because of inadequate facilities.

The needs of our children must be met and a proper method must be found to meet these needs. I believe that the bill before us meets the need without changing the concept of local autonomy. I intend to support it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time because it seems to me a great deal of this issue comes down to one of financing rather than one of education itself, because I think there is rather common agreement on both sides of the aisle and in this country for the need for more funds in the field of education. Certainly, I think we all agree that there are many areas where we can improve education. The question, then, is: How do we get those funds into the educational system in the best fashion?

The very fact the last speaker, the gentleman from Arizona, pointed out that all controls and methods of how the money should be spent should remain at the State and local level, is a demonstration that the only way in which we are trying to bring the Federal Government into this picture is as a tax collector. So the question really comes down to one of how efficient a tax collector is the Federal Government, and is there something peculiar about the Federal Government as a tax collector in this area that suggests to us that we should use it?

Before going into it and developing this point, because it is a point that I think the Committee on Ways and Means is particularly interested in and has studied a great deal, I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] for his very scholarly presentation of one aspect of this financial problem and the taxing problem.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on the point of tax collection?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I will in just a minute. In fact, I would like to yield when I ask this one question. I was impressed with the fact that apparently the committee has not held hearing on this particular bill. I have been interested over a period of time in following the committee's activities to find out whether they have gone into this aspect of tax collecting, as to whether they have actually studied the situation of communities and of States and, I may say, of the Federal Government in trying to resolve this tax problem. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. With respect first to the question of hearings I would like to point out that there is no new ground covered. We have had literally thousands of pages of testimony from hundreds of witnesses on this subject.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. On the subject of tax collection?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. On the subject of this legislation.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No; I did not yield for that.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. And on the subject of tax collection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is what I wanted to direct attention to and that was why I was yielded time.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I will confine myself to that.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. What studies has this committee made of the problem of local tax collection by the school districts?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. In the last Congress in considering the amondment of the gentleman from New York, our former colleague, Mr. Gwinn, we devoted a great deal of time to it.

We elicited some of the following information.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. From what sources?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. From all sources.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let us not deal in generalities. By source, did you call before you some of the county assessors or people from the county assessor's association, people from municipal bond houses who know something about this problem of financing, people from State revenue offices, anyone from the Ways and Means Committee, or the staff of the Ways and Means Committee?

That is what I mean by information and study in this area.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am unable to recall specifically at the moment.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. May I say that if the gentleman has anything to contribute he do so.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I have something to contribute.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Please deal with that.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The cost to the Federal Government for collecting taxes was determined to be 44 cents per $100, while the State cost for collecting $100 ran from 95 cents to $2.30.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Who made those estimates, if the gentleman can supply that information?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman from Montana can answer that question. He is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. METCALF. This was a survey made by our own Government Operations Committee.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Who were the witnesses? Who made the study? I have seen some very poor studies, and I have seen some good studies. This figure does not sound right. That is why I am asking the question.

Mr. METCALF. The Government Operations Committee filed a report with the House, and it has a record of hearings. It had various people such as the gentleman suggested called before that committee, some people from bond houses that were called before that committee, some experts from States who had to handle special improvement bonds.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Are we talking about taxes for education now or, generally, local taxes?

Mr. METCALF. Taxes for education.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let me ask another question. Did you then have someone from the Government Operations Committee testify before your committee with this information?

Mr. METCALF. The gentleman's committee is my committee.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I beg your pardon. Of course, I recognize that, but the gentleman was on the Committee on Education and Labor at the time supposedly some of these studies were being made.

Mr. METCALF. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Was that information before your committee?

Mr. METCALF. The testimony presented to the Committee on Government Operations is a part of the official record of the House, it is a part of the committee records, and is before the House.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. A lot of information is before the House that is not utilized. I am trying to pinpoint whether the committee in presenting the matter to the House has gone into those areas. I do not want to yield any further at this time because I want to develop a few points in reference to some problems involved in this tax area. I am going to make a general statement, which is a matter of opinion. Possibly some studies may bring it up to date. In collecting money in a local community, and sending it back into a community, that money in going back will be clipped by about 25 percent. It will not go back the full dollar, it will be minus about 25 cents on the dollar.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am not referring to the cost of tax collections, I am talking about the bureaucracy.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The survey upon which the statistics I gave was based was the result of questionnaires sent out to 3,300 school districts throughout the United States.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. What was the year?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The year was 1958.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. And the studies probably were based upon the situation existing in 1956 because the data they had would probably be about that time.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. This is 1958 I am referring to.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I understand you collected them in 1958, but the data was based on probably 1956.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. They were current.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is not current; 1956 is not current and 1958 is not current to 1960. This is an area of great dynamic advancement and I, as a Member of the House, expect a committee that is supposed to study these things to bring these matters up to date. They are the essence of this subject as to what the advancement has been in this area, and what are the problems. I would point out, as I did, that taking tax money out of a community and sending it back to a community results in a loss. As the gentleman from Arizona pointed out, how the money is spent in a community is to be decided by the community. Taking money out of a community to send it to

Washington, D.C., and thence back to the community is in itself an inefficient way, even though the Federal Government might be on some other basis a more efficient tax collector. It is going to have to go through the process of Federal bureaucracy, and I suggest it will be clipped by 25 cents on each dollar. One other reason for having our Federal Government used as a tax collector—and I am not confining this to education—is that it would be a very neat way of redistributing the wealth of the Nation. That was the plea in the thirties. But I suggest today that the wealth of this country is sufficiently redistributed so the Federal Government is no longer that convenient a method, even as demagogic a method, I might say, of redistributing the wealth. There is a third reason, and I think this reason deserves some real study, and it has been referred to from time to time. The Federal Government can be an equalizer among the States between the richer States and the poorer States. As in education, we rely on the States to be the equalizer for the various counties within the State or even school districts within the counties.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Just briefly.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I recognize the gentleman has a very orderly mind and wants to proceed in a chronological way. Now, you said that this money going back to the States will be clipped by 25 percent.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Will the gentleman support that in the RECORD; by putting into the RECORD his basis for making that statement?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes; I would be glad to. I said it was an estimate.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I would like to see you support it, since you want us to support the position.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I suggest to the gentleman—and his experience is possibly as good as mine—that the money has to go through the Federal bureaucracy, and in this instance through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the overhead and everything else that goes with it, and that enters into the picture.

To revert back to the point I was trying to make, the Federal Government might be used as an equalizer between the rich and the poor States. This is often an argument advanced by those who urge that the Federal Government's services as a tax collector be utilized in the field of education. However, this cannot be a very serious argument on the part of the proponents of this particular legislation inasmuch as distribution of federally collected taxes is to be made on a per capita student basis rather than upon a need basis.

Furthermore, there seems to be no real data available on the subject of need. To obtain this data the committee will have to not only obtain the assessed valuations in the various school districts for which a need is alleged, but also the overall assessed valuations in the State in which the county is located, plus the other bases the State may have for levying taxes. Although real estate taxes are the largest source of revenue for counties, municipalities, and school districts, there are other taxes available to them and certainly there are other taxes available to the States. If the States are to do their job of equalization between rich and poor school districts, perforce they must use other sources of revenue than the real estate tax for education purposes.

Actually, the only tax available to the Federal Government which is not available to the State governments is the tax on imported goods. The argument used as to why the States cannot use some kinds of taxes is that the States population and industry might shift if the States levied too heavy taxes. This theory is largely exploded. Certainly it is exploded as far as taxes for education are concerned. The States levying the heaviest taxes are the most populous and have the most industry. Conversely the States that do not seem to be doing so well are those that have been chary about levying taxes for basic needs such as education.

In studying the problems of local taxation, it is not sufficient to merely look at the assessed valuations. One must also look at the real valuations, particularly of real estate in relation to the assessed valuations. Certainly if there has been no recent reassessment of real estate in a county one can almost conclude that the assessed valuations have little relation to the real values involved.

All I am pointing out is that a real study must be made before we can conclude that certain States or certain counties are unable to levy the taxes necessary to support an adequate school system. I am satisfied that the case has not yet been made. Indeed, from a few spot checks of areas that are supposed not to have the wealth necessary to support an adequate school system, I am inclined to believe that it is lack of desire rather than wealth that lies at the bottom of the trouble.

One other factor constantly used to bolster the proposition that the States or counties or school boards cannot finance their own educational program is the bonded debt ceilings. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] made a point of the limit of the bonded indebtedness ceiling of Gary, Ind. This, of all arguments is the most specious, because any legislature can remove this obstacle. And what irony it is for the Federal Government to be constantly raising its debt ceiling because it is undertaking the financing the States and local communities are not undertaking.

There is a possible argument that might be advanced why the Federal Government has an obligation in the field of tax collecting in behalf of the States and local communities. After all, inflation resulted largely from the manner in which the Federal Government handled its fiscal affairs and inflation has been one of the greatest causes to aggravate the problems of tax collecting of the local communities.

For example, school districts derive most of their revenues from real estate taxes. Real estate taxes in turn are based upon real estate assessments which are placed on the assessor's books over a period of years. Most of the real estate in the counties of the United States was assessed in terms of the uninflated dollar of pre-1946. Nor can the counties and school districts correct this bias by simply raising the tax rates on real estate. When this method is followed all of the new real estate going on the assessor's books after 1946 is in terms of the inflated dollar. These new homes, incidentally are largely owned by the smaller income groups and the newly formed families. Only one real course has been left open to the local communities to correct for this damage resulting from inflation upon their basic tax system, that is to reassess all real estate on the books. This is a politically and mechanically difficult and costly step to take.

However, it would be foolish to use this as an argument for having the Federal Government move into the picture as a tax collector. Indeed, it is dangerous because the Federal Government unlike the States, local governments, and all private institutions and individuals does not have to match its expenditure side of the ledger with revenue. Unfortunately, from this standpoint the Federal Government has the power to print money and it can make up the difference between expenditures and tax collections by just printing more money. If the Federal Government does this then it merely compounds the difficulty the local communities have already found themselves in through past inflation by creating more inflation.

Incidentally, the bonded debt ceilings unless raised after the impact of inflation are just as unrealistic as the assessments of real estate unadjusted. How many States have raised the debt ceilings of the school districts to compensate for the impact of inflation on the fixed dollar figure?

There is a further problem the school districts and local communities in newly builtup suburban areas are finding in this business of taxation. Without fully realizing what they were doing they zoned themselves largely as bedroom areas. They did not want any industry around them, indeed many did not even want commerce around them. This is a fine luxury, if one can afford it. Unfortunately very few communities indeed can afford to have their tax base rest upon private residences. They must have industry and commerce to help bear a big share of the load for community services and for education.

There is only one way out of this dilemma and that is for the communities which have made this mistake to take new stock of themselves and their zoning laws and allow for industry and commerce to enter the community in accordance with good community planning.

Our colleague, the gentleman from New York, Congressman GOODELL, has pointed out another area of the State and communities own making, frequently the States and communities that

are alleged to have the need for help from the Federal Government as a tax collector. These communities in their desire to attract industry to their area forgave the industry the payment of local taxes for several years. This is possibly a wise move on their part, but the wisdom must be determined in balance. Certainly if the revenues obtained from the industry moving to the community do not offset the revenues forgiven there is no wisdom.

The question of marketability of school bonds should be a subject upon which this committee should be reporting to the House if we are to evaluate this proposed legislation intelligently. I doubt whether a great case can be made for the lack of market for municipal bonds exempt from Federal taxation as they are. Certainly, if we want to broaden the market, I suggest a few people get behind the legislation I have had before the House for several years which would broaden the municipal bond market by permitting investment trusts to invest in these securities and be able to pass on the tax-exempt feature of them to their holders.

I was going on to discuss some educational aspects of this problem which revolve around productivity in our educational system, but this has become an overly long discussion. I will simply mention a few possibilities. A four term year so that we use both the physical and administrative aspects of our educational plant 12 months of the year rather than 9. The 9-month school year is an inheritance we obtained from the days we were an agrarian society and is hardly necessary or applicable today. The 3-month vacation for pupils and possibly teachers might still remain, but surely there is no reason not to spread the overhead cost of physical plant and administration over the full year period. This would reduce our costs in this area, at any rate, by one-fourth. Use of teachers aids would save in salaries of the more highly trained teachers, or would permit money to be used to increase teachers salaries. The expansion of visual aids and educational TV probably could bring about a more efficient expenditure of the education dollar. Above all the NEA might devote more effort than they have to the problems involved in teacher training and teachers standards. It certainly is no advancement to education qualitywise or costwise to limit teaching jobs to graduates of schools under the domination of one select group of educators.

My colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER] has asked that I document my statement that 25 cents is clipped from each dollar collected by the Federal Government from the community and then sent back to the community for expenditure. I have reread my original statement on this and I wish to point out that I emphasized that this was a "general statement, which is a matter of opinion. Possibly some studies may bring it up to date." The opinion is based upon a general knowledge of the process through which a tax dollar once collected by the Federal Government must go before it is sent back to the communities. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is primarily involved in this processing, but so is the Treasury Department, the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and many other bureaus in various though limited ways. Furthermore, the receiving community or State must set up machinery which become part of this "distributive process." Maybe a guess of 25 percent is too much—on the other hand it may be too little. One thing I do agree with the gentleman from California on, is that this is an area which needs some studying. This ought to be taken out of the realm of opinion as best we can do so. The point I make, however, stands—it is a costly procedure to take money out of a community simply to return it to that community for its own expenditure. The proponents of this legislation are making much of the fact that they want the expenditure of the moneys to be wholly within the discretion of the communities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10128, the School Construction Assistance Act of 1960.

As a member of the General Education Subcommittee, I have listened to the testimony presented by many witnesses concerning the need to invest more in the education of our young people and I am convinced that this legislation is essential if we are to begin to meet the shortage of classrooms in the United States today.

Moreover, I am convinced that the American people favor the use of their own Federal tax moneys to support State and local efforts to build more schoolrooms.

In this field, as in many other fields, the people are often far ahead of many of the politicians in their understanding of the problem. A few weeks ago I sent out questionnaires to the homes of nearly every registered voter in my district, the Third of Indiana.

Over 23,000 persons answered my questionnaire and I may say that this poll came within 1 percent of predicting the actual party vote in the May 3 presidential primary in Indiana, so I believe the poll a fairly reliable indicator of public opinion in my district.

Mr. Chairman, on the question, "Do you favor Federal funds for classroom construction?" 65 percent of the persons responding to this poll answered "Yes," only 30 percent "No," and 5 percent had no answer. Just as revealing is the fact that a majority of every voter group endorsed Federal support of education—Democrats by a margin of 5 to 1, Republicans by 5 to 4, and independents by 5 to 3.

These Hoosier citizens know that money for our schools must come from some source and they know, too, that if the State and local governments find it impossible to meet the needs of our rapidly expanding school population we must make use of our Federal funds.

The facts are that in 1958 the Federal Government collected 69 percent of all tax revenue, the States 15 percent, and the localities 16 percent. Yet local sources provide 56 percent of the revenue for elementary and secondary education, State governments 40 percent, and the Federal Government less than 4 percent.

Some persons may still say the way to meet the shortage of classrooms in the United States is a sharp increase in the local property tax.

This is not an exceedingly popular approach in my part of the country, and any Republican who wants to run against me on a "let's raise the property tax" platform will be a more-than-welcome opponent.

Yet, in fact, every Congressman who votes against this school support bill will in effect be voting to raise the property taxes of the people of his State.

I do not say that the States are in every case unwilling to do the job of providing adequate tax support for schools. In many cases it is simply fiscally impossible for them to do so. I refer Members to the Wall Street Journal article of May 20, 1960, which my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], inserted in the RECORD yesterday. In some cases, however, the apostles of States rights are clearly talking out of both sides of their mouths when they blandly assure us there is no need for Federal support for education because the States will do the job.

The State of Indiana, according to the latest figures I have seen, ranks 15th in the United States in per capita income; if the States righters were doing their job, we should be 15th in the Nation in per-pupil expenditures for public education, but we are 31st.

In addition, State constitutional limitations on the bonding power of school districts make it extremely difficult to meet needs at local level.

Since our State constitution limits the spending power of school districts to 2 percent of their assessed valuation, such considerations as these help explain why 65 percent of people of my Hoosier district favor Federal support to build more classrooms. They help explain why people like Eric Johnston, a leading business figure and former president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, issues a ringing plea for Federal funds for education, why the Committee for Economic Development, an organization of top U.S. business and industrial leaders, endorses Federal assistance for education.

Mr. Chairman, others have discussed the shortage of classrooms. I want only to emphasize the significance of two statements made last year by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur Flemming.

In August of 1959 Secretary Flemming warned that the number of American students whose education was being impaired by the classroom shortage was 10 million.

In October of 1959 Secretary Flemming set the classroom shortage at between 130,000 and 140,000.

Yet he warned that the latest figures on school bond sales showed a drop of

fully 20 percent during the most recent 12-month period as compared with the previous such period, and then concluded, "Marked declines in school construction are to be expected."

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have seen here today that one of the major issues surrounding any proposal for increasing our national investment in education is that of Federal control.

As a former teacher, I certainly want no Federal control of what is taught in our schools.

But, Mr. Chairman, we must look at the facts, and I would respectfully suggest that the best evidence that Federal funds can be used for education without Federal control is the fact that we have been doing so for some years now.

Under Public Laws 815 and 874, Federal funds have been used under the impacted area program not only to build classrooms, but also to pay teachers' salaries and even to buy textbooks.

With reference to the statement by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] that there has been Federal control under Public Laws 815 and 874, I want to say that I asked the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Mr. Derthick, if the fact that this Federal aid was going to education had led to any Federal control under this program.

I want to read you his answer:

I am glad to say, Mr. BRADEMAS, that the question has not come up. On the contrary, there was a doctorate study done up at Teachers College, Columbia University, investigating to determine where there had been any semblance of Federal control in the administration of these laws throughout the United States. And the conclusion was impressive and complete, that there has not been any indication in any of these approximately 4,000 school districts.

And the Commissioner went on to assure the committee that his statement applied to the use of Federal funds both for school construction and for teachers' salaries.

For those persons, therefore, who are sincerely troubled about the issue of Federal control but who base their conclusions on facts, I urge a look not only at the express disclaimer of Federal control in the Thompson bill but at the actual record of administration of the Federal funds under present law.

Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude my remarks in support of this legislation by commenting briefly on a Presidential veto of a Federal aid-to-education bill.

This Federal aid-to-education bill was vetoed by the President of the United States on the basis of several objections. Some of the objections to the bill made by the President are worth quoting here today:

I deem it to be both inexpedient and unconstitutional.

This bill has been passed at a period when we can with great difficulty raise sufficient revenue to sustain the expenses of the Government.

Should the time ever arrive when the State governments shall look to the Federal Treasury for the means of supporting themselves and maintaining their systems of education and internal policy, the character of both governments will be greatly deteriorated * * * what is obtained easily and without responsibility will be lavishly expended.

It is extremely doubtful, to say the least, whether this bill would contribute to the advancement of agriculture and the mechanic arts.

This bill will injuriously interfere with existing colleges in the different States * * *.

I presume the general proposition is undeniable, that Congress does not possess the power to appropriate money in the Treasury, raised by taxes on the people of the United States, for the purpose of educating the people of the respective States. * * * Should Congress exercise such a power, this would be to break down the barriers which have been so carefully constructed in the Constitution to separate Federal from State authority.

Mr. Chairman, I have not of course been reading from a veto message of President Eisenhower. The quotations I have just read are from a veto message, not in 1959, but in 1859. For on February 24, 1859, just over one century ago, one of the first Federal aid-to-education bills in our history was vetoed.

The author of the veto was President James Buchanan, a Democrat.

The bill he vetoed was the Land-Grant College Act.

President Buchanan's successor in the White House, a Republican, did however sign that early Federal aid-to-education bill.

President Buchanan's successor, Mr. Chairman, was Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the American people have learned a great deal during the last 100 years.

With Abraham Lincoln, we have had to learn, as he said, "To think anew, to act anew, to disenthrall ourselves."

"The dogmas of the quiet past," said Lincoln, "are inadequate to the stormy present."

Mr. Chairman, I hope that Congress will this week pass this bill to increase our national investment in the most valuable natural resource we have, educated young men and women.

In this way, Congress will prove itself adequate to "the stormy present" of the modern world.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, the most frequent argument against Federal assistance for school construction is that there is no need—that the States are able to handle the load alone. I have heard this argument ever since coming to Congress and yet this year we still have our schools operating under terrific handicaps with a shortage of over 132,000 classrooms.

As a former educator, I am intimately acquainted with the schools in my State of Utah and know that some of our districts are in desperate need of some temporary Federal assistance.

For instance, I would like to tell you about a particular district in our State, Granite, which is located on the outskirts of Salt Lake City.

Granite District has experienced a growth of approximately 21,000 students in 9 years—which is a growth of 150 percent.

Their school enrollment this year increased 3,655 over last year. During the next 2 years their school enrollment is expected to increase each year about the same number, and then the increase should be approximately 4,000 students each year.

To meet this onslaught of students Granite District has levied by far the highest tax in Utah for schools—61.40 mills—and yet is unable to cope with the situation. They have had to resort to double sessions which really cheat the children out of adequate education by reducing the amount of learning time and efficiency of this time by compressing it into a single lengthy period without the normal kind of a lunch break that students usually have.

Their pressing needs for new buildings amount to a cost of more than $17 million and yet they only have something over $3 million for debt financing and construction.

Granite's situation has not been brought on by any slothfulness on the part of the district. It has been brought on by the population mobility which is a new social and economic factor with which past programs have been unable to cope. Let me illustrate the unmanageable problem which the population shifts impose:

The new census figures display that Utah's No. 1 city, Salt Lake City, has increased from 182,121 to 187,362 which is an increase of 5,241 over the past 10 years. In the same decade Salt Lake County has increased from 274,895 to 379,727—or an overwhelming 104,832. Other districts in Utah have similar problems to that of Granite.

I would like to quote briefly from a report on schoolbuilding needs in Utah that was made to our legislative council—consisting of members of the legislature and private citizens It states far more concisely than I can the emergency situation that exists there:

By the opening of school in September 1961 it is estimated that the school districts will need 1,224 additional classrooms. The cost of such additional classrooms has been computed at $42.6 million. Exhausting full bonding authority and applying a 10 mill local property levy, as estimated, will not cover the cost of additional classrooms in 6 of the 40 school districts. The six districts will require an estimated $14.5 million to provide the necessary classrooms. This estimate covers enrollment increases, present overcrowding conditions and replacement of intolerable classrooms.

These are the discouraging findings despite the fact that Utah has made an effort greater than most States, spending 5.51 percent of our income for education.

I urge every Member of Congress who thinks there is no need for a school construction bill to take a tour of the school districts in his State.

Mr. Chairman, my discussion has centered upon just one question, namely, "Is there a need in my home State for H.R. 10128?" Definitely there is. Furthermore if part of the building cost burden for further building be removed from the States and school districts by Federal help, these States and districts could divert some funds to teachers salaries that would otherwise need to go into buildings.

It must be admitted that this House bill, H.R. 10128, which I favor, will entail some Federal control over wages, costs, and construction of the buildings involved but when those buildings are once completed and turned over to the States all possibility of further control will be eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, I favor H.R. 10128 as reported out by the House Committee on Education and Labor and I hope it will receive the approval of the House.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in yielding this time to me.

I have taken this time to state to the committee that when we are under the 5-minute rule and the bill is open to amendment I will offer an amendment which will provide for the transfer of funds from the taxes collected on cigarettes to the States. Under the present law 8 cents is collected on every pack of cigarettes sold in the United States. My amendment will provide that 2 cents out of the 8 will be returned to the States for the purpose of school construction. By returning this 2 cents from the 8 cents collected you will have a fund larger than that contemplated in the Thompson bill. Many of the States will receive a little more than under the Thompson bill and some a little less.

However, it seems to me that this is an opportunity to return to the States a portion of their own tax money and by doing it this way there is absolutely no control by the Federal Government. The States get the money back. They use it. The provisions in the present bill which gives some semblance of control will be eliminated and in the future it will be only a matter of payment of this tax money back to the States.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. Listening to the gentleman's proposal on the refunding of the cigarette tax money, I was wondering if we would not get involved with the Committee on Ways and Means on any such amendment.

Mr. BOW. No. The bill I introduced and the amendment I will offer provide for an authorization for an appropriation based upon a particular formula. It does not change the tax structure. You still collect the same amount of tax, but a certain portion of it is allocated to the States for educational purposes.

Mr. WIER. I was merely thinking of the jurisdictional question, that a point of order might be raised against the amendment.

Mr. BOW. I quite understand that. I have studied it very carefully. In 1957 the same question was raised and the point of order was overruled by our late distinguished colleague, Jere Cooper, who was in the chair at the time. The amendment has been drafted so that it does not come under that rule and will not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps the gentleman from Minnesota would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio if his amendment would also include chewing tobacco.

Mr. BOW. No; this relates to cigarettes. It comes from the cigarette tax. It is a sufficient amount to take care of the school-construction problem in any State, and it takes away completely any control. It is a matter of local taxation.

If you really want to go back to the question of no Federal control and go back to the States taking care of their own, here is the chance to do it without any problems at all. I will offer the amendment tomorrow.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I should like to ask a question merely for information. Under the amendment to be offered by the gentleman, would the funds be administered by or channeled through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare?

Mr. BOW. No; the funds would be paid by the Treasury of the United States back to the States and there would be no clipping of the 25 percent. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] that you clip 25 percent when it comes down here. This would not happen. It would go directly back to the States by payment by the Treasury based upon the number of cigarettes that are sold in a particular State. It is amazing when you look at it and see the number of packs of cigarettes sold in these States, and when you take only 2 cents on each one and still take care of the construction of schools, it seems to me that it is a logical way to meet this problem.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, we are today considering legislation to provide Federal aid to education. This aid has a twofold purpose. First, it is supposed to improve educational facilities and opportunities for children attending elementary and secondary schools; and secondly, by fulfilling that purpose, it is supposed to strengthen our national educational system in order to help the United States of America successfully meet the challenge of communism.

These, Mr. Chairman, are our declared objectives. To meet these objectives, I believe our schools, public and private, should in some instances be improved. Therefore, I introduced H.R. 12269, which proposed to provide grants to public as well as to private and sectarian schools. I have learned, however, that this proposal could give rise to some question of constitutionality under a recent interpretation of article I of the Bill of Rights by the Supreme Court. Therefore, I prepared an alternate amendment that is embodied in H.R. 12349.

Mr. Chairman, despite what a certain columnist in the Washington Post says about my intentions to torpedo the school-construction bill, I strongly favor needed and nondiscriminatory Federal assistance to education. He classified me as "puller-back No. 3," who wants a school bill passed but wants to provide funds for Catholic schools. Evidently this columnist did not bother to read my substitute amendment, and, if he read it, he does not understand it. His statement is erroneous. My proposal would provide funds to all needy schools without discrimination and without regard to the religious convictions of students attending them.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time during our consideration of this legislation, I shall offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for H.R. 10128. I should like to take this opportunity to explain its purpose and the need for it.

AMENDMENT EMBODIED IN H.R. 12349

My amendment is embodied in H.R. 12349 which I introduced in the House a few days ago. It does not in any way alter the purpose of the bill before us, nor its scope. The amount of Federal assistance to be authorized—$325 million a year for 3 years—would remain unchanged.

The purpose for which this assistance is to be used, school construction, would remain the same; even the formula to be used in determining the size of the allotments to be given to each of the States would remain unaltered. The change which I shall propose will relate solely to the distribution of Federal assistance within each State. It will remove the objectionable and discriminatory provisions of H.R. 10128 which proposed to bar approximately 7 million American children from receiving any benefit from Federal aid to education.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am delighted to yield to my friend the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. There is no discrimination in H.R. 10128. Every American child would benefit from it. Those who attend nonpublic school do so entirely voluntarily. This is their right for which they choose to pay. I can agree with the gentleman except for the definition of school facilities set forth on page 24 of the bill, in which it says:

(e) The term "school facilities" means classrooms and related incidental facilities (including initial furniture, equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes) for education which is provided by a local educational agency as elementary or secondary education, in the applicable State, at public expense and under public supervision and direction; and interests in land (including site, grading, and improvement) on which such facilities are constructed. Such term does not include athletic stadiums, and does not include structures or facilities intended primarily for events, such as athletic exhibitions, contests, or games, for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman is not reading from my amendment?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. No; I am reading from the bill H.R. 10128, which is designed for public schools and public supported, controlled and operated, by the definition.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am very happy the gentleman asked me to yield. The gentleman will recall, yesterday I asked him whether the funds allocated to the States under his proposal could be available to private schools. I inquired of him whether in those States in which the State educational agency is authorized to make payments to private nonprofit institutions, such institutions would be in a position to benefit under H.R. 10128, and the gentleman told me they would.

I wish to remind the gentleman that he called my attention to section 4(b), lines 19–22, which provide that:

> Upon receipt by the State, funds allotted under this Act shall thereafter be deemed to be State funds to be distributed and expended in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

The gentleman, in doing so, indicated that in certain States private nonprofit schools could receive payments under his bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Following the discussion with my distinguished colleague yesterday, I made extensive examination of the legislation, and I regret to report that in my conversation yesterday I spoke out of context. I had not considered carefully enough the definitions in the bill which are quite specific in that they say "public" and in the definition states "at public expense and under public supervision and direction."

I apologize to the gentleman for my horseback opinion yesterday, which was in error.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I was under the impression that the gentleman, being thoroughly familiar with the provisions of his bill, gave me his opinion in all sincerity. I can assure him that I was just as sincere in asking my questions.

I would like to point out, however, that H.R. 10128 is not consistent with its own definitions. In many of the sections school facilities are not identified as public school facilities except, as the gentleman has pointed out, in the last section of the bill dealing with definitions. Further, the bill repeatedly refers to our Nation's education system. I am certain the gentleman will agree that when we refer to the American educational system, we know precisely what the term means. I should like to elaborate on this point.

THE DECLARED PURPOSE OF H.R. 10128

The title of the bill before us is "School Construction Assistance Act of 1960."

Section 2, paragraph 1, of the bill states that this legislation is intended to improve the quality of the Nation's educational program by providing assistance to eliminate the shortage of classrooms.

Paragraph 3 of that section refers again to the quality of American education. It states clearly that the purpose of this bill, and I quote, "is to provide Federal financial assistance to help meet the immediate problem of financing the construction of adequate school facilities and thereby to strengthen our Nation's educational system."

It is made perfectly clear, therefore, in section 1 and in section 2 of this legislation that it relates to education in the United States. Further, the bill states, and repeats, that its purpose is to strengthen our Nation's educational system—not any particular part of that system, but the system as a whole.

WEBSTER'S DEFINITION OF A "SYSTEM"

Now what precisely do we mean by the phrase, "our Nation's educational system?"

Webster's Dictionary defines the word "system" as "an assemblage of objects united by some form of regular interaction or interdependence;" further, as "an organic or organized whole."

The terms "unit," "whole" and "coherent whole" appear in Webster's definition of the word "system."

DEFINITION OF "AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM"

Relying on Webster's Dictionary, it would appear, therefore, that such phrases as "the American educational system" and, again, "our Nation's educational system," refer to and include the sum total of institutions engaged in the task of educating the youth of our Nation in compliance with local ordinances and State laws on this subject.

Let us go a step further and see what is included in this sum total of institutions engaged in the task of educating our youth.

Does our entire educational system consist of public, tax-supported schools only?

It certainly does not. In the State of Wisconsin, for instance, approximately one-fourth of the school-age population is receiving its education in other than public educational institutions.

Does our system, then, consist of only private educational institutions which meet local and State school requirements?

The answer again is "No."

The American educational system consists of—and has long consisted of—both private and public schools.

Both the private and the public sectors of our educational system serve a common purpose. They have an identical objective: The education of our children. They both fulfill this responsibility. They are both recognized and accepted by American custom, by American tradition, and by American law.

DOES H.R. 10128 PROVIDE ASSISTANCE FOR THE AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM?

Now let us take a closer look at H.R. 10128.

Does it really do what it says? Does it really provide Federal assistance for the strengthening of the American educational system?

The bill states that this is its purpose. It states it more than once. The bill includes all of the children being taught in the American educational system in determining the amount of Federal aid allocated to each of the States.

The bill departs from its objective, however, when it comes to the distribution of Federal assistance within the respective States.

According to the formula provided in H.R. 10128, Federal aid is to go only to the public sector of our Nation's educational system. The private sector is ignored entirely in the distribution of aid.

To use the example of the State of Wisconsin once more: 100 percent of our school-age population is being counted under H.R. 10128 in determining the amount of Federal assistance which Wisconsin should get. But, under this bill, only approximately 75 percent of our school population would derive any benefit from this legislation. The remaining 25 percent is left out in the cold. They are ignored and they are discriminated against.

My amendment would change this—it would provide that 100 percent of our school population should be counted in the determination and in the distribution of Federal aid.

This, I believe, is a fair proposal. It does not discriminate against anyone. It provides Federal aid, on the basis of need, to all the children in our Nation's educational system. It is fully in accord with the American tradition of freedom and equality for all of our citizens.

ARE CHILDREN ATTENDING PRIVATE SCHOOLS SECOND-CLASS CITIZENS?

After all, are the children being taught in the private sector of our educational system second-class citizens?

Do not their parents pay taxes—not only Federal taxes, the revenue from which we propose to distribute through this legislation—but also local and State taxes which are used, in part, to pay for the construction and support of public schools?

Will not these children, when they grow up, be expected and required to share the responsibility for defending our Nation, and for preserving its principles and institutions?

Are not these children, and their families, guaranteed the same rights and privileges by our Constitution as are the children attending public schools?

WHAT DOES OUR CONSTITUTION SAY?

Mr. Chairman, I ask nothing for any church, for any particular school, or for any special group.

I ask only for justice and equality for American children, for the rights which are guaranteed them by the Constitution.

Let me recall a few things about our Constitution and the rights it guarantees to all American citizens.

Article XIV guarantees every American citizen equal protection of the law; and article I of the Bill of Rights guarantees every individual the free exercise of his religion as a personal civil right.

Those two articles have a direct bearing on the legislation before us.

Throughout our history, many of our people have exercised their right to the free exercise of their religion by pro-

viding their children with religious education. They have done this as a matter of conscience, and as a matter of right. Their freedom of choice in this regard has been safeguarded by our Constitution, and acknowledged by our society. Their constitutional rights in this respect are as valid today as they were 50, or 100, or 150 years ago.

May I remind this body that freedom of religion cannot be equated with, or brushed aside by, a reference to the availability of publicly financed schools. Or by saying that those of our citizens who believe in religious education for their children are free to build their own schools.

All of our citizens have to pay local and State taxes for the support of public schools. Many of them assume a further burden by building and maintaining private and religious schools. They do this as a matter of conscience, but the financial burden upon them is not lessened by the fact that they do this in pursuance of their religious convictions. Many of them may be forced eventually by this double financial burden to abandon religious education of their children. And I ask you, what kind of religious freedom is there when a family is effectively denied even a reasonable economic opportunity to pursue its conscience?

WHAT DOES OUR CONSTITUTION PROHIBIT?

Mr. Chairman, I have referred to the rights which the 1st and 14th amendments guarantee all of our citizens. Some people, however, only stress the prohibitive features of the first amendment. They contend that it prohibits our Government from taking any action, or enacting any legislation which can offer assistance or recognition to any or all sectarian institutions. The proponents of this view will contend that the substitute which I propose to offer to H.R. 10128 is unconstitutional, on the grounds that it violates the first amendment to our Constitution.

What does the pertinent clause of the first amendment prohibit—and how has the Congress viewed this prohibition in the past?

Clause 1 of the first amendment states that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." The original proposal leading to this amendment was introduced in the House of Representatives by James Madison. When the first amendment was pending in Congress in substantially its present form, "Mr. Madison said, he apprehended the meaning of the words to be, that Congress should not establish a religion, and enforce the legal observation of it by law, nor compel men to worship God in any manner contrary to their conscience."

This, according to the original records available to us, is what the Congress intended in approving the first amendment. And the Supreme Court, in a series of cases, has stated that the first amendment to our Constitution does not proscribe the use of public funds to assist children attending private and sectarian schools.

In *Quick Bear* v. *Leupp* (210 U.S. 50 (1908)), the Supreme Court sustained a contract made at the request of Indians to whom money was due under a treaty, providing for the payment of such money by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the support of Indian Catholic schools.

In *Cochran* v. *Louisiana State Board of Education* (281 U.S. 370 (1930)), the Supreme Court sustained the use of public funds to furnish nonsectarian textbooks to pupils attending sectarian schools of Louisiana.

In *Everson* v. *Board of Education* (330 U.S. 1 (1947)), the Supreme Court sustained the use of public funds for the transportation of pupils attending sectarian schools in New Jersey.

NO DISCRIMINATION IN EARLIER FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Neither has the Congress, in the past, considered it necessary under our Constitution to prohibit the use of public funds to assist students attending nonpublic schools.

The GI bill of rights did not discriminate against our veterans because of their religious beliefs. Educational grants were given to all on equal terms. There was nothing in that legislation to prevent thousands of fine young men and women from using their GI benefits to study for ministry in the Protestant, Catholic and Jewish faiths, or to stop millions of other citizens from studying in colleges and universities of all leading religious groups.

There was nothing in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to restrict Federal assistance to the public sector of our educational system. Individual and institutional grants have been and are being made under that legislation without regard to the religious affiliation of students or of schools. The individual's constitutional right to pursue his religious convictions was not abridged by that legislation.

NO TIME TO BEGIN DISCRIMINATING NOW

This is no time for the Congress to start discriminating against our school-age youth because of an individual's conscience. If the Congress is to provide assistance for school construction to our Nation's educational system, let us do it fairly and without discrimination.

The Congress has done it before, and it can do it again.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, this is all that my amendment proposes to do. We have full justification and authority for this action in our Constitution, and we have precedent for it in earlier Federal legislation. Let us not depart from these principles now. I appeal to every Member to support my amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I have no reason to question the sincerity of the gentleman from Wisconsin. He has raised a challenging and interesting argument. I must remind him, however, that as the author of the bill under consideration—H.R. 10128—I intended it to relate only to public schools and public school facilities as defined in the legislation. I leave to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole the final decision as to the points raised by the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 10128. I am opposed to this legislation and I find it to be another vehicle to enable the States to avoid their responsibility in the field of school construction rather than a measure to encourage the States to assume their constitutional responsibility in the field of education. I realize that we have heretofore, in the Congress, invaded the education field with such legislation as the impacted area legislation, giving assistance to those areas where Federal installations were the cause of crowded schools. Impacted area legislation can be justified on the part of the Federal Government because the Federal Government is directly responsible for the situation in those schools. This legislation cannot be so justified.

EDUCATION IS A STATE RESPONSIBILITY

Looking at the school-construction picture in the United States we find certain of the States have engaged upon their own construction programs, and the people of those States have been brave enough, American enough and responsible enough to build their own schools and pay for them. I have in mind not only my own great State but the great State of Georgia, and in previous debate on legislation of this kind we have pointed out to those who will not see and stated to those who do not want to hear that this is a State responsibility and that any State, whose present financial potential has not been jeopardized by socialism on a State level, can issue its bonds and have some sort of tax to pay for school construction.

If a State cannot assume its responsibility in paying for school construction, how can it assume its responsibility in matching the funds of the Federal Government?

Where are the States going to get the matching funds? If a State is too poor now to build the schools, is it not too poor to get up the matching funds? I was told the other day that the State of Illinois is having a special session of its legislature to try to get a deficit of $22 million in welfare funds. Should the State of Illinois then have to be taxed to support a school in California, in New Jersey, or even in South Carolina if school construction is needed in those States? Is education the responsibility of the State as the Constitution says it is, or is it the responsibility of the United States?

DO NOT BE FOOLED THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WILL NOT TAKE OVER

Now I know that there will be a high cry that section 10 of this bill provides that in the administration of the act the United States shall not exercise any direction, supervision or control. Why is this included? If school construction is the responsibility of the States and is a State function, why is it necessary to include section 10? The inclusion of section 10 is not only a "come on" for those who still believe in States rights, and I am one of those believers, but can be used for reasoning, by some court of the future, that the Congress recognized by this legislation the duty and responsibility of the Federal Government, as

opposed to or imposed on the State government, in the field of education. Section 10 looks good on its face, but when you read section 2 of this legislation and find the wording, "there is still a serious shortage of classrooms which requires immediate action on the part of the Federal Government," and "this shortage of classrooms is seriously restricting the quality of the Nation's educational program," we find that we are paving the way for a judicial decision that the Federal Goverment shall take over the education in this country to "promote the general welfare," or "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." The welfare clause of the Constitution has previously been used to justify ridiculous departures from sound courses and the Constitution. Now the proposal to secure the blessings of liberty will be blazed on the pages of some newspapers as a new idea, grabbed at by some justice or some court, who or which are socialistic in their thinking and political in their design, and see a greatness by the route of departure from the Constitution rather than the greatness obtained by others in efforts toward its preservation.

THE OLD RUSSIAN SCARE

We are told that the Russians surpass us in the education field. If this is true, why do not the Russians have more automobiles, better clothes, more tourists come into this country, and more natural wealth? What evidence do we have? The fact is that the American tourists who do not speak Russian but seek to become an expert on Russia by virtue of one visit, having visited Russian schools which the Russians wanted visited, come back and tell us of the marvelous education. At the same time, they tell us of a Russian people who are not clothed as well and who suffer other deprivations. I wonder how we would pass any socialistic legislation if it were not for the Russian menace. It, therefore, appears that the menace in Russia is used as a stepping stone toward socialism rather than showing the deficiencies of socialism.

Let me pause here to say that I did not go to school in one of these ultramodern classrooms. I have no objection to them, and I have no particular impression about the classrooms I was privileged to sit in. What has impressed me and what has been a part of such success as I have had have been those fine men and women who led me in the right direction. They taught reading and writing and arithmetic, and they taught a man to spell and something about phonetics. We had to write a lot of themes and letters and we knew something about language punctuation and the construction of a sentence. I remember a beloved English teacher, and who still teaches, but who supervised dramatics in order that she might teach her students the ultimate in expression and inflection and the like. I remember a French teacher who insisted that French be spoken in her classroom for every question and answer after the first 6 weeks, except where English interpretation of French was necessary. These are the sort of things that make for good education. We were not raised in fear of Russia nor any other country. Nobody loved to sell us on the foolish idea that the situation in another part of the world had anything to do with our classrooms.

Today I received a telegram supposedly from a Class Room Teachers Association. Nobody signed the telegram and it was not in the form of a resolution. I do not know that it came from a teacher, but it stated:

> The schools of South Carolina need Federal aid. Please support a good education bill.

The teachers of this country are being told that Federal aid to education is the answer to all their problems, and surely they are many. Many hope to gain the support of the teachers, for this sort of legislation, by promising the teachers a pay raise. I do not believe the telegram I received reflects the true thinking of the teachers of my State and I do not believe they are willing to sacrifice their independence and the control of the State over education for a raise in their salaries. Our teachers are too fine to be led down such a road.

All of us recognize the fact that the teachers are not paid enough. We in South Carolina have strained our economy and we will continue to do so to pay our teachers. I am proud to be associated with the dedicated men and women who teach in South Carolina, and as much as I want them to have adequate salaries, I do not believe the Federal Government has that responsibility.

The housing of the pupil, the quality of the classroom, the curriculum of the student, and the pay and the qualification of the teachers all are the responsibility and prerogative of the State. If we put the Federal Government in the school construction business this year, within the next 5 years the Federal Government will have charge of the schools and curriculum, the certification of the teachers, and the education in the elementary and high schools of this Nation will suffer the blight the Federal bureaucracies always brings with its interference or regulations. They can cry all they want to that this legislation is needed, and that this program will not put the Federal Government in the school business, but it will.

I remember that the same elements which push this particular legislation and the same that proposed the civil rights bill are for votes only.

I read in the legislation that the Commissioner of Education shall have the authority to make the payments. One of the sops is the fact that only $325 million is allowed the first year and each of the 2 succeeding years. If this legislation is passed the bill will be a billion dollars a year within 5 years, and the school boards of this country will be encouraged toward dissatisfaction with their plant equipment in order to get more and more Federal money, bigger and better plans and different forms of equipment which they have been getting along without.

OUR PROBLEM IS CURRICULUM

This legislation offers no panacea for any educational program that we have. Our problem is curriculum. In too many schools today the curriculum is not stiff enough and I know this from the experience we in Congress have in attempting to nominate young men to the various academies. We feel a personal interest in these young men and most of the time I know the parents. We find a young man who has had a marvelous high school record, and we place his name for nomination, thinking of the pride we will have here in the office, and that his family and friends will have back home, in the fact that he will make the grade. Then the tests are given and the boy fails because he does not have the proper background. It is not his fault. He has assimilated the curriculum prepared for him and he has made, comparatively, the high marks that justify his being considered, hopefully, as a candidate for one of the academies. His curriculum has been too easy. The three "R's" have not been drilled into him. He has not had enough foreign language to compare or appreciate his own. This is not true particularly in South Carolina, but of the Nation as a whole. We find most of the trouble to be in English composition, spelling and lack of ability to read something intelligently and absorb it.

If we want to do something about our educational position in comparison with other countries of the world, let us suggest a study and advise the various departments of education of the various States and the respective counties, first, of the educational needs of our country, and its people in the future; second, the deficiencies in the present and proposed curriculums; third, a manner or means by which incentives could be given to persons to enter the teaching profession; and fourth, funds for pure research and development in the education field. A federally sponsored classroom is not the answer to the fact that we are not teaching foreign languages early enough in our schools, that our mathematics and science programs are not being sufficiently emphasized in a modern age, and that we are not stressing English composition which represents the ability of expression, and a must in an enlightened world.

Television has made a necessity of the desire that American leaders and the American people know when, where, and how to express their beliefs, their ideas, their desire for peace, and their freedoms.

FEDERAL AID IS NOT THE ANSWER

Some people have been fooled into thinking Federal aid to education is the answer. It is not. I want to go on record as thanking the Florence, S.C., Farm Bureau, and the farmers in general who have expressed to me their opposition to Federal aid to education. I want to thank those teachers who have written me who have not been beguiled into thinking that Federal aid to education is the answer because it promises some raise in the teachers' salaries.

On my desk is an article from the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont of November 18, 1959. Yale and Harvard withdrew from the Federal student loan program because they do not want to insist that a student who takes the taxpayers' money should have any loyalty to the taxpayers' country. In other words, a man or woman could be a Communist, Socialist, an enemy of the country, and take your and my tax money to get an education to use against us. Those who are willing or unwilling by the Communist line in this country yell to the high level that you have to have freedom in your educational program. They want freedom of access to the taxpayers' pocket, freedom of access to the educational schools, and reject loyalty to freedom as expressed by the purposes of this great Nation. So far, I thank heaven, we have not been diverted from our purposes of freedom despite all that the misguided, the "do gooders," the so-called internationalists, and those who secretly wish our subjugation have been able to do.

If Alabama is to get about $12 million over a period of 3 years for school construction, where will Alabama get the funds to match the Federal funds? Alaska, a struggling new State is to receive over a half million dollars—Alaska is suffering growing pains now and is not able to balance its own budget. Alaska could well use a million dollars for roads because the schools would follow the roads and the schools would follow the development of natural wealth of the State.

I see that the District of Columbia will get over $2 million. If that money is matched the taxpayers will have to put up that $2 million so that the District of Columbia is being discriminated in favor of. I have heard so much about the District of Columbia being discriminated against here and I want to point out this discriminating favor. And, if a mistake were made and they were given home rule, the taxpayers of the District of Columbia, who are not voting on the bill today, unless most of the present taxpayers would not live here because of home rule, would have to get up the $2 million. This is how ridiculous this proposition is in its present form.

I see where South Carolina would receive about $10 million or better. The taxpayers of South Carolina would have to get up $10 million and make arrangements to match the funds by payments. By their own bond program the people of South Carolina have had the guts, and the assured responsibility in order to give the children fine classrooms.

One of the troubles in education today is the fact that the spotlight and attention is focused always on the wrong thing. Instead of focusing on the preparation of the child's mind for his life's work and letting everything else be secondary or incidental, we are focusing on some comparison with Russia—as an excuse—school construction, whether or not the Federal Government should pay the teacher and many other facets of our education, deserving though they may be.

WHAT ARE THE LESSONS OF HISTORY?

Shall we neglect the lessons of our history? In the past we have compared the Americans with the students in Great Britain and in France, and at times, the ability of America to compete has been questioned. And yet we have sent these generations out to wars which they have won; into machine jobs in which they have produced better than any other peoples of this world; into Government which has benefited its people more than any other Government; into banking that has produced us the title of the world bankers of today; into education that has produced such fame to our great institutions and I include misguided Yale and Harvard in that category. We have sent them into the ministry and this Nation has become a symbol and bulwark of Christianity. And why? Because we have prepared the minds and not because the Federal Government has or has not helped build a pretty schoolhouse. Now these people have been educated by the State, and some of them in one-room schoolhouses. I would not have us revert for one minute to the one-room schoolhouse, but if our Nation can produce from one-room schoolhouses it can certainly produce if the people are of a mind from the modern schoolhouses of today.

THE SOUTH IS DOING ITS JOB

One of the things that concerns me is the the hue and cry that our Southern States are not doing the educational job they should. I am only familiar with South Carolina directly, the others indirectly. I am familiar with the fact, and proud of it, that everywhere I go I find people educated in South Carolina who have made their way in other parts of the country. Just yesterday I got a letter from a friend who is a success in the Foreign Service; a day or two ago I talked with another contemporary who has made a success in New York. Every day I meet or hear of someone, raised and educated in the South, who has gone to other parts of this country, or other parts of the world and made good. I am proud of them. They speak louder than any testimony before a committee. They are proof of what I say here.

WHAT IS LEFT OUT OF THE BILL

Let us take the formula set out in this bill. There is no formula which requires the State to certify, first, that it needs Federal assistance; second, that it has exhausted the means at its command to provide the school facilities that it needs; third, that no revenue or source of revenue is necessary to provide this need; fourth, that, based on experience, the increase in pupils will be such as to demand a school construction program over and above what the State is presently engaged in.

These are just a few of the things that should be required. Otherwise, the inclusion of every State, in writing this legislation, must be classified as solely for the purpose of getting votes, and a handout to those States who will not shoulder their responsibilities.

A GIMMICK

Section 7 of this bill has what we call a "gimmick." We find that we have a formula for "State school effort index." We take care of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia by saying their index is deemed equal to the national school effort index, but for South Carolina and other States, not rich States, we obtain their index by dividing (a) the expenditure for schools per public school child for the State by (b) the personal income per child of school age for the State. Now on its face that looks good for a State which has at the present time a low income per child of school age. This low income is due to the fact that South Carolina once had its agricultural wealth practically wiped out.

Not until the past two decades have we industrialized and our national income begun to rise. Our per capita income is still below the national average, but has risen 319 percent since 1929. In 1956, the average income in South Carolina was reported at $1,133, as compared with a national average of $1,940, but we expect to make progress, and if we make progress, are we going to be penalized for making that progress because of the index which is included?

Some might answer and say this is only a 3-year program. I know better than that, once the foot is in the trough, it is pretty hard to break the habit of depending on the Federal Government to take care of everything.

WE HAVE DONE IT—WHAT ABOUT YOU?

Over 50 percent of the students in South Carolina attend schools in buildings less than 5 years old. They are modern school buildings and we have done it. To those of you who make so much hay out of castigating the South and talk about discrimination, can you match that in your own State and have you any reasonable explanation for the failure of your State to do what South Carolina has done? Do you dare accuse your people of being unwilling to make the sacrifices the people of South Carolina have been willing to make to further education?

I question not only the need for this legislation but the sanity of the approach to it. There is no proof here that the program is sufficient, if there is a need. There is no proof here that in 3 years the situation will be cured. There is no certification from the State boards of education, who best know their needs, that this is necessary. I understand there were no public hearings on this bill this year, and there is no evidence, pro or con, whether testimony of another year would or would not be varied because of changes which have taken place and progress which has been made.

We have been told in the debate that this bill may be used in the integration fight, that funds would be withheld if the schools were not integrated. How far will they go in this legislation? If the States are to control, as section 10 says, how does this come about? This reveals the purposes of this bill. It is

the first of a design for the Federal Government to take over the schools, build them, control them, and integrate them. I might add that Federal aid to education will ruin the schools of this country.

Look at the mess the Federal Government has made of the agriculture program and the cost to the taxpayer. Look at the debt management. Look at the way it has handled its espionage, its intelligence. Let us keep the Federal Government off the back of our educational system.

I am opposed to this legislation and hope it will be defeated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, Federal aid to education ought to be just that. It ought not be restricted to construction only, or to construction and teachers salaries. It is my intention tomorrow to offer a suitable amendment to give the aid provided in this bill to construction and operation.

No person who has served in State or local government, as I have, wants the Federal Government to take over and administer education, any more than we would have the Federal Government administer the public health or public welfare functions. These services must necessarily be local in their administration; they must be kept close to the people in order that they may best serve the communities for which they are conducted.

And yet everyone knows the Federal Government has played a very significant role in strengthening and improving each of these functions through the technique of Federal grants-in-aid. It used to be popular to say the Federal Government did not have any resources that State and local governments did not also have. But any person familiar with the realities of public finance knows this argument cannot stand examination. The Federal Government has far greater freedom in raising its revenue than any State, and infinitely more freedom than local governments. The Federal Government can draw revenues equitably from the entire Nation and the entire national economy without worry about questions of interstate or intercounty tax comparisons and tax competition. Moreover, there are great differences in fiscal resources as between States. The richest State has a per capita income which is more than 2½ times the per capita income of the lowest income State. But if you move to the level of property assessments per child of school age, the differences between the richest school district and the poorest school district within the same State may reflect differences in fiscal ability as high as 100 to 1.

Every thoughtful student of school finances knows these facts and, therefore, supports within his own State some kind of basic school foundation finance act to provide a significant degree of equalizations between rich and poor districts. The richest district has a very real interest in the level of education in the poorest district, because it may very well be drawing its labor supply from these districts, and we want a literate, educated, productive labor force. Similarly, our richest States have an interest in the quality of education in our poorest States, because migration from low-income and depressed areas provides the new citizens and workers in the expanding metropolitan centers, where job opportunities are greater.

Mr. Chairman, it is regularly suggested that the increased school costs should be met at the State and local level, because of the heavy burdens on the Federal Government. What are the actual facts? Here is what has happened to State and local finance as against what has happened to Federal finance since the end of World War II. It provides a better perspective as to the relative burdens on the various levels of government.

We are accustomed to comparing budgets, both expenditures and revenues, merely from one year to the next. The June 1959 issue of Fortune magazine in an article on the "Taxes Closest to Home" gives us a little different perspective on State and local budgets. Fortune points out that the total of State and local expenditures and revenue in 1946 were a mere $12 billion. Today their outlays approach $50 billion, or practically a fourfold increase in that time. Total State and local debt has similarly increased, from $13 billion to $55 billion between 1946 and 1959.

Looking ahead, State and local expenditures in 1970 are expected to surpass $85 billion. Against this phenomenal growth of State and local expenditures, it is worth noting that the Federal budget has shown a much more modest growth over the past decade and indeed is even today less than the Federal budget outlays of 1945 or 1946. The Federal Government has been able, during the same period, to indulge itself in two major and several minor tax cuts and we look forward to a further reduction next year.

Meanwhile, State and local governments are straining at the revenue leash in trying to meet the immense demands for public capital and public services that arise out of the twin forces of rapid population growth and rising standard of living. We can look forward to the possibility of State and local budgets exceeding in size the entire Federal budget, within another 10 years. And in another 10 years, the Committee for Economic Development estimates public school costs will rise from $15 billion to $21 billion.

In the face of the fact that the Federal Government has far greater flexibility in revenue opportunities open to it—in face of the fact that it has a far greater interest in a high level of educational attainment throughout the Nation—not simply because of national defense demands but because of the obligation to promote the general welfare—it seems to me the Federal Government can no longer escape its obligation to carry a larger share of the growing load of financing an adequate educational program throughout the Nation. There is no more significant public outlay than the investment we make in educating our children.

WHAT KIND OF AID

Many systems are now doing an excellent job of public education, albeit at a very high level of local taxation. But these are usually the more prosperous districts. Our poorest districts may be making an even greater effort, but because of inadequate resources are unable to provide even a decent minimum of educational opportunity for their children.

As I look ahead to the demands of the next decade and the next generation, it seems to me our obligation is not to be met by a temporary or emergency program, but rather our obligation is to provide a formula which underwrites continuing Federal support for education. Remember that the taxpayer is going to pay for some kind of education one way or the other. In face of the great demands upon our local property taxes to provide water-supply systems, secondary streets and roads and other necessary public facilities of primarily local concern, we must recognize the limits to the capacity of local governments to bond themselves, which affect schools as well. These limits may help explain the failure of many recent local bond-issue elections.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill is written so as to pay for construction only. Is this wise? It has been popular, especially in Presidential messages, to talk about confining Federal aid to classroom construction to overcome the classroom deficit. I have served on the education committee of the Colorado Legislature, and I served on the legislative council's interim committee on education, and I want to tell you that this principle is much easier to state in a hearing than it is to convert into legal formulas.

Much the same point could be made about the other favorite for Federal aid, namely, teachers' salaries. I cannot recall a year in which the proposal for Federal aid to education was not couched in terms of teachers' salaries. Indeed, even in our State legislature it is popular to talk about State aid being for teachers' salaries.

But, realistically do we not want the classrooms to be heated and lighted? Do we not want them furnished? Do we not want textbooks? Visual aids? Related services? Do we not need some money for overhead administration? Is not a bus fleet part of the school system in many communities? All these things cost money. A local school board has to finance its entire program, both its operating and capital program, and they only have one local source of funds—a property tax mill levy.

When we say we will give them aid for one kind of outlay and not for another, are we not merely playing games? Do we not merely say "Let's pretend"? Would it not be much simpler and much more sensible to admit that education costs money—that education requires a capital plant that must be operated and maintained? It requires both teaching and nonteaching personnel. It requires goods and services. Do we not want to see to it that there are adequate funds available to provide a balanced educa-

tional program? Would we not make the job of the school board member, the school superintendent, the budget analyst and the treasurer much simpler and more sensible if we simply said at the State level we are going to give money to local schools based on a formula which relates the grant directly to need and inversely to financial ability? Those who have school experience know that the answer is, of course, a simple "Yes."

Would we not simplify the problem of the State legislator and the State department of education in passing a Federal grant-in-aid forward to the schools if we took the same approach? Why do we not just recognize that schools cost money? We know local units are doing the best they can. We want to help. Let us give Federal aid to the States on a basis directly proportional to our estimate of need and inversely proportional to fiscal ability, and then ask the States to do the same in passing this aid forward to local districts.

I have spent a good many years laboring in the vineyard of Federal-State-local fiscal relations. I have worked at and with every level of government. I am especially conscious of the operating problem of the poor fellow at the bottom of the heap—the school board member and school superintendent who has to meet the bills and keep school open. Too frequently we say to him, "Here is specific money for this purpose, and here is money for that purpose, but for the remaining educational purposes you are on your own." He has got to pay all the bills when they come due regardless of the amount he holds in any given fiscal aid envelope. Why do we not seek to avoid further proliferation of special accounts and special purposes?

We are very fond of saying we do not intend Federal grants to involve Federal control. Indeed, we are equally fond of saying we do not want State grants to involve State control. Yet every effort to earmark a grant-in-aid says it is for one class of outlay only, and not for the whole program.

Every such effort is a subtle, indirect, unwanted and usually unwarranted Federal or State intrusion into local freedom of operations. If we really trust our local citizens to operate their own school programs effectively, why do we not simply talk about a grant-in-aid-to-education program? I know it is politically more popular to want to earmark aid for some special, appealing purpose or special outlay believed to have great vote-winning value. But in the long run, are we not merely making work for ourselves and burdening the administrator, who has a whole job to do, by taking this limited view of our obligations?

BUDGETING FOR CAPITAL PLANT

I think it would be very helpful if we could do the financial accounting for school capital plants on a historic basis. We have tended also to think that once we have built a capital plant, then all we would have to meet are operating expenses. In a static society with no population growth, no obsolescence, no depreciation, no decay, this would be a reasonable assumption. But you know full well that school buildings wear out and lose their utility, and population shifts and grows.

Why, then, do we not provide for a capital consumption allowance in our public budgets, just as every businessman does in his own business budgets? He sets aside out of his annual receipts a depreciation fund which can be used to pay off his debt on existing structures, or used to provide funds for the expansion of the plant, or for replacement of existing plant. In face of our growing population, it seems to me perfectly reasonable to suggest that even those school districts which may have adequate school plant built and paid for are entitled to budget for capital consumption allowance because their buildings will also need to be replaced one day. Now if we take this attitude in our financial planning, then the task of the States in passing forward any Federal aid becomes much simpler and much more equitable.

I foresee great difficulty in securing equitable allocation of funds which are earmarked by Federal law to meet classroom deficits only. Let us take two districts. One has a stable population; its buildings are 50 years old; and it is a poor district. Has it a classroom deficit? It has space to spare. Or take a rapidly growing, rich suburban district; it has rapid population growth; it needs new classrooms; with its rich resources it probably can pay for them fairly easily.

If you were the administrator, how would you think the funds should be allocated? If you were the administrator, would you want this as discretionary power? Would you want to have to face across the table these rival claimants for replacement versus supplementary facilities? If you were the legislator, what formula could you write into law which could give guidance to the administrator?

Mr. Chairman, on the basis of this experience and analysis, I firmly believe that grants should be given for the broad purpose of education itself, both construction and operation. We should recognize that capital costs are part of annual expense of schools. This would be simpler, and fairer. It would be consistent with our stated intent to permit no Federal interference in local school operation.

We should look to the years ahead. The decisions we make here will influence our course of action for many years to come.

I invite the Members to support the amendment I will offer to broaden the purpose of this act to include not only "construction" but also "operation," and to define "operation" as the costs of all necessary personnel, utilities, materials and supplies, and maintenance.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I take pleasure at this time in giving my full support to H.R. 10128, the School Construction Assistance Act of 1960.

There is no doubt that the whole question of the adequacy of our educational system has been recently brought into sharp review, and that this review has been provoked in part, at least, by the phenomenal educational progress of the U.S.S.R. One writer recently stated that the emergence of Russia from the wheelbarrow age to the atomic age in one generation is the greatest miracle of modern times. This miracle was largely the result of a stepped-up educational system, whose scope and tempo possibly have not been matched in the history of the world.

The U.S. Office of Education, after recently sending some of its top educators to Russia to investigate the latter's educational system, made an official report to this Nation in a pamphlet entitled "Soviet Commitment to Education." They there pointed out that, while our people were spending less than 4 percent of their gross national product for education, the Russians were spending from 10 percent to 15 percent. The American educators deplored the large number of inferior and neglected American schools, and contrasted them with their Russian counterparts, which were receiving the very best that Russia could provide. One portion of the report concluded with the words:

> Clearly the Soviet Union is bent on overtaking and surpassing us as a world power, and it proposes to use education as one of the primary means of obtaining this objective.

It would be unfortunate, however, if we were to regard this healthy self-examination on the part of the United States as nothing more than a spontaneous reaction to the goading and prodding of our rivals, prompted by injured pride or humiliation.

I, personally, am interested in strengthening our educational system, not because it is a prerequisite to our outstripping the Russians, but because education is the heart and soul of the democratic process. As someone said: "Among the uneducated, democracy is nothing more than the consensus of ignorance."

Moreover, it would be unfortunate if the publicity which we have recently given to the Russian system were to result in our changing our own basic philosophy of education. There is nothing miraculous about the Russian educational system, as such. Ours is far superior, as a system, and it is far more compatible with the democratic processes, while theirs is not. What makes Russian education so effective is that the Russians take it so seriously, and are willing to sacrifice so generously and persistently for its improvement.

In discussing our system of education, therefore, I am not prompted by any spirit of self-disparagement. After all, I am a product of the American public school system, and am myself a former teacher. Moreover, I am particularly proud of the academic tradition of my own State, Utah, and of the heroism and self-sacrifice of its teachers who, in many instances, have declined positions of greater emolument to stay at their post of duty. I believe it to be beyond dispute that our educational system has been one of the chief contributors to America's becoming the foremost industrial power of the world, and the

foremost spokesman of free nations everywhere. The very excellence of our academic record, however—which, I might add, has been immeasurably improved by an infusion of brains imported from foreign countries—has tended to blind us to some serious blemishes and deficiencies, which are becoming more apparent with every passing day.

I have been a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics since the committee was formed 16 months ago, during which time I have heard much testimony about the startling Russian advances. Dr. Edward Teller, the father of the hydrogen bomb, recently stated that the Russians now had so much momentum, educationally speaking, and that the sands of time had run so far, that there was nothing we could now do to prevent their becoming, within the near future, the unchallenged world leaders in all major scientific disciplines.

According to the National Science Foundation, the following tabulation shows the estimated numbers of scientists and engineers in the United States of America and in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

	United States	U.S.S.R.
1. Number of professional engineers (1959)	850,000	894,000
2. Annual number of engineering graduates (1959)	38,000	106,000
3. Holders of advanced degrees (1959) (Ph. D. in the United States, kandidat or doctor nauk in the U.S.S.R.):		
Engineering	8,000	25,932
Physical and mathematical sciences	35,000	17,406
Life sciences (other than medical practitioners)	24,000	32,341
4. Number of advanced degrees in science and engineering (1950–55)	27,237	32,022

As good as our system may be, I am sorry to say that the naked, indisputable facts are that many of our students are not now receiving what may be considered a minimum educational entitlement for an enlightened democracy, and that many millions more are achieving far, far less than the full realization of their academic potential.

Better education should not be considered a partisan issue. On May 24, 1959, President Eisenhower's own Science Advisory Committee formally reported to the Nation the results of its exhaustive research into the educational problem confronting this Nation. Among other things it stated the following:

It is right and it is necessary that we should expend great effort and resources in order that every American child shall have the opportunity for the 10, 15, or even the 20 years of formal educational experience required to give him full command of his intellectual powers and enable him to live a rich and fruitful life. * * * There is much more to learn than there was 100 years ago, and hence the learning process must be made more efficient at every level. * * * But at this point we face the distressing fact that good teachers are now in short supply in all fields and at all levels and that they are going to be in shorter supply in the future. At the college and university level, teachers with Ph. D. degrees are important because of their more extended training in scholarship and research. In the recent past some 40 percent of such faculties have held Ph. D.'s, but the prospects for the future are that there will be a further decline. The National Science Foundation, in 1956, estimated that we must have 300,000 or more new college teachers by 1970 if we are to keep pace with our needs. Prospects for filling even 40 percent of these positions with Ph. D. recipients are very slim.

The report then points out that this Nation is spending approximately $15 billion on education, which represents slightly more than 3 percent of our gross national product. Its discussion of this aspect of the problem concludes with the words:

If we wisely spend twice that much to achieve higher quality it would be more than worth the cost. Doubling our current annual investment in education is probably a minimal rather than an extravagant goal.

If we are to fulfill the administration's own recommendation that we double our educational effort, then the $325 million a year for 3 years, provided for by the present bill, must be considered as only a modest start. It amounts to about 2 percent of the recommended minimum increase in school appropriations.

It is sincerely argued by some that the responsibility for education resides exclusively with the States and local school districts, and that the Federal Government should not enter into this realm of governmental activity.

Permit me to deal briefly with this argument. I approach it with respect, and even with reverence, because its advocates are motivated by a lofty political ideology which I share. From my youth I, too, have been taught to deplore the need for excessively centralized governmental authority, and for the armies of faceless, anonymous Federal functionaries whose position too often renders them insensitive to the individualities of local communities and to the feelings and the needs of the individual citizens of this land.

I have often said that a country that knows no academic freedom is a country in which no lover of truth would care to live.

If I felt that the School Construction Assistance Act of 1960 would impinge even slightly upon the rights of each State and community to determine what its schools should teach, and how they should teach it, I would now oppose the measure as, I am sure, the great majority of the teachers in my district would want me to do.

I have examined this bill carefully. I have studied the history of Federal assistance to education. I am convinced that restriction upon academic freedom is not here an issue. I join my friends who raise and defend the banner of academic freedom. I pledge myself to fight that fight wherever it is waged, but I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that that occasion is not now.

Let me repeat, this should not be considered a partisan issue. There was no man in our time, or any time, for that matter, who was more honestly and intelligently devoted to the preservation of American principles of intellectual freedom than was the late Senator Robert A. Taft. This great American in 1948, on the floor of the Senate, acknowledged that the original position that he had previously taken opposing Federal aid to education had been incorrect, and endorsed the Federal aid to education measure then pending before Congress. In the course of his remarks, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he stated:

Four years ago I opposed the then pending bill on this subject (Federal assistance to education), but in the course of that debate it became so apparent that many children in the United States were left without education, and then it became apparent, upon further study, that that was not the fault apparently of the States where they lived, but rather of the financial abilities of the States, that I could see no way to meet the condition which now exists regarding illiteracy in the United States and lack of education in the United States without Federal assistance * * *. I feel strongly that in the fields of education, health, housing, and relief the Federal Government has a secondary obligation.

I agree with the sentiments of this distinguished leader of the Senate. I agree that it is the primary duty of the local communities to educate their children. The citizens' sense of local responsibility should not be dulled by Federal largesse in the form of unneeded subsidies and grants. But where it becomes apparent, as it now does, that many local communities literally do not have the resources to support a first-class educational system, and where it is also apparent that the resulting intellectual poverty inevitably tends to spread itself across the land, trailing after it a wake of physical poverty, crime, and social unrest, and when it can be seen as clearly as the rising sun that the Nation as a whole must ultimately pay, in a thousand ways, the price of ignorance, wherever it is found, then I realize that we must invoke some kind of an equalizing principle by which all American children may be assured a good sound education. The Federal Government is the only agency equipped to apply this equalization principle on a national scale. Most States are well familiar with the practice of utilizing State funds to partially equalize differences among counties within the State. Why, then, should we not utilize the Federal Government to bring about at least a partial and very beneficial equalization on a national scale?

Incidentally, the State of Utah is a particularly good example of the successful operation of this equalization principle, on a statewide basis. We have school districts in our State which have been blessed with a certain amount of wealth in the form of mines, factories, mills, smelters, and industrial complexes. The assessed value of these installations is substantial. All too frequently, however, many, and sometimes most, of the thousands of men who operate these installations live in other districts, or even other counties. The latter may find themselves with many modest homes, but with little else by way of taxable real estate. Through the application of the equalization principle all school districts in the State have been able to share, in part, the wealth of the few affluent districts, and have

been able to provide for all the children of our State a high general level of education.

It must be emphasized that the purpose of the equalization plan is not to achieve absolute uniformity throughout the State. That would discourage individual districts from putting forth more than that effort necessary to attain the minimum. The purpose of the equalization plan is to make certain that no child in the State of Utah will be deprived of a sound education merely because he happens to be born in a school district which has no valuable taxable real estate. This basic principle of equalization has been one of the glories of Utah's school system. I can see no reason why it should not be equally valid when applied nationwide.

We are not talking about a system to effectuate complete uniformity throughout the Nation. That would be going too far. We are talking only about a system to raise the national standards generally, and to raise those of the poorer States particularly up to an acceptable national minimum.

According to the formula developed by the National Education Association, we should be spending annually an average of $540 per pupil for education. The facts are that the Nation is now spending an average of $310 per pupil. The figures for our individual States range from $540 per pupil, for New York, down to the incredibly low figure of $132 for Mississippi.

The State of Mississippi, however, simply does not have the financial capability of bringing its per capita expenditure up to the recommended minimum, or even to the national average. And yet it must be noted that Mississippi is currently putting forth a much greater relative educational effort than is New York. Mississippi's per capita residual income—that is, income left to individuals after deducting taxes and cost of necessaries—averages $418 for each school-age child, an income smaller than New York's annual expenditure per child for education. Of this income, Mississippians spend $132 per child for education, or almost 30 percent. By comparison, per capita residual income in New York is $5,956, for each school-age child, of which amount only 6 percent is spent for education.

It is demonstrable that in many local communities, particularly the so-called bedroom communities, where many families, particularly young families, live, but in which no large industrial installations are located, it would be an absolute financial impossibility to raise enough money to meet the minimum educational needs of that community. If they attempted to do so, through increasing local property tax levies, the inhabitants would simply move out. They could not carry the load.

The State of Utah offers an interesting case study. Utah's traditional love for academic excellence, even during early pioneer days when cultural refinements were achieved only through prodigious effort and sacrifice, has been noted by contemporary educational historians. Utah is proud of the fact that it ranks third among the sisterhood of States in the relative effort put forth for education. Yet irrefutable statistics show that Utah is now spending $60 a year less per pupil than the average which is spent nationally. This is due to the fact that while Utah has one of the highest birth rates, perhaps the highest birth rate, among the 50 States, it does not have the heavy concentrations of industry and capital that the wealthier States have. And so, notwithstanding the fact that Utah is spending $24 million a year for school construction, and notwithstanding the further fact that Utah school districts have increased their bonded indebtedness 800 percent since 1946, we are still faced with a serious classroom shortage. Many of Utah's schools are on double shifts. Granite School District, for example has had a total of 31 double shift schedules at various schools since 1952. Its kindergartens have been limited to 6 weeks during the summer, and every first grade has been placed on a double shift, each limited to 3 hours per day. The operation and maintenance budgets, out of which Utah teachers are paid, have been eroded by construction demands in the faster growing districts, and our teachers are consequently the poorest paid professional persons in the State.

Many other Utah school districts have their troubles. I want to read, for example, a letter from J. Easton Parratt, superintendent of Utah's Murray City Schools, which I believe strikingly describes the financial difficulties which many of the urban and suburban districts of Utah and other States face, and will continue to face as our population doubles over the next 40 years. Superintendent Parratt's letter observes:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KING: We have not made it a practice to go to Washington with all of our problems. Inasmuch as you have asked for our financial status, we will be pleased to briefly present it to you.

As you know we are in a rapidly growing area. As a result, we have resorted to various means to try to keep up with our school construction needs. All of our first grades are presently on double sessions. So far, by using every nook and corner we have been able to get by without further double sessions. We have classes on the stage, in the halls, entrance vestibules, and so forth. Even with this, we expect to have to go to additional classes on double session before next year is over.

Fortunately for us, we have received considerable State help. We are bonded to the constitutional limit of 10 percent of the assessed valuation. We have had no trouble selling our bonds. Our trouble comes in not being able to meet the payments of the bonds already sold and still keep building for the ever increasing number of children. Even with our heavy local effort and the help from the State, we are falling further and further behind. More unsatisfactory spaces are being used and more students are placed in each classroom. We often have 40 students in a classroom. We must receive more State or Federal help if we are to provide schools for our children. I have participated in several studies of the school building needs in Utah. Every study comes up with such a large figure it surprises our people. I am convinced the accumulated need in Utah is now so great that the State cannot meet these needs. Each year the needs become accumulatively greater even with our State bonds. Thus, I sincerely hope the Federal Government will join a partnership with the local and the States in providing the buildings we desperately need on a grant basis without strings attached as provided in H.R. 10128. This is the only basis that will be of any help to us.

We surely appreciate your interest in this serious problem and hope Congress will take some steps to start helping to correct it. The amount provided in the bill is relatively small compared to our needs. We could use the whole allotment for Utah in Murray alone. Nevertheless, it is a start and we will be grateful for even this small amount.

I want to emphasize that this bill does not pose a threat to academic freedom. Those who suggest that it does talk as though Federal assistance were some brand new principle. They overlook the fact that we have had Federal aid to education ever since the Constitution was ratified, and even before. The Northwest Ordinance of 1785 specified the manner in which the western lands should be surveyed, and stipulated that "there shall be reserved the lot number 16 of every township for the maintenance of public schools within said township." Even that far back it was recognized that the Federal Government had every right and, in fact, a responsibility to give encouragement to local school construction and maintenance through grants in aid. The above enabling act became the pattern for all States, and territories subsequently admitted into the Union.

Have we forgotten the Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862, signed into law by President Abraham Lincoln—the act which established Federal support for land-grant colleges? Can anyone validly argue that our many splendid agricultural colleges are straitjacketed in their academic pursuits? Have we forgotten the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, creating federally sponsored vocational schools, which act has been revamped and brought up to date no less than five times since its original enactment?

Certainly no one can overlook our GI educational bills, through which millions of deserving veterans have received an education. Has anyone seriously argued that these federally granted GI benefits encroached upon academic freedom? May I add that for 10 years I taught commercial law in an institution which received GI benefit payments. I can categorically deny, from my own experience, that the Federal Government ever sought to influence me directly or indirectly in what I taught. The Federal Government was interested only in seeing that the money was spent in the manner provided by law. The law itself contained no provision which could be construed as a threat to academic freedom, and anyone who intimates that it did either is intentionally misleading the public or is tragically uninformed.

Some of the most important scientific research in our country is carried out today under research contracts between the Federal Government and our various universities. In fact, more than 60 percent of all research and development done in this country today is accomplished under Federal sponsorship, in one form or another. This sponsorship

unquestionably has helped to make us the greatest scientific nation in the world. If the Federal Government were to withdraw from this field, including Federal grants for university research, the backbone of our scientific pioneering effort would be broken, and we would quickly sink to second-class status in science and technology.

Under the program designed to aid federally impacted areas, hundreds of millions of dollars have been paid out throughout the United States to local school districts. There are eight federally impacted districts in Utah. I took occasion last year to write to the superintendents of these eight districts, to ascertain whether or not the Federal grants they received infringed in any degree upon their control of the local schools. Their letters to me indicated that there was absolutely no infringement.

The 5,000 delegates to the recent NEA Representative Assembly approved the following proposition:

> Although control of education should remain in the hands of State and local authorities, the association believes that the Federal Government should share with these authorities a greater responsibility for financial support of education.

I concur with this statement. I agree that the initiative in education must always originate with the local communities. I agree that we do not want a national department of education whose purpose it is to prescribe national curricula for all local communities. This would be stultifying, and repugnant to the principle of unlimited academic freedom which has given both strength and sparkle to the American way of life.

But this is not going to happen. The very nature of the school-community relationship will not let it happen. Federal participation in school financing will not lead to Federal usurpation of school management in the future, any more than it has led to it in the past. Communities will never yield this right to administer their schools. Local interest in educating is not waning, and will not wane, and the communities themselves will never yield the initiative in education. This is because the schools serve what all communities hold to be their greatest and dearest asset—their children. Because the great majority of our citizens are parents, the schools will always command more deep citizen interest than will any other institutions of government.

But the closeness of the school-community relationship does not mean that the quality of American education is purely a local concern. Many of our problems are both local and national in character, and education has clearly become this kind of a problem.

It must be remembered, for example, that our national security in the long view rests firmly upon the quality of our education. Rapid changes in transportation and military science have shrunk the world until the geographic barriers which have shielded this country from invasion and annihilation in the past have disappeared almost entirely. We have also passed the day when we could depend upon the sheer weight of our natural and industrial resources to guarantee our ultimate victory. Our security today rests primarily upon the human resource. It rests upon our people, and upon the quality of the institutions we establish to develop to their limits the spiritual and intellectual qualities of our people.

In the instance of our schools, then, local weaknesses become national weaknesses. Poorly equipped and poorly staffed schools in any communities, in any of the 50 States, become chinks in the national armor.

The issue before us is not to resolve the contest between Federal Government and State or local government. The issue is whether the Federal Government should join hands with State and local government in a cooperative effort to solve a problem which is both local and national in character. No one wants local governments to be extinguished or crushed. They are still expected to exercise their initiative and leadership. The basic principle of this bill is to provide incentives for States to put forth greater effort. Where this incentive pattern has been employed in other programs of governmental activity—for example, construction of sewage-disposal facilities—it has been shown that the States and local communities have been stimulated into exerting initiative and effort which, in many cases, they did not exert prior to the creation of these programs. And so, instead of its being true that Federal grants-in-aid on an incentive basis stultify and enfeeble the States and local communities, the facts are exactly the reverse: They encourage and strengthen local activity.

May I propound the challenge voiced by Adlai E. Stevenson in a recent magazine article:

> The worry of thinkers today is whether Americans, undereducated and overentertained, tossing easefully but restlessly in what Reinhold Niebuhr calls a state of sophisticated vulgarity are still capable of discharging their moral duty as citizens to their country and to the world they live in.

This bill before us is extremely modest, and will accomplish no educational miracle. But it will help. Instead of raising ideological arguments which have no application to the facts of the case, let us get on with the job which we all know has to be done: to infuse a new strength and vitality into our educational system, to the end that we might be able to honestly tell our children that we have given them the best education of which we are capable.

I conclude with the thoughtful words of Alfred North Whitehead, who said:

> In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute: The race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your social charm, not all your wit, not all your victories on land or at sea, can move back the finger of fate. Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will then be pronounced on the uneducated.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] and to concur in much of what he has said. Tomorrow, when the bill is being read under the 5-minute rule, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] will offer as a substitute H.R. 22. I like this measure particular for two reasons: First, because of the fact I think it does a more thorough job in the field of education; and second, because it includes the very vital part which would allow the States to decide what portion of the funds which they receive should be spent for construction or for teachers' salaries. I understand if this substitute is not in order there will then be an amendment offered to the present bill which would give the opportunity to include in Mr. Thompson's bill the teachers' salary part of H.R. 22.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman remembers well that in committee the gentleman from New Jersey supported the provisions of H.R. 22, and I believe the gentleman recognizes that I still am in support of the principle involved in the Metcalf proposal.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I do, and I commend the gentleman for the very practical way in which he has been able to bring this matter of school construction before the House. Without his effort it would not be here today.

I would like to point out that both in the so-called Metcalf bill and in the Thompson bill there is stress laid, in the purposes of both bills, on the quality of education.

Now, quality of education cannot be achieved by any possible definition without including the type of teaching which is being given to the young people of this country. It cannot be gainsaid, I believe, that on the whole, while we know we must rectify the shortage of classrooms, at the same time we know that even in the State of California, which may not have as serious a classroom shortage as many other States, we do have a tremendous number of so-called substandard teachers actually teaching our young people. Therefore, it would seem to me that any common-sense yardstick would certainly give any State of the Union the option of deciding what their greatest need was and what the ratio was so that they could apply this amount of dollars or percentage to classrooms and another or the remaining percentage to teachers' salaries.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. As the gentleman knows, I am opposed to both the school construction and the teachers' salary aspect of this legislation. But, this argument has always left me a little befuddled. If we give the aid to States for school construction, is that not going to release comparable funds for teachers' salaries?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I do not want to let the gentleman remain befuddled, so I will try to briefly explain that obviously what we are doing is supplementing what the States are now doing. We are not replacing any of the funds which the States now are spending for education. They will need everything they now have plus what they will be able to get from the Federal Government, so it is not a question of releasing funds in any manner whatsoever. I hope I have cleared up the matter a little.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. In 10 years it is estimated, even at the present rate, we must double the expenditure for education by $30 billion. The real property tax takes $10 billion at the present time, and under the best estimate that will only give an additional $5 billion. Where is the other $10 billion to $15 billion to come from? It must come from some Federal source. This seems to be irrefutable in connection with our projected needs in the next 10 years.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is quite right. I simply want to ask that the Members give consideration to the equally important need regarding teachers' salaries, because a good teacher, it seems to me, can raise the quality of the youth of this Nation even though he might not have the best facilities. On the other hand, the best facilities alone, without good teachers, will not provide the quality which I think everyone recognizes is so badly needed.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman on his fine statement, and I should like to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation authorizing $975 million to the States for construction of school facilities. I have supported this legislation for a long time and last year introduced a companion to the proposed School Support Act of 1959 which was H.R. 22.

Our first proposal called for some $1.1 billion in assistance per year, while the legislation now before us has been trimmed down to $325 million per year for 3 years. That is the bill which was reported by the Committee on Education and Labor in June of 1959. In addition, that first bill would have allowed the States to use Federal grants for teachers salaries, as well as construction.

It is hard to believe that such trimming down is based on a study of the actual needs of our schools. Public school enrollment increased 50 percent between 1948 and 1960—from 24 million to 36 million. Not only do we have a classroom deficit now, but our national birth rate indicates that we must anticipate a new tidal wave of public school enrollment that will make the experience of the past dozen years seem modest indeed.

To meet the need, local district and State taxes and expenditures have gone up and up. In general, the total amount of money raised and spent on the State and local levels for all purposes has jumped from $12 billion in 1946 to almost $50 billion today. What is more, by 1970 State and local expenditures throughout the Nation are expected to surpass $85 billion.

In contrast, the Federal budget has shown a much more modest growth over the past decade. In simple fact, the Federal budget today is actually less than it was in 1945 or 1946. Furthermore, to pile fact on top of fact, the Federal Government has, in this same period of time, put into effect two major and several minor tax cuts.

Then State taxes and expenditures are ballooning. Federal taxes and expenditures are increasing at only a modest rate, by comparison. And all the while school needs grow and grow.

The case for Federal aid to education is that simple.

Mr. Chairman, I want to also say at this time that I fully support authorization of Federal aid to be used for teachers' salaries as well, for, when all else is said and done, we must have teaching personnel to man the classrooms we intend to construct through this legislation. I intend to support the amendment which I understand will be offered to enlarge the bill's purpose to give the States the alternative of using funds for teacher salaries.

I urge my colleagues to join in support of this legislation with such amendment.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is it not a fact that we do have very many fine schools in our country in many parts of our Nation where they have plant facilities but they cannot attract sufficient competent teachers because of the inability to pay, and the testimony before the committee showed that there was an urgent need in this regard?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. There certainly was, and I hope tomorrow in committee we can consider it well.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, the most critical domestic problem before the United States is education. I doubt that there is a Member of this body who would deny the importance of proper public education for our children, and yet in the Congress few issues have provoked such controversy. We agree as to the problem, but we battle over its solution.

I have examined report after report, studies of private and public groups, statements of educators and school administrators, and to me there remains the inescapable conclusion that we face a critical need for adequate educational facilities. It cannot be done without Federal support.

Federal assistance to education is not novel. For years it has existed. True, it has largely existed on the higher education level. And yet why do we so fear Federal assistance at elementary and secondary levels?

Technological changes demand greater skill. Population growth, increasing interdependence of community life, and a war-threatened society on the edge of space presents a challenge to our educational needs never before experienced. Grow we must. And with growth comes change. Let us face up to it and remember that the Nation goes forward together or not at all.

A Federal response to national educational needs should not be regarded as a substitute for local responsibility. The effort of States and local communities is paramount. The Federal Government seeks only to pull together the crevices and the chinks in the walls of this great country. That is an important function of the Federal Government.

Classroom shortages are foremost. The phenomenal increase in school-age population and the growing difficulty of local communities to cope with these demands cannot be ignored. These shortages deeply involve the national welfare. The number of pupils in excess of normal capacity in public elementary and secondary schools has reached the astounding figure of 1,883,000. This can be easily translated to mean that these pupils are denied adequate educational opportunities. In every community we are witnessing half-day sessions and crowded classrooms. This results in the downgrading of the educational standards of all. What is more critical, though, is the long-term results of this kind of inadequacy. Twenty years from now we could feel it in the most horrifying ways. We could find ourselves outstripped in every intellectual endeavor. Be on guard lest this occur.

In his state of the Union message this year the President urged prompt action to help localities build schools. The rate of construction continues to lag behind enrollments. The committee bill now before us is a sound approach and I shall vote for it. I would not feel otherwise that I was acting in the best interests of the Nation.

The committee bill, entitled "The School Construction Assistance Act of 1960," establishes a vital premise which we should be ever mindful of, namely, that there is no nefarious scheme here, as some seem to contend, that our actions here will reap a shift in control of school policies and programs from State and local authorities to a Federal bureaucracy. If I believed this to be true I would vote against such a proposal. Our efforts are designed to utilize a portion of our national resources to assist States and local communities in their efforts to bridge the gap between the school-age population and the critical classroom shortages.

The preamble of this bill clearly designates in strong and affirmative language that:

> The formulation of policy, and the administration of the Nation's public elementary and secondary schools resides in the States and local communities.

Such enunciation of our purposes should annihilate any superficial conception of migration of control from States and local communities to the Federal Government.

The enactment of this bill will unquestionably bring to bear a new Federal influence on public elementary and secondary education—an influence for adequate school facilities in needy communities.

The failure of enactment of this bill would also have an influence on our elementary and secondary schools—an influence for continued crowding and double sessions.

Neither enactment nor failure can result in any change in the traditional locus of control of our schools.

I support enactment of the bill because of the obviously preferable Federal influence which will result. The Federal purpose is to provide financial assistance to help meet the immediate problem. This bill calls for a Federal expenditure of $975 million over a span of 3 years. It can stimulate a total Federal-State expenditure of $1.625 billion; $325 million in capital grants would be made to the State education agencies for school construction in the first year and in the second and third years the States will match the Federal grants on a 50–50 basis. Another feature incorporated in the committee bill will allow the States, at their discretion, to elect to accept and match the capital grants, or to receive and match commitments to make interest and principal payments on an equivalent amount of bonds or a combination of both.

In order to receive assistance sole administration must reside in the State educational agency. Payments must be distributed by the States to local educational agencies under State established procedures whereby priority will be given to local agencies which have the greatest need for additional school facilities and which, in terms of available economic resources, are least able to finance the cost of facilities.

Adequate and equitable safeguards are provided to insure proper State and local efforts in diminishing their own critical needs by means of a "State school effort index" which will be the State expenditure for schools per school child divided by the personal income per school age child for the State. To the extent that this State index falls below the national index, an equivalent percentage will be reduced from the annual allotment.

The amounts in Federal assistance allotted from appropriated funds to each State will bear the same ratio to such total as the State school age population bears to the total national school age population. The State's allotment, if unpaid, will remain available to it for 3 years.

The long-standing impasse over Federal assistance to school construction is no longer a contest confined to the niceties of academic debate. In the face of compelling and critical need it is time to act and we must do so swiftly. With an admixture of politics, group pressures, ideological debates, sectional wrangles, and parliamentary delay we continue to preclude a constructive approach.

The fact remains that in the 1959–60 school year the Nation was short 132,400 public elementary and secondary classrooms needed to house the 1,883,000 students enrolled in excess of normal capacity and to replace obsolete facilities. Despite construction of 63,000 to 72,000 new classrooms per year since the 1955–56 school year the overall shortage declined only slightly. Despite a stepped-up construction effort the overall shortage dropped a mere 27,000, from 159,000 to 132,400. In my own State of New York there are some 2,735,000 students enrolled, 266,000 of which are in excess of normal capacity. As of September of last year New York had a need for 13,000 additional classrooms. These figures do not include the replacement factor in New York City, which can be safely estimated to be an additional 4,000—for a total shortage of at least 14,000.

This urgent necessity for prompt action constrains me to prefer the committee bill over the administration's debt service proposal which will pay half of the principal and interest annually becoming due on bonds issued by school districts to finance construction. Equivalent commitments must be made by the States. The difficulty in this proposal is that many communities have reached their constitutional bond limits and accordingly, their participation would be prevented for some time to come.

The committee bill can provide more than 40,000 classrooms in the next 3 years. Under this bill States would have the option to use the debt service plan, as proposed by the administration bill, if they should prefer it.

The time for action on school construction is long past. Let us stop being dilatory and do what we must do for the good of our country. A well educated youth is our strongest national resource. Let us go forward with the soundest investment that we can make.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS] in his constructive and interesting remarks in Monday's RECORD, made reference to a questionnaire sent to the Governors of the States last year by the House Education Subcommittee.

The response from the Governor of Nebraska evidently indicated a strong desire for Federal aid to education.

In order to set the record straight, I wish to point out that the Governor of Nebraska replied to a poll taken by the Omaha World-Herald just prior to the Nebraska primary election earlier this month. To the question, "Do you favor expanding Federal aid to education?" the Governor replied, "No."

In addition, a 1959 survey by the U.S. Office of Education indicated Nebraska schools had a backlog need of 521 classrooms. A recent report of the Nebraska Department of Education shows that 570 classrooms were built in our State in 1959 and twice that number are scheduled for completion in 1960.

Nebraska does not need or want Federal aid to education, as the votes of the delegation from Nebraska on this bill will show.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my support for this legislation to the views already expressed by so many of my able colleagues.

I feel that the time has come—in fact past due—when it is crucial for us to take action. It has been mentioned many times since this debate began that we currently have a backlog need for 132,400 additional classrooms in our elementary and secondary schools. This is an alarming figure but I do not feel that it adequately portrays the situation that actually exists. It is easy to shrug off the problem when you merely look at an abstract number of missing classrooms.

What I feel we should concern ourselves with for a moment is what this shortage actually means in terms of the effects on our children. The Office of Education has estimated from the State reports submitted to it that there are currently 1.88 million children in excess of normal classroom capacity. It has been further estimated that 10 million students are actually being penalized by this shortage. When there are 45 students in a classroom only 15 are listed as "in excess of normal classroom capacity" but all 45 are receiving inferior education due to the overcrowding and to the consequent lessening of the effectiveness of the teacher. This overcrowding means that thousands of children can attend school for only half of the day, and as much as 180 school hours can be lost to the child through such split sessions—almost 2 full months of schooling that the child was entitled to have. Or it means overcrowded classrooms with insufficient individual attention and assistance from an overburdened teacher. Finally, it means that thousands of children are attending classes in makeshift or obsolescent facilities. To be even more specific it was reported last fall that in one city the high school students were attending classes in tents and 30,000 of the more than a million public school pupils in the county were attending classes in double shift. This is just one example of the situation that exists in some parts of every State in the Union.

I wonder if my colleagues realize that 10 million students represent almost one-third of the entire public school enrollment. Certainly, when the problem is considered from this point of view—that one-third of all our schoolchildren are being handicapped by this shortage—we cannot dismiss the matter lightly and just say that the State and local governments will eventually take care of the problem. Eventually is not soon enough.

It seems abundantly clear to me that the States and local areas will not be able to erase this deficit. Although they have been making record-breaking school construction efforts for the last few years they are barely able to meet each year's new enrollment and replacement needs. And all indications are that the State and local governments will not be able to continue these record-breaking efforts. In 1957–58 they were able to build 72,100 new classrooms. In 1958–59 the figure dropped to 70,000. For this year, 1959–60, the figure is expected to drop to 62,700. Many States cannot spend the funds requisite for an adequate educational system because many school districts have no source of taxation by which needed revenue can be raised.

An infusion of Federal Government funds to assist our schools in catching up with this backlog is fully in keeping with our tradition and our spirit as a Nation. The President himself explained the philosophy behind this approach in his special message to the Congress on education on January 12, 1956:

> The responsibility for public education rests with the States and the local communities. Federal action which infringes upon this principle is alien to our system. But our history has demonstrated that the Federal Government, in the interest of the whole people, can and should help with certain problems of nationwide scope and concern when States and communities—acting independently—cannot solve the full problem or solve it rapidly enough.
>
> Clearly, this is the kind of situation we face today in considering the school classroom shortage.

Our State and local governments have demonstrated their inability to meet the classroom needs that arise each year due to increased enrollment and the need for replacement of obsolete facilities. If the Federal Government will help them to erase this backlog, they may then be able to meet the yearly problem alone.

I would also like to voice my approval for extending this bill to include funds for teachers' salaries as did the measure passed by the Senate. There is an indisputable shortage of qualified teachers across our country. Within the next 5 years 3,300 additional teachers will be needed in the State of Kansas, alone. We cannot hope to attract more qualified individuals into the teaching profession unless the salary level is raised; and the State and local governments cannot concentrate on raising teachers' salaries when they are forced to devote a substantial amount of their budgets to attempting to provide enough classrooms to house their students. I feel that we must assist both with construction and with teachers' salaries at least until the backlog of construction needs are erased.

The primary objection raised to any proposal for Federal funds for classroom construction and teachers' salaries is that such a measure would lead to Federal control of education. I would like to take a moment to consider this proposition. For over 10 years we have been allocating funds for classroom construction and for operating expenses—which includes teachers' salaries—under Public Laws 815 and 874. Surely these should be good test cases for whether this type of assistance does indeed lead to Federal control. Prior to serving in the Congress I worked as regional attorney approving applications under these laws, and I never saw any evidence of the "creeping Federal control" which the opponents of this bill would have us believe must necessarily follow. Furthermore, it has come to my attention that the University of Alabama's College of Education recently conducted a survey by means of a questionnaire submitted to a cross-section of school superintendents in more than 3,000 school districts receiving assistance under these two laws. Ninety-three percent of the superintendents felt that this aid had not constituted a threat to State and local control; 5 percent termed the threat "little"; and 2 percent were undecided. None of the superintendents considered the threat great.

The interests of national defense, the danger of the Communist threat, of the need for an expanding economy, and of the need for maximum development of each individual citizen demand that we strive to give each of our students the best possible educational opportunity. They certainly are not receiving this opportunity when they must be taught in overcrowded, obsolete classrooms, on double shifts, or by overworked teachers. No better investment can be made than in the education of American youth. It is an investment in the future to preserve our democratic way of life. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge passage of this legislation as in the best interest both of the Nation as a whole and of each individual citizen. It is vital and it is necessary.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, we are discussing today, in my opinion, one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before us during this session of Congress.

H.R. 10128 provides for Federal assistance in the construction of new schools, and is a long-awaited answer to the need for more classrooms and other school facilities. Numerous individuals and organizations in this country, representing all segments of our society, have espoused the cause of Federal aid to education. This is not a new concept. The Federal Government over the years has entered into various fields in an effort to provide financial support, and in fact has extended financial assistance for education in the past in the form of school lunches, vocational education programs, research and fellowship grants, et cetera—all without resultant Federal control.

Here in our great country we are enjoying a standard of living never before reached, and if we are to develop our most valuable commodity—our human resources—we must devote our time and efforts to the establishment of more and better educational facilities. The price will be high, but we cannot be content to sit back and tolerate a substandard second-rate program for education. Certainly the wealthiest nation on earth cannot afford to provide less than the best education for its children.

With the tremendous growth in our population in the last few decades we are faced with a critical shortage of school facilities. Many of our school buildings were built early in the century, and while new construction has tried to keep pace with our growing student population it has been impossible to do so through the State and local level. It has been proven beyond a doubt that proper classroom facilities, with the proper space and equipment, increase the quality of a child's education and permit a student to absorb more knowledge. Overcrowded conditions, poor equipment, inadequate facilities—all these tend to affect adversely the education of our millions of children. By the end of 1959 there was a shortage of about 130,000 classrooms, and I am afraid that the situation has not improved since that time. In fact, latest indications are that we will need some 41,000 new classrooms this fall just to take care of the ordinary increase in annual enrollments. We must increase the financial support for schools if we are to continue our progress in the field of human endeavors as we have in the fields of industry and science. Our children are our greatest assets and are the future citizens and leaders of this country. We cannot and must not economize on education if we are to retain our position of leadership in the world of the future.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill now before us, and I only regret that the pending legislation does not contain any provision which would bring about an increase in teacher salaries. However, it is my understanding that an amendment will be offered to the bill which would make it conform more closely to the bill passed in February of this year by the Senate—providing Federal aid for school construction or teachers' salaries—and I hope the amendment will be carried. The critical teacher shortage has a serious and damaging effect on our educational system, and under the present circumstances, with private industry offering much more lucrative returns, we do not seem to be able to attract and retain teachers with the highest qualifications to instruct our children. This major gap in our educational system must be closed, and I trust that we will have an opportunity to act on legislation which will enable the Federal Government to work along with the local and State agencies in an effort to alleviate these shortcomings in construction and qualified teacher personnel.

The President has indicated his opposition to direct Federal aid in this field, but as the distinguished senior Senator from Montana pointed out in a letter to the editor of the Washington Evening Star several months ago, Federal financial assistance for teacher salaries is not a new idea. To quote from the Senator's letter:

> During that period (fiscal 1953 and fiscal 1959) the Federal Government administered $231,572,000 under the vocational education acts, of which approximately 90 percent went for teachers' salaries. For the same period,

the Federal Government administered $688,500,000 under Public Law 874 (for current operating and maintenance expenses), of which approximately 65 percent went for teachers' salaries. This totals about $655,940,000 for teachers' salaries between fiscal 1953 and fiscal 1959.

In view of the fact that these programs have been in existence for a number of years, and in view of the fact that the Federal tax funds have been utilized for many years to help meet the salaries of many local officials where there is Federal-State cooperation, I might suggest that the President do a little homework on the subject, which would reveal that such Federal financial assistance is not a reprehensible new idea, but would be a continued step forward in the discharge of our responsibilities to our citizens, to provide our children with the best possible educational advantages.

Under article I, section 8, of the U.S. Constitution the Congress is empowered to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Under that provision the Federal Government has the right to enter the field of education, just as it has taken an interest in the past in public health programs, highway programs, reclamation and irrigation projects, and in providing subsidies to industry and agriculture. We have an obligation to meet in the field of education and we must discharge that obligation to the best of our abilities.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10128) to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities, had come to no resolution thereon.

CEREMONY AT EAST FRONT OF CAPITOL

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that the ceremony in connection with the raising of the first marble column of the east front of the Capitol will be held at 10:15 a.m. instead of 9:30 a.m. tomorrow morning.

REV. JOHN F. McGLINCHEY, WHO LIVED FOR GOD AND COUNTRY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to turn aside from the news of accidents, crimes, and "the Khrushchev war of nerves," and draw inspiration from the life of a good man.

As graduation time approaches, we recall with belated gratitude and wisdom, the debt we owe to the teachers of our formative years.

There is widespread concern among thinking Americans, that our country has lost its sense of direction and purpose.

That for the sake of material gain and convenience, we have traded away the ideals that were nurtured in us by devoted teachers. To the extent that this is so, we have failed them and ourselves. But we can recover our heritage by living up to the eternal truths that they taught us.

Such a teacher was the late Rev. John F. McGlinchey, who was curate for 26 years at St. Mary's Church in Lynn, Mass. Father McGlinchey taught the youth of St. Mary's Boys High School the love of their country, based upon knowledge of its history and traditions, that prepared them to serve it with honor as citizens and as soldiers.

Father McGlinchey was proud of our country and its respect for the brotherhood of man.

Although he has gone to his heavenly reward, he has left an indelible impression upon the youngsters he taught who have since grown to manhood.

The eulogy delivered by Msgr. Cornelius T. H. Sherlock at the funeral mass for Father McGlinchey was repeated by him at a special mass in Father McGlinchey's memory, at the request of parishioners.

Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD this moving tribute from the May 15, 1960, issue of the Lynn Sunday Post:

SAW FATHER MCGLINCHEY AS PRIESTLY SCHOLAR—MONSIGNOR SHERLOCK PAYS TRIBUTE TO HIM IN EULOGY

Lynners who attended the recent funeral Mass for Rev. John F. McGlinchey, a curate at St. Mary's Church for 26 years until his transfer in 1951, were touched by the eulogy of Msgr. Cornelius T. H. Sherlock, pastor of St. Mary's and a former fellow curate of the late beloved priest.

SPECIAL MASS

Because of the great interest in the eulogy, Monsignor Sherlock repeated it last Monday morning at a special Mass conducted here for the former boys' high school instructor and counselor.

For persons who knew Father McGlinchey but were unable to attend either Mass, the Sunday Post, with the permission of Monsignor Sherlock, today presents the complete eulogy.

Father McGlinchey died 2 weeks ago after a long illness. He had been the pastor of St. Julia's Church, Weston, for the last 9 years.

The tribute follows:

"Thou shalt forget thy misery and remember it only as waters that have passed away. And brightness, like the noonday sun, shall rise to thee at evening; and when thou shalt think thyself consumed, thou shalt rise as the star of morning. (Job 11: 16, 17.)

"I do not see my mission here this morning as reviewing the biography of a great priest. I see it rather as the expression of true sympathy with you in the loss of an old and valued friend. It is natural and good that, as we greet each other, we express the sorrow we feel and pray that this bereavement rest not too heavy on very human hearts. To Father McGlinchey's relatives and those intimates of his, those who watched him through his many trials, who day after day, were faithful in the expression of their devotion and love, we promise prayers that God may lighten their burden of sorrow. To the priests and sisters whom he served through 35 years of priestly life we hesitate to pronounce the sorrow that we feel but promise the suffrage of our prayers. To all those men and women who were fortunate to know him, and especially to the youth he served so skillfully and well, whose lives took on new dimensions because of the disciplined zeal of this priestly teacher, we extend condolences on the loss of their more than generous benefactor. We, the companions of his priestly service, we who worked and talked, who planned and prayed together, tell each other how hard it is to lose one we loved so much.

"But if sympathy and sorrow seem to be uppermost in our minds, they are far from the more important truths of which we should be conscious. The church, still mindful of the sadness of deserted friends, reminds us that death is but the vestibule of Heaven, that, after all, Catholics spend their lives preparing for that last day on earth when the cares and heartaches, the trials and disappointments of life are finally put aside and the most recent triumph and the last success take on their true proportions of littleness compared with God's eternal reward for those who love Him. She would drive home to our minds the unchanging truth that death is the gateway through which those who have served God well move on to an eternity of supernal happiness.

"PASSING INSTANT

"The truth is that Father McGlinchey, deep as was his love for us, would not return from the joys of Heaven. He would tell us that life at most is but a passing instant, and that if we would but follow the command to love God and love our neighbor, with all that this command implies, we should join him in his happiness in God's good time.

"Laughter and tears have a strange way of being mixed together in this uneven life of ours. For Catholics, even in such deep sadness as this, the fact of our eternal destiny transcends our sorrow and makes the day rich in the reality of a priest's ineffable reward, prepared for him before the beginning of time by an Almighty and all-loving Father. Today must be for us, as it is for Father McGlinchey, a day of splendid joy, seen though it is, through the evanescent mists of temporal loss and passing sorrow. After all, a priest has realized the destiny for which he was created, unbounded joy in the Lord.

"It is the way of priests to characterize their fellows by short descriptive words that catalog them by their salient traits. Describing a companion consumed with a desire to change the world, articulate beyond his fellow priests, a master of words and afire with zeal, one who takes his place in the pulpit or upon the platform, a veritable mouthpiece of God, with laconic swiftness they christen him 'the orator.' To indicate the priest who is gifted with a superior understanding of the structure of society and its activities, the organizer of men to carry on God's work with speed and efficiency, they forego descriptive phrases and call him simply 'the administrator.' The priest whose life is thoughtful and whose interests profound, who burns the midnight oil in his quest for knowledge to answer the whys and wherefores of this uncertain life, who with a deep Christian philosophy weighs the problems of the day and, with careful steps, appraises the course of the world, he, with telegraphic brevity, becomes 'the scholar.'

"SLAVE TO TRUTH

"It was to this third category that Father McGlinchey belonged. Rhetorical competence he had. He loved to savor the spoken word, to plumb its meaning and taste its beauty, but he distinguished between oratory and precise expression. He was a slave to the truth and despised the tricks of flamboyant speech as a debasement of the truth it was meant to serve. He was primarily a

teacher, and in conveying learning or in stimulating the learning activities of young men he preached in telling tones, day in and day out, reverence for one thing—the truth. He was a profound man with short patience with the superficial. He was easily upset by bluff and cant. He thought primarily of God as all true and searched the realm of truth with religious zeal. To him all truth was God's truth and he found God everywhere. His quest for truth was wide and deep. In this was his claim to greatness, the sublime greatness of simplicity.

"One evening 30 years ago we sat together in his room. He was refining his plan to teach high school boys the best he could give them. He said that to his mind the greatest area in the broad field of a liberal education was history. In history, he said, were to be found the thoughts and deeds that moved the world upward. (He was basically an optimist.)

"The vitality of these thoughts came from the vision of historic persons who said the words and performed the deeds that helped the world's progress. These he would present to the boys of his school. The application of the subject was to be the fact that all his students would become characters in history, broadly or narrowly conceived, and hence by teaching history he hoped to contribute at least a little toward a better world. The history he chose was that of the church and the biography of our Lord. He had the gift of great teachers in mentally projecting his students into adult activities. He saw this one as a doctor and that one as a lawyer. He waxed eloquent about one who would become great in the high vocation of politics and another who would be a priest like himself. His sanguine nature pictured them all as good, working at the problem of making a better world, extending God's kingdom into the marketplace, the courts, the operating room, and the public assembly. His concept of religion was dynamic and he hoped that through teaching he would have a causal part in it.

"LOYALTY

"Not every student of his justified his hopes but many did, and when sickness and sorrow dogged his path in later life his mind roamed through the fields of vicarious accomplishment and he took delight in the competent goodness of his old pupils.

"Loyalty was a great word with him. His loyalties were constant. His country was important. In his more intimate moods he would recount his father's flight from political harassment to this land of ours and felt that this country had been quite literally for him the land of opportunity. He worried about the best way to teach patriotism. He felt that patriotism, as a virtue, was going into partial eclipse. He saw the church in all its extension in time and space and in its local detail. He yearned for the most efficient way to bring the history of the church to his students, moving from the parish which claimed their immediate allegiance to the grand concept of the universal church and envisioned his students growing in a loyalty to the church that would consume them.

"MADE WORLD BETTER

"He served the multitude in his priestly way but gave himself in friendship to a few. To these his loyalty burned fiercely under the cover of a quiet manner and restrained and disciplined speech. He loved his friends as an outcome of his nature but philosophized that his real friends were an extension of himself and, since their ideals were the same as his, their behavior in the world always be such that it would extend his priestly influence among men. When he left Lynn some 10 years ago, he said he felt he was old enough to make a judgment. He told me at that time that he felt that his friends had justified his theory, that they had made the world better by the goodness of their lives and that he felt he had some part at least in their goodness.

"Sometimes, as we read the history of our times, we become disturbed by the inequities of the record. We find that men, who by their deeds, should be eternally great, are slighted in the pages of history while temporarily obtrusive men are enshrined in the recounting of their exploits. One writer has accepted this injustice and says, 'It came to pass that after a while the artist was forgotten but the work lived on' (Olive Shreiner, Dream). However, if you seek Father McGlinchey's name on the published page, it may not be carried in heavy type or with elaborate footnotes but you will find it engraved deeply in the hearts of those who knew him, those who drew strength from his teaching and grace from his priesthood, those who, having seen him, smiled once again in the grace of God. But you knew him. Maybe his best eulogy is written in your own hearts.

"Much of his life was beset by sickness, but that is over. The trials and suffering are ended and the prize is already won. So with the writer of old we say to him, 'Thou shalt forget the misery and remember it only as waters that have passed away. And brightness, like the noonday sun, shall arise to thee at evening and when thou shalt think thyself consumed, thou shalt rise as the star of morning. (Job 11: 16, 17.)'"

RADIO STATION WBT, OF CHARLOTTE, IS DOING A GREAT WORK FOR OUR COUNTRY

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I had intended asking for leave to address the House, but because of pressing business today did not take that time. I asked for this permission in order to salute and call attention to a marvelous and patriotic endeavor on the part of radio station WBT, of Charlotte, N.C., owned by the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co. This station and its employees, under the able guidance of Mr. Charles H. Crutchfield, its vice president, have engaged in a program of education so necessary to the survival of America. It is a program to inform the American people of the true character of the Russian Government, and alert our citizens to its danger. I quote from part of his letter to me, which I received today:

America does not suffer so much from a lack of dedication and concern on the part of its leaders as from a lack of informed interest and activity on the part of its citizens. For the past year, WBT has been using its 50,000 watts of "power for the people" to help in informing and activating American citizens in the free world's struggle against Communist dictatorship.

A year ago, WBT began the presentation of an editorial series called "Radio Moscow." Three times each week, our foreign affairs department selects tape-recorded material from Radio Moscow's English shortwave broadcasts and adds its own explanatory commentary in a 15-minute program that has attracted wide attention. The program has two purposes: to expose Communist propaganda techniques, and thereby counteract the distortions of truth that play so clever a part in these Soviet broadcasts; and to present legitimate counter-propaganda based on the American ideology of freedom in speech, enterprise, and belief.

We are pleased to acknowledge the frequent cooperation of the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberation in keeping us supplied with information on their own activities, and occasionally with material for our own broadcast use. The foreign affairs editor here at WBT, Mr. Rupert Gillett, has had 40 years of experience as a newspaper editor on some of the Nation's leading dailies, and much of our success is due to his wide background and keen analytical mind.

WBT's "Radio Moscow" is currently being broadcast by other stations in Little Rock, Shreveport, Evansville, Hartford, Rochester, and Chapel Hill. We now feel seasoned enough to begin a campaign of expansion. In our travels and your contacts, it would be of immeasurable help if you were sufficiently interested to mention the availability and unique character of this program to other broadcast media, or to patriotic citizens who might initiate inquiries as to its being broadcast in their own areas. Any more detailed information will be supplied on request. I have no favor to ask, other than this help in making known the existence of an available means of informing the public as to Communist propaganda techniques and motives in the world today. As a fit postscript, I will include two quotations that are worth your reading time:

Nikita Khrushchev: "Whether you like it or not, history is on our side. We will bury you."

Charles H. Malik, President of the General Assembly of the U.N.: "I submit the following irreducible facts: That for 42 years, communism has never been pushed back nor dislodged one inch from where it gained political power; it monolithically controls about one-third of mankind today; it has penetrated in varying degrees the remaining two-thirds, so that the field of struggle with communism is actually in these two-thirds rather than in the realm of communism itself; its basic objective of communizing the world, and destroying the values of freedom is absolutely unchanged. * * * When one fully grasps these facts, one is bound to conclude that the free world has not yet demonstrated that the Communist onslaught is not irresistible, and that communism is not after all the irreversible wave of the future * * * this is not the age of war in the classical sense, but of infiltration and indirect aggression; of espionage and counter-espionage; of the softening up of the will and the resolve; or the undermining of character and morale; of slander and character assassination; of bribery and demoralization; of the manipulation of the press and radio in the most vicious manner * * * in short, this is the age of the cold war, and those who keep on talking about aggression and territorial integrity and political independence, as though these were the real worries, are either naive or hypocrites or not living in this age. * * * Western civilization today is beleaguered. It is called upon to justify itself. Its fundamental values are not only denied and opposed by international communism and questioned by the awakened old cultures of Asia and Africa, but within its own ranks, skepticism and unbelief are working havoc. So far as the Western world is concerned, the deepest thing at stake is its faith in its values and its ability to justify and defend them."

I salute this magnificent effort. I urge any of you who will to ask your local radio stations to get into the program.

I am sure WBT will be glad to be of help. For the people of my district, which WBT serves, and for the people of my Nation, I thank this station, and those responsible, for these programs. I am gratified to hear they will be continued and expanded.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it it so ordered.

There was no objection.

SANITARY SEWER, DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday of next week it may be in order for the Speaker to recognize the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia or any member thereof to consider as under District of Columbia Day, one bill, H.R. 12063, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to plan, construct, operate, and maintain a sanitary sewer to connect the Dulles International Airport to the District of Columbia system.

This has been cleared with the ranking member of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the minority leader.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 102 I am listed as not voting. I did not vote due to an emergency situation which called me out of the Chamber. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF JAMES N. KEEFE AS LEADER OF MASSACHUSETTS HIGHWAY USERS CONFERENCE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to congratulate Jim Keefe on his 25th anniversary as a leader of the Massachusetts Highway Users Conference.

We, in his home city of Lawrence, Mass., remember him as one of the pioneers in working for harmony on the highways, back in the days of dirt roads, traffic signs or lights, when every driver was a rugged and somewhat reckless individualist. With their goggles and their dusters and their unpredictable steering skills they scared every horse that they met along the way.

With his faith in this new mode of transportation, Jim Keefe knew that it would revolutionize the appearance of city and countryside, become an indispensable ally of industry and commerce, and alter the habits and customs of every living American. He foresaw the rapid improvement that would come in the design and mechanical efficiency of automobiles, but he was not so sure that the human beings at the controls would measure up to their responsibilities. He knew they would need help, and it was here that he came to their assistance.

Jim Keefe formed the first autombile club in our community; a group effort to help in such emergencies as engine failure or flat tires, to provide maps giving route directions and accommodations for motorists who otherwise might stray off course, and encouraging them to observe the rules of safe driving. The motorists showed their appreciation of his devotion to their welfare by promoting him through the AAA of the Merrimack Valley to State and regional recognition, and finally to membership in the board of governors of the National Highway Users Conference.

Jim Keefe had the vision to see that better cars, better roads, and better drivers must work together in promoting economic progress and the pursuit of happiness. He deserves our heartfelt thanks for his work of a lifetime in advancing the cause of highway convenience and safety.

DIVIDEND RECEIVED CREDIT AND EXCLUSION

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, double taxation of dividends by the Federal Government results from the tax imposed on corporate incomes plus the subsequent tax on the share owners when they receive dividends paid out of these same corporate incomes. This double taxation in the opinion of many is one of the most glaring inequities in our Federal tax policy and until the 1954 Internal Revenue Code granted share owners a small measure of relief, through the dividend received credit and exclusion, all dividends to individuals were taxed at least twice.

The dividend received credit and exclusion have undoubtedly been among the incentives which have encouraged the low and middle income groups to invest their modest savings in America's business. One can readily realize the impact of these tax relief measures by noting that the number of share owners in this country has increased from 6,500,000 in 1952 to about 12,500,000 today—"Share Ownership in America, 1959," New York Stock Exchange, page 6.

Who are these share owners? Certainly not the wealthy, for the median income of this group as reported in 1959 was $7,000 per year—"Share Ownership in America, 1959," New York Stock Exchange, page 3—including dividends. With progressive taxation limiting the available investment capital of the higher income groups, business has had to rely more and more on the ever-increasing number of small investors for its equity capital, and this will in all probability hold true for the future.

Other relevant facts are available from a look at the share owners of one of our large corporations, namely the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. During 1959 nearly half of that company's 1,750,000 share owners received annual dividends of less than $100—according to a letter, April 6, 1960, by A. L. Stott to Colin F. Stam, chief of staff, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation—the maximum allowable exclusion. In addition, some 400,000 of A.T. & T. Co.'s share owners are over age 65 and many are dependent on their modest dividend income to supplement their pensions and social security. It is perfectly clear from these facts that the dividend credit and exclusion primarily benefit the small investor—the investor who can least afford double taxation.

A healthy financial atmosphere is necessary to keep the country economically strong, an atmosphere in which the investor, and particularly the small potential investor, will feel free to invest in our traditional free enterprise system. To do this, business must be able to return to the investor a fair dividend—a dividend that will not be unjustly taxed a second time. If we are to forestall the eroding economic effects of high taxes, inflation, and the like, we must provide added incentives for investment in America's privately owned industries.

Taxation is recognized by everyone as a necessity and with the tendency for the structure and programs of the Federal Government to become more extensive in filling the needs and desires of the citizens, the outlook is for increased taxes in the future. A fair distribution of this tax burden is an immediate need, not just a goal for some future date.

The dividend received credit and exclusion as presently provided by law are only a beginning toward correcting the discriminatory condition of double taxation of dividends. In the interest of tax equity and to promote continued economic growth of this country, double taxation of dividends should be completely eliminated. Toward this end the dividend credit and exclusion provisions should be expanded whenever the financial condition of the country is such that it can be done.

This discussion is entirely apart from another basic reason for avoiding double taxation of dividends. This other basic reason is that corporations should be financing their growth to a larger extent from new equity issues rather than retained earnings or debt financing which they have been doing in the past. Debt financing, of course, escapes the 52 percent corporate income tax and

retained earnings escapes the higher bracket individual income tax payment and has as a minimum a zero percent rate and as a maximum 25 percent capital gain rate. For many economic reasons, it is important that the American corporations have a strong base in equity investment and this equity investment should be widespread. This results from offering new equity stock from time to time to finance growth rather than through the device of retained earnings which generally keeps the existing stockholder group. Furthermore, the low income tax bracket stockholder generally needs the annual earnings from his equity investment for his personal budget. It is the higher income tax bracket stockholder who benefits, indeed, encourages the retention of earnings by the corporation because these earnings are taxed at the lower capital gains rates, if indeed they are ever taxed.

EAST FRONT EXTENSION PROJECT

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, May 26, 1960, may certainly be considered one of the most historic in the illustrious story of the U.S. Capitol Building. On that day, as the Speaker has already noted, the first of the new massive marble columns will be set in place on the east front. I hope all of you will find it convenient to be present tomorrow morning when a brief ceremony will be held noting this significant event. These new columns will replace the original sandstone shafts which came from the Aquia Creek quarry in Virginia, the first of which was set in place on May 19, 1824, according to the National Intelligencer, the newspaper of the day. That was sixscore, 16 years, and 6 days ago.

I think it would be worthwhile and in the public interest to pause and to take stock of the east front extension project, and review briefly the events which have led to this important occasion.

These are the members or former members of the Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol who have contributed to the development and success of this program for the extension and renovating of the Capitol Building of the United States of America:

Hon. SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON, Vice President of the United States.

Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK, minority floor leader of the House.

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, minority floor leader of the Senate.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., former member of the Commission.

Hon. William F. Knowland, former member of the Commission.

Hon. J. George Stewart, Architect of the Capitol.

But of all the men closely associated with every phase of the extension project, none deserves more unqualified appreciation from the Congress and the American people than the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN.

This work has been close to the Speaker's heart. Its completion will reflect great credit on Mr. RAYBURN as an individual, and the office he occupies. Acting within the prescribed orbit of his office and the normal train of our constitutional legislative process, Mr. RAYBURN has done his utmost to assure that the great traditions in architecture left to us by the founders of the Republic have been carried on. Under his leadership the preservation of the work of the three early Architects of the Capitol, Thornton, Latrobe, and Bulfinch, has been brought about. He has fulfilled the dream of Architect Walter, the designer of the Senate and House wings, the present dome, and the originator of the present east front extension.

Through his works and leadership in this regard the Honorable Speaker of the House has stimulated pride in the dignity of our architectural heritage and encouraged that elevation of thought and character which comes from great architecture.

No proper consideration of the east front extension could be made without calling attention to the work being carried on with such extraordinary diligence by the Architect of the Capitol, the Honorable J. George Stewart. A former Member of Congress, an engineer, and a builder. Mr. Stewart came to the Capitol well qualified for this demanding task.

For more than a hundred years, plans for the east front extension lay dormant. The distinguished Architect of the Capitol, Thomas U. Walter, first prepared plans for the extension, and officially pleaded in 1863 for the project to be undertaken. Indeed, every succeeding Architect of the Capitol has urged that the work be done. It was merely a matter of the economics of the moment rather than a departure from perceptive design that prevented the work from being started under Mr. Walter and those who succeeded him.

We were fortunate to have been living during the time when the extension began and to have had an intimate and important part in the progress of this long-sought and needed improvement.

The Congress and the Nation are fortunate in having as Architect of the Capitol during this historic period in the building of the Capitol, a person with the particular ability of Mr. Stewart. He will keep the architectural historians busy in setting down the record of his work, and will go down in history as a truly great, if not the greatest, Architect of the Capitol. The monument to his ingenuity and imagination will be the most meaningful and beautiful Capitol building in the world.

Mr. Stewart has been a strong believer in the necessity of carrying forward this great work in an expeditious, yet orderly and systematic manner, and I am confident that in so doing he will merit the thanks and approbation of future generations who will come here to view the handiwork we, with him, have assisted in bringing into being.

The execution of so vast a project has required remarkable vision and perception. It has also required a complete devotion to duty and boundless patience to withstand the rebuffs and misrepresentations of motives which are an inherent part of any such undertaking. I am certain, however, the Architect will agree that it has been worth the sacrifice.

As for myself, it is well known that at the outset of the project, because of my interest in history and therefore being a sort of a traditionalist, I was opposed to any sort of alteration of this building. I even sponsored a bill which would prevent the proposed extension and my position in this regard is a matter of record.

Then, because of my abiding interest in the building and its historical significance, I made some rather thorough research and an exhaustive investigation of the structure and its history. I discovered that the extension was planned as far back as the 1860's. The more I looked into the proposed changes, and observed the advanced deterioration of the old stone, the more I became convinced that instead of opposing the project I should actually support it.

Accordingly, I appeared before the House and announced that I had reconsidered the matter, and explained why I had changed my position.

It seems obvious to me that any thinking person who has taken the time to investigate for himself, and become thoroughly familiar with the facts in the case, will reach the conclusions I did on the matter of the east front extension program.

The need for the extension has been discussed widely by the Congress and in the press. I need only mention here the three main reasons for the work.

First, to bring to an immediate end the deterioration of the old sandstone walls.

Second, to correct the architectural defect of the overhang of the dome.

Third, to provide approximately 65 much-needed additional offices and committee rooms, 2 reception rooms, improved restaurant accommodations, and storage and service facilities for the Congress.

The work on the east front officially began with the erection of the scaffolding. The removal of the portico and steps followed soon thereafter.

Since then the work to extend the east front 32½ feet has progressed without interruption, and the exterior work will be completed, I am assured, by the first of October 1960.

The Architect reports that the inaugural stands will get under construction in mid-September. The main lobby and the entrance corridor will also be complete by the time of the inauguration of the next President of the United States. The interior and final construction will be finished in September 1961.

Today most of the exterior marble has been set, the principal steps are being returned to their accustomed place, and

the beautiful sculpture for the pediment is being faithfully reproduced and is almost ready for lifting onto the tympanum. The Statue of Peace, located to the south of the main door, has been reproduced in Vermont marble and was set in place on May 10. The companion Statue of War is being similarly reproduced and will be erected within the next few weeks.

The beautiful bronze doors, which have recently been put into their place at the new principal entrance of the building, are properly called the Columbus Doors. The panels of these doors depict scenes from the life of that great admiral.

They were designed and modeled in Rome in 1858 by a young American artist, Randolph Rogers, and were cast in Germany in 1860.

These magnificent doors were first located in the arch leading from Statuary Hall to the House of Representatives. They were moved to the principal entrance of the rotunda in 1870, by the Architect of the Capitol, Edward Clark.

It is interesting to note that the removal and preservation of these doors presented something of a problem to the architects and engineers when the present work began. It was not until a small, handwritten book was discovered in the research files of the Architect's Office that the question of the proper methods of removal and maintenance of the doors was resolved.

This little book was written in 1863 by the man who cast the doors for the Senate wing. In 1911 his son realized the similarity in the Senate doors and those executed by Rogers. He presented the book which contained detailed sketches of the inner workings of the doors to the Architect "to be available at future need as someday the costly bronzes in and around the Capitol will receive the expert attention needed to make their beauty effective."

The use of this obscure, but invaluable, document illustrates the care and exactness which has characterized the entire work program of the east front extension.

The prosecution of the work on the extension necessitated exposing a considerable part of the exterior of the foundation walls, most of it for the first time since the structure was built. The exposure of these walls afforded an opportunity to locate the original cornerstone, and it was considered desirable to do so. Records of the nature and location of the stone were vague, but it was generally believed to have been placed in the southeast corner of the old Senate wing.

It should be made quite clear, however, that the southeast portion of the original north wing as constructed, did not consist of a single corner. It has been found that there were three locations which could be considered to be the southeast corner. One is where the main east wall returns to the west, a second is where the setback position of the east wall meets the south wall of this wing as built, and a third is the southeast corner of the foundation of the original steps. The foundation of the steps was found to have been built integral with the setback wall and the return to the north.

Extensive excavations were carried on at all of the three locations using the most advanced methods at the disposal of the Government, yet no stone matching the one described in the early records was discovered. It may be assumed, therefore, that work carried on subsequent to the original construction made it necessary to remove or relocate the stone.

One of the most complex and important areas of construction is the work being carried forth on the dome, and much comment has appeared concerning the brilliant red color which now adorns the structure. One irreverent wag felt emboldened to say that it look like "the world's largest Howard Johnson's." I am happy to report that this color will soon be covered by the final coat of white, and once again at night, batteries of searchlights will trace the building's glowing dome on the vault of the sky; and by day, sunlight and drifting clouds will make picture-postcard scenes of the silhouette that symbolized American freedom, liberty, and greatness around the country and around the world.

From 1829, when the central section of the Capitol was completed, the U.S. Capitol was surmounted by a low wooden dome. This wooden dome was replaced by the present cast iron dome during the period 1856 to 1865.

The base of the dome as it now exists is many feet wider than the drum which originally supported the old dome and which is now the foundation upon which it rests. Upon this drum a very ingenious scheme of iron supports and brackets of sufficient projection to carry the base of the dome is placed, so that, though its inner wall appears to be supported directly on the existing masonry, the entire colonnade of the dome, with its bases and cornices, is in fact suspended and overhangs its real support. The dome, therefore, pretends to be supported directly from the ground, which is not the case, and seems to be of masonry, while it is really of iron. The seams of all this iron work are constantly parting, owing to expansion and contraction. The aggregate weight of material used in the construction of the dome is 8,909,200 pounds.

The immensity and strength of the dome is the amazement and admiration of all visitors. Above the outer colonnade, and resting directly over and bearing upon the strong foundations, 36 immense ribs of iron ascend, of a semi-ellipsoidal shape. These are the skeleton of the huge creation. Hundreds upon hundreds of iron panels, with clamps and bolts innumerable, riveted into one circuit of architectural symmetry around these metal ribs, constitute the dome.

The influence of the sun upon this vast iron structure is great. The sun causes the dome to oscillate a distance of between 3 and 4 inches daily. The motion is south, southwest, then west, and as the retiring sun declines and finally disappears, north, northeast, and east, returning to its original position.

Ever since its construction and completion in 1865, the present cast iron dome has been painted for purposes of preservation and to cause it to simulate a masonry dome and to harmonize with the House and Senate wings which are constructed of marble. It was painted every 4 years and at the time the present renovations were commenced in 1959, it is estimated that it had on it about 32 coats of paint.

As a part of the extension of the Capitol project, this dome has been subjected to a thorough, intensive inspection and necessary repairs and replacements have been made. In order to make this inspection and effect these repairs, it was necessary to erect a huge scaffold about the exterior of the dome. It was also necessary to erect scaffolding within the rotunda in order to inspect, clean and do minor restoration work on the large frescoe painting in the canopy of the dome. The painting was found in generally good condition and the necessary cleaning and restoration work has been done. All scaffolding was removed from the rotunda upon completion of this portion of the work.

The scaffolding used on the exterior of the dome consisted of exterior pipe and tube scaffolding, with a vertical tower, support towers, rampways at various levels, lower ramp, guys and hoisting equipment.

The principal repairs and replacements accomplished have included:

The rib covers at quadrant points of the dome have been removed and inspected, and necessary repairs made, and the rib covers reinstalled.

The interior bracing of the Statue of Freedom, which is located atop the dome, has been repaired and strengthened.

Corroded and cracked metal, including butt straps, has been repaired and replaced where necessary.

Existing bolts have been tightened, and short and defective bolts have been removed and replaced, and missing bolts supplied.

Brackets, skin plates, and angle loop at the top of the cupola have been reinforced.

A portion of the exterior plates at the main tholus columns have been replaced.

New tholus framing and ceiling and 12 bronze windows have been provided.

The top flange of skirt needle beams have been braced, using tie rods and angle struts; skirt needle beams and bracing at the top of skirt frames have been strengthened. This work included temporary underpinning and replacement of masonry at skirt needle beams, as necessary.

Masonry bearing plates were removed, and self-lubricating expansion plates were provided.

The deck plates at boiler plate level, the exterior platform at the peristyle level, and the trough and gutter section at the peristyle level were removed, repaired, and reset.

Temporary protective covering and steel cable and chain link fabric construction over metal and wood covering for the top surface of the canopy of the rotunda were provided.

Leaders and gutters of the drainage system at the cupola, peristyle, boiler plate, and roof levels of the dome were repaired and replaced where necessary.

The sheetmetal cover over the top surface of the canopy of the rotunda was removed, inspected, and reinstalled.

The glass at the cupola windows was replaced, and the second tier and peristyle windows were reglazed where necessary.

Stainless steel screening was installed at the trough of the peristyle platform at the backside of the lower skirt of the dome and along the inner edge of the boiler plate balustrade.

Repairs were made at the boiler plate level, including the installation of sheet metal flashing and stainless steel moldings and sills at the base of the drum; cable ties, boxes, and tensioning devices were added at the boiler plate girder, with necessary modifications in the panels of the drum and access doors.

The balustrade at the boiler plate level is being repaired, and expansion joints are being provided in the top rail.

The outside cornice at the base of the boilerplate balustrade is also being repaired.

The rib bolts at the boilerplate level are being removed and replaced.

Structural and other repairs have been made to ornamentations and connections, including those at the peristyle beams, the grape cluster ornamentations, the Statue of Freedom, the stylobate, the medallions, the acorn ornamentations, the cornice above the second tier windows, the ornamental pilasters at the spring of the cupola. Additional fastenings have been provided at the rib covers. Defects in castings and ornamentations have been repaired.

Additional leaders and gutters, down drains at the peristyle level, canopy leaders and gutters, and gutter strainers are being provided.

The 32 coats of paint have been sandblasted off the dome and the metal surfaces have been cleaned of rust and other foreign materials. A dark treatment of paint has been applied to the raw metal after the metal was cleaned by the sandblasting method. A primer red lead coat was next applied. Upon the red lead coat an intermediate coat of buff-colored paint is being applied. A final coat of oyster white paint will be applied, causing the appearance of the dome to harmonize with the new marble extended east front of the Capitol and the cleaned Senate and House marble wings.

In making the repairs and replacements to the dome structure, stainless steel has been used wherever critical structural elements were involved. In secondary locations, special alloyed steels, incorporating highly corrosion resistant elements, have been used.

An electronic bird control system is to be installed and the work is expected to be undertaken shortly. Additional lightning protection will also be provided.

So, as the first of the new columns is set in place, we are grateful for the courageous beginnings of the new Republic which were represented by the original stones, and for the growth and national prosperity represented by the new ones. May it be our earnest hope and prayer that this Capitol Building will continue to symbolize this Nation's unending purpose to maintain its leadership on the road to world peace, with justice for all people.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, almost before the last echoes of the battlefields of World War II had faded away, we were faced with the stark reality of another even more evil menace to the free world than that which we had fought so hard to destroy. As early as 1947 the Communists' objective of worldwide domination—and their willingness to use any means to accomplish this objective—had become obvious.

In response to the Communist threat we elected to assist in maintaining the freedom of all countries in the world who had the will to remain free. In fact, this became a basic facet of our foreign policy. This choice was based upon the realization that in the struggle against international communism we need allies, and these allies need us. We realized that only through concerted mutual effort could the free world adequately meet the threat of Communist aggression without individual national efforts of a magnitude that would in the end wreck national economies and eventually hasten the accomplishment of the objectives of the Communist offensive. The success of this concept depended in great measure upon the political, military and economic strength of our allies. In turn, the strength of our allies relied to a large degree upon the economic and military assistance which we could provide. Thus we embarked upon a course of providing this assistance.

The alternative to this course of action would have been a return to isolationism. This was impossible, not only because of the demands of our own national security, but to the mantle of leadership of the free world which was cast upon us at the close of World War II. The probable results had we chosen this alternative would have been disastrous. Had we abrogated our responsibility to the free world and failed to provide the necessary assistance to our less fortunate allies and friends:

Italy and Greece would most probably be Communist today;

The Turkish Straits would likely be controlled by the Soviet Union;

Iran would certainly be a Soviet satellite and the Russians would have established themselves on the Persian Gulf with control over the oilfields of the Middle East;

All of Indochina including Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos would be Communist;

India, Burma, Thailand, and a large portion of Africa would have fallen under the Communist domination. Berlin would long since have been buried behind the Iron Curtain; and

The lot of the European countries is questionable, but certainly we would not have the vital military bases which we now have in Western Europe, the Middle East, and northern Africa.

Had all these conditions come to pass—and without our economic and military assistance they undoubtedly would have—we would find ourselves on the defensive within our own shores.

Today, the Communist objectives remain unchanged. In fact, the threat to the free world posed by militant communism is if anything far greater than ever before. While our assistance has been highly successful in establishing a strong deterrent to Communist expansion, the day has by no means arrived when we can relax our efforts. Much has been accomplished, but there is much more to be done. We have no alternative, if we are to preserve the free world and in turn our own way of life, but to continue our efforts in military and economic assistance.

The mutual security program as proposed by the President for fiscal year 1961 represents a very modest continuation of our assistance to the rest of the free world. By comparison with the results it will achieve, both psychologically and materially, throughout the free world it is a most economical use of our national resources. We must by all means support this program and the objectives toward which it is directed as an indication of our determination to continue our opposition to Communist expansion.

HIGHWAY PROGRAM VIGILANCE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the minority members of the Special Select Subcommittee To Investigate the Federal-Aid Highway Program, I state that we were deeply shocked and disturbed over the revelations of fraud, purposeful misrepresentations, falsification of reports and duplication of payments by State employees relating to the Skelly Bypass Highway construction program in Tulsa, Okla.

Even more shocking is the fact that Oklahoma State Highway Commission employees, who had admittedly perpetrated these outrageous frauds and misrepresentations, have not been discharged.

To the contrary, the evidence showed that these people had been promoted, both in salary and responsibility, and were blanketed under a State merit system. Although, admittedly, the present Governor of Oklahoma and the prosecutor of Tulsa County had had evidence of this wrongdoing since September 1959, they had failed and had refused to give this evidence to the Bureau of Public Roads so that the Bureau could protect

the interests of the American taxpayer. Nonetheless, both the prosecutor and the Governor have indicated they are highly critical of the Bureau of Public Roads for not acting on evidence which it did not have and which had been withheld purposefully, which was testified to and admitted to by State employees.

In the face of the undisputed evidence, I cannot in good conscience, representing the taxpayers of the Federal Government, remain silent, or see main issues obscured, or succumb to attempts at soft-pedaling necessary corrective action.

I quote, in part, an obviously misguided and uninformed editorial appearing in the Saturday, May 7, 1960, issue of the Tulsa World, its concluding paragraph:

> We seriously doubt, however, that Oklahoma really owes the Federal Bureau [of Roads] a red penny. Rather, the Bureau owes itself a search of its own conscience and policies. There should be no pious shunting of the blame to the State when the Federal Bureau fixes the rules on road building and is vested with the responsibility for seeing that they are carried out.

So that the main issues are not obscured, that the Federal and State areas of responsibility are understood and that there is record of remedial action to protect the taxpayer and to remove any possible doubt on the overall integrity of the Bureau of Public Roads and the Federal-aid highway program, I submit for the RECORD a letter I dispatched to the Honorable Bertram D. Tallamy, Federal Highway Administrator, Bureau of Roads, requesting certain actions and information; a letter I wrote, as second ranking minority member, to the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, chairman, Special Subcommittee To Investigate the Federal-Aid Highway Program; the reply received from Ellis L. Armstrong, Commissioner of Public Roads; a copy of an additional letter dispatched by Mr. Armstrong to Mr. Roy J. Turner, chairman, State Highway Commission, State of Oklahoma; and instructional memorandum 21–8–60, issued by the Bureau of Public Roads on the subject: "Federal Law Pertaining to Factual Records and Tests of Materials on Construction of Federal-Aid Highway Projects." Additionally, I submit a copy of the May 5, 1960, telegram referred to, and instructional memorandum 20–5–60, issued by the Bureau of Public Roads, which also involves the Federal-aid highway program on the subject: "Inspection of Construction Projects."

I believe these actions should be a matter of record so that Members of Congress and the people of this country can be reassured of the determination of the Bureau of Public Roads and of the minority members of the special subcommittee that future Federal-aid road construction will be free from fraud as uncovered in Oklahoma and from the continued employment of persons who were a party or may be a party to such fraud.

This action should serve as a deterrent against future fraud. As well, it assures that the American taxpayer will be protected in the specific Oklahoma case with adequate restitution and the firing of employees admittedly involved in the perpetration of this fraud.

There are some who oppose the action taken in the Oklahoma case to protect the taxpayer. Suffice it to say, their arguments are based on quicksand, in my opinion, for to oppose this action, they have to argue that the present law which requires the Bureau to seek restitution and the firing of known fraud perpetrators should be flaunted on the spurious grounds that to live up to the law in this instance might discourage other States from bringing such fraud into the open.

I do not subscribe to this "let's wink at the law in this case" argument for to do so would have the effect of causing others to think they, too, might be "winked at" in the future.

Congress wrote the law and it is the duty of every Congressman to see that it is lived up to, and in doing so serve notice that all future lawless actions will be as rigorously opposed.

In restitution cases, such as that involving Oklahoma, it is the duty of the State as a party to the contract to sue to recover from the contractors, and the Federal demand for restitution from the State assures this action. Failure by the Federal Government to make such a demand for restitution would be a violation of the laws Congress has passed.

The documents referred to are as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1960.

Re investigations into Skelly Bypass, Tulsa, Okla.

The Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Air Highway Program, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing herewith copy of letter addressed to the Honorable Bertram D. Tallamy, Federal Highway Administrator, Bureau of Public Roads, advising him of my intention to request that the records of Mr. James Curry be made available to the Bureau in connection with its negotiations with the State of Oklahoma relative to the above matter.

This evidence was accepted by the committee for the purpose of establishing an estimate of the fraud involved and, being testimony of an expert nature, certainly this information should be made available to the Bureau in substantiating its request for restitution from the State of Oklahoma.

I am confident that you concur in this request and I am asking that I be advised as to the disposition of it.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. CRAMER.

Enclosure
WCC:jdm

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1960.

Re Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Air Highway Program Investigations Into Skelly Bypass, Tulsa, Okla.

The Honorable BERTRAM D. TALLAMY,
Federal Highway Administrator,
Bureau of Public Roads,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TALLAMY: As I expressed at the conclusion of the hearings regarding the above matter, I was deeply shocked and disturbed over the revelations of the fraud, purposeful misrepresentations, falsification of reports and duplication of payments, by State employees, nearly all of whom remain on the payrolls and have received promotions and/or increases in salary. I was amazed at the testimony by these employees that in some instances they had purposely withheld information of wrongdoing from the Bureau of Public Roads and, further, that public officials in Oklahoma had likewise, after learning of this information, failed to inform the Bureau in timely fashion in order to protect the 90 percent Federal contribution interest in this interstate project.

The evidence is in and is undisputed as to these facts and, as the acting ranking minority member of the Special Subcommittee, I am sure you realize I had a continuing interest in making certain that the actions taken by the Bureau in this matter are carried out toward the end that this Federal 90 percent interest is fully protected. I commend you again for your action on April 26th in advising Mr. Roy J. Turner, Chairman of the Oklahoma State Highway Commission, that his commission is required to make restitution for any erroneous or improper claim made by the State against the Federal government resulting from fraudulent practices on the part of such State employees and any deficiencies in the specifications on the jobs numbered 8, 10 and 20. Mr. James Curry, who was qualified as a competent witness and who had made a thorough investigation of the present conditions of these three sections of the Skelly Bypass, estimated that an overpayment of $524,698.15 on this $3.3 million phase of the Skelly Bypass project had been made. You advised the committee that negotiations would be started to acquire restitution to the Federal government by the State in the near future, this being consistent with my position during the hearings that the Bureau has a duty to require such restitution under the law.

In order to facilitate this action, I am requesting the chairman of the special subcommittee to make available to you the testimony and records of Mr. Curry to be considered in your negotiations with Oklahoma State officials. I would appreciate it if you would keep me advised as to the progress of these negotiations and the final restitution made because of my continuing interest on behalf of the Federal taxpayers. I also think that proper restitution in this instance would have a salutary effect on all other road bureau administrations and would perhaps result in the tightening up of their own procedures in an effort to detect any falsification of records in the future.

Likewise, I am requesting that you keep me advised as to whether your demand addressed to Mr. Turner on May 5 advising him that these employees who perpetrated these frauds "are not acceptable to the Bureau of Public Roads as representatives of the State highway department in any employment capacity in connection with Federal aid highway projects," and further requesting that all such persons "be immediately removed from all activities in connection with all Federal-aid highway projects," and that "vouchers will not be approved for payment of Federal funds for * * * any project in connection with which any such persons are employed" in the future.

I trust this will have the desirable effect of removing these employees from the payroll, which should have been done upon their discovery. It is unconscionable to me that the Federal taxpayer should have to assume the risk of their continued employment by the Oklahoma State Highway Department when it involves confessed fraudulent State record manipulators. I would like to be kept advised as to whether the State action complies with your request. As I

interpret the Highway Act, it is mandatory on the Bureau to take such action, and rightly so.

Further, it is my suggestion that a memorandum be prepared for the information of all State road departments as to the Federal authority under the law in cases of this nature and of the action taken in this instance so that all departments will be on notice, and this possibly will act as a deterrent against similar occurrences happening in the future.

This letter is written consistent with my duty as a Member of Congress, as I see it, to see that for any funds improperly requisitioned by the State, restitution shall be made and, further, that undesirable State employees, where Federal projects are involved, be fired. Only in this manner can the public be assured of honest administration of this $40 billion interstate highway program and of a dollar's worth of value for every Federal dollar spent.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. CRAMER.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1960.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: This is in response to your letter of May 9, 1960, to Mr. Tallamy, concerning the recent hearings held by the special subcommittee on the Federal aid highway program with respect to the Skelly bypass at Tulsa, Okla.

As stated at the hearings, we fully share your indignation at the testimony which was given by certain employees of the Oklahoma State Highway Department and others.

We sincerely appreciate your request that the chairman of the special subcommittee make available to the Bureau the testimony and records of Mr. James Curry. This information will be helpful in our further review of the matter and our discussions with the Oklahoma officials relative to the restitution of Federal funds. Governor Edmondson has requested that we defer any assessment against the State until after the appropriate Oklahoma officials have had an opportunity to confer with us. The Governor has been advised that we will most certainly arrange such a conference before making a final determination as to the amount and nature of such restitution.

You are familiar with the telegram sent by the Administrator on May 5 to the Oklahoma State Highway Department in connection with the employment of Messrs. Avery and Johnson. I'm sure you will be interested also in a letter I sent to Mr. Roy J. Turner, chairman of the State highway commission, on May 18. A copy is enclosed.

With respect to your suggestion that a memorandum be prepared for the information of the State road departments as to the Federal authority under the law, I am enclosing a copy of an instructional memorandum issued May 5, 1960. I believe that posting this section of the law on all Federal-aid projects will be an effective means of advising all persons involved of the possible consequences of improper action.

The several steps which the Bureau of Public Roads has taken to protect the Federal interest have been made known to the States, both by memorandums and in discussion at a recent meeting of State highway officials. It will be of interest to you, I'm sure, that the American Association of State Highway Officials has named a special committee to review existing State controls in such matters and to recommend any additional safeguards which may be necessary. We are holding an all-day meeting with this committee the first of next week.

I will be glad to keep you advised of the progress of our negotiations with the State of Oklahoma concerning restitution and as to the State's compliance with our request that certain individuals be removed from Federal-aid projects. It is indeed deplorable that events such as those disclosed at the hearings could have occurred, but I am hopeful that their revelation and the actions which we have taken will go far toward preventing a recurrence of this type of improper activity.

Sincerely yours,

ELLIS L. ARMSTRONG,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

MAY 18, 1960.

Mr. ROY J. TURNER,
Chairman, State Highway Commission,
Capitol Office Building,
Oklahoma City, Okla.

DEAR MR. TURNER: Further reference is made to Mr. Tallamy's letter of April 26 and subsequent telegraphic exchanges concerning the Skelly Bypass project in Tulsa. We earnestly wish to assist in the continuation of all Federal-aid work in Oklahoma which is being advanced in accord with the governing project requirements, but because of disclosures at the House Public Works special subcommittee hearing involving a number of employees and contractors of the Oklahoma Department of Highways, it was considered necessary to take action of the kind transmitted to you by telegram of May 5. We understand from newspaper reports that you are undertaking an analysis of the hearing transcript to determine what action you feel should be taken by you in connection with these individuals and firms to protect the State's interests, which generally are the same as our own in these matters. We do not wish to determine in advance of your own review what action should properly be taken with respect to several of the present employees referred to in the hearing, other than those named below where action seems clearly to be indicated.

At the hearing there was a definite admission or showing of improper actions on the part of Messrs. J. F. Avery and Joe R. Johnson, employees, and the D & G Construction Co. and Progress Construction Co., contractors. As indicated in our telegram, therefore, we have made the determination that we will make no payment of Federal-aid funds for projects on work done after the May 5 wire for which any of these individuals or firms may have any measure of responsibility. For all other employees who are still employed by the Oklahoma Department of Highways and who were also on the Skelly Bypass projects we are suspending further progress payments without prejudice to a final action yet to be determined. I should therefore appreciate your furnishing such names to our division engineer in Oklahoma as soon as the list can be compiled, together with present Federal-aid project locations of the listed employees, if they are assigned to such work, or a statement that they are not assigned at present on any Federal-aid highway project in such instances as this may be the case.

We also propose to you that we jointly reexamine the payments made and computations of quantities and quality of materials on these referent projects, using the data already developed but augmented as may be found desirable. Such reexamination would form the basis of our determination of what disallowances we should make on account of these projects and how these should be paid. If this is agreeable to you, please so advise, and further arrangements can then be made concerning details of how this is to be carried forward.

Sincerely yours,

ELLIS L. ARMSTRONG,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1960.

Instructional memorandum 21-8-60.

Subject: Federal law pertaining to factual records and tests of materials on construction of Federal-aid highway projects.

As pointed out in my circular memorandum of June 29, 1959, the providing of high quality and durable construction in conformance with approved plans and specifications requires that everyone in the engineer-contractor-worker team do their tasks carefully and thoroughly.

An instance has come to our attention which to a certain degree will reflect unfavorably on the efforts of many thousands of men and women working in the State highway departments and for the contractors and materials men dedicated to the building of a fine highway system for our States and Nation. A few, through lack of knowledge and by willful acts, have falsified certain samples of materials and records of tests and work accomplished. They have conspired to deliberately keep any such information from either the higher State officials or the Bureau of Public Roads.

In order to prevent any misunderstanding regarding the seriousness of these and similar acts the following notice shall be posted on each Federal-aid highway project in one or more places where it is readily available to all personnel concerned with the project:

"NOTICE TO ALL PERSONNEL ENGAGED ON FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROJECTS

"Title 18, United States Code, section 1020, reads as follows:

" 'Whoever, being an officer, agent, or employee of the United States, or of any State or Territory, or whoever, whether a person, association, firm, or corporation, knowingly makes any false statement, false representation, or false report as to the character, quality, quantity, or cost of the material used or to be used, or the quantity or quality of the work performed or to be performed, or the costs thereof in connection with the submission of plans, maps, specifications, contracts, or costs of construction of any highway or related project submitted for approval to the Secretary of Commerce; or

" 'Whoever knowingly makes any false statement, false representation, false report, or false claim with respect to the character, quality, quantity, or cost of any work performed or to be performed, or materials furnished or to be furnished, in connection with the construction of any highway or related project approved by the Secretary of Commerce; or

" 'Whoever knowingly makes any false statement or false representation as to a material fact in any statement, certificate, or report submitted pursuant to the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 1, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented,

" 'Shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.' "

A supply of printed posters will be furnished as soon as they are available. In the meantime, the notices should be typewritten and posted by the State highway departments.

The provisions of this instructional memorandum are applicable upon receipt of the memorandum and apply to all Federal-aid projects.

ELLIS L. ARMSTRONG,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

MAY 5, 1960.

ROY J. TURNER,
Chairman, State Highway Commission,
State Highway Department, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

At hearings this week before the special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway

Program, Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, several present Oklahoma State Highway Department employees have admitted under oath that they prepared false test reports, or prepared or secured spurious samples for submission, or submitted such samples, to the State central testing laboratory, or made other false statements, entries, or reports relative to tests or test samples in connection with Federal-aid highway projects, and did not give information thereof to any State highway department officials superior to the State resident engineer on such projects or to any representative of the Bureau of Public Roads prior to the recent investigations conducted in Oklahoma. Such persons are not acceptable to the Bureau of Public Roads as representatives of the State highway department in any employment capacity in connection with Federal-aid highway projects. It is requested that all such persons be immediately removed from all activities in connection with all Federal-aid highway projects. Vouchers will not be approved for payment of Federal funds for materials supplied or work performed after this date on account of any project in connection with which any such persons are employed after this date. Also, payment of Federal funds will be withheld on current projects, in connection with which such persons have been employed prior to this date, pending a complete examination of such projects.

B. D. TALLAMY,
Federal Highway-Administrator.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1960.

Instructional memorandum 20–5–60.

Subject: Inspection of construction projects—Supplements policy and procedure memorandum 20–6, dated May 21, 1956.

The Bureau's continuous reviews of its policies and procedures which are established to attain high quality results on every project in the Federal-aid highway program, indicate that still further attention should be given to the matter of testing the quantity and quality of materials incorporated into such projects. Three revisions of current procedures are therefore being instituted with the issuance of this memorandum.

1. In addition to the presently prescribed responsibility of the division engineer or his representative to inspect the material test reports during his visits to projects, he shall hereafter report for the Bureau's permanent project records the findings from such reviews and any actions taken regarding the materials and workmanship being incorporated into the job. Furthermore, in addition to his present responsibility of observing the methods by which these materials are being incorporated into the job, should the State at any such inspection not have on file all material test reports and other reports necessary to reflect the quality of workmanship required by the approved plans and specifications, then appropriate steps should be taken to defer payment of progress vouchers on the project until the necessary corrective action has been taken. This procedure shall become effective on the receipt of this memorandum.

2. Thickness or other lineal measurements of some or all materials in place on the project must be made at random points during each Bureau inspection and the results stated in the inspection report. Additionally a sample will occasionally be taken during such construction inspections at random locations chosen by the Bureau inspecting engineer of any of the materials being placed in the project. Such samples shall be taken in accordance with approved standard procedures, appropriately identified, and packaged for delivery to the State central laboratory for check test which shall be reported to the Bureau's division engineer. This procedure will be instituted with receipt of this memorandum.

3. At the time of the final inspection of each project or prior thereto, record samples of the finished work in place shall be taken for certification purposes on such items as may be selected by the Bureau's division engineer. These shall be obtained at random locations and in sufficient number to be reasonably representative of the completed work. Such record samples shall be taken and tested by highway department central materials laboratory representatives. The Bureau's division engineer shall be notified prior thereto in order that he or his representative may be present during both the sampling and testing. The results of the tests of such record samples shall then be certified to by the duly authorized State representative, as to conformity with the governing plans and specifications and whether the results of the record sample tests are reasonably representative of the materials incorporated in the project as shown by the regular testing and sampling done on the project as work progressed. This certified report of the record samples, together with certification of all other materials used in the work, will accompany the final voucher when submitted for payment, and no final voucher will be paid without a certification showing conformance with the governing plans and specifications. This procedure will be made effective on all projects for which final inspection is made on and after June 1, 1960.

The provisions of this memorandum will be applicable to all Federal-aid projects except those being constructed under the 1954 secondary road plan, for which projects, paragraph No. 3 only will be applicable.

ELLIS L. ARMSTRONG,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

ECONOMY AND INCOME

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in these tense and critical times, there may be a tendency to overlook meritorious work which deserves the attention and commendation of the Congress and the public.

I wish to mention particularly Report No. 1561, dated April 29, 1960, on the Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1961, submitted by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and his subcommittee. This report, on page 43, calls attention to the fact—

> In last year's report the committee gave particular attention to the need for some positive integration of Defense communications along the lines proposed during testimony on the 1960 budget estimates.

During the intervening year both the Defense Department and the committee have aggressively pursued this important matter, with the result that the committee was able to reduce the operation and maintenance appropriation request by $84.3 million on the basis that portions of the overlapping military communications systems could be integrated.

The report further stated:

> The total investment in defense long-haul facilities is about $2 billion and the current annual cost of leased commercial facilities is about $160 million. Under present planning, the Air Force alone would spend at least $1 billion on system modernization and expansion between now and 1970. It is most important, therefore, that the planning of the services be modified to take account of the development of the defense communications network so that the entire Defense Establishment may reap the benefits of joint procurement and joint use at the earliest possible date.

On May 12, 1960, the Secretary of Defense issued Directive No. 5105.19, thereby establishing a Defense Communications Agency (DCA) and on the same date by Directive No. 4600.2 established a Defense Communications System (DCS).

I feel confident that the action taken by the committee and by the Secretary of Defense, if properly implemented, will bring most favorable results to our defense effort both as to economies and effectiveness.

This action with respect to communications service points the way to further integration in the many common supply and service activities in which the DOD is now engaged and which utilize some 50 percent or more of the military budget. It will be recalled that I sponsored an amendment to the DOD Reorganization Act of 1958 which gave the Secretary of Defense great authority with respect to the improvement of management in supply and service activities common to more than one military department. Also during the debate on the bill I specifically mentioned that the amendment would permit the Secretary of Defense to bring about necessary integration in such activities as financial management, budgeting, disbursing, accounting, medical and hospital services, transportation—land, sea, and air—intelligence, legal, public relations, recruiting, military, police, training, and liaison activities.

It is certainly gratifying that this step has been taken with regard to communications since many Members of Congress, including myself, have long been of the opinion that the elimination of overlapping and waste in the many supply and service activities in the DOD, where so many billions are annually expended, would provide funds for many essential civilian and military activities of the Government which some people contend we cannot now afford. This confirms the old proverb that "Economy is a great source of income."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to again commend the Appropriations Committee and also others for their effective work.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, like so many organizations in our Nation, has

spoken out forcefully and strongly on behalf of legislation to improve the Fair Labor Standards Act. The federation has urged an increase in the minimum wage to at least $1.25 an hour and extension of the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to millions of workers now exempted from it.

The federation's members know from their everyday working experience what real poverty is and how devastating its effects are to the individual, the family, the community, and the Nation. They also know the necessary means for coping with economic suffering of hundreds of thousands of families. They consider the proposed improvements in the Fair Labor Standards Act to be one of the basic means for ending poverty.

I include in my remarks the text of the federation's resolution on the Fair Labor Standards Act legislation:

RESOLUTION ON MINIMUM WAGE

Adequate purchasing power is a vital stabilizing factor in a free economy. A minimum wage related to fluctuations in the cost of living contributes to a stable economy and enables the wage earner to maintain a reasonable standard of living.

Therefore, the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers advocates:

1. A basic minimum wage of at least $1.25 per hour.

2. The extension of the principles of the Fair Labor Standards Act to cover retail and service employees; employees of business enterprises engaged wholly in interstate commerce; farmworkers and professional persons unless self-employed.

We urge that the Congress and the several States enact suitable legislation to accomplish these purposes.

EAST GERMAN COLLECTIVIZATION: MODEL FOR CUBAN EXPROPRIATIONS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for more than a year I have made repeated statements, in and out of the Congress, relative to the Caribbean area, which is now a fourth front with the Panama Canal as its key target. In the contest now going on there, Cuba has become a Soviet captive just as the Soviet zone in East Germany. As such, it serves as a beachhead for Communist attacks on other nations of the Western Hemisphere, which are more dangerous than assaults from a landing force.

Unfortunately, the programs of conquest for either Cuba or East Germany have not been adequately presented to the people of the United States by important elements of our mass media. The prime objectives of these programs include abolition of private ownership in finance and industry and forced collectivization of farmers. In both East Germany and Cuba the patterns of confiscation follows the well-known Stalinistic pattern of liquidation that was so ruthlessly enforced in the Ukraine.

These sinister developments in East Germany, which are so applicable to Cuba, were recently described by Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, distinguished military editor of Christian Crusade, American Mercury, and other publications in a highly illuminating article.

In order that General Willoughby's latest contribution may be permanently recorded in the annals of the Congress and thus readily be available to the Nation at large, I quote its text:

EAST GERMAN COLLECTIVIZATION: MODEL FOR CUBAN EXPROPRIATIONS

(By Maj. Gen. C. A. Willoughby, U.S. Army (retired))

Even the dullest liberal corroded by the Jacobinism of this decade, must be aware that the Red police state is buttressed on two basic Marxist actions: the abolition of private property (in industry and finance) and the collectivization of individual farms (Kolchos). The postwar brigands whom the idiotic West has carefully nursed since 1945, from Cuba to Java, attempt to disguise their Marxist orientation by semantic protests of "agrarian reform" and the "welfare of the underprivileged" but in the end, the raw facts of forcible expropriation, police terror and repression begin to emerge: the hallmark of communism. Castro coolly evicts American owners from sugar plantations and cattle ranches (no whit different from farm properties in western United States) while Soekarno, a Japanese collaborator and quisling set the pattern, at the expense of a war-tested ally (1941–45) the Dutch. Now the same Marxist maneuver is being executed in East Germany, under Russian occupation pressure, promulgated by the Kremlin puppet Ulbricht. The repressive measures were obviously accelerated to create a social "fait accompli" before the summit negotiations, where the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain and expellees in the West have become a silent but inexorable item on the agenda.

The collectivization of Ukrainian farmers was one of the most brutal crimes in the sinister record of Stalin: the "liquidation" (i.e., mass murder and deportation) of the "Kulak," the Russian landowning farmer. Stalin has set the pattern to be followed by his stooges and disciples, from the Caribbean to the Mekong. In the enforced Roosevelt-Truman-Stalin partition of Germany (Yalta, Potsdam, Teheran) the brutal action of the present Red German Government is merely one more step in a relentless Communist evolution—but there is only one ending to that tortuous road: the mass collectivism of Red China, the antlike "communes." West Germany with millions of expellees from the Iron Curtain countries within her border, could hardly be indifferent to this prostitution of values. Dr. Walter Becher, Member of Parliament (Bulletin No. 58 German Federal Press Bureau) covered the situation ably:

"The leaders of the S.E.D. (Socialist Unity Party of the Soviet Zone), are not satisfied with collectivizing, step by step, mid-Germany's agricultural economy but are attempting to give this act of brutal compulsion a democratic appearance. Albert Norden, member of the Politburo, recently called the forced collectivization in the Soviet Zone a "democratic plebiscite in favor of socialism and against the war-minded West German deceivers and exploiters of the peasant class. S.E.D. Chief Walter Ulbricht sent the Communist Zone's farmers a congratulatory letter and last Sunday Neues Deutschland, S.E.D.'s central organ, termed the '100 percent collectivization' in the precincts of Rostock, Neubrandenburg, Frankfurt (Oder) and Potsdam the socialist spring of the year 1960."

The regime employed all sorts of dialectical propaganda to portray abroad the mass entry of farmers into agricultural productive cooperatives (Landwirtschaftliche Produktions-Genossenschaften, abbr. LPG) as being a spontaneous and completely voluntary, popular move. Comrade Ulbricht merely admits to some incidental exaggerations that occurred in the eager realization of an otherwise good and progressive program. Ulbricht, of course, could have carried out the collectivization by direct governmental decree approved by the so-called people's parliament (Volkskammer) with 100 percent certainty. In other words, Ulbricht could have reached his goal through a legalistic maneuver, so to speak. He was interested, however, in presenting this act of brutal compulsion as a voluntary move on the part of the mid-German farmers themselves who allegedly were convinced of the advantages of socialized agriculture.

The S.E.D. is also presenting a false picture of spontaneity because of the (then) approaching summit conference and Khrushchev's semantic (doubletalk deception) admission of the right of national self-determination. No doubt, the agricultural bolshevization of mid-Germany will be added to the socialist achievements to date which are not to be sacrificed, as Khrushchev repeatedly demanded, in case of a future reunification of Germany. Therefore, since the building of socialism was originally scheduled for completion in 1965, Ulbricht is speeding up, ahead of plan, the establishment of political faits accomplis to be accepted by the Western World, as expressions of voluntary popular decisions.

Against this background, it is necessary to recognize the manifold aspects of terror used in suppressing the farmers in mid-Germany, and to report on the numerous tragedies now taking place in the Soviet zone. The district and precinct leaders of the S.E.D. are competing with one another in beating the collectivization schedule. Whole brigades of Communist (S.E.D.) agitators are after the farmers, belaboring them day and night, at first with friendly assurances and gratuities of all kinds, then, when these blandishments prove ineffective, with threats and reprisals. In many cases these agents provocateur have even molested the farmers when already in bed, cajoling them and finally intimidating them to submit to the socialist cause, lest they be reported and punished as enemies of progress and peace.

The warning usually implied confiscation of property and loss of personal freedom. The legal and police authorities easily find some pretext for making short work of a blacklisted farmer. His complete ruin is the inevitable result. This explains, why the S.E.D. agents, by mass terror, succeeded in collectivizing 100 percent the agricultural properties in Rostock, Neubrandenburg, Potsdam, and Frankfurt (oder). The activist brigades are already at work in Saxony and Thuringia and they recently announced that a whole series of communities in that area have become productive cooperatives in full measure.

In order to arrive at large-scale "socialist agriculture" the individual L.P.G.'s are to be merged into even larger cooperatives. The new directives issued by the S.E.D. Politburo for the "socialist transformation" of the Soviet Zone's agricultural economy envisage productive cooperatives of 3,000 to 5,000 acres as the most appropriate size to fulfill the production targets stipulated by the 7-year plan. In this manner, the S.E.D. believes, the population of the Soviet Zone can be fully supplied with its own agricultural products, at a growing consumption rate by the end of 1963, at the same time surpassing the productivity of West German

grain and cattle farming per hectare. This is the tenor of the Politburo's proposed decree to be submitted to the eighth plenary session of the Communist central committee in April.

Such a deceptive forecast is used by Pankov's propaganda apparatus to camouflage the present campaign of terror against the independent farmers in the D.D.R. (German Democratic Republic), although the continued food shortage there is generally known to be due primarily to the failure of the agricultural cooperatives, despite their privileged position and the hundreds of millions of annual subvention moneys allotted to them by the state. It is known for a fact that the private farm operates more efficiently than the L.P.G. But economic aspects are obviously irrelevant, for S.E.D. chief Walter Ulbricht, regardless of costs, is only concerned with creating political faits accomplis designed to consolidate the Communist partition of Germany.

Protestant bishops filed a bitter protest with the Communist authorities of East Germany (Bulletin No. 58), which throws a sharp light on the forcible collectivization of individual farms that is going on there:

"It is not the function of the Church, to decide the merits of State-Socialism in economic problems but we receive reports from pastors and parishes of objectionable methods used to force individual landowners to enter collective units (Kolchos). We cannot go into details but it is a fact that the individual farmer is exposed to every kind of pressure, intimidation and coercion exercised by police and security organs to relinquish his property and then sign affidavits that it was a voluntary action. What can you expect in performance from people who are coerced by fear and resigned to despair? This is a prostitution of conscience. It is a violation of human dignity. You can stop these repressive tactics. The seventh conference of the central committee of your own party (S.E.D.) has accepted the principle of voluntary work. At a time when peaceful coexistence between people is a slogan, we request that you do not breach the peace amongst your own subjects."

The full impact of this calculated destruction of an entire social category, the landowning farmer, is evident in the expert comments of Almar Reitzner, editor of the German News and the Sudetendeutscher Artikel Dienst (April 1960). Amongst millions of refugees, fleeing the Soviet Zone there have been relatively few farmers, over the years. The sentimental bond with the land has been a strong one. Suddenly, there has been a sharp increase in fugitive farmers, due to the enforced collectivization of their land. This expropriation was decided on in the recent "Comecon" conferences (on agriculture) in Moscow.

The liquidation of the farmer in Communist East Germany has a calculated parallel in all Communist satellites, in variable degrees of execution. In Albania and Bulgaria, the process of expropriation is practically completed. In the abortive revolution of Hungary, the "Kolchos" were dissolved in a few days and private ownership restored. With the collapse of the uprising, the Kremlin stooge Kadar, however, has again instituted socialization of agriculture and brought it back to about 72 percent of arable properties. The status in Rumania is evident in the area around Bucharest, where 91,848 farmers were incorporated in the socialist sector, i.e., the state acquisition of about 1 million acres or a percentage level of 71 percent. It is only in Poland where forcible collectivization is cautiously handled, only 13 percent of the average in the general Communist domain. The reason is obvious: Poland is forced to import huge amounts of wheat and edibles; they are furnished by the United States under a patently phony arrangement of transferring surplus commodities ($40 million), ostensibly balanced by restitution (to the same amount) of previously confiscated American properties; this is hailed as a masterpiece of diplomacy by a smirking State Department; the bill, coming and going, is paid by that faceless slob the American taxpayer.

The general assault on the farmer, a psychological assault on private property in general, is most advanced in Czechoslovakia which was once the showcase of Wilsonian democracy—indeed his almost single handed creation if we consider the fanaticism with which he "pushed" his protégé Masaryk. Prague is roughly 2 years ahead of Pankow: on that basis, it is easy to speculate what will ultimately happen in East Germany. The Czechs, more rabidly Stalinist than Stalin, have pushed collectivization (the death of the Kulak) approximately 82 percent of the total arable areas; there were 12,500 Kolchos with a membership of 954,196 farm laborers, working approximately 9½ million acres. There is still a scattering of several thousand small farms in Moravia, of 2 to 4 acres in a relentless process of liquidation, through exorbitant pro rata demands, police persecution and endless trials by people's court (like in China) where they have received sentences of 2 to 7 years for economic sabotage and conspiracy against state organization. This process is in full swing in East Germany now; the percentage of expropriation 55 to 60 percent has not yet reached its maximum attainable level—but 12,000 snoopers, agents, provocateurs, etc., are working day and night, in a war of nerves, that has driven thousands of farmers to flight into West Germany or to suicide, in despair and hopelessness. In the meantime, the apathetic West is practically indifferent to this tragedy. The normally well-informed American press shies away from branding Castro's expropriation of farms and plantations, as an identical Communist maneuver. The defense of private property should be the single all-absorbing factor in the fight against global communism. Teddy Roosevelt, an infinitely better President than any of his colorless Democratic successors, made this the basic issue on his policy vis-a-vis Latin America. In the meantime, the corrosion of the West invites attention, once more, to Dimitri Manuilsky's forecast in 1931, lecturing at the Lenin School of Political Warfare, and a timetable of lethal significance:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep, so we will begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtones and unheard of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

Two years after this remarkably frank statement, F. D. Roosevelt recognized Red Russia diplomatically over the bitter protest of many of his advisers—naively opening the Pandora's box that has troubled civilized mankind ever since. Manuilsky's 20 and 30 years schedules are not far fetched: in 1951, there was the Kremlin engineered Sino-Korean war—a preliminary test of strength. His 30-year estimate will fall due in 1961. Was Khrushchev's spectacular visit designed to put the bourgeoisie to sleep? Is the Kremlin sponsored total disarmament in the category of electrifying overtones and unheard of concessions?

The forcible collectivization of individual farms in East Germany is not adequately covered by the American press. The affected area is probably too remote to arouse emotional interest. However, this myopic apathy seems to apply to next-door neighbors in the Caribbean? The expropriations of Castro of plantations, large and small, is hardly noted—except by the enraged absentee landlords. The fact that Castro is proceeding to the formation of collectives (Kolchos) has even found some naive (more likely fully paid) support, as in the case of the tomato farms.

Mr. Speaker, these appeasers throw in the puerile argument that Castro is not considered a real Communist though he has Communist advisers and associates. Card-holding Communists will never publicly admit membership in the party anyway. There is a clear index, however, to Communist character of subserviency to the Kremlin; that is the attitude of a government toward private property, especially agricultural and the freedom of the individual from police repressions. The destruction of private property and the calculated harassment—liquidation—of private ownership is the basic principle of Marxist-Leninism. By that yardstick, Castro's government is Communist and in the orbit of the Kremlin.

Teddy Roosevelt understood that administrative distinction perfectly: His foreign policy vis-a-vis some wayward Latin American countries was predicated on law and order, the protection of property and the discharge of foreign obligations. None of his vacillating successors have acted on this vital issue. Now the Kremlin has brazenly moved into the Caribbean. There is an ideological link between Cuba and East Germany. Castro and Ulbricht are birds of a feather.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. INOUYE (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for today, on account of official business in his district, inspecting the damages of the recent tidal wave.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. LESINSKI, for 1 hour, on Tuesday, May 31.

Mr. WRIGHT, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. EDMONDSON, for 30 minutes, on May 31.

Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. QUIE,) for 30 minutes, on May 26.

Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. QUIE), for 60 minutes, on June 7.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri (at the request of Mr. QUIE), for 1 hour, on Wednesday, June 1.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON), for 1 hour, on Tuesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. EDMONDSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POFF and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRAY (at the request of Mr. PRICE) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MOULDER.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina and to include an address by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. GOODELL, to revise and extend his remarks in Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter and tables and charts.

Mr. OSMERS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLTZMAN (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter during general debate on the school bill.

(At the request of Mr. QUIE, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. BRAY.

(At the request of Mr. EDMONDSON, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. SANTANGELO.

Mr. MEYER.

Mr. POWELL.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1605. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the apportionment of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries as they affect such States.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 24, 1960, present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9465. An act to authorize the loan of one submarine to Canada and the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China;

H.R. 9818. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida;

H.R. 10809. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 502. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune; and

H.J. Res. 546. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to present to the Senators and Representative in the Congress from the State of Hawaii the official flag of the United States bearing 50 stars which is first flown over the west front of the U.S. Capitol.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 26, 1960, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2184. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 6, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on York Harbor, Maine, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on June 2, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 395); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

2185. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 29, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Little Narragansett Bay and Watch Hill Cove, R.I., and Conn., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 31, 1957 (H. Doc. No. 396); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

2186. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 13, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Presque Isle Peninsula, Erie, Pa., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 397); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with four illustrations.

2187. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 9, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of shore from Newport Bay to San Mateo Creek, Orange County, Calif., appendix V, phase 1, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act of July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 398); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

2188. A communication from the President of the United States, relative to the correction of an error in his message of disapproval on H.R. 7947. In the last sentence of the second paragraph of his message the word "purchases" should be inserted in lieu of the word "sells"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2189. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, relative to a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately 37,609,878 pounds of palm oil now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (53 Stat. 811, as amended, 50 U.S.C. 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1653. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 12263. A bill to authorize the conclusion of an agreement for the joint construction by the United States and Mexico of a major international storage dam on the Rio Grande in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of February 3, 1944, with Mexico, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1654). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 11522. A bill to amend the act of August 26, 1935, to permit certain real property of the United States to be conveyed to States, municipalities, and other political subdivisions for highway purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1655). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1150. A bill to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in trust and restricted allotted lands and restricted purchased allotted lands in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1656). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 11953. A bill to provide for the assessing of Indian trust lands and restricted fee patent Indian lands within the Lummi Indian diking project on the Lummi Indian Reservation in the State of Washington, through drainage and diking district formed under the laws of the State of Washington; with amendment (Rept. No. 1657). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 11161. A bill to donate to the pueblos of Zia and Jemez a tract of land in the Ojo del Espiritu Santo grant, New Mexico; with amendment (Rept. No. 1658). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10639. A bill to amend section 3(b) of the act of May 9, 1958 (72 Stat. 105), relating to the preparation of a roll of the members of the Otoe and Missouri Tribe and to per capita distribution of judgment funds; without amendment (Rept. No. 1659). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 7656. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1660). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 12381. A bill to increase for a 1-year period the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act and to extend for 1 year the existing corporate normal-tax rate and certain excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 12382. A bill to increase for a 1-year period the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act and to extend for 1 year the existing corporate normal-tax rate and certain excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIER:

H.R. 12383. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage

rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 12384. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 12385. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 12386. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 12387. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FLYNN:

H.R. 12388. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the special milk program for children for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12389. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to the level of price support for milk for manufacturing purposes for butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 12390. A bill to promote mining and development research for beryl, chromite, and columbium-tantalum from domestic mines; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H.R. 12391. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 12392. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to include members, officers, and employees of the Interstate Commerce Commission among the officers and employees of the United States protected against forcible assault and homicide; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 12393. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the special milk program for children for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12394. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to the level of price support for milk for manufacturing purposes and for butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 12395. A bill to establish the Inland Navigation Commission; to authorize the provision and collection of fair and reasonable charges for use of inland waterway navigational improvements constructed, maintained, or operated with Federal funds; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.J. Res. 717. Joint resolution providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.J. Res. 718. Joint resolution to provide for a conference consisting of Federal, State, and local officials, and members of public and private groups or organizations to consider and propose methods of, and to coordinate action for, combating the traffic in obscene matters and materials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. Con. Res. 695. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING: Joint Resolution No. 7 of the Nevada Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a system of payments by the Federal Government to the State of Nevada or its local governments, which payments will be made in lieu of property taxes on federally owned property in this State, which property is immune from State or local taxation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, Joint Resolution No. 4 of the Nevada Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to prepare adequate State water rights legislation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, Joint Resolution No. 7 of the Nevada Senate memorializing Congress to propose a constitutional amendment abolishing income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibiting the Federal Government from engaging in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as provided in the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 12396. A bill for the relief of Georges Boutros il Khouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H.R. 12397. A bill for the relief of John D. Rocamora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 12398. A bill for the relief of Erwin P. Milspaugh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 12399. A bill for the relief of Col. Samuel Hale; Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12400. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Stultz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 12401. A bill for the relief of Walter H. Hanson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12402. A bill for the relief of Panayota Tanglis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 12403. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sabri Sami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H.R. 12404. A bill for the relief of Yee Nee Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.R. 12405. A bill for the relief of Julia and Alfredo Javier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12406. A bill for the relief of Thelma and Romeo Antonio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Memorial Day 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, within a few days Americans everywhere will observe Memorial Day.

In keeping with the occasion the following statement appeared in my Washington Newsletter May 28 in lieu of my usual report on legislative activities:

MEMORIAL DAY 1960

Memorial Day is distinctly an American institution—a deeply significant sentimental custom established by our American people more than 90 years ago. It is not only observed in every community across our Nation but in many foreign lands and across the high seas.

What the American people do in their local communities on Memorial Day is actually symbolic of our contribution to the overall Memorial Day observance which is being duplicated by millions throughout our land and in several foreign countries.

To make the point clear the following facts must be considered: There are more than 1 million names on the honor rolls of the American war dead. These names are the men and women who have fought and died for our country since this Nation was founded some 185 years ago.

Throughout the United States and in some 25 American military cemeteries beyond our shores, the mortal remains of some 400,000 Americans who gave their lives in World War I, and World War II and the Korean conflict are buried or are recorded as missing in action.

At 8 American military cemeteries or special memorials in France, England, and Belgium, there are nearly 31,000 World War I veterans buried.

Some 76,000 World War II dead are buried at 14 American cemeteries in England, France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Holland, Italy and Tunisa, north Africa. In addition, more than 90,000 World War II and Korean war dead are buried or recorded as missing at American cemeteries in Puerto Rico, Hawaii, Alaska, and the Philippines.

In Arlington National Cemetery on the banks of the Potomac River across from the Nation's Capital surrounding the Tomb of the Unknowns are some 99,000 other war dead which represent all forms of military service.

In the American military cemeteries are graves and chapels, pools and gardens, statues and—most impressive, the walls of the missing. Alined in rows there are two designs of white marble headstones, the Star of David for those of the Jewish faith and the Latin Cross for all others. These markers identify the remains of the known American war dead. All of these material tributes are creations of our best talent in architecture and landscaping and in poetry and prayer. These oversea cemeteries and

memorials are in charge of the American Battle Monuments Commission and the Department of the Army.

In our oversea cemeteries where our known American war dead are buried, there are more than 60,000 in France, 13,600 in Belgium, 17,000 in the Philippines, 13,500 in Hawaii, 12,000 in Italy, 8,000 in Holland, 5,000 in Luxembourg, 4,000 in England, and 2,000 in Tunisia, North Africa.

For the unknown war dead, rows of marked graves are to be found in the vicinity of tremendously imposing structures, the walls of the missing. One of these walls of the missing is located on the south coast of England and inscribed on its 274-foot-long wall are the names, the ranks, the combat organization and the home States of American servicemen presumed to be dead but whose remains have not been recovered or identified. The following inscription appears on the walls of the missing: "Here are recorded the names of Americans who gave their lives in the service of their country and who sleep in unknown graves—grant unto them, O Lord, eternal rest."

Thus the real meaning of Memorial Day is revealed by the worldwide tributes that we as Americans pay to our war dead. The sun never sets upon all of these memorials.

Above the hallowed grounds upon which these memorials are located flies the Stars and Stripes—the flag of our country. It is the flag which says: "They were my defenders. They were your defenders. Their patriotism and their valor were proved on the fields of battle. Let their achievements and sacrifices be your inspiration forever."

This is the message for each of us on this Memorial Day of 1960.

Soil Stewardship Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. MEYER
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, this is Soil Stewardship Week and a time for each of us to reexamine the great need for the proper conservation of our soil. For 25 years our Nation has been developing a program of soil and water conservation—and they have been years of progess. This I know, because I was personally and actively associated with it for some 14 years: in the early days of the Soil Erosion Service, and on the staff of the first soil conservation district in Vermont which started in 1940. I have watched this soil and water policy grow and expand from its inception to its present status with 2,861 soil conservation districts including more than 90 percent of the Nation's farmland and with the cooperation of some 1.8 million farmers. I have witnessed the manner in which the owners of the land grasped the significance of wise use and, through their local districts, have worked to conserve this basic resource in one of the most successful of Federal partnerships with people and local governments. I have had the privilege of participating in this great endeavor, and I wish to use this occasion to congratulate the people of our Nation for their foresight.

Much greater effort is needed, of course, because of the demands of a constantly growing population with its attendant complexities. There is a vital need for a comprehensive soil and water policy geared to the future. But, judging by our past accomplishments, we may hope to continue the task with a true sense of stewardship.

Opinion Poll for Seventh District Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, we have been in session this year for better than 4 months. In the remaining weeks before adjournment many important decisions will be made. As I have done on previous occasions, I am submitting to my constituents a list of questions, as follows, and requesting that they express their views in this manner. I will place the results of this poll in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Do you favor:

1. Government-sponsored medical care for social security retirees? H.R. 4700, the Forand bill, proposes that the Government pay the medical and hospital bills—with certain maximum limits—for social security retirees to be financed by increasing the social security tax. Opponents maintain this would injure the stability of social security, and that millions of elderly people not eligible for social security benefits would not receive this assistance.

2. Limiting national expenditures to balance the budget? President Eisenhower has predicted a budget surplus of $4 billion next year, which he believes should be used to retire part of the national debt. In the Congress many new programs are suggested which seem desirable, but which would involve the expenditure of millions of dollars. In deciding on new programs we must consider how the money for them will be raised or whether to borrow more money.

3. Use of import quotas to protect local industries from foreign competition? Many industries in Indiana manufacture products which are also produced abroad. In the continuing efforts of our Government to reduce tariff barriers, and facilitate world trade, the competition of these products coming from countries where wage standards are considerably lower is intense. It has been suggested that more adequate protection should be accorded our domestic industries, including farming.

4. Increased spending for national defense? We are spending more than $40 billion a year for defense, which is the major portion of our national budget. Yet many critics say our defense efforts have been pinchpenny and that recent Russian developments necessitate greater defense spending.

5. U.S. recognition of Red China? Today we recognize the Chinese Nationalist government on Formosa instead of the Communist government in Peiping. Some believe that we should recognize and begin trade with Red China.

6. Reduced funds for foreign aid? In the last 15 years the United States has spent in excess of $80 billion for foreign aid. Some claim that our aid is doing much to halt the further spread of communism and to build strong new bastions of freedom. On the other hand some say that it should be eliminated or cut.

7. Returning to each State one-half of the cigarette tax collected from its residents for educational uses without Federal direction? Proposals are before Congress to give Federal assistance to schools through grants to the States in accordance with a formula weighted to assist those which have a greater need. A different approach would be to return a portion of an excise tax collected in each State, such as the tax on cigarettes, provided that the money would be used for school purposes, either in the construction of buildings or teachers' salaries, but not subject to Federal direction. The return to Indiana of one-half of the Federal cigarette tax paid there, which would be 4 cents on each package, would realize $24 million per year, three times the amount to be received under another proposed program.

8. Giving in to the Russians by abandoning West Berlin? The prime target of Soviet foreign policy is to get the United States to withdraw from Berlin.

9. Withdrawing from pledge to buy sugar from Cuba at above the world price? We are obligated until the end of 1960, under the Sugar Act, to make one-third of our sugar purchases in Cuba at above world prices. Owing to anti-American feelings which have been expressed since the Castro regime took over, it has been suggested that we not renew the Cuban sugar quota.

10. Repeal of loyalty oath requirement of students receiving aid under the National Defense Education Act? Students applying for loans and fellowships under the National Defense Education Act are required to take an oath of loyalty to the United States. Bills are before the Congress to repeal this oath requirement.

11. Retention of the Connally amendment which allows the United States to reject the jurisdiction of the World Court? In accepting the jurisdiction of the World Court in 1948 the United States reserved the right to determine if a particular matter is domestic and hence not subject to international control. It has been suggested in the Senate that this amendment be repealed.

12. Increasing the conservation reserve—soil bank—from 28 million acres to 60 million acres? If you are engaged in farming, also check here ☐. The basis of the so-called farm problem has been overproduction, which is unquestionably causing great difficulties in the Farm Belt. We can, however, be thankful that our difficulties have been with abundance and not with

scarcity. The soil-bank program sets aside large areas of land for several years, insuring that they will not be used for production and that the soil will be conserved and replenished. There are about 28 million acres currently in this conservation reserve; some analysts suggest that if the reserve were increased to about 60 million acres it would balance agricultural production and eliminate creation of additional surpluses.

I am looking forward to the replies I will receive, and I will advise you at a later date of the results of this poll.

Dedication of Old Ben Coal Corp. Mine No. 21 at Sesser, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH J. GRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of representing one of the Nation's largest coal-producing areas. We are proud of the great contribution southern Illinois is making to the Nation and the world through the production of this great mineral called coal. Like all other industries we have felt the hardship created through automation by loss of jobs. Therefore, we all rejoice when a new mine is opened.

On June 14, in southern Illinois, an event will take place that may well become a milestone in the industrial progress of the United States. That event is the dedication of Old Ben Coal Corp. Mine No. 21 at Sesser, Ill. The new mine is a deep-shaft coal mine, the largest in the Midwest devoted to the production of metallurgical coal.

The significance of this new mine to national progress is best explained in the light of the relationship of coal and steel, as well as by the great changes that have been taking place in the coal-steel economy of this country.

America is the world's greatest steel producer, due largely to the abundance of iron ore in this country. Yet without an equally abundant supply of coal, the iron ore might well remain unused. For without coal and the coke made from it, there would be no practical, low-cost way to convert iron ore into steel.

From its earliest beginnings in this country and elsewhere, the steel industry has considered the availability of metallurgical coal to be of prime importance, and has located its mills close to this coal. For nearly a hundred years, the Appalachian region has been the major source of coking coal for steelmaking, and has accounted for the growth of Pittsburgh and other eastern cities as world-renowned steel-producing centers.

At the turn of the century, certain industry leaders realized that, if America were to continue satisfying the ever-increasing demands for steel, provision would have to be made for the day when eastern coal reserves would no longer be sufficient, and when steel production itself would move westward.

Thus it was that in 1918, the Old Ben Coal Corp. of Chicago purchased a reserve of 100 million tons of metallurgical coal in Franklin County, Ill., to be held against the day when the steel industry in the Midwest would match or exceed production elsewhere in the Nation.

This day has now come to pass. For several years now, steel production of the Chicago-Gary area has outstripped the East, and there are many indications that the Midwest will grow in importance as a steel region. Briefly, these indications are:

First, the central location of the area with respect to geography and population, an important consideration in market accessibility and shipping costs.

Second, the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the availability of the many fine water routes of the Mississippi Valley States, which make it economical to ship iron ore from new fields in Labrador and Venezuela directly to the mills.

Third, the availability of vast reserves of low sulfur metallurgical coal in Illinois for iron ore reduction.

It is interesting to note that even though steel production has made great progress in the Midwest, the mills have up to now continued to utilize eastern coal. This has resulted partially from past practice, partially from unfamiliarity with midwestern metallurgical coal.

In deciding that now is the time to open mine No. 21 and tap its metallurgical coal reserve, Old Ben officials believe that the steel industry is ready to begin buying Illinois metallurgical coal in ever increasing quantities. By 1962, much of mine No. 21's output of 3 million tons annually is expected to be going for steel production.

The dedication of this new mine is signal in Illinois history. It marks the first time a coal producer in the State has opened a mine designed specifically for metallurgical coal production. It also marks the tapping of the largest commercially available tonnage of metallurgical coal remaining in the State.

By making this pioneering move, Old Ben, which has 86 years of history behind it, is setting the stage for further development of the Midwest as a steel and coal producing center.

The anticipated benefits of this development are remarkable to contemplate. In the Chicago area alone, metallurgical consumption amounts to 18,250,000 tons yearly, which is now largely being met by coal from eastern fields. Much of this market is expected to be developed by Illinois coal producers.

For the steel industry, utilization of nearby coal means important freight savings, in some cases $1.50 per ton differential between coal shipped from the East and coal shipped from southern Illinois. At the same time, the railroads of the Midwest can look forward to more metallurgical coal traffic.

There is also the matter of many new jobs in mining and coal hauling for the people of southern Illinois, and for the hundreds of industries and businesses which supply the living needs of these workers. Increased industrial development of the area should contribute to its stability and economic health.

Finally, by contributing to the further development of the steel industry, mine No. 21 is providing new strength for our consumer economy and our national defense.

The foresight of company officials in obtaining the coal reserve, and their patience in waiting for the proper moment in the evolution of steel industry logistics to open the mine, are worthy of note. Their action will be of immense benefit to an industry, to a State, and to the Nation.

Nineteen Hundred and Sixty Osmers Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, those at home and abroad who think the Paris summit fiasco has divided the American people had better take a look at how voters in my district reacted to Khrushchev's abuse of our President.

On May 2, I mailed out 46,000 questionnaires to typical voters in my district. Just about half of the more than 9,800 replies which have been received to date came in before the ill-fated Paris meeting. Only 52 percent of my constituents replying prior to the Paris blowup favored the overall record of the Eisenhower administration, 34 percent were opposed to it with 14 percent undecided. Immediately after the vicious attack by Khrushchev on our President the percentage of those favoring the administration jumped to the almost unbelievable high of 82 percent, with only 11 percent in opposition, and 7 percent undecided. If Moscow is laboring under the impression that our people are divided by the U–2 incident and subsequent events, these answers from a good cross section of our people will set the record straight. Once again we have proof that, despite our many partisan differences over domestic issues, Americans close ranks when facing up to foreign threats. The final percentages on the record of the Eisenhower administration were 59 percent in favor, 30 percent opposed, and 11 percent undecided.

The replies to another one of my questions prove that Castro is in serious trouble with the American people. Only 9 percent of those answering were opposed to cutting Cuban sugar imports if Castro continues his anti-U.S. campaign, with a resounding 77 percent favoring such cuts.

It is interesting to note that a Federal program of health care for older citizens had better than 7 to 1 support among my constituents, 85 percent voting in favor and only 12 percent in opposition. On this question only 3 per-

cent were undecided. A voluntary plan for such health care was favored by 56 percent while 44 percent thought a compulsory one best.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members will be interested in the replies to other questions, too: Seventy-eight percent favor the United Nations as the best means of maintaining world peace; 80 percent want Congress to pass a strong law to curb radio and TV payola and fakery, and 60 percent favor legal action to end southern lunch counter sit-downs by requiring stores to treat all customers equally.

More than half, 53 percent oppose the present foreign aid program.

A strong majority want Federal help and tax relief for commuter railroads. An increase in the present Federal minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 per hour was favored by 63 percent with only 34 percent opposed to the increase. On this question 3 percent had not made up their minds.

On two of the three questions relating to education, the poll showed an almost even division of opinion on two of the questions. Those favoring education benefits for peacetime GI's led by a 46-percent to 44-percent margin over those opposed, while 10 percent gave no opinion; 39 percent opposed eliminating loyalty oaths and non-Communist affidavits by Federal scholarship students; 36 percent want them retained; 25 percent were undecided. On the third education question, voters favored Federal aid to education by 2 to 1, 59 percent to 29 percent, 12 percent expressing no opinion. Of those favoring Federal aid to education, 69 percent want the aid used for school construction, 14 percent for teachers' pay, while 17 percent thought all purposes should receive help.

This is the sixth year that I have conducted this broad poll, and the number of replies is the highest ever received. As in previous years, Mr. Speaker, hundreds of letters and comments on the questionnaire subjects, and others, have given me a wonderful insight into public opinion on the issues of the day at the grassroots in my district.

For the first time, a presidential poll was included this year at the request of many constituents. As soon as the results have been tabulated, they will be made public.

The mailing list used consists of two categories: First, 85 percent are registered voters taken at random from voting lists in the 39 municipalities in the Ninth Congressional District. Second, 15 percent are leaders and professional people in the district, such as doctors, dentists, clergymen, lawyers, labor leaders, clubwomen, businessmen, bankers, retailers, public officials, accountants, engineers, architects, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the 12 questions and the answers in percentages immediately following these remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[Percent]

Do you favor—	Yes	No	Undecided
1. The overall record of the Eisenhower administration?	59	30	11
2. The United Nations as the best means of maintaining world peace?	78	12	10
3. Cutting Cuban sugar imports if Castro continues anti-U.S. campaign?	77	9	14
4. Our foreign aid program at present levels	39	53	8
If no, more economic aid? 27 percent; less economic? 24 percent; more military aid? 3 percent; less military? 38 percent. No aid at all? 8 percent.			
5. A Federal program of health care for older citizens?	85	12	3
If yes, compulsory plan? 44 percent; or voluntary plan? 56 percent.			
6. A strong Federal law to curb payola and fakery on radio and TV?	80	15	5
7. Eliminating present loyalty oath and non-Communist affidavit requirements for students receiving Federal scholarships?	36	39	25
8. Legal action to prevent southern lunch counter sit-downs by requiring stores to treat all customers equally?	60	25	15
9. Increasing Federal minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 per hour?	63	34	3
If no, minimum of? 67 percent $1.15; no increase? 33 percent.			
10. Providing Federal help and tax relief for commuter railroads?	58	35	7
11. Granting peacetime GI's, with at least 2 years' active duty, education benefits similar to those given wartime GI's?	46	44	10
12. Federal aid to education?	59	29	12
If yes, for construction? 69 percent; teachers' pay? 14 percent; all purposes? 17 percent.			

A Tribute to Jane Addams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on April 29 I had the honor of participating in a series of meetings held at Rockford College, to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of Jane Addams. I ask unanimous consent that the address which I delivered on that occasion be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO JANE ADDAMS

(Delivered at Rockford College, Apr. 20, 1960, by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS)

Of all the American men and women of the last century the two, who to my mind most closely approached sainthood, have been Abraham Lincoln and Jane Addams. And we of Illinois can take a proper degree of local pride in the fact that both of these supreme characters developed within the texture of the life of our State.

When Jane Addams died a quarter of a century ago she was loved by many, respected by multitudes, but bitterly reviled and hated by most of the so-called leading citizens and formers of public opinion. Now with the passage of time, her nobility is more fully appreciated while the traducers have either died off, been converted, or have decided that since Miss Addams is no longer living they can afford to allow her to be praised.

So all over this country at this centennial of her birth proper tribute is being offered for her life and works. And since the dead lend themselves very readily to reconciliation we probably should not scrutinize too closely the credentials of those who elsewhere join to pay her honor.

Like most true saints, Jane Addams was a robust character who lived in no ivory tower but moved instead at the very center of the stresses and tensions of life. There was symmetry and nobility in every phase of her development from her girlhood in the Quaker home beside the mill in Cedarville, on through the years of illness, study, and travel both here and abroad and then to her busy life on Halsted Street as the helpful friend of the poor, the weak, the confused, the unfortunate, the exploited, and the friendless. And then by her awareness of the "solidarity of the human race" she became first a mighty force for good in Chicago and in Illinois, then a national figure almost as commending in her way as was Lincoln in his, and finally to deserved honor and then to death and simple burial on the hillside slope in Cedarville from whence she sprang.

The mere contemplation of such a career is in itself life enhancing and hence is ample justification for the services which are being conducted both here and elsewhere.

But Miss Addams was always a most modest person who was almost exclusively interested in the good which she could accomplish both for her generation and for those which were to follow and not in retrospective praise for her past achievements. So if her spirit watches these proceedings (as I hope it does) she would welcome any impetus which our tributes might give to help lessen the burdens, the dangers, and the anxieties which the men and women of today and tomorrow will inevitably experience. I hope you will pardon me if in a few brief minutes I try to sketch some of the general lessons which her life seems to me to impart, leaving for the discussion period the questions as to what her attitude would be as regards current questions and problems.

The first lesson which I would draw from Miss Addams' life is the esthetic beauty and practical ability of intelligent and energized compassion. This is a brittle and hard-boiled era in which commitment to causes and a desire to help people is not regarded as "good form." But Miss Addams' whole life was devoted to those purposes from the time that she and Ellen Starr moved into the big house on Halstead Street and began to nurse the sick, to offer counsel and recreation to those who sadly needed both, on through the days when she fought for laws and institutions which would protect women and children from being broken by excessive toil, starvation wages and insidious temptations, and then on to being a pilgrim for peace involved in the fate of mankind, who pled with the lowly and mighty alike that they might abandon the institution of war and devote their energies to the arts of peace. No person in our times has done so much for people.

And in thus devoting herself to others, Miss Addams became an ever more noble and more attractive woman. There was indeed never a better example of the truth of Jesus saying that "he who loses his life for My sake shall find it."

The second lesson which I would draw from her life is that in general it is better to begin where one lives, to be helpful there, and then follow life outward, upward, and I may say, inward as well. Miss Addams started on Halsted Street. She was the supremely good neighbor without being in the slightest sense a busybody or the proverbial lady bountiful. Just because she was a good neighbor, she took on the job of garbage collector and gradually excavated the loathesome piles which covered the streets and alleys of the bloody 20th ward. Then as a result of trying to help boys and girls out of trouble, she founded the Juvenile Protective Association, helped to create the juvenile court, and became a reforming member of the school board. She not only cared for individual immigrants, but set up the Immigrants Protective League to do the same job on a broader scale, with her doughty associates Julia Lathrop, of this very city of Rockford, Florence Kelly, and Alice Hamilton, Jessie Binford and the two Abbotts she crusaded for and obtained much-needed legislation to protect the women and children not only of Halsted Street but also of Illinois and the Nation. She was not afraid to defend the Pullman strikers of 1894 and the clothing workers in the great strike of 1910 and she helped to lay the basis for the model labor-management relations which have existed in the latter industry for the last 50 years. But since she was rooted in Halsted Street and always lived on intimate terms with her neighbors her advocacies were based in reality while her testimony had a vivid and living pith to it which the abstract statements of experts commonly lack. If we can take another moral from her life it is, "Begin where you are but do not be afraid to follow where truth and the pure spirit of the inner light may lead you."

Finally Miss Addams combined culture with character. There are too many of us who specialize on one of these attributes to the virtual exclusion of the other. But Miss Addams through her wide travels had sympathetic communion with the people of many lands; from her wide reading the whole great world of literature was part of her life as were the breathless creations of beauty in painting, sculpture, and music. She encouraged all this in her neighbors with her industrial museum, her Little Theater, and the classes in the arts, and in music which she and Miss Starr fostered. And this was reflected in the moving and prescient books which she wrote such as "Twenty Years at Hull House," "Democracy and Social Ethics," "The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets," "The Long Road of Woman's Memory," "Peace and Bread in Time of War," and the "Second 20 Years at Hull House."

What a legacy she has left us and what an inspiration her life still is. And in the words of a victorian poet whom Miss Addams loved:

"Through such souls only God stooping
Shows sufficient of His light
For us in the dark to rise by."

Perhaps I should stop here but this last week as I reread Bernard Shaw's "Saint Joan," I thought of the similarities between Joan of Arc who after five centuries was made Saint Joan, and our citizen of Illinois and of the world whom we may reverently term "Saint Jane." Saint Joan was burned at the stake for heresy in believing that God's voice told her to liberate France. The body of our brave saint was not burned at the stake but her spirit was scarred and indeed nailed upon the figurative cross of public passion and opinion.

And in the epilog of Shaw's play you will remember how Joan's shining apparition appeared a quarter of a century after her execution to those who had put her to death and to the friends who had failed her in the death agony. And in repentance they all praised her, confessed their sins, and vowed to do better. But when Joan announced her intention of returning to earth, one by one they all scurried away with the last to leave being the hulky and sensual soldier who had held up a cross before her dying eyes.

And I thought would that we could have this experience of our Saint Jane returning to us on this spring day a full quarter of a century after her death. Would our praise turn to abandonment if she or someone like her were to sound clear notes on the trumpet of probity.

It is quite probable, and I am frank to confess that knowing something of the nature of tyranny of the police states, I could not follow her in rejection of all forms of force. But I do say that if we could have more who would live as she did in the spirit which takes away the occasion for all war, the necessity for the use of force would be greatly reduced.

And I think we would all echo the last plea which Shaw made Joan utter, "O God, that madest this beautiful earth, when will it be ready to receive thy saints? How long, O Lord, how long?"

Thirty-second Anniversary of Jordan's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 32d anniversary of Jordan's independence. The history of the Jordanian independence dates back to May 25, 1928, at which time a self-internal independence became known as the Princedom of Transjordan. As the years drew back the curtain of repression and self-expression, in 1946 Trans-Jordan concluded a treaty with Britain, whereby the latter recognized the independence of Jordan and its full sovereignty, with His Majesty, King Abdullah, as the newly proclaimed King. This achievement of independence, this long awaited dream for Jordan's people became a reality through the unceasing efforts of His late Majesty, King Abdullah, the grandfather of His Majesty, the present King Hussein.

April of 1950 viewed the end of hostilities between the Arabs and Jews in Palestine. The Jordanian Parliament, composed of central Arab Palestine and Trans-Jordan proper, approved the union of the mentioned regions with the new state to be acknowledged as the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. Presently, Jordan's monarch is His Majesty King Hussein, the young grandson of the late King Abdullah.

The historic perseverance of this kingdom's zealous struggle for independence, the vigilant alertness which it protects itself from shackling antidemocratic elements, the perpetual challenge it brings to other nations, certainly characterizes a kingdom deservant of distinguished recognition.

From a persistent strife of chaos, a kingdom has risen to exert itself among the free nations of the world. Amid present misunderstandings and misgivings, the true sovereignty of Jordan has shown that the seeds of democratic principles can only grow and blossom through the tender nurturing of patience, understanding, and tolerance.

On this, their day of Independence, I wish to extend greetings to the people of Jordan, His Majesty, King Hussein, and the Honorable Dr. Yousuf Haikal, the Ambassador from Jordan.

Jobs for Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, during my study of the subject of juvenile delinquency, one of the greatest complaints against industry and government in connection with the prevention of juvenile delinquency was the failure to provide employment for the youth of our country. After high school and before induction into military service, employers have been reluctant to hire a young man because of the uncertainty of continuity of employment. As a result, young men who do not preoccupy their time in college find themselves unable to obtain employment to provide for their miscellaneous needs and to prepare for a future. The gloomy outlook is either a draft in the service or enlistment.

Some organizations have recognized the desideratum or need during this critical period and have embarked upon a program of obtaining jobs for youth. One of these organizations is the "Jobs for Youth," a nonprofit organization which has attempted to fill the needs of the employers and to help the youth of the community. The organizer and moving spirit of this group is Mr. Anthony Sorvillo of 68 East 97th Street, New York City. The organization Jobs for Youth is located at 400 East 83d Street, New York, N.Y. It has endeavored to obtain employment for young men as stock boys, messengers, packers, and delivery boys.

A brochure issued by this enterprising organization Jobs for Youth sets forth its purpose and the scope of its activities. If more agencies or organizations carried out a similar program, boys would be occupied and less likely to become juvenile delinquents. The brochure reads as follows and I commend it to the readers' attention:

Jobs for Youth is a free employment bureau and guidance service for young people. It serves youth 16 to 21 years old with special emphasis on boys. Younger boys are also given counseling and referred for after-school and summer work.

Boys who are intimidated by large downtown employment offices eagerly seek the advice of a friendly neighborhood counselor. In addition to the regular staff there is a part-time worker assigned from the New York State Employment Office who does counseling and job referral.

We know that a boy at work is less likely to become a delinquent or get into trouble.

Secretary of Defense Gates Opens SEATO Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith an address delivered by the Honorable Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., Secretary of Defense, on Wednesday, May 25, to the opening session of the 12th Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) Military Advisers Conference, in Washington. I had the great privilege of witnessing this historic event.

Secretary Gates' speech was a clear, concise, and dignified greeting and statement of our Government's stand against the Communist threat to world peace. With his usual and noteworthy clarity, he told the world of the U.S. intention to honor our commitments in defense of freedom-loving peoples in this important quadrant of the world's surface. The speech follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE THOMAS S. GATES, JR., AT OPENING OF THE SEATO 12TH MILITARY ADVISERS CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Excellencies, military advisers, delegates, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a unique honor to address this distinguished group and to open the 12th SEATO Military Advisers Conference.

On behalf of President Eisenhower, the U.S. Government, and the American people I extend to each of you a most cordial welcome.

We meet at a time when the world has been startled and shocked by the abruptness with which the hopes for the reduction of tensions from a successful summit conference have been shattered. One thing has emerged of great value to all who are devoted to freedom: a new appreciation of the solid basis on which our relationships with our allies rests. The people of this country are deeply grateful for the unity shown by the nations of the free world at this time. The bonds among us have never been stronger.

The purposes, current activities, and future tasks of SEATO constitute a vital element in maintaining stability in the course of world events. With communism seeking to destroy all that the free nations of the world are striving to build and to maintain, the stability of the free world depends on the security of each of us. SEATO is based on this concept of interdependence, and is a proud demonstration of its success.

The purposes of the SEATO collective defense to which we have mutually bound ourselves remain valid. Time moves quickly. It has been 6 years since eight free nations pledged their collective resources to maintain the peace and security of southeast Asia and southwest Pacific through common action. It is significant that the Communists have not challenged its integrity nor tested its collective strength through direct overt aggression.

During its short span of life SEATO has grown from an idea into an effective organization. National forces of the Southeast Asia countries, backed by powerful mobile forces contribute to the deterrent and provide the security behind which the free peoples of the area live and develop their resources. Coordinated SEATO military plans have been prepared and are capable of rapid execution to parry any likely Communist threat.

Through military field exercises, skills have been developed and refined, operating procedures established, and command arrangements tested. SEATO exercises have progressed from simple observer type to the sophisticated maneuvers of land, sea, and air units of member nations.

The United States remains dedicated in its support of SEATO. We are prepared and will honor our commitments. Our military forces have never been more powerful. They are capable of decisive action in general war if this should be forced upon us. Together with our allies we can meet lesser military actions anywhere in the world.

While it is inspiring to note the strides already made, great tasks still face us. The military threat of communism has not declined since SEATO was born in Manila 6 years ago. Communist leaders remain dedicated to the achievement of their goal of world domination. Their tactics, as you are aware, consist of threats and blandishments, warnings, and false promises. They exploit every opportunity and apply various forms of pressure. If a government is weak, greater and increasing pressures are applied in the hope that a revolutionary situation will develop. If a government successfully counters one particular Communist thrust, the Communist tactics change. The recent history of Southeast Asia and the southwest Pacific is replete with evidence of such Communist actions. They well may resort to military force if they believe it will be successful.

The nature of this opposition simply makes it more difficult for us to accomplish our high purpose. We can be encouraged, however, by our success to date. The collective security arrangements of the free world have deterred military aggression. The resolution of the nations of SEATO, backed by the tangible assistance rendered by the United States through its military assistance program, have achieved an effective defense.

The Secretary of State, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I are convinced of the indispensability of military assistance as an integral part not only of our own defenses but those of the entire free world.

We are strongly supporting the program of the President. We are determined to make the maximum use of the resources which Congress makes available. Our goal is to obtain on a worldwide basis the best possible free world defense.

I have just returned from Paris. Since the world press featured the Paris events on their front pages almost continuously for 2 weeks, there is not much I can add to what you already know. In view of the happenings in Paris, I wish to quote from President Eisenhower's message to the NATO ministerial meeting in Istanbul about a month ago:

"We approach these Paris talks with a sincere desire to do all possible to reduce the tensions and dangers that now exist. Yet we cannot reasonably anticipate any quick or spectacular results. This meeting will be one more in what may prove a long succession of diplomatic exchanges dealing with some of the most difficult problems of our era. These are not susceptible to early solution. We can, at best, hope to make some modest progress toward our goals."

We did approach these talks with a sincere desire to reduce world tensions. As the developments unfolded, however, it became increasingly clear that the Soviet Union had decided well in advance to torpedo the summit. Western firmness did not back down before Khrushchev's ultimatums.

I would be remiss if I failed to note that our colleagues from Britain and France, as well as the other NATO partners, displayed a convincing unity of purpose and action in the face of Soviet divisive efforts. The Soviet conduct both in Paris and at the United Nations demonstrated that a difficult road lies ahead as we seek solutions to the most complex problems of our times.

It is too early to tell what further developments may take place. The President of the United States will continue his efforts toward peace with justice and still hopes to make, as he put it, "some modest progress towards our goals" even though the Soviet actions have increased the difficulties. In short, we still intend to seek a relaxation of tensions by all means, short of impairing our common security. We must always negotiate from strength.

We recognize that military preparedness will not by itself meet the challenges facing Southeast Asia. Our multilateral efforts to promote the economic growth of the area and the material well-being of the people must be intensified. Mere survival is not enough to meet the demands of the future. Social and economic progress must be made. Mature and stable national institutions are necessary to the structure we are jointly striving to build.

Each SEATO Military Advisers Conference has cemented the ties of friendship and cooperation. Conferences have developed ideas and recommendations which resulted in coordinated plans and actions. This meeting I am confident will be no exception. I take pleasure in declaring this conference open, and I wish you every success in the work before you.

The New Spirit of Armed Forces Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of northeastern Oklahoma have just had the opportunity to observe a splendid demonstration of the coordination and unity which are strengthening our Armed Forces in their preparation for American defense.

The occasion was the observance of Armed Forces Day in Muskogee, last Saturday, May 21.

Thousands of Oklahomans were on hand to witness a combined Air Force, Army, and National Guard operation in which a mock battle was fought for control of Davis Field.

Thanks to television and radio coverage, additional hundreds of thousands of our citizens were both thrilled and

impressed by the well-planned and perfectly executed maneuvers, both on the ground and in the air, which accompanied the battle.

The demonstration not only provided a vivid illustration of the readiness of our National Guard and Reserve Forces, but also impressed thousands with the importance and effectiveness of strong, well-balanced forces to meet all military situations.

In the mock battle at Davis Field, an important airbase was saved from "enemy capture" by well organized team effort of our defense forces.

That team effort, which played such a significant role in the victory of World War II, is even more essential in the perilous times which now confront our Nation.

As representative of the district in which Davis Field is located, I am proud of the contribution which its mock battle of last week has made to public understanding of our defense effort, and to the effectiveness of that effort in Oklahoma.

I am also proud of the officers and men of all the Armed Forces units who planned and executed the exercises of last Saturday so admirably. They are all a credit to the uniforms which they wear.

Porter Hedge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the farmer has lost a good and true friend. Members who knew Porter Hedge will share with farmers everywhere the loss of one of agriculture's most articulate and well-informed voices.

Many of us knew of his ill health, but we were poorly prepared to learn of his passing Saturday last in the Arlington, Va., hospital.

Porter Hedge, who was a native of Iowa, was graduated in agricultural journalism and achieved a notable career in newspaper work in Iowa and in Texas. He was the author of the widely read book on agriculture, "The Fifth Plate."

At the time of his passing, Porter Hedge was associate editor of the Washington Farmletter, reviewing the field of farming and the activities of Federal agencies. His knowledge of agriculture and the laws pertaining to farming was remarkable. His able pen put into layman's language the intricate rules and administrative directives issued from Washington. His analysis of commodity programs assisted farmers of the Nation to plan their planting programs to best stabilize their business operations.

While Porter Hedge wrote on all aspects of agriculture, soybean growers will perhaps miss him most, for he was widely acquainted throughout the soybean industry and his columns on the soybean situation reached most of the commercial soybean growers of the belt.

But, Porter Hedge will be remembered most because of his integrity and his pleasant approach to all matters. He was a fine man and a devoted friend to agriculture. In a time when farmers need friends who can tell their story, they have lost one of the very best.

Slater High School Commencement Address, May 17, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the commencement exercises of Slater High School on May 17, 1960:

Reverend Byers, Reverend Hellwege, Dr. Gamby, Mr. Grubb, class of 1960, ladies and gentlemen, we all regret the death of Mr. Kendrick's mother and his unavoidable absence on this occasion and extend our deepest sympathy in his bereavement.

Your selection and invitation for me to be your speaker is a great honor to me and I hope I can justify your choice of a speaker by informative words which you will enjoy and always remember.

It has been said that new and important occasions teach new duties. Therefore I believe it to be my duty to discuss a few very important subjects with you this evening. First, I want to talk to you about the importance of government or politics—mind you, not Republican and not Democratic—but simply politics as the science or method by which all governments, big and little, are created and maintained throughout the world.

In this world in which we live today there is no subject which should have more interest and attention. And the subject of government should be particularly important to the young people who are now graduating not only from high school, but graduating soon into mature citizenship and full share of responsibility to the preservation of our great Nation.

If a nation values anything more than freedom and good government, it will lose its freedom and self-government; and the irony of it is, that if it is easy comfort or money that it values more, then it will lose that too.

Our priceless form of government was fashioned, in all of its ingenious complexity, to preserve to the very fullest extent possible the freedom and security of each individual citizen. This was the goal; this was the objective of those brave and thoughtful men who drafted the Declaration of Independence and adopted the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States. That was the goal of our forefathers; that was the purpose of their documentary handiwork; that was the heritage which they handed down to us.

Among the great and noble men who established our form of government was Thomas Jefferson who wrote the Declaration of Independence. You will always remember his historical words:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men * * *."

Then, almost 96 years ago, that great immortal Abraham Lincoln, standing on the site of one of the great battles of the Civil War, said this:

"Four score and 7 years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure."

There were times in the past history of mankind when the problems of all governments were extremely simple, when the citizen of any government expected no more of it than the protection of life and property. That was a long time ago.

As the centuries have rolled by, governments have materially changed. Leaving their simple character of early days, they have constantly become more and more complicated organizations as they have undertaken to perform added services and make greater requirements of the individual citizen.

Thus it came about that government has its hands upon all of us in some way from the moment we are born until the last rites when our mortal remains are whisked off to the cemetery.

If the influence of government is all persuasive in our lives as I have said it to be, then there can be little hesitation upon the part of any citizen, man or woman, about the necessity for his or her active participation in civic and political affairs.

In a word, it behooves every citizen to actively participate in civic and political affairs. And again I reiterate and emphasize that I do not recommend that you necessarily have to make politics a personal career nor do I suggest that it is necessary for you to seek public office in order to participate in government or political affairs. By the use of the word "politics," I am referring to the unbiased and serious study and discussion of the governmental issues and the exercise of your leadership and influence on those issues.

The United States, though but 194 years old, has lived through three epochs and is now at the threshold of the fourth. The three epochs that have passed into history are: (1) Independence; (2) enfranchisement; (3) unification. Today we are confronted with many serious problems and issues. The time allotted to me as your speaker this evening is insufficient to discuss all of these problems and issues. But I will mention a few which are vitally important to every man, woman and child.

Our military preparedness programs are essential but the present annual cost or expenditures for this purpose, plus the mutual security and other so-called foreign aid programs are endangering our national economy via inflation and a national debt larger than all other nations combined. This is a very serious problem.

Then we have the problem of inflation and high cost of living affecting millions of our citizens with stationary or retirement incomes; the problems of agriculture, so important to our national economy; the problems of taxation and Federal aid to education. There are many other important State and National problems which you must think about and help in solving by participating in political and civic affairs of your community and our country.

Bear this fact in mind—the American people are currently in the throes of tormenting and frustrating readjustment. Both as a nation and as individuals we grew up accustomed to regard war and peace as distinctly separate states of affairs like day and night. But, today we live in an around-the-clock twilight of neither war nor peace.

Youth is the first victim of war: the first fruit of peace. It takes many years to make a man: it takes only a few seconds of war to destroy him.

Too much is being spent by all nations today in fear of war. Sixty-five percent of every Federal tax dollar collected in our country each year in a so-called peace period is spent on military affairs. If these resources were turned to peaceful uses, many, many more of the world's problems could be more easily solved.

Once upon a time, we led the world, we, Americans, towards a lighted window, and, I think this is important and certainly before we spend any more billions trying to buy collective security, we owe ourselves this backward glance. From 1789, until World War I, all other nations on planet earth were totalitarian except the United States. Did you ever stop to realize this?

In 1789 we were a little country of 3 million people completely surrounded by an ocean of totalitarianism. Everywhere else kings claimed to rule by divine right, others ruled with military might, but we alone ruled ourselves. What happened? Suddenly, the rest of the world watching our experiment in individual liberty and self-government began to copy us. Statesmen and writers visited the United States and returned home with glowing reports and the urge for freedom began to spread like a prairie fire across whole continents. The French threw off the yoke of their dissolute king and repacious aristocracy. England initiated sweeping democratic reforms. Mexico, and Central America and South America freed themselves from Spain.

From 1789 until the full World War I broke out, democracy was spreading around the world. How come? Our Nation had not given the old nations any money. We had sent forth no paid propagandists. We'd beamed no broadcasts beyond our neighbor's borders. We hadn't sent any experts overseas to show them how. We sent them no guns, no butter, no money. We made no concessions to foreigners which would penalize domestic producers. Our new Nation didn't insist on any mutual defense agreements. And, yet, though we ignored them, the older nations began to imitate our example and freedom was the world's dynamic, expanding force prior to 1914, and when the German dynasty collapsed in 1917, the Russian's in 1918, the last strongholds of despotism had fallen.

But now what? Suddenly democracy began to take itself for granted. Communism, fascism, nazism—these became the world's dynamic political forces. We shot two, but we failed to follow through, and since World War II, communism has captured approximately 100 million new disciples every year. Our better product has been left unsold because they have a better sales technique; because, instead of trying to lead other nations as our gallant 3 million forefathers did, we've been trying to push them. Our Declaration of Independence has been supplanted with half a hundred declarations of dependence on others and so, failing to command respect, we try to buy it.

Times have changed? No, times haven't changed. We have changed. For all our grandeur and our gold, we win fewer converts to democracy today than our great granddaddies did with nothing but a light in the window.

I remember August 1945, when suddenly a weapon 400 million times more lethal than anything ever before had been loosed on the world—we sat down in our councils of men chewing our fingernails up past the second knuckle worrying about what we are going to do with this hideous weapon that suddenly had been loosed upon us.

Even today, there are some who would say we should bury it in a cave in New Mexico or, in concert with other nations, destroy this technological advantage. In World War III, God forbid it should ever be, they're going to outnumber us 8 to 3 and I mean even if all our frightened friends stick with us, the Soviets and their satellites are going to outnumber us better than 2 to 1.

We need Will Rogers with us today and I imagine he would say:

"Folks, I guess I ought to come back. Wyatt Earp is back and Matt Dilion and Bat Masterson and a lot of others.

"Do you know why folks nowadays like TV westerns? I'll tell you why. We've got so we can't do much for ourselves, anymore, so we like to watch somebody who could.

"Then a man could solve all his problems with a gun and a horse; today he needs radar, sonar, and an IBM machine.

"We had spacemen, though, back yonder. Cowboys ridin' herd on a quiet night in the middle of the prairie with all the heavens hung out above 'em. A cowboy could pick a star or the moon and go to it anytime he wanted. Must have gone to the moon a hundred times, sometimes twice a night.

"Then we went on those space flights for fun. Today you go on the run, scared. Little wonder. Some radio stations today make more noise just introducing a newscast than we did gettin' out the Claremore fire department. News ain't news, anymore. It's a round-the-clock warning.

"Why, you got a generation of parents scared of their own kids. Maybe it happened when you all moved to town. Men build great cities, but cities don't build great men.

"How many boys nowadays have seen a crop come on—and helped harvest it? How many boys know what it is to raise pigeons, to hear a screech owl at night, to be butted by a goat and 'rassle' a calf—that a 'possum can gnaw out of a wood box and be gone in the morning? That you don't have to sow weeds; you just put down the hoe and they'll choke out the flowers.

"How many boys know what nature always does to a coward or a loafer or a thief?

"The big city makes a man think he's boss—but he's not. That's why the Bible was written by farmers and shepherds and fishermen.

"Also, I figure this juvenile mischief was partly brought on by the safety razor and the electric shaver.

"So, 2 years in a row you had to go back to the one State of Mississippi to get yourself a beauty queen. You know, I remember once back in Claremore we had a beauty contest and nobody won. Nobody even came in second. A traveling man came in third and he wasn't even in the contest.

"So you took in Alaska and Hawaii? I'll say you did. Now they gotta kick into the Federal oversea kitty and provide asylum for their own old used Congressmen. Instead of askin' to be States, Alaska and Hawaii might a done better by askin' to make 'em full fledged foreign countries instead.

"Why did I leave this earth 'before my time,' as so many of you kind folks have said? I don't know. A fellow has something to do and he does it. He has something to say and he says it. After awhile there are new things to do and new people to do them, new things to say and new people to say them.

"The old fellow is from a different age and new people don't understand him. He is the 'old man around the house' who always wants to give advice. A man is seldom old enough to be a philosopher until he has looked into the eyes of his grandchild, and then he is so full of compassion and has so many warnings that the young'uns don't like to listen. A man had better do what he can and say what he has to say while he has people his own age to listen."

And then Will Rogers would probably say:

"My time's up. Thanks for lettin' me drop in like this. Now it's your turn. So long."

Well, at least Will Rogers was spared the indignity of TV. I got along so well for many years with radio that I kind of resent this TV stepchild in our midst. Also I seemed to have timed things so badly. Television was on the way in at the same time my hair was on the way out. But as some of you can attest, there's one thing about being bald—it's neat.

I keep remembering the old Mack Sennett comedies where the culprit chased by the policeman would point and say, "He went that-a-way." The policeman would tear off down the street after nobody and the thief would stroll home with the loot. We are chasing Russia and Russia is pointing at the moon and saying "That-a-way." While Russia prepares to pick up the marbles on planet Earth.

Soviet cars are now moving into U.S. markets. Khrushchev has declared economic war on us and when we strengthen his economy we're helping him win that war. Ten thousand Russian-made Moscovitch sedans have been ordered delivered in Syracuse, N.Y., where a dealer wants to sell them in the United States. But Congress is debating the space race and who will get first to Mars. Some of us are getting ulcers on our ulcers worrying that Russia might get to Mars before we do and the Russians have already landed in Syracuse.

Don't think the Soviet press wasn't delighted when that announcement was forthcoming. All 16 of Moscow's newspapers headlined the fact that "Soviet technical achievements are now such that Americans are having to buy Russian-made cars." In an economic war they construe this to be an American retreat.

Back in Washington military men are being called on the congressional carpet, confronted with the evidence that the Soviets are winning the space race and asked, "Why?" The result is almost certain to be an increased military budget, not because it makes sense, but because it will silence congressional critics in election year. Military men challenged, a military budget, military objectives, and we're not fighting a military war. We are engaged in an economic war, and we're not winning it.

In buying cars from the Soviets we are in effect supplying weapons to the enemy—inviting mass unemployment in the American automobile industry. Cheap foreign labor plus government subsidies have been enabling other countries to build 2,000-mile-an-hour jet airliners now, and we're not.

American manufacturers cannot afford to compete. The Russian and British Governments give tax dollars to the plane makers. CAB says unless our Government now subsidizes our plane makers, American airlines might be buying airliners from Russia in 5 years. I wonder if it isn't time for us to tend now to our homefront economy to keep us strong, to defend us against invasion from without and to think twice about hurling 100 missiles at the sky while Russia carefully tests only two.

I cannot help feeling—and I hope others will realize it—that our teachers in truth are our first line of national defense. In fact, they always have been, but we have never talked about it enough. Our schoolteachers, who are so grossly underpaid, are the quiet force in this country that molds our most precious resource—our children. The full impact of the valuable service teachers give to the people of this country and its future, in a sense, ultimately guides the destiny of the free world. I earnestly hope, in the near future, that we can find a

way to provide for our school systems the additional Federal financial support which they so urgently need.

During the present period of world strife and tension in international affairs and in the future, you of the class of 1960 will play an important part in preserving our democracy and American way of life. You will be called upon as an American citizen to exercise your influence to keep and preserve our democracy and form of government and the liberties which we American people now enjoy.

I recall my graduation from high school as the proudest occasion of my life, and I know that this evening you are affected with a deep feeling of nostalgia; memories of your school days, teachers, and friends. Nothing is so delicate as friendship and yet, nothing is so durable, so necessary, so pleasant, so inspiring, and so profitable as fond lasting memories and friendships.

But your graduation today is not a day for looking back. You have not traversed enough of life's path for that. This is a proud day for looking forward to the future.

High school graduation is indeed one of the major milestones in the journey through life. It symbolizes the transition from a period of youthful preparation to a lifetime of adult service and citizenship.

Even so, I am confident that you will regard this as a beginning, and not an ending, of your quest for knowledge and experience, and that you will apply your talents and energies to the development of a finer and better America for the future.

You are now facing one of the first really big decisions of your life. You must decide whether or not you will go on from high school to college. With the possible exception of choosing your future vocation or a husband or wife, this decision will probably have as far-reaching effect upon your life as any other decision you will ever make. Whether you realize it or not, the pattern of your life for the next 50 years may be determined by your answer to this question.

The question of whether or not you should seek a college education is for you to decide, with guidance from your parents, teachers, and older friends who have been through the mill of college. Don't plan your future education without examining all available sources of education. Don't decide hurriedly. Don't be swayed or influenced by such factors as whether or not your best friend is going to a certain college with you.

It is true that a college education is now considered as important as a high school education 50 years ago. However, many of the best thinkers on the subject today believe that even though it is essential for nearly everyone to complete high school, it is not necessarily essential for every young person to complete college. Probably a 2-year or junior college plan will be desirable for many high school graduates. However, a student who plans to enter a profession or special fields or arts, science, or executive administrative work will be compelled to attend college from 4 to 8 years.

The American creed that all men are created equal is not exactly true. What is actually meant is that before God, before the law, and before our fellow men we all start equal, and there is equal opportunity for all who have the talent, the ambition, the courage, and personality to use that opportunity.

But, we should always bear in mind that opportunities are not always in faraway lands. For most people it can be found at home, or in their own community, country, or State.

I am sure that you have heard the story of the man who, in his youth, constantly dreamed and was determined to become rich and successful by exploring and discovering diamond mines. He left his farm home and traveled throughout the world—working and toiling in his efforts to discover a diamond mine. Finally, in his old age, he returned back to his old home—sad and disillusioned. He resumed his farm operations on the old farm and one day while in his own backyard digging a well, he uncovered the greatest diamond mine ever discovered.

And so, in the battle of life, you can never be assured of the exact course one should travel for the location of financial success. But, above all financial success one may obtain in life, the most important success is happiness and contentment, and that success can never be achieved without honesty and faith.

Shakespeare said:

"This above all; to thine own self be true, and it must follow, as the night the day, thou canst not be false to any man."

No better advice can be found for the young men of this class than the advice given to Andrew Jackson by his beloved mother. When Andrew Jackson left his mother in North Carolina as a boy to seek his fortune in the West, he knew he probably would never see her again. After the Battle of New Orleans, this great man told his comrades:

"Gentlemen, how I wish she could have lived to see this day. There was never a woman like her. She was gentle as a dove and brave as a lioness. Almost her last words to me when about to start for Charleston on the errand of mercy that cost her life were: 'Andrew, if I should not see you again I wish you to remember and treasure up some things I have already said to you: In this world you will have to make your own way. To do that you must have friends. You can make friends by being honest, and you can keep them by being steadfast. You must keep in mind that friends worth having will in the long run expect as much from you as they give to you. To forget an obligation or be ungrateful for a kindness is a base crime—not merely a fault or a sin, but an actual crime. Men guilty of it sooner or later must suffer the penalty. In personal conduct be always polite, but never obsequious. No one will respect you more than you esteem yourself. Avoid quarrels as long as you can without yielding to imposition. But sustain your manhood always. Never bring a suit of law for assault and battery or for defamation. The law affords no remedy for such outrages that can satisfy the feelings of a true man. Never wound the feelings of others. Never brook wanton outrage upon your own feelings. If ever you have to vindicate your feelings or defend your honor, do it calmly. If angry at first, wait till your wrath cools before you proceed.' Gentlemen, her last words have been the law of my life. The memory of my mother and her teachings were after all the only capital I had to start in life with, and on that capital I have made my way."

And to the young ladies of this class of 1960; I hope you will always remember that in whatever role your lives may be cast, whether as homemakers, in the professions, the business world, or in religion, real success, and happiness will depend far more on character than on any other single element you count among your resources. Character is a thing of many facets. In women, as in men, it means integrity, strength, courage, consideration for others, ability to discern, and appreciate what is worth while, and to pursue it in spite of every distraction and every obstacle.

In addition, in woman, it implies the development and enrichment of qualities that are her special God-given gifts—namely, gentleness, graciousness, and the capacity for unselfish, and yes, at times even heroic, dedication.

I commend the faculty for their great work in this school and I join with each member of the graduating class in expressing appreciation to your proud parents and all others who provided for and made this high school graduation possible for you to achieve.

And I sincerely congratulate every one of you, the Slater High School class of 1960: Barbara Ackelberry, Emma Aldridge, Edna Baker, Jo Ann Bearden, Bobby Black, Betty Bock, Eldred Borgman, Larry Bossaller, Beverly Butts, Gay Byers, Catherine Coleman, Larry Cott, Wayne Cott, James Elliott, Jo Ann Feuers, Craig Gann, Everett L. Gilliam, Gladys Hader, LeRoy Hager, Birdie Hamilton, Lois Harris, Melody Ann Harriss, Brenda Herrmann, Kathleen Hogan, Nancy Huston, Corinthian Jaco, Jim Klasing, Sally Martin, Carol Ritterbusch McFarland, Edward McMellen, John Miles, Doris Murphy, Edward Narron, Geary Norris, Anna Lee Norton, Wayne Ruppert, Audrey Shepard, Sherry Shook, Charles Smith, Terry Ann Taylor, Linn Van Winkle, Michael Walker, George Washington, Dickie Wise, Elizabeth Wykoff, and James Young.

With all good wishes for your happiness and success throughout life.

Air Transport Progress Is Discussed by Stuart Tipton at Morgantown, W. Va., Chamber of Commerce 40th Anniversary Event

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, last night at Morgantown, W. Va., the chamber of commerce of that city held its annual dinner meeting in celebration of its 40th anniversary.

It was my privilege to have been a participant in the program in which Gov. Cecil H. Underwood and Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS made brief remarks.

The event, for which President Robert B. Creel ably served as toastmaster, was built principally around the theme of airport expansion and development and the importance of air transport to commerce, industry, educational progress, and community betterment.

To develop and discuss the topic, the organization appropriately had as guest speaker, Stuart G. Tipton, president of the Air Transport Association of America, with whom I have had a most pleasant relationship which dates back to my 14 years of service in the House of Representatives during the 1930's and 1940's.

Stuart Tipton was one of the men in government who was active in the drafting of legislation which culminated in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. He later served in the agency, and still later became associated with the organization he now leads, composed of 49 air carriers employing 120,000 men and women.

Mr. Tipton congratulated the Morgantown Chamber of Commerce on its 40th anniversary and noted that the Air Transport Association is having its 25th anniversary this year. He competently developed the story of the quarter of a century of progress by the air transport system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD extracts from Mr. Tipton's address.

There being no objection, extracts of the address were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRACTS OF ADDRESS BY STUART TIPTON

It was just 25 years ago that the airlines got together and formed the Air Transport Association. That was the beginning of the creation of an air transport system. There were airlines operating before 1936, of course, but they were operating in a highly individualistic manner. The common ground of a trade, and service, organization, permitted the airlines to offer the public a truly integrated network of transportation.

That network is still the backbone of the Nation's air transportation.

I'd like to tell you a little about this network because it has a direct application to Morgantown, and indeed, every city in the United States.

The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 established certain guidelines for the Nation's airlines. The act said that the airlines were to serve the Nation's domestic and international commerce; the post office; and the national defense.

As part of this mandate, the airlines were certificated by the newly formed Civil Aeronautics Administration in 1938. They were awarded certificates of convenience and necessity. Convenience: For the traveling and shipping public. Necessity: Because the Congress of the United States realized even in those fledgling days of air transportation that the future was in the air. And, if the United States was to take the leadership in air transportation, Government encouragement and Government leadership were vital.

This has been the result. The United States now has the finest, most efficient, system of air transport in the world.

But, all of the credit for this growth cannot be assigned to a single, Federal source.

It must be shared by the managements of the airlines, and by their employees, and by the investors who provided the private funds that permitted the carriers to invest in continually better aircraft.

But, it must also be shared by some 50 States of the Nation, and hundreds of municipalities.

I say this because it was the States, cities, and local communities that saw the air age approaching and set about to prepare for it. They did this by building airports.

I don't think I have to tell you that without airports, you don't have a system of air transportation. And if you didn't have a system of air transportation, here are some of the things you wouldn't have:

Almost 55 million passengers traveling by air, spending about $4 billion for food, lodging, entertainment, and other expenses, and about $2 billion for the air transportation.

Almost 2 billion letters sent to U.S. citizens throughout the Nation.

More than 650 million ton-miles of freight and express flown throughout the country, and to oversea destinations. And, perhaps more importantly, a fleet of 1,900 aircraft that are ready to support the defense effort in time of cold, or hot, war. Some of these aircraft—about 300—are in what is known as the civil reserve air fleet. These planes, and their crews, are frontline, modern, four-engined planes, ready on 36-hour notice to support the military anywhere in the world, carrying troops and critical supplies.

Other planes are part of WASP, the War Air Service Pattern. Their mission is to provide support to the military effort within the United States.

And, of course, all of the scheduled airlines would take a major role in the transportation of priority passengers on their regular routes and schedules during a crisis. It would be impossible for any transportation pattern to be devised that would not place primary reliance on air transport. Last year, for instance, 47 percent of all common carrier, intercity passenger-miles were handled by the commercial airlines.

Probably about this time, at the present rate of expansion, the total passenger-mile haul of the airlines is equal to the total of all intercity railroads and all buses.

Gen. Thomas D. White, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, in fact, said: "The importance of commercial air carriers and general aviation as elements of U.S. airpower has never been greater nor more influential than it is now."

But that's just one side of the contribution that the civil air transport system, and the civil airport system—and I can't emphasize that word system enough—make to the national defense.

Actually, the civil airport is an important link in the airpower chain. Here is how it works:

During World War II, about 430 airports were turned over to the military in the interest of the war effort. These fields had been designed, and built, from the ground up, to fulfill the needs of civil air commerce but the easy convertibility of peace to war needs made the transition smooth, and inexpensive.

And, today, 15 years after the end of hostilities, there are some 245 airports for which the Department of Defense has some military requirement. Just recently, the Air Force announced that it was considering plans for periodic or emergency dispersal of its B–47 bombers from military bases to civilian airports to help meet the growing Soviet missile threat."

The Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee also saw the overall value of the airport in terms of military preparedness. Last February, the committee pointed out that: Airports are not wholly local assets serving as vital and necessary links in the interstate flow of goods and passengers, in our foreign trade, in the discharge of Federal responsibility for the carriage of mail, and as active or standby facilities for military use." "Thus," the report went on, "in addition to the emergency value of civil airports, there is a day-to-day utilization of them by components of our Military Establishment."

And, I think you might be surprised to know that one out of every five landings or takeoffs at the Nation's civil airports is by a military plane.

The value, then, of airports in terms of the needs of the commercial airlines, and the national defense, is a dramatic, and visible, fact.

What is not as well known, perhaps because it is so well camouflaged into the routine fabric of community life, is the fact that the airport serves in other ways.

Take, for instance, that great and growing segment of activity known as general aviation.

The airlines operate less than 2,000 aircraft, the military about 37,000. General aviation—and by that I mean the private and company-owned aircraft—operates more than 70,000 planes.

Airports have provided an enormous stimulant to the postwar tendency to locate plants in smaller cities, and corporate aircraft have become flying offices—connecting the home factory, many miles away, with branch plants, subcontractors, and markets. Many corporations have established their own private airlines, in fact, and these are used in the main for trips to off-line airports. About 70 percent of the total passenger-miles of annual corporate flying is to these smaller airport cities.

The private pilot, and the student pilot, have a need for the airport because it provides the vital facilities—fuel, hangar space, trained mechanical personnel—that they must have. Some 400,000 men and women hold private pilot licenses. They are the nucleus of the Nation's reserve air strength, and the Civil Air Patrol.

It is not generally known that the airport is a tremendous asset to the farmer. In 46 States, farmer operators annually fly some 800,000 hours doing farm chores, such as spraying, seeding, dusting, surveying, checking crops, counting wild ducks, shooting coyotes, and fertilizing. Almost three-fourths of the Nation's airports sustain some portion of agricultural acitivity.

The airport today, then, is a key link in a circle of industrial and community development.

I have chosen "circle" as a description because it is more appropriate to the actual sequence of development than the analogy of the "chain."

Let's look at the circle. If you have an airport that is not up to date, that cannot adequately service all users, and I mean, of course, the private, the business, the corporate aircraft, as well as the commercial airline, then you will not be able to attract these users.

And, if you do not attract these users, the firms who are out scouting for new plant locations, will pass by your city, and look for one that can accommodate their aircraft.

If the plant scouts overlook your city, industrial development will lag and the need for commercial airline service that follows industrial development, with all of its attendant activity in terms of freight, passengers, and mail, will not materialize, and the airlines, too, will look for those cities that can produce the necessary amount of traffic.

Along about this time, you might find yourself like Goldsmith's "Deserted Village," where "village statesmen talked with looks profound—and news much older than their ale went round."

In brief, a community without an adequate airport in these days of air commerce, finds itself severely handicapped. It lacks that basic tool for getting, and doing business. As Gen. James Doolittle said: "A city's economic health depends to a considerable degree on its ability to accommodate aircraft efficiently and safely."

The modern-day ambitious city must grab that circle of development. And the place to grab hold is right at the threshold at the airport.

Let me bring this image into a little sharper focus and take a closer look at the Morgantown Airport.

As I understand it, the city council has decided to submit a $790,000 airport improvement bond issue to the voters at a city election on June 7. This represents the first opportunity that voters will have had to vote on a bond issue to improve the airport.

Several times during the past 10 years, your city leaders have applied for, and received, matching funds from the Federal Government. But Morgantown was unable to meet the Federal appropriation on the required 50–50 basis.

What this has meant, of course, is that needed improvements have not been made at the airport, and its facilities are just about what they were about 20 years ago when the first scheduled airline service was introduced.

As some of the forward-looking leaders in your city have pointed out, you have, in effect, stood still in this era. But as you know, transportation does not stand still. The picture has changed. I'm told that railroad passenger service is no longer available at your city. Bus service has changed

only slightly. The highway network in and around the Morgantown area is inadequate.

So, your future, as well as that of any city, of any size, is in the air.

But, let's do a little arithmetic on the problem of the airport improvement. Let's see what you get for your investment.

Last year, for instance, there were an estimated 75 persons earning their living in Morgantown in the aviation fields. Their total payroll was close to $350,000. And, more than half of the people were located at the airport itself.

Well, I've been talking in overall terms about the value of air transportation, now what does all this mean to Morgantown? It means this: Almost three-quarters of a million dollars a year.

Here's how it adds up. Last year, almost 10,000 persons came to Morgantown by air, most of them via commercial air transport. Their average stay was 3 days, and their average expenditure was $25 a day. The total for the year: three-quarters of a million dollars.

But the bond issue only calls for $790,000. Therefore, in the first year alone, your community will get back almost its entire investment.

And, of course, that return doesn't come back in chunks to a few; it spreads throughout the whole community—to hotels, and restaurants, and their suppliers; the retail stores, the local transit lines, the banks, the drugstores, and every kind of service and supply.

These figures are based on the "old" airport. A new airport, with adequate runway lengths, with more and better facilities for attracting the private pilot, the corporate plane, the commercial airliner, will add greatly to the return on the investment.

I can't imagine a better buy for the money.

But, looking at it from another point of view, suppose the airport is not improved. The impending sale of the Morgantown Ordnance Works brings the area to the doorstep of a potentially tremendous industrial expansion.

This expansion can only come about if you have a good "sky harbor"—available for industry and its ever-expanding and important labor force.

Also, consider the responsibility you have to the present industries and firms which are already here, and operating.

In order for them to compete with rival industries throughout the country, they, too, must have adequate air service, and an airport that can match that service.

A new hospital is going up at the university medical center. Much of the success of this new addition will depend upon the ease of transportation for the patients, visitors, medical specialists, staff, and critical supplies from Morgantown, to all parts of West Virginia.

But, this is the air age, and Morgantown, or Wheeling or any city in any State is not an entity, separate unto itself.

It is important, even essential, for instance, to Pittsburgh, that Morgantown have a modern airport because there are letters and express shipments, passengers, and freight, in Pittsburgh that are destined to be flown to Morgantown.

How many letters, how many passengers, how much freight is delivered, and how frequently, from just this one point depends upon what Morgantown is doing to improve its air facility: the airport.

This concept, really, is the heart of the Federal system of airports and it is why the Government does appropriate funds for airports throughout the country.

The Congress has passed, over the years, various pieces of legislation, and for varying amounts, to the end that this system would be strengthened.

They have had faith in the future of Morgantown as an important center of commerce. That's why, through the Federal Aviation Agency, funds are made available for the development, and improvement of your airport, and others.

They're described, as I said earlier, as "matching funds." What is needed, it seems to me, is for "matching faith" on the part of the Morgantown area residents who share the Government's optimism, as well as respect, for the potential of this city.

West Virginians can be well assured that they are being represented by legislators who understand the meaning of, and will work toward, the full realization of industrial and community development that the air age can bring.

Gen. Edward P. Curtis summed up what this means for all of us several years ago when he told President Eisenhower in a special report:

"The United States is becoming more and more an air community. During the last several years our national strategy has come to rest essentially upon airpower in its widening manifestations. The industrial skills devoted to air technologies now comprise the largest single pool of employment in manufacturing. The airplane has become the prime mover of our population in its circulation over distances of 200 miles. These developments are changing the American way of life, our habits of work, our national outlook. If they are given room to follow their logical evolutions they may well provide the principal sustaining elements to our social and economic well being as well as our national strength, for years to come."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in my remarks in introducing Mr. Tipton, I declared that West Virginia cities need better airlines service and suggested that there is a case pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board which could be most helpful to our State and its citizens, namely, the so-called Great Lakes Local Service case on which the Board should reach a decision, inasmuch as it has been processing the matter for more than 3 years.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed following these remarks, and at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, further excerpts from my talk at the chamber of commerce meeting.

There being no objection, excerpts from Senator RANDOLPH'S remarks were ordered printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

EXTRACTS OF REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, AT MORGANTOWN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE DINNER MEETING, MORGANTOWN, W. VA.

The CAB, by other decisions in recent years, has established a pattern of strengthening local service carriers, ether by substituting them for larger trunklines in smaller and medium-size cities, or by decertifying long-haul airlines at points where the feeder carriers have already been serving in conjunction with the bigger companies.

The purpose of these air traffic pattern changes has been to improve schedule frequency, and, at the same time, reduce the subsidy of the local carriers. The CAB has applied this program to dozens of cities, and it is significant that, although some communities raised questions at the time the issue was posed, I know of none which objected after the alteration in service was instituted.

The Civil Aeronautics Board, following receipt of the examiner's report last September, has had more than 7 months to reach a decision in the Great Lakes Local Service case which could be the means for real improvement in air traffic for numerous communities of West Virginia and other nearby States.

Frequency of service, and increased aircraft departures and enplaned passengers, are vital to our State. It has been the experience of other States and areas that frequency of departures and passenger increases have been stepped up as much as threefold after the changeover to local carrier service has been accomplished.

Then, too, new and expanded air transport service will aid in the industrial development of West Virginia.

It is appropriate, however, that I speak of the splendid service which has been provided to our State and its citizens by both trunklines and local carriers during the pioneering and transition period in which the pattern of airline service has been changing. I mention especially the American, Capital, Eastern, Trans World, Allegheny, and Piedmont Airlines.

I emphasize that it has been almost 8 months since a Civil Aeronautics Board examiner, after more than 3 years of investigations, made recommendations to the Board.

I do not imply any prejudice as to how the CAB should rule in deciding the case, but it does seem unreasonable that the Board should further delay a formal ruling which I hope would be consistent with the pattern it has established for other areas in recent years. Such a decision is vital to a number of West Virginia communities, especially those which presently experience too-infrequent aircraft arrivals and departures, such as Morgantown, Clarksburg-Fairmont, Elkins, Wheeling, Parkersburg, Huntington, Beckley, and Bluefield. Any decision improving local service schedules likewise would benefit aerial intercourse between these communities and the Capital City at Charleston, a trunkline airport city.

Recently, I addressed the members of the CAB and brought to their attention a special study which shows the remarkable increase in schedules and traffic enplaned at a number of typical cities in the year immediately following replacement of a trunkline by a local carrier, or suspension of a trunkline where a local carrier was already operating.

It was noted, for example, that at Bristol, Va., a trunkline company had 4,559 aircraft departures the year prior to August 25, 1952, whereas its successor on that date—a local service airline presently serving West Virginia—had 6,605 aircraft departures during its first year of operations at that airport following the August 25, 1952 trunkline-to-local service changeover. The trunkline had served 19,195 passengers the year prior to that date, whereas the local service airline successor served 29,416 passengers its first year at Bristol.

At Mansfield, Ohio, where another local service airline which figures in the case presently pending before the CAB replaced a trunkline had only 658 aircraft departures the year prior to April 15, 1953. But the local carrier successor had 2,332 aircraft departures its first year in service at Mansfield following that changeover date. Enplaned passengers increased from the 2,961 served the last year by the trunkline to 4,444 served by the local service airline its first year at Mansfield.

Equally significant changes could, and probably would, occur at the Morgantown, Clarksburg-Fairmont, Elkins, Wheeling, Parkersburg, Huntington, and other airports in West Virginia if the case pending before the CAB for so long could now be expedited and implemented.